DEGUILEVILLE AND HOCCLEVE AGAIN

Scholarly interest in Hoccleve’s knowledge of Deguileville’s *Pèlerinages* trilogy has tended to concentrate on the second part of the trilogy, *Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme*. As is well known, Hoccleve, like Chaucer, translated a single lyric from Deguileville’s *Pèlerinages* into English, and, like Chaucer’s ‘ABC to the Virgin’, Hoccleve’s version of the ‘Virgin’s lament’ circulated both within a Middle English version of one of the texts and as a free-standing lyric in England in the Middle Ages.¹ Hoccleve’s ‘Virgin’s lament’ survives as a discrete lyric in one manuscript, San Marino, Huntington Library, MS 111, and in a further ten manuscripts within the Middle English prose version of the *Pilgrimage of the Soul*.² It was also reproduced as part of Caxton’s edition of the Middle English prose *Pilgrimage of the Soul*.

It seems likely that Deguileville composed *Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme* in 1358, and, according to a translator’s colophon, it was translated into Middle English in 1413.³ Although significant portions of the *Pilgrimage of the Soul* follow Deguileville’s French text closely, the Middle English text is a version of *Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme* rather than a word-for-word translation, with its own nuances and preoccupations. Most of the *Pilgrimage of the Soul* has been rendered into prose, with the exception of fourteen lyrics, including the ‘Virgin’s lament’, which are in verse. The author of the *Pilgrimage of the Soul* evidently had access to a copy of Hoccleve’s translation of the ‘Virgin’s lament’, and he (or she) incorporated it into his version at the relevant point instead of translating that lyric from scratch. However, he may or may not have been aware that Hoccleve had not translated the lyric from *Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme*. It is my contention that the lyric which the author of the *Pilgrimage of the Soul* incorporated is actually a translation of a similar passage from *Le Pèlerinage Jhesucrist*.

The modern assumption that Hoccleve translated the lyric from *Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme* seems to have originated with Frederick J. Furnivall in 1897, who associates the lyric with *Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme* in the foreword to the third volume of his edition of *Hoccleve’s Works* for the Early English Text Society.⁴ This supposition has subsequently been perpetuated by later students of Deguileville and Hoccleve who have relied upon Furnivall’s assumption, and it has in turn given rise to a variety of other debates, including whether Hoccleve was responsible for the translation of other Middle English lyrics contained within the Middle English *Pilgrimage of the Soul* – and even whether he might be the translator of the whole text.⁵ Debate has also centred on the authorship of the final five stanzas of the Middle English lyric which do not exist either in Deguileville’s French text or in the version in San Marino, Huntington Library
was Hoccleve responsible for them or were they added by the translator of the rest of the Pilgrimage of the Soul?6

I shall argue that these various debates are misinformed because the real source of Hoccleve’s lyric has not been identified correctly. Despite increasing scholarly interest in both Hoccleve and Deguileville, the myth has been perpetuated that the source of Hoccleve’s ‘Virgin’s Lament’ is Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme. Versions of the ‘Virgin’s lament’, however, are included by Deguileville in the second and third parts of his trilogy, Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme and Le Pèlerinage Jhesucrist. These versions, although similar, are not identical, and a comparison demonstrates that Hoccleve’s translation is undoubtedly based upon the version in Le Pèlerinage Jhesucrist.

The main differences between the versions of the ‘Virgin’s lament’ in Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme and Le Pèlerinage Jhesucrist are prompted by a change in context from a crucifixion scene that is imagined within an allegory of dry and green trees in Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme, to a crucifixion that takes place at Golgotha in Le Pèlerinage Jhesucrist. The removal of references to trees, including to bark, apples, and juice, sometimes with appropriate substitutions, is not original to Hoccleve but was part of Deguileville’s revision of the lyric to fit its new narrative position in Le Pèlerinage Jhesucrist. For example, following Stürzinger’s editions, lines 6359–62 of Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme read:

Quant le me baillas a vestir
Et d’escorce humaine couvrir
Pour estre pomme, grant joye
M’en vint au cuer …7

compared with the revised version in Le Pèlerinage Jhesucrist:

Quant le me baillas a vestir
Et de char humainne couvrir
Pour estrë homme, grant joye
M’en vint au cuer …8

