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INTRODUCTION

I. THE MANUSCRIPT

The British Museum ms Egerton 3028 contains:

(a) part of an abridgment of the _Brut_ of Wace, with a continuation into the reign of Edward III (ff. 1 to 63 inclusive);

(b) a version of the _Destruction de Rome_, in similar style of writing, miniatures and language, (ff. 64-83);

(c) a version of the _Roman de Fierabras_, also in similar style (ff. 84-118).

It was acquired by the Museum in 1920 from a member of the Cornish family Pendarves, to which it had evidently passed by inheritance from the library of one of the Luttrells, of Dunster Castle, Somerset. Narcissus Luttrell, annalist and antiquarian, who died in 1732, inscribed his elaborate monogram, supposed to contain all the letters of his name, on the verso of the present first folio, with the date 1693. On the recto, in a hand which seems his, we read: "A Cronicle of England called Brutus in Frenche verse." Above the miniature on the verso of f. 63 is the inscription in an earlier hand, mutilated by subsequent
trimming; "La ..... Espagne Sarazin et Fierenbras son fils en le temps du Charlemagne." In the same hand on f. 83 verso, opposite the beginning of the Fierenbras proper, we read: "La Romance de fierenbras d'Alisandre fille de Laban d'Espaigne."

Written on vellum, in single column, the ms is of small format (19.5 x 12cm), reduced from its original size by the trimming noted above, possibly done when the nineteenth-century binding was put on. A miniature depicting some incident related in the text occupies roughly half of the recto of each folio except ff. 65 and 85, both of which follow next but one after a full-page picture at the beginning of the Destruction and the Fierenbras. The writing is a rather elaborate English hand of about the middle of the fourteenth century, and is on the whole careful; it is well preserved, apart from six lines at the top of the first folio, and a number of words here and there which are effaced by stains due to the gilding of the miniatures. In these cases the apparently correct reading is given in the copy of the text.

Larger initials in red, of fairly frequent occurrence, divide the work into paragraphs; they have
been forgotten in three places, (vv. 1308, 1631, 634) though in the last case a small v (the missing letter), of the size and colour of the ordinary text, has been inserted in the middle of the space left. Numerals are generally in Roman characters, and the frequent abbreviations are quite of normal type: 9, as is shown by occasional full spellings, represents cum or cun; gn't, gn't, kn't, kn't, gnt, gnt, all occur, but as grant, kuant, quant, seldom appear in full, these abbreviations have been rendered further grant, kant gaunt. This course seems justified by the fact that relatives are invariably written ai, ki, ae, ke, and that nun is rare in this text. I and j are as a rule carefully indicated by a small flourish above, and fondness is shown for flourishes, ornamented final letters of a line and so on. The inverted semi-colon ( : ) occurs frequently, generally in proximity to direct speech, after "dist il" etc. The writer is also partial to a left hand marginal sign consisting of two parallel inclined dashes; these often seem to mark off paragraphs, sense-groups, or sentences, but they also occur frequently
where it is difficult to explain their function.

The ms is incomplete. It begins with the end of Cymbeline's reign, corresponding to v. 5,000 of Wace's Brut, (ed. Le Roux de Lincy). or v. 4,883 of the edition made by T. Arnold. The British Museum Catalogue of Additions to the Department of Manuscripts 1916 - 1920 therefore suggests that it lacks five gatherings of eight leaves, or about 2,080 lines. Over 10,000 lines of Wace are here abridged into 2,914 lines, with an additional 354 lines bringing the "history" up to the time of the ms.

The fragment begins on the present f. 2, and the six effaced lines on f. 1. will not be found till v. 387 of our text. This arises from a bad assembly of the ms at some stage of its history, probably when the first part of the Brut, and perhaps the original binding, were lost. F. 1. should take the place of f. 8, which should follow f. 2, really the beginning of our fragment. The catchwords at the beginning foot of f. 1. b then come in their correct place at the end of a gathering if, as suggested, a number of complete gatherings has been lost. This disarrangement is evidently of ancient date, as the present f. 1. bears
every sign of long wear, presumably without fly-leaf or binding.

The value of the ms from a literary and philological viewpoint is increased by the tolerable certainty with which it can be dated.

The writing, from comparison with dated documents in such manuals as English Court Hand, (Johnson and Jenkinson), seems to belong to the latter part of the first half of the fourteenth century. The concluding lines refer to the reign of Edward III "re ore est." The king has already begun his invasion of French territory:

"Cil ad grant guere comenced ... Encoutrre le Roi de France en sa terre."

The date of composition should therefore be subsequent to July 1338, when Edward and his forces landed at Antwerp. If "en sa terre" is not used loosely of Flanders, it should date in fact from Edward's actual crossing of the French frontier at Buironfosse late in 1339. The ms ends with a prayer for victory such as aggressors usually eulogize from their churches, but there is no mention of the king's great naval victory at Sluys on June 25th 1340. As such an event would not doubt have found a large place in the patriotic ending of the poem it is natural to conclude that Sluys had not been won when the ms was
written, or at least composed. The limiting dates for composition therefore appear to be July 1338 and June 1340. That given by the Catalogue for the conclusion of the chronicle, (1338) thus seems rather early, and the evidence most favourable to the end of 1339 or the beginning of 1340. As the writing seems contemporary with the latest facts recorded, it is more than possible that the scribe was also the author of the chronicle. Obscure lines and downright errors, as distinct from irregularities regular in Anglo-Norman, are very few, and the quality of the versification which follows the end of Wace's story hardly suggests talent likely to be rare in a scribe. The miniatures have great curiosity value, as well as artistic and historical interest. Comparison with the fine work of many contemporary English artists seems to justify the comment of the Catalogue, "they are not beautiful but very interesting." Closer examination, however, shows in them rare skill in drawing and composition, and it is rather the crude colouring which conveys an unfavourable first impression. Professor Tocillon's opinion is that they are of great excellence, in fact unique. They seem to have been intended originally as pen-and-ink drawings. The
drawing is firm and clean, the drapery well rendered, and ignorance of proportion and perspective is only a common fault of the time. Some of the pictures, for example the scenes of fighting such as those on ff. 5 and 18, are particularly good and full of action. The faces of the men, with their wavy noses, the interrogative arc of the brow and the rather thick lips faintly curved in a smile or distressfully drawn, an occasion demands, are of a uniform ugliness which is at least distinctive.

The colouring and gilding, however, are much below the standard of the drawing. Hair and beards are usually a rusty purple, though some yellowish blondes appear, and even one or two bluebeards, notably Joseph, in the Nativity on f.2. The flat washes of dirty blue, reddish-brown, orange, yellow or dull green rarely keep within the outlines, and often obliterate interior drawing intended to show drapery, hair etc. This is so much the case that 24 pictures in the book, (e.g. ff. 7, 12, 30, 33, 82, ) show lining-over above the pigment, in the same black ink which surrounds the gilding and detracts so much from the work left us by the excellent draughtsman who worked with brown ink. This lining-over evidently represents some attempt to make amends by the perpetrator
of the colouring and gilding. Traces of the original brown outlines, distinct from the clumsy black edging of crowns, spear-heads, cups, etc., can be seen in half-a-dozen or more pictures, (e.g. ff. 9, 15, 17, 32, 39). The gold has almost disappeared, leaving only a dark mass, with a discolouration through to the text on the verso. All this gives the impression of a prentice hand different from that of the master of line responsible for the drawing.

The Catalogue gives (p. 338) a detailed list of the subjects of the miniatures. It suffices here to point out that they are all taken from the text of the actual page on which they occur, and that the artist's predilections appear to be for violence and gore: sixteen of the sixty-three illustrations to the Brut fall into this category. The spurring of the blood is irreproachably rendered, in a bright scarlet which contrasts favorably with the other dull colours and is no doubt the work of the original pen-artist; it is the same as that of the large initials. The artist shows especial fondness for royalty and heraldry, still a feature in the national character; nearly all his illustrations contain one or more kings, and a deal of what the Catalogue calls "imaginary
"heraldry." All kings of Britain, British, Saxon or Norman, bear the three leopards of Anjou. Frollo, Roman governor of Paris in the time of Arthur, carries on his shield, in common with Charlemagne, the lilies of France. Monarchs are easily distinguished by their crowns, of uniform pattern, which cling to the royal heads in all circumstances, even when these are gravitating after receiving a fatal stroke. Uther (f. 35) persists in wearing his royal badge when approaching Tintagel disguised as his vassal Gorlois. The baneful influence of these tarnished emblems on the text has been alluded to. The artist rarely misses the smallest opportunity of introducing ships: there are eight sea-pictures in the Brut, and twelve in the whole book. Other interesting subjects are: Uther's men trying to remove the Giants' Circle, mistakenly called in the Catalogue the erection of Stonehenge - the picture is clearly modelled on Stonehenge, however (f. 30); Arthur's giant adversary, obvious ancestor of the pantomime variety (f. 49); men dying of the pestilence (f. 58); and Edward the Confessor's shrine at Westminster, with sufferers awaiting cure (f. 59).

Other pictures beside f. 30 on which the Catalogue seems mistaken are:

F.7. "Trahern and the King of Norway." It was of course Octaves who solicited that monarch's aid.

The text tells us that Eldolf captured him before he reached the town; the incident portrayed is rather the overtaking of Hengist.

F. 31. "The king of Ireland's troops sail to aid Fasces." For the reason given in the next paragraph, it is more likely that Fasces' flight to Ireland is intended as mention of this immediately precedes the picture.

F. 45. "Arthur and Hoel discussing plans in a tower." The nearest mention of Hoel in the text is fifteen lines later. Arthur is haranguing all his barons in the Tour Gigantina and the picture comes at the point in his speech when he announces his intention of going to Rome; "Pur treud avor, nun fur ooncr." The artist may indeed intend the only other personage visible beside Arthur to be Hoel, or he may be portraying Arthur's projected meeting with the Emperor.

F. 51. "Fight between Arthur and the Emperor." Neither Waio, nor our author mentions this combat. Such a piece de résistance would certainly have been dealt with at length.

We have noted that the miniatures all portray incidents of the text. In fact, each miniature is invariably based, not only on what is related on the page where it occurs, but on the verse or verses immediately before it. This explains why the pictures occur in different parts of the page, with few, numerous or no verses above or below them. Thus the picture of Arviragus mounting
his horse (f. 8) is at the extreme top of the page, as the relevant verse, "si rest sur sun destrer muntez," comes at the bottom of f. 7b. As the Nativity at the top of f. 2 has no words above it, we may conclude that the last verse of the lost portion made allusion to the birth of Christ: v. 4901 of Wace (v. 4874, Arnold's edition) is in fact "A cel tans Jesus Crist naqui."

Such correspondence between text and illustrations suggests at least close cooperation between scribe and illustrator, not only in fitting the illustration to the text, but in fitting the text around the illustration. The ink of the text and of the pen drawing is of the same brown hue, while the initials and the blood of the miniatures are of the same red. The following circumstance suggests something further.

Of the reign of Cariz Wace says:-

En son tans vint la grant sorverse
De puiens et de gens averse
Que Guarmans amora par mor;
Bien en avès oi parler. (vv. 13, 791 – 13,794; ed. Arnold, vv 13379 – 13382)

The corresponding lines of the Egerton ms., at the foot of f. 53b, are:

En sun tempe vint la grant suverse
Des puiens et de gent adverse
Ke Gurguint monast par Mor;
Ore le vous voil mustrer.

And after four lines vv. describing the voyage to Britain, the miniature on f. 54a depicts Gurguint and his
warriors tossing in their ship. Again, the last verse before the miniature at the foot of f. 21 a, "Vent ont bon; si ont siglez," is repeated with slight differences at the top of f. 21 b, "Vent unt bon, fort unt siglé." This seems to be a glimpse of our scribe at work. The oversight, it may be, occurred because he had paused to make his drawing before turning over. There could hardly be better evidence for identifying illustrator with scribe.

The Catalogue points out that the unique style of the miniatures is similar only to that of the "Hanover Provincial Library ms IV 579," containing the "Destruction vfa and Eiérabrun, of which a notice, with phototypic reproduction of an opening, was given by Prof. Brand in Romania, (xxviii, p. 409). L. Olschki, in "Manuscrits français à pointures des bibliothèques d'Allemagne," also gives reproductions. At the Courtauld Institute, London, only two 14th-century mss have miniatures showing points of resemblance with the Egerton ms. They are the Apocalypse (ms Papyr 1803), at Magdalen College, Cambridge, and the "Liber de Officiis Regum" executed for Edward III after the East Anglian school, and dated 1326 (o.e.). The latter is at Christ Church, Oxford. Dr. Plevane, of Göttingen, quoted by Ida Wirtz (Studien zur Handschrift IV IV 578), connects the style of the Hanover miniatures with East Anglia, and dates them about in 1320-30. Those of the second
he says, show a different hand from the first, and are possibly modelled on the style of Matthew Paris, of about 1250-70. The British Museum experts, however, do not connect the Egerton miniatures with the well-known East-Anglian school. Of course, the existence by the 14th century of many travelling professional illuminators complicates the question of the origin of these miniatures. An attempt will be made in the next chapter to localise our ms on other evidence.

The resemblance of the Egerton miniatures particularly for the faces, with that reproduced from the Hanover ms, is very marked. The comparison gains in importance if carried further.

The Hanover ms similarly contains an average of one miniature per folio. Men's faces in the Romania reproduction are strikingly like those of the Egerton. The use of a banner pole as part of the right-hand border of a picture, with the banner itself projecting out beside the text, as seen on the final page of the Hanover Destruction is found eight times in the Egerton (ff. 47, 50, 74, 84, 89, 96, 97, 110). The last two lines above the final Destruction miniature, picturing Charlemagne's supper party are:

Charles le Roi de France son ad leve demandee Maintenant et tout peult assis au noper.
We have already noted the Egerton writer's habit of making the picture follow immediately the verse which it illustrates. Prof. Brandin speaks of the "mouvement, vivacité, variété" evidenced in the pictures of the Hanover Destruction, which, he believes with Dr. Plevener more recently, are not due to the same artist as those of Fiorabran. He speaks of crude colouring and continues "L'enlumineur de A (Fiorabran) nous fait sentir le moelleux des draperies, des costumes ou des voiles, ... se sont de dorures,... le coloris peut avoir été fait postérieurement, ou par une autre main... Les deux enlumineurs servent d'ailleurs le texte de très près, et leurs illustrations servent réellement à éclairer le poème qu'elles ornent." These remarks could hardly have been bettered for application to the Egerton miniatures. It may be added that, as far as can be judged from comparison of Prof. Brandin's list of the subjects of the Hanover pictures with those of the Egerton ms, at least fifteen subjects seem to be common to the two ms and of similar conception. Of course, the Egerton version of the stories being less full than the Hanover, and different, this number is less than it might otherwise have been.

Ida Wirtz goes so far as to say: "von den 34 auf den Fierenbras entfallen den Miniaturen der Egerton Handsch. 20 ein Gegenstück in unserer Ms. haben." She also says the ink of the Hanover is dark-brown, like that of the Egerton.
Consideration of the writing of the last page of the Hanover Destruction shows not only general likeness with that of the Egerton but also similar letter-forms and abbreviations. There is similar use of ornament such as the marginal / and the elaborate final r: the word "destrer" has the exact appearance which it takes more than once in the Brut. Spelling habits are also alike. Forms like oen, joi, voice, croice, bone vont, hanaper, pier, (for pere), beal(fem.), puosel, gaitoent, naferer, estour, comencen, totes(masc.), and ceste (masc.) are common to both, while -eint is a frequent imperfect ending in both ms. Ida Wirtz also points out many similarities in the language and versification.

The dimensions of the Hanover ms are 23 x 14 cm., which compare with those of the Egerton, bearing in mind the extensive trimming undergone by the latter. The Destruction occupies 24 folios, and Fierabras 76 folios of the Hanover ms. The respective numbers for the Egerton are 19 and 34. Prof. Brandin gives the average number of lines in a full page of the former as 45, with 24 on pages containing miniatures. The figures for the Egerton Brut are 36 and 17. Groeber, in his Romania article, (11, p. 6) says of the author of the Hanover Destruction; "Il n'a pas suivi très exactement son original; il a lui-même composé des vers.... s'est écarté dans ce cas des données du texte qu'il a eu sous les yeux." This applies with equal truth to the author of the Egerton Brut.
All this tempts one to suppose that the two men are the products of the same school of scribes and illuminators, and issued from the same Anglo-Norman scriptorium, presumably a small one as these seem its only products known to survive, and remote from the well-known centres as its style is so much its own. Its scribes were apparently skilled in the illustrator's art as well as the writer's. They further seemed to be versifiers on their own account, considerably altering their models and composing extensive additions. The Brut, at any rate, appears to be autograph as far as the last part is concerned.

Prof. Brandin dates at before 1280 the writing of the Hanover Destruction and the Fierabras at the beginning of the 14th century. Tanquerey (Evolution du Verbe, p. xvii) dates the Destruction 1300-1330. The writing of the three sections of the Egerton ms, if not from the same hand at, for example, short intervals of time, appears to be almost contemporaneous. Rather curiously, considering its later date, it resembles most closely the earlier hand in the Hanover ms. Since the Brut dates itself with tolerable certainty, the Egerton Destruction and Fierabras should thus represent a mid-century recension of a work already, in the Hanover ms, executed some years earlier in the same monastery. We may even wonder whether the latter now lacks an original first part containing the Brut. If it never did include this, it would be interesting to conjecture what recrudescence of popularity
or other causes, led to the inclusion of this piece in the Egerton. It is perhaps not irrelevant to note that a fragment of Wace's *Brut* and the *Roman de Fierabras* are found together in the Paris ms no. 12603.

If there is indeed family relationship between the two ms, the presence of one of them at Hanover may find an explanation in the close connection of the Electorate with England for over a century from 1715. Nothing is known, however, even at the library to which it belongs, about the history of the Hanover ms.
II LOCALITY OF ORIGIN

There are obvious difficulties in attempting to identify the place of origin of an Anglo-Norman text, except from direct evidence. It is common ground to say that each author followed his own sweet will in spelling and grammar, curbed only by the more or less of efficacy with which his teachers had instilled the rules of French as cultivated in England. That it was in more than one sense a cultivated language by the fourteenth century is shown by facts like the regulation necessary, in 1328, to ensure its use at Oriel, Oxford, or Edward III's 1334 ordinance encouraging Englishmen to have their children taught French, "par quoy il en fuisissent plus able et plus coustumier ans leur gheires," i.e., his aggression on France. O.F. Emerson, st. (Romanic Review, 1916 p.133), claiming that Edward's courtiers spoke English and did not understand continental French, quoted Froissart's note of the artfulness of the English in turning their ignorance to account: "La nature des Englos est telle que tous jours il se oriennent a estre decheu et repliquent tant apres une cose que merveles; et ce que il aueront en couvenant un jour, il le delieront l'autre. Et a tout ce lev enclin a faire ce que il n'em-tendent point bien tous les termes dou langage de France; ne on no lor scet comment bouter en la teste, se ce n'est tout dic a lor pourfit." Again, if English had not been the native language of the majority of his subjects, it would hardly have been worth the King's while to include among war propaganda
for preaching in the churches a pretended French plot to destroy
the English nation and language. The great poet of his later
reign, Chaucer, chose English matter and not French as the
medium in which to win the King's favour and that of the public.
It is certain, then, that by the fourteenth century the French
language was not a native growth in England. There seem,
however, to be several schools of thought as to the nature
of this artificial language, all supported by quotations from
contemporaries. Meyer, in his introduction to Boecou's Contes
moralisés, explained the differences in Anglo-Norman writers:
"Ce ne fut pas impunément que le français pénètre dans les classes
inférieures d'une population accoutumée aux sons et aux
formes d'un idiomme tout différent. La langue qui s'était
conservée dans un état de pureté relative jusqu'aux premières
années d'Henri III dégénère rapidement avant le milieu du XIIIe
siècle. Il ne semble pas qu'elle soit partout aussi uniforme
que le dit Ranulph Higden (Polycronicon)... elle offre au contraire
dans sa corruption une variété assez grande. Ce qui est
vrai, c'est que les différences linguistiques qu'on observe
d'un texte à un autre ne semblent pas correspondre, en général
du moins, à des régions déterminées, mais dépendant du plus ou
moins d'instruction des auteurs ou des copistes."

Prof. Studer (Study of Anglo-Norman, p.14) after
quoting Higden, "cum tamen Normannica lingua, quae adventitiam est, univoca mancat penes junctos," adds the comment of John
Trevise, Cornish vicar of Berkeley in Gloucestershire (c. 1385); "nevertheless there is so many dyvers manor Frensche in the reem of Frounce as is dyvers manor Englishe in the reem of England." The further remark quoted by miss Pope (From Latin to Modern French, p. 422) - "for a man of Kenty, southern, western and northern men spoken Frensche al lyke in sown and speche, but they spoken Frensche al lyke in sown and speche, but they spok not theyre Englysh so," is not Trevise's but Caxton's, so hardly constitutes contemporary evidence. Studer continues by urging that the language imposed by a conqueror is usually more uniform than that spoken in his own country, and that Meyer's opinion that there were in England numerous varieties of French needs revision: the most evident differences are only in spelling and are due to the introduction of Anglo-Saxon vowels. Prior declares (Romania, xliv): "Norman French changes and evolves at the same time and in the same way as English. It even follows the dialectal variations in the population, and the Anglo-Norman of the North differs from that of the South or West." To his support comes the oft-quoted author of Edward the Confessor (c. 1245): "language par pais varie." Individual fancy or ability (or lack of it), fundamental homogeneity with superficial spelling differences, or variation with English dialect-minimum regions, thus seem the chief possible explanations of the obvious lack of uniformity between Anglo-Norman texts.
In a conflict of authorities it is difficult to find truth. Perhaps, however, a more or less homogeneous French was used by lawyers and taught by schools all over the country, conforming, as far as standardisation could go, to the conventions of Marlborough or Stratford-atte-Bowe. Once removed from pedagogic restraint, however, individual exponents no doubt insensibly developed and wrote their own version of French. Did this spring merely from phantasy and ignorance as Meyer thought when he seemed to reject the evidence "language par pain Varis"? Such a conclusion was natural if he was looking for dialect regions of French. The occurrence in the same author of both archaic and highly-evolved forms, with apparent traits of numerous continental dialects, is enough to defeat attempts at classification on this basis. But instead of dialects or sub-dialects of French, should we not see rather a more or less homogeneous French influenced by different dialects of English? Suchier's pioneer attempt at chronological and regional classification of Anglo-Norman must rested on this assumption. If we can, in part at least, localise this by the forms of its place-names, as Prof. Brandin showed in Fouke Fitz Warin, we are tacitly acknowledging the influence of the coribes's local dialect on his spelling of some of the words he uses. Why should he not also betray, in the spelling of his school French, traces of the English dialect he spoke and heard around him, in greater proportion as his proficiency in the acquired language was less?

Prof. Prior suggested in "Cambridge Anglo-Norman Texts"
and in Romania, that English dialect phenomena, rather than French ones lay at the root of some Anglo-Norman orthography. This ought to be true at least of writings after 1250, by which date English is once more a literary language popular in Layamon's version of the Brut. Jewish immigrants are taking English and not French names, and foreign prelates are learning English. This is important, not so much as a sign of the preponderance of an English-speaking laity, as of an English-speaking lower clergy, with which the bishops would be in more immediate contact. That English literature surviving from the 12th century is largely homiletic is surely significant. The monastic orders were no doubt anglicised later than the seculars, and probably, with their international character, French speaking or bilingualism persisted longer in the monasteries than elsewhere. But the French of monks for the most part, isolated and working amid an Anglo-Saxon peasantry, and with a growing number of native Englishmen among them as the Constitutions of Clarendon became inoperative, could not fail in time to be modified just as much, or more, by the language spoken all around, as by the successive waves of Angevins, King John's loyalists, Pierre des Roches' Poitevins and Eleanor's Provençals, relatively few in number after all, and frequenting court rather than cloister.

The books they produced would soon register such
When the same writers began to be engaged on books in English as well as in French, English habits of pronunciation and sound-notation would no doubt show in their French works, and vice versa, as those were not yet days of exalted nationalism. This would be even more true of the professional lay scribes, numerous by the beginning of the 14th century: their contact with the English-speaking population would be even closer.

Such facts as the diphthongising of certain vowels while on the other hand a number of diphthongs were simplified have been assumed to prove continental influences. But, as Prof. Prior urged, it cannot be forgotten that diphthongising was, and is still, a marked characteristic of English, together with a contrary process of simplification which turned a number of Anglo-Saxon diphthongs into Middle English simple vowels. No one seems to have investigated the possibility that the change of many Anglo-Norman -er infinitives to -ier or -ir may have been helped by the analogy of English infinitives in -i.

Again, the constitutional difficulty which English speakers had, and have, in pronouncing certain French sounds has been noted at work in Anglo-Norman by Prof. Tanquerey (Evolution du verbe, pp. 751, 790.). To admit this difficulty, however, at once establishes the influence of the English pronunciation-habits: as there was not yet
a standard speech, this is tantamount to admitting the
influence of English dialects. This would no doubt be
more marked in some dialect regions than in others, just
as we find to-day that certain French vowels, for example,
are easier for Northerners than Southerners, whose vowels
are less pure and more liable to be diphthongs. May not this
difficulty, with other English speech habits and dialectal
traits, account for a number of phenomena whose origin is
unsolved, or which have been placed to the account of French
dialects of which it is sometimes difficult to trace
historically any widespread contact with England? Fourteenth-
century authorities like Higden and Robert of Gloucester
agree that even "uplandish men" are at pains to acquire
social distinction by learning French. What stronger influence
therefore, would lie behind the tendencies of Anglo-Norman
than that of the English dialect-speaking majority who for
social, commercial, military or legal reasons strove with
the divers "maneres de language" compiled for their
learning? Those tendencies are still disarmingly
disconcertingly
alive in the French of learners at many an English school
beside that of Stratford-atte-Bowe. The English Pronunciation
of Latin, until recent "reform" efforts at least, shows
what a fate awaited the French of England had it survived
as a pedagogic tradition removed from the influence of the
living language.
In the actual texts, there is great superficial dissimilarity, for example, between the forms found in Pierre de Langtoft, his contemporary the author of Fouke Fitz Warin, and the present piece. Pierre can be pinned down to Yorkshire; if he, or a scribe of his district, is responsible for the spelling of ai as ai found throughout his Chronicle, (ray, courtage, bayvre, etc.), this is quite in accord with Northern English phonology. Pierre's French is all through much more barbarous, though earlier, than that of the Egerton ms. The North, then, seems excluded as the latter's place of origin. In the East, at this very time (1338), Robert of Brunne was bringing out a Brut in English. We should expect the Egerton ms to originate from a region of stronger French tradition than either of these.

Examination of the proper nouns shows double vowel letters in Baathæ (v. 2613) Boos (2614) and Leoth, (1888 et al.) yo for o in Suongoastræ (984, 988); a for Anglo-Saxon or Welsh ag in Äxtis (1835) in Adilstan (2935); Alvered (2978) and Carlion (2182 et al.); for e in Barri (2160); for au in Galsæ (2053) and Arelius (1355). Vowels are transposed in Gillamærus (Gillosmarus, 1547 et al.) and consonants in Gafan; 168. All -bury place names have -bire or -birie. In consonants we find b for p (Jupiter, 913); cf. chambo forr
champ, Lapan for Laban (LXXV) in the Destruction; added final d in Symond; d for th in Adilstan (2935), Audeberd (Aethelbert, 2847), Egbrid (2915); t for th in Judit (2930) s for th in Suongcastre, Ciss (Scythia, 517); th for d in Cathwalader Cathwalander (2905), Cathwaleng (2863); omission of r in Temorius (Tremorius, 1511), Ambesbirie (1598), Aumesbire (Ambresbire, 1505); r for l in Frandres (2606); ch for k in Danemarche (2946, 2999), Cham (Caen, 3093), Pasche (2164 cf. Pask 1785), Ochrentis (2465); w for y in Ewerard (1440 et al.), Ewerard (3132), Wortiger (823), Walentin (456), Gernower (1957); metathesis of r in Irneside (2995 et al.) and perhaps Egbrid (2915).

Hengist's "Saxon" cry, "Nime ure sexes!" (1148, 1155) shows absence of th from the end of the Imperative the reduction of eoure to ure, and the reduction of ea to e in sexes.

Orthographic phenomena in French words, which may or may not have their significance, are:

(a) vowel doubling in Raen (2183), rees (from rasus, 1663), rees (sapis, 1230; c.f. seiez, 1226), peal (palum, 1162), pees (paceem, passim), feel (felo, 1649), neez (natus passim), loos (781 et al.), liissir, liissuz, rix eto. (Passim, but issuz 2264).

(b) elal for elle in eal (passim), beal (124, 1800), muceal (994), demoiseal (2930).
(c) feille, feil for fille, passim(cf. empoizement, 1099)
(d) very common diphthongising of e in tiel (passim)
siez (sapis, 2266), fiel (fel., 274), pier (patrem, 270, 1091 3116), chief (252, 424), chier (3032 et al.) eschiel, eschies (2608, 2619) chief (cadit, 2660) derechief (2910) chicié (2894) ier (2264, 1225?) ied (latus, 40; iestus 183 et al.) assied (assez, 1376) estier (ester, 2565, 2688), and many infinitives, preterites and past participles of conj. I.
(e) reduction of ie in mire (pierre 1190, 1529 et al.) nece (nepas, 396 et al.) arer, arere (2551, 2859) maner (1270 et al.) asseged assegé (1375, 1768), terce (286), tendrai, retendrai (2412, 920) vendras (1342 et al.), bere (2712) heriter (noun, 2973), doner (1915), guert (1484), amitez (141), meitez (1028).
(f) sie for se: suppie (2200, 2211), valgie (2600), seiez (sapis, 1226); cf. cumreies (passim) cumreies (1738)
(g) foai for seal (1196)
(h) leil (: cunseil, 386; cf. leal 462)
(i) what appears to be the tautological use of i, eg.
"en la presse i fu occis" (2697); also many examples of ni (n'ii?) where we expect ne eg. 241, 666, 1225, 1229, 1236, 1238, 1711, 2025-6, 2381, 2544; si for se, sei (2300?)
(j) prevalence of varabhaktio e before y.
(k) poice (pouls, 1671), provoits (Provosts, 301), vois (vouloir, 1282), coylla (culla 222)
In the consonants we find:
(a) d for t: *parde* (95, 2756), *gart* (subj. 2061), but c.f. *sourtes* (sourds, 3064).
(b) f for r: *naferer*, etc., *passim*, *naves* (navees, 860)
(c) d at the end of many past participles in a, u;
also invariably ad (habet), ensied, sungied amisted.
(d) -se, -ce, -see for s in *eloquence* (641), *tense* (640)
romance (966), *bretance* (987, 1607), nece, *decesse* (2872)
demerance (: anz, 2928), *fonce* (1320), *fousse* (2850) Escoce
(Escos, *passim*) *curteisse* (1959), *presse* (2871); *xzis* C.f.
*presse* (presse, 2218), *engres* (engresse, 2219);
also *orgoilouse* (masc. 2777).

(3) omission of r in *levse* (1586), *mervil* (mervinavv)
*nomes* (nomer, 2453), *suverse* (2792), *pristent* (2884)
desirez (desires, 1860).

A number of these *must* peculiarities may be slips
of the pen. Some are no doubt normal to most Anglo-Norman
texts, representing general phonetic tendencies or common
scribal habits, in many areas, though to call them such does
not explain their origin. A good many, however, represent
the scribe's attempts to render French sounds as heard or
spoken by him as well as English ones admittedly more likely
to show dialectal signs.

The doubling of a and e (rarely i and o, says
*Vising*, *Anglo-Norman Language* and *Literature*, p.31.) is
regarded as characteristic of Anglo-Norman as a whole. It
does not appear as often in *Pierre de Langtoft* as in the
present text, however. If it denotes vowel lengthening, it represents a still existing tendency of the dialects of south-western England. A 19th-century student of dialect Dr. Baynes, in claiming that the Somerset dialect of his time closely represented the classical language of the West Saxon kingdom, pointed out that with the softening or gliding-over of consonants and the lengthening of vowels, the dialect tended to become largely a language of vowel sounds. Though doubling of i and o are in Vising's opinion rare, co occurs in two proper names and in loca in the present text: lianir, etc., though perhaps only a form of cianir and etymologically justifiable, may illustrate a characteristic trait of Robert of Gloucester, who spells wiif, liif, etc.

The spelling Baathe well represents the present-day west country pronunciation of the place-name. Ciestra (Cirencester, 1934) and Berole (Berkeley, 3248) might almost be phonetic spellings of the present-day names of those places. Shaftisbury seems a Dorset spelling for a Dorset place-name, as soh is a characteristic combination in the Owl and the Nightingale from that county. Gloucester, more fortunate than most repeated place-names, occurs six times in the same form (Gloucestre). Suonoecastre is evidently a southern form, as the northern pronunciation would be Suoncenstre or Sauncæstra. The change of en into a in Alvered, etc., is also southern; Muchon says that a becomes more often than e in Gloucestershire. So far, then, the
evidence suggests a southern English origin, with reasons in favour of the west.

This may be supported by the numerous examples of the diphthongising of a into æ. Tanquerey (Recueil de lettres angh-normandes, p. xxx) says this is common after 1300; it is also common in Southern English, particularly south western, as shown by numerous forms like fiet (fit), dieth (death), ifielde (felt) in Robert of Gloucester. Modern Gloucestershire and Shropshire glossaries have dyeth (death), yed (head), yean (can), hyup (heap) and many other examples to show that the tendency is still prevalent. A letter written in 1322 for or by a lady of the Marcher Despenser family spells her name Alianora ye la Despensiere (Tanquerey, Recueil p.113), which beside ie for e shows a for æ, as in Barri, achatier, aparceud, manacier, sermonant, imparat in our text, and sarra for serra in a letter of Roger Mortimer, also a Marcher. Perhaps the spelling eal for elle has some connection with this tendency, or is simply an example of the Southern tendency to spell ed for æ.

Robert of Gloucester commonly shows the group sia; e.g. Romeseie, haisman (man of high rank), isio (Middle English esse, from esse). Espoio etc. may therefore show connection with the west country: if the Anglo-Norman esse be accounted an importation from South-West France, cf. Vising op. cit. p.32) it must not be forgotten that Bristol
and the Severn formed the chief avenue into England from that region. The prevalence of svarabhaktic a may also have some connection with a tendency shown in such Gloucestershire words as *leatheron* (leathern), *ellum* (elm), *anteny* (entry). In Robert, again, we find *hyps* filled appearing as *herea*; *feled*; the forms *feille*, *fell* may have some relation with this tendency, or with the beginning of the rich *i*-diphthong which enthusiasts regard as one of the beauties of the modern Gloucestershire dialect, ("foai" may be connected with this). As *feille*, however, is the form given in Kelham's 18th-century Dictionary of "Norman," it seems probable that this spelling was general at least in law French, (cf. *treiste* in *Plaintes de la Vierge*). Our ms shows almost invariable preference for *u*-spellings in words like *om*, *ur*, *honur*; in a letter of the Abbot and Convent of St. Peter, Gloucester (Tanquerey, p. 5.) *ur*, *omm*, *dun* *dunks*, *respu*ndu, *ur*, *neignur*, *purprye*, show the same preference.

Other phenomena noted are rather conflicting if they are to be taken as indications of locality. -Bury for -bury was general by this time, and only appears to exclude Kent and the North. The appearance of *p* in *Lapan*, *f* in *nafex*, and what seems a strong sibilance in *Escoce*, *eloquence curteisse*, etc., might point towards Wales. *Bamgor*, however, appears for *Bangor* in the ms of the *Brut* (E N. f. f. 1450) on which Le Roux de Lincy based his edition, (v. 14265) without allowing us to claim a Welsh origin for the ms. On the other
hand, we find voicing in such spellings as perde for derte, Jubiter. We find th becoming d in Adilstan, Frbrid, Cadwalader alternates between that form and Cathwalader, while Cadwalan is called Cathwalena. The Anglo-Saxon thorn is kept in Avelwolf (2924, 2927), and the question of th is still further complicated by the appearance of Thongoaster as Suongcastre, and Scythia as Cine - for the latter, Layamon a Worcester man, has Soise. "Nimē ure sexes" does not allow us to draw any conclusions as to dialect: the same passage of Layamon contains alternative spellings in the two places in which the phrase occurs.

Such inclusiveness, however, is not unfavourable to the idea of an origin not far from Gloucester. The dialect of the region prefers, and preferred, y to i and z to s, yet Robert of Gloucester has vi the for five, and French victuailles appears in Gloucestershire as fittles. Lather for ladder, and dreeaten for threaten show similar confusion to that in our ms. Zachrisson (Anglo-Norman Influence in English Place-Names, p. 43) says that the sound-change from ð(th) to d is well evidenced for the South of England in late middle English times, but that "inverted spellings" of th for d are also sporadic through all the south and south-west. Though alternation of r and l, giving titre and title, nutel and autier, was common in the middle ages Frandrea may be an example of the confusion which gave gallely, guerm (qualm), syllinge, still occurring in
Gloucestershire and Shropshire in the 19th century. The omission of r noted was also a trait of dialectal words in those counties. Prior, in the passages already cited, thought that as r was pronounced more strongly in the North its omission might be a sign of southern origin. Ch for kr though perhaps only graphical, may illustrate the tendency found in such Gloucester words as shab for scab, shatter for scatter. By the eighteenth century, o had been diphthongised to uo in Gloucestershire, as shown by spellings like stwons (stones) swoes, mwother in dialect writings. This tendency may be represented in Swooncastra.

In connection with the alternation of f and v and other sounds in Gloucestershire, and with the use of rising in our ms, it is interesting to quote the evidence of one John Smyth, warden of the fisheries in the Hundred of Berkeley at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Writing in 1639 at the age of 73, he says:

"In this Hundred of Berkeley are frequently used certaine words proverbs & phrases of speach which wee hundreds conceive...to bee not only native but confined to the soile, bounds & territory thereof.

"Society naturall is the dialect of pronouncing the tre (y) betwene words endyng and beginnyng with consonants, that it seems droppinge from the aire into our mouths: as, John y Smith, sit y downe, I can y finde it, com y-hither, well y said.... with thousands the like,"
accompting our selves by such manner of speach to bee true patriots, And true preservers of the honored memory of our old forefathers, Gower, Chaucer, Lidgate, Robert de Clouc and other of those old former ages.

"The letter (ff) is frequently used for V, as fewed for viewed, fowe for voice, venison for venison, farnish for varnish; and others the like.

"The ye (V) is also frequently used for (s) as vethers for fethers...... ... So powerfull a prerogative of transplanter on have wee hundreders over the alphabet." (Quoted by J. Drummond Robertson, English Dialect Society Publications, No. 61, 1890).

The case of Laran, Jupiter, chambe, rafez, Perde, etc. may merely show orthographical difficulties occurring when English was adopting French words and English scribes were writing French. Arricôt, wardrop (Middle English form of garde-robe) and fittles are probably signs of the fact that French consonants like b, d, v, had a more plosive character for English ears than those letters usually represented in English. Jupiter is still the English pronunciation of the word. Similarly a, pronounced e in Anglo-Saxon and nowadays in the west and generally when final, may have seemed inadequate to our scribe for representing final e in French, and led him to the interesting renderings for eloquens, Rasos, etc. His spellings of tense Romance, with similar ones in decease, use, face, are of
course still with us. As intervocalic ġ in Anglo-Saxon and Welsh was pronounced v, may have no special significance. The change of ġ into v in the proper names and in swesquied (2803): *swesques* (177) does not seem to indicate any particular area, as the change is usually regarded as widespread in the 14th century. Waterhouse, however, (Early English Texts Society, extra series no. 104) gives it as a characteristic of men executed in Dublin in the 15th century. Voice, wou, (voeu) appear in the Cursor Mundi, (Northern English, 1300-1325).

Such indications as might be thought to exist in the foregoing rather inclusive material may acquire greater value if confirmed by the matter of the Chronicle.

As the Catalogue says, the chronicler shows but scanty knowledge of the period. Undoubtedly a cleric, he was chiefly concerned with the succession, benefactions and burial of the monarchs, who are catalogued rather in the manner of the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah. Details recorded by him may therefore have some significance in conjecturing his locality.

A number of important reigns are dismissed in few lines, yet Edmund Ironside gets twenty-two, though his rule lasted only a few months and was never recognised by the larger part of England. A number of his battles with Canute were fought in the west country, and their final agreement was made on the Severn island of Olney. Our
scribe gives Glastonbury, 17 miles from Gloucester, as his burial place, and spells the name etymologically.

It is worth noting that the Arthurian legends, of which our ms is one more perpetuation, centred round, and were fostered by, the Abbey of Glastonbury. The space taken by Arthur's legendary reign in this ms, (834 lines out of 2914 of the Brut) may have some relation to this, though more probably due to similar disproportion in Wace, where Arthur occupies 4335 out of 15,000 lines. The Arthur legends were in any case looked upon in the west as somewhat common property, but the absence here of any addition to them should be an argument against a Welsh origin, particularly in view of important omissions such as Merlin's prophecy of Arthur's return and the Hope of the Welsh:

Encor i est, Breton l'atandent (L 13685, A 13279)

Of the reign of Henry III we are told:

La bataille de Lewes fu en sun tempo:
Mult i perdi de ses parenz, (v. 3173)

but Evesham, is dealt with at some length:

Et de Evesham la bataille
Ou mainte mil fu cois sans faille,
Et Sir Symond de Montford,
Et se Henry meinte altre de sun efforz,
Et Sir Henry sun fyz
Et meint pruz chivalor gentiz,
Et Sir Hugh le despenser
Et meint vaillant bacheler. (v. 3175 et seq.)

Simon de Montford's final campaign was of course fought along the Severn and the Welsh border, while Hugh le Despenser, Chief Justiciar of the baron's government, was
the only Marcher baron to remain loyal to Simon.

This may indicate the author's local interest and possible sympathy with the Despensers. The impression is heightened by the mention of another Sir Hugh as Edward's II's favorite when we should expect Gaveston to be mentioned first. The latter does not appear at all, however. The author's sympathy all through seems with the king and Despenser and the latter's death is a "vile hunting." It is not clear which of the Despensers is intended, but as the elder was hanged, drawn, eto at Bristol, and the younger at Hereford, the knowledge shown is quite compatible with west-country authorship. The strong terms used to condemn Roger Mortimer's actions make it unlikely that the author lived within the Mortimer domains, extending over large parts of south Shropshire and Herefordshire. Edward II's last refuge before his capture was in the Glamorganshire mountains near Neath Abbey.

The final recital of this king's burial and the miracles at his tomb seems the strongest argument for an origin not far from Gloucester. Fear of Mortimer made a number of west-country abbeys refuse to receive the king's body after the murder at Berkeley, but the Abbot of St. Peter's Gloucester gave it sumptuous burial. He had his reward. The legend of the miracles wrought at Edward's tomb brought such a concourse of pilgrims and such revenue
that St. Peter's was soon relieved of its debt, the nave
was restored and many additions made to the buildings.

Further, the Abbey received remission of taxation and other
privileges from Edward III after Mortimer's fall. We have
noted the condemnatory language about the latter. No doubt
other religious houses in the neighbourhood and on the
roads to Gloucester shared to some extent in the prosperity of
St. Peter's.

All this seems to point to an author having
some acquaintance with west-country events in spite of
general ignorance of history. His liking for ships in the
miniatures may mean familiarity with some port like
Bristol, Newport or Gloucester. His rendering of the
Giant's Circle (f.30) suggests that he knew Stonehenge in
Wiltshire.

What might seem a difficulty arises from the word
gaine (3079) or raigne (3142) in both cases preceded by the
masculine article and meaning "arrow." If this is merely the
French word from vaginam, the change of meaning seems rather
violent, and the use of the masculine article in both places
rather unusual persistence in carelessness or ignorance. We
find in Irish and Gaelic a masculine word of unknown foreign
origin spelt gaine or gainne, meaning "arrow, shaft, reed."
Though a is the vowel in this word, and in the graphic
representation of a sound like n-mouillé, a scribe with Anglo-
Norman spelling habits would no doubt write it as it appears here, in the spelling still accepted in Irish dictionaries. This might indicate an Irish scribe, for it seems unlikely that an Englishman taught after the school of Stratford-atte-Bowre would take such liberties with a French word, or borrow an Irish one.

The appearance of *mures* for some such word as *jovres* (895) — Wace has *jenes* in this passage — may be an echo of the Gaelic *nor* (big.). Our author makes the youths in question five years older than Wace's, who were only fifteen. He was generally careful to indicate *i* and *j*, and *mures* seems to be what he intended, using the adjective as substantive, as in French. Further, the spellings *provoits* (provosts), *poice* (poole, "police"?), *coilla* (coulé, perhaps negligence in writing) and *vois* (2nd person singular of vouloir) may have something to do with Irish usage in words like *roitin*, *noigin*, *caillín*, which have given us *rothan*, *nópin*, and *colleen*. The first *i* represents a glide between back vowel and front consonant.

Suancoastré might then be explained, if the scribe were Irish, by Irish difficulty with English breathed *th*, while as *d* in Anglo-Irish often becomes a sound resembling voiced *th*, Cathwalans and Cathwalader may add their support. We have already noted Waterhouse's opinion about interchange of *y* and *w* in Anglo-Irish ms of the 15th century. In the same passage he includes confusion of *th* with *d* and *t* as characteristic.
The presence of an Irish monk in a Gloucestershire or South Wales monastery, or his showing phonetic traits of this region, could be easily accounted for. The bulk of the Anglo-Norman army which invaded Ireland came from South-Wales and the marches, and the English dialect imported into Ireland was that of south-western England. Conquering nobles, such as the de Lacis, made gifts of Irish property to abbeys in their land of origin, and a number of west-country monasteries still held these in the 14th century.

One such religious house was Lanthony-by-Gloucester or Lanthony Secunda, originally daughter cell of Lanthony in Monmouthshire. After ill-treatment of the monks by the wild Welsh, it became their chief house, to which they moved with their chattels and their books, leaving Prima as a cell. King John confirmed a number of grants and benefactions, as did Edward II. We may note that both these monarchs are well treated in this ms; in most chronicles John, particularly, gets few good words. In 1342, shortly after the date of our ms, which would be far from hindering his policy, of popularising French for war purposes, and in which the conquests of his spiritual ancestor, Arthur, are glorified at length, Edward III took Lanthony Secunda, with its Irish estates, under his special protection. Finally, the only known possessors of the ms were west-country families, and the Luttrells have been at Dunster since 1402.
All these are of course merely interesting possibilities. The scribe is certainly abysmally ignorant of English history in general, even as understood at the time. Non-English birth, and remoteness from books and authoritative information might account for this. The knowledge he does show is chiefly such as would be gained by a resident in the south-western Marches, a region in which Norman strongholds and French abbeys came early and Anglo-Norman tradition persisted late, and where we find French words like stank (estanc), agate (aux aguets), levence (levains, O.F. nominative?), suant (suiant), fittle, still part of the folk speech in the 19th century.

The historical evidence is certainly stronger than the linguistic. If the former be thought to have some validity, it gives more value to the latter and greater justification for discussing it.
III MATTER OF THE "BRUT"

To treat at all adequately the question of the relationship of the Egerton version with the other Bruts, or to study the provenance of the changes which it shows and its apparent originalities, would alone provide sufficient material for a whole thesis. An attempt will be made, however, to point out the main lines of comparison and differentiation, and thus to arrive at some estimate of the author's contribution to the body of pseudo-history in which Geoffrey of Monmouth and Wace had led the way.

The Brut had by this time been popular for nearly two centuries. It had exerted a great influence on European literature, reinforcing and perhaps surpassing that of the Historia, first best-seller in the "matter of Britain." Margaret Pelan has traced this influence in works of Chrétien, Thomas, Marie de France and other writers of the period immediately following Wace. Her conclusion, "Son influence fut de courte durée et s'épuisa rapidement," may be true of Wace's direct influence on purely literary writers of the Continent. But, as we find in the present ms and its many predecessors and successors, the Brut is still looked upon, two centuries after its appearance, as the standard history of England; it is hardly to be improved upon, only to
be added to for the years subsequent to its finishing-point. Layamon translated and enlarged it for the "well-born", King John sent from Northampton in 1205 for the "Romantium de Historia Angliae" to "beguile his humours", and the industrious translator, Robert Mannyng of Brunne, again Englished it in 1338, about the date of our ms, adding a translation of Pierre de Langtoft's chronicle to bring it up to date. Pierre's own chronicle consisted of an abridgement, much more summary than the present one, of Wace's poem as far as it went, with the addition of his own account of subsequent history. In the fifteenth century Caxton prints it, in a prose version called the "Cronyoles of England", as a no doubt still-popular history.

