

Examine the role of appetite and consumption in Sir Gowther and Havelok the Dane.

Essay Development Plan

To date there has been only a limited amount of scholarly research into the topics of appetite and consumption in late medieval romance literature. The principal research outputs have been from Aaron Hostetter, whose PhD thesis entitled *Politics of Eating* and article entitled “Food, Sovereignty and Social Order in *Havelok the Dane*” represent the only sustained studies of these topics. These publications consider appetite and consumption in both texts under study in the essay, *Havelok the Dane* and *Sir Gowther* (the former in both works, the latter in his PhD thesis only), and they thus represent an integral aspect of the essay’s approach to the topic. Works as significant as these are necessarily incorporated throughout the essay written here, although at all stages Hostetter’s ideas are engaged with in the writing; while most are accepted some are challenged or rejected, and other models proposed.

The essay begins with a brief summary of other extant scholarship, highlighting the emphasis critics have placed on the importance of feasting and eating in the genre of Arthurian romance, where feasts operate as a key narrative tool to advance the story or give background to a character. The essay highlights, however, that despite acknowledging the importance of feasting in these texts, the same cannot be said for Middle English romances more broadly. This is strange, because the two texts considered here contain many references to appetite, consumption and feasting that are integral to authorial purposes and the construction of the protagonists’ characters, and the narrative arc. It then outlines the history of the texts under scrutiny, an important task since both have complex origins that have shaped the presentation

of appetite and consumption. It emphasises that while there is little to connect these texts—separated by two hundred years and with very different stories and settings—they are bound together by a shared focus on appetite and consumption, making them good candidates for investigation.

Although the author considered several different structures, including analysing each text in turn, ultimately a comparative approach has been taken. This structure nevertheless avoids masking the great differences between the works, and indeed emphasises difference. Thus, the essay looks at a number of themes associated with appetite and consumption in the texts, always exploring these in first *Havelok* and then *Gowther* but with cross-referencing where relevant. The structure of the essay reflects the structure of the narratives, progressing through each work and thus demonstrating how the authors of *Havelok* and *Gowther* change their approaches to appetite and consumption as their protagonist gains or loses influence or power.

Firstly, the respective appetites of Havelock and Gowther are considered in their childhoods. This section explores the connection made by *Havelok*'s author between the provision of food and kingship, and also highlights the differences between Havelock's large yet positively presented appetite, and Gowther's monstrous appetite. Secondly, it examines the miraculous provision of food in each work, arguing that these function to very different ends: where in *Havelok* this certifies the hero's right to rule, in *Gowther* the explanation is more complex, connected to passivity, penance the re-learning of behaviour. Finally, the sublimation of appetite is considered in each text. Both protagonists elect to go hungry to

advance their own personal cause, and this rejection of conspicuous consumption is examined.

Although the essay has considered the majority of references to feasting and eating in these works, the eating habits of other characters form only a marginal aspect, and if the essay were developed further this might be a suitable area for expansion. Similarly, one might also highlight models of economic trade and surplus, firmly in evidence in *Havelok* and yet almost entirely missing from *Gowther*, as a differentiating element between the works.

Works Cited

Hostetter, Aaron K. *The Politics of Eating and Cooking in Medieval English Romance*. Dissertation, Princeton University, 2011.

—. “Food, Sovereignty, and Social Order in Havelok the Dane.” *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, vol. 110, no. 1, 2011, pp. 53–77.

Examine the role of appetite and consumption in Sir Gowther and Havelok the Dane.

Introduction

In Middle English and Old French romance literature, food and feasting often occupy ubiquitous positions in the narrative. In spite of this prevalence, scholarly discussion of the narrative roles of appetite and consumption remains rather limited. With the exception of the work of Aaron Hostetter (*Politics of Eating*; “Food, Sovereignty”), many studies focus either on the earlier medieval period (Frantzen), on historical consumption and appetite (Hensch), or on the act of feasting, rather than food itself (Hanna). Scholars have, however, highlighted the importance of accounts of food and consumption to Arthurian romances. Feasting at Camelot serves as a vital element of the story, offering “a milieu of exchange, narrative and action” (Gordon 81). It is at the table that challenges are issued, threats or reinstatements are made, news is announced and the plot progressed by the author (Schmolke-Hasselmann 43). The act of feasting is not the only element of importance, however, and food often operates as an identity marker in romance literature: the attitude of a character towards food, and their behaviour around food, might provide clues to their current socio-economic standing or their past. Perceval and Fergus, for instance, are teased in Camelot for the fact that they are motivated by hunger (Gordon 83). In this context shared food and drinking can create a community; those who do not consume similar items are excluded from a social group or class (Ibid 79). Changes in attitudes to the consumption of food can in this genre also demonstrate changes in character, for instance as impoverished individuals progress from foraging or hunting to luxury foods and conspicuous consumption.

