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ABSTRACT OF THESIS

The Spanish Magdalene and Martha lives in MS Escorial h.I.13 are translations of Old French texts represented by MSS C and F respectively, and not of any other Latin or French source. The C French and D Franco-Provençal versions of the Magdalene life are independent translations of the Latin B text, and the F and C5 French versions of the Martha life are independently executed versions of the Latin E text. There are, however, some puzzling affinities between the Latin and Spanish texts.

The shorter Latin Magdalene life A is the original version, which was elaborated to form the longer Latin life B. The C French translation is shorter than B, but its source is the longer B rather than the shorter A text, the differences between original and translation being explained by the adaptive translation process. Comparison between the more complete D translation and the simplifying C text shows that the two versions C and D were intended for very different uses.

The two French Martha translations F and C5 are from Latin originals much closer to the E Latin text than to the Sanctuarium. F is a simplifying translation, intended, like the C Magdalene text, for oral delivery, while C5 is a more complete rendering, intended for private reading by aristocratic ladies.

The Spanish MS could not have contained complete translations of both the Magdalene and the Martha lives, since the missing four folios would not have been sufficient for the material involved. The distribution of non-standard linguistic features shows that the two Spanish texts are the work of two different translators. The Spanish translations are both, in general, accurately and competently executed, but the differing numbers of errors, additions, omissions and changes in each confirms that they are the work of two different translators.
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PREFACE

Some of the texts used in this study have already been edited: the Pilgrim episode of MS B is reproduced in Bolland. Catal. Paris. III, Supplem. I, 525-530; the Penance and Death episode appears in Faillon 1848, II, cols 433-436 and 445-451; the Magdalene life of MS C5 is edited by Shore 1979; the Spanish Magdalene and Martha texts have been edited by Ruggieri 1933, 191-204 and by Michel 1930; and the text of MS D is reproduced by Stimm 1955, 44-59. The remaining MS material has not, to my knowledge, been edited before.

The question of the sources of the French and Spanish translations has also been discussed in previous studies: Knust 1890, 82ff gives the Speculum Historiale as the source of both Spanish lives; Meyer, in several obiter dicta, mentions that the Magdalene lives of MSS C3 and C4 are very similar to that of MS D (NE 34(ii) (1895), 83); that the Magdalene life of MS C5 is a translation of that of MS B (NE 35(ii) (1897), 491-492); that the Martha life in MS C5 is a translation of a Latin text related to the Sanctuarium (NE 35(ii) (1897), 500-505); that the Latin original for the Magdalene lives in MSS C1 and C2 is MS B (HLF 33 (1906), 404); and that the Franco-Provençal Magdalene life of MS D may be a translation from the C French version (HLF 33 (1906), 445 note 1). Michel hesitates between claiming Latin and French sources for the Spanish texts (Michel 1930, lxxxii-iii), and is unaware of the existence of the F Martha life, instead comparing the Spanish text with the C5 Martha life (Michel 1930, lxxxiv). Elsewhere she excludes any extant texts as the sources of the Spanish lives (Michel 1930, cii). Ruggieri 1933, 189-204 suggests that the Spanish lives are derived from the Speculum Historiale, but with an admixture of the Legenda Aurea, and via an unspecified French version. Hansel 1936, 261-272 corrects Ruggieri's errors, pointing out that certain Latin MSS of my A and B groups are closer than the Speculum Historiale or the Legenda Aurea to the Spanish Magdalene life, but that the A texts are too short,
while the B texts are too long, to be the Spaniard's source. Stimm 1955, 157-165 established that the source of Franco-Provençal D Magdalene version was a Latin text resembling MSS B and B2. As recently as 1979, Shore was not certain which Latin source was used by the C Magdalene French translator (Shore 1979, 28-36), and even suggested that part of the Latin source of C may have been first translated from the vernacular into Latin (Shore 1979, 62).

Thus, although after some initial bad errors, certain of the translators' sources have been identified, the overall relationships between the texts remain unclear.

The question of the translators' treatment of their originals has received little attention: Meyer remarks (HLF 33 (1906), 378) that there are two general types of French translators of saints' lives in prose: the adapting translator and the faithful translator. Shore 1979, 28-36 devotes a short section to the question, concluding that the C French Magdalene life is a faithful, rather than an adaptive, translation. This judgement is not borne out by the detailed examination of the C translation in my chapter IV.

The stage reached by studies of the Magdalene and Martha lives is aptly summed up by Hansel 1936, 268: 'Die Frage, ob der kastilische Text unmittelbar auf eine lateinische Einzellegende ...oder auf eine französische Prosalegende als Zwischenstufe zurückgeht, kann erst nach näherer Prüfung der verschiedenen Lesarten entschieden werden'; and by Hansel 1936, 272: 'Die Frage, welche Fassung der Marthalegende der spanische Uebersetzer benutzt hat, kann ähnlich wie bei der Magdalenenlegende erst dann mit Sicherheit beantwortet werden, wenn das weitverbreitete Handschriftenmaterial gesichtet ist.'

The present study attempts to carry out this 'closer examination of the various versions' and 'sifting of the widely scattered MS material' advocated by Hansel.
The first task was to search for possible sources for the Spanish lives: very numerous MS catalogues were studied, several hundred MSS were examined, and the relevant texts were assembled and edited. The results are contained in volume II, together with summaries of the lives, and a brief history of the legends of the saints.

The next task was to try to establish the exact relationships between all the Latin, French and Spanish texts thus assembled. Since some aspects of the problem have been inconclusively studied for almost a century, it seemed desirable to resolve the question beyond any doubt; hence the exhaustive analyses in chapters I, II, III and V, which are intended to establish definitively which Latin and French texts were the antecedents of the two Spanish lives.

Only when the sources had been thus identified as closely as the extant texts allow, was it possible to examine the translation procedures used by the French and Spanish translators. An analysis of these procedures in the French texts, in chapters IV and VI, shows that the French sources of the Spanish lives are adaptive translations, probably intended for oral delivery to large audiences; comparison with other, more complete and accurate, translations of the same Latin versions shows more clearly this adaptation process, and indicates the type of public aimed at by each type of French text. The Spanish texts, studied in chapter VII, are fairly accurate renderings of their French originals. The widely differing numbers of non-Castilian linguistic features in each Spanish text shows that they are the work of two different translators, and this is confirmed by the different translation procedures observed in each text.
Chapter I: The Relationships between the Translations

Summary

Translations from Latin into the Romance vernaculars are generally oblique, variable and irreversible, and may involve simplification; on the other hand, translations from one Romance language into another are usually direct and literal. These facts allow us to identify initially the French texts used by the Spanish translators of the Magdalene and Martha lives, and to establish the exact relationships between the other related texts. The Spanish texts are also shown to agree in matters of detail with their putative French originals, to the exclusion of other French and Latin versions: they coincide in omitting material present in the Latin originals and in other French translations, and in adding material not present elsewhere; and certain features of the Spanish texts are only explicable in terms of a specific French intermediate stage in their derivation from the Latin original composition.

These relationships are not remarkable, and the close correspondences between the French originals and the Spanish translations need to be stated and illustrated in detail only because there are numerous cases where the Spanish translations coincide with the Latin texts, to the exclusion of the French versions. Most of these cases can be explained as coincidences, or by our possessing only inaccurate copies of the Spaniards' French originals or of the Spanish texts themselves; some, however, are difficult to explain in such terms, and may even indicate that the Spanish translators occasionally consulted Latin texts.
When Latin texts are translated into the Romance vernaculars, the translations are most often oblique, involving the procedures of transposition, modulation, equivalence and adaptation. Such translations are almost always variable, in that they are different each time a given Latin text is translated into, say, French; and they are irreversible, in that they would not produce the original Latin text if retranslated back into Latin.

By contrast, translations from one Romance language into another are usually direct, the commonest procedure being literal translation. Such translations are less variable than oblique renderings, and not as frequently irreversible.

The predominantly direct character of translations from one Romance language into another is simply explained: the source language and the target language can often use the same word-order and syntax; individual lexical items generally have a precise equivalent, often related etymologically; and there is usually little need for any adaptation or simplification during the translation process.

The oblique character of translations from Latin into Romance, which results in the variability of such renderings, is explained by several factors, related not only to the nature of the two languages involved, but also to external considerations:

(i) Certain features of Latin word-order and syntax have no parallel in Romance: Latin generally places a verb at the end of a clause or sentence, while in Romance this order is rare; there is no exact counterpart in Romance of such constructions as the 'ablative absolute', the 'connective relative', the 'accusative and infinitive', the biblical Latin initial 'Dixit et...', etc.; such constructions must therefore be translated obliquely, though this does not necessarily produce variable
translations, since there is often a standard rendering of such syntax: the ablative absolute will be translated by a temporal or a causal clause, the accusative and infinitive by noun clauses, etc. However, one feature of Latin syntax, the long and complex period with its extensive use of subordination and participles, cannot readily be translated intact, and must be divided up into a series of main clauses, with less use of subordination. Translators have a wide choice of alternatives in performing this task, and variability of translation is inevitably the result.

(ii) The history of the Romance languages demonstrates that Classical Latin words have often not passed into Romance, their place being taken by reflexes of Vulgar Latin terms, and by words from other sources (Celtic, Germanic, etc). In other cases, lexical items of Classical Latin have no equivalent at all in Romance, and need to be rendered by periphrases. In further cases, a Classical Latin term may be ambiguous (e.g. hospicio BL,19 may be either abstract or concrete), while the ambiguity cannot be continued in Romance. When different translators of a given Latin text come across such cases, they will rarely make identical choices among the various options available to them; they will thus produce variable translations.

(iii) Being a predominantly synthetic language, Latin can readily accommodate, by means of inflexions, complex combinations of lexical items (e.g. interioris hominis quam exterioris lumen BL,11); if these combinations were translated literally into the predominantly analytic Romance languages, the result would be verbose and cumbrous. Translators therefore have often to resort to oblique translation in such cases, and their choice of rendering can rarely be identical.

(iv) The very act of translation into Romance from Latin implies the need to produce a text for a public less well educated than a readership able to understand Latin. A
translator will therefore not only translate, but also adapt, explain, omit and simplify. No two translators will make the same changes in thus lowering the stylistic register; their translations will therefore be variable.

The fact that translations from one Romance language into another are most often direct and literal, while translations from Latin into Romance are oblique and variable, is very useful in establishing the exact relationships between the various translations of the Magdalene and Martha lives: if two French texts contain the same subject-matter, but differ from each other in details of word-order, syntax, lexis and degree and method of adaptation, then they are most likely to be independently executed translations of the same Latin text.

Thus the Magdalene French texts C and D are shown to be independent translations of the Latin text B; and the Martha French texts F and G are also shown to be the products of separate acts of translation from the Latin text E.

If a Spanish text closely resembles a French text, not only in subject-matter, but also in details of word-order, syntax and vocabulary, then the Spanish text must be a translation of that French text; it cannot be a translation of another French text (either extant or lost) resulting from a different act of translation from Latin, since the variability of such translations means that no two separate French translations can be very similar. Nor can the Spanish text be translated straight from Latin: the variability of translations from Latin into Romance means that no two independently executed translations from Latin could frequently coincide.

Thus the Spanish Magdalene text is shown to be a translation of the French text C, and not of D, not of the Latin text B, nor of any other text; and the Spanish Martha text is shown to be translated from the French
text F, and not from C5 nor from Latin E.

It is particularly important to establish these relationships beyond any doubt for three reasons:

(i) There are cases, discussed in detail in parts III and IV of this chapter, of agreement between the Spanish and Latin texts, to the exclusion of the French versions; these cases seem to contradict the relationships outlined above.

(ii) Meyer HLF 33 (1904), 445 note 1 has claimed that the Magdalene life in D, in Lyonnais, may be translated from northern French, and not from Latin.

(iii) Michel 1930, lxxxiv assumes that the source of the Sp Martha life is the French version in MS C5.

Examples are now given from the various versions of the Magdalene and Martha lives to illustrate the exact relationships between the texts, which are shown in the following diagrams:

Magdalene:

```
MS B (Latin) → MS C (French) → MS Sp (Spanish) → MS D (Lyonnais)
```
The correspondences between source and translation are analysed in detail in later chapters; here the object is to illustrate the overall relationships between the versions of each life by quoting typical examples, with references where appropriate to other cases which further confirm the relationships. The examples quoted in parts I and II below are of five types:

(i) Quotations which illustrate, on the one hand, the divergencies in word-order, syntax and lexis between a Latin text and separate French translations of it, and on the other hand, the close parallels between the translations from French into Spanish. The evidence of these cases is confirmed by:

(ii) Instances where the Spanish version and its putative French original agree in containing material not present in other texts;

(iii) Cases where an omission is common to the Spanish text and its putative French parent;

(iv) Cases where putative French source and Spanish translation agree in both containing an error or peculiarity;

(v) Features of the Spanish translations only explicable if we assume the source to be the putative French parent.
I Affinities between the French and Spanish Magdalene Texts

(1) Divergencies and affinities in word-order, syntax, lexis and adaptation

Bl,10 et illo qui cecus a nativitate linitis oculis
sputo dominico tam interioris hominis quam
exterioris lumen recepti

Cl,10 e avec celui avuglee qe nostre sires gueri par sa
salive

Sp1,10 e con aquel qiego que nuestro sennor Jesu Kristo
guerecio por su misericordia

D1,6 et saint Rustion, qui nasqet avoglos, cui nostre
sire Jhesu Crist rendet la lumneri del cors et de
l'arma, qant el li gluet los euz de sa saline

C and Sp agree almost exactly in simplifying and shortening
this biblical reference: the complex notion expressed by
interioris... exterioris is suppressed, and the action
expressed by linitis... dominico is made brief and concrete;
neither C nor Sp have the equivalent of a nativitate; and
gueri is paralleled by the closely related guarecio. Sp
misericordia is probably the mistake of a Spaniard who was
not familiar with the biblical allusion. D, on the other
hand, not only renders faithfully every item of the original,
it even adds information by naming the blind-man concerned.

Bl,19 qui eos hospicio exciperet
Cl,19 qui les herbergast
Sp1,20 quien los albergase
D1,15 qui los voucist albergier ne recivre en son ostel

hospicio here may have either an abstract meaning,
'hospitality', or a concrete meaning, 'house'; the
translator of D has recognized the ambiguity, and given
both meanings, as well as introducing the notion of
willingness. C has selected only one possible meaning,
which is translated into Spanish by an etymologically
related and visually similar term.
preerat has no counterpart in Romance, and is translated differently in D on the one hand, and in C and Sp on the other; provincie receives different treatment in D and in C and Sp; and the syntax of C and Sp deviates from that of B and D in replacing a relative by a main clause.

C and D have selected different renderings for sevitiam, which has not passed into Romance, and for perfidiam, which has passed only into Ibero-Romance porfia, with a complete change of meaning. Sp, however, has exactly the same interpretation as G, using visually similar and etymologically identical terms.

D is typically verbose here, but adheres closely to the spirit of B, while C and Sp agree closely in the terms used for lowering the stylistic register and bringing the event down to earth.
The semantic transition from 'easily' to 'soon' in C is a demonstration of variability; its duplication in C and Sp, but not in D, is a clear indication of the relationships between the texts.

There are clear visual, etymological and syntactic affinities between C and Sp when compared with B, of which C is an oblique translation, and with D, which is a different oblique translation of B.

The concise Latin construction clearly requires oblique translation, and C and D have made different choices in the various constructions available, and in the various possible translations of infelix. C and Sp, on the other hand, are very closely parallel.

D has retained the word-order of B, and has added li enfes; C, imitated by Sp, has inverted the Latin word-order, and has not made the addition in D.
The variability of translations from Latin is demonstrated not only by the different treatment in C and D of every lexical item of B, but also by the different syntax of each French version. C and Sp, on the other hand, are exactly parallel in both syntax and vocabulary.

B and D have the following logical order of events: (i) St Peter asks why the pilgrim has come to Palestine, (ii) St Peter sees the cross on the pilgrim's shoulder, so (iii) rejoices that the word of God is being taught in the land whence the pilgrim has come. The C translation, however, alters the order of events to a less logical (ii), (i), then (iii), an order followed also by Sp, which must therefore be a translation of C, and not of D or B. This is further confirmed by the absence in both C and Sp of any translation of *gavisus est*. 
The above quotations are a representative sample of cases where a comparison of word-order, syntax, lexis and means and degree of adaptation shows that C and Sp are closely parallel, and that C and D are independent, oblique and variable translations of B. The parallel lay-out of the texts in volume II allows numerous other examples to be readily located, and the following references to B indicate salient instances which clearly demonstrate the relationships between the Magdalene texts:

B2,6 et...; B2,12 eo quod...; B4,13 nec impune...; B4,15 ingemuit et...; B6,4 instat anxia...; B6,4 femineum...; B6,5 et pedibus...; B9,13 ad perditionis...; B9,16 Petistine...; B10,1 concipiens que...; B10,17 roborans...; B12,4 nec vertamur...

(ii) Cases of addition and amplification common to C and Sp, but not shared by B and D

There are numerous cases where the C and Sp texts coincide in containing elements not present in B and D; these are analysed in detail in chapter IV, pp. 200-207, where a complete list of such cases may be found. There follows a representative sample of such instances, where the added or expanded portion is underlined; these quotations serve to confirm the relationships between the texts posited in the previous section.

B2,6 predicavit
C2,6 comença a prechier
Sp2,6 començo de pedricar
D2,4 prediquet

B8,2 Eiciatur corpus
C8,2 Gitez hors le cors de la nef
Sp8,2 Echat fuera de la nao este cuerpo
D13,6 Getez lo cors...en la mar
Again C and Sp agree closely in making these additions, which are absent from both B and D; the relationships between the texts are thus further confirmed.

(iii) Omissions common to C and Sp

The French translator's procedures of simplifying and abbreviating his Latin original are discussed in detail on pp. 163-190, and it may be readily ascertained, by comparing the cases listed there with the corresponding part of the Spanish text, that the latter almost invariably has the same omission as C. Comparison with D shows that this more precise and learned Lyonnais version does not usually make the omissions.
It is therefore sufficient to quote a few typical examples of such omissions; the portion omitted is underlined in both the B and D texts.

B2,5 verba salutis, vere vite dogmata, ore prophetico predicavit
C2,6 comença a prechier les paroles de Dieu e de salut
Sp2,6 començo de pedricar las palabras de la vida e de la salut
D2,4 lor prediqet les parolles de salu et los enseignablos de la via verai

B2,7 pre specie, pre facundia, pre dulcedine eloquentie ipsius
C2,8 de sa beautee e de sa parole(e fu)sage
Sp2,8 de la su beldat e de las sus sesudas palabras
D2,5 de sa beuta et de sa bella parolla, de la doucor de la eloquenci

B6,2 de facili, quod absit, posses periclitari
C6,2 si porroiz tot perillier
Sp6,3 e podrades muy ayna caer en grant peligro
D8,7 et de legier porriez morir el chemin, de que Deus te defende, et jo non avire ja mais jor de ma vie joi

quod absit is not translated in C, and consequently does not appear in Sp; typically, D gives a copious rendering of the phrase.

B6,6 lacrimis obortis ceu mos est mulierum tandem obtinuit
C6,6 plora tant que li sires l'otroia qe ele iroit avec lui
Sp6,6 lloro tanto fasta que su ssennor le otorgo su yda
D9,1 illi fu dolenta et anguisosa et fit co que fenna vout toz jorz faire, gar fenna c'esforce toz jors de faire co que l'un li defent: La dama se mist a geneuz as pies de son mari et plora mout tendrement et preia tant son mari qe il li outroia son voleir...
Apart from inverting the Latin order of *doloribus* and *angustiis* (maintained by D), C and Sp coincide in not containing a translation of *ventris*.

This is a representative sample of cases where the C version, followed by the Sp translation, omits elements of B which are present in D. These cases further confirm that Sp is a translation of C, while C and D are independent oblique translations of B.

(iv) Case of translation error common only to C and Sp

The question of the C translator's mistakes is again discussed in detail in ch. IV, pp. 156-162, where there are abundant examples of errors subsequently duplicated in Sp; thus only one case is quoted below for its value in demonstrating the relationships between B, C, Sp and D:

D has a correct translation of B, while C, copied by Sp, has misinterpreted the sentence. The only possible interpretation of these four versions is that Sp is translated from C, and that C and D are independent translations of B.
(v) **Features of Sp only explicable if C is assumed to be its source**

Cases of this type of feature in Sp are discussed at length in ch. VII, 335-46; it will therefore suffice to quote two such cases here:

B5,1  Utilius esse existimo
C5,1  ele looit mieuus
Sp5,1  Yo lo querria e ternia por mejor
D6,1  Jo sai bien que plus profeitabla chosa serit

French *looit* (imperfect indicative of *loër* 'to approve') has been wrongly analysed by the Spaniard as *l'ooit* (imperfect indicative of *avoir*), and consequently mistranslated as *ternia*; it is improbable that the error operated in the reverse direction (i.e. that *ternia* originated from Latin, and was subsequently translated into French *l'ooit*); such an error presupposes this French version, with its probably inimitable translation from Latin; and no other French text, and still less a Latin text, could provide an explanation of this feature of Sp.

B9,10  foveam nequivisset effodere
C9,14  n'i pot en foir (also MSS C2 and C3)
MS C1  nes i porent emfoir
MS C4  nes pot enfoir
MS C5  ne li pot on enfoir
Sp9,14  la non pudo soterrar
D14,24  il ne les porroident sevelir

MSS C, C2 and C3 contain what was probably the original translation, 'one could not dig there'; a copyist seems to have mistaken *en foir* for *enfoir* 'to bury' (MSS C1 and C4), and subsequently a replacement for the lost *en* was introduced (MS C5). It must have been from a MS containing this error that the Sp translation was made, and the example shows in what minute detail the C and Sp versions are related. The process by which the error was generated
is such that, despite the evidence of D which coincides here with Sp against B and C, it is very unlikely to have operated in the reverse direction (soterrar giving enfoir, subsequently analysed as enfoir, beside B effodere); thus Sp is obviously translated from C and not vice versa.

All the cases quoted in sections (i) to (v) above clearly show, on the one hand the differences between C and D explained by the variability of oblique and adaptive translations; and on the other hand the close and detailed parallels between the source C and the translation Sp; the two features of Sp quoted in (v) also provide proof, if such were needed, that C was translated into Spanish, and not vice versa.

The relationships between the various translations is thus beyond any doubt as follows: B is the Latin source of two independently executed French versions C and D, and only C can be the source of Sp.
II Affinities between the French and Spanish Martha Texts

The versions of the Martha life contained in MSS E, F, C5 and Sp are now examined in the same way as the Magdalene texts: by means of a representative sample of characteristics studied at length in later chapters, it is demonstrated beyond doubt that F and C5 are independent, oblique and variable translations of E, while Sp is a direct and largely literal rendering of F.

(i) Divergencies and affinities in word-order, syntax, lexis and adaptation.

E13,10 successoribus christicolis ecclesiasticis
F13,10 a ceulz qui (venront)10 aprés
Sp13,13 a todos aquellos que despues vernan
C5 13,13 a tous crestiens ki furent e ki sont e ki a venir sont

Syntactically and lexically, F and Sp have an almost identical rendering of the Latin, while C5 is clearly of independent inspiration.

E15,6 nemo dicebat sibi aliquid proprium
F15,6 tuit cil...n'avoient rien propre
Sp15,6 quantos...non avian proprios ningunos
C5 15,11 nus ne clamoit nule cose a soie

The Latin accusative and infinitive (in this case the infinitive, as often, is suppressed) is not translated into a noun clause in F, nor, consequently in Sp; as frequently elsewhere, F has simplified his translation by avoiding subordination, while C5 has a different interpretation of the Latin syntax, closer to E.
C5 has retained the imperative of E, while F has altered the construction; the syntax and lexis of F are closely followed by Sp.

Here the parataxis of E is retained by C5, but modified by the use of very similar conjunctions in F and Sp; the interpretation by C5 of de sinu patris is also very different from that of F, and less accurate.

C5 has adhered closely to the syntax of E, while F has radically altered his original, a change reflected also in Sp, which must thus be a translation of F, not of C5 or E.
F and Sp have an identical rendering of the Latin relative clause, while the elaborate C5 version is clearly not related to either translation.

E24,16 solo prostratus  
F24,14 il se meist a genoulez  
Sp24,15 fincasen las rodillas  
C5 24,23 se coucaissent a terre

It cannot be a coincidence that both F and Sp contain the inaccurate translation 'kneel', while C5 has a correct version.

E25,13 vivus et incolmis surrexit  
F25,12 touz sainz e touz halegres se leva  
Sp25,11 E el se levanto luego bien sano e bien alegre  
C5 25,13 sailli sus, haitiés e sains e plains de vie

F and C5 show that the two Latin adjectives are capable of various interpretations, yet F and Sp have visually similar and etymologically identical terms.

E26,4 altero etiam de altero ignorante  
F26,4 sanz ce que li uns ne sot riens de l'autre  
Sp26,4 sin saber uno de otro  
C5 26,4 si ke li uns ne sot mot de l'autre

Of the several possible resolutions of the Latin ablative absolute, F, followed by Sp, has selected one containing 'without', while C5 has employed a different construction.

E28,2 ostenditur  
F28,2 il a aparat  
Sp28,2 alli pareçio  
C5 28,1 Or poez vous oir

F and Sp have the same interpretation of the Latin verb, while C5 is clearly an independent rendering.
F has translated the *venti* portion of the Latin with an appropriate adjective, omitted when F was translated into Spanish; C5, on the other hand, has chosen to translate the *turbo* portion.

In both of these examples there are very close lexical affinities between F and Sp, but divergencies between the oblique and variable F and C5.

The ablative absolute of Latin is translated by a clause in the more complete and precise C5 version, but is wrongly reduced to *Icele nuit* in the obviously independent F translation, then translated directly into Spanish.
The more learned and complete C5 version has rendered E fairly precisely, whereas the theological tone of Latin has not passed into the simplifying F translation; Sp, on the other hand, is lexically very close to F.

These quotations demonstrate that F and Sp are closely parallel in word-order, syntax, lexis and type of adaptation, whereas F and C5, while having a common Latin source, differ from each other in many of these respects, and are thus independent, oblique and variable translations of E. The following references to E provide further examples of similar divergencies and affinities:

E13,16 proximum nostrum...; E17,16 sic fecit...;
E18,8 ablatis etiam...; E19,8 ante heroes...; E19,18 multos supervenientes...; E20,4 in flumine...; E20,8 sevos...;
E25,19 his ita gestis...; E27,26 vivas...; E28,2 octava die...; E28,13 diligenter...; E28,16 sompno gravatis...;
E29,2 seductores mei...; E29,12 ad sonitum...; E29,12 dum in aliis...; E30,9 mirantur...; E34,7 tantam faceret...;
E35,4 litteris peritus...; E36,20 scribens ne...;
E37,15 nequitii...; E37,23 beate Marthe alumpni...

(ii) Cases of addition and amplification shared by F and Sp, but not present in either E or C5

There follows a list of cases where F and Sp coincide in expanding parts of E, and in adding elements not present in Latin; the additions are underlined. The corresponding sections of C5 are quoted to demonstrate that the additions are exclusive to F and Sp, which must therefore be very closely related.

E17,1 Videte quanta
F17,1 Or poez veoir comment
Sp17,1 Agora podedes ver commodo
C5 17,1 Or esgardes e entendes
E17,9 non vult Deus homini dare perfectam hereditatem nisi in celestibus regnis
F17,10 Ne a home ne donne mie en terre parmenable heritage, mes es cieux
Sp17,11 Non les quiso dar en tierra perdurable heredat, mas en los cielos
C5 17,15 Ausi ne vaut mie encor ore nostre sires doner al home ne a le feme parfait iretage se es ciels non

E17,19 deinde in mundum
F17,20 e de la virge el monde
Sp17,21 e de la virgen en el mundo
C5 17,26 de la vint il el monde

E18,9 ditavit
F18,11 fist riche e manant en sa gloire e de grant pooir
Sp18,11 fizola...rrica e de grant poder
(C5 omits this section)

E20,5 dentes...acutos
F20,6 denz agues e trenchanz
Sp20,6 los dientes agudos e tajadores
C5 20,10 les dens agus

E24,19 dominum oravit
F24,17 proia nostre seigneur en tele maniere
Sp24,18 rrogo a nuestro sennor desta guisa
C5 24,26 proia nostre signor e dist

E24,19 Adonay...Iesu Christe
F24,18 Adonay Jhesucrist debonnaires
Sp24,19 Adonay Jesu Xristo de buen talante
C5 24,27 Adonay Jhesucris

E25,9 Mox
F25,9 Maintenant que elle ot ce dit
Sp25,9 Tanto que ella esto dixo
C5 25,8 Et tantost
These additions are analysed in ch. VI, pp. 299-307, as part of the study of the French translator's technique; for the present purpose, however, the fact that the additions are shared by F and Sp demonstrates a degree of agreement that can only be the result of Sp being translated from F; also, the absence of the additions in C5 shows that F and C5 are independent renderings of E.
(iii) Omissions and contractions found only in F and Sp

One of the F translator's consistent procedures is to omit material from his Latin original, and this is discussed in ch. VI, pp. 265-287; the fact that the same material is also absent from Sp, but present in C5, confirms our earlier statements about the relationships between the Martha texts. There follow some typical examples of these omissions; the portions absent from F and Sp are underlined in E and C5. References are also given to further examples.

E18,15 ut qui eas olim baptizaverat, ipse bone conversationis exemplo ad regnum celorum eas perduceret

F18,17 que cil qui les avoit baptiziés les peust mener es cieus

Sp18,18 que aquel que las bautizara las pudiese levar a los cieloa

C5 18,78 por ce qu'il par l'exemple de bone vie les amenast al regne des ciels

E20,13 miraculis choruscantem et etiam demonia eicientem. Et venerunt ad eam

F20,13 fesoit moult de miracles; e vindrent a lui

Sp20,15 fazia muchos miraglos; e fueron a ella

C5 20,24 Dex faisoit par li tante bele miracle, e ke la u ele estoit n'avoit diables nule poissance. Il meut molt grans parole ensante e vinrent a li

E21,22 ibi beata Martha remansit, et quamdiu vixit ieiuniis vigiliis et precibus stetit

F21,22 elle remest illuec en oroisons e en geunes

Sp21,23 fincase. en ayunos e en oraciones

C5 21,38 demora la sainte Marthe tant con ele fu en vie; e sacies ke en jeunes e en proieres estoit ele.jor e nuit ententiwe

E23,8 divinis predicationibus os eius non cessabat

F23,8 touz jours preeschoit

Sp23,10 ella pedricava

C5 23,11 Sa bouche ne cessoit onques de saintes paroles dire
advenisse, erexit se et apprehensa manu pueri
dixit ei, 'Surge puer in nomine

venant, e prist la main de l'enfant e li dist,
'Lieve toi el non

venir... e tomo la mano del mançebo e dixole,
'Lievate en el nombre
descendre. Ele se leva si prist l'enfant par la
main... si li dist, 'Enfes lieve sus el non

qualiter de bona vita ad meliorem transivit
breviter dicamus

si dirons brieflyment comment elle trespassa
fablar vos hemos commo passo
dire comment elle trespassa de ceste vie e ala es
celestieux regnes

quoniam tribulor, velociter exaudi me adonay
que je sui moult troublee, aides moi
Mucho so torvada, guardame e ayudame
acline t'orelle a ma proiere isnielement, car je
ai grant paor ke je ne soie perillié

lampades et cerei omnes
li cierge e les lampes
las candelas e las lampadas
toutes les chierges e les lampes

post tergum eius palpitate voluisset
elle le volt atouchier
ella lo quiso tanner
le vaut atouchier par derriere

manibus tetrorum angelorum, nec Acherontis
claustris dilaniari. Sed sicut
des mains des ners angles; mes ausi
los angeles negros me lieven; mas ausi
es mains des noirs angeles ke je vi en ma presence,
ne ke je soie en l'encloseure d'infer devoree,
mais ausi
E34,16 dum ad corpus in antro ponendum me aptarem
F34,14 lors-quant nous meismes le cors en la fosse
Sp34,15 quando metimos el cuerpo en la cueva
C5 34,20 quant je m'aparellai del cors metre en terre e en la fosse

E35,13 in memoria eterna angelorum et hominum
F35,13 en la memoire des angles
Sp35,13 en la compagnia de los angeles
C5 35,17 en parmenable memoire des angeles e des homes

E38,3 ut dignis meritis ipsius post bona temporalia in celesti regno cum ea regnare valeamus
F38,4 que nous puissons venir avec lui devant Dieu
Sp38,5 que nos faga yr do elle es
C5 38,4 que par ses dignes merites puisssommes si trespassee par les biens temporeus ke nos puisssommes ensamble li avoir le conpaignie des angeles es celestiens regnes

F also omits to translate the following parts of E; the corresponding passages are also absent from Sp, but present in C5.

E18,19 domino ducente; E20,14 ut veniret; E21,8-18 eo quod...urit; E25,18 et suburbani; E26,24-26 Nam credentium...accipiebant; E27,23 ad sedes politicas; E27,27 in sede beata; E28,3 altera alteram traxit ad paradysum; E30,11 Dei magnalia...adhuc; E31,16 horis; E31,20-23 qui cum...secreta; E37,12 Ante Dei vultum Nil transibit inultum.

These omissions common to F and Sp confirm that F is the original for Sp, and that F and C5 are separate translations from E.
(iv) Translation errors common to F and Sp

The translator who produced F made numerous errors, which are discussed in ch. VI, pp. 251-264; here it will suffice to quote two obvious examples of such mistakes, which have been unsuspectingly translated into Spanish, and therefore prove that F is the source of Sp; the errors do not appear in C5.

E19,15 *iuxta* rupem ingentem
F19,15 *sor* une grant roche
Sp19,15 *sobre* una grant penna
C5 19,28 *jouste* une roche

F unaccountably mistranslated *iuxta* 'beside' as 'on', an error faithfully duplicated by Sp. C5 contains a correct translation.

E31,1 *cum totis animi sui* viribus in celum conversaretur et ipsum *polum* sine intermissione aspiceret
F31,1 comme elle resgardast u ciel de tout son cuer, e *le pueple* d'autre part
Sp31,1 cato contra el cielo de todo su corasçon, e el pueblo otrosy
C5 31,1 torna ses ielx e sa pensee vers *le ciel*

polum 'heavens' is wrongly rendered by *le pueple* in F, and the error has passed into Spanish; C5 has *le ciel*, which seems to be a translation of both *celum* and *polum*. The translator of F probably mistranslated through taking *polum* to be an abbreviation for *populum*.

The evidence of these errors exclusive to F and Sp further confirms that F is the source of Sp, and that C5 and F are independent translations of E.
(v) Features of the Sp Martha life only explicable if F is posited as its source

The features considered here are of two types: cases where the Spaniard has misread his original, and those where readings in the Sp text are explained by variants in the French MSS. A study of the first type appears in ch. VII, pp. 357-360, and the second cases are listed in vol. II, p. 489. Here two examples of each are given:

(a) translator's misreadings:

E32,16 cum ea usque ad eius transitum...perseveraverunt in loco ipsius
F32,6 furent avec li jusques a son trespassement
Sp32,6 fueron a su enterramiento con un obispo
C5 32,18 vinrent avoec li...ne onques de li ne se departirent

The erroneous con un obispo probably results from a misreading by the Spaniard of li jusques: the sequence of letters iju is represented in MSS by four juxtaposed minims (identical vertical strokes), and the Spaniard misinterpreted these as iui, causing him to read l'ivisques 'the bishop' instead of li jusques.

E33,4 sicut mos est
F33,4 si comme l'en seut
Sp33,4 asy commo es derecho
C5 33,4 si con il est acoustume

F and C5 are valid translations of E, while Sp is clearly an error; the mistake probably arose from a misreading by the Spanish translator of seut; he seems to have failed to recognize it as part of souloir 'to be accustomed', and to have translated instead as if it were part of seoir 'to be fitting'; such an error would be facilitated if the MS used by the Sp translator had contained the form siet, a variant of seut which is visually close to siet, the appropriate form of seoir.
Readings of Sp explained by French MSS readings

E17,3 Petuntur eorum cineres ossa pia et busta a populis
F17,2 Encor requiert li pueples la cendre e les os d'euls e les festes
MSS F1,F2, C3: les fiertes
Sp17,3 Aun agora los pueblos demandan la ceniza dellos e van a sus fiestas
C5 17,4 Li peuples...requierent lor sepultures e lor os e lor porres

fiertes or fiertres 'reliquaries, coffins' must have been the original translation, for which scribal error substituted festes 'feasts'; the error is continued by the translator of Sp, who has introduced the verb van in an attempt to make the text comprehensible.

E20,9 utraque parte munitus
F20,10 grainz d'une part e d'autre
MS .C3 garnis
Sp20,11 grannones de una parte e de otra
C5 20,14 Des coses avoit escut

garnis 'equipped with' is clearly the original rendering of munitus; a French scribe must have altered this to grainz, which was then translated into Sp. grannones 'spots'.

These four cases of features of Sp explicable only as translations of F confirm that only F could have contained the type of detail that would have resulted in the erroneous Sp version. In addition, the processes whereby the errors passed into Sp could not have operated in reverse, so that for these reasons as well as on grounds of cultural probability, F cannot be a translation of Sp.

Thus the quotations in (i) to (v) above demonstrate beyond any doubt that the Martha life in Sp is translated from F, and that F and C5 are independent, oblique and variable translations of E.
There can be no doubt, then, that the translators of the Spanish texts used French sources, represented by C for the Magdalene life, and by F for Martha. It is not remarkable that the Spanish translators should have chosen as their sources two French texts that were, to judge from the number of extant MSS, obviously popular and widespread material. Indeed, it would have been unnecessary, in parts I and II of this chapter, to go to such lengths to demonstrate the very numerous exact correspondences between French sources and Spanish translations, if there were not also, in the case of both the Magdalene and the Martha lives, some correspondences between the Latin and Spanish texts, to the exclusion of the French versions. These Latin/Spanish parallels are considered for Magdalene and Martha under the following ten headings:

(i) Parallels in word-order and syntax between the Latin and Spanish texts, where the French versions differ from both.
(ii) Lexical parallels between Latin and French versions, where the French texts differ from both.
(iii) Cases in which the Latin and Spanish texts agree in not having an addition which is exclusive to the French text.
(iv) Cases where the Latin and Spanish texts coincide in not making an omission which is exclusive to French.
(v) Deviations in the French translations not found in the Spanish versions.
(vi) Cases where the French texts translate only part of a Latin expression, and where the Spanish versions contain a translation of the remainder, but omit the portion contained in French.
(vii) Different renderings in French and Spanish of Latin expressions of which several translations are possible.
(viii) Cases in which the Spaniards seem to have turned to Latin texts after failing to understand French versions.
(ix) Errors and deviations in the Spanish translations which seem to originate in Latin rather than French.
Cases where differing translations in French and Spanish are reflected in differing readings in the Latin MSS.

The correspondences considered under (i) to (vi) are probably best explained by coincidence or by scribal error: in translating from French, the Spaniards may have made changes which, by coincidence, brought their texts closer to the Latin original of their French source; alternatively, the Spanish versions may be precise renderings of the now lost French MSS that were the sources of the Spanish translations, subsequent alterations by French scribes having then created apparent exclusive agreements between Latin and Spanish texts.

However, the correspondences discussed in (vii) to (x) are not as easily explained, and seem to suggest that the Spanish translators occasionally consulted a Latin text.
III Affinities between the Latin and Spanish Magdalene Texts

This section analyses the affinities between the Latin text B and the Spanish version Sp, where the French version C, shown in section I to be the source of Sp, differs from both B and Sp. The independent translation D is not relevant to this comparison, and so is not quoted in this section.

(i) Parallels in word-order and syntax between the Latin and Spanish texts

B1,13 Beatus venter qui te portavit et cetera
Sp1,13 Beatus venter qui te portavit e ubera que susisti, que quier dezir, Bendito fue el vientre que te traxo e las tetas que mamaste
C1,13 Benoit soit le ventres qui te porta

It is significant that the Spaniard first quotes in Latin, then gives the Spanish version. There are several possible explanations: the French MS used by the Spaniard may have also contained the Latin quotation, followed by a French translation; alternatively, the Spaniard may have known the Latin quotation, so inserted it before his translation; again, the Spaniard may have had to consult a Latin text at this point because he realized that his French text, like all the MSS of the C group, was incomplete. The Spanish fue beside French soit, considered under (vii) below, seems to suggest the last explanation.

B3,12 querens, cum tantas possideret divitias, quare... permitteret
Sp3,12 dixole que pues ella era tan rrica, que por que dexava
C3,12 demanda por qoi ele que avoit tant de richesses lessoit

The syntax of B and Sp, where cum is paralleled by pues, is very similar when compared with the relative clause of the C version.
Here Sp resembles B not only in word-order, but also in the use of the simple tenses *vy* and *vilo* compared with the compound tenses of C.

B and Sp agree in having direct speech, against the indirect speech of C.

In B and Sp, *spiritus* and *alma* are the subjects of *expleat* and *conplir*; in C, the subject of the verb is *ele*, which refers to the nearest noun *la dame*.

(ii) Lexical parallels between B and Sp

**B1,15** naviculam ingressi

**Sp1,17** entraron en una nave

**Cl,15** se mistrent en un nef

*entraron* is semantically closer to *ingressi* than to *se mistrent*.

**B1,17** Marsilie portui feliciter applicuerunt

**Sp1,18** aportaron en Marssella

**Cl,17** vindrent a Marseille

The B and Sp versions coincide in mentioning a port.
cum of B and con of Sp agree against e of C.

Sp dar de comer translates more accurately victualia erogari than it does the F version.

The Spanish form is etymologically closer to Latin than to French, though the affinity is probably fortuitous.

Etymologically and semantically, the Spanish term is closer to Latin than to French.

Though the French and Spanish forms en and ende are of the same etymology (c.f. the 11th century forms ent and end in French), ende of Sp is visually much closer to inde than to en. This apparent Latin/Spanish parallel is doubtless to be attributed also to chance.
ssaber is a more accurate translation of experiri 'find out' than of veoir.

Sp is semantically closer to B than to C.

Sp luengas seems to translate tractus in B, a word which has no equivalent in C.

Here Sp is very close to B, while C deviates from its original.

The choice of quanto in Sp seems inspired by B quantum rather than by C.

The similarity of ysca with inescati, compared with the
somewhat aberrant charoigne, seems to suggest a translation straight from Latin into Spanish. The passage is dealt with in detail in (viii).

B12,4 Revertamur
Sp12,5 tornaremos
Cl12,4 repeiroms

Sp is semantically closer to B than to C at this point.

(iii) Cases in which B and Sp agree in not having additions present in C

In the following quotations from B, C and Sp, the additions which are exclusive to C are underlined:

B2,6 ammirati sunt universi pre specie, pre facundia, pre dulcedine eloquentie ipsius. Sequenti vero die
Sp2,7 todos se maravillaron de la su beldat e de las sus sesudas palabras, de commo las mostrava sesudamente... Otro dia despues
C2,7 tuit s'esmerveillerent de sa beautee e de sa parole e fu si sage que ce ne fu si merveille non; e de la dougour de sa loyquence pessoit ele molt de gent. A l'autre jour après

B3,19 distulit enucleare
Sp3,19 non lo ose dezir
C3,19 ele n'osa dire a son mari

B4,15 matrona evigilans
Sp4,18 la buena duenna desperto
C4,17 Donc c'esveilla la femme a ce riche homme

B5,14 Quod cum matrona attenderet, ait
Sp5,16 Quando lo su mugier sopo, dixole
C5,16 Quant la dame l'ot apareceu, si vint a son seignor e li dist
B5,18  Cui dominus, 'Non sic fiet...
Sp5,20  'Non sera assy,' dijo el sennor
C5,20  Lors dist li sires tantost, 'Einssent n'iert pas...

B6,8  terras et possessiones suas
Sp6,9  sus tierras e sus heredades
C6,8  lor teres e lor possessions e tous lor biens

B9,10  foveam nequivisset effodere, in secretiori parte loci...corpus collocavit
Sp9,14  non pudo soterrar; e fue la poner en un logar apartado
C9,14  n'i pot en foir en nule manère, si pristrent le cors de la dame e l'enfant e les mistrent en une secree partie

B9,12  effusis lacrimis ait
Sp9,19  dijo el
C9,17  Et lors dist li barons a la dame tut en plorant

B11,11  lactans puerulum
Sp11,13  da leche al ninno
C11,13  aleste l'enfant de sa mamele

B12,16  tam in terra quam in mari, cuius hortamine
Sp12,17  en tierra e en mar, e por cuyo mandado
C12,17  en terre e en mere en cele voie

B12,17  cuius hortamine, qua de causa illuc venerat, diligenter explicuit. Quo penitus audito
Sp12,17  conto...por cuyo mandado...e la rrazon por que ally veniera. Quando ssant Pedro esto
C12,16  conta...par qi amonestement il li estoit la venuz, par l'amonestement a la douce Magdaleine. Seint Pere oi ce
(iv) Cases where B and Sp agree in not having omissions which are exclusive to C

B1,12  et Marcilla que loquente domino Iesu ad turbas dixit
Sp1,12  e con aquella palabra que dixo a Jesu Xristo en la pedracaçon
C1,12  e Marcille qui dist de Jhesu Crist

B4,2  fremens (et irata) et igneo vultu
Sp4,2  muy sannuda ... e muy temerosa. E semeljava su rrosto commo si fuese fuego
C4,2  a grant fremissement, e si sembloit de son viaire qui ce fust fez

B4,8  sanctos Dei
Sp4,9  los siervos de Dios
C4,9  les seintes gentz

B6,1  Graves enim sunt tractus viarum
Sp6,1  demas las carreras sson luengas e malas de andar
C6,1  e les voiez sont trop gries

B7,13- lamentabiles edit vagitus. Proh dolor! natus est...
B8,1  matris mammas appetentem? Attendit autem nautis procella seviente
Sp7,15- en llorando en grant dolor fue el ninno nado...
Sp8,1  demandar la teta en llorando? E la tenpestad era tan grande
C7,14- queroit la mamele en criant. E la tempeste fu si grans que li noutonier
C8,1  

The omission in C of five lines is probably caused by homoioioteleuton; it is likely that the original C translation contained very similar renderings of B7,13 mammarum maternarum querens solatia and of B7,18 matris mammas appetentem; a French scribe's eye may have wandered from the first to the second occurrence, thus causing this omission.

B9,10  in secretiori parte (collis)
Sp9,15  en un logar apartdo de la sierra
C9,15  en une secrete partie
B11,6 in mari consulit famulatur et lactat
Sp11,6 e la consejava en mar. Ella era maestra. Ella era ama
C11,6 e en mer est biaissee et norrice

B11,9 lactat vagientem
Sp11,10 Ella criava al ninno que llorava
C11,10 ele norrist l'enfant

(v) Deviations in C not found in B and Sp

Into this category may fall most of the items already mentioned in sections (i) to (iv); but three items merit more attention here:

B2,5 verba...vere vite
Sp2,6 las palabras de la vida
C2,7 les paroles de Dieu

C de Dieu is obviously not the source of de la vida in Sp, which may at this point be translated straight from Latin. Equally probably, though, a C MS containing de la vie was translated into Spanish, and a French scribe subsequently substituted the familiar expression les paroles de Dieu.

B5,5 ut oret deum suum
Sp5,5 que rruegue al su Dios
C5,5 q'ele prist pur nous

Again, Sp al su Dios may be translated from Latin, but the case is similar to the preceding one, in that C contains an expression resembling liturgical terminology which a scribe may have inadvertently substituted for the originally correct French translation.

B6,13 omnia que eis (predixerat) de domino Jhesu
Sp6,14 lo que les ella ante dixiera
C6,14 de Jhesu Crist ce qe ele avoit dist
This parallel between B predixerat and Sp ante dixiera, against the simple avoit dist of C, is discussed in (x) among cases where C and Sp seem to be translated from different Latin MSS. The affinities between B and Sp may indicate a Spanish translation straight from Latin, but there are other possible explanations: (a) A French scribe may have subsequently omitted the term for 'previously' from C; or (b) MS C5 has the reading ce ge ele en avoit dit, and the Spaniard may have translated French en by ende (c.f. the translation ende of de ce, Sp5,12); an inattentive Spanish scribe may then have mistaken ende for ante, thus producing a version coincidentally close to the Latin original; or (c) the Spanish translator may have read avoit dist as avant dist.

(vi) Cases in which the French text contains a translation of only part of a Latin expression, and where the Spanish version translates the remainder, omitting the portion contained in the French version

There are two cases in which C and Sp have each omitted different elements of the Latin original:

B10,10 naute remis incumbunt et iter inceptum arripiunt
Sp10,13 los marineros tornaron a guiar su nave
C10,13 li noutonier firent lor oire q'il avoient comencié

Here Sp contains a translation of remis incumbunt, while C only has a rendering of iter inceptum arripiunt22.

B10,12 femine nil levitatis habens! O pars partium omnium quam elegit sibi Maria
Sp10,15 ¡Ay, que bendita partera ella escogio!
C10,15 O tu famme de grant deserte qui n'as en toi nule legiertee!

In this case Sp has a translation (though erroneous, see (ix) below) of the second Latin phrase, while C has only the first phrase.
These two cases of alternate omissions may indicate that both C and Sp are translated from B, each translator making different selections of material from his Latin original. Also, however, the omissions could be explained by imperfect transmission of the C MSS: there may have been an early MS (X) of the French translation which contained both the elements in question; from this MS X two different copies may have been made: MS Y, the Spanish translator's French original, which omitted one element present in the extant MS C; and C, which omitted the other element, but still contained the material omitted in Y and in Sp:

Latin original, MS B

complete French translation, MS X

lost French MS Y (omits one element) extant French MS C (omits other element)

Spanish translation Sp

(vii) Different renderings in French and Spanish of Latin expressions of which several different translations are possible.

In the following cases, the C and Sp translations differ from each other, but both are acceptable versions of B; this seems to suggest that the Sp version is a translation straight from Latin at these points:

B1,13 Beatus venter qui
Sp1,15 Bendito fue el vientre
Cl,13 Benoît soit le ventres
The Latin expression is elliptical, and the absent main verb has been differently treated by C and Sp: the C translator has supplied *sit*, and translated it by *soit*, while the Spaniard has assumed that *fuit* was the unexpressed main verb, translated by *fue*. It is unlikely that *fue* was translated from *soit*, and seems more likely to be a translation from Latin; since Sp quotes the Vulgate, he may be translating his own quotation rather than C.

**B5,12 experiri**
**Sp5,15 ssaber**
**C5,14 veoir**

*ssaber* is a more accurate translation of *experiri* than is *veoir*, though both Romance versions are acceptable. It seems improbable that *ssaber* is translated from *veoir*, and more likely that the Spaniard turned to a Latin version at this point.

**B5,19 possessionibus nostris curam impendes**
**Sp5,23 endereçaredes vuestras cosas**
**C5,23 garderoiz nos possessions**

*curam* means here 'administration', and *impendere* has the sense of 'to carry out'; the meaning of B therefore seems to be, 'you will see to the administration of our possessions'. This is very close to the meaning of Sp *endereçaredes*, whereas *garderoiz* in C suggests merely a passive surveillance and protection of the property. Thus while C is just possible as a translation of B, it is obviously not the source of Sp, which may here be a rendering of a Latin text.

**B5,20 ne me absente**
**Sp5,23 que si me yo fuere**
**C5,23 qe quant ge m'en serrai alez**

Latin ablative absolute constructions may be the equivalent of temporal, conditional or concessive clauses. Here the C version has a temporal clause, while the translator of the
Sp version has chosen to use a conditional clause. Thus both the C and the Sp versions must be derived direct from Latin, since the Spanish phrase is not a possible rendering of the French.

B8,5 intra se nichil sustinet  
Sp8,5 non quier en sy cosa  
C8,5 ne reçoit nule chose

sustinet in B means either 'tolerates' or 'retains'; the Romance versions seem here to be independently derived from Latin, since the Spanish text, while containing a satisfactory translation of B in its first possible meaning, is not a translation of ne reçoit in C.

B11,3 Affuit et puerulo vagienti  
Sp11,3 Ella conforto al ninno que llorava  
C11,3 'Ele fu avec l'enfant plorant

Latin adesse may mean in this context either 'to be with or near to' or 'to protect or defend or sustain'; the French translator has selected the first meaning, while Sp contains a translation of the second sense; and it seems unlikely that Sp conforto is translated from fu avec.

B11,7 Consulit peregrinanti ne iter arreptum relinquat inconsummatum  
Sp11,7 Ella confortava el romero que non dexase lo que comenzara  
C11,7 Ele conceille le pelerin q'il ne leist mie ce q'il a comencié

B seems to mean 'she advises the pilgrim not to abandon', and this is the meaning that is translated in C. However Latin consulere can also mean 'to help', and Sp confortava is possibly a translation of the Latin which the Spaniard took to have this second meaning. Obviously Sp cannot be translated from C here, though it is more likely to be an erroneous translation from Latin; the case is discussed in detail in (ix) below. The discrepancy may also, however, be attributed to a Spanish scribe.
B11,19 Vas quod nec hyemalis temporis sollicitat molestia nec estivi solis perurit inclementia

Sp11,19 yazia tan seguro que...nin elada nin enbierno nin calentura non le enpesça

C11,19 estoit si seurs vessiaux que...(ne) yveer (ne)27 esteez ne li nuisoit

The version from which Sp is translated seems to have contained such words as 'the cold of winter and the heat of summer', while C contains only 'winter...summer'. This points to a Latin source for Sp, while the C translator, following his usual procedure, has reduced the complex Latin groups to single nouns, as described in ch. IV, pp. 184-187.

(viii) Cases where the Spaniard seems to have turned to a Latin text after failing to understand C.

Any assumptions about the Spaniard's knowledge of French are bound to be speculative; nevertheless there are many cases where the Spanish translator omits, or experiences difficulty with, words which in the French text have suffered phonetic reduction with relation to their Latin root (especially in the case of medial consonants), making them difficult to recognize; another source of difficulty for the Spaniard seems to be terms derived from Germanic roots not represented in the Iberian peninsula. Often these words seem to have simply provoked omission or error in the Spanish text, as discussed in ch. VII, pp. 335-341. In the following three cases, however, the occurrence of such terms seems to have led the Spaniard to turn to a Latin text.

B5,20 ne ...aliquis nostre iurisdictionis terminos presumat exterminare vel aliquid contra potestatem nostram temere usurpare

MSS A, ne...aliquis nostre iurisdictionis terminos invadere A1, A2 presumat

Sp5,23 que...non finquen mal endereçadas

C5,24 que nous veille saisir malveisement l'en nos choses ou faire acune chose qui fust encontre nostre jurisdiccion
Germanic sazjan, the root of French saisir, has no recognizable reflexes in the Iberian peninsula, and this may have caused problems for the Spanish translator: his translation is feeble, and merely repeats the notions of Sp5,23, endereçaredes vuestras cosas. Thus Sp cannot be from C, nor even from B; perhaps the Spaniard consulted one of the shorter Latin versions, such as MSS A, Al or A2, which, while not exactly the same as Sp, are of similar length and similarly imprecise.

B9,7 velut pisces hamo inescati
Sp9,10 asy commo el peçe desea la ysca
C9,10 ausi come li poissons la charoigne

The Spaniard may not have known French charoigne 'rotten flesh', since the term is not attested in the Iberian peninsula until 1601. He thus seems to have turned to a Latin text, using the term ysca 'bait' which is etymologically and semantically related to Latin inescati 'lured with bait'; C, on the other hand, deviates from Latin here, changing 'bait' to 'rotten flesh', a possible translation of B, but not a likely source for ysca.

B11,1 obstetricis adimplens officium
Sp11,1 Ella fizo el oficio de la maestra
C11,1 fu a son bail et fist tut l'office

The Spaniard probably did not know bail 'act of delivering'; it derives from Latin bajulare, of which reflexes are rare outside Gallo-Romance. We may suppose that his very understandable ignorance led the Spaniard to consult the Latin text, which Sp very closely resembles, while the C text is deviant.
(ix) Errors and deviations in Sp which seem to originate in Latin rather than in French

B1,12 et Marcilla que loquente domino Issu ad turbas dixit

Sp1,12 e con aquella palabra que dixo a Jesu Xristo en la pedricacion

C1,12 e Marcille qui dist.de Jhesu Crist

While the French translator, or possibly a scribe, has abridged his original at this point, the Sp version contains equivalents, if incorrect, of almost all the items of B; and it seems from the errors that Sp is a translation from Latin here. e con aquella palabra is an error (possibly of the translator, more probably of a copyist since the text makes no sense) for e con Marcilla, since in all other cases con precedes a member of the group in the ship. The rest of the phrase in Sp seems to be the product of the translator's failure to recognize the ablative absolute construction, possibly through disregarding the case endings. The result is that the subject of the participle loquente is taken to be Marcilla, not Jesus, and the ablative domino Jesu is construed as the indirect object after loquente, ad turbas then becomes en la pedricacion, loosely 'the occasion on which Marcilla spoke to Jesus' rather than 'those to whom Jesus was speaking'.

In this case Sp cannot be translated from C, and seems to derive direct, though with many errors, from B.

B8,3 quamdiu introfuerit

Sp8,3 demientre y andar

C8,2 tant com il i sera

Since in Spanish some past tenses of ir and ser both use the fu- stem, the use of andar here may have been provoked by the translator seeing the Latin form fuerit. There seems no obvious reason why the Spaniard should consult a Latin text at this point, but he has often interchanged parts of the verbs 'to be' and 'to go'; see ch. VII, pp. 411-413.
B10,12 O inestimabile Marie Magdalene premium! O celsi meriti femina, femine nil levitatis habens! O pars partium omnium quam elegit sibi Maria

Sp10,15 ¡Ay, que meresçimiento de la Madalena! ¡Ay, que bendita partera ella escogio!

C10,14 A tout grant deserte de la Magdaleine! O tu famme de grant deserte qui n'as en toi'nule legiertee!

B O celsi...habens appears in C, but not in Sp; B O pars... Maria 'rôle of all rôles that Mary chose for herself'31 is not in C, but is probably represented in Sp by '¡Ay que bendita partera ella escogio! 'what a saintly midwife she chose'. The Sp error partera could hardly have originated in C, since the French term for midwife is baiasse32, which is not present in C. It seems that partera is a mistranslation of a part of pars partium, which, because of the context, the Spaniard carelessly translated by partera.

B11,7 Consulit peregrinanti ne iter arreptum relinquat inconsummatum

Sp11,7 Ella confortava el romero que non dexase lo que comenga

C11,7 Ele conseille le pelerin q'il ne leist mie ce q'il a comencié

B here seems to mean 'she advises the pilgrim not to abandon', and it is this meaning that has been translated into French. consulere also has the meaning 'to take care of', so that the Latin sentence could also mean 'she takes care of the pilgrim so that he does not abandon';33. French conseillier can also have the meaning 'to help',34 so that C could just possibly translate this second meaning of consulere in B.

Sp confortava, however, requires some explanation, since it is not an obvious translation either of consulit or of conseille; it might translate the meaning 'to take care of' of Latin, or 'to help' of French, but the semantic differences make this an unsatisfactory explanation. A more likely explanation is that the Spaniard misread consulit
as part of the verb *consolari* 'to comfort', an error that would have been especially easy to commit in view of the fact that the sounds of long o and short u were not distinguished in Vulgar Latin.

(x) Cases where differing translations in C and Sp are reflected in different readings in the Latin MSS

In the following quotations, each different Latin reading is followed by the Romance text which is closest to it. These cases involve the types of omission and addition listed under (iii) and (iv) above, though they are more significant since the differences between C and Sp can also be observed in different Latin MSS, and thus point more strongly to the occasional use of a Latin text by the Spanish translator.

B4,2 fremens
C4,2 a grant fremissement
MSS B1, B2, B3 fremens et irata
Sp4,2 muy ssannuda... e muy temerosa

B4,11 Vides eos desolatos et inhospites et preteris.
C4,12 Tu voiz qu'il sont des conforteez e n'ont point d'ostel e tu les trespasses
MSS B1, B2, B3 Vides eos desolatos et inhospites et preteris; vides eos nudos et famelicos et permittis nec cibas nec in aliquo eis compateris
Sp4,12 Tu ves que ellos son desconfortados e non los confortas. Tu ves que non an posada e non gela das; tu passas por ellos e non los catas

B6,14 dixerat
C6,15 avoit dist
MSS B1, B2, B3 predixerat
Sp6,14 ante dixiera

However, for this case see also (v) above.
These cases, where differences between C and Sp are reflected in different readings of Latin MSS again indicate that the Spanish translator occasionally consulted a Latin MS, which was incidentally slightly different from that used by the translator of the C text. It is to be noted that a group of these cases occurs in B9,6, B9,11 and B9,12.
These numerous parallels between B and Sp seem to suggest that the Spanish translator, while using the C text as his principal source, was occasionally consulting a Latin text, possibly when his French source was illegible, incomprehensible or incomplete.

However, not all of the cases discussed in (i) to (x) above necessarily indicate such a relationship: most of the syntactic and lexical parallels discussed in (i) and (ii) could be the result of coincidence or of scribal alterations: in some cases the C translator may have made slightly deviant translations from B, which were then translated into Spanish by terms which happened to be closer to B than to C; in other cases, French scribes may have made alterations to the C MSS at a stage after the Sp translation was made, thus creating apparent close similarities between B and Sp when compared with C. The cases of additions and omissions in C, listed in (iii) and (iv), and the exclusive French deviations mentioned in (v), could also be imputed to French scribes; and the diagram on p.41 shows how the alternate omissions discussed in (vi) could also be blamed on French scribes.

The cases discussed in (vii) to (x), however, are less easily dismissed; and although inevitably some cases may represent stronger evidence than others, and some of the explanations offered are necessarily conjectural, nevertheless the evidence of sections (vii) to (x) taken together is significant, and puzzling. At the very least it indicates that the relationships between the texts B, C and Sp are more complex than is suggested by the evidence set out in section I above, as the result of inaccuracies of copying and translation in all three texts. At most, the evidence of this section indicates that the Spaniard was consulting a Latin text as well as his French source, though such an assumption raises several problems:

(i) Many of the types of Latin/Spanish parallels quoted above suggest that the Spaniard was making a detailed and systematic comparison between B and C before making his
translation; yet it is unlikely that a translator of a piece of popular literature would go to such trouble.