The linguistic and metrical changes wrought by this time in Wace's poem will be discussed separately: only the most noteworthy questions in the matter of the piece will be touched upon in this chapter. Obviously, in reducing 9984 lines of Wace (about 10,300 in Le Roux de Lincy's edition) to 2914 of his own, the author had to exercise some judgment in deciding what to retain and what to omit, and also, if the result of his operation was to be readable, some skill in the joining of what remained; not content with this, however, he made various small additions which usually appear his own, since
they are not found in the variants furnished by the different
texts of Wace, or in similar works. It is perhaps this
personal contribution which is the most interesting, as affording
material by which to assess the author, his ideas and ability
behind the wonted anonymity of the Middle Ages.

The best way to begin seems to compare, from the
literary point of view, the first lines of the Egerton ms
with the version of Wace represented in Arnold's text and
variants. This will afford sufficient indication of the author's
method and the relation of his text with the groupings of the
ms. Some account will then be given of the principal kinds
of omissions, then of the most important additions, and a note
on the value of the Chronicle portion will lead into a summing-
up of the author and his work.

The same letters will be used to denote the
different ms of the Brut as in Arnold's Introduction. They
are as follows:

A. College of Arms, Arundel XIV.
B. British Museum, Royal 13 A XXI.
C. " Cotton Vitellius A.X.
D. Durham Cathedral C.IV 27. 1.
E. British Museum, Harley 6508.
F. " Additional, 32125
G. Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, 2447
H. " Nationale, fond français 1450 (olim Cange 27)
J. " " " " 1416 (olim Colbert 7515)
K. " " " " 794 (olim Cange 33)
L. Lincoln Cathedral 104.
M. Montpellier, Bibliothèque de l'Ecole de Médecine, 251.
N. Bibliothèque Nationale, f.f. 1454 (olim 7537)
P. Ms belonging to Mr. Boies Penrose (America), formerly at Christ Church, Canterbury.*
R. Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal 2981.
S. Bibliothèque Nationale, nouvelles acquisitions fr. 1415 (olim Coelombe Library, Seville, 1098).
T. Corpus Christi, Cambridge, 50.
V. National Bibliothek, Vienna, 2603.

In line 6, the majority of texts have "Ne ne lur volt tenir dreiture." Egerton attaches itself to a group PSFA by having faire fôr tenir, but is unlike any other by further insertion of "nule!" In line 7, Engleter for the standard Bretaigne attaches Eg. to the group SRGM. The insertion of tote in line 8 makes Eg. unlike any others except A and G, which omit en. Lour for le in v. 11 puts Eg. in the group DLSAR. "Arivast" for "mer passa" in v. 16 groups it with D and L only. "L'Emperere" for "Claudius" at v. 25 brings it into the group DLSGRM. V. 29, "Purpensa sei qe fereit" for "Purpensa sei en meint endreit," again groups Eg. with SRGM, except that these have "que il fereit," making the correct number of syllables. To continue in less detail:

V. 32 is as in DLSGFARM.
V. 37 is unlike all other versions.
V. 39: conjuration "qe" appears in no other version.
V. 43: "la" is in no other version except D, which omits "ki."
V. 50: "desterre" is in no other version.

* Now British Museum Addit. MS. 45103.
v. 53. Most texts have "enseigne reial", DLFGRM have "enseigne le rei," ED. has "le signe le Roi"

v. 55. "nel" for "na" as in SKRM
v. 56. "Quident" is inserted, not appearing in the others.

v. 68: all others have "sui", not "Pursuie".

v. 80. Is unlike all other versions.

v. 94 "troyé" for "tomé" in all others
v. 106: "qe li" for "qu'il li" as LCT.

v. 107. "soul" in no other.

v. 112 "s'entre acordierent" for "s(acointerent", as SF, (s'acorderent)

vv. 113-4. In no others - an insertion.

v. 115 as CGRM

v. 118 "devereit" - "deveit" in all others
v. 123 "Sin" - "Si" in all others.

v. 139: "puis" as SHG; others "tut"

v. 140: "sun" as JOR - others "lor"

vv. 161-2. All others have: A Fleutere enveia, / Ki ort

pape, si li manda. V. 162 is thus an insertion

v. 163: All others have subjunctive "enveiast" for "envoier"

v. 170. "la ley diu" for "la lei" in the others.

v. 184 as DLGRM

v. 185 quite different from all others.

v. 192 "salvation" as SJKGM

v. 198: "Lucius" for "li reis" as SLRMMDA

After v. 208 some 300 lines of Wace are omitted -

vv. 209-10 resume the last passage in Wace that has been omitted

but vv. 211-12:

Issi tindrent Bretaigne a force.
Les Romeins od leur afforoe.

are not found in any text of Wace, who, in fact, had just been
telling of successful rebellion on the part of the Britons.

Vv. 218-9:

Tant creut la guerre et tant muntast
Coel en bataille, si le venquie

furnish an example of the author's method of abridgment. Wace
Vv. 221-2 have been inserted and the order of some words has in vv. 225-6 has been altered, giving a new rhyme:

out: solt instead of nurrie: clergie. From this point onwards the same continues: various points of detail occur which are found in some of the other texts, others show a similarity with ms groupings which normally include DLCSFGR, while occasionally a number of lines are more or less skilfully compressed into fewer, or insertions are made like: "Ambedeus se firent coroner / A Londres devant l'autier (vv 255-6), which do not appear in any ms of Wace. It thus seems clear that, while the Egerton ms is based upon a version represented by a ms group which includes particularly those of Durham, Lincoln and Seville and the Cotton ms, the scribe reserved to himself a considerable independence in form and matter.

Many examples like the one given above show that the abridgment was not a unskilfully accomplished, and was not achieved simply by leaving out more or less lengthy passages. Such omissions were made, however, and it seems possible to classify them broadly, if not to discover the reasons guiding the scribe. Generally the matter omitted was of
a tedious or complicated nature, and it is remarkable how little
the story as a whole suffers: only occasionally are we left
without the conclusion of an episode, or made to wonder when
some character appeared or disappeared.

In general, battles and campaigns are greatly
condensed, or omitted altogether. Perhaps public taste
was no longer for rambling battle stories, with single
combats detailed stroke by stroke. Thus forty lines on
Marius' invasion of Scotland are left out, then three hundred
on Severus' campaigns in Scotland and the North, with Fulgenes'
rebellion and subsequent complications. Four battles between
Vortimer and Hengist's Saxons disappear, those of Conisburgh
and Verolam are shortened and Uther's unsuccessful siege of
Tintagel and much of the struggle between Looth and Octa left
out. In Arthur's reign, a gap of about six hundred lines (at
v. 1952 of Egerton, after v. 9289 of L's edition, v. 9054 of
of A's) leaves out his defeat of the Saxons Balduf and Colgrim
with the famous battles of Halidon Hill and Mount Badon, his
conquest of Scotland and Ireland, and the resulting rejoicings
and rewards for his warriors. The campaigns against Norweg-
ians and Danes and against Frollo are greatly curtailed, as are
Arthur's single combats with the latter and the giant of Mount
Saint-Michel, nameless here though called Dinabuc in Wace, a
name suspiciously like that of Merlin's boyhood enemy. Riton,
the second giant is omitted altogether. Another long omission of over six hundred lines (after v. 2593, L.12019, A 11616) brings us almost immediately from the giants to the fight with the emperor of Rome — Gawain's adventures and the preliminary challenges and skirmishings are entirely lost, and Arthur's nephew becomes an insignificant personage. The decisive engagement between Arthur and Lucius occupies only sixty-six lines in Egerton (vv. 2640-2705) compared with 440 in Wace (L 12936 sqq., A 12535 sqq.); the prowess of Kei and Béduer then Arthur's Slaughtorous intervention which turns the scale when all seemed lost, are curtailed, the vengeance of Hiresgas, Béduer's nephew and the fight between Gawain and the Emperor are omitted. About 200 lines of Arthur's final struggle with Modred disappear: the supreme battle of "Tamre" has only eight lines and lose Wace's comment: "ne sai dire ... ne qui venquit ne qui moruit."

After Arthur, Wace's text receives less respect than ever. The revolt of Modred's sons against Arthur's successor, Conan, the struggle of Vortiporus against the Saxons, the whole reign of Malgo, disappear. About 250 lines of the story of Gormond (here Gurguint) and Isembard are omitted: "Gormond's coming ... from Africa, as Merlin foretold, his conquest of Ireland and Northumbria and the capture of Cirencester. Some 600 lines on the Heptarchy disappear
with the omission of Cadwan or Cadwalan and his dispute with Elfroi or Elfrith, the long-drawn out wars between their sons, then between Cadwalan, Peanda and Oswald.

Besides battle pieces, the long-winded eloquence of Wace’s characters very properly suffers condensation. The author generally shows some skill in choosing just those few lines of a speech which give the gist sufficiently for the purpose of the story, without frills and rhetoric. This is usually an improvement in realism, as when Arthur’s cry to his men in the thick of the fight is reduced from eleven lines to three (vv. 2683-5). "Un sage Romain" who gives a valedictory address to the Britons on the departure of the Roman forces fills twenty lines instead of sixty. Bishop Ridadus, perhaps as a result of dissension between the author’s monastery and episcopal authority, receives summary treatment: his first forty-line speech on the treatment to be given Hengist, on the biblical parallel of Agag is omitted altogether; his second, a plea for Hengist’s sons as reduced by half, the Biblical parallel again being lost. Merlin’s speeches are greatly reduced, as are many eve-of-battle harangues, and particularly the great feast of political oratory and repetition which begins with Lucius’ ultimatum to Arthur (v. 253, L. 19919, A. 19639). The long story of the old woman whom
met is omitted, so that we are left in ignorance of Elaine's ultimate fate. Again a change in public taste may be indicated: Chrétien de Troyes, in his imitations of Wace, already seems to have gently satirised knightly speechifying as well as lengthy battle descriptions.

Less accountable is the omission or curtailment of descriptions of feasting or ceremonial, an important factor in Wace's popularity. Some fifty lines of Wace (13582, A 8376) describing Uther's ceremonial entry and coronation at Winchester are condensed into:

Uther se fist coroner
A Winchester cum fort justiser. (1754)

The famous descriptions of Caerleon, which "sambla Rome", and of Tintagel, are left out, while the extravagant splendour of Arthur's victory festivities is much reduced. The celebrated and fictitious - list of notables, the scene of their arrival, the Queen's reception of the ladies, the thanksgiving service which went on all day, with the knights' coming and going

Tant por oir les clers chanter
Tant por les dames agarder,

lose in total some two hundred lines, and fifty lines of the actual feast go the same way. Much of this was in any case Wace's invention, as Geoffrey has only a few lines on it. Another famous passage, the departure of the fleet from Southampton, is shorn of the greater part of its glory: of highly
technical description.

Very many of Wace's moralisings, explanations, name-etymologies, prophetic allusions and other literary baggage are dispensed with, no doubt in the interests of space rather than from any lowering in estimation of their value. The author cuts out Wace's indication that Vortiger was marrying in Rowena, a pagan (I, 17163, A 6903), omits the miraculous history of the Giants' Circle, the allusion to the old Trojan custom of segregating the ladies at the feast, the denunciation of Modred's treachery; before he performed it (I, 1456-59, A 1178-88) Wace's explanations of the origins of the names of Hampton, Gloucester, Colchester, "Thongoaster," England and the English, the Saxon counties, are omitted or curtailed, as are his notes on the location or history of Verulamium, Meneve, Gonore. Wace had already abandoned Geoffrey's lengthy book of Merlin's prophecies, but the Egerton author restricts the magician's utterances even more than Wace; after the erection of Stonehenge we are allowed to forget him, whereas Wace details his prophecies about Arthur, the coming of Gormond, and the end of the British kings. It is noteworthy, however, that most of Wace's proverbial verses are kept, e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proverb</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tiels perte que puis secures (W: recouvre)</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merci ait que merti quert</td>
<td>1484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine surmunte vertu</td>
<td>1536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N'i ad del mort nul recoverer</td>
<td>1727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The whole part of the story which follows the end
of Arthur suffers drastic omissions. Perhaps this was the climax towards which the author had been working, after which he lost interest, or perhaps he had to work within limits of space and had given too generous treatment to the original up to that point. St. Augustine, for example, loses two long passages of about 100 lines, his miracles, his mission to Dorset, the dispute with the Welsh Church and the Bangor massacre. The story of the wicked Dorset folks' tails, apparently Wace's invention, may have seemed a little far-fetched, and the Saint's treatment of rival clergy unedifying. Finally, beside the omission of the involved janglings of the Heptarchy already noted, the whole reign of Cathwalader is condensed from 200 lines to twenty-three, leaving no mention of the sending of Ivor\textsubscript{1} to perpetuate the British nation in Wales, or the King's death on pilgrimage at Rome - our author makes him die in Brittany on his flight from the mortality.

Such are the principal omissions from the standard version of Wace, the negative side of the work of abridgment and adaption. There is also a more positive side, on one hand, the concentration into a few lines, sometimes with considerable differences, of matter occupying a good deal more space in the original; on the other, actual additions which do not appear in any other text. Characteristic examples of the first class beside the few already given are:
Wace: (L 7243) (A 7067)  
Ag Bretuns ad mult ennuied
Si unt al rei dit et preied
Que cele estrange gent ne creie,
Kar a veuc se desleie;
Trop ad de cels païens atrait,
Vilanie est, grant hunte fait.
Departe les, cument que seit,
Ou tut u le plus en envoit.

Eg. 1076:  
As Bretuns ad mult anuez,
Et si ont al Rei dit et pries
Ke cele estrange gent ne creie
Et de sa terre les enyeie.

At v. 1425 sqq.  
Eldolf l'ad venu aprissmer
An guise de hardi chivaler,
Molt l'en haizut, et bien deit,
Par le mordre q'il feseit
En le plene de Salesbire
 Quant les Bretuns fist oire,
Hengist atteint, si l'en onbraceast,
Par vive force l'en menast.

The 1' of v. 1425 refers to Hengist. Wace has (L8007; A7807):

Gorlois, li cuens de Cornëalle,
Vint' cume pruz en la bataille;
Eldulf l'ad veu aprissmer,
Plus seurs se fist e plus fier;
A guise de hardi vassal
Corut Henguist prendre al nasal,
A sei le traitt, si l'enbruncha,
Par vive force l'enmena.

Then follow ten lines of direct speech from Eldolf expressing his hatred for "cest chien enragié" but not directly alluding to the Amesbury massacre. The Egerton author has thus made Eldolf draw near to Hengist, whereas Wace makes him gain fresh courage for his fight with the Saxon, at the approach of Gorlois; he then inserts four lines of his own giving
Eldolf's motive in indirect speech, for the ten-line passage of direct speech which comes later in Wace. This is a typical sample of his method. Similar ones are found in the list of notables arriving at Caerleon for Arthur's coronation (Ep., 2183, L 10462, A 10206 gives "Mandast tuz ses barong par baan," joining neatly with L 10499, A 10243: "Mandast Ces Reis vs et ses Contes" - the list that follows is by no means the same as that of Wace, and ends with the rhymes vcnte: attargement, venir: chivalchier); and in the division of Arthur's army into "eschieles" (2802 sqq) - the arrangement of the commanders is quite different from that of Wace and the eighth "eschiele," is missed out altogether, (vv. 2614-5).

A few of the more significant alterations and additions in detail are worth noticing before passing on. Quite a number of complete couplets are inserted which do not appear in any version of Wace's text, e.g. the information that Constantius and Helena were crowned "A Londres devant l'autier," an obvious anachronism (vv. 255-6), the note that Octavius would regret making Conan his heir (vv 379-80), the explanation of the name "Bretagne minor" (vv 222-21) (vv. 441-2), the fact that there was none to oppose Maximilian's conquest of the Empire (vv. 459-60), that the Roman legion killed more than 15,000 Norsemen and Danes (vv. 573-4), that Vortiger came to Parliament (vv. 738-9), that he was a traitor and approached Costant (vv. 762-3), that Hengist and Horsa promised to serve him at his will (vv 922-3) etc. etc. It seems quite clear that a number of these insertions were made
with a view to illustration, as they occur immediately before a picture, e.g. vv 113-4:

Claudius out li Roi embracé,  
Par grant amour l'ad beisse,  

below which is depicted the embrace of two repulsive-looking royalties (f. 3a of the ms); vv 221-2:

Od le branc' tie coupe li dona  
Ke jusce'al dentz le branc' coilla,  

followed by a picture of Coel killing Astlepiadoc (f. 5a); vv. 610-11

Grant fu la doel qe la fust  
Kant detenir ne les poust,  

which form the motif of a picture of Britons registering deep emotion at the departure of the Romans (f. 12a); vv. 1469-70.

Devant le Roi s'est agenulez,  
En halt s'ad ses meines levez  

followed six lines later (f. 28a) by a picture of Gota on his knees, (a detail not given in the texts of Wace, though Layamon has "He fell to the ground before the King's feet"); vv. 1831-2:

Semblance de Gorlois avoit,  
A Tintagelle vindrent demeintenant  

with a picture of Uther, Ulfin and Merlin approaching the castle;

vv. 2192-3:

 Maint bel campaigne i veisses venir,  
Et espeasant chivalchier,  

introducing a picture of the "bel campaigne," vv. 2796-9:

En Engletere vint aiflant,  
Saxsons et gaiens menant;  
En sa flot treis cent'nefs avoit,  
En Bretnaigne oif ariveit
giving, as already noted, a picture of Gurguint at sea;

vv. 2849-50:

Cil ad Saint Austin baptisis
Et en le Saint founce regenererez,

after which we see Æthelbert's crowned head and bare shoulders protruding from the font in which St. Augustine has plunged him, a notable difference from Wace's:

Cil ad Saint Augustin or,
Baptisiez fu, en Deu orai. (L 14143, A 13695)

Similarly vv. 8759-60 of Wace (Edition L, A 8533):

A Londres furent enveié,
Et en.cartre pris et loïé,

are quite gratuitously altered into:

A Lundres les amonerent,  
En la Tour furent posez, 
Et od cheines mult ferme liez, (vv 1778-1780)

which furnishes an opportunity for a drawing of the prisoners entering the Tower of London. The foregoing may be considered to strengthen the suggestion in the first chapter that the author, scribe and illustrator were the same person, with a flair for the dramatic and the picturable.

A few other interesting touches do not appear in Wace; they sometimes bear a resemblance to Layamon's account, sometimes appear quite original. In no other version do we learn, for example, that those who informed Walins and Melga of Britain's undefended state were "les mariners qui les (i.e. the 11,000 virgins) guient" (v. 519), or that Vortiger was a pagan (v.
736 - "Païen fu" for Wace's "Uns fors hom") over-zealousness on the author's part since it is inconsistent with the King's concern at the paganism of Hengist and Horsa (v. 914 sqq.) The alteration of "le language as Saxons" (L 7122, A 6960) into "les langues" (1021), which appears in none of the variants, implies that the author was acquainted with the diversity of Anglo-Saxon dialects. The allusion to Parliament (v. 736) may have been merely a sign of the author's times, or due to the influence of Layamon, who mentions "hustings" in this passage. This influence may also be present in the account of the arrival of Hengist and Horsa (vv. 864 sqq.)

"Aleiz tost, si les amenez."
Li baron sunt al terre hastez,
Devant le Roi sunt'venu;
Gentement li ont salu.

This is quite different from Wace (cf L 6877 sqq. A 6721/sqq) but Layamon has "These came before the King and greeted him fair"; as Egerton, he gives the command in direct speech, which he prefers, instead of Wace's indirect speech. As a sidelight on the vexed question of the locality of Thongcaster comes the alteration of Hengist's "A un dos manes que jo ai" (L 7060, A 6902) i.e. in Lincolnshire where he already had territory, into "A un dos maners que joo sai" which betokens a much wider cupidity(94). An interesting change is that in the line "Incubi domoines ont nom"(L7633, A 7445) for which Egerton has: "Tcubi et
Succubi oie noun" (1273): though peculiar to our author, it implies at all events weak Latin declension on his part, since Incubi were tempters of nuns, while Succubae were temptresses of monks. No copyist of Wace seems to correct that poet's slip in placing the conception of Arthur both before and after the death of Gorlois, in which he only follows Geoffrey (L 8963, 9649; A 8733, 8815). The author of the present ms corrects this blunder, as does Layamon, but more neatly: he alters the second mention "La nuit a (ot) un fil oncume," into "La nuit einsi out un fiz oncume." Other unique features are the mention of fourteen kingdoms as the extent of Arthur's domains (v. 2321), and the entirely fictitious return of St. Augustine to Rome to report to the Pope on the success of his mission (vv. 2859-62) in place of the unedifying account of the Bangor massacre. He makes Edwin, in Wace Cadwalen's bitter rival whom he finally kills, into the son and successor of "Cathwalens", apparently identical with Cadwalen (2870). Oswald, another English king killed by Cadwalen, through his ally Peanda, according to Wace, is here made Edwin's son and successor (2873), as in Layamon. Peanda is a "diffàié" (2878) which is true, but not in Wace. An original account is given of the death of Oswy (2888) and of Cathwalader (2913). Apparently medieval writers assumed the privilege of making what order they could from the chaos of the early Anglo-Saxon period.

Beside the seeming correction in the story of
Arthur noted above, there are others which are only apparent ones because of the bad text chosen by Le Roux: de Lincy, e.g. "lundiels" for "oeus de Rome" at v. 831 and "le gent le Roi" for "li gent al duc" at v. 1843: Egerton shares the correct version with all the other mss. There are multitudinous examples of alterations in detail not shared with others, e.g. the interesting change from "Bien set, ce dist, de mal l'orrine" (L 8472, A 8264) to "Tantost li mette en decline" (1672) or that of "A Barbfloe, en Costentin" (L 11563, A 11282) to "A Barbeflet en sort lentin" (2531).

The author does not escape errors of his own, however; at v. 1088 he puts "sa mere" for "sa moillier" and thus makes Rowena into Vortimer's mother, forgetting that he has explained their relationship at vv. 1054-5; at v. 1341 he writes "fiz" for "fu" and makes Merlin a poor prophet, since by the change he is foretelling Vortiger's end at the hands of Constantino's grandson instead of his sons; at v. 1888, the omission of the complement to "liverast" which follows in Wace makes the passage meaningless unless the author saw in "liverast sur tous" the English "delivered-over-everything." There are also curious changes in proper names, such as that of Gormon to Gurguint (the name of a giant of times earlier than Cassibelasenus in Geoffrey of Monmouth), Tanet to Tamias as Augustine's place of arrival (2843) and Alain to Anlaf (2909). On the whole, however, the author shows care in his work of adaption, and intelligent skill in choosing and joining what he required from his original.
Three instances of slight resemblances (exclusive of Aurelius' speech to Eldolf at the siege of Goneror (L 7823, A 7629), Eldadus' analogy of the Gabionites (L 8153, A 7949) the marvels and adventures of the peace before Arthur's Scandinavian expeditions (L 10032, A 9787), Arthur's fight with the second giant, Riton (L 11960, A 11565) and his impossible exploits in the final battle with Lucius (L 13293, A 12889).

What appears to be the most important divergence of this MS from the known versions of Wace is the account of Uther's treatment of Gorlois, Earl of Cornwall. Wace had already named him as a doughty fighter for Aurelius against the Saxons (L 8007, A 7807) and as Uther's saviour by his wise counsel in battle (L 8685 sqq., A 8465); he seems to be so much ashamed of Uther's coveting of Igerne (cf. the rebuke he puts into the mouth of Ulfin, L 8894, A 8668) that he carefully keeps out the name of Gorlois all through the unsavoury episode, referring to him always as the Count. Geoffrey of Monmouth had known no such scruple, nor did Layamon; in naming Gorlois frequently, the author of our MS seems therefore to be following Geoffrey, Layamon or perhaps the hypothetical "expanded" Wace which some suppose to have been Layamon's model. There is sometimes vague resemblance between non-Wacian passages of Egerton and those of Geoffrey or Layamon, but seldom with both.

For the first:
Gorlois i vint de Cornewaille,  
Et sa femme i amena sanz faille (1793-4)

Geoffrey has: "aderat inter ceteros Gorlois dux Cornubiae  
cum Ygerna conjuge sua"; Layamon has no such compact mention  
of their arrival. For the passage 1829-39, in which Gorlois  
is named twice and which summarises: the disguising of Uther  
and the entry into Tintagel, Geoffrey has "commisit se medic-  
aminibus Merlini et in speciem Gorlois transmutatus est" - there  
is nothing substantial, apart from use of the name, to connect  
Egerton with Geoffrey or any particular version. Vv. 1815-26,  
differing from Wace:

Li Reis apres li s'est hasté,  
Ses terres en ad ars et gascé,

The accounts of the end of Gorlois are quite different from each  
other. The Egerton manuscript says, with Layamon, that the king's  
men assailed the castle in which Gorlois was (v. 1845), while  
Geoffrey says he was killed in a sortie after the King's followers  
had provoked him to battle.

This 14th century version of the Brut thus differs  
in its treatment of this and other episodes from that embodied  
in the vulgate texts, without giving any definite proof of ex- 
clusive recourse either to Geoffrey or to Layamon. The other  
resemblances elsewhere, however, might mean that the author knew
the latter,—or his hypothetical source: that the likeness between the Egerton ms and Layamon are no distant suggests that it was this French source rather than the English work. If so, this ms provides an argument in favour of Imelmann's thesis, though his data generally are not very securely founded. As the Munich Brut, which he considers part of the lost "expanded" version, stops short before the Egerton fragment begins, no comparison is possible. It is to be observed, however, that Layamon, who according to theory used this version, has a different and superior account of Lear and Cordelia from that of the Munich ms.

If it is difficult to trace a source for the alterations found in the Egerton ms, leaving us to assume that many of them, at all events, were the work of the scribe, there is at least one subsequent work, a well-known one, which seems derived from it or a very similar work. This is Caxton's "Cronycole of England," published in 1480, with numerous subsequent editions which prove its popularity: as Caxton chose it for one of his first books, it was no doubt already highly popular. According to the British Museum Catalogue, the work is by Douglas, a monk of Glastonbury, with a continuation sometimes ascribed to Caxton. This Douglas cannot be found anywhere but in the Catalogue. His English prose account of British "history" resembles closely, as far as the end of the Brut, that contained in the Egerton ms, of which the traditional title, judging from the inscription of f.1 and that on the modern binding,
(Chronique d'Angleterre) seems to connect it with the same series at least as Caxton's publication. The frequent occurrence of French words like enchescun, which could not have been very current in English by the end of the fifteenth century, may betray a French original. In the actual matter of Douglas' or Caxton's chronicle we find similar methods of abridgment to those already in Egerton. The long passage about Severus and Fulgenes is omitted, and the narrative jumps from Lucius to Aetlepiadoe and Coel (here called Aetlepades and Coeyll). The story of the end of Gorloic corresponds to that of Egerton. There is no double account of the conception of Arthur, and that King only fights one giant. Gawain's exploits and the killing of Marcellus are omitted, as in Egerton, while the battle with Lucius is much curtailed. Aethelred is buried at St. Paul's. On the other hand Caxton's version gives a short account of Augustine's Welsh dispute, which is omitted from Egerton. The post-Brut account of British history, and much fuller than that of Egerton, which is only fitting, since the century and a half which have elapsed should have seen some improvement on the historical knowledge which it shows.

It thus appears that the Egerton Brut was, if not the original, and we have seen that it contains much that is not to be found in earlier versions, at least an early example, of a shortened version of Wace's poem which enjoyed considerable favour even in Renaissance times.
IV THE CHRONICLE AND ITS AUTHOR

The author of this ms makes no corrections in the part of Wace's story which deals with historical times, for which recourse might have been had to the Saxon Chronicle, or other material available in English monasteries in the fourteenth century. He does in fact make more numerous and more material alterations in the story of historical times than in the legendary part, (no such distinction, of course, existed for the medieval writer). But, so far from bringing Wace's story nearer to history, they seem to take it further into fiction. His own continuation, apart from the very sketchy main outline, has hardly any greater claims to be called history. We shall therefore expect of the Chronicle little new or trustworthy material, but it contains much that is curious.

The complications of the so-called Saxon Heptarchy (or better, Anarchy) caused Wace some confusion. The Egerton author's solution, as we have seen, was to make matters simpler by applying the principle of primogeniture with which he was acquainted. He continues the method in the Chronicle. Egbert, his first monarch to follow the end of Wace's account, so far from being, as he says, Cadwalader's son, did not become king of Wessex till 802, well over a century after both Cadwalader and Caedwalla. He was indeed a contemporary of Charlemagne, but the author does not mention Egbert's stay at the court as an exile from England. As he reigned thirty-seven years, the total span of thirty-two allotted here (\(xxx et ii ann\'s vesqui\"), 2921) is rather inadequate.
Few indeed of the lengths of reigns given are correct.

Aethelwolf was Egbert's son, and did pay a visit to Rome, in 855, but in those turbulent times it would hardly have been safe for the King of Wessex to stay out of the country seven years, as stated here. It was of course Alfred, his youngest son, who made a long stay at Rome for his education. The Princess whom Aethelwolf married on his way back was the daughter of Charles the Bald, not of Charlemagne. The author may have been misled by some expression like "Charles douter ye gret Kyng", which we find in the "Shorter English Chronicle", c. 1300. Peter's Pence, or Rome Penny, is mentioned in his reign. Wace says the pious tax was instituted by Ina, others think it was started by Offa, Egbert's contemporary in Mercia, while Lingard thinks Alfred its originator. As this passage seems to confuse Alfred with his father, it may support Lingard's opinion.

Aethelstan, who "apres li regna" (i.e. after Aethelwolf), was Alfred's grandson, so that three reigns are omitted, including Alfred's. That such an important and enlightened reign should be passed over, or combined with Aethelwolf's, confirms the impression that the author was either occasionally ignorant or strongly biassed. This point will be returned to later.

The British Museum Catalogue points out some of the author's shortcomings as a historian. It accuses him of an anachronism in the reign of Aethelstan, identifying his "oslit Seint Johan, Arcevesque de Everwic", to whom the King owed his discumfiture of the "Scoteis" or "Escoco", with St John of Beverly, archbishop of York 705-718. Aethelstan's rule dated of course from 925 to 940, though our ms gives him only $9\frac{1}{2}$ years. His adversaries were the
Northumbrians and Scots under Constantine, and the forces of the
Danish Kings of Ireland, Anlaf Sihtriosson and Anlaf Gotfredson,
driven from Northumbria by Aethelstan shortly before. (It is to
be noted in passing that the name of Anlaf slips in twenty-five
lines before for that of Alain, Cathwalader's host in Brittany
250 years earlier. There was in Aethelstan's time an Alain of
Brittany, ward of the English King - the confusion may be due to
the scribo's vague memory of some other work dealing with Aethel-
stan). Aethelstan's victory, referred to in vv. 2939-44, must be
that of Brunanburh, until recently considered to be in Northum-
bia, not far from Beverley. The tradition on which this was based
evidently finds an echo here. Without quoting Ingulphus of Cro-
land, commonly called a forger, though his account provided the
basis for that of Lingard, the Catholic historian, we may give
John of Bromton's version:

"Dum rex Aethelstanus, pro aliquali dissensione inter ipsum et
Constantinum regem Scotorum habita, versus Scotiae tenderet, bea-
tum Johanne apud Beverlacum visitavit; super altare cultellum
pro vadio posuit, promittens si victor rediret, cultellum digno
pretio redimeret. Quod implevit; nam dimicando contra Scotos
Deum rogavit ut prece Sancti Johannis Beverlacii aliquod signum
evidens ostenderet quo praesentes et futuri cognoscere possunt
Scotos de jure debere Anglis subjugari; unde rex cum gladio suo
scopulum percussit quendam lapideum juxta castrum de Dunbar quod
usque hodie ad mensuram ulnae lapidae exictu cavatur; unde rex
Aethelstanus habita victoria et rege Constantino iterum submissis,
filium ejusdem Constantini de sacro fonte suscepit: et in redeun-
do territorium Sancti Johannis possessionibus privilegiis et
liber-
libertatis variis ditavit." (Chronicle, col. 838).

Our scribe was thus evidently not thinking of a lifetime intervention of the saint, only of a supernatural one; he alludes to him personally just as John says "rex... beatam Johannem.... visitavit", consistently with medieval faith and practice. Actually Beverley Minster was not dedicated to the English archbishop who became Lord of the town, but to the evangelist; the former had much to do with refounding and rebuilding it, however, and his fame no doubt soon outshone, or perhaps was confounded with, that of the other. His reputation was such that his image was one of the three carried by the English forces at the Battle of the Standard, 1138, the others being St Peter and St Wilfred of Ripon. The homonymous saints may have been confused by Aethelstan himself. The Yorkshireman Piers de Langtoft places Brunanburh on the Humber, and says Aethelstan confirmed grants made to St John of Beverley. The whole matter seems best resumed by the anonymous local author of a "Short History of Beverley Minster" (1825): "The name of Aethelstan is mentioned so often in conjunction with St John, that by many persons they seem to be considered as contemporaries and as united in founding the monastery at Beverley.... Aethelstan .... had no share either in the founding or increasing the monastery, though it had great obligations to him as a powerful patron and liberal benefactor."

Three more reigns are skipped when Edgar, Aethelstan's son, is made his brother and successor instead of Edmund. The legend of St Dunstan's prophecy at his birth was a current one; we find it also in the Cot. Vit. ms of the Brut. It is natural that his comparatively peaceful and beneficent reign should be dilated
upon lyrically by a monkish author, since Archbishop Dunstan, champion of the monks and purger of the seculars, was the power behind the throne and as J.R. Green says, "to his time English monasticism looked back in later days as the beginning of its continuous life". It is noteworthy that the correct number of years (16) is assigned to his reign, but the author buries the king at London instead of Glastonbury. The next King, Edward the Martyr, he correctly interred at Shaftesbury. "Estrice" is of course Ethelfrith or Ælffrith.

The author is not quite so ignorant as indicated by the British Museum Catalogue when it criticises him for "making Alfred an illegitimate son of Edgar". "Alvered" is of course a common form of "Alfred", and it is possible our author confused him with Æthelred the Unready, or even tried to discredit the great Saxon King by saddling him with the other's reign. His confusion was probably worse confused through Alfred's brother and predecessor also having the name Æthelred. If the name is Alfred's however, the deeds, the traitorous counsellor and the length of reign (37 years) are Æthelred's -

"En grant hunte sa terre garda
Car Daneis sovent ly gueroient
Par le conseil Edviz vendrent."

Nothing is said of the treacherous massacre of Danes on St Brice's Day, or the King's flight into Normandy. The taint here attached to his birth (2982) is not found in the historians, who merely make him the son of Edgar's second wife. He dies, like the rest, "de ses amis mult regretee." Though the Catalogue has now been amended, it is still unjust to our author; he does not make Alfred or even Æthelred, "the illegitimate son of Edward Martyr."
plainly enough "sun frere", while if we understand "Aethelred" for "Alvered", his relationship with Edmund Ironside is correctly given.

It is difficult to see why, in such a summary account of English history, the brief reign of Edmund Ironside, who was in fact only acknowledged by London, should have twenty-two lines unless local legend finds an echo here. Edmund's connection with the West Country has already been mentioned. The author subscribes to the tradition that Edric Streana was responsible for Edmund's death, as for most calamities of the time. The locally-produced Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester shows similar disproportion, giving Edmund 224 lines and making Edric responsible for his death.

Canute's reign is given as eight years, no doubt through the author's reading, or at least writing, viii for vin. The only thing in the reign thought noteworthy by our author is a kind of Durbar given at London. Harold, Canute's successor, has the cognomen denoting irregular birth, instead of the more usual one of Harefoot. The author is rather generous with this title, having already applied it to Edgar's stepson Aethelred, while the Conqueror gets it later, of course legitimately. "Alrod Axifot sun frere" is evidently intended to be Harthacanute, though the name seems to show confusion with both Aethelred and Harefoot. The impression is strengthened by this King's being credited with the parentage of Edward the Confessor; the relationship of Edward and Harthacanute, both sons of Emma of Normandy, the former by Aethelred and the latter by Canute, seems to have been too much for our author.

The statement that Edward devised his kingdom to William
In 1066, with the insistence on Harold's punishment for wrongly seizing the throne, and the sardonic

A Harald vint dure novelę;
Kar fërru fu parmi le corvele,

seem to be signs of a firm supporter of the Norman regime. There are other indications of this elsewhere. William's important reign gets only twelve lines. His pious foundation (Battle Abbey is no doubt intended, though not named) and the homage of his barons are the only points of interest to our author, who is an apologist for William Rufus; he says nothing of his unpopularity, and would have us believe this king died on a bed of sickness at Winchester.

The tales of years for the later monarchs are correct within a year or two, except in Henry II's case, (his reign is shortened seven years, no doubt because "Les franchise vouldreit retraire/Ke Seint Eglise devereit avoix") and Edward I's, who has eight years added to his, Henry III is given a reign of "ix anz cinckant et sis," which if it means 59\frac{1}{2} years shows an excess of 3\frac{1}{2}. Henry I's fame as lawgiver is duly recorded, but he died at Angers, not London. Maud is not mentioned, and two of Stephen's eight lines are devoted to his works of piety, which of course had the object of securing the support of the Church against followers of the Empress. Henry II was the son of Maud and Geoffrey of Anjou, not of Stephen as given here, and he died at Chinon, not Fontevrault. The place of v. 3141 seems to imply that Richard I was killed on the crusades.
Of John we learn

"Son realme quie en bele manere,
Malz grant adversité avoit
Pur Mestre Esteven q'il ne voleit,"

From his impartial tone, the author apparently attached no blame for the Interdict either to John or to Pope Innocent, "mult par seint hom." It did not last "sis anz et treis quartiers et un mois" but 5½ years, while the nondescript "evesché" mentioned as the cause of the trouble was merely the archiepiscopal throne. "Mestre Esteven" therefore seems the only guilty party, perhaps because his lead in the securing of Magna Charta was offensive to the sense of loyalty already noted in our author. The troubles with the barons and the invasion of the Dauphin Louis were no doubt part of John's "bele manere", and quite normal to the author's scheme of things.

Of Henry III we learn simply that in his time took place the battle of Lewes, where he lost many relations, and the battle of Evesham, where Simon de Montfort, Henry his son and Hugh Despenser are neatly rhymed off; no mention of the causes which led to the rising of the barons against the King, so that there can be no question of stirring old wounds in this Chronicle, at a time when King and barons are united against an outside foe.

As a further index of the author's historical accuracy may be briefly noted his monkish insistence on the places of death and burial of the Kings, even when he has only a few words to say of their whole reign. His favourite burying-places are London and Winchester, but he is nearly always wrong. Neither Aethelstan nor Edgar, for example, found rest at London, as he says, but the former at Malmesbury, the latter at Glastonbury. This mistake
about Edgar, the great benefactor of Glastonbury, makes it extremely unlikely that the ms originated there. If, however, to do the author justice, we read for Alvered not Alfred but Aethelred, it is correct to say that he died at London, and it is quite possible that the paradoxical English nation gave him a hero's funeral at St Paul's. Pierre de Langtoft calls Aethelred Eylrode or Aylrode, and the Cotton Vitellius ms of the Brut inter al him at St Paul's, as does William of Malmesbury. Robert of Gloucester, however, so far from burying Aethelred at St Paul's says "Feblesliche he livode al is lif and deyde in feble dethe." Canute and Harald Harefoot were buried respectively at Winchester and Oxford, not at London and Winchester. John, whose misdeeds the author palliates, is buried by him at Winchester, perhaps by confusion with Worcester. The same mistake appears elsewhere, for example in the Cambridge ms of the "Shorter English Chronicle". Edward I he makes die at London after wintering there, a proceeding which this King shared, according to the Chronicle, with Aethelstan and Henry (who in fact died at Angers). Perhaps Burgh-on-Sands was so remote that the London cliché was more convenient.

So much for the Chronicler's testimony on past events. Any hopes that he might show greater historical rectitude for the reign of Edward II, of which, presumably, he saw something, as it ended about a dozen years before the date of the ms, are quickly deceived. The fifty-one lines devoted to this reign show as much confusion and inaccuracy as the rest. Like most of his predecessors, Edward was "de grant poestis" and

"...... meintint bien les franchis
De Saint Eglise, et mult l'amoit
Rentes et possessions lour doneit".
Also, probably a more personal note:

"As povros freres de religion
Sovent dona mult riche doun".

He governed his Kingdom well, and often destroyed the Scots - Bannockburn is discreetly omitted. The first of the King's favorites, Gaveston, is not mentioned, but Hugh Despenser, or L'Es-penser, is given instead as the cause of the baron's revolt.

The author seems to have the impression that there was only one Despensor. Perhaps he had close knowledge of only one of them. As the elder Despenser was drawn, quartered and beheaded at Bristol, with Mortimer as one of his judges, while the younger was hanged at Hereford, the reference to Mortimer's part in the "vile huntage" may indicate the elder Sir Hugh. This perhaps means that the author lived nearer Bristol than Hereford. Significantly, he drops no word on the Queen Mother's part in all this. As there is no mention of the Despenses' burial at Tewkesbury, that town seems to be excluded as place of origin of the ms. The evidence of the final passages in favour of the Gloucester area has already been discussed; the omission of any reference to Henry III's exceptional coronation at Gloucester may oppose this. The extensive omissions noted on the subject of campaigns in Scotland and the North again seems to fix the author's habitat in the South.

The account already given of the omissions made in Wace's narrative seems to show that the chief purpose was to save space, hardly to improve historical accuracy. The same is true of many gaps in the post-Wacian story, though there is less excuse for disregard of historical continuity in times nearer to the author.
But it is hard to avoid the suspicion that other motives, perhaps of a piece with the whole purpose of the work, guided the author's manipulation of his material.

He is obviously an unswerving supporter of the Norman régime and of the idea "the King can do no wrong", by his almost automatic praise of every member of the dynasty, good, bad or indifferent, exception being made for Henry II, disturber of the Church. There might also be, in the absence of praise for Henry III and the list of barons killed at Evesham, a fleeting note of sympathy for the latter which might denote interest in the Despensers particularly. The dynasty's adopted ancestor, Arthur, has the biggest place in the story, and the author by his treatment of it seems to have little interest in the part of Wace which followed Arthur. In his own part he omits altogether the Anglo-Saxon hero Alfred, or (wilfully?) confounds him with the execrated Aethelred. He is careful to insist on the legality of William of Normandy's action in coming to claim his heritage, and the illegality of Harold's in seizing the throne himself; his sardonic comment on the justness of Harold's fate has already been noted.

The contrast between his attitude and that of writers of Chronicles in English is marked. The Short English Chronicle, for example, misses out Arthur, but like Robert of Gloucester praises Alfred, expresses dissatisfaction with the foreign influences which followed the Conqueror and supports Stephen Langton and Simon de Montfort.

Our author, then, whether from impartiality or ignorance shows unusual restraint from violent criticism except in the case...
of Harold, the Saxon, and Henry II, the enemy of the Church. He
does not seem interested in Scotland or the North. As we have
seen, Arthur's conquests there are among the major omissions, but
his pretexts and preparations for continental conquest are kept
at length, with, significantly, his overcoming of Frollo, govern-
or of Paris and bearer, in the miniature, of the lilies of France.
It might have been indiscreet to refer in too great detail to
Scotland, scene of Edward II's failure, but the parallel of Ar-
thur, conqueror of France and then of the world, was valuable to
the King who hoped to follow in his path. There can be little
doubt that this version of the Brut was intended to play a part
in Edward III's war propaganda, and in the popularizing of French
for war purposes in accord with his ordinance of 1334. It is care-
fully written and lavishly illustrated, but lacks the sumptuous-
ness which would indicate a direct royal commission or execution
for a member of the high nobility. Its inaccuracy even in con-
temporary affairs seems to mean also that it was not written for
any who had had a leading part in them or much knowledge of them;
a patron among the lesser nobility of Norman descent in the West
is indicated, perhaps among the followers of the Despensors.

The direct historical value of the ms is obviously small.
In spite of unusual care in the actual execution, little attempt
has been made to improve on such historical as might have been
contained in oral tradition. It is not part of the body of English
Chronicles which are, according to authorities, one of our most
valuable possessions. Its indirect historical value, however, lies
in showing how ignorant it was possible to be even when writing
for the pleasure and information of those classes still conversant with the polite language. By implication the latter are convicted of even greater ignorance.

Six centuries of progress in the public and those with the vocation of informing and entertaining it, hardly enable us to criticise a probably well-meaning forerunner of the historical film and the press of propaganda and sensation.
The rhymes must of course provide the material for the study of this piece from the phonetic point of view, but the fact that it is based upon an older poem reduces the quantity of such material. Most of Wace's rhymes have been taken over as they stood; the changes undergone by the word-pairs in the intervening 180 years are perhaps reflected in the spelling, but as they are still good rhymes for the most part, they often do not betray the real nature of the sounds. That the author was capable of adjusting his spelling to provide eye-rhymes; (examples are given in the chapter on versification) on the one hand makes us suspicious of what may be legitimate sound-pairings, and on the other may assist in determining sound-developments which orthographical conservatism might have concealed. In any case it shows the unreality of much Anglo-Norman spelling or the uncertainty of Anglo-Norman phonology, or both. The best method of approach seems therefore to study chiefly the rhymes used in the interpolations and alterations, and in the final portion. Those shared with Wace will be indicated by W, L signifying Le Roux de Linoy's text, A Arnold's.

I Tonic Vowels

Lat. $\acute{i}$ $>$ Fr. $i$. Numerous examples suggest that this sound, in other words beside verbs, had become assimilated to, or confused with, other vowels, e.g. (a) Lat. $\acute{a} >$ Fr. $e$: apolle; Normandie, 5053, afoblie; paasé 521, deliveré; aio 1956, lee; envaie 527, clergie; vie 642, abbey 2802, avio; exillie 3227. (b) Lat. $\acute{a}$ $>$ Fr. $e$; some examples: chivalier; venir 2193, a voider; entreferir 2103, decoler; occire 3245, demorer; fuir 432, maintenir; justisier (noun) 3395, conseiller 3225, fruisser; murir 1414, chalangier; meintoner
A good number of these examples are rhymes between ier and i-ier; others may be due to change of conjugation not noted in the spelling as it is in seisé: cumpard 5069, sigler: pleiser 2496, seisez (past part.): volez (vouloir) 1453. (Cf. Tanqueroy, p. 758, where he says this confusion takes place particularly before r) Such rhymes, with spellings like foille, empoyement (cf. treiste in Plaintes de la Viergo), may indicate that i, less stable than on the continent, had become more open in Anglo-Norman, at least in the area to which the scribe belonged. Lui: (avio 3222) is no doubt merely a spelling of li (cf. lie: vie, 3047). Lat. ē, ı free > Fr. oi. It is clear that this vowel had lost the second element of the diphthong by now in Anglo-Norman. Examples foiz: patriz, 596; vonguez, oir — (iter): mander, 696; aver: parler, 5063; cf. the spelling ostè = estoit 466. It rhymes once with a + jod (moisal, 968). Cf. also the above rhymes in ī. Lat. ē free > Fr. ē rhymes with ē = Lat. a in frer; eur (heri 172 e nomor; Pier (peter, 2925), which change seems to be confirmed by numerous spellings like pero for pierro, requer, destourber; mestier (1305 W). This sound also seems to rhyme with i in cimiter; Ambosbire (1505 W Ambresbère; cimètre or Ambroshiere; cimetiere, cimetiire), though the nature of the sound in -bire is by no means certain.

Lat. ē, ı free > Fr. ē, ē(r). As noted above, there seem to be cases of these sounds rhyming with ī, ı, ı, in infinitives, pretérits and past participles. Change of conjugation may be suspected in most cases, but hardly in apelles: Normundio, deliveré:
aie, venir: chivalchier, nor in tueiz: damagiez (assuming tueiz to 
be a word in -itium and not a misspelling of tuez). This sound 
also rhymes with e + l - mouilléc< -ilium in counseil: leil (le-
galem, 385, cf. leal: vassal 462, W). This last rhyme seems to con-
firm Miss Pope’s opinion (From Latin to Modern French, p.457) that 
in England legalem > lel: the final il, a graphy for l- mouilléc, 
could no doubt, owing to confusion of this with l, stand just as 
well for the simple sound. Cf. "the Land o' the Leal".
Lat. a + l blocked > O.F. au. In the rhyme regne: realme 3051 
a l, preceded by e plus jod, seems to have undergone the same 
fate as when free in legalem. All trace of the l, which is still 
spelt, has probably disappeared in pronunciation (cf. raem in 
John Trovisa, West of England c. 1380).
Lat. 0 blocked > Fr. 0. At v.333 ost rhymes with the archaic im-
perfect amenout. Elsewhere, however, these imperfects are coupl-
ed in rhyme with those in - eit.
Lat. o, ü free > Off. ou, Fr. oe. This sound variously spelt, is 
confused, as usual in Anglo-Norman, with (a) u < o, ü blocked, (b) 
y > ü. Examples: (a) houre: succure (succurrat?) 407; succure 
(imperative): honur, 674(W); jours: honors, 3037; (b) cure: honure 
103; pruz: iisuz, 87; socuruz: dolerouse, 537; pruz: touz, 2935. 
The rhyme bruiz: tout, 2294 is a legacy of Wace. Though the spon-
ning is altered, it is no doubt still a good rhyme, owing to the 
reduction of ui to u in A-N. Cf. eussent: fussent, 2827.

