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INTRODUCTION

As has been said, translation is always a shift, not between two languages but between two cultures – or two encyclopaedias. A translator must take into account rules that are not strictly linguistic but, broadly speaking, cultural.

(Eco 2003, 82)

Umberto Eco’s evaluation of the translation process starts from the premise that the translator’s primary role is one of negotiation. The translator intermediates between two cultures: the context in which the original text was produced (and possibly later received) and the new linguistic, social and cultural context in which his translation will function. In this respect, any translation presumes a form of contact between two more or less distinct, cultural environments. In the present study, I will explore the intercultural and interlinguistic contact between the French-speaking and Dutch-speaking world in the county of Holland in the fifteenth century. At the center of this analysis will be one particular case study: the Middle Dutch translation of Jean Froissart’s Chroniques.

The continuity of a tradition: literature at the court

In Court and Culture, an analysis of the literature produced in the surroundings of the Binnenhof, the comital residence at The Hague, F.P. van Oostrom evaluates the transition of Bavarian to Burgundian court culture in Holland:

For Middle Dutch court literature, this change was a serious setback, to say the least. What had been a great stimulus, namely the linguistic bonds between rulers and the people, was nullified, and the divided typical of the Hainault period restored.

(Van Oostrom 1992, 299)

1 The concept of originality in the context of medieval text production poses some difficulties. Like many other historians of his time, Froissart delivered several versions of his text (cf. infra § 2.1). When I use the term ‘original’ here, I refer to Froissart’s French text in general, without distinguishing between versions.
Indeed, Holland’s new Burgundian ruler, Philip of Burgundy rarely visited the Binnenhof. In the past, the Ridderzaal (Hall of Knights) had been the venue of many a splendid feast, adorned by performances in the vernacular by travelling poets (William of Hildegarsberch, Bartholomew of Watersloot and Peter Vreugdegae) or heralds, such as Bavaria ‘quondam Gelre’. Now, by want of the presence of the count, the revelry had subsided and as a consequence ‘Middle-Dutch literature was silent, a silence presided over by a remote, foreign and French-speaking administration’. Nevertheless, some late fifteenth-century examples of xenogamy of Burgundian and Dutch literature originating in Holland survive. The most conspicuous remnants, a number of luxuriously executed translations of Burgundian court literature, were produced for local administrators by the Gouda printer Gerard Leeu and his Haarlem associate Jacob Bellaert. Additionally, A. van Dixhoorn has shown that some of the regional councillors were also registered members of the chamber of rhetoric ‘Met ghenuchten’ at The Hague. All of this is interesting and presupposes a modest revival of Dutch literature at the deserted court of Holland at the end of the fifteenth century. However, there is an alternative explanation: interest in Middle Dutch literature had not entirely subsided in the surroundings of courtly administration. Possibly, it was more or less on pilot and receptive to influences of the ‘foreign French-speaking administration’ mentioned by Van Oostrom. In the context of this process of ‘Burgundianisation’, earlier translations, such as the Middle Dutch version of Mandeville’s travels and the Pelgrimage vander menscheliker creaturen dated to the end of the fourteenth and the (early) fifteenth century equally deserve our attention. The possibility exists that these works were inspired by the influence of Burgundian culture, which must have been palpable since the Wittelsbach-Valois intermarriage of 1385. The popularity of these texts in the backlists of printers in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century may be due to the increased Burgundian impact at the time. However, in the present study, the

2 Van Anrooij 1999, 234, 238.
3 Van Oostrom 1992, 299. Stuip 1991a discusses the presence of Burgundian culture in Holland. Stuip lists examples of Burgundian influence on architecture, the arts and literature. He distinguishes between Burgundian texts that have ‘rapports direct avec “la Hollande”’ and translations of Burgundian texts that were produced in Holland. When we consider the texts with connections to Holland, these are linked to the territorial expansion under Philip the Good (‘Livre du roy Rambeaux de Frise’ and a French translation of the chronicle of Beka) or indicate relations of aristocratic families from Holland with the French-speaking world (the French translation of the Brederode-chronicle). Stuip also mentions three Burgundian texts printed in Holland (two of which are linked to the subject-matter of Troy). It is remarkable that all three of these texts were translated in Dutch at the end of the fifteenth century (cf. infra). However, to date, no literary influence has been recorded in the first half of the century.
focus lies on yet another translation from the French to the Dutch, which traditionally has been situated right at the dividing line of Bavarian and Burgundian power: Gerard Potter’s translation of Jean Froissart’s *Chroniques*.

*Froissart’s Chroniques: author, patrons and manuscripts*

In this section, I will give a brief overview of the *status quaestionis* of the research on Froissart’s biography, the development in gradual stages and redactions of the Four Books of his chronicle, Froissart’s aims and intentions and finally the patronage and dissemination of the text. This summary will allow us to contextualise the conclusions as regards the translation, which are drawn at the end of each chapter of this study.

‘Et pour que ou temps à venir on puist savoir qui a mist ceste hystore sus, et qui en a esté actères, je me voel nommer. On m’appelle, qui tant me voet honnerer sire Jehan Froissart, net de le conté de Haynau et de la bonne, belle et friche ville de Valenciennes’.\(^5\)

In the prologue of Book One, the author introduces himself as ‘sires Jehan Froissart’, a priest, originating from Valenciennes in Hainault. In the late nineteenth century Baron Kervyn de Lettenhove has elaborately described the chronicler’s biography.\(^6\) More recently, the French scholar M. Zink and the Flemish medievalist G. Croenen have contributed to our knowledge of Froissart’s life.\(^7\)

Born ca. 1337 in the town of Valenciennes, at a young age, the chronicler travelled from his native county of Hainault to the court of Edward III of England and his queen-consort, Philippa of Hainault, one of Froissart’s compatriots.\(^8\) There, or so he claims, he was a member of the queen’s household.\(^9\) After Philippa’s death in 1369, Froissart returned to the continent, where he sought out the favour of Joan, duchess of Brabant and, more importantly, her husband duke Wenceslaus of Bohemia. During the same period, he was introduced to Robert of Namur and Guy of Blois. The former was Froissart’s late mistress’ brother-in-law, the latter her distant cousin.\(^10\) One redaction of Book One of the *Chroniques* has been dedicated to

---

\(^5\) Ainsworth and Diller 2001, 77.
\(^6\) Kervyn 1870.
\(^7\) Zink 1998, 1-18; Croenen 2006.
\(^8\) See Devaux 2000
\(^9\) Croenen 2006, 14 has shown that no documentary evidence survives to support this claim and argues that it is more likely that Froissart was employed on a free-lance basis.
\(^10\) Guy of Blois’ grandfather, John of Beaumont was Philippa’s uncle. Jean le Bel dedicated his chronicle, one of Froissart’s principal sources for Book One, to the lord of Beaumont.
Robert of Namur (Ordinary redaction, family A).\(^\text{11}\) It is probable that another redaction (family B) of Book One was initially dedicated to Guy of Blois (dedication preserved in Chicago, Newberry Library, Case MS, f.37, vol. 1).\(^\text{12}\) In any event the count of Blois was the primary patron of Books Two, Three and possibly also Book Four of the Chroniques.\(^\text{13}\) Before 1373, probably through mediation of Wenceslaus and Joan of Brabant, Froissart was appointed parish priest of Estinnes-au-Mont. Eventually, the office of treasurer of the rural chapter of Chimay was conferred upon him by his new patron, Guy of Blois.\(^\text{14}\) After the latter had died in 1397, the chronicler presumably enjoyed the patronage of the sovereigns of his native region, count Albert I of Wittelsbach and his son William of Ostrevant, governor of Hainault.\(^\text{15}\)

In the service of Philippa of Hainault, Froissart’s literary production primarily consisted of courtly poetry. The chronicler asserts that while he was young, naive and had hardly left school, he wrote a rhymed chronicle and dedicated it to the Queen of England: ‘si emprins je a dittier et a rimer les guerres dessus dites et porter en Angleterre le livre tout compile si comme je le lis et le presentay adont a treshaulte et tresnoble dame, dame Phelippe de Haynault’.\(^\text{16}\) In honour of Wenceslaus of Brabant, Froissart composed the Arthurian romance Meliador, in which he incorporated ‘toutes les chançons, balades, rondeaulx, virelaiz que le gentil duc fist de son temps’.\(^\text{17}\) Book One (first redaction: between 1370-1380) of his historiographic magnum opus has been transmitted in three major redactions (the most accomplished is found in: Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 869); Book Two (first redaction: ca. 1386-1388) was supposedly revised three times (final redaction preserved in: Chicago, Newberry Library, Case MS, f.37, vol. 2, cf. infra) and Book Three (first redaction: ca. 1390) was updated

\(^{11}\) Cf. the manuscript which is now kept at the Municipal library of Besançon fol. 1 v.: ‘J’ay emprins ceste histoire a poursuir sur l’ordonnance et fondation d’un mien chier seigneur et maistre monseigneur Robert de Namur, seigneur a qui je vueil devoir amour et obeissance’.

\(^{12}\) Croenen 2006, 27.

\(^{13}\) Croenen 2006, 26.


\(^{15}\) Zink 1998, 13. Although Froissart alludes to this relationship in his poetry as well as in Book Four of his Chroniques, there seems to be no documentary evidence of the presumed comital patronage. (Verwijs 1869, VI-X). In the ‘Joli Buisson de Joncée’ (vs. 307-310) Froissart explicitly refers to Albert of Bavaria stating: ‘Li dux Aubers premierment / M’a a toute heure liement / Recoelliet que vers li aloie, / Et grandement mi euls en valoie.’ (Fourrier 1975, 57). There is also the question of the ‘deux grans livres des wière de France et d’Angleterre’ which Albert of Bavaria acquired from the estate of Guy of Blois. According to Kervyn de Lettenhove it is plausible that these books contained the text of Book One and Book Two dedicated to Guy of Blois (Kervyn de Lettenhove 1873, 116.).

\(^{16}\) Besançon, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 864 fol. 1 v. This is the prologue of the ‘ordinary’ (second) redaction of Book One, family A.

\(^{17}\) Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 189.
once (second redaction in: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS fr. 2650). Book Four (ca. 1400) survives in only one redaction. Circa 1385-1386, Froissart composed a Chronique de Flandre, focusing on the uprising in Flanders. Later, this chronicle of revolt was incorporated into Book Two of the Chroniques, of which the main subject was a general description of the conflicts in Europe. For the composition of Book One, Froissart could still draw upon written sources such as the chronicle of Jean le Bel, but as the narrative approached his own time and the subject matter consisted of recent events, Froissart increasingly relied on eyewitness accounts, which he himself had gathered at the courts of Europe. This also becomes apparent in a change of tone:

Il y a deux ouvrages différents, les deux premiers livres d’une part, les deux derniers de l’autre. L’ultime et tardive rédaction du livre I porte la marque de cet autre ouvrage que sont les deux derniers livres. Un autre ouvrage qui mériterait davantage le titre de mémoires.

(Zink 1998, 17-18)

In their analysis of the textual tradition of Book Two, G. Croenen and N. Romanova have recorded a similar inclination towards memoir in the text of the manuscript kept at the Newberry library in Chicago. Since this manuscript should probably be identified with the lost manuscript of the Hafod library (the only known witness of the fourth redaction of Book Two), it appears that Froissart has revised his oeuvre in the later stages of his historiographic activity to match the more personal style that he had adopted in the Chroniques starting with the composition of Book Three (ca. 1390).

In the prologues of Book One and Three (quoted here in the version of the manuscripts kept at the Bibliothèque Municipale of Besançon), Froissart expresses his communicative intentions: to record the ‘honourables avenues, et nobbles aventures, faictes en armes, lesquelles sont avenues par les guerres de France et d’Angleterre’ in eternal memory. Indeed, a great number of men – noblemen and commoners – have told

---

18 Ainsworth and Diller 2001, 64-68; Kervyn 1873; Croenen 2009.
19 Varvaro 2006. It is possible that Froissart died before Book Four was fully achieved. Additionally, the possibility exists that Book Four was unknown until ca. 1450 and only existed in the form of an autograph (or apograph) manuscript. (G. Croenen, e-mail: 18 September 2009).
21 Most famous is his journey to the court of Gaston Fébus at Béarn, an account of which is given in the first part of Book Three. (Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 103-238). See: Zink 1998, 63-78.
22 Croenen and Romanova, ‘Book II of Froissart’s Chronicles: the Leiden MS and the rest of the manuscript tradition’, unpublished conference paper, Fifth International Chronicle Conference, Queen’s University Belfast, 22 July 2008.
stories about the wars of England and France, without any in-depth knowledge as regards to the Anglo-French conflict. In his chronicle, Froissart will record acts of prowess that should ‘tous nobles cuers encouragier et eulx monstre exemple et matiere d’onneur’. The chronicler explicitly stresses that the primary intention of his writing is to provide an audience of ‘noble spirits’ with a shining example of knightly conduct. Additionally, Froissart admits that he does not only want to inform: his readers should be entertained and enjoy what they read.23 The general gist of the prologue of Book Three is similar. In Book Two, Froissart had broadened his perspective to the Flanders’ revolt, but now he returns to the subject of the ‘besoignes des loingtaines marches’ (Portugal, Spain, England and France). In the mean time, Froissart is convinced that his narrative will be widely read and ‘y prendront tous nobles hommes plaisance et exemple de bien faire’.24 In the future, knights and squires will look upon his oeuvre with approval and his accounts of the conflicts in Europe will provide them with models, worthy of imitation. Additionally, the chronicler explicitly expresses the desire to entertain, which may offer an explanation for the presence in Book Three of the Monty Pythonesque story of the taking of Tarn by men in drag, fantastic tales such as the ordeals of the somnambulant Peter of Béarn, the demonic messenger of the lord of Coarazze and the absolutely nail-biting introduction to the shameful secret regarding the death of Gaston of Foix.25

In the above, I have already touched upon the majority of Froissart’s most important patrons: Philippa of Hainault, Joan of Brabant and Wenceslaus of Bohemia, Robert of Namur and Guy of Blois. Additionally, G. Croenen has advanced the hypothesis that the Dit dou florin and the first redaction of Book One (which survives in: Amiens, Municipal Library, MS. 486) were written for Enguerrand VII of Coucy.26 Indeed, in the allegorical poem Joli buisson de jonece, Froissart lists the lord of Coucy among ‘les signeurs que tu [=Froissart] a veüs / et dont tu as les dans êus’.27 G.T. Diller has designated the majority of Froissart’s patrons as lesser princes; B. Guenée calls them ‘seigneurs et maîtres’.28

As far as the dissemination of the Chroniques is concerned, Guenée observes: ‘La conclusion s’impose pourtant que, du vivant de Froissart, la diffusion du livre I de ses

---

23 Besançon, Municipal Library, MS 846, fol. 1 r.-2 r.
24 Besançon, Municipal Library, MS 865, fol. 201 r.; edited by Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 104.
25 Harf-Lancner 2002 gives a comprehensive analysis of the prologues in the different Books and redactions of the Chroniques.
26 Croenen 2006, 26-27.
27 Fourrier 1975, 55.
**Chroniques** a été fort médiocre, celle des livre III et IV étant, elle, nulle’. Nevertheless, as it seems, Froissart has been actively involved in dispersing his writing among his intended audience. However, it appears that copies of the *Chroniques* were not produced on a larger scale until the beginning of the fifteenth century, when manuscripts were produced under the direction of Parisian *libraires*, such as Pierre de Liffol. The luxury copies that have been dated to the second half of the fifteenth century were produced in Flanders.

Indeed, when one considers the significant numbers (146) of surviving manuscripts containing one or more books of Froissart’s *Chroniques*, one cannot help but wonder whether there was not at least some truth in the rumours that Gaston Fébus could foretell the future. On welcoming the Hainault chronicler to his court at Béarn, the lord of Foix ‘disoit bien que l’histoire que je [=Froissart] avoie fait et poursuivoie seroit au temps a avenir plus recommandee que nul autre’. In the light of the above, Fébus’ remark is also valid for the industrious research that has been performed since the 1980s. It seems that Palmer’s collection of essays *Froissart: Historian* has ushered in a golden age for the study of the chronicler’s work. In this sense, the summary given above is nothing but defective. I have only very briefly touched upon the analysis of the manuscripts’ cycles of illustration.

---

29 Guenée 2008, 175.
30 Varvaro 1994, 3 has underlined the importance of a note in the journal of the chancellor of the duke of Anjou regarding the confiscation of fifty-eight gatherings which ‘messire Jehan Froissart’ had sent to William Bailly, a Parisian illuminator, with the intention to offer them to Richard II, king of England. The dedications in the different redactions of Book One suggest that a manuscript was offered to the respective patrons: Robert of Namur, Guy of Blois and possibly Enguerrand de Coucy. Additionally, Froissart himself referred to the presentation of manuscripts of his writing (cf. Zink 1998, 19-36). In the prologue of Book One he informed his readership that he had composed a chronicle in verse and had presented it to Philippa of Hainault. When the chronicler travelled to the court of Gaston Fébus in 1389 he supposedly took with him a copy of his *Méliador* (cf. Book Three). On his journey to the court of Richard II in 1395, a book discussing matters of love was offered to the king (referred to in Book Four). Recently, G. Croenen, K. Figg and A. Taylor have argued that in 1395 Froissart brought with him not one but two copies of the collection of his poetry, one of which was offered to Richard II, the other to Thomas of Woodstock, one of the king’s uncles. They argue that the manuscripts referred to (Paris, National Library, MS fr. 830 and Paris, National Library, MS fr. 831) were commissioned by the author from a workshop in Valenciennes (Croenen, Figg and Taylor 2008).
31 Cf. Croenen, Rouse and Rouse, 2002. The pictorial programmes of some copies that were produced by the Paris book trade reveal sympathies for the French, others seem to have been aimed at an audience that supported the English cause. Cf. Harf-Lancner 1998; Ainsworth 2006a.
33 Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 292, 301; I have adopted the number of known manuscripts recorded by Croenen 2009a, 419. Guenée 2008, 174-175, 181 gives the following numbers: Book One ‘cinquante-cinq environ’, Book Two ‘une trentaine’, Book Three and Book Four, for each of them ‘un peu plus d’une vingtaine’. About twenty of these volumes (none of which contains the text of Book Four) were copied in Paris between 1404 and 1418. Circa twenty volumes contain the text of Book One, less than six the text of Book Two and only two or three surviving sets of manuscripts represent a full text of the *Chroniques* comprising Book One to Book Three.
34 Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 105.
and nothing has been said regarding the first editions of important manuscript witnesses or interpretative studies focusing on the entanglement of romance and historiographic features. What is more, the prospects appear to be promising. The ‘Online Froissart Project’ (launched in spring 2010) makes available to the public its transcriptions of a large number of textual witnesses, thus creating opportunities for innovative research.

The Middle Dutch translation of Froissart’s chronicle: a status quaestionis

As opposed to the abundant attention that has been paid to the original text, the Middle Dutch translation has gone relatively unnoticed. Nevertheless, the discovery of one of the two surviving copies in the legacy of the famous bibliophile Sir Thomas Phillipps († 1872) had been promising. The Dutch archivist Samuel Muller noted among the ‘items of great interest’ that he deemed suitable for acquisition by the Dutch government: ‘a Dutch translation of Froissart’s chronicle, with paintings, dated to the middle of the fifteenth century’. It was probably his brother’s discovery that inspired the Leyden philologist J.W. Muller to devote an article to ‘Gerijt Potter van der Loo en zijne vertaling van Froissart’ (‘Gerard Potter van der Loo and his Froissart-translation’). In his essay, Muller described the two extant manuscripts: Leyden, University Library, MS Bibliotheca Publica Latina 3 (two volumes), comprising the translation of Book Two and Book Three and the newly discovered Phillipps manuscript 2639 (currently The Hague, Royal Library, MS 130 B 21). He designated the beautifully decorated Phillipps manuscript as ‘exceptionally fine’, written ‘in a large, distinct and beautiful handwriting’ and adorned with ‘eight [in reality: nine] extraordinarily large and handsome miniatures’. However, Muller’s judgement regarding the translator and his text was less favourable: ‘Gerard Potter did not inherit his father’s [Dirk Potter’s] literary gift’, ‘the text has no historical merit whatsoever’, ‘his writing is tedious and dull’ and ‘interspersed with repetitions and loan-words’. It is probable that Muller’s condescending remarks are one of the primary reasons why Gerard Potter’s translation has been neglected in historical as well as philological research. Apart from the 1889 article, to date no in-depth study of Potter’s

35 For an overview of the research on Froissart and his Chroniques, I refer the interested reader to G. Croenen’s online Bibliography Jean Froissart.
36 S. Fz. Muller 1889, 120. Unless explicitly stated otherwise, translations from the Dutch (and occasionally French) are mine.
37 The Leyden manuscripts are further referred to by their sigla Le3-1 and Le3-2. The The Hague codex is referred to as H21.
38 Muller 1888, 265.
39 Muller 1888, 272-274.
Middle Dutch version of the *Chroniques* exists. The scope of the brief introduction to N. de Pauw’s edition of the sections of Book Two dealing with the Flemish revolt was limited. In 1929, A.E.H. Swaen devoted a short essay on the use of the specific terminology of falconry. In 1985, F. Adam wrote a *mémoire de licence* on the translation of the *Chroniques*, the introductory notes of which heavily relied on Muller’s observations. The most recent contribution to our understanding of the Middle Dutch version of Froissart’s chronicle is Van Oostrom’s discussion in the aforementioned monograph *Court and Culture*. Most probably, the present study will not result in the realisation of the prophetic words ‘dat noch in toeemenden tijden dese myne [Froissart/Potter] hystorye in groter regnacien wesen sal’ (‘that in the future my history will be widely read’), but it will certainly highlight some aspects of Gerard Potter’s translation that deserve further attention.

Methodology and structure

This contextualisation of the Middle Dutch translation of the *Chroniques* departs from an analysis of the translator’s linguistic and cultural environment(s), which has been embedded in Gerard Potter’s biography.

Chapter One focuses on the level of multilingualism at the court of the Wittelsbach counts of Holland as well as in the regional Council of their Burgundian successors. In the description of the linguistic situation, I adopt the point of view of Gerard Potter van der Loo, the translator. In addition to a general introduction in the area of multilingualism in Holland in the first half of the fifteenth century, this chapter provides important reference material (e.g. through the analysis of the translator’s professional networks and their cultural context) for the results of the analyses of chapters Four and Five (cf. infra).

Chapters Two and Three focus on the translation’s exemplar. In the first of these chapters, I situate the translation in the textual transmission of the original French text by means of a comparison of variant readings in the extant manuscripts of the *Chroniques* and the text of the translation. In Chapter Three, another line of approach has been adopted, i.e. the analysis of the paratextual features (rubrics and illustration) of one particular subgroup

---

40 Van Oostrom 1992, 344, which has been translated from Dutch, mentions a thesis ‘in progress’ by M. Desage, Her research is also mentioned in the original Dutch version *Het woord van eer* (1987). I have not found any other reference to M. Desage’s work, nor have I been able to contact her.
41 Swaen 1929.
42 Adam 1985.
43 Van Oostrom 1992, 297-299.
of manuscripts of the Chroniques and their respective counterparts in the surviving copie of Gerard Potter’s translation. This chapter yields important information on variation between manuscripts that were produced by the same team of book professionals and how this variation can be employed in comparative translation studies.

In Chapter Four, the French original text is compared to the Middle Dutch version. The main objective of this chapter is to describe the way in which Gerard Potter has approached the translation of the Chroniques. Additionally, this approach allows us to gain insight in characteristics of the translator’s intended audience. The focus of this chapter does not exclusively lie on interlinguistic translation, but I also pay attention to intersemiotic translation through the comparison of the pictorial programs of the French and Dutch version of Froissart’s chronicle and the way in which similar or diverging parts of his narrative have been highlighted by the libraire, artist or commissioner.

The fifth and final chapter of this study presents the results of an enquiry into tangible evidence for Gerard Potter’s audience by the examination of the extant manuscripts in their material realisation. Post-medieval inventories and auction catalogues constitute an additional yet important source of information in this chapter. In the conclusion, the results of Chapter Five (from the areas of manuscript studies) are connected to the general information of Chapter One (mainly taken from documentary evidence) and the comparative analysis of Chapter Four (from the field of translation studies). The combined presentation of the results of Chapters One to Five, originating from a diverse array of methodological approaches, allows us to sketch an informed and nuanced profile of the translator, the Middle Dutch translation of the Chroniques and its intended, primary and secondary audiences.

Three appendices further complete this study. Appendix A provides a list of the full shelfmarks of the manuscripts of the Chroniques and their Middle Dutch translation, which are referred to in the body of this study by their sigla. Appendix B is a diplomatic transcription of a sixteenth century inventory of the books of the castle Batestein. Appendix C consists of the codicological descriptions of the extant manuscripts of the translation and a description of the important Besançon copy of Froissart’s Chroniques.
CHAPTER ONE

THE TRANSLATOR AND HIS NETWORKS

*Karel ende Elegast, Beatrijs en Mariken* have in common that we do not know their authors. That applies to a large number of texts, but certainly not to all. Sometimes, like in the case of the *Reynaert*, we only know the first name William (or Arnold), sometimes also a surname, which often gives an indication of the place of birth or the location where the author exercised his literary or professional activities.

(Resoort 2004, 177)

The Middle Dutch translation of Froissart’s *magnum opus* provides us with one of those relatively rare occasions in which a Middle Dutch translator’s name has been disclosed. The colophons of the extant manuscripts refer to him as ‘Gerijt [= Gerard] Potter vander Loo’. Moreover, the translator’s professional activities have been recorded meticulously in the accounts and judicial registers of the Council of Holland. This situation, in which the author has been clearly identified and surviving records document his (professional activities), enables us to evaluate the contacts between the source and target text cultures from a privileged point of view. In this chapter, I will offer a reconstruction of the translator’s biography from his adolescence (§ 1.1.) to his death in 1454, with particular focus on Gerard Potter’s social and professional networks. Special attention will be paid to the contacts between the francophone environment of Froissart’s original text and the Dutch-speaking context of the translator’s (intended) audience. This audience should probably be located in the vicinity of the Bavarian court of Holland (§ 1.2.) or among his peers in the Burgundian regional Council (§ 1.3.). Therefore, an analysis of Gerard Potter’s professional contacts and activities, as well as a general description of the cultural environments he frequented may be of considerable importance to the evaluation of both the origin and the purpose of the translated text (cf. infra, Chapter Five and the final conclusion of this casestudy). Since an important local administrator belonging to the municipal government of Leyden was also the scribe of one of the surviving copies of the translation (*Le3-1* and *Le3-2*), I will additionally discuss Gerard Potter’s contacts with the cities of Holland.
CHAPTER ONE

The chapter is composed of three major sections, the first of which focuses on the translator’s adolescence and early adulthood. The second section deals with Gerard Potter’s presence in the household of Jacqueline of Bavaria, the last Wittelsbach countess of Holland, Zeeland and Hainault. In the third section, I will consider the translator’s activities as a member of the regional government of Holland after its absorption into the Burgundian personal union.

1.1. Gerard Potter’s youth: gaining access to the court (ca. 1395 – 1433)

1.1.1. Turmoil in the county of Holland

It is generally assumed that Gerard Potter was born circa 1395 as the firstborn son of Dirk Potter, a clerk in the comital treasury of Holland, and a woman named Gertrude, who possibly descended from a family of Dutch tradesmen.\(^1\) Two younger brothers, Jacob (born ca.1401?) and Dirk and one sister completed the family.\(^2\) The children grew up in turbulent times. The last years of the fourteenth and the first decade of the fifteenth century had been dominated by the Frisian wars and conflicts with the lord of Arkel.\(^3\) The second decade had started off with the continuation of a standing conflict between Holland and Guelders. But it was not until 1417 that disaster really struck.\(^4\) On 4 April, John of Touraine, dauphin of France and husband of Jacqueline of Bavaria, heiress to Holland, Zeeland and Hainault, died of an abscess in the neck.\(^5\) A few weeks later, Jacqueline’s father, William VI succumbed to the consequences of an inflamed dogbite.\(^6\) Before his death, the count had requested the cities and nobility of Holland to recognize his only daughter as his successor. The cities had indulged William’s request, but the situation became more complicated when the German emperor Sigismund of Luxemburg took interest in the matter. According to the emperor, the counties of Holland and Zeeland could only be transmitted to a male heir. The closest male relative of William VI was his brother, John of Bavaria (also known

---

\(^1\) Damen 2000, 484-485; Corbellini 2000, 76; Overmaat 1952, 128; Smit 1928, 560.
\(^2\) Damen 2000, 484.
\(^3\) Janse 2002, 101.
\(^4\) Corbellini 2000, 203.
\(^5\) Damen 2000, 13.
\(^6\) Comprehensive accounts of the war of succession in Holland, Zeeland and Hainault (1417-1433) have been given by Van Riemsdijk 1908, 237-239, 248-249, 256-257, 265-268, 294-299, 303-306 and 331-349; Vaughan 2002, 29-53; Jansen 1976, 35-118; Bos-Rops 1993, 149-153 and 184-191; The events have been summarised in Van Gent 1994, 23-26; Blockmans and Prevenier 1999, 57-59, 65-69, 86-91; Damen 2000, 13-14; Janse 2002, 101-102; Boone 2003, 76-82; Jacoba van Beieren. The most recent biography of Jacqueline of Bavaria has been written by Antheun Janse. (see: Janse 2009).
as ‘the Pitiless’), bishop elect of Liège and Jacqueline’s uncle. In accordance with feudal law, the emperor supported the latter’s claims to his deceased brother’s counties. The opposition between the claimants revived and at the same time was influenced by the struggle between two factions in Holland, the *Hooks* and the *Cods*, which had occasionally flared up since the second half of the fourteenth century. The *Cods* sided with John the Pitiless; the *Hooks*, most of whom were former partisans of her father, supported Jacqueline. In order to reinforce Jacqueline’s claims to the titles of Holland, Zeeland and Hainault, the comital family’s Burgundian in-laws arranged for Jacqueline to be wed to her cousin, John IV of Brabant (cf. fig. 1.1).

John, however, was weak and wasteful. In 1420, the treaty of Sint-Maartensdijk stipulated that Jacqueline’s counties would be leased out to her uncle John for a period of twelve years. Deeply humiliated by her husband, Jacqueline left his court at Brussels and fled to England. Since it was still not entirely clear whether the marriage between the countess and her cousin John IV had been legitimate, in 1422, she married Humphrey of Gloucester, brother of King Henry V. In 1424, John of Bavaria appointed Philip the Good the universal heir to his personal estates in Holland and Zeeland. Consequently, his Burgundian ally aided the regent in defending the usurped principalities against English attacks. On 6 January 1425, John of Bavaria died, possibly poisoned by supporters of Jacqueline of Bavaria’s. In February, John of Brabant travelled to The Hague and confirmed the rights of his subjects of Holland and Zeeland. By July, however, the duke of Brabant had already pawned the counties to Philip the Good. In the meantime, Jacqueline was kept in custody at Ghent, but in September she escaped. With the support of Gouda, Schoonhoven and a handful of other cities, Jacqueline waged war on her Burgundian cousin. However, her efforts were of no avail. In 1428, the countess was forced to give in. In the meanwhile, her marriage with the late John IV of Brabant (he had died in April 1427) had been declared valid. Gloucester had left her, married his mistress, Eleonora of Cobham, one of Jacqueline’s ladies-in-waiting and discontinued the English support. The treaty of Delft between Jacqueline and Philip the Good formally acknowledged Jacqueline as countess of Holland, Zeeland and Hainault. Philip, however, became her guardian and thus remained regent. In 1433, the countess abdicated and transferred her counties to her cousin, the duke of Burgundy. Finally, her lands were officially integrated into the Burgundian Empire and would be primarily governed from the South.⁷

---

⁷ The received view is that the abdication was the consequence of a secret marriage between Jacqueline of Bavaria and Frank of Borssele. In his recent biography of the countess, A. Janse debunks this myth. Janse
argues that there is no documentary evidence to support a secret union between Jacqueline and Borssele. Janse (2009), 288-311.
1.1.2. Gerard Potter’s network of kinship: a family in comital service

Gerard Potter probably grew up in The Hague, near the *Binnenhof*, the comital residence. In November 1402 his father, Dirk Potter, had traded two houses at *t Noorteynde* for a house situated by the *Plaats*, a square to the west of the court's lake. After Dirk’s death in 1428, Gerard Potter, his firstborn son, inherited the estate. Several prominent noblemen, including the lord of Brederode and later Frank of Borssele, count of Ostrevant, owned private residences in the vicinity, as did a number of Burgundian officials, like Jacob Cruesink and John of Haluin.

For nearly two centuries, the court made use of the Potter family’s services. The first known mention of Gerard’s grandfather and namesake in the accounts of the county of Holland is dated 1361. In the service of Albert of Bavaria, Gerard senior travelled to Cambrai (1368), Le Quesnoy (1370) and when in 1385 the marriage settlements of William of Ostrevant and Margaret of Burgundy needed to be sealed by the cities, he visited the towns of North and South Holland. In his capacity of clerk, Potter drew up charters and deeds in Dutch as well as in French. This was indeed not uncommon for the comital chancery, since after the death of John I in 1299, the Dutch-speaking principalities of Holland and Zeeland and the francophone county of Hainault had been united under the same sovereign. First, the counties were ruled by the French-speaking counts of Avesnes; from 1354 onwards by the German Wittelsbach family.

In 1385, Gerard’s son, Dirk, was rewarded for copying an account onto parchment. He is mentioned as the treasurer’s clerk in 1398 and 1401. From 1403 until his death in 1428, Potter was one of the comital secretaries, serving in succession count Albert (1403-1404), count William VI (1404-1417), his daughter Jacqueline (1417-1418), John IV of Brabant (1419/1425), John the Pitiless (1421-1425) and Philip of Burgundy.
(1425-1428). Before 1413, Dirk Potter was raised to the knighthood. Various missions lead him to Hainault, Utrecht, England, Rome, Calais, Frisia, Flanders and Brabant. These travels indicate that Dirk Potter had a thorough command of languages, which is confirmed by the secretary’s moral and didactical oeuvre. His *Der minnen loep* (*On the ways of love*) shows the influence of Latin sources such as Ovid. S. Corbellini has convincingly argued that his *Blome der doechen* was based on an Italian exemplar. In his *Mellibeus* Dirk gave a rather faithful translation of Renaut de Louhans’ *Livre de Melibee et de Prudence*, itself a French adaptation of Albertanus de Brescia’s *Liber consolationis et consilii*.

As a comital secretary, Dirk Potter was closely involved in the turbulent events that followed count William’s death in 1417. He first served Jacqueline of Bavaria and her second husband in the countess’ struggle against her uncle. In 1418, he paid Henry Sinne for seven large *vidimi*, three *instrumenta* and two scrolls as regards the negotiations between Jacqueline of Bavaria and her uncle John the Pitiless. Potter’s clerk, Henry Smit was paid for writing a scroll regarding the same negotiations. Earlier that year, Dirk had bought seventeen yards of ribbon for seven *vidimi* of the imperial charters regarding the enfeoffment of Holland, Zeeland and Hainault. In the same year, he was sent to France to meet the duke of Burgundy. When in 1420, after the treaty of Sint-Maartensdijk, John the Pitiless came to power in Holland and Zeeland as governor acting on behalf of John of Brabant, who at the time was Jacqueline’s husband, Dirk Potter stayed on as comital secretary. After the death of John the Pitiless in 1425, Dirk was involved at a high level in the process that led to the recognition of Philip of Burgundy as regent of Holland and Zeeland. Dirk’s good relations with the last Wittelsbach and first Valois rulers of the county must have provided promising career opportunities for his sons Gerard and Jacob, an aspect that will be discussed hereafter.

---

14 Van Riemsdijk 1908, 190, 225, 241-242, 253, 300-301, 324-330.
15 Corbellini 2000, 76.
16 Corbellini 2000, 201-207.
18 Corbellini 2000, 103. Corbellini excludes the possibility that Potter’s translation was based on one of the extant French manuscripts. She puts forward that some passages, which reflect the Italian text meticulously, suggest that it is probable that an Italian source was used, rather than a (lost) French or German version.
19 Overmaat 1950, 44-45; Van Oostrom 1987, 229.
20 AGH. 1270, fol. 51 r.
21 AGH 1270, fol. 47 v.
22 AGH 1270, fol. 47 r.
23 Prevenier and Smit 1987, 668, 673.
Dirk Potter was not the only of Gerard Potter senior’s sons who served the counts of Holland. In 1390, his brother Walter is mentioned as a torchbearer of Margaret of Burgundy, wife of William of Ostrevant.\textsuperscript{24} After their marriage in 1385, the government of Hainault had gradually been transferred from Albert of Bavaria to his son. As a consequence, William travelled frequently between the northern counties and Hainault. Margaret stayed mostly behind in the South.\textsuperscript{25} It is therefore plausible that Walter’s being retained by the comital family was an occasional affair. This is probably not the case for another of Dirk’s brothers, Peter, who in 1400 was active as clerk to the registry.\textsuperscript{26} In 1408 and 1412 he stood in for his brother Dirk, as sheriff of The Hague.\textsuperscript{27} The treasurer’s account of 1418 records that Peter Potter and Henry van der Goes, who was married to Peter’s daughter, Catherine, had lodged the councillors and emissaries of the king of England, William Sturmy, doctor of theology and other members of his household.\textsuperscript{28} In 1418, Peter Potter brought the accounts and registers to Schoonhoven and stayed there for thirty-two days.\textsuperscript{29}

Nothing is known about Gerard Potter junior’s childhood or early youth. Given the stress placed on education in his father’s literary works and Gerard’s future career, there is no denying that he received a proper education.\textsuperscript{30} The first record of his professional activity dates from 1433 and is found in an account drawn up by the treasurers of Frank of Borssele and Jacqueline of Bavaria.\textsuperscript{31} In his \textit{Chronicon Hollandiae}, Johannes a Leydis lists Gerard Potter among the knights and squires in Holland during the reign of William VI (1404-1417).\textsuperscript{32} What Gerard’s occupations were at the time is a matter for conjecture. It is possible that his father introduced him to the court during the first decades of the fifteenth century.

\textsuperscript{24} Overmaat 1952, 113.
\textsuperscript{25} Smit 1995, 20.
\textsuperscript{26} Overmaat 1952, 119.
\textsuperscript{27} Overmaat 1952, 120.
\textsuperscript{28} AGH 1270, fol. 34 v.; Damen 2000, 463.
\textsuperscript{29} AGH 1273, fol. 15 r.
\textsuperscript{30} E.g. Schoutens 1904, 123-124; Leendertz 1845, 4-5.
\textsuperscript{31} Reynegom de Buzet, fol. 5 v.
\textsuperscript{32} Brussels, Royal Library, MS 8343.
CHAPTER ONE

fig. 1.2.: Genealogy of the Potter family

- Elisabeth de Grebber
- John van der Mij (d. 1447)
  - Christine van der Mij (d. after 31.05/1465)
  - Gerard Potter (b. ca. 1395 - d. 10/11/1454)
  - Jacob Potter (b. ca. 1401 - d. 25/01/1453)
  - Dirk Potter
    - (b. ca. 1370 - d. 25/01/1425)
    - Dirk Potter
      - (b. ca. 1370 - d. 25/01/1425)
        - anonymous daughter
          - Aleida van der Weijde
        - anonymous daughter
          - Dirk Potter
            - (d. ca. 1481)
              - Catharine Bujzer
              - Duygen
        - anonymous daughter
          - Dirk of Hoogstraten
          - Gertrude Potter
          - John Potter the Younger
          - John Potter the Elder
          - Gerard Potter
          - Dirk Potter
            - (d. before 29/07/1400)
              - Peter Potter
1.1.3. The Bavarian court of Holland, a multilingual environment (1385-1433)

1.1.3.1. Multilingualism in government

The comital chancery of Holland, of which Gerard’s father was an active member, was a lettered environment in which some degree multilingualism was required.\(^{33}\) Until 1413, the clerk of the domestic expenses also paid out the count’s expenses when the latter was in Hainault.\(^{34}\) Conversely, when Count William VI was in Holland, he took with him his ‘Walssche clerk’ William Cambier, who was competent for matters with regards to Hainault.\(^{35}\) The office of *Walsche klerk* continued under Jacqueline of Bavaria and John IV of Brabant. At first, it was occupied by master Tiry, later by a clerk called John.\(^{36}\) During the rule of John of Bavaria, Gerard Durot, one of the regent’s secretaries held the office.\(^{37}\)

Contacts between the counts and the French-speaking world were plentiful. Most importantly, through the government of their southern French-speaking county of Hainault, they came into contact with French on a regular basis. Additionally, through the betrothal (1406) and marriage (1415) of Jacqueline of Bavaria and John of Touraine, the Wittelsbach court had become even more tightly linked to the French royal family, than it had already been since the double marriage between the children of Philip, duke of Burgundy and Albert of Bavaria. The young French prince was raised in Hainault, at the castle of Le Quesnoy, where his Bavarian in-laws saw to the young couple’s education.\(^{38}\) But also in Paris, William VI was held in high esteem. The count of Holland, Zeeland and Hainault held a close watch on the affaires of his princely son-in-law. In the first decade of the fifteenth century, William repeatedly resided at the court of France. In 1409, the duke of Berry offered him a residence in Paris.\(^{39}\) William VI also stayed in close contact with his Burgundian in-laws. In 1408, John the Fearless aided his brothers-in-law John of Bavaria and William VI in their struggle against the craftsmen of Liège at the battle of Othée.\(^{40}\)

\(^{33}\) Cf. supra: missions to Hainault; In the following I focus on the use of French. The court and comital chancery also had contacts with the papal court, for instance regarding the marriage of Jacqueline of Bavaria and John IV. These contacts were in Latin (e.g. Van Mieris 1753, 755, 789). The correspondence between the court and Emperor Sigismund were in German (e.g. Van Mieris 1753, 867).

\(^{34}\) Van Riemsdijk 1908, 224.

\(^{35}\) Van Riemsdijk 1908, 226-227.

\(^{36}\) Van Riemsdijk 1908, 242-243.

\(^{37}\) Van Riemsdijk 1908, 262.

\(^{38}\) Janse 2009, 54-59.

\(^{39}\) Janse 2009, 58.

\(^{40}\) Blockmans 2001, 69.
Additionally, the count negotiated in the argument between John the Fearless and the Armagnacs, the supporters of the duke of Orléans. After John of Touraine had become dauphin of France in 1415, William actively defended the rights of his daughter and son-in-law and dealt with the requests of the supporters of the duke of Burgundy and the Armagnac desires. In 1416, the count sojourned in England, where he celebrated the feasts of Ascension, Whitsun and Corpus Christi. The same winter, he attended the festivities for Christmas in France.

The rulers of Holland who succeeded William VI also used French in their official contacts with the sovereigns of neighbouring principalities. The correspondence between the duke of Burgundy and John IV of Brabant as regards a settlement between the latter and his wife, Jacqueline of Bavaria was conducted in French. Of other documents, such as the treaty of Delft both a French and a Dutch version exists. The regency of Philip the Good marked the beginning of an influx of Burgundian (francophone or bilingual) officers into Holland, amongst whom Roland of Uutkerke, a Flemish knight who was appointed captain of Holland. The French lord of L’Isle Adam, John of Villiers became stadtholder, the duke’s primary representative in the north.

1.1.3.2. Multilingualism and courtly culture

It is not certain whether Gerard Potter has attended or even participated in the splendour of courtly entertainment at the court of Holland during the first decades of the fifteenth century. In addition to the vivid literary activity in Dutch described by F. van Oostrom, the entertainment at the Bavarian court at The Hague was explicitly multilingual. This has been amply shown in the introduction of Van Oostrom’s monograph, in which the scholar lists a multitude of examples. Margaret of Burgundy read Dutch as well as French

---

41 Janse 2009, 57.
42 Janse 2009, 85-89.
44 Van Mieris 1753, 783.
45 Prevenier and Smit 1987, 716-717. The Dutch version was probably drafted for the members of the cities (and knighthood?) who were required to seal the agreement.
46 In 1425, John IV of Brabant had had to promise not to install foreigners in official positions. Apparently, the agreement with Philip of Burgundy included no such stipulation (Van Mieris 1753, 751). Regarding the offices held by Roland of Uutkerke, see: Damen 2000, 492-493.
47 Van Riemsdijk 1908, 309.
literature, in 1395 a Latin chronicle of Hainault was dedicated to the county’s Bavarian rulers, the prayer books that were commissioned for members of the comital family were in Latin, etc.\textsuperscript{49} Books associated with the court of Holland originated from France, Italy, Holland and Utrecht.\textsuperscript{50} In his \textit{Joli buisson de jonece}, Jean Froissart, the author of the \textit{Chroniques} proudly lists the Bavarian counts Albert and William among his patrons.\textsuperscript{51} Entertainers from anywhere in Europe visited the court of Holland to entertain the counts and their households.\textsuperscript{52} Even Jacqueline of Bavaria, whose favourite leisure activity seems to have been playing dice, frequently welcomed \textit{pyperen ende herauden} (‘pipers and heralds’). In November 1418, the trumpeters, heralds and fools of Charlois visited the court.\textsuperscript{53} In 1419, treasurer Floris of Borsele rewarded Bartholomew, who was a well-known poet, William the fool, the pipers of Cleves, Engelken ‘den passavant’ (a fool), the pipers of Ravensburg, a piper of the lady of Burgundy and finally the lady of Bavaria’s jester.\textsuperscript{54} In 1420, a ‘passavant’ from Spain visited the court of John the Pitiless. Musicians from Brabant, the fool Lecke, the municipal pipers of Haarlem and Amsterdam, and again, Bartholomew the poet provided additional entertainment.\textsuperscript{55} And these are but a few examples of the active comings and goings in the declining years of courtly splendour at the \textit{Binnenhof} at The Hague. Between 1370 and 1417, J. Verbij-Schillings estimates no less than 1600 recorded (!) payments to musicians, heralds and entertainers.\textsuperscript{56}

\subsection*{1.1.4. An exiled supporter of Jacqueline of Bavaria?}

The earliest documentary reference to Gerard Potter found to date is an entry in the \textit{Memoriale Ducis Johannis Brabantiae de anno 1425}. On 8 February 1425 ‘my lord [John IV of Brabant] gave Gerard Potter a sealed letter of free-conduct to enter and reside safely in all of his lands for an unspecified period or four days \textit{post revocationem’}.\textsuperscript{57} One month earlier, John the Pitiless had died and the counties of Holland and Zeeland had fallen to the duke of Brabant. To L.C.P.H. van den Bergh, the entry in the \textit{Memoriale} suggested that

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Van Oostrom 1987, 32-45.
\item Van Oostrom 1987, 34; Wüstefeld 1989, 25-36; \textit{Bibliotheca Neerlandica Manucripta}.
\item Fourrier 1975, 57.
\item Janse 1992, 124.
\item AGH 1271, fol. 42 r-v.
\item AGH 1272, fol. 44 v.
\item AGH 1275, fol. 38 r. Brinkman 1997, 39-42 argues that Bartholomew of Watersloot was in permanent service of the Bavarian counts.
\item Verbij-Schillings 1998, 47.
\item AGH 214, fol. 1 v.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Potter had studied at the University of Paris at the time and therefore had to cross the duchy of Brabant on his journey to France.\textsuperscript{58} However, this explanation is not satisfactory for a number of reasons. As opposed to his younger brother, Jacob, who held a doctorate in canon law, Gerard’s name has not been listed in the university’s matricules.\textsuperscript{59} Moreover, contrary to Jacob, in the accounts or judicial registers Gerard is not referred to with the academic title of \textit{meester (magister)}.\textsuperscript{60} Moreover, listings of witnesses do not include him in the sub-group of academics.

The other entries of the \textit{Memoriale} provide us with a more convincing explanation. Indeed, John IV had arrived at The Hague on 30 January and at the duke was arranging his affairs in his northern counties. On 8 February, when Gerard Potter’s letter of safe-conduct was issued, he confirmed the privileges of Holland and Zeeland. On the same day he had promised the barons, knight, squires, cities and people of Holland, Zeeland and Frisia that no exiles or fugitives would be allowed to enter his principalities, unless the duke, his Council and the respective cities consented to their return.\textsuperscript{61} Indeed, the letters of safe-conduct recorded in the \textit{Memoriale} exclusively mention foreign merchants or individuals who had rebelled against the reign of John the Pitiless. In the case of foreigners or merchants it is explicitly stated that there should be no ‘exiles or enemies’ among their entourage.\textsuperscript{62} On 29 June 1425, Nicolas Egbertsz., a burgher of Schoonhoven was allowed to travel through Holland on two conditions: (1) he would have to take an oath before the regent and treasurer of Holland not to return to Schoonhoven and (2) he should not support the government’s enemies within that city.\textsuperscript{63} The provisions are obvious: the Hook cities of Schoonhoven and Gouda were subversive and had persisted in their support of Jacqueline of Bavaria. It is possible that the reasons for Gerard Potter’s safeguard are similar. His political sympathies were probably (moderately) \textit{Hook}. The main reasons for this assumption are:

1. In 1433 we find him in the service of Jacqueline of Bavaria.
2. His wife, Christine van der Mije is the daughter of John van der Mije. During Jacqueline’s conflict with her uncle, John of Bavaria, John van der Mije was one of her fiercest supporters. He was a member of the

\textsuperscript{58} Van den Bergh 1853, 149.
\textsuperscript{59} Gabriel and Boyce 1964, 347.
\textsuperscript{60} I am aware of one instance that refers to \textit{meesters} Jacob and Gerard Potter. (Smit 2005, 242-243). Probably the clerk should have noted ‘\textit{meester} Jacob and Gerard Potter’. To my mind, the plural form is erroneous here.
\textsuperscript{61} Prevenier and Smit 1987, 646-648.
\textsuperscript{62} AGH 214, fol. 13 r; Van Mieris 1753, 752.
\textsuperscript{63} AGH 214, fol. 26 v.
alliance of *Hooks* (together with Frederick, bishop of Utrecht, John of Montfoort, John of Wassenaar and William of Brederode) against John the Pitiless (1420) and was a captain of Jacqueline’s fleet. After Jacqueline had died, Gerard’s father-in-law acted as executor on behalf of the countess’ mother, Margaret of Burgundy.

(3) It has been argued that Gerard's commission in 1445 as a salaried member of the Council suggests that he might have been regarded as a moderate *Hook*. Potter's position as clerk to receiver general William of Naaldwijk adds to this suggestion. After all, Naaldwijk may be regarded as one of the noblemen who represented the *Hooks* at court.

(4) In April 1481, Dirk Potter van der Loo, Gerard’s son, was executed. One of the charges was that he had assisted the *Hooks* in their occupation of Leyden. On several other occasions he had shown himself as one of their supporters.

In view of the above, it seems that Gerard Potter may well have been one of the *Hook* insurgents opposing the regency of John of Bavaria, Jacqueline’s uncle. Possibly, Potter resided outside the county, in Hainault, or maybe even joined Jacqueline in England. In any event, the kind of insurrection that resulted into exile would make it less probable that Gerard Potter wrote his translation at the court of John the Pitiless as has been suggested in the past. However, the hypothesis that Gerard Potter was exiled from Holland for his continued support of Jacqueline of Bavaria’s cause needs further documentary proof.

---

64 Damen 2000, 476.
65 Historisch Genootschap Utrecht 1852, 167.
66 Damen 2000, 181.
67 Damen 2000, 369; Janse 2001, 411 and 446 categorises the Naaldwijk family in the period 1420-1428 as *Hook/Cod*. However, that Henry and his son William of Naaldwijk were banished in 1426-1427, suggests that this branch of the family was rather *Hook* than *Cod*.
68 Van Gent 1994, 308.
70 Janse 2009, 214-215 refers to the presence of exiles from Holland in the fleet of Humphrey of Gloucester and Jacqueline of Bavaria. Additionally, upon their (=Humphrey of Gloucester and Jacqueline of Bavaria) return to Hainault ‘a variety of noblemen had offered their services to Humphrey and Jacqueline. The majority of them originated from Hainault, but there were also exiles from Holland and Zeeland’.
71 Van Oostrom 1992, 297.
1.1.5. Conclusion

Gerard Potter’s close relations with the court of The Hague probably introduced him at a young age to an environment in which multilingualism was almost self-evident. It is probable that a number of his close relatives had a thorough command of French (this certainly applies to his father), which may have facilitated his own understanding of the language. It is probable that Gerard Potter was one of the supporters of Jacqueline of Bavaria and belonged to the faction of the Hooks who contested the claims of the established regent John the Pitiless. This renders it less probable that Potter’s literary efforts were performed in the latter’s service.

1.2. A decade of transition: the shift from Bavaria to Burgundy (1430-1440)

When in 1433 the government of Holland was finally transferred to Philip of Burgundy, Gerard Potter initially stayed in the service of the former rulers of the county: Jacqueline of Bavaria and her fourth husband, Frank of Borssele, one of the county’s regents between 1430 and 1432. After Jacqueline’s death in 1436, Potter apparently left Borssele’s service and was appointed sheriff of ’s-Gravenzande under the authority of Philip the Good. Gradually, he became more involved in the regional government of Holland, first as an unsalaried member of the Council and treasurer’s clerk, later as a full-time councillor.

1.2.1. A network of patrons: the entourage of Jacqueline of Bavaria

The first documented contact between Gerard Potter and Jacqueline of Bavaria is dated 13 August 1428. On this day, the countess enfeoffed ‘our beloved Gerard Potter van der Loo’ with ‘all the houses, homesteads, shires, tithes, levies, lands, returns and property that he has inherited after his father’s death’. After Dirck Potter’s demise on 1 May 1428, Gerard came into a considerable estate. He inherited the house at the Plaats, the estate De Loo near Voorburg and became lord of Hubrechtsambacht and Snedelwijk in the parish of Waddinxveen. On 13 January 1432, possibly on the occasion of his marriage to Christine van der Mije, Jacqueline enfeoffed Gerard with approximately 15 hectares of boglands near the Bosberch, for him and his heirs to use to their best profits with the constraint that

---

72 AGH 712, fol. 10 r.
they were prohibited to dig for peat without the countess’ permission. In return, Jacqueline received an annual return of 14 shilling 6 pence. It is quite probable that at that time, Potter was already in the service of the former countess. Indeed, in a surviving account drawn up by Jacqueline's treasurers John van der Mije – Gerard Potter’s father-in-law – and John Ruychrock, the translator has been mentioned several times. On 2 August 1433, he was sent to Hainault to collect the revenues of Ponthieu. Given the fact that the steward's clerk was sent to Douai to meet Gerard and his servant there ‘because of the danger of armed folk’, this must have been a hazardous assignment. Apparently, the risk of being robbed was real and significant, since two men were hired to escort Gerard to Valenciennes. The mission was a success: in May 1434 Gerard was sent to Hainault once again, this time to collect the 500 écus of Ostrevant. He rode on to Arras and continued his journey to the steward of Ponthieu. Later that year, Gerard travelled to Brielle for ‘financial affairs’, now accompanied by one of Jacqueline’s treasurers, John Ruychrock and a servant. All in all, he was away on financial business for at least 64 days that year, small errands for the kitchen and other short journeys not included. Two qualities must have advanced Gerard’s career in the countess’ service: his command of languages and financial expertise, both of which seem to have run in the family.

In the night of 8 October 1436, Jacqueline succumbed to tuberculosis and died at the castle of Teilingen. As it seems, Gerard Potter did not stay in the service of Frank of Borssele. The accounts of Borssele mention him only once. In 1437, he appears to have been involved in a transaction of two barrels of red wine. Nevertheless, it appears that Borssele and Potter stayed in touch. The account of the executors of Jacqueline’s estate shows their close involvement in the settlement of the countess’ last will and testament. On

73 AGH 232 fol. 63 r. (fifteenth-century copy). Gerard Potter continued to expand his estate throughout his lifetime. This study does not allow for a complete discussion of his property. It is interesting, however, that he asked for the explicit permission of Philip the Good to divide his inheritance among his children. LRK 116, chapter North-Holland fol. 24 v. – 25 r.: ‘Philip etc. proclaims to all that Gerard Potter van der Loo, our trusted councillor has made it clear to our trustworthy councillor and chamberlain, the lord of Lannoy, our stadholder and our trusted councillors and vassals of Holland which will be named afterwards, that he has been enfeoffed with all manner of lands (...) and because he has many children at this time and may have more and after his death his eldest son is entitled to all his fiefs, he would like for us to allow him to divide his estate among his children (...)’
74 Reynegom de Buzet, fol. 54 r.
75 Reynegom de Buzet, fol. 59 r.
76 Reynegom de Buzet, fol. 80 r.
77 Reynegom de Buzet, fol. 26 r.; fol. 67 r.
78 Jacoba van Beieren.
79 Rodenberg 2006, 66.
6 November 1444, Gerard Potter van der Loo submitted the record of the arrangements made on the executor’s behalf to the court.\textsuperscript{80}

The executors included: Margaret of Burgundy, Jacqueline’s mother, Frank of Borssele, her husband, William of IJsselstein, Floris of Abele, John of Neck, Jacqueline’s father confessor, Gilles of Wissenkerke, councillor of Frank of Borssele and Floris of Kijfhoek, one of Jacqueline’s councillors. Margaret was represented by John van der Mije, Gerard Potter’s father-in-law and in 1433-1434 treasurer of Jacqueline of Bavaria. Jacqueline’s second treasurer, John Ruychrock, acted on behalf of Frank of Borssele. It seems that Gerard Potter held the position of receiver general or in any event fulfilled a similar financial role. In this capacity he was held responsible for the collection of revenues and the settlement of debts.\textsuperscript{81} His involvement in the execution of Jacqueline’s will does not only show Potter’s professional disposition towards the late countess, it also reveals true affection. As a reminder of his late mistress he bought a brooch, which had once been

\textsuperscript{80} Historisch Genootschap Utrecht 1852, 166-266.

\textsuperscript{81} He paid the count of Mörs 2000 écus that were part of the amount of 8000 écus Jacqueline owed him. The count was paid another 3600 écus by John Ruychrock. Additionally, Gerard Potter paid William of Montfoort for his services as sheriff of Egmond and his brother for the same office in Frisia. He also covered the expenses of an assembly of the executors at Noordwijk. In 1443 and 1444 Gerard Potter, John Ruychrock and John van der Mije collected the aides or subsidies in ’s-Gravenzande, Maassland, Vlaardingen, Vlaardingerambacht, Zouteveen and Delft. Historisch Genootschap Utrecht 1852, 204, 231, 240-241, 265
given to Jacqueline by Peter Wilsijn, the steward of Ponthieu. The suggestion of fond remembrance of the late countess is further emphasised by a donation made by Gerard Potter’s wife, Christine, ‘in honour of God and in support and blossoming of the aforementioned soul’.

The fact that the executors consigned their financial affairs to Gerard suggests that they knew and trusted him. This was certainly the case for Jacqueline's widower, Frank of Borssele. Additionally, the members of the Potter family were no strangers to Margaret of Burgundy. Moreover, on one occasion the executors were invited to Gerard's homestead for a meal, which corroborates the suggestion of familiarity. The account states that they ‘drank their way through 8 shillings at Gerard Potter's’.

Potter’s journeys to handle ‘all things concerning the will and all the petitions that have been recorded in the aforementioned will’ took him to Brabant, Artois, Flanders: anywhere the duke of Burgundy or his chancellor resided. In the period in which he was in the service of Jacqueline of Bavaria and during the settlement of her will, Gerard Potter secured contacts with the most important noblemen of Holland (in particular Frank of Borssele) and their entourage (Gilles of Wissenkerke, John Ruychrock). His travels by order of the former countess or the executors of her estate took him beyond the borders of Holland and introduced him to the court of his new sovereign, Philip the Good, duke of Burgundy.

---

82 Historisch Genootschap Utrecht 1852, 173.
83 Historisch Genootschap Utrecht 1852, 212.
84 Cf. supra § 1.1.1.
85 Historisch Genootschap Utrecht 1852, 205.
86 Historisch Genootschap Utrecht, 221. At the end of August 1438 Gerard was sent to Haarlem to inform Frank of Borssele of a letter from Philip the Good in which he invited the executors for a meeting with the chancellor (Nicolas Rolin) in Brussels. In September of the same year, William of Egmond, lord of IJsselstein, Gilles of Wissenkerke and Gerard Potter were sent to the chancellor in Brussels (Brabant). They finally met him in Antwerp (Brabant) where he apparently resided at the time. In November Gerard visited the chancellor at Hesdin (Artois) for matters concerning the arrears of a.o. Zeeland. (Historisch Genootschap Utrecht 1852, 257). 20 April 1440, he was sent to the lord of Vere (Frank of Borssele) with a copy of the claims made by the steward of Bevester-Schelde and Beooester-Schelde. He travelled on to Flanders, Brabant and Brussels, to talk to the chancellor of Burgundy. Gerard continued his journey to Bruges and returned to Vere. Having been on the road for 28 days he concluded his business in Tholen, where he summoned Anthony Kempenz. to pay his debts to the late countess (Historisch Genootschap Utrecht 1852, 258-259). In March 1441 Gerard visited Rolin in Brabant with messages sent to him by the executors (Historisch Genootschap Utrecht 1852, 259).
1.2.2. Entertainment and manuscript ownership in the surroundings of Jacqueline of Bavaria

1.2.2.1. Jacqueline of Bavaria

In spite of Jacqueline having forfeited her titles in 1433, the opulence of her court remained. A surviving account of 1433-1434, drawn up by Jacqueline’s treasurers John van der Mije and John Ruychrock, registers that all manner of luxury goods were imported for her household: Spanish soap and soap from Bruges, ginger, lime, pasties, lemons, pomegranates, scarlet, olives, capers, etc.\(^87\) Vellum and paper were purchased in Leyden, Brielle, Antwerp, Haarlem and Bruges, probably for the chancery.\(^88\) The clerks of Oostvoorne were provided with a new chest to store their accounts.\(^89\) Additionally, expenses were made for a new seal and signet and a silver aspersorium. Finally, Jacqueline’s private trumpeter received a new little banner.\(^90\)

As had been customary at the comital court of Holland, a host of musicians frequented Jacqueline’s court. In 1433-1434, the countess, as from 1434 together with her fourth husband Frank of Borssele, was visited by three trumpeters and the herald of Vredenburg, some unspecified singers, the herald of Braunschweig, the chamberlain of the king of Denmark, the herald of Otto of Bavaria, three pipers and one trumpeter and the pipers of the bishop of Utrecht.\(^91\) In the same year John of Neck, Jacqueline’s father confessor and one of the executors of her will, bought a small missal.\(^92\)

The account of 1433-1434 reveals nothing about Jacqueline of Bavaria’s and Frank of Borssele’s literary tastes. Nevertheless, it is known that both spouses possessed, and in the case of Borssele, acquired books. It appears from the surviving sources that Jacqueline’s library had no room for Dutch writing. The countess originated from a family of German princes, but from very early on in her life, Jacqueline’s destiny lay beyond the borders of Holland, in France. Not only was she the great-granddaughter of John the Good, king of France, at the age of five her parents and Burgundian in-laws arranged for her a marriage with John of Touraine, the nine-year-old son of Charles VI of France. Both fiancés were raised at Le Quesnoy in Hainault, which implies that Jacqueline and her

\(^87\) Reynegom de Buzet, fol. 34 r.
\(^88\) Reynegom de Buzet, fol. 35 v.
\(^89\) Reynegom de Buzet, fol. 35 v.
\(^90\) Reynegom de Buzet, fol. 37 r.
\(^91\) Reynegom de Buzet, fol. 41 r.
\(^92\) Reynegom de Buzet, fol. 72 r.
future husband were taught primarily in French. Their teacher, Albert Loison, was probably francophone. Their textbooks, like for example Alexander of Villadei's *Doctrinale*, were in Latin.93

As has been mentioned above, Jacqueline was widowed at a very young age. Not unlike herself, Jacqueline’s second husband, John IV of Brabant was of Burgundian descent. His father, Jacqueline’s uncle, was Anthony of Burgundy. At the beginning of the fifteenth century, the cities of Brabant had made sure that their new Burgundian rulers would be able to speak Dutch, the duchy’s native language. Although the francophone Burgundian court had determined their cultural taste, Anthony and his son John also showed a keen interest in Middle Dutch literature. In his study of the literature at the Brabant court, R. Sleiderink has drawn attention to the connections between John IV and the Brussels chamber of rhetoric *Den Boeck*.94 Sleiderink also suggests that the marriage between John IV and Jacqueline of Bavaria implied that ‘the courtly culture of Brabant and Holland-Hainault became intertwined for at least a while’.95 In an undated memorandum (probably issued between 21 August 1418 and 8 January 1419) regarding the state of affairs in Utrecht and the Nedersticht addressed to John IV of Brabant, Louis of Montfoort, treasurer of Holland, recorded that he should not forget ‘item mijnre vrouwen [Jacqueline of Bavaria] te segghen dat mijn vrouwe hoir moeder al hoer boeke wech heeft […]’ (‘to tell my lady that my lady her mother had [sent?] away all of her books’). Although it is not entirely clear how this laconic entry should be interpreted, it may be an indication that Margaret of Burgundy had sent her daughter’s library to wherever Jacqueline resided at the time, probably in Hainault.96

94 Sleiderink 2003, 148-149.
95 Sleiderink 2003, 149-150. Sleiderink refers to a number of texts by Bavaria herald (e.g. the Guelders armorial) that appear at the court of Brabant ca. 1420-1440. This could be one of the only indications that Jacqueline of Bavaria actively promoted (or that her husband took a keen interest in) her Dutch heritage. An alternative explanation could be provided by the system of heralds. In 1405, Bavaria herald calls himself ‘Beyeren quondam Gelre rex armorum de Ruyris’ (Bavaria, once Guelders, Ruyris King of Arms). The latter title had been granted to him by the duke of Brabant. As an explanation for the abundance of material concerning Brabant in Bavaria herald’s The Hague manuscript (The Hague, Royal Library, 131 G 37) J. Verbij-Schillings has put forward that he ‘probably was able consult the texts of his (Brabant) predecessor, not unlike his texts were obtained by his Burgundian successor Henry of Heessel, Ruyris King of Arms under the reign of Philip the Good (1419-1467)’ (Verbij-Schillings 1999, 18). T. Colenbrander has suggested that Bavaria herald was succeeded by Louvain, one of the heralds of John IV and/or Philip of Saint-Pol (Colenbrander 2006, 397). It is plausible that the Ruyris King of Arms inherited (part of) their predecessor’s archives. Quite, possibly, these were regarded as ‘official’ documents. This course of events would also account for the presence of texts associated with Bavaria herald at the court of Brabant in the period 1420-1440. See also: Croenen 1993, 52-55.
96 AGH 454, fol. 3 v.
In 1422, after she had left Hainault for England, Jacqueline married Humphrey of Gloucester, prince of England, who may have further familiarised her with francophone courtly life and literature. As it appears, contacts between the court of Henry VI, the king’s uncle Humphrey of Gloucester and Jacqueline of Bavaria were in French.\textsuperscript{97} In a letter dated 9 June 1427, addressed to the exchequer, the English king promises his ‘tresamee tante, la ducesse de Gloucestre’ financial support.\textsuperscript{98} A letter sent by Jacqueline in 1425 from ‘the treacherous city of Mons’ to a ‘dear cousin’ at the court of Gloucester shows that she corresponded in French with her relatives who had stayed behind in England.\textsuperscript{99} However, as appears from a letter in Dutch to her ‘lieve neve’, the lord of Lek (Engelbrecht of Nassau), dated 1 May 1426, Jacqueline adapted the language of her correspondence to the addressee.\textsuperscript{100}

Jacqueline’s new husband, the duke of Gloucester was the owner of an extensive library the size of which can now be hardly estimated, but probably accommodated between five hundred and one thousand volumes. The extant volumes (about forty-five in number) reveal a distinct taste for humanistic and classical texts, but also include religious and historiographic texts, both in Latin and the English and French vernaculars. Gloucester was an important patron of English authors (Lydgate) as well as of a number of Italian humanists (Decembrio, Castiglionchio, Pacini). Throughout his lifetime, he bequeathed circa three hundred volumes to Oxford University Library.\textsuperscript{101} Most of the surviving volumes are in Latin, but as it appears, Gloucester also owned a large number of books in the vernacular. Unfortunately, most of the vernacular manuscripts have not survived or are yet to be identified.\textsuperscript{102} An \textit{ex libris} in a manuscript of \textit{Le Roman de Renart} identifies Humphrey of Gloucester as its owner. He also possessed copies of amongst others \textit{La queste del saint Graal, Le mort au Roi Artus, Chronique de France ou de saint Denis}, French translations of Boccaccio’s \textit{De Camerone} and the \textit{Legenda aurea}, \textit{Le somme du Roi} and \textit{Le songe du verger}.\textsuperscript{103}

As it appears, Jacqueline acquired some English books as well, maybe as a gift from her husband. After her death in 1436, six books in English were sold to an English

\textsuperscript{97} Janse 2009, e.g. 226-227.
\textsuperscript{98} Van Mieris 1753, 894.
\textsuperscript{99} Van Mieris 1753, 784.
\textsuperscript{100} Van Mieris 1753, 840.
\textsuperscript{101} Saygin 2002; Vickers 1907, 340-425.
\textsuperscript{102} Wijsman 2003, 176-177.
\textsuperscript{103} Busby 2002, 672; Petrina 2004, 182.
tradesman because they were of no use to anyone in the county of Holland.\(^{104}\) In addition to the books in English, the will lists some songbooks, the language of which has been left unmentioned. A copy of the *Liber secretorum fidelium crucis* by Marino Sanudo, originating from the Burgundian library supposedly once belonged to the Bavarian countess.\(^{105}\) The titles listed in the inventory of her hôtel in Ghent do not reveal any sympathy for Dutch letters either.\(^{106}\) Among the religious manuscripts associated with Jacqueline we do not encounter any in Dutch. A bible attributed to the countess was written in French, and so was a portion of a book of hours associated with her.\(^{107}\) Another book of hours in Latin was probably manufactured for her and her fourth husband, the Zeeland nobleman, Frank of Borssele.\(^{108}\)

1.2.2.2. Frank of Borssele

Unlike his wife, Frank of Borssele demonstrably commissioned literature in Dutch. Unfortunately, apart from the book of hours mentioned above, to date no surviving manuscripts have been attributed to him. Nevertheless, the surviving accounts of his domains offer us a glimpse at some of the books that were manufactured at his request. Indeed, recent examinations of these accounts, first by Arkenbout and later by Janse, have yielded interesting information on manuscripts commissioned by Jacqueline’s widower. Between 1455 and 1465 Borssele commissioned a sizeable chronicle in Middle Dutch (1455), a translation of *De mirabilibus mundi* (1459), an astronomy book (1458), genealogies of the kings of England and the kings of France (1463-1464) and a *mappa mundi* (1465).\(^{109}\) The translation of *De mirabilibus* suggests that Borssele preferred to read

\(^{104}\) Historisch Genootschap Utrecht 1852, 176.

\(^{105}\) Brussels, Royal Library, 9404-05; Brussels, Royal Library, 9347-48.

\(^{106}\) Boone 2003, 83.

\(^{107}\) Bruges, Municipal Library, 321.

\(^{108}\) Mulard, Paris, no signature.

\(^{109}\) Janse 1998, 116; Arkenbout 1994, 195. Book possession in the Borssele family has been discussed by Wijsman 2003, 198-204. The chronicle in Dutch was probably copied by John, the clerk ('knecht') of Master Gilles (Gilles of Wissenkerke?). The latter was a member of the Council of Holland, but also had a seat in Borssele’s private council. This reference may point towards the production of chronicles in the vernacular in the surroundings of the Burgundian Council of Holland. The chronicle that was commissioned by Frank of Borssele was a sizeable work, the volume of which (277 fols.) can – as far as surviving manuscripts of chronicles that were produced in Holland are concerned – (only) be compared with the constituent parts of Gerard Potter’s chronicle translation. It may also have been a compilation (cf. *Bibliotheca Neerlandica Manuscripta*). I thank A. Janse for providing me with the original text of the entry: ‘GRRek. 5579, fol. 58. Item opent dach vors. [=28-10-1455] bij bevele van mijnen heere betaelt Johannes meister Gillis knecht van een zwart boeck te scriven van croniken in duytsche, welck boeck inheift II C LXXVII bladen bescreven van elck blat enen stuver fac. II lb. VI s. II g. Item van tvors. Boeck te binden IIII s. g. Item van dbouck tot Delft te bringen ende weder te halen ii g.’. (And on the same foresaid day [=28-10-1455] was paid at the request of
Albertus Magnus in the vernacular. Evidence for his command of other languages has not yet been examined. The accounts of Borssele’s estate record, however, that Frank frequently welcomed foreign visitors at his residences. He entertained Charles, count of Charolais at at least five separate occasions. In 1460, Charles’ ‘trumpers and pipers’ were rewarded for their performance at Brielle. On several other occasions Borssele’s Burgundian acquaintances provided the entertainment: the court was enlivened by two fools of Isabella of Portugal, by John the Walloon, the fool of ‘my lady of Charolais’ and by Malle Lyse (Silly Lyse), her husband’s ‘dwasige’ (fool). Other visitors came from Spain, Greece and the Holy Land. At one occasion, Borssele even entertained two Moorish priests from the land of Prester John.\footnote{Janse 1998, 116; Arkenbout 1994, 134-138. The accounts probably refer to visitors from Ethiopia, which as from the fourteenth century was identified with the mythical empire of the Prester. Alternatively, these ‘Moorish priests’ were impostors or the attribute ‘from the land of Prester John’ was used to contribute to the aura Borssele’s court.}

\subsection{The nobility of Holland}

Apparently other noblemen from Holland shared Frank of Borssele’s interest in historiography, which is suggested by his commission of genealogies and a Middle Dutch chronicle. It is plausible that in the fourteenth century, copies of Melis Stoke's verse chronicle circulated among members of the high nobility, the Naaldwijk, Polanen and Brederode families in particular.\footnote{Burgers 1999, 364-366; Janse 2001, 27.} Additionally, it has been put forward that in the 1450s William of Egmond commissioned a collection of chronicles in Middle Dutch.\footnote{Noordzij suggests more carefully ‘the context of the court of Guelders’. The compilation was composed after 1453 and contains an excerpt of John of Boendale’s Der leken spieghel (on the popes until Leo III), chronicles of the bishops of Cologne, Liège, Utrecht and Münster, A chronicle of the German emperors until Frederick II and chronicles of Guelders (until 1437), Holland (until 1404), a short verse chronicle of Brabant (until 1415), a chronicle of Mark and a chronicle of the dukes of Cleves (until 1453). I thank A. Noordzij for providing me with this information. (e-mail: 15 September 2009). See also: Wijsman 2003, 236. ‘The collection is one of the very rare illustrated historiographic manuscripts produced in the northern Low Countries. The only other example of a fifteenth-century illustrated chronicle from the northern Low Countries is a manuscript with the Chronicle of Holland of Claes Heynensz. (Bavaria herald). Additionally there is one other illustrated manuscript from the northern Low Countries of a chronicle, i.e. a translation of Froissart’s Chroniques. Both manuscripts are dated ca. 1460. It is striking that the group of three manuscripts is dated to the same period’. The manuscripts referred to by Wijsman are: The Hague, Museum Meermanno-Westrianum, 10 C 14; Anholt, archives of the princes of Salm-Salm, 42; The Hague, Royal Library 130 B 21.}

Although it seems reasonable to assume that every high-ranking noble family possessed at least a small number of manuscripts, very little is known about book-
ownership among the aristocracy in Holland in the fifteenth century. In a number of cases (Borssele, Nassau and Egmond) documentary evidence adds to our knowledge. However, very few surviving manuscripts can be attributed with certainty to noble families from, or related with, Holland. Nevertheless, some extant codices – most of them containing texts of a devotional nature – can be connected to the entourage of Jacqueline of Bavaria. Indeed, the countess maintained excellent relations with the illegitimate sons of Blois, the Utrecht Montfoorts, and the Holland Brederodes. Again, very little is known about these families' interest in manuscripts. A Latin breviary dated to the middle of the fourteenth century bears the arms of Dalem and Blois-Châtillon. This may suggest that it once belonged to John of Blois, his mistress Sophie of Dalem or one of their illegitimate children. J.W. Muller has suggested that Gerard Potter’s translation of Froissart's *Chroniques* was commissioned by one of the illegitimate descendants of John or Guy of Blois, possibly John, bastard of Blois. As far as the Montfoorts are concerned, apart from two books of hours that probably belonged to Henry of Montfoort and his wife, Margaret of Croÿ, nothing appears to have survived. Henry was the son of John of Montfoort, councillor of Jacqueline of Bavaria and Philip the Good. As regards the Brederodes two sixteenth-century inventories survive, in which the possessions, among which also a considerable number of books, of Reynald III and his son Henry II of Brederode have been listed. These listings will be discussed in Chapter Five.