(ii) If the Spaniard had available a Latin text as well as a French text, it is not clear why he did not simply translate straight from Latin; possibly he found that the French text already incorporated the stylistic changes which he would have had to make himself if he had used only a Latin text.

(iii) There is the same type of evidence in section IV below to suggest that the Spanish translator of the Martha life was also consulting a Latin text as well as his French source; yet it seems strange that such an exceptional procedure should have been used in two translations which, as is shown in chapter VII, are the work of two different Spanish translators.

However, the habit of consulting a Latin text in case of difficulty may not be particularly rare: there is an indisputable case at F20,10 where the copyist of Martha French MS F2 has consulted the Legenda Aurea version of the Martha life, and as a result has replaced F20,10 tortue by corne after L.A. cornua. The case is discussed in the notes on the Spanish text.
IV Affinities between the Latin and Spanish Martha Texts

In this section the parallels between the Latin life E and the Spanish version Sp, where both differ from the French text F, are examined under the same headings as those used for the Magdalene life in section III. Again, the independent translation in MS C5 is not relevant to this comparison, and so is not quoted here.

(i) Parallels in word-order and syntax between the Latin and Spanish texts

E14,21 domino et apostolis
E17,7 crimina peccatoribus condempnantur
E31,7 suscipe spiritum meum in requiem tuam. Non me permittas teneri

Sp14,22 a nuestro sennor Jesu Kristo e a los apostolos
Sp17,8 los pecados de los pecadores alli son perdonados
Sp31,6 tu rresgebiste el mi spiritu en tu santa folgança, e non sufras que...me lieven
Sp follows E in that, in both texts, it is the sins of the sinners that are forgiven, whilst in F the sinners are forgiven; the French MSS variants reveal some hesitation here, and possibly point to a scribal error.

F14,23 les apostres e nostre seigneur
F17,7 li pecheeur pardoné
F31,6 regoif mon esperit en ton repos; ne souffrir que il soit tenus

The syntax of Sp and E is similar in that the object in the second clause is in the first person (me); in F, on the other hand, this becomes a third person pronoun il, referring back to esperit in the preceding clause. Possibly the Spaniard consulted a Latin text, but more probably a
French scribe subsequently attempted to elevate the tone of the passage by making not Martha, but her spirit, the object of the malevolent intentions of the black angels.

E34,15 quas dum ad corpus in antro ponendum me aptarem illius ecclesie sacriste commendavi
Sp34,14 que di a guardar al sacristan quando metimos el cuerpo en la cueva
F34,14 que nous commandasmes au segretain lors qu' tant nous meismes le cors en la fosse

Of the two singular verbs of E, one appears as such in Sp, while in F both are in the plural. Possibly this indicates the influence of a Latin text on Sp, but more probably, in view of the otherwise close similarity between F and Sp, other factors explain the E/Sp parallel: either the French text from which the Spaniard was translating had the singular form of commandasmes; or the Spaniard noticed the inaccuracy of F (Christ would not have been wearing gloves) and corrected it by translating commandasmes by di.

E37,3 si quis furtum vel raptum vel falsum iuditium... fecit
Sp37,4 sy alguno fazia furto o rrobo, o diese falso juyzio
F37,3 se aucun fesoit larrecin ouvrant ou faus jugement

The French MSS have various versions here, none of which accurately reflects E, while Sp is an exact rendering of the Latin expression. Sp was probably translated from a correct French version, which was then miscopied by a process described in (v) below.

E38,10 dedistis mihi manducare
Sp38,16 vos me distes a comer
F38,12 vous me peustes

The construction in Sp is much closer to E than to F; and while the Spaniard may have looked at a Latin version here, or have had a slightly different copy of F before him, the
most likely explanation of this parallel between E and Sp is the influence, encountered elsewhere in less obvious forms, of scriptural reminiscence. The French text must have immediately recalled to the Spaniard the Latin text, or the Spanish translation of it, of Matthew 25.35: "esurivi enim, et dedistis mihi manducare"; the Spaniard would then have ignored the details of vocabulary and syntax of his French original, to write down either a translation of the Latin, or to quote from his knowledge of the Spanish Bible.

(ii) Lexical parallels between E and Sp

E17,8 Deus
Sp17,10 Dios
F17,8 nostres sires

E20,1 Naves etiam que per Rodanum transibant subvertebat
Sp20,1 e entornava las barcas en el rrio
F20,1 E les nes qui passoient par le Rosne il plungoit enz

This case is discussed in detail at (v) below.

E22,15 nudis pedibus incedens
Sp22,14 siempre andava descalça
F22,13 (elle estoit touz jors) nuz piez

Sp and E coincide in having a verb of motion, beside French estoit. There may have been Latin influence on Sp, although andava may be translated loosely from estoit, and only incidentally resemble incedens more closely than estoit. There are several cases where Sp renders parts of French estre by parts of andar, and these are discussed in chapter VII, pp. 420-422.
persequimini et comprehendite eam
Vayamos la tomar
Alons li sus
extincta dimiserant
ellos dexaron muertas
estaintes estoient
cum bona hospite suo
con su buen huesped
avec son (saint) hoste
This phrase apparently suffered at the hands of the French scribes, to whom the aberrant saint may be attributed.
ambo perrecti
se fueron anbos
Ambedui...furent porté
There may have been Latin interference on the Spanish text here, but equally probably this is an instance of the Spaniard's several errors involving the verbs 'to be' and 'to go': se fueron may be a mistaken translation of F, provoked by furent, which suggested to the Spaniard the preterite of the verb ir; see also ch. VII, pp. 420-422.
non est bonum reticeri
non debemos callar
l'en ne doit pas celer
The striking semantic parallel between callar and reticeri must be a coincidence; probably the Spaniard assumed that French celer (Latin celare) was the equivalent of callar (Latin *callare) because of its similar form; it is not clear, however, why the Spaniard should not have used celar, easily recognizable in French celer.
(iii) Cases in which E and Sp agree in not having additions present in F

Compared with the Magdalene texts, the proportion of such cases is very small; in the following quotations, the addition which is exclusive to F is underlined.

E14,17 aut filios aut agros propter nomen meum
Sp14,18 o fijos o posesiones por mi nombre
F14,18 ou enfanz ou terres ou vingnes pour mon non

E contains here an incomplete quotation from Matthew 19.29: 'Et omnis qui reliquerit domum, vel fratres, aut sorores, aut patrem, aut matrem, aut uxorem, aut filios; aut agros propter nomen meum, centuplum accipiet, et vitam aeternam possidebit.' The biblical passage contains no mention of vineyards, so that vingnes is a spurious French addition, presumably made by a scribe at a stage in transmission after the translation of Sp.

E32,19 eandem basilicam quam ipsa edificaverat
Sp32,12 aquella eglesia que feziera ella.
F32,8 l'iglise que elle avoit fet fere

Sp feziera reflects more closely E edificaverat than the factitive avoit fet fere of F; also the demonstrative aquella resembles E eandem more closely than the definite article of F. Though this may suggest Latin interference on the Spanish text, equally probably F fere is a scribal addition by a copyist who wished to improve his text by making it clear that Martha herself did not erect the basilica, but rather those under her instructions. Such an addition would have been made to a text that was not the original of Sp, but a subsequent copy of it.
E33,14 ecclesiam dive hospite ingressi, cum alius circa
corpus psallentibus psallere ceperunt

Sp33,13 entraron en la iglesia con aquellos que fazian el
oficio, e cantaron

F33,12 entrerent en l'iglise avec les autres qui fesoient
l'oseque, e chanterent avec les autres

This addition in F has the appearance of scribal
dittography.

(iv) Cases where E and Sp agree in not having omissions
which are exclusive to F

In the following quotations, the underlined parts of E and
Sp are those which do not appear in F:

E12,8 'Lazare veni foras,' qui quattuor annus fuerat
revixit. Interim....

Sp12,10 'Lazaro va fuera,' e asy fue. Entonces...

F12,10 'Ladre vienz for.' E lors

E13,8 duas viatas, contemplativam scilicet et activam,
quibus pie mulieres Maria et Martha salvatoris
gratiam acquisierunt

Sp13,8 dos maneras de vida, que llaman en latin
contemplativa e activa. Contemplativa vida es de
los cielos, e activa vida es del mundo; e diolas
a estas ermanas anbas, la contemplativa a santa
Maria Madalena, e la activa a santa Marta

F13,8 .ii. manieres de vies, ce fet a savoir la
contemplative e l'active, a cez .ii. serors
appropria

The Sp translator seems to have been uncharacteristically
effusive at this point, including in his translation
material that is in neither E nor F; thus, while the
presence in Sp but not in F of the saints' names may
represent a later omission by a French scribe, it is more
probably an independent addition by the Spaniard, an
addition which happens to correspond approximately to E.
E15,17 quosdam ratibus arectentes ablatis remis velis et gubernaculis omnibusque alimentis desolatos alta (tenendo) effugarunt

Sp15,19 e algunos metieron en barcas sin velas e sin rremos e sin governarios e sin viandas, e enbliaronlos por la mar a aventura

F15,18 aucun mistrent en nef sanz voile e sanz gouernal e sanz viande

E17,9 non vult Deus homini dare

Sp17,11 Non les quiso dar

F17,10 Ne a home ne donne mie

E19,5 gratiam sanitatum super omnes egros

Sp19,4 graçia... de guareçer todas enfermedades

F19,5 grace de saner les malades

E22,9 edificata sub honore Christi et beate Marie virginis

Sp22,8 fizo alii una muy fermosa eglesia a onrra de nuestra sennora ssanta Maria

F22,8 fist illuec une moult bele eglise de nostre dame

E23,17 Quot gentium milia... ad fidem Christi convertuntur

Sp23,14 quantos torno a la fe de Jesu Xristo

F23,15 combien ele converti de gent

E24,7 animatus eam videre

Sp24,6 ovo tan grant sabor de pasar alla por la ver

F24,7 pour lui veoir

E26,22 credentium tunc temporis

Sp26,16 de aquellos que... creyan entonces

F26,15 de ceuls qui crecient

E28,17 tres lampades in ede ardentes

Sp28,17 tres lanapadas que ardian

F28,17 .iii. lampes

E31,16 hebraice scriptam

Sp31,15 escripta en ebraico

F31,14 en ebrieu
E32,7-15: of the numerous saints and their biographical details given here, most are included in Sp, but only three appear in F.

E34,10 Res mira nobis evenit
Sp34,9 muy grant maravilla me aveno
F34,9 Une merveilleuse chose est avenue

E35,7 codicem quem manu tenebat apertum
Sp35,6 un libro que tenia abierto en sus manos
E35,5 le livre que il tenoit tout ouvert

E35,11 codicem revoluisset, cunctis foliis
Sp35,10 cato todas las fojas del libro
F35,10 revercast e retornast les fueilliez de ce livre

The cases of omissions in F quoted above are probably to be explained either (a) as French scribal omissions of elements which were present in the original French text as translated by the Spaniard, or (b) as adventitious additions, made by the Spaniard, which happen to resemble the Latin text.

(v) Deviations in F not found in E and Sp

Most of the items mentioned thus far may fall into this category, but the following cases are obvious deviations which can often be attributed with some certainty to French scribes.

E12,1 I1La puerum... refocilavit
Sp12,1 Aquella lo criò ninno
F12,1 La virge le norri

The discrepant French version is doubtless the work of a scribe who sought to clarify this passage, where the identities of the two parties in the long comparison are liable to confusion.
E20,1 Naves etiam que per Rodanum transibant
subvertebat
Sp20,1 entornava las barcas en el rrio
F20,1 les nes qui passoient par le Rosne il plunegoit enz

subvertebat and entornava both mean 'overturned', while plunegoit enz means 'thrust beneath the surface'. There are several possible explanations of this remarkable affinity between E and Sp, beside a semantically different F.
(a) entornava may simply be a free translation of plunegoit enz, it being merely a coincidence that it is semantically closer to E than to F.
(b) The Spaniard may have consulted a Latin text containing subvertebat, having failed to understand F; VL *plumbicare, the root of plunegoit, has no descendant in the Iberian peninsula, which may have been an obstacle to comprehension. That the Spaniard was not slavishly following F, as is his usual practice, is further suggested by the omission in Sp of qui passoient and of Rosne, and by the deviant word-order of Sp.
(c) There is the possibility of interference on the Sp text by an otherwise unrelated French text, as with the influence of MS F2 at F20,9; MS 423, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, reads at this point: '...fesoit les nes ou Rosnes verser'.
(d) The version of the French text used by the Spaniard may have contained an accurate translation of subvertebat, but subsequently a French scribe may have had difficulty in reading his MS, and so consulted a Latin text, such as the Legenda Aurea, which reads at this point (p. 444 line 22) naves submergebat. Such an occurence would have a parallel at F20,9, quoted in (c) above.

E37,3 si quis furtum vel raptum vel falsum iusiurandum... fecerit
Sp37,4 sy alguno fazia furto e rrbo, e diese false
F37,3 sa aucun fesoit larrecin ouvrant ou faus jugement

F makes no sense at this point, and cannot be the source of Sp, which is very close to E. The resemblance, however, is probably not to be explained by Latin influence on Sp,
but rather by scribal error in F. The variant readings in the French MSS look like attempts to make sense out of an obscure passage.

Comparison of *larrecin ouvrant* with *furtum vel raptum* makes it tempting to see in *ouvrant* the conjunction *ou*, followed by a word translating *raptum*, now not recognizable, but to be sought in the letters *vrant*. The word in question may well have been OFr *rat* (modern French *rapt* 'abduction by force'), the original reading of the French text being *larrecin ou rat* - the form in which it was translated into Sp. A copyist may have seen in this word *rat* the letters *rant*, assuming a stray flourish from the line above to be the usual sign for *n*; and since disregard for word-division is a regular feature of MSS, it would be easy for a scribe to misread *ou rant* as *ovrant*, a form subsequently given the alternative spelling *ovrant*.

(vi) Case in which F contains a translation of only part of a Latin expression, and where Sp has a translation of the remainder, omitting the portion translated in F

E24,8  *natre nudatus cepit*
Sp24,7  *sse metio por el rrio a nado*
F24,6  *se mist tous nuz el Rosne*

E *natre* appears in Sp as *a nado*, but is omitted in F, while E *nudatus* is not in Sp, but appears in F as *tous nuz*. This may indicate that the Spaniard turned to a Latin text after failing to understand F (he may not have known *nuz*, which has undergone considerable reduction in relation to its Latin root *nudus*).

However, the close similarity of *se mist* and *sse metio*, against the Latin, suggest otherwise, and the discrepancy is more likely to be the result of two separate French scribal omissions, as in the following diagram:
Different renderings in F and Sp of Latin expressions of which several different translations are possible

- **E24,7** navigio carens
- **Sp24,7** ca non pudo aver barca
- **F24,6** e il qui n'avoit nule nef

Both F and Sp are possible translations of E, but Sp is not an obvious translation of F. The case could be explained by a fortuitous resemblance between E and the Spaniard's translation of F; however, this part of the text (E24,6-9) contains several other parallels between E and Sp, dealt with in other sections, and briefly listed below:

(a) **E24,6** vidit citra gentium catervas, section (x), p. 80;
(b) **E24,7** animatus eam videre, section (iv), p.58;
(c) **E24,8** natare nudatus cepit, section (vi) p.61.

In addition, the word-order of F and Sp is different in this passage (F24,6-7), suggesting that the Spaniard was not following his French original closely, if at all, here.

This evidence taken together strongly suggests a Latin source for Sp at this point.

- **E29,7** in adiutorium meum intende
- **Sp29,5** se en mi ayuda
- **F29,6** resgardes en m'aide
Latin *intende* has here the meaning 'turn your attention', so that the phrase in E may mean 'look towards helping me', the meaning given to it by the French translator. On the other hand, Sp *se en mi aydua* may reflect another possible meaning of E: 'direct your efforts towards helping me', and so simply 'be a help to me'.

However, *se* may simply be a loose rendering of *regardes*, the variation being felt necessary because of the repetition of *regarde* at F29,8; or again, the Spaniard may not have known the French verb *regarder*, and so contented himself with the more general term *se*.

(viii) Case in which the Spaniard seems to have turned to a Latin text, having failed to understand F.

- E20,7 squamas acutas
- F20,8 l'eschaille poignans
- Sa235,33 squamas hirsutas
- Sp20,8 los cabellos del cuerpo

The discrepancies in these four versions are discussed in section (x) below, where it is suggested that the Spaniard may not have known *eschaille* which has a Germanic root with no reflex on the Iberian peninsula, and that he therefore turned to a Latin text, in this case not E, but rather a version closer to the Sanctuarium.

(ix) Spanish deviation indicating that the Spaniard may have been translating direct from Latin.

- E13,7 *duas vitas, contemplativam scilicet et activam*
- Sp13,8 *dos maneras de vida, que llaman en latin contemplativa e activa*
- F13,8 *ii. manieres de vies, ce fet a savoir la contemplative e l'active*

It is just possible to interpret Sp *que llaman en latin* as meaning that the Spaniard consulted a Latin text here.
to find out the exact Latin terminology, though the effect of this on his translation is not evident, since Sp follows F closely in introducing maneras from manieres, a notion with no equivalent in the Latin text. It is more probable that que llaman en latin is the Spaniard's translation of ce fet a savoir, intended, by the mention of a Latin source, to make his version more credible and authoritative, or to apologize for using scarcely Romance terms.

(x) Cases where different translations in F and Sp are reflected in different readings in E and in the Sanctuarium

The first three of the following four cases provide very strong evidence that the Spanish translator consulted a Latin text that was different from the Latin source of F.

E19,14 De drachone
F19,14 C'est le miracle du dragon
Sa235,25 Quomodo draconem manu sua alligavit
Sp19,14 Commo santa Marta ato el drugo

The parallel between Sa and Sp is striking, and the choice of wording in Sp must have been influenced by a Latin text. This case must be treated with caution, however, since it is a question of rubrics: thus the Sp rubricator might have brought to his task his knowledge of a Latin text containing the same rubric as Sa; or possibly a French rubricator had inserted a translation of a rubric similar to that of Sa, which was then translated into Sp.

E20,7 squamas acutas ut taravos scindentes
F20,8 l'eschaille poignans comme de tarent
Sa235,33 squamas hirsutas ut taravos scindentes
Sp20,8 los cabellos del cuerpo assi agudos comme espinas de erizo cachero

The translator of F must have used a Latin text containing squamas acutas to produce l'eschaille poignans, but los cabellos del cuerpo is not a translation of this; it seems
likely that the notion of 'hair' was derived from hirsutus in the Sanctuarium, which the Spaniard was obliged to consult because he experienced difficulties with F at this point: he may not have known eschaille, since its Germanic root skalja has no reflexes in Ibero-Romance, and he would doubtless have been puzzled by the incomprehensible tarente, with which a Latin text would have given him no help. espinas de erizo cachero is the product of a translator whose two sources have failed him.

E24,6 vidit citra gentium sanctam ascultantes
F24,5 la vit a cels qui (l'escoutoient) 44
Sa236,31 vidit citra gentium catervas sanctam auscultantes
Sp24,5 vido grant gente aderredor della que la ascuchavan

F is apparently translated from a defective Latin text like E which does not contain catervas; Sp, however, is close to gentium catervas of Sa. If the MS of the Spaniard's French original had contained, like F, the incorrect reading e cels qui le contoient, the Spaniard may have turned to a Latin text for elucidation.

E35,5 quis vel unde esset, et quo nomine uteretur
F35,4 que il estoit e quel non il avoit
Sa239,13 quis vel unde esset vel quo nomine uteretur
Sp35,4 quien era Jesu Kristo o commo avia nombre

There is no obvious reason other than coincidence for these parallels between, on the one hand, E and F, and on the other between Sa and Sp.
As with the Latin/Spanish affinities in the Magdalene texts, many of the cases quoted above are obviously explicable in terms of coincidence or of scribal error in the French and Spanish texts. Some cases are not so easily dismissed, however, and at least show that the relationships between the Martha texts are less straightforward than is suggested by the evidence assembled in part II. Several cases point strongly to Latin interference on the Spanish text, and to reference to Latin texts by French scribes. The evidence suggests, also, that the Latin text being thus consulted was different from E.

Such cases of translators consulting texts other than the ones they are translating are not unique: Wittlin 1971, 606 quotes cases of translators who consult commentaries on the texts they are translating, and whose renderings occasionally translate the commentary rather than the text itself; Deyermond 1973, 107 mentions three cases which suggest that, in making his translation of the Confisón del amante, Cuenca had access to Gower's English text, as well as to Payn's Portuguese translation of it. Also, the case of the MS F2 scribe who consulted the Legenda Aurea (see note on Sp20,10, p.817) shows that other material was available for consultation when such work was being carried out.
Conclusion

Part I of this chapter shows that the Spanish Magdalene life is a direct translation of the French version C, with which it agrees in great detail. This C version and the Lyonnais text D are separate, oblique and variable translations of the Latin Magdalene life B.

Part II establishes a similar pattern for the Martha texts: the Spanish Martha life is a direct translation of the French life F, while F and C5 are independent, and therefore oblique and variable, translations of the Latin life E.

These relationships between the various texts are not remarkable, but need to be established beyond all doubt because, as shown in parts III and IV, there are many cases where the Spanish lives agree with a Latin text against their French original. Such agreement would seem to suggest that we should seek, as the Spaniards' sources, different French translations of the Latin lives; and yet the existence of such sources has been discounted in parts I and II.

Other explanations of these Latin/Spanish parallels must therefore be sought. The majority of them could be explained by coincidence, or by scribal errors in the French and Spanish texts; but a few cases of these puzzling affinities are not easily explained, and may even indicate that the Spanish translators occasionally consulted Latin texts, while using French texts as their principal sources. These Latin texts seem to have been different from those which were the sources of the C and F French translations 45.
Notes to chapter I

1. The terms are those of Vinay and Darbelnet 1968, 46-55.

2. For the terms 'synthetic' and 'analytic', see for example Lyons 1969, 187-192.

3. These procedures are examined in chapter IV for Magdalene and in chapter VI for Martha.

4. In theory such close correspondence between Spanish and French texts could equally well show that the French text is translated from Spanish. However, this is not only culturally improbable, it is also disproved by the nature of some of the Spanish renderings discussed at I(v) and II(v) on pp. 30 and 43.

5. MS C3, which is frequently closer to the Latin B text than the other C MSS, has _ceulique nostre sires gariparsalvewquiavoittestavuglesnez_.

6. For Sp _misericordia_, see chapter VII, p. 345.

7. REW s.v. _perfidia_.

8. No other MS of the C group contains _e fu_; see variants.

9. This sentence is omitted from MS C; see variants.

10. MS C has _venroient_; see variants.

11. _descendit_ is not in MS E; see variants.

12. MS F has _deson saint pere_; see variants.

13. See notes to the texts for an explanation of the Spanish rendering.

14. _Bretanna_ is obviously an error for _Betanna_; this and other mistakes in toponyms are dealt with in chapter VII, pp. 357-360.

15. _conpannia_ is obviously an error, by translator or scribe, for _memoria_; the mistake was probably provoked by scriptural recollection, see also Sp12,3 and Sp23,3.

16. The habit of giving an important biblical quotation in Latin before translating it is quite common, and is frequently observed in the Martha life of MS C5, as mentioned in chapter VI, p. 311. The reference here is to Luke 11.27. See Zink 1976, 93-102.

17. MS C1, however, has _repererons_, and thus agrees closely with Sp in tense; see variants.

18. _et irata_ is in MSS Bl B2 and B3; see variants.

19. MS B has _loci_, not _collis_; see variants.

20. For similar cases, see Sp12,3, Sp23,3, Sp35,13.

21. MS B has _dixerat_, not _predixerat_; see variants.

22. The Spaniard may have sought the help of a Latin text at this point because of difficulty with French _circ_; see also Cl0,13, and C5,13 and C9,22, pp. 338-340.

23. LS s.v. _curam_ and _impedere_.

24. LS s.v. _sustinere_.

25 LS s.v. adesse.
26 LS s.v. consulere
27 MS C has n'en...n'en...; see variants.
28 REW s.v. sazian.
29 DECH s.v. carroña.
30 FEW s.v. baiulare.
31 A reference to Luke 10. 42; the Vulgate reads Maria optimam partem elegit, quae non auferetur ab ea.
32 baiasse is translated by maestra at Sp11,7, and by amiga in Martha Sp31,10. See chapter VII, p. 349.
33 LS s.v. consulere.
34 AFW s.v. conseillier.
35 For further examples, see also notes 15 and 20 above.
36 Matthew 25. 35 in MS Escorial 1.1.6 reads Ca que fambique e diastes me a comer. See Montgomery 1962, 66.
37 elle estoit touz jors is not in MS F; see variants.
38 MS F contains neither saint nor hoste; see variants.
39 REW s.v. *plumbicare.
40 For this case, see note on the Spanish text.
41 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds français MS 423, fol. 33b. This MS contains a much shorter version of the Martha life than the F MSS; see Meyer NE 36(i) (1899), 37 note 3. Another French version reads fesoit perir les nes: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds français MS 1553, fol. 270a; see Meyer NE 35(ii) (1897), 500.
42 LS s.v. intendere, IIc.
43 resgarde at F29,6 is also given the unsatisfactory translation guardame; see chapter VII, p. 349.
44 MS F has le contoient for l'escoutoient; see variants.
45 For further evidence that a Spanish translator may have been consulting a Latin text, see chapter VII, p. 328.
Chapter II: The Latin Magdalene Texts

Summary

The Pilgrim episode and the Penance and Death episode of the Magdalene life were originally two separate compositions, and their combination into a single life brought about the gradual suppression of the incompatible introductory material to the Penance and Death episode, and the elaboration of the shorter Pilgrim episode, to make its originally concise language match the more verbose style of the Penance and Death episode.

Two types of evidence indicate the elaboration of an originally shorter Pilgrim episode, rather than the abridgement of a longer form: a comparison of the textual details of the short form (A) and the long form (B) of the episode points to a process of elaboration rather than of abbreviation; this internal evidence is confirmed by the external evidence of the various combinations in which the episodes are found in the eight MSS in which both episodes occur. The varying contents of these MSS points to the gradual combination and harmonization of two originally independent compositions which had at first been in separate circulation.
Introduction

Throughout chapter I it has been assumed that the Latin Magdalene text B was the source of the French translation C. It was noted in passing that the French version was often much shorter than its supposed Latin original, but this was explained as the work of the French translator, and not by the use of a shorter Latin original.

However, Hansel 1936, 266 has claimed, on the contrary, that the source of the C French Magdalene life is close to the shorter Latin text of the Brussels MS 1079-84 (MS A1 in the present edition); and both Hansel and the Bollandists BHL 806 state that the Pilgrim episode in MS A1, number 5458 in the Bollandists' catalogue, is a shortened form of what they claim is the original version, BHL 5457, corresponding to the Pilgrim episode of the Latin B text.

The object of the present chapter is to show, that the shorter Latin text A (BHL 5458) is in fact the original composition of the Pilgrim episode, and that the longer Latin version B (BHL 5457) is an elaborated version of it. Hansel's claim that the French C translation was made from the short Latin rather than the long Latin text is disproved in chapter III.

There are two types of evidence which show that the short Latin Pilgrim episode, contained together with the Penance and Death episode in MSS A, A1 and A2, was the original form, subsequently expanded to produce the text of the episode contained, together with the same Penance and Death episode, in the B group of MSS.

First there is the internal evidence, which emerges from a detailed comparison of the short (A) and long (B) texts of the Pilgrim episode: an examination of the material present in B but not in A shows that this material was added to A, not removed from B. An analysis of the differences between the A and B texts also allows us to discover what types of change the elaborator wished to achieve.
Secondly, there is the external evidence of the various combinations in which the Pilgrim and Penance and Death episodes are found in the MSS. The Penance and Death episode is very frequently encountered in MSS containing Magdalene material; but of the numerous Latin MSS examined, only eight contain the Pilgrim episode: the MSS of the A group contain the short form, those of the B group the long version. All these eight MSS also contain the Penance and Death episode. The first stage in the combination of the two episodes is represented by MS A2, where the two episodes are separated from each other by several folios, and occur in the reverse of the usual order. Their initial combination is seen in MSS A and A1, and the remaining MSS represent different stages in the combination and harmonization process: MS B represents the stage at which the Pilgrim episode has been elaborated to match the verbose style of the following Penance and Death episode, but where there is still incompatible material between the two parts. This material, consisting of what was originally a prologue and introduction to the Penance and Death episode, is gradually discarded until harmonization is complete with MS B4.

Before proceeding to examine the internal and external evidence outlined above, it is necessary briefly to characterize and illustrate the widely differing styles of the shorter Pilgrim episode and of the Penance and Death episode, so that the reason for the elaboration may be appreciated. The difference in style of the two episodes is explained principally by the different subject-matter: the Pilgrim episode consists largely of a narrative account of a pilgrimage, and therefore contains numerous material details and terrestrial events, such as the loading of the ship, the departure, the storm, burial, etc. In such a narrative there is not much necessity for verbosity, and the A text is a fairly concise composition, becoming more wordy only when there is a biblical allusion (e.g. A1,1-14, A3,1-5), or at critical moments (e.g. A4,3-14, A7, 9-19), or at times of divine intervention (e.g. A10,11-A12,3) or in the case of prayers (e.g. A9,13-A10,7 and A15,8-15).
By contrast, the Penance and Death episode is the account of the Magdalene's life in the desert, where she is attended and fed by the angels, and of her spectacular death witnessed by St Maximin. Here the emphasis is not on material details, but on descriptions of the appearance of the angels, and accounts of miracles and other celestial happenings; these, and the complex religious notions and expressions of religious fervour associated with them, are naturally expressed in florid and verbose prose.

The best examples of the contrasting styles of the two episodes are to be found where they differently treat the same subject matter, in the introduction to the Pilgrim episode and the variable bridge passage which, as described below, is gradually suppressed:

A1,4 beata Maria Magdalena et beatus Maximinus, cui a beato Petro fuerat commendata
B18,20 Erat autem tunc temporis cum apostolis beatus Maximinus, unus ex septuaginta duobus discipulis, vir universa morum probitate conspicuos, doctrina pariter et miraculorum virtute preclarus. Huius religionis sanctitudini beata Maria Magdalene se contulit, beatitudinis contubernio illi coniuncta, veluti beata semper virgo Maria sancto evangeliste Iohanni utpote a domino sibi commissa.

A1,14 ad mare profecti sunt
B19,5 iter usque ad mare direxerunt
A1,18 egredientes navim
B19,8 vegetationem navis relinquentes
A1,21 ieiuniis et orationibus intenti pernoctaverunt
B19,10 die noctuque predicationi ieiuniis et orationibus insistendo, ut populum ipsius regionis incredulum nundumque fonte baptismatis innovatum ad agnitionem et cultum omnipotentis Dei perducerent.

These extracts clearly show that the same subject-matter is treated concisely in the short Pilgrim episode, and very elaborately in the Penance and Death episode. It
was doubtless these two widely differing styles that necessitated the expansion of the Pilgrim episode when this had been combined with the Penance and Death episode.

The evidence for this expansion, and the types of addition made, are examined in the following section.

I The Internal Evidence

The internal evidence considered below strongly suggests the ornamentation of a shorter original rather than the abridgement of a longer text. It is true that if an adaptor were preparing a summary of a text, he would probably omit largely the same superfluous material that an elaborator would add, so that many of the differences between the longer and shorter texts could be interpreted as supporting either contention; but some evidence points unmistakably to ornamentation rather than to abridgement, so that the remaining differences may be safely treated as additions, and not as abbreviations.

The most cogent reasons for assuming the elaboration of an initially shorter text are:

(i) that suspected additions often constitute repetitions of notions and terms already used in the shorter version;

(ii) that the putative additions often give unwarranted importance to relatively insignificant events or aspects of the narrative (though it is true that some provide necessary elucidation of obscure passages - see (v) below);

(iii) that these accretions sometimes produce inconsistencies in the longer form, spoiling the coherent account of events in the shorter form;

(iv) the evidence of three cases of the substitution of synonyms.
The remaining additions (as they now appear to be) of the longer form are discussed under the following heads:

(v) Explanatory additions;
(vi) Generalizations;
(vii) Expansion of expressions of time;
(viii) Expansion of details of the journey;
(ix) Dramatization;
(x) Rhetorical additions;
(xi) General ornamentation.

It seems to have been the elaborator's intention, not only to expand his original, but also to alter it, apparently beyond recognition, at every opportunity; he achieves this by:

(xii) the substitution of synonyms;
(xiii) the extensive re-arrangement of word-order;
(xiv) the interversion of some pronouns and diminutives.

Another fact to emerge from this comparison of the A and B Pilgrim episodes is that there is some material present in the shorter version which does not appear in the longer text; since it seems to have been the elaborator's intention to expand at all costs, it seems unlikely that he omitted this material. It is therefore necessary to assume a slightly shorter Latin version, to which the scribe of MS A (or its forerunner) made a few almost routine additions, but to which the adaptor who produced the longer B version made much more voluminous additions. This material is discussed at (xv) below.
(i) Suspected additions which constitute repetitions

Frequently the procedure of the Latin elaborator has been to duplicate an element of his shorter original by inserting, often before it, an approximate synonym of the term in question. This repetition is not always skilfully carried out, and sometimes involves terms very similar to those being duplicated (e.g. A2,18 audiebant, B2,18 audierant...audiebant); in other places the inserted elements are clearly inspired by a term in the short original, but have a completely different meaning (e.g. A6,11 aliquatenus, B6,11 aliqua temptatione).

Perhaps we should see in this creation of synonyms the Latin counterpart of the the habit of 'Synonymendoppelung' widespread among French prose writers, and observed particularly in the C5 version of the Martha life; see ch. IV, pp. 188-9, and ch. VI, pp. 279 and 310-11.

In the following representative sample of these cases of repetition, the repeated elements are underlined.

A2,3 Maria Magdalena assurgens vultu placito lingua diserta verba salutis ore prophetico predicavit
B2,3 Maria Magdalena assurgens vultu placido facie serena lingua diserta corpore procero, verba salutis, vere vite dogmata, ore prophetico predicavit

A2,17 Confluebant omnes ad eam et audiebant attentius
B2,17 Confluebant omnes ad eam ubi audierant verbum eius, et audiebant attentius

A3,1 os quod pie pedibus salvatoris oscula infixit
B3,1 os quod tam pia tam pura pie pedibus salvatoris oscula infixit

A3,6 per familiares quos sibi fidos noverat iussit
B3,6 per satellites quos sibi fidos noverat et familiares iussit
Evigilans matrona et ab imo ducens suspiria
matrona evigilans ingemuit, et ab imo pectore
ducens suspiria

ne me absente aliquis nostre iuriditionis terminos
invadere presumat
ne me absente aliquis nostre iurisdictionis
terminos presumat exterminare vel aliquid contra
potestatem nostram temere usurpare

As well as being an obvious case of ill-adapted expansion,
the longer version also attaches excessive importance to
a very minor point; see (ii) below.

ne temptator callidus iter quod inceperant
aliquatenus perverteret
ne ille callidus temptator hostis iter quod
inceperant aliqua temptatione perversa diverteret

A frequent procedure of the elaborator is seen in operation
here: he is prompted by aliquatenus to use aliqua
temptatione, and by perverteret to inset perversa; then, in
need of a different verb (though he is not always guided by
such stylistic constraints, see A2,17 above), he selects
the near-synonym diverteret.

dicens eis quod...Illis autem per eam sufficienter
edocti
sufficienter eos edocens quod...Illi consequenter
sic signati et hortamine honesto sufficienter
informati

cепитventus intumescere, ebullire profundum
cepit ventus intumescere et undarum ebullitio per
varios afflatus ebullire

The repetition ebullitio...ebullire reveals the longer text
as a rather unskilful expansion of the shorter; there is
a more successfully disguised repetition ofventus in
varios afflatus.
et matrona maxime, inbecillis et gravida, que tempora partus sui

et matrona maxime, imbecillis et gravida, que in tantum gravata est ut partus sui tempora

The infelicitous repetition of gravida 'pregnant' in gravata (same meaning) is unlikely to have existed in the shorter original, and follows a regular pattern of often inelegant expansion by the addition of a near-synonym; indeed the scribe of MS B1 seems to have found the repetition unacceptable, and has replaced gravata by aggravata 'ill'.

Sustinete modicum

Sinite modicum et sustinete

O inestimabile Marie Magdalene meritum!

O inestimabile Marie Magdalene premium! O celsi meriti femina

viro peregrinanti confert subsidium ne

viro peregrinanti affuit, conferens ei subsidium

precio dato nautis ad collem perductus est

dedit precium ut currsum sisterent et eum ad collem deferrent. Et precio mediante ad collem delatus est

It seems improbable from the context that two separate payments were made: the duplication of pretio dato by the modified dedit precium and precio mediante, as well as the less obvious repetition of perductus est by deferrent and delatus est, are typical of the elaborator's expansion procedure.

In the above quotations, it is the needless and unskilful repetition which reveals them as cases of expansion rather than of abridgement.
(ii) Additions which give disproportionate importance to insignificant aspects of the narrative.

In the following examples, the portion underlined in the short Latin text is expanded in the longer text; the expansion creates a stylistic imbalance in the text by giving unnecessary emphasis to events that are peripheral to the narrative.

A1,15 naviculam ingressi duce domino Marcilie pertui applicuerunt
B1,15 naviculam ingressi, zephiro spirante vernali gratiore aura, Deo duce cursu placito Marsilie portui feliciter applicuerunt

A6,17 vie necessariis preparatis, navem ingressi sunt
B6,16 omiserat puerisque gerulis auro et argento et vestimentorum mutatoris, profecti pactione inita cum nautis navem ingressi sunt.

In neither of these two cases do the details of the voyages play any subsequent part in the narrative, and yet they have been given an inordinate importance by the elaborator.

A9,7 Audita naute pecunia petitioni paruerunt
B9,6 naute audita pecunia, lucri odore velut pisces hamo inescati petitioni sue paruerunt

The greed of the sailors plays no further part in the narrative, and that the longer text should seize upon this minor detail to use a striking simile is strong evidence of the later excessive ornamentation of an initially shorter and more balanced version.

A11,15- A12,2 Iacet corpus quasi vas vacuum, sed signo salutifero consignatum, quod nec roris stillatio nec ymbrium inundatio nec ventorum molestat quassatio. Vas quod nec sitt nec esurt nec fetet nec deperit

B11,15- B12,2 Iacet corpus quasi vas vacuum, quod puerulus cura lactat pervigili. Vas, inquam, tutum, quod nec roris stillatio nec ymbrium inundatio nec ventorum tangit quassatio. Vas quod nec hyemalis temporis sollicitat molestia nec estivi solis perurit inclementia. Vas quod nec sitt nec esurt nec fetet nec deperit.
Already the shorter version, perhaps through religious fervour in describing the miraculous effects of the sign of the cross, has ascribed a slightly disproportionate importance to the resistance to the elements of the empty vessel of the dead mother's body; but the longer version extends the account of the body's durability to include almost every meteorological contingency, and is clearly a later, excessively elaborated, expansion.

Many of these additions resulting in disproportionate emphasis are of a religious nature: the mention of a biblical character or event, a holy place or a saintly virtue, is sufficient to provoke in the adaptor a considerable flood of religious fervour, as in the following examples:

A1,2 Post domini nostri Iesu Christi gloriosam resurrectionem
B1,2 Postquam dominus noster Iesus Christus, Dei et hominum mediator, per passionem et gloriosam resurrectionem suam devicto mortis imperio, glorificata humanitatis substantia, ad celos ascendit

A1,10 illo qui cecus a nativitate dominico sputo lumen recepit
B1,10 illo qui cecus a nativitate limitis oculis sputo dominico tam interioris hominis quam exterioris lumen recepit

The blind-man has no function in the narrative, and the information in the shorter text is just sufficient to specify which of the several biblical blind-men is meant. Compared with this form of biblical reference, however, the almost exegetic additions are out of place here, and give excessive importance to a very marginal character.

A2,14 Iesu Christi fidem plenius exponens
B2,14 Iesum Christum natum ex Maria virgine, a Iudeis crucifixum, mortuum et sepultum et die tercia resurgentem predicans

This elaboration appears to have been inspired by the Creed.
A6,10 ne temptator callidus iter quod inceperant aliquatenus perverteret
B6,10 ne ille callidus temptator hostis iter quod inceperant aliqua temptatione perversa diverteret
A10,12 O inestimabile Marie Magdalene meritum! que
B10,12 O inestimabile Marie Magdalene premium! O celsi meriti femina, femine nil levitatis habens! O pars partium omnium quam elegit sibi Maria, que
A12,10 obviavit apostolorum principi Petro
B12,10 obviavit ei qui supra firmam petram fundatus erat Petrus
A13,5 Cumque introduxisset (eum)\textsuperscript{3} Iherosolimis, et in fide plenius confirmasset, ostendit ei loca domini presentia et eius virtutibus illustrata
B13,5 Tunc introduxit eum Iherosolimis ubi passus, mortuus et sepultus fuerat dominus noster Iesus Christus, et ad alia plura loca duxit eum, ostendens ei virtutes et prodigia que fecit dominus noster Iesus Christus in conspectu discipulorum, que enumerare per singula non est nostre facultatis, qui nudis verbis et vulgaribus utimur sententiis

This is the third time that the events of Christ's passion have been enumerated in B (see B1,2 and B2,14); here a gratuitous allusion to Christ's miracles is accompanied by the liturgical-sounding phrase qui nudis verbis et vulgaribus utimur sententiis.

Thus some trivial events, but especially biblical allusions, have been given disproportionate emphasis by the elaborator. The mention of the resurrection, of a biblical character, of the devil, of the saint's virtues and of Christ's miracles has provided the stimulus for considerable expansion; the resulting additions are seen to be such because they are irrelevant to the narrative, and thus appear as an elaboration of a well-balanced original.
(iii) Additions which have produced defects and inconsistencies in the narrative

In several cases the adaptor's eagerness to elaborate his shorter original has resulted in the insertion of elements which spoil the structure and progression of the life; these elements are thus seen to be the same kind of ill-considered elaborations as those discussed at (i) and (ii) above. The most salient instances are discussed below.

B3,14 Addidit et minas, si marito suo suadere contempneret ut in brevi sanctorum inopias sublevare curaret

A4,1 apparuit matrone pariter et marito et ait

B4,1 apparuit utrique fremens et igneo vultu, ac si tota domus accenderetur, et ait

A4,3 Dormis, tyranne, quiescis, inimice crucis Christi

B4,3 Dormisne, tyranne, membrum patris tui Sathane, cum vipera coniuge tua, que verba mea tibi postposuit evolvere? Quiescisne, crucis Christi inimice

A4,6 diversis cyborum et potuum generibus refertus

B4,6 diversis ciborum et potuum generibus ventris tui ingluive referta

It is clear from this group of examples that the longer text is the later version: the additions making the Magdalene threatening and insulting are somewhat inconsistent with the gentle and loving character portrayed in the rest of the text. Also the saint's anger and threats are given such prominence in the longer version that any summary of the text would be certain to include some mention of them; yet they are absent from the shorter version, with the exception of inimice crucis Christi, in any case a mild reproach aimed at the Pilgrim's religious sensibility.
dictu mirabile. Iacet corpus

Ductus est spiritus eius peregre ut iter arreptum expleat quod debuit corpus complever. Non videtur ab aliquo, et quicquid vident alii potens est videre. Iacet corpus.

In the original shorter version, the suspense is preserved until the end of the episode, when the pilgrim's wife makes the dramatic revelation that she had been with him to the Holy Land in the company of the Magdalene: et viro suo quomodo Maria Magdalena duce eius itineris comes fuisset individua, quomodo terre sancte singula loca prospexisset, per ordinem exposuit. The elaborator's eagerness to expand the shorter original has spoilt the originally well-conceived presentation of events by giving the game away prematurely.

patrocinio commendatur. Interea carbasa impellente

precibus commendatur. Revertamur ad peregrinum, nec vertatur in tedium audire quale ei de desolatione sua solatium gloriosa Maria Magdalena precibus suis contulerit, qualiter mesticiam suam in gaudium converterit. Iam vento graviore carbasa impellente

Like the previous example, this addition spoils the dramatic tension of the plot by making the premature revelation that all will end well for the pilgrim. These two examples also provide negative evidence that the longer text is the later version: the two revelations are so important that no summary could reasonably omit them, and yet they are entirely absent from the shorter text.

utili consilio credidisti. Potens est dominus

utili consilio credidisti, persevera in bono et bene tibi erit. Nec moleste feras si salva facta sit mulier tua, si dormiat, si puerulus cum ea quiescit. Potens enim est dominus

The shorter text does not have St Peter tell the pilgrim at this stage that his wife and child are still alive on the island, so that there is nothing improbable in this version about his two year stay in the Holy Land. But the
longer version, because of its addition, has the pilgrim stay two years or more in Palestine, even though he knows that his wife and child are asleep on a rocky island! In both the short and the long texts, the return to the island was unintentional; this is as one may expect in the shorter text, but in the longer text the pilgrim might more logically wish to search for the island where he knows his wife and child are still alive. Instead, his only concern is to return home: B13,15 repatriare curavit. The adaptor has not considered carefully enough the consequences to the structure of the work of his inappropriate addition.

A13,8 ostendit ei loca domini presentia et eius virtutibus illustrata
B13,7 ad alia plura loca duxit eum, ostendens ei virtutes et prodigia que fecit dominus noster Jesus Christus in conspectu discipulorum

The unskillful expansion of this passage has already been mentioned in (ii) above; however, in trying to accommodate virtutibus illustrata, after already expanding loca into ad alia plura loca duxit eum, he runs into difficulties, and produces a version in which St Peter re-enacts Christ's miracles!

The differences between the A and B versions of the Pilgrim episode examined above are thus seen to be cases of expansion rather than of abridgement, because the additions spoil the structure and plausibility of an original which is relatively free of such defects.

(iv) The evidence of the substitution of synonyms

There are three cases in which the substitution of synonyms indicates that it is the shorter version that was expanded to produce the longer text, and not the reverse.

A2,2 ut more solito ydolis hostias immolareat
B2,2 ut more solito ydolis sacrificaret
We have already observed in (ii) above that the adaptor responsible for the longer version was frequently motivated in making changes and additions by a certain religious fervour; this fervour probably also resulted in the change of hostias immolaret of the shorter version to sacrificaret of the longer version. The term hostia, originally pagan, must have been early assumed into Christian Latin with the meaning 'host, body of Christ, bread consecrated in the Eucharist'. The religious purism of the adaptor was probably offended by the use of this term, for him recalling the central sacrament of the Church, to denote a pagan sacrifice; he therefore substituted the more general sacrificaret.

That the shorter text is the original is also clear from the relative lengths of these two expressions: if an adaptor were making a summary of a longer text, he would achieve no economy by replacing sacrificaret with hostias immolaret.

A13,18 iuxta collem...advenerunt
B13,18 iuxta collem...velificaverunt

The change from the neutral advenerunt of A to the more colourful velificaverunt of B is precisely what one might expect from an adaptor seeking to dramatize and elaborate his original; but an adaptor seeking to shorten his text would achieve no economy, and would needlessly lose an attractive feature of his original, by substituting advenerunt for velificaverunt. This change therefore points to the shorter text as the original version.

A17,1 Qui egressus cum hominibus suis, invenerunt beatam Mariam Magdalenam
B17,1 et egressi invenerunt beatam Magdalenam cum discipulis suis

It is improbable that an adaptor abbreviating a text should change discipulis into hominibus, since there would be a
loss of sense and no saving of space; much more probably, a religiously motivated adaptor altered the account of the home-coming in order to change the colourless *hominibus* into the specifically religious *discipulis*.

Thus the evidence of these three cases of substitution points to A as the original form of the text, and when added to the evidence of (i) to (iii), constitutes very strong proof that the longer text is the work of an adaptor who was elaborating a shorter original which was less ornate, but often more satisfactory from a literary point of view.

Now that this has been established, the remaining additions, as they are now seen to be, may be examined and categorized:

(v) *Explanatory additions*

Whereas many of the additions considered thus far have been unnecessary and even produce inconsistencies in the life, some nevertheless improve the original by making the plot more convincing, or by clarifying obscure passages:

A3,7  
iussit eis victualia erogari occulte. Cum igitur cum viro suo quadam nocte

B3,7  
iussit eis victualia erogari occulte. *Timuit enim viri sui sevitiam et gentium vicinarum perfidiam.* Presertim evolutis aliquot dierum curriculis, quadam nocte

In the shorter version it is not clear why the pilgrim's wife acts secretly in sending food to the disciples, and this addition, following immediately after *occulte*, seems to be an attempt to clarify the obscurity.

A3,19  
*iterato aspexit. Tercia vero nocte*

B3,19  
*iterato aspexit, quod secundo distulit enucleare.* Tercio vero

After the second vision, so as to leave no doubt that this
too was disregarded, the adaptor adds the underlined phrase.

A5,9 Evoluto brevi tempore cognovit se matrona precibus Marie Magdalene concepisse

B5,8 Evolutoque brevi tempore, debita (nature) illis exercentibus, cognovit se matrona precibus beate Marie Magdalene concepisse.

The adaptor doubtlessly reflected that, in the case of recently and reluctantly converted mortals, the Magdalene's prayers alone might not suffice; he therefore gave greater credibility to the event by his addition.

A8,1 audiat etiam adclamantes nautas ut ejectum corpus mortuum fluctibus immergatur. Qui pressus doloribus innumeris, 'Parcite...'

B8,1 Attendit etiam nautis procella seviente clamantibus, 'Eiciatur corpus antequam moriamur; numquam enim cessabit quasatia quamdiu introfuerit.' Non enim ambiguum est, cum multis experimentis et rationibus sit probatum, quod mare intra se nichil sustinet quod sit mortuum. Et cum apprehendissent corpus ut illud sevientis maris fluctibus eicerent, 'Parcite...'

The long addition seeks to justify the sailors' wish to dispose of the body; it is an attempt to make the incident more convincing for those who may have found it cruel, or who may not have been aware of the belief that dead bodies bring misfortune to ships.

A11,6 in mari consulit famulatur et lactat

B11,6 in mari consult famulatur et lactat. Consulit peregrinanti ne iter arreptum relinquat inconsummatum; famulatur parturienti, dolores allevans per obsequium, lactat vagientem ut teneri ploratus relevet esuriem

Possibly feeling that the three verbs of A need clarification, the elaborator has taken each term in turn, and explained what is meant by it.
Here the adaptor makes good an omission in his original.

For those who may not have realized why the child should be afraid on seeing his father, the elaborator provides the explanation.

(vi) Generalizations

The adaptor has inserted four general reflections into the text, three of them comments on the nature of women:

B6,3 Econtra mulier instat anxia, femineum nec mutans femina motum, nititur in vetitum; et pedibus

B6,6 lacrimis obortis ceu mos est mulierum tandem obtinuit

B8,3: the long addition concerning the disposal of the dead body in the ship contains a passage which has the appearance of similar authorial intervention: Non enim ambiguum est, cum multis experimentis et rationibus sit probatum, quod mare intra se nihil sustinet quod sit mortuum

A10,12 O inestimabile Marie Magdalene meritum! que
B10,12 O inestimabile Marie Magdalene premium! O celsi meriti femina, femine nil levitatis habens! O pars partium omnium quam elegit sibi Maria, que
(vii) Expansion of expressions of time

Frequently the adaptor has chosen to make expressions of time more elaborate; some typical examples follow:

A3,10 Cum igitur cum viro suo quadam nocte
B3,9 Presertim evolutis aliquot dierum curriculis, quadam nocte

A4,1 Tercia vero nocte
B4,1 Tercio vero sub intempeste noctis silentio

A12,10 post dies aliquot
B12,10 Emersoque aliquot dierum itinere

A13,13 Elapso autem biennio vel amplius
B13,13 evoluta sunt biennii vel amplioris temporis curricula

A14,16 ac si in archa vel in pertica collocati fuissent
B14,16 ac si in pertica vel in archa ab illa die in qua ibi positi fuerant diligenter fuissent collocati

Except perhaps in the case of the last example, where the insertion makes for greater precision, these additions have no useful function, and seem to be cases where the adaptor simply sought to produce a longer and more elaborate text.

(viii) Expansion of material details of the journeys

Like expressions of time, these are especially susceptible to expansion since they may be ornamented without any interference on the key events of the narrative. Some typical instances follow:

A1,16 duce domino Narcillie portui applicuerunt
B1,15 zephiro spirante vernali gratiore aura, Deo duce cursu placito Narsilie portui feliciter applicuerunt
vie necessariis preparatis navem ingressi sunt

navem ingressi sunt. Iam iamque

navem ingressi sunt. Naucleri vero rudentibus antempnis ceterisque navis armamentis dispositis, carinam fluctibus carbasa ventis imponunt. Iamiamque

navis optato portui applicuit, et egressus

navis optato portui applicuit, et dato nauto peregrinus egressus

dedit precium ut cursum sisterent et eum ad collem deferrent. Et precio mediante ad collem delatus est...scapha exilivit

(ix) Dramatization

In several cases the adaptor's additions have been inserted with the apparent intention of making confrontations and incidents more dramatic:

B3,14; B4,1; B4,3; B4,6: these four additions which have the effect of altering the Magdalene's character are discussed at (iii) above; however, despite the inconsistencies created by these additions, they were clearly made to dramatize the encounters between the Magdalene and the matron, and between the Magdalene and the pilgrim.

Sine me ire non potes

Quid est, domine? Putas sine me quoquam proficisci? Absit. Te enim recedente recedam, te veniente veniam, te quiescente quiescam.

As frequently in cases of direct speech, the adaptor has simply made the character speak more, without imparting any
extra information, in order to make the encounter more life-like.

A8,1  
adclamantes nautas ut eiectum corpus mortuum fluctibus immergatur

B8,1  
nautis... clamantibus, 'Eiciatur corpus antequam moriamur; numquam enim cessabit quassatio quamdiu introfuerit.'

The adaptor has dramatized this passage by making indirect speech into direct speech, and by expanding what was said.

A8,7  
Qui pressus doloribus innumeris, 'Parcite...

B8,6  
Et cum apprehendissent corpus ut illud sevientis fluctibus eicerent, 'Parcite...

In the shorter version the conflict between sailors and pilgrim is purely verbal; but through the above addition, the conflict is intensified in the longer version, and the incident becomes more dramatic.

B12,11  
The longer version adds here Et sciscitans peregrinum cuius ammonitione, qua de causa illuc venisset

The addition makes the encounter with St Peter more life-like, while in the shorter version it is the pilgrim who speaks first, after St Peter has admired in silence the sign of the cross on his shoulder.

A16,9  
et viro suo quomodo Maria Magdalena duce eius itineris comes fuisset individua, quomodo terre sancte singula loca prospexisset, per ordinem exposuit

B16,2-15  
Magni meriti es, o beata et gloriosa...ut nec in articulo deviaret.

This scene in which the resurrected wife speaks to her husband is very briefly treated in the A text; in the B version, however, direct speech is used, both husband and wife speak, and the dramatized scene covers fourteen lines.
(x) **Rhetorical additions**

Several of the additions in the longer version seem to have the purpose of appealing directly to the public:

A8,15  
Dum hec lugens diceret, non procul a navi

B8,15  
Dixit et **ecce** non procul a navi

A11,5  
exhibuit alimentum. In terris docet

B11,5  
exhibuit alimentum. **Quis audivit talia?** In terris docet

B11,16: the longer text inserts **inquam** in two places: Vas, **inquam**, signo signatum salutifero. Vas, **inquam**, **tutum**

B12,4  
B adds several lines at this point (see (iii)), prefaced by a direct appeal to the public: Revertamur ad peregrinum, nec **vertatur** in tedium audire quale...

A15,1  
Corpus etiam matrone adeo odorum erat

B15,1  
Consideravit etiam, **quod ad audiendum non est minus delectabile**, corpus matrone adeo odorum

This addition seems to be a kind of aside to the reader.

(xi) **General ornamentation**

Many of the additions in B do not readily fit into any category, and are best described as gratuitous ornament, since their insertion into the text appears to serve no immediately obvious purpose. Some examples follow:

A9,17  
conciperet et per conceptum periret

B9,17  
conciperet **hac de causa ut** per conceptum periret

A10,14  
que viro peregrinanti confert subsidium

B10,14  
que **in terris predicans** viro peregrinanti affuit
omnia que ei acciderant, cuius hortamine

omnia que ei acciderant, tam in terra quam in mari, cuius hortamine

enarrasset, ait Petrus

explicuit, Quo penitus audito, Petrus ait

conchis lapillulos immiscentem harenulis involutum. Quem attendens

haren involutum lapillos conchis immiscentem; et quidnam esset ammirari non desinens scapha exilivit. Quem cum attenueret

puerulum stature pulcherrime, papillas matris

puerulum stature pulcherrime vivum et papillas matris

pannos autem quos superposuerat corpori adeo recentes ac si

pannos vero quos corpori supposuerat et desuper adeo fragrantes, adeo recentes, ac si

Such cases are extremely numerous throughout the longer version of the Pilgrim episode.

The cases of addition and expansion considered under (i), (ii) and (iii) above, together with the three cases of substitution considered in (iv), clearly show that a shorter original A was expanded and ornamented to become the longer text B of the Pilgrim episode. The cases considered under (v) to (xi) must therefore also be cases of addition and elaboration.

This order of events — elaboration rather than abridgement — is further confirmed by a type of literary criticism which has been applied to similar problems in New Testament studies: one of the principles of literary criticism used by commentators on the Gospels, in examining different accounts of the same events, is that of preferring the less elaborate of two alternative versions. While the application of this principle is somewhat
vitiated by the existence of longer parts in A, discussed in (xv) below, this method of literary criticism applied to our texts would tend to confirm that the simpler form A is the original version, subsequently elaborated to produce the longer form B.

Not all the changes made by the elaborator involve addition and expansion: there are very numerous cases where words in A have been substituted by synonyms in B, where word-order has been extensively re-arranged, and where some pronouns and diminutives have been interverted. The reasons for these changes are not clear, since they usually are not consistent with the elaborator's aim of expanding at all costs in order to harmonize with a following verbose text. However, the routine nature of the changes suggests that the adaptor had some consistently held purpose in making them. It almost seems as if the elaborator wished to conceal his source, but of course plagiarism was a notion unknown in medieval literature, so that disguising a literary theft is unlikely to have been the motive for these puzzling changes.

(xii) The substitution of synonyms

The following list is a representative sample of cases where the adaptor has used in his longer version of the Pilgrim episode a synonym, sometimes approximate, of the term in the shorter original. In most cases the substitution seems fairly pointless, usually does not involve the use of a longer word, and seems to be the work of an adaptor seeking to change his original beyond recognition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1,22</th>
<th>intenti</th>
<th>B1,22</th>
<th>insistentes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2,1</td>
<td>quoniam</td>
<td>B2,1</td>
<td>si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5,5</td>
<td>rogemus</td>
<td>B5,4</td>
<td>dicamus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5,5</td>
<td>roget</td>
<td>B5,5</td>
<td>oret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5,9</td>
<td>ministrari</td>
<td>B5,8</td>
<td>ergari</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As mentioned in (i) above, some of the substituted items in B are clearly inspired by words in A, but have completely different meanings:

A3,3 redundabat B3,4 habunde
A4,12 inopes B4,12 inhospites
A6,13 doctore B6,12 edocens
A8,15 posita B8,15 posset, possit MSS B1, B2, B3, B4.

These are not necessarily errors on the part of the adaptor, but one case arouses suspicion of a misreading of the short version:

A5,11 Et audierunt B5,11 et gavisi sunt

Considering the parallel positions in the narrative occupied by these two terms, it is tempting to suggest that the
use of the verb *gaudere* in the B text was prompted by the misreading of the ampersand as the letter G.

(xiii) Re-arrangement of word-order

One of the most constant features of the adaptor's procedure is his alteration of word-order:

- **A4,6** inimice crucis Christi  
  **B4,6** crucis Christi inimice

- **A4,9** disperire permittis  
  **B4,9** permittis disperire

- **A4,10** pannis olosericis involutus  
  **B4,10** pannis involutus olosericis

- **A4,13** quod eis benefacere distulisti  
  **B4,13** quod tantum distulisti eis benefacere

- **A4,15** evigilans matrona  
  **B4,15** matrona evigilans

- **A5,24** invadere presumat  
  **B5,21** presumat exterminare

- **A6,1** viarum tractus  
  **B6,1** tractus viarum

- **A6,3** periclitari posses  
  **B6,3** posses periclitari

- **A6,9** eorum humeris  
  **B6,9** humeris eorum

- **A6,10** temptator callidus  
  **B6,10** callidus temptator
gravissimis angustiis urgebantur
gravissimis urgebantur angustiis

Palpitabat puerulus
Puerulus vero palpitatbat

vagientem puerulum
puerulum vagientem

audiat etiam adclamantes nautas
attendit etiam nautis precella seviente clamantibus

apparuit rupes
mons apparuit

quam ad devorandum marinis beluis fluctibus
quam marinis beluis ad devorandum fluctibus

audita naute pecunia
naute audita pecunia

ne in itinere merore confectus deficeret
ne merore confectus in itinere deficeret

signo salutifero consignatum
signo signatum salutifero

egressus peregrinus
peregrinus egressus est

verbum fidei predicatum
predicatum esset verbum Dei

ait Petrus
Petrus ait

ludentem vidit puerulum
vidit puerulum qui more solito secus litus lusum venerat
There are five cases where the copyists of the B life (as opposed to the elaborator himself) have made the same type of word-order change: see variants to B3,12; B9, 10; B10,6; B10,9; B15,12. It is therefore possible that in other cases, too, a copyist may be responsible for an alteration in word-order. However, even excepting these scribal alterations, there remains a large body of cases where the adaptor almost obsessively altered the word-order of his original, without achieving any noticeable improvement in clarity or style.
(xiv) Interversion of some pronouns and diminutives

The adaptor has gone to considerable lengths to make his version different from the original; just how intricate and painstaking this process could be may be seen in the details of his treatment of some pronouns (and possessive adjectives), and of some diminutives. There are many instances of exact correspondences between the treatment of these items in the two texts, but the following cases suffice to point to an obsessive desire for change:

A2,7 eloquentie eius  B2,7 eloquentie ipsius
A4,16 viro suo  B4,16 viro
A5,2 persuasionibus Marie Magdalene  B5,1 persuasionibus eius
A5,14 Vir autem eius  B5,11 consequenter vir
A6,8 eius tutele  B6,8 tutele sue
A6,10 temptator callidus  B6,10 ille callidus temptator
A6,14 in noticiam eorum  B6,14 in noticiam absent
A6,15 per eam  B6,15 absent

A similar determination to change his original may be seen in these instances of diminutives, where one might have expected the elaborator to prefer the longer form:

A9,9 cum puerulo  B9,9 cum puero
A10,8 cum puerulo  B10,8 cum puero
A14,6 lapillulos  B14,6 lapillos
A14,6 harenulis  B14,5 harene

It therefore emerges from the three types of modification discussed above under (xii), (xiii) and (xiv), that the adaptor was not only lengthening his original, but also, for no obvious reason, seeking to change it in every possible respect.
Material present in the shorter version but lacking in the longer text

There follows a list of some of the material which is not found in the longer version of the episode, but which is present in the shorter A version. This material may have been omitted by the adaptor when he made his longer version, but since he was clearly at pains to expand at all costs, this seems a less satisfactory explanation than to assume the existence of a slightly shorter text (now lost) than the extant short version A; to this putative original, a scribe may have made these few additions to produce the A group of MSS, while the adaptor who produced the B version used this now lost version on which to build his expanded and ornamented version.