While the importance of food and feasting is particularly visible in Arthurian romances, the importance of these themes is equally visible across the genre of romance texts throughout the high and later middle ages. Two Middle English texts are particularly remarkable for the insistent focus not only on food, but on appetite and consumption: the thirteenth-century *Havelok the Dane* (ed. Herzman, Drake and Salisbury, hereafter *Havelok*), and the fifteenth-century *Sir Gowther* (ed. Laskaya and Salisbury, hereafter *Gowther*). Both of these texts have complex histories of transmission, outlined below, and were written down in their current form almost two hundred years apart. Yet their shared focus on food binds the texts together, and demonstrates how themes of consumption and appetite might offer a window into broader issues of culture, societal concerns, and attitudes to nobility and sovereignty in the period. The essay will approach the themes of appetite and consumption by exploring crucial experiences of the protagonists chronologically in their respective tales, from their births and infancies, marked by extraordinary appetite, to periods of miraculous provision of food, starvation, and then abundance. It will argue that the different representations of appetite and consumption contained within these works nevertheless agree on certain themes—the societal dangers presented by excessive appetite, the intimate connection between nobility, sovereignty and abundance, and the injustice of the struggle for food.

Compositional Contexts

Despite their notable shared focus on appetite and consumption, examination of the respective histories of *Havelok* and *Gowther* reveals different compositional contexts that must be fully understood before their narratives can be successfully analysed. The story of Havelock is preserved in its earliest form in Gaimar's *L'Estoire des Engleis* (ed. Bell, *L'Estoire*), whence it was developed into a poem of 1100 lines in the *Lai d'Haveloc* (ed. Bell,

Le Lai) in the later twelfth century. These versions likely depend on local folk history from Lincolnshire (Kleinman, 245–77). It is unsurprising, therefore, that such earlier incarnations are broadly similar to the Middle English *Havelok the Dane*, written around the close of the thirteenth century and preserved in two manuscripts (Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS Laud Misc. 108 and Cambridge University Library Add. 4407). Yet the differences between the Middle English and Anglo-Norman versions are significant, and show the author of *Havelok* altered his source material to reflect a particular interest in depictions of sovereignty (Hostetter, *Politics of Eating* 56–7), a narrative concern that is connected to themes of consumption and appetite. Where the Anglo-Norman text owes much to the “fashionable” writings of Marie de France (Field 157), with their courtly staging, the Middle English text removes the courtly, aristocratic atmosphere (despite an audience that likely numbered these precise people, according to Crane (43)) and replaces it with “a pious, clerical attitude to kingship” (Field 166). Scholars agree that this version of the story is unambiguously set in the Anglo-Saxon era as opposed to ancient Britain, (Turville-Petre 122), a unique staging of Havelock’s story that offers its author the opportunity to present centuries-old examples of good kingship, good consumption, and their inverse, alongside the tale of Havelock himself. As Hostetter notes, *Havelok*’s author is “profoundly concerned” with the vulnerability of the human body and its hunger— “the romance never stops watching [Havelock’s] body” (*Politics of Eating* 53). As the narrative swings between extremes of glut and dearth, we see appetite and consumption operating on multiple narrative levels: Havelock “moves between these extremes in a relationship intelligible mostly through the consumption of food” (Ibid).

