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I.

G. S. to F. J. F.

'Partes autem meae sunt quatuor: litterae litteratura litteratus litterate.'

Martiani Minnei Felicis Capellae De Nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii.—Lib. II. s. 231 (52 b), p. 57, ed. Eyssenhardt, Lips., MD CCC LXVI.

Partes meae sunt quatuor—Dame Grammar saith, saith she, In Martian of the Goatlings (full quaintly writeth he I), Litterae, Litteratura, Litteratus, Litterate!

The good gray head we honour, she gave it of the four, And the gods, to eke the blessing, they added one thing more. So partes ejus quinque sunt, with the wielding of the oar!

Litterae, Litteratura. Well wot ye all, I trow, How he wrought at the speech of the kindreds, and gave us the same to know In a hundred goodly volumes—they face me all of a row!

Litteratus, Litterate. And not for place or pay, But all for the fame of the English, he wrought in the English way; And his sheaves they follow, as his wage, at the closing of the day.
G. S. TO F. J. F.

With the maids a-double-sculling, his water-pomp to be;
For ever he loved the water well—more well than wis(è)ly—
Men should not drink the water, save in the barley-bree!

These are the words of a Tory, a bitter beast of bale,
Who troweth in Church, and Kings, and Peers, and eke in
wine and ale—
But wisheth all love and honour to him of the Furnace-Vale!

EDINBURGH, Lammas, 1899.
II.

Dear Furnivall, whose happy age is strong,
Like some red oak in autumn which the storm
Knits faster; may all elements perform
Their duty to thee; may thy life be long.

Thou hast been friend and gossip of the dead,
Whose singing made our country like a wood
Peopled with nightingales—a passionate brood!
Whose pain and joy the heart of England fed.

Chaucer thou knewest; Shakespeare owned thy care;
We know them better for thy faithful love;
The men from England over-seas who drove
Their plough and sang, and those who made the air

Of rough Northumbria sweet with tuneful noise,
Live in thy labour. Nor didst thou forget
That age when Norman, Celt, and English met,
And built Romance! These were thy friends and joys,

And thou hast made them ours. For this thou hast
The praise of scholars and the thanks of all
Who, listening, love the tuneful swell and fall
Of England's singing now, and in the past.

Take then this shred of praising verse, and live
Happy by all the gratitude we give.

January 16, 1900.

Stopford A. Brooke.
A YOUNG friend came to me last night with the request that, as he was going in for an examination, I should tell him what exactly Waller did to the heroic couplet. To whom I replied that 'Waller was smooth,' that 'he polished our numbers' and 'struck the first note of classicism in English.' 'I know all that piffle,' said my young friend politely, 'it's in the books'—and he named with youthful scorn some of our most distinguished critics—'but I wanted some facts.' 'Well,' I said, 'although I assure you facts will be quite thrown away upon examiners, we will if you please take down Waller and see what we can see.' But even then, with a still lingering hope that some one else would do the work for me, I turned not to the poems, but to the preface (it was the 1690 edition), and found that the anonymous editor divided Waller's originality under four heads—the pause at the end of the couplet, a greater use of polysyllables, balance within the line, and emphatic rhymes. Here were at any rate tests that could be applied.

1. The editor here had Donne in his view with lines of this sort:

No, no, thou which since yesterday hast been
Almost about the whole world, hast thou seen,
O sun, in all thy journey, vanity
Such as swells the bladder of our court? I
A NOTE UPON WALLER'S DISTICH

Think he which made your waxen garden, and
Transported it from Italy to stand
With us at London, flouts our courtiers, for
Just such gay painted things which no sap nor
Taste have in them.

Certainly Waller was no pupil of Donne, and if he had reduced such a chaos as this to order by concluding the sense with each couplet, or quatrain, he would have deserved a monument in the inner sanctuary of the Palace of Art. But Marlowe had already written thus:

It lies not in our power to love or hate,
For will in us is overruled by fate.
When two are stript, long ere the course begin,
We wish that one should lose, the other win;
And one especially I do affect
Of two gold ingots, like in each respect.
The reason no man knows; let it suffice,
What we behold is censured by our eyes.
Where both deliberate, the love is slight,
Who ever loved that loved not at first sight?

Poets who wrote distichs between Marlowe and Waller, such as Sylvester in his translation of Du Bartas, and Sandys in his versions of Ovid and the Psalms, no less observe the rule of ending the sense with the couplet.

2. The second point made by our editor cannot altogether be allowed. It is true that Waller occasionally affects polysyllables of a smooth and light sort, such as obsequious (which I have noticed six times), impenetrable, inhabiting; but it is not true, as the editor also implies, that he used monosyllabic lines less than his predecessors. Lines frequently occur made up of little else:

We plow the deep and reap what others sow.
Now, for some ages, had the pride of Spain
Made the sun shine on half the world in vain;
While she bid war to all that durst supply
The place of those her cruelty made die.
Waller's distinction is not that he uses monosyllables less than previous poets—perhaps he uses them more—but that, as our editor says, they do not ‘come together in any cluster.’ Also there are never more than five accents in the line. Waller would not have allowed a line like—

This said, the whole fleet gave it their applause.

It is noticeable that Waller affects Latin words, as being lighter and neater than English, e.g. *repeat* for ‘seek again’; *reduce* for ‘bring back’; ‘our nobler part’, he writes, *invades* the sky. But here he had been anticipated by Sandys:

> He the congealed vapours melts again  
> Extenuated into drops of rain,  
> Which on the thirsty earth in showers distill  
> And all that life possess with plenty fill.  
> Who can the extension of his clouds explore,  
> Or tell how they in their collisions roar,  
> Gilt with the flashes of their horrid light,  
> Yet darken all below with their own night?

3, 4. On these points the editor's exact words are:

>'There was no distinction of parts [in the poets before Waller], no regular stops, nothing for the ear to rest upon; but as soon as the copy began, down it went, like a larum, incessantly; and the reader was sure to be out of breath before he got to the end of it: so that really verse, in those days, was but downright prose tagged with rhymes.

Mr. Waller removed all these faults ... bound up his thoughts better, and in a cadence more agreeable to the nature of the verse he wrote in; *so that wherever the natural stops of that were, he contrived the little breakings of his sense* so as to fall in with them; and, for that reason, since the stress of our verse lies commonly upon the last syllable, you will hardly ever find him using a word of no force there. I would say, if I were not afraid the reader would think me too nice, that he commonly closes with verbs, in which we know the life of language consists.
A NOTE UPON WALLER’S DISTICH

This admirable passage would have expressed with precision the change from the manner of Donne to that of Waller, if Waller had really taken that step. But, as has already been said, he had not to take it. His rhymes have no distinction from those of other writers who conclude the sense with the couplet.

As to Waller’s use of the caesura, I do not think he has more variety than Marlowe, though he easily outdistances all the writers of the interval, except Shakespeare. Sandys writes almost all his lines without any pause at all, and Sylvester is content with the common pauses after the second foot, or second and a half.

A distinction from Marlowe lay in Waller’s use of the uncompensated unemphatic accent in the third foot. By uncompensated I mean this—wherever, in Marlowe, an unemphatic monosyllable stands in an accented place in the line, it is always because a very emphatic monosyllable stands near to relieve it of the accent, the inversion thus making the emphatic word still more emphatic, e.g.:

Who builds a palace and rams up the gate.

To whom you offer and whose nun you are.

1 Shakespeare’s use of the couplet would require a treatise. Who, if he did not know, would attribute the following copies to the same hand?

(a) Let me pass
The same I am, ere ancient’st order was
Or what is now received: I witness to
The times that brought them in; so shall I do
To the freshest things now reigning, and make stale
The glistering of this present, as my tale
Now seems to it.

(b) She that was ever fair and never proud,
Had tongue at will and yet was never loud,
Never lack’d gold and yet went never gay,
Fled from her wish and yet said, ‘Now I may,’
She that being anger’d, her revenge being nigh,
Bade her wrong stay and her displeasure fly,
She that could think and ne’er disclose her mind,
See suitors following and not look behind,
She was a wight, if ever such wight were,
To suckle fools and chronicle small beer.
A NOTE UPON WALLER’S DISTICH

Her mind pure and her tongue untaught to close.

For incorporeal Fame
Whose weight consists in nothing but her name,
Is swifter than the wind, whose tardy plumes
Are reeking water and dull earthly fumes.

Waller uses the unemphatic accent without any such compensation.

To pardon willing and to punish loth
You strike with one hand but you heal with both.
The ship their coffin and the sea their grave.
Your flaming courage and your matchless worth.

No doubt we find occasionally a conjunction accented in this way in heroic verse before Waller; but in Waller the use is continual, and, we may be sure, systematic. Perhaps he borrowed it from the very tame couplets with which Fairfax concludes the stanzas in his version of Tasso, where it is frequent. Dryden tells us that ‘many besides myself have heard our famous Waller say that he derived the harmony of his numbers from “Godfrey of Bulloigne,” which was turned into English by Mr. Fairfax’ (Preface to Fables).

Another distinction is that Waller elides vowels as little as possible. He says ‘with | the arts | of peace’, where previous poets would have said ‘with th’ arts of peace.’ He never says ‘en’my’, or ‘gen’ral.’ And he has a strong affection for do and did and does.

5. One point remains to be noticed in which Waller did herald the eighteenth century, though even here Sandys must share his discredit. He introduced the tyranny of the epithet. If a passage of Marvell (say) be placed side by side with a passage of Waller, the contrast in this respect is striking. When Marvell uses an epithet you do not easily forget it, e.g.:

While indefatigable Cromwell hies—
A NOTE UPON WALLER'S DISTICH

or,

his sacred lute creates
The harmonious city of the seven gates,
Yet all composed by his attractive song
Into the animated city throng.

With Waller almost every noun has its epithet, and it becomes a point of style to condense whole clauses into epithets:

Through yielding planks the angry bullets fly.
The louder cannon had the thunder drown'd.
A royal sceptre made of Spanish gold.
Wealth that prevailing foes were to enjoy.

With these few facts to eke out his phrases my young friend betook himself to his examination; with what success I have not learned.

H. C. BEECHING.
IV.

SOME PREHISTORIC RIVER-NAMES.

(A BUNCH OF GUESSES.)

In the south-western quarter of the map of England there are several rivers bearing the name of Avon, three of them being streams of considerable importance: the Somersetshire Avon, flowing by Bath and Bristol; the Wiltshire and Hampshire Avon, which enters the English Channel at Christchurch; and the Warwickshire Avon, which flows by Warwick and Shakespeare's Stratford.

It is clear, however, that Avon (in Old English *Afene*) was not originally a proper name at all. It is the British word for 'river'—the Old Celtic *abonā*, in modern Welsh spelling *afon*. The Welsh nowadays constantly prefix *afon* to the proper names of rivers; in early times, we may conjecture, this practice was especially frequent in the south-western parts of England, the consequence being that in this district the word was mistaken by foreigners for a proper name. In the *Antonine Itinerary* a place between Caerwent and Bath, apparently on the Somersetshire Avon, has the name *Abone*; and the Ravenna geographer mentions a British river Abona. But it is certain that all the rivers now called Avon must have had proper names. There is evidence enough to show that the ancient Britons were in the habit of giving individual names to quite insignificant streams, so that it would be strange indeed if
a large river like the Warwickshire or the Somersetshire Avon were left to be designated by a mere appellative. The object of this paper is to suggest that it is possible that the prehistoric names of these rivers may be recoverable by means of indirect evidence.

In the doggerel verses with which the oldest form of the English Chronicle commemorates the coronation of Edgar in 972, Acemannesceaster is given as an alternative name of the city of Bath. This name has never been quite satisfactorily explained. All scholars are now aware of the utter absurdity of the notion started in the sixteenth century, and still repeated in guide-books and local histories, that the name means 'invalids' city' (ache-man's chester!). On the face of it, Acemannesceaster looks as if it contained the genitive of a man's name; and no doubt that would have been the interpretation natural to an Englishman of the tenth century. But there is no clear evidence of the existence of a name Acemann, either English or Celtic. There are some other Old English place-names ending in ceaster, of which the first element has the appearance of being the genitive of a personal name, but is known to be an adoption of a pre-English place-name. Thus the British Anderida became Andredesceaster, Venta became Wintanceaster, Isca Exanceaster, and so forth. It would seem that the English, guided by the analogies of their own nomenclature, were accustomed to give an eponymic interpretation to the names of British cities, and to embody this interpretation in the forms in which

There is, however, a Scotch surname Aikman, and there was an Old Northumbrian personal name Acwulf. It may be that the first element in these names is ac, oak. As the place-name Oakstead appears in Old English under the form ácæstęde (the w of the original *ákulw having apparently become vocalized between the two consonants), I ought perhaps to concede the possibility of an Old English personal name Acumann, which might become Acemann by later development. But even if Acemann were proved to be a genuine Old English name, that would not greatly weaken the arguments (whatever they may be worth) which I have advanced in this paper.
they adopted the names. It seems therefore reasonable to conjecture that Acemann is an eponymic figment, evolved from the pre-English name of Bath.

This mode of explanation is not altogether new, since many writers have suggested that Acemann was derived from Aquae Sulis, the name of Bath in the Antonine Itinerary. But to this there are two strong objections. In the first place Aquae is Latin, and it is probable that the city would have a native name, which would be more likely than the Roman name to attract the attention of the conquerors. In the second place, the hypothesis does not attempt to explain the syllable mann. On these grounds the derivation from Aquae must, I think, be set aside.

A more satisfactory explanation seems to be indicated by the forms urbs Achumanensis and civitas Aquamania, which occur as Latin names of the city in two charters purporting to have been granted by King Eadgar to Bath Abbey in 965 and 972 respectively. These charters (Birch, Nos. 1164 and 1287) are probably spurious, though from the character of the Old English in the lists of boundaries they seem to be of pre-Conquest date. Probably most scholars will be at first sight disposed to regard Achumanensis and Aquamania as mere fancy attempts to give a smooth-sounding Latin form to the Acemannesceaster of the Chronicle. The analogy of Maldubia civitas (with an adj. Maldubiensis) for Maildufas burh may fairly be quoted in support of this explanation. On the other hand, the charters in question were concocted at Bath itself, where the old name may very well have survived in monastic Latin use till a late period, just as Drobernia, (=Durovernum of the Antonine Itinerary) continued to be the Latin translation of Cantwaraburh down to Bæda's time, and indeed much later. It is even possible that the Acemannesceaster of the Chronicler (the form seems to
have no other independent witness) may have been his own invention, based on a contemporary Latin Acumania. This last form is obviously the type to which the documentary forms point back; and it seems to admit of a plausible etymological explanation.

On the assumption that the initial a is long, Ācumania has a notable resemblance to the name of the river Okement in Devon, on which is Oakhampton, called Ochementone in Domesday. The etymological sense of Okement seems to be ‘swift-going,’ from the Old Celtic *āку-, swift (= Gr. ὀκύς), preserved with negative prefix in Old Welsh di-auc, mod. diog; inert; and the root *men of Welsh myned, to go. Now several of the British names of towns in Ptolemy and the Antonine Itinerary are either identical with, or formed with derivative suffix from, the names of the rivers on which the towns stood; instances are Isca, Derventio, Corinion, Tamare. I therefore venture to suggest that Ācumania, the British name of the city which the Romans called ‘the waters of (the goddess) Súl’ and the English ‘Hot Baths,’ is a derivative of a prehistoric name of the Avon, etymologically identical with the Devonshire river-name Okement. The original British ā (which according to my hypothesis has been preserved in Ācumania because the name was adopted into monastic Latin at an

1 Because Aquamania has evidently been corrupted by learned etymology.
2 See Stokes in Fick, Idg. Wb., pp. 6 and 218. As to the appropriateness of the resulting meaning, compare the following passage referring to the Bristol Avon: ‘Penned in as this river is for a good part of the course by enclosing hills, it has become a roaring torrent—in places perhaps half a mile wide, but everywhere a rushing impetuous stream, with no quiet lakes such as lie along the banks of the Thames.’—Daily News, Feb. 20, 1900, p. 5.
3 Possibly the names Okement and Ācumam...
early date) is known to have become ṝ in the eighth century (compare Bæda's Dinooth for the British adoption of the Roman name Dōnātus), and therefore the spelling Oche-
mentone in Domesday presents no difficulty.

One objection that may be raised against my hypothesis is based on the name of Akeman-street applied by anti-
quaries to the Roman road leading to Bath from the east. If this name rests on genuine oral tradition, and has etymologically any connexion with Acemannesceaster, my whole speculation falls to the ground, because the long ṝ which I have assumed for the name of the city would in southern modern English have yielded o and not a as the initial. But there is some reason for believing that Akeman-street and Acemannesceaster are wholly uncon-
connected names. In Camden's map of 1586 Akeman-street appears as the name of a portion of the Roman road running north and south through Alchester to Dorchester. Dr. Plot, in his Natural History of Oxfordshire (1662), admits that the people of the neighbourhood apply the name as Camden does; but he maintains that Camden and local tradition must be wrong, because etymologically Akeman-street can only have meant 'the invalids' road' leading to 'the invalids' city,' Bath. Plot, however, adduces no documentary or traditional evidence in support of his transference of the name from the north-and-south road to the east-and-west road, and I have not been able to find that any such evidence has been discovered. Never-
theless, Plot's correction of Camden has been accepted by all subsequent antiquaries, and the Roman road to Bath from the east appears in the modern Ordnance Maps with the name of Akeman-street. It may perhaps some day be proved that Plot's guess was right; but in the meantime it should be regarded as a guess and nothing more. What can be the etymology of Akeman-street I do not know. It does not seem certain that this form is more
original than the variants Akeham-street and Akeley-street, which are given by Plot and other writers.

My conjectures with regard to the prehistoric antecedents of the other two Avons can be stated more briefly. As to the Warwick Avon, my suggestion is that Warwick (OE. Wærninge-wic) is the Caer Wrangon (‘City of Gwrangon’) of Welsh tradition, and that Gwrangon is not a personal name, but the name of the river. The identification of Caer Wrangon with Worcester, current since the twelfth century, may I think be disregarded, as other similar identifications are evidently erroneous, and the British name of Worcester is known to have been *Wigornia*. I had intended to withhold from publication my guess as to this river name, as being too audacious; but on inquiring of Professor Rhŷs whether any Afon Wrangon was known in Wales, I received the unexpected reply that a stream of that name exists near Aberdare¹. This is certainly, so far as it goes, a point in favour of my hypothesis.

The earlier name of the Salisbury Avon may perhaps lurk in the first element of the British name of Salisbury, *Sorbidunon* (which must be read *Sorwio*- on account of the OE. *Searo-burh*). If *Sorwio* is the word represented by the Irish *súrba*, easy, gentle, it would be a very appropriate name for the river.

I am very far from claiming to have demonstrated the overwhelming probability of the adventurous hypotheses propounded in this paper. The chances, no doubt, are against their being all correct. At the same time, I hope that I have shown that in the present state of knowledge each of them possesses a fair degree of likelihood, and supplies a more plausible explanation than has hitherto been offered for the name to which it relates.

HENRY BRADLEY.

¹ It rises about two miles south-west of Hirwain village.
V.

‘ON THE DICTES AND SAYINGS OF THE PHILOSOPHERS.’

This is in several ways an interesting book. It called the attention of English readers, when the full tide of Renaissance learning had not yet come in, to a number of ancient authors and thinkers, such as Homer, Solon, Hippocrates, Pythagoras, Diogenes, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Galenus, Aristophanes; though their names are mixed up with fabulous names—Sedechias, Hermes, Tac, &c., and though of their wisdom but little is conveyed, and that little half buried in commonplace. It was first translated out of Latin into French, by the Knight Guillaume de Tignonville, Provost of Paris, in 1410; and afterwards twice from this French version into English: in 1450 by Stephen Scrope, Squire, ‘for the contemplation and solace’ of John Fastolf, Knight—the brave Fastolf, well known from Shakespeare’s unjust representation, in 1 Henry VI, iii. 2. 104–110; and in 1474–7 by Antoine Wydeville, Earl Rivers, Lord Scales, who had seen a French copy on his pilgrimage to St. Iago de Compostella in 1473. It seems, too, to have been the first English book printed in England, by Caxton, in 1477. It proved a success, for Caxton had to reprint it twice. In modern times little attention has been paid to it; Scrope’s translation, preserved in MS.
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Harley 2266, is not yet edited; of Wydeville-Caxton’s translation a facsimile reprint was brought out in a small number of copies in 1877, London, Elliot Stock, 62 Paternoster Row, with a short introduction by Blades. Not a little affinity, I think, may be found between the editorial work of old Caxton and that of our Furnivall; I avail myself therefore of this opportunity to make a start towards investigating the history of this frequently mentioned but rarely read book.

Of the French original a fine copy, not later than the middle of the fifteenth century, is in the British Museum (Royal MSS. 19 B. IV). It begins (fol. 3, col. a) with the picture of a monk with a shaven crown, dressed in a blue gown with a white cowl and red sleeves, sitting on a bench before a lectern with an opened book, apparently lecturing. The text begins with the following words, which the picture was evidently meant to illustrate: Sedechias fut philosophe le premier par qui de la volente de dieu loy fut recene et sapience entendue. The first chapter is entirely devoted to the wise saws of this Sedechias, the second to those of Hermes &c., just as in the English versions.

Scrope’s text is incomplete at the beginning; one leaf at least is lost, and of the first leaf that is preserved the top part is mutilated on both margins. It is a well-written MS. of the second half of the fifteenth century.

Wydeville-Caxton’s text is complete. It has very distinct red marks to notify the beginnings of each chapter.

---

1 It is also contained in MS. Bodley 943, from which I quote a few lines, as they serve to supplement the incomplete beginning of the Harleian text. (a b) 4 And he saith it is bettir to be stille than to speke to oon that is igno- rant, and to be alone than to be in company and felawsheip of eville peple. And he saith when a king is eville condicioned and tacchid that is so bettir to him that is not knowen with him thanne to him that is a grete maister in his hous. And he saith that it is bettir to a woman to be baraigne than to bere evil condicioned childre.'—A. S. N.
and each paragraph. The first sentence runs thus: Sede-
chias was the first philosophir by whom through the wil and
pleaser of our lorde god Sapience was understande and
lawes rescyved—exactly corresponding to the French
original.

Did Wydeville, in making his translation, use the work
of his English predecessor? He himself denies it; in his
preface (f. 2, l. 1 f) he says: ... concluded in myself to
translate it into thenglyssh tounge, wiche in my jugement
was not before. A comparison of the three texts is likely
to prove that he said the truth. As a specimen I have
printed the first chapter (Sedechias) of Scrope's text as far
as it is preserved, with the corresponding parts of the French
original and the second English translation. Copies of the
two MSS. I owe to the kindness of Frl. K. Reinke and
Dr. J. Guggenheim, both of whom are glad to take a
share in celebrating Dr. Furnivall's seventy-fifth birthday.
The Caxton facsimile I have used is in the library of the
English Seminary in Berlin.

**TIGNONVILLE.**
(MS. Royal 19 B. IV.)

**SCROPE.**
(Harley 2266.)

f. 4, col. a, l. 18. Et f. 1, l. 1. ... [t]hat
dist, quil se vaut mielx
taire que parler a un
ignorant, et estre seul
que acomaigne de
mauvoise gens.

[fellow]ship of eville
peple.

l. 21. Et dist, quant l. 2. And ... yd, yt
un roy est mal entechie is ... [h]ym than is a
que mielx est a cellui[is]
qui na point de cou-
gnoissance a lui que a
ho[use].

cellui qui est grant
maistre en son hostel.

**WYDEVILLE-CAXTON.**

f. 4v, l. 4. And saide,
it is better a man to
holde his peas than to
speke myche to eny
ignorant ma[m], and to
be alone than to be
acompayned with evill
people.

l. 6. And saide,
whan a kyng or a
prince is evill tacked
and vicious, bettur is
thaim that have noo
knowleage of him than
to thoosthat be grettest
maisters in his house.
TIGNONVILLE.
(MS. Royal 19 B. IV.)

1. 25. Et dist, que mielx vult a une femme estre breaigne que porter enfant mal entechie.

1. 28. Et dist, que la compagnie d'un povere saigne vult mielx que d'un riche ignorant qui la cuide avoir par autre habilité.

col. b, l. 1. Et dist, qui fait fauhte a son creatour, par plus forte raison la fait il aux autres.

1. 4. Et dist, ne croy point en celui qui se dit savoir verite et fait le contraire.

1. 6. Et dist, que les ignorants ne se veulent abstener de la vouent corprelle et nayment leur vie fors seulement pour leur plaisance, quelque defence que on leur face; tout ainsi comme les enfans seforcent de mengier douces choses, especialement quart elles leur sont defendues; mais il est autrement des saiges, car ilz nayment leur vies seulement que en ben faisant et laissent les

SCROPE.
(Harley 2266.)

1. 5. ...betlyr to a woman to be barayn than ... childryn.

1. 6. And he seith that íe comp[any of a] wyse man is bettyr than of a riche igno[rant] wh ...[we]nyth to have yt by othir abylite.

1. 8. And he seith, belevyth n[ot] in hym þat seith he knowth the trouht and doth ye contrary.

1. 9. And he seith, who so doþe a fawte to his maker, by reason he doþe yt to othir.

1. 11. And he seith, that ignorants men that be yevyn to yvis wille not abystynye them from bodely wille, for they love not þer lyf but all oonly for their plesaunce, what defence þat men do to them; they faryn evyn as childryn, in þat enforsthyth them to ete swete thynggis and namely suche thynggis as is defendid hem; but it is alle oþer wyse in wyse men, for they love not in their lyvys

WYDEVILLE-CAXTON.

1. 9. And saide, betir is a woman to be bareyn than to bere an evill disposid or a wikked childe.

1. 11. And saide, the companie of a povere wieseman is betir than of a riche ignorant that weth to be wyse by subtilitee.

1. 13. And saide, he that offendeth god his creator, by gretter reason he faileth to other.

1. 14. And saide, beline not in him that seith he leveth and knoweth trouht and doth the contrary.

1. 16. And saide, the ignorante men wol not abystyne them from their sensualitees, but love their lif for their plesaunce, what defence so ever be made unto theym; right as children enfore themseleves to ete sweete thinges, and the rather that they be charged the contrarie; but it is other wiese with wiesemen, for they love their lives but onely to do goode deddis, and to leve
ON 'THE DICTES AND SAYINGS

TIGNONVILLE. (MS. Royal 19 B. IV.)
oyseuses delectacions de ce monde.

18. Et dist, comment pourroit on apsarargier les œuvres de ceulx qui tendent as bonnes œuvres de perfection perpetuelle aux de ceulx qui ne veulent que les deliz transitoryes.

18. Et he seith, how may a man that will not do but transtorty delytis, compare to the dedis of tho that tendyth and besythe hem perpetuelly to good dedis of perfection.

23. Et dist, cil nest point repute pour saige qui laboure en ce qui peut nuyre, pour laisser ce qui peut aider.

23. And he seith, he is not accountid ne takyn for wyse man that laboryth in that the which may noye, for to leve that he which may help.

26. Et dist, les Saiges portent les choses asprees et ameres tout ainsi comme se elles estoient douces comme miel, car ilz en cougnoissent la fin estre douce.

26. And seith wyse men weryth and occupythe thynggis sharp and byttyr lyche as though they were swete as hony, for they know wele that the end shall be swete.

4vº, col. a, l. 1. Et 26. And he seith, dist, que bonne chose est de faire un cuyle qui to tho that deservyth to them theyt have de-le deservent, et que et, that is right served it, and that it is ceste grant mal de bien to do wele to tho evild doon to do wele faire a ceulx qui ne le that deservyth yt not ; to thaim that have not deservent; et qui le for who so doye yt be deserved it; for all is

1 This comma in the original. With my punctuation I have been as sparing as possible.—B.
TIGNONVILLE.
(MS. Royal 19 B. IV.)
fait pert son labour, et
la chose a eulx donnee
est perdue, tout ainsi
comme la pluie qui
chiet sur la gravelle.

1. 8. Et dist, bien
eureux est cellui qui
use ses jours et ses
mieux faict chose
coovenables, et qui ne
pruent en ce monde fors
cel donc il ne peut ex-
cuser, et qui saplique
e bonnes œuvres et
laisse les mauvoises.

1. 14. Et dist, hom
ne doit point jugier un
bon me a ses paroles
mais a ses œuvres;
car paroles sont com-
munement vaines, mais
par les œuvres se
coungnoissent les dom-
naiges ou les prouffis.

1. 19. Et dist, quant
laumosne est donnee
aux povrez indigens,
elle prouffite tout aussi
comme la medicine qui
est covenablement
donnee aux malades;
elaumosne qui est
donnee aux non in-
digens est tout aussi
comme la medicine qui
est donnee sans cause.

SCROPE.
(Harley 2266.)
sure his labour and
the thynge yeveyn to
them is lost, liche as
he rayne is lost that
fullyth uppon gravel.

1. 30. And he seith
that he is riyght wele
fortunyed and happy
that usyth his daies
and his nyghtis in do-
ing covenable thynggis,
and that in this world
takyth but that he
shuld take, and that en-
ployeth and occupydeth
hyw but to goode dedis
and levyth the eville.

1. 34. And he seith,
a man shuld (w)...
[wor]dis but by his
dedis, for ... knowyn
boye harme and good.

v) l. 2. And he...
je powre nedy, yt pro-
fytyn liche a ... yeveyn
to syke men; and
almys that is yevyn[n]
medeycne that is yeveyn
without cause.

Wydeville-Caxton.

lost that is yeveyn unto
them, right as the
reyne falleth upon the
gravel.

fol. 5, l. 3. And
said, he is happy
that usith his dayes
in doyg covenable
things, and takith in
this worlde but that 1,
that is necessarie unto
him and may not for-
bere, applying himself
to do goode dedis and
to leve the badde.

1. 7. And said, a
man ought not to be
demed by his wordes 1,
but by his workeis; for
comenly wordes ben
vayne, but by the
dedes is known the
harme or the prouffit
of every thing.

1. 10. And said,
when that almes is
distribute to pover in-
digent peple, it prof-
fitet as a good
medicine covenably
yeveyn to them that be
seke; but the almes
yeveyn to the not in-
digent is a medicine
yevyn without cause.

1 This comma in the original.
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TIGNONVILLE.  
(MS. Royal 19 B. IV.)

L. 27. Et dist, cellui est bien eureux qui se esloingne de toutes ordures et qui en destourne son oye et sa vue.

L. 30. Et dist, que la plus couvenable despence que homme puisse faire en son servyant est celle qui est mise ou service de dieu et en bonnes œuvres; et la moyne qui est despendue en choses necessaires des quelles il ne se peut excuser, si commne en mengier en boire en dormir et en curant les maladies survenans; et la pire est celle qui est despendue en mauvoises œuvres.

SCROPE.  
(Harley 2266.)

L. 6. And he ... is right happy that wythdrawyth ferre from all harlotryes and vilonyes, and hat turnyth his ere and his sight per fro.

L. 8. And be se[ith] that þe most couvenable coste and dyspence that a man may make in his lyf is þat which is sette in goddis sarvyc', and in good dedis', and in necessary', the which oweth duly to be done as in mete, drynk, and slepe, and in helyng sykenes comyng on a man; and the worst cost and dyspence is that þe which is occupied and spent in evylle dedis.

Wydeville-Caxton.

L. 13. And sayd, he is happy that withdraweth his ere and his eye from alle vyle things.

L. 15. And sayd, the most couvenable dispence that any man may make in hys lyf', is hit that is sette in the service of god', and in good works; and the second is that isspended in necessarie thinges that may not be forborne, as mete drinkeclothing, and for remedies ayenst sike- nesse; and the worst of all is that is dis- pended in syn and evil werkis.

A. BRANDL.

BERLIN, November, 1899.

1 This comma in the original.  
2 This word has been corrected.
VI.

CONCERNING GRAMMATICAL ICTUS
IN ENGLISH VERSE.

Nam omnium magnarum artium sicut arborum altitudo nos delectat, radices stirpesque non item; sed esse illa sine his non potest.—Cicero, Orator xliii.

The true artist finds inspiring strength in the study of the technicalities of his art. The great Roman orator, at the close of his career, retires to ponder on the verbal and rhythmic elements of eloquence. There is no mere art, no 'mere literature,' that is legitimately independent of those underlying principles which are discovered and rightly valued by history and comparison critically pursued.

The following observations on the grammatical ictus in English verse may be introduced by a ready endorsement of the words of a reviewer of Guest's History of English Rhythms: 'Probably no new statement about verse will be found to be true; but some important truths have been imperfectly stated, and others have met with neglect, so that no one complete theory is now generally accepted. Instead of wearily picking out small modicums of truth from this or that half-forgotten author, let us search for the main laws of rhythm by listening to the actual sound of prose and verse as spoken nowadays.'

That the ingenious investigator of dielectric capacity was also fitted by powers of nice discernment to perceive the subtle diffusion of accentual force in words, is shown in many of his observations, one of which relates directly to the subject in hand. 'To scan an English line,' he says, 'we must further have leave to count any syllable long which receives a secondary accent, or is in any way slightly more prominent than its neighbour' (p. 165). If the author of these words had been equipped with the necessary knowledge of the grammatical import and history of the secondary accent, he could not have failed to fulfil the expectations aroused by his acceptance in theory of this variety of ictus. In the absence of this knowledge he has left the definition and illustration of his belief to be supplied.

'Prosody is a kind of grammar' is another expression that may be of service in detachment from the context in which it is employed by Jenkin. The laws of prosody are founded in the facts of grammar, and in this sense (which is not the sense Jenkin had in mind) prosody is a department of grammar. Coventry Patmore, on the other hand, in that suggestive 'Essay on English Metrical Law' which, as the author himself had occasion to regret, has not always received due acknowledgement, refers to the 'non-coincidence of the grammatical with the metrical ictus' of Greek and Latin verse. This clearly understood use of the designation 'grammatical ictus' does not however embrace the complete sense in which it is to be accepted in the present title. The 'grammatical ictus' is not only the chief word-accent with the verse-beat, but it is also the secondary word-accent in the same office; and the fact that both classes of accents, which are equally grammatical, are equally available for ictus furnishes not only the true

---

basis for the scansion of English verse, but also that for the
clear apprehension of the transition from 'accentual' to
'quantitative' versification. The limits to be observed
for the present purpose exclude a consideration of the latter
clause of this statement, although the following paragraphs
may give some indication of its import.

It is noteworthy that the modern ear is becoming dull to
distinctions of subordinate stress. Our excellent English
dictionaries report, as a rule, but the one dominant word-
stress, and ignore the rhythmic balance of the polysyllabics
as well as the vernacular consciousness of values attaching
to formative and derivative elements. As a consequence of
this neglect, in grammars, dictionaries, and works on versi-
fication, to note the historic transmission of secondary stresses,
the secrets of the poet's art (for the poet's finer ear is his
guide) are becoming obscured to the general reader of verse.

The prevailing manner in which poetry is now read aloud
is so far from representing (on the formal side) the process
of its construction, that the door has been thrown wide open
for the ready admission of unnatural and fantastic theories
of versification. The poets themselves indeed are sometimes
known to be 'very bad readers of their own verses.'

Coventry Patmore suggests that 'their acute sense of what
such reading ought to be, discomposes and discourages
them when they attempt to give their musical idea a
material realization'. However that may be, it is also
to be kept in mind that some poets have invariably read
their verses in 'sing-song,' and that the stage manner in the
delivery of dramatic poetry reveals, from time to time, to

\[1\] Mrs. Browning has reasoned the matter out in this fashion:

Or at times I read there, hoarsely, some new poem of my making—
Poets ever fail in reading their own verses to their worth,—
For the echo in you breaks upon the words which you are speaking,
And the chariot-wheels jar in the gate through which you drive them
forth.

*Lady Geraldine's Courtship.*
CONCERNING GRAMMATICAL ICTUS

the consternation of the prosaic critic, a 'monotonous cadence.' That verse is a kind of music requires nowadays to be taught with a renewed and enlightened enthusiasm. To quote Coventry Patmore again, 'People are too apt to fancy they are employing a figure of speech when they talk of the music of poetry.'

The harmonies of verse are not generally perceived, chiefly for two reasons. On the one hand we are apt to misunderstand the artistic quality of what is commonly described as 'monotony,' and then a second barrier is set up in the growing tendency in pronunciation to subordinate as uniformly unstressed all other syllables to those which have the chief word-stress.

As to the beauty of 'monotony,' when not denied outright, it may be thought to elude 'the examination of the reason,' and, as Pascal might say, 'to end where demonstration begins.' But 'monotone' in its usually accepted sense—for there is strictly no monotone in speech; it is made impossible by the alternation of accented and unaccented syllables, and underneath this wave of variation there is that which is inevitably produced by the articulations of consonants before and after vowels—but 'monotone' as usually understood has a rhythmical quality which should not require definition in these days of the return to Plain Song and Free Rhythm chanting in the churches. A clear notion of the musical or artistic monotone of verse may be gained through a recognition of the several types of oral English as they have been recently set forth by Professor Lloyd: the formal type, appropriate to solemn occasions, as in the reading of the liturgy; the careful type, of the best conversation and of public speakers; the careless type, which is tolerated 'as containing no very disagreeable errors'; and the vulgar type, containing inadmissible errors. It is

IN ENGLISH VERSE

important also to note that these types are described as differing chiefly in the matter of syllabic stress. 'The first,' says Professor Lloyd, 'contains few syllables which are quite stressless'; the second has none of them; the third 'exaggerates weakness of stress'; and in the fourth 'it often happens that the fully stressed syllables alone preserve their formal quality.' It is obvious enough that in formal utterances the language has qualities (which may be described as musical) which are available for artistic use, and that these qualities are bound up with the careful observance of not only the principal but also the subordinate stresses of the syllables. Much may be learned, therefore, in this connexion, from what the treatises say of the formal utterance of the stage and the pulpit, and the best manner of reading sometimes practised by the poets.

If the appropriate reading of lines which by content and natural movement are adapted to formal monotony be carefully attended to, it will be perceived that the undulations of the wave of stress are not wanting. In this type of verse we obtain indeed what may be held to be the elemental norm of the rhythm or measure. Variation is then obtained by changing the uniformly slight dip of the wave. This is done in many ways. The rhetorical demands of emphasis, the rhetorical demands of the poetry (requiring an emphasis which is only exceptional in prose), the occasional ictus-use of subordinate accents, these are the principal means at hand for producing in the wave of measured and rhythmical utterance the desired variations in amplitude and curvature.

1 See e.g. Thomas Sheridan, Lectures on the Art of Reading. In two parts, containing (1) The Art of Reading Prose; (2) The Art of Reading Verse. 3rd ed., London, 1877; and John Walker, A Rhetorical Grammar. 7th ed., London, 1833.

2 Mrs. Ritchie thus exclaims upon Tennyson's manner of reading: 'Reading, is it? One can hardly describe it. It is a sort of mystical incantation, a chant in which every note rises and falls and reverberates again.' Records of Tennyson, Ruskin, and Browning, by Annie Ritchie. London, 1893.
Other variation, in the form of the wave, is obtained by slurring (legato), and by resolution (breaking into parts) of either the arsis or the thesis.

Whatever may be thought of the artistic value of 'monotony' (as already implied, it is usually under-estimated), critics of the music of verse argue that it is chiefly in variety of cadence that the verse of the best poets gratifies the ear. Leigh Hunt\(^1\) describes poetry as 'modulating its language on the principle of variety in uniformity' . . . 'because it thus realizes the last idea of beauty itself, which includes the charm of diversity within the flowing round of habit and ease.' He returns to this topic in the paragraph which begins in more specific details: 'Variety in versification consists in whatsoever can be done for the prevention of monotony, by diversity of stops and cadences, distribution of emphasis, and retardation and acceleration of time; for the whole real secret of versification is a musical secret.' These generalizations are indeed sound, but in their application we are for the most part not correctly instructed. When Hunt in his fault-finding comes upon the 'see-saw' movement of a passage from Pope, he has apparently forgotten his doctrine, according to which a poet shows the perfection of art when in his hands difficulty itself is converted into felicity and joy; and in the placing of accent-marks to indicate either 'strength' or 'variety,' a subjective judgement of the inherent meaning and cadence of the line obscures altogether the view of its structural design.

We may also recur to the essay by Jenkin, cited above, for another typical illustration of the depreciation of 'monotony,' and a consequent misapprehension of the musical 'beats' of verse. Both Hunt and Jenkin insist too much upon a mode of reading which shall not bring into easy recognition the 'arrangement of the feet'; the

rules of scansion 'are best kept,' it is said, 'when they are kept well out of sight.' So too Robert Bridges¹ darkens counsel when he observes variation in the number and in the position of the stresses of blank verse. For example, it is not sufficient to say that there are 'only three full stresses' in the line—

His ministèrs of vèngeânce and pursûit.

The stress on the last syllable of 'ministers,' and that on 'and,' are as necessary to the complete cadence as the 'three full stresses'; and it is just this difference between the full logical stresses and the two subordinate ones that constitutes for the line its musical variation from the normal 'monotone.'

In his chapter on 'Inversion of Rhythm' Bridges fails to recognize in his third and fourth divisions the concomitant sectional pause; in his first division the examples should be scanned as follows:

A mind not tô be changed by place or time.
Me, me only, just object of his ire.
To the garđen of bliss, thy seat prepared.
In the visîons of God. It was a hill.

Nor should there be hesitancy in accepting the rhythm of:

Beyond all past example and futûre.
Which of us who beholds the bright surfâce.
Of Thrones and mighty Seraphim prostrâte.

He also scans the following lines incorrectly:

Universal reproach, far worse to bear.
By the wâters of life, where'er they sat.

We are brought nearer to our subject by Abbott and Seeley², who, however, also err in declaring that the following line 'is intended to be faulty':

This beauteous lady Thisby is certain.

¹ Milton's Prosody, Oxford, 1894.
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But inconsistently with this the metrical accent is correctly allowed to fall on the second member of a compound, and on a syllable which historically has a secondary stress:

Good gênsleêmên, look fреш and měrrît.

These authors are also clear in pointing out means of securing variation from 'intolerable monotony' in this use of words with two 'metrical accents,' such as hónoráblé incárnádine misprinted incárnádíne); they are also careful to preserve the measured cadence of the line when light words, such as the, and, of, &c., receive the metrical accent, as well as when logically emphatic syllables are thickly crowded into a line:

Rocks, câves, lakes, féns, bogs, dêns, and shâdes of dêath.

To show how deeply seated has been the feeling against the theoretic admission of the unbroken tradition in the poet's ictus-use of secondary word-accents and of rhetorically light words, we may contrast with the foregoing doctrine the judgements of Joseph Robertson¹, whose restless pen was once so well known to the readers of the Critical Review. According to Robertson the following lines infringe the law which requires the stress upon the last syllable:

And when the mountain-oak, or poplar tall,
Or pine, fit mast for some great admiral.

Unthought-of frailties cheat us in the wise;
The fool lies hid in inconsistencies.

'Nothing,' he says, 'can compensate the want of harmony in such lines as these, but the energy of the expression, or the beauty of the sentiment.' ... 'When there is neither of these excellences, the poet is inexcusable. In reading them we cannot fully comply with the rhyme, without falling into a drawling and ridiculous pronunciation.' On this account,

even a blank verse can scarcely end with dignity, when the last word is a polysyllable.' Then follow such examples as:

That to the height of this great argument
I may assert eternal providence.
Just confidence, and native righteousness.
Provoking God to raise them enemies.

These are thus commented on: 'As we cannot lay any regular accent on the last syllable in any of the foregoing lines, we can only favour the measure in some small degree, by pronouncing such syllables less rapidly and indistinctly than we should do in prose.'

In the same vein the ictus-use of light words is condemned: 'When the accented syllable happens to be an insignificant particle, or a syllable on which the voice cannot properly rest, the verse is lame and inharmonious.'

Now it will be observed that Robertson does not deny that the poets employ these objectionable verse-stresses, he merely contends that in doing so they impair their work. He would agree with Rice\(^1\) in his complaint against the monotony of the artificial declaimer of poetry: 'It is, nevertheless, a very whimsical reason for mouthing out the writings of an author, because they consist of couplets, or are printed in lines of ten syllables. And yet there is hardly one reader in ten thousand who would sit down to recite a tragedy, or epic poem, with that ease and placidity of countenance he would naturally wear in repeating a paragraph in a common newspaper.' Unfortunately it has come to pass that the terms of this ratio of one to ten thousand would now have to be taken in the inverted order. It is precisely the modulation of voice and the curve of stress appropriate to the reading of the newspaper paragraph in which many writers on versification are striving to find the artistic structure and movement of
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poetry. Adorned with the time-honoured technicalities of the classic systems, a pasticcio of substitutions, inversions, pauses, and what not, has been elaborated to rejoice the heart of the prosaic statistician. One might recall appositely a saying of Balzac, 'There are no principles, there are only events; there are no laws, there are only circumstances.'

If we now take a middle position in the history of English poetry, and observe the verse-technique of, let us say, John Donne, we shall find further illustrations for a concrete statement of the present argument. The stresses of the following lines require, after what has already been said, no further comment:

As vain, as witless, and as false as they
Which dwel in Court, for once going that way.

Sat. iv.

Yea he tells most cunningly each had cause.

Sat. vi.

I am no libellēr, nor will be any,
But (like a true man) say there are too many.

A Tale of a Citizen and his Wife.

Go through the great chambēr (why is it hung
With the seven deadly sins?) being among.

Sat. iv.

When I behold a stream, which from the spring
Doth with doubtfull melodious murmuringe.

Elegy vii.

Here are also a few lines from Crashaw:

Say, watery brot̄hĕrs,
Ye simpering sons of those fair eyes,
Yoūr fertile mothĕrs.

The WEEPĕr.

At this point it may be permitted to refer to the writer's communication on 'Proper Names in Old English Verse'¹ for a statement of the argument upon which the judgements

here advanced are founded. The present purpose will be served if an indication may be given of the importance of casting aside all artificial modes of analysing the music of verse, and of attuning our ears to those harmonics which abound inherently in the language as uttered in poetic exaltation. In the true reading of poetry one must approximate the exaltation of the poet, who in his act of creation does not use the language in the newspaper manner, as is assumed, but in a manner which evokes those strains and modulations of sound which are not required for the morning paragraph on finance.

The poetry of the centuries from *The Moral Ode* to *The Vision of Sin* contradicts all theory based upon the sophistications of those who would pervert the harmonious ‘numerosity’ of verse into an echo of their own intonation of its prosaic paraphrase. Our grammars are deficient in teaching the accentual content of the elements of words, and our dictionaries should record the history of stresses as well as that of form and meaning. Many readers may accept without question an ictus upon the last syllable of *modesty*, but, lacking the necessary historical and grammatical information, they will do so for a reason that will exclude the equally admissible *maný, ámong, parént, býond, &c.*

At a time when the study of all that relates to the origins and the traditions of our language and literature has become both a profession and a pleasure, when the founder of the Early English Text Society is receiving the hearty acknowledgements of a grateful and admiring generation, at such a time it should not be inappropriate to resolve to inquire of the poets of all the past how they have sung, and as we listen to them to dismiss from our minds our fancied

Dull receipts how poems may be made.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

*James W. Bright.*
VII.

E AND ÁE IN THE VESPASIAN PSALTER.

In the Vespasian Psalter (=VPs.)¹ and in certain other Old Mercian texts there occurs a curious distinction in the use of the letters e and æ, which for a long time has puzzled English philologists. I am, of course, referring to such forms as dég ‘day,’ dægas ‘days,’ tellan ‘to tell,’ feollan ‘to fell,’ nœht, neht ‘night,’ dēlan ‘to deal,’ and others. It has been supposed that æ in all cases where it occurred in VPs. denoted a long æ; evidently because West Saxon (=WS.) and Northumbrian (=North.) æ < West Germanic ai (in ānig, &c.) is in VPs. represented by æ, while WS. and North. æ < West Germanic a appears as e in VPs. (for instance, in dég ‘day’). From this supposition it has even been concluded that the Anglian forms falla(n) ‘to fall,’ erfe ‘inheritance,’ &c., and North. arm ‘brachium,’ feoll ‘ruina,’ &c., had long vowels². In the Anglia, Beiblatt, vol. ix. (1898), pp. 66 sq. and 101, I have offered a new explanation and have promised to discuss the problem more fully in a separate article. My explanation is that West Germanic (=WG.) a and ã, which

¹ Edited by H. Sweet for the Early English Text Society, in 1885.
² In the third edition of his Angelschichische Grammatik (Halle, 1898), Sievers has, however, partly corrected and partly suppressed his former statements.
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in WS. developed into æ and æ (for instance, in dagæ and side, p), turned into narrower sounds, viz. [e] or, perhaps, even [ɛ] and ë respectively, in the dialect of VPs. already before prehistoric Old English a and ã were mutated into æ, æ by i or j in the next syllable (for instance, in melælan ‘to melt’ and dælan ‘to deal’), and that all æ’s and æ’s of this or later origin were, as a rule, preserved as such, for instance, in cælf, gesæh, dægas, dælan, &c.¹ I propose to show this here by a detailed account of the different kinds of æ (e) and æ (e) that arose in the dialect of VPs. at different periods ².

I. æ (ë).

(1) First Group.

In the earliest prehistoric period of Old English (=OE.) WG. Æ, for instance, in *sat ‘sat,’ must have undergone a greater degree of fronting and narrowing in the dialect of VPs. than, for instance, in WS. This is clearly shown by the spelling æ which is used almost exclusively in VPs. (Zeuner, pp. 11 sq.), while æ is the regular symbol in other words. But the sound must have remained different from æ < WG. Æ (in weæg ‘way,’ &c.) or e < WG. æ by i-mutation (for instance, in sellæn ‘to sell’), though they are spelt alike, because the language of the Early Middle English legends

¹ In a recent publication also H. M. Chadwick has devoted a few remarks to the problem in hand, without knowing my article. He says (in the Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society, vol. iv. part ii (1899), p. 180 sq.), ‘the change of æ (in dagæ &c.) > e would seem to be earlier than the change of Æ (in dæd ‘deed,’ and also in nīd ‘need,’ and nācon ‘beacon’)) > ë, and can hardly have taken place much after the operation of palatal umlaut. It may of course be still earlier.’ On p. 195 he appears to assume that Æ < æ (in degæ &c.) had fallen together in sound with e < WG. Æ in weæg ‘way,’ &c., though they were usually kept distinct in spelling in the oldest glossaries. On p. 254 he says that the change æ > e (in degæ ‘was at least contemporary with (if not earlier than) the operation of palatal umlaut.’ In principle Mr. Chadwick is certainly right; the difference between degæ and dagæ, &c., must be explained chronologically. But his conclusions require several corrections.

² I shall, of course, avail myself of R. Zeuner’s excellent dissertation (Die Sprache des Kentischen Psalters, Halle, 1881), and of H. Sweet’s equally useful glossary to the text (in The Oldest English Texts, 1885).
of St. Katharine, St. Juliane, and St. Marhareté

of the Vespasian Psalter

which exhibit nearly the same dialect as VPs., still betrays the
difference; for here we also find the spellings feader, water,
&c., by the side of feder, weter, &c., while melten (<WG.
* miltan), men 'men,' &c., always show e.

It is principally

for this reason that the e of dog 'day,' feder 'father,' wres
'was,' &c., in VPs., must be supposed to denote an open
e-sound, possibly [ɛ], or, perhaps, more probably a sound
intermediate between e and æ [ɛ ɛ́] = [æt]. This sound
may have been the immediate result of the early narrowing
of the WG. vowels in early prehistoric OE., by which, for
instance, also the open WG. ɪ was changed into close e.

At all events, I see no sufficient reason to suppose that the
narrowing of WG. ɪ in the dialect of VPs. first stopped at
the stage where it remained in WS. and North., i.e. æ,
and was completed only in a somewhat later period after
an interval of stability.

In words which had only half stress or weak stress
the narrowing stopped at the sound æ : æt (only once we
find the strong form et : ðu bist et 'ades'), ðæt (the strong
form ðæt is rare; Zeuner, p. 13), ðæs (usually ðæs). Also
cwæð (three times; but forty-five times cwæð: Zeuner,
pp. 11 and 13) is perhaps a weak or half-strong form;
cp. Middle English and Modern English quoth (Geschichte
des Ablauts, p. 64; and Morsbach, Mittelengl. Gram., p. 136).

The few other forms in which æ, æe, or ɛ occurs instead
of e in words of this group (Zeuner, p. 13; add hwæt 'quid,'
10, 4) probably are scribal errors.

1 All published by the Early English Text Society.
2 Cp. my book on the Geschichte des Ablauts der starken Zeitwörter im
Südenglischen, Strassburg, 1889, p. 55 sq.; L. Morsbach, Mittelenglische
Grammatik, Halle, 1896, § 97 sq.; H. Stodte, Über die Sprache der Katharinen-
3 Cp. also what is said below concerning the change of WG. ɪ > ɛ,
under (4).
4 Cp. ðæt by the side of ðæt in the Middle English legends of St. Kath., &c.;
Stodte, pp. 12 and 14.
(2) Second Group.

In the next group of words ä is the result of i-umlaut of prehistoric OE. ā. This ä is faithfully preserved in VPs., where it is represented by the spellings ae, æ, or e (Zeuner, p. 15). In almost all instances it stands before il or il+consonant, before which WG. ā had undergone no breaking in the Anglian dialects: měltan, cělf, wělle, &c.¹ Only twice we find e, in wellan and wellum. These two forms either contain WG. ē (cp. Old High German wēlla) or WG. ā, which (according to Morsbach) may pass into ä in early prehistoric Anglian before Germanic il if i or j follows in the next syllable, and be mutated into e afterwards (just as in *saljan > *salljan > *sælljan, Mercian *se*iljan > sellan)². In both cases the e would be close. The derivation from WG. ē seems more probable.


Besides we have wrečan ‘advenam,’ i45, 9, and wreč[æ]an 93, 6. Both forms are legitimate, as the former may be explained from early prehistoric OE. *wraccjan (influenced by preracian and wracu; Anglia, Beiblatt, vol. ix. p. 93), and the latter from early prehistoric OE. *wreccejan. Geswicede ‘rapiat,’ 7, 3, if a reliable form, requires a similar explanation as wrečian, whilst leċcan, rečan, &c. (Zeuner, p. 14), stand on a level with wrečan.

¹ VPs. has no accents; it is therefore difficult to tell whether lengthening of æ had already taken place in eldra, gehaldan, &c. Regarding the date of the lengthening of short vowels before id, nd, &c., see L. Morsbach, Mittelengl. Gramm., §55, Anm. 1; and my articles in Anglia, Beiblatt, vol. ix. p. 67 sq., and Englische Studien, vol. xxvii. p. 87 sq.
³ I call ‘early prehistoric OE.’ the period before the operation of i-umlaut.
Also $\varepsilon$ in $\varepsilon\varsigma\epsilon\varsigma\upmu\nu\varsigma\mu$ 'securibus,' 73, 5, must be explained by $i$-umlaut of $\delta$, as Kluge has discovered (Sievers, *Ags._ Gramm., § 50, Anm. 2 and 3): Nom. Sg. $*\alpha\kappa\upsilon\varsigma\iota\upsilon\varsigma > *\alpha\kappa\gamma\varsigma\iota\varsigma > *\varkappa\gamma\varsigma\iota > \varkappa\varsigma\varsigma\epsilon\varsigma$ (cp. Sievers, § 100, Anm. 4). According to this theory we should also expect to find $\varkappa\delta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon$ in VPs. 3 but the actual form is $\varkappa\delta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon$, 149, 2. That $e$ here is no wrong spelling for $\varepsilon$ or $\iota$, is confirmed by the Middle English (= ME.) form $\varkappa\delta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon$ in the early legends (Marh. 5, 22; 10, 23; Stodte, p. 14). A simple way to explain the form would be to attribute to it a close $e$ and to consider it identical with Old Saxon $\varepsilon\delta\lambda\iota\iota$, Old High German $\varepsilon\delta\lambda\iota\iota$ ($*\alpha\pi\iota\iota\iota\iota > *\alpha\pi\iota\iota\iota$, Mercian $*\varepsilon\pi\iota\iota\iota$, by narrowing, $> *\varepsilon\pi\iota\iota\iota$, by $i$-mutation, $> \varkappa\delta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon$). But it is strange to find that in ME. $\varkappa\delta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon$ ($\varkappa\delta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon$) occurs only in texts which either generally or occasionally use the letter $e$ for OE. $\iota$ ($e$) in such words as $\rho\varepsilon\rho$, $\varsigma\varepsilon\iota\varepsilon\delta$ ($\rho\varepsilon\rho$, $\varsigma\varepsilon\iota\varepsilon\delta$), while texts with $\rho\varepsilon\rho$, $\varepsilon\rhot$, $\varsigma\iota\alpha\kappa$, have also $\varepsilon\rho\iota\iota$ (see Stratmann-Bradley and Mätzner). This may, of course, be a mere coincidence; but on the other hand it does not seem impossible that the stressed vowel of $\varkappa\delta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon$ was [$e^\ast$], and that the word thus belongs to the First Group above. For it may, perhaps, be identical with Old Saxon $\alpha\delta\lambda\iota\iota$ and WS. $\alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon$; and in Mercian $\varkappa\delta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon$ as well as in WS. $\varkappa\delta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon$ we may simply have instances of the early prehistoric English narrowing of WG. $\delta$. The solution of this problem, however, involves several other difficult questions, with which I propose to deal in a separate article.

On the form $\varepsilon\tau\ell\varepsilon\varsigma$ 'calicis,' which occurs once, see my note in the *Anglia*, Beiblatt, vol. ix. p. 293.

In spite of the few doubtful forms, the difference between the First and Second Groups is distinctly marked.

As the regular $i$-mutation of early prehistoric Mercian $e^\ast$ of course produced a close $e$ (for instance, in $s\epsilon\tau\ell\iota\iota\iota$), it

\footnote{Cp. $\delta\iota\iota\iota$, *Liber Vitae*, 46, and $\delta\iota\iota\iota$ in numerous compounds (Sweet, *Oldest English Texts*, p. 473).}
is superfluous to discuss the forms here. It is, however, noteworthy that the spelling of VPs. does not betray whether *gehêstan, *bifêstan, &c., have a close $e$ (=WS. $e$) or an open $e^m$ (=WS. $e^i$).

It is also unnecessary to discuss the $i$-umlaut of early prehistoric $ëo$, the result of breaking of WG. $ë$ before $r+$ consonant, because it has invariably produced close $e$ (for instance, in $érfe$, $ermõu$). The $i$-umlaut of $ëo$ before $h$ is treated together with the Third Group.

(3) Third Group.

(a) Prehistoric OE. $ëo$, which had arisen from WG. $ë$ by breaking before $h$, was smoothed in the Anglian dialects in the seventh century, and the resulting vowel $ë$ is faithfully preserved in VPs.: *ge$ë$eh, sa$h$, *ge$ë$eh$ë$, ã$ë$w$ë$, sl$ë$, m$ë$h, na$h$, m$ë$h$ë$, &c. (Zeuner, p. 33). The rare forms ne$h$, me$h$ë$, and ge$ë$eh, so far as they are reliable, must be explained by earlier $i$-mutation of $ëo$ (Anglia, Beiblatt, vol. ix. p. 71; vol. x. p. 1 sq.). But it seems more likely that the scribe has simply omitted the tag to the $e$ ($ë$). This may also have been the case in $wex$, which occurs only once by the side of $wex$ (1), $wàxx$ (2), $saëx$ (1) (Zeuner, p. 34). Otherwise $wex$ would have to be explained by palatal mutation (Anglia, Beiblatt, vol. x. p. 6 sq.). The preterites $bìë$hë$te$, $gë$ë$hë$te$, $ã$ë$hë$te$, as well as the corresponding past participles, have borrowed their $e$ from the present forms (Zeuner, p. 33 sq.; Sievers, § 407, Anm. 9).

Another irregular form is $hla$ë$hë[h]an$ 'to laugh,' for which I have offered an explanation in the Anglia, Beiblatt, vol. ix. p. 93. According to it, the form would belong to the Second Group above.
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(6) Prehistoric OE. ā, which had arisen from WG. ā by breaking before r+consonant, was smoothed before r+c, g, or h in the Anglian dialects in the seventh century; but the resulting vowel æ (which is preserved in the oldest Glossaries) has in VPs. turned into e: erto, ēsmerc, ērg, and ērge (Zeuner, p. 36).

(c) The combined influence of u/ā-umlaut and smoothing produced ë in dēgas, dēgum, plégian, cuvacian, &c. (Zeuner, p. 34 sq.)¹. The plural forms dēgas, dēga, dēgum, and wreca show influence of the singular forms dēg, dēges, dēge, and wrece, though probably only in spelling. Estan ‘cinerem,’ is, perhaps, only misspelt for eastan; both forms occur only once. Compare the forms dē[a]lēs, nē[a]lē, see[a]we, gelē[a]fsum (Zeuner, p. 48). But estan may also be identical with æstean, which occurs twice in the Paris Psalter, and would then have [e*].

II. Æ (6).

(4) FOURTH GROUP.

WG. ā (for instance, in *skēp ‘sheep’) has turned into close ē: stēp, slēp, &c. (Zeuner, p. 42). This change must have taken place before early prehistoric OE. ā (< WG. ai; for instance, in *ānig < *ainig) was mutated into ë; otherwise WG. ā and OE. ë < WG. ai would have fallen together in the dialect of VPs. (and in the non-WS. dialects generally) just the same as in WS. The early narrowing is also confirmed by the North. form stēp ‘sheep’ (from early prehistoric *stēp < *stīp < *stēp, whilst WS. *stēp produced stēp; cp. Anglia, Beiblatt, vol. ix. p. 98). Further evidence may be derived from Kentish nēor, nior ‘nearer’ (in a charter and the Bede-Glosses; Sweet, Oldest English Texts, p. 164), and fornion ‘paene’ (in the Kent. Glosses, ed. by Zupitza), if the development of WG. *nāhur, &c., in the

Kentish dialect was *nêhur > *nêuhur > *nêu(h)ur > nêor (cp. Sievers, § 112). The same development of WG. ǣ > ǣ > ǣo is noticeable in Angliand nêowest (VPs., Ru.2) and in Mercian nêolēcan, North. nêolēca. If WG. ǣ had been ǣ (or ǣo by breaking) in prehistoric Anglian and Kentish, the resulting forms after the loss of h would have ǣa (cp. Anglia, Beiblatt, vol. vii. p. 73; vol. ix. p. 107; and Sievers, § 165, Anm. 3). Also here I see no reason to suppose that the sound ǣ < WG. ǣ was kept for some time in the non-WS. dialects (except perhaps sporadically); but I think that in the change of ǣ > ē we must see one continuous development.

(5) Fifth Group.

Early prehistoric ǣ (< WG. ai) has been mutated into ǣ by Ḗ or ṕ in the next syllable: ǣ, sǣ sē, ingēō ingēō, clēne clēne, tōdēlān tōdēlān, &c. (Zeuner, p. 41).

But sometimes VPs. has the spelling e: I ēbrēdēd (usually with ǣ or ṕ), 3 ēlēdēd (more often lēdē, lēdan), 1 lēred (usually with ǣ), 4 fēscē (9 fēscē, 6 fēscē), 6 forōrēstan1 (11 ē, 3 ē, 1 a misspelt for ae), 1 bylēs (1 Ḗ, 5 ē; 1 lēssan, 2 ē), 4 ēnne (or ēnne? No ǣ or ṕ). In these words ē < ē is followed by d, r, sc, st, s, or n. We may add that, according to Zeuner, the spelling ē instead of æ (or ae) occurs especially before d. It is also very common before sc and st (see the instances above). This must, perhaps, be explained by an inclination of the scribe to write e before d, sc, and st, though generally he has added a tag to it, owing to an afterthought (g). At all events it seems certain that the twenty spellings with e are not merely accidental mistakes, but are due to the pronunciation of

1 Zeuner, p. 16, and Sievers3, § 405, Anm. 11, attribute WG. ǣ to this word, but the numerous forms with ē and æ in VPs. show that the vowel must have been WG. ai; cp. my remark above regarding bīfēstan, ēhefēlan (in the Second Group).
the scribe. This is evident from the fact that e appears only before certain consonants, which, roughly speaking, may be described as alveolars, while on the other hand ae, e, are used without exception in words where the vowel is final (se, sae, se, &c.), or stands before other consonants (for instance, m: ßam, ßam; or p: swapels; or h: xhte or xhte). And it is confirmed by corresponding forms with close i in ME. From an advance-sheet of Morsbach's ME. Grammatik, 2. Hälfte, § 140, I am allowed to quote the following remarks: 'In gewissen fällen, nämlich vor dentalen (n, d, t, s(t), r, l), palatalen eh (i) und im wortauslaut ist das alte [ə], wie namentlich die reime mit [ə] zeigen (vgl. auch Örrm's schreibung), [im Norden und Mittellande] vielfach zu einem [ə]laut erhöht worden. Diese erhöhung muss zum teil schon in ae. Zeit begonnen haben, wie die kürzungen liddre, sprēdde und besonders liddre 'leiter' u. s. w. zeigen; doch findet sie sich nicht überall in gleicher weise.' It is evident that we have the same change here as in the VPs, and that the forms in this text enable us to date the beginning of it pretty accurately. It may be added that in late Old Northumbrian we find i cline in Ri. (Lindelöf, p. 33) and i fiest in Li. (see Cook's Glossary); cp. also the list from Ru. in E. Miles Brown's dissertation, Göttingen (1891), p. 69 sq.

In the above list I have included the form ënne with diffidence, because the spelling with e has been explained as indicating shortness of vowel (Sievers 3, § 324). This view is strengthened by the forms en(d)efan 'eleven,' en(d)efan ‘eleventh,’ en(d)efan ‘equally,’ en(w)en(n)tre ‘one year old’ (cp. Sievers 3, § 100, Anm. 5). It does not,

1 See, however, also my recent article in the Englische Studien, vol. xxvii. p. 89 sq.

2 These forms are also interesting in connexion with another problem. Morsbach (Anglia, Belblatt, vol. vii. p. 300, footnote) has tried to explain ME. anðan, OE. anðan from early prehistoric *anðan, whilst he derives OE. anðan and all similar forms with e from *eðan, &c. He denies that early
however, follow that enne (xenne) had a short vowel in all dialects. As a matter of fact, we find Ænne (with a long vowel) even in the ME. period (in the Ormulum; see Morsbach, ME. Gramm., § 96, Anm. 1); and it may also be urged that the difference between Old North. enne and Old WS. ænne is not intelligible, unless we assume that the WS. dialect preserved the form ænne (which nevertheless may have been subject to occasional shortening). But it is very much more probable that enne had a short vowel, than a long one.

(6) Sixth Group.

Prehistoric äo < WG. au was smoothed before h, g, c, j in the Anglian dialects in the seventh century; but the resulting vowel ā, which is preserved in the oldest texts, has turned into ē in the VPs. and later Anglian texts: flēh, belēc, ēge, smējan, &c. The only exception is ðæth (Zeuner, p. 14), which must be explained by shortening of earlier *þæh or *þæn owing to want of stress (cp. Anglia, Beiblatt, vol. ix. pp. 67 u. 100; Stodte, p. 45; Konrath, Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen, vol. lxxviii. p. 58).

ADDENDA.

Besides we have contracted forms with ē in VPs. (gesē, flēm, &c.; cp. Zeuner, p. 44); but only some call for discussion here. The 2. and 3. sg. prs. ind. ðwēs, ðwēð, slēs slēð are perfectly regular (WG. ā > āo by breaking > ē by i-mutation, &c.; cp. Anglia, Beiblatt, vol. vii. p. 72 sq.; vol. ix. p. 100). But instead of the opt. ofslē (only once) we should expect ofslē or ofslē (WG. ā > xō by breaking > x by smoothing, + ā > x). The form may be misspelt; or OE. sandan could turn into sendan. The above examples with ē < ā < āo in WG. ai + i show, however, that a change of ā > ð before nasals did take place in some OE. dialects (see also Sievers, Anglia, vol. xiii. p. 16 sq.).
it may have been influenced by the 2. and 3. sg. of the
inds., though this does not seem likely (cp. Anglia, Beiblatt
vol. ix. p. 90 sq.).

The adj. ēre is a difficult word. The usual form in the
VPs. is ēre; only once we find ērere (dative). The former
has, perhaps, originated in this manner: *ajukia- *>ajuki—
by narrowing, > *ejyēi- by i-mutation, > *e(f)yēi— or
*e(f)iēi- > ēre by contraction. That the form *ajukia-
was possible in WG. by the side of *aiwis (just the same
as in Gothic ajukīps by the side of aiwā; cp. Streitberg,
Gothisches Elementarbuch, 1897, § 74, Anmerkung),
may be conjectured from the fact that we have meowle in OE.
(cp. Gothic mawilō, mawi, and maojōs; Streitberg, § 75,
Anmerkung). This theory would explain the existence
of the close ǣ in all OE. dialects. Also ērere may be
a legitimate form. At all events, it would be hazardous
to try and explain it away as a spelling mistake on the
part of a scribe that evidently distinguished so well between
ē and ǣ in other words. Moreover it is noteworthy that
also the Ritual of Durham and the Lindisfarne Gospels
have ēre (four times in each text) and ēnisse (once in Li.),
though the usual forms are ēre and ēnisse (see Lindelöf's
dissertation and Cook's Glossary). Ru. has four times ēre
and three forms with ǣ (Brown, p. 71); but this text has
no consistent spelling. On the same ground the three
forms with ǣ in the early Kentish charters (Sweet, Oldest
English Texts) are unreliable. But the authenticity of ēre
(ǣre) is placed beyond doubt by the ME. form āche which
occurs in the Trinity College MS. of the 'Moral Ode,' l. 364:
God ene sal bēn āche lif and blisse and āche reste (quoted in
the New English Dictionary). For this MS. usually has the
spelling a for old WS. ǣ: dāde (<dāde), āche (ǣche), rāde
(rǣde), lāde (lǣde), tāche (tǣcan), adrāde (andrǣde), āfre

1 Cp. F. Kluge, Nominale Stammbildungslehre, 1886, § a12a. I have not
got the second edition at hand.
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(āfre), grādi (grādī), &c.; but e for Old WS. ē: iquême (i kutâman), dēme (dēman), sēcheð (sēčeð), lēten (lēton), &c. (see Morris’ edition for the Early English Text Society, 1873). ME. āche and OE. ēcē distinctly point to a WG. form with ai > early prehistoric English ā, which was mutated to ā; thus the development was, perhaps, this: *aiwikia-* > *āwici- > *ē(w)ici- > ēcē.

The origin and the sound of the e or ē in ele (Zeuner, p. 37), spēd (p. 44), lēgan (p. 51), ēgjan (p. 48), &c., are perfectly clear, and require no comment.

K. D. Bulbring.

Groningen, Netherlands,
November 10, 1899.
VIII.

A NOTE ON THE ORIGIN OF THE LITURGICAL DRAMA.

The dramatic Latin services which formed a part of the celebration of Easter in the ritual of the Mediaeval Church are now generally conceded to be the ultimate source of the later Mysteries and Passion Plays. But the way in which these dramatic services\(^1\) originated, and the relations in which they stand to the ritual of the Church on the one hand, and to the drama on the other, are matters which may not yet have been generally understood. Before presenting the essential facts and the arguments on which the best views are based, we must give a typical example of these inchoate dramas, with a brief account of their literary history.

The liturgical dramas in their simplest form consist of a dialogue between the Maries and the Angels (or Angel) at the Lord's sepulchre on the morning of the Resurrection. This scene, which we may call the sepulchre scene, is common to all the dramas. To this are added certain amplifications; first, the running of the Apostles Peter and

---

\(^1\) The awkward phrase 'dramatic service,' or 'celebration,' is used to avoid the more conventional term 'play,' because the latter is more correctly applied to a very different and more highly developed form of the liturgical drama. The Germans distinguish the two as *Osterfeiern* and *Osterspiele*, respectively.
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John to the sepulchre (John xx. 4), which we shall call the Apostle scene; secondly, Jesus appearing to Mary Magdalen, called the Magdalen scene. Taking the introduction of new scenes and new personages as the best evidence of a dramatic advance, we shall divide the dramas into three stages of development, ignoring in the general scheme certain minor differences: I. Grave scene. II. Grave scene plus Apostle scene. III. Grave scene plus Magdalen scene (with or without the Apostle scene).

There are now available 224 of these liturgical dramas, thanks to Dr. Carl Lange. Of the 224, Germany furnishes 159, France 52, Italy 7, Holland 3, Spain 2, and England 1. To the first stage belong 108 of the examples studied by Lange. In the simplest form the dramas of this group consist of four sentences, all of which are derived directly from the ritual, in which the drama itself was to be introduced as part of the service for Matins on Easter Sunday, after the third Responsory: *Dum (or Cum) transisset Sabbatum, Maria Magdalena, et Maria Jacobi, et Salome, emerunt aromata: Ut venientes unguerent Jesum, aevia, aevia.* As a rule the celebration was closed with the singing of the *Te Deum.* The following is a typical example of these dramas. The earliest (one from Bamberg, and the one from England) date from the tenth century, but their origin may be placed much further back. The more highly developed forms became popular in the twelfth century, but the primitive form eventually outlived its rivals, surviving till the eighteenth century.

(1) Angels: *Quem queritis in sepulchro, o christicolae?*
(2) Mariæ: *Ihesum nazarenum crucifixum, o celicola.*
(3) Angels: *Non est hic, surrexit sicut dixerat; ite, nuntiate quia surrexit (de sepulchro).*

1 Karl Lange, *Die lateinischen Osterfeiern,* München, 1887.
2 Lange, p. 76 sq. and p. 134 sq.
3 This is found in several slightly varying forms, see Lange, p. 78.
(4) Maries, or as Antiphon by the whole choir:
Surræxit enim, sicut dixit, dominus. ecce, precedet vos in
Galileam, ibi eum videbitis, alleluia, alleluia.

These sentences are variously modified and supplemented, but the general scheme remains always the same. And the same may be said of the more elaborate forms of these dramas, which we cannot discuss here, namely, those classed in groups II and III. One of the earliest and most popular of the amplifications consists in the incorporation of a part or the whole of the famous sequence: Victimae Pascali laudes immolent Christiani, which still remains a part of the service for Easter.

In 45 of the 198 plays of what we have called the first stage the variation from the type given above is almost nil; and these plays represent widely separated localities. Such close agreement seems almost impossible without a common source, or a common original: which have we here? Two of the supporters of the older view are in accord on the main question, viz. that there was one original drama, of which the others are but copies. Mone decides that the liturgical drama of the Middle Ages arose in the twelfth century, was originally in Latin, and was performed by clerks in the church itself. It was based on the Scriptures and legends, and was confined to certain feast days, the Church service for the day being part of its material. Indeed, its dialogue rested on the choral service and the responses of the liturgy, sung by the priests and the choir. The action necessary to explain the chanted dialogue was soon added. These simple dramas were adorned and embellished by the addition of Latin hymns, parts of which were soon paraphrased in the vernacular. As the plays became more elaborate, laymen were introduced to supply the necessary number of actors, and thus the whole became

1 Lange, p. 59 sq.  
2 Lange, p. 18 sq.  
3 Schauspiele des Mittelalters, I, p. 1 sq.; see Milchsaek, pp. 7-18.
eventually secularised. Milchsacl\textsuperscript{1} points out the four sentences which are, in one form or another, the kernel of practically all the Easter celebrations. These sentences he finds, are derived from the Gospel for the day, Mark xvi.1–7, with some signs of the use of Matt. xxviii.6. The close agreement of all the early plays in the matter of this original kernel indicates that they all derive from a common original, which was the work of one writer, and was known throughout Germany and France in the eleventh century. Both writers, therefore, agree in assuming that the dramatic services were really bona fide dramas, consciously composed as such, and inserted in the ritual, and that they are based upon the biblical and legendary accounts.

The error in this view of the origin of the ritualistic celebration is fundamental, in that there is an assumption of conscious dramatic design on the part of the authors. The facts of the case, now made available by two excellent German monographs\textsuperscript{2}, are quite against any such theory. The services of the Church itself are the only source of the earlier forms of these special celebrations, which form an integral part of the service, and were developed from within the ritual, not inserted or interpolated. The incorporation into the ritual of an element so essentially foreign as even the simplest drama must be seems unnatural, if not incredible. The fact is, not that a drama was composed and inserted in the ritual for Easter Sunday, but that in the ritual itself there were germs which finally developed into a dramatic representation.

Matins on Easter Sunday is named as the time for the representation, where any time at all is mentioned; and


\textsuperscript{2} Lange, see above; and Ludwig Wirth, \textit{Die Oster- und Passionsspiele bis zum XVI. Jahrhundert}, Halle, 1889.
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the drama, if we must call it such, is to be introduced after
the third Responsory mentioned above, and the Te Deum
closes it. Not until much later do we find any assignment
of parts, or any indication that any sort of action
accompanied the presentation. Indeed, the whole was
sung by the choir, just as they sang the Antiphons and
Responsories. The choir was next divided into two halves,
one to sing the part assigned to the Marys, the other that
of the Angels. The next step was taken when the words
were no longer sung by a certain number of persons in
the choir, in groups, but by certain individuals representing
the personages. This change probably took place in the
tenth century, perhaps even earlier.

But even when the simple and almost bald form of the
drama was given up, with the object of lengthening the
action and increasing its interest for the outlook for the
congregation, who for the most part could not have understood
the Latin words, little attention was paid to the most
elementary dramatic requirements. An excellent illustra-
tion of this is furnished in the earliest of the sentence
incorporated in the original service, which is found in the
ritual as a Responsory for Matins on Easter Sunday, and else
where as an Antiphon (the biblical source is Matt. xxviii. 6).
The sentence is: Venite et vincite lexum ubi passus est
dominus, sancta, sancta... Now this, being the invitatio-
non of the heavenly messengers to the Marys to come and
assure themselves of the truth of the Resurrection, should
of course have been placed before the words: Itur sanctam
quae surrissit de sepulcro. But in the great majority of
cases the dramatic effect is lost because it is not so placed.
And the reason for this awkward arrangement, one may
suggest, was simply the desire to avoid changing the form
of the two set verses from the ritual, whence both of the
sentences are taken. In some cases the two sentence

1 Lunge, p. 80 sq.
2 Ibid., p. 43 sq.
are united, and sung by the same person or the same part of the choir. In some cases, as in the English play\(^1\), one or more phrases such as *Alleluia, resurrexit dominus!* were introduced between the sentences *Non est hic*, &c., and *Veni et videte*, &c. But then we have the Resurrection announced twice. One play alone has put the sentences in their logical order, and this is a play of the eighteenth century, from Angers.

The presentation of the subject has been, I fear, neither clear nor adequate; but I trust it will be sufficiently evident from the preceding pages that it is not correct to regard these liturgical services as dramas, if by that term we mean that they were composed for dramatic purposes and treated as something extra-ritualistic. They were originally not dramas based upon the Gospels, like the later Mysteries, but simply choral services for special occasions. The words used in them are not from the Gospels directly, but from the ritual, and this derivation from a common universal source, but not from a common dramatic original, is the explanation of the similarity in form during the earlier stages. As soon as the dramatic notion asserted itself, we find, as we should expect, a greater diversity in form and treatment; for as long as the plays were not plays (if one may be pardoned an Hibernicism), but a part of the ritual of the Church, respect for the forms of that ritual restricted innovation. Hence it is no surprise to us to find that of all the sentences used in the 224 dramas examined by Lange only two cannot be traced to some portion of the ritual, and must therefore have been composed especially for use in the drama\(^2\).

PHILADELPHIA, December 17, 1899.

Pierce Butler.

\(^1\) Lange, p. 39 sq.; see also for text of the English play, J. M. Manly, *Specimens of the Pre-Shakespearean Drama*, vol. i. Boston, 1897; and W. S. Logeman, in *Anglia*, vol. xiii. p. 426, and xv. p. 20 sq.

\(^2\) Lange, pp. 54, 56, 77, and 167.
IX.

THE GOSPEL OF NICODEMUS AND THE YORK MYSTERY PLAYS.

The northern middle-English metrical version of the Gospel of Nicodemus (beginning 'Bytyd þe tyme Tiberius Rewled rome wþ reale') was edited by Dr. Horstmann in Herrig's Archiv, liii. (1874), 391 ff., from MS. Harleian 4196. Another copy is in MS. Cotton Galba, E. ix. (variants in the Archiv, lvi. 73-77); these two versions differ very little, except in minor points of orthography. A third and inferior copy, from Sion Coll. MS., was also printed by Horstmann in Herrig’s Archiv, lxxviii. 207 ff. It may be noted here that Dr. Morris's text of Hampole's Prick of Conscience is based upon the first two of these manuscripts; from information obtained by Dr. Murray, it appears that the Harleian MS. has supplied lines 1537-1729, and 6293-9210, the remainder being from the Cotton MS. It is remarkable that Horstmann, in his detailed description of MS. Harl. 4196 (Allenglische Legenden, Neue Folge, p. lxxviii. ff.), makes no mention of the fact that the last piece in the volume is the Prick of Conscience; the one immediately preceding it is the Gospel of Nicodemus (fol. 206).

Although the text of the Gospel has thus been accessible for more than twenty-five years, and is in itself a remarkably
good piece of northern verse, it seems to have attracted very little attention. It is not mentioned in the lists prefixed to Stratmann's or Mätzner's lexicons, and is not directly quoted in these works, although it contains several unusual words. Apart from its own merits, however (and these are by no means insignificant), the poem is interesting as one of the immediate sources of the York Mystery Plays, as I shall presently show. It has, of course, been recognized before now that the Gospel of Nicodemus was largely utilized by the playwright (see Miss Toulmin-Smith's Introduction, pp. xlviii and xlix, and Kamann, Die Quellen der York-Spiele, in Anglia, vol. x. pp. 189–226); but so far as detailed comparisons have been made, they have been based on the Latin text, whereas the evidence of direct borrowing from the English translation makes it clear that the dramatist did not work exclusively from the Latin original, though he was probably acquainted with it.

In what follows I shall quote all the passages which distinctly prove that the author of some of the York Plays was familiar with the northern version of the Gospel. These are sufficiently numerous to make it unnecessary to allege others in which the resemblance is less obvious, although there may be a strong presumption that they have been suggested by the same original. The different treatment required by the dramatic form naturally made it difficult to 'convey' more than a few lines at a time, and the condensed narrative of the Gospel has often been so expanded in the Plays that direct proof of borrowing would be difficult to establish.

The second verse of the Gospel (line 13) opens thus:

Symon, Zayrus, & Cayphas,
Datam, & Gamaliel,
Neptalim, Leui, and Judas
w^t pair accusyings fals & fell
Alexander, and als Annas,
Ogays Ihesu þai speke & spell,
Bifor sir Pilate gan þai pass;
þair tales vntyll him gan þai tell.

The order of the names here is not that of the Latin text, which (as quoted by Horstmann) has: 'Annas et Caiaphas, Summas et Datam, Gamaliel, Judas, Levi, Neptalim, Alexander et Jairus et reliqui Judaorum,' &c. But in Play xxxiii. 113, Caiaphas cites his witnesses thus:

Simon, Zarus, and Judas
Datan and Gamaliell,
Neptalim, Leui, and Lucas
And Amys þis maters can mell
to-githere
þer tales for trewe can þey telle
Of this faytou þat false is and felle.

In the first line 'Cayphas' had of course to be omitted, as he is the speaker; Annas also disappears, being a leading person in the play itself; Lucas and Amys are apparently invented by the dramatist, but in other respects it is pretty obvious that the lines of the Play are an echo of those in the Gospel.

In the third verse (line 25) the accusing Jews say:

We wate wele Joseph was a wryght
Sothly he was his syre,
And Mary, vs menes, his moder hight.

The echo of these lines is to be found in Play xxxvii. 229, where Satan says to Jesus:

Thy þadir knewe I wele be sight,
He was a write his mette to wynne,
And Marie, me menys, þi modir hight.

The form of the last line seems conclusive for the borrowing.

It is perhaps of less significance that line 59,
Bryng him to barr þis tyde,
has its equivalent in the Play (xxxiii. 134),

*sit we both besoke you, late brynge hym to barre.*

The phrase is general enough to have occurred independently.

In the Gospel there follows immediately the incident of the beadle doing homage to Jesus, at which the Jews ‘wex all full gull & grene,’ and complain to Pilate:

*þe bedell, suld to þe be trew,*  
*And do þi comandment,*  
*On knese here kneled he to Ihesu*  
*Right in þine awen present.*

This incident takes place in Play xxx. 306 ff., where the beadle’s action scandalizes the attendant soldiers, one of whom says (line 316),

All bedillis to your biding schulde be boxsome and bayne,  
and the other adds (line 319):

*Yha, and in youre presence he prayed hym of pees,*  
*In knelyng on knes to þis knave.*

The imitation here is pretty free; but the phrase ‘in your presence,’ common to both texts, is not in the Latin.

There is also considerable similarity in the treatment of Pilate’s question as to the meaning of ‘Osanna.’ The Gospel has (line 105):

*‘Osanna,’ quad Pilate,*  
*‘What es þat for to say?’*  
*þai said, ‘it menes all gate:’*  
*Lord, saue vs, we þe pray.’*

Compare Play xxx. 346:

*Pil.*  
*Nowe, gode sir, be þi feith,*  
*What is Osanna to saie?*  

*Bed.*  
*Sir, constrew it we may ..*  
*þou saue vs, we praye.*

The words ‘we pray’ (correctly given as part of the interpretation of Hosanna) are not due to the Latin
original, which has ‘Osanna in excelsis’ and ‘Salva nos qui es in excelsis.’

When the standards bend down to Jesus, the Jews abuse the standard-bearers (line 133):

\[\begin{align*}
\text{\`e}n \text{\`e} \text{Jewes full sterne} & \& \text{stout} \\
\text{Said, ‘\`is es hard hethyng;} \\
\text{\`ir lurdans lattes \`air sahaftes lout} \\
\text{And wroght him wirschiphyng.}
\end{align*}\]

The same tone, which is not justified by the words of the original, appears in the Play (xxxiii. 169):

\[\begin{align*}
\text{\textit{Cai.}} \text{ A! sir, saugh \`e no\`t \`is sight, how \`at \`er sahaftes schuke,} \\
\text{And the\`e baneres to this brothell \`ai bowde all on brede.} \\
\text{\textit{Ann.}} \text{ \`a, ther cursed knyghtes by crafte lete them croke,} \\
\text{To worshippe \`is warlowe vnworthy in wede.}
\end{align*}\]

With the second line here compare the words of the soldiers’ defence in the Gospel (line 142),

\[\text{The baners gan him bow.}\]

Further, note Pilate’s question in the Play (line 177), and its general resemblance to line 135 of the Gospel, quoted above:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{How dar \`e} \\
\text{\`er baners on brede \`at her blawe,} \\
\text{Lat lowte to \`is lurdan so lawe.}
\end{align*}\]

The standard-bearer’s reply (Gospel, line 143) is:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{‘It was ogayns our will’}. \\
\text{\`ai said \`it was witerly} \\
\text{Ogayns \`air will all gate.}
\end{align*}\]

This is only implied, not expressly stated in the Latin, but the Play (line 184) has much the same words:

\[\text{And \`is werke \`at we haue wrought it was not oure will.}\]

The new standard-bearers in the Gospel (line 157) are threatened by Pilate with the loss of life and land if they allow the standards to bow to Jesus:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{\`e men, \`t wyght} \& \text{willy ware} \\
\text{Said: ‘To \`i steuen we stand;}
\end{align*}\]
Whase heued so heldes brede of ane hare,
Hardily hag of his hand."

This differs entirely from the Latin text, in which Pilate threatens the former standard-bearers with the loss of their heads if the new holders succeed in keeping the standards straight. The Play (xxxiii. 243) agrees with the English version:

_Caiph._ If ye baners² bowe _he brede of an hare_
Platy _ye be putte to perpetuell pyne . . .

_II Mil._ When it wringis or wronge it wendis . . .
_Hardly lat hakke of myn hande._

The words italicised here are clearly not an accidental resemblance.

The following passage in the Gospel (line 183 ff.) is remarkable, as there is nothing like it in any MS. of the Latin text:

> _pe fende _jan thoght, if he war slayne,
> he suld saue men of syn,
> And sawles _he _had tane _wé _trayne
> _ffro him _í _tyme suld twyn;
> _ffor _ji _he _dose _his _myght _& _mayne
> To _ger _pat _bargan blyn:
> On _pe _nyght _als _ane _aungell
> he appered to Pilates wyfe:
> 'va to _ji _lord _ou _tell
> he _lett _noght _Ihesus _lyf.'

The same explanation of the intercession made by Pilate’s wife on behalf of Jesus is adopted in Play xxx. 159, but the wording of the scene is original. The only verbal resemblance is that between ‘I haue bene dreched wé dremes’ in the Gospel (I. 197) and ‘A! I am drecchid with a dreme full dredfully to dowte’ in the Play (I. 177).

A little further on, we have in the Gospel (I. 121):

_Crist said:_ ilk man a mouth has fre
To weld at his awen will.

² This is an obvious emendation of the _youn barnes_ of the text.
The same words, somewhat expanded, occur in Play xxxiii. 301:

Jes. Every man has a mouthe that made is on molde
In wele and in woo to welde at his will.

It seems pretty certain that the lines of the Gospel (317)
Takes him to yhow for þi
And demes him be yhour lawes,
are echoed in xxxiii. 317:

But take hym vn-to you forthy,
And like as youre lawe will you lere
Deme þe his body to abye.

Equally close is the relationship in the following case, where there is nothing corresponding in the Latin:

Play xxxiii. 326. I haue herde al haly why in hertes þe hym hate.

From this point the playwright makes no notable use of the Gospel until we come to the testimony of the centurion (l. 675):

þis ilk was god son, sykerly,
þat þus to ded es dyght.

With this compare Play xxxvi. 323:

Goddis sone verraye was he þis daye
þat doulfully to dede þus is diigt.

The Latin text has 'hic homo justus erat.'

More conclusive, however, is line 689,

þai said: sir, clerkes þeclyppes it call,

compared with Play xxxviii. 99:

þe wote our clerkiþeclipsis þei call
Such sodayne sight.

The Latin text has only 'eclipse solis facta est.'

A more extensive appropriation comes in the same scene.
The Gospel has (line 703):

þe sonne at his dede wex all wan
wele thre myle way or mare,
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The next five hundred lines of the Gospel are not prominent in the Plays, although there is probably an echo of 807 ff. in xxxviii. 238–252; the resemblances here are, however, slight enough to be accidental. This is certainly not the case with the following passages:

Gospel 1189.
I preched & said: all Neptalim land
And Zabulon land w* all, . . .
Men in myrknese ded walkand
Lyght vnto þam schyne sall.
þus I said whils I was lyfand.
I se it now bi-fall.

Play xxxvii. 51.
I preched in Neptalym, þat lande,
And Zabulon even vntill ende.
I spake of folke in mirke walkand,
And saide a light schulde on þame lende.
This lered I whils I was leuand.
Nowe se I God þis same hath sende.

There is also close correspondence between the words of Simeon in the two texts:

Gospel 1214.
Lord, leue þi seruand lele
In pese to rest, lord, I þe pray,
for myne eghen saw þi helc.
Compare further the testimony of John the Baptist, which follows immediately after the above:

Gospel 1237.
I baptyst him ryght wᵗ my hand
In þe water of fiom Jordan;
þe haly gast on him gan lend
In a dowfe lyknes þan;
þe voyce of the fader downe was send
And þus to speke bygan.

Play xxxvii. 75.
I baptiste hym with bothe my hande
Euen in þe floode of flume Jordanne;
þe holy goste fro heuene discende,
Als a white dowue doune on hym þanne;
The Fadir voice, my mirthe to mende,
Was made to me euen als manne.

This is the last case of clear and extensive borrowing from the Gospel on the part of the dramatist, though one or two passages seem to contain reminiscences of it. One of these occurs in Satan’s speech (xxxvii. 150),

þis traytoure traues vs alway,

where the use of _traues_ (in the Towneley copy _trauesses_) is probably due to the fact that it occurs in the Gospel (l. 1301),

He has me tende and trauerst ay.

The above parallels are quite sufficient to prove that the author of the plays cited was familiar with the northern version of the _Gospel of Nicodemus_. From the general character of his borrowings it seems most probable that he had parts of it by heart, and utilized these when opportunity or memory served. Had he been working
directly from a written copy, his borrowings would probably have been more numerous and closer to his original. That the translator and the dramatist were one and the same person is less likely; style and vocabulary are distinctly against such a supposition. It may be noted too that while many of the Plays are written in a stanza resembling that of the Gospel, the precise metre of the latter is not adopted in a single case. The difference is that in the latter the even lines have only three stresses (six syllables), while in the Plays they have four; compare the passages quoted above (ll. 1189, 1214, 1237) with the corresponding extracts from the Plays.

Both manuscripts of the Gospel belong to the early part of the fifteenth century, and are thus not much (if at all) older than the manuscript of the York Plays. There can be little doubt, however, that the translation is much earlier than this; in all probability it belongs to the first half of the fourteenth century. In any case, it is scarcely possible to fix its date so precisely as to exclude the supposition that the York Plays are, as a whole, to be dated c. 1350, and thus form part of the same vigorous literary movement in the north which has given to us the Cursor, the northern Homilies and Legends, the Prick of Conscience, and other notable works. The Gospel of Nicodemus is but a small thing beside these, but it seems to deserve fully more attention than it has hitherto received.