The most significant instances of material present in A but absent from B are as follows:

A4,14 A adds ab oculis eorum

A5,6 A adds quatinus eius annuente gratia

A5,12 A adds quia magnificat dominus misericordiam suam cum illa et congratulabantur ei

A5,14- A has a longer version of this passage than B: Vir autem eius... plenius agnosceret

A5,20 A adds mariti sui provocata voto

A6,14 A adds perfectius

A8,15 dum hec lugens diceret beside B8,15 dixit

A9,6 A adds humanius

A13,14 A adds recordatus dulcedinis patrie peregrinus

A14,14 ore et manibus contractantem beside B14,14 suggentem
A15,10. A adds et que fuit comes tuo venientis, esset etiam comes tuo adiutorio revertentis.

The existence of these elements, present in A but not in B, might in part be explained as omissions of the elaborator: omissions of one word could easily be explained thus, and at least one case above (A14,14) bears the mark of the adaptor: in his attempt to substitute synonyms wherever possible, he has replaced contractantem by suggentem; he then finds that his replacement is not compatible with ore et manibus, so omits these words.

The longer additions are more difficult to explain in these terms, however, and suggest the existence of a slightly shorter prototype, from which both A and B were derived, as in the following diagram:

```
short prototype text of Pilgrim episode, now lost

Few additions

short version of Pilgrim episode (BHL 5458) in MSS A, A1, A2

Voluminous additions

long version of Pilgrim episode (BHL 5457) in MSS B, B1, B2, B3, B4
```

Summary of the internal evidence

Sections (i) to (iv) show that the shorter text A of the Pilgrim episode is close to the original composition, which was expanded by an adaptor who probably wished to adapt it to the verbose style of the following Penance and Death episode. Sections (v) to (xi) illustrate the main procedures used for this expansion and elaboration; and
sections (xii), (xiii) and (xiv) isolate some features of the adaptor's methods which reveal an almost obsessive desire to change his original. Section (xv) shows that we do not possess the exact original of this earlier shorter version, but a slightly expanded version of it, A.
II The External Evidence

A study of the combinations in which the components of the life appear in the eight MSS containing it, confirms that A is the earlier form of the Pilgrim episode, and that B is an elaborated version of it.

MS A2 represents the stage when the two episodes exist in the same MS, but separate and in reverse order, with a prologue and an introduction suggesting that they had not yet been combined.

MSS A and Al represent the next stage, when the two episodes have been placed together, presumably because they were seen to contain related material, and when the combination was partially facilitated by the suppression of what was originally the prologue to the Penance and Death episode. However, the combination remains unsatisfactory, because (a) the concise style of the A Pilgrim episode is at variance with the verbosity of the Penance and Death episode, and (b) the introduction to the Penance and Death episode (B18,1 to B20,4) repeats and contradicts the introduction to the Pilgrim episode (Al,1-22): both introductions contain an account of the journey from Palestine to Provence; in the introduction to the Pilgrim episode the Magdalene remains in Marseille and there is no further mention of St Maximin; in the Penance and Death introduction, on the other hand, the party from Palestine lands at Marseille, then goes direct to Aix, and the Magdalene leaves at once for the desert. It is these stylistic differences, and this repetition and contradiction, that is gradually eliminated in subsequent changes.

The next stage in the combination of the two episodes is represented by MS B, in which the shorter Pilgrim episode has been lengthened and ornamented to harmonize better with the already florid Penance and Death episode; but the life in MS B is still defective in that it still contains the superfluous and contradictory introduction to
the Penance and Death episode. This introduction now forms what may be considered a variable bridge passage.

The subsequent stages in the harmonization of the two episodes are characterized by the gradual reduction of this bridge passage: it is shortened in MSS B1 and B2, a few lines of it remain in MS B3, and it is entirely eliminated in MS B4.

The details of this process of combination and harmonization are set out below; the contents of the eight MSS involved are given in volume II, pp. 457-465.

(i) The first stage of combination: MS A2

The following details about this MS indicate that it represents the earliest stage in the combination of the two episodes:

(a) Both episodes occur in the same MS - a necessary prelude to the realization that they contain related material and so to their eventual combination - but the Penance and Death episode precedes the Pilgrim episode (the reverse order is found in all other MSS), and is separated from it by eleven folios.

(b) The Penance and Death episode of this MS is preceded by the prologue Liqueat plerisque relationis ... hec nosse sufficiat, which regularly precedes this episode when it occurs in MSS not containing the Pilgrim episode, but which is always suppressed when the Penance and Death episode follows the Pilgrim episode; such a prologue placed between the two episodes would evidently hinder the smooth combination of the two components even more seriously than the bridge passage. The prologue appears in volume II, p. 543.

(c) In this MS it is the introduction to the Pilgrim episode (A1,1-18) that is suppressed, presumably since the scribe or compiler felt that it repeated material already
present in the introduction to the (here preceding) Penance and Death episode (B18,1-B20,4). In four other cases (MSS B1, B2, B3 and B4) it is the introduction to the Penance and Death episode (or bridge passage) that is found to be redundant, and so gradually suppressed. In MS A2 the bridge passage is intact, and is in any case not a bridge passage at all, because of the reverse order and separation of the two episodes.

(d) It is the shorter version of the Pilgrim episode that appears in this MS, and the internal evidence considered above shows this to have been the earlier version.

(ii) The second stage of combination: MSS A and Al

The reasons for believing that these two MSS represent the second stage in the combination process are as follows:

(a) In the Penance and Death episode which now follows immediately the Pilgrim episode, the Liquet plerisque... prologue has been eliminated; see (i) (b) above.

(b) The superfluous bridge passage is still present.

(c) Both MSS contain the shorter, earlier form of the Pilgrim episode, of which the concise style is at variance with the more verbose Penance and Death episode which now follows.

Thus these two MSS show the two episodes combined for the first time, but with two obstacles to harmonization still present, (b) and (c) above.

(iii) The third stage of combination: MS B

The next documented stage in the combination process is represented by the text used as the base MS for this
edition; the following two features show its position in the evolution of the life:

(a) It contains the later, lengthened form of the Pilgrim episode, which now harmonizes better with the following verbose Penance and Death episode.

(b) It still has the superfluous and contradictory bridge passage.

It was at this stage in the combination process that the French C translation must have been made, since MS B is the only extant text which contains all the elements contained in C, that is the expanded Pilgrim episode, the complete bridge passage, and the Penance and Death episode. However, given the affinities between the French C text and other MSS of the B group, it should be stated that MS B cannot be the French translator's exact original, and is simply the text closer to C than any other extant MS.

(iv) The fourth stage of combination: MSS B1 and B2

These two MSS must represent the next documented stage in the combination process because in them we see the beginning of the reduction of the superfluous bridge passage; both MSS omit the account of the expulsion from Palestine and the arrival in Marseille (about two-thirds of the bridge passage) and begin, after the end of the Pilgrim episode which leaves the Magdalene in Marseille, with the departure of Magdalene and St Maximin from Marseille to Aix. This omission avoids the repetition of material, and so makes the Penance and Death episode follow more smoothly from the Pilgrim episode. Nevertheless, this combination of the episodes does have the defect of leaving St Maximin inactive and marking time while the Magdalene is busy with the Pilgrim episode. Subsequent versions remove this fault.
(v) The fifth stage: MS B3

MS B3 retains only about one eighth of the bridge passage, leaving only that portion which begins (B19,14) Rexit autem aquensem ecclesiam beatus Maximinus... This omission eliminates the problem of St Maximin's inactivity that vitiated earlier combinations to the two episodes. Indeed the compiler of this MS must have noticed the incompatibility of the bridge passage with the introduction to the Pilgrim episode, since his introduction to the Pilgrim episode is in effect a blend of the two (sc. of the introduction to the Pilgrim episode and of the bridge passage). Thus the Pilgrim episode of MS B3 begins Post dominice resurrectionis gloriam (as B18,2) and continues as the bridge passage as far as virtute preclarus (B18,23); it then changes back to the longer Pilgrim episode with Huic beata Maria Magdalena a beato Petro apostolo commendata est...(B1,8); see volume II, pp. 541-2.

By this omission of almost all of the bridge passage, thus suppressing all contradictory material, MS B3 achieves a much smoother combination of the two episodes than those considered above.

(vi) The final stage: MS B4

The last stage of the gradual elimination of the bridge passage is represented by MS B4, where the longer Pilgrim episode, ending (B17,13) statuerunt ecclesias in nomine domini nostri Iesu Christi, cui est honor et gloria in secula seculorum amen, is immediately followed by the Penance and Death episode proper, beginning (B20,1) Interea beata Maria Magdalena...9

The bridge passage is also absent from the MS D Lyonnais translation (D24,14-D25,1), so that it was probably at this stage that this translation was made - unless, as probably occurred with the Spanish translation, it was the translator who made the omission. MS B4 was
certainly not the source of the D translation, however, since the Latin MSS contains very many aberrations evident in the variant readings.

Thus the combination of the two originally separate and independent episodes involved three stages:

(a) The recognition that the two episodes contained related material, possibly following their appearance in the same MS.

(b) The expansion of the originally shorter form of the Pilgrim episode, to suit the following more verbose Penance and Death episode;

(c) The gradual elimination of the superfluous and contradictory bridge passage, a remnant of the introduction to the previously separate Penance and Death episode.

Three further considerations support the foregoing account of the combination of the two episodes:

(a) The longer version of the Pilgrim episode is always found immediately preceding the Penance and Death episode (B MSS), while only the shorter Pilgrim episode is ever found alone, in MS A2; it was expanded when combined with the more verbose Penance and Death episode. While such an expansion, to harmonize with a more verbose following text, is entirely comprehensible, it is most improbable that any adaptor should take the combination of the longer Pilgrim episode and the Penance and Death episode, and shorten only the first, leaving the second intact.

(b) It is just possible that the Pilgrim episode existed in both a longer and a shorter form before any combination with the Penance and Death episode was contemplated, and that compilers combined at will either the long or the
short version with the Penance and Death episode to produce the various extant combinations. However, the internal evidence in section I shows that the shorter version is the original; and, as stated at (a) above, the shorter version is the only one to appear alone, in MS A2. These circumstances suggest that the expansion was necessitated only by its combination with the more verbose Penance and Death episode, and that the combinations are not therefore fortuitous, but rather a series of progressive improvements.

(c) The contention that the bridge passage was felt to be superfluous is supported by the fact that the Spanish translator very probably discarded it when translating from a French text which contained it.

Conclusion

It is generally believed that the shorter Latin version of the Pilgrim episode BHL 5458 is an abridged form of the original longer form BHL 5457; but an analysis of the differences between the two texts - the internal evidence - shows that the shorter form is close to the original version, and that the longer form is an elaborated version of it.

The shorter version is likely to have been thus elaborated in order to make it more stylistically compatible with the following more verbose Penance and Death episode, with which it becomes combined. The external evidence - an examination of the various combinations in which the two episodes appear - confirms this reason for the elaboration, and shows the different stages of a gradual harmonization of the two components of the life.
Notes to chapter II

1 Some examples of MSS containing this Penance and Death episode are: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds latin, MSS 3800a, 3820, 5271, 5276, 5281, 5296, 5312, 5323, 5345, 5347, 5351, 5360, 5368, 5406, 5639, 12602, etc.

2 Both Mark 8. 22-26 and John 9. 1-41 mention the cure by saliva, while only John specifies in 9. 2 that the man was blind from birth. The healing of the blind man is also recounted in Matthew 9. 28 and Luke 18. 35-43, but neither congenital blindness nor the saliva cure are mentioned in these two accounts. Thus all the information in the short version A is necessary for a reference to John 9.

3 MS A omits eum; see variants.

4 FEW s.v. 


6 The term 'represents' is used to indicate that it is not these MSS themselves, but rather lost predecessors of them, that formed the various stages of the combination process. The dates of the A and B MSS, given in volume II section III, make this clear; and in the case of MS A2, the variant readings for the Penance and Death episode show that for this episode only, MS A2 agrees with MSS B1 B2 and B3, rather than with MSS A, A1 and B as might be expected. These affinities may even indicate that MS A2 is a combination of the original short Latin Pilgrim episode with a Penance and Death episode copied from a later version such as that of MSS B1, B2 or B3.

7 See note 1 above for examples of such MSS.

8 The major cases of such affinities are listed in volume II, pp. 466-8.

9 As mentioned in note 6, there cannot have been a linear progression from A2 to A + A1 to B to B1 + B2 to B3 to B4, and these MSS only represent the various stages of the combination process; indeed the variant readings show that MS B4 is closer to MS B than to the other B MSS.

10 This possibility is discussed in chapter VII, pp. 327-8.

11 See chapter VII, pp. 327-8.
Chapter III: The Latin Original of the French Magdalene Translation

Summary

The French C translation of the Magdalene life agrees in detail with the B Latin version in containing material absent in the Latin A text, and also in not having material which is exclusive to A. The translation agrees in a number of cases with A, while differing from B, but these cases are unlikely to indicate any direct relationship between A and C, since the apparent affinities can be explained either in terms of changes made during translation, or of scribal alterations during the copying of the B texts.

On the other hand the French C translation frequently does not contain material present in both A and B, and occasionally contains material found in neither A nor B. These circumstances may point to a source that is neither A nor B; but because no other possible source of C has come to light, because the B version was a widespread and popular text, because of the circumstances in which B arose, and because the changes that such a derivation implies would be pointless in Latin, but comprehensible in a simplifying translation, the Latin source of C is most likely to be a text very close to B. The discrepancies between B and C are to be explained by the translation procedures which are analysed in chapter IV.
Introduction

We have seen in chapter II that two types of Latin text have the same subject matter as the French C translation: the A group of MSS, which contain the original short form of the Pilgrim episode followed by the Penance and Death episode; and the B group of MSS, which have an expanded form of the Pilgrim episode followed by the same Penance and Death episode that appears in A.

It has been suggested by Hansel that the French C translation is derived from the A form of the life; similarly Shore 1979 is somewhat confused about the C translator's original. On pp. 61-62 she explains the differences between the translation and MS B by stating that the miracle may have 'originated in the vernacular tradition, and was then incorporated into the Latin'. Elsewhere she claims that omissions and additions in the French text indicate that MS B cannot be its source.

This chapter aims to dispel this confusion by establishing that, despite the similarities, particularly in length, between A and C, and despite the differences between C and both A and B, it is in fact MS B that is the closest extant Latin text to the French C translation. The question of the exact Latin source of the D translation of the Magdalene life is not discussed here, since the provenance of this version has been studied in detail by Stimm 1955, 44-59 and 157-165.

The French C text contains many elements which appear in the longer Latin text B, but which are absent from the shorter form A. These are the elements which were added to the A version by the elaborator who produced the B text, and their presence in the French translation clearly demonstrates the latter's derivation from the longer B Latin text. The close affinity between C and B is further confirmed by the absence in both of the few additions made to the otherwise shorter A version - see chapter II, pp. 115-116.
However, there are several cases where the French translation and the short A Latin version coincide in not containing elements present in the B version; these cases make it appear that there may be some direct relationship between C and A.

Again, there are many cases where the French version contains no equivalent of elements that are present in both the A and the B Latin texts; and there are a few cases where the French text contains elements with seemingly no Latin original.

Yet despite the different lengths of the B Latin and C French versions, despite some correspondences between the A and C texts, and despite some French omissions and additions not accounted for by either Latin text, there is nevertheless strong evidence that the French translator's only source was the longer B Latin version, in the form of a text very close to MS B, and that the apparent disparities between the Latin B text and the French C version are to be explained as the work of the translator. Indeed this provisional conclusion is confirmed in chapter IV, where the changes made by the translator are seen to correspond to a consistently followed series of procedures intended to produce a version which was destined for an uneducated public, and which was probably to be used as sermon material.

The evidence for these assertions is examined under the following headings:

I Cases where C follows B, and differs from A,
   (i) in containing material which is not in A,
   (ii) in not containing material present in A but not in B.

II Cases where C follows A, and differs from B.
III Cases where C follows neither A nor B
   (i) in not containing material present in both A and B,
   (ii) in containing material not in either A or B.

In section IV it is argued that C is nevertheless translated from B, despite the evidence of II and III above, and despite the assertions of other Magdalene scholars. This is maintained on the following grounds:
   (i) No other possible sources have come to light;
   (ii) The B version has survived in numerous MSS, and such a popular text would be an obvious choice for a translation;
   (iii) The existence of a Latin text agreeing with the French version in all details supposes either the re-abridgement of an expanded text, or a partially expanded stage in the elaboration of the shorter text; both are fairly improbable suppositions;
   (iv) In order to produce from the existing Latin texts a Latin version corresponding exactly with the French, it would be necessary to assume changes that would be both pointless and highly improbable in a Latin context; the changes are far more easily explained as the work of the translator.

This evidence is confirmed by the findings of chapter IV: if we assume that the French translator was using the Latin B text, then he seems consistently to be following procedures that would produce a text suitable for oral delivery, probably as a sermon, to an uneducated public. He achieves this principally by omitting difficult material, by lowering the stylistic register, by concretizing abstract and figurative language, and by making some additions. Such procedures would make no sense if used to adapt a Latin text, but are entirely comprehensible in the case of a translation.
I(i) Cases where C follows B, and differs from A, in containing material which is not in A

The French C translation and the longer B Latin version agree against the shorter A Latin text almost as often as the adaptor added material to expand the shorter into the longer Latin version in the process described in chapter II. A representative sample of self-explanatory examples will suffice to show the close affinity of B with C, and the considerable differences between these two and the A Latin text. Where appropriate, the material common to B and C is underlined.

A1,2 Post domini nostri Iesu Christi gloriosam resurrectionem

B1,2 Postquam dominus noster Iesus Christus, Dei et hominum mediator, per passionem et gloriosam resurrectionem suam devicto mortis imperio, glorificata humanitatis substantia, ad celos ascendet

C1,2 Après ce que nostre sires Jhesu Christ, qui est moien de Dieu e des hommes, par sa passion e par sa resurrectioun ot veincu la mort; quant s'umanitez fu glorifie e il monta es ciels

A4,1 apparuit matrone pariter et marito et ait, 'Dormis

B4,1 apparuit utrique fremens et igneo vultu, ac si tota domus accenderetur, et ait, 'Dormisne

C4,1 lor aparut la benoite Magdaleine a au ,ii. a grant fremisement, e si sembloit de son viaire qui ce fust fez, ausi come si la meson arsit. Et lors dist ele, 'Tiranz, dors tu

A4,6 diversis cyborum et potuum generibus refertus

B4,6 diversis ciborum et potuum generibus ventris tui ingluvie referta

C4,7 tu qui ton ventre norris de divers mengiers e de divers viandes e de divers boivres

A5,21 Sine me ire non potes

B5,15 Quid est, domine? Putas sine me quoquam proficisci? Absit. Te enim recedente recedam, te veniente veniam, te quiescente quiescam.

C5,17 Q'est ce sire, quidiez vous aler sanz moi? Ja n'avendra si Dieu plest. Si vous en alez, ge m'en irai, si vous venez, ge vendrai, si vous reposez, jeo reposerai.
Econtra mulier instat anxia, et mariti pedibus provoluta lacrimis extorsit consensum

Econtra mulier instat anxia, femineum nec mutans femina motum, nititur in vetitum; et pedibus viri provoluta lacrimis obortia ceu mos est mulierum tandem obtinuit

Encontre ce la dame s'arestoit, e ne-muoit pas son corage, einz se lessa cheoir aus pies son mari e plora tant que li sires l'otroia qe ele iroit avec lui

vie necessariis preparatis

oneratis plerisque gerulis auro et argento et vestimentorum mutatoriis, profecti pactione inita cum nautis

il pristrent or e argent e meintes robes diverses, e firent marchié au noutonier

tempestas orta est improvisa

in brevi maxima tempestas inoleret

vint a brief temps une grant tempeste

moriturus in brevi

et mori eum convenit

covint q'ele morust

Audita naute pecunia petitioni paruerunt

naute audita pecunie ( sponsione)⁴, lucri odore velut pisces hano inescati petitioni sue paruerunt

Quant li noutonier oirent la promesse de l'argent, e par le gain q'il disirrierent ausi comme li poissons la charoigne, si li otroieren e firent (sa) volunte

molestat quassatio. Vas quod nec sitit...

tangit quassatio. Vas quod nec hyemalis temporis sollicitat molestia nec estivi solis perurit inclementia. Vas quod nec sitit...

nel pout grever, n'en yveer n'en esteez ne li nuisoit. Il n'a scif...
The above examples show that C agrees with B, and differs from A, in containing material which is not in A; chapter II shows that the material in question is that which has been added by the Latin elaborator. Similar affinities between C and B, where both differ from A, may also be found at the following points in the text:

B2,17; B3,8; B3,9; B3,19-B4,5; B6,11; B6,12; B6,15; B7,10; B8,2-7; B9,16; B10,12; B10,14; B11,5; B11,7-10; B11,12-15; B12,16; B13,4; B16,17.
I(ii) Cases where C follows B, and differs from A, in not containing material present in A but not in B

Not only does the C French translation constantly agree with the longer B Latin text in containing material present in B but absent from the shorter A version; also the French translation has no equivalent of the few elements shown in chapter II,115 to be additions to the shorter Latin text, probably made after it had served as the basis for the adaptation into the longer B text. The more salient instances of this are listed below:

A4,14 Sic locuta est et evanuit ab oculis eorum
B4,14 Sic locuta est et evanuit
C4,16 Einssint parla e lors s'esvanoi

A5,5 ut roget deum suum quatinus eius annuente gratia concipere possim
B5,5 ut oret deum suum ut possim concipere
C5,5 q'ele prist pur nous, que jeo puise concevoir

A5,11 ...concepisse. Et audierunt vicini et cognati et amici quia magnificavit dominus misericordiam suam cum illa, et congratulabantur ei. Vir autem...
B5,10 ...concepisse, et gavisi sunt universi. Consequenter vir...
C5,11 concit la dame par la priere a la benoite Magdaleine, e de ce s'esjoirent mult de genz. Apres ce maintenant li sires...

A5,14 Vir autem eius super omnes letus effectus est, cogitans et disponens peregre proficisci ad terram presentia dominici corporis consecratam, ut ibidem de beneficio sibi celitus collato largitori omnium bonorum gratias referret, et quod a beata Maria Magdalena de Christi miraculis audierat plenius agnosceret. Quod cum matrona attenderet
B5,11 Consequenter vir itineri suo cepit disponere ut posset experiri si verum esset quod predicavit beata Maria Magdalena de domino nostro Iesu Christo. Quod cum matrona attenderet
C5,13 Apres ce maintenant li sires apareilla son oirre por aler veoir si c'estoit voirs qe la Magdaleine preschoit de nostre seignor Jhesu Crist. Quant la dame l'ot apareeu
Thus the cases quoted in I(i) and I(ii) show that the French C translation closely follows the longer B Latin text, and differs from the shorter A version, in a large number of instances - indeed almost as often as the longer Latin version differs from the shorter Latin text. The translation must therefore have been made from a Latin text much closer to B than to A.

Against this abundance of close corresponences between the French and longer Latin texts, there are nevertheless numerous cases in which the French translation coincides with the shorter A Latin text in not containing material which is present in the B version. These affinities between A and C have caused researchers to assume that the shorter form of the Latin life is the source of the French translation.
II Cases where C follows A, and differs from B

The cases in question are listed below, and the underlined portions of B are those which appear in neither A nor C. It will be noted that some correspondences are exact, while in other cases A and C coincide only in being shorter than B, without a close correspondence of detail. It will be shown that most of the affinities are very likely to be explained by coincidence: it happens that the French translator has omitted from B the same material that was added to A in the elaboration process. Certain of the affinities, however, are probably better explained in terms of scribal additions or omissions in the B Latin text.

B1,2 Postquam dominus noster Iesus Christus, Dei et hominum mendiator, per passionem et gloriosam resurrectionem suam devicto mortis imperio, glorificata humanitatis substantia, ad celos ascendit

A1,2 Post domini nostri Iesu Christi gloriosam resurrectionem

C1,2 Après ce que nostre sires Jhesu Christ, qui est moiens de Dieu e des hommes, par sa passioun e par sa resurrectioun ot veincu la mort; quant s'umanitez fu glorifiee e il monta es ciels

Here the French text is shorter than B, but in different respects from A; the omission of gloriosam, imperio and substantia will be seen in chapter IV to be part of the translator's usual procedure.

B1,6 et beatus Maximinus unus ex septuaginta duobus discipulis, cui commendata fuit a beata Petro

A1,6 et beatus Maximinus, cui a beato Petro fuerat commendata

C1,6 e Maximianarius, a qui seint Piezes l'avoi comande

B1,8 beato Petro apostolorum principe

A1,8 beato Petro

C1,8 seint Piezes
et illo quicunque a nativitate linitis oculis sputo dominico tam interioris hominis quam exterioris lumen receptit

et illo quicunque a nativitate dominico sputo lumen receptit

e avec celui aveugle que nostre sieurs gueri par sa salive

Et naviculam ingressi, zephiro spirante vernali gratiore aura, Deo duce cursu placito Marsilie portui feliciter applicuerunt

et naviculam ingressi duce domino Marcilie portui applicuerunt

e se mistrent en un nef, e orent bon vent e vindrent a Marseille

verba salutis, vere vitem dogmata, ore prophetico predicavit

verba salutis ore prophetico predicavit

et lors commenga a prechier les paroles de Dieu e de salut

quadam nocte cum matrona illa cum viro suo membra quieta committeret

Cum igitur cum viro septem nocte quiesceret matrona

ele se dormoit une nuit avec son mari

Tercio vero sub intempesto noctis silentio apparuit

Tercio vero nocte apparuit

A la tierce nuit Marie lor aparut

Dormisne, tyranne, membrum patris tui Sathane, cum vipera coniuge tua, que verba mea tibi postposuit evolvere? Quiescisne

Dormis, tyranne, quiescis —

Tiranz, dors tu avec la givre ta fame que tant a demoree que ele ne t'a pas dites mes paroles? Reposez:

matrona evigilans ingemuit, et ab imo pectore ducens suspiria

Evigilans matrona et ab imo ducens suspiria

Donc c'esveilla la femme a ce riche homme e commenza a suspirer de parfond cuer
precipiens sanctos Dei hospitari et in omnibus eis necessaria erogari

precipiens sanctos Dei hospicio recipi et eis necessaria ministriari

e comenda que la seinte gent fuit herbergié et q'en lor donast ce qe mestier lor serroit

Econtra mulier instat anxia, femineum nec mutans femina motum, nititur in vetitum; et pedibus viri provoluta lacrimis obortis ceu mos est mulierum tandem obtinuit

Econtra mulier instat anxia, et mariti pedibus provoluta lacrimis extorsit consensum

Encontre ce la dame s'arestoit, e ne muoit pas son corage, einz se lessa cheoir aus pies son mari e plora tant que li sires l'otroia qe ele iroit avec lui

cepit ventus intumescere et undarum ebullitio per varios afflatus ebullire

cepit ventus intumescere, ebullire profundum

li vens comenga a engrossir e la mer a emfler

inter dolores ventris et pressuras coacta est expirare

inter dolores et pressuras coacta est expirare

a la dolour q'ele ot de l'enfanter covint q'ele morust

Sinite modicum et sustinete

Sustinete modicum

Mes suffrez un pou

posset adhuc respirare

respirabit

revendroit

O inestimabile Marie Magdalene premium! O celsi meriti femina, femine nil levitatis habens! O pars partium omnium quam elegit sibi Maria, que in terris predicans viro peregrinanti

O inestimabile Marie Magdalene meritum! que viro peregrinanti

A tout-grant deserte de la Magdeleine! O tu famme de grant deserte qui n'as en toi nule legiertee! O tu...dona confort maintenant au pelerin
B11,2 inter dolores mentis et pressuras
A11,2 inter dolores et pressuras
C11,2 entre ces dolours

B12,2 quicquid beate Marie Magdalene patrociniiis et precibus commendatur
A12,2 quicquid beate Marie Magdalene patrocinio commendatur
C12,2 les choses qu'e l'en comande a la Magdaleine

B12,10 obviavit ei qui supra firmam petram fundatus erat Petrus
A12,10 obviavit apostolorum principi Petro
C12,10 seint Peres li apostres l'encontra

B12,19 Pax tibi, frater, bene venisti, utili consilio credidisti, persevera in bono, et bene tibi erit
A12,19 Pax tibi, frater, utili consilio credidisti
C12,20 Beau frere, Dieu te doint paiz, bien soiez tu venuz, tu as cru bon conseil, e tu auras bien

B14,11 sub clamide latitabat occulte
A14,11 sub clamide latitaret
C14,10 se coucha desouz son mantel

B14,14 pannos vero quos corpori supposuerat et desuper
A14,14 pannos autem quos superposuerat corpori
C14,14 les dras qu'il avoit mis desus le cors

B14,16 ac si in pertica vel in archa ab illa die in qua ibi positi fuerant diligenter fuissent collocati
A14,16 ac si in archa vel in pertica collocati fuisissent
C14,14 come s'il ussent estee gardee a une perche ou en une huche

B15,1 Consideravit etiam, quod ad audiendum non est minus delectabile, corpus matrone adeo odorum
A15,2 Corpus etiam matrone adeo odorum erat
C15,1 e le cors de la dame ausi fres
B15,10 Scio equidem scio et procul dubio credo
A15,12 Scio equidem et procul dubio credo
C15,10 ge sai bien e si croi certeinemnt

Thus the French translation, while corresponding very frequently and in great detail with B, as shown in I(i) and I(ii), is shown in II above to present affinities with the shorter A Latin text, where it differs from B.

Most of these cases, however, are probably to be explained either by coincidence or by scribal additions or omissions: the adaptor who produced the longer Latin text from the shorter version elaborated and ornamented his original, adding much redundant material, as described in chapter II. On the other hand, it will be seen in chapter IV that it was the object of the French translator, in preparing a text for an uneducated public, to simplify and abbreviate complicated passages, and to suppress superfluous material; he achieves this by consistently following the procedures described in chapter IV. Inevitably, these omissions in the French translation often cause the French text to coincide with the shorter A Latin text, to which superfluous material has not yet been added.

Thus for example at B1,10 the elaborator has made the addition tam interioris hominis quam exterioris, while the French translator omits the expression, following his practice of suppressing such abstract terminology; similarly at B14,11, the Latin elaborator has characteristically added occulte, which serves little purpose, and repeats the notion of 'hiding' already present in the verb latitabat; the French translator omits redundant material as a matter of course, and so does not translate occulte. It is such series of events which, in the majority of the cases quoted in II, have created a resemblance between A and C which is quite fortuitous, and explicable in terms of the processes of expansion and compression that the text has undergone in the course of its development.
Usually the correspondences between the French and short Latin texts are only partial: for example, at B4,3 A agrees with C in not containing *membrum patris tui Sathane*, but C follows B closely in translating the portion *cum vipera... evolvere*, which is absent from A. Likewise at B6,3, C agrees with A in not translating the elements *femineum, femina, nititur in vetitum, ceu mos est mulierum* of the B text; but in other respects C follows B, translating the phrase *nec mutans... motum* which is not in A. Such partial correspondences square well with the contention that these affinities between A and C are entirely fortuitous, and do not imply a direct relationship between the two texts.

Coincidence may explain all of these cases of agreement between A and C; however, in seven of the cases, exact words or phrases of B are lacking in both A and C, and the MSS provide evidence that the seven items concerned may be simply scribal additions made to the longer Latin text after it had served as the basis for the C translation:

A Group  | B Group  | MS B
---|---|---
Short Latin | long Latin | many additions

Alternatively, these seven cases of exact correspondence between A and C may represent seven omissions from MS B before it reached the stage from which it was translated into French:

A Group  | B Group  | French C translation
---|---|---
Short Latin | MS B | many additions  

| | long Latin | seven omissions  


When the words and phrases in question are examined, they appear to be the type of material that is almost routinely added to or removed from the B MSS: the following list shows the elements concerned:

B1,6 unus ex septuaginta duobus discipulis
B1,8 apostolorum principe
B4,3 membris patris tui Sathane
B5,7 in omnibus
B14,14 et desuper
B14,16 ab illa die in qua ibi positi fuerant diligenter
B15,1 quod ad audiendum non est minus delectabile

The B MSS present two types of evidence to show that these seven cases of exact agreement between A and C in omitting material from B are due to scribal additions or omissions in the transmission of the longer Latin text:

(i) There is disagreement among the B MSS about some of the items listed above: for example, at B14,14, MS B4 has only supposuerat, omitting et desuper like the A and C texts; and MS B itself has the erroneous superposuerat for supposuerat. At B15,1, MS B4 omits quod ad audiendum non est minus delectabile, like A and C, and at B14,16 contains medio temporis intervalle diligenter instead of ab illa... diligenter of MS B. Some of the material listed above appears in even longer forms in some B MSS; suggesting that the expressions may have gradually developed in a text which originally did not contain them at all: for example, at B1,6, MSS B1, B2 and B3 add to the already inserted unus ex septuaginta duobus discipulis the words vir universa morum probitate conspicuus doctrina pariter et miraculorum virtute praecclarus; and at B15,1 MS B2 adds to the already inserted quod ad audiendum non est minus delectabile the words quam admirabile

(ii) There are also many cases where expressions similar in length and equally unimportant are added or omitted in the various B MSS: for example, at B3,17, MS B4 adds
tyrannidem sui mariti tremula pertimescens; at B3,19, MS B4 expands distulit enucleare of MS B into distulit utpote timida revelare ac denudare; at B4,12, MS B1 adds vides eos nudos et famelicos et permittis nec cibas nec in aliquo eis compateris, and at B4,13 omits evades. The MSS variants provide very numerous further examples of this type of addition and omission, involving elements similar to those listed above.

These two types of MSS evidence (i) and (ii) strongly suggest that these seven cases of apparently exact correspondences between A and C are simply due to scribal additions and omissions in the copying of the B texts, and that there is thus no direct relationship between the short Latin text and the C French translation.

Thus far, then, the longer B Latin text appears as the only extant version to be a possible original for the French translation, and, despite some apparent affinities between A and C, any direct relationship between these two texts has been ruled out.

III Cases where C follows neither A nor B

Very frequently, however, the French translation omits or abbreviates material present in both the long and short Latin texts, and occasionally contains material absent from both Latin versions. All instances of the French translator's omissions and additions are analysed in detail in ch. IV, 163-190 and 200-207; here two cases of each type of occurrence will suffice to illustrate the type of discrepancies in question:
III(i) Cases where C does not contain material present in both A and B

In the following two examples, the parts of each Latin text which have no equivalent in the French translation are underlined:

A9,8  

et impositum scapha corpus cum puerulo ad rupem delatum est

B9,8  

et educta scapha corpus cum puer e o quo voluit delatum est

C9,12  
e mistrent le corps de la dame e l'enfant sus la montagne

A15,6  
cuius merit is et precibus tanta miracula noverat accidisse

B15,6  
cuius merit is et precibus talia novit sibi contingisse miracula

C15,6  
par qui si granz miracles estoient avenues

III(ii) Cases where C contains material that is not in either A nor B

The underlined parts of the French text have no equivalent in Latin:

A4,1  
apparuit matrone pariter et marito

B4,1  
apparuit utrique

C4,1  
lor aparut la benoite Magdaleine a au .ii.

A11,11  
lactans puerulum

B11,11  
lactans puerulum

C11,13  
aleste l'enfant de sa mamele

Cases of omission and addition illustrated by III(i) and III(ii) are very numerous, and may seem to contradict the claim made above that MS B is very close to the French translator's original; this evidence seems rather to point to a Latin original that is different from both A and B. Nevertheless, there is sufficient evidence to justify the
provisional conclusion that MS B is indeed very close to the French translator's original, and chapter IV will confirm that the changes made to B are the work of a translator who was preparing a text for an uneducated public.

IV Evidence that C can only be derived from B

None of the evidence for this contention is direct, but it combines to make the derivation of the C rendering from the longer B Latin text the most likely:

(i) An exhaustive search of all available MSS catalogues, of large numbers of MSS collections of saints' lives, and of material relating to Mary Magdalene, has not revealed a Latin MS closer to the French translation than MS B12.

(ii) The form of the life in the B group of MSS must have been a widespread and popular version, since it appears in five MSS as far apart as Rouen and The Hague; the Franco-Provençal translation of MS D shows that the B text was also known in the region of Lyon, and was considered suitable for translation on at least one other occasion. A version of the life which had proved its popularity in Latin was the obvious choice of the French translator.

(iii) A Latin original corresponding exactly with the French translation would have to be a text both shorter than B and longer than A (see sections I and II); the existence of such a text is improbable, since, as A is the original composition, it would imply either (a) the less extreme re-abridgement of an already expanded text:

```
Shorter  Longer  Re-shortened
Latin A  Latin B  Latin
          French C
```
or (b) an intermediate, partially expanded stage in the development of the longer B Latin from the original shorter A Latin versions:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Shorter Latin A} & \rightarrow & \text{Partially expanded Latin} \\
& & \rightarrow \text{Fully expanded Latin B} \\
& & \downarrow \text{French C translation}
\end{array}
\]

While neither of these processes of development is impossible, their very complexity makes them fairly improbable; and when it is recalled that in the first place the originally independent shorter A text of the Pilgrim episode was expanded simply so that it harmonized better with the more verbose Penance and Death episode that followed it in its later combination, any re-abridgement, or partial expansion, or even any form of the episode other than that found in the B text, would be quite unexpected.  

(iv) Even if the Latin source of the C translation were not the B text, the translator's original must have been a version very closely related to B: the detailed agreement of B with C demonstrated in section I is proof of this. If, therefore, we were to seek a Latin text which, when translated accurately and faithfully, with no omissions or simplification, would have yielded the French C version, we would then be supposing the existence of a Latin text which had undergone changes in relation to B (changes before the B stage was reached have been excluded in (iii) above). But if we examine the types of changes to B that such a hypothetical translator's source would imply, it will be seen that they are alterations which would be entirely pointless in a Latin context, but useful and readily comprehensible in the case of a translator wishing to produce simplified material for an uneducated audience. Some examples will illustrate the type of improbable changes in question:
It is improbable that an adaptor would have taken the trouble to re-write the Latin text replacing the delicate expression of B° with a version such as vir cum muliere sua iecit; only a translator writing for an unschooled public would need to give the down-to-earth rendering of the C version.

There would be little purpose in changing the poetic Latin expression to a neutral term such as navem solverunt or vela dederunt; the change must be the work of the translator, seeking to simplify the literary Latin expression for his humbler public; indeed it will be seen in chapter IV that part of the translator's method is to systematically curtail passages concerned with details of journeys; see chapter IV pp. 174-176.

There seems no reason for a change to evolutum est biennium vel amplius tempus: nothing would be gained by such a change, which would involve any adaptor in needless alterations of verb and terminations. The change is rather the work of the translator, who sought clarity and simplicity.

There is no need to assume that the French translator's original read nostrum salvatorem precantem, since the omissions have much more probably been made by the translator himself.
If the French *ele ne li respondi plus* had been a translation of a Latin clause *nihil ulterius illi respondit*, (itself an unlikely change in a Latin text), then the syntax of the *cum...* clause of B would have also had to be entirely different, becoming instead: *cum...interrogaret, illa...respondit*. Such changes were almost certainly never made to a Latin text, and are much more likely to be due to the translator.

The change of the B version to a putative *humiliter* would not be worth making in a Latin context, while a translator writing for an uneducated public would have every reason to suppress the abstract *devotione*; see chapter IV pp.184-7. Thus the existence of a Latin text closer to the French translation than the B text would imply changes made to B which would be pointless and improbable in Latin, sometimes necessitating considerable adjustments of case-endings, verb terminations and syntax. Such changes are much more readily explicable as the result of a process of adaptive translation.
Conclusion

Section I establishes the close affinity of the longer B Latin text with the C French translation by listing numerous cases where C and B contain material absent from the shorter A Latin text, and the few cases where additions to A appear in neither B nor C.

The affinities between A and C, where both differ from B, are shown in section II to be largely fortuitous: the French translator has omitted or curtailed material which the Latin adaptor added to A to produce B. Some of the exact correspondences may be the result of scribal additions or omissions in the copying of the B text.

Although the source of C seems thus to be much closer to B than to A, there are many cases, illustrated in section III, where the omissions and additions in C make it seem to be a translation of neither A nor B; but the indirect evidence set out in section IV combines to make the derivation of C from any source other than B most improbable: no other possible original has been located; the B text was a widespread and popular version; the circumstances of the development of B make the existence of another version unlikely; and the changes to B implied by the existence of a Latin text closer than B to C would be most improbable in Latin, but entirely natural in the case of an adaptive French translation, intended as sermon material for an uneducated audience. The analysis of the translation procedures in chapter IV, and the comparison of C with the more learned D translation, point very strongly to such an intended use for C, and confirm the derivation of C from a text very close to B.
Notes to chapter III

1 Hansel 1936, 266 states: 'Der gekürzte Text der Episode wird wiederholt auch in Handschriften altfranzösischer Prosalegendare überliefert, so Paris, Bibl. Nat. nouv. acq. fr. 10128... Brüssel, Bibl. Roy. 10326... London, Mus. Brit. add. 6524... Paris, Bibl. Nat. fr. 6447... Paris, Bibl. Nat. fr. 25532... Kopenhagen, Thott 217.' These MSS are, respectively, C1, C2, C4, C5, C3 and C of this edition; Thott 217 is an error for Thott 517. Curiously, Hansel believes that, while the C French text is derived from the 'shortened' form, the Spanish version follows the 'shortened' form more than the longer form, and has as its original a text that is 'less shortened' than MS 8.609.20 (my MS A2). His study of the MSS is thus seen to be, at best, cursory.

2 Shore 1979, 35; Shore's erroneous conclusion is the result of her belief that the French translator wished to translate all elements of his original (pp. 32-34). Besides, her first example of an omission (p. 35, referring to B7,14-19) is a scribal omission, since the passage appears in Spanish, and must therefore have been present in the Spanish translator's French original.

3 MSS C1 and C2 omit e de divers viandes, and thus agree more closely with B; see variants.

4 MSS B1, B2 and B3 have sponsione, absent from MS B; see variants.

5 For the altered word-order in French, see chapter I, p. 25.

6 For this French addition, see chapter IV, p. 154.

7 MS C3 has et avec celui que nostre sires Bari par sa salive qui avoit esté avugles nez; here, as elsewhere, this MS is closer than the other C MSS to the Latin original; see volume II, pp. 475-6.

8 This passage is discussed in chapter I, p. 62.

9 All other B MSS have the more likely reading ventris; see variants.

10 The B MSS differ widely here; see variants.


12 See bibliography for the material consulted.

13 The combination process is described in chapter II.
Chapter IV: The French Translator's Treatment of the Latin Magdalene Life

Summary

The evidence adduced in chapter III has justified the provisional assumption that the source of the C French translation was a text very close to the B Latin version; in chapter IV, the treatment of this putative Latin source by the French translator is examined in detail.

Section I shows that in general the French text is a competent and skilful translation: ingenuity has often been exercised in accommodating all items of the original, and the translator has in places improved the presentation of material and the clarity of B. The work is nevertheless marred by a number of errors, mostly the result of inattention to Latin syntax and the misreading of Latin abbreviations.

The C translation is not, however, a faithful rendering of the Latin original: section II shows that the translator has consistently omitted certain types of material, section III illustrates the translator's methods of achieving a lower stylistic register than that of his original, and section IV examines additions made in translation. These changes made by the translator of the C version are compared throughout with the Franco-Provençal translation of MS D, which consistently remains very close to the Latin original.

The differences between the two translations seem to indicate that they were intended for different types of public: the consistently-followed procedures of omission, simplification and clarification suggest that the C version was destined for oral delivery to an uneducated public, possibly as sermon material; the constantly more learned tone of the D version suggests that this text was intended
for private reading, or for reading aloud in small groups.

The fact that the translator apparently consistently follows procedures which would produce a text suitable for a specific type of public, seems to confirm the provisional conclusion of chapter III that the discrepancies between B and C are to be attributed to the translator, and do not indicate that the Latin original was substantially different from the longer B Latin text.
The Competence of the French Translator

The C French version is in many respects an accurate translation of the Latin original: although the translator omits specific elements of the Latin text, changes its stylistic register, and makes a number of errors, he has nevertheless produced, in general, a careful and well thought-out rendering. Indications of the translator’s competence are considered below under three headings: (i) The translator’s skill; (ii) The translator’s improvements; (iii) The translator’s errors.

(i) The translator’s skill

This may be judged from the following examples, where the translator shows ingenuity and attention to detail in including all the essential elements of the Latin text. In some cases it is clear from the separation of Latin elements in translation that the translator has painstakingly consulted his original several times in attempting to render each part of a complex Latin period in a language far less adapted than Latin to extensive subordination.

B7,2 carinam fluctibus carbas ventis imponunt.
Iamiamque cursu unius diei et noctis velificando consummato

C7,3 se mistrent en meer. Et quant il orent alee par meer . i. jor e un nuit a voille estendue

The position of a voille estendue seems to be an indication of the translator’s efforts to give an equivalent of every element of the Latin text, while avoiding stilted word-order: not only has the translator kept the phrase carbas ventis imponunt in mind from the previous sentence; he has also placed it in a stylistically advantageous position, where it suggests the speed of the journey, and is not lost in the accumulation of travel terms which occurs at the end of the preceding sentence in Latin.
Although technical terms are simplified, an anatomical detail (mentis pressuras) suppressed, and the stylistic register lowered (the Latin almost has the style of a hospital report!), the translator has nevertheless translated accurately almost every item of his original.

The translator seems to have had a good eye for repetitive and redundant material: dedit precium is repeated in precio mediante, and eum ad collem deferrent in ad collem delatus est; ut cursum sisterent is redundant since the operation could scarcely be carried out if they continued the voyage. These defects of style are corrected by the French translator, whose consistently-followed procedure is in any case the suppression of dispensable material, as described in section III below.

In order to accommodate all the elements of the Latin complex sentence, the French translator has divided his noun-clause into two parts, expressing in one of them the Latin ipsam dilectricem suam as l'amoit plus qe les autres, and thus avoiding the complexity of the Latin in what is an essentially simplifying translation.
Although the French rendering is fairly succinct, nothing essential has been lost in translation, and the translator has achieved admirable economy.

Thus the French translator has generally worked skilfully and with attention to detail, and appears to have been at pains to include in his translation as much of the original as possible, as long as it suited his purpose. This attention to detail makes it clear that the omissions, analysed in section II below, cannot be the result of indolence, inaccuracy, or rapidly executed translation, but were rather made methodically and deliberately, with a specific public in mind.

(ii) The translator's improvements

In addition to the above examples of skilful and attentive workmanship on the part of the translator, one may quote cases in which he even improves on the Latin, usually by presenting events in a more likely or more logical way, and by correcting inconsistencies of the original.

The addition of the underlined portion improves the presentation of events in the French version.

Quod cum matrona attenderet, ait

Quant la dame l'ot apareu, si vint a son seignor e li dist

Et cum apprehendissent corpus ut illud sevientis maris fluctibus eicerent

E quant li sergent de la nef vou drent prendre le cors e giter en la mer
The French insertion of *voudrent* produces an improved account of events: it is more likely that the pilgrim would ask the sailors to forbear before they seized his wife, as in French, rather than after, as in Latin.

B8,10  miseremini saltem pueruli vagientis
C8,10  suffrez au meins pur l'enfant qui pleure e quiere la mamele la mere

In appealing to the sailors not to throw the wife's body into the sea, the pilgrim pleads for their compassion; his plea is more effective in the French *qui pleure e quiere la mamele la mere* than in the brief Latin *vagientis*.

B9,8  petitioni sue paruerunt
C9,11  si li otroierent e firent la volonté

The French version is more precise than the Latin in stating that the sailors first agreed to the pilgrim's wish, then carried it out.

B20,11  cui nec modica etiam aquarum affluentia...fuerat
C20,11  e illuec n'avoit point d'eau

B22,10  eidem loco vicinam sibi cellam construxerat, *iuxta fontem modicum*
C22,10  cil si fist une petite ciaule deleez de leu

The Latin text contains a contradiction about the existence of a water supply; the French translator obviates this inconsistency by omitting to translate the second mention, *iuxta fontem modicum*.

B23,14  Cumque rediret, ambulandi usum crura cum pedibus prebebant.
C23,14  E quant il *voloit* retourner les jambes ne li pie ne li fesoient nul mal

The addition of *voloit* makes the French translation more logical than the Latin original: clearly the priest
could not start to move back until the use of his legs was restored!

These cases where the translator has improved the account of events he found in his original demonstrate further that the translator was not a rapid and neglectful worker, as his numerous omissions might suggest; the translation is on the whole an accurate and painstaking piece of work.

(iii) The translator's errors

Beside these examples of very competent and attentive workmanship, there are nevertheless some glaring errors. Explanations of these mistakes are obviously largely conjectural, but they seem to have arisen from the misreading of abbreviations, from the influence of nearby parts of the text, from inattention, and from failure to grasp the syntax of the Latin, sometimes through disregarding case-endings. Only those cases which are obviously errors are quoted; those which may be either errors or simply instances of free translation are not mentioned.

The errors are considered under the headings (a) lexical errors, and (b) syntactic errors.

(a) lexical errors

B1,20 in porticu que preerat phano gentis illius
C1,20 au port en la falaise

There has evidently been some inaccurate copying of this phrase in the Latin MSS, and the translator probably had before him a version containing in portu, as MS B1. The origin of falaise is not clear, but possibly results from a misinterpretation of phano which in the original may have begun fa- as in MS B4, the rest of the word being unclear or abbreviated. Whatever the explanation, the French text
and some of the Latin versions make little sense - there are practical problems in having a port situated on a cliff! - and the Spanish translation also indicates that the passage gave rise to difficulties; see ch. VII, 336.

B9,14 Marsilie partibus applicuisti
C9,19 venis tu au port de Marseille

The error port for partibus was doubtless facilitated by the use of the Latin abbreviation for par-, which is often indistinguishable from that for por- and for per-3.

B11,12 ut iter arreptum expleat quod debuit corpus complere
C11,15 por ce que ele acomplisist ce que li cors avoit commencé

It is rare for the French translation to be less specific than the Latin original: a constant feature of this translation is that it spells out and concretizes any vague Latin expression4. The vague ce que is therefore suspect beside the specific iter, and may be explained by another misreading of a Latin abbreviation: the superscript abbreviation for -er may have distorted the t of iter, causing the translator to read id instead of iter; id, taken with the nearby quod, would readily yield French ce que.

B14,4 vidit puerulum...harene involutum lapillos conchis immiscentem
C14,3 il vit l'enfant...Il estoit en la gravele e plunjoit les pierres en la mer

French en la mer is clearly an erroneous rendering of conchis, though the Latin variants suggest that the passage caused copyists some difficulty, and the form of the text used by the translator may at this point have been very different from the extant versions. Indeed the French error may merely be a creation of the translator, who failed to understand his unclear and ambiguous original5.
B22,4 ad centum stadia propinquus fuerat, et singulis annis...quadragesime tempore
C22,4 e l'ome avoit pres de .C. anz e el quaresme

The translator's eye appears to have wandered from stadia to the closely following annis, so that centum stadia 'a hundred stadia away' is wrongly rendered as 'a hundred years old'.

B22,5 dominice quadragesime tempora in solitudine solus perficere
C22,5 el quaresme il se departoit de ses compagnons e aloit tous seuls

This appears to be another case where the translator has confused the pro- and per- abbreviations: the error has led him to mistake perficere for a form resembling proficisci, and thus to translate the direct object tempora as tempore, ablative of time. See also C9,19 at p. 157.

B22,15 aperuit Deus prefati sacerdotis oculos
C22,15 nostre sires aparut a ce provoire

The translator has mistaken aperuit 'opened' for apparuit 'appeared', disregarding the case of oculos, which would need to be oculis if the Latin verb were apparere. The similarity of the abbreviations for per- and par- is doubtless again responsible for this error.
ostensa est ei visio. Igitur ante illucescentem dominice resurrectionis auroram

lors vit il la vision. Aprés quant vint au dymenche a l’aube levant

The French translation may be somewhat loose here, giving après as the equivalent of igitur, and a l’aube levant to translate ante illucescentem...auroram; but more probably, ante has been mistakenly translated by aprèes, possibly through a misinterpretation of the superscript symbol for n.

sicut ei mandatum fuerat

si come il souloit

Though it fits the context satisfactorily, souloit is not an accurate translation of mandatum fuerat; this inaccuracy may not be a translation error, however, but rather the result of a scribe’s confusion of parts of the verb souloir with parts of seoir; see also F28,4 and F33,4, ch.VII, 350.

(b) syntactic errors

Non videtur ab aliquo, et quicquid vident alii potens est videre

en ne la veoit pas et elle veoit les autres

This error appears to be simply the result of inattention on the part of the translator.

doctrina pariter et miraculorum virtute preclarus

faisoit granz miracles e par doctrine et par vertu

The translator has apparently not understood that doctrina and miraculorum virtute are the two reasons for Maximin’s fame.
The translator has failed to see, or at least to make clear in his rendering, that Mary Magdalene, and not the priest, is the subject of *celibem vitam ducebat*.

The translator seems to have disregarded the Latin case-endings, and to have failed to see that *totius* agrees, not with *languor*, but with *corporis*.

Latin *quousque* means both 'until when, until such time as' and 'how far, as far as'. It is clear from the context that the meaning here must be spatial, 'as far as', while the French translator has wrongly taken *quousque* in its temporal sense.

The translator has failed, apparently through inattention to case-endings, to see that the Latin phrase means 'she who, by the ardent desire and charity of her saviour...'.

The translator has wrongly analysed the syntax of his Latin original: he has taken *indubitabiliter credas* with the following clause, rather than with the preceding infinitive *contigisse*.

Thus the French C translation is occasionally marred by errors, some of them quite elementary. However, their frequency and their gravity are not sufficient to make it necessary to alter substantially the judgement stated above at (i) and (ii) that the French translation is generally a competent and accurate rendering of the Latin.

However, despite the above evidence for the overall competence and accuracy of the French C translation, the translator has consistently deviated from his original in respects which strongly suggest that, as well as translating, he was consciously adapting his material with a specific public in mind. Obviously, the very act of translation from Latin suggests that the intended public was not highly educated; but by suppressing or simplifying in translation any potentially difficult notions, by lowering noticeably the stylistic register, and by adding clarifying material, the translator was doubtless seeking to make his work accessible to a public with a minimal level of instruction.

On the other hand, the Franco-Provençal translation of MS D renders the Latin fairly faithfully, and makes no attempt to simplify or omit difficult material. The contrast between this D version of the life, and the text of the C translation makes it seem very likely that the two texts were translated with very different publics in mind: the C text was probably intended for an uneducated public, and therefore probably an audience; it is tempting...
to believe that it was intended for use as sermon material. In contrast, the D version was probably intended for a much more sophisticated public, to be used either for private individual reading, or for reading aloud in small groups, where difficult passages could be repeated or explained.

There follows a detailed examination of the means employed by the translator of the C version to adapt his text for his unlearned audience; the passages quoted are compared throughout with the corresponding part of the D translation, in order to demonstrate the different purposes to which these two vernacular versions were to be put.

Section II analyses cases where the translator has omitted or abbreviated parts of his Latin original; section III examines his methods of lowering the stylistic register; and section IV deals with the translator's additions.
II Omission and Abbreviation in the French Translation

The cases of omission and contraction in the C French translation may conveniently be divided into four main types: omission or contraction (i) of groups of semantically related terms, (ii) of elements relating to specific subject areas, (iii) of abstract terms, (iv) of synonymous or near-synonymous pairs of terms.

(i) Omission or contraction of groups of semantically related terms

The principal identifiable groups of terms in question are:

(a) those referring to habits and customs (more solito, sicut consueverat, etc.);
(b) those meaning 'the aforesaid', 'as mentioned above' (prefatus, ut prescriptum est, etc.);
(c) the terms manus and ministerium in the combination manus angelorum, ministerium angelorum, etc.

(a) Habits and customs

B2,2 ut more solito ydolis sacrificaret
C2,2 pur sacrificier aus ydols
D2,1 per sacrificier a les ydoles, issi com il aviont acostume

B2,10 ut ibidem sicut consueverat sacrificaret
C2,12 pur sacrificieer aus ydols
D2,7 per co que il sacrificiet, si com il soleit faire

B14,4 qui more solito secus littus lusum venerat
C14,4 qui estoit venuz esbatre sus le rivage si come il souloit
D20,5 qui ere venuz joier a la riva de la mėr, si com il avait acostume
Thus in five out of six cases the C version does not translate these expressions of 'habit and custom', while in one case, C14,4, the expression is translated; however, this one case occurs in the context of the small child's habits, of which every detail might have been considered interesting to an audience. On the other hand, the more learned D version has retained the expressions in five of the six cases in which they occur in Latin, (all except D20,10).

(b) 'the aforesaid', 'as mentioned above'

B19,5 in prefata dispersione beata Maria illi sociata
C19,4 e pur ce il se vindrent ensemble
D24,14 Entire Bridge Passage absent from D translation.

B20,11 divinitus, ut prediximus, preparata
C20,10 si come li angre l'avoient apparaillé
D25,4 que Deus li avit appareillia per les mans des angles

B22,2 loco predicto
C22,3 illuet
D26,18 al lua que jo vos ai davant dit
B22,11 ubi **sicut prediximus** quadragesimalis vite continentiam observabat
C22,11 et illuec fesoit estinance tout le quaresme
D27,4 En cella sella faisit li bons hom sa seintisma

B22,15 aperuit Deus **prefati** sacerdotis oculos
C22,15 nostre sires aparut a ce provoire
D27,5 uvrit nostre sire Jhesu Crist los euz del chapellan que jo vos ai dit davant

B23,15 si...ad **prefatum** locum procedere conareetur
C23,15 E quant il vouloit aler avant tout droit al leu
D28,10 Adonc el se comencet a tornar

B28,16 **predictus** sacerdos
C28,16 li prestres
D32,10 li chapellans, que jo vos ai dit

B28,17 celebris ut **prescriptum est** ostensa est ei visio
C28,17 e lors vit il la vision
D32,10 que jo vos ai dit...li fu monstra cisti visions

B31,15 infra **predictam** basilicam
C31,16 en cele eglise
D37,4 dedens l'egleisi

B32,13 in **prefato** aquensi comitatu
C32,13 a la comité d'Ays
D37,15 el contal d'Ays en Provenci

In all ten cases the C translation omits these expressions, which are characteristic of formal writing. The D version translates four out of nine (**prefata** at B19 occurs in the bridge passage which is absent from D), but shows a predilection for this type of expression by introducing one where none exists in Latin:

B26,6 universa que videris vel audieris ex ordine illi nuntiare studeas
D30,21 studia tei de contar tuit qant que tu verres et orreis, si com jo t'ai dit
(c) manus and ministerium in combination with angelus and angelicus

B20,4 in loco angelicus sibi manibus preparato
C20,4 en .i. leu que li angre l'avoient aparillee
D25,4 que Deus li avit appareillia per les mans des angles

B20,18 angelorum manibus in ethera elevabatur
C20,17 estoit ele portee es ciex par les angres
D26,8 illi era leva en l'air par les mans des angles

B21,5 per manus angelicas ad eundem revocata locellum
C21,6 amenee en cel leu par les angres
D26,11 li angre...la tornavont en son lua

B25,16 de loco isto angelicus evecta manibus
C25,16 de ce leu ci sui jeo portee
D30,13 je soi leva per les mans de sainz angelos

B26,1 per eorumdem angelorum ministerium sum in istum revecta locellum
C26,1 me raportent li angre en ce leu
D30,17 per l'aministrament de cels maimos anglos et jo ero aporta en cest maimes lua

B26,12 illuc per angelicum ministerium subvectam
C26,12 illuec serra jeo portee par mes angres
D30,24 li saint angelo Deu m'i arant porta

A similar combination is likewise abbreviated at:

B29,7 vidit choruni angelicum (abscedere) \(^{15}\)
C29,7 il vit qu'e li angre se departirent
D34,2 vit la compagni des anglos, qui s'en poiapont

In all the above cases, the element combined with angelus or angelicus is omitted in the C version, and in one case (B25,16) both elements are lacking. The result is a simplified translation, with any complicating or
dispensable material suppressed. In contrast, the D version contains a translation of both elements in five out of seven cases.

The above examples trace the treatment in the C translation of three recurring groups of words and phrases, and show that the translator's procedure for adapting his Latin original was a consciously and consistently-followed technique; none of the material suppressed is essential, and its removal would make the work more suitable for oral delivery to larger and less educated audiences. On the other hand, the retention in the D translation of the majority of these elements underlines the difference in type of the C and D renderings.

(ii) Omission or contraction of elements relating to specific subject areas

In addition to the specific lexical items discussed in (i), the French translator has also suppressed parts of his Latin original which are concerned with certain subjects; the areas most consistently affected are:

(a) Religion - by far the largest group of omissions
(b) Details of travel
(c) Details of time
(d) Spatial details
(e) Authorial comments

Examples of these types of omission are given below, together with the appropriate passage of the D translation, which almost always retains the items omitted in the C text.
(a) Suppression of religious terminology

In the Pilgrim episode, where religious terminology and echoes of the Bible and liturgy are not as frequently employed as in the rest of the text, such elements are almost always suppressed or curtailed. In the Bridge Passage and the Penance and Death episode, where the subject matter requires a greater density of religious vocabulary, some has inevitably been retained, though there is still a marked tendency to reduction or elimination of terminology relating to all but the simplest religious notions. The material in question is almost always retained in the D translation.

