

The Eyes Have It

Blindness and Vision in Matthew Paris's

*Estoire de seint Aedward le rei**

Nicole Leapley

La Estoire de seint Aedward le rei (The History of Saint Edward the King) is extant in only one manuscript—and it is stunning.¹ Containing this text alone, the manuscript offers on nearly each page three columns of text and a large, at least two-column wide, but more often three-column wide, pen and wash image, for a total of 64 images. The height of the illustrations is nearly equivalent to that of the text and a portion of the writing on each page in fact constitutes rubrics that caption the images. The physical arrangement of the manuscript thus puts the visual on par with the textual.

The work's visual aspects have attracted much of the attention this manuscript has received.² Paul Binski notes that its format "with framed illustrations at the head of the page resembles such autograph works of Matthew Paris as his *Life of St Alban*." Cynthia Hahn discusses the narrative effect of the *Estoire's* images in her excellent investigation of pictorial hagiography. Victoria Jordan, noting the three-fold narrative form of the work, made up of image, rubric, and text, argues for viewing it "as a multi-purpose book which offers to the consumer three different, yet equally valid, interpretations of the holy king's life", adding that the combination of these

* This article is dedicated to the memory of my brother, Lance Leapley.

¹ Cambridge, University Library, MS Ee.3.59. The manuscript can be accessed online at the Cambridge University Library website: <http://www.lib.cam.ac.uk/cgi-bin/Ee.3.59/bytext>.

² If we compare Matthew Paris's text to those on Edward that precede it, the visual aspect of the text is certainly the most evident difference. We know an anonymous 11th century Life, *Vita aedwardi regis qui apud westmonasterium requiescit*. In 1138, Osbert of Clare wrote the *Vita beati eadwardi*, in an attempt to have Edward canonized. Aelred, abbot of Rievaulx, presented a new version at Edward's translation. In Old French, there is the 12th century *Vie d'Edouard le confesseur* by a nun of Barking.

elements “through the cooperation of the eyes and ears” creates a more thorough treatment of Edward’s life.³ While the manuscript has been recognized as one of the most skillfully and abundantly illustrated of the thirteenth century, and its images have been widely discussed, the thematization within the text itself of vision and the bodily organs that permit it has not been examined. This is what I propose to do here, while also considering the visual program of the manuscript. I will focus on the role ordinary human vision and the eyes play in constructing authority in the *Estoire*, both political and literary, in order to show how the text functions as an authorizing and foundational text for both the monarchy and monastery. Before undertaking a close reading of the *Estoire* it will be useful to sketch the circumstances of its composition by tracing the importance of sight to the author and his abbey, to the intellectual milieu of thirteenth century England, and to the medieval imagination more generally.

The *Estoire de seint Aedward le rei* tells the story of King Edward the Confessor (reigned 1042–1066). While describing how Edward overcame seemingly insurmountable obstacles to reclaim his birthright and become King of England, Matthew Paris proves him to be a saint and an ideal ruler through sustained attention to vision. Edward’s insight contrasts with his enemies’ blindness. While Edward understands the transcendent significance of events, his enemies (the Danes and Count Godwin) see only the literal and short-term. Whereas the king’s special gift is curing the blind, his foes are responsible for literal blindings.⁴ They even die symbolically appropriate deaths—with their

³ Paul Binski, ‘Introduction to Life of St. Edward the Confessor’, Digital Library: The Life of King Edward the Confessor. Cambridge University Library: Cambridge 2003, at <http://www.lib.cam.ac.uk/deptserv/manuscripts/Ee.3.59/introduction.htm>; Cynthia J. Hahn, *Portrayed on the Heart: Narrative Effect in Pictorial Lives of Saints from the Tenth through the Thirteenth Century*, University of California Press: Berkeley, CA 2001; Victoria B. Jordan, ‘The Multiple Narratives of Matthew Paris’ *Estoire de seint Aedward le rei*: Cambridge, University Library MS Ee.iii.59’, *Parergon: Bulletin of the Australian and New Zealand Association for Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 13, no. 2 (January 1996): 77–92, at 79 and 91.

⁴ Blinding was indeed used in Medieval England as both punishment and political tool. In 1124, Henry I blinded some of the captured Normans who had rebelled against him. Blinding seems to have been practiced more widely and for a longer period in Wales and Ireland—Diarmait Mac Murchadhan killed or blinded seventeen members of the royal families of Leinster. In 1165, Henry II ordered Welsh hostages blinded and castrated while females were to have their noses and ears cut off. The English were, of course, not the first to use blinding as punishment. Bühner-Thierry, citing Lactantius, notes that, while Roman law codes did not mention blinding, it seems to have been widely practiced against the first Christians, becoming an archetype of martyrdom. In the sixth century, as gouging eyes was unknown in Frankish legislation, blinding continued to be associated with martyrdom and abuse of power. In Gregory of Tours, for example, blinding was

own eyes poked out. Thus, Edward's reign is one of clear vision that itself was presaged by an English bishop's holy vision. Ultimately, the structure of the text itself, organized around vision, looks constantly forward to the time when Edward's peace will be restored.

Matthew Paris, who wrote the text in Anglo-Norman between 1236 and 1245, dedicated it to the Queen of England, Eleanor of Provence, wife of King Henry III.⁵ The author was one of the most celebrated and prolific chroniclers of the Middle Ages and a Benedictine monk. He entered St. Albans Abbey in 1217 and replaced the chronicler Roger de Wendover in 1236 as director of the *scriptorium* there. Matthew Paris is best known today for his *Chronica majora*, a voluminous Latin work recording history from creation to 1259 when he is believed to have died.⁶ It is considered to be one of the most important primary sources in medieval studies. In addition to recording history, he made maps, illuminated manuscripts, worked precious metals, and wrote hagiography—the use of images permeates his work.

Context: The Importance of Sight

The centrality of vision in the *Estoire* can, in part, be explained by Matthew's heightened sensibility for the visual as a talented artist. It is also necessary, however, to appreciate the position of privilege sight held in the medieval imagination. By the time Matthew composed the text, a long and powerful Neo-platonic Christian tradition had firmly established vision as a reliable means to truth, knowledge and understanding; as consonant with sound

presented as an abuse of power by a wicked king. Geneviève Bühner-Thierry, "Just Anger" or "Vengeful Anger"? The Punishment of Blindness in the Early Medieval West', in Barbara H. Rosenwein ed., *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, Cornell University Press: Ithaca, NY 1998, 75–91, at 76–78.

