MALORY REVISITED:
FROM CAXTON TO STEINBECK[1]

Malory's work is, after Chaucer's, the most popular literary work from the Middle Ages that has been present among generations of readers for more than five centuries. The theme I want to address in this paper is closely related to the nature of Malory's work as a compiler, adapter, abridger, condenser, rearranger, or translator --whatever the reader prefers to call him. But I am not going to discuss Malory's own efforts, success and failures in his task with the "Frensshe bookes" and his debated "originality", something that has been done with great proficiency by many scholars since the nineteenth century.[2] My aim here is much more modest and can be described as an attempt to situate Malory's work in the context of its reception throughout the centuries, and particularly during the 20th century, when a new Malory has emerged as a consequence of the editions of his work. Because, as Larry Benson said more than thirty years ago now (Benson, 1968: 81), Malory's work is "a critical 'discovery' of the twentieth century", or as D. S. Brewer also wrote in 1970, alluding to Benson's statement (Brewer, 1970: 83): "The work of the last twenty years is greater than that of the preceding half millenium".

The nature of Malory's work itself is controversial, as is well known; and as the reader may have noticed, I have been referring to Malory's *work* in singular, in the general sense of an author's *oeuvre*, thus avoiding the men-

[1] This paper was written as a response to Professor Patricia Shaw's invitation to participate in the 8th International Conference of *Selim*, that took place at the University of Castellón in September 1995. It has remained unpublished, and now I wish to offer it here as a homage to her memory. I also wish to acknowledge the financial support received from the Spanish Ministry of Education, that allowed me to do research for the writing of this paper at Harvard University in 1993 and 1994 (Project codes 93-179 and 94-197).

[2] For a brief, but detailed, discussion of Malory's use of his sources see *Life*, 1980: 10-14; a greater emphasis on Malory's originality is found in the collection of essays edited by D. Thomas Hanks, Jr., 1990 (see specially Hanks's essay "Malory, the *Mort[e]s,* and the Confrontation in Guinevere's Chamber", pp. 78-90).

tion of the work proper: is it *Morte Darthur*, a single, although complex, work in the Caxtonian version, or is it rather what Vinaver has called simply "Malory's *Works*, a group of eight different and independent tales"? Although no real consensus seems to have been achieved in this 'unity' debate,[1] I think most would agree today with Vinaver's position rather than with the more traditional one represented by Caxton's edition. We cannot forget, however, as C. S. Lewis put it so accurately on the occasion of Vinaver's version of the Winchester manuscript (Life, 1980: 135), that "The new *Works of Malory* is the restoration; but the cathedral, our old familiar Caxton, is still there. We should all read the *Works*; but it would be an impoverishment if we did not return to the *Morte*". Notice also, much more recently, the defense made by James W. Spisak of Caxton's version in his own edition (Spisak, 1983),[2] as well as his brief comments on this issue in the Introduction to his edition of *Studies in Malory* (Spisak, 1985: 9-10).

Moreover, another feature of Malory's work that I think is worthwhile emphasizing on this occasion is that this characteristic of the work itself has been essential in its transmission through the centuries. I mean that --perhaps more than many other works-- Malory's *Morte Darthur* (let's call it like that, even though it may be misleading) has been read and known by millions of readers in these five centuries in *adapted* forms and under so many guises that the work itself seems to have acquired a life of its own, as if it were something independent from the form that the author gave it. That is, *Morte Darthur* has been read, perhaps by a majority of readers, not in the compilation, adaptation or translation that Malory made of his "Frensshe bookes", but through *other* compilations, adaptations and translations made by many other authors.[3] What has happened in Spanish may be an indication of what has normally been Malory's fate also in English and other languages. Notice, then, that the first faithful translation (the only one that we can really call a translation) is published in Spanish in 1985: *Muerte de Arturo*, by Francisco

[1] See Merriman, 1973, specially pp. 186-88 for a bibliography on this controversy; as well as Life, 1980: 15-19.

[2] Notice, however, that a severe criticism of this edition has been written by Toshiyuki Takamiya, revealing many inaccuracies in Spisak's text (Takamiya, 1985).

[3] Notice that the first edition, by Caxton, is indeed a compilation itself, responding to Caxton's interests and aims as a publisher; see on this Elizabeth Kirk, 1985: 275-295.

Torres Oliver, in a complete edition in three volumes published by Ediciones Siruela. But of course, Malory's tales were known to many readers in Spanish before, through at least two previous literary adaptations: one from 1914 by Manuel Vallvé, entitled *Los caballeros de la tabla redonda; leyendas relatadas a los niños*, published in Barcelona by Araluce in an illustrated edition of 128 pages, which is a translation based on Malory as well as on Tennyson's *Idylls of the King*; and a second one from 1963, due to Pilar Grimaldo Tormos: *Los caballeros de la tabla redonda*, published by Teide also in Barcelona, in a 78-page juvenile edition with illustrations. All this naturally without forgetting Walt Disney's adaptations (in film and book formats) of T. H. White's stories, or many other Hollywood (and more recently also European) film adaptations of the Arthurian tales, some derived from Malory as well as from his French sources.

Another source is one that I'll tackle later, John Steinbeck's version, *The Acts of King Arthur and His Noble Knights* (1976), translated into Spanish by Carlos Gardini in 1979 and reprinted on numerous occasions since then: in 1980, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1988, 1992, 1993, 1994, by different publishing houses: Editorial Sudamericana, Edhasa, Salvat and Círculo de Lectores.

Two distinguished Malory scholars have contributed decisively in mapping this picture of a multifaceted work in a continuous process of change and adaptation: first Page West Life in her splendid 1980 book *Sir Thomas Malory and the Morte Darthur. A Survey of Scholarship and Annotated Bibliography*, and second and more important in this aspect, ten years later, Barry Gaines in his 1990 astonishing and extraordinarily documented *Sir Thomas Malory. An Anecdotal Bibliography of Editions, 1485-1985*. Most of what I have tried to do in these pages would not have been possible at all without these two works, which are certainly two basic milestones in Malory scholarship.

Malory's work was popular very early. Its publication by Caxton in 1485 was soon followed by several editions; between 1485 and 1634 no less than five complete editions with woodcut illustrations were published: two by Wynkyn de Worde (1498 and 1529), one by William Copland (1557), another by Thomas East (c. 1578) and finally another one by William Stansby (1634) (for a detailed study of Malory's editions, see Gaines, 1969, 1974, 1984, as well

as Gaines, 1990: 3-46). Evidence of the popularity of the book is also provided by references to it during this period, some harshly critical from a moral perspective, such as Roger Ascham's comments in *The Scholemaster* (1570), and others favourable to it, as Sir Philip Sidney's praise in his *Defence of Poesie*.[1] During the second half of the seventeenth century and the eighteenth century Malory was not reedited, although he was not completely forgotten by educated people. The proof is that Thomas Warton, for instance, and others mention his work (see Gaines, 1990: 13). The book was published again in the early nineteenth century; in 1816 two different editions were produced, both based on the Stansby edition (1634). One was edited by Alexander Chalmers and published by Walker and Edwards in 2 volumes; although this edition was basically a reproduction of Stansby's text, it was very popular, and no less than 5000 books were produced (2500 2-volume sets); among its readers we can mention, for example, Wordsworth, Keats, and Tennyson. The second edition was better edited in three volumes by Joseph Haslewood, who took care in correcting some errors in Stansby's edition and in avoiding what he considered immoral passages; but it was not successful, since Chalmers's edition was generally preferred. Of course many other editions and reprints followed, most of them in slightly modernized spelling: thus by Robert Southey (1817, although the edition proper was the work of William Upcott, since Southey was only responsible for the Introduction and Notes); by Thomas Wright (1858, rpt. in 1866, 1889, 1893 and 1897); by Edward Strachey (1868, rpt. with revisions in 1868, 1869, 1891, and later; this edition was extensively corrected by Strachey, who eliminated

[1] Cf. Roger Ascham's words in *The Scholemaster:* "In our forefathers tyme, whan Papistrie, as a standyng poole, couered and ouerflowed all England, fewe bookes were read in our tong, sauying certaine bookes of Cheualrie, as they sayd, for pastime and pleasure, which, as some say, were made in Monasteries, by idle Monkes, or wanton Chanons: as one for example, *Morte Arthure:* the whole pleasure of which booke standeth in two speciall poyntes, in open mans slaughter, and bold bawdrye: In which booke those be counted the noblest Knights, that do kill most men without any quarell, and commit fowlest aduoulteries by sutlest shifts: as Sir *Launcelote,* with the wife of King *Arthure* his master: Syr *Tristram* with the wife of king *Marke* his vncle: Syr *Lamerocke* with the wife of king *Lote*, that was his own aunte. This is good stuffe, for wise men to laughe at, or honest men to take pleasure at. Yet I know, when Gods Bible was banished the Court, and *Morte Arthure* receiued into the Princes chamber. What toyes, the dayly readyng of such a booke, may worke in the will of a yong ientleman, or a yong mayde, that liueth welthelie and idlelie, wise men can iudge, and honest men do pitie"; as well as Sir Philip Sidney's in *Defence of Poesie:* "I dare undertake, *Orlando Furioso,* or honest king *Arthure,* will never displease a souldier" (quoted in Gaines, 1990: xi).

some immoral words, phrases and even passages, in order to make the book available to all readers, children included, and was by far the most popular complete edition of Malory's work in the 19th century); by H. Oskar Sommer (1889-1891); by Ernest Rhys (about 1892); by F. J. Simmons (1893-94, rpt. in 1909 and 1927 with additions); and by Israel Gollancz (1897).

On the other hand, the twentieth century has been, as I said earlier, the time for the "discovery" of Malory's work, with a new (modernized) edition by Alfred W. Pollard (1900, with many reprints since then); a reprint of the 1893 edition by F. J. Simmons, published in 1906 by Dent (known as the Everyman edition), as well as many other reprints of 19th-century editions by Rhys, by Southey, or even earlier, as A. S. Mott's edition in 1933 of Wynkyn de Worde's folio of 1498. But the best editions in this century are naturally those by Eugène Vinaver based on the Winchester manuscript: 1947, 1948 (1st ed.), 1954 and 1967 (2nd ed.), which has been considered by most scholars the standard definitive edition, and has been reprinted several times later: 1971, 1973,[1] until recently, when P. J. C. Field produced a revised edition (1990), the 3rd edition of Vinaver's version. However, we cannot forget other editions based on Caxton's version, which have also been well published and distributed, such as those by Janet Cowen (1969) for Penguin Books; R. M. Lumiansky (1982) for Charles Scribner's Sons, which also uses the Winchester manuscript and Vinaver's edition; and James W. Spisak (1983).

