# Hidden Identities: St. Benedict and Localization in the South English Legendary



# Hidden Identities:

## St. Benedict and Localization in the *South English Legendary*

Jacob Wayne RUNNER

**Abstract:**

The Middle English collection of saints' lives known as the *South English Legendary* (13th–14th Century) is set apart by the markedly 'local' nature and aspect of its hagiography. In this article I identify and assess the reduction of characters and omission of proper names as a representative stylistic element that contributes to this localization. Taking the figure of St. Benedict as a case study, I contrast presentations found in the *South English Legendary* with those contained in St. Gregory the Great's *Dialogues* (Latin, ca. end of 6th Century), Ælfric of Eynsham's *Catholic Homilies* (Old English, ca. end of 10th century), and Jacobus de Voragine's widely read and circulated *Golden Legend* (Latin, ca. mid-13th century). Ultimately, a case is made that the purposeful obscuring of specific identities enacts a contextual destabilization that allows Benedict's life to be not only translated and condensed, but also localized.

The Middle English collection of saints' lives known as the *South English Legendary* (13th–14th Century) is preserved variously in more than sixty surviving manuscripts, and it is set apart from preceding breviaries and even the source materials on which it draws by the markedly 'local' nature and aspect of its hagiography. In this article I identify and assess one easily overlooked stylistic element that contributes to this localization—the reduction of characters and omission of proper names. Taking the

figure and miracles of St. Benedict as a specific case study, I contrast presentations of the saint found in the *South English Legendary* with those contained in St. Gregory the Great's *Dialogues* (Latin, ca. end of 6th century), Ælfric of Eynsham's *Catholic Homilies* (Old English, ca. end of 10th century), and Jacobus de Voragine's widely read and circulated *Golden Legend* (Latin, ca. mid-13th century).

Differing even from its relative contemporary, the *Golden Legend*, it has been reasoned that the *South English Legendary* was possibly intended for instruction of the laity, and this would help to explain the large amount of additional commentary, symbolic explanation, and definition of religious terminology that the *South English Legendary* contains.[1] Katherine G. McMahon has even put forward the suggestion that perhaps the *South English Legendary* was produced as part of a tradition for the edification of women, an audience for whom a vernacular text would theoretically have been more accessible.[2] For modern readers, what is perhaps most critical to bear in mind is the reality that Thomas Liszka highlights: due to the rather large variation in terms of content that is seen in the numerous surviving manuscripts, the *South English Legendary* (or indeed, "*Legendaries*") might more accurately be viewed as a continuum of similar collections showing meaningful regional variation, rather than descendants of an original, unified text.[3] Yet whoever the intended original audience(s) may have been, the vernacular collection suggests itself to have been of use to individuals indisposed to benefit from earlier and contemporary Latin collections similarly containing the lives of saints.

---

[1] See further: Minnie E. Wells, "The South English Legendary in Its Relation to the Legenda Aurea," *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 51.2 (1936): 337–360.

[2] Katherine G. McMahon, "St. Scholastica – Not a Wife!" in *The South English Legendary: A Critical Assessment*, ed. Klaus P. Jankofsky (Tübingen: Francke Verlag, 1992), 18–28.

[3] Thomas Liszka, "The *South English Legendaries*," in *Rethinking the South English Legendaries*, eds. Heather Blurton and Jocelyn Wogan-Browne (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), 23–65.

This issue of audience and perspective is intrinsically linked with the notably 'local' aspect that characterizes the *South English Legendary* and which even seeps into its presentation of non-insular saints from the continent. In contradistinction to its depiction of St. Benedict and other such figures, Klaus Jankofsky notes how, "The *SEL* abounds in concrete historical-factual information about the English and Irish saints in contrast to the narrative treatment accorded to 'Latin' (i.e., non-British) saints and martyrs."[4] Placing this observation alongside textual evidence such as discernibly English idiomatic usages quite divorced from Latin, Jankofsky reinforces the notion that the *South English Legendary* does not simply act as a translation of Latin collections or as a modernization of previous breviaries, but instead functions as a sort of enculturation of the contained saints' lives. In the same vein, Minnie E. Wells has performed a comparative analysis of Harley MS 2277 and the *Golden Legend*, noting the *South English Legendary*'s apparent "omission of a considerable number of saints who were of slighter interest to an English than to a Continental audience […]"[5] The differences and variations encountered in the surviving manuscript record suggest that the *South English Legendary* may have purposefully functioned as something of an open text, one which could be added to or subtracted from depending upon local usage or suitability.[6]

