

The Romanic review : a
quarterly journal devoted to
research, the publications of
texts and documents, critical
[...]

Columbia university (New York). Department of Romance languages. Auteur du texte. The Romanic review : a quarterly journal devoted to research, the publications of texts and documents, critical discussions, notes, news and comment, in the field of the romance languages and literatures / edited by Henry Alfred Todd and Raymond Weeks. 1913.

1/ Les contenus accessibles sur le site Gallica sont pour la plupart des reproductions numériques d'oeuvres tombées dans le domaine public provenant des collections de la BnF. Leur réutilisation s'inscrit dans le cadre de la loi n°78-753 du 17 juillet 1978 :

- La réutilisation non commerciale de ces contenus ou dans le cadre d'une publication académique ou scientifique est libre et gratuite dans le respect de la législation en vigueur et notamment du maintien de la mention de source des contenus telle que précisée ci-après : « Source gallica.bnf.fr / Bibliothèque nationale de France » ou « Source gallica.bnf.fr / BnF ».

- La réutilisation commerciale de ces contenus est payante et fait l'objet d'une licence. Est entendue par réutilisation commerciale la revente de contenus sous forme de produits élaborés ou de fourniture de service ou toute autre réutilisation des contenus générant directement des revenus : publication vendue (à l'exception des ouvrages académiques ou scientifiques), une exposition, une production audiovisuelle, un service ou un produit payant, un support à vocation promotionnelle etc.

[CLIQUER ICI POUR ACCÉDER AUX TARIFS ET À LA LICENCE](#)

2/ Les contenus de Gallica sont la propriété de la BnF au sens de l'article L.2112-1 du code général de la propriété des personnes publiques.

3/ Quelques contenus sont soumis à un régime de réutilisation particulier. Il s'agit :

- des reproductions de documents protégés par un droit d'auteur appartenant à un tiers. Ces documents ne peuvent être réutilisés, sauf dans le cadre de la copie privée, sans l'autorisation préalable du titulaire des droits.

- des reproductions de documents conservés dans les bibliothèques ou autres institutions partenaires. Ceux-ci sont signalés par la mention Source gallica.BnF.fr / Bibliothèque municipale de ... (ou autre partenaire). L'utilisateur est invité à s'informer auprès de ces bibliothèques de leurs conditions de réutilisation.

4/ Gallica constitue une base de données, dont la BnF est le producteur, protégée au sens des articles L341-1 et suivants du code de la propriété intellectuelle.

5/ Les présentes conditions d'utilisation des contenus de Gallica sont régies par la loi française. En cas de réutilisation prévue dans un autre pays, il appartient à chaque utilisateur de vérifier la conformité de son projet avec le droit de ce pays.

6/ L'utilisateur s'engage à respecter les présentes conditions d'utilisation ainsi que la législation en vigueur, notamment en matière de propriété intellectuelle. En cas de non respect de ces dispositions, il est notamment passible d'une amende prévue par la loi du 17 juillet 1978.

7/ Pour obtenir un document de Gallica en haute définition, contacter utilisation.commerciale@bnf.fr.



* 1 1 8 0 1 *

THE ROMANIC REVIEW

VOL. IV — JULY-SEPTEMBER, 1913 — No. 3

RICHEUT, OLD FRENCH POEM OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY, WITH INTRODUCTION, NOTES AND GLOSSARY.

THE Old French poem Richeut is preserved in the well-known manuscript no. 354 of the library of Berne, fol. 125 verso, col. 1 to fol. 135 verso, col. 1. This manuscript,¹ which is perhaps of the thirteenth rather than of the fourteenth century as given in Hagen's catalogue, is in the Champagne dialect and shows considerable evidence of carelessness on the part of the copyist. The proportionally large number of obscure passages in our poem may be due to his negligence, or that of a preceding copyist, as well as to our necessarily limited knowledge of the language of the *lechëor* of the 12th century. The poem was not included in the collection of *fabliaux* by Montaiglon and Raynaud and we have, therefore, only the edition of Méon in his *Nouveau Recueil de Fabliaux et Contes*, vol. 1, 38-59. In this edition, made on the basis of the Sainte-Palaye copy of the manuscript, a considerable number of misreadings and omissions have been added to those already existing in the manuscript. A part, but not all, of these were corrected by Bédier in his article *Le Fabliau de Richeut*, published in *Études romanes dédiées à Gaston Paris*, 1891, pp. 30, 31. Gaston Paris, in his review of this volume in *Romania* xxii, 137, and A. Tobler, in the *Archiv für neuere Sprachen* 86, 442, have each added many conjectures as to the correct readings. In both cases these conjectures are based on Méon's text and not on the assured reading of the manuscript.

¹ For a description of this ms. see Armstrong, *Le Chevalier à L'Epee*, p. 37, and Hill, *La Mule sanz Frain*, p. 2.

A comparison of this text with a photograph of the manuscript some years ago showed me that at least some of the difficulties disappeared with a restoration of the manuscript reading, which in some cases Bédier had overlooked. It seemed well worth while to call attention once more to the difficulties of this important poem and to attempt to reduce them to as small a number as possible. My gleanings in the path of the scholars mentioned must necessarily be few and I must still say, in the words of Professor Tobler, "Ein paar Stellen habe ich immer noch dunkel lassen müssen; sie seien dem Nachdenken anderer empfohlen." I fear even that my list may be longer than his.

Since it is my intention to republish the poem in a more convenient form, in the following text, except where a correction seemed so evident as to be generally accepted, I have left the manuscript reading untouched and have placed in the notes the conjectures of Bédier, G. Paris and Tobler, with any discussion or conjectures of my own. I publish the poem in this form to invite criticism, with the hope that others may solve the difficulties that have escaped me and point out the places where I have gone astray.

The date of *Richeut* has been generally accepted as 1159 because of verses 991, 992,

Droit a Tolose
Que li rois Henris tant golose.

Since Henry II was besieging Toulouse in 1159 and this seems to be the only event to which these verses could refer the question would appear to be settled. However, it has been suggested to me that the relation of the poem to the *Roman de Renart* may be an objection to this date. Let us examine this supposed relation.

We have in our poem two female characters, *Richeut* and *Hersent* (*Herselot*). In the *Roman de Renart* the wife of the wolf is named *Hersent* and, at least in one branch, the wife of the fox is spoken of as *Richeut*. What more natural than the conclusion that the author of *Richeut* borrowed these names from the animal epic? On closer examination, however, this borrowing is not so evident. If we leave aside the fact that the author of *Richeut* himself mentions earlier stories of his heroine and gives

incidents that suggest a cycle of poems on her exploits, we find independent evidence of *Richeut's* fame nearly contemporary with our poem. In the well-known passage of Thomas' *Tristan* we find the name *Richeut* used as equivalent to "entremetteuse":

Or me dites, reïne Ysolt,
Des quant aves esté Richolt?
U apreïstes sun mester
De malveis hume si preiser
Et d'une caitive traïr? (1321-25)

The allusion here, as Bédier has pointed out, is not necessarily to our poem and that is not the point that interests us, but rather that as early as 1170 (if we take the latest possible date for the *Tristan*) the name *Richeut* is employed as a general term for "entremetteuse." Moreover, in the *Livre des Manieres* of Estienne Fougere, of approximately the same date, we find

Richeot li vient qui li conseille. (v. 1076)

That is, ten years at the most after 1159 *Richeut* is used as a synonym for "entremetteuse." In verse 10 of our poem, if I rightly interpret the passage, we have the same use. Words do not develop from individual to class signification in a day and, independently of this particular poem, *Richeut* would seem to have established her unenviable reputation before 1159.

Let us now turn for a moment to the name *Richeut* in the *Roman de Renart*. In Branch VII, 559 we find

Onques Richel[t] n'en sot neant
Ne nul barat envers Hersent.

Here, as Ebeling has shown, in his note to *Auberee* v. 191, *Richelt* is the famous "entremetteuse," not the wife of *Renart*. Again in Branch XXIV, 119 we find

Por Richout la fame Renart,
Por le grant engin et por l'art
Est la gorpille Richeut dite:
Se l'une est chate, l'autre et mite.
Moult a ci bone compaignie,
Et l'une et l'autre senefie.

Cist quatre sont bien asanblé,
 Einz ne furent mes tel trové,
 Se Ysengrin est mestre lerre,
 Ausi est li rous forz roberre;
 Si Richeuz est abaiarresse,
 La gorpille est fort lecheresse.

Here again, even if there be no playing with etymologies (*Richeut*, *Richart*, *Richaut*, *riche* + *art*), it seems to me that Ebeling is justified in his conclusion, "Da aber die Frau Renarts, wenigstens in dem bei Martin Gedruckten, sonst stets (*H*)*erme*(*line*) heisst, und nicht *Richaut*, da sie sonst durchaus nicht als 'durch List und tückische Anschläge' ausgezeichnet erscheint, vielmehr eine recht untergeordnete Rolle spielt, so ist anzunehmen, das der Vf. dieser Branche (XXIV) den Namen eigenmächtig eingeführt und zwar von der berühmten 'entremetteuse' entlehnt hat."

Hersent (*Herselot*) was not an uncommon name for a maid-servant in Old French and neither the name *Richeut* nor its combination with *Hersent* is sufficient reason to assume that the author knew the *Roman de Renart*. Nor can the mention of the *gorpil* and the *cornille* (vv. 940, 941) be such a reason, since the fable of the fox and the crow was a part of the learned tradition² and would have been familiar to any educated *clerc* such as the author of *Richeut* evidently was. In short, I see no valid reason to assume a dependence of this poem on the *Roman de Renart*. If there is influence at all, it would seem to be in the other direction, of the *Richeut* tradition on the *Roman de Renart*. Unless then, a study of the language should compel us to place the poem in a later period, we may take verses 991, 992 at their face value and retain the date 1159, or so near this date that the event mentioned was still fresh in the author's mind.

The strophic form chosen by the author, 2, 3, and rarely 4 octosyllabic verses followed by a short verse of 4 syllables (sometimes 2) which gives the rhyme for the following octosyllabics (8a8a(8a)(8a)4b8b, etc.), is striking in its satirical emphasis, but, because of this very emphasis, does not lend itself easily to narrative, and one has the impression that the author is not so much

² Hervieux, *Les Fabulistes Latins*, Vol. 2, p. 126, etc.

interested in his narrative as in the painting of life. With reference to this metrical form Bédier says,³ "Richeut est écrit dans un système strophique difficile; le genre n'a pas adopté jusqu'alors ces petits octosyllabes à rimes plates, ce mètre familier à tous nos conteurs légers de Rutebeuf à La Fontaine et à Musset, si cher aux poètes médiocres." Bédier seems to consider the strophic form of the poem due to its position in the development of the fabliau and to see in *Richeut* an early stage of this development. However, in a later note,⁴ he has also pointed out how much *Richeut* differs from the normal and traditional type of fabliau. It is on this difference, it seems to me, that more emphasis should be placed. Far from feeling his way toward a still undeveloped type, the author of *Richeut* is rather attempting something finer and more difficult, the delineation of characters with just enough intrigue to make these characters live. For this purpose his strophic form is admirable and may well be due to the deliberate choice of the author, who, had he lived at a later period, might have made use of the same form for the same purpose, without regard to the fabliaux in octosyllabics with which he might have been familiar.

A list of poems in the same strophic form as *Richeut* is given by Naetebus, *Die Nicht-Lyrischen Strophenformen*, p. 185 ff. To this list should be added the second part of *Le Privilège aux Bretons*,⁵ though here there is greater variation in the number of the octosyllabics, and parts of *Pyrame et Thisbé*,⁶ where the short line is of two syllables. The list could doubtless be still somewhat lengthened. A glance at these poems shows that they are in general rather satiric than purely narrative in character and, with the exception of *Pyrame et Thisbé*, are considerably later in date than *Richeut*. That the author of this poem chose a difficult metre evidently little used in his time, rather than the easier octosyllabic couplet, which must have been ready to hand, may mean that he felt the difference between his purpose and that of a mere *conte à rire*. To see in the form of *Richeut* an argument in establishing the history of the fabliau seems to me to take too little account of

³ *Les Fabliaux*, p. 16.

⁴ P. 268, note.

⁵ Edition, Faral, *Mimes Français du XIII^e Siècle*, 1910.

⁶ Edition, De Boer, 1911.

the art, perhaps conscious and deliberate, shown in the admirable fitness of this difficult and ingenious form for the author's purpose.

While insisting on the unique character of the poem, which limits its value in tracing the development of the fabliau, we should not disregard the evident fact that *Richeut* was written at a time when the fabliaux were, so to speak, in the making and were soon to appear in examples that can be grouped together as a literary type. That in the keen observation of certain phases of life we find much in *Richeut* that is common with the later fabliaux is not an accident, but due rather to the fact that the same growing interest in the painting of everyday life which, combined with a traditional story and touched with humor, produced the typical fabliau, shows itself in a more unique form in *Richeut*, as it might have shown itself in dramatic form, had such form been ready to hand. Historically, then, *Richeut* is an early manifestation of a new spirit which finds larger expression in fabliaux such as *Auberee*; on the formal side the poem stands alone and is without significance in the development of the fabliau.

RHYME. HIATUS

There are some cases of identical rhymes which, however, may not have existed in the original: *fame: raame: fame* (corr. *dame*) 726; *atraire: atraire* 1079, see the note.

The following inexact rhymes are to be noted: *dire: sire: Sezille: Gile* 987; *chose: grosse: fosse* 190; *done: bone: corone: some* 15; *lobe: robe: noble* 367; *carroge: aproche* 1027; and the not uncommon *rs: ss, orse: amorse: borse: rescosse* 219; *fiers: ies: estriers* 591; *corz: lors: toz* 755.⁷

Enclisis is found in *nel* 69, 140, etc., *no* 143, 177, 519; *jel* 109, 125, etc.; *sel* 134, 206, 264, *so* 79, *ses* 851, 884.

While we have the ordinary cases of elision, there are numerous examples of hiatus: *je* 165, 166, 1160; *se* (si) 511; *se* (sic) 901; *ne* (nec) 193; *ne* (non) 862; *ce* 242, 834, 1298; *que* (pron. and conj.) 352, 633, 641, 780, 426; *li* (art. nom. sing. mas.) 205.

The question of hiatus in other cases, in a short poem based on

⁷ For examples of such rhymes see Andresen, *Über den Einfluss von Metrum, Assonanz und Reim*, 1874 (Bonn Diss.), p. 18.

a single manuscript, is a delicate one. In the following verses I have allowed the hiatus to remain where a *t* has fallen, even though a slight correction would permit elision.

Puis li donë a liee chiere 289
 Qui mout erë en grant sopoïs 311
 Bien les enplumë et decoit 377
 Puis l'an envoië en secroi 432
 Mout aimë en escole a estre 606
 Cele robë avoc cui coche 971
 Si l'an moinë, o voille o non 1267
 Sansons la cuidë engignier 1180
 Des qu'il s'ahurtë au dusil 1278.

Against these 9 cases of hiatus of this character we have 13 cases of elision: 156, 280, 337, 381, 413, 415, 484, 971, 1128, 1247, 1253, 1273. Because of the frequency of hiatus I have not corrected 218, where *a la borse* would permit elision and satisfy the measure.

LANGUAGE

In discussing the language of the author it is well to remember that the poem is short and the number of significant rhymes necessarily small. Furthermore, we have but a single manuscript, considerably later in date than the original and the work of a somewhat careless copyist who wrote a dialect other than that of the author. Between the existing copy and the original there may have been intermediaries of whose number and dialect we know nothing. It would be a mistake therefore to give undue weight to an isolated rhyme.

Vowels

1. Tonic *a* before *l*. *mal* 521; *val*: *corsal*: *menestrel*: *autretel*: *Viel* 539; *Noel*: *el*: *menestrel* 92; *ostel* 433; *Viel* 1030; *jael*: *el*, but *ostal* 1088; *mal*: *aval*. Thus *ostal* and *ostel* as in *Eneas*.

2. *a* + *N* + *Cons.* is separated in rhyme from *e* + *N* + *Cons.* although the orthography of the manuscript shows confusion of the two sounds for the copyist. *Fame*: *dame* 682 is found in texts that separate *an* from *en*. Cf. Haase, *Das verhalten der pikard und wallon. Denkmäler*, p. 44, and Friedwagner, *La vengeance Raguidel*, p. LIII.

3. *e* < Lat. *a* rhymes only with itself.
4. *e* is distinct from *e*.
5. *i* Beside the regular product of Lat. *i* we have *reni: li* 285; *livre: delivre: ivre* 358; *ivres: delivres* 902; *gorpille: cornille: essille: fille* 939. These rhymes leave open the question as to *e* + *i* > *i*. On *cornille* see Ebeling, *Auberee* p. 132.
i: ui (o + yod), *cuide: Ovide* 748.
6. *o* *Mqt* 85, 1066, 1235, as in *Eneas. Troie*, with one exception, has *mqt*. The rhymes in *o* are unmixed.
7. *o* Free *o* rhymes with checked *o* 304, 657, 695, 935, 1193. In all these cases except 657 *preuz: toz: degroz: desoz*, *o* is followed by *r*.
There is one case of *-osus* in rhyme, *vos: avrillos* 1112.
o + *l* + *Cons.* rhymes only with itself, except *boche: toche: coche* (= *colche*).
8. *u* *Ostium* > *us* not *uis: jus: sus: plus* 1070, 1289.
9. *ai* rhymes regularly with itself, except before nasals. In one case before *st* and one before *str* it is reduced to *e*, *vest: pest* (*paist*): *gest* 371; *preste: mestre: estre* 604, as in *Eneas* and *Troie*. In 1010 *destroiz: plaiz: Biauvez* and 1283 *esmaie: desraie: fresaie* we have *ai: ei*. This rhyme, while particularly Anglo-Norman at this period (Cf. Thomas *Tristan* II, p. 16), is also found in the Center and East. Cf. Suchier, *Voyelles toniques*, 30b, and Ebeling, *Auberee*, p. 147. *Troie* has the isolated rhymes *baleient: traient* 12015, 17097, and *raie: baleie* 11352.
10. *ai* + nasal rhymes with *ei* + nasal, 151, 1004, 1132.
11. *ie*, *travailliee: iriee: empreigniee* 331 and *boidie: die: empraignie: ençaintie* 382. Since *empraignie* and *ençaintie* may be considered as participles of *empraignir* and *ençaintir*, *ie* for *iee* is not proved.
12. *eu jeu* (jocum): *aveu: leu* (locum) 342
neu (nodum): *feu* (focum): *queu* (cocum) 525
feu (feodum): *leu* (locum) 581
jeu (jocum): *leu* (locum): *feu* (feodum): *tonleu* 859.
Feu (feodum) in this series of rhymes would seem to prove *o* > *eu* in *aveu, neu*. The single rhyme in *-osus* (see 7) is hardly sufficient for a conclusion as to that ending.

13. *oi* rhymes with itself 673, 407. *Estoire: acroire: gloire* 955, correct *acroire* to *aoire*.

14. *oi* rhymes only with itself, except before nasals.

15. *oi* < *ei*. The orthography of the manuscript is *oi*, but, out of 36 separate combinations of this sound in rhyme, the rhymes are unmixed, with the exception of 956 *N'en volon oster ne acroire*, where rhyme and sense are satisfied by the correction *aoire*.

16. *ue, suens: buens: cuens* 541, *tuen: buen* 249, *puet: muet: estuet* 772, 1052.

17. *ui, cuide: Ovide* 749, as often in *Troie* and elsewhere. As mentioned under 8 *ostium* gives *us* not *uis*. The form *us*, while frequent beside *uis* (Cf. Suchier, *Voyelles toniques* 24b; Meyer-Lübke, *Grammaire des langues romanes* I, 62), seems to have been more particularly Norman and Eastern rather than Central. Cf. DeBoer, *Pyrame et Thisbé* p. 10, 19.

Consonants

18. *c, ch, Sace: face: place* 785, *grace: face: lace* 960. The form *sace* proves nothing as to *a + c + j > ache*. Cf. Thomas *Tristan*, II, 19, *Troie*, VI, 124, *Eneas*, p. xix, *Pyrame et Thisbé*, p. 12. *Vanche: la vanche: anche* 114 would rhyme equally well in the form *venque: la venque: enque*. *Carroge: aproche* 1028 is an inexact rhyme.

19. *l*. Vocalization of *l* is proved by *cruex: Dex* 1022, and *Richeut: deut: veut* 438, 875, *veut: sueut: Richeut* 997 where we have *e + l + Cons.: o + l + Cons.*

20. *n*. Final *m > n, non: sopeçon: non* (nomen). *Done: bone: corone: some* 18 (inexact rhyme).

21. *s*. *Fist: abit: petit: aït* 35 shows *s* mute before *t*. *Chose: grosse: fosse* 190 (*s: ss*) stands alone and is a case of inexact rhyme. Final *s* and *z* are carefully separated.

22. *t*. Isolated *t* is not kept, *foi: soi: moi* 101 but *fidus > fiz: diz: fiz* 732. For traces of *t* in the 3 sing. of the first conjugation see under Hiatus.

Morphology

As far as we can judge of the author's usage the conjugation system is correct and the rules of declension well observed. There

is perhaps a trace of the tendency seen in *Troie* to employ the oblique form for the nominative in the predicate in *Si est aver (s): doner: loer* 112, and in 330 where I should read *Car li termes n'est pas lointain (z): fain: plain*, rather than to correct *fain[z], plain[z]*. *Sire* (vocative): *ire* 165; *dire: aïre* 318. *Li preste: meleste* 163; *mestre* (nom. sing.): *estre* 605; *pere* (nom. sing.): *mere: here* 663.

Adjectives of the third declension without feminine e, *grant* 13, 471, 500, 532; *quel* 84, 648, but *grande* 872, *grieve* 260. *Dolente* 994 is a well-known exception.

Moi (not *mi*) is assured by rhyme. The forms *no, vo* are not found. The first person sing. indic. of verbs have not yet analogical *s*. The subjunctive present of the 1st conjugation has no e, *-ons* not *-omes*. *Seoir* not *seïr* 314. Forms such as *averai* are not found. *Vait* 1189: *retrait: plait*. *Va* is not found. *Vait* is the only form in rhyme in *Eneas*, and with two exceptions in *Troie*. The imperfect indicative of the 1st conjugation does not appear in rhyme.

Conclusion

From the above résumé I would conclude that the author of *Richeut* wrote the literary French of his time as represented by the *Roman de Troie* and *Eneas*. The careful separation of *an* from *en*, of *s* from *z*, of *ei* from *oi*, the form *us* instead of *uis*, and the absence of Picard forms would indicate the home of the author as Normandy or, if Ile de France, at least close to the Norman border. A more exact localization seems to me unjustified. Since there is nothing in the traits mentioned to demand a date later than the second half of the twelfth century, we may conclude that the poem was written in 1159. That the author was an educated *clerc* seems clear, but any further conclusion as to his name or character would be a mere conjecture.⁸

In the following text I have printed *-mant, vos, con* for the abbreviations of these forms, since, when unabbreviated they are thus written. For the same reason I solve by *n* the bar over a vowel before a labial consonant. *Et* and *mout* and *conme* are

⁸ For such a conjecture see Suchier, *Geschichte der Französischen Literatur*, 2nd edition, p. 197.

always abbreviated, but *enmasse* 214 written out. Proper names and numerals are left in their abbreviated form when thus written in the MS., except where I read *Sans* [*onet*] for the metre. Words or letters to be omitted are placed in parentheses; those to be supplied, in brackets. Accents are added where they facilitate reading. Before a verse which evidently needs correction but which is left as in the MS. I have placed a * for the convenience of the reader, who will find in the notes discussion of such verses. All other changes are indicated in the footnotes.

I am indebted to Mr. Jean Acher for his friendly interest and for valuable suggestions with regard to the text. For any of the faults or blunders he is in no way responsible.

TEXT

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>Or faites pais, si escotez
 Qui de Ri. oïr volez;
 Sovante foiz oï avez
 Conter sa vie.
 5 Maïstresse fu de lecherie,
 Mainte[s] fames ot en baillie
 *Qu'ele atrait tot as guise
 Par son atrait.
 Encor nule ne s'an retrait,
 10 Et cha[s]cune Ri. se fait
 De sa voisine.
 Ne voit en mais jone mes-
 chine
 Qui soit a grant bonté en-
 cline,
 Por po d'avoir s'estant sovine
 15 Qant en li done.
 El mont n'en a nes une bone,
 Ainz se lient a la corone,
 C'est de puterie la some,
 Et lo fardet
 20 Metent eles en lor raget.
 Chascune de soi s'entremet
 [124 v²]
 Bien atorner.
 Qant .i. vallez a que doner,</p> | <p>Bien se sofrent a acoler
 25 Por lui traïr et afoler:
 C'est lecherie;
 Mais il lor vient d'ancesserie.
 Totes sevent de trecherie
 Communaumant,
 30 Mais ce fu par l'anseigne-
 mant
 Ri., qui fu mout longuemant
 Par tot lo monde;
 Bien les aprist a la reonde.
 Nostre Sires Ri. confonde
 35 Qui tant mal fist,
 Car de nonain reçut l'abit,
 Mais ele lo tint mout petit.
 Escotez, se Dex vos aït,
 Qu'ele devint:
 40 Fors de l'abaïe s'an vint,
 Nonains i avoit plus de xx,
 N'i vost plus estre,
 Ainz en mena o soi lo preste
 El li toli regne celestre,
 45 Car il fu pris
 O li, desmanbrez et ocis.
 Ce fist el faire a ses amis
 Don ele a maint par lo païs.</p> |
|--|---|

- Ri. a fait riche[s] mandis.
 50 Por Herselot
 Dou preste ot el bien son
 escot, [125 r¹]
 Et si refist tenir por sot
 Lo chevalier.
 *Nes dan Guillaume lerde-
 fitier
 55 Qu' ere atornez a Deu
 proier,
 Refist el boivre lo destrier
 Et lo hernois.
 Ri. desjule les cortois,
 Clers et chevaliers et bor-
 jois
 60 Et les vilains.
 Par tot giete Ri. ses mains,
 Si deçoit les autres putains.
 *Ri. sert mout,
 Lo corage a fier et estout.
 65 Or diroie, s'avoie escout,
 De li un conte
 Qui trestoz les autres sor-
 monte,
 Et si ne lairai pas por honte
 Que je nel die;
 70 Qui de Ri. conte la vie
 Ne puet parler par cortoisie.
 Ele ot .i. fil
 Qui mout avoit l'angien
 sotil;
 Mainte[s] fames mist a
 essil.
 75 La face ot clere,
 Mout tenoit bien les mors sa
 mere.
 Ri. ne sot onques son pere,
 Et nequedant
 So mist el sus a plus de .c.
 54, Guill'. 55, qui ere. 76, lo mors.
- 80 Mout en conquist or et ar-
 gent.
 Or escotez [125 r²]
 Conmant il fu conçuz et nez,
 Norriz, apris et dostrinez
 Et en quel vie destinez,
 85 Quel non il ot.
 Entre Ri. et Herselot
 A cel jor firent .i. escot;
 Au feu n'orent plus que .i.
 pot,
 Bons vins ferrez
 90 La nuit burent a grant
 plantez
 Et a mangier orent assez
 Por lo Noël.
 Mout ont parlé et d'un et
 d'el.
 Ce dit Ri. la menestrel
 95 A sa conpeigne:
 "Par les sainz c'an quiert
 en Bretagne
 Mout ai del preste grant des-
 daigne
 Qui si me triche.
 Ainz n'oi del suen fors une
 affiche,
 100 Et si n'a nul veisin plus
 riche
 De soi.
 Il m'afia l'autrier sa foi
 Et lou vestir et lo conroi
 Ainz q'avenir poïst a moi;
 105 Or ne l'an chaut s'ai fain o
 soi,
 Mantie l'a:
 Hui a .viii. jors qu'il ne vint
 ça.

- Par Saint Denis mar m'i
tricha
Se jel puis faire.
- 110 Mout par est ore de mal'-
aire;
Si est avers, [125 v¹]
Croistre vialt et noiant
doner.
Herselot sez me que loer
Conmant m'an vanche?
- 115 "Charmez li, chiere, par la
vanche,
Ecrivez brief de sanc et
d'anche,
Faites [c]heraudes
Don les ymages soient chau-
des
Et refroidies."
- 120 Dit Ri., "ii. poires porries
Ne pris je pas ces sorceries.
Ce m'est avis
Ja par charaies n'iert con-
quis.
A moi meïsmes ai con-
seil pris
- 125 Con jel deçoive:
Miauz est que atorne[e]
herbe boive,
Puis foutraï tant con je con-
çoive,
Si metrai sore
Au preste, et meïsmes l'ore,
- 130 Don li lou je qu'il me secore,
Et s'il lo nie,
Ja Ri. n'ait bien en sa vie
Se a l'evesque ne l'anvie;
Sel tien a cort
- 135 Il i perdra ainz qu'i[1] s'an
tort.
S'ansi lo faz,
- Lo preste avrai dedanz mes
laz.
Or en entrerai en porchaz
Hastivemant.
- 140 Don nel me loes tu, Her-
sant?" [125 v²]
Dit Herselot, "Je n'i antant
Se tot bien non."
Ri. no mist en sopeçon,
Ainz quist une herbe qui ot
non
- 145 *Mandagloire.
*Ri. en but o ele esclaire
*Puis n'i guieres demore
Ainz croist a toz.
Tant a alé desus desoz
- 150 Et a retraiz sofert et boz
Qu'ele est ençainte.
Or a la face megre et tainte,
Dès or vialt faire sa con-
plainte.
Au preste en vint,
- 155 A sa maisele sa main tint,
Plore et sopire, soflant vint,
Puis dist itant:
"Mout malemant m'es[t]
covenant
Et s'an atant pis en avant
- 160 Assez,
Sire preste, bien lo savez."
"Ri., ne sai que vos avez,
Ce dit li preste(s),
Mout me mostrez chiere
meleste."
- 165 "Que je ai, sire?
Je ai assez coroz et ire,
Mais par Saint Pol
Mout savrai poi se nel vos
sol,

115, vache.

123, n't.

150, retrait.

167, pol.

- Si vos ferai tenir a fol."
[126 r¹]
- 170 Li danz li met les braz au
col,
Soef l'anbrace.
Ri. s'estort, si se delace,
Plore formant, mout lo
menace:
"O jel vos die, o jel vos
tace,
175 De vos sui prainz."
"Ri., je cuit que tu te
fainz."
"No faz, danz prestes, par
toz sainz
N'est pas controve;
Veez con li vantre se prove."
180 Li prestes mout celer lo rove
Icel secroi.
"Ri., fait il, je te mescroi.
Cuides tu donc ce soit de
moi?
Nenil voir."
185 Ri. respont, "Jel sai de voir;
Ja ne puisse je bien avoir,
Ainz soie ocisse,
Se je n'an portoie .i. joïsse
Que de vos fu dedanz moi
mise
190 Icestes chose
Don me veez ençainte et
grosse.
Ne cuidiez pas jel giet en
fosse
Ne en mostier
Se vos ne me volez aidier."
195 "Ri., ne di,
Je ne voil pas que soit ensi.
La moie foi, Ri., t'afi,
- Se viax del mien [126 r²]
Ja ne voldras icele rien
200 N'en puisses prandre.
Por quoi me feroies raien-
bre,
N'a l'evesque messe desfan-
dre?
Mais or celez
Ceste groisse tant con poez,
205 Et qant li anfes sera nez
Sel metez sore
.I. autre; se Dex me secore,
Ne vos faudrai puis nes .i.
ore."
Ri. se plaint mout et s'i plore
210 Et puis li dit:
"Certes ne vos ain pas petit;
Mout durement, se Dex
m'aït,
Lo tot puissant;
Se je ne vos enmasse tant
215 Nel celasse ne tant ne qant."
Oz de pute orse,
Qui lo prevoire si amorse!
La main li fait mestrë a
borse,
.V. sous li tant or a rescosse:
220 "Ce prenez ore,
Vos avroiz plus del mien
encore."
Et li prestes mout bien
l'estore.
Ri. se charge,
De son preu faire ne se
targe.
225 Bien a trové lo prestre large
Por l'acolee.
Mout s'an veit bien sozais-
selee [127 v¹]
- 174, jes . . . jes. 179, lo vantre. 181, cetroi.
187, coie. 221, des miens.

- De pain et d'el.
 Ploiant s'an veit a son ostel
 230 O el trova seignor Viel,
 Un chevalier
 Qui faisoit tenir son destrier,
 O lui Hersant por donoier.
 "A! Herselot!"
 235 Cele saut sus con sa dame
 ot;
 Li chevaliers vers li s'esjot,
 Si la salue.
 Et Ri. se tint .i. po mue,
 Pas ne li rant,
 240 Sanblant fait de grant malta-
 lant.
 De Herselot s'aproche atant:
 "Met ce en sauf."
 "De mautalant su et eschauf
 Qant je te voi;
 245 Tu m'as manti la toe foi,
 Mout par est fole
 La damoisele qui t'acole;
 N'a si aver jusq'a Nicole.
 C'oi je do tuen
 250 Desque[je] fis l'autrier ton
 buen
 (Lasse moi!) cline?
 Mar m'i cochai soz toi
 sovine;
 Maldite soit vostre racine
 Qui si poi giete.
 255 J'estoie encor bien jovenete,
 Or n'en iert mais qui s'an-
 tremete [126 v²]
 De moi amer.
 Vos m'avez fait lo flanc
 lever,
 Ne me valt mais rien a celer,
 260 De vos sui grieve.
- Veez lo vandre qui se lieve;
 De l'anfant li termes abrieve,
 Or m'an aidiez.
 Si m'aït Dex, sel ren[i]iez
 265 Vos en seroiz toz essilliez,
 Jel di por voir.
 Vos nen avez si fort menoir
 Que je ne vos feïsse ardoir
 Et metre en candre,
 270 Se sor vos nel voliez prandre.
 Miauz me lairoie ardoir o
 pandre,
 Pas ne vos mant,
 Que n'en aüssiez longue-
 mant.
 Je sui nee de bone gent,
 275 .Vii. chevalier sont mi
 parant,
 Si rai amis
 Qui tost avroie[nt] ome
 ocis."
 Li chevaliers en fait un ris,
 Si li respont:
 280 "Ri., li vins te monte el
 front.
 Ne sai que ces menaces sont.
 Di moi por quoi
 Es tu encainte? Est ce de
 moi?"
 "Oil amis." "Et je l'otroi,
 285 Pas nel reni." [127 r¹]
 Dit Herseloz, "Sire, aidiez
 li."
 "Volantiers, chiere."
 .X. sous atrait de s'aumon-
 iere(s),
 Puis li donë a liee chiere,
 290 Après la baise.
 Qui putain loe, si l'apaise.

230, ele. 241, a saproche.
 277, Si tost avroie. 281, ne sai de ces.

245, mantie. 262, et de.
 282, De.

- Ainz qu'il s'an tort firent lor
aise
Soz l'obier frois.
"Envoiez, dist il, enevois
295 Por de la char et por des
pois
Et por de bon vin orlenois."
Ce dit Ri., "Cist est cortois."
Alez s'an est.
Ri. ne panse
300 Fors d'atorner [r]iche des-
spanse.
Li jors decline,
Entre Ri. et sa meschine
Aprestent mout tost la cuis-
ine.
Plusor
305 I laisserent la nuit del lor.
Ri. se dort; qant vint au jor
Ri. s'apreste;
Despandu a, or vait en
queste.
Chies un borjois
310 En vait Ri. preu et cortois,
Qui mout erë en grant so-
pois
Qu'il n'avoit oir;
Onques ne pot enfant avoir.
Ri. garde, vit lo soir
[127 r²]
315 Sor sa fenestre.
Or li voudra conter son
estre;
Prist lo par l'espaule senes-
tre,
Dist li, "Biau sire,
Je vos voldroie .i. secré
dire."
305, il.
343, de ce te veu.
- 320 Cil fu cortois, pas ne s'aïre,
Bel li respont.
En une chambre endui en
vont,
Desor .i. lit asis se sont.
Asisse là
325 Ri. panse, puis si parla:
"Sire, je sui venue ça
Car mes granz besoinz m'i
chaça.
Pas ne me fain,
De vos meïsme a vos me
plain,
330 Car li termes n'est pas loin-
tainz
Qu'ier(t) travailliee.
Sire, por vos sui molt iriee,
Car je sui de vos enpreig-
niee."
"De moi? C'est gas."
335 "Non est, sire, par Saint
Tomas."
"Certes, Ri., manti i as."
El plore et gient,
A sa maisele sa main tient:
"Sire, fait el, ne vos sovient
340 D'un jor entier
Que me feïstes el solier
Lo commun jeu?" [127 v¹]
"Oïl, Ri., de ce t'aveu."
"Certes, biau sire, en icel leu
345 Pris je cest fais."
"Taisiez, Ri., nel dites mais."
"Dex me confonde se m'an
tais."
"Richaut, ne sai,
Bien puet estre je l'anjan-
drai;
314, cheoir.
345, Prist.

- 350 Icist soit miens,
S'il est vallez, n'i faudra
riens
Que il ne soit oirs de mes
biens."
"Sire, espoir
Que vos avroiz de moi
ma[s]le oir.
355 Mais il m'estuet de[l] vostre
avoir;
J'en ai besoin."
Cil met en sa borse lo poin,
.xx. sous li livre;
Ja ne(n) s'an verra mais
delivre.
360 Or lo moine Ri. con ivre.
De la putain!
"Envoyez ça, dist il, demain,
Si avroiz char et vin et
pain."
El l'an mercie.
365 Ri. s'an vait tote esjoïe,
Plus conquiert el par sa
boïdie
Et par sa lobe
Que cil qui prant et tost et
robe.
Ri. se tient et cointe et noble,
370 Et bien se vest
Et se conroie bien et pest.
*Plus est sivanz que lisse en
gest. [127 v²]
Bien les atrait,
Tant qu'el les a mis en son
plait.
375 N'i a si cointe que n'en ait
Plus que lo droit.
Bien les enplumë et deçoit.
- Ri. a tout qanqu'ele voit,
La grosse borse!
380 Agnel se fait, puis devient
orse.
Lo pas moine home et puis
l'acorse
Par sa boïdie.
N'i a celui cui el ne die
Que de lui est ele enpraing-
nie.
385 "Vos m'avez, fait ele, en-
çaintie;
Del tuen me done."
Ri. trestoz en araisone,
Les garçons prant et en-
prisone,
Puis les raant.
390 De totes parz les mains lor
tant.
Mout se conroie richemant.
N'i a mestier,
N'i a vilain ne pautonier
Ne bachelier ne essartier
395 Que nel raamme.
Oistes mais si male fame,
Qui totjors quialt et rien ne
seme?
Mar fust el nee
Qui si nos fu mal destinee,
400 Mar preïst el ceste vantree!
Par icel germe
Si a ploree mainte lerne.
[128 r¹]
Or est Ri. venue au terme,
Or couche, or lieve,
405 Or ploree, or crie, l'ore
abrieve;

365, tost estosie.