### 1.2.3. *Introduction to Burgundian service: sheriff of ’s-Gravenzande*

The extension of Gerard Potter’s network during the settlement of Jacqueline’s will must have been advantageous to his further career. Barely a fortnight had passed since the death of his mistress or Gerard sought out new professional perspectives. On 23 October 1436,

---

114 This, of course, does not mean that these noblemen did not possess books belonging to other genres. Indeed, the private nature of these devotional documents probably led to the insertion of heraldry or depictions that included the nobleman/woman (or couple) who had commissioned the manuscript. Moreover, it was general practice that books of hours were passed down the generations. As such, the representations gained new relevance as a locus of memory for posterity.
115 Muller 1888, 271. See also: Chapter Five (§ 5.3.1.).
116 Vienna, Austrian National Library, Series Nova, 12878; Chicago, Newberry Library, 56.
117 Damen 2000, 476.
118 See: Chapter Five (§ 5.2.2.) and Appendix B; for an extensive discussion see: Schoenaers & Wijsman 2009.
119 Not all of Jacqueline's servants had been this lucky. The executors’ account makes mention of ‘young Walraven’, Jacqueline's chamberlain. He secretly confessed ‘his misery and difficult circumstances’ to some
Philip of Burgundy appointed him as sheriff (*baljuw*) of ’s-Gravenzande ‘with all that pertains to it and to preserve it to our honour and respect, as a good man and sheriff is obliged to’, explicitly stating that all of the revenues out of the office should be transferred to the count.\(^{121}\)

The sheriff’s primary duty was maintaining law and order at a local level. He was the most important representative of local jurisdiction and had to ensure that sentences were enforced. The sheriff was also responsible for the collection of the *aides* and the general execution of comital decrees.\(^{122}\) In addition to this, he ratified private sales of land.\(^{123}\)

It was no coincidence that Philip the Good had to appoint a new sheriff for ’s-Gravenzande after Jacqueline's death. In 1434, Philip had traded ’s-Gravenzande, Maasland, the Vlaardingerambacht and Borssele with Jacqueline in exchange for the Nijenburg and Leerdam. Since Jacqueline’s marriage to Frank of Borssele had remained childless, after her death her personal estate had to be returned to the comital domain and of the executors and Gerard Potter. Because Jacqueline had died he could not provide for his wife and children anymore. (Historisch Genootschap Utrecht 1852, 221).

\(^{121}\) AGH 896, fol. 71 v.; In 1436-1437 no receipts were registered because Gerard Potter had not drawn up the account for that year. GRRek 137, fol. 10 r., in 1437-1439 there is no mention of Gerard in the receiver general’s accounts GRRek 138-139; 2 July 1439 Gerard pays in 40 schilden of approximately 2 pounds a piece GRRek 140, fol. 10 r.; in 1441 he pays 26 Burgundian schilden GRRek 141, fol. 11 r.; in 1446-1447 Gerard accounts for the rest of the revenues ‘for four entire years ending 24 days in October 1445’ and hands over 42 pounds, 16 shillings and 3 pence, which suggests that in 1441 alone he collected more revenues than during the last four years of his office.


\(^{123}\) Overmaat 1952, 133.
thus to Philip the Good. 124 ’s-Gravenzande was bequeathed to Frank of Borselle. However, Jacqueline’s husband was only entitled to the revenues of the lands, the permission to build mills and the lower justice. 125 In this capacity he could only appoint the bailiff (schout). The officer responsible for the high justice, the sheriff (baljuw) was appointed by the count/duke. This altered situation created a vacancy for the office of sheriff. It is not entirely clear exactly who took the initiative in getting Gerard commissioned. As it appears, at the end of his career as a sheriff, Gerard leased the office, as was fairly common in the Burgundian period. 126 Leasing out offices meant that the Burgundian dukes secured fixed revenues from their officials. 127 It also suggests that the latter must have indicated their interest in the position before the office was awarded. Having foreseen Jacqueline's death and the job opportunities that would be created, Gerard may have expressed his interest in the position of sheriff that would open up in ’s-Gravenzande. In the end, Gerard's history of employment and family network must have played an important role in securing the office. It is probable that as a former employee of Jacqueline's, Gerard was quite well known and respected in the area. Moreover, Gerard's father, Dirk, had been Duke Philip's loyal secretary for three years. Unfortunately, no records of the sheriffs of ʼs-Gravenzande survive for this period.

1.2.4. Conclusion

Gerard Potter’s activities in the service of Jacqueline of Bavaria clearly show the need for multilingual officials at the aristocratic court of Holland-Hainault. Potter’s flair for languages enabled him to collaborate with the francophone officers of Philip of Burgundy and his expertise in financial matters made him useful in the settlement of Jacqueline’s will. In performing services for the executors, Gerard Potter extended the foundations of a supra-regional network including some of the most powerful princes of his time. Eventually, these contacts would introduce him to local and later also regional jurisdiction and government.

124 Smit 1995, 205; Van Mieris 1753, 1049.
125 Rodenberg 2006, 161.
126 In the account covering the period 7 February 1448 to 7 February 1449 (GRRek 149, fol. 21 r) it is recorded that apparently Gerard had not yet paid the lease for the last month of his office (23 October – 30 November).
127 Van Gent 1994, 100. To secure fixed revenues, Philip the Good and his son Charles the Bold frequently leased out the offices of sheriff and bailiff. Examples of abuse of these (lower) judicial offices are manifold. Gerard's son Dirk was sheriff of Rhineland between 1469 and 1475. His misuse of authority led the city of Leyden to request his replacement.
It seems fair to exclude Jacqueline of Bavaria as a potential patron of Gerard Potter’s literary efforts. Surviving documentary sources clearly show that the countess was thoroughly immersed in francophone and Burgundian culture. Apparently, Frank of Borssele, her fourth husband favoured literature in Dutch. Nevertheless, his foreign contacts – he was a knight of the Golden Fleece – may suggest that his command of languages was better than is suggested by the books he commissioned. Although little is known about aristocratic libraries in Holland in the fifteenth century, Borssele was not alone in his preference for vernacular writing and historiography. William of Egmond probably commissioned a collection of Dutch chronicles and members of the families of Naaldwijk, Blois and Brederode demonstrably owned manuscripts as well. This observation is important as it renders them potential consumers of Gerard Potter’s writing. Indeed, as from ca. 1438, these and other important noblemen became the translator’s peers in the Council of Holland.

1.3. The Burgundian Council of Holland (1440-1454)

In 1428, after the treaty of Delft, a Council of nine members was established to tend to the daily government of the county. Philip of Burgundy appointed six councillors, the other three were authorised by Jacqueline of Bavaria.\textsuperscript{128} As from 1432, the number of councillors was extended considerably.\textsuperscript{129} A core group of seven salaried members of the Council, i.e. the (foreign) stadtholder, the receiver general and five councillors, was aided by a varying number of temporary councillors whose salary could be withdrawn at any time (‘raden tot wederzeggen’) and a group of unsalaried assistants. For instance, in 1435-1436, the accounts list a total of thirty-five councilmen. Among the unsalaried councillors, we encounter Gerard Potter van der Loo (1438-1445) and his brother Jacob (1440-1446). In 1445, when the composition of the Council was rendered more transparent by abandoning the system of unsalaried councillors, Philip the Good appointed Gerard as one of the fixed members of a stable Council of ten members.\textsuperscript{130} Potter would remain in office until his death on 10 November 1454.\textsuperscript{131}

\textsuperscript{128} Jansma 1932, 66. The councillors were (for Jacqueline) John of Montfoort, John of Vianen and Gerard of Zijl (for Philip the Good) Jacob of Gaasbeek, Henry of Borssele, William of Egmond, Roland of Uutkerke, Colaïrt of Comynes and Baldwin of Zwieten.

\textsuperscript{129} Jansma 1932, 74.

\textsuperscript{130} Damen 2000, 68.

\textsuperscript{131} GRRek, 156, fol. 90 r., ‘ende vanden XXII dach in mairte voirseid totten X dach in novembry dusent CCCC LIII excluz dat hij offivich wort’ marginal note: ‘Het is den luyden vander rekeninge wel kenlic ende
In the following, I will discuss Gerard Potter’s personal assets, which have played a role in his appointment to the office (§ 1.3.1.), the interaction with his peers (§ 1.3.2.1.) and their literary preferences (§ 1.3.2.2.). Additionally, I will give an overview of the translator’s contacts with the duke and duchess of Burgundy (§ 1.3.3.) and the cities of Holland (§ 1.3.4.).
1.3.1. A reconstruction of Gerard Potter’s letter of commission

The appointment of Burgundian officials was normally recorded in a letter of commission, ‘which mentioned the extraordinary qualities of the individual in question, the office to which he was appointed and the corresponding salary’. Unfortunately, to my knowledge no such letter survives for Gerard Potter. In the following, I will address the translator’s suitability for the office of councillor and give a brief description of the tasks a councillor should fulfil. On Gerard Potter’s salary, we can be brief: it was consistent throughout his career. Like all squires and councillors with a university degree (Van der Eycken, Utenhove, Wissenkerke), he received an annual salary of 400 écus. The councilmen that had been knighted received 500 écus. The receiver general’s annual allowance amounted to of 600 écus, the stadtholder’s to 1200 riders.

Four qualities have facilitated the appointment of Gerard Potter to the office of councillor. The first was the financial expertise he had gained in the service of Jacqueline of Bavaria. One of his primary tasks as a member of the Council was to assist in the collection of the aides. The accounts record Potter’s close involvement in the collections of 1439, 1445 and 1450-1452. Secondly, the fact that Gerard had belonged to Jacqueline’s clientele probably appealed to Philip of Burgundy as well. Indeed, it seems that the duke intentionally introduced former supporters of both Jacqueline and John of Bavaria into the Council. The modifications of 1445 had been inspired by the political troubles in the cities. The one-sided politics of stadtholder William of Lalaing who had favoured the Hooks over the Cods had revived the conflict between both factions. The appointment of new councillors shows the duke’s concern for the balance between the two rivalling parties in the Council of Holland. As has been argued above in § 1.2., Gerard Potter may be considered as moderately Hook. His new colleague Arnold of Ghent had been a supporter

132 Damen 2000, 46.
133 GRRek., 140 fol. 68 v, 69 r., 70 v - 71 r., fol 72 v.; GRRek., 146, fol. 109 r.; GRRek., 147, fol. 100 r.; GRRek., 153, fol. 77 r.; See also: De Blécourt-Meijers 1929, 99-100; Smit 2005, 129, 330, 460, 522; Damen 2000, 347 and Damen 2000b, 32.
134 Damen 2000, 181-184 describes the introduction of ‘Bavarian’ councillors to the Council. These men had all once belonged to the supporters of Jacqueline and her opponent John of Bavaria. Damen argues that Gerard Potter's political orientation probably was the major reason for his promotion to salaried member of the Council in 1445. One of the other ‘Bavarian’ councillors was Gerard's father-in-law, John van der Mije. Van der Mije had supported Jacqueline throughout the turmoil following her father's death. In 1434, he was active as an unsalaried councillor. It is possible that he acted as a reference for his son-in-law. De Blécourt – Meijers 1929, XXXVIII mentions John van der Mije as an unsalaried member of the Council between 1434-1444. He was steward of North-Holland between 1434 and 1440. Damen calls him one of the most active unsalaried councillors (Damen 2000, 476).
135 Cf. supra § 1.2. and infra § 1.3.4.; See also: Chapter Four (§ 4.4.4); GRRek, 146, fol. 76 r.-76 v; Van Gent 1994, 99; Damen 2000, 182.
of Jacqueline’s as well. In December 1445, Louis of Montfoort (Hook) and William of Egmond (Cod) were added to the Council as the primary representatives of both factions.\footnote{Damen 2000, 182.} Thirdly, during the exercise of his duties as sheriff of ‘s-Gravenzande, Potter had acquired legal expertise, which contributed to his suitability for the office of councillor. Finally, his command of languages was of considerable importance (cf. infra § 1.3.3.). In this respect, the translation of the Chroniques – whether or not it was produced before his commission – can be regarded as a means of representation, underlining the translator’s status and competence. Indeed, Gerard Potter’s translation shows his expertise, not only on a linguistic level, but also as regards the fairly recent history of European conflict (external affairs) and, given Froissart’s examples of good or warnings for bad practice in governmental issues, also matters of council and negotiation in general.

On 25 April 1445, Gerard Potter was appointed to the office of salaried member of the Council. In this capacity, he had to be present in the Chamber (Raadskamer) on a daily basis, except on religious holidays and during fixed recesses. The councillors convened for a period of three hours in the morning and two hours in the afternoon. Whenever the councillors wanted to leave The Hague, it was mandatory to alert the stadtholder. Only when the latter had given his permission, the councillors could be legally absent.\footnote{Damen 2000, 78k85. Given the amount of time Gerard Potter was on the road on official government business, the average percentage of 53.2% that he was present in the Chamber is relatively high. Even in 1454, the year in which he died and was absent for a considerable period, he was present at 34% of the meetings. In 1453 he even attended 72% of the Council’s sessions. (Damen 2000, 513-514). In 1447, his pay was cancelled for 38 days ‘because he was absent from the Hague’. (GRRek 148, fol. 79 r.). In 1449 he was absent for a period of time ‘in saken van partyen’ (‘on official business pertaining to his office’) and another five days after Easter (GRRek, 149, fol. 74 v.). In 1451 he joined the lord of IJsselstein on his private business for five days (GRRek, 151, fol. 69 r.). In the same year, IJsselstein’s pay was annulled for 20 days (GRRek, 151, fol. 78 r.). In 1452, Gerard was away on business for the lord of Montfoort for seven days, while Montfoort himself had been absent ‘for private business’ for just one day (GRRek, 153, fol. 67 r; GRRek, 153, fol. 68 r-v.). In 1452 Gerard Potter, councillor and Adam of Cleves, secretary, resided in Gorinchem for four days and were absent ‘in saken van partyen’ (GRRek, 154, fol. 85 r.).} The stadtholder and the members of the Council were the count’s legal substitutes.\footnote{De Blécourt-Meyers 1929, III.} On behalf of the duke of Burgundy, the Council saw to daily government, legislation and jurisdiction.\footnote{De Blécourt-Meyers 1929, pxi-xii. For an extensive overview of the Council’s competence, see Damen 2000, 41-43. Daily government: internal and foreign affairs, economics, defense, public works and embankment, monetary affairs; jurisdiction: primarily in cases concerning the count/duke or his officers, disputes involving foreigners, sexual offences or sexually deviant behaviour. In addition to this the Council served as a court of appeal. Van Gent 1994, 37 on comital jurisdiction: ‘Comital justice covered murder, rape, abduction, robbery, theft, burglary at night, intentional arson, rebellion and all other actions threatening comital rights’.} In this respect, Gerard's duties as a councillor were diverse. In daily meetings in the Ridderhuis (Hall of Knights) the councillors discussed governmental
matters, legislation and legal cases, but their job-description also included a fair amount of travel, amongst other things to inspect the embankments. Additionally, councillors attended the general meetings of the Estates of Holland.\footnote{In May 1440, William of Naaldwijk, William of Egmond, Gerard of Zijl, John of Neck, John Rosa and Gerard attended a meeting at Egmond with the Frisians of Oostergo and Westergo (GRRek, 141 fol. 58 r); Between 11 January 1443 and 2 February 1443 Henry Utenhove, Gerard and the cities' representatives attended a meeting in Ghent concerning a.o. the tolls of Geervliet and disputes between the merchants of Northern-Holland and Dordrecht (GRRek, 144 fol. 65 r - fol. 65 v ; Smit 1995, 215 ; nr. 266.) ; From 29 May to 18 June 1445 he attended a meeting in Leyden together with Gilles of Wissenkerke, Baldwin of Zwieten , Louis van der Eycken, Jacob Potter, Henry van der Goes , Gerard of Zijl and Henry Utenhove (GRRek, 146, fol. 109 r-109v ; Smit 1995, 298). In 1450, Potter attended a meeting at Rouen concerning the inhabitants of Dieppe (Smit 1995, 411)\footnote{Armstrong 1983, 192.} \footnote{Armstrong 1983, 203; Willemyns 1994, 165.} \footnote{Armstrong 1983, 202.} \footnote{Armstrong 1983, 194; Willemyns 1994, 167. In 1409, John the Fearless consented to the use of Flemish in the regional government of Flanders.} \footnote{Smit 1995, 193; Janse 2009, 268.} \footnote{Armstrong 1983, 207; Boone 2009, § 3.}}

\textbf{1.3.2. The Council of Holland: multilingualism and intercultural contact}

\textbf{1.3.2.1. The importance of language skills}

It is beyond question that French was the administrative language of Burgundian central government.\footnote{Armstrong 1983, 207; Boone 2009, § 3.} As regards to Holland, matters were more complicated. Indeed, in matters concerning Holland, the duke’s administrators used Dutch or official documents were translated. Decrees that applied to the whole of the Burgundian Netherlands were originally drawn up in French and translated at the court of The Hague.\footnote{Armstrong 1983, 207; Boone 2009, § 3.} Possibly this procedure was implemented because the expected rate of bilingualism in the county was lower than in the principalities that were adjacent to francophone regions.\footnote{Armstrong 1983, 207; Boone 2009, § 3.} At a regional level, the Burgundians respected the different vernaculars spoken in their principalities.\footnote{Armstrong 1983, 207; Boone 2009, § 3.} In 1427, after the death of John IV of Brabant, Philip the Good had already promised the nobility and cities of Holland that when he (i.e. Philip) left, he would appoint ‘captains whom the good people would be able to speak with and whom they would understand’.\footnote{Armstrong 1983, 207; Boone 2009, § 3.} However, in their contacts with their Burgundian lords (i.e. on a supra-regional level), the stadtholders were expected to use French. Since high officials, such as the stadtholders of Holland and probably also the receiver general, needed to understand and speak both French and Dutch, the Burgundians indirectly promoted bilingualism among the members of regional government.\footnote{Armstrong 1983, 207; Boone 2009, § 3.} Moreover, given that French was the language of...
communication with the highest governmental echelons, the Burgundian language policy heralded the implementation of a diglossic linguistic climate in the regional councils in which French was the language of power. To some extent regional government had already been multilingual (cf. supra), but in the Burgundian constellation French acquired a status that was different from Dutch. In this respect, the French colouring of Dutch in official accounts (cf. infra § 4.2.1.) reflects a shift in the perception of the power-relations between both languages and does not only reverberate the interlinguistic contacts of speakers of French and Dutch.

The contacts between bilingual foreign officials and the indigenous members of the Council and chancery become apparent from the accounts. From 1428 onwards, Burgundian officers, originating mainly from Flanders, audited the accounts of Holland that were drawn up in Dutch. Frequently, these auditors annotated the documents in French. Between 1439 and 1441, Gerard Potter served as clerk to receiver general William of Naaldwijk. In this capacity he prepared the original drafts of the accounts and afterwards wrote the copies in fine handwriting. Additionally, he copied various charters, rolls, charges, certificates, receipts and other writings that he drew up as was accustomed.

---

147 The term diglossia was first coined by Ferguson 1959 and originally only applied to the use of languages or dialects which were genetically related, used in one language community and one of which occupied an elevated status and the other applied to ordinary use. 'Diglossia is a relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any section of the community for ordinary conversation.' The use of the term was extended by Fishman 1967 to include genetically unrelated languages.

148 See also: Willemyns 1994, 170.

149 Gerard Potter's employment in the treasury may be partially explained by his involvement in the aides and the financial responsibilities that had been conferred upon him in the settlement of Jacqueline’s will. His appointment probably ended when William of Naaldwijk was removed from office. The latter had abused the stadtholder's signet to issue invalid pardons and letters of appointment, amongst others to Bengaert Say. When the deceit came to light, the invalid letters were revoked and the seal was broken. (Valens-Nip 1982, 43-44; Damen 2000, 94). Naaldwijk refused to transfer the office to his successor before he had been compensated for the 4000 pounds of advances he had paid. Nevertheless, he was replaced by William Engelbrechtsz on 1 January 1442 (Damen 2000, 478). Although it is highly probable that Gerard was involved in the copying of the letters, the affair does not appear to have had any repercussions for the further advancement of his career. Philip the Good permitted him to continue to perform his other duties as did he William of Naaldwijk.

150 GRRek 142, fol. 109 v. ‘Gerard Potter, clerck des voirscreven rentmeesters, voir sinen arbeyt van die rekeninge te mynuteren ende na te grosseren mits andere menyege ende diversche cedulen, rolle, mandementen, certificacien, quitancien, andere brieven daartoe dienende, gemaict nader ouder custume <>Il est ainsi accoustumé>.’ The word grosseren (literally : to write in large writing) in the original phrasing strongly suggests that the aforementioned accounts in the comital archives have been drawn up in Gerard Potter's handwriting ‘na der ouder custume’ has been translated by ‘as was accustomed’. The listing in the accounts of the fee of the treasurer's clerk is very common. It was not customary, however, that the clerk's
The Burgundian auditor, probably Bartholomew à la Truye from the chambre des comptes in Flanders, added in the margin: ‘il est ainsi accoustumé’ (fig. 1.6.). A marginal note in the account of 1439-1440 reveals that ‘ledit Gerard Potter’ was ‘present a l’audicion’. At the request of Isabella of Portugal, he had travelled to Gravelines with messages for the duke of Burgundy. The duchess-consort had also ordered him to send the auditors to The Hague. In 1443, Gerard Potter, ‘clerc dudit Guilleme de Naeldwije’, was present at the audit ‘au nom dudit Guilleme’. And finally, the account of the executors of Jacqueline’s will ‘baillié a court par Gerart Potter ou nom desd iz testamenteurs VIe jour de novembre M IIIIIXLIII’ has also been heavily annotated by a Francophone or multilingual auditor.

Gerard Potter van der Loo was frequently sent on missions with foreign officials. In 1440 he travelled to Egmond with the Fleming John Rosa. In 1443, he and Jacob Bossaert, another Fleming, investigated the claims of some Scottish tradesmen regarding damage to their ships. Together with Bartholomew à la Truye, he arbitrated in the dispute regarding the marital arrangements of Wolfert of Maalstede and the lady of Zijl. In 1445, Gerard Potter travelled to Leyden ons several occassions accompanied by A la Truye and Louis

name was mentioned. In the accounts of 1439 and 1441, both drawn up while William of Naaldwijk held the position of treasurer of Holland, the name Gerard Potter has been explicitly recorded. 

\[151\] GRRek 142, fol. 109 v.
\[152\] GRRek 140, fol. 68 v; his presence is repeated on fol. 79 v.
\[153\] GRRek 143, 129 r. At the time of the audit, William of Naaldwijk had already been removed from office, which explains Gerard Potter’s presence as the former treasurer’s deputy.
\[154\] e.g. GRRek 132, fol.2 v.
van der Eycken. In the Council he was confronted with the Burgundian representatives on an almost daily basis. Henry Utenhove, Anthony Michiels and Louis van der Eycken were Flemish magistrates and Gerard Potter’s colleagues in the Council. Jacob Bossaert, the attorney general, originated from Flanders, as did the secretaries Rosa, Van den Cruce and Marchant. Additionally, foreign officials regularly visited the Binnenhof.

These auditors and councillors were not the only Burgundian immigrants at the court of Holland. Philip of Burgundy had appointed stadtholders or governors originating from Flanders or Hainault to supervise daily government in the newly acquired principalities of Holland and Zeeland. These substitutes were obviously bilingual, since matters of regional government were handled in Dutch. However, as has been already mentioned, communication with the higher echelon was restricted to French. In 1464, former stadtholder John of Lannoy wrote a treatise dedicated to his one-year-old son, Louis. One of his recommendations to his infant son was to study ‘l’Alemant’ (‘Dutch’). Indeed, Lannoy himself had benefited from his knowledge of that language throughout his career.

Item, combien que j’ay parlé del’escolle et lessiét à parler du temps que tu mettras à apprenre, ne comment, à mon samblant, tu te deveras régler et gouverner, il m’est advis que l’on debveroit, premiers, faire apprenre ta créance, tes heures, à lire et à escripre, à l’ostel de quelque homme de bien, de Louvain, ou par un notable chappelain jusquez à l’eage de XI ou XII ans, adfin d’apprenre l’Alemant, qui est langage très convengnable et très seant à sçavoir, et lequel m’a moult valu et profité. Et, aprèz ce temps, polroies aller à escolles latines, fuist au dict Louvaing, Couloingne, ou à Paris. Et se tu avoies conseil d’aller à Paris, je seroie d’advis que tu eusses un homme de bien, presbtre ou aultre, de la

155 GRRek 140, fol. 58 r.; Lombarts and others. vii-X, 243, 338. The case of the Scottish tradesmen is an interesting one. It is tempting to interpret the fact that the Council sent two bilingual councillors as an indication that their linguistic skills should overcome the language barrier.

156 Damen 2000, 507-510. The linguistic flexibility of these secretaries is clearly shown in the court’s judicial registers, which contain entries in Dutch as well as in French and Latin.

157 E.g. Peter Bladelin, Lyon of Bournonville, Jacob of Crèvecoeur, Anthony of Croÿ, Louis Dommesent, John of Neufchâtel, etc. (Damen 2000, 503.)

158 Edition by Lannoy and Dansaert 1937. From 1448 to 1462 John of Lannoy was stadtholder. He originated from the francophone part of Flanders and probably was familiar with Flemish. Of course, this does not necessarily mean that he spoke Dutch prior to his commission in Holland. In this respect, his advice may reflect the difficulties that he experienced while learning the language at an older age. The governors that had preceded him, all had originated from Flanders or Hainault. John of Lannoy was related to the first stadtholder, Hugh of Lannoy. Hugh was succeeded by a Hainault nobleman, William of Lalaiing, who in 1445 was removed from office. His preferential treatment of the Hooks had led to the violent resurgence of party strife in the cities of Holland (cf. infra). In 1445, mostly for financial reasons, the stadtholder was replaced by a president of the Council, the Flemish lawyer Goswin de Wilde. John himself would be replaced by the Bruges nobleman, Louis of Gruuthuse. It would not be until well after Duke Philip's death in 1467, that the counties of Holland and Zeeland would have an indigenous governor, Wolfert of Borssele.

159 Lannoy and Dansaert 1937, 139.
At university in Paris, Louis should hire a ‘good man or priest, who speaks Dutch, to converse with and talk the language, because otherwise one easily forgets and who does not learn it at a young age, will never speak it properly’.

Philip of Burgundy’s reasons for hiring Flemings and Hainaulters in important offices appear to have been complex. Firstly, these foreigners had no part in the party strife that ravaged Holland at the time. Additionally, many of these administrators had been active in the local governments of Flanders or in the chambre des comptes of Lille. In this capacity, they had become experts of Burgundian administration. Finally, the duke’s choices were probably inspired by linguistic considerations. Bilingual administrators could negotiate between the Dutch vernacular of local government and the French official language of the central organs of Burgundian rule. As it appears, officers originating from Flanders and to a lesser extent Brabant were more suitable to fulfil this role, since indigenous, bilingual administrators were hard to come by. Entries in the accounts and registers of the Council of Holland confirm that several native government officials were not (sufficiently) proficient in French to perform their duties in that language. On 27 januari 1440, Philip of Burgundy and Isabella of Portugal summoned William of IJsselstein and treasurer William of Naaldwijk to Arras. They were to follow the duke to Saint-Omer and attend the negotiations between the Germans, Spaniards and Holland. The representatives of Holland were accompanied by the Fleming Jacob Bossaert ‘om te translateren uten Duytsschen in Walssche ende uten Walsschen in Duytssche, alle die saken die doe daier getrankert warden’ (‘to translate from Dutch to French and vice versa all matters that were negotiated there at the time’). In the same year, the Dutch nobleman Gerard of Poelgeest, asked for language assistance to argue the affairs of Margaret of Burgundy before Philip the Good.

---

160 Lannoy and Dansaert 1937, 139.
161 Damen 2000, 188-193.
162 Blockmans 2001, 75; Damen 2000, 188-193. It is noteworthy that Gerard Potter, as an indigenous member of the Council, met with two (expertise at the Bavarian court and bilingualism) of this set of three characteristics.
164 Damen 2000, 189.
1.3.2.2. Evidence of literary production and manuscript ownership

In his study of illustrated manuscripts in the Burgundian Netherlands, H. Wijsman has identified only one manuscript in French (combined with Latin) that has been produced in the Burgundian northern Netherlands.\(^\text{165}\) The *Bibliotheca Neerlandica Manuscripta* holds information about one more, a fragment of a Book of Hours dated to ca. 1435. The surviving miniature has been attributed to Nicolas Brouwer, who also contributed to the decoration of some of the Utrecht bibles.\(^\text{166}\) On its verso side, a French prayer has been added at a later date.\(^\text{167}\) Nevertheless, the lack of local production of French-language manuscripts does not necessarily entail a complete absence of interest in French books.\(^\text{168}\) Although the market for French texts was probably limited, the most plausible explanation for the lack of production of French-language manuscripts seems to be that an aristocratic readership interested in the acquisition of copies of French texts turned to Flanders or another francophone region instead.\(^\text{169}\) Wolfert of Borssele owned French-language manuscripts that had been produced in Paris and the Brabant nobleman Engelbert II of Nassau demonstrably commissioned French manuscripts from Flanders, which at the time was an important centre of production of Burgundian luxury manuscripts.\(^\text{170}\) The situation for the foreign government officials will have been no different. In spite of F. van Oostrom’s assertion that Philip of Burgundy’s residential politics had left the court of Holland ‘without literature’, it is very well conceivable that the foreign stadtholders ensured the continued influence of French, and more specifically Burgundian, literature at The Hague.\(^\text{171}\) After all, Philip’s representatives in Holland were men of letters. In the following paragraphs, I will discuss the literary scope of the stadtholders appointed in the period of Gerard Potter’s membership of the Council (1438-1454).


\(^{166}\) Korteweg 1989, 131-137.

\(^{167}\) *Bibliotheca Neerlandica Manuscripta*; Leyden, University Library, BPL 3026.

\(^{168}\) In his discussion of the geography of the (French) codex, Busby 2002, 635 concludes, however, that ‘to some degree, patterns of manuscript production depend on matters of patronage and primary ownership, although our information on these is scarce for the earlier periods’. It is telling that his survey of the centres of production of French manuscripts does not include the northern Dutch-speaking regions such as Holland, Utrecht or Guelders.

\(^{169}\) Other possible explanations may be that these manuscripts have not yet been identified or – and this seems less likely as Wijsman estimates that of all of the illustrated manuscripts about 20% has survived – none of them has been transmitted.

\(^{170}\)Wijsman 2003, 310-312.

\(^{171}\) Van Oostrom 1992, 299. In a note Van Oostrom adds ‘[artists] now turned increasingly to Frank of Borselen (and later to the Brederodes?)’ (Van Oostrom 1992, 344).
The will of Margaret of Blécourt, widow of Hugh of Lannoy (stadtholder, 1433-1440) lists twenty-four titles in French. Amongst these we find didactic works, romances and historiography. The same document also suggests that Hugh of Lannoy was the author of two ‘livres’, the titles of which have not been specified. Recently B. Sterchi has argued that Hugh of Lannoy – and not his brother Guillebert as has been generally assumed – was in fact the author of Enseignements paternels and l’Instruction d’un jeune prince. According to Sterchi, Hugh of Lannoy was also the author of a third treatise: Enseignement de vraie noblesse.

As has been mentioned above, Hugh’s relative John of Lannoy (stadtholder, 1448-1460) wrote a letter to his newborn son, Louis (cf. supra). The didactical treatise enjoyed a widespread reception in Burgundian circles. John was the owner of a manuscript containing Dits moraux des philosophes. A manuscript with La vie de notre seigneur Jésus Christ bears his motto. In addition to this his name is associated with a missal and book of hours.

Prior to his commission in Holland, William of Lalaing (stadtholder, 1440-1445) had been councillor-chamberlain to Philip the Good. Between 1436 and 1455, he was chevalier d’honneur of Isabella of Portugal. In these capacities, he must have been right at the centre of the splendour of the Burgundian court. Nevertheless, none of the titles in the extensive libraries of his relatives Charles II and Anthony of Lalaing (stadtholder, 1522-1540) has been associated with William of Lalaing. William’s daughter Yolanda, was educated at the court of Isabella of Portugal and married the Dutch nobleman Reynald II of Brederode. She was the patron of a Middle-Dutch chronicle describing the valour of her husband’s family. Additionally, it is probable that, together with her husband, she compiled a collection of books in French (mainly Arthurian romance), Latin (religious and

---

172 Wijsman 2003, 289.
173 Sterchi 2004, 114; See also: Visser-Fuchs, 2006. It should be noted that none of these works date from the period of his stadtholdership. However, Hugh of Lannoy is also the author of two ‘advises’ (1437 and 1439) to Philip of Burgundy. These texts were written when he was stadtholder of Holland. The will also lists ‘mon livre de chronicques de France, pour Jean de Rubempré, seigneur de Biévène’ According to Sterchi 2004, 106 ‘il s’agit probablement des Grandes chronicques de France ou des Chroniques de Jean Froissart, mais il existe aussi une collection de chronicques de Flandre connues sous ce titre. Il est peu probable qu’il s’agisse de ce fragment des Chroniques d’Enguerrand de Monstrelet dont Hugues de Lannoy a été en possession. Les éléments d’histoire de France que l’on découvre dans les oeuvres d’Hugues ne proviennent pas nécessairement de sources écrites’.
174 Wijsman 2003, 289.
175 Paris, Arsenal Library, 5205.
176 Wijsman 2003, 288-289; Lille, Municipal Library, 626.
177 Damen 2000, 471
178 Wijsman 2003, 274-286
179 Cf. Chapter Five (§ 5.2.2).
devotional books) and Dutch (didactics and historiography). The biography of her brother Jacob ‘the ideal knight’ was revered in Burgundian circles.

Even Goswin de Wilde (president 1445-1448), who descended of a relatively humble lineage, brought books to the court. After his arrest on a charge of ‘sodomie’ (‘sexually deviant behaviour’), his furniture and books were taken to the receiver general, Anthony Michiels. The books were registered separately, which may suggest that there was a fair amount of them. De Wilde held a doctorate in Roman law, which could imply that the major part of his collection consisted of legal reference works. However, not unlike the library of the fourteenth-century jurist Philip of Leyden, De Wilde’s books may have included other genres, such as historiography, as well.

The current state of research does not clearly show that councillors were involved in the production of literature or commissioned manuscripts. The Flemish knight Roland of Uutkerke, councillor-chamberlain of John the Fearless and Philip the Good, held a number of important offices in Holland between 1426 and 1439. He was a member of the ‘Guild of Our Lady of the Dry Tree’ (‘Gilde van Onze-Lieve-Vrouw van de Droge

---

180 See: Schoenaers & Wijsman 2009.
181 Wijsman 2003, 274-286.
183 Burgundian influence on vernacular literature in Holland becomes apparent from the third quarter of the fifteenth century. This may be due to the fact that Philip of Burgundy’s bibliophily did not flare up until the 1440s-1450s at the moment that his territories were pacified. However, we may not exclude the possibility that other, earlier translations, such as the Middle Dutch version of *Mandeville’s travels*, were produced under Burgundian influence. During the last decades of the fifteenth century, several works of Burgundian authors (Raoul Lefèvre, Pierre Michault, Olivier de la Marche) were translated into Dutch and printed by Gerard Leeu in Gouda and his associate in Haarlem, Jacob Bellaert (Lemaire 1977, 28-31, Resoort 2004, 196-198). It is striking that a number of these translations (*Histories van den vromen ridder Jason*, *Van den drie blinde danssen*) were produced by translators who originated from Flanders, but that the texts were printed in Holland and aimed at a local, aristocratic and wealthy audience (Nieuwstraten 1994, 111; Schuit 1955, XLVII). Editions of original French as well as translated texts were produced for local government officials with contacts at the court (Keesman 1993, 41-43; Speakman Sutch 2004, 140, 187-188). W. Keesman has convincingly argued that some of the translations printed by Bellaert were commissioned by Nicolas of Ruyven, bailiff of Haarlem. Speakman Sutch suggests that Nicolas of Ruyven’s brother-in-law, John of Kats commissioned the French edition of *Le Chevalier Délivré*. Additionally, the translation of the *Chevalier* by the Haarlem rhetorician Peter Willemesz., printed in Leyden by John Seversz. has been dedicated to Nicolas of Ruyven (Kronenberg 1932, 178-179). Ter Braake and Van Dixhoorn 2007 discuss the connections between members of the court at The Hague and the local chamber of rhetoric ‘Met ghenuchten’. Additionally, they show the relations between the ‘courtly’ families Oem of Wijngaerden and Zwieten and the families of John of Kats and Nicolas of Ruyven. The success of the translations or rather the lack thereof has been discussed by Brinkman 1997, 112-114 and Pleij 1990, 148-149. Pleij argues that there was no public for Dutch versions of Burgundian courtly texts. According to him, the nobility at the court and the aristocracy in Holland in general preferred to read the original French texts. Brinkman, however, suggests that, at the time, the market for fictional or narrative literature in general was too small to ensure that printing these texts would be profitable. Additionally, Brinkman points towards the economic crisis of the last quarter of the fifteenth century as an agent in the bankruptcy of a number of printers in Holland at the end of the century.
Boom’), which has been described as a religious society of aristocratic music lovers.\textsuperscript{185} Illustrious members included Philip the Good, his wife Isabella of Portugal, their son Charles the Bold and the latter’s half-brother Anthony the Great Bastard of Burgundy, but also important noblemen such as Adolph of Kleef and Engelbert of Nassau. The treatise \textit{Kaetspel gemoralizeert}, which was written by the Flemish jurist John van den Berghe in 1431, has been dedicated to Roland of Uutkerke. Van den Berge indicates the dedicatee as a fellow member of an anonymous aristocratic society, which had a keen interest in vernacular literature, ballads, rondels and virelais and was based in Bruges.\textsuperscript{186} The author claims that his aristocratic patron occasionally recited poetry at meetings of the society.\textsuperscript{187} Additionally, Roland van Uutkerke employed a number of minstrels, which occasionally also performed on behalf of the magistracy of Bruges.\textsuperscript{188} Gerard Potter, as we know, was the translator of Froissart’s \textit{Chroniques}. Secretary Baldwin of Zwieten commissioned several missals and an extant copy of the \textit{Fasciculus temporum} has been linked to his family.\textsuperscript{189} In 1447 several ‘books with clasps’ from the estate of master John Rosa, secretary at the court of Holland, were sold at auction.\textsuperscript{190} Peter of Beoostenzwene, clerk to the registry (1433-1441), compiled a catalogue of the comital registers (the \textit{Remissorium Philippi}), an illustrated copy of which was offered to Philip the Good in 1450.\textsuperscript{191} In 1449, Beoostenzwene finished a copy of the \textit{Directium iuris} of Peter Quevel.\textsuperscript{192} As has been observed, the production of one of the manuscripts of Melis Stoke’s rhyme chronicle can possibly be situated in the surroundings of the noble Naaldwijk family.\textsuperscript{193} Matheus Gerardi, rector of Naaldwijk completed the copy in 1390, possibly for Henry of Naaldwijk. It is possible that William, his son who was receiver general between 1439 and 1441, has known the manuscript. In any event, it seems that by the first decades of the sixteenth century, William’s grandson John had no access to Stoke’s chronicle.\textsuperscript{194}

Important noblemen and patrons of the arts such as Frank of Borssele remained in close contact with the Council at The Hague, be it through the mediation of ‘minions’ such

\textsuperscript{185} Hogenelst and Van Oostrom 1995, 241-244. 
\textsuperscript{186} Van den Berge claims that the initial impetus of his \textit{Kaetspel} was a discussion of \textit{Dat Scaecspel}, a Middle Dutch adaptation of Jacobus de Cessolis’ \textit{Ludus Scaccorum} dated to the beginning of the fifteenth century. 
\textsuperscript{187} Pleij 2007, 44-45. 
\textsuperscript{188} Prevenier 1998, 131. 
\textsuperscript{189} \textit{Bibliotheca Neerlandica Manuscripta}; Carasso-Kok 1981, 256. 
\textsuperscript{190} Brinkman 1997, 294. 
\textsuperscript{191} AGH 2149. 
\textsuperscript{192} Brussels, Royal Library, 225-226. 
\textsuperscript{193} The Hague, Royal Library, 128 E 5. 
\textsuperscript{194} I thank Sjoerd Levelt for this observation.
as Gilles of Wissenkerke and John Ruychrock. The possibility exists even that Gilles of Wissenkerke, one of Borssele’s followers at The Hague, provided his master with literature that was copied or maybe even produced in the surroundings of the court. The available information regarding the libraries of Frank of Borssele and other Dutch noblemen with connections to the Council such as William of IJsselstein and possibly Reynald II of Brederode defines their collections as pre-Burgundian: pragmatic and predominantly in the Dutch vernacular, with little room for narrative texts and French literature.

Occasions in which extant manuscripts can be associated with the councillors’ progeny are more numerous. This observation raises some interesting questions as to the ownership and production of manuscripts: did these men or women commission more manuscripts or were they rather inclined to incorporate marks of ownership on a more regular basis? It is conceivable, for instance, that their (grand-)parents’ status had provided them with the financial means to personalise their prayerbooks (and possibly other manuscripts) with self-selected depictions. The discussion in the following paragraph, however, will be limited to a number of examples.

Cornelis Cruesink, son of Jacob Cruesink (clerk to the Chambre des Comptes) and his wife Hildegard of Alkemade were the owners of a Book of Hours in Middle Dutch (circa 1494). The ownership becomes apparent from a portrait that also depicts their coats of arms and initials. The initials J and I, connected with a loveknot show that another Book of Hours in Latin (ca. 1482) belonged to councilman John of Wassenaar, son of Henry of Wassenaar, and his wife Joan of Haluin. Although no surviving manuscripts can be attributed to councilman Gerard of Assendelft, at least five extant manuscripts have been associated with his family. A Book of Hours in Middle Dutch (circa 1450-1475), now kept at the Pierpont Morgan Library, portrays a married couple that should probably be identified with members of the Assendelft family. The coats of arms in another Dutch Book of Hours (circa 1480-1490) show that the manuscript was manufactured for Gerard’s son, Nicolas of Assendelft and his wife Alice of Kijfhoek. Nicolas’ sister, Beatrice, who

---

196 Cf. supra. A Dutch chronicle, which was commissioned by Frank of Borssele in 1455, was copied by John, servant (or clerk?) of Gilles of Wissenkerke.
197 Wijsman 2003, 369. It is most regrettable that A. Derolez’ Corpus Catalogorum Belgii project has no counterpart in The Netherlands. Brinkman 1997 has shown that Meinsma 1903 is in need of updating. Schoenaers & Wijsman 2009 have suggested that in the case of the Brederodes the situation might be more complicated.
198 New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 1078.
199 Leyden, University Library, BPL 3091.
200 New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 1031.
201 Amsterdam, Bibliotheca Philosophica Hermetica, ICN 137.
CHAPTER ONE

entered the convent of Zijl at Haarlem in 1485, was the owner of a beautifully decorated breviary and a life of Jesus in Middle Dutch (both circa 1485). Both manuscripts were produced at St. Agnes of Josaphat in Delft, as was a Latin Book of Hours (1456) that was owned by Jacob Oem Tielmansz., a grandson of councillor Godscalc Oem van Wijngaarden (d. 1462).

Finally, in 1530, Gerard of Assendelft’s granddaughter Catherine was the owner of an old manuscript of Bavaria herald’s *Hollantsche Cronike* (‘Chronicle of Holland’) that had been manufactured circa 1460.

Ownership also becomes apparent from annotations or inscriptions in the manuscripts. In the colophon of the The Hague manuscript of a Middle Dutch translation of the French *Voyage d’Outremer* (Mandeville's Travels), the scribe reveals himself as William Ruychrock. He was the oldest son of John Ruychrock, treasurer of Jacqueline and Frank of Borssele and a member of the Council of Holland.

1.3.3. Philip the Good and Isabella of Portugal

1.3.3.1. Contacts between Gerard Potter and the Burgundian court

After 1428, Philip the Good rarely visited his most northern provinces. During his thirty four-year reign, he spent less than 3% of his time in Holland and Zeeland. On a number of occasions, the duchess-consort, the infanta Isabella of Portugal represented her husband at The Hague. The duke’s absence implied a lively correspondence between the Council and the sovereign, wherever he resided. In this respect, it is striking that in the 1440s and 1450s no more than a handful of indigenous members of the Council of Holland undertook fact-seeking journeys to the prince’s court: among them, Gerard of Zijl and Gerard Potter. In addition to this, Potter was frequently sent on missions on behalf of Isabella of Portugal, often to the duke, her husband. The reason as to why the Council (and possibly also the duchess) chose exactly these emissaries as representatives of Holland at the duke’s court is enigmatic. Both Philip of Burgundy and his son, Charles of Charolais, spoke Dutch. As has been stated by W. Blockmans and W. Prevenier, ‘bilingualism was one of

202 Utrecht, Museum Catharijneconvent, OKM 3; Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, 6 G 8; Utrecht, Museum Catharijne Convent, BMH 64.
203 The Hague, Museum Meermanno Westreenianum, 10 C 14.
204 *Bibliotheca Neerlandica Manuscripta*; Cramer 1908, XXXIX-XLI.
206 In 1432 (together with Philip the Good), 1441-1443, 1444; See: *Isabella of Portugal*.
207 Damen 2000, 84.
the elements that helped to make a Burgundian ruler the “natural prince” (naturlike prins) of his diverse people’. C.A.J. Armstrong has argued that Philip the Good preferred French to Dutch in the discussion of matters of state. Additionally, the choice of language was directed by protocol. This may explain the Council’s choice of Gerard Potter van der Loo, who was bilingual. An additional, pragmatic explanation is that the messengers should have a command of French in order to travel through francophone territories and to communicate with courtiers and servants while they resided at the Burgundian court.

It is not clear whether or not the duchess-consort, Isabella of Portugal, spoke or understood Dutch. Indeed, surviving letters show that French was the language of correspondence in her contacts with French-speaking as well as Dutch-speaking regions. At the beginning of January 1445, she ordered Gerard Potter and Nicolas de Vriese, treasurer of Holland to travel to Zierikzee and make arrangements for the aides. In a letter to the duchess, which was drafted in French or translated for the duchess, the canons of Saint-Lieven’s requested advice regarding an arbitration pronounced by the Council. In this letter, they referred to the visit of the two government officials. The language used in the letter, may suggest two things:

(1) the canons did not expect Isabella of Portugal to understand Dutch.

(2) the canons used French out of respect for the Duchess / because it was required by protocol.

In any event, the preparations were a success. Because of this, Philip promised his councillors a reward. Indeed, they had shown

outstanding and loyal diligence and labour [...] during the arrangement for the new five-year aides and [for the] difficulties the aforementioned steward [William of IJsselstein]

---

208 Blockmans and Prevenier 1999, 122; Armstrong 1983, 200. The bilingualism of Charles the Bold has been contested by Lemaire 1977, 23. She puts forward that Louis of Gruuthuse may have acted as the duke’s interpreter. Additionally, Charles the Bold appears to have had no interest whatsoever in Dutch literature.


210 See Boone 2009.

211 It is also possible that the duke was well disposed to Gerard Potter, the son of his loyal secretary, Dirk. At the baptism of Bengaert Say’s eldest son, Philip, Gerard Potter acted as replacement of Philip the Good, the boy’s namesake and godfather. He also delivered Philip’s gift to the child: six silver dishes, with gilded edges. (GRRek, 140 fol. 75 v; Nip 1983, 66; Valens-Nip 1982, 12; Damen 2000, 485).


213 De Blécourt-Meijers 1929, 99-100.

214 Cf. Boone 2009, § 3.
will experience, before he will be able to collect the *aides*, because the subjects of Holland and Frisia have been reduced to poverty by deaths and war. Therefore, only with the greatest difficulty, one can convince them to pay.

(GRRek, 140, fol. 72 v.) \(^{215}\)

William of Egmond was promised the amount of 1000 *écus* out of the surplus of the revenues, Gerard 750 *écus* and Otto of Egmond and Bengaert Say 625 *écus* each. Eventually, Gerard received 300 *écus*, which were finally reclaimed in 1457. \(^{216}\)

It was not Gerard Potter's first experience as a tax collector. \(^{217}\) In July 1439, the duchess had ordered him to travel to Gravelines 'with messages and finances' telling him to ask her husband for instructions concerning the new *aides* in Holland en Zeeland. Gerard stayed at Gravelines for eight days and travelled on to Saint-Omer. \(^{218}\) In November 1439, a committee consisting of Otto of Egmond, William of IJsselstein and Gerard Potter was appointed to determine the amount that should be contributed by the various districts of northern Holland. They should also inform the cities and villages and subsequently impose the taxes. \(^{219}\)

On 15 February 1442 William of Lalaing sent Gerard Potter to Isabella of Portugal, who resided at Brussels at the time. He carried 'many difficult matters and messages' concerning the recalcitrance of Amsterdam and how it should be brought to subservience.

\(^{215}\) 'ende mijn genadigen heren hem luden uut speciaelre gracien gegonnen ende gegeven heeft om die *werff* te bueren als over die goede ende getruwe naersticheyede ende arbeyt die de voirseide here van Ysselsteyn ende met hem de voirseiden Gerijt Potter deden inder settinge vander nuwer bede van vijff jaren also sij twee van mijn genadigen heren wegen gesent waeren over al Kennemerlant, Vrieslant, Waterlant ende Aemstelmarlant om aldair ele inden horen te setten up horen tacxe, die sij sijrijlickx geven zouden, twelke met groter moeynisse gedaen moste wesen. Des gelijcx die voirsscreven rentmeester die veele moeynisse ende arbeyts dar omne doet eer hij die penningen van deser selver bede gecrigen mach also die luden binnen den lande van Hollant ende Vrieslant zeer verarmt sijn. Mits dien dier tijt sterfje ende oirloge die sij gehadt hebben, machmen qualiken tot betalinge van hem luden comen. Oic mede also die voirsscreven Otte ende Bengairt mede altijd waeren bij den voirscreven heren van Ysselsteyn ende Gerijt inder voirseiden settinge'.

\(^{216}\) GRRek, 141, 59 v ; GRRek, 143, 89 v ; GRRek, 144, 79 r ; GRRek, 145, 74 r ; GRRek, 146, fol. 115 v.

\(^{217}\) Damen 2001, 36k40. 'The duchess and other beneficiaries of the first gift complained that they had not received what was promised, despite the fact that the duke had explicitly stated that the beneficiaries of the aftergift only would receive their gifts when the first-granted gifts were paid [i.e. 20,000 schilden promised in 1439 to Isabella of Portugal, Hugh of Lannoy, Haarlem, Nicolas Rolin, William of Egmond and Jacob of Crèvecoeur]. The beneficiaries of the first gift began a trial before the Grand Council who finally pronounced in their favour in 1457. They could recover their arrears from the beneficiaries of the aftergift. As five of the seven beneficiaries of the aftergift had already died, the money was requisitioned from their heirs. Except for those that had gone to Say, nearly all the obtained benefits were restituted.' (Damen 2001, 40).

\(^{218}\) Cf. supra § 1.2.1.

\(^{219}\) GRRek, 140 fol. 68 v.

\(^{219}\) Between 14 and 30 November 1439, Gerard and William of Egmond, lord of IJsselstein, travelled to Kennemerland to determine and impose the taxes (Smit 2005, 129). On 16 November, Nicolas de Wilde was sent to the cities in Kennemerland and Frisia to request them to meet the officers at Egmond to discuss the new *aides*. On 18 November, Hans, messenger of IJsselstein was sent to the cities of Waterland with the same petition. On 30 November 1439, Bengaert Say, the procurator general of Holland, joined Egmond and Potter (GRRek, 140, fol. 70 v - 71 r.).
Bremen had declared its growing hostility and the general assembly with England in Calais had to be prepared.\(^{220}\) As from 1439, Holland had started to restore its relations with England, which would result in a settlement in 1445.\(^{221}\) In the meantime, envoys of Holland and England had met on a regular basis at Calais, in England or The Hague and they would continue to do so afterwards.\(^{222}\) Urban dissent (cf. infra § 1.3.4.), international hostility and the difficult relations with the rivalling kingdoms of England and France are all recurring motives in the *Chroniques*. Provided that Gerard Potter at this time (1440-1445) had already read and translated Froissart’s chronicle, the ‘examples’ he had encountered there, would have certainly benefited him – and for that matter, his colleagues as well – in negotiations regarding these matters of state.

1.3.3.2. Language and genre in the libraries of Philip and Isabella

Many scholars have studied the libraries of Philip the Good and his third wife, Isabella of Portugal. Therefore, some general observations regarding language and genre in their respective collections will suffice here.\(^{223}\) In this paragraph, I will also briefly discuss the presence of Froissart’s *Chroniques* in the Burgundian library.

\(^{220}\) GRRek, 143, fol. 80 r.-v.; Smit 1928, 768-771. The troubles with Amsterdam had started in 1438. On 31 May 1438, a fleet from Holland and Zeeland had captured twenty-two Prussian ships and had claimed their cargo as spoils. On 23 August 1441, the treaty of Copenhagen had ended the war between Holland and the six Wendic cities of the Hanseatic League (Hamburg, Lubeck, Rostock, Wismar, Stralsund and Lüneberg). The treaty entailed grave financial consequences for Holland. Its citizens had to pay 5000 guilders to the king of Denmark, the twenty-two ships had to be compensated for, as did the damage sailors from Holland had caused. Administrators from Holland made arrangements for loans to pay the debt, putting themselves up as sureties (Smit 2005, 180 – 184). When Amsterdam refused to pay its part in the settlement, Isabella of Portugal was furious; she commanded that all citizens of Amsterdam be arrested and their possessions be seized. It was strictly forbidden to trade with them. In April 1442, the five sureties commited themselves to custody (Smit 2005,196-200). In 1444 and 1445, the duchess-consort sent councilors to Kampen, Bremen and Groningen. The negotiations finally resulted in the treaty of Bremen (GRRek, 235, fol. 42 r.). In 1447, Gerard Potter and Gilles of Wissenkerke negotiated with the Hanseatic league. Apparently, Gerard Potter himself had been a victim of the conflict. In 1446, he had given authority to John of Wichem and Jo Brand of Rijneghom to represent him in his dispute with some citizens of Gdansk (Lombarts, Van Soest-Zuurdeeg and Van Soest 1996, 58). The negotiations were successful. The cities of Holland were promised 2500 pounds to compensate for the ships that had been seized at Gdansk. On 26 September 1448, Dirk of Zwieten and Gerard Potter were commissioned to travel to Bremen. A meeting with the Prussians was convened in October. Decisions concerning mutual damage were postponed until Christmas 1454 (HvH, 16, fol. 19v-20r; Smit 2005, 380, 396-397; Von der Ropp 1876-1881, 339). Although Haarlem had been reluctant to grant Potter and Zwieten their allowance, it contributed 5 lb. 10s. 44. In the summer of 1452, Gerard Potter and Anthony Michiels travelled to Utrecht to attend a meeting with the envoys of Flanders and representatives of the Hanseatic League (Smit 2005, 459).

\(^{221}\) Vaughan 2002, 109.

\(^{222}\) See Smit 1928.

\(^{223}\) For an interesting analysis of the Burgundian Library, I refer to Wijsman 2003. Literature at the Burgundian court has been studied more comprehensively by G. Doutrepont 1909.
CHAPTER ONE

Of the circa nine hundred manuscripts that were present in the Burgundian library at the time of Philip’s death in 1467, only 3% are in Dutch. The vast majority (over 80%) of the duke’s manuscripts were in French.\textsuperscript{224} Since 40-45% of the manuscripts that were added to the Burgundian library during the rule of Philip and Isabella consist of historiographic and didactical texts, the duke of Burgundy seems to have shared with his father a distinct preference for these genres.\textsuperscript{225} H. Wijsman has argued, however, that especially the manuscripts with historiographic texts ‘were objects for representation and legitimation’ and as such did not belong necessarily to the prince’s daily reading matter.\textsuperscript{226}

The limited information on Isabella of Portugal’s reading habits suggests that the duchess primarily borrowed French texts from the Burgundian library and commissioned French translations of Latin historiography.\textsuperscript{227} In 1431, John de la Rue was paid for rebinding eight manuscripts. Quite possibly, these books were restored on behalf of Isabella of Portugal. One of the manuscripts was referred to as ‘le livre de Froissard’, probably a copy of his chronicle.\textsuperscript{228} Between the death of his father Philip the Bold in 1404 and the slaughter on the bridge of Montereau in 1419, John the Fearless had acquired a manuscript of Book One of the \textit{Chroniques}.\textsuperscript{229} It is probably this volume that was rebound in 1431. The 1467-1469 inventory of the Burgundian library, drawn up after Philip the Good had died, mentions five Froissart manuscripts: the manuscript that had been acquired by Philip’s father and four other manuscripts comprising Book One to Book Four.\textsuperscript{230}

1.3.4. Contact with the cities of Holland

After Goswin de Wilde had been appointed president of the Council of Holland, Zeeland and Frisia in 1445, the conflict between the rivaling factions of \textit{Hooks} and \textit{Cods} flared up once again, this time primarily in Leyden. The troubles started with a dispute between Baldwin of Zwieten and bailiff Floris of Boschhuysen over a burial place in St.-Peter’s church. When Simon Vrerix was appointed the new bailiff of Leyden, Boschuysen did not

\textsuperscript{224} Wijsman 2003, 129.
\textsuperscript{225} Wijsman 2003, 132.
\textsuperscript{226} Wijsman 2003, 136.
\textsuperscript{227} Wijsman 2003 144-146.
\textsuperscript{228} Wijsman 2003, 146; Doutrepont 1909, 127-128.
\textsuperscript{229} Le Guay 1998, 99. The inventory of 1404 lists no manuscript of the \textit{Chroniques}. It is quite possible that this volume was produced by the \textit{libraire} Pierre de Liffol, who was active in Paris in this period and produced a number of other copies of Froissart’s chronicle. See Chapter Two (§ 2.1.3.) and Chapter Three (§ 3.1. and § 3.6.).
\textsuperscript{230} I will expand on this in Chapter Two (§ 2.1.4.).
give up his office without a fight. He travelled to Brussels to lodge an appeal against Vrerix' commission. Simon Vrerix, however, turned to the president for support and Leyden was left with two bailiffs, both assisted by a deputy. The matter did not escalate until John Danelsz., Floris of Boschuysen's brother-in-law, passed Boeckel Heerman, and (accidentally?) broke wind. Heerman could not leave this insult without consequence and promised Danelsz. that the latter would regret his vulgar act. On 1 July, the feast of Visitatio Mariae, all hell broke loose. Members of the rivalling factions seized their weapons and prepared for battle. The Cods sent emissaries to The Hague to implore the Council to come and assist them. The president and the councillors hurried to Leyden. The officers claimed the town's banner and gathered at the Blauwe Steen. The Hooks assembled near the Hooglandse Church and prepared to cross the Rhine and destroy their adversaries. However,

when they [i.e. the Hooks] arrived at the Cornbridge, a man called Gerard Potter came to them, who was sent there by the faction of the Cods and he addressed them, wishing peace and concord and stopped the Hooks at the bridge. When he had received their answer, he promptly returned to the Cods, following another road than the one he had taken in coming there. And while he left, through the Cornbridge alley the Cods charged at the bridge to crush the Hooks, who were not there to fight, but to make peace, as Gerard Potter had asked them to.

Eventually, the Hooks were driven into St.Pancras’ Church. A large portion of the Hooks was hurt or taken prisoner. One hundred and twenty of the insurgent Hooks were taken to The Hague and three of them, John Danelsz., John of Haesbroec and Meynaert Aerntsz., were beheaded. Even more of the rioters would have been brought to justice, if the count of Ostrevant, Frank of Borssele, had not prevented it. Although this representation of events given by Cornelius Aurelius in his Cronycke van Hollandt, Zeelandt ende Vrieslant (Chronicle of Holland, Zeeland and Frisia) appears to be slightly biased, it seems that the Hooks resented the Council's arbitration in this matter. This comes hardly as a surprise:

231 This is the place in Leyden where in legal cases the complainant publicly had to put forward his charges before taking his matter to court and where prisoners were executed.
232 Divisiekroniek, XII; edited by Tilmans 2003, 86-88.
233 Tilmans argues that the Divisiekroniek for this part of the text relies on John of Naaldwijk's chronicle (1st version, ca. 1514), which is less detailed. As it appears, the report of Naaldwijk, as well as the record in the Kattendijke-chronicle, is closely related to the Goudse Kroniekje (Gouda-chronicle), which also contains a short version of the events (Janse and others. 2005, 530-531; London, British Library, Cotton ms. Vitelius F.XV, fol. 271 r.; Brussels, Royal Library, 6075, fol. 47 r.). Since the events of 1445 are part of the first continuation that was composed in 1456, the account of the Goudse Kroniekje is fairly contemporary. (Janse
the replacement of stadtholder Lalaing by president Goswin de Wilde in 1445 had put an end to the preferential treatment of the Hooks, which they had enjoyed since 1440.\footnote{234}{See: Oversteegen, 1990; Damen 2000, 364-376.} Thus, the Hooks’ grievances towards the Council and its representatives should be explained by the government’s apparent support of the Cods during the riots in Leyden. According to the chronicle of Dirk Frankensz. Pauw, the discord between Goswin de Wilde, president of the Council and the Hooks (and not the unspeakable sin of sodomy of which he had been accused, cf. supra 1.3.2.2.) had led to his decapitation in 1449.\footnote{235}{Valens-Nip 1982, 60.}

His involvement in the suppression of the urban uprising in Leyden in 1445 earned Gerard Potter a place in regional historiography. However, this case of civic insurrection gives a distorted view of the relation between the cities and the regional government. In their everyday contacts, Gerard Potter as well as the Council in general maintained excellent relations with the municipal governments in Leyden and the other major cities of Holland. The councillors and cities met at assemblies of the Estates and cities, councilmen assisted in local jurisdiction, in the institution of local authorities and they visited the cities for official purposes.\footnote{236}{In March 1445 Louis van der Eycke, Gerard Potter and Claes de Vriese travelled to Hoorne to reinstate the municipal government on behalf of Duke Philip. In November 1445, Gerard Potter was present at the vierschaar at Haarlem, together with Godschalc Oem and William Engelbrechtsz. (GRRek, 146, fol. 90 v, 109 r; GRRek, 156, fol. 111 v.; Damen 2000, 312; Smit 2005, 492.)}

In 1445, Gouda granted Godschalc Oem and Gerard Potter,
along with two men of the five cities, 20 guilders to cover their expenses while travelling to Philip of Burgundy. In May of that year, Gerard Potter and Louis of Treslong engaged in negotiations with Gouda on behalf of Philip of Burgundy. The duke wanted to sell the returns of some of his goods for the amount of 2000 pounds to Haarlem, Delft, Leyden and Gouda. The cities were reluctant, to say the least. Philip had to call on his maître d'hôtel Peter Bladelin, master John Lefèvre and Louis Dommesent to convince the cities. Eventually they consented in lending Philip 5000 Wilhelmusschilden. In return the cities would receive a yearly return of 500 écus for a period of 17 years.

The cities also maintained contacts with the councillors in a more agreeable way. This can be illustrated using some examples related to Gouda. In 1447, Gilles of Wissenkerke and Gerard Potter received two jugs of wine. This token of generosity was probably closely connected to the councillors’ negotiations with the Prussians at Bruges. On 5 September 1446, Philip the Good had given his councillors Gilles of Wissenkerke and Gerard Potter van der Loo a mandate to negotiate with the ambassadors of Prussia at the general assembly of Bruges. An entry in the accounts of Gouda records the expenditure of four pounds thirty-two shillings for ‘the journey of Bremen’.

Between 14 and 17 January 1449, expenses were made for William of IJsselstein, Gilles of Cabotre and Gerard Potter. In three days time the councillors, together with their servants and some of the city's magistrates, ate and drank their way through 110 meals and

---

237 The outcome of the general assembly of the Estates and cities at Leyden between 29 May and 25 June had probably caused anxiety in the cities. Philip the Good had promised to pay England 7500 nobels and 400 saluten, as a consequence of the acts of piracy performed by Amsterdam. If he failed to do so, the English would be entitled to requisition all the ships of Holland, Zeeland and Frisia and sell them without the profits being deducted from the initial amount. Moreover, the English would be allowed to claim all damages inflicted by the aforementioned countries. England and Philip's territories would be at war. Amsterdam, which was summoned to pay the damage its citizens had caused, refused to do so. Since the amount of 9000 saluten had to be paid before 29 September, the county would have to turn to Bruges in order to be able to settle its debts. Before doing so, however, the cities should try to devise a way to force Amsterdam to compensate the English. Moreover, William of Lalaing had been accused of the embezzlement of money he had received from the cities (Overstegen 1990). Louis van der Eycke, Gerard Potter and Andrew van den Cruce where commissioned to investigate the matter and to reach an agreement between the stadtholder and the cities. It is highly likely that Godschalc Oem, Gerard Potter and the cities' envoys discussed these matters with Philip of Burgundy. In June letters were sent to Leyden, Haarlem and Delft, ensuring that the money Philip had borrowed from these cities would be compensated for by a discount on the aides in the four years to come (Smit 2005, 299-303).

238 GAG, OA 1130, account 1447, fol. 11 v. In fact, from the amount of wine Potter received (usually no more than two jugs) his social status as a ‘normal’ member of the Council can be derived. Although not entirely without obligations, most of these gifts were not intended as a reward for specific services. Usually they were to be perceived as a general token of respect and appreciation for services rendered or to ensure a constant flow of information, as these ‘information brokers’ could provide valuable intelligence to the municipal government. I thank Mario Damen for providing me with the references to the municipal archives of Gouda, Leyden and Haarlem.

239 GRRek, 147, fol. 101 r-v.

240 Poelman 1917, 559-560.

241 GAG, OA, 1130, account 1447, fol. 11v.
99 litres of wine.\textsuperscript{242} It is not entirely clear what their business was in Gouda at this time, but it has been illustrated on several occasions that through these gifts and acts of ‘pouring’, the cities strengthened their relations with the prince and his officers.\textsuperscript{243} Later that year, Gerard Potter consumed eight meals and 4.5 litres of wine at Gouda and received another two jugs.\textsuperscript{244} In 1453, Dirk Boudewijnsz. of Zwieten, Henry Utenhove and Gerard Potter received 4 jugs of wine.\textsuperscript{245}

Gerard Potter's connections to the cities were not limited to Gouda. On 4 November 1449, the city of Leyden presented him and Henry van der Goes with two jugs of wine.\textsuperscript{246} In 1451 Louis van der Eycke, Anthony Michiels and Gerard Potter were invited to dinner by the city council.\textsuperscript{247} In 1450, in autumn, Potter had represented Holland at the negotiations with the king of France at Rouen. At the meeting, the envoy of Holland gave a detailed account of the damage citizens of Dieppe had inflicted on Holland and responded to the claims of the French. Potter had left The Hague on 5 October 1450, had dealt with his business at Rouen and on his return he passed through Lille. There, Philip the Good entrusted him with letters for Frank of Borssele. Passing through Brabant, he arrived in Holland on 8 December.\textsuperscript{248} In January 1451, Gerard Potter’s report was read out aloud at a meeting of the Leyden municipal council. The Leyden councilmen expressed their concern that the damage sustained by Holland had been underestimated. It is probable that this matter came up for discussion during dinner. In the same year Potter was invited by the mayors of the city to dine with them, because he temporarily resided with Gerard of Werve.\textsuperscript{249} As will be demonstrated later, Gerard Potter's relations with the Leyden city council may have had consequences for the later dissemination of his literary work.\textsuperscript{250}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{242} GAG, OA 1131, account 1448, fol. 25r.
\item \textsuperscript{243} Damen 2005; Damen 2006a; Damen 2000, 392-418, notably 393-398 ; Damen 2006, 80-82.
\item \textsuperscript{244} GAG, OA 1132, account 1449, fol. 10v.
\item \textsuperscript{245} GAG, OA 1133, account 1453, fol. 11v.
\item \textsuperscript{246} Leyden, SA 522, fol. 80v.
\item \textsuperscript{247} Leyden, SA 523, fol. 69r.
\item \textsuperscript{248} Smit 2005, 410.
\item \textsuperscript{249} Leyden, SA 523, fol. 69 v.; Brinkman 1997, 260; Brand 1996, appendices, Gerard of Werve: in 1449 member of the city council and in 1453-1454 one of the mayors.
\item \textsuperscript{250} See Chapter Five (§ 5.3.3).
\end{itemize}
1.3.5. Conclusion

Gerard Potter’s employment in the service of Jacqueline of Bavaria, his expertise in financial affairs and his multilingualism ensured that he was well equipped for the office of councillor. Particularly, his command of languages may have been regarded as an extra advantage with which he surpassed his peers. There are indications that a considerable number of the indigenous members of the Council were not sufficiently proficient in French to negotiate between the regional and supra-regional levels of government. These linguistic problems provide a partial explanation for the presence of foreign officers in the regional Council of Holland. In theory, the combination of these linguistic difficulties, the presence of bilingual individuals who were either well educated or originated from the surroundings of the Burgundian court creates an excellent environment for cultural exchange. As it appears, the foreign stadtholders were cultivated men of letters. Through their own literary production and/or the ownership or commission of manuscripts, these men promoted French literature. Nevertheless, it has become clear that in order to obtain French manuscripts, northerners had to turn to the south and most importantly to Flanders. Powerful native noblemen such as Frank of Borssele, William of IJsselstein and Reynald II of Brederode showed an interest in politics on the regional level and beyond, either by positioning their followers in the Council or by taking up a seat themselves. Since these aristocrats seem to have preferred practical texts in their own native language, they can be considered rather conservative when it comes to the consumption of literature.

Although his linguistic skills had provided Gerard Potter with access to both Philip the Good and his wife, Isabella of Portugal, it does not seem likely that either of them would have had a personal interest in Gerard Potter’s translation of the *Chroniques*. The duke’s bibliophilic frenzy had just launched and, more importantly, apparently he did not care for literature in the Dutch vernacular and neither did his wife. In addition to (professionally) interested colleagues in the Council, Potter may have found a secondary market for his translation in the cities. In the capacity of councillor, he had frequent professional contacts with municipal administrators. One of these, John Hendriksz. Paeds, transcribed part of Gerard Potter’s translation of the *Chroniques*, be it fifteen years after the translator’s death.
1.4. Conclusion

Multilingualism appears to have been a constant in Gerard Potter’s social and professional environments. His father understood Italian, Latin and French. The translator’s uncles were employed at a multicultural court, as the servants of immigrated Burgundian rulers and princesses, or were active in the chancery of Holland, which out of necessity had to cooperate with the francophone principality of Hainault. It seems that Potter was introduced at the court at a relatively young age. In any event, it is probable that he served Jacqueline of Bavaria on a long-term basis. Although the countess was the heir to Dutch-speaking Holland, she was raised in francophone Hainault with the prospect of becoming a French princess. After Jacqueline’s death, Gerard Potter came into the service of the executors of her will and eventually his financial, legal and linguistic expertise would earn him a seat in the Burgundian Council of Holland, which was presided by foreign stadtholders. Nevertheless, in none of Potter’s professional environments multilingualism was a universal. This is best illustrated by the difficulties native councillors appear to have experienced in carrying out their duties in the French, notwithstanding the fact that this was the language of supra-regional administration. Although indigenous noblemen such as Frank of Borssele provided a link between the old Bavarian rule and the new integration in the Burgundian personal union, there is little evidence of cultural xenogamy. French had indeed become the language of power, but these indigenous noblemen appear to have stood by their Dutch native language, at least in their acquisition of manuscripts. Nevertheless, it seems probable that the stadtholders and other foreign members of the Council nurtured the presence of French literary texts at The Hague. In this respect, the Burgundian Council – not unlike the court of the Bavarian princes of Holland, Zeeland and Hainault – provided excellent opportunities for cultural contacts that reached beyond language barriers.
In the mean time we have approached the edge of a perilous pitfall. The *Somme le roi* has been edited quite insufficiently. […] How can we exclude that amongst the more than eighty extant and unedited manuscripts of the *Somme le roi*, there is not a text version containing the most important variants of *Des coninx summe* originating from the quill of an eccentric editor-scribe? […] The only way to shed light on the matter is that a scholar buries himself in the manuscripts and compares them meticulously with the Middle Dutch variants.

(Van Oostrom 1996, 121)

In spite of F. van Oostrom’s invitation to scholars published in 1996, we are still awaiting a new textual study of *Des Coninx Summe* along the lines suggested above. Unfortunately, our imperfect knowledge of the textual history of John of Brederode’s translation of the *Somme le roi* is reflected by a score of other late medieval Middle Dutch adaptations of French originals. For instance, information on the source of the Middle Dutch translation of *Mandeville’s travels* is limited to the observation that the Dutch text bears some resemblance to the continental tradition of the *Voyage*.¹ Indeed, it was not until recently that the precise filiation of the Dutch manuscripts and printed editions was established.² In her study of the various Dutch translations of Guillaume de Digulleville’s *Pèlerinage de la vie humaine*, I. Biesheuvel asserts that the French text tradition has not yet been thoroughly examined, which renders the identification of an exemplar nearly impossible.³ As indicated by Van Oostrom, the only solution to this problem is to page patiently through the extant manuscripts and/or early prints.

In his edition of *Mellibeus*, B. Overmaat has undertaken a commendable attempt at tracing the French manuscript that Dirk Potter used for his rendering of Albertanus de Brescia’s *Liber Consolationis*. For want of a collation of Renaut de Louhan’s French adaptation titled *Le livre de Mellibee et Prudence*, he travelled from Nijmegen to the *Bibliothèque nationale* in Paris to examine the French manuscripts for himself. Information

¹ Tzanaki 2003, 15,17.
² Cramer 1908, XLVIII; Besamusca and Sonnemans 1999, 97; Ganser 1985, 276.
³ Biesheuvel 2005, 61.
on the manuscripts in London, Brussels and Besançon was obtained through a lively correspondence with the respective librarians in charge of those collections. In the end, Overmaat had to conclude that, in spite of all his efforts, he had not attained his primary objective: none of the surviving codices contained a text that corresponds to Dirk Potter’s translation ‘in each and every detail’. His venture, however, should not be considered a complete failure. Comparing the segmentation of the text in *Mellibeus* with Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 2240, Overmaat found some remarkable similarities. Moreover, the variants in this particular manuscript corresponded more often to the Dutch text than did the texts of any of the other manuscripts.

The outcome of Overmaat’s study of the extant French manuscripts made him question the validity of his quest for a French-language source manuscript corresponding in each and every detail to the text of the Dutch version rendered in Dirk Potter’s translation. Although the observation that a translator can never provide a translation that is in every way faithful to its exemplar is fairly self-evident, the assertion is worth repeating. Indeed, in the fifteenth century word-for-word translations (especially in the case of secular texts) were the exception; adaptation was the rule. Moreover, it would be a sheer and rather fortunate coincidence if the exact copy that the translator had in front of him survived.

From a methodological point of view, Overmaat’s study is full of merit. In his search for the exemplar of the translation, he did not only draw attention to textual variation, but also indicated paratextual similarities. His attention for visual means of text division allowed him to corroborate and refine further the results of his textual criticism.

In this respect, Overmaat’s inquiry into the position of the *Mellibeus* in the manuscript tradition of the French *Livre de Mellibee* shows the importance of the study of paratextual elements in general in this kind of research. The scrutiny of rubrication, text-division and iconology may corroborate, refine or falsify the outcome of the analysis of textual variants. This method will be adopted in Chapter Three of this study.

In the present chapter, I will attempt to determine the position that Gerard Potter’s translation of Book Three occupies in the textual transmission of Froissart’s *Chroniques*. Initially, I will try to reach this goal through close comparison of the textual variants in the

---

4 Overmaat 1950, 44-45.
5 Overmaat 1950, 44-49.
7 Van Oostrom 1996, 122.
8 An introduction to paratexts can be found in Genette 1991. Genette 2001 offers a more extensive exploration.
French manuscripts and the text of the Dutch translation. Indeed, as formulated by Van Oostrom, Biesheuvel and many others before and after them: without a clear indication of the textual witness that most accurately resembles the translation (or the place the exemplar occupied in the source text’s manuscript tradition), any statement as regards the translation process remains theoretical. Additionally, if the exemplar has survived, information on previous ownership could enable us to make observations regarding the way in which the source text manuscript may have arrived and functioned in the context in which it was eventually translated.

In order to be able to do all of the aforementioned it is essential to get an overall view of the source text’s manuscript tradition. I will therefore first provide a summary of the research on the textual filiation of the French text (§ 2.1.). Additionally; I will also outline the hypotheses that have been formulated on the translation’s position in the text tradition. Then I will present the results of the collation of a selection of chapters from the translation with their French-language counterparts (§ 2.2.). In Chapter Three the outcome of the textual analysis will be contextualised by an analysis of paratextual features such as the use of rubrics and illumination in both the extant manuscripts of the translation and a particular subgroup of French-language manuscripts of the Chroniques.