Hoccleve follows Deguileville’s change from ‘escorce’ (‘bark’) to ‘char humainne’ (‘human flesh’) and ‘pomme’ (‘apple’) to ‘homme’ (‘man’) when producing his translation:

I had ioye entiere and also gladnesse
Whan þu betook him me to clothe and wrappe
In mannes flesche.9

Lines 9275f. of Le Pèlerinage Jhesucrist represent a much more drastic pruning of the arboreal references from lines 6471–6 of Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme which again Hoccleve adopts. Mary’s lament to her son:

Fil, autrement, s’il te plëust
Et a ton vouloir venu feust,
Eust este l’arbre restabli
Et d’autre pomme ressaisi.
Et fort (y) a qu’on ne t’abate
Et jus venir (on) ne te face
Par les paroles de despit
Qué on te rue et qu’on te dit.10

is reduced to:

Fil, autrement s’il te plëust
Et a ton vouloir venu fust,
Homme rachaté autrement
Éusses sanz souffir tourment.11

and the latter is rendered by Hoccleve as:

Mighte nat, sone, the redempcioun
Of man han bee withoute effusion
Of thy blood? Yis, if it had been thy lust.
But what thou wilt be doon, souffre me must.12

Whilst the final line of Hoccleve’s stanza in this form does not seem particularly close to the original, Ellis’s critical apparatus of selected variants from non-holograph manuscripts demonstrates that a number of manuscripts’ readings are markedly closer to the French of *Le Pèlerinage Jhesucrist*. For example, ‘thow wilt’ is omitted from two of the manuscripts, London, British Library, Egerton MS 615 and New York Public Library, MS Spencer 19. Likewise ‘me’ is replaced in at least three manuscripts by variations on ‘you’: ‘thu’, found in Cambridge University Library MS Kk.1.7, and ‘the’ in London, British Library, Egerton MS 615 and New York Public Library, MS Spencer 19, which follow Deguileville’s ‘te’.13 A more comprehensive examination of such variants will become possible with the publication of the second volume of Rosemarie Potz McGerr’s edition of *The Pilgrimage of the Soul*, which contains the lyric.

Deguileville alters his reference to ‘cel arbre sec ou est pendu’ (‘this dry tree on which he is hanging’) in line 6520 of *Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme* to ‘cel aspre croiz ou est pendu’ (‘this harsh cross on which he is hanging’) in line 9302 of *Le Pèlerinage Jhesucrist*, and Hoccleve’s version duly reads ‘the crois on which he … / is hangid’.14 A final example of an alteration which results from this change of context is drawn from near the end of the ‘Virgin’s lament’ in *Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme*, and forms the conclusion of the lyric in *Le Pèlerinage Jhesucrist*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme</th>
<th>Le Pèlerinage Jhesucrist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ves ci ma pomme entemmec!</td>
<td>Vez ci mon fil par tout navré</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Qui) tant a este flagellee</td>
<td>Qui tant a este tourmente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que de toutes pars en saut hors</td>
<td>Que de toutes pars en saut hors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le jus a hondes et a gors.</td>
<td>Son sanc a ondes et a gors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venes, succies, n’est rien si douls!</td>
<td>Venes, succies, n’est rien si douz, 9385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faites qué yvres soies tous</td>
<td>Faites qué yvres soiés touz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De la grant amour qu’a vous a!</td>
<td>De la grant amour qu’à vouz a!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mere ne vëistes piec’a</td>
<td>Mere ne vëistes piec’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qui si tost sa cote fendist</td>
<td>Qui si tost sa cote fendist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The alterations in this excerpt exemplify Deguileville’s revision practices. Certain key words are transposed directly to their de-allegorized forms, such as ‘le jus’ (‘the juice’) in line 6602 to ‘son sanc’ (‘his blood’) in line 9384, as the allegory is decoded, and so the lines that contain them are left unchanged because they make sense in either context. Given that Deguileville did not need to mention the arboreal allegory specifically in every line for it to perpetuate, several lines at a time are left unchanged. His decision to leave these unaltered renders the eucharistic imagery more overt than when enshrouded in apple imagery: whilst Mary’s injunction, ‘venes; succies …’ (‘come; suck …’) does not seem out of place when on a literal level she is referring to an apple, it contains striking eucharistic connotations when it refers so explicitly to Jesus.

