

Publication du Centre européen  
d'études Souveraignes, N° 43  
2003

BAS JONGENELEN

*Dutch teacher 'Johan de Witt-gymnasium' Dordrecht*

**JAN PERTCHEVAL'S TRANSLATION OF *LE CHEVALIER DÉLIBÉRÉ* : *DEN CAMP VANDER DOOT*.  
SOURCE, TRANSLATION AND PUBLIC<sup>1</sup>**

Just by comparing *Le chevalier délibéré*, written by Olivier de la Marche, and *Den camp vander doot*, it's Dutch translation<sup>2</sup> made by Jan Pertcheval<sup>3</sup>, you will notice that they are quite similar as far as form is concerned. The only remarkable differences are that *Den camp vander doot* has a prologue and ends with a *tafel vant a.b.c.* which is introduced by an additional stanza. Both textelements need to be studied more closely and must have been meaningful for the reading public Jan Pertcheval had in mind. I shall leave these textelements for what they are for this

<sup>1</sup> Thanks to Molly van Diepenbrugge who tried to keep me from the path of Double Dutch.

<sup>2</sup> *Le chevalier délibéré* has been translated in several languages : Spanish, English and Italian, see about these translations : C. CLAVERIA, *Le chevalier délibéré de Olivier de la Marche y sus versiones españolas del siglo XVI*, Zaragoza, 1950 ; S.S. SUTCH & A.L. PRESCOTT, 'Translation as transformation : Olivier de la Marche's *Le chevalier délibéré* and its Hapsburg and Elizabethan permutations', in *Comparative Literature Studies*, vol. 25, 1988, p. 281-317 ; N. BARANDA, V. INFANTES & C. HUIDOBRO SALAS in the preface of O. DE LA MARCHE, *El caballero determinado* (reproducción facsímil), Toledo, 2000 ; D.A.L. MORGAN, "'The Resolved Gentleman' : Lewis Lewkenor, Olivier de la Marche and the consciousness of Burgundy', in *Publication CEEB*, numéro 41, 2001, p. 89-103. P. WILLEMSZ also made a Dutch translation called *Vanden ridder welghemoet*, see : M.E. KRONENBERG, 'Een onbekende Nederlandsche vertaling van *Le chevalier délibéré*, door Pieter Willemsz gemaakt', in *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse taal- en letterkunde*, t. 51, 1932, p. 178-196 ; and M.E. KRONENBERG, 'Fragmenten der Nederlandse vertaling van *Le chevalier délibéré* door Pieter Willemsz', in *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse taal- en letterkunde*, t. 69, 1952, p. 169-179. This translation was thought to be gone, but the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek in Vienna has a copy, see H. PLEIJ, "'Ridder welghemoet" in Wenen', in *Literatuur*, t. 2, 1987, p. 97-98.

<sup>3</sup> J. PERTCHEVAL, *Den camp vander doot - met inleiding, aantekeningen en glossarium door Dr. Gilbert DEGROOTE*, Antwerpen, 1948.

moment and I will focus on the text that *Le chevalier délibéré* and *Den camp vander doot* have in common. Both books have an equal number of stanzas (338), and lines per stanza (8). One of the woodcuts from *Den camp vander doot* has been removed, causing six stanzas from *Den camp vander doot* to be lost (stanzas 20 to 26). It is quite certain that they once belonged to the original text translated by Jan Pertcheval. Pertcheval translated stanza by stanza : the contents of a French stanza always corresponds with the Dutch stanza. Pertcheval never uses the contents of a French stanza for two Dutch stanzas, the contents of a French stanza never returns in a Dutch stanza at a later stage. Pertcheval is extremely precise in these matters, which encourages me to contend that exactly 6 stanzas have vanished and that Jan Pertcheval was not to blame. In this article I shall use to the numbering of stanzas used by La Marche, also when it concerns Jan Pertcheval's text.

So the form shows great correspondence, but what about contents? To this end I compared both texts and ofcourse there are differences ; the reading-public of a translation differs from a public reading a book in its original language. The translator will have to consider this. A translator is not your average reader. His eyes detect details that might not be noticed by an ordinary reader, he encounters mysteries that will have to be solved. He does not only read the original text, he dissects it, analyzes it, unwraps it, takes it to bits. He is to tell the story in his own words (in his mother-tongue) to his own reading-public<sup>4</sup>.