2. Nasal Vowels

There are no cases of ä; è.

Some rhymes seem to show denasalization, e.g. treit: empeint 3079, 
Vindrent: firent 2987, tresoun: jour (also loss of y) 1133.
3 O.F. Diphthongs and Triphthongs.

**Ai** seems to have become **è** (èj?) e.g. est; plést (placet, 3259; same rhyme in Black Prince, 891), salmoi 968, fait; toneit 3257, aver: retraire 3125 (cf. Engleterre, retriere, Black Prince 1565). More numerous examples of this are given in the section on orthography. Cf. Tanqueroy p. 755.

IE. Despite diversity of spelling, the rhymes suggest that ie in preterites, past participles and infinitives of conj.I and in words like amistié, congé, where the i is due to the influence of a preceding palatal or dental consonant or i, had been reduced to e (or è before r). The converse is possible, i.e. that e or è had acquired a first i- element in other positions than after palatals or dentals. This latter alternative would account for the ease with which verbs change their conjugation, in view of tendencies in i - verbs which seem to be noted in spellings like ouierent, oies, cumbatierent, orgoillierent, in this piece. Tanqueroy says such forms are rare (p. 749). It is to be suspected that the scribe was working from an older ms to which he gave only partial attention, as he coupled indiscriminately ie and o spellings:

(a) where, according to Suchier's rule (Les Voixelles toniques, p. 84), ie would be possible in both words, (b) where is is not normal in one of them (c) where it is not normal in either, (d) where both words have e-spelling not normal to one of them, (d) where both words have e when ie would be normal in both. Examples: (a) ds exiles: depeaciez 81, chivalers: archiers 89, :fiers 569, envois: apparaillez 115, baptised: lied 183, repaire: chargier 321, vergier : cunseiller 724, repairez: cungied 816, enforcier: requier 970, les- sex: detrenchies 357, meines: chargies 990, amistied: meitez 1028,
milliers:volunteers 1121, appareilliz (sic): aloignez 2099, dener: mestier 2388, drescie: husche 2392;
(b) destourber: mestier (W destorbier) 1305, demorer: commencer (L demorier; A demurer) 1409; atargier: armer 1395, mundier: espurger 1313, jetterent: enchantierent 571, enhauquier: mander 1509, valee: essacie (W asasée) 129; enhauquier: clamé 2320, autier: coroner 255, 3105, commencer: solemnité 2220, Pier: nomer 2925;

The most significant point in the above rhymes is that only five (Pier: nomer, doner: heiter, autier: coroner, despenser: bachelor, chier: frere) occur in the Chronicle. The uncertainty between e and ie spellings in the first part may therefore indicate occasional influence of spellings from the older ms, or that the sounds were sufficiently alike to cause confusion in the spelling. The spelling is much more regularly e in the Chronicle, which has no example at all of an ierinfinitive. The only cases of this spelling beside the above are millier (not at the rhyme) 2942, chantierent (: firmament) 2-56, damagierent (: gueroident) 2986, damagiez (: tuez) 3008, chivalchierent; encroierent 3239- all examples of regular i spelling which may easily have occurred because traditional. Examples have already been given of the rhyming of i with e, especially before r, though not exclusively. The cumulative effect
of these rhymes is to suggest that e, oi, ie and i in A-N all became levelled or at least, similar enough to be confused. Whether the result was a diphthong or a simple vowel seems difficult to decide. The spelling everywhere pore for pierre (Pier for the proper name, however,) manere, arete, etc. may mean reduction of ie.

On the other hand, spellings like pier (pore) chier, tiel may show diphthongisation of e. Loan-words from the two classes, e.g. cheer peer (<pair <par), (<chere, <cara), pierce, pier (<pierre <petra, cf. "Piers Plowman"), certainly have the same vowel in modern English.

As far as the parts of verbs are concerned, the phonetically easiest stages, not necessarily chronological ones, seem to have been the identification of e and ie in past participles (cf. ms F.f. 1450 of the Brut, a northern French one, which shows guerpie: laie, v. 6096 ed. L) and comme, nocie, v. 414); then of preterite endings in -erent, -ierent, whether of the first or other conjugations (cf. Tanquerey, p. 57), finally the past participles of -ier verbs rhyme with those of the second and other conjugations and with nouns, etc. in i, ie, while their infinitives rhyme with those in -ir, -ire. Examples of all these have already been given.

Tanquerey (p. 383) notes that the re-introduction of -ier in the first conjugation infinitives, even in verbs not having it originally, appears to have taken place towards the end of the 14th century. It appears to have happened earlier if our ms has been correctly dated (e.g. remuer: portier 1533, mundier: espurger 1313. Portier is the regular spelling for this verb and its compounds).

If our ms is in advance of others in this respect, the phenomenon may be connected with its locality of origin (cf. Chapter II above).

On the other hand, rhymes like remuer: portier, suggest that -ier
was only a spelling. Even more numerous examples have been given of this spelling in the third person plural of the preterite. They show that introduction of i takes place after r, t, or d without presence of i in the preceding syllable, as required by the rule quoted by Tanquerey (p. 382). Leu, The rhyme dieux; autiers 910, is another legacy from Wace (L dole; autels, a deus; auteurs) The form proper to the scribe is autier(s; coroner, 255, 3106, two rhymes of his own).

4 Final Atonic e

There is ample evidence, in rhymes as well as spellings, that final atonic e had disappeared or was disregarded in Añ. Examples: mere; lesser (1088), terre; bier (baro 2864); purloigner (1975), mander (3017),: justiser (3265); Espenser (3223); Hortimer (3241); frere; bacheler (2954); chier (3031); parler; chier (fem 1961); ser (mâle); fier (foriat, 2551); retraire; aver (3125); frer; eor (heri, 1732); craving; vestu (fem) 892, avie; lui (3221, cf. vie:lie, i.e. lui, 3047); mando; purloignant (2286); demande; covenant (1657; France); anz (2931); Irlande; grant (1527); corono; Southamptoun (2484, seisinsfin 2867, franchis; poestia 3212, voile; doel 604, noveles; vassels 848, portd; ensovoio 2551, porte; fort 1377, tot; dout 880, etc. etc.

To these must be added the large number of lines which show past participles and other words in -e, masculine or feminine, rhyming with others in -ee, either gender, e.g. alé; rovee 1239, parlee; prée 1627, valee; essacid 129, porté; ensevelee 3253; melee 1137; ensevelee 3167; ospee; achevé 2110. Also the rhyming of i past participles, 3rd person singulars of i-preterites and words with final i to which an irrational e has been added, with others having no such e, e.g. seisies; tolli 549, Henry; baillie 3169.
fendi: estendie 980, guerpie: fini 1177, vestie: tendi 1661, au-
hatie: ferri 2695, etc., etc. Verbal -ent appears to be similarly
mute, except in certain cases which will be discussed in the chap-
ter on versification. This would account for the writing of the
third person singular for the plural in a number of places, e.g.
cremeit: esteient 1401, aveit; teneient 2055; also the change in
the imperfect ending from -eient to -eint. Further reduction to
-ent owing to the change e > e is not unlikely (cf. Versification).

F: Final Consonants

Final consonants which had disappeared or were disappearing
in France as well as in England, have in some cases been reintro-
duced in spelling, but the rhymes show that they are not pronoun-
ced.

Labials, F - corps: Hors 852 (W ours; Hors), champ: auint 3006
temps: parenz 3173, tense: eloquence 640.
F - nefs: remes 2001, (W nes; remes), cf. poestis; sis 3183, poes-
tiz; fiz 3135.
V - naive: plentive 884 (W naive).

Dentals Judging from the confusion of spellings, most final den-
tals seem to have disappeared by now in Anglo-Norman pronuncia-
tion. D final had of course become t in O.F. (cf. Edward; part
2971, 3041; Irlande; grant 1527), but both seem lost in pronun-
ciation though often brought back in spelling: the frequency of
d at the end of past participles, etc., where it might in early
stages of A-N, represent the dental spirant, is probably due to
the influence of English weak past participles - the rhymes in-
dicate that the final dental had no phonetic value. Examples:
regnat: onura 3121, edlit: Everwic (2939 - ne doubt Anglo-Norman
convention allowed non-pronunciation of the K of the English place name), lied: acoustez 40, cuneud; bus 75, lessez; exilled 620, Crist: sis 3049. S and ts (Z) had likewise no doubt been assimilated and then silenced; the interchange of these letters in spelling (of Dynabussirasouz 1221, depesciés; exilosh 81, temps:par-enz 3173, poestiz: fiz 3135, socuruz: dolerouse 537) is enough to show assimilation; and their rhyming with a presumably orthographic d (lied: acoustez 38, preised; occisés 511, amistiod: meitez1028, tunduz: revestud 1663, Muntford: efforze 3177) and with forms without S (estrif: vifs 2262, encumbrers: guerrer 2937) seems to indicate their loss.

Against the loss of final S, we find rhymes like pres: engres (i.e. presse, engresse) 2218, purpense: tens 2526, franchis (franchises): poestis 3212, assis (i.e. assise); justisse 1953. Apart from purpense: tens, however, which shows addition of analogical e; in spelling at least, these rhymes prove little else than the loss of feminine e; where this loss had taken place, the S was no doubt still pronounced but this was not necessarily true of S normally final, i.e. (generally) a sign of number or case. Similar considerations seem to apply to T in entent:rent (nouns) 812, atent: Juvent (do) 1971, where the t, not properly final, was no doubt pronounced, though a final off-glide marked enough to be spelt.

Perhaps the spellings-ce, -se, -sse indicate words in which final S had not been lost, acquiring an e in spelling to show the remnant of an off-glide. Usually these words rhyme together, e.g. pretance: romance 988, tense: eloquence 640, but there is also force: aforce (efforze?) where the pronunciation is not in doubt. If these spellings thus represent sounded final S, the rhymes in
question and bretancesgeanz 1607, Franco: anz 2931, mortz: aforeach 2734, seem to imply that S and z final had not fallen. Perhaps they had disappeared in most words, and certainly as signs of declension, but could sound if required by rhyme. They were certainly interchangeable in spelling whether pronounced or not.

That S before final T had been effaced appears certain from the prevalence of at as the ending of the third person singular of the preterite, extending also to the future. Further confirmation comes from the following rhymes - jutimou:st 189, dit; enquiest 1014, apris (W's 11 apris is changed to l'ad apris, so the word is indubitably the past participle); surist 1032, oat; ame: nout 333, prist: Judit 2929, ad; deviast 3029, zregnant 3065, mort: cast: recent 2853, rast 2462; ferast 1080; pout: fust 55, esteat; dust 1638, prest: est 2438, Estre; Gloucestro 213; Cicestro (W) 702, does not conclude for or against pronunciation of S, as probably A-N convention allowed the suppression of S in these English place names. Cf baptesmo: creme 2857.

The disappearance of r seems registered in a good number of rhymes - ordinors: senez 1481, asez: nomez (infin) 2452, ordineez: (past part.): justiserez 2602, prost: ort, tresoun; jour 1133. There is also the common confusion, in spelling at least, between r and l in apostoils: gloira 165.

L is often written where it has clearly been vocalised - russeaus: muncoals 2704, vassas: mals 1718. It has disappeared from fiz - poostiz 3135, sis 3183, gontis: cunquis 2168. It seems to be an inverted spelling for u in words where it is not etymological, e.g. nevolz: pruz 2480, soute: salt 1187. (cf Popq, p. 459). It seems to
remain in voile (voeu): doel 604, and to be levelled with l-mouillée in feels: cunseilles (W) 2322 (where ille is evidently a souvenir of l-mouillée, even if the Anglo-Normans were incapable of the sound), and leil: cunseil.

Nasals. N seems to have doubtful value in treisoun: jour, sojourn: haiour 2742. Still more is this the case of n-mouillée — sojourne: Burgoine 2716, home: essoigne 2544, regne: realms 3056, aime: pleine (subjunctives of aimer, plaindre, 946. W has aint: plaint — the scribe has evidently kept the old rhyme while writing modern forms; the same seems to apply to rames: meins 2244), femme: regne 1799, 2482 (fenne: regne in Wace, a rhyme possible in S. Normandy, Champagne and Provence, where m assimilated to n instead of the normal reverse process, according to Miss Pope, From Latin to Modern French, p. 148).
(IV) ORTHOGRAPHY.

Tanquerey, in the Introduction to his *Evolution du verbe* postulates unity of language in any given Anglo-Norman work, whether of the eleventh or of the fourteenth century: despite the rapid changes in the language, that of any one work is fairly homogeneous. Such a piece as the present, derived though not slavishly copied from an older work, might be expected to upset this view by its mixture of features proper to its author and those of only a few years earlier. On the whole, however, its surprising degree of consistency only serves to confirm the view put forward by Tanquerey.

It is perhaps in its orthography that this consistency is most conspicuous. Fluctuation and irregularity are of course present, but chiefly in the representation of those sounds on whose value uncertainty was greatest for the Anglo-Normans, and particularly some which have already been discussed. Where an apparently irregular spelling is repeated, as is often the case, there was no doubt a phonetic basis, though scribal tradition may obscure its nature.

There is some evidence of care for rules such as those drawn up in the *Orthographia Gallica*, which were sometimes well-founded but were often fanciful enough to show the complete divorce of spelling convention from phonetic reality. Habet, for example is without exception distinguished from ad by use of the spellings ad, a. There are only four exceptions to the use of e after c to denote softening before a, v, u, and none of its omission after g in those circumstances. -Aet is almost generalised as the 3rd pers. sing. ending of the preterite. Numerous words of sometimes unusual form keep this form everywhere without varia-
tion, e.g. bosoigne, chivalor, chivalchier, primer, soul, seillo poi, solonc.

Vowels: e, ie.

The question of the spelling ie has already been discussed from the phonetic viewpoint. The fact that it is rare in the Chronicle, even in words where we might expect it, e.g. commence 3085, 3263, justiser 3196, 3266, chivalherent 3236, suggests that it was not proper to the Egerton scribe; to the support of rhymes like despenser: bacheler, autier; coroner, doner; heriter come spellings like desierez (desiriers) 1860, mesne, passim, littere; biero 1896 derere 1578, veiles (viells) 290, veillards 93, and many others already cited. Whether this means that phonetically ie tended to become e, while in turn e tended to change to ie, as in chier, chief and the numerous examples above quoted (but cf. chier; frere 3032), or whether again they were just variable graphies for indeterminate sounds, it is difficult from such evidence to conclude.

Spellings without e where we expect it are: oiz (imperative) 2620, apparrailiz (past participle) 2099.

Ö, o, ou, u

The sounds coming from the Latin ö, ō, ū and ū were perhaps those on which the Anglo-Normans felt the greatest uncertainty, and this is reflected in the spelling. Thus tottu is spelt tot, tout, tut with the first perhaps predominant; at v. 1820 there is trestoeb. Keurent at v. 2145 is the present of courir. e at the beginning of v. 562 seems to stand for ou. e in counterroric position likewise varies: oustez 603, oustages 1490, adouer 1504, ovreine 1522, restoror 1503, mori 1683, corone passim, dotant 740 honurö 1518, murdrie 1508 - perhaps o receives the preference.
O. F. ö likewise ranges through oo, oe, o, ou to u - qeor 593, doel 605 poeple 759, pueple 184, ovre 1528, avoglo 3063, soul passim, overours 1510 dolur:flour 1714, lour, lur passim, gule 1702, goule 1326, honur passim. Locum gives lu 132, leu 1509, leue 1524, lieu 2290; focum > feu 1342, 2557; due > dieu 854. The weight of numbers seems in favour of ou. U shows similar range: escomer 1325, estoet:creut 265, 1683, estuet: mut 1585, tresboucher 2117.

O. F. Diphthongs.

The evidence of the spelling, as of the rhymes, is in favour of the levelling of ai, ei, oi (to open e?). The only exception to pacem > pees, (pes 1999, (peeso 2371) is pais 98, 1937, 2001, 3163. Cf. paissiblement 1878. The past participle of faire is habitually fait, but rhymes with teneit 3257, veit (aller) 1287, treit (tractum) 1367, pleit 699. The infinitive and the imperative singular are also spelt faire, fai without exception, with fas as second person singular at v. 1295. But the e spelling is found invariably in fetes or fetez, and in the present participle and imperfect. The first person singular of savoir (which alternates with savor and rhymes with veer, 1575) is always sai, the second has ses 2263, sees 1230, seiez 1226, seiz 1535, or siez 2266. For the 3rd pers, sing. of aller we find veit 1288, voit 1864. peser gives peise and poise, taire, gives tes 1223, plaire plost passim; lesser has e invariably. Feible and its compounds are always spelt with e only, and tresun 1911, 3013, seems to show that even i in hiatus had been lost, in spite of the spelling traitre, 3009 and elsewhere. Seisir always keeps ei, however; moi appears for quoi at v. 1304, and moi; sai 968, stey 1819. Mestrésis appears at v. 3156, estraitement 1260. The 3rd person
sind. pros, subjunctive of avoir is alt 102, eit 104. Magis has become mes at v. 105, magistros mestres at 230. Compare also the spellings autreit (autre, autri?) 2091, receivit 2059, receivienent 844, citizeins 2144, enseplelez 3188, orgoins 2222, orgoiner 2223. The matter seems to be clinched by the free rhyming of the different imperfect endings, as veneit: appareilloit 2593, amoit: doneit 3213, feroint: savoient 730.

For eie, compare espeie 2200, 2211, valeie 2600, with abbé (abbaye) 3115.

The evidence seems in favour of the loss of the second element in oi, ui, e.g. su passim, conusaunce 47, conustre 55, conuso (imperative singular) 1247, cundure 492, destruent 619, 927, agener 101, L469, anuer 1076, emposoner 1110, rusele 1314, somuler 2502; on the other hand there are a few spellings like fruisser 1413, puisun 1356. Reduction seems to have left the i- element in autri 603. There is no clear distinction between lui and li in the dative-disjunctive form of the personal pronoun; there seem to be few cases of lui in the counter-tonic position, but more of li in the strong position after a proposition, e.g. W. 245, 2077.

Atonic e. Examples already given show that there is no consistent use of final "e mute" in past participles etc., or observation even of the curious rules to be found in the Orthographia Gallica. It is added to the masculine perhaps more often than to the feminine; respondue: eue 1237 are past participles not susceptible of agreement; the rhyme esgardee (fem): tourné (maso) 1801, might suggest that agreement was observed at least in spelling, if espooee: amé (both fem.) 1571, did not show that
such an idea is quite wrong, and that the most probable reason for such spellings is to diversify the appearance of the ms. - the ending -ee only appears once, 291-2, at the end of two consecutive verses. At the end of many nouns, e.g. champe: suiant 3005, it is obviously irrational. A possible explanation of some irrational es is suggested in the chapter on versification.

The regular spelling of -ement in adverbs and nouns in -ment may be intended to denote that counter-tonic e is pronounced, and not effaced as usual, e.g. boneement 99, definement 146, sureement 975, priveement 1818, oleément 1398, primorciement 753, - in forement 1706, 1322, the e is quite an intruder and presumably not pronounced. If the scribe had such a rule in mind, however, he broke it very frequently, e.g. finomment 152, chieré, ensement, passim, delivrement 1863, Chieré 2082, registers disappearance of counter-tonic e, and pers: frers 750-1, of final e.

Agglutination is sometimes shown by the omission of e - entrels passim, sometimes not - s'entreassemblerent 1932. There is regular diacritic use of e after c and g before a, o, u, with only four exceptions for c - enlocumz 1646, facoun 2508, policon 2233, macue 2560. The frequency of the ending- ea thus obtained in preterites like chacea, embracea, may be responsible for its use in bailee: baisoa 1034, engrotea 3132, movea 3192. Engrotea may be due to similarity of t and c in writing; the e in the first two examples may represent a lost (?) i, but movea seems to have no reason save analogy or possibly English spelling influence. Cf. Tanquerey's examples p.574. The frequency of diacritic e in u-verbs like cuneud, recent, may have caused its
intrusion by mistake in vencoud 470.

S replaces e final in guers 759.
I seems written for l (<u>) in provoitz 301, paice 1671; cf. voils 1282, and Pope p.459

Vowels plus Nasals

Aun, oun, only occur sporadically; the latter more frequently, perhaps more so than on; the usual graphy for œ is un.
There is no regularity about these spellings, France, for example occurring 16 times twice for Fraunce. They rhyme together without distinction. Ont prefers the 0-spelling to any other, though there are four cases of unt and one of ount 623. On the other hand aunt is always spelt with u, no doubt through Latin influence. The favourite spelling for nomen is noun; as it still survives, it was no doubt the current form.

There are only three examples of interchange of a ò nasal: an 1426, chalangier 2396, As already noted the rhymes show no case of confusing à and ǎ. N seems almost to be preferred in spelling before labials, e.g. enpointé 1577, embrace 113, enpoint 3080, enport 2663, enporée 3015, empris passim, but sempres, emporere etc. passim, emposonier 1110. Also emflast 1925.

N is omitted in Un cuire 974, Ioubi 1273. There is the common omission before V in covable (convenable) 1186, covenant 1658, coveitous 1660 -the English words show that denasalising was a fact

Consonants

C is commonly written for S, as in ces for ses, passim, ces for (cf. p.130) se (demonstrative for reflexive) 1676, 1895, 3105, c'îls; c'il; for s'îls, s'il passim; ces = si les 1812. Ce appears at the end of many words for S, as already noted-probably confusion with the ending of nouns coming from Latin words in -ia. C stands for qu in unc 1236, annus 1264, c'îls 1202, ascuns 368; for ch in sacont
773, encarchier 1210, cerchant 2546; though chastel is commonest, there also appear castel 1814, Kastel 562, showing the northern pronunciation which remains in English. Ch is commonly written for K or qu - Pasche 2164, arcevesches 2196. There is the common substitution of C for T in brand 221. Cf the rhyme eslit: Everwic.

2939.

C intrudos into the spelling of cunotes 301, cuntee 858. K appears everywhere for q, qu in ki, ke, kant, evasea, unkes 1241, aukes 1257, nekedent 2145, kerneus 626, Pask 1785, kei (quo) 1282, 1304; for e in kist 988. It is written for l in kes 626, cf. le for ke 1834. After q, u is omitted everywhere except in quuir and its compounds, which may be a sign that the sound kw remained here. U is never omitted after g in guerre and its compounds.

R Examples of the apparent disappearance of r have already been given, found in spelling as well as in rhyme. There is interchangep with l in Frandres 2606, forceollette 450.

The 1st ps. of the future of aller is invariable irrai, while dire has dirrai once 158. Cf. Tanquerey, p.707. Durrai 1653, durras 1652, merrai 2292, leras 2388 are regular forms, but être and faire also have r; serrad 1355, serra 2957, sorunt 1938 et al., serret 781, 961, ferreit 363. S is spelt sc occasionally; as pascez 1973, depecieur 81, pruesce 2650 (cf. pruez 2624 also prouesse) r, resceu 2146. The spelling of intervocalic voiceless s with one s is extremely common, perhaps more so than that with ss, e.g. rassemblez 79, hisuz 88, asembler 91, resemblez 918, asez 945, ausi 1886, asaille passim, garnissait 2076, languisait 1636, voises 624 et al., donase 962, fusent 362 etc. etc. If this implies voicing as in modern orthography, it would be a further argument in favour of a West-of-England origin for the ms; the English pronunciation
of dessert, resort, unison, resource, resemble, etc., seems to make it possible that the spelling does imply voicing, but the tendency was no doubt strongest in the West-Saxon area. Comparison of the spelling dessesse 2872 with the English pronunciation suggests that the scribe's spellings are an index of pronunciation. Paissiblement 1873, curtesise 1959, are no doubt "inverted" spellings.

As in the ending of the 3rd p.s. of conj. protoritites greatly outnumber - a; -ist seems to share the author's favour with -i or -ie in other conjugations, while in the u- preteritites, asigmatic spellings prevail. It thus appears very difficult to distinguish any rule of spelling which the scribe may have been observing in these endings - the evidence of the rhymes already quoted shows at any rate that the S had no phonetic reality. These endings are perhaps the cause of the spelling Reist (Reis) 231.

A number of cases of le for les (e.g. 895, 1769, 2498 - "le gentz alorient") les for le 1081, de for des (e.g. 1227, 574, 2255) a for as (e.g. 3002, 3045) and as for al 252, 2690, are no doubt due to the fall of final S from pronunciation. So also donase 2nd p.s. 962.

Evidence has already been given of the common interchange of s and z final and their probable sharing of the same effacement in most cases. Meinz (manus) 2211, shows there was often no question of representing ta. The Orthographia Gallica, quoted by Miss Pope p. 459, attempted to systematise the use of Z, but no system is distinguishable in the present ms. The presence of Z at the end of many past participles concluding the verse seems usually decorative. Thus in the space of a few lines we find posez; lioz (nom. plur. masc.) 1779, vengez; passez (nom. sing. masc.) 1781, espousez.
privez (fem. plur.) 1789, entrez (nom. plur. masc.); gastez (fem. sing.)
1833; also conquêtez (acc. sing. masc.); venez 435. Final -tz
is almost as common as plain z, o, g, dentz 222, gentz passim, morz
"; effortz 1780, encoimentz; presentz 1803, despitz; descunfitz
In the same line Z is apparently equivalent to ce in piez. Cf. lies
(lize? Wace had "l'ille").

Beyond the many past participles ending in d, no doubt through
English influence, there are instances of its addition at the end
of other words, e.g. somondo (3rd p.s.) 2280, (cf. Somon 1788) Sym-
mond 3177. This again seems an English, particularly a South-West-
tern, tendency, as in sound and other words. Cf. Relist 231.

Double consonants. No general statement on these seems possible,
except to say that in a majority of cases the simple consonant
seems preferred. Occire varies about equally between one and two
Cs, but acorder always has one. P is sometimes double (suffrir 34
offert 244), sometimes single (suffer 320, suffer 1417 afioit 306).
Ll seems preferred in meller and apeller, but tol is more usual
than entollie 8. Cf., valet 129, valetz 710. Mm is rare, occurring
occasionally in home, femme, summe 137, but m is more prevalent, in
nomer, comander, coment, comencier etc. Double n does not occur. P
and pp alternate in words like appeler, apparailler. T is pre-
ferred in battre and its compounds, tt in jeter (perhaps with some
notion of denoting the nature of the e). Compare attargeant 316,
atargier 1395, atreit 1377, atreit 1379, recette < receptum 970.

Consonnes mouillées. As usual, l- mouillée is variously represen-
ted - l, ll, ili, ille. Single l, with or without i, seems the com-
monest, e.g. folio 108 et al., conséiler 318, aparaleit 421, allour.
374, assaille 623, veilles (veils, 290 cf. veillard 93), oile 2261, mail-
tour 1187; somuler 2502, agenuler 1469, merveillouse passim. Appa-
railler seems to be about equally divided between l and ll. ll
seems preferred when final, e.g. conseille passim, orgoille 2260.
Cf. conseille; lell 385. In cervelle 2141, Averilde 2174, the gra-
phy for l- mouillée takes the place of l.

N- mouillée is very frequently spelt n (in), while gn generally
but not invariably stands for n after i, as proscribed by Or-
thographia Gallica. Examples: enginor 1544, groinour 803, chivo-
taine (Breetaigne) 1717, Gascoyn, Auverno, Burgoine 2155-6, plaine
(planat) 947; boscigne passim, poigne 1776, dedeigne 1900, fun-
taine 1921, overaigne 1194, gaigne 2044 (gaine 103). The Irish(t)
word gaine appears once with g, 3143, and once without 3079, Reine
is once written with G, 2483. Ng is the spelling in hange (haine)
1108, Lorengo 2157.
In Yeigneiont, prenqo, etc. we seem to have a phonetic change
due to the influence of the subjunctive, (cf. Tanqueroy, p. 806.)

Assimilation.

Orthography commonly shows vowel assimilation, but there are
few examples among consonants. Many of the cases below show that
Anglo-Norman at least spelt alike numerous vowels which had un-
dergone dissimilation in O.F. e.g. sojourn < sejor(n), honur
< enor.

Examples: e > i in cimier 1506, mediciner 2763, medicin 2705, espiriz 1712, Cf the common raising of e to i, (a) after
palatal in chivaler passim, chivalcher passim, chivalerie 3084,
chivetaine 553, 1717, achiverast 1290, (b) in intertonic syllable-
cunjuriamun 1588, damideu 187, ordiners 1481, (c) in other posi-
tions-primer, primorean passim, diffendud 469, difencion 635, discendirent 627.
o Þ a in initial and counter tonic syllables - as aiz 45 et al.,
manacert 838, manacier 1549, asaiez 1571, darain 3100, aage 382,
achacie 589, achatier 2896, anuez 1076, imparat 689, of ma acordorai
1858, sa acordewast 2040, et.

o Þ o in initial syllables - bosoigne passim, solom, solone 1696,
2171, poor (pavorem) 1138, 1614 of pour 1105 provost 1239, sojour-
nast 2148, of. succurs, succure, plusurs, etc. passim.

The above spellings seem frequent enough to imply actual phy-
netic tendencies. Words which remain in English, like chivalry, or-
mon, assay, provost succour, sojourn seem to give confirmation.

Dissimilation.

Countertonic 1 often becomes o: feny 188, fenist 1723, fine-
loit 1338, regoherai 1256, eloc 1851, gentlement 1838, (cf., gen-
témet 867) Pholippo 3162.

o Þ a in vassels 849, aloignez 2100, saeronant 2853, aforce
212 et al., guarir 1673.

A Þ e in maledic 3205, ? a entre nulierent 1323, orror (aron)
1488, lemont 2957.

O Þ o in dolerous 538, demeines 186.

Cf. also uncorl 484, desvelopé 2250, aitant passim.

Ida Wirtz notices this last form seven times in the Hanover ms.

Metathesis: not already common in O.F. is not much in evidence
in the vowels; the proper name Gillamorus is an example; perhaps
also monaile (monial) 1661, chposoiné 1912, but more probably these
are absent-minded spellings.

In consonants there is the proper name Gafan for Fagan, 168;
other possible examples are fiz (fist) 2708, provoitz 301, estre
(easter) 1621, destempré 1679.
Aphoresis. Ne te maior '1726, seems an example.
Perhaps also s'entre sailerent 1323, si tu as cumples 1655, se
1367, sa fermeté (for enfermeté) 1894.
Hiatus. There are three cases of the use of h to show hi-
tus- habie 352, regheral 1256, trahez 1581. The proper name
Johan 2940, -3, 3147, 3165, seems uncertain; the question of the
loss or preservation of hiatus seems best considered in the chap-
ter on versification.

(c) MORPHOLOGY

DECLENSION, (a) Nouns

Numerous examples of correct declension are found, but
as incorrectness is about equally prevalent, the proper use
of cases, if not a matter of luck, seems due rather to the
example of the model than to any particular respect for
grammar on the part of the author of this ms. The use of cor-
crect case forms is certainly commoner in the first 2900 lines
than in the remainder. Possibly the existence of distinctive
forms inherited from Latin declension is still realised, but
they have come to be looked upon less as a factor in expres-
sion, requiring to be carefully observed, than as an aid to
variety and perhaps to rhythm and rhyme. Since by this time
only a select few of continental writers, headed by
Froissart, are able to wield their cases correctly, our
Anglo-Norman writer is perhaps entitled to some indulgence.

The common word reis, always respectfully spelt with a capital, is a good example of the author's practice. In the part based upon the Brut, the proportion between the nominative singular with S and the nominative without is roughly three to one (99 cases of Reis or Rois to 35 of Rei or Roi). In the last part the proportion is reversed (5 cases of Reis or Rois to 13 of Rei or Roi). The number of examples of incorrect usage in the Brut would be reduced considerably if those occurring in (apparently) original passages were not counted (e.g. "dit le Roi", v.435). The plural and the oblique cases (including ten examples of the genitive without preposition) are managed quite correctly throughout, with one exception: at v. 836 the nominative appears for the accusative—"Reis se fist".

Other appellatives and common words show some survival of correct declension. Emperore (emperer, empereir') occurs six times compared with three examples of emperorum as nominative singular; two of the latter (vv. 2598, 2640) are in non-Wacian lines. The accusative is regularly empereour (seven examples). As the word does not appear in the final portion, no comparison is possible.

The use of Sire is fairly regular. It occurs seven times (apart from the English title Sir in the Chronicle) as nominative vocative singular, with seignour, seignur for the oblique cases at vv. 821, 823, 1368, 2303. The vocative plural at v.1300, however, shows an S.

Our author seems to owe the declension of Quiens to his model. The regular nominative occurs seven times in the Brut and not at all in the Chronicle, where the accusative form is
used (v. 2939) for the nominative. So also vv. 1847, 1849, an original passage.

Baron undergoes varying fortunes. Bior, the nominative, occurs thrice at the rhyme (vv. 1451, 2863, 2873), but at verse 233, an interpolation, baron is used for the nominative singular. Eleven cases of baron as nominative plural occur, all of them in the Brut; barons, however, is used four times as nominative plural in this part, nine times (including the form barones) in the Chronicle.

Similarly homo; the nominative singular homo, om, em, on or um occurs 13 times (three at the rhyme) while homo is three times accusative singular (vv. 462, 530, 1203), twice nominative plural (vv. 93, 160— influence of English men, or of Wace?) and four times nominative singular (vv. 107, 737, 2477, 3224). The last example is of course in the Chronicle, the last but one in an interpolation.

Traître is twice nominative singular (762, 3009) once accusative (723) and once acquires analogical S (1690). Ly Eveskos, nominative plural (635) li arceveskos (650) and cist bon Arceveskos (644) both nom. sing. are further indices to our author's consistency in declension. Neco appears regularly as the nom. sing. masculine, with neveu nevend as acc. Campaignus is acc. sing. (1157, 1396), or nom. plur. (2315, 2317) but the insertion of sumoine as acc. sing. for Wace's breton (1152) shows that there is no real feeling for declension. No doubt this is true also of drag, five times nom. sing to one case with S, apostolles, nom. sing. 165; apostolles, acc. 161, dat. 2861, appears to be correct. Fitz or fitz is everywhere indifferently nom. or acc.
There are, it is true, a fairly large number of Nominative- vocatives singulars, regularly ending in S, mostly in the first part e.g. Duas 434, 2190, surnoms 715, pers (perses 759), Viens 777, latiners 1019, diables 1038, eirs (ite 348), espiriz 1712, vassas 1718, feu 1380, 1699), ordinors 1481, cosins 1764, chivals (2106, followed soon after by three examples of chival acc.) chivalers 51, amis 774, senechals, hotelers 2654, poeple 2846. Vertuz 1344, coifs 2127, appear to be acc. sing.

A number of nominative plurals, also, show absence of S: ami 1025, amye 2968, 5056, escud 22, guise 150, chose 837, frere 842, voilland 93, veisin 1237, cunseiller 1181, querceour 1213, devineour 1289, 1307, eir (heres, 1351), flambe 1384. Messagier (121, 2418, 2423 - cf. messagers 2302) franchise 3125. Whether such plurals, when etymologically correct, are due to feeling for declension, to accidental omission of S, or to the influence of English strong plurals, we are left to form our own conclusions. Chivaler (: encuntrer) 2731, is acc. plur.

Some remnants of declension are also observable in the proper nouns, though most are undecor ed. Dieux, which is not accorded the capital vouchsafed to Heis, is regularly nom. sing. in seven places (vv. 258, 1683, 1714, 2011, 2361, 2653, 2721) with the form dieu in the Chronicle 3258. The nom. plur. is dieu at v. 179, but dieux is nom. plur. at v. 1472, acc. plur. at v. 910; the acc. or gen. sing. is deu or dieu (nine examples). Dieu also occurs twice as nom. sing. in the Brut 1252, 1444, and six times in the Chronicle. The compound Damideu seems to be undecor ed. Arviragus (nom.) alternates correctly with Arviragun (acc.) perhaps because of its Latin form. But his enemy Hamon never appears with the nom. Ham or Haim which he has in Wace. Similarly
Lucy nom. 183, spoils the effect of Luces nom. 154. Guinceins is correctly nom. at v. 642, 688, but without S at v. 644. Cosa has the curious acc. Cosant at v. 1772, Cosa at v. 1879—cf. Conant 2776; Costanz, 711, is nom.; Costant gen. 741. Pascens is four times nom., once acc; the latter case twice appears as Pascents.

Eldolf's has S only once (v. 1161) in four appearances in the nominatives. Octaves, correctly declined in Arnold's text, is invariable here.

In plurals there is also uncertainty. Remein, or Remeins is four times nom. plur. 614, 320, 607, 2055 but it is also nom. sing. once 582, while Remeins appears three times as the nom. plur. 57, 2327, 2689. Bretun shows 14 cases of nom. plur. without S, against 10 with S; At v. 1019 Bretun has been substituted for the correct nom. sing. Brez found in Wace. The Saxons are slightly better declined: six various spellings without final s are nom. plur., while only four nom. plur. have S, 1937, 1950, 2784, 2811.

(b) Adjectives

Declension of adjectives is preserved to some extent, again more consistently in the Brut proper than in the Chronicle, suggesting conscientious copying rather than real competence in grammar.

In the singular, nula usually shows correct declension, as; nula, nominative masculine, 55, 777, 1158, 3164, nul acc. 2064; but the latter form is nom. masc. (pronoun) at v. 1150 and elsewhere, fem at v. 886. Similarly tiels, nom. masc., 409, 1211, but tiel, 18: senez 1482, sened 1045; beaus 774, beals 3066, beau 882; gentils 1673, gentiz 2924, gentil 882, 1451, 2873; morz, mortz, mort passim; nez or neez is nom. or acc. passim; meiro, 732, 872, greindre 319 are correctly asigmatic, probably by accident.
The nom. masc. of words in -osus usually ends in e, as malicious 273, orgailouse 274, dolerouse (Plur.) 538, pitouse 676, plurouse 677, merveilouse passim. Though there are a fair number of examples of correct usage in the Chronicle, as: gentiz, nuls, beals above, pruz 2935 et al., poestiz 2995 et al., they are all common words, and less numerous than nominatives like saint 2925, seinte 3158, bele 2952, bon 2967 etc., etc. Acc. singulars like quels 1348, nuls 881, vius 2263, granz 710, show there was no real understanding of the role of s.

Correct use of e for the feminine is less frequent than its absence - nule 6, longe et lee 1485; but nul 886, creme u 239, gent 124 et al., beal 124 et al., malveis 700, né 709, chier (par or) 1962. Tele 238, and qele 785 et al., sometimes have analogical e; even in the masc. 909, but grant is invariable for both genders.

There is a curious frequency of final e in masc. accusatives (as: bone 1071 et al., tote 8, 791 et al., commune 15., qele 730, brefe 843, novele 1001, certeine 1345) or neuter (e.g. bone 1483) It is difficult to decide whether this was the result of some obscure rule, of confusion with feminine forms, of metrical considerations, or of chance.

The plural shows the same mixture of correctness and confusion. Though at first sight fort 431, 808, 1412 et al., sage 410, rebaudi 467, grant 414 et passim, melior 898, plusur 1214, tot 703, et al., totell 1007, petit 731, and others suggest that the asigmatic nomi plur. was known, there are probably as many others with s; e.g. tuz 1633, lagrun 1459, alkuns 548, tiels 371. These accusatives without s, like vaillant 918, fait 869, mort 432,
tote 1860, grant 1714 et passim, joiouse et lied 1385, show that there was little understanding of French rules and a probable influence from English undeclined adjectives. For fem. plurals there are toutz 1503, destruit 1502, cunquis (: gentis, masc. plur) 2168. Complete declensions like "11 gentil bier" 1451, and others given above, sufficiently confirm the haphazard nature of declension in this piece.

Possessives. Variety is again the keynote. The nom. sing. masc. sis is very frequent 107, 153, 147, et al., tis 750, 1291, with the plural mi 1289, 2315, et al. But there are also for the nom. sing. si 2106, 1521 (? si gent; current), mun 781, sun 143; 4, 1324, 1837, 2041 and passim in the Chronicle, while sun is plural atv.1999. The frequent use of sun, tun with fem. nouns 195, 755, 1171 et al. and sa for masc. 152, is no doubt due to usual Anglo-Norman weakness on gender.

Demonstratives. Cel is the normal masc. sing. but it is fem. at v. 333; and cels is both masc. and fem. 131, 605 et al., while cel serves for both genders in the plural 136, 136. Cf icel jour 856 icel tense 640 icel our e 2953. Cil seems reserved as nom. masc. pronoun, but cils mustiers 2204. Ceste is used for both genders 810, 821, 877, 984 but the masc. also has cest 822, cist 644, Kist 988. The neuter pronoun cec is used as demonstrative adjective, all the examples being with fem. nouns 1302, 1406, 1443.

Numerals. The regular nom. sing. masc. uns appears as the accusative at 357, 360, with une at 833, 1203. Cf the use of a and e in accusatives noted above. For the fem. un is perhaps commoner than une.

Duo is hardly ever written in full, but a regular nom.
dieu, appears at v. 854, while it seems to be correctly declined in combination with ambos: nom. ambedieu 1629, acc. ambedeous 255, 1244. We have to compliment the author on the fact that the first two examples are apparently his own contributions.

(C) Pronouns.

Personal Pronouns. Different forms of the third person singular masc. dies nom. are el 1124, els 282, ils 1553. Cil, sing. or plur., though sometimes spelt with s, is found everywhere as subject of a verb, and seems merely the equivalent of il, ils, though there is sometimes demonstrative force. Eal is a common spelling of the fem. For the third person plur. masc. nom. il and ils seem about equally numerous, comp. 578, 579, 1191 with 343, 788, 1130.

In accusative forms li often appears for le, 113, 163, 977 etc., etc., while le is written for the dative, etc., 1032, 1237 etc., etc. Les is similarly used for lur, 568, 1915; also for le, 1031, though this is probably a clerical error - the next word begins with s. There seems to be no distinction between li and lui; both are used as datives and as disjunctives after preposition, though li seems to preponderate. Vv. 3259-61 show four varieties of li:

Apres li regne sun fiz qa or est,
Ke Dieu li garde as li plest,
Edward li noble conquorour.

The disjunctive forms mei, tei, sei are commonly used in the unaccented position before verbs. Cf. vv. 1705, 1706, 1707, 1710.

Demonstratives. Illos invariably appears as els 368, 470, 1543 et al.. The form without vocalisation of l likewise prevails in ells, though ceus appears once or twice e.g. 297, 1879, as well as ells 1231, 2700, 2903 et al.. The neuter is cil 1301, or
cele 1207. Li uns appears regularly as the nominative, usually copied from Wace e.g. 285, 1317, 1703, but l'un is nom., 1222, and li uns is fem. plur. at v. 507.

Possessives. Soon is the sole form appearing.

Relatives. There is the usual confusion between the nom. and acc. forms, and ki, qi and ke, qe are used indiscriminately. There are 77 cases of "we, qe being used for ki, or qi (including two cases of elision 1045, 3035) but only three, 292, 1067, 1474 of the use of nom. form for the acc. - the cases of correct usage are more than twice as numerous as these abnormalities. This confusion in the relatives no doubt caused the conjunction que to be written qi at v. 838. The fact that it does not occur in the emphatic interrogative pronouns (cf. nominatives 1249, 1254, 1534; accusatives 820 1300) suggests that it was caused, partly at least, by assimilation of e and i in unstressed position. Another reason was doubt that the English relatives that and which (though not who) were undecorated. A large number of cases of ke for Ki occur where the verb is in the passive, as though there were some feeling that the relative was really object of the verb, e.g. 292, 427, 3079. 

Xi is equivalent to lequel at v. 1312.

Indefinite Pronouns. Chescuns is correctly nom. sing. at v. 1674, but there are far more examples of chescun, e.g. 1798, 1992, Ascuns, 368, is nom. plur. (Wace has alquant). Nullus gives indiscriminately nuls, nul, nule.

(d) Articles.

Li is everywhere in correct use as nom. masc. sing. and plur., but there are also many examples of confusion. Le appears for li at least six times e.g. 422, 1600, 2224 in the Brut proper, and
eight in the Chronicle e.g. 2963, 3052, 3095; on the other hand li appears for the acc. a good number of times, e.g. 113, 184, 1841; once for the fem. acc. 2612. The reasons are no doubt similar to those suggested for the relatives.

Of a dozen cases of feminine nouns preceded by le, e.g. 1041, 1429, 1884, all save one happen to be in the accusative case. This one (le gont suntent) may be the nominative plural or a case of change of gender (cf. cee gent 1406, le gentz 2498). Similarly, most cases of masc. nouns preceded by la are accusatives e.g. 171 la Roi 317, 753, but three are nominatives and thus entitled to li: la doel 610, la pape 3157, la Realme 3011. Cf. le (pron. obj. fem.) twice at v. 2412.

Le is found as the plural at vv. 895, 1769, 2498. In the "possessive by apposition" construction, le is the usual form of the article, e.g. le gont le roi 1843 but li at v. 1085.

There is great confusion in the enclitic forms. A appears for al 132, 2702, but al for a at vv. 182, 267, 1084, 1342; a for as 2306, 3045, but as for a 2690; al for as 222, 1341, but as 252, for al 2495. Similarly de for del 2275, 2848, but du for de 939, 771, 1010; de for des 95, 564, 777, 1956, 2255, but des for de 490, 991, 2321. These last phenomena may be rather a question of syntax than of morphology.
**CONJUGATION**

(a) **PERSONAL ENDINGS**  
On the whole, usage in this piece is fairly regular and only a few examples of the chief tendencies which it shares with Anglo-Norman as a whole, with very occasional peculiarities of its own, will call for notice. The forms quoted are rarely vouched for by rhyme, and cannot be checked by the metre, but in most cases the frequency of their occurrence gives them an appearance of validity.

**FIRST PERSON SINGULAR.**

**Final E.** In the present tense of the indicative analogical e has gained all verbs of conj. I in spelling. The rhymes often contradict the spelling, but they are Wace's and not the scribe's. Examples: counseille (consilium): merveille 1195, mande: purloignzt 2286. Confort: record 2622, is an apparent exception, but recorde appears three lines later. Envoyer gives the analogical envois, 817, as in Wace. This graphical e also extends to other conjugations: cunquere 816 (but requer 971), vaux oie 1652, die 2821, and other tenses: vie, conuse 1253, oie, sentie (preterite) 1261-2. Etymological e is not lost in the conditional fercoie 698, but appears to be in puis 964, first pers. sing. pres. subjunctive: this is quite probably an error in Syntax. Cf. third person, below. **Analogical e** is not found except in trois 2623, and envois, forms of long standing in French. **Final palatal** appears in every example of the present tense of
venir, tenir, with the preceding vowel written i - vino: tinc 1473, tink 2412.

SECOND PERSON SINGULAR.

Final s is not written in donase 962.

Beside the normal form sees 1230 capis is written with z - seez 1535, siez 1226, siez 2266. Z is also the ending of three present subjunctives - garz 1348 (properly representing ts), facez (after si, as in Wace) 2267, siez 2262.

For the vowel in this person the following are noteworthy - fas (faire) 1295, ieu (être - rare, according to Tanquerey, p. 78) 2264, 1225(?), vois (vouloir - cf. voiz, quoted by Tanquerey, p. 78) 2264 also the form of capis, above. In vegnes 2266, preignes retiègles 2267, the n - mouillée of the subjunctive has invaded the indicative, unless these are subjunctives in indirect question on the model of Latin.

THIRD PERSON SINGULAR.

Final e is often omitted in the present (a) indicative (b) subjunctive. Examples: (a) salt 1451 (non-Wacian passage) engres (: pres, i.e. en giorni pressa) 2219, (b) pri 1097, voil 2361, puis 2364, fier (: arer, i.e. arere) 2552. Analogical e is added (a) in the present indicative, (b) the preterite. Examples: perte, socure 408, pleine 947, mettre 1672, semonds 2280, die 2462. Most of these are no doubt invasions by the subjunctive. (b) desoisie 7, entolys 8, s'en fuie 67 and passim at the end of the verse.
St. appears in the present indicative in pleas 2363, 3260(: est),
and in the present subjunctive in leist (lesser or later?) 1098,
moins 3164. Possibly also in dist, Russin. — this form alternates with dit without any clear indication as to tense, but it seems present at v. 1080:

Li Reis leur dist ke nun ferast:
Bien les servent, mandé les ad.