W. A. CRAIGIE.
X.

THE PLACE OF ENGLISH IN EDUCATION.

When I was asked to indicate my high estimate of Dr. Furnivall's services to the restitution of English, by the contribution of an Essay to the present volume, I found it impossible, as I was situated, to produce a finished composition on any subject within the appointed time. It was therefore a relief to me to learn that the Editors would welcome brief Articles, or even Notes, upon appropriate subjects. The theme which I have chosen strikes me as germane to the work of Dr. Furnivall, and it is one that has often forced itself upon my thoughts, but I am not prepared to treat it with any approach to completeness. If in what I am about to write the sequence should be sometimes indistinct, I must take shelter under the plea that I am but offering a few Notes.

I said 'restitution of English.' The fact is that since the Norman Conquest the native English has rarely had a chance. Overlaid by foreign materials in the great French inundation, it at length made itself heard in the fourteenth century by the voices of Langland and Chaucer, only to be again submerged in the rising tide of the Renaissance. But though often baffled it has shown that
wherever the true spirit of literature speaks, there English gets a chance. It is nowhere so clear and firm as in Shakespeare. His voice was drowned in the classical cataclysm of the seventeenth century. But reaction came with time, and the native note was again heard above the Babel in Swift, Defoe, Addison, Johnson, and Goldsmith. The general acceptance of these as standards is the spontaneous plebiscite of the nation in favour of native English. We do not want to discard the rich furniture of words which we have inherited from our French and classic eras; but we wish to wear them as trophies, as the historic blazon of a great career, for the decoration and amplification of an imperial language whose thews and sinews and vital energies are wholly and essentially English.

All indications point to such a restitution as this, and among the most conspicuous of such indications is the magnificent series of the Early English Text Society. This restitution will be promoted by whatever tends to establish a true method of education. The method wants revising. To take only one part of the task of education, the intellectual, we may see that it is ineffective. The aim of this branch of education is to impart to the next generation the tradition of knowledge. To do this in any educational sense becomes more and more difficult as the stores of knowledge increase. Our hold upon the educational idea is more and more relaxed in favour of courses of instruction which aim at external advantage and commercial utility. Our methods want revising: present systems throw too much upon the memory, and by mere memory any real possession of knowledge—correlated, compact, organic, vital, prolific knowledge—cannot be acquired.

The chief preparatory work for admittance into a public school consists in learning the Latin and Greek Accidence;
that is, the different forms which words assume in order to express their grammatical relations to one another in the sentence. This is a long and weary work, and the burden of it is all on the memory. No other faculty is called into play in this process, which consequently has a deadening effect upon young minds that had once been alert with curiosity and inquiry. Whoever was the author of that saying, 'Education is the grave of a great mind,' may have been thinking of this stage. Some few, who are to retain their intellectual vitality, do at this stage by some instinctive prevision develop a passion for indiscriminate reading, in which there is surely some remedial tendency involved.

This long and tedious stage might be greatly reduced and almost superseded by an early familiarity with English grammar. If before touching the Latin grammar the child had been well practised in English parsing, he would quickly see the value of the Latin terminations, and then the strangeness of their form would interest his mind, and they would not be a dead weight upon his memory. And not only so, but he would catch sight of an inward sympathy between studies that seemed wide apart, and they would make him (thus early) the discoverer for himself of a master principle which pervades the whole realm of knowledge. Thus winged, the child would find in his schoolwork an exhilarating zest like that of the chase, he would pursue his studies with alacrity, and he would not need to be often assured that it is possible to find a keen pleasure in the pursuit of knowledge.

Grammar has two uses: educational and instrumental. The second is the one best known, recognized, and honoured. In its instrumental use grammar is an artificial help towards learning a new language; thus the Latin grammar is committed to memory as a means of acquiring the Latin language. If this were the only or the chief use
of Latin grammar, the process would be more of a failure than it is. It is certain that only a very small percentage of those who work through Latin grammar and do Latin lessons for many a long year can ever, with utmost stretch of courtesy, be said to have acquired the Latin language. Nevertheless, they do get something which is in the proper sense of the word educational. A youth who has gone through this training may fairly enough be said by an adverse critic to know nothing, and yet he cannot be said to be uneducated. He has not acquired much knowledge, but he can turn his mind to anything. And this is the outcome of grammatical exercises, entered upon for the instrumental purpose of learning Latin, but fruitful in a way unanticipated, in a higher way and wider range, in a manner truly educational. For while he has been exploring his bits of Latin and Greek, and making something out by dint of his old grammar lessons, he has been unconsciously exercising his mind in those inner relations of language by which a chaos of strange words is transformed into a reasonable sentence—and all this bears a real analogy to the problems of life. But alas! the period of childhood is already far advanced when this benefit is attained, whereas it might have been attained in earlier years with advantages multiplied manifold.

These educational advantages which are now gained indirectly through Latin, with great waste of time and power, might be gained directly and naturally through the medium of English grammar, leaving a great balance of time in favour of the child’s progress in Latin and many other things. More reasons than one might be rendered for this opinion, but I will on this occasion pass all others by for the sake of one. English is the mother tongue; when lessons begin, the child has already acquired English, that is his stock in hand. Upon this the educator ought to work, and then there is no sudden transition, no breach
of continuity. The known is made the avenue to the unknown. So learnt, grammar will plant in the mind a sense of inner relations, not quite explicitly and in full, as logic does, but only half revealed as a pleasurable instinct and impulse to curiosity.

Insight thus early acquired would illuminate all after-studies and quicken them indefinitely. As all lessons would glide along in the stream that took its start far above in the pre-lesson period, so the end of lessons would not be the end of education. The continuity established early would have become a habit of mind, and inner relations would be seen everywhere inviting the mind to inquiries ever new. This habit will lead him to be continually acquiring, easily and almost unconsciously growing in knowledge, and it will save him from the sentence which I am about to quote.

In one of Jowett's published letters he wrote to F. T. Palgrave thus: 'To teach men how they may learn to grow independently and for themselves, is perhaps the greatest service that one man can do for another—and how to grow, if possible, in after life. I hate to meet a man whom I have known ten years ago, and find that he is at precisely the same point, neither moderated, nor quickened, nor experienced, but simply stiffened; he ought to be beaten.'

The phenomenon here animadverted upon is familiar to all observers, and it is the natural result of a system of education which is abruptly detached from the leading of Nature. There is no mistaking the voice of Nature, which says that the primary material of education is the mother tongue.

This elementary truth is well attested by the authority of early educationalists, as may be seen in Mr. Quick's well-known book, entitled Essays on Educational Reformers. It was the opinion of Mulcaster (a great educator, though justly ridiculed by Shakespeare for his pedantic style) that
reading and writing in English were to be secured before Latin was begun. His elementary course included these five things: English reading, English writing, drawing, singing, playing a musical instrument. If these subjects occupied the school-time up to the age of twelve, Mulcaster held that more would be done between twelve and sixteen than between seven and seventeen in the ordinary way.

To the same effect is the testimony of Comenius the Moravian (1592-1671), in honour of whom the great library of pedagogy at Leipzig is called the 'Comenius Stiftung.' Comenius said that schools had failed, for instead of keeping to the true object of education, and teaching the foundations, relations, and intentions of all the most important things, they have neglected even the mother tongue, and confined the teaching to Latin; and yet that language has been so badly taught, that from ten to twenty years are spent in acquiring as much knowledge of Latin as is speedily acquired of any modern tongue. Till the pupil is from eight to ten years old he should be instructed only in the mother tongue, and about things. Then other languages can be acquired in about a year each; Latin, which is to be studied more thoroughly, in about two years.

English education has some admirable results, but they are not in the intellectual region: on this side the method needs revision, and will never be sound until the mother tongue is restored to its natural office.

J. EARLE.
ON THE HISTORY OF THE \textit{z}-GENITIVE IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

\textsc{Mätzner} in his \textit{Englische Grammatik}, vol. iii\textsuperscript{3}, p. 326, treats of the interesting case in which the genitival attribute of a noun, though formally governed by the latter, is logically the governing noun, while the other is its attribute. In the expression, 'I am a devil of a fellow' (Sheridan, \textit{Riv.} IV. i. 135), the word 'fellow' is in reality the governing word and the word 'devil' its attribute, the whole being equivalent to 'I am a devilish fellow.'

\textsc{Mätzner} takes this kind of genitive, or, as we will briefly call it, \textit{z}-genitive, to be a younger variety of the well-known appositive genitive; and in this he is no doubt right, as the former is but a special case of the condition common to both of them, that the notions contained both in the governing noun and the governed are represented as referring to one and the same thing or person, a condition not to be observed in other genitival combinations.

We shall now first of all have to consider how this theoretical assumption agrees with the historical facts. Expressions of the type 'I am a devil of a fellow' are, as is well known, quite common nowadays. But only a few centuries ago they were not so, \textsc{Mätzner}'s earliest instance dating from the third quarter of the seventeenth
century: ‘Twas a strange riddle of a lady’ (Butler, *Hudibras*, I. 3, 337). And the further we go back towards the Middle English period the more rarely are $x$-genitives to be met with. In the writings of the sixteenth century two examples only have been found up to now, one (if we do not count the questionable ones) in Shakespeare’s plays, ‘Whereon this Hydra son of war is born’ (*2 Henry IV*, iv. 2. 38); and one in Lord Berners’ *Huon*, ‘There was in þe castell a VII score prisoners of Frenchmen’ (90, 30).

And the same small number of instances are furnished by the writings of the fifteenth century: ‘he was a ryght good knyght of a yonge man’ (Malory, *Morte Arthure*, ed. Sommer, 117, 34), ‘and [he] helde a Royal feeste and table rounde with his alyes of kynges, prynces and noble knyghtes’ (*ibid.* 160, 3), these two being the earliest $x$-genitives of all that have been found in English up to the present day.

I may insert here in passing that in Swedish, Danish, and German the expression in question is likewise well known, but in these languages its use is of a much more recent date even than it is in English, as none of the examples found in them are earlier than the second quarter of the eighteenth century, Swedish taking the lead with *en arg skälm af en dräng* (Lagerström, a. 1731, cf. Dict. of the Swedish Academy, s. v. *af*); Danish following with *en Shyngel af en Barber* (Holberg, a. 1740?), and German closing with *irgend ein Ungeheuer von Geheimnis* (Schiller, 1778, cf. Heyne, *German Dict.* s. v. *von*).

Let me add here, by the way, that, as I am told by Prof. Mogk of Leipzig, the language of the common people in Norway shows no trace of the genitive in question, and that H. Paul in his *German Dict.* s. v. *von* accompanies the few $x$-genitives that he takes from Goethe’s plays with the remark that the construction is ‘of unknown origin.’ So that of all the Germanic $x$-genitives
known at present the English one is by far the oldest, and consequently has a better right to be looked at as indigenous than any of the rest.

Our next duty will be to try and find out if this English x-genitive is really what it appears to be: born on the soil on which it was to flourish later. Now if, as stated above, the x-genitive is the direct offspring of the genitive of apposition, we shall have to look for a free use in English of the latter genitival type for as long a period at least as the former should have been in the making, i.e. some time before the first English instances of the x-genitive make their appearance. And in this we are not disappointed, as during the whole period of what we call Middle English proper, appositive genitives are quite common. If, however, we go still further back, we meet with the same phenomenon as in the case of the x-genitive. In Early Middle English appositive genitives are comparatively scarce, their idea being more commonly expressed by means of the simpler apposition, i.e. juxtaposition. And in Old English this juxtaposition is distinctly the rule, with the proper noun at the end (ðæs burh Hierico, on þam ealond Sicilia), or in front (Orcadas þæ ealond, be Tinan þære ea, upan Sinai munt, on Augustus monē, scop him Hearþ naman), so much so that, not counting the several instances adduced by Wulfing in his Syntax in the Works of Alfred the Great, i. p. 45, which are some of them nearer related to the qualitative or partitive genitives than to the appositive one, while others in the excessive figurativeness of their conception betray unmistakably their oriental (viz. biblical) source, there are not more than two examples that I know of that are not objectionable in any way: one in Matth. iv. 13 (Durh.), he forleort ceastra Natsareōes, cited by Koch in his Historical Grammar of the English Language, ii. § 233;
and another one, *Romes burh*, which I found twice in a late tract contained in Wülker’s *Anglo-Saxon Prose* (ii. 181, 14 and 187, 188), these two being practically the only exceptions to the rule observed by Old English writers.

And this state of things is in perfect accordance with the rest of the Teutonic languages, which all of them are very poor in examples of the genuine appositive genitive, Old Norse excepted, which yields some instances of it in its full-grown unmistakable form; so that, looking at it broadly, we receive the impression that the genitive of apposition does not belong to the true Germanic stock of phrases.

But although it is evident that the English appositive genitive is the product of imitation rather than of regular development, of an imitation the model to which is neither far to seek nor hard to find, it had within a short time become incorporated into the language so entirely that it might very well have been capable of engendering from its own loins an *x*-genitive as genuine as any of those cited above. Certainly it might; however, considering the experience we made a few pages back, and many more such experiences mentioned elsewhere, I have not the slightest doubt that the English language, here as well as there, instead of laboriously developing the new phrase out of older materials, would have preferred imitating a handy foreign model if there should have been one in its reach. And the existence


2 Any more than, according to Delbrück, l.c., it belongs to that of the *indogermanic Ursprache.*
of some such foreign model is not to be doubted. We may
safely infer it from the sudden appearance of the $x$-genitive
in New Swedish. For if, as we have seen, that language
did not form it of itself, and as during the first decades of
the eighteenth century the influence of the English language
upon the Swedish language was so slight that the latter
cannot possibly have borrowed the phrase from the former,
we are forcibly driven to the conclusion that the model on
which the Swedish phrase was formed existed and was in
common use about that time in some language other than
those we have spoken of hitherto.

And in fact at that time there existed an $x$-genitive
outside the Teutonic languages; it was in common use in
a language which at various times has influenced the English
as well as the rest of the Teutonic languages to a very large
extent indeed. The language I mean is, as will be easily
guessed, the French. But although the Teutonic languages
have never been slow in importing and imitating words and
phrases from the French, in the case of the $x$-genitive
the indebtedness of the former to the latter has yet to be
proved. Of course if we had no Germanic instances earlier
than the beginning of the eighteenth century, the New
French ce fripon de valet would do perfectly for a model
to any one of the Teutonic languages. But unfortunately
our earliest examples date from the end of the fifteenth
century, while on the other hand not one Old French
$x$-genitive has come to light hitherto which, in structure
as well as in thought, would be qualified to pass for a model
of those earliest English examples. How are we to get
over this difficulty? With a view to clearing it away I
shall first of all make a few preliminary remarks on the
extent of the use of the $x$-genitive in the Romance
languages.

Now in the first place, if we refer to Delbrück's excellent
work on comparative syntax, cited above, we learn the
important fact that of all the Indogermanic languages it is
the Latin, and only the Latin, that ever succeeded in
forming out of the substance of its appositive genitive the
very kind of genitive which is the subject of this paper.
Delbrück gives two instances of it: *sceius viri* and
*monstrum mulieris*; a third, *flagitium hominis*, we find in
Diez’s *Grammar of the Romance Languages*, iii. p. 137, all
of them taken from the plays of Plautus and Terence, i.e.
belonging to the language of the Roman lower classes.

Here we must stop for a moment in order to answer first of
all the question, ‘Is it possible that it was that very Latin
*π*-genitive that served as a model to those Early English
imitators?’ From several reasons, I think, we shall have
to answer this question in the negative. For, firstly, in Old
English and Early Middle English, the periods during
which the Latin influence on English was strongest, we can
find no trace of the expression in the writings of the latter.
And secondly, as to Middle English proper, we meet with
no evidence favouring the opinion that the plays of Plautus
or Terence have ever been closely studied by the learned
men of that period, their favourite Roman playwright being
Seneca, whose stately lines will hardly be found guilty of an
*π*-genitive. So, everything considered, I do not think that
Latin expressions such as *monstrum mulieris* have ever
been any direct help in the forming of English phrases such
as ‘a monster of a woman,’ how identical soever the two
idioms may be as to form and thought. And so we shall
have to look further.

Now in studying the chapter on the genitive in Diez’s
Grammar, i.e., we are not surprised to find that our *π*-geni-
tive, like most of the expressions as well as forms belonging
to Low Latin speech, has been preserved by nearly all the
languages taking their origin from the Latin. Diez cites
specimens of the *π*-genitive from Italian (*il poverino di mio
fratello*), from Spanish (*el lindo de Cornelio*), from Portu-
guese (os cativos destes olhos meus), from Provençal (diable de gens), and from French (fripon de valet). From Old French, however, Diez does not know, or at any rate does not give, more than one solitary example, viz. la dolente d'emereris, meaning literally 'this doleful (one) of an empress,' and this with its adjective substantive for a governing noun, analogous as it is in structure to the phrase as found in most of the other Romance languages, just happens to be as unlike as possible to the Middle English or New English expression.

But here it is that the good comes in of our otherwise superfluous preliminary remarks. Looking at the Latin and the New French examples, it is easy to see that there must needs have been in Old French examples of the individual type of monstrum mulieris or fripon de valet. For if we could suppose that there is an unfilled gap between the two we should be driven to the conclusion that the New French type owed its existence to an imitation from the Latin idiom or the Provençal one, or perhaps even the English one, a conclusion which, improbable as it is on the face of it, we should certainly not be willing to make.

Being fully persuaded that the want of Old French instances of the type in question was due to oversight only, I resolved to go in search of the type myself, and to make matters short, have after many fruitless searchings at last succeeded in finding, what scores of monographs on Old French syntax were disappointing silent on, viz. no less than seven instances of it. They all of them occur in Froissart's Chronicles, and run as follows:

Et fuissent venu à paiz et à apointement envers le conte, se chiis diables de castiel n'eust esté ars, vol. ix, p. 186; nous le prions que il se voelle retraire et mettre hors de nostre royaume ces maleoites gens de Compagnes, vii. 57.—Très chiers sires, vous avés soustenu le oppinion monsigneur
Charle de Blois, votre cousin, et ossi fist vosbre signeur de père, vi. 177; quant il rendi les terres à son signeur de père, vii. 84; ce Philippe, qui demoroi avoecques sa demoiselle de mère, et vovoient de leurs rentes tout bellement, x. 82; car pour ce temps il estoit contes d'Artois, car sa dame de mère estoit morte, ibid. 251; les convenances qu'il avoit eues à son signeur de père, ibid. 252.

So the gap is satisfactorily stopped, and the chain of development happily complete, its first link being represented by the Latin examples, in which abstracts or part notions of abstracts are used as governing nouns; its second link being represented by one of the Old French examples and those of most of the other Romance languages, which show for a governing noun an adjective substantive, i.e. an abstract notion restricted to one individual; its third link being represented by one Provençal example, and most of the Old French as well as New French instances, in which appellatives are used as governing nouns. In this way we pass from the general to the particular by slow and consequently natural degrees.

From Old French the $x$-genitive was imported into English during the latter half of the fifteenth century, while it was more than three hundred years later that the New French $x$-genitive was imitated by the rest of the Germanic languages.

But throughout all these transmissions and ramifications the $x$-genitive preserved the one characteristic feature that it owned at the outset; that is, that its use is restricted to low or, at least, colloquial style.

Eugen Einenkel.

Münster, December, 1899.
XII.

JUDITH i—121.

Large is the face of our world, but she loosed not trust in His gifts,
And sure was the sheltering grace of His hand, in her sharpest call
To the Prince, who presides, far-famed, in the height, to protect her now
From the worst of the Fear; and the Lord of His creatures willed her the boon
For her fullness of faith in the glorious omnipotent Father enskied.
And the heart grew fain, as I heard, within Holofernes the king,
And he sent forth a bidding to wine, a banquet of bravery measureless,
For all the eldest of thanes in the orders of shielded fighters,
And the chiefs of the folk came quick to that mighty captain of theirs.

And fourth was the day since the fairly-radiant Damsel had sought him, the deep-souled Judith;
And they fared to the feast, his fellows in sorrow,
And with lust of the wine-cup uplifted was every Breast of the warrior in battle-mail.
And they bore down the benches the beakers lofty,
Full cups and flagons for feasting in hall;
And the soldiers seized them, the strong men in bucklers,
Who were sealed—and their sovereign saw not—to
death.
And the giver of gold was gay with the revel,
Holofernes, the fear and the friend of his earls,
And he laughed aloud, and hallooed and shouted
In fierceness of mood, and far the tempestuous
Clamour was caught by the children of mortals
As mad with the mead-cup he monished them often
To bear themselves bravely at board and be men.
Curst was his soul, and his company doughty he
Drowned in their drink while the daylight held,
And he whelmed them in wine, the warriors all,
Till they lay at the last like dead men stricken, in languor
lapped,
With good things gorged by their valorous giver of treasure.
And he
Saw they were served as they sat in the feast-hall
Till dusk had descended nigh on the world.
And he bade them, that soul of all sins commingled,
To bring to his bed the blest among women,
Bracelet-laden, and lordly with rings.
And swiftly his servants set to the will of
The mailed ones' master, and made in a flash
To the guest-room of Judith, of judgement deep.
And they found her, and fetched the fairest of ladies
To his tall-arched tent, the targeted warriors,
Where the lord Holofernes, the loathed of the Saviour,
Slept through the nights; and encircling the couch
Was a curtain all netted of comeliest gold
For the captain of war and contriver of harms
To watch on the warriors that went to his chamber,
And be noted by none that came near him of mortals
Whom he called not in quest of their counsel himself,
The prince in his pride, from the proven in battle.

And they carried unto his couch the woman whose
cunning was sure,
And the mind of the men was o'ercast as they went to
their master with word
That the heavenly maid had been brought to the bower;
and he, their lord,
The leader of cities, the famous, was stirred to laughter
of heart,
And was fain to defile the bright one and tarnish her
fairness. God,
Wielder of war-men, and Guardian of might, and Awarder
of fame,
Kept the king from his deed, and let not the crime
betide.
Then his heart was hot with his lust, and he went, the
hellish of soul,
Mid the press of his princes, along to his bed, where the
pride of his life
Was to finish before the morn; not soft was the fortune
here
Of the monarch of many, the puissant of soul, but meet
for his works
On earth done under the sky, and his mind was empty
of wit
As he stumbled to sleep his fill, the chieftain sodden with
wine.

Then strode the soldiers straight from the chamber,
Drenched in their drink; they had drawn the detested
one,
False to his faith and fell to his people, the
Last time on earth to his lair, in haste.
And the handmaid of God in her heart took counsel
Swiftly to slay, as he slumbered, the terrible
Lecher unclean, for her Lord; and His maiden
With coiling tresses, caught from its scabbard
A sword that was scoured unto sharpness of temper;
And next she besought by His Name the Redeemer of
Men upon earth by His might in the firmament:
‘Chief of Thy creatures and Child of Omnipotence,
Spirit of comfort and Star of the Trinity,
Give me Thy grace in my greatness of trouble.
For my heart is afire within, and my soul is heavy, and
sore
Sunken in sorrow; be mine of Thy grace, O Sovereign
above,
Conquest, and keenness of faith that my sword shall cut
him in twain,
Murder’s minister yonder! And mighty One, Master of all,
Glory-allotter to men, and great in Thy majesty, now
Favour and save me, of mercy, in this my fullness of need;
Wreak for the wrath and the flame of my soul a repayment.’
And soon
He in the highest who sits made sharp her heart in its
strength,
As He may for us men who entreat Him aright and with
meetness of faith;
And the heart of the holy maid was enlarged, and her
hope made new.

And hard she haled by the hair the idolater
Deadly and hateful, and dragging him disdainfully
Forth to her fealty, to fall at her mercy.
And the sword of the maiden with sinuous tresses
Flickered and fell on the furious-hearted
Bane of his foes, bit into his neck-bone.
And drunken he lay there, drowned in a stupor,
And life in him lingered, though large was his wound.
And she smote with the strength of her soul once more.
At the heathenish hound, and the head rolled over
Forth on the floor; and the filthy carrion
Lay on the bed without life; but the spirit had
Fared away far in the fathomless underworld,
To be hampered in hell-pains and humbled eternally,
Wreathen with serpents in regions of torment,
Fettered and fast in the flame of perdition.
He has done with our life; nor dare he have hope
In the heart of the dark habitation of dragons
Thence to depart, but he there must abide
In that dwelling of dimness, undawned on of joy,
Ever and ever for infinite ages.

OLIVER ELTON.
DURING the reign of Edward VI Udall devoted himself to theological works; he stood up for the royal prerogative in religious matters in his ‘Answer to the Articles of the Commoners of Devonshire and Cornwall’ (summer, 1549); he took his share in a memorial volume published in 1551 after Bucer’s death, and he translated Peter Martyr’s Tractatus and Disputatio de Eucharistia. A royal patent (of 1551) granted him the ‘privilege and lycense . . . to print the Bible in Englyshe, as well in the large volume for the use of the churches within this our Realme . . . as also in any other convenient volume.’ This privilege was not the only sign of royal favour: we find Udall in November, 1551, presented by the King to a prebend in Windsor, and later (in March, 1553) to the parsonage of Calborne in the Isle of Wight.

1 An interesting letter of Udall’s, dated August, 1552, referring to his place at Windsor, was printed in the Archaeologia, 1869, vol. xlii. p. 91, but has not hitherto been utilized for Udall’s biography. It refers to ‘peculations and alienations of property effected by the Dean and Chapter of the Royal Chapel of St. George,’ in which Udall fortunately was not implicated. The preface to a translation of T. Geminus’s Anatomy by Udall is dated July 20, 1552, cf. Cooper’s Account, xxxii; Udall’s Epistolas et Carmina ad Gul. Hermannum et ad Jo. Lelandum are quoted by Bale, and given under this year by Cooper l. c. (who reads Hermannum). But since Hermann died 1535 as vice-provost of Eton, at least the first part of these letters belongs to an earlier date.
After these favours received from Edward, and after these services in the Protestant camp, we should expect to find Udall in disgrace under Queen Mary and sharing with his fellow Protestants at least the bitter fate of exile; but Mary had apparently preserved a grateful memory for her former fellow worker in the Erasmian translation.

If indeed she did not use him as a theologian, she remembered his dramatic talents; and so we find that a special warrant\(^1\) was issued December 3, 1554, which shows us Udall in the rôle of playwright.

The Office of the Queen’s Revels was directed by the warrant referred to, to deliver to Udall such ‘apparel’ at any time, as he might require for the ‘setting forth of Dialogues and Enterludes’ before the Queen, for her ‘regell disporte and recreacion.’

In the beginning of this document appears an allusion to Udall as having shown previously ‘at soundrie seasons’ his ‘dilligence’ in arranging such dialogues and interludes, important documentary evidence of his connexion with the ‘Revels’; a connexion apparently begun with the pageant for which he furnished such poor verses at Anne Boleyn’s coronation.

This evidence for the fact that Udall was known as a writer of ‘plays’ before 1554 is singularly corroborated by the quotation of Roister’s letter to Custance as an example of ‘ambiguity’ in the 1553 edition of Wilson’s Logike\(^2\).

\(^1\) This warrant was communicated to the Archaeological Society, Dec. 9, 1824, by Mr. Brae (Archaeologia, xxi. 551), but not printed until 1896, in The Loqley MSS. . . . now first edited by A. J. Kempe, No. 91, p. 63.

\(^2\) The first edition of The Rule of Reason, 1551, does not contain the quotation from Roister Doister, neither does the edition of 1559 (cf. Arber, Introd., p. v, where a mistake of the printer has introduced the year 1669, 1665). The quotation appears for the first time in the third edition, 1553 (fol. 66). The Dict. Nat. Biogr. quotes again the first edition, 1550-1, as containing the passage, perpetuating Collier’s old mistake. Cf. the introduction to my edition of Roister Doister in Gayley’s Representative English Comedies, vol. i. (Macmillan, 1900).
As to the nature of Udall’s ‘Dialogues,’ ‘Enterludes,’ and ‘devises,’ we are not entirely without information.

The very date of the warrant would indicate the occasion for Udall’s services (December 3, 1554), if we had not a more definite statement. He was commissioned to get up the Christmas shows before Mary and Philip.

Philip had entered London in August (1554), and had perhaps not yet got over the shock which he received at the conduit in Gracechurch Street, where in a pageant of the nine worthies, Henry VIII was represented as one of them delivering a book to his son on which was written ‘Verbum Dei’! His stay in England had brought about a terrible crisis, the nation being almost rebellious, and the gaping volcano being scarcely hidden from his eyes by shows, ‘grette tryumphs,’ tournaments and processions.

Udall had a dangerous position, since any reference to the Protestant sympathies of the nation, any mask with Verbum Dei, for instance, would have cost his life; but he realized the situation, and with good tact presented ‘divers plaies,’ the ‘incydents’ of which were very innocent.

It is remarkable that the documents containing the references to these ‘plaies’ of Udall’s should never have been utilized before for his biography. They were published as early as 1836 in a volume of the greatest importance for the history of the English pageant: The Loseley M.S.S. M.S.S. and Documents illustrative of some of the more minute Particulars of English History, Biography and Manners, from the reign of Henry VIII to that of James I, preserved in the Muniment Room of James More Molynex, Esq., at

1 Cf. the amusing details given by Holinshed (after Fosse), edited 1586, fol. 1120; see also Froude, v. 425.
2 Cf. the splendid account of these critical months in Froude, v. 422-534.
3 They have been utilized as little for the biography of Heywood, of whom a ‘Play of Ireland’ and a ‘Play of Children’ are mentioned, p. 89, from the last years of Edward VI’s reign.

G 2

The account given by Kempe of the Christmas Mask, 1 & 2 Phil. and Mary, mentions besides the Christmas plays, a mask 'prepared against halow tyde,' another 'made against Shrovetide,' and others 'prepared at St. Androes tyde against the brekyng up of the terme,' and although the arrangement of the notes in Kempe is not quite clear, it seems highly probable that these plays were also by Udall.

The account, giving us the titles of at least two of Udall's pageants, is as follows:

A mask of patrons of gallies like Venetian senators, with galley-slaves for their torch-bearers; a mask of 6 Venuses or amorous ladies with 6 cupids and 6 torch-bearers to them [how Philip must have sighed here, sitting at the side of Mary!], and certen plates made by Nicholas Udall and ther incyidents; [now follow the 'incyidents':] 8 daggers for patrons of gallies of paste and cement; karver [for] 16 hed peces of ashen hoope wood in queynete and straunge fashion by him made and prepared by the men turkes maskers at 4s. the pec; 8 fawchons for the said turkes magistrates, very faier, the hafts, lockets, chapes, and cement mowided worke, the shethes covered with great velvet, and bulleynd with copper, very fayer, at 6s. 8d.; other fawchons for the said Turkes archers that were torche-bearers, made all of tree, carved with mens heads, of sundry fassions fayer, at 3s. 4d. the pec; 8 hed peces for women's maskses, goddesses, huntresses, at 2od. the pec; 8 quevers 3 square, w4 arrows in every of them for the same, very faier, at 2s. 8d. the pec; 8 bowes for them at 12d. the pec; 8 dartes of tree for the Turkie women that were torche-bearers at 16d. the pec; a mask of 8 maryners1, of cloth of golde and silver, with 8 other maryners to their torcher-berers, of silke sarcenet and taffata prepared against halow tyde; mowided worke for the Venuses hed peces2 at 3d. the pec; 8 bowes with arrows fastened in them, and going thorowe the bowes with a clapp, for the Cuples of the said mask of Venuses, at 16d. the pec; 8 quevers with 3 arrows a pec in them, to hange at the backes of the said cupides, at 2s. 8d. the pec; 8 dos.

1 By Udall
2 I suppose this refers to the Christmas Mask of '6 Venuses.'
of buttons to be turned for bothe the maskes of men and women, at 12d. the doz.; basket makers working upon properties by task; 8 pair of shakells and cheynes to them of wicker work, for the galley slaves, at 16d. the pece; making of 6 fruiterers baskets of wicker for the torche-berers to the women maskers, at 3d. the pece; hier of a barge with 8 oars and 2 wherries for carriage of the said masks, their torche berers, dromes, fieffes, apparel, with all their properties, furniture, chests, and hampers, by water, from the office of the Revels to the court, attending the same in the afternoon and very late at night 15s. 4d.; a mask of 6 Turkes magistrates, with 6 turkes archers, the torche-berers; a mask of women like goddesses, huntresses, with Turkey menne, the torche-berers, made against Shrouetide (1st and 2nd Philip and Mary); a maske of 6 Hercules or men of war comynge from the sea with 6 maryners to ther torche-berers, prepared at St Androes tyde, against the brekyng up of the terme; a mask of covetus men with long noses; a mask of men like Argus; a mask of women Mores; a mask of Amazons; a triumph of Cupide with pageants of Mars and Venus, their torche-berers and attendants; a mask of black and towney tinsell, with babuns faces; a mask of Pollenders, a mask of soldiers, to ther torche-berers; a maske of women like Diana hunting, a maske of matrons to their torche-berers.

Thus far the account of Udall’s ‘plaiés’ in Mr. Kempe’s extracts. A new and careful examination of the original documents at Loseley Hall would doubtless give us not only valuable new details, but also a greater certainty about the chronology of these old pageants, as valuable for the early history of the English drama, as for the history of English taste, of English manners.

Ewald Flügel.

Stanford University, California,
January 12, 1900.

1 This seems to refer to Udall’s Christmas Mask of ‘Patrons of Gallies,’ but it might also refer to the ‘Halow-tyde’ Mask of ‘8 Maryners.’
XIV.

TWO NOTES ON OLD ENGLISH DIALOGUE LITERATURE.

(a) A Fragment of an Old English Elucidarium.

To Greek philosophy we owe the introduction of dialogue as a special literary form into the world of letters. In passing through the hands of the Romans, it soon received a more practical turn, being used not so much for the discussion of ideas, as for the teaching of a given subject. At an early period the Christian Church adopted it as a welcome and effective means of instruction, now condensing the elements of Christian faith into baptismal scrutinia or catechisms, then collecting the whole of dogmatical theology or biblical archaeology and history into a more or less bulky Summa Theologiae or Elucidarium. With the Teutonic races this dialogical form of teaching became the sooner popular and the more familiar as it was met there by an ancient and deep-rooted custom of verbal contests and an inveterate love for riddle questions. There too, most likely, some popular or lay element first gained influence over those theological dialogues; they were almost entirely stripped of their purely dogmatic elements, and the rest of the questions

1 See R. Hirzel, Der Dialog, Leipzig, 1895, vol. i. p. 494.
was sifted by the test of appealing to a more worldly taste. Thus, in course of time, the learned Elucidaria, on the one side, tempered by a strong admixture of popular lore, degenerated into the familiar form of chapbooks; on the other hand, occasionally blended with the cosmography of the Greek φιλοσοφικά dialogues and interlarded with reminiscences of classical antiquity and profane history, they shrivelled into short collections of biblical questions and answers, such as have come down to us in the old Schlettstadt dialogue 1 of the seventh century, in the Munich Interrogationes 2, the Foca Monachorum 3, the Latin Adrianus et Epictus 4, Pseudo-Bæda’s Flores 6, the Altercato Hadriani Augusti et Epicteti philosophi 6, the Disputatio regalis et nobilissimi iuvemens Pippini cum Albino scholastico 7, and their translations or imitations in English 8, Irish 9, Breton 10, French 9, Catalan 10, Spanish 10,

1 Published by E. Wollfin-Troll in the Monatsberichte der königlich-prussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1873, p. 116.
3 Ed. by Wollfin, l.c., p. 109.
5 Partly printed by Kemble, l. c., p. 322, from the Cologne edition of 1612; the Bäle edition of 1563, however, has them in a more correct form.
7 Ed. by W. Wilmanns in the Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum, vol. xiv. p. 530. At the same place Prof. Wilmanns has shown that the ‘Disputatio Pippini cum Albino’ is a combination of the ‘Altercato Hadriani et Epicteti’ with the originally Greek ‘Sententiae Secundi philosophi.’
8 Viz.: in Old English the prose Salomon and Saturnus (Kemble, p. 176), and the Adrianus and Rithnis (Kemble, p. 198); in Middle English the Questions bywene the Maister of Oxenford and his Clerke (English Studies, vol. viii. p. 284, and, from a shortened text, Kemble, p. 216), which were translated from the same Latin original as the Old English prose Salomon and Saturn. An English version of Adrian and Epictet is cited by H. Knust (Mittheilungen aus dem Eskural, p. 61) under the title of ‘The Wyse Chylde.’
Provençal\(^1\), and Italian\(^2\), which, by a further step down, descended to the coarse ridicule of the French \textit{Demandes joyeuses en forme de quodlibet} and their comparatively tame abridgement in English\(^3\).

Of all the encyclopaedic repertories of Christian theology none seem to have enjoyed a greater popularity than the \textit{Elucidarium sive dialogus de summa totius Christianiae theologiae}, by Honorius Augustodunensis, who flourished under the Emperor Henry V (1106–1125), but composed his \textit{Elucidarium} in his early days, perhaps before the year 1092. How popular this work was we see from the many translations that have come down to us: witness the fragment of a Middle High German Version of the twelfth century\(^4\), and the translations of the whole work into Welsh\(^5\), French\(^6\), Provençal\(^7\), Dutch\(^8\), and Icelandic\(^9\). And in the form of chapbooks we meet with it in England\(^10\) as well as in Denmark\(^11\), Sweden\(^12\), Bohemia\(^13\), Germany\(^13\), France\(^14\), Spain\(^15\), and Italy\(^14\). Of the original work, however, no

\(^{3}\) Kemble, l. c., p. 287; \textit{Bulletin de la Société des anciens textes français}, 1875, p. 25.
\(^{8}\) See Ph. Blommaert, \textit{Oudvlaamse Gedichten}, Gent, 1837.
\(^{11}\) See C. J. Brandt, \textit{Lucidarius, en folkebog fra middelalderen}. Kjobenhavn, 1849, p. xviii.
\(^{12}\) See Hain, \textit{Repertorium bibliographicum}, No. 9803 ff.
\(^{13}\) See Brunet, \textit{Manuel du libraire}, vol. iii, p. 1214; Copinger’s \textit{Supplement to Hain} (London, 1896), vol. i. p. 305; Brandt, l. c., p. xi.
early trace, as far as I know, has been pointed out in England up till now. But here, too, the *Elucidarium* of Honorius, or rather part of it, was translated into the native language, and that at a remarkably early date.

In a twelfth-century manuscript of the British Museum, marked Vespasian D. xiv, we find, on fol. 163*–165*, a translation of the chapters xxii and xxiii from Honorius, which has been inserted there by a hand differing from the preceding as well as the following. The two chapters translated treat of Christ’s ascension and apparitions, and there is no trace that the unknown author, a monk, of course, ever translated more than what we have before us in the Vespasian manuscript now. As the manuscript, according to Prof. Napier (*The Academy* for 1890, vol. i. p. 134), was written early in the twelfth century and the Latin *Elucidarium* compiled during the last decades of the eleventh century, we could, with more certainty than is usual with Old English works, pronounce about the date of the composition of our Old English version and enjoy the rare gratification of having a genuine twelfth-century work—no mere copy from an earlier text—before us, if it was not for the doubt whether, perhaps, the Old English text was taken not directly from Honorius, but from an earlier source which Honorius, too, copied for his compilation. Unfortunately the language of the Old English text does not help to decide the question. For a twelfth-century work the total absence of any Scandinavian and French¹ element would be remarkable, but might be accounted for by the assumption that the translation was made in a district free from Scandinavian influence and by an old man, which latter suggestion seems to be borne out by the somewhat old-fashioned looking, thin style of the handwriting.

¹ The spelling *seint*, which, on account of the *e* instead of *a*, one might take to show French influence, may of course have been introduced by the scribe. Besides forms like *adsumunt* or *acewinte* occur as early as the eleventh century. See Napier’s Remarks on Wyld’s *English Gutturals*. 
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As will be seen from a comparison of the Old English text with the Latin original, printed at the bottom of the page, the translation is a very close one, though in one or two cases the manuscript from which the English monk translated may have been slightly different from our Latin text (= Migne's *Patrologia latina*, vol. clxxii). The rendering of *in monte Galilaeae* by *on Galilea dune* does not add much credit to the author's Latin and biblical scholarship.

I. Hwyr aras ure drihten of deacē 1 þæs fornestæ deacēs þære wucg? For he wolde þone forwordene middemeard eft aræren on þan ycan 3 deacē, þe he ærst þære timbroð wæs.

II. Hware wicode þe þa feowertiþ deacē æfter his æriste? Swa swa we ðeleæf, he wunede on þære eorelicen nepænewænge mid 6 Helian 7 Enoche 7 þa þa mid him ærisen of deacē.

III. Hwylce withe hæfde he æfter þan æriste? Beo seofen fealden briedere þonne sunne.

IV. On hwylican 8 heowe þe-segen hine his leorningsnihtes æfter his æriste? On þan ycan, þe heo ær wæren bewune hine to þe-segon.

V. Com [651, 164?] he to heom þe-scrydd? He þe-nam reaf of þaw leofte.

VI. Hwu oft æteowde 4 he hine his yingran? Twelf sīcen; þæs fornestæ deacēs his æristes he was æteowod eahhte sīcen. Ærest he com to Iosepe, þær þær he wæs on cwanterne for ures drithenes lichame, þe he hæfde be-byriged, swa swa þa þe-writen us cytæf, þe Nichodemus us wrohte. Æt þan ofre sīce he com to seinte Marian, his moder, swa swa Sedulie us sǽg. Æt þan þridden sīce he com to seinte Marian Magdalene, swa swa Marcus us cæd. Æt þan feorcan sīce he com to þan twam Marian, þær þær hi þe-erden fram þan þruwe, swa swa Mathheus us sǽg. Æt þan fīste sīce he com to sǣ Iacobe, swa swa sǣ Paulo berc þewisteæs; for he hæfde forhæten, þe þæt he holde metes abiten fram þan frīdeæfe, þe he þe-pined wæs, ær þonne he of deacē ærisen wære, þær he hine þe-sege on lifre. Æt þan

---

1 Of *deacē* above the line by the same scribe.
2 *Fe* above the line.
3 M.S. *wicode* with *h* above the line.
4 M.S. *æteowde* with *w* above the line, but wrongly inserted between *e* and *a*.

That the scribe meant *æteowde*, and not *æteowode* (which is often used, for instance, by *Ælfric*, see G. Schwerdtfeger, *Das schwache Verbem in *Ælfrics Homiliae*, Marburg, 1899, p. 50), is shown by l. 36 of our text.
DIALOGUE LITERATURE

24 sixten sicke be com to sce Petre, swa swa Lycas wrat¹ on his godspelle;
for he was un-rot for þære forsacunge, þæt he hæfde Crist forsacan 7
wæs to-scyled fram þære apostlæne 3e-ferraeddene [fol. 164r] 7 þurh-
wunede on wope. Æt þan scæften sicke he com to þan twam
loemüngcnihten, þe eoden to Emmaus, swa swa se sylfe Lycas eft
sette on 3e-write. Æt þan cahtedæ sicke he com to heom ealle be
lochene gate, þær þær heo waren to-gæderæ on æfen, swa swa Johannes
us cyðæ on his 3e-write. Æt þan niȝægen siccen, þa þa Thomas grapode
his wunden. Æt þan teode sicke he com to heom æt þære sæ:
33 Tiberiæs. Æt þan ændleoðe sicce on Galilea dune. Æt þan twelfe
sicke he com to þan ændleofanan apostlen, þær þær heo sæten to-
gæderæ, þa þa he tælde heora onyeleafsumnesse.

I. Discipulus: Quare in die prima hebdomadæ [resurrexit]? Magister: Ut mundum ea die renovaret, qua eum creaverat, [One question omitted.]

II. D. Ubi mansit illis quadraginta diebus? M. In paradiso terreno, ut creditur, cum Elia et Enoch, et cum iis qui cum eo
surrexerant.

III. D. Qualem formam post resurrectionem habuit? M. Septies splendidiorem quam sol.


V. D. Apparuit eis vestitus? M. Vestes ex aere assumpserat, quae eo ascendente in aerem evanuerunt.

VI. D. Quoties apparuit? M. Duodecies. Primo die octies: Primo Joseph ab Arimathia in carcere, in quo positus erat, eo quod
Joannes [xx. 19] descriptit. Nono in octavo die, quando eum Thomas
palpavit [Joh. xx. 28-31]. Decimo ad mare Tiberiæs [Joh. xvi. 1].
Undecimo in monte Galilææ [Mat. xxviii. 16-17]. Duodecimo
reincipentibus undecim discipulis apparuit [Marc. xvi. 14].

¹ By a later (?) hand changed into aurat.
VII. Hwylc hine ærest æteowde Marian Magdalene? Da godspelles wæren mid swyce mycelen wisdome scele gewritene, y eolden æor on writen nan þing, yte æor æor wæs heom eallen cuð. 

VIII. Steal he ane in to heofene? Ealle, þa þa of deæfe æræd wæren, astuðen mid him. 

VIII. On hwylcen heowe steal he up? On þan heowe, þe he hæfde beforan his prowunge, he steal up oð þa wolcnen, þa þa þa he on bufen þan wolcnen, þa þe-nam he swylc heow swylc he [sfol. 163'] 

Hæfde on þan munte Thabor. 

X. Hwylc ne steal he to heofene, sone swa he arisen wæs of deæfe? For þrim þingan: Þæt ærestæ þing, for þan þe þa apostles scolden witen sicerlice, þæt he arisen wæs of deæfe; for heo þe-ænæ bine etan 7 drincan mid heom. Þæt æor ðing wæs, for þan he wolde æfter feoweriþ dagen stiæn to heofene, þæt he cydde mid þan, þæt æalle, þa þe þe-fyldæ þa ten beðodan of þære æ beo þære feower godspelleæ lare, þa sculen æfter him to heofene. Þæt þridde is þæt, þæt Cristene folc sceal stiæn to heofene binnen feoweriþ dagen æfter þær þine, þe heo þolícæ under Antæ-Criste. 

VII. D. Cur dicit evangelista: Apparuit primo Mariae Magdaleæ. M. Evangelia cum summa auctoritate sunt edita; sed scribere evangelistae nobileant, nisi ea quae omnibus nota erant. [End of the answer and two questions omitted.]

VIII. D. Ascendit solus? M. Qui cum eo surrexerunt, cum eo etiam ascenderunt. 

VIII. D. Qua forma ascendit? M. Usque ad nubes ea forma, quam ante passionem habuit; susceptus autem a nubibus ea, qua in monte apparuit. 

X. D. Quare non statim ascendit postquam resurrexit? M. Propter tres causas: Primo, ut sui experimento discerent eum veraciter surrexisse, quem viderent manducare et bibere. Secundo, post quadragina dies voluit ascendere, ut demonstraret eos, qui decalogum legis per quatuor evangelia impleverint, posse caelum ascendere. Tertio, quod ecclesia, quae corpus Christi est, post passionem quam sub Antichristo erit passura, deinde post quadragina dies creditur caelum ascensusa. 

The above text derives a special interest from the form of language it is written in. Whether copied from tenth or eleventh-century original, or not, the text, suc[1 MS. feoweriþ and w corrected out of a.}
as it stands in the manuscript, exhibits very uniformly the advanced state of the English language of the twelfth century, unfortunately somewhat disguised under a traditional three centuries old orthography, from which, however, the scribe has emancipated himself sufficiently often to give us some glimpses of the real English then spoken.

The twelfth-century character of the language is almost invariably brought out in the vowels of the unaccented syllables, all of which appear levelled to an obscure e, with a consistency favourably contrasting with the wavering between a, e, and x found in other twelfth-century texts. Thus we find -e instead of the OE. ending -a in kware 4 (=OE. kwâra, an emphatic by-form of kwâr), bewone 10, eahte 13, sylfe 28, ánne 40, ðære (gen. pl.) 51, godspelle (gen. pl.) 52, apostlene 26, neoxenewanze 5; only in heora 35 the scribe has kept the old a. Without exception the weakening appears in the plural ending -es for OE. -as (dases 4, -enikes 9, godspelles 37, apostles 47), and in -ə for OE. -ə (selês 5, ðyde 15, pelizəd 54, ðe-fylled 51). In the case of OE. -an we meet with a few inconsistencies, insignificant however compared with the many weakened forms. Thus we have -en for -an in the infinitives arêren 2, atbêten 22, wrtten 38, witen 48, stltzen 50, 53; in the adverbs¹ bufen 44, bînnen 53, and in a great many forms of the n-declension (where partly the unaccented -n has been dropped); namely in the accusative brihtere 8, the genitives formeste 1, forwordene 2, the datives Marien 36 (but Marian 16, 18, 19), eordlichen 5, priden 17, sixten 24, seofoðen 27, nizêden 31, lichame 15, ðyre 16, ðyfter 20, eahtêde 29, teode 32, xendlefste 33, twelste 33 (n dropped seven times), and in the compound word middeneard 2;

¹ bute 38 does not fall under this head, as it is an old by-form of bûtan, corresponding to the old distinction between OE. åta and âtan, or Gothic ata and ätana.
the old a, however, has been retained in the infinitives
etan and drincan 49, the datives sing. ylcan 2, 10; feordan
19, the plural bebodan 51, and the adverb beforan 43; also
in the genitive vuca 1, where the -n has been suppressed.
But that the latter were not pronounced with an a by
the scribe, is shown by other instances which prove that
he was under the impression that a and e might be used
indiscriminately for the obscure vowel-sound in unaccented
syllables; for he writes a also in the participles forsacan
25, and arisan 46, where, of course, we have -en in OE.
as well as in ME. In the same way the dative ending
-an for older -um is altered into -en, though in three
instances the old spelling with -an has been retained:
felden 7, hyclcn 9, 42; siben 12, 13; -enheten 28, apostlen
34, eallen 39, mycelen 37, wolcnen 43, 44; dazen 50, 53;
but pingan 47, zigran 12, xendlefonan 34. In the phrase
be luchen gate 30, a further reduction seems to have taken
place by dropping the final -n.

Passing to o we find that also this vowel, if unaccented 1,
has been weakened into e, though in a few cases the scribe
adheres to the old spelling with o. Thus we have -en for
-on in the numeral seofen 7, and in the preterites (plur.
derb.) arisen 6, woren 10, 30, 41; ze-sezen 9, sketen 34.
nolden 38, scolden 48, sculen 52, coden 28, ze-cerden 19,
which, by way of the same mixture of e and a, noticed
above, is also meant in ze-sezan 48. In middle syllables
unaccented o has been kept in seofoten 27 and xendlefonan
34, but changed into e in nizefen 31, ehtede 29, sicerlice
48, heofene 40, 46, 50, 52, 53. Only in preterites and
participles of verbs in -tan the full forms in -ode, -od
outnumber those in -ede, -ed: witode 4, grâpode 31,
xelrowod 13, ze-timbrod 3, but wuned 5, 27; ze-pinod 22.

1 I do not think that the treatment of unaccented o in our text confirms
the rule given by Vance (Der spâltângelskishe Sermon in Froste S. Mariæ,
Darmstadt, 1894), p. 26, that, before dentals, the full e was preserved longer
than before nasals.
There is no example for an -e being dropped in the third syllable after the stress in polysyllabic words, a law which we find fully established in the earliest ME. texts and occasionally observed also in twelfth century MSS., as, for instance, in the Sermo S. Mariae (see Vance, l. c., p. 26). Nor are there any traces of e being inserted in compound words, or added, by analogy, to feminines, both of which phenomena are to be found in the Sermo S. Mariae (see Vance, p. 26) and the Cato version of the same MS. (see Nehab, Der altenglische Cato, Berlin, 1879, p. 32).

The insertion of e in the comparative brihtere 8 must be regarded as an attempt to denote the glide-sound between a voiceless stop and a liquid, not as a mere ‘graphische Arabeske,’ as Vance, p. 26, has done. Cp. also brihtenes 14.

The vowel-system in accented syllables exhibits few peculiarities, since it is still quite under the influence of OE. sound-notation. Thus the old diphthongs eo and ea have been retained in spelling, though a twelfth-century scribe is sure to have pronounced them as a single vowel: orton 5, seofen 7, leorning- 9, heofene 50, 53; feorðan 19, heom 11, 32, 39, 49; neorxenewanze 5, xndlofte 33, xndleofan 34. ze-sلونe (inf.) 10, téode 32, héo (plur.) 10, 34, 38, 48, 54; flowerteiz 4 (héowe 9, 42 (twice); wetowod 13), fealden 7, tale 40, eahet 13, dǽde 1, 6, 40; rǽaf 11, ungelleafsumnesse 35.

The real state of affairs is, however, betrayed by two spellings, where the scribe uses eo to denote the sound of e: viz. the preposition be is always written boe 1 (7, 51), and the remarkable form leofte 2 for OE. lyft most likely means left, a Kenticism not seldom found in Southern texts (see Mätzner, Altenglisches Wörterbuch, s.v. lyft). In other

---

1 Boe is also found throughout the Sermo S. Mariae (Vance, p. 19), and the Cato (Nehab, p. 34).
2 The spelling leofte occurs also in the Worcestershire Layamon. Moreover, cp. Morsbach, Mittelenglische Grammatik, § 107, note 1.
cases the i-umlaut of u appears as y, once written in the French way\(^1\), with an u, or as i: be-byrized 15, ge-fylle 51, cydd 31, cyded 15, cydde 50, cudd (third pers. sing.) 18; but drichten 1, 14; zingran 12, in both of which the un-rounding is found very early. I think it worth mentioning that the same wavering between ii, i, and e very often occurs in M.E. texts, written in the Western or middle districts of the South of England. Cp. Morsbach, l.c., § 133, note 3.

OE. i is often spelt with y: ylcan 2, 10; hwylce 7, 9, 42; swylc 44, mycelen (y=ii?) 37.

OE. ie after palatals appears both as y and as i: to-scyled 26, scele 38 (see below). For OE. ie as the umlaut of ea we have se-cerden 19. The i-umlaut of ia is represented by selfted 5, whilst OE. bo remains unmutated in hlowe 9, 42, originally an Anglian peculiarity, but early met with in West-Saxon texts. The same applies to the form ten 51 and to the use of e for WS. æ in formist 1, 13; ze-styen, 9, 23, 48; which latter form in the twelfth century had entirely replaced the WS. sêwon, sewen.

The spelling æ for e, often found in eleventh or twelfth-century MSS. (Morsbach, l.c., § 107, note 1; Napier, E.E.T.S., ciii. p. xlviii), occurs only before -n: andleofson 34, andleofte 33.

A peculiarity of the South-Western dialects (cp. Morsbach, § 93), viz. the exclusive use of a before nasals, is also shared by our text (ze-nam 11, 44; lichame 15, fram 19, 22, 46), no o occurring except in com, where o points at an OE. long o, and in on 5, bonne 8, 23, pone 2, where we find o settled in all dialects.

\(^1\) The spelling Lycos 24, 26, however, is most likely taken from the Latin original. At least I find this explanation to hold good in the case of the Greek name Gowrin, which in a twelfth-century MS. of the OE-Boethius (ed. by Sedgefield, p. 67) occurs as Tyde; the tenth-century Cottonian Metra (XVI, 15), however, have Tîde, where the Latin MSS. waver between Thule, T[â]lde, and Tîle.
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Whether cwaerterne 14 exhibits the ME. change of ea into a, or an unbroken vowel, cannot be made out.

Of the consonants in our text, the gutturals call for special attention, since, as Napier has pointed out in the Academy for 1890, vol. i. p. 133, an attempt has been successfully carried out to distinguish between the spirant ʒ (velar or palatal) and the stop ʒ (velar or palatal): ʒ occurs 42 times (dæxes 1, dæzes 13, dæże 3, 22; sæʒ 17, sæz 20, 36; ze-sézen 9, ze-sège 23, zezzen 48, ze- 19 times, floerveriz 50, 53; stizzen 50, 53; nizzen 31, zingran 12 be-byriz 15, poliz 54, dazes 4, dasen 50, 53; astuzen 41, -wanze 5); and ʒ 18 times (ting 38, 49; pingen 47, learning 9, 28; brownege 43, forsaunge 25, Magdalene 18, 37, zingran 12, grāpode 31, god 24, 36, 37, 52; gate 30, to-gædere 30, 35); all of them correctly used with the exception of one ʒ for g in -wanze 5. Palatal ʒ is altogether dropped before ea in middeneard 2; medi ally it is sometimes written -iz- after r or l: be-byriz 15, poliz 54. After ə it is sure to have been opened into an unsyllabic i (cp. ǣider in the Cato), though spellings like dæze 3, 22 (at the side of dæzes 1), and sæiz 20, 36 (at the side of sæʒ 17) are no sure proof for it. To decide what the scribe meant by the ch in lochene 30, must be left to a special study of all the ch's in our MS. as well as in the Rushworth and Lindisfarne Glosses. Since the spelling occurs only before front vowels, I think it most likely that the ch means a front-stop consonant, perhaps followed by a strong ð-like off-glide (but without dentalisation), or, more accurately expressed, a palatal explosive, at least in such forms as lochene, where the shutting-off of the breath after ə is of course effected at the soft palate, whilst the explosion, after a slight shifting forward of the tongue during the closure, takes place at the hard palate.

1 The Cato has: lichige, brochige, olachien.
2 The adjective Channaesca, which Miss Lea cites under the same head, is, of course, due to a Latin Channaenus, a spelling often found in MSS. of the Latin Vulgate.
The form *seinte* 16, 18 for OE. *sancte* seems to me to show French influence on account of its *ei*, though, it is true, the change of OE. *-ente* into *-einte* has been found as early as the eleventh century (see Napier’s *Remarks on Wild’s English Gutturals*). For, as far as I know, we have no example for the same change in OE. *ancte*, nor for the change of *ai* into *ei*, which in French took place in the eleventh century.

Another remarkable spelling occurs in the dative *průwe* 20 (from *průh* 2), which might be accounted for in different ways. I do not venture to decide whether the form is to be compared with *růwes* 3 at the side of *růges* (see Sievers, *Angelsächsische Grammatik*, § 116 note), or with *horwes* from *horh* (see Sievers, l. c., § 242), or if we may see in it an early expression of the well-known ME. change of the OE. velar spirant *g* into the labio-velar *v* 4.

OE. *hú* always appears as *húdd*, the *v* being due to the influence of other forms like *húdt*, &c.

A remarkable doubling or lengthening of consonants is found in *ze-ferræddene* 26. On the other hand the shortening of long *n* in the inflected infinitive *ze-seone* 10, has most likely taken place for want of stress.

Unaccented final *-m* has become *-n*. Thus the ending *-um* appears as *-en*, or, less frequently, as *-an*; and the dative *pám* is always weakened into *pán* 2, 7, 17, 18, 19, 23, 27, 31, 33, 34, 42, 47, 49, 50.

Leaving out of account the weakening of unaccented syllables mentioned on p. 93, the OE. inflectional system

---

1 At all other places (21, 24) the usual OE. abbreviation *æ* is used.
2 The Nicodemus of the same MS. has the guttural preserved: *fréh*, fol. 87’, and *frége*, fol. 88’, both being datives sing.
3 It is, perhaps, interesting to note that such an inorganic *w* after back vowels occurs even nowadays in northern English pronunciation. Lloyd (*Northern English*, Leipzig, 1899, § 70) has observed it in *sūwing*, *growing*.
4 To judge rightly about these forms, it must be kept in mind that in northern English long *æ* and *ë* are always maintained pure.
5 Two examples for this process occur as early as the twelfth century in a Worcester Glossary (see Wyld, *English Gutturals*, p. 25).
has been very accurately preserved. A few peculiarities are, however, worth mentioning. The well-known ME. spreading of the n-declension is to be seen in the plural forms ze-writen (nom.) 15, apostlene (gen.) 26, wunden (acc.) 32, wolken (acc.) 43, 44. The plural godspelles 37 is interesting as an early example of the tendency to make -es the normal ending, even for feminine and neuter words. The analogous dative moder 17 is often found in late texts. Æxt ðor þing 49 is perhaps a mere slip for ðore.

The OE. genders are preserved, with the exception of þære norrxenewanze 5.

The verb stizèn 50, 53 forms an analogous preterite, stéah (for stáh) 40, 42, 43, 46, and astuzen (for stizèn) 41. A 3rd pers. sing. without mutation, but with syncope, we have in berð 21, the usual form in late WS. (Sievers, § 371, note 3). The preterite wrohte 16 for worhte is, in early times, only found in the Lindisfarne Gloss, but in the ME. period it often occurs in Southern texts (see Stratmann-Bradley, s. v. wurchen).

The OE. phrase for þam (ðe) is preserved as for þan þe 47, or for þan 49, where it introduces a subordinate clause, but is shortened into for 2, 21, 48 in co-ordinate sentences.

In occurs only as an adverb (40), not as a preposition. In the passage mid Helian 7 Enoche 7 þa þa . . . avisen 6, we have most likely to read þa þa (=þan þa) for þa þa, since Enoche and mid . . . wisdome 37 prove that the scribe construed mid with the dative.

With regard to lexicography I call the reader’s attention to the following words not instanced in Bosworth-Toller or Hall: pin\(^1\) 54 (per pîne 54, which prove the gender to have been feminine), sicerlice\(^2\) 48, to-scyled 26, scele 38.

\(^1\) Also found in the Nicodemus of the same MS. fol. 87\(^v\): wro halend for wro alesdnyse gebolyde pîne on þe halgan rode.

\(^2\) Also found in the Wintney Version of the Rule of St. Benet (Schröer’s edition, p. 27, l. 4).
The latter word seems to be the same as Somner's scyle 'differentia, crimen' and the Corpus Gloss 1 564: 'concisium, sele.' It corresponds to ME. schyle, skel 'distinction, discrimination' (see Stratmann-Bradley, s. v.), and is also found in other Germanic dialects: MLG. schelle, schële, Dutch schèle, which occur by the side of MD. geschielle, ON. skil (whence NE. skill). The OE. verb *tòsciellan occurs also in Byrhtferð's Handbook: God xrest toscelede wæter from lande (see Anglia, vol. ix. p. 370, l. 11); and a verb *asciellan is to be assumed from the gloss ascelede, 'dividuntur' (in Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum, vol. ix. p. 438); also Somner gives a verb scylan 'distinguere, dividere.' Here again we have the same splitting up of the indg. root *skel- into Germanic *skilj- and *skalj-: cp. ON. skilja (whence the scylode . . . of male in the Abingdon Chronicle, A.D. 1049), Dutch verschillen with OE. *sciellan, MD. schellen, schëlen, MLG. schellen, schëlen.

It hardly seems necessary to specify all the reasons for ascribing our text to a West-Saxon district, perhaps somewhat near the Mercian frontier. A more accurate localization is impossible on the basis of the scanty materials offered by a single leaf of the Vespasian MS. But I should not wonder if a thorough study of the whole MS. would enable us to ascribe the codex to one of the great centres of ecclesiastical learning, say, for instance, to the then flourishing monastic school at Winchester—a guess which, as far as I see, is not refuted by a comparison with the fourteenth-century language of the 'Usages' of Winchester.

With regard to the date of composition we hardly can

1 I doubt whether Sweet is right in rendering the OE. gloss by 'destruction.' I suppose that it was taken from an interlinear or marginal gloss to Phil. iii. 2 (Vulgate: videte concisionem = βλέπετε την καταστροφήν), where concisionem might have been abbreviated as edosisum, and thus given rise to the Corpus lemma consciensum. If I am right, the meaning would be 'mutilation,' or, as the Authorized Version has it, 'concision.'
say more than that the pretty correct use of the OE. diphthongs and the fair preservation of the OE. inflectional system seem to point to an eleventh-century original, while the probable date of the Latin source (but see p. 89) does not allow us to go very far back. Perhaps the difficulty is best met by the assumption that the OE. translation was made by an old man at the turn of the eleventh century.

(b) Middle English Echoes.

The fact that the above-mentioned collections of biblical questions and answers were read and translated all during the Middle English period has been pointed out and verified by numerous references in J. Kemble’s excellent edition of the Dialogue of Salomon and Saturnus (Ælfric Society, London, 1848). By way of supplement I may be allowed to print here two more bits of Middle English verse which are derived from the same sources. They have both come down to us in fifteenth-century manuscripts, and both consist of rhyming couplets of four measures or accents each, the favourite form of the fourteenth century, which, however, was never quite abandoned for popular subjects, not even in the stanza-haunted fifteenth century.

The first of these scraps is to be found in the well-known Ashmole MS. 59 (written by Shirley in the first half of the fifteenth century), and runs as follows:

I. Who was ded ande never borne?
   Adam, pat was oure first befrome.

II. Who was borne and never deed 1 ?
   Ennok and Ely, pat we of reed.

III. Who was borne er fader or moder?
   Cayme, pat slough Abel his broher.

1 deed altered from dedd by the same hand.
IV. Who was borne and twyes deid?
Lasare, which God dreyped.

V. Who spake, after pat he was deede?
Samuel be glorious prophete.

VI. Who spake, or pat he was borne?
John Baptiste of olde\(^1\) in he moder wombe.

VII. Who was borne without . . . \(^3\)

The same questions occur, all but one, in one or other of the above-mentioned Latin or Old English collections, as may be seen from the following.

No. I is found in quite the same form in the Munich Interrogationes (Int.), No. 20 = Joca Monachorum (JM), No. 7 = Adrianus et Epictus (AE), No. 11: Quis est [AE fuit] mortuus et non est natus, and in similar collections at Paris (P), Munich (M), Tübingen (T), &c. Somewhat amplified we have it in Pseudo-Baeda's Flores (B), No. 46: Dic mihi, quis homo, qui non natus est et mortuus est, atque in utero matris suae post mortem baptizatus est? Adam, and, with a further addition in the Old English prose Salomon and Saturnus (SS), No. 15: Saga me, kwest wæs seðe acenned wes and eft behirged wes on his moder innide and æfter ðam deade gefullod wes? Ic þe scege, þæt wæs Adam; and in the Old English Adrianus and Rithenus (AR), No. 28: Saga me hwilc man were dead 7 were acenned æfter þam deade were eft be-byried in his moder innide? Ic þe scege, þæt wæs Adam se ðeresta man (quoted from a collation of Kemble's text with the MS.). The Disputatio Pippini cum Albino (DPA), No. 97, unites the first three Middle English couplets and gives a rather

---

\(^1\) MS. has god.
\(^2\) Of olde seems to have been erroneously added by a scribe.
\(^3\) The last line added in a sixteenth-century hand.
\(^5\) Hof- und Staatsbibliothek, Cod. germ. 444, fols. 117, 150 (ab. 1420), unprinted.
\(^6\) University Library, Cod. M. C. 144, fol. 17 (ab. 1425), printed in Mone's Ansager, vol. vii. p. 50.
mysterious answer: *A. Tres fuere: unus numquam natus et semel mortuus; alter semel natus, numquam mortuus; tertius semel natus et bis mortuus. P. Primus aequivocus terrae; secundus deo moe; tertius homini pauperi. A. Decem primas literas nominum. P. I. III. I. XXX.* (In the Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum, vol. xv. p. 166 note, Prof. Steinmeyer has shown that we must put the Greek numerals α and λ instead of I and XXX. to get the initials of Adam and Lazarus.) The development into a riddle we have, for instance, in the Strassburg Rätselbuch: Wer gestorben und mit geboren sey? Adam und Eva.

No. II=AE 18, *Quis fuit natus et non fuit mortuus? Enoc et Elyas=JM 7 (with est instead of fuit and Helias et Enoc)=B 5 and Int. 47, Qui sunt nati et non sunt mortui? Enoc et Elias (Int.: Helias et Enoc et Johannes evangelista); also in DPA 97 (see under No. I), M 1 and 17, T 1.

No. III is not met with in quite the same form in any of the other collections. But we have the same question, though a little expanded and with a different answer, in the Demaundes Joyous, No. 47: Whate was he, that was begoten or his fader and borne or his moder, and had the maydenhed of his beldame? That was Abell. The preceding question in the Demaundes Joyous is: What was he, that slewe the fourth parte of the worlde? Cayne, than that he slewe his broder Abell, in the whiche tyme was but foure persone in the worlde. May we, therefore, suppose that the Middle English couplet represents the union of two different questions? Also in the Tübingen M.S.: 3, Chayn fuit natus antequam pater et mater.

No. IV=AE 32, *Quis fuit bis mortuus et semel natus? Lazarus=Int. 38 (with a transposition of the bis and semel): Quis fuit natus et semel mortuus?=B 46, Quis vir mortuus bis et semel natus est? Lazurus, quem suscitavit Iesus=DPA 97 (see under No. I).
Nos. V and VI occur in T (No. 5, *Samuel locutus est post mortem: ve, ve, quante pene inferni!* No. 6, *Johannes baptista locutus est antequam natus*) as well as in M (No. 3, *Quis est post mortem locutus? Saul.* No. 4, *Quis locutus est et non natus? Johannes baptista*); in a somewhat different form also in B 43: *Duo prophetæ, quorum alter prophetavit post mortem, alter vero ante nativitatem, sunt Samuel et Johannes.*

What No. VII was meant to be we may guess from such questions as AE 17: *Quis conceptus fuit sine conceptione carnali? Dominus noster Iesus Christus*; or DPA 91: *Vidi quendam natum, antequam esset conceptus.*

Another Middle English echo is found in the Rawlinson Manuscript F. 35 (f. 205). The lines are scribbled with red ink on the flyleaf of the MS., in a fifteenth-century hand (third quarter), presumably the same that had to do the ‘rubra’ of the codex.

*xxxii teth, that behe full kene,*  
*CC bonys and nynete,*  
*CCC vaynys syxt and fyve,*  
*Every man hate, that is a-lyve.*

The two couplets are substantially the same as two sentences found at the end of the Old English prose *Salomon and Saturnus* and the Old English *Adrianus and Ritheus*, which, as I tried to show in the *Englische Studien*, vol. xxiii. p. 434, originally must have formed part of the dialogues, though as they stand in the MSS. now only the answer has been retained. The two Old English passages run as follows: *Mannes bán sindon on gerine ealra CC and xviii; mannes ðeddran [sindon] ealra CCC and V and LX; mannes tóða bêoð on eallum his liffe ii and xxx in 8 S, and Man hafað bana tua hundred 7 nigontine; 7 he hafað ðeddrena þreo hundred 7 fise 7 sixti* at the end of AE (first printed by Prof. Napier in the *Anglia*, vol. xi. p. 15).
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I may be allowed to subjoin here the two fifteenth-century collections of Biblical sayings, most closely agreeing with our ME. couplets.

(1) From Cod. germ. 444 (fols. 11r, 12v), Royal Library, Munich 1:

1. ELYAS. Quis est natus et non mortuus.
2. ADAM. Quis est mortuus et non natus.
3. SAUL. Quis est post mortem locutus.
4. JONNENES BAPTISTA. Quis locutus est et non natus.
5. JACOB, ESAU. Quis fecit litem antequam natus fuit.
6. ABEL. Quis clamuit sine lingwa.
7. JUDAS. Quis impleuit verbum dei et meruit penas.
8. STULTUS. Quis est in terra et caput eius in celo.
9. ABAKUCK. Quis non fuit in celo nec in terra nec in inferno.
10. STULTUS. Quis est ebrius sine potu.
11. LAZARUS. Quis est semel natus et bis mortuus.
12. [fol. 11v] DYONISIUS. Quis cucurrìtr tria miliaria et portauit quid suum in manibus.
13. CAMM. Quis edificavit primum ciuitatem.
14. TEBAL. Quis fecit primum organam.
15. ELIZEUS. Quis primum monasterium edificavit.
16. ADAM. Quis habuit barbam antequam natus fuit.
17. ELYAS ET Enoch. Qui sunt, qui non sunt mortui.
18. JULIUS. Quis fuit primum papa.
19. SAULUS. Quis fuit primum rex.
20. ABEL. Quis fuit primum pastor.
22. FILLIA JACOB. Quis fuit prima vidua.
23. ABAKUCK. Quis ad aliam provinciam vexit nec celum nec terram tetigit.
24. HIRCUS. Quis habet barbam, antequam est natus, &c.

(2) From MS. M. C. 114 (fol. 1r), University Library, Tübingen 2:

1. Enoch fuit natus, sed non mortuus.

---

1 The date of the MS. is fixed by an entry on fol. 7r: 'Anno domini M.CCCC. xxij. scripta est.'
2 A mistake, of course, for Samuel.
3 Written before 1425, which date we find on the last leaf, in the handwriting of the second scribe: 'Explicit vocabularius per manus Joù Brant anno domini M.CCCC. xxv. finitus hora vesperarum.'
2. Adam fuit mortuus, sed non natus.
3. Chayn 1 fuit natus, antequam pater et mater 2.
4. Dauid occidit decem milia in uno homine.
5. Samuel locutus est post mortem: ve, ve, quante pene inferni.
6. Johannes baptista locutus est antequam natus.
7. Melchisedech non habuit patrem nec materem; Abortivus fuit patre mortuo.
8. Jacobus fuit subplantator antequam natus.
10. Abel clamauit ad dominum non habens linguam.
11. Rachel manducauit et bibit nec ossa nec carnum habuit.
12. Chayn interfecit quartam partem mundi.
13. Angelus viuit non natus et non moritur.

15. Ein iungfrow hin geben wart,
   ee sii eins tags alt was;
   Vnd trug ein kind, ee sii eins jars alt wart;
   vnd starb, ee sii geboren wart.

MAX TH. W. FÖRSTER.

UNIVERSITY OF WÜRZBURG,
BAVARIA,
December, 1899.

1 May such an abbreviated Chay have given rise to the form Ceym of the ME. couplets?
2 In the MS. nati essent has been added in a later (sixteenth century?) hand.
3 Two similar German riddles have been printed in Mone's Anwiger, vol. vii. p. 259, as Nos. 172 and 176.—The same late hand that we noticed under No. 3 had added 's. Eva' on the margin after 'was.'
XV.

THE ROMANCE OF THE LILY.

Our romance has no connexion with the early poem of
Thomas Lovell Beddoes so entitled, in which

Young Balthasar, the Libyan king,
The lord of magic sages,

with more rhyme than reason immerses the beauteous
and innocent Queen Sabra in the waters of death. It is

founded on philology and buttressed by etymology; its

onders are of that class of romance in which natural law,
acting through historical and geographical circumstance,

then brings to pass results transcending the imagination of

ovelists. Would it not have appeared an audacious flight

ction in a novelist to represent the people of Brazil,

ation of yesterday, severed from ancient Egypt by the

en of years even more widely than from modern Egypt

by the ocean of waters, as calling a familiar flower by

stantially the same name as that by which it was known
to the Pharaohs? Yet nothing is more certain.

When looking, some years ago, into a volume of popular
Brazilian poetry, the writer of this paper was puzzled by
the word cecem. It evidently denoted some kind of flower,
but what kind did not appear; he was not then aware that
it had been used by Camoens; nor was Lacerda’s dictionary,
where he has since found the meaning, available at the time.
He put the matter aside, and thought no more of it until years afterwards, as he casually opened his colleague Dr. Budge's *First Steps in Egyptian*, the book unclosed at the words, *Sesêni, a lily*. His old Brazilian difficulty recurred to his mind, and the solution came along with it.

The descent of *cecem* from *sesêni*, or from some cognate form in a Semitic language allied to the Egyptian, presents no difficulty when both words are before us. The Spanish and Portuguese languages have frequently two words for the same object, one representing the original Iberian term or the Latin which supplanted it, the other adopted from the Moorish conquerors. Such is the case with the duplicate words for lily—*lirio* and *asucena*—which have no philological affinity. *Lirio* is manifestly the Latin *lilium*; *asucena*, the Arabic intruder, is as clearly nothing but *sesêni* or its representative lengthened out with true Castilian sonority, while *cecem* is merely *asucena* contracted to a disyllable.

This demonstration is neat and conclusive, but further speculation may raise more questions than in the present state of our knowledge we are competent to solve. How came the Egyptians to call the lily *sesêni*, which is evidently the same word as the Hebrew *shushan*? Are the two words derived from some common stem, like *lily, lis, lirio, giglio*, in modern European languages? If so the connexion of speech between the Egyptians and the Hebrews must be very close, and Egyptian is something more than a 'sub-Semitic language.' Or were the plant and the name introduced together into Egypt by Hebrew or other Semitic immigrants? Did Joseph, peradventure, acclimatize the spotless growth as the emblem of his innocence? Or was it brought in by those probably Semitic conquerors, the Shepherd Kings? or by that later Twenty-second Dynasty which is thought to have been of Semitic extrac-
tion, and the name of whose most famous king, Sheshonk, is so curiously like the Hebrew word for lily? There is another possible explanation. 'One curious innovation in the Egyptian language,' says Mr. Stuart Poole in his article on Egypt in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, 'was the fashion under the Rameses family of introducing Semitic words instead of Egyptian ones.' And again, 'During the late period of the Empire, partly through marriages of the Pharaohs, partly in consequence of the large employment of mercenaries, chiefly Libyans, great settlements of foreigners, Asiatic as well as African, were established in Egypt. So far from the Shemites being then disliked, a multitude of Semitic words were introduced into Egyptian, and it even became the fashion to give a Semitic form to native words.' Professor Flinders Petrie says the same of the great immigration of Syrian artisans under the eighteenth dynasty; and the recent discovery of the Tell-el-Amarna tablets has shown how well Assyrian, a Semitic language, was understood in Egypt at this time. It would, therefore, be interesting to ascertain at what period this Semitic word for lily is first met with, whether there is any non-Semitic equivalent, and when the flower first appears on painted or sculptured monuments.

If the Egyptian seseni puzzles, its Hebrew form shushan instructs. It unites with recent archaeological research to acquaint us that though Susa, the winter and vernal residence of the great king, was a great Persian city, it was not originally founded or named or inhabited by Persians. According to Athenaeus and Stephanus of Byzantium the city of Susa and the province of Susiana received their names from the abundance of lilies grown in the district, and shushan, as we have seen, is a Semitic word. Had the Aryan Persians been the original inhabitants, the name would have been taken from the Persian word for lily, lalak, the original of the Greek λέλυκον and of the
Latin *lilium*, and through these of the word denoting *lily* in most modern European languages. It seems reasonable to conclude that, as in analogous cases, the name and the thing were both brought to Greece from Persia, and that the vernacular word *κρόκος*, afterwards used for any kind of lily, originally denoted some allied plant. Herodotus knew of red *κρόκος*, perhaps the scarlet or flame-coloured lily which Christ must have had in view when He invoked the flower which with us symbolizes modest purity to disparage the pomp of Solomon. The Semitic *sesēnī* and *shushan* too, have found their way into Greece in the form *σόβος*, although its use is almost confined to botanical and medical writers. Dioscorides knows it as a Phoenician word, and affords the variant *σῶσα*. There can be little doubt that it came as the name of an article of commerce, for the adjective *σόβονος* is applied to describe ‘the oil of white lilies’ compounded in Egypt, a proof that the *sesēnī* was not the lotus, and that *sesēnī* and *shushan* denote a white lily, as *azucena* always does in Spanish and Portuguese.

Although the Semitic names for lily, floated into western Europe on the tide of Saracen conquest, have failed to become naturalized in the languages of the nations unaffected by it, they have found an unsuspected entrance in the pretty shape of a female proper name. *Susan* is *shushan*, and every *Susan*—even she of the black eyes—is or ought to be a lily. A name which from its association with milking and domestic service has come to be esteemed plebeian, is in truth ancient, Oriental, and most complimentary.

We see, then, that the names for *lily* common to modern Europe have arisen among two widely dissimilar races, and travelled westward by different routes: one a northern route, naturalizing the word and the flower among the
THE ROMANCE OF THE LILY

peoples who trace their culture to Greece and Rome; the other southern, the highway of Arabic civilization. We further learn that the inhabitants of remote Brazil, and not only they but the people of Spain, Portugal, and every land colonized by those nations, know the flower by substantially the same name as the Egyptians had given it in the days of the Pharaohs. And we further discover that the investigation of these facts, while solving one minor problem, confronts us with others in ancient speech, ethnology, and migrations which, with all the knowledge we have recently won from mound and catacomb, we are at present unable to elucidate:

Flower in the crannied wall,
I pluck you out of the crannies;—
Hold you here, root and all, in my hand,
Little flower—but if I could understand
What you are—root in all, and all in all—
I should know what God and man is.

R. GARNETT.
XVI.

THE QUATREFOIL OF LOVE:
AN ALLITERATIVE RELIGIOUS LYRIC.

Now first edited from Add. MS. British Museum 31,042, with Collations from Add. MS. A. 106 Bodleian Library
by Israel Gollancz.

The basis of the text, the British Museum MS., has already been described in the editor's volume, *The Parlement of the Thre Ages*, edited for the Roxburgh Club, 1897: it is contained in one of Robert Thornton's famous miscellanies of English poems and romances—a quarto of the fifteenth century. In the footnotes it is here referred to by the letter A. The Bodleian MS., a later and worse manuscript, differs from the Museum text in many respects; its discovery is, however, of great value in restoring some of the obliterated passages, and in removing some of the errors of Thornton’s version. The more important variants are given in the notes. The words and letters placed between brackets are illegible in the MS. Both MSS. confuse y and p: the latter has been used where necessary in the present edition of the poem: otherwise all changes in A. have been noted. So far as its metrical form is concerned, this ‘Complaint’ is a companion poem to the *Pistill of Susan*, attributed to the Scottish poet, Huchown ‘of the Aeile Ryale’ (fl. circa 1370), though it cannot be attributed to the same author; a phonological study of the rhymes (e.g. stanza xi. *maste* : *trayste* : *gaste* : *chaste*) seems to point to a somewhat later date, or at any rate to differentiate it from the *Pistill*. Its Northern origin is unmistakable. The MSS. give no indication of the title or authorship of the poem. The heading is a mere suggestion of its editor.
THE QUATREFOIL OF LOVE

I.

In a moruenyng of Maye whenne medowes salte spryng:
Blomes and blossomes of brighte coloures:
Als I went by a welle: on my playing:
Thurghe a mery orcheerde bedand myne hourres:
The birdis one bewes bigane for to synge:
And bowes for to burgeone and belde to pe bo[ures]:
Was I warre of a maye pat made mournyng:
Sekande and syghande amange pase flowres:
   So swete.
Scho made mournyng ynough:
Hir wepynge dide me¹ woughe:
Undir a tree I me droughe:
   Hir wille walde I wete.

II.

Stilly I stalkede and stode in pat stede:
For I walde wiete of hir wille and of hir wilde thoghte:
Rafe scho hir kertcheis, hir kelle of hir hede:
Wrange scho hir² handis, and wrothely scho wrog[hte]:
Scho saide: 'mylde mary, righte þou me reede:
For of alle þe wele of þis werlde I-wis³ I welde [noghte]:
Sende me somme socour or some be I dede:
Som sight of þat selcouth þat I hafe lange soughte:
   With care':
Thane spake a Turtiile one a tree:
Withe faire notis and free:
   'Thou birde for thi beauté:
   Whi syghys you so sare?'

¹ A. dide woughe.  B. dyd me roghe.
² A. scho handis.  B. scho hir handes.
³ A. werlde L.  B. warld I wys I.
THE QUATREFOIL OF LOVE:

III.

‘A thou, faire foule, faile noghte þi speche and þi spelle:
Thi carpyng es comforthe to herkenes and [here]1:
Alle my wylle3 and my thoghte walde I þe telle:
Mi wo and my wandrethe, walde þou come ner[e]’:
Than luflu he lyghtede, walde he noghte duelle:
To comforthe þat comly and couer hir chere:
Scho blyssede his body with buke and with belle:
And louede þat lady þat sente hir þat fere:
So fre.

‘When I was sary,
Besoughte I2 oure lady,
Scho hase sente me company:
Blyssede mote [scho]4 bee.

IV.

‘Thou faire foule, fulke of lufe, so mylde and so swete:
To moue of a mater now walde I begyne:
A trewe-lufe hafe I soughte be waye and be strete:
In many faire orcherdis þer floures er [ine]:
Als ferre als I hafe soughte fande6 I nane yete4:
Fele hafe I fundente of mare and of myne:
Brigthte birde of þi blee my balis may þou bete:
Wald þou me wyse wyssely a trew-luf [to wyne]:

With ryghte.
When I wene ratheste,
For to fynde lufe beste,
So feynyly es it feste.
It fares alle on flyghte.’

1 A. to . . . 2 A. bert. B. wylle.
3 A. of. B. L.
4 MS. scho corrected to he in a different hand, slightly later (? 16th c).
5 B. scho.
6 A. I fande. B. fande I.
4 A. yit.
V.

'The witte of a womane es wonder to here:
Es alle pi sare syghynge to seke lufe trewe:
Alle thi sythe may pou sighe and neuer mare be nere:
Bot if pou hade conceffe of one pat I knewe:
Whare it es spryngeande and euer more newe:
Withowttene diffadynge fulle faire and fulle clere:
Or castynge of coloure or changynge of hewe:
If pou be sett for to seke hit salle I pe lere:

So yare.

Hardely dare I say,
Ther is no luf pat lastis ay,
With-owtten tresone and tray,
Bot if it bygyne thare.

VI.

Whare pou fyndis grewanede a trew-lufe grysse:
With iij lef es it sett fulle louely aboute:
The firste lefe we may lykene to pe kynge of blisse:
Pat weldis alle pis werde with-ine and with-owte
He wroghte heuene with his hande and alle paradise:
And pis merie medil-erthe with-owttene any dowte:
Alle pe welthe of pis werde hally is his:
In whame vs awe for to leue [and] loue hym and lowtte:

Fulle wele.

Halde this lefe in pi mynde,
To we his felawes fynde:
Of pat trewlufe and pat kynde,
Pat neuer more salle kele.

1 A. spryngeande euer. B. spryngeande and euer.
2 A. iij es. B. iij lef es.
3 A. vnto. B. to.
4 A. tille we may his. B. to we his.
5 A. lyf. B. luf.
6 A. your. B. pi.
VII.

Bi this ilk seconde lefe I likene goddis sone:
Vnto pis ilke firste lefe es felawe and fere:
The thirde to þe holy gaste: togedir þay wone:
þase iij leues are of price with-owtte any pere:
Where þat semly kynge es sett on his trone:
Comly of colour curtase and clere
Es no thynge in this werlde lyke to hym one:
His gladenesse and his gudnesse comforthe vs here:

Off grace.

Alle this werlde he by-gane:
With wynde and water wanne:
And sythen he makede mane,
After his awenne face.

VIII.

Firste made he Adam and sythene made he Eue:
Putt he þame in paradisse is full grete degree:
Forbede he þame no thynge als I bilee:
Bot a grene appille þat grew one a tree:
Bot þan sary sathanasse soughte þame belyue:
For to wakken oure waa: þer weryede mott he bee!
Toke þam þat appille to stirre mekille stryue:
Þe foule sende was fayne þat syghte for to see:

For tene.

Þe firste lefe was full woo,
Where his flour-es felle hym froo,
His frendys solde to belle goo,
For a nappille grene.

¹ A. Now bi. B. Bi. ² so B. A. are done. ³ A. and with 4 B. syn made he.
IX.

Pane bigane þe firste lefe to morne for vs alle:
For his lusly handwerke þat þan¹ he hade lorne:
Gabriel þat ausgeltte on hym gune he calle:
Forthe come þat semely and knelede hym biforne:
Vn-to² maydene Marie my message³ þou sale:
And bere hir blythe bodworde of hir wille I be borne:
Þus he sent his dere sone owt of his heghe haulle:
Vnto þat mylde maydene in⁴ a mery morne:

And hir grett.

Gabriel þat faire face,
Hayl sede Marie fullé of grace,
Sayde, 'pereles is allé place,
With myrthe arte þou mett.

X.

Þou sale consayue a knaue childe comly and clere:
And alle þe bale of þis werde in þe salle be bët.'
‘Þat were a mekille meruetle I solde a childe bere⁸:
Was I neuer [mari]ede ne with mane mett.’
‘Behalde to thi Cosyne: consayuede hase to-þere:
Elezebeth in [hir held] þat lange hase bene l[ett].’
‘Lorde, thi hande-maydene,’ said Marie, ‘es here:
Fulle hally in thi seruyce es my hert sett:
So stille.’
Blissede be þat swete wighte,
That God sone inne lighte
Become mane fullé of myghte,
With his Fadir wille.

¹ A. þat he.  B. þat þan he.  ² A. Goo to.  B. Vn to.
³ A. messagere.  B. message.  ⁴ B. on.
⁵ A. þat I a childe solde bere.  B. I suld a child bere.
xi.

Now is¹ pis ilk seconde lefe for our² lufe maste:
Lighte in þat lady³ þat Gabryel grett:
With-owttene any tresoune so trewe for to trayste⁴:
With myrthe is a maydene, es God and mane mett:
It es þe Fadir and þe sone, and þe haly gaste:
Thre leues of lufe withowttene any lett:
Þe ferthe es þe maydene chosene for chaste:
Swik anoper trewlufe was neuer in lande sett:
For bote.
Thes foure leues maye neuer falle:
Bot euermore þay sprynge salle:
So gentille þay grewyn⁶ ahte,
One a righte rote.

xii.

Now thies thre louely leues a fourte fela base tane⁶:
For lufe in oure lady es oure lorde [lyghte]:
Josephe hir weddede and with hir gonne gane:
In þe burghe of Bedleme beldede þat bryghte:
By-twix an oxe and an asse: pride was þare nane:
A blysede barne was þer borne appone a⁷ [3ole nygte]:
There rasse a sterne hastily⁸ þat schynede⁹ and schane:
IIJ kynges of Coloyne þer-of hade a¹⁰ sight[e]:
And soughte.
Þay offerde hym¹¹, as þay wolde,
Mirre: Rekilles: and golde:
He thankkede þame fele¹² folde:
To blysse he þame broghte.

¹ A. now pis.  B. now is pis.  ² A. for lufe.  B. for owr lufe
³ A. a maydene.  B. þat lady.  ⁴ B. treste.  ⁵ A. joyne.  B. grent
⁶ A. Now allþ thies foure louely leues a fренде to þame base tane
⁷ B. þere
⁸ B. scharply.  ⁹ B. schewed.  ¹⁰ A. þay B. a.  ¹¹ A. to hym.  ¹² B. st
AN ALLITERATIVE RELIGIOUS LYRIC

XIII.

Vnsely Herawde þis tythynges herde telle:
þat a knaw childe¹ was borne þat kyng scholde be:
Garte he make message and sent he fulle snelle:
To seke knaue childer in þat citê²:
Lefte he nane in qwarte bot alle gane he quelle:
Pay spetide þame one speris . grete dole for to see:
Josephe wið his wedde wyffe walde noghte duelle:
He led hir in-to Egippe wið hir leues three:
To saue.
Thase childre gane there dede take
For þat same trewlufe³ sake:
The mare myrthe may þay make:
Hym selfe walde þame haue.

XIV.

þitt walde he mare do for his frendis dere:
For his haly hande-werke to belle walde he ga[ne]:
To sett vs ensample his lay for to lere:
Saynt Johne hym baptiste⁴ in flom jordane:
For thrity penys was he saulde . thurgh a false fere:
Vnto fele famene þat fayne walde hym [hafe slane]
Alle he sufferde for oure syne . hym selfe was clere:
Thurgh he a kysse þay hym knewe and tytte wa[s he tane]:
Also.
It was grete dole for to see,
When he scholde blenke of his blee,
Þe seconf lefe of þe three,
Þe ferthe was wo.

¹ A. þat a childe. B. A knaw chyld.
² A. to seke þat knawe childe. B. to seke knafe chylder in þat contre.
³ B. for þer trewluf. A. Baptiste hym. B. hym baptyste.
Pilate was justice and satt appone he:
For to deme Jhesu pat Judas hadde solde:
He said, 'leue lordynges, a treathe for to trye:
Pat semely es saklesse, say what 3e wol[de]':
The Jewes appone Jhesu bigane for to crye:
'He says' hym selfe he es a kynge, slyk wordis ar [bolde] = : And if pou wills noghte deme hym pis day for to dye:
Ryghte before the Emperor pis tale salle be tolde:
   For dred[e].'
   A drery dome gaffe be thare:
   I kane say 30w na mare:
   'I rede pat 3e take hym yare',
   And forthe 3e hym lede.'

Allas for pat ferthe lefe was lefte pan allans:
When hir faire felaunched was taken and [torne]:
Betyne with scowrge's body and bane:
Sythyn sprede one a crosse and crowned with a ' thor[ne] - : Thurghe his handis and his fete pe nayles gane gane:
A bygg spere till his hert brathely was borne:
He schede his blode for oure lufe, leued he hym nane:
Attir and ayselle pay bedde hym for skorne:
   With galle  
   Gret reuth was to see,
   When he was nayled one a tree:
   Pe seconde lefe of pe three,
   Sulde falowe and saltte.

1. A. said.  2. A. before Emperor.  3. A. were.  B. were (? = were).
4. A. with thor[ne].  B. with a thorne.  5. B. gone gane.
6. A. with alle.  B. with galle.  7. So B. A. It was gret dole for.
XVII.

The ferthe lefe of þat trewlufe all-anly scho stode:
Wrange scho[h]ir handis and wepe þane for wa!
With a mournande chere and with a drey mode:
þe sone blenkede of his ble and wexe þane alle blæ:
Be his white sydes rane þe rede blode:
þe harde roche gane ryue þe temple in twa:
þan swounede þat ferthe lefe and to þe grounde 3ode:
Allas for þat trew-lufe þat it sulde twyne swa:
So 3are.
Scho sawe hir dere sone dy:
Bot[2] sayn Johne was hir by,[3]
And comfortede þat lady,
Was castene in care.