2.1. The textual tradition of Book Three

2.1.1. The classifications of J.M.B.C. Kervyn de Lettenhove and L. Mirot

Recent articles by A. Varvaro and G. Croenen show a renewed interest in the textual tradition of the Chroniques. The result of these scholars’ efforts provides a basis for the comparison between the original and the translation, which, in their respective analyses of the Mellibeus and the Pelgrimage, Overmaat and Biesheuvel had to do without. Until recently, however, the only thorough study of the textual transmission of Froissart’s Chroniques was Kervyn de Lettenhove’s Recherches sur l’ordre et la date des diverses rédactions de Chroniques, published in 1873. Considering the substantial number of extant manuscripts containing one or more books of the Chroniques, Kervyn’s research is commedable. Nevertheless, the methodology applied in this first volume of his edition is in certain respects flawed, thereby compromising the outcome of his inquiry. Moreover,

9 A discussion of Kervyn’s methodology and its inadequacies can be found in Croenen 2009 and Varvaro 2006.
Kervyn de Lettenhove was not aware of the existence of all of the manuscripts that have now been identified. He did not know of the lavishly illuminated manuscript copy of Book Three that is currently kept at the J.P. Getty Museum in Los Angeles (Lud), nor could he have known the Cambridge fragment (Cam). Moreover, as it seems, Kervyn had only second-hand knowledge of a number of manuscripts, not having seen them for himself. Additionally, he relied too heavily on paratextual elements for his classification of the manuscripts. Although this kind of information has a certain value – as will clearly show from the analysis presented in Chapter Three – Kervyn overemphasised the importance of rubrication and did not pay sufficient attention to textual variation. In spite of these inadequacies in his methodological approach, Kervyn’s classification has been adopted by a range of scholars. In the following, I will consider his conclusions as regards to Book Two and Book Three, the parts of Froissart’s chronicle of which the Middle Dutch translation survives.

Kervyn classified the extant manuscripts in a number of redactions or text-versions that had been revised by Froissart himself. These redactions were further subdivided into smaller textual families or ‘séries’, which in turn could consist of even more closely affiliated groups of manuscripts or ‘classes’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First redaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Series 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 1 B88, P76, P472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2 Bes, B52, P58, P64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 1 P52, P68-69, P60, Rou.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2 L67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3 Ber, Bre, LR4, PA88, P44, P476, Ant, LR1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second redaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P13, P606, P57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third redaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P605, B02, Le2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fourth redaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lost manuscript of the library of Hafod, excerpts of which were incorporated in the English translation of M. Johnes. Probably Chi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- table 2.1.: Book Two – Redactions, series and classes according to Kervyn -
In the tradition of Book Two, Kervyn de Lettenhove recognises four separate redactions (cf. table 2.1.), the first of which was supposedly composed ca. 1387.\textsuperscript{11} This first redaction, comprising most of the manuscripts, consists of two textual families. The first series has been further divided into two classes, which can be distinguished by their \textit{incipit}. The text of the manuscripts of the first class begins at Book Two, § 1 (‘Vous avés bien oÿ recorder comment le duc de Bourgogne fist une chevauchée (…)’). The manuscripts of the second class (e.g. Bes) begin at Book Two, § 83 (Vous avés bien oÿ cy-dessus recorder comment li sires de Mucident (…)’). In the event that these manuscripts belong to a set of which also Book One survives, paragraphs § 1-82 of Book Two are situated at the end of the manuscripts with the text of Book One. The second series, according to Kervyn, differs from the first by the addition of Peter van den Bossche’s departure to England and the \textit{explicit} ‘ung grant office en la ville de Gand’.\textsuperscript{12} This series is further subdivided into three classes, which again can be distinguished by their \textit{incipits}. The \textit{incipit} of the manuscripts of the first class of the second series corresponds to the \textit{incipit} of the manuscripts of the first class of the first series (the campaign of the duke of Burgundy). The second class consists of only one manuscript, the \textit{incipit} of which corresponds to that of the manuscripts of the second class of the first series (the defection of the Lord of Mucident). The manuscripts of the third class of the second series share the \textit{incipit} ‘Quant le duc de Bourgogne eut fait ceste chevauchée’. According to Kervyn, the second redaction is characterised by the \textit{incipit} ‘En ce temps que li dus de Bourgogne fist son armée en Picardie’ and ‘quelques ramaniements de la narration’.\textsuperscript{13} The third redaction survives in three manuscripts and has the same \textit{incipit} as the second class manuscripts of the first redaction. It differs from the redaction in these manuscripts by its \textit{explicit}: ‘et dist au départir de la bonne ville de Gant’. The improvements in the text of this redaction are more numerous, details have been added and the information is more precise. The account of the events in Ghent between the peace of Tournai and the departure of Peter van den Bossche for England has been modified.\textsuperscript{14} Kervyn only knew the fourth redaction through some excerpts of a lost manuscript of the Hafod library incorporated in the English translation of M. Johnes. Recently, textual comparison of a number of manuscripts of Book Two has

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{11} Ainsworth 2000, 30 suggests that Book Two ‘gradually came into existence’.
\textsuperscript{12} Kervyn 1873, 308.
\textsuperscript{13} Kervyn 1873, 414 ; 141.
\textsuperscript{14} Kervyn, 1873, 141 ; 411-415.}
allowed the identification of this manuscript with the Froissart manuscript of the Newberry Library in Chicago.  

In the textual transmission of Book Three, Kervyn de Lettenhove discerned two distinct redactions. A first redaction compiled in 1390, comprises 21 extant manuscripts. A second redaction compiled in 1400-1404 survives in only one manuscript: \textit{P50}.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{First redaction} & \\
\hline
Series 1 & Class 1 \textit{B88, Ant, Mon, PA89} \\
& Class 2 \textit{Ber, LR5, P45, Tor} \\
& Class 3 \textit{P605, H84, L67, P53, P56, P70-71, P76, P487, Rou} \\
Series 2 & \textit{P475} \\
Series 3 & \textit{Bes} \\
Series 4 & \textit{Bre} \\
\hline
\textbf{Second Redaction} & \textit{P50} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Book Three – Redactions, series and classes according to Kervyn}
\end{table}

The first redaction is further divided into four series, which are characterized by (minor) differences in their initial rubrics, \textit{incipits} and \textit{explicit}s. The first series consists of three further subdivisions based on their initial rubric and \textit{explicit}. The initial rubric of the first class manuscripts reads: ‘Cy commence l’aультre (la tierce) partie principale des croniques sire Jehan Froissart’. The rubric of the second class manuscripts is worded in a slightly different way: ‘Cy commence le tiers volume de Froissart (…)’. The manuscripts of the third class have the same rubric as the first class manuscripts, but there is a subtle distinction in their \textit{explicit}s.\footnote{I exclude the witnesses indicated by Kervyn de Lettenhove as \textit{compilations}, i.e. abridged versions of the whole \textit{Chroniques}.} The second series consists of only one manuscript: \textit{P475}, copied by Raoul Tanguy, with minor differences in the prologue of Book Three. The \textit{Bes} manuscript is the only member of the third series. According to Kervyn, it was highly probable that Froissart himself was responsible for this combination of prior versions of Book One to Three.\footnote{Kervyn 1873, 270-271. Kervyn believed that Froissart had taken the \textit{Bes} manuscript with him on his journey to England in 1395 with the intention to offer a copy of his \textit{Chroniques} to Richard II.} The fourth series comprises the version \textit{Bre}, which according to Kervyn represents a thoroughly revised version of Froissart’s earlier work through which

\footnote{G. Croenen and N. Romanova, ‘Book II of Froissart’s \textit{Chronicles}: the Leiden MS and the rest of the manuscript tradition’, unpublished conference paper, Fifth International Chronicle Conference, Queen’s University Belfast, 22 July 2008.}
the author wanted to achieve a complete and consistent set of the four Books of his *Chroniques*.

In 1931, Léon Mirot delivered his edition of Book Three based on *P50*. In his introduction he adopted Kervyn’s division of the manuscripts in two distinct redactions, without further specifications. To his mind, *Bes* was the best representative of the first redaction, which is contained in a large number of manuscripts. The second redaction is only known through the manuscript that he used for his edition, *P50*. Mirot stated that the text in the *Bre* manuscript should be considered a revised version of the first redaction.

### 2.1.2. The position of the Dutch translation

Until recently, Kervyn’s and Mirot’s conclusions as regards the textual tradition of Froissart’s *Chroniques* were the only guidelines for scholars interested in the origin of the Dutch version. Therefore, up until now, any statement regarding the model of Gerard Potter’s text was based on their findings and no further research was done on the translation’s exemplar. In his edition of the sections of Book Two related to the events in Flanders, Napoleon de Pauw was only interested in the text’s historical content. His introduction therefore provided no information whatsoever concerning the possible provenance of Gerard Potter’s source text. However, J.W. Muller, G.I. Lieftinck, and more recently also J. van Herwaarden have attempted to indicate possible exemplars.

In his article on ‘Gerard Potter van der Loo and his translation of Froissart’, Muller tried to answer the question whether or not ‘Potter translated the entire Froissart’ and also asked himself ‘which of the numerous redactions of the French text he [Gerard Potter, DS] had in front of him’. According to Muller, the opening rubric of *Le3*-1 ‘Hier begint dat anderen volumen heren Jan Frotsairts canonnic ende tresorier des colegies tot Symays, […]’ and the closing formula of *Le3*-2 and *H21* ‘dair ie my gairne toe geven will om dat alle ten besten te vernemen’ limit the possible exemplars to a number of manuscripts. As far as Book Two is concerned, Muller situates the translation in the tradition of the group of manuscripts *P58, P64* and *Bes*. In Kervyn’s classification, these manuscripts belong to the *première série* of the *première rédaction, deuxième classe*, which contains manuscripts

---

18 Kervyn 1873, 105-119,143-147, 245-290, 368-372.
19 Mirot 1931, VII.
produced in Paris in the first decades of the fifteenth century. According to Kervyn de Lettenhove, this particular version is characterised by the initial rubric ‘Cy commence le second volume des nouvelles guerres de France et d’Angleterre […]’ and incipit ‘Vous avés bien chi-dessus oÿ recorder comment li sires de Moucident se tourna François’.

Indeed, the rubric and incipit of *Le 3-1* seem to correspond to this information. However, because it lists Froissart’s titles of canon and treasurer of Chimay in Hainault, it could be argued that the initial rubric corresponds even more closely to the rubric of the texts of the *première rédaction, deuxième série, troisième classe A* of Book Two: ‘Cy commence le second volume des croniques de France, d’Angleterre et d’aultre part jadis compilées par sire Jehan Froissart en son temps chanoine et trésorier de Chimay’.

This textual group includes some of the illuminated luxury manuscripts (e.g. *PA88, Bre, Ant*) produced in Flanders during the second half of the fifteenth century. It should be noted, however, that of these manuscripts neither the incipit nor the explicit resemble those of the Dutch translation. I will return to this matter in § 3.3.3.

Quite surprisingly, Muller also mentions *Le 2* as a possible base text for the translation. This text belongs to the *troisième rédaction* of Book Two. However, the *explicit* as recorded by Kervyn does not match the translation’s.

Based on the evidence from Book Two, Muller concluded that Gerard Potter produced his translation using a manuscript from the first redaction and more particularly series 1. As indicated above, on the basis of their variant *incipit* ‘Vous avés cy-dessus oÿ recorder comment le due de Bourgogne fist une chevauché ès marches de Picardie’, Muller could have further excluded the seven manuscripts of class 1. In addition to his analysis of the manuscripts of Book Two, Muller compared the ‘amusing medieval ghost-story of the evil spirit Horton’ in Book Three and some extracts containing information on John and Guy of Blois with ‘the original text’. Muller’s conclusion was that the Dutch text showed more similarities with the text of Kervyn than with the text of Buchon. Given that Kervyn used the *Bre* manuscript (first redaction, series 4) for his edition of Book Three and Buchon’s base manuscript was *Bes* (first redaction, series 3), Muller’s conclusion is rather

---

20 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS. fr. 2658 and 2664 contain the second Book. Muller 1888, 267 refers to them with their old catalogue numbers: 8329 and 8333.
21 Kervyn 1873, 412.
22 In fact, Kervyn’s assertion is misleading: this is the initial rubric of *PA88*. The other manuscripts of this family have a different initial rubric, which in general refers to ‘sir Jean Froissart’.
24 Leyden, UB, VGG 9 F II.
25 Kervyn 1873, 415.
26 Muller 1888, 266-267.
unexpected. Indeed, as regards Book Two, he had concluded that Potter’s exemplar probably was a manuscript of the first redaction, series 1, the textual family of – amongst other manuscripts – Bes. Possibly, Muller was misled by the ‘assez nombreuses améliorations’ that Buchon had introduced in his edition using the manuscripts P50 and P53.²⁷

In 1962, the Leyden codicologist G.I. Lieftinck held a series of seminars on the theme ‘Froissart in Dutch Manuscripts’. In his unpublished lecture notes, Lieftinck argued that ‘the Froissart of Besançon […] is also important [in addition to Le2 and Bre] for the study of the Dutch translation (ca. 1430?) by Gerard Potter van der Loo’.²⁸ Lieftinck admitted that the filiation of the translation with this early version of the Chroniques consisting of Book One to Book Three was not at all obvious. In accordance with Kervyn, Lieftinck surmised that after Guy of Blois had died in shame, Froissart sought out the patronage of Albert of Bavaria and his son, William of Ostrevant, in order to be able to continue his historiographical project.²⁹ Thus, it seemed self-evident that a copy of the Chroniques that was available at the court of Holland – Gerard Potter’s workplace – should also comprise the more recently composed Book Four of Froissart’s chronicle.³⁰ Therefore – in spite of the noteworthy resemblance Lieftinck had observed in the pictorial programmes of Bes and the manuscripts of the Middle Dutch translation – he concluded that a version similar to Bre, a full set of manuscripts comprising Book One to Book Four, was a better fit for the description of Gerard Potter’s exemplar.

The belief that the translator had used a set comprising Book One to Book Four (and therefore not Bes) led Lieftinck to look for another potential model. In this respect, he referred to a copy of the 1559 Lyon print of the Sauvage edition in the collection of the Plantin-Moretus museum in Antwerp. Among the manuscrits perdus Kervyn had pointed towards the Schoonhoven manuscript, which – again according to Kervyn de Lettenhove – had been lost since the sixteenth century. In the margins of the Antwerp Sauvage copy, someone had noted variants copied from Bre. Some of the variants had been indicated as originating from a manuscript referred to as ‘the Schoonhoven copy’. As the castle of Schoonhoven had been a residence of Guy of Blois, Kervyn surmised that David Aubert, the scribe responsible for the Bre manuscript – used the ancient Schoonhoven manuscript –

²⁷ Buchon 1835, 369; Buchon refers to the former sigla 8325 and 8328.
²⁸ Lieftinck 1962. These lecture notes have not been published. Copies can be found in the manuscript cabinets of the Royal Library at The Hague and the University Library, Leyden.
²⁹ No documentary evidence of this survives. See also the introduction to this study.
³⁰ This part of Froissart’s narrative gives – amongst other things – the account of Albert of Bavaria’s campaign to Frisia.
or a copy closely resembling it – as an exemplar for the copy that was destined for Anthony, the Bastard of Burgundy.\textsuperscript{31} However – and this seems to be a piece of information Lieftinck was unaware of or disagreed with – a decade after Kervyn’s edition, G. Raynaud had concluded that ‘the manuscript – or rather the copy of a manuscript – that André Madoets [the scribe responsible for the Antwerp notes] refers to at a number of instances as the Schoenhoven manuscript […] is no other than the famous Breslau manuscript’. The Schoenhoven copy and Bre were one and the same. Anthony of Burgundy had passed his copy on to his son Adolf. The manuscript had been kept at the castle of Schoenhoven until 1577. Later, Thomas Rehdiger acquired the manuscript and consequently left it to the city of Breslau.\textsuperscript{32}

Lieftinck’s conclusion that Gerard Potter’s exemplar was neither Bes nor Bre but a manuscript that in some way intermediated between these two stages (according to Lieftinck possibly the Schoenhoven copy, which in reality is just another name for Bre) was based on the erroneous presentation of Kervyn de Lettenhove. However, Lieftinck was quite correct in his observation of the resemblances between the illustration of Bes on the one hand and \textit{H21} and \textit{Le3} on the other. I will further expand on this in Chapter Three.

The latest addition to the scholarly debate about the question of Gerard Potter’s base text dates from 1980. In his essay ‘The war in the Low Countries’, J. van Herwaarden made great use of the Dutch translation of the \textit{Chroniques}. In a note he briefly explored the question of the text version that Potter used for his translation. Van Herwaarden argued that ‘the Dutch text of Gerrit Potter van der Loo is not just a translation of the final version of Book II; he probably translated a manuscript of Book II including a larger version of the original \textit{Chronique de Flandre} than that normally inserted in Book II’. No textual evidence is presented for this statement, and it does not stand up to further scrutiny.\textsuperscript{33}

\subsection*{2.1.3. The classifications of A. Varvaro and G. Croenen}

Over the last decades, the textual dissemination of Froissart’s \textit{Chroniques} has regained interest. In a first article published in 1994, A. Varvaro discusses the manuscripts of Book

\textsuperscript{31} Kervyn 1873, 431.
\textsuperscript{32} Raynaud 1895, 518-519.
\textsuperscript{33} Van Herwaarden 1981, 175; See also: Ainsworth 2000, 33.
One, their rubrication and their pictorial programmes.\textsuperscript{34} Four years later, L. Le Guay devoted a book-length study to the illustrated copies of Book Four of the \textit{Chroniques}.\textsuperscript{35} In 2006, Varvaro’s analysis of the textual tradition of Book Four was published in a volume of essays focusing on the book trade in late medieval Paris.\textsuperscript{36} Finally, 2009 saw the publication of G. Croenen’s study of the textual filiation of Book Three.\textsuperscript{37} The AHRC-funded ‘Online Froissart Project’ has opened up opportunities for similar analyses of Books One and Two.\textsuperscript{38}

Since no surviving witness of a Middle Dutch translation of Book Four of the \textit{Chroniques} has been localised to date, the textual filiation of its manuscripts would seem less relevant for the study of the connection between the French-language copies and their Dutch counterparts. Moreover, there is no evidence suggesting that a translation of Book Four ever existed. The scribal colophon in \textit{Le3-2} states that on 26 January 1470 John Hendriksz Paeds completed his transcription of Gerard Potter’s text, which indicates that Book Three was the final part of the translation.\textsuperscript{39} Nevertheless, Varvaro’s analysis of the textual dissemination of Book Four is relevant for at least two reasons. A first point of interest is methodological. In his article Varvaro suggests an abridged version of the philological method. Instead of collating all the extant manuscripts in their entirety, he proposes a study by sample (in Varvaro’s case about 1.5\% of the entire text) in which excerpts from all manuscripts are collated.\textsuperscript{40} Varvaro’s adaptation of the philological method seems to be applicable to the process of locating a translation’s position in the manuscript tradition of its source language counterparts. However, in such a venture, it is essential to take into account some particularities of the (medieval) translation process.\textsuperscript{41} Secondly, a comparison of the outcome of Varvaro’s study of Book Four and Croenen’s analysis of Book Three may yield some interesting information.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{34} Varvaro 1994.
\item \textsuperscript{35} Le Guay 1998.
\item \textsuperscript{36} Varvaro 2006.
\item \textsuperscript{37} Croenen 2009.
\item \textsuperscript{38} The Online Froissart Project (http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/onlinefroissart/index.jsp), which was completed in 2010, ran at the universities of Sheffield and Liverpool under the direction of P. Ainsworth and G. Croenen.
\item \textsuperscript{39} He was also the scribe of \textit{Le3-1}, fol. 41 r.-175 r., but did not add a colophon at the end of this volume. Although, it is possible that another scribe completed the fourth volume, this seems rather unlikely as the poor quality of the handwriting, layout and increasing sloppiness may suggest a copy for own use as was not uncommon among the (Dutch) upper middle classes at the time (cf. Chapter Five).
\item \textsuperscript{40} Varvaro 2006, 260-261. In his description of the transmission of Book Three, Croenen successfully applied Varvaro’s method, with a slightly larger sample of 4.5\%. (Croenen 2009, 25-27).
\item \textsuperscript{41} In this respect, one could think of alterations caused by linguistic differences between the source and target languages (e.g. sentence structure, use of subordinate clauses, etc.) or translation strategies such as disambiguation, rationalization, paraphrasing, etc.)
\end{itemize}
As regards Croenen’s inquiry into the textual dissemination of Book Three, a first important observation is based on codicological grounds. Croenen distinguishes two distinct classes of manuscripts, each of which has its own region of provenance. A first group is situated in the Parisian book industry of the opening decades of the fifteenth century. Under the direction of libraire Pierre de Liffol a team of scribes and illustrators (known as the Boethius Master and the Giac Master) produced a series of Froissart manuscripts several of which have survived. Unfortunately, extant witnesses of Book Three that probably were produced by De Liffol are limited to B88 (a fragment) and Bes. Apparently, De Liffol was also involved in the production of amongst others the manuscripts Sto, P63, L58-59, B51 (all Book One) and Rou, P64, B52 (all Book Two). Croenen argues that the situation of L67 is similar, considering the scribes and illustrators who participated in its production also collaborated with De Liffol. The second group of manuscripts consists of manuscripts produced in Flanders in the third quarter of the fifteenth century and comprises the illuminated luxury copies PA89, Ant, Bre, P45, LR5 and Lud.

The outcome of Croenen’s textual analysis is a stemma codicum accounting for all the extant manuscripts of Book Three. Although Kervyn’s division in two redactions has been maintained in this stemma, Croenen questions the chronological order of the première rédaction and the version contained in P50. The classification on codicological grounds is reflected in the stemma: the early Parisian manuscripts are situated at the highest level, relatively nearest to the (hypothetical) prototype. At approximately the same level as De Liffol’s model we find L67 and the fragment Cam, which are closely related. At the same level is P475. In his 2009 article, Croenen concluded that apparently all late fifteenth-century manuscripts could be traced back to the B88 manuscript.

42 Croenen’s observations as regards the manuscripts of Book Three correspond to those of Harf-Lancner 1998 (especially 221-227) who discusses the illustration of the manuscripts of Book One. Harf-Lancner (partially) draws on the information presented by Le Guay 1998 (especially 98-99).
43 Villela-Petit 2009, 24-45.
45 Stonyhurst, Stonyhurst College MS 1; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS fr. 2663; London, British Library, Additional MSS 38658–38659; Brussels, Royal Library, MS III 251. For the full shelfmarks of the manuscripts of Book Two and Three, see: Appendix A.
46 According to Croenen Ber possibly belongs to this group as well. A more extensive discussion of the illumination of the Paris manuscripts, see: Villela-Petit, 2009. For the group of manuscripts originating from Flanders, see: Wijnsman 2008, 66-69; Le Guay 1998, 27-44.
47 Croenen 2009, 22.
However, additional information derived from the collation of the manuscripts of Book Two has since led him to believe that not $B88$, but a now lost manuscript that closely resembled the Brussels manuscript, must have been the common ancestor ($\alpha'$) of the manuscripts dating from the second half of the fifteenth century. These copies in turn belong to three families, being $\beta$ (with $PA89$, $Ant$, $P45$, $P59$, $Ber$, $LR5$, $Lud$ and $Tor$), secondly $\gamma$ (consisting of $Mon$ and $Bre$) and finally $\delta$ (comprising $P53$, $P70-71$, $Rou$, $H84$, $P56$, $P487$, $P76$ and $Ver$).

---

Some interesting convergences between the illustration of the Book Three volumes of *Bre* on the one hand and the illustrated copies from the β group, suggest that an intermediate level should be added between the lost ancestor of the younger manuscripts and the γ and β families. The results of the comparison of the pictorial programmes were confirmed by an analysis of the textual variation in these manuscripts. Indeed, in a number of cases, members of the γ and δ families have the same variant reading, even when the reading in the δ manuscripts concurs with the version in the older Parisian manuscripts. This intermediate level would suggest that all of the illustrated luxury copies produced in Flanders could be traced back to one single illustrated manuscript (α’’).

In his analysis of the tradition of Book Four, Varvaro concluded that the extant manuscripts can be divided in two groups: α and λ. When we compare the classification of Book Four with the tradition of the manuscripts of Book Three, the information provided by Varvaro globally concurs with Croenen’s results. The manuscripts of Book Three in Croenen’s δ group correspond with Varvaro’s α copies. There seems to be, however, a discrepancy in the relative positions of *P70-72* and *H84*. Whereas Varvaro’s *P72* can be found on a higher level than *H84*, the situation for the manuscripts of Book Three seems to be reverse. Since Varvaro’s sample did not yield sufficient information, he did not explicitly propose internal relations within the group of Flemish luxury manuscripts (Varvaro’s λ family).
The relative positions of \( PA89, \) \( LR5, \) \( P45 \) and \( Ber \) can be found in Croenen’s stemma (Croenen’s \( \beta \) family concurs with Varvaro’s \( \lambda \)). Interestingly, Croenen proposes a separate division containing the manuscripts \( Mon \) and \( Bre \) (\( \gamma \)), which in Varvaro’s study respectively belong to the \( \alpha \) and \( \lambda \) families. A final point of interest yielded by the comparison of Varvaro’s and Croenen’s stemmata is that apparently none of the early Parisian manuscripts (\( Bes, B88, L67, Cam, P475 \)) have a Book Four counterpart, nor does the only extant manuscript of the second redaction, \( P50 \). Finally, when Kervyn’s classification is compared with Croenen’s analysis, there are some remarkable divergences. These differences in outcome clearly stress the need to be extremely careful when taking Kervyn’s classifications as the basis for conclusions on the textual tradition of the Chroniques.

2.1.4. \( \alpha'': \) the lost set of the Burgundian library?

As has been mentioned in the previous chapter (§ 1.3.3.2), the 1467-‘69 inventory of the Burgundian library, which was drawn up after the death of Philip the Good, refers to four volumes of Froissart’s Chroniques. The manuscript of Book Four is covered in satin, whereas the volumes of Book One to Three are covered in red leather. In their respective studies, L. Le Guay and H. Wijsman have referred to the difference in binding to argue that

\[ \text{Wijsman 2003, 147.} \]
a volume of the *Chroniques* that was rebound in 1431, probably on behalf of Isabella of Portugal, was a copy of Book Four. However, no evidence supports the presence of a Book Four manuscript in 1431, or for that matter, before 1453. Since an alternative explanation for the differences in material realisation of Book One to Three and Book Four exists, it is rather probable that the volume that was rebound in 1431 was the copy of Book One, which had also been mentioned in the 1420 inventory of the Burgundian collection.

Indeed, in 1453, John Wauquelin was paid for a copy of Book Four of the *Chroniques* commissioned by the duke of Burgundy. In 1444, the duke had borrowed a set of three volumes of the *Chroniques* from the abbey of Saint-Aubert in Cambrai. Probably, copies of these volumes should be identified with the manuscripts that were bound in red leather listed in the 1467-1469 inventory. The separate production of the manuscripts containing Book One to Three and the copy of Book Four explains the difference in binding of the manuscripts in the 1467-1469 catalogue. This hypothesis is further corroborated by the fact that the script type of the first three volumes (lettre de forme) differs from the script used in the volume containing Book Four (lettre bâtarde).

Quite possibly, this composite set was the first set of manuscripts to comprise all four books of Froissart’s chronicle. Thus, the gradual procuration of copies of the *Chroniques* by Philip the Good provides an excellent explanation for the fact that complete sets of Book One to Book Four emerge only in the second half of the fifteenth century. Unfortunately, none of the aforementioned Burgundian volumes have survived or they have yet to be identified. The only known copy of Froissart’s chronicle originating from

---

51 Le Guay 1998, 100.
52 G. Croenen, e-mail: 18 September 2009. See: Finot 1895, 196. ‘Le 13 aout 1443, quittance de l’abbé de St-Aubert de Cambrai, signée de sa main et scellée de son scel secret “De trios livres de Croniques Froissart, contens fais d’armes, lesquelz il avoit ja pièça prestés à Monseigneur le Duc”’. The reference has been recorded in an inventory of quittances for 1439-1445 by ‘Jean de Lachenel, dit Boulogne, garde des joyaux du duc de Bourgogne’. Lille, Archives Départementales du Nord, B 3499, fol. 38 v.
53 For reasons which will be explained in Chapter Three (see in particular § 3.2.) I believe that Gerard Potter used a set of two volumes comprising Book One to Book Three as a model for the translation. This excludes this lost set of manuscripts from the Burgundian Library as the translation’s exemplar (three manuscripts comprising Book One to Book Three and one manuscript with Book Four). Additionally, the textual variants in the β, γ and δ families suggest that the lost α’ and α’’ manuscripts were very similar to the B88 copy (cf. infra 2.2.2.). As was already suggested by Lieftinck and as will become even more apparent later, the exemplar Gerard Potter used closely resembled Bes, the readings of which sometimes differ considerably from the B88 and other Paris manuscripts.
54 G. Croenen, e-mail: 18 September 2009.
the collection of the dukes of Burgundy is the Arsenal manuscript \((PA87-PA90)\), which was produced at a later time.\(^{55}\)

Conceivably, the lost four-volume set of the Burgundian library served as an exemplar for a large part of the late fifteenth-century manuscripts of the \textit{Chroniques}.\(^{56}\) As I have argued above, this set of four manuscripts probably consisted of a copy of the manuscripts that Philip the Good had borrowed from the Saint-Aubert monastery in Cambrai and the volume of Book Four he had commissioned from John Wauquelin in 1453. Given the data provided by the stemmata of G. Croenen and A. Varvaro, the presence of \(P89\) and \(P90\) in the Burgundian library in 1487 and the fact that \textit{Bre} was copied for Philip of Burgundy’s illegitimate son, Anthony the Great Bastard, the 1444-1453 set may have consisted of several hypothetical combinations of manuscripts, which have been presented in table 2.3 (cf. infra).

The options (2) and (4) offer an explanation for the difference in classification of the \textit{Mon} and \textit{Bre} volumes of Book Three and Book Four. In Croenen’s stemma of Book Three, the \textit{Bre} and \textit{Mon} manuscripts have been categorised in the same textual family \(\gamma\). Varvaro classifies their Book Four counterparts in two different families \(\alpha\) (\textit{Mon}) and \(\lambda\) (\textit{Bre}). If one assumes that the sets \textit{Mon} and \textit{Bre} were copied from different combinations of exemplars for Book (One to) Three on the one hand and Book Four on the other, this configuration is even rather self-explanatory. For their copies \textit{Mon} and \textit{Bre} the respective scribes would then have used the same exemplar for the first volume(s) \((\alpha'\text{ or } \alpha'')\) but two different base manuscripts for the text of Book Four \((\alpha\text{ and } \lambda)\).

In this case, it remains unclear which exemplar has been used for the text of Book Three, either \(\alpha'\) or \(\alpha''\). Option (2) in table 2.3. presents some difficulties, which, however, are not at all insurmountable. First, it seems strange that the monastery of Saint-Aubert should have acquired Pierre de Liffol’s model, but this is certainly not impossible.

\(^{55}\) For the full shelf numbers, see Appendix A. The manuscript of Book One, which featured in the inventory of 1420, and John Wauquelin’s copy of Book Four had already disappeared in the catalogue of 1487. The volumes of Book One to Three were still present in this inventory (Le Guay 1998, 100).

\(^{56}\) The identification of the lost Burgundian set of manuscripts with \(\alpha'\text{ or } \alpha''\) is a probability, no certainty, as is the identification of the Wauquelin copy with \(O\text{ or } \lambda\). Since the manuscripts have been lost, no physical proof exists. Indeed, the textual transmission of Book Two may provide some difficulties for this presentation of the origin of the late fifteenth century manuscripts. The copies of Book Two of the \(PA\) set and \textit{Bre} contain at least two paragraphs which are present in the \textit{Le}2 manuscript, but in none of the Liffol copies. The possibility exists that the manuscripts were not only transmitted in complete sets of Book One to Three (or Four). Composite sets of manuscripts may have existed as well. Further research on the transmission of Book One and Two may shed light on this matter. However, the above has no influence on the validity of my conclusion regarding the relation between the Middle Dutch translation and the manuscripts of the Burgundian library in § 2.2.2.
Secondly, this interpretation implies that the set of manuscripts containing Book One to Three was copied once before the combination with Book Four and once after John Wauquelin had finished his copy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book Three copy in 1467-9 catalogue(^{57})</th>
<th>Its exemplar (the Cambrai copy)</th>
<th>The Book Four copy in 1467-9 catalogue(^{58})</th>
<th>Its exemplar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) (\alpha') = lost ancestor of the Liffol manuscripts ((\alpha))</td>
<td>(O) = Book Four prototype</td>
<td>(\lambda) = lost ancestor of Burgundian luxury manuscripts</td>
<td>(O) = a lost ancestor of (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) (\alpha') = lost ancestor of the Liffol manuscripts ((\alpha))</td>
<td>(\lambda) = lost ancestor of Burgundian luxury manuscripts</td>
<td>(O) = a lost ancestor of (O)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) (\alpha'') = a lost De Liffol copy</td>
<td>(O) = Book Four prototype</td>
<td>(\lambda) = lost ancestor of Burgundian luxury manuscripts</td>
<td>(O) = a lost ancestor of (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) (\alpha'') = a lost De Liffol copy</td>
<td>(O) = Book Four prototype</td>
<td>(\lambda) = lost ancestor of Burgundian luxury manuscripts</td>
<td>(O) = a lost ancestor of (O)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Table 2.3.: Possible identifications for the lost Froissart manuscript (and its exemplar) mentioned in the 1467-1469 catalogue of the Burgundian Library –

An explanation of the different distribution of the Book Three and Book Four manuscripts of the \(Bre\) and \(Mon\) sets, would require three independent combinations of Book (One to) Three and Book Four: the first (\(\delta\)) using one constellation of manuscripts (\(\alpha'\) and \(\alpha\)), the second (\(\alpha''\)) and third time (\(Bre\)) applying the same combination (\(\alpha'\) and \(\lambda\)). In any event, it seems plausible that the exemplar of the 1444 manuscripts of Book One to Three was either a now lost De Liffol copy or the \(libraire\)’s lost exemplar, which in its variant readings differed from the other De Liffol manuscripts, but was very similar to \(B88\). This observation will have important consequences for the later development of this research (cf. § 2.2.2. and § 2.3).\(^{59}\)

\(^{57}\) The sigla refer to my revised version of the stemma of Book Three (Croenen 2009). See: fig. 2.3.
\(^{58}\) The sigla refer to the stemma of Book Four (Varvaro 2006). See: fig. 2.4.
\(^{59}\) See also note 53 of the present chapter.
2.2. The Dutch translation vs. the French manuscripts

In §2.1.2., I have indicated that Muller’s conclusion on the provenance of Potter’s exemplar is in itself rather confusing. Indeed, his statements on the text versions that were used for the translation of Book Two on the one hand and Book Three on the other seem contradictory. Therefore it seems useful to test Muller’s hypothesis on the basis of the data generated by G. Croenen, which – given its methodological approach – are more reliable than the classification by Kervyn.

In what follows Croenen’s samples of Books Two and Three will be compared to the corresponding passages in the Dutch translation. The methodology applied by Varvaro and Croenen including the analysis of paratext and iconography will be adopted in Chapter Three. This approach will provide an insight in the production process of the codices manufactured by the Liffol cooperative. Additionally, the scrutiny of the manuscripts’ pictorial programmes will allow for the re-assessment of G.I. Lieftinck’s hypotheses of the correspondence between the manuscripts of the translation and the French-language Bes manuscript.

2.2.1. Variant readings: sloppy scribes and a faithful translator

The importance of variant readings in this type of scholarly investigation cannot be overstated. Due to the way in which medieval manuscripts where manufactured, individual copies always and inevitably display variation, not only in their material realisation but also in the text they contain. It was not uncommon that scribes dealt with their exemplars in a creative fashion. As such, adaptations of spelling, wording and grammar are not in the least unusual. Scribes deleted sections, interpolated excerpts from other texts, and added explanations for parts of the text that seemed unclear or difficult to understand. These alterations to the exemplar on their lectern were made on their own initiative or at the explicit request of the person who had commissioned the new copy. Occasionally, scribes were inaccurate or distracted. At other times, they tried to correct their predecessors’ errors.

In this chapter, the study of textual variants will be limited to the sample as drawn up by G. Croenen, who has kindly granted me access to his collation of selected chapters to compare the Dutch translation with its French equivalents. In his study of the manuscript tradition of Book Three, Croenen collated § 1 (the prologue), § 45-47 (the story of Horton) § 67-69 (the exemplum of John of Roquetaillade), § 159 (Britanny and John of Montfort), § 177 (reaction to the murder of Charles d’Espagne by John of Montfort) and § 306-308 (the wedding of the duke of Berry to Joan of Boulogne; treaty of Leulinghen). Croenen 2009, 26-27. The chapter numbers refer to the edition of the Société de l’histoire de France by L. Mirot.
or inaccuracies.\textsuperscript{61} Taken together all of these particularities resulted in unique readings in each and every textual witness, which in turn may or may not have been transmitted to translations based on these copies. In this view, variants (be it adaptations or errors) that are – or at least appear to be – unique to one particular manuscript of the source text and that in turn have been reflected by a faithful translator can be of invaluable importance to scholars who are interested in finding the translator’s model.

2.2.2. \textit{Variant readings in the prologue of Book Three}

Since he had elaborately dwelled upon the intrigues of Flanders, in the prologue of Book Three Jean Froissart expresses the desire to redirect his attention to the political developments in more distant regions. In order to gather the information he needs, Froissart has made arrangements to travel to the court of Foix at Orthez. After a hospitable welcome, the chronicler starts his inquiries.

A comparison of the individual versions of the prologue with the Dutch translation yields some interesting results. A first important conclusion is that Potter obviously used a manuscript of the first redaction. The final chapter (§ 308) of Book Three, which is absent from the single witness of the second redaction \textit{P50}, is indeed present in the translation, thus excluding the second redaction as a base text. This observation is further corroborated by textual variants in the prologue.

\textbf{example 1:} § 1 (t. 12, p. 1, l. 2-3): \textit{P50}: concerning my country; missing from \textit{H21, Le3-2}\textsuperscript{62}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{P50} \hspace{5pt} …mais les prochaines \textbf{touchans ma nacion}…
  \item \textit{1\textsuperscript{st} red.} \hspace{5pt} …mais les prochaines quant a present…
\end{itemize}

except for:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{LR5} \hspace{5pt} …mais les prochaines…
  \item \textit{Bes} \hspace{5pt} …mais les prochaines tant qu’a maintenant…
  \item \textit{P475} \hspace{5pt} …mais les prochaines tant que a maintenant…
  \item \textit{H21, Le3-2} \hspace{5pt} …welke gedaen heeft dat my die nagelegene ende geschiede dingen…
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{61} For scribal practice see for instance Busby 2002, 59-64; Pleij 2007, 56-58; Clemens & Graham 2007, 22-24.

\textsuperscript{62} When referring to manuscripts as belonging to a group or textual family, the orthography of its individual members has not been taken into account.
example 2: § 1 (t. 12, p. 1, l. 5-6) : P50: the developments in regions far away should not be forgotten; absent from H21, Le3-2

P50 …mais pour tant ne seroient mises en oubly les longtaines et ne sejournoient pas les vaillans hommes …

H21, Le3-2 …niet te min al ruste ic dair af te spreken so en rusten nochtans die edele vrome mannen ter wapene …

example 3: § 1 (t. 12, p. 1, l. 13) : P50 castles and fortresses vs. H21, Le3-2 cities and castles

P50 …prendre et embler et essillier chasteaulx et forteresses.

H21, Le3-2 …steden ende sloten af te stelen te beclymmen ende voirt alle te doen dat dair an cleeft

In addition to these examples from the prologue, it is also justified to exclude P50 as a potential base text on the basis of a number of examples taken from other chapters (e.g. example 4). Obviously, these minor textual variants only serve to corroborate the decisive argument, which is the presence in the translation of the final chapter (§ 308).

example 4: § 45 (t. 12, p. 171, l. 15): P50 : a hundred times vs. H21, Le3-2: many a time

P50 … je y ay pensé cent fois …

H21, Le3-2 … menich gepeyns up gehadt hebbe …
As shown in example 3, the translator may well have adapted his source by deleting tautologies or summarizing two synonyms in one word. However, the same example shows that in particular instances Gerard Potter also unresistingly adopted the Chroniques’ enumerations. The tripartite ‘prendre (1) et embler (2) et essillier (3)’ has been rendered as ‘te stelen (1), te beclymmen (2) ende voirt alle te doen dat dair an cleeft (3)’. It is tempting to interpret the absence of a tripartite enumeration in B88 and the descendants of α’ as an indication that none of these manuscripts should be identified with the translation’s direct predecessor. A number of other variant readings in the prologue confirm this hypothesis.

example 5: § 1(t. 12, p. 1, l. 9-10) : Bes, P75, P50 Auvergne and Thoulousain ; H21, Le3-2 Auvergne and Thoulousain

\[ B88, P53, \beta, \gamma, \delta \] ...en Gascogne, en Rouergue, en Quersin, en Limosin, en Thoulousain et en Bigorre…

\[ Bes, P75, P50 \] ...en Gascogne, en Rouergue, en Quersin, en Auvergne, en Limosin, en Thoulousain et en Bigorre…

\[ H21, Le3-2 \] … in Gasscongen, in Rouveringen, in Quarsijn, in Overingen, in Lymosijn, in Thoulousanen ende in Bygoiren …

Since P50 and the descendants of α’ have now been dismissed as the translation’s model, five extant manuscripts can be put forward as the potential exemplar: Bes, P475, the latter manuscript’s direct descendant P605, and theoretically also L67 and Cam. As the text of example 5 does not survive in these last two witnesses, it is impossible to exclude them at this stage. Although there is no certainty about the reading of Tor in this passage, its location in the β group suggests that, similar to the other members of that textual family, the toponym ‘Auvergne’ was absent in this manuscript. Out of the remaining manuscripts, a further four can be excluded from the list of possible exemplars on the basis of the passage quoted in example 6.

example 6: § 1 (t. 12, pp. 1-2, l. 16-2) : B88, P75, Cam, P50, α’ Guy of Chastillon, count of Blois, lord of Avesnes and of Beaumont, of Schoonhoven and Gouda vs H21, Le3-2 Guy, count of Blois

\[ B88, P75, Cam, P50, \alpha’ \] Guy de Chastillon, conte de Blois seigneur d’Avenes et de Biaumont, de Schonnehove et de la Geude

\[ 63 \] Although it is quite possible that in this case the translator’s exemplar only contained ‘chasteaulx’ or ‘forteresses’.
The abridged title for Guy of Blois in both Bes and H21 is striking. One might argue that the translator deleted the enumeration of titles on his own initiative and was not influenced his exemplar. However, the apanages of Schoonhoven and Gouda were situated in North-Holland, right in the region where Gerard Potter translated his text. This renders it less plausible that the translator should have omitted these titles intentionally. Indeed, a Dutch author, and by extension also his audience, must have considered the references to the cities of Gouda and Schoonhoven as relevant and interesting. Since the text in Bes does not indicate Guy of Blois’ as ‘lord of Avesnes, Beaumont, Schoonhoven and Gouda’, a plausible explanation for the hiatus in the translation should be looked for in Gerard Potter’s exemplar. Given the additional evidence of examples 7 and 8, it becomes increasingly tempting to identify Bes, or a close but now lost relative, with the manuscript that rested on Gerard Potter’s lectern.

**Example 7:** § 1(t. 12, pp. 2, l. 7-8): B88, P75, Cam, P50, α’ in the future, when I will be dead and wasted away, this high and noble history vs H21, Le3-2 in the future my history

| Bes | Guy, conte de Blois |
| H21, Le3-2 | Gwy, grave van Bloys |

example 8: § 1(t. 12, pp. 2, l. 10-21): B88, Cam, P50, α’ ... and the augmentation of good and also that I – thank God – have the sense and memory and a good recollection of all the things past and a clear and discerning mind to conceive of all the facts of which I may be informed concerning my principal matter, the age, the strength to exercise my body I decided that I would not stay idle and pursue my subject to know the truth of these remote developments, without sending someone other than myself. I have reasonably taken the decision and opportunity to go to the noble prince and renowned lord Gaston, count of Foix...

vs H21, Le3-2 ... to turn to virtue and honesty and practice these things. I wanted to be informed of the distant wars as well as those close by and thus I thought of the noble lord, my lord, the count of Foix...

B88, Cam, P50, α’ ... et augmentacion et endementoieres et que je avoye Dieu mercy sens et memoire et bonne souvenance de toutes les choses passées engin clair et agu pour concepvoir tous les fais dont je pourroie estre informé a ma principal matière touchans eage, corps et membres pour souffrir paine me advisay que je ne voloie mie sejourner de non poursuivir ma matiere et pour savoir la
verité des loingtaines besoignes sans ce que je y envioiasse autre personne que moy pris voie raisonable et occasion raisonnable d’aller devers hault prince et redoubté monseigneur Gascon, conte de Foeis … 64

P475
… et augmentation de bien faire [*****] 65

Bes
… et exemple de bien. Et entretant que je avoie et vouloie sçavoir les longtaines guerres aussi bien comme les prouchainnes m’avisay de tres hault et puissant monseigneur le conte de Foix …

H21, Le3-2
nemen hier inne hem tot duechden ende tot eerlijken zaken te keren ende eeffenen all woudick so wael weten van die verde gheschiede oirlogen also wael als van die hier bij gebuert waren so worde ic deincken upten hogen mogenden here minen here den grave van foys

The omission of the phrase ‘quant je seray mort et pourri’ in example 7 does not provide sufficient grounds to identify the exemplar with Bes. However, the significant reduction in example 8 is all the more convincing, since it is present in none of the other extant text versions. There is no obvious reason (e.g. eye skip) for the scribe to have missed out on this passage. The absence of the passage in H21 and Le3-2 indicates that no other extant manuscript, apart from Bes, may have possibly been the translation’s exemplar.

Based on the evidence presented so far, our analysis of variant readings in the prologue of Book Three concurs with Lieftinck’s observation that Bes very much resembles the extant manuscripts of the translation. The study of the diverging text versions of the extant manuscripts has corroborated the hypothesis that Bes indeed was the manuscript that served as a model for the Middle Dutch translation. Nevertheless, a number of other possibilities remain. In any event, it is plausible that Gerard Potter’s exemplar did not predate the Parisian production of manuscripts of the Chroniques in the second decade of the fifteenth century. Additionally, it seems increasingly likely that the exemplar was produced under the direction of Pierre de Liffol. The above notwithstanding, it does not appear to be possible to exclude the hypothetical descendants of the libraire’s manuscripts as possible exemplars. However, at the current state of research, it seems that only one of De Liffol’s copies was used for further production of manuscripts, i.e. the lost manuscript that has been indicated above as α’. As shown by the variants discussed above, this set of manuscripts, which was probably the exemplar of the manuscripts that were added to the Burgundian library ca. 1444, closely resembled the B88 set and differed

64 The text rendered here is the text of P50. The manuscripts differ, but not in a way relevant to the translation.
65 In P475 text has been lost because the opening miniature has been cut out.
significantly from *Bes*. Therefore the lost sibling α’ and its Burgundian descendants should be excluded as Gerard Potter’s exemplar. Nevertheless, it is possible that:

a) *Bes* served as a model for one or more manuscripts, one of which was consequently used as the translation’s exemplar.

b) *Bes* had other siblings apart from *B88* and α’, which now have been lost. It is possible that one of these lost manuscripts (or one of their lost descendants) was Gerard Potter’s exemplar.

Indeed, as I have indicated above, it is quite likely that not all of the witnesses of Book Three that were produced by De Liffol’s team of scribes and artists have survived. The set *P63-64*, which comprises only Books One and Two, was certainly manufactured under the direction of De Liffol; no corresponding Book Three manuscript exists today. Croenen, Rouse and Rouse have also made a good case for *Sto* and *B52* as a product of the Parisian *libraire*. If these manuscripts or sets ever comprised manuscripts of Book Three, these do not longer exist or have yet to be identified. It is possible that Gerard Potter used one of these hypothetical lost manuscripts for his translation. At this stage of the inquiry, four hypothetical scenarios should be taken into consideration. The manuscript (Y) that Potter used for the translation (trans) could have been *Bes* (a), its direct descendant (b), sibling (c) or ancestor (d).

![Diagram](image)

- fig. 2.5.: Possible filiation between *Bes* and the translation -

2.2.3. *Lectiones singulares in Bes*

Since the study of variant readings in the prologue has ruled out all other extant manuscripts as possible models for the translation, it is no longer useful to compare further Gerard Potter’s text to all textual witnesses in order to identify the exemplar. To corroborate or falsify the hypothesis that *Bes* indeed served as Potter’s exemplar it suffices
to collate the instances in the sample in which *Bes* differs from the other manuscripts with the text of the translation. For these variants to be significant and relevant, they should differ from the readings in the early (Parisian) manuscripts as well as from the variants in the *α’* group. If a reading found in *Bes* can also be found in the early manuscripts but differs from the descendants of *α’,* it is highly probable that the lost *α* manuscript, Pierre de Liffol’s exemplar and the ancestor of *Bes, B88* and *α’,* had the same text. The same is true for readings shared between *Bes* and the *β, γ* and *δ* families that are different from the readings in the early manuscripts. Only real *lectiones singulares,* which are typical of *Bes,* allow us to determine whether or not *Bes* was the exemplar of the translation. In the event that the translation does not correspond to the *Bes* variant but does match the reading of other witnesses (be it early Parisian or Burgundian), it becomes more likely that not *Bes* but rather a manuscript that was closely related to it was Potter’s actual exemplar. It should be noted, however, that for this evidence to be convincing the following conditions should be met:

a) these variants should be located at an accessible point in the text tradition, i.e. a point that can be traced back to the Liffol group without difficulty;
b) there should be no obvious reason to assume that the factor that has caused the variant reading could be easily repeated (e.g. eye skip);
c) in the case of an erroneous reading in *Bes,* but a correct reading in the translation corresponding to the text in other manuscripts, it should not be probable that the translator has formulated the correction without having had access to an exemplar with the correct reading.

2.2.3.1. Case 1: the translation matches the Bes variant

Some of the *lectiones singulares* that have allowed us to identify among the surviving witnesses *Bes* as the sole extant manuscript that may have been the translation’s exemplar have been discussed in our analysis of the prologue of Book Three. Throughout our text sample, other, albeit minor, instances can be found that corroborate the hypothesis.
example 9: § 1 (t. 12, p. 2, l.28-32): \( \alpha' \), early mss\(^{66}\), P50 and as I imagined, it happened to me and I proposed the journey that I wanted to make to the renowned lord, the count of Blois vs. Bes and I proposed the journey to my beloved and renowned lord, my lord the count of Blois vs. \( H21 \), \( Le3-2 \) and I proposed the plan for my journey to the foresaid my beloved the count of Blois’

\( \alpha' \), early mss, P50 … Et tout ainsi comme je le ymaginay il m’en avint et (lors je) (re)monstray ce et le voyage que je voloie faire a mon tres redoubte seigneur le conte de Blois…

Bes …Si remonstray ce voyage a mon treschier redoubte seigneur monseigneur le conte de Blois…

\( H21 \), \( Le3-2 \) …welke mijn upset van dese reyse te doen ic minen voirseide lieven here den grave van Bloys te kennen gaf…

In example 9, the translation and Bes do not mention the realisation of Froissart’s expectations as to his journey to Foix, which in the other manuscripts has been expressed by the phrase ‘Et tout ainsi comme je le ymaginay’. Additionally, the presence of ‘lieven’ (‘beloved’) in the translation can be traced back to the epithet ‘treschier’ in Bes, which does not appear in the other French-language manuscripts.

example 10: § 1 (t. 12, p. 3, l. 9-14): \( \alpha' \), early mss, P50 There I was informed of the larger part of the events that had happened in the kingdom of Castille, of Portugal, of Navarra, of Arragon vs. Bes there I was informed of the larger part of the events that had happened in the kingdom of Castille or the kingdom of Portugal or the kingdom of Navarra or the kingdom of Arragon vs. \( H21 \), \( Le3-2 \) In this place I heard the larger part of the events that had happened in the kingdom of Castille, the kingdom of Portugal, the kingdom of Navarra, the kingdom of Arragon

\( \alpha' \), early mss, P50 … la fu infourmé de la greigneur partie des besongnes qui estoient avenues ou royaume de Castille, de Portingal, de Navarre, d’ Aragon …

Bes … la fu enfourmez de la greigneur partie des besoigne s qui estoient avenues ou royaume de Castille ou royaume de Portingal ou royaume de Navarre ou royaume d’ Arragon …

\( H21 \), \( Le3-2 \) … up welke plaetse ic tmeeste deel van alle die zaken vernam die int concinckrijke van Castilgen of int rijcke van Poirtingael, int rijcke van Navairren, int rijcke van Arragon …

In Froissart’s reference to the provenance of his information as regards the Iberian peninsula, the Dutch manuscripts reflect the repetition of the recurring specifier ‘kingdom’

---

\(^{66}\) In the following the available readings of \( L67 \), \( Cam \), \( P475 \), \( P605 \) are indicated as ‘early mss’.
in the enumeration of principalities in *Bes*, thus corroborating *Bes*’ status as the translation’s exemplar.

The previous examples have all been taken from the prologue. However, variants readings elsewhere in the sample confirm the hypothesis that *Bes* indeed was Gerard Potter’s model. In § 45-47, Froissart recounts the story of Raymond, lord of Coarazze and his invisible messenger, Horton. A few times a week, Horton kept his master abreast of recent global news. Froissart illustrates this with an example. In the night of 1 December 1378, Coarazze’s faithful demon returned from Prague, where two days before Charles IV, emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, had died.

example 11: § 47(t. 12, p. 178, l. 4-5): β, γ, early mss, P50 I come from Prague in Bohemia. The emperor of Rome is dead vs. δ I come from Prague in Bohemia vs. *Bes* I come from Bohemia. The emperor of Rome is dead vs. *H21, Le3-2* I come from Prague in Bohemia. The empress of Rome is dead

β, γ, early mss, P50  Je viens de Praghe en Boësme. L’empereur de Romme est mort…
δ  Je viens de Prage en Boësme…
Bes, L67  Je vieng de Prage en Boësme L’emperiere de Romme est mort…
H21, Le3-2  Ic come van Prage in Bem. Die keyserinne van Romen is doot…

At first sight, the reading in *Bes* does not constitute a variant in meaning, but Gerard Potter’s translation is significant. Apparently, the translator misunderstood *emperiere* (emperor) for ‘empress’ and therefore translated it as the feminine form ‘keyserinne’. It is hard to imagine that Potter would have been confused if his exemplar had contained the variant *emperereur*, as in the other extant manuscripts (except for *L67*). Since none of the other early manuscripts nor the descendants of *α* use the *cas sujet*, which by the end of the fourteenth century had indeed become quite archaic, the correspondence between *Bes* and *L67* is probably due to the scribes’ sense of grammar.

A group of other variants constitute minor adaptations to the text (deletion of short phrases, names, titles). Therefore the resemblance between *Bes* and the translation in examples 12-14 could simply be the result of the translation process. These variant readings have been listed here as additional evidence for our hypothesis.

example 12: § 139 (t. 13, p. 139, l. 1-3): γ, early mss, P50 the count of Angouse, the count of Novarra and the count of Escalles, Galop Ferrant Pertek vs. *Bes* the count of Angouse, the count of Novarra and of Escalles, Galop Ferrant Pertek vs. *H21, Le3-2* the count of Angouse, de count of Novarra, Galop Ferrant Pertek
Froissart’s list of Portuguese barons that have come to Port to greet their young queen as presented in Bes does not refer to the lord of Escalez as a ‘count’. Gerard Potter may well have interpreted the ‘d’Escalez’ – without the proper form of address – as an additional title for the count of Novara and consequently has not recorded it in his translation.

example 13: § 177 (t. 14, p. 3, l. 7-9): $\gamma'$, early mss, P50 the city and castle were his and all that belonged to it because king Charles had given them to him and his heirs vs. Bes the city and castle and all that belonged to them king Charles had given them to him and his heirs vs. H21, Le3-2 because king Charles had given him the city and the castle and all that belonged to it to him and his heirs forever

$\alpha'$, early mss, P50 … car la ville et le chastel sont a luy et toutes les appendances/appartenances car le roy Charles les luy donna a luy et a ses hoirs …
Bes … car la ville, le chastel et toutes les appendances le roy Charles luy donna a luy et a ses hoirs …
H21, Le3-2 … want coninc Kairle hadde hem die stede dat slot ende alle dat dair toebehoirde voir hem ende sinen erven tot ewijgen dagen gegeven …

The resemblance between the variant readings in Bes and the translation could be the result of the paraphrase of this sentence. In the Dutch version two causal subclauses have been combined into one, which may have resulted in the deletion of the phrase ‘sont a luy’ as it did not fit the construction.

example 14: § 306 (t. 15): $\alpha'$, early mss to the count Gaston of Foix vs. Bes to the count of Foix vs. H21, Le3-2 to the count of Foix

$\alpha'$, early mss … devers le conte Gascon de Foéz…
Bes … devers le conte de Foiz…
H21, Le3-2 … anden grave van Fois…

As has been shown in the discussion of the prologue (example 6), Gerard Potter followed the use of names and titles as recorded in his exemplar. Example 14 may provide further evidence for this hypothesis.
In a number of cases the translation reflects readings, which are characteristic of Bes. This seemingly confirms the hypothesis that the latter manuscript was the translation’s exemplar. However, as will be shown in § 2.2.3.2, not all of the lectiones singulares match the variants of the Dutch text.

2.2.3.2. Case 2: the translation does not match the Bes variant

Although the evidence that supports the hypothesis of Bes as Gerard Potter’s exemplar seems convincing, not all of the Bes variants concur with the readings of the Dutch translation. In the following paragraphs, I will discuss a number of instances in which the Dutch text differs from the reading in Bes, but corresponds to the reading of one or more of the other Parisian manuscripts or to a variant of the descendants of α’. Possibly, these examples may indicate that not Bes but another set of manuscripts produced by Pierre de Liffol was the translation’s exemplar.

example 15: § 1 (t. 12 p.1 l. 14-15): α’, early mss and because of this I, sir John Froissart, have dedicated myself to dictate and chronicle this history at the request and contemplation and pleasure of the noble prince and renowned lord vs. Bes and because of this I, sir John Froissart, have dedicated and applied myself to dictate and chronicle this history at the request and contemplation of the noble prince and renowned lord vs. H21, Le3-2 and because of this, I, John Froissart have set and applied myself to compose and write down this history at the request and pleasure of the noble and renowned prince

α’, early mss
Et pour ce je sire Jehan Froissart qui me suy ensoigné de dictier et cronisier ceste hystoire (Bre : de croniquer et mettre par ordre ceste presente histoire) a la requeste et contemplation et plaisance de hault prince et renommé monseigneur…

Bes
Et pour ce je sires Jehans Froissars qui me sui ensoingnez et occupez de dicter et escripre ceste hystoire a la requeste et contemplation de hault prince et renommé messire…

H21, Le3-2
ende om dat ic, Jan Froissart, also ic ic my selven dair omme onledich gemaict ende toe gesait hebbe dese historien te dichten ende te setten ter begeerten ende luste vanden hogen ende vermairden prince

In example 15, the translation repeats the dual construction ‘ensoignez et occupez’ of Bes to describe Froissart’s dedication to his historiographical (‘onledich gemaict ende toe

---

67 E.g. the lost companion volumes of Sto or P63-64, another set that has not survived at all or the hypothetical descendants of one of these manuscripts)
gesait hebbe’). However, the Dutch text does not reflect the Bes variant in ‘a la requeste et contemplation’. Although the translation also has a bipartite enumeration ‘begeerten ende luste’, the denotation of *luste* seems to be cognate to the ‘normal’ variant *plaisance*, which does not appear in the latter manuscript. Nevertheless, this example does not provide a compelling argument to assume that Bes was not the translation’s exemplar. Since the semantic field of ‘begeerte’ (request, also desire) may have triggered the related ‘luste’ (desire, delight), the correspondence to the early manuscripts and the descendants of α’ may have been caused by association.

The following example has been taken from the story of Horton. Having completed his account of the lord of Coarazze and his messenger-demon, Froissart expresses the intention to redirect his attention to recent events in the Languedoc and France.

example 16: § 48 (t. 12 p.181 l. 14-16): α’, early mss and will talk to you about the events in the Languedoc and France vs. Bes and will talk to you about the events in the Langue d’Oïl and France vs. H21, Le3-2 and will return to the events and occurrences of Languedoc and France for a while…

Unlike the other manuscripts, Bes does not refer to the Languedoc but to the Langue d’Oïl. This variant reading is evidently the result of a scribe’s misinterpretation or inadvertance. Again, the correct reading ‘Languedock’ in the translation provides no conclusive evidence that Bes has not been Gerard Potter’s exemplar. After all, it is rather probable that the translator has corrected the nonsensical reading ‘Langue d’Oïl’ and thus arrived at the ‘correct’ variant as present in the other manuscripts.

The following example is slightly more complicated as the witnesses differ in their rendition of Froissart’s text. The passage is absent from Mon. However, the deviation in the Bes manuscript is rather significant.

example 17: § 159 (t. 13 p. 223 l. 25-29): α’, early mss the story has not been corrupted, L67/Bes the story has been corrupted vs. H21, Le3-2 the story has not been corrupted

β …ceste histoire qui n’est pas corrompu pour faveur que j’aye [P59 adds eu] au conte Guy de Bloys…
The reader of the Bes and L67 copies may be surprised to find that Froissart admits to having altered the truth as a token of affection for Guy of Blois, his patron. This reading is obviously incorrect and the result of scribal corruption. In spite of the fact that this manuscript belongs to the second redaction, the variant in P50 may suggest that the scribal error (an eyeskip from ceste histoire to noble histoire) occurred very early in the textual transmission of Book Three. The variant ‘Et ne doubtéz point que j’y aie riens corrompu’ in the closely related manuscripts P475 and P05 emends the error, which is maintained in L67 and Bes. The close relation of the β and γ families is underlined by the way in which the manuscripts in these families deal with the erroneous reading (‘qui pas n’est corrompu’), which suggests that this correction was introduced in α’. The δ family proposes another reading that (coincidentally?) resembles the original reading. Thus it appears that at least three different scribes have independently corrected the same error. Although it may be rash to exclude the possibility that Gerard Potter’s exemplar contained a correct variant, it is plausible that the translator encountered the incorrect reading in his exemplar, questioned it and subsequently formulated a less confusing alternative.

Paragraph 159 deals with the troubles of John of Montfort, duke of Brittany. Froissart asserts that Montfort became duke by ‘conquest and not by heritage’.\textsuperscript{68} In an attempt to subject the duchy’s rebellious cities, John of Montfort appealed to the king of England and his council to supply armed forces.

\textsuperscript{68} Mirot 1931, 222, § 159.
example 18: § 159 (t. 13 p. 225 l. 3-5): $\alpha'$, early mss if the king of England or one of his oncles wanted to come vs. Bes if the king of England or one of his oncles *would come or would want* to come vs. H21, Le3-2 if the king of England or one of his oncles wanted to come on his behalf…

$\alpha'$, early mss: …ou le roy d’Angeleterre ou l’ung de ses oncles vouldroient venir…

Bes: …ou le roy d’Angleterre ou l’un de ses oncles venroyent ou vouldroient venir…

H21, Le3-2: …indien die conine of enich sijnre omen van sijnre wegen [...] comen wouden…

In Bes the reading ‘vouldroient venir’ has been elaborated as a coordinate construction ‘venroyent ou vouldroient venir’. The Middle Dutch translation renders the condition as a simple phrase ‘comen wouden’.

At first sight, the variant in the final example (example 19) is not exclusive to the Bes manuscript. However, the resemblance between Bes and the manuscripts of the $\beta$ and $\gamma$ groups is most probably the result of independent scribal intervention. This is confirmed by the identical reading in the early manuscripts and the witnesses of the $\delta$ family.

example 19: § 177 (t. 14 p. 3 l. 17-19): $\delta$, early mss. Anyone who wants to may ask me how I know these things vs. $\beta$, $\gamma$, Bes Anyone may ask me how I know these things vs. H21, Le3-2 Anyone who wants to may ask me how I know such things

$\delta$, early mss: On me pourroit demander qui vouldroit comment telles choses me viennent a savoir…

$\beta$, $\gamma$: On me pourroit demander comment telles choses me viennent a savoir…

Bes: On me pourroit demander dont telles choses me viennent assavoir…

H21, Le3-2: Nu mochtment my wel vragen die wilde waen my dus […] van dustanyge materien coomt te weten…

In $\beta$, $\gamma$ and Bes the relative clause ‘qui vouldroit’ has been deleted. The presence of ‘die wilde’ in the translation may indicate that it has not been derived from the Bes manuscript but from its immediate ancestor or one of its siblings. Alternatively, the sentence ‘Nu mochtment my wel vragen die wilde’ can also be considered as a set phrase in which the relative clause ‘die wilde’ is a logical supplement to the principal expression ‘Men mocht my wel vragen’. Thus, the resemblance between the translation and the early manuscripts may be coincidental.
2.2.3.3. Conclusions as regards the lectiones singulares inBes, Book Three

It remains difficult to come to a conclusive evaluation of the *lectiones singulares* in Bes. The results of the analysis indicate that mostly the singular readings of Bes are reflected in the translation but at other times they are not. In this respect they do not provide compelling evidence, which would allow us to confidently state that Bes was Gerard Potter’s exemplar. Although not entirely convincing, the cases in which the translation does not concur with Bes give way to alternative scenarios. Nevertheless, it has become even more apparent that – in the event that Bes itself was not the exemplar – the translation’s model must have very closely resembled this particular manuscript. In spite of the fact that to this date no modern *stemma codicum* of Book Two exists, it may be useful to include into the analysis some examples from this part of the *Chroniques*.69 Additional material may clarify the complex situation that has become apparent from the scrutiny of the examples taken from Book Three.

2.2.3.4. Lectiones singulares in Bes, Book Two

In most cases, the variants from Book Two confirm the position of Bes as the translation’s exemplar, even when compared to the other presumed De Liffol manuscripts. When the latter manuscripts give the ‘standard’ reading, the translation usually follows the Bes alternative. In the following examples Base gives the variant that occurs most often in the manuscripts (the ‘standard’ variant). Additionally, the readings of Bes and some other De Liffol manuscripts (B52, P64) have been provided. When the phrasing of a particular manuscript outside of the Liffol group is similar to the version in the translation, its variant reading has been listed as well.

In examples 20-22, which were taken from Book Two (§ 313), the translation clearly reflects the text version given by Bes. Example 20 shows that the translation’s reading ‘so stercke’ not only resembles Bes but also (coincidentally) corresponds to ‘si forte’ in the manuscripts P476 and Dar. In example 21, Bes has replaced the more specific ‘connestables’ by the personal pronoun ‘il’. Accordingly, the Dutch translation reads ‘hij’. More convincing evidence to presume that Bes was used as a model is given by example

---

69 As has been stated above, contrary to the situation of the manuscripts of Book Three, several direct Book Two siblings of Bes survive. I thank G. Croenen for providing me with the collations of SHF Book II, § 313 and § 499.
22. The *Bes* scribe has reformulated the indirect speech of the other manuscripts into direct speech. Gerard Potter has adopted this stylistic adaptation in his translation. Additionally, the translation’s more specific ‘geantwoirt’ (‘answered’) corresponds better to ‘respondi’ in the other manuscripts. However, as translations tend to be more specific this may be the result of the translation process (cf. infra § 4.2.2.).

element 20: § 313: *Bes, P476, Dar* that **strong** vs. that **bad**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Ceste riviere dou Lis est telle et si malle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Bes</em></td>
<td>Ceste riviere du Lis est [del][/del]elle [del][et[/del] <strong>si forte</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>B52</em></td>
<td>Ceste riviere du Lis est telle et sy malle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>P64</em></td>
<td>Ceste riviere du Lys est sy malle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>P476</em></td>
<td>Ceste riviere du Liz est elle <strong>si forte</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dar</em></td>
<td>Ceste riviere du Lis est elle <strong>si forte</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>P04</em></td>
<td>Ceste riviere de la Liis est elle si malle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Le3-1</em></td>
<td>Die riviere van der Leyse <strong>so stercke</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

example 21: § 313: *Bes* he vs. **supreme commander**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Dont demanda li connestables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Bes</em></td>
<td>Dont demanda <strong>il</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>B52</em></td>
<td>Dont demanda le connestable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>P64</em></td>
<td>Dont demanda le connestable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Le3-1</em></td>
<td>Doe vraeghde <strong>hij</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

example 22: § 313: *Bes* Lord, they **said**, it comes from Aire and Saint-Omer vs. They **answered him that** it came from Aire and Saint-Omer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>On li respondi qu’elle venoit de devers Aire et Saint Omer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Bes</em></td>
<td><strong>Sire, dist on, elle vient</strong> de devers Ayre et Saint Omer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>B52</em></td>
<td>On lui respondi qu’elle venoit de devers Aire et Saint Omer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>P64</em></td>
<td>En lui respondy qu’elle venoit de devers Aire et Saint Omer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Le3-1</em></td>
<td><strong>Dair wert geantwoirt here sij comt</strong> hier van omtrent Aryen ende Sint Omers waert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same paragraph provides us with an example in which the translation does not seem to correspond to the *Bes* variant. However, since the use of tautologies characterises Gerard Potter as a translator (cf. § 4.2.1.), the difference between and *Bes* its Middle Dutch counterpart may be the result of the translation process.
CHAPTER TWO

Example 23: § 313: Bes haughty vs. haughty and arrogant

Base: sont bien si orgueilleux et si outrequidiet
Bes: sont bien si orgueilleux
B52: sont bien sy orgueilleux et sy outrecuited
P64: sont bien sy orgueilleux et sy outrecuited
Le3-1: so hoeverdich ende verwaent

Example 24 is very similar. Again, Gerard Potter may have added ‘waire’ as a tautology to ‘bonne’ in the source text. That ‘waire’ also corresponds to ‘vraie’ in P04, a manuscript of Froissart’s Chronique de Flandre, is most probably coincidental.

Example 24: § 499: Bes we will have it investigated thoroughly vs. we will have it investigated thoroughly and truthfully

Base: nous en ferons faire bonne et loyalle information et icelle veue
P357: nous en ferons faire bonne et loyalle informacion
Bes: nous en ferons faire bonne informacion
B52: nous en ferons faire bonne informacion
P64: nous en ferons faire bonne informacion
P58: nous en ferons faire bonne informacion
P04: nous en ferions faire bonne et vraye information
Le3-1: Goede ende waire informacie up doen doen

In example 25, Bes has inverted the word order of the predicates ‘droituriers et naturelz’. However, in the translation, the original word order appears to have been maintained.

Example 25: § 499 Bes natural and rightful souvereigns vs. rightful and natural souvereigns

Base: a ses successeurs roys de France et a noz droituriers et naturelz seigneur
Bes: a ses successeurs roys de France et noz naturelz et droitturiers seigneur
B52: a ses successeurs roys de France et noz droituriers et naturelz seigneur
P64: a ses successeurs roys de France et noz droicturiers et naturelz seigneur
P58: a ses successeurs roys de France et noz droicturiers et naturelz seigneur
Le3-1: sine nacomelingen coningen van Franckrijke als onse overhere ende oic onser natuerlijker heren

Finally, I wish to discuss one example drawn from § 401. After the death of his former patron Wenceslaus of Bohemia, Froissart elaborates on the duke’s virtues. According to the French text, the duke was gentle, noble, beautiful, elegant, wise and well versed in
matters of love. Moreover, after he had passed away, it was said that ‘the highest prince of the best lineage and noble blood had died’. The Middle Dutch translation adds to the above that Wenceslaus was ‘die hoichste bestgespraechste in den hogeduytse’ (that he spoke High-German very well). The duke’s language skills have not been mentioned in any of the extant French-language manuscripts.\textsuperscript{70}

example 26:

\textit{Base: } et, quant il issi de ce siecle, on disoit adont que li plus haus princes et li mieux enlinagês de haut lignage et de noble sang

\textit{Bes: } Et quant il yssy de ce siecle, on disoit adonc que le plus hault prince et le mieulx \textit{<- en langaigiez de haut langaige lign>-} enlignagiéz de hault lignaige et de noble sang

\textit{B52: } Et, quant il yssi de ce siecle, on disoit adonc que le plus hault prince et le mieulx enlanguaigiez, de hault lignage et de noble sang

\textit{P64: } Et quant il yssy de ce siecle, on disoit adoncques que le plus hault prince et le mieulx enlignagiéz de hault lignage et de nobles sangc

\textit{P58: } et, quant il yssy de ce siecle, on disoit adoncques le plus hault prince et le mieulx enlignagiéz de hault lignage et de noble sangc

\textit{Le3-I: } doe hij aflivich wert, \textit{die hoichste bestgespraechste in den hogeduytse}, die edelste van bloede ende machtichste van edelen magen van kersten gelove

The emphasis of the Middle Dutch version on Wenceslaus’s proficiency in High German should probably not be attributed to the widespread reputation of the duke’s linguistic talents. It appears that the Middle Dutch ‘bestgespraechste in den hogeduytse’ should be understood as an attempt of the translator to give a meaningful rendering of a vaguely corrected scribal error in \textit{Bes}. The model of \textit{Bes} and \textit{B52} (the extant De Liffol manuscript that is most closely connected to \textit{Bes}, cf. infra Chapter Three) probably read ‘enlanguaigiez de hault lignage’. To the \textit{B52} scribe, ‘enlanguaigiez’ was a valid alternative for ‘enlignagiéz’ (or he did not notice or care). In \textit{Bes}, however, the scribe seems to have been confused and continued his text along the ‘langage’ (language) line before noticing his mistake. Afterwards, the error was scored out with a very fine line of ink. The presence of a ‘correct’ reading in \textit{B52} (and the other presumed De Liffol copies) suggests that the error was not present in the exemplar Pierre de Liffol used to produce \textit{Bes} and the other manuscripts of Book Two. However tempting it may be to consider this as conclusive evidence to point towards \textit{Bes} as the translation’s exemplar, there is room for alternative scenarios. Maybe De Liffol had more than one model at his disposal, which may explain

\textsuperscript{70} I thank R. Sleiderink for directing my attention to this passage.
the correct reading in the other manuscripts. The error may have been adopted (or even been converted into a plausible reading) in a hypothetical descendant of Bes. In any event, it is probable that Gerard Potter encountered the erroneous reading ‘en langagiéz’ (a verb, something to do with languages) and ‘haulte langaige’ (high language) in his exemplar and subsequently tried to make the most of it. This course of action finally resulted in Wenceslaus’s exceptional knowledge of High German (bestgespraekste in den hogeduylse).

2.2.3.5. Conclusions as regards the lectiones singulares in Bes, Book Two

The additional examples taken from Book Two largely confirm the analysis of Book Three variants as presented in the previous paragraphs. In most cases, the readings in the translation concur with the Bes variants. At other times, the version of the translation corresponds better to the ‘standard’ reading. However, in most of these cases alterations made during the translation process provide a plausible explanation for the difference between the translation and Bes. In this view, the outcome of the analysis of these variants is ambiguous: on the one hand they may suggest that not Bes but a lost sibling manuscript was Gerard Potter’s exemplar, on the other hand, the evidence is not conclusive. The translated scribal error in example 26 makes a strong case for Bes (or a descendant manuscript) as the model of the translation. In any event, as both the translation and Bes often differ from the ‘standard’ reading when other De Liffol manuscripts have the normal variant, it is unlikely that the translation’s exemplar was De Liffol’s lost model (α). Therefore, we can tentatively exclude the hypothetical option (d) of fig. 2.1., which suggested that the translation’s exemplar was Bes’ parent. At the same time, the hypothesis of a lost sibling in option (c) has lost cogency as well.

- fig. 2.6.: Possible filiation between Bes and the translation (revised) -
2.3. Conclusion

At the end of this chapter, a number of possibilities remain: the translation’s exemplar may have been Bes, a daughter manuscript of Bes or – although this has become less likely – one of Bes’ lost siblings.\(^{71}\) In any event, even if the translation’s exemplar was not Bes itself, it now seems reasonable to assume that Gerard Potter’s model did not antedate the Parisian production of the first decades of the fifteenth century. The exemplar or one of its ancestors was produced under the direction of the \textit{libraire} Pierre de Liffol. An important consequence of this observation is that Gerard Potter apparently had no access to an early copy of the \textit{Chroniques}. Nevertheless, some of these first copies of the \textit{Chroniques}, which were produced in the last decade of the fourteenth century, must have been present in Holland or Hainault at the time of translation. Among these lost manuscripts were the presentation copy of Guy of Blois, who resided at Gouda or Schoonhoven, and, since after the death of Guy of Blois Albert of Bavaria and his son William of Ostrevant became Froissart’s presumed patrons, possibly also a set of manuscripts from the library of the counts of Holland and Hainault.\(^{72}\) The analysis of the variant readings has excluded the \(\alpha\)'-copy and all of its descendants. Thus it has become improbable that Gerard Potter used the set of manuscripts that was listed in the inventory of 1467-1469 and probably had been present in the Burgundian library as from circa 1444. Other hypotheses regarding the provenance of Gerard Potter’s exemplar will be discussed in Chapter Three (§ 3.6.).

