

Who wrote the nun's Life of Edward?

Article

Published Version

Bliss, J. (2012) Who wrote the nun's Life of Edward? Reading Medieval Studies, XXXVIII. pp. 77-98. ISSN 0950-3129
Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/84372/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

Publisher: University of Reading

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

Who Wrote the Nun's Life of Edward? ¹

Jane Bliss

University of Oxford

This article examines the identity of the Nun of Barking, author of an Anglo-Norman Life of Edward the Confessor,² and addresses three questions. The first is about the Nun's audience; the poem's destination is a vital element in discussion of the author's identity, and of the quality of her authorship. Next, I examine the available evidence for sources other than Aelred's *Vita*; the Nun's work has sometimes been regarded as a mere copy: 'a translation from start to finish'.³ My title focuses on 'writing' in the sense of 'authorship', because the Nun adapts her material so extensively that she can claim to be the author, not merely the translator, of her Edward. Lastly, to establish whether the Nun was identical with Clemence of Barking, author of the *Life of Saint Catherine* (of Alexandria),⁴ I analyse both poems.

My study draws upon a body of recent scholarship on women's writing, and on Anglo-Norman language and literature.⁵ The Nun's poem is a key text for a recent study of early mysticism;⁶ this aspect of her work has therefore been discussed elsewhere, as has her pioneering use of the term 'fin' amor', and the enhanced role of Edith, Edward's queen.⁷ Earlier scholars' neglect of the poem may be because some perceived it as a slavish translation, or because it suffered in comparison with the freer (later) version by Matthew Paris.⁸ Laurent thinks Matthew wanted to suppress it,⁹ but there is no evidence that Matthew did any such thing: the Nun's work survives in three manuscripts, and a fragment. Furthermore, it is the source for a French *Life* in prose, and for at least one of the Middle English *Lives* of Edward.¹⁰

The Nun ranks among the earliest of vernacular writers known to be female,¹¹ although the poem's precise date is uncertain. Its source, Aelred's *Vita*,¹² was written in 1163; and she must have completed the work before Henry II's death (in 1189), because she refers to him as living.¹³ She was probably writing before Becket's death (in 1170), rather than later in Henry's reign: her apparently sincere address of praise to the whole royal family (vv. 5001–6) seems to refer to them before the beginning of their many troubles.¹⁴ She does not, however, appear to be dedicating her work to the king or his court; it is not known who asked her to undertake it, and she does not explicitly present it to anybody.

It has been conjectured that the Nun may be identical with Clemence, who was probably writing a little later;¹⁵ naturally the declared anonymity of one text raises the possibility that one woman wrote both.¹⁶ It is conceivable that Clemence, who names herself in the *Catherine*, wrote the *Edward* as an apprenticeship and then, having achieved a successful life of one Saint, felt confident to embark on another. William MacBain concludes, after comparing the vocabulary of the two texts, that they are probably by the same writer.¹⁷ However, any two generically similar poems, contemporary with each other and in the same verse form, are likely to contain some similarities of vocabulary; further, Laurent ascribes any such similarity to 'l'influence d'une même spiritualité' within a community.¹⁸ David Howlett points out that common expressions and phrases do not necessarily indicate a common author; he takes it for granted that Clemence copied from her successful sister.¹⁹ If we assume too readily that two female writers, one unidentified, must be the same identified woman, then our overall view of women's writing in the Middle Ages risks becoming lop-sided.²⁰ Anonymity may be more common among female writers than male: women being apparently less confident, and reluctant to reveal that they were women, let alone say their names. But the Nun is anything but unconfident: the modesty expressed in her Prologue is conventional;²¹ she introduces herself much later in the poem (vv. 5296–332), after having established herself. It may be impossible to discover why she wished to remain anonymous, especially given the frank and open way she speaks to her audience; however, examination of her style may provide evidence as to whether she was Clemence or not.

Barking Abbey was home to a number of literate nuns, many aristocratic, and some very probably of mixed or English parentage; thus we can suppose some to have been fluent in least three languages. The Benedictine Rule obliged the

nuns to read, and several of them received letters in Latin from well-known authors.²² Further, the abbey was a centre of cultural significance, and welcomed many distinguished visitors.²³

The Nun's Audience

Some scholars believe her audience to have been exclusively internal,²⁴ but I consider this unlikely. One of the points in discussion of the nuns' style, below, is about the anonymous Nun's use of the address 'My Lords'. The meaning of this, could we discover it, may help to indicate who her audience were. It is hardly conceivable, given that she *adds* an address not present in her source, that she would make that address masculine if the audience were to be only ladies.²⁵ We may imagine a gathering of noble visitors being entertained after dinner; the nuns cannot have been so segregated from the world that they had no visitors.²⁶ These could include male religious, as well as lay nobility and itinerant authors: she uses the word 'Seignurs' for monks, quite regularly ('les seignurs de l'eglise', or similar). Aelred occasionally uses the word *seniores*, for monks, although less often than the Nun does,²⁷ and he does not address his reader(s) as *Seniores* — or as anything else. Laurent believes the Nun's mystical tone is proof her *Life* was for convent rather than court; Stein says the poem 'seems to provide a hagiographic starting-point for private meditation within a devotional community'.²⁸ But these leave out of account what was evidently a mixed listening audience. A strong element of piety and mysticism in the text under discussion is no guarantee it was intended for nuns only; as Duncan Robertson points out, medieval hagiographic romance reflects the desire of an educated laity for spirituality, and integrates adventures of all sorts into the frame.²⁹

Let us envisage a mixed audience, and clues that the text was intended to be used *outside* the Abbey fall into place.³⁰ If it was for use only inside, withholding the author's name is pointless — everybody would know her — therefore she must have been writing for others.³¹ She introduces herself as though to outsiders: 'En Berkinges en l'abeie Fu translatee ceste vie' (vv. 5304–5). Another clue introduces a miracle that happened to 'a lady in our Abbey, which is called Barking' (vv. 6443–4).³² In neither case does the Nun say 'Here, at Barking', as one would expect if she were addressing an internal audience. The Barking miracle appears in Aelred's version, but it is pleasing to know that the Nun heard it from the lady herself. She says she is still there to this day, a well-respected

nun; 'Nevertheless,' she says, 'it was written before, by him who made the *Life* in Latin' (she never names Aelred, who added the story). In conclusion, I believe the target audiences for the poem were not only mixed, but also imagined as absent and future.