In conj. I preterites, -ast is preferred to any other ending (contrary to Tanquey's observation that this is rare, p. 115), as is -ist for i-preterites, but -ast is less common than -ut. The rhyme pleas: seet quoted by Tanquey (p.120) from William of Wadington, end of 13th century, together with the evidence already given in the sections on Phonetics and Orthography, shows that by now the s in these endings was purely graphical. This is further demonstrated by the extension of ast to the future: durraat 106, poiserast (?) 380, ferast (: ad) 1080, 2405, achiverast 1290, atendrast: defendrast 2073, merrast (: ad) 2462; this tense also has -ad: -serrad: murrad 1355, tendrads 1358; and -at: remaindrat (: ferast) 2404 cf. pâchacast (pretente) 1617 -Ast also seems to have invaded the conditional xxxininxxx in vv. 11-2:

............. ouw chief jurast
Ke leur Treud restournerast
Et Wider desheriterast, (Conditionals in Wes)

and in v. 380

............. ja al Roi ne leiereit
Ke Conan del regne heritast,
Car puis après l'en poiserast
where the future (?) conditional (?) peiseraat rhymes with the imperfect subjunctive. Both these examples are probably, however, due to negligence or confusion of tenses: baptiserast occurs at v. 163 where the imperfect subjunctive is required and is correctly written in the next line.

-Ist likewise occurs in many preterites where it is not etymological, e.g. ciast, 159, 240 et al., chaist 263 et al., garnist 1370, fenist 1723 vist 184 et al., seisist 2723, venquist 3004. Against all these we find forms in -i, -ie, -it, e.g. -oi 165, oie 394 et al., oit 1389 et al.; chai 902, garni 1168, 2072; garnie 1612; feny, fify etc. 2922 et al., finie 2992; vit 1463, 2565, seisi, seisy etc. 2052 et al., seisie 220; venqui 336, 406 et al., venquie219 etc. etc.

-Ust appears in a few preterites where it does not belong, e.g. pouct 611, dust 761, conust 828, peust (svait) 795 morust 190, 231 et al., corust 1836, but corut 2574 pouf 24, et al. There are some examples showing absence of etymological s, as destruct 1620, 2800 and some asigmatic forms where grammar requires the imperfect min subjunctive - fu 223, pout 196, 152? 2560, recent (:eust) 2094, envoieit written for envoieist 1485. For the preterite of entre, fu is the favorite spelling, but just is frequent (e.g. 56, 610, 858), and also fud 661 (:eud past part.) 1483. For vouloir, volt is predominant but vouciat occurs four times.

Curiosities in third person endings are, s - s'en
vois 2229, puis 891; z - conustrez (condit.) 1074, fîz (Tanquerey 652, nates fex in Early Statute Statutes of Ireland), 2705; estê (imperf.) 1466, posît. (present indic.) 1198, cremen (present of craindre - plur. for sing? ) 2362.

All the preceding demonstrates effacement of the final consonants or consonantal group. This is registered in the spelling of vin 84, somon 1788.

Change of conjugation is shown in requerast 162, maintena 1941, aconduant 905, movea 3192, plaisant (plaisier) -engendrie 1254, 1926, menist 757, s'esveillie 2517, enagret 3028. All except plaisiant are confirmed by the xxm rhyme. Plaisant and s'esveillie are examples of the case with which -ier verbs become -ir verbs.

Imperfect endings of all periods are found, viz. out, cit, cit, but, as already noted, they can rhyme together. The last is by far the commonest. Haiout 1427, destrucout 3220 (gueriout), prencout (chacesout) 3194 seem to show, however, that this ending was still live enough to be acquired by conjugations to which it did not belong.

Abnormal spellings for the radical in this piece are - avint (pres. indic.) 107, (cf. tino etc. above and Tanquerey, p.182), hecût (hair) 947, cheset 1304, 2585, chest 2660, voit (aler or voeïr?) 1864, 2396, (aler) 3203, osteeet 772, 811 et al. (same form for pret. 265, 321 et al.) doint (pres. subj. doner) 3207, u a common form according to Tanquerey, pp. 314-5. Aider acquires h in hait 1252.

FIRST PERSON PLURAL. There is little to note, as this person
does not often occur. - Oms, -om, ums, -um all appear, e.g.
avoms 668 et al, eioms 879, pooms 2342, puoms 596, devoms 911
avom 589, aion 673, ferom 820, resurdom 672, poem 2343, occium
822, leveom 823, auum 591, perdom 821. Fuums 875 shows este
acquiring a weak form, unless this spelling represents loss of
e, with the double u to denote length.
SECOND PERSON PLURAL. - The only feature is the omission of e
in oiz 2620. The writing of double r in the present - querrez
871, and single r in conditional or future - puriez 597, is not
confined to this person.
THIRD PERSON PLURAL. - The question of the reduction of the
imperfect-conditional ending is the chief subject for remark;
there are no examples in this piece of reduction in the present
tense. -Eint frequently becomes -eint: fereint 730, purreint
60, 1580 (and five other places, in all of which purreint seems
used for the preterite or the imperfect). -Eint then seems to
be further reduced to -ent in purreint (apparently conditional) 1521
garient (cond.) : guerpisent (imperf.) 1094, and a number of
others which may only be present mistaken written for
the imperfect - creient (: estoient) 180, guiuent (disoient) 519,
guerient: manacent 838, ilsent (vencient) 1702, vegnent: :attargement)
2190. There are
similar examples of apparent conditionals which have acquired the
preterite spelling by the change - vengierent: amenerent 846,
tollerent (:parloient) 949, elirent (voleint) 1130, destruerent
(guerient) 1350, conseillerent (:diroient) 1480, cumbatierent
(diffendient, imperf.) 1541. These are numerous enough to suggest
that -ent was intended as the accented ending of the imperfect and conditional and was not mere careless spelling. In any case the ending seems regarded as a monosyllable.

-Ient seems to be another form assumed by this desinence. Examples: avient (avair) 484, solient 664, diffendient 1542, cf. supra, coroucient 2295. Cf. poient (pres. indic. ouvoir) 2702. Tanquerey, p. 256, regards this ending as a development peculiar to A-N of the 13th and 14th centuries, affecting chiefly the present indicative and subjunctive, and rare elsewhere, though coroucient, and particularly ferient 2755, ought to be preterites rather than any other tense. In the present piece it seems rather a sign of uncertainty over the spelling of the imperfect ending. Crement, or creiment 2362 (where the 3rd. pers. sing. of craindre is required) may be an example for the present tense. The rhyme vegnent: cumbatient 2089 shows apparently the coupling of the two abnormal imperfect indicative endings, though the subjunctive is required.

Galtoent 1685, escotoent 1231, are the only examples of the etymological imperfect ending for conj. I in this person, but both rhyme in -ient.

-ferent is a common spelling of the preterite ending of i-preterite verbs, e.g. cierent 555 (firent), 2422, (respondierent) et al.; issierent: espaundierent 2532-3, assailierent 2349, chaierent (durent) 2904. They only rhyme among themselves, however, apart from the first and last examples, and never with -ierent of conj I. Cf. s'entresailierent: virent
1323. -Like -ier for the infinitive and -ie for the past participle, -ieran is found in many verbs of conj. I to which it did not normally belong e.g. acordierent (herbergierent) 112 (assemblerent) 410, decretierent (passeierent) 562, aportierent (ariverent) 851, portierent 1598, gardierent 1879. Manjurerent 1899, untiert 2419, chantierent 2955.

Manjurerent 1006 shows change of conjugation or influence of the u of the present indicative. No accentent rhymes with amerent 3198.

Point 2304 is the only example of the ending -unt. For rhymes showing accented -ent, see p. 169, and (b) MOODS.

1. Indicative. There are numerous examples of the intrusion of the consonne mouilée of the max subjunctive, of the use of the subjunctive forms for indicative and vice versa. These phenomena are often no doubt syntactical rather than morphological, e.g. vegnes at. v. 2266 may be subjunctive in indirect question, on the Latin model.

Examples: (a) Present tense - preignes 2545, pregnent 1279, preignes, retigne 2266, tegnent 3108, vegnes, vagnent 2190 (?) geignent 2434, morgent (:devient) 2901, pleine 947; cf. examples given above of subjunctive forms for indicative in the third pers. sing. (b) Imperfect - vegnesient 2248, vegnent (?) :attargement 2190.

The use of the etymologically subjunctive endings for the 3rd. pers. sing. of the preterite has been mentioned already. Conuise 1253, seems an extension of this to the first
person pluixt, and desent (devoir) 928, to the third person plural. Peust (pascore 795, seems an analogical subjunctive form for the preterite, possibly even with hiatus for the metre. Cf. Versification.

2. Subjunctive. It is not necessary to repeat the examples given of the loss of etymological e in the 3rd. pers. sing of the present subjunctive. Halt (aider) 1252 is written correctly without analogical e; compare emporte: mort cited above. Meinst 3164 shows in manner the paragogic e noted particularly in donner by Tanquerey, p. 304. Puis 964, poet 3266 (also at v. 3108 of the Hanover ms, according to Ida Wirtz) court: 765, savez: purrez 886-7, show indicative forms for the subjunctive — again, perhaps, syntactical confusion. This is also common in the imperfect subj. owing, no doubt, to effacement of e before t and the same confusion, e.g. pout 1522, o 196, fu 223, receut(eust) 2094. Vouloir seems to prefer the e-type radical for the singular (vousist 725, 799), and the form without e for the plural (volisent 2677).

3. Imperative. Imperatives which borrow the form of the subjunctive are face 770, 789, 1488 (fai occurs in the verse preceding both the last two) prenge 776 (pren 778-9) receive 967. Final e of conj. i spreads to other conjugations; conusse (i.e. connois) 1247, entendre 1650 (cf. entent 1309) cumbate 1729, suivce 674.

Z appears at the end of the strong sa forms: ditez 1303 sqq., fetez 741, 1452, 2394. There is the common mixing of singular and plural imperative forms at 2370 sqq.
4. **Infinitive.** The following are spellings of conj. I infinitives, some of which have already been mentioned: - erré(:siglé) repairez (':cungied) 816, 1626, voidé 3200, désirez (plural verbal noun) 1860, nóméz(:assez) 2453, edifier(:chivalers) 448. Cf. Wace's "sun pensés? (L 11323, A 11045). Morir acquires a final e to rhyme with oc-cire at v. 3129; cf. avere 1183.

The irregular termination _ier in ex verbs, and the rhyming together of these endings, have already been discussed from the point of view of phonetics and orthography, pp. 81 sqq., 90. The spelling affects particularly porter and compounds, garder, ester (2565, 2688), amonester 54, munder 1313. In all these the radical ends in a dental without the preceding i that Suchier's rule required.

Change of conjugation seems to be noted in sufer 320, chaiser (':arder, cf. chaierent 2904) 1384, chair 1414, peroir 1413, fruisier (:murir) 1413, maintenir (:chaliangier) 2343, (:fier) 3124, maintenir (:encumbrer) 3217, (:cunseller) 3225, (:justiser) 3195, pleiser (:siglier) 2497, courer 2704:

There is change or confusion of the root vowel in error (:sare) 1488.

5. **Participles (a) Present.** There is nothing to note save the spelling demorance (nom. sing. :anz) 2928.

(b) Past. It has already become evident that the final consonant or e-mute of past participles have no particular significance in this piece except where, in the Brut, they happen to be signs of agreement because, no doubt, preserved from earlier scribes. Compare descunsis (fem. sing.) 1979,
descunfit (nom. sing. masc.) 2949 2071, descunfiz (nom. plur. masc.) 1949, descunfitz (acc. plur.) 1560.

Though d occurs at the end of participles in u, its especial prevalence in e participles suggests English influence rather than the remains of th.<t.

The question of the ending ié, related to that of ier infinitives and ierent preterites, has already been touched upon (pp. 78, 81 sqq., 90). It seems resumed as far as past participles are concerned by examples such as the following:-
(a) achacié or achatié 589, essacié 130, showing the change é > ié in verbs to which it is not proper in French, (b) exillie:avie 3228, showing apparent shift of accent to the i, tantamount to change of conjugation, (c) afeblie:passe 521, lee:enveiale 527, showing apparently the opposite shift and change.
Cf also the spellings hiez 1059, oiez<espies> 612, prophecyes 1332.

Disregard of syllabic correctness makes it impossible to affirm that syneresis had or had not taken place in the vowel-endings, and there is only the evidence of the spelling. For i past participles, hahi 552, is the only one in which hiatus is definitely indicated. For those in -eu, that of avoir always has e: the rhythm of some verses, e.g. 590, 660, 1054, seems to require two syllables, while in others, e.g. 1954, 2744, one seems more probable. The only exception to correct spelling of eu participles is muz 347 (everywhere eje meu or esmeu). Venceud 470, has an improper e, probably by analogy with numerous participles in -ceu. Cf. p. 142.

Of abnormal forms, the ancient one tolleit appears twice,
2272, 2285 (: dreit), but both cases are found in Wace, and it is probably an archaism by 1340 (cf. Tanquerey, p. 531). Tuez (: damagiez) 3007, may be one of the spelling in eiz noted by Tanquerey, p. 468, or more probably the noun in -itium. Salu 867, in a non-Wacian passage, seems a form of the author's. It is difficult to decide whether it is from saillir (cf. sailliz 2121) repeating the idea of venu in the previous line, or from saluer - the corresponding passage of Layamon is "they greeted him fair." (or adivey?).

Airez (: travers) is from aherdre Remes (: nefs) 1071, 2001, is the form of remansus inherited from Wace, while remis (: amis) 775, is in a passage of the author's, this spelling also appearing at 751. At v. 3080 enpoint, spelt enpoint 1577 et al., rhymes with treit. Feru usually has double r:- 2674, 2693, 3078.

Cases of apparent change of conjugation are:- occisés(?) : pressed 512, amové: turné (Wace has camauné, possibly misread by the scribe) 1038, chin cheiz 1414, seisez: volez 1454 (cf. infinitives above), départé: finé 1612, exillie: avie 3228, ensapelé, ensevelé, passim in the Chronicle. Apparailliz (: aloignez) 2099 seems absentmindedness.

(c) TENSES

1. Present Indicative There are four forms of the 3rd pers. plur. of pouvoir: - poent 1417, poient 2702, poeint 666, pount 2364. Destruent 619, 927, shows the absence of y, as well as the common reduction ui > u.

The double r of querrez 871, is not confined to this tense, and is probably due to influence of the future. Cf. below.

2. Imperfect Indicative The vowel of the present stem appear in receiveit 2059. Cf. conditional.
On appears in venoient 2748 on the analogy of the present subjunctive. Perhaps the same influence is in receiveit above.

Conquerreit 2035 courroièrent 2500 again show improper double r. Cité. syntax.

3. Preterite. The question of syncretism of the stem vowel cannot profitably be taken very far. It seems recognised in the spelling of most verbs originally having dieresis e.g. faire, conquerir, prendre, monoir (remist. 2716) though it may be assumed not to have taken place in oir, cheoir, regoir (regoist 1520 - the e seems to have another role than to soften the g) Out and urent, the invariable forms for avoir, seem to decide for that verb.

At v. 2894, vient may be a preterite, or a brusque change of tense from fut in the preceding verse. A normal form of prendre, pristrent occurs four times, but at v. 2884 occurs pristrent, perhaps only negligence, or perhaps a sign of the weakness of r, or perhaps of the influence of the singular, since r was mute. Two interesting spellings of u-preterites occur - destruerent 529, muerent (furent) 2459. They perhaps represent a step in an older aim towards the movement of the Chronicle (3172) Mientoindreint 1415, shows an unusual form of tenir, perhaps due to the influence of the future, or the English tendency to add d to a nasal; or it may be confusion between the older form and that which prevails in French.
Manimee, 875 (: venimes), shows loss of e and restoration of the n of the infinitive. Eschaueraast, 2142, is the curious form taken by eschauercira. Overi, 1835, overast, 1514, liversast, passim, naverast 2128 etc. show the prevalence of svarabhaktie in this tense. Ferri, 726 et al., shows abnormal double r again, as do current 433, purreint 2142-1158, 60, 1064, 2132, the latter under influence of the conditional. These two should possibly be counted as imperfects, resulting from syntactical confusion. Though the preterite is similarly at vv. 529-30, exilent and esparnisent are curious forms which may both be present, the latter involving a change of conjugation.

4. Imperfect Subjunctive. Hiatus seems to be preserved in the spelling of si-preterite verbs, but less frequently in the ui type. Examples: entremeisent 343, oceist 1152 (cf. occist 1205, occisent 344), deist 798 (contredist 1158) feist 2014, preist 1151, 1205; (conquesist 2154 seems a return to a very primitive form), post 340, 693, cf. post 2015, post 232, recent 2094.

Fuissent, 2828, is no doubt due to Latin influence.

5. Future and Conditional. There are numerous examples of the unetymological rr used by the Anglo-Normans. These two tenses of aller always have it (eight examples) - irrai 975 et al., irreit 1543 et al.), as doesêtre (serrad 1355, serua 2952 serreint 1038 et al., serraet 781 et al., but sercient 1148 - continental influence?); also dirrai 158, ferriet 363. There are the normal forms durrai, durras, 1652 durrast 106, and merrai 2292, merrast
2462, showing loss of the nasal, and also lerras, 2388, from laier or laisser. On the other hand, puriez, 597, shows an r too few.

Tenir and venir invariably show the O.F. stems tend-, vend-. Receivereiit 844, seems to show formation on receivre with svarabhaktic e, but conquerereiit 2022, seems quite barbarous. Orras 1283, is the future of air, but the same form in the next line seems careless repetition - Wace has saras (sa-voir) for the first.

Inchoative verbs invariably show the intetonic i becoming e, e.g. guerreerait 364, reggerai 1256, finereit 1338. Freit 2181, is the only example of loss of i in spelling. Tallir has the two forms tollerunt 951 and touldrai 2289. Occieraiit 1450 2091, 2526, may be a case of the ier spelling already noted in -irent preterites, or perhaps denotes a glide-vowel developing between i and y. Destrueiriit 1994, seems a similar case. Liverai 682, 2293, seems the future of e livrer.

Svarabhaktic is very prevalent in these tenses, e.g. liisterai 1857, cumbaterai 2550, cumbaterait 416, deveir 3126 avoir passim.

Conjugation Changes.

Apart from sporadic examples like menist, requerast, manjurent, s'esveilllic, eparniscent, aconduant, quoted above, and irent the frequent rhymes in o : i6 : i, erent: irent; er: ier; ir: iro, a few cases of change seem well established: maintenir, seinir and avoire give several instances of movement into conj. I. Finir, which has finast, finé, finereit, had of course made this move in O.F.
D. SYNTAX.

The chief deviations from O.F. usage calling for notice are in the use of verbs, though there is also confusion in other parts of speech, and some unusual constructions. Many peculiarities of all kinds seem to be due to the influence of English.

Use of Nouns. The use of apposition with partitive or possessive sense is perhaps more emphatic than in Wace, e.g. the change from that author's "Et a Hengist fust Kent avoir," to "Et Hengist prist Kent aveir" (1051); also "la feille Charlemein", 2931, "le fiz Roi Phelippe de France" 3162, "crystienté lei," 2874, "al entrant esté" 122 (Wace: "d'esté").

Gender. Numerous examples of the haphazard use of masculine and feminine articles were given in the section on declension. They do not necessarily mean change of gender in their nouns—la Roi, la Pape obviously do not. Nouns like bosoigne, (i.e. besoin) tense, however, appear to show real formation of feminine words on the masculine models, e.g. icole tense 640, ta bosoigne 2383—the latter is perhaps the French feminine word used as its masculine prototype, though the substitution occurs everywhere.

Use of Pronouns. The ms shows everywhere the usual A-N. employment of tonic for atonic forms of the personal pronouns.

Li (acc.) is used for the reflexive pronoun at v. 1172; apparently also le at v. 1670. On the other hand, sei is used for lor at v. 1542, and se for le at v. 1688. These may be Latinisms as both pronouns occur in indirect commands and refer to the subject of the principle clause.

Tu and vous, with the corresponding verbs, are as usual very mixed. See particularly the speeches of Hoel 2369-2389, and
Adjectives. The singular form of adjectives is often used with plural nouns, particularly grant, e.g. grant demeines 186, grant avers 422, grant honurs 5038; also, sun home devindrent 1899. This is no doubt due to the non-declension of English adjectives.

The non-accord of participles, even in adjectival use, has already been noticed. Most cases of correct accord are no doubt due to the model text, though the Chronicle has occasional examples. The adverb primes has become an adjective at W. 1020 (primes in Wace), 3103; it may, however, be primers, from which v has fallen, or a borrowing of the Latin primus. The word seems to have remained in English.

Articles. It has already been suggested (p. 109) that confusion in enclitic forms of the article with preposition may be syntactical rather than morphological. To the examples given may be added:

Ke des Daneis qe de Norreis 574
Jeo su neez des hois et de cuttes 1227
Des paiens et de gont adverso 2793
As povres abbeies et a hospitals 3045

These seem to show regular usage of the preposition alone before the second noun - perhaps some notion of the scribe's or due to the effacement of S. The preposition de is similarly used for the partitive des before lour at vv. 95, 564.

Prepositions. The correct use of prepositions being one of the most difficult parts of an acquired language, it is natural for a late Anglo-Norman writer to show uncertainty. The present scribe does not always keep to the usages of his model, putting pur (chierté) for par 283, though Wace also has pur joue, pur amistie as Egerton at v. 1029. Cf. perjeue for porjeuo 1278.
apartenance for apartenanz 955. Od is used for as or a at v. 1694:
Un estelle... od plusurs gentz est veue. Cf. od un gaine, 3679, 3142. A is omitted at v. 2895: "Bien passez tres jours chivalcher;" and possibly v. 1190: "Pere et mortier aloer." Perhaps v. 1051 should be "Prist Kent a aveir."

Conjunctions. Que gives the scribe some trouble. He omits it in "pur ce quant" (= "for that when"?) for "pur ce que quant" at v. 231. On the other hand he uses the conjunction deski Ke for the proposition deski at vv. 620, 2115. Ke = during which at v. 3202. Si appears to be written for sin at v. 1248 (Wace has si non).
The construction of vv. 1864-5 appears very complicated and un-Gallic:

A savoir li Rois voit coment
Si li Quiens estet ocis
Et li chastel par force cunquis.

Verbs. Mixed tenses. Beside the use of imperfect for preterite common in A-N (no doubt because English had only one simple past tense), e.g. vv. 1143, 1694, 2225, there is the converse use of preterite for imperfect, e.g. in vv. 2336-90.

The conditional also is often used for the imperfect, particularly with pouvoir and vouloir, no doubt because of the English analytical imperfect with would, e.g. vv. 118, 1260, 1509, 164, 2825, 3125-6. Conversely, the imperfect seems written for the conditional at vv. 1147, 1183 (or sub junctive?) 1204. The use of the (apparently) conditional of pouvoir for the preterite at vv. 60, 2332, 2532, 2636-9, 2826, may be due to the writing of purreint for purrent, though there is once purreint, and the combination of double r and eint or eient so often does not seem mere accidental spelling. Perhaps the conditional, having come to be looked upon as an imperfect, could then interchange with the preterite.
The futuro appears to be used for the conditional at vv. 11-12, 245-6, 380, 2073-4 (as Wace.)

Confusion of Moods. The indicative is often used where the subjunctive is required, e.g. v. 163 (baptiserast for baptisast), 156 (pout for poust), 485 (envoicte for enveiast), 886, 964, 1183, 1532, 1572, 2180-1, 3268. On the other hand the subjunctive, in form at least, is often used for the indicative, e.g. 610-1, 658, 673 (after si). Cf Morphology (Conjugation).

The author shows ingenuity in avoiding redoutable subjunctivos. Wace (Arnold's text 14661-2, 14665-6) has:

En sun tens fud falte de blo,
E do la falte uint chierté....
Bien peussiez treis jorz errer
No trovissiez a achater.

The Egorton ms has:

En sun temps fu falt de bleo
Et do la falt vient chierte;
Bien passoz tres jours chivalcher,
N'1 troverez que achater. (2892-5)

Non-accord of subject and verb. There are numerous examples of (a) singular verbs with plural subjects, e.g. li Dragun (pl.) signifiout...s'asseblout (if this is a case of the ending on, it is the only one in the piece) 1329-30, aveit for aveient 2055, cremeit for cremeient 1401, les Bretuns l'amast 269, ils solt1551, les barones corona 2892, les barons ama 2915, fu dolent si amye 2968, ses barons l'ensepelyst.. grant doel en fist 3133, les barons iceo vist 3234. Most of these are confirmed by rhyme.

(b) Plural verbs with singular subjects, e.g. l'autre partie... ne poeint 66, Igerne... les saluerent (Mentrerent) 1837, Edward... bien les maintenerent (:amerent) 3198, Li Roi... prendre les fist s'ils encroierent (:chivalcherent) 3240. It is noticeable that most examples are in the chronicle; the passage about Igerne also seems largely the scribe's handiwork.

Verbs conjugated with être. Many verbs were of course conjugated with être in O.F. which now have avoir. Numerous apparently unusual examples in this piece are in Wace also, e.g. li feus est en le chastel pris 1380, croître 892. In original passages verbs so conjugated are chivalcher 1892, 1904, faillir 2912. At v. 1425 venir is conjugated with avoir, as often in O.F.
Reflexive Verbs  Numerous reflexive verbs lose their reflexive pronouns and thus change into ordinary intransitive verbs, no doubt through English influence. Examples: s'apparail- ler 116, se plenindre 278, se haster 865, s'achever 1290, s'amer dre 1575, se lever 2640, s'arester 2643, s'en aler 3191. There is no case of conjugation with avoir.

Intransitive verbs with accusative. Use of the direct object pronoun with verbs requiring the indirect is common, no doubt again through the influence of English usage, e.g. envoyer 568, promettre 922, 1915, tramettre 1096, cuntredire 1158, repundre 1237, cuntir 2861.

Various constructions. Ne is omitted at vv. 103, 1074, 1330, 2552 - again a probable Anglicism.

"Avoir a nom" (3035, 3157) is peculiar to A-N. Gaimar uses it apparently to fill out the verse, but it may have some connection with the Middle English to-name, surname.

"Ou devenir," used twice 1197, 2810, where Wace has que de venir," is difficult to explain unless the author was thinking of venir rather than devenir. Cf. v. 180: "Ou li home paynym creient," where Wace again has que.

The inversion caused by inserting "il" in v. 100 is unnecessary. Cf. the ambiguity caused by inversion at v. 2849: Gil ad Seint Austin baptisez.

Anglicisms. There are a number of what appear to be Anglicisms, beside those already indicated. Envoyer pur, 1062-3, which Miss Pope picked out as an Anglicism in the Black Prince
is not one, as the expression occurs in the corresponding lines of Wace, in Le Roux de Lincy's continental text 7217-8. Mander pur is likewise common to both (E 1115, L 7371), but at v. 533 the Egerton ms has mander pur where Wace has envoyer à.

"Par nuit" 965, seems to render "by night," and "unt pris lour ouungé" 606, "have taken their leave." "Tenir od" VV. 1089-90, seems to be "hold with," i.e. support, while "conseiller od," 1044-5, equals "counsel with." "En decline" at v. 1672 seems to be English, as also "esteeit tenuz beals," 3046, and "qi d'els"(which of them) 2091, and "li uns qi se eschapierent"(the ones who escaped) 507. "L'autre partie ... ne poëint," 65-6, seems an English usage, as does the non-repetition of prepositions before nouns at vv. 601, 616, among others, and of adjectives at v. 1758, with the omission of que at vv. 231, 875. Other probable Anglicisms are: grantez à moi 968; un clero des lettres mult sachant (Knowing much of letters?)- the change from Wace's adjective "savant" seems significant)1266; a greniours choses attendeit (Attend to? Wace has entendoit)304; se il le volt mettre en sa meine (place it in his hands? W. has "s'il se veloit")1670. V. 1676 "Es meins ceo mist a cel felun," seems to show that the le of v. 1670 was no mere clerical error, though ceo may of course represent the reflexive pronoun.
(E) VOCABULARY.

The vocabulary is of course largely Wace's but the author's own poverty in this respect is evident in the Chronicle. There are, however, a number of interesting forms and meanings, some of which do not seem to appear elsewhere. A number of Romance words are seen at the interesting point of becoming English ones with modification of meaning and form, while a few English words are adapted to French forms.

In the Glossary will be found the principal forms and meanings not in the dictionaries like those of Godefroy and Tobler. Many of these, like acomuner, deservir, surverse, are Wace's, and a number of words which do appear in the dictionaries are exemplified chiefly from that author, e.g. carcele, conroi, deglazeiz, enlogun6. Others again, though not appearing in dictionaries, seem to be slightly-changed forms of Wace's words perhaps illustrating their actual development in Anglo-Norman, or being merely the scribe's approximations e.g. efforcement (544) for Wace's aenciment (1803), c'entre apaiert (7834) for se rapaiert. There are a number of coined words like aconduer (> amener) 905, aplianer (> aplanoier) 630, departiment (> depar') 615. A few cases seem to call for special mention.

Aforce 1777-8, 735, afforce 212, eforce 476, 1631(?), seem to be forms taken, (owing to phonetic changes of e>ae, æ> a?) by the word efforz 718, with the sense of army. The fact that it occurs at the end of two consecutive verses (1977-8) suggests that
in the first it had this meaning, in the second the sense of "effort."

Avie, subject of surdre 3221, object of avoir 3227, existed in English up to the 17th century in the adverbial form a-vie, no doubt an unconscious re-creation of the original word after apheresis had given vie: the latter is still found meaning "contest" of "challenge" in Holland's Plutarch. The probable origin is envie, anvie, which by denasalisation and obscuring of the pretonic syllable might give this form; the adverbial expression a (en)vie probably had an influence, just as a force may have helped to make aforce.

Creemiseit (ms reading) 1133. Wace has:

Ki se criensist de traitor?

while Eg. reads: Ke se cremeiseit de treisoun?. Whether by mistake or deliberately, the scribe appears to have changed craindre to cramoiser, with the sense of to stain. Or he may have intended cremeilleit (cf. cremeilleux = craintif).

Forcelette 450, so written, does not seem to appear elsewhere, though the form may be due to similarity of o and t. Forceret, however, appears in a letter of Edward III, 1357.

Gaine, gaigne 3080, 3143, has already been discussed (p. 38).

Lentin 2531 (:matin) appears to be a formation for the sake of rhyme, perhaps a misreading of Wace's "Costentin."

The forms given in Godefroy are lentif, lentiu (rhyming in -1u).

A number of verbs have different construction or meaning, or both, from those in O.F. Seafier 306, which normally meant "to pledge oneself," "place one's confidence," seems here to have the absolute meaning "be confident." (Wace's "s'i fia" is changed to "s'afioit"). Aprismer 279, with the preposition de, has the meaning of se préparer, unless it is a mistake for "aprismer à," i.e. consentir à. Venger 2397, (object li) had in O.F. the sense of se venger de, as here, but there seem no examples of its use with a personal direct object denoting the person on whom vengeance is taken.

Some note has already been made, (v. Orthography, Syntax) of the large number of masculine words showing a "feminine" form, sometimes even qualified by a feminine article or adjective. Some, like moigne 713, bosoigne passim, were common on the continent, though the feminine doublet often had a different meaning, as in the case of besoing, besoigne. (Both these senses are spelt bosoigne in this text). Typical in it are aforce, Romance: Bretance 986, 1507, decease 2872, decline 1672, gaigne 2044, juvencele 1770. nece, 399. 2776, poice 1671, poigne 1746, recette 970, tense 640, funce 1320, renge 2103, 2666. Of ems croice 291 (Croce in W.), peese 2871. The fact that many of these forms have remained in English attests to their reality. Of masculine adjectives like terce 286, eloquence 641, etc.

Other words which have taken almost their English form or meaning
are me ne (second, still no used in the west of England in the 19th
century) 286; joi, joy 1029, 2213; deviser (bequeath) 3052; bailif
(f lost in O.F. remained in England, showing early borrowing)
302; Periller (be in peril) 502; remuer (remove) 233; power
(large number, particularly a west of England use) 771; enfranchir
(bestow, endow with - examples of this meaning in Godefroy are
from A.N. mss) 3116; citizen 2144, ordeinant 2854.

Apart from actual Anglo-Saxon or English expressions like "Name are sexes," "Rome pery", English words are few. Ain 1995 still represents the Scottish form of "own"; it was apparently current in law French, as it appears in Kelham. Tide 2491, is in Arno d's text of Wace, from the A.N. Penrose ms, but French one, not in Le Font de Lincy's Northern. Wace may have used it, as he shows in this passage a nautical vocabulary more Germanic than French. Tide appears in Godefroy, but all the examples are from English mss. Estorne 2495, not in Wace, is evidently the Middle English steorn (helm) now stern.

To resume, this ms is not without importance as a linguistic document. It has a few characteristics which seem to differentiate it from most of its contemporaries, like the predominance of -ast in the preterite or the question of the diphthong ow digraph ie running through its phonology, orthography and morphology. But it is above all interesting, not as an isolated specimen, but as an almost final stage in the evolution, in rather less than two centuries, of Wace's "pure Norman." We are enabled to see what has en-
dured, and on the other hand the changes developed in that time, or deemed necessary by a scribe of 1340 to make Wace's language, as well as his story, acceptable to speakers of French in England.
VI  VERSIFICATION

A. METRE AND SCANSION

In the Egerton Brut we have the interesting combination of some 2,900 lines based upon an older work, with 354 composed to all appearances in the middle of the 14th century.

The Brut as Wace wrote it was correct by continental standards of versification. Though, as we have seen, there are reasons in Layamon's version, in the various Mss & in the present abridgment, for supposing that there existed a later and probably insular version or versions different from that embodied in the Le Roux de Lincy's edition, the prosody of these seems to have been fairly regular also. The Ms Cotton Vitellius A X, for example, dating from about 1240, is distinctly Anglo-Norman in language and orthography, but less irregular from the metrical point of view than the present Ms.

Of the latter it can be said in a general way that the versification is more "correct", apart from occasional startling "lapses", in the part based upon Wace than in the section which appears to be wholly original. Irregularities in the first part occur especially in passages apparently peculiar to our author, or in which he summarises longer passages of his model.

The basic metre of the piece is thus the octosyllabic rhymed couplet in which Wace originally wrote, that is to say, the author seemed to intend his lines to have, in Vising's formula, about eight syllables, and to rhyme in pairs.

In estimating the "correctness" or otherwise of the versification, or in attempting to find method in the apparent
metrical madness, we are brought against the problem of atomic o, the point on which French versification in England first began to deviate from the continental. Before its early demise, Anglo-Norman appears to have travelled with precocious speed along lines which continental spoken French has since followed, to have lost in pronunciation many atonic syllables, and brought about syneresis in many words which formerly had vowels in hiatus. There seem to be many cases in the present text where atonic syllables do not count for the author, and probably as many others where they count if the lines are to scan. Further, although final atonic e usually seems to require elision before a vowel, there are a number of lines which are only "correct" if hiatus is kept. Finally there seems great uncertainty on the value of words with internal hiatus.

We can hardly argue, as has often been done, our scribe’s ignorance of French versification, since he was working from an older model, though, as suggested, not necessarily as correct as Wace’s original. There is every evidence that he considered his system normal and that he was not learning versification as he went, as Vising supposes of the author of the Life of Pope Clement: the proportion of "correct" lines is in fact greater near the beginning of the fragment, and is smallest in the final portion. Vising has pointed out that the copyists often leave as in the same Ms a good copy of a French poem with an Anglo-Norman one in "bad" verse.

In many cases in this Ms, e is an inorganic or perhaps ornamental letter. On the other hand it has been omitted often where we should expect one. These cases will be discussed later.
but for the purposes of a preliminary assessment of the versification the scribe's addition or omission of e has been respected, and continental rules applied except in the following cases (a) about forty lines, mostly in the part based upon the Brut containing eight syllables plus one or more svarabhaktic e's have been counted correct, e.g. vv. 74 (with "several") 118 (deverei) 307 (deliverast), 416 (cumbatereit). Though modern English "deliver, sever," etc. seem to make it probable, we can hardly decide whether this e yet had syllabic value in Anglo-Norman. There are at least six lines, however, (1487, 1521, 1553, 1720, 3132, 3256), where counting a svarabhaktic e would make them octosyllabic.

(b) Another forty-odd lines, again mostly in the Brut, containing nine syllables as written, but having an elidable vowel, have also been counted correct (e.g. vv. 1041, 1050, 1267, 1290) (c) So (e.g. vv. 102, 129, 160, 766, ) have also over 100 lines (92 in the Brut) in which the final atomic e is in hiatus, but which are octosyllabic if scanned without elision, as Daimar apparently intended the line quoted by Vining (Anglo-Norman Language and Literature, p. 84): Si firent rei de Edelfriz.

This is by no means peculiar to Anglo-Norman, however. Wace has numerous lines like: Por demandor que il foroit (ed. L. 5154) which our author perversely cuts short by writing "q'il".

If he be thus pardoned about one hundred and ninety verses, we find in the whole piece nearly a thousand, or over 30%, containing, as written, more or less than eight syllables, of these, 822 are in the part based upon the Brut (2,914 lines) giving a percentage in this part of just over 28%, of "incorrect" verses, while the number in the last part (174 out of 354) represents
almost half, that is, the proportion which Ida Wirtz found in the Hanover Ms.

These facts alone seem to make it clear that in the first part our author was "disciplined" by an older and more "correct" poem. Having studied and abridged this piece of over 15,000 lines he is hardly in the position of Vising's learner, even if this were a first effort. In actual fact, his proficiency in French and French versification apparently suffers alarming and progressive decline the further he continues. Long passages near the beginning of the fragment are "correct", or almost so; independence of his model, both in matter and versification, grows as he progresses, till the final and apparently original section shows complete breakdown of French rules. The first two lines of this part:

Egbrid sun fiz enpres regna,
Les barons de la terre mult l'ama,

give the keynote of what is to follow: Pegasus has broken his traces and galloped for freedom, which proves, it is true, rather a pedestrian state.

The great majority of the irregular lines have seven or nine lines as written. There are only 41 lines having less than seven syllables, and twenty with eleven or more. Of about 110 decasyllabics, more than half contain one or two atonic e's. We thus have 350 verses containing, to judge strictly from the written text, seven syllables, and 478 nonasyllabics. Of the latter 338 contain one or more atonic e's, and in about 100 of these the atonic syllable occurs at the fifth. Sixty-two of the seven-syllable lines end in atonic syllables, but as these line rarely occur in pairs (though c.f. vv. 173-4, 818-9, 507-8 etc), they
can hardly be intended as a regular type of verse requiring the final syllable to be counted as the eighth, as Vising believes of Brendan and some other pieces. Indeed, a nine-syllable line commonly precedes or follows a seven-syllable one (cf. vv. 113-4 255-6, 1050-1, 1114-5, etc.), which may satisfy the author that his tale of syllables is complete in two lines if not in one.

There are palliating, or at least explanatory circumstances for many of the syllabically irregular lines. In his work of abridgment the author very often, for the sake of clearness, substitutes polysyllabic nouns for pronouns or other short words. Suchier noticed this care for clearness outweighing metrical considerations in Anglo-Norman poets. Thus in the very first line Kenbelin replaces Wace's Oist and gives the line two extra syllables. In v. 489 meschines is substituted for en; Wace had mentioned the maidens previously, but our author had not. Similarly Bretuns has to come into v. 533; Wace has (v. 6248, ed. L; 6109, ed. A) "Mandó ont a Maximian," with the Brittons as subject, but the omission of a long passage in our version leaves the invaders as subject of the verb unless "Bretuns" be inserted. Li Reis for il is a common substitution of this kind, cf. v. 661:

Puis que li Rois Maximian fu

for Wace's Puis que cil Maximain fu.

Cf. also vv. 870, 1046, 1088, 1355, etc. Lines 692, 1036, 1094 1100, 1455, among many others, owe their irregularity to the substitution of proper nouns for Pronouns.

Definite changes which he introduces into Wace's lines also
cause irregularity. The alteration of

Par lui reçut cristienté
Engleterre premierement (Wace, ed. L, 5335)

into

Par lui créeut Saint Cristienté
En Engleterre premièrement (Ed. 156)

is a fair example of his methods and its results. Another is the

compression of

As Yglises dona francise
Et de ses teres les fieva
Et grant maisnie lor dona (Wace, L. 5381)

into

Saint Eglise de ces terres flofaste
Et grant demeines leur donast. (Ed. 185)

Then we have insertion, omission or alteration of unimportant

words like et, en, noted by Miss Pope as a disturbing factor in

the Black Prince. Examples: Sovent tounner, sovent joindre (et

sovent in W. Ed. 52)

De sun chival Hamon discendeit (71. Del in W.)
En pees regnast et en pees fony. (188. Et not in W)
Et un Bretaigue les envoièrent:
Et un senatour Sever (200. In Bretaigne, un lor

senatov, in W.)

Other examples are found in vv. 1659, 2104, etc., etc.

A similar cause of irregularity is "modernisation" of words

particularly proper nouns, and a tendency to restore etymological

forms. Thus the author throughout prefers Pictiens to Pie and at

v. 1019 Bretun to Brez, a sign that his feeling for declension

is as weak as that for syllabic regularity: further examples are

Lorence for Loheraigne, (455, 2157.) verité for verté (1868),
arreisonez for araïsé (941), sudeinoment for sodement (499)plu-
váise for pluse (496), face for fai (770) and d'amperz for do

totes parts (624), des agus pars (2098). Customary formulae per-
haps creep in in de par bref for par bref (1788) (et. depar la

terre, 1501) and Rei et Seignur for Signor (1368). Line 857 is

upset by one of the author's few blunders: he has the relative
qe i. (qi) in the previous line, but repeats himself with qi at the beginning of this line. We have noted that Wace carefully avoids naming Uther's victim, Count Gorlois of Cornwall; our author has no such scruple, and the insertion of the name in lines based upon Wace usually upsets the tale of syllables.

Many words containing vowels in hiatus in Wace had almost certainly undergone syncretism in England by this time, judging by loan-words like realm, ransom, treason, gain, chain. In this text if we are to count syllables, there seems to be hesitation. Of the lines containing seur or its compounds, all except one (vl203) scan "correctly" if it is counted as disyllabic, (e.g. vv. 345, 350, 473). Similarly the e in -eu past participles seems to have syllabic value (e.g. vv. 348, 944, 73, 739), though a few v wors count nine syllables if this e is given value (e.g. 945, 1873). Line 347 has the past participle of mover without e, and counts only seven syllables. The above and other examples of apparent dieresis may be simply orthographical conservatism due to the influence of the original, while muz slips in to show the usual pronunciation, (cf. meuz, 1343). The subjunctives in ei (entremeisent, 343; deist 798; preist, 1151, 1205; feist, 2014; veisses, passim) seem to keep hiatus (but cf. occist, 1205) while many of those in eu seem to have lost it in spelling as well as pronunciation, e.g. post, 340, 693; avoir seems to keep it, as:oust, 2093; eussent, 2857. Tanquerey, in his edition of Plaintes de la Vierge, notes the difficulty of drawing any conclusions from the spelling of these past participles and subjunctives.

The majority of the twenty-one lines containing troyd are
"correct" if it is dissyllabic, though five seem to have nine
syllables: the spelling trul leaves v. 2267 with eight syllables.

Reine twice rhymes with ing (141, 1357) which might indicate
that it is still dissyllabic, but in that case five of the seven
lines in which it occurs have nine syllables, respectively in
the four verses where it occurs. We may note that if the word
has no diacriticals in v. 2214 (D'vant la Reine Convoire aloront) the
verse becomes one of the class of nonasyllables with an atonic
at the fifth. Lail (logalém, v. 386) rhymes with cunsel
and the verse has eight syllables if it is a monosyllable, Pre-
choient has lost (v 173) the second o which it had in Waco, like
quatre in the next line; both are left with only seven syllables.
The word spelt cremant in L's text, graunter in A's, is here
spelt graunter three times (vv. 109, 764, 976) grainter twice
(668, 1043). In w.109, 976 three syllables seem to be required,
in the other two. Auner (413 etc.) seems to keep diacriticals. The
words in-our or -our also show uncertainty: enour occurs ten
times and in eight at least seems to count four syllables: do-
vingour, quereour (128, 1397, 1213) also seem to count the e.
If parlour has only the two syllables with which it passed into
English, v. 749 has only seven syllables; or the other hand men-
tour (1295) and conquereour (3261) seem to need only two and three
syllables respectively. If diacriticals is kept in reigne, v. 692
has eleven syllables, and v. 2488 eight; the spelling reigne gives
340 only seven. Lines 1444, 1464, 1474, containing cheine, seem
altogether too doubtful for any conclusion to be drawn on its
value; the same is true of the half-a-dozen lines containing
saigne or saignor. Miss Pope thought that these words had no
hiatus in the Black Prince. In both these last two cases the
spelling here and the English form makes it practically certain
that syncope had taken place. If raunson is disyllabic only,
as in Aspromont, (v. c404) v. 1171 is a perfect octosyllabic; the
word was trisyllabic in Wace. In vv. 723, 762, 1690, traitre
seems to need three syllables, but in 832, 3009, only two; in fact
touz, not found in Wace's corresponding line, has been inserted
in line 832 as if to fill it out. A similar of legs is found in v.
1295 containing mentour:. noted above. Treisun is thrice spelt
thus (1126, 1133, 1675); if it is trisyllabic, the last two
verses have too many syllables. On the other hand, tresun in vv.
1911, 3013, only gives seven syllables in the verse. The treat-
ment of realms, which occurs nine times, in the last part only,
is uncertain if we are working on a syllabic basis, though the
rhyme realms: realms (3051), John Trovisa's room and the modern
pronunciation seem to indicate a monosyllable. Mone (moyen, v.
286 is obviously one, and plontivo (385) has been reduced by a
syllable. In the proper names Johan, if disyllabic, gives ten,
eleven, seven and nine syllables respectively in the four verses
where it occurs. Edward, considered by Miss Pope to count three
syllables in the Black Prince here seems to count only two; this
would give seven syllables in vv. 2971, 3041, but eight in vv.
30:7, 3065, 3190, 3209, 3261. Austin, which seems to count three
syllables in Gaimar, apparently requires that number in v.2841,
but only two in v.2949. Gloucesters seems invariably four syllables
as in Wace, though the Roux de Lincy did not always notice this
(cf. vv. 5206, 7443, 12722 of his edition).

Enclisis is often indicated by the spelling (e.g. sis, nes
sad, nel); many lines would be improved from the syllabic viewpoint if enclisis, as in Wace's text, were substituted for the full spelling given in Egerton, e.g. vv. 189, 219, 339, 812, 985, 1380, 2695.

More than any of the above, however, the chief cause of the poem's syllabic uncouthness, which it shares with contemporaries and predecessors, is the ubiquitous yet elusive letter o. As Ida Wirtz noticed in the Hanover ms we find it tacked on to many words, chiefly masculines, where it has no right in grammar, etymology or logic, and absent from many others to which it belongs by these same tokens, Line 1701:

De cele Dragon deus faies venient
is typical in this respect. With few exceptions, and those usually feminine, the word now tout is spelt toto, (e.g. vv. 8, 791, 1955, 1274, etc.), plural toted (82, 2865, 3018, etc.). "Totes see baron" is a favourite cliche. Bone, bele, are as a rule masculine (1648, 2135, etc.), the feminine of the latter being generally beau, (1959, 124, etc.), Meinte is generally masculine (e.g. 1648, 2135), as are petite (46, 261), ceste (821), merveilleuse (1707, 1774), veire (330), etc.etc. Tal, qel acquire an analogical e, in one case in the masculine (v. 730). Many, too, are the nouns with a caudal e: champs, cunseile, (passim) nefe (72 etc.), mere (mor 323 etc.), hanape (1030) engine (1184 etc.) coupe (221), mure (573 etc.), chastels (1846 etc.), cuire (873, 980) langure (3257) homoire 3254, homeine (320, 582). Adverbs also acquire e; demeine (1361, 1720) trope (889) entoure (973), as do also imperatives of the third conjugation; entende (1650) cumbate (1729), and a third person singular; seomonde (2280). We have also forms like Escose (Escos, passim) nece (nies, 399 etc.) trestourne (trestour, 41), deoigne
(dédain, 1900) *bosoigne* (passim). In all these and many other cases, the final e gives the line apparently nine syllables.