366, ele.

374, qu'il.

380, Enguil.

387, trestot.

389, raaint.

390, pars.

400, il.

- Mal soit de l'ore qu'el ne
crieve,
Ce fust grant joie.
Herselot a la crine bloie,
*Qui reconforte, sa dame
oie.
410 Qu'atant je tant?
Or se delivre d'un enfant
Masle.
Il crie et brait plus fort d'un
rasle,
Hersanz lo leve,
415 Baigne et conroie et asoeve,
En dras lo couche,
Tot lo couvre ne mes la
boche.
Richauz acline
Acouchiee est en la jecine;
420 Herselot la sert, qui ne fine.
Plus que lo saut
En vient au preste qui ne
faut.
"Sire, dist ele, Dex vos
saut."
"Et vos, ma bele."
425 "Dire vos sai boene novele."
"Et que est ce, ma dam-
oisele?"
"Un fil avez."
"Taisiez, Hersan[t], soef
parlez,
Je sai mout bien que vos
querez.
430 Venez a moi."
Chargié li a tot lo conroi,
Puis l'an envoïe en secroi.
[128 r²]
Vient a l'ostel,
Descharge soi, vait al Viel
435 Et au borjois.
426, qui. 445, Ri. 470, a masse en vont.
- *Cil li charge (jusq'a un
mois)
Et pain et vin jusq'a un
mois.
Or gist Ri.;
De la jecine mout se deut,
440 Mais ele a tot qanqu'ele veut.
Bien li estait,
Et Herselot tres bien s'an
paist;
Malede est qui malade trait.
Enpres mangier
445 Porte Herseloz a un mostier
Lo fil Ri. por prinseignier,
A Saint Germain.
Les marraines et li parrain
Lievent l'anfant a la putain.
450 Or a lo non de son parrain,
Seignor Sanson.
Hersanz en revint en maison
Atot l'aubé.
Or a Ri. sa volanté
455 Et Herseloz la sert a gré
De char, de vin et de claré
Et de pevrees,
De fruit, de nieles et d'obles
Et de parmainz.
460 Bien se costeïst en ses bainz,
De tote[s] parz vient li
gaainz.
Ri. se jut, [128 v¹]
A grant joie manja et but
Jusq' au terme que ele dut
465 A messe aler.
El ot lo vis vermoil et cler,
Mout entant a soi acesmer
Fresche color.
Ri. s'acesme au merëor,
470 A messe en vait.

- Mantel a ver, grant coe trait.
 N'i a lechëor ne agait,
 Tuit ont mervoille;
 L'uns a l'autre dit et con-
 soille
- 475 O el prant ce don s'aparoille:
 "Lo vis a bel,
 O prist ele si bon mantel,
 Et cel chainse ridé novel
 Qui si traîne?"
- 480 Ele a ëu bone gecine.
 Ri. devenue est meschine
 Par son tripot.
 S'ofrande fait et la messe ot,
 Puis s'en repaire a Herselot
- 485 Lo pas arriere;
 Grant coe trait par la po-
 driere.
 Ri. se tint et baude et fiere.
 "N'i valdroit rien, fait el,
 proiere
 Que nus me croisse."
- 490 Sanblant fait qu'an ne la
 conoisse.
 Ri. les met en grant engoisse,
 [128 v²]
 Mout les travaille.
 El soloit foutre por maaille
 Ainz que venist del tot a
 faille.
- 495 Enorgoillir
 Se vialt Ri. a engorllir:
 .I. denier part qui vialt ferir
 Desus l'anclume,
 Or a Ri. mué costume.
- 500 Li lechëor en font grant
 frume;
 Ele les esprant et alume
 Par ses blandiz,
 488, fait il.
 513, qu'ele.
- Toz les reçoit granz et petiz,
 Ja nus n'en ira escondiz.
 505 Mais el ne puet sofrir les
 criz
 Que li fait Sansonez, ses fiz;
 Quiert li norrice
 Por demener son jaëlice.
 El vient au preste, si l'antice,
 510 Ne li laira croiz ne calice
 Se il la croit.
 Lx. sous ot par destroit,
 Tant dist ele que il devoit
 A son enfant.
- 515 Au chevalier en vint corant,
 De lui en resache autretant,
 Puis au borjois,
 .C. sous ensache d'orlenois.
 Ja Ri. no laira ençois
- 520 Qu'il [i]ert ou val.
 Ri. avra ovré maint mal.
 [129 r¹]
 Oïstes mais putain corsal
 Qui si deçoive?
 Po sont des homes cui n'en-
 boive
- 525 Et do[nt] que que soit [ne]
 reçoive.
 Or a gros neu,
 A l'ostel vient, s'i fait grant
 feu
 [Dont] dame Herselot est
 queu;
 A grant foison
- 530 Et volaille [ont] et venison
 Et claré plus dolz que poison.
 Ri. s'antremet de Sanson
 Par mout grant cure.
 Ri. ot bone noiriture.
- 509, En vient.
 524, qui.

- 535 Ri. au preste sovant jure
 Qu'il lo resamble.
 Toz li cuers de joie li tranble,
 Et chascun jor lo soen li
 enble
 La menestrel.
- 540 Au borjois redit autretel,
 Et dit au chevalier Viel
 Qu'il iere suens:
 Mout par est preuz et biax
 et buens;
 Se engenré l'aüst .i. cuens
- 545 Ne fust plus biax.
 Or a Ri. toz ses aviax
 Por Sansonet.
 De lui bien vestir s'antremet
 Et a toz cez sore lo met
- 550 Qui li ont fait.
 N'i a si cointe do[nt] el n'ait,
 [129 r²]
 Car trop set d'arz.
 Ri. lace de totes parz.
 Tant crut Sansons qu'il fu
 granz garz.
- 555 Par la parole
 Fu Sansonez mis a escole.
 Mout ot cler sans,
 N'ot si sotil en toz les rans:
 Son sautier sot en po de
 tans,
- 560 Chanta .ii. anz,
 Voiz ot sor les autres enfanz,
 Mout sot et conduiz et so-
 chanz.
 Vait a gramaire,
 En .i. en sot bon ditié faire.
- 565 Con plus aprant et plus
 esclaire
 Tant a fait vers
- Qu'il en set faire de divers.
 N'ot en l'escole si porvers,
 Mout bien aprant,
 570 Et li maistres bien i entant
 Por lo grant loier qu'il en
 prant
 Del preste fol.
 Tant l'a Ri. feru el mol
 Qu'il a grisset mantel au col;
 575 Or est au lange.
 Au borjois vialt tolir lo
 chanje,
 Et par menacë et par blanje
 Que par proier
 A tant mené lo chevalier
 580 Que tot li a fait engagier
 [129 v¹]
 Et terre et feu.
 Qant Ri. est en icel leu
 Mout li aconté
 Que Sansons sanble fil de
 conte,
- 585 Car preuz est, isnelemant
 monte
 Sor son cheval.
 Ne dote mont, conbe ne val,
 Einz s'essaie con bon vasal,
 Nelui ne crient.
- 590 "Sire, fait ele, il t'appartient
 Car mout est fiers;
 Il est autex comme tu ies,
 Mout s'afiche sor les estriers,
 Bien s'ademet.
- 595 En cest país n'a nul vallet
 Qui plus sache de Sansonet."
 Viex acroit, del suen i met.
 Au borjois dit
 Que Sansonet son fil aït

535, dure.
 558, tot.

552, art.
 591, c. m. e. f. et sajes.

- 600 Del conter fait a grant es-
 ploit,
 El li dit voir, se il la croit
 Ne n'iert pas grief
 Et sa rante metra en brief.
 Ce dit au preste,
 605 Que Sansons est des autres
 mestre,
 Mout aimë en escole a estre
 Por plus savoir.
 Li danz set bien qu'ele dit
 voir,
 Si li charje tot son avoir.
 610 Ri. lo prant, [129 v²]
 Si s'en conroie richemant
 Car li garcons pas nel des-
 pant.

 Qui croit Ri. et qui la fot
 Mout est chaitis.
 615 Or a Ri. ses .iii. amis
 Par son engin sor fussi-ax
 mis;
 Et Sansonez a tant apris
 Par son cler sans
 Qu'i[1] est dialecticiens.
 620 Lo jeu des dez aprist par
 tans
 Et lo lechois.
 Volantiers vait o les cortois.
 Sonez set faire et servantois
 Et rotruanges.
 625 Fames deçoit par ses los-
 anges.
 Ses costez lace a longues
 franjes
 Et sa çainture;
 Coetee a sa vestëure.
 En lecherie met sa cure;
 612, nes. 616, P. s. e. fin f. m. 638, sor soi.
- 630 Chascuns retrait a sa nature.
 *Sanson revate,
 N'i a si roide qu'il n'abate
 Ne si cointe que il ne mate.
 Mout set caraudes,
 635 Les fames fait plus que feu
 chaudes;
 Les plus cointes fait estre
 baudes
 Et envoisiees.
 Soz soi les fait estre enra-
 giees. [130 r¹]
 Au bordel en a envoiees
 640 Plus d'un millier
 Que il a mises au mestier.
 Mout par les set bien engig-
 nier
 Et bareter.
 De si a Bar n'en a son per
 645 De lecherie,
 Car il li vient d'ancesserie.
 Ri. sa mere lo chastie:
 "Sansons, biax fiz, di moi
 quel vie
 Tu meneras.
 650 Voiz lo preste de Saint
 Thomas,
 Mout sera liez s'a lui t'an
 vas;
 Ou au borjois
 T'an va, s'i changeras a pois,
 Ou a dan Viël, lo cortois,
 655 Biax fiz, t'an va."
 "Par Deu, mere, ne ça ne la
 N'est l'aler[s] preuz,
 Car apovriz les avez toz.
 Ne puis sofrir malvais de-
 groz."
 660 Ri. s'an rit par de desoz,
 Sanson fait here:

- "Mais or me dites, bele
 mere,
 Li qex de ces .iii. est mes
 pere?"
 "Biax fiz, ne sai,
 665 Car a chascun de .iii. coplai,
 Et a mil autres. Pas n'en ai
 Envers toi honte.
 Fame sor cui tex pueples
 monte [130 r²]
 Conmant savroit tenir lo
 conte
 670 De ses enfanz?
 Ne sai[t] de cui conçoit ne
 qant.
 De ces .iii. va au plus
 menant;
 Met t'an a chois."
 "Mere, ne ça ne la ne vois;
 675 En cest país plus nen estois,
 Aler m'an voil,
 Ja n'ert prodom dedanz son
 soil.
 As riches cors panré escoil
 De cortoisie.
 680 Une masse sai de clergie,
 Connoistre voil chevalerie;
 S'avré les fames
 Et les cortoises riches dames.
 Mout les metrai encor en
 brames
 685 Et en error,
 Se puis encor [avoir] del lor
 Et par boïdie et par amor."
 Ri. s'an rit.
 "Biax fiz Sanson, que as tu
 dit?
 690 Ja sez tu encor si petit
 De cest tripot?
 Envers les fames n'en sez
 mot;
 Les homes font tenir por
 sot."
 "Mere, cil qui entant et ot
 695 Ses bons a[u]tors
 Set bien de fames les tres-
 tors,
 Car il descovre bien lor mors
 Et lor nature." [130 v¹]
 "Fiz, cil qui sevent d'escri-
 ture
 700 Solent amer a demesure;
 Cil qui plus set
 Aime plus tost et plus tost
 [h]et
 S'il voit chose qui li agret.
 Cil qui set plus
 705 Est par fame plus tost mis
 jus
 Que cil qui conoissent lor us,
 Qui que s'en gart.
 Fame cointe de male part
 Si se fait bien ver[s] lo mu-
 sart
 710 Et cointe et fiere."
 "Mere, je sa[i] bien la
 meniere,
 Mainte en ferai encore cor-
 siere.
 N'i a si cointe
 Que je ne face vers moi
 jointe.
 715 Se je tant faz que l'aie
 pointe,
 Tot li torrai;
 Ja nule rien ne li lairai."
 "Avoi, Sanson, certes bien
 sai,
 680, messe.

671, qanz.

696, tristors.

672, ses.

699, les escriture.

- Encor la te reproverai
 720 Ceste parole.
 N'i a si cointe clerc d'escole
 Que n'aie mise en ma jaiole
 Et toz raans.
 Biax fiz Sanson, si con je
 pans,
 725 Encor avras perdu lo sans
 Par art de fame.
 Mout crien qu'ele ne te
 raame."
 "Il n'a, dist il, si bele dame
 [130 v²]
 En cest païs
 730 Que tant fusse de li espris
 Que j'en poisse estre a pié
 mis,
 S'an sui toz fiz."
 "S'ansi lo faiz, Sanson, con
 diz,
 Don sai je bien que ies mes
 fiz."
 735 Ri. ne fine,
 Sansonet aprant et dostrine
 Conmant doit joer a mes-
 chine
 Et servir dame soz cortine

 Estroit la corbe, bien s'an-
 pai[g]ne,
 740 Soef la baist, vers soi l'es-
 traigne
 Tant qu'ele l'aint—
 Qu'est debonaires, totjorz
 vaint—
 Tot dis promete,
 Vers fames soit totjorz en
 dete,

723, tor (?).
 749, qui mout.

728, fame.
 755, cort.

- 745 De lor servir bien s'antre-
 mete
 De bel parler.
 Mout set Ri. de l'art d'amer
 Qui Sansonet vialt dostri-
 ner;
 Et mout en cuide
 750 Sansonez savoir par Ovide.
 Ri. sa mere li aide.
 La nuit sejourne;
 A sa mere, qant il ajorne,
 A pris congié, puis si s'an
 torne,
 755 Veit s'an a corz.
 Sansons ne fu ne fox ne
 lorz,
 Ançois se fist amer a toz,
 Car il set tant [131 r¹]
 Que n'en i a petit ne grant
 760 Qui ne li face bel sanblant.
 Et si ot grace,
 Ne lor desplaist chose qu'il
 face;
 Par sa parole les enlace.
 Par amistié
 765 Et par angin a porchacié
 Sanson don a ahernechié
 Son palefroi.
 Richemant vait, a bel con-
 roi;
 Bien set parler devant .i. roi
 770 Et devant conte
 Bel et cortoisemant sanz
 honte.
 Mar fu qant a enor ne
 monte,
 Mais il ne puet;
 De Ri. sa mere li muet

730, de lui.
 756, lors.

745, de sor servir.

- 775 La nature qu'il li estuet
Sore et tenir.
A pris ne puet i[1] pas
venir
Car del lechois ne puet
partir,
Il nel lairoit
780 Por trestot l'avoir que il
voit;
Non feroit il, qui li donroit
L'anor de Rome.
De lecherie set la some.
En nule cort
785 Ne trove si lonc ne si cort
Qui tant en sace.
N'i a nul qui taisir ne face.
O qu'i[1] veigne, soe est la
place, [131 r²]
Tant set de bordes
790 De proverbes et de falordes.
Mains a beles, plaines non
gordes;
Fames afole,
Voiz a; bien chante et bien
parole,
Bien en porroit tenir escole,
795 Mout i entant.
Soz ciel nen a cel estrumant
Don Sansons ne sache
grantmant.
Plus set Sansons
Rotruange, conduiz et sons;
800 Bien set faire les lais
bretons.
Si set des dez
Plus que nus hom de mere
nez;
Onques n'en pot estre en-
janez
- En nule guise.
805 Trestoz ses conpeignons
jostise,
Mainz en fait tranbler a l'as-
sise,
Il les despoille.
*Engloutie a mainte coille
Car il est forz.
810 Plusors en a gitié as porz
Et as putains puanz et orz
Plus que lanternes.
Onques rien ne perdi en
quernes,
N'a enbesa, n'a .ii. en ternes,
815 Totjors a quines;
*En .ii. des .iii. bouez ot
quines.
Tuit li plusor [131 v¹]
Des lechëors en font seignor.
Il les esvoille,
820 Sansons les met en la cor-
boille:
Qui mis i est pas ne so-
moille.
Sansons les bat,
Ja n'ert si cointes qu'il no
mat
Ainz qu'il s'an tort.
825 De Londre jusq'a Monz n'a
cort
O Sansons ne voist et sejort.
Sansons est biax,
A cez citez, a cez chastiax
As fames bastist gries cen-
biax,
830 Tost lor deniers, dras et
aniaux,
Neant a force;
.I. cotel a don les escorce,

777, apres.

803, encienez.

791, m. a. b. ne plaines non g.

825, Des L. jusq' as monz.

793, farin parole.

- C'est la losange.
Ce est Sansons qui toz nos
vange
835 Des pautonieres
Qui si se font envers nos
fieres.
Plus de mil en a fait cor-
sieres,
Mout est sauvage
La meschine qu'il n'as[o]aje
840 As dames fait muer coraje;
Se il s'an poine
N'i a si cointe qu'il n'en
moine.
Sansons les point jusq'a la
vaine,
Il les met en la grant alaine,
845 Les malsenees ;
Plus de .vii. cent en a
menees,
Puis les lait, qant les a
robees. [131 v²]
Sansons a droit,
S'il les fames tient en des-
troit.
850 Ri. sa mere homes deçoit
Et ses ahane ;
Sansonez les fames enjane,
N'en a son per jusc'a Viane
De bien deçoivre.
855 Del Noagre de ci c'au
Toivre
N'avra qui miauz sache de-
çoivre
Char de famele.
Sansons set tant de la favele
Que les plus cointes en apele
860 Del jeu.
Enui lor fait, s'il en a leu.
- Sansons ne a terre ne feu,
Mais des fames quialt lo
ton[1]eu
Par Alemaigne,
865 Par Lonbardie et par Bre-
taigne,
Et as Françoises regaaigne
Aucune chose.
En Engleterre passer ose
Qui de la mer est tote en-
close,
870 Nes en Irlande
Font les dames qanqu'i[1]
conmande,
Et de ci q'an Inde la grande
A il esté ;
Iluec a il mout conquesté.
875 Sor putains a la po[ë]sté
Li fiz Ri. ;
Cele qui l'escondit s'an
diaut. [132 r¹]
Sansons est sages,
De totes corz set les usages ;
880 Entre amanz porte les mes-
ages
Cortoisemant.
Asamblé en a plus de .c.,
Si ne li chaut si sont parant ;
Ses espose, c'une n'en prant
885 Mais qu'il gaaint.
Ce set il bien qu'en pechié
maint,
Mais li deliz do mont lo
vaint
Qui mout li plaist.
De ce se vit, de ce se paist
890 Richemant ; ja ne cuit qu'il
laist
Iceste vie.

851, alume.

884, ces.

855, a coivre.

889, de ce ce v. de ce ce p.

856, aira.

- En volanté m'est que vos die
De ses pechiez une partie
Des criminiaux.
- 895 Moines devint a Clerevax,
S'ot les blans dras, s'ert
moines faux
Et tot sans loi,
A ses freres manti sa foi,
Fuit s'an, s'en mena o soi
- 900 .I. cheval sor.
Si en porta tot lo tresor,
Croiz, calices d'argent et
d'or,
Li fox, li ivres.
Bien en porta .lx. livres,
- 905 Car grant despanse
Moine Sanson, qu'il ne
s'asanse [132 r²]
De Deu servir, tant ne se
panse,
Mais dès presant
Par tot ravist, par tot des-
pant.
- 910 Maint cuer a fait triste et
dolant
L'angin Sanson.
Jusq'au flun Jordain n'a
maison
Ne covant de relegion
O n'ait pris ordre.
- 915 Qant lui plaist, bien s'an set
estordre,
Mais il vialt ainz ses freres
mordre;
Trestoz les robe,
Pechié ne dote ne oprobe,
Toz les vaint Sansons par
sa lobe.
- 920 Il devint preste(s)
- Sacrez fu, ce dit, a Vincs-
tre.
A ces nonains dist qu'il vialt
estre
Lor chapelains:
Mar lo creïrent les nonains,
925 Car les plusor en fist pu-
tains,
Puis les roba.
Tant a alé et ça et la
Que plus de .c. en afola.
Une abeesse
- 930 En amena grosse et espesse,
Puis devint ele jugleresse.
Sanson enchante
Trestotes celes o il ante;
I[1] fout la niece et puis la
tante,
- 935 Puis les sorors.
A droit lo fait et a rebors,
[132 v¹]
Desor toz autres lechëors
Iert il lechieres;
Sor eles a esté trechieres
- 940 Plus que gorpille
Qui par engin prant la cor-
nille.
Sanson art fames et essille,
La mere fout et puis la fille
Et les coisines.
- 945 Sanson les fout totes sov-
ines,
Les genoz lor met as poit-
rines,
Il croist en coste
Et a copresse et a sopoeste;
Sanson croist bien,
- 950 A bachet et a pissechien.
Plus set Sansons,

896, c'ert.

907, de suir *or* fuir.

918, porbre.

- Car il les croist a estupons.
 Pardonez nos s'ansi parlons
 Vos qui entandez nos rai-
 sons,
 955 Tex est l'estoire,
 N'en volon oster ne aoire.
 De bien croistre ot Sanson
 gloire
 Et pris et los.
 Maintes en monta sor les dos
 960 A cui il fist croistre les os.
 Onques Sansons nen ot re-
 pos
 De lecherie.
 D'angignier ot il la maistrie,
 Toz les vainqui de lecherie.
 965 Sansons set tot:
 Une estorse set et un bot,
 [132 v²]
 N'i a putain, se il la fout,
 Que ne li face dire "tprot"
 D'el que de boche.
 970 Mal ait Sansons qui si les
 toche.
 Cele robë avoc cui coche
 En recelee.
 Mainte en avra ensi menee,
 Et qant ce vint a l'anjornee
 975 Trovoit soi nue.
 Cel jor l'estovoit estre an
 mue
 Ne se demonstroit pas en
 rue.
 Trop set Sansons qui si
 treslue
 Et qui si enble
 980 A totes celes ou asamble.
 Ri. sa mere bien resamble
 Qu'il fu ses fiz.
- Ainz Sanson ne fu eschar-
 niz
 Fors par Ri. la meretriz.
 985 Seignor, oëz
 Conmant Sansons fu en-
 ganez,
 Bien lo sai dire.
 San., qui des fames ert sire,
 .Vii. anz o plus fu en Sezille,
 990 Puis s'an avança ver[s]
 Saint Gile
 Droit a Tolose
 Que li rois Henris tant
 golose.
 Mainte meschine et mainte
 espose
 I fist dolante.
 995 Qant l'estre plus ne li tal-
 ante,
 Vint an Berri, [133 r¹]
 La o sa mere l'ot norri:
 Veoir la veut,
 Cuida fust la o hetier sueut.
 1000 N'i estoit pas dame Ri.;
 Sanson s'an torne,
 Les chastiax vait cerchant a
 orne,
 A Paris vient, iluec sejourne
 Une qui[n]zaine,
 1005 Grant joie et grant deduit i
 moine,
 Mainte putain i mist en
 poine.
 Vient a Biauvez,
 Iloques tient Ri. ses plaiz.
 Qant Sansons vint, mout fu
 destroiz
 1010 Des citeains;
 Tuit li demandent s'il est
 sains.

953, parlant.

956, acroire.

968, trop.

- Sa guere quialt vers les pu-
tains,
Ri. lo voit,
A lui est venue tot droit;
1015 El lo salue,
Il li rant mais ne se remue.
Sansons ne l'a pas conëue
Car .xii. anz a ne l'ot vëue.
Ri. se rit
1020 Des deduiz que faire li vit.
A soi meïsmes panse et dit.
"Si m'aït Dex,
De nos .ii. est li plus cruex
O je vers ome[s]
1025 O il vers fames? car mout
somes
Saje de l'art. [133 r²]
Sansons fet escot et esgart
En cel carroge."
Ri. n'atant plus, ainz
s'ap[r]oche
1030 Vient a l'ostel,
Herselot trova la jael.
Tote jor n'antandoit a el
Fors au panser
Conmant porroit Sanson
gaber
1035 Et engignier.
Ri. fait Herselot baignier,
Au col li mist bon mantel
chier,
D'orfrois li lace
Les .ii. costez et en rebrace.
1040 De blanchet li poroi[n]t la
face
Et lo menton.
El vis asist lo vermeillon
Desor lo blanc
- Por ce que del natural sanc
1045 Po i avoit.
Hersanz pert bele, mais n'es-
toit,
Ainz ert boschiee.
Ri. se hate ainz que s'an
chiee
Cele color.
1050 Bien sanble fille de contor.
Par li [i]ert Sansons en
error
Se Ri. puet.
Cointemant ovrer lor estuet;
Ri. o Herselot s'esmuet,
1055 Vont s'an lo pas
De l'autre part chies dan
Thomas [133 v¹]
Un riche marcheant de dras.
Une beasse
Avoit en la maison mout
grasse
1060 Qui de tripot sot une masse.
Ri. l'apele:
"Parlez a moi, ma damoi-
sele.
Dire vos sai bone novele.
Or de l'aidier
1065 Se tu viax avoir bon loier,
Monte laissus en cel solier
O Herselot,
Que vostre gent n'en sachent
mot."
Tout li a conté lo tripot.
1070 Or monte sus;
Ri. s'an ist, n'i tarda plus.
Ensi con ele issoit de l'uis
De la maison,
Garde, si voit venir Sanson.

1023, oruex.
1031, lael.

1025, semes.
1046, pt.

1027, Sansonet escot.

- 1075 Encontré l'a, mist l'a raison,
Tint soi mout simple,
Qu'il ne s'averte, mist sa
guimple
Sor son viaire.
Primes parole por atraire,
1080 Apres soef por miauz
atraire:
"San. n'ies pas, par Saint
Alaire,
Frans ne cortois ne debo-
naire,
Por noiant te vantes
Qu'antremetre te sez de
tantes.
1085 N'a moi ne viens, n'a moi ne
antes.
Mout par fais mal. [133 v²]
Ja tant n'iras n'amont n'aval
Que tu vieignes a mon ostal;
Sanson, vien i,
1090 Il n'est pas loin, voiz lo de
ci.
La moie foi, Sanson, t'afi,
Se vialx do mien
Ja ne voldras icele rien
Que tu n'aies, car je t'ain
bien.
1095 Amis Sanson, avoc moi
vien."
Sansons l'antant,
Bien aperçoit qu'ele li mant
Et sel trait a decevemant;
Ne la resoigne.
1100 Hai, quel nonain et quel
moine!
Mout set chascuns [d'els] de
faloine
Et de boidie.
San. li dist a voiz serie:
1090, te ci.
1114, Amont a la fenestre.
- "Conmant avez vos non,
amie?"
1105 "Amis, an m'apele Florie."
"Florie bele,
Benoi(e)te soit tex dam-
oisele
Qui son ami ensin apele.
Merciz et grez
1110 Del bel apel que fait m'avez.
Ja dites vos que vos m'amez
Et je ain vos."
San. garda, li avrillox,
Amont sor destre,
1115 Vit Herselot a la fenestre.
"Florie, di por Saint Sel-
vestre [134 r']
Qui est ce la?
Voiz quel cors et quel vis
ele a."
"Ou?" dist Ri. Il li monstra.
1120 "En cel solier."
"A! dist Ri., ce n'a mestier.
C'est la fille a un chevalier
Preu et cortois,
Qui l'a mise chies un borjois
1125 Qui l'aprant a ovrer orfrois
Avec sa fille."
San[sonez] d'angoisse fre-
tille.
Or ne se prise une co(r)-
quille
*S'il ne se leue.
1130 "Florie bele, car te leue."
"Vers cui?" "Vers moi,
qu'ele me seue
Et qu'ele m'aint."
"Ostez, dist ele, a rien
n'ataint."
De lui aidier Ri. se faint.
1099, raisone.
1134, fait.

- 1135 "S'amors, dist il, lo cuer
m'estraint
Desoz l'aissele.
De si qu'a Rome n'a si bele,
Non de si q'as porz de Bor-
dele.
Florie, va de lieu, l'apele.
1140 Se tant fais que mete ma sele
Je sui tes hom.
Si pran del mien tot a ban-
don."
Ri. en vait en la maison
Faire proiere.
1145 Trestot dit a la chanberiere
Con lo feront, en quel men-
iere. [134 r²]
A Sanson s'an revait arriere
A po de pose.
"Avez rien fait?" Oïl.
"Quel chose?"
1150 "Vaincue l'ai, la flor de rose,
Mais mout par sui herdie et
ose
Que ç'ai enpris.
Par la foi que doi Saint
Denis,
Trestot l'avoir de cest païs
1155 Ne me garroit,
Se li chevaliers lo savoit,
Que n'aüsse de mort des-
troit.
Mout sui desvee,
Moie corpe, malaüree!
1160 Je ai la meschine enjannee.
Mais or t'an va;
Sanpres a vespres revien ça,
Car, se je puis, ele i vanra
Hastivemant.
- 1165 Mais el est mout de haute
jant,
Si covient bel atornemant
La ou si riche rien descent.
Avroies tu nes pas d'ar-
gent?"
Sansonez l'ot,
1170 Bien aperçoit qu'ele l'anclot
Puisque do suen vialt faire
escot,
Mais lui sovient
Qui ne done ce que chier
tient
A ce qu'il aime a poine vient.
1175 Sansons foloie,
.V. sous li done de monoie.
[134 v¹]
Et si li dit que plus acroie
S'an a mestier,
Il sora tot au repairier.
1180 San. la cuide engignier
Et el Sanson.
Ri. a recëu son don;
Par convenant
Herseloz trait son vis avant,
1185 Si li a fait .i. bel sanblant.
Ri. la cine de son gant,
El se retrait.
"Amis Sanson, tu as ton
plait,
Va, si revien." Sanson s'an
veit,
1190 Ri. remaint.
Del conroi faire ne se faint,
Del autrui en a el fait maint
Des biax ators.
Et Ri. quiert .vii. lechëors

1139, apes.

1173, qu'il ne done.

1183, ton tenant.

1142, del main.

1177, Et cele.

1148, Po de chose.

1181, ele.

- 1195 Qui li venissent a secors
D'un home prandre.
Tot lo tripot lor fait entan-
dre,
Tot lor aprant :
Qant il vanra celeemant
1200 A la meschine,
Tot lo despoillent par ravine,
Nel tochent d'espee acerine
Ne de baston,
Qar bien savoit que c'ert
Sanson,
1205 Ses fiz,
Qui ainz ne pot estre escher-
niz. [134 v²]
Gaber lo vialt la meretriz.
Ci[1] li otroient,
Car si detor trestuit estoient.
1210 A l'ostel liee l'an envoie[nt].
Ri. repaire,
Vient a l'ostel, lo feu esclaire
*Jons et flors expandre par
l'aire
Et li jors faut.
1215 Ez vos Sanson, en l'ostel
saut
Qui mout estoit et liez et
baut.
"Florie, fait il, Dex vos
saut,
Li fiz Marie."
"Sanson[et], Dex te be-
neie."
1220 "Don n'est [enc]or venue
m'amie?"
"Nenil, amis.
Que diz, Sanson? Trop ies
hastis,
Encor ne puet, n'est mie
asis."
- Ez vos Hersant,
1225 Sansonez par la main la
prant,
La pute tranble dant a dant.
"Avoi! Florie,
Avez me vos donques
traïe?"
San. li dist. "Nenil, amie,
1230 Nenil, ma bele.
Mais vostre amor mout me
favele;
Li cuers m'estraint desoz
l'aïsele
Por vostre amor.
Se je pert vos, n'en ai retor ;
1235 Ja n'avra[i] mais joie nul
jor."
Et Herselot [135 r¹]
Li respont au miauz qu'ele
sot ;
Plore et sanglote mot a mot
Tot par faintié :
1240 "Florie, mal as exploitié
Qui a Sanson m'as acointié,
Mais or li otroi m'amistié
Par vostre lox.
Herdie sui qant faire l'ox,
1245 Mout par sui fole."
Dit Ri., "Ja n'en iert par-
ole."
Et Sansons la baise et acole,
Et ele plore.
El haster Sanson se demore,
1250 Mais del foutre estoit tans
et ore ;
Ja li feïst
Se Herseloz li consantist,
Mais el tressaut, tranble et
fremist
Con s'el fust chaste.

- 1255 Ri., qui tot prant et tot gaste,
La table a mise.
Lez Sanson s'est Hersanz
assise,
Des mes mangerent a devise
Et burent mout
1260 De bon vin ferré et estolt.
Herselot avoit cler lo volt
A la chandoille;
La face avoit clere et ver-
moille,
Pert que ce soit une mer-
voille
1265 Del vermeillon.
Après mangier la prist San-
son, [135 r²]
Si l'an moine, o voille o non;
El lit l'estant,
Les dras li lieve, el se deff-
ant
1270 Por les lechëors qu'ele atant.
Si estoit ele nequedant
En grant engoisse
Del recevoir plus que n'est
moisse.
A deslacier Sansons s'es-
loisse,
1275 Par lo peignil, qui sanble
moisse,
Li mist l'outil,
*Car la pute tot son penil.
Des qu'il s'ahurte au dusil,
Au cors abrive;
1280 Il n'i trova ne fonz ne rive
Plus qu'i[1] feïst en une
(h)ive.
San. s'esmaie,
Arriere saut, si se desraie,
"Ahi! dist il, pute fresaie,
1285 Escharni m'as.
- Mauvais serai, s'ensi t'an
vas;
Einçois me laisseras tes dras.
Certes ja ne m'an gaberass."
Il lieve sus,
1290 Et Herselot lo retrait jus.
Ez vos les lechëors a l'uis,
Traient les branz.
Que feïst uns encontre tanz?
"Ne vos movez," dit li plus
granz.
1295 I[1] l'ont saisi. [135 v¹]
Ce dit Ri., "Seignor, merci!
Por quoi l'avez si asailli?
Ce est folie."
Li uns respont, "Dame
Florie,
1300 Nostre parante avez honie
Et vos et il perdroiz la vie."
Mout lo menacent,
Lo mantel del col li delacent,
Tot lo despoillent,
1305 Ne li font mal don il se
doille.
San. crient que mort ne re-
coille,
Demande lor,
"Por coi me honissiez, seig-
nor?"
Ce dit li uns, "Por ma
ser[or]
1310 Que avez traite a desenor."
Ri. lor prie par amor
Qu'il ne l'ocient,
Et cil ne font mais que s'an
rient.
"Plegiez lo moi,
1315 Ce dit Ri., desor ma foi."
Dit li plus maïstres, "Je
l'otroi."

Or est plegiez,
 En la maison se gist toz liez.
 Ci fenit de Richaut et conmanche des Fevres.

NOTES

Title: *Ci fenist Catons en romanz et conmanche de richaut*. I have retained the orthography *Richeut* by which the poem is commonly known and which would represent the orthography of the author for the German *Richild*.

Text: in the following notes M. indicates the text of Méon, B., P. and T. respectively the corrections proposed by Bédier, G. Paris and Tobler.

V. 7. M. *Qu'ele atrait tot a sa guise*. Evidently in the *asguise* of the ms. the copyist intended *a sa guise*, but the rhyme indicates a fault. I am inclined to take *que* as a conjunction and correct:

Que les atrait totes et guie
 Par son atrait.

A sa guie also suggests itself (cf. Provençal *guia*, *guida* in the sense of guidance). *Guie* in French seems to be always masculine and to designate the person and not the action. However, it doubtless originally designated the action and we might have here a remnant of an older use of the word as a *nom d'action*. Cf. G. Paris, *Romania*, xxix, 442.

V. 10. *Richeut* seems to be used here in the general sense of *entremetteuse*.

V. 12, 15. *en = on*.

V. 17. Si croi, se Diex me beneie,
 Que fame qui ainsi se lie
 Et se desguise
 Et son chartois tant aime et prise,
 N'est pas de grant bonté esprise
 Dedenz le cuer.

(*Des Cornetes*, Jubinal, *Jongleurs et Trouveres*, 90, 91.) Cf. also *Li mariages des filles au diable*, Jubinal, *Nouveau Recueil*, I, 287; *Roman de la Rose*, 14238 ff., and *Romania*, xxix, 70.

V. 49, 50. I have adopted the punctuation suggested by G. Paris. It would be possible, however, to read, with Méon, period after 50 and no punctuation after 49.

V. 54. The verse is evidently corrupt. The ms. reads either *lerdefitier* or *lerdefiner*. Perhaps originally a noun and adjective or two adjectives of which the last was *fier*. I am unable to suggest a satisfactory correction. The suggestion of G. Paris, "*Dan Guillaume de Simier (ou quelque nom de pareil)*," was made on the basis of Méon's text which omits *ler*.

V. 55. B. *k'ert*. Cf. v. 742, *Qu'est debonaires tot jors vaint*.

V. 56. Tant i sejorna et tant fui
 Que mon mantel mengai et bui
 Et une cote et .i. sercot.

(*Du prestre teint*, Montaiglon et Raynaud, vi, 8.)

V. 63. P. *seit*. Perhaps *Ri. s'ert mout*, "she was indeed a Richeut." The ms. reads clearly *sert*.

V. 68. Bédier's statement, "Le ms. donne exactement: *Et si je ne lairai por honte,*" is probably a misprint.

V. 74. Or, *mainte fame(s)*.

V. 79. B. *Lo mist el*. But *so = si lo*.

V. 88. The following verses seem to require *Au feu orent plus que i. pot*, unless *n'avoir qu'un pot au feu* can mean here "make common cause," "eat together."

V. 101. For examples of *soi* for *lui*, see R. Warnecke, *Die Syntax des betonten Reflexivpronomens in Franz.*, 1908, p. 116.

V. 104. *Avenir* is used in the same sense in *Le Meunier d'Arleux*, Montaiglon et Raynaud, II, 43.

Car sachies il m'aniuie forment
Chou que il avint a ma feme.

V. 111. Perhaps *aver(s)*, accusative for nominative in the predicate.

V. 115. T. *par la u anche* (ebenso 1002 *enchant*, s. in Hollands Ausgabe des Ch. Lyon zu 2503; dagegen 999 *henter*). Tobler intends by *anche* a form from *engier* of which he would see the present participle in *enchant* 1002 (1001 of Méon's text). But 1002 should read *cerchant a orne* and 999 (M. 998) *hetier* (*haitier*). I therefore retain *par la vanche* and see in *vanche* the *vinca minor*, sometimes called *la violette des sorciers*. Herselot is proposing the ordinary magic with which she is familiar. In G. Paris' copy of Méon is the marginal note on 115, *Charmes li quierés por vengeance*.

V. 116-118. These verses refer to the practice, often mentioned in classical and medieval literature, of making figures of wax or lead which, when subjected to fire or placed in boiling water, cause the person whom they represent to burn with passion, suffer from fever or waste away. On this sort of sympathetic magic see Horace, *Satires*, I, viii, 29, Vergil, *Eclogues*, viii, 80, Theocritus, II, 28, 29; for the Middle Ages Heinrich Ploss-Max Bartels, *Das Weib in der Natur und Völkerkunde*, 9th ed. (1908), I, 646, and Hansen, *Geschichte des Hexwahns*, Bonn, 1901, where (p. 552) is quoted a report of a trial for sorcery at the Chatelet in 1390 which gives a detailed account of this method of vengeance. For a general bibliography on sympathetic magic cf. *Zeitschrift des Vereins für deutsche Volkskunde*, XXIII (1913), Heft I, p. 14.