In the next chapter, I will focus on the subgroup of De Liffol manuscripts. Since this group includes the set of manuscripts that served as the translation’s exemplar (Bes, possibly a lost sibling) or as the prototype of the exemplar (a descendant of Bes or lost sibling), it is unrefutably at the origin of the translation. In a final attempt to verify or falsify the status of Bes or a hypothetical descendant as Gerard Potter’s model, I will analyse the paratexts of a number of the manuscripts produced by this Parisian \textit{libraire}. This analysis will result in an evidence-based view of the production process that was at the basis of De Liffol’s finished manuscripts. A better understanding of Pierre de Liffol’s \textit{modus operandi} will allow us to determine whether or not it is reasonable to hypothesize a lost set of manuscripts, which were siblings of Bes and bore a more than striking resemblance to the latter manuscript.

\(^{71}\) Or, again, one of their descendants.

\(^{72}\) Albert of Bavaria bought ‘deux grans livres de wières de Franche et d’Angletierre’ from the estate of Guy of Blois. (Kervyn 1873, 115-116). Possibly, these volumes contained what now is called Book One and Book Two (Book Three also?) of Froissart’s \textit{Chroniques}.
CHAPTER THREE
A literary work consists, entirely or essentially, of a text, defined (very minimally) as a more or less long sequence of verbal statements that are more or less endowed with significance. But this text is rarely presented in an unadorned state, unreinforced and unaccompanied by a certain number of verbal or other productions, such as an author’s name, a title, a preface, illustrations. And although we do not always know whether these productions are to be regarded as belonging to the text, in any case they surround it and extend it, precisely in order to present it.

(G. Genette 2001, 1)

The ‘tresholds’ in the title of this chapter refers to what G. Genette has indicated as paratexts. In his foreword to the English translation of Genette’s monograph Seuils, R. Macksey comments: ‘Paratexts (…) is (as the French title also tells us) about “thresholds”, the literary and printerly conventions that mediate between the world of publishing and the world of the text’. Among the paratexts discussed by Genette are titles, prefaces and intertitles. As emphasized by the scholar in the epigraph quoted above, it is not always clear whether or not these features belong to the actual text.

A comparative study of the extant manuscripts of most medieval texts that have survived in more than one copy will show that there is some degree of diversity in the paratexts that ‘present’ the text in the respective manuscripts. Some of the codices have been illustrated; others have not. In some of the manuscripts chapters have been introduced by a rubricated title, in other copies these headings are absent. Quite understandably, the study of paratexts such as illustration and rubrication has become a popular topic in the study of medieval texts. In Codex and Context, Keith Busby devotes considerable

---

1 Macksey 1997, XVII. My use of Genette here is slightly anachronistic and should be adapted to a different context, that of manuscript production. In this context, all copies are different, which is not (always) the case in the publishing context Genette is referring to. However, this makes the analysis of paratexts even more useful and interesting.

attention to the paratexts of medieval manuscripts. Having analysed the rubrics in a number of copies with the text of *La vie des pères*, Busby concludes:

> It is almost certain that an exemplar being copied would have had *tituli* [i.e. rubrics] and that these were taken over wholesale in many instances. However, a number of factors could have led to the creation of variants, such as conscious scribal intervention or the tastes of a patron, both of which could slant tales in a particular direction. On a more pragmatic level, it may have been a simple question of space available and the *horror vacui* on the page.

(Busby 2002, 204)

In his study, Busby offers no clear opinion on who precisely formulated the rubrics. From the assertion that ‘the question of reader enticement is (…) crucial to the planners of manuscripts of *La vie des pères*, and especially visible in the formulation of the *tituli* and rubrics’, it appears, however, that he assumes that the rubrics were formulated in the workshops that distributed the manuscripts.\(^3\) It is likely that the process of incorporation of rubrics in the copies of Froissart’s *Chroniques* is in agreement with the situation of *La vie des pères* as described by Busby. In all probability, the earliest copies of the *Chroniques* did not have rubrics and in a recent article, R. and M. Rouse have put forward that the rubrics in the copies manufactured under the direction of Pierre de Liffol were especially designed for his productions.\(^4\)

From the previous chapter, it has become apparent that Gerard Potter’s exemplar probably was a manuscript of the *Chroniques* produced by Pierre de Liffol’s team of scribes and illustrators, possibly *Bes*, a lost sibling of the latter manuscript or a hypothetical manuscript that had been derived of one of these copies.\(^5\) In this respect, it may be useful to compare the paratextual programme of *Bes* with the extant manuscripts of the translation. Indeed, in his analysis of the Dutch and French manuscripts of Froissart’s chronicle, G.I. Lieftinck has indicated the similarities between the pictorial programmes of *Bes* on the one hand and *Le3* and *H21* on the other.\(^6\) If the manuscript used by Gerard

\(^3\) Busby 2002, 201.

\(^4\) Croenen 2009, 36; Rouse and Rouse (forthcoming), 6.

\(^5\) As any hypothetical copy of a manuscript may have been (nearly) identical to its parent and it is hardly feasible to distinguish between intervention by a translator or the scribe of a lost daughter manuscript, the possibility that not a manuscript which was produced by De Liffol (*Bes* or a lost sibling) but one of its descendants was the translation’s exemplar must remain open.

\(^6\) Lieftinck 1962.
Potter was not *Bes* (or a descendant), but another manuscript produced by De Liffol (or one of its daughters), this lost copy must have closely resembled the related *Bes* copy.

The main objective of this chapter is to establish whether or not it is reasonable to assume that Pierre de Liffol may have produced a set of manuscripts of the *Chroniques* that was nearly identical to *Bes* and thus may have been the translation’s exemplar or the model’s ancestor. In order to evaluate the similarities and differences between *Bes* and the translation correctly, it is necessary to establish the similarities and differences in the paratexts of the Liffol manuscripts on the one hand and the similarities and differences between the paratexts of the translation and the manuscripts produced by De Liffol (and *Bes* in particular) on the other.

In the following, I will start with a brief summary of the *status quaestionis* as regards the production of manuscripts by Pierre de Liffol (§3.1.). The chapter will be devoted to the discussion of three kinds of paratexts. First, I will draw attention to the manuscripts’ colophons as they reveal something about the text’s material distribution in sets of one, two or more codices (§ 3.2.). Then, I will discuss the rubrication of the Liffol manuscripts and the translation (§3.3.). Finally, I will focus on the similarities and differences in the pictorial programmes of the Dutch as well as the French-language versions of Froissart’s *Chroniques* (§ 3.4.).

### 3.1. The manuscripts produced by Pierre de Liffol

In their 2002 article, G. Croenen and R. and M. Rouse for the first time connected Pierre de Liffol to a manuscript of Froissart’s chronicle. Up until then, ‘Pierre de Linfol’ (recorded activity between 1410 and 1418) had only been known from an entry in the Burgundian accounts. In 1410, the Parisian *libraire* had delivered a French-language copy of Valerius Maximus’ *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* to John the Fearless, duke of Burgundy.7 An obscured quittance of the same bookseller was discovered on a flyleaf of a manuscript of Book One of Froissart’s *Chroniques* (*P63*). The person who commissioned the manuscript remains unknown (possibly Tanguy du Châtel), but it has been suggested that the dissemination of Froissart’s *Chroniques* by Pierre de Liffol may have been set into motion by Louis II of Anjou.8

---

7 Rouse and Rouse 2000, 112; Croenen, Rouse and Rouse 2002, 263.
8 Croenen, Rouse and Rouse 2002, 279.
Codicological and palaeographical evidence provided by Croenen, Rouse and Rouse suggests that at least two other manuscripts of Book One have been produced under the direction of De Liffol: Sto and Bes. Five other manuscripts of Book One have a frontispiece that is similar to the initial miniature in the core group of three manuscripts of Book One. Four of these additional codices (all except P75) have been decorated by, amongst other artists, the Giac Master or the Boethius Master, artists who were also involved in the production of P64, Bes and Sto. Since 2002, several other manuscripts of Book Two and Three have been attributed to the Parisian libraire and his team of (freelance) scribes and painters. Next to the manuscripts of Book Two belonging to the same sets as P63 and Bes, it is probable that B88, B52 and Rou are equally products of the same workshop. As far as Book Three is concerned, the only extant De Liffol manuscripts are B88 and Bes.

3.2. The translation’s colophon, the exemplar and the material distribution of the text

A colophon concludes each of the extant ‘books’ of the translation. This closing formula refers to the author of the work (Jean Froissart) and thus alludes to the authority of the text. Additionally, the colophon provides the text with an indication of genre, i.e. a chronicle, which should refer to a historiographical and reliable source. Finally, each colophon explicitly mentions the name of the translator: Gerard Potter van der Loo.

In the context of the inquiry into the translation’s exemplar it is interesting that each colophon informs the reader of the specific place of the constituent parts (or physical volumes) in the whole of the text (the first book, the second book, etc.). For instance, the colophon of Le3-1 states that the manuscript contains the ‘first book of the second volume’. This division into books and volumes will be the focus of this section.

Hier nint einde dat eerste boeck vanden anderden volumene heren Jan Froissairts cronyke getranslateert uuten Franssoyse in Duytscher tale bij Gerijt Potter vander Loo

10 See: Ainsworth and Croenen 2007; See also: Croenen 2009b, 14-23; Villela-Petit, 2009; Croenen, Rouse and Rouse 2002 and Croenen’s introductory essay ‘Pierre de Liffol and the Manuscripts of Froissart’s Chronicles’ on the Online Froissart website.
(Here ends the first book of the second volume of sir Jean Froissart’s *Chronicle*, translated from the French into the Dutch language by Gerard Potter vander Loo)

*(Le3-1, fol. 167 r.)*

The colophon of *Le3-2* is partially damaged. Its counterpart in *H21*, however, is complete. The structure of the colophon is very similar to that at the end of *Le3-1* and informs the reader that he has reached the end of the second together with the end of the Fourth Book in Dutch.

Hier nint eynde dat anderde volumene meyster Jan Frossairts cronycke getranslateert uuten Franssoyse in onser Duystscher tongen bij Gerijt Potter vander Loo ende is dat IIII de boeke in Duystsche.

*(H21, fol. 376 v.)*

(Here ends the second volume of master John Froissart’s *Chronicle* translated from the French into the Dutch language by Gerard Potter vander Loo and this is the Fourth Book in Dutch)

It is uncertain whether these colophons were formulated by the translator or should be considered as the work of a later scribe. Similar colophons in the *Bes* codices may indicate that the former was the case.

*Bes 1* (Book One):

Cy fine le premier volume des croniques sire Jehan Froissart

*Bes 2* (Book Two-Three):

Explicit le second volume des croniques maistre Jehan Froissart et le tiers aussi le quel commence en la fin de la guerre de Flanderes et de la chartre de la paix que le duc de Bourgoigne et de la duchesse donnerent, accorderent et seellerent a ceulx de Gand en la cite et ville de Tournay comme maistre Jehan Froissart meismes tesmoigne en ce livre au feuillet CCLXXVIIme et commence le tiers volume au feuillet CCl²
The assertion that the translator formulated these colophons is important for two reasons. Since these colophons offered Gerard Potter an additional opportunity to explicitly come forward as the translator of the *Chroniques*, they may tell us something about Gerard Potter’s intentions.\footnote{Similarly, in the accounts that were copied by Gerard Potter he also explicitly presents himself – contrary to convention – as the scribe. This can also be regarded as a call for recognition (in whatever form) GRRek. 140, fol. 104 v.; GRRek. 142, fol. 109 v. The translator may also have revealed his name in a general prologue in the now lost volumes of Book One of the translation.} In the colophons, the translator could assure that his identity was recorded in each of the constituent volumes and subsequently also in the copies of these codices. As regards to scribal colophons E. Overgaauw has concluded:

In some respects, a scribe adding a colophon at the end of a manuscript he copied can be compared to an actor, who, once the play has ended, appears before his audience to receive acclamation and applause as a reward for his performance. At that very moment, the actor no longer plays his role, but he shows his real face, his own face, although the costume he is wearing is the one of his character in the play.

(E. Overgaauw 1999, 91)

The purpose of Gerard Potter’s colophon may have been very similar: after the completion of his labour, he presents himself as Froissart’s translator, with all the expertise and capacities that pertain to this role. In the context of his translation, he explicitly and confidently comes forward with his achievement, not unlike the actor who takes a bow, ready to reap the potential profits of his performance, which in the case of this translation were probably not limited to ‘acclamation and applause’ but rather included status among his peers and intended audience, quite possibly complemented by advanced professional opportunities.

Additionally, when we return to the division in volumes, it appears that the colophons hold information about the physical characteristics of the translator’s exemplar. Contrary to the colophons in the Dutch manuscripts, the term ‘volume’ in the French colophons explicitly refers to the *Chroniques*’ subdivision into Books. In the Bes set of manuscripts, the first physical unit coincides with the textual unit of Book One (and Book Two, § 1-82, as in all manuscripts of Kervyn’s first redaction, first series, second class). The second physical volume comprises the text of Books Two (§ 83-499) and Three. The situation in the Middle Dutch manuscripts is different. Here, the division into volumes
probably refers to the appearance of the exemplar. Two (physical) French volumes were divided into four (physical) books in Dutch. The prologue of Book Two bears witness to this situation. In a paraphrase of his French source-text, Gerard Potter addresses his readership:

Ghij hebt wael hier voir gehoirt inden anderden boeke des eersten volumens heren Jan Froissarts hoe die heren van Mucident hem keerde ende wert Franssoys

(You have heard before in the second book of the first volume of sir John Froissart how the lord of Mucident defected to the French)

The Lord of Mucident defected to the French after the battle of Yemet on 1 September 1377 (SHF Book II § 8). In the Bes manuscript, this passage is situated towards the end of Book One. Therefore, Gerard Potter’s reference to the event as belonging to the second book of the first volume only makes sense if he divided Book One (complemented with § 1-82 of Book Two) into two more or less equal parts. This results in the following representation of the translation’s textual distribution relative to its French-language original.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French exemplar</th>
<th>Volume One (as Bes 1)</th>
<th>Volume Two (as Bes 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contents: the text of</td>
<td>Book One</td>
<td>Book Two (§ 1-82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Book in Dutch’</td>
<td>Book I</td>
<td>Book II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contents: the translation of</td>
<td>Book One (part 1)</td>
<td>Book One (part 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- the two volume French exemplar vs. the ‘four books in Dutch’ of the translation -

---

12 It is possible that the use of the term *volume* in his exemplar (*Bes* or an other De Liffol manuscript) confused the translator.

13 According to J.W. Muller Muller 1888, (267-268) the ‘Fourth Book’ in the colophon of Book Three should be identified with the ‘second volume’ (= French Book Two and Three). Muller argued that the translator had divided the first volume (=French Book One) into three books. My analysis suggests, however, that it is more likely that Potter divided Book One (= first volume) into two Books, analogous to the textual division in the French text between Book Two and Book Three such as in the second *Bes* volume.
The Dutch division in two volumes thus reflect the content of two physical volumes in French (like the Bes codices), which have been divided in ‘four books in Dutch’. This makes it plausible that the Dutch reference to the ‘eerste volumene’ (volume one) and ‘anderde volumene’ (volume two) should be interpreted as a textual reflection of the exemplar’s distribution of Froissart’s *Chroniques* (Book One to Three) over two separate codices.

The above prompts the question as to why the translator chose to explicitly refer to the physical appearance of his exemplar? It seems fair to assume that Gerard Potter’s (intended) audience should be able to interpret the colophon. Possibly, the French exemplar used by the Middle Dutch translator was known and available to the intended readership. In this respect, the colophons may have functioned as a rough, first concordance of the Middle Dutch translation and the original French version for those who wanted to verify the information in the Middle Dutch text against its French-language original. Additionally, the table of contents, which was probably present in the French exemplar and in at least one of the manuscripts of the Dutch translation, may have provided a more refined instrument of swift data retrieval.

In conclusion it should be noted that the colophons give us another interesting indication as to the exemplar used by Gerard Potter. *Bes* is the only extant two-volume set of manuscripts produced by Pierre De Liffol comprising the text of Books One to Three. The manuscripts *P63* and *Sto*, with the text of Book One, have both been complemented with volumes that only contain the text of Book Two (respectively *P64* and probably *B52*). Although the *B88* fragments once belonged to a set that comprised Books One to Three, it is not entirely certain whether the text was divided over two or three codices. Nevertheless, the Brussels fragments provide further evidence that De Liffol produced other copies with the text of Books One to Three. Therefore, at this point, it would be careless to assume that no other two-volume De Liffol set of Books One to Three ever existed.

---

14 I thank R. Sleiderink and H. Braun for this very useful observation.
15 Croenen 2009a, 415.
16 Gaspar and Lyna conclude that the fragments can be divided into two distinct categories based on the writing, illustration and decoration. The folios of the first category belong to Book One and Book Two. The folios of the second category belong to Book Three (Gaspar and Lyna 1984, 13). These differences in writing and illumination/illustration may suggest that the fragments originally belonged to two separate codices, the second of which comprised only Book Three. However, given the size of a hypothetical combination of Book One and Two it is more likely that the *B88* set was similar to *Bes* or consisted of three manuscripts.
3.3. The rubrication of the Liffol manuscripts

In a recent essay, Richard and Mary Rouse argue that the rubrics in the manuscripts of the *Chroniques* originating from Pierre de Liffol make ‘the products of Pierre de Liffol more visibly distinct, and distinguishable, than ever’. The scholars suggest that the rubrics in Liffol’s copies were designed specifically for those manuscripts. The rubrics in codices manufactured by other *libraires* seemed to be distinctively different from those of the Liffol manuscripts. Additionally, the Rouses put forward the hypothesis that De Liffol’s rubrics were copied onto a list that existed separately from the manuscripts produced by the *libraire*. A version of this list may have been handed down in the tables of contents in the codices of the *Bes* set.

3.3.1. The table of contents

Similar to *Bes*, in *H21* a list of rubrics, which is now incomplete, precedes the text of Book Three. The presence of such a list may suggest that a similar overview was present in the translation’s exemplar. Not unlike *Bes*, the rubrics listed in the table of contents, diverge from the rubrics as they have been recorded in the body of the text.

example 1: rubric 20

*H21 list:* Van hoe wijselijken ende scarpelijken hem die coninc van Poirtingale metten sinen ordyneerden upten berch van Juberoth om tegens den Spanjairden te strijden

*H21:* Van hoe wijselijken ende scarpelijken die coninck van Poirtingale ende sijn volk hem schichten ten strijde upten berch van Juberoth ende hoe dair alle die Fransoysen verslagen worden ende die coninc van Castilgen ter neder getogen alle sijn heer

*Le3-2:* Van hoe wijselijken die coninc van Poirtingale ende sijn volk hem schichten ten strijde upten berch van Juberot ende hoe dair alle die Fransoysen verslagen worden ende die coninc van Castilgen ter neder getogen alle sijn heer

---

17 The transcriptions of the rubrics of *Sto, B88, Bes* (Book One and Book Three) were provided by G. Croenen. The rubrics of *Bes* (Book Two) were transcribed by H. Miller. I wish to thank them for their generosity in sharing their transcriptions.

18 Rouse and Rouse (forthcoming), 6.

19 The first two folios of the list (rubrics 1-19) have been lost.

20 This number is based on the number of rubrics in the *Bes* manuscript.
In the example above, the rubric in the body of the manuscript differs substantially from the rubric in the list. A close comparison of the rubrics in the list of the The Hague manuscript \textit{H21} on the one hand and the rubrics in the text of \textit{H21} and its Leyden counterpart \textit{Le3-2} on the other shows that substantial differences mainly occur before rubric 46 (‘Hoe die coninc van Armenyen over reysde in Engeland,…’).

\textit{Bes list}: Comment le roy de Portingal et les siens s’ordonnerent saigement pour bataillier sur le mont de Jubert et comment les François furent deconfliz et le roy d’Espaigne et tout son ost mors desconfis

\textit{Bes}: Comment le roy de Portingal et les siens s’ordonnerrent sagement pour bataillier sus le mont de Jubert et comment les François furent occis et le roy d’Espaigne et tout son ost desconfis

The differences between the list in \textit{Bes} and the rubrics in the body of the manuscript do not provide an explanation for the differences between the rubrics in the list in \textit{H21} and the rubrics in the text. In general, as far as Book Three is concerned, the rubrics in the text of \textit{Bes} concur with the rubrics in the list. Nevertheless, there are some instances where the rubrics in the body of the text and the list of rubrics in \textit{H21} correspond to the rubrics in the text of \textit{Bes} and not to the list of rubrics.

example 2: rubric 13

\textit{Bes list}: Des grans biens et largesces qui estoient ou conte de Foix et la piteuse maniere de la mort de Gaston, filz au conte de Foix \textit{que le pere fist mourir.}

\textit{Bes}: Des grans bien et largeces qui estoient ou conte de Foix et la piteuse maniere de la mort de Gaston, filz au conte de Foix.

\textit{H21}: Vander grote duechde ende mildicheden die inden grave van Fois waren ende vander jammerlijkær maniere des doots van Gascon sinen enygen zone.

\textit{Le3-2}: Vander grote duechde ende mildicheden die inden grave van Foys waren ende vander jammerlījker maniere des doots van Gasscon sinen enyghen zone.
example 3: rubric 62

Bes list: Comment lettres furent escriptes a la voulinté du duc que le connestable lui rendoit ses villes et chasteaulx a lui et a ses hoirs a toujours maiz et comment lesdittes ville et chasteaulx furent livré aux gens du duc.

Bes : Comment lettres furent escriptes a la voulinté du duc que le connestable lui rendoit ses villes et chasteaulx a luy et a ses hoirs a tousjours et a jamaiiz et comment on exploitta tant que ces dittes ville et chasteaulx furent livré aux gens du duc.

H21 list: Hoe die brieve nades hertogen sinne van Bertangen gescreven ende gemaict worden dair hem die connestabel sine stede ende III slote voir hem ende sine erven mede overghaf tot ewygen dagen ende hoe men so vele dede dat dese stede ende III slote in handen vandes hertogen luden gestelt worden.

H21: Hoe die brieve nades hertogen sinne van Bertangen gescreven ende ghemaict worden dair hem die connestabel sine stede ende III slote voir hem ende sine erven mede overghaf tot ewygen daghen ende hoe men so vele dede dat dese stede ende drie slote in handen vandes hertogen luden gestelt worden ende des connestabels luden dair uut.

Le3-2: Hoe die brieve nades hertogen sinne van Bertangen gescreven ende ghemaict worden dair hem die connestabel sine stede ende drie slote voir hem ende sine erven mede over gaf tot ewygen daghen ende hoe men so vele dede dat dese stede ende drie slote in handen vandes hertogen luden gestelt worden ende des connestabels luden dair uut.

It is noteworthy that apparently not the list of rubrics, but the rubrics in the text have served as a model for the translation of the headings in the text as well as for the chapter titles as registered in the table of contents. This suggests that the list of rubrics as present in \textit{H21} was compiled from the rubrics in the text. Given that a similar list probably also preceded the text in the exemplar, to a modern audience, this mode of operation may seem rather laborious. Nevertheless, it is not at all implausible that, although a table of contents was indeed present in the exemplar, the rubrics were still drawn from the text. Conceivably, Gerard Potter did not translate the list. In the event that end users wanted a table of contents for reference purposes, a Middle Dutch version of the list of rubrics was not available to scribes producing additional copies of the text. Therefore they had to turn
to the rubrics in the text in order to compile such a reference tool. In most cases, the collation of the rubrics confirms this hypothesis. However, there are also instances contradicting the course of events as described above.

Example 4: Rubric 103

**H21 List:**
Hoe de coninc van Castilgen sine ambassiaten zandt anden hertoge van Lanclaster binnen der stadt van Bayoene om dair metten hertoge te dadingen een huwelick twisschen des coninx zone ende des hertogen dochter ende hoe tot verzoekte ende begeerte des hertogen van Berrijs ene vrede gemaict wert enen tijt geduerende twisschen den hertoge van Lanclaster ende die landen van Thoulousaen ende Roveringen totter rivier vanden Loire toe.

**H21:**
Hoe die coninc van Castilgen sine ambassiaten zandt anden hertoge van Lanclaster binnen der stadt van Bayoene om dair metten hertoge te dadingen een huwelick twisschen des coninx zone ende des hertogen dochter ende hoe tot verzoekte ende begeerte des hertogen van Berrijs ene vrede gemaict wert enen tijt geduerende twisschen den hertoge van Lanclaster ende die landen van Thoulousaen ende Roeveringen.

**Bes List:**
Comment le roy de Castille envoya ses ambaxadeurs devers le duc de Lancastre pour trairier du mariaige de son filz a la fille dudit duc Et comment par la requeste du duc de Berry une trieve fut prise entre le duc de Lancastre en Thoulousain et Rouerge jusques a la riviere de Loire.

**Bes:**
Comment le roy de Castille envoya ses ambaxadeurs devers le duc de Lancastre pour trairier du mariaige de son filz a la fille duc duc dessus dit et comment une trieve fut prinse entre le duc de Lancastre a la requeste duc de Berrye en Thoulousain et Rouerger jusques a la riviere de Loire.

The version of rubric 103 in the table of contents of **H21** is more informative than its counterpart in the body of text. This would not have been problematic, were it not that the addition ‘totter rivier vanden Loire toe’ concurs with ‘jusques a la riviere de la Loire’ in the rubrics of both **Bes** and **Bes List**. Seemingly, this contradicts the hypothesis that the table of contents as present in **H21** has been compiled from the rubrics in the body of text of that manuscript.

This puzzling situation can be explained in two ways. A possible hypothesis is that one of the predecessors of **H21** also read ‘totter rivier vanden Loire toe’ in the body of the
text. This version consequently was copied onto a list of rubrics that served as the exemplar for the list in \textit{H21}. For reasons of space the reference to the Loire was deleted in the text of (one of the ancestors of) \textit{H21}.

Alternatively, one could argue that not \textit{Bes} but another manuscript (with a list of rubrics) was the translation’s exemplar. In this case, the translation process of the rubrics may have been more straightforward: Gerard Potter translated both the list and the rubrics in the body of the text separately. This mode of operation would also account for the discrepancy between the list and the rubrics in the text of \textit{H21}. In this event, the striking differences between the list and the rubrics in the text up to rubric 46 should be explained by the process of rubrication as suggested by the Rouses: the list and the rubrics in the text were transcribed independently by the Liffol scribes, which caused differences between both sets. When the original text was translated, the discrepancy between the list and the rubrics in the body of the French-language exemplar was reflected in the Middle Dutch manuscripts.

3.3.2. The text-division of Book Three: \textit{Bes} vs. the translation

The Middle Dutch version of Book Three of the \textit{Chroniques} as it is contained in \textit{Le3-2} and \textit{H21} is divided into 127 sections. Each of these chapters is preceded by a rubric and indicated by a large initial. The number of rubrics in \textit{Bes} amounts to 128, each of which (leaving aside rubric 21 in \textit{Bes} which in fact is redundant) is situated at precisely the same points in the text as in Gerard Potter’s translation.\textsuperscript{21} With the exception of rubrics 20-46 as recorded in the list of rubrics in \textit{H21}, the rubrics of the translation resemble the rubrics of \textit{Bes} rather closely. Nevertheless, in a number of rubrics, some degree of variation between the translation and the rubrics in the text of \textit{Bes} may be observed.

In most cases, these differences can be attributed to the translation process. Indeed, it was not uncommon for medieval translators to render the information from the source

\textsuperscript{21} In his article on the textual filiation of manuscripts of Book Three, G. Croenen formulated the hypothesis that the lost ancestor of the later Burgundian manuscripts probably divided the text of Book Three in 115 sections that were preceded by a rubricated title. (Croenen 2008, 39) In this article Croenen identifies the lost ancestor with \textit{B88}. However, the collation of the manuscripts of Book Two suggested that not \textit{B88} but a sibling (in this study indicated as \(\alpha\)) was the lost prototype of these manuscript copies. In view of the opinion articulated by Richard and Mary Rouse that the rubrics are a characteristic feature of the Pierre de Liffol manuscripts, this reduced set of rubrics may indicate that the model of the Burgundian manuscripts was not produced by the Parisian \textit{libraire}. The fragmentary witness \textit{B88}, the manuscript that was most similar to the lost common ancestor, may provide an answer to this question. As far as Book Three is concerned, seven rubrics survive. Five of these closely correspond to the rubrics in \textit{Bes}. This may indicate that \textit{B88} and its lost sibling were indeed De Liffol products. See also: Chapter Three, note 28.
text in a more condense form (which leads to shortening) or to rephrase the original message more explicitly. More complex differences that involve rethinking the information provided in the rubric may just suggest the use of a different exemplar altogether; nevertheless, these alterations may also be the result of the translator’s engagement with the text.

Frequently, the rubrics in the translation are shorter than the rubrics in Bes. This could be the result of an intervention by the translator as well as a scribe (cf. infra 3.3.3.).

example 5: rubric 17

Bes : Comment un nommé Lymosin se rendi françois, et comment il fist prendre Loïs Raimbaut pour la villenie qu’il lui avoit faicte a Brude.

H21 : Hoe een genoemt Lymosijn omme ghinck ende wert Fransois ende hoe hi Lodewije Rambaut dede vangen onder smadichede willen die hij hem gedaen hadde.

In other instances, the rubrics in the Middle Dutch version are more explicit (example 6) or give a paraphrase of the French text (example 7).

example 6: rubric 57

Bes : Comment messire Guillaume de Lingnach et messire Gaultier de Passac vindrent a l’ayde du roy de Castille et comment ilz eurent conseil le roy et eulx comment ilz se maintenoient.

H21 : Hoe here Willem van Lignaets ende here Gautier van Passack bijden coninck van Castilgen met volk ende lude van wapene hem te baten quamen ende hoe die coninc hem met desen Franssoysen beriet hoe hij sine zaken ende oirloge anzetten soude

example 7: rubric 43

Bes : Comment le duc de Lancastre et la duchesce se tenoyent a Saint Jaques en Gallice, qui oyoient souvent nouvelles du mareschal de l’ost comment tout le paÿs se rendoit a luy, et aussi du roy de Portingal, et le roy de Portingal du duc de Lancastre.

H21 : Hoe hem die hertoge ende hertoghinne van Lanclaster binnen der stede van Sinte Jacobs hilden ende verhoiden dicwijle tijdingen van sinen mairschalk ende sijn ruyteren hoe sij alle tiant tot sijnre onderdanichede brochten ende oic vanden coninc van poirtingale ende hij weder van hem.
In other cases the differences between the translation and the rubrics in the Bes manuscript are not as straightforward. Although very similar to their French-language counterparts, rubrics 25-26 are also substantially different.

example 8: rubric 25 & 26

**Bes 25**: Comment le roy de Chippre fu tué et murtre en son lit par son propre frere par l'enortement et corrupcion des mescreans, pour la bonté et la hardieze qui estoit ou roy.

**Bes 26**: Comment le roy d'Ermenie fu examiné, et comment XXX Turs furent mors et desconfiz ou royaume de Honguerie.

**H21 25**: Hoe die coninc van Armenyen in Franckrijke quam verdreven wesende vanden Tartaren. Hoe die coninc van Sypers gemoirt wert van sijns selfs broeder ende hoe nairnstelijck die coninc van Armenyen vanden Franssen heren geexamyneert wert.

**H21 26**: Hoe die grote turck Lamorachbakijn sijn ambassiatoirs zant anden kersten grave van Nazara om van hem geobediert te wesen ende passaidge doir sijn landt te hebben om Ongeryen te beoirlygen

Rubric 25 in Bes does not mention the arrival of Leo VI of Lusignan, the king of Armenia. Nevertheless, the chapter begins: ‘En ce temps vindrent autres nouvelles en France, car le roy Lion d'Ermenie y vint, non pas en trop grant arroy mais aussi comme un roy enchaciez et boutez hors de son païs.’ 22 Additionally, the Middle Dutch version of rubric 25 anticipates the questioning of the Armenian king at the end of the chapter. 23 In Bes, the interrogation is mentioned in rubric 26, but in fact, at the start of this chapter, the report of Leo of Lusignan has already reached the point where sultan Murad I decides to invade Hungary. The rubric of the translation expands the partial description of the French rubric and thus – contrary to the rubric in Bes – covers the chapter’s full content. However, the rubric in the translation also omits information. The translation does not mention that infidels had encouraged the brothers of Peter I of Cyprus to assist in his assassination because of the king’s ‘kind and courageous spirit’. Possibly, if this additional information had been included, the Middle Dutch rubric would have become too lengthy.

---

22 Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 327.
23 Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 332-338.
Additionally, the Middle Dutch version of rubric 26 renders the chapter’s contents more accurately than its French-language counterpart. According to the Dutch translation, the negotiations with the ‘count of Nazara’ are the chapter’s focal point. The rubric in Bes claims that the chapter describes the sultan’s campaign of conquest as related by Leo of Lusignan. However, for the actual defeat of Murad I in Hungary, which is referred to in the French version of rubric 26, the reader should turn to chapter 27. The later manuscripts (e.g. PA89) have the same confusing reading as Bes. This suggests that the rubrics in the Burgundian manuscripts’ lost common ancestor (α’) must have been very similar to those in Bes. In turn, this may indicate that the confusing situation originated from Pierre de Liffol’s model.

It is probable that Gerard Potter has made an attempt to clarify the confused structure of his exemplar. On the other hand, it is still possible that the small alterations in the translation described at the beginning of this section and the case study discussed above are not the result of the translation process. Although the distribution of variants suggests that the tangle of rubrics 25 and 26 was also present in Pierre de Liffol’s model (and thus in its descendants), the reading in Gerard Potter’s exemplar may already have been corrected along the lines of the adjustments that are present in the translation. At this point, the differences between the rubrics of the translation and those in Bes provide no conclusive evidence to support either the hypothesis that Bes or a hypothetical manuscript that was derived from it was Gerard Potter’s exemplar or that he used a very similar and closely related sibling manuscript or one of its derivatives. Indeed, through lack of proper material for comparison, it is very difficult to determine what exactly the translator did encounter in his exemplar of Book Three, if indeed this manuscript was not Bes. For Books One and Two the situation is more promising. A comparison of the translation with Bes and the other manuscripts of the Liffol cooperative, may clarify the situation.

3.3.3. The text-division of Book Two: Bes, B52, Rou and P64 vs. Le3-1

Five extant manuscripts of Book Two were probably produced by a group of scribes and artists directed by Pierre de Liffol: B88, Bes, B52, Rou and P64. R. and M. Rouse have put forward that the rubrics in the Liffol copies of the Chroniques are nearly identical.

24 P. Ainsworth identifies the count of Nazara with the Serbian prince Lazar Hreblianovic. Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 339.
25 Only in Bre, the heavily adapted copy of Anthony, the Great Bastard of Burgundy, the scribe has attempted to clarify the situation.
However, a detailed analysis of the rubrication shows that the manuscripts mutually display some degree of divergence. An analysis of the similarities and differences between the rubrics of four of these closely related copies of Book Two will shed light on the matter. This will result in

(1) a better view of the mutual relations between these manuscripts.
(2) an overview of the differences which may occur in the paratexts of manuscripts that were produced by the same collaborative of scribes and artists.
(3) a better understanding of the differences between the rubrics of the translation and the rubrics of Bes. (cf. 3.2.1 and 3.2.2.)

One of the main objectives of this section is to determine whether the divergence between Bes and the translation is the result of the translation process or if the differences should be rather explained by the production process of the Liffol manuscripts. In the former case, Bes (or a hypothetical daughter) should be regarded as the translation’s model. In the latter, it is more probable that another lost De Liffol copy of the *Chroniques* or one of its descendants was Gerard Potter’s exemplar.

When compared to each other, the rubrics of these four copies of Book Two yield some interesting insights into the filiation of the Liffol manuscripts. Although R. and M. Rouse have observed that the rubrics in Book One are ‘nearly identical’, a more detailed analysis, which also takes into account the rubrics of Book Two and Three, suggests that their conclusions should be nuanced. Indeed, the rubrics in these manuscripts differ in a number of ways: rubrics have been lengthened, shortened and/or paraphrased. Additionally, as will become apparent from examples 9-15, in a number of cases the variants in the manuscripts are not distributed as *lectiones singulares* but the readings in the four extant manuscripts diverge in pairs.

example 9: rubric 24

*Bes:* Comment les Angloys vindrent devant Troyes et des bastides que le duc de Bourgoingne fist faire au dehors de Troyes pour resister aux Anglois et *comment un Anglois entre es bailles.*

---

26 The evidence (one rubric) that survives from B88 is too insignificant to include in the analysis.
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B52: Comment les Anglois vindrent devant Troyes et des bastides que le duc de Bourgoingne fist faire au dehors de Troyes pour resister et contrexter aux Anglois et comment un Anglois entra es bailles.

P64: Comment les Anglois vindrent devant Troyes et des bastides que le duc de Bourgoingne fist faire au dehors de Troyes pour resister aux Anglois.

Rou: Comment les Anglois vinrent devant Troyes et des bastides que le duc de Bourgoigne fist faire au dehors pour resister aux Angloys.

Le3-I: Hoe die Engelsen voir Troyes quamen ende hoe die hertoge van Bourgongen dair buyten der stad een groit blochuys hadde doen maken om aldair de Engelsen te wederstaen ende hoe dair een Engels binnen die bailge quam.

Example 10: rubric 97

Bes: Comment le duc Fedric de Baviere arriva en l'ost du roy de France et comment le conte Guy de Bloys a tout ses gens d'armes vint a Arras et comment l'avant garde du roy prinst la ville de Cassel et le chastel de Tringhem.

B52: Comment le duc Fedric de Baviere arriva en l'ost du roy de France et comment le conte Guy de Bloys a tout ses gens d'armes vint a Arras et comment l'avant garde du roy prinst la ville de Cassel et le chastel de Tringhem.

P64: Comment le duc Fedric de Baviere arriva en l'ost du roy de France et comment le conte Guy de Bloys a tout ses gens d'armes vint a Arras et de l'avant garde du roy prinst Cassel.

Rou: Comment le duc de Frederic de Baviere arriva en l’ost du roy de France Et comment le conte Guy de Blois vint a Arras et de l’avant garde du roy qui print Cassel.

Le3-I: Hoe hertoge Frederick van Beyeren indes coninx heer van Franckrijck quam te dienste des gelijcx hoe grave Gwy van Bloys met sinen volke van wapene tAtrecht quam ende hoe des coninx voigairde Cassele wan.

Examples 9 and 10 demonstrate that whereas the rubrics in Bes and B52 are long, the rubrics in both Rou and P64 have a shorter version. In both cases, the Middle Dutch translation concurs with the rubrics of Bes and B52. This remarkable distribution of variants could be the result of common scribal practice (the lengthening and shortening of rubrics). However, identical variant readings offered by the rubrics of Bes and B52 on the
one hand and Rou and P64 on the other (example 10) suggest otherwise. Similarly, in examples 11 and 12, variants within the rubrics occur in pairs: Bes-B52 and P64-Rou.

Example 11: rubric 18

Bes : Comment les Flamens furent guerroyés par les nobles du conte de Flandres, et de la mort de messire Bertran du Guesclin, conestable de France.

B52 : Comment les Flamens furent gueroiéz par les nobles du conte de Flandres, et de la mort de messire Bertran du Guesclin, conestable de France.

P64 : Comment les Flamens furent guerroyéz par les nobles de Flandres, et la mort de messire Bertran de Claiquin, conestable de France.

Rou : Comment les Flamens furent guerriéz par les nobles de Flandres, et de la mort messire Bertran de Claiquin, conestable de France.

Le3-1 : Hoe die van Gendt ende hoer vreenden vanden ed elen mannen uut Vlaenderen die metten grave toe waren gequelle waren an allen zijden ende vander doot heren Bortrams van Gleskijn, cognestabel van Franckrijck.

Example 12: rubric 26

Bes: Comment les Anglois chevauchoient et pilloient tout le païs de Beausse et de Gastinoys, et aussi comment ung escuier du païs requsit ung Anglois de jouster moult vaillamment.

B52: Comment les Anglois chevauchoient et pilloient tout le païs de Beausse et de Gastinois, et aussi comment un escuier du païs requsit un Anglois et de faire fait d’armes.

P64: Comment les Anglois chevauchoient et pilloient tout le païs de Gastinois et de Beausse, Et comment un escuier francois requsit ung Anglois de jouster moult vaillamment.

Rou: Comment les Anglois chevauchoient et pilloient tout le païs de Gastinois, et comment ung escuier françoys requsit ung escuier angloys de jouste moult vaillamment.

Le3-1: Hoe die Engelse doir lant tlant van Biausse reden ende also heel verdorven ende schendent ende oic doir lant van Gastinoys Ende hoe dar een joncker uutien lande enen Engelsen vromelijken uut daeghde om feyte van wapene te doen.
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Even more convincing evidence of this production in pairs, is provided by the presence of a particular rubric in two of the extant manuscripts, which is absent in the remaining copies (examples 13 – 15).

example 13: rubric 21

Bes: Comment le sire de Saint Py et le sire de Fransures poursuoioint les Angloys, et comment les Angloys se contenoient saigement sur le païs.

B52: Comment le sire de Saint Py et le sire de Fransures poursuivoient les Anglois, et comment ilz se contenoient saigement sus le païs.

P64: no rubric

Rou: no rubric

Le3-1: Hoe die here van Sainpy Fansures den Engelsen van afteren an volligh ende hoe wijselijken hem die Engelsen int velt hoirs weeghs altijt duer rijdende regieren ende hebben conden.

example 14: rubric 25

Bes: De l'escarmousche que les Anglois firent devant Troyes et comment ilz partirent du païs, et des lettres que le roy de France envoya a ceulx de Nantes en Bretaigne et ot bonne response.

B52: De l'escarmousche que les Angloys firent devant Troyes et comment ilz partirent du païs, et des lectres que le roy de France envoia a ceulx de Nantes en Bretaigne et de la response qu’ilz firent au roy.

P64: no rubric

Rou: no rubric

Le3-1: Vanden schermutsingen die die Engelse voir Troyes hadden ende hoe sij van dair schieden Ende vanden brien die die coninc van Franckrijcke screef en die stadt van Nantes in Bertangen ende vander goeden antwoirde.
example 15:

*Bes*:
No rubric

*B52*:
No rubric

*P64*:
Comment les Flamens furent desconfis en la bataille de Rosebecque

*Rou*:
Comment les Flamens furent desconfiz en la (...)

*Le3-1*:
No rubric

Two rubrics (examples 13 and 14) in *Bes* and *B52* do not appear in *P64* and *Rou*. The opposite is the case in example 15, where the rubric accompanying SHF II § 340 in *P64* and *Rou* is not present in *Bes* and *B52*. It is noteworthy that in the latter manuscripts the previous paragraph (SHF II § 339) has been introduced by a rubricated title and an illustration. In *P64* a miniature illustrates the events of SHF II § 340. It is very likely that the additional rubric in *P64* and *Rou* was intended as a caption for the illustration.²⁷

In a number of cases the situation is even more complicated: the reading offered by *P64* and *Rou* is similar whereas the rubrics of *Bes* and *B52* differ from the former manuscripts as well as from each other. It is noteworthy that in these cases (cf. example 16) the Middle Dutch translation follows the version as presented by *Bes*.

example 16: rubric 44

*Bes*:
Comment le roy d’Angleterre ala au dehors de Londres en la place que on dit la Milliende pour ouyr les requestes des menuz communes dessus dittes et lesquelles il leur accorda.

*B52*:
Comment le roy d’Angleterre contente le commun de parolle et de promesses et comment le dit commun fut bout hors de Londres et des mauvaises pugnis.

*P64*:
Comment le roy et les nobles furent en grant peril destre destrouis et commens les rebelle furent pugniz et renvoyees en leur maison

*Rou*:
Comment le roy d’Angleterre et les nobles furent en grant peril d’estre desconfiz et destruiz et comment les rebelles furent pugniz et renvoiéz en leurs païs et en leurs maisons.

²⁷ In *Rou* the miniature has been removed.
Examples 9-16 show that, in spite of the striking similarities between the rubrics in the surviving De Liffol manuscripts, the copies also differ in a number of ways. Some of these differences are rather basic and can be considered as common scribal practice.

(1) Rubrics get shortened or lengthened at the end (examples 9 and 10).

(2) In some of the manuscripts rubrics are more explicit (example 11).

(3) Changes in word order occur (example 12).

However, sometimes the rubrics in the Liffol manuscripts differ in a more fundamental way.

(4) Rubrics are added (e.g. as a caption for a miniature) or deleted (examples 13-15).

(5) Rubrics are paraphrased or formulated differently altogether (example 16 and example 17 below).

These observations are also valid for the Liffol manuscripts of Book One and Book Three, the fragments of $B88$ included.\(^{28}\)

In the manuscripts of Book Two, variants belonging to all of these categories occur ‘in pairs’. Concurring variant readings appear in $Bes$ and $B52$ on the one hand and in $P64$ and $Rou$ on the other. This observation suggests that the four extant copies – as far as the rubrication is concerned – have not been derived from a common ancestor. The distribution

---

\(^{28}\) The rubrics in the Liffol copies of Book One show a similar pattern of divergence. In general $Bes$ and $Sto$ concur to a considerable extent. In a number of cases the rubrics in $Bes$ are longer (1 and 2). Compared to $Bes$, a small number of rubrics seem to be missing from $Sto$ and $P63$ (4). In a rather large number of instances, $P63$ offers a paraphrase of $Bes$ or $Sto$ or is formulated differently (5). Another interesting feature of the rubrics in $P63$ is that the chapters between folios 316 v. and 336 r. have been divided into two minor divisions. Each of these subdivisions has a rubric of its own. The first part is preceded by the first half of the rubric as it is found in $Bes$ and $Sto$; the second part is introduced by the second half of that rubric. After SHF § 666 something noteworthy happens to the rubrics of $Sto$, $Bes$ and $P63$. From this point onwards, the titles differ to a great extent and it is hardly possible to detect any relation whatsoever between the rubrics of the three manuscripts. The readings of $Sto$ and $Bes$ join up after nine rubrics, $P63$ catches up after 16 rubrics, which corresponds to 14 rubrics in $Sto$ and $Bes$. This divergence is quite significant, especially as it begins at exactly the same point in the three manuscripts. It is possible that the model of the rubrics had been damaged or rendered illegible at this point in the text. Finally, the resemblance between $P63$ and $B88$ is remarkable. Both manuscripts have additional rubrics serving as captions for illustrations that do not appear in $Bes$ and $Sto$. This resemblance between $P63$ and $B88$ in its combination of rubrics and illustration makes it very likely that $B88$ was a product of the Liffol cooperative.
of variant readings can be explained in a number of ways. One of the manuscripts produced by De Liffol may have served as a model for (one of the) other manuscripts. A second possibility implies that De Liffol distributed a number of affiliated copies (of the rubrics) among the scribes in his workshop. Possibly, in time, the *libraire* had a number of full copies at his disposal that could be used for transcription. In any event, the first option, which suggests that one of the extant manuscripts served as an exemplar, is contradicted by the variant readings in the sets of rubrics. Each copy has singular readings in its rubrication, where the other three manuscripts concur. This distribution of variant readings renders it highly improbable that the rubrics in one of the surviving manuscripts have served as a model for one of the other copies.

The rubrics of the translation bear a strong resemblance to the rubrics of *Bes*. This is demonstrated by example 16. In this example, Gerard Potter’s translation corresponds closely to the singular reading in *Bes*. A similar case is presented in example 17. Only the rubric in *Bes* summarises the chapter as ‘This chapter describes the way in which the English drowned at sea on their way to Brittany and the great English expedition that invaded France afterwards’. The difference between formulation in *B52* and *Bes* may be explained by the presence of an illustration in the latter manuscript. In *Bes*, the rubric has been adjusted to the scene that has been portrayed in the miniature. The translation renders the rubric of *Bes* rather faithfully.

example 17: rubric 19

*Bes*: Cy parle des Anglois qui firent noyés en la mer en venant en Bretaigne et de la grosse chevauchee d’Angloys qui entra en France apres.

*B52*: Comment ceulx qui venoient au secours du duc de Bretaigne de par le roy d’Angleterre furent perilz par fortune et comment le conte de Bouquighen passa la mer.

*P64*: Du conte de Bouqueghen qui passa parmi le royaume de France pour aler en Bretaigne.

*Rou*: Du conte de Bouquinghen qui passa parmy le royaume de France pour aller en Bretaigne.

---

29 As the ‘divergence in pairs’ also occurs in the text of the manuscripts, it is probable that these conclusions are not limited to the rubrication.

30 E.g. *Rou*: rubric 2, rubric 9; *P64*: rubric 55; rubric 63, rubric 86; *Bes*: rubric 3, rubric 9, rubric 20; *B52*: rubric 23, rubric 24, rubric 26.
The unusual phrasing of rubric 19 (example 17) in both the French and the Dutch versions deserves some attention. Generally, the rubrics in the Liffol manuscripts are introduced by ‘Comment (…)’ or ‘De (…)’. The ‘Cy parle (…)’ introduction is rarely used. It does not occur in the rubrics of any of the extant De Liffol copies of Book One. Only one rubric of Book Three is phrased in this manner.\(^{31}\) Example 18 shows one more example of the formula, again in Bes, Book Two.

Example 18: rubric 11

\(\text{Bes} :\) Comment il parle cy de la mort de Jehan Lyon et des capitaines que les Gantoys eslurent et des bonnes villes de Flandres qui s'alièrent a ceulx de Gand encontre le conte et cetera.

\(\text{B52} :\) De la mort Jehan Lyon et des capitaines que les Gantois eslurent et des bonnes villes de Flandres qui s'alièrent a ceulx de Gand encontre le conte leur seigneur.

\(\text{P64} :\) De la mort de Jehan Lyon et des capitaines que les Gantois eslurent et des bonnes villes de Flandres qui s'alièrent a ceulx de Gand encontre le conte leur seigneur.

\(\text{Rou} :\) De la mort Jehan Lion, et des capitaines que les Gantoys esleurent, et des bonnes villes de Flandres qui s'alièrent a ceulx de Gant a l'encontre du conte de Flandres, leur seigneur.

\(\text{Le3-I} :\) Van hoe Jan Lyon hier spreect ende van sijnre doot oic mede vanden cappiteine die die van Gendt doe up hoeven ende koren ende vanden goeden steden slants van Vlaenderen die hem verbonden met die van Gendt tegens den grave.

It appears that the rubricator who transcribed the version of the rubric as present in \(\text{Bes}\) was inadvertent and mistakenly started the rubric with ‘Comment (…)’ instead of ‘De (…)’. He tried to correct his error by switching over to the ‘cy parle’ formula. This resulted in a rather uncommon (incorrect) formulation in the French original. The rather unusual phrasing has been reflected by the translation’s ill-understood rendering of the rubric,

\(^{31}\) Rubric 19. It also appears in the later copies (e.g. \(\text{P489}\))
which may be translated as ‘Of the way in which John Yoens speaks here and of his death (…)’. 32

The differences between the rubrics of Bes and the translation can be classified as ‘common’ differences. Sometimes the rubrics of the translation are shorter than the corresponding rubrics of Bes, often their phrasing is more explicit. In a number of cases, the alterations have been based on the content of the text that follows.

example 19: rubric 32

Bes: De l’escarmousche que le Barrois des Barres et Almaury de Clîçon firent le soir du Noël contre les Anglois qui seoyent devant Nantes. Le jeudy devant la vigille du Noel yssirent de Nantes sus le soir par la Porte de Sauvetout messire le Barrois des Barres et le sire de Salete (…)

Le3-I: Vander schermutsinge die die Barois van Bares ende die here van Salete des nachts voir kerstavont metten Engelsen hadden. Als dit ene wile geleden was so lieten hem die Barois van Bare ende die here van Salete des donredages (…)

In example 19, the opening line of the chapter has probably inspired the changes in the rubric: ‘Almaury de Clîçon’ (cf. Bes) has been transformed into ‘die here van Salete’ (cf. Le3-I and ‘le sire de Salete’ in the paragraph’s introduction). Cases in which an extended rubric seems to resemble the rubrics of other manuscripts (such as Rou or P64) can probably be explained in a similar fashion. Additionally, similarities in shorter rubrics may be the result of the translation process. For instance, the short rubric in example 10 resembles the rubrics of P64 and Rou. A short rubric in the common ancestor may have resulted in this resemblance, but it is equally possible that the translator or a later scribe intervened and shortened the title in order to tailor it to the limited space available.

Fundamental differences between the rubrics of Bes and the translation do not occur. Contrary to the differences between the two groups of manuscripts of Book Two produced by De Liffol, no rubrics have been added nor have rubrics been deleted. In general, the rubrics of the translation bear a close resemblance to those in Bes. Nevertheless, there are some minor differences in word order and voice and sometimes rubrics have been worded

32 It is noteworthy that this strange formulation also appears in the list of rubrics in Bes.
more explicitly. Otherwise, there are no paraphrases worthy of mention in the rubrics of the translation. The only exception is the introductory rubric.

Example 20: rubric 1

Bes:
Cy commence le second volume de sire Jehan Froissart qui contient les nouvelles guerres de France, d'Angleterre, d'Escoce, d'Espaigne, de Flandres et d'Italie et de plusieurs autres parties du monde.

Le3-I:

This rubric provides us with biographical detail about Jean Froissart’s life: Gerard Potter asserts that the chronicler was not only a ‘sire’ (priest) but also a ‘canonnic’ (canon) and treasurer of the chapter of Chimay. In the event that the translator did not encounter these facts in his exemplar – in any event, they are not present in Bes – the source of this information is rather enigmatic. The prologue of Book One in Bes only mentions Froissart’s name, not his occupation. In Book Three, Froissart is referred to as ‘sires’, the title that was given to a priest. The standard expression ‘canon and treasurer of Chimay’ only appears in Book Four of the Chroniques, which Potter never translated and the later versions of Book One. Additionally, the title of canon of Chimay can be found in the Chronique de Flandre and in the volumes of his poetry. The anthologies of Froissart’s verse may offer an explanation for the presence of his titles of canon and treasurer in the Middle Dutch translation. One of the extant manuscripts with the collection of Froissart’s poems once belonged to Humphrey of Gloucester, Jacqueline of Bavaria’s third husband. The possibility exists that Gerard Potter, who was one of the countess’ servants, had the

---

33 Voice: active or passive.
34 Croenen 2006, 20.
35 Paris, National Library, MS. Fr. 831; Croenen, Figg and Taylor 2008, 14 argues ‘On balance, it appears that a line of transmission from Froissart to Thomas of Woodstock, from Woodstock’s confiscated estate to King Richard II from Richard to Henry IV (or, if one is prepared to accept faults as “destined,” possibly directly from King Richard to his godson Richard Beauchamp), and finally from Beauchamp to Duke Humphrey as a gift is the likeliest possibility. For this manuscript, also: Janse 2009, 203-206
opportunity to consult this copy. However, after Jacqueline’s return to the mainland, the manuscript of the *Poésies* was probably left behind at the English court. There, Richard Neville, earl of Warwick acquired the volume. Another explanation for Gerard Potter’s familiarity with Froissart’s resumé is the Hainault chronicler’s undying reputation at the court of Holland. Indeed, it has been suggested that, some decades before Gerard Potter translated the *Chroniques*, the counts of Holland and Hainault had taken over Guy de Blois’ role as Froissart’s patrons. A final explanation takes into account Gerard Potter’s Burgundian connections. As has been argued above, Froissart’s Book Four (with the title of canon and treasurer of Chimay) seemingly appears for the first time in Burgundian circles ca. 1450. Although Gerard Potter’s exemplar should not be identified with this first complete set of Froissart manuscripts of the Burgundian library (ca. 1444-1453) or the manuscripts that served as a model for this particular collection, it is possible that the translator was influenced by a biographical tradition that had originated in the Burgundian circles in which the first copies of Book Four were produced. It does not seem a coincidence that the only known French manuscript of Book Two that in its opening rubric refers to ‘Jehan Froissart, en son temps chanoinne et tresorier de Chymay’ is PA88, a manuscript of the Burgundian library and probably a descendant of the Burgundian set of ca. 1444-1453. This explanation situates Gerard Potter as well as his translation firmly in a Burgundian tradition.

3.3.4. Conclusion

Although the presence of a list of rubrics in *H21* seemingly adds to the similarities between the translation and *Bes*, a number of observations obscure the resemblance. As it appears, the table of contents in the Middle Dutch manuscript is not a translation of the list of rubrics in *Bes*. By contrast, the rubrics in the list of *H21* were taken from the rubrics in the body of the translation. It should be noted that a comparison of the rubrics in *Le3-2, H21* and *Bes* shows that the extraction of the rubrics must have happened in (one of) the lost ancestor(s) of *H21* and *Le3-2*. The above notwithstanding, this mode of operation does not exclude *Bes* as the translation’s model. Conceivably, Gerard Potter did not translate the list in his exemplar. Possibly, he compiled the Dutch list from the rubrics in his translation or

36See Chapter One, § 1.1.2. To date, no documentary evidence has been discovered which proves that (a) Gerard Potter was already in Jacqueline’s service during the first half of the 1420s (b) that he followed the countess to England.
37 See: *Bibliotheca Neerlandica Manuscripta.*
consigned the drawing up of the table of contents to the scribe or scribes who were responsible for the dedication copy. Maybe, a later scribe compiled the list at a client’s explicit request.

The lack of clarity in the case of the list of rubrics has not been resolved by the collation of the French rubrics of Book Three and their Middle Dutch counterparts. The Dutch and French rubrics show a great deal of resemblance. The results of this analysis largely confirm the outcome of the scrutiny of textual variants as presented in Chapter Two. Differences between the translation and the rubrics in Bes can be attributed to interventions of the translator but may also have resulted from the use of another exemplar. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that the rubrication of none of the surviving French manuscripts resembles Bes as much as do the rubrics of the translation. B52, which seems to be very closely affiliated to Bes, is no exception to this rule.

Indeed, the comparison of the rubrics in four manuscripts of Book Two produced by Pierre de Liffol has shown that the rubrication of manuscripts produced by the same libraire can differ in a number of ways. Some of these differences can be understood as common scribal practice and it is not unlikely that a translator would interfere in a similar manner in the course of the translation process. Other differences that have an effect on the reader’s expectations of what will follow or which interfere in the segmentation of the text are more fundamental. In general, the differences between the rubrics of the translation and the titles in Bes can be classified under the first category. Although some interventions in a number of rubrics of Book Three (example 8) and the prologue of Book Two (example 20) are more drastic, these could still be regarded as the work of the translator.

Finally, the distribution of variants in the rubrics of the French manuscripts of Book Two deserves our interest. The occurrence of variants in pairs suggests that De Liffol used more than one exemplar. This conclusion somewhat diminishes the value of the observation that B88 probably is a product of the Liffol collaborative.\footnote{Cf. supra and note 20.} Since the abridgements in the prologue of Book Three in Bes do not appear in B88 nor in the other early Parisian manuscripts, two possibilities remain: (a) these variants are specific to Bes and its hypothetical descendants, (b) De Liffol used more than one exemplar for his copies of the Chroniques. The outcome of the analysis of the rubrics in Book Two implies that both options remain open.
3.4. The illustration of the Liffol manuscripts

In this section, I will explore the illustration of the Liffol manuscripts in a way that is similar to the analysis of the manuscripts’ rubrication presented above in § 3.3. First, I will focus on the differences in the pictorial programmes of the manuscripts of Book One. Afterwards, I will compare the cycles of illustration of the French manuscripts to the pictorial programme of the translation as intended in the Leyden copy of Book Two of the Middle Dutch translation (Le3-I). Finally, the illustrated copy H21 will allow us to compare a number of compositional characteristics of the illustration of Book Three in the B88, Bes and H21 manuscripts.

3.4.1. Book One: uniformity and diversity

In his 1994 article on the illustration of the manuscripts of Book One, A. Varvaro suggested that the programme of illustration of at least twelve copies could be traced back to a common archetype. According to Varvaro, similarities between these manuscripts indicated that this programme consisted of a quadripartite opening miniature and approximately twenty illustrations in the body of the text. Additionally, Varvaro assumed that Jean Froissart in person might have devised this programme:

I do not want to say that Froissart himself would have executed the programme by his own hand. But it seems very likely to me that the chronicler (…) directed the miniature painture in at least two ways: by indicating the essential events in the chronicle which should be illustrated

---

39 Croenen, Rouse and Rouse have shown that the majority of the miniatures has been executed by two artists. The Giac Master was responsible for the miniatures in no less than eight extant copies, four of which are in our subset of manuscripts: B88, Bes 1 (volume I), Sto and P64. Other Froissart manuscripts illustrated by the Giac Master include B51, L59, P62 and Tou. His colleague, the Boethius Master, illustrated at least 4 manuscripts containing the Chronicles, including Bes 2 (volume II) and P63. Croenen, Rouse and Rouse 2002, 284-288. Also, Villelak-Petit 2009.

40 The Rouses have recognized the diversity within the manuscripts of Book One. They accept that, although the manuscripts produced in De Liffol’s workshop are (amongst other things) ‘tightly linked’ by their programme of illumination, ‘the number and location of miniatures’ varies. In order to explain this divergence, the Rouses turn to Anne Hedeman’s study of the manuscript tradition of the Grandes Chroniques de France. Hedeman made it plausible that ‘in historical texts such as these the choice of miniatures often reflects family involvement’ (Rouse and Rouse (forthcoming), 5).

41 Varvaro 1994, 22-23. The manuscripts that Varvaro includes in his inquiry are: Bes, Bre, B88, H25, NY4, PA87, P43, P63, P86, Sto, Tou and W (=Bra). Varvaro did not include Y, because he did not know the actual place of preservation, Ami, P04, P474, B25 and P55 because the pictorial programme has not been executed. Additionally, he excluded Ant, Be, L67, LR2, P06, P47, P356 and Tux, because of the manuscripts’ limited programme of illustration.
and, possibly, by suggesting the way of representing them or at least to discuss the artist’s plans.\footnote{Varvaro 1994, 33. Translation from Italian: G. Croenen.}

A note in the journal of Jean le Fèvre, chancellor of Louis I of Anjou prompted Varvaro to assume that Froissart had indeed intervened in the illustration of his *Chroniques*. Le Fèvre reported that on 12 December 1381 the duke had confiscated fifty-six quires that Jean Froissart ‘avoit fait escripre’. Froissart had sent off the gatherings to be illuminated by William of Bailly, ‘enlumineur’ with the intent to send them to the king of England, ‘our enemy’.\footnote{Varvaro 1994, 3; Croenen, Rouse and Rouse 2002, 277-282 accept Varvaro’s presentation of events but tentatively draw the connection with the Parisian book trade and Pierre de Liffol in particular.} Obviously, the quires only comprised the text of Book One, as – at this point – the other Books had not yet been written. This observation is rather important as it suggests that Varvaro’s conclusions apply only to Book One. Whereas a rather large group of illustrated manuscripts of Book One shows a significant degree of resemblance, the opposite may be the case for corresponding Book Two and Book Three copies. It may be expected that these volumes show a larger degree of dissimilarity.

Varvaro admits, however, that divergences exist in the programme of illustration of the surviving manuscripts of Book One:

> It thus seems perfectly legitimate to me to conclude that we have here identified a coherent programme of illustration, in connection to which all our manuscripts, without exception, take a certain amount of liberty, either by adding or by omitting certain scenes.

(Varvaro 1994, 24)

In table 3.1., I have listed the scenes which have been illustrated in the core group of three manuscripts of Book One produced by Pierre de Liffol, complemented with *B88*. In his article, Varvaro presents a table that is very similar.\footnote{Ainsworth 2009 compares the programmes of illustration of *Bes* and *P63-64*.} His overview, however, only includes the group of twenty miniatures that – again according to Varvaro – belonged to the archetypical programme of illustration. In this respect, Varvaro’s overview is slightly misleading as it draws attention to the similarities and does not fully address the differences between the pictorial programmes of the manuscripts of Book One. Table 3.1. presents an overview of all the miniatures in the core group of De Liffol manuscripts. The miniatures that belong to the archetypical programme as suggested by Varvaro have been
marked with an asterisk. It is probable that the other miniatures are characteristic of a particular manuscript.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ SHF</th>
<th>description</th>
<th>B88</th>
<th>P63</th>
<th>Bes</th>
<th>Sto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHF I Prologue*</td>
<td>Opening miniature, four scenes</td>
<td>B88</td>
<td>P63</td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>Sto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Froissart presents a book to a king of England (Richard II)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) The queen of England and her son meet the king of France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Sea journey of the Queen of England and her son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Siege of Bristol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 13</td>
<td>Hugh li Despensiers and the count of Arundel kneel before Isabel of France</td>
<td></td>
<td>P63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 56</td>
<td>Edward III, his councilmen and Robert of Artois</td>
<td></td>
<td>P63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 63</td>
<td>Battle between de soldiers of Cagant and the English</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>Sto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 89</td>
<td>Edward III requests advice in the matters of Flanders of the duke of Brabant, the duke of Guelders, the Duke of Juliers, John of Hainault and Robert of Artois</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 113*</td>
<td>Sea battle at L’esculse (Sluis)</td>
<td>B88</td>
<td>P63</td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>Sto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 138*</td>
<td>Funeral procession for the duke of Brittany</td>
<td>B88</td>
<td>P63</td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>Sto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 165</td>
<td>Siege of Hennebont</td>
<td></td>
<td>P63</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 172*</td>
<td>Battle of Quimperlé</td>
<td>B88</td>
<td>P63</td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 218</td>
<td>Siege of Auberoche</td>
<td></td>
<td>P63</td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>Sto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 254</td>
<td>King Edward arrives at Normandy</td>
<td></td>
<td>P63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 260</td>
<td>Soldiers raiding a city (Saint-Lo-en-Constantin or Caen)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 262</td>
<td>Battle of Caen</td>
<td></td>
<td>B88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 263</td>
<td>Soldiers raiding a city (Caen)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 269*</td>
<td>Battle at the Blanche Taque</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 278*</td>
<td>Battle of Crecy</td>
<td></td>
<td>P63</td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>Sto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 279*</td>
<td>Battle of Crecy</td>
<td></td>
<td>B88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 297*</td>
<td>The queen of England welcomed at Newcastle</td>
<td>B88</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 305*</td>
<td>Battle of La Roche Derrien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 312*</td>
<td>Siege of Calais</td>
<td></td>
<td>P63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 317*</td>
<td>Siege/Surrender of Calais</td>
<td>B88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 331*</td>
<td>Wake at the coffin of king Philip VI of France</td>
<td>B88</td>
<td>P63</td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>Sto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 384*</td>
<td>Battle of Poitiers</td>
<td></td>
<td>P63</td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>Sto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 402</td>
<td>Death of Geoffry of Harcourt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 414</td>
<td>Battle scene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 440*</td>
<td>Siege of Meleun-sur-Seine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 443*</td>
<td>Battle of Nogent-sur-Seine</td>
<td>B88</td>
<td>P63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 494*</td>
<td>Battle of Brinay</td>
<td></td>
<td>P63</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 509</td>
<td>The king of England welcomes the king of France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 513*</td>
<td>Imagery related to the burial of king John of France, the coronation of Charles or the battle of Cocherel</td>
<td>B88</td>
<td>P63</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 521*</td>
<td>Defeat of the English and the army of Navarra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 532</td>
<td>Battle of Auray</td>
<td></td>
<td>P63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 538</td>
<td>Battle of Subise</td>
<td></td>
<td>P63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ SHF</td>
<td>description</td>
<td>B88</td>
<td>P63</td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>Sto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 557</td>
<td>Battle of Mont Auban</td>
<td></td>
<td>B88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 579*</td>
<td>Battle of Najera</td>
<td></td>
<td>P63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 583*</td>
<td>Battle of Najera, capture of Bertrand du Guesclin and flight of Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>Sto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 599*</td>
<td>Defeat of the king of Castille</td>
<td></td>
<td>P63</td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>Sto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 636</td>
<td>Siege of Puirenon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 644*</td>
<td>Battle of Pont-de-Lussac</td>
<td></td>
<td>P63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 662</td>
<td>Surrender of Limoges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 690*</td>
<td>Naval battle of La Rochelle. The count of Pembroke is defeated by the Spaniards.</td>
<td>B88</td>
<td></td>
<td>P63</td>
<td>Bes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 700</td>
<td>Battle of Subise 1372</td>
<td></td>
<td>P63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 723</td>
<td>Siege of Becherel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 792</td>
<td>Siege of Auray 1377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 44</td>
<td>Treaty at Windsor between Richard II and Charles of Navarre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- table 3.1. miniatures in Book One -

Detailed analysis shows that in a number of instances Varvaro groups miniatures notwithstanding the fact that in the respective manuscripts these appear at different locations in the text. Sometimes the miniatures indeed depict the same scene, e.g. the battle of Crecy in *B88* (§ 279) on the one hand and *Sto, Bes* and *P63* (§ 278) on the other. However, at other instances the interpretation is not that evident: the miniature accompanying § 440 in *Sto* probably does not illustrate the same event as its alleged counterparts in *B88* and *P63* preceding § 443. The same is true of the depiction of the battle of Najera in *Bes* and *P63* and the rendering of the siege and surrender of Calais in *B88, Sto* and *P63*.

Nevertheless, there is no ground to doubt Varvaro’s conclusion that the manuscripts the scholar included in his inquiry had a common model for their respective pictorial programmes.⁴⁵ This notwithstanding, I want to draw attention to the fact that each individual series of illustrations has its particularities. Indeed, approximately 15-20% of the miniatures in *Bes* do not occur in any of the other manuscripts studied by Varvaro or myself.

---

⁴⁵ Whether or not the full programme was designed by Froissart himself (cf. supra) is not clear. Probably, an important role in the matter is reserved for the early fifteenth-century Parisian booktrade and in particular Pierre de Liffol and the artists that were associated with him.
To paraphrase the Rouses: the miniatures that were added to the archetypical programme may well indicate certain personal preferences of the client who commissioned the manuscript. Unfortunately, as long as the textual filiation of the manuscripts of Book One has not been firmly established, it is hard to say whether or not scenes have been added or left out.

The distribution of miniatures in Bes, Sto, P63 and B88 suggests a common archetypical programme. However, the analysis also indicates that any two manuscripts produced under the direction of De Liffol diverged considerably as regards illustration. Since no Middle Dutch manuscripts of Book One survive, there is no means for comparison with the French copies. Nevertheless, the observation that the illustration of the French-language manuscripts differs to a considerable degree is also useful for Gerard Potter’s text. Lost (volumes of) manuscript sets produced by Pierre de Liffol probably displayed a similar degree of variation. Therefore, it seems fair to conclude that a high degree of similarity between the pictorial programme of the translation and one of the surviving manuscripts points towards a relation of dependence.

### 3.4.2. Book Two: the Liffol manuscripts and the intended programme of Le31

The extant manuscripts of Book Two allow us to compare the French and Dutch programmes of illustration. In Le31, the Leyden manuscript of the translation, fifteen blank spaces indicate scenes that should have been illustrated. However, these miniatures have never been added to the text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ SHF</th>
<th>description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 260</td>
<td>Soldiers raiding a city (Saint-Lou-en-Constantin or Caen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 402</td>
<td>Death of Geoffry of Harecourt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 636</td>
<td>Siege of Puirenon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF I § 662</td>
<td>Surrender of Limoges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 44</td>
<td>Treaty at Windsor between Richard II and Charles of Navarre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- miniatures that are characteristic of Bes -

---

46 Rouse and Rouse (forthcoming), 5.
47 It should be noted that this archetypical programme did not necessarily take the form of a fully illustrated manuscript. Other possibilities include lists of passages that could be illustrated (e.g. lists of rubrics) and adapted according to the desires of prospective clients.
48 As some of the blank spaces seem to be stained with what may be a residue of glue (e.g. Le31, fol.121 r.). I do not want to exclude the possibility that at one point pictures were pasted into the manuscript.
The programmes of illustration of the French-language manuscripts of Book Two are differ significantly. *P64* has six miniatures; in *Bes* ten scenes have been illustrated. Like *Bes*, *B52* was originally illustrated with ten miniatures. Eight of these miniatures have been removed. The set of miniatures of Book Two in *B88* appears to be incomplete. Only one miniature survives: the encounter between Joan, queen of Naples and pope Clement VII. This scene has not been illustrated in any of the other manuscripts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ SHF</th>
<th>description</th>
<th>B88</th>
<th>P64</th>
<th>B52</th>
<th>Bes</th>
<th>Le3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 83</td>
<td>Opening miniature, four scenes</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>P64</td>
<td>(B52)</td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 90</td>
<td>Two ships filled with soldiers</td>
<td>B88</td>
<td>P64</td>
<td>B52</td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>Le3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 99</td>
<td>The queen of Naples and Clement VII</td>
<td>P64</td>
<td>B52</td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>Le3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 102</td>
<td>Jan Yoons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 108</td>
<td>The Whitecaps of Ghent kill the sheriff</td>
<td>P64</td>
<td>B52</td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>Le3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 111</td>
<td>Twelve burghers of Ghent negotiate with the count. The Whitecaps burn the count’s castle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 117</td>
<td>Death of Jan Yoons / Uprising of the cities of Flanders / The siege of Oudenaarde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Le3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 120</td>
<td>The assault at Oudenaarde; peace between the count and the people of Flanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Le3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 126</td>
<td>Shipwreck of the English envoys sent to the duke of Brittany</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>Le3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 132</td>
<td>Submission of Oudenaarde</td>
<td>B52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Le3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 150</td>
<td>The English burn down the Champagne region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Le3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 172</td>
<td>The siege of Nantes</td>
<td>(B52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 176</td>
<td>The siege of Nantes</td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>Le3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 185</td>
<td>Acts of war between the French and English at Nantes</td>
<td>(B52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 217</td>
<td>Peasants’ revolt / The burghers at London</td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>Le3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 272</td>
<td>The victory of Ghent against the count and Bruges</td>
<td>P64</td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>Le3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 275</td>
<td>The taking of Bruges</td>
<td>(B52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 313</td>
<td>Battle on a bridge (near Comines)</td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>Le3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 315</td>
<td>The French cannot cross the bridge near Comines</td>
<td>(B52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 339</td>
<td>Battle of Rosebeke</td>
<td>(B52)</td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>Le3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 340</td>
<td>Battle of Rosebeke</td>
<td>P64</td>
<td>(B52)</td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>Le3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 345</td>
<td>Submission of Bruges</td>
<td>P64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 381</td>
<td>Assault on Ypres</td>
<td>(B52)</td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>Le3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 447</td>
<td>Joan of Brabant and Isabel of Bavaria</td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 454</td>
<td>Marriage of Charles of France and Isabel of Bavaria</td>
<td>(B52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to the other manuscripts, the text of Book Two in *B88* probably opened with a frontispiece illustrating four important parts of the narrative. Two scenes in the frontispieces of *P64* and *Bes* correspond to each other. Scene (a) in *Bes* illustrates the battle

49 It is not clear whether the folio has been left blank intentionally. See § 4.4.4.
of Cocherel, as does scene (b) in *P64*. The scene portrayed in (c) in *P64* and scene (d) in *Bes* may have been derived from a common model: two (noble) figures (the count of Flanders and the duke of Brittany) address a third, kneeling figure (Peter of Bournesel) from above. It is noteworthy that the position of the scenes in *Bes* and *P64* is mirrored.

Only one scene was illustrated in three of the manuscripts (*Bes, P64* and *B52*): the assassination of Roger of Auterive, the sheriff of Ghent. There is little iconographic similarity between the three depictions. The main correspondence is that a group of Whitecaps, vigilantes from the city of Ghent, attack one or more figures on horseback. In *P64*, the victim has already been wounded or maybe even killed and dangles from his mount. In *B52*, the Whitecaps stab the figure on horseback. Several bodies lie on the ground. In a stereotypical image, *Bes* portrays the moment right before the assassination: a group of men on foot, given specific detail by their white headdress, attack several soldiers on horseback. The differences in composition between the illustrations of the respective manuscripts are not surprising. Apparently, the illustrators did not have at their disposal a drawn of painted model that they could subsequently copy. Someone, probably the *libraire*, provided them with written instructions (cf. *Bes l*) that were erased after completion. This observation is important for the conclusions as regards the illustration of Book Three presented in § 3.4.3.2. Compositional similarities in the illustration of *Bes* and *H21*, the only extant manuscript of the translation in which the miniatures have been completed, may add weight to the hypothesis that the artist who executed the pictures in the illustrated apograph of the Middle Dutch version of the *Chroniques* consulted one particular manuscript (i.e. *Bes* or daughter) and imitated the style of its illustration.

Notwithstanding the above, evidence from Book Two calls for caution, even when the design of the miniatures is similar. Three illustrations appear in two manuscripts. The victory of Ghent has been illustrated in *P64* and *Bes* and both illustrations resemble each other. A group of soldiers (on the left) enters the gates of a city (Bruges, on the right). However, in opposition to the depiction in *Bes*, where the soldiers are still forcing their way into the city, *P64* situates the event after the battle. In this view, there is no one-to-one correspondence between the miniatures. In addition to these exact matches, there are some close similarities between the manuscripts. *P64* also includes a miniature of the battle of Rebecq-le-Rognon (Rosebeke), but at a slightly later point in the text. In *B52* five miniatures pertain to to subject matter which was also illustrated in *Bes*: the siege of Nantes (two miniatures), the taking of Bruges, the battle of Comines and the (events leading up to the) marriage of Isabel of Bavaria. Added to the exact matches discussed
above and the fact that the assault on Ypres and the battle of Rebecq-le-Rognon were illustrated in *B52* (miniatures removed) as well as in *Bes*, this suggests that the focus of the pictorial programmes of *B52* and *Bes* was very similar.