Hoccleve’s lyric is a version of Deguileville’s ‘Virgin’s lament’ rather than a word-for-word translation, and he in turn rewrites certain elements of the lyric. He replaces the exhortation to suck Christ’s blood with an appeal to the ‘sones of Adam’ to experience and demonstrate love and pity at the sight of Christ’s blood. He also emphasizes that Christ’s suffering is ‘for your gilt and blame’ which adds to the emotive nature of the text:

See how my sone for your gilt and blame
Hangith heer al bybled vpon the crois.
Bymeneth him in herte and cheere and vois.
His blody stremes see now and beholde.
If yee to him han any afeccioun
Now for his wo your hertes oghten colde.
Shewith your loue and your dileccioun.
For your gilt makith he correccioun
And amendes right by his owne deeth.
That yee nat reewe on him, myn herte it sleeth.
A modir þat so soone hir cote taar
Or rente, sy men neuere noon or this,
For chyld which þat shee of hir body baar
To yeue her tete, as my chyld þat heer is.
His cote hath torn for your gilt, nat for his,
And hath his blood despent in greet foysoun,
And al it was for your redempcioun.

Nonetheless, despite these elements of rewriting, Hoccleve’s ending evidently follows the version in *Le Pèlerinage Jhesucrist*. 
The contention that Hoccleve is following the revised version is not only based upon alterations which result from the change in context of the ‘Virgin’s lament’, however, and it is here, therefore, that the case for Hoccleve’s use of the version in Le Pèlerinage Jhesucrist is strongest. The ‘Virgin’s lament’ as it appears in Le Pèlerinage Jhesucrist includes several new lines which Hoccleve in turn includes in his lyric, and likewise Hoccleve’s version does not contain lines which are found in Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme but are not in Le Pèlerinage Jhesucrist. For example, the final two lines of the stanza addressed to Elizabeth, ‘I song to sone, for I sang be the morwe, / And now at even I wepe and make sorwe’, which Ellis suggests is ‘a probable addition by Hoccleve to the text’, is located in the same position in the Jhesucrist lyric, as Mary laments:

\[
\text{Trop tost lors jë en fis chancon,} \\
\text{Matin chantai avant heure,} \\
\text{Maintenant au soir en pleure.}^{18}
\]

By contrast, the additional sixteen lines of Mary’s lament to her son in Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme, which begin ‘He douls fils, pour quoi approucher / N’ose je pour toi embrasser?’ are not found in either Le Pèlerinage Jhesucrist or Hoccleve’s lyric.\(^{19}\)

That Hoccleve translated the ‘Virgin’s lament’ from Le Pèlerinage Jhesucrist rather than Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme casts new light upon the debate about the authorship of the final five stanzas of the version contained within the Middle English Pilgrimage of the Soul but which do not appear in San Marino, Huntington Library, MS 111. As Hoccleve did not translate the rest of the lyric from Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme, it is logical to conclude that he was not responsible for the additional five stanzas which are translated from Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme and tacked onto the end of his version of the ‘Virgin’s lament’ as it appears in the Pilgrimage of the Soul. It seems highly likely instead that the author of the Pilgrimage of the Soul incorporated Hoccleve’s translation from Le Pèlerinage Jhesucrist, making minor alterations as he did so, and added the final five stanzas himself. He may or may not have been aware that two versions of the lyric existed in French, and so may or may not have realized that he was incorporating a translation of the ‘wrong’ version. What he evidently noticed, however, is that after the final word, ‘redempcioun’ in line 6616 of Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme, the ‘Virgin’s lament’ continued, although Hoccleve’s translation did not, which explains his addition of the final five stanzas, composed in accordance with the style of translation that he employed elsewhere in the Pilgrimage of the Soul. These five stanzas include references to the allegory of Christ as an apple hanging on a tree, although this is inconsistent with the verses which precede them, because these allusions would have been present in the copy of Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme from which he was working.