Sometimes he may not find the original text clear enough, or ambiguous, or too much the product of its time. In that case it is the translator's duty to clarify, to explain to the reader. There are translators that follow their own trail, which leaves us with the question whether we may still speak of translating ; the term *adaptating* is then more appropriate. The translator could opt for not noticing the problems and translate the text literally, he will then plead innocence if the text is unclear : that is what it says in the original. Most translators find themselves somewhere in the middle, one part could be a proper adaptation whereas the next fragment is an exact translation and other fragments are a mixture of the two. One of the instruments a translator could use is *rationalising* (the translator clarifies anything that is vague to him)<sup>5</sup>. An other instrument is the *de-clarifying* (the translator de-clarifies anything that is explicit)<sup>6</sup>. In this article I shall first consider whether it is clear which version Pertcheval used as a source for his translation and then I shall prove that Jan Pertcheval was a capable translator, who remained

4 There are several studies to the intended reading audience of Dutch translations of French novels. E.g. F.P. VAN OOSTROM, *Lantsloot vander Haghedochte*, Amsterdam, 1981 ; R.J. RESOORT, *Een schoone historie vander borchgravinne van Vergi*, Hilversum, 1988 ; J.B. VAN DER HAVE, *De roman der Lorreinen - de fragmenten en het geheel*, Schiedam, 1990 ; I. SPIJKER, *Aymijns kinderen hoog te paard*, Hilversum, 1990 ; G.H.M. CLAASSENS, *De Middelnederlandse kruisvaartromans*, Amsterdam, 1993 ; S. RAUE, *Een nauwsluitend keurs*, Amsterdam, 1996.

5 OOSTROM, *Lantsloot*, p. 69-95.

6 OOSTROM, *Lantsloot*, p. 97-125.

loyal to Olivier de la Marche's original text. I shall use three arguments (*rationalising, de-clarification* and the figure of speech called enumeration) to this end.

#### Jan Pertcheval and Otgier Nachtegael in Schiedam.

In 1483 *Le chevalier délibéré* was published and it caused a tremendous effect. Many people wanted to acquaint themselves with it, read it, or even own it. The book was also known amongst the rhetoricians in Brussels. The factor of the chamber of rhetoric *De leliebroeders*, Jan Pertcheval, also held a copy in his possession. It is unknown how he got hold of this copy but because he knew Olivier de la Marche personally, it is not altogether unlikely that he had copied La Marche's private copy. Both *Le chevalier délibéré* and *Den camp vander doot* were published in Schiedam by Otgier Nachtegael. *Den camp vander doot* in 1503, the date of publication of *Le chavalier délibéré* is not known, it is likely to be round 1498-1505<sup>7</sup>. In 1493 (stanza 338) Pertcheval completed his translation, ten years after the publication of *Le chevalier délibéré*.

The question rises which copy Pertcheval used for his translation. In view of the dates, a certain number of books may be considered : a traditional manuscript, the Paris-publication of 1488<sup>8</sup>, the Gouda-publication of 1489<sup>9</sup> or a non-traditional manuscript. When comparing his translation to the original text it strikes us that it is fairly explicit, but on two points problems, as far as the various text-traditions are concerned, present themselves : in stanza 37 it says 'Dus heb di mijns naems verstant gecregen'. The striking word is *mijns*. In the traditional manuscripts<sup>10</sup> it says 'Or t'ay de **ton** nom devise' [bold print by B.J.], Paris 1488 also mentions *ton nom*. The Gouda and Schiedam publication have : 'Or t'ay de **mon** nom devise' [bold print by B.J.]. Pertcheval and the Gouda and the Schiedam printers used the same source.

As far as I am concerned we had not quite reached our goal : to find out which book Pertcheval used to translate from. Unfortunately my trail ended ; this was caused by Lippmann. His edition of the Schiedam-*Chevalier délibéré* contains an editing- or composition error where it is of vital importance to me. I will explain my train of thoughts now. In stanza 34 it says in *Den camp vander doot* : 'Mijn wandelen is in blijscapen groot' (My stroll makes me very happy) [bold print by B.J.]. Whereas the traditional manuscript says : 'Mon **Repas** se fait en liesse' [bold print by B.J.]. Paris 1488 and Gouda 1489 both apply *repas*. The fact that Pertcheval does not translate *repas* as *maaltijd* (meal) maar met *wandelen* (to stroll) is odd, and it is caused by Lippman's edition. Is *wandelen* the translation of *repos*? Not exactly, but it comes a lot closer than *repas*. According to the Mid-

7 O. DE LA MARCHE, *Le chevalier délibéré - the illustrations of the edition of Schiedam reproduced, with a preface by F. LIPPMANN and a reprint of the text*, London, 1897-1898.

8 O. DE LA MARCHE, *Le chevalier délibéré (printed at Paris in 1488)*, Washington, 1946.

9 <http://gallica.bnf.fr/scripts/ConsultationTout.exe?E=0&O=N071392>

10 O. DE LA MARCHE, *Le Chevalier delibéré (The Resolute Knight) - edited by C.W. CARROLL, translated by L.H. WILSON & C.W. CARROLL*, Tempe (Arizona), 1999.