V. 124. Here and 329 the regular oblique form *meisme* is assured by the metre; in 1021 either form can stand. For the form with *s* assured by rhyme see Foerster, *Yvain*, 3d edition, v. 65, note.

V. 126. B. Corriger, *Miauz est que atorne herbé boivre* (il vaut mieux que je prépare une boisson d'herbes magiques). One could read also, *atorné herbé boive*.

V. 145-47. P. Il faut s. d. *Mandagloiré* et au v. suivant *o le claré*. T. *o le claré*. It seems to me doubtful that a copyist would have changed *o le claré* into the unintelligible *o ele esclaire*, and *Mandagloiré* is surprising even to force a rhyme. The *ot* of Méon's text is not in the ms. I should prefer to correct

La mandagloire.
Ri. en but o elebore (electoire),
Puis n'i fist el guieres demore.

If the copyist found *elebore* separated *o ele bore* he might have changed the

unintelligible *bore* into *esclairer*. Hellebore was a sort of cure-all for the ancients and during the Middle Ages. Among its many uses was as a stimulant for the organs of reproduction. Cf. U. S. Dispensatory, 15th edition, p. 1662. The mention of *mandaglore* for this purpose is frequent. See *Poème moralisé*, II, 32 ff., Romania, xiv, and *Recettes médicales en Provençal*, Romania, xxxii, 280.

V. 154-56. T. 154, 155 *tient, vient*, 156 *sofle et jient* (vgl. 337). For the expression *tenir sa main a sa maissele* cf. Hamilton, *Zeitschrift für r. Phil.*, xxxiv, 571. For the same expression in Spanish H. Lang, *Transactions and Proceedings of the Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, vol. III, p. 16.

V. 174. T. etwa als Parenthese *Oies voidie, oies fallace!*

V. 188. T. *Se je n'an feroie un juïse*. A correction does not seem to me necessary. *Porter un juïse* is common and the imperfect tense here does not seem impossible.

V. 214. *enmasse*, cf. *Du Fotéor*, III *En son cuer à enmer le prist*.

V. 216. *Oz de pute orse*, cf. Tobler, *Vermischte Beiträge* I, 17.

V. 233. T. *A un serjant*.

V. 234. P. *C'est R. qui apelle sa meschine*.

V. 241. For the pleonastic possessive adjective cf. *Vermischte Beiträge* II, 79.

V. 242. Richeut evidently addresses this verse to Hersent as she hands her the booty obtained from the priest. The following verses are addressed to Seigneur Viel.

V. 250-51. The correction and punctuation is that of G. Paris. T. *Lasse meschine*. The construction is not entirely clear to me. *Cline* = submissive? It would also be possible to read *feïs* and perhaps interrogation after 250, connecting 251 with the following verse.

V. 273. T. *eüsse vengeance*. I take *longuemant* as a noun = *delai*, as *Se consoiller l'an doiz, n'i met pas longement*. J. Bodet, Sax. Lvii. See Godefroy.

V. 277. B. *Corriger, malgré le ms. : si tost auroient ome ocis*. T. *Qui tost avroient*. If we admit the hiatus the ms. reading can be retained with *ocis* as predicate participle, but *si* may well be a mistake for *qui* due to the *si* of the preceding verse.

V. 281. Perhaps *Ne sai de ces menaces c'ont* (qu'ont).

V. 289. T. *Puis si li*.

V. 324. P. *Assise l'a*. I have preferred *assise là* because of *asis se sont* of the preceding verse.

V. 343. P. *de ce l'aveu*. T. *l'aveu*.

V. 359. T. 359 (nach 360) *ne se verra*.

V. 365. Godefroy gives only this passage under *estosie* with the meaning *étonnée*, which is certainly erroneous. I have adopted Tobler's suggestion *esjoïe*.

V. 372. Godefroy *suiant*(?), and quotes this passage. *Sivanz* is perhaps a case of present participle with passive meaning (see Tobler, *Vermischte Beiträge* I, 36 ff.). For *en gest* the meaning given by Godefroy, *en gestation*, does not give a very satisfactory sense. Perhaps *en chaleur*. I have found no other examples of the word.

V. 377. T. *et les deçoit*. I prefer to retain the hiatus. On *enplumer* = *decevoir*, Foerster's note to *Cliges* 4532 and Ebeling, *Auberee*, p. 88.

V. 379. T. *A grosse borse Agnel se fait, puis devient orse*. *Lo pas moine home et puis l'acorse*. I see in *La grosse borse!* an expression applied to Richeut to emphasize her capacity for taking "tout quanqu'el voit."

V. 395. The corrections of P. and T. are unnecessary; the ms. reads *raamme* not *mainne*. Cf. 726.

V. 400. M. *perist il.* P. *iceste*.

V. 408-10. The passage is not clear. It is possible, of course, to take *oie* as subjunctive present and translate, "Let H., who comforts, hear her mistress," making 410 an exclamation of the author. This makes, however, a rather strained construction and one would expect *Q'atant je tant* to be an expression of impatience on the part of Herselot or Richeut. The suggestion of Tobler *A reconforter se cointoie* does not seem to me satisfactory and I have nothing better to offer. Perhaps, *Ce fust grant joie Herselot a la crine bloie, Qui reconfortë et amoie.*(?)

V. 418. *acline* may be either verb or adjective.

V. 426. T. *que*. *Qui* for *que* is found, but chiefly in the 13th century and after and then with transitive verbs; with intransitive verbs it is rare and as far as one can judge of the date of its appearance seems to be later than with transitives. Cf. Fahrenkamp, *Die Syntax der substantivischen Interrogativpromina*, p. 25 ff., and De Jong, *Die Relativ und Interrogativpromina*, p. 68.

V. 436. Perhaps *Cil li chargent et char et pois*, or *tot demanois*.

V. 448. The number of sponsors was not fixed until the Council of Trent.

V. 460. A variant of the common *costeïr et baignier*.

V. 476-79. These verses seem to be a direct quotation of the words of the *lechëor*.

V. 484. M. *repert*.

V. 495-96. *S'enorgoillir a engorllir*, "to take pride in putting money in her gorle (money-belt, purse)," in setting a higher price than formerly on her favors.

V. 508. *jaelice* here masculine. It is usually given as feminine, but in its most frequent use in the expression *en jaelice* there is no way of determining its gender.

V. 509. Or *s'en vient*. It might be possible to punctuate, period after 507, no punctuation after 508 and retain *en*.

V. 520. [*i*]ert ou val, until he shall be reduced to the last extremity, utterly impoverished. Although we should expect the subjunctive with *ençois que*, the indicative is found. That *ert* should be subjunctive of *errer*, 'engager en dominant des arrhes' and *val* = 'valeur,' does not seem to me possible.

V. 524. T. *que n'emboive* (denen sie es nicht anthue).

V. 525. T. *et don queque soit ne reçoive*. P. *et do quel que soit*.

V. 528. P. *Dont d.* T. *Done H. c'a por queu*(?).

V. 536. *Resambler* with the accusative. Cf. *Cliges* 6456, *Erec* 433, 770.

V. 555. T. *Par la parole Fu* (dem Gerede nach) oder *Por la parole* (um des Geredes willen). I would correct *Por la parole* (pour apprendre à bien parler).

V. 564. *en* = *annum*.

V. 568. B. *N'ot en l'escole si*. (sic dans le ms.). The ms. reads clearly *si porvers*, which, as G. Paris remarked in suggesting the word as satisfying the rhyme, does not agree very well with the sense of the passage.

V. 575. The ordinary expression is *se froter au lange*. *Guillaume de Dole* 2849. *Le mariage de Rutebeuf*, 95.

V. 577. T. *Que par m. que par blanje*. I have not corrected the ms. reading because I am not convinced that the author may not have written the sen-

tence as it stands, the first *et* connecting the two clauses and the second arising through the influence of the first. The whole would then be equivalent to *Et, que par m. que par b. que par p.*

V. 591. P. *Car mout est fiers* (suppr. *et sages*). T. *fiers et mout est*.

V. 592. P. *iers*. Cf. the rhymes *borse: rescosse* 216, *corz: lorz: toz* 754.

V. 598. There is evidently a lacuna of several verses after 598.

V. 599. T. *De conter set* (auf das Rechnen versteht sich der Junge). The sense seems to me clear as it stands. It is *Richeut* "qui fait grant exploit del conter" in talking to the *borjois* who is evidently a money-changer. Cf. 576, 653.

V. 606. T. *Et mout*. If we admit hiatus the correction is not necessary.

V. 613. T. *et qui la sant* (zu spuren bekommt). P. Lacune après 612.

V. 616. T. *sor fusiaus* (auf die Spindeln, nämlich die leeren). The only other case of this expression known to me is found in Noack, *Strophenausgang in der Altfr. Lyrik* (Ausc. und Abhand. XCVIII), *uncroffentliche Refrainlieder* I, 24, p. 99: *Les riches les povres metent aus fusiaus*. Jeanroy, in *Romania* XXX, p. 428, has noted the editor's mistaken explanation of the passage: "Dans l'expression 'mettre aus fusiaus,' *fusiel* ne signifie certainement pas 'boyau, culier, derrière.' Elle signifie simplement, et l'origine en est claire, 'réduire à la pauvreté.'"

V. 623. For another early mention of *serventois* see Wace, *Geste des Normans*, Vol. 2, v. 153.

V. 631. *revate*. Godefroy, *revater, battre le pavé, d'après Méon*. Méon's definition is taken from Sainte-Palaye. This seems to be the only example of the word and it may be a copyist's mistake.

V. 637. B. ms. *soz soi*. The ms. has *sor soi*.

V. 653. On *a pois*, cf. *Auberee* 294 *Je te vueil rendre tout a pois*, and Ebeling's note to this verse. *Richeut* means that Sanson will take up the business of a money-changer.

V. 676. The necessity of traveling to become *prodhom* is mentioned in *Cliges* 154 ff.

V. 677. Or *n'iert* for ms. *n't*.

V. 680. T. *masse*.

V. 682. Or *savré*.

V. 686. One can supply either *avoir* or *prendre*.

V. 693. Méon prints incorrectly *Les fames font*. The ms. has *homes* and Tobler's correction *Els te feront* is thus unnecessary.

V. 695. T. *autors*.

V. 699. P. *l'escriture* ou mieux *d'escriture*. T. *l'escriture*.

V. 701. Perhaps better correct *que que*, "however much."

V. 739, 40. The subjunctives are due to some expression of advice or command in the omitted portion.

V. 776. *Sore* = *solre*. See Glossary.

V. 798. T. *Mout*. Perhaps *si set*.

V. 808-13. P. *Englotie a mainte cooille*. The verses are not clear to me and I do not understand Gaston Paris' correction. What is *cooille*?

V. 814. T. *N'a ambesas n'a deus n'a ternes*, eines der *quines* wird mit *sines* zu vertauschen sein, doch bleibt 808-821 manches mir dunkel.

V. 815. *bouez?* No word remotely resembling this appears in Semrau, *Wurfel und Wurfelspiel im Alten Frankreich*, who, p. 63, note, says of this pas-

sage: "Richaut rühmt vom ihrem Sohne Sanson dass er der beste Spieler der Welt sei: *onques rien ne perdi[t] en quernes, N'a enbesas (=ambesas) n'a deus en ternes, Totjors a quines* (De Richaut 812, Méon I, 38). Wie der Sanson spielt, bleibt dahingestellt; doch dürfte *deus en ternes* 3 x 2 sein, so überraschend der Gebrauch von *ternes* auch sein mag. Das Gefühl, den Sinn des Distributiven ("je zwei") wiedergeben zu müssen, schlug sich auf 3, da für 2 keine Distributivzahl zur Verfügung stand." Semrau says nothing of the following verse, but, p. 48, note 2, says, "*en deus* = 'auf zweien' (Jus St. Nich. 904, 1116), wenn nämlich im ganzen drei im Spiele sind. Ebenso ib. 1131: *es (en les) autres II.*, wozu näheres S. 51, unten." The two passages from Li Jus de Saint Nicholai read,

Mais j'en ferai bien .XI. en deus
Et li autres soit deboutés. (904, 905)
Giete; Diex te doinst .VII. en deus. (1116).

If we accept this meaning for *en deus* in our passage, *bouez* can mean the dice themselves. On the other hand it may mean "throws," or it may be a past participle. With regard to *en ternes* I am of the opinion of Tobler and would correct *n'a ternes*, the copyist's mistake being due probably to *en quernes* of the line above. I would also correct the second *quines* to *sines* and *bouez* to *sovent*, thus,

Onques rien ne perdi en quernes,
N'a enbesas, n'a deus, n'a ternes,
Totjors a quines;
En .II. des .III. sovent ot sines.

I would translate, "He never lost by throwing fours, nor aces nor threes; he always threw fives and on two of the three he often had sixes."

V. 820. The only examples of the expression *mettre en la corbeille* with which I am familiar is in the story of Vergil in the basket. Cf. Comparetti, *Virgil im Mittelalter*, and DuMeril, *Mélanges archéologiques*, p. 429, note 4. From this story the expression may have taken a general use in the sense of "keep in fear or anxiety."

V. 851. P. *adame* (?)

V. 855. P. *de ci c'au Toivre*.

V. 856. Or *N'an a*.

V. 896. I correct *s'ert* since there are several cases of *c* for *s* in the ms., a not infrequent trait in an Eastern copyist. The first *s* = *si*, the second, *sic*.

V. 907. P. *De Deu servir* (?).

V. 908. *del present* (?).

V. 945 "Non omnes una figura decet. . . .

Mille modis veneris." Ovid., *De Arte amat.* 772 ff.

V. 947. *a soboste*. "Figurae quibus supinus rem habet cum prona." Cf. Ovid, *De Arte amat.* 777.

V. 950. *A brachet* (?).

V. 953-56. Cf. Chaucer's mock apology for his Miller's tale at the end of the prologue of that tale.

V. 968. P. *Que ne li face dire tropt*. T. *Que ne li face dire prot*. For discussion of this exclamation and its varying orthography see the continuation of Tobler's note and further *Archiv für n. s.*, vol. 87, 277, and Hans Espe, *Die Interjection in Altfranz.*, p. 77.

- V. 1023. T. *De nos qui est plus cruex O je vers omes O li vers fames? Car mout somes Saje de l'art. Sansons fet escout et esgart En cel carroge.*
- V. 1029. *ainz* here preposition? That is, "before approaching Sanson."
- V. 1032. On *tote jor* see Friedwagner, *La Vengeance Raguidel*, v. 90, note, and the literature there given.
- V. 1040. T. *poroint* (wie vermutlich auch Bédier annimmt).
- V. 1047. T. *beschiee* (narbig). This is the only example of *boschiee* given in Godefroy or found elsewhere to my knowledge. Tobler's correction is perhaps to be adopted.
- V. 1077. T. *s'äunte* (*ahonte*). In the ms. the line above a vowel to indicate a nasal and the hook to indicate *er* are often so similar as to be indistinguishable.
- V. 1079. T. *Primes parole par contraire, Apres soef por miex atraire*. The original may have had *atraire* in both places with a slight difference of meaning, 1079 *attirer*, 1080 *seduire, tromper*.
- V. 1081. T. *Ilaire* oder *Acaire*?
- V. 1001. P. *chascuns d'els*. T. *falsemoine* (ein mir sonst nicht begegnetes Wort).
- V. 1114. P. *Amont sor destre*. T. *Amont a l'estre*.
- V. 1119-21. *Il li monstra, En cel solier. A! dist Ri*. is omitted by Méon and the omission not noted by Bédier. The lacune noted by G. Paris is therefore in Méon, not in the ms.
- V. 1127. P. and T. *toz fretille*. I have preferred to read *Sansonnez* for the ms. *San*.
- V. 1129-31. P. *leue, leue, seue* (le second *leue* est loca, mais je ne comprends pas le premier; p.-ê corr. *S'il ne s'i jeue?*). T. *s'aliue: te liue: me siue*.
- V. 1148. P. *A po de pose*. T. *Et il la chose* (er dringt in sie).
- V. 1177. T. *Et si li dit*.
- V. 1180. T. *Sansonnez la c. e*. I prefer the hiatus.
- V. 1183. P. *par contenant*. T. *par covenant*.
- V. 1204. T. *sachent*. The correction is unnecessary; the subject of *savoit* is Richeut.
- V. 1213. P. Lacune après 1112. T. *espart parmi l'aire*.
- V. 1219. P. and T. *et Dex te beneie*.
- V. 1234. M. *par vos*. The ms. has *pt*. Either *par* or *pert* gives a satisfactory sense. Cf. 1264 where the ms. has *p* for *pert* (paroir).
- V. 1273 ff. This passage, mentioned by Tobler as obscure to him, has several difficulties. *Plus que ne moisse* is not clear. In *Chansons et dits artesiens du xiii siècle*, A. Jeanroy et H. Guy (fascic. II de la Bibliothèque des Universités du Midi), no. xx, 56-58, we find

Au rover euc mout grant angoisse,
Ja n'est il nule poignans moisse
Avers rover ne tel mal face.

The glossary gives "*Moisse* xx, 56? Voyez d'autres exemples de ce mot dans Godefroy (s. v. Penil), et dans une *fratrasie* anonyme (Jubinal, *Nouveau Recueil* II, p. 220). Remacle (Dict. Wallon) traduit *moisse* par pierres dans les chaines des murs plus larges que celles de dessus et de dessous, pierres d'attente. Ce sens ne peut guère convenir ici." The passage in Godefroy under *Penil* is the passage from *Richeut*. The example from Jubinal reads

Quatre rat a moisse
 Faisoient monnoie
 D'un viez corbillon,
 Uns moines de croie
 Faisoit moult joie, etc.

Evidently the correct reading is *rat a moie*. However, in *Mots obscurs et rares*, Romania xxxiii, p. 578, is given "*Moisse, mouche* xiv s. Et ki est plus chetis cors que li cors des gens ki sovent est mis a mort par moisse et par autre petite bestelette. J. LeBel "*Li Ars d'Amour*, pp. Petit II, 315." The meaning *mouche* is satisfactory in the chanson quoted above and I am inclined to accept it as the probable meaning for *moisse* of v. 1273. That *mouche* should be used in such a comparison is not surprising and a passage from the *Roman de Renard* lends some support to this view. Hermeline and Hersent are accusing each other of lack of chastity and Hersent says (Ib, 3133-34),

Qar plus estes pute que moche
 Qui en esté la gent entoche.

V. 1274. This is the only case known to me of the verb *esloissier* (exluxiare) used reflexively in the sense of *se hâter, se précipiter* (?).

V. 1275. *moisse* (muceus, a), moite.

V. 1277. I would correct *Car la pute a* (or *ot*) *tot son penil*, understanding the verse as parenthetical and explaining it as referring to a custom mentioned in the *Roman de Renard* xxii, 684-92:

La hure avec toute la pel
 Li a de teste sevrée
 Et autour le con si plantee
 Q'ainz puis ne la pot nus oster
 Por engin c'on peust trover;
 Ne gluz ne chaux ne poileçon
 N'i valent mie troi boston.
 Meslëure n'autre pelains,
 Que metre i vuelent ces putains,
 Ne lor vaut riens: que touz jorz croit
 Plus dru apres qu'avant n'estoit.

V. 1278. Cf. Rabelais, *Gargantua*, chap. iii, Si le diabol ne vult qu'elles engroissent, il faudra tortre le douzil, et bouche close.

V. 1284. Fame est la nuit chauve- souris,
 Fame est huans, fame est fresaie,
 La nuit se muce, le jor s'egaie.

(*Le blasme des fames*, Jubinal, Jongleurs et Trouvères, p. 80.)

V. 1281. P. *hive* (est-ce l'angl. *hive* "ruche," ou faut-il lire *Plus qu'il ne feïst en une ive*?) T. *Plus qu'il ne feïst en une ive* (Stute).

V. 1296. P.: après *Richaut* et à la fin.

V. 1299. M. *Li uns respont, Florie*. The ms. has *dame Florie*.

V. 1312. P. *Le dit Richaut, desor ma foi*.

LIST OF PROPER NAMES

Alaire (saint) 1081 <i>Corr.</i> Acaire <i>or</i>	Londres 825.
Ilair.	Marie, la Sainte Vierge 1218.
Alemagne 864.	Monz 825.
Bar 644.	Nicole 248.
Berri 996	Noagre 855?
Biauvez 1007.	Orlenois, vin orlenois 296.
Bordele, les porz de B. 1138.	Ovide 750.
Bretaigne 865.	Paris 1003.
Breton, les lais Bretons 800.	Pol (saint) 167.
Clerevax 895.	Richaut 2, 10, 31, etc.
Coivre (corr. Toivre) 855.	Rome 782.
Denis (saint) 108, 1153.	Sanson 451, 532, etc.
Engleterre 867.	Sansonnet 547, 596, etc.
Germain (saint), <i>église</i> , 447.	Selvestre (saint) 1116.
Gile (saint) 990.	Sezille 989.
Guillaume 54.	Thomas 1056.
Henri, le roi, 992.	Thomas (saint) Tomas 335, <i>église</i> 650.
Hersant. 140, 233, etc.	Toivre (ms. Coivre) 855.
Herselot 50, 86, 113, etc.	Tolose 991.
Inde, la grande 872.	Viane 853.
Irlande 870.	Viël (seignor) 230, 434, 541, 597, 654.
Jordain, le flux 912.	Vincestre 921.
Lonbardie 865.	

GLOSSARY

Abriver 1279, *s'élancer*. au cors abrive, *se lance au galop*.
 acesmer (s'), 469 *se parer*, 466 *préparer*.
 acline 418, *soumise*.
 acorsier 361, *faire courir*.
 ademetre (s') 594, *se lancer tête baissée (à cheval)*.
 afichier (s') 593, *se fixer, s'affermir [sur les étriers]*.
 agaitier 472, *guetter*.
 ahaner 851 (ms. alume), *tourmenter, agacer*.
 aire 1213, *lieu, place*; par l'aire, *par terre*.
 alaine 844, *haleine*. mettre en la grant a. *faire haleter*.
 ampaindre (s') 739, *s'appliquer*.
 anche 116, *encre*.
 anjornee 974, *point du jour*.
 anter 933, 1085, *fréquenter*.
 anticier 509, *exciter, provoquer*.
 anvier 133, *appeler devant un tribunal*.
 aoire 956 (ms. accroire), *augmenter*.
 asambler 980, *avoir des rapports*. Cf.

Et que tant vint a icel jor
 Qu'ele asenbla a son seignor.

(De la sorisete des estopes, v. 11, 12.)
 — 882, *joindre*.

asanser (s') 906, *se décider*.

assise 806, *séance de jeu*.

En un retrait ou ilz trouverent

Grant feu et belle table mise.

La fu tantost faicte l'assise

De trois dez quarrez de Paris.

Eustache Deschamps, *Le dit du gieu des dez*, v. 12-15.

ators 1193, *atours*.

atot 453, *avec*.

aubé 458, *enfant nouveau-né*.

avel, aviaux, 546 *désir*.

avrillos 1113, d'un tempérament printanier, changeant, érotique; "avrilleux."

Bachet (?) à b. 950, *figura Veneris*.

bareter 643, *tromper*.

beasse 1058, *jeune fille, servante*.

blanchet 1040, *sorte de fard*.

blanje 577, *flatterie*.

borde 789, *bourde, plaisanterie*.

bordel 639, *lieu de débauche; envoyer au bordel, prostituer*.

boschiee 1047, *feldée, déguisée*.

bot 150, 966, *coup (poussée)*.

bouez (?) 816, *voir la note*.

brame 684, *mettre en brames, mettre en pleurs, ou faire crier*.

Caraudes 634, cheraudes 117, *sortilèges*.

carroge 1028, *carrefour, place publique*.

cenbel, pl. cenbiax 829, *combat, ébats amoureux*.

chainse 478, *tunique de toile fine qui se portait sur la chemise*.

change 576, *table ou boutique de changeur de monnaie*.

charaies 123, *sortilèges*.

cine 1186 *de segnier, faire signe à*.

cline 251 *soumise*.

coe 471, 486, *queue*.

coetee 628, *vestëure coetee, garnie de basques*. Cf. *Auberee*, v. 85, note.

coille (?) 808.

conbe 586, *petite vallée, pli de terrain*.

conduit 562, 800, *sorte de composition musicale*. Voir Godefroy.

controve 178, *invention, mensonge*.

copresse 948, *action de serrer, de comprimer*.

corber 739, *jouir d'une femme*.

corboille 820, *corbeille, panier*.

corpe, moie corpe 1159, lat. *mea culpa*, *formule de pénitence*.

corsal 522, *libertin*.

corsiere 712, 837, *de mauvaise vie, coureuse*.

Degroz 659, *plaintes*.

desjugler 58, *tromper*.

deslacier 1274, *délacer*.

desreer (se) 1283, *s'emporter*.

destroit 1009, *tourmenté*.

desvee 1158, *égarée, folle*.

- detor 1209, *débiteur*.
 dusil 1277, *dousil ou doisil (au propre) fausset de tonneau*.
 Enbesa (ambesas) 814, *coup de dés qui amène deux as*. Cf. Semrau, *Wurfel und Würfelspiel im alten Frankreich*.
 enboire 524, *enivrer, ensorceler*.
 engorllir 496, *mettre de l'argent dans la "gorle"*.
 enplumer 377, *tromper, décevoir*. Voir la note.
 enpres 444, *après*.
 escoil 677, *prendre escoil, prendre son élan, son essor*.
 escot 51, 1170, *butin, 87 partie de plaisir*.
 escout 65, 1027, *attention*.
 esgart 1027, *faire esgart, guetter*.
 esloissier (s') 1274, *se hâter, se précipiter*.
 essartier 394, *laboureur*.
 estorse 966, *torsion*.
 estosie (?) Lire *esjoie?*
 estupons, a est. 952, *le corps plié en deux, penché en avant*. Voir Roques, *Romania*, Octobre 1912, 608.
 Falorde 789, *bourde, tromperie*.
 fardet 19, *fard*.
 favele 858, *mensonge, fourberie*.
 faveler 1231, *cajoler*.
 ferré, vin ferré 89, 1260, *vin en cercle, en tonneau*.
 feu 581, 862, *terre, fief*.
 fusel, fussiaux 616, *fuseau*. Voir la note.
 Gest, en gest 372, *en chaleur(?)*.
 goloser 992, *désirer*.
 grisset 573, *grisset mantel, manteau de gris (drap gris de qualité commune)*.
 guimple 1077, *sorte de coiffure qui couvrait la face*.
 Haster 1249, *presser*.
 herbe 126, *herbe préparée comme boisson*.
 here 661, *figure, mine; faire here, faire la moue*.
 hetier 999, *s'amuser (Peut-être à corr. henter)*.
 Jael 1031, *femme publique*.
 jaelice 508, *vie de femme publique*. Voir *Romania* II, 239.
 jaiole 722, *géôle, en ma jaiole, en mon pouvoir*.
 jostisier 805, *dominer, se rendre maître de*.
 lange 575, *étoffe de laine. être au lange, être dans une grande détresse*.
 lechois 621, *sensualité, débauche*.
 leve 414, *de laver*.
 lisse 372, *chienné*.
 lobe 367, 918, *mensonge, tromperie*.
 loer 140, *approuver*.
 loer (se) 1130, *se mettre aux gages de quelqu'un*.
 Malauree 1159, *malheureuse*.
 mandi 49, *mendiant, indigent*.
 mescroire 182, *ne pas croire*.
 moisse 1273, *mouche (?)*. Voir la note.
 moisse 1275, *moîte (?)*.

- mol 573, *partie sensible* (ou peut-être *le dedans des doigts*). Ferir el mol, *tirer de l'argent, " taper," faire chanter.*
- mouvoir (de) 774, *venir de, avoir son origine.*
- mue 238, *muette.*
- mue 976, *lieu de retraite, endroit retiré.* Estre en m., *en cachette.*
- Neu 526, *bourse.*
- nieles 449, *sorte de pâtisserie.*
- Obier 293, *espèce de viorne, boule-de-neige.*
- oblee 458, *oublie, espèce de pâtisserie.*
- orne, a orne 1002, *l'un après l'autre, à la ronde.*
- parmain 459, *espèce de poire ou de pomme.*
- partir 497, *partir un denier, donner, payer.* Pour partir dans des sens rapprochés voir *Zeitschrift für Rom. Phil.* xxxvi, p. 86, et Tobler, *Vermischte Beiträge* V, 310-11.
- pert, 1046, 1264, *de paroir.*
- pert 1234, *de perdre.*
- pevree 457, *mélange poivré.*
- pissecchien, a p. 950, *figura Veneris.*
- plain 791, *à chair ferme, non potelée.*
- poroindre 1040, *oindre.*
- pois 653, *poids, changer a pois, changer de l'argent au poids.*
- porz 810, *pl. de porc.*
- porchacier 765, *se procurer.*
- porchaz 138, *entrer en porchaz, entrer en poursuite.*
- porvers 568, *porté au mal.*
- prainz 175, *enceinte.*
- prinseignier 446, *baptiser.*
- prover(se) 179, *se montrer.*
- Quernes 813, *terme de jeu, avec trois dés = 3 x 4.* Voir Semrau, *ouvr. cité.*
- queu 528, *cuisinier.*
- quialt 397, 863, 1194 *de coillir.* 1012 c. *sa guere, reprendre sa guerre.*
- quines 815, 816 (*corr. sines?*), *coup de cinq aux dés.* Voir Semrau, *ouvr. cité.*
- Raget 20, *passion dérégulée.*
- raienbre 201, raant 389, raans 723, raame 395, 727, *condamner à une amende, dépouiller.*
- ranc 538, *rang.*
- rasle 413, *râle, genre d'oiseaux.*
- recelee 971 en r., *en secret, en cachette.*
- recoillir 1305, *recevoir.*
- revate 631? *Voir la note.*
- rotruange 624, 799, *poème, sorte de chanson.*
- Sanpres 1162, *tout de suite, tout à l'heure.*
- saut 235, 1183, *de saillir.*
- saut 423, *de sauver.*
- sele 1140, *selle, metre ma sele, faire l'amour.*
- seue 1131, *de suivre.*
- so 79, *si lo.*
- sochant (souschant) 562, *accompagnement d'un morceau de musique.*
- soil 677, *siège, dedanz son soil, chez lui.*

sore (soldre) 776, fut. sora 1179, *se soumettre aux lois de*. Cf. Deschamps, *Le miroir de mariage*, v. 130—

Et li oiselet ne sont lent
 Chascun an de leurs niz niser
 Et par nature eulx aviser
 De pondre, couver et esclorre
 Leur poucins, pour nature sorre
 Qui cest entendement leur baille
 Afin que leur forme ne faille.

sonet 622, *chanson*.
 sopeçon 143, *doute*.
 sopoïs 311, *inquiétude*.
 soposte 948, a soposte, *figura veneris*.
 sovine 14, 252, 945, *couchée sur le dos*.
 sozaisselee 227, *garnie sous l'aisselle*.
 Tonleu 863, *impôt, taxe*.
 tresluer 978, *tromper*.
 trestor 696, *ruse*.
 us 706, *usage*.
 Val 586, *Voir la note*.
 vanche 115, *pervenche*.
 viaire 1078, *visage*.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

I. C. LECOMPTE.

A BRIEF CATALONIAN MEDICAL TEXT

COD. Matritensis A 113 (ahora 105) contains 124 ff. of parchment, ruled with the hard point, and measuring mm. 263 by 190; has quires eight ff. with one or perhaps two exceptions, all indicated by catch-words except at f. 98, where the "réclame" has been cut off by the binder's knife; and has at the end four ff. modern paper. It has the usual rubrics and alternation of red and blue initials. It is described by Hartel-Loewe, *Bibliotheca Patrum Latinorum Hispaniensis*, I. p. 349. The last of the Latin extracts ends at the middle of fol. 122 R°, after which by the same hand occurs a series of medical recipes in Catalanian and dating like the remainder of the book from the fourteenth century. The whole Codex was certainly of that same origin, in spite of a note at the foot of f. 117 V°, in Castilian. There are some cursive sixteenth century notes of no moment. Fol. 122 R° will be reproduced in one of the future numbers of *Palaeographia Iberica*.

As for the writing of the recipes, the rubrics are by a different hand from the rest, and the poetical addition 123 V°, by a third, while the musical rendition *ibid.* and first line of 124 R° are by a fourth scribe. These scribes do not differ much in their modes of procedure. They use samples of the Rounded Gothic of the period which overlapping, fracture, etc.; they employ the regular abbreviations which are indicated in the transcription by the use of italics. The medical text accents not merely *i* or *j* in the presence of similar letters, but also the conjunction *o* and double vowels. *Y* occurs with and without the dot; the dotted character replaces *ny* (e. g., in *seyor liyatge*), and sometimes has the value of *j*. Note the variation in spelling *ayga*, *aygua*, and *ayges*. Our text, which is given in a strictly palaeographical copy, indicates an evident tendency to combine, by way of *scriptura continua*, a series of words into a group, when resting under just one accent.

The occurrence of musical formulae within the medical text seems to be a piece of archaism worthy of the attention of students of the history of medicine.

As additions to the text itself, the reader must observe that at the beginning of l. 27 122 V° *ra* has been prefixed thus completing the verb *cura*; l. 40, same leaf, is prefixed *decoto* to be read after *drap*; a circle, foot of 123 R° and repeated l. 2 124 R°, warns the reader that the interrupted recipes now resume; finally, l. 6 123 V°, the word *dona* has been cancelled by the aid of dots and a catch-sign repeated in the left hand margin replaces it with *uirge*.

Aquestes son lesuirtuts de laygua ardent.prímeirament | de conseruament de cabeyls que no tornen blancs çoes | canuts.Sils cabeyls muylaras souen ablayga ardent en | larayl.conseruals de canes emultiplicals eles canes fansi cri | (30) nes.çoes ro(s)sos. Depoyls quis façen elcap ó altres uermes. | Aucien poyls etot liyatge de uermes. De fleuma grossa 7 uis- | cosa. Consumex fleuma grossa euis-cosa. Fleuma esdita fer | uor ó calor destómach. De casina enlocap. Si locap sera ca- | mos çoes roys ó plen desarna :elacotna sera souen unta | (35) da daquela ayga.nedeyal edestrouex lescasina. çoes sarna. De- | tiya delcap. Si alcu sera tiyos e souen semuylara son cap daque- | la ayga.cural perfeytament dela tiya. Dereuma cadarn ofleu- | ma. Sil cap es rauinasat ó encadarnat.equesia be vntat els | locs que dolran ahom abaquela ayga. e quen tingue enlaboca molt | (40) maraueylosament dissolue 7 consumex lafleuma. Degota rosacca. | Silacara sera lauada abaquela aygua destrouex gota rosasca.çoes | (122 V°) uermeylura quisfa enlacara o elnas. *contrae segona* (?). Delebroses o mesels. | Untament daquela ayga pallia e cobre mesels o lebrosos. De sordea. | Sin met hom enles oreyles remou sordea. Delagaya. Sihom | sen vnta les palpebres.çoes les pastayes dels huyls remou la | gaya eproige enlacrimes. De ualida o deffeyta.tacha.ocarnaç | (5) qui sia en huyl. Si ualida.çoes deffeyta. o tacha.ocarnaç sera | auistada en huyl.ladonchs sia posa.i. uegada deldia enlouespre.i. | goteleta poca daquela ayga ellagrímar daquela pacient. Empero enaque- | la ayga sia primerament des-soluta.çoes destemprada. Quamphora | qui es specia. E siluyl es fort doloros ofort rog.adonchs iaquesca hom | (10) aquela hobra epos hom enluyl perassuauyar ladolor. Encara rosea | dissoluta primerament enlet defembra eben colada abbel drap blanc. | ecant luyl opora soferir tornse hom a la obra delayga desusdita. | Adent dolor. Si drap delí ó coto ó estopa de li sera muylada 7 po- | sada souen sobre ladent en que ladolor lidara equa tenga delayga en (15) labocha. i. gran estona ladolor sen partex detot entot. De cranch | de gryuíues. Si hon tendra deladita ayga en laboca souen.cura | lo-cranch deles giyníues edelpeledar.etot escaldament debocha ede | lenga. Deparalitios. Ladita aygua cura paralitios.çoes | dessolui-

ment demembres ó condiment destomach. sidaquela ayga sera so |
 (20) uen untat efregat alfoc. dela espina delesquena delcap dentro
 aaual | enlafin. els muscles els colçes. etotes lesuintures delapart delfet
 | ge. edues uegades delasemana prena pilloles cubertes opal | liades
 abtera. oabfuyador odargent. e queles prene lo malaute | segons que-
 la força delaobra puga sostenir 7 regir enladieta co- | (25) uinent-
 ment esegons ordinament desauí metge. Item depalitios. Cu- |
 (ra) la dita ayga tots paralitios sies réebuda perlaboca com tots
 los | locs quilidolguen ne sien untats souen. De contreyts ó debils.
 Ladita aygua cura espasmats. ço son contreyts edebils de | neruis.
 layga recebuda perlaboca abtriaga. que triaga remoue | (30) destro-
 uex tot uecí deserpent 7 daltra mala cuca. Item demuts. Sila |
 dita ayga sera recebuda perlaboca fa parlar los muts si perdos | ans
 ne recebra lomut eques regesca enladieta deguda segons | ordinament
 desauí metge. equereceba cascur uespre. Diacene. pli | ris abmu(s)c
 Diantos. Diasicíníbo. dianison. aitant dela un com de | (35) laltre
 el mut que duga correya detujr delop enlacontinua tota | uia perlotit
 temps. De malaltía qui fa hom caer. Cura entota | edat: çoes en
 iuuentut óenuylea. Epilentía .çoes malaltia qui fa | hom caer.
 Demors deserp. Amors deserp siprens drap deli óestro | pa (decoto)
 aço muylat enladita ayga. eques sia posat sobre lomors cu- (40) ral.
 etota altra malautia uerínosa ecura lanafra econserua | la depudri-
 ment. Perpostema qui sia el polmon. Qui recebra la | dita ayga
 perlaboca solta e destrouex periflemonía que es postema del- | (123
 Ro.) polmon. çoes delleu. Depostema flautiática. Encara destro-
 | uex tota postema flautiática sobre posat. i. barcalet daram | feyt euolt
 amanera demig cercle ódescut detartuga plen | dayga demalues tota
 ora sobre loloc que dolra. elmalault | que sia regit segons lamanera
 delamalautia abconseyl de | (5) sauímetge. Afeuma destomach
 edeuermes. Destrouex | fleuma destomach layga recebuda perla-
 boca. etot liyatgede | uermes uermes axi com lombrichs ealtres uermes.
 Abelea decara eacon | seruauament. Siabladita ayga sera mesclada
 laterça part | dayga rosada. equesen lau hom souen lacara. nedeyala.
 econ- (10) seruela eniouent. Amalaltia defredor. Atota malatiade
 | fredor ual layga beguda equenunt hom loloch ondolra. | Apo
 plexia qui es opilament deseruel. Sil peledar óles | narils seran be
 lauades abladita ayga dedíns. cura apople- | xia qui es opilament
 deceruel. óescampament desanch soptosament (15) qui ofega hom
 oaucíu soptosament. Delitargia. qui es mor- | tificament demembres
 bres. Encara cura litargia. çoes morti- | ficament demembres com
 cau hom que sadorm que apenes lopot- | hom despertar. e es dit
 litargit homsomnolent. E cura co- | risa çoes escampament dumors.
 decap qui uenen enlaboca efaem- (20) bargament eofegament enles
 nars abesternut. De cadarn: | Cadarn etot liyatge dereumas. menía

capazion :çoes ma- | laltia *perque* esdeue homorat ófol.çoes *per* diment
 desen.loqual | esdeue *per* colres negres.ócrues.omolt uerdes.emalen-
 colia la | qual esdeue hom *per* colra negra. Adolor eatrencament
 eá- | (25) colp: Do per conseyl *que* entota dolor.etrencament.ecolp. |
 omacament.onafra.oespasma. Siay posada deladita ayga. | Decarn
 deploma acoure. Si carn degalina odaltre auçel | sera posa crua *per*
 i.nuyt enladita ayga.qui *per*.iij.uegades sie | distillada *per* lalambich
 axi com laprimera uegada.sera cuíta | (30) *per* feytament senes
 corompiment que lacarn nonauría nuyt | temps. Dom qui fos vntat
 delayga ardent. Sinuyl *per*sona | morta ert posada enladita ayga.
per.i. dia natural qui son | .xxiiij.ores.çoes *per*.i.dia e*per*.i.nuyt
 estaria tots temps *que* nos | corumpria.axi com siera blasmat.
 Despecies óaltra cosa qui | (35) sia mesa enladita ayga *per* salut.
 Si alguna especia odo- | rant.oarbre.oerba.sera mesa dins enlayga.
 ladita ayga re- | te lasabor 7 lauertut daquelacosa qui sera mesa
 enlayga elaodor. | Epuyt tota *per*sona pora usar daquela ayga segons
 lacalitat | decascuna *per*sona.odelamalautia *que* aura pus *que* les
 dauant dites | (40) coses sien enlayga abeurades.çoes *que* les coses
 sien meses | enlayga segons lonecessarií dela.*per*sona.epuyt pot usar
 delay | ga. De uí qui fos torbat. Viu *que* si daquela ayga era
 posada | en.i.uel ó tona en *que* agues uí *que* fos torbat.tornavlie |
 (123 Vo.)