XVIII.

þitt spak þat noble kynge, was nayled on þat tre:
Vntille his modir dere was mournande þat tyde:
'Leue þi wepynge, womane, and morne noghte for me:
Take Johne to þi sone þat standis bi þi syde:
Johne, take Mary þi moder now moder[4] to þe:
To kepe and to comforte youre blysse for to byde[5].
þe hate blode of his hert dide Longeus to-see:
þat rane by þe spere schafta fra his wondis wyde[6].
þat daye
It was grete dole for to se:
When he was taken of þe tre:
þe seconde lefe of the three,
Was closede in claye.

[3] A. was by. B. was hir by.
[6] This and the previous line are out of place in A. at the beginning of the
XIX.

When he was dede on þe rode and dolvene so þare:
Alle ye welthe of þis werde in thre leues it lay:
þe ferthe fela¹ þane falowede and syghede fullereare:
Alle² þe trowthe of þis werde was in a trewe may:
þof his manhed ware dede his myghtie³ was þe mare:
Appone his halie handwerk was his hert ay:
þe saule with þe godhede to helle gane þay fare:
þe body with þe manhede habade þe thirde day:

Fulle þare.

Þat he hade with his handis⁴ wroghte,
And sythen with his blude boghte,
Tille þay were owt of balis⁵ broghte,
Hym langede fulle sare.

XX.

Than said sary⁶ Sathanas his sorowe was fulle sade⁷:
For sight of þat selcouth he wexe al vn-fayne:
"Vs commes som bodworde I hope⁸ it be badde":
"What art þou with þi fare?" faste gon he frayne:
"Kynge of joy es my name, þi gestis for to glade:
Lote me in for þaire lufe: þar thou⁹ nog[hte] layne":
"Wende away with þi myrthe þou makis me alle made:
What solde þou do in þis pitte, þou sees here bot payne:

So faste."

When þay herde þe kynge speke,
Alle þe yatis gane þay steke,
Bot sone gane þe bandis breke,
And alle þe barres braste.

¹ A. lefe.  B. fela.  ² A. And alle.  B. Alle.  ³ A. mygtie
⁴ B. hand.  ⁵ B. bale.  ⁶ said þat sary.  B. sayd sa.
⁷ B. wex sad.  ⁸ B. trow.  ⁹ A. thare the.
xxi.

For his haly handwerke heried he helle:
And alle broghte he owte of bale pat ever hade bene his:
Dauyd his derlynge made myrthe þer emethe:
He tuk an harpe in his hande and weldide it I-wyss:
And alle his retenewe owte gonne he telle:
And for his grete mercy forgaffe þame þair mysse:
‘I was saulde for þour sake and sufferde wondis felte:
And alle my bone childir are broghte vnto blyssse:
On rode.’
De sothe es noghte for to layne,
When þay were broghte owt of Payne,
Vn-to þe body agayne
De haly gaste yode.

xxii.

De fyrste lefe of þat trewlufe falowede for was:
Whane scho was leuede modir maydene and wyfe:
De fyrste lefe fulle of myghte his will was swa:
By assent of þe thirde lefe was þer no stryfe:
Raysede þay þe seconde lefe by-twixe þame twa:
Thruh grace of þe godhede fra dede vnto lyfe:
He toke ye crose in his hande and forthe gone he ga:
With his fleshe and his felle and his wondis fyve:
He yode.
When he was rysene agayne,
He mett with þe Maudelayne:
Na ferly if scho were fayne:
He was hir leche gude.

1 B. gud chylder.
XXIII.

Forthode þe Maudelayne with myrthe is hir mode:
Tolde scho thies tythynges to Thomas of [Ynde]:
'Criste es resynæ alle hale þat schede his hert blode:
Trow now þis, Tomas: þou salle it sothe fynde':
And þan spake Thomas in stede þer he stode:
'Women are carpend₁ it commes þame of kynde':
Walde he neuer leue it þat² Criste hym selfe þode:
Appered³ to þe appostilles as clerkes hase in [mynde]:
In by[e].
He putt his hande in his syde,
And alle he blyssed in þat tyde,
Þat leuede in his wondis wyde,
And sawe þame neuer with ey.

XXIV.

Forth wente þat semely a⁴ sothe for to say:
He þode to * his discypilles and taghte þame trewthe t[rew]:
And sythen to þat lady þat he louede ay:
Alle hale of his hurtes in hyde and in hewe:
Scho was stabille and stille and faylde neuer say:
Þase foure leues of lufe spynges alle new[e]:
Oure lorde steghe in-tyle heuenz one halowe thoresday:
Sythen folowed his moder with gamen [and]⁶ glew[e]:
Ful euyne.

Bifore hir sone scho knelyd dounæ,
With fulle gude deuocyounæ,
Vpon hir hede he sett a crowne,
And made hir qwen of heuen.

₁ A. are of carpyngæ. B. carpand.
₂ B. or.
₃ A. Or he appered.
₄ B. þe.
₅ B. soght.
₆ A. illegible, probably [and]; B. gramen and with.
XXV.

De serthe lefe of pat trewlufe, blyssede mot scho be!
Scho may hafe joy in hir hert of hir gentil chi[ld]:
Appon his fadir right hand hir sone may scho see:
And pe hende haly gaste vnto pam bathe b[elde]: ¹
Now are pay samen in a gode pase persons iii:
And scho es maydene of myght and modyr ful myl[de]:
Swinlk anopæ trewlufe grew neuer on tre:
Wha-so leues in per lufe salle neuer be bigyled:
  So hende.
    Bot wele es pat ilk wyghte,
    Pat may be sekir of pat syghte,
    Per euer es day and neuer nyghte,
    And joye wright-owtten ende.

XXVI.

Pus hase this faire trew-lufe made vs alle fre:
Our saules owt of bondage he boghte [on be rode]:
He comaundis vs for to kepe and giffes vs poust:
Our saules out of syne for our awene gude:
Mekele sorow wolde we hafe myght we our saulese sec:
When pay ar souenkene in syne as fer[cost] in fl[ode]:
For pan bide we in bonndage in bale for to be:
Pat he hase boghte hally with his hert [blode]:
  To blyssse.
Aske mercy whilles we may;
Bot oure lady for vs pray,
Or we be closede in clay,
  Off myrthe may we mysse.

¹ A. gl... b....  B. bath belde.
xxvii.

Blyssede be þat trewulfe so meke and so mylde:
Sekir and stedfaste and stabille at assaye:
When we hafe wretedede þe thre leues with our werkes wilde:
Þe ferthe es gracious and gude for to helpe aye:
Þan kneles þat lady downe before hir dere childes:
And sare wepys for our sake with hir eghe grace:
Scho es euer fulle of grace, elles1 were we by-gylede:
Scho wynnes with hir wepynge many faire praye:

To kepe.
Sen scho es welle of oure wele,
And alle oure cares will scho kele,
ALLAS, whi gare we hir knele,
And for oure werkes wepe!

xxviii.

Now es no wighte in þis werlde so derne2 ne so dere:
No kynge ne no kayser þof þay bere crowne:
Ne non so faire lady of coloure so clere:
Bot commes dredefulle dede and drawes þame downe:
Vs liste3 neuer leue it for prestes ne for freere:
Or we fele þat we fulle we swelte and we swoone4:
Bot whene our bare body es broghte one a bere:
Þan failes alle felawchipe in felde and in towne:

Bot fonne5:

In a clathe are we knytt,
And sythene putt in a pytt,
Of alle þis werlde are we qwitt,
Forgetynce are we stone.

1 A. grace and elles. B. grace els.
2 A. dewe. B. derne.
3 A. Liste vs. B. Vs lyt.
4 B. with swelt or with swone.
5 B.fone.
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XXIX.

Bot for þat kaytesfe corse es fulle liltille care:
And we be sekir of our saule were þat we salle duelle:
Bot now no wyghte in þis werde so wyse es of lare:
No clerke bi his conynge þat þerof kan þe telle:
How felle wayes ne how ferre vs falles for to fare:
Bot harde wayes are 4 to heuene and hasty to helle:
In purgatorye es payne who so commes þer:
Of mekille wa may þay wytt þat þer-in salle duelle:

Fulle lange.

þat we do are we fare,
Bifore vs fynde we fulle þare,
We may be sekir of na mare,

When paynes are so strange.

XXX.

When grett fyres and gryme are graythede in oure gate:
þer es no glasyng 2 by, bot ince buse vs glyde:
When we are putt in þat payne so harde and so hatte:
We seeke after socoure on euerylke a syde 3:
We calle on oure kynrede 4 þay comme alle to late:
Whene we haue frayste of þat fare felde es our pride:
Bot þan es alle our sorowe na certayne ende 5 we wate:
Bot triste in a trewelufe his mercy to byde:

With drede.

Bot now were tyme to bygynge,
þat trewilufe for to wyne,
þat alle oure bales may blyne,

Whene we haue maste nede.

1 B. Bot hard way is. 2 B. glading. 3 B. euer ilka syde.
4 A. kynredyne. B. kynred. 5 B. no certane.
XXXI.

Of alle þe dayes þat we hase drede, jit awes to knawe:
When we vmythynke vs of ane, fulle sare may we gryse:
þat grete lorde and þat gryme when his bemys salle blawe:
And þe hey iustys salle sytt apon a ful gret syssse:
And alle þe folke of þis werde salle ryse on a rawe:
Þat þe qwik may qwake, when þe dede sal vp ryse:
We may lett for no chance oure synnes for to schewe:
Þer may no golde ne no fee: make oure maynpryce:

No kyne.

Þan es alle our pryde gane,
Oure robis and our riche pane,
Alle bot a crysome on-ane,
þat we were crystened ine.

XXXII.

When we are callede to þat court, bihounes vs to here:
þer alle salle be soyttures bothe þe bonde and þe free:
þe saull[es] [and þe] bodyes þat la[ng]e ha[f]e bene sere:
Þame [behou]es samene come vnto þat sembelee:
Ilk a saule salle be sent at fett hys awenn fere:
When Crist wille vs gadir, a grete lorde es he:
With our flesche and our felle als we in werlde were:
And neuere salle sonderyng fra þat day be

To knawe,

Oure werkes are wretyn and scorde,
In a role of recorde,
Before þat ilk grete lorde,
Fulls scharply to schawe.

1 B. alane. 2 B. seyne.
3 Lines 3 and 4, being in the MS, the bottom line of f. 100 b, are mutilated and only the top half of the letters remains in most cases.
4 A. semelye. B. sembelee.
5 A. in. B. and.
AN ALLITERATIVE RELIGIOUS LYRIC
xxxv.

He schalle schew his wondis blody and bare:
Als he hase sofferde for oure sake wytter and wyde:
Kynges and kaysers before hym pane salle fare:
Byschopis and baroinnis and alle bus habyde:
Erelles and Empereours nane will he spare:
Prestys and parsones and prelatis of pryde:
Thies justyce and mellarse of lawe and of lare:
Pat now are fulle ryalle to ryne and to ryde:

In lande.

Paire dome salle pay take pare,
Ryghte als pay demyd are,
Whene pay ware of myghtis mare,
And domes hadde in hande.

xxxvi.

Thire ladysyre are arayede in robys ful sare:
Revers and rebanes with gowzcze and with gyde:
Bendys and botondys felettis and fare:
Golde on paire garlandis, perry and pryde:
Kelles and corchyfes at couere paire hare:
So schaply and schynand to schewe by paire hyde:
Alle pat welthe es a-way. and myrthe mekille mare:
Bot if we wyn pat treuuffle vnglade may we glyde:
For sorowe.

Betyme es beste pat we blyne,
If we be funne fulle of synne;
Per es no kythe ne no kyne,
Fra bale may vs borowe.

1 B. wyter.  2 B. before hys bus fare.  3 A. for nane.  B. nane.
4 B. meroures.  5 B. semande.  6 B. syde.  7 so B. A. vnglade
8 MS. fene, last letter blurred; it may be a e, but it resembles e. A. f
of synne.  B. fone fulle of synne.
XXXVII.

Be lordis and be ladys not alle¹ telle I:
Bot alswa by oper I synde fulle fele:
Thies galiarde gedlynges þat kythes gentry:
With denyos damysels þer many mene dele:
With purfelle and peloure and hedys fulle hye:
Hir corse es in mydwarde of² hir catele:
If men carpe of hir kyne a-waye wille scho scho wry:
Hir fadir and hir modir fayne wolde scho hele:
   And hyde.
   Bot when þat day sale begyne,
   þan schames nane with þair kyne,
   Bot alle may þam schame with þair syn,
   And with þair fulle pryde.

XXXVIII.

Þe dome of þat trewluſe ful sare may we drede:
For þan es tyme paste of mercy to craue:
When ilk mane sale be demede after his awenn dede:
Þan may we not ourselfe sytt and sende forthe our knau[e]:
He rekkenys by resonwe als clerkes rede³:
He settis one his ryght hande þat he wille saue:
Thase wafulle wyghtis þat may not þer spede:
Sal stand on his left-hand and wa⁴ sale þay haue:
   For ay.
   þan wille our lady wepe sare,
   For sorow þat scho sees þare,
   When scho may helpe no mare,
   Grete dole es þat day.

¹ B. anely.  ² A. in.  B. of.
³ A. als thies clerkis rede.  B. as clarkes rede.
⁴ so B.  A. þair sange es of sorowe and swa.
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XXXIX.

Bot now es tymé for to speke who so wille spede:

*And for to seke socoure and folys to fée*:

And noghte appons domesdaye when we haue maste nede:

For nowe es mekille mercy and þan salle nane be:

When oure lady Marie dare nott for drede:

Speke till hir dere sone so dredfullæ es he:

How may þay hase mercy for þaire mysdede:

þat wille not folowe perto. when þat it es fée:

*And þære*:

Ther es no way bot twa,

Vn to wele or to wa,

Whethir so salle we ga,

We duelle euer mare.'

XL.

Thus this trewe turtyle techis this may:

Scho blyssede his body his bone and his blode:

Vnto þat ilke fyrthe lefe I rede þat we praye:

þat scho wille bere oure message with a mylde mode:

And þat scho speke for oure lufe before þat laste day:

Vnto þase ilke iij leues þat we may wyne with mode:

þat grace grauntedæ grete gode þat dyede on gud fryday:

Vnto þat ilke fyrthe lefe gracyouse and gude:

þat kynge.

This herde I in a lay:

Als I wente one my way,

In a mornynge of may,

Whene medowes sall sprynge.

1. A. folys for to fée. B. folys to fée. 2. A. thære. B. þære. 3. A. whethir so salle to ga. B. Wheder þat we salles ga. 4. B. þat ilk lufe. 5. B. leves gracyous and gode þe lufe of þase iij leyes at we wyne may þat grace grente grete gud þat died on a rode. 6. B. wale. 
XVII.

THE SISTER'S SON.

An excellent judge, Professor E. B. Tylor, going over all the evidence for and against the theory of the matriarchate, charged the jury some three years ago to give a Scottish verdict. It is clear that fresh evidence, and not fresh arguments, will advance the question to a more satisfactory state; and while this paper has no direct facts to offer in regard to the matriarchate, it brings forward some evidence about the so-called nephew-right, a matter which in many ways concerns the larger question. Nobody denies the fact of nephew-right; it is established with more or less certainty for ancient Arabians, Hindus, Greeks and Germans, while the testimony of eye-witnesses confirms its existence among divers modern tribes. The nephew, not the son, inherits property and succeeds to dignities in Egypt, Nubia and the Soudan, in parts of India, and in America. Preference, moreover, in the majority of these cases is for the sister's son. I propose to review all the statements and hints which point to a survival of this preference in the English and Scottish popular ballads, with a glance at other legendary material; and then to ask whether this survival is a thing of legal and historical importance, or whether, as Westermarck, Schrader, Leist, and others would assert,
it is a natural outgrowth of a time when death of fat was so common as to bring the uncle into prominence. Evidence, moreover, must be straightforward and convincing. I shall not, for a far cry, cite that remarkable stanza of a version of *Fair Janet*¹—

Ye’ll do me up, and further up,  
To the top of yon greenwood tree;  
For every pain myself shall hae  
The same pain ye maun dree—

to prove either the *cownade* or a Darwinian tree-plate. Nor, to come to the actual subject, can we find much beyond ordinary domestic affection in the love of brother and sister, and in the numerous instances of fraternal affection found in so many ballads². True, one calls one’s self heart ‘sister’ as the dearest of names. Says the Connacht lover, with formidable tenderness—

There is no man would touch my one little sister,  
That I would not make powder of his bones³;

in Corsica, a young widow, wailing the *vocero* over a murdered spouse, calls herself his ‘sister’; and Janky, an outburst of conjugal love, appeals to his prostrate wife of Bath—as his ‘deere suster Alisoun.’ To take vengeance for a sister, so ran old Germanic sentiment, is better than thirst for gold; and the ballads are full of the same spirit witness, along with more familiar cases, *Proud Lady Gasdret* and the confident Wise William ⁴. But what of Valentine and Gretchen make no proof for the matrilineal bond. We shall rather look at those cases in the ballads ⁵

---

² Talij long ago remarked that Servian ballads put a positively character upon this relation.  
³ Douglas Hyde, *Love Songs of Connacht*, pp. 61, 73.  
⁴ Child, i. 495; iv. 383.
stress is laid upon the sister's son, a far less obvious matter, and where this stress seems to modern ideas unnecessary or abnormal or absurd, according to the occasion. If instances of this sort prevail, they make probable a legal or customary origin; the survival, by the very fact of its absurdity, points to primitive law. When one set of laws and customs must give place to another set, the former passes into communal sentiment; and communal sentiment is an antiseptic of the first power.

Now there is something more than the survivals in ballad and legend; there is a direct statement by Tacitus, and there are divers hints in the old Germanic chronicles and genealogies. One has, so to speak, both ends of a broken bridge. Tacitus is very clear; among his Germans 'a sister's sons are considered to be related to her brothers as nearly as to their own father. Some tribes even estēm the former tie to be the closer and more sacred of the two, and they tend to require it in exacting hostages, as appealing more strongly to the feelings and giving a wider hold upon the family. Nevertheless a man's own children are his heirs and successors, and there is no power of bequest.'

Now does this mean that, in the time of Tacitus the paternal system was adopted in Germanic law, while the sister's son remained sacred in sentiment and tradition? It is significant that Saxo Grammaticus fell upon a similar confusion in accounts of a certain royal succession. People who made the genealogies of the Danish kings—to adopt P. E. Müller's interpretation of perīta rerum prodit antiquitas—recorded that one Ingellus had four sons, of whom three were slain, and only one, Olaf, survived to reign in the stead of his father. But this Olaf, says Saxo, who knew traditions not glossed and edited by the learned, is thought by 'some' to

1 Germania, c. 20; Townshend's translation. Instances of nephew-right, Annales, xii. 29, 30; and Hist. iv. 33, v. 20.
2 Ed. Muller, p. 319, Bk. vii.
have been the old king’s sister’s son: quem quidam Ingelli sorore editum incerto opinionis arbitrio perhibent. To this Müller remarks that while two chronicles call Olavus son of Ingellus, a third makes the statement, by way of comment on the other relation, that for many years after the times of Ingellus, sons did not succeed to fathers on the throne, but nephews to uncles.

This matter can be followed in the German genealogies with which we have here no space to deal. Lamprecht sums up the tendency with the remark that a formal genealogy reckons by the patriarchal system; but so soon as one reaches mythical ground, the old notion of mother-right holds sway. Both Bachofen and Dargun have covered to some extent the reaches of Germanic legends in seeking proof for the matriarchate; but there is still plenty to record in the case of the sister’s son. In byways and episodes of legend, fragments of lost epic, offshoots and even rubbish, here and there occurs a valuable bit of evidence. Late poems often patch together odd shreds of nobler song, and yet leave the older pattern in sight. Pilgerin was brother to Uote, mother of the Burgundian kings; it is said that he had the Klage written because of his love for his sister’s sons. Ortwin is sister’s son to Hagen, Wolfhart to Hildebrand, Sigestap to Dietrich of Bern, and in all these cases there is store of mutual love. By the old notion, presently...

1 See also Saxo on Ermanric, where sister’s sons claim the throne—p. 413, B. viii.
2 Deutsche Geschichte, p. 98.
3 Gudrun, in one version, kills her own children because they did not as Atli for the lives of their mother’s brothers. W. Grimm, Heldensage, p. 370—See, too, Child, Ballads, iii. 18, where Olaf Tryggvason shoots at a chesman on the head of a young heathen’s sister’s son; and the Greek story of similar character.
4 The most astonishing vagary of the inferior powers is to make Volke’s a sister’s son to Kriemhild. These poems grow more and more confused about kinship. In Briemolf, Nantwin is sister’s son to Wittich, yet hostile; the situation calls out vehement protest from Hildebrand and Rudger. I have found perhaps a half-dozen cases in Germanic legend where specific rights are imputed to the sister’s daughter.
to be shown as survival in the ballads, famous men are
provided with a sister's son, while later tradition gives them,
or would give them, sons of their own flesh. Old and new
systems join hands in the case of King Ortnit; dying, he
commends his son to a king who is his 'mother's brother.'
Yet when one makes way back to the uncontaminated
legends, the sister's son has a preference quite in keeping
with the account given by Tacitus. The Waltharius, for
example, has several admirable passages¹ in point; not
until his sister's son is slain will Hagen fight his sworn
brother-in-arms. That must be a fearful and staggering
provocation which bade a man sever one of the most sacred
of all bonds; nevertheless—

decus tuæ manibus caædem perquiræ nepotis!

It is worth noting that this fight is a focal point of Germanic
ethics, a clash of three loves: for chieftain, for brother-in-
arms, for a sister's son; and it is no wonder that survivals
of these three virtues are found in the traditional Germanic
ballad.

But we must come nearer to these ballads, and at least
abide on English ground. In the Beowulf, with diminishing
sentiment as compared with ballad instances, there is
increased hint of a law in the case, lapsed indeed, but still
kept in mind, something akin to the confusion noted by
Tacitus and Saxo. What of Beowulf's family²? Little
comes out in regard to his father; but much is made of the
fact that he is sister's son to Hygelac, to whose court he
was sent as a boy, and of whom he always speaks in terms
of absolute devotion and love. Before the fight, he makes
Hygelac his heir; and when he hands him the gifts from

¹ One of them is cited by Dargun, Mutterrecht und Raubehe, p. 55. See
his other cases, from the Norse and the German, and from Gregory of
Tourns.
² The temptation to research in myth, to exploit Freyir, Nerthus and the
rest, is keen, but must not here be indulged.
Heorot, there is a hint that father and son were once even less to each other than in Beowulf's own day. 'Hrothgar gave me this battle-gear and bade me tell thee its story. He said that Heorogar... had it long while; yet for all that was he not fain to give it to his son, brave Heoroweard, though he was well minded towards him.' That is, folk had begun to ask why things of this sort were not in old times given to sons rather than to brothers. Then, too, there is an interesting contrast of a faithless brother's son at the Danish court 1, and the faithful sister's son personified by the hero himself. It is clear that Beowulf is expected to succeed his mother's brother on the throne; when Hygelac is slain, Beowulf shall marry the widow and rule over the realm, an expectation clearly founded on precedent custom, which cares little for the fact that Hygelac has left a son. But Beowulf belongs to the new order; he holds to the sentiment of nephew-right, but rejects its privileges 2. Moreover, he has probably been 'edited' into this state of mind, being quite too bland for a Germanic king of the old rock. Christian sentiment, blending with traditions of the sunny and peaceful Ingaevonic god, has put him into that condition which Huckleberry Finn and other right-minded savages abhor: he has been 'sivilized.' Is it folly to conjecture that the historical Beowulf, of whom those stories of uncanny strength and prowess went about, was sister's son to the historical Hygelac, and really took his uncle's kingdom by that right to which Danish chroniclers refer?

Before we come to the ballads, there is time for a hasty glance at that more courtly tradition which took refuge with Arthur and his knights. The sister's son—one thinks, too, of Roland and Charlemagne—throws his shadow over Layamon's *Brut*; and the shadow, for whatever reason, is

1 Beow. 1184 ff.
2 As culture-hero, bringer of a new system, celebrated in the *deus ille fui*—of legend and myth, this conduct of Beowulf is significant.
far better defined than with Wace and Geoffrey. Tradition of the countryside¹ and the monk’s own imagination filled out the details which he found in his books. Where Geoffrey uses the colourless nepos, as he does in most cases, and Wace nies, Layamon is sure, wherever genealogy permits, to bring out the sister’s son². In one place³, Geoffrey says that King Constantine was slain by his nephew Conan, ‘a youth of great probity,’ who proceeded to put another uncle into prison. Wace is laconic:

Conans ses nies après réna...
Son oncle guerroia et prist.

Neither Layamon nor the other translator of Wace, Robert of Brunne, is satisfied with this brevity. Robert adds emphatic words; but Layamon makes Conan ‘sister’s son’ to Constantine; so that when this young man of probity ‘betrays to death’ his mother’s brother, kills the other uncle, and poisons two cousins, one agrees with the monk that here was ‘the most accursed man that sun ever shone on!’ These are legal cases; the sentiment is of course more plentiful and more intense. Androgeus⁴, protecting his sister’s son, Evelin, from royal displeasure, is besieged by the king, but appeals to Caesar. ‘One was my sister’s son,’ he writes; ‘the other’ (whom Evelin had killed) ‘was corne of the king’s kin; he was his half-sister’s son, he was to the king most dear of all his folk’—a standing phrase for this relationship in Layamon. Another case is that of Bedver and Ridwathlan⁶; the latter slays the slayer of

¹ And surely, too, ballads like those which Malmesbury used, ‘cantilenis per succesiones temporum detritus.’
² Brut, ed. Madden, 23109 ff. Geoffrey makes Sichelinus have a nepos, Lot; Layamon says ‘Lot is his sister’s son, the better shall it be for him!’ So 22189 ff. Arthur says to Lot: ‘Thou hast my sister to wife, the better it shall be for thee . . . her sons twain, they are to me in the land dearest of all children’: Gawain and Mordred.
³ Ibid., 28730 ff.
⁴ Ibid., 22135 ff., however, Geoffrey is clearer than Layamon, who has misunderstood Wace. Ivor and Yuni were son and sister’s son to Alain.
⁵ Ibid., 8141 ff., 8407 ff.
⁶ Ibid., 27593 ff.
his mother’s brother, ‘Bedver, my love, that was best of our kin.’ Most affecting, however, is the story of Brian, bower-thane to the king, and his sister’s son, who takes the king’s head in his lap and lulls him to sleep. The king falls ill and has an exceeding desire for deer’s flesh. Brian hunts in vain, finds nothing, and in desperate case cuts flesh from his own thigh, roasts it and brings it to the king. One is glad to learn that this monarch recovers, and that Brian goes about as usual.

The cream of this sentiment, however, is in Malory. The smaller heroes, of course, have sister’s sons; Agnarus is rescued by an obliging uncle from a certain ‘earle,’ who thereupon sends out his nephews, and they burn the other uncle to a crisp. But it is Arthur’s sister’s sons who claim attention. There is Mordred, who like Sigmund’s Fitela, is both son and sister’s son; and over against this faithless nephew is set another son of Igrayne, that Gawain who at last dies nobly for his mother’s brother, and for whom Arthur makes lament: ‘Alas, Sir Gawain, my sister’s son, here now thou liest, the man in the world whom I loved most!’ When Arthur falls at the hands of the son-and-sister’s son, we moderns read the moral that our pleasant vices are made instruments to plague us; but perhaps an older world saw deeper tragedy in the astounding perversion of kinship. Here Layamon may speak in what is his longest interpolation and probably his own work; ill done, he cries, to go in secret to the queen, ill deed for a sister’s son!

1 Brut, ed. Madden, 30257 ff., 30549 ff. In regard to the bower-thane, see Ueland’s Graf Eberhard; Paul the Deacon’s Hist. Lombard., iii. 55; and even classical examples cited by Sittl, Gebärden der Griechen und Römer, p. 34.
2 Humbler forms of romance, such as Athelstone (Wright and Halliwell, Reliquiae Antiquae, ii. 85; Eng. Stud., xii,), yield good gains, but take us too far afield. There is a romantic trait in the Vílkonasaga, when Thidrek sends a sister’s son to woo Hilde, with results akin to those which beset King Mark and his sister’s son Tristan; although the generous Saxo goes on to supply nephew Herberi with a sister’s son of his own.
3 Morte Darthur, ed. Sommers, pp. 656 ff.
4 See the ballad account of Child Wynter, below.
This phrase of sister's son rings out in grim iteration when the treachery of Mordred is announced; and Walwain bids men bear witness that he renounces his own bond of brotherhood, and cleaves for life or death to his mother's brother, the king.

At last we come to the ballads. Of course, ballads about Arthur repeat the sister's son; where 'cousin,' 'cuz,' is used, sister's son is doubtless meant. The 'four and twenty of my next cousins' in *Old Robin of Portingale* is a variant of 'bauld four and twenty sister's sons' in a version of *Johnny Armstrong*. This sister's son in the ballads, as in the chronicles, the legends, and the romances, may look to inherit his uncle's estates. Often he is a foot-page to the mother's brother, just as Beowulf served Hygelac. When Old Robin has killed the four and twenty wife's 'cousins,' and Sir Gyles the lover to boot, the venerable hero 'call'd ... up his little foote-page, and made him heyre of all his lands'; and this may well be a sister's son. 'Here am I, a pretty little boy, your eldest sister's son,' says the foot-page, in a version of *Prince Robert*, ready to run upon his kinsman's service. Child Maurice feels no concern about his messenger:

'I fearna ill of my bonnie boy,
My sister's son are ye.'

A version of *Otterburn*, 'from recitation,' merely mentions the fact of kindred: 'near of Percy's kin'; but the Outlaw Murray, in great danger,

... called up his little foot-page,
His sister's son I trow was he.

All of us have sighed for that 'uncle in India'; but ballad

---

1 Probably even in the phrase 'Thou hast not been true to *sir or cuz*,' Child, iii. 151.
2 *My sister's sonne be ye,* says Arthur to his 'cozen, Sir Gawaine,' in *King Arthur and King Cornwall.* See below, p. 147.
3 *Ibid.,* ii. 385, C. 8; cf. B. 6, and *Fair Mary of Wallington*, ii. 311, where the page is 'near unto akin.'
4 Child, iii. 301; v. 195.
uncles were more to the purpose. Lang Johnny More, a Scot, in love with the English king’s daughter, is overcome at London by scoundrels who give him ‘draps of lodomy’ and chain him tight; he cries for a foot-page ‘that will rin on to my uncle, at the foot of Bennachie.’ The boy runs, Johnny is released, weds the princess, but spurns the suggestion of tocher—for why? He is rich himself and ‘heir to an estate at the foot of Bennachie.’ Maybe the little foot-page was himself Johnny’s sister’s son; but the fact is clear enough that this relationship explained affection and benefits that else would have set tongues wagging. Any one case, of course, might go to the account of ordinary family relations; but this cumulative proof about the sister’s son points to a more exquisite reason—Jellon Grame dares not acknowledge his own son, whose mother he has put to death:

And he’s brought up that bonny boy,  
Call’d him his sister’s son,

which might pass in a modern novel; but absurdity often gives the situation need of a prop in legal tradition, as when this relationship explains the doings of ladies. Lady Margaret gives poisoned wine to a former faithless lover, and answers his reproaches by the assurance that he is getting his deserts. However, her heart is not all flint:

‘But I will bury thee, Lord Thomas,’ she said,  
‘Just as if thou wert one of my own;  
And when that my good lord comes home,  
I will say thou’s my sister’s son.’

The sister’s son, in Germanic times, doubtless inherited something besides an estate; he was heir to the sacred heritage of vengeance. To be sure, in the ballads it is con—

1 Child, iv. 396 ff.  
2 Ibid., iv. 304, A. 16.  
3 Ibid., iv. 426 ff., a ballad traced ‘traditionally far into the last century.’
ventionally the son ‘on the nourice’s knee’ who announces this sense of responsibility; but now and then the sister’s son is substituted. In a traditional version of Lord Thomas and Fair Aunet\(^1\) a sort of conseil de famille is going on with regard to the hero’s choice of a wife; the sire has voted for the nut-brown bride with corn and cattle, presumably to the convincing of Willie the bridegroom, when

Up than spake his sister’s son
Sat on the nurse’s knee,

and gave the nobler counsel.

The best examples of a sister’s son taking the son’s place, however, are in the tragedies of kinship and love, precisely where one would expect to find them. In Lord Ingram and Child Wyet\(^2\), one version reaches the tragedy of the case by first taking the familiar old husband and young wife—‘Ihr kennt das alte Märchen!’—and then revealing the lover as sister’s son to the husband:

\[ 'Tis I forbid ye, Auld Ingram,
For to seek me to spouse;
For Lord Wayets, your sister’s son,
Has been into my bowers.’\]

A bonny boy runs to Wayets with the news. ‘What is it,’ asks the youth; ‘a son or a daughter, perchance?’ ‘Not at all,’ is the reply; ‘she bids you to her wedding!’ Wayets goes into the proper ballad rage, dinging up the table and ending cups into the fire: ‘Who dares marry my Maisdry?’

The boy feels that he has begun at the wrong end. ‘Why ’tis your mither’s brither!’ The climax is well managed; Lord Wayets is sobered at once, sends a deal of dainties and wine to the wedding, and attends it himself, in an agitated frame of mind, but with reasonably proper bearing. The tragic solution of the other versions is wanting; perhaps here the relationship brought about a happy end, for Auld

\(^1\) Child, iv. 469.  
\(^2\) Ibid., ii. 126, C.
Ingram offers to father the bairn. Another tragic motif, common in all times, is where Child Owlet, virtuous to his own undoing, refuses to be Lady Erskine’s lover:

‘How would I cuckold Lord Ronald,
And me his sister’s son?’

The tragic conclusion is familiar enough, but not the substitution of this relationship. Now the point in all these substitutions is the element of nearness, dearness, tenderness; the obligation to do or leave undone what modern ideas demand or forbid in the filial case. That sterling ballad, *Johnny Cock*, as it lies before us, is not at all clear in the article of kin, but it is suggestive. The forester who protests is Johnny’s sister’s son; and when Johnny proceeds to kill six and spare the seventh, this must be an uncle’s clemency, or gratitude. What, too, of the versions where neither bird nor boy, but a wounded forester, carries the bode-word to Johnny’s mother? What if Johnny was the sister’s son to the forester, a better station than uncle for one described as ‘the comeliest youth’? At all events, a mother’s brother was useful to the outlaw; witness the shelter which Little John and Much find in ‘Moch emy’s hous’. We should like, moreover, to see the confusion cleared up in the various copies of *Johnny Scot*. Johnny will fare to England and rescue his love, the princess, from death; but his parents cannily bid him lie close. However, in A, Johnny’s ‘best friend,’ in I, his ‘ae best man,’ in K, ‘a pretty youth’—foot-page and sister’s son?—sympathize with the hero’s yearning, and help him free the lady. In B, D, F, G, it is our gude Scotch king

---

1 Child, v. 156 sq.
2 Ibid., iii. 1-12.
3 In Percy’s copy. The ‘uncle’s son’ in E is a corruption, surely. Scott’s version puts the cruel counsel upon this sister’s son. Some versions omit all mention of kin. Was the sister’s son—or mother’s brother—in the original ballad a disguised ally of Johnny, like Grenelefe in the *Gest*?
4 *R. H. and Monk*, st. 38.
5 Child, iv. 377 sq.
who comes to the rescue; but in C we get silly sooth and
the old order of things. 'If ye to England go,' says the
sire¹, in melancholy agreement with the opinion of Dr.
Johnson, 'I fear ye'll nae return!'

But out and spake his uncle then,

and offers the five hundred life-guards; while Laidlaw's
copy for Scott says that

Johnie's uncle

Our Scottish king was he;

and so we work back to the Beowulf-Hygelac relation.

But we are waiting for the proof of the 'nearest and
dearest'; and this proof meets us in the climax of more
than one ballad. Take Geordie, of which 'many variations
exist among reciters².' Geordie's wife will free him from
gallows or block, and offers a series of ransoms in which the
climax must strike the modern reader, not only as ludicrous,
but even as somewhat nugatory; not so, however, if traditi-
ions of 'the dearest' still pointed to sister's son and
mother's brother. Take seven 'weel gawn mills' for 'the
sparin' of my Geordie!' No. My bairns, eleven of them,
and the twelfth 'bears up my body,' I'll see them all dead
before me 'afore I lose my Geordie!' No. Can the force
of nature go further?

'I hae se'en uncles in the north,
    They gang baith proud an lordly';

and the wife's bolt is shot. A similar offer, but better for
our purposes, is made by Johnny Armstrong³. Now in
ballads these things go by incremental repetition and the
best of three; note Johnny's third offer to the king. First,

¹ The colourless nature of the paternal relation in the ballads at large is
in striking contrast to the uncle's and the nephew's sharp outlines, as well
as to the significant stress laid upon the mother's counsels, whether for
treachery or for love.

² Child, iv. 124 ff. I quote the copy sent in 1802 by Laidlaw to Scott.

³ In the version from Allan Ramsay's Ever Green.
'mekle gude Inglis gilt'; second, 'four and twenty gauging mills'; third;

'Grant me my life, my liege, my king,
And a great gift I'll gie to thee;
Bauld four and twenty sister's sons'...

But the king is inexorable. Another offer, out of the triad, I take to be mere bravado, as Johnny sees his doom in the king's face—all the land between here and Newcastle; but the uncles were Johnny's trump card. Note, too, Johnny's further remark; knew the English king of this, he were blythe the indeed:

'For anes I slew his sister's son'...

Jock o' the Side has this to say of his fighting kin:

'Wee are brother's childer nine or ten,
And sister's children ten or eleven';

and we know what hot work of vengeance was made for the nephew in a feud of the border. In *The Lads of Wamphray*, Willie of the Kirkhill, presumably a sister's son, revenges the death of his uncle, William Johnstone, 'the Galliard'; the Biddessburn 'ran three days blood.' But a nephew's pains and benefits were not always a revenue, to quote Mackintosh's definition of Fame, 'payable to one's ghost.' Outlaw Murray sends for help to Halliday—'he certain is my sister's son,' and will succour promptly. Or take the rule of three and climax in *Sir Andrew Barton*. The only hope for the pirate is to get at those mysterious 'beams' in his topcastle. First, Sir Andrew calls on one Gourden, and offers three hundred pound; but Horsley's arrow frustrates this attempt.

'Come hither to me, James Hambleton,
Thou art my sister's sonne', I have no more'...

and Hambleton falls. Sir Andrew has no dearest left; he

---

1 See Layamon's case of Evelin, above.
2 Child, iii. 458; the event is dated 1593.
3 The three versions carefully notice this relationship.
goes himself, and to his death. In *Otterburn* and in *Cheviot*,
the sister's son peeps out of the cloud of tradition, but
vaguely. The bulk of our material for this subject lies in
inferior, vagrom ballads; for the survival is too incidental,
the allusion too obscure, to bear the scrutiny of fame in the
wear and chances of a great ballad. Scott's version of
*Otterburn*, however, has—

... 'Fetch my ain dear sister's son,
Sir Hugh Montgomery' ...

and in the *Cheviot*, probably, despite Mr. J. W. Hales's
vehement protest, the same fight, with doughty Douglas
were slain Sir Hugh and Sir Dauy Lwdale... 'his sister's
son was he.' One thinks of another great fight, far to the
south, and centuries earlier, where fey men began to fall, and

Wounded was Wulfmaer, he went to death,
Byrhtnoth's kinsman, with bills he was bewn,
His sister's son...

Let us leave the sister's son, however, in happier case,
though in sadly degenerate company. In *Robin Hood
Newly Revived*¹, Robin and young Gamwell fight, ignorant
of their own kinship, Hildebrand and Hathubrand with a
difference. 'I am looking for my uncle, one Robin Hood,'
says Gamwell. 'What! art thou a cousin of Robin Hood?'
'I am his own sister's son,' says Gamwell.

But Lord! what kissing and courting was there
When these two cousins did greet,
says the singer, like another Pepys; and tells how Little
John came up, wanted a bout, and was refused by Robin
with the 'only' formula, 'he's my own dear sister's son,
and cousins I have no mo.' A traditional version of *Robin
Hood Revived* is known as *The Bold Pedlar and Robin
Hood*; but the relationship is jarred a little. 'You are my

¹ Child, iii. 144.
mother's own sister's son; what nearer cousins can there be? This is the kin-bond which bound Christ to St. John in the Anglo-Saxon homilies. A piece of sheer ballad-mongery, the rollicking *Robin Hood's Birth, Breeding, and Marriage*¹, is yet more intricate through a hint of the peerage on Robin's spindle side, his mother being not only sister to Gamwell but niece to Guy of Warwick. The outlaw's genealogy is notoriously tangled, and should be set right by a capable scholar. In that beautiful ballad, *Robin Hood's Death*, the hero trusts in Dame Prior because she is his 'aunt's daughter'; but an aunt's daughter smacks of later fiction, and Robin, at any cost, must be kept clear of teacup sentiment. We cannot away with Robin Hood and an aunt's daughter; when matters are cleared up, he shall be right sister's son, a proper tragedy. Finally, romance and mawkishness join hands to do their worst in *Lady Elspat*², a ballad, strange to say, which has not lacked admirers. Lady Elspat's Sweet William is haled by her mother before a judge, a righteous judge, who sees nae faut in the young man.

'Take back your love now, Lady Elspat,
An' my best blessing you bainth upon;
For gin he be your own true-love,
He is my eldest sister's son.'

We could not possibly leave the sister's son in better case. He has 'gold enough, and Emilie,' Lady Elspat and his uncle's land, with this learned justicer as a bulwark against all assaults of the mother-in-law.

Here, then, is no remarkable store of examples; nevertheless, I think this persistent mention of a sister's son in the ballads something which indeed may not do much for the legal assumption if we take it as an isolated fact, but which, as a part of the cumulative proof furnished by Tacitus, by

¹ Child, iii. 214 ff.
² Ibid., iv. 197.
Germanic legend, by old genealogies, by romance, hints if it does not prove an older law in the case. There are wider fields to search; any one can think of stray instances in Celtic literature; and systematic investigation would doubtless bring additional and welcome evidence from this as well as from other stores of tradition.

FRANCIS B. GUMMERE.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE,
January 3, 1900.
XVIII.

RHETORIC IN THE TRANSLATION OF BEDE.

In the Modern Language Notes, November, 1893, Professor O. F. Emerson published a searching criticism of Earle's Doctrine of Bilingualism. At p. 205 occurs the following remark:

'Prof. Hart has also furnished me many similar examples of word-pairs in the so-called Alfredian Bede, pointing out also that in a great many such cases the two words are used to translate a single word in the original Latin.'

Throughout the college year 1892–3 I had been conducting a seminary in the OE. Bede. In the course of the reading I became more and more impressed with the rhetorical peculiarities of the translation. Long before the end of the year I became convinced that the translator of the Bede could not have been the translator of the Pastoral Care. The method of attacking, so to speak, the original is organically different in the two works.

The most obvious idiosyncrasy of the Bede translator is his almost incessant recourse to two terms for rendering one of the Latin. This idiosyncrasy became to us, in our seminary reading, a standing joke, formulated $a + b = x$. When Professor Emerson discussed with me the rough draft of his paper mentioned above, I called his attention...
to the *Bede* and gave him a couple of pages of illustrative passages. When the paper appeared, I conceived the plan of re-reading the *Bede* line by line and making an exhaustive tabulation of every instance in which the translator has employed two terms for one. This I did for the first 166 pages of Miller’s edition. At that point the work was interrupted.

Being invited to contribute my mite to the volume in honour of Dr. Furnivall, I venture to submit a select few out of the many ‘doublets’ thus discovered in one-third of the *Bede*. Even these few ought to satisfy any one that the process of rhetorical amplification was known in England long before the Conquest and quite apart from the seeds of alliterative verse. Further, I would ask those to still adhere to the Alfredian authorship of the *Bede* translation, if they can discover anything like this ‘doubling’ in the *Pastoral* or the *Orosius*.

The references are: for the OE. to Miller’s edition; for the Latin, to Plummer. In counting Plummer’s lines I have disregarded the chapter-headings. The doublets will be found to represent the several grammatical classes: noun, adjective, verb. The verbal concept is the one most equently doubled; this would be more obvious, were the list exhaustive.

**Latin.**

sedes, 12/21 (see 11/28).

obsecrans, 16/5 (see 28/28).

subito diuina gratia respectus, 18/15.

inquirere, 18/23.

nimio furore, 19/31.

praecipit, 19/32.

autumans, 19/32.

cum tormentis acerrimis, 19/34.

decollatus, 21/15.

**Old English.**

secel 7 eardungstowe, 28/27 (see 28/9).

bæd 7 halsade, 32/6 (see 290/24).

semninga mid ḟam godcundan gyfe gesawen 7 gemildsad, 34/18.

secan 7 acsian, 34/25.

mid miclum wylme 7 yrre, 36/30.

het 7 bebead, 36/30.

tealde 7 wende, 36/32.

mid grimnum swinglum 7 tintregum, 36/34.

heafde beslegen 7 gemartyrød, 40/11.
Latin.

subiectionem continuam, 26/6.
monent, 27/12.
a feris, 28/7.
gemitus, 28/23.
conruerunt, 28/9 (see 32/24).

Old English.
exōmode hyrnysse 7 singaleunder-
peodnysse, 44/13.
manedon 7 lærdon, 44/34.
from wulfum 7 wildeorum, 46/23.
geong 7 geomerung, 48/5.
gehruron 7 gefeollan, 48/15 (see
52/29).
gōd mon 7 gemetfest, 54/13.
wislicra 7 gehæledra, 56/3.
after hæse 7 bebode, 62/28.

The most convincing impression of the translator’s man-
nerism is to be gained from the Interrogations and Re-
sponses in Book I, ch. xxvii. This section is here treated
exhaustively.

Latin.

qualiter conuersentur, 48/13.
eum erudire studuit, 48/20.
conuersari, 48/20.
propter hospitalitatem atque sus-
ceptionem, 48/24.
ecclesiis reparandis, 48/24.
erudita, 48/26.
perducta, 48/28.
conuersationem, 48/29.
clerici, 49/3.
omne quod superest, 49/14.
erogandum est, 49/15.
quod superest, 49/16.
consuetudinem, 49/23.
mīhi placet, 49/24.
non ex furore, 50/7.

Old English.

hu hy drohtian 7 liñgan sculon,
64/6.
he hine geornlice tydde 7 lærde,
64/12.
drohtian 7 don, 64/13.
for feorme 7 onfongnesse geasta 7
cumen, 64/16.
to edneowunge 7 to bōte Godes
circum, 64/18.
getyd 7 gelered, 64/19.
becumen 7 gelaced, 64/21.
drohtunge 7 līf, 64/22.
preostas 7 Godes þæowas, 64/25.
eall þætte ofer bið to læfe, 66/10.
it is to reccenne 7 to sellene, 66/11.
þætte ofer seo 7 to læfe, 66/13.
þeaw 7 gewunan, 66/18.
me þynceþ 7 bet licscþ, 66/19.
nales of welmen of hatheortnesse,
68/7.
þreageþ 7 swingaþ, 68/11.
mid þam wihtum þreageþ 7 swen-
cacþ, 68/12.
lufacþ wilniaþ, 68/12.

uerberibus feriunt, 50/11.
doloribus adfigunt, 50/12.
querunt, 50/12.
LATIN.

insequi, 50/13.
dictat, 50/15.
hoc fieri modis omnibus licet, 50/23.
didicimus, 50/32.
succrescere, 50/33.
prohibet, 50/33.
debet abstinere, 51/3.
facinus, 51/4.
prece pariter fundant, 52/27.
priuare, 52/33.
debet agere, 53/3.
corrigantur, 53/4.
in disciplinae uigore, 53/4.
accendundus est, 53/5.
iussioni, 53/8.
immortalitatem quam acceperant, 54/10.
poenam, 54/30.
offrenda, 55/2.
nouimus, 55/22.
statim, 55/24.
bonarum mentium est, 56/11.
pollutum, 57/6.
pollutae cogitationis, 57/6.
congregationi fratrum, 57/22.
sentiant, 57/25.
lauaci, 57/27.
quod defeant, 58/31.
perundandum est, 59/5.

OLD ENGLISH.
eahtan 7 witnian, 68/14.
dihtaæ 7 findeæ, 68/16.
xis mot beon swa; 7 eallum
gemetum þæt is alyfed, 68/24.
we oncnwown 7 ongeton, 70/6.
growan ne weaxan, 70/7.
bewereæ 7 forbeodeæ, 70/8.
is to forbeorrenæ 7 to forhætenæ,
70/11.
begis máðan 7 godfrecnis, 70/12.
aetegedre heora bene 7 gebedo
senden 7 geoten, 72/19.
bescerian ne beneoman, 72/23.
hafa þu sprece 7 geþeahþe,
72/25.
gerhte 7 gebette beon scylen,
74/1.
in strengo þeodscipes 7 þrea,
74/2.
is he to onberenæne 7 to geber-
tenne, 74/2.
hæse 7 bebdum, 74/4.
þa undealblicnesse þe heo onfengon
7 in gescepene wæræ, 74/26.
sår 7 wihte, 76/18.
to geberenæne 7 to gefremmenæ,
76/25.
we weotan 7 leorniaæ, 78/10.
sona instæpe, 78/13.
þara godra mooda 7 monna þeaw
biþ, 78/34.
uncλæne 7 besmiten, 80/13.
besmitenes gepohætes 7 uncλænes,
80/14.
broðra 7 Godes þeowæ gesom-
nunge, 80/32.
ongete 7 halde, 80/34.
bæces 7 þweales, 82/2.
þæt hi wepen 7 hræowe don, 82/28.
is to smeagemæne 7 to geþencenne,
84/3.
Especially noteworthy is the bifurcated doubling: \textit{þæt heo...ætgædre heora bene 7 gebedo senden 7 geoten,} 72/19 = \textit{þæt heo...meston onfoon 7 þicgan,} 84/15. Almost as significant are: \textit{Micc\textit{el feoh 7 unlytel,}} 214/33 = \textit{non parua pecuniarum donatione,} 214/17, and—in the account of the assassination of Eadwine attempted by Eomær—\textit{Ond mid by he pa geswippre mufhe licetende ærend wreahhte (for reahte) 7 lease flesewade,} 122/16 = \textit{et cum simulatam legationem ore astuto volueret,} 99/8.

Let me end with a suggestion. Bede’s story of Cædmon is deservedly a favourite, and is given in all the reading-books for beginners. The suggestion is that the story should not be read without the most careful word-by-word comparison with the original. Otherwise the student will fail to apprehend this distinguishing feature of the translation.

J. M. HART.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.
THE ENGLISH RIVER-NAMES:

REA, REE, RHEE, &c.

Speaking of the river Cam, on p. 400 of A Student's Pastime, Skeat says:

'A third name was the Rhee or Ree, which I suspect merely meant "stream," as we find two rivers in Shropshire, both called the Rea Brook, a Ray River in Oxfordshire, and a Rae Burn in Dumfriesshire. Indeed, Willis and Clark give an example of "le Ee" in 1447; but this means "the river," from the A.S. èa, a stream.'

On p. 137 of Taylor's Words and Places, we find:

'The root Rhe or Rhin is connected with the Gaelic rea, rapid; with the Welsh rhe, swift; rhedu, to run; rhin, that which runs; and also with the Greek πη, the Sanskrit ri, and the English words run and rain. From this root we have the Rye in Kildare, Yorkshire, and Ayrshire; the Rea in Salop, Warwick, Herts, and Worcestershire; the Rey in Wilts, the Ray in Oxfordshire and Lancashire, the Rhee in Cambridgeshire, the Rhea in Staffordshire, the Wrey in Devon, the Roy in Inverness,' &c.,

not to copy further Taylor's rash combinations.

Not only is Skeat right in suspecting that Ree &c., like Ee, originally meant simply 'river,' but these various river-names beginning with R— are nothing but Ee in disguise. In Old English we have as regular and common phrases:

be and on bare èa,

which became in early Middle English:

be and o(n) per è.
THE ENGLISH RIVER NAMES:

When the article became *pe* throughout, the feminine dative -r in this phrase was preserved by the following vowel. *Be per ê,* pronounced *be peré,* was understood as *be pe rê* (cf. *all one > a-lone, at one > a-tone, at all > a-tall,* &c.); and the old word *ee 'river' having gone out of use, ree was regarded as a proper name, and the phrase was written by the *Ree,* &c. The case is exactly parallel with the familiar one, *for pen ūnes,* later *for pe nēnes* 'for the nonce.' This explains, then, the origin of all those English river-names that have the same phonology, whatever the spelling: *Rea, Ree, Rhee,* &c. How many of the other forms—*Rey, Wrey, Ray, Roy, Rye,* &c.—may be dialectic forms of *Ree,* I cannot tell without closer acquaintance with the local dialects. The classical-looking spelling *Rhee* may be due to *Rhine, Rhone,* &c. Compare *Rhode Island* for Dutch *Roodt Eylandt* 'red island,' influenced by the classical *Rhodes.*

That a common noun may in this way become a proper name is well understood. It is more likely to happen if the word passes out of use as a common noun. Thus, the word *bayou* is no longer in general use in a large part of our country where it once flourished. But in many places in Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan—for example, at Ypsilanti—the term 'the Bayou' is still applied to some small body of water near the town, but would never be used of similar bodies of water elsewhere. In other words, it is now a proper name. The change may also take place when the word persists as a common noun but suffers a shift in meaning or use, even if but a slight one. Thus, some early surveyors in Michigan, having had a fight with two or three Indians while encamped on a branch of the Kalamazoo River, called the stream the Battle Creek. A town on the banks later took the same name, while the stream came to be known as the Battle Creek River (cf. Skeat's citations, 'the Rea Brook' &c.), the word 'creek' being now applied
only to a smaller stream, such as is called a 'brook' in New England. I grew up at Battle Creek, and can well remember when it first dawned on me that the word 'Creek' in 'Battle Creek' and 'Battle Creek River' was the same as the familiar common noun 'creek.'

GEORGE HEMPL.

ANN ARBOR,
MICHIGAN.
XX.

BARNFIELD'S ODE: 'AS IT FELL UPON A DAY.'

The lines beginning 'As it fell upon a day' are still attributed by some editors, as in the Canterbury Poets, to Shakespeare, although, as Mr. Arber in his edition of Barnfield in the English Scholars' Library insists, not by the best scholars. That the poem was long held to be Shakespeare's came chiefly from its own excellence and partly from the fact that it was found among the miscellanies printed in the *Passionate Pilgrim*. This was a collection of verses from various sources, wrongly attributed as a whole to Shakespeare, and so apparently both surreptitious and unauthorized in its original publication in 1599 by William Jaggard. Shakespeare's name probably became attached to this volume of floating songs of the day as a sort of advertising catch; it is hardly possible, in sheer ignorance. Yet there are several undoubted poems of Shakespeare's in the *Passionate Pilgrim* collection: two of the sonnets are reproduced as the first two numbers, and there are two lyrics and a sonnet which are also found in *Love's Labour's Lost*. One lyric in the collection, not elsewhere identified, and so, merely because of its musical charm and grace frequently, though without better reason, attributed to Shakespeare, is the succession of verses
'AS IT FELL UPON A DAY'

beginning 'Crabbed age and youth cannot live together,' and continuing through a series of delightful antitheses. Several of the poems in the collection, therefore, both from external proof and internal excellence, gave a certain excuse for the association of Shakespeare's name with the volume in part.

The chief reason that the ode, 'As it fell upon a day,' is attributed to Barnfield is that it appeared in 1598, one year earlier than the *Passionate Pilgrim* collection, in Barnfield's *Poems in Divers Humours*. But, as will be later noted, while the ode was there, it was with a difference. The ode, in its beginning, is strikingly like an unquestioned poem of Shakespeare's in the *Passionate Pilgrim*, viz. No. XVII, the lyric occurring in *Love's Labour's Lost*. (The numbers are taken from the Globe edition.) This lyric also occurs in *England's Helicon*, 1600, where it is entitled 'The Passionate Shepherd's Song.' In Palgrave's *Golden Treasury* it bears the kindred name of 'Love's Perjuries.' Note the measure, the matter, and the distinction of manner:

On a day, alack the day!
Love, whose month was ever May,
Spied a blossom passing fair,
Playing in the wanton air: ...

And this grace continues through eighteen lines.

The Barnfield ode is No. XXI in the *Passionate Pilgrim* collection. As it begins it has precisely the same measure, has the same, or even greater, distinction of manner, and strikes the same note of May-time and love-time:

As it fell upon a day
In the merry month of May,
Sitting in a pleasant shade
Which a grove of myrtles made
Beasts did leap, and birds did sing,
Trees did grow, and plants did spring; ...
The very counterpart to the foregoing No. XVII, it seems to the reader of the *Passionate Pilgrim*; the two poems seem pendants, forming contrasts. For the kinship in method is marked with a wide difference in thought and situation which but emphasizes the possible relationship. In one it is the Passionate Shepherd sighing for his love:

That the lover, sick to death,
Wish'd himself the heaven's breath,
'Air,' quoth he, 'thy cheeks may blow;
Air, would I might triumph so!...

In the other Love has triumphed, and the note is clearer and truer. for it is the heart cry of Love desolate, as the deserted woman pours out her soul to the nightingale, *Philomel*, symbolic, from the legend, of her own forlorn state:

Every thing did banish stress,
Save the nightingale alone:
She, poor bird, as all forlorn,
Leant her breast up-til a thorn,
And there sung the dolefulst diryly:
That to hear it was great pity:
'Fie, fie, fie,' now would she cry;
'There, there,' by and by;
That to bear her so complain,
Since I could from tears refrain;
For her griefs, so lively shown,
Made me think upon mine own.

Both of the poems, the two contrasts, are found in *Euphues's Histories* in 1590, and from their relative position the collector of the series seems to have felt that they belonged to one another in thought. The one undoubtedly Shakespeare's, 'The Passionate Shepherd's Song,' with Shakespeare's name attached, has immediately following it a lyric, 'The Unknown Shepherd's Complaint.' It is a 'complaint' in contrast with the love-song going before; its author is 'unknown,' and it is signed 'Ignoto.' Then
following this 'Unknown Shepherd's Complaint' are the verses 'As it fell upon a day,' entitled, 'Another of the Same Shepherd's,' i.e., another 'complaint' in contrast with the preceding 'Passionate Shepherd's Song' and likewise signed 'Ignoto'—'unknown' or anonymous.

The lyric continues subjectively, as a true lyric ought, while the speaker finds in the tale of Philomel a picture of her own desolation:

Ah, thought I, thou mourn'st in vain!
None takes pity on thy pain:
Senseless trees they cannot hear thee;
Ruthless beasts they will not cheer thee:
King Pandion he is dead;
All thy friends are lapp'd in lead;
All thy fellow birds do sing,
Careless of thy sorrowing.
Even so, poor bird, like thee,
None alive will pity me.

The last two lines give the quickness of the turn of personal application, the home thrust. They strike the keynote of the poem; they tell the whole tale, reveal the tragic pathos, imply the woe. What unexpressed eloquence in what is left to the imagination and the heart to supply!

With this couplet the poem ends as it stands in England's Helicon. Thought and poetry alike demand that it should end. And here many editors, at any rate Mr. Palgrave among modern editors, close the poem. It is ended as a lyric. As good Dan Chaucer puts it: 'There is no more to say.' What could be more delicate! What more happy! Mr. Palgrave did not admit more, presumably because he could not in a 'Treasury' to be kept 'Golden' without alloy. The instinct of the early editor of England's Helicon and of Mr. Palgrave is correct. But it is strange that it is just this final couplet which Barnfield suppresses to give the poem quite another turn.

Not only are these two lines that express the personal
note omitted in the Barnfield form, but in their place are substituted two lines with altogether different thought, and the poem has as much added again: twenty-eight lines following to correspond with the twenty-eight lines preceding. Moreover, in this addition to the poem, as in the two lines mentioned, the spirit is completely changed. The situation is different. It is no longer painful and tragic, a true lyric in nature, expressing the abject pathos of a woman's heart simply uttered, when all nature and the world about seem bright and full of happiness and she alone hopeless and forlorn. The sense of deep pathos expressed clearly in a few words, the feeling of irreparable loss and grief eloquent in its unuttered helplessness, is gone. This spirit passes over into the commonplace, where the weakest didacticism prevails, and where there is an empty moralizing on 'fickle Fortune,' 'faithful friends,' and 'flattering foe.'

The new couplet in the Barnfield version which replaces the old passionate heart-cry and which hooks on the latter didactic portion, shows its true character and office:

Whilst as fickle Fortune smiled,
Thou and I were both beguiled.

No more about the history of Philomel! No more of the cry from a forsaken woman's heart full of despair! No more of the first person and the subjective attitude which the highest lyric poetry demands and which is the glory of the part already recited. There falls a different atmosphere. The impersonal and the objective note prevails. The words 'fickle Fortune' furnish the cue, and there follows a homily, facile enough to be sure, but no longer from the same well-spring of poesy:

Every one that flatters thee
Is no friend in misery.
Words are easy, like the wind;
Faithful friends are hard to find:
Every man will be thy friend
Whilst thou hast wherewith to spend;
But if store of crowns be scant,
No man will supply thy want....

Thus even the mercenary motive is not kept out. There succeeds a series of formal antitheses, and the wise saws conclude not unlike a didactic poem of an earlier age with the use of alliteration, something which Barnfield elsewhere affects:

These are certain signs to know
Faithful friend from flattering foe.

The pathos of a woman’s woe brought out in the former portion of the poem is so grossly misunderstood and so completely altered as to disturb the impression produced. One is almost tempted to wish that the evidence in point could render unto Shakespeare what is good enough to be Shakespeare’s and unto Barnfield what there is neither question nor disposition to doubt is Barnfield’s, viz. the didactic pointing of a moral to a lyric as text. Even if the question of the authorship be not involved, the composite character and changed conception of the poem are readily seen.

Mr. Arber reproduces in his English Scholars’ Library the arguments on behalf of Barnfield’s authorship of the poem. They do not touch this matter of bi-section at all and they contradict nothing here brought forward. The first of the two poems spoken of as contrasts, ‘On a day, lack the day,’ appeared first in Love’s Labour’s Lost, a play certainly not written later than 1594, and more probably according to Mr. Furnivall, Mr. Dowden, and Mr. Sidney Lee, as early as 1590 or 1591. The second poem, ‘As it fell upon a day,’ by whomsoever written, whether Barnfield or a greater, seems to have been felt as a contrast to the former and was possibly suggested by it. The significant use of the Philomel legend in the play of
'AS IT FELL UPON A DAY'

Titus Andronicus, variously assigned from 1588 to 1593, and the intimate acquaintance with Ovid's Metamorphoses by Shakespeare and by others, must also not be forgotten. If there be any force in all this, the second poem, 'As it fell upon a day,' would naturally be composed not very long after the first, apparently in the early nineties and a sufficient length of time before 1598, the date in which it appears in Barnfield's Poems in Divers Humours, to explain the altered form and spirit. When the poem is repeated in 1599 in the Passionate Pilgrim it contains both couplets referred to above: the originally concluding pair of lines and the substituted pair as new introduction for the latter didactic part. This is obviously a third stage of development and still later growth. One year later, in 1600, England's Helicon gives it in the shorter complete form with the true conclusion—the form in which the poem is best known from Palgrave's Golden Treasury—the form, in my opinion, in which one of the sweetest of all the Elizabethan lyrics was originally written.

John Bell Henneman.

The University of Tennessee,
January, 1900.
XXI.

A SCENE FROM IBSEN’S LOVE’S COMEDY.

[Prefatory Note.—The play of which the following scene is a specimen was produced at Christiania in 1862. It is famous throughout the Scandinavian world. Its subject is the comedy of impulsive love-making; of engagements from which romance has fled, of marriages in which all the spiritual fabric of manhood and womanhood has smouldered way. Strange ‘comedy,’ it will be thought. But no reader of Ibsen will expect his laughter to be gay. And is not hard to discover in this ‘comedy’ a keener sense of the lacrymae rerum than in many a tragedy. Of the personages who occur below, Falk, a young poet, is the arch-erider. Svanhild, the daughter of the house, ignored and lighted by her uncomprehending family, listens eagerly to eloquence, but, as will be seen, not without detecting the egoism of his aims. In a previous scene he has killed a bird whose song she loved, and whose rivalry was thus annoying. Strawman and his wife, so scornfully described at the outset, embody the ‘comedy’ of married lovers; he a pastor in the North, immersed in the cares of a scattered parish and a large family. Miss Jay and her fiancé Stiver are the ‘veterans’ of faded courtship. When the

1 A translation of the entire play, with an introduction and notes, is published by Messrs. Duckworth & Co.
scene opens, these, with the rest of the company, have just retired from the garden into the house, leaving Falk, tense with indignation, to discharge his passion under the stars. It is a lustrous summer night.]

FALK.
All is as if burnt out;—all desolate, dead!
So thro' the world they wander, two and two;
Charred wreckage, like the blackened stems that strew
The forest when the withering fire is fled.
Far as the eye can travel all is drought,
And nowhere peeps one spray of verdure out!

[SVANHILD comes out on to the verandah with a

flowering rose-tree, which she sets down.

Yes, one—yes, one!—

SVANHILD.
Falk, in the dark?

FALK. And fearless!

Darkness to me is fair, and light is cheerless;
But are not you afraid in yonder walls,
Where the lamp's light on sallow corpses falls—?

SVANHILD.
Shame!

FALK.

[Looking after Strawman, who appears at the window.]

He was once so brilliant and so strong;
Warred with the world to win his mistress; passed
For Custom's doughtiest iconoclast;
And poured forth love in psalms of glad song.
Look at him now! In solemn robes and wraps,
A two-legged drama on his own collapse!
And she, the limp-skirt slattern, with the shoes
Heel-trodden, that squeak and clatter in her traces,
This is the winged maid who was his Muse
And escort to the kingdom of the Graces!
Of all that fire this puff of smoke's the end.
*Sic transit gloria Amoris*, friend!

**SVANHILD.**

Yes, it is wretched, always, everywhere:
I know of no one's lot that I would share.

**FALK [eagerly].**

Then let us two rise up and bid defiance
To this same order, Art, not Nature, bred!

**SVANHILD [shaking her head].**

Then were the cause for which we make alliance
Ruined, as sure as this is earth we tread.

**FALK.**

No, triumph waits upon two souls in unity:
To Custom's parish-church no more we'll wend,
Seat-holders in the Philistine community!
See, Personality's one aim and end
Is to be independent, free, and true.
In that I am not wanting, nor are you.
A fiery spirit pulses in your veins,
For thoughts that master you have words that burn;
The corset of convention, that constrains
The beating hearts of other maids, you spurn.
The voice that you were born with will not chime to
The chorus Custom's baton gives the time to.

**SVANHILD.**

And do you think pain has not often pressed
Tears from my eyes, and quiet from my breast?
I longed to shape my way to my own bent—
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FALK.

'In pensive ease'?

SVANHILD.

O no, 'twas sternly meant.
But then the aunts came in with well-intended
Advice; the matter must be sifted, weighed—

[Coming nearer.]

'In pensive ease,' you say; oh no, I made
A bold experiment—in art—

FALK.

Which ended—?

SVANHILD.

In failure. I lacked talent for the brush.
The thirst for freedom, tho', I could not crush;
Checked at the easel, it essayed the stage—

FALK.

That plan was shattered also, I'll engage?

SVANHILD.

Upon the eldest aunt's suggestion, yes;
She much preferred a place as governess—

FALK.

But of all this I never heard a word!

SVANHILD [smiling].

No wonder; they took care that none was heard.
They trembled at the risk 'my future' ran
If this were whispered to unmarried Man.

FALK.

[After gazing a moment at her in meditative sympathy.]
That such must be your lot I long had guessed.
When first I met you, I can well recall,
You seemed to me quite other than the rest,
Beyond the comprehension of them all.
They sat at table,—fragrant tea a-brewing,
And small-talk humming with the tea in tune,
The young girls blushing, and the young men cooing,
Like pigeons on a sultry afternoon.
Old maids and matrons volubly averred
Morality and faith’s supreme felicity,
Young wives were loud in praise of domesticity,
While you stood lonely like a mateless bird;
And when at last the gabbling clamour rose
To a tea-orgy, a debauch of prose,
You seemed a piece of silver, newly minted,
Among foul notes and coppers dulled and dinted;
You were a coin imported, alien, strange,
Were valued at another rate of change,
Not passing current in that Babel mart
Poetry and butter, cheese and art.
Then—while Miss Jay in triumph took the field—

SVANHILD [gravely].

Her knight behind her, like a champion bold,
His hat upon his elbow, like a shield—

FALK.

Your mother nodded to your untouched cup:
‘Drink, Svanhild dear, before your tea grows cold!’
And then you drank the vapid liquor up,
The mawkish brew beloved of young and old.
But that name gripped me with a sudden spell,
The grim old Völsungs as they fought and fell,
With all their faded æons, seemed to rise
In never-ending line before my eyes;
In you I saw a Svanhild like the old,
But fashioned to the modern age’s mould.
Sick of its hollow warfare is the world;
Its lying banner it would fain have furled;
But when the world does evil, its offence
Is answered in the blood of innocence.

SVANHILD [with gentle irony].
I think, at any rate, the fumes of tea
Must answer for that direful fantasy;
But 'tis your least achievement, past dispute,
To hear the spirit speaking when 'tis mute.

FALK [with emotion].
Nay, Svanhild, do not jest: behind your scoff
Tears glitter—O, I see them plain enough;
And I see more: when you to dust are fray'd
And kneaded to a formless lump of clay,
Each bungling dilettante's scalpel-blade
On you his dull devices shall display.
The world usurps the creature of God's hand
And sets its image in the place of His,
Transforms—enlarges that part, lightens this,
And when upon the pedestal you stand
Complete, cries out in triumph: 'Now she is
At last what woman ought to be: behold,
How plasticly calm, how marble-cold!
Bathed in the lamplight's soft irradiation,
How well in keeping with the decoration!'

[Passionately seizing her hand]
But if you are to die, live first! Come forth
With me into the glory of God's earth!
Soon, soon the gilded cage will claim its prize—
The Lady thrives there, but the Woman dies,
And I love nothing but the Woman in you.
There, if they will, let others woo and win you,
But here, my spring of life began to shoot,
Here my song-tree put forth its firstling fruit;
Here I found wings and flight:—Svanhild, I know it,
Only be mine—here I shall grow a poet!

Svanhild.

[Gently reproachful, withdrawing her hand.]
O, why have you betrayed yourself? How sweet
It was when we as friends could freely meet!
You should have kept your counsel. Can we stake
Our bliss upon a word that we may break?
Now you have spoken, all is over.

Falk.

No!
I've pointed to the goal—now leap with me,
My high-souled Svanhild, if you dare, and show
That you have heart and courage to be free.

Svanhild.

Be free?

Falk.

Yes, free, for freedom's All-in-all
Is absolutely to fulfil our Call.
And you by heaven were destined, I know well,
Be my bulwark against beauty's spell.
I, like my falcon namesake, have to swing
Against the wind, if I would reach the sky!
You are the breeze I must be breasted by,
You, only you, put vigour in my wing:
Mine, be mine, until the world shall take you,
When leaves are falling, then our paths shall part.
Singing unto me the treasures of your heart,
And for each song another song I'll make you;
May you pass into the lamplit glow
Of age, as forests fade without a throe.
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SVANHILD [with suppressed bitterness].
I cannot thank you, for your words betray
The meaning of your kind solicitude.
You eye me as a boy a sallow, good
To cut and play the flute on for a day.

FALK.
Yes, better than to linger in the swamp
Till autumn choke it with her grey mists damp!

[Vehe...]
You must! you shall! To me you must present
What God to you so bountifully lent.
I speak in song what you in dreams have meant.
See yonder bird I innocently slew,
Her warbling was Song's book of books for you.
O, yield your music as she yielded hers!
My life shall be that music set to verse!

SVANHILD.
And when you know me, when my songs are flown,
And my last requiem chanted from the bough—
What then?

FALK [observing her].
What then? Ah well, remember now!

[Pointing to the garden.]

SVANHILD [gently].
Yes, I remember you can drive a stone.

FALK [with a scornful laugh].
This is your vaunted soul of freedom therefore!
All daring, if it had an end to dare for!

[Vehe...]
I've shown you one; now, once for all, your yea
Or nay.
Svanhild.

You know the answer I must make you:

I never can accept you in your way.

Falk [coldly, breaking off].

Then there's an end of it, the world may take you!

[Svanhild has silently turned away. She supports her hands upon the verandah railing, and rests her head upon them.]

Falk.

[Walks several times up and down, takes a cigar, stops near her and says, after a pause,]

You think the topic of my talk to-night extremely ludicrous, I should not wonder?

[Pauses for an answer. Svanhild is silent.]

I'm very conscious that it was a blunder; sister and daughter love alone possess you; henceforth I'll wear kid gloves when I address you, sure, so, of being understood aright.

[Pauses, but as Svanhild remains motionless, he turns and goes towards the right.]

Svanhild.

[Lifting her head after a brief silence, looking at him and drawing nearer.]

Now I will recompense your kind intent to save me, with an earnest admonition. That falcon-image gave me sudden vision what your 'emancipation' really meant. You said you were the falcon, that must fight against the wind if it would reach the sky, I was the breeze you must be breasted by, else vain were all your faculty of flight. How pitiful a fancy! rather say
How ludicrous, as you yourself divined. 
That seed, however, fell not by the way,
But bred another fancy in my mind 
Of a far more illuminating kind. 
You, as I saw it, were no falcon, but 
A tuneful dragon, out of paper cut, 
Whose Ego held a secondary station, 
Dependent on the string for animation; 
Its breast was scrawled with promises to pay 
In cash poetic—at some future day; 
The wings were stiff with barbs and shafts of wit 
That wildly beat the air, but never hit; 
The tail was a satiric rod in pickle 
To castigate the town's infirmities, 
But all it compass'd was to lightly tickle 
The casual doer of some small amiss. 
So you lay helpless at my feet, imploring:
'O raise me, how and where is all the same! 
Give me the power of singing and of soaring, 
No matter at what cost of bitter blame!' 

**FALK.**

*[Clenching his fists in inward agitation.]*

Heaven be my witness!—

**SVANHILD.**

No, you must be told:—

For such a childish sport I am too old; 
But you, whom Nature made for high endeavour—
Are you content the fields of air to tread 
Hanging your poet's life upon a thread 
That at my pleasure I can slip and sever? 

**FALK [hurriedly].**

What is the date to day?
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SVANHILD [more gently].

Mind well this day, and heed it, and beware;
Trust to your own wings only for your flight,
Sure, if they do not break, that they will bear.
The paper poem for the desk is fit;
That which is lived alone has life in it.
That only has the wings that scale the height;
Choose now between them, poet: be, or write!

[Neater to him.

Now I have done what you besought me; now
My requiem is chanted from the bough,
My only one; now, all my songs are flown,
Now, if you will, I'm ready for the stone!

[She goes into the house; Falk remains motionless,
   looking after her; far out in the fjord is seen
   a boat, from which the following chorus is
   faintly heard:

CHORUS.

My wings I open, my sail spread wide,
And cleave like an eagle life's glassy tide;
Gulls follow my furrow's foaming.
Overboard with the ballast of care and cark;
And what if I shatter my roaming bark,
It is passing sweet to be roaming!

C. H. HERFORD.
EMENDATIONS TO THE TEXT OF 
HAVELOK

Although many scholars, English as well as German, have contributed to the clearing of the Havelok-text, it is still so full of clerical errors and doubtful passages that some further attempts in this direction may not seem superfluous. The following remarks, which are the result of a repeated study of the ‘gest,’ will justify, I hope, a series of alterations made in a forthcoming critical edition of the poem:

v. 49 seq. Ne funde he non that him misseyyde,
N[e] with iuele on [him] hond leyde.

The second line would read much better in the forms which appear in l. 994: *Ne hond on him with yule leyde*, and in l. 1689: *Or hand with iuele onne leyd*.

v. 57. þat he ne weren sone to sorwe brouth.
Here *sone* overburdens the line and may be cancelled for smoothness’ sake.

v. 114 seqq. þan him tok an iuel strong,
 þat he we[l] wiste, and underfong,
 þat his deth was comen him on.

The form *underfong* is very strange, as one would expect *underfeng* instead of it; at the same time the meaning ‘understood,’ which is required here, is not found elsewhere.
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(cp. Skeat’s glossary). Stratmann-Bradley gives, indeed, only ‘seize, receive’ as the meaning of underfôn and underfangen, and Bosworth-Toller shows no instance where it might be translated by ‘understand.’ I believe therefore that the copyist has altered an original underfond to -fong, in order to make a perfect rhyme. Though underfond, which is quoted as obsolete or provincial in several Mod. English dictionaries¹, has not yet been found in OE. or ME., it is well known in Low German and Dutch, cp. O. Sax. underfindan, MLG. undervinden, Mod. Du. ondervinden, all meaning ‘to find out, investigate, learn, hear.’ Concerning the assonance strong : fond, cp. v. 172 seq. londe : londe.

v. 295. And me, and mine, hauen in hire hond
I propose to cancel hire, in order to make the line regular.

v. 550 seqq. Hwan he hauede don þat dede,
Hwan þe swike him hauede he yede,
þat he shulde him forth [lide].

In spite of the learned explanation of this difficult passage by Zupitza in Anglia, i. 469 seq., I do not consider it satisfactory to change he yede into eded ‘bound by an oath,’ as this participle would make but a poor rhyme with lede. The latter word is, indeed, only a conjecture of the editors, but I fail totally in trying to fill up its place with another more fitting one. Therefore I think we must give up this ingenious suggestion, and I would propose, changing with Morris the Hwan of v. 551 into That,

That þe swike him bad, he byede.

v. 559 seq. And seyde: ‘Wite þou þis knaue,
Al-so thou with mi lif haue.’

With stands of course for wile, but haue is strange. I think it is only a slip of the pen for saue.

v. 611. He shal do Godard ful wo.

¹ e.g. in Flügel’s, Muret’s, Halliwell’s. According to the latter it is a Derbyshire word. [Cp. additional note on p. 182.]
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Insert *gret* or *mikel* (cp. v. 510) between *ful* and *wo*.

v. 638. *bat in mi mouth was* *prist* *faste.*

The line would decidedly become better by inserting *ful* or *wel* (cp. v. 661) or *so* before *faste.*

v. 666. *bat was Denemar[r]k a stiward.*

This abominable line does not become much better by Skeat’s conjecture, to alter *Denemark* into *Denemarke.*

I propose: *bat was of Denemark a stiward.*

v. 693 seqq. And þoucte: ‘*[H]wat shal me to rede?*’

Wite þe him on line, he wile beþe

Heye hangen on galwe-tre.

Insert *us* between *wile* and *beþe.* The rhyme-words should be *roþe: boþe.*

v. 718. And sone dede he leyne in an ore.

The line is harsh, but becomes melodious by striking out the superfluous *leyne.*

v. 721 seqq. Fro londe wornen he borne a mile,

Ne were neuere but ane hwhile,

*bat it ne bigan a wind to rise.*

The second line seems highly suspicious, and may be altered thus: *Ne weren [h]e þere[þ] but ane hwhile.*

v. 730. And þrie he gat it al bidene.

I propose to read *yete* instead of *prie.*

v. 741 seq. So *bat he wel þore were*

Of here herboru herborwe þere.

The clumsy repetition of *þore* renders this passage extremely doubtful, and I hope that I am not too bold in writing *and siker* instead of *þore* in v. 741.

v. 800 seqq. *þe man þat may wel eten and drinken,*

*bat nouth ne haue but on swink long,*

To liggen at hom it is ful strong.

Read *þar* in l. 801, and *wrong* instead of *strong* in l. 802.

v. 819 seq. *Al þat he þe[r]-fore tok*  

With-held he nouth a serþinges nok.
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I suppose that of has been omitted before Al.

v. 1176 seq. þe messe he deden eueridel,
þat fel to spusing, and god cle[r]k.

Zupitza has corrected these lines by putting dede instead of he deden and altering and into a. But I think it would become still better if we read: þe messe dede [and] eueridel.

v. 1326 seq. Em and brofær, fader and sone,
Erl and baroun, dreng an[ð] þayn,
Knithes, and burgeys, and sweyn.

The last line, breaking the parallelism of the preceding ones, should probably be altered to [Clerk and] knith, burgeys and sweyn; cp. v. 2195: Klækes, knithes, burgeys, swynes.

v. 1337 seq. And do þou nouth on frest þis fare,
Lith and selthe felawes are.

The proverb contained in the last line seems to express almost the same as v. 1352: Dwelling haueth ofte scape wroth. Therefore lith cannot be explained by ‘alteration, comfort, peace,’ as Skeat and Mätzner do, nor can I any longer retain my former emendation, [s]light. [P]lith ‘danger’ would be better, but I consider it now as an error for hith=híht, híhp ‘haste, speed, hurry’—though an English proverb says: ‘Do nothing hastily but catching of fleas’ (Hazlitt², p. 120).

v. 1627 seq. Wile ich speke with non oþer reue,
But with þæt, þat iustise are.

Instead of þæ we must read you, according to the following þæt are; cp. also v. 1626, where Havelok addresses Ubbe with you.

v. 1640 seq. þat sholen ye forthward ful wel heren,
Yif þat ye wile þe storie heren.

Read leren in the first line, as in l. 12, where it also rhymes with heren.

v. 1674 seq. Hwanne he hauede his wille þat,
þe stede, þat he onne sat,
Smot Ubbe with spures faste.

N 2
Stratmann proposed to read *yat* 'got' instead of *pat* or *wat*, but the past part. of *geten* is *geten* in our poem, cp. v. 930. Nevertheless, I think there is something in his idea, if we only write *gete* and transpose v. 1675 to: *yat he onne sat, þe stede*. Assonant rhymes like *gete : stede* are not unfrequent in Havelok, cp. *yeme : quene, maked : shaped, graue : name, slawen : rauen, &c*. See Skeat’s edition, p. xlv seq.

Perhaps *yat* in l. 1674 is even a remnant of the original beginning of v. 1675, which was repeated, after *gete* had been omitted by the scribe!

v. 1678 seq. Or he fro him ferde,
Seyde he, *yat* his folk herde.

These lines are too short, wherefore I insert *yat* between *or* and *he* in the first, *it* between *folk* and *herde* in the second line.

v. 1919. Ne wente þer away liues non.
Read: *Ne wente awey þer liues non.*


As in all the parallel passages, *on* must be inserted before *stede*.

v. 2036. We[l] is set he etes mete.
Read, as in v. 907: *Wel is set [þe] mete he etes.*

v. 2045. *yat weren of Kaym kin and Eues.*
Read *Kaym[es].*

v. 2110 seq. And saw al *yat* mikel lith
Fro Hauelok cam, *yat* was so brith.

Insert *yat* before *al.*

v. 2170. Dere sone, wel is me.

Insert *ful* before *wel.*

v. 2242. Non so fayr, ne non so long.

I would read: *[Nis] non so fayr, &c.*

v. 2290 seq. Hwan he hauenden alle þe king gret
And he weren alle dun set.
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After v. 162 seq. we may change this into:

Hwan he haueden þe king [r]gret,
And he weren alle set.

v. 2297 seq. þe king þat was umbe stonde wore
For to yeme, and wel were.

Insert us before for, cp. v. 2151 seq.: þat was hem wore
wel to yeme, &c.

v. 2468 seq. For he kneu, þe swike dam,
Eueridel God was him gram.

As dam or dan is, as a title, only used immediately
before proper names, it seems highly suspicious here.
I take it therefore as a clerical error instead of man.
Cp. the rhyme, rym : fyn, v. 21 sq.

v. 2549. þat al þat euere mouhte o stede
Ride, or helm on heued bere,
Brini on bac, and sheld, and spere,
Or ani ojer weyne bere,
Hand-ax, syþe, gisarm, or spere.

The repetition of the same rhymes shows that this passage
must be corrupt. Perhaps we might in l. 2552 seq. read
weyne of ferd, and gisarm, or swerd at the end of the lines.

v. 2582 seq. Al þat euere mithen he finde,
He brenne kirkes, and prestes binde.

It seems that these two lines must change places.

v. 2666. So þat with alþer-lest[e] dint.

Insert þe before alþer, cp. v. 1978: þat of þe alþerleste
wounde.

v. 2691 seq. þat none¹ kin[n]es best ne spares,
þanne his gon, for he garte alle.

Skeat adds he in brackets after his, but the construction
of the sentence requires us to read he is instead of his.

v. 2800 seq. For Englund auhte forto ben youres,
And we youre men and youres.

¹ neuer MS.
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I suppose that the poet wrote:

\[ \ldots \text{awhte for to ben} \]
\[ \text{Youres, and we yours men.} \]

v. 2848. \text{pat ich se ride and go.}

By transposing two words we get a correct line: \text{pat ich ride se and go.}

v. 2888. \text{pat spusinge was god time made.}

Insert \text{in} or \text{at} before \text{time}.

v. 2897 seqq. \text{Hanelok pe gode ne forgat nouth}
\text{Bertram, pat was the erles kok,}
\text{pat he ne dide callen ok.}

I think that \text{him} is wanting before \text{callen}.

[Additional note to v. 115 (see p. 177). I had forgotten that \text{underfinden} really occurs in ME., viz. in \text{Vices and Virtues}, p. 99, l. 32.]

F. HOLTHAUSEN.

GOTENBURG,

\text{September 20, 1899.}
XXIII.

A NOTE ON PAGEANTS AND 'SCAFFOLDS HYE.'

MIDDLE plays, so popular in England from the Nor-
man times, almost the Stuart times, were performed, Chaucer
in his 'scaffolds hye.' On such a scaffold jolly Absolon
the part of King Herod; and the sight of his crown,
'righte bronde,' and grand gesticulations would touch,
right, the heart of wesil waistied Alisoun.

The scaffolds were usually called *pageants*; a loose
applications also to the wooden stage, the text of the
and the *ensemble* of the fête or theatrical display,
the same way as the French word *billard*, which at first
acted the curved staves used in the game, came to
also the game itself, the room wherein and the table
in which it was played.

These numerous English towns in which the various
customs used to represent, at fixed epochs, a more or less
datable part of the Old and the New Testament, each
region had its own wooden structure or pageant,
according to the necessities of the special scenes
performed. Exactly similar pageants could not do
all scenes: for the throne of the king, the den of
fiends, the paradise of the angels. While king and
stood on high, hell mouth always opened on the
place to allow fiends to run about the place, frighten
young maidens, and make manly bystanders laugh: 'De—
omones discurrunt per plateas, gestum facientes compe—
tentem.—Discursum faciet [diabolus] per populum.'—
'Avecques contentement du peuple et grande frayeur de
petits enfants,' said Rabelais, witnessing four centuries late =
an exactly similar display.

The fact that these pageants did not consist of temporary
scaffolds, of beams and boards roughly nailed together,
meant to last only a day, has its importance. If they
were preserved from year to year, housed at the cost of
the society, and repaired when injured by long usage, they
must surely have deserved the care and expense bestowed
upon them. Such care and expense denote a properly
joined structure, strong enough to resist the conveyance
of one place to another; a stage fitted to the words of
the drama, and improved, may be, by some of those orna-
ments with which the fertile brain and clever hand of the
mediaeval workman was sure to embellish almost any sort
of wood or stone he had occasion to touch, from the stalls
in the church to the protruding ends of the house beams.

Though endowed, many of them, with very limited
means, those gilds assumed such expenses not only because
the plays were, for their members and for the town at
large, a source of keen enjoyment and some profit, but also
because they felt sure of the continued success of the per-
formances. Last year's pageants were certain to be needed
again, if not positively next year, at least at no distant
date. Crises had been gone through, opposition had been
baffled, and prohibitions set at nought; now, in the
fourteenth century, miracle-playing had a firm footing,
and a future before it; obscure preachers might possibly

1 Adam, mystère du XIIe siècle, 1877, ed. Palustre (a Norman or Anglo-
Norman text).
2 See in Furnivall, Digby Mysteries, 1882, p. xlv, the entries concerning
the performance of the Chester Plays.
grumble: the king himself countenanced the plays; he came to see them, and so did the greatest poet of the land, Chaucer.

Miracle plays covered an immense number of years, and included a variety of countries. Chronology and geography had to be compressed: a day’s performance would comprehend four thousand years; a public square hold Rome, Jerusalem, Marseilles, and the Mediterranean Sea; mystery writers did not trouble themselves about Aristotelian unities.

The several localities where the action took place were represented by different stages or pageants. Sometimes the various pageants were established in close vicinity like so many boxes on one or more sides of the same city square; players, according to the necessities of the action, would go down from their ‘scaffold hye’ by a ladder, cross the square and go to another stage, which everybody knew, either from their saying so, or from a label neatly pasted upon it, to be Rome or Jerusalem—a short journey: a messenger had scarcely finished speaking to Herod when he began talking to the emperor. The public was not very exacting, and the

1 Their grumblings being, however, most instructive as showing the reasons given by the opponents of the religious drama, and evidencing the immense popularity of those displays: ‘That thei shulden spendyn upon the nedis of ther neybors, thei spenden upon the pleyis; and to payen ther rente and ther dette thei wolten grucche, and to spende two (twice) so myche upon ther pley thei wolten nothinge grucche . . .

To han wherof to spenden on these myraclis . . . thei bisien hem befor to more greedly bygilen ther neybors, in byinge and in sellyng,’ sings the more dangerous, adds this decidedly pessimistic preacher, as ‘the world . . . is now at his endyng’ (end of fourteenth century). Wright and Halliwell, Reliquiae Antiquae, ii. p. 54.

2 In Mary Magdalens (Digby Mysteries, 1882, ed. Furnivall, p. 103), a messenger is ordered by Pilate to go to Herod, thence to the emperor. The messenger goes therefore from one scaffold to another, and he is careful to mention each time that he must be supposed to change town:

Now hens wol l fast owt of this town.

He has however not far to go, but merely to cross the place, and being at once arrived, says all of a breath, addressing Herod:

Heyll! soferyn kyng onder crown!

In the same manner, being ordered to Rome, he turns from Herod and finds himself immediately before the throne of the emperor, saying:
ladders were not always concealed behind the scenes; they were sometimes in front of the scaffold, and they put the raised platform into communication with the ground below.

The Flood, the Lake of Gennesaret, the Mediterranean Sea, were represented with as much simplicity as towns and palaces; but in a way that the public held to be quite sufficient, and telling. A square hole was dug in the ground before the scaffolds and filled with water enough to float a little boat; one corner was, at will, Jaffa, and another Marseilles; and though the boat had scarcely room enough to turn, people took it as an excellent representation. The mere fact of a boat being seen on the public square was enough to transport their minds to the realms of fancy. No laughable state of mind; the phenomenon is of all time. Not long ago, a play had a run only because a real or (supposed real) railway engine was seen in it people flocked to the play, and paid to see, and were carried to the realms of fancy in seeing, what they could see for nothing any day in any railway station. But the engine was unexpected there, as the boat was on the public square; and the wonder was enough to transport the beholders' minds to the land of wonders.

The journey by sea did not take more time than the journey by land; Mary Magdalen travels as fast as Herod's messenger. She sails from Palestine; the 'wynd is good,' says the shipmaster as she gets into the boat; all at once he adds:

Yond ther is the lond of Torke—

Heyll be yow sofreyn setting in solas!

In French mysteries the meaning of each scaffold was sometimes explained in a prologue (Julleville, Mystères, i. 397): 'Here you have the paradise, and there the palace of the emperor':

Philippe l'empereur romain . . .
Est en ce haut palais assis.

Note the allusion to a 'scaffold bye.' In other cases the scaffolds had each of them their label: 'As for the place-names,' we read in another prologue,

. . . . . . . vous les povez cognoistre

Par l'escritel que dessus voyez estre.
‘yond’—in the mist of unborn centuries! . . . Now ‘the shep-men syng,’ says an entry in the MS., and as their song is finished—finding themselves at the other corner of the tank—they discover that they are arrived at Marseilles.

Stryk! be-ware of sond! . . .

Of Marlylle this is the kynge’s lond. (Mary Magdalene.)

In some towns a different sort of scaffolds were used. The pageants were set on wheels, and driven in turn to each of the principal squares or crossways; they came in due order according to the succession of events in the drama. A well-known text gives a very clear idea of how, in such cases, the plays were performed, and perfect order was preserved. ‘The manner of which playes,’ says Archdeacon Rogers, of Chester, was thus: ‘They were divided into 24 pagiantes or partes, acordinge to the number of yᵉ companyes of yᵉ cittie, and every company ought forth their pagiente, which was yᵉ cariage or place which they played in. . . . They were played upon monday, wednesday and wenseday in witson weeke. And they first ganne at yᵉ Abbaye gates; and when the firste pagiente was played at yᵉ Abbaye gates, then it was wheeled from the one to the pentice at yᵉ highe crosse before yᵉ Mayor; and before that was donne, the seconde came, and yᵉ firste wente in-to the watergate streete, and from thence unto yᵉ Bridge-streete, and soe all, one after an other, till all yᵉ pagiantes weare played.’

The shape and build of the pageants are then no less clearly described: ‘These pagiantes or cariage was a highe place made like a house with ij roomes, beinge open on yᵉ to pe: the lower rowme they apparelled and dressed them selves; and in the higher rowme they played: and they stode upon six wheeles.’