Turning to the specific example of St. Benedict of Nursia, one is confronted with a significant religious figure who was not to be omitted from the collection, but whose life as described in the *South English Legendary* displays noteworthy omissions that distance it from previous exemplars. St. Benedict (ca. 480–547 CE) is remembered

---

[4] Klaus P. Jankofsky, "National Characteristics in the Portrayal of English Saints in the *South English Legendary*," in *Images of Sainthood in Medieval Europe*, eds. Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski and Timea Szell (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), 81–93 (p.83).

[5] Wells, "The South English Legendary," 352.

[6] See further Sherry Reames, "The *South English Legendary* and its Major Latin Models," in *Rethinking the South English Legendaries*, eds. Heather Blurton and Jocelyn Wogan-Browne, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), 84–105.

for his tremendously influential *Rule of St. Benedict* and looked to as one of the fathers of western European Christian monasticism. The *South English Legendary* presents a 176-line *vita* of St. Benedict, and he also makes an appearance in a shorter, 64-line rendering of the life of his sister St. Scholastica. These two versions are likely more familiar to a modern readership, as they are accessible in two modern critical editions. Both the 1956–1959 edition of C. D'Evelyn and A. J. Mills, and the 2004 edition of E. Gordon Whatley, Anne B. Thompson, and Robert K. Upchurch reproduce the lives of St. Benedict and St. Scholastica with readings drawn and collated from a combination of Corpus Christi College Cambridge MS 145, British Museum MS Harley 2247, Bodley MS Ashmole 43, British Museum MS Cotton Julius D, and other similar corresponding manuscripts.[7]

Manuscripts such as the Vernon MS and the Lambeth MS, however, contain a less prevalent, alternate version of the life of St. Benedict totaling some 92 lines,[8] and there are marked differences between the former two accounts and that of the shorter *vita*. Only two miracles are shared in common, that of a monk being pulled from service by a demon appearing as a boy, and that of a man being warned by Benedict about a snake that lay concealed within the wine he had been ordered to deliver but kept back for his private use. Both versions attribute additional miracles to the saint that are not present in the other, though all can trace their origin back to earlier accounts of Benedict's life.

---

[7] Compare the critical apparatus of: C. D'Evelyn and A. J. Mills, eds., *The South English Legendary: Edited from Corpus Christi College Cambridge MS 145 and British Museum MS Harley 2247, with Variants from Bodley MS Ashmole 43 and British Museum MS Cotton Julius D. IX* (London: Early English Text Society, 1956–1959); and of: E. Gordon Whatley, Anne B. Thompson, and Robert K. Upchurch, eds., *Saints' Lives in Middle English Collections* (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2004).

[8] A reproduction of this shorter version from the Vernon MS with two readings from the Lambeth MS can be found in: Dom Justin McCann, "Early English Verses on St. Benedict," *The Downside Review* 41 (1923): 44–56.

The second book of St. Gregory the Great's *Dialogues* embodies one such foundational account, and coupled with the influence of the *Rule of St. Benedict*, Gregory's work contributed to the entrenchment of the saint's cult and to Benedict's lasting prominence, even in the era preceding that of the *South English Legendary*. Old English translations of both the *Rule* and the *Dialogues* survive, and a succinct version of Benedict's life is contained within the *Old English Martyrology* entry on his death date (21 March). Still another version was composed by Ælfric, abbot of Eynsham, for inclusion in a homiletic series supplying texts for the complete church calendar year. These two Old English versions especially provide an interesting counterpoint to the *Dialogues*, *Golden Legend*, and *South English Legendary*, as they too are adapted vernacular renderings, however faithful one might judge them to be.