Quant ay lo mon consirat tot lals es njient masdeu 7 com bem son
 apensatlo | comyat es forment greu. E carnos em de greus peccats
 carregats síu | enquerem podians esser *per*donat car seyor tal auem
 cuy plad merce pus que | platz eaxines acostumat. | Aytal seyor de-
 uem tembre 2 honrar quj *per*nos tots se uolc tant humiliar can tra-
 mes lan | (5) gol seu dona (corr. to uirge) saludar.el plac en ela
 entrar. Quan zo for fayt *per* nos altres asa- | luar *sus* en la crotz
 lo seu sangre uolc escampar.2 apres laseu mort alterz yorn ressus-
 citar | *quens* pogues tots deliurar. Al quarente dia uolc elcel puyar
 el.cinquante sent espirit | enujar *per* zo *quei* s emflames.7 poguessem
predicar la fe *per* nos asaluar. Apres la fi del | mon uenra *per*
 iutyar los bons els mals segons lur merjt cobrar galardó 7 trobar.
 car axi | (10) coue afar *per*dretra asaluar. | hon *per*yarem tots ensems
 lo creador *quens* do samor ens gart de mal 7 deiror: | Quant ay
 lomonsirat totlals es nient mas deu e com ben son a- | pensat lo
 comyat es forment greu. E carnos em de greus peccats car- | regats
 síu enquerem podians ser *per*donats.carseyor tal auem cuy | (15)
 plad merce plus que platz eaxines acostumet. Hon *per*yarem | (124
 Ro.) tots ensems lo creador *quens* do damor ens gart de mal deiror. |
 ensauirtut eretendría sabor decosa *que* hom hi meses.primerament |
 axi com salúa.óalcuna especia bona *que* hom hi meses. De uir- | tuti-
 bus: Moltes altres virtuts ha ladita ayga les quals cas | *cun* saui se

pora aesmar segons lasua saúiea en medicina. De- | (5) quartanes. Dien alguns queladita ayga cure quartana eto | ta febra emayorment quan ue defredor. Sila ayga réép hom | enans dela accessio. çoes enans dela ora quelafebra deu uenir. eual | aquartana sies donada abuí cuit abgermandira. çoes espe- | tia etroban hom als speciers. Per humors sobreflues. Atotes | (10) humors qui sien sobre flues corrompudes destrouexeconsumex en | cors dom.o en *persona*. mayorment quant son de fredors. Mas calor | natural esfoçe e crex e destrouex son contrari. Dels alambichs. | Lalembich enque hom fa aquesta ayga. fa hom mig debon ui fort se | nes ayga. e destillan hom la sisena part debona ayga per beure | (15) sil uí es bo esenes ayga eben uermeyl. edaquel uí matex qui roma | enlalembich fa hom altra aya meyns fort *quela* primera. Efan | hom meyns lameytat *quedel* primera sihom se uolra segons | que hom lauuytle ferfort.o simpla. eaquela segona es bona als | huyls ealacara. Epuys feytes les dues ayges gita hom | (20) lo ui delalembich emetni hom daltre sin uol pus fer delayga | Mas sihom uolra destillar altra uegada layga bona *que* primera | sera feyta tornla enlalembich sens altre uí. edestilla altra | uegada si pus fort lauolra epus afinada. edeu miruarla | terça part qui romanga enlalembich *que* non destille pus. E silauolra | (25) destillar la terçera uegada deu miruar la dehena part. çoes *que* la- | dehena part deu romanir en lalambich. Eaxi çoes destillada | .iij. uegades es molt fort emolt afinada. eaquela fa coure carn | degalina ó daltre auçel. axi com ia desus es dit. Delayga ardent afer. Lamanera delayga ardent afer. Nolaporia hom per- | (30) feytament mostrar si no ho ueya abhuyl. Lalambich es feyt | enaquesta forma de ios aseyalada eay ops. i. portadora plena- day- | ga freda perlaqual passe. i. cano uoltat en. iij. ujes e esde | lauto elalembich decoure estayat *dedins*: labonea delayga co- | nex hom ab. i. poch dedrap deli *que* hom muyle enlayga dita qui | (35) entre delalembich enlampoleta esíldit drap creme acostat al- | foc layga es bona eaxi aseyale hom auegades. equant ueu | hom quel drap muylat en ela nouol cremar. leuan hom lam | pola etraune hom *aquela* ayga. epuys tornelay lampola altra | (125 Vo.) uegada. o altra ampola erecy layga *eaquela* es lasegona ayga qui | nouol cremar si hom neuol fer. *Eaquela* es bona als huyls ealaca | ra perço com es pus simpla. Laboca delalembich edelcano edelam | pola clou hom lemuirona ab pasta pura *defroment* perço *que-* | layga nos pusca esbabrar ne la força pirdre que sia pus for- (5) | ts epus uirtuosa. Per fredor. Aquesta ayga es bona mer | ueylosament adones quisien defredor eque sen lauen lur huyls | elacara per lauista áauer pus bela ela cara. |

Laus tibi sit xpiste *quoniam* liber explicit iste. :

JOHN M. BURNAM.

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI.

THE SOURCES OF BARTOLOME PALAU'S
FARSA SALAMANTINA

THE various studies¹ that have touched upon the *Farsa Salamantina* have left open the question of sources. The present study aims to supply in part the lacking information. Palau states on the title-page that he is an *estudiante*, and that the play *es obra que passa entre los estudiantes en Salamanca*. In the prologue he testifies to its originality by calling it *vn muy nucuo argumento de vnos amores fingido[s]*.

When Palau wrote his play the schools of Encina and of Torres Naharro² had been in vogue for many years, and a new one was being formed under the leadership of Lope de Rueda. In the main the *Farsa Salamantina* belongs to the school of Torres Naharro, and as such it has long been classed. It has not been pointed out, however, that its nearest ancestor appears to be the *Comedia intitulada Tesorina*³ of Jayme de Guete. To bring out the differences as well as the points in common, somewhat extensive synopses of the two plays are given on the following pages.

In both plays the *introito*, put into the mouth of a rustic, contains the usual address to the audience, followed by obscene jests and stories of amorous adventures with the village maids. Generally this portion of the prologue is intended to be amusing and nothing more. The *Salamantina*, however, contains something of the

¹ This play is preserved in a single copy of the year 1552, now in the Royal Library at Munich. An excellent edition of this text with introduction and notes was published by M. Morel-Fatio in the *Bulletin Hispanique*, Tome II (1900), pp. 237-304. All studies of importance bearing on his text are discussed by the editor with his usual conciseness. An important review of this edition was made by M. Léo Rouanet in the *Revue Critique d'Histoire et de Littérature*, Nouv. Série, Tome LI (1901), pp. 177-179. Another study of Palau's works appeared recently under the title *Bartolomé Palau y sus Obras* as an introduction to Rouanet's reprint of the *Farsa llamada Custodia del Hombre* in the *Archivo de Investigaciones Históricas*, Tomo I (1911), pp. 267-274.

² See especially Menéndez y Pelayo: *Tres Comedias de Alonso de Vega*, Prólogo, p. XII (Gesellschaft für Romanische Literatur, 1905).

³ Republished by Urban Cronan: *Teatro Español del Siglo XVI*, Tomo I (Bibliófilos Madrileños, X, 1913), pp. 81-170.

satiric vein that is so highly developed in both of the plays of Guete. The following short passages show a similarity of treatment that would scarcely be evidence if considered alone, but that becomes significant when taken in connection with the other evidence. Palau chooses the dandy as the butt of his satire, Guete the courtesan.

(*Tesorina*, lines 50-59)

O pobretas!
van vnas esmoladetas,
tic y tic, menudeando,
que parescen anadetas,
segun que van culeando.
Lo primero:
no yran sin escudillero
que las llebe, de cabestro,
y anda el otro majadero
presumiendo de muy diestro;

(*Salamantina*, lines 60-69)

Esmolates
vereys a vnos galantes
mas que vn grillo yr hufanos,
y luego " beso las manos "
y por tierra los bonetes
con primores.
Otros ay que, avnque señores,
son tan nescios y abouados
que se hazen seruidores
y no estan avn vedriados.

The closing lines of the prologue offer further points of similarity.

(*Tesorina*, 125-49)

Quantis, que
vna que anoche tope
desfraçada, a vn callejon,
dile ansinas con el pie,
pensando que era melon;
.....
solo resta de presente,
porque quedemos en paz,
hazelles algun presente
con que reciban solaz.
Y vernan
vn moço con vn galan;
y del resto habreys auis,
todos quantos aqui estan,
lo vereys sino hos moris.
Juuentud
hos de Dios, y senectud,
con descansos a manojos,
y hos atieste de salud
hasta saltar por los ojos.

(*Salamantina*, 135-74)

Quantis que
vna que yo me tope,
saludela, juro al cielo,
arremeti en buena fe
y echela luego en el suelo,
.....
Solamente hora sabreys
que es vna farsa muy fina
llamada Salamantina:
lo de mas bien lo vereys.
Su intento
es vn muy nueuo argumento
de vnos amores fingido,
en cinco autos repartidos,
con muy largo cumplimiento.
Yr me quiero,
porque mi habrar grossero
pienso nos deue agradar.
Dios hos de paz y dinero
hasta querer rebentar!

As source evidence the passages cited are less convincing than might seem at first sight because they deal with commonplaces of the period. The noteworthy point is an omission for which a parallel is not to be found in any other play of this school that has been made accessible up to this time. Although Palau entitles his prologue *Introyto y Argumento*, like the *Tesorina*, it contains no synopsis of the play that is to follow. The eight comedias of Torres Naharro, the *Tidea* of Francisco de las Natas, the *Radiana* of Agustín Ortiz, and even the *Vidriana* of Jayme de Guete are all preceded by an *argumento* in which an adequate outline of the plot is given.

(Salamantina, Jornada I, 175-654) The student tells of the straits to which he has been reduced by his parents, who have been sending him promises instead of money. He meets Soriano who has spent his years in vain in the service of ungrateful masters. After a long discussion they decide to join forces. Their scheme is to obtain second-hand clothing, and assume the role of *cavallero* and *criado*. Then they will make love to some rich lady with the hope of getting her dowry. (655-784) At this point Juancho, a Basque, appears. He is in despair because he cannot write to his parents. In an almost unintelligible jargon, he tells that he has exchanged his cross-bow for a guitar from which he gets pleasant sounds by scratching its belly and twisting its ear. The student writes the letter and receives a small piece of money. Then Juancho disappears from the play. (785-989) The *bobo* Anton enters singing "*Sangre para las morcillas y tripas para el quajar.*" His mother Mencia, the *tripera*, has sent him to the slaughter-house for supplies, and he is singing the names of the articles wanted in order not to forget them. Anton praises his mother's sausages, and directs the two companions to her house. They go there at once, and haggle over the price of a sausage, which they finally order cooked. Then a quarrel arises over the mysterious disappearance of a piece of Mencia's bacon. Anton reenters singing out his purchases, and takes sides with his mother in the quarrel that closes the first act.

(Tesorina, Jornada, I)

Tesorino chides Pinedo, his servant, for not having delivered to Lucina a letter he had written. Pinedo claims that he has done his best. He suggests that a little money would be useful in winning the favor of Citeria, Lucina's maid. He receives a ducat with the promise of more as needed.

Citeria complains of the hard lot of a servant. Lucina enters and scolds her for her laziness. A piece of cheese that the maid had hidden is the subject of further rebuke.

(495-618) Gilyracho, a shepherd, brings milk to the home of Lucina and asks for something to eat. Citeria enters the house, saying that she will return at once. While she is absent, Gilyracho declares as follows his intention of attempting certain familiarities:

Dios, que la quiero tentar,
pellizcarla delas çancas,
procuralla de besar
por ver si consiente de ancas;

In attempting to carry out his plan he receives a slap, and a quarrel, from which the following lines are quoted, closes the first act:

Cit. Anda, ve para asnejon.

Gil. Guarda, doña carbonera,
no hos ahyque el requesson.

Ve en mal ora,
doña golosa, traydora,
tiñosa, suzia, bellaca,
sobacuda, cardadora,

(Salamantina, Jornada, II)

(990-1079) Beltran comes to the house and finds the door locked. He arouses Teresa, the servant, and a quarrel ensues. Salamantina intervenes, and Teresa tells her mistress,

“Señora, queria me besar
y avn hazer mas adelante.”

Salamantina reproves Beltran, then all enter the house to get the provisions for which Beltran had come.

1083-1253) The student and Soriano appear on the scene ready to carry out their schemes. The student succeeds in starting a conversation with Salamantina, who has evidently appeared at the window. He claims that he has long loved her in secret. Salamantina listens, but assures him that he can gain her favor only in case he is honorable and wishes to marry her. This is to the liking of the two plotters. When they go away, Salamantina tells Teresa to make the acquaintance of Soriano, and find out who his master is.

(Jornada III)

(1254-1368) Beltran continues his quarrel with Teresa. (The whole of this coarse dialogue, from which only a few lines need be quoted, is strikingly similar to the corresponding scene in the *Tesorina*.)

Bel. Ha, Teresa!

A do estas, avn te veas tessa?

Porque no me das el çurron?

pedorra, tetas de vaca;
nariguda,
tripera, carabaçuda,
ojegazos de cabron,
patiancha, dentarruda,
quartachos de sopicon!

(Jornada II)

The tongue-tied Fray Vegezio, confessor of Lucina, comes along alternately reciting Latin scriptures and scolding his gluttonous servant, Juan, who has depleted the priest's larder. He arrives too early at the house of Lucina, and goes away to say mass with the promise of returning later.

Tesorino laments his lot as an unsuccessful lover, citing many classic examples. Lucina sees him from within, and is prevailed upon by Citeria to appear at the window. Tesorino begs that Lucina reward his courtship, which has continued more than a year. Lucina promises to grant his wishes if he will use discretion. Their conversation is broken off by the return of the friar.

Tesorino is overjoyed at the results of his talk with Lucina. He at once concocts a scheme to get the friar's cloak and enter the house of Lucina in this disguise. This plan seems easy of accomplishment because of the absence of her father. When the friar comes out of the house, Tesorino pretends to be in flight. He claims that he has just wounded a man in a quarrel for which he was not

Acaba, sobacos de artesa,
quartachos de sopeton.

.

Queda en mala hora, potrosa,
despinfarrada vellaca,
descula pesebres, tiñosa,
pedorra, tetas de vaca.

O morruda,
patiancha, dentarruda,
monton de suzios handrajos!

(1369-1583) Teresa meets Soriano and asks information about his master. Soriano says that he comes from an illustrious family, and that he is in search of a wife. They have a typical servants' flirtation.

(1584-1789) A certain *bachiller* visits the house of Mencia. In the course of a long conversation, Mencia tells of her former high rank as a prostitute. The *bachiller* encourages her to believe that her charms are not entirely gone. Then he obtains the services of Anton as acolyte to aid him *conjurat la langosta*. A comic scene follows, in which Anton puts conjuring book to soak in a kettle.

(Jornada III)

(1790-1839) Leandro, the father of Salamantina, advises his daughter to lead a good life while he is absent on a trip he has to make.

(1840-1894) The alguazil meets Anton, who is selling *morzillas*. The officer insists on inspecting his wares for the welfare of the public, and incidentally satisfies his own appetite.

to blame. He is closely pursued and proposes an exchange of clothes in order to throw his enemies off the track. This trade is made quickly. When the friar has disappeared, Tesorino gains admittance to the house of Lucina on the pretext that he has left his psalter behind.

In the meantime the friar falls in with Pinedo. The latter at once recognizes his master's clothing. He threatens to kill the friar and has him prepare for death. He compromises, however, by taking away his master's clothing and giving the confessor a beating.

(Jornada III)

Gilyracho has a long talk with his donkey as he prepares for a nap on its back. He meets Peregrillo and tells him that he has lost one of his donkeys. The latter, however, shows him that he is riding on it.

Tesorino, still in the friar's garb, leaves the house of Lucina. He promises that he will go to her confessor at once and arrange for their marriage. He meets Gilyracho and Peregrillo, who show him the way to the friar's hermitage.

(Jornada IIII)

Pinedo goes to a dark alley by the house of Lucina. He meets Citeria and tells her that Tesorino is to come that night with the friar. He is told that Lucina is

(1895-2054) The student and Soriano approach the house of Salamantina when they have an encounter with Anton. The *bobo* is quieted with a drink. Then the student talks through the window with Salamantina. She is won over and promises to leave the house with him under promise of marriage. The student and his aid then enter the house.

(2055-2296) Beltran appears in a scene that occurs at night, and talks at length to his donkey. Salamantina and Teresa come out of the house with their companions. The dowry has been given into the care of the student. Beltran recognizes his mistress and her maid. He asks where they are going. Teresa answers:

"A casa de vna vezina;

calla ya, hermano Beltran."

But Beltran considers the presence of male escorts suspicious, and continues to raise a disturbance. The student tells Soriano to beat him into submission, but the result is that his cries bring the alguazil. The latter tries to arrest the party, but the women get back into the house without difficulty, while the student and his companion escape. Beltran and the officer knock at the door of the house. When they finally get a response, Teresa tells them that all the household has been in bed for hours. The alguazil con-

waiting and that her aunt is asleep. Tesorino arrives with the friar, who is in dread of the results of performing such a marriage. The party is admitted, and the friar performs the marriage ceremony, to which he adds a sermon in his stammering speech. It is then decided that Lucina go with Tesorino to his inn to await the return of her father. As they start away, Gilyracho comes up singing. He raises a disturbance. To quiet him, Citeria makes herself known. The shepherd wants to know who the other people are, what they are doing in that dark street, and where they are going. Citeria answers:

"que soy de casa salida
por passar a esta vezina."

Gilyracho insists that Lucina return home. He argues and threatens until Tesorino orders Pinedo to quiet him by force. The struggle between the servants and the escape of the principals close the act.

(Jornada V)

Timbreo returns home and finds his house in an uproar over the disappearance of his daughter. The father laments and wishes to put an end to his life. Gilyracho is suspected of knowing more than he is willing to tell. The servants are trying to get a confession out of him when Fray Vegezio arrives and takes Timbreo aside for an explanation. Soon the father returns with the an-

cludes that Beltran must have mistaken a couple of street characters for Salamantina and her maid.

(Jornada V)

(2297-2325) The student and Soriano divide the spoils, return their hired finery, and disappear from the play.

(2326-2611) Teresa advises Salamantina to deny everything. The loss of the money would not embarrass them, as it was a gift of her dying mother of which her father knew nothing. Beltran, who has been listening to them, enters and threatens to tell what he knows. Leandro returns at this point. Beltran tells his story, while Salamantina and Teresa deny all. The alguazil is called in, but he is convinced of the innocence of Salamantina. Beltran then concludes that he may have dreamed it all as he was sleeping on the back of his donkey.

(2612-2790) Anton's lunch is interrupted by Mencia, who wishes him to deliver some sausages. His mother has to promise a sausage to him in order to get him to do the errand. The *bobo* then departs, eating on the sly the one he is to deliver. The alguazil enters and demands a gratuity, because he has discovered that Mencia has been selling filthy wares. She denies the charge. Anton returns to take part in the

nouncement that he is willing to accept the results of what has been done in his absence.

A comic turn is given at the end by a quarrel between Gilyracho and a colored servant named Margarita.

quarrel. The alguazil helps himself to what he wants and departs.

Mencia and Anton close the play by running away to hide for fear that officers may be sent to arrest them.

In the absence of a common source, it seems evident that one of these plays is based to a considerable extent on the other. Since the late M. Rouanet has limited more definitely the period of Palau's activity,⁴ it is fairly certain that Palau is the borrower. The *Salamantina* dates from about the year 1550. The *Tesorina* is undated, but its mode of preservation is an indication of value for its date. The Madrid print once formed part of a collection of fifty-nine separately printed pieces,⁵ mostly undated, but containing five dates ranging from 1534 to 1537. As I have argued elsewhere,⁶ this collection must have been made soon after these works had issued from the press. If further proof of the priority of the *Tesorina* be needed, it is to be noted that the *Tesorina* is a type of drama that was popular in its time, while the *Salamantina* stands alone. It is extremely improbable that one whose plays conform closely to a fixed type should seek an outline for his plot outside of his own circle, but for the writer of a farce like the *Salamantina*, a play of the prevailing school would be the natural model.

It seems rather conclusive then that Palau used the *Tesorina* as the model for the framework of his plot. This imitation is shown in the *Introyto y Argumento*, the scene in which Beltran arrives at the house of Salamantina and quarrels with Teresa, the colloquy of Beltran with his donkey, the attempted elopement of Salamantina and the discovery of the plot by Beltran, and in the appearance in the last act of the father whose absence had left his daughter unprotected. The pretended suit of Salamantina by the student is probably to be added to the foregoing, yet the objection arises that a model might be found in almost any love play of the Torres Naharro group. The parallel passages show further that Palau was not a servile imitator. The verbal similarities are few in number,

⁴ *Archivo de Investigaciones Históricas*, Tomo I, p. 272.

⁵ *Bibliotheca Heberiana*, Vol. VI, No. 2818.

⁶ *Modern Philology*, Vol. VII, 509-510.

and are apparently recollections of scenes that had caught his fancy. There is small probability that he could have pieced the lines together with the book of his predecessor open before him.

The *Salamantina* is much richer in comic materials than the *Tesorina*. In addition to the main theme of the play and the scenes which find a parallel in the *Tesorina*, there are five episodes that merit attention apart. These are, the Juancho episode, Anton's encounter with the student and its immediate consequences, the *bachiller's* visit to Mencia and his excursion with her son, and the two occasions on which the alguazil pilfers Mencia's sausages. Persistent search has failed to uncover a possible prototype for these scenes in the schools of Encina or Torres Naharro. On the other hand, they bear a striking resemblance to the type of humor found in the *pasos* of Lope de Rueda.⁷

The comic repertory of the earlier writers of secular plays was rather limited. The domestics who were necessary to the development of the plot assumed frequently comic roles in which they parodied the love affairs of their masters, quarreled among themselves, and displayed such traits as gluttonousness, laziness and effrontery. The chief fun-makers, however, were the shepherds, who filled in the gaps in the action with their rustic buffoonery, and remained in the play to the end. With few exceptions, the mirth-provoking qualities of these characters were stupidity, rusticity, and vulgarity.

As far as we now know, it was Lope de Rueda who brought to the Spanish stage an entirely new set of dramatic traditions. He introduced a large number of new comic types drawn largely from the city classes. *Paje, simple, médico, ladrón, estudiante, alguazil, hidalgo, fregona, mundana*, these are some of the characters that jostle each other in his *pasos*. In structure the *paso* is a short episode that has little or no connection with the main plot of the play in which it is presented, and that often brings in new characters only to let them disappear from the play when the *paso* comes to an end. Its prevailing tone was one of picaresque realism. It portrayed before the people who frequented the public square the types that flourished in their midst. The *pasos* that survive are

⁷ Morel-Fatio discovered a passage in one of Rueda's *pasos* that seems to be a personal description of Palau. This would make it probable that Palau knew something of Rueda and his plays. See the introduction to the *Salamantina*.

somewhat varied in theme, but they show a marked tendency to represent shrewd tricks played by quick-witted rogues on their simple-minded fellows.

The traits here noted in Rueda's *pasos* are likewise to be found in the last mentioned comic scenes of the *Salamantina*. It must be admitted, however, that the sources of the various episodes cannot be traced. We might compare the following:

(Entra Anton, cantando.)

"Sangre para las morzillas
y tripas para el quajar!"

Salamantina, 785-786.

"Tripas traygo y sangre, a fe,
y para que, yo me lo se."

do., 958-959.

(Entra Joan de Buenalma, simple, cantando.)

"De casta de cornocales
traygo yo los huevos, madre,
pienso que buenos serane."

Rueda, *Obras* (ed. Acad.), II, p. 252.

A certain smutty pun found in the *Salamantina*, line 19, occurs in Rueda, *Obras*, II, pp. 228 ff. Other parallels of this sort might be found, but they could scarcely be considered source evidence, since it would be impossible to distinguish borrower from lender. Palau may or may not have borrowed entire scenes from Rueda. We do not know how much of Rueda's work is lost. It seems probable that most of the material in the *pasos* that were presented before 1552 had disappeared or been reworked beyond recognition before they were put in the printed form in which we know them. Moreover Palau did not imitate closely in the case of the *Tesorina*, which he must have seen in print, while his acquaintance with the works of Rueda would naturally come from seeing them represented. It is not by verbal coincidence but by similarity of methods and material that the relationship between the two men is apparent.

While the *pasos* that were published separately offer interesting analogies, a comedy in its entirety is a better subject of comparison, because it shows the way in which these little skits were presented. Of the four surviving comedies of Rueda, the *Medora* offers the closest parallel to the *Salamantina*. Here it is necessary merely to

call attention to a few points brought out in Professor Stiefel's well-known article.⁸ Professor Stiefel is inclined to consider this the earliest⁹ of Rueda's comedies. It should then represent better than any other the period of Rueda's activity that might have influenced Palau. Its main source is known: it is, therefore possible to distinguish Rueda's own additions. Two of these will suffice for the present comparison.¹⁰ In the midst of a plot which follows the Italian model closely, Rueda adds an episode in which Gargullo boasts of the beating that he is going to administer to Peñalba. However, when Peñalba and his friend Logroño appear, Gargullo turns arrant coward and suffers all their insults, only to lie shamelessly about his encounter with them as soon as their backs are turned. Then the main theme of the play is taken up again, while Logroño and Peñalba disappear from the play. The other scene is one that passes between Ortega and Perico. Both of these characters are inventions of Rueda. Ortega is the indispensable *simple*, who appears from time to time throughout the play. The page Perico is brought in just long enough to be cheated out of a generous provision of bread under the pretext that he is to share in a dinner furnished by Ortega. This theme, for which other parallels are to be found in Rueda's works, is practically that of three episodes in the *Salamantina*, in which Mencia is victimized by the student and the alguazil. Since no claim is made in this article that we have the direct sources of any portion of the *Salamantina* in Rueda's surviving works, it seems unnecessary to cite further examples.

All the five episodes in the *Salamantina* to which attention has been called are picaresque¹¹ and realistic in tone. They are wholly unrelated to the main theme of the play, and the characters that appear in them may not appear elsewhere. The fact that Palau wrote his *pasos* in verse is explained by the setting in which they are found. If it be proven that there is a close resemblance in a certain type of scene found both in the works of Rueda and of

⁸ *Lope de Rueda und das italienische Lustspiel*, Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie, XV (1891), pp. 183-216 and 318-343.

⁹ *I. c.*, p. 320.

¹⁰ *I. c.*, pp. 323-324.

¹¹ In his review, Rouanet called attention to the picaresque types in the *Salamantina*, and noted certain interesting analogies in older French literature.

Palau, it is almost certain that the latter is the borrower. No matter who invented the *paso*, Rueda at least made it popular in Spain and worthy of imitation.

The Salamantina seems, then, to fall between two schools of drama. The form and general arrangement of the main plot are based on a type created by Torres Naharro, but a notable portion of the comic scenes point to a direct imitation of the *pasos* of Lope de Rueda.

Whatever results may have been obtained in this article, it is still evident that Palau's claim of originality for his main theme has not been contradicted. It is likewise certain that the play is not the production of a novice, as might be inferred from some of the older studies dedicated to it, but of one who was well informed on the literary traditions of his time.

RALPH E. HOUSE.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

AN ITALIAN PROVERB COLLECTION

IT is thought that the following poem, taken from a manuscript long in the possession of the University of Chicago, will not be without interest to students of Italian and of proverb literature.¹ The literary value of the poem is assuredly not great, but it seems to us to take rank with many of the productions to be found in the *Scelta di Curiosità Letterarie*.

Its particular claim to interest lies in its resemblance, in several ways, to those proverb collections that formed part of the didactic literature of the Middle Ages. Many of the proverbs have their parallels—perhaps remote origin—in the *Disticha Catonis*: many are also extant, in some form, in modern Italian: all have their analogues in the proverbs of other nations.²

While it may not be categorically stated that any of the *Proverbia Vulgaria* that follow were composed directly upon the model of the *Disticha Catonis*, the indirect influence seems often evident. As didactic literature, the latter had great vogue during the Middle Ages, and passed, in the form of adaptations and more-or-less faithful translations, into almost all the vernaculars of Western Europe. In Italy the *Disticha* were represented by many versions in dialect, and naturally many of the proverbs found their way into popular speech.³

¹ I owe my acquaintance with this manuscript to Prof. Karl Pietsch, who drew my attention to its particular importance in another respect.

² Cf. Düringfeld, *Sprichwörter in der Germ. u. Rom. Sprachen. 2v. Leipzig, 1872*. Consult under separate words the *Diz. della Crusca*. Among the general collections consulted are: G. Capponi, *Raccolta di Proverbi Toscani*. Firenze, 1871; A. Tiraboschi, *Raccolta di Proverbi Bergamaschi*. Bergamo, 1875; G. Rampoldi, *I proverbi e le sentenze proverbiali*. 3 v. Milano, 1852; A. Monosini, *Floris Italicae*. 3 v. 1629.

³ For the most important old Italian versions, consult Vannucci in the *Scelta di Curiosità; Libro di Cato o tre volgarizzamenti del libro di Cato de' costumi*. Milano, 1829; A. Tobler in *Abhandl. d. königl. Akad. zu Berlin* (1884) I, 1-87; *Die altvenezianische Übersetzung der Sprüche des Dionysius Cato*: A. Miola in *Propugnatore* XI, 2, 319, a Neapolitan version of the 14th century: a free rendition of the 13th and 14th centuries in the "dialetto agnanino," in the *Rendiconti della Reale Accad. dei Lincei*, VIII, 245; Paitoni, *Bibliotheca degli autori antichi greci e latini volgarizzati*. Venez. 1766, I, 200).

Exigencies of rime and metre alone would go far to explain the varying interpretations of the Italian and French versions, purporting to be translations of the *Disticha*.⁴ The popularization of these proverbs would likewise further lend flexibility to the manner of expression, causing the popular imitations to depart, in the way of vocabulary and metaphors, so far from the common model as to become almost unrecognizable.

Denunciation of vices—intemperance, garrulity, prodigality, avarice, sloth, etc.—and praise of the opposing virtues, form the theme of most of the old proverbs. These themes are common to many minds working independently of each other, and are often couched in identical terms, so limited is language in vocabulary, scope, and variety. The *Disticha*, for example, apparently often gleaned from the *Book of Proverbs*, and in turn gave rise to similar proverb collections. The germinal idea, then, underlying each of the *Proverbia Vulgaria*, apart from the manner of expression, is a common moral concept, and cannot well be laid directly to the influence of the *Disticha*.

The author of our little poem termed his proverbs “vulgaria,” and probably gathered most of them from popular speech, whatever be their ultimate origin. The *Disticha* are of a philosophical and spiritual value: the *Proverbia Vulgaria*, on similar themes, are presented under cover of homely metaphors that make appeal to the ordinary mind.

The *Proverbia Vulgaria* are made somewhat unique by the fact that the compiler has adapted his proverbs to rimed couplets whose *lezioni* are diametrically opposed to each other. The purpose of each couplet is, as the title explains, to point out the golden “mean” (medium) of human conduct suggested by the two verses. The substance of the entire collection might well be expressed by several verses of the Venetian version of the *Disticha*.⁵

Fai quele cause,
Le qual te torna apro;

⁴ A notable example of such dissimilar translations may be seen in three O. Fr. versions edited by E. Stengel in *Ausgaben u. Abhandl. d. Rom. Phil.*, XLVII, Marburg, 1886; *Elies de Wincestre eines Anonymus und Everarts Übertragungen der Disticha Catonis*.

⁵ Tobler, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

Seate recordamento
 Per contrario
 Asciuar
 Quele cause,
 En le qual
 Perman error.
 Enagene certa speranza de fadiga.

As, in a later article, we shall describe the manuscript in detail, we defer further discussion of this fascicle, save to say that it is, to all appearances, of the second half of the fifteenth century, and, linguistically considered, gives evidence, in many of its forms, of Venetian influence.⁶

Ista sunt prouerbia uulgaria quorum medium tenendum est.

Ogna tropo sta per noce⁷ pocho focho mal se coce
 Chi tropo he sauiio may non aseguara⁸
 E quello che he mato may non ha pagura⁹
 Chi tropo pensa perde sua memoria
 Chi non pensa raro ha uictoria¹⁰
 Chi tropo çercha troua lo lupo nelo bosco¹¹
 Chi non çercha non troua in casa ruscho
 Chi tropo he seguro non troua compagno
 Chi ha pagura non sta a la dura¹²
 Chi tropo he presto non fuçe dal fogo

⁶ It was thought expedient to give in most cases, proverbs of similar import, wherever found. Considerable search has failed to reveal proverbs corresponding to a few of the *Proverbia Vulgaria*. Some are not recognizable as from the store of literary or popular sayings, and are probably *sententiae* fashioned by the compiler to meet the exigencies of the case. Any detailed exposition of the bibliography or history of early Italian proverb collections is here rendered unnecessary by the splendid introduction and notes of F. Novati in the *Giornale Storico* (ser. III, 15, 18, 54, 55: *Le serie alfabetiche proverbiali e gli alfabeti disposti nella letteratura italiana de' primi tre secoli.*), to which we gratefully refer.

⁷ Capp. 317, Ogni troppo è troppo; Novati XVIII, 122, Ogni nimio torna in fastidio; Bartsch (*Germania* III, 340), Quicquid erit nimium datur experiendo nocivum; *Dist.*, Quod nimium est fugito.

⁸ Capp. 199, Chi è savio, non è sempre sicuro.

⁹ *Proverbs*, XIV, 16, A wise man feareth and departeth from evil; but the fool rageth and is confident.

¹⁰ Capp. 279, verses identical.

¹¹ Capp. 316, Chi più boschi cerca, più lupi trova.

¹² Cicero, *Philipp.* II, 36, Timor non est diuturnus magister officii.

Chi tropo he pegro non ge troua logo¹³
 Chi he tropo largo non se po deffendere
 E lo avaro more inanzi che spendere¹⁴
 Chi tropo serue pare che habia tema
 Chi non serue he odiato dala çente
 Chi tropo parla recresce¹⁵ ala çente¹⁶
 Chi non parla non piace ala çente¹⁷
 Chi he tropo baldo spesse uolte falla
 Chi tropo se uergogna no sa come se balla
 Chi tropo ride fi tenuto da mato¹⁸
 Chi non ride fi tenuto corrotto he falso
 Chi tropo se ira perde sua bonta
 Chi non se ira sente da falsita
 Chi tropo he superbo non dura in terra
 Chi he humile non ge ua uoluntera
 Chi tropo se alza cade da scagno¹⁹
 Chi tropo se tene al basso si sena lo dano
 Chi tropo abraça mal liga so fasso²⁰
 Mal se mantene a chi non fa so procaço²¹
 Richeza subita pocho dura in terra

¹³ Trovare logo = Trovare pace, riposo. *Prov.* XV, 19, Iter pigrorum quasi sepes spinarum; Stengel, 133, Si tu ne fuiz peresce, Par dreite destresce, Malueise ert ta vie.

¹⁴ *Dist.*, Aeger dives habet nummos, se non habet ipsum.

¹⁵ Rinresce.

¹⁶ *Perc.* (ed. Potvin, 4427/9), Pour çou qu'il a oï retraire:
C'ausi bien se puet on trop taire
Com trop parler a la foïe.

Dist., Virtutem primam esse puta, compescere linguam.

Ovid, *Ars Am.*, II, 603, Exigua est virtus praestare silentia rebus:
At contra gravis est culpa, tacenda loqui.

¹⁷ Stengel, 142, Gard(e) tei de cels ki murne e taisant sunt.

¹⁸ Monosini, 328, Dal riso molto, conosci lo stolto; Dal continuo riso, raro hai buono avviso; Chi troppo ride ha natura di matto, E chi non ride è di razza di gatto. A much-used medieval Latin proverb was: Per risum multum possis cognoscere stultum.

¹⁹ Capp. 21, Chi troppo in alto sal cade repente. Cf. *Prov.* XVI, 18, and *Luke* I, 52.

²⁰ Capp. 316, Chi troppo abbraccia nulla stringe; Novati XVIII, 132, Chi tropo abraza pocho astrenghe.