⁵ This manuscript is not Matthew Paris's original, but is believed to be a copy executed at Westminster or London around 1255—perhaps for Eleanor's daughter-in-law, Eleanor of Castile who married Prince Edward, the eldest son of Henry III and Eleanor, in 1254. On the attribution and dating of the *Estoire*, see Richard Vaughan, *Matthew Paris*, (Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, New Series 6), Cambridge University Press: Cambridge 1958; Paul Binski, 'Reflections on La Estoire De Seint Aedward Le Rei: Hagiography and Kingship in Thirteenth-Century England', *Journal of Medieval History* 16 (1990): 333–350; Matthew Paris, *The History of Saint Edward the King*, Thelma S. Fenster and Jocelyn Wogan-Browne ed. and trans., (Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies), Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies: Tempe, AZ 2008, at 26–27.

⁶ Where the chronicle deals with events prior to 1235, Matthew is essentially editing the work of his predecessor. For biographical information on Matthew Paris, see Richard Vaughan 1958.

judgment and therefore authority.⁷ In medieval art and thought, light and sight were understood as attributes of divinity while blindness and darkness were associated with sin.⁸ To understand Matthew's text, it is crucial to recognize the rich significance and moral implications that sight and light, blindness and darkness evoked for the medieval reader.

This tradition was particularly salient at St. Albans Abbey. The organs of sight play a key role in the creation story of the monastery as the saints specially linked to the author's house were associated with blindness and the restoration of sight. Matthew honored St. Alban, his abbey's namesake and Britain's first martyr, with an Anglo-Norman saint's life, *La vie de seint Auban* (The Life of St. Alban). In one remarkable illustration of the autograph manuscript, the viewer witnesses the executioner of the monastery's patron saint punished by blindness, when his eyes fall out of his head.⁹ Matthew

⁷ In the Old Testament, blindness was a punishment sent and revoked by God, barring the blind from priestly office. In the New Testament, Jesus called the Pharisees "the blind leading the blind" (John 9:40). Vision is further linked with Jesus, as healer of the blind and light of the world. Blindness became a metaphor for the flesh, the old law, and the letter. The Pauline contrast between blindness and vision shows that the spiritual man sees and understands all things in relation to God while the carnal man is entrapped and blinded by the things of the world. It is essential, however, to underline the metaphoric nature of these notions, to make clear that literal blindness is not a penalty for sin, neither is corporal sight the same as spiritual insight. Ronald B. Bond, 'Blindness', in *A Dictionary of biblical tradition in English literature*, in David L. Jeffrey ed., Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, Grand Rapids, Mich. 1992. See also the introduction to Suzanne Conklin Akbari, *Seeing through the Veil: Optical Theory and Medieval Allegory*, University of Toronto Press: Toronto 2004.

⁸ Hugh of St. Victor, for example, uses the pseudo-Dionysian figure of the three eyes to describe different kinds of understanding. While the eye of the flesh remained intact after the fall, the eye of reason and self-knowledge deteriorated, and the eye of contemplation was blinded. Prelapsarian man participated in the divine wisdom directly "by a single and simple illumination of divine imparting", but the fall brought about blindness and darkness. The human eye can, however, help humanity know and understand God and to ascend to him, thanks to the created work of foundation. Cited in Taylor's introduction, Jerome Taylor, *The Didascalicon of Hugh of St. Victor: A Medieval Guide to the Arts*, Columbia University Press: New York 1991, at 14. In her book on architectural allegory, Christiania Whitehead (*Castles of the Mind: A Study of Medieval Architectural Allegory*, Religion and Culture in the Middle Ages, University of Wales Press: Cardiff 2003, at 20) explains the rising interest in the topic by its visual attributes, noting that: "The twelfth-century fascination with textual architecture was also supported by the evolution of a very positive religious evaluation of the visual imagination" giving the example of Hugh of St. Victor who wrote, "It is impossible to show the invisible, except by the visible". The twelfth century's renewed focus on nature and human reason emphasized the importance of creation and the role of the senses in humanity's quest to reach God, but did not result in significant changes in visual theory.

⁹ *Life of St. Alban*, Dublin, Trinity College Library, MS E. I. 40, f. 38r. The image is reproduced in Nigel J. Morgan and Richard Marks, *The Golden Age of English Manuscript Painting (1200–1500)*, (Illuminated Manuscript Series), G. Braziller: New York 1981. It can also be accessed at <http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/3/30/DublinTrinityCollegeMSEi40LifeAlbanFol38rMartyrdomAlban.jpg>. See the discussion of this and similar images in Suzanne Lewis, *The Art of Matthew Paris in the Chronica Majora*, (California Studies in the History of Art, 21), University of California Press: Berkeley 1987, 106–121.

commemorated the two saint-kings associated with the foundation of his house in his *Vitae duorum Offarum*. Both Offas are born blind and deaf and then healed, Offa II when his parents, recalling the story of the first Offa, pray that their child's health be restored, promising that their son would fulfill the first Offa's vow to found a monastery.

Matthew Paris uses the power of vision to authorize his text and underline his own role as writer and illustrator, but also to advance the institutions for which he works, St. Albans abbey and the reigning English monarchy. Suzanne Lewis argues convincingly that, through a calculated placement of his illustration of the martyrdom of St. Alban in the *Chronica Majora* and by collecting together the *Liber Additamentorum* (which includes an almost identical illustration), Matthew manipulates text and image to make the foundation of his abbey even more ancient (claiming it dated from the 8th instead of the 12th century), sanctioned (providing evidence of papal approval), and saintly (tying St. Alban more closely with King Offa by depicting them in the same space) in order to further guarantee St. Albans' authority and freedom.¹⁰ This is also precisely what Matthew is doing in the *Estoire*. Emphasizing sight in this text underlines claims he makes in the *Chronica* on behalf of his abbey and for the Anglo-Norman monarchy (the institution to which his dedicatee, Queen Eleanor, was linked), he depicts Edward, the last Anglo-Saxon king, as the spiritual father to the Normans who sees and announces the arrival of his righteous successors. Matthew thus bolsters the dynasty by making their claim more ancient, sanctioned, and saintly as well.¹¹

Vision was not only a well-established cultural concept, but it was also the focus of intense scientific inquiry in Matthew Paris's time. Vaughan has noted Matthew's interest in natural philosophy, giving for example his illustration with twenty-three diagrams of a copy of William of Conches' *Dragmaticon*, which Akbari describes as a crucial source for later natural

¹⁰ Lewis, referring to the *Chronica Majora* as given in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 26 at p. 117, writes "Matthew's pictorial celebration of the miraculous invention could have been partly motivated to quell rival claims to St. Albans' relics; the controversy between St. Albans and Ely over this issue lasted for several hundred years" and "The drawings in MS 26 serve to counter thirteenth-century threats against St. Albans from both crown and papacy by reasserting the authenticity of the abbey's relics, thereby supporting the pious fiction of its special position conferred by the English king and the Roman pontiff at the end of the eighth century". Lewis 1987, at 110–112.