I have mentioned so far only the complete editions, but although these give a good idea of the popularity of Malory's work in the 16th, 17th, 19th and 20th centuries, they constitute but a partial proof of this popularity. That a work of the extension of *Morte Darthur* was edited and reprinted so many

[1] Notice that each of these two editions was printed in two different versions, one in 3 volumes, with extensive commentaries by the editor, and another in a single volume, with the complete text but very few commentaries and explanations. The first edition consists of: *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory,* in 1947, by the Clarendon Press of Oxford (3 vols., cxv + 1742 pp.), which was reprinted with corrections in 1948, and *Malory: Works,* in 1954, by Oxford University Press (xviii + 919 pp.). The second edition is: *Malory: Works,* in 1967, by the Clarendon Press of Oxford (3 vols., rpt. with corrections and additions in 1973), and *Malory: Works,* in 1971, by Oxford University Press (xv + 811 pp.).

times in its entirety says a lot, I think, of the value it has had for many generations of readers; but another aspect of Malory's reception during this period is the huge amount of abridgments, selections and adaptations, which have been probably much more effective in popularizing Malory's tales. A substantial contribution to this popularity is certainly due to versions and adaptations for children. As Barry Gaines has commented (Gaines, 1990: xi), T. S. Eliot, for instance, referred to a juvenile version of Malory which "was in my hands when I was a child of eleven or twelve. It was then, and perhaps has always been, my favorite book". John Steinbeck also explained his attraction towards this book; he tells that Shakespeare and *Pilgrim's Progress* came to him at the time he was a very little boy through his uncles and his mother's milk, but that his first experience as a reader was through Malory, a Malory in old spelling but a simplified Malory nevertheless. These are his words (Steinbeck, 1976: xi):

> […] one day, an aunt gave me a book […] I stared at the black print with hatred, and then, gradually, the pages opened and let me in. The magic happened. The Bible and Shakespeare and *Pilgrim's Progress* belonged to everyone. But this was mine --It was a cut version of the Caxton *Morte d'Arthur* of Thomas Malory. I loved the old spelling of the words --and the words no longer used. Perhaps a passionate love for the English language opened to me from this one book. I was delighted to find out paradoxes --that *cleave* means both to stick together and to cut apart; that *host* means both an enemy and a welcoming friend; that *king* and *gens* (people) stem from the same root. For a long time, I had a secret language --*yclept* and *hyght*, *wist*-- and *accord* meaning peace, and *entente* meaning purpose, and *fyaunce* meaning promise. […]

Many other testimonies could be added to this, but I don't think it's necessary. Steinbeck's fascination for Malory, which later in his life was to exert a great influence on his own work, is just another example of the vigour of Malory's presence in contemporary life and literature. But what is relevant and I wish to emphasize now is that this influence, the heritage represented by *Morte Darthur*, is very often indirect because --as in T. S. Eliot or Steinbeck-- the first (and for many, only) contact that most readers have had with Malory's work is not any of the complete editions of his tales, but some other version, simplified, abridged, modernized, etc.

Despite the general availability of complete editions in each generation, many readers have had access to Malory through a version or adaptation of the original text, designed basically to shorten its length. The information gathered by Gaines about abridgments and selections, as well as adaptations, is impressive. I don't have naturally the space here to discuss all this in detail, but let me give at least a general account of it, so that I can pass then to analyse one particular case more attentively.

The distinction between abridgments or selections on the one hand, and adaptations on the other is not easy to make, and occasionally different authors classify particular texts in diverse categories. Thus Page West Life, for instance, gives as the first abridgment the famous 19th century edition by James T. Knowles (1862), *The Story of King Arthur and His Knights of the Round Table*, while Barry Gaines includes this title in "adaptations". I will follow here Gaines's classification, which seems to me more reasonable and transparent, as he is much more informative in his descriptions of each item than Life.

Gaines presents fifty different abridgments, selections or editions of single tales, although this number refers to completely different editions, not to reprints or slightly different versions of the same edition, which are many more and are also registered by Gaines in detail.

Both abridgments and adaptations start by the middle of the 19th century, as a way of familiarizing ordinary readership (and specially --although not exclusively-- children) with Malory's work. Many of them were originated by the popularity obtained by Tennyson's *Idylls of the King* (1859 --1st set: "Enid", "Vivien", "Elaine" and "Guinevere"-- and 1872 --virtually the complete edition, with the exception of "Balin and Balan", published in 1885--). The first abridgment registered by Gaines is by Edward Conybeare (1868), entitled *La Morte D'Arthur: The History of King Arthur*. The editor explained (see Gaines, 1990: 47) that the length and confusion in the structure of the original text constituted at that time "insuperable obstacles to popularity", and consequently his purpose was to abbreviate and rearrange the original text to make it more attractive to contemporary readers. This meant that "coarse passages" were cut out and that the whole structure was changed, in a new division in books and chapters, although no new material was intro-

duced. This procedure was the one generally followed in the best abridgments of the 19th century, such as Sidney Lanier's *The Boy's King Arthur* (1880), Henry Frith's *King Arthur and his Knights of the Round Table* (1884), Ernest Rhys's *Malory's History of King Arthur and the Quest of the Holy Grail* (1886), and Charles Morris's *King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table* (1891).[1]

Lanier's edition (1880) was specifically addressed to children, as is shown by the title. Thus, some parts of the narrative were cut out, in order to avoid (quoted by Gaines, 1990: 49) "monotonous repetitions of adventure and of combat", as well as those parts concerned with the love relationship between Lancelot and Guenever, and Tristram and Isolde, while the fact that Galahad was Lancelot's son by Elaine, and Mordred Arthur's son by his sister was obscured. This edition was a big success, to the extent that by 1 May 1899 (almost twenty years later) sixteen reprints had been made, which amounted to 12,900 copies; and only five years later, by September 1904, this figure was 20,700. But of course its success cannot be measured by numbers alone, although these tell much about the popularity of Lanier's edition; it is also important to notice, for instance, that it was through this edition that Mark Twain was first acquainted with the Arthurian theme, which he was going to develop later in his well known book *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court*.[2] On top of that, let me add that it was Lanier's edition the one which was translated into Greek (1956) and Hebrew (1966), so that the first versions of Malory's work in these languages came through this abridgment (for details on these translations, see Gaines, 1990: 130-131).

Frith's abridgment (1884) follows a similar line, cutting out aspects that did not seem convenient for children; as the author states in the introduction to his edition (quoted by Gaines, 1990: 53): "Writing for boys, we have preserved all the vigour and valour of the action, and as much of the original as our limits permitted, with a due regard to good taste and their improvement".

[1] See Lanier (1880) (more versions of this edition, with different illustrations, followed: 1917, 1950, 1960…); Henry Frith (1884) (more versions, with other illustrations, followed this edition: 1912, 1928, 1932, 1955); Ernest Rhys (1886); and Charles Morris (1891) (other versions followed: 1896, 1908).

[2] On this work and its significance in Twain's *oeuvre*, see H. Bruce Franklin (1992), Jane Gardiner (1992); Lyall Powers (1985); Gary Scharnhorst (1989); and Mary Lyndon Shanley & Peter G. Stillman (1982).

Rhys's edition (1886), however, was not addressed specifically to an infantile audience, so that the abridgment responded to other purposes, mainly to make the story more clearly available and its reading more pleasant to 19th century readers, who otherwise might feel confused and dissuaded by an archaic language. Thus seven of Caxton's twenty-one books were cut out, and the spelling was revised in order to facilitate the comprehension of old vocabulary and phrases.

Finally, Morris's edition (1891) was also a modernized version, published initially in three volumes and later in one and two-volume format (1896 and 1908 respectively). It was this edition the one that T. S. Eliot read as a child, as can be ascertained from the copy with his signature that is kept in Harvard's Houghton Library. The treatment followed is summarized by Morris himself with these words (quoted by Gaines, 1990: 55):

> In attempting to adapt this old masterpiece to the readers of our own day, we have no purpose to seek to paraphrase or improve on Malory. To remove the antique flavor would be to destroy the spirit of the work. We shall leave it as we find it, other than to reduce its obsolete phraseology and crudities of style to modern English, abridge the narrative where it is wearisomely extended, omit repetitions and uninteresting incidents, reduce its confusion of arrangement, attempt a more artistic division into books and chapters, and by other arts of editorial revision seek to make easier reading, while preserving as fully as possible those unique characteristics which have long made it delightful to lovers of old literature.

As a partial conclusion, then, we can state that most nineteenth-century abridged editions responded to these motives: 1) cuts in particular episodes which were considered morally inappropriate for children, to whom many of these editions were addressed; 2) modernization of spelling and language in order to make the text more easily available to modern audiences; 3) rearrangement of books and chapters, so that the development of Malory's narrative were clearer; and 4) frequent use of illustrations, with the same aims.

Some of these features are also shared by twentieth-century editions, particularly by those conceived as school texts for secondary schools. These versions were occasionally enriched with questions for classroom use, and

were also very often illustrated. Examples of these are many, but let me quote some of the most successful: one is *Selections from Malory* edited by Agnes M. Mackenzie (1915), with introduction notes and glossary. Another one is Dorothy M. Macardle's *Selections from Le Morte D'Arthur of Sir Thomas Malory* (1917); although this edition follows the original diction, it rearranges passages and chapters, and adds questions and exercises, as well as a glossary and notes, since the aim was (quoted by Gaines, 1990: 62) "to give a consecutive and dramatic story in a small compass; to indicate, by means of notes, the imagined environment, and to suggest (by questions) how the story may be made the theme of a term's work in oral and written composition, recitation, play-making and acting". Not specifically designed to teach, but also addressed to young audiences, was Uriel Waldo Cutler's *Stories of King Arthur and his Knights* (1904), which was very popular and has been reprinted many times,[1] to the extent, for example, that the first Polish version of Malory's work (1937) was a translation from Cutler's abridgment (details in Gaines, 1990: 133; it is based on the 1933 edition published by Harrap). Cutler explained in his introduction (quoted by Gaines, 1990: 59) that he had tried to choose "such stories as best represent the whole [and had modified] these only in order to remove what could possibly hide the thought, or be so crude in taste and morals as to seem unworthy of the really high-minded author of five hundred years ago", and added furthermore: "It aims also so to condense the book that, in this age of hurry, readers may not be repelled from the tales merely because of their length". This kind of rewriting of Malory for young readers was also carried out by Henry Burrowes Lathrop in his abridgment *Malory's King Arthur and his Knights* (1911), where (quoted by Gaines, 1990: 60) "the morally barbaric or otherwise unsuitable parts have been omitted".

Other abridged editions which have been very popular throughout the century, are Alfred W. Pollard's version *The Romance of King Arthur and his Knights of the Round Table* (1917), with famous illustrations by Arthur Rackham, and Philip Allan's *The Noble Tale of the Sangreal* (1920), which is a faithful version of Caxton's Books 13 to 17 in modern spelling, punctuation and paragraphing. A curious selection of the end of the 1920s is *Women of the Morte Darthur* by Ann D. Alexander (1927), which comprised twelve love

[1] Reprints in 1905 and 1914 by George G. Harrap (London), and also by Harrap but in different format in 1911 *(Tales from Malory)* and 1933 *(King Arthur and his Knights),* as well as by Thomas Y. Crowell in 1924 and 1941.

stories from Malory's work, which present (quoted by Gaines, 1990: 64) "many types of femininity […], from the light woman to the saint, but the good predominate; for the *Morte d'Arthur* folks are true children of the Age of Faith, and with very few exceptions, struggle heroically to follow in the footsteps of the Knight of Bethlehem".