How the Nun differs from her source

Discussion of the Nun's distinctive style leads naturally into discussion of the way she differs from Aelred. Her editor remarks on the additions that she makes: not only personal reflections, but also rhetorical markers such as *apostrophe*.³³ Some interesting differences have already been studied elsewhere (see Introduction, above); here I discuss a few more. First, the Nun's work, unlike Aelred's, clearly addresses a listening audience. Apart from formal difference (French verse renders Latin prose), this is what strikes a reader on every page of the two versions: the difference in tone and register.³⁴ Aelred rarely moves out of the third person; the Nun, by contrast, typically rounds off an episode with some remark of her own, often pious or homiletic, and she begins almost every episode with an address to the audience. Aelred links one episode with another, but not in such a conversational manner. The Nun frequently interrupts herself with comments; seeming comfortable in her role as story-teller, and competent at handling her audience. Wherever she got this authorial voice from, it was not Aelred, who rarely gives a personal opinion, let alone exhorts an audience. This distinctive and assertive style differentiates the Nun, as I shall show, from the more decorous Clemence, and is also one of the elements that make her stand out as an author independently of Aelred. Her text comes across as a good deal more homiletic, if less biblical, than Aelred's. For example, the Nun cuts many of his Bible references (though she does add a few). This might be because Latin prose can easily echo the Vulgate: the Nun is constrained by language, metre, and rhyme, so direct verbal echoes may be lost. Although she would have known the Bible well, the Nun seems to have removed many citations deliberately, often replacing them with proverbial sentences that might better suit her mixed lay audience.

The Nun develops a personal approach to Edward's life, in which the action of prayer is combined with ideas of spiritual journey and the wonder of supernatural visitation.

What else did the Nun know?

I present a few of the most striking features of the *Edward*, from details such as words to major items of "fact" which the Nun must have known from another source. Passages markedly different from Aelred's may shed light on the Nun's literary environment, for example, acquaintance with other authors (including figures such as Osbert).³⁵ Questions include what her other sources may have been, how she developed her writing-style, and how she chose to treat her material. What is known about books available to the nuns? We cannot assume the Nun had nothing but Aelred and the Bible to hand. Bell supposes a library containing approximately forty books, to be lent one to each nun annually.³⁶ We know three manuscripts, belonging to Barking early enough for our nuns to have known them;³⁷ we can only guess at the remaining three dozen. Also, what sort of thing was common knowledge (stories, gossip, table-talk, legends) circulating orally? What languages did the nuns use and understand? I examine passages or phrases in the poem that differ markedly from the main source: things the Nun is unlikely to have invented, and so must have taken from somewhere else.

First, the Nun's description of Edward's qualities is not directly modelled on Aelred's:³⁸ in particular, she stresses a virtuous moderation. In the twelfth century, the source for catalogues of hagiographical virtues is likely to have been the common idea of a set of Contrary Virtues which matched, and did battle against, the Deadly Sins. There exists no standard list: virtues were numbered and grouped differently by thinkers and preachers, and Edward's virtues correspond broadly to lists that both Aelred and the Nun could have known. Doubtless each monastery, each parish, would be familiar with a selection of such Virtues. An example of these Contrary Virtues, variously attributed to Alexander of Ashby and Bartholomew of Exeter (both twelfth-century Englishmen), appears in a recently-edited Anglo-Norman Sermon on Penance.³⁹

The Nun explicitly aligns Edward with Jesus as Saviour: 'Or prium Deu, en qui semblance Edward fist as suens delivrance' (vv. 785-6ff); this is not in Aelred's text, and nor is a similar passage (at vv. 727-60) where Edward, like Christ, brings happiness after sin. Like Aelred, she develops the theme of Edward's friendship with the monks he loved in his youth, and with his favourite saints, John the Evangelist and Peter. But the theme is more strongly marked in the *Vie*: she adds a phrase about friends to the list of Edward's qualities (vv. 863-4);⁴⁰ and mentions Edward and Edith's friendship.⁴¹

Besides virtues, there are vices. Describing the young Edward, the Nun hints blatantly at homosexuality: she says he was not subject to the vice known to be common “over there”, in Normandy where Edward grew up. Aelred refers merely to the shortcomings of youth, but she goes on: ‘you won’t hear a word about that from me’ (v. 320) — as though she has heard something but is coyly refusing to tell. Her life cannot have been so sheltered she never heard news, current affairs, and sheer gossip. Perhaps the rumour (if rumour it was) was one of the many guesses about why Edward had no children.⁴²

There are variations of historical detail, where the Nun differs from her source.⁴³ One is that she amplifies the death of Edward’s brother, Alfred. In spite of her *occupatio* (‘I have told you of his death briefly because I do not know the story’), she moralizes about bad luck and those who court it; she elaborates the prince’s reason for travelling, and spells out that both Danish and English were responsible for the murder. She remarks: ‘it has been fully told elsewhere’, without indicating where this could have been (vv. 603–20). She probably knew Aelred’s earlier *Genealogy*, as well as the *Vita*, but the former does not add much.⁴⁴

The most striking detail so far discovered appears in the story about a girl who insulted Edward’s memory. The feast-day of the Confessor’s uncle Edward the Martyr is approaching, and the girl’s employer is wondering whether to honour the Martyr by not working. The girl thinks her mistress is talking about our Edward, and she has no very high opinion of him. But the Nun *adds* a detail: that the Martyr was murdered by his stepmother. Aelred does not mention it, and the Nun goes out of her way to condemn the woman’s cruel and treacherous will to power.⁴⁵ The poem’s editor notes the legend as highly dubious, without discussing its source. William of Malmesbury added the story to his source (an eleventh-century *Passio*); William’s editor deems he had it from nuns at Shaftesbury, and it is known that Barking had connections with West Country foundations. Both abbeys had royal connections at about this time (depending on when the Nun was writing); both had abbesses who were near relations of the king. It is also possible that the Nun knew William (d. c. 1142); he travelled widely in search of material for his works.⁴⁶ But a more likely source is a twelfth-century manuscript containing saints’ lives, including a *Passio* of Edward the Martyr, known to have been at Barking.⁴⁷ The collection includes Barking saints, and the Nun probably read about the Martyr among them: in this version, blame is placed squarely upon the stepmother.⁴⁸ The incomplete version in the *Acta*

Sanctorum is followed by an extract from Osbern's *Life* of Saint Dunstan, which also blames the stepmother. William of Malmesbury rewrote this *Life*, so here is another possible source for the story, if the Nun knew it. It may be impossible to determine its ultimate origin; I am concerned merely to discover where the Nun may have found it. If it was the Cardiff manuscript,⁴⁹ this is strong evidence for the Nun having at least one source independent of Aelred.

The story of the stepmother is in Gaimar's *Estoire*, but not in his major source; Gaimar's editor thinks such stories may have been common knowledge. But in what language? Did William speak English? We know Gaimar read English (he used the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*); Aelred was a native English speaker; the list is too extensive to be set out in the present article.

My last point here has already been published: the Nun adds a comment about the ageing King that looks remarkably like a quote from *The Battle of Maldon*.⁵⁰ The lost manuscript containing *Maldon*, BM Cotton Otho A xii, also contained saints' lives, many relating to Barking. There is no evidence that the items in the manuscript had any connection with one another before collation in the seventeenth century. However, some scholars have suggested Barking as the original home of most of the items, for a number of reasons: connections between Barking, the hero of *Maldon*, and royal figures; the location of the Battle as well as of the Abbey; the theme of resistance to Vikings.⁵¹ It is perhaps no coincidence that the *Lives* in the manuscript are by Goscelin, as in the Cardiff manuscript; the overlap is so small there is little duplication,⁵² and both collections could have been at Barking. After the Conquest hagiography was thought more worth preserving, in Old English literature, than epic;⁵³ both Asser's *Life of Alfred* and *Maldon* come into the former category. Further, the *Maldon* story was widely known, and there may have been other versions that have not survived. It has been remarked that a twelfth-century Anglophone should have had no difficulty reading an English text of the late tenth or early eleventh century; it is also notable that Edward would have been considered as both *pious* and *strenuous*, like *Maldon's* hero.⁵⁴ In sum, although there is no proof the Nun knew *Maldon*, it is certainly not to be ruled out.