¹¹ For more on the chaste Edward as father, Nicole M. Leapley, 'Rewriting Paternity: The Meaning of Renovating Westminster' in *La Estoire de seint Aedward le rei*, *Medievalia et Humanistica: Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Culture* 37 (2011), 37–64.

philosophers, one that included an excellent synthesis of work in optics.¹² Matthew was writing at the very inception of a new philosophy of light and advances in optical theories that would produce a sea-change in the medieval understanding of optics by the end of the century.¹³ His use of vision is not just a call to traditional authority, but also a claim to relevance.¹⁴

A key figure in this development, the first significant writer on optics in the West, and one of the most important intellectuals of the thirteenth century, Robert Grosseteste,¹⁵ became Bishop of Lincoln in 1235, just one year before Matthew Paris took over the *scriptorium* at St. Albans Abbey—arguably the most important Benedictine abbey in the see of Lincoln. Grosseteste oversaw the bishopric until his death in 1253, not long before Matthew's own in 1259.¹⁶

When Grosseteste began his work, Plato's theories of light and vision, which had held sway since the fourth century translation and commentary of the *Timaeus* by Chalcidius, still predominated. While Grosseteste did not discard the Platonic framework, he did begin to incorporate some of the new learning trickling in from the East. Plato's theory of vision posited that light

¹² Vaughan 1958, 254. Akbari 2004, 33.

¹³ To be fully realized later in the century by his student Roger Bacon and the other Perspectivists. The dates of Grosseteste's works are uncertain, but his commentary on Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics*, *On Truth*, and *On Light* are thought to have been written in the 1220s and 30s. The *Estoire* dates from between 1236–1245, while the manuscript dates from the 1250s.

¹⁴ This is further evidence for Binski's point that the *Estoire* modernizes older narratives about the saint to tell a story in accord with contemporary concerns. Binski 1990. Several recent works have emphasized the growing importance of vision in the thirteenth century, including Suzannah Biernoff, *Sight and Embodiment in the Middle Ages*, Palgrave Macmillan: 2002; Akbari 2004; Roland Recht, *Believing and Seeing: The Art of Gothic Cathedrals*, University of Chicago Press: Chicago 2008.

¹⁵ Grosseteste explained the very origin and structure of the physical universe in terms of the action of light. Light is at the heart of his philosophy, not only in his account of the corporeal world, but also in his biblical commentaries, in his explanation of sense perception and the relation between body and soul, in his illuminationist epistemology, and of course, in his writings on optics. Perhaps the most important aspect of his work is that by establishing the primacy of light and sight to theology, he established optics, once and for all, as a legitimate, even essential, field of study, freeing his followers from having to justify their work. Lindberg, while insisting on the preliminary, even primitive, nature of Grosseteste's work, recognizes Grosseteste's importance as transitional figure. He represents the initial stages of the assimilation of the Greek and Islamic advances in optics. David C. Lindberg, *Theories of Vision from Al-Kindi to Kepler* (University of Chicago History of Science and Medicine), University of Chicago Press: Chicago 1976, at 95. See also Akbari on Grosseteste's contributions. Akbari 2004, 36.

¹⁶ The Bishopric of Lincoln would have included St. Albans in its see, but the abbey was exempted from episcopal jurisdiction—part of its special privileges evoked above. Matthew's opinion of Grosseteste was mixed, as his own *Chronica* reveals—he criticized Grosseteste's harsh handling of monasteries in his see, but lauded his criticism of the pope. Vaughan also notes that, in an inscription at the beginning of *Suidas De probatione Virginitatis Beate Marie* (London, British Library, Royal MS 4 D vii, f. 248a), Matthew claims to have gotten his copy directly from Grosseteste.

issues forth from the eyes, joins with and is strengthened by external light, which enables it to draw from visible objects their colors. This is characterized as an extramission theory of vision because seeing is thought to occur by something issuing forth from the eye, rather than occurring when the eyes receive rays emanating from visible objects (the intromission theory). Grosseteste's theory of the multiplication of species imagines all objects as constantly emitting species along rays in all directions and thus allows for intromission. Combining this idea with extramission allows him to characterize sight as both passive and active, staying within the Platonic framework.¹⁷ Additionally, while Grosseteste did not arrive at the correct explanation for the rainbow, he was the first to introduce the idea of refraction into the theory.¹⁸ He discussed the effect of the purity of the medium refracting the rays and how refracted rays were bent at different angles. Grosseteste also put forward the earliest known form of the wave theory of light.¹⁹

In addition to signaling the inception of major developments in optics, the thirteenth century was a period increasingly interested in first-person eyewitness accounts of sanctity—as reflected in changes in canonization procedures that emerge at this time and in the corresponding increase of contemporary saints, the most obvious example of which is Francis.²⁰ Franciscan preachers (whose first teacher at Oxford was none other than Robert Grosseteste) especially recognized the power of the visual and aimed to use it in their preaching and teaching.²¹

¹⁷ Lindberg 1976, 101.

¹⁸ Boyer lauds this contribution while Lindberg feels Grosseteste's contributions to refraction have been overblown. Carl B. Boyer, 'Robert Grosseteste on the Rainbow', *Osiris* 11(1954): 247–258. Crombie feels Grosseteste's discussion on refraction was his most relevant on the topic of optics (196–198). Alistair Cameron Crombie, *Science, Optics, and Music in Medieval and Early Modern Thought*, Hambleton Press: London 1990.

¹⁹ Crombie 1990, 125–126.

²⁰ Pope Gregory IX (1227–1241) established procedures to investigate the life and miracles of a candidate for sainthood and required the use of a standardized form during canonization inquiries, formalizing the process and making papal canonization the only legitimate form. He incorporated these practices into church law in 1234, through his *Decretals*. See André Vauchez, *La Sainteté en Occident aux derniers siècles du Moyen Age: D'après les procès de canonisation et les documents hagiographiques*, (Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 241), École française de Rome: Rome 1981, 58. Francis was canonized in 1228 and Elizabeth of Hungary in 1235. Hers was one of the first in which the papacy used its new highly codified canonization proceedings. Recht 2008, 76: "After 1230, when the friars' conduct was no longer on view, the papal authorities hastened to provide the faithful with pictorial evidence of the saint's pastoral activities".