*delnederlandsch Woordenboek*<sup>11</sup> (MNW) *Wandelen* in the first place means 'heen en weer gaan' (going to and fro), 'rondlopen' (walking around), 'rondreizen' (traveling around), 'rondlopen' (roaming around) and '(rond-)dwalen' (wandering around). Not really related to *repos*, but *wandelen*, according to the very same MNW, could also mean: 'verkeren' (to be), 'zich ophouden' (to loiter), 'verblijf houden' (to sojourn), of 'wonen' (to dwell). I think it does contain a form of 'rust' (peace and quiet) or 'rusthouden' (to rest). The reflexive verb 'wandelen' could indeed mean 'zich ontspannen' (to relax), 'zich vermeien of verlustigen' (to disport one self or to exult in). The MNW provides us with this meaning in the last place, so it is quite obvious that this is not commonly used, but it certainly is the translation of *repos* we need. So I hereby venture to conclude that Otgier Nachtegael used the French book from which Pertcheval translated to print his edition of *Le chevalier délibéré*.

But *helas...* sometimes things are too good to be true. When I came across copies of the Schiedam print on the internet<sup>12</sup> I saw that Otgier Nachtegael had just used *repas*, not *repos*. So Lippman's edition fails us. Instead of offering us a solution for this *repas/repos*-error, it presents us with a new question: Why did Jan Pertcheval translate *repas* as *wandelen*? Obviously for him to know and for us to find out.

And yet we must conclude that Nachtegael and Pertcheval had drawn from the same book. I can prove this indirectly: Pertcheval and Nachtegael had been in contact with each other for the publication of *Den camp vander doot*; could it not have been the case that Nachtegael had made use of the situation to gain permission to borrow Pertcheval's French text? This sounds quite sane to me; it even seems a very logical thought, as a matter of fact. Obviously Nachtegael would never set about trying to get hold of *Le chevalier délibéré* indirectly if he knew someone who actually owned a copy - Jan Pertcheval<sup>13</sup>. It is not quite clear how this tale equals in the Gouda-print. Bearing the *mon nom*-quotation in mind, Gouda, Schiedam and Jan Pertcheval must have had common grounds somewhere, but exactly where? Did Nachtegael and Pertcheval use Gouda 1498 for their versions? Or could it be that Schiedam, Gouda and *Den camp vanden doot* are based on one (lost) manuscript? The relation that exists between the works that belong to the *mon nom*-tradition remains vague for the time being; a sound comparison between the Gouda- and Schiedam-texts might shed some light on the matter. This provides us with a task for the near future.

11 *Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek* (cd rom), Den Haag, 1998.

12 <http://gallica.bnf.fr/scripts/ConsultationTout.exe?E=0&O=N071775>

13 About publishers / printers and how they get hands on their books: H. PLEIJ, *De wereld volgens Thomas v/d Noot*, Muiderberg, 1982; P.J.A. FRANSSEN, *Tussen tekst en publiek - Jan van Doesburg, drukker-uitgever en literator te Antwerpen en Utrecht in de eerste helft van de zestiende eeuw*, Amsterdam, 1990; K. GOUDRIAAN, *Een drukker zoekt publiek. Gheraert Leeu te Gouda 1477-1484*, Delft, 1993; P.M.H. CUIJPERS, *Teksten als koopwaar: vroege drukkers verkennen de markt*, Amsterdam, 1998.

### Rationalising

Rationalising usually boils down to making explicit which is vague or unclear in any other respect in the original text. The translator may add something to the text. Or leave something out, that is also a solution. In any case the translator does not consider a fragment of the text clear enough for his reading-public, and he finds he must do something about it. He will ruminate about the problem and he will look for a solution and find one. He will present this solution on the particular position of the original fragment. There are translators that add things to a translation which cause it to become longer. Jan Pertcheval does not use this kind of rationalisation. He does not add to his text, he tries to solve the mystery within the same number of lines. In general he uses the most elementary form of rationalisation: he makes explicit which had remained implicit in the French text. I shall now pass a number of rationalisations the review.

The best example of rationalisation can be found more or less right at the beginning. Stanza 5 deals with La Marche's source of inspiration to write *Le chevalier délibéré: Le pas de la mort*, written by Amé de Montgesoie. La Marche mentions this book in line 5 of this stanza. Is this work known to all those read *Den camp vander doot*? Probably not, Pertcheval must have thought, for he does not mention this book; yet he does refer to its Dutch translation: *Pas vander doot* written by Colijn Caillieu ('Caellui' Pertcheval writes), the book which actually bears the name of *Tdal sonder wederkeren*, subtitled *Pas vander doot*<sup>14</sup>. Pertcheval adapts his translation to his readers. His Dutch reading public do not really benefit of the advice to read the French book written by Montgesoie, that is why they should study the Dutch translation. In line 4 of stanza 5 La Marche writes either about the book *Pas la mort*, or about its writer, Amé de Montgesoie: 'Plus riche que d'or ne de soye'. Pertcheval found a problem in this: who or what has a greater value than gold and silk? He solves this by referring explicitly to the writer (who was in this case the translator of Amé de Montgesoie, Colijn Caillieu): 'woonachtig te Brusel' (resident of Brussels). He also passes a judgement on the writer, Caillieu is known to be quite malign at times: 'die zo bij ten react'. 'Bijten en raken' (biting and hitting) means striking a person severely, 'bij ten raect' is then a setting error for 'bijt en raect'. La Marche informs his readers in stanza 160 of the importance to keep up to date with literature, to study and to reflect on matters that concern life and death: the first-person narrator is advised to 'va et estudies'. But what is to be studied remains unexplained. It is likely that La Marche refers here again to Montgesoie's book. Pertcheval is more explicit in this: 'Den pas der doot' is to be studied, Colijn Caillieu's book. That is a clear piece of advice and that is of use to the reader.