This raises several questions: Could the Nun read Old English, and was she bilingual? How many writers of this period knew English?⁵⁵ It is likely that many twelfth-century writers were bilingual, as well as being able to read and/or write Latin.⁵⁶ Although the Nun writes in French, it is possible that English was her first language.⁵⁷ It is clear that even people of French-speaking family used

English for a variety of purposes.⁵⁸ Clues in any text may be misleading: a scattering of English words in a French text (or vice versa) is no safe indication that any author was bilingual; they might put them in to show off their knowledge of a 'foreign' language or, conversely, an Anglophone writer might wish to show off her French by taking care to use no English at all. Legge remarks that Anglo-Norman was regarded as no different from other dialects much before the end of the twelfth century: the Nun's being the first mention of it as a dialect at all. She opines that within a generation of the Conquest most people were bilingual; she also discusses the community of tastes that obtained among Normans and English even before the Conquest.⁵⁹ There are several 'anglicisms' in the *Edward* (noted by the editor without comment), so *either* the Nun knew English, *or* her French contained them for some other reason.

Anglo-Saxon survived into the Middle English period; manuscripts being copied well into the twelfth century.⁶⁰ Space does not permit a survey of what writers say about their sources,⁶¹ but we do know that the nuns at Barking were familiar with at least some writers known to have used English; one is William of Malmesbury (mentioned above), and Osbert may have known English.⁶² Adgar, with his English name and French alias (William or Guillaume, 'call me what you like'), is known to have read English as well as Latin and may have been a cleric at Barking.⁶³ The nuns may have known Aelred personally; he was (and read) English. Although some writers undeniably invent sources, there is every probability that some were genuine.

Since publication of my article (above) another analogue to the *Edward* passage, in the *Dialogues* of Gregory the Great, has been brought to my attention: 'as his body was wearied with pain, so ... his soul was refreshed with heavenly comfort' (Bk. 4, Ch. 10, the departure of Abbot Hope's soul). The *Dialogues* (Lives of Saints) were widely known, and it is reasonable to suggest they were known at Barking; their popularity did not cease with the Conquest, and they reflected and encouraged a contemporary preoccupation with the miraculous.⁶⁴ All this notwithstanding, the Nun could have come up with the notion independently of anything she had read.

On the Nuns' sources in general, other influences have been suggested: Bernard of Clairvaux, Augustine, and Anselm of Canterbury.⁶⁵ There is, for example, a remarkable passage near the beginning of the *Vie* (vv. 23-40) which is an addition to Aelred's text, 'une libre invention de l'auteur'.⁶⁶ Fenster and Wogan-Browne have produced rich and stimulating work on the Nun and Anselm; how

likely is it that there was a direct influence? By the time our nuns were writing, his influence was widely diffused; Fenster discussed it in some detail, in a draft of her paper for the New York symposium.⁶⁷ Wogan-Browne suggests that Clemence may have known his work via *florilegia*;⁶⁸ further, she identifies an Anselmian treatise on the custody of the soul, in a manuscript that may have been at Barking (a collect to Saint Ethelburga added, in a fifteenth-century hand). This sermon, 'de duabus beatudinis et miseriis', is likely to be Pseudo-Anselm; the manuscript is thirteenth century, so could not have been known by our nuns.⁶⁹ However, if Clemence knew Anselm through *florilegia*, then so too might the other Nun of Barking. Wogan-Browne also discusses Clemence's Anselmian aesthetic, where puns are a sign of divine patterning; it is notable that another difference between our authors is that the Nun does not go in for puns as much as Clemence does. Jean Leclercq discusses Anselm's influence: 'on certain minds such as ... Aelred of Rievaulx'.⁷⁰

Interestingly, Edmund of Abingdon's *Speculum Ecclesie* contains sentiments similar to those mentioned above. This work is too late for our nuns to have known, but they could have been familiar with underlying Augustinian notions, as pointed out by Batt.⁷¹ Leyser has discussed mystical influences (on the Barking nuns *inter al*) of not only Anselm but also Aelred; she points to the Old English origins, albeit transformed, of twelfth-century mysticism.⁷² This brings me back to the work of other scholars, on differences between the Latin and the Anglo-Norman *Lives* of Edward.

Differences between the Nun's poem and Clemence's

Differences suggest strongly that these are not by the same person. First, Clemence's modification of the Emperor's character is to be noted.⁷³ One cannot imagine the Nun showing any sympathy with a villain: she sees things in black and white, whereas Clemence is more subtle. In spite of some similarities of religious vocabulary,⁷⁴ 'courtly' vocabulary varies between the two poems: Clemence emphasizes ideas of knightliness and nobility by using words such as 'chevalerie', 'barnilment'; the Nun emphasizes ideas of courtesy and love with words such as 'corteisie' and 'fin' amor' (several instances of each). Sarcasm, as used by Clemence and by Katherine herself,⁷⁵ is never encountered in the Nun's work. Further, as O'Donnell points out, Clemence's discussion of her source (*Catherine*, vv. 29–50) betrays a sense of ephemerality entirely absent from the

Nun's way of thinking: Clemence says that times have changed between the earlier translation and now, as they *will* change again after we are gone. Remarks about 'the old days' are common to both Clemence and the Nun, but the Nun never looks at how audiences and their expectations might change in the future.⁷⁶

*Analysis of Style*⁷⁷

My study analyses the poems' style in terms of syntax and prosody, as more likely than vocabulary to exhibit personal differences. Having examined both authorial voices, particularly their manner or 'address', I conclude that they are not by the same writer. There are some similarities, but the Nun's address is markedly different from Clemence's. *Catherine* is a shorter poem (2700 lines), with an economical narrative style and many long speeches which leave little room for personal comment; judging by the Nun's generally conversational style in the longer *Edward* (6685 lines), the latter would very probably make room if it were her work.

1) Both texts were examined in their entirety,⁷⁸ for first and second person forms in the first instance.⁷⁹ The analysis counts only those forms used by the narrators in their own voice to address the audience. Both texts contain a good deal of direct speech; any such forms in speech have not been counted. Further, both contain a number of prayers expressed as if in the narrator's voice; these use not the conventional story-teller's 'we', but a 'we' inclusive of all God's creation. Therefore the latter have not been counted either.⁸⁰ The Nun uses three times as many first-person forms, and more than twice as many second-person forms, as Clemence does.⁸¹

The Nun's fragment of Prologue (vv. 1–10) expresses conventional modesty, using first person singular; she addresses the audience directly ('vus'). Clemence's Introduction (vv. 1–50), is different in style: beginning with discussion of why one ought to write, and prayer to God for help with the work she has undertaken, she then explains why a new translation of this Life is needed. She does not address the audience; they are referred to as 'les oianz' (34) whom she hopes to please; there are no second-person forms in this passage at all.