G.I. Lieftinck had already observed the notable similarity between the pictorial programmes of *Bes* and the extant manuscripts of the translation. The divergence between *P64* and *Bes* makes the correspondence between *Bes* and *Le3-1* all the more interesting. The loose similarity of focus in the pictorial programmes of *Bes* and *B52* does not diminish the importance of the strict correspondence in the illustration of *Bes* and *Le3-1*. No less than eight miniatures in *Le3-1* have a direct counterpart in *Bes*.

In spite of the near-uniformity of their pictorial programmes, there are also important differences between *Le3-1* and *Bes*. As it appears, no space was left blank for an opening miniature, nor was the representation of the meeting between Joan of Brabant and Isabel of Bavaria taken into account. Additionally, as compared to *Bes*, six blank spaces indicate additional miniatures in *Le3-1*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ SHF</th>
<th>description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 102</td>
<td>John Yoens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 111</td>
<td>Delegation of twelve burghers from Ghent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 117</td>
<td>The siege of Oudenaarde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 120</td>
<td>The assault at Oudenaarde; the peace between the count and the people of Flanders through the duke of Burgundy’s mediation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 132</td>
<td>Submission of Oudenaarde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 150</td>
<td>The English burn down the Champagne region</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- miniatures that are characteristic of *Le3-1* -

These additional miniatures result in a significant concentration of illustrated passages between § 102 and § 150, which probably represented scenes of urban uprising. Although the similarity between *Bes* and *Le3-1* is remarkable, some reservation is in order. The possibility remains that not *Bes*, but another copy (a sibling or daughter) was the translation’s exemplar. Thus, the differences between *Bes* and *Le3-1* may be the result of alterations introduced in another French manuscript. The possibility that the additions are not specific to the pictorial programme of the translation but to the *Le3-1* copy is another reason for caution. In Chapter Four (§ 4.4.4.), I will give a tentative interpretation of the way in which the pictorial programme of *Bes* differs from the translation’s programme as intended in *Le3-1*.
3.4.3. The illustration of Book Three: the Liffol manuscripts vs. the Dutch translation

As opposed to the intended pictorial programme of Le3-1 (Book Two) and Le3-2 (Book Three), the illustration of H21 (Book Three) has been completed. Nine coloured pen drawings illustrate the text in this manuscript. These miniatures give us the unique opportunity to compare the illustration of the French and Middle Dutch manuscripts, not only with regards to the scenes that were illustrated, but also as regards their composition.

A first important observation is that the pictorial programmes of H21 and Le3-2 were probably identical. Although Le3-2 has one additional blank space (SHF III § 51), it is not clear whether the space was provided intentionally for a miniature to be added, or was left blank because of an irregularity in the paper. The latter is suggested by a corresponding blank space on the verso side of the folio. A note says ‘nichil’ (nothing).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ SHF</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>B88</th>
<th>Bes</th>
<th>H21</th>
<th>Le3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHF III § 1</td>
<td>Opening miniature, multiple scenes, depicted content differs</td>
<td>B88</td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>H21</td>
<td>Le3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF III § 7</td>
<td>The citizens of Cassères surrender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF III § 39</td>
<td>Battle of Aljubarrota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF III § 51</td>
<td>Siege of Brest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF III § 63</td>
<td>Battle between the count of Najera, the army of Hungary and Murad I of Turkey</td>
<td>B88</td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>H21</td>
<td>Le3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF III § 141</td>
<td>Two citizens of Besances leaving the city</td>
<td>B88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF III § 172</td>
<td>The troops of the duke of Lancaster besiege the city of Aurent</td>
<td>B88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF III § 195</td>
<td>Battle against the duke of Ireland</td>
<td>B88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF III § 226</td>
<td>Conversation between the duchess of Brabant and the duke of Gueldres</td>
<td>B88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF III § 235-236</td>
<td>The embassy of the duchess of Brabant to the king of France</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>H21</td>
<td>Le3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF III § 249</td>
<td>The siege of Montferrant. Pierrot le Bernoys surrenders</td>
<td>B88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF III § 252</td>
<td>The weddings of the duke of Berry’s son and daughter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>Le3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF III § 266</td>
<td>The duke of Brittany welcomes the lord of Coucy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>H21</td>
<td>Le3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF III § 283</td>
<td>Hélon de Lignac rapports to the duke of Berry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF III § 285</td>
<td>Soldiers burn a city (Durham)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF III § 288</td>
<td>The battle of Otterburn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF III § 294</td>
<td>The duke of Guelders surrenders to the king of France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H21</td>
<td>Le3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF III § 296</td>
<td>The troops of the count of Arundel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- table 3.3. distribution of miniatures in Book Three -

3.4.3.1. B88 vs. Bes and H21

Although extant manuscripts of Book Three produced by Pierre de Liffol are probably limited to Bes and B88, the comparison of the illustration of these French-language manuscripts with the manuscripts of the translation yields some important information.
Attention should be drawn to the striking differences between the pictorial programmes of *B88* and *Bes*, which reflect the situation as present in the Liffol manuscripts of Book Two. Although it is wise to take into account the possibility of lost miniatures in *B88* (cf. supra, §3.4.2.), only two (surviving) miniatures have a counterpart in *Bes*: the initial miniature and the battle between Lazar Hrebljanovic of Serbia and Sultan Murad I of Turkey.

The opening miniatures in the Liffol manuscripts depict different parts of Froissart’s narrative. The frontispiece of *B88* consists of two scenes. The left-hand scene portrays how a boy, dressed in blue, waits on a company of five noblemen, seated at a banquet. In front of the table lies a dog. The scene on the right-hand side depicts three noblemen (judging from their dress, the same as in the scene on the left-hand side), standing at the foot of a tower. The boy, who was waiting the table in the scene on the left, is looking out of the tower’s only window. The youngster in both scenes is Gaston of Foix, Fébus’ adolescent son, who is waiting on his father ‘as was his habit’. In the course of the meal, disaster strikes. The count has learned that Gaston keeps hidden on his body a suspicious purse of which the content is unknown. Suspecting his son of treason, Fébus takes the pouch from his son, sprinkles some of the powder it contains on a piece of bread and feeds it to one of his hounds, which immediately dies. The purse had been given to Gaston by his uncle, Charles II of Navarre, with the promise that if the young boy mixed some of the powder with his father’s meal, the latter would be reconciled with the boy’s mother. Although Fébus accuses his son of the attempt at murder, the king of Navarre’s plan to poison his illustrious brother-in-law backfires. The scene on the right-hand side depicts the continuation of the story: Fébus and his councillors are on their way to check on young Gaston in his prison. In this tower, the decline of the comital lineage of Foix is executed. Blinded with rage, Gaston Fébus kills his only legitimate son.

The *Bes* miniature represents three scenes: (a) Froissart is welcomed by Gaston Fébus, (b) Froissart is informed by the noblemen at the court and (c) Fébus and his

---

50 See: *Medieval Illuminated Manuscripts*.

51 According to Kervyn de Lettenhove, the bipartite miniature portrays a knight, Espan de Lion and his squire, looking at the castle of Mauvoisin. The scene on the left-hand side depicts a banquet. Espan de Lion, wearing the same outfit and his squire are seated. Froissart ‘whose attitude and physionomy recall in a striking manner his portrait as it is given by the miniature in the Besançon manuscript’ is ushered in (Kervyn de Lettenhove 1873, 248). Gaspar and Lyna 1981, 12 confirm Kervyn’s interpretation. In his new edition of Book Three, P. Ainsworth advanced the following interpretation (1) Gaston Fébus à table, son fils taillant devant lui; un lévrier mal en point; (2) le jeune Gaston en prison dans la tour Moncade à Orthez; son père le regarde d’en bas. Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 505.

52 The choice of the scenes depicted in the frontispieces of manuscripts of Book Three is very interesting. Indeed, the story of Gaston of Foix gives the account of a noble lineage that is terminated. The lineage of Guy of Blois, Froissart’s principal patron, had faced a similar ordeal. In this respect, the opening miniature of *B88* touches on one of the central themes of the *Chroniques*: heritage and legitimacy.
entourage watch a fight between two male figures. Quite possibly, the fighting characters can be identified as Gaston, Fébus’ son and his bastard brother, Yvain. This interpretation would imply that the frontispiece in Bes partially illustrates a part of Froissart’s narrative that is closely related to the subject matter depicted in the opening miniature of B88.53

The opening miniature in the Middle Dutch manuscript H21 consists of four scenes. At first sight, the order in which these scenes should be read is rather odd: a-c-d-b (ant-clockwise), but the reader/viewer is directed to the correct interpretation by the logical stages of Froissart’s journey to the castle of Orthéz. (a) depicts Froissart and Espan de Lion crossing the river Garonne. In (c) Froissart and Espan are mounted on horses and follow a pathway to the castle. In (d) the travelling companions conclude their journey on foot along the same path. Finally, in (b), both men are welcomed at Orthéz by the count of Foix. Both Froissart (probably the character in blue dress) and Espan de Lion (in scarlet dress) have been portrayed as noblemen.54

- fig. 3.1.: Frontispiece displaying Froissart’s journey to the court at Béarn. (H21, fol. 1 r.) -

53 Castan interpreted (c) as consisting of two separate depictions and identifies the fighting male figures as ‘personages civils’. Castan 1865, 134. Ainsworth 2009, 84 identifies them as ‘probablement les propres fils du comte de Foix, l’un légitime et l’autre bâtard, qui s’entraînent au maniement des armes avec des dagues ou des épées raccourcies’.

54 None of the surviving French manuscripts has a similar frontispiece. Although several later manuscripts (e.g. Bes, Bre, LR5, Lud) depict the cordial welcome at Orthéz, none of these miniatures portrays Froissart’s journey. Other manuscripts represent different scenes altogether: e.g. a battle-scene (P45) or the coronation of John I of Portugal (PA89, Ant). This may indicate that this picture has been specifically designed for the translation. The colours of the characters’ dress are possibly significant: the colour of the official dress of Burgundian officials was scarlet. At the Bavarian court, servants wore a greyish blue livery. According to Damen, both colours make sense in a Burgundian context, as both of them were present in the arms of Burgundy. (cf. Damen 2000, 66).
Chapter Three

In B88, the battle scene between the Turks and the Hungarians has been represented as a combat between mounted knights on the one hand and footsoldiers on the other. At first sight, the miniature has nothing in common with its Bes counterpart. Bes pictures the battle as a struggle between two groups of footsoldiers one of which (most probably the Turks) is clearly cornered by the other. Although the Hungarian army has made its first casualties, the outcome of the battle in the miniature in H21 has not yet been decided. The position of the armies (Turks: left, Hungarians: right) is a mirror image of the position in Bes. As opposed to the miniatures in B88 and Bes, both armies fight under their respective banners. The Hungarians carry a cross of gules on a background of argent, the Turkish coat of arms is represented by a dragon of sable on a background of or. These are probably fictional coats conjured up by the imagination of the illustrator or one of his predecessors to express the opposition of Christians and infidels. The setting of the battle is largely the same in the three miniatures: a hilly field with low cover. The presence of shrubbery in the left-side bottom corner in Bes and H21 is interesting. A similar analogous use of flora reminiscent of the style of the Boethius master can be found in the miniatures representing the battle of Otterburn and to a lesser extent in the representations of the battle of Aljubarrota.\(^55\)

3.4.3.2. Bes vs. H21

Ten miniatures illustrate the text of Book Three in Bes. Eight of these also occur in H21. Only the illustrations accompanying SHF § 7 (the surrender of Cassères) and SHF § 283 (Helion of Lignac reports to the duke of Berry) have no counterpart in the The Hague manuscript of the translation. By contrast, H21 illustrates SHF § 294 (the duke of Guelders surrenders to the king of France); this miniature is not present in Bes.

I have already indicated similarities in the use of flora as elements of the décor. Additionally, other analogous elements – although inconspicuous – catch the eye.\(^56\) In the representation of the battle of Aljubarrota in Bes, the army at the right-hand side consists of soldiers who stand their ground and soldiers who have taken to flight. A similar situation can be observed in the corresponding miniature in H21. The scenes depicting the siege of

\(^55\) I. Villela-Petit refers to this feature of the artist’s style as ‘les petits arbres au guéillage mouchoiré’ Villela-Petit 2009, 40.

\(^56\) In the search for similarities between Bes and H21, it should be kept in mind that it is very probable that the illuminator of H21 never laid eyes on the translation’s exemplar. Thus, any iconographical similarity between Bes and H21 is indirect. It is probable that one or more versions have preceded the surviving witnesses (see also: § 5.2.1.).
Montferrant in Bes and H21 are mirror images of one another. An army defends the gate of the city against its assailants by means of long pikes. The most obvious similarity in composition by far, is the portrayal of the encounter between the duke of Brittany and the lord of Coucy in both manuscripts. The duke of Brittany welcomes the lord of Coucy and his entourage with a handshake. With the other hand he points towards the castle that is located behind him. Additionally, the way in which the sea-battle in the final miniature has been depicted in H21 bears a close resemblance to the corresponding miniature in Bes. The battle has been represented as a confrontation between two ships filled with soldiers. In Bes the armies barrage each other with arrows, whereas in H21 only the English army has bows.

The comparison of the sea-battle in H21 and Bes also touches on the differences between the manuscripts. In Bes it is hard, even impossible to distinguish the armies. None of the soldiers wear badges, they carry no banners; there is no sign of heraldry.\footnote{Cf. Ainsworth 2006a.} In H21, however, each army fights under its own standard. In the example of the battle between the Turks and the Hungarians, the heraldry seems to be a fabrication of the illustrator. However, in other cases the banners and coats of arms are quite correct. In the depiction of the naval battle, the ship on the left bears the banner of France, whereas the ship on the right sails under the colours of England. The former coat of arms is also depicted in the added miniature representing the duke of Guelders, kneeling before the king of France. William of Guelders wears a coat with medlar flowers as a symbol of his duchy.\footnote{Nijsten 2004, 411-412.} The miniature of the battle of Otterburn depicts the English on the right, with their banner. The Scottish bear a quadripartite banner of which the first and fourth quarter have a cross of gules on a background of or; the second and third quarter consist of a Saint-Andrew’s cross of azur on a background of argent. Finally, in the battle of Aljubarrota the Portuguese army is depicted on the left, attacking the Castilian army.

The Portuguese banner stays with the king. The accuracy of the depiction of the Portuguese coat of arms (five escutcheons with five silver bezants each, eight golden castles in the border, with the Avis cross, ca. 1385-1485) is noteworthy. The Castilian banner, a castle with three towers of gules on a background of argent seems to be falling. The depiction of the Castilian coat of arms does not seem as well informed (especially in its use of heraldic colour) as the Portuguese banner. Although Korteweg and Chavannes-
Mazel call him a ‘lesser master’, the *H21* miniaturist (or one of his predecessors) was well practised in heraldry.\(^59\)

- fig. 3.2.: (*H21*, fol. 62 r.) The battle of Aljubarrota -

### 3.4.4. Conclusion

On the whole, the analysis of the illustration suggests an even stronger connection between the extant manuscripts of the translation and *Bes* than did the comparisons of variant readings and rubrication. Indeed, the results of the analysis of the pictorial programmes of the manuscripts of Book One produced by De Liffol presented both diversification and equality. Undeniably, there is every indication that the pictorial programme in a large group of manuscripts of Book One can be traced back to a common archetype.\(^60\) This notwithstanding, every manuscript has its own particularities. In view of these individual characteristics, the convergence of the distribution of miniatures in Book Two in *Bes* and *Le3-1* is all the more striking. Indeed, none of the manuscripts of Book Two – not even *B52*, the manuscript that is most closely related to *Bes* – shows a similar degree of

---

\(^{59}\) Another difference is also connected to the battleground: the presentation of casualties. Although the Boethius Master is not indifferent to the harsh reality of war, his presentation of casualties is clinical: no blood, no mutilation. This contrasts sharply with the ‘bloodlust’ of the *H21* illuminator, who seizes every opportunity to portray a victim and use his red paint lavishly.

\(^{60}\) According to Varvaro 1994 this is the manuscript Jean Froissart wanted to send to Richard II of England.
correspondence. Moreover, the iconography in the miniatures of Bes and H21 (Book Three) is similar in its use of elements of the décor and in the posture of the depicted characters. Given the differences between corresponding depictions in Bes and other Liffol manuscripts, this resemblance in the miniatures’ design is highly significant. Moreover, as it is very probable that the similarities in the illustration of Bes and H21 are indirect (it is rather likely that H21 is a copy of another, illustrated but now lost copy of the translation), the illustration provides us with additional grounds to assume that Bes or one of its hypothetical daughters was indeed the translation’s exemplar. The idiosyncratic depiction of the opening-miniature of H21 should not be interpreted as a reason to dismiss Bes as the translation’s model. None of the surviving manuscripts represents Froissart’s journey to Foix, nor is there any evidence that later manuscripts were derived from a lost archetype with this representation.

3.5. The evidence provided by paratextual elements

The analysis of paratextual elements has yielded a considerable amount of information. Apparently, the colophons of the translation tell us something about the physical appearance of the French exemplar: a two-volume set of manuscripts of which the first comprised Book One and the second comprised Books Two and Three. The list of rubrics in H21 proved to be less informative. It seems unlikely that it is a translation of a similar table of contents in the French exemplars. To the contrary, it is rather probable that the list of rubrics was compiled from the rubrics in the body of the translation. However, the comparison of the rubrics in the Liffol manuscripts has uncovered some interesting data. Although these copies were manufactured under the direction of the same libraire, they do not show the degree of uniformity that is expected of products from the same shop. The presence of textual variation and difference in length of the tituli could be considered as the result of ‘normal’ practice. The observation of divergence in the number of rubrics and their distribution was, by contrast, surprising to say the least. In a number of cases, fundamental changes in the rubrication (added rubrics, rephrasing) appear to be the result of the close relationship between illustration and rubric. It is significant that the translation also corresponds to Bes in cases where miniatures interfere in the segmentation and/or focus of the text. Finally, the differences between the pictorial programmes (especially in the case of Books Two and Three) of the Liffol manuscripts have proven to be even more far-reaching than the differences in rubrication. Since none of the extant French-language
manuscripts corresponds as closely to *Bes* as the manuscripts of the Middle Dutch translation, the high degree of similarity in the distribution and composition of miniatures is of a notable importance. The fact that the paratextual programmes of no other two sets of Liffol manuscripts are as closely as *Bes* and the extant manuscripts of the translation strongly suggests that the former manuscript or one of its descendants once lay on Gerard Potter’s writing desk.

### 3.6. A translation and its exemplar: from Paris to The Hague?

At the end of the previous chapter, the evidence provided by the textual variants was inconclusive. The correspondence between a number of readings in the translation with the readings of manuscripts other than *Bes* left open the possibility that Gerard Potter did not use *Bes* or one of its hypothetical descendants but another, closely affiliated copy as an exemplar. Although the evidence should be considered as inconclusive, the arguments provided by textual variation supporting the hypothesis that not *Bes* or a daughter was the exemplar was rather weak. In most cases, it is plausible that the translator has corrected or adapted his exemplar, which consequently resulted in divergence between *Bes* and the translation.

The analysis of the paratexts of the manuscripts produced by Pierre de Liffol has been highly informative and corroborates the hypothesis that *Bes* or a hypothetical descendant was Gerard Potter’s exemplar. Indeed, notwithstanding the fact that the Liffol manuscripts were manufactured by the same group of scribes and illustrators and the production process was guided by the same *libraire*, the rubrics and illustration of no two of these manuscripts are as similar as the paratexts of *Bes* and the translation. Although it is not impossible that a now lost manuscript sibling resembled the translation more than *Bes*, the differences in the paratexts of the manuscripts produced by Pierre de Liffol suggests that it is rather improbable that such a manuscript ever existed.

At this point, it seems reasonable to state that the combined study of textual variation and paratexts provides evidence to confirm the hypothesis that *Bes* (or a lost daughter manuscript) indeed has been the model of the translation. In this view, the study of variant readings and paratextual features is supplementary and an inquiry into the production process of the French manuscripts provides a way to overcome the limitations of textual criticism in translation studies.
Although it is impossible to exclude a (nearly) identical daughter manuscript, the observation that Gerard Potter’s exemplar probably either was *Bes* or a hypothetical descendant, allows us to confidently state that the history of the translation’s model starts in the Paris workshop of Pierre de Liffol. In other words: it is safe to say that the exemplar was not a now lost fourteenth century copy that originated from the Blois family (through Guy of Blois) or the Bavarian counts of Holland and Hainault. The exemplar or its prototype (in both cases, i.e. *Bes*) was produced in Paris, probably between 1408 and 1417. In the case that *Bes* itself was used as an exemplar for the translation, the manuscript ended up in The Hague, where Gerard Potter translated it. In the last quarter of the sixteenth century, *Bes* resurfaced in the library of Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle. It is not known how the manuscript came in the cardinal’s possession. In the event that Gerard Potter van der Loo did not use *Bes*, but one of the manuscript’s hypothetical descendants, the Besançon manuscript served as the model of another copy, in Paris or elsewhere. Whatever the case may actually have been: the link we have established with Pierre de Liffol’s Parisian workshop provides us with some interesting clues towards how the exemplar finally ended up in Holland.

Assuming that Louis II of Anjou set in motion the distribution of the *Chroniques* by Pierre de Liffol and that the former distributed a number of copies among influential members of his family, ‘such as his uncle the duke of Berry and his cousin the duke of Burgundy’, it is tempting to put forward some hypotheses. One possibility is that Louis II of Anjou did not only honour his uncle and cousin with manuscripts of the *Chroniques*, but also (one of) the young dauphins of France. This would explain the illustration in at least two manuscripts of Book Two (*B52* and *Bes*) of subject matter related to the wedding of Charles VI and Isabel of Bavaria, the princes’ parents. When in December 1415 Louis of Guyenne – the heir apparent – died, his younger brother John of Touraine became heir to the throne. At the time, the young crown prince was married to Jacqueline of Bavaria, countess of Holland and Hainault. However, very soon, Jacqueline would be left a widow. On 5 April 1417, her young husband died from an abscess in the neck. The possibility exists that Gerard Potter encountered the Parisian manuscripts among the books of his mistress, possibly after her death in 1436, when he was involved in the administering of her estate.

---

61 Croenen, Rouse and Rouse 2002, 279.
62 Another possible explanation also leads to the Bavarian counts of Holland. As has been mentioned in § 1.1.3.1., in the first decades of the fifteenth century count William VI, who was one of Froissart’s presumed
Another possible explanation presupposes a Burgundian origin for the manuscripts. In their 2002 article, Croenen, Rouse and Rouse refer to the ‘first-known owners’ of manuscripts of the *Chroniques* as ‘members of the lower to middling nobility, who stood high in the esteem, and in the loyal service, of warring princes’. The scholars refer to John of Roubaix (probably the first owner of London, British Library, Add. 38658-38659) and Peter of Fontenay (the owner and presumed commissioner of New York, Pierpont Morgan, M.804), vehement supporters of the dukes of Burgundy. Other manuscripts that were illuminated by the Gia Master were produced for Charles of Savoisy (Paris, National Library, MS fr.2662) and Walram or Peter of Luxemburg (The Hague, Royal Library, MS 72 A 25). Several confidants of the Burgundian dukes held offices at the court of Holland. For instance: Hugh of Lannoy, stadtholder from 1433 to 1440, had been chamberlain of John the Fearless between 1406 and 1419 and William of Lalaing, stadtholder between 1440 and 1445, had practically spent his whole life at the Burgundian courts, first in the service of Philip the Good, later as *chevalier d’honneur* of Isabella of Portugal. The possibility that one of these Burgundian officials brought the *Chroniques* to Gerard Potter’s attention deserves serious consideration. The context in which the translation was produced may provide additional evidence for this hypothesis. The question of Gerard Potter’s audience is the focal point of Chapters Four and Five of this study.

---

*patrons, maintained close relations with the French court (he was the father-in-law of John of Touraine, prince and later dauphin of France) and the dukes of Berry and Burgundy (John the Fearless was his brother-in-law). His involvement in French politics and frequent residence in Paris also fits the timeframe in which Pierre de Liffol was active.*

64 In 1427, John of Roubaix was in Holland with Philip of Burgundy (Van Riemsdijk 1908, 442); in the same year, Roland of Uutkerke and John of Roubaix received a reward from the city of Leyden because they had assisted in obtaining privileges from the duke (Damen 2000, 408).
66 Damen 2000, 471.*
(Gutt 1998, 52)

As regards the British Isles, R. Ellis has drawn attention to the involvement of the aristocracy in late medieval translation. From the fourteenth century onwards, influential aristocrats commissioned translations in the English vernacular, but – not unlike Gerard Potter – also fulfilled the role of translator.\(^1\) Ellis shows how the translations manufactured by these noblemen bear witness to their translators’ aristocratic lifestyle (e.g. Edward, Duke of York). Furthermore, it is argued that the English translations provide a ‘narrowly focused view of what aristocratic readers might want or need’. Ellis further describes the preferred subjects of translated texts commissioned by royals and aristocrats as ‘chivalric manuals’ and texts discussing ‘the practicalities of warfare and peacemaking’ and texts conveying examples for those in government (the so-called *specula principum*).

The purpose of the present chapter is to contextualise Gerard Potter’s text by analysing his translation technique. An interesting question is whether the translator’s aristocratic social and professional context (cf. Chapter One) has influenced his translation along the lines suggested by Ellis for aristocratic translations in English. Recent insights into the nature of the translation process would indeed suggest that Froissart’s text was adapted to its new context. The ‘cultural turn’, which has been dominant in translation studies since the 1990s, has emphasized that translation is not limited to a linguistic transfer between languages, but also implies a dialogue between cultures.\(^2\) Groundbreaking research (e.g. in the area of postcolonial translation theory) has been done on the relation

---

\(^1\) Ellis 2008, 99-107.
\(^2\) E.g. Munday 2008, Chapter 8.
between translation and power.\textsuperscript{3} These theoretical frameworks may prove to be valuable for further investigation as to the cultural dynamics of Burgundianisation and the role of translation in this process. Therefore, for the further development of this chapter, I do not turn to classical theories of translation based on rhetorics (Cicero) or early Christian translators (St. Jerome, Boethius), but rather start from a theoretical framework which highlights the differences and similarities between the source-language and target-language cultures (cf. § 4.1.).\textsuperscript{4}

A number of in-depth studies on Middle Dutch translations and their French-language originals have shown that a profound analysis of the strategies employed by translators to adequately transfer the original text to its new cultural and linguistic context may lead to interesting observations as to the aesthetics and values of the translator and his intended audience. As regards the Middle Dutch translation of the \textit{Lancelot en prose} included in the so-called \textit{Lancelot compilation}, B. Besamusca has noted that the translator attempted to translate his French source-text as faithfully as possible, hindered only by the peremptory demands of the verse-form he employs.\textsuperscript{5} This observation consequently allows the scholar to deliberately assign specific meaning to passages in which the Dutch version diverges from the French original text. Besamusca concludes that the departures in the Middle Dutch text reveal the translator’s literary aesthetics. Furthermore, the translation’s audience appears to have been rather well versed in Arthurian romance.\textsuperscript{6} In his study of the \textit{Lanceloet}, Besamusca does not venture to conclusively identify the translation’s primary audience. Conversely, a close comparison of the Middle Dutch version of the \textit{Partonopeu de Blois} and its French original does not only allow A. Reynders to identify the environment in which the translation probably circulated as the high aristocracy at the court of Brabant, but also suggests a possible stimulus for its creation, being the introduction of non-aristocratic newcomers at the centre of power.\textsuperscript{7} The translation strategies employed by Gerard Potter and their significance for the translator’s intended audience will be presented in § 4.2.

The research presented in § 4.3. links up with Ellis’ observation of aristocratic translations being influenced by the codes of conduct which govern the environments of the translator and his intended audience. This section focuses on a number of areas that

\textsuperscript{3} E.g Tymoczko and Gentzler 2002; Bassnett and Trivedi 1999.
\textsuperscript{4} The Churchfathers and rhetoricians have been suggested as the primary framework for medieval translation by, amongst others, Copeland 1991, Besamusca and Sonnemans 1999.
\textsuperscript{5} Besamusca 1991, 72-73.
\textsuperscript{6} Besamusca 1991, 123.
\textsuperscript{7} Reynders 2002.
probably were of interest to Gerard Potter and his aristocratic audience: the classification of chivalry, courtly patterns of behaviour and the conduct of war. The way in which the translator deals with the subtleties of these subjects may be revealing of his – and by extension his audience’s – attitude towards these characteristic features of aristocratic society.

In § 4.4., I try to further narrow down the audience for whom Froissart’s chronicle was translated into Middle Dutch. I will do so using two approaches. Firstly, in his text, Jean Froissart refers to highly placed relatives of people who also occur in Gerard Potter’s professional networks. The latter can be considered as belonging to the intended audience or may even have actively encouraged Potter’s translation effort. Any preferential treatment of their forebears could point towards patronage. Secondly, it has been observed that the illustration of a manuscript is often linked to the preferences of its commissioner.8 This observation is particularly interesting in the case of the Middle Dutch version of the Chroniques, since it is possible to compare the translation’s pictorial programme with the illustration of the exemplar or, in any event, a manuscript that was nearly identical to it. Differences in the programmes of illustration may indeed indicate a difference in focus and as such suggest a particular patron or purpose for the text.

4.1. Imagining audiences: translation and relevance

The general approach adopted in this chapter is the relevance theory of translation, which is based on a communicative framework formulated in 1986 by Sperber and Wilson. The theory was applied to the field of translation studies by E.A. Gutt in 1991.9 In brief, relevance theorists assume that in order to guarantee the success of an act of communication, the utterance or stimulus should be optimally relevant or meaningful to the receiver.10 In order to process a message correctly the receiver or addressee needs to consult his/her cognitive environment, a web of knowledge comprising all the information the individual has collected through observation, education, upbringing, social interaction, etc. In his article on ‘Audiences, relevance and cognitive environments’ C. Tindale has summarized the notion of cognitive environment as follows:

---

8 Rouse and Rouse (forthcoming).
9 For an introduction to translation and the principle of relevance, see Hatim and Munday 2004, 57-66.
10 The following relies heavily on Gutt 2004.
(…) a cognitive environment is a set of facts and assumptions which an individual, or, in the case of shared cognitive environments, a number of individuals, is capable of mentally representing and accepting as true (although they may be mistaken in doing so). (…) And these environments tell us nothing about what a person knows or assumes, but about what they could be expected to know or assume.

(Tindale 1992, 182)

To successfully interpret the message, the addressee needs to select from this knowledge the information that is relevant to the interpretation of the stimulus (communicative context) and consequently use this information to infer correctly the speaker’s intention.\(^\text{11}\) This cognitive process of inference is universal and can only function optimally when the communicator through careful choice of the stimulus allows the receiver to select relevant information from his cognitive environment ‘without requiring unnecessary processing effort’.\(^\text{12}\) In brief, for communication to be successful, an utterance is preferably relevant and not unnecessarily complicated.

This process implies that the communicator can make accurate assumptions (a) about the cognitive environment of the receptor audience (as Tindale points out: we have no direct knowledge of the cognitive environments of other individuals) and (b) the way in which the receiver will select the appropriate context. In situations where the cognitive environments of communicator and audience can be expected to be similar, this process is fairly straightforward. Thus, the communicator can, to a large extent, rely on his beliefs regarding the audience’s interpretation. As far as translations are concerned, however, this is not always the case. In situations where cognitive environments of the original communicator (the author) and the translator diverge from one another, the latter needs to reconstruct the communicative process between the author of the original text and his intended audience together with their respective cognitive environments. This capacity is called ‘metarepresentation’.

Translation typically, though not necessarily, brings into contact people with different cognitive environments and therefore metarepresentation is one of the crucial challenges facing translators. Thus, very often the translator cannot simply use his own cognitive environment when trying to understand the original; rather he has to metarepresent to

\(^{11}\) The cognitive environment ‘includes any information accessible to that individual from memory, perception or inferential thought processes’. Context should be understood as ‘the subset of information necessary to interpret a particular text correctly’. Gutt 2004, 78.

\(^{12}\) Gutt 2004, 78.
himself the mutual cognitive environment shared between the original communicator and original audience.

(Gutt 2004, 82)

In the case of Gerard Potter’s translation of the *Chroniques*, the situation can be represented as follows. In order to understand Froissart’s text correctly, the translator needs to reconstruct for each stimulus or utterance:

1. Froissart’s communicative intentions;
2. (Froissart’s beliefs regarding the) information accessible to the author and his intended audience through their (shared or similar) cognitive environments.

Due to their presence in similar socio-cultural circles (aristocratic courts), in this case, the common ground between the cognitive environments of the original author and the translator must have provided Gerard Potter with a sufficient basis to adequately understand and translate Froissart’s text.  

On the other hand, differences between their respective backgrounds (time, place) equally confronted the translator with difficulties. Born in Holland and raised in the vicinity of the court, Gerard Potter certainly had some affinity with Froissart’s native soil of Hainault and its neighbouring principalities. His (relative) proximity to the rulers of the county – and possibly his own involvement in local government requiring him to travel throughout the Low Countries, Germany and France – familiarised him with foreign policy (e.g. the war between the rivalling kingdoms of England and France). It is doubtful, however, that the level of Froissart’s background information was always equivalent to his Dutch translator’s. Indeed, some of the events recounted in Froissart’s narrative took place over half a century before Gerard Potter even was born and, what is more, in regions which in some cases were probably unknown to him. In this respect, it is highly probable that the translator was not always familiar with the places or people referred to in the text. These, next to more general, linguistic problems of comprehension, may have left their mark on Gerard Potter’s translation.

---

13 For Potter’s socio-cultural environment: see Chapter One.
14 Cf. Chapter One.
15 Gerard Potter’s translation of ‘Asquesufort’ (Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 109), i.e. Oxford, as ‘Zuytvolk’ (H21,fol. 3 r.; also fol. 134 v.), which refers to Suffolk, shows that French toponyms occasionally were a problem (or that the translator did not fully understand the relations between the English aristocracy or was unfamiliar with the geography of England).
However, it is not sufficient that the translator adequately understands the original text. It is imperative that the translation he produces is also relevant or at least intelligible to his audience. This entails that it should be possible for the readers to contextualise the text within the boundaries of their own cognitive environment.

On the production side, the translator can largely rely on his intuitions about relevance – except that differences between the original and the receptor environment may again need to be taken into account, either by helping the receptors adjust their own cognitive environment or by adapting the resemblance relations accordingly. However, to take either of these steps the translator would need to first identify the differences between the background knowledge of the original and the receptor audiences (…)

(Gutt 2004, 86)

Gutt suggests that when a translator anticipates a problem in his audience’s understanding of the text, he can act appropriately in two ways: he can try to expand the cognitive environment of his/her readership by somehow adding the required information to the translation or he can adapt the ‘resemblance relations’ between the original text and the translation, e.g. by using a paraphrase that fits the audience’s cognitive context or by deleting (cultural) information which is unnecessarily confusing.16 In 1967, Levý had proposed that – when confronted with a problem – a translator chooses the solution ‘which promises [the audience] maximum effect for minimal effort’.17

The degree in which the translator interferes in the source-text situates his translation on the scale of direct translations (i.e. close to the original text, what has been called ‘faithful’) and indirect translations which ‘are intended to survive on their own, and involve whatever changes the translator deems necessary to maximize relevance for a new audience’.18 The notions of translation, adaptation and rewrite, commonly used in the debate on medieval translation, should be regarded as representing different positions on this gliding-scale.19

16 Gutt elaborates both mechanisms in his 2007 article on bible translation (Gutt 2007, 97-99).
17 Hatim and Munday 2004, 60.
18 Hatim and Munday 2004, 62.
19 For translation, adaptation and rewrite: Reynders 2000, 219-220. In recent articles on translation and relevance, the difference between direct and indirect translation has been exchanged for the idea that language can be used in stimulus-oriented mode (s-mode), which focuses on the formal resemblance of the utterances in the source and target-language and interpretation-oriented mode (i-mode), which focuses on how the stimulus should be interpreted rather than on the stimulus itself. Cf. Gutt 2004a.
In the following, I will analyse the alterations that Gerard Potter made in order to re-produce the *Chroniques* in a new linguistic and social context. Given that the translator’s interferences in the text may (a) provide information about possible differences between the cognitive environment of the original author (shared by his intended audience) and the cognitive environment of the translator and (b) point towards expectations that the translator had regarding his intended receptor audience, this approach appears to be promising for the contextualisation of Gerard Potter’s text.

### 4.2. Use of translation strategies

From the above, it has become apparent that no one-to-one relationship exists between the ‘original’ text and its translation. In order to provide his intended audience with an optimally relevant translation, the translator does not only need to modify his model on the level of form (e.g. because of differences in modes of expression of the source and target-languages), but, necessarily also interferes on the level of content, e.g. because of differences in the cognitive environments of the original and receptor audiences. In this paragraph I will explore the different strategies Gerard Potter has employed in order to adapt the *Chroniques* to a new audience. Examples taken from three chapters of Book Three will illustrate this description.\(^{20}\)

#### 4.2.1. Tautology (doublet)

Compared to Froissart’s original, Potter’s translation tends to be more elaborate. In his brief study of the Middle Dutch translation of the *Chroniques*, J.W. Muller notes: ‘In his translation, Potter has probably further expanded the fairly elaborate text of the original: time and again, one encounters repetitions, accumulations of the most synonymous words, etc.’\(^{21}\) Muller considered these characteristics as evidence of poor literary style. However,

---

\(^{20}\) Examples have been taken from the prologue (§ 1) the election of John I of Portugal (§ 2-4) and the events leading up to the death of Gaston of Foix (§ 19-21). Whenever possible, I refer to the first volume of the edition of *Bes* 2, Book Three by P. Ainsworth and G. Croenen (Ainsworth and Croenen 2007) which comprises the first 32 chapters of the text (also accessible through the Online Froissart website). Henceforth, I refer to the division in chapters in Bes, which has been adopted by the 2007 edition. In my discussion of portions of text which extend beyond the modern edition of *Bes* as available at this moment (2010), I refer to the folio numbers in the manuscript. As far as the translation is concerned, I refer to the folio numbers of the The Hague manuscript, *H21* (Book Three) and the edition of De Pauw 1898 (Book Two).

\(^{21}\) Muller 1888, 274.
in view of the relevance theory and its application to translation studies as presented above, it is worthwhile to consider alternative explanations.

The form of repetition that occurs most frequently in Gerard Potter’s translation is tautology and more specifically the use of doublets, i.e. (near) synonyms that have been connected by a coordinating conjunction. This technique has been recognized in the translations of several Middle Dutch poets. In his discussion of the translation process of the Middle Dutch (rhymed) version of the *Lancelot en prose*, B. Besamusca concluded that ‘(...) tautology is closely connected with the peremptory demand that Middle Dutch verses rhyme’. For obvious reasons, this cannot be the explanation for Gerard Potter’s abundant use of this trope.

In the majority of the doublets, the addition of a (near) synonym adds meaning or connotation to the expression used in the French-language original. Even in the opening lines of the prologue of Book Three, when Froissart states ‘Je me sui longuement tenu a parler des besoignes des loingtaines marches’, Gerard Potter’s translation is more specific. The French ‘tenu’ (here in the sense of ‘I have restrained myself’) has been translated by the doublet ‘gerust ende ghetoeft’ (‘I have paused and restrained myself), ‘parler’ (to speak) has been rendered by the doublet ‘te scriven ende te openbaren’ (to write and to reveal). In the first instance, the Dutch ‘gerust’ (literally ‘rested’) seems to add a sense of leisurely calm, in the second instance the Dutch text is more specific in its choice of words: the author does not ‘talk’ but ‘writes’ and in doing so ‘reveals’ information to the reader.

A clear example of this tendency towards increased specificity is the translation of the *Chroniques* objective: with his text Froissart wants to ‘exemplifier les bons qui se desiren a avancier par armes’. In the Middle Dutch translation the rather generic ‘bons’ (good deeds? Or rather good qualities?) have become ‘der vromer duechde ende ere’. Gerard Potter has rendered the general idea of ‘good’ by means of two qualities ‘duechde’ (virtue, excellence) and ‘ere’ (honour) characteristics of ‘vromer’ (courageous men). These concepts probably give us an insight in what the translator believed to be commendable characteristics for members of the military elite, i.e. knights and squires.

The translator is also more specific as regards the receptor end of the communication process. As far as the ‘grans fais d’armes, prinses et assaulx de villes et de

---

22 Besamusca 1991, 48. Besamusca’s study focuses on the Middle Dutch translation that is incorporated in the famous ‘Lancelot-compilation’ (The Hague, Royal Library, 129A10) ca. 1320-1325.
23 Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 103; *H21*, fol.1 r.
chasteaulx, batailles adreciees et durs rencontres’ are concerned, Froissart promises his audience ‘vous en trouverez grant foison’. 24 Gerard Potter translates:

van vele groter zaken ende feyten van wapenen so in strijden, in stormen, an lude, steden ende sloten ende van menich scarp gemoeten ende,recontre gheschiet te wesen so suldy dier gelijken noch hier na bij groten hopen horen ende vernemen geschiet te wesen.

(of many great things and feats of arms as well as in battle, attacks, of people, of cities and castles and of many brutal clashes and encounters that happened, but in the following you will hear and be informed of similar feats that have happened in large numbers.)

(H21, fol. 2 r.)

The ‘batailles adreciees’ have been moved forward, thus changing the word order of the French text, a process frequently employed by the Dutch translator. The bipartite enumeration ‘villes et chasteaulx’ has been expanded to include attacks on people, thus providing a more complete summary of the chronicle’s subject matter. Additionally, the image of the reader actively engaged in exploring the text, finding or encountering information, is replaced by a more topic representation of reception: the audience will ‘hear and be informed’ of these acts of war. 25

A final example of this category shows how the doublet can further specify the meaning of a general expression. When the envoys sent to Lisbon to convince the Portuguese of the rightful claims of the king of Castile to the Portuguese throne, realise that their mission has failed, they take leave ‘ainsi comme il appertenoit’. The Dutch translation copies the general expression by the adverb ‘bequamelijken’ but adds to it ‘ende zedichlijken’, meaning ‘civilised, decent’. 26

Tautologies and doublets can also reflect two or more of the different meanings of words that are polysemous in the original language. When one word suffices for Froissart to describe the men fighting in the kingdoms of Castile, Portugal and other remote regions: ‘vaillans’ (deserving, courageous), Gerard Potter translates both meanings: ‘edele’ (in the sense of ‘meritorious’) and ‘vrome’ (in the sense of ‘brave’). 27 Froissart also uses ‘vaillans’ to describe ‘maître Denis’, the illegitimate son of Peter I of Portugal.

25 The reference to ‘hearing’ by no means indicates an aural mode of reception. See: e.g. Pleij 1990, 101-137, especially 114.
26 Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 115; H21, fol. 4 v.
27 Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 105; H21, fol. 2 r.
and later crowned as John I of Portugal. Again, the Dutch translator needs more than one word to capture the meaning of ‘vaillans’. In Dutch, ‘meyster Denijs’ is a ‘vromen, wijzen man’.\textsuperscript{28} In his translation, Potter expresses the characteristics a (future) king should have: courage and wisdom. Similarly, the expression ‘nobles hommes’ may have presented Potter with a problem, since ‘noble’ may refer to social rank as well as a set of personal characteristics. In the Dutch translation ‘hoge ende edele mannen’, the noblemen’s high social standing is reflected by the qualifier ‘hoge’, whereas their moral excellence is expressed by the (still ambiguous) adjective ‘edele’.\textsuperscript{29} These examples show the translator’s preoccupation with a correct or complete rendering of the meanings that are conveyed by his French example. The ambiguity is not resolved by a clear choice for a particular option but tackled by the rendition of a variety of possible meanings. This manner of translation may be interpreted as an attempt to exclude ‘faulty’ translation and is probably aimed at preventing an incorrect understanding of the French text. Indeed, translation errors would demean the value and validity of Gerard Potter’s work.\textsuperscript{30}

Admittedly, it is not always clear whether these polysemous doublets have been inspired by Gerard Potter’s linguistic knowledge or his own expectations regarding the situation described in the \textit{Chroniques}. When Gaston Fébus discovers that his son Gaston (unknowingly) came very close to poisoning him, he is ‘courrouciez’, the primary meaning of which is ‘furious’. Potter’s translation presents us with a more human reaction: Fébus is ‘ontstelt ende verthoornt’ (confused and outraged).\textsuperscript{31} ‘Courroucer’ may have the connotation of ‘troubled’, which more or less captures the meaning of the Dutch ‘ontstelt’. In turn, ‘ontstelt’ sometimes refers to strong feelings associated with anger, which might explain Potter’s choice of words.\textsuperscript{32} The fact that he declares that the king of Castile is ‘gestuert ende verthoornt’ (confused and outraged) at the election of John I of Portugal, may indicate that the translator automatically connected the French ‘courrouciez’ with this connotation of ‘confusion, chaos’.\textsuperscript{33}

Apart from specifying and explicitating the ambiguities of expressions in the original language, tautologies can also be used in a more poetic manner: they can intensify

\textsuperscript{28} Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 111; \textit{H21}, fol. 3 v.
\textsuperscript{29} \textit{H21}, fol. 1 v.
\textsuperscript{30} Boone 2009 refers to an arrest of the Parlement at Paris which discusses the risks of incorrect translations in the ducal Council at Ghent ‘which have rendered its judgment void’.
\textsuperscript{31} Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 198; \textit{H21}, fol. 33 v.
\textsuperscript{32} This kind of tautology does not always refer to human characteristics or emotion. Compare \textit{H21}, fol. 3 v. ‘rechten ende vrijheden’ as a translation for the French ‘franchises’ (Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 113). ‘Rechten’ may refer to (written) law and ‘vrijheden’ to certain privileges.
\textsuperscript{33} \textit{H21} fol. 4 r.; Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 113.
the meaning of the original expression. In Froissart’s account of the tragic death of Gaston of Foix, one of the characteristics attributed to Charles II of Navarre is ‘malice’ (evil). Given that the king of Navarre has (indirectly) caused his nephew’s death and the extinction of the lineage of Gaston Fébus, this is hardly an exaggeration. Gerard Potter’s translation reads ‘scalkhede ende argelisticchede’ (maliciousness and deceit). Although both words share the connotation of ‘evil’, the second word may refer to the malevolent scheme set up by the king of Navarre intended to eliminate the count of Foix, his brother-in-law.

Another category of tautologies combines a French loanword with an indigenous alternative. In the prologue, Froissart recounts the cordial welcome he enjoyed at the court of Foix and in particular the praise of Gaston Fébus. The latter has told him that his ‘istoire (…) seroit ou temps a avenir plus recommandee que nulle autre’. In Potter’s translation Froissart’s narrative will be ‘vermairt ende gerecommandeert’ (renowned and recommended). The second qualification as regards Froissart’s chronicle has clearly been inspired by the French original. This is by no means remarkable: it is very common for a translation to display the influence of the original text. The phenomenon has been described in the second of G. Toury’s laws of translation: the law of interference, stating that ‘common ST [source-text] lexical and syntactic patterns tend to be copied, creating unusual patterns in the TT [target-text]’. Another example has been presented above. When Froissart reveals to his readership what is to come, Gerard Potter translates ‘dur rencontres’ by a doublet: ‘scarpe gemoeten ende ren contre’. It is clear that in these cases (a) Toury’s law of interference is at work and (b) the indigenous part of the doublet serves as an explanation of the French loan. The fact that the translator added the Dutch alternative may indicate that he questioned the audience’s ability to interpret the French loan word. Nevertheless, the fact that he intentionally also used the French hybrid,

---

34 Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 194.
35 For a summary of the story see Chapter Three (3.4.3), the discussion of the frontispiece of B88.
36 Potter’s use of French loans is partially the reason for J.W. Muller’s negative appreciation of the translation (Muller 1888, 272-274). Muller did not limit his criticism of the translator’s vocabulary and style to the cited article. In a survey of French loans, Muller branded Potter as one of the worst Gallicists known to Middle Dutch literature (Muller 1920, 11 n. 1).
37 Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 105; H21, fol. 1v.
38 As such, the French loans may have a ‘foreignising’ effect on the audience by giving it a glimpse at the source language culture. Other interventions (such as the substitution of names, expressions) have the opposite effect of ‘domesticating’ the text, rendering it more familiar to a new audience, e.g. the example in § 4.3.2. in which Potter renders the common French names ‘Gautier’ and ‘Guillaume’ by a name which probably was very common in Dutch at the time, ‘Pieter’. The terms ‘foreignisation’ and ‘domestication’ were first coined by L. Venuti (cf. Snell-Hornby 2006, 145). I have the distinct impression that Gerard
suggests that Gerard Potter accepted it as relevant to his audience. In this respect, I agree with F. van Oostrom when he states:

> These neologisms should not be blamed on Gerard’s lack of translation experience, nor should it be thought that he used Frenchified terms simply because he could not think of the Dutch equivalent – there are too many passages in which he uses French-sounding words quite unlike those found in the original version (…). The explanation must be something other than incompetence, namely that French was once again *bon ton* at The Hague.

*(Van Oostrom 1992, 298)*

Nevertheless, I am not entirely convinced by Van Oostrom’s assertion that the language of the original has not influenced the French-sounding words that differ from those in Froissart’s French text. To the contrary, it is plausible that during the translation process the translator grew accustomed to the French of the original text, which inspired him to use French-sounding alternatives, even when there was no direct relation with the word in the text. In any event, it seems reasonable to assume that, in the instances when a French loan is not accompanied by its Dutch alternative, Gerard Potter expected his audience to know and understand this lexical item. Sometimes, this comes as quite a surprise. Indeed, some of these French loans seemingly appear for the first time in the translation of the *Chroniques*. In her *Chronologisch woordenboek* (chronological dictionary of Dutch) N. van der Sijs suggests that the first use of ‘recommanderen’ should be dated to the period

---

39 I agree with Van Oostrom’s observation that the presence of French hybrids tells us something about the literary or rather cultural tastes of Gerard Potter’s intended audience. To my mind, however, no evidence exists to situate the translation during the last years of the reign of John the Pitiless as suggested by Van Oostrom 1992, 297: ‘This new French influence is reflected in the only literary work apparently produced in the very last years of Bavarian rule at The Hague’ and ‘That Froissart’s work should have been chosen for translation is no less significant: it is a monument to chivalry erected (…) for distant relatives of John of Bavaria’. Van Oostrom’s argument is confusing as a few pages later he states: ‘The language difference between Potter van der Loo Senior and Junior, indeed, symbolizes the difference between Bavarian and Burgundian court culture in Holland’. For reasons which will be explained in Chapter Five, I am rather inclined to share the view of Kukenheim and Roussel who use Potter’s translation as an example of the fact that ‘après l’abdication de Jacqueline de Bavière (1430), les Pays-Bas tendent à se détacher du Saint-Empire pour être intégrés au domaine bourguignon, leur vie culturelle devient de plus en plus un prolongement de celle de France’ (Kukenheim and Roussel 1957, 175). J. Van Herwaarden concludes: ‘this context [the first years of Burgundian rule] helps us to understand that Gerrit Potter’s Dutch was influenced by the French exemplar’ (Van Herwaarden 1990, 2-3).

40 Cf. Van Driel 2007, 131-141.
1467-1490. As the terminus *ante quem* for Gerard Potter’s Middle Dutch translation of the *Chroniques* is 14 November 1454 (Potter’s death), his use of this term obviously predates the occurrence listed by the *Chronologisch woordenboek*. Although this may be an indication that Van der Sijs’ dating is not always completely accurate, it seems that (a) Gerard Potter’s language is very modern and (b) that he expected his Dutch-speaking audience to understand the fashionable French-sounding words that had just been incorporated in their native language. Some other examples have been listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First attested in</th>
<th>Lexical item</th>
<th>fol. in H21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1433</td>
<td>affectie</td>
<td>104 r., 145 r. (ende goede gunste), 153 r. (ende begeerten)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1436</td>
<td>kust</td>
<td>23 v., 24 v., 25 v., 80 v., 82 r., 141 v., 144 v., 148v., 156 r., 159 v., 160 r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1436</td>
<td>spijt</td>
<td>52 v., 54 v., 81 r. (ende verdroit), 106 r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1437</td>
<td>traktaat</td>
<td>24 r. (ende overdrachten), 24 v. (of compacten), 67 v. (middelen ende), 91 v., 94 r. (ende dadinge), 127 r., 127 v., 136 v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1442</td>
<td>concipiëren (Lat.)</td>
<td>118 r. (ende begreep)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1445</td>
<td>correctie</td>
<td>74 v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1451</td>
<td>authentiek (Lat.)</td>
<td>166 r., 376 r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1451-1500</td>
<td>neutraal</td>
<td>103 r. (ende stille)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1451-1500</td>
<td>informatie</td>
<td>14 r., 53 r., 96 r., 226 r. (ende onderzoek)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1452-1494</td>
<td>accepteren</td>
<td>26 r. (ende annemen), 102 r. (noch anvairden), 127 v. (ende nanteran)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1467-1490</td>
<td>recommanderen</td>
<td>1 v. (vermaart ende)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501-1550</td>
<td>personage</td>
<td>96 v.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- table 4.1. : French-sounding neologisms in the translation -

The examples listed above clearly show that Gerard Potter’s use of neologisms often predates the dating of the chronological dictionary. Additionally, the relatively late dating of the majority of the French loans that appear in the translation, may also suggest a

---

41 Van der Sijs 2001, 644. It is not my intention to be critical of Van der Sijs’ highly commendable venture, given that it is impossible to take into account all of the surviving (literary and documentary) sources.

42 Most probably J.W. Muller’s interpretation of the Dutch-French doublets in the Dutch translation of Mandeville does not (fully) apply to the doublets in Potter’s translation. According to Muller, the audience of the Middle Dutch Mandeville knew the French loans as well as (or even better as) their ‘Dutch purist alternatives’. The poet’s primary objective was to ‘flaunt someone else’s feathers’ (Muller 1931, 222).
slightly later dating for Gerard Potter’s text, rather than an early one as suggested by Muller and Van Oostrom (ca. 1430). In any event, the presence of these French-sounding neologisms shows that Gerard Potter’s audience must have been right at the centre of the linguistic innovations and/or must have had some (basic) knowledge of Latin and French. Since the incorporation of French loan words was probably promoted by the intercultural contacts between Burgundian and indigenous court officials, it seems reasonable that an audience of ‘early adopters’ should be situated at the courts of the Dutch-speaking ‘pays par deça’, which had been recently annexed by the Burgundian personal union. J.W. Muller already connects the Dutch-French doublets with ‘the chancery style of official documents’, the need to be complete and precise (cf. supra, the handling of ambiguities) and the Burgundian government of civil servants. R. Willemyns has suggested that the Dutch translationese, which was interspersed with French loans, was heralded in by the insufficient linguistic competence of some ‘Frenchified’ officials. In § 1.3.2.1., I have suggested that the Burgundian language policy resulted into a shift of power between French and Dutch in the local governments of the Dutch-speaking regions. This may also be the explanation for the ‘Frenchified’ language of the officials in these governments. It is not implausible that the perception of French as the language of supra-regional power has led to a ‘Frenchified’ variant of Dutch, which established itself as the language of regional government. In this respect, the introduction of French loans is not the result of ‘insufficient linguistic knowledge’ but the result of a refined intuition of the importance of language in the construction of social norms and power relations.

The purpose of the final category of tautologies, in which one constituent part of the doublets is almost entirely void of specific meaning, is harder to explain. In most cases, this hollow constituent is ‘zaken’ (things). In the prologue, Froissart explains that he wants to travel to the court of Foix at Béarn ‘pour estre informez de toutes nouvelles’ (to gather news). The doublet in the translation ‘om alle zaken ende tijdingen te vernemen’ (to learn of all things and tidings’) does not specify or intensify the meaning of the original text. ‘Zaken’ does not add anything that might facilitate the audience’s interpretation. Therefore, it is probable that this kind of doublet does not function on the interpretative level, but rather on the formal level of translation. Indeed, the effects of the

---

43 See also Chapter One. Muller 1931, 228, 232; Willemyns 1994, 168. Some examples taken from the accounts of 1439-1440 (GRRek 140): ‘quitancie’ (fol. 42 r.), ‘recompencien’ (fol. 43 r.), ‘quitancien’, (fol. 43 r.) ‘acquite’ (fol. 56 v.), ‘zustineren’ (fol. 60 v.), ‘ordinancen’ (fol. 60 v.), ‘certificacien’ (fol. 75 r.), ‘geedificeert’ (fol. 79 r.), ‘brieve van mandemente’ (fol. 80 r.).
44 Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 104; H21, fol. 1 v.
law of interference, which have been proposed as an explanation for exotic words in the
text, is not only active on the lexical level, but also on the level of syntax. This means that
translators are also inclined to copy the formal characteristics of the original text. In this
respect, it is possible that they do not only imitate, but also emulate formal properties and
apply stylistic singularities even in instances when these have no counterpart in the
source-language version of the text.

However, there is an alternative, audience-centred explanation for the presence of
these empty tautologies. This explanation is connected to the demands of versification,
which Besamusca indicated as an explanation for the doublets in the *Lancelot-
compilation*. It is possible that Middle Dutch poets, authors, translators and audiences had
grown accustomed to tautologies, the primary function of which had been the construction
of a well-formed line of poetry. In this view, by the fifteenth century, these tautologies
had acquired a new, stylistic relevance, even when the old rhymed form was abandoned
and exchanged for the more modern prose style.45

4.2.2. Explicitation

Research in translation studies has shown that translations tend to be more explicit than
non-translations.46 Information, which was implicit in the original text, but could be
derived from the context, has been made explicit in the translation. A comprehensive
definition of explicitation has been formulated by Klaudy and Károly:

Explicitation takes place, for example, when a SL [source-language] unit of a more
general meaning is replaced by a TL [target-language] unit of a more special meaning;
the complex meaning of a SL word is distributed over several words in the TL; new
meaningful elements appear in the TL text; one sentence in the SL is divided into two or
several sentences in the TL; or, when SL phrases are extended or “elevated” into clauses
in the TL, etc.

(As quoted by Pym 2005, 32)

45 In their respective studies of the Dutch *Mandeville* and the first Dutch translation of the *Pèlerinage* both
Cramer and Biesheuvel draw the attention to the use of tautologies. (Cramer 1908, LVII-LXII; Biesheuvel
2005, 94-95). Muller 1931 discusses other late fourteenth and fifteenth century examples.
46 Hatim and Munday 2004, 7 list explicitation and greater cohesion (see: 4.2.3.) as possible translation
universals. Pym 2005 proposes interesting alternative explanations for the frequent occurrence of
explicitation in translated texts.
Some of these processes have already been observed in the discussion of Gerard Potter’s use of tautologies. Indeed, some of the doublets are more specific (‘special’) in their rendering of the meaning of the French original. Other instances of tautology present different, related meanings of polysemous words (i.e. ‘with a complex meaning’).

However, in addition to his use of tautologies, which partially may have been inspired by stylistic considerations, but also the preoccupation to be precise, Gerard Potter makes his text more explicit in other ways. An analysis of the translator’s handling of the departure of the earl of Cambridge from Portugal illustrates the use of explicitation.

Teles paroles et autres avoit remonstré le conte de Cantebruge avant son departement au roy de Portingal, le quel roy les avoit bien o¿es et entendues, mais non obstant ce, onques il ne s’osa combatre ens es plains de Salenence, quant ilz furent l’un devant l’autre, aux Espaignolz, ne point ne le trouvoit en conseil de ceulx de son pays. Si lui disoient: “Sire, la puissance du roy de Castile est maintenant trop grande, et se par fortune ou mesaventure vous perdiez la journée, vous perdriez vostre royaume sans recouvrer. Si vous vault miex souffrir que faire chose ou vous aiez dommaige ne peril.” Et quant le conte de Cantebruge voit que il n’en aroit autre chose, lui retourné a Lusebonne, il fist appareillier sa navie et prinst congé au roy de Portingal, et entra en mer avec ses gens.

(Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 108)

Compared to the French original, Gerard Potter’s account of the same events is remarkably longer (by about 150%):

Deser ende andere gelijke woirde hadde dese grave Aymont van Cambrits genoich metten coninc van Pointingael eer hij uut Pointingale of van hem schiet, de welke woirde dese coninc wael gehoirt ende verstaen hadde. Niet te min en was hij nye so coene dat ter wijlen hij met alle sijnre machten in tvelt van Salence lach ende die Engelse bij hem dair sij voir malkanderen lagen dat hij hadde dorren strijden metten Castillyanen.47 Oick wast wail wair dat sijn rade en ryedens hem niet, mer zeechden tot hem: “Here, des coninx machte van Castilgen is up desen tijt u veel te groot om te bevechten ende of bij ongevalle of snoder aventueren ghij den strijt verloort, sonder twyvel ghij verloort gansselijken all heel u coninckrijke van Pointingale sonder dat ymmermeer weder te mogen verhalen. Ende hier omme raden wij u dat ghij u lijdet ende dat is beter dan dat ghij dedet dair ghij in verderffelicheden om comen mochtest.” Doe dese grave van Caembrits alle dese woirde metten coninck gehadt hadde ende weder omme des coninx raedt vander opynien was als

47 The substitution of ‘Espaignolz’ by ‘Castillyanen’ seems largely arbitrary. Indeed, like Froissart, Potter also uses ‘Spangen’ (Spain) with reference to Castile. Both toponyms seem mutually interchangeable.
voirscreven is ende dat sijn wille niet en mochte voirtgaen, hem weder gekeert wesende
tot Lusebonne toe, nam hij oirlof anden coninc ende dede bereyden sijn scepen ende
sloech dair met sinen hope inder zee (...) 

(H21, fol. 2 v.)

A first example of explicitation is probably the result of a problem in interpreting the French construction. It is unclear whether the prepositional clause ‘au roy de Portugal’ is linked to ‘remonstré’ (he talked to the king of Portugal time and again’) or rather to ‘departement’ (his departure of the king of Portugal). In his translation, Potter chooses to cover both options: the earl of Cambridge (specifically referred to as ‘Aymont’) talked to the king of Portugal before he left Portugal or the king. This mode of operation is completely in line with the translator’s treatment of ambiguous words: he translates not one, but all of the possible alternatives that occur to him. This particularity of Gerard Potter’s behaviour as a translator may be the result of the need to be complete, to be precise, not to limit the possible meanings that were available to the audience of the French source text. The additions ‘met alle sijnre machten’ ‘ende die Engelse bij hem dair’ (with all of his force; and the English with him) give the reader a better idea of the situation on the battlefield: Ferdinand I of Portugal had promised Edmund, earl of Cambridge, to aid him in his struggle against John I of Castile. However, the king of Portugal had, against the earl’s will, entered into a treaty with the king of Castile. Thus, when the army of Castile confronted the Anglo-Portuguese alliance, the Portuguese king refused to engage in combat. Gerard Potter’s representation of the events underlines the frustration of the English troops. Indeed, the Portuguese reluctance to fight effectively ended their campaign on the Iberian Peninsula.

In some cases, short additions further specify a statement in the original text. Froissart says that, according to the Portuguese council, the military power of the king of Castile is too large. Potter is more specific: the king’s power is too large ‘to fight against’. If the king engages into battle, he will lose his kingdom, more specifically: ‘the kingdom of Portugal’. Potter’s additions also intensify the original text: the king of Portugal will ‘sonder twyvel’ (without a shadow of a doubt) lose his kingdom and will not regain it, ‘ymmermeer’ (forever).

Finally, the extension of the last sentence of the fragment summarises what has been described before. In the French original, the earl of Cambridge leaves because ‘il
n’en aroit autre chose’ (nothing else will come of it). Potter’s version repeats the reasons for the Portuguese persistent reluctance to fight: the earl had tried to change the king’s mind, but the council had ruled against an armed conflict.

In brief, the analysis shows that Gerard Potter’s explicitations serve three different purposes:

(1) when the original allows for more than one interpretation, several have been made explicit in the translation.

(2) explicitations clarify the original text and thus render it more comprehensible to the reader.

(3) explicitations intensify the original text and thus affect the impact it has on its readership.

Finally, some examples may indicate that repeated explicitation reinforces recurring motifs of the text. This becomes clear from the story of the death of Gaston of Foix. One of the important side characters is Yvain, the illegitimate son of Gaston Fébus. He was the first to discover the pouch with ‘magical’ powder, which was tucked away under his half-brother’s tunic. Froissart introduces Yvain as follows:

Or estoit il d’ordonance en l’ostel de Fois que molt souvent Gaston et Yewain son frere bastart gisoient ensemble en une chambre, et s’entramoient ainsi que enfans freres font (Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 196)

Gerard Potter translates the last part as ‘want sij twee hadden malkanderen zere lief’ and fails to add ‘as little brothers do’. After this, Froissart refers to Gaston’s brother as ‘Yvain’. In three instances, the translator adds a reference to the boy’s illegitimate descent.

- Ende creech dese Yewijn, die bastart, Gasscons wamboys (...)
- Dat Gaston wert vertoornde up Yewijn sinen bastart broeder (...)
- Dese bastart wert van desen slage zere verstuert (...)

(A21, fol. 33 v.)

---

48 A21, fol. 33 v.
These additions could be dismissed as the result of the translator’s predilection for comprehensiveness. However, it is also plausible that Yvain’s illegitimacy was sufficiently relevant to the translator to be repeated several times. This is seemingly confirmed by a reference to Gaston. When Fébus wants to kill his son in a fit of anger, the noblemen of Béarn beg him: ‘vous enformez avant de la besoigne que vous faceiez a vostre filz nul mal’ (first inform yourself with regards to the matter before you hurt your son). The Dutch version reads: ‘wilt u eerst van desen zake wael van der wairheyt doen informeren eer ghij uwen enygen getruweden zone dus hoochelijken overvallen ende doden wilt’ (please, first find out the truth before you attack and kill your only legitimate son).\textsuperscript{49} It is clear that, in this case, Gerard Potter overtly stresses the importance of Gaston’s legitimate descent. Indeed, the actual tragedy of the story is not so much that Fébus has killed his son, but rather that he has killed his sole legitimate heir.

\textit{4.2.3. Textual cohesion}

In the \textit{Chroniques}, Froissart frequently refers back to what has gone before and points forward to what is to come (e.g. ‘si comme il est cy dessoubz contenu en nostre histoire’, ‘comment vous oiréz ci ensuivant’).\textsuperscript{50} In this way, the author guarantees that the macro-structure of his narrative is transparent to the audience. Gerard Potter has adopted and further reinforced these structural markers in his translation.\textsuperscript{51} In itself, this is not uncommon. Indeed, it has been suggested that a greater cohesion, like explicitation, is a universal characteristic of translated texts.\textsuperscript{52} Gerard Potter has not only copied Froissart’s use of macro-structural markers, but has also enhanced the text’s cohesion and/or transparency by adding or modifying deictic elements (e.g. personal pronouns) and signal words, which indicate the text’s internal organisation.

The translator frequently uses the participles ‘voirscreven’ and ‘voirseide/voirseit’ (aforementioned) to refer back to an earlier point in the text, even when the original has no

\textsuperscript{49} Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 198; \textit{H21}, fol. 34 r.
\textsuperscript{50} Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 106, 355.
\textsuperscript{51} As has been argued in Chapter Three, Gerard Potter introduces a structural division in four (physical) books, which is referred to in the colophons but also in cross references (e.g. at the beginning of Book Two: ‘Ghij hebt wael hiervoir gehoirt inden anderden boeke des eersten volumens’, \textit{Le3-I}, fol. 1 r. vs. ‘Vous avès bien oÿ cy dessus recorder ’ \textit{Bes 2}, fol. 1 r.
\textsuperscript{52} Hatim and Munday 2004, 7. In fact, the concern for textual coherence could be regarded as an explicitation of the formal features of the text, underling its internal organisation.
cross-reference. For instance, when Froissart tells us in the prologue that Guy of Blois has given him ‘ses lettres de familiarié adreçans au conte de Fois’, Gerard Potter reminds his audience that the addressee has already been mentioned, ‘gaende anden grave van Foys voirseit’ (addressed to the aforementioned count of Foix).

The addition of signal words when in French the sentences or clauses have been joined by coordinating conjuncts has a similar effect. Froissart asserts that his reveries of foreign wars had reminded him of the count of Foix ‘et bien sçavoie que se je pouoie venir en son hostel, je ne pourroie mieulx cheoir ou monde pour estre informez de toutes nouvelles’. In the Dutch version, this understanding is presented as the reason why the chronicler’s thoughts wander off to the count. This relation of cause (the presence of news at the court of Foix) and effect (thoughts of Fèbus) is expressed by the Dutch signal word ‘want’ (because).

The translator’s manipulation of deictics generally enhances the text’s transparency. Often, personal pronouns have been substituted for more specific nominal references or – in the case of human referents – names. In the following example the personal pronoun ‘li’ has been replaced by the more specific ‘sinen neven den coninc’ (his nephew, the king).

(...) et si avoit son cousin le roy Richart d’Angleterre delez li qui ne li estoit trop proprices et par especial y estoit le conte d’Asquesufort.

(Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 109)

Oick overdachte hij wael an die ander zijde dat coninc Richairt sijs neven rade die uptien tijt alle die regnacie ende gelove bij sinen neven den coninc hadden hem niet alte wael gedeeylt en waren ende bijsondere die grave Zuytvolk.

(H21, fol. 3 r.)

It is plausible that the translator expected that the double use of the personal pronoun ‘li’ (‘him’, the first time referring to king Richard, the second time referring to the duke of Lancaster, mentioned earlier in the text) would compromise the reader’s understanding of the passage.

53 These markers are also frequently found in the official documents (accounts, judicial daybooks) of the court of Holland, often abbreviated in the same, uncommon, way as in H21.
54 Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 104; H21, fol. 1 v.
4.2.4. Conclusion: a prudent translator

In general, Gerard Potter’s manipulation of the French original guides his audience intentionally towards a (correct) interpretation of the text. Tautologies underline particular nuances, reflect the translator’s interpretation of general concepts (e.g. ‘good’, ‘worthy’) or express the complex meaning of certain words and thus present the reader with a variety of possible meanings conveyed by the French original. Additionally, doublets serve as glosses to fashionable neologisms and possibly enhance the stylistic qualities of the text. By explicitly adding information that is implicit in the original, the translator wants to ensure that his audience comes to a well-founded understanding of the text. In order to achieve this, Gerard Potter tends to be more elaborate in his description of particular situations and frequently repeats significant information. The increased attention that has been paid to textual cohesion serves a similar goal. The modification and adding of macro-structural markers, signal words and deictic elements was intended to make the text more transparent to its readership. In this respect, like the author of the *Lancelot en prose*, Gerard Potter could be characterised as ‘a ‘bon greffier’, whose work could bear the motto ‘tout dire, tout expliquer’’. Given his social and professional background, this label is striking. Although the translator’s verbosity has probably been inspired by the desire to present his audience with a text they could interpret ‘correctly’ without unnecessary effort, J.W. Muller’s explanation of Potter’s style may have been partially correct.

If the translation could be dated to a later period of Potter’s life, one would almost think that the former judge had become addicted to the official style with its long-winded, verbose mode of expression and repetition and French loans to such a degree that he could not refrain from it in his literary work.

(Muller 1888, 274)

Indeed, to a modern readership, Potter’s writing sometimes seems tedious and longwinded. The fact that it shares several of its characteristics (e.g. tautology, explicitation) with other Middle Dutch translations written and/or read at the time (e.g. the *Mandeville* or the *Pelegrimage der menscheliker creaturen*) may suggest that a fifteenth-century audience

---

55 Gerard Potter hardly ever leaves information untranslated. In most cases, his interferences are restricted to the removal of tautologies, leaving out titles (e.g. lord, count) or discourse markers (e.g. Dear sir, …) that in other instances are added to the text as has been shown in (§ 4.2.)

would not have shared our appreciation.\textsuperscript{57} In any event, the characteristics that we regard as dull were probably inspired by good intentions. In this respect, Potter shares his preoccupations with other translators:

The elements are there: prudence, Gricean cooperation, relevance to a new reception situation, (…). For all of those things, we could say that translators have reasons to be risk-averse; or they are given to minimizing risks; or they do not want to take risks in their own name. This hypothetical risk aversion would then be our general explanation for explicitation.

(Pym 2005, 40-41.)

In the above, Gerard Potter has been characterized as a prudent (i.e. ‘risk-averse’) translator. But what were the ‘risks’ he was confronted with? As has been mentioned above, it is very probable that the translator himself left his name in the colophon at the end of every volume of the translation.\textsuperscript{58} Thus, users in Gerard Potter’s immediate surroundings could immediately connect the translation to its translator. I have also argued that linguistic capacities were an important asset in Potter’s career advancement, especially for his appointment in the Burgundian Council.\textsuperscript{59} In this respect, one might argue that the quality of his translation reflected upon his professional credibility. It is tempting to read into this that Gerard Potter’s translation functioned in a (partially bilingual) environment in which the translation could be collated with the French original ‘volumes’, which are explicitly referred to in the text and the colophons.\textsuperscript{60} When one adds the French-sounding

\textsuperscript{57} See Biesheuvel 2005 and Cramer 1908.

\textsuperscript{58} Cf. § 3.2.

\textsuperscript{59} § 1.3.1. Boone 2009 refers to the risk of faulty translation in the Council of Flanders.

\textsuperscript{60} This preoccupation with a ‘correct’ translation is in accordance with a trope that is often found in medieval translator’s prologues. In a commonplace, the translator expresses the desire that his readership appreciates his difficulties and corrects his errors (Ellis 2008, 99). This safeguard obviously presumes that at least a portion of the audience (a) possibly had access to the original text and (b) was able to understand and interpret the text in its original language. The situation of Gerard Potter’s translation of the Chroniques may well have been similar. Examples of this topos in Middle Dutch translations may be found in e.g. the Luikse Diatesseron and the Middle Dutch translation of Gregory’s Dialogi. The translator of the Luikse diatesseron pleads his readership for understanding if ‘in some instances I err in saying too much, or not enough, or something different than I ought to or than is appropriate for this noble subject matter’ (Besamusca and Sonnemans 1999, 46). In his translation of Saint Gregory’s Dialogi Petrus Naghel (otherwise known as the Bible Translator of 1360) admits to his intellectual limitation and hopes that others who have a better understanding of his subject matter will correct him (Besamusca and Sonnemans 1999, 67). Other examples occur in Leven ons Heren Jhesu Cristi (Besamusca and Sonnemans 1999, 93), the Middle Dutch translation of Mandeville’s travels (Besamusca and Sonnemans 1999, 97), Redaction H of Tondalus’ vision ((Besamusca and Sonnemans 1999, 103) and the Ghent (Besamusca and Sonnemans 1999, 110) and Bruges (Besamusca and Sonnemans 1999, 113) Boethius-translations. The translator of the fifteenth-century Passie
flair of the translator’s language to the equation, the Burgundian Council of Holland comes forward as a natural setting for the reception of Gerard Potter’s translation of the *Chroniques*.  

4.3. Reflections of the social / cognitive environment

In the previous section, I have argued that Gerard Potter’s manipulation of the original text may be described as reader- or target-oriented. The translator’s preoccupation with comprehensiveness and accuracy breaks open the various meanings of a polysemic text. Thus, his translation should not be characterized as ‘one-to-one’ or ‘word-by-word’, but as ‘one-to-many’ or ‘meaning-by-meaning’. The reader obviously benefits from the representation of this full array of meanings in the sense that he is not confined to the subjective choice of the translator. Other modifications, e.g. the enhancement of the transparancy of the text’s macro-structure, have also been made in the best interest of his audience (cf. above § 4.2.) or should be explained by the translator’s own understanding of the text. In both cases, the adaptation can be explained by differences between the supposed cognitive environment of the intended audience of the original text and the cognitive environment of the translator / the intended receptor audience (cf. § 4.1.). Therefore, it may be useful to further analyse the way in which some of the preferred fields of interest of Froissart’s intended audience are handled in the French original and its translation. In the following, I will consecutively focus on the way in which the translation deals with the social structuring of knighthood, descriptions of the courtly environment and the language of war.

4.3.1. The language of knighthood

In his groundbreaking study of the nobility of Holland, A. Janse discusses the social stratification of knighthood. The knighthood or *ridderscap* – a term that according to Janse was not common until the beginning of the fifteenth century – was divided into three social ranks. The highest rank ‘baron’ (*baroen, baenrots* or *baanderheer*) was reserved for the

*ons Heren* explicitly refers his readership to the vulgate text and challenges them to collate the Dutch and Latin versions (Besamusca and Sonnemans 1999, 107-108).

61 § 1.3.2.1.