Precautions were taken that the proper order should be maintained, and the streets were left free in time for the pageants to be wheeled at the appropriate moment from
one place to another: 'And thus they came from one streete to an other keepinge a direct order in every streete... without any stayinge in any place; for, worde beinge broughte how every place was neere done, they came, and made no place to tarye, till ye last was played.'

This is a late text, as Archdeacon Rogers made his 'Collectiones of ye cittie of Chester' in the second half of the sixteenth century; but he describes customs established time out of mind; he well knew the city, one of the most famous for her dramatic cycle; he knew her history and traditions. Earlier texts, moreover, confirm his descriptions on several points. In his table of payments connected with the performance of the Corpus Christi Plays at Coventry, in 1490, Thomas Sharp mentions—besides 'Imprimis to God ijs.... Item to Heroude iij. iiiijd.'—Drink 'to the drivers of the pageant, xad.; twelve men driving it, x.5.'

Both systems, consisting either in fixed stages or movable ones, were resorted to in France as well as in England. The popularity of miracle-play performances was immense on the continent. To show their importance and success, it will be enough to recall that the remains of the miracle-play literature in the French language consist at this day of more than a million lines.

Some few contemporary pictures of French religious performances are still in existence; they are highly valuable and curious. Without speaking of the beautiful Très excellent et saint mystère du Vieil Testament, adorned with woodcuts 'pour plus facile intelligence,' the National Library in Paris possesses the manuscript of a Passion

---

1 Notes on the Chester Plays... from Harleian Mss., in Furnivall Digby Mysteries, pp. 18 and ff.
2 A Dissertation on the Pageants... at Coventry, 1895, pp. 15 and 48.
3 In his valuable Studies in the English Mystery Plays, 1893, Yale University.
4 Mr. Davidson alleges that movable scaffolds were used only in England but they were known also in France.
5 Paris, Colinet, 1549, fol.
AND ‘SCAFFOLDS HYE’

The play, illustrated throughout in a most gorgeous and instructive manner. It is a late one, being dated 1547, and containing the text of the drama then performed at Valenciennes (MS. Fr. 15236). A folding picture at the beginning of the M.S. shows us all the various pageants, ‘establies,’ or ‘mansions,’ as they were called in French, erected on that occasion around the Valenciennes square. They are most handsome, and elaborately carved and painted; they belong to the fixed sort of stages. The architecture and the ornaments are strongly influenced, as might be expected, by the art of the Renaissance; but a good deal of pristine flavour still remains; hell has its usual shape of a monstrous head, its usual pieces of ordnance, and its comical airy little fiends; ‘the sea’ consists of the customary square hole with water enough to float a small boat.

An older and more valuable picture is to be seen at Antilley; it was painted by the famous Jean Fouquet in the fifteenth century, and gives a delightful and minute presentation of the miracle play of ‘Sainte Apolline,’ with the various mansions, also fixed, hell mouth, paradise, the presence chamber of the emperor, &c., supplied with very visible ladders for the actors to come down and go at need from one scaffold to the other.

English equivalents for those pictures are not easy to add; and none, that I know, have been pointed out. Such rarity is the more curious that miracle plays were among the most popular enjoyments of old England; jokes in them had become proverbial, heroes had been turned into typical personages, constantly quoted or referred to in current speech. Add to this that games and amusements, ‘sports and pastimes,’ constantly tempted the chisel or pencil of the mediaeval English artist, and figure, pleasant, humorous, numerable, on manuscript margins or church stalls.

1 Engraved in Shakespeare in France, 1899, p. 63.
2 Literary History of the English People, i. 470.
While studying one of the illustrated manuscripts whose pictures supply us with the best store of knowledge on fourteenth-century manners, namely the MS. 264 in the Bodleian Library, I noticed drawings which offer the greatest interest as regards our subject, and have escaped attention up to now. They are particularly important, being the oldest yet discovered, and having been painted more than a century before the Fouquet miniature.

The principal work contained in this huge volume is *Li romans du boin roi Alixandre*, in French. Both text and illuminations are dated; the scribe did not give his name, but the painter did. A note from the first informs us that he finished his work on Dec. 18, 1338; the second states that his own came to an end on April 18, 1344, his name being Jean de Grise: ‘Che livre fue perfaiz de le enluminure au xviiij day d’avryl par Jehan de Grise, l’an de grace M.cccxliij.’ The scribe from his style of writing seems to have been French; the painter from his name seems to have been French too.

The connexion of the MS. with England is, however, very intimate; it appears to have been compiled for English people, perhaps on English soil. Without speaking of the names of the owners, who are all English, the producing of the volume was the result of a multiple collaboration, one of the hands employed, namely, the rubricator’s, being Anglo-Norman. The probability of its having been painted on English soil, or in an English milieu, might again be deduced from the fact that the painter placed his margin

---

2 The earliest name, however, belongs only to the fifteenth century, being the name of ‘Monseigneur Richard de Widenville Seignur de Rivieres,’ who purchased the work in London in 1466; and was the Earl Rivers whose daughter King Edward IV had married shortly before.
3 Les rubriques de ce MS. sont d’une autre main et même d’une autre langue que le texte. Elles offrent beaucoup de formes anglo-normandes.’ P. Meyer, op. cit.
illuminations at the bottom of the pages. But this is a very difficult and moot point, and though such a characteristic is sometimes considered as proof positive of English workmanship, yet the question remains a doubtful one, and requires new investigations.

Be this as it may, it does not seem to be too much to assume that the illuminator of our MS. was conversant with both French and English customs; his drawings cannot be considered as typically French to the exclusion of English fashions, or typically English in contrast to French manners. His work well fits an age when the old Anglo-Saxon style had died out, a separate English style in painting as well as in literature was only beginning, and there reigned in England a king of French blood, the son of a Plantagenet and a Capétienne.

The abundant miniatures at the foot of the pages are of extreme interest for the historian, and can scarcely be matched by any MS., except perhaps the famous 10 E IV. in the British Museum, whose humour and subjects recall many respects the Bodleian volume. Everyday life in the fourteenth century is there represented in its varied manifestations: peace and war, clerical and worldly life, tales of hatred and of love, games, trades, juggleries of all sorts. We have thus castles and ships, water-mills (one with three wheels, fol. 1), adventures of monks and nuns in the fabliau style; a monk preaching (fol. 80v); some resque love scenes; a variety of carts, 42b; tumbrils, 110v; and carriages with two or four horses, 84b, 103a; a blind man led by his dog, 78b; beggars and cripples, 110; a kitchen with spits, 171b; hunting scenes; school scenes; labourers working in the fields and workmen in the shop; a smith shoeing a horse, 148a; goldsmiths and cutlers, 160a; wine-making (with the same process as in Gozzoli’s fresco at Pisa), 124a. But the MS. is especially rich in representations of amusements of all kinds; fools, buffoons, and
jugglers dance along the pages, a motley crew; many show, as John of Salisbury had remarked long before, what 'eru-bescat videre vel cynicus.' No cynic is shown, but a lady at one place, quite shocked. There are also mummers (copied by Strutt), trained animals, a dancing bear, 71a; a cock-fight, 50a; ladies' games; children's games; an orchestra, 189b. The spectacular part of the illustrations is considerable; the painter being obviously fond of sights and shows.

Such being his inclination, it is not surprising to find that he gave room, in his ample collection, to representations of dramatic performances. One may be seen on fol. 54b, and another on fol. 76a; we insert a photographic reproduction of both.

Here we have fourteenth-century pictures of those 'scaffoldes hye' upon which Chaucerian heroes used to strut to the wonder of young Alisouns. The general disposition tallies with Archdeacon Rogers' description. The pageant is really a 'highe place made like a howse, with ij rowmes, beinge open on ye tope'; a lower room in which 'they apparrelled and dressed them selves; and in the higher rowme they played.' A flowing drapery conceals the first, and does not allow us to see whether the pageant represented belonged to the fixed or to the movable sort, and whether it had 'six wheeles.' In the same manner, even in our own age, those modern 'pageants' used in cavalcades or vachalcedes, figuring at need Olympus, or Montmartre, are hung with draperies concealing their lower part and their wheels. Here however a real room had to be provided, not only for the players to 'apparrel' themselves, but to change their dress in (for the same performer had at times to sustain several parts); and also to allow of the appearance or disappearance of personages: the fall of the bad angels 'into the deepe pitte of hell'; Satan coming from underneath, or returning below: 'Then the serpent
I come up out of a hole; the Egyptians swallowed the dead sea.

The upper room in our two pictures has a roof. A roof was necessary, not simply for the preservation from rain which no one cared then, or for the better sounding of the actors' voices, but on account of a variety of people things which had to descend from above: angels ac dissenditt angelus—Mary Magdalene, 'a cloud from above' (ibid.), flames, turtle-doves (meaning the Holy Ghost), our Lord on a cloud 'if that can be contrived' descendit Jesus quasi in nube si fieri poterit.—Chester vs; Doomsday). This upper room was undoubtedly roomy in the reality than the drawing shows; the compression was used in this case by our artist as all others: his pageants are certainly not more succinct than his shops, his castles, and structures of all sorts.

The mansions in the Fouquet pictures are also divided into rooms, the upper one having a roof; both are provided with curtains veiling at need the upper as well as the lower.

No curtains are visible in the upper part of our pictures, but there must certainly have been some, sealed probably behind the woodwork. We know from the directions in English miracle plays that the scaffolds ed and unclosed at need: 'Her xall hevyno opyne and is xall shew [hymself'] (Mary Magdalene, p. 56).—Here take Jhesu and lede hym in gret hast to Herowde; the Herowdys scaffold xall unclose, shewing Herowdes stat' (Ludus Coventria, Trial of Christ). In this case, very frequent one, the dialogue took place between others on the scaffold and others on the ground below.

Fouquet miniature shows a similar arrangement.

The scenes presented to view by the painter of the Chester Plays, I and II.

2 Townley Mysteries—Pharao.

3 That is, the scaffold representing heaven.
Bodleian MS. are lively ones. In the first a man and a woman occupy the stage; the man is provided with a heavy club, and the woman seems to be delivering a speech accompanied with energetic gesticulation. In the second one warriors are fighting; and it is difficult to say whether a single combat is meant, or a battle between two armies: for single persons were often used as signs and symbols meaning a multitude. If, in the days of Sir Philip Sidney, two armies were ‘represented with foure swords and bucklers,’ and Elizabethan playgoers had to ‘receive it for a pitched battle,’ fourteenth-century sightseers were sure not to be more exacting.

In both cases, besides the ‘pageant,’ an audience has been represented. The painting of crowds and huge assemblies of people was not the forte of the mediaeval miniaturist; like the dramatist, he usually produced a few as a sign for many. In one case we have four men whose interest in the play takes that very unpleasant shape, both for neighbours and actors, of talk and comment. In the other case, a feminine audience is shown, looking and admiring, with raised finger, outstretched neck, but, as it seems, closed lips; a model audience, whose various sentiments and keen attention have been interpreted by the artist with a care and success rare at that date. To such quiet listeners, the Octavian of the Chester Plays would allude for the more fun when, pointing to the audience, he exclaimed:

‘Boye, their be ladyes many a one,
Amonge them all chouse thee one,
Take the faiereste, or elles none,
And freelye I geve her thee.’

(Salutation and Nativity.)

All pageants doubtless were not alike in all towns; there were variants. Here, as it seems to me, we have an average one, offering the main characteristics of such
A PAGEANT

(From MS. Bodl. 264, fol. 76a)
structures; they fit fourteenth-century entries, and sixteenth-century descriptions; and we may readily believe that before some such scaffoldings Chaucer came and elbowed the wife of Bath, Shakespeare came and heard the 'Old Vice' cry 'Ah ha! to the devil,' and saw the Absalons of his day deserve the whip 'for o'er-doing Termagant' and 'out-heroding Herod.'

COPENHAGEN,
January, 1900.

J. J. JUSERAND.
XXIV.

PANURGE'S ENGLISH.

"Lard ge' tholb be sua virtu: it be intelligence: aff yi body schal be naturalli relvith tholb fuld of me pety have for natur haft wh'egualy made: but fortune ium exaltit heif and ogis depreu: non yeleff violii men virtus depreu: and virtu:i mem dicriuii for anen yelad end iif non gud."

In the ninth chapter of Pantagruel it is written how Pantagruel met with Panurge, whom he loved all his life. Panurge made a display of various idioms before coming to his proper language of Touraine; among them he spoke English, and his English sentence is given above and on the opposite page as it appears in the edition of 1535, published at Lyons by Pierre de Ste. Lucie:

"Les horribles fiets et pouvoirs esquenables de Pantagruel : Roy des Dyspodez coposez par M. Alcofris, abstrateur de quinte essence. M.D. 1535"


Panurge apparently did not speak English in any earlier edition; in the edition without place or year, which is noted in the British Museum Catalogue as possibly of Paris and possibly of 1535, there is nothing between the Italian and the Low Dutch sentence. After 1535 there were still further interpolations by the author, as we shall see.

The English, which does not look intelligible as it stands, was kept without much alteration down to the middle of the seventeenth century, when apparently some linguist of
bëtsin aminacethin millzo priz na ekmin enchoch dal hebë ensouin; kauthin al din allzatin ntim/broth dechoch pour' miy michals in dendoch/pruch dal marsouin hot moch dansletin lapathas im doldemoch. Niz sur diast uoloch marchochin dal gousch patferpry dus hiz souch pruch gasech dalchii non/mzin soulechich al contin bukhar chren dorh dal priz. Entendez vous riez la-dift Panta- gruel es assistès. Aquoy dist Epistemon. Je croy que cest lagaige des Antipodes/le diable ny mozhet mite. Lors dist Pantagruel. Çopere le ne croyt les murailles vous entendent/mais de nous nous ny entend not. Donc dist le çopaignon. Signez miz boi videre per exemplo che la Comnusana non suona mai se la nona il dentre pleno... Lcoi to partinëte non bi sapere contare le miefortune/se prizna il tetulaco bierre nó a la solita resectione. Al quale e aduiso che le manit à la denti abdut perso illozo ozione naturale e del tutto annihillati. Aquoy respaide Episte- mon. Autant de lun comme de lauttre. Donc dist Panurge. Lards ges chòd bi sua stetiuss e inteligente; ass yi body schalbis de naturall rebthsé chòd sulb osine pery have for natur haff l'is egualy maide; bot fortune sun e sialite hesand opis depreut: non yeless bidiss men stettiuss depreut e stetiuss mem distetiuss for anez pelaend end iss non gud. Aquoy dist Carapini. Saic Treijnée fourys Boë descoss/ou lop sallia a entorde. Lors rëndie Panurge. Prug frest stenti sorgbinàd strochët dins pag bestëd. Bravoc chaungny pomarkiere rusti phalibragz deu- ntere pres salti pays. Seuisse trasmwe monach drupp desmenplif dist einpe drenz doelbi bp drizt loch minc fis
the Netherlands set himself to mend the spelling of the English, the Danish, and other outlandish quotations.

In the Elzevir edition of 1663, Panurge's English is given in the form which it has kept ever since:

‘Dont dit Panurge: Lord, if you be so vertuous of intelligence, as you be naturally releaved to the body, you should have pity of me: for nature hath made us equal, but fortune hath some exalted and others deprived: nevertheless is vertue often deprived, and the vertuous men despied: for before the last end none is good.’

This is fairly clear, but this is not Panurge's English. Panurge's English is of the Northern dialect, and he learned it no doubt from some wandering Scottish student. The French printer could not spell because he had not the requisite w's. To make a w he took an l and a b, imitating as well as he could the written form which will be found in the Troilus facsimile given in this volume as an illustration of Mr. McCormick's paper. So in their Danish the French printers, following a common practice of theirs, use l+r in place of the missing k—lædebon for klædebon.

Unfortunately there has been some confusion in printing the Scottish sentence, but the first part of it is clear:

‘Lard, gef thow be sua virtiuss be intelligence as thi body schawiss, be natural rewth thow suld of me pety haue for natur hass wss equaly [or equalis?] maide: bot fortune sum exaltit hess and otheris depreuit: non the less—’

Here the entanglement begins. Possibly a line has been dropped out in the copying. 'vioiss' looks like 'viciuss,' which would agree with the spelling 'virtiuss.' Perhaps 'hess' has been lost by similarity of ending after 'non the less'- 'nontheless hess viciuss men virtiuss depreuit' = 'nevertheless have the vicious despoiled the virtuous,' i.e. the poverty of Panurge is due to the fraud of the unrighteous, and his supplication is that of the just man suffering wrong; all which is quite in keeping with his character. 'And virtiuss men discruiuss foranen the last [or lat = latter?] end iss non gud,' i.e. 'and virtuous men expound that with regard to
the latter end none is good'; which is to say that as no one is to be counted good absolutely, having regard to the final summing up of man's merits, therefore Panurge may claim to be deserving of sympathy and help. This may be so; it is not quite satisfactory, and may be left for further consideration.

There is another point to be noted in this text. What Carpalim says is neither decency nor good grammar, but it shows that Carpalim recognized the idiom. It is on that account that he makes his blasphemous reference to the saint revered by all the Scots abroad, whether they were clerks or Scottish archers; and the singular inflexion of his verb is meant to gibe at the Northern sibilant terminations in -is, e.g. schawis, discrivis.

In later editions this speech of Carpalim's was thrown out of place. In the 1542 editions the Basque sentence is added after the English, and by some oversight Carpalim and his reference to St. Ringan were shifted so that they stand where they still remain in the Vulgate, separated from their proper station by the interpolated Basque. Naturally the words have been mistaken for mere aimless ribaldry, whereas they were originally ribaldry with a meaning, though apparently the Extractor of Quintessence had forgotten or neglected it when he revised Panurge for the last time.

I am indebted to Mr. George Neilson for some good advice, and more particularly for his reading of 'reluth,' which I had not at first made out. I have also to thank M. Paul Reyher for some bibliographical notes which he has kindly sent me.

W. P. Ker.
XXV.

ANGLO-SAXON ETYMOLOGIES.

1. A-Sax. scealfor, 'mergus,' by dissimilation for *scearfor, is connected with OHG. scarbo, 'mergus.'

2. A-Sax. cwīfa, 'womb,' already recorded in the Epinal Glossary, is generally supposed to have ə as root-vowel; but no objection could be raised to ï, seeing that pre-Germanic ə (cp. Gothic gipus) would have remained unaltered as ə. An A-Sax. cwīfa could be explained as resulting from Germanic *gīpan-, and we should have relationship, or rather identity, with Latin venter.

3. A-Sax. gepeah, 'thought,' cannot be etymologically connected with A-Sax. pencan, as the root of the latter contains a nasal. It is of course possible that it has been influenced by pencan, but, in itself it cannot well be anything else than an abstract formation from the verb represented by Gothic pahan, OHG. dagōn, OSax. thagōn, 'to be silent' (cp. Lat. tacere). The fundamental idea of gepeah would then be 'silence, the silent consideration of something.' In the Helian we meet with the common formula thagōn endi thenkian, whilst the command for silence was the regular opening ceremony of the Old Germanic popular assemblies.

4. A-Sax. cesol, 'gizzard,' already recorded in the Epinal Glossary, stands alone in Germanic. The other dialects have no corresponding form. I believe that it is etymologi-
cally identical with the NE. gizzard, which is borrowed from the French geisier, which, in its turn, represents the Latin giseria. If a form *ciseria were anywhere recorded in Lat. or Romance, the borrowing of the A-Sax. word from the Latin would be undoubted, as the change of suffix presents no difficulty. Whether such a form *ciseria for giseria represents a provincial pronunciation of the Latin word, or whether this latter was in any way influenced in form by some existing English word, is a question which I leave open.

5. A-Sax. swegldrēam is explained as meaning ‘joy of heaven,’ but wrongly. The swegl in this compound is an entirely different word; it is connected with Gothic swiglan, ‘to play the flute,’ swiglja, ‘flute-player,’ OHG. swēgala, ‘flute.’ Hence swegldrēam means ‘music.’

6. A-Sax. sprincl, ‘a basket,’ is connected with spranca, ‘twig,’ just as iēnel is related to iān. As to form, cp. the Austrian stinge with High German stengel, related to stanga.

7. A-Sax. feldwop, ‘bradigabo,’ Epinal Gl. 131 = Corp. Gl. 323, which later glosses, derived from these, wrongly explain as ‘ploratus campi.’ But the Latin bradigabo, which is nowhere recorded in Latin literature, means, according to Steinmeyer, Althochdeutsche Gl. iv. 24548, ‘the wild hop’ (OSax. feldhoppo). Does this explain A-Sax. feldwop? The feldwop might be regarded as the old u-stem, felbu-, and feldu-hopp(o) may have become feldwop, just as ONorse Bóðvildr stands for *Badu[h]ild-r. I by no means ignore the still unexplained difficulties; but the passage in the Althochdeutsche Gl. iv. 245, above referred to, would seem to confirm this explanation, even in the absence of any recorded A-Sax. hop(a), ‘hop.’

FRIEDR. KLUGE.

Freiburg,
April, 1900.
XXVI.

TAUTOLOGICAL COMPOUNDS OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

Some tautological compounds, i.e. combinations of entirely synonymous words, of the Gothic and the High German dialects, have been registered by Wilmanns in his Deutsche Grammatik, Zweite Abteilung: Wortbildung (Strassburg, 1896), § 399, 2. Wilmanns mentions the following words: Goth. piu-magus, mari-saius, OHG. gom-man (gomo), MHG. diub-stôle (OHG. diuba f. and stôla f. furtum), NHG. Streif-zug (MHG. streif m.), Schalks-knecht, Zeit-alter.

A few other High German instances of the same type are: OHG. lind-wurm 'dragon'; perhaps also NHG. Habergeiss, a popular name of the bird Heerschnepfe 'common snipe,' though this is a doubtful case, the isolated word haber not being traced in High German; the willow-tree was known in OHG. as salaha and as zelda, which two names are united in the NHG. compound Salweide; the adjective OHG. sir 'sower,' together with its synonym OHG. ampfaro, originally an adjective but used as a noun, gave the NHG. compound Sauerampfer 'sorrel.' The two words which according to Kluge's analysis are hidden in OHG. geisala, NHG. Geisel 'whip, scourge,' originally *gais-wala, containing Germanic *gaiz
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(OHG gér) and Goth. walus (cf. Kluge, Etymol. Wörterbuch 6, s.v. Geisel), must have been nearly identical in meaning. But words like NHG. Windhund, Walfsch, belong to another class of compounds in which the first word was originally quite sufficient to indicate the animal, while the second more general word was a later explanatory addition.

Without having made a thorough methodic search¹, I have noted in Old English up to the present time the following tautological compounds:

OE. gang 'path' + weg 'path' > gang-weg. The interchangeableness of the two elements of this compound appears clearly in a quotation from the Blickling Homilies, given in Bosworth-Toller and in the New Engl. Dictionary: 'taxcean lifes weg and rihrne gang to heofonum.' The NE. 'gangway' has been specialized in its meaning, being used almost exclusively as a nautical and parliamentary term.

OE. megen 'strength' + craf 'strength' > megen-craf, cf. OS. megin-kraf, OHG. megen-kraf.

OE. megen + strengo, strengō > megen-strengo, megen-strengō.

OE. holt 'wood' + wudu 'wood' > holt-wudu.

OE. racente 'chain' + téag 'chain' > racontēag, racetēag, ME. rachentege, raketege.

OE. word 'what is said' + cwide 'what is said' > word-cwide, cf. OS. word-QUiDi.

Doubtful cases are:

OE. olaēfe 'clover,' in which word Pogatscher recognizes a combination of the German (OHG. klé, kléo) and the Scandinavian (O. Icel. smári) name of this plant, on the basis of his theory about the change of the consonantal group mr into OE. br (cf. his paper 'Altenenglisch br aus

¹ In Th. Storch's dissertation Angelsächsische Nominalcomposita, Strassburg, 1868, the tautological compounds are not treated as a separate group.
in the Festschrift zum VIII. Allgemeinen Deutschen Neuphilologentage in Wien, Wien, 1898, p. 97 ff).

OE. cancer ‘crab’ + hæfern ‘crab’ > cancer-hæbern, also a tautological compound if we accept Pogatscher’s hypothesis concerning the etymology of the second word (cf. l.c., p. 101 ff.), who derives it from a Germanic type *hamaras.

OE. ort-geard ‘orchard,’ if Kluge be right in considering ort=Germ. *aurta- as a German derivative from Latin hortus (cf. Engl. Studien, xx. 333), instead of connecting it with Goth. waïrths, as most former etymologists—and more recently Uhlenbeck in his Etymol. Wörterbuch der Got. Sprache, s.v. aiurja—have done.

Carefully to be distinguished from tautological compounds, strictly speaking, in which the two elements are perfectly identical in meaning, are compounds like OE. mbr-berie and perhaps also streaw-berie (cf. Kluge, Engl. Studien, xx. 332) and hemlic (Kluge-Lutz, English Etymology, s.v. hemlock). In such combinations the second element with its wider, more comprehensive sense, is a later explanatory addition, just as in the NHG. compound Windhund, &c.

In later periods of the English language, after the adoption of so many Norse and French words, one would think that there was a strong impulse, and a very favourable opportunity for the formation of new tautological compounds, for the creation of tautological hybrids, half Norse or French, half English. Considering the great number of tautological phrases in Middle English, collected by L. Kellner in his interesting essay ‘Abwechslung und Tautologie. Zwei Eigenthümlichkeiten des alt- und mittelengl. Stiles’ (Englische Studien, xx. 1 ff.), one might expect a similar rich harvest of tautological hybrids. But since I have made it a point to collect such compounds the results of my own reading did not exceed the material
collected by the industrious and deeply-read scholar whose premature death we had to lament a few weeks ago—the late Professor Eugen Köllbing. In one of the learned notes to his edition of the romance of Ipomedon in drei englischen Bearbeitungen (Breslau, 1889), Köllbing mentions (p. 366) the following tautological hybrids, half English, half French:

_love-amour:_ *Noughte she couthe of love amoure.*

Ipomedon, 127.

_love-drury:_ *And of ladies love drury*

Anon *I wol yow telle.*

Chaucer’s *Sir Thopas*, 2085.

_wonder-mervaille:_ *Of armes that dede wonder-mervaille.*

Arth. and Merl. 9186.

_cite-toun:_ *So he com to a cite toun.*

*Am. and Amil.* 1865.

Later on, in the New English period, some newly formed tautological compounds gained currency, as for instance:

OE. *sleeg* ‘hammer’ + OE. *hamor* ‘hammer > NE.

_sledge-hammer* ;

OE. *pæð* ‘path, way’ + OE. *weg* ‘way’ > NE. *path-way* ;

ON. *happ* ‘chance’ + Fr. *hasard* ‘chance’ > NE. *hap-

_hasard.*

In other compounds like ME. NE. *grey-hound* (cf. ON. *grey* = ON. *bikka* ‘bitch’), ME. *cauce-wey, causey-vey*, NE. *causeway*, NE. *gooseberry, raspberry*, the second more general element is not identical, but explanatory.

Additions to this short and, I have no doubt, very incomplete list of English tautological compounds would be very welcome.

**Emil Koeppel.**

Strassburg,

*October, 1899.*
XXVII.

SOME ENGLISH PLAYS AND PLAYERS, 1220-1548.

As there is no subject to which Dr. Furnivall has devoted more attention, or in which he has done better work, than the origin and early history of the English drama, I can make no more appropriate contribution to his Birthday Book than a collection of facts which may serve to throw further light on the subject.

These facts are gathered from the records of two ancient towns, Beverley and Lincoln: the one, the capital of the East Riding of Yorkshire when that Riding was the first in wealth and population, and its capital took much the same position as a place of merchandise and shipping that its later rival, Hull, does now; while the other was not merely the political capital of a county and one of the staple towns, but the ecclesiastical capital of the largest diocese in England, which embraced the greater part of the midlands, and stretched from the Humber to the Thames.

They serve to make one point, which is of the first importance, if the origin of the English Play is not to continue to be involved in darkness; and that is, that it must be sought not in country monasteries and among the 'religious' professionally so called, but in the great towns
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and among the common tonsured ones, or the secular clergy who lived and worked among them.

The records of Beverley have been better preserved than the records of the great towns. The earliest reference to a public play there is very early indeed. In the first quarter of the thirteenth century a Continuatore of the eleventh-century history of the most famous of the northern English saints, the glorious Confessor, Saint John of Beverley, Archbishop of York, succeeded (probably with a view to contributions for the existing Minster, the choir and treasuries of which were then about to be begun, as well as for the benefit of posterity) the wonderful miracles wrought by the saint for the benefit of his town and church, within the space of five years. Not the least quaint of these is one which may be called 'The Sacristan's Story; or, the Tale of a Resurrection' (Historians of the Church of York, Rolls Series, No. 71, i. 328).

"It happened that one summer in the churchyard of St. John's Church, on the south side, there was a representation as usual by players (surnomed masques) of the Lord's Ascension in words and acting. A large crowd of both sexes assembled, led there by different impetuses, some by mere pleasure and wonder, others for the holy purpose of exciting their religious feelings. As the crowd gathered in a thick ring, many, especially short people, went into the church: to pray or to look at the pictures, or by some form of amusement to while away the day. Some youths when they got inside, happened to find a door half open which gave access to the steps up to the top of the walls. With boyish light-heartedness they ran up and went on to the vaults and galleries [the clerestory and triforium] on the top of the church, to get, I suppose, through the lofty windows of the towers or any holes there might be in the stained glass windows, a better view of the persons and gestures of the players, and to hear the dialogue more easily, like Zaccheus when he climbed up the sycamore tree. Some one however told the sextons what the youths were doing, and as they were afraid that the boys would make holes in the windows for the sake of seeing the performers, they at once gave chase, and by dint of heavy blows made them go back. But some of the boys, seeing the
punishment inflicted on their companions, to avoid falling into the hands of their pursuers fled to the upper parts, and climbed beyond the great cross then placed by St. Martin’s altar [i.e. on the rood-loft at the entrance to the choir]. One of them, looking down, placed his foot on a block of stone which suddenly gave way, and fell with a loud crash on the stone pavement, and was broken into fragments. The boy, frightened at the noise, lost his foothold and fell to the ground and for some time lay senseless and as if dead. The bystanders wept, the parents tore their hair and screamed. But God did not suffer His church, dedicated in the honour of Him and His confessor, to be polluted by shedding of human blood; but wishing it to enjoy greater sanctity for the future, and at the same time to give testimony to the truth, which was then being shown in the representation of the Resurrection, in the sight of all those present raised up the youth supposed to be dead, whole, without the smallest injury in any part of his body. Thus it happened that those who could not through the multitude of people be present at the representation outside the church, saw a more marvellous proof of the Resurrection inside; and not only of the Resurrection, but also of the Lord’s passion.  

The historian then improves the occasion, quite after the manner of the modern preacher: ‘The stone falling without the intervention of man plainly indicates the Lord’s Incarnation from a virgin: the fall of both, viz. stone and boy, signified his passion, as man and God. The stone broken in its fall was the type of the ram slain; and the youth the type of Isaac remaining unharmed. And in like manner, as the fall was in His humanity a sign of His passion, so His miraculous rising was in His Godhead a sign of His resurrection.’  

This tale is very interesting, as showing how the great churches were regarded as picture galleries and ‘places to spend a happy day,’ quite apart from any religious purpose. The reference to the play shows that the passion for it already existed, and that it was already a customary institution, long before the foundation of the Feast of Corpus Christi led to the concentration in one play of the various religious dramas already presented
to the public. The Resurrection was the pageant or play which, according to the ordinances of the Wrights’ or Carpenters’ Gild, codified in 1420, was their contribution to the Corpus Christi Play, and in 1520 still continued to be so.

Beverley Minster, in which this incident took place, was not a monastery, but a collegiate church of secular canons, and the play performed at its gates was certainly no ‘monkish’ play, for there were no monks in Beverley or near it.

A long gap ensues in the records of Beverley from the thirteenth to the fourteenth century. We leap from about 1220 to about 1380; from the legend of a saint to an official return, and a sober-sided town record. But when the curtain lifts again it shows us Beverley still addicted to the play.

In 1410 the town authorities caused a digest of the customs and liberties of the town of Beverley to be prepared by the town clerk, and entered by him in a large parchment register, in a good clerkly hand with red ink headings or rubrics, and fine red ink illuminated initial letters. Some felonious antiquary has made away with its no doubt massive and beautiful binding. But the text itself, which I found on the floor of the muniment room, a Cinderella among records, remains intact, and I have dubbed it the Great Gild Book. Among the digests and orders, and one of the longest, is an Ordinance of the Play of Corpus Christi in 1390. It was then ‘ordered by the whole community that all the craftsmen (artifices) of Beverley, viz. Mercers, Tanners, Masons,’ and thirty-three other companies of trades or mysteries, ‘shall have their plays and pageants ready henceforth on every Corpus Christi Day in fashion and form according to the ancient customs of the town of Beverley, to play in honour of the Body of Christ, under the penalty of 40s. for every
craft (artis) that fails.' It looks at first as if the point of this order was that the authorities of the town as a whole then converted into written and positive law, with a definite sanction, that which had hitherto been only an unwritten custom of the crafts. But as in 1392, only two years later, the penalty is spoken of as having been ordered by the commonalty 'from of old,' it is probably only a re-enactment of an old law. Certain it is that the crafts themselves had long before taken an official part in the Corpus Christi play. For another Order recites how in 1377 the Keepers of the town and the Tailors consented in the Gild Hall, that all the Tailors of Beverley should be personally present at the yearly accounts made of their pageant of the Play of Corpus Christi, and in their castle on Monday in the Rogation Days: but any free tailor, not in the livery of the craft, should pay to the expenses of the castle only.' This last refers to the custom of conveying the shrine of St. John of Beverley out of the Minster and round the town on Cross Monday, or Monday in Rogation Week, when all the crafts sat in wooden stages called, and no doubt made in the shape of, castles, clad in their best livery, to see the procession go by, and then rode after it on horseback to St. Mary's Church by the North Gate, and back again to the Minster.

In 1391, we get an indication of how entirely the play was in the hands of the town and its craftsmen from the entry that 'John of Arras, a "Hayrer" of the town of Beverley, came before the twelve keepers or governors of the town, and gave surety for himself and his brethren of the same craft to play a play called Paradise on the Feast of Corpus Christi, when the other craftsmen of the same town play; and, during his life, at his proper cost.' 'And he also undertook to redeliver to the twelve keepers at the end of his life all the properties (res necessarias) which he had belonging to the same play.' Then follows
what is I believe the earliest known list of stage properties.

'1 Karre, 8 haspis, 18 stapulos, 2 visers, 2 wenges angel, 1 furpsarr, 1 worme,'—or in modern English 'a car, 8 hasps, 18 staples, 2 masks, 2 angel's wings, 1 deal pole, (for the tree of knowledge), 1 serpent.' The list concludes in Latin with '2 pairs of shirts, 2 pairs of linen stockings, one sword.'

The hasps and staples were presumably to fasten the gates of Paradise when Adam and Eve were driven out by the angel, who wore the wings and descended in a car from heaven, and bore the sword in his hand. The shirts and hose were for Adam and Eve when driven out. In the Chester Play, for this scene of Paradise the stage directions runs: 'Then Adam and Eve shall stand naked and shall not be ashamed.' At Beverley perhaps they conformed more nearly to the Lord Chamberlain's requirements, though it is not improbable that they clothed themselves in their linen smocks and stockings coram populo. The 'Hayers' appear to be the ropers. In the early sixteenth-century list of the plays the Making of Adam and Eve was performed by the 'Walkers' or fullers, and The Breaking of the Commandment of God by the 'Rapers' or ropers. In the Town Minute-book, under date July 11, 1452, John Chapeley, hairer, was ordered to pay every year to the Alderman and Stewards of the Ropers' Craft for their play of Paradice 4d., while one Julius Barker was to pay 2d. for the same.

That the penalties by which the crafts bound themselves to perform their plays were no mere formality appears from an entry in 1392, that the Smiths, having failed in their play on Corpus Christi Day, should pay the full penalty of 40s.; while on June 16, 1452, the Porters and Creelers (the common carriers, who carried goods in baskets or creels) were warned to have a new pageant ready on Corpus Christi Day next, or forfeit 40s.
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In 1411, a curious contest seems to have arisen between
the richer and poorer commons of Beverley (‘the worthier
sort’ and the ‘lesser sort,’ as the record has it), which was
appeased by an order that ‘the worthier sort, not having any
very as those of other crafts have, and not playing any
play, should thenceforth under the oversight of the twelve
cepers cause a fit and proper pageant to be made, and
fit play played in the same’; a striking proof of the
importance of the play in town life.

During the fifteenth century, maintenance of the play
appears among the primary objects of all the craft gilds;
thus the ordinances of the ‘Barbitonosers,’ or barbers,
which were ‘ordained and used from of old,’ but apparently
first written down or codified in 1414 (Great Gild Book,
f. 59), provide as follows in Latin:

‘And first to the praise and honour of Almighty God,
the glorious Virgin Mary, and St. John the Baptist, it was
ordered and decreed that there shall be a brotherhood of
the same barbers for the reformation of peace and quiet,
and they shall maintain and find yearly honest serges of
wax or light in the chapel of the Blessed Mary, Virgin, of
Beverley, before the image of St. John the Baptist, as here-
tofore; and that they play or cause to be played a pageant of
the aforesaid St. John baptizing Christ in the Jordan, yearly,
when the Commonalty of Beverley on April 25 consent that
the plays should be played; under the penalty registered
in the Common Register.

‘And every one of the aforesaid craft newly setting up
shop and newly carrying on business as a master shall pay
the alderman and steward for the maintenance of the play
and light aforesaid 2s., and 1 lb. of wax, on beginning busi-
ness, without delay.

‘And every master newly beginning business and taking
an apprentice into his service, whether bound by indenture
or not, shall pay the alderman for the time being 2s., before
the account of the alderman for that year towards the main-
tenance of the play and light aforesaid.

'Moreover, every brother of the same craft who reproves
his alderman without measure and offensively, or attacks
him with abusive words while he holds office, and is there-
fore convicted by his brethren giving evidence thereof, shall
pay to the community of the town of Beverley to the use
of the community 20d., and to the maintenance of the
pageant and light aforesaid, 20d., as often as he shall be
convicted, without any pardon.'

So too the 'Barkers' or Tanners' ordinances Englished in
1494:

'Item, yt ys ordeyned and statuted the viith daye of Marche
in the yere of our lord God mivcccc th iiiij x xiijth, by x of
the xij Governors of the toune and comonaltie of Bever-
ley, that what journeyman that shall woorke within the
toune of Beverley with any maister of the said craft by
the space of xiiij dayes, be he ether brother or contributor,
shall paye yerly to the Alderman for the tyme beynge to
the expenses of the sayd crafte, whan the playe of Corporis
Christi ys played in the sayd toune of Beverley, viijd. and
yerly whan that play ys note played vjd.'

Again, in 1467 the twelve Governours of the towne pub-
lished some New Ordinances, with the consent and assent
of all the good burgesses of the towne aforesaid, and all the
aldermen and stewards of every craft and mystery of the
town aforesaid, for the reformation of certain abuses of
contributions and unlawful customs used among the burg-
gesses and inhabitants of the town aforesaid, and for the
common advantage and necessary benefit of the whole
community.

'And first it was decreed and ordered that if any one, of
whatsoever estate, degree, or condition he may be, wish to
live in the town of Beverley, he may freely come to live,
dwell, and occupy his mystery or craft as a master in the
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town aforesaid, without any exaction or contribution of money to be paid to the community of the town aforesaid, or any one else of his mystery or craft, for the first year of his coming to the town aforesaid, except only to the laudable and necessary expenses of the castle and light of his mystery or craft and the play, if any is ordered by the governors of the town aforesaid for that year, as a master of his mystery or craft, and shall not be further charged for the first year.

'But after the first year of his coming to the town aforesaid, as long as he stay there and set up open shop and ply his craft, and is not a burgess, he shall thenceforth pay and contribute, until he is made a burgess, to the community of the town aforesaid 12d. besides the charges of expenses of castle, light and play of his mystery or craft, yearly falling on him as a master.

'But others, receiving wages, or hired men called journeymen, shall observe the decrees and orders made about them, as is noted in the orders of the burgesses of every mystery and craft in the town aforesaid in their respective places.'

The conditions for journeymen were not very onerous, as we saw that the journeyman tanner paid 8d. a year when the Corpus Christi Play was played, and 6d. when it was not, so that the cost of the play to him only represented 2d.

The ordinances of the other crafts are equally full of references to their pageant or play. Indeed, the performance of a play, or more strictly, an act in the Corpus Christi Play, was regarded as so much a distinguishing mark of a Craft Gild, that when in 1498 the Drapers separated from the Mercers and set up as a separate company, they also undertook the performance of a separate play. Thus while the Mercers did Black Herod—this much travestied potentate always appearing with a black face, and con-
continually in a rage—the Drapers took on themselves *Domine Pilate*, or Pilate sitting on the judgement seat.

In the fifteenth century the Corpus Christi Play seems to have been performed every year, as a general rule. Among the town orders indeed is an entry which seems to point to the performance being occasional only. On St. Mark’s Day, the day of the municipal election, we find the crafts ordered to be ready to play with the pageants on Corpus Christi Day, 1437. But in 1456 the common burgesses presented a petition to the venerable Keepers to have their play yearly on Corpus Christi Day as they had been accustomed to have it. The town accounts, too, only a few of which are preserved, and the town minute-books, imply that the performance was a yearly event. They show that the performance of the play was a great function, and not without considerable cost to the town. In 1423, out of a total expenditure of £93 odd, ‘a breakfast made by agreement of the twelve keepers on Corpus Christi Day to the Earl of Northumberland’—the Percies at Leconfield were near neighbours to Beverley—‘in the house of William Thixhill, barber, and the countess and family dining and supping there at the cost of the community, with divers rewards to divers officers and servants,’ cost £4 os. 4d. Then ‘the expenses of the twelve Keepers labouring on Corpus Christi Day in governing all the pageants passing through the whole town on the said day’ came to 7s. 6d. This item is repeated in subsequent years. Thus, in 1449 ‘the expenses of the twelve Governors of the town, the common clerk and sergeant together at North Bar governing the pageants of the town of the Play of Corpus Christi through the whole day,’ came to 2s. 6d. Next year the same expenses came to a penny more; while they also under the name of charity and the ‘alms of the community,’ contributed 4s. ‘to the craft of Skinners for their pageant or play on Corpus Christi Day.’
In 1460 they increased the expenses to 4s. by erecting a scaffold and covering it with stuff for their accommodation, 'sitting at the North Bar to see and govern the Pageants.'

In 1423 an interesting item is, 'Paid to Master Thomas Bynham, a friar preacher [Dominican], for making and composing the banns (banis) before the Corpus Christi Play proclaimed through the whole town of Beverley 4 May, 5s. 8d.'; while the minstrels or waits (spiculatores) of the town were given 20d. 'for riding with the said proclamation of Corpus Christi through the whole town.' It is noteworthy that it was not the play itself which the friar (who was presumably, from the word master, a University M.A.) wrote, but only the proclamation or notice of it. A late specimen of these banns may be seen in the Chester Play in 1600 in the Shakespeare Society's edition of 1853. It begins by giving a quite unhistorical account of the origin of the play, apologizes for anything in it offensive to modern manners, and tells the crafts the acts they are to perform, with short comments on them, e.g.:

And you, worshipful mercers, tho' costly and fine
Ye trim up your carriage as custom e'er was,
Yet in a stable was he born that mighty king divine,
Poorly in a stable 'twixt an ox and an ass!

The third line is evidently, from its mingled metre, corrupt. I put in here a caveat. Take notice that the writer of the banns was not a monk, whose duty was to be immured in his cloister and his church, but a friar whose business it was to go about and be a man of the world; more secular than the secular clergy themselves.

In the only extant mediaeval town Minute-book, which extends from 1436–1470, there are several notices of both the Corpus Christi and the Pater Noster Plays. They show us that the performances had fixed places assigned to
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June 1st, 1454, Henry VII, it was ordered by the mayor of the ancient London or Governors that the pageant of Corpus Christi be assigned to be played on June 23 at the North Bar by the Bailiwick; between John Stowmouth and James Camin in Highgate; at the Free House: at the Fishmongers' was called Wednesday market: at the Warrior Bar or one end, and at the Beck. It is annexed that on of the two aldermen after wards on June 25th gave his admission to the mayor. Next year (£ 89. 6.) the same places were assigned. The same Governors looked after the pageant too. In 1453, the account rolls show that a fine of £ was exacted on Roger Penycote, because he did not produce his pageant at the North Bar on Corpus Christi Day according to the proclamation and ordinance made and penalty of £. He absolved 40s. and the rest was pardoned. At the same time, John, or some other, was fined a shilling for impeding the play of divers pageants on Corpus Christi Day in Highgate.

On June 21, 1454, £ 89. 6s., fine 'shapers' were made to pay down to each for a fine for not playing their play on Corpus Christi Day, and ordered to have their pageant ready by Palm Sunday next at the latest. On May 21, 1454, Henry Cooper, a 'weaver,' or weaver, because he did not show his past, was ordered to show on Corpus Christi Day, in spite of the proclamation by the common bellman, forfeited £ 40. 4d. to the community: and showed £ 39. 4d. in respect of that penalty, and because he was poor 4d. was taken from him. and the rest graciously excused on condition of not doing it again. A few days afterwards (£ 89. 6s.), the 'Porters and Crears' were warned to have a pageant made ready on Corpus Christi Day next, on pain of forfeiture of £ 40. to the use of the community. In like manner, June 1, 1456, William Hoseham was warned in the Gild Hall to put down 40s. because the players of the pageant of the Dyers' craft were not ready to play their pageant in the
first place at the North Bar. The money was returned, he promising that it should not occur again.

Next year, July 20, 1451, John Bonde laid down before the Governors 6s. 8d. in the name of 40s., the full fine, because being alderman of the Skinners, he did not produce his play to be played on Corpus Christi Day. They took 4s., and remitted the rest.

Even being tardy with your play was a municipal offence and finable by the authorities. On June 5, 1459 (l. 121), Thomas Lord, alderman of the Butchers, paid down 40s. because they came late with their players to the North Bar to play their pageants. 40d. was taken, and the rest returned. A 40s. fine then was of course a serious matter, equivalent to at least £40 now.

At last the Governors of the town became so exacting that they fined the craftsmen if the plays were not well put on the stage. In 1520–1, under the heading of ‘Receipts from transgressions’ (or trespasses), the Governors account for 2s. received from Richard Trollopp, alderman of the ‘paynetors’ (painters), ‘because their play of The Three Kings of Colleyn (Cologne) was badly and confusedly played, in contempt of the whole community, before many strangers’; and 1s. received from Richard Gaynstang, alderman of ‘talours,’ because his play of Slepyng Pilate was badly played contrary to the order thereof made; and 2s. received of William Patson, alderman of drapers, for his play being badly played.’ As the Governors that year spent no less than 45s. 3d. on themselves and other gentlemen (generosorum) at the time of the Corpus Christi Play, they needed some set-off. It was I believe in this year, or perhaps a year or two earlier, that the list was made of the acts of the play as performed at Beverley, and the crafts who performed them, which was printed in Poulson’s Beverlac in 1827. Poulson’s list, followed by Miss Toulmin Smith in her York Play, is terribly mutilated, and was
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taken from a Lansdowne MS. I give a correct version from the original on the flyleaf of the Great Gild Book:

GUBERNACIO LUDI CORPORIS CHRISTI.

Tylers: the fallinge of Lucifer.
Saddelers: the makinge of the World.
Walkers: makinge of Adam and eve.
Ropers: the brekinge of the Comaundments of God.
Criyers: gravinge and Spynnynge.
Glovers: Cayn.
Shermen: Adam and Seth.
Wattermen: Noe Shipp.
Bowers and Flethers: Abraham and Isaak.
Musterdmakers and Chanlers: Salutation of Our Lady.
Husbandmen: Bedleem.
Vynteners: Sheipherds.
Goldsmyths: Kyngs of Colan.
Fysheurs: Symeon.
Cowyers: fleynge to Egieppe.
Shomakers: Children of Ysraell.
Scriveners: Disputacion in the Temple.
Bbronours: Sent John Baptyste.
Laborers: the Pynacle.
The Myliners: rasynge of Lazar.
Skynnners: ierusalem.
Bakers: the Mawndy.
Listers: prainge at the Mownte.
Tailours: Sleipinge Pilate.
Marchants: Blak Herod.
Drapers: Demynge Pylate.
Bocheours: Scorgynge.
Cutlers and Potters: the Stedynynge.
Wevers: the Stanginge.
Barker: the Takinge of the Crose.
Cooks: Haryinge of hell.

1 'arechser,' Poulson.
2 Chaulers, P.
3 A goldsmythe, King of Colan (P.). It is of course the Three Kings of Cologne, or Magi.
4 'lusters,' Poulson.
5 'sveynynge,' Poulson. It appears from the ordinances of the cutlers, made Feb. 1445, that 'stedynyng' means the crucifixion.
6 This means the taking off the cross.
Wrights: the Resurrection.
Gentylmen: Castle of Emaut.
Smyths: Ascencion.
Prestes: Coronacion of Our Lady.
Marchaunts: Domesday.

There were thus thirty-five acts in the play at Beverley, as compared with fifty-seven at York in 1415; thirty-two at Wakefield in the reign of Henry VI; forty-two at Coventry, and twenty-five at Chester in the last decade of the sixteenth century. This is a striking testimony to the elasticity of the play, the scenes of which varied with the number of gilds taking part in it: a fact which no doubt largely accounted for its popularity. Great scope was given for local talent in devising new acts, the only conditions being that they represented some part of the Biblical narrative or the legends, such as the Harrying of Hell, and The Coronation of the Virgin, which had been tacked on to it in the popular religion. Some attempt was made to adapt the character of the scene to be performed to the nature of the craft carried on by the performers. Thus, the Priests at Beverley, and, as we shall see, at Lincoln, presented The Coronation of the Virgin; while the Cooks everywhere performed The Harrying of Hell, called 'the coks pageant,' because they were in the habit of taking things out of the fire; and the Watermen found the ark, or 'Noes Shippe'; the Bakers the maundy. One of the richest gilds at Beverley, the Goldsmiths, at other places the Mercers, performed The Magi, with gorgeous dresses for the three kings; and another rich gild at Beverley, the Merchants, gave the expensive scene of Domesday, or The Last Judgement. Very appropriate to the Scriveners, or lawyers, was the Disputation in the Temple.

Poulson says (p. 278) that 'these plays are referred to by entries similar to those already given until the reign of James I.' This is an entire delusion. They are not men-
tioned again after 1520, in the only existing records for the period, some sporadic account rolls.

There is, for instance, not a word of them in 1545. The Archbishops of York were lords of Beverley town, as well as patrons and chief of the Minster. Both Edward Lee, who became Archbishop of York in 1531, and Thomas Holgate, who succeeded in 1545, were reformers, and no doubt discouraged these plays as superstitious. Their place was taken first by performances by the players of the king and various lords to whom frequent payments are recorded; and, as far as the town itself was concerned, by plays got up under the superintendence of the master of the Grammar School. The account rolls and minute-books for the reign of Edward have, unfortunately, entirely, and for the reign of Mary, and the first eight years of Elizabeth, almost entirely disappeared. When they begin again, in 1566 and succeeding years, we find such entries as the following (printed in my *Early Yorkshire Schools*, i. 117, 1899):

1566. 'Common expenses,' 'given in rewarde to the schoolmasters’ players, 5s.'

1567. 'Gyven to the Schole maister his players 17s.'

'Item payd to the waits for playing when the Schole maister's players played 3s. 4d.'

1570. 'Given in rewarde to Scholemaister players upon the potacion day before Fastnes evin 10s.'

After 1572 even these payments disappear, and the town became dependent for plays on strolling players, or, puritanically, eschewed plays altogether.

So much for the Corpus Christi Play. There was another play, which in the fifteenth century became almost as popular. This was the *Pater Noster* Play. From the notices of it which have been preserved the Play seems to have been a much more regular drama, with a fixed number of scenes and personages.

At Beverley, on May 29, 1469 (Minute-book, f. 150).
divers crafts of the town—eighteen are named—agreed to play the Pater Noster Play in the town on Sunday after St. Peter ad Vincula (August 1). Copies of the play or parts (registra) were given out to these crafts and to three others. Seven places for the performance were assigned, and were practically the same as for the Corpus Christi Play, viz.: ‘North Bar: the Bulryng; at Richard Couton’s dore in Highgate: Crossebrig: Wedynsday market; Mynsterbowe and Beksyde.’ The players (lusores) were: ‘Pryde: Invy: Ire: Avaryce: Sleweth: Glotony Luxuria: Vicious.’ Under the heading, ‘the craftsmen (artifices) and misteries are assigned to play the said play,’ is the entry:

‘All these worshipful persons (venerabiles) and craftsmen were appointed to play the different pagends of Pater Noster, as appears below, namely; To the pageant of Viciose; the gentilmen, merchands, clerks and valets, and Roger Kelk and John Copy were appointed aldermen of the said pageant.

Pride (superbie), the shomakers, goldsmiths, Glover, glasiers skynnerns and fishers; William Downes was appointed alderman.

Lust (luxurie), the litsters (dyers), walkers (fullers), wevers, pynners, cardmakers, wiredraghers.

To the pageant of Sloth (accidie), the watermen, husbandmen, laborors, sadlers, ropers (ropemakers), crelers, mylners (millers), and furbishours (armour polishers).

Gluttony (gule), baxters (bakers), vinters, innkeepers (pandoxatores), cooks, tilers.

Hatred (invidie), bochers, wrights, coupers, fletchers (arrowmakers), patyners (patten or wooden-shoe makers).

Avarice (avaricie), tailleors, masons, braciers (braziers), plammers, and cutellers.

Anger (ire), tanners, barbers, smiths, and painters.

The names of the last contingent of trades are for some odd reason written in Latin, though the names of the other crafts and gilds are given in English. A single alderman was appointed to each pageant except the first. The number of crafts mentioned, including the Gentlemen, Clerks, and Valets, is thirty-nine.
Of course, the occasion did not pass off without a quarrel. On August 6, John Copy, alderman of the craft of Merchants of the town of Beverley, for his rebellion offered to the players in the pageant of the craft and other his rebellions, had to place in the hands of the Keepers, on the second day of the session of the twelve Keepers after their return from London, 40s. He afterwards appeared and laid down 40s.

At Lincoln plays were not less ancient or less a matter in the fifteenth century of common municipal concern than at Beverley. In 1236, Bishop Grosseteste thundered against the vicars of the choir of the Minster for their Feast of Fools, with its plays and maskings. He thundered in vain; for in 1390 we find Courtney, after an archiepiscopal visitation, objecting (Chapter Act Book, A. 2. 28, fol. 32) that on January 1, 'the vicars and clerks dressed like laymen, laughed, shouted, and acted plays which they commonly and fitly call The Feast of Fools,' and he ordered them to stop, and also their public drinkings in the church. A sarcastic vicar has written in the margin, 'Harrow barrow. Here goes the Feast of Fools (hic subducitur festum stultorum).' Among the rolls of Bishop Lexington's episcopal register in the Bishops' Registry, is one headed in Latin: 'This Roll (ista rotula—I never met with a feminine roll elsewhere) belongs to me Thomas Pournay, gentleman, which I had written,' apparently in the reign of Henry VIII. It is intended chiefly to be a list of the mayors and bailiffs, who afterwards, when Lincoln became a county of a city, were converted into the sheriffs of Lincoln. The list begins in the thirty-fourth year of Edward III. The roll is diversified with various rubricated entries in the nature of a chronicle of important events in the history of the city and the county at large. It has, of course, nothing to do with the bishop or his
registers, and would more appropriately find its home among the archives of the city—in the Stone Bow instead of in the Gate house of the bishop's palace. The entries are of this sort: 3 Richard II. 'Galiots and other small shippes of Spain brent most parte of the towne of Gravesend.' The year 10 Richard II has a Latin entry to the effect that this year the king granted the mayor a sword to be borne before him. 1 Henry V. This year 'the Lord Cobham made insurreccion with many "Lollers."' 23 Edward IV. 'This year the king's sons were put to silence'—a euphemism quite Hellenic in character.

Interspersed among these lists of town officials and notable events are the following references to the play:

26 Henry VI, 1447–8. *Ludus Sancte Susanne*.
31 Henry VI, 1452–3. King Henry was at Lincoln for the second time; *et Ludus de Kyng Robert of Cesill*.
35 Henry VI, 1456–7. Earthquake on the Vigil of St. Thomas the Apostle (Dec. 28), at 3 o'clock; *et Ludus de Pater Noster*.
14 Edward IV, 1473–4. This year was made le Bisshop Brig; *et Ludus de Corporis Christi*.

In 7 Henry VIII the roll ends without any further reference to plays. The plays here mentioned are not, however, an exhaustive list. For example, in 1469, one of the Chapter Act Books (A. 2. 36, fol. 32) has a reference to the Show or Play of St. Anne. The Chapter provided for the expenses of Sir J. Hanson, chaplain, about the show (*visum*) of the Assumption of the Virgin on St. Anne's Day last past, given in the nave of the church, with a reward to him out of the money coming from the next opening
of the high altar, i.e. of the collection-box there. Nor did the plays cease in 1474. For in the second earliest existing City Minute-book on December 31, 13 Henry VIII, 1521, at a Corporation meeting, it was ‘agreed that Paternoster Play shall be played this year.’ Also that every alderman shall make a gown for the ‘kyngys’ in the pageant in the procession of St. Anne’s Day. Next year on June 13, 1522, it was ordered that ‘every occupancy within this city shall prepare and make redy their pageant to be brought forth the same day according to the old laudable custom.’ The mayor was to ‘ayde the Graceman in the ordering of the same,’ while two persons were appointed to collect in each parish. Again, on Nov. 12, 31 Henry VII, it was agreed by the Common Council that a large door should be made at the late school-house that the pageants may be sent in, and rent was to be charged for warehousing of 4d. for every pageant, ‘and Noy schippe 12d.’

Here then we see that as at Beverley the play was a city function, and that the various craft gilds of the city acted, or were responsible for, different acts or scenes in the play; while the reference to the graceman—a title peculiar to Lincolnshire apparently, for the alderman or head of a gild—shows that the Play of St. Anne, at all events, was like the Play of Pater Noster at York, as evidenced by the still extant account roll of its receipts, under the general superintendence of a special gild. The Pater Noster Play seems to have been the favourite play at Lincoln, as its performance is recorded five times, as against two performances of the Corpus Christi Play, and one each of the Play of St. Lawrence, one of Susanna, one of King Robert of Cecil, and one of St. Clara. It would be interesting to learn more of these plays; especially of that of King Robert of Sicily, ‘the Proud King,’ whose story was acted again at Chester
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in 1529. The Play of St. Anne does not seem to be mentioned before 1483, when it is discussed in a very curious passage in one of the Act-books or minute-books of the Chapter (A. 31, f. 18). 'On Saturday, the Chapter Day, June 1483, in the high choir of the Cathedral Church of the Blessed Mary of Lincoln, after compline, Sir Dean with his brethren, the Precentor, Chancellor, Treasurer, and Alford standing according to custom before the west door of the choir, and discussing the procession of St. Anne to be made by the citizens of Lincoln on St. Anne's Day next, determined that they would have the play or speech (sermonium) of the Assumption or Coronation of the Blessed Mary repaired and got ready, and played and shown in the procession aforesaid, as usual in the nave of the said church. The question being raised at whose expense this was to be done: they said at the expense of those who were willing to contribute and give anything to it, and the rest to be met by the common fund and the fabric fund in equal shares; and Sir Treasurer and G. Alford were made surveyors of the work.' Here then we find the Dean and Chapter being responsible like one of the city gilds for the performance of one of the scenes of St. Anne's Play, and that one the Assumption or Coronation of the Virgin, undoubtedly the crowning scene of the play, in the very nave of the cathedral itself;—and grand theatre it must have been.

The playwright as well as the theatre were provided by the Chapter. On Sept. 13, 1488, the canons granted Chapter Act-book, A. 2. 37, f. 46) to the Treasurer the presentation of the chantry in Burton then held by Robert Clarke, on its next vacancy, and to keep Robert Clarke with him because 'he is so ingenious in the show and play called the Ascension, given every year on St. Anne's Day.' A similar provision was made on the appointment on Sept. 22, 1517, of Sir Robert Denyar as St. Anne's priest,
to sing for the gild, he promising yearly to help to the bringing forth and preparing of the pageants in St. Anne’s Gild (Hist. MS. Commission, Fourteenth Report, App. viii, p. 26).

The Play of St. Anne in the reign of Henry VIII appears to have completely superseded both the Corpus Christi and the Pater Noster Play. Thus did the cult of the Mother tend to eclipse that of the Son and His works. But from the mention of four plays, four distinct pageants or acts, Noah’s ship, the Three Kings of Cologne, the Ascension, and the Coronation of the Virgin, it seems most likely that the Play of St. Anne did not differ much from the Corpus Christi Play. Like the latter, it was a conglomeration of divers plays on incidents in Biblical history, performed on St. Anne’s Day instead of Corpus Christi Day, and with special scenes added in honour of the Virgin and her mother. There are almost yearly mentions in the city minute-books of the gild and pageants of St. Anne’s Play, which point to its identity in all but name and day with the Corpus Christi Play, while in 1554 it is even called by the latter name. Thus, in 1518 every alderman is to send out a minister with a rochet, and a torch to be lighted in the procession about the Sacrament, and another person with a black gown to go in procession.

In 1521 the mayor ‘produced a paper of Mr. Dighton, who be it noted was the Grammar-School master, ‘for the foundation of a chantry priest in St. Michael-on-Hill, to be appointed by the Mayor and Commonalty after Dighton’s death, with a proviso that he shall yearly be ready to help to the preparing and bringing forth the procession of St. Anne’s Day.’ The same year two aldermen were ordered to bring forth the Gild of St. Anne under penalty of 40s., and on their complaining that because of the plague they cannot get such garments and ‘honourments’ as should be in the pageants, it was agreed to borrow a gown of Lady
Powis for one of the Mariæ, and the other Mary to be arrayed in the crimson gown of velvet belonging to the gild. In 1539 'it was agreed that St. Anne’s Gild shall go up on the Sunday next after St. Anne’s Day, in manner and form as it hath been in times past, and every one in default to forfeit 3s. 4d.' Next year a similar order was made, and the ‘occupations’ were ordered to bring forth their pageants according to the old custom; but the significant addition is made, ‘and every occupation that hath their pageants broken to make them ready against the day, on pain of forfeiting 20s.’ Two years later two collectors were appointed ‘to go about the country yearly, gathering for St. Anne’s Gild.’ In 1547 an order was made on June 13 for ‘the procession and show’ on Sunday after St. Anne’s Day as in times past. But on Nov. 5 comes the ominous order to bring in an inventory of all the jewels, plate, and ornaments belonging to the procession of ‘St. Anne’s sight,’ and the same to be sold for the use of the Common Chamber. Next year the Court of Augmentations of the revenues of the Crown demanded £4 13s. 4d., the cost of St. Anne’s Gild. We hear no more of the gild or play till July 6, 1554, when Mary of bloody memory had restored the old régime. In Secret Council ‘it was ordered that St. Anne’s Gild with Corpus Christi Play shall be brought forth and played this year; and that every craft shall bring forth their pageants as hath been accustomed.’ Next year a like order was made. Then again darkness falls on the play.

But the city, though it might conform to Protestantism, did not abandon its love for the play. On March 4, 1564, ‘it was agreed that a standing play of some story of the Bible shall be played two days this summertime,’ and persons were appointed to collect contributions. At the end of the Minute-book is given a list of the properties of the stage [play], played in July, anno sexto reginae Elizabethae
in Brodgait, and it was the story of Tobias in the Old Testament. The first property and the last we may safely swear were derived from the St. Anne's Play; for the first was 'Hell mouth, with a nether chap' (chop or jaw), and the last 'a firmament with a fiery cloud and a double cloud.' So too 'a tomb with a covering,' and the 'city of Jerusalem with towers and pynacles,' savour strongly of the Corpus Christi pageants, while the King's Palace of Nineveh, and 'Olde Toby's house' and the rest, were no doubt old scenes under new names. For as late as 1569 the 'gear of St. Anne's Gild' was still in existence, 'remaining in a tenement next St. Benedict's churchyard,' and ordered to be laid and kept 'in the lower chamber of the Gildhall.' The last actual record of a common city performance seems to be Jan. 26, 1566, when it was agreed 'that the stage-play of the story of Toby shall go forward and be played in Whitsun holydays next, the Common Chamber to bear £4 towards the charges, and the orders thereof to be appointed by the mayor and his brother.'

The St. Anne's Play in which the clergy of the Minster participated on the footing of being one gild out of many, suggests some remarks on what has hitherto been written as to the writers and originators of these plays.

From first to last, both at Lincoln and Beverley, the plays were in the hands of the civic authorities and the craft gilds, assisted of course by the clergy, the secular clergy, but with no mention of monks or regular canons.

As usual with regard to anything in the 'Middle Ages' the credit of them has been given to 'the monks.' The earliest published specimens, the Towneley Mysteries and the Chester Play, have been attributed as a matter of course to 'monkish' sources. The so-called Towneley Mysteries were put down, both as to writers and as to performers, to 'the monks' of Woodkirk near Wakefield.
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by their first editor in the Surtees Society edition in 1836; and Mr. A. W. Pollard, in his edition for the Early English Text Society in 1897, unfortunately stamped the story with the authority of repetition. There is not, however, the shadow of a shred of evidence in support of such an origin. Through the kindness of Mr. B. A. Quaritch, to whom the MS. now belongs, I have examined the original. There is not, from beginning to end of the volume, a single reference to Woodkirk. On the contrary, at the foot of the first page the word Wakefield stares the reader in the face in bold rubricated letters: ‘Adsit principio Sancta Maria meo Wakefield’; while beneath is written in a different hand the word ‘Barkers.’ At the beginning of the second act, the ‘Mactacio Abel,’ is written ‘Glover pag.’ At the beginning of the third act, there is again a bold rubricated heading, ‘Processus Noe cum filiis. Wakefield.’ Notice surely could not be given in plainer letters that the play was the Wakefield Play. It is simply the Corpus Christi Play as edited for performance by the craft gilds at Wakefield. The first act was performed by the Barkers or tanners, the second by the Glovers; while similar entries refer the ‘Pharaoh’ act to the Litsters or dyers; and the ‘Pilgrims Act,’ or, as it is called at Beverley, the Castle of Emaut’ or Emaus, was done by the ‘Fysshers.’ The names of the other gilds’ performances are not preserved; but the margins have been severely cut in binding, and the gilds’ names may have appeared in more plays. At all events there cannot be the least doubt that the Towneley Mysteries were written for performance at Wakefield, the then capital of the West Riding. The attribution to Woodkirk is due to a note by Douce, the antiquary, inserted in an auction catalogue, when the MS., then belonging to the Towneleys of Towneley Hall in Lancashire, was put up for sale in 1814. It is quite on the cards that Douce had actually misread the word Wake-
field into Widkirk. If not, it was a pure guess. The value he put on it may be judged from the fact that in editing one of the Acts, the Judgement or ‘Deeming Pilate,’ for the Roxburgh Club in 1822, he attributed it ‘to the Abbey of Whalley.’ This seems based on no other ground than that Whalley was the largest abbey in the neighbourhood of the Towneley family, to whom the MS. belonged. ‘The Abbey of Widkirk’ was a little cell of the Priory of St. Oswald’s, Nostell, not itself one of the largest houses of Augustinian Canons. Why the people of Wakefield, a large town, with a great church, many chantries, and a grammar school, should ever have been supposed to find it necessary to resort for their plays, full of character and showing great knowledge of the world, to a couple of canons (not by the way monks, as Mr. Pollard dubs them, p. xxviii), who by their rule were forbidden to leave their cloister or mix with the world, passes comprehension.

It has, of course, now been pointed out that many of the Wakefield Plays are adaptations of the York Corpus Christi Play, or of a common original. There are not wanting indications that the original play was in Latin, not only from the titles of the acts, and the stage directions being written in that language, but from such relics as the first stanza of Pilate’s speech being entirely in Latin, and the other stanzas being a curious mixture of Latin and English:

Rule I the jury
Maxime pure,
Town quoque rure,
Me faventis!

has quite the ring of the famous ‘Trumpeter unus erat qui coatum scarlet habebat’ in the present century, and probably is an actual emanation from the Gollards and carmina Burana of earlier centuries.

The monkish origin attributed to the Chester Play is equally guesswork. It is founded on a note written in a
copy made in 1607 by James Miller (Harl. 2124, quoted in Dr. Furnivall's edition of the Digby Mysteries). 'The Whitsun Playes first made by one Don Randle Higgonet of Chester Abbey, who was thrice at Rome before he could obtain leave of the Pope to have them in the English tongue.' And another writer (Harl. 1944), a few years earlier, says: 'Note that these playes of Chester called the Whitson playes weare the worke of one Randell, a monk of the Abbey of St. Warburghe in Chester, who reduced the whole history of the byble into Englishe storyes in mether (metre) 'in the Englishe tongue: and this moncke in a good desire to do good, published the same. Then the firste mayor of Chester, namely Sir John Arneway knight, he caused the same to be played.' As to Randell Hignet, this seems to be pure guesswork on the part of the excellent archdeacon who wrote the account. Undoubtedly the person meant was Randolph Higden, the author of the famous Polychronicon, the great mediaeval encyclopaedia of English history. Writing in 1594, the archdeacon was merely putting a name to the author by the simple expedient of attributing the play to the only monk of Chester whose name he knew, just as he attributed the first performance to the most famous, because the first mayor of whom he was aware, much as all jokes of unknown paternity are still wont to be laid at the door of Sydney Smith. The mayor meant was apparently Richard Ernes, mayor 1327–8, who was not by any means the first, as Ormerod's Cheshire, i. 207, shows. The statement that Higden translated the Bible into English shows that the archdeacon was very ill acquainted with the date or character of Higden's writings, and is probably a confused reminiscence of the work of Higden's translator, John of Trevisa, a very different person, no monk, but a secular clerk, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, and Canon of the College of Westbury-on-Trym. Higden wrote his Polychro-
nicon not later than 1327. It was translated in 1388, and a famous passage in the translation as to the use of French by gentlemen, clergymen, and scholars, till that time, shows that if Higden had written in the vernacular at all he would have written in French. The archdeacon is, moreover, contradicted by an earlier account, purporting to be contained in the banns given out in 24 Henry VIII (1532), which attributes it to ‘one Sir Henry Frances, sometime monck of this monastery dissolved.’ The authority is bad, as the monastery was not dissolved in 1532, nor till 1540.

The assignment of the so-called Coventry Play, edited by J. O. Halliwell for the Shakespeare Society, to the Grey Friars of that city has no better foundation. There is not a spark of evidence to connect it either with Coventry or the Grey Friars. The connexion rests entirely on a statement of Dugdale, derived apparently from Dr. James, the librarian of the Cottonian Library, or to Dr. James, derived from Dugdale, both writing 150 years after the event, with no authority cited in support. The only indication of origin in the MS. is the name of a former owner, who calls himself Dunelmensis, i.e. of Durham. The banns of the play, as was long ago pointed out by T. Sharp in his *Dissertation on the Coventry Mysteries*, show that they were written for a company of strolling players, for they have the name of the town a blank, represented by N. for *nomen*. Sharp says, that Henry VII, when at Coventry in 1492, saw the play performed by the Grey Friars, but while he gives authorities for other sovereigns having seen plays at Coventry performed by the craft gilds, he gives none for this performance by the Grey Friars. There is, on the other hand, a mass of evidence collected (though misinterpreted) by Sharp and Miss Dormer in her *Life in an Old English Town*, to show that the play of that city was, like the plays at Beverley and York, performed by the craft gilds, under the same superintendence of the municipal authority. The
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supposition that, because the only pageants mentioned in the city accounts and minute-books refer to scenes drawn from the New Testament, there were none shown from the Old, and that the scenes from the Old Testament were done by the Grey Friars and formed a separate Coventry Play, is not supported by evidence, and is highly improbable in itself. There were admittedly many gilds the names of whose pageants are unknown, and it is probably a mere chance arising from the greater proportion of plays from the New Testament compared with those from the Old that the names of the gild occur in connexion with New Testament scenes only. At Beverley only nine out of thirty-five, at Chester six out of twenty-seven plays were drawn from the Old Testament; and in the so-called Coventry Play, seven out of forty-two. Naturally; for the object of the play was to tell the story of the Body and Blood of Christ, and the Old Testament scenes only came in as ‘types,’ or as the egg of Leda to introduce the Trojan War.

The truth is that the monkish attribution of the origin of the Corpus Christi Play is extremely improbable. Everything we know of the play and the players points to a secular origin, an intimate connexion with the townspeople. Among the secular clerks of the Universities, the secular canons and vicars choral of the collegiate churches, the Parish Clerks of Oxford, like Absolon, who ‘often played upon a scaffold high,’ or the gilds of Parish Clerks which existed of Lincoln or of London, the latter of whom at Skinners’ Well performed in a play lasting many days, the town clergy and town clerks who lived among the people, or the Grammar-School masters who were scattered broadcast over the land, and like Nicholas Udall and Lily gave such impetus to the development of the drama in Henry VIII’s reign, we must look for the players and authors of the Corpus Christi Plays. The Begging Friars, the globe-trotters and news-mongers of the Middle Ages, many of them with a University
education, and all men of the world, may have contributed
as authors, as at Beverley. But to search for the play-
wrights amongst the monks or regular canons, who, if they
were in earnest, were immured in their churches and their
cloisters, fasting, psalm-singing, and copying service-books,
or, at the best, composing histories; and for the most part
if they were not in earnest, were chiefly employed in cult
Curanda, is to look for the living among the dead.

That the Corpus Christi Play had a Latin and foreign
original is not improbable. It is curious, that in the
Wakefield Play and Chester Play there still remain traces
of a Lincolnshire origin. In the former it is casually
remarked that you might go from Lincoln to Lynn with-
out finding such and such a thing; and in the latter, that
from London to Louth you could not find such and such
a man. In the Gild returns made to Richard II there were
more gilds returned for Lincolnshire, Beverley, and East
Anglia than for all the rest of the country put together.
The Beverley Corpus Christi Gild was one of the earliest
of its kind. The connexion of these counties and of London
with the great Flemish and North-eastern French towns
was very close. At Beverley the chief street was Fleming-
gate. I suspect and suggest that the origin of the Corpus
Christi Play in England is to be sought in the develop-
ments of the great town democracies and craft gilds of
Flanders, whether French or Teutonic.

ARTHUR F. LEACH.

LONDON,
February, 1900.
XXVIII.

SHAKESPEARE AND THE ELIZABETHAN PLAYGOER.¹

In a freak of fancy, Robert Louis Stevenson sent to a congenial spirit the imaginary intelligence that a well-known firm of London publishers had, after their wont, 'declined with thanks' six undiscovered tragedies, one romantic comedy, a fragment of a journal extending over six years, and an unfinished autobiography reaching up to the first performance of *King John* by 'that venerable but still respected writer, William Shakespeare.' Stevenson was writing in a frivolous mood, but such words stir the imagination. The ordinary person, if he had to choose among the enumerated items of Shakespeare's newly discovered manuscripts, would cheerfully go without the six new tragedies and the one romantic comedy if he had at his disposal, by way of consolation, the journal extending over six years and the autobiography reaching up to the first performance of *King John*. We should deem ourselves fortunate if we had the journal alone. It would hardly matter which six years of Shakespeare's life the journal covered. As a boy, as a young actor, as an industrious reviser of other men's plays, as the humorous creator of

¹ A Lecture delivered on Tuesday afternoon, March 20, 1900, at Queen's College (for Women) in Harley Street, London, in aid of the Fund for securing a picture commemorating the Queen's visit to the College in 1898.
Falstaff, Benedick, and Mercutio, as the profound philosopher of the great tragedies, he could never have been quite an ordinary diarist. Great men have been known to keep diaries in which the main level of interest has been represented by such records as 'to-day I had my hair cut,' or 'yesterday I spent twopence in omnibus fares.' We need not damp our spirits by anticipating such depressing characteristics in Shakespeare's journal. Reference to his glorious achievement must have found place there. Son of a notice, we may be sure, figured there of the first performances of his great plays on the stage. However eminent a man is through native genius or from place of power—and no man was ever more eminent than Shakespeare in any regard—he can never be indifferent, whatever his casual professions on the subject, to the reception accorded by his fellow men to the work of his hand and head. I picture Shakespeare as the soul of modesty and gentleness in the social relations of life, not seeking unbecoming self-advertisement, and rating at its just value empty flattery, the mere adulation of the lips. Gushing laudation is as little to the taste of wise men as treacle. They cannot escape condiments of the kind, but the smaller and less frequent the doses the better they are content. Shakespeare no doubt had the great man's self-confidence. At the same time, the knowledge that he had succeeded in stirring the reader or hearer of his plays, the knowledge that his words had gripped their hearts and intellects, cannot have been ungrateful to him. To desire for his work the recognition that it deserves is for the artist an inevitable and a laudable ambition. A working dramatist by the circumstance of his calling appeals as soon as the play is written to the playscraper for a sympathetic appreciation. Nature thus impelled Shakespeare to note on the tablets of his journal his impression of the sentiment with which the fruits of his pen were welcomed in the playhouse.
But Shakespeare's journal does not exist, and we can only speculate as to its contents.

We would give a good deal to know how Shakespeare recorded in his diary the first performance of Hamlet, he most fascinating of all his works. He himself, we are old, played the Ghost. We would give a good deal for record of the feelings which lay on the first production of the play beneath the breast of the silent apparition in the first scene which twice crossed the stage and affrighted Marcellus, Horatio, and the guards on the platform before the castle of Elsinore. No piece of literature that ever came from human pen or human brain is more closely packed with the fruits of the imaginative study of human life than is Shakespeare's tragedy of Hamlet; and while the author acted the part of the Ghost in the play's initial representation in the theatre, he was watching the revelation of its pregnant message for the first time to the external world. When the author in his weird rôle of Hamlet's murdered father opened his lips for the first time, we might almost imagine that in the words 'pity me not, but lend thine serious hearing to what I shall unfold,' he was reflecting the author's personal interest in the proceedings of that memorable afternoon. (Performances of plays in his time took place in the afternoon.) We can imagine Shakespeare, as he saw the audience responding to his grave appeal, giving with the confidence of greatness, despite his habitual modesty, special emphasis to the subsequent words as he repeated them in face of his audience:

I find thee apt;
And duller shouldst thou be than the fat weed
That rots itself in ease on Lethe wharf,
Wouldst thou not stir in this.

And as the Ghost vanished and the air rang mysteriously with his piercing words 'Remember me,' we would like to imagine the whole intelligence of Elizabethan England
responding to that cry as it sprang on its first utterance in the theatre from the great dramatist's own lips—we would like to imagine the whole intelligence of the world's ecstasy:

Ay, thou great soul
In this distracted globe.

Remember thee!

But this is mere romance. None the less there is a certain justification in fact for this fancy. There is no doubt at all that Shakespeare conspicuously caught the ear of the Elizabethan playgoer at a very early date in his career and held it firmly for life. 'These plays,' wrote two of his professional associates of the reception of the whole series in the playhouse in his lifetime,—'These plays have had their trial already, and stood out all appeals.' (You will remember that Matthew Arnold when seeking to express in a sonnet the universality of Shakespeare's reputation in his own day—in our own day—used unconsciously almost the same expression.

Others abide our judgement, thou art free, is the first line of Arnold's sonnet.) With as little qualification Ben Jonson, another contemporary, apostrophized Shakespeare as

Soul of the age,
The applause, delight, and wonder of our stage.

And this play of Hamlet, this play of his 'which most kindled English hearts,' received a specially hearty welcome from Elizabethan playgoers. It was acted repeatedly, not merely in London, but also—an unusual distinction—at the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. It was constantly reprinted.

Thus the charge sometimes brought against the Elizabethan playgoer of failing to recognize Shakespeare's sovereign genius should be reckoned among popular error
Eлизабетанский театральный посетитель

It was not merely the recognition of the critical and highly educated that Shakespeare personally received. It was by voice of the half-educated populace, whose heart and intellect were for once in the right, that he was acclaimed the greatest interpreter of human nature that literature had known, and, as subsequent experience has proved, was likely to be. There is evidence that throughout his lifetime and generation afterwards his plays drew crowds to pit, galleries, and galleries alike. It is true that he was one of number of popular dramatists many of whom had rare and all of whom gloved with a spark of the genuine fire. But Shakespeare was the sun in the firmament: when his light shone the fires of all contemporaries were lighted in the contemporary playgoer's eye. You know the simple and humorous portrayal of human frailty and strictness in plays of Shakespeare's contemporary, Ben Jonson. You know that Ben Jonson was a classical man, which Shakespeare was not. Jonson was as well known in Roman history as a college tutor. But when Shakespeare and Ben Jonson both tried their hands at dramatic episodes in Roman history, the Elizabethan public of degree of intelligence welcomed Shakespeare's efforts with an enthusiasm which they rigidly withheld from Ben Jonson's. This is how an ordinary playgoer contrasted the reception of Jonson's Roman play of Catiline's Conspiracy with that of Shakespeare's Roman play of Julius Caesar:

So have I seen when Caesar would appear,
And on the stage at half-sword parley were
Brutus and Cassius—oh! how the audience
Were ravished, with what wonder they went thence;
When some new day they would not brook a line
Of tedious though well-laboured Catiline.

Shakespeare was the popular favourite. It is rare that artist who is a hero with the multitude is also a hero
with the cultivated few. But Shakespeare's universality of appeal was such as to include among his worshippers from the first the trained and the untrained playgoer of his time.

Very early in his career did Shakespeare attract the notice of the cultivated section of Elizabeth's Court, and hardly sufficient notice has been taken by students of the poet's biography of the earliest recognition accorded him by the great queen, herself an inveterate lover of the drama, and an embodiment of the taste of the people in literature. The story is worth retelling. In the middle of December, 1594, Queen Elizabeth removed from Whitehall to Greenwich to spend Christmas at that palace of Greenwich in which she was born sixty-one years earlier. And she made the celebration of Christmas of 1594 more memorable than any other in the annals of her reign or in the literary history of the country by summoning Shakespeare to Court. It was less than eight years since the poet had first set foot in the metropolis. His career was little more than opened. But by 1594 Shakespeare had given his countrymen unmistakable indications of the stuff of which he was made. His progress had been rapid. A young man of two-and-twenty, burdened with a wife and three children, he had left his home in the little country town of Stratford-on-Avon in 1586 to seek his fortune in London. Without friends, without money, he had, like any other stage-struck youth, set his heart on becoming an actor in the metropolis. Fortune favoured him. He sought and won the humble office of call-boy in a London playhouse; but no sooner had his foot touched the lowest rung of the theatrical ladder than his genius taught him that the topmost rung was within his reach. He tried his hand on a play and the manager was not slow to recognize the unmatched gift for dramatic writing. The attempt was a success.

It was not probably till 1591, when he was twenty-seven,
that his earliest original play, *Love's Labour's Lost*, was performed. It showed the hand of a beginner; it abounded in trivial Witticisms. But above all, there shone out clearly and unmistakably the dramatic and poetic fire, the humorous outlook on life, the insight into human feeling, which were to inspire Titanic achievements in the future.

Soon after, he scaled the tragic heights of *Romeo and Juliet*, and he was hailed as the prophet of a new world of art. Fashionable London society then, as now, befriended the theatre. Cultivated noblemen offered their patronage to promising writers for the stage, and Shakespeare soon gained the ear of the young Earl of Southampton, one of the most accomplished and handsome of the queen’s noble courtiers, who was said to spend nearly all his time in going to the playhouse every day. It was undoubtedly at Southampton’s suggestion that in the week preceding the Christmas of 1594 orders from the Lord Chamberlain reached the Theatre in Shoreditch, where Shakespeare was at work as playwright and actor, that he was to come to Court for the two days following Christmas, and was to give his sovereign each of the two evenings a taste of his quality. He was to act before her in his own plays.

It cannot have been Shakespeare’s promise as an actor that led to the royal summons. His histrionic fame had not progressed at the same rate as his literary repute. He was never to win the laurels of a great actor. His most conspicuous triumph on the stage was achieved in middle life as the Ghost in his own *Hamlet*, and he ordinarily confined his efforts to old men of secondary rank. Ample compensation was provided by his companions for his personal deficiencies as an actor on his first visit to Court; he was to come supported by actors of the highest eminence in their generation. Directions were given that the greatest of the tragic actors of the day, Richard Burbage, and the greatest of the comic actors, William Kemp, were to bear the young actor-
dramatist company. With neither of these was Shake- 
spere's historic position then or at any time comparable. 
For years they were leaders of the acting profession. 
Shakespeare's relations with each were close, both privately 
and professionally. Almost all Shakespeare's great tragic 
characters were created on the stage by Burbage, who 
had recently aroused London to enthusiasm by his stirring 
presentation of Shakespeare's Richard III for the first time. 
As long as Kemp lived he conferred a like service on many 
of Shakespeare's comic characters; and he had recently 
proved his worth as a Shakespearean comedian by his 
original rendering of the part of Peter, the Nurse's \(\text{gr} \) 
son, in Romeo and Juliet. Thus stoutly backed, Shakes- 
peare appeared for the first time in the royal presence-
chamber in Greenwich Palace on the evening of St. Stephen's 
Day (the Boxing Day of subsequent generations) in 1594.

Extant documentary evidence attests that Shakespeare 
and his two associates performed one 'comedy or interlude' 
on that night of Boxing Day in 1594, and gave another 
'comedy or interlude' on the following night; that the 
Lord Chamberlain paid the three men for their services 
the sum of £13 6s. 8d., and that the queen added to the 
honorarium, as a personal proof of her satisfaction, the 
further sum of £6 13s. 4d. These were substantial sums 
in those days when the purchasing power of money was 
eight times as much as it is to-day, and the three actors' 
reward would now be equivalent to £160. But unhappily 
the record does not go beyond the payment of the money. 
What words of commendation or encouragement Shake- 
speare received from his royal auditor are not handed down 
to us, nor do we know for certain what plays were performed 
on the great occasion. All the scenes came from Shake- 
speare's repertory, and it is reasonable to infer that they were 
drawn from Love's Labour's Lost, which was always popular 
in later years at Elizabeth's Court, and from the Comedy of
Errors, where the farcical confusions and horse-play were after the queen’s own heart and robust taste. But nothing can be stated with absolute certainty except that on December 29 Shakespeare travelled up the river from Greenwich to London with a heavier purse and a lighter heart than on his setting out. That the visit had in all ways been crowned with success there is ample indirect evidence. He and his work had fascinated his sovereign, and many a time was she to seek delight again in the renderings of plays by himself and his fellow actors at her palaces on the banks of the Thames during her remaining nine years of life. When Shakespeare was penning his new play of Midsummer Night’s Dream next year, he could not forbear to make a passing obeisance of gallantry (in that vein for which the old spinster queen was always thirsting) to ‘a fair vestal throned by the West,’ who passed her life ‘in maiden meditation, fancy free.’

Although literature and art can flourish without royal favour and royal patronage, still it is rare that royal patronage has any other effect than that of raising those who are its objects in the estimation of contemporaries. The interest that his work excited at Court was continuous throughout his life. When James I ascended the throne no author was more frequently honoured by ‘command’ performances of his plays in the presence of the sovereign. And then, as now, the playgoer’s appreciation was quickened by his knowledge that the play they were witnessing had been produced before the Court at Whitehall a few days earlier. Shakespeare’s publishers were not above advertising facts like these, as you may see by looking at the pages of editions published in his lifetime. ‘The pleasant conceited comedy called Love’s Labour’s Lost’ was advertised with the appended words, ‘as it was presented before her highness this last Christmas.’ ‘A most pleasant and excellent conceited comedy of Sir John
Falstaff and the Merry Wives of Windsor’ was stated to have been ‘divers times acted both before her majesty and elsewhere.’ The play of Lear was advertised, ‘as it was played before the king’s majesty at Whitehall on St. Stephen’s night in the Christmas holidays.’

Although Shakespeare’s illimitable power of expression, his universality of knowledge and insight, cannot easily be overlooked by any man or woman possessed of the ordinary human faculties, still, from some points of view, there is ground for surprise that the Elizabethan playgoer’s enthusiasm for Shakespeare’s work was so marked and unequivocal as we know that it was. Just consider for a moment the physical conditions of the theatre, the methods of stage representation in Shakespeare’s day. Theatres were in their infancy. The theatre was a new institution in social life for Shakespeare’s public, and all the methods and the whole system of the theatrical world came into being after Shakespeare came into the world. In estimating Shakespeare’s genius one ought to bear in mind that he was an innovator—almost the inventor—of the English drama as well as the practiser of it in the highest perfection that it has as yet known. There were before his day some efforts made at dramatic representation. The Middle Ages had their miracle plays and moralities and interludes. But of poetic, literary, romantic drama, England knew practically nothing until Shakespeare was of age; Marlowe was only Shakespeare’s senior by two months. It was not till 1576, when Shakespeare was twelve, that London for the first time possessed a theatre—a building definitely built for the purpose of presenting plays. The inn yards or a platform improvised in a market-place or a field had served before for such purposes in the case of interludes or moralities. It was not precisely in London proper that this primal theatre, which is known in history simply as The Theatre, was set up. London in Shakespeare’s day was
a very different place to what you know. You could pick daisies and buttercups in the meadows which are now transformed into Charing Cross railway station and Trafalgar Square. Green lanes conducted you to the rural retreat of Islington, and if you were of an adventurous disposition, you might go out of town for an airing to the rustic seclusion of Mary-le-bone. These things are possible no longer.

Well, it was in the fields near London, not in London itself, that the first theatre was set up—in the fields of Finsbury and Shoreditch, which the Great Eastern Railway now occupies. Many sober and religious citizens of London viewed the innovation of a theatre, even though it were placed outside the walls of their city, with serious misgiving. But after much fighting the battle was finally won by the supporters of the play. Two or three other theatres sprang up in other parts of London's environment, and when Shakespeare was reaching the zenith of his career the centre of theatrical life was transferred from Shoreditch to the Southwark bank of the river at the south side of London Bridge, and it was at the Globe Theatre in Bankside which was reached by boat from the city side of the river, that he won his greatest triumphs.

The new London theatres had for the Elizabethan all the fascination that a new toy has for a child. The ordinary Elizabethan, excepting only him of an ultra-pious disposition, became an enthusiastic playgoer. A visitor to London, Thomas Platter, a native of Basle, whose journal has recently been discovered, described with enthusiasm the delighted encouragement which the populace extended to the new playhouses. Some of the attractions they offered had little to do with the drama. Their advantages included the privileges of eating and drinking while the play was in progress. After the play there was invariably a dance on the stage, often a brisk and boisterous Irish jig. The
foreign observer was impressed too by the beauty of the actors' costumes, which he accounted for thus:

'The players wear the most costly and beautiful dresses, for it is the custom in England, that when noblemen or knights die, they leave their finest clothes to their servants, who, since it would not be fitting for them to wear such splendid garments, sell them soon afterwards to the players for a small sum.'

But other features of the entertainment seem to have been hardly exhilarating. The mass of the spectators filled the pit, where there was standing room only, for there were no seats at all. Seats were only to be found in the galleries on extra payment, and if the playgoer had plenty of money at his command he could, according to the German visitor whom I am quoting, hire not only a seat but a cushion, 'so that,' says our author, 'he might not only see the play, but what is also often more important for rich people, be seen' by the audience to be occupying a specially distinguished place. Very proud playgoers could, if they opened their purses wide enough, secure seats on the stage. This last practice must have proved an embarrassment to and obscured the view of the gentlemen and ladies who could only afford cheaper standing positions in the pit.

That reflection is a fitting prelude to a few remarks on what appear to us to be the extraordinary disadvantages under which Shakespeare's plays were originally produced on the stage, disadvantages which render the unqualified enthusiasm that greeted their production matter for surprise.

There was no scenery. The bare boards of the stage projected into the auditorium. At the back was a raised platform or balcony, equally undecorated, which was

---

1. Professor Binz, of Basle, printed in September, 1899, some extracts from Thomas Platter's unpublished diary of travels under the title 'Londoner Theater und Schauspiele im Jahre 1599.' Platter spent a month in London, September 18, to October 20, 1599. Platter's manuscript is in the Library of Basle University.
pressed into the service when the text of the play indicated that the speakers were not actually standing on the same level. From the raised platform Juliet addressed Romeo, and the citizens of Angers in *King John* held colloquy with the English besiegers. But this was the limit of the Elizabethan stage-manager’s notion of stage realism. The bare boards were held to present adequate semblance as occasion demanded of a king’s throne-room, a chapel, a forest, a ship at sea, a mountainous pass, a market-place, a battle-field, or a churchyard. At the same time, it was thought unseemly for women to act at all. Female parts were played by boys or young men—a most ungracious substitution. Shakespeare alludes to the appearance of boys and men in women’s parts when he makes Rosalind say, laughingly and saucily, to the men of the audience in the epilogue to *As you like it*, ‘If I were a woman I would kiss as many of you as had beards that pleased me,’ and so forth. ‘If I were a woman,’ she says. The jest lies in the fact that the speaker was not a woman but a boy. Similarly, Cleopatra on her downfall in *Antony and Cleopatra*, V. ii. 220, laments

the quick comedians
Extemporally will stage us . . . and I shall see
Some squeaking Cleopatra boy my greatness.

