

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
INTRODUCTION, - - - - -	iv
THE FRENCH PONTIUS.	
Origin, date, relation to Horn et Rimel, - - -	iv
Manuscripts of the French Pontius, - - - -	xviii
Early printed eds. and subsequent history of the romance, - - - - -	xxi
THE ENGLISH PONTIUS.	
The Digby ms. and Douce Fragments, - - - -	xxiii
Language of the Digby ms., - - - - -	xxviii
Wynkyn de Worde's ed. of 1511, - - - - -	xxx
Relations of the two English versions, - - - -	xxxiii
THE GERMAN PONTIUS, - - - - -	xli
THE PONTIUS-RIMMUR, - - - - -	xliv
LITERARY CONSIDERATIONS, - - - - -	xlvi
PLAN OF THE PRESENT EDITION, - - - - -	xlix
NOTES, - - - - -	li
NAMES OF PERSONS AND PLACES, - - - - -	lix
GLOSSARY, - - - - -	lxiv
THE DIGBY TEXT, - - - - -	1-150

INTRODUCTION.

THE FRENCH PONTIUS.

ORIGIN, DATE, RELATION TO HORN ET RIMEL.

Just as the story of Melusine was written to glorify the family of Lusignan so the romance of Ponthus was written in honor of a member of the famous Tour Landry family of Anjou. Montaiglon, in the introduction to his edition of *Le Livre du Chevalier de La Tour Landry*¹ (Paris, 1854), has collected the little that is known of the Ponthus de La Tour, for whom our romance was named. The famous knight Geoffroy de La Tour Landry left a son, Geoffroy, who died, leaving his widow in possession of the family estates. Her second husband, Charles, assumed the name of La Tour and thus became head of the family. Their second son was our Ponthus.

In 1424, this Ponthus gave tithes of his estates at Cornouaille, to the convent of St. John the Evangelist at Angers. The 21 Mar., 1431, he was a sponsor (*ôtage*) at the wedding of the Count of Montfort and Yolande, daughter of the queen of Sicily. He appears to have been present at the battle of Formigrey in 1450. It concerns us immediately only to know that his activity covered the second quarter of the fifteenth century, and that in this quarter-century, in any case, some years before 1445, the probable date of the Royal ms., the French *Ponthus* was written.

Montaiglon (Intr., p. xxij f.) continues:—Il est aussi bien a croire que c'est lui qui a fait écrire par quelque clerc le roman

¹ Wright, in his ed. of *The Book of the Knight of La Tour-Landry* (E. E. T. S., No. 33, Intr., pp. viii ff.), summarizes Montaiglon's study, but fails to make the genealogy of Ponthus of Tour-Landry sufficiently clear.

de chevalerie de Ponthus, fils du roi de Galice, et de la belle Sidoine, fille du roi de Bretagne, souvent réimprimé; c'était un moyen de populariser l'illustration de la famille et d'en faire reculer très loin l'ancienneté,—Bourdigné, comme on l'a vu, s'y est laissé prendre,—que de la mettre au milieu d'une action à la fois romanesque et à demi historique. Les La Tour Landry, ont voulu avoir leur roman, comme les Lusignan avoient Mélusine. Nous n'avoir pas à entrer dans le détail de ce très pauvre roman, qui se passe en Galice, en Bretagne et Angleterre, ni à suivre les péripéties des amours de Ponthus et de Sidoine, traversées par les fourberies du traître Guennelet et enfin couronnées par une mariage. Ce qu'il nous importe de signaler c'est la certitude de l'origine de ce roman. Le héros de l'histoire porte le nom fort particulier¹ d'un des membres de la famille, et, parmi ses compagnons, se voit toujours au premier rang Landry de La Tour. Tous les noms propres sont de ce côté de la France; ce sont: Geoffroy de Lusignan, le sire de Laval, d'Oucelles et de Sillié, Guillaume et Bernard de la Roche, le sire de Doé, Girard de Chateau Gaultier, Jean de Malevrier. Les quelques noms de localités françaises concourent aussi à la même preuve: c'est à Vannes que se fait le grand tournoi, et, quand l'armée se réunit, c'est à la tour d'Orbondelles, près de Tallemont; or Tallemont est un bourg de Vendée (Poitou) situé à 13 kil. des Sables. Un passage donneroit peut-être la date exacte de la composition du Roman, c'est lorsque pour réunir une armée contre les Sarrasins, on écrit à la comtesse d'Anjou: car, dit le romancier, le comte étoit mort, et son fils n'avoit que dix ans.² Mais c'est trop long-temps m'arrêter à ce dire, qu'il étoit pourtant nécessaire de signaler.

Strangely enough, as M. Paul Meyer remarks (*Romania*, xv, p. 275), those who have treated the King Horn story

¹ The name was I fancy not excessively rare, though I recall at present only Pontus de Thiard, a somewhat obscure luminary of the Pleiade.

² Probably a mere pseudo-realistic touch of the romancer. The only Duke of Anjou who at all fits the case, Louis I, claimant of the throne of Naples, died 1384. His eldest son Louis II was ten years old in 1387. But our romance could hardly have been written so early. Unfortunately we are ignorant of the date of the historic Ponthus' birth. A theory that the romance might have been written in 1387, when Ponthus was a child, for his training,—within a few years too of the writing of the prose *Mélusine* and perhaps in rivalry with it,—would be alluring rather than plausible.

have failed to note Montaignon's very satisfactory theory of the origin of the romance of Ponthus. M. Montaignon in his turn was apparently ignorant of the fact, known since the third ed. of Warton's *Hist.* that *Ponthus* is merely a *rifacimento* of the story of King Horn, more definitely of the Anglo-Norman *Horn et Rimel*.¹ That is, the romancer spared himself the responsibility and labor of invention by accepting as a whole the plot of the forgotten *roman d'aventure*, reshaping it on the lines of a book of courtesy, amplifying and adding details from his own invention and knowledge of the early prose romances, localizing most of the scenes in the provinces most familiar to his patron, Ponthus of La Tour Landry, and introducing incidentally many names of the local nobility.

I have endeavored to show concisely in the following pages the measure in which *Ponthus* (P) departs from its original *Horn et Rimel* (HR) by omission and by amplification. For practical reasons the references to P are made to this edition of the English *Ponthus*, which represents faithfully the story of the French version, rather than to my transcript of the French ms. of the British Museum (Royal 15, E. vi).

THE DEATH OF KING TIBER (THIBOR) AND THE ESCAPE OF PONTIUS (P, pp. 1-9, HR, ll. 1-114).

HR starts *in medias res* with the finding of Horn and his fifteen (13 in P) fellows in a garden by the African Malbroin. Master Thomas has already told

Cum li bers Aaluf est uenuz a sa fin.

It is possible that the early pages of P, the sultan of Babylon² and his three sons, the taking of Corunna³ (Colloigne)

¹ Edited by Fr. Michel for the Bannantyne Club, Paris, 1845. I cite the convenient reprint of the mss. by Brede and Stengel, Marburg, 1885 (Aus. u. Abhand, No. viii).

² A prominent figure in the prose romances, as in the later Charlemagne romances, *Paris and Vienne* Roxb. Libr., p. 72, etc. There is a M. E. romance with this title (E. E. T. S., No. 38).

³ For variant spellings see index of proper names. Wynkyn de Worde's print shows in the first chapter-heading and in the first chapter *Croyne* the usual English equivalent of Corunna.

by a strategem, etc., may preserve the outlines of this last poem of Thomas.¹ This could hardly be proved in any case, while it appears more likely that the romancer merely wished to give the three Saracen brothers a motive for their invasions, which in HR the five African brothers of the sultan of Persia, have nowhere expressed for them. The character of Sir Denis (p. 3, l. 25, Dampdenis), the priest, who hides the children and of Sir Patrick, the pretended Saracen, who saves them, are not in HR. In HR an *alchaie sur mer* advises the king Rodmund (the Brodas of P) to set the children adrift in a cranky ship, without sail or rudder: this is done in fact,—in P merely in appearance. The agreement of Sir Patrick and the Earl of Asturias (Destruie, pp. 6–8) to save the country by feigning the Saracen religion, thereby becoming Brodas' lieutenants, is not in HR.

Minor differences are that in P Pontius conceals his identity from the king, in HR Horn reveals it boldly, while the premonitory dream of the king that Pontius in a lion's form² slew him (p. 6) is peculiar to P.

PONTIUS IN BRITTANY.—HIS MEETING WITH SIDONE (P, pp. 9–18; HR, ll. 115–1301).

The two versions show only insignificant differences. Herlant, the seneschal of king Hunlaf of Brittany (P. Huguell, R. Haguell?), is the single name common to the two. P mentions and describes briefly the princess Sidone when her father is first mentioned (p. 9), HR reserves the princess Rigmel till the love plot begins to open (l. 405 ff.). The insistence upon Pontius' piety (p. 11) is as usual only in P. Horn chooses to have his fellow Haderof educated with him under Herlant

¹ Horn's statement, l. 278 f.:

*Mis peres ifud pris par sa ruiste fierte
Ki atendre ne uout ke uenist sa barne,*

points to a beginning like that of the English *King Horn*.

² See Mentz, E, *Die Träume in den Altfr, Karls- und Artus-epen*, Marburg, 1888; Aug. u. Abhand, LXXIII, p. 53 ff., for a collection of similar lion dreams.

(l. 361 ff.). Pollides is educated separately by the Lord of Laval. In HR (ll. 588 ff.) Rigmel gives gift upon gift to Herlant, Sidone is content to give him a palfrey, reserving her gift of a cup (p. 17) till he has actually brought Ponthus; furthermore Rigmel (ll. 758 ff.) follows up the tardy Herlant with reminders from Herselote, her maid, that he is to bring Horn at once. The incident is absent from P. The action of Herlant in substituting Pollides for Ponthus (p. 13) is left without expressed motive in P, in HR he explains (l. 693 f.).

Qui merrai Haderof, par laparceiement
 Quel semblant el li fra a cest assemblement.

Godswij, Rigmel's nurse, first recognizes Haderof in HR (l. 852 f.). Pollides in P declares himself promptly. Herselote, who has seen Horn at the feast, describes his beauty elaborately to Rigmel (ll. 950 ff.), Eloix (Ellious), Sidone's maid, uses a similar description as she sees from the window Ponthus coming. Sidone gives Ponthus a diamond ring at their first meeting (p. 17), Rigmel shows Horn this mark of favor only after his notable service in battle (l. 1790 ff.). These slight differences are only worth recording to show the freedom of the romancer's handling of his original. In a general way the descriptions of Ponthus' beauty, accomplishments and virtues are expanded in the manner of books of courtesy, while our author protests unnecessarily (p. 17) the innocence of the love of Ponthus and Sidone.

THE FIGHT WITH THE SARACEN MESSENGER AND THE
 DEFEAT OF THE INVADING SARACENS (P, pp. 18-32; HR,
 ll. 1302-1722).

Carodas, brother of the slayer of Ponthus father (in RH two kings, Eglof and Gudolf, brothers of Rodmund), sends a messenger¹ (in HR Marmorin) to defy king Huguell. Horn, having slain the challenger (l. 1541 ff.), presents the Saracen's head to Hunlaf as a trophy, Ponthus (p. 21) sends it back to

¹The insolent Saracen messenger is a typical figure in the Charlemagne romances. Examples are hardly necessary.

Carodas by the two Saracen squires with a message of defiance. Immediately after the single combat Horn is appointed constable of Brittany (l. 1547 f.), Ponthus only after the general engagement (p. 37). Rigmel only hears of the duel after it is finished, then she gives Horn a pennon to bear in the battle (l. 1579 f.), Sidone gives Ponthus "a kerchef to beŕ on his spere" (p. 20) before the duel. Ponthus rescues the king of Brittany, who is unhorsed (p. 27 f.), but Horn, only Herland the seneschal (l. 1691 ff.).

The considerable elaboration of the course of the battle in P, as compared with HR where Horn and Haderof are the only prominent figures, was due to the romancer's desire to use prominently as many names of his French nobles as possible (see especially p. 24 and pp. 28-30).

PONTHUS CONSTABLE (pp. 32-34). THE FIRST TREASON OF GUENELETE (pp. 34-39). THE YEARS JOUSTING IN THE FOREST OF BROCELIANDE (pp. 40-59). THE GREAT TOURNAMENT AT VANNES (pp. 59-61).

Except the election as constable, which HR uses earlier, this entire chapter rests upon the romancer's invention and borrowings, in part easily identified, from other romances.