The Nun's introduction of herself (vv. 5296–335) is again very different from the corresponding passage in Clemence's text (vv. 2689–700). The Nun, perhaps surprisingly, refers to herself in the third person. She begins by

addressing the audience in the second person ('Si nul de vus est desiranz ...'), and explains who she is. She goes on to say why she has undertaken the work (for the love of Edward), and asks all who hear or will hear (third-person) not to think the worse of it because a woman did it; she returns to second-person at line 5322 (if it is not well done, then blame ('emblasmez') her powerlessness). The last part of the passage asks the audience ('requierez', 5324) to pray for everybody in the abbey where she lives. Clemence, on the other hand, introduces herself (2690), explains that she is writing for love of the abbey (not of the saint), and asks all who will hear (third-person, future only, 2693-4) her book to pray for her ('mei', 2696-8) rather than for 'us' (herself and her sisters). The differing style of address in these key passages strongly suggests two different individuals. General 'here-and-now' comments are much more common in the Nun's text; one does not feel that Clemence is having a conversation with her audience, and the Nun is frequently conversational. Also more frequent, in the Nun's work, are remarks about how life, or the world, is different now from what it was at the time of the story, and so forth.⁸² Pious interjections of several lines are more common in the Nun's poem, though Clemence's has them too; these personal moral comments often contain first- or second-person phrases.

1a) A related but differently-focused analysis follows, of deictics: this is a difficult area, largely because of the habit, common among medieval writers, of switching tenses (so that a present tense does not always point to the here and now).⁸³ Further, it is hard to decide where to draw the line between proverbial utterances (many of which tend towards the deictic) and homiletic ones which are often the narrator's own reflections. There are a number of narrator's comments, much more frequent with the Nun than with Clemence, which point to the here and now without using first or second person forms. They include remarks such as 'One can still see it, to this day' (objects that prove the truth of a story), 'Things are not as they used to be' (reflections on modern life); another common topic is the rhetorical question apparently addressed to the audience: 'How could the hermit know ...?' (the answer is that God told him), or 'Who can tell the goodness of this holy man?' Such comments are of considerable interest, but would need to be listed, translated, and explained individually because they are so varied; it may be noted here, however, that my count showed about twice as many in the Nun's text as in Clemence's.⁸⁴

Some special 'pointers' can readily be counted: the Nun uses second-person 'veisiez' or 'oissiez' ('you would see', or 'hear') 14 times;⁸⁵ Clemence but once ('oussiez error', 1182: 'you would have been mistaken').⁸⁶ However, Clemence points to special scenes in a different way: she says 'ki veist' (3 times), meaning 'whoever saw ... [would feel, or react, etc]'. The Nun never uses this particular (third-person) pointer.⁸⁷

Clemence addresses her audience as 'My Lords' ('Segnurs') once, and the Nun five times (one is 'sires').⁸⁸ Clemence's internal audience, addressed *not* by the author but by Katherine, are frequently 'segnurs' (being nearly all men). The single 'segnurs' to external audience comes very shortly after one to internal audience, so conceivably the writer made a slip at this point.⁸⁹ However, even if Clemence did frequently address her external audience as 'my lords', this would suggest merely that her audience, like the Nun's, was mixed — not that the two writers were the same.⁹⁰

Overall, deictic pointers are much more frequent in the Nun's work than in Clemence's, with the effect that the former seems more dramatic, immediate, and conversational.⁹¹

2) When reading the two texts side-by-side, one is struck by how much more personal and digressive the Nun is than Clemence. A further examination follows, of the narrators' direct addresses to the audience, so as to illustrate more precisely how it is that readers get this impression:⁹²

Clemence, lines of direct address, 16.⁹³ None is aimed at urging the audience to pay attention, nor at expressing a private opinion; most do no more than remind listeners where they are in the story.⁹⁴ The Nun makes a much larger number of direct addresses to the audience; the total of lines where the narrator's voice is most clearly heard, 159.⁹⁵ It is impossible to list them all, but here is a breakdown of their functions:

Some are at the same level as those used by Clemence: reminders here and there, to help listeners keep track. Others are much more strongly worded: 29 contain remarks such as 'you'll hear more, if you want to know. And now I ...' (353-5); 'as you shall hear, if you have the desire ...' (2959-60); 'as you heard before, if you were paying attention' (4518-9); 'as well as what we've just told, we shall tell ...' (6244-5). These are a different order of narratorial comment, and Clemence never speaks to her audience in this rather authoritarian way.

A number of them are deictic words and phrases, as discussed above. Next, some of the Nun's direct addresses contain explanation of what is to come, and they total 71 lines. An example is the explanation that precedes, and follows, the Nun's exposition of the Green Tree prophecy (4913–28 & 5007–20): she seems to be having difficulty with this subject, and speaks directly to her listeners. Another example is where she introduces the story of the Barking nun healed by Edward (6442–52). A total of 10 lines are various forms of *occupatio*, which Clemence never uses.⁹⁶

The most interesting comments are where the reader really seems to hear the Nun's own voice. Counting only those containing a first-person form (there are many third-person passages where the voice nevertheless seems to be present), I find 11 such lines, as follows: 'I'm not going to say a word about that!' (320, young men's bad habits); 'I couldn't tell you about the rich dishes, because I wasn't there and I didn't taste them' (1339–41, a feast); 'I don't know which way they went ...' (1903–4, a journey); 'but I don't know why ...' (3455, somebody's illness); 'I think, rather, that ...' (4668, about the dying Edward); 'I've heard her called Matilda the Good' (4978, within the explanation of the Green Tree); 'but I don't know what sort of ornament the lady ordered ...' (6109, about the seamstress); 'Somebody, I don't know whether it was a man or a woman ...' (6171, at a helper's appearance). It is by such comments that I am convinced that the Nun's voice does not belong to Clemence, who never talks in this way.

3) A further analysis may be applied, as follows: O. D. Macrae-Gibson discusses how to ascertain whether two or more texts could be by the same writer, in his edition of *Of Arthur and of Merlin*.⁹⁷ He finds many *similarities* inconclusive, indicating merely a group of writers writing in the same area at the same time, 'using naturally therefore the same sort of language' (p. 67); 'however much similarity of all sorts can be found, in an age in which the notion of plagiarism as an offence did not exist, it will still be impossible to distinguish in this way between common authorship and authorship by a "school" whose members knew each other's work' (p. 73). This agrees well with what has already been said about the Barking nuns; our texts are from an earlier century, but they are likewise insular vernacular narrative in rhyming couplets. Macrae-Gibson then examines how to distinguish *different* writers by means of personal minutiae, identifying a group of usages which might show personal 'signature', and yet be immune to scribal corruption (because of the need to retain the rhyme): rhyming tags.⁹⁸

The following examination of the two poems, by the Nun and by Clemence, identifies half-lines, or end-of-line phrases, which add little to the sense and appear to be present chiefly to supply a rhyme.⁹⁹ In a poem of 2270 lines, Clemence uses 13 such phrases; in a poem of 6685 lines, the Nun uses only 16. This is on the face of it surprising, because the Nun's language seems more digressive and wordy; however, she demonstrably does not use so very many fillers. Very few of these phrases match, if at all (phrases are grouped by topic where possible, and rhyme words printed after each line-number).