The converse happens in many feminine and other words having a right to atonic e. *un* appears for *une* almost everywhere, *tot* for *tote* (1979, 3017, etc.), *maint* for *mainte* (584) *nul* for *nule* (2163), *mis* (mises, 491), *icel* (icelo, 2953), *joi* (708), *joy* (2004), *vei* (veio, 121) *pier* (pere, passim), *gent* et *beal* (gente et belo, 124), *dreit* (dreite, 268) *Engleter*, (445) *Irland* (1969) *cum* (1663 and passim). These forms appear to leave the line with only seven syllables, yet in others the syncopation leaves the line with eight syllables as *flot* (flote, 2798), *un lance* (2693), *un maladie* (3186). Numerals like *unze*, *quinze*, very rarely written in full, seem to lose their final e in vv. 489, 573, 1497, 2321 etc., while they appear to require it in vv. 447, 1540, 2479 etc. Trente always seems to require its e (cf. vv. 2983, 3109). There are also a number of adverbs or nouns *in-ment* showing the spelling *ee* as *bonnement* (99), *definément* (146), *primerializement* (753), where this *ee* only seems to count one syllable. Yet counting *privelement* as four syllables only gives seven to the whole line 341 (note spelling *priveelement* in v. 2343), and *primereotype* should only count three to be "correct". *Sire*, written *Sir* or *Syr* in the Chronicle, seems to need sometimes one syllable, sometimes two, the latter especially in places where it is spelt without e; *ore* could apparently do without e in the majority of cases, as has been noticed of the same word in Thomas' Tristan. Similarly *aventeois* (3219, 3194 etc.) seems usually to need only three syllables, and *forement* (1322, 1706), *ambedeus* (255, 1244) only two. In a number of lines (e.g. 56, 112, 169, 255 etc.) the
verbal ending -ent seems not to count, as Meyer noticed in Froissart. Perhaps, as in Musset and other moderns, the scanning of this syllable was optional. Perhaps even lines like 870: "De quelle terre dit le Roi, venez?" anticipate Verlaine and others in "potache" mood: "De quel'ter, dit le Roi, venez?" (cf. 185). The occurrence of an extra atomic syllable at the fifth in about 100 lines suggests that such a syllable did not count in Anglo-Norman verse. The number of such lines would be increased if decasyllabics were added which contain an atomic fifth syllable and perhaps another in the remaining part of the verse (e.g. 499, 301, 870, 1866).

We also have examples appearing to indicate effort to fill out the measure by the introduction of irrational letters which require to be pronounced, to replace loss elsewhere, as:

En un nefe entrer volesit (72)
Ni ad uns hemoine lessez (357)
Munt le tint pur bone devin (1336)
Un fort chaine de fere tint (1468)
Et celle loos li vint a gro (2427)
Les barones l'en corona (2892)

Similar effort to effect reparation for losses real or felt seems to show itself in:

Ke la malvais gent ont venou (700 W. has no conjunction but his adjective agrees)

Grant pouer i ad des traitours(771 W. Grant paor ni de t.
Les traitres fist touz decolor(832 W. does not need tous
Et jno meismes od tel irrai (2398 W. no: no conjunction
Et l'Empereour qi te defie (2377, same remark)
Munt parlez resonablement (2370 L:paroles avonnammen
(M:paroles raisnable-
mement),

Pur mentours les feraf tenir (1295. W: menteurs fera)

Tanquerey has noticed how, owing to phonetic changes, Anglo-Norman writers seem to count or ignore mute syllables at will: "leur traitement des muettes leur a fait très tôt perdre le sens même de ce qu'est un vers français. Leur façon de prononcer le
français rendait incorrect les neuf dixièmes des vers français corrects qu'il leur arrivait de lire, car tous les vers qu'ils avaient sous les yeux semblaient avoir un nombre de syllabes extrêmement variable, suivant le nombre d'e atones qu'ils avaient et que les Anglo-Français comptaient ou no compptaient pas. Il en résulta qu'après un temps ils oublièrent et ne purent plus reconnaître que le principe du vers français, c'est le nombre fixe de syllabes." (Evolution p.783). The foregoing paragraphs have amply borne out these remarks.

Perhaps, however, discussion of this piece, and others like it, from the syllabic point of view is beside the mark. The chief feeling which emerges from the foregoing is that it is hopeless to seek to apply the French principles of versification. Are we to attribute this apparent chaos merely to the decline of French in England and the ignorance of Anglo-Norman poets, as has been generally done so far? Or were these poets in reality applying other methods instead of, or in addition to, the remains of the French system?

Vising (op. cit. p. 81) says: "The Anglo-Norman poets were in general, even if they belonged to the clergy, people of little learning, and what they possessed least of all was system and theory. Most of them did not know English, or knew it only imperfectly, and at the same time they found no little difficulty, as they themselves admit, in handling the French language and French versification. How was it possible for them to construct out of two metrical systems they hardly knew a now and very complicated system?"

Most of this could be contested in detail. The vast didac-
didactic literature they have left, including the earliest known attempts at grammars of French, hardly convicts the Anglo-Normans of ignorance or lack of system greater than they shared with their contemporaries in other countries. Even the most learned of them, like Archbishop Peckham, who had been a professor at the University of Paris, persists in writing French very little different from that of less distinguished compatriots who might be considered more ignorant. The incompetence which they admit was no doubt in French versification as understood on the continent, not necessarily in their own system; it is still the prerogative of the English to persist in the ignorant practices for which they apologise to the foreigner. But the idea that Anglo-Norman poets had a good knowledge of neither English nor French is astonishing.

How had they come to be denied a mother-tongue? Without citing Gower, can it be asserted that men of Parisian learning like Robert Grosse, Toste or Peckham - and they were for long numerous enough to constitute a "nation" at the University of Paris, - had no clear idea of what they were trying to write? If they had not been confident, like modern French-Canadians, that their version of French was as good as that of Paris, they would no doubt have been capable of producing works much more resembling attempts at Parisian French, which they had had every opportunity of learning. Again, the history of any one language and its poetry, or comparison between those of nations in different stages of civilisation, suggests generally that they evolve from a cumbersome infancy towards simplicity and the breakdown of primitive complication. An occasional stasis, when fashion or some other cause maintains an artificial tradition, is an exception whose rapid passing only
proves the rule. An artificial language such as Anglo-Norman seems to have been for the majority after 1250, (Prior suggests that its whole existence in England was artificial, a political expedient; in no other country did the Northmen and their descendants impose their language or resist the assimilation of native speech and habits) might be expected to have an artificial and perhaps complicated versification, just as the sonnet is a monument of a particular phase of Italian civilisation.

The view that Anglo-Norman poets were unable to count their fingers, or at least were unable to place those fingers with any precision on the syllables of French, is more understandable, though this inability would be due to the rapid changes in the language rather than lack of such advanced arithmetical skill or of rhythmical sense.

Professor Prior, (Romania 1923) gave examples of poetic tours de force in two or three languages to show that versifiers capable of fashioning perfectly good Latin and English verses, apparently insisted on spoiling them with French ones atrocious if judged by the method of counting syllables. He went on to urge the influence of English versification and to come round once more to the idea, scouted by Meyer, Vising and others, of an accentual rather than syllabic scansion for Anglo-Norman verse. Even the works of early and "correct" poets he says, lend themselves to iambic rhythm, as, for example, the St Thomas of Benoît of St Albans; later they can be scanned by stresses. This accentual basis seems to grow more marked as time goes on, till poems mingling two or three languages, with French alone, we are asked to believe, preserving a syllabic basis, become a regular genre.
The graceful, Villonesque prayer of c. 1300 in the Leominster ms, quoted by Prior (p. 178), bears repetition;

Maiden mode mild
Oiez cel őreysoun
From shame vou mo shilde
A dé ly malfeidoun
For love of nine childe
Me menez dé tresdun
Ich wes wód and wilde
Œre su ón prisoun.

This hardly betokens ignorance of both languages, either in the poet or the public to which he addressed himself. Both apparently felt the same rhythm in both English and French lines, or the poem would have no unity; it was no doubt this rhythm which governed the value to be placed upon the syllables of the French and led to the use of the "barbarism" de ly.

This example suggests an explanation other than ignorance and corruption for the phenomena of our text. The seemingly fanciful way in which atonic e is scattered abroad in it is only paralleled in contemporary English versification, where it had this optional value in contributing to a stress-rhythm which took little account of the number of syllables. The divorce of spelling from pronunciation, the hallmark of modern English to which we cling with touching fidelity, had already begun, and written e was not always pronounced. It is generally admitted that the French of England shared the same development. In many apparently "incorrect" verse of our poem, particularly decasyllabics like v. 1701 quoted above, also:

Qu il out cue en meinte beseigne (2135)
Ke pointe, qe helte, qe entretor (2201)
Bel o temps fist, li solelle levast (2529)

one or more of the e's must be merely decorative. Champo is, as
already noted, generally so written, yet at vv. 3005-6 it rimes with suiant. Numerous are such ornamental es at the end of lines, satisfying no doubt our author's artistic eye, e.g. Arthuscerus (spelt thus at v. 2069, and nowhere else). As for the value of words normally containing hiatus, like cheine, troisum, realme, we may suppose that sometimes, especially in the Brut proper, the author gave them their ancient French value, at others, particularly in his own portion, the value they had at the time of borrowing into English. As in English, e could no doubt be elided, not only before vowels, but also before consonants. In her introduction to the Black Prince, Miss Pope thinks that Gower's use of a les, de los, du for de là, etc., was due less to ignorance than "a metrically convenient forgetfulness of the declension of the article". (Cf. de ly in the Leominster prayer).

Such compromise and complication, whatever Meyer, Vising and the others have said, is foreign neither to English character nor to English versification. In the works of Chaucer, born about the time of our ms, we find the same arbitrary use of e and the same arbitrary accentuation of French words. As Prior points out, he accents words like honour sometimes on the second syllable, sometimes on the first. The modern pronunciation of this and other loan-words like absence, baron, exploit indicates a process which they may have been undergoing even before they began to be used in English, a process just as likely to have worked upon all polysyllabic words in Anglo-Norman, whether they passed into English or not.

We must remember that Chaucer was in comprehensible for
his own countrymen, and pitied as a boorish pioneer, till the 18th century discovery that in his verse e sometimes had a value, sometimes not, and that French words were sometimes accented in French fashion, sometimes in English. It was then found that he wrote generally irreproachable iambic ten syllable lines. Even Vising admits of the learned Gower: "for him it was possible to combine adherence to English rhythm with the French syllabic system". C.C. Macauley says of Gower's work: "With all the correctness, the verses of the Mirour have an unmistakably English rhythm ... the verse is in a certain sense accentual as well as syllabic, the writer imposing upon himself generally the rule of the alternate beat of accents, and seldom allowing absolutely weak syllables to stand in the even place of his verse", (p. 111v of the introduction to his edition of Gower). Did Chaucer and Gower, then, achieve a sudden success not built upon the efforts of predecessors writing in English, or Anglo-Norman, or both? Meyer and Vising's comparison of Italo-French poetry with Anglo-Norman is evidence against rather than for their thesis: Italian dialects had stronger stresses than French, and Italian poetry was destined, like English, to be based upon accentual feet rather than syllabic rhythm.

Koch's view (Chardri, p. xliii) seems the most natural: it is hardly possible that for two or three centuries the inhabitants of England lost all sense of the rhythm which was a basic element in their poetry before and since. In criticising Koch, Vising (Versification a-n, p. 56) admits that of course this loss must have been gradual, not sudden. Then would the feeling of rhythm, having been gradually lost, be suddenly regained? If it
seems to be resurrected with Layamon and to blaze out suddenly in Chaucer's triumphant welding together of both French and Anglo-Saxon elements in language and prosody, it can hardly have been absent from the French efforts of English versifiers all the time. As French poetry, from being an importation, gradually became a home product, we can only presume that English-born poets, while their medium of expression was the Anglo-Norman language, felt an English rhythm in their verses; they would often place an iotus where there was none, or only a weak one, in continental French— the latter itself seems to have known more strongly-marked accents than the modern language. The process must have increased in strength till the end of Anglo-Norman literature, Chaucer only utilising what was already accepted in both languages used in England. By some process of reasoning, to which he adheres forty years later in "Anglo-Norman Language and Literature", Vising alleges in the page cited above that the Anglo-Normans' loss of the sense of rhythm is proved by the laments of William of Wadington, Luces de Gast, the author of St Aedward, and others, for their loss of "le sentiment de la langue Olloméme". This loss is not at issue, nor that of the feeling for French rhythm which was its consequence. But instead of proving that a nation lost its sense of rhythm, these losses surely make it only more probable that it substituted for the lost French one the accentual rhythm which forms a principal basis of poetry for the English mind.

If in the present text, therefore, we seek stresses rather than syllables, it will perhaps appear less of a metrical enigma.
We have seen that our author, by his insertions and alterations, seems to have little sense of the French scansion. Yet we cannot accuse him of lacking a rhythmical sense, even in lines syllabically "correct". He makes very numerous alterations as compared with Roux de Lincy's basic ms, (now F.f. 1450) obviously a continental one, and a still-considerable number compared with the 13th-century Anglo-Norman Penrose ms utilised by Arnold. These bear not merely on the matter, changes in which have already been discussed, but even more upon order and choice of words: for the latter class of alteration it is usually difficult to see any reasons other than metrical.

There are numerous examples to show that where Arnold's text and Egerton agree to differ in word order from Le Roux de Lincy's, a definite alternate beat results. In the following only L. and E. are given, as A agrees with E except in orthographical detail:

L 5033: qui a vint a vint mil escus
E 22: Kt vint od plus de mil esuud (A 4916)

L 5907: et partot estoit rois clamés
E 346: Et reis esteem par tot claméz (A 5786)

L 8140: Qu'il ait merci qui merci quiert
E 1484: Ko morci ait od merci quert (A 7936)

L 5404: Que partie a lui en sosmist
E 207: Ke un partio a lui susmist (A 5283)

L 13043: Car plus quo nul home l'amot
E 2664: Milt l'aveit chier et mult l'amout (A 12657)

L 13060: Ou Romain volissent u non
E 2677: Volissent oil de Rome ou noun (A 12654)

L 6540: Il te tornera a honor
E 675: Si t'ert turné a grant honor (A 6394)

Other examples are vv. 2659 (L 13037, A 12632), 2687 (L 13292, A 12888), 2759 (L 13678, A 13273).

It is not the immediate purpose, however, to demonstrate
how our author shared a particular rhythm with other Anglo-Norman scribes, or perhaps with Wace himself as distinct from continental copyists, but that changes by which he differs from the other known versions accentuate the tendency to alternate beats. The first six examples which follow are lines in which he shows different word order from L and A; the rest do not appear in any of the known versions, or occur in the final part, being in both cases presumably the work of the author of the ms.

L 5053: Priveement l'a desarmé— (A 4938)
E 32: Le corps ad pris et desarmad
L 5127: A Forcestre sunt retornées (A )
E 80: Et a Forcostre retournez
L 5860: Constantina a Rome manoit (A 5739)
E 303: Et Constantin a Rome estoit
L 5926: A qui Engleterre lairoit (A 5804)
E 364: A ki son remorse suporsoit
L 6305: Et plusieurs corps et detranció (A 61:6)
E 573: Plus de xv (monsyllabes) 'mil en ort ois
L 6555: De sa main destre le seigna (A 6412)
E 687: Levast la destro, mis seignent
L 6613: Un cotel avoit, sol' fer: (A 6467)
E 726: S' espé out trait, et le ferri
E 233: De Rome un baron remueil
272: Cil fu de counte eloquence
326: Et les richoses assemblez
354: Meint chivalor i amenout
380: Car puis après l'en poiserast
538: Et les paigns sunt dolerousse
574: Ke des Norrais que de Daneis
738: Al Parlement fu cil venu
923: De li servir a sun devis
2221: Mult i avoit solompnité
3198: Bien solt sun Realmo maintenir
3268: Qu'il poest la victorie avoit.

These examples, which could be multiplied, are sufficient to show that even when keeping within octosyllabic limits, the author leans towards an iambic rhythm. English readers can often be detected trying to read this into French verse, but it would be difficult for anyone to avoid doing so in the above lines and many others. Further, there seems a tendency towards hemistichic
division of the verse (marked by internal rhyme or assonance at v. 22 and elsewhere - see below) with a pause at the half-way point, a feature of traditional English versification, with its parallelism and repetition. It would be difficult to find examples where our author changes a line of Wace already containing this division or lending itself to iambic rhythm.

Vising (A-N Lang. & Lit., p. 84) says "It is probable the octosyllabic line never has had a caesura, as it has not in modern times". Fifteen of the above nineteen examples, with a caesura, sometimes a strong one, after the fourth syllable, seem to show that Anglo-Norman verse did not conform to this feeling that the French octosyllabic is too short to have a caesura, and also to illustrate a tendency to symmetrise the lines of Wace. The Norman poet, however, had already given his successors an example for nonconformity. A few lines from near the beginning of our ms, corresponding exactly to the lines of Wace on which they are based, are sufficient proof of this.

In vv. 32, 303, 726 quoted above, as well as in lines which he shares with Arnold's text, we find our author preferring an order elsewhere, which gives a pause after the fourth syllable instead of as in Wace. Other cases not shared with A are:

L 9893: Artur l'am a mult et et chiere (A 9636)
E 1952: Arthur l'amast et la tint chier

L 9949: Et cascuns i avoit s'espie (A 9712)
E 1992: Et chescun d'elie i out s'espie
It is tempting to suppose the author inserted a non-stympological e, with syllabic value, in peust (v. 795): "Bien les peust, bien los amast," with the idea of dividing the line symmetrically by the semi-colon which he writes after peust. Wace's line is: "Et bien les pot et abovra." (L 6769) or "Bion les peut, bion les abovra," (A 6604, as Paris f.f. 1416). Was there intention to emphasise the medial pause by use of atonic e ? It has already been noted that in about 100 apparently non-syllabic lines the extra syllable is a mute at the fifth. In most of these cases a distinct pause follows, e.g.

**Italics**

It is tempting to suppose the author inserted a non-stympological e, with syllabic value, in peust (v. 795): "Bien les peust, bien los amast," with the idea of dividing the line symmetrically by the semi-colon which he writes after peust. Wace's line is: "Et bien les pot et abovra." (L 6769) or "Bion les peut, bion les abovra," (A 6604, as Paris f.f. 1416). Was there intention to emphasise the medial pause by use of atonic e? It has already been noted that in about 100 apparently non-syllabic lines the extra syllable is a mute at the fifth. In most of these cases a distinct pause follows, e.g.

E 46: *Mais mult potto se arestast*

L 6037: *Qui ont maint de ses homens mort*
A 5906: *Ki de ses homes unt maint mort*
E 432: *Ki de ses hommes ont meinte mort*

L 5007: *Ni ne lor valt tener droiture*
E 6: *Ne leur volt faire nule droiture* (A 4090)

L 5236: *Englezor premmirement*
E 157: *En Angléterre primitivement* (A 5215)

L 5397: *En Bretagne les envolvent*
E 200: *Et en Bretagne les envoient* (A 5276)

L 5877: *Et les Romains soffrir nos porent*
E 320: *Et li Romaine suferer nel purent* (A 5736)

L 5832: *Mena a nome par chiertot*
E 283: *Mencast a nome pur chieretot* (A 5713)
These examples, of course, may merely be taken to confirm the disappearance of the atonic e. On the other hand, given the tendencies we have noted, the author may have been availing himself of its optional value in giving the lines a medial pause with iambic rhythm. There seem to be a large number of examples in the Cot. Vitell. A ms of the Brut, some hundred years older than the Egerton, of a similar occurrence of the e mute at the hemistich.

If the above seem evidence of iambic rhythm, it may lead to an explanation of a great many of the apparently irrational e-mutes which intrude everywhere in our text, and in others.

In line 432 mainte has of course no right to its e, and the line could be read "correctly", as in A: "Ki de ses hommes ont maint mort", still an improvement on the order in L. But maint and Mort would be two heavy syllables in succession; our author probably inserted the e to give an iambic rhythm with medial pause. This is the more likely as there are many other examples of what seems a rhythmical use of this letter which we have already seen apparently filling out the octosyllabic.

As: 152; Mult béle fu sa finémont
261; Xi ánz petite plús avait
417; Et lés homeines guéröret
502; Et mainte nöre périllör
576; Un müre firent sur un fósse (Æscoco. But in vv 579, the a docs not seem to have a rôle)
Perhaps the variation in the spelling of natus is due, occasionally at all events, to its position at the weak or strong syllable of an iambus, as in vv. 871-2:

\[
\text{Quelle part vôstre guère court}
\]

Of füstes neez, et qé querréz?

Héngist, qe Meâre et alinz nez fú ...

Cf. vv. 1, 2, 1085, 1227, 1645, 2346. But there are perhaps as many cases of spelling with one e at what should be the strong syllable, e.g. 142, 490, 709, 805. The alternation of qi or ki (strong ?) with qe or ke (weak?) for the nominative relative, and of le and li, may be sometimes not unconnected with metre, though it would be dangerous to generalise from a few examples like:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Envoier lui qe li baptiserât,} & \\
\text{Et qi la ley li enseignast} & \quad (163-4) \\
\text{De lá langure qe li teneit} & \quad (325/)
\end{align*}
\]

The great majority of cases of qe for qi (25 in the first 800 lines) fall on what would be the weak syllable of an iambic foot.

An iambic rhythm seems recognisable also in many of the "irregular" lines of seven, nine or more syllables if, as often in English, a catalectic syllable be counted strong, replacing a whole foot, an occasional anapest be allowed, or an e-mute be elided before a consonant, as:

\[
\begin{align*}
107: & \quad \text{s'il volat soulis hômmes dévenir} \\
151: & \quad \text{Côil sé cuntint mult noblement} \\
252: & \quad \text{et as chièf de set jours dêviast} \\
280: & \quad \text{Archierês et chivalêrs amenast} \\
399: & \quad \text{Octavæs les prist, alis décolast} \\
381: & \quad \text{Ne ké sun eire faço dé Conânn} \\
418: & \quad \text{tur Valéntin et Gratiân q'il habît}
\end{align*}
\]
441: Pur céo Bretaigne minor l'únt nomé
522: Kar móint bon chivalér en ërt passé
762: Vörtigér ñe tráilre fú
843: Et a bréfe térme révendroient
1662: Coróne físt hált ai sé tundi
1803: As countenáñz et és enceíñeméntz
2290: Ne sáverás on nule liéu tapír
2658: Béduér férist parmi le cérps
2699: Et el córps d'un laúnce náveréz
3079: Od un gáine qé a lí fu tráit
3158: Múlt par éstet sëinte hém
3215: As póvres fréres dé réaligión.

As seen in Chaucer, 14th century English poets found no harm in
accenting the same word differently in different places or in ac-
ccenting French words English fashion. The violence done to French
ears by such accentuation as the above could not have been felt
by the nation which produced Law French, no doubt largely a crys-
tallisation (or petrifaction) of the French spoken here in the
13th and 14th centuries.

If we admit some evidence in the foregoing of the iambic
metre which was soon to be firmly entrenched in English poetry,
a good many other lines, (or indeed some of the above) may simply
represent the older English tradition of fixed accents with vari-
able number of weak syllables, soon to give way altogether, with
Gower, Chaucer and their successors, to isometrical iambic metre.
This would explain the facility with which the scribe inserts proper names, extra words etc., without apparently feeling that he was doing violence. English prosody allowed such freedom.

Thus four (or more) stresses may be intended in polysyllabic lines such as:

66: Kī ne poéint turnér a la mayfe

640: A Lũndres estéjt a icéle ténse (or iambic: A Lũn-dres estéjt a icéle ténse?)

1036: Hówen estéjt devánt le Kói defublé

174": En le chemýn enconstrást un mésage (or iambic: En le chemýn enconstrást un mésage?)

2137: De ōre et de mal talénf fu ešmēk (or: De ōre et de mal talénf fu ešmēk)

3173: La batväille de Êwes fu en sun témpe

3259: Apres lí régne sun ríz que or ėst

It is possible that in many cases we ought not to place the accent on verbal endings. English verbs were not so accented and the development of Anglo-Norman ones, for example the change of conjugation/infinitives into conjugation IV often suggests that they underwent an analogous shift of accent (cf. Tanquerey, Evolution pp. 437, 793).

Another attribute of English versification, alliteration, may be intentional in this text - it can at least be found in a good many lines, though of course not absent from Wace and continental poets. If anything, examples are most numerous in the last part, but it is interesting to note how changes made in Wace have resulted, perhaps not by accident, in alliteration or an increase of it. It is obvious in the English lines of the prayer quoted above, and can be detected in the French. Examples in the Egerton text are:

8. Et tote lour troud entollie

(L 5009; A 4892: Et le tra{uentoli )
Nearly a century-and-a-half before our poem, Layamon's versification was, as Prior pointed out (loc. cit.) a mixture of accents and alliteration, and, as it said, of rhyme. Twenty years after it, Langland's "Vision of Piers the Plowman" shows that the old alliterative-accentual system is not dead. Not long after -
that again, Chaucer's rhymed iambics do not scorn alliteration. England was in this, as it has ever been, a repository of things old and new, the English a nation of adaptors. Our poet seems sometimes to be looking back to Layamon, sometimes forward towards Chaucer. If he keeps the French octosyllabic, we cannot be sure that he does not feel a non-French iambic rhythm in it - his rearrangement of the order in his model frequently seems to aim at this. If he breaks into polysyllabic metre, we again seem to feel an iambic or at least an English accentual rhythm. He uses the atonic e, not with preoccupations of grammar, etymology or consistency, but perhaps for ends connected with rhythm. He treats the language he writes in as an artistic medium, to be shaped and arranged for his purpose, just as he "improves" Wace from the standpoint of English rhythm. It is the attitude, not of ignorance merely, but of aesthetic detachment towards a language which is no longer a living tradition but an accomplishment.

**Enjambement** calls for little remark, except to point out its frequency. Vising says (op.cit. p.85) "on the whole enjambement is rare in Anglo-Norman poetry". Prior, on the contrary, says (loc.cit.p.174) that it is freely employed, the strong accentual rhythm now giving the verse its unity, and leading also to the weakening of rhyme. The example of English must here again have made itself felt. The sense runs on very commonly from one line to the next in this ms, e.g. vv. 10, 13, 47, 93, 1506, 2768, 2770. In all these and many other cases the corresponding lines of Wace show the same running on. But there are examples also in the modifications, as:
Lf senatour soulement
Les envoieit ignelement
Un Legion des chivalers
Ki mult furent pruz et fiers (vv. 567-70)

Compare Wace: Une legion solement
Lor envoierent de lor gent (L vv. 6299-6300)

Examples in the final part are of even more emphatic kind:

En repairant, par franchise prist
A femme demoiseal Judith (vv. 2929-30)

Mais ad le aide de le salit
Seiit Johan, arcevesqi de Everwic. (vv. 2939-40)

Icel oure q'il nasquie,
Seiit Dunstan en oie
Les Angoles qi chantierent
Emont en le firmament
Ke lon poes en serrá
Tant cum Edgar regneva. (vv. 2953-8)

Car Estrice, sa marastre, le fist ocire
A doel et a grant martire
Pur covetise de la repne dowar
A Alvered sun fiz pur heriter (vv. 2975-8)

Other examples are at vv. 3034, 3044, 3078, 3149 etc.

C Rhyme

The outstanding feature of the rhymes employed in the present
ms is the apparent contrast between the care distinguishing a
good many, and what seems to be lack of it in others.

Vising in particular (op. cit., and "Sur la versification
Anglo-Normande"), called attention to this contradiction in
Anglo-Norman versification. He says, however, "Une rime inad-
missible en ancien français mais répétée en Anglo-Normand prouve
que ce n'est pas une négligence." He therefore allows rhymes like
or: ur as being in accord with the phonetic development of the
language; also the rhyming of er infinitives with words in ere,
owing to Anglo-Norman loss of final e mute, and such rhymes as
The Egerton text abounds in examples of these and analogous spellings for sounds evidently considered to be rhymes. Thus plus-sur rhyman with quoreour(1213) and astour (2758); demuro: empor-eour (2394), jours: honurs (3037), Angieu; Poitou (2469), pruz: nevolz (2480) touz (2938), haurze: socume (407). succuro; honor (647). The phonetic identity of o and u for Anglo-Norman writers receives further demonstration in sunt; font (892), parfondo; fundo (1311), homes; sumos (890, 2372), Rome: summe (137, 2252) Knout:bot (2998), socuruz: dolerouse (1357), plurent (plemror); Keurent (courir, 2144); vorous; orgoilous (3095). The reduction of ui to u, noted in many spellings in this place, is shown by bruit; tout (2294), eussent; fuissent (2827).

There is little need to insist further on the disregard of final e mute, which is shown in the rhymes as well as in the metre. Beside rhymes looked upon as normal by Vising, there are others whose frequency, and what we know of phonetic development in Anglo-Norman, seem to give them sanction, e.g. the rhyming of past participles and other words ending in e, ie, and i, of preterites in erent, iorent, and iorent and infinitives in er, ier, ir and ire; of ei with e of different origins; of all the different imperfect endings (in ai, ei, ci, ou and o); of the different classes of preterito endings (as;ad;ast;at, i;ie; it;ist, ut;ust; out; olt;ot) - for examples see Phonetics and Orthography.

Other rhymes are due to the way in which certain consonants, o.e. r, n, s, consonnes mouillés, changed, disappeared, or perhaps reappeared in spelling when they had ceased to be pronounced. Most of these again have been discussed in the sections on Phonetics and Orthography, but it seems convenient to bring them

There are a number of rhymes, permissible perhaps in England if not in France, which the author has evidently been at some pains to make pleasing to eye as well as ear. Decorative e's are found in certeine: demoine 1345, a bite (noun): petite (masc. pl. 742), counsello (noun): mervelle (1st pers. sing. 1195) Ar- thuro: oire 2069, lie (lui): vie (3047, cf. lui: avie above),
emfeblie (masc.); maladie 3185, morire; occire 3129, Declension and syntax are adjusted for the sake of rhyme in guise (plur.); aprise (fem. plur., 150), desceunfis (fem); pris (masc.); 1979, cunquies (fem. plur., 2168), enmaladie (pret.); amyo (masc. plur., 2967) gastez (fem. plur.); entrez (masc. plur., 1883), armez (masc. plur.); guercoiez (perf. part., 3073), trei; Kei 2547, boteleras; brancos d'asciers 2654, meuz (masc. plur.); par grant vertuz 1343, assez; nomez (infin., 2452) odifiers; chivalers (447, cf. thirteen cases of infinitives ending in a noted by Ida Wirtz in the Hanover ms-, op. cit. p. 48). Even meaning seems to be altered in Abbez (abbés); Evèsquiez (ovòques) 2186). That our scèbe was capable of respecting declension for rhyme as well as altering it, is shown by neun; hom (nom. sing., 3157) in the part of which he seems the author.

As the desinence -ent seems to have optional value metrically for the Anglo-Norman versifier, this was probably also the case in rhyming. Rhymes like cremeit; estsient 1401, avoit; tounsient 2055, were thus no doubt satisfactory to him. A very large number of others can only be called rhymes if verbal -ent in Anglo-Norman constituted of itself a satisfactory rhyming-syllable. Some of the examples are perhaps, though not necessarily, due to carelessness in the omission of ei, oi before -ent, or in writing -sient for -ent, and vice versa. Emendations for these are tentatively put forward later, but the ms readings are kept here. Their number suggests that they were not all accidental, and did not shock our scribe.

Thus we find (apparently) presents rhyming with (a) imperfects or conditionals (perhaps -sient, after the reduction to -ent, became -ent by the change eind), guiens; disoient 519.
tournent: saveint 1307, venoient: lisent 1701, vequent: cumbatierent 2089, solei ent: voilent 2338, also three presents (?) guercient: manacent 838, oxient: espaminent 529, morgent: devient (devier, 2901.

(b) Presents rhyming with preterites, e.g. entrerent: robbent (618, possibly the sign for er has been omitted in the ms, cf. 916) this line, with the accented rhyme, though unvoiced, e.g. garirent: guerpisent (1094, both imperfects in Waco) guercient: destruerent 1349, apaierent 2833, damagierent 2988.

(c) Imperfects or conditionals rhyming with preterites, e.g. cumbatierent: diffendient 1541, parloient: tollerent 948, voient: elirent 1129, dirent: counselliorent 1479, aproti ent: accordient 2424, releverent: guidoient 2784. A number of these "preteritos" may be conditionals in which, as suggested above, the ending has undergone reduction to /ent.

(d) -Ent preterites rhyme with - silent preterites, (perhaps through a stage represented by the rhyme furent: muerent 2458, or simply by shifting the accent on to the ending), e.g. furent: ame rent 1777, chanterent 3087, aprestiorent: urenent 1899, durent: chaierent 2903.

Such "rhymes" as guercient: fusent 862 do not enter into any of the above classes. The last two verbs, however, as well as morgent: devient 2901 occur at the end of lines containing seven syllables only, unless the -ent is counted. Perhaps, therefore it was intended to be accented and counted, in these and other cases given above. This idea is supported by occistant (at end of line containing six syllables without -ent): wusomenti 742, vequent (item): attargent 2133, chanterent (seven syllables without -ent): firmament 2955. Verbal -ent thus seems capable of
receiving an accent if necessary for the rhyme. Vising quotes
malement; ferirent, solayeont; sent from Political Songs (Wright),
and reminds us that Gaston Paris showed that such rhymes were not
unknown on the continent. It seems apposite to note that there was
in medieval Irish poetry a rhyming tour de force called aird-rinn
in which an accented syllable at the end of the first line of a
couplet rhymed with an unaccented one at the end of the second,
( or the accent could fall on the penultimate and antepenultimate
respectively) as in the lines:

     The slender free palms of her
     Than gull on sea are whiter.

     Though men owe respect to them
     Presage of woe - a poem.

     A far greater than any
     Man has killed my Company.

Hyde, who gives these translated examples, (Literary History of
Ireland, p. 483) points out that a highly evolved poetical tech-
nique, including aird-rinn and the seven-syllable line, existed
by the seventh century in Ireland, and supports feusa's opinion
that Europe owes rhyme to the Colts. Were the seven-syllable line
and the rhymes discussed above, which appear to require shift of
accent, really borrowed from Ireland by the Anglo-Normans? Of
course, if our author was Irish, he would merely been utilising
what had already been the property of the bards of his native
land for centuries. It happens, however, that the two best known
Anglo-Norman pieces of Irish origin, the Fortification of now
Ross (Harl. 913), and Dornot, have no examples of this species
of rhyme. The latter is indeed remarkable in the non-appearance
of -ent verbal formae at the rhyme. Both are of course much ear-
lier than Egerton.
There remain four pairs of line-endings which seem neither rhymes nor assonances in the form written, dieux; autiers 910, names; meins 2244, (correct rhymes in Wace - see Phonetics) Anglovin; Poitou 2154 (this seems absent-mindedness when Anjou was available), avoit; demeintemant 1831. There are also five lines which do not rhyme, generally through abridgment of Wace, though as a rule truncated portions are joined with some ingenuity. These are vv. 575 (or 577 - the endings of 575-7 are: aun6, fosse, Escoco ), 2109, 2546, 2567, 2806, (the author probably considered that porté 2109 rhymed with espeau, achevé (fem.) in the following verses. There is another example of three lines in rhyme at vv. 1766-8. Omur rhymes with itself at 101-2 - there seems unhooding repetition in this passage; Wace's rhyme is amor; honor. Anforco also rhymes with itself at 1977-8, but the word may have different meanings in the two cases. There is an example of rime embrasse at vv. 2212-5, and numerous cases of four lines rhyming together.

Vising, once more, is of the opinion, with Meyer, that this phenomenon is characteristic of the Anglo-Norman poets, occurring early, he says, and in the most correct poems. (Anglo-Norman Lang. and Lit.p.68). In actual fact, of the 58 groups of 4 lines containing one rhyme in our ms (55 in the part based upon the Brut) 29 are borrowed from Wace's original. Many of the others are caused by the bringing together of rhyming lines through the cuts made in Wace's text. The latter shows, besides many other cases of 4-line rhyme-groups not given in our ms, at least two cases of 6-line groups (Le Roux de Lincy's edition, vv. 6053-5, 10048-53, Arnold's edition 6697-6702, 9803-8, 7023-8). It looks as if the origin of this feature is Norman rather than Anglo-Norman.
A tendency has been noted to divide the lines of this piece rhythmically into hemistiches. This impression is heightened by a number of internal rhymes and assonances falling on the fourth syllable or second stressed syllable in the line, a common feature in English ballad verse. Accident may be their explanation, as of other phenomena noted, but they seem more numerous in the present text than in Wace, certainly more numerous in Le Houx de Lincy’s text. Examples:

L 5033: Qui i vint a vint mil escus
A 4916: Ki vint od plus de mil escuz
E 22: Ki vint od plus de mil escud

E 87: Arvirague, qi esteit pruz (in neither ed. W)
E 92: Et al lancier, et al jetter (in both ed.)
E 106: Une fille ad qe li durrast

L 5338: A 5215 Parler od de Jesu Crist
E 573-4:Parler od de Jesu Crist

E 5734: Plus de xv mil en ont oís (not in either ed.)
Ke des Norris qe de Danois

L 6982:Od les Saisneset od Bretons (as A)
E 931:Od ses Soissons,od ces Bretons

L 6886: Et dont estes etu alés
A 6728: U fustes nez et que querez.
E 871: Ou fustes nez et qe quorrez.

L 6846: Mais d’autre part fu angoises
A 6690: Mais de dous choses est ainsus
E 837: Mais de dous chose fu anguisoue

E 1006: Le jour manjurent et tant burent (L,A, have regular preterite)
E 1140: Lez l’abbuye d’Aumebirle (L Ambresbger, A Ambresbire).

L 7625: Si li dist, se estre poeit
A 7437: Si demanda s’estre poeit
E 1267: Si demandeit qe estre poeit.

E 1384: Flambe voler, maisons chaier (L caoir, A chaier
E 1414: Naferez chair, chaiz murir (L caoir, A chaer)

L 8114: E tot si baron altresi
A 7910: E tresuit si home altresi
E 1466: Et tote si homme altresi.
The cases of assonance between the medial and final syllable, many of them not to be found in Wace, are too numerous to be quoted. Not a few may have been considered rhymes by the author, judging by the standards of rhyme shown above. There are also a few examples of rhyming at the homistich, some of them in Wace. The following is not in this author:

"Arthur" out noun de sa bounté,  
Dunt grant renoun ad puis esté (1875-6)

The second line is changed from "A grant parole a puis esté" (L 9052, A 8818).

In the matter of rhyme, them, as well as of metrics generally, our author resembles most contemporary writers of French in England, "Il prend son bien où il le trouve". If he could take such liberties as we have noted to satisfy the eye, we cannot suppose he shrank from similar ways of pleasing the ear, producing, like other Anglo-Norman poets, an astonishing medley of good and even ingenious rhymes with others whose secret we have lost, if they had one. We are reminded irresistibly in his work of the versification of traditional English poetry which has come down to us from those times. The lines on the birth of Edgar, the first six of which seem to show a change from 4-stress to 3-stress rhythm are surely the echo if not the substance of a Christmas carol:

Icol oure q’il nasquie  
Seint Dunstan en oie
To such versification it would be useless to apply the rules of French prosody. There is no notion of the rhythm attained by syllabic correctness but, as we have seen, there is reason to suspect that other concepts of rhythm, and of prosody in general, are yielding their influence. As the insular language had its own development, almost cut off from that of the continent, the metrics adapted to it must have undergone similar change. A nation does not lose its native rhythm because it lisps in foreign numbers.

The study of this markedly altered version of a classic shows it to be an important document for the history of Anglo-Norman and English versification.
Kenoelin out deus fit, "ider, l'ain neez,
Et Arviragun le pule neez.
Diz anz fu Rois, et puis finast,
Et Wider, sun fit, uritast.

5 Del amour as Romans ol n'out cure,
Ne mm our volt faire nule dreiture;
D'Engleter leur deceisie,
Et tote leur treud entollie.

CLAUDIUS mult sei dedaignaust:
10 Emperere ert, sun chief jurast
Ke our Treud restournerast,
Et Wider desheritardat.
Per comune cunseille del sené
Ad tant chivalché et erres,

2 b 15 Et od grant oct qu'il assemblast,
Ke en Engleterre arivast;
Forte et terre prist a Forcestre.
Kuis fu tiel jour ni vousist entre.
L'emperere ad Forcestre assi,
20 Mais pesanz ou inz kel fu pris,
Car Wyder les ad socurud,
Ke vint od plus de mil escud,
Mnaembl od lui Arviragus:
Neu pouf suffir Claudius.
25 L'emperere out od sei Hamoun,
Sun cunseiller et sun baroun.
Cil ad vouf "ider combatre,
Romains ferir, Romains abatre:
Hurnpena sei ke ferait,
30 Goment occirc le purriet.
Un des Bretuns ad mort troved.
Le corps ad pris et deuarmad.
Des armes al Bretun n'armast,
Et as Bretuns s'entremellist.
35 Ensemble od les Bretuns alout.
Ensemble od les Bretuns parlout.
Hamon alast tant traversant,
Et tant armere et tant avant,
qe al Rei Wyder s'est acoustez,
40 Et jouste li fu lied a lied.
A un trestourne ke li Rei fist
Traist Hamon l'espée, si le ocist.

ARVIRAGUS, qi la aparcaut
Ke li Reis mort al terre jut,
45 Cez fu li primerz qi' trovast,
mais muit petite sei arestast:
L'amereure et la consaunce
Ad pris del Roi, sans demorance.
Privement s'en est armez,
Si vost est sur son destrer munter.

8 a
Dunc veisses chivalers poindre,
Covent tourner, sovent joindre,
Et le signe le Roi criar,
Et les brestus amonentier.

55
Nules home commastre nel' sont:
Suliant ce ceo Wyer li Rei fust.
Li Romeins fuient a deaen,
S'ont attendre sun coune.
En deux moitez les fiet partir,
Ne sui pointent entretenir.

Un partie as nesf tournant,
Et si sint sont entrer entrast.
Claudius est od ses turnez,
Et as nesf s'am est entrast.

65
Al bois turnant l'autre partie
Et se point turner a la Navye.
Ensemble od eus home est en fuiie,
Et Arviragus la suiue.

Tant ont de bois ce plaine corud
Ec au port ar nesf aint venud.
De sun chival home discendait,
Et un Neste etrner volst;
Arviragus l'ad cuncus,
Ke li severast le chief du bus.

70
ARVLAGUS out home mort,
Le coros lasquant gissant al nort.
En demenira ge eus ayint
Claudius al torre revint;
Totes nesf ad ramonelez,
Et a FORCETRE retournez.

Les murs ad freiez et despeschiez,
Et totes les homes exilaz.
Kant il out abatua FORCETRE,
Od quankil von vin al incestre;

85
Arviragus estit dedez
Od tot le plus de ces parenz.
Arviragus, ci estelt pruz,
De la Cité ort fora liuez,
Curent fiet de ses chivalers.

90
Et de ceus parz mist ses archiers.
Ja esteient al assemblaz,
Et al lancier, et al jetter.
Quant li rage boste et li veillard
Sei sunt trovez a une part:

95
La verde accrepresent de leur,
Si requierent l'Empereur
Rur demancer lui faireit.
Si pais ou bataille voleit;
Et il respondu boneement
100 Ke de la bataille n'ont il talent,
Ainz volt la pes et volt l'onor,
(1) Le mois de Rome est l'onor:
De nul autre gaine ad otre
Ne :mès de Rome est sa honore.

105 Arvirugus en honorast,
Une feile ad ce li durast
S'il volt soul sig homme devenir
Et de Rome son fee tenir.
Arvirugus l'ac grante,

110 Si sei sunt entifels acceuf,
En Winchester c'en hertsegrent,
Auns furent, si n'entre acordivrent.
Claudius out li Rei entmezé,
Par grant amour l'ac telise.

115 D'il sec et li Rome envioer
Cil ci en sunt exparenaez
Par Genuis faire amener
Ke Claudius deverait lonier.
Entre tant conquirt Orkenie
Par Arvirugus et erige.
Li gersager lur et lindrent,
Et al entrant est' ravinent,
3 b
Si'n amenerent Genuis,
Gant de corps, beai de vis.

125 A la machene marier
Et a leur covenantfermer,
Furent li baron de la terre
Entre Sales et Encletera,
Et Saverne, en un valée

130 Ke multi eloche et escraché.
Par cole plie mettre en remembrance
Firat a li tel honorance:
Ke uno cité i fundarent,
Et Gloucester li moullent.

135 Lant Genuis fu marié,
A cola noce fu coronce;
Empres les nocez fu la hume
Ke Claudius alast a Rome.

ARVIUGUS puis son vivant

140 Tint au Romains un covenant
Par l'amitez de la Reine,
Ne nez estoit de lur urino.
Parins, son fuz de mulier,
Ouz puis le regne a justiser.

145 Cil vesqui bien longement.
Et apres son defineement
Regnast Coil, ce fu sia fuz.
Od les Romeins fu cil Huiriz;(*)
Les lais Romeins out aprisc,

150 Et sans et ars de plusieurs guise.
Coil sui cunntint mult noblement,
Mult beale fu sa finesment.

(*) Capital LAT in ms.
Après en il fu six fiz Reis:
Luces out noun, mult fu curteis,

Et mult fu de grant honesté;
Par li creut saint Cristiennent
En Engleterre prinsemento.
Si vous mirrai cum saitement
Parler oist de Jhesu Crist,

Et deus miracles ce il fist.
Ait Aposoille envolant,
Doucenent il requerast
Envoyer lui ce il baptizerast,
Et si la ley li enseignat.

Cuant oso li apostolls,
A Dieu rendi graces et gloirs:
Ait rei envolant liuavat
Et un nocn compaignoun Ephas.
A lui vindrent, si le baptiserent,
Et la ley dieu li enseignerent.

Oure la Rei fu la maison
Et sa gent tout bostadé.

Li dieu Ephas retroient,
Et on les contrés aloient.

Par le Rei et par son otreiz,
A cum custome est et droiz.
On firent establer Eneas
Et de sur uco arcevescés.

Les temples ou li dieu estoient
Ou li home caynym creient,
Ont sanctifiez et mondez
Et li dieu sentir consacrez.

Lucy li heyn se fist mult lied
Ne li puple vint baptised.

Saint Ethlise de uen terrés feofat,
Et grant demeines lior donast.
Volunters oaindeu servy,
En pese regnast, et en pese fany.

A corus a Gloucestre jut;

Reis en dieu Cenit cingant anz et sia morust
Vuis que dieu Incarnation
Print sur nostre salvacion.

A terme de sa mortant
Douit li Reis Feoma ne enfant,

Ne procenue de suu parenté
Ki tenir toint li erité.

Saint as homeins vint a sauer
Se mort seloit lucien sans oir,
Deus reglems apparrièrent
Et en Bretaigne les enveloprent;
Et en senatour seuer
Sur la terre a leur oes gardier.
Sever vint od deus Legions,
Mais mult trovast Bretuna feluna,
Et nekedent tant guerreiaat,
Et tant pramist et tant donaat
Ke un partie a lui sumist
Par ki plus des autres cunquist.
Puis ont Astlepiadoc coroeud,
Et a leur Rei l'ont sacré.
Isse tindrent Bretaigne a force
Les Romeins od leur afforce.
Coel, une quiens de Gloucestre,
Eut dedeigne de leur estre.

Cil estoit de grant parage,
Et mult estoit de fier corage.
Od Astlepiadoc guerolaat;
Tant creut la guere, et tant vuntaast
Coel en bataille, si le venquis,
La Rei occist, l'onur seisie.
Od le branctiel coupe li dona
Ke juscald dentz le branct colla.
Qi k'en peisast, ne ki fu bel,
D'Engleterre fu Rei Coel.

Elle na Reine un feil out
Ke mult de arte et de clergie solt:
Mir le Rei soul estre devait,
Car fiz no feille altre n'avait.
Muit la fist li Rei bien apren dre,
Et mult i fist mestres entendre,
Fur cee qant li Reiist morust,
Le Regne enpres tenir sust.

DE Rome un baron remueit,
Costans out noun, mult l'em preisseit.
Espaigne avrait ancieus cunquis
Et sus l'Empire od Romeins mis.
Kant cil arivaet en Bretaigne
Muit out telo gent en sa campagne,
Cremuz fu, et sa gent cremu.

Coil, qe oist sa venu,
Cunte li melier ni ooaat;
Se grant pris ert, mult le doutaat.
Ses messagiers li ad tramise,
Si li ad offert et pramise

Et Bretaigne de li tendrad
Et le treud nomé rendrad,
Costans li ad bien otreied,
Si ont entr'eeis pris amistied.

EMPLR cee ert un mois passez,
En le secante estait entrez,
Coel out mal, si enfermast,
Et a chief de set jours deviaust;
Et Costans prist en foille Eleine,
Ci tint Breteigne en son demëino.

255
Ambe deus se firent coroner
À Londres, devant l'autier.
Un fìz ont entr'elus désiré,
Et dieux leur ad un fìz doncé;
Contentin ouf noum, mult l'amèrent,
Et de bien nutrir scit peinerent.

260
Unze anz petite plus aviez,
Sult amendéut et mult cressait,
Quant Costans chaist en lampour,
Ne pouf par mire aver retour;
Ceo fu la fin, morir l'estoet.