Gowther in both its manuscript survival and tone is a later tale, and survives in two fifteenth century manuscripts (Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, Advocates’ MS 19.3.1 and

British Library MS Royal 17.B.43). The story as preserved is believed to have been written around c. 1400, but its author has clearly been influenced by a number of earlier works. Sometimes labeled as satire, its outlandish story is based at least in part on the French *Robert le Diable* (ed. Löseth), and perhaps on a tale recorded by Matthew Paris of a “demon child” born in Herefordshire (cited in Cartlidge, *Boundaries*, 181). Described by Cartlidge as “the most self-consciously shocking of all Middle English romances” (“Therof seyus clerkus,” 135), *Gowther* presents a vision of consumption markedly different from the struggles presented in *Havelok*. Where Havelok’s experience swings from feast to famine and back again, and food is struggled for throughout his childhood, Gowther instead faces an overabundance of food followed by a struggle for consumption that is marked by both silence and *choice*: it is Gowther’s penance for his previous behaviour that forces him to change his methods of consumption.

Havelok and Gowther – Appetites in Childhood

Havelok’s childhood is marked by oscillating access to food that seems to dominate his existence, an unusual struggle for survival when compared to other romances, which focus instead on courtly etiquette and behaviour (Hostetter, *Politics of Eating* 54). The story opens with the backdrop to Havelok’s story, describing both his father and that of his English bride-to-be, Goldeboru. Both are exceptional kings, but it is Goldeboru’s father who is framed in terms of sating the appetite of his people:

He was large and no wicth gnede.
Havede he non so god brede
Ne on his bord non so god shrede (ll. 97–9)

Athelwold manages to succeed in the difficult task of feasting at a level appropriate to his stature whilst still providing his followers with food. It is a sign of impending doom in

Havelok that Athelwold cannot eat: “He ne mouthe no mete hete” (l. 146). Indeed, throughout the story the withholding of food is held to be an unjust and sometimes calamitous event. Imprisoned by his father’s successor, Havelock and his sisters are deprived of food: “Ther he greten ofte sore / Bothe for hunger and for kold” (ll. 415–6). After the young Havelock requests more food, his captor Godard brutally dismembers his sisters as a form of nutrition, offering them as a meal to the young prince. The horrifying episode illustrates not only Havelock’s vulnerability but also his awareness of his own status, that is, one deserving of food not just as a human being but as an heir to the throne:

"For us hungreth swithe sore" -
Seyden he, "we wolden more:
We ne have to hete, ne we ne have
Her inne neyther knith ne knave
That yeveth us drinke ne no mete,
Halvendel that we moun ete -
Wo is us that we weren born!
Weilawei! nis it no korn
That men micte maken of bred?
Us hungreth - we aren ney ded!" (ll. 455–64)

Hostetter (“Food, Sovereignty” 56), drawing on the ideas of Bataille (53), argues that the episode not only reveals *Havelok’s* expectations of consumption but the author’s understanding of the relationship between sovereignty and the act of consuming. More profoundly it illustrates the weakness at the heart of sovereign power: consumption without production requires willing participants who offer up their share to a higher power (Hostetter, “Food, Sovereignty” 56). It is possible to take the interpretation of this episode in a different direction too, one more focused on narrative purpose: Godard’s ironic feast for Havelock at once demonstrates to the audience his inherent wickedness, already apparent but here rendered beyond doubt, and framed around food. It is also an occasion (one of very few in the text) where food is rejected: Godard’s offerings of nourishment are again refused at the end

of the narrative, when he tries to retain his own men in the face of Havelock's superior claim to the throne:

“Mine knithes, hwat do yet?
Sule ye thusgate fro me fle?
Ich have you fed and yet shal fede –
Helpe me nw in this need” (ll. 2419–22)

Abandoned by his own men, Godard thus fails to feed anyone throughout the entire tale explicitly. His near-demonic presentation of Havelock's sisters as a meal, and his pleas to his knights to remember past meals bracket the narrative, at both stages confirming to the reader Godard's inability to rule expressed through the provision of food.