62 Other interesting areas might include negotiation, trade, religion, etc. Some of these fields are briefly touched upon in the analysis presented in this section.
most elevated noblemen. The title of the middle group (the knights or *ridders*) was hereditary and was only awarded to adult members of nobility. The third category consisted of the squires (*knecht, knaap or jonker*) or potential knights.⁶³

In this section, I will analyse the way in which Gerard Potter – he himself a squire – uses the notions of baron (*baron*), knight (*chevalier*) and squire (*escuier*). This analysis is particularly interesting because of the differences in the vocabulary available to speakers of French and Dutch. Indeed, the lexical variation also implies a different cognitive representation of this social group. In the *Chroniques*, Froissart presents his audience with an unambiguous stratification that uses one term only for each category. As appears from the introductory paragraph, the Dutch terminology regarding knighthood is less straightforward (e.g. *escuier* can be translated in three possible ways). Compared to the simplicity of the French terminology, the Dutch vocabulary is relatively complex. This may point towards differences in the perception of the stratification in French and Dutch opening up the possibility that different connotations or shades of meaning are reflected by Gerard Potter’s use of the terminology available to him. In the following, I will analyse the translation of the words *baron*, *chevalier* and *escuier* in the first twenty-one chapters of Book Three.⁶⁴

In general, the translation of the term *chevalier* is *ridder*. Still, there are some exceptions. In combination with *escuier*, *chevalier* is sometimes translated as *edele mannen* (noblemen), thus obscuring the difference in rank between both categories (e.g. 104; 1 v.). In other instances, the meaning of *chevalier* has been further specified. ‘Vous nous ecristeret mandastes en Angleterre par vostre chevalier’ has been translated as ‘die gene die ons screeft ende ontboot in Engelant bij enen uwen ridderen ende raedt’ (107; 2v). Apparently, the function of emissary may define the generic ‘knight’ as a member of the council, as does the specification ‘de son hostel’ (118; 5 v.). In another instance, ‘chevalier de l’hostel’ (referring to Espan de Lion) has been translated as ‘ridder van den huysgesinne’ (128; 8 v.), which probably is a more accurate translation.⁶⁵ Sometimes, for the sake of lexical variation, Potter uses the translation ‘here’ – the title bestowed on dubbed knights (e.g. 132; 10 v.). The term ‘ridderscappen’ is used as a translation for the plural form *chevaliers* (e.g. 110; 3 r.).

---

⁶³ This presentation is a highly simplified summary of Janse 2001, 92.
⁶⁴ I.e. from the beginning of Book Three to the battle of Aljubarrota. In the references to examples, the first number refers to the page in the first volume of the edition of Bes 2 by Ainsworth and Croenen. The second number refers to the folio in H21.
⁶⁵ The title of ‘chevalier de l’hostel’ is generally preserved for knights who occupy high positions at the princely courts.
The French *Baron* can be translated in two or three possible ways: *baroen*, *baenrots* or *bannerhere*. According to Janse, the terms *baenrots* and *baanderheer* are military terms, referring to eminent noblemen ‘who were allowed to command an independent division into battle under their own square banner’.\(^{66}\) In particular cases these terms coincide with the feudal term *baroen*, indicating a nobleman of high status. In spite of this distinction between *baanderheer* and *baenrots* on the one hand and *baroen* on the other, Janse questions the differences in use of these terms.

It appears that Gerard Potter only uses the terms *baroen* and *bannerheer* as a translation of the French *baron*. The use of *bannerheer* is not restricted to military situations. In the prologue, Froissart designates his sources at the court of Foix as ‘barons, chevaliers et escuiers’. The translation of ‘barons’ as ‘bannerheren’ possibly underlines the nature of the information collected by the chronicler, which mainly exists of the noblemen’s war records (105; 2 r.).\(^ {67}\) When Froissart refers to the lord of La-Voulté-sur-Rhône as ‘un baron demourant sur la riviere du Rosne’ there is no reference to a military situation whatsoever. This notwithstanding, Gerard Potter designates him as ‘bannerhere’ (230; 44 v.). The term *bannervrouwe* (‘dat ene hoge bannervrouwe is in desen lande’) is used as the Dutch version of *baronesse* (‘une haute barronesse en ce pays’) (206; 36 v.). Otherwise (245; 49 v./247; 50 r./285; 65 v.), the context allows an interpretation in the military sense (e.g. war, combat, etc.).

Gerard Potter also uses the term *baroen* to refer to high noblemen on the battlefield (e.g. 285/65 v.). The possibility exists that the translator wants to stress the noblemen’s social status in these instances, but this is unclear. It should be noted, that when a qualifier such as ‘haulx’ or ‘grans’ accompanies the title of *baron*, the Dutch translation reads *baroen*.\(^ {68}\) Quite possibly, this is an indication of the connection between the term *baroen* and high social rank. When a prince seeks the advice of his barons, Potter consistently uses the translation *baroen* (e.g. 255 ‘Si appella une foiz les barons de France pour avoir conseil’; 53 v. ‘Des riep hij up enen tijt die Fransse baroenen ende cappiteynen bij hem te rade’).

The terms *jonker*, *knecht* and *(scilt)knaap* occur as the translation of the French ‘escuier’. *(Scilt)knaap* is indifferently used in battle situations (277; 62 v). On one occasion Gerard Potter uses the term as a condescending insult directed at a squire, after the latter

\(^{66}\) Janse 2001, 83-84.
\(^ {67}\) The fact that ‘escuiers’ is translated by ‘knechten’ also points in that direction.
\(^ {68}\) However, as was mentioned above ‘haulte baronesse’ is translated by ‘bannervrouwe’. The only other exception is 245; 49 v., which lists the names of the noblemen of Béarn that are preparing for battle.
had been overpowered by his opponent’s servant (164; 21 v.). This use shows that – at least for the translator – the term knaap could have a pejorative connotation denoting servitude or inferiority.

The ‘normal’ translation of escuier appears to be knecht. It is noteworthy that, in general, the term is not used to refer to Froissart’s informants. These are referred to as joncker (e.g. 204; 36 r.). The latter expression is also used to indicate (young) people of high descent, such as Gaston, the son of the count of Foix (32 v.). This preference in use suggests a considerable difference in the connotation of knecht and joncker. Janse explains the difference as follows: knapen [and knechten] descend from lineages of modest means; jonckers ‘can call upon their elevated descent and a sizeable fortune’. Gerard Potter’s use confirms this distinction. This observation has consequences for the reader’s interpretation as regards the status of Froissart’s sources. By applying the social distinctions in this category of knighthood, which are implicit, or absent even, in French but clearly explicitated in Dutch, the translator increases the social level of Froissart’s informants and in doing so probably presents them as more reliable.

In a reference to the Battle of the Thirty, Froissart focuses on a particular duel between two squires: Guillonnet de Salles et Arnauton de Sainte Colomme (163-164; 21 r.-v.). In this episode, the translation of escuier is never knecht, but always joncker or edelen man. Although several of the combatants were slain, the preference for the term joncker may be explained by the aristocratic, arranged nature of the fight. Another explanation is that Gerard Potter wanted to avoid misinterpretation. When he saw that his master was about to lose the fight, the ‘varlet’ of Arnauton de Sainte Colomme, ‘qui est assez bel escuier’ took action and came to his master’s assistance. The Dutch translation of varlet is knecht, but this is also a possible – and in this particular case probably the most appropriate – translation of escuier. If Potter had translated both varlet and escuier by knecht, this would inevitably have hindered the interpretative process.

A final translation of escuier is the hyperonym edele mannen, which may refer to barons, knights and squires (e.g. 119; 6 r.). As has been mentioned above, when escuiers

---

69 This is noteworthy since the term knecht is not frequently used. Janse 2001, 87.
70 The only exception is one reference in the prologue.
71 Gerard Potter himself belonged to the first category of squires. It is probable that he did not aspire to become a knight, nor did he expect it for his progeny. As opposed to his father who had ensured that his oldest son, Gerard, inherited the estate, Gerard Potter himself explicitly made provisions for his inheritance to be divided among his children. Although he had added to the family estate by acquiring (feudal) property, in dividing these fiefs among his sons (and daughter), he reduced the size of the estate and thus the prospects of knighthood.
occurs alongside *chevaliers*, the translation *edele mannen* is used to refer to both knights and squires.

In general, Gerard Potter’s use of the terminology regarding knighthood largely confirms Janse’s observations. Although the distinction between *baroen* and *bannerheer* does not appear to be absolute, general tendencies confirm that the first term indicates social rank, whereas the second has a military connotation. The same is true for the distinction between *(scilt)knaap, knecht* and *joncker*. In Potter’s use the term *knecht* comes forward as neutral, *knaap* appears to have a military connotation and *sciltknaap* can be used pejoratively. The term *joncker* refers to a privileged category of adolescents or men of noble and affluent descent. This notion of ‘being privileged’ probably inspires a connotation of excellence, which explains the translator’s preference of referring to Froissart’s informants as *jonckers* and not as *knechten*. The differences in the French and Dutch vocabulary result in structured lexical variation that is clearly meaningful to the translator and probably also relevant to his audience. Indeed, Gerard Potter adapts the unambiguous terminology of the French original text to the complexity of the Dutch situation and applies the polysemy of French fairly consistently to his translation. The above seems to indicate that the translator is quite well informed when it comes to the subtleties of chivalric society and, as it appears, he expects no less of his audience. Given his own social standing and that of his peers, the tendency to obscure the clear-cut difference between knight and squire by using hyperonyms in his translation, may suggest that Gerard Potter did not always fully appreciate the relevance of the social stratification of knighthood or wanted to upgrade the category in which he himself and at least a portion of his audience should be classified.

4.3.2. The language of the court

In the opening section of Book Three that has become known as the *Voyage à Béarn*, Froissart describes the splendour of the court of Gaston Fébus. In chapters 13, 15 and 18, the chronicler pays attention to various aspects of courtly life. A close comparison of these sections in the French original text and Gerard Potter’s translation may reveal the translator’s experience of the court and his expectations as regards to the intended audience’s familiarity with courtly patterns of behaviour.

---

In his translation of Fébus’ daily routine as described by Froissart, Gerard Potter reveals his own views on the schedule of a prince by formulating a detailed timetable. Whereas Froissart suffices in stating that the count awakes at noon, gets out of bed and has dinner at midnight, the translator asserts that Fébus was accustomed to:

upten hogen middage eerst des morgens up te staen, dair na misse te horen, sinen raedt te houden ende dan sijn middachmaele te eten ende en adt sijn avondtmael nymmmermeer ten was midnacht

(to rise at high noon, hear mass, hold council and have lunch and he never had dinner before midnight)

(Apparently, Froissart’s sketchy overview of Fébus’ day did not correspond to the translator’s idea of a prince who was ‘de toutes choses si tres parfait que on ne le pourroit trop louer’. Religious practice and the consultation of councillors should occupy an important place in the sovereign’s daily routine. Potter comments on the count’s behaviour elsewhere. According to Froissart the count ‘disoit planté d’oroisons, tous les jours: une nocturne du psaultier, heures de Nostre Dame, du Saint Esperit, de la Croix, et vigilles de mors’. Potter translates ‘disoit planté d’oroisons’ as ‘bidden ende lesen’ (to pray and to read) and as such possibly further underlines the use of a written text, which was already suggested in the French ‘psaultier’. From the French text, it appears that the count usually can be found in his ‘retret’ (drawing room, chambers). The Dutch translation stresses Fébus piety by the doublet ‘oratoren of retraten’ (chapel or chambers). Further attention has been drawn to the count’s religious orthodoxy by a description of his entourage: ‘il n’eust oncques mescreant avecques lui’. The specificity of Potter’s translation seems to show even more religious zeal: ‘Jode noch heyden noch gene andere ongelovighe en machten onder hem wesen of wonen’ (Jew nor heathen nor any other infidel could be around him or was allowed to live with him). The count’s attitude towards religion is expressed most clearly in Froissart’s description of Fébus’ organisation of the religious feast of Saint Nicolas, the splendour of which competes with the majesty

\[H21, 30 v.\]

73 Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 188.
74 Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 189.
75 Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 190.
76 Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 191; \(H21\), fol. 31 r.
77 Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 190; \(H21\), fol. 31 r.
of Easter or Christmas at the papal court, the court of France and – according to Potter – also the court of England.\textsuperscript{78} In this respect it should be noted that the opening words in Latin of psalm 143 do not seem to be problematic for the translator, but he does not provide a translation either.\textsuperscript{79} When the psalm is finished, it is sung again, from the beginning, or at least that is what Froissart tells us. According to Gerard Potter ‘wert dair up geheven dat introitum vander hoichmissen des dages als men (...) up enen Paesche off Kersdach soude mogen beginnen ende voirt uut discanteren’ (‘afterwards, they started the introïtum [first words] of the high mass of that day, like one begins at Easter or Christmas and sings in high voice’).\textsuperscript{80} Particularly interesting is the translator’s apposite use of ecclesiastical jargon such as introitum and discanteren.

Another aspect of Froissart’s account that must have appealed to Gerard Potter is the description of Fébus’ chancery. Indeed, the translator’s family had been active in the chancery of Holland for the better part of a century: Gerard’s grandfather was a clerk; his father began his career ‘as the least of the comital chancery’ and served no less than five consecutive counts as one of their secretaries. Gerard’s uncle, Peter was clerk to the registry and it is highly probable that Gerard Potter himself had been active as a clerk. In any event, in the early 1440s, he drew up the accounts for the executors of the will of Jacqueline of Bavaria and was clerk to William of Naaldwijk, the receiver general of Holland. In his capacity of clerk and councillor, Gerard Potter was present at the audit of the accounts.\textsuperscript{81} In this respect, the following description must have sounded very familiar:

Il faisoit du plus especial homme au quel il se confioit le plus son contreroleur, et a cellui tous les autres comptoient et rendoient leurs comptes de leurs receptes. Et cil contreroleur comptoit au conte de Fois par roulles ou par livres escrips, et ses comptes laissoit par devers le dit conte.

\textit{(Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 190)}

Although Potter’s translation ‘van horen ontfange rekening doen’ is a fairly literal translation of the French ‘et rendoient leurs comptes de leurs receptes’, it echoes the fixed vocabulary (‘ontfange’, ‘rekening doen’) used in the accounts.\textsuperscript{82} Another interesting

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{78} Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 210; \textit{H21}, fol. 38 r.
  \item \textsuperscript{79} This may be explained by the quotation’s religious nature.
  \item \textsuperscript{80} Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 210; \textit{H21}, fol. 38 r.
  \item \textsuperscript{81} See Chapter One.
  \item \textsuperscript{82} This may confirm that Gerard Potter was familiar with the language used in official documents. Cf. § 4.2.4.
\end{itemize}
CHAPTER FOUR

Modification concerns Fébus’ contacts with his secretaries. Whenever the count needs his scribes, he does not call them by their names such as ‘Jean’, ‘Gautier’ or ‘Guillaume’, but he refers to them as ‘Maumesert’. Gerard Potter adapts this passage in two ways: first, he adjusts the names to the situation in Holland. Instead of using the names ‘Jan’, ‘Walter’ and ‘Willem’, Froissart’s examples are substituted by ‘Jan’ and ‘Pieter’. Secondly, the translator renders ‘Maumesert’ as ‘Vyen cha, ma me sert!’ which compared to Froissart’s version is more transparent. Moreover, in order to ensure that his Dutch speaking audience understands the meaning of this nickname, the translator adds ‘dat in onsen talen te seggen is com hair, du die my qualick dienste!’ ‘Which in our language means: come here, you who serve me poorly’).

This is yet another example of Gerard Potter’s receptor-centred mode of translation.

Froissart proudly refers to the nightly recitation of his Méliador, the text he had compiled ‘a la requeste et contemplacion de monseigneur Wincelaus de Boesme, duc de Luxembourc et de Braibant, et sont contenus ou dit livre, (...) toutes les chançons, balades, rondeaulx, virelaiz que le gentil duc fist en son temps, lesquelles choses parmi l’ymaginacion que je avoiz en dicter et ordonner le livre’. In his translation, Potter states that all of the ‘liedekijns, sproockskijns, gedichten, rondeletten ende vyrelayen’ that were composed by duke Wenceslaus have been incorporated in the text. The French ‘balades’ has been translated by ‘sproockskijns, gedichten’. It is possible that the translator did not understand the term ballade and substituted it for the broad term spoken (short poetry) or gedichten (poems). However, to some extent, ‘sproockskijns’ or spoken as a genre correspond to the ballade on a formal level. Although the similarity may be coincidental, both ballade and sproke can be defined as short, rhyming texts. The features of the sproke, however, are not as restrictive as the formal characteristics of the French literary ballad (e.g. organisation of the stanza, rhyme scheme). Nevertheless, the translator may have assumed that his readership was not familiar with the French term ballade, but might have judged that his audience’s mental representation of the term sproke in some respects corresponded to the French concept of the literary ballad. Additionally, Gerard Potter’s reference to the genre of ‘sproockskijns’ suggests that the translator assumed that the genre still was relevant.

83 Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 191; H21, fol. 31 v.
84 Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 188-189; H21, fol. 30 r.-v.
85 Cf. Hogenelst’s definition of sproke: ‘Short non-lyrical texts in Middle Dutch, which have been transmitted independently, usually in paired rhyme and suited to be recited by sprekers’. (Hogenelst 1997, 202)
for his aristocratic audience.\textsuperscript{86} The fact that the translator copies the terms ‘rondeaux’ (‘rondeletten’) and ‘virelaiz’ (‘vyrelayen’) without further explanation, equally suggests that he expected his audience to be familiar with these literary genres.\textsuperscript{87}

Possibly, Gerard Potter’s expectations as to courtly entertainment are also reflected in his translation of ‘menestrelz’ (musicians). It appears that, whenever the term is used, the translator primarily thinks of ‘pijperen’ (players of a wind instrument, ‘piper’), followed by ‘fluyeten’ (flutes) or other non-specified ‘instrumenten van musijke’ (musical instruments).\textsuperscript{88} This presentation corresponds to the descriptions in the comital accounts of Holland. The heading of the section in which the expenses for entertainment were listed indifferently refers to ‘pipers ende herauden’ (‘pipers and heralds’).\textsuperscript{89} Potter’s familiarity with the customs at the comital court of Holland possibly explains another of his modifications. Froissart recounts how the count of Foix rewards the musicians of the duke of Touraine by presenting them with livery for a total value of two hundred francs. In

\textsuperscript{86} According to D. Hogenelst, the 	extit{sproke} was popular at aristocratic courts in the Low Countries from the second half of the fourteenth century until about 1420-1430 (Hogenelst 1997, 178-179). There is some debate as to why 	extit{sprekers} (and thus 	extit{sproken}) appear less frequently in aristocratic accounts as from 1410-1420. The last recorded performance at a court of a Dutch nobleman dates from 1467 when Engel the 	extit{sproecsprecer} recited his poetry at the court of Frank of Borssele and was paid twelve 	extit{grogen} for this performance.

\textsuperscript{87} It is not certain whether or not Gerard Potter expects his public to be familiar with the mati\`ere of Renault of Montalbaen. The Dutch version is very similar to the version of the French original text:

\begin{quote}
‘Here dair sijnre hier int lant wael die binnen also voorsien ende geordyneert sijn, sonderlinge alle die sloten die Reynalt van Montaubien toebehoirden ende inne hadde sijn alle also bezorcht want doe hij ende sijn broderen tegens coninc Karel van Franckrijcke oirloochden, deden sij alle hoir sloten ordyneren bij rade Maugijs, hoirs neve’. (\textit{H21}, fol. 77 r.-v.).
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
‘Sire […] de telz chasteaulx a pluseurs en ce pays, et par especial tous les chasteaulx qui jadiz fuertent a Regnault de Montaunben sont de tel condicion, car quant ilz et ses freres guerroierent au roy Charlemaine de France, ilz les firent ordonner de tele fa\c{c}on par le conseil de Maugijs leur cousin.’
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
(Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 315)
\end{quote}

The translator does not alter the summary of the conflict between, Regnault and the French king substantially: ‘Charlemagne’ has become ‘King Charles of France’, Potter has added an explicitation to the fortification of the castles belonging to Montauban (‘with moats’). However, the variant ‘Renaut of Montaubien’ used in the translation does not seem to be common in the Middle Dutch versions of the epic of revolt. Additionally, the translation preserves the French ‘Maugis’ to refer to Montaubien’s cousin (a character which also appears in the Middle-Dutch epic and its prequel and is referred to as ‘Madelgiijs’ or ‘Malegijs’). In the light of his profile as a translator, one would expect Potter to have adapted these names to his Dutch-speaking audience in order to render the story even more familiar. It seems less probable that – if he indeed had been familiar with the story – Potter would not have recognised the names ‘Regnault de Montaunben’ and ‘Maugis’ as the French variants of the characters, which in the Dutch versions are called Renout van Montalbaen and Malegijs, especially in the context in which they appear in Froissart’s text.

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{88} Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 191 and 237; \textit{H21}, fol. 31 v. and 47 r.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{89} Van Gent and Le Bailly 2003, 138. After the incorporation in the Burgundian personal union, this section does not appear in the accounts of the receiver general. The explanation for this is evident: the court of Holland in the sense of a prince and his entourage had ceased to exist. In this respect, in the strictest sense of the word one can hardly speak of ‘courtly’ culture or entertainment. See also: Van Oostrom 1992, 299.
\end{quote}
accordance with ordinary practice at the comital court of Holland, the ‘pijperen van Toureynen’ (pipers of Touraine) in the Middle Dutch translation were paid in cash.\footnote{Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 237; H21, fol. 47 r.}

4.3.3. The language of war

In the prologue of Book Three Froissart expresses the desire to ‘sçavoir le longtainnes guerres aussi bien comme les prouchainnes’\footnote{Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 104.}. And indeed, in his histoire the chronicler expands on the wars of Portugal, Castile, Hungary, France and England. In this section, I will focus on two of these episodes. In the first, Froissart describes the preparations of Charles VI, king of France for a campaign to England in 1386.\footnote{Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 104.} The second passage recounts the course of the battle of Aljubarrota.\footnote{Bes 2, fol. 283 v.-287 v. (SHF III, § 101-105); H21, fol. 130 v.-134 v.}

In his description of the preparatory excitement for the military expedition of 1386, Froissart elaborately lists the necessities that need to be shipped to England. In spite of some small differences, Gerard Potter’s translation is very accurate, especially as far as victuals are concerned. Potter translates ‘oignon’ as ‘loock, ajuin’ (garlic, onion) and (accidentally?) does not list ‘olietes’ (olives), possibly because these did not seem necessary to him or maybe rather because he did not understand the French word.\footnote{Bes 2, fol. 284 r.; H21, fol. 130 v. and Bes 2, fol. 285 R.; H21, fol. 131 v.} The designations of specific arms, however, seem to have caused the translator some concern. Froissart’s ‘bacinés, esperons, cousteaulx, haches, congnees, pix, haveaulx, cloyes de boys’ (bacinets, spurs, knives, axes, battle-axes, pikes, pickaxes, wooden fencing) has been translated as ‘alrehande hernasse als huyven, piecken, glayen, breeckbijlen, horden’ (all kinds of equipment such as helmets, pikes, spears, crowbars and fencing). In his translation, Gerard Potter seems to have been oblivious to the specific characteristics of the bascinet (Middle Dutch ‘beckineel’, Potter translates as the generic ‘huyve’), haches and haveaulx.\footnote{De Vries 1992, 89.} Nevertheless, at other instances it appears that the translator was indeed versed in the language of war: he uses the specific translations ‘haetse ende hameren’ for ‘hache’ (‘battle-axe’) ‘wijndaesbogeschoten’ for ‘trait d’une arbalestre’ (‘arbalest’), ‘ghyzairne’ for ‘bracquemart’ (‘double-edged knife’, ‘double-edged axe’).\footnote{Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 279; H21, fol. 63 r-63 v and Bes 2, fol. 286 v.; H21, fol. 133 v.}
In view of his nuanced use of terms related to knighthood, it is remarkable that when François Ackerman tells Peter Bosch that the duke of Burgundy has offered him the office of ‘escuier d’escuierie’ (equerry), Gerard Potter leaves the French term untranslated. Since the Middle Dutch term for escuierie is maersclarkerie, there certainly was a native alternative for the French title.\(^97\) It is possible that the translator did not understand the term. Alternatively, Gerard Potter may have judged that his audience would be more familiar with the French terminology.

In both passages, the translator emphasizes the reliability of Froissart’s account. By highlighting the nature of Froissart’s sources, Gerard Potter influences his audience’s appreciation of the information he/Froissart presents them with. According to the translator, Froissart’s description of the Portuguese as ‘fres comment gens pourroient estre’ is hearsay. Additionally, Potter ensures his readership that Froissart’s assertion ‘it is safer to hold ground than to flee’ is ‘an old and reliable rule’\(^98\). The intelligence that the uncles of the king of France had received about the duke of Lancaster’s intention to leave for Spain was ‘wairachtelijken’ (‘true’), that the preparations in Flanders were unprecedented was clearly something that ‘ic [=Froissart] hoorde indien tijden seggen’ (‘At the time, I heard people say…’).\(^99\) Since veracity claims and acknowledgements of sources are characteristics of Froissart’s original text, Gerard Potter’s additions may be explained as a case of interference. Alternatively, the translator may have underlined the truthfulness of his story because of his own preoccupation with the truth, reliability and the validity of the information that is recorded in his translation.

Another peculiarity of Gerard Potter’s text is the occasional substitution of ‘mon [=the king of Portugal’s] honneur’, ‘païs’, ‘royaulme’ by the Middle Dutch ‘crone’ (crown).\(^100\) The first expression denotes one particular ruler; the second and third refer to territorial boundaries. The metonymical use of crone (the crown descending from sovereign to sovereign) stresses the continuity of monarchical rule, thus underlining one of the principal motifs of the Chroniques: the continuity of (worldly as well as religious) leadership and continuality of aristocratic lineages.\(^101\)

In certain instances, Gerard Potter modifies the original’s topography. This gives us a (brief) glance at the geographical horizon of the translator and his intended audience.

\(^{97}\) Bes 2, fol. 286 r.; H21, fol. 132 v.
\(^{98}\) Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 278-279; H21, fol. 63 r-63 v.
\(^{99}\) Bes 2, fol. 284 r., 284 v.; H21, fol. 130 r., 131 r.
\(^{100}\) Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 279,281; H21, fol. 62 v., 64 r. and Bes 2, fol. 284 v.; H21, fol. 130 v.
Froissart tells his readership that the French fleet is assembled at ‘l’Escluse’. In his translation, Gerard Potter frequently adds ‘int Zwin’, referring to the polders at the coastline, which provided direct access to the sea. The French original states that the French confiscated ships from the harbour of Seville in Spain to Prussia (‘Mouvant d’Espaigne, du port de Seville jusques en Prusce ne remest gros vaissel sur mer ou les Françoys peussent mettre leur main’), Gerard Potter translates: ‘Ghij sult weten dat die verzameninge der groter scepen wert hier toe so groot, dat gheen schip doir die zee twisschen die havene van Sevilgen in Spangen ende der stad havene van Dansijke veylch zeylen en mochte ten wert angehailt vanden Fransoys’. The Dutch version substitutes ‘Prusce’ for ‘Dansijke’ (Gdansk) without further explanation. This suggests that the translator regarded it self-evident that his intended audience was familiar with the Polish harbour. The commercial relations between Holland and the Baltic regions could provide an explanation for the audience’s knowledge. As from 1438 the Dutch commercial activities had disturbed the county’s relations with the Hanseatic league of which Gdansk was a member.

Finally, the passages on the expedition of 1386 and the battle of Aljubarrota give some fine examples of Gerard Potter’s expressive language. In his description of the battle between the Portuguese and Castilian forces, Gerard Potter intensifies Froissart’s assertion that ‘plusieurs chevaliers et escuiers y firent grand foison d’appertise d’armes’ by adding ‘want sij en thierden hem niet dan als hoeverdighe bruysschende leewen up malkanderen’ (because the did not act any different than proud, roaring lions). The imagery of French expressions is substituted by their Dutch counterparts, e.g. in the French original, the expression for ‘offering resistance’ is ‘trouver bien a qui parler’ (‘find someone to talk to’). The Dutch version is ‘den wairt al thuys vinden’ (‘find that the master of the house is at home’). Thereafter, Froissart describes the destructive force of the arbalests of Genua with an understatement: ‘qui en estoit attaint, il avoit fait pour la journée et l’en couvenoit

102 Bes 2, fol. 284 v.; H21, fol. 131 r.
103 Bes 2, fol. 284 v.; H21, fol. 130 v.
104 Spading 1973, 10. ‘Besonders die Stadt Danzig entwickelte und pflegte die Verbindung [i.e. as a commercial partner]. (…) In dem letzten Jahrzehnt des 14. Jahrhunderts waren Quellenhinweise über den Verkehr van Holländern in dieser Stadt zahlreicher. (…) Für Danzig un die preussischen Städte (…) war es äusserst günstig, dass die Holländer in ihren Häfen erschienen’.
105 Vaughan 2002, 92-94. ‘The war of 1438-1441, in which Holland attacked all Hanseatic shipping, though in actual fact only the so-called Wendish quarter of the Hanse, comprising Lübeck, Hamburg, Wismar, Rostock, Stralsund and Lüneburg, had declared war on Holland, was a direct result of commercial competition’. As a councillor, Potter was directly involved in treaties with the Hanseatic League and Prussia in 1446 and 1452. He himself had some issues with seafarers from Danzig in 1446. See Chapter One.
106 Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 279; H21, fol. 63 v.
reporter a l’ostel’. Potter’s translation exudes the same atmosphere, but probably had greater appeal to his intended audience: ‘Want wie dair af geraect wert, die was wael van dier dachuyeren betailt en dorste voirtan niet meer sorghen voir kase ende brootgebrech te hebben sijn leven lanck’ (‘who was hit [by the arbaester] had been paid good wages and would not have to worry about a shortage of cheese and bread ever again’). In other instances, the translator’s use of language is less evocative. As compared to the lively French ‘Laisiez venir ces Françoys, par Dieu! Il n’en retournera jamais couillon en France’ of the Hainault priest, the Dutch squire’s version seems rather chaste ‘Laet ons dese Franssoysen hier comen, bij Gode, dair en salre nymmermeer geen weder levendich over in Franckrijcke comen’.

4.3.4. Conclusion

The small-scale corpus research on the classification of knighthood has yielded some interesting results. Gerard Potter’s translation of the unambiguous French terminology reveals a refined understanding of the usage of the Dutch terms. By applying the specific vocabulary of his native language to the foreign text, the translator illuminates nuances that were implicit or absent in the French original. By indicating Froissart’s sources as joncker and not as knecht or knape – alternatives that are equally valid – he revalues their reliability. This preoccupation with the validity of sources also comes forward from his adaptation of the text, e.g. by qualifying the information by adding acknowledgements. The translator’s representation of life at the court further confirms his identity as someone who has been profoundly immersed in courtly culture. Gerard Potter’s translation bears witness to a high degree of familiarity with the course of affairs at aristocratic courts and courtly entertainment. In his description of a sovereign’s duties, Potter highlights the personal piety of the prince and the importance of the sovereign consulting his councillors. Whenever necessary, the translator modifies the original text to better suit the context of his Dutch-speaking audience. This becomes most apparent from his domesticating translation of expressions. Finally, Gerard Potter’s modification of topography tells us something about the expected geographical horizon of the translator’s intended audience.

108 Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 318; H21, fol. 78v.
109 Assuming that Potter did not translate the Chroniques before 1440, it is possible that against the backdrop of the famine of the late 1430s/early 1440s, this expression may have had even greater effect.
110 Bes 2, fol. 287 t.; H21, fol. 134 v.
111 Cf. supra § 4.2.1.
4.4. Clues towards intended audiences?

In a well-known passage of Book Three, Froissart prides himself on his impartial representation of events. The chronicler stresses that his narrative has not been biased by the his own appreciation of his benefactors’ support:

(...) et on le puet veoir clerement qui list ycy de ssus ceste hystoire [en plusieurs lieux. Et tout ce qui est escript est veritable. On ne dye pas que je aye la noble hystoire] corrompu par la faveur que je aye eu au conte Gui de Bloys, qui le me fist faire et qui bien m’en a paye tant que je m’en contempte (...)

(Bes, fol. 333 r.; wanted passage added by G. Croenen)

One might wonder whether the same is true for the translator. Indeed, among the factors that influence translator decision-making Hatim and Munday list ‘commission’.

In addition to aesthetics, cognition and the criterion of knowledge base, the task specification agreed with clients could drastically influence decision-making. This raises issues of translation *skopos* or purpose, loyalty and conflict of interests, etc.

(Hatim and Munday 2004, 54)

Although Hatim and Munday’s statement is rather modern in its choice of words, the above is undeniably applicable to literary patronage. Therefore, in § 4.4.1., Gerard Potter’s translation will be examined for the influence of a number of possible patrons.

§ 4.4.2. is primarily devoted to the imagery in the manuscripts of the translation. In her study of the *Grandes Chroniques de France*, A. Hedeman has been observed that a manuscript’s cycle of illustration is telling of the particular interests or concerns of its commissioner. A similar observation can be made as regards the illustrated manuscripts of Froissart’s chronicle. Therefore, it seems plausible that differences between the pictorial programme of the exemplar (or a manuscript very closely related to it) and the translation may have been inspired by the preferences of the translator’s patron, the commissioner of one particular copy or considerations as regards the translation’s

---

112 See Chapter Three.
113 Le Guay 1998; Harf-Lancner 1998; Harf-Lancner 2008; I will devote further attention to the pictorial programmes of the illustrated manuscripts of Book Three in a forthcoming article.
envisaged audience.\textsuperscript{114} In this respect, changes in the original pictorial programme may point towards passages that were particularly relevant to the translation’s primary readership.\textsuperscript{115}

4.4.1. Translation and patronage

Although it is possible that Gerard Potter undertook his literary efforts on his own initiative – very much as has been suggested repeatedly for his father, Dirk Potter – it is quite likely that some impulse has initiated his activities.\textsuperscript{116} J.W. Muller has suggested that Gerard Potter translated the \textit{Chroniques} at the explicit request of John, the Bastard of Blois.\textsuperscript{117} Since the dedication manuscript of Guy of Blois would have been manufactured at the end of the fourteenth century, the provenance of the translation’s exemplar does not only render Muller’s suggestion rather improbable but also clears the way for alternative hypotheses. Given their possible intermediation between translation and exemplar, it is useful to examine the translation for influence of the court of Jacqueline of Bavaria or the Burgundian Council of Holland.\textsuperscript{118} Therefore, in this section, attention will be paid to increased bias or sympathy towards the comital families of Blois (§ 4.4.1.1.), the Bavarian Wittelsbachs (§ 4.4.1.2.) or the Valois dukes of Burgundy (§ 4.4.1.3.).

\textsuperscript{114} Given the near-uniformity of correlation of the programmes of illustration of \textit{H21} and \textit{Le3-2}, I assume that this pictorial programme has been derived from the authorial copy of Gerard Potter’s translation of the \textit{Chroniques}. It is therefore likely that the differences between the illustration of the French exemplar and the manuscripts of the translation should be explained by the preferences of the intended readership of the translation, rather than the commissioner of one particular manuscript copy. See also § 5.2.1.

\textsuperscript{115} Cf. Le Guay 1998 16-18. Le Guay draws attention to the fact to some (illustrated) passages that in \textit{Bre} have been further elaborated. She wonders whether these additions should be attributed to David Aubert, the scribe of \textit{Bre}, possibly at the request of the manuscript’s commissioner, Anthony the Great Bastard of Burgundy. An alternative possibility is that the additions represent an extended version of the \textit{Chroniques} that has been influenced by Froissart’s new patrons, the counts of Hainault.

\textsuperscript{116} There is, however, a great deal of difference between the works of father and son. Whereas Dirk Potter’s creations were relatively short, his son’s translation was of considerable size. It seems therefore less plausible that Gerard Potter would have initiated a project of this scale without some exterior motive. As H. Wijsman argues for J. Mansel’s \textit{Fleur des histoires}: ‘It seems hard to imagine a fifteenth-century author compiling such a huge work without planning to present it to someone, if only to be rewarded for it and to get the work known’. (Wijsman 2008, 20). As I have argued above, the ‘reward’ Gerard Potter aimed at may well have been professional advancement in regional government.

\textsuperscript{117} Muller 1888, 271. See also Chapter Five of this study.

\textsuperscript{118} See Chapter Three (§ 3.6).
4.4.1.1. The Blois family

The way in which Gerard Potter deals with the passages mentioning Guy or John of Blois does not differ notably from his Potter’s normal mode of translation. At first sight, it seems significant that the Dutch translation does not record that Guy of Blois takes leave of his wife and son Louis when he departs from Hainault. Given Muller’s hypothesis that John, bastard of Blois, had commissioned the translation, it is tempting to suspect the translator of conveniently having missed out on this particular information. However, since Marie of Namur and her son Louis are mentioned elsewhere in the translation (a section has been devoted to Louis’ marriage to Marie of France, daughter of John of Berry) the omission does not seem deliberate.

In another passage, situated towards the end of Book Two, Froissart records Guy of Blois’ resolve to join the French king’s troops at Saint-Omer. Although the count had been ill for quite a while, he was averse to staying at home. According to Froissart, Guy of Blois’ decision had been inspired by his sense of honour. The translation, however, claims that the captains had sent for him, imploring him – if his health permitted it – to advance with the king’s army. The count judged that it would not be fair if he stayed at home, when his companions waged war. It would be better to march with the king’s army, than to stay at home, pretending to be ill. The translation concurs, but slightly adapts the original: Guy of Blois wanted to avoid malicious gossip that claimed that he deliberately had reported ‘schoolzieck’ (that he pretended to be ill to avoid going to school).\(^{119}\)

The account of the marriage of Louis of Blois and Marie of France is a quite faithful rendering of the French original.\(^{120}\) Only one elaboration discussing Guy of Blois’ hospitality is worthy of mention. Whereas Froissart reports that the count welcomes the duchess of Berry and her daughter in a suitable manner. Gerard Potter adds ‘also wael den

\(^{119}\) Bes 2, fol. 153 r.; De Pauw 1898, 408

\(^{120}\) Bes 2, fol. 398 r.; H21, fol. 299 v.-300 r. The lexical field of education is one that the Gerard Potter relishes. The following addition is striking. In order to repress the Flemish insurrection, the French army has to cross the river Lys. Oliver of Clion assembles his marshals to discuss the most appropriate strategy. The translator adds a telling metaphorical digression to the constable’s plea.

Here God, wij en comen doch hier niet als vervairde lude (...), mer wij comen hier meten scoolmeyster ende soecken ons heren ende scoolmeysters ongehoirsamige scoolkinderen ende die willen wij corrigeren ende weder tot hoirs meysters onderdanicheden bringen.

(Dear God, we have not come here as cowards! (...) but we are here with the schoolmaster and we are looking for our lord and teacher’s disobedient pupils and we will reprimand them and bring them to our master’s submission)

(De Pauw 1898, 264)
minsten vreendelijken te sijn als den meesten elc na sinen state’ (to be amicable to the most common as well as to the most elevated, each in accordance with their rank’).

4.4.1.2. The counts of Holland

In 1385, the relations between the comital family of Hainault, Holland and Zeeland and were tightened by a double marriage. John of Nevers, the oldest son of Philip the Bold married Margaret, daughter of Albert of Bavaria. Margaret’s brother, William of Ostrevant, heir apparent to his father’s principalities, married Margaret of Burgundy, Philip’s daughter. In Book Two of his Chroniques, Froissart relates how duchess Joan of Brabant devised the union between the Wittelsbach comital family and the Valois dukes. The chronicler describes the negotiations between Albert of Bavaria and Philip the Bold preceding the festive consecration in Cambrai.121 The central figures of this episode are Albert of Bavaria and Philip the Bold. As Hainault was Froissart’s native region, it is rather obvious that he refers to Albert of Bavaria as ‘bail de Hainault’. However, it is equally intelligible that the Dutch translator adapts the title to his own perspective and that of his envisaged audience ‘beware der lande van Henegouwen, Hollant, Zeelant ende Vrieselant’ (guardian of Hainault, Holland, Zeeland and Frisia).122 When Froissart lists the principalities of duke of Albert, Gerard Potter adds ‘Vrieslant’ (Frisia) to the list.123 According to the Hainault chronicler, the chief purpose of the Bavarian-Burgundian intermarriage was to achieve harmony between Flanders, Hainault and Brabant. In the Dutch version Holland and Zeeland have been added to the alliance.124 Elsewhere, in the story of Horton, the demonic messenger of Raymond of Coarazze, the translator’s chauvinism glimmers through in an even subtler fashion. Froissart tells us that the spirit carried news from England, Scotland, Germany, Flanders, Brabant and elsewhere. Potter adapts the list to his audience: ‘in Engelant, in Scotlant, in Duytslant of anderswair: in Brabant, in Hollant of in Vlaenderen’.125 It is obvious, that through these small (chauvinistic) alterations the text becomes more familiar and relevant to an audience in Holland.

121 Bes 2, fol. 169 r.-171 v.; De Pauw 1898, 457-470.
122 Bes 2, fol. 169 r.; De Pauw 1898, 457.
123 Bes 2, fol. 169 r.; De Pauw 1898, 458.
124 Bes 2, fol. 169 v.; De Pauw 1898, 461.
125 Ainsworth and Croenen 2007, 296; H21, fol. 70 r. It is hard to say whether it is significant that the translator has moved Flanders to the final position.
In one instance, Gerard Potter modifies the original significantly in favour of the rulers of Holland. A simple assertion of the duchess of Brabant, which Froissart presents in indirect speech, has been further elaborated by the Dutch translator.

(...) elle ne pouoit veoir lieu ne assigner ou ilz feussent mieulx que es enfans de Haynault pour reconfermer les païys ensemble et pour donner grant cremeur a ses annemis.

(Bes 2, fol. 169 v.)

‘Dair sij wael waren ende hier sijn’, sprack sij, ‘die schone kinderen van Henegouwen, indien ghij tesamen vergadert wart, dat soude uwer beyder landen enen vasten bandt maken, ende ghij soudts uwen vyanden groot ontsich geven, want sonder twyvel, neve, een grave van Henegouwen, van Hollant ende van Zeelant is een here die sinen vyanden wael lede ende vreenden lieve machte heeft te doen, als hij wille.

‘[You should seek out good opportunities for your beautiful children to marry], and I present you,’ she said, ‘with the honourable children of Hainault. If you were to be related, it would tighten the relationship between your countries and your enemies would tremble with fear. Indeed, my dear cousin, there is no shadow of a doubt that a count of Hainault, of Holland and of Zeeland is a lord who has the power to strike down his enemies and elevate his friends as he pleases’

(De Pauw 1898, 460.)

This addition extends beyond a chauvinistic aside. It should be read as a celebration of the power wielded by whoever has (or gains?) control over these northern principalities. Indeed, in reference to William of Ostrevant, the future count of Hainault, Holland and Zeeland, Gerard Potter adds: ‘dat een die heerlicste prince werden wille van kerstenhede’ (‘who will be one of the most prominent princes of the christian world’).126 In these instances, the lord of Holland is unmistakably presented as an extremely powerful sovereign.

126 Bes 2, fol. 169 v.; De Pauw 1898, 460. See also : § 1.1.3.1.
4.4.1.3. The dukes of Burgundy

As regards the dukes of Burgundy, the translation emphasizes the God-given rights and sovereignty of the Burgundian lineage. In the original, Joan of Brabant designates the Burgundians as her rightful heirs and ‘des plus grans du monde’ (of the greatest princes in the world). The Dutch version conveys exactly the same message, but translates ‘monde’ as ‘van Kersten gelove’ (‘of the christian faith’). Froissart describes Philip the Bold as ‘en ce monde un grans sires’. According to Gerard Potter, the duke of Burgundy has derived his power directly from God: ‘hoe hij van Gode in der werelt ghescepen waere tot enen groten, machten here te wesen’ (‘how God had put him on this world to be a great and powerful lord’). In Book Three, while discussing the court of Foix, Potter also underlines Fèbus’ piety. Nevertheless, the juxtaposition of the concept of ‘divine right’ and inheritance casu quo marital politics of the duke of Burgundy is of an altogether different nature.

Gerard Potter’s rendering of Philip the Bold’s mediation between his father-in-law, Louis of Male, and the Flemish rioters provides another fine example of the explicitation of the Burgundians’ prospects. Margaret of France, grandmother of Margaret of Male, Philip’s wife, had called upon the duke of Burgundy to arbitrate between her son, the count of Flanders, and his subjects. Froissart notes that Philip would inherit ‘Flandres depar Marguerite, sa femme, (…) aprés la mort du conte’. In the Dutch version, Artois has been included in the inheritance: ‘hartoge Phillips van Bourgongen, dair die graefscappen van Vlaenderen ende van Arthoys, na hoire ende grave Lodewijcs doit, ancomen soude van sijns wijfs wegen, vrouwe Margarieten dair sij oudemoeder af was’ (‘Duke Philip of Burgundy, who would inherit the counties of Flanders and Artois after her [i.e. Margaret of France] and count Louis [of Male’s] death, on account of his wife Margaret, of whom she was the grandmother’). When Philip the Bold decides to leave for Arras and visit Margaret of France, Gerard Potter adds that this is ‘ter begeerten van siden sconemoeder’ (‘to please his [grand]mother-in-law’).

It is tempting to consider these reminders of the relations between the dukes of Burgundy and the comital houses of the Low Countries as a proof of the legitimacy of their rule in these parts and, to some extent, this is exactly their purpose. Indeed, Philip the

127 Bes 2, fol. 169 r.; De Pauw 1898, 458.
128 Bes 2, fol. 169 v.; De Pauw 1898, 460.
129 Cf. § 4.3.2.
130 Bes 2, fol. 22 v.; De Pauw 1898, 54.
Bold’s status as heir of Flanders is relevant to the further course of Book Two. When Gerard Potter adds that the duke also inherits the county of Artois after the death of Margaret of France, this seems less important for the narrative. If anything, this explicitation is indicative of the translator’s familiarity with the alliances of the Valois dukes. However, these genealogical excursions are not exclusive to Philip the Bold and his relatives. Whenever necessary, Gerard Potter elucidates the family relations of the Chroniques’ protagonists.

4.4.2. The relevance of illustration

The comparison of the Dutch translation of the chapters preceded by miniatures that have been added to the exemplar’s pictorial programme has not yielded any significant results. In general, the study of these passages confirms the analysis of Gerard Potter’s translation technique as presented in § 4.1. Explicitation causes some slight shifts in Froissart’s character sketches. In the first chapters of Book Two of the translation, John Yoens has been presented more explicitly as sensible and Louis of Male’s greed is more prominent, as is the malice of the Mahieus.

Notwithstanding the above, it seems useful to revaluate the significance of changes in the pictorial programme relative to their relevance for an envisaged audience in Holland. Quite plausibly, intersemiotic translation is subject to the same rules that also apply to translation proper. The composition of the miniatures in H21 and Bes, for instance, suggests that a rather significant degree of interference has occurred between the illustration of the original and the manuscripts of the translation. Application of the relevance theory to illustration would suggest that the transformation from linguistic description to visual depiction implies that the illustrated sections of the narrative are particularly relevant to the envisaged audience, confirming the observations of Hedeman, Le Guay and Harf-Lancner. An additional consequence is that alterations in the pictorial programme of the exemplar are also relevant to a new context. As has been observed in the case of translation proper, this altered relevance may be perceived on different levels: the interpretative level (e.g. caused by cultural differences) or the formal level (e.g. style). Similarly, illustration may be relevant as a complement to the meaning of the text or aesthetically as an objet d’art.

In Chapter Three (§ 3.4.2.), I have briefly discussed the differences in illustration between Bes and the manuscripts of the translation. However, I have refrained from offering an extensive interpretation of these differences. Indeed, although variant readings and the (para)text of the French-language manuscripts and the manuscripts of the translation strongly suggest that either Bes or a hypothetical daughter manuscript was the translation’s exemplar, it is nonetheless wise to be cautious still in matters related to the Gerard Potter’s model. In this section, I will attempt to offer an explanation of the differences between the pictorial programmes of the translation and Bes. In my analysis, I assume that

1. the pictorial programme of the translation’s exemplar was (nearly) identical to the programme of Bes.
2. all of the open spaces in Le3-I were intended for miniatures.
3. the pictorial programmes of Le3-I&2 and H21 were identical to the pictorial programme as drafted for the translation.\(^{132}\)

Compared to the pictorial programme of Book Two in Bes, blank spaces in Le3-I indicate the presence of six additional miniatures in the pictorial programme of Book Two. In Le3-2 and H21 only one miniature precedes a passage that has not been illustrated in Bes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHF II § 102</th>
<th>John Yoens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 111</td>
<td>The twelve burghers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 117</td>
<td>The siege of Oudenaarde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 120</td>
<td>The assault at Oudenaarde; the peace between the count and the people of Flanders through the duke of Burgundy’s mediation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 132</td>
<td>Submission of Oudenaarde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF II § 150</td>
<td>The English burn down the Champagne region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHF III § 294</td>
<td>Submission of the duke of Guelders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- miniatures that are characteristic of the extant manuscripts of the translation -

These added miniatures (except for the miniature accompanying Book Two, § 150) seem to gather round one central theme: ‘the failed rebellion of one or more subjects against their rightful sovereign’. The first and most important group of miniatures is related to the Flemish revolt. The significance of these illustrations only becomes apparent when they

\(^{132}\) It is reasonable that most, if not all of these conditions correspond to the actual situation. See also: § 3.4.2.
are considered as one self-contained unit. The first miniature (Le3-1, fol. 11 r.) probably illustrated the ‘principal causes of the Flemish revolt’, the prologue to the Flanders Revolt. The miniatures that follow exemplify how Louis of Male has been wronged by his Flemish subjects: the scandalous murder of Roger of Auterive, sheriff of Ghent (Le3-1, fol. 16 r., also present in Bev) and the betrayal of John Yoens, who burnt down the count’s residence after the latter had concluded a peace treaty with twelve prominent patricians of Ghent (Le3-1, fol. 17 v.). The siege of Oudenaarde (fol. 21 v.) is yet another provocation. It is uncertain whether the empty fol. 23 v. has been left blank intentionally. A full-page illustration would have emphasized the exceptional importance of the passage. Probably, this miniature should depict the assault at Oudenaarde or the negotiations of Philip the Bold between the count and his subjects. The cycle concludes with the submission of Oudenaarde (Le3-1; fol 31 r.). This group of miniatures illustrates a coherent narrative of revolt: the causes of insurrection, development of the rebellion and, finally, submission. Quite interestingly, there is a distinct emphasis on the events at Oudenaarde. Since the submission of the latter city does not constitute the end of the Flemish revolt, the above does not fully justify the increased attention devoted to the siege of the city. A number of noblemen from Hainault and Holland (e.g. Dirk, lord of Brederode) were lodged in Oudenaarde during the siege. This may provide a plausible explanation for the added illustrations.

A similar cycle of arising – revolt – appeasement is observed in the description of the rebellion of the duke of Guelders (illustrated Le3-2, fol. 251 r.; H21, fol. 359 r.). The miniature in H21 depicts the vassal kneeling before his liege.

133 It would be the only full-page miniature (except for the frontispiece). The following folio is numbered ‘XXIII’ also. There is an annotation on the blank page ‘niet’ (‘not’ or ‘nothing’). See also: § 3.4.2. Le3-2 (Book Three) has a blank space that does not correspond to a miniature in H21. This blank is probably due to an irregularity in the paper and has also been marked (‘nichil’ or ‘nothing’).
134 De Pauw 1898, 48-50.
135 The latter miniature may exclude the court of Jacqueline of Bavaria as the environment in or for which the translation was produced. In the 1430s, the duke of Guelders supported Jacqueline’s struggle against her enemies. Cf. Blockmans and Prevenier 1999, 82: ‘Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, (…) formed an anti-Burgundian alliance on the Continent towards the end of 1435. The alliance consisted largely of Philip’s old enemies: Jacqueline of Bavaria (…); the German emperor Sigismund; Arnold of Egmond, the duke of Guelders and an ally of the emperor; and the count Palatine of the Rhine’.
Apparently, the matièr̄e of rebellious subjects, brought to submission by their sovereign was a primary concern of the translation’s audience. Quite interestingly, the illustrations further emphasize those parts of the narrative in which subjects revolt against their lord, whereas passages in which one pretender contests the legitimacy of the other receive no additional attention.¹³⁶ A possible explanation for the interest in these narratives of revolt may be found in the political situation in the Burgundian Low Countries. Throughout the fifteenth century, civic rebellion frequently flared up, in Flanders and elsewhere.

The power of the Valois dukes of Burgundy had been established in Flanders in the 1380s over the dead bodies of thousands of Ghenters, slain on the field of Roosebeke, and Ghent remained a trouble-spot for every one of Philip the Bold’s successors. In Bruges, too, revolt flared up from time to time, notably in 1437, when Philip the Good only just escaped with his life. In 1439 and 1445 it was the Dutch towns, Rotterdam, Amsterdam and Leiden in particular which were convulsed by civic commotion and revolt, though

¹³⁶ The illustration of matters of succession would have been in line with the conflict between Jacqueline of Bavaria, her uncle John the Pitiless, second husband John of Brabant and cousin Philip of Burgundy. The battle of Aljubarrota has also been illustrated in Bes.
here the situation was complicated by party struggles (…) the troubles at Ghent exploded into a prolonged and disastrous war which involved the ducal government and the entire Burgundian state in a veritable struggle for survival. (…) This protracted crisis began 1447 with a clash between ducal authority and civic pretensions.

(Vaughan 1970, 303-304)

Any of these uprisings may have given new relevance to the illustrated stories of revolt. It is plausible – but not necessary – that for a Dutch audience, this was particular the case for the uproar in the cities of Holland in 1439-1445. A connection to the Second Ghent War of 1449-1453 would explain the extra-ordinary attention given to the Flanders uprising of the 1380s. In 1451 the Ghentenaars besieged the town of Oudenaarde, as they had frequently done during the 1379-1385 conflict. Mid-1453, Philip of Burgundy turned to stadtholder John of Lannoy with the request to send a contingent of Dutch troops. Reinoud II of Brederode and his brother Ghijsbrecht, along with one thousand soldiers they had financed at their own expense, joined the Burgundian armed forces under the command of Antony, the Great Bastard of Burgundy. After the battle of Gavere, situated between Ghent and Oudenaarde, a peace treaty was signed between the duke and his rebellious Flemish subjects. In 1451-1452, an official proclamation had enunciated the conflict between the Ghentenaars and their Burgundian sovereign, the duke had requested a war loan and the vassals had been ordered to have their troops in operational order. In the meanwhile, the Ghentenaars appealed to the cities in Holland to support their cause. Inflammatory pamphlets were passed on the Council, which actively engaged in the combat against the Ghent rebellion through the diffusion of official information and the organisation of religious processions.

The added miniature representing the submission of the duke of Guelders may be explained by rather protracted conflict between Holland and Guelders in 1452-1453. In 1452, a group of Guelders pillagers had privateered forty-two trading vessels from Holland. In spite of lively negotiations and official letters going hence and forth between the regional Council, the aristocracy of Guelders and the duke of Burgundy, even in February 1453, trade with Guelders was forbidden ‘because of the damage inflicted by the count of Oldenburg and his piracy’. The Guelders conflict in 1452-1453, together with the

---

137 See also: Blockmans and Prevenier 1999, 96-99; 107-109.
139 Jongkees 1990, 48-51.
140 Smit 2005, 459, 480.
simultaneous Dutch involvement in the Second Ghent War provides a coherent interpretation of the differences between the pictorial programmes of Bes and the translation. This interpretation suggests that Gerard Potter translated the *Chroniques* at an advanced stage in his career and relatively shortly before his death in 1454. Alternatively, the events of 1453 inspired a change in the programme of illustration of the translation, at a time at which manuscripts of the text had already been circulating for quite a while.

It should be noted that this tentative interpretation does not explain all of the differences between the pictorial programmes of Bes and the extant manuscripts of the translation. The illustration of the English raid on the Champagne region does not correspond to the description of ‘rebellion against the liege’. A possible explanation supports the Burgundian context that has been suggested above. Indeed, the passage describes the siege of Troyes, which Philip the Bold at the time defended against its English, Gascogne and Hainault assailants.

The manuscripts of the translation omit the illustration of three passages that have been illustrated in Bes: the encounter between Joan of Brabant and Isabella of Bavaria prior to the latter’s marriage to Charles VI of France, the surrender of Cassères and the diplomatic mission of Hélion of Lignac. The omission of miniatures could be explained by an economic relevance. Taking into account the price of raw materials and the fact that illustration was labour intensive, miniatures were an expensive commodity. Since, compared to Bes, a relatively large number of illustrations had been added, the objective of the omission of possibly irrelevant miniatures was a reduction of expense.

Nevertheless, at least one of the omitted miniatures, notably the encounter between Joan of Brabant and Isabella of Bavaria, must have had some relevance to an aristocratic audience in Holland. Isabella was the granddaughter of Stephen II of Bavaria, brother of Albert of Bavaria, the late count of Holland and Hainault. The latter’s granddaughter, Jacqueline of Bavaria, had been given in marriage to Isabella’s son, John of Touraine. When the latter died in 1417, the Bavarian dream of delivering the Queen of France had been shattered. In this view, it is possible that an audience in Holland preferred not to be reminded of this unfortunate course of events.

---

141 Since it is possible that not Bes but another (very similar) manuscript was the translation’s exemplar, some of the differences between the respective programmes of illustration may be due to differences between Bes and its hypothetical lost daughter.

142 Clemens and Graham 2007, 31-32
4.4.3. Conclusion

Although the directed search for indications of Gerard Potter’s envisaged audience has yielded some interesting results, the outcome does not directly point towards one specific patron. Gerard Potter’s explicitating manner of translation obscures the influence of commission. Nevertheless, the analysis of passages related to the aristocratic families of Blois, Bavaria and Burgundy have yielded some interesting insights into the translator’s cognitive environment. Gerard Potter’s references to Holland must have increased the text’s relevance for a Dutch audience. The translator emphasises the power of the lords of Holland, Zeeland and Hainault. Additionally, in his translation of the negotiations between Duke Albert and Philip the Bold, the divine right of Burgundian rule is juxtaposed to legitimacy by inheritance. A tentative conclusion proposes that Potter’s intended audience belonged to the ruling classes favouring their new, Burgundian sovereign.

In § 4.4.2., I have formulated a coherent explanation for the differences between the pictorial programmes of *Bes* and the manuscripts of the translation. The illustration of cycles of revolt may have been meaningful against the backdrop of the civic uprisings in the Low Countries ca. 1440-1450. The political situation in Holland of 1452-1453 provides a meaningful framework for the increased emphasis on the Ghent War and the submission of William of Guelders. As it appears, Holland was drawn into the conflict by both the Ghentenaar revolters and their Burgundian sovereign. Moreover, the regional government actively engaged in the war against subversion. At approximately the same time, Holland was involved in a longstanding conflict with the duchy of Guelders.

4.5. Conclusion

The relevance theory has proven to be an interesting methodological framework for the analysis of Gerard Potter’s translation of the *Chroniques*. The principles from which it departs are regarded as characteristic of human cognition. This is particularly appealing in historical translation studies. An analysis of the differences between the French-language original and the Middle Dutch translation has allowed us to draw up a profile of Gerard Potter as a translator. Additionally, it has enabled us to make a number of observations as regards the translator’s beliefs and/or those of his envisaged audience. First and foremost, one of Gerard Potter’s most important concerns as a translator/editor appears to have been the validity of his translation. An important characteristic of Gerard Potter’s translation...
technique is the explicitation of the text’s polysemy. When the French text is open to interpretation, the translation offers a number of options and does not limit the reader’s interpretation to one possibility that is the translator’s subjective choice. Additionally, the translator’s modifications increase the text’s relevance in its new social and linguistic context. In particular cases, references to Holland and Zeeland have been added to the French text. In this sense, Gerard Potter’s translation may be characterised as domesticising. By contrast, in its use of French-sounding neologisms resonating the new language of power, the text must have come across as very modern, avant-garde even. Potter’s ease in the use of the terminology of knighthood and his acquaintance with courtly customs and entertainment firmly locate him and his audience in the circles of aristocracy. His explicitating fashion of translation emphasises a number of the themes and motifs of the *Chroniques*, e.g. the continuity of aristocratic and monarchical lineages. A comparison of the translation and the original text has not yet allowed us to get a distinct image of the translator’s intended audience. Apparently, Gerard Potter assumed that his readers and listeners were at least as versed in the subtleties of courtly society as he was. Additionally, it seems that his envisaged readership’s geographical horizon extended well beyond the borders of Holland. Finally, the analysis of the way in which the translator has modified the original text appears to situate the audience in a pro-Burgundian context. This becomes most apparent from the way in which the translator emphasizes the Burgundians’ divine right. Additionally, the translation’s linguistic colouring suggests linguistic contact with the new, supra-regional elite. The hypothesis that has been put forward as an explanation for the differences between the pictorial programmes of *Bes* and the manuscripts of the translation also presupposes an audience that sympathized with the situation of the sovereign. The pictorial emphasis on narratives of revolt – the First Ghent War and the subversion of William of Guelders – becomes particularly relevant against the background of the inflammatory political situation of the 1440s and 1450s. The increased interest expressed by the illustration of these conflicts of interest fit in with Holland’s involvement in the Second Ghent War and the dispute with Guelders of 1452-1453. Taking into consideration the translator’s professional networks as presented in Chapter One, the above suggests that Gerard Potter’s audience was probably situated among members of the Burgundian Council of Holland. As regards translations of historical texts into the vernacular, T. Summerfield and R. Allen have argued that ‘many contribute to the development, change, or construction of community and society; they frequently have a political, hortatory, pragmatic, utilitarian, or exegetical function’. Universal as this
description may be, it is tempting to attribute a social and pragmatic function to the translation of the *Chroniques*. As has been argued above in § 3.6. among the first owners of Froissart manuscripts of Parisian making were ardent supporters of the dukes of Burgundy. A similar provenance might be assumed for the translation’s exemplar. Quite possibly, a Burgundian administrator in Holland (one of the stadtholders, auditors or councillors) drew Gerard Potter’s attention to Froissart’s *Chroniques* because of their relevance in political matters related to the county of Holland and its new Burgundian sovereigns: the previous history of the Hundred Years’ War, the recalcitrance of Flanders, even subjects directly related to Holland and Hainault (e.g. the family relations between the Valois dukes of Burgundy and the Wittelsbach Bavarians). Additionally, as Froissart repeatedly asserts, his history contains an abundance of good (and bad) practice in matters of negotiation and council. It is probably this utilitarian use that made Gerard Potter’s translation valuable for members of regional government. Inviting as it may seem, the above is primarily based on a possible interpretation of Potter’s translation technique, differences between the Middle Dutch and French-language version and differences in their pictorial programmes. Chapter Five further tests this hypothesis against the evidence provided by the translation’s manuscripts.
In almost every field of medieval studies scholars try to provide themselves and their audience with a social, political and cultural context for the text, the work of art and the ideas they are concerned with. […] Attention is paid to its contemporary use, its failure or success, measured – among other criteria – by the quantity and quality of transcriptions or prints and their diffusion and the use that was made of them. The emphasis will remain as often as not on the text itself, but it is by now generally accepted that more attention to the material transmission of texts and what was related to them can bring much extra information that would not be available in any other way.

(Jos M.M. Hermans 1999, xi)

In his study of the fourteenth-century *Rijmkroniek van Holland* (‘Rhyme-chronicle of Holland’), J.W.J. Burgers has devoted an appendix to the text’s manuscripts and reception. In the annex, Burgers provides an elaborate description of each manuscript or fragment. Codicological characteristics as well as annotations in the manuscripts and scribal colophons allow him to sketch a rather well developed view of the *Rijmkroniek*’s dissemination and reception. The contextualisation of the scribal colophon in The Hague, Royal Library, MS 128 E 3 has led Burgers to believe that the manuscript was a copy of an exemplar produced for the benefit of John I of Polanen. A corrected scribal error in The Hague, Royal Library, MS 128 E 4 allows the scholar to date the manuscript rather precisely between 1385 and 1420. The colophon in The Hague, Royal Library, MS 128 E 5 reveals the scribe’s name, profession and the date at which he completed the copy, most probably at the request of William II, lord of Naaldwijk. Based on palaeographical grounds, the fragment Brussels, Royal Library, MS IV 398, 6 should be located in a comital or ducal chancery ca. 1315-1325. In conclusion, textual variation enables Burgers to establish the relations between the extant manuscripts.¹

In the present chapter, I attempt at sketching the dissemination and reception of Gerard Potter’s translation of the *Chroniques*. For the codicological descriptions of the extant manuscripts The Hague, Royal Library, MS 130 B 21 (*H21*, Book Three) and

---

¹ Burgers 1999, 319-374.
Leyden, University Library, Bibliotheca Publica Latina MS 3 I& II (Le3-I&2, Book Two and Book Three), I refer the reader to Appendix C. In the first part of this chapter (§ 5.1.), I reevaluate the dating of the translation ca. 1430. Ever since Muller’s 1888 article, this date has been repeatedly suggested on rather infirm grounds. Since such an early date would contradict the hypothesis formulated in the conclusion of the previous chapter (§ 4.5), a more precise and well-founded indication of the period in which Gerard Potter translated the Chroniques is desirable. In the following section (§ 5.2.), I will show that the dissemination of the Middle Dutch translation extended beyond the extant manuscripts. I will argue that – as has been previously assumed – Le3 is no direct copy of H21. Additionally, evidence from post-medieval inventories and sales-catalogues points towards lost manuscripts. Members of the most important aristocratic family of Holland appear to have owned a full set of manuscripts of the translation. In the seventeenth century, a manuscript appears in the collection of one of Holland’s most important book-collectors. The third part of this chapter returns to the extant manuscripts. The illumination, together with a sixteenth-century owner’s mark in H21 and the scribal colophon of Le3-2 further add to the contextualisation of Gerard Potter’s text (§ 5.3.).

5.1. The manuscripts and the dating of the translation

As has become apparent from the previous chapter, a correct dating of Gerard Potter’s text is of great importance to its contextualisation. In Court and Culture, F. van Oostrom’s has characterised the translation rather ambiguously as ‘the first (and at the same time last) product of Burgundian court culture in Holland’. On the other hand, he notes that the translation might be ‘the only literary work apparently produced in the very last years of Bavarian rule at The Hague’. Both assertions are reconciled if one quite legitimately accepts that the Burgundian influence must have been palpable during the reign of John the Pitiless of Bavaria, the last Wittelsbach ruler of Holland. Be this as it may, Van Oostrom seems to be undecided whether the translation was produced under Bavarian or by contrast under Burgundian authority. The uncertainty emanates from the date that has been generally assigned to the text. Consensus has it that Gerard Potter completed his translation circa 1430, right at the transition of Wittelsbach to Valois rule. However, besides Muller’s

---

2 Van Oostrom 1992, 297.
dating of the The Hague manuscript (=H21), which has been based on the script-type, there is no substantial evidence whatsoever to support this *communis opinio*. Moreover, Muller himself was not certain of his dating of the codex. In spite of the scholar’s own incertitude, several researchers have adopted his dating to ca. 1430. Codicological evidence, however, shows that H21 should be dated at least one, maybe two decades later than generally has been assumed.

The watermark in the paper (fol. viii) is very similar to a watermark that occurs in letters issued at Bruges in August 1445 (cf. fig. 5.1.-5.2). It takes the form of a cup-shaped flower. The sepals (three) and outer (four) and inner (five) petals are clearly distinguishable. The flower is connected to a curved peduncle with at either side one leaf, attached to the stalk at incongruous points. The watermark is situated between the fourth and sixth chain-line. The fifth chain-line divides the flower in half. The distance between the chain-lines is 30 mm. The height of the watermark, measured from the top of the flower to the bottom of the stalk, is 82 mm. The width – the distance between the

either Bavarian or Burgundian side. Van Oostrom suggests that Gerard – as his father – may have been one of the first autonomous authors at the court of Holland. In § 1.3.1. and § 3.2., I have formulated the hypothesis that the translation may have been advantageous to Gerard Potter’s career advancement or maybe rather further validated his position in the Council.

4 Muller 1888, 265
5 Muller 1888, 270: ‘If the ms. H [H21] is indeed not younger than circa 1430, he [Gerard Potter] must have taken up the translation of Froissart’s colossal work at an early age, even before he held his judicial offices’.
6 Landesarchiv Baden-Württemberg, Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, J 340 (http://www.piccard-online.de), no.127163. The paper is found in two letters (Bruges, 20 and 22 August 1445) addressed to the Grandmaster of the Teutonic Order. These letters were sent by Johann Reppin, Chief Agent of Königsberg and Hans Reppin, the Grandmaster’s messenger. Johann Reppin informs the Grandmaster about his negotiations with the duke of Burgundy and the emissaries of Holland. Hans Reppin notifies the Grandmaster that the talks are at a near standstill. (Joachim and Hubatsch 1948-1950, 570 nrs. 8866 and 8870). I thank Dr. D. Heckmann for providing the reference.
extremities of the leaves – is 55 mm. The watermark’s ‘twin’ (e.g. fol. IV; cf. fig. 5.3.), in which the two leaves are connected to the stalk at the same point, does not appear in the Piccard-database.

The penwork decoration of the initials in the manuscript has been identified as a specific variant of the thorn-and-stitch type. The subgroup of ‘mask’ penwork decoration is characterised by the presence of ‘grotesques, men’s heads in profile, which are frequently situated within the circular curls of vines’.

---

7 I thank Gerard van Thienen, former curator of incunabula at the Royal Library, The Hague, for producing the rubbings of the watermarks in the manuscript.
9 Hülsmann and Nieuwstraten 1992, 88. In her dissertation, Hülsmann indicates this type as ‘Grotesque head’ or ‘Mug’ (Dutch: ‘tronie’) flourishings. Additionally, Hülsmann points towards a number of large centres for this type of decoration, amongst others Third Order convents in Amsterdam and Haarlem. Hülsmann 2009.
The Byvanck–database (Royal Library, The Hague) counts twenty-seven representatives, the earliest of which is dated 1440-1460. Several manuscripts of the group should be dated circa 1450, among which several devotional books illustrated by the Masters of the Haarlem Bible. In the case of the Lucerne breviary, these artists collaborated with the Masters of Otto of Moerdrecht. The illustrations of two books of hours have been executed by the Masters of the Suffrages (added at a later time) and the Masters of the Boston City of God. The artist(s) responsible for the drawings in H21 do not seem to belong to any of these groups of painters. According to the classification of Hülsmann 2009, the penwork-decoration should be located at Haarlem.

Certain features of the attire in the miniatures point towards a dating of circa 1450-1460. According to B. Cardon, ‘the personages are (...) dressed with the typical garment of the period around 1460: a short houppelande, with wide shoulders and narrow hips.’ The headwear, mainly chaperons with long streamers and round hats made of rush seem to confirm the dating to circa 1450. These garments, complemented with the long-toed footwear, led A. Korteweg and C. Chavannes-Mazel to put forward that the artists were inspired by a Burgundian model.

Nevertheless, this later dating of the The Hague codex has not always been linked to the date of translation. At present the terminus post quem should be fixed on 1408-1417, the period in which the Parisian collaborative centred round Pierre de Liffol was active.

---

10 Utrecht, Museum Convent of Saint Catherine, BMH, h. 167.
11 Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, Add. 494 A; Cambridge, Queens College, 50; Lucerne, Royal Library, P. Msc. 13; Utrecht, Museum Convent of Saint Catherine, StCC h 1.
12 Respectively Rotterdam, Municipal Library, 96 G 8 and Utrecht, Museum Convent of Saint Catherine, ABM h 25.
13 The style of the painted miniatures in H21 seems similar to that of Master A, who was responsible for over 160 illustrations in the The Hague copy of the History Bible (The Hague, Royal Library, 78 D 38 I+II.). See: Korteweg 1989, 130-135.
14 Hülsmann 2009, 117-120. Although Hülsmann does not discuss the decoration of H21, the penwork decoration fits her description of the decoration of the ‘Haarlem’ group of manuscripts that were possibly manufactured at the Third Order Convent of Saint Anthony Orchard at Haarlem. H21 can be attributed to this group based on the type of ‘beardie’, a bearded figure in profile, the ‘Haarlem’ type of thorns and the presence of little hash-like squares and triangular wedges made up of stripes.
15 Cardon 1996, 341; Compare Brewerd 1995, 18. He quotes M. Scott: ‘By 1450 men had become very wide-shouldered, narrow-waisted creatures walking around on long slim legs which ended in the tapering toes of pointed shoes or boots’.
17 Korteweg and Chavannes-Mazel 1980, 183. The soldiers’ headwear exists of bacinet (14th century to about 1450, with and without visor) combined with a gorget or bevor and kettle hats to which an aventail is attached in order to protect the neck and shoulders. The sallet (popular from the 1450s onwards) does not appear in the miniatures. In general, full plate armour is worn. The footsoldiers are armed with longbows, crossbows, halberds, scythes, battle-axes, goedendags and early examples of arquebuses (Battle of Otterburn, fol. 361v).
The illustration of Froissart manuscripts by the Giac Master and Boethius Master should probably be dated to circa 1415 (see Chapter Three). The terminus ante quem, however, appears to be later than generally has been assumed: circa 1450.\textsuperscript{18} Since it confirms the approximate dating ca. 1440-1450 (possibly 1452-1453) suggested in the previous chapter, the new ante quem is quite significant. Additionally, if $H21$ was produced before 10 November 1454 (and not about 1460 as has been suggested by Cardon), it is possible that Gerard Potter himself may have had a hand in its production.

\section*{5.2. Lost manuscripts: rubrication, inventories and catalogues}

Compared to the considerable number of manuscripts in which Froissart’s chronicle has been transmitted to us, the textual transmission of its Middle Dutch counterpart appears as rather meagre.\textsuperscript{19} Whereas in a number of cases the \textit{Chroniques} have survived in full sets of three to five codices, no complete sets comprising all the Books of the translation exist today. In the past, this incompleteness has been interpreted as an indication of failure, since it presumably suggested that Potter prematurely abandoned his translation project.\textsuperscript{20} This, of course, assumes that the \textit{Chroniques} were always disseminated in complete sets of four Books. However, as has been argued in Chapters Two and Three, for his translation Gerard Potter relied on a two-volume set containing the text of Book One, Book Two and Book Three. Indeed, scholars studying the tradition of the French manuscripts have noted that ‘complete’ sets consisting of Book One to Book Four were not produced until the second half of the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{21} Additionally, the scribal colophon at the end of the Leyden copy of the translation (‘This book was written by John Hendriksz. Paeds and was finished on 26 January 1470’), indicates that the scribe had completed his transcription and that therefore no translation of Book Four was present in his exemplar.\textsuperscript{22} When he had finished his transcription of the first extant volume, Paeds did not record his involvement in the production of the copy. Even though the first part of this volume (fol. 1 r. to fol. 41 r.) has

\textsuperscript{18} The neologisms in the text suggest that this date is reasonably close to the production of the translation. See Chapter Four.

\textsuperscript{19} The modest circulation of the text is further underlined by the fact that John of Naaldwijk, the grandson of William III of Naaldwijk, Gerard’s superior in the treasury of Holland, apparently did not know of or did not have at his disposal Gerard Potter’s translation of the \textit{Chroniques} when he was compiling his own chronicle (1514/after 1517). In his description of the Peasants’ Revolt, John of Naaldwijk translates the relevant sections of Book Two himself or he uses a translation which is not Potter’s. (S. Levelt, e-mail: 12 September 2006).

\textsuperscript{20} Van Oostrom 1992, 297-299.


\textsuperscript{22} \textit{LE}3-2, fol. 263 r.
been written by an anonymous scribe, one would expect that – in the case that he added a colophon to each volume he completed – Paeds would have added an inscription at the end of Le3-I as well. This observation suggests that of the Leyden set of manuscripts only Book One is missing, the subject matter of which had probably been divided over two codices (see § 3.2.). It seems therefore very likely that manuscripts of the Middle Dutch version of Book One once existed but simply have not survived.

5.2.1. The rubrication of H21 and Le3-2

Other sets of manuscripts, which now have been lost, must have circulated. Close scrutiny of the relations between the rubrics in Bes, the list in H21 and the rubrics in the text of both extant copies of the translation of Book Three (H21 and Le3-2) reveals some interesting information about the relation between the Dutch manuscripts. It has been put forward that for his copy of the translation, of which Le3-I and Le3-2 are the surviving witnesses, John Hendrikisz. Paeds used as an exemplar the set of manuscripts of which now only the last volume (H21) survives. However, when the translation’s rubrics are compared to the rubrics in the Bes manuscript – the manuscript of which the text resembles most the text of the translation and probably the exemplar Gerard Potter used – it becomes apparent that in some cases the rubrics of Le3-2 correspond better to the rubrics of Bes than those found in H21. The research of R. and M. Rouse has shown that the distribution, as well as the formulation of the rubrics is characteristic of the manuscripts manufactured under the direction of Pierre de Liffol, the subgroup of copies in which the translation’s exemplar originated. The analysis of the rubrics of Book Three presented in Chapter Three confirms their findings, although it should be noted that notable differences between the manuscripts of this group still occur.

Compared to Bes, the rubric in example 1 has been shortened in the text of H21. In itself, this is common scribal practice (cf. § 3.3.). Nevertheless, it is meaningful that the list in H21 as well as the titles in Le3-2 have preserved the longer version of the rubrics. In example 2, both the list and the text of H21 have a shorter title, whereas Le3-2 has retained the longer version of the French-language original.