Another kind of abridgment or selection of Malory's text, which is a privative feature of 20th century editions, is that oriented to university education, or to a general adult reader, most of them produced after World War II. These were mainly selections of one or several tales, which normally preserved the totality of each tale, without any kind of emendation except occasional modernization of spelling. Good illustrations of this type of edition are several by Brian Kennedy Cooke: *King Arthur of Britain* (1946), *Sir Lancelot* (1951), *The Holy Grail* (1953), and *The Quest of the Beast* (1957). He was not really editing complete tales, but selections from several parts of Malory's work concerned with the topic of each of his versions; his aim was to fight against the vision of Malory given by 19th-century eds. for children, which he strongly deplored with these words (quoted by Gaines, 1990: 67):

> a lamentable fashion arose towards the end of the last century of producing insipid special versions for children, illustrated with two-dimensional dummies in pasteboard armour, which kindly but undiscerning aunts and uncles could pick up without effort on the Christmas bookstalls. These things came between the late Victorian or Edwardian child and Malory. And so the great work, which has some claim to be regarded as the earliest novel in our language, has fallen into some neglect.

But surely better examples of this kind of selected editions are those by well known philologists, such as Eugène Vinaver or D. S. Brewer.

Vinaver not only produced the best complete edition we have today of the Winchester manuscript; he also edited several independent tales, such as *The Tale of the Death of King Arthur* (1955), following his 1947 3-volume edition, and *King Arthur and his Knights* (1956), which was initially constituted by a selection of modernized fragments and later, in 1968, was reprinted with revisions and the addition of the complete last tale. R. T. Davies also pub-

lished a selected edition, in a modernized version: *King Arthur and his Knights* (1967), which follows Vinaver's first edition (1947). Other scholarly editions, addressed to a university audience, are those by D. S. Brewer (1968) and P. J. C. Field (1977). Brewer edited in 1968 the last two books in a modernized version, with the title *The Morte Darthur. Parts Seven and Eight*, which was --as Gaines has shown-- a reprint of the corresponding parts in Vinaver's first edition. P. J. C. Field edited the same tales: *Le Morte Darthur: The Seventh and Eighth Tales* (1977), although Field preserved the original spelling, without any modernization. Both editions are characteristically thought for university study, with additional material such as introductions, notes, commentaries and glossaries (Brewer's is published as a volume of the collection of York Medieval Texts, edited by Elizabeth Salter and Derek Pearsall, and Field's was printed in "The London Medieval and Renaissance Series", under the general editorship of A. V. C. Schmidt).

I have been alluding so far to abridgments or selections. But a substantial amount of other versions of Malory's work have been in print since the early 19th century, versions that should be called "adaptations", since the editors have not merely rearranged, cut, and modernized spelling, punctuation and paragraphing, as in these selections I have been discussing. In the adaptations, their authors have introduced new material, have re-written Malory, have combined Caxton's text or the Winchester manuscript with other texts, etc. The number of adaptations gathered by Gaines in his Bibliography is impressive, especially if we consider that he has made a selection, disregarding many texts, such as all poetic adaptations and screen plays. He has left out of his selection well known books which in one way or another have nurtured on Malory, works that have been extremely influential in spreading the popularity of the Arthurian tales, such as Tennyson's *Idylls*, Twain's *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court* or T. H. White's *The Sword in the Stone*, *The Once and Future King*, etc.[1] These, and others, are not

[1] For details on the extensive bibliography produced on Tennyson's adaptation, see specially Roger Simpson (1990), particularly chapter 5: "Tennyson and the Arthurian Revival", pp. 190-254; and also the editions by Christopher Ricks (1969), and by John Pfordresher (1973) (see the "Introduction", pp. 1-64, for a detailed study of the genesis and development of the *Idylls)*. On T. H. White's adaptations the bibliography is also large; cf. C. M. Adderley (1992); Martin Kellman (1991); Adrienne Kertzer (1985); Alan Macdonald (1993); Marilyn K.

included because Gaines considers they have gone far beyond Malory, and that they are not truly adaptations of *Morte Darthur* but rather "recreations" of the Arthurian cycle, Malory not being its fundamental source.

Well, even after all these exceptions, the number of adaptations collected by Gaines is 100; but again this figure does not reflect the whole number of editions and reprints, since some of these works were frequently reprinted and republished in slightly different form, under different titles some times, with other illustrations, occasionally even with some changes in the text, etc.

The great majority of these adaptations are again mainly addressed to young audiences, although a few are also thought for adult readers. That is the case, for instance, of the first adaptation collected by Gaines in the nineteenth century, which was a classic in the period, surely influenced by the popularity of Tennyson's *Idylls*: James Thomas Knowles's *The Story of King Arthur and his Knights of the Round Table* (1862), which was reedited, with many changes and diverse illustrations, throughout the nineteenth century and even during the first half of the twentieth. Knowles used Caxton's text and simplified it, occasionally adding material from Monmouth and other sources; he modernized the style and naturally, as we have seen with the other Victorian versions (quoted by Gaines, 1990: 78), "suppressed and modified where changed manners and morals have made it absolutely necessary to do so for the preservation of a lofty original ideal".

But most adaptations are indeed addressed to children, are accompanied by illustrations and experience frequent reprintings and further adaptations. Some were so popular and so successful as William Thomas Stead's version *King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table* (1899), in the famous series "Books for the Bairns", which in a later arrangement by Robert S. Wood (n. d.) was the basis for the first translation of Malory's work into French (Mlle. Latappy, 1910). Other adaptations were specially designed for boys and girls in the primary school, being written by influential education authorities in the

Nellis (1983); Florence Field Sandler (1992); Evelyn Schroth (1983); Evans Lansing Smith (1991); William E. Tanner (1993); and Sylvia Townsend Warner & Trevor Stubley (1988). See also some doctoral dissertations on this topic: Susan Elizabeth Chapman (1990); Angela Lindley (1990); Meredith Jane Ross (1986); and Jimmie Elaine Thomas (1983).

early 20th century: thus Dr. Edward Brooks's version *The Story of King Arthur and the Knights of the Table Round* (1900), Brooks being the Superintendent of Schools of Philadelphia; or James Baldwin's *Stories of the King* (1910), since this James Baldwin was superintendent of Indiana primary schools and editor of school books at the American Book Company.

Also very popular as reading for children were Mary MacLeod's version *The Book of King Arthur and his Noble Knights* (1900), reprinted extensively both in Britain and the United States until the mid-sixties;[1] or Andrew Lang's *The Book of Romance* (1902), which has been republished in different formats and titles: *Tales of the Round Table*, *Tales of King Arthur and the Round Table*, etc. (see Andrew Lang, 1903, 1905, 1967 and 1968); or the version written and illustrated by Howard Pyle: *The Story of King Arthur and his Knights*, originally published in installments in the children's magazine *St. Nicholas* (November 1902-October 1903), and later reprinted in a variety of titles and formats, the latest collected by Gaines being published in 1984.[2] This version by Pyle has been extraordinarily popular, and even Mark Twain --who was obviously familiarized with the Arthurian tales-- wrote this about these stories: "They were never so finely told in prose before. And then the pictures --one can never tire of examining them and studying them. Long ago you made the best Robin Hood that was ever written and your Morte d'Arthur is going to be another masterpiece. It was a great idea. I am glad that it was born to you".[3] The success of the first editions of this title was so great, that Pyle added other volumes later: *The Story of the Champions of the Round Table* (1905), *The Story of Sir Launcelot and his Companions* (1907), and *The Story of the Grail and the Passing of Arthur* (1910) (All these titles

1 Details about its numerous reprints and further adaptations and abridgments (sometimes under different titles) are provided by Gaines, 1990: 84-87.

2 *The Story of King Arthur and his Knights,* written and illustrated by Howard Pyle, *St. Nicholas,* 30 (November 1902-October 1903), New York, Scribners. Reprints as a book are numerous: 1903 (by Charles Scribner's Sons in New York and by George Newnes in London, of which three facsimile editions have appeared in New York: one in 1965 by Dover, another in 1978 by Marathon, and the third in 1984 by Scribner's); also in The Howard Pyle Brandywine Edition 1853-1933, which is a facsimile reprint with a frontispiece in color and a note by W.J. Aylward, a former Pyle pupil, with pen decorations by Robert Ball, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933. More recent reprints, under diverse titles and with different illustrations, are Pyle (1965, 1969 and 1979).

3 Quoted in *Howard Pyle: Diversity in Depth,* Wilmington, Delaware Art Museum, 1973, p. 8, cited by Gaines, 1990: 94.

have been reprinted on numerous occasions later, some of them very recently: there are facsimile reprints published by Scribner's Sons in 1984 and 1985). His intentions were very clear:

> I wish to represent in my book all that is noble and high and great, and to omit, if it is possible, all that is cruel and mean and treacherous. Unfortunately the stories of chivalry seem to be very full not only of meanness and of treachery, but of murder and many other and nameless wickednesses, that discolor the very noblest of the characters --such, even, as the character of king Arthur himself … So I try to represent those which are known in the best possible light (quoted in Charles D. Abbott, 1925: 128, cited by Gaines, 1990: 93-94).

Other adapters for children worthwhile mentioning are Mary Macgregor, whose version *Stories of King Arthur's Knights* (1905) has been for a very long time one of the most popular among very young children; or Henry Gilbert's *King Arthur's Knights* (1911) published extensively in different series by Nelson;[1] or Blanche Winder's *Stories of King Arthur* (1925), reprinted until the late sixties (other editions following that of 1925, both in Great Britain and the United States, were produced in 1935, 1937, 1968, etc.); or finally two versions by the most famous children's writer, Enid Blyton: one entitled *The Knights of the Round Table*, initially addressed to older children in 1930 and reissued again in 1950,[2] and a second one called *King Arthur and his Knights* (1939) which is a much more simplified version for very young children (only 64 pages).

The adaptations are so many and so diverse that I cannot refer to all of them; there are several editions in simplified versions for foreign learners (in Longman and Macmillan), for blind people in braille, and scripts for television

[1] Several reprints by Nelson & Sons, with some changes and slightly different titles: 1914, 1925, 1928, 1929, 1932, 1933, 1934, 1940, 1952. This book (or diverse versions of it) have been included in Nelson's series such as "Honour Books", "Nelson's Classics", "Classics Series", "Winchester Classics Series", "Parkside Classics Series", "School Classics Series", and "Favourite Books". A facsimile reprint of the first edition was produced by Bracken Books in London in 1985.

[2] This was reissued under the same title but with different illustrations: *The Knights of the Round Table*, retold by Enid Blyton, illustrated by Kathleen Gell, London, Latimer House, 1950, 96 pp.

series on the character of King Arthur, etc.[1] However, the most interesting adaptations from a literary point of view are perhaps those not specifically addressed to young audiences; among these, let me quote the following, which are relatively recent and have acquired a certain popularity: Keith Baines's *Sir Thomas Malory's Le Morte d'Arthur*, a modernized version, which was published with an introduction by Robert Graves (1962), John Steinbeck's *The Acts of King Arthur and his Noble Knights* (1976), Rosemary Sutcliff's trilogy *The Lights Beyond the Forest: The Quest for the Holy Grail* (1979), *The Sword and the Circle; King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table* (1980) and *The Road to Camlann* (1982), and Marion Zimmer Bradley's *The Mists of Avalon* (1983).