In contrast to Havelock, during his infancy Gowther never has to struggle for food. In fact, his nourishment is privileged above the needs, comfort and safety of others. His father, the duke, organizes for his infant son to be wet-nursed, a practice synonymous with stratified society and intimately connected to issues of consumption and the wasting of food. As Hostetter writes, “wet nursing is itself a practice of privileged waste and expenditure: the high-status birth mother's own milk is wasted” (*Politics of Eating* 182). Not only this, but the milk biologically intended to provide nourishment to another infant is sacrificed in favour of Gowther, an expression of social hierarchy (Ibid). What makes Gowther's consumption even more significant in terms of social order is the fact that the wet nurses are drawn by his father not from the working classes but from the wives of his knights: “full gud knyghttys wyffys” (l. 112). Unlike contemporary medieval society, therefore, the wet nurses of *Gowther* are aristocratic, nourishing the child of their immediate superior. Gowther's excessive consumption is represented by a single twelve-line stanza, “a masterful example of how form can be used to evoke horror” (Hostetter, *Politics of Eating* 183):

That was full gud knyghttys wyffys.
He sowkyd hom so thei lost ther lyvys,
Sone had he sleyne three!
Tho chyld was yong and fast he wex -
The Duke gard prycke aftur sex -
Hende harkons yee:
Be twelfe monethys was gon
Nine norsus had he slon
Of ladys feyr and fre (ll. 112–20)

Reflecting Gowther's non-human origins, his appetite threatens the social order and even destroys the lives of his wet-nurses. The baby's excessive and grotesque consumption is reflected in the narrative structure: the nine lines reflect the nine knights' wives killed by Gowther's ravenous hunger, while the full twelve-line stanza corresponds to the twelve-month period in which the deaths took place (Hostetter, *Politics of Eating* 183). Unlike the *Havelok* poet, however, much of Gowther's feeding is left to the imagination, and the audience must fill in the blanks as to the grisly deaths of these women. It is thus no surprise that the knights refuse to send their wives, and Gowther's mother must instead attempt to sate the appetite of her child:

His modur fell afowle unhappe,
Upon a day bad hym tho pappe,
He snaffulld to hit soo
He rofe tho hed fro tho brest (ll. 127–30)

In stark contrast to the aristocratic women, Gowther's mother suffers a brutal and explicit injury from the mouth of her son. Here, *Gowther* is perhaps influenced by another tale of injury inflicted through the mouth of a child: the late thirteenth-century *Robert le Diable* describes how Robert in his infancy kicks, scratches and bites his nurses to the extent that he must be fed using a horn (ll. 105–12; Hostetter, *Politics of Eating* 184 n. 270). As Hostetter remarks, Gowther's appetite "is for the material itself ... he thrives off motherly bodies"

(*Politics of Eating* 184). It is thus small wonder that his mother turns her attentions to providing nurture to the knights of the court (l. 149) instead of her son. Comparison of the two childhoods reveals that while both experience horror and have large appetites, the respective authors use these shared qualities to very different ends: one establishes the monstrous aspect of their “hero”, the other the frailty of their child protagonist.

Miraculous Provision of Food

Both texts also present circumstances under which food miraculously appears to the protagonist at a crucial stage in the narrative. Comparison reveals a shared biblical association in the texts, as both bring to mind liturgical and biblical episodes. Yet, as above, ultimately these function in very different ways. After Havelock is sent by Godard to his death at the hands of the fisherman Grim, his time with the latter’s family represents arguably the most lavish account of consumption in the tale. While Grim intends to kill the young prince at first, the blazing light that shines from Havelock’s mouth convinces him to betray his lord and instead shelter the boy:

She saw therinne a lith ful shir,
Al so brith so it were day,
Aboute the knave ther he lay.
Of hise mouth it stod a stem
Als it were a sunnebem;
Al so lith was it therinne
So ther brenden cerges inne (ll. 589–95)

The light blazing from Havelock’s mouth is unusual but not entirely without precedent, and may be intended to bring to mind liturgical or biblical connotations, such as the candles in church or the Apostles at Pentecost (Hostetter, “Food, Sovereignty” 59; Hirsch 51). Although not explicitly connected appetite or consumption it is significant that Havelock’s bodily representation of sovereignty stems from his mouth, in a text so preoccupied with food and

eating. While before he was about to be killed, the emanation from Havelock's mouth also serves to reassert the "correct" social order, placing Grim and his wife Leve beneath Havelock. The couple then promise to nourish Havelock until he is an adult ("Louerd, we sholen thee wel fede ... Til that thu cone ful wel bere", ll. 622 and 624), at once acknowledging his frailty and their societal position as provisioners of food to the king. Havelock's presence and regal status cause a miracle connected to consumption: a wildly luxurious and ostentatious meal that goes far beyond the means of the fisherman and his wife appears and they all eat. Unlike later feasts in the narrative, this meal has no social etiquette described or entertainment; it literally saves the boy protagonist from starvation (Hanning 594). The abundance and exotic nature of the food demonstrates Havelock's rightful claim to royal power, but they also show that supporting the boy's claim to the throne will result in rewards that outstrip the costs.