In HR Horn chastises the rebellious count of Anjou for king Hunlaf and makes all the king's subjects and neighbors fear him (ll. 1737-1749). Rigmel praises him and gives him a ring (l. 1790 ff.). None of this in P. Only Guenelete's motive for slandering Ponthus is borrowed from HR—that Ponthus refuses him the horse, Liard,¹ Sidone's present. In HR Wikel asks for Horn's *blanc cheval*, the gift of Herland, which Horn had already given to Haderof (l. 1850 f.). This scene in HR occurs just before Wikel slanders Horn to the king. The writer of P uses it to introduce this first treason of Guenelete, his own invention.

¹The common name of a grey horse. Used of Herlant's horse (HR, l. 1696), in *Richard Coer de Lion* (Webber), 2320, in *Ipomedon A* (Kölbing), 3892, 3911.

There are certain obvious borrowings in P. The *Fontaine des Merveilles* in the forest of Broceliande (Breselyn, p. 44) is the *Fontaine Perilleuse* of *Yvain* (Foerster, l. 380 ff.), but our author is more likely to have taken it from the prose *Tristan* (Löseth, *Le Roman en Prose de Tristan*, Paris, 1891; 82^e fasc. de la bilb. de l'École de Hautes Études, p. 248). It is there Tristan, who, by pouring water of the well on the stone, arouses the knight of the tour. In P the incident is mere stage-setting.

The not uninteresting mummery for choosing the contestants by shooting at their shields (pp. 41-43) is probably borrowed, but I have been unable to trace the source. In the prose *Tristan* (Löseth, p. 321) the knight of the *Tour du pin rond* hangs his shield on a pine and jousts with all who will strike it, but this is scarcely parallel.

Again these detailed single combats and elaborate tournaments give the romancer the opportunity of bringing into prominence his chief minor characters, Landry de La Tour, Bernard de La Roche, Geoffrey de Lusignan,¹ etc.

GUENELETE'S SECOND TREASON. PONTIUS ACCUSED TO THE KING (P, pp. 63-69; HR, ll. 1818-2135).

Wikel's pretence of quarreling with Horn about the *blanc cheval* has been already used by P as the motive of Guenelete's first treason (p. 34). Envy is this time the motive.

Wikel in addition to charging Horn with Rigmel's dishonor,—the sole accusation in P,—makes him plot with her against the king (l. 1893 ff.).

The versions correspond very closely in Horn's words with the king and his refusal to swear (l. 1940 ff.), as in the entire section, but Horn sees the king once more after leaving Rigmel and reaffirms his innocence (l. 2071 ff.), and Rigmel exchanges rings with Horn (l. 2051 ff.), giving him a sapphire ring that will protect him from fire, water and

¹This is the name of the famous hero of the Great Tooth, the sixth son of Mélusine. See the index of *Mélusine*, E. E. T. S., Ext. S. 68.

battle. In P Pontus receives a ring, which has no talismanic properties, only at his first meeting with Sidone (P, 17).

PONTIUS IN ENGLAND (P, pp. 70–96; HR, ll. 2136–3681).

Horn assumes the name of Gudmod (l. 2160) on arriving in Ireland (Westir), Pontus in England that of Le Surdit de Droite Voie,¹—that is, *the accused one* who sought in vain the *straight path* of vindication by combat.²

The incident of the boar (P, p. 70) is not in HR. There Guffer and Egfer, sons of king Gudreche of Ireland have an agreement that the first two foreign knights arriving shall enter the service of Guffer, the elder, the third, that of Egfer (l. 2206 ff.). Riding together they meet Gudmod (Horn), who represents himself as the son of a vavasour; both desire his service, but it is Egfer's turn.

Gudreche, the king of Ireland, knew Allof, Horn's father, and Horn, when a child; he immediately marks Gudmod's likeness to Horn. Lenburc and Sudburc, daughters of the king, are immediately attracted to Gudmod. Lenburc, the elder, sends him a golden cup from which she has drunk, bidding him drink the rest and keep the cup (l. 2399 ff.). Horn reproves her and refuses the gift. Lenburc, still insistent, receives no encouragement. P omits all this except the general statement that the king's daughters loved Surdit (Pontus) and goes on to the stone-casting (p. 72; HR, l. 2567 ff.).

Eglof, a vassal, outdid both the king's sons—in P, only Henry—in casting the stone. Implored by his master Egfer,

¹Prince Philip of France, having relinquished his heirship to fight against the Great Turk, calls himself *Le Despurveu* (*Three Kings' Sons*, E. E. T. Soc., Extra S., No. 67, p. 9). Iolanthe, feeling the name to be inappropriate, calls him *Le Surnome* (p. 36). Later the king of Sicily rechristens him *Le Nounpareil* (p. 55). *Noms de guerre* are common enough in all romances, but they seldom have any especial signification.

²As explained in the Royal ms. *Quant le roy ouyst quil [Pontus] se nommoit ainsi. Si pensa que cestoit pour ce quil lui auoit mis sur quil auoit sa fille [Sidone]. Le seurnom, pour ce quil lui auoit refuse droicte voye, pour ce qui se vouloit combatre contre deux ou trois* (cf. p. 104, l. 18 of this text).

Gudmod without exertion equalled Eglof's boasted cast. Eglof casts a foot better. Again Gudmod equals his cast. Eglof, with a supreme effort, casts half a foot farther. Gudmod, conjured by his love,—the allusion is turned to his mother only in P,—outcasts him by seven feet (l. 2659 ff.). In all this P follows HR with the slightest changes.

The two brothers go with Gudmod to disport themselves (l. 2698 ff.) in Lenburc's chamber. A game of chess in which Gudmod beats Lenburc—omitted in P—is elaborately described in HR (ll. 2726–2772).

Lenburc takes her harp and sings half the lay—all she knows—which Baderof made to his sister Rigmel in Brittany. Gudmod finishes the lay with marvellous sweetness, so that Lenburc cries out :

Coe est Horn, cum ioe crei

(l. 2852),

and is with difficulty dissuaded. Wissman (*Anglia* IV, p. 394) has already pointed out that this incident is probably imitated from *Tristan*. In P, Surdit sings to Genever the lay which he himself made to Sidone—the princess recognizes it immediately. They all make Surdit repeat it to the king.

The whole episode of the war with the king of Iceland,—so in the Royal ms., in both English versions Ireland,—his capture by Ponthus, his marriage to the king's younger daughter by Ponthus' advice, is apparently original with the writer of P (pp. 76–82). P, on the other hand, entirely omits the single combat with Rollac, slayer of Horn's father,—though the long description in HR (ll. 3108–3210) may have yielded certain details for the fight with Carodas' messenger earlier (p. 20 f.),—and goes directly to the battle with Corbatan (Corboran) the sultan of Babylon's third son. In HR Hildebrant and Herebrant, brothers of the African invaders of England and Brittany, and of the *soudein de Perse, dan Gudbrant*, l. 3000, are the invading kings.

The battle in P (pp. 82–86) is little dependent upon HR. Hildebrant kills Guffer and is himself killed by Gudmod

(l. 3298 ff.); Herebrant (by mistake Hildebrant in both mss. Harleian corrects to Herebrant on the margin) wounds mortally Egfer, Gudmod's master, but falls himself at Gudmod's hand (ll. 3359-3405). HR (l. 3497 ff.) dwells effectively upon the scene between Gudmod and his dying master.

In HR it is the king of Orkney (l. 3574 ff.) who tries to arrange the marriage between Gudmod and Lenburc, in P the king of Scots (p. 87). In HR Gudmond feigns to be betrothed to the daughter of a vavasour in Brittany (l. 3663 ff.), in P he offers only the general excuse of his low birth.

GUENELETE AND THE DUKE OF BURGUNDY.¹ OLIVER SEEKS PONTIUS IN ENGLAND (P, pp. 88-93; HR, ll. 3682-3917).

There is no change of scene to Brittany in HR. Only the barest details of Wikel's plot are told to Horn by Joceran, Herland's son, who appears as a palmer in the court and calls him by name. Modin (Modun), king of Fenenie, represents the Duke of Burgundy of P.

All the details of Guenelete's treachery, except the deposition of Herlant, such as Sidone's gaining time by pleading sickness² (p. 90), and Oliver's falling among thieves (p. 91), are original with P. HR offers only the slight differences that Joceran has wandered three years in search of Horn (l. 3702), and that Lenburc, hearing of Horn's betrothal, will become a nun and leave him heir to the kingdom of Westir (ll. 3875 ff.).

PONTIUS' RETURN TO BRITTANY. DEATH OF THE DUKE OF BURGUNDY. WEDDING OF SIDONE AND PONTIUS (P, pp. 93-106; HR, ll. 3918-4594).

¹The son of the Duc of Bourgoyne is Paris' chief rival with Vienne (*Paris and Vienne*, Roxb. Libr., p. 57, 62, etc.); Vienne's father imprisons her because she will not marry the Duke (p. 62); is a character of *Three Kings' Sons* (see index); his brother Guy (mentioned P, p. 105, l. 33) bears the name of the hero of a *chanson de geste* (*Gui de Bourgoyne*, ed. par Guesard et Michelant, Paris).

²Vienne, imprisoned, when her father attempts to force her into a marriage,—with her own lover disguised,—simulates a loathesome disease, by the unpleasant means specified on p. 85 of *Paris and Vienne*.

The chapter follows HR with few changes. In HR Horn first learns of the day and place of the wedding of king Modin from the palmer with whom he changes clothes (l. 3954 ff.). Horn's parable of the fisher to Modin and Wikel (l. 4046 ff.) is of course absent from P. The description of the custom of having thirteen poor men entertained at great feasts (p. 98) is not in HR. Horn merely pushes into the hall, having thrown the opposing porter under the bridge, with the press. He demands a drink of Rigmel (l. 4164 ff.) instead of waiting his turn. The pun on Horn (l. 4206 ff.) is necessarily absent from P. Rigmel knows Horn on the instant. Explanations then are made in the hall at the feast, not in the princess's chamber as in P (p. 99). She immediately offers to follow him in poverty, so the test questions of P (p. 99) are absent from the earlier version.

Horn tells Rigmel to persuade Modin to hold a tournament (l. 4323), in P it follows a wedding feast as a matter of course. Horn unhorses Modin in the tournament (l. 4479 ff.), then as Modin's people come to the rescue, blows his horn, summoning his concealed troops to capture Modin and take the town of Lions. In P the Duke of Burgundy, worsted by Ponthus, is precipitated into a pit by his unruly horse and killed (p. 102 f.). In HR Horn and Modin are reconciled (l. 4545 ff.), and Wikel pardoned for this treachery (l. 4565 ff.).

PONTHUS RECONQUERS GALICIA (P, pp. 106-119; HR, ll. 4595-4881).

There is a large loss of text in HR after l. 4594, so that the portion corresponding to the vow at the wedding feast (P, p. 108) and the invasion of Galicia, the finding of Sir Patrick and the Earl of Asturias at prayer in a chapel (p. 111), is missing. But at l. 4595, Hardre, formerly seneschal for king Allof, appears in the character of the Sir Patrick of P, deceiving the heathen king as to Horn's strength, and planning an ambush for the battle. Rodmund has dreamed that a wild boar gored his horse and wounded him mortally (HR, l. 4656 ff.), Brodas has dreamed that he became a wolf, and that a

greyhound, accompanied by a "brachet,"¹ pulled him down (P, p. 113).

The stratagem by which the town is taken (P, 115) is not in HR. Horn delivers his friend Haderof from desperate straits, in killing Rodmund (l. 4782 f.) otherwise the battle in P follows HR in a general way, with greater elaboration as usual and provision for a larger number of characters.

PONTIUS RECOGNIZES HIS MOTHER (P, pp. 119-122; HR, ll. 4882-4967).

The scene of recognition so sympathetically described in HR as to lead Michel to the rash appreciation, *Si j'étois forcé de choisir entre cet épisode et celui de la reconnaissance d'Ulysse par Pénélope, je ne sais auquel je donnerois la préférence* (Intr., LXII), is somewhat amplified in P, but presented with equal delicacy of feeling. Slight changes in P are, first, the queen enters the banquet hall as one of the thirteen poor people to be fed in honor of God and his apostles (p. 119, cf. p. 98); second, the Earl of Asturias, her brother, recognizes the queen,—a character missing in HR, where Hardre first recognizes her. The scene (l. 4928 ff.) where Horn returning from the chase meets his mother disguised at the door, is only in HR.