I understand that the experiment of entrusting a boy with the part of Ophelia was lately tried in London not unsuccessfully; but it is difficult to understand how a boy could adequately interpret most of Shakespeare’s female characters. It seems almost sacrilegious to conceive the part of Cleopatra, the most highly sensitized in its minutest details of all dramatic portrayals of female character,—it seems almost sacrilegious for her sublimity of passion to be interpreted by an un fledged representative of the other sex. Yet such solecisms were imperative under
HARKNESS AND THE

Shakespeare and the

late sixteenth and early seventeenth-century system of
tage representation. Men taking women's parts seem to
me most certain, and those not that have imposed on
men when the complaints, that it would hardly seem to
say a women's part because he had a beard coming a
character by his manager, Sturm to play Thomas's in a
mask, was not till the seventeenth century was well advanced
at women were permitted to act in the public theater.
was the character of Desdemona, which was first
done by a woman, and the absurdity of the old practice
as noticed in the prologue done for this revival of
shakes which was made unudianteable by the innovation.
was the stage lines to the prologue done for the old practice.

For to speak truth, men are not like that are between
Pussy or little, women are
With love as large as men are for unhappy.
When you call Desdemona, let Caesar.

Profound commiseration seems therefore due to the
Elizabethan player who was always liable to have his
fortis in the tenderness and gentleness of Desdemona rude
when by the irruption in the stage of a Seaworset broad
welcomed athletes masquerading in her sweet name. Boys
all shapes and sizes squeezing out or hawking out the
bottle and pathetic lines of Shakespeare's heroines, and
joy of scenery to distract the player from the unwont
consistency? As first sight it would seem that the Eliz
theater player's lot was not a happy one.

Contrast with his hard fate the situation of the Victorian
player. Look at the present conditions under which
Shakespeare is presented to the public. Men know that in
most influential circles of the theatrical profession and
theatrical public it is a commonplace that Shakespearean
rama cannot and must not be produced on the stage
without an infinitude of scenic spectacle and gorgeous
costume. It is a tradition of the modern stage that every
revival of a Shakespearean play at a leading theatre must exceed in spectacular magnificence all that went before. The mere dramatic interest is deemed by the manager inadequate to satisfy the purposes of the theatre. The feast that Shakespeare's plays offer to the playgoer is regarded as tasteless and colourless unless it be fortified by stimulants derived from the independent arts of music and painting. Shakespeare's words must be spoken to musical accompaniments. Pictorial tableaux, even though they suggest topics without relevance to the development of the plot, have to be interpolated in order to keep the attention of the audience alive. Very striking therefore is the contrast offered by the methods of representation accepted with enthusiasm by the Elizabethan playgoer in Shakespeare's day, and by the methods of representation deemed essential by the fashionable modern manager.

What is the conclusion to be drawn. I fear it is one that is wholly to the credit of our ancestors, and not much to the credit of ourselves. The needful dramatic illusion was obviously evoked in the playgoer of the past with an ease that is unknown to the present patrons of the stage. The absence of scenery, the substitution of boys and men for women—that most ungracious device—could only have passed muster with the Elizabethan because the Elizabethan audience were able to realize the dramatic potency of the poet's work without any, or any but the slightest, adventitious aid outside the words of the play. When one compares the simplicity of the scenic mechanism which satisfied the theatrical audiences of Shakespeare's day with its complexity at the moment, one is brought to the conclusion that the imagination of the theatre-going public is in our own time not what it was of old. The play alone was then 'the thing'; now 'the thing,' it seems, is largely something outside the play—namely, the painted scene and the music and the costume. It is impossible
to understand how characters like Lady Macbeth and
Deademona were adequately rendered by beardless youths
or ill-shaven men. But the fact that renderings under
such conditions proved popular and satisfactory seems
convincing testimony, not certainly to the ability of the
boys—the nature of boys is a pretty permanent factor
in human society—but to the superior imaginative faculty
of the Elizabethan playgoer. Do not therefore let us
pity him; let us rather pity ourselves for lack of those
qualities the possession of which entitled him to lasting
honour and respect. Doubtless some of the Elizabethan
playgoers lacked the imaginative faculty. The playgoing
mob always includes groundlings who delight exclusively
in dumb shows and noise. But the reception accorded to
Shakespeare's plays in the theatre of his days under
contemporary theatrical conditions is proof positive of a
signal imaginative faculty in an exceptionally large pro-
portion of contemporary playgoers.

Shakespeare has declared in his own person that no
amount of scenery can ever secure success on the stage for
a great work of the imagination. He valued at a just rate
competent acting. In Hamlet, as you will remember, he
points out the perennial defects of the actor, and shows how
they may and must be corrected. He did all he could for
the Elizabethan playgoer in the way of insisting that the
art of acting should be studied seriously, and that the
dramatist's words should reach the ears of the audience,
clearly and intelligibly enunciated—a most important matter
for all playgoers:

'Speak the speech, I pray you,' he tells the actor, 'as I
pronounce it to you, trippingly on the tongue; but if you
mouth it, as many of your players do, I had as lief the
town-crier spoke my lines. Nor do not saw the air too
much with your hand, thus; but use all gently: for in the
very torrent, tempest, and—as I may say—whirlwind of
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passion, you must acquire and beget a temperance, that
may give it smoothness.

‘Be not too tame neither, but let your own discretion be
your tutor: suit the action to the word, the word to the
action; with this special observance, that you o’erstep not
the modesty of nature. O! there be players that I have
seen play, and heard others praise, and that highly, not
to speak it profanely, that, neither having the accent of
Christians nor the gait of Christian, pagan, nor man, have
so strutted and bellowed that I have thought some of
nature’s journeymen had made men and not made them
well, they imitated humanity so abominably.’

The player amiably responds: ‘I hope we have reformed
that indifferently with us.’ Shakespeare in the person of
Hamlet responds in a tone of some impatience: ‘O! reform
it altogether. And let those that play your clowns speak
no more than is set down for them.’ If every actor obeyed
these instructions the theatrical critic’s function would be
largely dissipated, but the theatrical critic would be the
only loser.

Nevertheless the final success of a great imaginative
play on the stage does not depend alone on the com-
petence of the actor. Much also depends on the fitness of
the audience. A great imaginative play well acted will
not achieve complete success unless the audience has at
command sufficient imaginative power to induce in them
an active sympathy with the efforts of the competent actor
and dramatist. In the well-known chorus before the first
act of Henry V, beginning,—

O! for a Muse of fire, that would ascend
The brightest heaven of invention;
A kingdom for a stage, princes to act,
And monarchs to behold the swelling scene,

Shakespeare modestly tells his audience what is expected
of them:
Shakespeare in this splendid prelude to his play of Henry V appeals to his audience to bring to its observation their highest powers of imagination, for by that alone can full justice be done to his magnificent scheme. Shakespeare in the majesty of his eloquence must bear in mind that the dramatist’s words can at the best do no more than suggest the things he would have the audience see and understand; the actors aid the suggestion according to their ability; very little reliance can be placed on the scenery. Shakespeare finally admonishes his hearers that the illusion of the drama can only be complete in the theatre through the working of ‘the imaginary forces’ of the spectators. It is needful for them to ‘make imaginary puissance.’ It is their ‘thoughts’ that ‘must deck’ the kings of the stage. He asks before his play of Henry V:

Can this cockpit hold
The vasty fields of France? or may we cram

‘No,’ he answers in effect, ‘that is physically impossible, but none the less, you, the audience, can bring in your mind’s eye within the girdle of these walls not merely the vasty fields of France but all that pertains to the rival monarchy of England.’ Pretentious scenic appliances can never produce such dramatic illusion as that. The true dramatic illusion must be sought in a very different sphere. In other words,
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Shakespeare lays down this law, that in the case of great romantic plays the genuinely artistic success of the dramatic representation mainly depends on the 'thoughts' or imagination of the spectators, which is alone capable of supplying the inevitable 'imperfections' of actor and stage carpenter.

It is not only in the chorus to Henry V that Shakespeare has declared his conviction that the success of actors, the creation of the needful dramatic illusion, is due not so much to the actor's exercise of the imagination, as to the exercise of the like faculty on the part of the audience. Theseus, in A Midsummer Night's Dream, in the capacity of a spectator of a play, makes a penetrating reflection on the essential character of acting, whatever its degree or capacity.

'The best in this kind,' says Theseus of actors, 'are but shadows, and the worst are no worse, if imagination amend them.' To which Hippolyta, also in the character of a spectator at a play, sagely retorts: 'It must be your imagination (i.e., the spectator's), then, and not theirs' (i.e., the actors'). These sentences are as much as to say that at its very best acting is but the shadow, the simulation of life; acting at its very worst is likewise a shadow of the truth, and aided by the imagination of the audience, inferior acting may produce effects hardly distinguishable from those of the best acting. Such reflections imply a lower estimate on Shakespeare's part of the histrionic art than is generally allowed. Theseus's sentiment would almost warrant an actor when in the presence of an audience that could reasonably be credited with imaginative faculty, in acting badly on the ground that the audience would, involuntarily by the working of its imagination, supply his defects or even convert his vices into virtues. It would be unwise to press Theseus's words to these limits, especially for actors and actresses. All that it behoves us to deduce from them is the unimpeachable principle that the success of the romantic drama on the stage depends not merely on the
actor’s gift of imagination, but also to a large extent on the possession by the audience of a similar faculty. Good acting is needful, scenery in moderation will aid the dramatic illusion, but excess of scenery or scenic machinery, may destroy altogether that illusion which must mainly spring from the active and unrestricted exercise of the imaginative faculty.

What is the moral to be deduced from our examination of the Elizabethan playgoer’s attitude to Shakespeare’s plays? It is something of this kind. We must emulate our ancestors’ command of the imagination. We must seek to enlarge our imaginative sympathy with Shakespeare’s poetry. The imaginative faculty will not come to us at our call; it will not come to us by the mere mechanism of study; it may not come to us at all. It is easier to point out the things that will hinder its approach than the things that will encourage its coming. Absorption in the material needs or the decorative paraphernalia of life, the concentration of all our energies on the increase of our worldly goods, leave little room for the entrance into our brains of the imaginative faculty and its free play when it is there. The best way of seeking it is by reading the greatest of great imaginative literature and by freely yielding our minds to its influence, and by exercising our minds under its influence.

And the greatest imaginative literature that was ever penned was penned by Shakespeare. And so to make an end I will adapt the words of two of his personal friends, the men who were the first editors of his work, and bid you: ‘Read him therefore, and again and again, and then if you do not like him, surely you are in some manifest danger of’ losing a saving grace of life.

SIDNEY LEE.
XXIX.

A NEW SOURCE OF THE PARSON’S TALE.

It was the late Dr. Morris who first pointed out the similarity between Chaucer’s *Parson’s Tale* and *La Somme de Vices et de Virtues* of Laurentius Gallus. But there are many points of difference between Frere Lorens’ *Summa* and the *Tale*, and the *Tale* shows in places similarities to other OFr. *Summae*\(^2\), so that it is possible to conclude that Chaucer worked from one of these which has been lost. The English, however, of *The Parson’s Tale* does not show the common peculiarities of Chaucer’s language when he is translating from an OFr. original; such peculiarities as appear from a comparison of the *Tale of Melibœus* with the French *Histoire de Mellibêle*, or of the *Boece* with its French source. Then, too, it is hard to conceive of an

\(^1\) If we may assume that Chaucer wrote it. That there are good grounds for such an assumption has been shown by Dr. Emil Köppel in his paper *Ueber das Verhältnis von Chaucer’s Prosawerken zu seinen Dichtungen und die Echtheit der Parson’s Tale*, *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, lxxxvi. p. 33 ff.


\(^3\) See *The Academy* for May 30, 1896, p. 447, and June 20, 1896, p. 509, for a description of one of them, M.S. Bodl. 90, which contains striking resemblances to Chaucer’s text.
original version written by an ecclesiastic as a *Summa* that would be so confused and disjointed as the *Tale* is; for *The Parson's Tale* is not a tale, nor is it a 'meditacion,' as the Parson says it is, nor yet a sermon, as the prefaced text from Jer. vi. 26 would indicate, but rather a clumsy combination of two religious treatises, one on Penitence, discussing the subject in the usual mediaeval tripartite manner under heads of Contrition, Confession, and Satisfaction; the other a tract on the Seven Deadly Sins. The suggestion of a treatment of the Ten Commandments, a common subject in mediaeval Summae, is made at I. 957; a sketch of the Lord's seven last words is another favourite subject in these Summae, is introduced at I. 1033; a treatment of the subject (see I. 1040-1045); an enumeration of the Seven Deeds of Mercy, another subject usually included in Summae, is introduced at I. 1033; a discussion of Alms, one of the subdivisions of 'Satisfaction' (see the discussion of Alms, one of the subdivisions of 'Satisfaction'), 'What is Penitence,' 'Why it is clesped Penitence,' 'And what manner of aiouuty,' 'How manie manere bee the aiouunt or werkynges,' 'The effects,' of Penitence,' 'How manyes species ther ben of Penitence,' 'Which Thynges aperten and behoven to Penitence,' and 'Which thynges distourben Penitence,' indicate a treatment which is not carried out. There are also yawning chasms, repetitions, and confusions in the work which are not to be accounted for by assuming a bad copy as the original of the known MSS. of the *Tale*. Furthermore, none of the Latin, English, or French treatises on this subject that I have seen (and I have examined a great number in the hope of

1 The text seems to have been chosen rather for its appropriateness to the Canterbury travellers, 'State super vias,' than for its connexion with 'penitance.' Perhaps the Parson only intended it to be a fitting introduction to his sermon.

2 In the MS. of the Marquis of Bath (cp. Report of Hist. MSS. Comm., iii. 181) *The Parson's Tale* is called *The Thre Parties of Penitence*. 
Finding the source of Chaucer's work is so confused and 
disproportioned as Chaucer's is. It does not seem likely, 
therefore, that The Parson's Tale is a close translation of 
some hitherto unnoticed French or Latin Summa.

It is rather what the Prologue, I. 54-60, says it is: a 
meditation (the use of the word in this inaccurate sense 
betraying an unfamiliarity with formal mediaeval theology) 
put forth as subject to the 'correction' of clerics, and not 
textual, but representing a layman's sense of the doctrines 
of the Church as found in easily accessible theological writ-
ings. It bears the earmarks of a layman. If it is Chau-
cer's work, it is rather the material that he proposed to 
make use of for a sermon to be put into the Parson's mouth 
than the sermon itself. The unfinished condition of The 
Canterbury Tales offers sufficient excuse for its inclusion 
among them in its present form.

As to its two parts, Köppel's view (p. 50 of the paper 
already cited) that the treatise on the Seven Deadly Sins 
is an earlier work inserted into the treatise on Penitence, 
gains an additional force from the fact that a discussion on 
the Seven Deadly Sins usually forms a part of mediaeval 
Summae. In The Clensyng of Manne Sowle, which is 
described below, such a discussion is inserted at the end of 
the treatment of Confession. The rubric runs: 'The seventh 
chapite sche with a forme of general confessedion in whiche 
forme bene specified divers spicies of the seuen dedely synnes 
and of pe offese aseins pe ten comandements,' &c. Chau-
cer's discussion of the subject follows a treatment of 'venial 
syne' in the early part of 'confessioun.' But it is clear

1 It bears some earmarks of Chaucer's, too; cp. Köppel's paper above 
referred to, and Dr. Furnivall's opinion as given in his Trial Forwards, 
Chaucer Soc., Second Series, No. 6, p. 113, though I should not include 
the Retraction with it as Dr. Furnivall does.

2 It is preceded by the statement 'Men may also refreyne venial synne... 
by general confession of confiteor at masse,' &c. (I. 896); and at the end 
of the treatise Chaucer indicates a desire to discuss the Ten Commandments, 
I. 957. Compare these statements with the rubric just cited.
from the disproportion of the part on the Seven Deadly Sins to the rest of the Tale, and from the abrupt transition to it, that the two were originally independent.

In order to keep the two parts of the Tale distinct, let us call the tract on the Seven Deadly Sins B, and the body of the Tale, i.e. the part on Penitence proper, A. Dismissing B as being a translation or adaptation of Frère Lorens’ Summa, or of some treatise like it, let us take up A. Where did Chaucer get his material for it?

MS. Bodley 923 of the Bodleian Library contains a book on Penitence with the title The Clensyng of Mannes Sowle, which, being independent of The Parson’s Tale, furnishes us with an interesting analogue of Chaucer’s tract, if not the actual source of portions of it. It has never been edited or described, except in a very brief way in the old Catalogue of the Bodley Collection. The MS. is a parchment codex in small quarto, 7½ by 5½ inches, of 153 folios, in a handwriting, according to Mr. Madan, of the end of the fourteenth century. The rubrics are in red ink, and the subject-matter is clearly and logically divided into paragraphs preceded by paragraph signs alternating in red and blue. Folio 4r has an illuminated border. The chapter initials are in blue ornamented with red, and the biblical quotations are generally underscored with red ink. A few marginal notes appear in the first part, written with red ink and in the same hand as that of the rest of the MS. On the last folio, in a different hand (?), appears Anno Domini 1401, and in a hand different from both the preceding—

Iste liber constat Sibille de Sfelton
Abatisse de Berkyng 1.

The Table of Contents gives a clear idea of the plan and scope of the book. It is as follows 2:

1 According to Dugdale, Monasticon, i. p. 137, she was Abbess of Barking in 1394.
2 Abbreviations are expanded in italic type. The punctuation and capitals are my own.
*Here ben the chapitles of the boke folowyng, the whiche boke is deuyded in thre parties. ¶ The first partye is of matiere that longyth to contricioun. The secounde partye is of mater that longyth to confessioun. ¶ And þe thrid party is of mater þat longyth to satisfacioun.

¶ Of contricioun.

[In black ink.]

The ferst chapitle of the ferst [partye?] is a generall schewynge in general wordes that a soule most be wasche and clensed from the fylthe of synne; and that hit most be wasche wiþ þe sacrament of penaunce be thre diuers Waschynges; and of the worthynes and nobley of mannes soule.

¶ The secunde is of synne, what hit is þat so defowlith the beaute of mannes soule. And of distinciouns of synnes by general dfficuoun of the whiche komen al ofer synnes.

¶ *The þridde is of conscience where with a man schulde deme and knowe hym self here in þis lijf and wherewith he schal be demed aftir the deth, and what is conscience; of diuers conscience in thre maner men; whan a conscience is syker, clene, and pure; and what reste is in a gode conscience.

¶ The ferþe is of penaunce, what is penaunce; and why hit is clesped penaunce. In what maner a man schal be verrv repentaunt for synne; and what profyt is in verray penaunce.

¶ The fift is of thre spices of þe sacrament of penaunce; what is nedeful to þe had in fulfilyng verrey trewe penaunce; and what peril is in late penaunce.

¶ The sixte is of contricioun; whiche is contricioun, and which is atricioun; þat þe sorrow in contricioun schal be scharp, scharper & moost scharpe.

¶ The seuenthe chapitle tellith whiche ben þe causes þat bryngen or sterlyn a man to contricioun; what longyth to contricioun; how effectuall contricioun wurcheth in þe soule; in what maner synne is forouen be contricioun.

¶ Of confessioun.

[In red.]

The first chapitle of the seconde partye tellith what is confessioun; þat confessioun is nedefull be resoun and auctorite.
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The seconde tellith to whom þou schalt make thy confession; that alle preste in alle tymes bowen not leefully here alle mens confession and assouly hem.

The þridde is þat thi persoun or thi parische prest most remy the to þi bishop, and he to his soureyns in som case; that a man in tym of confession schal be sorowefull; which ben tokens of sorowe in confession.

The ferthe tellith what longith to confession, þat hit moowe be fructuose and spedeful; and how profytable confession is be many weles.

The fift tellith why a man may or schulde be confessed ægis of þat he was confessed; & man schulde make his confession wip the circumstaunce of þe same; and how he schal scheue þe circumstaunce.

The sexte tellith of þe feith; and how a man may wurche in hem goostly; and how ben þe ben seune dedely synne; & which ben þe ten commaundement; which ben þe fyue wytte; whiche ben þe seune dedes of mercy; and of alle whiche a man * schulde confesse him, þif he fyue synne couplable in eny of hem.

The seuenth chapitle seith a forme of general confession, in whiche forme ben specified ... ægis of þe seune dedely synne; and of þe offese ægis þe ten commaundement; and offese not fulfilyng þe seune dedes of mercy moowe be comprenid and confessed among þe spices of þe seune dedely synnes be this maner forme of confession; and a shorth forme of confession for hem þat ben ofte confessed.

Of Satisfaccioun.

[In red.]

The first chapitle of the þrid party tellith what is satisfaccioun; and pat satisfaccioun schaff be wilful, plener, iuste, & right; and þat satisfaccioun principally is in prayer, almes, and in fastynge, wip other bodily affliccions.

The seconde tellith what is almes; and þat there ben þre maner 3° of almes; & wherof almes schal be done; and who schall ðeene almes.

The thridde tellith to whom almes schal be done; what ordre schal be kept in þe murkyng almes; and how vertuously almes schall be done & ðouen, and with which condiciouns.

The ferth is of fastynge; what is fastynge; of þre maners of fastynge; what longith to fastynge; and to what extent a man shal
chastise his flesh and make hit lowe wip fastynge and other bodily afflicciouns; and hat bodily affliccioun is in four maners.

¶ The ffte is prayer; what is prayer; which is fructuous prayer; and whiche is not frucccuouse [sic]; whiche peticions in prayer a man may aske simply wipout condicioun, and *whiche with condicioun.

¶ The sexte tellith how jou schal despose the whan jou wult go to prayer; and how jou schalt preye; and of deuocioun in prer, and whiche ben toknes of deuocioun.

¶ The seuenthe schewith a schort recapitulacioun of alle pe thre parties and of pe reformacioun of a mannes soule.

In the name of our lord Iesu Crist, which name is swete and delectable to deout lyuers, comfort and trusty hope to synfull men, I purpos to write a few words of the sacrament of penaunce be pe instance & prier of such hat I haue in goostly affeccioun, ffor, as I wene be comowynge & be experience of word outward, many men & women pere ben, not letted and of simple *knowynge but ful fferent.

In hat name han of Iesu, brethren & sustren, to Him clepynge for grace & help in pis epistel folowyng, I will schewe swow how, wip pe mercy of God, how pe mowe wasche you goostly, & clense your soules clenely from pe filthe of synne.

*Whiche epistel I wil deuyde into pe parties, and into pe [?]re diuers waschynge. The first partie schal be of contricous as for pe first waschynge. The seconde of confession as for pe seconde waschynge. And the 3rd partie of satissacuoun as for pe 3rd waschynge and for pe clene clensynge.

*gif hit plese swow pe mowe skilfully *clepe pis boke pe clensyng of mannes soule.

As to the tract itself and its relation to the A part of Chaucer’s Tale:

The First Chapter contains the sort of treatment outlined in the rubric, and while it gives many points corresponding to the part of The Parson’s Tale that treats of sin, L 322–386, contains no striking resemblances to The Parson’s Tale.

The Second Chapter likewise presents few striking similarities.
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Chapter III is a treatment of Conscience, and contains nothing at all that is paralleled in Chaucer.

Chapter IV and following, as will be seen from the Table of Contents, marks the real beginning of Chaucer's tract. The rubrics to Chapters IV and V contain the points made by Chaucer in I. 82–84. Chap. IV begins (I quote some parts of it that are similar to Chaucer), fol. 22b, l. 15:

'Penance is vertue or grace by the which we hate or make sorowe for synnes that we haue done, with purpos to amende vs & in will neu to do that ayein wherfore we make sorowe. Penance, after some clerkes diffincion, is a wilful affliccion inward & outward for the I. offense to god by synne to haue foryeuences of that synne & of the synne. Penance is bothe outwarde and inward. Penance outward is the sacrament of confession of mouth & ojer bodily penance be satisfaccon in dede. Penance also is a sorowe of hert & a bitternes of vs soule for synnes that a man hath done.'

'T And perfore penance is as mochel to sey as an holdynge of peyn. flour by jot peyn inward & outward a man punischith that he hath done vnleesfully; he punischith vengyng his synne alwey at he hath done, wip weeping and contynuel sorowe of hert in wille at that tyme never to fallie or to turne to that synne ayein.'

This tells us 'whennes it is cleped penitence,' which Chaucer does not do, though he promises to in I. 83. The 'three accions of penance,' I. 96, only one of which is given by Chaucer (I. 97), follow on fol. 25:

'flour verrey penance, as I rede, makith ayein in liif that was dede; hit recouerith & winneth ayein that was lost; and hit kepith that is wonne and recouerid (MS. recouerith).'

1 Cf. I. 85. In MS., Bodl. 451, fol. 106b, we find Chaucer's quotations from Ambrose and Isidor occurring together: 'Pentosita prout secundum (sanctam!) ambrosium diffinitur: est mala praterita plangere: et plangenda iterum non committere. . . . Ysidorus ait: Irrisor et non penitens, qui adue agit quod penitent . . . Multa lacrinas desinenter fundunt et peccare non desinunt . . . Nichil prosunt lamenti, si replicantur peccata.'
2 Cf. I. 86.
3 Cf. I. 88.
4 Cf. I. 86.
5 The omission of the other two is apparently accidental; cf. Skeat's note to the passage.
we have a detailed treatment of each of these
but nothing about baptism as in Chaucer. Bap-
bour tract is discussed in Chap. I, fol. 7, as the
three divers washings mentioned in the rubric
'kontricioun.'
Next point treated in Chaucer is on fol. 27, l. 9, at
agreement is very close:

[Chaucer, I. 101-108,
p. 266.]

'The species of penitence been thre. That oon of hem is solempne,
another is commune, and the
thridde is privee. Thilke penance
that is solempne is in two maneris;
as to be put out of holye chirche
in Lente for slaughtre of children,
and swich maner thyng. Another
thyng is whan a man hath synned
openly, of which synne the fame
is openly spoken in the contree,
and thanne holye chirche by
jugemente destreyeth hym for
to do open penance.

'Commune' penance is that
preestes enjouyn men in certeyn
caas, as for to goon peraventure
naked in pilgrimages, or bare-
foot.

Chaucer uses 'commune' here in the sense of 'public.'
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hers quenez and horrible and...

"Frywe penance is thilke thine
denow, alday for privee synne,
of whiche they shryve hem privily,
and receyve privee penance."

After these definitions follows:

"To the sacrament of penance & to have verry pennaunce fyn
towres ben needed."

First, the peniuent must be "a Christian in full bileeve
with wol to the" given the "pent messal." These twy
(ch. II. 288–292), am authoris of The Clewe
for in sumyng up

"Now the preuynce, this
proes, ther, Contrition, &
the sacrament of Penance.

And it is the other
Confession, & Satyryl
that from the main division of
the book. They arc ststes as falls (cp. I. 108 ff.):

"The thrid is that a man must hase ffor his synne sorewe in her,
which sorewe is clyped contrition. fiir right as 1 a man delith
not him "and synmeth in thoughtes which come out from the her, right
so a man schold do pennaunce inward in the her for his synnes be
contrition. The fureth is confession be mouth, fiir right as a man
waschaunesthy synmeth be mouth in speche vylefully, right so he
schold do pennaunce be speche schwyngye him self his synnes be
mouthes, not sparyngye him self for shame. . . . The fffe point which
is needful to the sacrament of pennaunce is satisfactorie in wurching
or in deed. . . . fiir right as a man synmeth in deede or in wurching
right so he schold do pennaunce in transles wurching and body
pennaunce be due satisfactorie. . . .

"Ther for hit is gode & a seyker way 2 to do pennaunce be tyymes in

1 'an' added above in later hand.
2 Ch. II. 99, 'but tak the siker way.'
yonge age, as a tre that bryngyth forth in joughte best fruyt & fairest; fol. ffor * than schal oure penaunce be fructuous: this techynge we haue in the gospel where he seith *facite dignos fructus penitence, that is to sey, "Do the wyrthy fruytes of penaunce":"

On fol. 31b follows Chap. VI. on Contrition (see Tabula, and cp. I. 127 ff.):

"For after diffinicioun of doctours contricious is a sorowe taken for synnes with purpos to be confessed & to do satisfaccioun. Contricious also may be seide a sorowe of the soule formed be gracie which sorow comith of bethenkyng of a mannes synnes and of the drede of the day of dome with stedfast purpos to be confessed and to do satisfaccioun after the ordinance of holy chirche."

This is succeed by a discussion of the difference between 'Contrition' and 'Attrition,' no hint of which is found in The Parson's Tale.

A little further down, folio 33, we have a passage very like that in I. 131 ff. Here The Clensyng of Mannes Soule does not miss the point of the quotation from Bernard. Chaucer, however, gives the source of the quotation, which MS. Bodl. 923 does not, though there is the possibility of another MS. of the tract having had a gloss Bernardus in the margin. MS. Bodl. 450, fol. 108, gives the original passage thus:

"Dolor peccati debet esse triplex, secundum Bernardum, videlicet, acer, acrior, acerrimus. Acrer quia offendimus dominum, creatorem omnium. Acrior quia [offendimus] patrem nostrum celestem, quia nos pascit multipliciter. Acerrimus quia offendimus redemptorem nostrum, qui nos liberavit proprium sanguine suo a vinculis peccatorum, a crudelitate demonum et de acerbitate gehenne."

For purposes of comparison I put the two English versions side by side:

"Than schal contricioun be [Globe Chaucer, I. 131-133.] scharp & bytyng, ffor as moche 1 And this sorwe shal been in 1 Note Chaucer's figure of the tree, I. 111-117, and his error in respect to the text quoted from Matt. iii. 8. 2 Cf. I. 118, 119, 120."
as by our synne we offende god creatour and former of alle thinges. Hit schal also be more bittir & scharper for as mocbel as by our synne we offende god our hevenly fader, that bodily & goostly fedith vs graciosly as manye maners. And hit schal be most bittir and scharpest in sorowe of the hert, for we offende that gode goddes sone, our lord Iesu, which bought vs with his precious blode: and deliuered vs by his mercy fro the bonde of synne, & fro the crueltie of the fendas, & the bitternesse of the peyne of helle.'

Fol. 33b ff. contains a discussion of the 'sixe causes' which should stir a man to Contrition. Four of the causes are like Chaucer's (I. 133 ff.), two somewhat different. After the third cause (the fourth in our tract) Chaucer has inserted a passage on the Pain many cases the same in each tract. Hezekiah's 'Recogito tabi omnes annos meos in amaritudine anime mee' is correctly given in The Clensyng of Mannes Sowle as from Isaiah (xxxviii. 15), and 'Qui facit peccatum seruus est peccati' as coming from St. John (viii. 34), and not from St. Peter as in Chaucer. The quotation from Seneca is likewise in both tracts. In some places the two show similar phraseology, in other parts only general agreement, in others substantial variations. As the passage is a good illustration of the style of the tract, perhaps it may be well to cite it in its entirety:

'Sixe causes pr[n]cipaly schulde stere a man to cont[s]cious & to make sorrowe for synne: The first is thought, as whan a man som tyme of the night or day bethenkithe him how he hath lyuyd, & whan

1 Chaucer's use of the word manere here is confusing, 'Manner' in both tracts being the second head, and the treatment following the order: Definition, Cause, Manner, Effects. Cp. I. 306, 309.
hise synnes ben presented to his mynde, to make than sorowe inwardly fro day to day for the offense to god. Such thoughtes schulde bringe a man to contriccion. Therfore seide the prophete ysaie, "Recogitabo tibi omnes annos meos in amaritudine anime mee"; that is to say, "I schal thenk a syn to the affe myn þeres, hou they haue ben spendid in synne, in bitternes of my soule."

"¶ The secunde is schame for synne *that is done. For this I rede amonge the prophecies: Revelabo pudenda tua in faciem tuam; that is to say, "I schal schewe thi schamefast thinges in thi face"; and that is to vndirstonde, "I schal1 schewe openliche thi schamfulf synnes in to thi schame & for thi confusion."

"¶ The prid is abominacione or lothinge of the filthe of synne, for which filthe man is full foule bothe in the sight of god & man. And skilfully may ech man be stered with this cause that kan or wille thenke on the beaute & nobley or dignite of the soule after the first creacio, & to se now how hit is blemeshed, how fer hit is put a bak fro the sight of god & how vnwurthy hit is eny grace or blisse so foul hit is corrupt with filthe & stenche of synne. Th[er]efore hit is seide in scripture "Qua vilis facta es nimis iterans vias tuas;" that is to sey, "full moche thou art made foule turnynge awaye thi waies."
An this may properly be vnderstonden in hem that continue in synne or elles be fals colours excuse hem of her synne. For he that so doth byndeth in a maner him to synne. Therfore seith seint Iohannes, "Qui facit peccatum seruus est peccati." That is to sey "He that dothe synne contynuall or wilfully is servaunt of synne." Also the philosophes in olde tyme lothed synne for filthe that they sey in synne by her clergie. Therfore seide seneca, "Thogh I wist hit schulde be vknowe to god, and thorh man schulde nat knowe hit, hit wolde I lothe and haue abominacione of the filthe of synne."

"¶ The ferthe is the drede of the day of dome and of the peyn of helle. Of this dreedful dome spekith seint Petir in his epistles, "Si justus vix salubitur, impius & peccator vbi parehant." That is to sey "yf a rightful man vnethes schal be saued, where schal a wicked man and a synful aper." Also seint Poul seith "Stipendia peccati moris," that is to sey "The medes of synne is deth." Of this dreedful dome seint Ierom spekith also thus: "As ofte as I beholde that day I schal qwake in all my hert." Also he seith: "Whether I ete or drînk, or do eny other thing, euer me semith as that horrible trompe sounyth in my ere & seith, "Ariseth vp, ye that ben dede, & cometh to the dome."

"¶ The fift sorowe is for the losse of heuen & for owre grete offence

1 schal added above in the same hand.
A NEW SOURCE OF

To our maker and creator. As for the house of heaven hit is said in the books of the apocalypse: "How good bookes, at memo deci" diem aee"e; view there;": that is: to say, "Habite that thou hast, that none take this care." And for the offence of our creator our servile abode is a sharper in trouble: matter; that is to say sharper; & mee sharper: & mese sharper: which trouble sorrowed, I achieved: before in the same chapitile.

""The same cause; that bringeth a pain to contriving: is hope. And that is a more hope, as hope of forrenness, hope of grace, and hope of grace: and bliss: and bliss: hope of forrenness that our synee shall close be forren; hope of grace, it to the gates wherein, and to enaccine here is not verne: and "hope of joy & bliss, with which glorie we hope to be writ"- resolved for our good worth; this matter we have in the apocalypse there: "Here is set out the gates of paradise & entereth?; that is to say, "So I stumble at the open the gate, who sooner here my voce & open the gate, I shall enter therein, & I shall surge with him, and lie with me.""

"Those are causes which we have achieved move: stere yow to contriving: if then be grace ye in: we come to contriving, seek now what contriving shalt be or seek ill before: be.'

Then follows the "maner; "Contriving" (cp. I. 366). It must be "continual" and, with "bitternesse" of heart; "discrete" or "mesurable"; and "general and hole for alle synnes"; and it must be "even right" for the offence done to God and not for fear of hell.

This first party ends with a paragraph on the effects of Contrition (cp. I. 399). It "bith a sondre and al to grynqth the hert; it bresth and departh a sondre alle the grete hope of synnes which were a grete stone wall betwixt God and us"; it "brekith the gremyes and the cheynes of the devyl, hit reendith also the bonde and the obligacion of eurolastynge peyne. It delieverith also fro the foulest seruage of the deuel, and from the horrible company of deuils. Hit restorith a man ajein to alle goostly jites & alle holy felawship and to be partener of alle suffrages of holy chirche. And hit makith a man to be the child of God and of grace, which in synne was the child of the deuel & of wrath.'
In the second part of *The Parson’s Tale* Chaucer outlines a treatment (I. 317) such as is contained in Chaps. I and IV of *The Clensyng of Mannes Sowle* (cf. the *Tabula*), but in the discussion itself ignores the rubric ‘whether it oghte nedes be doon or noon,’ a question answered in the affirmative in our tract—‘confessioun is nedeful be resoun and be auctoritee’—and discussed immediately after the definition of Confession. Into the definition of Confession Chaucer interjects B with a prefixed discussion of sin.

The opening words of the first chapter on Confession in *The Clensyng of Mannes Sowle* are very much like those of *The Parson’s Tale*, I. 319–320. They are:

‘Confessioun is a law*ful declaracioun of synnes tofore the prest.

A declaracioun hit is clesed, for there schulde no hidying be, ne excusacioun of synnes, but open schewyng of synnes, and not declaracioun or schewyng of gode dedes but in certaine cases. Lawful hit is clesed be cause hit schulde haue with hit al condiciouns that longryth to confessioun.’

Chapter II, on the proper qualifications of Priests to hear Confession, is not paralleled in *The Parson’s Tale*.

Chapter III, however, contains at the end of it the matter found in I. 983–998, viz. ‘Sorowe of herte and its tokens’ (fol. 51, at bottom):

‘That is a gode & a fructuouse confession that is soroweful . . . Seeth now which ben the tokens of sorowe and bitternessse in confessedioun. The first tokne is schame for synne. Of this schame spekith the prophete Ieremie, “Tunc erubesces & consumeris ab omni via tue.” That is to vnderstonde thus: when thou schewest thi synne in confessedioun, than schalt thou were aschamed, and thou shalt be confounded of alle thi wey tofore that thou hast gone & lyued in synne.’

‘The secunde tokne is strength which ouercomith schame. Of this hit is writen “Pro anima tua non confundaris dicere verum;” That is to vnderstonde thus: for helthe of thi soule be not confounded, that is, spare not for shame, to sye the sothe. Ensample

---

1 Cp. I. 982, 983.  
2 Chaucer’s fourth ‘signe’; cp. I. 996.  
3 Cp. I. 985.
herof ye haue of Seint Mary Maudaleyn that confessed the filthe of al her synnes in the presence of alle tho that sat at the fest.

"If The thrid tokne is terys of wepyng, which wasche the trespas
*fol. that schame is to con*fesse be mouthe. These terys weren in Peir
52. & Marie Maudaleyn 1.

"If The feryth tokne is mekenes, in word, in lokinage, and in chere.
Therfore seith the scripture thus: "Presbitero humilia animam tuam." That is to sey Meke thy soule to the prest 3. Ensemple also hereof we haue of the publican which for mekenes and lownesse hought him self vnworthi to lifte vp his eien to heuen 8.

"If The fytte tokne is redynesse to obey lowely to his confessour 17.
(Example of Paul, "Domine quid vis me facere", . . . and the prophet who said "Paratus sum & non sum turbatus ut custos mandata tua.")

*fol. 1 "Thus than confessioun schal be soroweful be bitternesse of hert, 52 8 with schame for synne, with strength of the soule nat sparing to schewe out for schame of the synne, with wepyng teres to wasche the synne with mekenes of hert inward and with lowely chere outward 4, and with redynes of wil to obey to the prest gladly to receyue what he biddith him do."

Chapter IV continues the conditions of Confession [fol. 53]:

"Confessioun 3if hit schal be fructuous most haue sorowe and bitternesse of hert, as I seide now before. & also hit most be hasty, and nat taried from day to day, for many perilis: first for vncertein tym of our liif or of our deth; also for peril that may falle in multiplicacour or encresse of synne, for, as seint Gregori seith, "Synne that is nat waschen away be pennaunce drawith sone to another synne"; also for drede or difficulte of turning, for the forther a man goth away from god by long abiding in synne the more hard hit is to turne to a good liif; also for peril of late pennaunce, for vnethis in greuous sekenesse eny man may bethen openly his synne *fol. ne be verrey repen*taunt; And for manye other perilis that fallen be 53 late doynge of pennaunce as ye haue tofore in the fitle chapitle of the firste partie 6.

"If Confessioun also most be hool; that is to sey that a man sey holly all his synnes, nat to sey som to o man and som to another, but hooly all to o prest 7.

1 Cp. I. 994. 2 Cp. I. 990. 3 Chaucer uses this example in connexion with *schame.* 4 Cp. I. 998. 5 Chaucer makes this distinction between 'inward' and 'outward' in I. 998. 6 Cp. I. 1001-1003. 7 Cp. I. 1007.
Then follow certain other conditions as in Chaucer. Perhaps, therefore, we should insert 'othere' before 'condicioouns' in I. 1013. They are:

Confessiou also most be naked. ffor a man schal nat make his confessiou be no messenger, ne be no lettre but be speche of his own mouth. Also be no gay wordes or termes to hyde his synne vnder fair colours, be hit neuer so fowle þou most tel hit in such termes þat þe prest move knowe what þou woldest mene. Confessiou also most be wilful as þe confessiou was of the þeef beside þe crosse. Confessiou also schal be feipful, so þat þe prest and he þat is confessed be in ful feith of holy chirche, wipouten eny heresye or oþer errours, or fals opinions, and so feith ful þat he be in ful trust to haue forþuenesse be þe mercy of God. Confessiou also most be propré, þat is to sey þat a man excuse him self and none oþer as for none accusacion or for greuance to an oþer. But somwe case may be þat nedes he most telle of anoþer persone, be cause he is party of þat synne; as ðif a man haue synned with such one of his kynne þat nedes be his tellynge þe prest most nedes know who hit is, for peraunture there ben no mo. Such tellynge is none accusacion, for he schewith not to þat entent. Confessiou most also be accusatorie, þat is to sey, a man schal accuse him self in confessiou, & desipse himself, and not preyse himself, as many men done. Confessiou also most be sotheast, þat is to sey not hyding þat is sothe, ne schewynge þat is fals, be cause of mekenes or ypocrisie. ffor such mekenes is a foule spice of pride. Therfore seip seint Bernard, "hit is a wundirful þing and a foule thing þat þou kannie not be holden hooly but þou schewe þe a wicked man." Confessiou also schal be discrete; þat is to sein þat þou deseter discretely ech synne he seyns himself. Also þat þou chese a discrete confessour be leue of thi parisch preste or of thi soureyn. Confessiou most also be pure: þat is to sein þat hit be done for gode entent, nat for veyn glorie ne ypocrisie ne for drede of peyn onløy; but specially for þe oﬀense to god wipout eny feynynge. And confessiou most be abidying; þat is to sey þat hit be not done lightly with passyng wordes, as a man wolde teiÞ anothær a veyn tale; but hit most be done sadli wyþ gode deliberacioun and ayusement, nonjing to leue þat may come to mynde, and wyþ sad abidyng þat þou move be þat maner of confessiou be stered to deuocioun, and þat þou move haue þereby in þat tyme the

more contricous and þe more scheame for thi synnes. Alle þese þat I haue schewed yow here ben nedeful to confessioune, þat hit move be fructuous. And for alle þese I might schewe manye auctorites, but I passe forth at þis tyme.

Then follows a detailed treatment of the profit of Confession, under ten heads, a subject not touched on by Chaucer.

The first part of the next chapter tells under what circumstances Confession should be repeated. Its introductory sentences lay down the general principle that Confession should be frequent, and they contain the substance of what we find in I. 1026–1028. It begins [fol. 56]:

"Many men and women use ofte tymes to be confessed of þat they haue ben confessed . . . rehersyng in confession al[e] her liif ones or twyes in þe þere; and somwe ofter at certain hegh festes. Pogh this he ought alwey nedeful þit hit is spedeful and proffitable, as ofte as hit is rehersed for mekenesse. fior, as seith seint Austyn, "The ofter þat a man is confessed & knowelech þe pleynly þe filthe of his synne, vpon hope of foryuenesse and to haue þe lesse peyn in purgatorie, þe lightlier he schal haue foryuenesse and purchase him grace."

This question of repeated Confession being disposed of, the author takes up the method of Confession, put by Chaucer at the beginning of this second part of Confession (I. 960–980). This method is to confess the sin 'with the circumstances that "aggregen" the synne' (as the author of our tract says on fol. 53b). Chaucer prefaces his treatment of the subject with a general statement about the sins of the five wits, a matter discussed at full length in the sixth chapter of the second part of The Clensyng of Mannes Sowele. The similarity between the two tracts is so striking, and The Clensyng of Mannes Sowele throws such a light on Chaucer's treatment of the subject, that I arrange the two in parallel columns:


'And for as moche as I seide here, and in þe chapite before Now is it good to understande

1 Cp. I. 1025.
The Parson's Tale

The circumstances that aggretteth muchel every synne."

'Thow shalt considere what thow art that doost the synne; whether thou be male or female, yong or oold, gentil or thral, free or servant, hool or syk, wedded or sengle, ordred or unordred, wys or fool, clerk or seculeer; if she be of thy kynrede, bodily or goostly, or noon; if any of thy kynrede have synned with hire or noon, and manye mo things.'

'Another circumstace is this, whether it be doon in fornicacioun, or in avowtrie, or noon, incest or noon, mayden or noon, in manere of homicide or noon, horrible grete synnes or smale, and how longe thou hast continued in synne.'

'The thridde circumstace is the place ther thou hast do synne, on's omission of 1 or who it was with whom the synne was done' for the confusion which follows.
holy place, or owt of holy place
or in eny place suspended, or in
eny lorde's place or in a pore
mannes house, or what other place.'

\[95\] By whom, \( \text{pat} \) is to sey be
which menes, or mediatours, or
messagers betwene. for all such
ben partyners of pe synne and of pe
damnacioun. And also pe synner
is gyly\(^1\) and bounde for her
synnes in that they were helpers
to his synne.\(^2\)

\[96\] Also "be whom" may be
ynder stonde wip whom, for
whom, \& azenis whom.'

\[97\] How ofte, \( \text{pat} \) is to sey he
\( \text{pat} \) is confessed schal not knowe-
leche oonly \( \text{pe} \) bare synne,
but schewe and knoweleche how
\( \text{ofte} \) he ha\( \text{p} \) falle in \( \text{pat} \) synne;
as to sey how ofte he dede \( \text{pat}
\) fleschly synne wip such a woman\(^3\),
and wheuer \( \text{per} \) was but oon,

\[970\] for he that ofte falleth in
synne he despiseth the mercy of
God and encresseth hys synne,
and is unkynde to Crist, and he
wexeth the moore fieble to with-

---

\(^{1}\) gyly over erasure in a different hand.

\(^{2}\) Cp. Chaucer's seventh circumstance.
nye; how ofte he spakenge wordes and despituous s neghbor; how ofte hech wronges to his neghbor, forth of opera synnes, for hit is to heele a wunde ofte broken.'

Why, that is to sey be whatciousthe dede hit; wheperf e hit sodeinly, or he were wip eny temptacioun, or dede hit after longe trouailltacioun. Also wheperf he onstreyneyled or compelled, at maner of compellynge, nip condicioen or wipout thou; whejir for couteist eny nede, or elles for nede and pouerte; wheperf, or in bourd, or elles in nest and in full wil to m, and so forth of opera.

Now, ? is to sey to tell pe maner of pe doynge in, and pe maner of suffrynge per wey. Whanne, that is wheperf in holy tyme or lention or in eny fastynge light or day; and wheperf he toke his penaunce or rd & brak his penaunce. Penaunce ?at is for satis- must be done in clene nip ?e circumstaunces and stonde synne and synneth the moore lightly. And the latter ariseth, and is the moore eschew for to shryn hym, namely to hym that is his confessour; for which that folk whan they falle agayn in hir olde folies, outher they forleten hir olde confessours al outrely, or elles they departen hir shirft in diverse places, but soothe wisch departed shirft deserveth no mercy of God of his synnes.'

'The sixte circumstaunce is, why that a man synneth, as by whiche temptacioun, and if hymself procure thilke temptacioun, or by the excitynge of oother folke; or if he synne with a womman by force, or by hire owene assent, or if the womman maugreehir hed hath been afforced or noon, this shal she telle; for coveitise, or for povertie, and if it was hire procurynge or noon, and swiche manere harneys.'

[975] The sevente circum- staunce is, in what manere he hath doon his synne, or how that she hath suffred that folk han doon to hire, and the same shal the man telle pleylnly with alle circumstaunces, and wheither he hath synnd with comune bordel wommen or noon, or doon his synne in hooly tymes or noon, in fastynge tymes or noon, or biforn his shirfte, or after his latter
such mo a man schulde make his confessione."

shripte, and hath peraventure broken therfore his penance en-
joyned; by whos helpe and whos conseil, by sorcerie or craft-
al moste be toold. Alle these thynges, after that they been
grete or smale, engreggen the conscience of a man."

The subject of Confession in the tract is completed in
two further chapters, as outlined in the Tabula.
Part third, on Satisfaction is treated at much greater
length than in The Parson's Tale. Chaucer seems to have
tired of his subject, although he did not leave it un-
finished as in the case of Astrolabe, contented himself
with but a fragmentary treatise of Satisfaction. Most of his
subject-matter is in The Clensyng of Mannes Sovle, and
much of it is couched in similar phraseology. The Seven
Dedes of Mercy are subsequently recapitulated in I. 1032-
1034, as part of Alms; which may be due to the fact that
in our tract Alms is considered as one of the deeds of
mercy, viz. Compassion, the fifth of the seven spiritual
deeds of mercy. A very brief discussion of the Lord's
Prayer is inserted by Chaucer into the paragraph on prayer
in general, I. 1040 ff. This is not found in our tract, but in
Frère Lorens' Sumne. Chaucer finishes his work with an
account of the hindrances to Penance, as in Frère Lorens.
Frère Lorens' Sumne and our tract therefore yield almost
all the material for the Third Part of The Parson's Tale.

In conclusion; as to the relation of The Clensyng of
Mannes Sovle to The Parson's Tale, this much is evident:
1st. That this tract of the latter part of the fourteenth
century is independent of Chaucer, containing a systematic,
coherent, well-proportioned treatment of Penitence as the
means of purifying the soul, and having none of the mis-
takes and confusions of The Parson's Tale.
2nd. That, while it does not furnish all the material, especially in respect to many of the Patristic and Biblical quotations, it does give us most of the substance of The Parson’s Tale, exclusive of the part on the Seven Deadly Sins.

3rd. That the phraseology of the tract is in many places almost identical with Chaucer’s, being much more like The Parson’s Tale than that of Lorens’ Summe is.

We are therefore safe in concluding, for the present at least, that The Parson’s Tale was made up from The Clensyng of Mannes Sowle, and Frère Lorens’ Summe, supplemented by various notes taken from Chaucer’s own theological reading and personal experience.

Of course there still remains the possibility of Chaucer’s having literally followed a lost French or Latin Summa; but, as I stated before, this does not seem likely from an examination of the style and structure of The Parson’s Tale. Moreover, we know from his other work, the Boece for example, that he was in the habit of working from two sources, now following one, now the other.

Mark H. Liddell.

University of Texas,
January, 1900.
The line use by Drury's first edition (L. 2. 139) is

misere in one sense only which the folio of 1623 has

announced. In this line which seems to have tickled

the sponsor more to an extraordinary extent, it will be

necessary difficult for the general reader—who is also

a general reader, since on second hand—to produce it

announced in a different line. Fortunately, this attempt

of mine to assume Easy—I cannot say to prove—that

Shakespeare was not write the line as it is nowadays always

announced, is not announced to the general public but to

scholars who will have no difficulty in considering the

line of a new edition.

When we have to choose between two readings, both

announced in the text as a common word and the

name of one another one, and especially if this uncommon

one should occur in the earlier text, we may a priori

suppose the uncommon one to represent the original

reading.

We next proceed, of a less general character, is more

likewise in its considered another. It is to the effect that

the Roman text of the second quarter, written in 1603 or

1605, and produced in 1604 when Shakespeare was in

London, is more likely to contain the genuine text of the

play than the folio of 1623, and that consequently the
readings of that quarto text should generally be followed where they can be explained; i.e. that in reality the burden of proof is, or should be, on the shoulders of those who prefer to follow the folio readings. In the compass of this paper it would of course be idle to attempt proving this point. I must be content to give it as my mature opinion in order to explain the fact of my using it as an additional argument rather than as an attempt to convince the folio-admirers.

Let us now apply these considerations to our case. The second quarto has 'O that this too too sallied flesh would melt;' against the reading of the folios, 'solid flesh.' Not one—to my knowledge—of the commentators that followed the folio-reading, has thought it worth while to defend this reading, or even to explain why he preferred the quarto text. Sallied of the quarto was most likely merely considered a misprint. Well, even if I should not succeed in proving it to have been Shakespeare's word, I hope to raise it at least to the dignity of a reading. In connexion with my two preceding propositions I must now prove it to have a meaning.

Of course we think of the substantive sally and its congeners, but the difficulty is more especially in the meaning. We evidently want the meaning attack here, which is not in the dictionaries; i.e. we want it used as a transitive verb, for it will not do to say merely that the senses of 'sally forth' and 'attack' are so closely allied that we do not need any further proof, however true the statement in itself would be.

I think I can quote one instance of this verb, which seems to have been overlooked in this connexion, and

---

1 The only instances of sally as a transitive verb found in some dictionaries are so technical and so special—see, e.g., Stute bespringen in Muret—that I do not wish to lay any undue stress on them. Still these usages are likely to take away any doubt that might have arisen as to the possibility of the development of the meaning.
'THIS TOO TOO SOLID FLESH'

which is decisive. In *The pleasant Comodie of Patiat Grissill* (printed in 1603, ed. Hübisch, Erlangen, 1893) I find, in the very first speech, the 'Marquesse' exhorting his followers to 'teach (their) Ionond spirits to ply the Chase' now that dawn has come; and he says: 'The sally not this morning with foule looke'; to which Paul answers: 'We . . . do not throw On these your pastimes, a contracted brow'—in this way repeating the image of salt in to throw on. It will be seen how unnecessary Collier's change into *sully was*.

Does not then the reading of 1604 deserve the preference before that of 1543, seeing that it is quite explicable that sallied should have been corrupted into the common solid? I cannot take it upon me to assume the substitution of such an uncommon word as sallied (v. a.) instead of solid. Nor is this all. I have hitherto left the first quarto out of consideration. Whatever opinion my readers may hold of its origin, one thing would seem beyond cavil, viz. that it is one of the 'Stolne, and surreptitious copies' that Heminge and Condell complain of. And certainly if it is, but even if it were not, its reading, 'O that this too much grieued and sallied flesh,' can only be explained by assuming Shakespeare's original manuscript to have had solid for the Unless indeed we go so far as to assume that Shakespeare, finding this splendid 'grieud and sallied flesh', changed it into solid, and that this was again corrupted under the influence of the first quarto representation into sallied. I am here dangerously near to an entirely useless discussion—which I therefore wish to avoid but am forced to touch upon—as to the comparative beauty of the imagery involved in sallied and solid. The discussion would be dangerous because too long, and especially because it would be useless, seeing that the decision depends entirely upon subjective opinion—and nineteenth-century opinion, too. I only wish to add that
this would presuppose the first quarto (with the reading *griev'd and sallied*) not to be Shakespeare's, which view is nearly quite abandoned, and rightly so, as it would seem to me.

And here I should finish if it were not for a confession I have to make. Up till a few days ago when the latest *Hamlet* edition, that of Professor Dowden, came to hand, I had fondly imagined—my reader is welcome to take the adjective in its now obsolete sense—that I had not been anticipated. That youthful delusion has been most cruelly destroyed! Can there be anything new under the Shakespearean sun? Professor Dowden's reference to this former defence of the reading *sallied* led to the further discovery of a note on this line in the New Shakspere Society's *Transactions* (1880–85, ii. p. 51) by Miss Rochfort-Smith, and to a further reconsideration of the matter in connexion with the Professor's own note, which, it may be added, is somewhat confused ¹. As independent discussions, even if on exactly the same lines, may still be welcome, I did not think it necessary to hold this note back. This was all the more undesirable because this case shows once more how difficult it is not to find oneself anticipated by the man whose name one meets on nearly every page of the records of Early English literature, and who here again would seem to have been the first to advocate the quarto reading. It need hardly be said that it is the name of him whom we honour in this Album.

**H. LOGEMAN.**

*University of Ghent, Belgium,*

*December 21, 1899.*

¹ If we retain *sallied*, he says, he would explain it as *sullied*; the first quarto's *sallied* gives him again reason to think that *sullied* is right. This is not very clear. I may add that the small Shakespeare library at my disposal did not allow of my investigating this matter further, nor of my verifying Dr. Dowden's references.
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THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE EARLY HAMLET.

For many years the view has been generally accepted that the Hamlet referred to by Nash in his preface to Greene's Menaphon (1587 or 1589), probably the play which was performed at Newington Butts in 1594, and which furnished Lodge with a simile in his Wit's Misantry (1385), was an un-Shakespearean piece. This view, with which the Clarendon Press edition of Hamlet has familiarized wider circles of English readers, has the adherence of most critics in England and Germany. Further, Malone's conjecture that Kyd was author of the lost play has received much support; and has been worked out most fully and suggestively by Herr Sarrazin in his essays on the Entstehung der Hamlet-tragödie in Anglia (xii, xiii, xiv).

The following notes are not meant to contradict this position. The balance of evidence seems on the whole against Shakespeare and in favour of Kyd. But many of the arguments brought forward are not very convincing, and the considerations which finally turn the scale, though weighty, are few. It is well to draw attention to this, that the case for Kyd may not be considered stronger than it is; and the easiest method of doing so, within
the limits of a short paper, will be to adopt for the moment the attitude of a convinced but candid partisan of the Shakespearean theory, and give a statement from his point of view.

Many of the objections to Shakespeare’s authorship rest on the assumption that the lost Hamlet was very similar in character to the version of the first quarto; and disappear if we suppose it a mere ‘Tragedy of Blood’ like Titus Andronicus or Kyd’s pieces. In this case the omission of it by Meres from his list of plays, while he includes Titus, is not so strange as it looks, for Titus may well have been quite equal or even superior to the early Hamlet.

Again, of Lodge’s reference to the ghost ‘which cried so miserably at the theatre, like an oyster-wife, Hamlet, revenge!’ the Clarendon Press editors say that it ‘would alone be sufficient to prove that the play in question was not the Hamlet of Shakespeare.’ This is only an argument if we assume that the first draft was verbally identical with the later edition. There is nothing exactly like this in the Hamlets we know; but it did occur in an early Hamlet, as to the authorship of which it contains no clue one way or another.

Or, once more, the same editors say of the passage in Nash’s preface, that it is difficult to imagine that this reference ‘could be to Shakespeare, who was then only in his twenty-third year.’ This takes for granted 1587 as the date of Menaphon, which might be questioned; but even supposing 1587 to be correct, wherein does the difficulty lie? Shakespeare doubtless could hardly have produced by that date a play like his final Hamlet or even the Hamlet of the first quarto. But Schiller’s Räuber and Goethe’s Geschichte Gottfriedens von Berlichingen were both written at an earlier age, and we may surmise that the lost Hamlet had a good deal less permanent merit.
than either of these juvenile works. Besides in the sixteenth century genius developed fast, and at twenty-three Marlowe had produced his Tamburlaine.

So far then this theory makes no very large demands. It postulates Shakespeare’s youthful treatment of a subject to which he afterwards returned and which he afterwards recast. There is nothing in this that is inherently improbable. Dante seems already in the Vita Nuova to have had the conception of his infernal journey, but a different one from that which is carried out in the Comedy:

Che dirà nell’ Inferno a’ malnati:
Io vidi la speranza de’ beati.

Goethe in the early fragments of Faust seems to have conceived Mephistopheles as an emissary of the Earth-spirit, but there is hardly a trace of this in his final treatment. Scott, when he turned once more to Waverley, largely modified his original plan. It seems inevitable that a man who lingers over a subject, or resumes it after a lapse of years, should greatly change his method of dealing with it.

Another postulate of the Shakespearean theory is that this youthful play, written in the period of storm and strain, was crude and turgid, effective enough to be reproduced at intervals, popular enough to provoke the gibes of the wits at its sustian, but not good enough to be mentioned by Meres when he was seeking to do Shakespeare honour. It must be imagined as a tragedy full of declamation, savagery, and horror, introducing the episodes, certainly of the ghost, and probably of the included play, but otherwise approximating more closely to the original novel than even the German version of Der bestrafte Brüdermord. It must in a word be placed on the same line with Titus, but perhaps, since Meres does not mention it, at a lower level.
THE EARLY *HAMLET*

Now of course the authorship of *Titus* is very uncertain, and many would assign it too in substance to Kyd rather than to Shakespeare. But the attempts to bring back Aaron within the circle of human feeling, the conception of poetic justice which not only avenges the wrong but shows the character of the victim inviting its infliction, and the outlook to a restitution of righteous order at the close, are all suggestive of Shakespeare and not of Kyd; while it is difficult to read Mr. Wyndham's discussion of some of the most painful scenes without agreeing that the style and treatment are very Shakespearean. But if so, most people will add that Shakespeare is here working with the tools of Kyd. There is the same ferocity of action, the same over-strained portraiture, the same vengeful retaliation. The masque-like appearance of Tamora and her sons in disguise as Revenge, Rape, and Murder is like Kyd's device of the play within the play in the *Spanish Tragedy*; and the madness of Andronicus, partly genuine, partly assumed, wholly hysterical and somewhat futile, is very like that of Hieronimo.

Those therefore who attribute *Titus Andronicus* to Shakespeare, will find no intrinsic difficulty in the supposition that he may also about the same date have written a *Hamlet* in Kyd's manner, ferocious, over-strained, vengeful, like the original novel; containing a study in madness real or feigned; employing the machinery of an included play; and, in further imitation of Kyd, introducing the figure of a vindictive ghost.

Thus a large portion of Sarrazin's argument which emphasizes the affinities between *Hamlet* and Kyd's pieces to prove Kyd's authorship of the lost play, is equally compatible with the other view. But when he singles out certain traits as characteristic of Kyd in opposition to Shakespeare, one may be allowed to dissent. Among these, for example, he instances the designation
of Danish personages by Italian or classical names. But, first, we do not know how Kyd would have proceeded in such a case, as we have no play of his (unless it be Hamlet, which is the very point at issue) that deals with a Danish subject; and, second, we find Shakespeare using Italian and classical names of his own in Measure for Measure, even when he has placed the scene of the action in Teutonic Vienna. Again, Sarrazin points out how in Hamlet the primitive story has been made modern and contemporary in tone, while Lear and Macbeth retain something of the original barbarous colouring; and this change he considers typical of Kyd. But here too we have no evidence as to how Kyd would have treated a primitive theme; and, on the other hand, to judge from the description of Theseus' court in A Midsummer Night's Dream, Shakespeare was even more careless about congruity with tradition at the outset of his career than he afterwards became. Sarrazin further lays stress on the Catholic strain in Hamlet as characteristic not of Shakespeare but of Kyd. Probably many will feel that he exaggerates this Catholicism. But at any rate he takes the German Brudermond as preserving in some measure an earlier form (Y) of the Hamlet drama. Now in it, despite a few petty and current anachronisms, references to the Last Judgement, the Almighty, and the like, the setting is neither Catholic nor even Christian, but heathen; it is 'the gods' that are appealed to; and this agrees with the novel, which dates its story 'long time before the kingdom of Denmark received the faith of Jesus Christ and embraced the doctrine of the Christians.' The inference seems plain that this trait was passed on from the novel to the German version through the lost play; but if that lost play was by Kyd, what becomes of his Catholic tendencies?

Again Sarrazin regards certain episodes, not found in
the novel, as un-Shakespearean in character; he would apparently treat them as blemishes which Shakespeare suffered to remain in his redaction of his predecessor’s play. ‘Scenes like the close of the first act, the revolt of Laertes, the burial of Ophelia, and the brawl between Hamlet and Laertes’ do not seem ‘as though they could have been invented by Shakespeare even in his earliest youth.’ ‘On the one hand they are too cleverly calculated for stage effect; on the other their motives are too superficial and psychologically defective.’ In reference to which we may answer, first, that Shakespeare had generally a good eye to stage effect—advanced critics would persuade us he had little else—and that the motives for these scenes are not always on the surface and are perfectly adequate. What is wrong, for instance, with the fencing-match? Laertes and the king have good reasons for arranging it; and that Hamlet should thus consent to make sport before his enemy when there is so much else, so urgent and so different, that he ought to do, is perhaps the most subtle and the most ironical touch in the whole delineation of his character. But, second, even supposing that these scenes were theatrically effective and artistically defective, we should still have to say with Polonius:

now remains
That we find out the cause of this effect,
Or rather say, the cause of this defect;
For this effect defective comes by cause.

And this cause can hardly be their survival from a non-Shakespearean play. For in the German piece, Laertes’ revolt, Ophelia’s burial, the brawl between Hamlet and Laertes, are all wanting. If they are so effective, it is strange that they should have been omitted in such a play. If they are so defective, it is strange that an unknown author had the tact and conscientiousness to reject them
while Shakespeare retained them. But third, supposing that they were mere striking situations with a superficial motive, accepted as such in indolence or self-interest from a play of Kyd's, Shakespeare would hardly have gone out of his way to blur them and make them less intelligible. But such, on this hypothesis, would be his procedure in regard to the conclusion of the first act. Why should the Ghost persist in interfering when Hamlet administers the oath of secrecy to his companions? In the German play the cut-and-dry answer is obvious, and indeed is given by the prince himself. He is pledging them to conceal, not as in the English versions from the first quarto on, the mere fact that the Ghost has appeared, but the purport of its revelation, which he fully intends to disclose to them. Of a sudden it strikes him; 'Oh, now I understand what it is! The ghost of my father is perturbed that I should make this matter known.' If, in the scene he has given us, Shakespeare has retained an alien trait, we certainly cannot say that he has been content with the old superficial and obvious motive.

We may agree then with Sarrazin in his contention that Hamlet has many similarities with Kyd, and yet refuse to follow him when he asserts that these definitely imply Kyd's and not Shakespeare's handiwork.

In like manner we may accept his further argument that the first quarto is more typical of Kyd than the subsequent editions, and that the prologue to the German play reproduces an original prologue in Kyd's style. This quite adapts itself to the theory that the lost Hamlet was a work of Shakespeare's youth composed under Kyd's influence. But in regard to this also Sarrazin's general statement must be qualified and some of his inferences criticized.

For example, he rightly lays stress on the numerous resemblances to Kyd in the diction of the included play;
but most of those which he points out occur in the revised version, not in the widely different one of the first quarto, which would furnish by no means so rich a quarry.

This must be borne in mind when we admit the greater affinity between Kyd and the first quarto than between Kyd and the later editions, and shows that some of Shakespeare’s most authentic alterations were for a particular purpose in the manner of Kyd. It answers Sarrazin’s remark that an approximation to Kyd was unlikely when Shakespeare was at the height of his creative activity, for these undoubtedly belong to the interval between the first and the second quarto. Further, they connect not only with the Spanish Tragedy but with Soliman and Perseda and with Cornelia, and thus conflict with another of Sarrazin’s positions. He asserts that elsewhere in Shakespeare the reminiscences of Kyd point almost exclusively to the first of these three plays, while in Hamlet they suggest the others as well; he supposes that Shakespeare knew the popular Spanish Tragedy well by performance on the stage, but that with Kyd’s remaining work, especially with Cornelia, he was less acquainted; and he explains the wider range of coincidences in Hamlet by taking them to be not Shakespearean reminiscences or analogues, but traces of Kyd’s own original work. But the revised version of the enclosed play is indubitably Shakespeare’s, and precisely in it we find a crowd of parallels from three of Kyd’s plays, with Cornelia very much in evidence.

Sarrazin’s most general and weighty arguments against the theory of Shakespeare’s authorship seem to be the following:

(1) ‘If the original Hamlet was composed by Shakespeare himself, we must assume either that the young poet already treated the traditional story quite freely and independently, while nevertheless, e.g. in Romeo and Juliet, he still kept close to his authority as respects the course
of the action; or that in his later years he completely remodelled his own work, and that in a way that conforms neither to his earliest nor his latest manner of composition.

Even in his early period, however, Shakespeare could make considerable changes in his sources, witness his *Comedy of Errors*. And even were the meaning of the last part of Sarrazin's statement more definite and more plausible than it is, it would always be rash to dogmatize about the ways of Genies. The fact remains that a poet can treat the same theme at different periods in very different ways, as we see by comparing Tennyson's *Sir Galahad* with his *Holy Grail*, and other of his Arthurian lyrics with his *Idylls of the King*.

(2) But if the original *Hamlet* was written by Shakespeare about the same time as *Titus Andronicus* it should show the same general features as *Titus*, and this according to Sarrazin it cannot have done. *Hamlet*, he says, has far less unity of place and action. But is the difference greater than between the *Comedy of Errors* and the *Two Gentlemen of Verona*? In *Hamlet*, he goes on, the catastrophe is the result of chance, while in *Titus* and Shakespeare's other tragedies it is brought about by the conscious will of the persons. But here too is it not really determined by Hamlet himself? It is 'his incapacity for a direct act of will... and his continual seeking for some motive from without which makes him play with chance till chance finally plays with him'. In *Hamlet*, continues Sarrazin, there is a shrinking from open deeds of blood as compared with the brutal revenges and horrors of *Titus*. One would have thought there was enough bloodshed in *Hamlet* as we know it, and we cannot guess how much more there may have been in the original play; but even stretching this argument its full length, is there a greater difference in tone between, say, the German play and *Titus* than

---

there is between Göts and Werther, or Fiesko and Luise Millerin?

But indeed Sarrazin, if he were correct, would prove too much. For, granting that in some of these respects Hamlet is unlike Titus, it is even more unlike Soliman and Perseda, which nevertheless he attributes, with Hamlet, to Kyd. In Soliman the unity of place is not remarkable, for it shifts from Rhodes to Constantinople. Neither is the unity of action, for it falls into three main episodes each of which might perfectly well furnish forth a play by itself: the early history of Erastus’ wooing, his union with Perseda through Soliman’s magnanimity, his treacherous murder and Perseda’s revenge. In one aspect, doubtless, the play is a tissue of accidents, but the accidents are all manipulated and the finale is brought about ‘by the conscious will of the persons.’ And what about the dislike for bloodshed in a piece where all the characters with names, and some of those without, are slaughtered before the close, and these slaughters are distributed very impartially through the whole course of the story? If Sarrazin on such grounds refuses to admit common authorship in the case of the lost Hamlet and Titus, much more should he reject it in the case of the lost Hamlet and Soliman.

(3) He argues that if Shakespeare composed the original Hamlet at about the same time as Titus, a similarity of diction would be still traceable in the existing versions, which is not the case. The difference in style between the two plays is doubtless very great; but not beyond explanation, if we remember the difference of subject on the one hand, and assume a thorough and repeated revision on the other. But the revised Hamlet, it will be answered, does contain coincidences of expression with Kyd: how, in that case, is their presence to be accounted for? Now in the first place, some of the alleged traces of Kyd’s
to dwell on them. Suffice it to repeat, that the writer of the early Hamlet was obnoxious to the scholar playwrights, that he had followed a number of pursuits, that his taking to the drama seemed a bit of presumption to the University gentlemen, that he was accused of plagiarism, that he was not an advanced classical scholar, and that he had tried his hand at law. All this applies on the evidence of Greene or others, or by plausible conjecture, to Shakespeare; not all is so applicable to Kyd. For instance, we do not know that he had any feud with the University dramatists, and we do know that he had intimate relations with Marlowe, one of their number. So, too, Shakespeare, with his 'small Latin,' might well be taxed with using an 'English Seneca' and with inability to "latinise his neck verse"; but Kyd, however inexact his scholarship, had evidently a very current knowledge of Latin.

The second part of Nash's attack is much obscurer and some of the passages have not yet received a satisfactory explanation. The reference to the 'French Doudie' can hardly be to Cornelia if, as seems on other grounds probable, that translation was executed towards the end of Kyd's career. It looks as though some much less respectable lady were intended.

Does the scoff that certain writers have not learned 'the just measure of the horizon without an hexameter,' mean that they could not give the right quantity of the word without the scansion of a regular metre to guide them? Compare (Henry VI, c. iv. 7. 81) 'above the border of this horizon.' The 'bodging up of blank verse with ifs and ands' is taken by Sarrazin to mean the emphatic repetition of these conjunctions, and he quotes instances from Kyd.

1 Sarrazin, to prove that the expression 'Blood is a beggar' was in Kyd's style, quotes a vague parallel from one of his later pamphlets. One might with equal justice cite Richard II, i. 1. 104, 'Which blood, like sacrificing Abel's, cries,' &c.
THE AUTHORSHIP OF

There are also instances in Titus, ii. 4. 13; iv. 1. 99, which Shakespearian reviewer to be Shakespeare's. It may be questioned, however, if this is a sufficiently marked mannerism to of forth commence, and I would suggest that the reference is not in the use of an if, a more offensive resemblance in padding a line. But this is very common in Titus; e.g.

II. 3. 109. 'As if she do, I would I were an ass.'
II. 3. 210. 'As if we were to meet him handsomely.'
IV. 4. 9. 'Of old Ambrosius. And what so if?'
V. 1. 59. 'Sing one; or if it please me which then speak'st.'
V. 1. 62. 'As if it please thee! why, come thee, Lucius.'
V. 3. 36. 'As if your highness knew my heart, you were.'

Though the bursting of 'Ethias into Hell' is true of Kyd (see Seneca's references), and is not found in any of Shakespeare's surviving pieces, it may have occurred in the lost Eumolpe and been removed owing to this very criticism. Shakespeare was not above taking a hint, if we may judge by the omission from Julius Caesar of the line to which Ben Jonson objected.

Even Nash's statement that persons like the author of Senex, when their plagiarms of Seneca gives out, set about to imitate 'the Kidde in Aesop' is not an insuperable difficulty. It might be interpreted as a punning reference to the dramatist, and yet taken in the literal sense, that Shakespeare, beginning in the style of 'English Seneca' went on to compose plays (The Titus) in imitation of Kyd.

So far I think the partisans of the Shakespeare theory may get without more casuistry than is considered lawful among literary critics. But one of Nash's clauses seems to bar the way. It is not perhaps impossible to get over it, but it is hard to see how the attempt to do so can be duly acquitted of bias. He says of the sort of persons he is assailing, that they 'intermeddle with Italian translations'; and talks of the 'two open pamphlets' thus produced.
THE EARLY HAMLET

Now of course the word pamphlet was then used in its widest sense; Shakespeare calls his Lucrece a pamphlet. Also it is open to any one to maintain that Shakespeare translated from the Italian. And, finally, it may be argued that the last portion of Nash's invective is more general in its application than the first. But the obvious and natural explanation of this passage is, that the author of Hamlet tried his hand at the translation of Italian tracts. There is no reason to suppose that Shakespeare did anything of the kind; but in 1588 Kyd published 'The Householder's Philosophie,' from the Italian of 'that excellent orator and poet, Torquato Tasso.'

Unless or until this piece of evidence is explained away Kyd's claim to the original Hamlet must be considered to have the preference.

M. W. MacCallum.

UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY.
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ANOTHER CHAUCER STANZA?

MS. Rawlinson Poet. A copy of Chaucer's Troilus—Professor Skeat discovered
has some interesting features. He has reproduced the page
on a flyleaf (fol. 114) at the end of the MS. a unique copy
of a Balade which he has entitled To Rosemonde (Skeat's
Chaucer, vol. i. pp. 81, 82). He has reproduced the page
in his Twelve Facsimiles.

The accompanying facsimile of fol. 39 illustrates three
other features in this manuscript, which, I believe, are also
unique.

1. The MS. omits the Proems of Troilus, books ii, iii, iv,
though it contains the first eight stanzas of book i, and the
first stanza of book v, which may be regarded as the Proems
of these books. Note that Liber Tercius opens with line 50.

2. It contains throughout side-headings intended to indi-
cate and summarize what we may call the chapters of the
story, e.g. 'How Crisseide com in to Troilus at the hous of
Deiphbus wher he lay syke and besought hym of his grace.'

3. But the most interesting feature of this Troilus text is,
that it contains a stanza which does not occur in any other
known copy.

Fol. 386 ends with line 1750 of book ii.

Com of therfore | and bring hym in to hele [bringeth him to hele].

But between this line and line 1751

But now to yow | ye lovers that ben heer
Complied he helthyn of his lifnes and faithfully that pite was to heere.

For ye must outher/thamgen ye faze.
That ye be fre of mercy & bounted.
Or ells ye do this man imprisonment.
For this great felibeth of necesye.
He sethe as god ye in his mayntrue.
That acuttee/with so bonygne a other.
Ye may not taye/in a stone yeere.

But note to posse ye shere that ben heere.
Now Troilus not in a fandart.
That lay and myght/the whispering of hem heere.
And thoughte laude/mess renedeth alle my sorte.
Fulke to dye or hane aun compit.
And ous the fyst tyme he shulde pree.
Of some mystery god what that he seye.

The terons.
And said so that it shert you to quappe keeping her close and often saw she, And Pandaran; that had her on the laps Came near and saw her at the easterne pyle And seide, God do boole on alle pyle, Se who is heer/youd comen to hiseste To heer is she/that is your setth he wents He with it sped, as he slept al mooste, Ha sh provint/the unrest, Where me be was almighty god thowe chopte Who pe ther I may not se treuly, Hold Exiffeide comm to Eransus at the house of Seiphe, bus wher he lay syke it be sight, hym of his syre
which follows in all other MSS., we find at the top of fol. 39 the following nine lines:

Compleined ek heleyne of his siknes \{ vacat
And feithfully | that pitee was to heere
For ye must outher | chaungen [in?] your face
That is so ful of mercy and bountee
Or elles must ye do this man sum grace
For this thyng folweth of necessyte
As sothe as god ys in his magestee
That crueltee | with so benigne a chier
Ne may not last | in o persone yfere

The first two lines are a mistaken repetition of ii. 1576, 7. From the difference in ink it seems that the scribe had written them at some previous time, and used the leaf for his present copy of Troilus, contenting himself with correcting the mistake by writing vacat at the side. How the following stanza came here it is harder to say. It is evidently intended by the scribe to follow l. 1750; but it does not form a natural conclusion to Pandarus’ argument in the two preceding stanzas. A more appropriate place would be in Pandarus’ previous exhortation to his niece, ii. 316–350. But I cannot find anything in Boccaccio of which it might be regarded as a translation. On the other hand, there is no reason to doubt that it is Chaucer’s. The rhymes are correct; and the few ungrammatical spellings (as chier, last, for chere, laste) are easily rectified. A syllable is wanting in the first line. I suggest in, because in l. 1750 (probably the preceding line of the manuscript from which this was copied) an in has been wrongly inserted. This insertion in the wrong line of a correction put at the side or between the lines is a very frequent mistake of the scribes, and accounts for many various readings.

Perhaps the most likely guess as to this stanza is that it represents Chaucer’s first intention, or a part of it, for which
he substituted ll. 1737-1750. The omission of the three Proems might also lead us to suppose that the manuscript represents an early draft of the poem, and that the three Proems were inserted later; though it is possible that they were deliberately excised, as interrupting the story.

In any case, this stanza and the balade To Rosemounde are evidence that this manuscript has descended from, or has been influenced by, some original of which no other known MS. bears the same trace. This must give its text of Troilus a peculiar interest. Unfortunately, however, as is probably the case with most, if not all, Chaucer MSS. at some stage or other of their descent, its text has been 'contaminated'; that is, its readings come down from more than one source. This may have resulted from the scribe having had two or more copies before him, or from his single copy having been 'corrected' from another. Here are three examples out of many. The five stanzas, iii. 1212-1246, occur twice: first after l. 1099, and a second time in their correct place; but the two versions show differences which cannot be accidental, as in some cases both readings occur in other MSS. In MS. Rawl., iii. 1632 reads:

Thou art at ese hold the w now therinne.

MS. Harl. 1239, and Caxton, have now as in MS. Rawl.; MS. Harl. 2394 has now before hold; while the other MSS. have wel for now. Again, iv. 1531 reads—all in one hand—

But afterward it wolde sore it wol is [us] rewe

The common reading of the MSS. is

But afterward ful sore it wol us rewe

But MS. Harl. 1239 reads:

But Aftyrward it wolde ful sore vs Rewe

The question of genealogy is too large to enter upon here. But I may mention that I have failed in spite of repeated attempts to make out any satisfactory pedigree of the
ANOTHER CHAUCER STANZA?

_Troilus_ MSS.; and that no pedigree I have seen of other poems of Chaucer, where we have a sufficient number of MSS., is free from grave improbabilities. Indeed the only conclusion I have to offer is that—whether the fault of Chaucer in giving his scribes ‘bad copy,’ or the fault of Adam and his colleagues in failing to ‘write trewe’ (which is Chaucer’s version of the matter), or, as is most probable, the fault of both poet and scribe—the first copies of Chaucer’s poems were far from perfect; and for the source of what Chaucerian scholars regard as the ‘good’ MSS. (e.g. MS. Campsall of _Troilus_, or MS. Ellesmere of _The Canterbury Tales_) we are indebted to Chaucer’s first editors.

It remains to say that this _Troilus_ MS. seems to be the work of four scribes, probably members of the same scriptorium. ‘Tregentyl’ or ‘Tregentil’ (hand δ) who signs his name\(^1\) at the end of _Troilus_, and again at the foot of the _Balade_, is responsible only for

(1) fol. 1–fol. 9b (i. 1–700)
(3) fol. 16, l. 4 from bottom–fol. 19b (ii. 118–433)
(5) fol. 29, 29b (ii. 1044–1113) [an inserted leaf?]
(9) fol. 59, l. 2 from bottom–fol. 114 (iii. 1374–end, including _balade_).

Hand β writes

(2) fol. 10–fol. 16, l. 5 from bottom (i. 701–ii. 117)
(7) fol. 43–fol. 51b, l. 9 from top (iii. 306–iii. 912).

Hand a (that of our facsimile) writes

(4) fol. 20–fol. 28b (ii. 434–ii. 1043)
(6) fol. 30–fol. 42b (ii. 1114–iii. 305).

Hand γ writes

(8) fol. 51, l. 10 from top–fol. 59, l. 3 from bottom (iii. 913–iii. 1373).

I have lettered the Hands (a, β, γ, δ) according to what seems their order of writing; but it may be well to point out

\(^1\) I take Skeat’s explanation of this word, as I have no other to offer.
that in the case of Hand a there is no absolute proof. The paper of leaves 10–17, 20–24, 30–32, and, strange to say, of leaf 114, is of the same make, and of a different make from that of the rest of the volume.

Some leaves have been torn out: i. 318–350; ii. 169–248 partly; iv. 431–560; v. 843–920. The MS. omits the stanz (l. 890–896) which is omitted in all known MSS. except Phillippo 8252, Harl. 3943, and Harl. 3992; and, with Harl. 3992, it omits the Latin verses inserted by all other MSS. between l. 1498 and l. 1499 of book v. Otherwise its text is complete.

W. S. McCormick.
XXXIII.

ON THE DATE OF THE KNIGHT’S TALE.

In the Prologue of the *Legende of Good Women*, line 420, we read that Chaucer made

...al the love of Palamon and Arcyte
Of Thebes, though the story is knowne lyte.

It was Tyrwhitt who first drew from these lines the inference, obvious—when once the *Legende* was dated—that *Palamon and Arcite* was written before the appearance of the same story as the first of the *Canterbury Tales*. ‘It is not impossible,’ he writes with characteristic caution (London ed., 1865, vol. i. p. cx), ‘that at first it was a mere translation of the *Theseida* of Boccaccio, and that its present form was given it when Chaucer determined to assign it the first place among his *Canterbury Tales*.’ William Godwin naturally received Tyrwhitt’s guarded suggestion as proven fact; and if any one will observe a capital instance of the outrage that the reckless popularizer may do the scholar, he may find it in this section of Godwin’s great historical romance (*Life of Chaucer*, 2nd ed., London, 1804, vol. ii. p. 76 ff.). By a curious chance it fell to the sanest of Chaucer critics to raise this amiable fiction of Godwin’s to the level of serious hypothesis—an hypothesis which for nearly thirty years has passed for fact.
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Ten Brink in his epoch-making book, Chaucer, Studien zur Geschichte seiner Entwicklung, u. s. w., Minster, 1870, advanced the theory that the lost Palamon and Arcite was, as Tyrwhitt had suggested and Godwin asserted, a fairly literal translation of the Teseide; furthermore that, like most of the works of the "Italian Period," it was composed in seven-line stanzas. He offered in evidence fragments of the Teseide, rather literally translated, which are found in several of Chaucer's rime royal poems. These scraps Ten Brink regarded as the débris of a larger work, namely, Palamon, in st. This close version of the Teseide Chaucer had done to suppress. Its demolition he had already begun; in its fragments in Anesida and in Troilus—but only recast as the Knight's Tale.

The Teseide stanzas in the Parliament of Fowles were not out of the original Palamon, Ten Brink judged; for they fitted too perfectly in their present place, whereas other passages from Palamon, such as the inserted stanzas toward the end of Troilus, show the join only too plainly. The original Palamon, then, must have treated the temple of Venus with the freedom we remark in the Knight's Tale (ll. 1060-1108). Anesida and Arcite, which contains several

1 By Palamon or Palamon and Arcite I designate always the supposed early version in seven-line stanzas. I permit myself also the anachronism of speaking of the Knight's Tale long before the poem thus entitled bore that name. To say 'the story later known as the Knight's Tale' would be too clumsy.

2 To set the evidence once for all before the reader, I quote entire from the Oxford Chaucer, vol. iii. p. 306; the note on Legende, l. 420.—The Palamon and Arcite here referred to was no doubt a translation of Boccaccio's Teseide, or of selections from it, in seven-line stanzas. Though not preserved to us in its entirety, several fragments of it remain. These are to be found (1) in sixteen stanzas of the Parliament of Fowles (ll. 183-204), translated from the Teseide, bk. vii., st. 51-66; (2) in part of the first ten stanzas of Anesida, from the same, bk. i., st. 1-9, and bk. ii., st. 10-12; (3) in three stanzas near the end of Troilus (viz. st. 7, 8, and 9 from the end, bk. v., ll. 1807-1827), from the same, bk. xi., st. 1-3; and (4) in a rewritten form, in what is now known as the Knight's Tale.
stanzas from *Palamon*, is one of Chaucer's latest works, a work left unfinished at his death. Finally, *Palamon* must be the first considerable poem written after the Italian journey of 1372–1373.

It will lead to clearness and justness of appreciation to remind ourselves that this theory of Ten Brink's was never anything more than an ingenious working hypothesis. Given the problem—the existence of a story of Palamon and Arcite before the *Canterbury Tales*, and the presence of scattered translations, in stanzas, from the *Teseide*—here was a very pretty solution. It should be added that Ten Brink failed to show from the *Knight's Tale* itself any clearly marked traces of heroic condensation from a much longer version. Such reduction in length should surely betray itself somewhere. So thought the great German scholar who supplemented from internal evidence the researches of Ten Brink.

Koch in his study first printed in *Englische Studien*, bd. i. bl. 249–293, reprinted in *Essays on Chaucer*, pp. 358–415, modified the results of Ten Brink as follows: first, he reclaimed for *Palamon* the sixteen stanzas which, in the *Parlement*, describe the temple of Venus. Next he endeavoured to show that certain blunders and inconsistencies in the *Knight's Tale* were due to the negligent rewriting of

---

1 A view he later abandoned. 'Even before he had finished the *Knight's Tale*, he had probably begun the poem of *Aelyda and Arcyte* (Hist. of Eng. Lit., vol. ii. p. 186).

2 Wherein, however, the circle appears only too plainly: Certain scattered translations from the *Teseide* may indicate a *Palamon* in stanzas. The handling of these fragments proves what this *Palamon* in stanzas must have been. Here is the argument in brief.

3 Those cited by him (l.c., p. 370 l.) are of a sort common in Chaucer's works—common in all poetry, one might say. They are furthermore errors more likely to have arisen from condensing a foreign original, than from revising one of Chaucer's own poems. A better example would have been *Knight's Tale*, ll. 4057 ff, which in the *Teseide* describe a grove. In Chaucer they must apply by error or negligence to the 'fr-makyne.' See the note on this line in my edition of the *Prologue*, &c., Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston.
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_Palamon_. In this important part of his argument he made much of the fact that the Knight uses an unwarranted 'I saw' (Essays on Chaucer, p. 371) in the description of the temples of Mars and of Diana. "As this 'I saw,' so inconsistent with the present character of the tale, is still to be met with in the recast of the poem, we must suppose that it was before, originally, in the first version" (I. c., p. 375).

But is this 'I saw,' so inconsistent with the tale? What should the Knight have said? Clearly he could not use the 'she saw' (she being the personified prayer of Arcite) of his original, for he had rejected the personification of the prayers; while it would be awkward to create a person merely to see the temples for the Canterbury Pilgrims. The form 'maystow se' used for the temple of Venus A. 1918, 1947 (a form by the way equally 'inconsistent with the tale,' though escaping Koch's vigilance), would not be tolerable through a long description. Chaucer had also pretty well exhausted historical 'was's' and 'werto' in the description of the temple of Mars (A. 1975-1994) before he changed over to the 'Ther saugh I' of line 1995.

After all, the passing over from historical narration to the first person, for the sake of vividness, is the commonest rhetorical device. It is only surprising that a scholar of Koch's acumen should have hung an argument on so insignificant a fact. There is, besides, a much simpler explanation of the whole matter, which _pietas causa_ I would fain withhold. Is it not possible that Chaucer simply confused the third with the first person of the Italian preterite? A man with small Italian, and Chaucer surely was that, might well translate _vidit_, 'I saw' and _semissi_, 'I heard.' A certain class in Italian, which I know to be better instructed, relapses occasionally into precisely this error.

So far as demonstration of the existence of a _Palamon_ in Shakespeare was concerned, the article of Koch was nugatory;
but the attaching of the *Parlement of Foules*¹ to the marriage of Richard II was a substantial gain to Chaucer chronology, while the discussion of the *Teseide* stanzas in *Troilus* and the placing of *Anelida* before 1386 removed the chief difficulties of Ten Brink’s hypothesis.

In the meantime Professor Skeat, working in ignorance of the *Studien*², had arrived at the general results of Ten Brink, avoiding however the infelicity of making *Anelida* later than *Palamon*. This theory first summarily stated in *The Prioress’s Tale*, Oxford, 1874 (see 3rd ed., 1880, pp. xvi-xx), was first adequately explained in Professor Skeat’s Postscript of 1888 to Morris’s edition of the *Prologue* (see ed. 1895, pp. lii-liii). Long before this time the hypothesis had found general acceptance among scholars; and when in the Oxford *Chaucer* (vol. i. p. 529; vol. iii. p. 306, note to l. 420, and ibid., pp. 389-390) the editor passes from the potential mood of his earlier studies to the indicative, he only expresses by the change the attitude of his colleagues generally.

It is strange indeed that so vulnerable a theory has lacked the attentions of the devil’s advocate. The editor of the *Globe Chaucer* first appears in the rôle of the *geist der stets verneint*, in which part I propose to follow him. Let

¹ Koch chooses St. Valentine’s Day, 1381, as the date. But at that time the results of the negotiations for the match were uncertain. It seems to me that this occasional poem would not have been written until its occasion was perfectly assured. It seems likely too that Chaucer would not have presented it till the ‘Formel Eagle’ (the queen) could share the compliment with the ‘Royal Eagle.’ Shortly before Christmas, 1381, the princess Anne of Bohemia arrived; and Parliament adjourned till after Christmas and the wedding (see *Chronicon Angliae*, 1386-1388, Rolls Series, p. 381). The royal wedding was solemnized Jan. 14, 1382 (*Essays on Chaucer*, p. 409, Dr. Furnivall’s note). The *Parlement* must have been written before the wedding; and the coming of Richard II’s affianced bride to England in December, 1381, would have afforded to Chaucer the best possible occasion of presenting an apologue gracefully retrospective of his master’s courtship. There is nothing upon St. Valentine’s Day, which is only the fictitious time of the poem, a season prescribed by the *Parlement* being at once a love poem and a bird poem.

me quote at length Mr. A. W. Pollard's criticism of the Ten Brink-Skeat hypothesis: "Ingenious as this theory is, the supposition of the writing and suppression of a poem necessarily of considerable length, is no light matter, and if Chaucer really wrote such a poem and subsequently used fragments of it in other works, it is extraordinary that he should have called attention to a tale thus cruelly treated by an entirely gratuitous reference in the Legende. As for the fragments of the Teseide found in the seven-line poems, there is a parallel instance of the nearly simultaneous use of the same material in two different metres, in the story Dido and Aeneas, which we find first in the octosyllabic couplets of the House of Fame, and again in the decasyllabic couplets of the Legende of Good Women. On the whole, and with all due deference to the great authority of the scholars who have held the opposite view, it seems best to regard the theory of a lost seven-line version of Palamon and Arcite as a needless hypothesis. If this be so, the reference in the Legende must be almost certainly to the Knight's Tale, and this fine poem is thus brought back nearer to the period of the Troilus, with which it is so clearly allied in style and temper." (Globe Chaucer, pp. xxvi–xxvii). Here are the chief difficulties of Ten Brink's theory fairly stated; and if the scope of the Globe Chaucer had permitted Mr. Pollard to develop fully the grounds of his opinion this article would be quite superfluous. As it is, I have only to follow the lines broadly laid down in the passage just quoted.

Certain of these objections Ten Brink had already anticipated. He had explained the suppression of Palamon by assuming it to be voluntary on Chaucer's part. But this is asking us to believe too much. It is doubtful if Chaucer ever was capable of self-criticism so heroic. Condense and rewrite a work—passe encore; but to dismember

1 Though not definitely expressed in the Studien, this is certainly implied in the theory of the gradual diisemberment of Palamon.
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a great epic gradually, and finally, after the lapse of years, to rewrite what happens to remain—this lacks inherent probability. Besides, is it any way likely that Chaucer could have suppressed Palamon? Imagine with Ten Brink (Hist. of Eng. Lit., vol. ii. p. 68) Palamon and Arcite 'as a kind of middle point between the Teseide and the Knight's Tale,' then set beside it the literature that Chaucer's London read; remember the 'Moral Gower' with his scores of manuscripts, ponder on the romances burlesqued in Sir Thopas, and you will feel that nothing of the quality of this assumed Palamon could have been recalled when once committed to that public.