McGerr has observed that the composer of the Pilgrimage of the Soul often departs significantly from the French text of Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme, which gives the Middle English text ‘an integrity of its own’.\(^{20}\) She judges that ‘by modern standards, therefore, The Pilgrimage of the Soul might best be considered
an adaptation, rather than translation, of *Le Pèlerinage de l’âme*; by medieval standards, however, the *Soul* remains a translation, though not a literal one. The five stanzas which are added onto the end of Hoccleve’s translation accord with this description. Whereas Hoccleve’s translation follows the French text reasonably closely, although not dogmatically, these final five stanzas vary in their proximity to the French text. Sometimes their author follows the French text closely; in other places he translates ideas rather than word for word, and so his text often seems loosely based on the Virgin’s addresses to the ‘fils Adam’ and the dry tree. He also rearranges some material and omits other lines altogether.

To take these practices in order, there is an example of the author’s close translation practice in the fourth stanza as Mary describes herself as:

... moul dolente,
Car mon cueur as en toi ﬁchie
Dedens ma pomme et atachie.
Son cueur et le mien n’est quë un,
A l’un et a l’autre est commun.

In Middle English this is expressed succinctly but accurately as:

It is to me but all discounfortable
To se myn herte attached the vpon,
For he and I, oure hert is but one.

By contrast, at the beginning of the same stanza, the tone of Mary’s direct address to the dry tree is reproduced faithfully, although her actual words are altered. Her statement:

Arbre sec, a toi reparler
Vueil, se me daignes escouter.
Tu es venu a t’entente …

becomes

O aduersari, [t]hrow cruel drye tree,
To the speke I, now hast þu thi entent.

The Virgin announces in both versions that she will speak to the dry tree, although her possibly sarcastic qualification, ‘se me daignes escouter’ (‘if you will deign to listen to me’), is omitted from the translation; instead, she refers to the tree as ‘cruel’. The interjectory ‘O’ is presumably added to render this address consistent with the other stanzas and to affirm that it is part of the ‘Virgin’s lament’ rather than concluding comments following the ‘Virgin’s lament’ (the latter seems to be its position in the French version, where notably a preceding ‘He’ is absent). Line 16b renders ‘tu es venu a t’entente’ idiomatically. A final example demonstrates both omission and redistribution. The translator omits the reference to tasting the ‘cinc pepinieres’ (‘ﬁve seeds’); instead he uses an earlier line which Hoccleve forbore to translate, rendering ‘Venes, succies, n’est rien si douls!’ as ‘Go suke the iuce. The is no thing so sweet’.

If, then, these verses were translated by the composer of the *Pilgrimage of the*
Soul rather than Hoccleve, there is no evidence to suggest that Hoccleve himself necessarily ever had access to a copy of Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme. As we only can be certain that he knew Le Pèlerinage Jhesucrist, or at the very least the version of the ‘Virgin’s lament’ therein, the grounds for suggesting that he translated the other lyrics found in the Middle English Pilgrimage of the Soul become much more shaky, and it certainly seems extremely unlikely that he should be identified as the author of the Pilgrimage of the Soul in its entirety. All we can say for certain is that Hoccleve translated the ‘Virgin’s lament’ from Le Pèlerinage Jhesucrist and that somehow the author of the Pilgrimage of the Soul gained access to his work. To postulate Hoccleve’s further involvement in the composition of the Pilgrimage of the Soul is to push existing evidence beyond its reasonable limits.
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NOTES


2 San Marino, Huntington Library, MS 111 contains a collection of sixteen poems by Hoccleve. It is ex-Phillipps 8151. It is missing its first leaf, and with it the first six stanzas of the ‘Virgin’s lament’. The Middle English Pilgrimage of the Soul is found in Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 124/61; Cambridge, University Library, MS KK.1.7; Hatfield (Herts.), Hatfield House, MS Cecil 270; London, British Library, Additional MS 34,193; London, British Library, Egerton MS 615; Melbourne, Victoria State Library, MS *096/G94; New York, Public Library, MS Spencer 19; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 770; Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 237; Oxford, University College, MS 181. See The Pilgrimage of the Soul: A Critical Edition of the Middle English Dream Vision, ed. Rosemarie Potz McGerr, vol. I, Garland Medieval Texts 16 (New York, 1990), pp. lv–xcii for descriptions of these manuscripts.


4 Hoccleve’s Works III: The Regement of Princes, ed. Frederick J. Furnivall, EETS, S 72 (London, 1897), p. vii. Furnivall mistakenly assumes that the Middle English Pilgrimage of the Soul was translated from Jean Gallopes’s later French prose redaction of Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme.