B1,6  beatus Maximinus unus ex septuaginta duobus discipulis, cui commendata fuit a beato Petro apostolorum principe

C1,6  Maximianus, a qui seint Pieres l'avoit comandee

D1,4  sains Maximins, uns del setanta disciplos Jhesu Crist, cui sainz Peros li princes des apostolos avit comanda

B1,10 et illo qui cecus a nativitate limitis oculis sputo dominico tam interioris hominis quam exterioris lumen recepit.

C1,17  e avec celui avuglee qe nostre sires gueri par sa saline

D1,6  et saint Rustion, qui nasqet avoglos, cui nostre sire Jhesu Crist rendet la lumeri del cors et de l'arma, qant el li gluet los euz de sa saliva

B1,12 et Marcilla que loquente domino Iesu ad turbas dixit

C1,12  e Marcille qui dist de Jhesu Crist

D1,18 et sainti Marcellina qui criert, domenters que nostre sire Jhesu Cris parlave a les genz

B2,5  verba salutis, vere vite dogmata, ore prophetico predicavit

C2,6  comença a prechier les paroles de Dieu e de salut

D2,4  lor prediquet les paroles de salu et los enseignablos de la via verai
Maria Magdalena, apostolorum apostola, spiritu sancto repleta

la benoite Maugdeleine

La douce Marie Magdaleine apostola des apostolos, raemplia de Saint Esperit

peramplius et perfectius ceteris verbi Dei spiraret odorem; spiravit utique et effudit habunde

parloit bien e sagement

espirave mieuz et plus perfaitsment la doci odor de la parolla Jhesu Crist. Illi espirave la bona odor per co que illi la espandit plus avondeusament.

Dormisne, tyranne, membrum patris tui Sathane

Tiranz, dors tu

O tiranz, membros de ton paro Sathana, dors tu

beate Marie Magdalene patrocinis et precibus

a la Magdaleine

a les preieres ne auz aidemenz de la beinaurea Maria Magdaleina

obviavit ei qui supra firmam petram fundatus erat Petrus

seint Peres li apostres l'encontra

li vint a l'encontre sainz Peros, qui est fondes sur pera ferma

cuius meritis et precibus

par qui

per les cui preeres et per les cui merites

pietatis intitu ancille implevisti officium

tu as fet l'office de baiasse

levas mon enfant et me servis

spiritus paraclyti de supernis missionem

il ot envoié le seint esperit

bridge passage not translated in this version.
et Maria matre Iesu, ut Lucas evangelista narrat
avec la mere Jhesu Crist
bridge passage not translated in this version.

veluti beata semper virgo Maria
aussi come la virge
bridge passage not translated in this version.

domino annuente aquensem aggressi sunt comitatum,
divini verbi semina cunctis largiter erogantes
e d'iluec en la contre d'Ais, e illuec prechierent
la loy Jhesu Crist
bridge passage not translated in this version

ad agnitionem et cultum omnipotentis Dei
perducerent

verba predicationis inherendo, demones pellendo,
mortuos suscitando

quaque die septem canonicens horis
a vii. eures del jour
chascum jor en les set hores del jor

celestium agminum concentus qui in conditoris sui
laudes dulcissimis modulationibus resonabant,
corporeis etiam auribus audiebat

ooit le chant des angres qui locient nostre
seignour

oit los glorious chanz que li glorious sant et
saintes chantont, et los douz orgenemenz que il
fant el loemos de lor creator

sanctissima illius anima de corporis ergastulo
soluta

dut morir e rendre l'ame

li sainti arma saillit de la chartra del cors
Secunda igitur feria ipsius ebdomade quam proxime secuturus dies dominice resurrectionis futurus erat

le lundi devant pasques

Lo lona de la semana sainti

omnipotentis Dei clementiam cum lacrimis invocare

pria nostre seignour en plorant

Mout en preia en plorant la bonte del totpoissant Deu

ait ad eum famula Christi

li dist la Magdeleyne

Li douci Maria Magdaleina, ancella Jhesu Crist, li dit

propter domini mei Iesu Christi gratiam

par la grace de Dieu

per la graci de mon seignor Jhesu Crist

a domino meo salvatore michi relatum est

nostre sires m'a renuncié

il m'est reveilla de mon seignor Jhesu Crist lo salveor

ab omni vinculo iniquitatum clementer absolvis

doucement lour pardonz lor pechiez

los asols bonament de toz los lians de peches

illius beate mulieris

ele

de la douci Maria Magdaleina

sanctissima illius anima...transmigravit ad dominum

rendi l'ame Jhesu Crist

li beinaurea arma de la seinti Maria Magdalena s'en ala a nostro Seignor
It is obvious from these examples that the French translator, as a matter of course, greatly simplifies, or eliminates from the narrative, expressions or single words which have a religious, theological or liturgical flavour. No vital material is lost through the suppression or reduction of these elements, many of which can in any case be considered as standard epithets (e.g. sanctissimum, beata semper,) or as formulae (e.g. domino annuente) which are a regular component of Latin compositions of this kind. Their omission may indeed in some cases have been prompted as much by stylistic considerations (see III below) as by their religious content.

By contrast, the vast majority of this religious terminology is retained in the D translation, a fact which further demonstrates that the two versions were intended for different types of public.

There are several cases where passages with a predominantly religious content are not curtailed, e.g.

B2,14  Iesum Christum natum ex Maria virgine, a Iudeis crucifixum, mortuum et sepultum et die tercia resurgentem predicans
C2,17  comenga a prechier de Jhesu Crist coment il estoit nez de la virge e coment il Juif l'avoient crucifiee e coment il avoit estaa mort e ensevelis e coment il estoit au tiers jour resuscitee
D3,2 lor predica Jhesum Crist qui esteit nez de la douci virgina Maria, que li jueu crucifieront et occiront, et lor dit coment il fu sevelis et coment il resurexit al tierz jor

B4,6 crucis Christi inimice
C4,7 qui es anemis de la crois Jhesu Crist
D5,5 O henemieus de la crois de Jhesu Crist

B13,5 Iherosolimis ubi passus, mortuus et sepultus fuerat dominus noster Iesus Christus
C13,6 en Jerusalem, la ou Jhesu Crist fu mors e suffri passion e la ou il fu ensevelis
D19,8 dedanz Jherusalem et lo menet iqi ou Deu Jhesu Cris fu crucesfiez et morz et seveliz

There is even one case where, in what seems to be a pious outburst, the French translator exceptionally makes an addition of pious material:

B27,8 redemptor mundi, qui penitentes recipis
C27,8 qui remssis le monde de touz perils de ton precieus sanc, reçoif ceus qui font penitance
D31,10 remsire del mont, qui recis los repintens

However, with the exception of the last quotation, which is a wholly uncharacteristic interpolation on the part of the translator, these passages, though containing religious notions, relate the basic facts of the life of Christ; such material would be familiar to any type of public, and there would be no need to modify or suppress it in a translation intended for a large, uneducated audience.
(b) Omission and contraction of words and phrases concerned with material details of travel

An important feature of a narrative intended to hold the attention of an uneducated listening public would be an action which advanced fairly rapidly, unencumbered by an excess of detail. The French C translation frequently contains no equivalent of Latin expressions recounting the physical details of the pilgrim's journey: navigational and financial details are usually suppressed or curtailed, and accounts of journeys are rendered by such formulae as et orent bon vent. The D translation characteristically retains the detail of the Latin original, sometimes even adding material of the translator's invention.

The following examples illustrate this process of adaptation employed fairly consistently by the C French translator. The examples are taken from the Pilgrim episode and from the bridge passage, since the Penance and Death episode is not concerned with travel, and so does not contain any of the terminology under discussion.

B1,15  zephiro spirante vernali gratiore aura, Deo duce
cursu placito Marsilie portui feliciter
appliquerunt

C1,16  orent bon vent, e vindrent a Marseille

D1,11  il orent un vent que l'un apele Zephiro, qui vente
sovent en primaveila et est douz venz et agraablos.
Et nostre Sire los giot, si veniron a pleisiblo
cors arrivar al port de Marseilli.

B6,16  oneratis plerisque gerulis auro et argento et
vestimentorum mutatorlis

C6,16  il pristrent or e argent e meintes robes diverses

D11,2  chargeront lor nef de besquet et de vin et de cher
sallec et d'or et d'argent et de diverses maneres
de vestimens.
Naucleri vero rudentibus antemnis ceterisque navis armamentis dispositis

E li noutoniers atornerent les antoines e les autres aornemens de la nef

Li natoner dreceront lor veilles et leveront lor antennes et adreceront lor garnimenz de la na et distront a ceuz qui remaniont al port 'vale'

petitioni sue paruerunt, et educta scapha corpus...delatum est

si li otroierent e firent la volunté e mistrent le cors

distront qu'il fariont son voleir. Et meneront la nef a la montaigne e pristront lo cors

quo recepto naute remis incubunt et iter inceptum arripiunt

E quant il fu receu en la nef, li noutonier firent lor oire q'il avoient commencié

Qant li mariner oront recet lo pellerin en lor nef, il dreceront lor veilles et adreceront lor rams et commenceront a negier lor chemin

Iam vento graviore carbasa impellente, navis optato portui applicuit, et dato naulo peregrinus egressus est.

il et bon vent qui menoit la nef a force, e vint au port q'il avoit tant desiree. E quant il ot pris port si issi hors

Deu tramist a la nef un vent douz et agraiblo, qui se ferit en les veilles, issi que il veniron mout tost al port que il desiravont. Et nostre pelerins paia les mariners et sailli de la nef

Nautis vero obnixe remis utentibus...velificaverunt

Il alerent e orent bone vent, e avint...qu'il revindrent

Li mariner dreceront lor veilles et lor autres pannes. Et...passeront

dedit precium ut cursum sisterent et eum ad colem deferrent. Et precio medianta ad colem delatus est

il pramist au noutonier argent qu'il le menassent a la montaigne, e il si firent

il dit as marigners, 'Arestez vostre cors! Jo vos darei mout grant averir, si vos me menez a cella montaigni.' Il distront que si fereient. Li pellerins lor dona grant avoir, et cil teneront la nef a la montaigni.
It is clear from these examples that the French C translator endeavoured to render as briefly and simply as possible the physical details of the journeys: information about the wind and the parts of the ship's equipment, the sailors' pay and the minutiae of the pilgrim's preparations for the voyage – all these details are either omitted or abbreviated. An account shorn of such detail would be better adapted to oral delivery to large audiences, who were not able to absorb technical detail, nor, because of the circumstances of delivery (probably a sermon) able to ask for difficult passages to be repeated.

By contrast, the D translation reproduces all the information of the Latin text, often even inserting further embellishment (see D11.2, D11.4, D16.3 and D20.2 quoted above). This makes it probable that this version was intended for delivery in more intimate circumstances, or simply for private reading.
(c) Omission and contraction of temporal details

The French translator has also consistently eliminated or shortened expressions of time:

B4,1 Tercio vero sub intempeste noctis silentio
C4,1 A la tierce nuit
D5,1 La terci nuit apres, entor la mei nuit

B5,8 Evolutoque brevi tempore
C5,10 .i. pou apres
D6,7 No demora puis lono temps que

B13,13 evoluta sunt biennii vel amplioris temporis currricula. Tandem
C13,12 .ii. anz ou plus furent passees; apres ices .ii. anz
D19,13^27 i. tens de deus anz fu passas. Qant li dui an furont passe

B14,16 ac si in pertica vel in archa ab illa die in qua ibi positi fuerant diligenter fuissent collocati
C14,16 come s'il ussent estee gardees a une perche ou en une huche
D21,4 come se il eusant este en una bella chambra a la perchi deis l'ora que il furont pose

B18,9^28 crescebatque credentium numerus cotidie
C18,9 E mout acroissoit li nombres des creanz
D24/25 bridge passage not translated in this version

B20,5 per triginta continuorum annorum currricula
C20,5 .xxx. anz
D25,5 .xxx. anz continuaument

B21,8 Appropinquante vero tempore quo
C21,9 E quant
D26,13 Qant aprocha li tens que

B22,5 singulis annis ter...artius vacare consueverat
C22,5 il se departoit de ses compagnons
D26,20 faisit treis gareismes l'an
The above cases exemplify a further type of expression which the French C translator reduces or eliminates, while the same material is almost always retained (or elaborated as in D21,4) in the D translation.

Clearly, not all expressions of time may be thus reduced or removed, and the following two examples show types that have been retained intact in translation.

At B15,12, per biennium...pavisti is faithfully rendered by C15,12 l'as norri par .ii. anz; here the period of time is an essential part of the narrative, since it is a proof of Mary Magdalene's miracle that the child should have been fed for so long a period.
Similarly, at B32,14, Transiit autem beatus Maximinus sexto idus iunii is translated exactly by C32,14 E seint Maximin trespassa le .vi.iesme ydre de junet; but while such a detail would doubtless have been curtailed in the body of the text, here it is a convenient means of ending the life, and of lending authenticity to the narrative. Also, it would doubtless not have seemed out of place at this point to an audience whose lives were regulated by the liturgical calendar.

(d) Omission and simplification of spatial details

The translator of the C text has further adapted his work to the needs of his audience by reducing and suppressing details relating to space, as in the following examples; the D translation also reduces some of the expressions in question.

B18,15 a finibus suis Christi testes procul pellendo
C18,16 firent chacier hors de lour contree tous ceux qui precheiont le noun Jhesu Crist
D24/25 bridge passage not translated in this version

B18,18 diversa regna terrarum
C18,20 divers roiaumes
D24/25 bridge passage not translated in this version

B22,10 ad duodecim stadia eidem loco vicinam...cellam
C22,10 une...ciaule delez de leu
D27,3 una cella, qui ere pres de la balma...douze stadios

B24,13 Cumque sacerdos pavidus usque ad medii termini spacium appropinquasset
C24,13 Quant li pristres se fu aprochez del leu
D29,4 Qant li chapellans...paoros et tremblanz s'aprocha plus pres de lui

B25,17 sublimis etheris sum provecta fastigio
C25,16 sui jeo portee en haut en l'eir
D30,13 jo soi leva...en haut en l'air
Such expressions of distance, height and location are not numerous in the Latin text, but they have been reduced and suppressed in the C translation so consistently as to indicate that the translator considered an exact translation of them to be unsuitable for his audience. In three out of six cases (D27,3, D34,2 and D34,4) — a lower proportion than usual — the D translator has adhered closely to his Latin original; but two of these cases (D27,3 and D34,4) are precisely those which are the most complicated of the spatial details, and their retention seems to be indicative of the type of public for which the D translation was intended.

(e) Authorial comments

There are several cases where the Latin text contains comments by the author on the events of the narrative; these authorial asides are sometimes reduced or suppressed in the French C translation, doubtless to avoid the learned tone they may give to the text, and to allow the narrative to proceed unencumbered by extraneous detail. These comments consist of expressions of the author's wonder (B11,5, B11,11, B15,1, B27,17), generalizations from specific incidents
(B6,4, B6,6, B8,3) and attempts to establish the authenticity of the events narrated (B18,8, B29,16). The treatment in translation of these three types of authorial intervention is shown below.

**Author's wonder**

| B11,5 | Quis audivit talia? |
| C11,5 | Qui onques mes oï ce? |
| D16,16 | Qui est cil qui onques mais oit teuz miraclos? |

| B11,11 | quod est dictu mirabile |
| C11,13 | Or orroiz merveilles a dire |
| D17,1 | Co est merveille |

| B15,1 | quod ad audiendum non est minus delectabile |
| C15,1 | omits |
| D21,6 | un' autra chosa qui est merveilli a oir et deloitablo a savoir |

| B27,17 | Mirandis semper mirabiliora succeedunt |
| C27,19 | Ne nus ne se doit merveillier de ceste merveille |
| D31,17 | A ceuz qui se meravillont vinont ades plus meravilouses choses |

Such exclamations of wonder are not inconsistent with use as sermon material, and it is not surprising to find that only one of the cases, B15,1, has not been translated. The case at B27,17 is given a very approximate translation, and the difficulty of the Latin may be reflected in the erroneous version of D, where Latin mirandis is rendered as if it were mirantibus.

**Generalizations**

| B6,4 | femineum nec mutans femina motum |
| C6,4 | la dame...ne muoit pas son corage |
| D9,1 | fit co que fenna vout toz jorz faire |
The inclusion of such generalizations could have the effect of making the translation seem excessively learned, and their inclusion in C is therefore significant: the first case is retained, but is changed from a general to a specific statement, relating only to this woman, while in the D version the phrase has clearly been translated as a generalization. The second case is suppressed in C, as one would expect. The third case is retained, for one of two possible reasons: in the Latin and French texts, it is not clear whether this passage is direct speech or an authorial aside, while the D version has the words spoken by the sailors. Thus the passage may be included in C because it is spoken by the sailors, and not a comment by the author. Alternatively, even if the passage is an authorial generalization, it may have been retained because it was thought to be an indispensable explanation of the sailors' behaviour.

**Authenticity**

B18,8 ut Lucas evangeliasta narrat
C18,7 omits
D24/25 bridge passage not translated in this version
B29,16 sicut in vita eiusdem beati Maximini expressum reperimus

C29,16 einssint come sint Maximin le raconta

D35,1 Et issi com nos trovem escrit espressaument el livro saint Maximin

The first case is typically omitted in C, while the second case is included, though in a much simplified form which does not imitate the bookish style of the Latin, closely imitated by the more learned D version.
(iii) Omission of abstract terms

Sermon material intended for an audience with a low level of instruction might be expected to contain a smaller proportion of abstract terms than the relatively learned piece of Latin writing from which it is translated and adapted; and indeed abstract nouns are suppressed almost as a matter of course in the French C translation. This is especially so when they occur in Latin in combination with the genitive form (or occasionally the adjectival form) of another noun, in such pairs as *resurrectionis gloriām*, *ascensionis triumphum* (B18,2), *beatitudinis contubernio* (B19,2). In these pairs of terms, the noun in the genitive case is generally the important element, the second term usually forming an elegant combination with it, without making a significant contribution to the sense. It is this second, less important element that is regularly suppressed in the C translation, while, significantly, both terms of the pair are usually retained in the D translation.

These pairs of terms are in fact usually two components of a tripartite construction much affected by the Latin writer, often consisting of the two terms in combination with a verbal element. In the cases quoted below, all three elements are quoted in Latin where appropriate, so that the frequency of the tripartite construction may be appreciated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Code</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1,4</td>
<td><em>devicto mortis imperio, glorificata humanitatis substantia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1,2</td>
<td>Après ce que nostre sires...ot veincu la mort; quant s'umaniteez fu glorifiee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1,1</td>
<td>Après co que Deus...ot vencu l'emperio de mort, et li sustanci de sa humanita fu glorifia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4,7</td>
<td><em>ventris tui ingluvie referta</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4,7</td>
<td>qui ton ventre norris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5,6</td>
<td>qui as refait la glotoni de ton ventre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7,5</td>
<td>undarum ebullītio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7,5</td>
<td>la mer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12,2</td>
<td>li buillimenz de les undes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mammarum maternarum querens solatia
queroit la mamele
querit lo beneficio des mamelles
lucri odore
par le gain
del talent et del gahaigner
ad perditionis et miserie mee cumulum
por mon destruiement e por mon essil
per mei destruire et per mei faire chaitif
uberrimum lactis exhibuit alimentum
le norrissoit de let
li donastes nурiment de lait en grant avondanci
Vas...quod nec roris stillatio nec ymbrium
inundatio nec ventorum tangit quassatio. Vas quod
nec hymalis temporis sollicitat molestia nec
estivi solis perurit inclementia
vessiaux que rousee ne pluie ne vent nel pout
grever, (ne) vveer (ne) esteez ne li nuisoit
vaissex...que no pot qassar degeuz de rosa ne
enundations de ploives ne turbine ne forci de vent...
que no pot enfreidir li anguoissous freiz del tens
d'iver, ne li chalor del soleil del tens estival
ne lo pot trop eschaufier
cum vite spiraculo vegetaretur
quant ele estoit en vie
quant ele estoit viva
obstetricis implesti officium
fus baiasse
levas mon enfant et me servis
Post dominice resurrectionis gloriam ascensionisque
triumphum
Aprés la resurreccioun Jhesu Crist e après ce qu'il
monta el ciel
bridge passage not translated in this version
beatitudinis contubernio illi coniuncta
A la seintee de cestui s'acompaigna
bridge passage not translated in this version

divini verbi semina
la loy Jhesu Crist
bridge passage not translated in this version

nec modica etiam aquarum affluentia, nec herbarum aliquarum nec arborum solatium fuerat
n'avoit point d'eau ne herbes n'arbres nul
non avit ne po ne prou d'eigi, ne point d'erba, ne negun confort d'arbre

nosse poteris omnium eorum que tua desiderat anima veritatem
sauras la verité de ces choses qui tu requiers
porra savoir t'arma la verita de tottes les choses que illi desire

sublimis etheris sum provecta fastigio
sui jeo portee en haut en l'eir
jo soi leva...en haut en l'air

absque omni ambiguitatis scrupulo
sanz dotance
senz dotanci

ampliorem circa se dilectionis novit affectum
conuit la perfeccion del amor que ele avoit en lui
cognut plus grant amor et plus ampla et plus ferma

tante...superne lucis splendore
de si grant clarté
de si grant resplendor de la lumere celestial

solis radios
le souleil
la rai deu soleil
Beside these very numerous cases of the suppression of the less essential abstract part of these combinations of terms, there are two cases where the procedure is not followed:

However, with these exceptions, the procedure is followed remarkably consistently, and reveals a conscious effort to produce a text suited to the needs of a specific type of public, for whom a high incidence of abstract terms might have been an obstacle to comprehension.

On the other hand, these abstract terms are retained with equal consistency in the D translation: in only four of the cases quoted above are the abstract terms suppressed (D15,2, D21,8, D30,13 and D31,18). Their retention on such a scale must point to an intended public fundamentally different from that envisaged by the French C translator.

The elements suppressed in the above cases are all abstract nouns; yet they are almost always omitted when they occur in a specific construction, a fact which may suggest that they were suppressed as much for the purpose of syntactic simplification, as because the translator wished to avoid abstract nouns; see also section III(ii) below at pp. 193-196.
(iv) Reduction of synonymous and near-synonymous pairs of words

The French C translator has further disencumbered the narrative by eliminating one element of such pairs, or by using a term which covers both, as in the following examples:

B2,1  generatio prava et exasperans
C2,1  la generacioun malveise
D2,1  li felonessa generations et aspra

B4,2  fremens (et irata)
C4,2  a grant fremissement
D5,2  fu totta frenenz, ausi com se illi fust iria

B4,15 ingemuit et ab imo pectore ducens suspiria
C4,18 comença a suspirer de parfond cuer
D5,14 comencet a gemir et a suspirer et gitave mout grant suspirs del prevont del piz

B8,13 Sinite modicum et sustinete
C8,14 suffrez un pou
D14,14 arestez un po lo cors de la nef, arestes un petit la nef

B10,17 roborans eum et confirmans
C10,19 li conforta
D16,10 l'enforcet et conformet

B11,2 inter dolores mentis et pressuras
C11,2 entre ces dolours
D16,14 de les dolors del ventro et de ses anguoisses

B13,12 investigaret et sedula mente inquireret
C13,12 enquist tant
D19,13 encerchave cestes choses et enquerit ententivament

B19,13 ad agnitionem et cultum omnipotentis Dei
C19,14 a la foi Jhesu Crist
D24/25 bridge passage not translated in this version
sacerdos (tremens et) pavidus
li pristres...qui avoit mout grant poor
li chapellans...paoros et tremblans

Not all such near-synonymous pairs receive the same treatment, however; in one case both terms of the pair are omitted:

Summas et innumerases gratiarum actiones tibi refero
jeo te rend graces e mercis
Soveraines et no nombrables graces te rendo jo

In other cases, both terms of the pair are retained in translation:

in merore et angustiis
en error e en angoisses
en plors et en anguoisses.

sana et incolumi
seine e halegre
sana et salva

In the great majority of cases, though, the C translator's procedure is to translate such pairs by a single term; in so doing, he shows that his objectives were different from those of such writers of prose as Geoffrey de Villehardouin, Robert de Clari and Henri de Valenciennes. According to Schon 1960, 163-185, these chroniclers, roughly contemporary with the French C translator, consistently employ the device of 'Synonymendoppelung'; that the device is entirely absent from the C version, and very widely used in the D translation, even where synonymous pairs do not appear in Latin, shows that the C text was intended as a simple version of the legend, shorn of embellishment and stylistic devices.
Thus the types of omission considered in section II point to a translation adapted to the needs of a specific type of audience. The suppression of certain bookish or 'curial' terms (i) would make the work more palatable to an uneducated audience listening to a sermon; the great reduction and simplification of religious terminology (ii,a) would also serve such audiences, while the removal of material relating to travel (ii,b), the passage of time (ii,c) and spatial details (ii,d) would allow the narrative to proceed more rapidly, and so retain the popular attention. Removal of some instances of authorial intervention (ii,e) would also be appropriate in such sermon material. One would also expect such a work to be shorn of ornament and of difficult and dispensable material, and the suppression of abstract terms (iii) and the reduction of synonymous pairs (iv) have precisely the effect of allowing the narrative to be more readily comprehensible, perhaps in difficult listening conditions, and to proceed briskly and unencumbered. Comparison with the more complete and more learned D version makes the intended use of C even clearer.

The overall effect of such omissions is to simplify the C text. This is further achieved by the changes discussed in the next section (III), which seem to be aimed at lowering the stylistic register. It is not always possible to distinguish between reduction and change, and some of the cases quoted in II are duplicated in III, where they are equally appropriate.
III Change of Stylistic Register

The style of the B Latin Magdalene life may be described as literary, elevated and erudite: the literary aspirations of the author are illustrated by his adherence to Classical Latin syntax, and by his constant use of such stylistic devices as the tripartite construction mentioned in II,(iii) (pannis involutus olosericis, B4,10; utili mulieris consilio, B5,6, etc.). That the style is elevated is illustrated by the density of abstract vocabulary (see II,iii) and by the use of figurative language (III,i). The erudite tone is due to the use of some bookish terms (II,i,a-c) and of some authorial comments (II,ii,e). Despite its high stylistic register, however, the Latin B text has some severe stylistic defects - repetition, padding, inappropriate emphasis, etc. - defects which are principally explicable by the circumstances of its composition discussed in chapter II.

The translator of the D version has been at pains to maintain the stylistic register of his Latin original: in most of the cases we have examined where the C translation deviates from the Latin, the D text contains a faithful rendering of almost every element of B, sometimes even elaborating with additional detail.

The C French translator, on the other hand, has devoted just as much effort to lowering the stylistic register of his Latin original. Many of the cases of omission discussed above in II have the effect, not only of shortening and disencumbering the narrative, but also, especially in the cases of omission of bookish terms and of abstract nouns, of considerably lowering the stylistic register. This change of register is further achieved by three other principal means, involving the use of simpler language, rather than mere omission as in II.
The procedures involved in lowering the stylistic register of the B Latin text in the C French translation may be conveniently considered under the following headings:

(i) the avoidance of figurative expressions

(ii) the use of simpler syntax

(iii) the use of simpler vocabulary.

Examples of these three types of adaptive translation are given below.

(i) The avoidance of figurative expressions

I have noted seven cases where the C French translator has simplified his version by transforming figurative usage of the Latin text into simple language.

- B3,3 verbi Dei *spiraret odorem*
- C3,2 parloit bien e sagement
- D3,8 *espirave mieuz et plus perfaitiment la doci odor de la parolla Jhesu Crist*

- B15,3 *cum vite spiraculo vegetaretur*
- C15,3 quant ele *estoit en vie*
- D21,8 quant ele *estoit viva*

- B18,12 Invidie igitur *facibus accensi*
- C18,13 qui furent embrasee par envie
- D24/25 bridge passage not translated in this version

- B18,16 Hac ergo persecutionis *procella seviente*
- C18,18 Endementiers que ceste persecucioun *estoit*
- D24/25 bridge passage not translated in this version

- B19,9 *divini verbi semina cunctis largiter erogantes.*
- C19,10 prechierent *la loy Jhesu Crist*
- D24/25 bridge passage not translated in this version
The C translator has consistently removed figurative expressions, rendering them in greatly simplified terms, while the D translator has usually retained these metaphors. Of the four cases which occur outside the bridge passage (which is not translated in D), only one (B15,3) has not been retained in D.

(ii) Simplification of syntax

While the Franco-Provençal text generally adheres quite closely to the syntax of the Latin, so far as the different structures of Latin and Romance allow this, the French C text consistently simplifies the sentence structure, mostly by avoiding subordination; it achieves this by making Latin subordinate clauses and participial phrases into main clauses, and by omitting verbs introducing indirect statements, which thus become main clauses. A representative sample of cases of this routine process follows:

In the C translation, the ablative absolute is rendered by a main clause, and the syntax of the rest is much simplified by the suppression of the verb attendit, a device parallel with the suppression of cognovit at B5,9 and of cognoscas at B25,15, quoted below. The D translation retains the overall structure of B.
B15,11 scio et procul dubio credo quod tu puerum dedisti et per biennium in hac rupe pavisti, matrem poteris... sanitati restituere

C15,10 ge sa bien e si croi cernement ge l'enfant tu m'as donee e l'as norri par .ii. anz, e sa bien ge la mere porroit bien sanctee avoir

D22,6 Jo sa bien cernement et sa senz doto et croi que tu, qui m'as done l'enfant et l'as paisseu en cesta rochi dous anz, que... me porrez rendre la mare totta sana

The C translation has avoided the complication of the relative clauses que...dedisti et...pavisti by making them both into noun clauses after credo quod/croi ge, and by repeating the verb sai to introduce the remaining noun clause quod poteris... resistuere. D has retained the same syntax as B.

B22,2 qui parve preerat congregationi, loco predicto in quo beata Maria Magdalena omnibus incognita celibem vitam ducebat

C22,2 qui'estoit mestres d'une petite congrégacioun illuet pres de la Magdaleine, e menoit vie d'angre e nus ne la conoissoit

D26,17 qui ere prior d'un petit covent qui ere...ou li beinaurea Magdaleina, qui non ere cognussa de negun, menave celestial via

The C translator's reluctance to use subordinate clauses has here resulted in a confused sentence: it seems that the priest is the subject of menoit vie d'angre, while only the pronoun la shows that it was Magdalene, not the priest, who was unknown to all men. No such confusion exists in D, which has followed the Latin syntax more closely.

B23,7 Mane itaque sequentis diei clarius illucescente, creatori suo precibus sese commendans, ad locum... properabat

C23,7 A l'andemain matin li jours fu clers e il se comanda a nostre seignour e aloit a leu

D28,6 El matin, gant li jorz fu esclaris, li chapellans dist ses oraisonset se comanda a son creator et s'en ala al lua

Here again the C translator has avoided subordination, at
the expense of clarity: *illu*cescent is translated as a main clause, and this version implies some causal relationship between the two clauses *li jours fu clers* and *il se comanda*. The sense of the Latin is much more clearly rendered by the temporal clause *gant li jorz fu esclaris* of the D translation.

B25,13  *ita diebus singulis...contigisse cognoscas et indubitabiliter credas. Nam de loco isto...evecta*

C25,13  *ausint chascoun jour...m'est il avenu. E de ce soiez tu certeinz, que de ce leu ci sui jeso portee*

D30,11  *issi saipes de voir et crei senz tota dotta que chascun jor...m'ant issi fait...; gar jo soi leva*

Here the C translator has simplified his syntax by two means: as is his custom, he has suppressed the verb *cognoscas* introducing the noun clause; and he has separated *soiez tu certeinz* from what would have been its subordinate clause *m'est il avenu*. This has led to an inaccuracy, since *soiez tu certeinz* has been taken (possibly by a copyist) to be part of the following sentence, introducing another noun clause.

B29,11  *Cumque accedere propius dubitaret et trepidaret beata famula Christi leniter conversa dixit ad eum*

C29,11  *ne il n'osoit aler avant; la benoite amie nostre seignour se torna vers li mult doucement e li dist*

D34,5  *Et gant sainz Maximins vit ico, si fu tot tremblans de paor et non oset aler avant. Adonc li beinaurea Maria Magdaleina ancella Jhesu Crist se virot vers lui et li dit*

C has considerably simplified the syntax of its original by rendering with main clauses the Latin causal or temporal clause (*cumque*) and the participle *conversa*. However, by its failure to use a subordinate clause to render *cum... trepidaret*, the C translation does not clearly express the causal relationship between this and the following clause; the D translation makes this relationship clear by adding the clause *Et gant sainz Maximins vit ico*, and the word *Adonc*. 
Thus, while the syntax of the Franco-Provençal D translation is as complex as that of its Latin original, and occasionally more so, the translator of the C text has gone to some trouble to simplify his syntax by avoiding subordination, even sometimes at the expense of clarity. It is obviously easier to understand a passage consisting of main clauses, than one in which there is extensive subordination; thus the different syntax of the C and D translations shows that C has been made with a large and possibly less educated audience in mind, quite different from the public aimed at by the D version.

(iii) Simplification of vocabulary

As discussed in section II, the vocabulary of the C translation has been much simplified by omission and abbreviation; in addition, it is often by his choice of vocabulary that the C translator has lowered the stylistic register of his version. Frequently such simple terms as grant, mout, biaus and bon are used to render more elevated Latin terminology; parts of estre and aver translate more complicated Latin verbs; and often an elaborate Latin phrase (such as membra quieti committeret at B3,9) is brought down to earth, and spelt out for an unsophisticated audience (by the translation se dormoit at C3,10). In the following examples of this type of adaptive translation, a comparison with the D version demonstrates the different intentions of the two translators.

B3,15 si marito suo suadere contemperet ut in brevi sanctorum inopias sublevare curaret
C3,15 si ele ne dissoit son mari que il en brief temps eidaust aus seintes genz
D4,9 se tu non o dis et amonestes ton mari que lor face bien...Et di li que penseise de solevar en bria temps les soffraies des sainz et de les saintes Deu
ammirari non desino

m'en merveil mou\t

no refino de meravillier

quam iram dei sui...incurrere

q'il ussent l'ire del dieu

qe de encordre la iri de son deu

sevientis maris fluctibus

en la mer

en la mer

fluctibus

en la mer

en les ondes de la mer

fluctibus

en la mer

en les ondes de la mer

O ineffabilis Dei miseratio! O inestimabile Marie Magdalene premium!

A tot grant misericorde Jhesu Crist! A tout grant deserte de la Magdaleine!

O Dex beauz Sire, qui porrit recontet vostra pidia ne vostre misericordi! O douci Maria Magdaleina, qui porreit aemar lo grant giardon...

nec vertatur in tedium audire

ne vos soit pas ennuiiz d'oir

no vos tort a henoi a oir

utili consilio credidisti

tu as cru bon conseil

Tu as creu profitable conseil

qui nudis verbis et vulgaribus utimur sententiis

qui avons poi de science

qui usen de les sentences nues et vulgars
puerulum stature pulcherrime
l'emfant qui trop estoit beaus
l'enfant de trop belle estature et blans come nei
nundumque fonte baptismatis innovatum
ne qui n'estoit mie baptisiez
bridge passage not translated in this version
eam...cum divinis laudibus revocabant
la reportoient en chantant
la tornavont...chantant los divins loemes
audaci devotione
par grant devocioun
per ardia devocioun
vocem sic dicens elevavit
dist
dit a hauta voix
persistentem in laudibus salvatoris mei
priant nostre seignour
jo chanterei los loemos de mon salveor
tante ibi suavitatis odor efferbuit
si grant oudor de la soatume de lui fu
tant bona odors et tant sua ere sentia
in honorifico collocavit mausoleo
le mist en un mult ennoree leu
la posa en un tombel honorablo et cher
mirabilis architecture basilicam
un beau mostier
una egleisi de mout richi ovra
flere non erubescens
en plorant
illi non ot vergoigni de plorar
The above examples appear to show that the C translator has purposely selected lexical items which are simpler, more readily comprehensible, and of a lower stylistic register than those of the Latin original; many seem to concretize and spell out the meaning of the Latin terms. In some cases, Old French may simply have not possessed the resources for translation at the same register, so that some of the changes are a consequence of the act of translation, rather than of the choice of the translator. Nevertheless, comparison with the D version shows that in many cases the vernacular did possess the resources necessary for a translation in a higher register, had the C translator chosen to use them.

Thus the C version seems to be the result of a consciously and consistently applied process of adaptive translation, which made it more suitable for a public of a lower level of instruction than that for which the more faithful D translation was intended.
IV The French Translator's Additions

We have seen in sections II and III above that the C French translation is characterized by the conscious omission of certain identifiable elements of the Latin, and by the deliberate lowering of the stylistic register. These two features were interpreted as showing that the French C version had been simplified by a process of adaptive translation to suit the requirements of a less sophisticated public.

In a translation which manifestly aims at simplifying its original, any material which is added or expanded by the translator merits attention, since additions to the text might be expected to complicate it, and so to an extent undo the work of simplification. Therefore the additions made by the C translator of material apparently not present in his Latin original are analysed below.

It emerges from this analysis that the great majority of these additions, far from complicating the translation, help to explain and clarify certain passages, to more accurately identify characters, and to remove inconsistencies. Other accretions are the result of what has been termed 'compensatory addition'. A few are attributable to the use of formulae, while only a handful are not readily explicable except as whims of the translator.

These cases of addition and expansion are examined below under the following headings:

(i) explicative additions
(ii) identifying additions
(iii) corrective additions (discussed above at I, ii)
(iv) compensatory additions
(v) formulae
(vi) other additions
(i) Cases of explicative addition and expansion

The following additions seem to serve to clarify or spell out potentially difficult or obscure passages:

B1,9 una cum couterinis suis Martha scilicet et Lazaro
C1,9 avec sa sœur Marthe e a son frère Ladre
D1,5 et sos compagnons et ses compaines, co est a savoir sainti Martha et saint Lazaro

B4,2 igneo vultu
C4,2 si semblait de son viaire qui ce fust fez
D5,3 et ot la faci totta vermeilli, come si fust fues de que totta la maisons arsit

B6,7 obtinuit
C6,6 li sires l'otroia qe ele iroit avec lui
D9,4 il li outroia son voleir. La dama ot mout grant joi, qant sos maris li ot outreia son voloir

B11,11 lactans puerulum
C11,13 aleste l'enfant de sa mamele
D17,1 alaite son enfant

The French translator may have felt it necessary to add this detail because the mother was dead.

B13,14 Tandem
C13,13 après ices .ii. anz (recapitulating from preceding sentence)
D19,14 Qant li dui an furont passe

B18,16 Christi testes
C18,17 tous ceux qui precheiont le noun Jhesu Crist
D24/25 bridge passage not translated in this version

B18,18 credentés
C18,19 cil qui crecient en Dieu li tout puissant
D24/24 bridge passage not translated in this version
Though some of these additions are not vital to the clarity of the translation, and in some instances are slightly cumbrous, they nevertheless seem to have the function of explaining terms that are not sufficiently clear in Latin. Similar additions in the D version suggest that this translator might also have found that some of the passages needed explanation.  

(ii) Identifying additions

The following additions seem intended to help identify clearly the character concerned:

B4,1 apparuit utrique
C4,1 Marie lor aparut la benoite Magdaleine a au .ii.
D5,1 s'aparut li douci Magdaleina a ambedeus

B4,15 matrona
C4,17 la femme a ce riche homme
D5,13 li richi dame

B7,12 Puerulus
C7,14 li emfes qui nez estoit
D13,1 Li petiz enfes qui estoit nes

B8,6 Et cum apprehendissent corpus.
C8,6 E quant li sergent de la nef voudrent prendre le corps
D14,1 Adonc pristront la dama
The C translator's additions remove any doubt as to identity, though again these accretions are not always essential. The D translator seems to have found most of the same passages ambiguous, since he has made very similar additions; alternatively, though, the material in question may have been present in the Latin original of C and D, but absent from the extant B MSS.
(iii) **Corrective additions**

These additions are at B5,14 B8,6 B8,10 B9,8 and B23,14, and seem intended to remove inconsistencies in the Latin text, producing a more logical account of events. They are discussed in section I(ii) of this chapter, under the heading *The translator's improvements*; see pp. 154-156.

(iv) **Compensatory additions**

In these cases the French C translator, apparently conscious that some of the sense of the Latin original has been lost in the simplifying translation, compensates with the addition of an extraneous element, frequently part of the verb *commencer*. In the following examples, both the portion that is greatly reduced in translation, and the suspected 'compensatory addition', are underlined:

**Example 1**: B2,5

\[\text{B2,5} \quad \text{verba salutis, vere vite dogmata, ore prophetico predicavit}\]

**Example 2**: C2,6

\[\text{C2,6} \quad \text{comença a prechier les paroles de Dieu e de salut}\]

**Example 3**: D2,4

\[\text{D2,4} \quad \text{prediquet les parolles de salu et los enseignablos de la via verai}\]

**Example 4**: B4,15

\[\text{B4,15} \quad \text{ingemuit, et ab imo pectore ducens suspiria}\]

**Example 5**: C4,18

\[\text{C4,18} \quad \text{comença a suspirer de parfond cuer}\]

**Example 6**: D5,14

\[\text{D5,14} \quad \text{comencet a gemir et a suspirer et gitave mout grant suspirs del prevont del piz}\]

**Example 7**: B6,1

\[\text{B6,1} \quad \text{Graves enim sunt tractus viarum}\]

**Example 8**: C6,1

\[\text{C6,1} \quad \text{e les voiez sont trop gries}\]

**Example 9**: D8,5

\[\text{D8,5} \quad \text{les vies del viago...sont mout longes et gries}\]

**Example 10**: B9,10

\[\text{B9,10} \quad \text{foveam nequivisset effodere}\]

**Example 11**: C9,14

\[\text{C9,14} \quad \text{n'i pot en foir en nule maniere}\]

**Example 12**: D14,23

\[\text{D14,23} \quad \text{ne porront chaver la fossa}\]
Clearly the concept of 'compensatory addition' is somewhat conjectural; and yet it is remarkable that these additions usually occur in close proximity to cases of extreme reduction or of omission in C, for which the translator may have wished to compensate. The D version, of course, is largely a complete rendering of B, so that such compensatory additions are unnecessary and absent; the one case of the addition of *comencet* (D5,14) may represent the use of a formula (see below).
(v) Formulae

It was noted above at II.11.b that the expression *or en et bon-vent* is used to translate a variety of Latin phrases (see B1,15, B13,17 and B19,6), and that it thus constitutes a sort of formula for translation. The uses of *comença* a recorded above at IV.iv are also frequent enough to suggest that it is a question of a formula. It is therefore not surprising to find that four cases of additions in the C French translation are expressions which Schon 1960, 159-163 lists as frequently used formulae in Old French prose works. These are the phrases *avint que* and *sachez que*, which occur in the following quotations:

B8,3 Non enim ambiguum est
C8,3 E sachez qu'il est veritez
D13,7 Sachez...de co no devez doter, qar il est prove

B12,12 Sic, sic servatur
C12,2 E sachiez que aussint sont gardez
D17,12 et sachez qu'il est garda

B13,18 Deo disponente...velificaverunt
C13,17 a avint par la grace de Dieu qu'il revindrent
D19,18 Et Deu lor donet tant bon vent que il passeront

B22,15 aperuit Deus prefati sacerdotis oculos
C22,13 E avint que...nostre sires aparut a ce provoire
D27,5 uvrit nostre sire Jhesu Crist los euz del chapellan

Although the C text is too short to allow any conclusive observations about the translator's use of formulae, nevertheless the above four cases of additions by the C translator coincide with formulae known to be frequently used in Old French prose, and the additions are probably to be explained as such. Even so, the incidence of such formulae is much lower in C than in D, where particularly cases of *sachez que* are numerous: see D4,9, D5,17, D8,5, D23,5, D32,7, etc.
Other additions

The following additions seem to be best explained as whims of the translator, or as the result of inattention:

- B5,16 Absit
- C5,18 Ja n'avendra si Dieu plest
- D7,7 Deus te defende qe tu non aillies senz mei

- B5,18 Cui dominus, 'Non sic fiet
- C5,20 Lors dist li sires tantost, 'Einssent n'iert il pas
- D8,1 Adonc li dit sos maris, 'Bella amia, co non ert pas issi

- B19,11 predicationi ieiuniis et orationibus insistendo
- C19,11 entendoient a predicacion e en vigesses e en geunes e en oreisons
- D24/25 bridge passage not translated in this version

- B27,8 redemptor mundi
- C27,8 qui remssis le monde de touz perils de ton precieus sanc
- D31,10 remsire del mont

B5,16 represents an expansion, paralleled in D, of a particularly concise Latin expression; B5,18 is a very minor addition; and B19,11 and B27,8 are somewhat unexpected additions in a translation which has otherwise so extensively suppressed pious elements. Perhaps vigiles so often forms a collocation with geunes and oreisons in religious texts that its inclusion is due to inattention. The phrase de touz perils de ton precieus sanc, following qui remssis le monde, also has a pious ring which suggests an addition due to inattention.

We have seen above in section IV that most of the cases of addition and expansion in the C translation could have been included for clarification of the text; a few are possibly to be attributed to other factors, notably the need to compensate for omissions, the use of formulae, and inattention.
Conclusion

This comparison of the C French translation with its putative Latin original has allowed us to examine the translation procedures apparently employed by the Frenchman, and to form an idea about the type of public for which the text was intended.

The C translation is fairly skilfully executed, containing a few errors, but also some improvements over its original. It is not a faithful translation of B, however: many items of vocabulary have been eliminated, the stylistic register has been greatly reduced, and some material has been added. All of these changes have the effect of simplifying the text, and are consistent with an adaptive translation intended for oral delivery, probably as sermon material, to a large and humble audience. Such simplification would allow the text to be understood when listening conditions were difficult, when there was a need to retain the audience's attention with a more quickly moving narrative, and when the listeners could not readily grasp complicated or abstract notions.

That the C text was intended for such a humble public emerges even more clearly from a comparison with the D Franco-Provençal version, which is a more faithful, more learned rendering of the same Latin original, retaining many of the complex notions, and much of the intricate syntax and advanced vocabulary of the Latin. This translation was evidently intended for private reading, or at least for reading aloud in small groups, where difficult passages could be repeated or discussed.

The fact that the C French translator's adaptive procedures are so consistently applied, and so consistently square with the notion of a simplified translation intended for a humble public, confirms the provisional conclusion of chapter III that it is a text close to B, and not a simpler Latin version, that is the source of the C French text.
Notes to chapter IV

1 MSS B1, B2, B3 and B4 have the more likely ventris for mentis; see variants.

2 This sentence has been omitted from MSS C, C4 and C5, probably through homoioteleuton provoked by the repetition of E quant at C23,15.

3 For other examples of errors probably arising from misread abbreviations for por-, per- and par-, see also C22,5 and C22,15, discussed on p. 158.

4 For examples of this type of change, see section II, and section III(iii), pp. 163-190 and 196-199.

5 For the different possible meanings of this passage, see note on the text in volume II.

6 One stadium equals 125 paces; LS s.v. stadium

7 The error may, however, have been made by a Latin copyist: MS A has proficere, MS Al has proficisci, and tempore for tempora. While neither of these MSS can have been the translator's original, since both contain the shorter version of the Pilgrim episode (see chapter II), these readings nevertheless demonstrate the possibility of such scribal errors in Latin.

8 This sentence is not in MS C; see variants.

9 However, the C translator may have been using a version such as MS B4, which omits vident; if the case of alii is disregarded, alii potens est videre could just have been translated as ele veoit les autres.

10 This inaccuracy is also mentioned in Shore 1979, 34.

11 LS s.v. guousque.

12 MS B2 has desiderio in caritate, which may be slightly closer to C; see variants.

13 The subject is discussed in detail in Walker 1971,40-41.

14 que jo vos ai dit seems to cover both B26,16 predictus and B26,17 ut prescriptum est.

15 MS B has ascendere; see variants.

16 There is disagreement among the MSS as to the number; MSS B1, B2 and B4 omit duobus. See variants and Luke 10,1.

17 MS C3 is closer to B here, as elsewhere; see variants.

18 MS B4 also has Marcellina; see variants.

19 The fact that pietatis intuitu is absent from MS B4, and that, unusually, it is not translated in D, may suggest that it was not in the Latin original used by the C translator.

20 demones pellendo, mortuos suscitando is however absent from most MSS; see variants.

21 la Magdaleyne for famula Christi is a simplification apparently intended to clarify the text for an audience which might not grasp the biblical allusion.
22 Cf the suppression in translation of sanctissimum (B30,16), sanctum (B31,18) and sanctissimum (B32,10).

23 MS C3 has apostles, all other C MSS have portes; see variants.

24 This detail is however translated at B10,9/C10,12 by a une bargue.

25 The D translation is inaccurate here.

26 This passage is also quoted above on p.153 to show the translator's skill in avoiding repetition.

27 D follows B closely in containing an equivalent (li_tens) of curricula; however the agreement of C and D against B in containing a longer equivalent of tandem is suspicious, and may indicate that both C and D were translating a Latin expression different from the reading of B.

28 However, cotidie is lacking in MS A; see variants.

29 The C translator's Latin original may not have contained this expression; see chapter III, p. 141.

30 In this section (D15,1-8) the D text deviates considerably from B.

31 MS C has n'en yveer n'en esteez, which is not as close to B as the other C MSS; see variants.

32 Cf modern French ni_peu ni prou 'none at all'. D agrees with B here in length, if not precisely in sense.

33 et irata, absent from MS B, appears in MSS B1, B2 and B3, and is also translated in D; it therefore may well have been present in the C translator's Latin original. See variants.

34 The other B MSS have ventris, not mentis; see variants.

35 The evidence of D and of some B MSS suggests that tremens et may have been present in the C translator's original; see variants.

36 Of the use of pairs of synonyms in the works of the chroniclers, Schon remarks, 'Die Synonymendoppelung ist bei den drei Chronisten so häufig, dass im Durchschnitt bei Clari und bei Villehardouin auf jede 11. Zeile, bei Valenciennes auf jede 10. Zeile eine Synonymendoppelung entfällt.'

37 E.g. B1,16 gratiore/D1,13 douz...agraableblos; B1,19 qui eos hospicio exciperet/D1,16 qui los voucist albergier ne recivre en son ostel; B2,9 nobilissimus/D2,6 uns noblos hom et richos, etc. The question of synonyms is also discussed in chapter VI, pp. 279-280 and 310-311.

38 However, doubtless in imitation of biblical Latin, he has largely abandoned the classical Latin 'accusative and infinitive' construction, preferring instead the noun clause with quod and a finite verb, as at B12,14: Novit enim quod...predicatum esset verbum Dei. There are nevertheless a few cases of the accusative and infinitive construction, e.g. B5,1 Utilius esse existimo.
This passage occurs in all the C MSS except MS C; see variants.

Some additions to the French text are almost certainly due, not to the translator, but to copyists, since they do not appear in all the C MSS; see variants passim.

There is also the possibility, since these apparent additions exist in both the C and D translations, that they were present in the translators' Latin originals, which the B MSS may not accurately reflect at these points.

The addition of voudrent is discussed above on p. 154.

maxima is not in MS B, but appears in MSS B1, B2, B3 and A2.
Summary

Previous research has suggested that the Sanctuarium (Sa), and not MS E, was the original for the F and C5 French Martha translations. Section I of this chapter shows that this research is incomplete and misleading, and section II demonstrates that in fact E is considerably closer than Sa to both French translations.

In section III, cases of agreement between F and C5, where both differ from Latin E, are used to show that in places E must be different from the lost Latin originals used by the two French translators.

Divergencies between the two French translations, examined in section IV, indicate that the translators used Latin originals that were different from each other, and that the source used by the C5 translator, while being close to E, also has some features in common with Sa.

The schema in section V illustrates the putative relationships between the two Latin and two French texts discussed in this chapter.
Previous work on the Latin Martha Texts

In the case of the Latin Magdalene life, it was necessary to examine all available texts in order to study the problem of the shorter and longer versions, and to establish which text was being translated into French. The question of the Martha Latin texts, however, is less complex, because there are no versions of differing length, and because only two texts of the Latin life need be considered: the Sanctuarium of Bonitus Mombritius (Sa), and the version of the life in MS E. However, previous research on the Latin Martha life has not been sufficiently rigorous, and is misleading.

Meyer NE 35(ii) (1897), 501 states that the Martha text of MS C5 is a translation of a Latin legend dating from the twelfth century, which appears in an augmented form in the Sanctuarium of Mombritius. Meyer does not, however, specify any MSS containing this Latin original.

The C5 French version is manifestly an independently executed translation of the same (or a very similar) Latin text as that used for the F French translation, since there is a very close correspondence between the details of the narrative of each French version. It was therefore clear that the Latin original of the F Martha translation was to be sought among the same antecedents of the Sanctuarium life which were indicated by Meyer as a source for the C5 version. The translators' Latin source cannot, of course, have been the Sanctuarium itself: this was compiled and printed in Milan in about 1480 by Mombritius, while the date of the earliest MS of the F translation is about 1300, and that of C5 even earlier.

Despite this discrepancy between the dates of the Sanctuarium and the two French translations, it had originally been intended to use in the present edition the Latin Martha version in Mombritius' compilation as a basis for comparison of the translations with their Latin original;
it was thought that the work of Eis, and to a lesser extent that of the Solesmes monks who have edited the Sanctuarium, made it unnecessary to attempt to locate Latin texts which were contemporaneous with the French translations.

Eis gives the following information relevant to the present study:

(i) Eis 1933,84ff states that the Sanctuarium Martha life, like a further 119 of the 334 saints' lives in the compilation, is taken from the twelfth-century Magnum Legenarum Austriacum (MLA); the two MSS of the MLA which contain this Martha life are kept at the monasteries of Zwettl and Heiligenkreuz.

(ii) Eis 1933,21 claims that the copying of religious texts in general was carried out with a very great degree of accuracy.

(iii) Eis 1933,136-7 states that Mombritius may have occasionally improved or shortened his originals, but never expanded them.

(iv) Eis 1933,84 points out that the Aliscamps section is present both in the two Austrian MSS and in the Sanctuarium, but absent from MS E; this, he claims, is further evidence that the Zwettl and Heiligenkreuz MSS represent Mombritius' source.

(v) Eis 1933,84 states that the only other known MS containing this version of the Martha life is MS E of the present edition; Eis rejects this MS as a source for the Sanctuarium text (a) because it does not contain the Aliscamps passage, and (b) because it contains 'only a similar story' (eine nur ähnliche Geschichte).

Eis's findings therefore seemed to suggest that no Latin texts existed which were closer than the Sanctuarium to the two French translations: the Martha lives in the MSS held
by two inaccessible Austrian monasteries would have been so accurately copied that they would be almost identical to the Sanctuarium text; the absence in F and C5 of the Aliscamps appendage could well represent omissions in translation, and does not necessarily point to another source; and the Martha life of MS E seemed not to be worth examination, not only because it had been rejected by Eis, but also because the Solesmes monks claim in their edition of the Sanctuarium to have included the variant readings of MS E.

Previous research seemed thus to have made it unnecessary to investigate further the Latin predecessors of the Sanctuarium, and the edition by the Solesmes monks was to have been used as the basis for the comparison of the French translations with the Latin original.

However, when the Martha text in MS E was being cursorily examined to gain an approximate idea of its relationship to the Sanctuarium, it became clear that, far from being 'only similar' to the Mombritius text, MS E agrees very closely with the Sanctuarium. The differences are (a) that MS E agrees with the two French translations against the Sanctuarium in a very large number of details, and (b) MS E, like the translations, does not contain the Aliscamps passage. Thus the Martha life of MS E, dismissed by Eis, who cannot have consulted this MS, is very close to the Sanctuarium, and closer than the Sanctuarium to the French translations. The Paris MS must therefore obviously be used in preference to the Sanctuarium for a comparison with the F and C5 translations.

A further factor makes the use of MS E, and not of the Sanctuarium, essential for this comparison: it emerges that the Solesmes monks have included in their edition only a fraction of the variant readings of MS E, while in their introduction, their remarks about the critical apparatus at least suggest that the list of variants is comprehensive.
Thus the discoveries that Eis's scholarship is not beyond reproach, and that the Solesmes monks have given a very incomplete list of variant readings, have dictated the inclusion in this edition of the text of MS E, the closest extant Latin text to the F and C5 translations. The use of MS E has two overwhelming advantages over the use of the Sanctuarium:

(a) It resolves the problem of dates: one is on much safer ground comparing a twelfth-century Latin original with a thirteenth-century translation, than comparing a fifteenth-century printed Latin text with a translation made two centuries earlier.

(b) It resolves the problem of the geographical origin of the text: although Eis traces the Latin Martha life to the MLA, and seems to suggest that the legend is of Austrian origin, the history of the Martha legend shows clearly that it arose as the result of a local dispute in Tarascon, and must therefore have been composed in southern France. The references to details of local geography also indicate a specifically southern French origin. Similar Latin versions probably travelled from Tarascon north-east into Austria, where they were incorporated into the MLA, and to the north of France, where the translations were made. It would have been very surprising if no Latin text of French origin had survived: the Martha life was evidently fairly popular in France, since it was twice translated, and since one of those translations has survived in seven MSS. Thus the discovery of the close affinities between the Paris MS E and the two French translations has removed an apparent geographical anomaly.

The details of the agreements and differences between the Sanctuarium, MS E, the F translation and the C5 translation, are examined below.
II The choice of MS E (E) over the Sanctuarium (Sa)

There are a few cases in which the two French versions are closer to Sa than to E; these are examined below under (i). Much more frequently, though, the French translations agree with E against Sa; the differences between the two Latin texts are given in detail in the critical apppartus\(^1\), but those which unequivocally indicate the preferability of E over Sa are discussed below, under the following headings: (ii) cases in which a different reading of E corresponds more closely to F and C5 than the reading of Sa; (iii) cases in which Sa does not contain material present in both E and in F and C5 - these cases probably represent omissions from Sa; (iv) cases in which Sa contains elements not present either in E nor in F and C5 - these cases are probably additions made to the original Latin text.

The examination of these cases incidentally shows how Mombritius (or possibly an earlier copyist) treated his source: in the main, the text has been remarkably accurately copied over a period of nearly three centuries. The differences between readings of E and Sa are minor, and are accounted for by some errors in Sa, by the substitution of some synonyms, by some omissions from Sa (about 20 cases), and by a lower number of additions to Sa (some 8 cases); most of these omissions and additions are of only one or two words. This tendency to omit more frequently than to expand partly supports Eis's claim that Mombritius very occasionally shortened his original, but never lengthened it\(^1\) - though Eis is clearly incorrect in stating that additions were never made.

(i) Cases in which the French F and C5 translations resemble the Sanctuarium life more closely than that of MS E

All such cases are listed below. They are very few, and mostly very minor:
muliebribus operibus dedita
muliebribus operibus pulchre erudita
bien apprise de toutes oeuvres de fame
aprise d'oeuvres de demiseles e de dames
omits
eam tantum diligebat quod in eius aede quam alibi hospitari malebat
il l'ama plus que les autres, e plus sovent herberga en son hostel qu'en autre leu
Dont il avint ke ele ama mult nostre signor, e il li, car plus herbrejoit en se maison ke en nule autre
quam Martha invenit
quam Martha significat
qui senefié est par Marthe
omits this passage
in huius sancte mulieris hospitalitate comprobatur
in huius mulieris hospitalitate comprobatur
par ceste hotesse Jhesucrist apert
e par ceste damoisele le puet on prover e entendre
Diligebat, inquit ewangelium, Martham
diligebat enim inquit evangelista dominus Iesus Martham
Car si con dist l'eivangile, nostres sires amoit Marthe
omits this passage, probably through homoioteleuton
Consors apostoli principis Petri
Consors principis apostolorum Petri
compaigne saint Pere le prince des apostres
compaigne...a saint Piere le prince des aposteles
Consors principis est
Consors Petri est
Compaigne saint Pere
A saint Piere doit ele iestre compaigne
E17,7 crimina peccatoribus **condempnantur**
Sa234,52 crimina peccatoribus **condonantur**
F17,7 li pecheeur **pardoné**
C5 17,11 e sont li pechié **pardoné**

E17,15 de paradiso illum **exulavit** in hunc mundum
Sa235,1 De paradiso illum **exulando mancipavit** in hunc mundum
F17,15 il essilla de paradis e le **mist** puis el monde
C5 17,20 de paradis...l'envoia il en **eseil** el monde

E17,19 de sinu patris in alvum beate virginis
Sa235,3 de sinu patris **descendit** in beate virginis alvum
F17,1917 de son saint pere **descendi** il ou ventre a la virge
C5 17,25 de ses hautes maisons **descendi** il el ventre le glorieuse virgene

E18,6 Comes in **mente** mors amara in mundo
Sa235,8 Comes mors amara in mundo
F18,7 El monde si est nostre compaigne la mort
C5 18,10 En cest monde avommes nous le premiere mort a compaignesse

E21,1 eiecta super eum aqua quam secum tulerat
Sa235,40 iacta super eum aqua **sacrata** quam secum tulerat
F21,118 Ele se gita sor lui a toute l'eauè beneoite
C5 21,3 maintenant jeta sor li aigue **benoite**

E24,15 Egregia amica Christi
Sa236,37 **mox** egregia amica Christi
F24,12 Maintenant l'amie Jhesucrist
C5 24,21 Tantost la noble demisele

E29,19 vidit...occurrere suam Mariam Magdalenam
Sa237,48 vidit...occurrere sororem suam Mariam magdalenam
F29,12 ele vit sa **suer** la Magdalaine devant li
C5 29,13 vit se **sereur** Marie Madeleine venir
Of these fifteen cases, eleven involve the addition or omission of only one word, or a different reading for one word. Three others involve only two or three words. Indeed, the only case of any importance is the omission in E at E4,1 of a complete sentence common to Sa and to the two French translations.

These affinities between Sa and the French texts are negligible when compared with the considerable number of correspondences between E, F and C5. Only the more important of these are listed below; a complete list is to be found in the variant readings.