GUENELETE'S FINAL TREASON² AND DEATH (P, pp. 122-140; HR, ll. 4968-5215).

Horn dreams that Wikel attempts to drown Rigmel (l. 4968 ff.). Pontius dreams that a bear devours Sidone³ (p. 122). All the details of Guenelete's treason differ from the simple account in HR (ll. 5040-5146). The king and his daughter, warned by Wothere, Wikel's brother, that Wikel intends to imprison them in his new castle and marry Rigmel,

¹ See Mentz, *Die Träume*, u. s. w., p. 61, but there are no close parallels.

² In Caxton's *Bianchardyn and Eglantyne* (E. E. T. S., Ext. S., No. 68, p. 172 ff.; p. 197 ff.) Subyon plays a part very similar to Guenelete's. Left in charge of Eglantyne, he corrupts the commons, tries to force her to marry him, and besieges her.

³ For bear dreams see Mentz, *Die Träume*, u. s. w., p. 56. Most like the present instance are those cited from *Berte aus grans piés*, l. 1678, and *Aye d'Avignon*, l. 2514.

defend the town, suffer hunger, and are forced to agree to a truce for fifteen days, and then to surrender, if Horn does not in the meantime return.

The elaborate description of Guenelete's forged letters, his corruption of the commons, Sidone's retreat to a tower, etc., is borrowed from Mordred's treachery in the *Morte d'Arthure*, usually appended to the prose *Lancelot*. The parallel is striking with the version represented by Füeterer's German *Lancelot* (Bibl. d. Litt. Vereins, No. 175, Tübingen, 1885, p. 348 f.). In this version Mordred, left in charge of the kingdom and the queen, wins over the people by great gifts, has a messenger bring a letter from Arthur, with word that he, lying at the point of death and all his people destroyed, makes Mordred king, and as a last request bids "Ginofer" marry Mordred. The queen doubts the letter, obtains four days' respite, in which time she shuts herself up in a tower, provisioned and garrisoned, to await rescue from Arthur and Lancelot. She upbraids Mordred for his ingratitude from a window as Sidone does Guenelete (p. 130 f.). Malory (Somner, p. 839) gives the same account with less detail.

Only in P (p. 133) Sidone dreams of her husband's coming.

The Earl of Richmond's journey to arrange the marriage of Genever and Pollides (P, p. 136 f.), and the details of the tournament (p. 138 ff.) are original with P.

PONTHUS' VISITS TO ENGLAND AND GALICIA (P, pp. 140-150; HR, ll. 5226-5250).

In the main P only amplifies tediously the score of lines in HR. Ponthus marries Genever to Pollides and reads him a homily (p. 145 ff.) on the duties of a prince, especially of one who has married above his station. Horn in Ireland has to provide for both princesses, Lenbure he marries to his former rival, Modin, Sudbure to Haderof, his companion, who, like Pollides, becomes heir to the kingdom. HR adds, Horn and Rigmel had a son Hadermod, who conquered Africa; Thomas could tell his story, but leaves it to his son Gilemot.

SUMMARY.

This tedious comparison shows :

(1) That P has used every essential element of the plot of HR, but has filled in the skeleton freely by invention, amplification, and occasional borrowings. I cannot find any clear instance where the French *Ponthus* has borrowed verbally from HR, but its general freedom of treatment makes a supposition that another version of the French *Horn* than HR was used gratuitous.

(2) P has definitely localized the story in Galicia,—instead of the Suddene (England) of HR, in Brittany,—in this agreeing with HR,—and in England, instead of Westir (Ireland). The Charlemagne romances may have caused the shifting of the early scenes of the romance to Spain, geographical proximity may have drawn the Irish episode of HR to England. All the geography of P is quite accurate, no more recondite reference than the index of Bædeker's *Northern France* is necessary to identify nine-tenths of the localities represented by the minor characters of the poem. All important proper names, those difficult of identification, or unidentified are collected in an alphabetical list at the end of the introduction. At times the scribe of the Digby ms. has bungled these proper names sadly ; the necessary corrections have been made usually in the alphabetical list rather than in the notes.

(3) The only really important additions of the romancer to the plot of HR are : (1) Guenelete's first treason and the resulting year's jousting in the forest of Broceliande with its sequel, the great tournament at Vannes (pp. 40-61); and (2) the episode of the king of Iceland (Ireland) (pp. 76-82).

(4) The amplifications of the motives of HR, are either in the way of bringing out more definitely and elaborately the courtesy of the hero, or, in battles, etc., those imposed upon the romancer by the necessity of providing parts for a great number of minor characters.

(5) There are demonstrable borrowings from the prose *Tristan*, and *Lancelot*. The names show that the romancer knew in a general way the legends of Arthur and of Charlemagne. Guenelete is clearly only a double diminutive of Guenes, the arch-traitor, Geneŕ (Genever) is as clearly the name of Arthur's queen, king Hoël of Brittany may have suggested, not given, Huguell (a mere diminutive of the familiar Hugues). These parallels Mr. Ward (*Cat. of Romances*, vol. I, p. 470) has already drawn. Beside these Carodas, son of the sultan of Babylon, gets his name from Carados of the Arthur legend (e. g. *The Prose Merlin*, E. E. T. S., vol. 36, p. 442, p. 594), while Fireague (Ferragu), a Saracen, who slays prince John of England, is apparently Ferragus, an insolent Saracen messenger familiar to the Charlemagne romances from the chronicle of Pseudo-Turpin to the English *Roland and Vernagu* (E. E. T. S., No. 39). It is probable that one more familiar than myself with the great mediaeval romances could supply many additional parallels, both in name and incident.

MSS. OF THE FRENCH PONTIUS.

I have examined only the three English MSS., of these the Cambridge MSS. only cursorily.

(1) Ms. Royal 15, E. VI, of the British Museum, which I cite constantly, from my transcript, as R, is a large folio in double columns, with many handsome miniatures. It was given to Margaret of Anjou, wife of Henry VI, presumably on the occasion of her marriage (1445), by the 1st Earl of Shrewsbury (died 1452). The description of this interesting volume of Romances in Ward's *Catalogue*, I, p. 130, is so accessible that I pass it here. The romance of *Pontius* occupies ff. 207-226^b. Mr. Ward (p. 470) counts 47 chapters with rubrics, but no numbers—I count 48. There is, as usual, no title.

The first rubric begins :

Cy commence ung noble liure du Roy Pontus filz du Roy thibor de galice le quel Pontus fut sauue des mains des Sarrazins. Et de puis fist de beaultz faiz darmes comme vous pourres oyr cy a pres.

The romance begins :

Compter vous vueil vue hystoire Douz len pourroit assez de bien et dexemplaire aprendre, etc.

Ends :

Le roy Pontus et la royne vesquirent asses longuement et regnerent au plaisir de leur pays. Et puis trespasèrent Et moult furent moult [*sic*] regretes de tout le peuple Mais ainsi est de la vie mondaine. Car si beau sy bon sy riche, ne sy fort, nest que en la fin Ne conuiege laisser ce siecle
Explicit le liure du Roy Pontus.

The Royal ms. represents an earlier stage of the romance than either of the Cambridge MSS., with its absolute monotony of sentence structure,—endless *si's* and *et's* at the beginning of sentences, etc., but it shows also a version slightly condensed. All the long lists of names of knights are promptly cut off with an *et moult d'autres*. In the closing chapters, corresponding to pp. 118–150 of the present text, R frequently condenses details more fully treated in all other versions, but never in a way to alter essentially the course of the story. This would render it inadvisable to make R the basis of an edition of the French *Ponthus*, in spite of its assured early date (between 1445 and 1452).

(2) MS. Hh, 3, 16 of the Cambridge University Library,—cited as H, fol. vellum, 82 leaves (originally 84),¹ written probably about the middle of the 15th cent. The ms. contained originally 88 leaves as follows, a single fol. (2 leaves) containing the rubrics of the chapters, ten gathers of four folios (8 leaves) each, a final gather of six leaves. Two leaves have been cut out, probably for miniatures they contained,—the second leaf of the third gather of eights, and the fifth leaf of

¹At the end in an old hand (17th cent. ?),

Sum Jacobi Marranti & amicorum.

the sixth gather of eights. The leaves are not numbered. The ms. in its present condition has 45 chapters with rubrics; it probably had at least two more. The chapter divisions are in the main those of R, but the chapter headings are quite different in form, occasional differences from the text of R appear to be revisions in the interest of varying the monotonous style of the original. H has always the full reading where R. condenses. It would undoubtedly, its two *lacunae* filled from R, be the best of the English MSS. to print.

3) ms. Ff., 3, 31 of the Cambridge University Library,—cited as F. Fol. paper, 15th cent. (probably late), ff. 33. This ms. is only remarkable for its geometrical capitals, and for a very dull prologue in octosyllabic couplets which M. Paul Meyer has printed with a brief description of the volume in *Romania*, xv, p. 275 ff. It is more minutely divided into chapters than the other MSS.,¹ in place of the usual chapter headings each capital at the head of the chapter contains a motto or verse bearing upon the subject of the chapter (Meyer, p. 276). The language is considerably revised and modernized.²

I find two MSS. registered for the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris (see *Bibl. Imper. Man. Fran. Ancien Fonds*, Paris, 1868, Tom. I).

No. 1486, vellum, 14th Cent. (The date is, of course, impossible, but it should, at least, be an early MS. to get such a rating.) No. 1487, paper, dated 1462. I have no description of these MSS.

A romance so popular as the French *Ponthus* was must exist in many MS. copies. I have lacked the opportunity of searching further the catalogues of the great libraries.

¹ E. g. there are 47 divisions in the portion of text corresponding to the first 17 chapters of R.

²At the end of the MSS. are the following signatures of former owners,
John Dalton /1619/
William Townley of the parish of S.
Giles's in the Fields.

EARLY PRINTED EDITIONS.

Seven editions of the French romance within as many decades indicate the popularity of the book. Of these I have seen only the third, the others I cite summarily from Brunet, *Manuel du Libraire* (Paris, 1863), to which I refer the reader for exact bibliographical indications.

(1) Fol. 69 ff. without name, place or date, but published at Geneva, *circa* 1478.

(2) Fol. Lyon Guillaume Le Roy, *circa* 1480.

(3) Fol. Lyon Caspar Ortuin, *circa* 1500.

This is No. 177 of the Douce Coll. in the Bodleian Library.

The first (a), fifth (e), and tenth (i) gathers are fours (8 leaves), all the others, including the eleventh and last (l), are threes. There are then 72 leaves in all (Brunet reports 71 because the final leaf is blank). Ai (front) contains only the brief title, PONTIUS ET LA BELLE SIDOYNE. Ai (back) contains the first text,

¶ Cy commence une excellent histoire le quelle fait moult a noter/du tres-uaillant roy pontus filz du roy de galice et de la belle sidoyne/fille du roy de bretagne.

A large woodcut of a mounted knight with a hawk, and a maiden offering a carnation fills the rest of the page, and the romance proper begins on Aii (front),

Conter vous vueil, etc.

There are in the text thirty-six rude but occasionally spirited woodcuts. The text ends on the back of the unlettered leaf of fol. l. ii (leaf 71, back),

Puis finerent leur vie a grant regret de leurs pais.
Mais ainsi et [*sic*] il de la vie mondaine qui
nest si beau ne si riche ne si bon a qui au fort
ne conuienne laisser cest siecle et auoir fin.

Cy finist le tresexcellent romant du noble et
cheualeureux roy Pontus et de la tresbelle Si-
doyne fille du roy de bretagne imprime par
maistre caspar ortuin a lyon :

The final leaf is blank.

This version agrees very exactly in all H's grosser variants from R. In its chapter divisions, and in the form of the chapter headings it represents closely the original of Wynkyn de Worde's edition. We shall return to this point in the discussion of that version.

4) Quarto, double cols. Paris, Jean Trepperel, after 1500.

5) Quarto, 58 ff. Paris, Michel Le Noir, *circa* 1520.

5^a) " " " Alain Lotrian, without date, reported from the Royal Library at Stuttgart. Possibly the same impression as 5.

6) Quarto. Paris, Nic. Crestien, *circa* 1550.

7) Quarto. Paris, Jean Bonfons.

These are all printed in the so-called Gothic character.