Nun: 'a sun avis' (407, 'vis'), and 'm'est il avis' (3169, 'amis'); Clemence: 'ceo m'est avis' (1042, 'jadis').

Nun: 'bien de fi' (4584, 'esjoï'); Clemence: 'bien senz faillance' (1943, 'venjance'), and 'bien te segur' (2485, 'jur').

Nun: 'ço creï' (3504, 'rei'); Clemence: 'si cùm jeo quit' (2188, 'delit'), and 'se me vols creire' (1953, 'eire').

It will be seen that the rhyme-words differ, and that the only phrase which matches closely in terms of sense and metre is structurally different ('m'est il avis', 'ceo m'est avis'): it is likely that the same person would have used the same structure.

Clemence's tags, with no matches in the Nun: 'e bel e bien' (332, 'rhetorien') and then 'e bien e bel' (345, 'anel'), 'si cume entent' (765, 'cumentement'), 'cume senee' (806, 'finee'), 'pur ço pri' (1653, 'mari'), 'ço vus pri' (1141, 'ami'), 'petit e grant' (1012, 'itant').

The Nun's tags, with no matches in Clemence:

'a bon voleir' (1093, 'heir'), 'en cel language' (1252, 'parage'), 'sue merci' (1672, 'fiz'), 'de nuiz e de jur' (3110, 'puür') and 'nuit e jur' (3544, 'dulur'), 'tut cuntez' (5214, 'nez'), 'or en present' (3683, 'ensement'), 'se vus vulez' (6520, 'guarrez'), 'par divise' (6553, 'iglise'), 'cum ainz oïstes' (4517, 'entendistes') and 'cum einz vus diz' (4639, 'suppris').

Lastly, we find: in the Nun 'de pres e de luin' (2513, 'busuin'); and in Clemence 'e pres e loin' (329, 'besoin') — but the former is more necessary to the sense than the latter, and the two phrases are structured slightly differently.

There is only one near match among these; also notable is that Clemence uses a tag of this kind approximately every 208 lines, whereas the Nun uses one approximately every 420 lines — half as many as her sister.

These are three different analyses of elements of style, each using a different method of detecting writers' individual voices. I conclude that it is very unlikely that either poem is by the younger or less confident maker of the other. The Nun may wish to withhold her name, but her address is anything but unconfident; in any case the brisker style of Clemence's poem is no proof of added maturity, even if some consider it more competent. The converse is unlikely: that Clemence wrote the *Edward* as an older woman, having developed a more authoritative style and a more intrusive narrating voice. But I believe that this voice, so conversational and "prosy", did indeed belong to an older woman — the Nun — and that Clemence was her younger colleague.¹⁰⁰ I conclude that the two poems are not by the same person, in spite of a few similar vocabulary items. The latter must be the result of a communal vocabulary among the nuns, arising from their similar subject-matter, their Latinity, their religious and liturgical environment, and the fact that they probably had the same teachers.¹⁰¹ Barking contained two, if not more, 'able versifiers'.¹⁰²

Conclusion

I have indicated a number of differences between Aelred's text and the Nun's; these show that she must have had independent sources, probably in more than one language. So far only one is identified with any certainty, namely, the *Life* of Edward the Martyr; but others are suggested: these include further sources for historical material, Old English poetry, Gregory's *Dialogues*, collections such as *florilegia*. Her distinctive style, and her confident handling of Aelred's Latin text, both become increasingly apparent as I examine the ways in which she departs from her source. Further, I have demonstrated stylistic differences between Clemence's text and the Nun's: I argue that she is a poet with her own voice, writing and re-writing with a particular audience in mind; and that she and Clemence are not one but two authors.

Notes

¹ An early version of this paper was presented at Oxford Medieval English Seminar, November 2008; it is further developed from a presentation to Leeds International Medieval Congress, July 2009. My thanks to colleagues who have kindly discussed it with me.

² *La Vie d'Edouard le Confesseur*, ed. Östen Södergård (Uppsala, Almqvist & Wiksells, 1948); all translations are mine.

³ *La Estoire de Seint Aedward le Rei*, by Matthew Paris, ed. Kathryn Young Wallace, ANTS 41 (London, Anglo-Norman Text Society, 1983), p. xxiv. See also Södergård (p. 27); and M. Dominica Legge, *Anglo-Norman Literature and its Background* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1963), p. 65.

⁴ Clemence of Barking, *Life of Saint Catherine*, ed. William MacBain, ANTS 18 (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1964).

⁵ For women's writing, and reading, in the twelfth century see especially *Barking Abbey and Its Texts*, ed. Donna A. Bussell and Jennifer N. Brown (Woodbridge, Boydell & Brewer, 2011), forthcoming. See also R. Howard Bloch, *The Anonymous Marie de France* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2003); *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Women's Writing*, ed. Carolyn Dinshaw and David Wallace (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2003); *Women and Literature in Britain, 1150–1500*, ed. Carol M. Meale (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993); *Guidance for Woman in 12th-Century Convents*, trans. Vera Morton (Cambridge, D.S. Brewer, 2003); *Writing the Wilton Women*, ed. Stephanie Hollis et al (Turnhout, Brepols, 2004); David N. Bell, *What Nuns Read: Books and Libraries in Medieval English Nunneries* (Kalamazoo MI & Spencer MA, Cistercian Publications, 1995). For recent scholarship in Anglo-Norman, particularly on multi-lingualism during this period, see especially Ian Short, *Manual of Anglo-Norman*, ANTS OPS 7 (London, Anglo-Norman Text Society, 2007), and his 'Another Look at "Le Faus Franceis"', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 54 (2010), 35–55; *Language and Culture in Medieval Britain: The French of England c. 1100–c. 1500*, ed. Jocelyn Wogan-Browne et al (Woodbridge, York Medieval Press, 2009); Robert M. Stein, 'Multilingualism', in *Middle English*, ed. Paul Strohm (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007); *The Anglo-Norman Language and its Contexts*, ed. Richard Ingham (Woodbridge, York Medieval Press, 2010).

⁶ Henrietta Leyser, 'c. 1080–1215: texts', in *Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Mysticism*, ed. Samuel Fanous and Vincent Gillespie (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 49–67. I thank Henrietta for introducing me to the poem, and for her continuing support.

⁷ MacBain, 'Some Religious and Secular Uses of the Vocabulary of *Fin' Amor* in the Early Decades of the Northern French Narrative Poem', *French Forum*, 13 (1988), 261–76; Françoise Laurent, *Plaire et édifier: Les récits hagiographiques composés en Angleterre aux XIIIe et XIIIe siècles* (Paris, Honoré Champion, 1998).

⁸ The *Estoire*; and *The History of Saint Edward the King*, trans. Thelma Fenster and Jocelyn Wogan-Browne, FRETS 1 (Tempe AZ, ACMRS, 2008), the *History*.

⁹ Laurent, p. 470.