²¹ Grosseteste taught them from 1229–1235.

It is before this backdrop, in a turbulent world of new monastic orders and freshly minted saints, under a pope who tirelessly promoted the new orders,²² under a bishop who was such a famous teacher, friend, and supporter of the Franciscans that he is sometimes mistaken for one of them,²³ that Matthew Paris, a Benedictine monk (an order that traces its origins to the very beginnings of the Christian monastic movement) composes his *Estoire de seint Aedward le rei* about a saint who has been dead for 170 years and canonized for seventy-five.

Structure: The Eyes

Matthew conveys St. Edward the Confessor's perspicacity, which points to his legitimacy and holiness, by references to literal human vision and the organs that permit it—the eyes. The word *oil* or *oilz* (eyes) appears forty-four times in the *Estoire*. These numerous allusions to the eyes are arranged symmetrically and give shape to the text.²⁴ King Edward's own eyes are mentioned twice, each depiction of the royal eyes aligning with a paired series of blind eyes healed by the king. The scenes depicting King Edward's seeing eyes and his ability to return sight to the blind enclose and set off passages involving Count Godwin and his two sons where eyes are injured. Framing all of these examples and bookending Edward's reign are a pair of blindings—that of Edward's brother Alfred and that of King Harold II. This symmetry, clearly discernable in the body of the text, is also reflected in the rubrics. The wounding and killing of Alfred and King Harold II include the first and final use of the word *oilz* in the rubrics as well as in the body. The term *oilz* only appears six other times in the rubrics—three refer to the first series of blind men healed by Edward and three

²² Gregory (1227–1241) carried on Innocent III's work by continuing to promote and protect the new monastic orders and by emphasizing the power of the Holy See. Many have already remarked on Matthew Paris's resistance to what he saw as papal overreaching.

²³ Matthew certainly recognized Grosseteste as someone with whom he was competing for power, as evidenced by his intense criticism of Grosseteste's visits of monastic houses in his see. Matthew may have felt a special need to defend the prestige of his house against this new bishop and the rise of the new orders he supported. Matthew Paris may have felt that using sight, a symbol and tool especially dear to Grosseteste and the Franciscans, was a particularly potent way to do it.

²⁴ I have noted each instance of the term and presented the resulting structure as a table in an appendix. For an alternative interpretation of the poem's structure (based on prayers and organized around Edward's coronation) see: Jean-Guy Gouttebroze, 'Structure Et Sens Des Textes De Prières Contenus Dans La Estoire De Seint Aedward Le Rei', *La Prière au Moyen-Age: Littérature et civilisation* (1981): 299–314.

to the second. The use of “oilz” in the rubrics therefore strengthens the visual structure of the text. The rubrics also, by their very nature as captions to the images, tie the visual organization of the text to the illuminations.

Accordingly, I will begin my close reading of the *Estoire* by focusing on the interplay of text, image, and rubric in four scenes: first the blinding of Edward’s brother, Alfred, by King Harold I; second, the childhood fight of Godwin’s sons Harold and Tostin; third, the death of Godwin, and fourth, the death of King Harold II. The second part of my analysis will treat Edith’s visual artistry, Edward’s clear vision and his gift of healing the blind, and will conclude by examining the author’s depiction of his own relationship with vision. This will show how the different elements of the text function individually and work together to steadily build a consistent, but richly-nuanced argument authorizing the text, the author, and his patrons.

Blindness

The family of Godwin, Count of Kent, and the Danish conqueror kings are associated with blindness early on in the text. Upon King Cnut’s death, his son Harold is crowned King of England while his brother, Hardacnut, sits upon the throne of Denmark. Edward’s brother, Alfred, sails from the family’s place of exile in Normandy, believing that his time to rule has come. Godwin arrests Alfred, after having treacherously embraced him as his true lord, and takes him to King Harold, who has the prince’s eyes put out: “Ses oilz fait crever a dreiture” (440).²⁵ These acts of treachery and barbarity substantiate that these men, Godwin and Harold I, are not the lawful rulers of England. Alfred, however, in his legitimate claim to the kingship, by his justified action of setting sail for England from Normandy, prefigures and establishes the precedent for William the Conqueror’s sailing for England from Normandy and legitimizes the Norman ascent to the English throne accomplished at the end of the text.

Like his father Godwin and namesake King Harold I, the future King Harold II is connected with blindness and is thus contrasted with his immediate predecessor, Edward, a symbol of clarity and foresight. King

²⁵ Line and rubric numbers throughout refer to Kathryn Young Wallace’s edition. Matthew Paris, *La Estoire de seint Aedward le rei*, Kathryn Young Wallace ed. (*Anglo-Norman Texts*, 41), Anglo-Norman Text Society: London 1983. Translations throughout are taken from Fenster and Wogan-Browne.

Edward and Godwin watch Godwin's two young sons, Harold and Tostin, playing together. Eventually the two boys begin to fight and Harold, the stronger and bolder of the two, grabs his brother by the hair, throws him down, and tries to gouge out his eyes: "Crever li vout andeus lé oilz"²⁶. The use of the infinitive *crever*, to gouge, together with the direct object *oilz*, eyes, recalls the first scene where King Harold I has Alfred blinded, linking the two scenes, even though they are separated by thousands of lines.

The visual representation of the second scene also echoes that of the first. Their layout is strikingly similar. On the extreme left of the frame stands the king, wearing the crown and pointing to his interlocutor who, in turn, indicates the action, with his extended arm and pointing finger in the first illustration and with a long stick in the second. The main action in each scene involves three men. One man, at the extreme right of the image, faces into the frame and stands at the same level as the king and his interlocutor. He bends at the waist and stretches both arms toward the two men below while leaning over a table. In the first scene, he reaches down to the table, to which Alfred is tied, holding Alfred by the hair with his left hand and gouging out Alfred's right eye with his right. The final man in the scene is helping to hold Alfred—pulling him by the hair with one hand and by the throat with the other.²⁷

In the second scene, the standing man is not the torturer, but rather an aide trying to separate the two fighters, who are pulling hair and choking each other. These two scenes, by their similarities, invite us to compare them, while their subtle differences show us how to interpret them. In both scenes Godwin appears to be the king's interlocutor, but in the first, the king depicted is Harold, ordering the blinding, while in the second, the king is Edward, interpreting the scene, thus driving home the point that while Harold and Godwin cause blindness, Edward is a visionary who helps us see.²⁸

The thrust of the scene depicting Harold and Tostin's childhood fight, as Edward's interpretation explicitly states, looks into the future, to their adult behavior and its disastrous effects on the kingdom:²⁹

²⁶ Line 3152: "[H]e wanted to put out both his eyes".