With regard to the question of possible source material for the different versions contained in the *South English Legendary*, the writer(s) or compiler(s) would presumably not have had easy immediate access—neither physical nor linguistic—to the Old English texts. Manfred Görlach further notes that for the life of St. Benedict, access to a French version would also not have been readily available, and therefore the source(s) can be assumed to have been in Latin.[9] Beyond the manifest possibility that the producer(s) of the *South English Legendary* had access to some form of Gregory's *Dialogues* or its version of the life, previous commentators have debated the likelihood that the *Golden Legend* served as a general source for the collection, as various segments of the texts display similarities and parallels. As Görlach highlights, however, copies of the *Golden Legend* available in 13th Century England were often incomplete selections, and it is altogether difficult to determine which fragment(s) the compiler(s) of the *South English Legendary* may have possessed.[10] One possibility Görlach suggests is that of an intermediary epitome that has since been lost, but which replaced Gregory's dialogue

[9] Manfred Görlach, *The Textual Tradition of the South English Legendary* (Leeds: University of Leeds, 1974), 30.

[10] Ibid, 23.

format with something resembling a more purely narrative style.[11] With regard to St. Benedict in particular, it bears noting that the two *South English Legendary* versions do not share a single line in common, and that they appear to agree with the *Golden Legend* in discordant places, both of which facts point toward different source material for each.[12]

Despite their divergences with respect to content and source material, there is a stylistic element that unites the two *South English Legendary* versions, and which is revealing in terms of the collection's overall rhetorical agenda. As part of an analysis of Gregory's intentions in the *Dialogues*' stories of St. Benedict and St. Scholastica, J. H. Wansbrough writes that, "One suggested criterion of literal historical truth in the modern sense of the word is that at least those stories are historically true in our sense which are 'anchored' by some outside historical or geographical datum."[13] Borrowing this notion, it is possible to extend and add nuance to Jankofsky's interpretation noted above. In contrast to an emphasis on and highlighting of historicity, the *South English Legendary* versions of Benedict's life do not merely abridge and narrativize the story, they actively remove this 'anchoring' and strip the story of much of its historical and geographical moorings. While this can hardly be said to effect a complete 'Anglicization' of the life of St. Benedict, it does contribute to a noticeable dulling of its historical and external qualities, presumably with the aim of enhancing accessibility for a vernacular audience.

This tendency manifests itself clearly in the marked disappearance of numerous personal names from the *South English Legendary*'s St. Benedict stories, a point of particular contrast with the exemplars noted above as predecessors and possible source material. This is perhaps unsurprising in comparison with the lengthy, detailed account in Gregory's *Dialogues*. The Old English versions and the *Golden Legend* themselves

---

[11] Ibid, 155.

[12] Ibid, 154-155. Equally, in the case of the 176-line Benedict, the text actually agrees more closely with the *Dialogues* in certain places where the *Golden Legend* diverges.

[13] J. H. Wansbrough, "St. Gregory's Intention in the Stories of St. Scholastica and St. Benedict," *Revue Bénédictine* 75 (1965): 145-151 (p. 146).

too display alterations and omitted details. Yet even in comparison with those later abridged renderings, the degree of omission witnessed in the *South English Legendary* seems altogether too high to be easily explained away, and it is in a manner which is suggestive of the collection's intent and possible audience(s). A poignant demonstration of this is found by looking at the presentation of certain miracles in the *South English Legendary*'s two Benedicts side by side with the same miracles as presented by Gregory, de Voragine, and Ælfric.[14]

The first instance to be noted is actually one that is missing from both *South English Legendary* accounts of St. Benedict's life, and its omission sets a revealing precedent for subsequent examples, because it directly concerns the onomastics and significance of Benedict's Latinate name. Gregory's rendering begins by naming the saint, *Benedictus*, and referring to his blessedness. The *Golden Legend* is even more overt and offers at the outset a pseudo-etymological explanation of the name: "Benedict, whose name means blessed, was so called because he blessed many, or because he had many blessings, or again because all spoke well (*bene dicere*) of him, or because he merited eternal blessings."[15]

The name's significance is reiterated as part of the narrative as well in an instance that appears in the *Dialogues* beginning from part VII line 15, in the *Golden Legend* from line 70, and in Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* from line 171.[16] In these three

[14] Though its similar abandonment of proper names may make for a compelling comparison, the *Old English Martyrology* is excluded from in-depth consideration here as the majority of the miracles discussed are in fact omitted from its entirely succinct account of the life.