La Marche wrote his *chevalier délibéré* for a titled public. He could afford to use expressions that were commonplace in those circles. Jan Pertcheval had a problem: what the nobility already knew, his readers might not know intrinsical-

14 C. CAILLIEU, *Dal sonder wederkeeren of Pas der doot*, door P. DE KEYSER, Antwerpen, 1936.

ly, he sometimes needed to explain. In some instances it is about the military ; old-hat for the nobility, yet unknown territory to the commoners. The nobility knew exactly what La Marche meant in stanza 11 with 'harnas de guerre'. If Pertcheval wrote for commoners he could be presented with a small problem here : what exactly is a suit of armour. Of course everyone had seen a suit of armour at some point in their lives, so this is not a major problem ; and yet some explanation might be asked for : 'spee schilt ende sweerde' (spear, shield and sword). Pertcheval points out that it is all about proper armour, his readers picture an armoured knight in full regalia. Anyone that is familiar with the military knows that the righthand glove of a suit of armour is a heavily armoured one. La Marche writes in stanza 92 : 'gantelet dextre'. Amongst the nobility this did not want any further explanation, it is quite probable that the Dutch reading public Pertcheval had in mind, were not fully aware of the applications of various parts of the battledress. Pertcheval explains about the glove : he does not refer to it as the righthand glove, but as the 'gewapende hantscoen' (armoured glove). In that manner his readers were able to understand that it did not concern any old glove but a very heavy one, in other words, an armoured glove<sup>15</sup>.

Titles in nobility were probably a great deal clearer to members of the nobility ; they definitely dealt with it in a different way, for the Dutch commoners not all ins and outs concerning this matter spoke for itself. 'Les cours des princes et des grans seigneurs' (stanza 96) is too vague for Pertcheval : who is meant, exactly? It is up to him to clarify who these 'grand lords' might be : 'der heeren hoven der prinschen ende den hertoghen mede' (the lords of the prince's courts and the dukes as well). He categorizes the lords into princes and dukes. A perfect explicit reference to the Burgundian ducal court, by the way.

Now I will briefly discuss the remaining rationalisations :

(1) It is quite evident that no tournaments were held at night and yet La Marche writes : 'Sans avoir jour ne nuit repos' in stanza 6. It seems that Pertcheval thinks it is so obvious that there were no tournaments at night that he leaves it out, he translates it with : 'sijnder dagen'.

(2) 'Depuis ta premiere chemise' La Marche writes in stanza 8 : from your first vest onwards. Apparently Pertcheval considered this form of imagery carried a little too far, he thinks that if you mean since you were born, you should write it down as such. 'Doen gij inde werelt tordt', from the moment you came into this world.

(3) One of the first opponents with whom the first-person narrator will contend is Outheit (Old Age), called Eage by La Marche. This fight is not a life-and-death struggle ; that fight will take place a lot later in the arena of Atropos. In stanza 10, however, La Marche mentions Maladie as a contestant who should be challenged in a tournament, 'plus vis' (the longer you live). Pertcheval intervenes and does

15 Literature for Brussels's citizens and their way of approaching literature for the nobility is object to the studies of H. PLEIJ, see e.g. his *De sneeuwpoppen van 1511*, Amsterdam, 1998.

not translate *Maladie* with *Crancheit*, but correctly with *Outheit*. As a matter of fact *Pertcheval* commits a translating-error when he mentions *Outheit* in stanza 17 where it should be *Crancheit*: '*Outheit of Accidente*', in French we find the same line '*Debile ou Messire Accident*'. *Sickness*, *Accident's* companion is meant here, not *Old Age*.

(4) There is an other armour dilemma in stanza 217. There it says that there is no device to fight death: '*cuirasse ne cappe*', no armour and no helmet. Seemingly it is so evident to *Pertcheval* that a helmet is part of a suit of armour that he actually leaves the helmet out. However, he does add something: '*raet*' (advice). A coat of armour does not do the trick, and neither does a sound piece of advice.

(5) When the author asks permission to stay with the hermit, it is because of the time of day: it is already late. The author appeals to the hospitality the hermit must grant because of the works of charity: hosting travellers. In stanza 26 *La Marche* has the hermit say: '*inderdaad*' (indeed), ('soye'). *Pertcheval* must have found this slightly problematic, for he translates it with: '*twas na der sonnen*'. An additional direction for the reader that the author not just begs for hospitality, but that it was about time to look for shelter anyway, it had already grown dark.