(ii) Cases in which readings of MS E correspond more closely than those of Sa to the French translations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sa</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>C5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>231,45</td>
<td>omnium saeculorum Christus suscitator</td>
<td>suscitor omnium fidelium Christi</td>
<td>li sires de tout le monde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232,44</td>
<td>illi tanto labore ad serviendum</td>
<td>illi tanto heroi ad serviendum</td>
<td>a servir a tel seigneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233,11</td>
<td>inquit euanglista</td>
<td>inquit ewangelium</td>
<td>a si haut signor servir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233,50</td>
<td>parvum puerum</td>
<td>puerum unius diei</td>
<td>sen fil ki Dex e hom estoit (departs from Latin)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(220)
in eius aede placuit hospitari
in eius ede voluit hospitari
volt estre herbergiez...en la meson
li plot e vaut herbregier...en le maison

in contemplatiua vita cum Maria laetabimur
in contemplativa vita cum Maria maneboimus
nous (serons) avec Marie en la vie contemplative
'In eterna vita maneboimus cum Maria;' c'est a
dire, 'En parmenable vie manrons nous avec Marie.'

Quomodo suum proprium dimisit
Quomodo suum proprium divisit
Comment...devisa tout son propre
This version always omits rubric.

Bituricas Urcissino
Bituricas Austregisilo
Boorges Autregiselo
a saint Andrigisile dona il Bouorges

illis adhuc clare non cessat
illis adhuc dare non cessat
...fet bien au siens
lor dona...si ne lor cesse de donner encore ore

in hortum
in orcum
en enfer
en infer

in hortum
in orcum
en enfer
a infer

Quomodo draconem manu sua alligavit
De drachone
C'est le miracle du dragon
This version always omits rubric
Sa235,33 squamas hirsutas
E20,7 squamas acutas
F20,8 l'eschaille poignans
C5 20,12 escailles dures et trenchans

Sa236,2 uenia magistri sui praefati Maximini
E21,2 licentia sui prefati Maximini
F21,21 par le congillé saint Mauxime son mestre
C5 21,36 par le congillé saint Maximien sen bon maistre

Sa236,5 quis est qui valeat dicere
E22,3 non potest recordari
F22,1 ne porroit on (recorder)
C5 22,1 Nus homme ne porroit recorder ne descrire

Sa236,627 pomis sylvestribus vescitur
E22,5 pomisque silvestribus vixit
F22,4 vesqui...de pommes sauvages
C5 22,4 vesqui...de pumes savages

Sa236,19 hospitalitate...semper fulgebat
E23,6 hospitalitate...perfulgebat
F23,6 ele valoit trop d'hospitalité
C5 23,8 de herbregier...ne se metoit ele mie arriere

Sa236,37 ammonuit populum ut solo prostrata deum exoraret
E24,15 ammonuit populum ut solo prostratus Deum exoraret
F24,14 amounesta le pueple que il se meist a genoulz e proiassent nostre seigneur
C5 24,22 amonesta le pueple ke tout se coucaissent a terre e priaissent a nostre signor

Sa237,10 Erat enim episcopa omnium credentium...mater
E26,22 Erat enim ipsa credentium...mater
F26,15 Car de ceuls qui creoient...ele estoit mere
C5 26,33 estoit...mere...de tous ciaus ki en Deu creoient
supponi, "E30,18 solo poni. F30,15 se fist mettre a terre C5 30,26 le misent a terre

sanctaeque crucis lignum E30,19 et sancte crucis signum F30,17 le signe de la croiz C5 30,29 de la sainte crois le signe

dicit mox est E33,5 dicit mas est F33,4 si comme l'en seut C5 33,4 si con il est acoustume

quis vel unde esset uel quo nomine uteretur E35,5 quis vel unde esset, et quo nomine uteretur F35,4 que il estoit e quel non il avoit C5 35,6 dont il estoit e quel non il avoit

De rege Dodoneo E36,1 De rege Clodoveo F36,1 Du roi Clodue C5 36,1 This text always omits rubric

qui prius rex Francorum...fuit E36,9 qui primus rex Francorum...exstitit F36,6 qui fu le premier roi de France C5 36,10 ki premerains fu rois de France

trium miliariorum spacio integro...terram E36,17 trium miliariorum spatio in girum...terram F36,13 .iii. liues de terre tout environ C5 36,24 .iii. liues environ de terre

This sample of cases of different readings of the Latin texts already strongly suggests a close affinity between E and the French translations, despite a few correspondences between Sa and C5. This close affinity is further confirmed
by the following analysis of putative omissions from and additions to the text of the Sanctuarium.

(iii) Probable omissions from the Sanctuarium

Below are listed the more obvious cases of words and phrases present in E, F and C5, but absent from Sa; all such cases are to be found in the variant readings. Given the later date of Sa, these cases probably represent omissions, by Mombritius or by earlier scribes, of material which was present in the original Latin composition.

Sa231,43 _Betanico regalis prosapiae
E1,15 Bethanico egregiis heroibus regalis prosapie
F1,15 Bethanii...noble de lignage e de roial lingniee
C5 1,13 Bethanii; haute fu li demisle, car ele fu de roial lignié

Sa231,50 corpore venusta muliebribus operibus erudita
E2,3 corpore venusta, facie decora, eloquiis luculentâ, muliebribus operibus subdita
F2,3 noble estoit de cors, bele de face, bien parlanz, bien aprise
C5 2,430 Molt fu jente de core li bone damoisele e tres bele de viaire e de parler e de raison rendre, e aprise

Sa232,16 omnes tam domesticos quam barbaros susciperet
E3,13 Omnis tam domesticus quam barbarus superveniens ad larem eius bethanicum, quicquid petebat accipiebat
F3,14 Tuit cil qui vencient en sa meson en Bethanie, fust estranges fust privez, il avoit ce qu'il demandoit
C5 3,22 ne privés ne estraignes ne venist a se maison en Betanie qu'il n'eust cou qu'il requeroit sans nule faille
mari latior quem multi prophetae et reges
qui est plus large que la mer, lequel li cieux et le ciel des ciex ne pueent penre, lequel maint roi e maint prophete
mari latior, quem celum et cela celorum capere nequeunt...c'est a dire...plus les ke li mers; le ciels ne toute sa grans hautesce n'en pueent mie comprendre, e cui molt de prophete e plusior roi
Res magna et laude digna
He ceste chose merveilleuse e digne de loange e de joie
Molt se doit on esjoir e esleechier de ceste cose
die illa comederunt steterunt in domo
die illa comederunt, biberunt, steterunt in lare
Ceil jor il burent e mengierent...e furent en la meson
e mengierent e burent a grant plente e reposerent
O quanta fides
Mirandum est quanta fides
Si fet mult a amerveillier comme grant foi
Entendes ore...con grans fois e con esmervellable
Martham et Mariam magdalenam
beatam Martham et sororem eius Mariam Magdalenam
sainte Marthe e la Magdalaine sa suer
sainte Marthain e a se sereur Marie Madelaine
transeuntes et supervenientes homines
supervenientes et transeuntes in loco homines
les homes passanz par illuec
tous cels ki la s'embatoient, homes e femes
septem annis radicibus haerbisque crudis
septem annis glandibus et radicibus herbisque crudis
.vii. anz ele vesqui de glant e de racines, d'erbes crues
.vii. jors vesqui ele de glans e de racines e de cruel erbes
quo et audientes virtutes tuas credant in te
quatenus presentes populi et futuri videntes et
audientes virtutes tuas credant in te
que tuit cil (pueples) qui te verront e orront
tes vertuz te croient e aourent
si que cis peules ki ci esgarde e cil ki a venir
sont e orront tes grans miracles e tes grans
vertus conter e dire, les croient e toi aorent
omits rubric
De dedicatione eius ecclesie
La dedicacion de l'eglyse sainte Marthe
this text always omits rubric
hii tres usitationis causa
hii tres heroes visitationis causa
cez .iii. barons pour lui visiter
cist troi baron vinrent visiter
omits rubric
Quomodo Christus eam visitavit
Comment Jhesucrist la visita
this text always omits rubric
qui pro nobis natus es passus mortuus
qui pro nobis dignatus es nasci, pati, mori
qui pour nos daigna nestre e souffrir mort e morir
qui por nous deignas naistre de la virgene pucele Marie, e resusciter
hunc locum observauerint
hunc locum observaverint et manu tenuerint
cest lieu maintendront
cest lieu garderont e detenront
cereis et lampadibus
cereis candelis et lampadibus
a tout cierges e a tout granz chandoiles
a grant luminaire
This list (which is not exhaustive) of cases of probable omissions in the Sanctuarium text of material which is present in E, F and C5, clearly demonstrates that the two French translations are much closer to E than to Sa.

(iv) Probable additions to the Sanctuarium

This close affinity between E, F and C5, demonstrated in (ii) and (iii) above, is further established by a study of the cases in which Sa contains material which is not present in E nor in the French versions. It will be noted that these putative additions by Mombritius (or an earlier scribe) are mostly short, and are far less numerous than his omissions. A complete list of these cases follows:

Sa232,44 sed non satis uidebatur eo quod etiam tota domus
E6,4 sed videbatur ei quod etiam tota laris
F6,4 e si sambloit que toute la mesniee
C5 6,6 mais encore li sanloit ke...quian ke li maisons

Sa233,5 in aede beatae Marthae sibi gratum suscepit hospitium
E7,15 in ede beate Marthe hospitium suscepit
F7,15 prist en cele meson son hostel
C5 7,12 se herbrega...en le maison sainte Marthe
Sa233,43 Consors *quoque* diuae virginis *in parte* efficitur
E11,4 Consors dive virginis efficitur
F11,4 Consors dive virginis efficitur
C5 11,4 ceste fu compaigne nostre dame

Sa233,49 ipsum *deuote* recepit
E11,15 ipsum suscepit
F11,14 le reçut
C5 11,17 le reciut

Sa235,13 Iohanni *evangelistae* sic *beato* Maximino Martham
E18,13 Iohanni *evangeliste*, sic *beatam* Martham
F18,15 Jehan l*eivangeliste*, ausint douna il sainte Marthe
C5 18,76 Celui aconpaigna li saint esperis a me demisle sainte Marthain (modifies original)

Sa236,23 *Super auscultantes* se manus imponebat et *spiritus sanctum* accipiebant. *Super aegros manus* imponebat et *spiritus sanctum* accipiebant. *Super aegros manus* imponebat et *bene habebant*
E23,14 *Super auscultantes* manus imponebat et *spiritum sanctum* accipiebant. *Super aegros manus* imponebat et *bene habebant*
F23,13 Sor ceuls qui l'ocient en bien ele metoit sa main, e il avoient bien
C5 23,19 Sor cels ki l'escoutoient de cuer metoit ele ses mains, e tantost recevoient le saint esperit; par li erent tout li enferm turnée a garison de lor maladies

Sa238,11 *crucis lignum* ante se teneri, *sicque agitur*. Tunc fratres...praecata est
E30,19 *crucis signum* ante se teneri. Tunc fratres... *deprecata* est
F30,17 metre le signe de la croiz devant soi. E proia lors les freres
C5 30,29 devant li tenir de la sainte crois le signe. Et dont pria ele ses freres

Sa239,1 Tunc *sanctus* presul
E34,8 Tunc presul
F34,6 lors li evesques
C5 34,9 Adont revint li vesques
There are thus ten cases where Mombritius, or an earlier scribe, has made additions to the original Latin composition; these putative additions are absent from E, F and C5, and thus provide further evidence that E, and not Sa, is the closest extant Latin text to the French translations.

In addition, the small number of such additions in Sa, and their minor nature (they consist mostly of one or two words) partly support Eis's view, mentioned in section I above, that Mombritius never expanded the texts which he was incorporating into his compilation.
III Differences between the extant Latin texts and the French translations

The evidence examined thus far shows that the two French translations have a few minor features in common with Sa, but that in the vast majority of cases where Sa and E differ, the translations agree with E against Sa.

There are however some cases which show that the text (or more properly, the texts, see section IV) used by the translators probably differed from both E and Sa. These suspected differences may conveniently be examined under the following three headings:

(i) Cases in which the two French versions have similar readings, which conflict with the reading of Sa and E; these cases suggest that the translators' Latin originals differed from the extant texts in these places.

(ii) Cases where the two French translations independently omit the same material, present in both Latin texts; these cases may suggest that the translators' originals did not contain this material, but considering the tendency of both translators to omit material in translation, a proportion of these cases is probably to be ascribed to coincidence.

(iii) Cases where both French texts contain material not present in either Latin version - suggesting that this material was present in the translators' originals.

There follows a detailed examination of these three types of occurrences. Only the reading of E is quoted in Latin, since in all but a few of the instances quoted, E and Sa are identical; the differences, where they exist, are indicated in the notes.
(1) *Suspected different Latin readings*

Agreement between F and C5 suggests differences between E and the translators' originals in the following cases:

E16,2  \(\text{divina Providentia...ditavit}\)
F16,2  \(\text{nostres sires lor douna plus}\)
C5 16,2  \(\text{nostre sires les porvei}\)

It would have been typical of the F translator to 'concretize' the abstract *divina providentia* with the translation *nostres sires*, but this is not a change we would expect from the more precise C5 translator \(^{42}\); the fact that each translator has independently given the same version suggests a Latin original containing *dominus noster* rather than *divina providentia*.

E25,6  \(\text{credant in te, adonay Iesu Christe}\)
F25,6  \(\text{te croient e aourent}\)
C5 25,7  \(\text{les croient e toi aorent}\)

The agreement of the two French texts suggests that their originals may have contained *credant in te et adorent*; an inattentive Latin copyist, prompted by the similarity of the beginning of the words *adonay* and *adorent*, could have been responsible for the error \(^{43}\).

E27,18  \(\text{angelicos choros...audivit}\)
F27,14  \(\text{elle vit la compagnie des angles}\)
C5 27,25  \(\text{ele vit grant compaignie d'angeles}\)

The translators' originals probably contained *vidit*, not *audivit*, at this point; a slight visual similarity between *vidit* and *audivit* may explain the difference, introduced by scribal error.

E38,2  \(\text{memorum suorum ipsa sit memor ante Deum}\)
F38,3  \(\text{si que ele soit remembranz de nous devant Dieu}\)
C5 38,3  \(\text{por çou qu'ele prist por nous a nostre signor}\)
Both translators may have been translating by formula here, but the similarity of de nous/por nous beside memorum suorum suggests that the Latin originals for the French versions may have contained nostrum, and that a Latin scribe may have been mislead by abbreviations into making the substitution.

E38,12 cuius regnum et imperium sine fine permanet in secula seculorum amen
F38,13 qui vit e regne avec som pere e le saint esperit a tout jours amen
C5 38,19 ki vit e regne par le siecle des siecles. Amen.

It is possible that each French translator independently used a common formula to end his work; but equally possibly both translators had before them a Latin text which ended with such frequent formulae as: qui vivis et regnas in saecula saeculorum or qui cum Patre et eodem Spiritu Sancto vivis et regnas in saecula saeculorum.

In the above places, then, the reading of the translators' Latin originals seems to have differed from the extant Latin versions.

(ii) Suspected Latin omissions.

There are two types of cases where the agreement of the two French texts suggests that material present in the extant Latin texts may have been absent from the translators' Latin originals: first, there are numerous minor Latin words and phrases which have no equivalent in either French text. These elements may have been absent from the translators' originals, or may simply have been independently omitted in both translations, by the processes discussed in chapter VI. These relatively unimportant Latin elements are listed below:

E3,15 unde contigit ut
E8,3 hospitalitatis gratia
E8,11 magis
E8,13 fideles
Secondly, however, there are longer, more significant parts of the extant Latin texts which have no equivalent in either French version. Most of these cases are of broadly similar material, being phrases or sentences which are resumptive or repetitive, or which add to an enumeration:

E11,9* Quos illa genuit, ista fovit (resumptive)
E13,9 quibus pie mulieres Maria et Martha salvatoris gratiam acquisierunt (resumptive)
E15,9 Quoniam ut philosophus ait, 'Omne bonum in commune deductum clarius lucescit.' (resumptive)
E21,9* Erat enim utpote dracho ex genere illius qui vocatur in libro Iob Leviatan, qui absorbit fluvium; et non miratur, sed habuit fiduciam, quod influeret Iordanis in os eius (addition to the enumeration of the dragon's characteristics)
E22,6* Yringius et affrodiillus et arborum boletus fercula erant sibi meliora (addition to enumeration)
E25,6 Iesu Christe hely hyskiros, qui vivis et regnas cum patre et spiritu sancto et matre Maria virgine in secula seculorum amen

The insertion of this formula was probably due to the mistaken substitution of *adonay* for *adorent* discussed in (i) above; *adonay* may then have caused an inattentive copyist to insert automatically a common formula.

E26,12 a beato Petro apostolo antistite ordinati (explicative intercalation)

E26,15 ille scilicet qui in itinere mortuus fuerat et tactus baculo beati Petri revixit (identifying intercalation)

E28,1 et quam inestimabilis (repetitive)

E29,20 que me hospitio tuo suscepisti (resumptive)

E37,6 vel res eiusdem loci fraudaverit (repetitive)

Coincidence can surely not account for all of these cases, and it seems likely that, in view of the resumptive, repetitive and clarifying nature of the material involved, a Latin scribe was responsible either for their addition to E or for their omission (as redundant) from the Latin text that formed the French translators' originals.

(iii) Suspected Latin additions

There are two cases where the combined evidence of the two French versions suggests that their Latin originals contained material not found in E or Sa:

E36,11 auditis dive Christi hospite rumoribus
F36,8 quant il oï les nouvelles des vertuz de sainte Marthe
C5 36,12 Cil oï les noveles de la sainte ostesse Jhesucrist, ke Dex faisoit por li maint haut miracle

The presence of *vertuz* and *miracle* in the translations suggests that their originals may have contained the word *miraculorum*. 
E37,17\textsuperscript{52} \textit{predicato evangeli\o Christi}

F37,13 \textit{en qui preschierent \textit{le non} Dieu}

C5 37,22 \textit{la preschierent \textit{il le non nostre signor e le saint ewangile.}}

The presence of the underlined portions of the two translations suggests that their originals may have contained \textit{nomine Dei} or \textit{nomine domini nostri}, with the F translator characteristically omitting one part of an almost synonymous pair, while equally typically the C5 text retains both parts.

We have seen, then, in section III that, on the evidence of cases of agreement between the F and C5 translations, their Latin originals probably differed from the only known Latin texts E and Sa in containing some different readings, in making some omissions, and in having two additions.
IV Differences between the translators' Latin originals

Thus far it may appear that the two French texts agree with each other so consistently as to suggest that the two translators used an identical Latin text. There are, however, several places where C5 follows Sa, while F is closer to E. These cases point clearly to the conclusion that each translator used a different Latin text, and that the C5 translator's Latin original had several features in common with Sa, while being for the most part very close to E. There is only one place where the F translation may agree with Sa while C5 follows E.

In the following cases there is agreement between on the one hand Sa and C5, and on the other between E and F:

Sa231,45 omnium saeculorum Christus suscitator
C5 1,19 lì sires de tout le monde
E1,19 suscitator omnium fidelium Christi
F1,20 qui resuscite touz les benecz

Sa232,29 o vere felicem et gloriosam quae tantum hospitem meruit habere, angelorum panem pascentem a quo ipsa pascabatur; quam felix et gloriosa est mulier illa quam Iesus tantum dilexit quod apud eam hospitari voluit et pasci. Illum magnum et admirabilem hospitem suscepit qui angelos et homines hospitatur et pascit. Illum cibavit qui omnes pascit creaturas.

C5 4,21 Or voel jou ke vous sacies ke molt fu ceste demoisele bone, eureuse e gloriusse ki deservi ot a avoir si haut oste, ki dou pain as angeles pocit a sa volenté paistre toute creature, e par cui ele estoit receue e sousteneue. Certes molt par fu ore eureuse cui nostre sire tant ama qu'il avec li vaut herbregier e estre peus de ses viandes. Cil grant signor e esmericavell herbrega ele ki les angeles paist e herberge. Celui peut ele par cui tantes creatures sont peues e gouvernees.

E4,17 Or vere felix valde et gloriosa mulier illa quam Iesus tantum dilexit quod ab ipsa voluit hospitari et pasci. Illum cibavit qui omnes creaturas pascit

F4,17 Or com gloriusse e benecite fu cele fame que nostres sires ama tant que il volt estre herberglez (de.lui) et peus, cil qui herberge les angles e peust; ele donna a mengier a celui qui toutes creatures peust.
Here the C5 translation contains an equivalent of all the material of Sa, although it has duplicated part of the Latin by translating *twice qui omnes pascit creaturas*; the whole passage is repetitive, a fact which probably explains the translator's confusion. The E version, however, has omitted the first of two similar sentences - those beginning *vere felicem et gloriosam* and *quam felix et gloriosa*; a copyist probably made this omission because of the similarity of the beginnings of the two sentences, but also because he happened to be turning his page at this point (fol.131r to 131v).

The F translation also has this omission, but contains some material which is not present in E (underlined in F), and which seems to be a partial rendering of Sa *qui angelos (et homines) hospitatur et pascit*.

This case demonstrates how C5 follows Sa and how F is close to E; it also shows that, since F contains material omitted from E, this translation must be a rendering of a predecessor of E, and not of a text derived from MS E. This relationship is represented in the diagram below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sa</th>
<th>C5</th>
<th>E5</th>
<th>F5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>232,36</td>
<td>multi prophetae et reges</td>
<td>multi prophete et reges...c'est a dire...molt de prophete e plusior roi</td>
<td>multi reges et prophete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232,45</td>
<td>nisi eius soror ad praeparanda ei subueniret</td>
<td>Se suer ne li aidoit point a porveir son afaire</td>
<td>nisi eius soror ad preparanda prandia ei subveniret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232,46</td>
<td>stetit ante dominum stupefacta</td>
<td>s'en vint la damisele devant nostre signor</td>
<td>stetit in medio laris stupefacta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This case demonstrates how C5 follows Sa and how F is close to E; it also shows that, since F contains material omitted from E, this translation must be a rendering of a predecessor of E, and not of a text derived from MS E. This relationship is represented in the diagram below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sa</th>
<th>C5</th>
<th>E5</th>
<th>F5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>232,36</td>
<td>multi prophetae et reges</td>
<td>multi prophete et reges...c'est a dire...molt de prophete e plusior roi</td>
<td>multi reges et prophete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232,45</td>
<td>nisi eius soror ad praeparanda ei subueniret</td>
<td>Se suer ne li aidoit point a porveir son afaire</td>
<td>nisi eius soror ad preparanda prandia ei subveniret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232,46</td>
<td>stetit ante dominum stupefacta</td>
<td>s'en vint la damisele devant nostre signor</td>
<td>stetit in medio laris stupefacta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This case demonstrates how C5 follows Sa and how F is close to E; it also shows that, since F contains material omitted from E, this translation must be a rendering of a predecessor of E, and not of a text derived from MS E. This relationship is represented in the diagram below.
et ei super hac re conquerens ait

Por ceste cose...e si li dist

et super re conquerens clementi iudici ait

e si se complaint au douz juge, e dist

Ab hinc ex more saluator in aede beatæ Marthae

sibi gratum suscepit hospitium

Tres cel jor en avant se herbrega li sauveres del

monde par coustume en le maison sainte Marthe

abhinc salvator in ede beatae Marthe hospitium

susceptit

des lors en avant nostres sires prist en cele

meson son hostel

Suscepit enim gloriae virgo Maria deum et hominem.

ausi herbrega ceste sainte damoisele a le tres

haute glorieuse virgene. Car la sainte roine

suscepit virgo Deum et hominem

einsint reçut ceste Dieu e home

totam religionem omnium religiosorum

toute la religion de tous saint homes

totam religiones religiosorum

toute religion.

c5 follows sa exactly, but e makes no sense without the
emendation. F toute religion seems to be an attempt to make
sense of the defective E by reading religionem for
religiosorum, though the F rendering could also be an
abbreviating translation of the complete version represented
by Sa.

manciparunt, quosdam ut Iacobum premerunt

misent en prison...e tels i ot qu'il ocisent si
con mon signor saint Jakeme

manciparunt, quosdam ut Stephanum lapidaverunt,
quosdam ut Iacobum premerunt

mistrent en prison, aucuns en lapiderent si comme
saçt Estienne, aucun en ocistrent si comme saint
Jasque.
Sa235,27 *medius animal terrestre medius piscis*

C5 19,31 *il ert la moitié poissons e la moitié beste*

E19,18 *medius ales medius piscis*

F19,17 *la moitié de lui estoit oisiaus e l'autre moitié poisson*

Sa235,42 *Nuncupatur autem draco ille Tirascurus*

C5 21,13 *Cil serpens estoit apielés par non Tarascurus*

E21,5 *Nuncupatur autem ab incolis Tarascurus*

F21,5 *E ce leu claimment les genz du pais Tesacur*

Sa237,10 *omnium credentium*

C5 26,34 *de tous ciaus ki en Deu creoient*

E26,22 *credentium*

F26,15 *de ceuls qui creoient*

Sa238,21 *Quae dum secundo legeretur et lector diceret*

C5 31,18 *cil ki le lisoit l'ot recommencé, e si vint a cel mot ke nostre sire dist.*

E31,17 *Que dum legeretur, et lector diceret*

F31,14 *e quant li freres dist*

Against these fourteen cases which point clearly to affinities between Sa and C5 on the one hand, and between E and F on the other, there is one minor case which may indicate the reverse of these affinities:

Sa235,14 *Ut qui eas olim baptizauerat Ipse... ad regnum caelorum eas perduceret*

F18,18 *que cil qui les avoit baptiziés les peust mener es cieus*

E18,15 *ut quasi eas olim baptizaverat, ipse... ad regnum celorum eas perduceret*

C5 18,78 *por ce qu'il... les amenast al regne des ciels, car il les avoit en saint fons rengenerees e baptiziés*

F translates Sa *Ut qui* exactly by *que cil qui*; in E, however, the suspected omission of *qui* spoils the sense of the sentence, and apparently causes the C5 translator (whose original may not have contained *qui*) to take *ut eas olim baptizaverat* to mean 'as he had once baptized them', translated by *car il les avoit... baptiziés*. But this
isolated instance should perhaps be rather explained as a coincidence: the C5 translator, using the correct ut qui version, has rearranged the syntax of the original, being thus obliged to add the il les avoit...baptizées portion later; by choosing to attach this to the preceding sentence by car, he accidentally created a similarity with the apparently defective E text.

This one instance, then, need not disprove the affinities of C5 with Sa and of F with E demonstrated by the preceding fourteen examples in section IV.
V Diagram of the Latin and French Martha texts

This schema represents the simplest possible relationships between the extant Latin and French versions of the Martha life discussed in this chapter:

Original Latin composition

Closely similar Latin copies

Magnum
Legendarium
Austriacum

Sanctuarium
Translation

X

Y
Z

C5
Translation

F
Translation

E
Latin

X, Y and Z represent three closely similar Latin copies of the original Latin composition; it is necessary to posit X and Y in order to account for the affinities on the one hand between Sa and C5, and on the other hand between C5 and F. The evidence of Sa232,29 discussed in section IV makes it necessary to assume the existence of Z.
Conclusion

In spite of statements by other researchers, we have seen that the Latin Martha life in MS E, and not the Sanctuarium version, is the closest known text to the French translations of MSS F and C5. Although there are a few cases where the two translations both agree with Sa against E, in the main they follow the E text far more closely than Sa.

In places both French translations agree together against both Latin versions, which suggests that the translators' originals were different from any known Latin text; and in a number of cases C5 follows Sa, while F adheres to E, showing that each translator must have used a different Latin original; both were very close to E, but that used by the C5 translator had some features in common with Sa.
Notes to chapter V

1 See chapter I, section II, for examples of such correspondences.

2 The scant information available about the life and work of Mombritius is given in Mombritius 1910, I and XII, and in Eis 1933, 15-18.

3 For details, see volume II, pp. 483-486.

4 Meyer 1897, 501 uses biographical details of Marguerite, countess of Flanders (for whom the life was translated, see ch. VI, pp. 313-4) to establish that the translation was made between 1244 and 1280. Other evidence shows that the MS was probably executed in about 1275.

5 '...oft ward ein Heiligenleben in den verschiedensten Ländern vielmals so getreu abgeschrieben, dass zwischen zwei ganz ähnlichen Texten vier, fünf und noch mehr Zwischenstufen gewesen sein könnten.' Eis 1933, 21.

6 '...er hat...aus dem alten österreichischen Sammelwerk Legenden in grosser Zahl ohne künstlerische oder gelehrte kritische Überarbeitung aufgenommen. Nur in ganz vereinzelten Fällen hat er geglättet, gebessert, gekürzt - erweitert nie.' The Solesmes monks have the same view of Mombritius' fidelity as a transcriber: '...vir ists... nequaquam hagiographicos textus artis rhetoricae legibus tractandos duxerit, neque Sanctorum 'historias' exculto calamo conficiendas aut expoliendas esse putaverit, sed genuinos eorum Vitae et... passiones e manuscriptis codicibus, sedum fideliter, sed et summa cum scrupulositate decerpserit... ' Mombritius 1910, I, IX.

7 This 'sonst nirgends nachweisbare Anhängsel des Mombritius von dem berühten Friedhof von Aliscamps' (Eis 1933, 84) is on p. 240 (lines 1-55) of the Solesmes edition.

8 Mombritius 1910, II, 694: Correctiones, variae lectiones et notae. The Solesmes monks also mention here that there exist very few MSS containing this text: 'Textus, post Mombritium ineditus, legitur in codicibus manuscriptis nec multis nec valde antiquis.'

9 Mombritius 1910, I, XI: '...apparatus... ubi lectiones non paucas ex variis documentis tum editis tum manuscriptis concessimus, ad textum emendandum, aut supplendum, aut etiam aliquo modo illustrandum.'

10 Eis's overall intention in finding an Austrian, not an Italian or French, source for the Sanctuarium, seems to be to demonstrate that the Germanic lands also made a contribution to the Renaissance; his nationalist glee at his conclusions is occasionally detectable - see Eis 1933, 137 et passim.

11 See volume II, pp. 450-452 for details.

12 See for example El9,15-17 and E24,2-6.
Among the most recurrent differences may be mentioned here the routine substitution of \textit{Sa mors} for \textit{E nescies}, of \textit{Sa urbs} and \textit{castella} for \textit{E castra}, and of \textit{Sa -que} for \textit{E et}.

See note 6 above.

A copyist was probably mislead by the recurrence of \textit{evangile}, once to translate \textit{E8,8 evangeliun}, and again at \textit{C5 8,10}.

The Solesmes edition has Petrie \textit{st}.

For \textit{de son saint pere} beside \textit{de sinu patris}, see Notes.

\textit{F5} is closer to the Latin text here, omitting \textit{se} and \textit{a toute}; see variants.

The occurrence in \textit{E} of \textit{suam} without an associated noun probably indicates that such a noun as \textit{sororem} has been omitted through scribal error.

\textit{F1} and \textit{F3} have \textit{illeuc}, see variants.

\textit{plot e vaut} is probably an instance of 'Synonymen-doppelung' for which the \textit{C5} translator shows a great propensity. The reading may, however, indicate that the original of the \textit{C5} translation contained \textit{placuit et voluit}, and should perhaps be numbered among those cases listed in section IV where \textit{C5} agrees with \textit{Sa} against \textit{F} and \textit{E}.

\textit{F1}, \textit{F2}, \textit{C3} and \textit{F5} have \textit{serons}, while \textit{F} has \textit{irons}; see variants.

The Spanish version of this rubric at \textit{Sp19,14} reads \textit{Commo santa Marta ato el drugo}; the implications of this apparent agreement between \textit{Sa} and \textit{Sp} are considered in chapter I, p. 79.

The omission of \textit{magistri} in \textit{E} is apparently a scribal error, since it would be unusual to precede the proper noun \textit{Maximini} by \textit{aui}; cf. the omission of \textit{Sa sororem} at \textit{Sa237,48}, discussed in note 19 above.

\textit{F} has \textit{retrere}, and \textit{F3} has \textit{raconter}; all other MSS have \textit{recorder}. Despite the similarity of \textit{Sa dicere} to \textit{retrere} and \textit{raconter}, the syntax of \textit{F} more closely resembles \textit{E} than \textit{Sa}, and the different readings of \textit{F} are probably no more than variation on a common formula.

\textit{C5 recorder} and \textit{descrire} may be another case of 'Synonymendoppelung', or may be another instance where \textit{C5} has affinities with both \textit{E} and \textit{Sa}; see note 21 above.

Despite the similarity in form between \textit{Sa vescitur} and the translation \textit{vesqui} (Pope 1966, 382), the translation is most probably from \textit{vixit}.

The form \textit{episcopa} may be due to a misunderstanding of the abbreviation for \textit{ipsa}. The correspondence of \textit{Sa omnium} with \textit{C5 tous} is discussed below in section IV.

\textit{Sp35,5} has \textit{o} corresponding to \textit{Sa vel}; cf. \textit{Sa235,25} and \textit{Sa235,39} where \textit{Sa} also corresponds with \textit{Sp}; see chapter I, pp. 79-80.
The repetition in C5 de parler and de raison rendre probably represents a case of 'Synonymendoppelung' rather than evidence of a different Latin original; see chapter VI, pp. 310-311.

The similar word-order of Sa and C5 is mentioned below in section IV, p.237.

If F merveilleuse represents Sa magna, it seems that E may have omitted this word. Otherwise, though, E gaudio may have been wrongly copied as magna in Sa, in which case this instance belongs among the different Latin readings discussed in section II,ii, on pp. 231-232.

C5 jors beside annis and anz is an error either of scribe or of translator.

All MSS except MS F have pueples, see variants. For F aourent and C5 aorent see III,i, on p. 231.

The apparent scribal error in E of dignatus for natus probably arose from similarities between the two words; a scribe doubtless realized his error, but chose to alter the syntax of what followed, rather than to make a correction.

F is clearly faulty here, mort being superfluous; the other F MSS are even further from E, however, see variants.

The omission of vel falsum iuditium in Sa is probably to be explained by homoioteleuton, provoked by the repetition of vel falsum in the original.

F ouvrant is probably a scribal error for ou rat; see chapter I, pp. 75-76.

The reading is that of MS Fl; four of the seven F MSS are defective here, see variants. The defect is probably the result of homoioteleuton caused by the repetition of meson.

The insertion into Sa of beato Maximino was necessary for Sa to make sense after part of the text had been incorporated into the rubric at Sa235,11.

The addition in Sa is probably to be explained as a case of homoioteleuton in reverse: the copyist, having reached the second case of manus imponebat, may have mistakenly looked back in his original to the first case, and so repeated et spiritum sanctum accipiebant.

See chapter VI for a study of the translation procedures.

The scribal error of adonay for adorent is probably also responsible for the following Latin addition; see section III,ii on p. 234.

See, for example, Breviarium Romanum 371, Ordo ministrandi Extremam Unctionem.

Sa236,32 has fluiumque transmeare cupiens.

Sa233,46 has Quem, not Quos.
47 Sa235,46 has fluuios, not fluvium.
48 Sa236,7 omits yringuis, and has affродилиus for affродилиus. See Notes for these words.
49 Sa236,44 omits hely hyskiros, and has matre uirgine Maria, not matre Maria virgine.
50 Sa237,29 has inextimabilis, not inestimabilis.
51 Sa239,38 has fraudaverit, not fraudavit.
52 Sa239,43 has praedicato ibi euangelio Christi.
53 MS F omits de lui; MS C3 has par li; see variants.
54 It could be argued that this is a Sa addition rather than an E omission, though the F translation shows that at least the qui angelos...pascit section of E is missing.
55 The difference between the two Latin texts is probably to be explained originally by confusion between parts of domus and dominus, which may be very similar in their abbreviated forms; laris could be a subsequent substitution for domus.
56 The C5 translator seems to have mistakenly assumed that gloriola virgo is the object of suscepit; it remains clear, though, that his original contained gloriitas and enim.
57 If there is an omission from Sa here, it is probably a case of homoioteleuton caused by the repetition of quosdam ut.
58 MS F5 has biste for MS F oisiaus, and thus follows Sa rather than E.
Chapter VI: The French Translators' Treatment of the Latin Martha Life

Summary.

The F French version is compared with the E Latin text of the Martha life to assess the competence of the translator and to establish what changes were made in translation.

Section I shows that the F Martha translation is mostly accurate, and occasionally improves on the Latin text. Often, though, the translator tends to follow his original too slavishly, producing awkward and sometimes incorrect renderings of Latin as a result. The work indeed contains many errors, lexical errors in particular being more than twice as frequent as in the C Magdalene translation.

Section II examines the types of material omitted in translation, and shows that the incidence of omissions is much lower in the first third of the text - the section dealing with biblical events - than in the remainder.

Section III demonstrates how the translator has lowered the stylistic register of his original by the selection of simpler vocabulary and by some simplification of syntax; section IV analyses the translator's few additions, which are inserted mostly for clarity and precision.

Throughout the chapter, the changes made in the F translation are contrasted with the reading of the independent C5 French translation of the Martha life; in section V the main characteristics of this version are listed. The four translations studied thus far (Magdalene C and D, Martha F and C5) allow us to distinguish in section VI three different types of translation, and a different treatment by one translator of two different types of material.
I The Translator's Competence

The translator of the F Martha version has usually produced an accurate and complete version of his original, the omissions (see II below) being mostly of dispensable elements of the Latin; in some cases the translator has eliminated inelegant repetition in Latin, and has intelligently compressed some verbose passages of his original. However, excessively close adherence to the Latin has produced some defects, and ignorance or carelessness has led to numerous lexical and syntactic errors. These characteristics of the F translation are discussed under the headings: (i) the translator's skill, (ii) the translator's slavishness, and (iii) the translator's errors.

(i) The translator's skill

In the following cases, the F translator seems to have been conscious of repetition and redundant material in his original, and to have eliminated them in translation:

E9,16 Exsurgent mortui et resurgent qui sunt in monumentis
F9,16 Li mort releveront e cil qui sont es sarquieus
C5 9,17 Li mort s'esleveront, e resusciteront tout cil ki sont es sepucres

E16,2 hos...in melioribus regionibus ditavit. Ditavit villis et castellis et urbibus, locupletavit gazis multis
F16,2 lor douna plus en autres terres; il les enrichi de viles e de chastiaus e d'autres choses
C5 16,3 les porvei...e les assena...en mellors contrees, e si les enrichi de viles e de castiaus e de cités de de grans avoirs

F avoids here the Latin repetition of ditavit, and has suppressed the redundant locupletavit; C5 has the same number of terms as E, though the C5 translator's use of synonyms has avoided repetition.
cum apud Avinionum ante foras urbanas in quodam loco ameno inter urbem et fluvium Rodani... predicaret

Endementres que...preeschoit en .i. leu entre la porte d'Avignon e le Rosne

preeschoit...a Avegnon devant les portes de la cite en .i. molt bel liu e delitable entre la cite e le Rosne

Parts of the underlined Latin phrases are redundant, since a location that is between the city and the river is clearly outside the city. F successfully conflates the two Latin phrases, while the more verbose C5 translates in full.

Cum...suo pio hospiti...placeret, meritorum eius stipendia ei reddere volens, ille pius hospes suus innotuit

Comment la beneoiste hostesse Jhesucrist ot moult de bienz fez, ses hostes li volt rendre son loier, e li fist savoir

ceste sainte plot molt a sen bon oste...li vaut bien la. soie deserte rendre, si li laissa savoir

0 genus dignum gloriose mortis. Quis unquam tam dignam atque pretiosam necem audivit?

0 qui onques si bele maniere de mort vit?

Ki of onques mais si digne e si precieuse mort?

The above few cases show that the F translator occasionally saw defects in his original, and thus deviated from it by avoiding repetition and pleonasm.

(ii) The translator's slavishness

More usually, however, the F translator adheres closely to his original. In general the result is a complete and accurate rendering of the Latin, as may be appreciated from the French version of the following passages, where the accuracy of F is comparable to that of the D Magdalene translation: E3,15-19; E7,6-9; E9,3-10; E9,15-E10,6; E10,16-19; E11,1-4; E26,2-5; E35,6-11. As discussed below in section II, the F translation is much more complete in the first third of
the text than in the remainder.

However, the F translator's close adherence to the Latin has sometimes been such that awkward and repetitive translations have resulted, as in the following examples:

E22,1 Quot labores, quot angustias, quot egritudines, quantas persecutiones quantasque anxietates, quantas fames ibi sustinuit

F22,1 combien eles souffri d'angoisse e de labour e de travail e d'enfermeté, de perssecucions, de faims e d'autres angoisses

C5 22,1 le travail ke ele soufri, ne les angoisses ne les maladies ne les parsecutions ne les destreces ne les famines

F and C5 have the same number of forms of discomfort as E, but the additional e d'autres angoisses of F seems to have the purpose of compensating for possible inadequacies in the translation; the F translator's desire to produce a faithful rendering has thus resulted in the unfortunate repetition of angoisses; he seems at this point to have been more concerned with completeness than with style.

E34,4 antistitem dormitantem in cathedra pulsat, cui ille adhuc nullum dat responsum. Unde totus clerus et viri cives ad missam astantes mirantur, sciscitantes quare presul tantam faceret moram.

F34,3 de l'evesque, e le bouta en sa chaire, ne il ne respondi pas. E li clergiez e tuit cil qui ooiient la messe se merveillerent de l'evesque qui se dornoit en sa chaire

C5 34,5 e il vit qu'il dormoit, si le commença a croller .i. poi, mais li vesques ne s'esvella mie. Li clerc e les gens ki estoient venu por oir la messe s'esmerveillient molt ke li vesques faisoit si grant demorance.

The F translator seems to have been so intent on including the detail in cathedra, omitted completely in C5, that he has repeated it in the next sentence.
E36,11 auditis dive Christi hospite rumoribus, gravem
morbum renum passus, ad locum eius venit

F36,8 quant il oi les noueules des vertuz de sainte
Marthe, il avoit une grant maladie es rains, e a
celui maintenant que il vint au leu

C5 36,12 Cil oi les noveles de la sainte ostesse Jhesucrist,
ke Dex faisoit par li maint haut miracle; une grant
maladie avoit en ses rains...e parvint dusqu'a sa
sepulture

The F translator has adhered so closely to E here that the
presentation of events is unsatisfactory; it seems that
Clovis's disease appeared only when he heard of Martha's
miracles! C5 has altered the syntax of E to give a less
ambiguous presentation of events.

Thus by following his Latin original too slavishly, the
F translator has occasionally produced inelegant or
illogical renderings. It is probably also partly through
excessively close adherence to E that the translator has
made some of the errors of syntax considered below at
I,iii(b).

(iii) The translator's errors

In addition to the unsatisfactory translations considered
above, the F translator has also made a number of mistakes,
which are now considered under the headings (a) lexical
errors, and (b) syntactic errors. The frequency of lexical
errors is much higher than in the C Magdalene translation,
while syntactic errors occur with about the same frequency.

(a) Lexical errors

Most of the lexical errors discussed below seem to be
the result of ignorance or inattention; many cases apparently
involve misinterpreted Latin abbreviations.

E2,8 Nusquam legitur
F2,9 n'en ne list onques
C5 2,12 on ne trueve lisant en nule escriture
C5 confirms the Latin reading Nusquam; the F translator, through inattention, or through misreading the abbreviated form nūquā, seems to have read nusquam as numquam.

accubitus means here 'couch for reclining at table', the sense in which it is taken by the C5 translator; the F translator assumes the term to refer to sleeping accommodation, thus displaying an ignorance of Roman eating habits.

The rendering of F is either a very loose interpretation of perseverantibus, or an inexplicable error.

F treats archisynagogi (the priest who was the chief ruler of the synagogue) as a proper name, and is unaware of the allusion to Jairus. This error, as well as that at E4,105, suggests that the translator's knowledge of the scriptures was imperfect.

C5 12,12 Ce fu sen frere ki iiii. jors avoit jeu en terre, e tantost con nostre sire l'apiela e dist, 'Lazers viencha fors,' il tantost issi del moniment e fu resuscités
C5 translates freely at this point, so provides no evidence for the accuracy of E; however, it is unlikely that the Latin original for F contained qui for quia, since this would not have fitted syntactically with the following qui clause. It thus seems probable that the F translator has misread qui for quia.

E12,17 eumque bono corde invocantem pro quo Deum invocaverit
F12,17 qui de bon cuer l'apelerata pour qui ele proiera nostre seigneur
C5 12,30 ki de vrai cuer l'apeleront...dont ele proiera son bon oste

The F translator has mistakenly read E eumque as eamque, though the context makes it clear that eumque is indeed the correct reading. C5 has rearranged the original at this point, but seems to have made the same error as F. The misreading may be explained by a carelessly formed superscript abbreviation for m in eumque, which may have caused the u to resemble a.

E13,13 omnes regule cunctorum religiosorum
F13,13 toutes les regules de religion
C5 13,16 toutes les riules de tous les saint homes religieus

C5 accurately translates, and thus confirms, the reading of E, while F has only an approximation; this may be the result of deliberate abridgement, but could also be another case of a mis-read Latin abbreviation: the sign for the genitive plural ending on religiosorum may have led the translator to believe that he was rendering religionum instead, since such an error would only involve mistaking s for n.

E19,12 maxima pars populorum illius pagi conversa est
F19,11 grant patie'des genz qui ne creoiuent se convertirent
C5 19,25 fu grans partie dou peule de cel pais convertis

C5 confirms the reading illius pagi 'of that country' of E; the similarity in form between pagi and pagani seems to account for this error in F, doubtless aided by the context.
E19,15  iuxta rupem ingentem
F19,15  sor une grant roche
C5 19,28  joustes une roche

F has inexplicably deviated from E at this point, whereas C5 translates accurately.

E20,8  sevos pedes et ungues ursinos
F20,8  piez de lyon e ongles d'ours
C5 20,13 omits this detail

The F error de lyon for sevos, unless indeed it is a loose rendering, may be explained either by the translator being misled by nearby comparisons with lions (E20,5 and E20,10), or by his need to find an animal parallel to the following ursinos.

E20,11  Cum... incole... eum perimere nequissent
F20,11  quant li gaaaigneur du pais ne le poioient veintre
C5 20,21 Quant li paisant de la contree virent qu'il ne le porroient... veintre

Latin incole means 'inhabitants', accurately translated in C5, where paisant means 'men of the country or district'. F has used the imprecise translation gaaaigneur 'agricultural labourer' probably under the influence of the element col- of incole, which doubtless recalled to the translator the Latin verb colere 'to cultivate'.

E21,2  dracho stetit victus ut ovis
F21,2  li dragons aussi comme touz veincuz se tint cois
C5 21,4 li serpens ne se mut nient plus c'uns aligniaus

ut ovis (confirmed by C5 c'uns aigniaus) is the type of comparison that the F translator would not normally omit, and an explanation of the omission must be sought. The F translator may have failed to recognize the term ovis, reading instead the word omnis, since an abbreviation for omnis would resemble onis, and u, v and n are not always
clearly differentiated. Such a misreading would explained
F `touz, and `cois would have been added to make sense after
se tint from stetit.

E22,19 Extensis solo ramis arboreis vel vitibus
F22,17 ele metoit les rains de noiers
G5 22,28 estendoit a terre rains d'arbres u de vignes

The agreement of C5 with E confirms the Latin reading, while
the replacement in F of a general term by a specific one is
untypical and inexplicable.

E23,5 fide, spe et caritate cunctisque virtutibus
F23,5 de foi, d'esperance, de charite e d'autres vertuz
C5 23,7 De foi e de carite e de vraie esperance e de toutes
bones vertus

The translation by F autres of E cunctis (confirmed by C5
toutes) is not a serious deviation, but may be explained by
a misreading of cunctisque as ceterisque, an error which
would have been facilitated by the abbreviation of cunctisque
to cunctisque and by the existence of abbreviations to
represent the letters er.

E23,12 gentium catervis divini verbi semina erogabat
F23,8 preeschoit aus autres genz
C5 23,16 disoit le foi crestiene a cels ki estoient
mescreant

C5 is aberrant here, and Sa contains caterius for catervis.
F autres is likely to be the result of a misreading of
ceteris for E catervis 'crowds', perhaps facilitated by the
use in Latin of an abbreviation to represent the letters er.

E25,4 resuscita puerum istum
F25,5 resuscites cest mort
C5 25,4 resuscite cest jovenecel

E puerum is confirmed by C5 jovenecel; the aberrant F mort
may be an error due to inattention, or a deliberate change by
the translator who is seen in IV below to be very attentive
to details of identity.
E25,18 cives et suburbani crediderunt in dominum nostrum Iesum Christum et baptismum subierunt
F25,15 quant cil de la cite virent ce, il se baptisierent
C5 25,14 Tout cil ki la estoient de la cite e des autres viles creirent en Jhesucrist, e rechurent baptesme

The F translator appears to have read viderunt for crediderunt, possibly through misunderstanding an abbreviation: the letters re, di or de may well have been abbreviated in the MS.

E26,3 Eutropius Aurasicensis
F26,3 Eutropoles Avariscie
C5 26,2 saint Eutropes d'Orange

Aurasicensis is a form of the more usual arausicënsis, the adjectival form of Arausio, 'Orange'. The more learned C5 translator has correctly translated the Latin, while the F translator has apparently failed to recognize the geographical allusion, and produced the conjectural form Avariscie. This ignorance also probably explains the omission from F of E16,12 Aurasicam alii Eutropio; further evidence of the F translator's poor knowledge of French toponymy is found in the confused translation of the passage referring to the origin of Tarascon at E21,5. His poor knowledge of the scriptures confirms this lower level of instruction compared with the C5 translator.

E27,22 michi congratulamini
F27,17 venez entour moi
C5 27,29 esjoissies vous ensamble moi

C5 contains an acceptable rendering of E, while F venez is suspect; perhaps, through inattention, the translator misread in congratulamini part of the verb congredior 'to go or come', an error which would have been facilitated if the translator had had in mind the simple form gradior of which congredior is a compound.
E28,16  turbo venti a parte maligna veniens
F28,15  e vint uns granz vens en la chambre ou sainte Marthe gisait malade
C5 28,20  uns estorbellons vint par diable

C5 correctly interprets E a parte maligna, while F wrongly takes maligna to mean 'ill'.

E29,10  velociter exaudi me
F29,8  aides moi
C5 29,6  acline t'orelle a ma proiere isnielement

C5 here confirms the reading exaudi in E, of which F could just be a loose translation, with the sense of 'heed'; but since at E30, 40 exaudiam is rendered by orrai, aides moi seems suspect here, especially considering the similarity and correspondence of letters between exaudi and the verb auxiliari.

E30,16  iussit se...retro basilicam...deferi
F30,13 10  commanda que on la meist...delez un moustier
C5 30,22  se commanda ele a porter...derriere l'eglise

The substitution of 'beside' for 'behind' is inexplicable, and the confusion is further compounded in Sp30,14 which has antel monasterio!

E31,2  et ipsum polum sine intermissione aspiceret
F31,1  elle regardast...le pueple d'autre part
C5 31,1  torna ses ielx...vers le ciel

It seems very likely that the F translator has erroneously read polum as an abbreviation of populum; presumably the addition of d'autre part was needed in order for the sentence to make sense.

E37,24  beato fine ibi quiiverunt
F37,18  il vindrent a bone fin
C5 37,31  la en furent li cors mis en terre, e les ames es ciels portees
The expanded C5 version suggests that the Latin original was indeed *guieverunt*, whereas the F translator seems to have translated *venerunt*, a reading that would be inappropriate in this context. Possibly the F translator misread *guieverunt* as follows: *g* and the first stroke of the following *u* may have been taken as an abbreviation of the suffix *-que*; the second stroke of *u* and the following *i* could then be read as *u/y* and the *v* as *n*, since these letters are usually not clearly distinguishable in MSS. Such misreadings could thus easily cause *quieverunt* to be read as *-que venerunt*.

E38,4 in celesti regno cum ea *regnare* valeamus  
F38,4 nous puissions *venir* avec lui devant Dieu  
C5 38,4 puissommes si trespasser par les biens temporeus ke nos puissommes ensemble li avoir le compagnie des angeles es celestiens regnes

The prolixity of C5 makes it difficult to use this text to confirm *regnare* against *venir*, though *avoir le compagnie* suggests the immobility of *regnare*. F *venir* may either be a loose translation of *regnare*, or may represent the use, in a moment of inattention, of a formula common in this context.

The above cases of disparity between E and F are most likely to be errors on the part of the translator, and seem to be caused by inattention and ignorance, and by misreading often resulting from confusion over abbreviated Latin forms.

A few further cases of lexical disparity may also be errors of translation, though there is evidence that they may instead be blamed on French scribes:

E14,21 ex qua ipsa...apostolis...victum et vestitum prebuit  
F14,22 de quoi ele peust soustenir les apostres  
C5 14,33 aposteles lor en livra ele e amenestra *vestimens e peuture*
soustenir is possibly an adequate translation of the elements victum et vestitum, but the presence of peust is suspicious: this could be part of pooir 'to be able', and thus constitute an addition by the translator; but equally, peust may be part of paistre 'to feed', and may have originally been a translation of victum 'food'. A French scribe may have subsequently confused the two meanings, and altered the sentence to accommodate his interpretation.

While looit 'praised' is possibly a very free translation of recipiebantur, its similarity to part of ofr 'to hear' suggests that a French scribe may have been prompted by the context to add an initial 1 to what had originally been ooit. C5 ooient supports this view.

The readings of C5 and the Speculum Historiale confirm E caprina, while F chanvre (correctly translated by Sp22,14 cannamo) is suspect. The similarity in form between chevre and chanvre (variant form chanre) suggests that the original F translation contained chevre, which was then misread by a French scribe, who is thus to blame for the form chanvre (Fl chanre) in all the extant MSS. Very frequently n and v/u are indistinguishable in the MSS, and it would require a scribe only to misread a for e for chevre to be read as chanre, the variant form of chanvre attested in Fl.
F may here be a very approximate rendering of E, though the form mort is suspiciously close to mont 'world'; a French scribe may have misread mort for mont, then altered the sentence to suit his misreading.

The above four cases of discrepancy between E and F may represent translation errors, but seem much more likely to be French scribal errors. The numerous cases of French scribal errors attested in some French MSS, and repeated in the Sp translation, are mentioned in volume II; the above four cases are mentioned here because there is no direct evidence in the MSS of scribal blunders.

Excluding these four suspected scribal errors, the F Martha version contains 25 lexical errors in 38 pages, compared with ten lexical errors over 32 pages in the C Magdalene text. Thus, even allowing for factors such as the varying legibility of MSS and different incidence of words susceptible to misreading, there is evidence that the F Martha translator worked less skilfully and less attentively than the C Magdalene translator.

(b) Syntactic errors

Below are discussed the most obvious cases where the F translator has failed to grasp the syntax of his Latin original; excessively close adherence to the Latin word-order seems often to be the cause of this failure.

E2,18  
sensu et probitate habundantior et potentior erat, cunctisque gazis erat optima

F2,18  
ele de senz e de proesce valoit mieux, e estoit plus puissanz que tuit li autre; ele estoit trop riche

C5,2,36  
par son sens e par sa proeuche avoit ele...l'onor e le signorie. De tous avoirs estoit ele assé riche

C5 correctly takes cunctis as agreeing with gazis, whereas the F translator takes cunctis as an 'ablative of comparison'
after the comparative potentior - hence the translation plus puissanz que tuit li autre.

E3,7  ad decus illius qui Lazarum suscitaverat
F3,7  pour l'amour de Lazarum son frere que il avoit resuscité
C5 3,10  a la loenge de celui ki avoit resuscité Lazaron son frere

The consistently more attentive C5 translator has correctly understood the Latin syntax here, while the F translator has mistaken the function of Lazarum in the sentence.

E4,10  Hinc accidit ut dominus, castrorum et urbium quibus predicabat itinere utpote carnaliter fessus
F4,10  Il avint que nostres sires, qui estoit sires des chastiaus e des citez, quant il venoit de preeschier, fu lassez charnelment de la voie
C5 4,8  il avint .i. jor...ke nostre sire repaiera de preeschier molt lasses de se char...e entra en .i. castel

The incident recounted here is that of Luke 10. 38, which, however, does not remotely resemble the E version, and so throws no light on the difficult syntax of the latter. C5 does not give a complete translation at this point, and so is of little help. Nevertheless, the interpretation which makes most sense is to take castrorum et urbium with itinere...fessus 'tired from travelling between the citadels and towns'. The F translator, however, has adhered too closely to the Latin word-order, and wrongly assumed that castrorum et urbium is to be taken with dominus, an interpretation that is improbable if only on scriptural grounds.

E13,10  successoribus christicolis ecclesiasticis recte vivere desiderantibus
F13,10  a ceulz qui venroient après qu'il voudroient vivre selonc l'estat de sainte yglise
C5 13,13  a tous crestiens ki furent e ki sont e ki a venir sont, ki droiturierement voelent vivre

The meaning of E seems to be 'to future ecclesiastical (possibly orthodox or church-going) christians wishing to
lead good lives' - the adjective *ecclesiasticis* refers most naturally to *successoribus christicolis*. However, ignoring the conventions of Latin syntax, the F translator has taken *ecclesiasticis* to be related to *desiderantibus*, to produce the meaning 'who wish to live as men of the church'. Though C5 omits *ecclesiasticis*, the translator of this text seems to have understood the Latin, since he has not inserted an equivalent of *ecclesiasticis* with his translation of *recte vivere*.

E14,20  
Primam (sc. partem) sorori sue Magdalene dedit, *ex qua* ipsa domino et apostolis eius victum et vestitum illis *annexa* prebuit

F14,21  
La premiere douna a sa sereur la Magdalaine, de quoi elle peust soustenir les apostres e nostre seigneur e ceuls qui le serviroient

C5 14,36  
La premiere partie douna ele a se sereur Marie Magdelaine, *ki molt fu bien emploie*, car tant com ele fu avoec nostre signor e avoec les aposteles lor en livra ele e amenestra vestimens e peutur

Latin *annexa*, from *annectere* 'to bind', must agree with *ex qua* (parte), giving the meaning 'the first part which was given over to them, and from which...'. C5 *ki molt fu bien emploie* seems to be a translation of *annexa*, showing that the translator of this text has correctly understood the Latin, while the F translator, again misled by the Latin word-order, has rendered *annexa* as if it were *annexis*, indirect object of *prebuit*.

E15,3  
salvatorem et discipulos dum *ad eam* venirent pascebat.

F15,2  
de quoi ele aidast aus apostres e ceuls qui sivoient nostre seigneur

C5 15,3  
en paissoit nostre signor e ses aposteles quant ali venoient

The C5 translator has correctly grasped the Latin syntax, taking *ad eam* to refer to Martha. The less attentive F translator has failed to understand the syntax of the sentence, possibly through misreading *eum* for *eam*; the result is the mistaken translation *nostre seigneur*. 
E23,4 genua ad terram flectebat; fide, spe et caritate cunctisque virtutibus pollebat; hospitalitate... perfulgebat

F23,5 s'agenoulloit de foi, d'esperance, de charité e d'autres vertuz; ele valoit trop d'ospitalité

C5 23,5 Ele flechissoit e agenoill. oit... sans faille. De foi e de carité e de vraie esperance e de toutes bones vertus poissans e enluminee, e de herbregier povres... ne se metoit ele mie arriere.

The F translator has taken fide...virtutibus as modifying the verb genua...flectebat, whereas these ablatives belong with pollebat, as C5 clearly shows. The F translator has been mislead by the Latin word-order into placing fide...virtutibus in the wrong sentence.

E25,10 sensit de celo Dei virtutem advenisse

F25,9 elle senti la vertu du ciel venant

C5 25,8 la sainte virgene senti la vertu del ciel descendre

Both the omission of Dei and the juxtaposition of du ciel to vertu suggest that both translators have erred here by taking de celo to mean 'of heaven', not 'from heaven'.

E30,17 super cineream crucem...solo pons

F30,15 se fist metre a terre en cendre

C5 30,26 le misent a terre...jesir, e en la terre desous li avoit on une crois portraite

The meaning of E seems to be 'to be placed on the ground upon a cross drawn in ashes', the meaning given to it by C5 with the omission of 'ashes'. The F translator has failed to grasp that cineream is an adjective agreeing with crucem, and his version seems to mean 'she had herself placed on the ground as ashes'.

The above instances of syntactic errors seem to indicate that the F translator sometimes followed his original too closely, failing to grasp the overall syntax of a sentence before translating it; by contrast, in almost all these cases, the more skilful C5 translator has made a correct
rendering. The F Martha text achieves approximately the same degree of accuracy as the C Magdalene translation: C Magdalene contains seven syntactic errors in 32 pages, a proportion similar to the nine syntactic errors over the 38 pages of the F Martha text.

The foregoing assessment of the F Martha translator's competence shows that, while he has occasionally improved on his Latin original through the elimination of repetition, he has a tendency to slavish adherence to the Latin, which has produced some awkward and repetitive translations. This slavishness is probably also responsible for a number of syntactic errors. The high proportion of lexical errors, compared with their lower frequency in the C Magdalene translation, shows a translator who is often led into error through inattention, ignorance and failure to interpret correctly the Latin abbreviations.
II Omission and Abbreviation in the French Translation

An analysis of the cases of omission and abbreviation in the F translation shows that their distribution is not uniform, and that the material omitted and reduced does not fall into the same categories as in the C Magdalene translation\(^\text{15}\); however, the types of material in question show that the translator's intention in omitting and abridging was probably the same as that of the C Magdalene translator — to make his text readily comprehensible to an audience with a lower level of instruction, or suitable for delivery in difficult listening conditions. That the F text was intended for such a purpose emerges more clearly from a comparison with the usually more complete and learned C5 Martha translation, which, as shown in section V below, was probably intended to be read by aristocratic ladies.

The number of cases of omission and abbreviation is very different in each of the two main sections of the F Martha life: the first section of the text, dealing with the saint's life in Palestine, and based on biblical accounts, has considerably fewer omissions than the second section, which recounts events which take place in Gaul. Thus in the 250 lines of the first part (from E1,1 to E14,9) of the Latin text, F has omitted 193 words, an average rate of omission of 0.772 words per line, while in the second section (E14,14 to E38,13), from the 564 lines of the Latin text, the F translator has omitted 936 words, or an average of 1.66 words per line.

Thus the rate of omission in the first section, based on the gospel accounts, is less than half that in the second section, based on less authoritative sources. These figures require to be interpreted.