Nor does it follow from the fact that scraps of the Teseide are found in the seven-line poems that the whole poem once existed in this metre. It was I believe Professor Hempl—or was it Professor Kittredge?—who speaking of the Boethius passages in Troilus, said to me, 'Why not a proto-Boethius, too, in seven-line stanzas?'

The following graver difficulty has, I believe, passed unnoticed: the poem of Anelida and Arcite stops just where, on the supposition of an earlier Palamon, it would have been most easy to keep on. It stops abruptly with the promise of a description of the temple of Mars, a description which, according to the theory, lay ready in Palamon. It is strange that Anelida should end where it required only a little copying to carry the story scores of lines further. It is most unlikely that Chaucer would have brought the poem deliberately up to a descriptive passage which he meant to save for the Knight's Tale. Assuming the position which Ten Brink himself later relinquished, namely that Anelida is one of the latest poems, we have again the difficulty that Chaucer had translated so closely the description at issue in the Knight's Tale that a return to the subject was difficult, if not impossible. The inference lies near that Anelida was
dropped voluntarily because Chaucer had found a better use for the rich material of the *Teseide*. This point will occupy us later.

So far I have tried to show not only that the hypothesis of a *Palamon* in stanzas is unnecessary, but also that it involves grave improbabilities. I am now in decency bound to account for these perplexing translations from the *Teseide*, by offering a solution of the problem at least no worse than that I have been fain to oppose. In the presentation of personal opinions we are in danger of mistaking our own self-confidence for demonstration; and I wish once for all to remind myself that the solution here offered is one of inference only: to be judged as such. It will surrender unconditionally to a better interpretation of the facts. But enough and too much of personal explanation.

Now wol I torne agayn to my matere.

Let us assume first of all—and the burden of proof lies with any other assumption—that the *Palamon* and *Arise* mentioned in the *Legende of Good Women* (1385) is to all intents and purposes the *Knight’s Tale* as we have it. The question immediately arises. Where are we to date it? Somewhere near *Troilus* it must surely go, for the two poems agree notably in thought and in expression. For the proof of this generally recognized relation the reader need only consult Professor Skeat’s collection of parallel passages see the *Oxford Eng. Poets*, vol. iii. p. 354). We shall find in *Troilus* itself reasons for placing the *Knight’s Tale* after rather than before that poem. As first issued.

Admitting of course that slight changes may have been made in adapting it to the *Knight*, these are small in this case. In fact the whole paragraph which appears to have been interpolated at this time. Possibly the broken line at the end of the poem was also written for the *Knight*. But something of the sort there must have been in the original draft. Other changes, in the nature of the case, aside detection, though we might suspect that a couplet has been jumped inadvertently, in copying, between lines 3 and 4.
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Troilus lacked certain passages from Boethius, and, what is more important, the three stanzas from the Teseide describing the apotheosis of the hero. The absence of these passages from many manuscripts proves the point abundantly. Now if Chaucer on finishing Troilus were free to use these three stanzas, that is if he had already rejected them in the Knight's Tale, it is hard to see why they should not have appeared from the first in Troilus. Nor is it likely that at a subsequent season Chaucer should have rummaged in the unused portions of the Teseide to enrich Troilus, the Parlement of Foules, and Anelida and Arcite. Such a process suggests unpleasantly literary "cold-storage"; it is, I believe, most unlike Chaucer. For this and other reasons no scholar has placed the Knight's Tale before Troilus.

Now suppose the Knight's Tale to have followed Troilus closely, and the relation of the poems becomes a reasonable one. The three stanzas describing, in the Teseide, the apotheosis of Arcite would have come under the poet's eye while he was still discontented with the homiletic and quite conventional ending of his greatest work. It is natural that he should have slipped these three stanzas into Troilus, slightly adapting them thereto; while it is quite consonant with his literary habits that he should have left the slight necessary rewriting of the conclusion of that poem to a more convenient season, which never came.

We have established a probability that the Knight's Tale followed Troilus. Fortunately Professor Skeat comes to

---

1 Book v, ll. 1807-1827 (from the Teseide) are lacking in MSS. Harl. 3943, Harl. 2392, and are inserted later in the Phillipps MS.

Of the passages from Boethius, bk. iii, ll. 1744-1771 are omitted in Harl. 3943, and inserted later in Phillipps; bk. iv, ll. 953-1085 are omitted in MSS. Harl. 1239, Harl. 2392, Cambr. Gg. 4, 27 (except ll. 1079-95), and inserted later in Phillipps. I depend in this note on Professor McCormick's collations in the Globe Chaucer.

2 Of course the two poems may have been in hand at once, assuming always that Troilus was begun and ended earlier. In this case Anelida
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aid at this point with an exact date. The study of the references of the Knight's Tale convinced Professor Skeat that Chaucer had worked out its fictitious time to suit the calendar of a definite year. This year he very reasonably assumed to be that of the writing of the poem; and he found that the time references actually fitted the years 1370, 1381, 1387, 1398. The extreme dates are clearly out of the question; 1387, too, seems very doubtful, for this assumes that Chaucer went to the pains of working out a chronology while revising a poem which presumably already had its own; 1381 fills every condition.

Imagine that the Knight's Tale was planned and written, as we have it, in the year 1381. This would have left Chaucer free to use elsewhere material from the Teseide not reserved for his romance. It appears certain that two of the poems which received material from the Teseide were Troilus gained the stanzas which had originally described the apotheosis of Arcite; and the Parlement of Foules gained the temple of Venus, of which description a very free rendering had sufficed for the Knight's Tale. Probably the long passages from Boethius were thrust upon Troilus at the same time that similar passages were worked into the Knight's Tale. Thus the whole preoccupation with the Teseide would have extended over only a year or so, and certainly this supposition is better than that of its gradual dismemberment.

must also be contemporaneous with Troilus, for it is the necessary middle stage between that poem and the Knight's Tale.

1 A Temporary Preface, Chaucer Society, pp. 103 ff. Unfortunately Professor Skeat, accepting perhaps the over-severe criticism of Ten Brink (Studien, p. 186, note 75), has reproduced this note only in incomplete form in his editions (The Prol., Clarendon Press, note to Knight's Tale, I, 999; Oxford Chaucer, vol. v. A. 1890).

2 This use of passages from the Teseide follows necessarily the completion of the plan of the Knight's Tale, the actual writing of which may have run beyond the Parlement of Foules into 1382.

3 Particularly Knight's Tale, II, 2139-2158.
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But I have left the Teseide stanzas in Anelida and Arcite out of the count. Clearly that poem must have been begun before the Knight's Tale; for Chaucer would not have duplicated so exactly the setting of two works, had he intended both for publication. It has not been observed, I think, that the plots of Troilus and Anelida are identical, only the main rôles being reversed. Troilus is the story of a woman's perfidy, Anelida of a man's. This suggests that Chaucer having completed Troilus began Anelida as a pendant to it. The plot of the poem was to be of his own invention (or he may have had a source unknown to us), the setting was to be that of the Teseide. The poem remained unfinished, possibly from flagging invention, more probably because the poet had conceived a better plan for the rich material he was wasting on a work of little promise. The voluntary suppression of a poem like the fragment of Anelida offers no difficulty; the withdrawal of a work like the supposed Palamon offers many. This suppression of Anelida would account for its absence from the lists in the Legende and in the 'Retracciouns' of the Canterbury Tales.

There is perhaps one serious difficulty in the supposition that Palamon and the Knight's Tale are one and the same thing. That is the metre of the latter. Professor Skeat in his edition of the Prioress's Tale laid down the principle that poems in stanzas are early, poems in couplets late. The heroic couplet, he believed, first appears in the Legende. The general truth of this dictum is too obvious to require comment. But is there not great risk in thus delimiting the periods of a great poet's growth in technic, when external evidence fails? A man who wrote octosyllabic couplets, and decasyllables in stanzas, was likely at any time to use

---

1 This is nearly the view of Professor Cowell in Essays on Chaucer, p. 630: 'The Poem of "Queen Anelyda and the false Arcyte"... is evidently an early attempt of Chaucer's, which was laid aside; and the plan of the poem was ultimately changed for the story of Palamon and Arcite.'
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the old time arrangement with the new line. Furthermore, Chaucer presumably knew Machault's completes, which Professor SiouxF. supposes he imitated, as early as the Ball of His Racket. There is, however, a possible indication that the metre was first used in the Legend of the Peacocks, in the line

1 P. 53: where the god of Love says to the poet—

'Make the metres of them as thee please.'

I say a possible indication; for while the line is clearly an implied apology for an unfamiliar metre, it does not at all follow that metre was first used for the first time. The Knight's Tale, lacking a prologue, afforded no opportunity for a similar explanation.

Other difficulties may well be in store for a man with a new theory. No others at present occur to me.

Let me in conclusion recapitulate the results arrived at in this paper, warning the reader to supply the potential mood when necessary. After writing Troilus, Chaucer began Aesop as a pendant, or rather offset, to the greater poem. Relinquishing this plan in favour of the poem later known as the Knight's Tale, much of the descriptive material of the Teseide was left for other uses: and, as he worked over Boccaccio's epic, he used parts of it as occasion offered.

1 Mental variants should be collected for all of Chaucer's poems in the heroic couplet. It is possible that results as valuable as those obtained from the analytical study of Shakespeare's blank verse might be reached. Such an investigation would at least throw light on Chaucer's technique; at best, it might help establish the chronology of the Canterbury Tales. Who of our young 'doctors' many of them are less profitably employed, will undertake the task?

2 It might be urged, for instance, that Chaucer, after amplifying greatly Il Filostrato, would hardly have turned about within the year and cut down the Teseide by four-fifths. But the inconsistency is only apparent. In each case he is emphasizing the inherent character of his original, Il Filostrato was already in posse a psychological romance, in Chaucer's hands it receives that definite character. The Teseide was a romance of incident disguised as an epic; with Chaucer it reasserts its essential character as pure romance. The difference in treatment in the two cases is required by the difference in subject; and the artistic point of view, when rightly apprehended, is identical in the two widely different poems.

3 Not so new after all, for it must be nearly that of Mr. A. W. Pollard.
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inserting three stanzas into Troilus and sixteen into the Parlement of Foules. The whole rehandling of the Teseide would fall within the year 1381, including perhaps the early months of 1382.

If this view is just, literary criticism must rewrite the chapter of Chaucer’s development which bears the heading ‘Italian Period’; for the acceptance of this theory means the crowding of all the poet’s greatest work into some dozen marvellous years. In the introduction of a class-book, the Prologue, &c., recently published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston, I have attempted this readjustment of appreciation, without completely stating the grounds of my belief. If now I have made it probable that the Palamon of the Legende and the Knight’s Tale are identical, I shall have redeemed, measurably, that indiscretion.

FRANK JEWETT MATHER, JR.

WILLIAMSTOWN, MASS., U.S.A.
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THE WORD 'VENDUE.'

ALLUDING to the example of double entendre, Dr. Fennell
that it was 'an instance of the survival in a foreign land of a phrase
which has died out in its native country.' Another example of a similar survival is fur-
nished by the word vendue. An old French term, in common use from the thirteenth to the seventeenth centuries, it is now found in France as a dialect word. In 1611 it was recognized, but put as obsolete or provincial.

Curiously enough, just as the word was passing out of general vogue in France, it was coming into use in the English colonies in America. With 'auction,' 'outcry,' and 'sale' already in the language, it would seem as if the American colonists had no need of a fourth term to express:

2 Vendue, qui se prononce souvent vendus, est encore usuel dans la Normandie, dans la Flandre, dans le Tournais, dans le Montois (F. Godfroy, Dictionnaire de l'Ancienne Langue Francaise, 1895, viii. 169). Godfroy cites examples ranging from 1639 to 1612. Godfroy's is apparently the only French dictionary to recognize the word.
3 R. Cotgrave, A Dictionary of the English and French Tongues, 1611. It is also found in the 1624 and 1650 editions of Cotgrave.
the same thing. Yet the case was otherwise; and the history of vendue during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in what are now the United States, is shown by the extracts which follow.

"There hath been an address from Captain Cantwell in the name of his son, resigning all the right, title and interest his son might have to the estate of William Tom deceased by virtue of his will, and desiring it may be sold at a public vendue for the payment of his just debts."

"The common council... resolved to dispose off and sell some lotts of grounde upon ye Plain... which said lotts of grounde ye common council will dispose of at a publicke vendu or out cry in ye city hall on Wednesday ye first day of December."

"Mr. Van Dam Reported from ye Comittee to whom was Comitted the Bill Entituled, An Act to Regulate the Sale of Goods by Publick outcry, Auction or Vendue in ye City of New York they have gone Through ye Said Bill & made some Amendments."

"Be it therefore enacted... That... all and singular the goods and merchandizes, negroes and effects whatsoever, which shall be brought into the Province... and which person or persons, merchants or others, have a mind should be put up and exposed to sale at publick out-cry, shall first be viewed and seen by the person herein after appointed public vendue master..."

"Be it Enacted... That... such Vendue Master so Elected and Engaged as aforesaid, shall sell all Goods of private Persons, put up at any Vendue or publick Outcry..."

"There was also read a Petition of the Shop Keepers and others, Inhabitants of the City of Philadelphia, setting forth the Loss they sustain through the practice of the present Master of the Vendue, in selling and retailing at public Vendue Shop Goods to the value of one Shilling and under..."
The committee on the petition of Francis Williams were authorized to make an investigation on the subject. The committee reported that the petition was valid and that the petitioners were entitled to the benefits requested.

Resolved, That the committee on the petition of Francis Williams be authorized to make an investigation on the subject. The committee reported that the petition was valid and that the petitioners were entitled to the benefits requested.

The committee on the petition of Francis Williams were authorized to make an investigation on the subject. The committee reported that the petition was valid and that the petitioners were entitled to the benefits requested.

Resolved, That the committee on the petition of Francis Williams be authorized to make an investigation on the subject. The committee reported that the petition was valid and that the petitioners were entitled to the benefits requested.

The committee on the petition of Francis Williams were authorized to make an investigation on the subject. The committee reported that the petition was valid and that the petitioners were entitled to the benefits requested.

Resolved, That the committee on the petition of Francis Williams be authorized to make an investigation on the subject. The committee reported that the petition was valid and that the petitioners were entitled to the benefits requested.
THE WORD 'VENDUE.'

raised or manufactured within the same (except slaves, ...) shall be exposed to sale at publick vendue, under penalty on each person selling or buying at such vendue, for each article so sold, of double the value thereof. 1

' We perceive by your minutes sent to us, that you are of opinion that the vendue laws are expired, and we find it is probable a new law will be passed this session, and Auctioneers nominated therein.'

'Voted that when said Pews are built They shall be disposed of at Public Vendue, at a legal Town Meeting called for That purpose.'

'The meeting ... then met and Vandued to Mathew Clark the Collection of the Bills taken out of Abraham Livermore hands if Clark provide sufficient bondsman.'

'2v voted that Ephraim Smiths and family be Supported by Putting out to the lowest Bidder by the week ... the second article taken in hand the vendue opned. Proceeded as follows Jonas Smith Bid of by Mr. Joseph Phelps for 1/9 p's week Board & Lodge.'

'Voted, to appoint a person as Vendue-master to vendue the materials.'

It is thus seen that, used attributively, in combination and as a verb, vendue was long a household word from New Hampshire to Georgia. If we inquire how it came to be introduced into America, we at once meet with difficulties; but four explanations suggest themselves. First, like so many other words and phrases, the term may have been current in England and have been brought thence to America. Some countenance is given this notion by a quotation from Smollett, often thought to indicate English usage. While it is true that the word occurs in

1 1777, Virginia Statutes at Large, 1821, ix. 384.
2 1783, Pennsylvania Colonial Records, 1833, xiii. 761.
3 This spelling indicates the usual pronunciation of the word in New England.
4 1783, Worcester Town Records, 1882, p. 432. (Collections of the Worcester Society of Antiquaries, iv.)
6 1786, Old Records of the Town of Fitchburg, 1898, p. 332.
7 1790, in E. Hyde's History of the Town of Winchendon, 1849, p. 113.
8 At present, while still in use in country districts, the word no longer enjoys the vogue that it formerly did.
9 Cited by T. L. O. Davies in his Supplementary English Glossary, 1881, p. 706; and thence in recent dictionaries.
the first edition of *Roderick Random* \(^1\), yet the hero of that novel was at the time in Jamaica, and it was no doubt introduced as a bit of local colour \(^2\); moreover, Smollett soon withdrew it, presumably because it was not understood in England, and substituted ‘sale’ in its place \(^3\). His employment of the term, therefore, cannot be taken as proof of English usage. The presence of the word in English dictionaries is due to American usage \(^4\). Finally, Dr. Murray informs me that there is no evidence in his possession to show that the word was ever employed in England. Hence the idea that it came to America from Great Britain must be abandoned.

Secondly, *vendue* may have been brought to Canada by the French, and so have found its way into the English-speaking colonies of America. Evidence is lacking that the word was used in Canada in the seventeenth century \(^5\); and though it occasionally occurs there in the eighteenth century, it was perhaps introduced from the south \(^6\). In regard to

---

\(^1\) Next day we sailed for Port Royal, where we arrived safely with our prizes; and as there was nothing to do on board, I went ashore, and having purchased a laced waistcoat, with some other cloaths at a vendue, made a swaggering figure for some days, among the taverns. (Vol. i. chap. xxxvi. p. 324.)

\(^2\) Just as, in the same novel, Smollett employs the words *canoë, baro-longo, &c.*

\(^3\) The first (1748) and the third (1750) editions of the novel have ‘vendue’; the fourth edition I have not seen; the fifth (1760) and all subsequent editions have ‘sale.’

\(^4\) This is even the case with J. J. S. Wharton’s *Law Lexicon.* The first (1848) and second (1860) London editions do not contain the word. In 1864 there was published at Philadelphia a ‘second American from the second London Edition, with Additions, by E. Hopper;’ and, naturally, *vendue* is found in it. In the same year a third London edition appeared, and this and all subsequent editions contain the word.

\(^5\) Through Prof. J. D. Butler, of Madison, Wisconsin, and Mr. R. G. Thwaites, editor of the *Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents,* I learn that the readers of that work have not noticed the word. To those gentlemen, also, I am indebted for procuring the letters presently to be quoted.

\(^6\) In 1755, J. Thomas, while in Halifax, wrote that he ‘went to Vandue’ and bought ‘twenty-six French Regimental Coats’ (New England Historical and Genealogical Register, 1879, xxxiii, 397). Thomas was a native of Massachusetts; and there were many New Englanders in Nova Scotia at
present usage, there is some uncertainty. Sir John G. Bourinot writes from Ottawa that 'we never have the word in English Canada—not even in the maritime provinces where we had certainly more connexion with French Canada than New England.' Mr. Douglass Brymner writes, also from Ottawa, that he 'cannot find that the term vendue has existed in Western Canada; but among the French population here, vendue is still used, at least among the older people.' Mr. Crawford Lindsay writes from Quebec that a volume 'giving a list of appointments in Lower Canada from 1791 to the Union, contains an appointment to the position of vendue master in Montreal.' It seems incredible, so few are the traces now to be found of vendue in Canada, that it could have been widely current there in the seventeenth century—as must have been the case, if the word was thence carried into the present United States¹.

Thirdly, Sir John G. Bourinot suggests that vendue was brought to the English colonies by the Huguenot immigrants from France. There were probably but few Huguenots in America before the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, at which time, as we have seen, the word was already established in New York.

Fourthly, vendue may have been carried by the French to the West Indies, and thence introduced into the continent of America. It is found in Barbados in 1753 ², and the passage from Smollett may be accepted as evidence that

that time. Once, under date of 1756, vendue occurs in the Nova Scotia Archives, 1869, p. 292; but it appears in a bill presented by a New York firm for deporting the Acadians.

¹ It may be added that S. Clapin evidently does not regard the word as of Canadian origin. He says: 'Vendue, s.f., vieux mot français passé dans la langue anglo-américaine, et désignant dans l'ouest des États-Unis une vente quelquefois aux enchères publiques. Ce mot est encore usité aujourd'hui, en ce sens, en Normandie.' (Dictionnaire Canadien-Français, 1894, p. 330.)

² In the Barbados Gazette for May 30, 1753, No. 1052, certain goods were advertised to be sold 'At Publick Vendue.'
force us to the conclusion, however, the American origin of-nameless cann...
XXXV.

COLOUR IN THE ENGLISH AND SCOTTISH BALLADS.

I.

The English and Scottish ballads form the largest body of native poetry, exhibiting a national character, that we possess. The ballads, taken as a whole, are of very unequal merit, and they are, of course, the product of widely separated ages. Yet, taken in the mass, they present a remarkable number of common characteristics. This is also, of other ballads than those of England or Scotland. The ballad style tends to become conventional and stereotyped, and its form too often persists where its inner and spirit are lost.

No single element, apart from mere metrical form, is more persistent in the ballads than that of colour. This in the ballads, to a greater degree, perhaps, than in any other English poetry, an essential, vital part of the structure.

The ballads are often preserved in from five to ten versions differing widely in detail. Yet the colour-words very frequently maintain their place when other elements are either irreducibly lost or greatly changed. The colour-words may

This paper is based upon an investigation of the ballads contained in Id's great collection of English and Scottish Popular Ballads, Boston, 2-1898.
not be identical throughout the several versions, some other colour being easily substituted. What is important to note, however, is that the colour makes a sufficient impression to secure its continued preservation. Quite possibly some of the colour-words used in particular cases have been substituted for others within a comparatively recent period. All the more remarkable, therefore, is the continuity observable in the traditional colouring.

The narrow limits allotted to this paper preclude the treatment of the topic with the use of full illustrative material, and compel the concentration of attention upon a few definite questions. We have, then, to inquire: What colour-words are used? What is their colour-value? Are they used literally, symbolically, conventionally? In what ways are the colour-words emphasized?

II.

Comparison of the colour-words of the ballads with those of Old English poetry\(^1\) brings out some striking differences.

1. Of the words for white used in Old English poetry only \textit{hwit} remains, \textit{blāc} and \textit{blanc} being lost. Moreover, the suggestion of brightness or light so common in this group of words in Old English poetry\(^2\) has wellnigh vanished from the ballads. But other new words for white, such as \textit{milk-white}, \textit{snow-white}, \&c., more than make good any losses.

2. The group of Old English words for black\(^3\) included \textit{blæc}, \textit{sweart}, \textit{sweartian}, (\textit{ge})\textit{sweorcian}, \textit{gesweor}, \textit{wan(n)}, \textit{salowigpād}, \textit{earp}. None of these appear in the ballads except \textit{blæc} and \textit{wan(n)}; and \textit{wan} is largely become a synonym for pale. On the other hand the

---

\(^{1}\) I must beg to refer the reader to my paper on 'Color in Old English Poetry,' printed in the \textit{Publications of the Modern Language Assoc. of America}, vol. xiv. No. 2, pp. 169-206.

\(^{2}\) Ibid., pp. 176-181.

\(^{3}\) Ibid., pp. 181-189.
ballads have added coal-black, jet-black, and several comparisons, 'black as a sloe,' 'black as a raven,' &c.

3. Gray is one of the favourite Old English colours, and is expressed by græg, flōd-græg, flint-græg, hār, hasu, blōden-feax, gamol-feax. Of these, none are found in the ballads except græg and hār, the latter, however, being very rare. The ballads add apple-gray, dapple-gray, gray-haired, gray-headed, penny-gray.

4. Brown is expressed by Old English brūn, brūn-ecg, brūnfāg, brūnwān, sealbrūn. Of these, only brūn is retained in the ballads, but berry-brown, nut-brown, penny-brown, russet, dun, are added. Especially interesting is the retention of brown as an epithet for the sword, as in Old English poetry.

5. Red had a somewhat restricted use in Old English poetry, not being found in any of the heroic poems or in the lyrics. Four examples occur in the Riddles and sixteen other examples in the religious pieces. On the other hand, red is used in the ballads with extraordinary frequency, the red group including such words as blood-red, bloody, coral, rosy, ruby, ruddy, purple, crimson, scarlet, and possibly bay.

6. Yellow is represented in Old English poetry by geolo (four examples), fealo (seventeen examples), and by gold and its compounds. In the ballads yellow, fallow, gold, golden, gilden, and saffron appear.

7. Blue occurs only once in Old English poetry, but it is found in at least eighteen different ballads, although even in them it is used less than any other principal colour.

8. Green is, perhaps, the favourite colour in Old English poetry, although the examples are almost wholly confined to the religious poems, none being found in Beowulf or in any of the other heroic poems. The ballads are very

---

No. 2, pp. 189-193.
2 Ibid., pp. 193-195.
3 Ibid., pp. 197-199.
4 Ibid., pp. 195-197.
5 Ibid., pp. 200-203.
Color symbolism in Old English poetry plays a significant role in the ballads. This symbolism is indicated by the objects to which they are applied: fire, water, and earth. Connotations may be considered in terms of the predominant colors. For instance, the gold connoted a gleam or radiance or yellow to be understood when these words are used without a determining object like grass, or hand, or something of the sort, is an indication in the melody of a modern English practice.

As connected with the English poetry the ballads are unmistakably free from word-conventionality. Old English poetry contained words denoting brightness or light in signify something joyous and blinding; words denoting blackness and darkness to signify something fearful and terrible. Black is meant in the ballads to indicate mourning; brown and grey gray and green are called chances, that is, unmentioned or unmentioned: white and weather, red and gold, are indications of beauty. But the color is in most of these cases used literally enough; and the added symbolic meaning comes to the mind only when one starts to think.

On the other hand, conventionality plays a very large part in the use of color throughout the ballads. White especially with white, black, and brown, red, yellow, and green are constantly used as mere epithets. This conventionality appears in the frequent recurrence of the same objects with certain colors. Details belong to the discussion of the separate stories but I note in passing the constant mention of red gold, of yellow hair, of wan water, of white money, of white hands, of milk-white steeds, of green grass, green leaves, of black steeds, of brown steeds.

One characteristic of the ballads deserves special mention
when compared with Old English poetry—the emphasizing the colour-words. This is brought about by repetition, as in 'the red, red blood'; 'saddle to me the black, the black': by comparisons, as in 'skin as white as Lilly-flower'; 'wounds washen as white as a linen clout': by the use of compounds, both elements of which suggest the colour, as in blood-red, milk-white, grass-green. These devices are wellnigh non-existent in Old English poetry, repetition and comparisons being altogether lacking, and the compounds being restricted to a few words like blöðfug, göldfug, heofonbeorht, &c.

III.

We are now prepared to take up very briefly the individual colour-words\(^1\) in the ballads, and to note the objects to which they are applied. It is to be observed what a prominent part clothing and ornaments of various sorts play in the choice of objects to which colour is assigned\(^2\).

1. WHITE. This is a very favourite colour, which is often used with a genuine feeling for the colour-value. It is most frequently, and most conventionally, applied to fingers, to bread, and to money—white money being, of course, silver. The simple adjective white is applied to a coat, to cloth, to velvet, to silk, sarsenet, feathers, hats, to a fan, a scarf, to a swan, a knight, a lily, a hand, a loaf, a breast-bone, a house-bone, flesh, a horse, a palfrey, a steed, a lion, a boar, a swine, a fisher, a fish, a wand, a rose, a sea-maw (mew), stots, &c. The word is often strengthened, as are most of the other colour-words, by the addition of so (sae), as in 'fingers sae white,' a 'towel sae white,' &c.

Comparisons are used to strengthen the impressions, as in

---

\(^1\) Certain colours like orange, indigo, vermilion, violet, are not found at all in the ballads.

\(^2\) None of the lists here given are complete, though I have full lists with exact references.
'sheets as white as snow;’ ‘with her feet as white as sleet,' 'white as milk or the sea-maw;’ ‘cheeks white as any clay,' 'sark whiter than a swan.'

Compounds are freely used. We find 'snow-white sheets,' a 'snow-white boy,' 'snow-white feet,' a 'whey-white face,' and a maiden 'whose breast was like the snaaw.'

Milk-white. This is one of the commonest epithets in the ballads, and is most often used conventionally to describe a steed. About a hundred and fifty examples in the aggregate occur of this conventional usage if all versions are counted. A milk-white hand is mentioned wherever possible. Scattered examples of other objects to which the epithet is applied also occur. Among these are skin, breast, chin, side, foot, stockings, weeds (clothing), lace, horse, calves, swine, geese, hen. Maids have hands like milk; a boy has a skin like the milk. Lily feet, a lily breast-bone, lily-white flesh, lily hands, and especially lily-white hands, abound.

Emphasis, by repetition, is sparingly used, but an instance occurs in 'white, white hand.'

Pale is possibly not to be regarded as a colour, but it is frequently used to express either a lack of colour or a dusky white. It is applied to the face, to the cheek, to velvet, to lips, to a ring, to diamonds. Especially common is the phrase 'pale and wan.' Emphatic repetition occurs in 'her pale, pale lips'; 'pale, pale ghost'; 'pale, pale grew her rosy cheeks.'

Wan has a double meaning. When used in the phrases 'pale and wan,' or 'wan moonlight,' or 'colour waxing wan,' little difference exists between wan and pale. When applied to water (as it is some forty times), to the burn-bank, to the waterside, it doubtless preserves much of the meaning of O. E. wan(%,) dark.

1 Where the epithet is not lily-white but lily, the word may be, as Child suggests, a mere equivalent for O. E. l地中海, lovely.
Silver is very frequently mentioned in the ballads with brilliant effect, the colour indicated being sometimes specifically named as white, but I cannot take space for illustrations. One or two are given incidentally in the account of gold.

2. Gray (grey) is frequently used, but it is so distributed among different objects that it hardly appears to be used conventionally, except, perhaps, when it is applied to a steed. The word is strengthened by the addition of so (sae) in ‘silver so gray,’ ‘gelding so gray,’ ‘over the floods so gray.’ There is a slight touch of symbolism in ‘the dowie (sad) gray.’

The following is a partial list of the objects to which gray (grey) is applied: steed, horse, nag, mare, hawk, hound, dogs, cock, hawk, goshawk, rats, cat, hares, een (eyes), meal, stone, goose-wing, feathers, robes, gown, gravel, mountain, evening, beard, water; ‘gloves of the silver gray,’ ‘dark gray was the fox,’ ‘light grey was the hounds.’

Dapple-gray, which is commonly used as a substantive, is a thoroughly conventional term that occurs in sixteen different ballads. In each case it designates a horse. Apple-gray occurs but once.

Hore (O.E. här) (hoar) occurs in ‘grene wode hore,’ ‘holtes hore,’ but the word has no general use.

3. Brown. This colour is used with considerable frequency, especially as applied to steeds. A very favourite formula occurs in:

O saddle to me the black, the black,
O saddle to me the brown.

Steeds are also often called berry-brown.

As in Old English poetry, swords are described as brown¹, or as light-brown, bright-brown, berry-brown, nut-brown. The group of objects to which brown is applied is comparatively restricted, but it includes brown bread, brown or berry-

¹ For an explanation of this colour when applied to swords, see Child’s glossary to the Ballads, and my ‘Color in Old English Poetry,’ in the volume already cited, pp. 193, 194.
brown ale, a brown bowl, brown clothing, a coat of the linsey-brown, a brown silk gown, robes of brown, brown hemen sheets, brown bents (slopes), brown hills, brown fields, brown rushes, brown locks, brown hair, a nut-brown hawk, nut-brown livery.

The colour is emphasized in the phrases, 'the fields sae brown,' 'hills sae brown,' 'silks sae brown.'

Brown is not a colour symbolic of joy. It is more than once referred to as 'the dowie (sad) brown,' 'the mournfu' brown.' Moreover, brown is not a colour for a maiden to covet. A brown girl, a brown or nut-brown bride is at a decided disadvantage beside her fairer rival.

Among the words for brown is the singular expression 'penny-brown,' as applied to a steed, that is, as brown as a penny. Penny-gray, which also occurs, may mean, as Child suggests, dappled with brown (gray) spots.

Russet is a very rare term in the ballads, but it is used two or three times to describe a coat or gown.

Dun is a colour not very easy to describe. It is used in but few ballads, and is usually applied to deer. In such cases it may mean dull brown, or simply dark. When applied to a horse, a bull, or a feather, it may represent various shades of brown or black, and may mean no more than swarthy or dark.

4. Red is the most brilliant of all the colours, and it is used in the ballads with great freedom. The most conventional employment of the word appears in the very common mention of red gold and red wine. Macaulay, in one of his rhetorical flourishes, observed that in the ballads all the gold is red ¹ and all the ladies are gay. But numerous instances occur in which gold is referred to as yellow. In these examples we may note the traditional, conventional colour, yielding place to the modern conception. Blood

¹ Gold is described as red in Old English poetry and in Middle High German poems. For a possible explanation, see op. cit., p. 195.
naturally takes the epithet red, and so do rosy lips. Less conventional are ‘a cloak patched black, blue, and red’; ‘a coat neither green, yellow, nor red’; a red fan, red silk, red velvet, red swine, red deer, red buck-skin, a ‘red-hot gad of iron,’ a ‘bonnie blue plaidie, wi red and green stripes thro it a’, and various other phrases in which clothing is mentioned.

The word is strengthened by the addition of so (sae); by compounding with words denoting red, as in ‘blood-red lips,’ ‘blood-red wine’; by repetition, as in ‘drops of red, red blood’; ‘ried, ried silk’; ‘red, red rose’; ‘red, red drops of my bonny heart’s blood’; by comparisons, as in ‘a cherry red as blood.’ Some comparisons are very striking:

And aye she dighted her father’s bloody wounds,
That were redder than the wine.—7 B 8.

The red that’s on my true love’s cheek
Is like blood-drops on the snow.—96 E 7.

Varieties of red are ruby, rosy, cherry, ruddy, coral. Ruby is always applied to lips; cherry, with an exception or two, is applied to the cheeks; and rosy may be used with either. Ruddy is used only of the colour of the face or the cheeks. Coral appears once:

And then he kist her coral lips.—75 I 14.

Especially effective is scarlet. This is most commonly used to describe clothing—robes, a cloak, a gown, a mantle, a hood, stockings. We find mention of ‘gold lace and scarlet.’ Sometimes red is joined with scarlet, as in ‘the red scarlet robes,’ ‘his coat was of the red scarlet.’

Purple is found a few times, once used to describe blood, otherwise to describe clothing.

Bloody is used conventionally when referring to wounds, but with genuine colour effect in:

Bloody, bloody were his hawks, and bloody were his hounds. 88 B 17.

Several other striking passages also occur.
COLOUR IN THE ENGLISH

_**Crimson** and _**cramasie** (crimson stuff) occur a few times; cramasie in each case being used to refer to clothing, but crimson being also employed as in the following:

> And there she lay, like the crimson red.—96 D 13.

_Bay_ is rarely used, in each case referring to horses.

Verbs denoting colour are very rare in the ballads. _Blush_ occurs now and then. A more notable example is _rudd_, to redden:

> My life-blood rudds the heather brown.—193 B 34.

5. **Black** is very freely used, especially as an epithet for a horse or steed, and as applied to clothing. As already noted in the discussion of brown, a favourite formula is:

> 0 saddle to me the black, the black.

This occurs in many ballads otherwise quite unlike in character. Most commonly the word is used as a substantive when referring to a horse, though here and there we find black steed, black mare, black nag, black palfrey, bonny black horse, the black, black steed, coal-black steed, jet-black steed, horse raven-black.

Black is naturally often used to describe various articles of dress. Hence we find black clothing, mantles, gowns, breeches, hats, feathers, beads, silk, velvet, mask, black shoon, ‘coal-black shoon,’ ‘robes of black,’ ‘gay black snoods,’ ‘hose of the bonny black.’

Miscellaneous objects that are described as black are—oats, ravens, ditches, water, cow-tails, cow-horns, tin, iron, puddings, a bull’s skin, a dog, hair, eyebrows, ‘seals of black,’ a ‘rolling black eye,’ ‘eyes black as a sloe.’

Black is the colour of mourning, and hence it is referred to as the ‘dowie black,’ ‘the grisly black.’ By an easy transition the symbolic use enters, as in ‘Wi heart as black
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s any stone.' Now and then the colour is lavished without
tint, as in the following passage:

O black was King Henry, and black were his men,
And black was the steed that King Henry rode on,
And black were the ladies, and black were their fans,
And black were the gloves that they wore on their hands,
And black were the ribbands they wore on their heads,
And black were the pages and black were the maids.

170 C 4, 5.

One of the very rare verbs denoting colour appears in:

O he has blaket his bonny face.—252 C 31.

6. BLUE is most commonly used to describe clothing.
   Thus we find a ‘blue plaidie,’ ‘feathers blue,’ a ‘blue
   bonnet,’ a ‘cloak patched black, blew, and red,’ ‘red silk and
   the blue,’ a ‘knight in blue.’ But mention is also made of
   a blue boar, of a ring that grows pale and blue, of a blue
   jilled horn, of a blue corpse, of blue flowers, of blue eyes,
   of veins so blue, of a covering blue. At best, however, blue
   is a rare colour in early English poetry.

7. YELLOW is the most conventional of all the colours
   except milk-white, and it is in the great majority of
   cases used in the phrases yellow hair, yellow locks. Yet
   we find also ‘clad in yellow,’ ‘with the light green and
   the yellow,’ ‘gold so yellow,’ ‘yellow gold stuff,’ ‘when the
   woods grow green and yellow’; ‘when corn grew green
   and yellow’; ‘the blue flowers and the yellow’; ‘yellow-
   footed (footed) was his hound’; ‘yellow, yellow the torches they
   bore in their hands.’

Saffron occurs in only one ballad, in describing skin that
was—

Like a saffron bag.—33 C 7.

Fallow (O. E. fealo) is not very common, but it occurs in
seven ballads, in every case but one in the phrase ‘fallow
deer.’ The exception is ‘fallow doe,’ referring to a young
woman about to become a mother.
Gold, golden, and gilded form a group deserving more extended treatment than I can give. The prevailing effect of gold is of course yellow, though, as already observed, gold is frequently referred to in the ballads as red. Gold is mentioned as the material of objects the most diverse—crowns, combs, girdles, birdcages, rings, masts of shining gold, tassels, shoes of the purest gold, brocade, gloves, fans, buckles, mantles, armour gilded with gold so clear, slippers covered o’er with gold, a chair of gold. Hair is said to be like the threads of gold. Then there are golden girdles, golden rings, golden keys, golden pins, golden chairs, golden bands, golden laces, golden belts, golden helmets, arrows with a golden head. So, too, we find a gilded sheath, a gilded saddle, a blue gilded horn, a sword all of gilt, a steel cap gilded with good red gold, a gilded boat, high-heeled shoes made of gilded leather.

A further illustration or two out of a great number must suffice to indicate the lavishness in the use of precious metals when the ballad-maker was put to no expense in furnishing the material:

Our ship it was a gudely ship,
Its topmast was of gold,
And at every tack of needlework
There hung a silver bell."—58 L 1.

Annie’s steed was silver shod,
And golden graithed behin;
At every teet o her horse mane
A silver bell did ring.

When Annie was in her saddle set,
She glanced like the moon;
There was as much gould abov her brow
Would buy an earidom.—73 F 18, 19.

8. Green. The colour most extraordinary for its frequency in the ballads is green. It occurs in more than half of the entire number. The grass, the meadow, the fields,
clover, rushes, oats, bracken, the forest, the groves, the leaves, the heather, the oak-tree, gravel, turf, sod, gardens receive this obvious descriptive epithet. The greenwood and the greenwood tree (spray) are frequently mentioned when there is probably little real feeling for the colour; but the words have become a part of the ballad machinery, and are used as an easy aid in filling out the line.

Green is a favourite colour for clothing, not only with Robin Hood's merry men, who are commonly clad in Lincoln green, but with men and women of various stations. We meet constantly with references to green clothing in general, to green livery, to robes of green, to men or women 'drest in green,' 'clad in green,' 'drest in apple-green,' 'clothed all in green,' 'clad in glistening green.' More specifically, there is frequent mention of 'mantles green,' of a 'gown of velvet as green as the grass,' of 'green kirtles,' of 'gloves of green,' of 'coats of green silk.' Especially common are green or grass-green sleeves.

A genuine feeling for the colour appears in—

For thro and thro my goodly ship
I see the green-waved sea.—58 C 15.

Robin Hood is once referred to as a green hart, with obvious allusion to his suit of Lincoln green:

Yonder I saw a ryght fayre harte,
His colore is of grene;
Seuen score of dere vpon a herde
Be with hym all bydene.—117 — 185.

Vividness is imparted by comparisons and by compounds:

And out then cam the fair Janet,
As green as onie glass.—39 A 10.

She did swear by stars o licht
And grass-green growing corn.—68 D 21.

And thrice she blaw on a grass-green horn.—35 — 8.
Emphasis is secured by repetition and by the use of so (sae)—‘leaves so green,’ ‘grass so green’:

I'll dance above your green, green grave.—295 B 16.

Green is usually regarded as a colour in harmony with a cheerful temper, but it is a few times referred to as downy (sad).

Green shares the tendency of most of the other colours to become conventional and then to be used as a mere epithet; but a large number of examples seem to indicate a real appreciation of the colour-value.

This rapid sketch affords no adequate indication of the wealth of colour in the ballads, and it needs to be supplemented by full lists with exact references; but it is sufficiently extended to show that the objects to which colour is applied are drawn from a very wide field, and that in spite of conventionality hardening into rigid formula the colour-words are often used with a vigour and picturesque brilliancy not often equalled in modern English poetry.

MIDDLETOWN, CONN.

WILLIAM E. MEAD.
XXXVI.

SHAKESPEARE'S *KING JOHN* AND
THE TROUBLESOME Raigne.

I note two small instances in which Shakespeare, in *King John*, borrows something from the *Troublesome Raigne*, but uses it in another connexion than its original one. Both illustrate his fineness of feeling.

In the old play the Bastard, in his anger at the marriage of Lewis and Blanch, threatens Lewis that he will cause his wife to be unfaithful to him:—

But let the froelicke Frenchman take no scorne
If Philip front him with an English horne,

(Hazlitt's *Shakespeare's Library*, vol. v. p. 249.)

Shakespeare treats the marriage as one in which the audience are to feel a sympathetic interest; and in this connexion the Bastard's threat would be an outrage. But Shakespeare allows the Bastard to utter the same taunt to Austria (ii. i, 292) for whom the audience have no sympathy whatever.

In the old play the Bastard utters a horrible threat to his mother, to treat her as Nero treated Agrippina, unless she will tell him the truth (p. 235). This was too revolting for Shakespeare to keep in this connexion, but he used the same historical illustration for the conduct of the rebel lords towards England (v. 2, 152).

Perhaps I may be allowed to contest a statement made by Mr. Gollancz in his preface to *King John* in the 'Temple Shakespeare': 'Shakespeare for the most part
follows the older play in the treatment of historical in-
but he departs therefrom noticeably in representing him
as a child.' As Mr. Gollancz gives no reason for the seg-
ment which he here makes by implication, viz. that the play
does not represent Arthur as a child, I imagine he may be following Mr. Edward Rose who, in his paper 'Shakespeare as an Adapter' (referred to by Mr. Gollancz) expresses the same view, though somewhat tentatively and solely on the ground of the maturity of Arthur's Kap-
mentation with Hubert (Hazlitt, p. 269). But however inappropriate to a child Arthur's language in this sex may be, we may remember by the way that some sixteenth-
century boys, e.g. Edward VI, were very precocious. I still hold (and I think that any one who reads through the play carefully must agree with me) that it was the author of the Troublesome Raigne, and not Shakespeare, who gained pathos for the rôle of Arthur by representing him (unhistorically) as a child. Arthur throughout the play is in tutelage. Philip of France has taken him 'into his guardian and protection' (p. 225), he is but young and yet vametco to raigne' (p. 248). His mother constantly speaks for him (pp. 240, 248), and it is she who according to Queen Eleanor 'pricks him' to arms, 'so she may bring herself to rule a realm' (p. 226). We have constantly such expressions as 'tell the boy' (p. 226), 'young Arthur' (pp. 230, 238, 247), 'trust me, youngling,' 'the hazard of this youth' (p. 247), 'boy,' 'lovely boy' (p. 252), 'boy' (p. 257) 'the young prince' (p. 259), 'young lord' (p. 271), 'the best' (p. 277), 'so sweete a flower' (p. 288), 'the sweetest youth alive' (p. 279), 'sweet youth' (p. 258), 'the withered flower' (p. 284), 'the lovely Prince' (p. 288). Twice (pp. 245, 255) he is merely 'Lady Con-
stance Sonnet,' e.g.:

We crave my Lord to please the Commons with
The liberty of Lady Constance Sonnet.
that naturally said of a young man asserting claims by right of his father? Finally (p. 295) he is 'that sweet
nguilty childe.' Will Mr. Gollancz still maintain that
akespeare 'departs noticeably' from the older play in representing Arthur as a child?

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, SHEFFIELD.
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THE PHYSICIAN IN CHAUCER

Nowhere is there such a moving and lifelike panorama of the various classes of bygone days as in Chaucer's **Froissart**. More attention has been paid to the figures of other of the pilgrims to Canterbury, but the physician is well worthy of attention. Amongst the pilgrims there are only eight of whom the poet gives a longer account. The thirty-four lines that describe the physician tell us of his dress, his studies, and something of the nature of his treatment. In all these matters, it is unnecessary to add the fourteenth-century doctor is widely different from any medical man of the present day.

Chaucer's language is not difficult to follow. He calls the physician a 'doctour of phisyk.' Thus early had the word doctor, originally **teacher**, gained its modern popular meaning; thus early had 'physic' been narrowed down from the science of nature to the meaning of a remedy for disease. Macbeth's 'throw physic to the dogs' has the sound of a modern wish. In one form of a word Chaucer's use is better than our own. 'Practisour' is surely shapelier than our 'practitioner' with its double termination?

The physician's line of study is the more remarkable in that he lived before the invention of printing. The mass of manuscript that he must have waded through is, however, diminished by the fact that some at least of the authorities left no works behind them for posterity to study. We are not told where the physician was educated.
nor whether he had taken his degree of Doctor in one of the Universities; but we are definitely informed that he ‘knew well’ no fewer than fifteen authors. Nearly half of them were Arabian, five were Greek, two were English, and one was a Scotchman. The large Arabian element is that which most surprises a modern reader, unless he knows his Gibbon and is aware how much of mediaeval learning came from the race of the Arabs and the disciples of Mohammed. The descendants of the men who burnt the library of Alexandria were the preservers of much learning for the after-time, as even the first syllable of the words *algebra*, *alchymy*, and *alembic* may serve to teach.

The order of the fifteen names in Chaucer’s list is mainly historical—first the Greeks, then the Arabs, then the more modern men. Inside these divisions the order is decided by considerations of rhythm or rhyme. Aesculapius heads the list, and the physician would have found some difficulty to know his works, for he left none, if indeed he ever existed. It has been suggested that his name may have been borrowed for some treatise on medicine not now extant, but this is to enter the large and fertile but unsatisfactory field of conjecture. Hippocrates the Great—his name corrupted in the middle ages to Ypocrates, and then used also for the name of a cunningly compounded drink—belongs to the fifth and fourth centuries before Christ. His treatises are the earliest extant upon medicine. Dioscorides, a writer on *materia medica*, chiefly herbs, is the earliest after the Christian era. Galen and Rufus also belonged to the second century, living in the palmy days of the Roman Empire, when the model Emperor Trajan was master of the world. Rufus was of Ephesus, and wrote on the names of the parts of the human body. Galen—spelt in the Middle Ages Galien—was probably the most eminent of all on the list. His works are not studied now, except for the history of medicine, but in
their pages Chaucer's physician had a treasury of knowledge. It may be doubted whether medical science made much advance from the second to the fourteenth century, from Galen to Chaucer's time. It is now its proud boast that during the last fifty years it has made a greater advance than from the beginning of the world to the middle of the nineteenth century.

In the list of the Arabian authorities Chaucer has preserved no order. When Greek learning became pedantry, the torch of medical learning kindled at that of the Greek schools was kept alight at Damascus and Bagdad. John of Damascus represents the one; and Rhazes, a great authority on small-pox, the other. Both belong to the ninth century. Next come three eleventh-century men, Avicenna (born at Bokhara), Haly, and Serapion. Averroes (born in Cordova) is of the twelfth. Haly is Alhazen, a Persian, author of a medical treatise known as the Royal Book, but more famous for his knowledge and discoveries in astronomy, i.e. astrology; but Chaucer's physician recognized a close connexion between star-lore and the healing craft. Indeed several of the six were not specially distinguished as physicians, but as men of wide learning. They were philosophers, with or without the special meaning of alchymist that Chaucer and his contemporaries attach to the word. Avicenna was a commentator upon Aristotle, and Averroes upon Plato and Aristotle. Of the two, Averroes had the greater influence as a philosopher, Avicenna as a writer on medicine. Mediaeval students learnt Greek philosophy through Latin versions of Arabic versions of the originals. Avicenna's book was the Canon of Medicine, a text-book of medical study in the European Universities of the middle ages. No doubt the physician read all these books in Latin: in his time Greek was never studied, much less Arabic.

Serapion is a Greek name, and it was that of a famous
physician living long before the time of Christ, an Alexandrine Greek who wrote against Hippocrates. His works however are not extant, and it is more likely that the reference is to one of two Arab physicians of the name, who very likely assumed it because of its ancient renown; but they belonged to the eleventh century. Constantyn is Constantius Afer, a native of Carthage, and probably of Arab origin, but a Christian monk, who left Carthage and became one of the founders of the famous medical school at Salerno in Italy. Salerno may be said to have owed its greatness to the fact that the Saracens brought Arab medical learning across the Mediterraneain. In the Merchant's Tale Chaucer quotes from a work by Constantius on a strictly medical subject, calling him 'the cursed monk dan Constantyn.'

The three last mentioned by Chaucer lived nearer to his own time. Gilbertyn is Gilbertus Anglicus, Gilbert the Englishman, who wrote his Compendium Medicinae at some time after the middle of the thirteenth century. Bernard Gordon was a Scot, who became Professor of Medicine at Montpellier, fully a century and a half before Rabelais took his thirst for learning and his love of fun to that renowned medical school. John of Gaddesden, of Merton College, Oxford, belongs to the generation just before Chaucer's, dying in 1361. He is usually described as Court Physician in the reign of Edward the Second. He certainly had a large London practice, and once treated the king's brother for small-pox. If the anti-vaccination folk win the day, small-pox may again be prevalent, so Gaddesden's treatment should be noted. He wrapped the royal patient 'in scarlet cloth, in a bed and room with scarlet hangings,' and the result was that not a trace of the malady was left behind. This quotation is taken from Gaddesden's latest biography. Dr. Norman Moore, in the Dictionary of National Biography, says that his book
called Roso Medicum, often called Roso Anglica, is
crammed with quotations from ..." and then follow
a list almost identical with Chaucer's. "The book begin
with an account of fevers based on Galen's arrangement;
then goes through diseases and injuries, beginning with
the head; and ends with an antidotarium or treatise on
remedies. It contains some remarks on cooking, and
innumerable prescriptions, many of which are superstitions,
while others prove to be common-sense remedies when
carefully considered. Thus, the sealskin girdle with whal-
bone buckle which he recommends for colic is no more
than the modern and useful cholera belt of flannel. He
cared for his gains, and boasts of getting a large price
from the Barber Surgeons' Guild for a prescription of
which the chief ingredient is tree frogs. His disposition,
his peculiarities, and his reading are so precisely those
of the Doctour of Phisyk in Chaucer's Prologue that it
seems possible that Gaddesden is the contemporary from
whom Chaucer drew this character." Gaddesden was in
priest's orders. If Chaucer was born, as is now generally
held, in 1340, he would have been of age in the year
that Gaddesden died, and in the smaller London of those
days it is not at all improbable that he may have met
the eminent doctor, and have remembered his peculiarities.

If Chaucer's physician digested all this varied mass
of learning, let us see what use he made of it. Astrology
formed one basis of his treatment. He watched the sky
for a favourable star or stars to be in the ascendant, then
he made an image of his patient. If this image were
made at a season astrologically propitious, it was thought
treatment of the image helped the patient through magic.
It may be wondered to what extent the doctor believed
in cures being effected through this magic treatment by
proxy, or whether it was a way of leaving Nature to
work out her own cure. This doctor, however, by no
means relied solely on astrology to help him in medicine and surgery. Chaucer says that he knew the cause of every malady, and attacked the root of the mischief. What more could be desired? His diagnosis of the cause referred it to what were called the ‘elements,’ or to the ‘humours.’ Each of these composed a set of four: cold, hot, moist, and dry; black bile, yellow bile, blood, and phlegm. Chaucer mentions the former by name, but he does not detail the latter: they were too well known. This famous theory of the humours is very old, probably dating from Hippocrates, and certainly systematised by Galen. The Latin *humor* means moisture, fluid. The ancients believed that these four humours or fluids were present in every man; and that his temperament, temper, idiosyncrasy, complexion, depended on the way in which the humours were mixed. If the mixture was equal, he was said to be good-tempered or good-humoured; but if any one of the four was in excess the temper was decided thereby. If black bile, he was atrabilious or melancholy; if the other bile, he was choleric; if blood, he was sanguine; if phlegm, he was phlegmatic. This is not merely an explanation of a cluster of modern English words, but throws light on many a passage of our literature. ‘Dis-temper’ we still say of a dog’s ailment. Our ancestors applied the word to human beings likewise.

Once the diagnosis made, the physician was able to prescribe, and to give the sick man his remedy,—his boote, that which makes better. These were mostly herbal, and made up in two forms, *drages* or drugs, and *letuaries* or electuaries. The former word is by many connected with *dry*, and seems to be used of some form of powder; whilst the latter is something to be licked. Both imply that the medicine was made up in a pleasant form, like the powder in the jam of nursery days. The word ‘drug’ nowadays suggests an unpleasant medicine,
but Skeat quotes from *Cotgrave’s Dictionary*, published in the Restoration year, 1660: ‘*dragee, a kind of digestive powder prescribed unto weak stomachs after meat*’ [that is, after food, not necessarily flesh], ‘and hence any jonkets, comfits, or sweetmeats served in the last course for stomach-closers.’ The modern French *dragée* is a sugar-plum, a word conveying a different meaning from its English congener *drug*. Fifty years ago medicines (the black dose! ugh!) were nastier than they are now; and yet the mediaeval notion that drugs should be sweetmeats might to some extent be reintroduced with advantage. Then as now the medicine came from the chemist, though he was always called the apothecary. The first meaning of the word chemist was alchymist\(^1\); and its modern use is a little awkward, the scientific investigator being called by the same name as the dispenser of medicines. In the United States this confusion is unknown, for there the latter is always called a *druggist*. Chaucer accuses the physician and the chemist of playing into each other’s hands—a practice expressly forbidden by the laws of some of the modern medical colleges. ‘*How?*’ asks the innocent. The doctor would prescribe expensive remedies from which the chemist would reap a large profit, and in return he would recommend patients to visit the obliging doctor. Let us hope the accusation was a libel.

Chaucer proceeds to tell us that this physician looked after himself, that he was particular as to his own diet, that he did not eat much, but that what he ate was right nourishing food and easily digested. During the Crimean War an attempt was made to feed soldiers on food that would pack into small compass, but it was found that the human body requires to be filled, as well as nourished; a continued course of small quantities of very nourishing

\(^1\) ‘The starving chemist in his golden views
Supremely blest.’  
(\textit{Pope, Essay on Man}.:)
food left a vacuum such as Nature abhors. Incidentally, Chaucer mentions that the study of the physician was 'but little on the Bible.' This comes as a surprise to those who thought that Protestantism first introduced the study of the Bible amongst the laity. There is a truly modern flavour about the jibe. Next the appearance of the doctor is described. He was 'clad in sanguin and in pers.' Modern times have indeed taken much of the picturesque out of ordinary life, especially the colour out of the garments of men. The pilgrims travelling Canterbury-wards wore distinctive garbs. Even in the eighteenth century, to judge from pictures of Tonbridge Wells, costume differentiated man from man in a way that has quite ceased. This doctor rode in the party arrayed in cloth of blood-red and of the colour of peach-blossom. It must have looked rich and handsome. Even the lining is mentioned: it was of taffeta and sendal, that is a rich thin silk. But for fear lest it should be thought that this gay apparel denoted extravagance, our poet adds that the physician was moderate in his expenditure. No spendthrift, he kept what he had fairly earned during the terrible pestilences that scourged England in the fourteenth century, of which the Black Death was the most deadly and the best remembered. At that time the doctor made money in the modern sense of the term, not as the alchemists professed to make gold. Gold formed part of the mediaeval pharmacopoeia. Dr. Skeat refers to various authorities that show that *aurum potabile* was a medicine made in some way from gold, either by boiling the gold in oil and then using the oil, or else by actually melting down some small portion of the gold itself. This remedy was held in high honour amongst the alchemists, who (it must be remembered) sought the panacea, cure for all ailments that flesh is heir to, or the elixir of life, as well as the philosopher's stone.
that would turn baser metals into gold. Strangely enough, it was believed that the same substance would fulfil the double purpose. With a sly hit at the value attached by the doctor to gold upon purely professional grounds, Chaucer lets him pass from under the poetic scalpel.

Besides the account in the Prologue, Chaucer frequently gives a second and shorter account of the chief tale-tellers when the turn for their story arrives. In the case of the physician, however, there is a gap—the second in the whole of the Canterbury Tales—just when the physician is called upon. The 'head-link' is missing. The Physician's Tale is the old story of Virginia, originally from Livy, but taken by Chaucer from the Roman de la Rose. At the end Harry Bailly, the host, as the presiding genius of the story-telling, utters some eulogy of the teller, whilst he indulges in some banter about the sadness of the story. He was so distressed by it that (how modern!) he would like a drink after it. The praise of the doctor is contained in the words 'thou art a proper man, and lyk a prelat'—good-looking and dignified, worthy, if only a priest [Gaddesden was a priest], to be made a bishop or a mitred abbot. It sounds a little strange to a modern ear that the host wanted 'treacle.' It was not as a vehicle for brimstone that he wanted it. Treacle has changed its meaning. Originally an antidote against the bite of a wild animal, it came to mean a medicine, and later the favourite vehicle for medicine. The host in his chaff says that he has been so grievously harrowed by the story that he has developed heart-disease: 'Please give me some medicine. Perhaps a draught of moyste and comy ale would do; or a really funny story might serve as the needed medicine.' Thus the host passes from the physician; and the pardoner is called upon next for his story.

University of Melbourne.

E. E. MORRIS.
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AN ENGLISH DEED OF 1376.

Some ten years ago, while on a visit to England for the purpose of collecting early English Documents, which when edited should form a companion volume to your Fifty Earliest English Wills, I discovered what I take to be the oldest ME. private legal instrument, representing a valuable specimen of south-western English of the time of Chaucer. The publication of this text may perhaps be received by you as part payment of the debt I owe you for the many acts of kindly help so readily afforded to me in the field of English Philology. During our last meeting in London, three years ago, you gave expression to the fear that on account of the long delay in preparing my material for publication, you might perhaps not live to see it all in print. We came, however, to an understanding that you would not 'shuffle off this mortal coil' before you should have the satisfaction of seeing my labours brought into the light of day. The length of your life being, therefore, made contingent on the publication of my work, the delay of it can only be looked upon as a benefit to the world of English Philology at large and to your more intimate friends in particular.

The document printed here for the first time is found in the British Museum, and has been entered into the
Catalogue of the Harley Charters as 45 A 37 with the following remarks:

'Concerning lands in Porton (Co. Wilts.), purchased by Sir Renaud of Reinesbury, and given by him to John Folyot, Jhone his wife, and their heirs. Dat. Edw. III (1375). Seal.'

In this entry appear to be two errors. First, the place-name, which is here called Reinesbury, should read, as the document plainly shows, Remmesbury or Rem(e)sbury. This locality represents the modern Ramsbury, which like Porton, also mentioned in the document, is situated in Wiltshire. The deed, as is proved also by the seals attached, of which, however, only one has been preserved, is of course an original document and not a copy. The document, therefore, belongs to Wiltshire, a fact which is also supported by the dialect in which it is written. The second of the errors referred to is found in the alleged date, 1375. Now as St. Hilary falls on January 13, and Edward III was crowned February 1, 1327, whereas in the words of the document the deed was drawn up on the Thursday before St. Hilary in the 49th year of the reign of this king, the date to be assigned to the document is, therefore, 1376, and not 1375.

The deed is a parchment, throughout in the same handwriting, and is perfectly legible, except in a few passages in which some letters, twice even whole words, have disappeared.

The following transcript of the deed has been made with the utmost care. It is not a mere 'diplomatic' reproduction, which would only add needless difficulties to a ready understanding of the text. I have departed from the MS. only in the following points:

1) The use of capitals has been made consistent. In the MS. the proper names are arbitrarily written, sometimes with, sometimes without capitals; even the word God occurs
with a small letter. On the other hand the scribe has occasionally employed a capital at the beginning of a period, naturally also for the first word of the deed.

(2) As the punctuation is altogether defective and unequal, especially in the English part, and even occasionally stops are introduced in wrong places, I have throughout adopted modern punctuation.

(3) The numerous abbreviations of the document have been everywhere expanded; these expansions are indicated in the English portion by italics, in the Latin part only in those cases where any doubt might arise, as most of these abbreviations are perfectly familiar. Nor has any notice been taken in the notes on the Latin of the irregular use of capital and small letters and of the punctuation.

In this connexion I may also mention that the horizontal strokes above and through certain letters are still significant and do not represent, as is frequently the case in fifteenth-century MSS., mere ornamental flourishes. The only exceptions are the word *John*, and once *wuch* (see note to the text), in which the stroke through *h* is meaningless.

(4) Parts of compounds, often separated in the text, have been joined by hyphens, and vice versa, phrases that are written together have been divided according to modern usage.

(5) The two characters for *r* and *s* respectively in the MS. are not distinguished in our transcript. The distinction between *g* and *g*, as they represent different sounds, has been preserved, as also the *f* where it occurs.

Finally, I may mention that all deviations, even the most minute, have been indicated in the footnotes, with the exception of my own punctuation, although the original stops and similar signs are referred to.

The text is followed by a few remarks in which the most striking peculiarities are pointed out. Grammatical
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discussions which would involve lengthy investigations have been purposely avoided. The few notes that I have added are intended merely to facilitate the complete understanding of the text.

AN ENGLISH DEED OF 1376.

Hit is to vnderstandinge þat sir 1 Renauld of Remmesbury purchacede certayn londes in Portone to him and his heires 2; wuche londes þe foreseide Renauld jat to John Folyot 3 and to Jhone his wyf, cosyne to þe foreside 5 Renauld, and to here heires, trweliche of þulke Jhone byjute 4; and in cas 5 þat hit so by-ful 6 þat non heires ne com by-twuxte 7 þe foreside John 8 and Jhone, þe foreseide londes turne agayn to sir Renauld of Remmembury and to his heires for euermore. Afterward þe foreside John Foliot 9 by-gat 10 þre douteres in þe foreside Jhone his wyf 11; of wuche þre douteres þat on was a munechon, þat ouþer weddede Roger

1. 1. to understandinge, from late OE. to understandende (for earlier to understanden(n)e), with phonetic change of -ende into -inde and -inge, of which other examples are not rare. In how far the verbal substantive in -inge, in certain constructions, may have influenced this development has not been hitherto determined.

1. 6. by-ful=OE. bifieolle, 3rd pret. subj.; cf. below fulle=OE. ffeolion, with south-western u for OE. ðo.

com=OE. cumen, 3rd pres. subj.

1. 8. Remmsembury, probably for Remmembury.

1. 11. munechon=OE. myne cen, nun.

1 sir. It is doubtful whether the scribe intends this to stand for sin, as the e is indistinct and blotted; the abbreviated form means sir.

1 A dot after heires.

1 ffolyot with ff, which was originally a merely graphic development of f, but afterwards also taken to represent F.

1 by jute.

1 by at the end of one, and ful at the beginning of the next line.

1 by-twuxte.

1 John.

1 foliot.

1 by-gat.

11 Dot after wyf, so also after munechon, and apparently after þat.
Paynes fader, wuch 1 heit Margerie; of wuch Margerie com Roger and Nichol 3; pe pridde souster weddede Henry Dun, wuch heyt . . . 4; of wuch . . . 4 com Water Dun and John. Afterward 5 pe forseide Roger Payn weddede 15 Marione pat was Water Dunes soster, wuch Marione was bastard; of wuche Roger and Marione com Roberd treveliche by-gete 6 in spoushod; and also com of pe forseide Roger and Marione twey douteres bastardes, Letisse 7 and Alisse 8, wuch were longe tyme ibore and 20 by-gete 9 er pe forseide Roger and Marione were iwedd. Afterward com John 10 Janequin and spousede 11 pe forseide Letise bastard; of wuche Letise 12 com Ansteise 13 and Mold. Of pe forseiden, Roger and Roberd wuche were

1. 12. wuch. The stroke through the h in the MS. seems to be meaningless, as otherwise in our document the uninflected singular is wuch, whereas the inflected forms of singular and plural are wuche and wuch.

heit, occurs also as het, and = OE. hēht and het.

l. 13. souster, also soster = late OE. swoster, swoster, from earlier sweoster.

ll. 14, 16, 26. water in MS.


l. 23. Ansteise, French form of Latin Anastasia.

l. 24. Mold, for Maud, Maud.

1 wuch.

2 The special form at the beginning of Margerie, Marione and Mold, also found in munecch, matere, but not in man, may have been intended by the scribe for a capital.

3 Dot after Nichol.

4 The name is illegible in both places; in the former it has quite disappeared, in the latter indistinct traces of letters only are left.

5 afterward. 6 by-gete.

7 leisse.

8 alise.

9 by-gete.

10 John.

11 After spousede full was written and struck out by a horizontal line.

12 leisse. 13 ansteise.
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25 rystfol 1 heires 2, deyde with-oute 3 heires 4, warfor pe foreside londes fulle in-to Water Dumes hand and hi heires, and in pes 5 held be torme of his lif and his heir after him, with-oute 6 chalenge 7 of any man 8. He foreside Water 10 weddede Margerie, wuch pat sut lyuth; 90 of wuch Water 11 and Margerie com Roberd; and in on 9 pat he foreside Roberd deye with-oute 12 eires of his body treweliche by-jete 14, he foresede 15 londes turneth to sir Renaud of 16 Remsbury and his heires for evermore 9. Of alle pes foreside mater Margerie 9 pat sut lysteth, pat 95 was he foreside Wateres 18 wif 19, witnysseth 20 and wytinwy wole to-fore God 21 and man, pat hit is triwe and non oth,

1. 25. In case the scribe did not intend to write rystfol (cf. ausle, l. 37, for ausle, with the well-known Anglo-French st for English lif, we have here an instance of contamination of rystfol and rystfol.

1. 27. held he. The object is to be supplied from the preceding words, and, according to M.E. usage, is not repeated in the form of a pronoun.

1. 34. mater. The abbreviation can here only indicate the singular; cf. wateres, l. 35. Hence pes must be taken as singular.

1. 36. wole, an unusual form for the singular indicative, unless the s stands for another l; cf. wol, below.

outher = O.E. iber; the spelling ou for o is also found elsewhere.

1 Appears to me to be certainly rystfol, and not rystfol; cf. ausle, l. 37.
8 Dot after heires.
10 Dot after heires.
11 with-oute.
12 with-oute.
13 g with a small flourish, which is not likely to indicate the plural, but stands for a.
14 Dot after chalenge.
15 Dot and upright semicircle after man.
16 He.
17 water; with a small initial also, ll. 14, 16, 26.
18 wif.
19 Dot after wif.
20 Dot after witnysseth.
21 god.
and that he wol do in alle degre that a triwe womman aust for to do.

Hec premissa omnia et singula supradicta Margeria relicta Walteri Dun, diligenter examinata coram nobis, 40 Matilla, permisso[ne]1 diuina abbatissa Wiltonensi, Henrico Haueresham, maiore burgi Wiltonensis, Johanne Cole, Nico-
lao Vyniter, Thoma Wysdom, Henrico Bount2 co[ncilia]-
riis3 burgi predicti testificata est. E[t n]os4, prefata abbatiss[a], ad5 requisicionem dleicti nobis Johannis 45 Remmesbury, ad maiorem fidem et testimonium eorundem
sigillum nostrum presentibus apposuimus.

Et ego Henricus Haveresham, maior Wiltonensis6, die
Jovis proximo ante festum sancti Hillarii, anno regni Regis
Eduardi tertii post conquestum quadragesimo nono, qui so
super examinacionem predicte Margerie super premissis
personalibus interfui ipsamque illa testificantem audivi,
similiter ad requisicionem predicti Johannis Remmesbury
sigillum maiorita[tis]7 burgi Wiltonensis presentibus ap-
posu. 55

In order to facilitate the understanding of the facts of
the document I may perhaps give a short résumé of the
relationship which appears to have existed among the
various persons mentioned.

The property in question was bought by and belonged
to a certain Sir Renaud of Ramsbury. This land was

1. 37. he wol; he=OE. hēo, fem.
auste for auhte, from late OE. āhte pret.; see note to l. 25.
1. 41. Matilla for Matilda.

1 Of the last two letters e gone and only a trace left of n.
2 Connected with the upper part of the t is an upright semicircle, which,
however, does not seem to indicate cr.
3 The middle part, consisting of four or five letters, quite disappeared.
4 Two letters gone.
5 abbatiss ad.
6 Wilton.
7 The end of the word gone.
conveyed by him to John Folyot and his wife Joan; she was a cousin of Sir Renaud’s. The children of this marriage were:

(i) A daughter who became a nun.
(ii) Margery, who married a certain Roger Payn; they had two sons, Roger and Nichol.
(iii) A daughter, whose name was given in the document but is now illegible. This daughter married a Henry Dun and their two sons were Walter and John.

Roger Payn junior married his cousin Marion, Walter Dun’s sister; this Marion, however, is declared to be illegitimate in the document. This couple had a legitimate son, Robert, and two illegitimate daughters, Lettice and Alice, born before the marriage of their parents.

Lettice married John Janequin (Jenkin); their two daughters were Anstreise and Maud (Maud).

The aforementioned Roger Payn junior and his son Robert died without heirs.

Therefore the lands fell into the hands of the heirs of the third daughter of Folyot and Joan, namely into those of Walter Dun, son of Henry Dun and this third daughter. He held the property to his death.

This Walter Dun married Margery, who was still alive at the drawing up of the document; their son was Robert, who at that time had no heirs; and if he should die without legal heirs, the property would revert to the original proprietor and his heirs.

LORENZ MORSBACH

GÖTTINGEN,
November, 1899.
XXXIX.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO OLD ENGLISH LITERATURE.

1. AN OLD ENGLISH HOMILY ON THE OBSERVANCE OF SUNDAY.

In an interesting article on 'The chief Sources of some Anglo-Saxon Homilies' in the *Otia Merseiana*, i. 129 (Liverpool, 1899), Professor R. Priebsch has treated of the origin of five Old English Homilies which have for their subject a letter purporting to have been sent from heaven in order to inculcate the strict observance of Sunday. It enforces the abstention from all kinds of work, and enumerates the severe afflictions and punishments to come in case of disobedience. Four of the five OE. Homilies were printed by myself in my *Wulfstan* (Berlin, 1883): viz. Nos. xlvi. (= A), xliii. (= C), xlv. (= D), lvii. (= E); whilst a fifth (= B) is edited by Priebsch for the first time from MS. 140 in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. He has also published from a fourteenth-century Vienna Codex (MS. 1355) a Latin homily which evidently represents the Latin version from which A was ultimately derived.

1 This homily was already in type when Prof. Ker suggested that I should add my notes on the Franks Casket (cp. p. 362). Hence this double article.

2 Priebsch has in preparation a monograph dealing with the whole history of this letter of Christ in the Middle Ages.

A 2 2
Priebsch shows that these homilies should be divided into three groups according to the varying forms of their Latin authority. In the first group, to which A and B as well as the Vienna Latin version belong, the letter is represented as falling from heaven to a gate of Jerusalem called Effrem, where it is found by a priest Achorius (Ichor) and after passing through various hands, finally comes to St. Peter's altar at Rome.

In the second group, to which C and D belong, Christ's letter has been brought into connexion with a certain deacon Nial, who comes to life again after having been dead for some time, and announces that fire is to fall upon the earth in consequence of men's disbelief in the heavenly letter. This version concludes with the statement that Florentius was Pope, and Petrus Bishop of Rome, when the letter was found upon St. Peter's altar.

In the third group Peter, Bishop of Antioch, is the recipient of the letter from heaven. Of this group Priebsch has only one OE. representative, viz. E, but there is a second version belonging to it (F) which, as it has not yet been published, I give below in full. It is contained in the eleventh-century MS. 162 (Corpus Christi College, Cambridge), pp. 44–52. In printing I have disregarded the manuscript punctuation, as well as the use of capitals; the contractions are indicated by italics; in other respects I have followed the MS.

A comparison of F with E (Wulfstan, pp. 291–299) at once reveals a great similarity between them. Although they differ entirely in their wording, their contents are to a large extent identical, and they are evidently independently derived from one and the same Latin original. The agreement between the two extends down to Wulfstan.

1 An OE. homily in MS. Otho B. 10, which is now destroyed, appear to have been closely allied to B. (cp. Priebsch, p. 139).
2 C and D are merely two recensions of one and the same OE. homily.
OLD ENGLISH LITERATURE

p. 298 \(^{12}\), where the mention of hell has led the scribe of E into an enumeration of the different kinds of sinners destined to go thither, how the devil tempts men to sin, &c.—nothing further being said about the heavenly letter—and we may fairly assume that, in this respect, E represents the original less faithfully than F, which concludes with a solemn attestation of the genuineness of the letter by Bishop Peter of Antioch. It is noteworthy that in both the OE. representatives of this group (and therefore in their Latin original) it is an angel who is the actual writer and bearer of the letter, whilst in the other non-English versions no mention whatever is made of an angel\(^{1}\) (cp. Priebsch, p. 147).

Be þam drihtenlican sunnandæg folces lâr.

Men þa leofestan, her orginæ ðæt ærendgewrit urses Drihtnes. middangeardes Hælendes, be þam forebode ealra yfela 7 be þam embegange ealra goda. Þawrat Drihtnes engel into his sylfes fingrum and hit sealde Petre þam biscoope on Æære Antiochisca cirican beבודende 7 halsigende (p. 45) þurh naman þæs lifigendan Godes þ he gewidmaersode þas Drihtnes word eallum cynegum 7 biscoþum 7 eac swilce eallum cristenum folce.

Pillic is ponne se fruma þæs ærendgewrites: 'Ic, ærendcara 7 boda Drihtnes Hælendes Cristes, betæce 7 bebede þam biscoþum 7 þam cynegum 7 eallum gepungenum mannum þi hi luðien rihtwisynsse on eallum þingenum 7 þowien Drihtne on eallum ege, 7 þi ge gehealdan sunnandæg framt eallum woruldicum weorcum, forðanæ God geworhte manega wunda on þam sunnandæge. Þi is ponne æræst, þi he on þam sunnandæge geworhte heofonas 7 eordæan mid eallum heofonlicum endebyrdnyssum 7 þ unehwedlice andweorc. On sunnandæg he\(^{2}\) geworhte ealle þæs ðe witulicis syndon gesewene 7 wunianæ. On þam dæge he gesceop

\(^{1}\) Cp. Cockayne, Leechdoms, &c. iii. 288, where a charm is brought by an angel from heaven, and laid on St. Peter’s altar at Rome.

\(^{2}\) After he about eight letters erased.
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ealra manna sawla; 7 on ðam dæge Crist wæs acenned þine middaneard to alysene; 7 on ðam dæge he todælde þa readan sæ on twelf¹ dælas; 7 on ðam dæge arás ure Drihten of deade; 7 on ðone dæg he asende Haligene Gast ofer his serendracan; 7 on ðone dæg he let rinan wundorlice andlyfene of heofonum ofer þis Ihsana folc, 7 hi on ðam sedde feowertig wihtna. 7 on ðam dæge he gecyrde wæter (p. 46) to wine on Chana, þære Galileiscan byrig; 7 on ðam dæge God gebletse³ v. berene hlasas 7 .ii. fixas, 7 of þam he afedde v. þusend manna, 7 þær to lafa weorun .xii. cypan fulle on þam gebytstum. 7 on sunnandæg tosale Ìndea gesammung 7 acenned weard⁶ seo gleafulfel gesammung. 7 on þam dæge bidden þes middanerd geendad; 7 on ðam dæge God demnemscynne. 7 þa þe he rihltice lybbad, hi gewitad⁷ on þe ece lif; 7 þa þe he on woh libbað, hi gewitad on þe ece fyr, and hi beod⁶ cwylmede on ecum byrne mid þam deostle 7 his gesidum.

Pi þonne eow bebeodeð Drihten God 7 ge þone sunnandæg healdan fram eallum woruldlicum weorcum: 7 is þonne fram uncennynsse 7 fram forligre 7 fram druncennysse 7 fram manslihte 7 fram lesungse 7 fram reaflece 7 fram stale 7 fram unriðhemede 7 fram gefelte 7 fram andan 7 fram eallum máne. 7 þas þing sindon eallum tidum forbdene. 7 healdon ge þone sunnandæg wið scece ceapunga. On ðam dæge sy þe eower æreste weorc þe ge eow zeemtigne on gebedum, 7 þe ge gehyre on cirican halige bodunga fram eowrum lareowum, 7 sæcum halige stowe 7 geneosid⁴ untrumma manna 7 deade bebyrgeða. 7 on ðan dæge ge sceolon þearfan fedan 7 nacode scrydan þurstigum⁵ drincas (p. 47) syllan 7 haefnedlingas alysan 7 ælpeodige wilsulmlice onfon 7 wrecan helpan þæatlædan 7 wudewan frofor gearwian 7 gesibsumian þa ungesedan cristenan. Þas ægelana weorc sint to healdenne on eallum tidum beforan Gode, þeahhæreðere swipost on sunnandæg, forðan æge sunnandæg is se forma 7 se ytemysta dæg ealra daga.

³Gif ge þonne elles doð butan þas forespræcenan þing, þonne swinge ic eow þam heardostan swinglan; þe is þic asette on eordan

¹ Over twelf another hand has added xii.
² The ge of gebl- added above the line.
³ 7 acenned . . gesammung added in another hand above the line.
⁴ þurstigum altered from -ige.
mine feower wyrrestan domas, hungor 7 hæftned 7 gefeohht 7
eewl, 7 ic eow gesyle to sêpæodigra handa, 7 ic eow forðó
7 besence eow, swa ic dyde Sodomæ 7 Gomorran, 7 ic dyde
Dathan 7 Abiron, þa yfelan þe wiðsocon minum naman 7 forsworn
mine sacerdas; 7 ic eow gelæde to hergienne on þa ðeode þe ge
heora gereord ne cunnan, 7 hi gegripæ ongan eow scylås 7
flåna; 7 þære þeode stefen angryslice fram norðdale ofer eow
swegð, 7 heora hlisa eow gebregð ærðandæ he to eow cume,
7 geswenceð mid sare 7 gegreeð eow swa þð eacningen wif,
forþæ ge ðe ne healdaþ þone halgan sunnandæg, 7 forðandæ ge
onscuniað me 7 ge nellað mine word gehyran.'

And be þysum ylcan andgyte Drihten cwæð, 'Se ðe of Gode bið,
he Godes word gehyrð.' 7a yfelan þþwyran men hyt (p. 48) gehyrð,
ac hi hyt healdan nelað, forðæpe hi þæs deofles syndon, gif hi yfelæ
geswican nelað 7 þam gelyfan þe we eow herbeforan ær sædan.
Drihten sylf cwæð, 'Wite 2 ge gewislæce 7 on gemyndum habbað
þ þæ fram frýmðe bebead þone sunnandæg to healdenne; 7 swa
hwa swa swa ængwoldic weorc on sunnandæg wyrð, oððæ heægel
wæsecð oððæ æegræne 3craeft 3 wyrðæ, oððæ he his fex efsige oððæ
hlæfas bace oððæ ægræ ængræfæ þing þurhþæp, ic hine fornime
7 his gewyrðtan 7 his gefylstan of minum rice; 7 þa þe þís doð,
hi minre blestunge ne onfæ ne næfre ne gemetað. Ac for þære
blestunge þe hi forhodgon on þam sunnandæge buton yldinge
wigignysse hi gemetað. 7 ic asende on heora hiwradene unar-
medlice untrunnynysse 7 cwælmas, ægræer ge ofer hi ge ofer heora
bearn 7 ofer heora hired 7 ofer heora nytenu, forðææhe hi min word
ofhergodon. La forhwf ne geman seo þwære þeod 7 seo wider-
wearde, þe nu wunanð on þære ytemestan tide þises middanærdes,
uic hic het Romana cyningas faran to Hierusalem þære ceastre, seo
me wæs ofer ealle ðære ceastre þeo 4 gercorenesse, 7 ic hic het ut
alædan on þone halgan easterdæg of ðære ceastre xii. siðsum hundred
þusenda on hæftned; 7 hi hundred þusenda (p. 49) þærinne ofslagon,
forðæ mine leofan Hierusalemceasterware me forhodgon 7 mine
lærweas, 7 hi ne heoldon þone drihtlican sunnandæg swa ic him be-
bead. Gif ge þonne on þam halgan sunnandæge on ænigum geflite

1 John viii. 47. 2 MS. witæ, after which a letter has been erased.
3 The t of craeft added over the line. 4 So MS.
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standað oððe on ænigum fullicum weorcum oððe on Unnytum, ic þonne onsende yfela gehwilc, 7 hi todrifene weorðað 7 geteoriað mid arleasra sawulum, forðaþe hi min gebod forhogodan. Soðlice, gif ge þis ne healdæþ þone halgan sunnande fram eallum weorcum, ægðer ge þeowe ge frige, fram þære niggocan tide þæs saxternes-dæges oð þone morgen on monandæg, ic eow amansumige fram minum fæder, 7 ge dael nabbæð mid me ne mid minum englum. Ac gyf ge þis forhigcað 7 sacerdum ne gehyræð 7 eowrum yldrum 7 wisum lareowum, þe eow swuteliað þisne weg 71 eow sceggæð eowre sawle pearhe, hwæt ge for Godes lufon don scylon, 7 ge þæt forhigiað, þonne onsend ic ofer eowerne eard ysta 7 ligræscas 7 wilde fyr on eowrum ceastrum 7 on eowrum tunum 7 mista hreoðgynsse 7 ungemetlice hætan 7 unwaestmbærnasysse æcera 7 treowa 7 wingearða 7 eallra eorðan blosmena. And gif ge getreowlice 7 rihtlice þa frunscattas eowre teobunga of eallum eowrum geswincum, oððe on landes teolunge, oððe on ænigum cæste, on ælmihtiges Godes naman to ðam (p. 50) cyrican ne bringað þe eow mid rihte to gehyræð, þonne anime ic eow fram þa nigon dægas 7 ic þærtocæcan gedó 7 on eowrum hûsum weordæð acennede blinde bearn 7 deafe 7 änhende, hreoðlan 7 ðäman, 7 eow þonne gewyrð swa micel hungor þe se welega ne meæ þam waedlan gehelpan.

Men ða leofestan, ge habbað genoh gehyrde be ðam sunnandæge, forðanþe se þe of Gode is, he Godes word gehylst 7 þa wel gehylt. For ures Drihtnes, Hælendes Cristes lufon ic myngie eow 7 eac halsige þe ge georne þis eall understandan þe ic eow gesed hæbbe, forðan þisæ middaneardes ende 4 is swide nei, 7 eower gæra gerim ys gescyrt. Ðonne is eow micel neadpearf þe ge gebeton þa ping þe eow fram Gode forbodene weron 7 on ðære ealdan cæthynsse þurh healfæderas 7 witegan 7 on ðære niwan þurh Godes sunu anna 7 þurh þa apostolas 7 þa witigan 7 þurh þa wundra þe God daghwamlice on middaneard ætyweð, ægþer ge on eorðan ge on heofonum ge on steorran ge on sæge on eallum gescealum. Gemunað ge weligan þe ge eowre wiste rihtlice gehalden, 7 on-

1 7 eow . . . forhigiað added in another hand above the line.
2 MS. eorðana blosman.
3 -ndæ] a altered from n.
4 ende in a different hand above the line, below it about six letters have been erased.
drædā eow þ þ awriten is þurh pone witegan. 'Wā eow þe wyrcā dæg to nihte 7 niht to dæge, 7 wendās swēte on biter 7 biter on swēte. Wā eow þe fram morgen oð æfen 7 fram æfen oð morgen mid missenlicra gīwa oferfiligās 1 (p. 51) 7 druncennysse neosís oð onewrum geboerscipum oð wambe fyllyssē. 'Nyte ge þ ofermudignys bið þæs god þe 2 hyre filigē, 7 gytsung is þæs god þe hyre þeowās. Se þe þeowas gýwnysse 7 oferdruccynysse, hi him beðf for hlaford getéalde; 7 ælc man bið swa fela leahtra þeow swa he underpeod bið. Geornstlice 3 se 4 se swilcum leahtrum filigē, hi þone soðan God forlatac. 5 Þi ic eow þonne halsige þ ge ealle þæs uncysta forlæoten, ærfrian se deað eowre sawle on helle cwicsusle teo. Gif þonne hwîle bisceop oðþe hwîle gehæred man, ærfþanc he 6 þis ærendgewrht him on handa hæð 7 hit næle þam folce underpeoden ne him 8 rædan, buton twyon ærnædlice he polc Godes dômes; forðanc swa hwîle sacerd swa ne gebodað þam folce heora synna, huru þinga on domesþæge heora blod bið fram him asoht, 7 he scildig þinne stent be heora synnum on Godes andweardynysse. Gif he him þonne bodað heora synna, 7 heora måne 7 ne byð geðef mid him, he unsclidig byð of heora ynnun.

Men ða leofestan, þis gewrht næs æt fruman awriten ne amærcað purh nanes eordlice mannes handa, ac Godes engel hit awrat mid his agenum fìngrum, swa ic eow ær herbeforan seede, 7 hit Petre sealde, þam bisceope, 7 he (p. 52) hit swutele mid æðsweara geæðē 9 geswor, þas cwaðende: 'Ic Petrus and bisceop on þere Anti- ochscan cyricean geæðē 8 7 swerige purh pone lisigendan Godes

1 The text seems corrupt. Read mid missenlicra gīwa begeane oferfillice 7 druncennysse neosisex, &c.? 2 Cp. Wolstan, 297 29. 3 After þæ a þe erased. 4 Geornost- Late Kentish for WS, Eorn-. 5 Read either se þe . . . filigē, he forlet, or þa þe . . . filigē, ht . . . forletæð. 6 he over the line. 7 After him about two letters (ne?) erased. 8 Read múnes! Geðef (geðaf) biðn 'to be a consenting party to, to acknowledge,' otherwise takes a genitive: cp. Wulfing, Die Syntax in den Werken Alfreds des Grossen, Bonn, 1894, p. 10; Modern Language Notes, xi. 116; xii. 127.

8 Of the OE. verb geæðan 'to swear' the dictionaries only record the past participle, geæðed mann 'a sworn witness,' from Edgar's laws (Thorpe, Ancient Laws and Institutes of England, i. 274 14). On the corresponding ME. ðeow, cp. Zupitza, Angha, i. 469-70; and to the instances given by Zupitza add Wars of Alexander, i. 940.
2. THE FRANKS CASKET.

The first we are able to ascertain with certainty concerning the history of the well-known Franks Casket is that it was (presumably in the first half of the present century) in the possession of a family in Auzon (Brioude, Haute-Loire, France), by the members of which it was used as a workbox, and that subsequently, the silver fittings which held it together having been removed, the whole fell to pieces. The top and three of the sides then came into the possession of a Professor Mathieu, of Clermont Ferrand, in Auvergne, who in vain offered a reward for the missing end, which had quite disappeared. The fragments then fell into the hands of a Paris dealer in antiquities, who sold them in 1837 to the late Sir Augustus Wollaston Franks, and they were afterwards presented by him to the British Museum. An account of the history of the casket, so far as Franks could ascertain it, together with facsimiles and interpretations of the runes and pictures, was given in 1867 by G. Stephens in his Old Northern Runic Monuments, i. 470 sqq.

1 MS. fruma.
2 Example in another hand, above the line.
3 The literature referring to the casket will be found enumerated in Walker's Grundriiss meiner Geschichte der angelsächsischen Literatur, p. 358.
4 Referred to in the following pages as Run. Mon.
About 1870 the attention of the late K. Hofmann of Munich was called to the casket by one of the workers on the *Monumenta Germ. hist.*, W. Arndt, who discovered a plaster cast of it in the sacristy of one of the churches at Clermont, and copied the runes as well as he could. His copy he sent to Hofmann, who was led thereby to make inquiries, and learnt that the casket was in the British Museum, and that facsimiles of it had been published by Stephens. By the help of these latter he published his interpretations of the runes in the *Sitzungsberichte der kgl. bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1871, p. 665.

This cast is no doubt identical with one which, as I learn through the kindness of Professor Paul Meyer, is now owned by a daughter of Professor Mathieu, and which was therefore in all probability taken from the fragments when in the possession of the latter, and not from the casket whilst still intact. In this view I am confirmed by Mr. W. H. J. Weale, who some years ago made inquiries about the casket at Auzon and Brioude, and who was also told that it had originally belonged to St. Julian's at Brioude.

Hofmann states, without giving any authority for it, that the casket had once been in the possession of the church at Clermont in the Auvergne, and had subsequently been sold to a dealer (said to be English) in antiquities. This information, presumably obtained by Arndt from some one connected with the church at Clermont, is certainly erroneous.

Mr. Weale has also kindly informed me that the fourth side was subsequently discovered in a drawer at Auzon, and was purchased by M. Carrand, of Lyons, who be-

---

1 Cp. l. c. 665 : 'In einer Sakristei der Stadt Clermont (?) in der Auvergne befand sich vor Jahren ein geschnitztes Kästchen, welches mit anderen Altertümern an einen (angeblich) englischen Antiquitätenhändler verkauft, vorher aber noch in Gyps abgegossen wurde.'
queathed his collection to the Museo Nazionale at Florence, where it now is. Although I believe that the authorities of the British Museum were not ignorant of the whereabouts of the fragment, it was generally supposed to be lost, until in the *Academy*, August 2, 1890, p. 90, it was stated that Dr. Söderberg of Lund had discovered the missing side in a museum in Florence and that it contained 'a representation of a scene from the Sigurd myth, explained by Runic inscriptions.' A photograph of the Florence portion has been pasted in position on the casket in the British Museum.

Some time ago Professor W. P. Ker and I determined to have photographs taken of all the sides in the British Museum, and Ker was also able to obtain a photograph of the fourth side from Florence. Of this side we had therefore two photographs, the one taken direct in Florence, the other being a photograph of the photograph pasted on to the casket in the British Museum. As no reproduction of the Florence fragment has as yet been published, and as

---

1 The Florence fragment consists not only of the right side, but also of the corner-piece joining this side to the front and completing the inscription (*enberig*) on the right end of the front.

2 As this last-mentioned shows the corner-piece joining the left side to the back, which corner-piece is in the British Museum and therefore does not appear on the Florence photograph, both photographs have been reproduced here.

3 A reproduction of all the sides of the casket, including the Florence one, has since been published by Dr. E. Wadstein, Upsala, 1900, under the title of *The Clermont Runic Casket,* but, as my article was written before Wadstein's pamphlet appeared, as his facsimiles are on a considerably reduced scale, and as I do not agree with his interpretation of the runes on the fourth side, it seemed advisable to go on with the projected publication of our photographs. I think I should add a few words on the history of Wadstein's booklet. We sent copies of our Florence photograph of the hitherto missing side to a few scholars, amongst others to a friend who had been until then unaware of the existence of the Florence fragment. Our friend happened to show it to Wadstein, who was also quite ignorant that the fourth side had been found, and owes his knowledge of it to our photographs. He then borrowed it, had it reproduced, and published it. The key to the arbitrary rune-signs used for the vowels on this side was also furnished him by our friend. I wish to state my belief that Dr. Wadstein was not aware that we intended to publish our facsimile, though we were not unnaturally surprised at his doing so
the modern means of photography can produce more accurate facsimiles of the original than Stephens was able to give in his *Runic Monuments*, a work not everywhere accessible, Professor Ker suggested that I should, in addition to my rendering of the runes on the Florence fragment, reproduce the photographs of all the sides in the Furnivall volume. I may add that the collotypes here given represent the exact size of the casket, with the exception of those of the left side. In the case of the London photograph this side is slightly reduced, in that of the Florence photograph, slightly enlarged.

As is indicated by the inscription on the front side, the material of which the casket is made is the bone of some kind of whale.

I.

THE TOP.

Of this only a portion has been preserved, and there may have been an inscription running along the top and bottom.

without first communicating with us. As my article was already written before I read Wadstein’s pamphlet, I am only able to give my comments on it in the notes.