For obvious reasons, John Steinbeck's adaptation has received some attention from critics and scholars specialized in Steinbeck's production, although not much --as far as I know-- from those working on Malory.[2] Let me briefly examine what has been done on this.

First, the work done by Steinbeck and his aims. The American writer felt always fascinated with Malory's work, from the time he was nine years old and received a copy of a simplified version of *Morte d'Arthur*,[3] as I mentioned earlier. The interest in Malory surely left a deep influence on his own work early in his career, as has been proved by scholars such as Warren French, Joseph Fontenrose and Arthur F. Kinney, particularly with reference to *Tortilla Flat* (Steinbeck himself pointed to the parallel with *Morte D'Arthur* in the preface he wrote for this novel), but not only in relation with

[1] For details about these adaptations, cf. Gaines, 1990: 111, 115, 116, 122 *passim*.

[2] The main reviews and comments on Steinbeck's work are the following ones, taken from Life, 1980: 73: P. L. Adams (1976a and 1976b); Edmund Fuller (1976); J. Gardner (1976); G. A. Masterton (1976 and 1977); M. S. Cosgrave (1977); Cynthia Johnson (1977); Derek Mahon (1977); Diana Rowan (1977); T. A. Shippey (1977); M. C. Williams (1977); and John Ditsky (1978). More recent essays are Laura F. Hodges (1992); Andrew Welsh (1991); and Mary C. Williams (1984). See also note 19 for a discussion on the influence exerted by Malory on Steinbeck's other works.

[3] Perhaps a copy of Dr. Edward Brooks's *The Story of King Arthur and the Knights of the Table Round For Boys and Girls* (1900); cf. Steinbeck's words in a letter to Mr. and Mrs. David Heyler, Jr. (19 November 1956): "There has not been an edition of this since 1893, the Dent edition of Caxton, except for a cut version called the Boy's King Arthur in about 1900 which was the one I cut my teeth on. And there is no rendering of it into modern English" (in Steinbeck & Wallsten, 1975: 540).

Tortilla Flat, since this interest is also present in other works of fiction: *Cup of Gold*, *In Dubious Battle* and *Of Mice and Men*.[1]

Steinbeck's fascination with Malory was so strong that he contemplated for many years a very ambitious plan: to rewrite *Morte D'Arthur* for the sake of those who found Malory unpalatable to contemporary taste. I quote his own words, when he explained exactly what he intended:

> […] in our day, we are perhaps impatient with the old words and the stately rhythms of Malory. My own first and continuing enchantment with these things is not generally shared. I wanted to set them down in plain present-day speech for my own young sons, and for other sons not so young --to set the stories down in meaning as they were written, leaving out nothing and adding nothing-- perhaps to compete with the moving pictures, the comic-strip travesties which are the only available source for those children and others of today who are impatient with the difficulties of Malory's spelling and use of archaic words. If I can do this and keep the wonder and the magic, I shall be pleased and gratified. In no sense do I wish to rewrite Malory, or reduce him, or change him, or soften or sentimentalize him. I believe the stories are great enough to survive my tampering, which at best will make the history available to more readers, and at worst can't hurt Malory very much (1976: xiii).

According to this, then, Steinbeck was pursuing none of the usual aims characteristic of the abridgments and adaptations I have briefly examined before, *i. e.*, he did not want to rewrite properly, in the sense of reducing the original, or changing what he did not consider "appropriate", or softening or sentimentalizing the text, as many 19th- and also 20th-century authors had done. His purpose was not moral, nor educational in the strict sense of the

[1] Cf. Warren French (1961); Joseph Fontenrose (1963); Arthur F. Kinney (1965); as well as No. 5 of *Steinbeck Monograph Series,* entitled *Steinbeck and the Arthurian Theme,* edited by Tetsumaro Hayashi for The John Steinbeck Society of America (English Department, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana, 1975). This volumen contains the following essays: Warren French, "Steinbeck's Use of Malory", pp. 4-11; Arthur Kinney, "*Tortilla Flat* Re-Visited", pp. 12-24; Roy S. Simmonds, "A Note on Steinbeck's Unpublished Arthurian Stories", pp. 25-29, and "The Unrealized Dream: Steinbeck's Modern Version of Malory", pp. 30-43; as well as "A Selected Bibliography: Steinbeck and the Arthurian Theme" by Tetsumaro Hayashi, pp. 44-46.

word. He simply wanted to put Malory's language "in present-day speech". Well, that is what he says he tried to do. What did he finally achieve? What is the result of many years of work on Malory, because he was concerned -- even if not working on it continuously-- at least from 1956 (notice his letter to Mr. and Mrs. David Heyler, Jr. quoted earlier in note 18) to almost the end of his life in 1968?

Although he was worried and tried to work in this project during a period of about 12 years, Steinbeck never finished it, and what he wrote was not published by him, but was only posthumously edited by his friend Chase Horton in 1976 under the title *The Acts of King Arthur and his Noble Knights*. Moreover, it seems that the text which was published does not collect the totality of work completed by Steinbeck on Malory's version, since a Steinbeck scholar, Roy S. Simmonds, studied for his 1975 paper "A Note on Steinbeck's Unpublished Arthurian Stories" (1975a) the typescript of what Steinbeck had called *Arthur*, and the description he makes of it does not coincide with the final version edited by Horton.

Steinbeck's book (from now onwards *Acts*) comprises seven chapters; the titles are: "Merlin", "The Knight with the Two Swords", "The Wedding of King Arthur", "The Death of Merlin", "Morgan le Fay", "Gawain, Ewain, and Marhalt", and "The Noble Tale of Sir Lancelot of the Lake". The first six chapters, although the titles are not exactly the same, correspond to the six chapters into which Vinaver divided the first tale in his edition of the *Works*, that is, "The Tale of King Arthur"; and the seventh is naturally a rendering of the third tale in Vinaver's edition, "A Noble Tale of Sir Launcelot du Lake". However, Roy S. Simmonds mentions in his paper an eighth chapter, the longest of all, entitled "The Tale of Sir Gareth of Orkney", which would correspond logically to the following (fourth) tale in Vinaver's edition. Chase Horton did not include this in his edition of *Acts* and does not even mention it, despite the fact that Simmonds had obviously examined it, and two copies of this typescript are preserved, one (the original) being held by McIntosh and Otis, Inc., and the other, a carbon copy, is found in the University of Texas at Austin, in the Pascal Covici-John Steinbeck collection held by the Humanities Research Center (see Simmonds, 1975a: 25-26). It seems evident, then, that Steinbeck was following Vinaver's edition, and that he probably did not have the intention of working on the second romance, "The Tale of the Noble King Arthur That Was Emperor Himself Through Dignity Of His

Hands", according to Vinaver because (quoted by Simmonds, 1975a: 26) "the omission of the second romance is perfectly justifiable on the grounds that stylistically it is far too archaic to lend itself to the same treatment that Steinbeck had given the other sections".

What kind of work did Steinbeck do, then? How could he do it, was he a scholar, could he read and understand the original text? These are questions that can be answered briefly before we pass to examine his achievements.

I have already commented on his aims, quoting his own words from the Introduction to the book. Let me now quote him again, from a letter of 19 November 1956 to his literary agent Elizabeth Otis, where he explains clearly his method:

> I'm going to make a trial run --not removing all of the old forms, nor all the Malory sentence structure, but substituting known simple words and reversing sentences which even now are puzzling.
>
> There are several things I will *not* do. I will not clean it up. Pendragon did take the wife of Cornwall, and that is the way it was. I think children not only understand these things but accept them until they are confused by moralities which try by silence to eliminate reality. These men had *women* and I'm going to keep them. On the other hand, I am going to keep the book and chapter heads and in these I shall keep the Malory-Caxton language intact. I think it is going to be fun to do.
>
> When I have some of it done, I shall with an opening essay tell of my own interest in the cycle, when it started and where it went -- into scholarship and out again on the other side. In this essay I shall also try to put down what I think has been the impact of this book on our language, our attitudes, and morals, and our ethics. […]
>
> One other thing I do not want to do. There are many places in this book which are not clear, as poetry is not clear. They are not literal. I don't intend to make them clear or literal. I remember too well my own delight in conjecture (Steinbeck, 1976: 297).

About Steinbeck's knowledge of Middle English and his expertise in scholarship there is some controversy; some critics have pointed that he was

(Frazier, 1969, cited by Simmonds, 1975a: 27) "rather less-read than he claimed". But a scholar of the reputation of Eugène Vinaver no less, who met Steinbeck on numerous occasions and was familiar with his project on Malory, has written judgments like the following ones; referring to his scholarship he said:

> He was […] very modest about it, and anxious to learn as much as he could. He knew his Malory very well indeed, and it was a fascinating experience to talk to him about it. He could see in Malory certain things that the so-called experts have consistently failed to see, for instance the stylistic discrepancies between the various parts of the work, indicative of its gradual growth.[1]

On Steinbeck's version specifically, Vinaver wrote:

> It is an admirable piece of prose --both Steinbeckian and Malorian-- and would make a much more attractive book than any other adaptation I know of Malory's romances … It would have been wonderful to have his version of the Death of Arthur story, which is the finest of them all.[2]

It seems that Vinaver had seen some 100 pages of the total amount of about 500 that Steinbeck completed before his death and his judgement was very favourable. In another letter to Roy S. Simmonds, Vinaver added that the drafts he read were "by far the best thing of its kind written in English since the fifteenth century".[3]

Steinbeck himself insisted several times that his work on Malory was to be his greatest achievement and that he had been preparing for it almost all his life. In a letter to his boyhood friend John Murphy dated 12 June 1961 he put it very clearly, foreseeing even the impossibility of the task:

> All my life has been aimed at one book and I haven't started it yet. The rest had all been practice. Do you remember the Arthurian

[1] Eugène Vinaver, in a letter to Roy S. Simmonds, dated 25 July 1970, quoted in Simmonds, 1975a: 27

[2] Eugène Vinaver, in a letter to Roy S. Simmonds, dated 1 August 1972, quoted in Simmonds, 1975a: 27.

[3] Eugène Vinaver, in a letter to Roy S. Simmonds, dated 25 July 1970, quoted in Simmonds, 1975b: 43.

> legend well enough to raise in your mind the symbols of Launcelot and his son Galahad? You see, Launcelot was imperfect and so he never got to see the Holy Grail. So it is with all of us. […]
>
> The setting down of words is only the final process. It is possible, through accident, that the words for my book may never be set down but I have been working and studying toward it for over forty years. Only the last of the process waits to be done --and it scares the hell out of me (Steinbeck & Wallsten, 1975: 859).

In short, then, Steinbeck's work was not an improvisation. He was fully conscious of what he was doing, of the difficulties involved, and tried to prepare himself for the task. His interest was so genuine that after the discovery and subsequent publication by Vinaver of the Winchester manuscript he studied the text and met the Manchester professor in 1957 to discuss his plans. He even visited Glastonbury and was so fascinated with the place that, with the help of the playwright Robert Bolt, rented a cottage (Discove Cottage) in the area, and in March 1959 arrived in England with the purpose of writing his version of Malory. As he wrote to Vinaver, explaining his purpose in setting in Somerset:

> To hear the speech and feel the air, to rub hands on the lithic tactile memories at Stonehenge, to sit at night on the untouristed eyrie at Tintagel and to find Arthur's mound and try to make friends with the Cornish fayries and the harsh weirds of the Pennines. That's what I want, so that my book grows out of its natural earth (Steinbeck & Wallsten, 1975: 605).