The remaining history of Ponthus in France may be told in a word. It is amusing, at least, to find that Jehan de Bourdigné, the Chronicler of Anjou and of Maine, accepted our romance as good history. In his *Chroniques d'Anjou et du Maine*, first printed in 1529,—I cite the edition printed at Angers, 1842,—Bourdigné gravely describes the descent of Karados upon the coast of Brittany (Cap. XVI, p. 74 ff.) and all the course of the battle precisely, in outline, as it is described in chapters IX to XI of our text. The names of the participants, even the list of slain, are the same. After the battle (p. 80) Ponthus jousting in the forest of "Brecilian" is rather mentioned than described. After the jousts Ponthus' expedition to reconquer Galicia is mentioned, with lists of the French champions and of the slain in the final battle quite as in the romance. Finally the chronicler states that these annals are, *extraictes de plusieurs cronicques, hystoires et livres anciens*. Pity that no bearer of the then extinct name of Tour Landry could see his family romance accepted as good history.

The condition of public taste in France in the 17th century did not, as in Germany, tolerate the survival of *Ponthus* as a *Volks-buch*, and the French history of "Ponthus" closes,¹ or

¹ I should confess that a reference in Büsching and Von der Hagen's *Buch der Liebe*, S., XLV, states that the French Ponthus is treated in T. II, p. 180

possibly reopens, with the careful abstract presented in *Mélanges Tirées d'une grande Bibliothèque*, Tom. x, pp. 1-62. This abstract is based upon one of the editions in 4to, probably that of Jean Trepperel, about 1500. On p. 61 the author writes that Pontius and Sidoine

eurent deux filz, don't l'aîné porta avec gloire la première de ces deux couronnes [Galice] & le second, nommé Conan Meriadeuc, est la tige des Rois & Ducs de Bretagne.

I did not happen upon this bit of imaginary genealogy in "Bourdigné," and there is nothing of the sort in any version of *Pontius* that I have examined.

THE ENGLISH PONTIUS.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE DIGBY MS. AND DOUCE FRAGMENT.

The earliest form of the English *Pontius* is that of MS. Digby 185 of the Bodleian Library. The volume is a folio of 203 leaves handsomely written on thin vellum. The contents of the MS. are:—

1) Fol. 1-79. The prose chronicle usually called *The Brute of England*, with the prologue, ending with the capture of Rouen in the year 1418.

2) Fol. 80-144^b. Thomas Hoccleve's poem, *De Regimine Principum*. At the place where the miniature portrait of Chaucer should stand there is an elaborate s-shaped flourish in the margin with the side note *Chaucer's Ymago* (I neglected to note the exact form of the second word). This shows that the poem was copied from a MS. that contained the miniature.

and 250, of the *Biblioth. des Romans*. Having searched everything that could possibly be cited as a T. II in that distracting collection, I came forth from its mazes empty handed. Some one who knows the way may yet find it. It probably signifies nothing that the index vol. does not contain the name of Pontius.

3) Fol. 145–156. Hoccleve's story of the emperor Gere-laus and his wife (published, E. E. T. S., Ext. S. 61, p. 140 ff.). The prose exposition or moralization of the story follows on fol. 156–157.

4) Fol. 157^b–164. Hoccleve's story of Jonathas and his paramour (E. E. T. S., Ext. S. 61, p. 215 ff.). The prologue is lacking. The tale proper begins,

Sum tyme an Emperour' prudent and wise
Reigned in Rome.

The prose exposition follows on 164^b and 165.

5) Fol. 166–203. *Ponthus*.

The facsimile (exact size) of Fol. 166^{ro} will give a sufficient specimen of the fine and legible handwriting of the scribe, while affording an excellent example of the heraldic illumination of initial capitals.

These heraldic illuminations make it possible to locate the MS. and approximately to date it.

On page 1 of the MS. at the head of the *Brute* is this coat of arms: Quarterly, 1 and 4, Argent, a chevron azure, with a label of three points ermine;¹ 2 and 3, gules, a griffin segreant or;² crest, a friar's head, proper, hooded argent.³ The crest and arms quartered 1 and 4, indicating the family descent, were borne by a Sir George Hopton of Swillington, who was knighted by Henry VII at the battle of Stoke beside Newark, June 9, 1487 (W. C. Metcalf, *A Book of Knights*, 1885, p. 14). The Hoptons were descended from an illegitimate son of Robert de Swillington, one Thomas Hopton who died in 1430 (Joseph Foster, *Yorkshire Pedigrees*, Vol. II), and they inherited the manor of Swillington near Leeds, Yorkshire (*Loidis and Elmete*, p. 232. T. D. Whitaker, Leeds, 1816). The

¹ These arms are attributed to the Swillington family in the Catalogue of Digby MSS. erroneously,—Swillington arms in Burke's *General Armoury* are, arg. a chevron az, and gules, a griffin segreant or (the Leicestershire family).

² Catalogue, ["Rivers or Swinlington?"]

³ Catalogue, "The head of a savage."

arms (gules, a griffin segreant or) quartered with the Hopton arms are given by Burke as those of the Swillingtons of Leicestershire, presumably related to the Yorkshire Swillingtons. The Digby MS. was then written for a head of the Hopton family of Swillington, not improbably for Sir William Hopton,¹ Treasurer for Edward IV (*circa* 1465).

The initial capital of Hocceve's *De Regimine*, Fol. 80, contains the arms of Hopton described above, impaling quarterly, 1 and 4, Argent a bendlet sable, thereon three mullets argent; 2 and 3, gules fretty argent² (Beauchamp, *Cat. of Digby MSS.*). They are the arms of a daughter of the Hopton family impaled with those of her husband, probably a Beauchamp.

In an initial, Fol. 157^b, ten small coats of arms are introduced. The curious will find them described in the *Catalogue of Digby MSS.*

The initial letter of *Ponthus*, Fol. 166, see facsimile, contains the quartered arms of Hopton and Swillington, impaling those already described under Fol. 80. This indicates that the husband had assumed the arms of his wife, probably as heir to the titles of Hopton and Swillington. Thus the facsimile shows all the arms here described.

I have gone into this tedious matter of the arms, on the chance that some enthusiast in genealogy may be able to determine the marriage indicated by the second and third shields, and thus date the MS. My own cursory study of the matter was quite fruitless. It is of chief importance only for us to know that the MS. was written for a Yorkshire family residing near Leeds. This will prepare us for the language

¹ He would have been in his prime about the middle of the century, the probable time of writing of the MS., and of an age to have the married daughter whose arms are contained in the MS.

But this whole matter of the Hopton genealogy appears to be vague and is certainly incomplete.

² I could not identify these impaled arms. I fancy that Beauchamp is merely offered as a suggestion in the catalogue. Foster's *Pedigrees* and the county histories show no marriage in the Hopton family corresponding to this impalement. But all the genealogies are sadly incomplete.

of the text. It is also an admissible theory, and a pleasant, to feel that the book is a sort of a family book. A father, who must have played some small part in the history of his day, chose the prose chronicle of England; his daughter chose, perhaps for the education of her children, Hoccleve's *De Regimine Principum*; her husband, with a feeling for something less ponderous than Hoccleve, and yet sufficiently edifying, chose the new and fashionable romance of *Ponthus*. It wasn't a bad sort of book to have about a house.

DATE OF THE DIGBY MS.

On palaeographical grounds we are safe in dating the Digby MS. after the first quarter of the fifteenth century. It falls then within a period when palaeographical data are peculiarly uncertain. The Rev. W. D. Macray, of the Bodleian Library, who kindly gave me his opinion in the matter, regarded a date about the middle of the century as the latest possible for the writing of the MS. The difficulty of determining narrowly by the language the date of a text partly changed from its original dialect is considerable, but there is I think nothing in the language of *Ponthus* that is incompatible with a date of about 1450. A date much earlier I think improbable.

The MS. is written solidly, without paragraph divisions; chapter divisions are marked only by illuminated capitals; even punctuation, except for an occasional ¶ or || is lacking. The short, downright stroke of the rubricator—see the facsimile—is used somewhat capriciously, usually in giving prominence to capitals, or initials, but often enough within the word (e. g., l. 18 of the facsimile *tHe cristen*; l. 19, *Doos anD moste*—the capitals represent small letters rubricated).

Catchwords occur at the end of every gather of 8 leaves, enclosed in rough pen-drawings.

Fol. 173^b, lower margin. On an oakleaf folded back the catchwords, *have a bettre*.

Fol. 181^b, lower margin. On the lower part of a knight's head and shoulders in armor, the catchword *Ponthus*.

Fol. 189^b, lower margin. Across the side of a large fish, the catchwords, *And Pollides*.

Fol. 197^b, lower margin. In a scroll the catchwords, *you in this case*.

The matter of contractions and terminal flourishes is treated in the section on the plan of my edition of the Digby MS. Finally the Digby MS., though itself perfect, appears to have been copied from a MS. of *Ponthus* that lacked a leaf (p. 57, note).

THE DOUCE FRAGMENT.

MS. Douce 384, of the Bodleian Library, is a miscellaneous collection. Its first two leaves are a folio (the leaves non-consecutive) from a Fol. paper MS. of *Ponthus*. The text of these two leaves is printed in full at the foot of the corresponding pages of text in this edition, pp. 33–35 and 42–45. The gap between the two leaves corresponds in bulk to four leaves of the same content. The Douce fragment was probably then the second Fol. of a gather of four, possibly the first of a gather of three.

The text is that of the Digby MS. with the usual unimportant variants.¹ A chapter division (p. 34), corresponding to Cap. XIII of D, shows that, like D, it lacked chapter headings. The catalogue dates it merely 15th cent. It must I think be set towards the last quarter.

¹The fly-leaf of the MS. contains the following note in Douce's handwriting: "This is a fragment of the Romance of "Ponthus of Galyce," printed by Wynkyn de Worde, 1511, 4^{to}. The language of this fragment differs materially from that in the printed copy. No perfect MS. of this romance in English seems to be known." Douce also entered on the margin of the fragment references to the corresponding signatures of W, and occasionally variants from that text.

LANGUAGE OF THE DIGBY MS.

Though written at a period rather late for marked dialect in Yorkshire, the Digby ms. shows every where the traces of its Northern scribe.

If we apply the time honored test of the inflection of the Pres. Indic. of the verb we shall find that beside the regular first persons singular, and plurals with no ending or only a final e, surely unpronounced, we have a fair number of specifically Northern forms.

First persons singular in -s only occur in verbs separated from a pronominal subject by another verb.

I loue and trustes, 68, 14. *I swer' . . . and has sworne*, 99, 28.

I haue commaunded and commaundes, 123, 23. *And here I leve of the kyng of Bretan and retourne*s, etc., 124, 3.

Second person singular in -s: *havis*, 20, 30; *has*, 130, 32; 134, 28; *makes*, 130, 32; *says*, 97, 27; *thinkes*, 22, 18; *yeldes*, 130, 35.

Plurals in -s: *drives*, 68, 22; (people) *dwellys*, 26, 30; *has*, 87, 26; 94, 23; 95, 12; 117, 9; 134, 16; *laboures*, 26, 31; *losys*, 97, 15; *travells*, 26, 31; *was*, 129, 31; *ye loue God and dredys hym*, 62, 31.

Imperatives in -es: *calles*, 38, 13; *comes*, 25, 22; *meruelles*, 83, 16; *sendes*, 23, 22; 113, 2.

Participles in -nd: *dredand*, 5, 32.

The verbal noun *tythandes*, 63, 5.

Beside these northern forms are the midland plurals: *semen*, 4, 17; *ben*, 5, 14; 23, 19; *sayn*, 6, 31; *sayne*, 13, 18 and 21; *drawen*, 76, 15.

Singulars in -st and -th: 2nd person, *feylest*, 4, 21; 3rd person, *baketh*, *gryndyth*, 6, 32; *lieth*, 5, 15; 25, 22; *longeth*, 23, 4; *semeth*, 23, 9; 119, 12; and the imperative in -th: *goth*, 21, 32.

It is perilous to commit oneself to any statement of dialectal usage in the fifteenth century, while Prof. Wright's great dictionary is actually publishing. Certain words, how-

ever, in our text are clearly Northern: *As*, *bustus*, 73, 10; *boustously*, 49, 3; *gude*, 63, 26; *vngudely*, 128, 16; *gudelenes*, 143, 19; *gar'* (cause), 77, 33; *luke*, etc., 119, 13, 29, 31; *reiosed*, 98, 32; *reiose*, 132, 7; *trast*, 107, 18; *traysted*, 89, 9; *sall*, 87, 15; 134, 29; *suld*, 66, 29.