¹⁰ *Vie*, Introduction (p. 45); and *The Middle English Verse Life of Edward the Confessor*, ed. Grace Edna Moore (Philadelphia PA, University of Pennsylvania, 1942), pp. lxiii–lxxi.

¹¹ Short, *Manual*, p. 32.

¹² Aelred of Rievaulx's Latin Prose Life: *Vita S. Edwardi Regis et Confessoris*, in *PL* 195, 737B–790B; see the translation (*Life*), in *Aelred's Historical Works*, ed. Marsha L. Dutton, trans. Jane Patricia Freeland (Kalamazoo MI, Cistercian Publications, 2005).

¹³ Emily Mitchell, 'Patrons and Politics at Twelfth-Century Barking Abbey', *Revue Bénédictine*, 113 (2003), 247–64; Emma Campbell, *Medieval Saints' Lives: The Gift, Kinship and Community in Old*

French Hagiography (Cambridge, D. S. Brewer, 2008), p. 231.

14 Legge, pp. 60–61.

15 MacBain, 'The Literary Apprenticeship of Clemence of Barking', in *Journal of the Australasian Universities Languages and Literature Association*, 9 (November 1958), 3–22. Although some scholars consider the matter impossible to determine, essays in *Barking Abbey* put forth the view that one woman wrote both texts; see especially the article by Delbert Russell (whom I thank for showing me his draft). A paper given at the New York Symposium (CUNY, 11th Sept. 2009), whose proceedings comprise the volume, expresses the view as follows: 'I believe, along with Delbert [Russell] and Jocelyn [Wogan-Browne], and the late William MacBain, that both ... were composed by the same person' (I thank Thelma Fenster for sending me a copy of her paper).

16 The Nun feels unworthy to be named on the same page as the Saint whose life she wishes to translate: 'Qu'en livre seit oi ne lit U si tres saint num ad escrit' (vv. 5310–11).

17 'Anglo-Norman Women Hagiographers', in *Anglo-Norman Anniversary Essays*, ed. Ian Short, ANTS OPS 2 (London, Anglo-Norman Text Society, 1993), pp. 235–50; and his 'Literary Apprenticeship'.

18 p. 263; see, further, Russell, for communal religious identity at Barking.

19 *The English Origins of Old French Literature* (Dublin, Four Courts Press, 1996), pp. 67–9, pp. 73–4.

20 Thanks to Emma Campbell for discussing this important point with me.

21 The only clue to her gender is a feminine 'reprise' (v. 3). Protestations of inadequacy are not exclusive to female writers; see Wogan-Browne, 'Wreaths of Thyme: The Female Translator', in *The Medieval Translator* IV, ed. Roger Ellis and Ruth Evans (Binghamton NY, MRTS, 1994), pp. 46–65 (p. 52); and her '“Clerc u lai, müine u dame”: Women and Anglo-Norman Hagiography in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries', in Meale, pp. 61–85 (p. 63). See also Antonia Gransden, 'Prologues in the Historiography of Twelfth-Century England', in *England in the Twelfth Century: Proceedings of the 1988 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Daniel Williams (Woodbridge, The Boydell Press, 1990), pp. 55–81 (pp. 55–6).

22 Osbert of Clare, author of the *Vita* which preceded Aelred's, wrote to three or four of the Barking religious: his two nieces, the abbess, and Ida (niece of Adeliza of Louvain, who may have been at Barking); see *The Letters of Osbert of Clare*, ed. E. W. Williamson (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1998), letters 21, 22, 40, 42 (and notes). Osbert may have fostered the nuns' interest in Edward, and perhaps knew the Nun herself. John of Salisbury wrote to the abbess of Barking; see John McLoughlin, 'Amicitia in practice: John of Salisbury (c. 1120–1180) and his Circle', in Williams ed., pp. 165–81 (p. 170).

23 Adgar (see note 35, below), and Guernes de Pont-Ste-Maxence (see Thomas O'Donnell, 'The Ladies Have Made Me Quite Fat: Authors and Patrons at Barking Abbey', in *Barking Abbey*; I am grateful for permission to cite this, and O'Donnell's paper for the Leeds conference, cited below). Earlier visitors included Goscelin of Saint-Bertin (see O'Donnell, 'The Ladies'), perhaps author of the first (anonymous) Life of Edward; close ties with Osbert and Goscelin are likely to have resulted Barking's special interest in Edward the Confessor.

24 See note 28, below.

25 MacBain takes it for granted that both the Nun's audience and Clemence's would be the court ('Hagiographers', p. 249). Campbell argues that 'a female community might have recognized itself within such a collective term [as 'seignurs']', without exploring the possibility that the community, for performance of the Nun's poem at least, could have been mixed (pp. 203–4).

26 For links with court life, see Mitchell (p. 364); Campbell (p. 231). The Abbey had royal connections

at least as far back as Edgar (see *The Oxford Dictionary of Saints*, Wulfhilda, for its re-endowment); consequent links with West Country foundations make communication between Barking and, for example, Shaftesbury more likely.

27 *Seniores* had several meanings, but here it refers to older (senior) religious; Aelred usually has *fratres, sancti, or monachi*.

28 Laurent, pp. 460–4; Stein p. 34.

29 *The Medieval Saints' Lives: Spiritual Renewal and Old French Literature* (Lexington KY, French Forum, 1995), p. 248. The word 'romance' here has the widest of applications; after 1200, verse as a medium for historiography began to suffer from association with the licentious fictions of romance (the Nun uses the word 'rumanz' for her work, vv. 5297 & 5313): *ibid.* p. 23.

30 The oldest manuscript, thirteenth or even twelfth century, was intended for a male (or mixed) audience; see the *Vie*, p. 48, and Wogan-Browne, 'Clerc u lai', p. 62 (and note 11).

31 See v. 5308; Gillespie makes a similar point: 'Anonymous Devotional Writings', in *A Companion to Middle English Prose*, ed. A. S. G. Edwards (Cambridge, D. S. Brewer, 2004), pp. 127–49.

32 *Vie*, vv. 6442–545; *Life*, ch. 41. The lady may have been a friend of Osbert (see his *Letters*, p. 23).

33 Introduction to the *Vie* (pp. 26–37) for a detailed comparison; these notes give the lie to Södergård's opinion that the poem is 'fondée entièrement' on the *Vita*.

34 For translation of Latin prose into vernacular verse, see Robertson: the poet had to reckon with French courtly vocabulary, and exploit it (p. 116).

35 See note 22, above. One was Guernes de Pont-Ste-Maxence (see O'Donnell, 'The Ladies'; A. T. Baker, 'Saints' Lives Written in Anglo-French: Their Historical, Social and Literary Importance', in *Essays by Divers Hands*, ed. Edmund Gosse (London, Oxford University Press, 1924), pp. 119–56 (p. 125); Wogan-Browne, 'Clerc u lai'). Another was Adgar, who dedicates his *Miracles* of the Virgin to Mahaut, perhaps Matilda, daughter of Henry II and an abbess of Barking. Adgar may have been a Barking cleric; see *Le Gracial*, ed. Pierre Kunstmann (Ottawa, Editions de l'Université, 1982), pp. 12–14.