Costant amendéast et creut;
Li baron l'ont levé al Rei.
Et l'amèrent par droit fai.
Les Bretuns l'amast par su mer,
Et cœus de Rome par sun pier.

270
À Rome cœt a cel jour saxence,
S'il fu de compte eloquence,
Emperer mult orgellouse,
Sult fiel et mult maliciouse.

275
Les honurs de Rome prostast,
Et leur dignité steinst.
Les barons ni volent a Rome meindre,
À Costantin alicerent pleindre.

D'alor a Rome cil aprismast,

280
Archiers et chivalers amenast.
Treis uncles çi sa mere avait,
T'els mult amout et croyet,
Renent a Rome pur chierté.
Li a mist en ordre de sené.

285
Li une avezt noun Lëor, 
Le meno Trahern, li terce Marin.
Dunt fu Contentin Empereire,
Et Eleine, sa bone worre,
En Jerusalem trespassant,

290
Touz les veiles juas assemblest:
Bi fu par ly la croice troves
Ke lunge avezt esté calee.
Al uncle Eleine, Lyonin,
Donnat l'um femme de halt lin.

295
Un soul fiz urent, la noriren;
Aaximien norer le firent.

GEU se breteigne garder durent,
Ke par Costantin remis furent,
Octaves les priet, cis docolant;

300
Roi se fìst, si sei coronant.
Les provoitz occist et les cunctes,
Et les bailifs, et les viscantes.
Et Costantin a Rome estoit,
A greniours choses attendoit.

305
Un uncle Eleine i avet,
Trahern out noun, mult s'afioit,
Ki 'en Engleterre deliverast,
Et deus legions i amenast.
Trahern a Forcestrה tournast,

310 Deus jours ehtiers i sojournaot,
Puis li fu la cite renou,
Ne pout ni estre plus tenu.
A Wincestre d'ilooc alast,
Par force prendre la quelle;

315 Mais Octaves li s'int devant,
Ki n'alast mie attargeant.
En la champe qu'out noun tresure
Fu la bataile entr'els mult dure;
Mais li Bretun greindre force urent,

320 Et li Romeine sufrer nel' purent.
As porz les estoet repaire,
Et Trahern fisat ses nefa chargier.
Tant alant par la mere siglant,
Et tant alast avironant,

325 Ke en Escoce vint al rivage,
Grant mal i fist et grant damage.
Totes les viles ad roberez,
Et les richeces assemblez.
Octaves oint renovatem,

7a 330 Et pur veire l'em prist a cuuter
Ke Trahern Escoce gantout,
Aveir ne tresor n'i leissant.
Cel part s'en vint od grant ost,
Meint chivaler i amennout;

335 Mais Trahern pas n'i s'en fu,
Ainz vint contre li, si le venqu;
Et Octaves s'en alout fialant,
En Norweye aie querant
Al Rei Comperd, qi le secourast

340 Contre Trahern se il pust.
Triveement out priez
Touz ses amis qu'il out leesse
X'lis leur pourer s'entremelissent,
Et pur li Trahern occisent.

345 Tot est Trahern assuurez,
Et Rei estet par tot clamez.
Un jour ert de Lundres muz,
Mais si eirs estet trop seoz:
Par my un valez trespassnot,

350 Tote a seur, rien ne dotout,
Kant uns guiena de un aiat mailli,
Qe pur Octaves l'out habi;
Chivalers out od soi mult bones,
Trahern oisst entre les soons.

355 Dunc fist Octaves revenir
Et de Bretaigne le fist sesoir.
M'i ad uns Romeine lesesz
Ki'il n'ait ocis et detrenchiez.
Longes ad puis en peas tenud,
Et longes ad en peas vescud.
Kanf il out bien sun temps usé,
Et sun sage trespassé,
Purpensa sei q'il ferreit,
A ki sun regne guerperceit.

365 Un feile aveit, s'il vousist
Ke le regne enpres li tenist;
A ses amis en ad parlé,
Et aucuns d'els li ont lois
Ke uns des nobles Romeine mandast,
Sa feile od l'onur li donast.
Tiels i out qe Conan ame rent,
Neveu le Roi, si le loierent
Ke Conan del tote heritast,
Et sa feile alicours mariast.

370 UN noble conte aveit illoc,
De Cornewail, Caradoc.
Cil dit qe ja n'otrioreit,
Ne ja al Roi ne loireit
Ke Conan del regne heritast,-

380 Car puis aprés li'en peisorast—
Ne ke sun eire face de Conan,
Maio enveit pur Maximian,
Ke a Rome eirt, fiz Lyonyn,
Cosin Eleine et Costentin.

385 Li Reis se tint a cee cunsell,
Et Caradoc li Conte leil

1 a

...............................

390 ..... cement). ...........

395 (et dunt il venoit)
(Cum aveit noun et qe quereit)
Maximian mult enjoie
Del maundement q'il oie.

395 Al Rei vint, qi l'aveit mandé maundé,
Et li Rei l'ad mult honoré.
Sa feille a femme li donast,
Et de Bretaigne l'eatast.
Conan aie nece fu retournez,

400 Et ad Escoc com ajoutez;
Sun uncle et sa gent defiast,
Et Maximian guercoast.

405 Maximian sei defendie,
Ke li Rei out mie disesise;
Et par maintefois i perdi,
Et par maintefois le vanqui:
Issi avint bien par tel houre
Ke tiels perte qe puis secure.
A la parfin les assemberent

410 Li sage homme, siis acordierent;
Et Maximian li pramist
Riche home a faire, et si le fist.

EN trois anz tresurs aunast,
Et grant avere, si s'en vantast

415
Ke vers France mere passerait,
Et as fançois sei cumbateris,
Et les Romeines guerereis.

Pur Valentin et Gracien q'il haizit,
Qe cuntre li Rome tenoient;

420
Ne cuncorde ne li qu'avoient.
Maximian s'aparaleit,
Grant gent ouit, grant avers portoiet;
Cum li home de grant bobanc;

425
Vers occident, el chief de France,
Arivast en une cunté
Qe est Armoriche appellé.

Humbaoe, qe sire ert del pais,
Maundast sa gent et ses amis;
La terre lour voult deforciier,

430
Et de sun fee les volt chacier.
Mais li breton furent plus fort,
Ki de ses hommes ont mainte mort:
Ne sei purrent pas demorer,
Lur Duce fu mort, c'il vont fuir.

435 "Sire Conan, dit le Roi, ore tones
Le pais qe ai cunquestez."
Conan ad le doun receud,
Et mult l'en ad graces rendud.
Issi fu la terre voidee

440
Et as Bretuns tote lessé.
Pur ceo Bretaigne minor l'unt nomé,
Pur Bretuns qi l'ont cunquesté.
Et Maximien, qi mult mult sout,
Et qu la terre poepler volt,

445
D'Engleter fist amener
Cent mil vilaines a laborer,
Et trente mil chivalers
Pur le pais edifiers.
Duno ad fait Conan coroner,

450
Et les forcelettes deliverer.
Ne volt pas sojournier aitant,
Vers France passast avant.
France cunquist, et Lorenga,
Et Treves fist chief de sun regne.

455
Duno prist vers Rome sun chemin
Sur Gratien et Valentin;
Lumbardie et Rome cunquist,
L'un en chaceast, l'autre ocist.

460
Tot l'empire ad seisie,
N'i ad nule qe li cuntre die.
A Dyanoth, un soen vassal,
Un Gentile home. et un leal.
Aveit Engletere deliveré
Et la Justice commande.

Cil aievit un feile mult bel
Xi esté apelé Ursel.

FRANÇAIS, qu'furent rebaudi,
Ont Conan de guere accilli;
Mais Conan est bien difendud,
Unkes par eis ne fu venceud.

Pur la terre meulz gaigner,
Pur meulz poeplier, pur herbergier,
Et pur sa gent asseurir,
Volt as hommes femmes doner.

Ne lour volt pas donner francies,
Ne pur eforce, ne pur richeces,
Ne pur linage entremeller,
Ne pur terres acomuner.

Pur ceo fist Dyanoth requere,
Qi aievit en garde Engletere,
Ke sa feille li otreiast,
Ursel, se luy envoiast,
Et des feiles as vavesours
Et n'avient uncore seignurs,
Li enveleit qank'il purreit,
Et il bien les marriereit.
Dyanoth ad sa feille otreiast,
Et od grant richesces enveleit.

Unze mil meschines ad assembliez,
Totes des gentils hommes nez.
En nefes a Londres mis furent,
Od ceus qu'cundure les durent.

Aval Tamise sunt corud,
Et de si en la mere venud.

Lour avint un tempeste merveilouse,
Et une nue mult pluviose,
Ke le vent fist devant turner,
L'air vertir, le jour obscurer:

Unkes n'oistes tant soudainement
Tempeste sourdre ne turment,
En mult poi de oure nefes traverser,
Et mainte nefes perilier.

Xi dunc oist orier meschines,
Et enhauicier voises femines,

Mult par i: ouz Nefes periliez.
Et meschines a doel nelez.
Li uns qz se eschapiereit
Entre pailens ariverent;
Octis furent, ou vendud,

Ou en servage retenud.
Dis mil des puceles preised
A Coléigne furent occisés;
Maint en ront en la mer trové

"alins et Melga, esgardé."
Walins esteit Rois de Hungrie,
Par mere alout od grant Navye;
Walga esteit de Cise sâro,
Ki les meschines en fist ocire.
Les mariners gi les guient

A Walins et Walga disoient
Cum Angleter ert afbebie,
Kar meint bon chivaler en ort passé:
A Rome en ort partie alé,
Ke Maximian en ort mené;
Conam en ort grant partie,
Si est la terre desgarnie.
De la novele sunt li paiens les,
C'ili sunt tout par Escoce envoye:
Tot destmurerent et exilent,

Unc home n'i esparnisent.
Empres unt Hombre passé,
Tot le pleine pais ont gasté.
Mandé ont Bretuns pur Maximian,
Et il leur tramist Gracian,
Un chivaler mult socurable,
De deus legions Conestable.
Cil ad les Bretuns socuruz,
Et les paiens sunt dolorouse.
D'Engleterre touz les jetta,
Et en Irlande les chacea.

ENTRE tant vindrent li cosyn
Et li bon parent Valentin
Par Theodosien de Orient,
Un Rei de grant afforciement.

Maximian a force priastrent
En Aquilé, si le ocistrent.
Des Bretuns qi furent od lui
Sunt alkuns mort, alkuns fui,
Et Valentin r'ad ceo seisie

Gratian ne fist nient plus,
Ke d'Engleterre out lo deus.
Chivetaigne sei fist et Rei,
Si demenast mult grant noblei.

Kant Walins et Walga oirent
Ke Bretuns Rei de Gracian firent,
Assemblé ont les Colandeis
Et les Norreis et les Daneis,
Et ceus d'Escoce et ceus d'Irlande,
Si purpristrent Northumbraelinde.
Humber od lur genz passerent,
O Kastels et viles descartierent.
Li Breton virent la tristour
Et le desert faire de lour:

Al Senatour ont derechief
Mandé par home et par bref.
Li senatour seulement
Les envoieit ignélement
Un Legion des chivalers

570
Li munt furent pruz et piers.
Walms et Melga oui en jettorent
Et en Escoco les echacierent;
Plus de quinze mil en ont ocis,
Le des Norreis ce de Danelia.

575
Morter et pier ont suné,
Un mure firent sur un fosse
Entre Anglieterre et Escoco.
Quant il urent tote achevé
Le mure c'il urent cumpareé,

580
As grants barons del puis
Ont a Lundres parlement pris.

UN sage Romeine i fu ce parlant,
De la parole avant mostrast.
"Seignours, dit-il, maint grant perte,

595
Et maint grant perte ont avuet
Ascuns de nos anciensours,
Et nous ensement pur vos amours.
Vous nous avez treud doné,
Et nous l'avom bien achacié;

600
Et nous l'avom un an eud.
Le Deus enz aures l'avum perdua;
Notre treud nous retoliez,
Tat encontre geor le nous rendez.
Neulz nous valdret le treu gurpir

605
Le issi lunes deservir.
"Li ouoms venir tantes feiz:
Fetes le meuz ce vous ouier.
Quant vous vos terres ne defendez,
Balzement autres cunquerez:

610
Fetes franx tours et chastels fors
Sur les rivages et les pors;
Maintenez bien vostre franchiso;
Si vous ostez d'autri servise,
Vous ferez bien vostre voile."

A cele parcie ont grant doel,
Dunc ont pris leur congé

615
Et li Romein sei sunt alié;
Et bien distrent al departir
Es jameis ne gudent revenir.

Orant fu la doel de la fut
Kant detennir ne les poust.

"ALLIS et Seign ont orez
Les noveles par lour cûpies,
Ke li Romein finaiblement

620
Avetent pris departiment.
Od les Fictiens et les Daneis,
Od les Escoces, od les Norreis,
En Newhthumbrelant entrerent,
Ardent, destucent et robbeart.
Desi k'al Mure n'ont rien leseez
Qe tot n'aint exille.
Li Bre ton ont le mure garmye,
Et cils defors l'ont assailli.
Dunc voises d'amparz

625
Gaveloas lancier et darz.
Li Bre ton kes kerneus guerpirent
Et qe ainz pout discendirent.
Cils de fores sun al mure mante,
En pluurs lues l'ont effundre.

630
Empres l'ont tote aplaneez,
Fosse et mure esquassez,
Chasteles et vilees ont purpris,
Et des Bre tung ont meinz oois.
Partot alerent a baundon,
N'i troverent difezechion.

LY Eveskes s'entre assemberent,
Dolent furent, et mult douterent
Ke par cele gent aliene
En perrierat la lei cristienne.

640
A Lundres esteit a icaue tense
Un Arcevesque mult eloquence,
Guincelins, de mult graunt clergie,
Et al esteit de bone vie.

645
Guincelin, cist bon Arceveskes,
Par le cunisile de ces Evesques,
En Bre tai gne Minor trespassant
Qe Conan des Bre tung poeplast.
Aldrogen, qe l'onur teneit,
Quart Reis apres Conan esteit.

650
Li Arcevesque tant errast
Ke Aldrogen le Roi trovast.
Li Reis le fist mult honurer,
Car mult l'avait oie loier.
Demandeit li qe quereit,
Ke de si longe a lui voneit.

13 a
"Sire, d'outre mere au venu cam,
Zar grant bosoigne me en chacoa.
Sire, tu parler oie n'en aies
Des grantez dolours et grantez plaiss.

660
Ke Bretun ont sovent aud
Puis qe il Rois Maximian fud,
Ki l'onur qe tu tiens cunquist,
Et qe Conan seignur en fist.
Jadis solient li Bretun

665
Conquere mainte Region:
Ore ni poeint mi soulement
La leur difender d' altre gent.
Nous n'avons prince ne Rei,
Et li valens sans lai"
670 Ont nostre terre si cunquis,
Et la gent tot si suspris,
Jamais, jeo crei, ne resurdrom
Se d'autre part aucurs n'aiom.
Bosoigne avom, ore nous succure,
Si t'ert turné a grant honur."

13 b

ALDROGEN, qi mult fu mult pitoueo,
Devint tote tristes et plurse.
"Si jeo, dist-il, vous puis valer,
Jeo ne vous faudrai a mun power.

680 Costentin, mun frero, en meneres,
Et Conetable li foroz.
Deus mil armez li livrai
Des plus prises que jeo averai."
Duno ad Costentin demandé,

685 Al Arceveseq l'ad deliveree.
Eoit Guin celins l'eggardast,
Leuaat la destre, si's seignast;
Puis en ad dit: "Cristus regnat,
Cristus vincit et imparat."

690 Od mult riche apparailement
Les mist as nefs des que out vent;
Et Aldrogen moismes od els alonst
Se il pust et il osast,
Mais il avet guere as francois.

695 Costentin vint a Toteneia,
Vers Lundren tindrent lour eir,
De touz parz Bretuns faient mandar-
Ke vous feroie-jeo longe ploie?
Tant ont erré et tant fait

700 Ke la malvai gent ont vencu
Qi la terre avet cunfundu.

PUIS tindrent cuncel a Circestre,
Tout li baron i durant estre.
Costentin ont al Rei esait

705 Sans cuntredit et sans respit,
L'ont a grant joi coroné,
Si l'ont fait lour avowé.
Empres li ont femme doné
Ke des gentils Romeins eurt né.

710 Treis valetz out, et li plus grand
En fist li Roi apeler Costanz.
A Winestre le fiat nurir,
Et là le fiat Eoigne devenir.
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Empres fu nez Aureliu,

715 Sis surnons fu Ambroxiu;
Derainenemt Uter nasqui,
Ceo fu cil que plus venqui.
Si Costentin longo regnan,
Tote la terre en amendast,
Mais trop morunt hastivement:
Duze ad re hont 'an' eirrent.
Un des liottieus out en sa maison,
Un traître, un mal felon.
Où le menaist en un vergier
725 Cum c'il le vouast conseiller,
S'espé out trait, si le ferri,
Le Roi occia, si s'en fui.
Où de la terre s'assemblerent;
Roi voulrent faire, s'il douterent
730 De quel des valetz Roi fereint,
Petit erent, et poi savoient.
Costanz li ains néz, qui estoit meire,
N'assoient del habite attreire.
Un des deus avoient choisie,
735 Quant Vortiger avant saillie:
Paioi fu, et en Gaiez manoit,
Riches homez est. et Quiens estoit.
Al parlement fu cil venu,
De leur dit fu toto esmeu.
740 "Ke alez vous, dit-il, tant dotant?
Feriez Roi del goigne Costant.
Dreitz heir est; tolum l'abite,
Car li aitre sunt trop petite."
Urible chose leur semoivent,
745 Mais Vortiger, ci mal pensoit,
A Wincestre est venu poignant,
Tant aluest Costans demandant
Co par le cungied del Priour
Parlaist a lui al parlour.
750 "COSTANS, dist-il, morz est tis pers,
Ramis est la terre a tes frers.
Mais tu des heritablement
La reigne tenir primereiment."
Et Costans li ad tot graunté:
755 "Fetec, Sire, tum volunte."
Et Vortiger aemores le prist,
Et fore del Abbeie le menist.
A Lundres l'ad d'iloec mené,
L'i out guera repele aué.
760 Iloec Costan la corone receut,
L'ordre guerp ci tenir dust.
Vortiger, qe traiit fu,
Al Roi Costans est venu.
"Sire, dit-il, jeo sai de voir,
Et jeo te del faire savoir,
Quo assemblé sunt li Danois
Et de Norweie li Norreis,
C'ilz volent en ceo pais entrer,
Et tes chastezls prendre et gastier.
765 Enco garnir et garder tes Tours:
Grant pouer i ad des traitours,
Si t'estoet tes chastezls livere
A cels qui sacen bien gardier.
- Amis, dit li Rois, beaus amis,
Je suis tout en tûn conseille remis.
Prêne ma terre toute à ta garde,
Que nule n'ët tolë, ne riens n'ët arde.
Prêne mes dîtes, prêne mes aëers,
Prêne mes tresors, prêne mes maërs.
- Sirî, dis-ît, si vous plaiseit,
Lun looo et mun conseille serëit
Ze tu envoies pur chivalere
Des Pictiëns, des Escocë a soulôers,
Ze od toë saient en ta cort:

Quele part vostre guerre court,
Pictiëns purrez bien envoyer
Lë ou tu averas mesther.
- Fai, dis-ît Li Rœis, a tûn plaiseit:
Tant cum tu vols en face venir."

RANT Vortiger ouë tot sesëis,
Et le tresor totë recûllëis,
Des Pictiëns manœst tant cum il plout;
Et oill vindrent ei cum il volt.
Vortiger mult lez honœraët,
Bien les paëst, bien les amœst.
Tant lour ad Vortiger donë,
Et tant ad chacœn honœrë,
N'i ouë un soul qi ne deist, (7)
Oiant que oir le vouaëis,
Ke Vortiger ertz plus suëis
Et mult valeiët mëals ze li Reïs.
Bien fu digne d'aver l'onur
Ke li Reïs ad, ou greïnour.
Vortiger c'en glorifïout,
Et puis plus les honerout.
Un jour les out enbevered,
Et toûz les out saluëd.
"Muit vous aime, dit-îl, chivalers,
Et servî vous ai volunërs.

Le Reï ai rentës en caste terre:
Aîeurs m'estoët plus aër quere.
En le Reï servise ai mës m'ëntent,
Si n'ai pas de li tant deënt
Dunt jeo tienne honouremente -
Garante serjanz soulœment,
Si jeo cunquerë al repaires:
Ore m'en vois a vos cungied."
Vortiger aïtant s'en turnënt,
Faus fu, et fraudëmënt parlaët.

Li Pictiëns dient: "Ce ferom
Si nous caste bon seignur perdum?
Cest fol Reï occiom,
Et Wortiger al Reï levom."

Aîtant sunt en la chambre entrë,
Le Reï ont pris et deëlë,
Le chief li ont del bus sevërez.

(7) le in ms.
A Vortiger l'ont presentez.
Cil conust le chief sun Seignour,
Semblant ad fait de graunt tristour.

830 Pur sa felonie celer
Fist les Lundrais assembler,
Les traitres fist touz decoler,
N'i lessast une vifs eschapier.

VORTIGER out les fermetez,
Les chastels et les cites.
Reis se fist, mult fu orgoilouse,
Mais de deus chose fu anguisouse:
Del un part qi le gueroient
Li Pictiens qe mult le manacent,
D'autre part mult sei grevout
Ke tote gent li destinout
Qe li deus frere armes aveient,
Et a brefe terme revendroient,
Et les baron les receivreient,
Et lour fee de els tendroient;
Costans lur frere vengierent
Car gent merveilouse amenerent:
Assez eart qi duneit noveles.
Entre tant vindrent treis vassels

835 A un porte en Kent ariverent,
Ki gent estraunge sportierent,
Od beaus vaineurs, od grantz corps:
Lour sire fu Hengist et Hors,
Dieu frere de grant estature

840 Et d'un estraunge parlure.
A Vortiger, qe a icel jour,
Ki ert a Cantorbië a sojour,
Fust tost la novele cunctee
Ke estrange gent d'autre regne

845 Esteient arives, treis nafez
Mult belement atirez.
Li Reis rovast qe cil fusent,
Si pews ou guere queroient:
"Alez tost, si les amenez."

850 Li barons sunt al terre hastez,
Devant le Roi sunt venu,
Gentement li ont salu.
Li Roi regardast les deus freros,
As corps bien fait et faces clers:

855 "De quelle terre, dit li Roi, venez,
Cu fustes neez, et qe quarruz?"
Hengist, qe Nieire et ainz nez fu,,
Pur touz ensemble ad respundud:

"DE Saxson, dist-il, venimes,
Là fuums nez, et là manimes.
Si tu voiz cier l'encheun

860 Ke nous par ceste mere querum,
Jo t'en dirai la verité
Si nous eions ta seureté.

880  - Dy, dit li Rois, ta reison tot,
Ja mar de nuls n'averez dout.
- Beau Reis, dit Hengist, gentil sire,
Ne sai si unkes l'ois dire:
Nostre terre est de gent naie

885  Plus habundable et plentive
Qe nul altre qe vous savez,
Ne dunt vous ja oir purrez.
Nos gentz merveilles multipliant,
Et li enfant trophe fructifiant;

890  Trop i ad femmes et trop hommes,
Geo puis nous peiser qe ci sumes.
Qant nostre gent est tant creue
Et la terre en est trop vestu,
Li princes a ki les terres sunt
Totes le mures assembler fent
Ki de vint ans sunt ou de plus,
Si cum costume est et us:
Tot li melicour et li plus fort
Sunt mis fors del pais par sort.

900  Si vont par autres Regions
Pur quere terres et mansions.
Pur le sorte qe sur nous chai
Avoms nostre pais guerpi,
Et Mercurius nous governast,

905  Un dieux qe nous acunduast.4

KANT li Rois li oiamt nomer
Le dieu q'ils ont a gouverner,
Demandast li qcl dieu aveit,
Et en quim quele dieu sa gent crecit.

910 "Nous avoms, dit-il, plusieurs dieux
A ki nous devons faire autiers:
Geo est Phebus et Saturnus,
Jubiter et Mercurius.
- Malement, dit li Roi, creez,

915  Et malvais damideu avez.
Geo poise moi, et nekedent
Bele m'est de vostre avenement.
Vaillant homes et fortz ressemblez,
Et si vous servir me volez,

920  Touz ensemble vous retendrai,
Et riches homes vous ferai."
Et oll ont le Roi pramis
De li servir a sun devia.

NE demorast pas longement
Ke li Pictiens efforcieme
En la terre le Roi entrersent,
Ardent, destruent et robbrent.
Kant le Humber dusent passar,
Li Reis, qe en est parlar.

AUN t l unstel...
Od ses Beissons, od ces Bretons.
Dunc veisses bataille dure,
Mult i out grant discumfiture.
Par Hengist et par son adjutoire
935
En out Vortiger la victoire.
Li Roi a Hengist dona maners
En Lindesey, et bones aviers.
Hengist sott bien le Roi gloser
En guise du faus losengier.
940
Un jour trovast le Roi hautez,
Si l’ad a cunselle areisonz.
"Tu m’as, dit il, mult honurez,
Et assez m’as del toen donez;
Mais j’ai assez apareud,
Asez oi, et assez veud
Qu tu n’en as Barou qi te aime:
Chesun te heet, chescun te pleine.
Ne sai de quels enfanz parioient,
Ke de tun Realme l’onur te tollerent. (*)
950
Jusc’al poi de terme vendrunt,
Et ceste terre toi tollerunt.
Pur ceo m’en pense de tei aider,
Si voil en ma terre enveiner
Pur ma femme, pur mes enfanz.
955
Et pur altres apurtenanz.
Jeo t’ai ja grant piece servy,
Si ai pur tei meint enemy.
Ne puis par nuit estre a seur
Hors de chantel ne hors de Mur.
960
Pur ceo, sire si tei pleiseit,
Tun pris et tun grant preud serreit
Qu tu mei donase Citez,
Ou Chastelé ou fermetez
Ou jeo, sire, me pu guerir
965
Et a seur par nuit dormir.

- PUR ta gent, dit li Rois, enveie:
Bale les remeive, bel les cunreie.
- Sire, dit Hengist, grantez a moi,
A un des maners qu jeo sai,
970
Un recette clore et enforcier,
Et tant de terre, plus ne requer
Cum jeo purrai un cuire estendre,
Et od le cuire entoure purprendre:
U cuire de tor tant sullement,
975
Si g’irrai plus aseement."
Vortiger li ad graunte
Et Hengist li ad mercié.
Sun messager apparellant,
Et pur ses parenz et femme envoias.
980
Un cuire de tor prist, si le fendi,

Un coreie si estendie,
Dunt un grant terre avironast,
Bones overers prist, chastel fermast.
Ceste noun "Suongcastre" li ad mis,
En la langage de sun pais;
"Chastel de cornes" en Romance,
"Kam Kehari" en Bretanco.

KIST Suongcastre fu tot fermez.
De ceux que Hengist out mandez
Vindrent din uit nefs chargiez
Des chivalers et des meinsoz.
Sa feile li ont amené,
Ki n'ert pas uncore murié.
Rowen out noun, ei ert puceal;
A grant merveille ert gent et beal.

A un jour q'il out esgardé
Ad Hengist li Roi envelé
A venir od lui herbergier,
Et de(du)ir et manquier,
Et pur veor sa noele gent,
Et sun noele herbergiemont.
Li Reis vint esgariement,
Ki volt estre priveement.
Le chastel vist, l'overine gardast;
Muilt fu bien fait, mult le loiaist.
Le jour manjurent, et tant burent
Ke a eise tote s'en furent.
Dunt est fors de la chambre iissuz
Rowen, la mesohine et bun vestuz.

Fleine coupe du vine portast,
Devant le Roi s'agenulast.
Muilt humblement li enclinast,
Et a sa lei le saluast:
"Laverd, King, Wesaile;" ad dit.

Li Reis demandant et enqu ист,
Ki le langage ne saveit,
Ye la mesohine li diseit.
Cheredio respundi primers:
Bretun ert, ei ert bons latiners.

Ceo fu li primes des Bretuns
Ki solt les langages as Saxons.
"Sire, Rowen, dit-il, t'ad salué,
Et Seignur et Rei t'ad appelé.
Custume est, sire, en lour pais,
Kant ami behvent entre amis;
Dunc ciz diz "Wesaile" qi deit beivre,
Et "Drinshaile" qi deit receivre.
Dunc beict cic tote ou la meitez,
Et pur joi, et pur amistiod;
Al hanap receivre et bailier
Est custume d'entre baiser."
Li Reis, si cêm cil l'ad apris,
Dist "Drinchnile," et si surist.
Rowen beut, et puis li bailea,
1035 Et en baileant le Roi baisa.
Rowen estoit devant le Roi defublé,
Xì merveilloure l'ad esgardé.
Tant l'ad li dieble amové,
1040 Xì mainte home ad a mal turné,
D'amour et de rage le print
De esporer le seilc Hengist.
Sempré l'ad o Hengist rové,
Et Hengist l'ad molt totst granté.
Mais Hengist ad conseille.
1045 Où sun frere, F'estêt senad,
Fe li Roi li doint delivrement:
20 b Si demande en drurie Kent.
Li Reis coveitnat la maschine,
Amé fent, et la fent Reine.
1050 Le jour l'améêt, si la out le seir,
Et Hengist prist Kent aveir.

VORTIGER out Rowan esposéd,
Mais molt l'ad il amé.
Treis fisz avoit de luy oui,
1055 Xì ja erent totse narceud:
Li primer out noun vortimer,
Et puis Pasens et Katiger.
"Sire, dit Hengist al Roi,
Tu es partie haiez nur moi:
1060 Si tu vols asseur regarer,
Et ceus qi te haient grover,
Entavez pur mun fisc Octa,
Et pur sun coevn Waisa.
Vers麾cez lour donne terre,
kar d'illoec vint totens ta guere,
"Rai, dit li Roi, our tu vouldras:
Mannaz touz ceus à bones saveras."
Et Hengist sempré envoient,
Sun fisc et sun Nueaud mandast,
1070 Et cils vinrent ad treis ont nefs,
N'i ad bone chivaler romen.
Tost furent si munte,
As cristienns entremelk
Avizunc conuntrez l'om (*)
1075 Xì ert cristien, ne li noun.
As Bretona ad molt anuez,
Et si ont al Rei dit et priez
Ke cela estrange gent ne creie,
Et de sa terre les enveie.
1080 Li Reis leur dist ke nun ferast:
Bien le sovent, mondé les ad. (*)
Dunc se sunt Breton assamblé,
A Landres sunt totst alé.

(*)See p. 129. (**)les for le in ms; cf. p.107.
Vortimer ont al Roi levée,
L'un des trois fit li Roi, l'ainz nee.
Cil ad les Caissons defied,
Et de la terre les ad jetted.
Vortiger, pur l'amour sa mere,
Tint od els, ne sa volent lesser:
Vortimer tint od les Bretuns
Cuntrre sun pier et ses burons;
Par qatre foiz sei cumbati,
Et par qatre foiz les venqui.
Kant li Saisson virten qe ne garirent
Si la terre ne guerpisent,
Tranmis ont le Roi Vortiger
Ke il pri sun fiz Vortimer
qe aler les leiis quitement,
Sans faire puis d'empereinent.
Endementirs cum le Roi alout,
Et cel treud purchaseout,
Saisson sunt en leur nefs entrez,
Vent ont bon, si ont siglez.
[Vent ont bon, fort ont siglé]
A grant pour n'en eschapient,
En leur cuntrés n'en realerent.

OIEZ cum fait diablerie
Par grant hange et par envie:
Rowen la Reine, cum malé marastre,
Fist emposoner sun filaster
Vortimer, qe eal haeit,
Pur Hengist qe chacled esteit.
Dunc refu fait Vortiger Reis,
Si cum out esté auncein.
Pur sa femme, qe li en priast,
Pur Hengist en Saisson mandast;
Ceo li mandast q'il repairast,
Mais petite de gent amenast
Ke li Bretun ne sei afreisament,
Et de rechief sei remellassent.
Hengist repairast volunteres,
Mais il amenast tres cent millers
D'omes armez - Bretuns cremain.
Si ferait el qe einz n'avait.
Hengist, qe out le queor falun
Mandast al Rei par treisun
Ke pees et treud lour donasent,
Et entre tant a eux parlassent:
Pees amient et pees voloint,
Cels retiient q'ils elirten.
Bretun ont le treud doné.
Et d'amparz fu afié.
Ke se cremaiseit de treisoun?
Del parlement ad mis un jour,
Et li-Rois mandast a Hengist
Le esgarniement venist,
Qua nuie arme n'i eit porté
Pur poor de mover wellée.

22 a 1140

Æs granz plaigues de Salesbirie,
Lez l'abbeye d'Aumesbirie,
Vindront de deus parz a ceo plai
Le jour des Kalendes de May.
Hengist out touz ses campaignuns
Bien enseignez et bien somons

1145

K'en iour faudes cuteals possasent
Ties q' amparz trenchacent:
Kant iis as Bretuns parloient,
Et tot entremellé seroient,
"Nime ure sexes!" crierieit,

1150

Ke nul des Bretuns n'entendreit;
Chescun dunc sun cotel preait
Et sun procheine cuimpoino oceist.
Qant tuz furant al parliement
Entremellé communement,

"Nime ure sexes!" escriasti.
Chescun dunc sun cotele sachast,
Et chescun sun campaigun oceist,
Ke nule ne les cuntredist:
Par mi piz, parmi boules

1160

Firent passer lour alemeles.

22 b

ELDOUG, un Quiens de Cloucestre,
Tint un grant pel en sun gaigne destre.
Bien en ocist seiñante et ois:
Freuz ert li Quiens, et de grant pris.

1165

A sun chival vint traversant,
S'il out mult bone et mult corant.
À Cloucestre s'en fui,
La cité et au tour garni.
Saxson ont le Roi pris,

1170

En anelé de fer li ont mis.
Li Roi, pur faire sun raunecon,
Et pur il deliverer de prisun,
Lour otreiaent en fee Susexe
Et tout Essex et Midlescxe,

1175

Pur ceo qe prèc erent de Ront
Ke Hengist out primcomaiement:
Vortiger trestot lur guerpie,
Outre Saverne s'en fui;
Longes en Gales s'en trepasa;

1180

Ilouc fui et conversa.
Lolé li ont si counsellor
Ke tleui tour face edifier
Je ja par force n'estoit pris,
Ne par engine de home cunguin.
1185 Dunc fist eslire et fist gardier
Leue covable a tour funder;
Maceons quiat, les meiour qu'iles solt,
Et fist overir al einz qu'il pout.
Cil ont womenciid a overir,

1190 Pere et mortier a loer;
Mais qant qu'il ont le jour ovré
Estate al nuit al terre effundé.
Qant li Reis sout et aparate
Ke sun overaigne alterm nt ne creut,

1195 Ses devins traist a cunelle:
"Par foal! dit-il, jeo me merveille
Cu ceste ovré poet devenir.
Ne la poeit terre sustenir:
Gardez et enqueriez ceo qe deit,
Et coment terre la tendreit."

1200 Cil ont deviné et sortie,
Mais ni pout estre c'il s'en mentie:
Si una home trover poeit
Ke sanz pich averse nez esteit,

1205 Occist le, le sans preist,
Et od le mortier l'aspaunderist:
Par cels purreint seur durer,
Si purroint a seur overir.
Dunc ad fait li Reis envoyer

1210 Par tote Galess, et encerchier:
Si ja tiels home esteit trover,
Xo dovant li fust amenez.
Turné s'en sunt li quereur,
Par plusurs cuntrés plusur.

1215 Deus ki alerent un chemyn
Vindrent ensemble a Kermedyn:
Devant la cité, al entré,
Avait d'enfanz grant assemblé.
Entre cels q'i juerent

1220 Out deus valetz ki s'en mellerent.
Ceo fu Merlin et Dynabus,
L'un vers l'autre er irascuz.
"Tes-tei! dist Dynabus, Merlin,
Jeo su assez de plus halt lin

1225 Qe tu ni es, si tei repose:
Ne seiez qe tu es malveis chose.
Jeo su meez des Rois et de cuntes,
Mais si tu tes parent acuntes,
Ja tun pere ni nomeras,

1230 Car tu ne sees, ne saveras."
Ciês qi les enfanz escotoent,
Ki tiel home querant aloient,
Qant oierent le tenceon
As veisiins vindrent enivroun

1235 Pur enquere qe oll esteit
Qe unc pier ni aieit;
Et li veisin l'ont respondue
Ke unc pier ni out eue.
Dunc sunt cil al provost ale,
De part le Roi li ont rovée
Ke Merlin, qa unkes n'out pier,
Seit menez al Roi, et sa Mer.
Li Provost noi' pout dansleier,
Ambdeus les fist al Roi menner.
1245 Li Reis les receut bosomeent,
Si parlast amabhement:

"DAME, dit li Roi, ore conuse la veir:
Ne puis, ai par tei, veir sauer.
Ki engendra tun fix Merlin?
La nonele tint le chief anclin.
Kant eal out pensé un petit:
24 a
- Si Dieu, dist eal, mei hait,
Unkes ne conuse ne ne vie
Ki ceste valet engendrie.
Mais ceo sai, et de veir le sai,
Et pur veir le regeherai:
Qant jeo fu aukes grant nurrie,
-Ne sai si fu fanteимерie,-
Une chose veneit sovent

Ki mal beiserit estraitement;
Cum home parler le oie,
Et cum homme le sentie.
Od mei ce couchast, ai cunceu:
Uncs homme puis ne conu."

Dunc fist li Reis venir Xagant,
Un clero des lettres multit sachant;
Si demandait ke estre poiet,
Ceo ke la nonele li diseit.
24 b
"Sire Roi, trové avoms esrirt
Ke une maner d'espirit
Est entre la lune et la terre:
Qi volt de leur nature quere
loubl et Sucubi oie noun;
Pa tot e l'air ont lur Regionn.

Cil pregnent humaine nature,
Ceo cunceut bien leur figure:
Mainte maschine ont desceue
Et en tiel maner perjeus.
Issi pout Mcelin estre nez,
1280 Et issi pout estre engendrez.

- REI, ceo dit Merlin, mandé m'as:
Ke me vois, pur kei moi mandas?
- Merlin, dit li Roi, ja orras
Si tu vols, et tu l'orras:

1285 Un Tour ai fait comencier,
Et fait mettre pier et mortier.
Mais qant ke l'um ad le jour fait
Enfondre en terre et dedenz veit.
Ceo dient mi devineour
1290
Que ja ne achiverast ma tour
Si tis sanc ne seilt dedenz mis
Pur ceo que sans pier nasquis.
- Ja Dieu, ceo dit Merlin, ne place
Que par mun sans tun tour en face:
1295
Pur mentours les feral tenir
Si tu les fas devant moi venir."_
Li Reis les ad fait demander,
Si's fiz a Merlin amener.
Qant Merlin les out esgardez:
1300
"Seignours, dit-il, que devinez?
Dites que deit, et dunt oill vient
Ke ceo oversine ne se tient.
Ditez q'i ad el fundement,
Pur kei la tour cheet tant sovent;
Ditez al Rei le destourber,
Puis ditez que i ad mestier."
Tote li devineour sei tournent,
A Merlin rien dire ne sarmeint.

"SYR Rei, dit Merlin, entent:
1310
Desouz ta tour, el fundement,
Ad un estanc grant et parfonde
Par ki ta Tour en terre funde.
Fai, dit-il, cel estanc mundier,
Par ruseles l'ewe espourgter;
1315
Al fouz ad deus draguns dormanz
De souz un roche cave mult granz.
Li uns des Dragons est tots blancs,
Et li autre est rouge cum sancs."
Li Hoi fist genz laborer
1320
Et le funce mundifier:
Deu dragons sunt del funce saillie
Et forement sei sunt envaie.
Par grant fierté s'entreseilerent,
Si ke li baron tot les virent.
1325
Bien les veises escomer,
Et des goules flambees jeter.
Li Reis dejouste l'estano s'asist,
Merlin priast qe li diat
Ke li Dragun signifiout,
1330
Qe par ire s'asemiblout.
'Dunc, dit Merlin, les prophecies
Ke vous avez, ceo crei, ciez,
Des Reis qe a venir esteient,
Ke la terre tenir deveient.
1335
Li ad mult Reis loilé Merlin,
Mult le tint pur bone devin.
Demandeit li quand il murreit,
Et par qele mort il finereit,
Car de sa fin ert en effrei.
1340 "Garde- tei, dit Merlin, garde- tei
del fis al enfanz Contentin,
Car par lour feu vendras al fin.
D'Armoriche sunt ja meus,
Par Mer siglent par grant vertuz.

1345 De ceo te puis faire certeine,
ke a Toteneis vendrunt demeino.
Deus encombrers as de deus pars,
Ne sai de quels primes tei garz:
D'un part Saison te gueroient,

1350 ke volunters tei destruerent;
Del altre part vendrunt li eir
Xi ceste regne volent aver
Bretnaige volent desrainer
Et lour frere Costans venger.

1355 Aurelius primes Reis primes serrad,
Et par puison primes murrad.
Uther, sis frere, Pendragun,
Tendrad enpres la Region."

Merrlins sa parole finast

1360 Et Wartiger d'ilooc turnast,
el demeane plus no demorast.
La flote as freres arivast
En Dertemeue, a Toteneis,
Od chivalers et od herneis.

1365 E vous Bretuns jolouse et lied,
s'il sunt ore bien enforced.
Il sei sunt ensemble treit,
De Aurelius ont Rei et Seignur fait.

Wartiger, qi cel pleit oist,
En Gales fu, si s'en garnist;
A un chastel, - Conore out noun -
Cil alast quere defencion.
Lour barons ont li frere pris,
Tant ont le Roi Vortiger quis

1375 X'en sun chastel l'ont assegied,
Assied cil ont trait et lancied;
Attrait ont fait bois al porte,
Ke esteit barré mult fort.
Si ont en l'atreit le feu mis

1380 Et li feus est en le chastel pris;
Del chastel s'en prist en la Tour,
Et es maisons qi sunt entour.
Dunc veisés le chastel arder,
Flambe volcr, maisons chaier:

1385 Ars fu Vortiger et cil od lui
Qe od lui urent pris refui.

Xant li novels Reis out cunquis
Et tourné a sei le pais,
Hengist l'oit dire, mult le dotast,
Vers Escoce s'en trespassast.
Li Reis, de journée en journée,
Ad celle part sa gent menée.

1395 Hengist sott qant li Reis veneit,
Que sanz meller n'en partimeit.

1395 Cil ne voit plus atargier,
Ces campaignuns fist touz armer.
Cuntre Bretuns hastivement
Alast chivalcher celemont:
Desarmez les quidout trover,

1400 Si les pensout desbarreter.
Mais Bretuns, que paisyens cremeit,
Jour et nuit armez estesient.
Cuntre Hengist chivalches irroussment,

1405 Cuntre Hengist chivalche irroussment,
Trei cunreies ad fait de cee gent.
Eis vous el champe venu Hengist,
Li grant masse del champe purprist.
Ne firent pas grant demorer

1410 A la bataille commencer.
Dunc veissés vassals cumbatre,
Li fort lès febbes en abatre,
Esceu percir, hamtes fruisser,
Naferem chair, chaiz murir..

1415 Bretuns leur cunreies bun maintendirent,
Et li paisyens le dos turnerent.
N'i poent l'estour sufrir:
Volent ou noun, lour estoct sortir.

27 a Qant Hengist vist les soens turner,
Les dos as coupes abandonner,
À Conigburne vint poignant:
Iloco quidast trover garant.
Mais li Rois à alast pursuant,
Criant as soens; "Avant, avant! "

1425 Eldolf l'ad venu aprismer
An guise de hardi chivaler.
Muit l'en halout, et bien deit,
Pur le mordre q'il feesait
En le pleine de Salesbire

1430 Qant les Bretuns en fist ooire.
Hengist atteint, si l'enbrac caste,
Par vive force l'en menast.
Dunc fu Hengist bien justiséd,
En cheines mis et lied;

1435 Au Roi Aurelie fu delivered,
Bien fu destreit et bien garded.
Sis fizo q'ert el champe, Dota,
Et sis cosines Ebissa,

27 b A peine sei sunt eschapel
Et en Ewerwic sunt entré.
La Cité ont dedenz garnie
Od tant q'il urent de aye.
LI Rois fu lieu de cee gloire
Ke dieu li out done la victoire.
1445 Dedenz Conigburne entrast,
Treis jours entiers i sojournast.
Entre tant as Bretuns parlast,
Communement lour demandast
Ke del felun Hengist feret,
1450 Si le tendreit ou l'occiereit.
Eldolf sault sus, li gentil bier:
"Sire, car le fetez decoler!
- Fetez, dist li Roi, cum vous volez."
Eldolf sailli, si l'out saissiez,
1455 Fors de la vile Hengist amenast,
S'espé trait, si le decolast.
Li Rois se cuntint vivament,
Ne sojournout pas longement;
A Ewerwic vint od grant est,
1460 Ses enemis dedens enclost.
Octa, fitz Hengist, ert dedens,
Et partie de ces parenz.
Cil vit qu'ns moccurs n'aveit,
Ne diffendre ne sei purriet.
1465 De la Citez un pies issi
Et tote si homme autresi.
Octa, qi primer al Rei vint,
Un fort cheine de fere tint;
Devant le Roi s'est agenulez,
1470 En halt s'ad ses meines levez:
"Sire, dit-il, merci, mercy!
Trestouz nos dieux nous ont failli.
Vencuz su, a ta merci vino:
Pren la cheine qi jeo tino,
Si feras de moi tun talent,
Et de mes homes ensement."
Li Reis fu de grant pité,
Entour sei ad esgardé
Saveir qi li baron dizoient,
1480 Et coment l'em le conseillerent.
Eldadus, li bons ordiners,
Parlast avant cum senez:
"Bone est, dist-il, et fud et ert,
Ke merci ait qi merci quert."
1485 Bretaigne, qi ert longe et lee.
Par plusieurs lées desherité,
Fai-lour un parti liverner,
Sis face errer et laborer,
Sy viveront de lour gaingages:
1490 Mais primes en prenge bones oustages,
Ke lealment tei serviront
Et lealment sei cuntendrunt."

LI Reis terre lour otrelast,
Cum li Evesqe li loist.
De joustes escoces a gaigner,
Dunt s'alerent la herbergier.
Li Rois fu qu'aize jours en la vile;
Des gentz mandast, si tint cuncile.
Lour flus et lur dreiz lur rendi

Ke par les Faiens furent folli.
Les Eglises de par la terre,
Ke destruit erent par guere,
Fist li Rois toutz restorer
A dieu servir a adouer.

Puis est alé a Ambesbire,
Pur visiter le cimenter
Ou oll erent ensevelis
Ke na cuteaus furent murdrie:
Le leu voldret enhaucler,
Si fist bones overours mander.

Temorio, un sage hom,
Arcevesque de Karliun,
Li rovast qe Merlin mandast
Et par sun cunseile en overast.

Li Rois volt mult Merlin veer,
Et oir volt de souv savoir:
Fur li en Gales l'ad eneyé,
Que mult l'en ad honoré.
Mult le priast, mult le requist,
Que l'enseignast et regeast
Cum si gent purrent ovoir
Ovreine qe pout longe durer,
Pur remembrer a tut dis
Le leue ou Bretuns furent oois:

"Beau Rois, ciez a ma parole,
Fai ci aportier la carole
Que Geanz fiant en Irlande,
Un merveilleus ovre et grant,
Des peres en un cerne assis,
Les uns sur les autres mis.

-MERLIN, dit li Rois en riant,
Des qe les peres paisez tant
Ke hom nes pout remuer,
Ki mei purreit ci portéer?

- Rois, dit Merlin, dunt ne sesz-tu
Ke engine surmuntz vertu?
Engine poez les peres mover,
Et pur engine poez l'am aver."
Li Rois ad Uther ordainz,

Od qinze mil Barons armé,
Ki a Irreis se cumbatierent
Si les peres sei diffendient.
Merlin ensemble od els irzeir,
Ki les peres enginereit.

Qant Uther fu tot apresté,
En Irlande ad la mer passé.
GILLAMORUS, qui esteit Reis,
Mandast ses genz et ces Irresis.
Les Bretuns prist a manacier
Et del pais les volt chacier.
Qant ils solt que querolent,
Et pur peres venud estoient.
"Ja un, dit-ils, n'en averunt,
Ne ja un n'enporterunt."