(6) In stanza 28 the first-person narrator hears the name of the hermit's servant: *Bonne Enfance*. In what manner he heard this name, he explains as follows: '*En ce point l'oyz je nomme*'. So in fact he heard it mentioned. *Pertcheval* rationalises this: when do you hear anything mentioned? When you are talking; the hermit was talking to his servant and he called him by his name: '*Dus hoerdic hem noemen bij anderen dingen*'.

(7) The hermit is an old and wise man; '*Homme de bel et grant courrage / et ressembloit bien estre saige*' (stanza 31), he also has a white beard and a white head (white hair on his head). *Pertcheval* does not think this was enough, he adds a little extra to the description of this man: '*Wit haren baert had hij gelijc eenen geeste / Scheen hij rechts vuyt abstinencien / En wel een man sijnde van grooter sciencen*'. He looks wise, but because of his fasting he has the appearance of a ghost. The reader is able to learn more from this description: a man that does not make a ball of his life, but fasts a lot and studies a great deal, this must be an extremely wise man.

(8) How did Kain kill Abel? With the jawbone of a donkey, and not with his bare hands. And yet *La Marche* writes the following: '*Vecy le soc d'une charrue / Dont Accident Abel occist / Par Cayn, et sa main nue*' (stanza 52). *Pertcheval* finds this odd and clarifies the matter. In the first place, it is not about a plowshare at all, but the jawbone of a donkey (used as a plowshare, I must add). Apart from this all it is an apocryphal story; according to the bible Kain killed Abel (Genesis 4:8), but the instrument of murder is not mentioned. The fact that Kain used a jawbone, means that he did not kill his brother with his bare hands. *Pertcheval* applies the omission as rationalisation here: '*Siet her dit is van eenen ezel tkakebeen / Daer Accident Abel met bracht ter dood / Bij Cayn dien brachte int gheween*'.

(9) Sometimes it is difficult to determine whether *Pertcheval* rationalises, or whether he uses a stopgap for the sake of rhyme. In stanza 64 *La Marche* writes

about Holofernes ('Olofferne le grant'). Does Pertcheval believe his readers to be so dim-witted that they need additional explanation about Holofernes? Meaning that he lived a long time ago? This is highly unlikely, and yet he does provide this additional explanation: 'Holofernes is voerleeden tyen'. Strictly speaking this is rationalising, but it is more plausible that Pertcheval in fact just needed a rhyme-word.

(10) The same case presents itself in stanza 69. Here La Marche writes about Iobab murdering Amaza; the two embrace and Iobab stabs Amaza with a knife. Pertcheval elaborates on this: 'Mit deser grooten daggehn swaer / Quetste Iobab by hem comen was / Amazam mit een cusse openbaer / en dooden heymelijc van achter daer'. Pertcheval seems to emphasize the fact that it was a treacherous embrace: they kiss in public, but one sneakily stabs the other. The antithesis 'openbaer' (in public) - 'heymelijc' (in secret) has been applied here very appropriately. Or is it a rhyme-stopgap ('openbaer-daer')? Or is it a rationalisation? Or could it be all three at the same time? The fact remains that Pertcheval explains a great deal more than La Marche and that it concerns a rationalisation here, in any case.

(11) In stanza 77 La Marche names the hermit 'le preudomme' Pertcheval does not refer to this literally, but gives the hermit's age an extra quality: he calls him his friend 'out verdaegt' (old of days). In his point of view old age also says something about quality. The hermit is not only a good person, he is old and wise with it.

(12) The first-person narrator is being dumped with a symbol that he has reached a certain age. He is given a beard after he lost his fight with Ouderdom. La Marche writes in stanza 102 'barbe meslee', translated by Pertcheval with a 'grijsen baert', a grey beard. But he does not leave it at that; illustrating that it is no small matter to get rid of your grey beard, the first-person narrator is given a grey beard that keeps growing and growing: 'eenen grijsen baert die zeer wast' (a grey beard that grows very well and rapidly). Being an old man you are recognizable and will always be so.

(13) In stanza 129 La Marche uses a metaphor voor sexual intercourse: 'prendre connins a l'embucque', meaning: having banging bunnies in ambush. Pertcheval does not think this fit for his readers: he is more direct: 'to woe women'. Might this kind of metaphor be unknown in the Dutch field of language? Pertcheval's translation is certainly clearer than the original.

(14) When Fresche Memoire points out where the graves are, La Marche describes this as a plain as extensive as 'de Paris en Espagne' (stanza 158). Pertcheval finds this a little overdone, for him the plain is too large to gain a proper insight. He edits it into 'tuschen Paris ende Schelde', between Paris and the river the Schelde. This should seem a great deal more comprehensible for the Dutch readers than the comparison with Spain which, after all, is quite a long way away.