He and his wife stayed in the cottage for seven months; Steinbeck wrote there approximately 2000 words per day, although a good deal of what he wrote went to the waste paper basket (about 500 pages according to his own information) (see Simmonds, 1975b: 39). What Steinbeck did with Malory after this British visit is difficult to know with accuracy because he was very reluctant to talk about his work,[1] although there are many passing references in his letters of subsequent years to this work in progress.[1]

[1] As he said to Michael Ratcliffe in an interview for the *Sunday Times* ("Cutting Loose at Sixty: by John Steinbeck", *Sunday Times,* 16 December 1962, p. 20), he had been working on Malory for several years, but "I don't like to talk about it, as

What is no doubt of great interest is to see through some of these letters the process of rewriting Malory, how the original plan was evolving when Steinbeck encountered the natural difficulties of adapting the 15th century language to contemporary English. I'll allude to some of this when I examine the text. In writing to Vinaver while in Discove Cottage (27 August 1959) Steinbeck feels frustrated when faced to the difficulty of the task (Steinbeck & Wallsten, 1975: 648):

> I have a dreadful discontent with any efforts so far. They seem puny in the face of a hideous subject and I use the word in a Malorian sense. How to capture this greatness? Who could improve on or change Launcelot's "For I take recorde of God, in you I have had myn erthly joye--" There it is. It can't be changed or moved. Or Launcelot's brother Ector di Maris --"Thou were the curtest knight that ever bare shelde! And thou were the trewest frende to thy lover that ever bestrayed hors and thou were the truest lover of a synful man that ever loved woman--" Good God, who could make that more moving? This is great poetry, passionate and epic and with also the stab of heartbreak. Can you see the problem? Do you know any answer?

I have no space here to delve into detailed analysis of Malory's and Steinbeck's prose, so I shall have to give simply an outline of the difficulties that Steinbeck had to face in order to rewrite Malory without being unfaithful to his prose and to the spirit of the work. I have found extremely useful two books which I think contain the best analyses done on Malory's language: P. J. C. Field's *Romance and Chronicle. A Study of Malory's Prose Style* (1971) and Mark Lambert's *Malory. Style and Vision in "Le Morte Darthur"* (1975). It would be very fruitful to study some of the devices examined by Field and

when I do I put it by, but it isn't going to be like T. H. White, that I do know" (quoted by Simmonds, 1975b: 40).

[1] See his letters, specially those to his agent Elizabeth Otis and to Chase Horton included in the Appendix of Chase Horton's edition of the *Acts* (pp. 297-364), but also the numerous letters addressed to many other friends and people collected in Elaine Steinbeck' & Robert Wallsten's edition of *Steinbeck. A Life in Letters* (1975): pp. 540, 541-42, 544, 551, 552-54, 575-80, 591-92, 593-94, 598-99, 604, 611, 621-24, 627-28, 632, 634, 635, 638, 640, 642, 647, 648, 649-50, 656, 749, 792-93, 794, 821-823, and 825.

Lambert and compare them with what Steinbeck did in his *Acts* because it would tell us much of what we miss when we read this sort of adaptations.

Certainly, a common point between Malory and Steinbeck that can be perceived at first sight is the effort carried out by the American writer to preserve the simplicity so characteristic, and so much praised by critics, in Malory's prose. Steinbeck's language in the *Acts* is generally direct, clear, as he uses a simple vocabulary and a straightforward syntax. In this he coincides with the features of Malory's style described so convincingly by Field in his book: both in narration and in description, as well as in dialogue, Steinbeck seems to be fighting to preserve the values of the original text, without falling into clumsiness. Notice, for instance, how he solves this passage in Malory, which Field cites as an instance of Malory's abusive use of coordination to the extent that today it sounds childish or very primitive, or -- as Field puts it (Field, 1971: 41)-- "sub-literate" (Vinaver, 1971: 67, quoted by Field, 1971: 41):

> Than the kynge and the quene were gretely displeased with sir Gawayne for the sleynge of the lady, and there by ordynaunce of the queene there was sette a queste of ladyes uppon sir Gawayne, and they juged hym for ever whyle he lyved to be with all ladyes and to fyght for hir quarels; and ever that he sholde be curteyse, and never to refuse mercy to hym that askith mercy.

Steinbeck's version is of course very simple, but avoids the extremes of the original (Steinbeck, 1976: 87):

> The king and queen were displeased with him for killing the lady. Then Guinevere set an eternal quest on Gawain that during his whole life he would defend all ladies and fight in their cause. And she further commanded that he should be courteous always and he should grant mercy when it was asked.

Steinbeck's effort at simplification and clarity is so extraordinary that eventually he avoids even the simple hypotactic constructions characteristic of Malory. See, for instance, another passage discussed by Field, who has pointed to the use of the adverbial clause of time to open a sentence, which is followed then by "abusive" coordination; Steinbeck's version is even simpler, avoiding any hypotaxis whatsoever:

> And as kynge Arthure loked besyde hym he sawe a knight that was passyngely well horsed. And therewith kynge Arthure ran to hym and smote hym on the helme, that hys swerde wente unto his teeth, and the knyght sanke downe to the erthe dede (Vinaver, 1971: 22-23, quoted in Field, 1971: 41).

> Arthur saw a knight nerby well mounted on a good horse, and he ran at him and drove his sword through helmet and teeth and brain, and Arthur led his good horse to King Ban […] (Steinbeck, 1976: 28)

However, Steinbeck occasionaly also likes to expand. As evidence of this, and of his ability to render dialogue and combine it with description, notice the following passage, which tells of the meeting of Gawain and Ettard. This excerpt --according to Field (1971: 138-139)-- is unique in Malory for its transformation of the meeting between both characters in the sources used by Malory, and also for its remarkable diction. The deliberate ambiguity in the use of language both by Ettard and by Gawain is strongly suggestive of these characters, and marks clearly the process of seduction. Notice how Steinbeck also makes use of this ambiguity in his version, renders fifteenth-century colloquial language into equivalent contemporary idiom and recreates the whole scene with additional details:

> "Truly," seyde she, "that is grete pyté for he was a passynge good knyght of his body. But of all men on lyve I hated hym moste, for I coude never be quytte of hym. And for ye have slayne hym I shall be your woman and to do onythynge that may please you."
>
> So she made sir Gawayne good chere. Than sir Gawayne sayde that he loved a lady and by no meane she wolde love hym.
>
> "Sche is to blame," seyde Ettarde, "and she woll nat love you, for ye that be so well-borne a man and suche a man of prouesse, there is no lady in this worlde to good for you."
>
> "Woll ye," seyde sir Gawaye, "promyse me to do what that ye may do be the fayth of your body to gete me the love of my lady?"
>
> "Yee, sir, and that I promyse you be my fayth."

"Now," seyde sir Gawayne, "hit is yourself that I love so well; therefore holde your promyse. "

"I may nat chese," seyde the lady Ettarde, "but if I sholde be forsworne." (Vinaver, 1971: 102, quoted by Field, 1971: 138-139)

"That is true," Ettarde said. "He was a wonderful fighting man -- but I hated him because I could not be rid of him. He cried and wept and moaned like a sick calf until I wished him dead. I like a man of decision. Since you have slain him for me, I shall grant you anything you wish." And Ettarde blushed when she said it.

Now Gawain looked at her and saw that she was fair, and he remembered his faithless little damsel with loathing, and his vanity cried out for conquest. He smiled with confidence. "I will hold you to your promise, my lady," he said and he was pleased to see her cheeks turn rosy with excitement. She led him to her castle and set a bath for him with scented water, and when he was clad in a loose robe of purple cloth, she gave him food and wine and sat beside him so that her shoulder touched him. "Now tell me what you wish of me?" she said softly. "You will find I pay my debts."

Gawain took her hand. "Very well," he said. "I love a lady, but she does not love me."

"Oh!" Ettarde exclaimed in confusion and jealousy. "Then she is a fool. You are a king's son and a king's nephew, young, handsome, brave. What ails your love? No lady in the world is too good for you. She must be a fool." She looked into Gawain's smiling eyes.

"As my reward," he said, "I want your promise that you will do anything in your power to get me the love of my lady."

Ettarde controlled her face to conceal her disappointment. "I don't know what I could do," she said.

"Do I have your promise, on your faith?"

"Well --yes--yes. I promise, since I promised. Who is the lady and what can I do?"

Gawain looked long at her before he replied, "You are the lady, you are my love. You know what you can do. I hold you to your promise. "

> "Oh!" she cried. "You are a trickster. No lady is safe with you. You have laid a trap for me."
>
> "Your promise!"
>
> "I suppose I cannot help myself," said the lady Ettarde. "If I should not give you what you ask I would be false to my oath, and I hold my honor above my life, my love." (Steinbeck, 1976: 147-148)

More considerable expansions are found in Steinbeck's version of the third tale, "A Noble Tale of Sir Launcelot du Lake", where a simple paragraph in Malory becomes several pages in Steinbeck's prose. This, as one Steinbeck scholar (John Ditsky) has commented, is an effect of the natural impatience felt by the novelist with the tiresome task of literal translation. It is then when Steinbeck behaves exactly like Malory with his "Frensshe bookes", introducing new material --thus contravening his own initial purpose-- and freely imagining new episodes. His innovations are occasionally rather bold, as when he introduces references to his own personal life and friends. This critic, John Ditsky, has drawn our attention over the following passage in Malory and Steinbeck (second chapter of the first tale):

> And there sir Kay the Senesciall dud passyngely well, that dayes of hys lyff the worship wente never frome hym, and sir Hervis de Revel that dud merveylous dedys of armys that day with Arthur (Vinaver, 1971: 47).
>
> Sir Kay fought so well that day that the memory of his deeds has lived forever. And Sir Hervis de Revel of the line of Sir Thomas Malory distinguished himself, as did Sir Tobinus Streat de Montroy (Steinbeck, 1976: 61).

As Ditsky explains, this intruder Sir Tobinus Streat is none other than "Steinbeck's old crony from earlier days in California, Webster F. ("Toby") Street". Ditsky adds (Ditsky, 1978: 634): "What finer tribute to a former college roommate and drinking companion --the man who turned over to him the idea for *To a God Unknown* when he himself had been unable to work it into a satisfactory play-- than to place him in print and eternal glory, fighting alongside King Arthur, and with distinction?".