²⁷ F. 6r: <http://www.lib.cam.ac.uk/cgi-bin/Ee.3.59/browse?6>

²⁸ F. 24v: <http://www.lib.cam.ac.uk/cgi-bin/Ee.3.59/browse?44>

²⁹ Lines 3157–3160, 3165–3170, italics mine: "The king *watched* the two fighting and began to think. He took his time speaking, for he *saw* in them something that was revealed only later, after a long time had passed... The king said: Earl, don't you *see* the fighting between your sons? Yes sire. That's their fun. It's a

*Li reis les cumbatans regarde,
 Pensis en est, de parler tarde,
 Kar il vit en eus teu chose
 K'après grant tens fu desclose...
 Dist li reis: 'Ne veis tu mie
 De tes fiz, quens, la crapoudie?'
 'Oïl, sire, c'est lur deduitz.'
 'Einz est estrifs feluns e fruitz.'
 'Sire, n'i a mal ne peril.'
 'N'entenz tu el?' 'Sire, nenil.'*

While Harold tries to blind his brother, his father, Count Godwin, is blind to the significance of his sons' behavior. He sees his sons fighting, but has no insight; he is incapable of seeing the tussle as anything but a simple game. He is oblivious to its real meaning—he is actually looking away from the main action in both scenes—while King Edward recognizes this childhood brawl as a sign that points to future behavior.

How is it possible that Edward sees what is happening, but Godwin does not? Is the truth of the event present in it or in Edward's mind alone? As noted above, the intromission theory was just beginning to be incorporated into visual theory at this time. In his theory of the multiplication of species, Grosseteste explains that an object propagates its power (emits its species or likeness) indifferently, "for it does not act by deliberation and choice," going on to note the species' effects depend on the recipient (the beholder), "for when received by the senses this power produces an operation in some way more spiritual and more noble; on the other hand when received by matter it produces a material operation."³⁰ The power of the vision, of the viewed event, is the same, but the power of the senses in each man is different, more spiritual and noble in Edward, more material in Godwin. Human sight has both a physical and a spiritual aspect.

rather nasty and violent battle. Sire, there is no ill or danger in it. You don't understand it in any other way? Not at all, sire".

³⁰ Grosseteste's explanation is cited in Biernoff 2002, 70 and Crombie 1990, 196.

Indeed, Edward's prediction is afterward confirmed, as the text points out.³¹

*Après pou d'aunz la prophecie
Fu averee e acumplie*

The author summarizes the adult behavior of Harold and Tostin in order to “esclarcir le dit Aedward”.³² Like the king, he has the ability to understand events and shed light to make things clear—going beyond relating events in words and images, he interprets them, helping his audience see and understand. The audience may not be as insightful as Edward, but by listening and looking, and with the text's help, they can achieve understanding.

The next instance of *oilz* in the text (only 174 lines after its use in Harold and Tostin's boyhood clash) appears in the scene recounting the death of Godwin. On Easter, while Edward and his men dine, one of the king's cupbearers trips while stepping up onto the dais.³³ Referring to the way the man catches himself with his other foot; Godwin cleverly tells the king that in the same way one brother helps another. Edward's response is cutting:³⁴

*Si pust men moi, si il fust vifs,
Si vus, quens, l'ussez sufert!*

The king's words express his loss and openly accuse Godwin in front of the entire court of murdering Alfred.

In order to save face, Godwin claims he is not guilty of Alfred's death and is in fact saddened by it. He offers proof, announcing that if he can swallow a morsel of food he is innocent. Edward blesses the food, asking God to reveal

³¹ Lines 3189–3190: “In a few years the prophecy came true”.

³² Line 3197: “explain how Edward's words were realized”.

³³ Judith Collard, in 'Effigies Ad Regem Angliae and the Representation of Kingship in Thirteenth-Century English Royal Culture', *The Electronic British Library Journal*, article 9 (2007), 1–26, at <http://www.bl.uk/ebli/2007/articles/article9.html>, discusses Henry III's organization and decoration of the Great Hall, where the court gathered for major events, and in particular the role the dais, the stage on which the king performed his public duties, played in expressing courtly hierarchy and in establishing “the formal theatre of sovereignty”.

³⁴ Lines 3296–3297: “So could mine, were he alive, if you, earl, had allowed him to live”.

the truth. Godwin chokes on the morsel and while he is suffocating, “andui li oil eu chef li virent”.³⁵

The verb *virer* (‘to turn’) is related to the noun *vireton*—which denotes a projectile, an arrow or bolt with fletchings to make it spin in flight. This association with projectiles, along with the context of strangulation, makes *virent* connote eyes that not only roll up in the head but also bulge out. For an attentive reader, the use of *virer* to describe the appearance of Godwin’s eyes at his death foreshadows the arrow that blinds Harold, Godwin’s son, at the end of the text. The arrow striking the eye of Harold figures the visual species entering the eye of the viewer as described by the intromission theory, but instead of resulting in a vision of the object, it blinds. This description of Godwin’s death, eyes rolling, also recalls Alfred’s torture and symbolizes that justice is served. Finally, Godwin, the origin of ocular problems in the text, falls victim to God’s just vengeance when he dies, eyes bulging, choking on a bite of food.

The use of the words “andui li oil” (both eyes) links the passage depicting Godwin’s death with that recounting Godwin’s sons’ wrestling match, “andeus lé oilz” (both eyes). The two scenes are also narrated in the same visual space. The scenes, depicted on facing pages—folio 24 verso and 25 recto—are separated only by the gutter.³⁶ The image occupies the space above the two innermost columns of each page, leaving the outer column to serve as a second frame to the image. The illuminations are additionally conjoined by the table—the dinner table of the scene on the left extends to the right becoming the banquet table of Godwin’s death scene. Further to the right, already hands are being laid on Godwin, preparing to drag him out of the right side of the frame, just as the rubric immediately right of the frame narrates.