Once again, the miraculous provision of food in *Gowther* presents a very different authorial and narrative strategy. After Gowther has sought penitence and received instruction from the pope that he can "eyt no meyt bot that thu revus of howndus mothe" (l. 296), he briefly goes hungry but then is fed by greyhounds in a manner that immediately seems to negate the pope's outlined penance thanks to its effortlessness and grace:

A greyhownde broght hym meyt untyll
Or evon yche a dey.
Thre neythtys ther he ley:
Tho grwhownd ylke a dey
A whyte lofe he hym brogght... (ll. 311–5)

The scene in many ways provides a second infancy for Gowther—far from the grisly and horrifying experiences of his childhood, marred by the murder of wet nurses and the harm of

his mother, here he re-learns how to behave, how to consume without harming others. The scene appears to act as a kind of recalibration for Gowther, who “lovyd God in his thocht” (l. 318) by the end of the experience. Many scholars have commented on this and Gowther’s regression to the oral phase or “archaic ego state” (Uebel 106). Gowther must restrain the ravening appetite of his childhood and instead learn to accept, passively, food from the greyhound. Hostetter expresses amazement at the injustice of Gowther’s so-called penance, describing the protagonist as “clearly undeserving” (*Politics of Eating* 196). Yet Uebel makes a powerful observation here that supports the above interpretation of the scene: “the visiting greyhound ... ostensibly defeats the point of Gowther’s penance ... Passivity, however, may be the real point. Gowther is compelled to base his interactions with this gentle other ... upon restraint receptivity” (106). The food Gowther consumes—white bread—is reminiscent of receiving the Eucharist, a liturgical event associated with swallowing and not eating, and thus a regression to infancy and breastfeeding (Borkenau 410–1). It is also worth noting that the scene reflects not only the new model of consumption for Gowther but also the repression of both the consumption and the appetite of the greyhound, who subordinates its instincts to bite the bread or consume food to deliver it to Gowther. In choosing a greyhound, the author of the poem selects an animal known in the Middle Ages for its nobility, and symbolic of “chivalric virtues and ... the aristocratic way of life” (Schmitt 59).

Rejection of Appetite

Although Grim and his family do their best in Havelok to support their foster-child, as Havelock moves into adulthood his enormous appetite threatens to reduce the family to penury:

“Ich am wel waxen and wel may eten
More than evere Grim may geten.
Ich ete more, bi God on live,
Than Grim an hise children five!” (ll. 791–5)

In acknowledging this disparity, Havelock personally displaces himself from the sovereign position he occupies in the family, and places himself alongside them, as a labourer who must work for food. When famine strikes and Havelock leaves the family, he initially starves in search of work (“Two dayes ther fastinde he yede, / That non for his werk wolde him fede” (ll. 866–7)), suppressing his own appetite to support himself independently, and thus rejecting his sovereign right to be provided with food. Yet Havelock’s lack of knowledge of the daily life of the working class is revealed by his statement that he requires payment only in objects he can consume:

“Goddot!” quoth he, “leve sire,
Bidde ich you non other hire,
But yeveth me inow to ete” (ll. 910–2)

The protagonist thus sets himself apart from the common man, in a speech that some argue reveals Havelock to be the “ideal” subsistence worker (Purdon 27). Yet much of Havelock’s adult life is notable for the very evident absence of his appetite. Once married to Goldeboru, and after a scene in which he feasts with his foster-brothers, Havelock is never again mentioned eating in the text (Hostetter, “Food, Sovereignty” 73). Simultaneously, the importance of food more generally decreases in the narrative, and once Havelock has been made rightful king no one explicitly eats again in the narrative. This steady change runs parallel to the growing magnificence of feasts held by Havelock’s friends and allies in the narrative. Thus, as Hostetter (ibid) notes, the author mentions the food provided by Ubbe in his description of the feast given by him in Denmark, but the act of consumption and

Havelock's appetite, so evident in earlier meals, is in this instance subordinated to descriptions of the behaviour of those present at the meal; no one is described as enjoying the food or consuming it, and instead there is greater interest in social etiquette:

“Dame, thou and Havelok shulen ete samen,
Goldeboru shal ete wit me.... “

...