The two parts of the French text may just have been produced by different translators with different approaches to their work; or the later increase in omissions may be explained by the translator's increasing carelessness or
fatigue as his task progressed. But much more probably the distribution of omissions reflects the translator's attitudes towards the material with which he was dealing: the first section, having the authority of the gospels, and containing many quotations from them, would have been treated with more respect, and therefore translated almost intact; it is very significant that, of the cases of omission of religious terminology listed under (iv) below, only three are from the first section of the life. On the other hand, the F translator was probably conscious that the account of events in the second part was less important and less credible, and therefore merited less painstaking treatment.

The cases of omission and abbreviation in the F Martha translation are considered under the headings set out below. Not surprisingly in the case of two texts C and F, with different subject-matters produced by different translators, the types and patterns of omission and abbreviation encountered in F are not exactly comparable with those in the C Magdalene text, enumerated in chapter IV. The types of cases considered have, however, been placed as far as possible in a similar order:

(i) Curial terms
(ii) Latin particles
(iii) Latin epithets
(iv) Pious references
(v) Abstract nouns
(vi) Synonymous pairs
(vii) Reinforcing elements
(viii) Curtailment of enumeration
(ix) Titles and identification
(x) Resumptive sentences
(xi) Accidental omission
(i) The omission of curial terms

It was noted in chapter IV pp.164-5 that the C Magdalene translator consistently omitted curial expressions such as those meaning 'the aforesaid', 'as mentioned above'; all such expressions are also suppressed in the F Martha text, and very frequently do not appear in the C5 translation:

E14,14 cum prefato fratre
F2,14 avec son frere
C5 2,30 e ses freres

E18,18 cum multus aliis et quibusdam ex prefatis
F18,19 avec mainz autres
C5 18,86 con cil e cels

E19,6 Erat enim ut diximus corpore venusta
F19,6 Ele estoit bele de cors
C5 19,18 Car si con je vous ai dit devant, ele estoit jente de cors

E21,21 licentia (magistri) sui prefati Maximini
F21,21 par le congié saint Mauxime son mestre
C5 21,36 par le congié saint Maximien sen bon maistre

Other 'bookish' terms are also excluded from F, with the same consistency as was observed in the case of the C Magdalene translation. Thus scilicet, nomine, eundem... eidem, and ex more are suppressed in F, and also almost always in C5:

E4,17 in ede scilicet Marthe
F4,19 yestre en se maison hostelés et herbergiés
C5 4,19 Dont fu primes ceste parole aemplie quant il traist al ostel sainte Marthe

E5,10 utraque duarum sororum Martha scilicet et Maria Magdalene
F5,12 chascune de ses sereurs Marie Magdalainne e Marthe
C5 5,24 cascune de ces .ii. sereurs
Frontoni scilicet seniori

a saint Front

a saint Front ki plus ert anciiens

hec mulier Martha nomine excipit illum in domum suam

ceste fame Marthe le reçut en sa meson

le reçut e herbrega sainte Marthe en se maison

per eundem Maximinum eidem Marthe Maria

li demanda la Magdalainne sa suer par Maxime

par saint Maximin a medame sainte Marie Madelaine

interula caprina...ex more induebatur

avoir...une chemise de chanvre

avoir ele...haire faite de poil de kievre ke ele vestoit

In the same category as these curial terms we may also consider phrases relating to translation and adaptation:

cuius vitam non parvo volumine hebrahice edidit, deinde ego Sintex multa pretermittens latine transcripti

sa vie je Sinitex mist en .i. petit volume

escrist en ebriu toutes ses oevres e se vie, dont il i ot grant volume; e Syntex le translata d'ebriu en latin, e l'abreja por le trop grant matere

The omission of these items from F has the effect of making the text simpler and less formal; their almost complete absence in the usually more faithful C5 translation is significant, and suggests that such curial terms have no place in vernacular texts. However, the inclusion in C5 of the phrases relating to translation and adaptation (C5 37,25) doubtless reflects that translator's preoccupation with constant references to his Latin original; also, despite C5's regular suppression of prefatus, expressions meaning 'as we have said' are frequently inserted in this text even when they do not occur in Latin.
Several other types of omission in F have the effect of simplifying the original, and of lowering its stylistic register; and yet these cases are probably to be explained just as much by the fact that the material concerned constitutes a constant feature of Latin writing, with no precise counterpart in the vernacular; it will be seen that the C5 translation, normally very exact and complete, does not always give an equivalent of the Latin elements concerned, which include certain Latin particles and epithets.

(ii) The omission of certain Latin particles

The Latin text is studded with such words as valde, porro and magis which are practically empty of meaning in the contexts in which they occur, and which are present simply as a characteristic of Latin writing. The F translator has generally suppressed such items, which are not always translated even in the C5 version:

E2,1 omnium creatorem valde dilexit.
F2,1 ama le creatour del monde
C5 2,1 ama molt le creator de tout le monde

E6,16 Porro unum est necessarium
F6,16 une chose est necessaire
C5 6,22 Saces c'une cose est necessaire

E8,10 quam Christus inter ceteras magis dilexit
F8,10 que nostres sires ama entre toutes les autres
C5 8,8 ke nostre sires tant ama entre les autres

E8,13 qui specialiter a domino diligi...designentur
F8,13 que Jhesucrist nomme ceuls que il aimme
C5 8,11 ki...soient devisé speciaumont a l'amor nostre signor

E9,18 presentem fratris...adhuc dubitabat
F9,19 doutoit la resurrection son frere de maintenant
C5 9,20 le presente resurrection...de son frere doutoit ele encore
(iii) The omission of Latin epithets

The F translation is characterized by the almost routine removal of many Latin epithets which seem to be present as a stylistic feature of hagiographic Latin, and to be readily dispensable in translation. Over a third of such elements are also omitted from C5.

The majority of the terms concerned are those epithets, abundant in this type of Latin composition, expressing holiness and virtue:

E2,5 *piis moribus excellens*
F2,5 elle valoit mieux de mors
C5 2,8 estoit ele de plus *piues* meurs

E2,11 dux exstitisset *egregius*
F2,11 eust esté dux
C5 2,17 dus estoit
E2,13 atheniensium civium predicator fuit fidelissimus
F2,13 il en ala preeschier a Atheinnes
C5 2,27 La preecha il a cels de la cite...feelment e
droiturierement con saintismes hom e sages

E3,2 ut sacra asserunt evangelia
F3,2 comment les ewangiles le dient
C5 3,1 si con les saintes escritures tesmoignent

E7,11 unicuique istorum sanctarum feminarum
F7,11 a chascune des .ii. sereurs
C5 7,8 omits this sentence

E9,3 certa fides pie mulieris
F9,3 comme certainne foi avoit ceste fame
C5 9,3 Or oies la grande foi de ceste feme

E13,4 In eius domo sacra
F13,5 en la meson sainte Marthe
C5 13,7 en cele sainte maison

E18,12 dominus gloriosam matrem suam...sociavit
F18,14 nostres sires...commanda sa mere
C5 18,72 omits this passage

E19,5 divine predicationis facundiam
F19,5 habondance de predication
C5 19,16 bone loquense de le divine predication

E20,17 confidens in vero hospite suo:
F20,16 se fioit en son hoste
C5 20,35 ele avoit fiance en sen vrai oste

E22,17 sacrum alvum suum...stringebat
F22,15 elle estraignoit...son ventre
C5 22,22 De gou se chaignoit ele a se char toute nue

E24,15 Egregia amica Christi
F24,13 l'amie Jhesucrist
C5 24,21 la noble demisele
baptismum in nomine sancte trinitatis subiit

reçut baptesme el non de la trenoîté

reciut Baptesme

mater pia et nutrix

mere e norrice

piue mere e norrice

nate intacte virginis Marie

filz de la virge

naistre de la virgene pucelle Marie

animam suam dignam

l'ame

li ame

in memoria eterna angelorum

en la memoire des angles

en parmenable memoire des angeles

sacrum eius tumulum tetigit

il toucha a la tombe

baisié ot la sepulture

Examples of other types of epithets omitted are:

nobilis antiqua decurrens laude parentum

ele fu de parenté noble

fu estraite de haut lignage

prime legis preceptis subdita

fu sougiete aus commandemenz de la loy

tint les commandemens de le vies loi e aempli

iure hereditatis materne possidebat

qui movoit de son heritage

alters to: ki fu li ainsnee
E5,3 solo palmo omnia concludit
F5,3 en son poing tient toutes choses
C5 5,4 en cui puing totes coses sont encloses

E16,1 dira Iudeorum sevitia
F16,1 l'envie des Juïs
C5 16,1 li grans derverie e li grans cruautes des Juïs

E19,17 dracho ingens
F19,16 i. dragon
C5 19,27 uns grans serpens

E19,18 multos supervenientes et transeuntes...perimebat
F19,18 ocioit les homes passanz par illuec
C5 19,32 tous cels ki la s'embatoient...destruisoit e devoroit

E24,20 fratrem meum Lazarum et dilectum tuum olim a mortuis suscitasti
F24,20 resuscitas mon frere Ladre de mort a vie
C5 24,28 resuscitas ton ami Lazaron mon frere de mort a vie

E27,1 Frontoni scilicet seniori
F27,1 a saint Front
C5 27,1 a saint Front ki plus ert anciiens

E27,24 pulcherrima felix et mi dilecta soror
F27,19 bele tres douce suer
C5 27,31 Tresbele suer e treseureuse e treschiere amie

The F translator also has a tendency to omit epithets meaning 'all', 'the whole'; however, it is difficult to draw any conclusion from such omissions, since equally frequently the F translator has added such terms - see below section IV, Translator's Additions.

E3,17 in omnibus nobis...dilectionem requirit
F3,18 en nous requiert amour
C5 3,15 omits this passage
E26,23 nutriebat cunctos
F26,15 de ceuls...ele estoit mere e norrice
C5 26,33 estoit...mere e norrice de tous ciaus

E29,16 lampades...et cerie omnes illico accenduntur
F29,14 li cierge...espristrent
C5 29,15 ele aluma toutes les chierges e les lampes

E33,15 to officium...peregerunt
F33,14 firent l'office
C5 33,17 tant ke tous fu fais li services

(iv) Omission of pious references

Besides the numerous religious epithets whose omission is discussed at (iii) above, the F translator has often omitted phrases and sentences containing pious references. Much of the material concerned expresses slightly complex notions, or has a theological ring, and its omission is a clear indication of the type of public for which the F text was intended.

It is also significant that only three such omissions occur in the first section of the life, based on the gospel accounts; this part was clearly given more careful treatment than the apocryphal second part, in which these omissions are much more numerous.

The four minor cases of omission of such material in the first part of the life are:

E3,4 illa amore domini ex more ministrabat
F3,3 ele amenistroit touz jourz
C5 3,4 ele par le grant amor ke ele avoit a nostre signor ministroit e servoit tout adies a le table

E7,6 activa vita sancte ecclesie
F7,8 la vie active
C5 7,7 omits this passage
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E9,9 per quem pater filio postulante fratrem suum resuscitaret
F9,8 que ses freres peust estre resuscitez
C5 9,7 de resusciter sen frere

E12,8 ad vocem domini...qui quattuoridianus fuerat revixit
F12,9 qui revesqui de la voix de nostre de nostre seigneur
C5 12,12 Ce fu sen frere ki ,iii, jors avoit jeu en terre, e tantost con nostre sire l'apiela e dist...il tantost issi del moniment e fu resuscites

Similar omissions are frequent in the second part of the life; indeed a long omission of eight lines occurs between the two parts, consisting of a synopsis of the moral lessons to be learned from what precedes, and typical of the material frequently omitted from now on:

E14,3-  in contemplativa vita cum Maria manebimus. Sic sunt tractanda terrena...regnum celorum possidere valeamus. Hactenus
E14,9
F14,3 nous ironz avec Marie en la vie contemplative. Jusqu'a ore
C5 14,12- En parmenable vie manrons nous avec Marie. Ensi se doit on traitier en ceste mortal vie...es regnes des cielz puissons avoir sa compaignie. Tresque ci
C5 14,22

E18,15 spiritus sanctus sociavit
F18,16 douna il
C5 18,76 aconpaigna li saint esperis

E18,16 ipse bone conversationis exemplo ad regnum celorum eas perduceret
F18,18 les peust mener es cieux
C5 18,78 il par l'exemple de bone vie les amenast al regne des cielz

E18,19 Marsilie domino ducente pervenerunt
F18,20 vindrent a Marseille
C5 18,87 a l'aie del signor ki tout gouverne...il vinrent... al port de la cite de Marselle
populum...miraculorum signis et predicationibus...convertunt

li pueple...convertirent

le peule...a convertir...par preechemens e par miracles

miraculis choruscantem et etiam demonia eicientem

esoit moult de miracles

faisoit...tante bele miracles, e ke la u ele estoit n'avoit diables nule poissance

sancta Dei amica hospita Christi

bon oste

li amie Jhesucrist la bone osteliere

edificata sub honore Christi et beate Marie virginis maxima basilica

fist illeuc une moult bele eglise de nostre dame

estora ele une bele eglise en l'onor Jhesucrist e ma dame sainte Marie

beata Christi hospita, que Christo operante orcum expoliavit et hominem qui bina nece ante damnatus fuerat gemina resurrectione Christi fidei restauravit

Bien est beneoite qui enfer despoilla, e l'enfant resuscita en cors e en ame

omits this sentence

animam ad sedes politicas ferentes

qui emportent...l'ame

porter...l'ame...en paradis lasus es clers sieges

Vivas cum magistro et vero hospite nostro in sede beata

Je voeill bien que tu vives avec nostre hoste

L'ame de vous soit assise es bon eures sieges avoec nostre bon maistre
These cases of omission of material containing religious terminology demonstrate that the F translator was seeking to simplify his text, probably for a specific type of public and delivery. The incidence of omission is much smaller in the first part of the life compared with the second part, which betrays the translator's more respectful attitude towards a text based on biblical accounts. The material is present in the C5 translation in almost every case, a fact which reflects the more learned nature of this version, and the different circumstances in which it was intended to be read.

(v) The omission of abstract nouns

It was noted in chapter IV (section II,iii) that a major feature of the C Magdalene translator's procedure is to suppress abstract nouns almost as a matter of course, especially when they are part of the tripartite construction which occurs frequently in the B Latin text. By contrast, abstract nouns are rarely suppressed in the F Martha translation, and the following are the only cases where this occurs. Characteristically, most of the terms are retained in the C5 version.
Several factors probably explain this difference between the C Magdalene and F Martha translations: the B Latin tripartite construction, in which the abstract noun is often superfluous, is not common in the E Latin text; in E there is no equivalent of the fast-moving narrative of the B pilgrim episode, where abstract and other terms had to be removed in order to disencumber the text which might otherwise not have retained the popular attention; and the two translators simply had different approaches to their tasks.

E6,14  sic offitium unius laudat
F6,13  loa en tele maniere l'un
C5 6,18  loa le service de l'une si qu'il...

E8,6  per amicitiam hospitalitatis beate Marthe
F8,6  pour l'amour de la beneoite Marthe
C5 8,4  par l'amistie del ostage sainte Marthain

E8,11  Patris sapientia quamvis dicat
F8,11  ja soit ce que Dieux li peres die
C5 8,9  Encore soit çou ke nostre sires die en l'ewangile

E12,10  sollempnia tantorum gaudiorum cena facta
F12,11  firent grant joie e souperent
C5 12,16  omits sollempnia but greatly expands this passage

E27,4  si Deus sibi facultatem tandiu vivendi preberet
F27,2  se Dieux li dounoit vie
C5 27,6  s'il poodit en nule maniere

E28,19  tetrorum spirituum turbam ante se cernens
F28,18  elle vit les mauvez esperiz devant soi
C5 28,22  vit...une grant flote de noirs esperis devant li ester
(vi) The treatment of synonymous pairs

The treatment in F of synonymous or near-synonymous pairs is similar to that in the C Magdalene translation (see chapter IV, pp. 188-190): in both C and F, these pairs of Latin terms are generally translated either by a single term which approximately covers both Latin terms, or simply by the suppression of one of the Latin terms. In either case, little of the sense of the original is lost.

However, the procedure itself is indicative of the translator's intentions: a salient feature of French prose-writing of the period (see chapter IV, section II, iv) is the very frequent use of synonymous pairs, and this feature is particularly noticeable in many translations, where, according to Rickard 1974,84, a sense of the inferiority of the vernacular led translators to believe that a Latin term often needed a pair of French terms to give its meaning adequately. The D Magdalene translation, and to an even greater degree the C5 Martha translation, make very widespread use of this procedure; but, like the C Magdalene version, the F Martha text not only has no trace of this feature, but even avoids translating those pairs of similar terms which appear in the Latin original.

This feature in F is another strong indication that the F and C5 Martha texts were made for widely differing purposes: the absence in F of such a common stylistic feature suggests a utilitarian purpose, and an audience more susceptible to clarity and brevity than to stylistic refinement.

Examples of such 'Synonymendoppelung' in C5 are given below in section V; the cases where the F text conflates even such pairs as are already present in the E Latin text are as follows:
In one isolated instance F creates a near-synonymous pair, though this probably occurred because the translator felt the need to use two terms to render the Latin combination:

(vii) The omission of reinforcing elements

A characteristic of the E Latin writer's style is the frequent use of elements to reinforce a notion, or to make it more specific. Usually this device takes the form of a noun reinforcing a verb (e.g. corde credidit, E12,3), but there are also cases where a verb reinforces a verb (e.g. habere poterat, E15,4), or where a noun reinforces a noun (e.g. ascensionem ad celos, E15,5); several other types of reinforcing combinations are also found. The F translator's procedure is to remove such elements, which are almost always retained or even elaborated in C5:
Nouns reinforcing verbs:

E1,18  quern ab orco et busto suscitavit
F1,19  que nostres sires resuscita
C5 1,21  fist le cors relever sain e haitie de la sepulture

E12,3  corde credit
F12,3  crut
C5 12,25  crei de vrai cuer

E12,15  ab orco et busto...resuscitavit
F12,16  resuscita
C5 12,25  resuscita...de mort a vie

E20,11  nullo modo eum perimere nequissent
F20,12  ne le poeient veintre
C5 20,21  il ne le porroient en nule maniere vaintre ne prendre

E24,16  ut solo prostratus Deum exoraret
F24,14  que il se meist a genoulz e proiassent
C5 24,23  ke tout se couaiissent a terre e priaissent

E25,1  qui morti inperas et a facie tua fugit
F25,1  qui commandes a la mort e ele s'enfuit
C5 25,1  omits this passage

E28,18  velocissimis insufflationibus extinxit
F28,17  estaint
C5 28,21  estainst

Verbs reinforcing verbs:

E15,4  quicquid habere poterat
F15,3  quanque ele avoit
C5 15,8  quan ke ele pot avoir
sanitatem...se recepisse letatus est
fu gariz de s'enfermeté
fu tos garis de l'enfermeté...Dont fu...molt esjois

Nouns reinforcing nouns:

post Christi ascensionem ad celos
après l'asencion nostre seigneur
Après çou ke nostre sires...fu montés es ciels

beate Marthe fuis Deo precibus
par la priere sainte Marthe
par les orisons ke eles avoient a nostre signor faites

illius ecclesie sacriste commendavi
nous commandasmes au segretain
je commandai al secretain de l'eglise

hebraicis apicibus docta
ele savoit ebreu
ele estoit bien enseignié

visibleterius audita et percepta sententia
Quant...ot entendu e oi
ot bien retenu de vrai cuer le parole

in horis Jerosolimitanis
en Jherusalem
en la terre de Jherusalem

signo ligneo sancte crucis
le seigne de la croiz
de la sainte crois le haut signe

sanaret egros sibi oblatos
garissoit les enfers
garissoit malades ki aporté li estoient
(viii) Curtailment of enumeration

The F translator has further shortened and simplified his Latin original by reducing the number of items in lists; there follow the more obvious examples of such curtailed lists, where the more complete C5 version has retained all the material of his Latin original:

E3,10 Abraham et Loth et Josue et multi alii
F3,11 Abraham Loth e Josué
C5 3,17 Abraham e Loth e Josué e maint autre preudome

E5,7 voluerunt videre et non viderunt, et audire et non audierunt
F5,8 voudrent veoir e ne le porent veoir
C5 5,14 vaurent veir e si n'en virent mie, e oir si n'en oirent mie

E16,3 Ditavit villis et castellis et urbis, locupletavit gazis multis, dotavit ecclesiis, multiplicavit servis et heroibus
F16,3 il les enrichi de viles e de chastiaus e d'autres choses
C5 16,5 les enrichi de viles e de castiaus e de cités e de granz avoirs e de haus barons e de sera

E16,12 Bisuntium Ferutio, Aurasicam alli Eutropio, Petragoricas Frontoni
F16,12 Besançon a Ferut, Pierregort a Fronte
C5 16,15 Bezençon a saint Ferne, e a saint Eutrope dona il Orenge e Piergort

E17,4 sanantur...egri, clarificantur ceci, eriguntur claudi, liberantur demoniaci, datur consolatio mestis, crimina peccatoribus condempnantur
F17,5 li malade i sont sané, li avugle i sont sané e voient, li clop i sont redrecié, li corroucié i sont reconforté, li pecheur pardoné
C5 17,8 sont wari e sané li malade ki les requirent, li avle ralumé, li clop redrecié, li fors del sens delivré del diable, li desconsellié fors mis de lor tristeces, e sont li pechié pardoné...
multitudines languentium nobilium et ignobilium, claudorum, cecorum, aridorum, mutorum, surdorum, lunaticorum, demoniacorum et omnium morborum generum

multitudes de languissanz, de clops, d'avugles, de muz, de sours e de forssenez e de toutes autres manieres de maladies

vilain e haut home, clop e awle, mut, palazinet, sourt e lunage e dervé e de toutes autres maladies

(ix) Omission of titles and terms of identification

Frequently the F translator omits titles (e.g. pia hospita, E11,9) and identifying terms (e.g. sororem, E8,9). However, this cannot always be considered as part of the translator's simplifying procedure, since, as discussed in part IV of this chapter, such terms are also frequently added in translation. While F has often altered the distribution of these terms, C5 has almost always adhered to the Latin text, as in the following examples:

Martham et sororem Mariam et Lazaran
Marthe, Marie e Ladre lor frere
Martham e se suer Marie e Lazaron

hec pia hospita Martha...fovit
reçut ele
repeat e herbrega saint Marthe li bone osteliere

Christi egregia hospita sensit
elle senti
la sainte virgene senti

Surge puer in nomine domini nostri Iesu Christi
Lieve toî el non Jhesucrist
Enfes lieve sus el non nostre signor Jhesucrist

uni illorum sanctorum, Frontoni scilicet seniori
a saint Front
a saint Front ki plus ert anciiens
sanctioribus fratribus domus... patefecit

la damoisele conta a ses plus saint freres

intacte virginis Marie
de la virge
de la virgene pucele Marie:

illa amica Dei dormivit
elle devia
omits this passage

dominus noster Iesus Christus duxit me
Jhesucrist m'a mené
Nos tre sire Jhesucrist me mena

fratribus suis beate Marthe funebria... enarraret
il lor racontoit l'oseque
conta... saint Frons a ses freres... de ceste cose

sacrum corpus dive hospite pervigilaverunt
furent entour son sepulchre
demorerent avoec le cors de la saint damoisele

(x) Omission of resumptive sentences

In four cases the F. translator has omitted sentences which repeat the essence of a preceding passage in a concise form; such material is obviously repetitive, and its suppression is consistent with the F. translator's apparent intention of disencumbering and simplifying his text; C5 characteristically retains all the material concerned.

in celestibus mansionibus. Unicuique dedit urbem et patriam: Arelatem Trophimo
em paradis; il douna Tropfin Arelate
es celestieus regnes. A cascun dona il cité e contree: a saint Trophim douna il Arle
(xi) Accidental omission

Any number of the omissions discussed in section II could be accidental, though in the vast majority of cases the consistency with which the omissions have been made suggests that they were intentional. However, in one case it seems that the omission is the result of a misreading by the French translator:

The reading of C5 seems to confirm that of E, and probably the French omission is a case of homoioteleuton: the translator's eye slipped from the first to the second occurrence of manus imponebat, with the resultant omission of the intervening material.27.
In conclusion, the analysis of the frequency of omissions in F shows that the rate of omission in the first part of the text is less than half that in the second part; this distribution seems to indicate that the F translator had a greater respect for the account in part one of events based on the gospels, compared with the less authoritative subject-matter of part two.

From an examination of the types of material omitted in F and C5, it emerges that certain types of omission (curial terms, epithets and Latin particles) occur in both French texts; these items are probably suppressed simply because they are a common component of this type of Latin writing, but have no precise counterpart in vernacular texts. All the other types of material examined (iv to xi above) are usually suppressed only in F, but very occasionally in C5; these cases clearly point to a translator who wished to simplify and disencumber his text, by contrast with the C5 translator, who adheres closely to his Latin original.
III Change of stylistic register

The F Martha translator has used the same methods as the C Magdalene translator in lowering the stylistic register of his Latin original: in addition to the omissions detailed above in II, he has (i) avoided figurative and literary language, (ii) slightly simplified the syntax of E, and (iii) used a simpler vocabulary. In matters of syntax, the C5 translator almost always makes the same changes as F, but usually adheres closely to E in retaining figurative language and in using a comparable register of vocabulary. Examples of these three types of change are given below.

(i) Avoidance of figurative and literary language

In the following six cases, the F translator has avoided such expressions, either by using simpler language, or by omission:

E7,5: omnis laus in fine canitur
F7,7: la fine loe l'ome
C5 7,6: a celui ki le parfait est ele donee

E9,4: sub trabea carnis humane videbat latentem
F9,5: ele veoit qui estoit en char
C5 9,5: ele veoit vestu de char humaine

E9,7: spiritum sanctum quasi quoddam indissolubile amoris vinculum inter patrem et filium credebat
F9,8: creoit que li sainz esperilz fust uns moians entre le filz e le pere
C5 9,6: omits several lines here

E27,8: de bona vita ad meliorem transivit
F27,6: elle trespassa
C5 27,14: ele trespassa de ceste vie e ala es celestieus regnes
E28,6  *iter suum ad celum* eucharistia et confessione munivit

F28,5  reçu le cors Jhesucrist e se confessa

C5 28,6  se confessa e fist acumenier

E31,7  *Non me permittas teneri manibus tetrorum angelorum,*
       *nec Acherontis claustris dilaniari*

F31,6  ne souffrir que il soit tenus des mains des ners,
       angles

C5 31,7  ne suefre mie ke je soie tenue es mains des noirs
       angeles ke je vi en ma presence, ne ke je soie en
       l'encloseure d'infer devoree

In three of the above six cases, C5 adheres to E in retaining these figurative expressions; in one case (C5 7,6) C5 has an incorrect translation, in another C5 does not contain the passage in question (C5 9,6), while in the remaining case (C5 28,6) C5 is closer to F than to E.

(ii) **Simplification of syntax**

The F translator has modified the syntax of E using much the same procedures as those used by the C Magdalene translator in simplifying B: long and complex Latin periods are broken up into shorter series of clauses, and subordinate clauses and participial phrases are sometimes made into main clauses. These changes are not numerous in the F text, and may in many cases reflect inherent differences between Latin and vernacular writing, rather than a conscious attempt to simplify. This seems to be confirmed by the C5 translation, which almost always makes the same syntactic changes as F. This is in contrast to the Franco-Provençal D Magdalene translation, which, as was observed in chapter IV, 193-6, usually adheres as far as possible to the syntax of its B Latin original.

There follows a typical case of the simplification of a long Latin period, followed by a representative sample of syntactic changes; also listed are two isolated instances where the F translator creates subordinate clauses not present in Latin.
E33,2 Sequenti vero die dominica in medio basilica, omnis congregatio religiosorum omnesque popularum caterve cum circa corpus starent et obsequium funebrium sicut mos est agere vellent, et alii psallerent atque alii flierent, ecce hora tercia apud Petragoricam, missam celebrant, lecta iam epistola in cathedra, ante altare dormianti in ecclesia sua beato Frontoni episcopo apparuit dominus, dicens ei...

F33,2 Le jour d'un diemence après en mi l'eglise, granz compagnies de genz e de pueple estoient entour le cors, e fesoit en l'oseque si comme l'en seut, e li un siaumeoient e li autre ploroiuent. A Pierregorci saiunt Frons li evesques entour tierce chantoit la messe, et comme l'espistre fu leue e il fu en sa chaiere, il s'endormi; e nostres sires li aparut e li dist...

C5 33,1 Quant vint le diemence, e li cors fu portes en l'eglise, li saint home e li pueples s'asamblèrent por faire ke service. Li un ploroiuent e li autre liisiento si con il est acoustume, e faisoient ço qu'il apartenoit. A l'eure de tierce tout droit cantoit la messe a Pierregort saiunt Frons ki estoit evesques. Quant epistles fu lius e li vesques fu assis en sa chaiere, il commença a dormir, e nostres sires s'aparut a lui si li dist...

This typical Latin period contains one main clause whose verb is apparuit, and eight subordinate clauses or phrases whose verbs are underlined. The F translator has rendered this complex sentence by means of eight main clauses and three subordinate clauses, thereby achieving much simplification and considerably greater clarity. A similar procedure in C5 has produced eight main clauses and eight subordinate clauses.

More frequently, however, syntactic simplification affects single subordinate clauses in E; in some cases these subordinate clauses are translated by main clauses, while in other cases a verb - either the main verb or the subordinate verb - is suppressed to avoid subordination. Participial phrases are treated in a similar way. Examples of both types of avoidance of subordination are given below.

As observed above on pp. 249-251, the F translator in general adheres more closely than the C translator to his Latin original, sometimes even translating slavishly. This doubtless explains the lower incidence of syntactic changes in F compared with C.
Subordinate clauses and participial phrases translated as main clauses in F

Relative clauses:

E1,17 cuius uterini fuere beata Maria Magdalene et Lazarus
F1,18 e la Magdalainne fu sa suer e sainz Ladres ses freres
C5 1,15 Me dame sainte Marie Magdelaine fu se suer, e saint Ladres fu ses freres

E2,11 dux...qui post...dispersionem...predicato fuit
F2,11 dux...apres la dispersion...il en ala preeschier
C5 2,24 li saint hom...si s'en ala...la preecha il

E4,6 sororibus apud quas hospitabantur
F4,6 ses sereurs, e illec se herbergoit
C5 4,7 ses sereurs, e avoec els herbregoit

E26,8 Ad quorum cenam...convertitur
F26,8 E le soir au souper...devint
C5 26,10 la ucil saint home...e sainte Marthe secient au mangier, devint

Causal clauses:

E8,14 quia beata Martha...sciebat se diligii et non dubitatbat ab eo aliquid sibi posse impetrari, et quia audierat
F8,14 pour ce que la beneoite Marthe savoit que elle estoit amee...ele ne dutoit mie qu'ele n'eust ce qu'ele requerroit, e ele avoit oi dire
C5 8,13 por ce ke sainte Marthe savoit bien qu'ele estoit... amee, ne dutoit ele mie a lui aucune grant cose a querre. Et por cou qu'ele avoit oi dire

E24,11 Tota die illa a civibus...cum...reperiri non potuisset, secunda die...inventum corpus ponitur
F24,9 Li home de la vile le guistrent toute jour, e nel porent trouver; au secont jour trova l'en le cors... e le mist on
C5 24,16 Rameur entrerent...ki toute jor le quisent, mais n'en troverent mie tresque...Dont fu li cors trovés...Tantost k'il fu fors mis...l'aporta on
E27,16 Cumque per totum...annum febribus agitaretur, ante suam dissolutionem die octavo...audivit
F27,12 En tout cel an elle ot fievre, e .viii. jours devant qu'elle deust morir, elle vit
C5 27,22 Par tout l'an...le demena maladie de fievres, e quant vint .vii. jours devant çoou ke ele deust trespasser...ele vit

Result clause:

E4,131 eam tantum diligebat quod in eius aede quam alibi hospitari malebat
F4,1 il l'ama plus que les autres, e plus sovent herberga en son hostel qu'en autre leu
C5 4,1 il avint ke ele ama mult nostre'signor, e il li, car plus herbrejoit en se maison ke en nule autre

Participial phrases:

E12,10 Interim sollemnia tantorum gaudiorum cena facta
F12,10 E lors firent grant joie e souperent
C5 12,16 De ceste resurrection fu grans joie demenee
E19,1 ieiuniis et precibus insistentes
F19,1 e geunerent e proierent Dieu
C5 19,11 oroisons e par jeunes
E21,2 signo ligneo sante crucis ei ostenso
F21,1 e le seigne de la croiz li mostra
C5 21,3 e si li moustra de la sainte crois le haut signe
E22,7 coadunato...conventu et edificata...basilica
F22,7 elle auna le covant...e fist...une...eglise
C5 22,7 estora ele une...eglise...e la assanla .i. couvent

Avoidance of subordination by suppression of verbs:

E3,15 Unde contigit ut...hec agendo diligere ceperit
F3,16 E en ce fesant commença a amer
C5 3,24 omits this passage
These two instances are isolated and untypical.

Thus the adaptations made by both F and C5 to the syntax of E result in less subordination, and therefore in greater simplicity and clarity.
(iii) **Simplification of vocabulary**

The F Martha translation shares with C Magdalene a marked tendency to simplify the terminology of the Latin; doubtless some of these cases of apparent simplification may reflect the more limited lexical resources of the vernacular, but the corresponding readings of the more learned C5 text (as the D text in the case of the Magdalene translations) seem to show that in many cases a more 'elevated' vocabulary was available, had the F translator chosen to use it. Thus while F 'spells out' certain potentially difficult terms, and employs simpler verbs such as estre, aveir, faire and aler to render 'advanced' Latin vocabulary, C5 usually adheres more closely to the vocabulary of the Latin original. Some of the more obvious examples of this form of adaptive translation follow:

**Use of estre, aveir, faire and aler:**

- **E6,1** tantum hospitem ede susceperat
- **F6,1** ele avoit tel hoste en son hostel
- **C5 6,2** ele avoit si haut oste receu en son ostel

- **E9,4** sub trabea carnis humane videbat latentem
- **F9,5** veoit qui estoit en char
- **C5 9,5** ele veoit vestu de char humaine

- **E10,5** quam vera confessio redundat in hac sancta muliere
- **F10,6** comme grant...veraie confession estoit en ceste fame
- **C5 10,7** com vraie confessions estoit e habitoit en ceste feme

- **E11,4** Consors dive virginis efficitur
- **F11,632** ceste fu compaigne nostre dame
- **C5 11,4** omits this passage

- **E11,10** consors dive virginis effecta est
- **F11,9** est elle compaigne nostre dame
- **C5 11,10** ele est compaignesse a le glorieuse roine
merito acceptit quod a domino petiit  
cest ce qu'ele desirroit ot de nostre seigneur  
ot ele e recut par droit cou ke ele reciut a son bon oste

sollemnia tantorum gaudiorum... celebrantur  
firent grant joie  
fu grans joie demenee

ecclesiam informavit  
fist il une yglise  
fu sainte eglise confermee

In his duabus vitis omnes regule... pendent et adimplentur  
En ces .ii. vies sont toutes les reugles  
En ces vies sont aempliées toutes les riules

in activa vita cum Martha maneimbus  
ous serons en la vie active avec Marthe  
ces oevres senefie sainte Marthe

cum Maria maneimbus  
ous irons avec Marie  
manrons nous avec Marie

vitam eternam possidebit  
aura la vie parmenable  
je li rendrai... vie parmenable

in celo... conversabatur  
Elle estoit el ciel  
El ciel estoit toustans... habitoit

celebrior exstitit  
plus fu en auctorité  
fu ele plus essaucié e amee
Further use of an almost standard simple term for more complex Latin vocabulary is seen in the translation *bien* and *bone* on several occasions:

- **E7,4** *bonum opus* inchoantibus
  - **F7,4** a touz ceuls qui *bien* commencent
  - **C5 7,5** a celui ki *bone oevre* commence

- **E8,10** *generatio felix et laudabilis*
  - **F8,10** bone generacion
  - **C5 8,7** sainte lignié e bone e ke on doit bien loer

- **E35,14** *iusta hospita Christi*
  - **F35,12** la *bone* hotesse Jhesucrist
  - **C5 35,17** sainte Marthe

But in addition to these standard methods of simplification, there is an overall tendency, evident in almost every sentence of the F text, to adapt the vocabulary
of the Latin original, apparently for the benefit of an
unlettered public; as in other respects, comparison with
the more faithful C5 translation highlights this adaptive
translation procedure, of which some typical instances
follow. In most, the F translator simplifies, spells out
or concretizes a Latin expression, while C5 is closer to
the Latin.

E2,13 Athenienium civium predicator fuit fidelissimus
F2,13 il en ala preeschier a Atheinnes
C5 2,27 s'en ala a la cite d'Athaines, La preecha il a cels:
de la cite la foi e la loi crestitiene feelment e
droiturierement con saintismes hom e sages

E6,7 universaliter omnis contio domus
F6,7 tuit cil de la meson
C5 6,10 toute sa maisnie e tout cil ki de son ostel estoient

E9,17 Novissimam et universalem resurrectionem credebat
F9,17 creoit que tuit doivent resusciter au darreinier jour
C5 9,19 creoit bien le commune e le daerraine resurrection

E21,5 attritus est totus
F21,5 le tuerent
C5 21,12 l'ocisent e tout le depechierent

E23,7 Mensa eius cum peregrinis et hospitibus erat ex
more; divinis predicationibus os eius non cessabat
F23,7 sa table estoit commune; e touz jours preeschoit
C5 23,8 de herbregier povres e pelerins qui trespassoient ne se metoit ele mie arriere... Sa bouche ne
cessoit onques de saintes paroles dire

E23,12 divini verbi semina erogabat
F23,1133 souvent preeschoit
C5 23,16 anonchoit e disoit le foi crestitiene
Section III has shown the three methods by which the F translator simplifies the Latin text: he has avoided the figurative language, the extensive subordination and difficult or elevated vocabulary of his original. The C5 translator adheres more closely to E in the area of vocabulary, but has made the same types of syntactic changes as F. The agreement of F and C5 in the area of syntax suggests that a number of these changes reflect inherent features of vernacular writing rather than conscious attempts at simplification.
IV The F Translator's Additions

The F translator, as we have seen in sections II and III above, has usually sought to simplify his Latin original, and additions in translation are minor and not numerous; most of them appear to be included for clarification, or for the more precise identification of characters. These additions may be conveniently considered under the following headings:

(i) Clarification and explanation
(ii) Titles and identification
(iii) Formulae
(iv) Pious additions
(v) Improving additions
(vi) Emphasis and dramatization
(vii) Other additions

The appropriate part of C5 is quoted to confirm that it is a question of an addition by the F translator, and not of a deficiency in the E Latin text.

(i) Clarifying and explicative additions

The additions in F underlined in the following cases appear to have the function of clarifying the sense of the original or of providing additional explanation; not all of the additions are strictly necessary.

E5,1 maius quam Abraham hospitio suscepit
F5,1 reçut plus en son hostel que ne fist Abraham
C5 5,13 herbrega plus grant cose ke Abraham ne fist

E9,15 Legerat in prophetis
F9,16 Elle avoit leu es prophetes qui dient
C5 9,15 Ele avoit leu es prophetes

E10,8 Consors principis apostolorum Petri
F10,9 En ce fu ele compaigne saint Pere le prince des apostres
C5 10,13 fu compaigne...a saint Pierre le prince des apostes
sanantur...egri, clarificantur ceci, eriguntur claudi...datur consolatio mestis, crimina peccatoribus condemnuntur

li malade i sont sané, li avugle i sont sané e voient, li clop i sont redrecié, li corroucié i sont reconforté, li pecheeur pardonné

sont vari...li malade...li avle ralumé, li clop redrecié...li desconsellié fors mis de lor tristeces, e sont li pechié pardoné

homini dare perfectam hereditatem nisi in celestibus regnis

Ne a home ne donne mie en terre parmenable heritage, mes es cieux
doner al home...parfait ieritage se es ciels non
de paradiso illum exulavit in hunc mundum

il essilla de paradis e le mist puis el monde
de paradis...l'envoia il en eseil el monde
deinde in bustum
e del monde monta en la croiz
e après en la sepulture

Mox ut...sensit
Maintenant que elle ot ce dit, elle senti
Et tantost...senti
custodibus sompno gravatis
les gardes qui estoient grevees de veillier s'endormirent
cil...ki garder le devoient s'endormirent...car de veillier molt lassé estoient

anulum
l'anel d'or
l'anel
cunctis foliis hoc reperit scriptum
il n'i trova autre chose escrit que ce versset par tout
n'i trova il autre cose
The above additions have the effect of making the text more precise and clear, sometimes to the extent of stating what is obvious.

(ii) Addition of titles and identification

The following additions are akin to those above in that they too make references to characters precise and unambiguous.

E4,5 cum Maria et Martha sororibus.
F4,5 e Marie Magdalaine e Marthe ses sereurs.
C5 4,6 Marie e Marthe ses sereurs.

E4,8 Rubric: Quomodo Christum ede suscepit
F4,8 Comment sainte Marthe reçut nostre seigneur Jhesucrist en sa meson
C5 4,8 C5 always omits rubric

E8,1 Rubric: Quomodo sua prece Lazarus suscitatur
F8,1 Comment saint Ladre fu resuscitez par la priere sainte Marthe
C5 8,1 C5 always omits rubric

E8,18 super fratris nece
F8,20 de la mort son frere Ladre
C5 8,17 omits this clause

E9,1 frater meus non fuisset mortuus
F9,1 mes freres Ladres ne fust mie mors.
C5 9,37 Lazarons mes freres ne fust mie mors
While the above cases appear to have the function of clarifying the text, two factors must make us cautious of stating that these additions constitute a conscious effort at clarification: firstly, as observed in section II, ix above, such elements are also frequently suppressed in translation; and secondly, more than half of the above additions occur in rubric, which could be the work of a copyist rather than of a translator, and which would always be required to give precise information about the portion of text above which it is placed. The insertion into rubric of titles and identification is not therefore unexpected.
(iii) Formulae

Il avint que, listed by Schon 1960, 159-163 as a frequently used formula in Old French prose, occurs only once in the F French text as an addition. The expression il apert que, and variants on it, occurs three times as an addition, and thus seems to constitute a formula. Isolated instances of the addition of what seem to be elements of common collocations are also listed here. The C5 translation, by contrast, has a very high incidence of added formulae such as sachez que, and these are discussed at V below.

E10,19 credendo resurrectionem futuram
F10,19 qui croit le commune resurrection a avenir
C5 10,28 omits this passage

E12,2 Itaque fidem prophetarum et confessionem apostolorum corde credidit
F12,2 Dont apert bien que ceste crut la foi des prophetes e la confession des apostres
C5 12,4 En ceste maniere ke vous oes, vos di jou ke sainte Marthe crei de vrai cuer...l'affaire des prophetes e le confession des apostes

E14,16 sententia domini
F14,16 la sainte parole nostre seigneur
C5 14,27 le parole ke nostre sires ot dit

E26,22 credentium
F26,15 ceuls qui crecien bien en nostre seigneur Jhesucrist
C5 26,34 tous ciaus ki en Deu crecien

E26,15 Nocte vero media
F28,15 Il avint que une nuit a mie nuit
C5 28,16 Quant vint a mie nuit

E35,17 Valde eius animam dilexit Christus
F35,16 E apert que Jhesucrist ama moult l'ame
C5 35,22 Certes molt ama nostre sires l'ame
It thus emerges that the F translation, like the C
Magdalene translation, has very few of the formulae that
are a constant stylistic device in literary prose, and much
in evidence in the D Magdalene and C5 Martha texts. Again
this feature of F points to the utilitarian intentions of
the translator.

(iv) Pious additions

Three untypical additions appear to result from the
pious feelings inspired in the translator by his subject-
matter:

E5,9 Res gaudio et laude digna
F5,9 He ceste chose merveilleuse e digne de loange e
de joie
C5 5,19 Molt se doit on esjoir e esleechier de ceste cose

E18,9 ditavit
F18,11 la fist riche e manant en sa gloire e de grant
pooir
C5 18,14 incorporates this passage into a long verse section

E24,19 Adonay...Iesu Christe
F24,18 Adonay Jhesucrist debonnaire
C5 24,27 Adonay Jhesucris

(v) Improving additions

By the addition of the underlined items, the F translator
has slightly improved the presentation of material in his
Latin original:
Both translators evidently felt it necessary to specify that Christ was tired after he had finished preaching.

The sense requires the addition of other, and both translators have inserted this.

The text makes more sense with the F addition.

(vi) Emphasis and dramatization

These additions mostly consist of emphasizing adverbs, but the last two help to dramatize the dragon episode by emphasizing the nastiness of the beast's teeth, and the violence of its eating habits:
celestia intuendo

nous chaille...touz jours des celestieux

veir la face de celui ki fist...toute creature

ditat in celestibus mansionibus

enrichist chascun jour el ciel lasus em paradis

les enrichi...e si sont es celestieus regnes

dentes ut spata acutos

denz agues e trenchanz comme une espee

les dens agus comme espee

reperit drachonem in nemore, hominem quem iugulaverat comedentem

trova le dragon el bois sor .i. home que il avoit estranglé, e le mengoit

trova le serpent sor .i. home qu'il avoit estranglé: si le manjoit par grant forsenerie

(vii) Other additions

Most additions fall into one or other of the above categories (i) to (vi); however, several have no obvious cause:

soror mea reliquit me solam ministare

ma suer me lesse seule amenistrer câienz

me suer me lait minister toute seule

câienz may have been added with the intention of making the tone more conversational.

Omnis qui reliquerit patrem et matrem aut uxorem aut filios aut agros propter nomen meum

Tuit cil qui leront pere ou mere ou fame ou enfanz ou terres ou vingnes pour mon non

Kiconques gerpira son pere e sa mere u sa feme u ses enfans u ses terres por mon non

The addition of ou vingnes is quite untypical in a translation
which routinely reduces enumeration (see II,viii above), and quite inexplicable since the source of the quotation, Matthew 19.29, contains no mention of this item.40.

Finally, it was observed in II,iii that the translator has sometimes omitted words meaning 'all'; just as often, however, the translator has added such words. There seems to be no obvious reason for this treatment of such terms.

E2,441 muliebribus operibus dedita
F2,4 bien aprise de toutes oevres de fame
C5 2,7 aprise d'uevres de demiseles e de dames

E2,20 militibus et familiis suis
F2,20 a ses chevaliers e a toute s'autre mesniee
C5 2,39 a se maisnie ne a ses chevaliers

E6,8 stetit in medio laris stupefacta
F6,8 Elle se tint en mi la meson toute esbahie
C5 6,13 s'en vint la damisele devant nostre signor

E14,13 Rubric: Quomodo suum proprium divisit
F14,13 Comment madame sainte Marthe devisa tout son propre e douna tout pour...
C5 14,26 C5 always omits rubric

E21,1 aqua
F21,1 toute l'eaue
C5 21,3 aigue

E25,13 vivus et incolumis
F25,12 touz sainz e touz halegres
C5 25,13 haities e saina e plains de vie

The above examination of the F translator's additions shows that many seem intended to clarify and improve the original, but that some are more difficult to explain, and may often be affective or simply adventitious.
V The C5 Martha Translation

The relationship between the F and C5 Martha texts is similar to that between the C and D Magdalene texts: F and C are simplifying and abbreviating translations, while C5 and D are more complete, learned and literary. Both C5 and D are therefore invaluable as 'control' texts in a study of the C and F translation procedures.

In chapter IV it was not necessary to discuss the D text in detail, since Stimm 1955, 157 ff has already dealt with the question of its relationship to the Latin MSS. However, no edition exists of the C5 Martha life, which appears here for the first time; therefore its main characteristics are briefly outlined below; this is all the more necessary since Michel 1930 appears to believe that the h.I.13 Martha life is closely related to C543.

The characteristics of C5, and the respects in which it differs from F, are discussed under the following headings; for greater brevity, references to E and C5 are used rather than extensive quotation.

(i) Material omitted from C5
(ii) Authorial intervention
(iii) Use of doublets
(iv) Latin quotations
(v) Material added to C5
(vi) Intended public

(i) Material omitted from C5

It was observed throughout the examination of the F translator's omissions (section II above) that C5 usually did not make these omissions; generally C5 contains a translation of all items of each sentence of his Latin original, as demonstrated in the following example:
E30,7 ecce a rogo non reperto redeuntes custodes domum intrant, et ultra quam dici fas est mirantur inter se, sciscitantes qui sic studiose luminaria que extincta dimiserant accenderat

F30,8 les gardes qui point ne troverent de feu revindrent, e se merveillierent qui avoit alumé les cierges e les lampes qui estaintes estoient

C5 30,12 cil ki venoient del feu querre n'en orrent point trové, si repairiert en le maison, e plus ke on ne poroit dire s'esmerveillèrent de la grant clarté qu'il troverent, e demanda li uns a l'autre ki ensï avoit ces chierges e ces lampes alumees ki estaintes estoient

Compared with F, C5 contains an almost complete rendering of E; the underlined portions of E and C5 are those which are not translated in F.

However, the C5 translator has made many omissions, but they are of a completely different type: whereas F renders, with omissions, almost every clause of E, the C5 translator's procedure is to omit whole clauses, sentences and sections, as well as all rubric. While there is no completely consistent pattern to these C5 omissions, they tend to be of passages involving difficult religious notions, or of material not suitable for a female audience. The following references give a representative sample of these omissions:

E6,12 not in C5 6,17: one clause omitted
E7,6-13 not in C5 7,7: several sentences omitted
E8,18-19 not in C5 8,17: participial phrase omitted
E25,14-17 not in C5 25,14: omission of sentence containing complex religious notions
E29,3-5 not in C5 29,4: sentence of direct speech omitted
E35,16-17 not in C5 35,22: one sentence omitted, with theological notions.

The fact that C5 was intended for a female readership probably explains two omissions: at E20,6, ut dolabrum may have been excluded because medieval women could not be expected to have knowledge of such an instrument; and at E21,15, the omission of quod stercore fluente insectatores suos submovet may have been intended to spare the sensibilities of a female audience - see (vi) below.
(ii) Authorial intervention

The C5 translation contains a strikingly large number of direct appeals and comments from author to public, and these are almost entirely absent from E and F. A few examples of this form of addition follow, and there are similar cases on every page of C5:

C5 1,26 si con j'oi dire
C5 1,29 si con j'oi en l' estoire retraire
C5 2,19 Itant vous dirai jou
C5 3,12 Dit vous ai ke
C5 3,13 Or vous dirai con
C5 4,21 Or voel jou ke vous sacies ke
C5 5,21 si con je vous di
C5 7,15 ce vous sai je bien retraire
C5 8,1 Or oies e entendes con

Direct address to readership or audience is virtually absent from E and F, and though we are warned by Walker 1971 not to interpret their inclusion as proof that the text was intended for oral delivery, nevertheless their absence in one translation and their striking frequency in another is a fact that deserves to be interpreted: possibly these cases of authorial intervention reflect the more secular and intimate circumstances in which the text was to be read, while the somewhat more stark and less luxurious F version was intended for oral delivery to large audiences.

(iii) Use of doublets

As mentioned in section II,iv of chapter IV and in section II,vi of the present chapter, the use of pairs of synonymous (or near-synonymous) terms was a constant feature of literary Old French prose, and particularly evident in translations from Latin. The C5 translation uses this procedure of Synonymendoppelung on an even greater scale than that observed in the D Magdalene translation. Some typical examples follow:
Such doublets, translating single Latin terms, occur every few lines in the C5 text; the absence of such pairs from C and F, their presence in D, and their abundance in C5, are probably accurate pointers to the type of stylistic register, and therefore to the type of public, for which these four translations were intended.

(iv) Latin quotations

Occasionally the C5 translation contains a Latin quotation followed by the words c’est a dire preceding the French translation. In most cases (except for C5 14,11) these are well-known biblical quotations, and usually appear in a different coloured ink in the MS. They occur in the following places in C5:

C5 4,14; C5 5,6; C5 9,15; C5 14,11; C5 14,28; C5 31,20; C5 35,9; C5 35,19; C5 38,11.

The reason for the inclusion of these Latin quotations from E is not clear: they may have been an opportunity for the translator or reader to impress his aristocratic public (see (vi) below) with his erudition; reference to a Latin original may have lent authenticity to the text; or the quotations may reflect a reverence for the Latin original, and a feeling that these sacred words cannot be adequately translated - a phenomenon akin to that which may explain some of the cases of the introduction of doublets discussed in (iii) above. Such a reverence for the Latin original is the explanation suggested by Zink 1976, 93-102 for the presence of such Latin elements in Romance sermon texts.
(v) Material added to C5

In addition to the cases of doublets and authorial intervention, and as well as the constant tendency to expand observed throughout this chapter, the C5 translator has added considerable amounts of other material: long passages of verse and prose have been inserted, shorter additions of clauses or one or two sentences give more detail or extra information, and a third type of addition appears to be aimed at a female readership.

There are four major additions to the C5 text: a long verse prologue of 92 octosyllables (covering fols 301d to 302a, and containing valuable evidence about the intended public, see below); the expansion into thirteen lines of prose at C5 13,21-33 of three lines of Latin at E13,16-18, containing an exhortation to various virtues; a passage of 58 octosyllables, inserted at C5 18,14-71, concerning the folly of amassing worldly wealth; and a passage of ten lines of prose inserted at C5 21,26-35 recounting the results of the slaying of the dragon.

The shorter additions are inserted to provide further detail of an incident (e.g. at C5 21,7-8 the dragon is led out of the forest before being killed by the people) or additional information (e.g. at C5 19,6-9 we are told that at the time St Lazarus was bishop of Marseille, the first to hold the post). There follows a list of references to the more significant cases of such additions:

C5 5,29-31; C5 18,72-76; C5 19,6-9; C5 20,16-20; C5 21,7-8; C5 21,26-35; C5 24,10-11; C5 24,14-16; C5 25,4; C5 26,18-20; C5 27,8-11; C5 29,10-11; C5 30,10; C5 36,13-18; C5 38,15-18.

It will be seen in section (vi) below that the C5 translation was probably made for the use of aristocratic ladies, and certain additions to the text are certainly consistent with such an intended public: some small additions
show that the translator was eager to show that both men and women were involved, e.g. C5 1,8 oil e celes, C5 17,6 al home ne a le feme. Also mention of women is frequently expanded, e.g. C5 2,7 de demiseles e de dames, C5 2,8 toutes les hautes dames.

However, it is three longer additions which confirm that the C5 text was principally for use by women. At C5 2,10-15, three lines of Latin (E2,7-9) concerning Martha's chastity are greatly expanded; at C5 5,31 there is an addition giving detail of domestic arrangements; and, most significantly, at C5 22,24-28, there is an otherwise inexplicable enumeration of the details of the luxurious sheets and pillows which Martha did not spread on the ground in place of her bed of branches and pillow of stone. It seems probable that, in the thirteenth century, such additions would appeal to a female rather than to a male public.

(vi) Intended public

The verse prologue to the C5 Martha text tells us exactly who ordered the translation to be made:

line 61: ... ains parlerai
Al miux ke je onques porrai
De cels ki Damedeu servirent
Et par terre le porsivirent.
Ensi le commande ma Dame
Cui Dex garisse cors et ama,
Et ait merchi de son bon pere
Ki fu et guens et emperere
De Constantinoble le grant,
Et de sa mere le vaillant
Ki fu tres jentils dame et sainte.

According to Meyer NE 35(ii) (1897), 501, this lady, whose father Baudouin had been count and emperor of Constantinople, was Marguerite, countess of Flanders and Hainaut from 1244 until her death in 1280. The work must therefore have been
written between 1244 and 1280\(^4\), and we may assume that it was intended for use — probably private reading or reading aloud in small groups — among Marguerite's entourage of aristocratic ladies. The nature of the translation, especially its insistence, beyond the Latin text, on womanly virtues, and the luxurious character of the MS, are certainly in keeping with such use.
Conclusion

The comparison of the F Martha text with its E Latin original shows that the translation is mostly fairly accurate, but sometimes follows E too slavishly, and contains a high proportion of lexical errors. The translation procedures involved are broadly the same as those used by the C Magdalene translator, in that they involve the omission of certain types of material, the lowering of the stylistic register, and the insertion of a few additions. However, although the overall effect of these adaptive translation procedures is to produce a similarly simplified and shortened text, the F and C translations differ in the types of alterations made: notably, fewer abstract terms are eliminated from F, and fewer syntactic changes are made in F. However, such differences are not unexpected in texts with differing subject-matter, presumably produced by different translators. These differences of detail do not make it necessary to alter the conclusion that the C Magdalene and the F Martha translations, being produced by similar processes, were intended for similar types of public: the omissions and simplification involved strongly suggest that C and F were intended for oral delivery, possibly as sermon material, for use where the level of instruction of the audience was not high, or where listening conditions were not such as to allow the easy comprehension of complex syntax and vocabulary.

This more utilitarian application of C and F becomes all the more obvious when these texts are compared with the D Franco-Provençal Magdalene translation and with the C5 French Martha version. These two texts are similar to each other in that they both translate all elements of Latin sentences; they are also both more faithful than C and F in that their vocabulary is generally closer to that of the original, being of a more learned type, often etymologically related to the Latin lexical item being translated. Both also employ the literary stylistic device of 'Synonymendoppelung', though D uses this much more moderately than C5.
However, D and C5 differ from each other in certain fundamental respects: we have seen above that C5 has many omissions, mostly of complete clauses, sentences and sections, and also contains many additions, some of them quite substantial. It is also evident from extensive authorial intervention, from the addition of material apparently destined for a female public, and from the literary refinement of this luxury edition, that the C5 text was intended for use by aristocratic ladies in intimate, secular circumstances, and was probably meant to be read aloud.

By contrast, the D Magdalene translation has only one small omission, and only a small number of minor additions; its style, though erudite, is comparatively restrained, and the translator's overriding aim seems to have been to provide a complete and accurate rendering of his original. Its intended use seems therefore to have been somewhat different from that of C5, and we may surmise that it was produced principally for private reading, or for reading aloud in small groups, in less luxurious circumstances, possibly in a religious institution.

It was observed of the F Martha translation that the rate of omission in the first part of the text, based on biblical accounts, was less than half the rate in the second part, based on less revered sources. Thus we see a translator treating his original material differently according to its type: biblical material is treated with reverence, and fewer omissions are made, while more apocryphal material is treated with less respect.

Thus the four French texts C, F, D and C5 contain in effect four different types of translation: C and F were produced for oral delivery, and were intended to be used in unfavourable listening conditions, for an uneducated audience; D is a more complete and learned translation, but its unadorned, strictly accurate character would make it suitable for private reading, or reading aloud in small groups, possibly within a religious institution. The C5
translator has paid much attention to literary style, and has made modifications to adapt his text for use by aristocratic ladies. Finally, the two parts of the F text show a different attitude, and different translation procedures, for different types of original material.
Notes to chapter VI

1. The C5 translator's extensive use of synonymous pairs is discussed in section V,iii on pp. 310-311.

2. This awareness of the inadequacies of the vernacular possibly also explains the widespread use of synonymous pairs in medieval translations; see section II,vi, p.279.

3. MSS F1, F2 C3 and F5 have more satisfactory readings at this point; see variants.


5. See syntactic errors, I,iii,b, p.261.

6. In fact the primary meaning of incolere is 'to cultivate,' though the meaning 'cultivator' is not listed for incola. LS s.v. incolere, incola and AFW s.v. païsant and gäignäor.


8. See for example E8,17 discussed above at I,iii,a, and E4,10 discussed at I,iii,b. The substitution of Poitou for Aquitaniam at E16,9 may also betray the translator's ignorance of geography; the question is discussed by Ruggieri 1933,190 and by Michel 1930,95.

9. ou sainte Marthe gisit malade is absent from four of the seven C MSS, and may therefore be a scribal addition rather than a translation error.

10. This is the reading of MS F1, the passage being absent from MS F; see variants.

11. The Speculum Historiale tome X, p.360, column 1, reads at this point: Cunctis itaque circumstantibus sanctis orationibus occupatis, and this phrase resembles o le pueple d'autre part; but otherwise the Speculum Historiale is very different from E at this point, and an explanation for the aberrant reading of F is more likely to be a misreading of populum for polum.


13. Speculum Historiale tome X, p.358: in aestate tunica et birro induebatur, cilicio ad carnem ex more cohaerente. LS defines ciliciolum as a small garment of (originally Cilician) goat's hair.

14. For these French scribal errors perpetuated in Spanish, see volume II, pp. 489-492, and Notes.

15. See chapter IV', section II, pp. 163-190.

16. E omits magistri, see variants

17. MS F does not contain this phrase, which is apparently displaced from line 17; see variants.

18. See section V,iv below, p. 311.

19. See section V,ii below, p. 310.

20. Saces'ke is often inserted into C5 (see V,ii), and does not necessarily correspond to Porro; see p. 310.
MS F has volt, not nomme; see variants.

Sa has porro, not igitur; see variants.

MS F has le contoient, not l'escoutoient; see variants.

Except, of course for the abstract nouns considered under other headings, notably II, iv, religious terminology.

The omission from F of Aurasicam alli Eutropio may also be explained by the translator's ignorance of toponyms; see the confusion at E21,5, and E26,3 mentioned on p. 256.

The addition of lor frere beside the omission of sororem is typical of the F translator's treatment of titles and terms of identification; see also section IV, ii.

The absence of this material from F may also be the result of a similarly explained scribal omission in the copy of the Latin text used by the F translator.

Although some of these cases should more properly be listed under II Omissions, they are discussed here to avoid further multiplication of categories.

The C5 translator appears to have misunderstood his original here.

In addition to the cases quoted here, there are a few other instances in the F text, notably at F9,10; F10,12; F15,4-8; F20,3; F22,17-19; F34,1-4.

Only Sa contains this sentence; see variants.

This is the reading of MS F1, MS F being defective here; see variants.

MS F has omitted several lines here, probably through homoioteleuton; see variants.

It is unlikely that any Latin version contained an equivalent of que ne fist; doubtless both the F and C5 translators independently inserted the words for clarity.

This is the reading of Sa, since E is defective here; see variants.

The ablative absolute construction of E makes it unlikely that any Latin text contained an equivalent of s'endormirent; both translators probably independently felt the need for the addition.

However, the agreement of F with C5 may mean that their Latin originals contained Lazarus.

The F translator's syntactic error is discussed on p. 261 of this chapter.