1 Being anxious, if possible, to ascertain exactly what the material is, I wrote to Professor E. Ray Lankester, who very kindly went to the Museum and examined the casket for me. He came to the conclusion that it is the bone of some species of whale, but took a small fragment of the casket bone with him for microscopical examination, the result of which I give in his own words:

‘A microscopical examination of the bone of the casket proves it to be the bone of a whale. So far as microscopical structure goes it might be that of a dugong or a whale. But the plates of bone are too large to have been cut from any bone of the dugong. There are certain highly refractive concentric and radial stripes in the dense matter of the bone of the casket as shown by the microscopic sections under high power, which are characteristic of whale and dugong but are not seen in walrus or any other mammal’s bone, so far as I can ascertain. The sections of the casket bone have been compared for me by Dr. Ridewood and Prof. Charles Stewart, F.R.S., with the large collection of microscopic sections of bone which are preserved in the Museum of the Royal College of Surgeons. I therefore consider it certain that the bone of the casket is the bone of a whale, but cannot say of what species or what size.’
The only runes on the existing fragment are those yielding the name Ægill.

Bugge (Run. Mon. i. p. lxx) follows up his explanation of the Weland picture on the front of the casket with the suggestion that the bowman on the top piece is Egil, Weland’s brother, and thinks that “the carving tells a story about him of which we know nothing. We see that he defends himself with arrows. Behind him appears to sit a woman in a house; possibly this may be Egil’s spouse Ólfrún.” Stephens (Run. Mon. ii. 903) accepted this explanation, and also held that it referred to some lost chapter of the Egil Saga.

Hofmann, however, who independently identified the archer with Egil, believed the carving to refer to a story preserved in the þiðrek Saga: how Weland was escaping from King Niðhad (to use the English forms) by the aid of the wings he had fashioned from the feathers of the birds shot by Egil. The latter is forced by the king to shoot at his retreating brother. The horizontal figure above the central disk is, according to Hofmann, the flying Weland. Egil however is not shooting at him, as in the Saga, but at the figures to the left of the disk, and the arrows on this side are from his bow. He suggests that Egil only made a feint of shooting at his brother, and then turned and attacked Niðhad and his men.

I do not feel able to accept this explanation. A flying

---

1 Cp. below, p. 368.
2 Wadstein believes that the picture refers to an incident told in the ballad of Wylliam of Coundesle, who has been identified by Jakob Grimm, Child, and others, with Egil. Wylliam, who had been ‘outlawed for venison,’ was visiting his wife, when the justice and sheriff, informed of his visit, attacked him, and, after a fierce resistance, he was finally taken. This attack, Wadstein thinks, is represented by the picture.

But outlawry stories of this kind were common; they easily and naturally originated in post-Conquest times as a result of the severity of the forest laws, so that there is no justification whatever in assuming this particular incident in the late ballad to have any old Germanic background or to have formed an integral part of the old Egil Saga.
Weland would surely have been represented with wings instead of with a superfluous shield. I take it that this figure (as also the figure underneath the disk) is carved in a horizontal position merely because there was otherwise no room for him.

II.

THE FRONT.

The inscription runs:

Left: hronæs ban
Top: fisc. flodu. ahof on ferg
Right: enberig ¹
Bottom (reversed runes reading from right to left): warþ ga:ric grorn þær he on greut giswom

Of the various renderings proposed ², that of Sweet ³ seems to be the most generally accepted, though it is not free from difficulties. He translates: ‘The fish-flood lifted the whale’s bones on to the mainland; the ocean became turbid where he swam aground on the shingle.’

Hofmann separates the hronæs ban from the rest and takes it to refer to the material from which the casket is made. In this I think he is right; it is metrically superfluous. Fisc flodu he rightly regards as two words, the latter being

¹ The right end-piece, separated from the rest on the photograph by a dark line, is supposed by Wadstein to be a recent restoration, a theoretical reconstruction, and he speaks of it as a ‘modern substitute.’ As a matter of fact it is the corner-piece of the Florence fragment (cp. p. 364, note 1), and Wadstein’s supposed ‘modern substitute’ in the British Museum is a photograph of the Florence piece pasted in its proper place.

² Cp. Grein-Walker, l. 282. Wadstein translates: ‘This is whale’s bone. The flow heaved up the fish on the cliff-bank; he became sad, being wounded by spears, when he swam (impetuously) on the shingle.’ The gær-te he takes to be for gür-te, ‘spear-wounded,’ but this is unlikely. A form sæ for sæ, WS. sæc, is not sufficiently supported by the two isolated instances of iæ before g from the Vespasian Psalter, to which he refers; whilst forms from the late Rushworth Gospels prove little for the Anglo-Saxon dialect of some centuries earlier.

³ Cp. Englische Studien, ii. 315.
the subject. His rendering is, 'Walfischbein. Den Fisch erhob die Fluth,' &c. His 'Berghügel' seems a better translation of *fergenberig* than Sweet's 'mainland'; it evidently refers to a steep shore. For the second line I can suggest nothing better than Sweet's explanation.

The carving in the centre is divided into two compartments, which have no connexion with each other. That on the right represents, as Stephens rightly recognized, the adoration of the Magi, over whose heads the word *mægi* is cut. The picture on the left was first correctly explained by Bugge (Run. Mon. i. p. lxix). It shows us a scene from the Weland legend which is preserved in the *Pidsrek* Saga. To the left is Weland the smith, who is holding in a pair of tongs the head of one of Niňhād's sons over an anvil, underneath which lies the headless body of the boy. Weland, as we know, killed the king's two sons, and made drinking cups of their skulls. In front of Weland is Beadhild, King Niňhād's daughter, who, according to the Saga, went with her attendant to Weland to have her ring mended. The figure catching birds on the right is Weland's brother Egil, who, the Saga tells us, shot birds and brought them to Weland to make wings from their feathers and escape.

---

1 The word *fergenberig*, or rather the second part of it, seems strange to Wükker (cp. l. c., p. 283, note a). The first element is of course the correct Anglian representative of Gothic *fargunja* (-*fargunja*), which would be WS. *forgen*; the recorded WS. *fregen* (fr-) with umlaut, is from a form with the -*inba* suffix. The *berig* is the Northumbrian form corresponding to WS. *berg*, with *e* for *œ* before *rg*, and the svarabhakti -i. The svarabhakti vowel is characteristic of Old Northumbrian, cp. *wylif* (left side), *Cudberht* (Lancaster Cross), *Cyniburug* (Bewcastle Cross), the frequent *berc* and *walsc* names in Beda, and the *aluc* names in the *Liber Vitae* (cp. Sweet, Oldest Engl. Texts, pp. 489 and 530), as well as the *Eadberht* on the coins of Eadberht of Northumbria, a. d. 727-738 (cp. Brit. Mus. Cat. of Engl. Coins, Anglo-Sax. Series, i. p. 140), *Cudberht*, monneler of Redwulf king of Northumbria, a. d. 844 (l. c., p. 184), *Eadberht*, king of Northumbria, a. d. 849-867 (l. c., p. 187), &c. Cp. also Bulbring, Beblatt sur Anglia, iz. 70.

2 Hofmann independently suggested the Weland Saga.
III.

LEFT SIDE.

The inscription runs:
Left: ọple unneg
Top: romanwalus and reumwalus twoegen
Right: gibroþer
Bottom (runes inverted): afodde his wy lil in romææstri;

The rendering of this presents no difficulties: ‘Far from their native land Romulus and Remus, two brothers; a she-wolf nourished them in Rome-city.’ The picture illustrates this.

The use of the g- rune for h in unneg and also in fegtāp (Back) should be noted. Stephens, followed by Sweet in his Oldest English Texts, p. 127, reads gibroþer faddæ; Hofmann, p. 667, separates gibroþer afaddæ. The latter is, no doubt, correct. A form gibroþer scarcely admits of explanation. Sweet’s suggestion (l.c., p. 642) that it stands for gibroþru seems untenable: on the one hand because the representation of the final -ru by -ra, common enough in later West Saxon, cannot be assumed for early eighth-century Northumbrian, and secondly because a svarabhakti vowel, as the æ must be, if this explanation is correct, would not be æ after a preceding o, but o (cp. the instances, p. 368, note 1, which show that the character of the svarabhakti vowel was regulated by that of the preceding vowel). A gibroþer, on the other hand, would equate exactly with the OS. plur. gibroðer, the ending of which, as in OHG. (plur.) muoter, tohter, represents an Indog. -ter. ¹ That

¹ In this explanation it is immaterial whether we regard the -peror, -tor in the nom. plur. (as in OS. gibroðer, OHG. muoter, &c.) to represent the Indog. nom. plur. -ters (as in ēpyrēs, μπύρης, varǐpes), which is the view taken by Streitberg, Urgermanische Grammatik, p. 251, and by Kluge, Paul’s Grundriß, and ed., i. p. 450, § 291, or whether we accept Brugmann’s limitation in view of OHG. ubir, ON. yfr = Skr. upari, that Indog. unaccented -er is represented by -er in Germanic only, if no palatal vowel follows. In the latter case the Germanic -er in the nom. plur. must have been taken over from the accusative sing. -erty (cf. varǐpa).
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Indog. -er- would appear in early Northumbrian as -er, is shown by the *extar = *apteros (Falstone inscription). The ordinary OE. nom. plur. brofor corresponds to Indog. *bhvātore (cp. φυάτωρες): a West Germanic unaccented -ar- (= Indog. -or-, -os-) appears in OE. as -or: cp. lomber, salor, &c. (from Indog. -os-).¹

IV.

THE BACK.

The inscription (partly in runes, partly in Roman characters) runs:—

Left: her fagtap
Top: titus end giupeasu hic fugiant hierusalim
Right: affitatores
Bottom: dom (on the left) giasil (on the right).

Giupeasu is an impossible form; if a nom. pl., we should expect giupes², 'the Jews.' The most plausible explanation is furnished by Mr. H. Bradley's very ingenious suggestion that we should read giupea sumes, 'some of the Jews, a portion of their army.' The giupesasu stands at the end of a division in the inscription, and the carver, proceeding to the next, might easily forget the mē. Fugiant is miscut for -unt; affitatores is habitatores.

The inscription may be rendered: 'Here fight Titus and

¹ Wadstein also regards *brofer as the correct form, supporting it by a reference to Brugmann, ii. § 320. What he means is not clear. Brugmann there gives the ending Indog. -res as the regular ending from which the Germanic nom. plur. is derived (as in ON. (Runic) dohtrir, ON. brir); but this would have yielded a form with the umlaut a in the root syllable.

² On the ḥ of giuhea, which occurs also in OS. Judeo, O. Fris. John, cp. Kluge, Zeitschrift für roman. Philol., xx. 325. Wadstein regards the -asu as a 'remarkable nom. plur. ending' (it certainly would be!), and suggests that it may be the original of the later -as plural. Does he imagine that a form corresponding to the Sanskrit -dus could by any possibility give a seventh or eighth century English -as? I fear his suggestion will not meet with acceptance.
some of the Jews. Here the inhabitants flee from Jerusalem.\footnote{Wadstein accepts the first suggestion and regards the dom compartment as representing Fronto holding the court in which the fate of the captured Jews was decided (Josephus, De bello jud., lib. vi. cap. ix). The right-hand gist compartment he thinks shows the captives taken by Titus, and he believes that gist is used either collectively or as a neuter plur., and means captives.' His reasoning, in the absence of any such collective or neuter use of gist elsewhere in OE., has not convinced me that there is any reason for departing from the usual rendering 'hostage.'}

As to the meaning of the dom gist, D. H. Haigh, The Conquest of Britain, p. 43, thought they might perhaps form 'a rebus of the name of the maker of this casket, dom-gist.' To Stephens (Run. Mon. i. 473) they 'rather appear to refer to the scenes represented, the strong measures taken by Titus to secure the obedience of the conquered city and of the people of Judaea generally.' In Run. Mon. iii. 203 he gave another less probable explanation of dom.\footnote{Cf. p. 380.}

\vspace{1cm}

V.

THE RIGHT SIDE (NOW IN FLORENCE).

A glance at the facsimile shows that in addition to the ordinary runes the carver has made use of certain arbitrary signs (\(\text{†}, \lambda, \times, \xi, \mathbf{†}, \mathbf{f}\)), and, furthermore, that there is an almost entire absence of vowel-runes, the only exceptions being the a in the ligature fa (left), and the e rune\footnote{Mr. H. Bradley and Mr. W. A. Craigie arrived quite independently at the same interpretation of the arbitrary runes.} (bottom).

The natural conclusion to be drawn from this was that the arbitrary signs represent the missing vowels, and it was not difficult to assign to them their respective values (\(\text{†} = a, \lambda = a, \times = e, \xi = i, \mathbf{†} = o\)).

\footnote{The last three signs are new ones. The first (\(\text{†}\)) is the ordinary e-rune (as used on the Ruthwell Cross, &c.), the second (\(\lambda\)) is another form of the e-rune (identical with that used on the other sides of the casket, e.g. in esatri, gastri). They cannot however denote e here, but are arbitrarily used for some other sound.}

\footnote{The sign \(\xi\) varies somewhat in form, but I believe that the various forms have all the same value.}
Looking at rdynsheard (bottom) it was evident that the word-division must come between the u and the s, since (with certain well-known exceptions due to syncope, &c.) an s is not found after an u, the latter having been lost in that position in prehistoric English. Taking the letters sheard, the word sorg is most obvious, and looking a few runes ahead we see the synonymous torn. Turning now to the top line and interpreting h as o, we get on hullbysorgla, in the byrg of which we recognize the North. borg, WS. beorg, and a dative ending being required after the on, we may interpret λ as standing on hærmbergeæ, which, except that the carver has taken m instead of harm or hearne, gives a perfectly intelligible reading. Applying the newly gained values to the second line and left, we get sorgæ hund sefa tornææ, where it is evident that h stands for a ('with sorrow and grief of heart'). The only remaining vowel sign occurring more than once (i.e., one naturally first tries the value i, and this smoothening of in to i the right-hand line yields the word *driugiæ, with Anglian WS. *driegiæ), and what more appropriate than 'sunder connexion with 'sorrow-hill'? In the whole of the inscription there are only two vowel-runes, the ð in the ligature (fa), and the M in dMy. In the transmutation given above I have provisionally assigned to the first its ordinary value a. When however we bear in mind that we already have h for a, it becomes probable that the ð is meant for some other vowel, and this is confirmed by the consideration that in the oblique cases of the weak declension we expect the ending -a, not -a. Hence I believe that we must read sefu (gen. sing.). We may similarly conclude that M was intended to denote some other vowel not already represented (a, y, ea, eo).  

1 Cp. foldu (acc. sing.) Cædmon's Hymn; galgu (acc. sing.) Ruthwell Cross; cordu (acc. sing.) Leiden Riddle.  
2 Wadstein has overlooked this and reads dMy as dem. He also reads ñu for swae (right side), wrongly taking the λ to be f, the ordinary i-rune.
These considerations led me to the following reading of the runes, and the word her naturally pointed to the beginning:

Top: her hos sitip on härmbäge agl[ ]
Right: dirigip swæ
Bottom (runes inverted): hiri eotaegisgræfsærð Mνa sorge a
Left: nd sefu torne

Arranging this in three lines and altering sitip ⁴ and härmb- to sitip, harm- ⁵, we get:

Her hos sitip on härmbæge
agl[ ] dirigip swæ hiri eotaegisgræf
særðMνa sorge a and sefu torne.

The meaning of the beginning and the end is pretty clear: ‘Here sits . . . on the sorrow-hill . . . with sorrow and anguish of heart.’ The main difficulties are presented by the middle portion. In this part we at once recognize dirigip, ‘endures,’ and the word eotaeggræf, ‘terror-grove,’ is, at first sight, equally obvious: it suits the ‘sorrow-hill,’ the

¹ After i is a vertical stroke, and after that, traces of a slanting one high up. One has the impression that the carver has purposely cut something out. If the vertical stroke is not a mere mistake, it must be part of one of the arbitrary vowel-runes, and then can only be I or M. The sloping stroke, of which we see a trace, Mr. H. Bradley suggests may be part of a squeezed-up g-rune, yielding aqlag for aqlac (cp. p. 375, note 1), but whether we read the preceding rune as H or M I do not think there is room for it.

² Only the upper part of the λ is still preserved, but still sufficient to make the reading quite certain. Wadstein wrongly takes it to be l (the ordinary r-rune : cp. p. 372, note 2) and reads swæ, but there is no room for a b, nor any trace of another letter.

³ I have purposely not separated the words here.

⁴ Cp. p. 370, note 1. Wadstein evidently regards sitip as a correct early Anglian form for the 3rd person sing., and he cites Sievers, Angelsächs. Gramm., § 358, Anm. 2 ; but Sievers is there only speaking of the late tenth-century interlinear glosses with their well-known utter confusion of grammatical forms. It is impossible to ascribe any such confusion to an early Northumbrian text which accurately distinguishes between i and e in the unaccented syllables. Sitip is, of course, the only possible form.

⁵ The carver or copyist (cp. p. 374, note 2) was evidently thoroughly acquainted with the ordinary runes, for he uses them throughout accurately; but in the case of the arbitrary vowel-runes, which were new to him, he has made several mistakes: sitip for sitip, härmb- for harm-, and presumably hiri for hire, seð for sar.
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'suffers,' and the 'sorrow and anguish of heart.' But for all that, I believe that egisgraf is untenable.

The first and last of the three lines above printed form metrically correct alliterative lines, representing Sievers' types C + C and A + C respectively, and the presumption is that the middle portion should yield an equally perfect line. Since age evidently does not belong to one of the classes of words without sentence stress (conjunctions, prepositions, &c.), nor, on account of the following dragip, can it be a verb, it must be a substantive, adjective, or adverb, presumably the first. In any case it must bear the alliteration. Now as the second half-line can only have one alliterating syllable, and that must be the first of the two arses, and as a substantive egisgraf, beginning as it does with a vowel, would necessarily alliterate, it would follow that the arses in the second half-line must fall on the eg- (or egis-) and on the -graf, and that swe hiri erta, whatever it means, must be unaccented and constitutes an australt of five syllables. But such a half-line as xxxxxc is metrically impossible, whether we regard the xx as a reduced arsis + thesis, or as a resolved arsis. Moreover, erta is neither conjunction nor preposition, but looks like a substantive, and in that case would also alliterate. I propose therefore to give up the egisgraf, tempting as it is, and to read swe hiri ertae gisgraf, which I regard as equivalent to swe hirae erta.

1 Wadstein regards hiri as the possessive 'her'; he believes it to be an old locative and equates it with Frisian hiri. But as we learn from van Helten's Allesfriesische Grammatik (his authority for this form), hiri only occurs in the two so-called Rüstring MSS. (13-14 cent.), the regular form being hin. A reference to van Helten, § 60, shows that a Germanic final -ai is regularly represented in Frisian by -a, but that in the two Rüstring MSS.—and there only—it occasionally appears as i. May we not therefore assume with van Helten (cp. § 24, where he refers back to § 60) that the Rüstring hiri is not a locative at all, but a dative, identical with the ordinary Frisian hir, and that it goes back to a form ending in -ai, just as the OE. hir, later hir, does?

2 I presume that the carver either cut direct from a parchment copy with the verses written in Roman characters, or from a copy, written in runes, made from such an original. That assumption will serve to explain one or two errors. Since in our earliest English MSS. we find as written much
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giscraf¹, 'as "Ertæ" had imposed upon her (assigned to her). We thus get a perfectly metrical half-line of type B, and can compare it with Beowulf, l. 2574, swa him wyrd ne gescraf.

There still remains agl[ ], which must, for metrical reasons, represent a word of at least two syllables. If a substantive, as it most probably is, it may either be the object of dirigib and its subject. In the latter case it must be a feminine proper name because of the following hiri. On the former assumption I should suggest that it may be for aglæ, the accusative of a strong fem. aglī related to egle, adj., eglian, 'to ail,' and to the Gothic weak fem. aglō, 'tribulation, anguish.'

With regard to sær[ ], the M must obviously represent one of the vowels for which the carver had no other symbol (cp. p. 372), i.e. æ, y, ea, eo. If we read sær denn and regard it as equivalent to sär³ denn⁴, it might mean 'rendered miserable.'

Ertæ⁵ I take to be a female proper name. The three more frequently than the ligature æ (in the Epinal Glosses it is regularly written so, cp. Dieter, Ueber Sprachte, &c. der ältesten engl. Dichtung 1885, p. 17), one can easily understand how a copyist, when turning the Roman letters into runes, might mechanically render the æ of his original by H instead of by λ. And if Stevenson's suggestion is correct (cp. note 5), he might misread erca as ercæ.

1 The reason why the carver cut giscraf with g instead of c was that he was already using the two forms of the c-rune (H, λ) as vowels (a, æ), and was therefore precluded from employing either of them here. That being so, the g-rune was the most obvious substitute.
2 The root vowel must in that case be miscent for æ. Or the agl[ ] might conceivably represent an aglæ, the accusative of a weak fem. corresponding to Gothic aglō. Wadstein suggests aglāc, 'misery, torment,' which occurs elsewhere in connexion with drīogan (cp. Grein, s. v. aglāc), and which would suit excellently as regards meaning, but there is certainly no room for the æ (cp. p. 373, note 1).
3 Cp. æ for a in herm-, and p. 373, note 5.
4 For the construction cp. Grein, s. v. dōn: þu mē dydest eðmiðnu, dō mē eowene, &c. It is true that I have found no instance of the passive construction. Moreover one would expect gidon.
5 My friend Mr. W. H. Stevenson suggests the Erce (Erce, Erce, Erce, Eorlan mōder) of the charm, in which case we should have to assume that the carver, or the copyist who turned the Roman letters into runes, misread
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lines would then run: 'Here "hos" sits on the sorrow-hill, endures tribulation as Ertae (Erca?) had imposed upon her, rendered wretched by sorrow and anguish of heart.'

This interpretation of the runes at any rate yields three perfectly correct metrical lines, and also a connected sense. Although I incline to this rendering, I willingly allow that there are difficulties which must not be lost sight of.

On the one hand, it might be urged that, if correct, the inscription would only refer to a small portion of the picture, the rest being ignored. Again, who or what is hos? A proper name? It can scarcely be hōs, 'a troop.'

The her, with which the lines begin, points to the conclusion that the inscription refers to the picture, and it seems difficult to dissociate the hos sitting on the 'sorrow-hill' from the figure with an animal's head sitting on a mound. In that case it would seem simplest to adopt Mr. Bradley's suggestion that hos stands for hōrs, the r-rune having been accidentally omitted. Now apart from the fact that hōrs would scarcely be used of a woman, the sitting figure on the mound is undoubtedly in a man's dress, and it is therefore difficult to see how the kiri, 'upon her,' in l. 2, can refer to it. In that case, the only

the Roman cas (cp. p. 374, note a), no uncommon mistake. But who was Eros? Wadstein connects erla with the ME. verb eren, 'to provoke,' &c., and renders it by 'incitation' (cp. p. 378, note a); but this verb does not appear until the fourteenth century, and is, no doubt, a Scandinavian loan-word from ON. erja.

1 Can hos be the name of some legendary heroine?

2 It is not, in my opinion, necessary for the inscription to refer to more than a part of the picture. If the front, e.g., had been provided with runes referring to the carving, it is quite possible that they would only have referred to a part, say to Weland and Beaduhild, without mentioning either Egil catching birds or the Magi.

3 An interpretation hos et, 'eats the vine-shoot (vine-leaf)' (cp. Napier, O. E. Glosses, i. 364, pampnos = hōsses), in spite of the fact that the sitting figure seems to be biting at the leaves of the branch he is holding in his hand (cp. p. 378), I also think is untenable.

4 For Wadstein's explanation of the picture cp. p. 378, note a.

5 Compare the dress of Weland with those of Beaduhild and her attendant on the front of the casket.
possibility seems to be to separate the first line from the rest and to put a full stop after *harmberga*. Taking that view, can *ag[ ]* be a woman’s name? ‘Ag[ ] suffers’, as Erzæ had imposed upon her, rendered wretched by sorrow;’ &c. If she is represented by the little cooped-up figure in the central portion of the picture, we may perhaps imagine that some story of banishment to a cave in a wood is alluded to, as in the *Wife’s Complaint*, II. 27–28:

Hehte mec mon wunian on wuda bearwe
under æctério in þam eorðscrafe.

There is still a further possibility, though it seems to me far less likely. Should all three lines be separated and regarded as respectively explaining the three scenes *representing* the carving? In that case the last line would refer to the three figures standing on the right, and we should need a verb. The only part of the line which can contain a verb is the *særd Mn*, in which the *d, n* would point to a weak preterite, and we should have to read *særdun*, the preterite plural of a weak verb *særan*, which would presumably mean ‘to make sore or sad.’ It could scarcely mean ‘to be sore or sad.’ Then the line would be rendered by: ‘[They, the three figures?] saddened [whom?] with sorrow and anguish of heart.’ But why the sudden transition from the present *sitip, drigip*, to the preterite *særdun*, and from the singular to the plural? Moreover, we expect a subject to this plural verb to be expressed. Can it be that these three lines have been selected from three different passages from some longer poem dealing with the tale here depicted, and that, though without their context they are not complete, they were sufficiently intelligible to an

1 Or perhaps rather ‘passes her life.’ As an intransitive verb *drīgan* is only recorded in the sense of ‘to be employed, busy,’ not ‘to be suffering,’ but this may be merely an accident.


3 I merely put this forward as a possibility to be taken into account. I do not myself believe in it. We should then be forced to read *sefa*, not *sef(u* (cp. p. 372).
Anglian of the seventh or eighth century, conversant as he would be with the story, to serve as headings for the three situations represented on the picture.

With regard to the words on the carving itself, in which the ordinary vowel-runes are used, we read *risi bita* above, and *wudu* below. The last would seem to indicate that the scene of the story illustrated by this part of the picture is laid in a wood. Is it too bold a suggestion to make that the *risi bita* is a compound meaning ‘rush-biter’, feeder on rushes or coarse swampy grass’, and that it refers to the animal below? Does not the figure sitting on the ‘sorrow-hill’ seem to be nibbling at the leaves of the (very unrush-like) branch he is holding in his hand?

I hope that these suggestions may have thrown some light on the mysterious inscription on the Florence fragment, or at any rate may in some measure advance us nearer to its complete elucidation. A thoroughly satisfactory solution of all the problems connected with it is scarcely to be hoped for until we know to what the carving refers, who the actors, and what the scenes were thereon depicted.

1 The form *risi* would correspond to the later WS. *riso*, *riso*, which is recorded (e.g. *Ælfric’s Homilies*, ed. Thorpe, ii. 409?), besides *ris* (*Corpus, Epinal Gil.*, *Ælfric’s Grammar*, ed. Zupitza, 311, &c.). The dictionaries take it to be a fem. in-stem, but that is, I believe, merely based on the genitive plural *carixuma* in *Cockayne’s Leechdoms*, iii. 199. This proves nothing, for it is taken from a twelfth-century MS., in which the OE. declensions are already confused. *Riso* may therefore quite well be an in-stem.

Wadstein believes that *risi* stands by metathesis for *risi*, and that it is an abstract formed by the suffix in from a substantive *ris*., ‘darkness,’ which represents the s form of an ox, es, a stem, of which the Gothic *rīzi* represents the es form, and ON. *rykkr* the ox form (this s form should, by the way, be *riss*, not *risi*). But as such abstract formations were made in Germanic with few exceptions from adjectives—I know of no OE. instances derived from substantives—as moreover the in-abstracts have in OE. all taken the ending *u* (o), as there is absolutely no evidence elsewhere of the existence of an OE. cognate to *rīzi*, and as there is no corroborating form like *hauor* besides *hux*, *huxe* (if Sievers is right, § 289, Anm. 3, in taking this as the s form of an ox, es stem), I cannot accept Wadstein’s suggestion.

2 Wadstein suggests, as Söderberg had already done (cp. p. 964), that the carving on this side represents scenes from the Sigurd (*Sigfrid*) Saga.
There still remain the questions of dialect and age. It is obvious at a glance that the runes were carved by an Anglian, not by a West-Saxon. We have the distinctively Anglian smoothing of diphthongic sounds before h, g, rg, in fergen (cp. p. 368, note 1), berig, unneg, fegtap, bergæ, drigēp (cf. p. 372), and the absence of diphthongization after an initial palatal in castrī. Stephens assigned a Northumbrian origin to the casket, and this is confirmed by the loss of the inflexional n in sefu, by the insertion of a svarabhakti vowel in berig.

Although I remain entirely unconvinced by the reasons he puts forward, and believe that the true explanation of the picture has still to be found, I give a brief account of his views. The mound to the left is the tumulus where Sigfrid lies buried, the figure in man’s clothing seated thereon is Sigfrid’s horse, Grane, whilst the man standing in front of it is Hogn, the murderer of Sigfrid. The centre of the picture again shows us the horse standing with his head bent down over a tumulus in the interior of which the dead Sigfrid can be seen. The figure to the right of the tumulus is Sigfrid’s wife, Guðrun, also mourning over the dead hero. It is night, and the scene is laid in a wood, indicated in the carving by the words risi, ‘darkness’ (cp. p. 378, note 1), and swudu respectively. Of the three figures to the right, the middle one is Brynhild, who is egging on Gunnar and Hogn to the slaughter of Sigfrid.

Wadstein divides the inscription into three parts, each referring to one of the divisions of the picture, and his rendering of it is as follows: (x) ‘Here the horse (Wadstein adopts Mr. Bradley’s suggestion) sits on the sorrow-hill, suffers strong (swif) torment.’ This refers to the sitting Grane. (2) Hinnrta, ‘her incitation.’ This refers to the group of three figures on the right. (3) Egitgrafo, swerdun sorga and sofā-tornas, ‘The grave of awe, the grievous cave of sorrows and afflications of mind.’ On swif cp. p. 373, note 2. Egigrafo might mean ‘terror-grove,’ but not ‘grave of awe,’ which would be -grafo. On swerdun cp. p. 375; moreover OE. don means the ‘lair of a wild beast’; in the sense of ‘a cave’ it does not occur until the fourteenth century. Sorge and torna Wadstein regards as genitive plural, but does not explain how an OE. genitive plural can possibly end in -ae; they are of course dative singular. The genitive plural ending, Indog. -om (with circumflexed accent), is represented by -a in the earliest Northumbrian as well as in West Saxon; cp. wundra, welda in Caedmon’s Hymn. Finally, I may point out that Wadstein has taken no account of metrical considerations.

1 It might be urged that the loss of the inflexional n would not exclude the North Mercian area, as a similar loss of n (side by side with n preserved) is frequent in the later North Mercian glosses to St. Matthew (cp. Brown, Language of the Rushworth Glosses to the Gospel of St. Matthew, ii, pp. 93, 43, 46, 79, 85), whilst it does not occur in the more Southern Vespasian Psalter (cp. Zeuner, Die Sprache des kentischen Psalters, p. 77); but this partial loss of n in the North Mercian Rushworth Glosses would seem not to be Mercian, but to be due to the influence of the Northumbrian
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wylif (cp. p. 368, note 1), and by the æ in cæstri, which in the Mercian Vespasian Psalter would be ȝest—1. We may, I think, safely assert that the home of the casket was the coast of Northumbria. Can the whale have been stranded at the foot of the cliffs on the summit of which stood the abbey of Streoneshalh?

With regard to the age of the carvings, the preservation of the u in flödu points to a date not later than the end of the seventh century, whilst the accurately marked distinction between i and æ in the unaccented syllables—there is not a single instance of the later e—shows that it cannot be much later than 740, by which date e's began to creep in (cp. Sievers, Anglia, xiii. 13). The ēu in grent cannot well be later than early eighth century; in the Epinal Glosses, which Chadwick, 'Studies in Old English' (Cambr. Philol. Trans., 1899, p. 248), dates about 730 at the latest, there are only three instances of ēu as compared with about six times as many of the later eo, io. The use of f instead of b in wylif, sefu, might be urged against the seventh century, but does not militate against the first half of the eighth: cp. the hefæerces besides heben in Cædmon's Hymn, A. D. 737, and Sievers, Anglia, xiii. 15-16. The same may be said of the loss of n in sefu: cp. foldu (= WS. foldan) in Cædmon's Hymn, and galgu on the Ruthwell Cross. The
dialect, as Mr. Henry Bradley has shown in an interesting and convincing article in the Academy, Feb. 17, 1883, p. 116, that the place-names afford undoubted evidence that the present southern boundary of Yorkshire constitutes the boundary line for the loss of n: north of this line the n was regularly dropped, south of it it was invariably preserved: OE. geh beverage, for instance, appears in North Derbyshire, a few miles south of this line, as Händley (in Domesday, Henly), about a mile to the north of it as Helty, &c., &c. This loss of n may therefore be taken as incontrovertible proof of Northumbrian origin. 

1 This in itself would not preclude North Mercian origin, as the Rushworth Matthew generally has æ.

2 I attach great weight to the preservation of n in flödu. This form cannot have been copied from an older original, as the inscription on this side was evidently composed for the occasion, viz. the stranding of the whale. This shows that it cannot be much later than 700.
sīfu, 'seven,' which occurs twice in an early eighth-century Northumbrian gloss (cp. Napier, O. E. Glosses, 54, 1, and Academy, August 24, 1889, p. 119), exhibits both f and loss of n. The most likely date therefore which can be arrived at from linguistic considerations is the beginning of the eighth century.

A. S. NAPIER.

OXFORD,
February, 1900.
THE collection of documents in possession of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, Edinburgh, includes one by the Commendator and Prior of Melrose in 1555, entitled Ane nynetene zeir tak Kir of Dunscoir, granting the teinds or tithes of the Liddesdale parish to Thomas Kirkpatrick, laird of Longhedge, a farm one day to become the home of Burns. Kirkpatrick was to pay to the commendator or abbot annually a rent of £20 Scots per year, equivalent to £380 to the term of the lease. Times were awkward for abbots, however, in 1565; lay impropriation of Church property was epidemic; and a memorandum at the foot of the document attests that the tenant bought up the abbey's rights under the lease by compounding for a slump payment of £61 6s. 8d.

Componitur cum abbate pro presenti assedatione pro octoginta marcis et cum monachis pro duodecim marcis.

This surrender for a mess of pottage struck somebody in the sixteenth century as peculiarly pusillanimous, for, faintly scratched on the upturned bottom of the parchment, are the dry words of a dissatisfied contemporary commentator:

Miserrimis Britis animalibus Abbate et monachis!
II.

The final annotations on John Barbour are not yet written. They ought to contain a warning to innocent persons about the joke in a passage which, by some perversion of critical taste, has been taken as the standard purple patch in the great poem of The Bruce—

A! fredome is a noble thing!

Generation after generation quotes it, even edits it for ingenuous youth, always going on to the close of the apostrophe to cite the clerkly ‘question’ with which it concludes. Mayhap the demure reader will look at his Barbour again and consider the passage in Book I, lines 249 to 260, wherein a conflict of domestic thraldoms is presented upon which, just when we expect a verdict to be pronounced, the poet eludes us with airy modesty:

I leve all the solucioun
Till thaim that ar of mar renown.

This solution which—with his tongue in his cheek—John Barbour left to others more renowned, is debated with virtuous and strenuous fullness in Father Sanchez, De Sancto Matrimonii Sacramento (lib. ix, de debito conjugalii, disputatio 24), where a truly appalling load of canon law is laid on the aside so silly introduced into the address to liberty by the patriotic and circumspect archdeacon. Peradventure the clerks’ disputation to which he referred were found in that volume of Decretals which, as his biographers tell, the honest man borrowed from the Cathedral Library at Aberdeen and never returned.

III.

Morte Arthure, in its alliterative version, has an episode evidently derived from law. When the ambassadors of Lucius ‘the Emperour’ are defiantly dismissed by King
Arthur at Carlisle, the imperial messengers, the senator and his retinue of knights, are ordered back to Rome by the straightest road and in quick time:

Fiue this phase to the porte there thou salk passe over,
Seuen dayes to Sandwych, sette at the large,
Sonly styde on a day, the sounne es hot lyttille!
These muste speke at the spurs and space noughte thi fol.
These wydyne by Wulfgyn-trisse and by no wyay ells:
These shoue mustye one nghte, under must thy longe,
Be it fierce or feld found thou no furttere.

Fiue by thou foundene a sate with-oute the fode metts,
After the armynente daye where sundrye es rungane,
Thou salk be hevede in sixe and with horse drawen
And seynye bepye be handede, boundes to guenwene!

So the senator with his suite departed 'owtt of Carele';
Sir Cador guiding and accompanying 'to Catrile these cuawaye.' And on they went unhalting till the seventh day they heared the bells of Sandwich,

Waye to the wate set they went alle att ones,
With the mene of the walle they wayde up thire ankyns,
And fled at the fire fude in Flandres they rowede.

What does not meet the lay eye here constitutes the point of the ignominy of the exit of the imperial embassy. The mode of departure laid down so stringently under pains and penalties is precisely that prescribed by old English law for the criminal who, having fled to sanctuary, was allowed to escape the gallows by adjuring the realm. Bracton (ed. 1640, ff. 133s, 135) and Fleta (ed. 1647, pp. 45, 46) contain the regulations. The coroner assigned the port; the number of days' journeys was fixed; there was to be no delay: deviation from the direct road was prohibited; when the grith-man reached his port he must go on board ship at once. On the journey if he wandered from the king's highway it was at the risk of being beheaded. If the
sanctuary-man's ship was not in port waiting for him then he must wade into the sea as public evidence of his due arrival—a detail sufficiently brought in by the poetical reference to the floodmark which, by the way, is itself a very ancient term of law both English and Scots.

Thus the poet must have deliberately selected for the senator the most undignified exit conceivable. His further mention of Catterick, famous as the junction of two great arms of the Roman road, or Watling Street, shows an equal appreciation of the ancient recta via and via regia from Carlisle to Sandwich, along which any man of affairs or pilgrim to Canterbury might often enough see grith-men marching under 'the banner of the Church' into exile via Sandwich.

Geo. Neilson.

February, 1900.
1. On sait que l'élision d'un e féminin en hiatus dans l'intérieur des mots, devenue générale en français, s'est produite beaucoup plus tôt en Angleterre que sur le continent. De là la différence du quatrième vers dans ce passage:

G, II. 99-103.
Qu'anc de rens esperance n'urent
Fors de repairer a laesce
E a grant joie senz tristesce
En leur païs a envaisure,
Ne fust ceste forte aventure.

P, 1882-86.
En esperance adonques furen;
De repairier a grant leece
Et a grant houner sansz tristesce
O leur signeur en leur païs
A leur paren, a leur amis.

2. L'anglo-normand dès le xii* siècle confond ë avec i, ce que ne fait pas le français de France, surtout celui du nord. La différence apparaît dans deux passages:

G, II. 1-2.
... A Nuvers, la riche cité;
Amadas l'ot mut deshaité;
Li quer il eschaufe d'ardur.

Mès nul meilleur cunsail ne seuent.
Quel talant qu'ait, atant le levent
Sur un souf amblant destrier.

P, 1879-83.
... A Nevers, la rice cité;
Amadas l'ot, si a troublé
Le cuer et escaufe d'ardeur.

P, 1905-8.
Angoisseus en sont et dolent.
Puis l'ont monté iseuellement
Sus un souf amblant destrier.

Cité et deshaité, seuent et ë, pouvaient rimer en Angleterre, mais non en France.

3. La cause de divergence de beaucoup la plus fréquente est la déclinaison. Dès le xii* siècle beaucoup d'écrivains anglo-normands emploient, comme le français moderne, l'accusatif avec la fonction du nominatif. Cette particularité apparaît à la rime dans plusieurs passages des fragments de Göttingen: elle ne se retrouve pas aux endroits correspondants du ms. de Paris, soit que les vers où elle se présente y manquent, soit qu'ils aient une autre forme. Je n'ai pas compté moins de quinze
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cas\(^1\) de ce genre, que je relève en en formant certains
groupes.

\(a\). Accusatif sing. de la 1\(er\) déclinaison pour nominatif:

\(G\), I. 47–8.
Vus savez ben que dou baiser
A cel point at mut grant mester.

\(G\), I. 67–72.
De l’un fu l’autre s’esprent,
Si s’ajustent naturelment ;
Alumé sunt de tel chalur
Et de tel fu que ja mais jur
Qu’alient a vivre n’ert estait,
Tant cum la vie el cors lur maint-

\(G\), I. 88–90.
Et dit souf et belement :
‘Deus ! cum ai grant [torment]
eût \(^2\)!’
Kar uncore ert tut esperdut.

\(P\), 1155–6.
Vous savez bien que dou baiser
A icel point eut grant mester.

\(P\), 1175–80.
Dou fu d’amor l’uns l’autre
esprent,
Si s’ajustent naturellement
Par si fine loial amour
Et de tel fu que ja mais jour
C’alent a vivre n’estaindra,
Tant cum cascuns vivans sera.

\(P\), 1196–99.
Et dist souf et belement,
Con cili qui est tous esperdus :
‘Dix ! cil grans max dont m’est
venus?’

\(G\), II. 1–2.
... A Nuvers, la riche cité.’
Amadas l’ot mut deshaït ;
Li quer li eschauf d’ardur.

\(G\), II. 15–16.
Deus ! cum aiz fut curtais e sage!
Or est desvé od la grant rage.

\(G\), II. 23–24.
En l’espaude as denz l’aert,
Que l’os remaint tut descouvert.

\(G\), II. 35–6.
Kar dur l’ot semble le deduit :
De lui s’estort et si s’en suit.

\(P\), 1791–3.
... A Nevers, la rice cité.’
Amadas l’ot, si a troublé
Le cuer et escauf d’ardeur\(^3\).

\(P\) manquent.

\(P\), 1811–12.
En l’espaule as denz l’aert,
Que l’os li a tout descouvert.

\(P\), 1823–24.
Qu’il n’aime pas ital deduit :
De lui s’estort et si s’en suit.

\(^1\) J’en omets quatre où la forme de \(G\) peut se défendre comme étant celle
du vocatif (II. 108), ou du nominatif pluriel (II. 114, 131), ou du neutre
(II. 118).

\(^2\) M. Andresen comble un peu autrement la lacune.

\(^3\) Ce même passage a été cité plus haut à propos de la rime de \(i\) avec \(e\).
b. Accusatif de la déclinaison à accent mobile pour nominatif:

... Revent de pamisuns l’emfant.  
A mut grant paine en suspirant  
Ovre les uliz pitusement.

P, 1193-95.  
... Que l’evint de pasmisons.  
Un souspir je tei ki fu lons;  
Les eulz oevre pitusement.

Un autre exemple, avec le mot *bricun*, a été donné à l’instant.

c. Accusatif pluriel pour nominatif:

L’exemple, avec *maltalentis* pour *maltalentif*, a été donné ci-dessus.

Ce n’est pas seulement la rime, c’est la mesure qui permet parfois de constater les infractions du texte anglo-normand à la déclinaison, correcte dans le texte artésien. En voici deux exemples:

G, II. 85-8.  
Kis veist si plurer et plaindre  
Dire poist qu’unc n’oif graindre  
Ploureis ne dol* de nul home,  
Sulunc ço que li livre asume.

P, 1869-72.  
Qui les oist plouter et plaindre  
Dire peist aïc n’oif graindre  
Ploureïc ne duel faire d’oume  
Que li sien font, ce est la soume.

* Le ms. a *Plower ne dol* ; M. Andresen corrige *dol en dolur* ; mais P indique la bonne correction.
Il est clair que dans la plupart de ces cas, sinon dans tous, nous avons affaire, non à des négligences de copiste, mais à des changements voulus et pratiqués avec intention. De quel côté est le texte original? Il n’est guère possible d’en douter. Les formes continentales n’avaient rien qui pût choquer un Anglo-Normand du commencement du XIIIe siècle: il les admettait, soit pour la phonétique, soit pour la morphologie, à côté de celles qui lui étaient propres; il n’aurait pas eu l’idée de changer les rimes en é: ié pour en faire des rimes en é: é, ou de détruire avec acharnement la déclinaison à deux cas 3. Au contraire les formes anglo-normandes, l’élision de l’e en hiatus, la réduction de ié à é, l’emploi de l’accusatif pour le nominatif, choquaient un Français du continent et l’engageaient, s’il voulait faire goûter à ses compatriotes un poème écrit en Angleterre qui présentait ces particularités et d’autres analogues, à les faire disparaître par un travail attentif, qui devait souvent aller jusqu’à refaire complètement ou

1 Ms. Ex; M. Andresen imprime E'n, qui est inadmissible, et propose de corriger, d’après P, Et si li mendent la verur, mais cela paraît inutile.

2 Le fragment s’arrête là, en sorte que le rapport exact des deux textes n’est pas visible.

3 Il est vrai qu’on a des transcriptions anglo-normandes de poèmes continentaux dans lesquelles les formes originales sont souvent remplacées, même à la rime, par des formes insulaires; mais il est aisé de voir que ce sont des copies faites avec une grande négligence, et pour lesquelles il faut parfois admettre l’intermédiaire d’une transmission orale. Au contraire le manuscrit d’où proviennent nos fragments est évidemment très voisin de l’original et est l’œuvre d’un scribe attentif; les altérations, de quelque côté qu’elles proviennent, ont été faites volontairement.

4 Un tel poème pouvait très bien ne pas les présenter. Des Anglais de race écrivaient le plus pur français; on n’a relevé par exemple aucun trait anglo-normand dans l’Ipomedon de Huon de Rotelande.
à supprimer certains passages. C'est un travail de ce genre dont nous avons le résultat dans le ms. P d'Amadas, et il résulte de là avec certitude que le poème original a été composé en Angletre. Ainsi la littérature anglo-normande, qui, dans le genre auquel appartiennent Amadas, possédait déjà, à notre connaissance, le Tristan de Thomas, le roman encore inédit de Waldef, Gui de Warwick, et les deux remarquables ouvrages de Huon de Rotelande, Ipomedon et Protesilaus, peut également revendiquer Amadas et Idoine. Cela sera plaisir, je l'espère, au fondateur de l'Early English Text Society, et le consolera un peu de la perte probable d'une traduction anglaise de ce poème.

L'acquisition est loin en effet d'être sans valeur: le roman d'Amadas est une œuvre du XIIe siècle originale

1 Ce travail serait intéressant à étudier de près; il est en général fait avec beaucoup de soin; toutefois le reviseur a laissé passer quelques endroits qui auraient dû appeler des corrections: ainsi au v. 1296 (G. l. 30) il gardo la rime de sorciere avec dece, tandis qu'il faudrait sorcera (Wace, il est vrai, a aider). On trouve des traces semblables, mais très légères, d'anglo-normanisme dans le reste du poème, pour lequel l'élément de comparaison nous fait défaut (cf. Andresen, p. 86, n. 10, où il faut cependant supprimer l'exemple du v. 286, mal imprimé par Hippeau).—La leçon refaita pour les besoins de la rime ou de la mesure est naturellement souvent inférieure à la leçon originale; cela est sensible notamment aux vers 1155-6, 1196-99, 1817-38, 1847-50 (avec la cheville ce m'est assez), 1899-73 (ce est la soume); noter aussi les omissions. Il faut cependant reconnaître que le manuscrit a généralement accompli sa tâche avec habileté.


3 L'auteur d'Amadas, qui nomme plusieurs fois Tristan et Iseut, les connaissait sans doute par le poème de Thomas: son prologue paraît imité du délicieux épilogue du Tristan.

4 M. Grober ne veut pas reculer Amadas au delà du premier quart du XIIIe siècle; mais la citation du Donnée des Amans et la date du ms. de Göttingen parlent contre cette opinion. Le savant auteur a connu une inadvertance assez singulière en écrivant (Grunderia f. roman. Philol., II. l. 31): "In Berol's Tristan, S. 65-66, erscheinen zwar Amadas und Idoine schon selbst als ein Liebespaar, mit dem exemplifiziert werden kann"; ce n'est
et intéressante par bien des côtés ; il a notamment l’honneur d’avoir introduit dans la poésie, à peu près en même temps que Chrétien de Troies, le motif de la folie où tombe le héros sous l’empire d’un chagrin d’amour, motif qui a, comme on sait, fait une brillante fortune, puisque des romans en prose de la Table Ronde, qui l’avaient emprunté au *Chevalier au lion*, et peut-être aussi à notre poème, il a passé à l’*Orlando furioso*, dont il est devenu le motif dominant.

Le remaniement continental d’une œuvre poétique anglo-normande n’est pas un fait isolé, bien qu’il n’ait pas jusqu’à présent été souvent constaté. On possède une copie faite en Picardie du *Saint Brendan* de Beneeit, composé en 1125 pour la reine d’Angleterre Aélis, dans laquelle on s’est surtout attaché à faire disparaître une particularité de la versification de l’auteur. Mais le parallèle le plus frappant nous est offert par la *Vie de sainte Catherine*, écrite en Angleterre au XIIᵉ siècle par la sœur Clémence de Barking, et dont il existe une rédaction française où les traits anglo-normands de l’original ont été effacés avec autant de soin et par les mêmes procédés que l’ont été ceux d’*Amadas et Idoine* dans notre copie artésienne.

Il serait pas dans le *Tristan* de Béroul, c’est dans le *Donnei des Amans*, cité par Fr. Michel à la p. lxv du t. i. de son édition des fragments de *Tristan*, que sont allégorés Amadas et Idoine ; M. Gröber, qui le sait parfaitement, a fait ici une confusion dans ses notes.

1 Il n’est pas probable que notre poète l’ait emprunté à Chrétien, car il ne paraît pas connaître ce poète : il cite de nombreux romans, parmi lesquels ne figure aucun de ceux de Chrétien.

2 Voyez l’enumération des sources de l’Arioste pour la folie de Roland dans le beau livre de M. P. Rajna, *Le Fonti dell’ Orlando furioso*, p. 342 ss., où d’ailleurs il n’est pas fait mention de notre poème. C’est à tort qu’on a supposé qu’il pouvait y avoir un lien entre *Amadas et Amadis*, où le héros, d’ailleurs, ne devient pas fou à proprement parler.


4 Clémence elle-même nous apprend qu’elle s’est bornée à ‘amender’ une vie plus ancienne, sans doute également anglo-normande.

SUR 'AMADAS ET IDOINE'.

intéressant de retrouver d'autres cas semblables et de prouver ainsi que, si la littérature anglo-normande a largement subi, comme il était naturel, l'influence de la littérature française du continent, elle l'a parfois influencée à son tour ¹.

GASTON PARIS.

¹ Je ne touche pas ici la question bien plus importante de savoir si des poèmes anglo-normands n'ont pas servi de sources à des poèmes français, question très discutée, comme on sait, à propos des romans de la Table Ronde (M. Förster lui-même, l'adversaire déclaré de 'l'hypothèse anglo-normande,' l'accorde pour le premier Tristan). Le fait ne paraît pas douteux pour un roman d'un groupe, Pontus et Sidoina, roman en prose du XIVᵉ siècle, qui est ancêtre du poème anglo-normand de Hervé, probablement à travers un poème français perdu (voyez Romania, xxvi. 468). Il semble de même que les versions continentales des romans de Hamtone aient toutes pour source première un poème anglo-normand.
XLII.

BÉOWULF AND WATANABE-NO-TSUNA.

There was in the tenth century, in Japan, a great nobleman, Yorimitsu of the famous Minamoto family, who had four champions famous for wisdom, courage, strength, and skill; one of these, Kintoki, is the Japanese Orson or Perceval, brought up by the Lady of the Mountain away from mankind, with bears for his playfellows. Another is Watanabe-no-Tsuna, the Japanese Béowulf.

He was sent upon an errand on a wild and stormy night by his lord, Yorimitsu, and as he came back, by a certain deserted, haunted temple, a demon (at first trying to deceive him by falsely appearing as a forlorn maiden) suddenly seized him up and attempted to carry him off. With his master's renowned blade Hinge-kiri, which he was wearing that night, Watanabe freed himself, cutting off at a sweep the demon's arm that had grappled him by the helmet. This arm with its huge claws he bore off as a trophy, and, locking it up in a stone chest, congratulated himself on his exploit, which would, he believed, free the temple from the evil beings that made its neighbourhood dreadful and dangerous. Next day, however, the old lady who had fostered him, an aged kinswoman to whom he owed reverence, was ushered before him and he was prayed to show his trophy to her. He could not refuse so slight a favour; but as soon as the chest was opened the old lady turned to a horrid demon, caught up the grisly arm and dashed off through the roof, half wrecking the room she left, before Watanabe was able to do anything to hinder her or
recapture his enemy’s arm. In the end, however, the
demons are disposed of.

It is clear that, though the details differ, there are in this
story several of the characteristic Béowulf motives. The
haunting Oni or goblin, the discomfiture of the Oni and the
loss of his arm, the borrowed sword, the woman-fiend or fiend
in guise of an old woman, and the recovery of the missing
arm—these are common to both England and Japan, and it
is probable that, account for it as we may (and I have no
means of forming any conclusion on the matter), we have
here the same story. It is difficult at present in Europe
to get at old Japanese books. I have therefore used the
Vulgate of the Japanese children’s picture-books of this
century, and the colour prints by Hokusai and by
Toyokuni and his school, with whom some of the incidents,
such as the struggle at the temple-gate of Rachamon, and
the rescue of the arm, are not uncommon subjects for illus-
tration. In L. E. Bertin, Guerres Civiles du Japon, Paris,
1894, p. 102, will be found a fair reproduction of one of
Hokusai’s famous woodcuts of the arm-lobbing.

Of course till we can get early texts of the Yorimitsu
cycle, the date of the Watanabe stories cannot be settled.
It would be interesting to know whether like Béowulf (and
his Icelandic copy Grettir) the Japanese kerai was a mighty
swimmer.

There are several other well-known tales in Japan iden-
tical with those of Europe, e.g. Shippictaro, the Wooden
Bowl, Crab and Monkey, the Man with the Wen, Little
Peachling—but all these might easily have been brought
in at any time from the West, whereas there does not
seem, at first sight, much probability of this Béowulf story
(which for some time has been connected with a tenth-cen-
tury Japanese hero) having been transmitted from Northern
Europe to Japan before the fifteenth century.

F. YORK POWELL.
XLIII.

JOHN AUDELAY’S POEM
ON THE OBSERVANCE OF SUNDAY
AND ITS SOURCE.

On p. 357 of this volume Professor Napier has printed an O. E. homily, which by reason of its contents forms part of a widespread fiction purporting to be a ‘Letter fallen from Heaven,’ whilst its form links it at once with other texts to which I have elsewhere given the general designation ‘Second Redaction of the Epistle’; their common characteristic consists chiefly in an epilogue in the form of an attestation of the genuineness of the epistle by some mythical bishop or pope. But if with several of them a bishop Peter of Antioch is made the recipient of the heavenly letter, with another a bishop Peter of Nimes, a third subdivision of Red. II has bestowed this important office on a bishop Peter of Gaza. Of this group several Latin texts, ranging from the eleventh to the fifteenth century, and with one exception written on the Continent,

1. *Oitia Merseiana*, i. p. 142 (Liverpool, 1899).
4. Royal MS. 8 F. vii; of the others one was written in the twelfth century at Todi, near Perugia (printed *Anecdotœ Literaria*, i. 61), three belong to the Imperial Library at Vienna, three to the Court Library at Munich, one to the Town Library at Hamburg (printed *Zeitsch. f. Kirchengesch.* xi. 436).
are known to me; also a fragment in the Old Czech
language of the fourteenth century, and finally a ME.
poem, which I print here in full, together with its source.

This poem, written in stanzas of thirteen lines each, claims
the 'blynd Awdlay' for its author. He was a monk at
Haghmon in Shropshire (to the north-east of Shrewsbury),
and wrote about 1426 a good many lines of bad poetry, from
which alone we may gather some scanty information about
his person and character. Part of his poems are printed
from the Douce MS. 302—the only known copy—in vol.
xiv. of the Percy Society (1844), pp. 1–81; one in Morris' 
O. E. Miscellany, p. 210, &c.; in the Anglia, xviii. p. 175,
&c. E. Wülfling deals with 'Der Dichter John Audelay
und sein Werk.' On p. 203 he gives a short account of our
poem, whilst it is altogether omitted in the Percy Society
publication.

Amongst all the above-mentioned Latin texts of this
Peter of Gaza group, none stands—as a careful comparison
has proved to me—so near to Audelay's poem as that con-
tained in the Roy. MS. 8 F. vi², a small folio MS. of English
origin, as I have pointed out, and written in the fifteenth
century. Audelay's immediate source, which no doubt he
found in a MS. of the Haghmon Library, differed pre-
sumably from this text in some minor details, for it seems
that the first stanza of his poem rests on a heading of his
Latin copy not to be found in 8 F. vi, and the same holds
good of stanza xii. 1–5, the lacking Latin parallel of which
appears, however, in the corrupt Todi MS.

Leaving these two points out of consideration, we may
claim the epistle in 8 F. vi as the source of the English
poem, and account, I think, for the differences between the

¹ Preserved in the Strachow Library at Prague (cf. Dobrowsky, Gez d. böh. Sprache, 1792, 79).
² It is noteworthy that the 'Vision of St. Paul in Hell,' which in Audelay's
book forms the next piece to 'The Heavenly Letter,' precedes it here and
moreover represents the source of stanzas i–xxv.
two under the following headings: (1) additions of Audelay's own making, (2) intentional omissions or shortenings and transpositions, (3) deviations arising from the restrictions imposed by the rhymes and stanza form.

Under (1) fall the three last stanzas (xiv-xvi), i.e. a description of the joys awaiting the faithful observer of the Lord's day, a prayer to Christ, and finally the request to bear in mind Christ's commandment and to pray for the author. The lines 7-13 of stanza vii may also belong here; at least I cannot find their original in any of the Latin texts.

To (2) I would reckon (a) the transposition as clearly seen in stanza xiii, and the shortening of the 'Dignatio diei dominicae'; (b) the omission of some passages, when compared with the source, in stanza x, arising probably from the fact that they have already occurred in stanzas viii and ix, and lastly the omission of the Latin 'Siquis conturbationes fecerit ... dispergetur,' in stanza vi.

This passage, which already forms part of the First Redaction of the Epistle, refers to some abuses connected with the noisy behaviour of the people in church; having lost its validity at the time Audelay wrote his poem, he, very wisely, suppressed it.

All other deviations, it seems to me, may well have their origin in point (3).

In printing from the MSS. (Douce 302 and Roy. 8 F. vi) I have introduced punctuation, the numbering of the stanzas, and I have also expanded the many contractions to be found in every line of these texts.

1 This stanza recurs, slightly altered, in other poems of Audelay (cp. Anglia, xviii. p. 179).
2 Cf. Migne, vol. xxxix. c. 2275, 4; ibid. 2238, 3.
3 I am greatly indebted to Professor A. Napier for comparing my copy of Audelay's poem, which I had somewhat hastily taken several years ago, with the original, and for giving me his valuable advice on several doubtful points.
MS. DOUCE 202, fol. 16.

AUDELAY'S POEM.

I.

Now here pis pistil, I 3ou pray,
Fore Crist hit wrot with his oun hond,
hou 3e schul halou pe sonday
al cristin men in euere lond,
and send hit to Petir porq his swete sond
to preche pe pepul with good entent
and do al curatours to vnderstond
pat hit is Cristis comawndment.
Belene pis euerechon.

he pat beleuys pis treuly
schal haue grace and mercy
and no noper securely,
he is pe child of perdecon.

II.

Fore 3e connot of god pis holeday
kepe clene out of dedle syn,
derfore hys wrapi, Syris, V 3ow say
schal fal on 3oue false cristyn men.

3our enmyes and aleyns schal ouer 3ou ren
and lede 3oue to praldam fore euere and ay
bop ryful, rob, sle, and bren,
bot 3if 3e kepyn pat holeday.
herefore 3e wil be chent,

Raueners sodenly schal fal on 3ou
and wyckid terantis cast 3ou ful loue,
fore gracious god 3e wyl not know
ne kynde kepe his comawndment.

II, 9 chent] ch = sch occurs frequently in the MS.
II, 11 terantis] 'tyrans' translates rapaces.

* nesciitis tenor nec custodi. 
III.

Herefore fro you I wil turne my face and betake you into your enmyse hond and withdraw fro you merce and grace and blynd you bob with schame and schond and drown you within a lytyle stownd, as I did Sodom and Comor that pe erpe swolewed to helground sodenly or pai were ware. Hauie mend, Siris, here apon, beware be tyme or se be schend and your mysdedis loke se amend and serue your god, foresake pe fynd: pen schul se haue remyssion.

IV.

Hwo so euer wil go, Siris, truly into any oþer plase, I say, bot to hole cherche specialy in pe fest of pat holeday, or on pilgrimage seyntis to pray, or vesid pe seke pat woful be, ore make acord and treu loueday to bring men into charyte and serue your saueour:

Ellis I schal bete 30ue with scorgis sore and send into your place herefore sorou and sekenes fore eer more, swerd, pestlens, hongir with gret dolour.

III, 7 swolewed first e altered from or, weth erased.

1 faciebis. 2 sbm'ci. 3 om., before vivas the MS. has pæd (r).
V.

He pat on any erand wil ryd or goo
in pe fest of pat holeday
Fore one cause he hap to do,
or schaue heerus of heed or berde away,
bot go to pe cherche 3if pat 3e may,
and hold him þer in his prayere:
Al euylis y wil send him sop to say
and chortyn his days he schuld haue here.
Beware, Sierys, I 3ou pray,
or he pat waschis clopis or hed,
on sunday breuys or bakus bred,
y schal him blynd with carful red
Noper haue my blessyng nygþ ne day.

VI.

Bot my curse haue he schal.
y wyl send sekenes and sorous sore
apon 3ou and 3our childer all,
þat 3e schul curse þat 3e were bore.
3e vnbeleuyd pepul, herkyns more,
and schreud generacons, þat nyl beleue;
3our days schal be ful schort þerfore,
fore 3e set noȝt by 3our god to greue.
I am among 3ou euer present
and synful men I wyl abyde,
3if þay wil turne in one tyde,
foresake cursid couetyse, enuy, and pride
and here mysydis be tyme repent.
scilicet dies [vestri]. Ego enim sum patiens super vos et expectabo
peccatores, vt convieriantur ad penetentiam.

V, 11 breuys] neither in the Latin source nor in any other text of this
Redaction.
VI, 9 present] seems to have arisen from a misreading of patiens, which
was perhaps contracted.

1 scierit.
ON THE OBSERVANCE OF SUNDAY

VII.

1. In vi days al þyng I made,
on þe sunday y rest of my werkis al;
þe same do 3e, þen schul þe glad
of þour labors þop gret and smale.

5. Non oper þyng do 3e schal
bot go to þe cherche to godis seruyse
also wel þour seruandis þat þe þe 30ue þral.
Non oper warkis loke þat þai vse
þen ful ioyful schul þe be.

10. þour corne, þour vynes and creaturs all
schul bryng þor þop þo 30ue gret and smale
þat no þyng to cristyng men vont hit schal
bot pese and rest in vche cunte.

VIII.

1. Bot 3if 3e kepyn þis holeday
Fro settreday at non y say 3ou þen
into þe furst our of monday
in reuerens and worship of þour soueren,
5. I schal curse 30ue to fore my fader in
heuen.
3e schul haue no part þerin with me
ne with my angelys þat with me bene
in þe word of wordis perpetually
bot þy wyl send 30ue herefore
10. gret fyrus and leyts 30ue fore to bren,
al euelys to perysche þour labors þen,
þour cornes, þour froytis, þour vynus, þour
tren
and neuer rayn schal fal on 3ou more.

Si non custodieritis
diem dominicum de
hora nona sabbati usque
ad horam primam
ferie secunde, anatematizabo vos coram
patre meo qui est in
celis et non habebitis
partem mecum neque
cum angelis mei in
secula seculorum.

VII, 3 same] MS. sahe.
IX.

3 your tepis 3our offryngis 3euyn treuly to my prestis, I 3ou pray,
pat seruene me in hole cherche spesialy and prayn fore 3ou bop nyȝt and day.
5 Hwo so euer his tepys defraudys away, his froytis in epr defraudid schuld bene and neuer se lyȝt bot derkenes ay, ne neuer hau 3our lastyng lyue hen, bot hongyr in erpe among cristin schal be.
10 Fore I kepe my dome for unbelueyd men, and yet I nold dampne hem þen my comawnmentis to kepe and ken and foresake here synys and aske mercy.

X.

7 Treule 3if 3e wil haloue þis holeday, þe rakkis of heuen I wil opyn and mutypye 3ou in me fore euer and ay, 3if 3e wil do after my tokyn.
3 and knov wel þat I am god alone, and non oþer þer is saue y þat may 3ou grawnt remyssyon and 3if 3ou grace and mercy. Loke 3e leuen treuly þis.
10 Amen, fore sop to 3ou I say: 3if 3e wil halou þis haedalys, al euelis fro 3ou y wyl do awa, þen schul 3e neuer faire amys.

Sacerdotibus mei decimas sideliter date; qui fraudauerit deci-
mas suas, fraudatas erit in terra et non videbit lumen in eter-
num nec vitam eter-
nam habebit et fames erit in terras cristia-
norum. Omnibus crude-
lis 4 populus (1) iudici-
cium vos bibis serru nec volo condempnare, si feceritis que precipio
vos.

Si custodieritis diem
dominicum de hora
nona sabbati usque ad
secundam feriae hora
prima, aperiem 5 vos
cateractas 4 cell et mul-
tiplicabo laborum ve-
strum et elongabuntur
dies vestri et non crit
fames in terras cristia-
norum neque turbatis,
et stabo in vos et vos
in me. et scitis, quia
dominus sum et no
est aliquid preter me.
aem dico vobis, si ob-
seruaeritis sanctam
diem dominicum, omnis
mala auferam a vobis.

IX, 1 3euyn] a spot on the n. 8 hen] MS. he = hene (hence). 10 for
MS. fro, but cp. source indicium vobis seruo. 12-15 we should expect a
conditional sentence.

1 'e dit very indistinctly written; according to Audelay's text we should
read incredulus.
2 apias. 3 preceded by ερίφου.
ON THE OBSERVANCE OF SUNDAY

XI.

What prest pis pistil nyl not teche to my pepil, as I ham pray, in cetis, in tounus, in cherche hem preche how pai schal halow jus holeday, to haue hit in memory fore ever and ay: my domys apny my prestis schal passe; I schal ham ponys treuly in pay bop without mercy and grace. Bot if pai techen pis pistil treuly and make men to haloue pis hole day, I schal ham curse in herp I say and in pe word of wordis pat lasty p ay and in myn oon trone in heuen on yce.

Si quis sacerdos istam epistolam non legerit et non custodierit siue in villa siue in Civitate, judicium sustinebit et auferat nomen eius de libro vite, et si non legerit per dies dominicos, vt semper habeant in memoriam: quod si non custodieritis ipsam epistolam, anatematizabo vos usque in seculum seculi et in presenti et futuro et septimo trono.

XII.

Pis pistil our lord Jhesu Crist send in to pe sete of Gason, per y Petur was made bishcop furst in pe present 3ere to fore agoone. Pat hit be trewe and leosyng non, y Peter swere be goddus pouere, and be Jhesu Crist, his houle sone, and be pe hole treneate in fere and be iii euangelistes, pis is no nay, and be pe patryarchis and prophetus and postlis holy and be angelis and archangelis and Mary and be al pe holy scnyis in heuen pat be, pat hit is sop pat I syn say.

[iuro ego Petrus] per deum omnipotentem et per Iesum Cristum, filium eius, et per sanctam ecclesiam trinitatem et per xij prophetis et per xij apostulis et per iiijevangelistas et per beatam Mariam et per reliquias omnium sanctorum.

[XII, iur y Petur] written over an erasure.

1 These words are not in the Anecdota.
2 pacio, but cp. Andelays's poem; Petrus also in the other Latin copies in this place.
XIII.

If Ryȝt as þe sun hab more clerte þen ane ster of þe fyrmant,
So þe sunday is worþear of dyngnete þen ane day in þe wike present.
5 þat day mad angeles omnipotent þe ix orders of in heuen on hye,
þat day Noys flod sesud verament,
his schip tok rest of þe hil of Armony.
I swere to þoue þat beþ present:
to þis pistil was neuer ordent of erple mon
bot transelat out of heuen trone,
Crist wrot hit with his fyngers alon
to warne his pepel lest þay were chent.

Archa super diluuium. [In die dominico eripuit populum suum israelicum de egipto de manu pharaonis. In die dominico pluit dominus manna de celo. In die dominico fecit dominus aquam vinum. In die dominico pauit dominus v. milia hominum de v. panibus et duobus piscibus. In die dominico baptizatus est a Johanne. In die dominico misit deus spiritum suum apostolis. In die dominico sedet Christus ad dexteram patris sui, cui est honor et gloria in secula seculorum Amen.]

XIV.

If Fore he callis ȝou to his grace echon,
Cum to me fore ȝiftis, ȝou pray,
Fore I grawnt ȝou remission
and ioy and blis fore euer and ay.
5 No hert may þenke, tung tel hit may þe lest ioy Jhesus wil ioyne ȝou to.
3if ȝe halou þe sunday,
ȝe schul have wel without wo.
A synful mon here of have mynde;
10 þat ioy hit schal neuer sees
bot euer endeuer and euer encresse,
and euer in loue rest and pes
in ioy and blis withouton ende.

XIII, 8 tok rest] MS. tokrest.

\[1\] fortinata.

\[2\] read celo.
ON THE OBSERVANCE OF SUNDAY

xv.

† To þat blis Crist he vs bryng
was cruçefyd on cros and croned \ with 
Þorne,
and forçif vs oure mysleuyng
þat we han offendid here be forne,
g and let vs neuer, lord, be forlorne
bot graunt vs grace þat we may,
as 3e were of a maydýn borne,
in clannes to halou þe suneday.
Lord omnipotent,
10 Fore þi passion þu haue pete
apon our soulis when we schul dey
and grawnt vs þi grace and þi mercy,
Fadur, to fore þi iugement.

xvi.

† Meruel 3e noȝt of þis makyng,
Fore I me excuse hit is not I,
Fore þis of godis oun wrytyng
þat he send doun fro heuen on hye,
5 Fore I couþ neuer bot he foly.
he hap me chastist for my leuyng.
I þonk my god my grace treuly
of his gracious vesetyng.
Beware, serys, I 3ou pray,
10 Fore I mad þis with good entent,
Fore hit is Cristis comawndment.
Prays fore me þat bæp present,
my name hit is þe blynd Awday.

XV, 2 Relative om.† 8 suneday] MS. sunnoday.

R. PRIEBSCHE.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON,
April, 1900.
XLIV.

‘ANDREAS’ AND ‘FATA APOSTOLORUM’

I cannot help thinking that the poems entitled ‘Andreas’ and ‘Fata Apostolorum’ have never yet received full justice. In the edition by Baskerville (1885) the poem of ‘Andreas’ comes to an end at l. 1718, and the ‘Fata Apostolorum’ is entirely ignored. Notwithstanding the various articles which have already appeared, I venture to give my own view of the subject after an independent investigation of it.

The whole matter has been obscured by the very unfortunate way in which the editors have treated the division of ‘Andreas’ into Fits or Cantos; yet everything really turns upon this. No one can understand this matter without consulting Wülker’s excellent and useful photographic reproduction of the M.S. itself. This tells us much that the editors have most carefully either suppressed or misrepresented.

For we thus learn that ‘Andreas’ and the ‘Fata Apostolorum’ are written continuously, as if they formed one entire poem; and this I hold, with Mr. Gollancz, Sarrazin, and Trautmann, to be the simple truth. When the scribe fairly arrives at last at the real end of the whole, he adds FINIT in capital letters, and the rest of the page is blank. Why? Simply because it is the very and true end.

The poem (I am assuming it now to be all one) is divided
into sixteen Fits. Each Fit begins with quite a large capital letter, and the rest of the first word in the Fit is in (smaller) capitals also. Moreover, after each Fit there is always a blank space equivalent to the breadth of a single line, neither more nor less. All these facts, which are absolutely essential to our understanding the make-up of the poem, are either suppressed or misrepresented. I have not Grimm's edition, but I here make a note of what the other editors have done.

1. Thorpe's edition really indicates the true places where the Fits begin, but only in a most meagre and inefficient manner, viz. by a very short dividing stroke, which is not explained. When he comes to the end of Fit 15, he starts a wholly new poem, and calls it 'The Fates of the Twelve Apostles,' and 'a fragment.' Yet it is obviously in the MS. complete as far as it goes, and to call it 'a fragment' is mere mystification. Perhaps his reason was simply this, viz. that he did not print it all, but stopped (as Grein did) at the end of 1. 95 of the Fit; merely adding a couple of lines of asterisks. A glance at the facsimile shows the reason of this. He stopped because he could not decipher the contents of the last page, fol. 54 (recto) of the MS. And indeed, this page is in a horrible mess. Wilker gives it as his opinion (and I believe he is quite right) that the first discoverer of the MS., viz. Dr. Blume in 1832, treated this page with some chemical, to make it more legible. It is a most foolish, unnecessary, and unjustifiable process; of course a man who fails to read a page of a MS. ought to leave it as he found it, to give his successors a chance. And it so happens that, as Prof. Napier has shown, these lines, when deciphered, are the most valuable of all, as giving the author's name. The runes occurring on this page give the name Cynwulf, a variant of Cynewulf, which occurs elsewhere, i.e. in the poem of 'Crist.' The occurrence of this name does not absolutely prove that Cynewulf, the
author of 'Elene,' wrote 'Andreas,' but it proves that the writer of 'Andreas' put Cynewulf's name to it, and so claimed it for some one of that name. And we have no right to suppress this evidence.

2. Kemble's edition ignores the division into Fits; and he omits the 'Fata Apostolorum' altogether. In his Preface, p. vii, he says that 'St. Andrew' is the first poem in the MS., and that 'The Fates of the Twelve Apostles' is the second.

3. Grein arbitrarily divides the poem of 'Andreas' into eleven Fits; without telling us why he did so. The divisions are made just where it pleased him, without any reference to the divisions in the MS. Thus, the MS. assigns to the first Fit 121 lines; but Grein gives it 160, which is quite abnormal. And so on throughout.

4. Still more wonderfully, Baskerville divides the poem of 'Andreas' into twenty-nine Fits, without assigning any reason. He likewise pays no heed whatever to the divisions in the MS., so that his first Fit contains only 39 lines!

Under the circumstances, it seems worth while to state how the MS. itself treats these Fits. I give the numbering of the lines as in Baskerville, adding Grein's numbering (where different) within square brackets.

1. Fit 1 begins with HWÆT, the H being a large capital. It contains 121 lines.

2. Fit 2 begins with ÆA, with a large capital. Baskerville and Grein print it ÆA; with an ordinary capital thorn-letter. It contains 108 lines; ending at l. 229.

3. Fit 3 begins with the same word, only this time the first letter is actually a large capital thorn-letter. It contains 122 lines, ending at l. 351. The perversity of the editors is strangely shown by the fact that Baskerville concludes his sixth Fit, and Grein his second, just seven lines further on!

4. Fit 4 begins with the same word as Fit 2, written in the same way. It contains 117 lines, ending at l. 468.
5. Fit 5 begins with Ongan, written in a very remarkable way. The capital N is written inside a large O, and the rest of the word is in small letters. It contains 132 lines, and ends at l. 600.


We should particularly note that this last Fit is of a fair average length, and quite consistent with the rest; for the Fits vary from 95 lines to 132, the average length being 115. Compared with Fit 16, we notice that five Fits are longer, nine are shorter, and one (the third) of precisely the same length. This goes a long way towards showing that it really belongs to the fifteen Fits that precede it; and that there is no metrical reason for separating it from them.

It is sad to reflect that this last Fit has never yet been printed in its entirety in an accessible book. Baskerville and Kemble omit it altogether; whilst Grein and Thorpe give only 95 lines. Moreover, Grein makes these lines precede ‘Andreas’; whereas, in the MS., they come at the end of it! As for the last 27 lines, we have to look for them in Prof. Napier’s article, in the Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum, vol. xxxiii, p. 72; in Sievers’ article in Anglia, vol. xiii; and in the last page of the Preface to Wülker’s edition of the facsimile of the MS. By a singular fatality, Sievers gives eleven of the verses on pp. 9, 10 of his article; but at pp. 22 and 23, where the rest appear, he calls
them twelve verses, and thus gives the whole number of the extra verses as 28, when they are really 27. Adding these to the 95 in Grein, we see that Fit 16 contains 122 lines, as aforesaid.

The point which I am trying to bring out is simply this; that, if we go by the testimony of the M.S. itself, we must allow that the first poem in the M.S. occupies the back of fol. 29, folios 30–53, and fol. 54, recto, where it ends with the word FINIT; below which is a blank space sufficient to contain six more lines. And further, that this poem consists of 1840 lines, disposed in 16 Fits, of about 115 lines apiece, on an average. We have now to inquire, why the last Fit was cut away from the rest.

I suppose that the unfortunate omission, in Thorpe’s edition, of the last 27 lines had something to do with it; for it helped to obscure the true state of the case. And for this it is possible that Dr. Blume was to blame. But, as it was he who discovered the M.S., he is obviously to be gratefully remembered; and his peccadillo (if it was really his) must by common consent be condoned. But there is no harm in praying fervently against the recurrence of a similar error of judgement.

And next, of course, it was observed that Fits 1–15 treat mainly of the legend of St. Andrew, whilst Fit 16 mentions all the Apostles. It was therefore assumed that these were distinct poems; and Fit 16 was labelled ‘Fata Apostolorum,’ and printed apart from the rest.

This is not the doing of the scribe; for he assigned no title at all to the poem or poems. He simply began his work with a word in large capitals, and went right

---

1 He also omits the word FINIT at the end; which, in my view, is material. In writing out ‘Eline,’ the scribe unluckily wrote ‘finit’ at the end of what seemed to be the last Fit; but discovering that another Fit followed by way of Epilogue, he had to mark the true end of the poem by adding ‘AMEN.’
on till he came to FINIT. It is therefore admissible for me, or for any one else, to propose any title we please.

Now it seems to me perfectly clear that the title 'Andreas' or 'St. Andrew,' though extremely convenient and descriptive, is technically wrong. The right title is surely—'The Twelve Apostles.' Moreover, if we are to select any one Apostle as the subject of the poem, then the true person to select is St. Matthew. In order to see this, we have merely to take the opinion of the author himself, the only person that, in such a case, has the real right to decide. And to get the author's opinion, we must read his preface, i.e. the opening lines of his poem. I therefore subjoin a rough rendering of part of ll. 1-13, which will suffice for the purpose:

Lo! we have heard, in days of yore, of TWELVE FAMOUS HEROES beneath the stars, THE LORD'S DISCIPLES. Never failed their glory in hard conflict, when standards met clashing, after they had parted asunder, even as the Lord himself, the high King of heaven, appointed each one his lot. THESE were men illustrious on the earth, excellent leaders of the people, and keen in onset, men well-renowned, at what time shield-rim and hand defended the helmet upon the battle-plain, upon the field of destiny. One of them was MATTHEW, who first of all began amongst the Jews to write a gospel in words with wondrous skill; to WHOM, &c.

Here the poet tells us, as plainly as he can speak, that the subject of the poem is the Twelve Apostles; and by way of sample, he takes St. Matthew first. And the story is at first wholly concerned with him, for more than 160 lines. St. Andrew is first mentioned in l. 169; and, though he occupies a large portion of the rest of the poem, his function is really a subordinate one. His business was to rescue St. Matthew, who at last issues
'ANDREAS' AND 'FATA APOSTOLORUM'

from his prison in triumph (l. 1042); so that his story practically ends at the end of Fit 9. When St. Matthew is thus happily disposed of, the story of St. Andrew, henceforward considered as the principal hero, really begins; for indeed, he was likewise one of THE TWELVE, and thus entitled to become the poet's subject on his own account.

At the end of Fit 15 St. Andrew safely returns to Achaia, the province whence he had been summoned in order to save St. Matthew.

If this matter has been rightly grasped, the reader will now understand the remarkable way in which Fit 16 (the last) begins. The poet reverts to his original theme; but finding by this time that the Apostles cannot all be discoursed of at the same length as St. Matthew and St. Andrew, he cuts the story short by the ingenious device of giving, not their whole legends, but merely a brief account of how each one came to his end. As neither St. Matthew nor St. Andrew were killed off in Fits 1-15, it became necessary to give each of these a few lines more. We thus learn that St. Matthew was executed (put to sleep by weapons), and that St. Andrew was crucified (was extended on the gallows). It is also worth noting that the Twelve Apostles include St. Paul, place being made for him by ignoring St. Matthias. I now give a rough rendering of the beginning of this sixteenth Fit:

Lo! I composed THIS SONG when weary with life's journey, when my mind was ill at ease; I collected, with wide search, the tale how THE NOBLE ONES displayed their courage, those illustrious and FAMOUS ONES. TWELVE were they, celebrated for their deeds, CHOSEN BY THE LORD, beloved in this life. Their praise spread widely, the might and fame, throughout the earth, of THE LORD'S DISCIPLES; their glory was not small. Each one's lot directed the holy band where they should adjudicate the Lord's justice,
and explain things in the sight of men. Some in the city of Rome, bold and keen in onset, yielded up their lives, owing to Nero’s oppressive cunning, namely, Peter and Paul. The rank of the Apostles was widely honoured among the nations of mankind; as, for instance, Andrew in the land of Achaea, &c.

It is impossible not to be struck by the fact that these opening lines of Fit 16 are precisely parallel to the opening lines of Fit 1; as Trautmann so explicitly declares. They announce the same theme, viz. the Twelve Apostles, and in the same way; with actual repetition of some of the more striking words. Thus both begin with the usual note to call attention, the exclamation hwæt. In Fit 1, l. 1, we find wē gefrunan, answering to ic fand in Fit 16, l. 1. Fit 1, l. 2 runs thus:

twelfe under tunglum tir-eadige hæleþ;

and Fit 16, l. 4 is:

torhte and tir-eadige. Twelfe wæron.

Fit 1, l. 3 is:

þeodnes þegnas; nō hira þrym ǽlæg.

Fit 16, l. 8 is:

þeodnes þegna, þrym unlytel.

Fit 1, ll. 5 and 6 express precisely the same idea as Fit 16, ll. 9, 10. Compare:

after they had parted asunder, even as the Lord himself, the high King of heaven, appointed each one his lot (l. 5, 6). Each one’s lot directed the holy band where they should adjudicate the Lord’s justice (XVI. 9, 10).

In Fit 1, l. 8, the Apostles are called fyrdhwote; and the very same epithet is applied to them in Fit 16, l. 12. Even the latter half of Fit 1, l. 11—‘Wæs hira Matheus sum’—is echoed by the latter half of Fit 16, l. 11—‘Sume on Rome byrig.’ This shows at once that Fit 16 is really
a continuation of the main poem, and I hold that it is this whole poem, and not merely the scrap in Fit 16, which the poet calls his SONG: ‘Lo! I composed THIS SONG’; i.e. this long poem. The word song is, in fact, contrasted with the word Fit below; for when he draws attention to the runes contained in Fit 16, he says:

Hér mæg findan forelances glēaw . . .
hwā þæs fitte fægde.
i.e. ‘Here may one who is skilled in penetration discover who composed this Fit’—

viz. the Fit which contains the runes, and so names the author of the whole. And observe that the use of the word Fit implies the existence of a poem to which the Fit belongs.

It is perhaps just worth while to add that, besides the coincidence above, other lines occurring in the main poem are repeated in Fit 16 without much variation. Compare the following:

wuldræ gewlitegad ofer werþeoda (543):
wide geweorþod ofer werþeoda (XVI. 15).
in Achaia Andreas was (169):
swylce Andreas in Achaia (XVI. 16).
heriges bryhtne (1200): heriges byrhtne (XVI. 21).
eglæna ordfruma (146): englæ ordfruma (XVI. 28).
bearhtne boldwelan (524): bearhtne boldwelan (XVI. 33).
siþfeates sæne (204, 211): siþes sæne (XVI. 34).
beornas beado-creft (219): beano-creftg beorn (XVI. 44).
beornas beadu-rœfe (847): beornas beadu-rœfe (XVI. 78).”

And once more, at the end of the Fit (exclusive of the

1 Trautmann draws the same conclusion from the expression ’bysses giddles begang’—the study of this poem—which occurs twice in Fit XVI. ll. 89, 107. It is much too grandiloquent an expression to be used of a mere scrap.

2 Trautmann adds that XVI. 10 is repeated from 1192 [1194] and 1400 [1403].
epilogue), the author declares that his theme is the Twelve Apostles:

THUS the noble ones received their deaths,
The TWELVE excellent in mind; these servants of glory possessed with their souls imperishable renown.

Surely the author of this work has met with much ill fortune. He composes a poem in sixteen Fits of nearly equal length. At the beginning of the first of these he announces as his the theme subject of the Twelve Apostles. He begins with St. Matthew, and shows how he was rescued by St. Andrew. He then treats of St. Andrew alone, but only so as to bring him safely back to Achaia. Then, in his last Fit, he gives the final fate of all the Apostles in order, introducing St. Paul in the place of St. Matthias, so as to bring his subject to an end; and concludes with an epilogue, containing the name of Cynwulf, expressed in runes.

It is difficult to see how he could have done better. He could not foresee that the last page in the only copy of his poem which happened to be preserved would be so spoilt that the first editor would omit its contents altogether; that the same editor would imagine Fit 16 to belong to another poem, and would call it a fragment; that the connexion of Fit 16 with the rest would then be so completely severed that Grein would actually make it precede Fit 1; and that the poem would never be printed in its entirety even as late as 1899; so that no man would be permitted to see the true state of the case.

It is worth notice that the poem of 'Elene' consists of 15 Fits, of which the last forms the Epilogue. The Fits, as a rule, are somewhat shorter, the average length being 88 lines; but the first Fit (98 lines) is of the same length as the eleventh and twelfth of 'Andreas,' and the second (like the sixth of 'Andreas') contains 95 lines. If we arrange the four marked poems according to the average
length of a Fit, we have the series: ‘Andreas,’ 115 lines; ‘Juliana,’ (about) 111; ‘Crist,’ 98; ‘Elene,’ 88. The average length in the ‘Phoenix’ is 94 lines.

Let me draw attention (as Sievers has done already) to yet one more matter in connexion with this Fit 16 which also requires some further discussion. For this purpose, it is necessary to consider the whole of the twenty-seven lines at the end, which Thorpe omitted. As Fits 1–15 contain 1718 lines, and Grein has printed ninety-five lines more, making in all 1813 lines, these last twenty-seven lines are really ll. 1814–1840. I now subjoin a translation of them, and number them correctly, which has never been done yet:

Here may one who is skilled in penetration discover, who it was that composed this Fit. Fœoh [wealth] stands at the end thereof,

which men enjoy while upon earth; but they cannot always be together while dwelling in this world. Wynn [joy] must fade, Ûr [ours] though it be in our home. So must finally decay the transitory trappings of the body, even as Lago [water] glides away.

Then shall Cen [bold warrior] and Yfel [the wretched one] seek for help in the anxious watches of the night. Nýd [constraint] lies upon him, the service due to the King. Now mayst thou discover who in these words has been revealed to men.

Let him who loves the study of this poem be mindful of one thing, namely, to give me help and desire my comfort. I must needs, far hence, all alone seek elsewhere a new habitation, and undertake a journey, I myself know not whither, out of this world. My new chambers are unknown, my new dwelling-place and home. So will it be for every man, unless he cleave fast to the divine Spirit. But let us the more earnestly cry unto God, let us send up our petitions to the bright heaven, that we may enjoy the habitation,

1 i.e. at the end of the name, viz. Cynwulf, which ends with Fœoh, or F.
the true home on high, where are the greatest of joys, where the King of angels grants to the pure an everlasting reward. Now his praise shall endure for ever, great and all-glorious, and his power with it, eternal and freshly young, throughout all creation. 1840

It is further absolutely necessary to observe the eight lines that precede these, viz. ll. 1806–1813; which run thus:

Now I beseech the man who loves the study of this poem, that he pray for help, for me who lament, to the communion of saints, for my peace and support, now that I need gentle friends upon my journey, since all alone I must seek a long-lasting home, an unknown habitation, and upon my track I leave my body, a portion of earth, as a spoil for the benefit of worms to dwell in.

It is clear that these eight lines are a mere repetition, not very much altered, of ll. 1825–1840 above. We have, in fact, two epilogues, as has been so clearly pointed out by Sievers. One is exhibited in ll. 1806–1813 (the eight lines above) and in ll. 1814–1824, which immediately follow them and contain the runes; and the other in ll. 1825–1840, which (in the present copy) conclude the poem. Of these alternative forms, one or the other is superfluous; and how is the phenomenon to be explained?

Let us call ll. 1806–1824, which now come first, by the name of Epilogue B; and let us call ll. 1825–1840, which now end the poem, by the name of Epilogue A; and the problem is solved.

The author's first intention was to end with Epilogue A. But he afterwards determined to compose an epilogue containing runes, so as to give a clue to his name. Consequently he composed Epilogue B in its stead, and placed it in its right position, at the end of the poem. But by some chance the scribe had access to a copy of the original Epilogue A; and, thinking it too good to be lost—for which he is not to be blamed—he inartistically
tacked it on to the end of the poem. Of course it is not wanted; so we have only to neglect it. That is, we should simply omit ll. 1825–1840, and stop at l. 1824. Thus the true and final form of Fit 16 does not really contain 122 lines, as had to be temporarily assumed; but it contains 16 lines less, or 106 lines, being just 1 line shorter than Fit 9. There are still four Fits of a shorter length.

And then, at the end of the poem, we find that the scribe has kindly preserved for us a copy of the original epilogue (1825–1840), without runes; which he poet afterwards rejected and did not desire to retain, though he kept a copy of it.

I have now sketched the complete history of this poem on 'The Twelve Apostles,' rightly consisting of 1824 lines, disposed in 16 Fits of approximately equal length. It is so far from being a 'Fragment' that we possess 16 lines too much, in the form of a rejected epilogue. Had the MS. been correctly printed at the beginning, no difficulty would have arisen, and it would have been seen at once that all the 1824 lines—and indeed all the 1840 lines—were 'written by an author who gives his name as Cynwulf.' But as things have happened, this fact has been accidentally concealed; and so the critics have made up their minds that, for reasons which do not appeal to me, 'Andreas,' as they call it, was not written by Cynwulf, but by some one else. And having once said this, they will go on saying it, just as some of our writers on English literature go on attributing to Chaucer 'The Flower and the Leaf.' It is not of much use for an author to say that he wrote a certain poem, if—for any reason whatever—the critics have once laid it down that he 'could not' have done so. But all things mend in course of time; and a complete edition of the poem may yet appear in the coming century.

WALTER W. SKEAT.

October 17, 1899.
XLV.

THE INTRODUCTION OF ENGLISH AS THE VEHICLE OF INSTRUCTION IN ENGLISH SCHOOLS.

One of the most important events in the history of mediaeval education in this country was the supersession of French by English as the vehicle of instruction. The change was momentous, for it was soon followed by the substitution of English for French in parliamentary and legal proceedings. The credit of initiating this great change is ascribed, in 1385, by John of Trevisa to John of Cornwall, 'a mayster of gramere,' shortly after the 'furste moreyn,' that is the Black Death of 1349. This information is conveyed to us in an interpolation in Trevisa's translation of Ranulph Higden's *Polychronicon*, the great history-book of the later Middle Ages. Higden relates that English children, against the usage of other nations, were compelled to construe their lessons in French, and that they had done so since the Norman Conquest†. To this Trevisa added:

† There is an Oxford statute in Anstey's *Munimenta Academica*, p. 438, which enjoins Masters of Grammar 'attendere, quod scholares sui regulam observent vel in Latinis vel in Romanis, prout exigunt status diversi; non observantes verum puniantur; tenentur etiam construere, necnon construendo significaciones dictionum docere in Anglico et vicissim in Gallico, ne illa lingua Gallica penitus sit omissa.' The editor ascribes this to the thirteenth century (p. lxx), but the clause 'ne illa lingua Gallica penitus sit omissa' is not compatible with what we know of the extensive use of French by Englishmen in that century. It would seem that the statute, or at all events this portion of it, is subsequent in date to the introduction of English into legal proceedings, &c., and therefore can hardly be earlier than the latter part of the fourteenth century.
THE INTRODUCTION OF ENGLISH

*Pys manere was moche y-used tofore þe furste moreyn, and ys þe somdel ychaunged. For Iohan Cornwall, a mayster of gramere, chaynged þe lore in gramere-scole, and construccon of Freynsch into Englysch; and Richard Pencrych lurnede þat manere techynge of ðysa, and oþer men of Pencrych. So þat now, the þer of oure Lord a þouȝt þre hundred foure score and fyte, of þe seconde kyng Richard afte þe conquste nyne, in al þe gramere-scoles of Engelond children lereþ Frensch and construeþ and lurnþ an Englysch, and habbeþ þery avantaȝe in on syde and desaunyte yn anþer, etc.

John of Trevisa, a Cornishman, was a Fellow of Stapeldon Hall, now known as Exeter College, Oxford, from 1362 to 1365. He was thus resident in Oxford in the West Country College within a few years of the Black Death. John of Cornwall was, we may conclude from his name, a native of Cornwall, and was probably an acquaintance of Trevisa's, for the provincial spirit was very strong amongst the Oxford students of the Middle Ages. It has been suggested that Pencrych was also a Cornishman, because of the frequency of the prefix *Pen* in local names of that county, but it is probable that he derived his name from Penkridge, formerly Pencrigh, co. Stafford.