36 Bell, p. 42.

37 Bell, pp. 108–12; and N. R. Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain* (London, Royal Historical Society, 1941), *sub* Barking: Bodley 155, c10, Gospels (into which the nuns copied records); Bodley Laud lat. 19, c12, Song of Songs and Lamentations (glossed, with theological excerpts); Cardiff MS 1.381, c12, Saints' Lives.

38 Aelred developed ideas about kingship during his time at the Scottish court; see Introduction to Walter Daniel's *Life of Aelred of Rievaulx*, ed. and trans. F. M. Powicke (London, Nelson, 1950); see Introduction to the *Life* (*The Historical Works*, pp. 10–12), for his own 'Mirror' for the future Henry II.

39 Richard Newhauser, 'Preaching the "Contrary Virtues"', *Mediaeval Studies*, 70 (2008), 135–62. For the Sermon, see "*Cher Alme*": *Texts of Anglo-Norman Piety* (FRETS OPS 1), ed. Tony Hunt, trans. Jane Bliss, Introduction by Henrietta Leyser (Tempe AZ, ACMRS, 2010), p. 311.

40 Aelred says Edward treated servants (*domesticis*) as equals, but the Nun translates as 'privez' — this, according to the glossary and to the *Anglo-Norman Dictionary*, means friends and not servants (however privy or intimate).

41 Especially at v. 1405; cf. *Life* ch. 8, where chaste love, not mutual friendship, is mentioned.

42 Aelred is silent on the subject; see his *De Institutione Inclusarum: Two English Versions*, ed. J. Ayto and A. Barratt, EETS OS 287 (London, Oxford University Press, 1984), for his own youthful sins 'of a homosexual nature' (pp. 147–8, note to 1102) and his readiness to be open about them (pp. 104–5, notes to 63–4, 65). William Burgwinkle does not discuss Edward in his *Sodomy, Masculinity, and Law in*

Medieval Literature (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2004).

43 Some variations may result from differences between the manuscript(s) used as base text for the PL *Vita*, and the copy available to the Nun; it is not currently possible to identify either with any certainty. I focus on differences likely to have originated with the Nun herself.

44 See vv. 601–21. Cf. Aelred's *Genealogy* (c.1153), in *The Historical Works*, trans. Freeland, ch. 20; and his *Life* (p. 139).

45 vv. 6116–23. The Nun refers to the story, in French, whereas the *Life* of the Martyr recounts it, in Latin; verbal parallels are not to be expected.

46 A. G. Rigg, *A History of Anglo-Latin Literature 1066–1422* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 34–5.

47 Both Ker, *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries* (4 vols, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1977), vol. II (pp. 347–9), and Bell (p. 108), describe Cardiff Public Library MS 1.381: the Edward (fols. 97–102) follows Goscelin's lives of Ethelburga and Hildelitha, and is followed by another from this author (c. 1035–c. 1107), who had close connections with Barking. See *The Life of King Edward who Rests at Westminster*, ed. and trans. Frank Barlow (London, Nelson, 1962), Appendix C, for his authorship of the anonymous Life which precedes Osbert's; and p. 97 note 3, that Muriel of Wilton may have written it.

48 *Edward King and Martyr*, ed. Christine E. Fell (Leeds, University of Leeds School of English, 1971), Introduction, and pp. 3–5 in the text (that it was written for Barking, see esp. pp. xvii–xx). I thank the Local Studies Department of Cardiff Central Library for a copy of the Edward section of the manuscript.

49 For the history of the Cardiff MS, see Fell (Introduction); and Hollis, 'The Manuscripts' in Hollis ed, pp. 236–44.

50 Jane Bliss, 'An Anglo-Norman Nun: An Old English *Gnome*', *Notes & Queries*, 254.1 (Mar. 2009), 16–18.

51 The contents of the manuscript are listed in the introduction to *The Battle of Maldon*, ed. D. G. Scragg (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1981), together with summary (and references) of these conjectures. See also E. D. Laborde, *Byrhtnoth and Maldon* (London, Heinemann, 1936), for historical background of characters.

52 In the late eleventh century, Aelfgyva asked Goscelin to write lives of Barking's three Anglo-Saxon saints: Ethelburga, Hildelith, and Wulfhilda (*Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, The Hagiography of the Female Saints of Ely*, ed. and trans. Rosalind C. Love (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 2004), p. xxi). The Cotton MS contains part of a life of Ethelburga, and a Translation and Life of Wulfhilda; the Cardiff MS contains a life of Ethelburga, and one of Hildelith.

53 H. M. Thomas, *The English and the Normans: Ethnic Hostility, Assimilation, and Identity 1066–c. 1220* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2003), esp. Introduction, and ch. 23. See further, on how *Maldon* looks not back to epic but forward to a new style, E. S. Sclar, 'The Battle of Maldon and the Popular Tradition: Some Rhymed Formulas', *Philological Quarterly*, 54 (1975), 409–18.

54 Thomas D. Hill, 'The *Liber Eliensis* "Historical Selections" and the Old English *Battle of Maldon*', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 96 (1997), 1–12 (p. 9, and note 28 on p. 12). For the inheritance of Old English, see John Frankis, 'Languages and Cultures in Contact: Vernacular Lives of St Giles and Anglo-Norman Annotations in an Anglo-Saxon Manuscript', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 38 (2007), 101–33.

55 Paul Strohm says 'a single-language text can rest on a foundation of disguised multi-lingual presumptions', in *Middle English*, p. 1; see also Short, *Manual*.