Sempraz sei sunt entrevenud,
Et bien sei sunt entreferud.
Irresis n'erent pas bien armé,
De cumbatre n'erent acustumé:
Des Bretuns urent despitz,
Mes Bretuns les ont desconfitz.
Li Reis Gillaamorus alout fuiant,
De vile en vile prestournant.
Kant Bretun sei furent desarmé,
Et bien sei furent reposé,

Merlin, qui est en la campaigne,
Les menast en une muntaigne
Ou la carole estoit assis
As Geanz qui l'avoient cunquis.
Cils ont les peres esgardés,
Assez les ont avironés.
"Seignusz, dit Merlin, assiez
Si par vertu que vous avez
Purrez ces peres remuer,
Et si vous les purrez portier."

Cils sunt as peres aires,
Derere, devant et de travers;
Bien ont enpointe et bun boté,
Et bien retrait et bun crolé:
Uno par force a la menour

Ne purreint faire peindre un tour.
"Trahez-vous, dit Merlin, en sus:
Ja par force ne ferex plus.
Ore verrez engine et savoir
Meñez que vertu de corps valer."

Dunc alast avant, si s'estuet,
Entour gardast, le lumy mut
Cum home que fist oraisun -
Ne sai s'il fist conjurisoun.
Dunc ad les Bretuns raperlez:

"Venez, dit-il, avant venez.
Ore poez les peres bailier,
A vos nefs portier et chargier."
Si cum Merlin enseignast,
Si cumi il dit et commandast,

Ont li Bretun les peres pris,
As nefs portez et euz mis.
En Engletere les amenerent,
A Ambesbirie les portierent.
En la champaigne d'iloec en jouste;
Le Roi i vint à Pentecouste.
Ses Évesques et ses Abbez
Et ces Barons ad touz mandez.
Autre gent mult i asemblast;
Feste tint, së se coronast,
Et Merlin les pères dreceast,
En leur ordre les raloïast.
Bretun les soleient en bretance
Apeler "la carole as Ganz:"
"Stonhenges" ad noun en engeis,
"Pere pendues" en franceis.
Qant la gralt feste fu finé,
La curte al Rei s'est departé.

PASOENS, un des fiz Vortiger,
Pur poor de Aurelio et de Uther,
Gales et Bretaigne guerpie,
Vers Alemeine s'en guî;
Hommes purchaseat et Nabyte,
Mais n'out mye grant campaigne.
En Bretaigne Northt arivaent,
Viles destruit, terres gastast;
Mais longes estre n'i osast,
Car li Rei vint, si l'en chaceast.
Xant Pascons refu la Mer,
N'osast la dunt il vint turner:
Vers Irlande dreit ad siglé,
Bone vent out, et bone arré.

Al Rei de la terre ad parles,
Tant li ad pramis et prié,
Et tant ont ambedieu conseilled,
Qe od li venir l'ont granbédd.
Od tant de force cum aver purent
Passerent Mer qant bon vent uren.
En Gales sunt tuz arives,
Et en Meneve sunt entré.

Li Rei Aurelie se giseit
A Wincestre, si languiseit.
Qant il out oie de Pascent
Et del Rei d'Irlande ensemment,
Uther sun frere i envioast:
Nif pout aler, mult sei peisast.
Uther ad mandé ses barons,
Et tuz ses chivalers somons.
En dementirs q'il s'apareilast,
Appas à Pascons parlast:

Palez ert, et de Saxons neez,
Qi mult estet enloçunes;
De medicine se feseit sage,
Si saveit parler meinte langage;
Feel esteit, et de mal fei.
1650 "Pascens, dit-il, entende mei:
TU as piecea le Roi haie -
Ko me durras si jeo l'ociie?
- Mil livres, dit-il, te durrai,
Et jamais jour ne te fauldrai
1655 Si tu ta parâle as cumplis
Que li Reis saiit par tei oois.
- Ne jeo, dit-il, plus ne demande." 
Issi firent leur covenant.
Appas fu mult enginous,
1660 Et del argent mult coveitoues.
De draz moniale se vestic, (*)
Corone fiant hault, si se yundi.
Cum Noigne rees et tunduz,
Et cum Noigne revestud,
1665 Od cuntance moniale
Est alez a la curt regale.
Trichier fu, mire se fist,
Al Rei parlast, si le pramist
Ke a brof termo l'is ferait seine
1670 Se il le volt mettre en sa mains.
Tastast le pèse, et mist l'orine,
Tantost li mette en decline.
Li gentil Roi guairir voilest,
Cum chescuns de nous voldreit:
1675 N'avait doute de treison,
Es meins ceo mist a cel felun;
Et oii li ad puisun doné
De venime tot destrempré.
32
Puis se fist chaudement coverir
1680 Et gair en pees et dormir:
Des qe li Rois fu eschaufier,
Et li venime al corps mellez,
Dieux, qe dolour! morir l'estoet.
Mais qant il soit qe murir dust,
1685 A ses homes dist, qi le gaitoent,
Aussi veralement cum ils le amoînt,
Ke a Stonhenges sun cors postassent,
Et iloec dedenz s'enterrassent.
Issi fu mort, issi finye,
1690 Et li traitres s'en fuye.
UTHER fu en Gales entres,
A Kenoce out Irreis trovez.
Un esteille est dunc aparue,
Et od plusurs gentz ert veus.
1695 Comete out noun: signifie
Muement de Roi, colom clergie.
Olier esteit merveileusement,
Si jetout vii rai soulely.

(*) In ms Monalle.
Uns feus qi de cel raves liisset
Figure de Dragoun feseit;
De cele Dragon deus raves venoient,
Ec par la gule fons se liisset:
Li uns sur France s'ostendeit,
Et l'autre vers Irlande alout,
Et en set raves sei devisout.
Uther forement sei merveilast,
Et merveilouse sei efreiat.
Merlin ad pried q'il li die
Ke ni fait signe signifie;
Et Merlin mult sei cunsublast,
Douel out en qeor, mots n'i sonait.
Qant, sis espiriz repaissast,
Mulfu dolent, et suspirast:

"HE dieux! dit Merlin, cum grant dolurs,
Cum grant damage, cum grant plours
Sunt avenud huy en Bretaigne!
Perdu ont lur bone chivetaigne;
Mort est li Rei, li bone vassas,
Qi de dolurs et de grant mals
Ad sun terre delivered
Et des meins as Pailens osté."
Qant Uther oist de sun frer,
Del bone Roi, qe fenist eer,
Mulfu dolent, mult s'esmaist,
Mais Merlin mult se cunfortast:
"Uther, dit-il, ne te maier -
N'i ad del mort nul recoverer.
Espleita cco qe tu as quis,
Cumbate-tei od tes enemis:
La victoire demaine t'amet
Del Roy d' Irlande et de Pascent."
Qant Uther out escouté
Cum Merlin l'out cunforté,
La nuit fist xëxix ses gentz reposer
Et par matin les fist armer.
La Cité vouldrent assailir,
Mais les Irreis les vist venir,
Pristrent lur armes, cunresies firent,
Et a cumbatre form liisset:
Ficercent sei sunt cumbatu,
Mais assez tost furent vencu,
Car Bretuns les occistrent,
Et le Roi de Irlande enseement.
Zunt Uther out fenye sun afaire,
Vers Wincestre prist sun repaire,
Le meulz od lui de sun barnage.
En le chemyn enconuàit un message
Ke li ad dit veralement
Cum li Rois ext mort et coment,
1750
Et li Evesges, par grant ours,
Aveient fait sa sepulture
Dedenz la carole as Geanz,
Si cum il comanda a ses serjanz.
Uther se fist coroner
A Wincestre cum fort justiser.

1755
OCTA, qe fiz Hengist eateit,
A ki li Reis doné aveit
Grantz terres et mansions,
A li et a ses campaignuns,

1760
Kant oit qe li Reis ert mortz
Ke mainteneit les grantz efforts,
Petit preisaat le novel Rei,
Serement ne li deit, ne fei.
Sis cosins od li, Cosa,

1765
Et grant ost i assemble,
Vers Escoce de lunc, de lee,
Puis sunt a Dwurwic allez,
La Cité entour ont assegé.
Uther oist le noveles,

1770
Grant ost assemble des juvencles,
Et A Dwurwic vint tost errant,
Octa et Cosant asaillant.
Dunc veisses,grantz tueiz
Et merveilouse deglageiz,

1775
Ventres pernier, piz sfoundrer,
Testes trenchèz; pié et poigne voler.
Octa et Cosa pris i furant,

34 a
A Lundres les amenerent,
Et en la Téur furent posez,

1780
Et od cheines mult fermo liez.
Kant Uther issu fu vengez,
Par Northumbrelande esteit passerz.
Kant vers Northt out fait sun afaire,
A Lundres driez prizt sun repaire;

1785
Et quant le jour de l'ask venuit,
Et il coroner se voileit,
Ducs et Cunctes de sun famarge
Somon de par bref et par message,
Et od leur femmes espouses,

1790
Et od leur meisoné prives;
A Lundres seient a la feste,
Kar feste voileit tenir honeste.
Gorlois i vint, de Cornowaille,
Et sa femme i: amena sans faille.

34 b . 1795
AL manger est assis li Reis,
Au chief de la sale, a un deois.
Li baron s'asistrent en tour,
Chescun en l'ordre de s'conour.
Liez Gorlois i sist Igerne sa femme :

1800
Néen out plus beal en tote la regne.
Muit l'ad li Roin espardoe,
S'amour ad vers li tourné,
As countenanz et as enceinoments,
Et as saluz et as presentz,

Aparceut bien li Quiens et sout
Qe li Roi sa mulier amout.
De la table ou il sist sailli,
Sa femme prist, si s'en fessi.

Li Reie li ad enpres maundé;
Qant ne vint, si l'ad manacié.

Corlois en Cornawaille revertie,
Deus chastels out, c'es bien garnie.
Sa femme mist a Tintagelle,
Castel esteit assis mult bel.

Li Reis aprèes li s'est hasté,
Ses terres en ad ares et gasté.
Ulfin, sun bon urivee,
Ad priveement appellé:

"ULFIN, dit-il, cunseillez-moy,
My cunseillez est tresoet en tey.
L'amour Igerne m'ad suspris,
Tot m'ad vencud, tot m'ad cunquis.
- Sire, ne vous sai cunseille doner,
Mais fetos Merlin demander."

Li Reis, par le cunseille Ulfin,
Fist maunder et venir Merlin.
Li Rois l'ad sun bosoigne mustré,
Et Merlin de aider l'ad otroié.

Merlin en fist le Roi munter,
Tot sa colour en fist chaungier,
Semblance de Corlois ayeit.
A Tintagelle vinrent deméintenant.
Cils qi la porte gardier durent
Quierent le Corlois od sa mainné furent;

La porte overi, o'ils entrerent:
Igerne i corust, si les saluerent.
Eal quidout qe sun seignur i fust,
Centelemment laad reaceut.

Li Reis od Igerne se jut,
Et Igerne la nuit cunœut
Li bon Roi, li fort, li seur.
Ke vous oiez nomer Arthur.
Lo gent le Roi surent mult tost
Ke li Reis n'esteit mi en l'ost.

Servir le volent a grace:
Un chasteie ont assaillé
Ou li Conte Corlois esteit.
L'asalt comencierent a grant esplêt:
Corlois li conte i fu oois.

Et li chastele fu sempres pris.
Askuns qi d'aloc eschapiern
A Tintagelo nutnior alorent
Coment lour est mesavenued
De lour Seignur q'ils ont perdu.

"Taisez! dit li Rois, n'est m'i issi:
Vifs su et sainz, dieu merci.
Cuntre le Roi la fors iisterai;
Peces guerarai, si ma acorderai."

AITANT a'est del chastele liissuz,
Sesz desizrez outota euz.
Kant fors furent en lour chemin,
Li Rois et Ulfin et Merlin,
Al ost vindrent delivremet;
Asavoir li Rois voit comemt

Si li Quiens esteit ocis,
Et li chastele par force cunquia.
Assez fu q'i l'ad cuntee
De l'un et del altre la verité.
A Tintagelo a'est retournex,

Cals del chastele ad apellex.
Li Rois, qi out Igerno amé,
Sanz essoinq l'ad espesse.
La nuit eizn out un fiz cunque,
Et al terme out un fiz eue.

"Arthur" out noun de sa bounté,
Dunt grant renoun ad puis esté.
Uther regnant bien longement
Sains et sauf et paisiblement.
Caus qi Octa et Cosa gardieront

Pur doun del chartre les delivereron.
Quant oisils furent en lour cuntrés
Et lour gent urent assemblés,
O'oisils sont en Northumbrelande entrez:
Le terre ont ars et gastez.

Uther, qi malados estoit,
Et qi aider ne so posoit,
Pur sa terre ot li diffendre
Liverass sur tuez a Looth, sun prendre.
Octa et Cosa s'en orgoillieron,

De Colgrin lour seignur firent;
Grant oit out assembly,
Vere Looth furent chivalché.

OIEZ du home de grant fierté:
Uther n'i lessast pur sa formeted,
Fottier cso fist cum en biere,
Od chivals en un mille liter.
A Verolam vint li Rois tot droiet,
La ou Octa et Cosa estoit.
Cisls de cùmbate se apresticierent,
Del Roi Uther dedeigne urent
m

Ke en la char se cocheit,
Ke sueier les voloit.
Lor escheles ont ordinez,
Encrute Loophu sunt chivalchez.

1905
Vencuz fu et occis Octa
Et els bonz cosins Cosca;
Et Coigrin s'en est eschappe,
Vers Encoco s'en est alle.
Li Saxson, qi furent chaciez,
1910
Et Coigrin, lor avowez,
Un tresun ont purpounz
Hunt li Reis et enposoiné;
Homes ont esiz malfesanz,
Ne vous sai dire qelo ne kaunz;
1915
Denes et terres les tranistrent.
Al curt li Koi les tranistrent.
Cil ont tant alé et venu
K'il ont oye, q'il ont veu
Ke li Reis eve freide, uesit,
1920
Nui altre beivre ne usout.
Cil ont la funtaigne envenimé,
Puis sunt fort de la cite turné.
Li Reis cochast, mult mai eisé,
A beivre l'ewe ad demandé;
1925
Del eve beat, empre enflost,
Plaisist et verti, sempres finast.

KANT Uther li Roi fu ci fines,
A Stonhenge fu aportez.
Ilococ dedenz fu enterrez

9930
Delez sun frere, lez a lez.
Li Evesaces s'entroassemblerent
Et li curon s'entroassemblerent:
Arthur le fiz Uther manderent,
A Cioestre le coronerent.

37 a 1935
Quent Arthur fu Reis novellament.
De sun gre fist un sceament
De ja Saxsons pue ne avert;
Tant cum el regne od li errant;
Sun uncle et sun pers ont ois,
Et troblé ont tot le pais.
Coigrin les Saxsons maintena,
Grant est cil assembla.
Arthur, li prur et cumbatant,
Grant juvente assembla demaintenant:
1940
Vers Northt li Roi chivalcha,
Et Coigrin tout l'encontra.
Sultz en chaist d'amparz,
Od launcés, od quareals et od darz.
Mais descunfiz a la parfin

1945

37 b 1950
Si furent Saxsons et Colgrin.
Colgrin fu mort, et m{(int)} milliers
Des Saxsons pruz et legiers.
XANT Arthur out sa terre assise
Et partot au bone justise,
Et tote son regne out delivré
De Saxons et Pour alis,
Goncuvre print, si la fist Reine,
Un cointe et noble maschine;
Realem estoit, curteisme et gent.

Et sa nobles Romains parent.
Huit fu large et de bele parler:
Arthur l'amist et la tunt chier
Mais entre eus doys n'urent nul air,
Ne ne purreint enfant avoir.

ARTHUR, cant yver fu passé
Et od le chaud revint esté,
Et mer fu bele a navier,
Sun l'avye fist apparaillier:
En Irland, ceo dit, irreit,
Et toute Irlande cunquerret.

U' fist Arthur longe atten
Kaarunder fist sa melior juvent.
Yant parcerz furent en Irlande,
Jar la terre printrent viande.

Gillamorus, Rois de la terre,
Ne se volt purloigner:
Encontre Arthur vint od sun aforce,
Mais ne li valut sun aforce,
Tot en cent fu descunfis

Et li Rois Gillamorus fu prié.
Mais cil fist a Arthur homagé,
Si print de lui sun heritage.
Yant Arthur out cunquis Irlande,
Tropassez ezt justques Islande:

La terre print toyt et cunquit.
Et a sci toye la sumist,
Artot volt aver saignurie.

Convais, c'i ort Rois de Orkone,
Et Doldanyn, Rois de Gallande,
Et Pumarec, Rei de Westmerlande,
U'rent tost le novele oie,
Et checun d'els i out s'espie
Re Arthur sur ois passereit
Et tot les Isles destruereit.

Checun od sun ain degré
Sunt en Irlande a Arthur alé.
De leur avoirs tant li portèrent,
Tant li promistrent et tant donnerent,
Pex firen, sun home devindrent,
Lur heritage de lui tindrent.

Qant cils sunt tot en pais remes,
Et Arthur estoit venuz a Nefa,
En Anglerter etz rovenez,
Et od grant joy resceuz.
DUNZE anz enpres cel repairement
Regnast Arthur paisiblement,
Nuit se cuintn tant noblement,
Tant belle et tant curtselement.
Il list faire la rounde table
Dunt Bretuns dient meinte fable.
Nuit l'avet dieux honoré,
De luy vint grant renomé:
N'i oines parler de chivaler
Ke auken foist a preser
Qi de sa meison ne fust,
Si pur aiter entrer pouat.
Par la bounté de sun corage,
Et par le loos de sun harnage,
Sit Arthur qe mere passerait
Et tot France conquerret;
Mais en Norwvoye primes irret,
Et la terre conquerreit.
Grant Norway et grant gent mandast,
En Norway a force entrast.
Ricolf n'i volt mi fuir,
Ne le paien ni volt guerpir.
Vencuz fu Picolf et occis,
Et plusur de ses amis.
Fant Norwaye iussi fu deliveré,
A Looth sun soroge l'ad tot doné
Mais qe il de Arthur la tendreit,
Et a seignur le conustreit.

ASCHILLE, qi ert Roy des Daneis,
Vist lor Bretuns, vist les Norveis,
Vist Arthur, qi toto conquerret,
Vist qe tenir ne se purreit:
Ne se volt leser damagier,
Ne sa terre enpirer.
Tant requiert, et tant priast
Qi od le Roi Arthur sa acordsart.
Fautet fist, sun home devint,
Sun regne tote de Arthar tint.
Arthur fu liez del grant espleit
Et del gaigne q'il fesest.
Ne li pout my uncore suffire:
De Danemarche en fist esleire
'ones chivalers et bons archiers,
Ne sei quanz cent, ne kants milliers.
'ener ien volt od sei en Frasnce,
Et il el fist anz dornuance.
Flaunders et Bopigne conquerzt
Viler sei et chastels print.
France out noun Galie a icel jour,
Si n'i awwt Rei ne seignour.
Romaine en demeine l'avet,
Et en demeine la tenseit.
En garde ert a Frolle livré,
Et il l'avoit longe gardé;
Treu et rentes reçoulvient
2060 Et par termes les tranéteit
A Rome, a le Empereur.
Frolle fu de grant vigour,
Des nobles hommes ert de Rome,
Ne dotuut par aun corps nul home.

FROLLE soute par plusieurs messages
Les caisines et les damnages
Ke Arthur et sa gent foseit,
Ni an Romains leur droit toleit.
Al bataille alant contre Arthure,
2070 Mais nel fust mi a bone eure:
Descunfit fu, si s'en fut
A l'uris, si s'en garmi.
Ilocc Arthur atendrait,
Et ilocc soi defendrait.

Arthur soit qo Frolle foseit,
Xi a Paris soi garmisait:
Entre li vint si l'angeast,
En bourges entour soi herbergeast.
L'erbe et la terre fist gardier
2080 Ke viande n'i pour entrer.
Grant peopl ert aoit en la cité,
De viande ert aoit grant chiercé.
Lour vitallees ont mangé et usé,
Vult veises pepele afoamé.

Frolle veit le pepele distreit
Per la vitaille qe failleit,
Bien cei flout en sa bounté:
Al Roi Arthur ad nandé
2090 Ke il deu en liz veagnent
Et corps a corps soi cumbatien;
Et qi d'els l'autreit occureit,
Ou qe vief veincro pursreit,
La terre tot al altre euet,
Et tot l'eur de France receueit.
2095 Arthur assenti al mandement
Et mout le vint bien a talent.
Issi firent donner leur gages,
Et mitrent d'amparz oustages.

KANT il surot apparailliz,
De deu parz soi sunt aloyner.
En un bele pleine sunt amenez,
De cumbatré sunt aperetie;
Dunc firent leu rengez voider,
C'elis s'en vont entreferir.

Mais Frolle al ferir failli.
Ne sai se ni chivalre guenchi;
Et Arthur ad Frolle ferru
Desous le boucle del escu.
De sun chival l'ad longe porté,
De sur li peint, si trait l'espee:
Ja Fust la bataille achevó (?)
Qant Froolke sur ses piez sailli,
Cuntre Arthur sa lance estendi,
Sun chival dreit a piz ferri,
De-si q'en Qcor li enbat:
Le chival et le chivaler
Fist tot ensemble tresboucher.
Dunc voisses genz estormir,
Brestuns crior, armes seisir:

2120 Venuz fusent al capieiz.
Kant Arthur est en piez sailler,
Levast l'escu, le chief covri;
Froolke od s'espé requeri,
S'espé haueast cuntre munt,
Arthur ferri en mi le frunt;
Li healme quassast et derumnie,
Et li fort coifs fendi.
En mi le frunt Arthur naverast,
Et li sanc en vis li avalast.

2130 KANT Arthur se senti naveré
Et il se vist ensanglanté,
A poi de ire se aragea,
Sun fort escu embrasea;
Caliburme out, s'espé, el poigne,
Qe il out eue en meinte bosoigne.
Ci l'out brandi par grant vertu,
De ire et de mal talent fu esmeu;
Froolke ad en sun le chief ferru,
Juoqes en espaules l'ad fendu
Trait et peint, et cil chaist.

2140 Corveille et sanc tota espaundist,
Des piez un poi eschaverast,
Ioecc morut, mot n'i sonant.
Li citizeins pur Froolke plurent,
Et nekedent ac portes keurent,
Arthur out resseuz dedenz,
Et ses meinesset ses gentz.

2150 ARThUR a l'aris soijournast,
Ballife asist, pees ordeinaast.
S'est devisast en deus partis,
Si estuoli deus campaignies.
A Hoel suv Neveu liverast
L'un meité, ai li rovast
Od ceux cunquesist Angevyn
Gascoyn, Auverne et Peitou,
Et li Burgoine cunquerreit
Et Lorenge, se il poeit.

2155 Hoel fist sun commandement
Colono sun establissez.

2160 Barri cunquist, puis Torroigne,

(*) lust in ms.
Angervyn, Auverne et Gascoyne.

ZANT Arthur out en pces la terre,
Xe de nul part n'en out guerre,
A unes Pasche a Paris

Tint Arthur feste od ses amis.
A ses hommes rendi leur pertes,
Et a chescuns donast cun dignité.

Chescun fu bien enhérito,
Chescon colonc sun dignité.

Et fait riches tus ses prives,
En Averille, cun esté entrast,

La Engleterro trespassast.

Donast a ses barons gentis:

Chescun fu bien enhérito,
Chescon colonc sun dignité.

Et pur faire de sei parler,
Krist cunseille qu il fu loié
Qu a Pentecoste, en esté,

Fereit sunt barnage assembler
Et donc se froit coroner.

A Carlion en Glamorgan

Amandast tus ses barons par baan,
Amandast ses Reis et ses Contes,

L'armast ses Ducs et viscountes,
Amandast Caisers et Abbez,
Amandast Priours et Evensquez;

Et cil vindrent qu mandé furent,
Si cum a feste venir durent.

Meint Roi et Ducs i vegnent
A Carlion sanz attargement:

Aup'fes campaigne i veilles venir,
Et espessement chivalchier.

Al matin, le jour de la feste,

- Cee dit l'estoire de la feste, -
Vindrent trois arceveches.

Et li abbé. et li Evesques,
El palaic le Roi coronent,

Et puis al mistier la menerent.

Qatro espeis i out a or,

Xe pointe. que helto. que entrotor;

Qatro Reis ces qatro portoient,

Ke droit dovant le Roi aloient:

Cils mestiers lor apartenoit.

Qant li Reis feste ou curt teneit,

Cil d'Eccoce et cil de Norwales,

Et li tierce estoit de Southwales;

Cador de Cornemaille estoit
Ke la quarte espee teneit.

Devant le Roi les Reis aloient,
Les espeis en leur meinz sorteoinent.
Jusc’al mustier s’en aloient,
Grant joi tuz en demenerent.
Devant la Reine Gonovre alerent
2215 Quatre dames qi postolent
Quatre columbes blause plumez:
Mult furent belas et afaitez.

As processions out grant pres,
D’aler avant chescun s’engros.
2220 Kant la Messe fu commencié,
Mult i avoit solemnité,
Mult oisses orgoins soner
Et cler chaunter et orgoiner.
Kant le service fu fini

2225 Et ‘Ite missa’ ert chaunte,
Li Reis ad sa corone ouste
K’il avoit al mustier porté.
Qant Arthur turmast del mustier,
En sun palais s’en vois mangier.

2230 Assis furent li barun entour,
Chescun de ordre de sun honur.
Li seneschaux Keys out a noun,
Vestuz d’un hermin peliquoun:
Servy al mangier le Rei,

2235 Lit chivalers avec sei.
Seduer del altre partie
Servist de la botelerie.

ARTHUR fu assis el balt deis,
Entour ii Contes et Reis.
2240 Eis vos duze hommes blancs chanuz,
Bien asublez et bien vestuz;
Deus et deus en la sale vindrent,
Et deus et deus as meins se tindrent.
Duze esteient, et duze rames

43 a 2245 De Olive tindrent en leur meins.
Parmi le sale trespasserent,
Al Roi vindrent, si le saluerent.
De Rome, cee distrent, vegmeient,
Et massager de Rome esteient.

2250 Un chartre ont devolupé,
A Arthur l’ad un d’els liveré
De par l’emperceur de Rome.
Oiez de la chartre la summe:

"Luce, qi Rome ad en baillie,
Et de Romeins ad la seignorie,
Maunde coo q’il ad deservye
Al Rei Arthur sun enemye.
Mult me dedeigne en merveillant,
(*)
Et me merveille en dedeignant,

2260 Ke par forfait et par orgoille
Osez vers Rome ovrir tun oile:
Ne prendre contre Rome estrif
Tant cum tu ses un Romeine vifs.
Tu ies issuz de ta nature
Et trespassé as ta mesure.
Siez-tu qu tu es, et dunt tu vagnes,
Ki n'as truz preignes et retignes?
Julius, nostre anceissoeur,
- Mais poi en preises sun honur -
Pris Bretaigne, si'n out traud,
Et nostre gent l'ad puis eud.
Ore avez tolleit par presumptie,
Milt as fait grant folie.
Uneore as fait grande huntage,
Dunt plus nous est qu de damage:
Frolle, nostre Baron, as mort,
Et France et Flandre tiens a tort.
Fur oeo qu tu n'en as doté
Rome ne sa grant dignité,
Te somonde li sené et maunde,
Et en somonant te comande.
Ke tu seiez en my augment
A Rome a ly, qu'l te count:
Apparaillez de faire dritel
De oeo qu tu li as toleit;
Et si tu vas rien purloignant,
Ke ai nel' facez cum jeo te mande,
Bongieu a force passerai,
Bretaigne et France te toudrai:
Ne saveras en nule lieu tapir
Dunt jeo ne te face sailler;
Lied a Rome te merrai
Et al sené te livrai."

A ceste parole out grant bruit,
Et mult sei corouciert tout.
Milt oisses Bretuns crier,
Dieu aramir et dieu jurer
Ke cii serrunt des honuré
Ke tiel message ont apporté.
Maïs li Reis s'i levast es piez,
Ki leur criast: "Taisez, taisez!
N'i averunt mal: messagers sunt,
Seigneurs ont, leur message font.
Dire pount quam'il vouldrunt,
Ja pur nul home mal n'averunt."

KANT la noise fu trespassé,
Et la curt fu reseuré,
Ses dois, ses Ducs, ses privés
Ad tuz li Reis od sei monez
En un soon tour pe-rin
Que home apelle Tour Gigantin.
Cunsell iloec prendre voeleit
Ke a ces messagiers respondrait.
Baron, diist li Roi, qi estes cy,
mi compaignun et my amy,
campaignun de prosperité
et campaignun de adversité,
si grant guerre n’est avenu,
yous l’avoz od mei sustenu;
par vous au tant enhaucité
que des quatorze regnes su Roy clamé.
totens vous ai trové feels
en afaires et en cunseilles.
Oye avez le maundment
et des lettres l’entendement,
et le forfait et la fierté
ke li Romeins nous ont mandé:
de Breaigne treud dezandent,
aver deiv dent, cco nous mandent.
cesar, dient, la cunquist:
fort home esteit, sa force foiat.
ne sei purreint Bretuns difendro,
treud leur foiat a force rentre.
vauntez sei sunt q’ils nos ancesours venquirent,
treud et rentes leur toilirent.
tenir volent en heritage
le hunte a nous et le tollage.
treud de Bretuns aver soleint,
pur cco de nos aver le volotent.
par mesmes cele reison,
et par altre tiel acheison,
pooms Rome chalengier
et bien la poom maintener.
belin, que fu Reis des Bretuns,
et Brenne, duc des Burgaignons,
dieu frere de Breaigne née,
chivalers vaillant et sené,
a Rome alerent, ci l’asistrent.
asaileren la, si la pristrent.
c’ils le tinueant en fealté,
treud ne Bretuns urent doné.
pur cco me voil a Rome aler.
pur treud aver, nun pur doner.
de France et des autres countrées
ki de leur meins avome oustez.
ne deiv dent il nul plait tenir
quant ils ne les voloient garantir.
ore ait tete qi aver le poet:
altre dreiture n’i estoet.
li Emperer nous manace:
n’voil dieux que mal nous face.
petit nous preise, poi me creiment,
mais si dieu plest, et il s’avient,
ainz q’il se puis repaire
n’avaera talent de manacier."
KANT Arthur li Reis out parlé, 
Et as barons out tot cunté, 
Hoel parlast enpres le Rei: 
"Sire, dit-il, en ma fey, 
Mult parlez reasonablement, 
Nuls n'i poët mettre amendent. 
Mande ta gent, somont tes hommes, 
Et nous qe ci a ta curt sumes. 
Trespassez mer sans demorance, 
Passe Burgoin et passe France, 
Passe Lumbardie et l'Empereour, qi te defie, 
Nettez en errour et en effreü, 
Q'il n'eit leisir de grever tei. 
Tiel plaie ou Romeins esmeud 
Dunt il serrunt tot cunfundud. 
Jeo irrail, Sire, en ta campagne; 
Ainz qe ta boasigne remaigne, 
Dis mil chivalers armes, 
Et, si tu n'as avoir assez. 
Tote ma terre engagerai, 
L'or et l'argent te livrerai; 
Ja mar ne larras un damer 
Tant qe vous avezz mestier."

2390

ENFRES la parole Hoel 
Dit li Roi d'Escoce, Angusel. 
Cil estoit es piez dresci, 
En halt en ad "Arthur!" husché: 
"Sire, n'i fetez luno demure, 
Alez cumbatre od l'Empereour 
Ke treud de vous voit chalangier. 
Ore vous en pensez de li vengier, 
Et jeo meisme od tei irrai, 
Et deus mil chivalers merrai; 
Et de gent a pié tiel plente 
Ja pur home n'ert numbre." 
Kant li Reis d'Escoce out parlé, 
Tot ensemble ont dit et crié: 
"Honiz seitz qil remaindrat, 
Et q'i sun power n'i ferast!" 
Kant chacoun out dit sun pensé 
Et Arthur out tot escouté. 
Ses brefs fiaist faire et sceler, 
As messagiers les fiaist lêverer. 
"A Rome, dit Arthur, poez dire 
Ke jec su de Breaigne Sire: 
Franc le tink et franco le tendrai, 
Et des Romeines la defendrai; 
Et eco sachiez veraiment 
Ke a Rome irrai procheinement, 
Ne mi pur Treud portier, 
Mais pur treud d'els demander."
LI messagier d'Arthur turnerent,
A Rome vindrent, si cuntierent
Cum faitement Arthur troverent,
Et ou et comet a li parlerent.
Kant li baron de Rome oierent
Que li messagier respondierent,
Et les chartres q'ils aportoient,
A lour paroles sei accordierent:
A l'Empereur ont loié,
Et cele loos li vint a gré,
Ke tost sun Empire mandast
Mungieu et Burgoinie passat,
Al Rei Arthur sei cumbatist,
Regne et coronc lui tollist.

LUCIUS Iber n'i targeast:
Reis, Ducs et Cuntes mandast
Q'ils en veignent al diame jour
Si cum chescun aime s'ouor;
Seient a Rome a li tot prest
De quere Arthur la ou il c't.
Cils vindrent delivrement,
Et cils qi oierent le mauventem:^t
2440 Epistroc i vint, le Roi de Grece,
Et Echion, duc de Boece;
Hirtac i vint, le Roi d'Egypte,
Et de Crete Rois Ypolite,
De Babiloine Miepesa,
Et d'Espaigne Aliphatisma;
2445 De Mede i vint li Roi Brocus,
Et de Libie Sertorius.
De ces del ordre del sexe sené
Ki en Rome urent dignité,

2450 Vint Marcel et Lucas Catel,
Cocoa et Calus Matel;
Autre barons i out assez
Dunt jeo ne sai a vous noez.
Kant il furent tot assembié,

2455 Qatre cent mil furent numbré,
Et cent et qatre vint muntanz
Estre esquier et serjauntz.
Kant prest et apparailliez furent,
Entrant Auguste de Rome murent.

2460 ARTHUR out sa curt departie,
As bamsuns toz out quis aye.
Chescun die qantz chivalers merrast,
Chescun solonc le fey q'il ad.
Irreis, Golandeis, Islandais,

2465 Danais, Norweis et Orchenais;
Siis vint mil armez ont pramis
A la guise de lour pais.
Cils de Normundi et d'Angleu,
Cils de Masa, cils de Feitou,
Cils de Flandres, cil de Boloigne,
Od totes armes, sans essoince;
Qatre vint mil armes pramistènt,
Et de tant devent servir, cecio distrent.
DIs milier pramist Hoël,
Deus milliers d'Escoce Angusel.
De Bretaigne, sa propre terre,
Ke homme clcime ore Engletere,
Fist Arthur numbert chivalers
Od haubercse seisante milliers.

A WODRED, un de ces nevolz,
Chivaler merveilouse et pruz,
Liverost en garde Arthur sun regne
Et Guenowre la Reigne, sa femme:
Tot comanda fors la corone.

Puys voit passer a Suththamptoun.
La furent ses nefs amenez
Et les meisnez assemblez.
Arthur meisme eschipa,
Barons et Contes i amena.

Kant os Nefs furent tot entré
Et tide urent, et bon orrè,
Dunc veaiissès ancrès lever,
Estrons traire, hobans fèmer;
Les vèiles unt sus sachè,

Li mestre sunt as estorno basté:
Balement commencierent a sigler,
Vent out bone et a pleiser.
Le gentz Arthur a joï aloient,
Bon vent afoient, bien sigloient.

A mi nuit par mer curroient,
Vers Barbeflot leur cours tenoient,
Kant Arthur prist a somuler,
Endormy sei, ne pout veuller.
Vis li fu, la ou il dormeit,

Ke hait en eir un urs veieit
Devers orient avolant,
Mult estoit gros et fort et grant,
Mult estoit d'orible façoun.
D'altre part veit un dragoun

Ki devers occident voleit,
Et de see oiz flambe jetteit.
Li Dragun le urs envaiseit,
Et cil forement sei diffendeit.
Mais li dragun le urs embraceout,
Et a terre le acraventout.
Kant Arthur out un poi dormye,
Pur le sounge qu'il vist a seveillie,
Zevellingt sei, si s'en droceaut.
As ciers et as Rois le mustrast,
Tot en ordre la visioun

Q'il vist del urs et del dragun.
Asquons d'elis li ont responduz
Ke li Dragun q'il out veuz
Estéit de lui signification,
Et li grant urs est demaunterance
D'ascun Geant q'il occieret,
Xi d'estranger terre vendrait.
A celo paroles ajournait,
Bele témé fist, li soleile levant.

Al coste vondrent assez matin.
A Barbeilot en port latin.
Cum ainsi purcent des Nefs lisserent,
Par la camptré s'espaundierent.
N'aviet mi longe attendu

Ke Arthur oist et dit li fu,
Ke uns Geant bien componus
Estoi de Espaigne venuz;
Nece Noel Eleine out pris,
Ravye l'out, en le munte l'out mis

Ke home or Saint Michel apele:
N'i aviet autier ne chapele.

KANT Arthur en oist parler,
Kei appelast, et Beduer,
Ni volt parler a nul autre home.

Celo nuit empres ne preigne essoigne,
S'en aleront le Munt cherchant;
Quatre Munt sunt aié tot trei,
Arthur, Beduer et Kei.
"Jeo irrai: dit Arthur, avant:
Jeo m'en cumbaterai al Geant.
Vous vendrez empres moi arer,
Et bien gardez que nul i fier
Tant qom jeo m'en purrai aider,
Ne ja, si jeo n'en ai mostier."

Et Arthur c'est avant aié,
Li Geant en ad trovez,
Ke pres du fu sur le munte seoit,
Un grant porc pres la fu turnoit.
Arthur le quidast ainz sus prendre
Ainz q'il pout sa maçue prendre;
Mais li Geant Arthur choisie,
Merveillant sei es piez saillie;
Sa mace ad el cole leve,
Xi mult estoit gros et quarre.

Arthur le vit es piez estier,
Et de ferir bien acciner;
S'esté brandist, l'escu levant,
Le braz hauceast et estendi,
Le Geant en le front ferri,
les deus surcilz li atamast,
Le sanc en les oizz li avalast.
Kant li Geant se senti ferrue,
Mult estoit de ire esmeue:
Corut a Arthur, si l'enbraceast,
Pur l'épée n'i lessast.
Grant fu et fort, parmi le prist,
A genuls Arthur venir fist;
Mais oïl tost s'envertiaat,
Eu piez revint, si redreceast,
Od calibrune tiel li donast
Le en le cerveile le baignast,
Trait et peint, et cil chaiz,
En trebouchant si fist un ori.
Tiel escrios fist et chaizement
Cum un cheine qu'chezet pur vent.
Arthur est al est repaire,
De la victoire fu joious et lié.

KANT de tozt parz venud furent,
Ceus qi od Arthor aler durent,
Arthur de jour en journée
Ad l'orandie trespassé;
Francais passast, vint en Burgéine,
De tozt partz vindrent a sun bosoigne.
Luce, qi max de Rome ekt Sire.
Encunto Arthur volt chivalchier.
Ses gentz ad bien ordainé
Et de combat tre esté.
Arthur solt qu l'Empereur venoit,
Et cum pur combatre se appareiloit.
C'îls sunt en un valeis entré,
Ses gentz ad tozt ordainé:
Duze eschielos ad ordainez,
Del primer fu Xeus Justizierz,
Et Beduer li botelers
Out en sa garde dis milliers;
A Conge de Frangres, Haldin
Et a Guichard li Peitevin
Fu la terce eschiel comandez,
Et il l'ont voluners guiez;
La quart out Jugen de Leicestre,
Et la quint Jonathas de Dorcestr;
Li siene de Cestre Cursalen,
Et le setim de Baathe Uroen;
Boo de Oxenford le novime,
Et li Quens de Nicol de disiame;
Le cunte de Warwik out le unisme,
Et li Roi d'E scoce de duzime. (*)

KANT Arthur out fait ses partiz,
Et ses eschielos departiz,
Oiz qu'il dit a ses nuziz,
A ses barons, a leur fiz:
"Barons, dit-il, mult mei confort
Kant jeo vos grantz bountez record,
Von grantz pruez, vos grantz cunquent;
Tote tems vous trois hardiz et brest,
Kant jeo recorde et jeo purcaise
Ke Breitaine est en nostre tenst:
Par vous et car vos compagnzus
(*)de in ms.
Rei su de qatorze regions:
Vos pruesce, vos bones meins,
Ont deus fois vendud les Romeins,
Et vous encore les venquez,
Si's averez duno vœmand trois foiz."
Qant la parole fu finé

Ke li Rois out dit et mustré,
A un voice li re(spundi)erent,
Tot ensemble (s'escrièrent
Ke meulz voleint (ilœc murir
Ke del champe sans victorie liissir.

L'EMPEREOUR matin èmmast levast,
De combats s'aparaillast.
Del un part de la valee
Sunt la gent Romeine arresté;
Del altre part en mi leur vis

Urent Bretun le champe surpris.
Duno vindrent as lances beiser, òt
Et as gna ascuz fendre et perciert;
Empres vindrent al capleiz
Et as granz coups d'espees fourbiz.

Duno i out estour mervellous,
Unc no vie plus perilous.
Bien firent Beduer et Sir Kei:
Dieux! qels barons en curt le Rei!
Kels seneschals, qels botelers,
Qant servent bien des brancs d'asciers!
Mais Beduer s'est folament alé,
Li Reis Boccus l'ad encontré:
Beduer férist par my le cors
Et fist passer le fer de fors.

Beduer chïst, le qeor li part,
L'alme s'en voit, Jésu la gard!
Kei ad trové Beduer mort.
En talent ñi l'enport;
Munt l'aveit chier et mult l'amout.

Od tant de gent qu'il out
Fist les renges departir,
Et la place leur fist guerpir.
Mais al targier et al attendre
Q'il fist al corpos Beduer prendre

S'est li Reis de Libie aprismé,
Sertorius out noun, mult ert priscod.
Cil out Kei nafre mertelevement,
Et occis out mult de sa gent:
Munt l'ont nafre, mult l'unt ferru,
Mais il l'ad bien le corps tenu.
Porté out Beduer al Mágrun,
Volisent cil de Rome ou nouu.

ARTHUR vist sa gent sortir
Et ceux de Rome rebaudir,
Et le champ contre luý purprendre:
Ne pout ne ne volt plus attendre.
Od sa campaigne vint criant:
"Ke fetez-vous? Alez avant!
Veez moi icy vostre garantit!
N'i lessez un soul aler vivant!"
Dunc veisses Arthur cumbatre,
Hommes occire, hommes abatre;
N'i purreint puis Romeins estier.
Ne ne purreient recourer.
As grantz turbîs s'en vont fuïant,
Les uns sås les autres abatant.
L'empereour fu abatuz,
El corps d'un lance fu ferruz.
Jeo ne sai qi le abatia,
Ne ne sai dire qi le ferri:
En la presse fu entrepris,
Et en la presse i fu oois.
Entre les mortz fu mort trovez,
Et el corps d'un lance navages.
Cils de Rome, cils d'orient,
Et li autre communement,
A plus tost q'ils pèient fuisse,
Bretuns les en chacent et occien.
Sanc veisses courer as russaus,
Et occis gisir as muncals.
Arthur se fist joiuuse et lied,
Ke le orgoille de Rome out plaisied;
Ses gentz fiz enterrer,
En Abbeies les fist sepeler.
Le corps fist del Empereour
Prendre et garder a grant honur.
A Rome en bere l'en envoiait,
Et a ceux de Rome maundust
Ke de Bretaigne, qe il teneit,
Altre treud ne lour deveit.
Arthur remist en Burgoin,
Tote l'ivere i sojourne.
En este volt Munoye passier
Et a Rome volt dreit aler,
Nais Modred l'en ad retorné:
Dieux! qele hunte et qel vililet
Ly fist qant sa femme priet
Et sa terre a ses oîlz saisest!
Arthur oie, et de veire sout
Ke Modred fei ne li portout.
Qasi vint Arthur a Whitsaund,
Del parjure Modred pleignant.

ARTHUR fist ses gentz eschipper,
Tant menast gent, ne sai numbrer.
Modred lour fust a l'encontre
Od vint mil chivaler.
Al entrer surterre fu occis
Gawain, li pruz, li gentis.
Li Roi Anguesel i fu mortz,
Et plusieurs de lour aforco.

2735
Mais puis qu'le Bretuns furent al terrein
Et parigale furent el pleine,
N' i pout Modred aver duré,
Del champe s'en est od sa gent alié.
Vers Cornewaille s'en est hasté,
Graunt ost en ad assemblé.
Arthur n'out cure de sojourno,
Kar vers Modred out graunt haïour;
De Anguesel ad grant doel oud

2740
Et de Gawein qu'il out saerdud.
Modred n'en out de fuir cure,
Sun cors wolt mettre en aventure.
Joust Tamre fu la bataille,
En le entré de Cornewaille.

2745
Iloeo s'en volt le Roi attendre
Et sun cors encontre li defendre.
Arthur i vint od ses chivalera,
Plus i out qu'cent milliers.
Aitant sei sunt entreferru,
D'amparz i ferient par graunt vertu.

2750
Grant fu d'amparz la perde,
La pleine fu des mortz couvert
Occis fu Modred en l'estour
Et de sa gent tot li plusur.
Arthur, si la jeste ne ment,
Fu iloeo nafre mortelemet;
En Avaloun se fist portier

2755
Pur ses plâies mediciner.
Portier se fist en Avaloun.
Pur veir, puis l'en Incarnacion
Cink cent et qarant et deuz anz.
Damage fu qu'il n'out enfautz
Al fiz Cador, Costantin
De Cornewaille, un scen cousin,

2760
Liverast sun regne, et si li dist
X'il fust Reis tant qu'il revemist.
Treis anz oïl regna poëtis,
Geo fu grant doel qant fu fenis..
A Stonhenges fu aportiez,

2765
Od grant honur enterrez.

CONANT sis nece après regnast:
Orgoillouse fu, mult sei praissant.
Pees ne solt faire ne gardier.
Ses gentz laïssout entremêllar.

2770
Entre li meimes et sa gent
Aveit grant descordement.
Qatro anz fu Reis et petit plus,
Empres fu Reis Vortiporus.
En son temps Saxons releverent,
La terre tot aver quidoient.
Mais li Roi sa terre diffendi,
Et en bataille les venqui.
Maladie l'en priet, si morust;
A Lundres ensepelie fust.

2785 CARIZ fu puis Reis de la terre,
Mais tote la perdi par guerre.
En son temps vint la grant suverse
Des paiens et de gent adverse
Ke Gurguint menast par Meri;
Ore le vous voilt mustrer.
En Engletere vint viglant,
Saxons et paiens menant.
En sa flot treis cent nefs avelt,
En Bretaigne cil ariveit.

2800 Gorguint destruit meinte Cité
Et meint chastei d'antiquité,
Vant eglise et meinte clergie,
Mante esquesyed et meint abbyo.
Kant il out gasté le pain,
Les viles arr, l'aver pris,
Le reigne ad a Saxsons doné.
Li Reis Cariz s'en returnast,
Colement par nuit s'en alant;
En Gales dreit sa veie tint,
Ne sai puis ou il devint.
Saxons ont la terre recuillie,
Ke mult l'aveient encovrie.
Pur un linage dunt il furent,
Ki la terre primes reeurent,
Se firent Engleis apeller
Pur leur orine remembrer,
Et England ont apellé
La terre ke leur ort doné.
Desge Brutus de Troie vint,
Tozens Bretaigne sun moune tint
Jusc'al terme qu jeo vous die
Ke par Gurguint sun noune perdie.
Les nons des viles trentournorent,
En leur langage les nomorent.

2825 ENGLEIS voldreient Reis establir,
Mais ne sei purreint assentir
Ke un Rei seulement aessent,
Et a un Rei tot sojette fuissent.
Ne se accordent mi a une,
Ainz par conseille commune
Plusurs Reis par plusurs cuntrés,
Si on les terres devisés.
Plusurs feiz a'entraguerolient,
Et plusurs feiz s'entre apaiet.
Issi ont longement estée
Sanz les et sansz cristienté.
Cent anz et plus i ont esté
Sanz ley et sansz cristienté.
Parler en ôye Seint Gregoire,
Ki a icel temps ert apostoire.
Seint Austin i enveiaat
Ke las eglises sacrast.
En Tamise vint primererement
Et d'iloec passast en Kent.
A Cauntorbizis s'aprismaast
Et li pôples mult l'onurast.
Reis AudebeMD, que Kent teneiat.
De linage Hengist cil estait,
Gîl ad Seint Austin baptizez,
Et en le seint founcre regeneretz.
Empres le Rei fu la meiñé
Regeneretz et baptize;
Par le terre alout sarmonant,
Musters fequant, clers ôtdeinant.

KANT li Reis et li Saxson,
Primes li Engleis et li baron,
Urent tuz receuëz baptesme,
Enfanz levez et oint de creme,
Arere s'en est repairé,
Mult esteit joïouse et lied.
L'apostolhe ad tot cunté
Cum out le poeple regeneré.
Cathwalens, un gentil bier
Cil out un partie de la terre.
Totes les Reis enguerolast
Et descurfit et mort les ad.
C'il out la terre et la seisin
Et le tint juscial sa fin.
Unze anz cil regnast;
Edwyn, sun fiz, en heritast.
Cil tint le regne en bone pesse
Tot dis juscial sun decease.