(15) The Burgundian court was very interested in the Trojan history (which European nobiliary court was not, for that matter) La Marche does not need to



explain that Troy is besieged by the Greeks (stanza 164). Would it have been less clear-cut for Pertcheval's readers? At any rate, Pertcheval thinks it worth-while to be a little more explicit about history : 'De Troyanen vanden Grieken beladen'.

(16) When reading a book one does not always make a mental note of the date it was written. La Marche makes the mistake to think that everybody knows that his work was written in 1483 when he writes 'Cy sont ceulx que Mort oppressa depuis l'an trente cinq en ca' (stanza 165). Pertcheval is clearer in this, the dead he describes are given a date : they have been buried there from 'viertienhondert .v. ende dertigh' (1430). A date is more objective, he must have thought.

(17) What was wrong with Pope Eugenius IV and antipope Felix? Both caused a schisma, because both were too proud, both wanted to be the Pope and neither of them would listen to reason. Fortunately they both died. La Marche places them snugly underneath one stone (stanza 173), but he says that death ended the war ('ceste guerre') between the popes. Pertcheval regards it more subtly, he is not concerned about the war but about the pride of the pope and the antipope, it was this pride that was ended by death : 'Crancheit stackse beide inder aerden and maecte een inde huer hovaerden' (Death buried both and ended their pride).

(18) The translation of stanza 204 is more accurate than the original. La Marche writes that the Duke of Savoie more or less died the same way the Duke of Guienne did. Pertcheval felt this jarring, for he translated it with 'van sulcker doot'. In this way he removes the ambiguity in this sentence.

(19) Pertcheval makes the reader realise that he is reading a book : a sword is described as 'Quaet aventure int gedichte', in this poem, in this tale the sword is related to as Quaet Aventure. Pertcheval takes the position of the metafictional writer<sup>16</sup>, he makes clear that you, reader, are reading a poem and in this poem objects have symbolic names. Of course there is no real sword bearing the name of Quaet Aventure but in literature this is quite viable. In La Marche's corresponding stanza (250) there is no trace of the writer and reader meeting each other beyond the book to reflect on the tale.

(20) In the last rationalisation the question rises whether Death has any friends. According La Marche he does, in stanza 265 he writes that death gets the best of everybody : 'son ennemy et son affin', his enemy and his friend. Pertcheval thinks death does not have any friends, just enemies : 'Hueren viant'. A consistent thought.

Concluding from these rationalisations Jan Pertcheval had a different public in mind than Olivier de la Marche did. Whereas la Marche wrote his poetry for a French reading public primarily amongst the nobility, Pertcheval translated for the Dutch middle-classes. And yet the number of rationalisations remains quite limited. The distinction between middle class and nobility can only be detected in a

16 See for this very postmodern idea of metafiction : P. WAUGH, *Metafiction : the theory and practice of self-conscious fiction*, London, 1984 ; H. BERTENS & T. D'HAEN, *Het postmodernisme in de literatuur*, Amsterdam, 1988, p. 102-118.

small number of instances. Some rationalisations relate to rhyme-words and/or clichés. This modest number of real rationalisations also proves that Jan Pertcheval did not really take on the French text as far as this matter is concerned, he translated *Le chevalier délibéré* and did not edit it. The rationalisations do not indicate that Jan Pertcheval followed his own programme.

### De-clarification

No matter how one classifies *Le chevalier délibéré*, it is not a realistic work. Translator Pertcheval does add some realism by means of rationalisations, but that does not make it a realistic romance. The book depicts how people should idealistically live or fight. Jan Pertcheval felt free to de-clarify the text where it seemed too concrete and also too realistic to him. In some cases idealisation establishes itself and the story (or the characters mentioned in the text) is or are elevated onto a higher level. Pertcheval here adheres to the original text as well and generally refrains from action. The number of de-clarification remains limited and so does the number of idealisation correspondingly, he occasionally makes matters seem more beautiful than they really are, but he does not commit the sins of excrescences and idolizing.

That de-clarifying may lead to idealising is illustrated in stanza 134 : from here to England (*de cy en Engleterre*) is on the one hand a vague definition of place - where is 'here' after all? But on the other hand it definitely determines something - as far as England. La Marche was at the Burgundian court in Brussels, so if he writes this we can work out the size of the area he had in mind. It is quite likely it concerns a 'by way of speaking', but the definition of place as in England does not leave much to the reader's imagination. Pertcheval thought even bigger : it is about a land *Dat men begaen mach of rijden mit paerden* (a land to go to, or ride to on horse back). By de-clarifying to this degree an idealisation presents itself ; this beautiful place is not between here and England, but 'somewhere'. An other de-clarification in a three-dimensional sense can be found in stanza 225. Philip the Good is considered by La Marche as *Le plus grant des ducs de Ponnant* (the greatest duke of the West). Even this is too explicit for Pertcheval, he just thinks '*De grootste vanden hertoghe hij bekint was*'. So also compared to the dukes in the East, Philip is the greatest.