The use of *to* in the sense of *till*, 43, 19; 118, 33; 124, 2, and of *unto*, 38, 10; 39, 16, is Northern; likewise the great preponderance of *and* over *if* as the conditional conjunction. The invariable *awn* for the intensive pronoun must be regarded as a Northernism in a text of this date.

Stuffe in the sense of *provision*, frequent in this text, I believe to be a Northernism, though it occurs in *W*, and I have noted it in *Malory* (Somner, 839, 19). *Lugge*, 2, 24; *luges*, 27, 9, for *lodge*, is probably dialectal. It is barely possible that *there*, 15, 35 (note), is an isolated instance of the Northern demonstrative.

It may be well to note one or two phonetic matters, possibly dialectal.

An intervocalic *s*, but pretty certainly final in pronunciation, is frequently doubled, indicating the voiceless pronunciation, *please*, 16, 27; 31, 33; 35, 5; 56, 5, etc. The single *s* is usual when the word is dissyllabic; e. g., *itt please me, if it please my fadre*, 79, 32. Similarly, *rysse*, 139, 23, and *rosse*, 39, 19; 45, 25; 117, 22; 139, 21, etc.

Similar is the representation of a *v* sound by *f* in *gyf*, 2, 1; 11, 29; 103, 20; *gyfes*, 63, 1; *gafe*, 8, 8; these besides forms like *yevys* and *yeave*; so *relese*, vb., 8, 20. The change of *b* to *p* in *warderop*, 14, 1; 67, 23, etc., was possibly more general. Precisely the reverse of this is the constant representation of *live* by *lyue*, etc.

Certain spellings appear to indicate that the *a* vowel was beginning to approximate its present front pronunciation: e. g., *sale*, 5, 26; *saled*, 5, 27 for *sail*; *prase*, 94, 7 and *prased*, 18, 2, beside *praysed*, 18, 5. *Wate*, 21, 15, and the verb, 65, 6. *Wale* (wail), 37, 15. *Captanes*, 111, 1. *Ordaned*, 111, 4; 112, 21; 123, 17, etc. *Agane*, 111, 7; 123, 16, etc., very

frequent. This fronting of the *a* is usually set much later. There is evidence in the present text for such a pronunciation which should at least be considered.

The dentals differ somewhat from standard English usage. *Hunderyth* regularly used for *hundred* is probably Northern. *Smoth*, 21, 11 for *smote* occurs but once. *Garthyn*, 3, 23 and *bothome*, 5, 26, 33 perhaps hardly call for mention.

In general apart from the singular of the verb the whole text has the look of London English of its time. The Douce fragment shows no Northern peculiarities. It would be difficult to disprove the thesis that the text might have been composed by a Northerner who knew standard English well and only occasionally lapsed into dialect, but it is far simpler to suppose that the translation was made in standard English of the time and slightly Northernized by the scribe, who prepared the present copy for the Hopton family of Yorkshire.

WYNKYN DE WORDE'S EDITION OF 1511.

The only known copy of this quarto is in the Bodleian Library.¹ Since the signatures misrepresent the make up of the book it may be well to give the matter a moment's attention. The book originally contained 100 leaves of which the

¹ In the Douce Coll. I transcribe one or two of Douce's notes from the fly leaf. Douce notes first, his ms. fragment and French edition (Ortuin's). Then continues,

"This romance is placed among the anonymous writers in Du Verdier's *Bibliothèque Française*."

"See it in *Bibl. Reg.* 15 E., vi, 6."

An instance of Douce's wide reading in obscure fields is the following:

"'From Pontus came Sidon, who by the exceeding sweetness of her voice first found out the hymns of odes, & praises and Posidon or Neptune.' See Cumberland's *Sanchoniatho*, p. 33. It is a whimsical coincidence of names at least."

"This romance is an enlarged version of *King Horn*, see Warton, *Hist. of Eng. Poetry*, I, 46, new edition."

"Concerning *King Ponthus* see Bourdigné, *Chronique d'Anjou*, xxxv, &c."

first two are missing. It is made up of alternate 8s and 4s (leaves) with the single exception that the last two signatures P and Q are both eights.

8s regularly numbered i-iiij + 4 unnumbered leaves, are,

a (i and ij lacking), c, e, g, j, l, n, p, q.

4s numbered i-ij + a single unnumbered leaf, are,

b, h, k, o.

4s numbered i-iiij, with no unnumbered leaf, are,

d, f, m.

Although a, i and ii are missing, the actual loss of text is but a single page,—exactly Cap. I of the present edition. We may safely assume then that the front of a, i contained only a brief title, that the back was blank, a large woodcut must have filled the front of b, i, leaving space, probably, only for the first rather long chapter heading (see the first rubric of R). The romance proper must have begun low on a, ij (front) or at the top of a, ij (back). Since a large portion of W is used to fill a gap in D (pp. 57-60), there printed line for line and letter for letter,¹ it will not be necessary to give specimens of the text here, beyond the beginning and ending. On a, iij (front) the text begins :

**¶ How Broadas sone to the Soudan toke
Croyne and slewe the kyng Tyber.**

SO befell it as fortune it wolde one of the thre
sones came as þ wynde brought his navy by
grete tourment that he passed besyde Croyne in galy
ce and there he came up.

The romance ends q [iiij] front.

¹Through my failure to give the printer sufficiently explicit directions the right hand margins are ragged and unsightly. Of course the "justification" was accurate in the original print. Otherwise the reprint represents as well as anything short of *facsimile* can, the typographical form of W.

But

thus it is of the worldly lyfe for there is none
so fayre nor so ryche so stronge nor soo goodly but at the laste
he must nedes leue this worlde.

Deo gratias.

q [iiij] back,

¶ Here endeth the noble hystory of the moost excellent
and myghty prynce & hygh renommed knyght kynge
Ponthus of Galyce & of lytell Brytayne. Enprynted
at London in Fletestrete at the sygne of the sonne by
Wynkyn de Worde. In the yere of our lorde god.
M.CCCCC.XI.

Below this is the printer's mark,—a slight variation of No. 5 in E. Gordon Duff's *Handlist*, and a scroll bearing the name of Wynkyn de Worde.

The book is divided (counting the missing leaves as the first chapter) into sixty unnumbered chapters with headings. There are fifty-four woodcuts of very crude and feeble execution.

Mr. Nicholson of the Bodleian Library kindly wrote to me of a signature of four leaves (d, i and ij) of an unknown edition by Wynkyn de Worde, in his custody, and had the fragment copied for me. The transcript corresponds page for page with signature d of the edition of 1511. Slight differences in the justification of the lines, a variant spelling or two, the difference in designating the signatures (the fragment, d, i and ij + 2, unsigned; 1511, d, i-iiij, none unsigned), prove resetting.

In Lowndes' *Manual*, an edition of 1548 is noted. Repeated inquiries at the English libraries and at the great London booksellers have brought me no information of this volume or of its whereabouts. W. C. Hazlitt, *Notes and Collections*, says characteristically, "I have not seen the book, but is likely that for 1548 we should read 1648."

The printed edition shows nothing of unusual interest linguistically. A few rare words are cited in my notes. The discussion of the relation of W to its French source and to R, falls to the next section.

THE RELATIONS OF THE TWO ENGLISH VERSIONS.

The problem of the relations of D and R offers unusual difficulties, which a statement of the general results of the comparison of the two texts will set before the reader. W is throughout a close and even slavish translation of its French original. Pp. 1-61 of D follow W so loosely that they might almost be regarded as an independent translation. D is in general shorter, condensing the narrative by cutting out superfluous descriptive details. Verbal correspondences of any length are rare in this portion. D, pp. 62-113, l. 6, agrees more closely with W. The versions are still fairly distinct, but frequent verbal agreement of long sentences makes it clear that one version is in some fashion a revision of the other. D, pp. 113, l. 7-150, is to all intents identical with the corresponding portion of W. The verbal agreement is unusually close for two prose documents of this period. Roughly speaking, then, the first two-fifths of D is a loose paraphrase of its French original, and only remotely connected with W; the second two-fifths is a close paraphrase, and closely connected with W; the final fifth is a close translation and virtually identical with W.

Before attempting an explanation of these phenomena it may be well to show by a representative example from the first part the relations of the two English versions to each other, and to the French text R. I have chosen Pontius' fight with the Saracen messenger.

D (p. 21).		W (C. iij ^{vo} . ff.).
And Pontus withdrew hym a litle, and putt his sper' in the reste; and come with a goode will & smote hym betweyn his sheld and his hel-		& he afrayed hym a lytell & toke his spere & came to hym a grete pace and smote hym bytwene y ^e shelde and the helme that he perced the

R (Fol. 210, Col. 1).

Il se eslogne ung pou et coucha sa lance et vient grant aleure contre lui et le fiert entre lescu et le heulme tant qui lui perca sa manche et ses

mett, that he brake his shuldre. And the

Saresyn smote Ponthus so myghtely that he brake his sper'. And when the kyng and the people sawe the iustyng, thei thonked Gode and said that Ponthus had wele iusted. Then Ponthus went forthre and drewe oute his swerd, and come to the Saresyn and gave hym suche a stroke aboute the vyser' of his helme that men myght se his vysage all open. Then hade the

Cristen ioye, and hope in Gode. The Saresyn drewe oute his swerd, whiche was a full grete blade of stele, and smoth Ponthus therwith so grete a stroke that he made his hede to shake and fire to smyte out of his eeyn: so he was sore astoned of that stroke, and sore was the feght between theym. Bot at all tymes Ponthus hade the bettre and lay in wate to smyte hym in the visage that

mayle and the doublet/& put the Iren & the tree bytwene y^e necke & the shoulders/& the tree brake well a two fote from the heed whiche greued hym moche/& the paynym smote Ponthus in the shelde & brake his spere in his breste. And whan the kyng & other sawe these Iustes/ they thanked god & said that Ponthus had lusted ryght fayre & prayed that god sholde helpe hym. Ponthus passed forth & made his cours & sette his hande on his swerde/& came towarde the paynym & gaue hym soo grete a stroke that he kytte a two halfe his ventayle & vnmaylled it so that y^e vyser bename hym the syght & the paynym rent it of so boys-tously y^t his vysage was all dys-couered/& than had the crysten men grete Ioy & grete hope/& the paynym drewe his swerde of stele & smote Ponthus so that he made all his heed to shake & his eyen to sparkle in his heed/so he felte hym astonyed of the grete stroke/& smote the hors w^t his spores & came agayne & smote him a grete stroke. So was y^e batayle bytwene them stronge & longe enduryng/& all wayes Ponthus wayted to smyte the paynym in

estoffes et lui mist le fer et le fust entre le col et les espaulles, et fu rompue sa lance a deux piedz du fust, qui moult greua le payen. A pres le payen ferist pontus en lescu et brisa sa lance en pieces. Quant le roy et les autres virent ceste iouste, si mercierent dieu et disoient que bel auoit iouste pontus et que dieu lui aideroit. pontus passa oultre et parfait son poindre et met sa main a lespee et vient vers le payen et lui donne si grant coup qui lui abat et trenche la moitie de la bauaille tellement que sa visaigiere lui tollu la veue, tant que le payen la print et erracha tant quil eust tout la (?) visaige a descouert, dont eurent grant Ioye le *Cristiens* et grant esperance en pontus quil gagneroit. A dont le payen trait le branc dacier et ferist pontus si grant coup qui lui fist la teste toute fremir tant que les yeulx lui estinceserent en la teste. Si se senti estourdy du grant coup quil eust. Si feri oultre et reuint et reffiert le payen si grant coup que merueille fu. Si fu forte la bataille dentre eulx et moult dure. Et touteffois estoit pontus tou-

was open; and so he mett with hym at a travers, that he smote of his nose and his chynne, so that it helde bot by the skynne: so he blede in suche wyse that his shelde and his nek wer' full of bloode, that vnneth he myght sitt on hors bake. Then Pontus toke

hym by the helme and pulled itt fro the hede, and aftre gave hym suche a stroke that he fell doune to the grounde. And when he had doon so, he smote of his hede and putt itt on his swerde poynte and broght itt to the squyers Saresyns and said to theym, "Fair Saresyns, I present you with the hede of *your* maistre."

the vysage/whiche was dyscouered /& soo moche that he wente to caste suche a trauers/that he smote the nose the mouth & the chyn/so y^e all helde not bot the skyn so bledde he strongely/& soo moche he bledde y^e all his shelde before was blody. The kynge & the people whiche sawe that stroke made ryght grete Ioye & thanked god. The paynym lost the blode & febled fast & so moche that unnethes he myght holde hym on his hors/& Pontus ranne vpon hym sharpely tyll he caste hym doune as he that hadde loste his blode & myght holde hymselfe no more. Than Pontus toke and rente of his helme from his heed/and afterwards smote hym suche a stroke that he made his heed for to flee too grounde. And he bowed doune and nyghed it with his swerde/and lyfte it vp and bare it vnto the two squyers sara-synes/and sayd vnto them in this wyse. Fayre lordes I present you with your maysters heed.

siours en a guet de le ferir par le visaige qui estoit descouuert. Et tant qui va getter trauerse tellement qui lui couppa le nez la bouche et le menton tant que tout ne tenoit que a la peau. Si seigna si fort que tout son escu estoit senglant. Le roy et la peuple qui virent ce coup firent grant ioye et mercierent dieu. Le payen perdi le sang et affoybli tant que a paine se pouait tenir sur son cheual. Et pontus lui couroit sur asprement et tant quil reuersa comme cellui qui auoit perdu le sang et lui erracha le heulme de la teste. Et puis le feri tel coup qui lui fist la teste voler a terre. Et puis senclina et la picqua & leua sus et la porta aux deux escuiers payens. Et leur dist. Beaulx seigneurs ie vous presente la teste de vostre maistre.