²¹ Novati 55, Tu che procuri molti facti altrui, Sempre abbia cura de far ben li tuoi; 296, Pon cura sempre (co)si a facti tui, Che po' ssin ben e non sconci li altrui.

Novati, 133, Chi tosto acquista tosto perde.

Piçolo guadagno non fa granda altura
 Chi tropo se arme se armisse male
 Chi tropo se arma²² in batalia non uale
 Chi tropo he duro rompere se conuene
 Chi tropo he uano pocho se mantene
 Chi he adorno fi tenuto femenile
 Chi tropo he desconço fi tenuto da porçile
 Chi tropo ha le male guadagna de arte
 Chi he falso si fa mala parte
 Chi tropo uole tuto perdere he brama²³
 Chi non ha del suo falso se chiama
 Non te piaça tropo le losengere persone²⁴
 Chi non sa losengare non troua dona
 Chi tropo se faticha tropo se stanca
 Chi non lauora la roba ge mancha²⁵
 Chi tropo dorme pegra diuenta²⁶
 Chi non dorme non polsa bene
 Chi tropo mança si ne uene al mene
 Chi non mança lauorare non po bene²⁷
 Chi tropo beue sempre more de sede²⁸
 Chi non beue sede non se uede
 Chi tropo studia si ne uene malinconioso²⁹
 E mal impara chi non he dubioso³⁰

²² The three forms of this verb are readily explainable on the principle of such verbs as *incoraggiare* (= *incoraggire*, with or without inchoative ending).

²³ Capp. 5. Chi più vuole, meno adopera; 316, Chi tutto vuole, tutto perde.

²⁴ *Dist.*, Noli homines blando nimium sermone probare; another version reads; Non bene creduntur nimium qui blanda locuntur.

²⁵ Capp. 229, Chi non suda non ha roba; *Dist.*, Quum labor in damno est, crescit mortalis egestas.

²⁶ *Dist.*, Segnitium fugito, quae vitae ignavia fertur: Nam, quum animus languet, consumit inertia corpus. Stengel, 114, Repos e trop dormir, funt l'ume deuenir, malueis e pareceus.

²⁷ Capp. 285, Poco vive chi troppo sparcchia; Monosini 314, Chi troppo mangia la pancia gli duole, E chi non mangia lavorar non puole.

²⁸ Capp. 5, Chi assai desidera, assidera.

²⁹ Capp. 294, Chi troppo studia matto diventa, Chi niente studia mangia polenta. Cf. *Eccles.* XII, 12.

³⁰ Capp. 275. Chi non dubita di nulla, non sa mai nulla; *Dist.*, Discere ne cesses, cura sapientia crescit; *Rom. de Dolopathos* (Brunet et Mont., vv. 1636/7, Toz jors doit saiges hons douter, N'est pas saiges ki ne se doute. The theme is of common use with famous writers: Bacon, *De Aug. Scient.* V, 116, Prudens interrogatio quasi dimidium scientiae; Dante, *Par.* III, 130/3, Nasce a guisa di rampollo, A piè del vero il dubbio; ed è natura Che al sommo pingo noi di collo in collo.

E de çeschauna cosa lo superchio³¹
 Si come se dice se rompe lo couerchio
 E ognia cossa uole modo he misura
 Chi non fa cosi pocho si la dura³²
 Chi per si non sa e altrui non uol credere
 La mala uia el conuen prendere
 Chi da çouene non fa bene
 E da uechio la mala uia tene³³
 Chi per altru intra in briga per se n'esce
 La porta da intrare in briga
 E cossi granda como he lo pian de Lombardia
 Serue he non guardar a chi³⁴
 A chi tu offendi guardate da si³⁵
 O tardi per tempo putane he ladri roman dolenti
 Da far bene non da demora³⁶
 Che in pocho tempo el passa l'ora
 Chi te fa honore piu ch'l non sol fare³⁷
 O che te ingana o che te uole inganare
 Ne per dormire ne per fuçire
 Non se quista may honore³⁸
 El ualore che uene dal core

³¹ Novati, 142, Ognia cosa superflua rompe lo couergio; Capp. 317, Il superchio rompe il coperchio.

³² Capp. 233, Chi la misura la dura, chi non la misura non dura; 317, Ogni cosa vuol misura; Novati, 276, In tucte cose abbia modo e misura, Senza la qual nulla cosa dura. The theme is evidently of Latin origin: Horace, *Sat.* I, 106, Est modus in rebus; Plautus, *Poenul.* I, 2, Modus omnibus in rebus, soror, optimum est habitu. Nimia omnia nimium exhibent negocium hominibus ex se.

³³ Capp. 143, Chi non fa bene in gioventù stenta in vecchiaia; Novati, 269, Chi in gioventù si piglia qualche vizio, Quando l'è vecchio attende a quel uffitio; Quaglia, 49, Consuetus vizio cuique juvenilibus annis illud in extremo dimittere tempore nescit.

³⁴ Capp. 42, Servi, e non badare a chie; Novati, 384, Serui a ciascun e non guardar a cchi.

³⁵ Capp. 144, Di chi mal fai, di lui non ti fidar mai.

³⁶ Novati, 128, Al ben fare non indusiare; 51, Quando ben puoi fare non lo tardare.

³⁷ Capp. 3, Chi t'accarezza più di qual che suole, o t'ha ingannato o ingannar ti vuole; Novati, 55, Quando alchun to losingha e porge laude, Amico, guarti, ch'armato è di fraude.

³⁸ Capp. 227, A gloria non si va senza fatica; Frezzi, *Quadrir.* IV, Nessun mai per fuggir, o per riposo, Venne in altezza fama ovver in gloria; Sallust, *Jug.* 85, Ignavia nemo immortalis factus.

Si fa l'omo agrandire³⁹
De quello che tu oldi abatine le doy parte
De quello che tu uedi abatine la metade⁴⁰
Qui non assuesit uertutibus dum iuuenesit
Amicis nesit discere quando senesit⁴¹

Amen.

SHIRLEY GALE PATTERSON.

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO.

³⁹ Novati, 54, Servire e ben dire fa l'uomo ingrandire.

⁴⁰ Capp. 132, Quel che vedi poco credi, quel che senti non creder niente; Novati, 267, A ciò che ti fie decto non farai fede, Ch'a pena se può credere quel c'om vede.

⁴¹ Capp. 143, In gioventù bisogna acquistare, Quel che in vecchiezza ti può giovare; Tobler, 78, Inprende da quelli, qe se amaestradi; Ma tu medesmo amaestraras quili, que nose amaestradi.

THE STAGE SETTING OF HELL AND THE ICONOGRAPHY OF THE MIDDLE AGES¹

FOR the investigation of the relationship of stage decoration to the art of the Middle Ages, the way has been opened by the remarkable and, for the most part, sound thesis of M. Mâle² that the mystery plays gave new subjects to the art of the fifteenth century, transformed and renewed its spirit by placing models on the stage which the artists tried to copy. Thanks to the stage, the art of the fifteenth century became more realistic and less symbolic. It is only when M. Mâle pushes his excellent theory to the extreme and claims that certain scenes were traditional and existed beforehand on the stage merely because they are found represented later in art, that one becomes skeptical. For instance, he points out that the seating arrangement in the scene of the Last Supper in Michel's *Passion* corresponds to the arrangement in the picture of the Last Supper by Thierry Bouts, which is anterior to the play by more than twenty years. Instead of reaching the conclusion that the playwright copied the artist, M. Mâle makes the rather too bold statement, without any proof, that such an arrangement was traditional in the theatre and was not invented by Jean Michel.³ In a like manner he insists that other playwrights before Jean Michel must have used the episode of the old woman, Hédroit, who forges the nails for the crucifixion, because the scene is found in works of art anterior to Michel's play.⁴ Proceeding in this manner it would be only too easy to reconstruct the stage decoration of the period; but if the evidence of the iconography is to be of real value in solv-

¹ This article may be regarded as a chapter supplementary to the author's *Stage Decoration in France in the Middle Ages*, New York, 1910, and is believed to add satisfactory proofs of certain of the positions maintained in that work. A further article on *Stage Decoration and the Unity of Place* has recently appeared in *Modern Philology* (X, pp. 393-406), which carries on the treatment of the subject to more recent times.

² Mâle: *l'Art religieux de la fin du moyen âge en France*, Paris, 1908.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

ing certain problems of stage setting, it must be corroborated in every case either by the stage directions or the lines of the play.

While one does not deny the influence of the stage on art, yet there must have been a reciprocal influence of art on the stage; and one cannot help feeling that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible in many cases, to discover in which direction the influence was working, since it often happened that the artist was also a scene-painter. Only to mention a few examples, Jehan Yvonet at Lyon, Thévenot at Rouen, Jean Fouquet, all of them artists, had charge of mounting plays,⁵ and the question naturally arises whether they were more influenced in producing works of art by their work as scene-painters, or whether as scene-painters they merely enlarged their miniatures. The question is almost unanswerable except as we remember that they were artists first and last, and scene-painters only on occasion.

The author of the *Pseudo Méditations* of St. Bonaventure influenced the theatre profoundly, according to M. Mâle; and through the intermediary of the theatre he influenced the plastic arts.⁶ For proof of this statement M. Mâle asserts that the pillar supporting the roof of the stable in which Christ is born, was mentioned in the *Méditations*, and that, coming from that source, it was represented on the stage where it was copied by the miniature artists. This being a matter of theory, it seems easier to believe that some devout miniature painter was poring over this very popular book and with great exactness and painstaking illustrated what he read, than to believe that some grosser artisan, such as a stage carpenter, wishing to build a scene for the stable, consulted the *Méditations* and reproduced what he found in the text. It is more likely that stage carpenters enlarged some already existing miniature; or, if in this case the artist and the stage carpenter were the same, it is more probable that he, as stage carpenter, reproduced his more careful work as artist. The stage setting was ephemeral; put up and torn down in a short time. The miniature would have a much longer life. It is more likely that the artists, who were to be influenced by this innovation of the pillar, saw it in a permanent miniature, than

⁵ Cohen: *la Mise-en-scène dans le théâtre religieux français du moyen âge*, Paris, 1906, p. 127.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 34.

that they saw it on some stage which only existed for a few days. The picture would more easily become a type and a lasting model, not only for artists, but also for stage carpenters.

To find a specific case in which the stage was reproducing a scene represented in art, one only has to turn to the first day of Michel's *Passion* in which a piece of scenery is called for, showing a temple with fifteen steps which the child Mary ascends. The apocryphal gospels of Matthew⁷ and the *Evangile de la Nativité de Marie*⁸ are the source of this episode which was painted in the fourteenth century by Taddeo Gaddi,⁹ Giovanni da Milano,¹⁰ and Orcagna,¹¹ all of whom represented the fifteen steps with the utmost exactness over a hundred years before Michel introduced the scene into his *Passion*.¹²

Thus, just as at present, when a stage manager produces a play whose setting is laid in some former century, he copies his scenery from pictures, so the stage manager in the Middle Ages must have found many ideas for his scenery in the iconography of the period. The influence of art and that of the stage must have been reciprocal; and, by consulting the iconographic representations of Hell in the Middle Ages, we hope to throw some light upon the scenery representing Hell on the stage. We shall use this evidence only as corroborative of the evidence furnished by the plays, for to do more than this would be hazardous in the extreme.

The horrible, grinning dragon's head, which was sometimes used to represent Hell, is so strikingly dramatic that its use has been misinterpreted, and it has been given undue importance in the minds of investigators of the subject because it is so remarkable. The statement made by Professor Petit de Julleville and the one which has been too generally accepted as containing the whole truth, reads

⁷ Michel, C.: *Evangelies apocryphes*, Paris, 1911, p. 72.

⁸ Caput VI.

⁹ Santa Croce in Florence.

¹⁰ Santa Croce in Florence.

¹¹ Or'San Michele in Florence.

¹² One wonders if the temple in the *Hours* of the duc de Berri only has fourteen steps because the artist did not realize why his model had fifteen. This miniature goes back either directly or indirectly to Taddeo Gaddi, as is plainly seen from the architecture and the decoration of the temple. See reproductions in Venturi, *La Madonna*, Milan, 1900, p. 110 ff.

as follows: "*Le premier plan de la scène . . . recouvrait et cachait l'enfer, et lui ouvrait un passage par une trappe cachée derrière un rideau, qui représentait une tête hideuse et grimaçante.*"¹³ Professor Wright, in discussing the question in his recent *History of French Literature*, repeats this idea, saying: "At the back and on a higher level was a platform representing Paradise, and in the direct foreground or at one side of the stage was a hideous and grimacing head concealing a trap-door, whence the devils and demons emerged from Hell."¹⁴ In some cases, as in the *Martyre de sainte Apolline* this arrangement of scenery existed, as is sufficiently proved, by Jean Fouquet's miniature representing the stage setting.¹⁵ There are many other plays, however, in which scenery was not arranged in this manner and in which Hell was not represented by a dragon's head; or, if the hideous head did serve as the entrance to Hell, it did not "cover or hide" in any way the interior of the abode of the damned.

In regard to the position of the stage of the scenery representing both Heaven and Hell, we have attempted to prove from evidence furnished by both the lines and the stage directions of plays that these two scenes were often at opposite ends of the stage, and that sometimes they were on the same level, while at other times Heaven was above the stage proper.¹⁶ The iconography of the Middle Ages furnishes strong corroborative evidence that all of these arrangements of scenery existed. To cite specific cases, the lines of the prolog to the *Résurrection du Sauveur* of the thirteenth century, speak of Hell on one side of the stage, as they enumerate the scenes, the *maisons* on the other side and, finally, Heaven.¹⁷ It was evidently a stage of one level with Heaven and Hell at opposite ends. In 1474 at Rouen, the *Passion* was produced with Heaven set on the eastern end of the stage, according to the direction which reads: *Premièrement vers Orient, Paradis*. Then come the other scenes, and finally Hell is placed at the other end of the stage toward the

¹³ Petit de Julleville: *les Mystères*, Paris, 1888, p. 388.

¹⁴ Wright: *A History of French Literature*, New York, 1912, p. 79.

¹⁵ Reproduced in Cohen: *op. cit.*, p. 86.

¹⁶ Stuart: *Stage Decoration in France in the Middle Ages*, New York, 1910, *passim*.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

west.¹⁸ Heaven is shown at one end of the stage and Hell at the other end in the *Vie de S. Martin*, according to the prolog.¹⁹ The stage directions of the *Trois Doms* call for Heaven above the eastern end of the stage and Hell on the western end.²⁰ The Valenciennes *Passion* of 1547 was set thus, according to the somewhat inexact miniature of the stage.²¹ In Lucerne in 1583, the market place was set for the *Passion* with Heaven in front of the inn "zur Sonne" on the eastern side of the market place, while Hell was on the opposite side.²²

This arrangement of the stage is the result of the influence of the symbolic iconography of the Middle Ages. As a rule, the western façade of the churches was the one on which the scene of the Last Judgment was carved, since by false analogy the scholars of the period connected the word *occidens* with the verb *occidere* (to kill), and hence the region of the dead was toward the west.²³ Also in the plastic representations of the Last Judgment, Heaven and the saved souls are accorded the honor of being on the right hand of Christ, while Hell and the condemned are relegated to his left. This influence of art on the stage is shown in the Provençal play of the Last Judgment in which Paradise is *a la part dextra*, and the damned are *a la part senestra*.²⁴ In other words, the stage carpenters copied the scenes as portrayed on the portals of the churches; and it is, therefore, not surprising to find Hell toward the west and Heaven on the opposite end of the stage.²⁵

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 116.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 168.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 175.

²¹ Reproduced in Suchier und Birch-Hirschfeld: *Geschichte der Französischen Litteratur*, Leipzig, 1900, p. 286.

²² See plan in Cohen: *Geschichte der Inszenierung im Geistlichen Schauspiel des Mittelalters in Frankreich*, ins Deutsche uebertragen von C. Bauer, Leipzig, 1907, p. 74.

²³ Mâle: *l'Art religieux du XIII^e siècle en France*, Paris, 1898, p. 6.

²⁴ Stuart: *op. cit.*, p. 156.

²⁵ Cf. Montaigne: *Essais*, livre I, ch. XXX, *Des cannibals*. Ils croient les ames éternelles; et celles qui ont bien merité des dieux, estre logées à l'endroit du ciel où le soleil se lève; les mauldites, du costé de l'occident.

Churches continued to be orientated in this way until the fifteenth century. In 1646, however, Mère Angélique Arnauld complains that, because this orientation of churches was obsolete, the Jansenists were accused of being sun-worshippers, since their chapel at Port Royal faced the east. See, St. Cyres: *Pascal*, New York, 1910, p. 245.

As for the different levels of the Heaven and Hell scene, it is hardly necessary to call upon the iconography to prove that Heaven was often above the stage, since that situation of the scene has never been questioned. The Fouquet miniature, just mentioned, however, corroborates this theory. That Heaven and Hell were set on the same level at times is a theory which we have lately advanced, relying upon the evidence of the plays themselves. We find that this is practically confirmed by such representations as that on the portal of St. Etienne at Bourges where the gate of Heaven and that of Hell are shown on the same panel on the same level.²⁶ This idea is also carried out in a miniature to be found in the *Cabinet des Estampes* in which Paradise in the form of a building is on the same level as the dragon's mouth.²⁷

The earliest extant play which calls for a Hell scene is the *Sponsus*. This simple drama is in reality a primitive Last Judgment play, as the story of the Wise and Foolish Virgins was symbolic of the judgment of Christ. Unfortunately there is no possibility of deducing any exact information in regard to the setting of Hell from the lines or stage decorations, and it is not until the thirteenth century that we find a play in which the scenery portraying Hell is described. In the *Adam* play, however, Hell is represented by gates from which smoke escapes.²⁸ This scene, which is called Hell in the play, is, of course, Limbo, which, as we shall show later, was generally conceived as a prison or stronghold and thus was shown on the stage. That this conception existed in the thirteenth century is proved by a Parisian miniature of that date in which Hell is pictured as a stronghold with towers from which devils defend the place. The gates are broken down, for Christ is freeing the prophets.²⁹ This, in turn, is also Limbo. Hence we are not surprised to find on the stage just such a scene for the *Adam* play in which no dragon's head is found. The miniature confirms the idea of the setting gained from the play.

In the *Miracle de Théophile* Hell seems to have been used as a

²⁶ See von der Muelbe: *Die Darstellung des Jüngsten Gerichts an den Romanischen und Gotischen Kirchenportalen Frankreichs*, Leipzig, 1910, for reproduction of portals.

²⁷ Mâle: *op. cit.*, p. 499.

²⁸ Stuart: *op. cit.*, p. 35.

²⁹ Grimouard de St. Laurent: *Guide de l'art chrétienne*, vol. 4, p. 362.

mere exit. Certainly the interior was not visible; and, as far as can be judged from the play itself, the Hell scene was unimportant, there being no indications of tortures, smoke, flames, dragon's head, or any of the attributes of the scene as it appeared in the Mysteries or the purely religious dramas. All the scenery that is necessary is a door by which Satan can enter and leave the stage. In the *Taymouth Hours*,³⁰ written about 1320, this miracle is illustrated; and when the devil withdraws, defeated, he is pictured disappearing from the scene through a high narrow door, like that of a sentry-box. So much scenery and no more was needed for the play; and it seems to be more than a coincidence that the artist should have illustrated the setting. He may well have seen the play, and this perfunctory representation of Hell may well have appeared on the stage, since it appears in the iconography. In purely religious plays of the Last Judgment, the dragon's head would naturally be the usual setting, because the entrance to Hell was shown in that form in the plastic representations of the scene; but in the miracle plays, the Hell scene was unimportant, was generally merely an exit and was probably some such device as shown in the *Taymouth Hours*.

Hell is just as unimportant in the *Miracles de Notre Dame*; but perhaps in the action of the devils loading the souls into a wheelbarrow and trundling them into Hell³¹ is found another example of the realistic influence of the stage on art. In a book of *Hours*³² of the fifteenth century the devils are shown bringing the souls to Hell in a wheelbarrow. This was evidently a stage device to overcome the difficulty of carrying an actor and was copied by the artist.³³

The *Miracles de Ste. Geneviève* show the tortures of Hell when Nero is placed in a cauldron and the devils blow upon a fire beneath it. The cauldron as an instrument of torture is a very com-

³⁰ Thompson: *Some Illuminated Manuscripts*, London, 1912, p. 21.

³¹ *Miracle de l'evêque que l'arcediacre murtrit*, l. 1074.

³² British Museum, Add. MS. 29433f89; reproduced in *Reproductions from Illuminated Manuscripts of the British Museum*, 1910.

³³ Professor George Elderkin has called my attention to a similar scene in an Etruscan wall painting showing two angels, one of the lower world, drawing a soul to Hades on a two wheeled cart. Is this a coincidence or the survival of a tradition in art? The entrance to Hades also bears a strong resemblance to the entrance of Hell depicted in the *Taymouth Hours*. For the Etruscan painting see Micale: *Storia degli Antichi Popoli Italiani*, Milano, 1836, vol. 4, plate 65.

mon *motif* in the iconography of the Hell scene. On the judgment portal of the cathedral at Reims, the cauldron alone is found representing Hell as it does in this play. In other instances it is combined with the dragon's head, sometimes resting in the open jaws, as on the cathedral at Rouen. The morality of the *Maulvais Riche* requires an interior scene in Hell in which Lucifer appears, as is usual; and the cauldron is used as an instrument of torture. The Hell scene of *Bien avisé et mal avisé* is set to resemble the kitchen in the house of a great lord, according to the stage directions. This is plainly a development of the flames, smoke, and the cauldron of other scenes in Hell. Also, in this play, the dragon's jaws are employed to cover the depths of the infernal regions. There can be little doubt that the stage managers in such cases were dramatizing the scenes of the portals.

In the *Nativité*, *Passion*, and *Résurrection* of the Jubinal collection, Hell is divided into two parts: Limbo, the first stage in Hell in which the prophets are held prisoners, and Hell proper.³⁴ The division was probably taken from the *Elucidarium* of Honorius d'Autun in which the author describes Hell as consisting of two levels: an upper part in which the just who died before Christ are kept, and a lower part where are those forever damned. A thirteenth century manuscript contains a miniature in which this idea is carried out, showing Limbo as the gate of a stronghold or prison, and outside of it a dragon's head covering the lower part of the infernal abode.³⁵ Hell is thus divided in this miniature into two distinct parts just as the scene demands in the plays of the Jubinal collection. It is a question whether the dragon's head was used as a part of scenery in these plays; but there were the gates which were bolted at the command of Satan, corresponding to the gates in the miniature. Moreover the division of the scene is corroborated by the picture.

The *Passion*³⁶ of the Arras manuscript is one which demands a very elaborate scene to represent Hell. Here again, according to the lines and stage directions, we find a stronghold with gates, which can be barred and chained, towers and windows. A strong ram-

³⁴ Stuart: *op. cit.*, p. 96 ff.

³⁵ Cloquet: *Eléments d'iconographie chrétienne*, Lille, p. 279.

³⁶ Richard: *le Mystère de la Passion*, Arras, 1891. See lines 5130, 1110, 5522, 18169, 18225, 20890. Also Stuart: *op. cit.*, p. 111.

part is built in front of the principal donjon. Cannons guard the windows, while the devils stand as sentries on the walls. The building is called a *palais diabolique*. Lucifer is within, bound by a chain in the fire of Hell. Snakes, toads, monsters, and the cauldron add to the horror of the scene, but the dragon's head does not seem to have appeared as a part of the scenery. Such a scene of a *palais diabolique*, as far as the exterior is concerned, appears in the painting of the Last Judgment done about 1430 by Lochner. But how was the interior of the scene shown? The wall toward the audience must have been taken out of the scenery. This would be the natural procedure, and this theory is borne out by the evidence obtained from certain plastic representations of Hell. In the miniature mentioned above, found in the book of *Hours* of the fifteenth century, Hell is shown as a diabolic palace with the wall removed in order to show the interior. The roof is supported by pillars and by two round towers of small circumference extending above the roof, which takes the form of a battlement. At the entrance two devils are dragging in souls, while just within, a large crowd of the damned stand before the gigantic Lucifer. On the other side of him a cauldron contains some suffering souls, while snakes and monsters inflict tortures on others. There is no dragon's head in the picture, which is evidence that the Hell mouth was not an indispensable part of the setting.

An English fresco at Stratford-on-Avon³⁷ shows the interior and exterior of the Hell; but it is hard to tell just what the picture represents because of the faulty perspective. It appears at first glance that the artist has attempted to depict two regions in Hell, such as required by the plays of the Jubinal collection, with Limbo above and the pit of Hell, with its tortures, below. It may be, however, that the pit of Hell is merely in front of the tower and we are looking over the walls. The picture at any rate is strong evidence that the interior of Hell was set on the stage, and that different degrees of punishment were indicated. A Last Judgment³⁸ by Jeronimus Bos (1470-1518?) presents yet another possible means of disclosing the interior of Hell, which may have been employed on the stage. The dragon's mouth is wide open;

³⁷ Reproduced in Gayley: *Plays of Our Forefathers*, New York, 1907, frontispiece.

and looking down the throat one sees the familiar cauldron containing the damned. The mouth is the opening of a flaming rocky cliff, and far in the background is the stone gate. Did the jaws at the Rouen *Passion* (1474), which, according to the direction "opened and closed when necessary," disclose the interior of the scene in this manner?

The means of showing the interior of Hell by taking out the wall toward the audience dates far back of the period of elaborate stage settings. On the south portal of the Chapelle de Perse at Espalion, which dates from the eleventh century, a dragon's head serves as entrance to Hell; and behind this entrance Lucifer sits enthroned, surrounded by serpents and monsters, the whole scene being open to view. Thus the scenery must have been set on the stage whenever it was necessary to show the interior of Hell; and thus the dragon's head would in no way "cover and hide" the interior of Hell, as has been believed. The scenery must have been arranged in this manner for the *Mystère des Trois Doms*, played at Romans in 1509. A dragon's head served as entrance to Hell; but, at the same time, scenes take place within Hell and the interior must have been exposed to the view of the spectators.³⁹ Naturally it was in the plays, such as the *Vie de S. Didier*, in which there was no scene in Hell, that the *gueule d'enfer* could serve as an exit and could "cover and hide" the depths of Hell. The dragon's jaws serve for just that purpose on the judgment portals at Amiens and Chartres.

Another scene in which the interior of the infernal regions is shown is found on the east portal of the church at Conques, which, dating from the eleventh century, hence antedates any elaborate setting of Hell, and may well have been a model for stage-carpenters. Here we also find the explanation of the vexatious question as to how the dragon's head and the gate could both serve as the entrance to Hell at the same time. On this portal the door of the gate is thrown back. The bolts and locks, so often mentioned in the plays, are plainly shown. The dragon's head is thrust through the open door. It is thus that the entrance to Hell is described by Brunon d'Asti, who is evidently the source of this idea, when he

³⁸ Original in the Detroit Museum of Art.

³⁹ Stuart: *op. cit.*, p. 175.

says: "By breaking down the doors of Hell, Jesus Christ broke down the doors behind which Leviathan hid his face."⁴⁰ Behind this entrance, as it is represented at Conques, is found a scene in Hell with Lucifer, the devils, and the usual torture, all recalling the plays of the Middle Ages. The judgment portal of the cathedral at Autun also portrays the dragon's head sticking out at the entrance. In reconstructing the scenery for the *Jour du jugement*, Roy attempted to solve the problem of combining the two entrances suggested in the miniatures of the manuscript, by claiming that the dragon's head was the real entrance, while the gates appeared as a second entrance behind the jaws.⁴¹ We have already advanced the theory that the dragon's head was behind the gates, appearing when the gates were opened, and we find this theory substantiated by the evidence of these portals.⁴² The action of the plays made it necessary for Christ to come to the portals first and break them down in order to enter Hell. A curious means of representing this action and yet showing the grotesque head is portrayed in the tapestries of La Chaise-Dieu in which Limbo is in the shape of a devil's head. The souls are emerging from an opening in the back of the head, the broken doors lying on the ground; and the face is turned in the opposite direction.⁴³

At Rouen, on the judgment portal of the cathedral a gate is represented serving alone as the entrance to Hell. There is a dragon's head within but it is upright and holds a cauldron in its jaws. It is neither an entrance nor an exit into the lowest depths, but a part of the tortures. Thus one seems very safe in assuming that in some plays only a gate appeared on the stage to represent the entrance, as is implied by the lines and stage directions. We have already attempted to show that the dragon's jaws were not indispensable to the Hell scene,⁴⁴ and when one finds no reference to them in a play, but instead finds a gate called for, there is no reason to believe that the jaws appeared on the stage. The absence of the dragon's head as the entrance to Hell in certain iconographic

⁴⁰ Mâle: *l'Art religieux du XIII^e siècle*, p. 480.

⁴¹ *Le Jour du jugement*, publié par Roy, Paris, 1902.

⁴² *Op. cit.*, p. 178.

⁴³ Reproduced in: *Speculum Humanae Salvationis*, Lutz und Perdrizet, Mülhausen, 1907, plate 125.

⁴⁴ Stuart: *op. cit.*, p. 177 ff.

representations of the scene, confirms the absence of it on the stage, unless it is directly called for in the play.

The *Passion*, played at Rouen in 1474, represented Hell by two scenes: the jaws which opened and closed when necessary, and Limbo in the form of a prison.⁴⁵ The stage carpenter could have found his model for the Hell mouth on the *Portail des Libraires* of the cathedral. On the church of St. Maclou, Hell is represented as a building from which flames are escaping and perhaps Limbo on the stage was copied from it. Limbo is constantly represented in art as a prison—or at least a stronghold, and as a rocky cavern with gates.

The elaborate Hell of Michel's *Résurrection* was divided, according to the explicit stage directions, into four parts: Limbo, Purgatory, Limbo of the infants, and the pit of Hell. These scenes were evidently set on four different levels with Limbo highest and the pit of Hell lowest corresponding to the description of Hell given by Lazurus in Gréban's *Passion*.⁴⁶ The impulse to make different levels in Hell and to differentiate the regions of eternal punishment had come to the artists from such books as the *Vision de Saint Paul*⁴⁷ and from the reported journies through Hell of Dante, St. Brendan, Owen and Tungdal. The description given by Lazurus in Gréban's play, composed about the year 1450, seems to have been derived from Mielot's *Miroir de la salvation humaine*⁴⁸ written in 1448. The four levels in Hell are described in chapter XXVIII, just as Lazurus recounts them, with the pit of Hell lowest of all, above that comes the *enfer des enfans*, then Purgatory, and finally Limbo. Michel, however, probably derived his scene from Gréban's *Passion*, since he was intimately acquainted with this play, as his *Passion* is an amplification of two *journées* of Gréban's *Passion*. Michel's scenery is so exactly described by the stage directions, which are the best source of information, that one would hardly feel the lack of corroborative evidence from the field of art; but Hone cites an engraving of Wierx of which the model may have been a Hell scene similar to the

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 117.

⁴⁶ Stuart: *op. cit.*, p. 129 ff.

⁴⁷ Mâle: *l'Art religieux de la fin du moyen âge en France*, ch. IV.

⁴⁸ *Speculum Humanae Salvationis*, Lutz und Perdrizet, Mülhausen, 1907.

one in Michel's play. Hone describes the picture as follows: "A landscape with a view of the earth beneath, containing a semi-section of hell, which is a globe divided into four parts: (1) The devil sitting on the body of Judas in the center, surrounded by a body of fire containing the damned in torment. (2) The compartment surrounding the centre is the flame of purgatory with its inhabitants. (3) The next circle is the limbo of infants, whose heat seems to be less fierce. (4) The outer circle is the limbo of the Fathers to which Christ has penetrated from his grave, with a banner surrounded by a light cloud filled with angels." We find here the four divisions of Hell as shown in the Michel *Passion* with the exception that Purgatory and the Limbo of the infants are transposed.⁴⁹ This may be another example to support M. Mâle's theory of the influence of the stage on art at this later date; but the early date of the portals at Conques and Espalion forces us to admit that models for scenery to represent Hell were ready at hand for the scenic artists. The stage and the iconography of the Middle Ages exerted a reciprocal influence.

The iconography of the Middle Ages, therefore, confirms the theory, which we have already advanced, that the stage decoration of the period was very elastic, especially in regard to the Hell scene. The simple gates developed into the elaborate stronghold or prison. Hell could be represented on the stage merely by a cauldron. A dragon's head could serve as an entrance in other cases, and could conceal the depths of Hell, or these depths could be revealed if necessary. The dragon's head could be combined with the gates, or it could be separated from the portals of Hell and symbolize Hell proper in contradistinction to Limbo. Finally, Hell could be set without the dragon's head appearing at all. To reconstruct a typical stage of the Middle Ages, except on the broadest lines, is quite impossible, so varied was the treatment of the one scene, which has generally been considered as consisting of merely dragon's jaws.

DONALD CLIVE STUART.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

⁴⁹ Hone: *Ancient Mysteries Described*, London, 1823, p. 121.

THE DISCUSSION OF THE DATE OF THE BIRTH OF BOCCACCIO

SINCE the publication of my article *The Date of the Birth of Boccaccio* in the *ROMANIC REVIEW* in 1910,¹ four discussions of the question have appeared: one by Hauvette, in his *Pour la biographie de Boccace*;² one by Bacci, *La data di nascita di Giovanni Boccaccio*;³ one by Massèra, in his *Studi boccacceschi*;⁴ and one by Torraca, in his *Per la biografia di Giovanni Boccaccio*.⁵ I am returning to the subject in order to revise my own results in view of certain arguments advanced by Hauvette and Massèra, and to criticize those arguments in the four discussions that seem to me inconclusive.

The course of the argument in my previous article was as follows:

The direct sources of information as to the date in question are a statement by Petrarch in a letter to Boccaccio written July 20, 1366, the 62d anniversary of Petrarch's birth: "ego te in nascendi ordine, nouem annorum spatio antecessi"; and a statement by Filippo Villani as to Boccaccio's age at death. Petrarch's statement may have any one of four connotations: first, "you were born on the 9th anniversary of my birth"; second, "you were born on the 9th anniversary of my birth or on one of the 364 days following"; third, "you were born within half a year of the 9th anniversary of my birth"; and fourth, "you were born in the calendar year subsequent by 9 to the calendar year of my birth." If the fourth connotation is the correct one, Petrarch may have had in mind the Roman civil year, beginning Jan. 1, or the year *ab incarnatione*, beginning March 25. If the statement has the first connotation, it implies that Boccaccio was born July 20, 1313. If the second, it implies that he was born in the period July 20, 1313–July 19, 1314. If the third, it implies

¹ I, 367–372.

² *Bulletin italien*, XI (1911), no. 3, pp. 1–10 of the reprint.

³ In *Studii dedicati a Francesco Torraca*, Naples, 1912, pp. 191–194. Bacci summarizes this article in his *Studi recenti sul Boccaccio*, in *Miscellanea storica della Valdelsa*, XIX (1911), pp. 115–116.

⁴ *Zeitschrift für rom. Phil.*, XXXVI (1912), pp. 192–201.

⁵ Milan, 1912, pp. 5–11.

that he was born in the period Jan. 1313–Jan. 1314. If it has the fourth connotation, and Petrarch had in mind the year *ab incarnatione*, it implies that Boccaccio was born in the period March 25, 1313–March 24, 1314. The proper inference from the statement of Petrarch is therefore that Boccaccio was born in 1313 or in 1314 before July 20. The proper inference from the statement of Villani is that Boccaccio was born in the period Dec. 21, 1312–Dec. 20, 1314. Both statements are reliable. The proper conclusion is, therefore, identical with that derived from the more precise statement, that of Petrarch.

Hauvette accepts my inference from the statement of Villani, and accepts as rigorously correct my inference from the statement of Petrarch. He then continues:

Cependant, à y regarder de plus près, on s'aperçoit aisément que cette différence de neuf ans ne résulte pas d'un calcul fait par Boccace et transmis tel quel à son ami: c'est Pétrarque qui a tiré cette conséquence des données que son correspondant lui avait fournies: "Ainsi donc *si tu m'as dit la vérité*, je t'ai précédé de neuf ans." Évidemment, Boccace lui avait dit son âge. Quand? Nous l'ignorons. Sous quelle forme? Probablement d'une façon très vague, sans indication de mois, ou du moins Pétrarque l'avait oublié. Boccace avait pu dire: "Je suis né en 1313"; ou bien, à une date déterminée, il avait énoncé le nombre de ses années, et son ami avait conservé le souvenir précis de ce chiffre: 1313; Pétrarque fait donc une soustraction très simple et obtient le reste neuf, sans pouvoir tenir compte des fractions d'année.

He then notes that "1313" probably meant to Petrarch the period March 25, 1313–March 24, 1314.

Hauvette's argument is this: Petrarch's statement is secondary, and is based upon an original statement by Boccaccio; we should therefore reconstruct, from the statement of Petrarch, the original statement of Boccaccio; and we should base our inference as to the date of the birth of Boccaccio upon Boccaccio's original statement as reconstructed, rather than upon Petrarch's secondary statement. This argument is unquestionably valid, but its logical application seems to me to lead to results quite different from those reached by Hauvette. He suggests two plausible reconstructions of Boccaccio's statement, and bases his inference upon those reconstructions, but he does not attempt to consider *all the possible* reconstructions of Boccaccio's statement. It should seem evident *a priori* that if

Petrarch's statement be regarded as a secondary interpretation it may correspond to any one of several possible different statements by Boccaccio; that our basis for argument becomes therefore wider than before; and that the results will necessarily be less precise than before. As a matter of fact, it can readily be shown that Petrarch's statement may have been derived from a statement by Boccaccio consistent with a date as early as Dec. 1312—the earliest date possible in view of Villani's statement—for the birth of Boccaccio; or from a statement by Boccaccio consistent with a birth-date as late as Dec. 1314, the latest date possible in view of Villani's statement.

Suppose, for instance, that Boccaccio was born in Dec. 1312, and that he stated his age to Petrarch in August 1360. His statement would then have been "I am 47 years old." Petrarch was at that time 56 years old: he would therefore have formed the impression, from such a statement, that he was nine years older than Boccaccio. Suppose now that Boccaccio was born in August 1314, and that he stated his age to Petrarch in June 1360. His statement might then have been either: "I am 45 years old" or (in view of the fact that his next birthday was so near) "I am 46 years old." Petrarch was at that time 55 years old. If Boccaccio made the statement "I am 46 years old," Petrarch might have formed the impression that he was nine years older than Boccaccio.⁶ This supposition puts no strain on probability. By the admission of such a strain the hypothetical date of the birth of Boccaccio could be moved to the very latest day made possible by the statement of Villani. Suppose that Boccaccio was born Dec. 20, 1314, and that he stated his age to Petrarch early in July 1360. On June 20, 1360, Boccaccio had passed the mid-point between his attainment of the age of 45 and his attainment of the age of 46. He might then possibly have said "I am 46"; and from such a statement, made at that time, Petrarch, then 55, might have formed the impression that he was nine years older than Boccaccio.