Thanne were set and bord leyd
And the beneysyun was seyd (ll. 1718–9b; 1723–4)

In his analysis of this particular meal and emphasis on the absence of appetite, Hostetter perhaps overstates the case: although *Havelok's* author in this passage shows greater concern for social etiquette than in previous feasting scenes, food and drink nevertheless occupy a central portion of the description of the event, with “... the beste mete / That king or cayser wolde ete” (ll. 1725–6), and a list of meat, fish and drinks entirely in keeping with the tone of the meal set out. Comparison with the meal offered by Grim to the infant Havelock shows that both involve superlative food, although Ubbe's offering is more in keeping with both his own and Havelock's status. Yet Hostetter's analysis is correct in that the appetite and consumption of the diners is *implied*, and the author claims that he does not dwell on the scene for the purposes of narrative, where before he described these acts at length:

Ne of the win bidde I nout dwelle;
That is the storie for to lenge –
It wolde anuye this fayre genge (ll. 1734–6)

The last feast described by the author in *Havelok* takes this tendency even further. Here the food is entirely subordinated to the courtly etiquette and events that accompany the feast. It is almost as though the appetite and consumption of the guests has somehow become an inappropriate topic to dwell on, as at this social level hunger should not be a motivating factor:

Buttinge with sharpe speres,
Skirring with talevaces that men beres,
Wrastling with laddes, putting of ston... (ll 2323–5)

In contrast with a long list of activities, the food is simply described as “gode”: one word replaces the length lists of earlier feasts, and consumption is, as at the earlier feast held by Ubbe, relegated to an implicit event. Once Havelock assumes the thrones of England and Denmark, food is no longer mentioned in connection with him: “there is nothing left to hunger for” (Hostetter, “Food, Sovereignty” 75). The absence of food is more profound than this, however, and throughout *Havelok* the act of eating, and themes of appetite and consumption are intricately intertwined with concepts of changes to the social order, injustice, and struggle.

Turning to *Gowther*, like Havelock the hero here also rejects food. In both cases the rejection takes the form of self-sacrifice: Gowther elects only to eat food taken from the mouths of animals to compensate for the evil acts he has committed in his youth. Thus, at the court at which he finds refuge, he is offered various delicacies that he rejects, sublimating his appetite for the purposes of penance: “And yett mey hapon thoro sum chans / That it wer gyffon hym in penans” (ll. 345–6). Those at court nevertheless realise he is a penitent, and ensure that he is well fed:

Thei gaffe tho hondus meyt ynoghhe,
Tho dompe Duke to hom he droghhe,
That was is best beld. (ll. 364–6)

Where Havelock’s sacrifice helps others; Gowther’s helps his own soul. It is in many ways an unsatisfactory penitence, as many have remarked, and has a satirical tone. Gowther rejects

his own appetite for violence but his appetite for food and nourishment never really suffers throughout the narrative. Instead, it is his understanding of the purpose and meaning of consumption and nourishment that shift, enabling him to eventually be forgiven by the pope and even end his life as a saint.

This final point highlights the ultimate disparity in the two narratives. Whilst in *Havelok* some meals are pleasant occasions, by and large food is an object that individuals fight for and struggle to gain, marked by social inequality, rather than a pleasurable opportunity for sharing and enjoyment. Once abundant consumption is possible without miraculous intervention, dwelling on food becomes of less interest to the author, and there is even a sense that it is inappropriate to describe such conspicuous consumption. In *Gowther*, in contrast, our first glimpses of nourishment are nothing short of monstrous: exploiting the social order to the extent that lives are lost, and all for the purposes of feeding a baby. While Gowther's punishment at first seems both grotesque and gruelling, and confirmation that the protagonist is barely human—the child of a demon who repents by eating with animals (Benton 59)—the miraculous presentation of food and then the kindness of others mean the protagonist never truly struggles for food. Instead, his penitence is connected to passivity: Gowther must learn to accept food rather than take it by force.

Bibliography

Anon. *Havelock the Dane*, edited by Ronald B. Herzman, Graham Drake, and Eve Salisbury, in *Four Romances of England: King Horn, Havelock the Dane, Bevis of Hampton, Athelston*. Medieval Institute Publications, 1999. MS Word file used.