23 Lieftinck 1962. Gumbert 1988, 143. Although the Paeds family maintained close connections with the court and Council of Holland throughout the fifteenth century, the idea that H21 was Paeds’ exemplar may have been an important reason for J.P. Gumbert to point tentatively towards The Hague as the manuscript’s place of origin.
CHAPTER FIVE

Example 1: rubric 121

_H21 list:_  Hoe die hertoge van Gulic ende die airdsbiscop **van Colne** schieden vanden coninc van Franckrijck ende togen tot Nyemegen bijden hertoge van Gelre ende hoe dese hertoge van Gelre bij horen onderwijse ende rade weder ter zoene ende te passe quam metten coninc van Franckrijck ende oic mede metter hertoginne van Brabant

_H21:_ Hoe die hertoge van Gulic ende die airdsbiscop schieden vanden coninc van Franckrijke ende togen tot Nyemegen bijden hertoge van Gelre ende hoe dese hertoge van Gelre bij horen onderwijse ende rade weder ter zoene ende te passe quam metten coninc van Franckrijke ende oick mede metter hertoghinnen van Brabanndt

_Le3-2:_ Hoe die hertoge van Gulick ende die airdsbiscop **van Colne** schieden vanden coninc van Franckrijke ende togen tot Nyemegen bijden hertoge van Gelre bij horen onderwijse ende rade weder ter zoene ende te passen quam metten coninc van Franckrijke ende oick mede metter hertoginne van Brabant

_Bes list:_ Comment le duc de Julliers et l’archivesque de Coulongne se partirent du roy de France et s’en alerent a Nymaye devers le duc de Guerles et comment par l’admonnestement de eulx il fut reconsillié et mis a paix devers le roy de France et la duchié de Braibant

_Bes:_ Comment le duc de Julliers et l’archievesque de Couloigne se partirent du roy de France et s’en allerent a Nimaye devers le duc de Guerles et comment par l’admonnestement d’eulx il fut reconsillié et mis a paix devers le roy de France et la duchié de Braibant

Example 2: rubric 124

_H21 list:_ Hoe Joffroy Herthooft dair hij in sijn dootbedde lach twee cappiteyenen koys die na sijn doot up Ventadour cappiteynen wesen souden ende van sijn testamente dat hij doe hij sterven soude maicte. Voirt hoe die hertoge van Gelre uut sine landen schiet om in Pruysen te reysen ende van die aventuer ende misvalle dat hem gebuerde in dat hertogdomme vander Stolpe

_H21:_ Hoe Joffroy Herthooft dair hij in sijn dootbedde lach twee cappiteyenen koys die na sijn doot up Ventadour cappiteynen wesen souden ende van sijn testamente dat hij doe hij sterven soude maicte. Voirt hoe die hertoge van Gelre uut sine landen schiedt om in Pruysen te reysen ende van die aventuer ende misvalle dat hem gebuerde in dat hertoichdomme vander Stolpe
These examples are no isolated cases. In various instances, the rubrics in Le3 correspond more closely to the rubrics in the list in H21 (example 1) and to the rubrics in Bes (examples 1 and 2).24 This suggests that the Leyden manuscript has not been copied from the The Hague codex, but that both manuscripts were derived from a common but now lost ancestor.

In spite of the fact that the set of manuscripts that was the common ancestor of both H21 and Le3 does not survive, some observations can be made as to what it may have looked like. The colophon in both H21 and Le3-2 (‘ende is dat vierde boecke in Duytsche’ or ‘which is the fourth book in Dutch’) suggests that the Middle Dutch translation of the Chroniques circulated in sets of four codices (cf. § 3.3.1.).25 It is highly probable that the lost prototype also took that form. In addition, the converging distribution of miniatures in H21 and Le3-2 implies that the lost prototype was illustrated. This makes it probable that the lost set of codices was a valuable, complete copy of Gerard Potter’s translation. Indeed, it seems unlikely that both the H21 scribe and John Hendriksz. Paeds had access to the translator’s authorial exemplar. It is rather plausible that instead, they used an illustrated copy that had been derived from the autograph.26 In view of the resemblance between the

24 The absence of ‘ende hoe dese hertoge van Gelre’ in the Le3-2 rubric in example 1 is probably the result of eyeskip.
25 Cf. Chapter Three.
26 An extensive and interesting discussion of the compositional stages of medieval texts and a classification of autographs can be found in Houthuys 2009, 58-67. As none of the extant manuscripts is in Potter’s own hand (examples of which survive in the comital accounts of 1439-1440 and 1440-1441), we cannot know for
illustration of *Bes*-2 and the pictorial programme of the translation, it is probable that Potter either provided detailed directions for the artwork which eventually had to be included in the apograph and/or presentation copy or that the illustrator of this copy has been able to consult the illustrated French exemplar or a set of illustrations that had been based on the miniatures in the model.\textsuperscript{27} Taking into account these considerations, it is therefore possible to represent the dissemination of the translation’s manuscripts schematically as in fig. 5.5. Gerard Potter used the Parisian manuscript *Bes* (ca. 1410-1418, or a hypothetical daughter manuscript) as the model for his Middle Dutch version of the *Chroniques*. His translation efforts resulted in one or more rough (autograph) versions of the translation (A), which in turn served as the basis for an illustrated apograph or presentation copy (α). This copy was the lost archetype of which both *H21* (ca. 1450) and *Le3* (1470) are descendants.

\textsuperscript{27} In the terminology of Houthuys the terms apograph (and possibly even the presentation copy) could be replaced by ‘original authorial exemplar’, a copy of the text that originated in the close surroundings of and under the supervision of the author. In view of the dating of *H21* the latter observation may also be valid for this extant manuscript.
5.2.2. Primary audiences: the Brederode manuscripts

Evidence for lost manuscripts also arises from post-medieval inventories and sales catalogues. One of these listings provides the first – and possibly only – indication of ownership of a full (?) set of Middle Dutch Froissart manuscripts. After the death of Reynald III of Brederode (1492-1556), his servant Druet Warhel drew up an inventory of the possessions of the deceased lord of Brederode and Vianen.28 Next to the valuables, armoury, clothing and paintings present in his residence of Batestein, the list refers to ‘les livres tant en Latin que en Alleman et en Franchois’.29 The inventory records twenty-four items in Latin, six items in Dutch and twenty-one items in French.30 Among the Dutch titles we encounter three ‘books’ by Jean Froissart.

*Deersten boek van Jan Frossaerts.*
*Het tweede van Jan Frossaert.*
*Het tiel boeck van Jan Frossaert.*

The collection includes a wide range of genres: geographical works (a *Liber Orientalium Regionum*, possibly the voyages of Marco Polo), biblical books (an *Evangelium*, the *Apocalipsis*, etc.), morality and didactic treatises (*Liber Apum*, *Het Scaeckspel*, etc.), French vernacular texts with a distinct preference for Arturian romance (*Les romains de Meliadus*, *Tristan*, *Le second volume de Merlin*, *Lanssolot du Lacq*, *Amadis de Gaule*, *Petrarcha de Remedes de Fortune*, etc.) and historiography (*Josephus*, *Valerius Maximus*, *Die Cronicken van Brederode*, etc.).31

Unfortunately, apart from the titles, Warhel has not noted down a great deal of additional information. This renders it difficult to distinguish manuscripts from printed books and newly acquired items from older inherited ones. A book in Dutch ‘which I do not know’ was further specified by the characteristic ‘met parckement’ (= with parchment).32 The *L’Istoire de l’Empereur de Romme* was described as ‘a hefty and ancient volume’. Of other French volumes (*Le Second volume de Merlin*, *Le premier

28 Salverda de Grave 1918, 2.
29 Brederode, 55, fol. 7 r. – 8r. Edited by Salverda de Grave 1918, 49-51.
30 For an extensive discussion of the books in the Brederode inventories, see: Schoenaers & Wijsman 2009. Although *Alleman* may refer to both German and Dutch dialects, the titles Warhel refers to all seem to be in Dutch.
31 For an overview of the Brederode library as listed in the 1556 catalogue: see appendix B.
32 It is unclear how this should be interpreted: the manuscript may have been written on vellum, may have consisted of vellum and paper or might have been bound in a simple parchment binding.
chapitre de Adam et Eva) Warhel noted that they were of ‘parchemin’, others had a simple binding of parchment (Le livre de Jan de Boccace, Petrarcha Remedes de Fortune), and one book was specifically referred to as printed (‘Le Tristan chevalierz de la table ronde, nouvellement imprimé a Paris’).

Additional information can be secured from a second inventory. In 1567, a catalogue was drawn up after Reynald’s son, Henry II of Brederode, had fled from Vianen. This inventory did not only list a considerable number of titles that were not included in the first inventory, it also provided additional information about the volumes that had already been listed in 1556. The Quintilianus mentioned above was a written book, as was the Valerius Maximus. The Terentius, however, was an old print. The Dutch Froissart volumes were ‘gescreven in franchin in drie stucken’ (‘written, in/on parchment, in three parts’).

Surprisingly, the specification ‘in three pieces’ seems to refer to three separate volumes and not four as suggested by the colophon in the extant manuscripts. This opens up the possibility that the ‘fourth book in Dutch’ does not refer to a set of physical volumes after all, but rather indicates a compositional subdivision. Another possibility is that the Brederode set was incomplete.

Although the designations ‘handwritten’ and ‘print’ could provide some clues towards the age of the items in the listings, the inventories give no further information about the provenance of the books and manuscripts. Based on the largely hypothetical printing dates reported by Salverda de Grave, H. Wijsman concluded that the collection ‘does not appear to have been an inherited family library’. Indeed, a large number of the volumes seem to be of a relatively recent date. However, it should be noted that De Grave’s identifications are all but certain. Since a number of the titles indicated by Salverda as recent prints may have been older manuscripts, Wijsman notes that – if

33 Salverda de Grave 1918, 59-119.
34 Although it is quite reasonable to assume that Henry II of Brederode acquired a fair number of new volumes after his father had died, it is also possible that for some reason or other Warhel failed to include some of the volumes in the 1556 inventory (e.g. they were not at Batestein at the time). It is remarkable that quite a few of the new items seem to be in German and French.
35 Salverda de Grave 1918, 75.
36 Derolez 2001, 31 defines carta froncina as parchment made of sheepskin, which ‘was sometimes greasy or wrinkly, the hairside mostly yellowish, the flesh side white’. In 1599 the Dutch lexicographer Kiliaan described francijn as ‘Membrana Francica siue Gallica, Pergamena: membrana veruecina siue vitulina’, parchment originating from France, the skin of a wether or calfskin. (cf. Digitale Bibliotheek der Nederlandse Letteren, C. Kiliaan, Etymologicum Teutonicae Lingae). The Letterkundig Lexicon states that initially francijn referred to high quality vellum.
anything – his conclusion is provisional.\textsuperscript{37} Further research by Schoenaers and Wijsman has demonstrated that it is plausible that a small core collection of manuscripts was handed down from one generation to the other. Additionally, it is probable that at least some of the volumes in the sixteenth-century listings already belonged to Reynald II of Brederode (b. 1415- d. 1473) and his wife Yolanda of Lalaing (d. 1497).\textsuperscript{38} This is particularly plausible for one of the items classified by Salverda de Grave as a printed book. \textit{Die Cronicken van Brederode} should be identified as a copy of the Middle Dutch Brederode-chronicle, which was composed by Johannes Gherbrandi a Leydis at the end of the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{39} The first known printed version of this account of the noble deeds of the lords of Brederode is the edition by A. Matthaeus (1698).\textsuperscript{40} However, the Dutch chronicle survives in eight manuscripts dating from the fifteenth and sixteenth-century, two of which are currently located among the records of the Brederode family archive in Detmold.\textsuperscript{41} Since this chronicle informs us about the Brederodes’ concerns with vernacular literature in the second half of the fifteenth century, it deserves some further attention.\textsuperscript{42}

In the last quarter of the fifteenth century (probably ca. 1478), an anonymous author composed a chronicle of the noble lineage of Brederode. It is generally assumed that this chronicler should be identified with Johannes a Leydis, the author of the \textit{Chronicon Comitum Hollandiae et Episcoporum Ultraieictensium} (1467-1469). The Brederode-chronicle exists: in three versions: one in Latin, one in French and one in Dutch. The latter version has been explicitly dedicated to Yolanda of Lalaing, the widow of Reynald II of Brederode.\textsuperscript{43}

Yolanda of Lalaing and Reynald II of Brederode were married in autumn/winter of 1445. The new lady of Brederode was the daughter of the Hainault nobleman William of Lalaing, chevalier d’honneur of Isabella of Portugal and from 1440 to 1445 stadtholder of Holland. Lalaing’s sympathy for the \textit{Hook} faction, which eventually led to his dismissal, indicates that during his term as governor, he must have maintained good relations with the lord of Brederode. The latter was generally considered as the leader of the \textit{Hook} party. At

\textsuperscript{37} Wijsman 2003, 214.
\textsuperscript{38} Schoenaers & Wijsman 2009.
\textsuperscript{39} Salverda de Grave 1918, 150-151.
\textsuperscript{40} Carasso-Kok 1981, 329-331; A work titled \textit{Oorspronck, voortganck en daeden der doorluchtiger heeren van Brederode} by Paulus Voet was printed in Utrecht by Joannes Janssonius of Waesberge in 1656. (\textit{Short Title Catalogue Netherlands})
\textsuperscript{41} Detmold, Nordrhein-Westfälisches Staatsarchiv, L 3 Holland n 429 & 430. Cf. \textit{Bibliotheca Neerlandica Manuscripta}; Inventaris 1909, 178-179; Alberts and Rutgers 1957, 119-120.
\textsuperscript{42} For this chronicle, also see: Porck 2009.
this same time, Gerard Potter – who was a mild supporter of the Hooks – fulfilled a number of offices at the Binnenhof at The Hague.\textsuperscript{44} Lalaing’s daughters Yolanda and Isabel were raised at the court of Isabella of Portugal.\textsuperscript{45} In the course of her upbringing in the highest Burgundian circles, the future wife of the lord of Brederode must have been thoroughly imbued with the court’s cultural trends. Besides the patronage of the Brederode chronicle, Yolanda’s name is attached to one additional manuscript. Between 1450 and 1460, a Book of Hours was commissioned for Yolanda, the illustration of which clearly displays interest in courtly recreation.\textsuperscript{46} It is quite possible that Froissart’s chronicle was known at the court of Isabella of Portugal, where Yolanda spent her childhood and youth.\textsuperscript{47} Additionally, manuscripts of the Chroniques might have circulated in the Lalaing family. John II of Croÿ who was married to Mary of Lalaing probably owned two manuscripts of the Chroniques.\textsuperscript{48}

It is remarkable that a decade after Reynald II had died, his wife, Yolanda of Lalaing, commissioned a chronicle that supported the Brederode’s claim of comital descent.\textsuperscript{49} Obviously, one of the chronicle’s purposes was to provide the Brederode lineage

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{44} Cf. Chapter One. AGH, 140, fol. 68v.; AGH. 143, fol. 80r-80v.
\item \textsuperscript{45} Damen 2000, 374.
\item \textsuperscript{46} Lulofs 1987, 85.
\item \textsuperscript{47} The opening miniatures of Book Three in the Arsenal and Antwerp manuscripts depict the coronation of Isabella’s father, John I of Portugal. The former manuscript once belonged to the Burgundian library and was copied from an earlier (possibly also Burgundian) model. As a similar frontispiece appears in the later Antwerp manuscript it seems probable that the frontispiece of the lost common ancestor also represented the coronation of John I of Portugal. It is quite possible that Philip the Good (or someone in his close surroundings) may have explicitly commissioned the frontispiece to honour the Burgundian in-laws.
\item \textsuperscript{48} Wijsman 2003, 221-222. The Amiens manuscript (Amiens, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 486; second half 15th century) and the Valenciennes manuscript (Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 638, undecorated). Kervyn de Lettenhove 1873, 436-437 refers to a Froissart manuscript that was described by Dacier comprising Books One and Two. ‘Il m’a été impossible de reconnaître à quel manuscrit du British Museum s’applique la description d’un codex de Froissart adressée à Dacier par M. Dutems en 1784. Une grande miniature représentait un personnage portant les armes de la maison de Bourgogne assis devant un pupitre. Au fond de la salle sur les vitraux d’une fenêtre on remarquait deux écussons, l’un aux armes de Lalaing, l’autre aux armes de Croÿ écartelées de Melun et de Sarrebruck’. Kervyn suggests that these coats of arms might point toward John II of Croÿ and Mary of Lalaing. Mary was a cousin of Yolanda’s father William of Lalaing. The frontispiece described by Dacier is very similar to the opening miniature of the Livre des faits de Jacques de Lalaing (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS fr. 16830, ca. 1475-1480). The coats of arms depicted in the miniature are those of Croÿ (according to H. Wijsman not John II of Croÿ, possibly his brother, Anthony of Croÿ?) and Lalaing. The manuscript’s first owner appears to have been William Lord Hastings (Cf. Wijsman 2002). Possibly, MS fr. 16830 and the manuscript described by M. Dutens are one and the same manuscript, although in this event the connection to the London Museum is rather puzzling. The manuscript was probably bequeathed to the abbey of Saint-Germain by Henri Charles du Cambout de Coislin in 1732. As from 1793 it was the property of the National library at Paris. Alternatively, the manuscript at the London Museum may have been a twin manuscript. As it appears, however, it is probable that the manuscript referred to by Kervyn de Lettenhove was not a manuscript of the Chroniques but rather a manuscript of the Livre des faits de Jacques de Lalaing.
\item \textsuperscript{49} The chronicle claims that the Brederodes descended from Syphridus, the legendary first lord of Brederode and son of count Arnulf I of Holland (951-993). Reynald II of Brederode bore the coat of arms of Holland (On a field of or a lion rampant of gules langued and clawed of azure). In the Brederode-chronicle these arms
with an elevated descent. However, in spite of her husband’s refutation of all accusations of insubordination, it is quite clear that the Brederodes were perceived as the leaders of the Hooks, thus opposing the Cod-faction.\textsuperscript{50} Compared to the Latin text, the presentation of events in the Dutch text is even more biased. The author of the text clearly favours the Hooks at the expense of the pro-Burgundian Cods.\textsuperscript{51} Notwithstanding the above, it has to be noted that the chronicles’ anti-Cod tendencies did not necessarily entail an encouragement to subversion.\textsuperscript{52}

Conceivably, the chronicle’s principal object was apologetic. Quite possibly, Johannes a Leydis or Yolanda of Lalaing wanted to acquit the Brederodes of the accusations they had endured in the course of the third quarter of the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{53} A series of events, starting with the choice of Ghijsbrecht of Brederode as elect of Utrecht over Philip the Good’s illegitimate son David – had burdened the family with a rather unfavourable reputation at the Burgundian court.\textsuperscript{54} Several times, Reynald II and his brother Ghijsbrecht had to be called to justice. In 1455, the former was summoned to the Chapter of the Golden Fleece at The Hague. Reynald II had been admitted to the Order on 12 December 1445, shortly after he and William of Lalaing had agreed to the conditions of the marriage contract between Reynald and the former stadtholder’s daughter. Along with Frank of Borssele, Brederode was among the first noblemen from Holland and Zeeland to be awarded the membership of the Golden Fleece.\textsuperscript{55} At the 1455 Chapter, Reynald was asked to account for his stance in the conflict between his brother Ghijsbrecht and the duke’s illegitimate son. Remarkably, he did not conduct his defence in French or Latin, but in Dutch.\textsuperscript{56} Interestingly, the prosecution’s charges had to be interpreted from the French by Peter Bladelin. C.A.J. Armstrong has put forward that ‘the employment by Reynald of Brederode of his native language was intended to emphasize that a feudal family of

---

\textsuperscript{50} Van Gent 1995, 13-14; Lulofs 1987, 97.

\textsuperscript{51} Bruch and Stuip 1984, 39; Lulofs 1987, 93.

\textsuperscript{52} Van Gent 1995, 38-39.

\textsuperscript{53} The purpose of the French translation of the chronicle as proposed by René Stuip may provide further grounds for this hypothesis (Stuip 1991, 37-38).

\textsuperscript{54} On 7 April 1455 Ghijsbrecht of Brederode had been elected bishop of Utrecht. However, Philip the Good disputed the outcome of the election. As a result, Pope Calixt III did not confirm Ghijsbrecht as bishop, but instead installed David of Burgundy. The Brederodes, however, stood by the original result. Although Ghijsbrecht and Reynald II eventually accepted the situation, David of Burgundy continued to perceive them as a threat. In 1470, the bishop captured Reynald, accused him of high treason and subjected him to torture. In the end, the lord of Brederode was acquitted by his fellow members of the Order of the Golden Fleece.

\textsuperscript{55} Damen 2006, 78.

Holland was challenging the Burgundian dynastic interest'. Indeed, from a linguistic point of view, the use of Dutch in the Chapter of the Golden Fleece, a situation in which the official languages were French and/or Latin, may have been regarded as a transgression of the regional language into the area of the language of power and as such an intentional violation of prevailing social norms. However, there is an alternative, more banal explanation for Brederode’s choice of his mother tongue. One should not dismiss the possibility that the lord of Brederode did not want to get caught in the legal subtleties of a language that was not his own. Although his wife’s native language was French, it still seems plausible that Reynald’s own command of the language was insufficient. Additionally, it is worthwhile asking the question to what degree Brederode’s request for a Dutch version of the statutes of the Golden Fleece, agrees with Armstrong’s conjecture of insubordination.

Apart from A Leydis’ Brederode chronicle, the Brederode family had a tradition of sponsoring and acquiring historiographical texts. In 1321-1322, William Procurator, author of a Chronicon that covers the period 1168-1332, was the chaplain of lord Henry of Brederode. As ‘relatively much attention is given to the Brederode family’, it seems likely that he wrote the first part of his chronicle (up to 1321) in the family castle at Santpoort. It was possibly also at the court of the Brederodes that Procurator encountered a manuscript of the Chronicon Egmondanum or a similar chronicle, along with a copy of the Middle Dutch Rijmkroniek van Holland. Wim van Anrooij suspects that this ‘secular environment’ could be the place where Procurator picked up the subject matter of the Nine Worthies. Apart from the Dutch Froissart volumes, the 1556 catalogue lists a considerable number of historiographical texts. Moreover, there seems to be evidence that the version of the Universal Chronicle of Bavaria Herald and a Dutch Chronicle of Holland copied in 1476 by the Haarlem municipal secretary Scheenwissenz. of Kercwerff should be located in the surroundings of the Brederodes or their supporters. Yolanda of Lalaing’s name has associated with the Dutch translation of the history of Jason. It has

---

58 Verhoog 1997, 446; I am grateful to M. van Gent for suggesting this explanation.
59 Janse 2009a, 21 explains Reynald of Brederode’s claim of linguistic incompetence as ‘an opportunist political argument to stress the unsuitability of the francophone David of Burgundy’ as a bishop of Utrecht.
62 Van Anrooij 1997, 41.
63 Cf. supra. See also: appendix B.
64 Verbij-Schillings 1995, 54, 284.
65 Nieuwstraten 1994b, 142-144.
even been suggested that the Brederodes’ or Yolanda de Lalaing’s fascination with the subject matter of Troy is reflected in the editorial choices of the fifteenth century Haarlem printer Jacob Bellaert and his clients.\textsuperscript{66} Considering the above, it seems safe to conclude that the Brederodes have shown a sound interest in historiography from the fourteenth century onwards and have continued to do so well into the sixteenth century.

The union between Reynald II of Brederode and Yolanda of Lalaing in 1445 coincides more or less with the dating that has been suggested for the The Hague manuscript (\textit{H21}) of the Dutch translation of Froissart’s \textit{Chroniques}. Nevertheless, it should be emphasized that this surviving codex probably did not belong to the set of manuscripts that was described in the 1556 and 1567 Brederode inventories. In 1564, the The Hague codex was owned by the Voorne canon Nicolas of Bronchorst. Moreover, the manuscript consists of paper and not of vellum.\textsuperscript{67} Given the relatively limited dissemination of the translation, it is possible that the Brederode manuscript was closely related to the The Hague manuscript. In any event the Brederode-Lalaing connection seems to provide a plausible framework for the production of the Froissart translation or at least the acquisition of a copy.

As has been argued above, it is probable that the francophone Lalaings from Hainault were familiar with Froissart’s chronicle. Additionally, evidence exists that in the first decades of the fifteenth century supporters of the dukes of Burgundy commissioned manuscripts of the text in Paris.\textsuperscript{68} Thus, William of Lalaing as well as his daughter Yolanda may have come across the \textit{Chroniques} in Burgundian courtly circles. Given the Brederode’s concerns with historiography and Reynald of Brederode’s own involvement in regional government and supra-regional politics, it is not inconceivable that Yolanda’s husband has taken an interest in the text’s subject matter. Indeed, Froissart examined the subtleties of international politics, the Hundred Years’ war and urban conflict. Additionally, the Burgundian dukes, the new sovereigns of Holland, as well as their dynastic relations played an important role in Froissart’s narrative. Furthermore, it has become clear that Reynald II of Brederode’s command of French may not have been sufficient to appreciate the \textit{Chroniques} in their original language, which makes it fair to assume that he preferred a translation of the text over the French original. As has been

\textsuperscript{66} Keesman 1993, 45–46.
\textsuperscript{67} The possibility exists that the Brederode set was incomplete (‘in drie stucken’, ‘in three parts’, not four as suggested by the colophons). Possibly, the characterization ‘in franchin’ was erroneous.
\textsuperscript{68} See Chapter Three.
demonstrated in § 1.3.2.1., this also applies to at least a few of his colleagues in the Council of Holland.

At the centre of this hypothesis is the translator, Gerard Potter van der Loo. At the time, when William of Lalaing and Reynald II of Brederode maintained close relations (1440-1445), Potter was an unsalaried member of the Council of Holland, which was presided by Brederode’s father-in-law. In his capacity of councillor, Reynald II – although rarely present – was the translator’s colleague. Gerard Potter, for his part, comes forward as a mild supporter of the cause of the Hooks, the faction of which Brederode was the perceived captain. It is tempting to assume that William of Lalaing or another Burgundian official introduced Gerard Potter to the Chroniques, who consequently translated them for Lalaing’s protégé the lord of Brederode.

Notwithstanding the above, this hypothesis presents some difficulties related to the interpretation of the pictorial programme as formulated in § 4.4.4. and § 4.5. The imagery associated with failed rebellion does not seem to agree with the Hook interests of Reynald II of Brederode. Brederode’s participation in the campaign against Ghent in 1453 would, however, explain the increased pictorial attention devoted to the First Ghent War. Alternatively, the illustration was not inspired by the dedicatee, but by the dedicator, William of Lalaing; who wanted to present his (future) son-in-law with examples of what could happen if the vassal rebelled against the legitimate sovereign. But again, this explanation is not entirely unproblematic. The question as to the extent at which this explanation squares with Lalaing’s pro-Hook politics is certainly valid. After all, the stadtholder’s bias had been one of the primary reasons for the uprisings in the cities in 1445.

By way of conclusion, it may be wise not to look towards the lord of Brederode as a specific dedicatee. In any event, the presence of the set of manuscripts in the collection of Reynald of Brederode does not contradict the hypothesis that was formulated at the end of the previous chapter. If indeed Gerard Potter’s translation had a public function in the Council, it is not at all surprising that copies were also acquired by its most affluent and influential members. Quite possibly, the Middle Dutch Froissart in the Brederode library was Reynald of Brederode’s own private copy of a text that could also be consulted at the Ridderhuis in The Hague.
5.2.3. **Secondary audiences: the 1666 Petrus Leffen sales-catalogue**

On 23 January 1666 the *Oprechte Haerlemse Courant* advertised the auction of the library of the late doctor Johannes Wourdanus at the house of Peter Leffen in Leyden. The *Courant* of 26 January refers to ‘a large number of special books’, silver and brass medaillons and other rarities. Interested buyers could page through the sales catalogues in several bookstores in Amsterdam and at Straffinvelt’s, notary at Gouda. The auction seems to have been a success. However, not all of the books on offer were also sold. On 30 November 1666 the ‘librorum qui supersunt ex auctione D. Johannis Wourdani’ were auctioned together with a large anonymous collection.\(^{69}\)

The latter collection comprised circa 950 items. Among the *libri in folio* we find under lot 9 ‘De Wercken van Frossart overgeset in ‘t Hollandts, door Gerrit Potter vander Loo, over 250 jaren, met geillumineerde figuren, M.S.’ (‘The works of Froissart, translated in Dutch by Gerard Potter van der Loo, more than 250 years old, with illuminated figures, manuscript’).\(^{70}\) Based on the presence of ‘a number of editions of classical authors annotated by him’ in the catalogue, F.L. Hoffmann surmised that Claude Saumaise had been the owner of this collection.\(^{71}\) Indeed the text of the *Caesaris Commentarii* had been ‘corrected with his [= Salmasius’] own hand on a large number of occasions’ (p.13), and a *Tertulianus* (p.36) had been annotated by him. The *Plutarchi Opera Graece* in octavo had been ‘emendated in an infinite number of instances in his own [=Saumaise’s] hand’ (p.37) Moreover, the collection included a number of Salmasius’ writings.\(^{72}\) In this respect, Hoffmann’s suggestion was not at all far-fetched.

However, the Paris copy of the sales catalogue points towards an alternative interpretation. On the title page the name ‘Is(aaci) Vossii’ has been added in black ink.

---

\(^{69}\) The Hague, Royal Library, microfiche 3129; original: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Q 2221; The Hague, Royal Library, microfiche 3125; original: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Q 2220.

\(^{70}\) The dating ‘over 250 years old’ should probably be regarded as a rough estimation by the person who has drawn up the catalogue and as such does not mean that the manuscript in question was manufactured before 1416.

\(^{71}\) Hoffmann 1848.

\(^{72}\) *Contra Miltonum, De Re Militari Romanorum* (p.18), *Duorum inscriptionum Herodis Attici (…) explicatio* (p. 20), *Censura in Herodem Infantidum Heinsii* (34), *De Manna et Sacchari Commentarius* (p. 38), *Contra Petavium* (p. 39), *De Annis Climactericis* (p. 43), *De Foenore Trapez. Itico* (p. 44), *De Modo Usarum* (p.46), *De Usuris Liber* (p.46), *De Lingua Hellenistica* (two copies) (p.46) *De Calculo* (two copies) (p. 47, p. 49)
This annotation can be interpreted in a number of ways. One possible interpretation suggests that this particular copy of the Leffen sales catalogue belonged to Isaac Vossius. Another, more plausible explanation is that on 30 November 1666 Vossius auctioned off a substantial part of his own library. A first indication that corroborates this hypothesis is the position of the added text: *Catalogus librorum illustrium <+Is. Vossii> quorum Auctio habebitur Lugduni in Batavis in aedibus Petri Leffen* which should be understood as ‘a Catalogue of illustrious books <+belonging to Isaac Vossius> that will be auctioned at Leyden at Peter Leffen’s’. If the annotation meant to indicate that this was Vossius’ private copy of the catalogue, the note would probably have been made at a different place in the title (e.g. after ‘Catalogus’).  

The presence of volumes annotated by Salmasius does not contradict this interpretation. On the contrary, it may provide further evidence for Vossius’ ownership. Saumaise had been Vossius’ tutor and in 1650-1651 Vossius and he were colleagues at the court of Queen Christine of Sweden, where the former had been offered the function of librarian. The friendship between Salmasius and Vossius ended in a quarrel over an unpaid debt. Vossius may have received the books as a gift from Saumaise himself or he may have taken them from the Royal Library after Christine of Sweden had abdicated. Indeed, after the queen had left Stockholm, Vossius had appropriated a number of precious volumes, such as the *codices chymici* that had once belonged to Rudolph II of Habsburg.

---

73 Additionally, in view of the way in which the Leffen auctions were advertised (catalogues in bookstores) it would have been strange for Vossius to have owned a private copy of the sales catalogue.
75 Blok 1974, 10-11.
If the books auctioned in 1666 were indeed Vossius’, it is highly likely that the last item in the catalogue originated from the library of Christine of Sweden as well.

Hier nevens sal verkocht werden een Geometrisch en Astronomisch Quadrant seer konstich gemaect en ghesneden op kostelijck vergult metael, eertijds door Tycko Brahe vereert aen de keyser Rodolphus.\textsuperscript{76}

(Leffen 1666, 50)

The fact that the collection was auctioned anonymously also adds weight to the hypothesis that the collection once belonged to Isaac Vossius.\textsuperscript{77} Protectionist measures to guard the book trade prohibited the auctions of collections of books belonging to living persons.\textsuperscript{78} In 1656, Vossius had already circumvented this measure by putting up for auction a portion of his own book collection by attributing the books to the library of his deceased father. Interestingly, in this case also, Peter Leffen had aided him in his deceit.\textsuperscript{79}

The 1666 catalogue refers to the Froissart-manuscript as over two hundred and fifty years old (cf. note 67), handwritten and with ‘illuminated drawings’. Only one of the extant manuscripts fits the description. Indeed, the miniatures of the Leyden manuscripts (\textit{Le3-I&2}) have been left unfinished. Moreover, Leyden University Library probably acquired the codices between 1623 and 1640, some decades before the Vossius manuscripts were auctioned.\textsuperscript{80} The manuscript currently kept at the Royal Library at The Hague is illustrated, but whether it should be identified with the volume in the Leffen catalogue is uncertain. As appears from the spaces that have been left open in the Leyden codices and the similarities between the illustration of \textit{H21} and the French \textit{Bes} copy, illustration was a common feature of the manuscripts of the Dutch Froissart translation. Therefore, it is plausible that lost manuscripts (such as the Brederode set) and most certainly the missing \textit{H21} volumes that contained Books One and Two were also illustrated.

\textsuperscript{76} Additionally a geometrical and astronomical quadrant was offered for sale, which had been artfully crafted and cut on precious gilded metal, and had been offered to emperor Rudolph by Tycko Brahe.

\textsuperscript{77} This has been confirmed by A.C. Balsem who at my request was kind enough to examine the catalogue’s contents. (e-mail 10 October 2007).


\textsuperscript{79} Blok 1974, 16-33. Note the position of Gerard’s name in the phrasing of the catalogue’s heading. \textit{Catalogus variorum et exquisitissimorum librorum Gerardi Ioannis Vossii quorum auction habeitur in aedibus Petri Leffen}.

\textsuperscript{80} I am grateful to M.F.J. Compaan-Vermetten who very kindly searched for the Froissart manuscripts in the seventeenth-century University Library catalogues.
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H21 has some post-medieval annotation, which could confirm that the 1666 volume and the The Hague copy are one and the same volume. After the colophon mentioning the translator’s name, a modern hand has added the following reference to the Potter family.

Dese Potters vander Loo sijn voortijts besitters geweest van de hofstede de Loo eeven buyten Voorburgh. Siet Sim. van Leeuwen in sijn boek genaamt Costumen etc. van het Baljuws. der lande van Rijnland. p. 27.

(H21, fol. 376 v.)

This hand does not appear to be Vossius’s. Indeed, the work by Simon of Leeuwen referred to in the annotation at the end of the text was first published in 1667.\textsuperscript{79} By then, the Froissart volume listed in the Leffen catalogue would have presumably already changed hands. The same hand has noted on the spine of the binding ‘Froissaarts Cronijke van G Potter van der Loo vertaalt’.

\[\text{fig. 5.7.: passage from Van Leeuwen’s } \textit{Costumen} \text{ referred to by the annotation on } H21, \text{ fol. 376 v.}^{81}\]

On the verso side of the fifth flyleaf, in the top lefthand corner, possibly the same hand has added: ‘Froissard is gheboren te Valenchien. p.28 infra’. This note refers to the well-known passage in which Froissart assures Espan de Lion of the fact that he will conscientiously record the knight’s communications when he returns to his homeland of Hainault.

\textsuperscript{81} Van Leeuwen 1667, 27: ‘Het huys ende Hofstede van DE LOO, mede op den selven hoogen streek gelegen, van het welk een Edel geslagt in Holland sijnen naam plagt te hebben, is naarmaals beseten by den geslagte Potters, toegenaamt van Loo, ende daarna gecomen aan de Brassers […]’. ‘The house and manor DE LOO, which also is situated in the same elevated area, which lent its name to the noble lineage in Holland, afterwards belonged to the Potters, surnamed \textit{van Loo} and afterwards fell to the \textit{Brassers […]’}. 
[...] indien God gonnet met lieve ende gesondichede weder omme thuys te mogen comen int graefscape van Henegouwen inder stede van Valenchienes daer ic geboren bin

(‘If God grants me to return home alive and healthily in the county of Hainault in the city of Valenciennes where I was born’)  

(H21, fol. 28 v.)

On the first page of the table of rubrics, in smaller, less careful handwriting, a note provides further information on the date of the battle of Aljubarrotta. By means of a portion of text, taken from fol. 67 v., the paragraph title referring to the battle has been completed ‘MCCCCLXXXV up eenen zaterdags doe wesende Ons Liefs Vrouwedach te halfooste’.

Unfortunately, as I have not been able to identify either of the annotators as Isaac Vossius, the question of the 1666 volume remains unresolved. It is not clear whether or not the The Hague manuscript is the same copy as the one advertised in the 1666 Peter Leffen catalogue. Hence, as for now, the somewhat meagre conclusion must be that (early modern / 17th century) readers have taken an interest in the biographical details of the author, Jean Froissart, and the translator, Gerard Potter van der Loo. One of them shows to have had a particular interest in local government, jurisprudence and history. Moreover, the reference to the work of Simon of Leeuwen might locate this former owner in the circles of Johannes Wourdanus, the late owner of the small remainder of books that were sold together with Vossius’ collection. Indeed, Simon of Leeuwen had been Wourdanus’ pupil at the Latin school of Gouda. Although the Peter Leffen catalogue shows that in the seventeenth century a copy of Gerard Potter’s translation was found in the circles of prominent scholars, the contemporary annotations in the The Hague manuscript provide no evidence of a profound interest in the manuscript’s contents.

82 A 17th century note on the pastedown at the back of the manuscript ‘129 Bl Lett’ (129 blue letters) may indicate that the manuscript was put up for auction. Indeed, the blue initials may have increased the manuscript’s value. I thank J. Biemans for suggesting this interpretation. (J. Biemans, e-mail 10 May 2006).

83 Simon of Leeuwen offered his master Wourdanus a manuscript of Maerlant’s Rijmbijbel (currently Groningen, University Library, MS 405). This manuscript was sold in the February 1666 sale of Peter Leffen and was added to the library of A. Bentes, alderman of Amsterdam. (Deschamps 1972, 91). It may be significant that the The Hague copy of the translation would eventually turn up in the same circles and more specifically in the collection of the mayor of Amsterdam, John Rendorp (Sotheby 1825, 66).
5.2.4. Conclusion

It has become apparent that the extant manuscripts give an incomplete image of the textual transmission of Gerard Potter’s translation. It seems that \( H21 \) and \( Le3 \) were derived from a common, illustrated ancestor, which is unlikely to have been the translator’s autograph. Further evidence for ‘lost’ sets of the translation comes from different types of listings: inventories and auction catalogues. These sources also shed light on possible primary and secondary audiences for the translation. Two sixteenth-century inventories of the castle of Batestein reveal that a set of three codices with the Froissart translation once belonged to the book collection of the lords of Brederode. For a number of reasons, it is plausible that these manuscripts were manufactured for the important Dutch nobleman Reynald II of Brederode, a contemporary and colleague of the translator. Although Brederode’s marriage with Yolanda of Lalaing provides a plausible context for the production of the translation, it is probably rash to conclude that Gerard Potter translated the *Chroniques* for the benefit of Reynald II. Brederode may have commissioned the set of manuscripts as his own private copy of a text that was present in the Council. In the seventeenth century, a manuscript of the translation was auctioned as part of the library of the important philologist and bibliophile Isaac Vossius. The fact that Vossius prematurely parted with his copy may be telling of the scholar’s appreciation of Gerard Potter’s text. In any event, the seventeenth-century annotations in the The Hague manuscript reveal very little about the fields of interest of its contemporary readership.

5.3. The extant manuscripts: illustration, ownership and production

In an article discussing a collection of books belonging to Godfrey of Naste, C. van Coolput-Storms notes that the study of medieval libraries ‘s’appuie essentiellement sur deux sortes de documents: les manuscrits médiévaux qui sont parvenus jusqu’à nous et les catalogues, inventaires ou autres témoignages mentionnant les livres’.\(^84\) In the foregoing, I have primarily concentrated on the second type of source. In the following, I will examine the extant manuscripts of the translation for clues that may point towards the environment for which they were intended and the circles in which they were eventually used. Indeed, the illustration of \( H21 \) reveals something about the manuscript’s intended readership (see also:

\(^84\) Van Coolput-Storms 2007, 529.
§ 4.4.). In the remaining sections of this chapter, I will turn my attention to one of the owner’s marks in this manuscript and the scribal colophon of Le3.

5.3.1. H21 and the Order of Saint Anthony

As has been argued in Chapter Three, the imagery of the frontispiece in H21 has probably been specifically designed for this manuscript or rather for the illustration cycle of the translation. The four timeframes of the opening miniature show a particular interest in the voyage à Béarn during which Froissart’s travelling companion Espan de Lion informed the chronicler of the martial exploits in the region. The miniature thus provides a metafictional comment on the genesis and nature of Froissart’s Chroniques. Quite interestingly, precisely at this point in the narrative, when Froissart’s writing irreversibly crosses the borderline between chronicle and memoir, the initial miniatures of both the Dutch and French codices award considerable attention to the role of the author. The writer explicitly steps forward, not in the humble, topical fashion of presentation imagery, but confidently researching his subject matter.

The frontispiece’s interest does not only lie in the pictorial emphasis of the text referring to its own development, but also in its detail. Froissart and Espan de Lion are both presented as noblemen, wearing the contemporary, mid-fifteenth century fashion of houppelande and chaperon (Espan) or a hat made of rush (Froissart). Both figures wear a chain, seemingly gold or gilded, with a small but clearly distinguishable pendant. As Froissart clearly presents himself as belonging to the secular clergy, one might expect a religious symbol such as the cross. However, this is not the case. The pendant is shaped as a capital letter T with a remarkable ‘bulge’ at the base. The same collar is found in the miniature on fol. 315 v. depicting John of Montfort, duke of Brittany, who welcomes Enguerrand VII, lord of Coucy.

85 It could be argued however that the imagery is related to the opening miniature of Bes, which also presents Froissart in the process of acquiring information from his interlocutors. The four time frames have been probably fashioned after the quadripartite images that introduced Books One and Two in the manuscripts originating from the Liffol collaborative.

86 For the autobiographical and metafictional turn in Froissart’s historiographical writing, see Zink 1998, 17. This is especially the case in the lavishly illustrated Bre manuscript. In this manuscript other paratextual elements such as rubrication assist in stressing the text’s metafictional dimensions. I will return to the imagery of the opening miniatures in the extant codices of Book Three elsewhere.

87 SHF III, § 266.
It is striking that the lord of Coucy and another member of his entourage both wear the same type of collar with a tau-shaped pendant. It has to be noted, however, that the men in this miniature bear a striking resemblance to the depiction of Froissart and Espan de Lion in the lower left-hand corner of the opening-miniature, as well as in posture, as in clothing and headwear. Quite possibly, the painter of this miniature – according to Korteweg and Chavannes-Mazel a ‘lesser artist’ – has imitated the example of his more accomplished colleague or master, who was responsible for the frontispiece.  

Since the tau cross was used as an identifying mark by a number of medieval confraternalities dedicated to Saint Anthony of Egypt, this detail of the manuscript’s imagery may add to our understanding of the context in which it was produced. In the Low Countries, brotherhoods of Saint-Antony were founded at Bailleul, Maastricht, Cleves and Havré. The collar in the miniatures of the The Hague manuscript resembles most that of the Confraternity of Havré ‘de l’ordene Dieu Nostre Damme et monsieur saint Anthonne de Barbefosse’. In its statutes the insignia are described as ‘ung coller tel que devise est en icelle, pendant a icelly coller une pottente et au debout d’icelle une cloquette sonnanz’. The collar has been depicted in two sixteenth-century copies of the Order’s

---

89 An extensive discussion of confraternalities dedicated to Saint Anthony can be found in Noordeloos 1949.
90 Noordeloos 1949, 494; Brussels, Royal Library, Goethals 707, fol. 34.
91 Noordeloos 1949, 494.
The chain is plaited with a tau-shaped pendant to which a small bell has been attached.

The origin of the chivalric order is shrouded in mystery and several hypotheses about its foundation have been advanced. Although the specific circumstances remain unclear, it seems safe to assume that the Order of Saint Anthony was founded at the end of the fourteenth or the beginning of the fifteenth century, probably by Gerard II of Enghien and his son Gerard III with the approval of the Wittelsbach counts of Holland, Zeeland and Hainault. The confraternity’s members should be ‘de nobile genere procreatus vel doctores in sancto jure a universitate factus’. In general, membership included ‘dominos, duces, comites et marchiones, milites, scutiferos, domicellos, nobiles ac alias graves et notabiles

---

92 Brussels, Royal Library, Goethals 707 Mons, University Library, Puissant 11/132 transcription in Chaussier and Van Innis 1994. The MS Goethals comprises a ‘Traité de Blason’ a set of armorys (Cour Amoureuse, Saint Antoine, preceded by the revised statutes of the Order), a genealogy of the dukes of Burgundy (up to Philip the Fair), a chronicle from creation to 1444, letters of Philip the Good and Charles the Bold and a description of the cities of Hainault. Generally, the collection has a distinct Hainault-Burgundian tinge. (cf. Van den Bergen-Pantens 1985, 55-56.) The collection of the MS Puissant is more closely linked to the Order of Saint Anthony. It contains the 1402 statutes of the Order, texts related to the foundation of the confraternity and the admission of its members and the armorial of the Order. (See: CICweb.be.) Apparently, the first part of the collection corresponds closely to the texts in the MS Chifflet (Besançon, Municipal Library, MS Chifflet 84), which also contains information on the foundation of the order, the (original) statutes and the ceremonial for admission of new members.

93 Hülsmann 2009 situates the type of penwork decoration that is found in H21 at Haarlem and more specifically at the Convent of Saint Anthony Orchard. This new information invites another explanation for the presence of the tau cross. However, to this date, there is little proof that manuscripts were also illustrated at the convent (possibly, the Master of the Haarlem Bible was active there, Hülsmann 2003, 130), the artist may have added the tau as a symbol of the monastery. However, in religious orders as well as secular confraternities, the emblem was rather used in the form of a patch and not of a pendant. Additionally, the plaited collar specifically refers to the Order of Saint Anthony at Barbefosse.

94 A survey can be found in Noordeloos 1949,486-487; Chaussier & Van Innis 1994, 19; Marchandisse 1998, 121-123. A number of dates and individuals have been put forward for the foundation of the Order: 1352-1382: a group of anonymous knights (Rhodos); 1382: Albert of Bavaria; 1389: William of Ostrevant (the future William VI of Holland); 1389/1402: Gerard of Enghien; 1390-1395: John of Bavaria.

95 Besançon, Municipal Library, MS Chifflet 84, fol. 14 v.
personas quas virtutes nobilitate illustrarent’. It has been generally assumed that the incorporation of Hainault and Holland in the Burgundian personal union and the installation of the ducal Order of the Golden Fleece have accelerated the confraternity’s demise.

The presence of the confraternity’s symbol in H21 can be explained in a number of ways. Firstly, the confraternity’s members were often portrayed wearing the Order’s collar. However, the miniatures in the Froissart translation obviously do not depict members of the Order. Indeed, some of the figures represent individuals who may have been familiar with the Hainault confraternity (Froissart, Enguerrand de Coucy?), but most certainly did not belong to it. A possible explanation is that both images were derived from a generic stock-figure representing a fifteenth-century nobleman from Holland whose social status was made explicit by his collar. However, there is also a more tempting explanation for the presence of the insignia. Possibly, one of the confraternity’s members commissioned the The Hague manuscript (or one of its direct predecessors) and that the illustrator received explicit directions to include the Order’s symbol in the manuscript’s imagery. Since Gerard Potter demonstrably was acquainted with a number of the Order’s members on a professional basis, it seems justified to further explore this hypothesis through the analysis of the intersection of the translator’s professional networks and the names listed in the armorials of the Orders.

96 Besançon, Municipal Library, MS Chifflet 84, fol. 13 r.-v.
97 Nevertheless, depictions of its symbols are not limited to the fifteenth century. Even in 1528, when John of Scorel portrayed the members of the Order of Jerusalem, Francis Hoostraat (in Jerusalem in 1515) was depicted wearing the tau-with-bell. Köhler 2006. Contrary to the information in the catalogue, Hoostraat does not wear a Jerusalem Cross, but the symbol of the Order of Saint Anthony.
98 Some of these depictions (e.g. the portraits of Jacqueline of Bavaria and Frank of Borssele which are now kept at the National Museum in Amsterdam) belonged to a tradition that was started by the Order’s most prominent members. In 1418, a picture of Jacqueline’s mother, Margaret of Burgundy had been commissioned by the lord of Havré, one of the founders of the Order, to be placed in the chapel at Barbefosse. In 1423, John IV of Brabant turned to Pierre Henne, the artist who had portrayed his mother-in-law, for a similar portrait. (Marchandisse 1998, 33.) The picture of a man with a carnation, which often is described as a copy of a Van Eyck original, could belong to the same tradition. (Gemäldegalerie Berlin. For an extensive discussion: Marchandisse 1998). The picture has alternatively been identified with William VI of Holland and his brother John the Pitiless. Lemaire 2002, 57-58, has advanced the hypothesis that the man depicted might be John of Heinsberg. On a commemorative painting, commissioned by Joan of Zwieten, several fifteenth-century members of the aristocratic Zwieten family have been depicted wearing the tau-cross (See: Memoria in Beeld, Van Kan 1983, 50-51). Both a drawing of a fishing party at the court of William VI and the miniature ‘Prayer on the Shore’ in the Turin Book of Hours, show members of the Bavarian comital family with the symbol the Order of Saint Anthony (Brauer 1980). In a miniature in the Remissorium Philippi (ca. 1450) dedicated to Philip the Good by the former clerk to the registry Peter of Beoostenzwene, stadtholder John of Lannoy (†1493) is depicted with the collar of the Order of Saint Anthony (Damen 2000, 11-12). At approximately the same time, William of Montfoort, viscount of Utrecht (†1468), commissioned a Book of Hours in which painter Willem Vrelant depicted the Montfoort coat of arms with the confraternity’s insignia (Hachez 1903, 105-106, Wüstefeld 1989, 161-162.). Finally, The Tau-cross appears – in sculpture – on the tomb of Isabella of Bourbon, the wife of Charles the Bold, as a pleurant that is believed to represent Albert or William VI of Bavaria (National Museum, Amsterdam).
Since Potter was raised in the near vicinity of the Binnenhof at The Hague in a family of courtly administrators, Gerard Potter came into contact with the comital family at a relatively young age. At a later stage in his professional career, he served Margaret of Burgundy, Jacqueline of Bavaria and Frank of Borssele, all of the aforementioned being illustrious members of the Order. Some of Jacqueline’s fiercest supporters, such as the Montfoorts and William of Brederode, were also members of the chivalric confraternity. Potter may have encountered these men in Jacqueline’s Council. John of Wassenaar, Gerard of Poelgeest and Jacob Kats, all members of the Order, were Potter’s colleagues in the Council of Holland, as was Louis of Blois. The latter was the son of John, bastard of Blois and grandson of John of Blois, brother of Froissart’s patron Guy. Another influential member of the confraternity, also occurring in Gerard Potter’s professional network, was William of Lalaing, stadtholder and chairman of the Council between 1440 and 1445 and father-in-law of Reynald II of Brederode. However, membership did not only include traditional nobility. Like Gerard Potter and his relatives, the Zwieten family – although more affluent – were representatives of the fairly recent noblesse de robe.

Some of Gerard Potter’s acquaintances, who were also members of the Order of Saint Anthony, may have been interested in a copy of his translation. This seems to be particularly the case for the Brederode, Blois and Borssele families. The Brederode-connection has been discussed in the previous paragraph (cf. § 5.2.). Because of the association with the Blois lineage, the translation might have appealed to Louis of Blois of Treslong, Gerard’s colleague in the Council of Holland – or for that matter one of his family members e.g. Louis’s father, John the Bastard of Blois, who was a councillor of Jacqueline of Bavaria. However, as far as the Blois are concerned, it comes as a surprise that Potter did not have access to an early copy of the Chroniques, such as the dedication copy of Guy of Blois, but instead had to turn to a manuscript that was produced in Paris in the first decades of the fifteenth century. Apart from the evidence discussed in Chapter

101 This has been suggested by Muller 1888, 271 and Damen 2000, 182. To corroborate his hypothesis, Muller points towards John of Blois’ functions as chatelain of Gouda (1419,1425) and his role in the Council of Holland during the reigns of William VI and Jacqueline of Bavaria. Gerard Potter’s fiefs of Waddinxveen and Snedelwijk were situated in the vicinity of Gouda and both Dirck Potter, the translator’s father, and John, bastard of Blois, had played a prominent role at the Court of Holland in the first quarter of the fifteenth century. Thus Muller assumed that it is plausible that Gerard Potter translated the Chroniques at the request of one of the relatives (probably one of the illegitimate sons) of John or Guy of Blois. Even if John the bastard of Blois († ca.1435) could be identified as the patron for the translation, Muller’s hypothesis that the The Hague manuscript (ca. 1450) was part of the dedication copy has proven to be incorrect.
One that relates the production of several Dutch manuscripts, one of which a chronicle in Middle Dutch, to Frank of Borssele, *H21* may have been connected to the latter’s castle at Oostvoorne.

5.3.2. *H21* and Voorne

On the recto-side of the third flyleaf in *H21*, a rough and starchy piece of parchment has been pasted in. This piece of vellum may have served originally as a flyleaf or even as a temporary, rudimentary protective binding.

Indeed, a low-quality binding of this kind may offer a plausible explanation for the damage to the paper of the first and last quires of the manuscript. In large, clear, decorated letters, a previous owner has noted:

102 The marks at the left-hand side of the fragment possibly indicate the presence of strips connecting the front and backsides of a rudimentary parchment cover. Also: Muller 1888, 265.
Claes van Bronchorst Canonick te Voirne anno XV vier ende zestich naert gemeen screyven
Amor vincit omnia\(^\text{103}\)

(‘Nicolas of Bronchorst, canon at Voorne, in the year 1564. Love conquers all.’)

\((H21, \text{flyleaf})\)

This annotation led J.W. Muller to believe that the canon acquired the manuscript from Jasper of Blois of Treslong, grandson of Louis of Blois and at the time sheriff of Brielle.\(^\text{104}\) However, alternative explanations are possible.

The date on the parchment may be significant as it coincides with the year in which Nicolas of Bronchorst’s father passed away. Joost of Bronchorst, knight and lord of Bleiswijk in South-Holland, died on 15 April 1564.\(^\text{105}\) He belonged to a noble lineage that first appeared in Holland in the first quarter of the fifteenth century when William of Bronchorst married Gillisken of Weena and became lord of Bleiswijk.\(^\text{106}\) In 1446, his grandson Jacob of Bronchorst and two of his relatives requested to be recognized as members of the aristocracy of Holland. Lord Otto of Bronchorst and Borculo – a nobleman from Guelders – attested that the three petitioners were members of his lineage. In spite of this ‘certificate of nobility’, the settlement of the case does not seem to have been unproblematic.\(^\text{107}\) A century later, Joost of Bronchorst and his close relatives had risen through the ranks as officers of local government in Holland as well as Zeeland. Joost had been bailiff in Haarlem and in Leyden in 1519.\(^\text{108}\) Between 1527 and 1535, he was castellan of the castle of Oostvoorne. He fulfilled the office together with his brother Andrew, who bought the castellany in 1536.\(^\text{109}\) In 1540, Andrew secured a seat in the Council of Holland.\(^\text{110}\) Between 1537 and 1549, Joost of Bronchorst held the office of sheriff of

\(^{103}\) Other notes on the piece of parchment are now illegible even under UV-light.
\(^{104}\) Muller 1888, 271.
\(^{105}\) Kort 1978, 411; Kort 1977, 213.
\(^{106}\) Bezember and Unger 1895.
\(^{107}\) Van den Arend 1993, 298-299.
\(^{108}\) Van Nierop 1993, 158.
\(^{109}\) Arkenbout and van der Graaf 1974, 68.
\(^{110}\) Hoek 1970, 122.
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Kennemerland. Additionally, he was rekenmeester – a senior member of the chambre des comptes – in the Auditor’s Office at The Hague.

Two of Joost of Bronchorst’s sons held prebends in the Chapter of Saint-Pancras, attached to the court chapel of Oostvoorne, where their father Joost and uncle Andrew had been castellans. William was dean of the Chapter between 1543 and 1551. Nicolas was canon of the Chapter and appears in the visitation report of 1571. In that year he was about 46 years old and had been a canon for about 25 years. He was accused of having a concubine and of having fathered two children. In the report, Bronchorst admits that he has had a concubinam for a long time now, but he promises to end the relationship within four days and to have no further contact with her. This piece of intimate information regarding the canon’s love life may explain the presence of the quote from Virgil on the piece of parchment in H21: ‘amor vincit omnia’ that in the Eclogues is continued ‘nos et cedamus amori’ (so why do we not give into it as well). Alternative explanations could be that there was a connection to the Christian concept of caritas (charity) or his father’s death in the same year that the annotation was made (love conquers all, [even death]).

Even though Nicolas of Bronchorst claims he does not have the key the presence of ‘archives’ in the court chapel is equally interesting. In these archives, the chapel’s precious objects were kept. Two inventories, one drawn up in 1511 and another dated 1569, give an overview of the splendour of the court chapel of Oostvoorne. The treasures include reliquaries, devotional images and religious robes, some of which date back to the time of Frank of Borssele and Jacqueline of Bavaria. Other items were probably donated by previous rulers of Voorne, such as Margaret of Burgundy. The 1569 inventory mentions a ‘little silver booklet, encrusted with diverse precious stones and decorated with the coat of arms of Voorne on both sides’. The 1511 list mentions the presence of additional manuscripts and old prints, all of a religious nature. The fact that none of the texts that have been listed in the inventories is of a secular nature makes it less probable that Nicolas

111 Van Santen 1652, 268.
113 F.A.L van Rappard and S. Muller 1911, 311-12.
114 F.A.L van Rappard and S. Muller 1911, 312.
115 These descriptions have been edited by A.M. van Lomme 1881, 257-260 (inventory of 1511) and 265-267 (inventory of 1569). Van Lomme 1881, 260, ‘Item een blau fluweel of carmefijn cassufel mit gulden blommen mit een alf, stoel ende manipel, ende heeft ghegeven die edele vrouwe Jacob vrouwe van Holland, Zeeland, etc. Item een roet cassufel gheheelt, van flueel of carmesijn mit gulden boerden ende twee tunicalen desgelijcx mit alven, stoelen ende manipulen, ende drie cappen van derselver materie tot een heel capelle toe. Ende heeft ghegeven die edele grave van Oestervant heer van Borselen etc’.
116 Van Lomme 1881, 266 ‘Eenen zilveren wieroeckvat m it eenen zilveren ketene ende dair up gesteken de wapen van Mevrouw de douagere van Bourgoingen’.
117 Van Lomme 1881, 260.
of Bronchorst encountered the Froissart manuscript among the Chapter’s possessions. The
discovery remained, however, that after the death of Frank of Borssele the last lord of
Voorne, some manuscripts were left behind at his castle. Nicolas’ father, Joost of
Bronchorst, may have chanced on the manuscript while he was castellan of Borssele’s
former residence and later bequeathed it to his son.

Besides *H21*, two other manuscripts can be connected to the Bronchorst family. Both are fifteenth-century Books of Hours that seemingly were part of the family’s legacy. The first manuscript was probably produced in Delft between 1440 and 1460 and was the property of the The Hague Bronchorsts.\(^{118}\) The history of the other manuscript shows how these devotional books were handed down the generations.\(^{119}\) The booklet had been given to
Anne of Woerden, Andrew of Bronchorst’s wife, by her aunt Soet of Schoten. The latter had
inherited it from Helen van de Werve, whose father Costijn was a cousin of Josina of
Kruiningen, Anne of Woerden’s grandmother.\(^{120}\) In addition to these Books of Hours, the
family had sufficient means to acquire other precious objects to underline their status. John
Mostaert, well known for his portraits of courtiers such as John of Wassenaar, also painted a
portrait of Joost of Bronchorst, Nicolas’ father.\(^{121}\) Mostaert and Bronchorst probably met
each other through Bronchorst’s professional network at the *chambre des comptes* at The
Hague.

By writing his name on a parchment cover or flyleaf, Nicolas of Bronchorst has left
us another cryptic indication as regards the environment in which the Middle Dutch
translation of the *Chroniques* was originally received. About a century after its production,
*H21* apparently still circulated in the same social context for which it was originally
produced. Like Gerard Potter and his peers, the Bronchorsts belonged to the indigenous
nobility that was also active in local and regional administration. Joost of Bronchorst, the
annotator’s father, was employed at the *Binnenhof*, where Froissart’s translator had
preceeded him. Moreover, like Gerard Potter he held several judicial offices. Joost’s brother
Andrew – like Potter – was a member of the Council of Holland. The brothers’ castellany at
Oostvoorne connected them to one of the translator’s wealthy and influential employers,
Frank of Borssele. It was probably in his capacity of castellan that Andrew of Bronchorst
could procure prebends at the castle’s court chapel for his nephews William and Nicolas.
Unfortunately, it is impossible to ascertain where and in which way Nicolas of Bronchorst

\(^{118}\) The Hague, Royal Library, 74 H 28.
\(^{119}\) London, British Library, MS Arundel 316.
\(^{120}\) *Bibliotheca Neerlandica Manuscripta.*
\(^{121}\) Van Nierop 1993, 151.
acquired the The Hague manuscript. Indeed, the canon may have acquired the codex second-hand from a bookseller or at an auction, the manuscript may have been a gift from a friend or a relative, or someone else may have bequeathed it to him.\(^{122}\) Although the hypotheses formulated above are certainly within the bounds of the possible, as yet none of them can be confirmed by concrete evidence.

5.3.3. The colophon of Le3-2

The most important information on the provenance of the Leyden manuscripts Le3-1&2 has been recorded in the scribal colophon:

Dit boecke is gescreven bij handen Jan Heynrick Paedsenz. ende is <-geeydet> geyndet
in jair ons heren X\(\text{III}\)\(\text{I}\) ende lxx upten XXVI\(\text{dach}\) in januario

(Le3-2, fol. 263r.)

John Hendriksz. Paeds was a member an influential family of Leyden drapers.\(^{123}\) His father, Henry Paeds, had had a succesful political career as alderman and one of the town’s mayors.\(^{124}\) John himself held the office of alderman in 1445, 1447 and 1450 and the office of mayor in 1464-1465 and 1472.\(^{125}\) The Paeds family had good connections with the Council at The Hague, as did other Leyden families (e.g. Naaldwijk, Poelgeest, Zijl, Zwieten). John’s uncle Floris, had risen from local office (alderman, mayor), to the hoogheemraadschap of Rhineland (1430) and the Council of Holland (1428-1442).\(^{126}\) John Hendriksz. Paeds’ wife, Gertrude, was probably related to John Ruychrock, who had been a colleague of Gerard Potter’s ever since they both were in the service of Jacqueline of Bavaria. Additionally, members of the Council of Holland frequently visited the city councils (cf. supra § 1.3.4.). It is tempting to believe that this was the channel through which one of the manuscripts of the translation reached the Leyden scribe. As has been noted by H. Brinkman, it is quite possible that John Hendriksz. Paeds and Gerard Potter knew each other.\(^{127}\) In 1445, when Paeds was alderman of Leyden, Potter was involved in

---

\(^{122}\) On the different ways in which manuscripts were acquired, see Colette van Coolput-Storms 2007, 541-545.

\(^{123}\) Brand 1996, 163, 174.

\(^{124}\) See: Over Macht en Overwicht; Brand 1996, 148.

\(^{125}\) See: Over Macht en Overwicht.

\(^{126}\) Brand 1996, 14, 48; Damen 2001, 175.

\(^{127}\) Brinkman 1997, 260.
calming down the urban uprisings in Leyden (cf. § 1.3.4.). In 1451, Gerard Potter and some of his fellow councillors had dinner with the city council.\footnote{See: Chapter One.} Although Potter and Paeds may have been acquainted, it seems quite unlikely that the scribe received his exemplar directly from the hands of the translator. Indeed, in such a scenario it would be difficult to account for the period of about two decades between the moment(s) when both men met and Paeds’ transcription. Additionally, we should not forget that the handwriting in the first part of Le3-I is different from the writing in the rest of the Leyden text. Possibly, one of Paeds’ colleagues in the city council or one of his family members started copying the text, but for some reason or another was unable to finish it (cf. infra).

Since not one, but two scribes were involved in the production of the Leyden codices, the connections between John Hendriksz. Paeds and the environment in which Gerard Potter’s translation was produced and received may be misleading. Paeds’ anonymous colleague was probably responsible for the transcription of the lost volumes with the text of Book One and for a portion of the extant copy of Book Two (Le3-I, fol. 1 r – 41 r). Additionally, as it seems, both scribes have collaborated rather closely as the paper of Le3-I, which was used by the anonymous scribe, is similar to the paper of Le3-2, which John Hendriksz. Paeds used for his partial transcription of the text.\footnote{See also Appendix C.} One particular kind of paper that appears in both codices bears a watermark that should be dated to ca.1472.\footnote{Briquet 1907, nr. 9183.} The change in hands happens at a rather puzzling place: in the middle of a column, in the middle of a quire, in the middle of a paragraph. It seems therefore unlikely that the two scribes have divided the workload equally. It is rather plausible that one person, who had the intention to make a full transcription of the translation, had to abandon his project prematurely for reasons that will probably remain undisclosed. However, as is shown by the watermarks in the paper, it probably did not take John Hendriksz. Paeds long to continue and eventually finish the copy.

Paeds’ careless, compressed handwriting makes it hard to believe that the Leyden codices were intended for the market. By the second half of the fifteenth century, it had become fairly common to make transcriptions of texts for one’s own use. In 1462, William Ruychrock produced his very own copy of the Dutch translation of Mandeville’s travels. Between 1473 and 1481, John Phillipsz., a municipal secretary of Leyden, brought together a collection of short texts as a personal compilation of religious and moral literature. The
primary impulse for the production of Le3 should probably be looked for in the surrounding of the Leyden city council. John Hendriksz. Given that the translation had been produced by a member of the regional Council and that manuscripts were probably owned by influential aristocrats, Paeds’ anonymous predecessor may have regarded his transcription as a prestige project. John Hendriksz. Paeds probably shared this sentiment and finished the transcription, possibly to be consulted in matters of local and regional politics. Even though the Leyden manuscripts but a shadow of the splendour of H21, Le3 may additionally have been intended as a status symbol, the finishing touches of which unfortunately remained unaccomplished. Indeed, the size of the codices alone is quite impressive and must also have appeared as such to a medieval urban audience.

As far as the further history of the Leyden copy is concerned, I will be brief. It has been suggested that at the end of the fifteenth or in the first half of the sixteenth century the Leyden codices have been prepared for print. Nevertheless, to this date no printed version of Gerard Potter’s translation has been identified. Indeed, the translation printed by John Hendriksz. Paeds’ distant relative, John Jacobsz. Paeds in 1587 is not Gerard Potter’s. It contains a Dutch translation of Sleidan’s Latin abridgement by Adolph de Jager (Adolphus Tectander Venator), a preacher from Alkmaar, playwright, author and translator of theological and historical treatises. Between 1623 and 1640, the manuscripts came into the possession of Leyden University Library.

5.3.4. Conclusion

As it appears, both H21 and Le3 have functioned in circles connected to regional and local government and its administration. Quite possibly, a detail in the former manuscript’s frontispiece points towards a member of the chivalric Order of Saint Anthony as its commissioner. A number of noblemen from Holland who were members of the confraternity also belonged to Gerard Potter’s professional network: the entourage of Jacqueline of Bavaria and the Council of Holland. About a century after it had been manufactured, H21 still circulated in similar circles. Members of the Bronchorst family held
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131 Van den Berg 1988, 1-2. She notes that marks in the margin indicate which portions of text should be typeset and which should be omitted. See also Appendix C. This observation deserves further attention.
132 John Jacobsz. Paeds was probably John Hendriksz. Paeds’ great-great-grandson. He was active as printer in Leyden between 1578 and 1622. He was University printer between 1603 and 1619. His heirs continued printing until 1630. Possibly, the Leyden codices stayed in the Paeds family until the first decades of the seventeenth century when Leyden University Library added the manuscripts to its collection.
133 Short Title Catalogue Netherlands, Muller 1890, 20-21, Molhuysen and others, 445-446.
a variety of offices in regional government. The second part of *Le3-1* as well *Le3-2* in its entirety were copied by John Hendriksz. Paeds, a prominent member of the municipal council of Leyden. Since the local administration frequently lodged members of the Council, it is beyond reasonable doubt that these relations constituted channel for the cultural transfer between the regional government and the cities. One example of this kind of transfer may have been Gerard Potter’s translation of Froissart’s *Chroniques*.

### 5.4. Conclusion

The research presented in this chapter has led a better understanding of the translation’s textual tradition and the contexts in which it was produced and received. By moving forward the *terminus ante quem* of Gerard Potter’s translation activities from 1430 to ca. 1450, it has become possible to situate the Froissart translation unequivocally in the context of Burgundian rule in Holland. Moreover, this date confirms the hypothesis that was formulated at the end of the previous chapter based on the translation technique, illustration and the political context of the 1440s and 1450s. The information provided by the imagery of *H21* and the Brederode inventories seems to indicate that manuscripts of the translation have primarily circulated among the high aristocracy of Holland. The Brederodes were considered as the county’s first noble family. If the hypothetical attribution of *H21* to Frank of Borssele can be verified, the manuscript was produced for one of the most important noblemen of Holland and Zeeland. Since Gerard Potter’s text was copied in Leyden in the surroundings of the municipal council, it has become plausible that the frequent contact between councillors and local administrators was crucial to the translation’s transfer to its new urban environment. In the sixteenth century, the Middle Dutch translation of the *Chroniques* circulated in largely the same circles. A member of the noble Bronchorst family owned *H21*, the lost Brederode volumes were kept at the family castle of Vianen. A century later, manuscripts found their way to scholarly collections. *Le3* was added to the collection of Leyden University Library, *H21* had been acquired by Isaac Vossius. This notwithstanding, the translation’s incorporation into these collections does not necessarily mean that the scientific or historiographic merit of Gerard Potter’s text was also recognised. Isaac Vossius’ auctioned off his copy when he was still alive. Moreover, the annotations in *H21* reveal little about its previous owners’ use of the text.
CONCLUSION

Want ic up ten tijt des sluytens van dit volumen ende boeke niet wael en noch wairachtelijken die geschiedenissen te rechte dair af en wiste, mostic dair mede van nu hier yet af te setten verthoeven [...] So sal ic gairne horen, onthouden ende u allen te voirschijn bringen ende voirt alle andere geschieden dingen ende materien die van my int wair vernomen sullen worden zeder dat slot van desen [...] boeke gemaict ende gesloten wesende dair ic my gairne toe geven will om dat alle ten beste te vernemen.¹

(H21, fol. 376 v.)

The epilogue of Book Three of the *Chroniques* articulates a sound approach to the conclusion of any kind of research, be it historiographical and investigative like Froissart’s chronicle, be it academic like the study at hand. In the chronicler’s closing remarks, three basic attitudes towards the concept of knowledge shine through: humility, generosity and enthusiasm. In the following, I will give a brief overview of my own contribution to:

1. the study of intercultural contact in Holland in the fifteenth century (Chapter One).
2. the provenance of French exemplars (Chapters Two and Three).
3. Middle Dutch translations and their audiences (cf. Chapters Four and Five).

For each of these areas, my observations have been largely limited to the Middle Dutch translation of Froissart’s *Chroniques*. Some of these may be generalised and transferred to other texts, especially those that provide evidence of interlingual contact in the fifteenth century; in other aspects the scope of this research is limited. Therefore, I will take the opportunity to outline prospects of further research.

¹ ‘At this very moment, when I conclude this Book and Volume, I do not know the full truth of the matter. Therefore, it is for the best that I stop writing now. However, I will readily learn more, keep in mind what I have learnt and share it with every one of you. Moreover, I will gladly make every effort to understand more, about other subjects as well, and take in all the information that was uncovered since I concluded my investigations.’
CONCLUSION

*Intercultural contact in Holland in the fifteenth century*

In the first chapter of this study, I have attempted to reconstruct the contacts between the French-speaking world and Holland in the fifteenth century as experienced by the translator of the *Chroniques*. As it appears, multilingualism was quite common among the members of his family. Dirk Potter, Gerard’s father, travelled extensively. His journeys were not limited to the neighbouring principalities and bishoprics (Flanders, Hainault, Utrecht), but also included diplomatic missions to England and Rome. The documents that bear witness of his travel to these remote regions are in Latin. Which language he himself used during these journeys is unknown, but his writings suggest that he understood French, Latin and Italian. The translator’s grandfather, uncles and also his brother, Jacob, all held offices that required some degree of bilinguality or even multilingualism. The comital chancery, their workplace, processed and issued documents in German, Latin and French. Under the Bavarian counts of Holland, documents in the latter language belonged to the domain of an expert, the *Walschclerc*.

It is plausible that Gerard Potter started off his career in this multilingual environment. In any event, in 1433-1434 he is registered as a servant of Jacqueline of Bavaria. His range of duties in the former countess’ service included missions to French-speaking regions such as Hainault and Artois, which were often related to financial affairs. The translator’s family network, linguistic skills and financial expertise introduced him to some of the most powerful men and women of his age. In 1445, Philip of Burgundy appointed him as a salaried member of the Council of Holland. The presence of foreign stadtholders, secretaries, councilmen and visiting auditors ensured that this was a place of intercultural and, more importantly, interlingual contact. Additionally, the introduction of French as the language of communication with the supraregional level of government had promoted a linguistic culture of diglossia in which French was the language of power. As a councillor, Gerard Potter frequently travelled to France and Germany in order to discuss matters of state. The duke of Burgundy and the duchess-consort rarely visited the court at The Hague. Nevertheless, Gerard Potter must have met them on a number of occasions. Both the Council of Holland and – when she resided at The Hague – Isabella of Portugal deployed him as an emissary to Philip the Good, an honour which was awarded to very few of the indigenous administrators.

Apparently not all of Gerard Potter’s native colleagues were bilingual to the same degree. Some of his peers were not sufficiently proficient in French to perform their duties
in this language. This raises the question of French as *interlingua* among the members of the European nobility. In the case of the Bavarian Wittelsbach counts of Holland, it is clear that their relations with the Hainault Avesnes, the ducal family of Burgundy and the French royals has stimulated affinity with French language and culture. One step down the feudal ladder, when we consider lord Reynald II of Brederode – whose wife Yolanda of Lalaing was from Hainault! – the linguistic situation becomes more opaque. The question is whether his determination to address the assembly of the knights of the Golden Fleece in his own native vernacular was inspired by an intentional challenge of accepted social standards or rather by a lack of proficiency in French.  

The information that is available, little as it may be, suggests that – if anything – Dutch noblemen preferred to read – or in any event commissioned – books that were written in their own vernacular. Apparently, the data regarding aristocratic book possession corresponds to the linguistic difficulties that were experienced by the local officials. The foreign stadtholders and administrators maintained the francophone connection in their contacts with the supra-regional government as well as in their literary taste. The ambiguity of this linguistic situation probably has influenced literary consumption, production and has consequently promoted translation on the level of administration as well as culture.

A systematic analysis of published as well as unpublished sources could yield interesting information on the linguistic aspect of the contacts between the court and Council of Holland and the neighbouring, French-speaking regions. A similar analysis of the surviving archives of noblemen like Borssele and Brederode may shed some further light on this issue. Additionally, research may focus on the linguistic situation in local municipal councils, which consisted mainly of merchants and craftsmen. Equally interesting is the situation in monasteries, which often accommodated foreign monks. Diachronic research could focus attention on differences and continuity in the rule of the houses of Holland, Avesnes, Wittelsbach and Valois. In any event, the possibilities for sociolinguistic research as regards intercultural/interlinguistic contact in Holland seem promising.

---

2 Anteun Janse assumes that it is almost inconceivable that Reynald II of Brederode would not have spoken and understood French and thus should have been able to read the *Chroniques* in French. A. Janse, e-mail: 26 June 2006; See also : Janse 2009a, 20-23.

3 Cf. Schoenaers & Wijsman 2009.

4 E.g. Van Mieris 1753; Poelman 1917; Smit 1928; Prevenier and Smit 1987; Smit 2005; the editions of the registers ‘Rosa’ by De Blécourt-Meyers, Lombarts, etc.