⁶ If Boccaccio was born in May or June 1314, there are several forms of statement he might have used in 1360 before July 20 from any one of which Petrarch might have inferred that he was nine years older than Boccaccio. *E. g.*: "I am 46" (literally true after Boccaccio's birthday in 1360, and approximately true even in the early months of 1360); "I was born early in 1314"; "I was born in the spring of 1314"; "I was born in May (or June) 1314."

Strictly, then, the proper conclusion as to the date of the birth of Boccaccio is identical with that derived from the statement of Villani: namely, that Boccaccio was born in the period Dec. 21, 1312–Dec. 20, 1314. Since the admission of the possibility that Boccaccio was born late in 1314 rests upon a rather unlikely supposition as to the statement of Boccaccio to Petrarch, it may be regarded as improbable that Boccaccio was born late in 1314.

To his main argument as to the date of the birth of Boccaccio Hauvette adds a secondary argument intended to define more closely the *probabilities* as to that date. This argument may be summarized as follows: Boccaccio's father left Paris not later than Sept. 1314; he left Paris not long after the birth of Boccaccio; the birth of Boccaccio occurred before March 25, 1314; it therefore occurred, probably, in 1314 before March 25, or else late in 1313.

Although I believe, as will presently appear, that the probabilities in the case are very much as Hauvette here claims, I cannot feel that they are established by his argument, for the first link in that argument seems to me very weak. The claim that Boccaccio's father left Paris not later than Sept. 1314 is based upon a Florentine document of Oct. 1318,⁷ in which Boccaccio's father and Boccaccio's uncle Vanni request exemption from assessment in the communes of Certaldo and Pulciano on the ground that they have been residents of Florence "iam sunt quatuor anni et ultra." But this does not prove that Boccaccio's father came personally to Florence in 1314. Crescini points out the inconclusiveness of the document:

Possiamo anche pensare che a Firenze nel 1314 si trasferisse realmente il solo Vanni, che solo legalmente vi apparisse trasferito anche il fratello Boccaccio. Se la Ditta de' Chellini da Certaldo era composta de' fratelli indivisi Boccaccio e Vanni, non necessitava che materialmente i due componenti di essa insieme passassero ad abitare sulle rive dell' Arno: bastava che lo facesse uno de' rappresentanti, mentre l'altro poteva seguitare a risiedere in Parigi.⁸

Della Torre argues the matter at some length,⁹ and agrees with

⁷ Printed by Della Torre, *La giovinezza di G. Boccaccio*, Città di Castello, 1905, pp. 11–13.

⁸ *Contributo agli studi sul Boccaccio*, Turin, 1887, p. 41, n. 1.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 6–8. Della Torre points out that a mere power of attorney from Boccaccio's father to Vanni would have been enough to constitute Vanni's

Crescini. Hauvette's note—"Aucune raison ne nous oblige, ne nous engage meme à supposer que Vanni avait pu s'y installer d'abord seul, en son nom et au nom de son frère (Crescini, *Contributo*, p. 41, n. 1)"—hardly suffices to remove the doubts raised by Crescini and Della Torre. Moreover, some indication that Boccaccio's father did not return to Florence in 1314 is afforded by the fact that his name has not been found in Florentine documents of 1314, 1315, or 1316, while it appears rather frequently in Florentine documents of 1317 and the following years.¹⁰

The limitation "before March 25" which appears in the last two links of Hauvette's secondary argument is taken over from his main argument, which I have already criticized.

Massèra accepts the conclusions of Hauvette, and seeks to reënforce them by the following argument:

When Boccaccio went to Naples he had almost completed his 14th year; between his arrival and his enamorment there intervened not less than 89 and not more than 100 months; his enamorment occurred March 30, 1336; his arrival therefore occurred in the period Nov. 1327–Oct. 1328; his birth therefore occurred late in 1313 or early in 1314.

As an absolute argument this can hardly stand, for each of its first three links has merely the strength of probability. The first premise rests upon certain autobiographical statements in the story of Caleone in the *Ameto*:

"fanciullo cercai i regni etrurii, e di quelli, in più ferma età venuto, qui venni"; "mi vidi alla entrata de' luoghi cercati: ove io entrai, e l'età pubescente di nuovo, senza ridurre la veduta donna ne' miei pensieri, vi trassi"; "colei, che, nella mia puerizia vegnendo a questi luoghi, apparitami e baciato mi, lieta m'avea la venuta proferta"; "colei, che nella mia puerizia . . . mi apparve."

I am convinced that Massèra's interpretation of these much discussed passages is literally correct; but it should be noted that it is very possible that in these statements the youthfulness of Boccaccio at the time of his arrival in Naples is exaggerated. The dominant residence in Florence the legal residence of Boccaccio's father. Della Torre remarks that the existence of such a "ditta" as Crescini refers to is not established. It is indicated, however, by one of the Parisian documents cited by Hauvette (p. 5 of the reprint).

¹⁰ Della Torre, pp. 6–14.

literary motive of the story of Caleone is the predestination of Fiammetta to Caleone. The statement of that predestination is obtained by means of accounts of two preliminary visions of Fiammetta vouchsafed to Caleone, and the first of these visions occurs just as Caleone reaches Naples. For the effectiveness of the predestination motive it was desirable that the occurrence of the first vision should be placed as early as possible. That Boccaccio regarded its early dating as important is clear from the fact of his insistence upon the idea "she who *in my boyhood* appeared to me in vision." A specific influence, tending in the direction of such exaggeration, was the influence of Dante's account in the *Vita nuova* of the beginnings of his love for Beatrice. That love began, in a certain mystic sense, in Dante's boyhood. It is therefore evident that familiarity with the early date assigned by Dante to the beginning of his love for Beatrice might have led Boccaccio to represent the event with which he associated the mystic beginning of his love for Fiammetta as occurring in his boyhood, even if in reality it occurred after the beginning of adolescence.

The second link in Massèra's argument depends upon the accuracy of Caleone's statement that six years intervened between his arrival at Naples and his dismissal by Abrotonia. It is possible that the number "six" is unintentionally inaccurate. The *Ameto* was written after Boccaccio's return to Florence: it is possible that lapse of memory or faulty calculation may have led him to write the number "six," even if the interval was actually of five or of seven years.¹¹

I have recently shown that 1336 cannot be regarded as certainly the year of the enamorment.¹²

As an indication of probabilities, however, Massèra's argument

¹¹ Some time ago my friend Mr. Rudolph Altrocchi had the great kindness to ascertain for me the readings of ten Florentine MSS. and eleven early editions of the *Ameto* for the two passages in the story of Caleone containing numerical chronological statements: "e ancorachè Febo avesse tutti i dodici segnali mostrati del cielo sei volte" and "Ma sedici volte ritonda, e altrettante bicorna ci si mostrò Febea" (*L'Ameto*, Florence, 1834 [in *Opere volgari di Giovanni Boccaccio*, vol. XV], p. 153). The several MSS. and editions are unanimous in confirming the "sei" and the "sedici," except that one MS., Naz. Palat. 362, apparently of the 15th century, has "dieci" instead of "sedici."

¹² *The Enamorment of Boccaccio*, in *Modern Philology*, XI (1913-14), 39-55.

seems to me admirable in process and excellent in detail, though it should be modified, I think, in two minor respects. The dismissal by Abrotonia probably occurred, as Massèra shows, in Nov. or Dec. 1334. Caleone states that six years intervened between the arrival in Naples and the dismissal. If the arrival had occurred late in 1327, it seems to me highly probable that Caleone would have said "seven years" rather than "six years." It seems to me, therefore, that it may be regarded as improbable that the arrival occurred late in 1327. Then, since the arrival probably occurred in 1328, and since it probably occurred before the completion of Boccaccio's 14th year, it follows that the birth of Boccaccio probably occurred in 1314.

Massèra offers an argument in favor of arrival in Nov. 1327, pointing out the fact that Boccaccio's father went from Florence to Naples at some time between Sept. 1 and Nov. 30, 1327. It cannot, however, be more than a matter of conjecture that he took the young Boccaccio with him. There is nothing at all improbable in the supposition that he left Boccaccio in Florence, and sent for him after finding a good position for him in Naples. Neither in the story of Caleone nor in that of Idalagos does Boccaccio imply that he came to Naples with his father: indeed, the story of Idalagos seems to contain implication that he did not come with his father: "mi diè per padre un pastore chiamato Eucomos, i cui vestigi quasi tutta la mia puerile età seguitai"; "tanta fu la paura, che abbandonati i paternali campi, in questi boschi venni l' apparato ufficio a operare."¹³

Massèra's limitation "early" in 1314 is taken over from Hauvette, and does not result from Massèra's own argument. That argument, indeed, gains in probability just in proportion as the date of the birth of Boccaccio is advanced in 1314.

The arguments and conclusions of Bacci and Torraca are virtually identical. Both think my inference from Petrarch unjustified in its allowance of so long a period of possibility. The essential portion of Bacci's argument is as follows:

Possiamo ben esser sicuri che il Petrarca, dunque, con molta ponderazione, scrivendo al Boccaccio, notava cifre e date, e faceva

¹³ *Filocolo*, vol. II (= *Opere volgari*, vol. VIII), Florence, 1829, pp. 238, 243.

calcoli, com'egli soleva. Si deve, perciò, dare la massima importanza alla frase *io ti precedetti di nove anni*, come prova che il Boccaccio al 20 di luglio del 1366 non aveva oltrepassato i 53 anni, o, almeno, non li aveva ancora raggiunti, o li aveva superati di pochissimi giorni, perché il Petrarca, in vena di computi, non avrebbe tralasciato di aggiungere un *quasi* o un *circa*; e, anzi, avrebbe dovuto propendere piuttosto verso l'8° che verso il 9° anno, dato il contesto, e lo spirito ironico dell'osservazione a proposito del Boccaccio. Più giovane di quello che l'amico gli risultasse per i precisi computi, che veniva esponendo, non sembra che egli volesse farlo in quel momento. Qual data poi gli avesse e come indicata l'amico Boccaccio, non c'è noto (la questione sarebbe allora bell' e risolta), ma si può arguire che essa fosse tale e in tal modo fornita da lasciar essere, e credere a noi, esatto, o approssimativamente esatto, il calcolo comparativo del Petrarca. Anzi, le parole del Petrarca fanno supporre che l'indicazione dell'amico fosse precisa, appunto perché è preciso quel *novem*. Cosicché a me non par dubbio che si debba andare ben poco prima, o ben poco oltre il luglio 1313, per fissare la data di nascita del Boccaccio.

Torraca says, with reference to Hauvette's summary of my examination of the statement of Petrarch:

L'osservazione è acuta; ma, considerando il testo *de plus près*, a me sembra se ne possa arguire soltanto che il Boccaccio era nato verso il mese di luglio del 1313. Il Petrarca non dice indeterminatamente:—Io ho nove anni più di te; bensì:—*Io sono nato nove anni prima di te*, e lo dice nel giorno anniversario della propria nascita, mentre ricorda sinanche l'ora—allo spuntar dell'alba—che toccò “la soglia di questa vita.” Se differenza notevole, in più o in meno, vi fosse stata, non gli sarebbe, certo, mancato modo di accennarvi; soprattutto se fosse stata di mezzo anno e più, come l'Hauvette finisce col supporre.

The common argument of Bacci and Torraca is then this: since Petrarch says “nine years” instead of saying “about nine years,” he must have meant “precisely nine years.” That argument fails to take account of the several possibilities pointed out in my previous paper and in the first part of this paper. Its procedure *ex silentio* seems to me unjustified. One might as well argue just the other way: since Petrarch says “nine years” instead of saying “precisely nine years,” he cannot have meant “precisely nine years.” When a man means to imply that he is almost exactly nine years older than another man, he does not say simply: “I am nine years older than

B.”; he says: “I am almost exactly nine years older than B.” Moreover, when a man says “I am *about* nine years older than B.,” he ordinarily means, *not* “I am within a few months of being precisely nine years older than B.,” but “I am somewhere from 8 to 10 years older than B.”

All that Bacci says about the exactness of Petrarch’s computations regarding his own age is perfectly true, but it does not follow that Petrarch was equally interested in the details of Boccaccio’s age. Petrarch was an infinitely more important person, to Petrarch, than Boccaccio—or any one else.

Torraca’s claim that there is a difference in implication between “ego te in nascendi ordine novem annorum spatio antecessi” and “I am nine years older than you” is hardly susceptible of proof. The difference seems to me merely the difference between commonplace and literary phraseology.

Strictly, then, I repeat, the exact conclusion as to the date of the birth of Boccaccio is identical with that derived from the statement of Villani: namely, that Boccaccio was born in the period Dec. 21, 1312–Dec. 20, 1314. It has been shown to be improbable, on the one hand, that his birth occurred late in 1314, and, on the other hand, that it occurred before the beginning of 1314. Briefly, then, the matter may be stated thus: Boccaccio was born in 1313 or 1314, probably in the first half of 1314.

ERNEST H. WILKINS.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

STUDIES IN THE IRPINO DIALECT

THE study of Italian dialects is becoming more and more difficult. The spread of education, military service, and the growth of internal commerce cause the formation of various strata of speech in the same community. Southern dialects have not received the same attention as the Northern, and we believe they should, before they become hopelessly entangled with Italian and with neighboring dialects.

The dialect studied in this treatise is spoken in the territory inhabited in ancient times by the Irpini. At present, it is known as the province of Avellino, or, by a former name, as the *Principato Ulteriore*. It comprises the *circondari* of Avellino, Ariano, and Sant'Angelo dei Lombardi, and has a population of about 400,000. The province is bounded on the North by the province of Molise, on the North-East by Capitanata, on the East by Basilicata, on the South by Principato Citeriore, and on the West by Terra di Lavoro. It is here that we find the *forculae Claudinae* and also the lakes Am-sanctus and Mofete which still give forth pernicious gas as in the times of Virgil.

This dialect bears a striking resemblance to Neapolitan. One of the main divergencies is found in the quantitative accent still preserved in Neapolitan; for the tonic vowels being prolonged cause a weakening of the post-tonic vowels to *e*. In the Irpino dialect the accent denotes mere stress, and the post-tonic vowels are less liable to weaken.

On the whole, the vowels develop much in the same way as in Neapolitan. The difference appears in the fate of the consonants. Initial *b* when confused with *v* is dentilabial, while in Neapolitan it is bilabial. *FL* never gives *fr* as in the Neapolitan *frauto: flauto*, *PL* may give *pr* in Neapolitan: *prebba, pratea, Irpino plebba, platea*. Initial *d* often becomes *r*, while that seldom happens in Neapolitan, thus we have *ri, ronna, rinto, ruie*. Initial *l* becomes *r* in this dialect; it remains in Neapolitan. *R* becomes *l* in many words: *lebbrica, leggistro, lepubbrica*; also *d: demerio, decreà*; in Neapolitan, it

remains. *CU* before *a, o, u*, becomes at times *qu*: *quiro, quisto, questa, quera*; but in Neapolitan we have: *chillo, chisto, chesta, chella*. *G* before *a, o, u*, may give *v* as in *varzone, vozza*, but not so in Neapolitan; before *e, i*, we find that it may give *j*: *jennero, jelà*, forms not found in Neapolitan.

Medial *b* becomes *v* with more frequency than in Neapolitan. Likewise the change from *d* to *r* is more common in this dialect: *mierico, caruta, verè*. *LL* often becomes *dd*, a development not to be found in Neapolitan; thus: *gaddina, iddo, edda, quedda*. *LM* often becomes *rm*: *parma, sarma*, but remains in Neapolitan. *LT* does not become *rd* as in some cases in Neapolitan; so that we have *utemo* and not *urdemo*.

The pronunciation is the same as that of Italian, with the exception that unaccented *e* and *o*, whether medial or final, have an indistinct sound, and in rapid speech are scarcely audible. The treatise has been made possible by a practical knowledge of the dialect by the author, and by the aid received from friendly teachers scattered throughout the province. The author has also made constant use of Felice de Maria's "Dizionarietto dialettale italiano della Provincia di Avellino."

I

TONIC VOWELS

a

1. Whether in position or not, *a* remains: *sango, patre, malato, trave*.
2. *-arium* gives *-aro* and *-iere*: *jennaro* < **jennarium*; *azzaro* < **acciarium*; *cavorara* < *caldarium*; *cancelliere* < *cancellarium*; *varriere* < **barbarium*; *canneliere* < *candelarium*.

ĩ, ē

1. Whether in position or not, *ĩ, ē* give close *e* unless there is a *u* in the following syllable, in which case they become *i*: *re* < *rex*; *forese* < *forenses*; *cannela* < *candelam*; *sirena* < *sirenam*; *trezza* < **tricheam*; *penna* < *pinnam*; *verde* < *viridem*; *pepe* < *piper*; *tiso* < *tensum*; *nimico* < *inimicum*; *niro* < *nigrum*; *quiro* < *eccum illum*; *misso* < *missum*; *capillo* < *capillum*; *rito* < *digitum*; *siggillo* < *sigillum*.

2. Some words have *e* in the singular and *i* in the plural under the influence of a following *i*: *paese, paisi; pesce, pisci; tornese, tornisi; bellezza, bellizzi*.

ě

1. It diphthongizes to *ie* when followed by *u* in the next syllable, otherwise it remains: *pietto* < *pectus*; *viento* < *ventum*; *fierro* < *ferrum*; *auciello* < **avicellum*; *tiembo* < *tempus*; *lietto* < *lectum*; *mantiello* < *mantellum*; *mierico* < *medicum*; but *sempe* < *semper*; *bene* < *bene*; *fonesta* < *fenestram*; *preta* < *petram*; *potenza* < *potentiam*; *gente* < *gentem*; *mele* < *mel*.
2. A few words have *e* in the singular and *ie* in the plural: *rente, rienti* < *dentem*; *certo, cierti; parente, parienti*.

ī

Long *i* remains: *bacile* < **bacinum*; *vico* < *vicum*; *rigina* < *reginam*; *accossì* < *aequa sic*; *lessia* < **lixivam*.

ŷ, ō

1. Whether in position or not, *ŷ, ō* become close *o*: *vocca* < **buccam*; *doce* < *dulcem*; *poleve* < *pulverem*; *stoppa* < *stuppam*; *sciore* < *florem*; *ora* < *horam*; *sole* < *solem*; *lione* < *leonem*.
2. If followed by *u* in the next syllable or by *i*, be it the plural ending or resultant from latin *s*, they give *u*: *surco* < *sulcum*; *curto* < *curtum*; *urse* < *ursum*; *munno* < *mundum*; *chiummo* < *plumbum*; *punnio* < *pugnum*; *pasturi* < *pastorem*; *sciuri* < *florem*; *canzuni* < *cantionem*; *raziuni* < *orationem*; *nui* < *nos*; *vui, vuje, bui* < *vos*; *dui, duje* < *duo*; but *doje* when feminine.

As for *juorno* < *diurnum*, close *o* became open under the influence of *rn* and it still persists in the South; later the open *o* gave *uo*. A southerner will often say *buon giorno* instead of *buon giorno*.

ō

When followed by *i* or *u* in the next syllable it gives *uo*, but if followed by *a, e, or o* it gives open *o*: *tuorto* < *tortum*; *luongo* < *longum*; *uorco* < *orcum*; *puorco* < *porcum*; *vuosto* < *vostrum*; *uosso* < *ossum*; *uoglio* < *oleum*; *bona* < *bonam*; *sora* < *soror*; *figliola* < *filio-*

lam; notte < *noctem*; *omo* < *homo*; *mo* < *modo*; *sciorta* < *sortem*; *fore* < *foras*.

ū

It remains: *pure, sicuro; chiù* < *plus*; *ummeto* < *humidum*; *fumo, lume*.

II

PRETONIC VOWELS.

a

1. Pretonic *a* usually remains: *granato, nnammorato, capilli, allora, ammore, calamaro, aggarbato*.
2. In a number of words it falls when initial: *bbaschio* < *ad-bassum*; *batessa* < *abbatissam*; *runare* < *adunare*; *locco* < *aluccum*; *nannasso* < *ananas*; *scella* < *axillam*.
3. Often we find forms compounded with *ad*, the *d* being assimilated to the following consonant: *addò* < *ad-de-ubi*; *appresentà* < *ad-praesentare*; *addimannà* < *ad-demandare*; *allecordà* < *ad-recordare*; *affigurà* < *ad-figurare*; *arrefutà* < **ad-reflutare*.
4. Sometimes an *a* is found in place of other vowels: *addorà*: It. *odorare*; *carmosino* < *Ar. qermazî*; *ascì* < *exire*; *cainato* < *cognatum*; *coccatò* < *qualis quam altrum*; *saburco* < *sepulcrum*; *giagante* < *gigantem*; *quarera* < *querelam*; *stannardo* < **extendardum*; *valanza* < *bilancem*; *zanzaro* < *censualem*.

ě

1. When initial it falls: *cunomia* < *æconomiam*; *limosina* < *eleemosyna*; *pifania* < *epiphania*; *spierto* < *experitum*; *remito* < *eremita*; *state* < *aestatem*; *stenne* < *extendere*; *nchiosto* < **inclaustrum*; *ncignà* < *encænare*; *scummonicà* < *excommunicare*.
2. When not initial it remains, but it is pronounced indistinctly, almost like the French mute *e*: *venì* < *venire*; *beleno* < *venenum*; *mercina* < *medicinam*; *ferraro* < *ferrarium*; *renucchio* < *genuculum*; *jelà* < *gelare*.
3. In hiatus it becomes *i*: *renià* < *renegare*; *lione* < *leonem*; *prià* < *precare*.
4. A few cases of substitution are: *sommana* < *septimanam*; *fonesta* < *fenestram*; *luvato* < *levatum*; *romaso* < *remansum*.

ĩ

1. When initial, it generally falls: *nimmico* < *inimicum*; *mparà* < **imparare*; *nnanzi* < *in-ante*; *ncomodà* < *incommodare*; *ngrassà* < **incrassare*; *nventà* < *inventare*; *nviria* < *invidiam*.
2. When not initial, it gives in most cases *e*, slightly pronounced: *fedele* < *fidelem*; *menà* < *minare*; *carrecà* < *carricare*; *verè* < *videre*; *desasto* < *disastrum*; *mazzecà* < *masticare*.
3. In some cases *i* remains, either through learned influence or on account of a neighboring *i* or a palatal: *roscignuolo* < **lusci-niolum*; *piglià* < **piliare*; *lacrimà* < *lacrimare*; *nimmico* < *inimicum*; *cicoria* < **cichoriam*; *carità* < *caritatem*.

ē

1. Generally remains and is slightly pronounced: *relicato* < *delicatum*; *semminà* < *seminare*; *verità* < *veritas*; *sentinella* < *semita*.
2. In hiatus it becomes *i*: *riale* < *regalem*; *mio* < **meum*.

ĩ

1. Initial it falls: *nfierno* < *infernum*; *nfilà* < **infilare*; *nsaccà* < **insaccare*; *nserà* < *insertare*.
2. Not initial it remains: *marità* < *maritare*; *figliola* < *filiolam*; *finì* < *finire*; *sirena* < *sirenam*; *vicino* < *vicinum*.

ō, ō

1. Both *o* and *u* are found. In the speech of the lower classes the *u* prevails; so that one hears both *morì* and *murì* < **morire*; *corona* and *curona* < *coronam*; *sordato* and *surdato* < **solidatum*; *portà* and *purtà* < *portare*; *fontana* and *funtana* < *fontanam*; *consolà* and *cunzulà* < *consolare*.
2. Only in a few words they fall when initial: *scuro* < *obscurum*; *razione* < *orationem*; *pinione* < *opinionem*.
3. An *a* is found in: *occasione* < *occasionem*; *accide* < *occidere*; *ad-dore* < *odorem*; *affocà* < *offocare*.

ũ, ũ

1. Generally remain: *vuccone* < *bucconem*; *addunucchià* < *ingenuculare*; *curtiello* < *cultellum*; *rucato* < *ducatum*; *justizia* < *justitiam*; *salutà* < *salutare*; *crurele* < *crudelem*.

2. In a few words we find an *o* instead: *mogliera* < **mulierem*; *giovà* < *juvare*; *onnejà* < **undideare*; *iodecà* < *judicare*.
3. They fall when initial in: *mbrello* < **umbrellam*; *ncino* < *uncinum*; *nu* < *unum* (proclitic).

III

POST-TONIC VOWELS, NOT FINAL

a

Remains: *sabbato* < *sabbatum*; *barbara* < *barbaram*; *cannavo* < *canabam*.

ě, ē

Remain: *vence* < *vincere*; *carcere* < *carcerem*; *polleve* < *polverem*; *iенnero* < *generum*; *move* < *movere*; *mogne* < *mulgere*.

ĩ

1. It generally gives *e*: *museca* < *musicam*; *sorece* < *soricem*; *ummeto* < *humidum*; *ermece* < *imbricem*.
2. In some cases it remains: *cicoria* < **cichoria*; *grazia* < *gratiam*; *forbicia* < *forficem*.

ö

Remains: *arbore* < *arborem*; *pecora* < *pecorem*; *riavolo* < *diabolum*.

ũ

Generally remains: *mierulo* < *merulam*; *fabbula* < *fabulam*; *perula* < *pergulam*; *spiculo* < *spiculum*.

Final vowels remain and develop much as in Italian, although greatly obscured in pronunciation. This weakening of the final vowels causes great confusion between *u* and *o* and between *e* and *i*. Thus we find *nu*, *lu*, *stu*, *dopu*, and *lo*, *sto*, *no*; *te*, *de*, *me*, *se*, and *ti*, *di*, *mi*, *si*.

IV.

CONSONANTS.—INITIAL

Initial consonants are often doubled to denote a more vigorous pronunciation.

B

1. In many cases it gives a denti-labial *v*: *vaso*, *viato*, *vascio*, *vocca*, *varra*, *vareva*, *voria* (Italian *bacio*, *beato*, *basso*, *bocca barra*, *barba*, *boria*).

2. In a more limited number of words *b* remains: *bene, bello, battaglia, buono, benerice*.
3. By attraction we find an *m* in *mammace* and *mammuoccio* (It. *bambagia* and *bamboccio*).

F

Initial *f* remains: *figliola, finì, fonesta, farina*.

V

1. Generally remains: *vico, vui, venì, velo, via, verde*.
2. It is also confused with *b*: *boglio, bene, bote, beleno, bui, biernerì* (It. *voglio, viene, volte, veleno, voi, venerdì*).

P

Initial *p* remains: *pietto, preta, panno, patrone, penna*.

D

1. It remains in the speech of the better educated classes: *Dio, dintò, denaro, duje, donna, doce, durmì*.
2. In the speech of the lower classes initial *d* becomes *r*: *rieci, rurici, ri, ronna, rinto, ra, ruje, ranno, riavolo* (It. *dieci, dodici, donna, dentro, da, due, danno, diavolo*).

T

Remains: *tutto, tanto, tiembo, taverna, tornata*.

L

Generally remains: *lettera, luna, luongo*. It gives *r* in *re, ra, ro*; but forms with *l* (*le, la, lo*) are also common. In the speech of the lower classes it falls in *'u, 'i, 'a*, (It. *lo, li, la*).

M, N

Remain: *muorto, mare, munno; nova, notte, nuvanda, nui*.

R

1. Generally remains: *rinnegata, rosa, robba, riggina*.

2. In a few cases it gives *d*: *demerio* < *remedium*; *decrea* < *recreare*; *defreggerio* < **refrigerium*; *defrisco* < **re-frisk*.
3. It becomes *l* in: *lebbrica* < **replicam*; *leggistro*: It. *registro*; *leprubbrica* < *rem publicam*.

S

1. Initial *s* generally remains: *sera*, *sole*, *suonno*, *sempe*, *seta*.
2. In a few cases it becomes *z*: *zuca* < **suculare*; *zanzaro*; It. *sen-sale*; *zurfo* < *sulfur*.
3. It gives *š* in: *sciorta* < *sortem*; *scemo* < **semus*.

C

1. Before *a*, *o*, *u*, initial *c* gives *k*: *capilli*, *calamite*, *confessà*, *cumpagno*.
2. It becomes *qu* in: *quiro* < *eccum illum*; *quaglià* < *coagulare*.
3. Before *i*, *e*, it gives *č*: *cima*, *centrella*, *cità*, *ciento*, *cera*.

G

1. Initial *g* before *a*, *o*, *u*, remains: *guato*, *galante*, *gode*, *guluso*.
2. In the speech of the lower classes it often falls: 'allina: It. *gal-lina*; 'ore < *gaudere*; 'Offrero: It. *Goffredo*; 'unnella < *gunna*.
3. A *v* is found in: *valiota*, *varzone*, *vozza* (It. *galeotta*, *garzone*, *gozzo*).
4. Before *e*, *i*, initial *g* gives *ğ*: *gente*, *gentile*, *giro*.
5. More often it gives *j*: *jennero* < *generum*; ~~*jenesta* < *genestam*;~~
~~*jelà* < *gelare*.~~

W

It becomes *gu*: *guarnì* < *warnjan*; *guardà* < **warda*; *guaio* < *wai*.

GE, Z

Become *g*: *giluso* < *ξήλος*; *Giorgio* < *Γέωργιος*; *giografia* < *geographiam*.

DE, DI, J

1. Become *j*: *jì* < *de-ire*; *jinto* < *de-intro*; *juorno* < *diurnum*; *jettà*; *jennaro*, *justizia*, *jurice*.
2. In a few cases initial *j* becomes *ğ*: *già* < *jam*; *giovà* < *juvare*.

V

INITIAL GROUPS OF CONSONANTS

1

Groups ending in *l*

- BL gives *j*: *janco* < *blank*; *junno* < *bland*; *jastemà* < *blasphemare*.
 CL gives *chi*: *chiamà* < *clamare*; *chiaro* < *clarum*; *chiave* < *clavem*.
 FL gives *fi* and *š*, rarely *fl* and *j*: *fiore*, *sciore* < *florem*; *jato*, *sciato* < *flatum*; *sciumo* < *flumen*; *flagello* < *flagellum*.
 GL becomes *j* and *gli*: *jaccio* < **glacium*; *gliotte* < **gluttire*.
 PL becomes *chi* and in a few cases *pi*: *chiù* < *plus*; *chiagne* < *plangere*; *chiummo* < *plumbum*; *chiazza* < *plateam*; *piace* < *placere*; *piatto* < **plattum*.
 SCL, STL give *schi*: *schiattà* < **exclapitare*; *schioppetta* < *stloppus*.
 VL becomes *fi*: *fiasco* < *vlascu*.

2

Groups ending in *r*

Remain: *braccio*, *brutto*, *croce*, *craje*, *franchezza*, *grazia*, *prìa*, *scrive*, *trezza*, *trave*.

3

qu, *cu*

1. *qu* remains in most cases: *quanno* < *quando*; *quanto* < *quantum*; *quatto* < *quattuor*; *quarera* < *querelam*; *quarco* < *qualis quam*.
2. It becomes *k* in: *chiunque* < *qui-unquam*; *como* < *quomodo*; *cac-cosa* < *qualis quam causam*; and *c* in *cerza* < *querceam*.
3. *cu* becomes *qu*: *quisto* < *eccu-istum*; *quiro* < *eccu-illum*; *qua* < *eccu-hac*; the forms *chisto*, *chillo*, *chisse* are Neapolitan.

4

Groups beginning with *s* or *x* becoming initial

- XB becomes *sb*: *sbranà* < **ex-branare*; *sbatte* < **ex-battere*.
 SC, XC become *sk* before *a*, *o*, *u*: *scala* < *scalam*; *scola* < *scholam*; *scommenicà* < *excommunicare*. Before *e*, *i*, they become *š*: *scenne* < *descendere*; *scetà* < *excitare*; *sciglie* < *exsolvere*.
 SD, XD give *sd*: *sdegno* < **disdignare*; *sdentato* < **ex-dentatum*; *sdradicà* < **ex-radicare*.
 SF, XF give *sf*: *sfacciato* < **ex-faciatum*; *sfonnà* < **ex-fundare*.

SP, XP give *sp*: *spada* < *spatham*; *spina* < *spinam*; *spanne* < *expandere*.

ST, XT give *st*: *stà* < *stare*; *stella* < *stellam*; *stannardo* < **extendardum*.

VI

MEDIAL CONSONANTS

B

1. In most cases intervocalic *b* becomes *v*: *davante* < *de ab antes*; *taverna*, *cavallo*, *lavorà* < *laborare*; *riavolo* < *diabolum*; *veve* < *bibere*.
2. In learned words *b* remains: *subito*, *robba*, *dubbio*, *diebbito*.
3. In some cases the *b* falls: *riciano*, *ria*, *faciano* (It. *dicevano*, *dava*, *facevano*).
4. It becomes *p* in: *beppeta* < *bibitam*.

F

Remains: *rifesa*, *capofuoco*, *giografia*, *cofano*, *refonnere*.

V

1. Generally remains: *levà*, *favore*, *nova*, *ulivo*, *chiave*, *neve*.
2. It falls in: *paura* < **pavuram*; *paone* < *pavonem*.

P

1. Remains in: *capo*, *sape*, *lupo*, *pepe*, *riposa*.
2. It gives *v* in: *povero* < *pauperem*; *vescovo* < *episcopum*; *riceve* < *recipere*.

D

1. Intervocalic *d* often becomes *r*: *mierico*, *caruta*, *verè*, *crurele*, *biernerì*, *pere* (It. *medico*, *caduta*, *vedere*, *crudele*, *venerdì*, *piede*).
2. Under Italian influence we find also forms with *d*: *adorà*, *crudele*, *nudeco*, *radeca*.
3. It becomes *t* in: *muceto* < **muccidum*; *nfracità* < **in-fracidare*; *nzipeto* < **insapidum*; *ummeto* < *humidum*.

T

1. Generally remains: *salutà, rito* < *digitum*; *vita, dote, aiutà, catena*.
2. It becomes *d* in: *spedalo* < *hospitale*m; *strada* < *stratam*; *spada* < *spatham*; *vidella* < *botellum*.

L

1. Generally remains: *sole, calamite, scala, molino*.
2. In a few cases it becomes *r*: *saraca* < *sala-caccabia*; *sbarià* < **ex-baulare*.

M

Intervocalic *m* remains: *calamaro, chiammà, ammore, fumo*.

N

Remains: *cane, lione, menà, molenaro*.

R

1. Intervocalic *r* remains: *cerasa, dolore, paura, muri*.
2. Infinitives lose final *re*: *cantà, parlà, chiammà*.

S

Remains: *riposa, cosa, rosa, paese, mese*.

C

1. Intervocalic *c* before *e, i* becomes *č*: *auciello* < **avicellum*; *jurice* < *judicem*; *merecina* < *medicinam*; *croce* < *crucem*; *luce* < *lucem*.
2. Before *a, o, u* becomes *k*: *vico, poco, pecora, luoco, fuoco*. In a few cases it becomes *g*: *pagà* < *pacare*; *annegà* < *enecare*. It falls in: *prià* < *precare*; *maneà* < *manicare*.

G

1. Intervocalic *g* before *e, i* becomes *ǰ* or *ǰǰ*: *seggillo* < *sigillum*; *riggina* < *reginam*; *defreggerio* < **refrigerium*; *legistro* < *regestum*; *magginà* < *imaginare*.
2. It falls in: *maesto* < *magistrum*; *paese* < *pagensem*; *frie* < *frigere*; *saetta* < *sagittam*.

3. It gives *j* in: *fuje* < *fugere*; *maje* < *magis*; *proje* < *porgere*; *quarajesima* < *quadragesimam*.
4. Intervocalic *g* before *a*, *o*, *u* remains in a very few cases: *legato*, *figura*.
5. It falls in: *fatià* < *fatigare*; *riale* < *regalem*; *rinneata* < *renegatam*; *nià* < *negare*; *austo* < *augustum*.
6. It gives *v* in: *suvaro*: It. *sughero*; *nivuro* < *nigrum*; *fravola*: It. *fragola*.
7. It gives *j* in: *castijà* < *castigare*; *chiaja* < *plagam*.

VII

MEDIAL GROUPS

- BB remains in *sabbato* < *sabbatum*; the form *sapato* is also found.
 BL becomes *bbr*: *obbregà* < *obligare*; *leprubbreca* < *res publica*; but *solleone* < *sub leonem*; *nneglia* < *nebulam*.
 BR remains: *libro* < *librum*; *ottobre* < *octobrem*; *frabeca* < *fabricam* shows methathesis; in *frea* < *febrem*, the *b* falls.
 BY, BBY become *ǰǰi*: *aggio* < *habeo*; *raggia* < **rabiam*; *loggia* < **laubja*; *suggettà* < *subjectare*.
 BT becomes *tt*: *sotto* < *subtus*; *sotterrà* < *subterrare*.
 FF remains: *affaccià* < **affaciare*; *affittà* < **affictare*; *affilà* < **affilare*.
 Fl, FFL give *š* in *ascià* < *afflare*; *ffr* in *affriggere* < *affligere*; *ffi* in *affianco* < **afflaccum*; *affiatà* < *afflatare*.
 FR, FFR remain: *suffrì*, *affruntà*, *defreggerio*.
 VV from DV becomes *bb*: *abbambà*, *abbeli*, *abbeni*, *abbia*, *abbinato* (It. *avvampare*, *avvilire*, *avvenire*, *avviare*, *avvinazzato*).
 VY gives *ǰǰ*: *caggiola* < **caveola*; *liggero* < *leviarium*.
 PP remains: *appiccià*, *appenne*, *stoppa*, *cappiello*.
 PY, PPY give *čč*: *accio* < *apium*; *saccio* < *sapio*; *piccione* < *pipionem*; *seccia* < *sepium*.
 PL, PPL give *cchi*: *acchianà* < **applanare*; *cocchia* < *cupulam*; *restocchia* < **re-stipula*; also *ppi* as in *duppio* < *duplum*; *ppr* as in *suppreca* < *supplicare*; *br* in *allebrecà* < *replicare*.
 PR, PPR remain in: *rappresentà*, *appriesso*, *soprano*, *apri*; it gives *br* in *lebbro* < *leporem*.
 PS gives *š* in *cascia* < *capsam*; and *ss* in *isso* < **ipsum*; *stesso* < **iste-
ipsum*.