#### Other de-clarifications :

(1) In the first stanza La Marche writes that Pensee kept him company (*la journee*). This clear description is not right according to Pertcheval, due to the fact that the story covers more than one day. The period of time Ghepeys (Pensee) kept him company, *geselscapte* him, is kept unresolved by Pertcheval. It is quite amusing that Pertcheval himself finds this de-clarification very clear : *geseit int clare*, it has been stated very explicitly.

(2) *Int groot forest van Atropos* the two knights, Crancheit and Accident, fight people in order to suppress them. La Marche describes this in the active voice, which gives a lively impression. Pertcheval opts for the passive voice here : *De*

*menige krijgt daer sulken schos* (stanza 6). The result is that the reader does not and cannot visualize two strong knights. It remains vague what the situation is exactly and who does what.

(3) The next stanza describes that the young and strong (*les jones et les forts*) will have to fight Accident le Terrible as well. Pertcheval sees the fight against ill-fortune in a wider context, not only the young and strong, but also the old-aged will have to fend for themselves against Accident the Savage : *al die iongen oft ouwen*. And that means everyone, he is more implicit here and so more undefined than La Marche who merely mentions the young.

(4) *Ce voyage humain* is what La Marche calls human life (stanza 41). Very clear and appropriate within the story where a person sets out to fight old-age, sickness and ill-fate. Pertcheval is a little less explicit, he speaks of a road, a path : *deesen wech*. The reader will understand what he is talking about, but it certainly is less well-defined.

(5) Stanza 60 deals with Hannibal of Carthago. He met his end through poisoning. Because of this he died when he was in fact too young : he should live on an other quarter or third part (*avant qu'il eust tiers ne quart age*). Assuming that a human being should reach the age of seventy, Hannibal had turned somewhere between 46 and 52. Pertcheval does not allow us this arithmetic. *Voer zijn tijt* apparently is sufficient.

(6) The tale of Melusine is mentioned in stanza 67 : Remondin kills his uncle Fromont. In the dusk (*par le serin*) he thinks he is a wild boar. Of course Pertcheval refers to the story, but he omits to observe that the mistake Raeymondijn made, occurred due to poor visibility. Raeymondijn kills Fromont, but exactly how and when remains unclear.

(7) The writer is beaten by Old Age, and in stanza 87 he begins his story, who he is and what he does. Old Age says that he is known *par mon grant vasselaige* (because of my great loyalty). Pertcheval also has him say that he is known, but he does not mention from what we are supposed to know him. He does tell us from where : from a poem (*Bekint doer mijn enen ghedichte*). But it remains obscure which poem is meant and what can be read about Old Age in this poem.

(8) In stanza 95 Olivier de la Marche abandons allegory : he speaks about old (or aging) people - *les gens d'eage*. This clarifies the situation for the reader : if or when one loses the fight with Outheyt, one grows old. Old-age has caught up with you. Pertcheval (rather vaguely) persists in using the allegorical form (*Het is voer doutheyt groot ongeual*).

(9) *Au cul et con* is written by La Marche when he arrives at the palace of love and that does not leave anything unsaid (stanza 116). This plain language is a little too much of a good thing for Pertcheval (and the middleclass he belongs to). He prefers using guarded terms : *Der minnen spel* (the game of love). It speaks for itself that every reader knows quite well what is meant by it, but it definitely is not as transparent as La Marche describes it.

(10) The gloves are off in the fight in stanza 232, it is about *d'or trente millions*. Pertcheval had not imagined it to be this real. Much gold is at stake but the figure

has to remain symbolic and vague in its wake. So he keeps to *M. pont grote*.

(11) In stanza 234 Philip the Good is compared to a *fest*, a leaf of grass. In that manner the merciful duke is conquered, as if he were a leaf of grass. Jan Pertcheval however, speaks about something more implicit : the least meaningful under the sun (*den snoodsten onder der zonnen*). Who or what that is, is up to the reader.

(12) Michiel van Bergen is, according to stanza 278, a *chevalier n'ot en Brabant pour grande vertu et villance*. So Olivier de la Marche turns him into a genuine knight from Brabant. Pertcheval's view has a wider perspective : *ten is in desen tijt noch van hondert iaren out die sulck ridder weet int swerelts behout*. Which means as much as : Michiel van Bergen is the ablest knight in the world and not only in Brabant.

(13) One stanza further along Memoire tells *plus de vingt* history lessons. Pertcheval finds this too concrete : *verhalende veel gesciedenis*, a lot of tales.

(14) That knights should be tough and not cowardly is made clear to us by La Marche in stanza 284. Those not standing up for their rights are *failly, lache, recrant et defailly* : cowardly, a sissy, fainthearted and white-livered. These direct imputations cannot be traced back in Pertcheval's translation, he writes about a deposit that has been paid by way of squaring up. This may well be a middle-class interpretation.