[15] Jacobus de Voragine, *The Golden Legend*, trans. by William Granger Ryan (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012), 186.

[16] Gregory I, *Fonti per la Storia d'Italia Volume 57: Gregorii Magni Dialogi*, ed. Umberto Moricca (Rome: Tipografia del Senato, 1924), 96; Jacobus de Voragine, *Legenda Aurea*, 2 vols, ed. Giovanni Paolo Maggioni (Tavarnuzze and Firenze: Sismel, 1998–1999), 314; Ælfric of Eynsham, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The Second Series*, ed. Malcolm Godden (London:

similar accounts, Benedict is confronted by the devil ("antiquus hostis"; "ealda deofol") for turning sites near Mount Cassino that were formerly dedicated to Apollo into ones dedicated to St. John and St. Martin. While the *Golden Legend* neglects to mention St. Martin, all three record the devil addressing Benedict by name to ridicule and curse him: "Maledicte, non benedicte." Ælfric's version too faithfully produces the Latin taunt along with an accompanying Old English explanation: "þu awyrigeda, and na gebletsod."

The fixation upon and significance attached to Benedict's name in the story make the disappearance from both *South English Legendary* versions all the more compelling. No mention is made of the event, nor is direct reference made to the name's meaning. Whereas 'Benedictus' functions clearly as both a name and an intrinsically meaningful signifier for readers of Latin, 'Benet' may function a little less transparently in English. With reference to Gregory, Wansbrough observes that names often serve such a dual purpose as historical reinforcement and meaning-carrying signifiers, and also that there even appear to be a "class of colourless names which we have suggested as being in the *Dialogues* rather a refusal to give a name."[17] While Ælfric and de Voragine can be seen to have done away with some of Gregory's 'placeholder' names, the *South English Legendary* goes still a step further. In keeping with the interpretation that the collection was intended for audiences less familiar with Latin, all manner of different names vanish from the *South English Legendary*, and only those essential to the fundamental narrative appear to have been maintained.

This loss of personal name and details surrounding characters can be observed plainly in an examination of the first miracle which is contained in both *South English*

---

Early English Text Society/Oxford University Press, 1979), 97. Line and page numbers will hereafter to be drawn from these same editions.

[17] Wansbrough, "St. Gregory's Intention," 146–149 (p.149). Romanus, the monk who feeds Benedict while he is living in the wilderness, is given as an example of the latter, and Benedict's sister Scholastica represents a possible instance of the former, embodying contemplation.

*Legendary* versions of Benedict's life. The sequence appears from line 123 in the longer version and from line 63 in the shorter. A person bringing wine to Benedict hides one of the containers along the way with the intention of collecting it later for himself. He is then cautioned by Benedict to be careful when opening the stashed wine, as the saint has not only intuited the man's scheme, but also foreseen that a dangerous snake lies concealed within the container.

In the *Dialogues* the sequence begins part XVIII, and in this earliest version the boy sent by his master ("puer"; "filius") is not only named ("Exhilaratus") and given the personalizing epithet "noster [our]," he is even further identified as someone whom the audience knows ("quem ipse conversum nosti").[18] The versions of both de Voragine (from line 104) and Ælfric (from line 274) omit the name, personalization, and address to the audience, and the individual is left simply as "puer" / "filius" or "cnapa" / "bearn" respectively. The *South English Legendary* similarly refer to him as "messager," "sone," and "yonge man." The longer version's episode closes by focusing on Benedict and offering a humanization of the saint, explaining that despite the man's trickery, Benedict did not wish for him to be poisoned. While this effectively demonstrates the general principle of portentous simplification, the other miracle contained in both *South English Legendary* accounts displays an even higher degree of alteration and meaningful omission.