—. *Le Lai d'Haveloc*, in *Le Lai d'Haveloc and Gaimar's Haveloc Episode*, edited by Alexander Bell. Longman Books, 1925.

—. *Robert le Diable: roman d'aventures*, edited by Eilert Løseth. Paris, 1903.

—. *Sir Gowther*, edited by Anne Laskaya and Eve Salisbury, in *The Middle English Breton Lays*. Medieval Institute Publications, 1995. MS Word file used.

Bataille, George. *The Accused Share*. Vol 3: *Sovereignty*, translated by Robert Hurley. Zone, 1993.

Benton, Andrea Gronstal. *Telling Description: Convention, Coherence, and the Making of the Self in Middle English Romance*. PhD Dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2008.

Borkenau, Franz. *End and Beginning: On the Generations of Culture and the Origins of the West*, edited by Richard Lowenthal. Columbia University Press, 1981.

Cartlidge, Neil. *Boundaries in Medieval Romance*. D. S. Brewer, 2008.

—. ““Therof seyus clerkus”: Slander, Rape and *Sir Gowther*.” *Cultural Encounters in the Romance of Medieval England*, edited by Corinne Saunders. D. S. Brewer, 2005, pp. 135–48.

Crane, Susan. *Insular romance*. University of California Press, 1986.

Field, Rosalind. “Romance in England, 1066–1400.” *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature*, edited by David Wallace. Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 152–76.

Frantzen, Allen J. *Food, Eating and Identity in Early Medieval England*. Boydell Press, 2014.

Gaimer, Geoffrey. *Les Estores des Engleis*, edited by Alexander Bell. Basil Blackwell, 1960.

Gordon, Sarah. "Consumption and the Construction of Identity in Medieval European Arthurian Romance." *Arthurian Literature XXIV: the European Dimensions of Arthurian Literature*, edited by Bart Besamusca, Frank Brandsma and Keith Busby. Boydell & Brewer, 2007, pp. 79–90.

Hanna, Ralph. "Feasting in Middle English Alliterative Poetry." *New Perspectives on Middle English Texts: A Festschrift for R. A. Waldron*, edited by Susan Powell and Jeremy J. Smith. D. S. Brewer, 2000, pp. 31–54.

Hanning, Robert W. "'Havelok the Dane': Structure, Symbols, Meaning." *Studies in Philology*, vol. 64, no. 4, 1967, pp. 586–605.

Henisch, Bridget Anne. *Fast and Feast: Food in Medieval Society*. University Park, 1978.

Hostetter, Aaron K. *The Politics of Eating and Cooking in Medieval English Romance*. Dissertation, Princeton University, 2011.

—. "Food, Sovereignty, and Social Order in Havelok the Dane." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, vol. 110, no. 1, 2011, pp. 53–77.

Kleinman, Susan. "The Legend of *Havelok the Dane* and the Historiography of East Anglia." *Studies in Philology*, vol. 100, 2003, pp. 245–77.

Purdon, Liam. "The Rite of Vassalage in *Havelock the Dane*". *Medievalia et Humanistica* vol. 20, 1994, pp. 25–40.

Schmitt, Jean-Claude. *The Holy Greyhound: Guinefort, Healer of Children since the Thirteenth Century*. Translated by Martin Thom. Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Schmolke-Hasselmann, Beate. *The Evolution of Arthurian Romance: The Verse Tradition from Chrétien to Froissart*, translated by Margaret Middleton and Roger Middleton. Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Turville-Petre, Thorlac. "Havelok and the History of the Nation." *Readings in Medieval English Romance*, edited by Carol A. Meale. D. S. Brewer, 1994, pp. 123–58.

Uebel, Michael. "The Foreigner within: the Subject of Abjection in *Sir Gowther*." *Meeting the Foreign in the Middle Ages*, edited by Albrecht Classen. Routledge, 2002, pp. 96–117.

Woolgar, Christopher. "Fast and Feast: Conspicuous Consumption and the Diet of the Nobility in the Fifteenth Century". *Revolution and Consumption in Late Medieval England*, edited by Michael Hicks. Boydell & Brewer, 2001, pp. 7–26.