- PT gives *tt*: *accattà* < **accaptare*; *scritto* < *scriptum*; *sette* < *septem*.
 PTY gives *čč*: *caccia* < **captiam*.
 DD remains: *adduce*, *addio*, *addormì*, *addò*.
 DR remains: *quadro*, *addrizzà* < **ad-directare*.
 DY gives *ǵǵ* in *appoggià* < **appodiare*; *giaggiolo* < *gladiolum*; *j* in *gioia* < *gaudium*; *raio* < *radium*; *appoià* < **appodiare*; *abbaià* < **ad-badiare*; *oie* < *hodie*; *zz* in *miezze* < *medium*; it remains in *mmidia* < *invidiam*; *fastidioso* < *fastidiosum*; *odio* < *odium*.
 D of AD followed by a consonant is assimilated to it: *abbandono*, *accussì*, *affaccià*, *aggraziato*, *affrigo*, *appromette*, *arrefutà*.
 TT remains: *mette*, *mattina*, *piatto*, *vattaglio*.
 TR generally remains: *lettra*, *pollitro*, *nutrizza*, *patrone*; the *r* disappears in *quatto* < *quattuor*; *arreto* < *ad retrum*; it becomes *dr* in *padre* < *patrem*.
 TY generally becomes *zz* or *zi*: *chiazza* < *plateam*; *palazzo* < *palatium*; *puzzo* < *puteum*; *grazia* < *gratiam*; *justizia* < *justitiam*; in some cases we find *ǵǵ*: *artigiano* < **artitianum*; *raggione* < *rationem*.
 TC gives *ǵǵ*: *dammaggio* < *damnaticum*; *companaggio* < **cumpnaticum*.
 TL gives *ll* in *spalla* < *spatulam*.
 LL either remains or becomes *dd*: *bello*, *cuollo*, *seggillo*, *auciello*, *cavallo*; *gaddina*, *zurfarieddo*, *gonnedda*, *quiddo* (It. *gallina*, *zolfanello*, *gonnella*, *quello*).
 LB becomes *rb*: *arba*, *arboro* (It. *alba*, *albero*).
 LC becomes *rc*: *carcagno* < *calcaneum*; *barcone*: It. *balcone*; *carcara* < *calcaram*; *surco* < *sulcum*; the *l* falls in *doce* < *dulcem*; but, in *fauce*, *favoce* < *falcem*, the *l* becomes either *u* or *v*.
 LD gives either *rd* or *ud*: *mmardì* < *male dicere*; *sordato* < **solidatus*; *caudo* < *calidum*; *scaudà* < *excaldare*.
 LY gives *gli*: *voglio*, *figliola*, *piaglià*, *foglia*, *meglio*.
 LG before *e* gives *gli*: *sceglie* < **ex-eligere*; *coglie* < *colligere*.
 LNY gives *gn*: *bagnà* < *balneare*.
 LM gives *rm*: *parma* < *palmam*; *sarma* < **salmam*.
 LP gives *rp*: *vorpa* < *vulpem*; *scarpiello* < *scalpillum*.
 LF gives *rf*: *zurfo* < *sulfur*.
 LS gives *rz* or *uz*: *sarza* < *salsam*; *mbarzamà* < **inbalsamare*; *fauzo* < *falsum*; *puzo* < *pulsum*.

- LT gives *rt*, but more often the *l* falls; forms in which the *l* becomes *u* or *v* are also found, in the latter case a vowel is interpolated between the *v* and the *t*: *bertà* < **bellitatem*; *curtiello* < *cultellum*; *vota* < **voltam*; *aveto* < *altum*; *autara* < *altarem*.
- LTY gives *uz*: *auzà* < **altiare*.
- LTR gives *t* or *ut*: *ato*, *auto* < *altrum*.
- LV gives *rv*: *marva* < *malvam*.
- MM remains: *sommà*, *cummannà* *mamma*.
- MB usually becomes *mm*: *vammace* < **bambaceam*; *tammurro*: It. *tamburo*; *bomma*: It. *bomba*.
- MBY, MY, become *gn*: *cagnà* < *cambiare*; *scagnà* < **excambiare*; *scigna* < *simia*; *vennegna* < *vindemiam*.
- MP remains, although in some cases the *p* becomes *b*: *sempe*, *stampà*, *campanella*, *lampà*; but: *abbambà*: It. *avvampare*; *tiembo* < *tempus*; *mbastà*: It. *impastare*.
- MPL gives *nchi* or *mbr*: *enchiere* < *implere*; *nchiastro* < *emplastrum*; *nzembrice* < *simplicem*.
- MPR remains: *mproperio*, *comprà*.
- MPTY gives *nz*: *scunzà* < **excomptiare*.
- MPT gives *nt*: *pronto* < *promptum*.
- MN gives *nn* or *mm*: *colonna*, *donna*, *suonno*; *uommeni*, *dammaggio*.
- NN remains: *penna*, *anno*, *cannito*, *vennella*.
- NC before *a*, *o*, *u* remains: *mancà*, *ncantà*, *ianco*; it gives *g* in *ngantà*: It. *incantare*; *rangascia*: It. *gran cassa*; *ngunia* < **incudinam*.
- NC before *e*, *i*, and NCY give *nč* or *nz*: *vence* < *vincere*; *provincia* < *provinciam*; *valanza* < *bilancem*; *onza* < **unciam*.
- NCL gives *nchi*: *caravunchiolo* < *carbunculum*; *nchiosto* < **inclastrum*; *nchiavà* < **inclavare*.
- NCT gives *nt*: *santo* < *sanctum*; *punto* < **punctum*.
- ND becomes *nn*: *quanno* < *quando*; *cannela* < *candelam*; *munno* < *mundum*; *vennetta* < *vindictam*.
- NDY gives *nz*: *pranzo* < *prandium*.
- NF remains: *cunfidà* < **confidare*; *cunfusione* < *confusionem*.
- NFL gives *nfi*: *runfià* < **runflare*; *nfiammà* < *inflammare*.
- NG before *e*, *i* becomes *nğ*: *fenge* < *ingere*; *ngegnà* < **ingeniare*; *chiange* < *plangere*; forms with *gn* are Neapolitan.

NG before *a, o, u* remains: *sango, luongo, lenga*.

NGL gives *gn*: *cigna* < *cingulam*; *cignale* < *singularum*; *ogna* < *ungulam*.

NY becomes *gn*: *carcagno* < *calcaneum*; *campagna* < *campaniam*; *castagna* < *castaneam*.

NS becomes *nz*: *sanzalo* < *censualem*; *ncienzo* < *incensum*; *nzipeto* < **insipidus*. In a few cases the *n* disappears: *tiso* < *tensum*; *misurà* < *mensurare*; *mese* < *mensem*.

NT remains: *gentile, cantà, mantene*. There is also a tendency to soften the *t* to *d*: *ndonà* < **intonare*; *vindi, trenda, quaranda*.

NTR gives *nt* in *rinto* < *de-intro*; but *ntr* in *contro, ntricante, centrella*.

NTY becomes *nz*: *canzone, licenzia, presenzia, spranza, linzulo*.

NV gives *mm*: *mmità* < *invitare*; *mmentà* < *inventare*.

RR remains: *arrivà, fierro, corre, terra*.

RB gives *rv*: *varva* < *barbam*; *suorvo* < *sorbus*; *erva* < *herbam*; forms with *rb* are due to Italian influence: *birbia*: It. *birba*; *riverboro*: It. *riverbero*; *aggarbato*: It. *garbato*; the *r* falls in *auscio* < **arbutum*.

RC before *a, o, u* remains: *uorco, puorco, barca*.

RC before *e, i* gives *rc*: *carcere, purciello*.

RCL becomes *rchi*: *circhio* < *circulum*; *cupierchio* < *coperculum*; *supierchio* < **superculum*.

RD remains: *guardà, turdo, perde, verde*.

RDY becomes *rz*: *uorzo* < *hordeum*; *verzà* < **viridiatam*.

RG before *a, o, u* gives *ri*: *lario* < *largum*; before *e, i* it gives *rg*: *argiento*.

RM, RN, RP remain: *durmì, fermà, iuorno, vierno, scarpa*.

RS gives *rz*: *perzo*: It. *perso*; *descurzo*: It. *discorso*; *urzo* < *ursum*; *traverza* < *transversam*.

RT remains: *parte, porta, carta, muorto*.

RTY gives *rz*: *terzo* < *tertium*.

RY gives *r*: *ferraro* < *ferrarium*; *calamaro* < *calamarium*.

SS gives *ss* or *š*: *passo, fossa, esse*; *vascio* < **bassum*; *cascia*: It. *cassa*.

SC before *e, i* gives *š*: *nasce, mmasciata, pasce*.

ST remains: *questa, festa, castiello*.

STR gives *st*: *orchesto, ienesta, canisto, vuosto*.

- SY gives *s*: *vaso* < *basium*; *cerasa* < **ceresiam*.
- CC before *a, o, u* remains: *vocca, sicco, accordà, scioccà* < **floccare*.
- CC before *e, i* gives *čč* and seldom *zz*: *accide* < *occidere*; *socere* < *succedere*; *accenne* < *accendere*; *azzettà* < **acceptare*.
- CL becomes *cchi*: *fenuccio* < *fenuculum*; *uocchio* < *oculum*; *vrecchia* < *auriculam*; *viecchio* < **veculum*. In a few cases it gives *gli*: *tenaglia* < *tenaculum*; *cuniglio* < *cuniculum*.
- CR either remains or gives *gr*: *suocro* < *socerum*; *lucrà* < *lucrare*; *lagrima* < *lacrimam*; *sigreto* < *secretum*.
- CS gives *ss* or *š*: *tuossico* < *toxicum*; *tesse* < *texere*; *lassà* < *laxare*; *asci* < *exire*; *lascià* < *laxare*; *liscia* < **lixivam*.
- CT gives *tt*: *lietto, pietto, affitto, iettà*.
- CTY gives *zz* or *zi*: *drizzà* < **directiare*; *lezione* < *lectionem*.
- CY gives *zz* and *čč*: *lazzo* and *laccio* < **laceum*; *azzaro* < **aciarium*; *fazzo* < *faceo*; *setazzo* < *setaceum*; *faccia* < *faciam*; *crapiccio* < **capricium*.
- CL gives *gli*: *quaglià* < *coagulare*; *striglià* < *strigulare*.
- GN either remains or loses the *g*: *segno* < *signum*; *agniello* < *agnellum*; *canosce* < *cognoscere*; *cainato* < *cognatum*.
- GR either remains or loses the *g*: *agreste* < *agrestem*; *niro* < *nigrum*.
- Final consonants develop as in Italian. Final *s*, however, gives in some monosyllables *je* or *j*: *nuje, vuje, craje* and *nui, vui, crai*.

VIII

MORPHOLOGICAL PECULIARITIES

1. Cases of methathesis: *frabecà* < *fabricare*; *lorgio* < *orologium*; *freva* < *febrem*; *preta* < *petram*; < *biernerì* < *veneris dies*; *brevogna* < *verecundiam*; *crapiccio* < **capricium*.
2. *Noun*.—As in Italian, the Latin neuter singular becomes masculine in this dialect: *'u cuorpo, 'u fiore, 'u pietto, 'u lume, 'u mele*. But *caput* instead of giving *capo* as in Italian, gives the feminine *capa*.
The plural of Latin neuters become masculine: *'i piecori, 'i vrazzi, 'i rinucchi, 'i riti*.
Some masculine nouns which become feminine in Italian remain masculine in this dialect: *'u carcere, 'u cemice, 'u police*.
3. *Comparison of Adjectives*.—The comparative is formed with

chiù < *plus*. The comparative of inferiority with *meno* is not found. *Migliore* and *peggiore* have been replaced by the adverbs *meglio* and *peggio* or *pevo*. *Manco* is used for the Italian *nemmeno*: *manco nu soldo*: It. *nemmeno un soldo*. The superlative absolute in *-issimo* is expressed by *assai* before the positive: *assai gruosso*: It. *grandissimo*.

4. *Personal Pronouns*.—Subject pronouns: *io, tu, isso* (or *iddo*), *essa* (or *edda*); *nui, vui* (or *bui*), *issi, esse*.

Direct and indirect objects: *mi, ti, lu* (or *'u, ro*), *li* (or *ci*), *la* (or *'a, ra, ci*); *ci, vi, li* (or *'i, ri, ci*), *le* (or *'e, re, ci*). As in Italian the *i* becomes *e* before another pronoun beginning with *l* or *n*.

Objects of prepositions: *me, te, isso* (or *iddo*), *essa* (or *edda*), *nui, vui, issi, esse* (or *loro*).

5. *Possessive Adjectives*.—*Mio, mia; tujo, toja; sujo, soja; nuosto, nostà; vuosto, vosta; loro; mii, mie; tuji, toje; sui, soje; nuosti, noste; vuosti, voste; loro*.

Possessive adjectives are always placed after the noun: *'a casa mia, 'u libro mio*. *Frateme, sorema, mammeta, caseta* are also found for Italian *mio fratello, mia sorella, tua madre, tua casa*.

The possessive pronouns are the same as the adjectives, but they take the definite article.

6. *Demonstrative Adjectives*.—*Sto, stu*: It. *questo*; *sta*: It. *questa*; plurals: *sti* and *ste*. *Sso, su*: It. *cotesto*; *sa*: It. *cotesta*; plurals: *si* and *se*. *Quiro* or *quiddo*: It. *quello*; *quera* or *quedda*: It. *quella*; plurals: *quiri* or *quiddi*, and *quere* or *quedde*.

7. *Demonstrative Pronouns*.—*Quisto, questa*; pl. *quisti, queste*; *quisso, quessa* for Italian *costui, costei*; pl. *quissi, quesse*; *quiro* or *quiddo, quera* or *quedda* for Italian *colui, colei*; pl. *quiri* or *quiddi, quere* or *quedde*.

8. *Definite Article*.—*lo, lu, 'u; la, 'a*; pl. *li, 'i, le*.

Indefinite article: *nu, na*.

9. *Numerals*.—*uno, rue, trea, quatto, cinc, sei, sett, ott, nove, rici, unnici, rurici, tririci, quattuordici, quinnici, sirici, riciessette; riciotto, ricinnove, vindi, trenda, quaranda, cinquanda, sissanda, sittanda, ottanda, nuvanda, ciendo*.

10. *Verb*.—In this dialect the future tense is not used to denote futurity but only to denote probability. Future action is ex-

pressed by the present indicative of the verb *to have* and the infinitive of the verb in question, generally connected by the preposition *da*; so that Italian *farò* becomes *aggia fa*, *aggia* being a contraction of *aggio* and *da*. The present subjunctive is lacking. The infinitive loses its ending and often adds *en* at the end: *parlane, vedene, amane*.

(a) First conjugation in *à*: *parlà, parlanno, parlato*.

Present Indicative: *parlo, parli parla, parliamo, parlate, parlano*.

Imperfect Indicative: *parlava, parlavi, parlava, parlávamo, parlávate, parlavano*.

Preterite: *parlai, parlasti, parlatte, parlammo, parlaste, parlarono*.

Future: *parlarraggio, parlarrai, parlarrae, parlarramo, parlarrate, parlarranno*.

Conditional: *parlarria, parlarristi, parlarria, parlarrimmo, parlarriste, parlarriano*.

Imperfect Subjunctive: *parlassi, parlassi, parlasse, parlassimo, parlasseve, parlassino*.

Imperative: *parla, parlate*.

(b) Second conjugation in *è* or *'e*: *crede, credenno, creduto*.

Present Indicative: *credo, cridi, crede, cridimo, cridite, credono*.

Imperfect Indicative: *credeva, cridivi, credeva, credévamo, credévate, credevano*.

Preterite: *cridietti, cridisti, credette, credemmo, cridiste, crederono*.

Future: *credarraggio, credarrai, credarrà, credarrimo, credarrite, credarranno*.

Conditional: *credarria, cridarristi, credarria, cridarrimmo, cridarriste, cridarriano*.

Imperfect Subjunctive: *credessi, cridissi, credesse, credessimo, cridisseve, credessero*.

Imperative: *cridi, cridite*.

(c) Third conjugation in *ì*: *sentì, sentenno, sentuto*.

Present Indicative: *sentò, senti, sente, sintimo, sintite, sentono*.

Imperfect Indicative: *sinteva, sintivi, sinteva, sentévamo, sentévate, sintevano*.

Preterite: *sintietti, sintisti, sintette, sintemmo, sintiste, sinterono*.

Future: *sintarraggio, sientarrai, sintarrà, sintarrimo, sintarrite, sintarranno*.

Conditional: *sintarria, sintarristi, sintarria, sintarrimmo, sintarriste, sintarriano.*

Imperfect Subjunctive: *sintessi, sintissi, sintesse, sintessimo, sintisseve, sintessero.*

Imperative: *sienti, sintite.*

The present indicative of *finì* is: *finiscio, finisci, finisce, finimo, finite, finisciono.* The other tenses follow *sentì*.

(d) *Stà, stanno, stato.*

Present Indicative: *stongo, stai, sta, stimo, stite, stanno.*

Imperfect Indicative: *stava, stivi, steva stévamo, stévate, stevano.*

Preterite: *stietti, stisti, stette, stiettimo, stiste, stettero.*

Future: *starraggio, starrai, starrà, starrimo, starrite, starranno.*

Conditional: *starria, starristi, starria, starriamo, starriste, starriano.*

Imperfect Subjunctive: *stessi, stissi, stesse, stessimo, stissive, stessero.*

Imperative: *sta, stite.*

(e) *dà, danno, dato.*

Present Indicative: *dongo, dai, dà, damo, date, danno.*

Imperfect Indicative: *deva, divi, deva, dévamo, dévate, devano.*

Preterite: *dietti, disti, dette, dettimo, diste, derono.*

Future: *darraggio, darrai, darrà, darrimo, darrite, darranno.*

Conditional: *darria, darristi, darria, darrimmo, darriste, darriano.*

Imperfect Subjunctive: *dessi, dissi, desse, dessimo, dissive, dessero.*

Imperative: *dà, date.*

(f) *jì, jèno juto* (It. *andare*).

Present Indicative: *vaco, vai, va, jamo, jate, vanno.*

Imperfect Indicative: *jeva, jivi, jeva, jévamo, jévate, jevano.*

Preterite: *jetti, jisti, jette, jettimo, jeste, jettero.*

Future: *jarraggio, jarrai, jarrà, jarrimo, jarrite, jarranno.*

Conditional: *jarria, jarristi, jarria, jarrimmo, jarrite, jarriano.*

Imperfect Subjunctive: *jessi, jissi, jesse, jessimo, jisseve, jessero.*

Imperative: *va, jate.*

(g) *fà, facenno, fatto.*

Present Indicative: *fazzo, fai, face, facimo, facite, fanno.*

Imperfect Indicative: *faceva, facivi, faceva, facévamo, facévate, facevano.*

Preterite: *faciètti, facisti, facette, facemmo, faciste, facerono.*

Future: *faciarraggio, faciarrai, faciarrà, faciarrimo, faciarrite, faciarranno.*

Conditional: *faciarria, faciarristi, faciarria, faciarrimmo, faciarriste, faciarriano.*

Imperfect Subjunctive: *facessi, facissi, facesse, facessimo, facisseve, facessero.*

Imperative: *fà, facite.*

(h) *sape, sapenno, saputo.*

Present Indicative: *saccio, sai, sape, sapimo, sapite, sapano.*

Imperfect Indicative: *sapeva, sapivi, sapeva, sapévamo, sapévate, sapevano.*

Preterite: *sapietti, sapisti, sapette, sapemmo, sapiste, saperono.*

Future: *saparraggio, saparra, saparrà, saparrimo, saparrite, saparranno.*

Conditional: *saparrria, saparristi, saparrria, saparrimmo, saparriste, saparriano.*

Imperfect Subjunctive: *sapessi, sapissi, sapesse, sapessimo, sapisseve, sapessero.*

Imperative: *sa, sapite.*

(i) *vole, volenno, voluto.*

Present Indicative: *voglio, vuoi, vole, volimo, volite, vonno.*

Imperfect Indicative: *voleva, volivi, voleva, volévamo, volévate, volevano.*

Preterite: *vulietti, vulisti, vulette, vulemmo, vuliste, vulerono.*

Future: *vularraggio, vularrai, vularrà, vularrimmo, vularrite, vularranno.*

Conditional: *vularria, vularristi, vularria, vularrimmo, vularriste, vularriano.*

Imperfect Subjunctive: *vullessi, vulissi, vulesse, vulessimo, vulissive, vulessero.*

(k) *pote, putenno, potuto.*

Present Indicative: *pozzo, puoi, pote, putimo, putite, ponno.*

Imperfect Indicative: *puteva, putivi, puteva, putévamo, putévate, putevano.*

Preterite: *putietti, putisti, putette, putemmo, putiste, puterono.*

Future: *putarraggio, putarra, putarrà, putarrimo, putarrite, putarranno.*

Conditional: *putarria, putarristi, putarria, putarriamo, putarrite, putarriano.*

Imperfect Subjunctive: *putessi, putissi, putesse, putessimo, putisseve, putessero.*

(l) *esse, essenno, stato.*

Present Indicative: *songo, si, è or ea, simo, site, so.*

Imperfect Indicative: *era, iri, era, éramo, érate, erano.*

Preterite: *fozi, fusti, foze, fozemo, fuste, fozero.*

Future: *sarraggio, sarrai, sarrà, sarrimo, sarrite, sarranno.*

Conditional: *sarria, sarristi, sarria, sarriamo, sarrite, sarriano.*

Imperfect Subjunctive: *fossi, fussi, fosse, fossimo, fusseve, fossero.*

Imperative: *si, site.*

(m) *ave, avenno, avuto or auto.*

Present Indicative: *aggio, hai, have, avimo, avite, hanno.*

Imperfect Indicative: *aveva, avivi, aveva, avévamo, avévate, avévano.*

Preterite: *avietti, avisti, avette, avemmo, aviste, averono.*

Future: *avarraggio, avarrai, avarrà, avarrimmo, avarrite, avarranno.*

Conditional: *avarria, avarristi, avarria, avarriamo, avarrite, avarriano.*

Imperfect Subjunctive: *avessi, avissi, avesse, avessimo, avisseve, avessero.*

Imperative: *hai, avite.*

(n) *vedè, vedenno, veduto.*

Present Indicative: *veco, vidi, vede, vidimo, vidite, vedono.*

Imperfect Indicative: *videva, vidivi, videva, vidévamo, vidévate, videvano.*

Preterite: *vidiètti, vidisti, vidette, videmmo, vidiste, viderono.*

Future: *vidarraggio, vidarrai, vidarrà, vidarrimmo, vidarrite, vidarranno.*

Conditional: *vidarria, vidarristi, vidarria, vidarriamo, vidarrite, vidarriano.*

Imperfect Subjunctive: *videssi, vidissi, vedesse, videssimo, vidissive, vedessero.*

Imperative: *vidi, vidite.*

(o) *dì or dice, dicenno, ditto.*

Present Indicative: *dico, dici, dice, dicimo, dicite, diciono.*

Imperfect Indicative: *diceva, dicivi, diceva, dicévumo, dicévate, dicevano.*

Preterite: *dicietti, dicisti, dicette, dicemmo, diciste, dicerono.*

Future: *diciarraggio, diciarrai, diciarrà, diciarrimo, diciarrite, diciarranno.*

Conditional: *diciarria, diciarristi, diciarria, diciarriamo, diciarriste, diciarriano.*

Imperfect Subjunctive: *dicessi, dicissi, dicesse, dicessimo, dicissive, dicessero.*

Imperative: *dì, dicite.*

(*p*) *mette, mettenno, miso or mittuto.*

Present Indicative: *metto, mitti, mette, mittimo, mittite, mettono.*

Imperfect Indicative: *mitteva, mittivi, mitteva, mittévamo, mittévate, mittevano.*

Preterite: *mittietti, mittisti, mittette, mittemmo, mittiste, mitterono.*

Future: *mittarraggio, mittarrai, mittarrà, mittarrimo, mittarrite, mittarranno.*

Conditional: *mittarria, mittarristi, mittarria, mittarriamo, mittarristeve, mittarriano.*

Imperfect Subjunctive: *mittessi, mittissi, mittesse, mittessimo, mittissive, mittessero.*

Imperative: *mitti, mittite.*

IX

WORDS NO LONGER IN USE IN LITERARY ITALIAN, BUT STILL IN USE IN THIS DIALECT

Accattare, comprare.	Attassà, turbare.
Accio, sedano.	Bacolo, bastone.
Accunto, avventore.	Ca<qua re, che.
Affatturà; ammaliare.	Caniglia, crusca.
Affettà, fingere.	Carosare, tosare.
Ammoccià, trafugarsi.	Commò, cassettone.
Angiuglia, ngunaglia, anguinaglia.	Crai, domani.
Antragne, l'interiori del corpo.	Crisuommolo, pesco cotogno.
Arrepezzà, rattoppare.	Cuffià, burlare.
Arillo, vinacciuolo.	Culemo, fusto delle graminacee.
	Ferracavallo, maniscalco.

Fete, puzzare.	Messora, falce.
Ficetula, beccafico.	Mierco, cicatrice.
Forgia, fucina.	Pirchio, avaro.
Frecola, minuzzolo.	Pizza, focaccia.
Guaglione, fanciullo.	Puca, marza.
Jusso, diritto.	Sarcena, carico.
Izzio, ira.	Sceppà, divellere.
Lammia, volta.	Sciarra, rissa.
Langella, brocca.	Stutà, spegnere.
Liscia, ranno.	Zoca, fune.
Loco, colà.	

X

WORDS WHICH DIFFER IN MEANING FROM THEIR CORRESPONDING
ITALIAN FORMS

Appannà: It. appannare, offuscare; here it means socchiudere.
Arrecetà: It. ricettare, dar ricetta; here, rimettere in assetto.
Arronzà: It. arronzare, affannarsi, affaticarsi; here, abborracciare.
Chiatto: It. piatto, basso e schiacciato; here, pingue.
Cria: It. il più stentato e debole di una famiglia; here, niente.
Ferzola: It. sferzata; here, cicatrice.
Frommella: It. formella, buca in forma quadrata; here, bottone.
Pacchiana: It. pacchiano, balordo; here, campagnola (as also dialectically in Tuscany).
Palomma: It. colomba; here, farfalla.
Sacca: It. sacco; here, tasca.
Scella: It. concavo sotto il braccio; here, ala.

XI

WORDS NOT FOUND IN LITERARY ITALIAN

Abba: l. l. aba, scilecca.	nolo; it means filugello.
Abbafà < * <i>ad-babare</i> ; It. bava; trafelare.	Annocà, guarnire.
Abbonato, semplice, alla buona.	Antrasatto < * <i>in trans actum</i> , all'improvviso.
Accrianzato, costumato.	Appilà < v. l. appilare, turare.
Accuaturò, nascondiglio.	Appuosto: It. appostare, agguato.
Agnulillo: dim. of angelo, ag-	

Asmezza, di rovescio.	Chianca, beccheria.
Ascià < <i>afflare</i> , trovare.	Devacà, votare.
Aguanno, quest 'anno.	Fattumio, egoista.
Arrassà, farsi indietro.	Fecozza, cazzotto.
Abboffà < v. 1. <i>buffare</i> , gonfiare, annoiare.	Fraccomodo, lento, pigro.
Addonà < * <i>adunare</i> , andare a vedere.	Fruscià, sprecare.
'Allifà, avvilirsi, sfinire.	Futo, profondo.
Alluccà, gridare.	Golio, desiderio.
Ammelo, brocca.	Guappo, bravo.
Apprettà < * <i>appectorare</i> , quere- larsi.	Gualano, carradore.
Attrassà < * <i>ad-transare</i> , trala- sciare.	Iacca, cicatrice.
Butto: It. buttare, caduta.	Ianara, strega.
Cucciarda, allodola.	Iusillo, porcile.
Cacaglio, scilinguato.	Londro, pantano.
Cacciacarne, forchettone.	Lotano, seccatura.
Caliscino, saliscendi.	Mafaro, turacciolo.
Cancaniglia, pantano.	Mannese, carrajo.
Cancariata, paternale.	Mantesino, grembiale.
Cannacca, collana.	Maraisso, misero lui.
Capotico, caparbio.	Mazzeccane, sasso.
Carosiello, salvadanaio.	Mpecà, truffare.
Casadduoglio, pizzicagnolo.	Menchescia, uomo da poco.
Ciammaruca, chiocciola.	Mappina, straccio.
Cifero, diavolo.	Maiatico, polputo.
Ciruto, burbero.	Marpione, astuto.
Colata, bucato.	Morra, stuolo.
Corrivo, stizza.	Natta, panna.
Coppola, berretto.	Nchiemà, imbastire.
Canià, arrabbiare.	Nemmiccola, lenticchia.
Centrella, chiodo.	Ntalià, indugiare.
Campese < Sp. <i>campesino</i> , con- tadino.	Ngoppa, sopra.
Canzo, scampo.	Nzurà, sposare.
Ceniero, morbido.	Ncanna, in gola, alla gola.
	Nponne, fermarsi.
	Nghianà, salire.
	Noglia, salsiccia.
	Pazzià, scherzare.
	Picca, poco.

Piretto, caraffa.	Taccaglia, legaccio.
Posema, amido.	Taccaro, bastone.
Quatrana, giovanetta.	Taluorno, fastidio.
Raú <Fr. <i>ragoût</i> , stufato.	Tanno, allora.
Rippo, fastello.	Tavuto <Sp. <i>ataud</i> , cassa funebre.
Roddo, porcile.	Trasi < <i>transire</i> , entrare.
Scaruso, in zucca.	Tremente, guardare.
Sciamarro, piccone.	Tricà <v. l. <i>tricare</i> , tardare, indugiare.
Senga, fessura.	Uffolo, anca.
Suglia, lesina.	Usevà, fiutare.
Scarola, endivia.	Vasolato, lastrico.
Scetà, risvegliare.	Vrenna, crusca.
Suoccio < <i>socium</i> , eguale.	Zella, tigna.
Sfriddo, calo, scemamento.	Zennià, ammiccare.
Sinale, grembiale.	Ziarella, nastrino.
Sciammerica, soprabito.	Zumbo, salto.
Scolla, cravatta.	
Stacca, giumenta.	

XII

SPECIMENS

(Mostly inedited)

I

(From Montella)

a

Quanno mmi partietti ra Montella,
 Tre bote mmi botai sopra 'no passo;
 Ia facenno:—"Monte è la Montella,
 "Monte, Montella bella addò ti lascio?
 Io mme voglio jì a nzorà rinto Avellino,
 MMe la voglio piglià maccaronara;
 'A 'no carrino venne li maccaruni,
 Ciento rocati la maccaronara.
 Jetti pe da 'no vaso a li maccaruni,
 Mpietto coglietti a la maccaronara.

b

Arreto, arreto la bardascieria
Mo che nge canto io nnanzi a sta porta;
Mo che nge canta la persona mmia,
Arreto, arreto chi nu bo la morte;
Mo che nge canta la persona mmia
S'appicciano re cannele e po la fossa.

c

Quanno era piccirillo e ghija a la scola,
Tutti mme ro diciano:—"buono figlio!"
Mo so crisciuto e so fatto cchiù buono,
Nisciuna mamma mme vole ra la figlia.

II

(From Bagnoli Irpino)

a

Tutta sta notte voglio jì cantanno,
Voglio trovà la chiazza re stu vico.
Pe gloria de DDio l'aggio truvata,
Io mo mm'assetto e doje canzone dico;
Una la dico alla mia cognata,
N'auta la dico alla faccia polita,
N'auta la dico alla mmia nnammorata,
Quella ca s'ha da gode sta mia vita.

b

Lo nnammorato mmio è luongo e sottile,
Porta la calatella re lo sole.
La mamma rice ca è piccirillo,
Lo padre 'o vole fa prerecatore;
O Cristo re lo cielo! pigliatillo,
No mme nge fa calà più passione.

c

Tutta stanotte voglio jì cantanno,
La voglio fa 'na nuttata tonna.

Nce sta 'na nenna ca mme sta spettanno,
 Ncoppa a la fenesta a cecà re suonno.
 Te prego, nenna mmia, trasetenne;
 Nun voglio ca pe me pierdi stu suonno.
 T'aggiu amato iuorni, misi, e anne;
 Se fossi amato DDio, sarria 'nu santo.

d

La primma vota ca me cunfessaie,
 Me lo truvaie 'nu buono cunfessore.
 La primma vota ca m'addimannavo:
 Se si zitella, si fai l'ammore:
 —“ Patre, mo te la rico la verità,
 “ Io n'astao amanno duie figliuli.
 —“ Figlia mia, te puozzi fa santa,
 “ Come li puoi amare tutt 'e duie?
 —“ Patre, faccio comm 'a l'ausanza,
 “ Lu bello amo e lu brutto abbandono.

III

(From Ariano)

'Addò si juta penna d'Ariano,
 Che chiù no scrivi cume anticamente.
 Bastava fa lu segno cu la mano
 Pe fa luvà le coppole alla gente.
 Mo si riddutta preta di lavina,
 Nisciuno chiù t'annora e ti rispetta:
 Mo si riddutta come 'na mappina
 Che penneleia nfaccia a la cascetta.

IV

(From Pietrastornina)

'Nu juorno ca vidietti a Catarina,
 Era d'ottobre e ghieva a vennenghià.
 Luceva comm'a 'na stella mattutina,
 Facea l'aucielli e l'uommeni ncantà.
 Tenea mezz'accorciata la vonnella,
 Le braccia erano quase alla scoperta,
 Mme sembrava 'na cosa accossì bella!
 Remase tutto ncantato e a bocca aperta.

V

(From Grottaminarda)

a

La notte de Natale fusti vista,
Nzieme co duje giuvani a parlà;
Dinto Sant'Anna quanno po trasiste,
Co ssi duje uocchi le lampe allumaste;
A quiro luoco che tu te mettiste,
Na fonte d'acqua santa nce criaste;
Li paternuosti che a Cristo diciste,
A Roma all 'anno santo li mannaste.

b

L'ammore mio mm'ha mannato a dice,
Ca so brunetto e no mme vole.
Io le mannatte a dice accossì:
—“La terra nera buono grano mena,
“La terra janca va pe lo vallone;
“La terra nera sse compre a denaro.
“Non te fidà de l'albero che penne,
“Manco de l'omo curto che te nganna.

VI

(From Sturno)

a

Uocchiniri non la vuoje finì?
La via de la chiesa non piglià.
No nce venì quanno nce sto io,
Manco nu santo mme faje adorà.
Nu paternuosto voglio di a Cristo,
E tu no mme lo faje appresentà.
Uocchiniri, rinneata, cane,
Ve te confessa e no mme ffa muri.

b

Quanno nasciotti io la stella veriètti,
Lu cielo a lutto niro sse mettette;

La mammanella mmia subito currivo,
E co nu velo niro mme coprivo.
Io nasciotti fra liuni e ursi.
E la sirena mme cantaje li versi.
Stonco a stu munno comme non ce stesse,
Mm'hanno misso a lu libro de li persi.

c

Stu masto ch'è asciuto aguanno,
Scardalana sse vole mparà;
Addò tu vidi le donne affacciate,
Tu te mpunni e te mietti a strillà;
—“ Chi la lana vol 'esse scardata,
“ Nce la scarda ma senza pagà.

ALFONSO DE SALVIO.

MISCELLANEOUS

COGITARE IN GALLO-ROMAN; ROMANIC CINCTU AND PUNCTU

I N *Romania*, XLI, 452, A. Thomas criticizes Meyer-Lübke for assuming French *cuidier* < *cōgitāre*, and expresses his belief in a primitiv **cūgitāre* "q'il faut expliqer et non escamoter." I think it iz possibl to explain *cuidier* az a normal derivativ ov *cogitare*. We lac definit nolej about vouels that wer lost, but it seems reaznabl to say that **koyido* miht hav had stresless *i*, du to the influence ov *y*, at a time hwen the derivativ ov *cubitu* woz **kovedo*. This wood harmonize with strest *i* in the derivativs ov *mercēde* and *pagense*; compare also Italian *gittare* az a variant ov *gettare*. If we admit **koyido* < *cogito*, the rest ov the development iz regular. Erly French has *vin* < **vini* < *uēni* and *mui* < **mowī* < **movwi*. In **vini* the *i* woz formd by assimilacion. In *mui* the sound *ü* woz formd from *u* by direct assimilacion; the sound *u* woz formd from *o* by the clozing influence ov *i*, az in Spanish *durmió* for **dormiό* paralel with *sirvió* for **serviό*. Evidently *cuid(e)* < **küyido* < **kuyido* < **koyido* wood agree with the development ov *mui*.

Nou it may be askt hwy *digitu* did not make **deyido* hwen *cogito* made **koyido*. It did, but the agreement stopt thær. In **koyido*, *y* follod a velar vouel and woz kept unchanjed; in **deyido*, *y* woz between palatal vouels and woz absorbd. For this variabl treatment ov *y* we find a good paralel in Spanish: *y* iz kept after *u* in *cuyo* and *huyó*, but has bin lost in *veo* < *veyo* and *rió* < *riyó*.¹ Thus **deyido* became **deido* and developt in the same way az *boive* < *beivet* < *bibat*: *deit* > *doit*. I do not mean to say that **deido* woz necesserily contemporery with *beivet* or **beivat*; **kovedo* made **kovdo*, and likewise **deido* may hav become **dedo*, afterwards redeveloping *ei* from clōs *e*. It iz notewerthy that clōs *e* and clōs *o* wer not alterd by contact with *i* or with a palatal consonant: the ending *-oir* < **-oiro* < *-ōriu* kept *o*, becauz the *i* woz displaced befoar the strest

¹ Bello, *Gramática de la lengua castellana*, 143, Paris, 1898.

vowels ov *uēni* and **movwi* underwent chanje. The final *o*'s ritn abuv in theoretic forms need not be taken litrally for the later stajes; the sound may hav bin alterd, or lost after a simpl consonant, without afecting the developments otherwize.

French has *tuit* < **tōtti* paralel with *mui* < **movwi*. Provencial shares with French the formacion ov *ü* in the derivativ ov **tōtti*. We may thærfoar assume that in *cuidar* and *cujar* the sound *ü* woz normal, just az it woz in French *cuidier*.

In erly Latin the sound-groop *ŋkt* normaly became *nt*, with compensatory lengthening ov the preceeding vouel, az in *quīntus* beside rarer *quinctus*. The sound *k* ov the latter form woz prezervd or restoard under the influence ov *quīnque* < **peŋkwe*, in hwich the long vouel woz du to that ov *quīntus*. Mōst werds ov this kind belongd to verbs, and in them a stronger analojy protected *k*. Thus classic Latin had *cinctus*, in acordance with *cingere*, *cingo*, *cinxi*. Spoken Latin seems to have formd **cīntus* < *cinctus*, or **cīntus* < **cīntos* < *cinctos*, with the strict sound-development seen in *quīntus*. From *cinctu* come French *ceint* and Provencial *cench*, hwile **cīntu* corresponds to Italian *cinto*, Spanish *cinto*, Portugees *cinto*. In the same way Fr. *point*, Pv. *ponch* and Pt. *ponto* come from *punctu*, but It. *punto* and Sp. *punto* from **pūntu*.

E. H. TUTTLE

NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

REVIEWS

La Vie de Saint Remi. Poème du XIII^e siècle par Richier publié pour la première fois d'après deux manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Royale de Bruxelles par W. N. BOLDERSTON. London: Henry Frowde. Oxford University Press, 1912.

After an introduction of 38 pages, including two appendices, comes the text of the poem, 8234 lines, followed by a few pages of "Analyse et Notes," a glossary and a list of proper names. All these parts are open to criticism, as is to be expected when the text to be edited is long and by no means easy to understand in several places, and when the editor has had no previous experience in preparing a text for publication.