Nevertheless, Steinbeck is constantly returning to his source, and his fidelity to Malory's text is manifest in strict quotation. That is, sometimes he does not translate; he merely reproduces some sentences from the original. Thus at the end of some chapters (second and third chapters of the first tale, and the end of the third tale), as well as within his text, when an episode is finished. He then appropriates Malory's words, used in italics, and simply quotes: "Here begynnith the fyrst batayle that ever Sir Gawayne ded after he was made knyght" (Steinbeck, 1976: 83), or "And thus endith the adventure of Sir Gawayne that he did at the mariage of Arthure" (Steinbeck, 1976: 87); also when Malory employs his typical device of the narrator who seeks the reader's complicity: "Now leve we thes knyghtes presoners, and speke we of sir Lancelot de Lake that lyeth undir the appil-tre slepynge" (Steinbeck, 1976: 226), and even in longer passages:

> Now turn we back to yonge Syr Gaherys who rode into the manor of Syr Tarquin slayne by Lancelot. And there he found a yoman porter kepyng many keyes. Than sir Gaherys threw the porter unto the grounde and toke the keyes frome hym; and hastely he opynde the preson dore, and there he lette all the presoners oute, and every man lowsed other of their bondys (Steinbeck, 1976: 265).[1]

Evidently, Steinbeck tried to avoid archaic vocabulary and phrases, but in so doing he also had to abandon manners of expression which were typically medieval and that we consider today not even as "devices" but rather as "mistakes". For Lambert, however, these presumed infelicities of medieval and Malorian style are (Lambert, 1975: 1) "as respectable and functional as any other rhetorical or stylistic devices", and should be taken into account as relevant features of the style of the period.

One of these "mistakes" is the device Lambert calls "confirmation", that is (Lambert, 1975: 8), "a marked similarity between the vocabularies of narrator and character or of different characters in a relatively short passage". This is characteristic of medieval prose, and has an important role in the interplay of direct and indirect styles. As an illustration of how Steinbeck dealt with this

[1] The original is slightly different in the beginning, but not much different; Vinaver's edition reads: "And so they departed frome Gaherys; and Gaherys yode into the maner, and there he founde a yoman …" (the rest is exactly the same) (Vinaver, 1971: 159).

kind of device, let us examine the following passage, briefly abridged by Lambert, in the first tale:

> So after the feste and journeye kynge Arthur drewe hym unto London. And soo by the *counceil* of Merlyn the kyng lete calle his barons to *counceil*, for Merlyn had told the kynge that the sixe kynges that made warre upon hym wold in all haste be awroke on hym and on his landys; wherfor the kyng asked *counceil* at hem al. They coude no *counceil* gyve, but said they were bygge ynough. "Ye saye well," said Arthur, "I thank you for your good courage; but wil ye al that loveth me speke with Merlyn? Ye knowe wel that he hath done moche for me, and he knoweth many thynges. And whan he is afore you I wold that ye *prayd* hym hertely of his *best avyse*." Alle the barons sayd they wold *pray* hym and *desyre* hym. Soo Merlyn was sente for and fair *desyred* of al the barons to gyve them *best counceil*. "I shall say you," said Merlyn. …"What were best to do in this cause?" said al the barons. "I shall telle you," said Merlyn, "myne *advys*. There ar two bretheren beyond the see. … Wherfor this is my *counceil*: that our kyng and soverayne lord sende unto the kynges Ban and Bors by two trusty knyghtes with letters wel devysed, that and they wil come and see kynge Arthur and his courte to helpe hym in hys warrys, that he wolde be sworne unto them to helpe hem in theire warrys agaynst kynge Caludas. Now what sey ye unto this *counceyle*?" "Thys ys well *councelde*," seyde the kynge (Vinaver, 1971: 13, quoted by Lambert, 1975: 12-13).

And this is Steinbeck's version:

> Then Arthur rested his knights and feasted them. And after a time, when all was in order, he marched back to London and called a general council of all his loyal barons. Merlin foretold that the six rebellious lords would continue the war with raids and forays into the realm. When the king asked his barons what he should do, they answered that they would not offer their *advice* but only their strength and loyalty.
>
> Arthur thanked them for their courage and support, but he said, "I beg all of you who love me to speak with Merlin. You will know what he has done for me. He knows many strange and secret

> things. When yo are with him ask him for his *advice* about what we should do. "
>
> The barons agreed to this, and when Merlin came to them, they begged for his help.
>
> "Since you ask I will tell you," Merlin said. […] "What should we do then?" cried the barons. "What is our best course?"
>
> "This is my *advice* to you," said Merlin. "Across the Channel in France there are two brothers […] I suggest that our king should choose two trusty knights and send them with letters to the Kings Ban and Bors, asking their help against his enemies and promising them that he will help them against King Claudas. Now what do you think of this suggestion?"
>
> King Arthur said, "It seems good *advice* to me." [My emphasis] (Steinbeck, 1976: 17-18)

We can appreciate that Steinbeck has avoided the repetitive style of "confirmation", preferring elegant variation, although he retains a lesser degree of repetition, as in the case of the word *advice*.

Many other features could be mentioned: the use of adjectives, the stock phrases, the level of formality in speech, the descriptions, the creation of landscape and setting, etc. But suffice it for the time being to give an idea of the accomplishments and shortcomings of Steinbeck's adaptation. Further and more detailed analyses and comparisons between Malory's and Steinbeck's prose are still needed, but my impression is that Steinbeck was not completely wrong in what he was doing. Thus I cannot share the disappointment felt by some critics, like Gaines, who says (Gaines, 1990: 121) he is "left with a sense of a vision unfulfilled and a quest incomplete". True, his version was not faithful, was not a strict translation into modern idiom of Malory's text, and was also far from being the sort of "re-creation" practised by that character in a famous Borges' tale, Pierre Menard, who re-wrote chapters from *Don Quixote* through the apparently simple procedure of copying, in the 20th century, word by word, what Cervantes had written in the 17th.

It seems that Steinbeck, as he was progressing in his writing, felt more and more imbued with Malory's spirit, and treated his text as the English writer had done with his French sources. Steinbeck's merit is, in this respect, higher than many other adapters before him, who simply wanted to simplify and accommodate the text to specific audiences (mostly children). Steinbeck was really re-writing Malory, treating him almost as an equal, as a fellow novelist, although always from a position of respect and worship. He did not try to sentimentalize him, to soften him, to make him something different from what he was, as had been done by preceding adapters. He simply tried to be Malory again writing in the twentieth century, no simple task indeed!

Let me finish with a quotation from one letter by Steinbeck sent to Chase Horton in March 1959, which I think summarizes very well Steinbeck's awareness of what he was doing (Steinbeck, 1976: 330):

> Malory wrote the stories for and to his time. Any man hearing him knew every word and every reference. There was nothing obscure, he wrote the clear and common speech of his time and country. But that has changed --the words and the references are no longer common property, for a new language has come into being. Malory did not write the stories. He simply wrote them for his time and his time understood them. And so you know, Chase, suddenly in this home ground, I was not afraid of Malory any more nor ever will be again. This does not lessen my admiration but it does not inhibit me either. Only I can write this for my time. And as for place --the place has become not a little island set in a silver sea, but the world.
>
> And with that, almost by enchantment the words began to flow, a close-reined, taut, economical English, unaccented and unlocalized. I put down no word that has not been judged for general understanding. Where my time cannot fill in, I build up, and where my time would be impatient with repetition, I cut. So did Malory for his time. It is just as simple as that and I think it is the best prose I have ever written. I hope this is so and I believe it.

Fernando Galván

Universidad de Alcalá

WORKS CITED

Abbot, Charles D. 1925: *Howard Pyle: A Chronicle*, New York, Harper.

Adams, P. L. 1976a: *Atlantic Monthly*, 238 November: 118.

Adams, P. L. 1976b: *Booklist*, 73 15 October: 294, 316.

Adderley, C. M. 1992: The Best Thing for Being Sad: Education and Educators in T. H. White's *Once and Future King*. *Quondam et Futurus: A Journal of Arthurian Interpretations*, 2, 1: 55-68.

Alexander, Ann D. 1927: *Women of the Morte Darthur*, twelve of the most romantic of the world's love stories selected from Malory's Morte Darthur and illustrated by Ann D. Alexander, London, Methuen, xvi + 252 pp.

Allan, Philip 1920: *The Noble Tale of the Sangreal*, drawn out of the French Tongue by Sir Thomas Malory, Kt., and first printed by Master William Caxton, London, Philip Allan, xi + 209 pp.

Baines, Keith 1962: *Sir Thomas Malory's Le Morte d'Arthur*. *King Arthur and the Legends of the Round Table*, a Rendition in modern idiom, with an introduction by Robert Graves, decorative illustrations by Enrico Arno, New York, Clarkson N. Potter, 1962 [rpt in New York, Bramhill House; and London, George G. Harrap, 1963, 512 pp.].

Baldwin, James 1910: *Stories of the King*, illustrated by Arthur Becher, New York, American Book; and London, Appleton, 335 pp.

Benson, Larry 1968: Sir Thomas Malory's *Le Morte Darthur*. R. M. Lumiansky & Herschel Baker eds. 1968: *Critical Approaches to Six Major English Works*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Blyton, Enid 1930: *The Knights of the Round Table*, illustrated by Thomas Heath Robinson, London, George Newnes, 126 pp.

Blyton, Enid 1939: *King Arthur and his Knights*, illustrated by Macdowell, London, W. and A. K. Johnston, 64 pp.

Bradley, Marion Zimmer 1983: *The Mists of Avalon*, New York, Knopf, xi + 876 pp.

Brewer, D. S. 1968: *The Morte Darthur*. *Parts Seven and Eight* by Sir Thomas Malory, London, Edward Arnold, and Evanston, Northwestern University Press, 166 pp.

Brewer, D. S. 1970: The Present Study of Malory. *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 6: 83-97 [rpt. in D. D. R. Owen ed. 1971: *Arthurian Romance: Seven Essays*, New York, Barnes and Noble].

Brooks, Edward 1900: *The Story of King Arthur and the Knights of the Table Round*, for Boys and Girls, with thirteen illustrations by Aubrey Beardsley, Philadelphia, Penn Publishing, 383 pp.

Caxton, William 1485: *The Noble and Joyous Book Entytled Le Morte Darthur*, Abbey Westmestre.

Chalmers, Alexander 1816: *The History of the Renowned Prince Arthur, King of Britain*, illustrations by Thomas Uwins, engraved by Charles Warren, London, Walker & Edwards, 2 vv., xxxii +468; xvi +488 pp.

Chapman, Susan Elizabeth 1990: A Study of the Genre of T. H. White's Arthurian Books. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 50, 9: 2903A.

Conybeare, Edward 1868: *La Morte D'Arthur: The History of King Arthur*, compiled by Sir Thomas Mallory [sic], abridged and revised by Edward Conybeare, London, Edward Moxon, xx + 414 pp.

Cooke, Brian Kennedy 1946: *King Arthur of Britain*, from Sir Thomas Malory's Morte D'Arthur, illuminated in the Style of Early English Miniatures by Anthony Rado, Leicester, Edmund Ward, 140 pp.

Cooke, Brian Kennedy 1951: *Sir Lancelot*, from Sir Thomas Malory's Morte D'Arthur and Other Sources, illustrated after water-colours by W. Russell Flint, Leicester, Edmund Ward, 192 pp.

Cooke, Brian Kennedy 1953: *The Holy Grail*, from Sir Thomas Malory's Morte D'Arthur and Other Sources, illustrated from the "Codice Palatino" in the Florence Museum, Leicester, Edmund Ward, 190 pp.