The final use of *oil* in the body of the text functions to depict as poetically just the death of Godwin’s son, King Harold II.³⁷ He who would gouge out the eyes of his brother dies from a dart in his own eye:³⁸

³⁵ Line 3326: “Both eyes rolled in his head”.

³⁶ Ff. 24v and 25r: <http://www.lib.cam.ac.uk/cgi-bin/Ee.3.59/browse?44>

³⁷ Michael Evans opens his book, *The Death of Kings: Royal Deaths in Medieval England*, Continuum International Publishing Group: London and New York 2007, by discussing the dramatic and sudden death of Harold, tracing what makes blinding an appropriate death: it is practical—a physical handicap that makes it hard to rule and do battle—and moral, since blindness is associated with sin, especially infidelity.

³⁸ Lines 4608–4610: “The king, struck in the eye by a lance, fell and was soon defeated”.

*Li rois, feruz en l'oil d'un dart,
Chet e tost est defulez,
Periz, ocis, e adirez.*

At the bottom left of a very crowded depiction of the Battle of Hastings,³⁹ we see Harold falling from his horse, right hand on the reins, the left on the sheath of his sword. He looks straight out of the frame at the viewer, an arrow in his open left eye. Further to the right, Harold is depicted a second time, the arrow still in his left eye, the green background signaling the grass he is lying on while being cut to pieces. King Harold II's demise, like his father's, is shamefully appropriate and reads as divine approval of William the Conqueror and his line, just as Godwin's death reads as divine approval of King Edward.⁴⁰

Aligning these four scenes in this multimedia and layered fashion effectively uses vision and blindness to show the Norman invasion and Harold's violent death to be necessary, even healing, justified by the treacherous cruelty of the blinding of Alfred at the beginning of the text, then carefully foreshadowed by the Godwinsons' fight and their father's death. This strategy also allows Matthew Paris to display his visual and literary talent for deploying vision, effectively reclaiming the device for himself, recalling its alignment with St. Alban's Abbey, and demonstrating the relevance of Benedictine hagiography and its role in teaching.

Vision

Throughout the text, Matthew uses vision to delineate two camps—symbolizing illegitimacy, treachery, and destruction on one side (the Danes and Godwins) while pointing to legitimacy, foresight, and divine justice on the other (Edward and the Normans). This division is not dictated by genealogy, as one might be tempted to conclude from the Godwinsons' depravity, but it does

³⁹ F. 34v: <http://www.lib.cam.ac.uk/cgi-bin/Ee.3.59/browse?64>

⁴⁰ Robert M. Stein (*Reality Fictions: Romance, History, and Governmental Authority, 1025–1180*, University of Notre Dame: Notre Dame, Indiana 2006, at 79) cites Gerald of Wales's version. It too reports that Harold's defeat in the battle at Hastings was divine punishment, noting that he "was wounded in many places, losing his left eye through an arrow that penetrated it," but that he escaped and "it is believed" lived out the rest of his life like an anchorite.

nevertheless reflect inner qualities. The stark contrast the text draws between Godwin's daughter, Edith, and her father and brothers underlines this fact:⁴¹

*Une fille avoit mut bele,
Bein entetchee damoisele
D'afaitement endoctrinee
Edith ki fu apelee.
Vers Deu, vers gent out mut de graces,
Du pere ne siut pas les traces.*

She is not only "well-bred,"⁴² but also very beautiful. Rather than a simple commonplace of the medieval portrayal of noble women, this description of Edith as visually attractive serves to associate her positively with vision and thus to disassociate her from her kin; an interpretation supported by her production of a variety of beautiful cultural objects that earn her an international reputation:⁴³

*Mut fu de bon sen en lettrure
E tute ren u mist sa cure,
Dunt oïsez la fame expandre
D'Engleterre en Alisandre.
D'entaille e de purtraiture,
D'or e argent brudure
Tant fist verais, p[r]opres e beaus,
U d'agoille u de taveus,
Hummes, oiseus, bestes e flurs,
E tant parti ben ses culurs,
E de autre ovre riche e noble,*

⁴¹ Lines 1147–1152: "Godwin had a very beautiful, well-bred daughter who had been taught to comport herself graciously; she was named Edith. She loved God, was kind to other people, and did not follow in her father's footsteps".

⁴² Another possible translation would be "disposed to good".

⁴³ Lines 1155–1166: "[S]he was intelligent at letters, as she was at everything she undertook. You could hear talk about her from England to Alexandria! With gold and silver embroidery, whether with a needle or with ribbons, she produced such fine and accurate likenesses of men, birds, animals, and flowers, and she balanced her colors so effectively. She did just as well at other rich and noble work: there was not her equal all the way to Constantinople".

N'out per gesk'en Constantinoble.

A talented artist, Edith has a literary gift and her visual representations (in a variety of media—sculpture, portraiture, and embroidery) are unparalleled, precise, and true to nature. By this depiction, she functions as a surrogate for the author. Both Edith and Matthew lead lives that are chaste and artistically productive. Matthew uses the words “lettrure” and “portraiture” in the text to describe Edith’s creation and rhymes the same two words when describing his own undertaking:⁴⁴

*Or vus pri, gentilz rois Aedward,
K'a moi pecchur eiez regard
Ki ai translaté du latin
Sulum mun sen e mun engin
En franceis la vostre estoire,
Ke se espanse ta memoire
E pur lais ki de lettrure
Ne sevent, en purtraiture
Figuree apertement
L'ai en cest livret present,
Pur ço ke desir e voil
Ke oraille ot, voient li oil.*

Matthew Paris creates a more comprehensive and accessible text by pairing the vernacular with abundant imagery. Thanks to these illuminations, those who can only hear language (and not read it) are not totally deprived of the visual aspect of the story or of the material aspect of the book.

Matthew pairs his work with Edith’s again in the rubrics by using the word *portraiture* twice—once in reference to Edith’s work and once in reference to his own (lines 4687, 4780). Edith’s discerning eye is a model, not only for the author, but also for the audience; in particular of course for its dedicatee, Queen

⁴⁴ Lines 3957–3966: “Now I pray you, noble King Edward to remember me, a sinner who has translated your story from Latin into French as my intelligence and skill allowed, so that the memory of you may be spread about. For laypeople who do not know how to read, I have also represented your story in illustrations in this very same book, because I want the eyes to see what the ears hear”.