In the introduction (p. 5) is said: "On ne trouve guère de traces, dans les écrits contemporains, de la première partie de sa [the saint's] vie, mais on s'accorde à constater qu'à l'âge de vingt et un ans il fut fait évêque." This might be understood to include Richier's main source, Hincmar; see on v. 1055, below.—P. 9. Speaking of the lost MS., of which the second leaf began according to the old inventory with Com .j. hault (v. 53 in the printed text) our editor says in a note: "Le texte a 'nus' que Mallet a lu comme 'uns' et écrit '.j.'" The reading *uns* is certainly preferable and the testimony of Mallet (14th century) as to what was in the lost MS. is not to be summarily rejected.—P. 12. The use of Hincmar begins before v. 200 instead of at "vers 240 environ," as P. Meyer noted in his article in *Notices et Extraits des MSS.*, XXXV, and the poet himself refers to "Imer" (v. 194) as his authority for what follows.—The passage quoted (p. 15) from Chrétien de Troyes seems indeed to have been, directly or indirectly, the source of vv. 844 ff., as the phraseology and the rimes indicate. The other verse quotations in the *Analyse et Notes* are much less probable as sources.—P. 16. Strangely enough the editor ascribes to the dots after certain words in the MSS. a significance for the versification, taking them to mark "une forte césure," "une coupe hardie," and as the two MSS. agree in a large proportion of cases in using this mark he thinks this punctuation is due to the author and not to any copyist (which may in part be the fact). But there is no assurance that some or even all of these dots are not due to copyists, who may have added some as well as omitted some. The editor assumes omissions in both MSS. but no additions. He further counts for a thousand verses the number of cases of *coupe masculine* and of *coupe féminine* after the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth syllables respectively. There is no serious objection to reproducing this punctuation, tho it sometimes interferes with modern punctuation, and I suppose the inverted periods appearing after some more or less important or emphatic words do reproduce this feature of one (or both?) of the MSS., tho I find no explanation given. Since this punctuation seems so remarkable to the editor I add that the older of the two MSS. of the *Roman de la Rose* in the Harvard College library shows the same use in many cases. That there is not necessarily any marked pause is shown by elision of *-e*, as it often

is by the sense. It occurs notably where a number of names occur in succession; cf. vv. 98 ff., 119. It has no significance for the versification except perhaps incidentally as indicating a possible rhetorical pause.—Pp. 17, 18 (rimes). Either here or, if they are useful for the determination of the author's dialect, in the next section, that on the dialect, might be mentioned some noteworthy rimes, such as 1397-8 (*esbani[i]ez: recriez*; Godefroy [*Compl.*, s. v. 2. *recreer*], has the second word three times from Gautier de Coincy with the *i*); 6011-12 (*peür: asseür*; so 7963-4); 6813-4 (*empereres: freres*, accus. pl.); 7691-2 (*pere: empere*) 7773-4 (*coivre: boivre*); notice also 8079-80 (*eritage* and *taire* are the words which should rime).

Pp. 19 ff. (on the dialect). This is the least satisfactory part of the introduction, because Mr. Bolderston does not make it clear that he has properly studied the rimes. I am, however, inclined to believe that he has done so more thoroughly than is indicated by what he says. It certainly appears that he has searched for decisive examples of *-ie* for *-iée*. But his examination of the "graphie des manuscrits, tout en notant les exemples où les formes se trouvent à la rime," and his making comparisons only "avec le français normal" make a bad impression. When he says (p. 20) that *an* and *en* rime, referring only to "3418 etc." one involuntarily asks whether he is thinking of *an* and *en* in spelling only, which in this case—the only one he mentions—have the same sound (the words are *comment* = *commant*, 'I commend' and *demant*, 'I ask'), or whether he means that originally distinct *an* and *en* are shown by the rimes to be sounded alike. Further on (p. 28), discussing "le dialecte auquel appartiennent les copistes et l'auteur," he says: "les rimes fréquentes entre *-en* et *-an* écartent le dialecte picard-wallon." This should refer to pronunciation and not to spelling. But such rimes are far from frequent. I have made a somewhat careful examination of all the rimes and find that the author carefully distinguishes *en* and *an* with a few exceptions well known to occur in Picard dialects. In the four words printed as *temps* 618, 881 (*Montans*, *B Montains*), *penitence*, *femme*, *gemme* (in rime 6117, with *femme*) the sound is *ã*, and probably only *ã*, with some slight doubt for *temps* and *gemme*. In *oiance*, *cheance*, *creance*, *aparance*, *conoissance*, *repentance*, and possibly one or two similar cases, the sound is *ã*, following the participle in *-ant*, but other words in original *-ence* (*pacience*, *presence*, *reverence*, etc.) never show *ã*, and *dolent*, *escient*, *nient*, *orient*, *parente*, *talent* never rime with an indubitable *ã*. Perhaps the dialect with which these features best agree is that of Gautier de Coincy (cf. H. Haase's dissertation (1880) on *an* and *en* in Picard and Walloon, pp. 34, 44-46), but I refrain from precise localization. I pass over some details in the pages devoted to the dialect, but note (p. 24) the four instances of the imperfect indic., 3d sing., in *-ot* of verbs of the first conjugation riming with *ot* < *habuit*, because this was not considered at all in the attempt to localize the author's dialect. But the first conj. imperf. 3d sing. also rimes with imperfects not of the first conj.; cf. 401-2, 1727-8, 6575-6, and lines 6573-6 show the same rime in four successive lines. After due consideration of all this and of the variants for the four *-ot* rimes in the first conj. (*B* as well as *A*, has an *oit* for *ot* [in 5316], tho not in rime, and I do not see how the critic in *Romania* XLII, 277, understands this line) I think it probable that the author's dialect had some forms with *o* for older *oi* (cf. Schwan-Behrens, *Grammaire*, ed. of 1913, § 229 Rem.). Lines 4469-72 perhaps offer another instance of four successive rime-words in *-oit* or *-ot*.

The first appendix is a short passage from the text of Hincmar with the corresponding passage in the poem for comparison. The second appendix contains the text of the *Visio Karoli Calvi*, as the source of what is told in some five hundred lines of the poem beginning about line 7630.

We come now to the text itself. There are many passages for which notes would be desirable, either because the sense is not clear or because one asks how the editor understood them. The use of accents is strange. Both the acute and the grave are to be found on accented syllables, to which I do not object, but the acute is also often placed over an unaccented *e* before a vowel, and the editor is very inconsistent; cf. *créance* several times, *creance* 480, *mescréans* 643, *creans* 644, *meschëance* 464, *soudéé* 746, *véez* 7651; *ie* in two syllables is sometimes *ïe*, sometimes *ie* (*science* 281, *conscience* 282, *crestiennes* 400, *crestiens* 462, *ancien* 488; similarly *chärent* 4641, *envayrent* 4642; and an acute sometimes appears in accented final *-ez*; for instance, *mandéz* 4501, *sauvéz* 3523, *eschauvéz* 3524, etc. Why *pilés* and *oiselés* 1369-70? Why *remès: mès* 7311-12 (cf. *mes: remés* 7003-4, *remest: mest* 1779-80)? For *confaitement* and *sifaitement* a peculiar rule is followed: the former is written as one word, the latter as two (*si faitement*). The punctuation is often wrong; a period, for instance, is more than once misplaced. A striking instance, because the Latin text of the *Visio*, which the editor prints as his second appendix to the introduction, should have prevented the error, is seen in v. 7752. He prints *Si l'en traist vigoureusement. Après lui einsis s'arrouterent*, etc. But *Après lui* belongs with *traist*, as the Latin *traxitque me post se fortiter* shows. Some of these things are perhaps due to insufficient care in proofreading, but mistakes and inconsistencies are inexcusably numerous.

Out of the many passages I have marked I select a number for comment. v. 199. The glossary defines *periceus* as *périlleux*; in this and the other passages referred to it is the modern *pareseux*.—239. For *ajue* read *aiue* (and similarly in 336 and 1809).—450. For *emporterent* read *em porterent*.—915. For *parfaisement* cf. the editor's note on *parfaissement* 4964; it also occurs in 7615. If "Godefroy ne connaît pas ce mot" it is certainly desirable to include it in the glossary with mention of all the places where it is found in the text.—1055. *Et je n'ai que .xxi. ans.* The note says: "Les deux manuscrits ont 'xxii ans', ce qui rend le vers faux: le texte latin donne 'xxi'." The editor was not aware that xxii is in Old French *vint et deus* and the verse is correct with xxii. Moreover in the Latin of Hincmar (Richier's most important source) may be found *cum ad viginti et duos aetatis suae annos pervenit*.—1069. The period at the end of this line leaves the sentence incomplete.—1152. For *en tranja* read *estranja*? The introduction, p. 21, takes *tranja* as *trancha*.—1372. The added [en], if added at all, should be before *wels*, not after it.—1374. There should be no punctuation at the end of the line. The editor puts a period.—1381. Is *trovasse* a misprint for *trovasses*?—1411. The accus. *aucun dechaement* (subject of *en(s)tre*) instead of the nom. is supported by the rime.—1413. For *com* read *c'om*.—1656-7. Period after the second of these lines instead of after the first.—1727. The glossary translates *louissiaus* by *lumière* (evidently from Godefroy's 2. *luisel*, really the same as *luissel*), which is obviously not the meaning. See *Romania* XXXI, 107 and references there; also Meyer-Lübke, *Rom. Etym. Wörterb.*, s. v. *globuscellum*. The form *loincel* (*loinsiaus*) is correctly defined in the glossary.—1941. For *tantost* read *tant ot* (or *o(s)t*).—2044. Omit

the period after *sairement* and put a period after *voir* in 2046? *Por la purté* in 2046 begins a new sentence, I think.—2151. For *n'en voiast* (misprint?) read *n'envoïast*.—2165. *Qui li*, read *Qu' i[l] li*.—2262. Comma instead of period at the end of the line; so too in 2309 and 2311.—2405. Read *Fist, veant qui* (not *Fist veant, qui*). It means "he made, in the sight of whoever wished to see it."—2627. The form *peres* as nom. sing. is supported by the meter (cf. the introduction, p. 23, and v. 6813).—2891. Read *A cui? A Dieu*.—3218. Read *enroïllée* (five syllables).—3408. *B* is better. At the foot of the page 3048 is a misprint for 3408.—3558. For *qu'en vos dites* read *que vos dites*.—3571. *A mettre les*; this position of the unstressed pronoun is rather frequent in this text; cf. 3167, 4500, 5118, 6777, 7725.—3742. *Ne*, read *ne*.—4145. Comma after *voir*.—4198. Read *fust (B)*, not *fu*.—4210. *Emplore*, rather *Em plore*.—4306. It may be observed that in the list of proper names *Rencien* is rightly assumed here instead of what is printed in the text.—4341. Here *eslaisier* is for *eslaisier*, 'to widen'.—4372. The spelling *ostroier* here means *ostoyer*.—4388. *Joislains ses freres l'amena*. Better without *l'* as in *B*, and an *i* could be inserted by omitting the final *s* of *freres*.—4564. For *signant* read *si grant*.—4931. For *seüst* read *seü (B)*.—4995. For *parent* read *par ens*.—5064. Omit the period after *delivrement*.—5280. The word *desputeres* here is rather *disputator* than the same as *deputaire*.—5699. Omit the comma after *vendre*.—5785. For *emmaine* read *em maine*.—5786. *Com seüe chose demainne*. Read, as in *A*, *Comme seue* [possessive pron., cf. *B's sienne*] *c. d.*—5938. Omit the comma at the end of the verse.—5974. For *emporta* read *em porta*.—5988. For *il li* read *il i*.—6083. *Qu'i*; rather *Qui*.—6142. For *qu' il emporteroient* read *qu' i[l] l' em porteroient*.—6259. For *la tornerent* read rather *l' atornerent*.—6605. For *mujoient* read *muioient*.—6786. *Et deslojes*, rather *Et desloies*.—6957. '*Li soleus samble sac de haire*.' The note says: "peut-être Apocal. ix. 2." Not so; it's Apoc. vi. 12: "Et sol factus est niger tamquam saccus cilicinus."—7832. For *maus* read *mains (< minus)*?—7985. For *en a* read *a en*.—8046. The editor's correction [*i*]ere spoils the rime with *frere*.—8175. There should be no period at the end of the line.—8180. Omit the comma.

The preceding comments are far from clearing up all the difficulties, and I have omitted also some pretty obvious corrections. It is not necessary to examine in detail the analysis and notes, nor the glossary. Enough has already been said to show that these parts are not entirely satisfactory. The editor has undertaken too lightly a difficult task for which his training and his knowledge of Old French had not adequately prepared him.

Before this review was quite finished the April number of *Romania*, containing M. Philipot's important review of the work, written in an admirable spirit, reached me. Since reading his observations I have struck out a good many of my own comments in which he had anticipated me, and have made some other changes.

E. S. SHELDON.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

Primera Parte de Guzman de Alfarache, compuesta por MATEO ALEMAN. . . .
Edición transcrita y revisada por JULIO CEJADOR. Biblioteca Renacimiento
(Colección de Obras Maestras), Madrid, 1913, pp. 375.

Mateo Aleman: Guzmán de Alfarache. Primera Parte. Bibliotheca Romanica,
tomos 183, 184, 185, 186, 187. Biblioteca Española. Strasburgo [s. a.],
pp. 347.

Sometime before the close of the year 1604, Luís Valdés wrote that he had heard of more than 26 editions of the first part of Guzmán de Alfarache. Although these cannot all be traced at the present time, it is certain that during the years 1599 and 1600 there were at least eleven editions and that for 250 years after, the book continued to reappear at short intervals both in the original language and in translations.

For the last sixty years however, the Spanish reading world has been content with the *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles* and other editions of the first half of the nineteenth century; and the appearance of two reprints during the present year, one in Madrid and the other in Strasburg, marks an epoch in the history of this remarkable book. The former is published by the "Biblioteca Renacimiento" under the title of *Obras Maestras de la Literatura Universal* and is edited by Mr. Julio Cejador; the latter, edited by Mr. Fritz Holle, forms nos. 183-187 (in one vol.) of the *Bibliotheca Romanica*.

Though probably without intention, these editions could not have been better planned to meet the needs of two entirely different classes of students, for while one is thoroughly modernized the other is the first edition known that attempts to be an exact reprint of one dating from the early part of the seventeenth century.

On the title page of the copy from Madrid these words are found: "Edición transcrita y revisada por Julio Cejador" and the editor referring in his prologue to the readers who object to the moral reflexions and wish only the story, says: "Lo más que podremos será mudarles el plato de la puntuación que no es poco engorro ni pequeña pejuquera para el lector de las antiguas ediciones y en nada toca á la sustancia de la obra" (page 11).

The spelling has been almost entirely modernized, although such forms as *mesmo*, *nascimento*, *dellos* are found. The accentuation and use of capitals conform to the rules of the Academy. Sentences have been shortened and re-punctuated and the inverted exclamation and interrogation marks have been supplied. Long paragraphs have been divided, parentheses omitted and the proverbs printed in italics. Its size, binding and general appearance as well as price (2.50 pts.) should appeal to all readers of the classics who have not learned to love the old novelist best in his stiff ruffs and doublet. It was a happy thought on the part of the editor to insert the picture of Mateo Alemán—a reproduction of the wood engraving from the *Ortografía Castellana* published in Mexico in 1609—for the face of the "Español divino" is too little known at the present time. In the Prólogo the editor discusses the philosophy of the picaresque novel and gives a short account of the life of Alemán, based chiefly on the researches of Mr. Rodríguez Marín, as embodied in his discourse before the Royal Academy in 1907.

The *Bibliotheca Romanica* publishes at 2.50 pts. unbound, an exact reprint of the edition chosen. The first 32 pages consist of the Introducción by the

editor, the greater part of which is devoted to the analysis of Saavedra's spurious second part, and the Bibliografía in which 42 editions of the first and second parts are enumerated, together with some translations and other works of Alemán.

In this edition of Guzmán a student who does not have access to early editions can easily see what changes in orthography and in typographic custom have taken place during the last 300 years—in the special use of b, u, v, c, z, x, s, h, etc.; by the use of italics to indicate letters supplied in the expansion of abbreviations, and by the omission of the inverted exclamation and interrogation marks; in the lack of rules for the use of accents, punctuation marks and capital letters, the last more frequently employed than now, especially for proper adjectives.

Mr. Holle has gone over the text carefully and thoughtfully, indicating by footnotes, single and double brackets and parentheses the variant readings in later editions, the folio numbers in the original and the letters or words that should, in his judgment, be omitted or supplied.

Some errors have crept into both the Madrid and Strasburg reprints and it is quite possible that criticism will not always agree with the conclusions drawn, but the point I wish especially to discuss here is that of the editions selected. Was the choice in each case a wise one, considering the amount of time and study required to prepare the two books now ready for use?

On the last page of the Cejador reprint, after the table of contents, appears the following: "Acabóse esta reimpression de la edición de Coimbra del año MDC, en la imprenta "Renacimiento" el dia 15 de Febrero del año MCMXIII." The Coimbra edition was probably the earliest of the seven appearing that year, the license being dated Jan. 4, 1600. It is based upon the Madrid 1599 edition rather than on the editions of Barcelona or Zaragoza, so that barring typographical errors, especially those due to the Portuguese printer, which the editor has corrected, it would be as free from mistakes and as safe to follow as any except the princeps. But it has one characteristic to which Mr. Cejador has omitted all reference—in common with the other books of Alemán printed in Portugal it bears the permission of the Inquisition and shows that several corrections were made.

The title page has been modernized, the title itself, although like the original Coimbra edition in words, differs in spelling and in the lines, while the words SIC VOS on the left and NON VOBIS on the right of the vignette have been omitted, as has also the following: Em Coimbra, / Na Officina de Antonio de Mariz, Per feu Genro, / Herdeyro Diogo Gomez Loureyro, Im- / preffor da Vniverfidade. M. D. C. / Com Licença da S. Inquifição.

Of the introductory matter this edition of 1600 omits the Aprobación found in the princeps and also the Tassa, Erratas, El Rey,¹ the Latin poem *Ad Guzmanem* and the portrait. The Tabla is placed at the end instead of at the beginning, and the sonnet, which Alemán put at the close of the book, is inserted near the end of the preceding paragraph after the words "las dos manos atadas al cuello y por dogal un soneto"; and the final sentence "El foneto que

¹The omission of this, with its threat of punishment against those who published unauthorized editions, would seem to indicate that this was an unauthorized edition.

pufieron a Oratio, traduzido en el vulgar nueſtro dize afsi," is omitted. With two exceptions Mr. Cejador follows all these changes: as already stated, he places the portrait of Alemán taken from the Ortografía at the very beginning of the volume; and he omits a very interesting paragraph that appears just before the Dedication. It is the License which reads as follows: Licença da Mesa Geral da Sancta Inquiſição. Podeſe Imprimir eſte Libro intitulado Guzman de Alfarache cõ as emendas que o Reuedor pos amargẽ delle & deſpois de impreſſo tornarã a eſte Conſelho pera ſe conferir como Original, & ſe dar licença pera poder correr. Em Lisboa a quatro de Ianeyro de mil & feiscentos. Marcos Teyxeira. Ruy Pirys de Veyga.

One of these "emendas" is found in the first chapter (page 40 of the Cejador edition, line two, before the sentence beginning "Muchos veo") "No hay de que nos asombremos, alla se entienden, alla se lo hayan, a sus confesores dan larga cuenta dello, solo es Dios el juez de aquestas cosas, mire quien los absuelve lo que hace."

Since the edition chosen as a basis is, of all those appearing for over 300 years, the most nearly like the princeps, it would have been well worth while for the editor to call the attention of the reader to the peculiarities of the book as it was issued from the press of Antonio de Mariz by his son-in-law and heir.

In regard to the Guzmán published in the Bibliotheca Romanica, the thought that comes uppermost is, that it is a great pity such a careful and thorough piece of work should have been based on so poor an edition. Mr. Holle says in the Introducción that the "presente reimpression está basada en la edición de Burgos 1619 . . . que tal vez es el prototipo de cuantas después se imprimieron en los siglos XVII & XVIII." In this he is correct; for some reason the Burgos edition was used as the basis of the reprints not only of the seventeenth and eighteenth but also of the nineteenth centuries and is the source of mistakes which have made passages unintelligible ever since.

What is the history of the Burgos edition? In the spring of 1599 Varez de Castro published the so-called princeps. In the next year an edition of the same size and foliation (though with different signatures) appeared "En Madrid por los herederos de Iuan Yñiguez de Lequerica," who, Pérez Pastor asserts (Biblioteca Madrileña), "fueron ajustados [1599] para trabajar en la imprenta que el Licenciado Varez de Castro había puesto en Madrid donde existieron hasta 1601." This reprint is the only one of the nine appearing during these first two years (the Paris Bonfons editions I know nothing about) that follows the princeps exactly in printing the same introductory matter in the same order and nothing else. But the text has many changes some of which will be noted later. With the exception of Martínez (Madrid 1601) and León (Sevilla 1602) no other publisher, so far as I can ascertain, follows these textual changes until the year 1619, when Juan Bautista Varesio of Burgos apparently selected the edition of Lequerica instead of that of Varez de Castro for his own. The Tassa, Erratas and Licencia are new, the dedication to Rojas is omitted and the old Aprobación of Fray Diego Davila has a mistake in the date "a 15 de Enero" instead of "de Enero 13." But the textual changes in the Lequerica edition are found here, and these with still others and typographical errors have been followed to the present time. A comparison of a few sentences from the three books will aid in understanding the matter. The readings in the first column are those of Varez de Castro, in the second of

Lequerica and in the third of Varesio and in general of all the editions since. The numbers refer to the pages in Mr. Holle's book.

Madrid, 1599 (Princeps) VAREZ DE CASTRO	Madrid, 1600. IUAN YÑIGUEZ DE LEQUERICA	Burgos, 1619 JUAN BAUTISTA VARECIO
Teniendo escrita esta Poetica historia	Teniendo escrita esta Poetica historia	Holle, page 39, end: Teniendo escrita esta potica ² historia
seria cosa justa obviar este inconveniente, pues con muy pocas palabras quedaran absueltas	seria cosa justa quitar este inconveniente, pues con muy pocas palabras quedara bien claro	Holle, page 39: (same)
Deo volente	Dios mediante	Holle, p. 40, last line Dec.: Dios mediante
un portillo por donde me entrara qualquier ter- minista, acusando de mal Latin	un portillo por donde me pudiera entrar acu- sando qualquier terminis- ta de mal Latin	Holle, p. 45, last line un portillo por donde me pudiera entrar cu- rando ³ qualquier termi- nista de mal Latin
afrentas ajenas, como de ordinario se acostum- bra: lo qual condeno por necedad de siete capas. descubro mi punto y no salva mi yerro el de mi vecino, o deudo. Antes es siempre vituperado el maldiciente	afrentas ajenas segun de ordinario se acostum- bra: lo qual condeno por necedad solemne de siete capas...descubro mi punto no salvando mi yerro el de mi vecino o deudo. Y siempre vemos vituperado el maldiciente	Holle, p. 46, middle: (same)
claros y oscuros segun y en el lugar que convenia	claros y oscuros en las partes y segun que convenia	47, end of paragraph: (same)

² The Amberes edition of 1681 changes this word to *poquita* in order to make sense and *poquita* it has remained ever since, with the exception of the Madrid edition of 1723 and the one under consideration, both of which prefer *politica*.

³ This mistake seems never to have been corrected except by Aribau in the *Autores Españoles* and he changes *curando* to *cuando*. It is interesting to note that this error and the one above noted were corrected by hand years ago in the edition owned by the Hispanic Society, New York City.

mas bien premiado	(same)	Holle, p. 48, end: mas bien premiado y gratificado su trabajo
pudo de alli en adelante quedar rico	pudo quedar de alli en adelante rico	Holle, p. 51, end: (same)
A el amancebado.. A el ladron.. A el murmurador.. A el soberbio.. A el blasfemo	Al amancebado...Al famoso ladron.. Al temerario murmurador.. Al soberbio... Al desatinado blasfemo	Holle, p. 54: (same)
la fertilidad de la tierra	la fertilidad y disposicion de la tierra	Holle, p. 63, middle: (same)
Confianza que de los dos hazian	confianza que hazian de los dos	Holle, p. 72, top: confianza que harian de los dos
aquello me parecia silla de manos	me parecia aquello silla de manos	Holle, p. 86, middle: (same)
Como el Medico viniese y no lo hallase	Como el Medico lo viniese a visitar y no lo hallase	Holle, p. 87, top: (same)
a fe de caballero	a fe de quien soy	Holle, p. 87, middle: (same)
las dos manos atadas al cuello y por dogal un soneto	(same)	Holle, p. 347, middle: las dos manos atadas al cuello
El soneto que pusieron a Oratio, traduzido en el vulgar nuestro dize asi	(same)	Holle, p. 347, end: (omitted)
Sonnet	Sonnet	(omitted)

ALICE H. BUSHEE.

WELLESLEY COLLEGE.

La Damoisele a la Mule, conte en vers du cycle arthurien par PAÏEN DE MAISIÈRES; nouvelle édition critique par BOLESLAS ORLOWSKI. Paris: Champion, 1911.

This is not the first time that two students have chosen the same subject as thesis for the doctorate, but it is unusual that two editions of the same text should be published in the same year. In his preface Mr. Orłowski explains how this came about. As early as 1896 Wendelin Foerster and Gaston Paris had announced in *Romania*, XXV that they intended to include this poem in a collection. As this edition had not appeared although a suitable time had elapsed, Mr. Orłowski took up the work, and to forstall competition, he asked to have an announcement of it put in the *Romania*. This however was not done, and when already much of his work had been completed a copy of the American edition reached Paris.¹ Fortunately soon afterward Mr. Orłowski and I met each other there, and everything was amicably adjusted. Since my study of the literature was not entirely completed, it was decided that he continue his plan of publishing his work and put special emphasis upon that feature. By another strange coincidence, we had both begun an edition of the still unpublished Arthurian romance '*De Gunbaut or Gawain et Humbaut*.' As Mr. Orłowski had not yet done much work upon this, he was willing to renounce all claims, hence a satisfactory compromise was effected.

Orłowski's edition is divided into two parts: the first contains a brief study of the language of the author and an analysis of the different literary themes; the second consists of the text, notes, vocabulary and bibliography. There is also a short description of the manuscript and a facsimile. The treatment of the language of the author is too condensed. It contains mention of certain characteristics which belong only to the copyist, such as *faut: saut*, cited to prove that *l* is vocalised, and *diäus: viäus* as a case of Picard dialect. In the interpretation of the few dialectical peculiarities the editor reaches the same conclusion as that expressed by those who had studied the text before him, viz., that the author was from Champagne and wrote in the latter part of the twelfth or the beginning of the thirteenth century. After a few pages devoted to certain syntactical usages, without reaching any important conclusions, the editor discusses the versification of the poem. Here he shows a regrettable carelessness in his citations. One can not understand why under *rimes homonymes* he should class v. 1007 *quaroloient: demenoient*, and under examples of '*fort enjambement*,' v. 587, where there is a marked pause indicated in his text by a period. Similarly, under the few cases of elision listed by him, it is surprising to find the three instances of *si* (Lat. sic), verses 143, 258, 268. The first case is not *si* but *se* used in a contrary-to-fact condition and correctly classified by him in his chapter on syntax; while the second and third are both instances of the reflexive pronoun *se*. Similar inaccuracy appears in the statistics showing the proportion of broken couplets in Païen compared with Chrétien de Troyes. Of course in this computation it is almost impossible for two men to arrive at exactly the same result, for individual opinion must vary regarding the close connection of the phrases. Still there is scarcely reason for the wide discrepancy between Orłowski's 34.5 per cent. and my 23 per cent. His figures are erroneous when he mentions the proportion found in Chrétien to be 16.7 per cent., whereas Prof.

¹ *La Mule sanz Fraïn*, ed. by R. T. Hill. Baltimore, 1911.

F. M. Warren² has shown that for the first 2000 verses of *Erec* it is 15.5 per cent., but that for the rest of *Erec* and all the other long poems by the same author it averages 33 per cent. Under the heading 'Style,' ten pages are used to show that the author does not have any, that he shows little or no originality, and that most of his descriptive terms are commonplace. This chapter might well have been omitted.

At least half of the volume is given up to the treatment of the literary themes. The editor shows the main story to be that of the disinherited maiden who has been dispossessed by her sister and calls upon a knight to aid her to recover her rights. This same theme is found related at length in Chrétien's *Yvain* and in the long compilation *Diu Krône* by the Middle High German poet, Heinrich von dem Türlin. Orlowski shows by a comparative table that Chrétien's version departs in many particulars from Païen's, but that the German poem has a great amount of similarity not only in the general outline but in the numerous interpolated adventures. He then cites parallel passages, which are so similar even in the details that there seems to be no room for doubt that one poet was influenced by the other. Of course there are slight differences, for Heinrich has made the *vilain*, who guarded the princess, to be her uncle, and has given names to the chief personages who bore none in the French poem. This is in line with the German poet's habit in the rest of his long poem; many of the changes were necessitated by the need of binding together the different sources which he used. Such a close resemblance leaves no room for doubt that one must have been directly or indirectly influenced by the other. It is not probable that Païen borrowed from the German, for in most cases of influence at this time the reverse tendency is true. Furthermore, Heinrich admits that he knows French and is familiar with the works of Chrétien and others. Yet in spite of the abundance of proof, Orlowski can not bring himself to think that Heinrich used the French poem, but inclines to the theory of one common source used by both. However, he does not stop there but states that Chrétien too drew on this imaginary source for a part of his *Yvain*. This seems to me absurd, for there is no close verbal similarity between the *Yvain* and the other poems. On the other hand the divergences between *Diu Krône* and *La Damoisele a la Mule* are few and of little or no importance. The following passages cited by Orlowski under divergences seem to be the opposite:

Ein Stec smaller denne ein Hant,	
der was gar stahlen	<i>Diu Krône</i> , 13848
Une planche negaires lee	
. . . estoit de fer trestote.	<i>La Mule</i> , 240.

The few instances where *Diu Krône* presents a better text than *La Mule* may be due to the fact that Heinrich had at his disposal a much better manuscript of the French poem than that in which it is preserved to us. A comparative examination of these poems would be a most interesting study for a thorough investigation, which I hope sometime to make. Meanwhile it must be pointed out that the conclusion reached by Orlowski is made contrary to his own evidence and against the opinions of those who have considered the subject before.

² *Modern Philology*, IV, 670, 671.

After this detailed study of the main theme, the editor discusses certain minor features. The mention of a fountain which is described simply as '*clere et saine*' suggests for some reason magic fountains and he digresses upon Broceliande. Similarly the episode of the turning castle is the occasion for citing other instances of this common phenomenon of Arthurian poems. A similar compilation is made of extremely narrow bridges. Other chapters, on dwarfs, combats and magic mules, consist merely of commonplace truths. What is the use of showing that dwarfs are common personages in Arthurian literature, that combats are often described in similar language, that mules are animals of supernatural power? All this is so perfectly self-evident to anyone at all familiar with this literature that it is idle to dilate upon it. Orłowski does not seriously attempt to solve the meaning of the bridle and its quest, but merely mentions the possibility that it is symbolic and means the rights of inheritance. It is important to remember that it has nothing to do with the mule, as the old title '*la Mule sanz Frain*' might lead one to think. The mule to be sure has no bridle but these magic beasts need none. After Gawain has obtained it, he does not put it on his steed, but brings it back to court, where he hands it over to the younger sister. So there is no doubt but that the title adopted by Orłowski is the proper one; but it is a question whether one should abandon the other, by which the poem has been known, or whether it would not be better to give the poem a double title. The concluding chapter, on the author and his poem, shows that we know nothing about him, and that if we judge him by this piece, the only one preserved, he has no claims to literary distinction. The rest of the volume consists of the text, two pages of notes, and a bibliography. The last is unnecessarily expanded, including books on the Grail, and medieval histories, while the poem is absolutely lacking in historical references. When, however, Orłowski sees fit to include *Le Dictionnaire des postes et télégraphes . . . de la France continentale, de la Corse et de l'Algérie*. Paris, 1905, and *La Semaine des Enfants: magasin d'images et de lectures amusantes*, etc., one forgets that the subject of the dissertation is an Arthurian romance of the twelfth century.

This analysis has been sufficiently detailed to show that the literary treatment has included much unnecessary matter and has led to no definite conclusions; that the most interesting part, the comparison with a similar poem in Middle High German, was not utilized to the best advantage and led to incorrect theories; and that in the study of the language and versification unpardonable carelessness is frequently apparent.

The following remarks upon the text are intended to supplement the text criticisms of Prof. Roques in his excellent review of both dissertations in *Romania*, XLI, 144-7: v. 45, semicolon instead of comma;—v. 53, ms. has *que a*, which is essential to the verse; v. 62, ms. *montrerai*;—vv. 108, 109, period after 108;—v. 152, *sagenilloient* is the ms. form; the note being incorrect;—vv. 172, 173, remove period after 172;—v. 197, remove period; then it is unnecessary to change *qui* to *voir* in 199;—v. 211, *et* is not in ms., nor is it necessary;—v. 335, ms. \bar{q} *il*, hence no need of change;—v. 343, put semicolon at end;—v. 361, I see no reason for changing the punctuation as M. Roques suggests. A similar change from plural subject to sing. verb occurs v. 159, where *chascuns* is used. To make the 'mule' the subject of *vet* seems forced, for the subject of 355-359 is *Gawain* and in 364 *les bestes*. If one wishes to avoid changing from pl. to

sing., then correct *vet* to *vont*;—v. 363, period at end;—v. 387, semicolon;—v. 407, ms. has *par* not *por*;—v. 483, change of *Gauvain* to *soiez* useless—v. 492, change of *et* to *que* good;—v. 493, comma instead of interrogation point;—v. 494, period at end;—v. 556, *aisier* has only two syllables; correct to *aaisier*;—v. 593, ms. reads *maintenat*;—v. 617, ms. *coven*;—v. 619, one syllable lacking in ms.; Orłowski changes *vien* to *venez* but the 2nd pers. sing. is used in the rest of the dialogue; so I prefer to change *or* to *ore*, a form found v. 957;—v. 636, read *fait* as in ms.;—v. 693, period at end;—v. 700, one syllable lacking, but ms. reads *que il*, not *qu il*. This correction to *que il* was made by Prof. Roques probably without knowing the ms.; v. 740, *es denz* as in ms.;—v. 772, no need to change *fait* to *fust*; the form is impersonal;—v. 797, variant listed incorrectly under 787;—v. 808, period at end;—v. 844, ms. *ausi*;—v. 851, read *a fere*; cf. 872; interrogation point at end of verse;—v. 885, read *escriture*; the copyist recognized his error and placed a dot beneath the second *s*;—v. 884, not necessary to change *lo* to *li*, for acc. pronoun is found with *ferir un coup*: cf. Tobler, *Vermischte Beiträge*, I. 89 A; Z FSL, XXIII, 106;—v. 912, ms. *main a main*, not the form in the variant;—v. 953, read *fet* with the ms.;—v. 956, *des mes*, not *desmès*;—v. 986, ms. *fait*;—v. 1025, misspelling for *ovraingne*;—v. 1110, ms. *queroles*.—In the vocabulary *fel* and *felon* should be put under one head. The same is true of *fol* and *fous*, *pel* and *pieus*, *poi* and *pou*, *jame* and *jambe*. *Oirre* means 'way,' 'route.' Errors in spelling are *solans* for *solaus*, *quiens* for *quieus*, and *pregne* for *preigne* (subj. of *prendre*).

RAYMOND T. HILL.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

Vom Ursprung der provenzalischen Schriftsprache. VON HEINRICH MORF. (Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.) 1912 (XLV). Berlin, Reichsdruckerei. Pp. 22.

The general belief that the language of the troubadours of southern France took its rise in the ancient "Limousin" dialect is due to the obvious misinterpretation of a frequently quoted passage from Ramon Vidal's famous *Razos de trobar*. This erroneous opinion, advanced by superficial medieval readers and scholars, was consecrated, in 1350, by the author of the *Leys d'Amors* and has been maintained up to the present time by a stately line of excellent Romance scholars, who implicitly transmitted it from one to the other. If now and then a sort of doubt arose, no one earnestly ventured to dispel it. Professor H. Morf, with his accustomed energy and incision, is the first to point out this deeply rooted error, whose history he traces accurately and in detail.

By confronting the testimony of Ramon Vidal and G. Molinier, he arrives at the conclusion that Vidal, who as a foreign critic (from Catalonia), is at a loss to sum up under one general designation the literary work of southern France, gives a marked preference to the "Limousin," the contemporary literary splendor of which dazzles him. One manuscript of the *Razos* (MS. C) boldly replaces *lemozi* by *proensal*, thus anticipating the term since consecrated by usage to designate the literary hegemony of all southern France.

M. J. MINCKWITZ

MUNICH

NOTES AND NEWS

B. M. Woodbridge has been appointed to the adjunct professorship in Romance languages at the University of Texas, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Professor Frederick C. Ostrander.

William Samuel Hendrix, A.M. (Cornell Univ.), for three years assistant in Romance languages at the University of Illinois, after spending the summer at the vacation courses of the University of Madrid, will go to an instructorship in Romance languages at the University of Texas.

The following changes in Romance languages have taken place at the University of Illinois.

Associate professor David Hobart Carnahan is spending his sabbatical leave in study in France. His address for the coming year will be in care of the American Express Co., Paris, France.

Assistant professor David Simon Blondheim has been granted a year's leave of absence to allow him to accept a research fellowship at the Johns Hopkins University.

L. M. Turner, Docteur de l'Université de Paris, has been appointed associate. John Shulters, A.M. (Illinois), Thomas Wesenberg, A.M. (Pennsylvania), Charles S. Carry, B. ès L. (Besançon), and Conrad Joseph Eppels have been appointed assistants.

J. K. Ditchy, A.M. (Illinois), for three years an assistant in Romance languages at the University of Illinois, goes to an instructorship at Ohio State University.

Arthur L. Owen, A.M. (Illinois), assistant professor of Romance languages at the University of Kansas, has been granted a leave of absence for a year of study at the University of Chicago.

Mark Skidmore, A.M. (Illinois), goes from an instructorship in Romance languages at Dartmouth to an instructorship in the same department at the University of Kansas.

Albert Cohn MacMaster goes from an instructorship in Romance languages at Williams College to a similar position at Dartmouth College.

Professor André Marie, of the Lycée, Bordeaux, has been elected Associate professor of French at the Johns Hopkins University, to succeed Professor Terracher. At the same university Mr. Raymond Leguy has been appointed instructor.

Dr. R. B. Michell of the University of Wisconsin has been promoted to an Assistant-professorship. Mr. L. R. Herrick of the same university has been made Professor of Romance languages at Hamline University.

Professor Albert Schintz of Bryn Mawr College has accepted the chiefship in Romance languages at Smith College.

A memorial service for the late Professor Henry Lampart LeDaum was held at the University of North Dakota, on March 13, 1913.