- 56 See, for example, Mark Faulkner, 'Gerald of Wales and Standard Old English', *Notes & Queries*, 256.1, March 2011, 19–24, for writers' recognition of English dialects.
- 57 Short, 'Another Look', pp. 50–3: the Nun's remark about those who have learned French elsewhere implies that she has learned it here, English being her mother tongue.
- 58 For Anglo-Norman identity, bilingualism, and English as mother tongue in the late twelfth century, see Ian Short, 'Tam Angli quam Franci: Self-Definition in Anglo-Norman England', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 18 (1995), 153–75 (p. 174); and works cited in note 5, above.
- 59 Legge, pp. 366, 370 & 371.
- 60 See, for example, G. R. Owst, *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England* (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1961), p. 4 for bilingualism: English survived as a language for preaching even in the twelfth century.
- 61 A valuable recent anthology is *From the Norman Conquest to the Black Death*, ed. Douglas Gray (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011): the introduction to each selection (Anglo-Latin or Anglo-Norman) sketches what is known about each text and its author.
- 62 Leyser, p. 49 & note 2.
- 63 Elizabeth Tyler is certain that the Maud in question was the abbess of Barking; see her 'From Old English to Old French', in Wogan-Browne ed, *Language* (pp. 164–78), pp. 166–7.
- 64 I thank Winfried Rudolf, for identifying the passage in Gregory, and generously supplying me with text and translation.
- 65 See, especially, 'The Life of Saint Catherine' (Introduction), in *Virgin Lives and Holy Deaths*, trans. Jocelyn Wogan-Browne and Glyn S. Burgess (London, Dent, 1996); also Catherine Batt, 'Clemence of Barking's Transformations of *courtoisie* in *La Vie de Sainte Catherine d'Alexandrie*', *New Comparison*, 12 (1991), 102–23.
- 66 *Vie*, p. 27.
- 67 I am grateful to her for showing it to me. See also Jocelyn Wogan-Browne, *Saints' Lives and Women's Literary Culture: Virginity and its Authorizations, c. 1150–1300* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 231.
- 68 *Saints' Lives*, pp. 232–3, note 29.
- 69 Wogan-Browne, 'Wreaths', p. 53 (where she refers to Anselm [*sic*] of Rievaulx's concern with almsgiving) and note 27; and her *Saints' Lives* (pp. 232–3, note 29). For Cambridge, Trinity College MS O.2.29 (1133), see M. R. James, *Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge* (4 vols., Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1902), III, 122; and *Memorials of St Anselm*, ed. R. W. Southern and F. S. Schmitt (London, British Academy, 1969), for editions of the works in question.
- 70 Wogan-Browne, 'Women's Formal and Informal Traditions of Biblical Knowledge in Anglo-Norman England', in *Saints, Scholars, and Politicians: Gender as a Tool in Medieval Studies*, ed. Mathilde van Dijk and Renée Nip (Turnhout, Brepols, 2005), pp. 85–109 (p. 96); and Jean Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: A Study of Monastic Culture*, trans. Catharine Misrahi, 3rd edn (New York, Fordham University Press, 1985), Appendix. William of Malmesbury, too, knew and admired Anselm greatly. However, it is not clear whether the nuns knew Anselm's work directly, or via their various sources (Osbert corresponded with Anselm's nephew; he may have discussed the uncle's work with the nuns).
- 71 pp. 105, 108, & 113; and note 16.
- 72 Leyser, esp. pp. 52 & 60.
- 73 See MacBain, 'Hagiographers' (pp. 243–7); and Batt, for treatment of the legend.
- 74 See Fenster and Russell in *Barking Abbey*: the similarity between 'Dunc veisiej ... plurer' (Nun, vv.

4631–2) and 'Iloc vit ... plurer' (Clemence, vv. 179–80) is suggestive but, significantly, the phrases are constructed differently and therefore penned by different authors, in my opinion. Further, use of the rare phrase 'nun disable' (the Nun, v. 982; Clemence, vv. 597, 826, 1190, 1786) can be explained by a communal religious vocabulary among the nuns and their *magistrae*, as can the examples of 'informed theological comment', perhaps influenced by Anselm of Canterbury. None is evidence that the two writers are the same, nor do the authors note the fact that *only* the Nun uses and exploits the phrase 'fin' amur'. They argue that once we have ceased to take the Nun's 'apology' as denoting a poor self-image we can identify her with Clemence; this does not follow. But I fully concur with their conclusion, that both express 'implicitly and overtly, the importance of female learning.'

75 vv. 401, 483–4, and especially 1305–6.

76 'False French and the Monastic Vocation: Twelfth-Century Translations at Barking Abbey' (paper given at Leeds International Medieval Congress, July 2009).

77 Methodology: occurrences counted by hand were checked with an English translation by computer: the texts contain too many different forms of pronouns and verb-endings, and verbs where the subject is understood, for any convenient electronic analysis. Furthermore, only a human eye can readily distinguish whether any verb-form is within a speech or not, or whether a first-person plural form (for example) is an address to the audience or part of a prayer where 'nus/nostre' has a different semantic content.

78 Clemence = 2638 lines, the Nun = 6635 lines. The prologues omitted from the count (10 lines and 50 lines respectively), together with the Nun's introduction of herself (40 lines, part-way through her text) and Clemence's epilogue in which she introduces herself (12 lines), are examined separately.

79 The Nun: 85 first-person forms (every 78–9 lines); 73 second-person forms (every 90–91 lines). Clemence: 11 first-person forms (every 239–40 lines); 13 second-person forms (every 202–3 lines).

80 'Let us pray to God who made us all' is very different from 'We have already told you about ...'.

81 A further analysis, counting lines in which the narrating voice addresses the audience directly, with examples, follows below.

82 Those occurring in the Nun are too numerous to list; those in Clemence, and an overall comparative count, follow below.

83 See Karl D. Uitti, 'The Clerkly Narrator Figure in Old French Hagiography and Romance', *Medioevo Romanzo*, 2 (1975), 394–408 (394–6).

84 But see section 2 of this analysis, below.

85 vv. 1795, 2013, 2391, 2395, 3223, 4631, 5115, 5261, 5436, 5496, 5822, 5928, 6231, 6682.

86 These were included in the count of second-person forms.

87 Laurent (p. 354) counted 11 cases of the 'oisiez/veisiez' form without remarking that they are all (plus 3 that she missed) in the Nun's text. She refers to her pp. 78–9, on 'des verbes de perception conjugués au subjonctif ...'. On p. 354, further, she notes the use of 'ki veist' for passages of intense feeling, without remarking that only Clemence uses it (her reference to lines 2513–30 contains examples of 'ki veist'). Her references to the Nun (5117–44), and to Clemence (2164–82), are on the topic of 'dol' and contain neither of those pointers; it has been noted that Clemence's emperor laments in tones reminiscent of Thomas d'Angleterre; the Nun, while exploiting the idea of 'fin' amur', shows no sign of knowing the Tristan story.

88 Clemence, v. 1159; Nun, vv. 1295, 4639, 4913, 5007, 6372.

89 Katherine, to internal audience: vv. 97, 671, 737, 1059, 1139, 1609, 1981.

90 See my section on the Nun's audience, above.

91 Such pointers, which make the narrative more immediate and vivid, may indicate that Clemence's audience was different from the Nun's.

92 The following omits, as previously, the passages in which the authors explain themselves and their work.

93 vv. 170, 406, 611, 1042, 1151, 1171, 1182, 1372, 1382, 2061–2, 2119, 2317, 2622, 2639–40.

94 Respectively: '... that I spoke of before', 'See! The news has come', 'therefore I tell you', 'so it is, I think', 'My lords, you have heard ...', 'I want to show you ...', 'you would be mistaken about ...', '... that you haven't heard before', '... that I told you about earlier', 'We shall tell you what we know about ...', 'See! Here is the queen', '... whom I told you about before', 'therefore I don't wish to hide ...', 'Now we wish to go back to her death, and tell you about her feast-day'.

95 Clemence addresses the audience every 164–5 lines, and the Nun every 41–2 lines; four times as frequently.

96 'It would take me a long time to ...' (112–13); 'Because I don't know the story, I'll tell you briefly' (619–20); 'As we could prove to you, but it would take too long ...' (3689–92).

97 EETS OS 279 (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1979), vol. 2 (of 2), pp. 65–75.

98 He explains how the overall pattern is unlikely to be copied exactly, even if the range and general use of such tags could be taken over from another writer.

99 Here no distinction need be made between narrative and direct speech.

100 They may have had the same teacher, or the Nun was Clemence's teacher (Bell, pp. 62–3). For the school and its *magistrae* at Barking, see *The History of Barking Abbey*, E. A. Loftus and H. F. Chettle (Barking, Wilson & Whitworth, 1954), p. 55.

101 See note 100, above.

102 *Catherine*, p. xxvi.