Eleanor. In a way that is appropriate to her gender and that befits a queen,⁴⁵ Edith is associated with vision, reversing her father's example and mirroring Edward's, allying her with her future husband—both have special visual gifts.⁴⁶

*Diverses graces e vertuz
Avoit li reis Aedward sur tuz,
Mais de vue restorer
N'avoit unke, ço crei, sun per.*

Edward's optical talents include, in addition to the insight into the transcendent meaning of human behavior that we've already seen, an ability to cure the blind. Just as Edith's visual representations are so true and beautiful that she "[n]out per gesk'en Constantinoble," Edward's ability to restore sight was peerless: "[n]'avoit unke [...] sun per." Edith has "mut de graces" and likewise, Edward enjoys "diverses graces."⁴⁷ Both Edith and the king remain chaste in marriage. This bodily purity explains the acuity of their sense of vision. Spiritual sight is linked with the body, but it is not inborn. It is instead moral, behavioral.⁴⁸

Aelred of Rievaulx's *Life of St. Edward* explicitly attributes Edward's gift to "his inner purity. As his unusual chastity kept the gaze of his heart clear, just so did he dispel darkness from the outward eyes of others." Aelred goes on to use Edward's healing of seven eyes to illustrate how the king was filled with the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit.⁴⁹ A similar passage in Matthew Paris details how the four men are healed:⁵⁰

⁴⁵ Perhaps Edith's artistic production helps to compensate for her failure to produce children.

⁴⁶ Lines 4029–4032: "King Edward had many graces and powers that surpassed others', but in restoring sight I believe none was his equal".

⁴⁷ In this context, Edward's graces are gifts from God while Edith's are qualities pleasing to God and man.

⁴⁸ Biernoff (2002) discusses the fact that in the thirteenth century bodily senses, especially vision, were increasingly freed from their Augustinian association with fleshly sensuality and aligned with experimental knowledge. The *Estoire* is composed quite early in this evolution and therefore the evacuation of "fleshly sensuality" associated with bodily sight in the *Estoire* relies on Edward's sanctity, specifically on his bodily purity achieved through chastity. Biernoff is getting at something like this on page 67 when she compares the abstraction and rarefication of sight in Grosseteste's optics to the way the bodies of the blessed are "denuded of flesh".

⁴⁹ Aelred of Rievaulx, *The Life of St. Edward, King and Confessor*, Jerome Bertram trans., Saint Austin Press: Southampton 1997, at 64 and 70–71.

⁵⁰ Lines 3091–3092: "seven rays that brought light to the four men had issued forth from the king".

*Saet rais du rei sunt ja issuz
Ki eslument ces quatre tuz.*

And further:⁵¹

*Des saet rais du Seint Espirit
Fu li reis pleners e parfit.
Les saet rais out li reis rëantz,
Dunt fist saet tenebrus lusantz*

We have already been told that Edward was not present at the healing. A servant had stolen some of his wash water and, while wetting the blind men's eyes with it, he prayed to Jesus that the miracle be worked through Edward:

*Mais la vertu par li descende
De vus, Sire, ki es fontaine
De saluz e de tus bens veine.*⁵²

It is clear, therefore, that the seven rays of the Holy Spirit go into Edward⁵³ and he uses them to heal. The seven rays shining forth from Edward do not *directly* bring light to the blind men. These rays, we surmise, go into the transparent medium of the water when the king washes his hands.

The rays are seven because that is the number of gifts of the Holy Spirit, as set forth in Isaiah (11:2–3). Seven indicates fullness, completeness, and perfection in other biblical contexts as well, as *sheva*, the Hebrew word for seven, also means full or complete. Edward is perfectly filled with the Holy

⁵¹ Lines 3117–3120: “the king was filled with the seven rays of the Holy Sprit. With those seven branching rays he illumined seven shadowy places”.

⁵² Lines 3072–3074: “But let your power, Lord, you who are a fountain of health and the source of all good, descend through Edward”.

⁵³ The rays bring to mind artistic representations of humans receiving divine influence. In his article on Giotto's Assisi Fresco, c. 1300, Arnold I. Davidson, in his ‘Miracles of Bodily Transformation, or How St. Francis Received the Stigmata,’ *Critical Inquiry* 35 (2009), 451–480, observes that the luminosity of saints represents a divinization of the soul and that some depictions of the transfiguration show actual rays of light descending to the disciples, but he emphasizes the radical novelty of Giotto's fresco. It is the first painting to depict the physical process of the stigmatization and it does so through five rays of light descending from Christ's stigmata to produce Francis's stigmata..

Spirit and it shines forth through him. He is a beacon of holiness here on earth.⁵⁴

*Li Seint Espiritz est cunfort
A tuz dolensz, as periz port,
E lumere as tenebrus.
Pur ço cum vus dis la sus,
Par rei Aedward k'ert espuriz
Du Seint Esprit e esclarciz.*

This depiction of Edward as virginal intermediary through whom the Holy Spirit works to illuminate the world calls to mind the Virgin Mary and in particular her representation as a kind of immaculate prism through which the holy light is embodied and shines forth. She too is full of grace, possessed of the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit and the seven virtues. She is the vessel through which God became man. This depiction is found in *Le Chastel d'amur*, an Anglo-Norman text written c. 1220–1230 by that most famous teacher of Franciscans and philosopher of light, Robert Grosseteste. This influential text allegorizes the incarnation through the traditional metaphor that represents the body as castle in order to teach salvation history to a lay audience.⁵⁵ The body of the virgin is the castle of love through which God descends and becomes man. The exterior of the castle is painted in three colors (green, blue, and red), but inside it as white as falling snow and it gives forth great light to the earth. There is also an ivory throne whiter than midday approached by seven steps and overarched by the rainbow:

*Le arc du ciel entour s'estent
Od la colur k'a li apent.*⁵⁶

⁵⁴ Lines 3121–3126: “The Holy Spirit is a comfort to all unfortunates, a port to the imperiled, and a light in the darkness. That’s why, as I told you above, King Edward, purified and illumined by the Holy Spirit, had the grace of God to cure blind men”.

⁵⁵ Whitehead (2003, 93) discusses the allegory at length, underlining the text’s popularity from the time of its composition until the end of the Middle Ages, noting its survival in sixteen Anglo-Norman manuscripts and its circulation in four distinct Middle English translations.

⁵⁶ Robert Grosseteste, *Le château d'amour de Robert Grosseteste, évêque de Lincoln*. J. Murray ed., Champion: Paris 1918, lines 648–649. “The rainbow nearby is spread, with the color appropriate to it”. Translation mine.