Since in this specimen, as always, *W* is nearer the French original than *D*, it is clear that it cannot be derived directly from *D*. The obvious working hypothesis would then be the converse, that *D* is essentially a revision of *W*'s original, a close translation of the French. The reviser setting out with

the intention of rewriting and condensing W would then have carried out his plan for two-fifths of the way, flagged in the undertaking for the next two-fifths, from there out, sunk to the position of mere transcriber. But this theory that W represents a complete translation of which D is an early and partial revision is far too simple to account for the facts with which we have to deal, for there is a third term to be considered, namely, that in the revision of one version by the other there was reference to a copy of the French *Ponthus*. This is proved by the existence of variants which, while they could have come about by no process of scribal corruption in the English tradition, are readily accounted for as direct mis-translations from the French. Recognizing the possibilities of capricious revision in prose of this time I have limited myself to clear instances of independent use of a French text in D and W.

When Ponthus appoints the weekly jousting for a year in the Forest of Broceliande, being in disfavor with his lady, he appropriately calls himself *le chevalier noir aux larmes blanches*, to indicate his sorrow. W translates this properly "the black knight with the white tears" (see p. 58, l. 2 f.), but D always translates "white arms."¹ Now it will be perfectly clear that no miscopying of *teres* would result in *armes*, and that conversely *armes* could never suggest *teres* to the stupidest of scribes. Reference to the French sets the matter straight in a moment; the translator of D simply read in his original for the correct *aux larmes blanches*, *aux armes blanches*, this mistake, actually found in Ortuin's French print of about 1500, is one that any careless copyist of the French text would naturally make.

Another instance. Ponthus forced to leave Brittany and Sidone by Guenelete's slander naturally calls himself in W the "moost vnhappyest (R *le plus maleureux*) knyght that lyued;" in D (p. 67, l. 14) he holds himself "the mervellest knyght livyng" quite unaccountably, till we see that the writer

¹*Armes whyte* 40, 10, 13, 28, 34; 42, 3; 43, 10, 13; 47, 17; 50, 32; 56, 4.

of D read *merveilleux* for *malheureux*. So (D, p. 49, l. 19), Geoffroy strikes a stone with his "goode swerde" so that he falls. W more naturally makes him strike it "w^t his fote," R "de son pie," out of the latter reading D, or a careless scribe, managed to make *bon espee*.

Again in W the barons advise king Huguell to make haste to offer his daughter to Pontius because Pontius is so rich that he "setteth bot lytel by any daunger," that is, will bear little haggling in the matter, and the king begins his speech of consent "Fair lordes—;" we have here a reading that a copyist is little likely to have changed into, "he setteth not by noo daungerous lordes," while a careless translator might well have so rendered the original R, [il] *en pris mains denger Seigneurs dist le roy*—, construing *denger* with *Seigneurs* and supposing the king's speech to begin only after *dist le roy*.¹ I would not insist too much upon this, though it is the most probable explanation.

Certain unimportant variant readings, which would appear at first sight merely the work of a scribe's caprice, have MS. authority. Thus in D (p. 2, l. 13) Brodas lands "he and xxi men with hym," the detail supported, if not mathematically, by F's *lui trente vngyesme* and H's *lui vintiesme*, is lacking in W and equally absent from R. So D (p. 3, l. 3) sets the number of Saracens disguised as merchants at forty, two French MSS. at least give the decimal, F, *xliiij*; H, *Quarante deux*, R gives no number; so W. Again D (p. 18, l. 13) makes the Saracen host "twenty" thousand in number following R's *xx*, W reads "thyrti" following O's *xxx*.

A final clear case of independent mistranslation by D is:—

D, p. 14, l. 25, "ye shuld vndirstonde wele not to bryng me another in stede of hym."

R, "Auoy," *dist elle*, "si eussez encor attendu, non pas [mene] ung autre pour lui."

¹ The full passages, parallel, will make the point clear.

R, "il a tres grant tresor quil en pris mains nul denger." "Seigneurs" *dist le roy*,
 D, —that he setteth not by no daungerous lordes." *Sayd the king*—
 W, —he setteth not by ony daunger." "Fair lordes" *said ye kynny*—

W, "Do way," said she, "than shuld ye haue abyde as yet & not haue broughte a nother for hym."

That is, "you ought to have waited till you could get Ponthus." The mistranslation of D, especially the *vdirstonde*, is I think most easily explained on the supposition that the translator mis-read *entendu* for *attendu*, though it may be sheer mistranslation.

We come back then to the old problem with one term added. W and R cannot be independent translations, one must be a revision of the other with the use of a French text. The question then is, which is the antecedent translation?—which the revision? A general characterization of the two versions may throw some light on the question.

A glance at the notes on the lists of proper names in D (pp. 29, 30, 55) will show that the translator probably misunderstood these obscure French names and that successive scribes must have added to the confusion. W is singularly correct in this respect, so accurate that it is difficult to believe that it had ever been copied by one ignorant of the French original. In its chapter divisions¹ W practically agrees with Ortuin's print of about 1500, and the chapter headings are with rare exceptions exact translations of those of O. This may of course only mean that Ortuin's ms. was of the same class as the original of W. The coincidence is at least striking, when the three French mss. in England differ so essentially in chapter divisions and headings. It is probably not fortuitous that D lacks chapter headings. The fact that it, the earliest German edition (1483) and the French ms. F, differing to be sure in chapter divisions, all appear without chapter headings, is at least an indication that the French *Ponthus* was originally composed without them, and that the

¹The chapter division of W corresponding to xxv, p. 88 of D, is represented in O only by a break and a large capital, but W has apparently used what was originally a mere transition—"Now here I leue of Surdyte, etc.," as a chapter heading. Otherwise the chapter divisions are coincident.

varying rubrics are, as would be expected, the work of the scribes.

We are now in a position to test the theory that D is a revision of the version represented by W. First we must suppose that a scribe setting out before 1450 to condense, unsystematically, an English romance took the pains to use the French original in this revision, we must suppose further that a plan begun thus elaborately was gradually relinquished till the reviser became mere copyist, finally we must suppose that a scribe careful enough to use a French MS. in revision, in at least two instances changed the obviously correct translation before him in favor of an error in his French original, which the correct translation would have made perfectly apparent. It is unnecessary to dwell upon the improbability of any or all of these suppositions.

Forced then to the theory that W is in some fashion a revision of D made with a French original, we shall find the motives for such a revision in the probable method of preparing W for de Worde's press. Suppose that Wynkyn de Worde planned to print the famous romance of *Ponthus* in English. He would pretty certainly have turned over one of the early printed editions of the French *Ponthus* to some hack with directions to translate it. This translator would naturally avail himself of the earlier English version, which Wynkyn de Worde, most conscientious of early printers, may have rejected as inaccurate,—keeping it open before him as he translated from the French. The early portion of D, being loose paraphrase, would have supplied him only with occasional phrases and sentences, the second portion, free translation, would have furnished him much material, the third portion, close translation, could have been transcribed for press with slight changes. The resulting version would then be W's rather slavish translation, which contains a large portion of the earlier D. The theory has more than *prima facie* probability to commend it. If W represents a translation made especially for Wynkyn de Worde's press, the unusual correctness of its

proper names is immediately accounted for, and the coincidence of its chapter divisions and headings with those of Ortuin's edition ceases to be surprising.

There are only a few instances in which errors in *W* are more likely to be misunderstandings of *D* than of a French text. For instance, where *Ponthus* sings his song in the forest,—

D, p. 39, l. 28, "he made ther' a song of the whiche the refrete was this melodie:—"Of byrdes and of wordly ioy is to me no disporte," etc., following.

R. "Si fist une chancon et auoit ou refrain, "Chant des oiseaulx, etc.

W reads, "[*Ponthus*] made a song where he was at the refraynyng of y^e byrdes, "No Joye shuld me reconforte." (Cf. note p. 39, l. 28.)

That is, *W* was misled by the form of *D*'s translation into throwing most of the first line of the song into the preceding description. *D* had already carried over the first word of the song (*chant* = *melodie*). *W* simply carried the process a point further. The mistake is not likely to have arisen directly from the French. Again *W* has just once the mistake "whyte armes" for "whyte teres" (the first occurrence of the phrase, *D*, p. 40, l. 10). This cannot be a genuine mistranslation, for the phrase is correctly translated three lines below. Only in the mechanical copying of *D*'s reading when the attention had wandered a moment from the French text could the mistake have arisen. Only such a mistake of the eye would have escaped immediate correction.

Though the satisfactory demonstration of this solution of the problem would require the identification of the printed book from which *W* was translated,—a study which I have lacked opportunity to make,—I believe that the evidence is sufficient to establish, at least provisionally, this theory of the relation of the two English texts.

To recapitulate: *D* is a rough translation in its earlier parts, a fairly close translation in its central portion as the translator gained knowledge of French or warmed up to the work, finally, a literal translation. The only extant copy was made probably about 1450 by a Yorkshire scribe, from

a standard English original. A copy of this early version, somewhat better than the Digby MS.,¹ lay before the man who prepared the version of W for the press in 1511. This reviser followed a French text, probably printed, closely. So he was obliged virtually to retranslate all the first two-fifths with only occasional assistance from the older translation, in the second two-fifths he revised the older work carefully from the French. The final fifth was so accurate that he merely transcribed it with minor corrections.

THE GERMAN PONTIUS.

Pontus was early translated into German by no less a personage than the princess Eleanor, daughter of James I., of Scotland. Her motive is set forth in the first edition of 1483, where it is stated that the Archduchess of Austria [dise histori], *lößlich von frantzosischer zungen in teutch getransferiert vn gemacht hat dem durchleüchtigen hochgeporenem fürsten vnd herren Sigmunden ertzherzog zû österreich, &c. jrem eelichen gemahel tzû lieb und zû geuallen.* Eleanor married Sigismund of Austria in the year 1448. The earliest German MS. is dated 1465.² Between these dates then the translation was made, and from the middle of the fifteenth century to the present time the romance of Pontus has been readily accessible in Germany. Only in Germany the romance passed the sixteenth century, there even in the eighteenth century it was published for popular reading. Probably the earliest allusion to *Pontus* (the Fr. version?) in German, is in the colophon of the first German edition of *Mélusine*, printed 1484, but written in 1456. There the translator, Thüring von Rüggeilingen, mentions it in an interesting list: *Und ich hab*

¹ For W furnishes not a few emendations to D in the last part, pp. 113-150, where the versions are virtually identical. See the footnotes *passim*.

² So in Goedeke's *Grundriss*, I, p. 356. Büsching and Von der Hagen, *Buch der Liebe*, XLVI, give 1464 in their reprint of the exact form of the colophon of the Gotha MS.

auch gesehen vnd gelesen vil schöner hystori vn bücher Es sey von künig artus hof vn von vil seiner Ritter von der Tafeltram Es sey von her Ywan vn her Gawan/her Lantzelot/her Tristan/her Parcefal/der ijegliches sein besunder hystori vnd lesen hat Dar zû von sant Wilhelm von Pontus von hertzog wilhelm von Orliens vn von Malin [? Merlin]. Büsching and von der Hagen, *Buch der Liebe*, XL and XLV, cite passages from the *Adelspiegel* of Spangenberg and the *Ehrenbrief* of Püterich von Reicherzhausen which mention *Ponthus*. But the best proof of the popularity of the story is the many editions of Eleanor's rather dull version. The translation which I have read in part in the edition of 1483 is a faithful rendering of a very early form of the French text, showing all the monotony of the French ms. R of the British Museum. The second edition (1498) already shows revision and successive printers worked it into the quite readable form of the 16th cent. *Buch der Liebe*.