For rejection of Hoccleve’s authorship of these stanzas, see J. A. Burrow, *English Writers of the Late Middle Ages: Thomas Hoccleve*, Authors of the Middle Ages 4 (Aldershot, 1994), p. 24 n. 93.

7 ‘When you handed him over to me to clothe and cover in human bark in order to be an apple, great joy came to my heart because of it …’, Guillaume de Deguileville, *Le Pèlerinage de l’Âme*, ed. J. J. Stürzinger (London, 1895), lines 6339–363a.

8 ‘When you handed him over to me to clothe and cover in human flesh in order to be a man, great joy came to my heart because of it …’, Guillaume de Deguileville, *Le Pèlerinage de Jhesucrist*, ed. J. J. Stürzinger (London, 1897), lines 9157–160a.

9 Ellis, ‘Conpleynt paramont’, lines 8–10.

10 ‘Son, if it had pleased you otherwise and you had consented to it, the tree would have been restored and raised from another apple. And no-one there would have struck you painfully, and caused juice to come through the words of contempt that people cast on you and say to you.’ *Âme*, ed. Stürzinger, lines 6469–76.

11 ‘Son, if it had pleased you otherwise and you had consented to it, you might have redeemed man differently without suffering torment.’ *Jhesucrist*, ed. Stürzinger, lines 9271–4.

12 Ellis, ‘Conpleyne paramont’, lines 116–19.

13 Ellis, ‘Conpleyne paramont’, Appendix 5, p. 278. He cites his siglum ‘U’ (Cambridge University Library, MS Ff.i.6) rather than ‘U2’ (Cambridge University Library, MS Kk.1.7) but it is obvious that he is referring to Cambridge University Library, Kk.1.7.

14 Ellis, ‘Conpleyne paramont’, lines 149f.

15 ‘See here my broken apple which has been struck so much that from all parts of him the juice rushes out in waves and in floods. Come, suck, there is nothing so sweet! Cause yourselves to be entirely drunk on the great love that he has for you! You did not see the mother long ago who tore her coat so soon for the child that she nourished and to whom she gave her breast, as soon as he abandoned himself to piercing and his peel to violation in order for you to suck his juice. Come, my apple is given over to ravaging and piercing, and his juice poured out so freely that you have redemption from it.’ *Âme*, ed. Stürzinger, lines 6599–620. The lament to the Sons of Adam continues until line 6626, then the Green Tree addresses the Dry Tree directly for a further eighteen lines.

16 ‘See here my son wounded everywhere, who has been so tortured that from all parts of him his blood rushes out in waves and in floods. Come, suck, there is nothing so sweet; cause yourselves to be entirely drunk on the great love that he has for you! You never before saw a mother who tore her coat so soon for the child that she nourished and to whom she gave her breast, as soon as he abandoned himself to piercing and his blood poured out so freely that you have redemption from it.’ *Jhesucrist*, ed. Stürzinger, lines 9381–98. The lament ends here.

17 Ellis, ‘Conpleyne paramont’, lines 232–45.

18 ‘I sang about it too soon then; I sang in the morning before the allotted time, now I weep about it in the evening.’ *Jhesucrist*, ed. Stürzinger, lines 9194–6; Ellis, ‘Conpleynt paramont’, lines 41f.; p. 61 nn. 41f.

19 ‘Hey sweet son, why do I not dare to draw near to you to embrace you?’ *Âme*, ed. Stürzinger, lines 6477–92.

21 Ibid., p. xxix.

22 ‘... very sad because you have my heart fastened and attached in you, inside my apple. His heart and mine are but one; it is shared by both of us.’ *Âme*, ed. Stürzinger, lines 6630–2.

23 *Âme*, ed. Stürzinger, lines 6630–4; Ellis, Appendix 1, lines 26–8.

24 ‘Dry Tree, I want to reply to you, if you will deign to listen to me. You have reached your goal.’ *Âme*, ed. Stürzinger, lines 6627–9; Ellis, Appendix 1, lines 15f.

25 *Âme*, ed. Stürzinger, line 6619; Ellis, Appendix 1, line 6.