We have already seen that Grosseteste was interested in the rainbow and refraction. Here we see that he used the refraction of white light through a pure, transparent medium (the castle of love representing the virgin's body) into the full solar spectrum of colors to help believers envision the incarnation.⁵⁷

Further tying the two texts together, in the middle of the highest tower of the castle of love is a fountain which gives forth waters that heal any ill (lines 629–636). Like Edward, Mary is gifted with an overabundance of grace that overflows from her to succor others:⁵⁸

*Mes la Pucele tant ama
Ke pleine grâce li dona,
Dont la grâce ki surunde
Fet sueur a tut le munde.*

Mary's grace overflows or "*surunde*" which by the component *unde* (wave) conjures the image of water, but also that of light, especially when we recall that the author of the *Chastel*, Robert Grosseteste, was the first to theorize light as a wave.

Edward's healing the blind men by the grace of the Holy Spirit accounts for the majority of the instances of the word *oilz* in the text (as the table in the appendix reflects). These instances are organized into two sections (lines 2710–3087 and lines 4036–4410). Each healing series follows an allusion to King Edward's own eyes. Like the blinding of Alfred and Harold II, these allusions define Edward's reign; the first succession occurs 100 lines after he becomes king and the second occurs on his deathbed. Both times Edward's own eyes are

⁵⁷ Today we represent the rainbow with seven colors, but it is of course a spectrum. In the Middle Ages the rainbow was often interpreted as having three colors (as we see here with the castle's paint job). In another work, Grosseteste describes colors as a spectrum going from black to white following an Aristotelian model with seven colors depicted on each half of the continuum (for a total of fourteen colors plus black and white). See Recht 2008, 177–178. In his *Dragmaticon* William of Conches discusses refraction, using it to show how our eyes are deceived (cited in Akbari 2002, 59–63) but it seems Grosseteste gives refraction a positive valence. Indeed, the rainbow looks different than white light, but it is not a deception, but rather evidence of the divine manifesting in the world.

⁵⁸ Robert Grosseteste, *Le château d'amour*, lines 751–754; "But He loved the maid so much that He gave her complete grace, the surplus of which gave succor to everyone".

mentioned, he is using them in humility and compassion. When Edward first becomes king:⁵⁹

*A simple semblant e umble oil
Regarde checun sanz orgoil*

And on his deathbed, surrounded by his court, he:⁶⁰

*les regarde e les oilz leve,
Veit la reine, si li greve,
Ki se pleint, plure e suspire,
Ses cheveus trait, ses dras decire.*

Both times the king's eyes are referred to, he does not dwell upon his own situation, but uses his eyes to *regarde*, or look, at each person in his entourage. In the second instance, the addition of the verb *veit*, to see, indicates his special concern for his wife, Edith. Edward's eyes are associated with their proper use, looking and seeing, and specifically with a will to understand others, whereas with the other principal characters in the text, the eyes are not associated with looking and seeing, but rather contrasted with it.

Furthermore, Edward's death is at pointed variance with those of Godwin and Harold II. He is not blinded and his eyes do not roll up in his head—his physical eyes work until the very end, as the scene cited above makes clear. What is more, he receives his most significant vision, “sue grant avisiun” [his great vision] on his deathbed (line 3709).⁶¹

Edward has a divine vision of what God has planned for England's future, but his eyes do not link him with the celestial alone, they also connect him to the human—with his subjects and with his wife. Yes, his vision is transcendent, but it is also humble. His human gaze makes him more accessible and imitable. This paradox reflects the fundamental enigma of vision in the Middle Ages. It is a sense grounded in corporeal organs and so is, by definition, linked with the body, but it was also thought to be the least material and the

⁵⁹ Lines 964–965: “With simple demeanor and modest gaze, he looked upon each person without arrogance”.

⁶⁰ Lines 3867–3870: “Then he raised his eyes and looked at them. It grieved him to see the queen lamenting, sighing, and weeping, tearing her hair and clothing”.

⁶¹ Due to space limitations, I will deal elsewhere with the important role divine visions play in the *Estoire*.

most noble of the senses. Vision was seen as a link between the physical and the spiritual, as a way for embodied people to access the divine.

As visual artist and monk at St. Albans Abbey, Matthew is very aware that its visual aspect makes his text new and powerful. He draws attention to his use of images and emphasizes their importance by his choice of vocabulary, metaphors, and symbols in his written narrative. Matthew Paris, like Edward (and Edith), has a rare gift for and recognizes the importance of the power of sight.

This complex understanding of vision, along with the depiction of royal sanctity as “visionary”, allows the author to interject himself into the work, calling attention to the importance of his role as writer and artist.⁶²

*Fame s'espant cum fumee
D'encens par fu ki est muntee.
Testmoin de gent veritable
En rent fame veritable.
L'oil verrai ki cerche l'ovre
Les vertuz partut descovre.*

It is he who makes Edward's holy life accessible to the audience through the metaphor of sight and numerous illuminations that come as close as possible to making the members of his audience themselves visual witnesses to the sanctity of their king. Matthew Paris brilliantly emphasizes the theme of sight, using his own talents as visual artist to make his text more relevant by maximizing already-circulating traditions of Edward the Confessor's insightful and sight-giving sanctity while showcasing his own gifts as author and illustrator, historian and hagiographer.

Matthew Paris's text therefore bolsters dynastic, monastic, and writerly authority through the motif of vision. He creates a work that speaks to a wider audience by aligning his own work with the saintly work of Edward the Confessor and by combining media and genres to create a hybrid text.

⁶² Lines 4413–4418: “Fame spreads like smoke that rises from burning incense, and the testimony of truthful people renders fame genuine. The truthful eye that seeks the deed finds its power everywhere”.

Nicole Leapley, PhD
 Department of Modern Languages and Literatures,
 Saint Anselm College.
 nleapley[at]Anselm.Edu

Appendix

Subject associated with word	Times word appears in text	Line numbers	Times word appears in rubrics	Line numbers
Alfred	1	440	1	4716
Edward	1	964	0	
Fisherman	1	2120	0	
Blind men	20	2710-3087	3	4946, 4970, 4971
Harold and Tostin	1	3152	0	
Godwin	1	3326	0	
Edward	1	3778	0	
Edward	1	3867	0	
Author/one	1	3966	0	
Blind men	6	4036-4410	3	5096, 5152, 5155
Author/one	1	4417	0	
Harold II	1	4608	1	5202
Totals = 44	36		8	