Although both translations contain sor i.e. home, it is improbable that any Latin original contained a preposition, since this would be difficult to incorporate into the Latin syntax. It is possible, however, that sor is a translation of super at E21,1, to which the translators' eyes had strayed.
Matthew 19. 29 reads: Et omnis qui reliquerit domum, vel fratres, aut sorores, aut patrem, aut matrem, aut uxorem, aut filios, aut agros propter nomen meum, centuplum accipiet, et vitam aeternam possidebit.

The reading erudita of Sa is closer to F than E dedita; see variants.

C5 follows Sa more closely than E here, see variants and chapter V, p.237.

The reading erudita of Sa is closer to F than E dedita; see variants.

C5 follows Sa more closely than E here, see variants and chapter V, p.237.

Michel 1930, lxxxiv; Michel does not mention the F version of the Martha life, and seems unaware of its existence.

Both long verse passages are quoted in full by Meyer NE 35(ii) (1897), 500-505.

Meyer 1897,501 gives further details of Marguerite’s family: 'Marguerite de Flandre était fille de Marie de Champagne et par conséquent petite-fille du comte de Champagne Henri le Libéral et de Marie de France, fille de Louis VII et d’Eléonore de Guyenne. Elle était d’une famille qui n’avait point ménagé sa protection et ses encouragements aux poètes.'

Other evidence from the list of contents of the MS enables the date to be fixed even more accurately, to before 1275; see Meyer NE 35(ii) (1897), 436.

This is at D36,4, where the translator seems to suppress B30,10-13; however, exactly the same passage is lacking in C30,10, so the material may well have been absent in both translators' originals.

These additions are at D1,17; D7,1-4; D8,1-2; D8,5; D8,8; D10,3; D11,2; D11,5-6; D14,21-22; D19,16; D20,10-11; D21,2; D35,7-8. They serve to dramatize speech, to give further details of the journey, to add religious detail, to give more information about the child, and to clarify parts of the text.
Chapter VII: The Spanish Texts

Summary

In part A of this chapter, calculations show that the four folios missing from MS h.1.13 could not have provided enough space for this MS to contain a complete translation of the French Magdalene and Martha lives of C and F. The Spanish translator may have omitted the Bridge Passage of the Magdalene text, as well as other material.

Part B examines the Spanish Magdalene and Martha texts themselves. Section B1 deals with the non-Castilian features found in each translation; a comparison of these forms shows a far greater number in the Martha text than in the Magdalene text, a fact which suggests that these lives are the work of two different translators.

Section B2 analyses the translation procedures for each text: usually the texts are such faithful and accurate renderings of their French originals that any deviations by the translator may justifiably be seen as significant. These deviations are divided for analysis into: I Errors, II Additions, III Omissions and IV Alterations. After an account of each type of deviation, its frequency in each text is compared, and the differing concentrations of deviations in some categories seem to confirm that the texts are the work of two different translators.
Part A: The Missing Portion of the Spanish MS

It is clear that some folios of MS Sp are lacking, since the Magdalene life breaks off in mid-sentence at the end of folio 2\(^v\), and on folio 3\(^r\) we find the Martha life, about a third the way from the beginning. The questions arise, how many folios are missing, and what could they have contained?

I The Number of Missing Folios in MS Sp

Two features of MS Sp allow the number of lost folios to be counted with some certainty: (i) the existence of two sets of page-numbers, and (ii) the system of guide-words employed by the scribe.

(i) The MS was repaginated in Arabic numerals after the loss of the folios in question, and the remains of the original pagination in Roman numerals enable us to see how many folios are missing, even though these Roman numerals are mostly indistinct or completely absent. No Roman numerals are visible on the first two folios of the MS, but in the far top right-hand corner of the present folio 3\(^r\) is the Roman numeral vii; next the Roman numeral x appears on present folio 6\(^r\), and xi on folio 7\(^r\); folio 8\(^r\) bears xii, 9\(^r\) has xiii, and so on, sporadically, throughout the MS\(^1\).

Thus, if we assume that present folio 1 is the former folio i, and that folio 2 is former folio ii, then it seems clear that between present folio 2 (=ii) and present folio 3 (=vii) there were originally four folios, iii, iv, v and vi\(^2\).

(ii) That four folios have been lost is further confirmed by the Spanish scribe's use of guide-words: at the foot of the last folio of each set of eight folios (quaternion) the scribe has usually written in a rectangular box the first word or words of the first folio of the next
quaternion. Thus at the foot of present folio 12v (former xvi
v) appear in a box the words con pesar, the first words
of present folio 13r (former xvii
r); the words ende aveno
appear boxed at the foot of present folio 28v (former
xxxii
v), and are the first words of present folio 29r
(former xxxiii
r); the words nin fija appear at the foot of
present 36v (former xl
v) and at the beginning of 37r (former
xli
r). sabia que yo e mi hermano, the first words of 45r or
xlix
r, also appear in a box at the foot of 44v or xlviii
v.

Thus, in terms of the Roman pagination, there are
guide-words between xvi
v and xvii
r, between xxxii
v and
xxxiii
r, between xl
v and xli
r, between xlviii
v and xlix
r,
and so on, with some irregularities, throughout the MS
3.

Despite some irregularities in the system of guide-
words, they appear usually at the end of each group of eight
folios. It therefore follows that the guide-word vida,
which appears boxed at the foot of modern folio 4v, and is
the first word of modern folio 5r, indicates that modern
folio 4v was originally at the end of a quaternion, the
first quaternion of the MS, and so must have been folio
viii
v before the loss of folios iii, iv, v and vi.

Thus the evidence of the Spanish scribe's guide-words
confirms the evidence of the old and new pagination systems,
that four folios are missing from MS Sp between the present
folios 2 and 3. These four folios almost certainly contained
two columns per side, as the rest of the MS, and so
represent a loss from the MS of a total of sixteen columns
of text.
II The Contents of the Missing Four Folios

Simple calculations show that, before the loss of folios iii, iv, v and vi, MS Sp probably did not contain a complete translation of all the material in the French C Magdalene and F Martha lives: the sixteen columns lacking in the Spanish MS would have been insufficient to contain all the material involved, which would have filled between 18.5 and 19 columns of MS Sp. One of the Spanish translations seems therefore to have omitted part of the French original, and such an omission seems more likely in the case of the Magdalene life rather than of the Martha life.

The first stage of the calculation shows the number of MS Sp columns that would have been required to contain the remainder of the translation of the Magdalene life in C, from the point where the Spanish fragment breaks off to the end of the Penance and Death episode (C12,20 to C32,18). Then a similar calculation shows how many columns of MS Sp would have been needed for the missing portion of the translation of the F Martha life (F1,1 to F11,15).

The sum of these two numbers of columns is greater than the number of columns - sixteen - in the missing four folios; this points to an incomplete version of the lives in the Spanish MS, shorter by two and a half or three columns than would be expected. Approximately the same result is obtained with the following three combinations of French MSS: (i) MS C Magdalene with MS F Martha; (ii) MS C3 Magdalene with MS C3 Martha; (iii) MS C1 Magdalene with MS F3 Martha. These three combinations were chosen entirely at random.
(1) MS C Magdalene with MS F Martha

The whole Magdalene life occupies 31.3 columns of MS C.

The material in the Spanish Magdalene fragment (eight columns) occupies 12.9625 columns of MS C.

The part of the C Magdalene life supposedly missing from MS Sp occupies 18.3375 columns of MS C.

If 12.9625 columns of MS C equal 8 columns of MS Sp, then 1 column of MS C equals \(8 \div 12.9625\) columns of MS Sp, so 18.3375 columns of MS C (the portion missing from Sp) would occupy \((8 \div 12.9625) \times 18.3375\) columns of MS Sp, = 11.32 columns.

Thus the missing Spanish portion of the Magdalene life would have occupied 11.32 columns of the sixteen lost columns in MS Sp.

The whole Martha life occupies 18.2024 columns of MS F.

The MS Sp Martha fragment (eighteen columns) occupies 12.9523 columns of MS F.

The missing portion of the MS Sp Martha life occupies 5.25 columns of MS F.

If 12.9523 columns of MS F equal 18 columns of MS Sp, then 1 column of MS F equals \(18 \div 12.9523\) columns of MS Sp, so 5.25 columns of MS F (the portion missing from MS Sp) would occupy \((18 \div 12.9523) \times 5.25\) columns of MS Sp, = 7.30 columns.

Thus the two French lives contain material, absent from the Spanish MS, that would occupy 11.32 + 7.30 = 18.62 columns of MS Sp, while the missing portion of MS Sp is known to have contained only 16 columns.
(ii) MS C3 Magdalene with MS C3 Martha

The Magdalene life occupies 18.952 columns of MS C3; the material of the Spanish Magdalene fragment (8 columns) occupies 7.8 columns of MS C3, and the material missing from MS Sp occupies 11.125 columns of MS C3. Thus the portion of MS C3 missing from MS Sp would have occupied \((8 \div 7.8) \times 11.25\) columns of MS Sp

\[= 11.41\text{ columns}\]

The Martha life occupies 20.4625 columns of MS C3; the material corresponding to the MS Sp fragment (18 columns) occupies 14.4375 columns of MS C3, and the material lacking in MS Sp takes up 6.025 columns of MS C3. The material lacking from MS Sp would therefore have occupied \((18 \div 14.4375) \times 6.025\) columns of MS Sp

\[= 7.51\text{ columns}\]

This calculation shows that a complete translation of the two French lives in MS C3 would have occupied 11.41 + 7.51 = 18.92 additional columns of the Spanish MS, thus leaving 2.92 columns unaccounted for.

(iii) MS C1 Magdalene with MS F3 Martha

The Magdalene life occupies 22.222 columns of MS C1; the contents of MS Sp fragment occupy 9.125 columns of MS C1, and the material missing from MS Sp occupies 13.097 columns of MS C1. Thus the portion of MS C1 missing from MS Sp would have occupied \((8 \div 9.125) \times 13.097\) columns of MS Sp

\[= 11.48\text{ columns}\]

The Martha life occupies 23.143 columns of MS F3, of which the MS Sp fragment accounts for 16.381 columns; the material absent from MS Sp occupies 6.762 columns of MS F3. The part of MS F3 missing from MS Sp would thus have occupied \((18 \div 16.381) \times 6.762\) columns of MS Sp

\[= 7.43\text{ columns}\]
Calculation (iii) thus shows that the missing part of the Spanish Magdalene life would have occupied 11.48 columns of MS Sp, and that the missing part of the Spanish Martha life would have occupied 7.43 columns of MS Sp; this total of 18.91 leaves 2.91 columns of MS Sp unaccounted for.

The following table summarizes these figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSS used</th>
<th>Magdalene</th>
<th>Martha</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS C/MS F</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>18.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS C3/MS C3</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>18.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS C1/MS F3</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>18.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus in order to contain a complete translation of the C Magdalene and F Martha lives, MS Sp would need an average of 2.82 columns in addition to the sixteen known to be missing from the MS.

The reliability of these calculations, despite the widely differing lay-out, column-size and length of the French MSS used, is confirmed by the closely similar results obtained; the small differences are doubtless explained by the slight variations in the proportion of space occupied by rubric and illuminated capitals in each MS. There thus seems little doubt that MS Sp did not contain a complete translation of both the French lives.

One may speculate about what is omitted in the Spanish text: omission from the Martha life seems unlikely, since this text has only one major division - that between the account of the Saint's life in Palestine, and the account of her acts in Provence. There are no smaller, detachable sections which the translator could have conveniently omitted without spoiling the structure of the whole.
The Magdalene life, on the other hand, would be easier to shorten: indeed, we have seen in chapter II that the bridge passage (B18 and B19) was gradually eliminated from the Latin redactions of the text, probably because it was seen to be superfluous, and even inconsistent with the remainder of the text. The Spanish translator may well have also noticed this defect in his French original, and similarly discarded the passage.

The bridge passage (C18 and C19) occupies 2.1 columns of MS C, equivalent to 1.295 columns of MS Sp; if this passage had been omitted in translation, it would still remain to account for \(2.82 - 1.295 = 1.525\) columns of MS Sp. It was suggested in chapter I that the Spanish translator may have been occasionally consulting a Latin text, while working principally from a French version. Could it be that he was led by the Latin text (such as MS B3 or MS B4), not only to omit the bridge passage (absent from these two MSS), but also to modify and curtail the ending of the Penance and Death episode, as these two Latin MSS have done? Such a modification might explain the remainder of the shortfall in space in MS Sp.
Part B: The Spanish Texts


This section does not attempt a detailed linguistic analysis of the Spanish Magdalene and Martha lives: this has already been comprehensively carried out by Michel 1930, cvii-clxxii, 38-103 and 166-221. The purpose here of isolating and listing the non-Castilian (mostly Leonese and Galician-Portuguese) features of each text is to provide evidence that the two lives are the work of two different translators, evidence which is confirmed by a comparison in section B2 of the translation procedures in each Spanish life.

The Spanish Magdalene life contains only four certain cases of non-Castilian linguistic features, while in the Martha text there are 36 cases. Since the whole MS is in the same hand, this vast difference in the number of Western linguistic features makes it highly likely that the two lives belonged originally to two different MS traditions, and were thus made by two different translators; only subsequently did a Spanish scribe bring them together.

The four Western features of the Magdalene life are: the form pregarias, rather than Castilian plegarias, at Sp1,22⁹; ca with the Western meaning 'than' at Sp5,3, where it is followed by ca with the Castilian meaning 'for';¹⁰ at Sp9,11 vsca is used with the Western meaning of 'bait', not with the Castilian sense of 'tinder';¹¹ and finally at Sp11,19 del sennal shows the masculine gender of this word in Western dialects (cf. Martha Sp30,17 discussed below) rather than the feminine gender as at Sp6,9 la sennal.

The much more numerous non-Castilian features of the Martha life, some of them recurrent, are listed below, together with a brief explanation of their classification as non-standard; fuller references are given in the notes.
Sp12,3 creyu is still a Leonese form of the preterite; c.f. 'oyu at Sp14,16.

Sp12,7 crey is a Western form of the present tense.

Sp14,16 oyu is a Western preterite, c.f. creyu at Sp12,3.

Sp14,22 governar translating Flk, 22 soustenir is Western in meaning.

Sp15,11 apostolessa is a Western form.

Sp17,19 por lo Mar Ruvio: the form of the definite article and the masculine gender of Mar are Western features.

Sp19,5 abondança is a popular descendant of Latin abundantia, beside the Castilian learned borrowing abundancia; this suggests that abondança is Western, since such popular forms are numerous in the West - modern Leonese abondu has the meaning 'very'.

Sp19,17 mata (also at Sp20,3) has here the Western meaning 'forest' rather than the Castilian one of 'grove' or 'undergrowth'.

Sp20,9 erizo cachero is a Galician-Portuguese combination in which cachero restricts the meaning of erizo to 'porcupine'.

Sp22,13 culame: forms in -ame are generally Western.

Sp25,2 fugía: the retention of the internal consonant is a Western (but also an Aragonese) feature.

Sp25,3 huespede (also at Sp27,9 and Sp27,21): the retention of e after d (or c) of the stem is a Western characteristic, c.f. falsedade at Sp37,6.

Sp27,4 miragles (also miracle at Sp30,11): e for o in the final syllable makes this a Western form.
Sp27,16 erguidevos: the retention of e in the second person plural of the imperative is a Western feature.

Sp28,1 guan manno: guan is more frequent than tan in the West.

Sp28,17 lanpadas (also at Sp29,15): the retention of d beside Castilian r may indicate either an archaism, or a Western form.

Sp30,6 sey is a Western form of the imperative.

Sp30,17 estramenna: the epenthetic r makes this a Western form, still found in modern Leonese.

Sp30,17 el sennal: the masculine gender indicates a Westernism.

Sp33,3 asonado has the Western meaning 'assembled'.

Sp33,11 toste: compared with the standard Old Spanish tosto, toste is a Galician-Portuguese form.

Sp34,13 traga is a Western formation, of which the Castilian form would be traya.

Sp35,3 egleja: palatalization makes this a Western form.

Sp35,3 frade retains e after d of the stem, c.f. huespede at Sp25,3, Sp27,9 and Sp27,21; also falsedade at Sp37,6.

Sp35,7 bielso (also vielso at Sp35,11) has l beside Castilian ñ, and is thus likely to be a Western form.

Sp35,8 an mia rrremenbrança: this position of the strong form of the possessive is more common in the West.

Sp35,9 duldara is a Leonese form, c.f. Castilian dubdar.
falsedad: retention of e after d of the stem, as in huespede and fraude above, makes this a Western form.

sandece: the retention of e after the c of the stem makes this a Western form.

These 36 cases of Western linguistic features in the Spanish Martha life contrast markedly with the mere four cases in the Magdalene life, and provide very strong evidence that the two lives were produced by two different translators, or at least that they were not originally contained in the same MS. It is just possible that, between translation by the same Spaniard and the copying of MS Sp, the Magdalene and Martha lives were separately copied by scribes from different regions; but such an explanation of the different numbers of Western linguistic features is less likely because more complex.

The evidence adduced in section B2 below also strongly suggests that the two lives are the work of two different Spanish translators.
B2: The Spanish Translators' Treatment of their French Sources

It is clear from a comparison of the two Spanish texts with the corresponding French versions that it was the Spaniards' intention to produce a faithful and accurate rendering of their French originals. It suffices to compare certain sections of the French and Spanish texts in order to immediately appreciate the extent to which the Spaniards carried out this intention. It is precisely because the translations are usually so accurate that exceptions are considered to be significant, and to merit close attention as indications of the translators' limitations and competence.

Despite their overall fidelity and accuracy, both Spanish translations contain a considerable number of errors, some of which are possibly scribal, but of which many are clearly attributable to the translators, whose knowledge of the French language and of French toponymy is sometimes seen to be unsound. Differences in the distribution of some of these errors and inaccuracies between the two Spanish texts confirm that they are not the work of the same translator.

Besides these errors, the two Spanish lives have been changed in translation in other respects: material has been added to and omitted from the Spanish texts, and the sense of the original has sometimes been altered. Some of these additions, omissions and alterations are possibly further errors, and others appear to be merely whims of the translators. A considerable number, though, may be seen as attempts to improve the French originals: this is achieved principally by removing superfluous material, by adding explicative words and phrases, and by re-arranging the syntax and word-order of the French for stylistic or logical improvement. Some differences in the distribution between the two Spanish texts of these changes may also indicate that they are the work of two different translators.
The following section examines those parts of the Spanish texts where the translators seem to have deviated from their French originals; the deviations are considered under the headings: I Errors, II Additions, III Omissions, IV Alterations.

I The Spanish Translators' Errors

Both Spanish texts contain errors and inaccuracies, which fall into the following categories:

(i) those which seem to result from the translators' failure to understand a French term; numerous omissions are also considered in this category;

(ii) those which may result from a misunderstanding of a French term which is similar in form to a Spanish term, but different in meaning (so-called 'faux amis');

(iii) those which result from the Spaniard's failure to grasp the syntax of his French text;

(iv) those which may be explained by the Spaniard's incorrect understanding of word-division, or his failure to read correctly groups of letters within French words; such errors are referred to as 'misreadings' for brevity;

(v) other errors and inaccuracies, mostly attributable to the translators' inattention to their task, and including a proportion of scribal errors.

There follows an analysis of these five types of error, first for the Magdalene life, and then for the Martha text. The frequencies of each type of error in each text are then compared.
Errors in the Spanish Magdalene Text

(i) Errors and omissions imputable to the Spanish Magdalene translator's defective knowledge of French

In a remarkably high proportion of cases where the Spaniard has apparently made a mistake, or produced a very approximate translation, or omitted part of his French original, the French terms involved may not have been known to the translator.

In some cases this is because the French word has undergone, in its development from Latin, changes that were far more drastic than those which accompanied its evolution into Spanish, thus making such a term as Old French tiede (C8,10) unrecognizable to a Spaniard who would be familiar only with Spanish tibio and probably also with Latin tepidus.

In other cases the Spaniard may not have recognized a French term because it had no cognate at all in Spanish, and had diverged beyond recognition from its Latin parent: such a term as saoulez (C11,11) has no Spanish cognate, and the fall of the medial consonant, which must have been an important factor in recognizability, rendered it unrecognizable as a derivative of a reflex of Vulgar Latin satullum, itself possibly not in use in medieval Latin.

In yet other cases, a French word of Germanic origin might well have posed problems for a Spanish translator who was relying heavily on the close similarity between French and Spanish; a word such as falaise (C1,20) was probably unknown to the Spaniard, who at this point produced a very approximate rendering.

There follows an account of the cases where the inaccuracy of the translation could be explained by the factors outlined above; this is followed by an enumeration of Spanish omissions which might be similarly explained.
(a) Errors and approximations

C1,20 revindrent au port en la falaise
Sp1,20 tornaronse a la rrribera

The Spaniard may not have known falaise (from Frankish falisa, cf. German Fels) which has no cognate in Spanish; indeed it was originally adialect term confined to Normandy and Picardy. This may well explain the Spanish rendering rrribera, which has the appearance of an approximation. The French text may be defective here (ports are not situated on cliffs) and the Latin texts present several variants at this point - a fact which must have increased the Spaniard’s difficulties further.

C1,21 en oresons e en geunes
Sp1,22 en pregarias e en oraciones

The French and Spanish terms for 'fast' are both related to Latin ieiunare, but geune is very different in appearance from ayuno, so that a Spaniard may not have recognized the French term, contenting himself with the use of a synonym of pregarias. It is significant that geunes in the Martha life (F21,23) is translated correctly, a fact which further suggests that a different translator produced each of the Spanish texts. See also C4,5 givre, not translated into Spanish, compared with F20,9 guiver in Martha, correctly translated at Sp20,10; also baiasse at C11,7 and F31,10, mentioned in note 67.

C2,8 de sa beautee e de sa parole e fu si sage que ce ne fu si merveille non; e de la doucour de sa loyquence pessoit ele molt de gent
Sp2,8 de la su beldat e de las sus sesudas palabras, de commo las mostrava sesudament.

The French MSS have several different spellings of loyquence (loquenceuse, loquence) as well as the variant loengue, so that the Spaniard may have had before him a version he could not understand; even if he had known pessoit, its presence in this context might have puzzled him if he had not been
aware of its figurative use with loquence. The Spanish rendering, with its characteristic repetition of sesuda, has the appearance of an approximation by a translator who could not understand his original.

C3,15 que il...aidaust aus seintes genz
Sp3,16 que les feziese alguna cosa

The Spanish translation is a feeble approximation to the French, possibly because the French term, through its drastic modification, was not recognizable as a reflex of Latin adiutare.

C8,17 ne demora guerres q'il vit
Sp8,18 cato e vio

The Spaniard may not have followed the French text exactly here because he did not recognize guerres 'scarcely', Frankish waigaro having no reflex in Castilian. The fact that Catalan gayra is a reflex of waigaro suggests in addition that the translator was not of Eastern origin, since he would otherwise have readily recognized guerres. Again the Spanish rendering has the duplication of near-synonyms which often betrays a translation problem.

C11,10 ele norrist l'enfant, et quant il est saoulez de lait li emfes en lait son plorer
Sp11,10 Ella criava al ninno que llorava por lo confortar e lo guitar de llorar

The Spanish version does not correspond to the French, and the repetition of confortar by guitar de llorar again suggests a translation difficulty. The problem may have been failure to understand saoulez, since Castilian has no reflex of Latin satullum. The Spaniard has also missed the apparent pun on the word lait, and seems also to have been led into error by the verb lait (see faux amis at (ii) below).
C11,20 ne vent nel pout grever, n'en yveer n'en esteez
Sp11,20 nin viento nin elada nin enbierno nin calentura

The repetition elada...enbierno suggests a translation problem, possibly arising from French grever; Spanish gravar is a late (16th or 17th century) borrowing, so that French grever was probably unknown to the Spanish translator.

(b) Omissions

The following are cases where the translator's defective knowledge of French may have led him to omit a word or phrase, rather than to produce a wrong or approximate rendering, as in the above cases:

C2,15 ja soit ce qu'il le vousist mout volentiers
Sp2,15 que deseava mucho

It seems likely that the translator was not aware that the French phrase ja soit ce que meant 'although', and rendered it simply by the relative pronoun.

C4,5 avec la givre ta fame
Sp4,5 e tu mugier

The development in French of Latin vipera has made it so different from Spanish víbora that the translator seems not to have recognized it\(^45\); the word is, however, correctly translated in the Martha life at F20,9\(^46\).

C5,13 li sires apareilla son oirre
Sp5,14 guisose el sennor

French oirre, which seems to have caused translation problems elsewhere\(^47\), is so different in appearance from its Latin antecedent iter (which has no Spanish reflex) that the translator might not have known it. Perhaps,
however, we should see in this omission a stylistic improvement where the translator has cut out a superfluous term: if the pilgrim was going to the Holy Land, it is redundant to say that he was preparing his journey, and sufficient to say that he was preparing himself.\(^{48}\)

C5,22 \textit{demorroiz en meson et vivroiz aisiement}  
Sp5,21 \textit{vos fincaredes en casa}

It is quite probable that the translator did not know the term aisiement, since the Ibero-Romance reflexes of Latin adiacentia in no way resemble aisiement in either form or meaning.\(^{49}\) The translator may thus have reflected that, since demorroiz was similar in meaning to vivroiz, he could omit the latter together with the unknown aisiement.

C5,24 \textit{qe nous veille saisir malveisement l'en nos choses}  
Sp5,23 \textit{que...non finquen mal endereçadas}

The Spanish translation is unsatisfactory because it repeats endereçadas at Sp5,23 (thus betraying a problem), and because it is a very rough approximation to the French. Possibly French saisir (from O.H.G. sazian)\(^{50}\) which has no cognate in Spanish, was not known to the translator, who thus tried to make sense out of his original by taking veille 'wish' as part of veiller 'to watch over', as discussed in section (ii) faux amis below.

C6,11 \textit{li soduianz anemis}  
Sp6,11 \textit{el diablo}

The Spanish rendering may be an intentional simplification, but it is tempting to think that this was provoked by the Spaniard's ignorance of the form soduianz, since Latin subducere has no reflexes in the Iberian peninsula, and has undergone considerable linguistic attrition in its passage into French.
French *flos*, usually meaning 'waves', seems to be used here in the sense of 'the sea' or 'the deep'. The Spaniard possibly considered it redundant, and omitted it for this reason; but he may well not have known *flos*, since the Germanic root *flod* with these meanings has not penetrated into the Iberian peninsula.  

Latin *tepidus* has undergone a fairly drastic change during its passage into French *tiede*, and may thus have been unrecognizable to the translator.  

It has already been noted under C5,13 above that French *oirre* presented difficulties to the translator.  

The French MSS have several variants for *legiértée*, including *lechiérté* and *lecierie*; and while a Spaniard would doubtless have understood *legiértée*, since *ligero* is an early borrowing from French, the other readings may well have led the translator to omit the phrase because he did not know the term, and because Spanish has no reflex of Germanic *lekkon*.  

French bail 'delivery' is formed from the verb bailler, a reflex of Latin baiulare 'to carry', which has no descendants in Spain\textsuperscript{54}, and may thus have been unknown to the translator\textsuperscript{55}.

Clearly, any statement about the translator's knowledge of the French language can only be tentative. It does, however, seem very significant that in the above cases of errors, inaccuracies and omissions, there are reasons why particular French terms may have been unknown to the Spanish translator.
(ii) **Spanish Magdalene errors imputable to 'faux amis'**

There are several places where the Spanish translator seems to have been led into error by the deceptive appearance of a French term. In some cases the Spaniard has selected from the several possible meanings of a French term one that is not appropriate to the context; in other cases the cognate Spanish term does not have the same meaning as the word in the French original. In some instances these 'faux amis' have also led to syntactic errors.

C2,16  
Et *lors endroit* la benoite Maugdeleine lor comença a prechier

Sp2,16  
E la bendita Magdalena pedricava *alli*

*Lors endroit* means 'thereupon', *endroit* being used with an emphasizing force together with adverbs of time (and place)⁵⁶. The Spaniard was apparently unaware of this use of *endroit*, and translated by *alli* because of the more familiar meaning of 'place'.

C2,25  
por *la savor* de sa parole

Sp2,26  
por *sabor* de oyr su palabra

French *savor* means here 'pleasantness' so that the phrase may be translated 'because of the pleasantness of her words'. Misled by the appearance of French *savor*, the Spaniard has produced a rendering which means, 'because of a desire to hear her words'⁵⁷.

C3,12  
*e la demanda* por qui ele que avoit tant de richesses lessoit

Sp3,12  
*e dixole* que pues ella era tan rrica, que por que dexava

*Demander* in French means 'to ask' or 'to request', while Spanish *demandar* is more peremptory, meaning 'to tell' or 'to demand'; the Spaniard seems to have been unaware of this difference when he translated
demanda 'asked' by dixo 'told'. He was probably unaware of the possible meaning 'to reproach'.

C3,15 la menaça, si ele ne dissoit son mari que il...
eidaust

Sp3,15 amenazola, sy nen lo dixiese todo a su marido, que
les feziese alguna cosa

The meaning of dissoit is clearly 'ordered', while that of dixiese is 'recounted'; the translator has made the wrong choice among the several meanings of the French verb. Combined with the Spaniard's ignorance of eidaust (see (i) above), this error has also resulted in the syntactic error of taking the que les feziese clause to be dependent on amenazo.

C4,2 e si sembloit de son viaire qui ce fuss fez, ausi
come si la meson arsist

Sp4,2 E semejava su rrostro commo si fuese fuego, o asi
commo sy la casa ardiese

The French version means 'it seemed from her face that there was a fire', a fair translation of B4,2; however, the Spanish text means 'her face looked as if it were a fire' or 'her face resembled a fire'. While the inaccuracy is not serious, it is significant in that it reveals a misunderstanding of French sembloit: deceived by the formal similarity of sembler to semejar, or by an awareness of their common etymology, the Spaniard has used semejava in a construction which shows that it means 'looked', not 'seemed'. The error may, however, be purely syntactical, resulting from the translator's failure to read the preposition de: this would cause son viaire to appear to be the subject of the verb sembloit.

C4,18 e dist a son mari qui suspiroit pur ce meismes

Sp4,19 e ssu marido le pregunto por que ssospirava

The aberrant Spanish por que 'why' is probably to be explained, not as a translation of MS C, but rather of a text resembling MS C5, which at this point reads ki por ce
meismes souspiroit. It seems that the translator mistook por ce for por que, probably aided by the context in which such a question would be natural.

C5,24 que nous veille saisir malveisement l'en nos choses
Sp5,23 que...non finquen mal endereçadas

The case of the omission of saisir is discussed above at (i). The translation non finquen mal endereçadas is probably attributable to the close similarity in appearance between the verb veiller 'to watch over' and the present subjunctive of vouloir 'to wish', compounded by ignorance of saisir. Thus 'that no-one should wickedly seize' is wrongly interpreted as 'that no-one should watch over them badly', and translated accordingly.

C10,17 ele dona confort maintenant au pelerin, q'il
por son desconfort ne se desesperast
Sp10,17 e le dio conforte e ayuda al romer, que por su
conforte non se desesperase

The translator seems to have interpreted the French por as 'thanks to' rather than 'because of', and to have altered 'discomfort' to 'comfort' to fit this interpretation.

C11,11 li emfes en lait son plourer
Sp11,11 lo guitar de llorar

The Spanish interpretation of this passage may be explained by the fact that both the French verb laier and the Spanish guitar sometimes mean 'to leave'.

Although the above aberrations do not seriously impair the translation, they are nevertheless indications of the Spaniard's imperfect knowledge of French.
(iii) Spanish Magdalene errors of syntax

All the syntactic aberrations of the Magdalene translation have already been discussed under (i) and (ii) above, since they are not primarily syntactic errors, but rather the results of other types of mistakes. For the cases involved, see above at C2,8; C2,15; C2,25; C3,15; C4,2; C4,18 and C5,24.

(iv) Misreadings leading to Spanish Magdalene errors

There are four cases where aberrant Spanish translations are probably to be explained by misunderstanding of word-division, or incorrect reading of groups of letters within French words.

C1,11 que nostre sires gueri par sa *salive*
Sp1,11 que nuestro sennor...guareció por su *misericordia*

*misericordia* may be the error of a Spanish scribe who inattentively wrote out a much-used formula; more probably, though, possibly through being unaware of the biblical reference to John 9, 1-9, he misread in the word *salive* a word which he thought began with *salv...* and which recalled such terms as *salvador* and *salvación*; this may have led him to translate by the semantically related *misericordia*. A French MS would contain three vertical strokes (minims) after the *l* of *salive*, and these could be read as either *vi* or as *iv*.

C5,1 *ele locit mieus*
Sp5,1 *ternia* por mejor

The translator has apparently mistaken French *locit* (from *loër* 'to approve') for *locit* (from *avoir*), and has consequently translated by *ternia*. 
The three vertical strokes for the letters vi are identical in most MSS to those for the letter m; in addition, the letter t is often indistinguishable from c. Thus in covient the translator could easily have read comenc..., supplied the termination, and translated by comenzó.

C11,13 Or orroiz merveilles a dire
Sp11,13 E otra cosa que es maravilla

The recurrent problems posed by parts of the verb ouir, and the frequent similarity in MSS between the letters r and t, probably combined to lead the Spaniard to read otro- in French orro, and consequently to translate by otra cosa. See F35,9, discussed on p. 351.

However, only one of these four cases, C7,11 above, is indisputable; the explanation of misericordia at Sp1,11 is by no means certain, ternia por mejor might be considered an adequate translation of looit mieus, and in the case of C11,13, if the explanation is correct, the Spaniard must have been very surprised to find a Spanish term otro in a French text! Furthermore, none of the four cases are truly errors in that they do not seriously alter the meaning of the passages concerned; when we compare the much more numerous and more serious cases of such misreading presented by the Martha translation, the evidence for two different translators is considerably reinforced.

(v) Errors of inattention in the Spanish Magdalene life

This life has no errors of inattention like those found in the Martha text. However, it is possible that between C6,19 and C7,3 the Spanish omission is a case of homoioteleuton, where the translator's eye slipped from en la nef (C6,18) to en la nef at C7,3.
Errors in the Spanish Martha Text

The same five types of errors and omissions are now examined for the Spanish Martha translation.

(i) Errors and omissions imputable to the Spanish Martha translator's defective knowledge of French

(a) Errors and approximations

F12,4 tint par oeuvre  
Sp12,4 tovo por verdadera

The change of the intervocalic p in Latin *opera*, combined with the diphthongization and complex spelling in *oeuvre*, probably made the word unrecognizable to the Spaniard, who thus made a guess inspired by the context; though, to be fair to the translator, he may have been using a MS with a defect, such as MS F which has *regne* for *oeuvre*, which obliged him to hazard this translation.

F15,2 ele aidast aus apostres  
Sp15,2 fiziese bien a los apostolos

The feeble *fiziese bien* corroborates what was said of the translation of *eaidaust* at Magdalene C3,16 - that French linguistic changes had rendered Latin *aiutare* unrecognizable to the Spaniard

F17,4 A lor fiertes  
Sp17,5 en sus andancas

Since there is no Spanish descendant of Latin *feretrum*, the translator probably did not know *fiertes* 'reliquary, coffin', and seems to have taken it to be a variant spelling of *festas* (a French scribal error for *fiertes*, see variants) at F17,4; at all events, *andancas* has a meaning not very different from *fiestas*. 
les nes...plungoit enz
entornava las barcas

The translator may not have known plungoit, since Spanish has no reflex of Latin *plumbicare; entornava is therefore possibly a guess.

l'eschaille poignans
los cabellos del cuerpo...agudos

eschaille is of Germanic origin (*skalja), and was at first restricted to Norman and Picard dialects; it has no cognates in Spain. It is therefore likely that the Spaniard experienced difficulty with the word, and produced the feeble cabellos del cuerpo. See, however, chapter I pp. 79-80.

coste and garnacha are not the same garment: Old French cotte meant a short coat, while Spanish garnacha was long. Castilian borrowed the French term (Spanish cota) as early as 1330, so the word may have been known to the translator. In the present case, however, the French coste, with its aberrant spelling (the s is not etymological since cotte derives from Frankish *kotta) may well have been unrecognizable to the Spaniard who, realizing that it was a question of clothing, simply made a guess.

Une corroie sainte de crinz de cheval noueuse
una cynta de sedas de cavallo gruesa

The loss of the medial consonant in the passage of Latin nodosus into French probably rendered noueuse (and the other MSS readings of this phrase) unrecognizable to the Spaniard, who simply invented a term suitable to the context.
The fall of the medial consonant in the development of Latin *nucarius into French noier has created problems for the Spaniard, who would thus not have been helped by his knowledge of such forms as Spanish noguera and nogal. Hence the imprecise translation otros ramos.

F25,6 te croient e aourent
Sp25,6 te crean e te oren

The meanings of Spanish orar and adorar are often the same, so that the translation of aouer by orar may not be an error at all. Nevertheless, the choice of orar rather than adorar might have been due to the fall of the medial consonant in the passage of Latin adorare to Old French aouer, causing the Spaniard not to recognize aourent, or causing him to see in the French verb a resemblance to orar.

F29,6/8 resgardes...resgarde
Sp29,5/8 se...guardame

The Spaniard appears not to have been aware of the semantic change brought about by the prefix re- in French.

F30,8 ne troverent dé feu
Sp30,8 non traxieron fuego

The Spaniard may not have recognized troverent, since there is no widely used Spanish descendant of Vulgar Latin tropare which produced French trouver.66

F31,10 tà povre baiasse
Sp31,10 tu pobre amiga

amiga is an imprecise translation of baiasse 'servant'; the Spaniard probably did not know the word, of which the origin is disputed, but which probably represents the reduction of the medial consonant in a Vulgar Latin form *bacassa or *bagassa. The difference in meaning would have made any resemblance to Spanish bagasa 'prostitute' unhelpful.67
Because of the phonological reductions which accompanied parts of the verb *solere* into French (Old French *soloir*) the translator probably did not recognize *seut* as part of *soloir*, and therefore made a guess appropriate to the context. The verb is also omitted at F28,4, see (b) below.

The Spanish Martha translator's ignorance of the French term concerned.

(b) Omissions

The cases of omission listed below are those which may have been provoked by the Spanish Martha translator's ignorance of the French term concerned.

It was noted above in (a) that the translator experienced difficulties with parts of *soloir* (see F33,4), and this omission is possibly to be explained in the same way.

The surprising imprecision of the Spaniard here is difficult to explain, since both French and Spanish have descendants
of ecclesiatical Latin diaconus; possibly the introduction of the intrusive -r- and the accompanying changes in dyacres had altered the word beyond recognition beside Spanish diacono.

This is another case where the fall of the medial consonant in Latin locus probably made French lieu unrecognizable to the Spaniard, in whose language the consonant had only been voiced in its passage from Latin to Spanish lugar (Latin localis).

Here the omission of sautier is untypical of the Spaniard, who is generally careful to reproduce this type of detail. Possibly the vocalization of l to u in sautier (ecclesiastical Latin psalterium) made the word unrecognizable.

droituriere may have not been known to the Spaniard, see F38,8 discussed at (a) above.

The verb ouir and its derivatives have elsewhere posed problems for the translator (see Magdalene C11,13, discussed at (iv) above); here his solution has been to omit the difficult term.
(ii) Spanish Martha errors imputable to 'faux amis'

French 

F12,4   la tint par oeuvre  
Sp12,4   la tovo por verdadera

Here the translator has taken tint in its sense of 'held', 'considered' rather in that of 'kept to', 'respected'; the error is probably closely connected with the translator's ignorance of French oeuvre, discussed at (i) above.

F12,18   l'apelerà pour qui ele proiera  
Sp12,18  la... llamar... ca ella rrogara

The context makes it clear that in the French text pour qui (qui is often used for que in this MS) introduces a final clause, while the Spaniard has interpreted the construction as a causal clause. He probably made the error through the similarity between French pour que and Spanish porque. The case is also listed under syntactic errors at (iii) below.

F16,68   e (encore) enrichist  
Sp16,6   e mas los enrriqueçio

The Spaniard has incorrectly taken encore to mean 'more', while the context makes it clear that the meaning is 'still'. The error has also contributed to a syntactic mistake, see (iii) below.

F26,5   vindrent la  
Sp26,5   la fueron ver

The error of translating la 'there' as if it were la 'her' is doubtless explained by the identical French forms; the error probably also necessitated the additional verb ver. There is a case of a similar process operating in reverse at F38,2, mentioned below.
Although the inaccuracy of callar for celer is very minor, and possibly not even an error at all, it is very likely that the choice of the verb callar was influenced by its visual similarity to French celer. The translator may have been aware of the frequent correspondence between French e (when stressed) and Spanish a (mer/mar, sel/sal, etc), so that a correspondence celer/callar would seem obvious. Although the more obvious choice, celular, had been in use in Spain since the end of the 12th century, this borrowing, which was probably at first confined to learned usage, may not have been sufficiently widespread to be known to the translator.

The error of alla for la, provoked by the misreading of alons for aions discussed at (iv) below, is parallel to the error mentioned at F26,5 above.
(iii) Spanish Martha errors of syntax

This type of error is more frequent than in the Magdalene translation:

F12,18  l'apelera pour qui ele proiera
Spl2,18  la llamar... ca ella rregara

As was pointed out in (ii) above, the error probably arose as a result of the visual similarity between French pour que and Spanish porque. However, since in Old Spanish porque had the two meanings 'in order that' (with subjunctive) and 'because' (with indicative), it seems to have been the French future tense (rather than subjunctive) that was ultimately responsible for this basically syntactic error.

F15,4  Sa partie e quanque ele avoit après l'asencion nostre seigneur, elle offri
Spl5,4  E despues de la ascension de nuestro sennor, ofreçio la su parte

The Spaniard has distorted the meaning of the original by failing to grasp its syntax; the error may have resulted from his failure to understand the word quanque 'whatever'.

F16,6  e (encore) enrichist chascun jour el ciel lasus em paradis (for encore, see variant readings)
Spl6,6  e mas los enrriquecio que les dio la rriquezas del parayso en el cielo

The translator's misinterpretation of encore as 'more' rather than 'still' has caused him to add the extra clause que les dio... in order to complete the sense. See also 'faux amis' at (ii) above.

F17,3  requiert li pueples la cendre e les os d'euls e les festes
Spl7,3  los pueblos demandan la ceniza dellos e los huessos e van a sus fiestas

This error may have been the fault of the Spaniard who, failing to recognize French fiertes 'reliquaries' (the
original translation), translated by the visually similar fiestas (see F17,4, discussed at (i)(a) above), and added the verb van to complete the sense. The error may well be the fault of a French scribe, however: see chapter I, section II (v) (b).

F17,4 Il sont mort e si aident aus vis. A lor fiertes
li malade i sont sané
Sp17,4 Ellos son muertos e ayudan los bivos en sus
andanças. Los enfermos allí son sanos

As discussed above at (i)(a), the Spaniard has wrongly rendered a lor fiertes 'before their reliquaries' by en sus andanças, then incorrectly placed this Spanish phrase with the preceding rather than the following clause.

F19,16 avoit .i. dragon en .i. bois, e se tenoit vers occident
Sp19,17 avia en una mata una animalia a que llamavan dragon contra ocidente

The French version is a fair translation of Latin erat... in nemore quodam...versus occidentalem plagam draco ingens '...towards the Western region...'; the Spaniard has badly misunderstood the French construction (possibly as a result of difficulty with tenoit, cf. F12,4 discussed at (ii). above) and seems to have used contra ocidente as part of the dragon's name!

F23,5 s'agenouilloit de foi, d'esperance, de charité e d'autres vertuz
Sp23,4 fincava los inojos...por derecha fe de esperança e de claridat e de outras virtudes

The nouns foi, esperance, charité and vertuz are all separate reasons for Martha's action. The Spaniard has not understood the meaning of the French proposition de with the last three nouns, and has thus made esperança, claridat and virtudes dependant on por derecha fe.
In these two cases the Spaniard seems not to have recognized the French factitive construction, though he has correctly translated the same construction elsewhere, e.g. at F30,15 se fist mettre and at F30,16 se fist couvrir.

Sp is probably a translation of sainte Marthe avoit norri, the reading of MSS F1 F2 and C3. The Spaniard has failed to see that sainte Marthe is the subject, not the object, of the verb avoit norri. The error is probably connected with the identical subject and object forms of the Spanish relative pronoun, or possibly with a Spanish scribe's mistaken addition of n (or its abbreviation) to an original criara.

Purely syntactic errors are thus more frequent in the Martha translation, and their greater incidence may be further evidence that two different translators are involved.
(iv) Misreadings leading to Spanish Martha errors

The following cases of Spanish aberrations seem to result from mistaken word-division or from the misreading of groups of letters within words. The incidence of this type of translation error is considerably greater in the Martha text than in the Magdalene life, and while this could mean that the French Martha text was simply more difficult to read than the French Magdalene life, it could also indicate that a less skillful translator produced the Spanish Martha version.

F12,3 la foi des prophetes
Sp12,3 la ley de los profetas

The error of ley for foi is likely to have been provoked by several factors: (1) the probable existence of a form fey; (2) the frequent similarity of the letters f and l in MSS; (3) the existence of the expression 'the law and the prophets' at several places in the scriptures.

F12,6 toute chose peut avenir a celui qui bien croit
Sp12,6 todas las cosas puede aver el que bien crey

The mistranslation of avenir by aver seems to be explained by a misreading of an abbreviated form avoir; if the translator disregarded, or could not see, the horizontal bar representing the letter n, he would read in his French text avoir 'to have', and translate accordingly, disregarding the French preposition a. However, it could be that the error is the fault of a Spanish scribe, who misread pueden avenir (translating toutes choses puent avenir in MSS F1 F2 C3 F5), perhaps written puede avenir in the MS he was copying, as puede aver.

F15,3 ceuls qui sivoient nostre seigneur
Sp15,3 aquellos que servian a nuestro senyor

Probably the French original contained the form suivient, in which the letters ult would be represented by five
minims. We have seen elsewhere that such clusters of letters frequently give rise to errors, and it would be easy for the Spaniard to misread the first three strokes as er, especially since servient would be quite appropriate in this context.

F16,10 Le Mans
Sp16,10 el condado de Alemanna

The passage concerned is a list of toponyms and saints' names, containing many times the preposition a, and many ampersands; in some of the French MSS these are misplaced (see variants). It is likely that a misplaced a or ampersand in the translator's French original was interpreted by the Spaniard as part of the toponym, leading him to read alemans for le mans, and to translate accordingly.72.

F20,10 douze lyon e .xii. ours
Sp20,12 doze omnes e doze leones

In the French MSS, u is usually represented by two vertical strokes, and r by a vertical stroke with an often indistinct horizontal stroke. These three vertical strokes could easily be misread as the letter m, so that ours was misread as oms and therefore translated as omnes. Alternatively, a French scribe may have altered ours to oms by the same process.

F23,5 charité
Sp23,6 claridat

This error may be attributable to the misreading by the translator of cl- for ch-, though a French scribe could also have produced the mistake.

F23,7 en Betanie
Sp23,7 en Bretanna

Geographical ignorance and misreading bre- for be- seem to have combined to produce this error.
The visual similarity between *troverent* and *traxieron* strongly suggests a misreading; see also (i) (a) above.

In the French MSS the letters *li* of *li jusques* are written as four contiguous vertical strokes: *liiiisques*. As frequently elsewhere, the Spaniard has misread these minims, taking them to be all part of one word, *l'ivisques*, a form of the more usual *ivesques* 'bishop'.

Again a poor knowledge of geography has combined with a misreading to produce an error of translation: the Spanish translator’s French MS may have contained indistinctly written vowels, since all but one of the consonants in *d'Alemaigne* also occur, in the same order, in *de LemoZes*, and the remaining French *n* may have been represented, as often, by a horizontal bar, subsequently mislaid.

The letters *t* and *c* are not always readily distinguishable in the French MSS. The Spaniard seems to have misread *c* for *t* at the beginning of *terres*, then to have hazarded a guess, using a word beginning with *c* and containing *rre* that was appropriate to the context.

The Spaniard has misread the *i* of *aions* as an *l*, translating
alone by vamos; this error also provoked the mistranslation of la by alla, discussed above at (ii).

There are thus at least twelve cases where the Spanish Martha translator has misread his original, either by misinterpreting a division between words, or by misreading a letter or a group of letters. This contrasts with the Spanish Magdalene translation, which has a maximum of four such cases.

The different incidence of these errors may indicate that the same translator was using a French Martha text that was more difficult to read than his MS of the French Magdalene life. However, the recurrent errors involving wrong analysis of clusters of vertical strokes are of a type that could occur in the case of any MS, however clearly executed. The more likely explanation of the higher incidence of this type of error is that the Martha translation is the work of a different, less skilful, translator.
Errors of inattention in the Spanish Martha life

The inaccuracies listed below seem not to result from the translator's ignorance or incompetence, since they involve language which would not normally be susceptible to misinterpretation; they seem rather to be the result of the translator's momentary inattention to his task.

Since scribal errors are essentially mistakes due to inattention, this group will probably contain more scribal errors than groups (i) to (iv) above; and while it is almost impossible to distinguish between scribal errors and translator's errors, several of the cases listed below are mentioned as possible scribal errors.

F13,8  fist il une yglise, e .ii. manieres de vies
Sp13,8  fizo el una eglesia de dos maneras de vida

The error of de for e could be attributed to a scribe or to the translator.

F20,9  des paumes comme tortue
Sp20,11 ssus palmas comme de cavallo

The eye of the translator or copyist seems in this case to have wandered to one of the several other occurrences of cheval or cavallo just above this phrase at F20,5 and F20,7.

F23,3  Elle estoit el ciel par penssee e en terre par cors
Sp23,3  ella era en cuerpo e en alma en el cielo

The translator or copyist may have been led into error by his knowledge of a frequent collocation 'body and soul'. However, the re-arranged word-order suggests that the translator, and not a copyist, was responsible for the error.
The Spanish translator has failed to notice that two different groups of people are involved.

The substitution of martirio for baptesme seems, as in the case of en cuerpo e el alma at Sp23,3, to be a case of inattentive translation or copying, influenced by a knowledge of a formula.

Again knowledge of a formula may have provoked this error of translation or copying.

This error may result from the Spaniard's ignorance of French conjugation; however, only an imperative is appropriate to the context, which suggests that this is an error of inattention.

There are two Spanish errors here: (1) levada for la lit, which is probably the error of a scribe who wrote levada for leida, originally correctly translated; (2) by his use of despues que, the translator shows that he failed to see that the direct speech 'Buen padre...' was part of what was being read.
The corresponding part of the Latin text at E32,4, *vi. feria hora nona*, confirms the French reading \(^76\); the curious Spanish error can surely only be explained by inattention, on the part of translator or scribe.

Again, knowledge of a formula seems to have provoked this inaccuracy.
The evidence of the Spanish errors

The numbers of these defects in the two Spanish texts are summarized below. The relative frequencies of the imperfections may be assessed by bearing in mind that the fragment of the Spanish Magdalene life is about half the length of the Martha fragment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of error</th>
<th>Magdalene</th>
<th>Martha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Unknown vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) errors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) omissions</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Faux amis</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Syntax</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Misreadings</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Inattention</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evidence of the varying distribution of errors must be interpreted with caution, firstly because even if the same translator had produced both Spanish texts, a uniform distribution of all these types of errors could scarcely be expected; and secondly, because the categorization of the errors is not always clear-cut.

Thus for types (i)(a) and (i)(b), while the frequency of errors is uniform throughout the two texts (there are about twice as many in the Martha life, which is about twice as long as the Magdalene life), the frequency of omissions due to ignorance is almost four times higher in the Magdalene text. This could point to two different translators, but may simply reflect a different concentration of difficult vocabulary in each French original.
Similarly, the errors due to 'faux amis' are over three times more frequent in the Magdalene text, and it is tempting to see this as an indication that the two lives are the work of two different translators, one of whom was more prone than the other to this type of error. Yet the differences in the numbers of errors due to 'faux amis' may merely mean that the two French originals contained different concentrations of such potential pitfalls.

As for the errors of syntax, these are much more frequent in Martha than in Magdalene, though in certain cases it is difficult to decide whether an error is fundamentally syntactic, or whether it was initially provoked by another error. The disparity may be explained simply by a higher incidence of more difficult syntax in the French Martha text, although it is not easy to establish what types of syntax a Spaniard might have found difficult. Errors of syntax, however, are a clearer pointer to a translator's competence than lexical errors, since the syntactic features of a language are recurrent, while a lexical item could easily remain unknown to a Spanish translator with a good knowledge of French. The different distribution of syntactic errors might, therefore, be evidence that each Spanish text was the work of a different translator.

The evidence of the different frequency of cases of misreadings by the translator must similarly be approached with caution: in the Spanish Magdalene text there are only three or four possible cases of misreading, compared with twelve clear cases in Martha, that is six times the frequency of the Magdalene text, with the possibility that all but one of the Magdalene cases are not misreadings at all. This certainly suggests for the Martha text a Spaniard less able to read French; but we must also reckon with the possibility of the same translator becoming less attentive as his work progressed, or with the same translator using French Magdalene and Martha texts of differing legibility.
In the case of the errors of inattention, the great disparity in numbers (one error in Magdalene, ten in Martha) seems to point to two translators of differing competence; yet many of the errors in question could be attributed to a scribe, so that the apparent differences between the two Spanish translations might be explained by a change of scribes in an earlier copying of the Spanish MS.

Thus, though the evidence of the translation errors must be interpreted with caution, it seems to suggest that the two lives are the work of two different translators: the translator who produced the Magdalene life tended more than the other to omit words that he did not know, and was more prone to errors provoked by homonyms or near-homonyms. The Martha translator had a weaker knowledge of French syntax, more frequently misread his original, and was less attentive to his task.

It is interesting to consider briefly at this point the errors contained in the next text in the Spanish MS, the life of Saint Mary of Egypt. If we accept the assessment in Walker 1977, XXIX that there are 'one or two possible errors', then the Mary of Egypt text should without doubt be counted as the work of a third, completely different translator, incomparably more competent that the two others.

However, Walker's opinion of the Mary of Egypt translator may be a somewhat charitable one, and if we apply the more severe criteria that were used to assess the Spanish Magdalene and Martha translations, principally that of judging every deviation from the French original to be significant, then there emerge at least twenty errors, divided as follows, with references to pages and lines in Walker 1977. For the French original, references are to page numbers in Baker 1916.
Errors in the Spanish Mary of Egypt life of MS Sp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of error</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Unknown vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) errors: 5,4; 21,10; 27,1; 30,10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) omissions: 5,6; 24,20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Faux amis: 9,20; 12,14; 20,15; 27,14; 28,11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Syntax: 7,8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Misreadings: 9,5; 16,9; 17,12; 23,6; 31,14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Inattention: 3,6; 23,23; 25,8; 28,7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reasons for believing that the above are errors of translation are given very briefly in the following pages.

(1)(a) Errors due to unknown vocabulary

288 sanz seu de pere/5,4 syn mandado de padre
The fall of the medial consonant in descendants of Latin sapere probably rendered seu unrecognizable to the translator.

337 nul qui ofe parler de guerre/21,10 ninguno non oes fablar de guerra. Parts of outr pose problems in translation, cf. Magdalene C11,13 and Martha F35,9, and see Walker 1977,XXIX.

361 au ruissel/27,1 aquel logar. The Spaniard probably did not know the exclusively Northern French ruissel.

373 oz tu/30,10 do eres tu. The Spaniard seems not to have known the exclamative oz, though at some stage a French scribe may have misread an exclamative o for ou; see Walker 1977,38, note 40.
(i)(b) Omissions due to unknown vocabulary

289 la mestre rue/5,6 la rrúa. The Spaniard seems not to have known the meaning 'main' of the French mestre.

352 et tel leum/24,20 omits. The fall of the medial consonant in the passage of Latin legumen to leum may have rendered the Old French term unrecognizable to the Spaniard.

(ii) Faux amis

303 en la presse/9,20 en la mayor priesa. Presse 'crowd' has been confused with priesa 'hurry'.

312 ala droit a l'image/12,14 tornose a la imagen e parose en derecho della. The Spaniard has taken the wrong sense of droit ('to the right' rather than 'straight'); cf. 18,11 where it is correctly translated.

336 tu l'as servi/20,15 tú lo meresciste. The Spaniard probably used a French version containing deservi (see Walker 1977,36 note 21) which means 'served' or 'deserved'; he selected the wrong meaning.

364 pour sainte Eglise et pour le peuple meismement/27,14 por santa eglesia e por el pueblo e por ella e por sí mesmo. The Spaniard has been misled by the element meisme- in meismement.

367 le cors a qui tout-li mons ne pouroit comparer/28,11 el cuerpo que todo el mundo non podría comprar. French comparer means 'to compare' (cf n'a se per in the verse version), while the Spaniard has been misled by its form into translating by comprar 'to buy'.

(iii) Syntactic error

296 que je n'ai qu'un seul denier/7,8 que sól non he un dinero. This syntactic blunder is mentioned in Walker 1977, XXIX.
(iv) Misreadings

302 ele ot tant sa folie avivee/9,5 ella ovo toda su follia conplida. The translator might have read avivee as aunee 'accumulated', of which conplida is an approximate rendering.

323 il vivoient moult povrement/16,11 ellos bivian fuerte vida de pan d'orde. Considering the following list of victuals, it seems likely that the translator misread the first syllable of povrement as pan, and invented the rest.

326 il verront le filz Dieu/17,2 verná el fijo de Dios. Cf Walker XXIX, who assumes this to be a scribal error.

344 Deus li voudra demander/23,6 Dios gelo verná demandar. The translator apparently read voudra as vendra.

377 aucuns de ses freres/31,14 alguna de sus fechos. This error bears the marks of a misreading by the translator.

(v) Inattention

286 en sa jouvente/3,6 entre su compaňa. See Walker 1977,33.

348 bessa/23,23 vio

353 tendoit les mains vers le ciel/25,8 erguyó los ojos contra el cielo

366 sa proie ou la beste sauvage/28,7 su prea que dixa en el monte

The Spanish life of Saint Mary of Egypt is much longer than the other two texts (over 28 columns of MS Sp, compared with eight for Magdalene and eighteen for Martha), so that the frequency of errors is lower in Mary of Egypt for almost all the categories (i) to (v) than in either of the other two texts. One may conjecture that a third, more competent translator was at work; that the Mary of Egypt text was
easier to translate; or that Mary of Egypt was the work of one of the other two translators, now more experienced in the task. The puzzling fact is that, on the evidence of the errors alone, the level of competence of the Mary of Egypt translator is greater than that of either of the other two, but closer to that of the Magdalene translator.

Thus, unless we assume that the collection of translations in MS Sp was the work of a team of translators (Magdalene and Mary of Egypt being produced by one translator, Martha by another), the evidence of the translators' errors points to a later compilation of a number of independently executed translations from French.
II The Spanish Translators' Additions

Both Spanish texts have in parts been expanded in translation. The most frequent additions are those which clarify or explain part of the French original, sometimes to the extent of labouring an obvious point. Other additions may be classed as stylistic improvements. Also common are additions which increase the devotional character of the texts, which are possibly the work of very pious translators. The remaining additions do not appear consistently throughout the texts, and include additions which make direct speech more dramatic, and the addition of some terms to form synonymous pairs, unexpected in the case of translators usually seeking to suppress superfluous terms.

These various types of addition and expansion are examined below for the Magdalene and Martha translations, under the following headings:

(i) Clarifying and explicative additions;
(ii) Additions for stylistic improvement;
(iii) Pious additions;
(iv) Additions to direct speech;
(v) Creation of synonymous pairs.
Additions to the Spanish Magdalene Text

(i) Clarifying and explicative additions

If we include cases of additional Spanish rubric\(^\text{78}\), there are fifteen instances of this type of addition in the Magdalene text. Two illustrative examples are discussed, and the remaining cases are quoted without comment.

\[\text{C6,15} \quad \text{Après ce q'il furent eínssint enseignié e amonestee}\]

\[\text{Sp6,16} \quad \text{Después que ellos fueron cruzados e aprendieron que de sant Pedro podrian saber aquello}\]

The underlined portion is a typical Spanish explicative addition: to leave no doubt what is meant by eínssint... amonestee, which refers back to C6,13 ge per... dist, the Spaniard has repeated in the underlined portion the material already translated two lines earlier at Sp6,13 que por... dixiera. This explicative addition seems somewhat laboured, but may have been necessitated by the inclusion in Spanish of the rubric Commo pario la duenna, which separates the two repeated phrases; some recapitulation may have been felt necessary to provide a link between the two sections thus formed.

\[\text{C11,16} \quad \text{Li cors de lui gist ausi come uns vessiaux voids, e li emfes l'alaita}\]

\[\text{Sp11,17} \quad \text{el cuerpo della yazia asy commo un vaso vazio. E de aquel vaso vazio tomava el ninno leche}\]

Apparently to avoid any doubt about what is meant by the French pronoun, the Spanish translator has spelt it out by the repetitive addition of the underlined portion, a typical clarifying addition.

Other cases are listed below:

\[\text{C2,1} \quad \text{la generacioun malveise}\]

\[\text{Sp2,1} \quad \text{la mala gent de la villa}\]
These cases suggest that the Spaniard was a painstaking worker, eager for every detail of his original to be clearly understood by his public. This preoccupation has sometimes led to inelegant repetition and to statements of the obvious.
(ii) Addition for stylistic improvement

In one case in the Magdalene text, an addition has the effect of considerably improving the style of the French original:

C12,13 par qi amonestement e par quele chose il estoit la venuz
Sp12,13 por cuyo mandado prendiera la cruz, e por que veniera alli

The two underlined elements in French are very close in meaning, and almost repetitive; the Spaniard's addition of prendiera la cruz serves to differentiate the two elements, thus removing the stylistic defect.

(iii) Pious additions

Several additions suggest that the Spaniard wished to produce a work of a more devotional character than his original, e.g.

C2,21 lor desamonesta ele les sacrificies
Sp2,21 les mandava que non feziesen sacrificio a los ydolos, e que aquel creyesen e adorasen que todo el mundo feziera e formara

Similarly the translator's treatment of the names of characters suggests that he regarded them with piety, giving them a longer form than the mere needs of identification would require, e.g.