OSWALD, sun fiz, un gentil bier,
Por cristienté lei garder,
Uns noble home de frank corage,
Out la terre en heritage.
Oswald fu martirizé
Par Peanda, un diffaié.
Un des freres Oswald, Oswy,
Le regne sun frere seissi.
Oswy out parenz et neveuz
Assez riches et assez pruz,
Ke pur aver part de la terre
Pristent encuntele li estrif et guere.
Mais Oswy bien ne le diffendi,
Que nul terre ne luy tolle.
Neuf ans oyl Oswy regna;
Malades estoit, et luy devia.
A Ewerwic fu exporte,
A grant honur escevelo.

CADAVALADER enpros regna,
Len barones l’on corona.
En sun temps fu falt de ulea,
Et de la falt vient chierté.
Bien passez trein jorue chivaluer.
N’i trouverez qu’o amater.
Ovek icel mesaventure
Revint un alerg, algre dure:
Mortalité fu grant do gent
Par air corumpe et par vent.
Mangeant, parlant, alant morgent.
Sudéinemont, sans langour devient.
Clos qi len mortz enterre durant
En la sopculturo mort chañent.
Cathaladair, qi Rain estoit,
Ki la terre garder devoit
Pur la grant mortalité
En Britagne Minour est aié,
Al Rei Aníaf, qi cult l’onura.
Tot dorechief li cunta
Do la grant mortalité.
Et coment lur est failli le bien.
Cathaladair n’i sojourn.
Dediz un mois devia.

EGBRÍD sun fize enpros regna.
Les barones de la terre mult l’ama.
Cil out la regne, si se füst coroner;
Bien le saveit justiser.
En sun temps Charlemain regna,
Ki l’onur de France garda.
Egbríd trente et deux ans venqui:
A Wincestre gist, et la finy.

APRES li regna nun fize,
Apelfwolf out nun, mult fu gantiz.
Cil dona a Dieu et a saint fier
Ke vous oiez Rome peny nomer.
Apelfwolf fu a Rome est ans
En la cité demorance.
En reparant, par franchine oriet
A fême demoinesal Juit,
La fer le Charlemain de France.
Mais ne venqui pus qu’oic he ans
Quant il engrota et morunt:
A Wincestre apelle lus.
APRES li regna Aëlistan li pruz.
Mult par esteit amé de touz.
Encoco li firent grant encumbera.
Soventefois le vont guerrer.
Main od le aide de la eslit.

Seint Johan, arcevesque de Evercio,
Furent li Sooteins descunfiz,
Heinte millier i furent ooz.
Seint Johan l'arcevesque mult bun foofa.
Rentes et honours le dona;

Puis volt a Lundres ater,
Tot l'iver i volt nojourner.
Grant doel fust c'il enmaladie;
Neuf anz regna et demye.
Quant il estait duiié
A Wincentro fu enterré.
Puis regna Edgar sun frero,
Muit esteit bele bacherel.
Icol ouro qu'il nasquie,
Seint Dunstan en oie.

Los Angeles qi chantierent
Emont en le firmament
Ke lon pees en sorra
Tant cum Edgar regnera;
Et si avient certilment;

Tiel plenteé i avezit entre tot gent,
Et pees et cuncorde i avezit,
Ke nule pleindre no ao poét.
Saise anz le Roi regna:
En chescun an renovealta
Eglises, rentes ou abeiles,
Ou hospitales ou pontz ou veiles.
Icol bon Rois enmaladie,
Muit fu dolent si amye.
A Lundres ort ensapellé

Et od grant honur enterré.

APRES li regna Edward,
Cil fu joefnos et de bon part,
Cil regna treis anz et demi;
A grant doel n'en finy

Car Estrico, sa marastro, le fust oclo
A doel et a grant martire,
Pur coveitice de la regne doner
A Alvered, sun fiz, pur heriter.
A Schaftisbiry fu enporté.

Od grant honur enterré.

PUIS regna Alvered sun frere;
Mais bastard ert de par sa mare.
Trente est anz cil regna;
En grant hunte sa terre garda,

Car Danesia sovent l'y pueroient
Et de sa gent mult damagierent.
Par le conseil Edriz vîndrent, 2990
Grant anuye sovent le firent.
Cunte catoit aill de Salesbire,
Et de Vincetra oill fu aire.
Le Roy pur dolour enmainadie,
A Lundres gist, illoc finie.
A Saint Pole fu enterré,
De ses amis mult regretoe.

EDMUNDE Irenside, eis fiz.
Après li regna, Roy poestiz.
N'i out longement la Realme tenu
Ke grant guere n'en out eu;
Car de Danemarche le Roi Knout
Od grant Navye vînt a bot.
Un Englotes ariva,
Ilus de seisante mil armez aumâna.
Cunte le Roi bataille priet,
Et en bataille le venquist;
Et le seconde jour suivant
Edmund le venqi en un châmpe.
Mîl i aivet d'amparz tueiz,
Et d'amparz mult damagiez.
Edriz li traitre o'en alai
Fur acorde mettre a' pone
Si que la Realme fu departô,
Et entre les deux Rois devisé.
Puis par le treaun Edriz
Fu li Rois Edmund murdriz.
A Glastingbâry fu enportô,
A grant honor ensepolé.

KNOUT seiy puis tot la terre,
Totes les baruns i fist maundir:
A Lundres grant feste tint,
Duca et Contes, testuz i vînt.
Chescun li out fait homage,
Povres et richens do halt parage.
Knout enpres viii anz vesqui,
A Lundres fu ensepoli.

HARALD bastard puis regna,
Totes ses barons mult l'ama.
Qatre anz et demi en peus vesqui,
A Winacstre enagroty.
Illoc morut et devinast,
Illoc ensepolie l'en ad.

PUIS regna Alfred Axîfot, sun frere,
Le fiz Knout, c'il out mult chier.
Le regne tint, bien le guia.
Knout li Roî l'engendra
De un Francisco k'avait a nun Emma:
Muit par esteit boal cum gemme.
Deus anz regna et dieu jours,
Puis fu ensepole a grant honur.
A Lambeth, pres de Lundres, eruest,
Et a Wincoentre ensepole fust.

3040

APRES regna Saint Edward,
Fiz Alfred, Roi de Done part.
Dieu et Saint eglise mult ama.
Rentes et terres sovent dona
3045

Aa povres abbeies et a hospitains;
Muit par esteit tenuz beina.
Muit granz miracles fiet dieu pur lio.
Aprés sa mort et en sa vie.
L'an del Incarnation Jheu crist
3050

ui. seianete et sin,
Et vint un de sun regne
Devina le Roi sun roialme
A William, bastard appelé,
Sun Neveve et Duc de Normandie.
3055

Li Roi Edward enmuladie,
Muit sei pleignent si amys.
A Westminster esteit enterrer,
A grant honor ensepelez.
Puis fu de sa tumbe prin,
3060

Et en fentre i fu mis;
Devant le autier l'en ad poné.
Dieu l'ad mult honuré:
Les avogles fait lour voulo aver,
Et les soutes en fait parlor
3065

APRES Edward, Harald regnand,
La terre a sun oes prin ad.
Piz Godwin cist esteit,
Qi la cuntfé de Kent teneit.
3070

A tort ad la terre seisé.
Mais puis l'avoir chier - comparé. (4)
Neuf mois la terre tint
Quant William Bastard li survint
Od Normanz et od gents armes,
Harald en out mult guerolier;
3075

Et Harald grant ost assembla,
Encunentro William Bastard ala.
Mais a Harald vint dure novele,
Kar ferru fu parmi la cereve;
Od un gaine qui a li fu trait;
3080

Ke de sun chief ne fu ensepoint.
A Waltham fu Harald enporté
Et od honor enseveleu.

WILLIAM Bastard puis regna,
Ke grant chivalerte amena.
3085

Un grant abbeie ad començé
Et grantz rentes lour ad doné

(*)See „Corrections“, p. 239.
Ke pur les mortz tot jorns chanteront,
Fur ceus qe en bataille oois furent.
Les barons li firent hommage,
De lui tindrent leur heritage.
Vin un anz cist William regna,
En Normandie esteit quant devia.
A Cham fu li Roi parté,
Entre ses parentz ensevelé.

3095
PUIS regna William le Rous:
Sun fiz esteit, mult orgoilous.
Grant reddour fist en sa terre,
Nul n'i ooutil mover guere.
Duze anz cil le regne tint,
Au darae cil malades devint.
A Wincentre fist et devia,
Illoc en sepulchre sepullore l'en poma.

60 a
PUISES Henry puis regna,
Sun frere esteit, qi mult l'ama.
A Londres seu fist coroner,
A Westminster devant le nutier.
Cil fist faire les bones lei,
Ke uncoro tennent les Engleis.
Trente ass anz cil regna,
A Lundres esteit et devia.
A Redding esteit porté,
En le abbeye ensevelé.

3100
PUIS sun Neuer Esteven regna,
Le Realme prist, bien le garda.
Vaint abbé en sa terre fist,
Mult richement les enfranchist.
Din neuf anz la terre garda,
Maladie en prist, q'il devia.
A Payrechcom fu enporcé,
Od grant solomonité enterré.

60 b
PUIS lo second Henry regnat,
Sun fiz esteit, et mult l'onura.
Mult par esteit orgoilouse et fier,
Et totonc de faunine maintenêr.
3125
Les franchise vouldreit retraire
Ke Saint Eglise deveroit aver.
Point Thomas le cuntrediseit,
Ke le archeveché de Cantorbirre teneit.
Lur oeo le fist a doel morto,
A Cantorbiria le fist occire.
Vin net unz cil regna,
A Font Everard enprêto.
Illoc seu barons l'ensevelint,
Ki mult grant doel pur lui en fist.

3135
PUIS regna Richard sun; fiz.
Gist estoit Reis poestiz, 
Sun Realme mult bien garda 
Ke nully ne le guerxoia. 
Cil les payens novent gueroleit 
Et soventfoiz les damageit. 
Lais illoec fu nafre, 
Od un gaince a mort jette. 
Cil regna dis anz et demy, 
Grant doel fu quant fu finy. 
A Font Everard en fu porté, 
Dejouste sun pier ensevelé.

Puis regna Johan sun frere, 
Sun Realme guie en belo maner; 
Mais grant adversité aviet 
Par Mestre Esteven, qu'il no volet, 
Que l'Apostoille aviet envoyé 
Receivre a un Evansché: 
Fu Engletero entredit, 
Ne mesue ne baptesme n'i aviet. 
Dis anz et tres quartiers en un mois 
Durant l'entredit a Estroi. 
Innocent la pape out a noun, 
Mult par estoit sleinte hom. 
En temps le Roi out grant guere 
Par entre les barons d'Engletero. 
Duso estoit SirLewis arivé, 
La fiz Roi Philippe de France nas. 
Cil fist pais en la terre, 
Ke nula vera autres n'i moyst guere. 
Johan regna seize ans et demy, 
Mult sei pleigment au amy. 
A Wincestre estoit porte. 
A grant honur ensevelée. 

Puis regna sun fiz Henry, 
Cist out le regno en baillio. 
En sun temp le barons de la terre 
Cuntre luy moverent grant guere. 
La bataille de Lewes fu en sun temp, 
Mult i perdi de ses parentz; 
Et de Evesham la bataille, 
Ou mainte mil fu oois sans faille, 
Et Sir Gymond de Muntford, 
Et meintltre de sun efforz, 
Et Sir Henry, sun fiz. 
Et meint pruz chivaler gentiz; 
Et Sir Hugh le despenser, 
Et meint vaillant bacheler. 
Neuf unz cinckant et mis 
Cist estoit mois poestis. 
Mult par estoit enfeblie, 
Si cheeit en un maladie; 
Cist morust, et fu portez, 
A Westmouster enseveliez.

EDWARD, sun fij, apres regnast, Cil tint la terre, si le gardast. Cil fu de grant poestis, C'il meintint bien ses franchies De Seint Egliz, et mult l'amoit, Rentas et possesions lour doneit; As povres freres de religion Sovent dona mult riche doun. Bien solt sun Realme maintenir; As Escocz fist meint encumbrer, Car soventefoiz les guerliou, Et soventefoiz les destrou. En uns tempes surdit grant avie Par entre ses barons et lui, Pur un baron qi fu en la terre, Ke homo appelleit Hugh l'Espensier. Le Roi le vousist maintenir, Car il estoit sun conseiller. Pur cee les barons urent avie, De la Realme l'ont exillie. Li Rei n'i trova en li si bien noun, Si le fist aver posession De ses rentas et de ses fees, Si li out ses portes restorez: Od li le tint cum aizn fist. Xant les barons icoz vist. Cuntre le Roi prizrent guerm, Cuntre li chivalcherent en sa terre. Li Rei grandement se corucose, Grant ost i assembla. Touz qi encuntre li chivalcherent, Prendre les fist, si's encroierent. Puis par un Conte de la terre Ke l'em appelleit Rogier Mortimer,
Li surdit mult grant hantage.
Oil li tolli sun heritage,
O'il fist Sir Hugh occire,
Et a vile hantage decoler.
Puis le Roi par force prist,
Al chastel de Berole le tramist:
A vile mort le fist morir,
Et vileinelement le fist mourdrir.
Vint anz fu Reis poestis,
Et qant fu mort et fenis
A Gloucestre esteit porté,
A grant honure ensevelée.
Dieu laad grandement honoré,
Car meint home ad delivré
De la langure qo li teneit:
Dieuz pur li granz miracles ad fait.

APRES li regne sun fix qe or est,
Ke dieu li garde me li plesct:
Edward li noble conquerour,
Xi fort et pruz est en estour.
Oil ad grant guerre commencé,
Pur ses dreitures s'en est pené
Encuntre le Roi de France en sa terre.
Dieu, qi tot poet justiser,
Li doint grace et power
Q'il poet la victorie aver.

Amen.

Explicit Brutus
NOTES ON THE TEXT

The text given reproduces that of the MS except for the following details:

Punctuation has of course been added. The only punctuation in the MS is an inverted semi-colon : and an oblique stroke /. The former is of frequent occurrence within the line and is usually represented in the transcription by a colon or comma, though in some cases its purpose is doubtful and it is not in accord with any modern rules of punctuation. / occurs four times, and seems to be chiefly decorative.

The scribe's use of capitals is preserved except for changing Descoce into d'Escoces, Lemaire into l'Empereur, etc., and omitting them from non-substantives nöriz 148, monaile 1661.

Roman numerals have been replaced in all except two cases by the French words spelt in conformity with habits shown in a few examples written in full. The exceptions are viii (1698) and viii (3023); the scribe indicates two and three un respectively, but the correct reading should be un and vin.

The usual abbreviations and compendia have of course been expanded.

Words and letters within parenthesis are suggested renderings for those effaced by wear or stains in the MS.

There are no marginal "scribbles", except that beside the illustration on f. 34 a, showing Octa and Cosa being led into the Tower; the hand responsible for the text, or a similar one, has written in red ink "Octa le fix Hengist." Catchwords are found at the foot of ff. I b, and 32 b. The former consists of the whole verse appearing at the top of f. 93; as this is exceptional, it may suggest that the misplacement of the leaves (V. Introduction, p. 4) took place when the book was first made.

Corrections. Definite clerical errors are few. Incarcacion appears at v. 191 for Incarnation, en for et 591, for ne 639, et for ke(?) 893, le for ke 1834, lust for lust or lust 2111, ses for les (7) 3218, le for ne 798, et for em 2258, de for le 2617. "P cumparé" at v. 3070 seems to show change of intention from purpayé to compará.

The syllable en seems to have given some trouble. It is apparently omitted in femine 504, covable 1186, and superfluous in derainement 716, crainement (13rd pers. sing. of craindre) 2843. For omission of ne see p. 129. Er may be omitted in livrer (fut. livrer) 682, 2293, a in mortier aleg 1190, en in v. 1554, le in aver deivent 2329. V. 2662 should perhaps read qil l'enport.

Judging from Wace's text, cest moigne is necessary after Rei in complete v. 822, paizen after set in v. 1072.
It is possible that the syllable ei is omitted in many verbs apparently in the imperfect indicative or the conditional, e.g. creient 180, gueroint 838, manacent 839, garirent 1094, guerpisent 1095, elirent 1130, maximatem destruerent 1356, conseillerent 1480, etc. These spellings may have another explanation, however. V. pp. 115, 168. Possible corrections in verbs are: parleroient for parloient 1147, cremeient for cremeit 1401, aveient for avait 2055, aporterent for aportoient 2424, s'entreguero9srent for s'entregueroient 2834, damagieient for damagieent/2986.
GLOSSARY

Chief words or meanings not found in the dictionaries:

ACOMINER v. t. 478, share
ACONDUIER v. t. 905, bring
AFIER v. ref. 306, be confident
AFORE 1977, AFFORCE 212, EFORCE 476, 1631, n. force, army, cf. f'orfez
AITANT 451, 818, 824, 1859, adv. then
AIN 2995, adj. (Eng.) own.
APRISMER v. n. (de), 279, prepare? consent? V. p. 133.
ATTENDRE v. n. (a), 304, attend to
AUTREIT pron. 2091, the other
AVIE n. 3221, 3227, content, strife. V. p. 132.
BRETAGNE n. 987, 1607, Breton or British language
CAROLE M. 1526, stone circle, (word first found in Wace)
CUNEGUD, past part. 73, pres. indic. 1276, of cunsuivre
DEDEIGNER v. ref. 9, 2258, be disdainful (used by Wace, but Codefroy's examples are late)
DEPARTEMENT n. 615, departure. Cf. descordienment 2781.
DESERVIR v. n. 595, stay (s'arester?); v. a. 2256, decide (arester?) - Wace's word
DESNEIER v. a. 124, refute
ENAGROIT V. 3t: 3029, a) 304, attend to
ERROR v. n. 1488, for arer
ESTORNE n. 2495, (Eng.) helm, rudder
FORELETTE n. 450, fortress
GAIGNE v. n. 1495, wend (gaigner = pied?)
GAINE 3080, GAIGNE 3143, n., arrow
GUERRER v. a. 2938, 2986, wage war on
LENTIN adj. adv. 2531, form of lentif
LIED A LIED adv. 40, - lez a lez
LEVE n. 1586, for levre or levres
MENE adj. 286, second. V. p. 134.
MURE(?) adj. 895. V. p. 39.
NECE n. masc. 399, 2777, = nies
NOBLEI n. 554, pomp
PERILER v. n. 502, 505, be in peril
POICE n. 1671 (for polce?), pulse
PRUEZ n. 2642, prowess (plur.)
RECETTE n. 970 (for recet). recrait
REMELLER V. n. 1120, fight again
REMWER v. n. 233, remove
SEPELER v. a. 2709, bury (ensepeler in Chronicle)
SUSEVRSE n. 2793, flood, invasion (surverne in Wace)
TRAIRE v. ref. 1367, gather (= s'atraire)
VENCER v. a. 2397, v. p. 133.
INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

ADILSTAN 2935; Aethelstan grandson of Alfred.
ALDROGEN 649, 651, 676, 692; king of Britain.
Alemoine 1616; Germany.
ALIPHATISMA 2445; Spanish chief.
ALRED AXIPOT 3031, 3042; Harold Harefoot. V. p. 70
ALVERED 2978, 2981; Aethelred the Redless. V. p. 69
Amberbirie 1598, Aumebirie 1505, Aumebirie 1140; Amesbury
Amegyn 2154, 2161, Angieu 2468; Anjou.
ANGUESEL 2391, 2475, 2734, 2744; king of Scotland, Arthur's ally.
ANLAF 2909; Danish king of Ireland. V. p. 67
APPAS 1644, 1659; murderer of Aurelius.
Átila Aquilea 546; Aquileia.
ARELIUS 1355, AURELIE 1435, 1614, 1635, AURELIUS ANDROSIO 714; son of Constantine and king of Britain.
Armoriche 426, 1343; Armorica.
ARTHUR 2069; king of Britain.
ARVIRACUS 2, 85, 105, 120, ARVIRACUS 23, 43, 68, 73, 75, 87, 109, 139; son of Cymbeline, king of Britain.
ARCHELLE 2033; king of Denmark.
ASTLAPIADOG 217, ASTLEPIADOG 209; king of Britain.
AETHWOLF 2924, 2927; Aethelwulf, king of Wessex and Kent, d. 858
AUDEBERD 2847; Aethelbert, king of Kent.
Auguste 2459; Month of August.
ARELIUS etc. v. ARELIUS.
AUSTIN 2841, 2849; Saint Augustine.
Auverge 2155, 2161; Auvergne.
Avalon 2762, 2764; Avalon.
Averelle 2174; month of April.
BAEHELE 2613; Bath, Somerset.
Babiloise 2444; Babylon.
Harbeilot 2501, 2531; Barfleur.
Harri 2160; Berri.
BEDUER 2236, 2543, 2548, 2604, 2652, 2656, 2658, 2660, 2662, 2676; Arthur's seneschal.
BELIN 2344; Gaulish chief, brother of Brennus.
Harcel 3248; Berkeley, Glos.
BUCCUS, 2657; BROCUUS 2446; king of Media.
Bocce 2441; Basotia.
Boloigne 2051, 2470; Boulogne.
BOOS 2614; earl of Oxford under Arthur.
BRENNE 2345; Brennus, Gaulish chief.
Brëtain 200, 211, 237, 245, 254, 297, 356, 398, 353, 1485, 1615, 1619, 1766, 2270, 2289, 2328, 2346, 2411, 2627, 2714, 2736, 2799, 2820; Britain.

Brëtain minor 441, 646, Brëtainne minor 2908; Brittany.


BRUTUS 2819; legendary ancestor of the Britons.

Burgoinouns 2345; Burgundians.

Burgerne 2156, 2375, 2429, 2592, 2716; Burgundy.

CADOR 2208, 2768; king of Cornwall under Arthur.

CADWALADER 2891, CATHWALADER 2905, 2914; last British king.

Caliburne 2134, 2580; Arthur's sword.

Cantorbiria 3128, Cantorbiria 857, 3130, Cauntorbiria 2845; Canterbury.

CARADOC 376, 386; Earl of Cornwall.

CARIZ 2790, 2807; king of Britain.

Carlion 2182, Carlioun 2191, Karlion 1512; Caerleon-upon-Usk.

CATHWALAD 2863; king of "a part of the land," evidently a confusion of Cadwalla the Saxon and Cadwallon of Wales.

Cestre 2682; Chester.

Cham 3093; Caen.

CHARLEMANN 2919, 2931 CHARLEMEN 2931; Charlemagne.

CHEREDIG 1018; Vortiger's interpreter. Actually the name of a Saxon leader.

Cicer 1934, Cireceter 702; Cirencester.

Cise 517; Scythia.

CLAUDIUS 9, 24, 63, 78, 113, 118, 138; Roman emperor.

COCCA 2451; Roman senator.

COIL 213, 219, 224, 251, COIL 240; king of Britain.

COIL 147, 151, 153; king of Britain.

COGRIN 1890, 1907, 1910, 1941, 1946, 1950, 1951; Octa's ally.

Colongne 512; Cologne.

COMPERD 339; king of Norway.

CONAN 371, 373, 375, 379, 381, 399, 435, 449, 468, 469, 525, 649, 663; Octave's nephew.

CONANT 2776; king of Britain after Constantine of Cornwall.

Conibourne 1421, 1445; Conisborough.

Cornwall 276, 1793, 1811, 2208, 2740, 2749, 2769; Cornwall.

COSA 1764, 1777, 1877, 1889, 1898, 1906, 1907; Hendig's nephew, perhaps the same as Ebissa; called Eosa in other versions.

COSTANS (i) 234, 247, 253, 263; Constantius Chlorus.

COSTANS (ii) 732, 747, 750, 754, 760, 763, 846, 1354; COSTANT 741, COSTANT 711; eldest son of Constantine (i).

COSTANTIN (i) 266, 278, 298, 384, COSTENTIN 259, 267, 303; Constantine the Great.

COSTANTIN (ii) 684, 718, COSTENTIN 680, 695, 704, 1341; king of Britain.

COSTANTIN (iii) 2768; king after Arthur.
Crete 2443.
CHRIST 159, 688, 689; Christ.
CURSALEN 2612; earl of Chester.
Daneis 558, 574, 616, 766, 2033, 2465, 2985; Danes.
Danemarche 2046, 2999; Denmark.
Darteneue 1363; Dartmouth.
DOLDOHANYN 1988; king of "Gothland."
Dorchester 2611; Dorchester
DUNIAN 167; Roman missionary.
DUNSTAN 2954; St. Dunstan, archbishop of Canterbury.
DYANOYTH 461, 479, 487; Deonatus, governor of Britain.
DYNABUS 1221, 1223; Merlin's youthful adversary.
EBISSA 1063, 1438; nephew or cousin of Hengist, perhaps Octa.
ECHION 2441; duke of BONOTIA.
EDGAR 2952, 2958; king of Wessex.
EDMUNDE IRNESIDE 2995, 3006, 3014; Edmund Ironside.
EDRIZ 2987, 3009, 3013; Edric Streona.
EDWARD (1) 2971; Edward the Martyr.
EDWARD (11) 3041, 3055, 3065; Edward the Confessor.
EDWARD (111) 3190; Edward I; (iv) 3219; Edward II; (v) 3261; Edward III.
EDWYN 2870; king of Northumbria.
EGBRORD 2915, 2921; Egbert, king of Wessex, first overlord of England.
Egipte 2442; Egypt.
ELDAUB 1481; bishop under Aurelius.
ELDOLF 1425, 1451, 1454, ELDOLFS 1161; earl of Gloucester.
ELEINE (i) 225; wife of Coel.
ELEINE (ii) 253, 288, 293, 305, 384; Coel's daughter, wife of Costant (1).
EMME 3035; wife of Canute.
Engelard 2817.
ENGLIS 2815, 2825, 2856, 3108; English.
EPISTR0 2440; king of Greece.
ESCOC 325, 331, 400, 528 559, 572, 577, 1064, 1390, 1495, 1766, 1907, 2206, 2391, 3192; Scotland.
ESCOC 617, 783, 2937, 3218; Scots.
ESPaigne 235, 2445, 2537; Spain.
ESTEVEN (1) 3113; Stephen of Blois.
ESTEVEN (11) 3150; Stephen Langton.
ESTRICE 2975; Ethelfrida.
EVERWE 2940, EWVERICO 4440, 1459, 1767, 1771, 2889; York.
EVERHAM 3175.
Faversham 3119; Faversham.
Flandre 2277, Flandres 2470, Flanandres 2051, Frandrea 2606; Flanders.
Font Everard 3145, Font Everard 3132; Fontevrault.
France 415, 424, 452, 453, 1703, 2020, 2053, 2094, 2277, 2289.
2375, 2920, 2931, 3162, 3265; Franche 2354, 2592.
Francois 416, 867, 3035; French.
FROLLE 2057, 2062, 2085, 2105, 2107, 2112, 2123, 2138, 2144, 2276; Roman governor of Paris.
GAFAN (for Fagan) 168; Roman missionary to Britain.
GAIUS METEL 2451; Roman senator

Gales 128, 736, 1179, 1210, 1370, 1517, 1615, 1633, 1691, 2809; Wales.

Galle 2053; Gaul.

Cascovyn 2155, Cascovyne 2161; Connely

Cædwalla

Cawein 2733, 2745; Arthur's nephew.

Genius 117, 123, 135; daughter of Claudius

Cillamor 1547, 1561, 1975, 1980; King of kings of Ireland opposing successively Uther and Arthur.

Clamorgan 2182.

Glastingbire 3015; Glastonbury.

Gloucester 134, 189, 213, 1161, 1167, 3253; Gloucester.

Godwin 3067; Earl Godwin, father of Harold.

Gollande 1989; "Gothland."

Gollandeis 2464, Gollandeis 557; men of Gothland.

Conore 1371; Canarew, Herefordshire.

Conovre 2214, GONOWRE 1957, Guenovre 2483; Arthur's wife.

GONWaise 1988; King of Orkney.

GORQUINT 2800, GUROUQUINT 2794, 2822; Cormond, a Saxon chief, no doubt the same as Guthrum.

GORLOIS 1793, 1799, 1811, 1831, 1834, 1847, 1849; Earl of Cornwall.

GRACIAN 534, 551, 556; Roman general.

GRACIEN 418, GRATIEN 456; brother of Valentinian.

Grce 2440; Greece.

GREGOIRE 2839; Pope Gregory the Great.

Guichard 2607; a vassal of Arthur.

Guinecelin 644, Quinecelins 642, 686; Archbishop of London.

Hamon 37, 42, 67, 71, 75, Hamoun 25; counsellor of Claudius

Harald Bastard 3025; Harold Hardfoot. V. p. 70.

Harald 3065, 3074, 3075, 3077, 3081; King Harold.

Hengist 853, 872, 934, 936, 938, 968, 977, 997, 1041, 1042, 1043, 1051, 1058, 1068, 1112, 1116, 1121, 1125, 1135, 1143, 1176, 1389, 1393, 1405, 1407, 1419, 1431, 1433, 1449, 1455, 1756, 2748;

Henry (13) 1031, 3121; (11) 3169; Henry I, Henry II.

Henry 3179; son of Simon de Montfort.

Hirtac 2442; king of Egypt.

Hoel 2152, 2158, 2368, 2390, 2474, 2538; Arthur's nephew.

Holdin 2606; Count of Flanders.

Hors 853; Horsa.

Hugh le Despenser 3181; Chief Justice of the barons.

Hugh le Despenser 3224, 3245; Favorite of Edward II.

Humbras 427; Armorican chief.

Humbræ 531, 561, 928; Humber.

Ibert 1799, 1821, 1836, 1840, 1841, 1871; Wife of Gorlois.

Innocent 3157; Innocent III.


Irreis 1541, 1548, 1557, 1692, 1731, 2464; Irish.

Islande 1984; Iceland.

Islandeis 2404; Icelanders.

Jerusalem (abbrev.) 289.

Jh (abbrev.) 159, 2061, 3049.
JOHAN (St) 2940, 2943; John of Beverley, archbishop of York.
JOHAN 3147, 3185; king of England.
JONATHAS 2611; earl of Dorchester.
JUBITER 913; Jupiter.
JUDIT 2930; daughter of Charles the Bald.
Jues 290; Jews.
JUCAEN 2610; earl of Leicester.
JULIUS CESAR 2268, 2330; Julius Caesar.
Kaer Karai 987; Càetic name of Thongcaster.
Karliun, v. Carlion.
KATIGER 1077; son of Vortiger.
KEI 2543, 2548, 2652, 2662, 2672, KEUS 2603, KEYS 2232; Arthur's butler.
KENBELIN 1; Cymbeline.
Kent 850, 1047, 1051, 1175, 2844, 2847, 3068.
Kermyn 1216; Carmarthen.
KNOUT 2999, 3017, 3123, 3032, 3034; Canute.
Lambeth 3039.
LAWIS 3161; Louis, son of Philippe-Auguste, later Louis VIII.
Leicester 2610; Leicester.
LEONIN 293, LEONYN 28g, LYONYN 383; uncle of Eleine.
Lewes 3173.
Libie 2447, 2670; Libya.
Lindeseye 937; part of Lincolnshire.
Londres 256, 491, 1083, 3105, 3203; Lundres 347, 581, 640, 696 798, 1778, 1784, 1791, 2789, 2945, 2992, 3019, 3024, 3039 3110; London.
LOOTH 1888, 1892, 1904, 2030; brother-in-law of Arthur.
Lorenga 453, 2157; Lorraine.
LUCE 2554, 2594, LUBIUS IBER 2432; Roman emperor.
LUCES 154, LUCIUS 198, LUCY 183; first Christian king of Britain.
LUCES CATEL 2450; Roman leader.
Lumbardin 467, 2376; Lombardy.
Lundres 831; citizens of London.
MACANT 1256; soothsayer.
Mans 2469; Le Mans?
MARCEL 2450; Roman leader.
MARIN 286; uncle of Eleine.
MARIUS 143; son of Arviragus.
MAXENCE 271; emperor Maxentius.
MAXIMAN 382, 393, 403, 411, 421, 524, 533, 550, 651, MAXIMIEN 296, 402, 443, 545; Maximian, killed by Theodosius.
May 1142.
Mede 2446; Media.
MELDA 514, 517, 520, 555, 571, 612; king of Scythia.
Meneve 1634, 1692; Menevia. (St. David, Pembrokeshire)
MERCIURIUS 904, 913.
MERLIN 1221, 1223, 1241, 1249, 1279, 1281, 1283, 1293, 1298, 1299, 1308, 1309, 1328, 1331, 1335, 1340, 1359, 1513, 1515, 1531, 1535, 1543, 1565, 1571, 1581, 1593, 1605, 1708, 1714, 1725, 1733, 1824, 1826, 1828, 1829, 1862.
MICHEL, Saint, 2540; Mont-Saint-Michel.

Middlesex 1174.

MIEPESA 2444; king of Babylon.

MODRED 2480, 2720, 2730, 2738, 2743, 2746, 2758; Arthur's nephew

Mongieu 2288, Mongieu 2376, 2429, Munoye 2718; the Great St. 

Bernard.

MORCIMER 3242.

MUNTORD 3177; Simon de Montford.

Nicol 2615; Lincoln.

Northumbrelane 560, Northumbrelant 618, Northumbrelande 

1782, 1883; Northumberland.

Norman 3073; Normans.

Normânti 2468, Normandie 2591, 3054, 3092; Normandy.

Norreis 558, 574, 617, 767; Norweis 2634, 2465; Norsemen.

Norwea 2206; North Wales.

Norweya 2024, 2029, Norweis 767. Norway 338; Norway

OCTAVES 299, 315, 329, 337, 352, 355; chief of a rebellion 

against Constantine in Britain.

Orcheneis 2465; man of Orkney.

Orkene 1988; Orkney.

OSWALD 2873, 2877, 2879; king of Northumbria

OSWY 2879, 2881, 2885, 2887; king of Northumbria.

Paris 2072, 2076, 2148, 2164.

PASSENS 1057, 1613, 1623, 1644, 1650, PASCENT 1637, 1731; son 

of Vortiger.

Pasche 2164; Pasque 1785; Easter.

PEANDA 2878, Pend, king of Mercia.

Peltout 2469; Poitou.

Pentecosta 2179; Pentecostae 1600; Whitsun

PHEBUS 912; Phoebus.

PHELIPPE 3162; Philip Augustus of France

Pictiens 616, 722, 753, 786, 797, 820, 839, 925; Picts

POLE 2993; St Paul's cathedral.

Porchester 17, 19, 80, 309; Porchester, near Portsmouth.

Redding 3111; Reading.

RICHARD 3135; Richard I

RICOLF 2025, 2027; king of Norway.


303, 383, 419, 455, 467, 523, 2061, 2062, 2248, 2252, 2254 

2261, 2262, 2279, 2283, 2282, 2324, 2342, 2348, 2352, 2410, 2416 

2419, 2422, 2436, 2449, 2677, 2679, 2700, 2707, 2712, 2713 

2719, 2926.

Romein 607, 614, Romeine 320, 357, 582, 2055, 2263, 2643.

Romeines 417, 2433, Romeines 5, 28, 55, 140, 148, 197, 236 

369, 1960, 2068, 2255, 2327, 2380, 2631, 2688; Romans.

ROWAN 1052, 1109, ROWEN 994, 1009, 1022, 1034, 1036; Hengist's 

daughter.

RUMÁREC 1990; king of "Westmerland" 

Salesbire 1429, 2989, Salesbirie 1139; Salisbury.

SATURNUS 912.

Saxon 874, Saisson 1116; Saxony.

Sauverne 1178, Saverne 129; Severn.

Shaftesbury 2979; Shaftesbury.

Scoctes 2941; Scots.

SERTORIUS 2447, 2671; king of Libya.

SEVER 201, 203; emperor Lucius Septimius Severus.

Stonhenge 1609, 1687, 1928, 2774; Stonehenge.

Susancoastr 984, Susancoastr 988; "Thongcaster".

Suse 1173; Sussex.

Suthhampton 2485; Southampton.

Southwales 2207; South Wales.

Symond 3177; Simon de Montford.

Tamiss 493; Thames. V. p. 60.

Temre 2748; the Tamar.

TENORIUS 1511; Tremorius, archbishop of Caerleon.

THEODOSIEN 543; Theodosius the Great.

THOMAS 3127; Thomas à Becket.

Tintagel, 1852, 1869, Tintagelle 1813, 1832; Tintagel.

Tolaine 2160; Touraine.

Tottenes 695, 1346, 1363; Totnes.


Treves 454; capital of Maximius.

Trois 2849; Troy.

Ulfen 1817, 1819, 1825; Uther's counsellor.

Urgen 2613; lord of Bath (Urgen in other versions).

Ursel 466, 482; Ursula.

Uter 717, Uther 1357, 1539, 1545 1616, 16391, 1641, 1691, 1706, 1722, 1726, 1732, 1744, 1769, 1781, 1862, 1877, 1885, 1894, 1898, 1927, 1933; king of Britain.

Valentin 418, 542, 549, Valentinian II.

Verolam 1897; St Albans.

Vortiger 1636, 735, 745, 756, 762, 790, 794, 796, 800, 804, 818, 827, 834, 856, 935, 976, 1052, 1088, 1096, 1113, 1117, 1369, 1374, 1385, 1613; Wortiger 823, 1360; king of Britain.

Vortimer 1085, 1084, 1090, 1097, 1111; son of Vortiger.

Vortiporus 2983; king of Britain.

Walins 514, 515, 520, 555, 571, 610; "king of Hungary".

Waltham 3081.

Wark 2615; Warwick.

Westmerlande 1990; (Wace: Guenelande L; Weneland A; Layamon: Winelond).

Westmoister 3057, 3806, 3188, 3208; Westminster.

Whitsaunder 2726; Wissant.

Wider 1 4, 12, 27; Wyder 21, 39, 56; son of Cymbeline.

William 1 3053, 3072, 3076, 3083, 3091, William 2 3095; William I, William II.

Wincheatre 84, 111, 313, 712, 746, 1636, 1745, 1755, 2922, 2934, 2951, 2990, 3028, 3040, 3167; Winchester.
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Catalogue, British Museum, 4, 6, 8, 9, 35, 66, 69.
Caxton, 20, 43, 63, 249.
Ceremonial, 51.
Ch, 26, 33, 95.
Charlemagne, 2, 9, 65, 66.
Chaucer, 19, 152 - 154, 161, 164.
Christien de Troyes, 42, 51.
Cirencester, 29, 49.
Coel, 46, 64.
Conisborough, 9, 48.
Conjugation, 110 - 124; change, 114, 119, 120, 121, 124, 162; with être, 128.
Conjunctions, 127.
Consonants, 25, 28, 85, phonetics, 94, spelling, 97, 112 - 114, 166.
Consonnes mouillées, 88, phonetic, 97, spelling, 166.
Constantine of Scotland, 67.
Corrections to Wace, 59.
Costans, 55, 104.
Cotton, ms 44, 68, 73, 138, 169, 167, 249.
D, phonetics 85; spelling 26, 28, 32, 35, 97.
Date of ms, 5 - 6, 83.
Declension, 100 - 109, 141, 168.
Demonstrative adjectives, 106; pronouns, 107.
Dentals, 85, 98 - 97.
Description of ms, 1 sqq., Despensers 30, 36, 37, 72, 74 - 76.
Diphthongs, 23, 25, 27, 30, 33, phonetics, 81 - 84, spelling 90 - 92.
Dissimilation, 99.
Double vowel spellings, 25, 26, 28.
Douglas of Glastonbury, 63.
Dunstan, 68.
Durham ms, 44 - 47.
E, atonic, 84, 92 - 3, 157 - 159, 151, 158 - 159, 164, atonic final in declension, 105; in conjugation, 110, 111, 113; in versification, 165 - 166; diatritic 93; irrational 93, 145, 147, 159; Latin, 79; nasalised, 80; spelling, 27, 91; svarabhaktic, 27, 31, 124, 138.
Ea, 26, 93.
Edgar, 68 - 70, 72.
Edmund Ironside, 35, 70.
Edric, 69, 70.
Edward the Confessor, 9, 70.
Edward I, 71, 73; II, 37, 40, 73, 76; III, 5, 18, 38, 40, 76.
Edward the Martyr, 69.
Edwin, 59.
Egbert, 65, 66.
EI, 25, 26, 31, 91, 115.
Eie, 27, 30, 92.
Elaine, 51.
 Eldolf, 10, 54, 61, 104.
Elision, 137, 138.
Emerson, 18, 249.
Enclisis, 104, 144.
English dialects, 20 - 24, 29, 30, 40, 58.
English influence, -conjugation, 119, 122; language, 1899; spelling
Errors, 60, 239.
Evesham, 36, 72, 75.
Eye-rhymes, 167.
F, 31, 33, 85.
Ficabas, 1, 2, 14, 16, 17.
Fouke Fitz Warin, 21, 25, 249.
Froissart, 19, 100.
Frollo, 9, 48, 76.
Fulgenes, 48, 64.
Future, 95, 112, 122, 123.
G, 89, 93, 95.
Gaveston, 74.
Gawain, 49, 64.
Gender, 109, 125, 133.
Geoffrey of Monmouth, 42, 51, 52, 59, 62.
Glastonbury, 36, 69, 72.
Gloucester, Gloucestershire, 29-33, 36-40, 52, 74.
Gorlois, 9, 54, 59, 61, 64, 142.
Gormond, (Gurguint) 11, 49, 52, 60.
Gower, 149, 152, 153, 161.
Groebber, 15.
Grossetete, 149.
Hanover ms, 12-17, 99, 118, 139, 145, 168.
Harold, 71, 75, 76.
Harold Harefoot, 70, 73.
Harthacanute, 70.
Hemistich, 157-158, 172.
Hengist, 9, 48, 50, 54, 55, 58.
Henry I, 71; II, 71, 75, 76; III, 71, 73, 75.
Heptarchy, 49, 53, 59, 65.
Hilatus, 100, 118, 120, 137, 138, 142, 152.
Higden, 19, 24.
History in the ms, 42, 65-77.
I, phonetics, 78; spelling, 27, 33.
Iambic rhythm, 155-160, 164.
Ie, conjugation, 116, 119, 120, 124; phonetics, 81-84; spelling 27, 30, 90.
Ieu, 84.
Igerne, 61.
Illustrator of ms, 11, 14, 56.
Immelmann, 63.
Imperative, 118.
Imperfect, indicative, 92, 114, 117, 121, 127, 168, 169; subjunctive, 113, 117, 118, 123, 142.
Incorrect lines, proportion of, 138.
Inoubl, 59.
Indicative, 111, 117, 121, 128.
Infinitive, 119.
Ingulphus, 67.
Innocent III, 72.
Intransitive verbs, 129.
Inversion, 129.
Ireland, 9, 38, 39, 48, 49, 67, 170.
John (St), 66 sqq.
John of Bromton, 67.
John, King, 40, 43, 72, 73.
Jupiter, 33, 34.
K, 26, 95.
Kei, 49.
Kelham, 31, 134.
Koch, 153.
L, 87, 94.
L-mouillée, 80, 88, 97.
Langland, 163.
Lanthony, 40.
Latinisms, 111, 125.
Layamon, 22, 32, 43, 55, 57, 59, 61, 62, 63, 136, 154, 163, 164.
Lincoln ms, 44-47.
London, 9, 12, 47, 55, 57, 72, 73.
Lucius, emperor, 491, 50, 61, 64.
Luttrell, 1, 40.
M, 88.
Manuscripts of Brut, 44-47.
Marius, 48.
Merlin, 36, 48, 50, 52, 60, 62.
Metathesis, 25, 99.
Metrical irregularity causes, 140.
Meyer, 19, 20, 21, 147, 150, 152, 171, 249.
Middle English, 129, 134.
Miniatures, 1, 2, 6 sqq; 38.
Modred, 49, 52.
Mont-Saint-Michel giant, 19, 48.
Montfort, 36.
Moods, 117, 121, 128.
Mortimer, 30, 37, 38, 74.
Munich ms, 63, 243.
Morphology, 100-124.
Nasals, consonants, 88, 94; vowels, 80, 94.
N-mouillée, 38, 88, 98.
Nouns, declension, 100-104; syntax, 125; versification, 140.
Numerals, 106.
O, Latin, phonetics, 80; spelling, 90, 99, 166.
O, Latin, phonetics, 80; spelling 90, 166.
O, nasalised, 94.
Oe, phonetics 80; spelling, 90, 166.
O, ui, phonetics, 79; spelling 91, 92.
Omissions from Wace, 47-55, 59.
Origin, 16, 18-41, 74.
Orthographia Gallica, 89, 92, 96.
Orthography, 15, 22, 25-35, 38, 59, 78, 89-100.
P, 86.
Palaeographical details 2-4, 15, 233.
Palatalization, 110.
Participles, (past) agreement, 84, 92, 96, 119, 126; forms, 78, 82-84, 86, 120, 142; (present) 119.

Peanda, 50, 59.

Pelan, 42, 249.


Personal Pronouns, 92, 107, 125.

Phonetics, 78-88.

Pierre de Langtoft, 25, 28, 43, 68, 73, 249.

Plevner, 12, 14.

Pope, 20, 80, 87, 94, 96, 129, 141, 143, 144, 152, 249.

Possessive adjectives, 106; pronouns, 108.

Prepositions, 126.

Present tense, indicative, 111, 112, 117, 121, 168-169; subjunctive, 92, 111, 117, 128.

Preterite, 89, 93, 116, 117, 122, 127, 169.

Prior, 20, 21, 23, 33, 150, 151, 152, 163, 164, 249.

Pronouns, declension, 107-108; demonstrative, 107; indefinite 108; personal, 107; possessive, 108; reflexive, 125; relative, 108; syntax, 125; versification, 140.

Proper nouns, 25, 60, 103.

Proverbs, 52.

R, 32, 95; omitted, 26, 28, 33, 80, 87, 95; double r, 95, 115, 121, 122, 123.

Reduction in vowels, 25, 27, 30, 79.

Reflexive pronouns, 125, 129.

Reflexive verbs, 129.

Relative pronouns, 108.

Rhyme, 78, 92, 100, 164, 165-173.

Rhythm, 100, 151, 153-162, 164.

Richard I, 71.

Riton, 48, 61.

Robert of Gloucester, 24, 29, 30, 31, 32, 70, 75, 249.

Robert Mannyng of Brunne, 25, 43.

Rome Penny, 66.

Rowena, 52, 60.

S, conjugation 110, 111; declension, 101-108; phonetics (affas- ment) 86-87, 96; spelling, 28, 31, 34, 94, 96, 97.

Saxons, 48, 49, 52, 104.

Scotland, 48, 74, 76.

Scots, 66, 67, 74.

Severus, 48, 64.

Seville ms 44-47.

Short: English Chronicle, 66, 73, 75, 249.

Simon de Montfort, 72, 75.

Singular and plural, confusion, 109, 118.

Sources, 63.

St, conjugation, 112, 113, 118; phonetics, 87, 90.

Stephen, 71.

Stephen Langton, 72, 75.

Stonehenge, 9, 52.
Stress, 154, 162.
Studer, 19, 249.
Subject and verb, 128.
Subjunctive, imperfect, 113, 118, 123, 142; present, 92, 111, 112, 117, 118, 128.
Suchier, 21, 84, 119.
Suongcaster, 29. V. Thongcaster.
Syneresis, 120, 122, 137, 142 sqq.
Syntax, 125-130.
T, 85
Tamise, 60.
Tanquerey, 16, 23, 30, 31, 84, 118, 142, 147, 249.
Tenses, 121-124; confusion, 127.
Th, 26, 32, 39.
Thanet, 60.
Thongcaster, 32, 52, 58.
Tintagel, 9, 48, 51, 62.
Trevisa, 20, 144.
U, Latin, 80, 90.
U, Latin, phonetics, 80; rhyme, 166; spelling, 91.
Ui, 80, 92, 166.
Uther, 9, 48, 51, 58, 67, 62.
V, 26, 35, 39, 85.
Verbal endings, 110-117, 162, 163.
Verolam, 48, 52.
Versification, 136-174.
Vocabulary, 131-135.
Vortigern, 26, 52, 55, 57, 60.
Vortimer, 48, 60.
Vowels, conjugation, 111, 114, 119; phonetics, 78-85; spelling, 25, 26, 28, 90-94.
W, 26, 35, 39.
West Country, 35, 37, 38, 40, 41, 70, 76, 95, 134.
William I, 70, 75; II, 71.
Winchester, 51, 71, 72, 73.
Wirtz, 12, 14, 15, 99, 118, 139, 145, 168, 249.
Z, 86, 96, 97, 114, 118.
Zachrisson, 32, 249.