The second shared miracle tells of a monk who inevitably withdrew from church service, prayer, or other variety of divine office. Having perceived a demon in the form of a small, black, close-cropped boy ("lute, blac, pollede grom"; "lite blac-pollede grom") that took the monk away, Benedict follows the monk and strikes him with a staff. Thereafter, the demon flees, never to disturb the monk again. The *South English Legendary* recounts this event from line 77 in the longer version of the life and from line 35 in the shorter. In the other texts of this study, the miracle appears beginning on line 6

[18] Moricca (ed.), *Dialogi*, 108.

of part IV (*Dialogues*), on line 109 (*Catholic Homilies*), and on line 33 (*Golden Legend*).[19]

In addition to more minor fluctuations from version to version, two significant named individuals fall out of the narrative as characters. Gregory relates that upon observing the "niger puerulus [black little boy]," Benedict questions the troubled monk's abbot, Pompeianus, and his fellow monk, Maurus, whether they too are able to see the demon. Of the two, only Maurus is able to perceive it, and even then only after two days of prayer. In the *Golden Legend*, De Voragine maintains the sequence and the name of Maurus, albeit omitting that of Pompeianus. Ælfric and the *South English Legendary* do away with this additional sequence, and the figure of Maurus vanishes from *South English Legendary* entirely. This disappearance is particularly striking, not solely because Maurus himself was to be later recognized as a saint in his own right, but also because of the role that he plays in a number of miracles contained in the Latin versions of Benedict's life.

While Ælfric does not include Maurus in relation to this miracle, he does name Maurus as taking part in a different miracle mere lines above. Maurus is commanded to save another monk from drowning, and he is able to do so by walking on water. After this young monk named Placidus is saved, both Maurus and Benedict show humility and deny being the source for the miracle, claiming the other to have been responsible. The *Golden Legend* contains an analogous episode beginning at line 50, also naming both monks. The *Dialogues*, in keeping with the pattern already established, contain this episode and also an additional miracle in which Maurus helps to recover a scythe blade. Even the name of Maurus's father, Euthicius, is provided. Not unlike Maurus, Placidus too came to be revered as a saint, and in Gregory's and Ælfric's versions he is named as having been present at another of Benedict's miracles—namely, Benedict's production of a water source for a monastery.

---

[19] NB. The miracle was apparently even significant enough to have merited inclusion in the succinct *Old English Martyrology* entry.

The episode in which Maurus walks on water does not appear at all in the longer *South English Legendary*'s version of Benedict's life, but it is given a distinct and notable place in the shorter *vita*. It occupies 12 lines (75–87) of the short, 92 line text, and is, moreover, the final miracle mentioned before the poem's conclusion. Yet despite the prominence that is afforded to the scene, the *South English Legendary* still neglects to name either Maurus or Placidus. The text's references to "child" and "monk" seem almost willfully flavorless. The segment in which Benedict and Maurus both disavow responsibility for the act has also disappeared.

Still another striking omission relates to Maurus, and it concerns the death of the bishop Florentius. In Gregory, Ælfric, and de Voragine, Florentius is a figure who detests Benedict, seeking to give him poisoned bread and to sabotage Benedict's monks by sending licentious women into their midst. Eventually, Benedict elects to withdraw and leave Florentius to his own devices. Yet even as Benedict is doing so, Florentius perishes as part of his home collapses. Maurus rushes to recall Benedict, and despite the fact that Florentius had been their adversary, Benedict promptly chastises Maurus for rejoicing in his death. Once again, none of the events in this sequence relating to Florentius are preserved in the 176-line *South English Legendary* life of Benedict. The 92-line version, however, does contain the incident in which Florentius attempts to poison Benedict, only to be foiled when a raven that Benedict has been feeding each day carries away the poisoned bread.

This miracle, found on lines 43–62, is particularly worth noting. Aside from patently major figures such as "Iesu Christ" and "Seyn Ion the Baptist," Benedict and Florentius are the only two active characters given a proper name. Lines 43–44 read: "Ther bisyde. ther was a preost. that highte Florentyn. / That hedde envye to seint Benet. and thoughte thorwh engyn."[20] Unique as the occurrence is, one is compelled to wonder why Florentius in particular merited naming when other figures like Maurus were permitted to pass anonymously. Though in truth little more than speculation, I would

[20] McCann, "Early English Verses," 54.

suggest two possibilities, either or both of which offer a plausible rationale. First, and perhaps somewhat uninspiringly, "Florentyn" and "engyn" could simply have made for an intuitive rhyme in keeping with the work's poetic structure. Second, and more compelling as it draws on the previously raised notions of intended audience, it seems not impossible that naming Florentius in the role of an antagonist figure allowed him to function in clear counterpoint to Benedict, serving as a negative cautionary example for the text's audience, an adversarial 'heel' as it were. Setting up an uncomplicated 'bad guy' in opposition to Benedict need not encumber the straightforward, accessible narrative with any historical or explanatory contextual baggage that might come along with the inclusion of additional ecclesiastical figures and saints the likes of Maurus and Placidus.