Cooke, Brian Kennedy 1957: *The Quest of the Beast*, from Sir Thomas Malory's 'Morte D'Arthur' and Other Sources, illustrations in the text from "Tavola Rotonda" Cod. Pal. 556 by Courtesy of the National Library, Florence, London, Edmund Ward, 215 pp.

Copland, William 1557: *The Story of the Moste Noble and Worthy Kynge Arthur*, London.

Cosgrave, M. S. 1977: *Horn Book*, 53 October: 561.

Cowen, Janet 1969: *Le Morte D'Arthur*, with an Introduction by John Lawlor, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, lv + 461 pp.

Cutler, Uriel Waldo 1904: *Stories of King Arthur & his Knights* New York, Thomas Y. Crowell, xviii + 322 pp.

David, R[eginald] T[horne] 1967: *King Arthur and his Knights*, a selection from what has been known as *Le Morte Darthur*, London, Faber and Faber, and New York, Barnes and Noble, 271 pp.

Ditsky, John 1978: The Friend at the Round Table: A Note on Steinbeck's *Acts*. *American Literature*, 49, 4: 633-635.

East, Thomas c. 1578: *The Storye of the Most Noble and Worthy Kynge Arthur*, London.

Field, P. J. C. 1971: *Romance and Chronicle. A Study of Malory's Prose Style*, London, Barrie & Jenkins.

Field, P. J. C. 1977: *Le Morte Darthur: The Seventh and Eighth Tales*, New York, Holmes and Meier [and London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1978], iv + 284 pp.

Fontenrose, Joseph 1963: *John Steinbeck: An Introduction and Interpretation*, New York, Barnes and Noble.

Franklin, H. Bruce 1992: Traveling in Time with Mark Twain. Robert J. Scholnick ed. 1992: *American Literature and Science*, Lexington, University Press of Kentucky: 157-171.

Frazier, George 1969: John Steinbeck! John Steinbeck! How Still We See Thee Lie and Lie. And Lie. *Esquire*, 72 November.

French, Warren 1961: *John Steinbeck*, New York, Twayne.

French, Warren 1975: "Steinbeck's Use of Malory", in Tetsumaro Hatashi, ed. 1975: 4-11.

Frith, Henry 1884: *King Arthur and his Knights of the Round Table*, with original illustrations by F[rancis] A[rthur] Fraser, London, George Routledge, ix + 408 pp.

Fuller, Edmund 1976: *Wall Street Journal*, 19 November: 1.

Gaines, Barry 1969: A Forgotten Artist: John Harris and the Rylands Copy of Caxton's Edition of Malory. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 52: 115-128.

Gaines, Barry 1974: The Editions of Malory in the Early Nineteenth Century. *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 68: 1-17.

Gaines, Barry 1984: Malory's Castles in Text and Illustration. Kathryn Reyerson & Faye Powe eds. 1984: *The Medieval Castle: Romance and Reality*, Medieval Studies at Minnesota 1, Kendall/Hunt, Dubuque: 215-228.

Gaines, Barry 1990: *Sir Thomas Malory. An Anecdotal Bibliography of Editions, 1485-1985*, New York, AMS Press.

Gardiner, Jane 1992: "'A More Splendid Necromancy': Mark Twain's *Connecticut Yankee* and the Electrical Revolution", in Prafulla C. Kar ed. 1992: *Mark Twain: An Anthology of Recent Criticism*, Delhi, Pencraft: 182-194.

Gardini, Carlos 1979: *Los hechos del rey Arturo y sus nobles caballeros: según la obra de Sir Thomas Malory y otras fuentes*, Barcelona, Edhasa [rpt. by the same publishers in 1980, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985,

1986, 1988 and 1993; by Salvat in Barcelona in 1994; by Editorial Sudamericana, Buenos Aires, 1994; and by Círculo de Lectores, Barcelona, 1992, under a slightly different title: *Los hechos del Rey Arturo y sus nobles caballeros: según los manuscritos de Winchester de Thomas Malory y otras fuentes* introduction by Pedro Sorela].

Gardner, J. 1976: *New York Times Book Review*, 24 October: 31.

Gilbert, Henry 1911: *King Arthur's Knights: The Tales Re-told for Boys & Girls*, with 16 illustrations in colour by Walter Crane, London, T. C. and E. C. Jack; and New York, Frederick A. Stokes, xi + 367 pp.

Gollancz, Israel 1897: *Le Morte Darthur*, four illustrations by Aubrey Beardsley, London, J. M. Dent, 4 vols., 312; 308; 324; and 314 pp.

Grimaldo Tormos, Pilar 1963: *Los caballeros de la tabla redonda*, Barcelona, Editorial Teide, 78 pp. illustrations by Mario Logle and Gabriele Santini.

Hanks, D. Thomas, Jr. 1990: *Sir Thomas Malory. Views and Re-views*, New York, AMS Press.

Haslewood, Joseph 1816: *La Mort D'Arthur*, illustrations by William Marshall Craig, engraved by Richard Rhodes, London, R. Wilks, 3 vols., xxiv + 326; xv + 331; xvi + 384 pp.

Hayashi, Tetsumaro, ed. 1975: *Steinbeck Monograph Series*, No. 5, entitled *Steinbeck and the Arthurian Theme*, edited by Tetsumaro Hayashi for The John Steinbeck Society of America English Department, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana.

Hodges, Laura F. 1992: Steinbeck's Adaptation of Malory's *Launcelot*: A Triumph of Realism over Supernaturalism. *Quondam et Futurus: A Journal of Arthurian Interpretations*, 2, 1: 69-81.

Johnson, Cynthia 1977: *School Library Journal*, 23 April: 84.

Kellman, Martin 1991: T. H. White's Merlyn: A Flawed Prophet. James Gollnick ed., *Comparative Studies in Merlin from the Vedas to C. G. Jung*, Lewiston, NY, Mellen: 55-61.

Kertzer, Adrienne 1985: T. H. White's *The Sword in the Stone*: Education and the Child Reader. Perry Nodelman ed., *Tochstones: Reflections on the Best in Children's Literature*, vol. 1, West Lafayetete, Children's Lit. Assoc.: 281-290.

Kinney, Arthur F. 1965: The Arthurian Cycle in *Tortilla Flat*. *Modern Fiction Studies*, 11: 11-20 [rpt. in Robert Murray Davis ed. 1972: *Steinbeck: A Collection of Critical Essays*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall: 36-46].

Kinney, Arthur F. 1975: *Tortilla Flat* Re-Visited. Tetsumaro Hayashi, ed. 1975: 12-24.

Kirk, Elizabeth 1985: "Clerkes, Poetes and Historiographs': The *Morte Darthur* and Caxton's 'Poetics' of Fiction. SPISAK ed. 1985: 275-295.

Knowles, James Thomas 1862: *The Story of King Arthur and his Knights of the Round Table*, compiled and arranged by J[ames] T[homas] K[nowles], with illustrations by G[eorge] H[ousman] Thomas, London, Griffith and Farran, iii + 325 pp.

Lambert, Mark 1975: *Malory. Style and Vision in "Le Morte Darthur"*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press.

Lang, Andrew 1902: *The Book of Romance*, with numerous illustrations by H[enry] J[ustice] Ford, London, Longmans, Green, ix + 384 pp.

Lang, Andrew 1903: *Tales of the Round Table*, based on the tales in *The Book of Romance* edited by Andrew Lang with 4 coloured plates and 21 other illustrations by H. J. Ford, London, Longmans, 174 pp.

Lang, Andrew 1905: *Tales of King Arthur and the Round Table*, adapted from *The Book of Romance* by Andrew Lang, with introduction, notes, etc. by J[ohn] C. Allen and twenty illustrations by H. J. Ford, London, Longmans, viii + 152 pp.

Lang, Andrew 1967: *King Arthur: Tales of the Round Table*, illustrated by H. J. Ford, New York, Schocken Books, 174 pp.

Lang, Andrew 1968: *King Arthur: Tales of the Round Table*, pictures by Charles Mozley, New York, Franklin Watts.

Lanier, Sidney 1880: *The Boy's King Arthur, being Sir Thomas Malory's History of King Arthur and his Knights of the Round Table*, edited for Boys with an Introduction by Sidney Lanier, illustrated by Alfred Kappes, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, xlvii + 403 pp.

Latappy, Mlle. 1910: *Le Roi Arthur et les Chevaliers de la Table ronde*, illustrations de Brinsley Le Fanu, Paris, Librairie Larousse, "Les Livres roses pour la Jeunesse, Collection Stead, new series no. 21.

Lathrop, Henry Borrowes 1911: *Malory's King Arthur and his Knights*, an abridgment of Le Morte Darthur, illustrated by Reginald Birch, New York, Baker and Taylor, xv + 421 pp.

Lewis, C. S. 1947: The *Morte Darthur. TLS*, 7 June: 273-274 [rpt. in C. S. Lewis 1966: *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Literature*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 103-110].

Life, Page West 1980: *Sir Thomas Malory and the Morte Darthur. A Survey of Scholarship and Annotated Bibliography*, Charlottesville, University Press of Virginia.

Lindley, Angela 1990: Biography and the Critical Reception of T. H. White's 'The Once and Future King'. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 50, 8: 2499A.

Lumiansky, R. M. 1982: *Le Morte Darthur*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, xi + 750 pp.

Macardle, Dorothy M. 1917: *Selections from Le Morte D'Arthur of Sir Thomas Malory*, London, Macmillan, xii + 117 pp.

Macdonald, Alan 1993: A Lost Story of Perversion: T. H. White's 'The Witch in the Wood'. *Library Chronicle of the University of Texas*, 23, 4: 106-129.

Macgregor, Mary 1905: *Stories of King Arthur's Knights*, told to the Children with pictures by Katharine Cameron, London, T. C. and E. C. Jack, x + 115 pp.

Mackenzie, Agnes M. 1915: *Selections from Malory*, being an Introductory Reader in Middle English for Secondary Classes, edited with introduction notes and glossary, London, George G. Harrap, 107 pp. [It contains Caxton's Book IX, chapters 1-9, and Book IV, chapters 6-12 and 14-16].

Macleod, Mary 1900: *The Book of King Arthur and his Noble Knights*, Stories from Sir Thomas Malory's Morte Darthur, introduction by John W. Hales, illustrated from drawings by A. G. Walker, London, Wells Gardner, Darton; and New York, E. & J. B. Young, xxviii + 418 pp.

Mahon, Derek 1977: *New Statesman*, 93 11 February: 195.

Masterton, G. A. 1976: *Library Journal*, 101 15 October, no. 2178.

Masterton, G. A. 1977: *Choice*, 14 March: 64.

Merriman, James Douglas 1973: *The Flower of Kings: A Study of the Arthurian Legend in England between 1485 and 1835*, Lawrence, University of Kansas Press.

Morris, Charles 1891: *King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table*, a modernized version of the "Morte Darthur" by Charles Morris, Philadelphia, Lippincott [rpt. in 1892 in London by W. W. Gibbings, 3 vols. 256, 256 and 255 pp.].