C1,11 nostre sires
Sp1,11 nuestro sennor Jesu Xristo

Other cases of this type of pious addition are listed below:
la bénédite Magdeline
la bendita santa Maria Magdalena

The Spaniard shows a greater reverence for the scriptures by first quoting 'Beatus venter... in Latin before translating.

s'esvanoi
la bendita Magdalena fuese
Marie Magdalaïne
santa Maria Madalena

Ge command a ton Dieu
Yo te demando e rruego que rruegues a tu Dios
del signe de la croiz
del sennal de la cruz santa

la Magdaleine
santa Maria Magdalena

el vendito apostol vio

la duenna

Some of these additions (such as the inclusion of santa in the name of the saint) may simply be part of the varying correspondences of proper names between the French and Spanish versions, some being added or expanded, others reduced or suppressed: at C3,19 the Spaniard adds la duenna but omits a son mari, and at C5,11 he replaces la dame by ella, for example. Nevertheless, there emerges a tendency on the part of the Spanish translator to add elements of a devotional nature, and to add pious epithets to names of characters or objects.
(iv) Additions to direct speech

The Spaniard has apparently attempted to make the passages of direct speech more life-like and dramatic by the addition of material not present in the French original; in one case at C5,1 he has even changed French indirect speech into direct speech:

C5,1 Lors dist la dame q'ele looit mieus
Sp5,1 E ella dixo, 'Yo lo querria e ternia por mejor

The other cases of this type of addition are given below:

C4,4 Tiranz
Sp4,4 Omne de grant crueza

C4,12 Tu voiz q'il sont desconforteez e n'ont point d'ostel e tu les trespasses
Sp4,12 Tu ves que ellos son des confortados, e non los confortas. Tu ves que non an posada, e non gela das; tu pasas por ellos e non los catas

C6,1 les voiez sont trop gries
Sp6,1 las carrerassson luengas e malas de andar

C8,1 li noutonier cricicent
Sp8,1 los marineros dar bozes e dezir

C8,8 suffrez
Sp8,8 sofrid vos un poco

C9,19 purqoi venis tu au port de Marseille
Sp9,19 por que veniste tu nunca al puerto de Marsella

C9,20 por mon essil
Sp9,21 por mi desterramiento veniste tu y

C10,6 s'il est puissanz
Sp10,7 sy el es tan poderoso commo tu pedricas
(v) Creation of synonymous pairs

It will be seen in the examination of the translator's omissions in section III that the Spaniard has often suppressed superfluous material, notably near-synonymous pairs, which are already scarce in the French versions, as observed in chapters IV and VI. It therefore seems strange that the Spaniard should at the same time have created some such pairs:

C2,15 enfant
Sp2,15 fijo nin fija

C4,2 a grant fremissement
Sp4,2 muy ssannuda...e muy temerosa

C6,1 trop gries
Sp6,1 luengas e malas de andar

C9,13 li leus estoit si durs
Sp9,13 fallo el suelo tan duro e tan pedregoso

It may be significant that the last three of these cases of near-synonymous pairs appear at critical and dramatic moments in the narrative, which the translator wished to emphasize.
Additions to the Spanish Martha Text

(i) Clarifying and explicative additions

Some typical examples are discussed, followed by a list of the other cases.

F13,8 ce fet a savoir la contemplative e l'active
Sp13,8 que llaman en latin contemplativa e activa.
Contemplativa es de los cielos, e activa vida es del mundo

By making the underlined addition, the Spaniard seems to be spelling out a potentially difficult passage for his public. The same procedure is followed again in connection with the same two terms contemplativa...activa:

F13,9 a cez .ii. serors apropria
Sp13,11 e diolas a estas ermanas anbas, la contemplativa a santa Maria Madalena, e la activa a santa Marta

The above examples are explicative additions, defining and explaining possibly difficult terms; others, usually shorter, may be called clarifying additions, which remove ambiguities or make a passage more precise or more complete:

F14,16 la (sentence) nostre seigneur qui dist
Sp14,16 el juizio que nuestro sennor diera quando dixo

F17,12 vien en la terre que je te mousterrai, e je te fera croistre
Sp17,14 vee a la tierra que te yo mostrare, e ally te fare crescer

Here the underlined portions have the effect of removing all possible ambiguity from the French versions. The other cases of such additions are listed below.

F12,6 pour ce que toute chose peut avenir...cest...ot
Sp12,6 porque todas las cosas puede aver...por ende ovo esta
'Ladre vienz fors'

'Lazar va fuera', e asy fue

e a ceulz qui
e otrosi las dio a todos aquello que

les reugles de religion

las reglas de religion e de orden

ca aquella sazon quantos creyen en nuestro sennor
non avian propios ningunos

ne lor volt mie douner

non quiso...dar a estos santos

de la croiz en enfer
de la cruz descendo al infierno

Ausint nostres sires a saint Marthe

Asy fezo nuestro sennor a santa Marta

sor une grant roche sor le Rosne

sobre una grant penna que estava ssobre el rrio
de Rrodano

una animalia a que llamavan dragon

d'autres angoisses

de otras coytas que ovo

ele vesqui de glant

non bivio ssy non de vellotas

sa table estoit commune

ssu mesa era communal a todos
F28,17 tres lanapadas que ardian
Sp28,17 " . . III. lampes

F31,13 la pasion Jhesucrist... en e brieu
Sp31,13 la pasion de Jesu Xristo... escrita en ebraico

F33,2 Le jour d'un diemenche après
Sp33,2 El domingo después fue soterrada

F33,5 A Pierregort sainz Frons li evesques... chantoit
Sp33,6 la messe

F35,14 e ne douterla pas lors que Dieu dira, 'Alez...
Sp35,14 e por esto non duldara ella quando Dios dira en

F36,15 e le seella de son seel
Sp36,14 e sello ende privillejo con su anillo en que
tenya su sello

F36,16 fist le leu franc e l'iglise franche
Sp36,15 e fezo el logar e la eglesias cotada e quita de
todo fuero

F37,3 fescoit larrecin ouvrant ou faus jugement ou faus
serement ou adultere ou aucune forssenerie
Sp37,5 fazia furto o robo, o diese falso juyzio, o
jurase falsedade e feziese fornizio, o feziese
alguna sandeçe

F37,17 furent entour son sepulchre
Sp37,19 servieron en aquella eglesia do la sepultura de
santa Marta era

F38,7 par li apert que
Sp38,9 bien pareció por ella e por sus obras que

The underlined portions of the Spanish translation have been added or expanded apparently to explain or clarify the passage concerned; some of the additions, however, are not essential to the clarity or comprehensibility of the Spanish.
text, and sometimes seem to spell out the sense of the passage in a rather laboured way, as if for a public of modest learning. Some additions of this type seem to be redundant, e.g.

F24,11 le mist on devant les piez sainte Marthe
Sp24,12 tomaronlo e echaronlo ante los pies de santa Marta

F25,1 qui commandes a la mort e ele s'enfuit
Sp25,2 que mandas a la muerte que fuia, e fuge

(ii) Additions for stylistic improvement

On the other hand, several of the Spaniard's additions considerably improve the style of the French original:

F13,3 ausint il qui lessoit les palais des rois volt estre herbergiez
Sp13,3 asy dexo las casas de los reyes e de los otros príncipes do podiera posar, e quiso posar

The French qui lessoit les palais des rois is obscure, and the difficulty has been removed by the addition of do podiera posar.

F15,15 Aucun
Sp15,15 E algunos otros

The Spanish addition of otros serves to distinguish those imprisoned from those expelled.

F15,18 aucun mistrent en nef
Sp15,19 algunos metieron en barcas...e enbiaronlos por la mar a aventura

The Spanish version is more readily comprehensible because of the addition; in the French text it seems that the persecuted Christians may not have left shore!
lor douna plus en autres terres

F16,2
dio mas bien en las tierras agenas que en las suyas

Sp16,1

Again the obscurity of the French text is elucidated by the Spanish addition.

quant li gaaigneur du pais ne le pooint veintre, il oirent

F20,11

Quando los labradores de la tierra vieron que lo non podian venger, oyeron

Sp20,13

The French version is a translation of E20,11 Cum autem incole nullo modo eum perimere nequissent, audierunt..., where the context suggests that cum means 'since' rather than 'when' (French quant). By the addition of vieron que, the Spanish translator has corrected the awkward presentation of events caused by the French mistranslation.

ala la e trova le dragon

F20,16

fue alla e levo agua bendita e una cruz, e fallole

Sp20,18

The addition of the underlined portion explains how the saint came to possess her two weapons for her subsequent battle with the dragon (cf. Sp21,1 E mostrole la cruz e echole del agua bendita). In the French version, their sudden appearance at F21,1 is puzzling.
(iii) Pious additions

As in the case of the Magdalene text, the translator of the Spanish Martha text has added material which suggests a desire to make the work more pious, and a reverential attitude towards the characters of the narrative, reflected in the fact that their names or titles are given a form longer than would be necessary merely to identify them. These cases are listed below:

F12,17 chascun pecheor penitent
Sp12,17 cada un pecador que de sus pecados dolier

F14,22 la Magdalainne
Sp14,22 santa Maria Madalena

F14,23 nostre seigneur
Sp14,23 nuestro sennor Jesu Xristo

F16,14 toute France a saint Denise
Sp16,14 toda Franquia a sant Dionis, toda Espanna a Santiago

F17,8 lor
Sp17,10 a estos santos

F18,16 la Magdalainne
Sp18,17 ssanta Maria Madalena

F19,11 Marie
Sp19,11 ssanta Maria Madalena

F21,22 Marie Magdalainne
Sp21,23 santa Maria Magdalena

F22,7 elle auna le covant de ses freres
Sp22,6 yunto convento de ssus hermanos que tornara a la fe de Jesu Xristo

F22,8 une...eglie de nostre dame
Sp22,8 una...eglesia a omrra de nuestra sennora ssanta Maria
en ton repos
en tu santa folgança
avec son hoste
con su buen huesped Jesu Xristo
li un siaumeoient e li autre plouroient
los unos rrezavan salmos, e los otros oraciones, e otros lloravan
t'ottesse
a tu amiga santa Marta
l'ame
el alma de santa Marta
ceste beneoite sainte
la bendita santa Marta
aions la sainte en memoire
vamos alla en su rremenbrança, e fagamosle nuestros ruegos e nuestras oraciones
devant Dieu
ante Dios Jesu Xristo nuestro salvador
qui (recevrонт) les povres en lor hostel
que rresçibiran los pobres en sus posadas, asy commo deven syn dubdar ninguna cosa
prenez le regne
tomad el rregno de los cielos

As in the case of the Magdalene translation, the majority of the pious additions are made in connection with names and titles. All those listed above suggest that the translator treated his work with piety and reverence.
(iv) **Additions to direct speech**

Only two very minor cases of this type of addition occur in the Martha text, and both are in the same passage of direct speech:

F34,9 Une merveilleuse chose est avenue: Jhesucrist m'a mené a l'oseque sainte Marthe s'otesse

Sp34,9 Ca muy grant maravilla me aveno agora: Jesu Xristo me tomo e levo al enterramiento de santa Marta su huespeda

Compared with the eight cases in Magdalene, the incidence of this type of addition is thus much lower in Martha. These differing frequencies may show that the Martha text is the work of a different translator, although the passages of direct speech in the Magdalene text occur in much more dramatic circumstances, and express more human emotions, than those in Martha, and thus provide more scope for expansion.

(v) **Creation of synonymous pairs**

As in the Magdalene text, there are several examples of the introduction of terms to form synonymous or near-synonymous pairs:

F21,3 se tint cois
Sp21,2 estovo quedo e manso

F22,1 combien ele souffri
Sp22,1 quanta...sorrió e paso

F22,4 de glant
Sp22,5 de vellotas e de landes

F22,11 En yver...i. pelicon e i. mantel avoit
Sp22,12 En el inbierno, bestia un pellote e cobria un gulame
The evidence of the Spanish additions

The numbers of these five types of additions are given below; a few additions appear in more than one category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of addition</th>
<th>Magdalene</th>
<th>Martha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Clarifying and explicative</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Stylistic improvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Pious additions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Direct speech</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Synonymous pairs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the Martha text is about twice as long as Magdalene, the frequency of types (i), (iii) and (v) is approximately the same in each text. Type (ii) is much more frequent in Martha, and type (iv) much more frequent in Magdalene.

The different concentrations of these two types of addition may indicate two translators, though against this there is the evidence of the very similar frequencies for the other three types of addition. The greater frequency of improving additions (ii) in Martha may show that the same translator was becoming more skilful as his task progressed, while the more numerous additions to direct speech (iv) in Magdalene may be explained by the more dramatic subject-matter, which gives more opportunity for such additions.
III The Spanish Translators' Omissions

Some of the omissions in the Spanish translations show a developed sense of style, and close attention to an orderly and concise presentation of the elements of the French originals. Other omissions might be seen as the suppression of material that is dispensable though not always redundant, while further omissions remove from the French texts features which might have been thought attractive to an audience; these omissions therefore detract from the originals. Yet other omissions are in areas where the Spanish translators' usage is variable: in the treatment of titles and identities, of narrative formulae and of common collocations.

A separate group of omissions have been discussed in section I, i(b) above, pp. 338-41, where they were attributed to the translators' defective knowledge of French. Also, in certain cases, apparent Spanish omissions are in reality later French scribal additions to the texts, just as some Spanish additions in reality represent French scribal omissions.

The different types of omission are discussed below for each Spanish translation, under the following headings:

(i) Improving omissions;

(ii) Omissions of redundant material;

(iii) Detracting omissions;

(iv) Omissions in the treatment of titles and identities;

(v) Omission of narrative formulae;

(vi) Omission in the treatment of common collocations.
Omissions from the Spanish Magdalene Text

(i) Improving omissions

In several places the French text, following the Latin life closely, has an excessively complex syntax and a style lacking in conciseness. In the cases discussed below the Spaniard has attempted to remedy this complexity and diffuseness:

C1,2 Apres ce que nostre sires...ot veincu la mort;
quant s'umaniteez fu glorifiee e il monta es ciels

Sp1,2 Despues que nuestro sennor...ovo vençida la muerte,
e fue glorificado e sobido a los cielos

The French text has largely adhered to the Latin devicto mortis imperio, glorificata humanitatis substantia (B1,4), resulting in changes of subject and a complicated sentence. The Spanish version loses little of the sense by the omission of s'umaniteez, and avoids the complexity and awkwardness of the French by the suppression of quant, thus making all three subordinate clauses depend on the initial Despues que.

C5,7 comenda que la seinte gent fuit herbergié et q'en lor donast ce qe mestier lor serroit
Sp5,7 mando que diessen a la santa conpanna posada e lo que les fuese menester

The two French subordinate clauses depending on comenda que (closely following B5,7'precipiens...hospitari et...erogari) are in Spanish condensed into one concise clause by changes which allow a single verb diessen to be used.

C5,13 li sires apareilla son oirre
Sp5,14 guisose el sennor

As discussed in section I, p.338 the omission of oirre may be the result of ignorance, but could equally represent the substitution of a more concise expression.
il vit une montaigne qui estoit pres de la nef.  
Quant il la vit, il pensa

vio la nave yr por cerca de una montanna; e penso

Quant il la vit translates B9,1 Quo viso, a connective relative construction quite usual in Latin, but not necessary here in French since it repeats the immediately preceding il vit. The Spaniard has corrected this defect by the elimination of Quant il la vit.

Tenez vos un pou, e prenez
Tomad

The Spaniard may have suppressed Tenez vos un pou e as excessive here because he saw that the pilgrim has already used two very similar expressions in this same plea: C8,8 suffrez and C8,14 suffrez un pou.

meteëz le cors de ceste dame
ponedme la duenna

il couvri le cors de la dame
cobrio la duenna

The Spaniard's great attention to detail is reflected in the omission of le cors in these two cases: he does not wish to state that the pilgrim's wife is dead, since she is later discovered to be sleeping. The same consideration may also explain the omission of the phrase si pristrent le cors de la dame e l'enfant at C9,14.

e la couvrirent de son mantel
omits

cobrio la duenna e el ninno de su manto

The French text has the pilgrim cover his wife and child with his cloak on two occasions, thus perpetuating the
error of the Latin version, which reads clamide superposita at B9,11, then clamide...operuit at B10,8. The Spaniard has corrected this defect by omitting the first occurrence, a correction which seems to imply that, to discover such a defect, he had read the entire episode beforehand.

C11,20\textsuperscript{89} ne vent nel pout grever, (ne) yveer (ne) esteez ne li nuisoit

Sp11,20 nin viento nin elada nin enbierno nin calentura non le enpescia

The use of two largely synonymous verbs in French (following B11,20 sollicitat...perurit) makes the French text verbose here; the Spaniard has neatly rendered both verbs by the single enpescia 'damaged'.\textsuperscript{90}

C12,7 Il ot bon vent qui menoit la nef a force, e vint au port q'il avoit tant desiree. E quant il ot pris port si issi hors

Sp12,8 La nave ovo buen viento e llego cedo al puerto que deseava, e salieron fuera

The French version is diffuse and repetitive here, and the Spaniard has improved on his original by neatly rendering all the underlined portions of the French with the words e llego cedo al puerto, an economy achieved with no loss of sense.

We should also record here that the Spaniard has reduced some synonymous pairs of words, thus achieving greater conciseness of style with negligible loss of sense. It should also be noted, however, that the translator has also created some such pairs (see II(v) above), and that some of the pairs may have been reduced more through ignorance than design. The four cases concerned are listed below:

C3,5 ses serjans que ele quidoit ses feables e ses amis

Sp3,6 sus siervos que entendio quel eran leales
In most of the cases discussed above in section (i), it seems clear that the Spanish omissions have been made in conscious attempts to improve on the French original, whose stylistic defects often result from excessively close adherence to its Latin predecessor.

However, beside these cases of attentive workmanship, there are many more where the translator's motives for omission are not clear: many of the cases recorded seem to involve the omission of superfluous material; and yet the material omitted is often no more superfluous than the material added in the cases discussed above as 'clarifying and explicative additions' (see II(i) above). Some omissions actually detract from the original, while others involve material which it is very untypical for the translator to omit. One is therefore often left with the impression that the translation procedure is not consistent, and that frequently nothing more significant than the translator's whim might account for some of the cases where translation and original do not correspond.

Nevertheless, despite these reservations, the remaining cases of material omitted by the Spaniard are listed below, with possible reasons for the omission.
(ii) Omission of redundant material

In the following cases, the material omitted in translation may be classed as dispensable, though considering the translator's frequent desire to clarify and explain (see section II(i) above), some of the omissions seem slightly inconsistent with his usual translation procedures.

C5,16 Quant la dame l'ot apareceu, si vint a son seignor e li dist
Sp5,16 Quando lo su mugier sopo, dixole

C6,9 mist le signe de la croiz en lor espaules, e pur ceste purviance que li soduianz anemis
Sp6,9 puso la sseninal de la cruz en las ssus espaldas, que el diablo

C6,13 enseigna ele mult bien qe
Sp6,12 ensennoles que

C9,9 la promesse de l'argent, e par le gain q'il disirrierent
Sp9,9 la promesa del aver que deseavan

C9,14 n'i pot en foir en nule maniere
Sp9,14 la non pudo soterrar

C11,13 aleste l'enfant de sa mamele
Sp11,13 da leche al ninno

One such omission is particularly unexpected:

C5,11 concit la dame par la priere a la benoite Magdaleine
Sp5,11 ella congebio

The phrase omitted by the Spaniard is similar to the type of material which he frequently added in order to accentuate the devotional character of the work (see pious additions at II(iii) above); it is therefore an untypical omission.
(iii) Detracting omissions

While the omissions at (ii) involve dispensable material, those discussed below involve the loss of details that an audience may have found interesting and attractive; these omissions thus detract from the French original.

C3,5 envoi...en repost a mengier a ces seintes genz
Sp3,5 embio dar de comer a aquellos omes

The secrecy of the wife's behaviour is explained in the following sentence: Qar elle doutoit la cruauté de son mari...; since en repost is not translated in Spanish, the following sentence Ca sse temia mucho de la crueza de su marido has little purpose.

C6,18 firent marchié au noutonier e entrerent en la nef
Sp6,19 entraron en una nave

C7,19 E li noutoniers atornerent les antoines e les autres aornemen de la nef e se mistrent en meer.
Et quant il orent alee
Sp7,3 e andaron

While these two material details of the journey are not vital to the narrative, their omission certainly makes the Spanish version much less colourful and more austere than its French original.

C8,4 bien esproveechose chose par mout experimenz
Sp8,4 cosa bien provada

Another interesting detail has been suppressed in translation.

C8,11 l'enfant qui pleure e quiere la mamele
Sp8,11 el ninno que demanda la teta

The omission of pleure again detracts from the translation.
(iv) **Omissions in the treatment of titles and identities**

The translator seems to have no consistent approach to titles and identities; for while he has often made additions in this area (see II(iii) above), there are also the following cases of omission:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C3,7</td>
<td>a ces seintes genz</td>
<td>Sp3,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4,1</td>
<td>Marie... la benoite Magdaleine</td>
<td>Sp4,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5,5</td>
<td>a Marie Magdaleine</td>
<td>Sp5,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5,15</td>
<td>nostre seignor Jhesu Crist</td>
<td>Sp5,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6,9</td>
<td>la Magdaleine</td>
<td>Sp6,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8,11</td>
<td>la mamele la mere</td>
<td>Sp8,11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(v) **Omission of narrative formulae**

Certain recurrent narrative formulae used in the French text have been omitted by the Spaniard, though his treatment of them is not consistent:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2,17</td>
<td>comenca a prechier</td>
<td>Sp2,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12,13</td>
<td>il comenca a demander</td>
<td>Sp12,13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
avint que la fame...envoit
la mugier...enbio

avint que ele se dormoit
dormia

avint...que li sires jut a sa femme
aveno quel sennor yogo con su mugier

il li covient qu'ele enfantast
comencó que queria aver ssu fijo

covint qu'ele morust
morio ende

(vi) Omissions in the treatment of common collocations

This type of omission is frequent in the Martha text, but rare in Magdalene. The only clear case is given below:

aus noutoniers de la nef
a los marineros

The omission of de la nef is similar to the cases found in the Martha text, where one element of a common collocation is omitted with little loss of sense, since the remaining element still implies the original collocation. There are two other possible cases of this type of omission, though they have already been included under other headings:

les ondes des flòs
las ondas

See also I(i)(b) and III(i) for this omission.

la mamele la mere
la teta

See also III(iv) for this omission.
There is one case where a collocation reduced in the Martha text remains intact in the Spanish Magdalene translation:

C6,9    le signe de la croiz
Sp6,9   la sennal de la cruz

See below at Martha (vi) under F21,1.
Omissions from the Spanish Martha text

The omissions made by the Spanish Martha translator are now discussed under the same headings as for the Magdalene text.

(i) Improving omissions

As in the Magdalene text, there are cases where the Martha translator has evidently removed parts of his French original in order to avoid repetition, pleonasm and diffuseness, and to achieve a more logical presentation of events. Again, these are often attempts to correct the defects in the French text caused by excessively close adherence to the Latin original.

F12,19 le deliverra de ses pechiez e le fera sauf
Sp12,18 sera de sus pecados libre e salvo

The Spaniard has reduced the two clauses of the French into one by the use of the single verb sera, thus making the text more concise without loss of meaning.

F14,10 Ore dirons des ore mes
Sp14,10 Agora fablaremos

The Spaniard has avoided the repetition of his original.

F14,13 Comment madame sainte Marthe devisa tout son propre e dona tout pour l'amour de nostre seigneur Jhesucrist
Sp14,13 Commo santa Marta partio lo que avia en servicio de Dios

Again the translation is made less diffuse than the original through the conflation of two clauses into one. However, E14,13 Quomodo suum proprium divisit is simpler than both Romance versions, and there is often a lack of correspondence in rubrics.
ele valoit mieux repeats devant tous les autres, the French verbosity being the result of close adherence to pre ceteris sodalibus...magis proficiebat. The repetition has been eliminated in the Spanish translation.

The pleonastic qui ne crecient, itself an error of the French translator, has been eliminated by the Spaniard.

The French translation contains a verbose rendering of hospita...confidens; the Spaniard has conflated the two French clauses into one.

In the French version, Christ and St Front arrive in Tarascon part-way through the funeral service, so that des le commencement is inappropriate. The Spaniard has shown great attention to detail by avoiding this inaccuracy. The inaccuracy originates in the omission in French of vellent, a term which suggests that the service did not begin until the arrival of Christ and St Front.
The Spaniard has again avoided the awkward repetition of the French.

The Spaniard has also reduced a number of synonymous or near-synonymous pairs of words, though it should be noted that, as with the Magdalene translation, rather more such pairs have been created than have been suppressed, as discussed at II(v) above.

(ii) Omission of redundant material

While the omissions and contractions discussed above are clearly desirable modifications made by the translator, the reasons for other types of omission are not so obvious; those listed below neither improve nor damage the translation:
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qui passoient par le Rosne
en el río

touz jours preeschoit
ella pedricava

ele commença plus à languir qu'ele ne souloit
començó ella a enfermar

que elle avoit aportee avec soi
que ella truxiera

Le jour d'un dimanche après en mi l'église
El domingo después

lor dist a touz
les dixo

en tesmoing de ceste chose
por testimonio

As in the Magdalene translation, the Martha version omits two phrases which, while not essential to the sense, constitute the type of material which the Spaniard has elsewhere always included or even added:

ne nous chaille des choses terriennes mes touz jours des celestieux
despreciaremos las cosas terrenales

Since we have already observed at II(iii) above the Spaniard's attempts to emphasize the devotional nature of the text, this omission seems to be out of character.

a ceuls que l'envie des Juis enchaga
a aquellos

The omission of the underlined material is also untypical of the translator: as discussed at II(i) above, he has often included or added such clarifying details.
(iii) Detracting omissions

Some omissions involve the loss of attractive phrases and similes, of dramatic and interesting detail, and a reduction of clarity:

F12,1 le norri enfant d'un jour
Sp12,1 lo crio ninno

F20,16 trova le dragon el bois sor. i. home que il avoit estranglé, e le mengoit
Sp20,19 fallole que estava comiendo un omne

F21,3 ele de sa sainture le lia, e maintenant le pueple de lances e de pierres le tuerent
Sp21,3 ella lo ato con su çinta

F26,16 ele estoit mere e norrice, ausint comme la norrice norrist son enfant e la geline ses poucins
Sp26,17 era ella madre e ama

F30,6 je venrai encore a toi
Sp30,6 yo verne a ty

In the context, encore is essential to the sense.

(iv) Omissions in the treatment of titles and identities

As in the Magdalene text, the translator does not treat consistently the titles of characters, or terms serving to identify them; for, beside those added or expanded (see II(iii) above), the following have been omitted or shortened:

F12,1 La virge
Sp12,1 Aquella

F19,11 sainte Marthe
Sp19,11 ella
The translator has eliminated from the text the three cases where the French version uses a formula, frequently encountered in prose works, declaring an intention to be brief:

(v) Omission of narrative formulae

F14,11 dirons...briefment
Sp14,11 fablaremos

F24,8 vint au fons. Que vous diriez ge plus? Li home de la vile
Sp24,9 fuese a fondo. E todos los omnes de la villa

F27,5 dirons briefment
Sp27,5 fablar vos hemos

(vi) Omission in the treatment of common collocations

A type of omission or reduction frequent in the Martha translation, but rare in the Magdalene text, is the suppression of one element of a common combination of two terms. This is generally achieved with little or no loss of sense, since the simpler form still implies the longer one:

F12,16 par la proiere sainte Marthe
Sp12,16 por santa Marta

F14,10 par le tesmoinge des eiwangiles
Sp14,10 por los evangelios
It is above all this type of omission, frequent in the Spanish Martha translation, but almost absent from the Magdalene text, which suggests two different translation techniques, and therefore two different Spanish translators.
The evidence of the Spanish omissions

The numbers of these six types of Spanish omission are given in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of omission</th>
<th>Magdalene</th>
<th>Martha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Improving omissions</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Redundant material</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Detracting omissions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Titles and identities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Narrative formulae</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) Common collocations</td>
<td>1 (possibly 3)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To compare the additions made to each translation, as in section II above, is very informative, since additions are necessarily deliberate, and therefore positive indications of possible differences in translation techniques. However, a comparison of the numbers of omissions for each translation is a less reliable guide to possible differences of translation technique, since omissions may often be involuntary, and since different texts may offer differing numbers of opportunities for omission. Also the distribution of the omissions among the six categories is not always unambiguous, and is inevitably subjective.

Thus a comparison of the frequency of the types of omission discussed under headings (ii), (iii), (iv) and (v) probably sheds no light on the question of whether the translations are the work of the same or of different translators.
However, with the reservations stated above, the relative frequencies of types (i) and (vi) possibly are significant, since these two kinds of omission appear to be deliberate, positive attempts at improvement.

The frequency of improving omissions is about twice as great in the Magdalene text as in Martha, and the reduction of common collocations is rare in Magdalene, but frequent in Martha. These facts seem to indicate that the Spanish texts were the work of two different translators.
IV The Spanish Translators’ Changes

Several of the changes made during translation into Spanish, and not involving addition or omission, are improvements over the French originals from the point of view of style, logical presentation of events, or appropriateness of vocabulary. Some other changes, which produce equivalents or paraphrases instead of direct translations, are not easily explained except as whims of the translators. Other types of changes are those concerned with the identification of characters, those which are evidence of the Spaniards’ piety, those which appear to show the use of stock descriptions and formulae, and finally those involving the verb ‘to go’ and associated terms.

These various types of change are examined below, first for the Magdalene text, then for Martha, under the following headings:

(i) Improving changes;

(ii) Changes producing equivalents and paraphrases;

(iii) Changes in identification of characters;

(iv) Pious changes;

(v) Changes involving stock descriptions and formulae;

(vi) Changes involving the verb ‘to go’ and associated terms.
(1) **Improving changes**

In the following cases the translator's changes have improved the Spanish version compared with its French original:

**C2,22**  
Il venoient tuit a li quant qe avoient oie sa parole, e après l'escoutoient il plus volontiers

**Sp2,24**  
Aquellos todos que oyan la su palabra yvan despues a ella mas de grado

The order of events in French (and Latin, see B2,17) is confused, while the Spanish rearrangement makes more sense.

**C3,5**  
envoit par ses serjans que ele quidoit ses feables e ses amis en repost a mengier a ces seintes genz

**Sp3,5**  
enbio dar de comer a aquellos omes por sus siervos que entendio quel eran leales

The awkward separation by several lines of envoit and a mengier is avoided by the Spaniard.

**C3,8**  
la desleauté de ceux enter

**Sp3,8**  
la deslealtad de los que bivian con el

Both ceux enter and Latin gentium vicinarum (B3,8) are imprecise and ambiguous; the Spaniard has clarified the phrase.

**C5,1**  
Lors dist la dame q'ele locit miesus

**Sp5,1**  
E ella dixo, 'Yo lo querría e ternia por mejor

The Spaniard has used direct speech in order to dramatize the exchanges between husband and wife; see section II(iv) above, but also chapter I, section III(i), p. 48.
The immediate juxtaposition of the two pieces of direct speech makes the Spanish rendering read much more like an authentic argument.

The Spaniard has avoided further subordination in an already complex sentence.

The two underlined parts in French represent an unnecessary and obvious repetition; the Spaniard has retained the repetition, but has made it less obvious by a rearrangement of the word-order in which the repeated elements are no longer juxtaposed.

This case is similar to that quoted above: the similar elements placed together in French represent an obvious repetition, less inelegant when separated as in Spanish.

The replacement of the French clause by a Spanish substantive simplifies the syntax, and provides a neater connection with the preceding verb.
In both the above cases, the Spanish translator has improved on the style of his original through his concise renderings of more verbose expressions.

The Spaniard not only avoids the repetition of the French, but also makes the pilgrim reply precisely and in the correct order to the two questions asked at Sp12,13: *por cuyo mandado prendiera la cruz, e la rrazon por que ally veniera* - a passage where the Spaniard has also improved on his original, as discussed at II(ii) above. When translating Sp12,18, the Spaniard must have remembered this earlier change (or looked back at it), and such consistency demonstrates how attentively the Spanish translator approached his task.
(ii) Changes producing equivalents and paraphrases

While the changes discussed above clearly represent conscious improvements over the French text, the reasons for making the alterations listed below are far from clear:

C4,8   ton ventre norris
Sp4,8  crias tu cuerpo

C5,4   ne lor estoit demostree teel avision
Sp5,4  no nos dixiera aquella

C5,14  por aler veoir
Sp5,14  de yr a ssaber

C11,3  Ele fu avec l'enfant
Sp11,3  Ella conforto al ninno

C11,17 li vessiax... estoit si seurs
Sp11,18 el vaso... yazia tan seguro

The equivalents and paraphrases involved are, however, fairly minor, and probably represent nothing more significant than whims of the translator.

(iii) Changes in identification of characters

Several changes made by the Spanish translator are in the field of titles and identity; a number of additions and omissions in this area have already been noted at II(i) and at III(iv) above, showing that there is no consistent translation procedure in such cases:

C4,17  la femme a ce riche homme
Sp4,18  la buena duenna

C8,8   seignour
Sp8,8  Amigos
(iv) Pious changes

Three changes suggest that the translator was attempting to give a more pious tone to his rendering:

C4,9  les seintes gentz
Sp4,9  los siervos de Dios

C5,5  q'ele prist pur nous
Sp5,5  que rruegue al su Dios

C12,18 il li estoit la venuz
Sp12,18 tomara la cruz

(v) Change involving stock description

In one case, the Spanish Magdalene translator seems to be using stock expressions rather than a precise translation:

C2,4  estoit de visage plesanz e de face clere e de langue sage e de cors viguereuse
Sp2,4  era muy fernrosa e de buen donaire e muy sesuda e de muy buena palabra e muy arreziada

(vi) Changes involving the verb 'to go' and associated terms

The Spanish Magdalene translator has made a series of puzzling changes in connection with the verb 'to go'; in two cases, where the French text has part of the verb 'to come', the Spaniard has substituted the verb 'to go':

C2,22  vencient
Sp2,24  yvan

C6,7  vindrent
Sp6,8  fueronse
This apparent tendency to avoid the verb 'to come' is confirmed by three further cases:

C1,17 vindrent
Sp1,18 aportaron

C2,3 venoit
Sp2,3 llegaron

C7,6 vint
Sp7,6 fue

In four other cases the French verb 'to be' has been translated by Spanish 'to go':

C7,7 estoient
Sp7,7 andavan

C8,3 sera
Sp8,3 andar

C8,18 estoit
Sp8,19 yr

C10,17 es preschanz
Sp10,17 fue pedricar

Three other cases may form part of this series of changes:

C1,21 furent
Sp1,22 yoguyeron

C4,16 s'esvanoi
Sp4,18 fuese

C11,19 estoit
Sp11,19 yazia
This exchange between 'to come', 'to go' and 'to be' is not consistent, however:

C2,11  vint
Sp2,11  veno

C5,14  aler
Sp5,14  yr

C5,18  aler
Sp5,18  yr

There are sufficient cases of this type of exchange to suggest a general pattern, also to be found in the Martha text. These changes may represent an idiosyncrasy of the translator, in which case both texts are his work; perhaps in some cases they may result from a confusion created by the identical forms of parts of the Spanish verbs 'to go' and 'to be'; or such interchanges between 'to come' and 'to go' may be an inherent feature of Old Spanish.

Most probably, however, the substitution of 'to go' for 'to come' is a reflection of the feeling of remoteness provoked by the act of translation: an original 'they came' was probably seen as a remote event by a translator, who thus translated 'they went'. The phenomenon may sometimes also have a geographical explanation: a French translator, writing of an arrival in his own country, would naturally use 'to come', while the same event, seen through Spanish eyes as an arrival in a distant country, would be rendered by 'to go'.
Changes in the Spanish Martha Text

The Spanish Martha translation contains instances of all the types of change observed in the Magdalene text, though their frequency is sometimes different:

(i) Improving changes

The Martha text contains less frequent instances of this type of change than the Magdalene translation:

F13,3 ausint il qui lessoit les palais des rois volt estre herbergiez
Sp13,3 asy dexo las casas de los reys...e quiso posar

The French translator has distorted the sense of the Latin by translating E13,3 regum vitans palatia by a relative clause, thus losing the idea of sequence implied in Latin. The Spaniard has restored this notion of sequence by altering the syntax to produce two main clauses.

F17,12 de ta terre e de ta narie
Sp17,13 de tu tierra onde eres natural

The Spaniard has avoided the near-synonymous pair terre/narie while losing none of his original's sense.

F19,1 proierent Dieu, e li pueple qui bien ne creoit convertiren a la foi Jhesucrist
Sp19,1 alli pedricaron e tornaron el pueblo, que bien non creya, a la fe de Jesu Xristo

With the following convertiren/tornaron a la fe, pedricaron is a more satisfactory choice of verb than proierent.

F22,11 En yver .i. pelicon e .i. mantel avoit, e en esté avoit une coste
Sp22,12 En el inbierno bestia un pellote e cobria un çulame; en la calentura vestia una garnacha

Despite some repetition, the Spaniard has used terminology more appropriate than that of the French original.
F22,14 Une corroie sainte de crinz de cheval noueuse, elle estraignoit si son ventre que de la porreture souvent li ver encheoient

Sp22,16 tenia una gynta de sedas de cavallo gruesa, e apretavase tanto en ella que la podrescia, assy que muchas vezes le cayan gusanos

In the French text the details of cause and effect are unclear because the translator has adhered too closely to the Latin, failing to render the time sequence expressed by the participles corrupta et putrefacta in E22,16 cingulo nodoso... alvum suum ita sedule stringebat quod vermes ex corrupta et putrefacta carne sepe affluebant. Surely the order of events was: (1) she tightened her belt too much, (2) her flesh rotted, (3) worms formed, (4) worms fell out. The Spaniard has changed the text in translation to give this more logical presentation of events.

F24,3 le Rosne...le Rosne...del Rosne

Sp24,3 el Rruedano...el rrio...el rrio

The Spaniard has avoided the repetition of the French by the substitution of el rrio.

F24,5 la vit e cels qui l'escoutoient

Sp24,5 vido grant gente aderredor della que la ascuchavan

The Spanish text presents the events in a more logical way, since the crowds would have been more clearly visible than the saint herself.

F28,5 e recut le cors Jhesucrist, e se confessa e ordena cez choses, e conforta e ordena e conferma cez genz en la foi Dieu a tenir

Sp28,4 e manifestose e ordeno sus cosas, e conforto sus gentes e confirmolas en tener la fe de Dios, e crescebio el cuerpo del sennor

Confession habitually precedes Communion, a fact which might explain the Spaniard's altered word-order; but the change is also in keeping with his desire to emphasize the devotional character of the work; thus he alters the order of events so
that the receiving of the Eucharist - what he sees as the climax - occurs at the end of the series of actions.

F30,13 conmanda que l'ani la meist hors de la maison delez .i. moustier si que eel poist vecir le ciel, desouz .i. moult grant arbre

Sp30,13 mando que la sacasen de casa e que la levasen so un arbor que estava antel monasterio, asy que pudiese ver el cielo

The French translator has followed the Latin text in its arrangement of the elements of the sentence, so that the verb meist, which has to be close to conmanda, is separated by several lines from desouz...arbre, while clarity requires these two elements to be close together. The Spaniard has eliminated this defect by altering the word-order and syntax of his original.

F36,8 quant il oi les nouveles des vertuz de sainte Marthe, il avoit une grant maladie es rains, et vint a cel lieu et maintenant que il vint au lieu et il toucha a la tombe, il fu gariz de s'enfermet

Sp36,7 quando oyo las nuevas de las virtudes que fazia santa Marta, fue ay; e tanto que tannio en el monimento, fue luego sano de una grant enfermedat que avia de los lomos

The illogical order of events in French - it seems as if the king's lumbar disorder was caused by hearing the news! - is again the result of adhering too closely to the Latin word-order at E36,11: auditis...rumoribus, gravem morbum renum passus, ad locum eius venit; the French translator has failed to make it clear that passus is causative, but the Spaniard has eliminated this error by placing the details of the disease at the end of the passage.
(ii) Changes producing equivalents and paraphrases

While the above changes represent considerable improvements over the French text, those listed below are difficult to explain, indeed probably inexplicable.

**F12,14** seeient a la table  
Sp12,14 a la mesa **comieron**

**F13,2** estre embraciez des bras sa mere  
Sp13,2 folgar entre los braços de su madre

**F13,8** ce fet a savoir  
Sp13,8 que llaman en latin

**F13,9** a cez .ii. serors apropria  
Sp13,11 diolas a estas ermanas anbas

**F14,12** (rubric) tout son propre  
Sp14,13 (rubric) lo que avia

**F21,19** (rubric) Comment sainte Marthe demora en l'ermitage  
Sp21,19 (rubric) De la vida que passava santa Marta

**F22,5** pommes sauvages  
Sp22,6 frutas montesas

**F22,12** en esté  
Sp22,13 en la calentura

**F25,16** plus fu en auctorité  
Sp25,17 la tovieron mas en caro

**F26,1** (rubric) La dedicacion de l'eglyse saint Marthe  
Sp26,1 (rubric) Commo fue sagrada una eglesia a su onrra

**F26,4** sanz amonestement  
Sp26,4 sin rruego de ninguno
F26,14 il furent apesiez par la proiere sainte Marthe
Sp26,15 metio y paz e grant concordia santa Marta

F27,16 Biauz dous compaignons
Sp27,16 Erguidevos

F28,2 l'une fu morte après l'autre a .viii. jours après
Sp28,2 la una fue muerta ante que la otra ocho dias

F28,12 (rubric) Comment li deable' vindrent a la mort
sainte Marthe
Sp28,12 (rubric) Commo los diablos entraron en su camara

F28,18 les mauvez esperiz
Sp28,18 los diablos

F29,9 (rubric) Comment Jhesucrist la visita
Sp29,9 (rubric) Commo santa Marta fizo oracion e fino

F29,12 ele vit sa suer la Magdalainne devant li
Sp29,13 vido a su hermana Magdalena que la venia ver

F32,11 venoient des viles entor
Sp32,14 venieron de todas partes

F33,1 Comment Jhesucrist e sainz Frons l'ensevelirent
Sp33,1 (rubric) Commo sant Frontes fue a sus onrras

It should be noted that in the case of rubric, exact
correspondence between F and Sp is rare.
(iii) Changes in identification of characters

As in the Magdalene text, there is some variation in the area of titles and identity, some elements being added (II(i) above) and omitted (III(iv) above), others being changed, as below:

F13,1 si douz sires
Sp13,1 nuestro sennor

F16,2 nostres sires
Sp16,1 Dios

F17,8 nostres sires
Sp17,10 Dios

F17,10 Ne a home ne donne mie
Sp17,11 Non les quiso dar

(iv) Pious changes

Two changes suggest that the translator wished to emphasize the devotional character of the work:

F14,23 soustenir les apostres e nostre seigneur
Sp14,22 governar a nuestro sennor Jesu Xristo e a los apostolos

F27,10 il li’fist savoir en esperist
Sp27,10 fizole saber por el angel

In the first case the Spanish translator has piously placed the characters in order of precedence; in the second case, the Spanish text uses a more tangible form of divine intervention.
(v) Changes involving stock descriptions and formulae

There are two cases of this type of change in Martha:

F19,6  Ele estoit bele de cors et clere de face et gracieuse, ague de paroles, sage de lange
Sp19,6  Ella era muy bien fecha en el cuerpo e muy fermosa, en el rostro, e de muy buen donayre, e avia aguda la lengua, e era sesuda en fablar.

The disparities between translation and original may be explained by the knowledge of a stock description common in such circumstances, and similar to that used at Sp2,4 in the Magdalene text.

F29,1  cil deable sont apareillie devant moi qui me deveurent
Sp29,1  estos diablos son aqui por me levar

por me levar is a phrase that must frequently arise in connection with devils, and knowledge of such a formula probably lead to this change in translation.

(vi) Changes involving the verb 'to go' and associated terms

The irregular treatment of the verbs 'to come', 'to go' and some others is a feature of the Martha text as well as of the Magdalene text. In a high proportion of cases, French 'to come' is translated by Spanish 'to go':

F12,10  vienz
Sp12,10  va

F17,12  vien
Sp17,14  vee

F19,1  vindrent
Sp19,1  fueronse
In two further cases, the Spaniard avoids the verb 'to come':

F18,20 vindrent
Sp18,21 aportaron

F27,17 venez
Sp27,16 estad

In three cases the translator has avoided the verb 'to be':

F13,18 serons en
Sp13,21 averemos

F14,3 serons (though MSS F1 F2 C3 and F5 have irons)
Sp14,3 averemos

F32,4 est
Sp32,5 fuelga

However, the Spaniard has not always made these changes:

F13,15 sont alé e iront
Sp13,18 son ydos e yran
The treatment of these verbs in the Martha translation thus shows a similar pattern to their treatment by the Spanish Magdalene translator.
The evidence of the Spanish changes

The numbers of these six types of translation change are compared in the table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of change</th>
<th>Magdalene</th>
<th>Martha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Improving changes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Equivalents and paraphrases</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Identification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Pious changes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Stock descriptions and formulae</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) Avoidance of <em>venir</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*14 excluding rubric)

A comparison of the frequency of translation changes in each text is not a reliable means of determining whether the two texts are the work of one or of two translators; for, as in the case of translation omissions discussed at III above, the same translator may have produced both texts, making different numbers of changes merely because each French original contained differing numbers of passages in need of change or offering the opportunity for change.

Thus no conclusion may be drawn from a comparison of the types of change discussed under headings (ii), (iii), (iv) and (v). However, the much higher frequency in the Magdalene text of improving changes of type (i) tends to suggest, subject to the reservations mentioned above, that the Magdalene translator took much greater care over style and logical presentation than the Martha translator. At first sight the evidence of the changes of type (vi),
involving the verb *venir* (only the cases of avoidance of parts of *venir* are counted) seems to be against this conclusion, since these changes have the same frequency in each text. However, it is very likely that the changes involving the verbs 'to come' and 'to go' are a feature of translations in general, and result from a translator's naturally remote view of events in his original, which seem to him to be less immediate and present, or to be occurring in a foreign country. These changes are thus not necessarily a feature exclusive to these two texts, and thus to one translator.
Conclusion

From the existence of two series of pagination, and from the scribe's custom of using guide words, we know that four folios, very probably containing sixteen columns of text, have been lost from MS Sp between present folios two and three. Calculations show that before the loss of these four folios, MS Sp was too short by about 2.8 columns to contain complete translations of both the French C Magdalene and F Martha lives. The MS probably contained a shortened form of the Magdalene life with a complete form of the Martha life.

The Magdalene translation contains only four non-Castilian features, while in the Martha text there are 36 such cases. Since both texts are written in the same hand in the MS, this great difference in the frequency of non-standard (mostly Western) linguistic features shows at least that, at some stage before their inclusion in MS Sp, the two texts belonged to different MS traditions. The differing concentrations of these linguistic features also suggest very strongly that the two texts are the work of two different Spanish translators with different linguistic habits. This seems to be confirmed by the evidence of the two different translation procedures.

An examination of the translation procedures in each text reveals translators who, though normally attentive and adhering closely to their originals, have nevertheless made some mistakes, largely attributable to ignorance of French or to inattention. They have also made additions, omissions and alterations, some of which are obviously the result of carelessness or ignorance; many, however, have been made with the clear intention of improving the style of the French, or of presenting events in a more logical way.

A comparison of the frequency of the various types of deviation from the French original for each text shows that their concentration is often different for each translation.
The evidence of these different frequencies of deviation must be interpreted with caution, since each French text will clearly have presented differing numbers of potential problems, and since it is often difficult to distinguish between deliberate and accidental addition, omission and alteration. Also, the deviations may not in every case fit precisely into the categories that have been used.

Nevertheless, despite these reservations, the relative frequencies of certain categories of deviation seem to point to two different translation procedures and so to two Spanish translators.

The evidence of the translators' errors suggests that the Magdalene translator tended, more than the Martha translator, to omit lexical items which he did not know, and to make errors provoked by 'faux amis'. The Martha translator has made more syntactic errors and more errors through misreading his original, and seems to have been less attentive to his task.

The evidence of the translators' additions may be more dependable than that of other types of deviation, since additions are likely to be mostly deliberate. It emerges that the Magdalene translator made more additions intended to dramatize direct speech, while the Martha translator made more additions for stylistic improvement.

The comparison of frequency of omissions may not shed much light on whether we are studying the works of one or of two translators, since omissions are often likely to be involuntary. Nevertheless, a comparison of the various types of omission shows that omissions intended to improve the text are much more frequent in Magdalene, and omissions from common collocations are much more frequent in Martha.

A comparison of translation changes - those involving neither additions nor omissions - shows that changes to improve the style of the original, or its presentation of
events; are much more numerous in the Magdalene translation than in Martha.

The comparison of translation procedures thus shows that, while both translations seem intended to render as accurately as possible their French originals, the two translators - for the cumulative evidence clearly shows two translators at work - brought different degrees of skill to their tasks: on the whole, the Magdalene translator seems to have worked more accurately and attentively, and to have been more stylistically aware than the Martha translator.
Notes to chapter VII

1 Michel 1930, xcii also claims to be able to distinguish the numeral viii on present folio 4r, but this is not visible on the microfilm used for this edition.

2 For works containing a description of the material state of the MS, see volume II, p. 481.

3 Some of the irregularities in the pagination are mentioned by Michel 1930, xcii note 2, though she does not explain the absence of a guide-word between folios xxivv and xxv (modern fols 20v/21r), presumably a scribal omission.

4 These MSS are described in volume II, pp. 471-3, 483-6.

5 See chapter II, pp. 118-124.

6 The Spanish Magdalene translator has shown a similar discernment in the removal of inconsistencies at C9,17 and C10,10; there is another instance of his vigilance at C12,18. See pp. 389-390 and 409.

7 See variants to B30 and B32.

8 Michel 1930,65 states that the missing portion of MS Sp probably contained only the remainder of the Pilgrim episode. However, the omission of the whole of the bridge passage and the Penance and Death episode from MS Sp is most improbable, since a rendering of the Pilgrim episode alone would not occupy all the available space in the MS.

9 *pregarias*: see Alvar 1960, text XXXVII, line 18; Zamora Vicente 1960,101; Baird 1976,134.

10 *ca*: see DECH s.v. *ca*.

11 *ysca*: see Michel 1930, 61 and 220.

12 *creyu*: see Zamora Vicente 1960,136 and Michel 1930,cxx, clxvi and 66.

13 *crey*: see Michel 1930,68-9.

14 *oyu*: see Zamora Vicente 1960,136 and Michel 1930,cxx, clxvi and 78.

15 *governar*: see DECH s.v. *gobernar*.

16 *apostolessa*: see Michel 1930,cxxx.

17 *por lo Mar Ruvio*: for *lo*, see Zamora Vicente 1960,121; for gender, see DECH s.v. *mar*.

18 *abondanca*: see DECH s.v. *onda*.

19 *mata*: see DECH s.v. *mata*, and Michel 1930,cxxx and 108.

20 *erizo cachero*: Michel 1930, 110; Nascentes 1932 sv. *cachear*.

21 *culame*: see García de Diego 1954, s.v. *zulame*, and Michel 1930,cxxx.

22 *fuge*: García de Diego 1954, s.v. *fugere*, and Michel 1930,clxv and 125.

23 *huesped*: see Baird 1976,129 and 178; DECH s.v. *huéspedes*; Zamora Vicente 1960,89; Michel 1930,cxxix-cxxx.
24. miracles: see García de Diego 1954, s.v. miraculum; Michel 1930, 130.
25. erguidevos: see Baird 1976, 151 and Michel 1930, clvii and 125.
26. guan manno: see García de Diego 1954, s.v. guam magnus.
27. lanpadas: see DECH s.v. lámpara.
29. estramenna: see Michel 1930, 139.
30. el sennal: see Michel 1930, cxxxi and DECH s.v. seña.
31. asonado: see Michel 1930, 152 and DECH s.v. asonada.
32. toste: see García de Diego 1954, s.v. tostus.
33. traga: see Baird 1976, 150-1.
34. egleja: see Michel 1930, 156.
35. fraile: see Michel 1930, cxxix-cxxx; Baird 1976, 129 and 178; fraile is a Provençal borrowing.
36. bielso: see Zamora Vicente 1960, 101.
37. en mia rremenbranca: see Zamora Vicente 1960, 127.
38. duldara: see Baird 1976, 133 and 178.
39. falsedade: see Michel 1930, cxxix and Baird 1976, 129.
40. sandete: see Michel 1930, cxxix-cxxx and 61; Baird 1976, 129 and 178.

These extremely close correspondences between the French and Spanish texts may be appreciated both from the examples quoted in chapter I, and from a comparison of the following parts of the Spanish texts with the French originals: for Magdalene: Sp2, 18-20; Sp4, 5-13; Sp5, 17-20; Sp6, 12-15; Sp7, 3-7; Sp8, 1-4; Sp9, 19-Sp10, 10; Sp12, 1-16. For Martha: Sp13, 1-19; Sp15, 5-21; Sp18, 2-12; Sp21, 20-Sp22, 12; Sp27, 1-21; Sp29, 10-Sp30, 5; Sp37, 3-17.

42. See FEW s.v. falisa; DELF s.v. falaise.
43. See REW s.v. jejunare.

This use of near-synonyms or of repetition is used in other cases of suspected ignorance of French terms; cf. C2, 8; C5, 24; C8, 17; C11, 10; C11, 20, discussed on pp. 336, 339, 337, 337 and 338 respectively.

46. Cf. the case of geunes, correctly translated in Martha at F21, 23, but not in Magdalene C1, 21; see p. 236, and baisse at C11, 7 and F31, 10 discussed at note 67 below.
48. For this case, see also p. 388.
49. See REW s.v. adjacens.
50. REW s.v. sazian gives asir as a descendant of sazian, though DECH s.v. asir derives asir from asa; but even if saisir and asir were cognates, this would hardly have been an aid to recognition.
51 See REW s.v. *flotian and DELF s.v. *flot.

52 However the Spaniard may have been using a French text such as MS C3, which has encore toute chaude.

53 REW s.v. *ligicare and *leviarius; AFW s.v. lecherie and legerté; DECH s.v. leve.

54 See REW s.v. bajulare and FEW s.v. bajulare; of bailer DELF s.v. bailer states 'peu répandu hors du gallo-roman, qui présente seul le sens de donner'.

55 Alternatively, though, in view of the context and of the following et fist tut l'office/Ella fizo el oficio de la maestra, the Spaniard may have considered e fu a son bail to be redundant, and omitted it for this reason.

56 See AFW s.v. endroit (2).

57 See AFW s.v. savor, 'agrément, attrait'; DECH s.v. saber, 'ganas, deseo'.

58 At C5,11 quiere 'demands' is translated by demanda, thus confirming that the Spaniard thought of demandar (and so probably of French demander) as meaning 'to demand'. The Spaniard possibly intended his construction to be '...tells her that she should...', and the awkward que...que por que may suggest a change of intended construction.

59 See REW s.v. similare (for sembler) and s.v. similiare (for semejar); also DECH s.v. semejar, which states of this verb, 'En la lengua antigua tiene todos los valores del parecer moderno.'

60 The Spanish and Latin texts suggest that maintenant is a scribal error for maintenance.

61 C7,3 en la nef occurs only in MS C2; see also p. 393.

62 See the error at C3,15, discussed on p. 337.

63 The possibility of a different origin for entornava is discussed in chapter I, p. 75.

64 See DELF s.v. écaille, 'forme dialectale d'une région maritime du normand ou du picard'; also REW s.v. *skalja.

65 See REW s.v. *kotta, Littré s.v. cotte, DECH s.v. garnacha I, 'vestidura talar'.

66 Aragonese and Catalan trobar were probably known, if not widely used, in other parts of the Peninsula, though this Eastern term may not have penetrated as far West as the region of origin of this text.

67 See REW s.v. *bacassa. At Magdalene C11,7 baiasse seems to mean 'midwife', so that its derivation from bail 'delivery'-cannot-be ruled out. The Spanish Magdalene translator correctly renders baiasse as maestra, thus further confirming that we are dealing with works by two different translators. Cf. gaunes at C1,21 and F21, 23 and givre at C4,5 and F20,9. See p. 338 and note 46.

68 MS F has the suspect reading en chose for encore.

69 Several of these cases are also discussed in chapter I, p. 43.
AFW s.v. foi lists foi, feit, fei, feid, foy and fai; it would not, therefore, be surprising to find the form fey.

E.g. Matthew 11. 13; John 1. 5; Acts 13. 15. There is also the possibility that a French scribe, recalling the biblical expression, was responsible for the change of foi to loi.

The Spaniard has made other errors in translating toponyms (e.g. Bretanna for Betanie at F23,7 and Lemoges for Alemaigne at F36,6, see pp. 358-9); there is thus no need for the explanation in Michel 1930,96 that Alemanna refers here, not to the 'country of the Teutons', but to the geographically closer Maine.

For this error, see also ch. I, p. 43.

This is the reading of MS Fl, since part of the passage is lacking in MS F.

This is the reading of MS Fl, closer to Sp than MS F.

sexta feria means 'Friday'; see Elcock 1971,167-8.

For these reductions, see pp. 392 and 399-400.

There is much variation in the rubrics of the French texts (see variants), so that it is not certain that the Spanish rubrics really are additions; they may be translations of the different rubrics of a French MS which we do not possess.

The addition of de la maestra may be intended to replace a son bail at C11,1; see note 55 above, and p. 341.

MS F has sainte parole for sentence, and is thus not as close to Sp as MSS Fl, F2 C3 and F5.

For an explanation of this addition, see Michel 1930, 74-6.

a todos may be a mistaken translation of e touz in e touz jours which immediately follows commune in F.

The original French translation was probably larrecin ou rat, as discussed on pp. 75-76.

See also p. 379.

See also p. 380.

recevront is the reading of MSS Fl, F2 and C3; MS F has recoivent.

See also (iv) on p. 385.

For these cases, see pp. 51-54, 71-74, 476-8 and 489-92.

MS C has n'en...n'en; see variants.

See, however, section I(i)(a), p. 338.

This omission may be the result of homoioteleuton: C6,18 en la nef may have been confused with a reading such as that of MS C2 en la nef en mer at C7,3.

comencó may, however, be a misreading of C covent, as discussed on p. 346.
The French error is discussed in chapter VI, p. 253.

For norris, MS C3 has desfent, closer in meaning to F gardes, and therefore more susceptible to suppression.

This change is also discussed at IV(vi) on p. 412, but may simply be an error caused by the presence at C11,16/Sp11,17 of gist/yazia, to which the translator's (or the scribe's) eye wandered.

See Michel 1930, 69-70.

The translation of crinz 'mane' by sedas 'silk' is unsatisfactory, and may be a Spanish scribal error; the original Spanish translation was probably cerdas 'horsehair', subsequently misread as sedas.

This is the reading of MSS F1, F2, C3 and F5; MS F has the suspect le contoient; see variants.

This is the reading of MS F2, MS F being defective here.

The reading of MS F is suspect here; the reading presented is that of MS F2; see variants.

Another possible reflection of the translator's 'remoteness' is the translation of nostre (F27,21) by vuestro (Sp27,21).

Michel 1930, civ-cv suggests that Florencia, Carlos Maynes and Crescentia are the work of a different translator from the one who produced the Magdalene and Martha texts.
CONCLUSION

The Spanish Magdalene life is a direct translation of the French life of the C group of MSS, which in turn contain an oblique translation of the Latin life of the B group of MSS. The MS D Franco-Provençal Magdalene life is also an oblique translation of the version represented by the B MSS. Similarly, the Spanish Martha life is a direct translation of the French life of the F group of MSS, which contain an oblique translation of a Latin life very close to that of MS E. MS C5 contains an independent French translation of an almost identical Latin Martha life. There are, however, some affinities between the Spanish and Latin versions of both lives; and while most of these may be explained in terms of coincidences or of scribal changes to the French texts, some of these correspondences could indicate that the Spanish translators occasionally had recourse to Latin texts.

The shorter Latin version A of the Magdalene Pilgrim episode is the original form of the episode, subsequently elaborated to harmonize with the more verbose Penance and Death episode with which it was gradually combined. Both the internal evidence of the details of the texts, and the external evidence of the combinations in which the two episodes are found in MSS, show that B is an elaborated form of A, thus disproving the traditional view that A is an abbreviated form of B.

The C French Magdalene translation is in many respects shorter than the B Latin text, and thus appears to resemble the short A form. These affinities between A and C are shown to be fortuitous. Despite numerous features of C which correspond to neither A nor B, it is nevertheless maintained that the original for C is indeed the B text, and that the discrepancies are to be explained by the adaptive translation procedures used to produce C, not, as others have claimed, by the fact that we do not possess the C translator's Latin original. An analysis of the
changes made by the C translator shows that these are predominantly of a type intended to produce a simpler text, suitable for oral delivery to a large audience; the nature of these changes thus confirms the provisional conclusion that the B Latin text, and no other, is the original for the C translation. By comparison the MS D Franco-Provençal version is a more faithful and learned translation, clearly intended for a different public.

Both the F and C5 French Martha translations are much closer to the MS E Latin text than to the Sanctuarium; however, C5 has a number of features which it shares exclusively with the Sanctuarium. F is an adaptive translation produced by procedures similar to those of the C Magdalen translator, and is thus intended for a similar public; however, the translation of events based on the bible has noticeably less omissions than the remainder of the life. The C5 translation has features which show that it was for use by aristocratic ladies.

The D, C5, C and F lives thus contain four different types of French translation: D is a complete, accurate and unadorned translation, probably for private reading in a religious institution, or at least in less secular circumstances than the luxury C5 version, with its verse interpolations and other adornment. By contrast, the C and F translations are simplified, more austere productions, whose most obvious use would be as sermon material; the F Martha translation also has a more complete rendering of biblical events than of material based on less revered sources.

A study of the Spanish MS shows that the four missing folios would not have provided sufficient space to contain complete translations of both the C Magdalen and the F Martha texts; the Magdalen text is more likely than the Martha text to have been curtailed.

The Magdalen translation contains only four certain cases of non-Castilian linguistic features, compared with
the 36 such cases in the Spanish Martha life. Since the MS is in the same hand throughout, this difference means at least that the two texts were copied by scribes of different regions at a stage before the copying of MS h.I.13; it more probably shows that the lives are the work of two different translators.

A comparison of the Spanish lives with their French originals shows that, despite some errors due mostly to ignorance of the French language and of toponyms, the Spanish versions are for the most part accurate renderings; a comparison of translation procedures in each supports the view that two different translators produced the lives, the Magdalene translator being more precise, attentive and stylistically aware than the Martha translator.