There is one final omission to note which further attests to the *South English Legendary*'s general pattern of severing historical and geographic ties in the life of St. Benedict. In precisely the same manner as the ecclesiastical figures already highlighted, one important secular figure has his identity obscured in the *South English Legendary*. The event does not appear in the shorter rendering whatsoever, but the more prevalent 176-version tells of a ruler who seeks to put Benedict's divine comprehension of unseen things to the test on lines 115–122. The ruler dresses one of his subordinates in his own regalia and sends him to meet with Benedict in his stead, only to have Benedict see through the ruse. The *Dialogues*' version of the event appears in Part XIV, the *Golden Legend*'s on lines 93–97, and the *Catholic Homilies*' from line 234. In addition to the proper names of this ruler and his subordinate both being abandoned by the *South English Legendary*, the event comparatively shows some of the greatest variation and difference in detail.

With the exception of only the *South English Legendary* where he is simply called "the king," the other versions considered in this investigation all identify the ruler as T(h)otil(l)a, King of the Ostrogoths, who assumed power in 541 CE.[21] The

[21] For reference, see further: Peter Heather, *The Goths* (Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 1996), 267–269.

subordinate's role is clarified ("spatarius"; "swurdboran" [armsbearer]), and Gregory and Ælfric even name the man as "Riggo." The *South English Legendary* not only loses both names, it goes still further and demotes Riggo to the position of king's "jogulour" (l. 118), or in Benedict's words: "Ac a *fol* thisulf thou hider come, and a *fol* thou schalt hom wende" (l. 122). Exceeding even the previous examples noted above, this adaptation of Riggo and omission of the specific identity of Totila represent an altogether undeniable instance of contextual destabilization. Glossing over the figure of the Ostrogothic ruler effectively removes an important historical and geographic reference point. If present, the life of Benedict is referentially situated in and around the Italian peninsula in the 6th Century. If absent, the scene becomes nearly archetypal; it could seemingly take place almost anywhere.

While most readily discernible in this final instance, all of the occurrences highlighted here point in a similar direction. Jankofsky has persuasively argued that the *South English Legendary* meaningfully sought to focus on local significance, to "make holy places in the land we inhabit,"[22] and in part this could be accomplished through the inclusion of historical and geographical items of information for their connection to local pilgrimage sites and for their ability to assert an individual regional identity.[23] In contrast, the examples raised in this investigation have repeatedly demonstrated the paradigm to work almost perfectly in reverse for the *South English Legendary*'s two different lives of St. Benedict.

Dom Justin McCann has poetically, if also somewhat reductively, characterized the collection as "among the first fruits" of a "native literature [which] began to blossom anew" following the Norman Conquest.[24] Collaboratively along with other modified

---

[22] Jankofsky, "National Characteristics," 92.

[23] See further Katherine J. Lewis, "History, Historiography and Re-writing the Past," in *A Companion to Middle English Hagiography*, ed. Sarah Salih (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2006), 122–140 (pp. 129–131).

[24] McCann, "Early English Verses," 46.

elements and alterations, the deliberate omission of names and the obscuring of specific identities help to enact a contextual destabilization. This destabilization allows Benedict—a continental saint displaced from the *South English Legendary*'s audience by centuries—to fit into the purposefully 'English' collection more comfortably. Benedict's life has not only been translated and condensed, but also, to borrow a term from modern translation studies, localized.

（金沢大学国際基幹教育院外国語教育系）

**Works Cited**

*Primary Sources*

Ælfric of Eynsham. *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies*. 3 vols. Edited by Peter Clemoes and Malcolm Godden. London: Early English Text Society/Oxford University Press, 1979/1997/2000.

de Voragine, Jacobus. *Legenda Aurea*. 2 vols. Edited by Giovanni Paolo Maggioni. Tavarnuzze and Firenze: Sismel, 1998–1999.

