German publisher Edition Tintenfaß has so far issued no less than twenty-eight translations of Antoine Saint-Exupéry’s *Le Petit Prince*, both into modern languages, earlier stages of these and extinct ones. Their large format and layout is identical to one another and includes all illustrations from the 1946 French edition. Among these are two versions translated into past stages of the English language, namely Old English and Middle English. Due to both chronological and regional variation the translators had to settle on specific variants, namely Late West Saxon from around the year 1000 and the London dialect of Geoffrey Chaucer from the later 14th century. These choices are easily understandable since they are most familiar to students of English language history and represent a large amount of literature written in Old and Middle English. However, there were certainly no standards at the time and original texts may display variation to a significant extent. For this reason, any translations into Old and Middle English represent idealised and artificial versions, which may not have existed, but are nevertheless desirable to provide readers with accessible texts. Still, in the spirit of earlier sources, some minor variation is included, which occasionally results in a more authentic linguistic representation; some occurrences are pointed out in the “Translator’s Note” of the Old English edition, for example, occasional alternation between *land* and *lond* as well as *þæm* and *þam* (Kemmler S. 96). Being a prose text, *Le Petit Prince* is naturally also presented in this way by the translators, which facilitates their task, as in Old English neither particular verse types nor alliteration need to be adhered to, and Chaucer’s metre and end rhyme can also be avoided.
Any editor of Old and Middle English texts intended for a modern readership is forced to make alterations in his representation of the original manuscript or he would be no editor, but merely a transliterator. Such changes may range from the incorporation of modern punctuation or capitalisation to larger intervention into the source, such as the emendation of corrupt or damaged passages. On the other hand, translators into earlier language stages also have to provide some modern conventions, but are spared by the latter problem. However, they face a different issue: how should they express words or concepts which either did not exist in the past or for which no adequate terms are attested? Whereas in Old and Middle English new words might have been introduced by borrowing or by various types of loan formation, the first process is not feasible in translations of modern texts: it would simply look odd and confusing to include clearly modern words in texts that are to create an atmosphere of past language stages. However, the second possibility does not distract from the illusion of dealing with an old text as it uses already existing morphemes, which may either adopt new meanings as semantic loans or which may be newly combined in the function of loan formations. Both processes become evident in the brief lists of some Old or Middle English terms which the translators provide alongside their French equivalents (Kemmler S. 96; Sauer S. 96). One typical Old English example is lyftfloga, an attested kenning which literally means ‘flier in the air’ and is used for the dragon in Beowulf, but here for ‘avion’. In the same vein the compound strætcandel is newly created in order to render ‘réverbère’. Concepts may also be expressed by particular phrases, such as wisa para papa for ‘aiguilleur’. Besides compounds and phrases we also find semantic loans, such as færeld (‘motion’) for ‘train’. The Middle English text follows similar principles and renders the same words as eir-ship (‘avion’), strete lampe (‘réverbère’), chaunger of pathes (‘aiguilleur’) and iren-chaar (‘train’) respectively. Occasionally both translators follow different principles, e.g. ‘États-Unis’ is literally translated into Old English as Geanlæhtum Eardum, here in its inflected form, but rather described in Middle English as loondes beyonde the see. For reasons of space, these lists cannot be complete and ‘the readers are invited to use their imagination’ (Kemmler S. 96).

The question needs to be asked why translations from a modern language into earlier language stages are useful. For this reason the Old and Middle English Le Petit Prince was discussed in a seminar on Medievalism at the University of Göttingen during winter term 2010/11, alongside two other children’s books in these languages, namely Wilhelm Busch’s Max und Moritz and Heinrich Hoffmann’s Der Struwwelpeter, the latter one also from Edition Tintenfaß. Response by the students
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was generally positive. Their familiarity with the original texts resulted in a greater accessibility of material written in past language stages, which for beginners seem therefore less frightening than the more remote content of original compositions. In consequence, interest in such sources was evoked once the students had been introduced into the intricacies of Old and Middle English with the help of texts like *Le Petit Prince*. Moreover, general linguistic consciousness was raised since the need to create words to express new concepts is not restricted to any particular language stage. One is therefore faced with similar problems as the medieval population which required new terms when faced with fresh developments, such as, for example, the introduction of Christianity or the invasions of the Vikings. Such linguistic thought processes may also be reflected in our own language and the awareness of past language stages is therefore increased. They no longer seem so different after all. Ultimately, fresh compositions in Old and Middle English make these language stages stay alive, which is also demonstrated in ongoing online resources, for example, the *New Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, or *Geoffrey Chaucer Hath a Blog*.

The Old and Middle English *Le Petit Prince* is certainly a very welcome and valuable resource for teaching purposes. Fortunately, these versions have been very diligently translated by renowned specialists in the field and do not contain many obvious mistakes, but occasionally there are wrong inflections in the Old English version, which could not have existed in the original language, for example, *mæg* for the second person singular present indicative form of *magan* instead of *meaht* (Kemmler S. 9, Z. 4, 12), or *pone* for the nominative masculine singular form of the article instead of *se* (Kemmler S. 27, Z. 7). Sometimes modern meanings are assigned to words that have undergone semantic change, for example, *wiþ* (‘against’) instead of *mid* (‘with’) (Kemmler S. 11, Z. 20). But such instances are rare and do not distract from the reading; on the contrary, they can be used to point out the difficulties of translating into earlier language stages to students, who are therefore trained to spot particular problems arising from language change. It might have been helpful to provide lengthmarks for the Old English text, a convention that is certainly not necessary in scholarly editions, but may prove beneficial to students. Apart from its use in the classroom *Le Petit Prince* can also be seen as entertaining reading for a more advanced audience which regrets the limited corpus of Old and Middle English and welcomes any new additions. The publisher of the Old High German version has termed it a ‘cleverer Philologenspaß’. And indeed it is translations like these which show us that there is much to be enjoyed in dealing with past language stages. The rendition of one of the most popular books of our time may serve as evidence for this point of view.
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