John of Cornwall was a Master of Grammar, that is a man who was licensed by the University to teach (Latin) grammar, but who had not graduated in the other six liberal arts which, with grammar, constituted the curriculum for the Master of Arts. His was therefore an inferior

---

1 Morris and Skeat's *Specimens of Early English*, ii. 241; Higden's *Polychronicon*, Rolls Series, ii. 157. This passage did not escape the patient researches of Dr. Hickes, by whom it is quoted ('Præfacio' to his *Theesaurus*, vol. i. p. xvii).

2 Boase, *Registrum Colligii Exoniensis*, Oxford Historical Society, p. 11. Trevisa was subsequently a Fellow of Queen's College from 1369 to 1374; ibid.

3 Upon these Masters of Grammar see Anthony Wood, *History and Antiquities of the University of Oxford*, ed. Gutch, ii. 712; Anstey, *Monumenta Academica*, pp. lxxi, lxx, xcvi; Sir H. C. Maxwell Lyte, *History of the University of Oxford*, p. 234. William of Worcester, in his *Itinerarium*, records the death in 1469 of Mr. Robert Lond, 'grammaticus villae Bristol' (p. 222), who kept a 'scola grammatica' at Newgate, Bristol, one of the town gates (p. 178, where he is called Lane). He had been an assistant,
degree. In mediaeval Oxford there were Halls licensed for the teaching of grammar, generally to Masters of Grammar. Herein they taught Latin grammar to boys who were not yet matriculated, discharging the functions of the modern secondary schools. The want of secondary schools was felt by the father of the College system, Walter de Merton. In the statutes of his College he provided for the teaching of boys of his kin, and also for their maintenance from their earliest years. In a similar manner New College and Magdalen were equipped with grammar schools, which are still in existence, and we may trace a similar relationship between Eton and King's College.

Some ten years ago, whilst calendaring the records of Merton College, I came across the names of 'Master John de Cornubia,' and also of Penkryssh. Recently the Warden and Fellows have been kind enough to grant me permission to follow up the clue. The results of my examination of their very valuable records are here given.

The boys of the Founder's kin lived by themselves in Nunne Hall, the site of which is now merged in the College, apparently, of a celebrated Oxford Master of Grammar. The passage is: 'At Newyate, ubi quondam scola grammatica per Magistrum Robertum Lane, principalem grammaticum cum (Iohanne) Leland, Magistro Grammaticorum in Oxonia; dicebatur (Leland)uisse flos grammaticorum et poetaeur temporibus annis plurimis revolutus, et tempore, quo primum veni ad Oxoniam universitatem scolatizandii, obiit in termino Pascae, anno Christi 1432, circa mensem Ianii, quando generalis eclipsis die Sancti Botulphi accidebat.' The poet referred to is John Leland, the elder, who died April 30, 1438 (see Wood, City of Oxford, ed. Clark, ii. 174, and Dict. of National Biography).

His Grammar Hall became shortly after his death a hall of law under the name of Pekwater Inn; John Rowe in Appendix to Leland's Itinerary, iv, p. 159. The keepers of the mediaeval grammar schools in other towns were, probably, Masters of Grammar and not Masters of Arts, and it would therefore seem that the 'school-master' derives his name from the former and not the latter. The Master of Grammar in Cambridge was known, apparently, by the strange corruption of 'Master of Glomery.' See the New English Dictionary, s. v. 'Glomery.'

1 See Wood, History and Antiquities of the University of Oxford, ed. Gutch, ii, 712.

2 Non-graduate teachers were, however, compelled to enter the names of their scholars on the roll of some Master of Arts; Anstey, p. lxiv.

3 Wood, loc. laud.
They are mentioned as early as circ. 1280, in the account of the proctor of the College (No. 4049 a). The Bursear, in 1296, accounts for payment on behalf of the pueri de sanguine fundatoris, and also on behalf of pueri de villa (No. 3625), who would seem to have been allowed to share in the education of the boys of the Founder's kin, much as oppidans were permitted in later times to attend the grammar schools of New College and Magdalen College. The accounts of the boys of the Founder's kin continue until the fifteenth century, and were kept separately from those of the boys introduced on to the Foundation by John Wyllot's benefaction, now known by the unique title of 'Postmasters'; the accounts of the latter begin in 1380–1 (No. 4561).

The boys of the Founder's kin remained in Nunne Hall until they determined B.A., and hence we find them divided into grammatici and artistae, the latter corresponding to the modern undergraduate. There is a lower grade than that of student of grammar, for there are charges for teaching some of the boys to write. A payment of 2s. in salarium magistri grammaticalium for the summer term occurs in an undated account circ. 1300–1325 (No. 4104 b), at which time eleven boys were in residence. In 1340 threepence each is paid for the salarium of seven pueri grammatici (No. 4104 c). It would seem that the Master of Grammar was not the lecturer on grammar provided by the Founder for the benefit of the Fellows, but was one of the Grammar Masters who had Halls for the teaching of grammar, for he is paid a salarium for each pupil, and the usher of his Hall receives a fee. In 1347 Master John of Cornwall receives payment pro salario scole, and his usher (hostiarium) is also paid a fee. Similar entries appear in the account for 1347–8. After this there is a gap of about twenty years in the accounts in existence. Although Master John of Cornwall is not described as a 'Master of Grammar,' I think it will

1 Wood, loc. laud.
appear from a consideration of the following extracts that he filled the position so described in other accounts.

In making these extracts I have included a few entries that throw light upon the life and education of the boys of the Founder's kin.

A.D. 1300-1. Account of Sub-Warden, including 'expense nepotum Fundatoris.' 'Item pro scolagio septem puerrorum, ii3. iii8.' (No. 3964 c.)

Circ. 1300-1325. Account of boys 'in Aula Monialium.' 'Item in salario Magistri Scolarum Gram(m)aticalium pro dicto termino estivali pro gram(m)aticis, ii8.' (No. 4104 b.)

1334. Sub-Warden's account of expenses for 'Pueri de genere Fundatoris.' Entries of medical expenses, coals for the hall. 'Item in salario Magistri Gram(m)atici in termino Yemali pro ix. gram(m)aticis iii8.' In Lent term 35. 4d. for eight 'gram(m)atici.' In winter term 25. 8d. for eight 'grammatici.' 'Item in salario hostiarii scolarum gram(m)atici pro eisdem puereis per annum iii8.' 'Item in pergamento empto ad usum gram(m)aticorum, iii8.' (No. 3967 b.)

1340-1. Like account. 'Eodem (die) pro salario vii. puerrorum gram(m)aticorum, xxii8., videlicet, pro singulis iii8.' 'Eodem (die) pro salario puerrorum gram(m)aticorum xxii8., ut prius.' (No. 4104 c.)

1347. Account of Thomas de Herlyndon (one of the Pueri) 'pro pueris de genere Fundatoris'; six boys. The principal expenditure was on boots. 'Expense in communi. Idem computat in candelis per vices x4.' Item in membrana xiii8. ob. et in incausto per vices i8. Item in uncto pro sotularibus puerrorum per vices iii8. ob. Item in filo albo et viridi et ceteris pertinentiis ad reparacionem vestium tam artistarum quam gram(m)aticorum, vi8. Item in stipendio cissoris, x4. Item Magistro Johanni Cornubiensi pro salario scolae in termino Quadragesimali, x4., et hostiario suo, i8. ob. Item Johanni Boure et fratrici suo in die Parsasesves per preceptum vicecustodis pro sotularibus, x8. Item pro filo pro minoribus reparacionibus ob. Item in corda pro repositorio faciendo pro vestibus puerrorum reponendas, quad. Item in filo albo et nigro et ligatura pro collaribus vestium puerrorum, i8. Item Magistro Johanni Cornubiensi pro termino estivali, x3. et hostiario suo i8. ob.' In a schedule affixed to this account: 'In-primis, pro salario vi. puerrorum, qui vacabant modo scribendi, prima septimana ante Assumpcionem Sancte Marie, xii8. In secunda septimana pro iii. puereis, viii8. In tercia pro iii. puereis, viii8. In quarta
pro iii. puereis, viiia. In quinta pro iii. puereis, viiia. In sexta pro iii. puereis, viiia, quorum unae infirmabatur per meditatem septimane. In septimana pro iii. puereis, viiia. In carbonibus diversis vicibus, iiiia, viia. In pergamenio et incausto diversis vicibus, iiia. In ciphis et platellis, vi
d. In mappa, iiiia, pro lotrice in autunno, viiia. Pro superlente vices muncipii in autunno, xiiia. Pro salario viiia. Grammaticorum, iiiia, videlicet pro singulis iiiia, ob. in termino. In candelis diversis vicibus, xxiiia. (No. 4105.)

(1347)-1348. Account of Thomas de Herlyngdome ‘pro pueris de genere Fundatoris.’ Purchases and repairs of boots, mending clothes, separately accounted for under each of fifteen boys, including expenses. Six pairs of boots each at fixed dates, costing 3d, 5/4d, 4d, 5d, 5/4d, varying in cost probably according to ages of boys. Expense communis. Item computat in candelis emptis per vices tam pro artistis quam grammaticis iiiia, viiia, ob. Item in membranis emptis per vices pro artistis et grammaticis iiiia, viiia, quad. Item in incausto empto per vices, iiia, ob. Item coco Nicholao Bonham pro servicio a medio Quadragesime usque ad autunnum, xiiia. Item in pircicado empto pro igne de nocte habendo, iia, et sulphure cum fynbre ob. Item in debili libro Oraclii empto pro puereis, ob. Item in doobus paribus tabellarum albarum pro grammaticis pro argumentis reportandis, iiia, ob. Item Magistro Iohanni Cornewayle in termino hymali pro salario domus, xiiia, et suo hostiario, iiiia. Item eadem Iohanni pro termino Quadragesime, xiiia, et hostiario suo ad tunc, iiia, ob. Item eadem Iohanni pro termino estivali, xiiia, et suo hostiario ad tunc, iiiia. Item in uncto empto pro sodularibus puerorum per vices, viia, ob. Item in membrana empta iiiia, quad. Item in stipendio lotriccis pro termino estivali, xiiia. (No. 4106.)

Circ. 1367. Account for six boys; payments to manceple; payments ‘pro magistro suo speciali’ for boy; ‘dat. determinatori’; expenditure ‘in gaudiis’; ‘Dat. magistro informanti pueros de genere Fundatoris.’ (No. 4106 c.)

1377-99. Item pro ordinario magistro, xiiia. Item pro salario magistorum pro tribus terminis recipiendis terminatim, xiiia, viia. ‘In ordinario magistro, xiiia. In salario magistri et coci pro tribus septimanis, iiiia, ob. In salario magistri et pensione camere pro tribus terminis, viiia.’ (charged separately for several boys). Expenses about Determination. (No. 4107.)

The dates of the occurrence of Master John de Cornwall in these Merton accounts are compatible with the theory that he was the John of Cornwall referred to by John of
Trevisa. The extracts show us Master John of Cornwall teaching the Merton boys grammar one and two years before the Black Death. The loss of the accounts of the following years do not enable us to say how much longer he continued in this office. From Trevisa we learn that the introduction of English in place of French in schools by John of Cornwall took place between 1349, the year of the Black Death, and 1385. As Trevisa was expelled from his Fellowship at Queen's in 1379\(^1\), it is possible that this change came under his notice in Oxford prior to that year. Trevisa says that Richard Pencrych learned 'that manner of teaching' from John of Cornwall, and other men from Pencrych, so that in 1385 construction in English had superseded construction in French in all the grammar schools in England.

This does not prove that Pencrych was a pupil of Cornwall, but it would argue that if John of Cornwall was a resident in Oxford, it was there that Pencrych must have learned this innovation from him. It is a singular coincidence that there was living near Merton College in 1367 some one of the name of Penkrissh, for an account of the College proctor for that year (No. 4101) contains seven entries of payments to three men for making a wall *ex opprisito Penkrisch*, entries for 'bordnayl'\(^1\) for the door *ex opposito Penkrisch*, for two men placing a door in the wall *ex opposito Penkrissh*, and for a lock and key for the door *ex opposito Penkrissh*\(^2\). This wall and door were probably, from the nature of the College site, either in Merton Street or on the site of Corpus Christi College. The most probable site would be the Merton garden. Opposite this, on the site of the new Schools, was a Pencrych Hall, which, like so many other Halls, must have derived its name from an

\(^{1}\) Boase, loc. laud.

\(^{2}\) As the name of Penkrissh is not found in the ancient list of Fellows of Merton, drawn up in the early part of the fifteenth century, it is obvious that Penkrissh’s house here mentioned must have been outside the College.
owner or principal. It is mentioned amongst the property acquired by William of Wainfleet, by virtue of a licence to found Magdalen College, dated in 1448. All the property lay between High Street and Merton Street, Logic Lane and Eastgate Street. We have no further indication of the site of Pencyrch Hall, but the Merton account shows that it faced the College, and must therefore have been on the north side of Merton Street, between Logic Lane and Eastgate Street. Here it would almost have faced Nun Hall, the residence of the Merton boys de genere Fundatoris. We are able to carry back Pencyrchall to 1380 by a subsidy roll of that date, containing payment by the manciple of Pencyrchall of poll-tax for himself and his wife. The Merton account of 1367 suggests that Penkryssh was then alive, and we may perhaps conclude that his tenure had been then so short that the Hall had not yet received his name. This, again, would be in close agreement with the dates given by Trevisa.

To sum up, we have evidence that, at the period referred to by Trevisa, an Oxford man, there was a Master John of Cornwall teaching the boys of the Founder’s kin at Merton College, and, to all appearances, teaching them grammar; that a man named Pencyrch was residing near Merton College in a house in 1367 that is described in 1380 as Pencyrch Hall, and was therefore a place of learning licensed by the University to a principal, who must have been either a Master of Arts or of Grammar. It does not seem too bold to conclude that these two men are those described by Trevisa as the introducers of English as the vehicle of instruction in grammar schools, and that one, if not both,

1 Wood, Colleges and Halls, ed. Gutch, 307-8. It is mentioned in the 1438 list of Halls in the ‘Aulary Cautions’ in Anstey, Munimenta Academica, p. 390. John Rowse, writing in the latter part of the fifteenth century, records ‘Penchrich Hawle’ amongst the Halls destroyed before his time; Appendix to Leland’s Itinerary, iv. 159.

of them lived under the shadow of Walter de Merton's great foundation, the mother of the collegiate system in the English universities. It would therefore seem that two great educational changes in mediaeval England are associated with one quiet street in Oxford. Of the two that instituted by John of Cornwall is possibly of the greatest importance; it is certainly the one that will most interest the readers of a volume prepared in honour of one who has rendered such unparalleled and unselfish services to the study of English as Frederick James Furnivall.

W. H. Stevenson.

Oxford,
January, 1900.
XLVI.

A SOURCE OF SHELLEY'S ALASTOR

Shelley's Alastor is so original both in treatment that it afforded the poet little scope for or unconscious reproduction of the work of his p or contemporaries beyond a few reminiscences of worth and other poets of the same school. poem, too, is highly subjective. The hero is Shel The action and scenery of this 'nature-epic,' with boat and winding river, is an idealization of own pursuits and surroundings. But nevertheless are parts of Alastor which show that Shelley not only turns of expression but also part of his from others.

He was, as we know, a great reader of the works female novelists of the latter half of the eighteen Their refinement of language and sentiment congenial to him than the brutal realism of Fi Smollett. When to this was added romantic a love of wild nature, the attraction must have been

All these characteristics were united in Charlot novels, whose masterpiece, The Old Manor Ho favourite of Sir Walter Scott, and can still be pleasure.

Charlotte Smith was born in 1749, and diec After receiving what was then considered a bril
cation, she married an uncongenial husband, who, after wasting a large fortune, left her to support herself by literature. Her third novel, *Celestina*, appeared in 1791, and rapidly went through several editions. In 1815, when *Alastor* was published, Mrs. Smith was still a popular novelist, and her works must have been known to Shelley.

In *Celestina* there is a picturesque description of the Pyrenees, the details of which are apparently taken from some book of travels, not from personal knowledge. Charlotte Smith's travels in France do not seem to have extended further south than Normandy: in 1783 she and her husband spent their summer holiday in an old castle near Dieppe.

I now give the parallel passages from *Alastor* and the description of the Pyrenees in *Celestina* (second edition, 1791, vol. iv, p. 190), numbering the paragraphs of the latter for convenience of reference. I give every passage where influence is possible, without implying the necessity of assuming such influence in every case. The most important words in such passages as seem most to prove influence, or which are identical with words used by Shelley, are in italics.

**ALASTOR.**

1. 78. Many a wide waste and tangled wilderness has lured his fearless steps; and he has bought with his sweet voice and eyes from savage men his rest and food.

**CELESTINA.**

1. On the morning of his departure from the foot of Montlouis he travelled towards the southeast, always ascending, and was soon in the very heart of the Pyrenees.

2. In scenes . . . where no vestiges of man were ever seen, but here and there a solitary cabin.

3. In these huts Willoughby found a wild, but simple and benevolent people;
The cottagers, who ministered with human charity his human wants, beheld with wonder ing awe their fleeting visitant.

Meanwhile an Arab maiden brought her food, her daily portion, from her father's tent, and spread her matting for his couch... and watched his nightly sleep...
...Then, when red morn made paler the pale moon, to her cold home... returned.

The mountaineer, encountering on some dizzy precipice that spectral form, deemed that the Spirit of wind... had paused... in its career.

Grey rocks did peep from the spare moss, and stemmed the struggling brook.

The boat fled on—the boiling torrent drove—the crags closed round with black and jagged arms, the shattered mountain overhung the sea, ...

...the abrupt mountain breaks, and seems... to overhang the world.

always ready to supply him with such food as their flocks, among these desert regions, afforded to themselves;

and in one of them, or a temporary bed, made of the skins of their sheep whom accident had destroyed, after a deep sigh, which was drawn from him by the memory of Celestina, and with which every day concluded, he obtained a few hours of refreshing sleep, and with the dawn of the next day pursued his journey towards the summit of the mountain.

Amid these paths that wound among the almost perpendicular points of the cliffs he often sat down; surveying with awe and admiration the stupendous works of the Divine Architect, before whose simplest creation the labouried productions of the most intelligent of his creatures sink into insignificance.

Huge masses of grey marble or a dark granite frowned above his head;

whose crevices here and there afforded a scanty subsistence to the lichen and moss campion;

while the desert barrenness of other parts, added to that threatening aspect with which they seemed to hang over the wandering traveller, and to bid him to fear lest even the light step of the lizard (the chamois of the Pyrenees) or the wild goats, who now and then appeared suspended amid the craggy fissures, should
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103. And the wild antelope... [would] suspend
her timid steps to gaze upon a form
more graceful than her own.
436. Like clouds suspended in an emerald sky,
the ash and the acacia floating hang,
tremulous and pale.
142. O'er the aerial mountains which pour down
Indus and Oxus from their icy caves...
374. Where the mountain, riven, exposed those black depths to the azure sky,
ere yet the flood's enormous volume fell
even to the base of Caucasus, with sound
that shook the everlasting rocks, the mass
filled with one whirlpool all that ample chasm.
571. Yet the grey precipice and solemn pine
and torrent were not all; one silent nook was there...
It was a tranquil spot, that seemed to smile
even in the lap of horror...
625. When on the threshold of the green recess
the wanderer's footsteps fell, he knew that death
was on him.
420. The noonday sun now shone upon the forest, one vast mass
of mingling shade, whose brown magnificence
disunite them from the mountain itself, and bury him beneath their thundering ruins.

9. Dashing down amongst these immense piles of stone, the cataracts, formed by the melting of the snows and the ice of the glaciers in the bosom of the mountains, fell roaring into dark and abyss-like chasms, whither the eye feared to follow them...

10. Yet frequently, amidst the wildest horrors of these great objects, was seen some little green recess,

11. shaded by immense pines, cedars, or mountain-ash;
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a narrow vale embrases . . .
More dark
and dark the shades accumulata
The oak
. . . the light beech. The
pyramids
of the tall cedar . . .
The ash and the acacia . . .

448. Soft mossy lawns
beneath these canopies [of trees]
extend their swells,
fragrant with perfumed herbs, and
eyed with blooms
minute yet beautiful.

494. The rivulet,
wanton and wild, thru' many a
green ravine
beneath the forest flowed. Some-
times it fell
among the moss with hollow
harmony
dark and profound. Now on the
polished stones
it danced, like childhood laughing
as it went;
then through the plain in tranquil
wanderings crept,
reflecting every herb and drooping
bud
that overhung its quietness.
' O stream!
. . . thy loud and hollow gulfs,' . . .

514. Beside the grassy shore
of the small stream he went; he
did impress
on the green moss his tremulous
step.

344. The little boat
still fled before the storm; still
fled, like foam
down the steep cataract of a
wintry river.

12. and the short turf beneath
them appeared spangled with the
Selinumus and fringed pink, or
blushing with the scented weaths
of the Daphne Caesum—

13. while through the crags
and hollows of the surrounding
wall of rock were filtered small
and clear streams, that crept
away among the tufts of juniper,
rosemary, and the rhododendron
of the Alps, that clothed the less
abrupt declivity;

14. where, uninterrupted by
intervening crags, the mountain,
shelving gradually to its base,
opened a bosom more smiling and
fertile;
540. The stream, that with a larger volume now rolled through the labyrinthine dell.

437. The ash and the acacia floating hang, tremulous and pale.

550. Lo! where the pass expands its stony jaws, the abrupt mountain breaks, and seems with its accumulated crags to overhang the world (see § 8): for wide expand beneath the wan stars and descending moon islanded seas, blue mountains, mightystreams, dim tracts and vast ...

Allowing for the total difference of subject and the necessary difference of treatment, it must be admitted that the resemblances between the parallel passages are often striking. It must also be remembered that the exigencies of metre would often prevent the poet from repeating the exact words of the novel.

The most striking verbal repetitions are those in § 10. Most of the other parallels are, as might be expected, more in the thought than the form. But it can hardly be doubted that, for instance, the magnificent description of Caucasus overhanging the world beneath it—a description which is enough to give a sensation of actual physical giddiness—was directly suggested by § 8. What we have to consider in such cases is not the adequacy of the description, but what it was capable of suggesting to a sympathetic mind at a time when such descriptions were still rare in literature.

Oxford.

H. Sweet.
XLVII.

BENVENUTO DA IMOLA AND HIS COMMENTARY ON THE DIVINA COMMEDIA.

BENVENUTO RAMBALDI, the author of what is perhaps the most valuable commentary we possess on the Divina Commedia, was born at Imola between 1336 and 1340, less than twenty years after the death of Dante. He was thus the junior of his two famous contemporaries, Petrarch and Boccaccio, with both of whom he was on terms of friendship, if not of intimacy, by some thirty-five and twenty-six years respectively. The date of his death, which was long uncertain, has recently been established by the publication of a letter in which it is alluded to as having just taken place. This letter, which was written from Padua on June 17, 1390, by Pier Paolo Vergerio, the biographer of Petrarch, to Ugo da Ferrara, runs as follows:

"I heard yesterday that that bright star of eloquence, Benvenuto of Imola, has suffered eclipse; yet in such wise as to lose none of his proper light, nay rather he must now shine with increased brilliancy, if we are to believe that merit in this life is rewarded after death. From us, however, he is hidden. On his account I rejoice, but on our own I lament, for we are deprived of a great light. The cause was a report that he had been busy with a work on the book of Valerius Maximus, which was like to surpass all that previous write..."
had attempted. It is not known how far this work was carried, but it is supposed that he did not complete it. If you have any information on this subject, write to me, and give such consolation as you can to your sorrowing friend 1.

It is assumed from this letter that Benvenuto died at Ferrara, but no record of his burial has been found, nor any trace of a monument to him, such as we should naturally expect to have been erected to so distinguished a citizen.

The year 1380 was formerly assigned as the date of Benvenuto's death, owing to the alleged absence of any allusion in the Commentary (which was certainly supplemented from time to time) to events subsequent to 1379; and to the fact that in the Libellus Augustalis, which was generally held to have been the latest of his writings, a mention of the young Emperor Wenceslaus, who succeeded his father in 1378, is accompanied by the parenthetical remark: 'quid facturus sit ignoro.' This remark plainly points to the comparatively recent accession of the emperor; and it was urged that if Benvenuto had survived to know of the excesses committed by Wenceslaus, which gained him the nicknames of the Cruel and the Toper, he would not have neglected this opportunity of making some pointed allusion to them. This argument can now, of course, only be used to fix the date of the Libellus. As regards, however, the internal evidence to be derived from the Commentary, it may be observed that there is in that work what appears to be an undoubted allusion to the Emperor Wenceslaus, which has escaped the notice of Benvenuto's biographers. This allusion occurs in the comment on the word Cesare in the first canto of the Paradiso, line 29 2, where, after speaking of the triumphs

1 See Rossi-Casé, Di Maestro Benvenuto da Imola (Pergola, 1889), p. 95, n. 1.
of the old Roman emperors, Benvenuto adds, by way of contrast, that 'our present emperor devotes himself to the cult of Father Bacchus' ("Noster vero imperator Liberum patrem colit"). The reference here to the intemperate habits of Wenceslaus appears unmistakable; and unless it be the fact, which seems unlikely, that the young Wenceslaus, who at first gave promise of being an excellent sovereign, was already notorious for wine-bibbing within two years of his accession, it follows that the terminus ad quem of the Commentary should be advanced somewhat beyond the year 1380. The point of this remark of Benvenuto's was evidently lost upon the editor of the Commentary, for he has made nonsense of the passage by printing liberum patrem instead of Liberum patrem.

The main facts of Benvenuto's life, so far as it has been possible to trace them, appear to be as follows. His boyhood was passed under his father's roof at Imola, until such time as he was of age to go to the neighbouring University of Bologna. It is probable that he made a long stay at Bologna, owing to the disturbed condition of the University, which was at that time constantly embroiled with the Papal authority, but transferred himself to Florence, where he spent the period between 1357 and 1360. It was no doubt at this time that Benvenuto made the acquaintance of Boccaccio; and there can be little question that the latter, directly or indirectly, assisted him in his studies, for he no less than four times in his

---

1 Since the above was written I have found that in his Libellus Augustali, which was certainly composed within a year or two of the accession of Wenceslaus, Benvenuto uses a similar expression of the Emperor Charles IV (the father and predecessor of Wenceslaus), whom he describes as 'Bacchi immolans'—a reproach which appears to have been levelled at that Emperor by Boccaccio also (see Cochin, Études Italiennes, p. 110). It is not so certain, therefore, as appeared at first sight, that the reference in the Commentary is to Wenceslaus.

2 Cf. Rossi-Casè, op. cit.
Commentary\(^1\) refers to Boccaccio as ‘venerabilis praecceptor meus.’ It must have been during these years, too, that Benvenuto gained that intimate knowledge of Florence and Florentine ways which is displayed at every turn in his Commentary.

In 1361, or 1362 at the latest, he was again in Bologna, at that time under the governorship of the Spanish Cardinal Albornoz, at whose request he wrote a compendium of Roman history (under the title of Romuleon), as he himself tells us in the introductory chapter of that work. The next two or three years appear to have been spent partly in Imola, partly in Bologna, where in 1364 he had the opportunity of making the acquaintance of Petrarch, who has left a record in two of his letters\(^2\) of his visit to Bologna in that year. Not long before this date Benvenuto’s father, Compagno, who was a notary and lecturer on law, and who is mentioned in the Commentary\(^3\) as having been a neighbour of the notorious Cianghella della Tosa, had died at Imola. It is evident that by this time Benvenuto himself was a person of some importance in his native city, for in the spring of 1365 he was appointed one of the five orators who were dispatched to Avignon by the Anziani of Imola to bespeak the good offices of Pope Urban V.

While on this mission at the Papal Court at Avignon he met his future patron, Nicholas II of Este, and once more found himself in the company of Boccaccio, who was present, as the representative of Florence, among the deputies sent from various parts of Italy to invite the Pope to abandon France and return to Rome. Several reminiscences of Benvenuto’s stay at Avignon occur in the Commentary. For instance, in a note on the word ponticelli\(^4\) in the eighteenth canto of the Inferno, line 15,

\(^1\) I. 79; V. 145, 164, 301.\(^2\) Fam. V. 16; Sot. X. 5.\(^3\) V. 151.\(^4\) II. 4.
he takes occasion to mention the stone bridges over the Arno and Tiber at Florence and Rome, and couples with them the bridge over the Rhone at Avignon, which had already at that date been standing for nearly two hundred years, but of which only four arches now remain. In another passage 1 (on Inferno, III. 55–7) he describes an immense crowd of tramps and beggars whom he once saw besieging the gates of the almonry at Avignon. It is in connexion with Avignon too that he indulges in one of his fiercest outbursts against the corruption of the Papal Court. In his comment 2 on the passage in the nineteenth canto of the Inferno (lines 90–114), where Dante rebukes the Bishops of Rome for their simony and avarice, and denounces the unholy traffic between the Scarlet Woman and the Kings of Christendom, Benvenuto does not hesitate to identify Avignon with Babylon, as Petrarch had done before him, to whose well-known Sonnet 3 (beginning ‘Dell’ empia Babilonia’) he pointedly refers:

‘Our most recent poet Petrarch,’ he says, ‘takes that great Babylon to mean Avignon, the new Babylon in France, which may well be described as a great Babylon, not so much by reason of the circumference of her walls, as by reason of the presumption of her people. Verily is Avignon the mother of fornication, and lust, and drunkenness, full of abomination and of all filthiness, and seated upon the rushing waters of the Rhone, the Durance, and the Sorgue. And verily are her prelates like the Scarlet Woman, arrayed with purple and gold and silver and precious stones, and drunken with the blood of the martyrs, and of Christ.’

Benvenuto had had his own experience of the shameless corruption of the Papal officials at Avignon, as he relates in his comment 4 on the trick played by Malacoda upon Dante and Virgil as to their route in Malebolge:

‘God is my witness,’ he exclaims, ‘that a trick of this same sort was played upon myself in the Papal Court at Avignon. I had

1 I. 116.  
2 II. 59.  
3 Cf. also Petrarch’s Epist. sine titulo.  
4 I. 118.
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a certain affair in the hands of the chief treasurer of Urban V., who pretended that he was convinced of the justice of my cause, and was exceedingly anxious to help me. But nevertheless he kept putting me off from day to day, protesting all the time that I was certain to succeed in the end. At last, however, when he found that I did not make him the present he expected, he began to look askance at me—and to tell the truth he did squint horribly, to say nothing of his moral obliquity—and finally I was left in the lurch. And so he behaved like the devil Malacoda, for he wanted to send me on a road which it was not in the nature of things I should follow.

While at Avignon, Benvenuto appears to have availed himself of the opportunity to make a pilgrimage to Vaucluse\(^1\), which had been abandoned by Petrarch some twelve years before\(^2\). On the same occasion he visited the neighbouring cities of Arles and Orange, certain details of which he describes from personal observation\(^3\). He was present, he tells us\(^4\), at Arles when the Emperor Charles IV was crowned there, an event which took place on June 4, 1365. His stay in Provence probably lasted till the autumn of 1367, when he is supposed to have returned to Italy in the train of Urban V, who went first to Viterbo and then to Rome. Benvenuto certainly visited Rome at one period of his life, as is evident from several passages in his Commentary. It may have been either on this occasion, or seventeen years earlier at the time of the Second Jubilee in 1350, to which he refers\(^5\) in terms which seem to imply that he was present, à propos of Dante’s mention of the Jubilee\(^6\) instituted by Boniface VIII. Nothing is known for certain of his whereabouts during the next five years (1368–1373), save that he was not for any length of time in his native city. Upon his return to Italy from his mission at Avignon, which we may gather was a failure, he seems to have found that a change

---

\(^{1}\) IV. 488.  \(^{2}\) In 1353.  \(^{3}\) II. 6.  \(^{4}\) Inf. XVIII. 29.
unfavourable to himself had taken place in the affairs of Imola. At any rate there is no record of his holding any further public office there, and such evidence as is available goes to prove that he never again from this date made any considerable stay in that city. Certain expressions in his Commentary, such as his qualification of Dante's apostrophe to the men of Romagna: 'O Romagnoli tornati in bastardi,' as by no means forcible enough—'Nimis curialiter loquitur iste: immo debuisset dixisse, in spurius, immo in mulos, specie permutata'—and his comparison of himself to Dante, as having like him suffered the miseries of exile and poverty through the malignity of his fellow men, have been taken to imply that he was a victim to political animosity.

It is probable that during a part at least of this period Benvenuto was occupied in teaching at Bologna, and in the private exposition of the Divina Commedia. The first draft at any rate of his magnum opus, the Commentary on the Commedia, was completed in the year 1373, for in a letter to Petrarch, written in the spring of the following year, a fragment of which is extant, he states the fact in so many words, and promises to send a copy to the old poet, who a few weeks later (July 18, 1374) was found dead among his books at Arquà—the death he had longed for.

'You must know,' writes Benvenuto, 'that last year I put the finishing touch to my Commentary on Dante, about which you used so often to inquire. I will send you a copy of it as soon as I can find a safe messenger.'

This passage is interesting, not only as giving a positive date for the completion of the first draft of the Commentary,
but also as showing that Benvenuto was encouraged by Petrarch in his task.

One of the last letters written by Petrarch before his death, if not actually the last, was addressed to Benvenuto from Padua, in February, 1374, in response to an inquiry from the latter as to whether poetry ought to be included among the liberal arts; and it was in reply to this epistle, to which allusion is twice made in the Commentary, that Benvenuto wrote the letter in which the passage above quoted occurs. As a proof of Benvenuto’s reverence for Petrarch it may be mentioned here that it was largely owing to his exertions that we are indebted for the preservation of Petrarch’s Latin poem Africa, upon which the poet confidently based his hopes of immortality, but which had been left unfinished. Petrarch’s son-in-law, Francescuolo da Brossano, contemplated either burning the incomplete MS., or, what might have proved an even worse fate, handing it over to be revised and corrected by other hands before publication. Benvenuto was strongly opposed to any such act of vandalism, and wrote not only to Francescuolo himself, but also to Boccaccio, Coluccio Salutati, and others, to urge the preservation of the poem as it had been left by the author. His letters have been lost, but several of those written to him on the subject are extant, among them two from Coluccio Salutati, the tone of which is evidence of the high esteem in which Benvenuto was held by his brother men of letters.

Some time between the autumn of 1373 and the summer of 1374 Benvenuto was in Florence, where he attended Boccaccio’s lectures upon the Divina Commedia, as he himself informs us in his comment on Paradiso, XV. 97–8. Dante in this passage refers to the old Benedictine

---

1 See Rossi-Casè, op. cit., pp. 72–4.
2 I. 10; IV. 230.
3 See F. Novati, Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati, vol. i. pp. 198–204.
4 V. 145.
monastery, known as the Badia, from whose chimes, he says, in the days of Cacciaguida, Florence used to take her time. Benvenuto remarks:—

'In the inner circle of Florence is the abbey of the Benedictine monks, whose church is called Santo Stefano; where the chimes used to tell the hour more regularly than in any other church in the city. At the present time, however, it is sadly neglected and out of repair, as I noticed while I was attending the lectures of my revered master, Boccaccio of Certaldo, upon the Divina Commedia, which he delivered in this same church.'

Boccaccio began his course on October 23, 1373, and continued to lecture until the spring of 1375, when he was compelled by illness to break off abruptly and retire to Certaldo, where he died in the following December. Benvenuto cannot have attended the whole course, for it appears from the letters of Coluccio Salutati that he was not in Florence from July, 1374, to July, 1375. In this latter year he was back in Bologna, and was himself lecturing upon the Divina Commedia, as he records in his Commentary; and we know from the same source that he spent altogether ten years in that city. Benvenuto's lectures at Bologna, like those of Boccaccio at Florence, were delivered in an official capacity, he having been appointed to fill the Dante chair, which the Bolognese, following the example of the Florentines, founded in 1375. It is certain, however, that his Commentary, unlike that of Boccaccio, was not composed in the first instance for the purposes of this lectureship, for we have already seen that the first draft of it was completed in 1373, two years before the Bologna chair was instituted.

In 1377 Benvenuto retired from Bologna to Ferrara, where he resided under the protection of the Marquis Niccolò II of Este; and it was doubtless here that he put the last touches to his Commentary, the final draft

---

1 I. 523. 2 II. 16. 3 See above, p. 442. 4 d. 1388.
of which he formally dedicated to the Marquis. From a letter addressed to him here by Coluccio Salutati 1 under date April 6, 1379, we learn that Benvenuto was engaged in teaching at Ferrara, and also that by this time he had been for some years married, and had a family of children growing up, which caused him some anxiety. Here too he wrote his most important other works, namely the Commentaries on Lucan’s Pharsalia (1378), on Seneca’s tragedies, and on Valerius Maximus (which was finished in 1388), as well as the Libellus Augustalis (probably 1386), the two last, like the Commentary on the Commedia, being dedicated to his patron Niccolò; and at Ferrara, in all probability, he ended his days in 1390. Besides the above works, and the Romuleon already mentioned 2 as having been written at Bologna between 1361 and 1362, Benvenuto also wrote a Commentary on the Latin Eclogues of Petrarch, which was completed before 1374, as we know from the same letter in which he refers to the completion of the first draft of his Commentary on Dante.

As might be expected, we find frequent allusions to Bologna in the Commentary, and to Benvenuto’s own experiences while he was resident there. He loses no opportunity of bringing in a compliment, when he can honestly do so, to the illustrious city whose guest he was, and to its famous University. ‘Dicitur Bononia,’ he says on one occasion 3, with his characteristic fondness for punning etymologies, ‘quasi bona per omnia’; and he quotes in confirmation the old line:

Omnibus est linguis laudanda Bononia pinguis.

On another occasion 4 he speaks of the city as ‘mater studii, et nutrix omnium scientiarum’; and again 5, ‘est Bononia nidus philosophorum, et mater legum, omniumque

1 Epistolario, I. 313-21. 2 See above, p. 439. 3 II. 75. 4 II. 187. 5 III. 390.
bonorum fertillis, humanitatis piissima nutrix.' The
inhabitants he describes as of courteous manners and
kindly temperament, and as being distinguished above
the rest of Italy for their hospitality and geniality to
strangers, whom they delight to honour. 'In proof of
this,' he adds, 'I can quote my own experience, for I spent
ten years among them.' He takes occasion also to pay
a compliment to the women, mindful perhaps that the lady
professor was a not unknown element in Bolognese tradi-
tions. On the other hand he does not hesitate to be equally
outspoken with regard to their vices, which he condemns
in no measured terms. He was especially shocked at
the hideous immorality which at one time during his
residence was prevalent to a terrible extent among the
students. It is a proof of his moral courage that he did
not shrink from reporting the matter to the Papal Legate
in Bologna, who caused inquiries to be made, and by
vigorous measures stamped out the iniquity. By his
action on this occasion Benvenuto not only incurred
very considerable odium, but he ran a grave personal
risk, as he himself was well aware. In fact there is little
doubt that his departure from Bologna in 1377 was
directly due to this cause. He several times refers to
his experiences as lecturer, one of which is utilized as an
illustration of Dante's description of the wrathful, who
are represented as tearing and pounding and biting each
other, 'exactly,' says Benvenuto, 'as I once saw two of
my students doing; for not content with using their fists
and nails, they actually tore each other with their teeth
into the bargain.' Another illustration from his lectures,
which he evidently recalls with a certain satisfaction, he
makes use of in his comment on Purgatorio, XV. 55-7,
where Dante says that the greater the number of those

1 II. 17. 2 II. 15. 3 I. 523. 4 I. 524.
2 I. 269. 5 III. 414.
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who enjoy the same good, the greater the enjoyment of each in particular.

‘That one and the same good,’ explains Benvenuto, ‘is not diminished by the participation of many is evident, for by single voice is conveyed to the ears of a multitude of students, and diffuses my teaching into the minds of a numerous audience, to different degrees, of course, according to their capacities; and yet it is not diminished in me, but is increased, as I remember I used to say when I was lecturing on Dante at Bologna.’

In another passage he refers to his difficulty at times in arriving at Dante’s exact meaning, which was often a trouble to him, he says, during these same lectures. He now and then indulges in a sly hit at the Bolognese, as, for instance, when he relates an anecdote reflecting on the reputation of their great legal luminary, Accursius,—how Benincasa of Arezzo, himself a distinguished jurist, being interrogated on a point of law by some Bolognese students, referred them contemptuously to their own Accursius, who he said had befouled the whole corpus iuris.

Many details of interest with regard to the old city of Bologna and its surroundings are supplied in the Commentary, and for the most part are here recorded for the first time, Jacopo della Lana, the Bolognese commentator, having omitted to mention them. Thus Benvenuto tells us that the famous Carisenda tower, which is now (as probably in his day) only 163 ft. high, was in Dante’s time considerably higher, but that a great part of it was thrown down between 1351 and 1360 by Giovanni di Oleggio, one of the Visconti of Milan, during his lordship of Bologna. This statement effectually disposes of the absurd theory, first, apparently, propounded by Goethe, and still repeated in modern guide-books, that the tower was built purposely with a lean, in order that

1 IV. 336.  
2 III. 168.  
3 II. 485.
it should attract more attention than the lofty Asinelli
tower at its side, and that the inclination being excessive
it was found impossible to carry it any higher. The
absurdity of this theory is in any case obvious to the
careful observer, for a close inspection of the building
reveals the fact that the courses of bricks, as well as the
holes for the scaffolding (which still remain), run at right
angles to the inclination of the tower, thus proving that
the leaning is due, not to design, but to the accidental
sinking of the foundations.

Benvenuto, too, is the first to give the real explanation
of the term salse¹ (Inf. XVIII. 51), which the earlier com-
mentators took in the literal sense of sauce or pickle.

¹ To the proper understanding of this phrase, he says, ‘and that
you may realize how many things are left unexplained through
ignorance in this poem of Dante’s, I would have you know that
Salte is the name of a certain ravine outside the city of Bologna,
close behind the Church of Santa Maria in Monte, into which the
bodies of suicides, usurers, and other criminals used to be thrown.
And I have heard boys at Bologna jeer at one another, and say
tauntingly: ‘Your father was flung into the Salte.’ It is easy
therefore to take the word in the sense of sauce, as the general
do, for such a metaphor would not be appropriate here.’

He also mentions² an ancient building at Bologna called
the Corbis, of which apparently no trace nor memory now
remains; and he refers³ to the Carrobio, the old Dogana, or
Foro de’ Mercanti, which was used partly as a market and
partly as an exchange. This building stood on the site of
the present Palazzo della Mercanzia, and in it the money-
changers and bankers used to have their quarters. In his
account⁴ of the Andalò and Catalani families of Bologna
he records that the ruins of the palace of the former were
still to be seen in his day close to where the law-school
then was; and that of the Catalani residence nothing was

¹ II. 11-12. ² I. 185. ³ V. 162. ⁴ II. 179-80.
left but a single lofty tower, which was chiefly remarkable from the frequency with which it was struck by lightning.

Reminiscences of Florence naturally also abound, many of them doubtless dating back to the days of his student-ship, a part of which, as we have seen, was spent in that city. Of Florentine boys and their ways he gives us several delightful pictures, some derived from his own experience, some at second-hand from Boccaccio. All of these are turned to good account in the Commentary. Thus Dante’s mention of the paleo in Paradiso, XVIII. 42, furnishes him with the opportunity of describing in detail their favourite game of whip-top, which he does with great solemnity.

‘You must know,’ he says, ‘that the paleo is a certain object made of wood, which the Florentine boys use in one of their games. It is a sort of half top, full and squat in the upper part, and the lower part round and tapered to a point. And the boys have a cord or lash attached to a stick, and they hold the stick in their hands and whip the top with the lash when once they have got it to spin, and by continued whipping they keep up the spinning for any length of time.’

Another boys’ game, not confined to Florence, to which he refers in illustration of Paradiso, XVIII. 102, is that played of winter evenings, when a smouldering brand is taken from the fire, and beaten upon the hearth so as to make the sparks fly, by which they tell their luck, ‘crying, so many cities, so many castles, so many pigs, so many sheep; and in this way they make the time pass.’ On Boccaccio’s authority he tells the story of the two naughty boys who threw mud at the old statue of Mars on the Ponte Vecchio, both of whom came to a bad end in consequence, one being hanged, and the other drowned in the Arno. On the same authority he relates another anecdote in support of his contention that Dante’s lonza was a leopard.

1 V. 212.  2 V. 222-3.  3 I. 461.
“*Lonza,* he says, *is a Florentine word which apparently denotes a leopard, and not any other beast; for Boccaccio told me that once when a leopard was being carried through the streets of Florence, it was followed by a crowd of boys shouting, *eccò la lonza!*”

It appears from an old document preserved in the city archives, and quoted by Casini, that it used to be a custom in Florence in Dante’s day, if not later, to keep a caged leopard outside the Palazzo del Podesta, so that doubtless the appearance of the animal was familiar enough to the Florentines.

Of the Florentines themselves Benvenuto does not give altogether a favourable account, for he speaks of them as being noted, among other things, for their gluttony and excessive vindictiveness. The Florentine ladies, he says, are the greatest adepts in the world at the art of adorning their persons. Not content with their natural beauty, they are always contriving how to add to it artificially; and any defects they manage to conceal with the utmost skill. Shortness of stature they conceal by wearing high pattens; if their complexion is swarthy they use powder, if too pale they rouge it; they dye their hair yellow, and make their teeth like ivory; in fact, there’s hardly a part of their persons that they do not make up in some way or other.”

One of the most interesting of his reminiscences of Florence is the mention of a marble statue of Venus he had seen in a private house there, which from his description must have been a replica from the same model as the so-called Venus de’ Medici, now in the Tribuna of the Uffizi. Lacaita, the editor of the Commentary, rashly asserts that the statue seen by Benvenuto, of which nothing further appears to be known, was identical with the Medici Venus—a manifest impossibility, since the latter was not discovered until the sixteenth century at Rome. Another interesting reference is that to the ancient stone lions of Florence,
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which Benvenuto says at that time were located close to the Palazzo della Signoria, near the site of the ruined palaces of the Uberti in the old Gardingo, not far apparently from where they now stand.

Besides being well acquainted with Florence and Bologna, Benvenuto was certainly familiar with many other parts of Italy. Venice, for example, we may feel pretty sure he visited, from his references to the Rialto\(^1\), and his accurate description of the Doge’s cap\(^2\). It was probably at Venice that he came across the long-haired Greeks he speaks of\(^3\); and saw the bales of hides from Barbary, bound with ropes of twisted grass, to which he refers\(^4\) in his note on the word *strambe* (Inf. XIX. 27). Here too no doubt he watched the manoeuvring of a galley, and observed the wonderful discipline of the galley-slaves\(^5\), who would instantly stop rowing as one man at the sound of the captain’s whistle—a sight which seems to have greatly impressed him, for he declares his belief that no ruler in all the world is so promptly obeyed as is the captain of a galley by his crew. It was perhaps on his way to Venice that he got that experience of the sea which he so feelingly describes on another occasion.

\(^1\) Nature,’ he remarks\(^6\) (on Inf. XI. 11), ‘abhors sudden changes, as we know by experience; for when a man goes on board ship for the first time, he feels upset and becomes sick; but after a while he gets accustomed to the motion, and then he finds his appetite sharper than ever it was before.’

By means of the Commentary it might be possible to follow pretty closely Benvenuto’s movements from place to place—not by a series of brilliant conjectures, such as enabled Mr. Gladstone and Dean Plumptre to picture Dante as a student at Oxford, or worshipping in the cathedral at Wells, but from his own explicit statements,

\(^1\) V. 5, 162. \(^2\) III. 315. \(^3\) II. 87.  
\(^4\) II. 36. \(^5\) V. 369.  
\(^6\) I. 364.
such as ‘I saw,’ or ‘when I was there.’ It certainly would not be safe in Benvenuto’s case to rely wholly upon prima facie evidence, unsupported by some such assurance that he was personally present in any particular locality. A circumstantial account of Naeples, for instance, with an eye to the incalculable reader to suppose that he visited these places; the whole of the Itinerarium of Petrarch conveyed it almost verbatim, with a record of his own experience. In this connexion, it is true, but which comes from the same source of the account, however, comes in the tradition that the Castello di Pozzuoli, might lead Benvenuto had himself the way; whence Benvenuto has without a hint that it is not a record of his own experience. He mentions Petrarch only to tell the story, of how King Robert asked whether there was any truth before which Petrarch replied, with a laugh, that he had always been understood that Virgil was a poet, not a stonemason.

But on many occasions he is undoubtedly recalling his own experiences. Thus we may sometimes horseback, sometimes on a mule, now riding a restive and timid animal through wild and unfamiliar country; now settling himself into the saddle, ready to break into a gallop, at the sight of distant bands of marauders and of burning and desolated villages; now jogging along quietly, making plans for the night’s lodging. At one time we find him crossing the Alps, where, as he says, the old snow ever awaits the new, doubtless on his way to or from Avignon; at another he is caught in a mountain mist on the journey from Florence to Bologna over the Apennines, which brings to his mind Dante’s words, ‘Ricorditi, se mai nell’Alpe Ti colse nebbia’

1 III. 86–7. 2 I. 585–6. 3 III. 405. 4 I. 472. 5 III. 453.
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(Purg. XVII. 1–2); or yet again he struggles painfully along the break-neck track overhanging the Genoese riviera in the direction of Turbia, the frontier-fortress, whose name gives occasion to another of his punning etymologies—'Turbia, quasi turbans viam volentibus intrare vel exire Italian.' Under more favourable conditions we may accompany him along the shores of the Lago di Garda, from the Castle of Riva at the head of the lake, close to where the Sarcha comes tumbling in with its milky waters, which have the effect, to Benvenuto’s eyes, of a rushing stream of flour, down to Peschiera at the southern extremity, and the fishing-village of 'olive-silvery' Sirmio, which is associated in his memory with ancient ruins and carps fried in oil. From Peschiera he traverses the rich pastures watered by the Mincio, where he notes the immense herds of cattle and horses, and brings us to Verona, whose amphitheatre recalls the configuration of Dante’s Hell, or, from another aspect, that of the Mountain of Purgatory; and so on to Vicenza, in one direction, with its wonderful labyrinth, and Padua with its ancient triple fortifications; or to Mantua and Parma, with its octagonal church, in the other.

Benvenuto’s references to his contemporaries and to contemporary events are some of them of considerable interest. The persons he most often mentions are not unnaturally the two illustrious men of letters with whom, as has already been indicated, he was on terms of personal friendship, namely Petrarch and Boccaccio.

Petrarch he mentions by name no less than thirty times, usually describing him as ‘novissimus poeta Petrarcha.’ He twice records, with some complacency, the fact that Petrarch had addressed an epistle to himself, from which

1 III. 95. 2 II. 80. 3 II. 81. 4 II. 82.
5 I. 185. 6 III. 43. 7 I. 387. 8 I. 294.
9 II. 35. 10 I. 10; IV. 290.
he gives extracts; and he refers to many of the poet’s other writings, such as the *Apolo
logia contra Gallum* 1, the *Itinerarium Syriacum* 2, his Ecl
ogues 3 (on which he wrote Psalms 4, and his famous Dante 5; to the *Africa*
, nor to the *Cansonier*, the sonnet ‘Dell’ empi
a comment), his Penitential letter to Boccaccio concerning Babilonia,’ which, as has been seen above, he glances at
apparently, he makes no allusion à propos of Avignon 6. He refers to Petrarch’s coronation 7 in the Capitol at Rome in April, 1341, and to his residence at Avignon and Vaucluse 8; and observation an interesting detail on habits of the poet, who, he says, his appetite with coarse food and would reject dainties such as of Petrarch he tells the following the scandals which disgraced the Papal Court at Avignon.
One day two Cardinals, who were returning from the Papal palace, were besieged by a crowd of impatient applicants clamouring to know how their several affairs were progressing in the Pope’s hands. In order to be rid the Cardinals, who was evidently an old hand at the practice, glibly gave an answer to each as to what the Pope had said in his particular case, lying and inventing unblushingly without turning a hair. When the crowd was thus disposed of, his companion, who was not as yet utterly degraded, said to the other, ‘Are you not ashamed to trifle with the feelings of these poor dupes, and to fabricate answers from the Pope, when you know we have not seen him at all to-day, nor for many days past?’ On the contrary, he retorted the other, who was an inveterate jobber, ‘it is you that

1 I 89. 2 I 125. 3 III 6. 4 III 145. 5 I 79.
4 II 59. 6 III 225. 7 II 185; IV 488. 8 I 224.
should be ashamed, who are so dull as not yet to have learnt the ways of the Papal Court.' Whereupon the bystanders burst out laughing, and applauded the ready answer. But Petrarch, who was present, and had heard what passed, turned away in indignation and disgust.

Benvenuto's references to Boccaccio are not so numerous as those to Petrarch, but as a rule they are more interesting, owing to the closer personal relations which subsisted between the two. 'Venerabilis praeceptor meus,' 'placidissimus hominum,' 'suavissimus Boccatius de Certaldo,' 'humillimus hominum,' 'curiosus inquisitor omnium delectabilium historiarum,' are some of the terms by which Benvenuto refers to his former master, from whose works he has helped himself pretty liberally. The Decameron he avowedly quotes once only, for the story of Ghin di Tacco and the Abbot of Clugny (X. 2), but at least eleven others of the tales are laid under contribution without the smallest acknowledgement, in several cases the novel being transcribed entire, and no doubt other excerpts might be traced. The De Genealogia Deorum, the De Montibus et Silvis, and the De Casibus Virorum Illustrium are utilized in the same unscrupulous fashion, it being apparently a matter of complete indifference whether the name of the authority is mentioned or not. Such proceedings, of course, are common enough with mediaeval writers, with whom what we regard as plagiarism was a venial offence, if it was an offence at all; but the particular instances noted in the cases of Petrarch and Boccaccio are somewhat remarkable, seeing that the Commentary was written, and in part at least published, during Boccaccio's lifetime at any rate.

1 III. 169, 265; I. 35; III. 341, 392.
2 I. 95, 167-8, 210, 284, 546; III. 265, 312, 314, 388-9, 392; IV. 382; V. 262.
3 V. 164.
4 I. 124, 509, 514; III. 376; IV. 488; V. 164.
5 I. 289; III. 341; IV. 12-13; V. 164.
Boccaccio's *Vita di Dante*, sometimes named, more often not, is responsible for most of the information about Dante personally which is given in the Commentary. Several stories, however, occur here for the first time in connexion with Dante. One of these—how Dante expressed surprise at the beauty of Giotto's paintings, and at the ugliness of his children, to which Giotto made the well-known reply, ('Quia pingo de die, sed fingo de nocte')—is as old as Macrobius, as Benvenuto himself points out. To this same passage in the Commentary is due the tradition that Dante was at Padua at the time when Giotto, as a young man, was painting the frescoes in the Chapel of the Madonna dell'Arena in that city. In connexion with Dante's extraordinary facility in the matter of rhymes Benvenuto repeats a quaint conceit, which had been imagined, he says, by an ardent admirer of the poet: When Dante first heard the composition of his poem, all the rhyme of so many lovely maidens, and each in turn hummed petitioned to be granted admittance into this great work of his genius. In answer to their prayers, Dante called one and then another, and assigned to each its appropriate place in the poem, so that, when at last the work was complete, it was found that not a single one had been left out.

Several of the anecdotes supplied by Boccaccio have already been quoted in another connexion. The most interesting piece of information Benvenuto derived from him, is the account of his visit to the Monastery of Monte Cassino, which is quoted in the comment on Par. XXII. 74:

'My revered master, Boccaccio, told me,' he says, 'that he once in the neighbourhood of Monte Cassino, he paid the monastery a visit, and asked if he might see the library. Whereupon on

1 III. 313.  
2 IV. 166.  
3 V. 391.
the monks, pointing to a staircase, said gruffly: "Go up; it is open." Boccaccio went up, and saw to his astonishment that the library, the storehouse of the monastic treasures, had neither door nor fastening; and on entering in he found grass growing on the windows, and all the books and benches buried in dust. When he came to turn over the books, some of which were very rare and of great value, he discovered that many of them had been mutilated and defaced by having leaves torn out, or the margins cut—a discovery which greatly distressed him. In answer to his inquiries as to how this damage had been caused, he was told that it was the work of some of the monks themselves. These vandals, desirous of making a little money, were in the habit of tearing out leaves from some of the manuscripts, and of cutting the margins off others, for the purpose of converting them into psalters and breviaries, which they afterwards sold. "Now, student," exclaims Benvenuto, "go and weary your brains with the making of books!"

The shameful maltreatment of the books at Monte Cassino, which Boccaccio so graphically here describes, fortunately seems to have been exceptional at that time in Italy, for Petrarch, who had a large experience of monastic libraries, never records any instance of their neglect, but on the contrary expresses his gratitude to the monks for their careful preservation of so many priceless treasures.

Of the contemporary events alluded to by Benvenuto, that which seems to have impressed his imagination the most was the capture of the French king by the English at Poictiers (Sept. 19, 1356). To this incident reference is made no less than four times as a cruel instance of the reverses of fortune. He is especially indignant at the conduct of Clement VI in granting subsidies to the French in aid of the war with England; and à propos of Dante's reference to the dealings between Clement V and Philip the Fair, he breaks out:

[1] What would Dante have said if he had seen this other Clement, who was much more corrupt and more carnal than his predecessor,

1 Nolhac, op cit., p. 39.  
2 I. 267; II. 55; III. 532; V. 248.
and poured out the whole of the immense treasure of the Church in aid of King John of France against the King of England; yet the only result that both treasure and victory fell to the English, who captured the French king into the bargain! 1

Benvenuto had evidently a special dislike to the French, due perhaps to his experience of them at Avignon, and he misses no opportunity of ridiculing them. When Dante speaks of the vanity of the Siensese, which he says is even greater than that of the French, Benvenuto comments 2:

1 Indeed, the French have ever been the vainest of all nations: as it was in the days of Julius Caesar so it is now, for we see them every day inventing new clothes, and new modes of dress; not a part of their persons but has its own special fashion—they wear chains round their necks, bracelets on their arms, long pointed shoes, short jackets which expose the very part of the body they ought to conceal, and hoods over their faces which hide the part they ought to show—in fact there is no end to their vanities. And it makes my blood boil, he adds, to see Italians, and especially Italian nobles, trying to ape the French, and learning their language, which they claim to be the most elegant of all tongues. This claim I nonsense admit, for French is nothing but a bastard Italian, as any one can see. Not being able to pronounce cavaliere properly, for instance, they corrupt it into chevalier; and it is the same with Signore, which they turn into Sir, and so on. And the proof of what I maintain is this—that when they want to say “loquere vulgariter,” that is, to speak in the vulgar tongue, they say “loquere romanice,” that is, to speak romance; and their vernaculars they call romance. Italians therefore ought not gratuitously to slight their own noble speech and manners for those of the ignoble French. 2

On other occasions he jeers at the drunken habits of the French, and at their love of violence and robbery 3; and when pointing out 4 that Vincent of Beauvais, in his Speculum Historiale, has made the ridiculous mistake of confounding Cato of Utica with the so-called Dionysius Cato, author of the Disticha, he maliciously adds, ‘just like a Frenchman.’ There are many other interesting

1 II. 55. 2 II. 409. 3 II. 71; III. 530; V. 463. 4 III. 38.
allusions in the Commentary to contemporary events, some of which are introduced with telling effect. Thus, in his comment on Purgatorio, VI. 97–151, where Dante reproaches the Emperor Albert for his neglect of Italy, Benvenuto remarks:

'Certainly former emperors did less harm by not coming into Italy than our present Emperor Charles of Luxemburg, grandson of the good Henry VII, has done in his two visits to our country; especially on the second occasion, in the time of Urban V, when he came with an immense host, from which great things were expected; but instead of flying the victorious eagles he brought with him a nest of harpies, and, to his everlasting infamy, piled up gold by selling the liberties of those he came to protect.'

The coronation of this same Charles IV at Arles, on June 4, 1365, is also alluded to, on which occasion, as we have already seen, Benvenuto was himself present, he being at that time in France on his mission to Urban V at Avignon. The gallant resistance of the people of Pavia to the Visconti of Milan, under the leadership of the eloquent friar, Jacopo Bossolaro, is brought in as an example of the power of eloquence, à propos of the 'messo del ciel' of Inferno, IX. 85, whom Benvenuto, with a curious lapse from his customary good sense, insists on identifying with the god Mercury. Dante's denunciation, in the twentieth canto of the Purgatorio, of the shameful marriage of Beatrice of Naples to the bloodthirsty Azzo of Este, evokes a reference to the marriage of Isabella, daughter of King John of France, the prisoner of the English, to the Milanese tyrant, Gian Galeazzo Visconti, which took place in June, 1360. Other events alluded to are the defeat and death of Pedro the Cruel of Castile at the hands of his natural brother Henry in 1368; the invasion and conquest of Cyprus by the Genoese in 1373;
and the destruction of the Castle of Sant' Angelo at Rome in 1379, during the contest between the partisans of Pope Urban VI and those of his rival, Cardinal Robert of Geneva, better known as the anti-pope Clement VII. This last reference is taken by Benvenuto's editor as fixing the terminus ad quem of the Commentary, but as has already been pointed out, he has overlooked a probable reference to the Emperor Wenceslaus, which makes it possible to advance this limit by several years.

Dante's description of the devastation of Aegina by plague (Inferno, XXIX. 58–64) gives occasion to the mention of the great plagues in Italy in 1348 and 1362; in the former, which figures in the Proemio of Boccaccio's Decameron, Benvenuto states that the mortality was especially heavy in Sicily and Sardinia, where it amounted to ninety per cent. of the whole population. There is one reference, and one only, to Cola di Rienzi, 'the last of the tribunes,' 'Nicholaus tribunus Romae, vir magna probitas et prudentiae,' as Benvenuto describes him; this occurs à propos of the letters S. P. Q. R., which Rienzi once in his contempt for the Roman populace is said to have explained as Sozzo Popolo Conchagato Romane, whatever that may mean.

To the unsettled state of Italy, and the numerous bands of foreign mercenaries which infested the country, we find repeated reference. À propos of Guido del Duca's lament (in the fourteenth canto of the Purgatorio) over the condition of Romagna in those days, Benvenuto exclaims:

'Well might I echo Guido's words, save that now his description would apply, not to one province only, but to the whole of Italy!'

The 'Stipendiarii,' he says, are like the Centaurs in the seventh circle of Hell—more beast than man; they are

1 II. 8, 53.  2 IV. 305.  3 II. 397–8.
4 V. 181–2.  5 III. 397.  6 I. 394–5.
ever rushing to deal or receive death at the bidding of 
a master, whom they do not scruple to leave in the lurch 
whenever it suits them, especially when it comes to fighting 
in the open and they have no fortress nor city-walls to 
shelter them.

'Woe is me!' he concludes, 'that it has fallen to my lot to live in these evil days, when Italy is overrun with these foreign companies of every nation of Europe,—bloody English, raving Germans, brutal Bretons, rapacious Gascons, and filthy Hungarians, who are all banded together for the undoing of Italy, laying waste her provinces, plundering her noble cities, and working desolation on all sides by fraud and treachery and violence.'

PAGET TOYNBEE.
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XLVIII.

Tewrdanck and Weisskunig,

And Their Historical Interest.

At first sight the poem Tewrdanck, unlike its prose companion Weisskunig, might seem entitled to claim a certain literary as well as an historical interest; but I fear that any effort to sustain such a claim would too soon end in collapse. Dr. Furnivall himself, who of such material nihil tetigit quod non illuminaverit, would find it difficult to light up a dullness so solid and so unconscious. Although, whatever may have been his other defects, there was no want of vivacity in the 'begetter' of the poem, and although its theme was of a nature to set male ambition as well as female sentiment on fire, the worthy scribes who put the production into shape succeeded in effacing from it any vestige of poetic feeling, and effectually burdened the German Renascence with a literary monument of almost unrelieved heaviness. On the other hand, the style of Tewrdanck must be allowed the merits of straightforwardness and simplicity, and of freedom from the rhetorical bombast to which, in Germany as elsewhere, the Renascence so readily found its way. Thus, the poem deserves to be praised as no slight linguistic achievement; and its diction has been correctly described as, notwithstanding contractions and other colloquial liberties, so modern in form that it is
difficult to believe the composition to have by several years preceded Luther's version of the Bible. The pedestrian Weisskunig moves, so far as style is concerned, with the pretentious unpretence of the chancery, and is quite above literary criticism.

The personality of Maximilian I—it may be unhesitatingly asserted—impressed itself far otherwise upon his contemporaries, upon his family, upon his nation, and upon his political friends and foes, than it does upon latter-day historical critics. One of the reasons accounting for this is to be sought in his relations to the intellectual and more especially the literary movement of his age, and in the interpretations which, no doubt partly for reasons of their own, the German humanists were eager to put upon the relations in question. Here it must suffice to say that, in whatever sense his patronage of learning, letters, and art was secondary to the dynastic ambition which formed the mainspring of his conduct and action, it was largely prompted by an inborn and consistently cultivated activity of intellect. An enthusiastic votary of the bodily prowess which was accounted the highest personal ornament of a great prince, he was awake to all the intellectual interests which add a higher zest to life; and he was one of those who abhor killing time. He soon perceived what capital he could make out of his inclinations, and though persis

and of which he showed Pirkheimer some (in more respects than one) distracting beginnings, remained a confused fragment; and, in a form more or less moulded by other hands, his autobiography survives in literature mainly in the verse of *Tewrdanck*, and in the prose of *Weisskunig*.

More or less;—for, as cannot be here expounded in detail, his authorship must in both instances be concluded to have gone far beyond what would be expressed by the conveniently vague term ‘inspiration.’ In the case of *Tewrdanck*, there can be no reasonable doubt but that Max, besides designing the general scheme of the poem, devised the contents, and probably drafted the substance, of the large majority of the chapters, leaving to the private secretaries, whom he always chose among lettered men, the elaboration, and above all the versification, of what, assisted probably by other familiars, he had placed before them in outline. Melchior Pfinzing of Nürnberg may without much hesitation be held responsible for most of the diction of the poem, as well as for such purely literary devices as the figures of the Tempter (chap. x) and the Good Angel at the other end of the book (chap. cxv).

Considerable obscurity prevails as to the several designs of another private secretary, Marx Treiszauerwein von Ehrentreiz, and of Maximilian’s favourite councillor Sigmund von Dietrichstein; but the final redaction was so distinctly the work of Pfinzing, that he calls himself the author—not the editor—of the work, when at last completed two years before the emperor’s death. Treiszauerwein, who had elaborated the first two parts of the *Weisskunig*, had not been able to submit the third to Maximilian before his death; and the work accordingly remained unpublished till a much later date (1775). Inasmuch as the *Tewrdanck* too was only privately circulated in the emperor’s lifetime, it would be out of place to dwell upon whatever self-glorification *per alios*
may be sought in the profusion of laudatory epithets and phrases lavished in both productions upon the hero who was also, in a sense, their author.

_Tewrdanck_ is an allegory of a simple sort, intended as everybody knows to celebrate the expedition which in the year 1477 secured to the Archduke Maximilian of Austria, when a youth of eighteen years of age, the hand of Mary of Burgundy. But the allegory, though simple, is, as will be seen, singularly free. King Romreich (Charles the Bold), when he grew old and weak and came to die—in a fair garden of his choice, not ‘on feathers in a bed’—left a will in which, out of the twelve suitors of his daughter Erenreich (Mary), he chose the hero Tewrdanck (Max) to be her consort. Though her father’s death touched her more nearly than any one else, so that the tears ran from her eyes, Erenreich, with the assent of her councilors and the approval of the diet (Landschaft) of her realm, summoned the hero to come and claim her. Accompanied by his faithful follower Erenhold (Dietrichstein), Tewrdanck sets forth on his journey, but not until after a preliminary series of discussions with the Evil One in person. (These are palpably based on the Temptation in the New Testament; but it is worthy of notice that Satan appears to Tewrdanck ‘arrayed as a learned doctor.’) To his inspirations are due the wiles of the three captains in the service of Queen Erenreich, whose intention had been ‘to marry her for money, as this happens in the world up to the present day’; and his struggles against their manoeuvres make up the substance of the poem. The three are aware that if the queen secures a hero for a husband, and if her ‘wide domain, with its fair castles and numerous towns,’ finds a master, their own power is at an end; and accordingly each in his turn sets his wits to work to render the pass committed to his care the end of

_h h_
Tewrdanck's journey. Their names are Fürwittig, Unäh, and Neidelhart—as who should say Presumptuous, Calaminoso, and Pick-Envy; but no attempt at characterdrawing is made in the case of these or of any personages of the poem except its hero; and the figure of the members of the evil triad can at the most have been suggested by the Burgundian councillors (Hugues, d'Himbercourt, and de Clugny), of whom the two laymen suffered death for their advocacy of the French marriage scheme before Maximilian's arrival. Their machinations against Tewrdanck, which increase in magnitude of scale and range as they proceed, are of course facilitated by his own adventurous spirit, and by his resolution to accomplish so many 'good things' that he may with honour be chosen in wedlock by the queen when he presents himself before her. The perils through which the hero passes unscathed are, as we learn from Melchior Pfanzing's Key, largely reproductions of the hairbreadth escapes actually experienced by Max as a sportsman in divers lands and in quest of all kinds of game—the chamois in the Tyrol, where his famous detention at the Martinswand must have only been one among many similar hazards, and the stag in Brabant; not to mention the boar on the ice in Flanders, and the lion at Utrecht. Some of the hero's adventures hardly rise above the dignity of accidents, including avalanches, landslips, and more especially dangers due to powder and guns, apt instruments of devilry. One attempt at least occurs at poisoning outright, besides a minor effort or two at bringing about the same result by perverse medical treatment—these latter being defeated by the patient's superior insight into his own constitution. More exciting are his perils by water, plainly to be associated with the coasts of Holland, Zealand, and Friesland, with which Maximilian acquired no little familiarity. Unluckily the Key often
fails us in the narrative of Tewrdanck's third series of adventures, which are chiefly concerned with his military campaigns. But a good deal of the allegory is quite transparent; the high and mighty lord who sate next to the queen's land and made violent war upon her must be Lewis XI (ch. lxxvi), and in the episode which evidently refers to the Bruges troubles of 1488—by far the most serious of all Maximilian's mainbournie—there is in some respects a close adherence to facts (ch. xcv). Yet, strange to say, the cardinal fact of the king's imprisonment is not only ignored but contradicted. 'He departed in safety; nobody dared to attack him.' Thus the most significant incident in the chapter is his abstention from mixing with the excited multitude which had 'in order' and under arms assembled in the public place where stood the castle occupied by Tewrdanck. His impulse, guilefully approved by Neidelhart, had at first been to proceed among the people; but when he was on his way and the turbulent cries against him reached his ears, he bethought himself once more, and declined to 'repair among the common folk; for he knew their ways, and was well acquainted with them by experience—how they were full of faithlessness, and would in no wise be commanded; so he returned softly to the castle.'

After at last prevailing over the designs of his adversaries, which culminate in the placing in his garden of an infernal machine upon which the rain providentially descends, Tewrdanck, reflecting with some reason on his simplicity in having allowed himself to be so long delayed, finds himself at Queen Erenreich's court. This is well described, neither the eating and drinking nor the dances and merry spelen being forgotten. He has narrated his adventures to the queen (more briefly than Æneas told his to Dido), and—herein a true copy of his original—he has listened with true pleasure to the wondrous music of her chapel. She
seems on the point of redeeming her promise when fresh delays intervene. (The real Max was married to Mary on the morning of his arrival at Ghent.) Tewrdanck fish himself under an obligation of contending in the lists against six knights in Welsh, i.e. French, fashion; and on the next day he repeats the process in the German way, hitherto little known at the queen’s court. In recognition of his victories, and of all his previous deeds in defence of her land and people, she bestows on him a wreath of the plant called jessamine, while the three evil counsellors are put to death—Fischedrig being beheaded, Unfalo hanged, and Weidhurt cast down from a great height, praying the while that envy may come to an end with him. Yet at the last an obstacle of a very different kind appears to delay the union of Ernestine and Tewrdanck. Herself, she urges upon him that before they become man and wife, he should crown his chivalrous achievements by undertaking an expedition against the Komdels, who had penetrated as far as her own kingdom. An angel descends from on high to support this appeal, to which Tewrdanck says Amen. But before he sets forth on the enterprise, for which she provides him with all the sinews of war (the perennial demidiotrem of his prototype), he prevails upon her to weep him according to the rites of the Church, so that his “divine marriage” may coincide with his departure for his supreme “contest of honour.” Although Maximilian’s crusade remained a pious intention, there can be no doubt that the thought of it was some fide cherished by him. No sooner had his son Philip succeeded to the government of the Netherlands, than Max (at Antwerp in 1494) assumed the insignia of the crusading Order of St. George, and appealed to all Christian potentates to follow his example.

If in this respect at all events Tewrdanck renders justice to the ideals of the original of its hero, I am not aware that, either designedly or unconsciously, it offers many
other illustrations of his character. The great body of the
adventures narrated in the poem tend to show that, as in
the case of some greater personages of history than he,
the 'dear hero's' capacity for falling into difficulties was
surpassed only by his skill in extricating himself from
them. Unfalo is not far from the truth when with hypo-
critical solicitude he tells Tewrdanck: 'I have to-day
clearly perceived that you are too precipitate in affairs,
and take no thought of what may happen to you.' But
together with his chivalrous and sportsmanlike spirit, his
resourcefulness, his coolness, and his unassuming self-respect
('I have broken a few bits of wood, more than once')
are felicitously brought out. Determined to deserve the
queen's hand by his deeds, he is far from being dazzled
by the extent and wealth of her possessions. When after
a tempest (not ill described) he finds himself in a fair
city of the queen's, and is pressed for his opinion of it
by Unfalo, he coolly replies that he likes the place—Ant-
werp or Amsterdam, perhaps—very well, and that he dares
say there is not a thing which cannot be bought in it (ch.
xliii). Tewrdanck, although the soul of courtesy, pretends
to no likes or dislikes but those of his princely caste.
Neidelhart is responsible for the assertion that all the
'people of honour' in the queen's dominions are in
Tewrdanck's favour. Such was at no time the case with
Maximilian, though he owed much to native nobles like
Dadizeele. It has been seen what was the hero's opinion
of the common people of the towns, who in the Nether-
lands were the real adversaries of the Austrian régime;
and it would be interesting to know whether to Max
himself is due the incidental generalization (ch. lxix), on
which his commanders certainly acted in his name, if he
did not so act himself: 'the faithlessness of the peasantry
is manifold.'

Of the Weisskunig I have left myself little room for
The man in question is Arthur, a man of many talents and an accomplished writer. He has been known to write under the pseudonym "The Pen of Wisdom," and his works have been praised for their depth and insight. Arthur's life has been marked by a series of fortunate events, which have allowed him to pursue his passion for writing. He has been fortunate enough to meet many great minds, and his interactions with them have only served to enhance his own abilities.

Despite his success, Arthur remains humble and modest, a trait that has earned him the respect of his peers. His personality is described as warm and charming, and he is often sought after for his advice and counsel. Arthur is a man of many talents and is always willing to help those in need. His generosity and kindness are well-known, and he is respected for his integrity and moral compass.

Arthur's journey has been one of continuous learning and growth, and he continues to pursue his passion for writing with unwavering determination. He is a true example of the old adage that "success is having been once successful," and his story serves as an inspiration to many. Arthur's story is a testament to the power of opportunity and the beauty and charmableness of his nature.
Bohemian and Windic tongues he was taught by a peasant. Experts of a different sort initiated him into the arts of painting, architecture and carpentry, music and the lyre. He was instructed, we further find, in all meats, and in mummeries, and acquainted himself with the processes of the mint. Needless to add, that he became familiar with all the varieties of the chase, including that of the chamois and the use of the crossbow; with fishing and falconry, with all kinds of fencing, and with knightly jousting after both the German and the ‘Welsh’ manner; with horsemanship, with the fabrication and use of all varieties of arms, and with the practice of guns and artillery.

The remainder of the work shows how a schooling of which the above summary is anything but exhaustive, was put to the test of life. The powerful King of Feuressen (this not very euphonious pseudonym alludes, not to any fire-eating propensities which a captious criticism might deem noticeable in Charles the Bold, but to the flaming links of the chain of the great Burgundian Order) had agreed to the marriage of his only daughter to the son of the Old Weisskunig; but the two sovereigns were at war with one another, and the Blue King (Louis XI. of France) joined the alliance against him of Feuressen, who fell in battle (Nancy). Hereupon, at the invitation of the young queen, the Old Weisskunig’s son, after carrying on a campaign against the Green King (Matthias Corvinus of Hungary), repaired to Feuressen and married its heiress. They found no difficulty as to language, for the bridegroom was acquainted with Flemish, English, Spanish, and ‘Welsh’; in fact, he was able to converse with seven captains in their seven several tongues. (As to ‘Welsh,’ the less said of Maximilian’s French the better.)

From this point onward, the narrative (of which Part III was, as has been seen, never submitted to the author in
its final form) is attenuated into a more conscientious than interesting record of the long series of campaigns carried on by the Young Weisskunig—or, in other words, of the campaigns of Maximilian, in the Netherlands and elsewhere, between the years 1477 and 1513. There is little or nothing allegorical about this narrative, save that, as already noticed, the chief princes that appear on the scene are designated by their heraldic colours, actual or supposed, while leagues or associations of states or cities are similarly distinguished—the Flemish communes as the Brown League, the Gueldrian towns as the Grey, and so forth. The Eidgenossen appear as the League of Many Colours; and the peasants of Kennemerland, who waged the 'Bread-and-Cheese-war,' so called from the symbol which like other peasant hosts they bore aloft in lieu of a standard, are still less inventively called 'the peasants with the strange flag' (den seltsamen Faun).

I am not aware of any other features relieving the tedium of this compilation, which, notwithstanding Maximilian's desire to encourage German historical composition, stands to the fifteenth-century chronicles of Burgundy and France in a relation hardly more favourable than that which Tewrdanck holds towards The King's Quair.

A. W. Ward.
XLIX.

THE EARLY ENGLISH TEXT SOCIETY
IN GERMANY.

In 1819 appeared the first volume of Grimm's *Deutsche Grammatik*. It included the phonology and the inflections of the Teutonic tongues, and also, for the first time in Germany, or indeed anywhere, 'die mittelenglischen Laute,' as Grimm called them, placing these Middle English sounds by the side of the Anglo-Saxon, as marking the transition to Modern English. He also made the following statement: 'Through want of space and insufficient study my résumé must necessarily be superficial. The sources, however, are not unworthy of notice and invite further study. With the exception of Tristrem and Chaucer's works the most important material is to be found in the collection of Ritson and Weber, and deals with the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.'

Grimm modestly ascribed the incompleteness of his treatment of 'Mittelenglisch' to 'want of space and insufficient study,' but he might more correctly have attributed it to the want of trustworthy editions of manuscripts. True, Tyrwhitt's text of Chaucer was readable, but it was sadly in want of the accuracy and uniformity necessary for the founding of a system of phonetics. The dialect of
Tristrem is quite different from that of Chaucer, and Ritsa and Weber in their collections place poems of different dialects and written at different periods side by side with no regard to order. And so it is not surprising that an accurate treatment of Middle English based on this material could be given—all honour to Jakob Grimm that he was able, out of such limited means, to produce such a work as lies before us. But he appears to have recognized the difficulties and so turned his attention away from the Middle English period, as far as its forms and inflections were concerned.

The first German Historical Grammar of the English language, written by Eduard Fiedler (1853), suffered by similar inabilities. Thorpe’s Analecta Saxonica, Wright and Halliwell’s Reliquiae Antiquae served as examples of the transition period; specimens in Latham’s English Language, Sir Tristrem, the Chronicles of Robert of Gloucester and of Robert Manning of Brunne, published by Hearne, the Visions of Piers the Plowman, Wright’s Political Songs of England (Camden Society, 1839), Specimens of Lyric Poetry (Wright, Percy Society, 1842), and finally Wright’s Chaucer were used as representatives of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

When Friedrich Koch began his fundamental work (1 omit all reference to the more practical grammar of Eduard Mätzner), the first volume of which was published in October, 1861, he was indebted to the same sources as his predecessors. At the time of the composition of the second volume (1865) these sources were still richer. Mort Arthure, Sir Gawayne and the Greene Knight, Early English Poems, such as Genesis and Exodus and Lancelot, threw more light on the peculiarities of the Northern and Scottish dialects than was formerly possible to obtain. Further material came to hand for the third volume (1869), and this was due to the E.E.T.S., which, founded by Frederick
Furnivall in 1864, had between that date and 1869 published more than thirty volumes in its 'Original' and 'Extra Series.' The influence of the E.E.T.S. volumes will be more clearly manifested when Koch's 'Handexemplar' of his Grammar is published: until his death (October, 1872) this learned scholar continually added fresh material to his 'Specimens,' so that the volumes were expanded to twice their former size, nearly all the additions being taken from the texts of the E.E.T.S. Unfortunately the 'Handexemplar' of the first part, into which most of the new material had been brought, disappeared in a curious way after Koch's death; but this philologist often said how greatly he was indebted to the founders and editors of the E.E.T.S.  

We obtain a like impression from an examination of the recently published Grammars of Kluge and Morsbach.

When we turn to the Readers the same fact is apparent as in the case of the Grammars. In 1867 Eduard Mätzner published the first part of his *Altenglische Sprachproben.* It contained poetry; but out of forty-one extracts only four are taken from the publications of the E.E.T.S. and six from those of the founder of the Society. The reason for the inclusion of so few extracts from this source is due to the fact that the materials had been collected earlier, but that the publication was delayed by difficulties of printing and other causes. The second part (prose) dates from the same time as the first, and contained out of eleven extracts only two from the publications of the E.E.T.S., but these occupy nearly a quarter of the book. The Readers which have appeared of later years in Germany containing specimens of the Middle English Period, are almost entirely based on E.E.T.S. publications, and indeed it is due to this Society that their production was made possible.

---

1 Cf. the praise which Koch accorded these gentlemen in his review of Stratmann's *Old English Dictionary* in Zacher's Zeitschrift, 1, p. 364.
Zupitza in his Übungsbuch, in the part dealing with the same period, is likewise indebted to the E.E.T.S., and the present writer's gratitude can only be fully estimated by himself.

In speaking of Dictionaries the case is somewhat different. Grein's Anglo-Saxon Dictionary must not be included in this review, as it was finished in the same year as the E.E.T.S. was founded, and is complete in itself. But volume sixty-five of the 'Original Series' appeared shortly before Grein's death, and was taken up in toto in the new edition of the Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Poesie (vol. ii).

The first sections of Stratmann's Old English Dictionary were issued in 1864, and the whole was completed three years later. But new volumes being published every year through the industry of the E.E.T.S. editors, mainly relative to the period 1200–1400 A.D., the same period in fact dealt with by Stratmann, he felt himself compelled to issue a new edition in 1871. This contained much improved and extended information, and almost all the additions were taken from E.E.T.S. publications, which up to this time numbered nearly sixty volumes. Mätzner from the first took his examples for his Alteenglisches Wörterbuch from editions of this Society, and his work can therefore lay claim to be the special dictionary of the whole collection.

The metres also of the older periods could never have been so comprehensively treated as they were by Jakob Schipper (1881–1888) were it not for the labours of Furnivall and his friends. Similarly a history of literature such as that of Ten Brink's could never have been written, the later Middle Ages in England could never have been so clearly brought before us, and the development of Modern English out of the older dialects would have remained untraced, had it not been for the unselfish and unceasing labours of English editors.
The importance of the Text Society was early recognized in Germany. Koch’s appreciative critique, which appeared in Zacher’s Zeitschrift, vol. i. (1868), was already freely quoted. The Bibliography for Ebert’s Jahrbuch für romanische und englische Literatur (vol. vii, ed. by L. Lemcke, 1866) noticed the first publications of the collection (p. 462 sq.), and after a preliminary account of former Societies in England goes on to speak of the publications of Furnivall and others, to be found in the Transactions of the Philological Society. In the Germania, published by Franz Pfeiffer (vol. viii, 1863, p. 117 sq.), San Marte (A. Schulz) speaks in high terms of these Transactions, and especially commends the industry of Mr. Frederick Furnivall, ‘the honoured editor of Robert of Brunne’s Handlyng Synne, William of Waddington’s Manuel des Pechies, of Lonelich’s and Borron’s Saynt Graal.’ In the following numbers of the same periodical we always find a notice of the newest publications of the Society; they may also be read in the Jahrbuch, seventh and following volumes.

Lastly, it must be remembered that the E.E.T.S. has by its publications given not only an impulse to more advanced work in Germany, and indeed made it possible, but also an opportunity to German scholars of publishing editions among the volumes of the Society. The names of Zupitza and Kölbing, both of whom died too early, call for especial mention; also those of Buelbring, Deimling, Einenkel, Fleischhacker, Hausknecht, Holthausen, Horstmann, Kellner, Schick, and many others whose editions are in prospect.

As a conclusion to an article the aim of which has been rather to indicate various lines of thought than to work them out, let me say that the activity of the E.E.T.S. has instilled life into the study of Early English, both in England and Germany. And if this branch of knowledge
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H. Littlehales.
THE COMMEMORATION OF
DR. FURNIVALL'S BIRTHDAY.

On July 12, 1899, a few friends of Dr. Furnivall, chiefly students and professors of English Literature, met in the rooms of the Bibliographical Society to consider in what manner his seventy-fifth birthday could most fittingly be celebrated. Professor Ker was asked to take the Chair, Mr. George Macmillan to act as Hon. Treasurer, Mr. Alfred Pollard and Mr. Robert Steele to be Hon. Secretaries. It was resolved that the commemoration ought to have both a personal and a public side, and that it should take the triple form of (1) some personal present, preferably a new boat; (2) an English Miscellany or 'Festschrift' in Dr. Furnivall's honour, to which students of English should be invited to contribute under the editorship of Professors Ker, Napier, and Skeat, as representing English studies at London, Oxford, and Cambridge; and (3) a special fund for the benefit of the Early English Text Society, by way of helping on what has been the main work of Dr. Furnivall's life.

To promote these objects in England a General Committee, of over sixty members, whose names are marked in the following list by an asterisk, was speedily got together; and a similar movement was started in the United States by Professors Bright and Kittredge, and in Germany by Professors Büllbring, Brandl, Hausknecht and others. Circulars were sent out alluding to the services which Dr. Furnivall has rendered to all students of English, both by the publication of texts and by helping to originate
the New English Dictionary, and to the special work which he has done through the Chaucer and Early English Text Societies. These elicited a ready response, enthusiastic as regards the personal side of the presentation, but as regards the help to be given to the Early English Text Society, somewhat checked in England by the outbreak of war in South Africa, with the consequent opening of numerous subscriptions for objects undeniably more urgent. Nevertheless it was evident from the first that, after providing for the personal present, there would be a considerable surplus available for the Society, to whose aid, moreover, certain subscriptions or portions of subscriptions were specially allocated, just as others were to the personal gifts. Professors Ker, Napier, and Skeat cheerfully accepted the editorship of the Miscellany, contributions of papers were freely offered \(^1\), and the responsibility for the publication of the book was taken over by the Clarendon Press on terms which, it is hoped, may bring some further advantage to the Early English Text Society.

The triple programme, which had at first seemed rather ambitious, was thus soon on its way to success, but as Dr. Furnivall’s birthday approached a serious difficulty arose as to who should choose the boat. No member of the Committee was willing to take this responsibility, and a letter was at last written to Dr. Furnivall, confessing the plot which was in progress, and asking him to select a boat-builder and give him his own instructions for a new ‘randan.’ The answer to this request came in a characteristic letter, in which Dr. Furnivall wrote:

‘Your kind and quite unexpected offer of a new Randan comes home to me, and if I were not sure that it would mean throwing away money needlessly, I’d accept your

---

\(^1\) The present writer must take the responsibility for a misunderstanding, owing to which the invitation to contribute to the Miscellany did not reach several American scholars until so late that it was impossible for them to comply with it.
offer at once. But the fact is that at Richmond a randan can't be kept in a boathouse and run in and out as you want her: she is too heavy and the banks are too high. She has to lie out in the river all the season, getting rub'd by other boats, so that at the end of the season a new boat looks just like an old one. I couldn't take a new boat. But I will gladly accept a second-hand one, which can be knockt about and lent to friends, and which would have more room for the sitters' legs than my present boat has. I should like to feel that my friends and I were using your kind present; and if you'll authorize me to go to Hart's of Surbiton and buy one of his second-handers I'll thankfully accept that from you; and all its users will be more happy in it than in a new boat, which every one would have to bother about and see that the varnish wasn't scratched, &c.'

The Committee were a little taken aback by this proposal, but the Doctor's wish was law to them; the second-hand boat was duly bought, and those of Dr. Furnivall's friends who have joined his river parties this summer will testify that it is a comfortable one and goes very well. But as the Doctor was so determined in his economy as regards the boat, and could not be brought to suggest anything else he wanted, the Committee were obliged to please themselves as to the disposal of the balance of the personal section of the Fund, and they resolved to ask permission to have his portrait painted.

As February 4, Dr. Furnivall's birthday, fell this year on a Sunday, he was asked to meet his friends at University College, London, on the afternoon of Saturday the 3rd, and he was there welcomed and congratulated by Professor Ker, who also read a congratulatory letter written by Professor Bright on behalf of friends in America. Mr. George Macmillan, as Treasurer to the Fund, handed
over a voucher for the boat, and Professor Napier (through whom they had been sent) presented addresses, as beautifully printed as gracefully worded, from the German Shakespeare Society (Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft), the Berlin Society for the Study of Modern Languages (Gesellschaft für das Studium der neueren Sprachen in Berlin), the German Modern Languages Association (Deutscher Verein für die neueren Philologie), the Saxon Association of Modern Languages (Sächsischer Neuphilo-
gen-Verband), and the Faculty of Philosophy in the German University at Prague.

Mr. Saintsbury's verses were recited, amid much applause, and Dr. Furnivall then returned his thanks in a speech full of graceful compliments and pleasant chaff for his friends, and treating everything which he had himself accomplished as the easiest and most natural thing in the world. The little function was not without its touch of academic dignity, but it somehow closed to the strains of a well-known chorus, and was certainly a very pleasant and friendly one, despite the bitter weather outside, which had obliged some old friends from Oxford and Cambridge reluctantly at the last moment to give up coming.

What remains to be told needs only a few words. At the University College meeting Dr. Furnivall promised to sit for his portrait, and a commission for this has been accepted. The 'Festschrift,' the present English Miscellany, speaks for itself, and will remain a permanent record of the esteem in which Dr. Furnivall is held wherever English literature is read, or the English language studied. As for the Early English Text Society, despite the War-Funds and the many other calls which English people have had made on them in this too eventful year, it will benefit by the seventy-fifth birthday of its Director to the extent of some four
hundred guineas. Of this one half has been devoted to reducing the Society’s debt to its printers, the other to subsidizing, as a ‘Furnivall volume,’ a new edition of the *Handlyng Synne*, edited as long ago as 1862 by Dr. Furnivall for the Roxburghe Club, and hitherto therefore restricted to the very limited circulation which Roxburghe Club books are allowed to attain. Few books in our earlier literature are more full of the human interest which has always been to Dr. Furnivall the chief pleasure in his work, and for this reason, and as one of the earliest books which he edited, it has a special appropriateness as a gift from his friends to the Society. It may be hoped that the inclusion of so attractive a volume among its Society’s books for 1901 may bring the Society fresh subscribers, and thus help it to begin the new century with something of the vigour and enthusiasm with which it was started six and thirty years ago.

A. W. P.
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IN HONOREM F. J. F. (A.D. 1900).

(From MS. Harl. 7334, fol. 999, back).

A CLERK ther was of Cauntebrigge also,
That unto rowing haddè longe y-go.
Of thinnè shidès¹ wolde he shippès makè,
And he was nat right fat, I undertakè.
And whan his ship he wrought had attè fullè,
Right gladly up the river wolde he pullè,
And eek returne as blythly as he wentè.
Him rekkèd nevere that the sonne him brentè,²
Ne stintèd he his cours for reyn ne snowè;
It was a joyè for to seen him rowè!
Yit was him lever, in his shelves newè,
Six oldè textès,³ clad in greenish hewè,
Of Chaucer and his oldè poesyè
Than ale, or wyn of Lepe,⁴ or Malvoisyè.
And therwithal he wex a philosofre;
And peynèd him to gadren gold in cofre
Of sundry folk; and al that he mightè hentè⁵
On textès and emprinting he it spentè;
And busily gun bokès to purveyè
For hem that yeve him wherwith to scoleyè.⁶
Of glossaryès took he hedè and curè;⁷
And when he spyèd had, by aventure,
A word that semèd him or strange or rarè,
To hentè⁸ it anon he noldè sparè,⁹
But wolde it on a shredè¹⁰ of paper wrytè,
And in a cheste he dide his shredès whytè,
And preyèd every man to doon the samè;
Swich maner study was to him but gamè.
And on this wysè many a yeer he wroughtè,
Ay storing every shreed that men him broughtè,
Til, attè lastè, from the noble pressè
Of Clarendoun, at Oxenforde, I gessè,
Cam stalking forth the Grettè Dictionàrie
That no man wel may pinче at11 ne contràrie.
But for to tellen alle his queintè gerè,13
They wolden occupye wel seven yerès;
Therfore I passe as lightly as I may;
Ne speke I of his hatte or his array,
Ne how his berd by every wind was shake
When as, for hete, his hat he wolde of takè.
Souning in13 Erly English was his spechè,
“And gladly wolde he lerne, and gladly techè.”

W. W. S.