———*The Golden Legend*. Translated by William Granger Ryan. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012.

D'Evelyn, C. and A. J. Mills, eds. *The South English Legendary: Edited from Corpus Christi College Cambridge MS 145 and British Museum MS Harley 2247, with Variants from Bodley MS Ashmole 43 and British Museum MS Cotton Julius D. IX*. London: Early English Text Society/Oxford University Press, 1956–1959.

Gregory I. *The Fathers of the Church Volume 39: Saint Gregory the Great Dialogues*. Translated by Odo John Zimmerman. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2002.

——— *Fonti per la Storia d'Italia Volume 57: Gregorii Magni Dialogi*. Edited by Umberto Moricca. Rome: Tipografia del Senato, 1924.

McCann, Dom Justin. "Early English Verses on St. Benedict." *The Downside Review* 41 (1923): 44–56.

Rauer, Christine, editor and translator. *The Old English Martyrology*. Cambridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2013.

Whatley, E. Gordon, Anne B. Thompson, and Robert K. Upchurch, eds. *Saints' Lives in Middle English Collections*. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2004.

*Secondary Sources*

Blurton, Heather and Jocelyn Wogan-Browne, editors. *Rethinking the South English Legendary*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011.

Görlach, Manfred. *The Textual Tradition of the South English Legendary*. Leeds: University of Leeds, 1974.

Heather, Peter. *The Goths*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 1996.

Jankofsky, Klaus P. "National Characteristics in the Portrayal of English saints in the *South English Legendary*." In *Images of Sainthood in Medieval Europe*, edited by Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski and Timea Szell, 81–93. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.

Lewis, Katherine J. “History, Historiography and Re-writing the Past.” In *A Companion to Middle English Hagiography*, edited by Sarah Salih, 122–140. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2006.

Liszka, Thomas. “The *South English Legendaries.*” In *Rethinking the South English Legendaries*, edited by Heather Blurton and Jocelyn Wogan-Browne, 23–65. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011.

McMahon, Katherine G. “St. Scholastica – Not a Wife!” In *The South English Legendary: A Critical Assessment*, edited by Klaus P. Jankofsky, 18–28. Tübingen: Francke Verlag, 1992.

Reames, Sherry. “The *South English Legendary* and its Major Latin Models.” In *Rethinking the South English Legendaries*, edited by Heather Blurton and Jocelyn Wogan-Browne, 84–105. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011.

Wansbrough, J. H. “St. Gregory’s Intention in the Stories of St. Scholastica and St. Benedict.” *Revue Bénédictine* 75 (1965): 145–151.

Wells, Minnie E. “The South English Legendary in Its Relation to the Legenda Aurea.” *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 51.2 (1936): 337–360.

# 隠されたアイデンティティ：
## 聖ベネディクトゥスと *South English Legendary* における ローカリゼーションの仕組み

ジェイコブ・ウェイン・ラナー

要旨

中英語の『南部英語聖人伝』(*South English Legendary*)は著しくローカルな性質を持っていることで他の中英語作品の中でも際立つ存在である。本研究では代表的なローカリゼーション要素を特定し、登場人物と固有名詞の省略を調べる。対比的なケーススタディーとして、以下の四つテキストの聖ベネディクトゥスの描写を比較する：

- *South English Legendary* 『南部英語聖人伝』(中英語・13〜14 世紀)
- *Dialogi*『対話編』*St. Gregory the Great* グレゴリウス 1 世 (ラテン語・6 世紀末頃)
- *Sermones Catholici*『カトリック説教集』 Ælfric of Eynsham アルフリック (古英語・10 世紀末頃)
- *Legenda Aurea*『黄金伝説』Jacobus de Voragine ヤコブス・デ・ウォラギネ(ラテン語・13 世紀半ば前後)

本稿では、最終的には、アイデンティティ要素をわざと曖昧にすることで *South English Legendary* はコンテクストの不安定化を引き起すと主張する。これにより、ベネディクトゥスの聖人伝ナラティブが翻訳・凝縮されるだけでなく、ローカライズされる。