(15) Olivier de la Marche dictates that we should cross ourselves *deux fois ou trois*, twice or three times (stanza 315). Jan Pertcheval stands by *dicwyl*, which a great deal more inexplicit. This cross is *contre charme, sort ou parole* - magic words, magic charm and enchantments. (La Marche), or *tegens tsviants voerbringen* (Pertcheval). The Dutch translation is much more vague : you should often cross yourself against the devil, in stead of those two or three times against enchantments.

The de-clarifications show, as the rationalisations did, that Jan Pertcheval had a different public in mind than Olivier de la Marche. A public that looked up to the nobility, a public that regarded the nobility as superstars, who were not just good, but the best and not the best of western Europe, but the best in the world. And yet the number of de-clarifications / idealisations is not as large as one would think. Again it appears that Pertcheval remains very close to the original text. He does not allow himself many liberties, leaves the text to its own value as often as possible and modifies it as little as possible.

### Enumerations

A striking feature of both *Le chevalier délibéré* and *Den camp vander doot* is the use of enumerations, ranging from the smallest version possible (two elements) up to and including the enumeration of eighteen elements in Pertcheval. This is in stanza 209 : 'Keysers, [...] trauuten, cockinen, Ongeuallige, safftiers oft coninghen, Hertogen, grauen en die dagelijcx pijnen, Brootbidders, scepenen, doctoen in medicinen, Arme, rijke, ouders oft ionghelinghen, Sotten, dasaerts'.

This is a somewhat looser interpretation of the enumeration of thirteen : 'Les empereurs et les coquins, les mechaniques et les roys, contes et ducs, et galopins, les bedeaux et les escheuins, pources, riches, sotsz et adrois'.

This example might give you the impression that Pertcheval exaggerates in his text somewhat ; that he, in addition to the enumeration, also applies the metaphor of the hyperbole lavishly. This seems a very appealing hypothesis, the more so because Pertcheval presumably translated for middle-class readers. The middle-class readers regarded the nobiliary characters in *Le chevalier délibéré* as the rich and famous. It also appears that in the case of a number of de-clarifications / idealisations Pertcheval liked presenting matters a little more favourable than they actually were. Enough reasons to investigate whether he overdoes it in the case of enumerations too.

I have added up all his enumerations and have found a total of 796 elements that had been involved in enumerations in the French text against 845 elements Pertcheval came up with. It cannot be readily concluded whether this difference is significant ; there is no reference material. That is the reason why I applied a different calculation. I investigated in how many cases there is a deviant enumeration. So when Olivier de la Marche has an enumeration of three, and Jan Pertcheval in fact translates this with three, there is observation. An observation takes place if the translator deviates in the number of enumerations. I ended at the total of 250 observations, of which 129 were exaggerations. In the other cases Olivier de la Marche had more elements in his enumerations. This presented us with the following information :

$H_0 : p = 0.5$  (Pertcheval has no system of increasing or decreasing)

$H_1 : p > 0.5$  (Pertcheval made his translation more glamorous by exaggerating enumerations)

This information constitutes the following formula :

$$P(X = 129)_{p=0.5}^{n=250} \approx 0.4$$

The conclusion is that the difference is hardly significant : so Jan Pertcheval has not exaggerated his translation. He increased almost as many enumerations as decreasing them. So all in all he uses just a few more elements in his enumerations as Olivier de la Marche does, but they are too few in number to draw any conclusions from it. As far as the enumerations are concerned it can be concluded that Jan Pertcheval was a very docile translator who does not do his own thing or follows his own trail. He keeps very close to Olivier de la Marche's original text.

#### Conclusion and discussion

It is obvious that Jan Pertcheval's translation of *Le chevalier délibéré* and its publication by Nachtegael in Schiedam were based on the same original. Unfortu-

nately this original is lost and not much can be said about it now. However, something can be said about the translation. Concluding from the same number of stanzas and the same number of lines per stanza *Den camp vanden doot* so happens to be a very accurate translation of *Le chevalier délibéré*. In some instances Jan Pertcheval uses a translation that finds better access to his target-readers : the Dutch speaking middle-classes. He uses rationalisations and de-clarifications. And yet the instances where he uses these devices to translate, are limited. Considering the fact that Pertcheval, even when applying figures of speech, stays close to *Le chevalier délibéré*, one can not but conclude that Jan Pertcheval was indeed a very accurate translator who translated the original text almost 1-to-1.

Nevertheless the question remains why Pertcheval did indeed stay so close to the French text. We can only have a guess at the answer to this, but this interesting matter certainly deserves closer investigation. In my opinion there are three options. (1) Pertcheval was so impressed by the literary qualities of *Le chevalier délibéré* that he did not have the heart to change anything. (2) Pertcheval adhered to a translator's poetics that one should not change anything from the original text (which seems an autonomous literary principle and so a little (post)modern for someone that lived in the late Middle Ages). (3) Pertcheval delivered an authorized translation : a translation which was approved by the original writer. This last option is the most interesting, for that would imply that Olivier de la Marche was able to read Dutch...