It could serve no useful purpose to repeat the matter in Goedeke's *Grundriss*, Bd. I, b. 355 f., where all mss. and printed versions are described. I will simply enumerate the editions with brief comment, marking with an asterisk those which I have not seen.

(1) Fol. Hans Schönsberger, Augsburg, 1483. (2) the same, 1498. These like the early ms. described in Büsching and von der Hagen, XLVI f., have no chapter numbers or headings. * (3) Fol. Martinus Flach, Strassburg, 1509. (4) Fol. Sigmund Bun, Strassburg, 1539. This was the edition modernized by Büsching and von der Hagen in their "*Buch der Liebe*," Berlin, 1809. It contains a long homiletic introduction which tells "*wie und warumb si [dise histori] zulesen sei*," which the interested will find at the end of Büsching and von der Hagen's reprint. It is presumably only a publisher's flourish to tell the reader that "*dise [histori] ausz Frantzösischer zungen in das Latein und nachmals in unser Teütsch sprach / bracht worden sei*." The translation is still Eleanor's, but considerably revised and provided with chapter numbers and headings.

It enlarges the final paragraph exhorting the reader to recognize the shortness of life and follow the example of Pontus. No other version has this modified ending. (5) Fol. 62 numbered leaves, no place or printer, 1548. Aside from its fine woodcuts¹ this edition has a certain interest as the source of the modified version of *Pontus* found in the famous 16th cent. *Buch der Liebe*. The introduction of (4) is again used also the chapter divisions and headings of the immediately preceding edition, but there is one interesting change. Where all the earlier German versions following the French make Pontus prepare for the tournament with a dwarf, this edition makes him consult with an "edelmänn," and instead of the mummery of Pontus disguised as a hermit, the masked old lady, shooting the shields, etc. (cf. p. 40 ff.), substitutes, in due form, a herald to direct the jousting. The change is evidently to make Pontus' conduct conform more nearly to the actual code of the time.² * (6) 8^{vo}. Wygand Han, Frankfurt a. M., 1557. * (7) 8^{vo}. No date or printer. Frankfurt. * (8) 8^{vo}. Frankfurt, 1568. (9) *Buch der Liebe*. Fol. Feyerabend, Frankfurt, 1578 and 1587. Printed from a version showing the changes made in 5. (10³) "*Ritter Pontus*." 16^o. Frankfurt [circa 1600], follows the *Buch der Liebe*. * (11) 8^{vo}. Nürnberg, 1656. * (12) 8^{vo}. Nürnberg, 1657. * (13) 8^{vo}. Nürnberg, 1670. (14) 8^{vo}. Frankfurt, 1769. To these should be added *Ridder Pontus*, a Low German version, "Hamborch," 1601, the reprint in Büsching and von der Hagen's *Buch der Liebe*, 1809, and in Simrock's *Die Deutschen Volks-*

¹ Several of them bear the mark of Hans Schüpfelin the younger, a monogram HS. and a small spade.

² Büsching and von der Hagen, p. I, had already noticed this difference between the version they printed (4), and that of the 16th. cent. *Buch der Liebe*, but they were ignorant of this ed. of 1548, in which the change first occurs.

³ The edition is not cited in Goedeke, unless it is No. 7. It is not probable that he should have assigned so early a date to the book. I have seen 10 in the British Museum, it is if anything, later than the date assigned. My numbers 11-14 are Goedeke's 10-13.

bücher, vol. XI, Frankfurt, 1865, as usual without indication of source. Since it has the additional didactic paragraph found only in the ed. of 1539 and von der Hagen's reprint it is pretty certain that Simrock merely reprinted von der Hagen's edition. Since Simrock's series was popular rather than antiquarian in intention, it closes a tradition of nearly four hundred years of the popular survival of the romance of Ponthus in Germany.

THE PONTUS-RÍMUR.

It was a curious fate that the chivalresque *Ponthus*, which had come through the stages of the heroic *Geste of King Horn* and the French roman d'Aventure, should return towards its origins by being done into a Northern rímur. I learned first of the existence of this version through examining a small paper MS., Bor. 106¹ of the Bodleian Library,—the first page told me that it was the second part of a Pontus-rímur and by Petür Einarsson. This is all I should have known about it, if my friend, Dr. W. H. Schofield, had not come to my aid. I print entire the notes he has kindly sent me from Christiania.

"The Icelandic work usually called *Pontus-rímur* has not, so far as I know, been published. It is, however, preserved more or less complete in at least 10 MSS. (outside of that one in the Bodleian to which you refer). Seven of them are in the Arnamagnæan collection in Copenhagen, and may be found described in the *Katalog over den Arnamagnæanske Håndskriftsamling*, Copen., 1892-94, Vol. II, Parts 1-2, under the following numbers:

- No. 1562 (AM. 611 g, 4^{to}—paper of 17th century).
- " 1575 (AM. 613 e, 4^{to}— " " ").
- " 1576 (AM. 613 f, 4^{to}— " " ").
- " 1578 (AM. 613 h, 4^{to}— " " ").
- " 1579 (AM. 613 i, 4^{to}—paper, ca. 1700).
- " 1583 (AM. 614 d, 4^{to}— " " 1656).
- " 2611, 2, (Rask, 40—18th century).

¹Ff. 163. The heading is, *Añar Partur Pontus Rímna Orrturg: Petre Einarssyne*. It is divided into 17 "fits." In Dr. Schofield's notes Einarsson is said to be the author of the last 16 songs of the rímur. The difference may indicate only a scribe's subdivision of one of the original songs.

"Jón Þorkelsson in his Doctor's thesis entitled *Om Digtingen paa Island i det 15 og 16. Aarhundrede*, Copen., 1888, p. 377, mentions three others: two fragmentary paper MSS. in Stockholm, and another fragment, I Bfél. Nr. 238, 8^{vo}.

"From the last-named book, I extract the following information as to the *Pontus-rímur*, and its author:

"The work was begun by MAGNÚS JÓNSSON surnamed PRÚÐI, or GAMLI, who was born between 1520-25 and died in 1591. It seems to have been written in his 33rd year, for he speaks of his first wife as then dead. He, however, finished only the first 13 songs. His heirs decided that the poem should be continued by the priest ÓLAFÜR HALDÓRSSON (who died before 1639); but he got no farther than the 14th and 15th songs. Later in the 17th century, it was continued by Pétur Einarsson of Ballará (still alive in 1665), who began where Magnús left off, and brought the work to a conclusion, writing songs XIV to XXIX. Thus we have two versions of songs XIV and XV.

"The corresponding saga is to be found in Thott's ms., No. 513, 8^{vo}; but this seems to have been made up after the *rímur* by Magnús Jónsson digri (great-grandson of Magnús Jónsson prúði), died 1702. In (Uno von Troil), *Bref Rörande en Resa til Island*, 1772, Upsala, 1777, p. 164, we have a *Pontúsar saga* mentioned.

"Magnús was given the complimentary surname (*hinn*) *prúði*, *i. e.*, 'the elegant,' because of the distinction of his bearing, and the general esteem in which he was held. His other surname (*hinn*) *gamli*, *i. e.*, 'the old,' was doubtless not added until the last part of the 17th century, when his great-grand-son was a grown man. His descendants raised a very costly monument to his memory, provided with a long Latin inscription.

"In *Historia Literaria Islandiæ*, auctore Halldano Einari, Ed. nova, 1786, p. 85, we have the following insertion:

"*Magnus Johannis*, regionis Torskafiordensis Chronomus, illustri genere natus, fatis cessit 1596, Historiam Ponti, pulchro verborum delectu, carmineque numero gratiorum fecit. Tribuntur porro illi in quibusdam exemplaribus XII carmina, quæ historiam Ingrari, VIII, quæ Conradi Richardi Imperatoris filii, & nonnulla, quæ Amici & Æmilii complectuntur historias.

"Magnús Jónsson prúði was one of the most enlightened and cultivated men of his time. He was considered the best speaker then living, and one of the most learned of jurists. He was also an historian, and is said to have composed annals and other similar works. As a poet he was held in unusually high esteem by his contemporaries.

"Most of his shorter poems are lost, only separate verses being found here and there in chronicles and histories. Among other things of his, which are preserved, we have a *Amíkusrímur* og *Amilíus* (*i. e.*, *rímur* on Amis and Amiloun), on which see Kölbing in *Beit. zur Gesch. der deut. Sprache*, IV, 1877, pp. 271-314; also *Germania*, XIX, 184-189. This was

edited by Kölbing in his *Alteng. Bibliothek*, II, Heilbronn, 1884, pp. 189-229. He, however, did not know the name of the author, and was wrong in dating it at ca. 1500, for it really should be dated ca. 1560-70, or about the same time as the *Pontus-rímur* (see Þorkelsson, pp. 377-8).

"Magnús was very familiar with German. In his youth he spent several years in Germany, where he doubtless laid the foundation of his unusual and all-round culture. It looks as if it was, therefore, a German version of the Pontus story on which he based his *rímur*. Yet Þorkelsson notes (p. 118) that there are certain verses on Pontus (preserved in other Icel. documents) which are not in Magnús's poem, and seem to point to an older poem on the subject. Séra Þorsteinn Pétursson puts the *Pontus-rímur* in the 15th century. This is probably a blunder; but he may have known other older versions of the story than those preserved (p. 176).

"Þorkelsson notes further (p. 117) that certain verses of the *Pontus-rímur* are still living in popular tradition in Iceland."

I need only add that the form of the proper names in the Bodleian MS. made it clear that Einarsson worked from a German, not a French version; in this it is probable that he only followed Magnus Jonsson. *Gendil*, f. 24^b, 26, comes from the *Gendelot* of the German versions. *Geneve*, 40^b, *Geneve*, 41^b, is the German form of Guenever. Even more striking is *Probus*, 51^b, for the French *Brodas*. *Tiburt*, 89^b, is also the German, not the French form of the name of Ponthus' father. So *Henrich*, 39^b, 59^b.

LITERARY CONSIDERATIONS.

The late prose romances have found little favor with the critics, and with a certain justice, for most of them are clearly debasements, vulgarizations in the bad sense, of stories that had been better told. MM. Montaiglon and Mayer in their passing characterization of *Ponthus* as *pauvre livre* and *faible ouvrage*, evidently regard the book as at best an average example of its dull class. The indulgence of an editor for the foster-child of his fancy, if no more serious consideration, would make me bespeak for the book at least the mitigated condemnation of faint praise.

In its programme of "mervelles," jousts, battles and adventures, the book, it seems to me, calls neither for praise nor blame. Such descriptions have the inevitable monotony of the *genre*, yet I believe the reader will find Pontius' first battle with the Saracen messenger convincingly sanguinary, and Guenelete, at the last, a formidable villain of a melodramatic sort. The long lists of names, a sheer hindrance to the enjoyment of the English version, constituted a very real and legitimate attraction to the first readers of the romance. The Angevin family of Tour Landry and their neighbors certainly felt no less a thrill at recognizing their ancestors fighting for the faith than did the high-born Athenian in reading familiar names among the captains that sailed for Troy to avenge Helen's rape. But as sheer romance, *Pontius* is certainly far inferior to Malory and in no way notable among stories of adventure.

As a serious and consistent attempt to draw the portrait of an ideal knight of the 15th century, in character as well as in achievement, *Pontius* has, I believe, a unique interest. No great literary skill in the execution of this task was to be expected; and yet it must be said to the unknown author's credit that he thoroughly believed in his own hero, and that his ideal of the knightly character was high and manly. So that in *Pontius* we have a hero who has no vices and all the virtues, and yet is distinctly not a prig,—no Grandison out of due time. Besides the older duties of valor and generosity, the author proposes for his hero above all things a certain cleanness of life and a tactful kindness that includes all relations of life. In the attempt to express in incident some of the finer emotions, I believe the romance rises well above its class. Recognizing fully the incompleteness of performance in every case, it was no perfunctory hand that described Sidone's sorrow at her lover's departure, Pontius' farewell to Brittany, his recognition of his mother, and many another less notable scene of the book. The romancer then offers as the chief virtues of his hero a certain sweetness and gaiety of

mind, purity and justness of life. Only in the instructions to Pollides in the presence of his wife does Ponthus appear to strike a jarring note. A modern reader would hope that Genever's assurance, "Ser, he shall doo as a goode man owe to doo," was spoken with a certain resentment. But we must remember that the 15th century took its instruction, as well as its transgression, sturdily. The whole scene and the long homily that Ponthus reads his cousin must have been sufficiently in character when the book was written. Ponthus as definitely represents the later ideal of knighthood,—the tone of the book is often singularly like the life of the Chevalier Bayard,—as Gawain represented the earlier ideal of knightly courtesy. The later hero, obscurely represented in a single romance, can never in any way rival the knight of Arthur's court, celebrated by the great mediæval romancers, but I believe that the character of Ponthus will hold a certain representative value, permanent, if humble. It was no wholly frivolous or contemptible motive that gave the book its contemporary popularity. It was the portrait of a knight that men recognized and that men approved.