Mott, A[drian] S[pear] 1933: *The Noble & Joyous Boke Entytled Le Morte Darthur*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell for the Shakespeare Head Press, 2 vols. xxviii + 316; 373 pp.

Nellis, Marilyn K. 1983: "Anachronistic Humor in Two Arthurian Romances of Education: *To the Chapel Perilous* and *The Sword and the Stone*", *Studies in Medievalism*, 2, 4: 57-77.

Pfordresher, John 1973: *A Variorum Edition of Tennyson's 'Idylls of the King'*, New York and London, Columbia University Press.

Pollard, Alfred W. 1900: *Le Morte Darthur*, London & New York, Macmillan, 2 vols.; xxviii + 439; xix + 531 pp.

Pollard, Alfred W. 1917: *The Romance of King Arthur and his Knights of the Round Table*, abridged from Malory's Morte D'Arthur, illustrated by Arthur Rackham, London & New York, Macmillan, xxiv + 517 pp.

Powers, Lyall 1985: Mark Twain and the Future of Picaresque. Robert Giddings ed. 1985: *Mark Twain: A Sumptuous Variety*, Totowa, NJ, Barnes & Noble: 155-175.

Pyle, Howard 1902-1903: *The Story of King Arthur and his Knights*, in *St. Nicholas*, 30 November 1902-October 1903, New York, Scribners.

Pyle, Howard 1905: *The Story of the Champions of the Round Table*, written and illustrated by Howard Pyle, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons; and London, George Newnes, xviii + 329 pp.

Pyle, Howard 1907: *The Story of Sir Launcelot and his Companions*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons; and London, Chapman and Hall, xviii + 340 pp.

Pyle, Howard 1910: *The Story of the Grail and the Passing of Arthur*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons; and London, Bickers, xviii + 258 pp.

Pyle, Howard 1965: *The Story of King Arthur and his Knights*, illustrations by Sergio Leone, New York, Grosset and Dunlap, xvii + 320 pp.

Pyle, Howard 1969: *The Book of King Arthur*, cover by Don Irwin, and illustrated by Ron King, Chicago, Children's Press, 192 pp.

Pyle, Howard 1979: *The Story of King Arthur and his Knights*, Woodbury, Bobley Publishing, 400 pp.

Rhys, Ernest 1886: *Malory's History of King Arthur and the Quest of the Holy Grail* From the Morte D'Arthur, edited, with general introduction to the "Camelot Series," by Ernest Rhys, London, Walter Scott, xl + 330 pp.

Rhys, Ernest 1892: *The Noble and Joyous History of King Arthur*, edited by Ernest Rhys: *Morte D'Arthur: The First Nine Books*, London, Walter Scott, xv + 325 pp. [A second volume entitled: *The Book of Marvellous Adventures, & Other Books of the Morte D'Arthur*, edited by Ernest Rhys: *Morte D'Arthur: The Last Twelve Books*, London, Walter Scott, xiii + 384 pp.].

Ricks, Christopher 1969: *The Poems of Tennyson*, London, Longman.

Ross, Meredith Jane 1986: The Sublime to the Ridiculous: The Restructuring of Arthurian Materials in Selected Modern Novels. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 46, 12: 3717A.

Rowan, Diana 1977: *Christian Science Monitor*, 12 January: 23.

Sandler, Florence Field 1992: Family Romance in *The Once and Future King*. *Quondam et Futurus: A Journal of Arthurian Interpretations*, 2, 2: 73-80.

Scharnhorst, Gary 1989: Mark Twain and the Millerites: Notes on *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court*. *American Transcendental Quarterly*, 3, 3: 297-304.

Schroth, Evelyn 1983: Camelot: Contemporary Interpretation of Arthur in 'Sens' and 'Matiere'. *Journal of Popular Culture*, 17, 2: 31-43.

Shanley, MAry Lyndon & Peter G. Stillman 1982: Mark Twain: Technology, Social Change, and Political Power. Benjamin R. Barber & Michael J. Gargas McGrath eds. 1982: *The Artist and Political Vision*, New Brunswick, Transaction: 267-289.

Shippey, T. A. 1977: *Times Literary Supplement*, 29 April: 536.

Simmonds, Roy S. 1975a: A Note on Steinbeck's Unpublished Arthurian Stories. Tesumaro Hayashi, ed. 1975: 25-29.

Simmonds, Roy S. 1975b: The Unrealized Dream: Steinbeck's Modern Version of Malory. Tesumaro Hayashi, ed. 1975: 30-43.

Simmons, F. J. 1893-1894: *The Birth, Life and Acts of King Arthur*, with an introduction by Professor [John] Rhys and embellished with many original designs by Aubrey Beardsley, London, J. M. Dent [issued in 12 monthly parts; 1500 copies on smooth grey-green paper to be bound in 2 vols. and 300 copies on Dutch hand-made paper to be bound in 3 vols.], xc + 990 pp. [2nd ed.: London, J. M. Dent, 1909; 3rd ed.: London, J. M. Dent, 1927].

Simpson, Roger 1990: *Camelot Regained. The Arthurian Revival and Tennyson 1800-1849*, Cambridge, D. S. Brewer.

Smith, Evans Lansing 1991: The Narrative Structure of T. H. White's *The Once and Future King*. *Quondam et Futurus: A Journal of Arthurian Interpretations*, 1, 4: 39-52.

Sommer, H. Oskar 1889-1891: *Le Morte Darthur by Syr Thomas Malory*, with an essay on Malory's prose style by Andrew Lang, London, David Nutt, 3 vols., x + 861; xxv + 338; vii + 230 pp.

Southey, Robert 1817: *The Byrth, Lyf, and Actes of Kyng Arthur*, with an Introduction and Notes by Robert Southey, edited by William Upcott,

London, Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 2 vols., xxxix + 383; 495 pp.

Spisak, James W. 1983: *Caxton's Malory. A New Edition of Sir Thomas Malory's Le Morte Darthur Based on the Pierpont Morgan Copy of William Caxton's Edition of 1485*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 2 vols., viii + 920 pp.

Spisak, James W. ed. 1985: *Studies in Malory*, Kalamazoo, Michigan, Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University.

Stansby, William 1634: *The Most Ancient and Famous History of the Renowned Prince Arthur King of Britaine*, London, printed by William Stansby, for Jacob Bloome.

Stead, William Thomas 1899: *King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table*, Old Stories Re-Told, illustrated by Brinsley Le Fanu, London, "Review of Reviews" Office, 62 pp. [reprints in 1908 by Penn Publishing in Philadelphia, and with arrangements by Robert S. Wood under the title *Stories of King Arthur's Knights* was published by Stead's Bairns' Library in London in 2 volumes, n. d., 79 pp.].

Steinbeck, Elaine & Robert Wallsten, eds. 1975: *Steinbeck. A Life in Letters*, New York, The Viking Press.

Steinbeck, John 1976: *The Acts of King Arthur and His Noble Nights*, New York, Farrar, Straus and Giroux; and London, Heinemann, xiv + 364 pp. [rpt. in paperback by Ballantine New York, 1977 and by Pan Books London, 1979].

Strachey, Edward 1868: *Morte Darthur*, London, Macmillan, xxxvii + 496 pp. [rpt. with revisions in 1868, 1869 and 1891].

Sutcliff, Rosemary 1979: *The Light Beyond the Forest: The Quest for the Holy Grail*, decorations by Shirley Felts, London, Bodley Head [rpt. in New York, Dutton, 1980], 148 pp.

Sutcliff, Rosemary 1980: *The Sword and the Circle; King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table*, decorations by Shirley Felts, London, Bodley Head; and New York; Dutton, 260 pp.

Sutcliff, Rosemary 1981: *The Road to Camlann*, decorations by Shirley Felts, London, Bodley Head [rpt. in New York, Dutton, 1982], 143 pp.

Takamiya, Toshiyuki 1985: Caxton's Malory Re-edited. *Poetica*, 21-22: 48-70.

Tanner, William E. 1993: Tangled Web of Time. William E. Tanner ed., *The Arthurian Myth of Quest and Magic: A Festschrift in Honor of Lavon B. Fulwiler*, Dallas, Caxton's Mod. Arts: 49-62.

Thomas, Jimmie Elaine 1983: The Once and Present King: A Study of the World View Revealed in Contemporary Arthurian Adaptations. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 43, 10: 3316A.

Torres Oliver, Francisco 1985: *Muerte de Arturo*, Madrid, Ediciones Siruela, 3 vols., 950 pp.

Vallvé, Manuel 1914: *Los caballeros de la tabla redonda; leyendas relatadas a los niños*, Barcelona, Ediciones Araluce, 1914, 128 pp. illustrations by J. Segrelles.

Vinaver, Eugène 1947: *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 3 vols. cxv + 1742 pp. rpt. with corrections in 1948 1st ed. .

Vinaver, Eugène 1954: *Malory: Works*, London, Oxford University Press, xviii + 919 pp. 1st ed. .

Vinaver, Eugène 1955: *The Tale of the Death of King Arthur* by Sir Thomas Malory, Oxford, Clarendon Press, xxvi + 146 pp.

Vinaver, Eugène 1956: *King Arthur and his Knights*, selections from the Works of Sir Thomas Malory, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin, xxi + 166 pp. the revised and enlarged edition, with the same title, was published by the same house in 1968 [xxi + 230 pp.], as well as by Oxford University Press in 1975 [xxi + 231 pp.].

Vinaver, Eugène 1967: *Malory: Works*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 3 vols. rpt. with corrections and additions, 1973 2nd ed. .

Vinaver, Eugène 1971: *Malory: Works*, London, Oxford University Press, xv + 811 pp. 2nd ed. .

Vinaver, Eugène 1990: *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory*, revised by P. J. C. Field, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 3 vols. cxlvii + 1768 pp. 3rd ed.

Warner, Sylvia Towsend & Trevor Stubley 1988: *The Book of Merlyn: The Unpublished Conclusion to "The Once and Future King"*, Austin, The University of Texas Press.

Welsh, Andrew 1991: Lancelot at the Crossroads in Malory and Steinbeck. *Philological Quarterly*, 70, 4: 485-502.

Williams, M. C. 1977: *New Republic*, 176 5 February: 34-35.

Williams, Mary C. 1984: Lessons from Ladies in Steinbeck's 'Gawain, Ewain, and Marhalt'. *Avalon to Camelot*, 1, 4: 40-41.

Winder, Blanche 1925: *Stories of King Arthur*, with 48 Colour Plates by Harry G. Theaker, London, Ward, Lock, 340 pp. [rptd. without the illustrations in 1935 by the same publishing house].

Worde, Wynkyn de 1498: *The Noble and Joyous Book Entytled Le Morte Darthur*, Westmestre [2nd ed. in London in 1529].

Wright, Thomas 1858: *La Mort d'Arthure*, edited from the text of the edition of 1634, with introduction and notes by Thomas Wright, London, John Russell Smith, 3 vols. xliii + 304; xv + 356; xvi + 348 pp. [2nd ed.: London, John Russell Smith, 1866, 3 vols; 3rd ed.: London, Reeves and Turner, 1889, 3 vols.; 4th ed.: London, George Routledge and Sons, 1893; 5th ed.: London, Gibbings, 1897, 3 vols.].

* † *