5 Existing studies such as Van der Sijs 2001 or Willemsyns 1994 and 1997 focus mostly on the development of the language and pay relatively little attention to multilingualism or sociolinguistic diversity.
The provenance of French exemplars

H. Wijsman’s research, combined with directed searches in the Bibliotheca Neerlandica Manuscripta database has shown that French language manuscripts were rarely produced in Holland. Patrons of the arts who were interested in a copy of a French romance, a French-language religious or historiographic text procured their manuscripts elsewhere: Hainault, Artois, Paris, Flanders, etc. The collation of the French extant manuscripts of the Chroniques and the Middle Dutch translation has shown that the provenance of Gerard Potter’s model can be traced back to a group of manuscripts produced between 1408 and 1417 by the Parisian libraire Pierre de Liffol. The codices that lay on Gerard Potter’s lectern should probably be identified with the two-volume set of manuscripts that is now kept at the Municipal Library of Besançon or one of its hypothetical descendants. This identification deserves our attention for three reasons. The first is the period of production. It is worth noting that the exemplar of the Dutch translation was not a manuscript that Froissart himself had offered to one of his patrons, Guy of Blois or Albert or William of Ostrevant. This entails that the translation’s model did not belong to the Blois or Wittelsbach legacy. Secondly, among Pierre de Liffol’s clientele one important category included John of Berry and John the Fearless, another Tanguy du Châtel, John of Roubaix and Peter of Fontenay. The first group can be described as relatives of Charles VI, king of France, the second as their supporters. Indeed, the French connection provides two possible pathways to Holland. Because of the countess’ first marriage to the dauphin John of Touraine one path guides us to the court of Jacqueline of Bavaria. The other path leads to the Burgundian Council of Holland with its foreign officials (e.g. William of Lalaing and John of Lannoy), some of which were long-standing partisans of the dukes of Burgundy. Thirdly, as opposed to what has been suggested in the past, the translation was not unaccomplished: since the exemplar was a set that only comprised Book One to Book Three of the Chroniques, no translation of Book Four of the translation exists today or for that matter has ever existed.

The comparison of the Middle Dutch translation with the extant French manuscripts has presented us with some difficulties, arising from the process of medieval manuscript
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6 Guenée 2008, 182 describes them as ‘gens de petite noblesse, qui ne firent carrière ni dans l’église ni dans la robe’. Tanguy du Châtel was a supporter of Louis of Orléans. John of Roubaix and Peter of Fontenay, both owners of (a set of) Froissart manuscripts, were chamberlains of Philip the Good. John of Roubaix was the owner of a copy of Book One, Peter of Fontenay owned manuscripts of Book One and Two. It is an interesting question whether they purchased their manuscripts before or after John the Fearless had acquired his (now lost or unidentified) copy of Book One.
production. Invariably, scribes introduced textual variants in the texts they produced, which – for the comparison of the translation and the original text-tradition, at least – is rather convenient. Unfortunately, medieval translators were subject to the same conditions and influences that caused scribal variation: inadvertence, creativity, patronage, etc. Because of this, it is sometimes difficult to assess the differences between a particular copy of the source text and the text of the translation in the extant manuscripts. Matters become even more complicated when the possibility arises that the translator has recognised blatant scribal errors in his exemplar and has corrected them. This leads to confusing situations in which the translation has a ‘correct’ reading, whereas the presumed model is erroneous. These difficulties render it nearly impossible to identify a translation’s exemplar solely on the basis of textual variation in the transmission of the original text.

However, recurring patterns of similarity and deviation may eliminate manuscripts as possible exemplars. The comparison has identified the manuscript of the Municipal Library of Besançon (Bes) as the only extant copy that may have been Gerard Potter’s model. But even in this case, the possibility remains that either a hypothetical descendant of Bes or a lost set of manuscripts produced by Pierre de Liffol (a sibling) was the manuscript that Gerard Potter used. In the third chapter of the present study, I have attempted to address the question of lost manuscripts through the analysis of paratextual elements.

In general, in the production of a new copy of a text, the paratexts of the model are even more liable to radical modification than the text of the manuscript. Depending on the specific desires of a prospective buyer of the manuscript, important changes are made to the pictorial programme of the libraire’s showroom copy. It has been observed that the introduction of new miniatures may have an effect on the segmentation of the text. This is also the case in the manuscripts we have studied. Since the Liffol copies do not allow for illustration without the introduction of a rubricated caption, the addition of a miniature at a point in the text that was not already accompanied by a descriptive title necessarily entailed that a new rubric was introduced. Additionally, in particular cases existing rubrics were adapted to fit the scene that was depicted in the miniature. This procedure causes considerable variation in manuscripts of the same text, even when they were produced under the direction of the same libraire.

In Chapter Three, I have compared the degree of variation between the extant Liffol manuscripts of the Chroniques to the degree of variation between Bes and the extant manuscripts of the translation. The outcome of this comparison shows that the paratexts of
none of the extant French manuscripts resemble another copy as closely as the paratexts of the manuscripts of the translation match Bes. In this respect, it does not seem likely that Pierre de Liffol produced a manuscript that resembled the extant manuscripts of the translation even more than Bes. Therefore it seems fair to conclude that in view of the close correspondence between the variant readings of Bes and the text of the translation and the fact that the paratexts of the translation and Bes are exceptionally similar as well, there are good grounds to identify Bes as the translation’s exemplar. It is, however, not possible to exclude the possibility that not Bes but one of its hypothetical descendants was Gerard Potter’s model.

The foregoing shows that a clear view of the textual transmission of the manuscripts of the original text, as well as an insight in the production process of these manuscript copies is invaluable for the contextualisation of the Middle Dutch translation. The renewed interest in Jean Froissart’s Chroniques has led to a privileged situation, which is both fortunate and regrettable. Fortunately, the vibrant research has provided an excellent starting point for an in-depth analysis. Regrettably, the textual transmission of the French originals of other fifteenth-century Dutch translations has not been studied as profoundly as the manuscripts of Froissart’s Chroniques. Consequently, in certain aspects our understanding of the precise relations between these Middle Dutch translations and their French models remains rather turbid.

**Middle Dutch translations and their audiences**

In Chapters Four and Five, Gerard Potter’s translation and its intended, primary and secondary audiences have moved to the centre of attention. In Chapter Four, the premise that the translator adapts the original text in order to ensure that his translation is optimally relevant was the starting point for the inquiry into his intended audience. An analysis of Gerard Potter as a translator characterises him as prudent, yet innovative. Potter’s elaborate style – which has been described as long-winded and tedious – opens up multiple interpretations of the text. Additionally, the translator further stresses important motifs and enhances the textual cohesion. To a contemporary audience familiar with (translated?) literature, Gerard Potter’s use of tautology probably sounded familiar. The translator’s vocabulary, which clearly shows the influence of the French language of power used for communication with the supra-regional government, must have been perceived as very modern, even in the 1440s or 1450s. On the one hand, the use of French-sounding
neologisms shows that Potter may have intentionally introduced French-sounding words in his text or may have been influenced by the language of the French-language original. On the other hand, the presence of these new lexical items shows that Gerard Potter expected his audience to understand French loans that had been introduced only very recently into the Dutch vernacular. The presence of these Gallicisms, together with Gerard Potter’s concern to provide his readership with a text that presents itself as authentic in its reflection of polysemy and truthfull in its enhancement of the text’s authority may situate the Middle Dutch version of the *Chroniques* in a particular sociocultural environment, the Council of Holland.

This environment may have influenced Gerard Potter’s elaborate mode of translation. Not only do the stylistic characteristics of the translation resemble the tautologising and explicitating style of other fifteenth-century translations, it is also very similar to the language used in the chancery of Holland with its constant repetition and French-sounding vocabulary. The question remains whether the translator was influenced by contemporary literary style, chancery style, both or – in the case of interference of the source text – neither. If Gerard Potter was indeed influenced by the chancery style, the question thrusts itself upon us if a similar influence may have left its marks on other (early) fifteenth century translations (e.g. *Mandeville, Pelgrimage*). A possible line of research may be a systematic diachronic study of the language in the accounts, complemented by the vocabulary of the translations.

The comparison of the French text and the Dutch translations provides further grounds to locate the intended audience among the governmental and administrative aristocracy of Holland. The nuanced understanding of the vocabulary of knighthood and courtly entertainment that the translator apparently presumed in his audience certainly point into this direction. Additionally, as compared to the pictorial programme of *Bes*, the illustration of the Dutch manuscripts shows an increased interest in suppressed rebellion against the sovereign. This may be meaningful against the backdrop of the turbulent situation in the Low Countries in the 1440s and 1450s. Possibly, the changes were inspired by the Dutch involvement in the Second Ghent War and a conflict with the duchy of Guelders in 1452-1453. The narratives of revolt illustrated in the translation resulted in submission to the rightful sovereign, which suggests an audience that sympathises with the position of the ruling classes. Such an audience should be located among the aristocrats of the Burgundian Council of Holland, which in part consisted of native noblemen taking up responsibility in regional government. It is plausible that in such an environment the
translation was used either to further familiarise these indigenous knights and squires with the dynastic relations, feats of war and diplomatic expertise of their new Burgundian souvereigns (including the marriage between William VI and Margaret of Burgundy). Additionally, the regional councillors were informed about the standing conflict between England and France and provided with examples of negotiation and diplomacy worthy of imitation. Gerard Potter’s primary motive for producing the translation may be connected to his position as a councillor. In this sense, the translation may be regarded as an agent in career advancement or otherwise as a means of representation, displaying the translator’s command of languages and expertise in matters of state.

In Chapter Five, the hypothesis formulated above has been tested against concrete evidence of the manuscript transmission of Gerard Potter’s translation. This analysis suggests that at least four, if not five, sets of manuscripts have been produced, the translator’s autograph included. Apart from the autograph, there is reason to assume that an illustrated apograph was the common ancestor of the two sets of which one (H21) and two (Le3-1&2) manuscripts survive. Additionally, a set of manuscripts of the translation was registered in two sixteenth-century inventories of the lords of Brederode. Possibly, this set, which has now been lost, should be identified with the lost apograph. Alternatively, it may have been a fifth set of manuscripts. In 1666, the Leyden bookseller Peter Leffen auctioned a selection of books from the library of Isaac Vossius, among them an illustrated manuscript of Gerard Potter’s translation. Possibly, this manuscript should be identified with H21.

A number of paratextual features of H21 further reveal its functioning in the context of the governmental aristocracy. The illustration of H21 confirms the hypothesis that copies of the translation circulated among the nobility of Holland. Two miniatures depict noblemen wearing the insignia of the aristocratic Order of Saint Antoine de Barbefosse, which recruited among the governmental nobility of Holland and Hainault. A further comparison of the imagery with contemporary illustrated manuscripts is desirable and could further specify the localisation of H21. A piece of parchment which has been pasted onto one of the flyleaves of H21, bears the sixteenth-century ex libris of Nicolas of Bronchorst, canon at the court chapel of Oostvoorne and a member of the noble Bronchorst family. This family was an aristocratic line of regional administrators, who were closely

---

7 The possibility exists that the common ancestor was produced by a clerk of the chancery at The Hague. Abbreviations which seem unusual for literary manuscripts are used in the extant manuscripts of the translation and in the comital chancery alike. This observation deserves further attention.
connected to the isle of Voorne. Joost of Bronchorst, the annotator’s father, was the castellan of the castle of Voorne, the former residence of Frank of Borssele.

The other extant copy, *Le3* functioned in the circles of the municipal administration of Leyden. The second part of the text was transcribed by a prominent member of the Leyden city council, John Hendriksz. Documentary sources show that it is likely that he and Gerard Potter have met each other on a number of occasions. Indeed, the regional councilmen and the cities of Holland maintained close contact. The production of a manuscript of a text that probably was also read (and put to use?) by members of the regional Council in circles of municipal administration may suggest that the primary purpose of the copy was that of a status symbol.

*Language, power and translation*

In this study, I have sketched the *Binnenhof* at The Hague, the residence of the counts of Holland, as a multilingual environment with continuous contacts between Dutch-speaking and bilingual officials and administrators. After the incorporation of Holland into the Burgundian personal union, the comital residence accommodated the regional government of the county. A number of characteristics of both the translation of the *Chroniques* and the extant manuscripts in which it has survived point towards members of the Burgundian Council of Holland as a plausible receptor audience. One could argue that one of the text’s main purposes was to disseminate information regarding the new sovereigns of Holland and the history of the troubles between England and France among the indigenous members of the Council.\(^8\) Additionally, the translation offers examples of (good?) practice in negotiation and warfare. High rank Burgundian officials in the Council may have stimulated Gerard Potter – one of the few indigenous members who was also bilingual – to translate the *Chroniques*. Indeed, Froissart’s text had been popular among supporters of the Burgundian dukes since the first decades of the fifteenth century. In any event, during the fourteenth and fifteenth century aristocratic families in Holland have expressed a keen interest in historiography. The purchase of genealogies of the kings of France and the kings of England by Frank of Borssele further shows that at least one native aristocrat was concerned with the subject matter of the *Chroniques*. Alternatively, the translator took on

---

\(^8\) This has also been suggested by H. Wijsman as the reason why Isabella of Portugal (possibly) was provided with a manuscript of the *Chroniques*. However, the argument that a copy of Book Four could familiarise her with (more) recent events is not valid. Cf. supra § 2.1.4.
the enterprise on his own initiative and strategically employed it in his professional career. In any event, the Burgundian Council of Holland with its interlingual and intercultural exchange provides an excellent starting point for the production of translations. Further dissemination of these texts may have been mediated through the Council of Holland: it is plausible that Reynald II of Brederode, one of the most influential indigenous noblemen, owned a private copy of Gerard Potter’s text. Additionally, it is probable that the frequent contact between regional councillors and the cities of Holland have facilitated the transfer of the translation from to a new urban environment in which local administrators produced their own copy of the text.

The study of intercultural contact and translation in Holland in the fifteenth century deserves further attention. It is needless to emphasize that such an enterprise should be based on the combined study of documentary and literary sources. A diachronic study of the official documents of (supra-)regional and local government may lead to a better understanding of the linguistic consequences of contacts with the French-speaking world. As from 1385, these interlingual relations may be perceived in the context of Burgundianisation. More importantly, this analysis could provide us with an insight into the social stratification of multilingualism. Such an understanding could further enable us to identify stimuli and reception audiences for translations from the French. Additionally, analyses of the contents of these translations combined with in-depth comparison with the French-language originals would certainly lead to a more profound insight in the use of translation as an agent in political change through the propagation of socially desirable ideas and modes of conduct.

‘Hier nit eynde dat […] volumene’
‘Explicit le […] volume’

(‘Here ends this volume’)

(H21, fol. 376 v.)
(Bes, fol. 451 v.)
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THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE CHRONIQUES: SIGLA OF THE WITNESSES OF BOOK TWO AND BOOK THREE

I adopt the system of sigla used by A. Varvaro, G. Croenen and the ‘Online Froissart Project’. Varvaro lists the manuscripts in an unambiguous way by using the first letter(s) of the location of their repository (e.g. L for the British Library in London, but Le for the University Library of Leyden). Whenever necessary, for instance to distinguish between the main manuscript collection of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, kept at the site Richelieu and the subcollection Arsenal in Paris, the repository is indicated by a letter (P for the Bibliothèque nationale and PA for the Arsenal collection). The last digits of the manuscript’s shelf number complete the sigla. Repositories with only one manuscript of the Chroniques are referred to by the first letters of the location (e.g. Rou for Rouen). Famous manuscripts, e.g. the lavishly illuminated Breslau copy, which is now kept at the Staatsbibliothek in Berlin, are referred to by the first letters of the name by which they are generally known. The two volumes of Leyden, University Library, MS Bibliotheca Publica Latina 3 will be indicated as Le3-1 and Le3-2. The The Hague manuscript of the translation will be referred to as H21.

Manuscripts of Book Two (cf. table 2.1.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sigla</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ant</td>
<td>Antwerpen, Museum Plantin-Moretus, MS M 15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bre</td>
<td>Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, MS Rehdiger 1 (Depot Breslau, 1, Bd. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ber</td>
<td>Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS A13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>Besançon, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B52</td>
<td>Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS II 2552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B88</td>
<td>Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS II 88, fol. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21</td>
<td>Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS IV 921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B02</td>
<td>Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS IV 1102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi</td>
<td>Chicago, Newberry Library, Case MS, f.37, vol. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dar</td>
<td>Universität- und Landesbibliothek, MS 132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This list has been drawn from the list of manuscripts of the Chroniques compiled by the Online Froissart Project.
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Le2  Leyden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Vossiani Germano-Gallici in-Folio, MS 9, vol. 2
LR4  London, British Library, Royal 14 D 4
LR1  London, British Library, Royal 18 E 1
NY4  New York, Morgan Library, MS M 804
P44  Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 2644
P52  Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 2652
P58  Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 2658
P60  Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 2660
P64  Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 2664
P68-69  Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MSS fr. 2668-2669
P76  Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 2676
P472  Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 6472
P476  Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 6476
P357  Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 20357
P13  Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, nouv. acq. fr., 5213, fol. 397 v-398 v
P606  Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, nouv. acq. fr., 9606
PA88  Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, MS 5188
Rou  Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 1147, fol. 209 r.-379 v.

Manuscripts of Book Three (cf. table 2.2.)

Ant  Antwerpen, Museum Plantin-Moretus, MS M 15.6
Bre  Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, MS Rehdiger 3 (Depot Breslau, 1, Bd. 3)
Ber  Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS A14
Bes  Besançon, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 865
B88  Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS II 88, fol. 16-23
Cam  Cambridge, University Library, Hh.3.16 fol. VII (flyleaf)
H84  Hannover, Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek, MS XXVI 1584 (P. III)
LR5  London, British Library, Royal 14 D 5
Lud  Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum, MS Ludwig XIII 7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sigla</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Mons, Bibliothèque centrale de l’Université de Mons-Hainaut, MS 240-359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P45</td>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 2645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P50</td>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 2650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P53</td>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 2653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P56</td>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 2656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P58</td>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 2659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P70-71</td>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 2670-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P76</td>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 2676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P475</td>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 6475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P487</td>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr. 15487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P605</td>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, nouv. acq. fr., 9605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA89</td>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, MS 5189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rou</td>
<td>Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tor</td>
<td>Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria, MS L.IV.26 (lost in the 1904 fire)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Manuscripts of the translation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sigla</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Le3</td>
<td>Leyden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Bibliotheca Publica Latina 3 (2 vols.) (Book Two and Three)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H21</td>
<td>The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS 130 B 21 (Book Three)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- List of the books of Reynald III of Brederode (Brederode, 55, fol. 7 r.) -
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LIST OF THE BOOKS OF REYNALD III OF BREDERODE (1556)\(^1\)

Edition of the manuscript section of the inventory of valuables in the castle of Batestein, drawn up by Druet Warhel after the death of Reynald III of Brederode.\(^2\)

INVENTAIRE DE TOUT CE QUE DRUET WARHEL AT EN GARDE DE MONSEIGNEUR MONSIEUR DE BREDERODE FAICTE ET ESCRIPTE DE NOUVEAU - ANNO 1556

(…)

[fol. 7 r.]

LES LIVRES TANT EN LATIN QUE EN ALLEMAN ET EN FRANCHOIS

**LATIjin**

- Historia Petri Comestoris – Catalogus
- De Civitati Dei
- Fortilitium Fidei
- Josephus
- Valerius Maximus
- De Civitati Dei
- A. Pedianus In Orationes Ciceronis
- Liber Orentalium Regionum
- Evangelium
- Additiones Pauli
- Lucas Sirus
- Opera Enee Silvii
- Liber Apuni [sic]
- Quintilianus

\(^1\) Brederode, 55.

\(^2\) A full edition of the inventory is printed in Salverda de Grave 1918, 40-59. For an extensive discussion of this list and the inventory of 1567, see: Schoenaers & Wijsman 2009.
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- Bocatius De Claris Mulieribus
- Terencius
- Summarium 2\(^1\) lib. 2\(^6\) partis Seti Tho
- De Vinis Officiis
- Historii Troyani
- Universus Cristi
- Apocalipsis
- Johannes Episcopus
- Aristoteles
- Epistoli Pauli

[fol. 7 v.]

LIVRES EN ALLEMAN

<+ Een Istorien>\(^3\)

- Deersten boek van Jan Frossaerts
- Het tweede van Jan Frossaert
- Het III\(^6\) boeck van Jan Frossaert
- Het Scaecck Spel
- Een ander boucken die ick niet en kent <+ met parchement>
- Die Cronicken van Brederode

[fol. 8 r.]

LIVRES EN FRANCHOIS

- Ung grand vieulx livre. l'Istoire de l' empereur de Romme. Comment il bailla son filz a VII sages de Romme pour l’aprendre en doctrine.
- Ung grand livre de Tristan qui fut filz au Roy Meliadus de Leonois
- Ung grand livre de parchemin. Les Romains de Meliadus le second volume ainssi escript a la fin du livre

\(^3\) Added in the margin.
- Ung livre en parchemin. Le premier chapitre de Adam et Eva
- Le second volume de Merlin en parchemin
- Giron le Courtois
- Les VII volumes des Antiquites de la Gaule Belgique
- Le Tristan Chevalierz de la Table Ronde, nouvellement imprimé a Paris
- <- Les XI livres d'Amadis de Gaule>
- Appian Alexandrin
- Paolo Jovio Comois, Evesque de Nocera
- Le premier livre de la Cronicque de dom Flores de Grece
- Le premier livre du nouveau Tristan, prince de Leonois
- Les XII livres de Amadis de Gaule, en VII livres
- Le V et VIe volume des Perceforest
- Les X premiers livres de L'Iliade d'Homere, en ung volume
- Primalion de Grece
- Le livre de Jan Boccace, couvert de parchemin
- Petrarcha de Remedes de Fortune, couvert de parchemin

[fol. 8 v.]

- Les Commentaires de Jules Cesar, en petit volume
- Ung petit livre. Des Estats et Maisons
- Ung petit livre. Les Apophthegmes et beaulx dictz de plusieurs rois
- Lansselot du Lacq
- Le livre de medecine de monssieur

(...)
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- H21, fol. 349 v., miniature representing the battle of Otterburn (1388) -
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CODICOLOGICAL DEScriptions

The structure of these codicological descriptions has been based on Biemans 2005. The description of the Besançon manuscript heavily relies on Croenen’s codicological study in Ainsworth and Croenen 2007.

1. The Hague, Royal Library, MS 130 B 21 (H21)
Den Haag, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, 130 B 21
Olim Phillipps (Cheltenham), MS 2639

Contents

- Fol. 1 r. – VIII v.: list of rubrics (incomplete)

Incipit

Van hoe wijselijken ende scarpelijken hem die coninc van Poirtingale metten sinen ordyneerden upten berch van Juberoth om tegens den Spanjairden te strijden (...)

Explicit

Van enyge voirsienyge wijse tracteerres die so lange verspraken ende tractierden ende te samen concordierden dat sij ene vaste vrede ende zeker bestant maecten duyerende III jair lang om een twisschen den Fransoysen ende den Engelsen so wael ter zee als te lande dair die hulperen ende medeplegeren beyde der coningen alle mede binnen begrepen waren CCCLXXV

- Fol. 1 r. – 376 v.: Jean Froissart, *Chroniques*, Book Three
  Middle Dutch translation by Gerard Potter van der Loo
Incipit

Hoe hem here Jan Froissairt nairnstelicken dede informeren ende onder zochte hoe die oirlogen spruytende uut der cronen van Franckrijke ghevoert ende gehantiert hadden geweest

IC hebbe zere lange gerust ende ghetoeft te scriven ende te openbaren vanden zaken ende hantieringen van den verden landen (...)

Explicit

(...) ende so sal ict hem te lieve ende ter eren gairne onthouden ende vallen voirt te voirschijn bringen ende voirt alle andere geschiede dingen ende materien die van my int wair vernomen sullen worden zeder dat slot van desen IIIen boeke gemaict ende gesloten wesende dair ic my gairne toe geven will om dat alle ten besten te vernemen

Colophon

Hier nimt eynde dat anderde volumene meyster Jan Frossairts cronyke getranslateert uuten Franssoyse in onser Duytscher tongen bij Gerijt Potter vander Loo ende is dat IIIe boeke in Duytsche

Material

The codex consists of two kinds of paper, each characterised by its own watermark. The two watermarks closely resemble each other. The first watermark (A) (a cup-shaped flower with two leaves connected to the stalk at incongruous points) is (nearly) identical to Landesarchiv Baden-Württemberg, Hauptstaats-archiv Stuttgart, J 340, no.127163 (http://www.piccard-online.de) and should be dated circa 1445. The second watermark (B) (a cup-shaped flower with two leaves connected to the stalk at the same point) does not appear in the Piccard database. Both watermarks alternate throughout the codex. The paper of the preliminary papers (I – V) and end papers is modern.
In numerous instances the edges of the folios have been damaged by damp. This is especially the case for the first and last folios (the list of rubrics, the first and last pages of the actual text, fols. 1 – 9; fols. 369-376). The damage may suggest that, at least for some time, the manuscript has been stored without binding or in a binding that offered insufficient protection. The restoration does not appear to be of a recent date. In other instances, pages have been stained (fol. 13 r., 23 v., 100 r., 220 v., 221 r.), slightly torn (fol. 68, 124, 309, 338) or have (small) holes in them (48 r.). Otherwise, the manuscript is in fine condition.

*Number of pages and foliation*

The manuscript opens with five preliminary papers, followed by an incomplete list of rubrics. Starting from a regular sexternion, four pages are wanting. The first eighteen rubrics are missing from the list. This suggests that the table of contents started on the fourth missing page. A modern hand has added page numbers (roman numerals), after the first folios of the quire were lost. The actual text is copied onto 376 folios, which have a contemporary foliation in roman numerals (in rubric, on the recto side of the folio, at the top of the page in the middle). Three modern end papers complete the manuscript.

*Collation and quire marks*

The modern preliminary and end papers not included, the manuscript consists of thirty-three quires, the first of which holds the list of rubrics. The actual text begins on the first folio of the second quire. Apart from these first two quires and the last quire, all gatherings
(most of which are regular sexternions) have been marked in the top left-hand corner. The remarkable position of the quire marks and the script-type suggest that these signatures have been added at a later date, e.g. when the manuscript was rebound in its current binding. The quire marks consist of an arabic numeral followed by a superscript letter \(^{a}\). (the third quire is marked \(2^{a}\), the fourth \(3^{a}\), etc.)

Collation originally (flyleaves and endpapers not included): 1-32\(^{12}\) 33\(^{4}\) of which \(1^{1-4}\) are wanting.

**Dimensions**

The manuscript’s current dimensions are 385 x 270 mm. At several instances (e.g. fol. 356) the foliation appears to have been affected by trimming. The absence of prickings further suggests that the manuscript’s edges have been trimmed.

**Ruling-pattern**

Ruling in plummet. The justification of the list of rubrics is 286 x 180 mm. The first letter of each rubricated title (lombard letter, 2 lines) is situated in a separate column at the left (20 mm). The titles have been copied in a second column (160 mm). The folio numbers have been written to the right of the justification. There is no ruling for the separate lines of writing. The justification for the actual text is 286 x 204 mm. The writing space is divided into two columns of ca. 88 mm. The space between the columns is 28 mm. In general, every column has 36 lines of writing. There is no ruling for the separate lines of writing. On average, the lines of writing have a height of 8 mm. It is remarkable that writing starts above top line.

**Script**

The text, as well as the rubricated titles, has been written in one hand. The script, which is generally well legible, is best described as a cursiva libraria. The long ascenders of the letters ‘b’, ‘h’ and ‘k’ and the equally extended descenders of ‘h’, the long ‘s’ and ‘f’ give the writing a vertical aspect. The minims however are compressed. Distinctive features of the handwriting are the shapes of the letters ‘d’ and ‘g’. The looped ‘d’ is open at the left-
hand side even when its not connected to the previous letter. The ‘g’ is one-horned, with a characteristically long horn at the right-hand side. I-longa is found in initial position, which appears to be uncharacteristic of northern manuscripts and may reveal influence of French cursive or bastarda. The letter ‘v’ (also in ‘w’) is generally looped and occurs in initial position; ‘u’ is open. The descender of the letter ‘y’ has a distinctive hairline bending to the right as does the letter ‘z’, which descends below the baseline. Punctuation is limited to virgula suspensiva (/) to mark a pause and the hyphen (=) to mark that a word is broken at the end of a line of writing.

Abbreviations

The scribe abbreviates profusely. Most of the abbreviations employed are fairly common in Middle Dutch literary texts (e.g. tilde for a nasal consonant, for a combination of ‘r’ and a vowel), others appear less frequently (subscript  for ‘en’,  as a general abbreviation).

Superscript vowel: e.g. fol. 24 r. gve: grave
\sim: e.g. fol. 25 r. ymers: ymmers; enë: enen; but also fol. 4 seggeñ: seggende and fol. 1 v. geþsenteede: gepsenteeert
\textsuperscript{9}: e.g. fol. 49 r. ter: ter; fol. 89 r.: he\textsuperscript{9}: here; fol. 88 r. d\textsuperscript{9}: dair but also fol. 9 r. vergadet\textsuperscript{9}: vergadert
9: fol. 2 r. ald9: aldus
d\textsuperscript{9}: e.g. fol. 49 r. spangaird\textsuperscript{9}: spangairden; fol. 1 v. voirgaend\textsuperscript{9}: voirgaenden; fol. 1 v. voirs\textsuperscript{9}: voirseiden
p: e.g. fol. 11 r. pden: pairden
p: e.g. fol. 148 v. pvande: provande
b: e.g. fol 10 v. her\textsuperscript{b}gen: herbergen
\h: e.g. fol. 6 v. htoichdomme: hertoichdomme
4: e.g. fol. 9 r. franckr\textsuperscript{4}: franckrijk; fol. 10 r. juffr\textsuperscript{4}: juffrouw

\footnote{Derolez 2003, 147.}
Corrections

Small additions indicate words that have been omitted or forgotten while copying the text. Erroneous passages (e.g. ditographies) have been deleted. Additions and deletions occur in black ink as well as in rubric.

Addition:
- supralinear addition: e.g. fol. 83 r. piete\(^9\) \(\uparrow\) liet\(\uparrow\) enẽ: Pieter \(<\text{liet}>\) enen
- interlinear addition: e.g. fol. 6 v. p\(^9\) ncesse \(\uparrow\) dus\(\uparrow\) om: princesse \(<\text{dus}>\) om

Deletion
- Strikethrough: e.g. fol. 83 r. bijde \(\uparrow\) bijde: bijden \(<\text{bijden}>\)
- Expungation + strikethrough: e.g. fol. 5 r. die \(\uparrow\) die: \(<\text{die}>\) die

The colour of the ink of corrections generally differs from the ink that was used for the ‘normal’ text in that the former ink is darker. This suggests that the text of the manuscript was reviewed after completion of a larger portion of text and corrections were made at a later stage in the production process.

Structure

Each chapter is preceded by a rubricated title. The chapter generally opens with a pen flourished initial. These initials are bright blue, the pen decoration is in red ink. The only exception to this rule is the initial on folio 38 r. This initial (‘I’) has been executed in red ink, the pen decoration is in purple ink. In general, the initials at the start of a chapter that has been illustrated by a miniature are slightly larger (height: 7 lines) than the initials at the beginning of the other chapters (average height: 5-6 lines). The extent of the pen decoration varies according to the position of the initial in the column (top – middle – bottom). Additionally, initials that follow an illustration have been decorated more elaborately. Chapters 1-17 have been internally structured by means of rubricated paragraph signs (rounded). The first lombard letter (red ink, general height: 3 lines) appears in chapter 18. It is noteworthy that the situation in the French manuscript Bes is identical. Semi-paragraph signs (triangular) are less frequent. Since they also follow
lombard letters, they do not seem to be subordinate to the rounded paragraph signs. As both variants appear throughout chapters and quires, the distribution does not appear to be artist-related. Paragraph signs as well as semi-paragraph signs mark the presence of temporal adjuncts, changes of speaker and developments in the narrative. It does seem, however, that (apart from chapter 1-17, obviously) paragraph signs and semi-paragraph are subordinate to lombard letters, the latter demarcating larger portions of text. At the syntactic level, whole sentences as well as subclauses start with a *littera notabilior* that has been highlighted with a dash of red ink.

**Rubrication**

Some of the features that have been executed in rubric have already been discussed above: chapter headings, lombard letters, (semi-)paragraph signs and the pen decoration of the pen flourished initials at the beginning of a chapter. Rubric has also been used for the foliation at the top of the folio. Occasionally rubric is used for corrections. The letters at the start of a clause have been highlighted by a vertical dash of red ink through the letter; roman numerals have been underscored in rubric. Rubric has also been employed for the execution of line fillers at the end of chapter headings and at the close of a chapter. In the list of rubrics, the lines of writing have been filled out with a fine line of red ink.

**Decoration**

Most of the decorative elements in the manuscript have been discussed above. Nevertheless, the pen flourishing of the initial letters deserves some additional attention. The pen decoration has been characterised as belonging to the mask type. This type of pen flourishing is a characteristic variant of the thorn-and-stitch type. In addition to general characteristics that are applicable to all variants of the latter type (rims with pearls and small thorns, lines with stitches crossing over, horizontal radiations at the initial and nerved leaves at both ends of the decoration), in mask flourishing, grotesques frequently decorate the curls of the vines. Examples of masks that frequently appear in the manuscript are a bearded man (‘beardie’) (e.g. fol. 2 r., 6 r., 7 v., 10 r., etc.), a gargoyle (14 v.) and a dog’s head (e.g. 53 v., 161 r., 177 v.). The type of ‘beardie’, the ‘Haarlem’ thorns,

---

small hash-like rectangular shapes and striped triangular wedges locate the decoration in Haarlem. Small guide letters (in ink), which in numerous cases are still visible, informed the decorator of which letter should be painted in.

**Illustration**

The text has been illustrated with nine miniatures, which cover about half of the justification. Nevertheless, the dimensions of the illustrations vary quite a bit. The width of the drawings is generally ca. 200-205 mm. The height fluctuates between 105 mm (fol. 361 v. naval battle before La Rochelle) and 173 mm (fol. 1 r. initial miniature). Each miniature has a coloured frame of circa 4 mm. The frame of the frontispiece is scarlet (fol. 1), the frames of the other miniatures are brownish (fol. 62 r.; 88 r.; 282 v; 296 v.; 315 v.; 349 v.; 359 r.; 361 v.). Anne Korteweg has suggested that two artists have executed the illustration. The first of these illustrators painted the initial miniature. His less accomplished colleague or apprentice tended to the other miniatures. Indeed, the miniatures in the manuscript have not been executed as carefully as the frontispiece. Whether this is due to the craftsmanship of different artists or is a matter of different levels of execution employed by the same illustrator remains to be answered. In any event, the similarities in countenance, attire and posture of the characters in the initial miniature and the miniature on folio 315 v. are noteworthy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 1 r.</td>
<td>Opening miniature, multiple scenes content differs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 62 r.</td>
<td>Battle of Aljubarrota.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 88 r.</td>
<td>Battle between the count of Najera, the army of Hungary and Murad I of Turkey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 282 v.</td>
<td>The embassy of the duchess of Brabant to the king of France.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 296 v.</td>
<td>The siege of Montferrat Pierrot le Bernoys surrenders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 315 v.</td>
<td>The duke of Brittany welcomes the lord of Coucy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 349 v.</td>
<td>The battle of Otterburn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 359 r.</td>
<td>The duke of Guelders surrenders to the king of France.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 361 v.</td>
<td>Naval battle before La Rochelle between the English (count of Arundel) and the French.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 Hülsmann 2009, 117-120.
4 Korteweg 1980, 183.
The miniatures have been distributed unevenly over the manuscript. As a result, there is a large concentration of illustrated scenes at the end of the manuscript. This situation is a reflection of the distribution in the translation’s French exemplar.

Distinctive features of the composition of the miniatures are the use of small shrubbery as elements of the décor, which probably echoes the style of the Boethius Master, who probably illustrated the translation’s exemplar. Additionally, apart from the miniature on fol. 88 r., the heraldry in the manuscript is relatively faithful. The latter characteristic should be attributed to the illustrator of H21 or one of his predecessors. In general, the depicted characters’ facial expressions are rather blank. By contrast, their gestures are open and expressive.

**Dating and localisation**

Ca.1450, North-Holland (decorated at Haarlem, Saint Anthony Orchard?)

A number of features confirm a dating of circa 1450. Elements of the dress depicted in the miniatures (the short houppelande with wide shoulders and narrow hip, chaperons with long streamers) point towards the middle of the fifteenth century. This is confirmed by the presence of mask flourishing, which had its heyday circa 1450. Additionally, the watermark in the paper also occurs in paper that was used for correspondence during negotiations between emissaries of Holland and representatives of the Teutonic Order in 1445.\(^5\) The localisation has been based on the pen decoration, which has been found in manuscripts from Amsterdam and Haarlem. The particular subtype of mask flourishing found in H21 should probably be located at Haarlem, possibly at the Third Order convent of Saint Anthony Orchard.

**History of the manuscript**

In 1564, the manuscript was owned by Nicolas of Bronchorst, canon of the chapter of Saint-Pancras, which was attached to the court chapel of Oostvoorne (cf. parchment pasted onto the recto side of the third flyleaf, pastedown not included). H21 can possibly be identified with the manuscript that was auctioned at Peter Leffen’s on 30 November 1666.

\(^5\) Joachim and Hubatsch 1948-1950, 570.
According to an annotation on the cover of the Paris copy of the sales catalogue, the books that were put up for auction belonged to the famous bibliophile Isaac Vossius.\(^6\) A note on the pastedown at the back of the manuscript (129 BILett, possibly referring to the 127 decorated initials at the start of each chapter) may suggest that the codex has been valued for auction. In any event, during the eight-day sale of Sotheby’s starting on 28 February 1825, the manuscript was auctioned as lot 1332 of the collection of John Rendorp (b. 1728 – d. 1792), mayor of Amsterdam and lord of Marquette.\(^7\) Although difficult to distinguish, this number is possibly still visible on the fourth flyleaf. At the auction, Sotheby’s colleague, Thomas Thorpe acquired the manuscript. The latter then sold it to Sir Thomas Phillipps (bookplate on fourth flyleaf) along with amongst other manuscripts a *Ceremonie Boek van Holland* and a copy of the *Spiegel Historiae* (now Leyden, University Library, BPL 1291), also originating from Rendorp’s collection.\(^8\) The indication in English ‘Froissart’s Chronicles by G. Potter – Belgicé’, which has been pasted on the first flyleaf as well as the gilded title on the spine was probably put there on Phillipps’ behalf. In 1888, the government of The Netherlands acquired the manuscript from Phillipps’ estate.\(^9\) The codex was first kept at Utrecht, subsequently lent to J.W. Muller at the University of Leyden and was finally transferred to the Royal Library (Koninklijke Bibliotheek) at The Hague in 1889 (cf. annotation on second flyleaf 1889/4; stamps on recto side of fourth flyleaf and on fol. 376 v.; the reference Y444 on the pastedown at the back of the manuscript is an old shelfnumber of the Royal Library). In his partial edition of the Leyden manuscripts (1898), Napoleon de Pauw refers to the codex as the ‘Amsterdamsch Hs’, which is probably erroneous.

**Owner’s / user’s marks in the manuscript**

**Spine:**
- Froissart’s Cronyke G. Potter van der Loo vertaalt
- Froissart’s Chronicles by G. Potter – Belgicé (gilded)
- 2639 (shelfmark Phillipps)

**Pastedown:**
- List of individuals who have consulted the manuscript in the Royal Library
  - 1937: Dr. W. de Vreese
  - 1948: F. De Tollenaere
  - 1962: G.I. Lieftinck
  - 1987: F.P. van Oostrom

---

\(^6\) Leffen 1666, lot 9.

\(^7\) Sotheby’s 1825, 66.

\(^8\) Phillipps and Munby 1968, 31.

\(^9\) S. Fz. Muller 1889, 120; Muller 1889, 264.
1988/1991: James Marrow
1999: Peter Ainsworth
1999: G. Croenen

Flyleaf 1 r.: Froissart’s Chronicles by G. Potter Belgicé (small piece of paper, pasted in)
Flyleaf 1 v.: tracing of modern watermark (GA)
Flyleaf 2 r.: tracing of contramark
Flyleaf 2 v.: annotation 1889/4 A/525
Flyleaf 3 r.: piece of parchment pasted on flyleaf: ‘Claes van Bronchorst Canonick te Voirne anno XVè vier ende zestich naert gemeen scrijven. Amor vincit omnia’. Two lines of writing have been rendered illegible, even under UV light.
Flyleaf 4 r.: 130 B 21 (shelfnumber Royal Library)
‘7 miniatures in this volume’ (in pencil; erroneous: the manuscript has nine miniatures).
Bookplate Phillipps + shelfnumber ‘2639’ + 1332? (number is difficult to read)
Stamp Royal Library
Flyleaf 4 v.: ‘Froissaard is gheboren te Valenchien p 28 infra’ (16th-17th cy?; cf. spine?)
Fol. 1 r.: ‘MCCCLXXXV up eenen zaterdags doe wesende ons liefsvrouwdach te halfsooste’ (cf. Flyleaf 4 v.?)
Fol. 1 r. – VIII v.: Modern page numbers have been added (roman numerals)
Fol. 376 v. ‘Dese Potters vander Loo sijn voortijt s besitters geweest van de hofstede de Loo even buyten Voorburgh. Siet Sim. van Leeuwen in sijn boe k genaamt Costumen etc. van het Baljuws. der lande van Rijnland p. 27.’ (17th-18th cy?)
Fol. 376 v. Stamp Royal Library
Pastedown Y 444 (former shelfmark of Royal Library)
129 BIlett (annotation of auctioneer?)
Throughout the second half of the manuscript a modern hand has added references to the corresponding pages in the edition of Kervyn de Lettenhove.

Binding

A sixteenth-century binding (410 x 285 x 90 mm) of wooden boards (partially visible through the damaged leather), covered with tanned calfskin leather, protects the book-block. The edges of the boards have been bevelled at the inner side. The book-block has been sewn onto five chords, which appear as five ribs on the spine. The quires have been attached to the chords using six stitches, the thread passing through each sewing hole twice. The leather has been blind-tooled with a line pattern constituting five concentric frames, each of which has its own decoration (tooling or hand-stamp). A diamond-pattern has been tooled in the middle. This pattern is surrounded by a motif of curls and vines. The most interesting framework, however, is the frame consisting of two alternating hand-
stamps. Both stamps portray male heads in profile. Similar stamps can be found on the binding of the Kattendijke-chronicle. The outer frame has been decorated with a leaf pattern. Originally, the manuscript could be closed by means of two clasps. The upper clasp has now been lost. The leather attachment is still present. The remaining clasp has been decorated with pineapple and star motifs. The fore-edge of the book-block has been painted azur.

_Literature_

*Bibliotheca Neerlandica Manuscripta.*

Korteweg 1980, 183.

Lieftinck 1962, 3.
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2. Leyden, University Library, Bibliotheca Publica Latina, MS 3 I & II (*Le3-1* and *Le3-2*)

Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 3 I & II

Both codices are – in part – the work of the same scribe (and possibly also decorator). Hence, the two manuscripts will be treated here together. Differences between the manuscripts will be made apparent in the description.

_Contents_

BPL 3 I fol. 1 r. – 176 r.: Jean Froissart, _Chroniques_, Book Two (SHF, II § 83-499)

Middle Dutch translation by Gerard Potter van der Loo

Partially edited by N. de Pauw (1898).

*Incipit*

_Hier beginnet dat anderden volumen heren Jan Frotsairts, canonnic ende tresorier des colegies tot Symays in Henegouwen, dat inhout ende begrijpt van die nyeue oirlogen gevallen in Vranekrijk, in Engelant, in Scotlant, in Spangen, in Vlaenderen, in Ytalian,
in Romen ende in Romenyen, in Neapels, in Poelgen, in Calabren, in Sevylgen, in
Pointingael ende in anderen landen ende hoeken des werelts gelijken gij dat inden
nagescriften hier in desen buec vinden sult.

GHij hebt wel hier voir gehoirt inden anderden boeke des eersten volumens heren Jan
Frotssarts hoe doe here van Mucident hem keerde (...)

*Explicit*

(...) ende die zegelen onsen voriseide steden an dese jeenwoirdige zoenebrieve doen hangen
die gemaict ende gegeven sijn binnen der stede van Doirnicke den XVIII\textsuperscript{en} dach der maent
decembrijs in jair ons Heren duysent driehondert vive ende tachtich

*Colophon*

Hier nint einde dat eerste boeck vanden anderden volumene heren Jan Frossairts cronyke
getranslateert uuten Franssoyse in Duytscher tale bij Gerijt Potter vander Loo

BPL 3 II fol. 1 r. 263 r.: Jean Froissart, *Chroniques*, Book Three
Middle Dutch translation by Gerard Potter van der Loo

*Incipit*

_Hoe hem here Jan Froissaert nairntstelijken dede informeren ende ondersochte hoe die
oirlogen spruytende uut der cronen van Franckrijke gevoert ende gehantiert hadden
geweest_

[IJC hebbe zere lange gerust ende ghetoeft te scriven ende te openbaren vanden zaken ende
hantieringen van den verden landen (...)_

*Explicit*

(...) ende so sal ict hem te lieve ende ter eren gairme onthouden ende vallen voirt te voirschijn
bringen ende voirt alle andere geschiede dingen ende materien die van my int wair vernomen
sullen worden zeder dat slot van desen vier boeke gemaict ende gesloten wesende dair ic my
gairme toe geven wil om dat alle ten besten te vernemen
APPENDIX C

Colophon

Hier nimt eynde dat [anderde volumene] meyster Jan Frossairts c[ronyke getransla]teert uuten Franssoyse in onser Duyscher tongen bij Gerijt Potter vander Loo ende is dat vierde boecke in Duystsche

Scribal Colophon

Dit boecke is gescreven bij handen Jan Heynrick Paedssenz. ende is <geeydet> geeyndet in jair ons heren Xtit ende lxx upten xxviid dach in januario

Material

The writing support used in both codices is paper. BPL 3 I consists of paper with one watermark (further referred to as watermark ‘A’): the letter ‘y’, with cross above, tail consisting of two lines, with cloverleaf, not tangent to the chainline, left and right vertical stroke separated, descender on the right vertical stroke, (height: 70 mm; distance between chainlines: 40 mm). This watermark also appears in BPL 3 II. Three other watermarks appear in the latter manuscript. The first one represents three lilies in a shield with a crown above (watermark ‘B’, height: 85 mm; distance between chainlines: 40 mm). The second is the uncial letter ‘m’ consisting of two lines, which is apparently an older motif (watermark ‘C’, height: 38 mm; distance between the chainlines: 20 mm). The third watermark, the letter ‘p’ (watermark ‘D’) consisting of two lines, left and right vertical stroke separated, descender in the right vertical stroke, with bifurcated tail appears in the flyleaves (watermark ‘D’, height: 60 mm; distance between chainlines: 32 mm). Watermark ‘A’ is used in quires 1 to 3 of BPL 3 II, ‘B’ occurs in quires 3 to 6, ‘C’ in quires 6 to 20. Watermarks ‘A’ and ‘B’ reappear in quires 20-22. The paper with watermark ‘C’ is lighter, more transparent and feltier. Apart from some small imperfections in the paper, stains (BPL 3 I fol. 4 v., on fol. 31 v. and 32 r.), blots of ink (BPL 3 II fol. 2 r., 61 r.), damage caused by moisture (BPL II fol. 48, 59, 212, 213) and small tears (corner of BPL 3 II fol. 263) both codices – after having been restored and rebound in 1995 – are in good condition.
Number of pages and foliation

BPL 3 I consists of 176 foliums with contemporary foliation in red ink (top of the recto side of each folio, in the middle). Modern foliation (in arabic numerals) has been added in the top right-hand corner of the recto side of each folio. An error has occurred in the original foliation. Folio 135 has been erroneously foliated CXXV. Since the foliator has not noticed his mistake, all the following folios have been marked with a wrong number. BPL 3 II has 264 foliums, which have not been foliated.

Collation and quire marks

BPL 3 I opens with three flyleaves and ends with two endpapers. The actual text is copied onto eighteen quires, in general regular quinions, covering 176 foliums. The quires have been marked with bifoliums signatures, which take the form of two letters, the first of which refers to the quire and the second to the position of the bifolium in that quire (e.g. ‘ab’ is the first folium of the first quire, ‘ac’ is the second folium of the first quire, etc., ‘bc’ is the first folium of the second quire, etc., ‘cd’ is the first folium of the third quire). Catchwords appear at the end of the first four quires (which were copied by scribe A, cf. infra).

Collation originally (flyleaves and endpapers not included): 1-2^{10} 3^6 4-18^{10}
BPL 3 II opens with two flyleaves and ends with three endpapers. The text is copied onto twenty-two quires, most of which are regular sexternions, and covers 263 foliums. The quires have been marked with bifolium signatures, which are a combination of a letter and a number. The letter identifies the quire, whereas the number refers to the position of the bifolium in the quire. As is the case in BPL 3 I, quire marks do not occur in each quire indicating that the edges of the foliums have been cut. The tenth quire has been marked in a similar fashion, but in this quire the second half of the bifolium has also been marked.

Collation originally (flyleaves and endpapers not included): $1^{10+1}$ 2-20$^{12}$ 21$^{14}$ 22$^{12}$ of which 21$^{14}$ and 22$^{12}$ are wanting (not constituting text loss). $1^{10}$ has been added to the quire.

**Dimensions**

The current dimensions of the foliums in the manuscripts are:

- BPL 3 I: ca. 395 x 288 mm
- BPL 3 II: ca. 390 x 275 mm

The absence of quire marks in some of the quires, the relative positioning of the foliation to the edge of the folio in BPL 3 I and corrections that have been cut (e.g. BPL 3 I, fol. 79 v.; BPL 3 II fol. 18 r.) suggest that the edges of the paper have been trimmed after copying.

**Ruling-pattern**

The frames of the column have been ruled in ink. In some instances, the prickings at the head of columns (star-shaped holes or small cuts) are still discernible. The justification is ca. 270-275 mm x 195 mm. Both manuscripts have been ruled for two columns of 80 and 85 mm of 50 (beginning of BPL 3 I) to 60 (second part of BPL 3 I and BPL 3 II) lines. The space between the columns is 30 mm. There is no ruling for the individual lines of writing.

**Script**

BPL 3 I has been written in two hands. The change in hands occurs at folio 41 recto between lines 21 and 22 of column A. As from line 19 the colour of the ink becomes
lighter. It darkens again from line 22. The first part of the codex was written by the anonymous scribe A. The rest of the manuscript is copied in a second hand, belonging to John Hendriksz. Paeds. He has also transcribed the text of Book Three in BPL 3 II. In the colophon of this manuscript, Paeds reveals his name, together with the date on which he finished his transcription (26 January 1470). Both hands are examples of cursiva script. The hand of scribe A is neat, well legible and its level of execution can be categorised as libraria. Paeds’ writing tends to be sloppier and the pages written in his hand give a compressed impression. Although the handwriting is very legible, one could argue that it leans more towards a currens level of execution, certainly when compared to hand A. One of the distinctive features of Paeds’ hand is the fine curved hairline at the end of the headstroke of the letter ‘t’ in final position. The slightly curved descenders of the letters ‘s’ and ‘f’ further distinguish Paeds’ writing from his anonymous colleague’s. The change in hands is also marked by the introduction of the virgula (rubricated in BPL 3 I). The form of the letter ‘d’ in the second part of BPL 3 I (looped) and BPL 3 II (not looped) is different. The correspondence between other letter forms, however, suggests that the transcriptions are the work of the same scribe: John Hendriksz. Paeds.
Abbreviations

BPL 3 I fol. 1 – fol. 41 r. a

Superscript vowel: e.g. fol. 8 r. g⁸ve: grave

~: e.g. fol. 5 r. nimermeer: nimmermeer; mogelike: mogelik; fol. 32 r. zwemen: zwemmen; but also fol. 3 r. eñ: ende and fol. 2 v. coñ: coninc

⁹: e.g. fol. 3 r. h⁹toge: hertoge

⁹: e.g. fol. 7 r. ald⁹: aldus

⁹: e.g. fol. 3 r. des⁹: desen; fol. 6 r. scild⁹: scilden; fol. 1 r. voirs⁹: voirseiden

p: e.g. fol. 35 r. plement: pairlement

4: e.g. fol. 5 v. franckr⁴: franckrijke; fol. 7 r. macht⁴: machten

BPL 3 I fol. 41 r. a – fol. 176 r.; BPL 3 II

Superscript vowel: e.g. BPL 3 I fol. 52 r. g⁸ve: grave; BPL 3 II fol. 2 v.: g⁸ve: grave

~: e.g. BPL 3 I fol. 49 r. Wille: Willem; eñ: ende; BPL 3 II fol. 15 r. pëningë: penningen

⁹: e.g. BPL 3 I fol. 49 r. vand⁹: vander; BPL 3 II fol. 15 r. d⁹: dair

⁹: e.g. BPL 3 I fol. 53 r. ald⁹: aldus;

d⁹: e.g. BPL 3 I fol. 53 r. des⁹: desen; BPL 3 II fol. 15 r. guld⁹: gulden

p: e.g. BPL 3 I fol. 51 v. psy: Persy

b: e.g. BPL 3 I fol 52 r. btangen: Bertangen; BPL 3 II fol. 150 r.: btangen: Bertangen.

h: e.g. BPL 3 I fol. 52 r. htoge: hertoge; BPL 3 II fol. 14 v.: htoge: hertoge.
4: e.g. BPL 3 I fol. 51 v. francker: franckrijke; BPL 3 II fol. 7 r.: francker: franckrijke; BPL 3 II fol. 81 r. ontfing: ontfing

John Hendriksz. Paeds, the scribe of this part of the text, uses the abbreviation far less frequently than his anonymous colleague.

**Corrections**

**BPL 3 I fol. 1 – fol. 41 r. a**

Addition:
- supralinear addition: e.g. fol. 29 r. clairlijken: clairlijken \(<+ende> wartachtijken\)

Deletion
- Strikethrough: e.g. fol. 19 v. poinen: <-poinen> pointen

**BPL 3 I fol. 41 r. a – fol. 176 r.; BPL 3 II**

Addition
- Supralinear addition: e.g. BPL 3 II fol. 82 r. dair: dair \(<+toe> quam\)

Starshaped sign with addition in the margin:
- e.g. BPL 3 II fol. 79 v. *niet geselscape* ende met noch ande: geselscamppe \(<+niet> met noch andere\)

+ sign, with addition in the lower margin:
- e.g. BPL 3 II fol. 88 r. ende men niet: + en enn
  - ende men nie: <-en> vernam dat.

Deletion
- Strikethrough (rubric): e.g. BPL 3 II fol. 15 r. penningen: penningen huyden upth dach die sijn sijn bij hi sprac we: he Jan geloofes zeker hij heeft d' guld, peninge huyde: penningen: <-huyden uppen> dach die sijn sijn bij hem sprac weder here Jan geloofes zeker hij heeft dair gulden penningen.
Sometimes correction also in rubric, e.g. BPL 3 II fol 79 r.

Structure

BPL 3 I opens with a large blue initial G (height: 12 lines), the eye of which has been decorated with ornamental floral design. The initial is further highlighted with rubricated pen flourishings. At the opening of BPL 3 II space (height: 8 lines) has been left for a similar initial that has never been executed. Rubricated headings divide the text into chapters. Every chapter opens with an initial in rubric. In these initials decorative geometrical or abstract patterns have been left blank. Generally, these initials are 6-8 lines in height. After the change in hands on BPL 3 I, folio 41 r., the initials become smaller (3-4 lines in height) and the decoration disappears. Except for their height, nothing distinguishes these letters from the lombard letters that internally structure the chapters. In this portion of the text, the lombard letters are 2 lines in height (as opposed to 4-5 lines in the portion transcribed by the anonymous scribe A). Larger initials (5-7 lines in height, sometimes decorated, but not always) reappear as from BPL 3 I, folio 96 r. The initials in BPL 3 II are of the same size, but generally poorly executed in a style imitating the decorative style of BPL 3 I. One feature, which further distinguishes the initials of BPL 3 I and II, is the herringbone pattern in the I-initials of the latter manuscript (e.g. fol. 12 v; 64 r.). Both initials and lombard letters have been indicated with guide letters (sometimes in rubric; BPL 3 II: black ink). Paragraphs have been further divided into smaller sections using rounded paragraph signs (rubric). The difference in design of the paragraph signs adds to the impression that another, less accomplished artist has decorated BPL 3 II. The opening of a sentence has been highlighted with a dash of rubric. In BPL 3 II, only letters occurring after an initial, lombard letter and paragraph sign have been highlighted in this fashion.

Rubrication

Apart from the items mentioned above (pen flourishing, chapter headings, lombard letters, paragraph signs, guide letters) rubric has also been used for foliation (BPL 3 I), line fillers (BPL 3 I), the virgula (BPL 3 I), strikethrough correction (BPL 3 I and II) and the underscoring of numbers and amounts.
Decoration

The decorative elements of both codices have been sufficiently discussed in the previous paragraphs. Differences in the decoration of BPL 3 I and BPL 3 II (absence of line fillers in BPL 3 II, design of paragraph signs, different level of execution, other decorative motifs) suggest that the decorative elements of both codices have not been executed by the same artist.

Illustration

In their preparation of the layout of BPL 3 I and II, the scribes have allowed for illustration. While copying the text, spaces for miniatures with a width of one or two columns have been left vacant. BPL 3 I has sixteen open spaces, BPL 3 II has eleven (cf. infra). The height of the blank areas varies between 1/3 and 2/3 of the height of a column. However, the illustration has never been added. It is possible that, at some point, paintings or woodcuts were pasted in (cf. residue of glue on BPL 3 I fol. 121 r.). It is not certain whether or not all of the open spaces have been left blank intentionally. The full page opening on BPL 3 I, fol. 23 v. may be due to scribal error. Another (later?) hand has added the word ‘niet’ (‘not’). Similarly, in the open space on BPL 3 II fol. 59 r., the word ‘nichil’ (‘nothing’) has been added. Scratches have been drawn over the blank area as well as over the corresponding white space on the verso side of the folio. Possibly, in this instance the spaces were left blank to avoid writing on a section of the folio that had been damaged by moisture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Description of scene that was meant to be illustrated</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 4 v.</td>
<td>The fleet of the count of Salisbury</td>
<td>Two columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 11 r.</td>
<td>Jan Yoens</td>
<td>Right column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 16 r.</td>
<td>The Whitecaps in kill the sheriff</td>
<td>Two columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 17 v.</td>
<td>Twelve burghers of Ghent negotiate with the count.</td>
<td>Two columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Whitecaps burn the count’s castle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 21 v.</td>
<td>Death of Jan Yoens / Uprising of the cities of Flanders/</td>
<td>Two columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The siege of Oudenaarde</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 23 v.</td>
<td>The assault at Oudenaarde; the peace between the count and</td>
<td>Full page??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the people of Flanders ??</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 27 r.</td>
<td>Shipwreck of the English envoys sent to the duke of</td>
<td>Two columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brittany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 31 r.</td>
<td>Submission of Oudenaarde</td>
<td>Two columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 40 r.</td>
<td>The English burn down the Champagne region</td>
<td>Two columns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Description of scene that was meant to be illustrated</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 54 r.</td>
<td>The siege of Nantes</td>
<td>Left column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 73 r.</td>
<td>Peasants’ revolt / The burghers at London</td>
<td>Left column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 96 r.</td>
<td>The victory of Ghent against the count and Bruges</td>
<td>Left column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 110 v.</td>
<td>Battle on a bridge (near Comines)</td>
<td>Left column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 120 v.</td>
<td>Battle of Rosebeke</td>
<td>Right column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 121 r.</td>
<td>Assault on Ypres</td>
<td>Two columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 134 v.</td>
<td>Joan of Brabant and Isabel of Bavaria</td>
<td>Two columns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**- blank areas in BPL 3 I -**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Description of scene that was meant to be illustrated</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 1 r.</td>
<td>Opening miniature, multiple scenes content differs</td>
<td>Two columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 49 r.</td>
<td>Battle of Aljubarrota</td>
<td>Two columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 59 r.?</td>
<td>Siege of Brest??</td>
<td>Left column??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 59 v.?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Right column??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 68 r.</td>
<td>Battle between the count of Najera ,the army of Hungary and Murad I of Turkey</td>
<td>Right column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 202 r.</td>
<td>The embassy of the duchess of Brabant to the king of France</td>
<td>Two columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 212 r.</td>
<td>The siege of Montferrat. Pierrot le Bernoys surrenders</td>
<td>Left column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 223 r.</td>
<td>The duke of Brittany welcomes the lord of Coucy</td>
<td>Right column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 244 v.</td>
<td>The battle of Otterburn</td>
<td>Two columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 251 r.</td>
<td>The duke of Guelders surrenders to the king of France</td>
<td>Two columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 253 r.</td>
<td>Naval battle before la Rochelle</td>
<td>Two columns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**- blank areas in BPL 3 II -**

**Dating and localisation**

1470, Leyden

The scribal colophon of BPL 3 II (fol. 263 r.) informs us that John Hendriksz. Paeds finished his copy on 26 January 1470.

_Dit boecke is gescreven bij handen Jan Heynrick Paedszenz. ende is 〈-geeydet〉 geeyndet in jair ons heren XIII† ende lxx upten XXVI† dach in januario_

(This book was written by John Hendriksz. Paeds and was finished in the year of our Lord 1470 on the 26th day of January)

The scribe John Hendriksz Paeds should probably be identified with an eponymous draper, who was alderman and mayor of Leyden in approximately the same period (third
quarter of the fifteenth century). Therefore it is within reason to assume that the
manuscript has been copied in Leyden (and not The Hague as has been put forward by
Gumbert 1988).

History of the manuscripts

Some elements such as an alpha-like mark, which is found in the vicinity of initials and
lombard letters, the word ‘niet’ (‘not’) in the margins, scratches (blind corrections) in the
text and blind crosses in the margins may suggest that the manuscripts have been prepared
for print at the end of the fifteenth or in the first half of the sixteenth century. The
manuscript was acquired by Leyden University Library between 1623 and 1640 (stamp
ACAD.LUGD: BPL 3 I fol. 1 r., fol. BPL 3 II: flyleaf, fol. 2 r., fol. 263 r.; fol. 11 r.
annotation: ‘dit hoort aen de biblioteeck pub’). The annotation ‘N°4’ on BPL 3 I fol. 1 r.
and BPL 3 II fol. 264 v. possibly refers to an old shelfnumber.

BPL 3 I, on the first flyleaf:

Bibliotheca Publica [Latina]
Codex N°3
Vol. 1um 176 foliorum

Pasted in, catalogue description (catalogus 1716):

Chronica rerum in Gallia, & aliis regionibus gestarum, auctore Johanne Froissarto, in
Belgicum sermonem translate by Gerrit Potter vander Loo, geschreven by handen Jan
Heynrick Paedssen, in jair ons Heren XIIIe ende LXX upten XXVIe dach in Januario. In charta
per columnas. 3

Written:

De hocce codice cf.: Oeuvres de Froissart publiées…par M. le baron Kervyn de Lettenhove, tom. 12e-3e
parties (1873). Pag. 455. Ubi per errorum codicis numerus citatur 324 et in membrane scriptus codex
perhibetur.

Codex totus photographice depictus 1950 viaprilis.
APPENDIX C

BPL 3 I has been consulted by:

1889 J.W. Muller
1889/1897 N. de Pauw
1906 C. van de Putte
1935/1937 Willem de Vreese
1991 J. Marrow

BPL 3 II on the flyleaf:

Bibliotheca Publica Latina
N° 3. II
263 foliorum

Jan Froissart’s Cronyke getranslateert uten Franssoyse door Gerijt Potter van der Loo het vierde boeck

Binding

The manuscripts were restored in 1995 by Schrijen bookbinders and restorers (Nieuwstadt, The Netherlands). At this time the book-blocks were bound in modern cream coloured bindings.

Literature

Bibliotheca Neerlandica Manuscripta.
Gumbert 1988, 142.
Gumbert 2009, 14.
Lieftinck 1962.
Muller 1889, 266.
De Pauw 1898.
3. Besançon, Municipal Library, MS 864-865 (Bes 1 and Bes 2)
Besançon, Bibliothèque d’Étude et de conservation, MS 864 -865

The following description is a brief summary of the findings of Castan (1865) and Croenen (in Ainsworth and Croenen 2007). For a detailed analysis of the manuscripts, I refer the reader to their respective studies.

Contents

MS 864 Fol. 1 r. – IX v.: list of rubrics

Incipit

Ci commencent lez rubriches du premier volume des croniques que fist sire Jehan Froissart (…)

Explicit

De la paix qui fut faitte entre le roy d’Espaigne et le roy de Navarre, et de la mort du roy Henry d’Espagne et du couronnement de Jehan, son filz ainsné IIIF IIIXIII XVIII

MS 864 Fol. 1 r. – 399 v.: Jean Froissart, Chroniques
Book One; Book Two (SHF II § 1-82)

Incipit

Cy commencent les croniques que fist sire Jehan Froissart lesquelles parlent des nouvelles guerres de France, d’Angleterre, d’Escoce, d’Espaigne et de Bretaigne, don’t le premier chapitre fait mention de la cause pourquoi elles sont faites, et les noms des seigneurs qui ont esté es besoingnes

AFin que honourables avenues et nobles aventures (…)
Explicit

(...) et le roy Jehan de Castille qui dura moult longuement si comme vous orrés recorder avant en l’istore

Colophon

Cy fine le premier volume des croniques sire Jehan Froissart

MS 865 Fol. 1 r. – IX v.: list of rubrics

Incipit

Ci commencent les rubriches du second volume des croniques de sire Jehan Froissart

Explicit

Comment certains traiteurs et saiges himmes pourparlerent et prindrent unes trieves a durer trios ans entre les François et les Anglois et tous leurs allies tant d’une partie comme d’autre par mer et par terre aussi CCC. LI

Colophon

Ci finent les rubriches du second volume des croniques sire Jehan Froissart

MS 865 Fol. 1 r. – 200 v.: Jean Froissart, Chroniques, Book Two (SHF II § 83-499)

Incipit

Cy commence le second volume de sire Jehan Froissart qui contient les nouvelles guerres de France, d’Engleterre, d’Escoce, d’Espaigne, de Flandres et d’Ytalie et de plusieurs autres parties du monde

Vous avez bien oý cy dessus recorder (…)

288
Explicit

(... l’an de grace mil trois cens quatre vins et cinq

Colophon

Ci commence le tiers volume de sire Jehan Froissart

MS 865 Fol. 201 r. – 451 v.: Jean Froissart, Chroniques,

Book Three

Incipit

Comment sire Jehan Froissart en querroit diligemment comment les guerres s’estoient portees part toutes les parties de France

JE me suis longuement tenu a parler (...)

Explicit

(...) et pour l’amour de luy je y entendray et de toutes choses ci advenues depuis ce tier livre clos, je m’enfourmeray voulentiers

Colophon

¶ Explicit le second volume des croniques maistre Jehan Froissart, et le tiers aussi, le quel commence en la fin de la guerre de Flandres et de la chartre de la paix que le duc de Bourgoigne et la duchesse donnerent, accorderent et seellerent a ceulx de Gand en la cite et ville de Tournay, comme maistre Jehan Froissart meismes tesmoingne en ce livre au feuillet CCCLXXVIIme. Et commence le tiers volume au feuillet CCf

Material

Both codices have been made up of good quality parchment. The edges have been trimmed at the moment of rebinding. In some instances, the parchment has been repaired (pieces of parchment that have been pasted onto the foliums).
Number of pages and foliation

MS 864 consists of 412 foliums; MS 865 has 464 foliums. A table of contents that covers nine foliums precedes the actual text in both manuscripts. Foliation (in Roman numerals, in rubric) has been added in a contemporary hand. Several errors have occurred in the foliation of MS 865.

Collation and quire marks

No contemporary quire marks survive. Catchwords have been added at the bottom of the verso-side of the last folio of each quire. The vast majority of the gatherings are regular quaternions. However, a small number of quires (typically the quires with the table of contents and the last quire of the manuscript) diverge from this pattern.

MS 864: $1^8, 2-15^8, 16^2, 17-18^4, 19-53^8, 54^{2-1}$
MS 865: $1^8, 2-15^8, 16^{8+1}, 17-57^8, 58^6$

Dimensions

MS 864: 360 x 277 mm
MS 865: 351 x 282 mm

Ruling-pattern

The justification of MS 864 is 250 x 187 mm. The manuscript has been ruled for writing in two columns (81 and 85 mm, interspace 22 mm). The justification of MS 865 is 249 x 186 mm. The manuscript has also been ruled for writing in two columns (78 and 86 mm, interspace 22 mm). The columns have been ruled for 41 lines of writing (average height: 6 mm). Ruling in plummet. The prickings that delineate the writing space are still visible.
CODICOLOGICAL DESCRIPTIONS

Script

The script of both volumes is a cursiva libraria. The text has been copied by six principal scribes. The handwriting of some of these scribes has also been found in other codices that have been produced under the direction of the Parisian libraire Pierre de Liffol.

Scribe B: MS 864, quires 2 – 15, quire 16 (fol. 1 r. – 114 v.); also P63
Scribe D: MS 864, quires 17 – 20 (fol. 115 r. – 138 v.); rubrics: scribe E
Scribe B: MS 864, quires 21 – 29 (fol. 139 r. – 206 r./208 v.)
Scribe D: MS 864, quires 29 – 54 (fol. 206 r./208 v. – 399 v.)
Scribe F: MS 865, quires 2 – 7 (fol. 1 r. – 48 v.)
Scribe C: MS 865, quires 8 – 26 (fol. 49 r. – 200 v.); also P64 and Sto
Scribe G: MS 865; quire 27 – 36 (fol. 201 r. – 280 v.)
Scribe C: MS 865; quire 37 – 58 (fol. 281 r. – 451 v.)

Another anonymous hand (possibly the libraire) has indicated the placement of miniatures by copying a portion of text. Other scribes have collaborated in copying the tables of content and the folio numbers.

Structure

The text is divided into chapters by means of rubricated headings. In general, the internal structure of these chapters becomes apparent from the use of relatively small champ initials (height, 2-4 lines) and rounded paragraph signs. The initials that accompany miniatures are generally decorated and larger in size. Nevertheless, the height of these decorated letters varies between scribes and even within the portions of text copied by one scribe. The decoration of the large initials in MS 864 and MS 865 displays stylistic differences. The initials in MS 864 have been decorated with ornamental vines and leaves (blue and red on a gilded background). MS 865 has two types of initial: blue or red initials decorated with foliage in white, blue and red on a coloured background with gilded frame for the large miniatures; parti-coloured initials with filigrane decoration accompany the other miniatures.
Rubrication

Red ink has been reserved for the headings of chapters, for folio numbers, for decorated initials and pen flourishings.

Decoration

The marginal decoration of MS 864 has been described as more conservative (baguettes partially blue, magenta or white, partially gilded with decorative vines with some coloured flowers). Paragraph signs are gilded and framed in blue or magenta. Line fillers occur only in the table of contents. The marginal decoration of MS 865 consists of two types: gilded frames partially blue and magenta with a wavy pattern in white, decorated with acanthus, flowers and vines. The other type consists of a band of half lilies in blue and goldleaf accompanied by filigrane decoration. The manuscript also has two types of paragraph sign: gilded with filigrane decoration in black ink or blue with filigrane decoration in red ink. The line fillers in the table of contents are a combination of blue and goldleaf or blue and red, decorated with a wavy pattern.

Illustration

The illustration of MS 864 has been executed by the Giac Master. This painter also illustrated the Froissart volumes of Michael of Lallier (B51), of Charles of Savoisy (P62), of John of Roubaix (L58-59), the manuscript of Toulouse (Tou) and Sto, B88 and P63. The background of acanthus leaves on a pastel background (in addition to mosaïque motifs), precise armory and bloody battle scenes characterise the work of the Giac Master in MS 864. The Boethius Master, a close colleague of the Giac Master’s, illustrated MS 865. The latter also illustrated P64 and the Froissart of Peter of Fontenay (NY4), L67 and collaborated with the Giac Master for the illumination of the former Clumber Park manuscript, which is now part of a private collection. His work is characterised by the representation of armed forces by build up of helmets. The facial expression is generally blank with a sad or uninterested glance. Another distinguishing feature of the Boethius Master’s compositions is the use of relief or small trees and shrubbery to divide the illustrated area into different scenes.
MS 864: 25 miniatures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 1 r.</td>
<td>Opening miniature, four scenes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Froissart presents a book to a king of England (Richard II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>The queen of England and her son meet the king of France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Sea journey of the Queen of England and her son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Siege of Bristol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 34 v.</td>
<td>Battle between de soldiers of Cagant and the English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 46 v.</td>
<td>Edward III requests advice in the matters of Flanders of the duke of Brabant, the duke of Guelders, the Duke of Juliers, John of Hainault and Robert of Artois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 49 r</td>
<td>Sea battle at L’escluse (Sluis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 72 v.</td>
<td>Funeral procession for the duke of Brittany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 91 r.</td>
<td>Battle of Quimperle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 112 r</td>
<td>Siege of Aubreroche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 130 r</td>
<td>Soldiers raiding a city (Saint-Lo-en-Constantin or Caen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 135 r</td>
<td>Battle at the Blanche Taque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 138 r</td>
<td>Battle of Crecy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 154 v.</td>
<td>The queen of England is welcomed at Newcastle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 150 v.</td>
<td>Battle of La Roche Derrien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 159 v.</td>
<td>The wake at the coffin of king Philip VI of France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 172 r</td>
<td>Coronation of Jean II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 172 r</td>
<td>Battle of Poitiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 181 r</td>
<td>Death of Geoffry of Harcouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 235 r</td>
<td>The king of England welcomes the king of France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 248 v.</td>
<td>Defeat of the English and the army of Navarra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 250 v.</td>
<td>Battle of Auray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 277 v.</td>
<td>Battle of Najera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 286 v.</td>
<td>Murder of Peter the Cruel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 312 r</td>
<td>Siege of Puirenon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 330 r</td>
<td>Surrender of Limoges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 358 r</td>
<td>Naval battle of La Rochelle. The count of Pembroke is defeated by the Spaniards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 358 r</td>
<td>Siege of Bécherel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 384 v.</td>
<td>Treaty at Windsor between Richard II and Charles of Navarre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MS 865: 21 miniatures in total

Book Two: 11 miniatures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 1 r.</td>
<td>Opening miniature, four scenes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 5 r.</td>
<td>Two ships filled with soldiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 15 v.</td>
<td>The Whitecaps in Ghent kill the sheriff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 25 r.</td>
<td>Shipwreck of the English envoys sent to the duke of Brittany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 49 v.</td>
<td>The siege of Nantes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 73 r.</td>
<td>Peasants’ revolt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 103 r.</td>
<td>The victory of Ghent against the count and Bruges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 120 r.</td>
<td>Battle on a bridge (near Comines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 133 v.</td>
<td>Battle of Rosebeke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 151 v.</td>
<td>Assault on Ypres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 178 r.</td>
<td>Joan of Brabant and Isabel of Bavaria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Book Three: 10 miniatures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 201 r.</td>
<td>Opening miniature of Book Three, multiple scenes, Froissart gathering information at the court of Foix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 207 r.</td>
<td>Surrender of the citizens of Cassères</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 239 r.</td>
<td>Battle of Aljubarrota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 255 r.</td>
<td>Battle between the count of Najera, the army of Hungary and Murad I of Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 386 v.</td>
<td>The embassy of the duchess of Brabant to the king of France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 396 r.</td>
<td>The siege of Montferrat. Pierrot le Bernoys surrenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 408 v.</td>
<td>The duke of Brittany welcomes the lord of Coucy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 426 v.</td>
<td>Helion de Lignac rapports to the duke of Berry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 433 v.</td>
<td>The battle of Otterburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 441 r.</td>
<td>The troops of the count of Arundel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dating and localisation

First decades of the fifteenth century, probably between 1411 and 1418, Paris

The dating (and localisation) has been based on the script type, marginal decoration and the activity of the illustrators: the Giac Master and Boethius Master. The dimensions of the lay out, the text and collaborating scribes and artists situate the manuscripts within the production of the Parisian libraire Pierre de Liffol.

### History of the manuscript

The manuscript’s first owner is unknown. Possibly, the codices were commissioned by a supporter of John the Fearless in the surroundings of the court of Charles VI of France. Unfortunately, the coats of arms on the opening pages of MS 864 and MS 865 have not been filled in. Both manuscripts bear some medieval annotation (dat. and nota). Further
analysis of these nota signs would certainly be interesting. In several instances, the text of MS 864 has been corrected using an early incunabula version of the text printed by Verard (cf. annotation in MS 864: ‘Ce manuscript est bien différent de l’édition de Paris 1518, tant pour les expressions bien que pour les títres et la divisions des chapitres’). The manuscript’s first known owner is cardinal Antoine de Granvelle (b. 1517 – d. 1587). He bequeathed his library to his nephew François Perrenot de Granvelle, lord of Cante-Croix (d. 1606, cf. annotation at the opening of MS 864). Later, the cardinal’s collection was inherited by the latter’s son François-Thomas de Granvelle (d. 1629). After François-Thomas de Granvelle’s only son had died in 1639, the estate was transferred upon Jacques-Nicolas de la Baume. Nearly all of the cardinal’s books were acquired by Jean-Baptiste Boisot, abbot of the library of Saint-Vincent de Besançon (cf. annotation: ‘Ex bibliotheca Joannis-Baptistae Boisot, Vesontini, Prioris de Grandecourt et de La Loye). After his death (1695) Boison left the books to the abbey where they became the core of the collection of what was to become the Municipal Library of Besançon.

Binding

Modern, nineteenth-century pigskin binding on cardboard boards.
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