From the point of view of style, *faible ouvrage* the French *Ponthus* certainly is. Better things may be said of the English translation. It will I believe be difficult to find any English prose of the first half of the 15th century on the whole so fluent and readable. Briskly and easily the story chatters along, when most of the prose of the time lingers in hopeless monotony. Style, in the sense in which Malory, Pecoek, or a modern has style, the story has not. It is more like good unaffected talk than anything else,—no slight merit at the time, and a merit almost wholly the translator's. Just as the homespun virtues and equally clear-cut vices of the book cannot compete in interest with the subtle union of sensuality and religious mysticism that in Malory exercises a somewhat morbid fascination, so the clearness and brightness of its English, excellent for its subject, may appear

insignificant, almost inaudible, when Malory resounds in full volume; yet there is room for both, and none of the early English prose romances is likely to suffer less by the contrast. With all its defects of proportion, and they are many, it remains a pleasantly told story "wherof a man may lerne many goode ensamples" of an ideal of character by no means valueless to-day. In the prose of the 15th century it should gain and hold a modest place.

PLAN OF THE PRESENT EDITION.

The text printed is that of the Digby ms. with only the following changes,—the representation of contractions by the full form in *Italic*, the normalization of the use of capitals, the introduction of paragraphing and punctuation. The first change is now universal, the publishing of a fac-simile page makes it unnecessary to follow the fashion of the ms.—unsightly on the printed page,—in capitalization, the absence of punctuation in the ms. except a rare ¶ and ||,—always reproduced in the text,—makes the introduction of punctuation indispensable to the comfortable use of the text, finally when it is once understood that the ms. is written solidly with no breaks in the chapters, except the few marked by ¶¶, the division into paragraphs in the text, an obvious convenience, is in no way misleading. Rare editorial changes are clearly explained in the footnotes or, in the case of insertions inclosed in brackets or parentheses, the former [] indicate matter supplied by the editor, the latter () emendations from Wynkyn de Worde's edition of 1511. To supply the lack of any running analysis in the original I have written the chapter headings inclosed in brackets. That they should be congruous with the text, I have followed the orthography, and attempted to imitate the style of the Digby ms. The perils of this sort of composition have, I hope, been avoided

by the use whenever practicable of material supplied in the text itself, of the chapter headings of *W*, or the translation and imitation of the chapter headings of the French *MS*. The difficulty confronting every editor of texts of this period, the treatment of terminal tags and flourishes, has been the less in this case: first, because the fac-simile page gives all needful information upon this point; second, because the Yorkshire scribe of the *MS*. could have pronounced no final e's; third, because most of these tags are clearly only flourishes. It seemed advisable then to disregard all except the tailed *r*. This is so much more clearly written than other tags and so consistently used that it seemed desirable to represent it in the text. An \bar{r} was then cut to represent the tailed character of the *MS*. Occasionally, usually after $-\bar{r}$, I have printed $-\bar{r}e$, and $-re$, as more sightly.

It was at first my intention to insert all textual notes at the foot of the page. All the readings of the *MS*., when changed in the text, are so recorded. The impracticability of holding the proof-sheets long, made it necessary to place the longer textual notes, and a few that escaped my attention among the general notes. The proper names are frequently so thoroughly corrupted in the *MS*. that it seemed best in the text to abide by the strictly palaeographical reading, and to make the necessary corrections in the case of important names in the alphabetical list of proper names, in the case of minor names in the longer lists, in the general notes. Any formal inconsistency in this matter will I trust be the more readily pardoned, that the whole material is readily accessible. Finally the reasonable certainty that *W* is a revision of *D* made it superfluous to swell this already bulky volume with its innumerable variant readings. I have registered at the foot of the page or among the general notes all readings of *W* which have any intrinsic interest, besides the few that appear to represent readings of the old translation better than those transmitted in *D*.

NOTES.

CONTRACTIONS.

- D. ms. Digby 185 of the Bodleian Library.
 W. Wynkyn de Worde's Ed. of 1511.
 R. ms. Royal 15, E. vi, Brit. Mus., of the French Text.
 H. ms. Hh. 3, 16, Cambr., of the French Text.
 F. ms. Ff. 3, 31, Cambr., of the French Text.
 O. Ortuin's Ed., Lyon, circa 1500, of the French Text.

P. 2, l. 11, passed Spayne in Galice. The reading is justified by H, [il] *passa par en coste espaigne et en galice*, and F, *le vent le amena . . . passer toute espaigne en galice*, but W's reading *besyde Croyne* is the better. It follows R, [il] *passa par jouste Couloine en Galice*.

P. 9, l. 17, Armoric. W's reading *Morygne* appears to be a corruption of R's *Montgrant*.

P. 9, l. 20, Mast. W, *sayle yerde*; R, *tref*.

P. 10, l. 5, Susteny. R, *susinio*; W, *suffone* (sic). *Sucinio* is the name of a château, once the summer residence of the Dukes of Brittany near Sarzeau.

P. 10, l. 17, Viceat. W, *verrac*.

P. 10, l. 30. W has only, *So made he theym to lepe upon theyr horses & led theym to Vennes*, following R literally.

The easiest way out of the contradictory reading in D is to read with W, *theym* for *hym* in both instances in l. 30 f., and to suppose that the detail *behinde hym*, not in the French, was copied in by mistake from the passage in l. 13. A later scribe, wishing to emphasize Pontius' dignity as a prince, would have added the clause *and he . . . aloone*.

P. 11, l. 9, whete. W, *marchaundyse*; R, *fourmens*.

P. 11, l. 31. W names the game, *yf he played at the playe of the tenys*, etc.; R, *a la pelotte*; O, *paume*.

P. 12, l. 5, breke his taylor. The expression is in the *Romaunt of the Rose*, l. 6221 :

Right thus whyl Fals-Semblaunt sermoneth
 Eftsones Love him aresoneth,
 And brak his tale in the speking.

P. 12, l. 8, live dayes. W interpolates with R, the following conventional description: *for he was grete and large in y^e brest & small in the waste/& y^e shuldres y^e armes y^e thyghes and y^e fete were made of ryght deuysse/y^e vysage was clere browne/the eyen so meke/the mouth rede/& the nose streyte/he semed lyke an awngell*, etc. In other respects also the versions differ slightly at this point.

P. 13, l. 11, palfrey. W adds with R, *and a meruayllous gentyll faucon*.

P. 13, l. 16, Norye. R, *nourriture*; W, *chylde*.

P. 14, l. 25, for . . . copp, which translates R, is not in W.

P. 15, l. 21 f. A mistranslation or arbitrary change. In W Sidone replies, "*I byleue the,*" also as she whiche was caught w^t y^e loue of hym; R, *comme celle qui ia estoit toute esprise de lamour de lui*.

P. 18, l. 29, fir-hows. W also uses the technical word *fyre hous*; R, *chascun feu*.

P. 19, l. 27, Susanne. Allusions to the apocryphal chapters of Daniel are, I believe, relatively rare, at least in English literature. In *Horn et Rimel*, l. 2082 ff., Horn tells the king that he will maintain his innocence by combat against five or six:

Taunt me fi en cel deu. ki salua israel.
Susanne deliuerad. par lenfant daniel.
E lui meimes pus. des lions el putel.

In Shylock's taunting of Portia, "A Daniel come to judgment! yea, a Daniel," *Merch. of Venice*, IV, 1, 223, is the same allusion.

P. 19, *passim*, *the* and *thou*. As in all texts of this time *ye* is used in polite address, *thou* apparently only contemptuously. In the present instance Ponthus defies the Saracen with *the*, and the Saracen returns the contemptuous pronoun.

Similarly p. 20, l. 27, the Saracen in pitying scorn of Ponthus calls him *thou*, which Ponthus returns.

P. 22, l. 18, it is on the contrary used in prayer to Christ. W uses *ye* and *your* in this instance.

Ponthus, in giving the Saracen king, Corbatan, his death-blow, p. 85, l. 2, calls him at once *false Saresyn* and *thou*.

Ponthus chides his yeoman, p. 97, l. 15, *Hold thy peace*.

Guenelete, p. 97, l. 27, calls Ponthus, disguised as a beggar, *thou*, in anger.

The porter of the hall, rudely brushed aside, curses Ponthus with *thou*.

Sidone always calls Guenelete *thou* as she upbraids him for his treachery, p. 130, l. 30 ff. Ponthus similarly when on the point of killing Guenelete in the hall, p. 134, l. 28 f. With the single exception of the instance in prayer, it is always used in anger or in scorn in this text, never in intimacy.

• P. 20, l. 2, kerchef. W, *pensell*.

P. 24, l. 4, Morteyne. W adds *paynel*.

P. 24, l. 5, Duches. W, *Countesse*.

P. 24, l. 6, deid. W adds with R, *and her sone was but a yere olde*.

P. 24, l. 6, Gouter. W, *payne de chateau Goutyer*; R, *payen*; O, *paon*.

P. 24, l. 29, Vale. W adds with R, *the lorde of dynaux of ye brytons, brytonauntes. And of Galos, etc.* The *Galyce* of D is then a corruption of *Galos*.

P. 24, l. 30, Edmund. W and R, *Guy*.—Dole. W, the later form *dueil*.—La Roche. W and R, *ronge*.

P. 24, l. 34, Mayne. W, *mans*.

P. 25, l. 14, Robt. de Sanguyn, Ranald de Sylle. The first name is hard to identify, probably a mere corruption. W, *Regnault de sully/and Aygret de pouilly*; R, *Robert de chenegue, regnault de sulli & aigret de prully*.

P. 28, l. 13, ryght. R, *senestre*; W renders *best*, apparently a printer's error for *left*.

P. 28, l. 14, Vicecounte Daniou. W, *Erle of Dongres* apparently the correct reading, but R has *le viconte de rohan* agreeing in the title with D.

P. 28, l. 15, Valoynes. W and R, *la Roche*.

P. 28, l. 28, Creton. W and R, *Craon*.

P. 28, l. 27–30. I give a characteristic variant of W, which agrees with R, *Kynge Karados helde with grete dystres the erle of Mans/and the lorde of Craon/and had ouerthrowen them and many of the manceaus and herupoys/as Hamelyn de sylle, Geruays de la porte, Thybault de matheselon, Peter de doncelles, Sauary de la hay, Gerarde de chateau goutyer, Guyllam de roches, Geoffrey de lesygnen/and Leoncel. But they defended them on fote/& were assembled whiche auayled them moche. Androwe de la toure/and Bertram de donne sette grete payne for to recouer theym/but there was too grete prees of saresynes/and soo grete a folke that vnnetes myght they come to them/tyll that Guyllam de roches sawe Ponthus whiche that made the renges to shake with the helpe that sewed hym. "Syr it is nede se yonder a grete partye of our barons the whiche ben on fote."*

D certainly gains by dropping the list of names, but compresses so much that the incident is hardly clear.

P. 29, l. 6, Ralond de Avyon. Probably a corruption of R's *rol. de dynain*; W, *Guyllam de dygnan*.

P. 29, l. 24, Vaucay. W, *Bausaye mayle*.—Daniou. W, *daner*.

P. 30, l. 20, Peonny. W, *paynell*.—Wylron. W, *Villyers*.

P. 30, l. 21, Roger. W and O, *Hongres*.

P. 30, l. 22, Gaciane de Mounte Vyel. W, *Gassos de Mountreul*; probably for *Montreuil-Bellay*.—Tenull. W and O, *chenulle*; possibly an error for Chemillé in Maine.

P. 30, l. 23, Hundes de Prouere. W, *Endes de penances*.

P. 30, l. 24, Chastameny. W, *Gautyer de chateau neuf*.—Monte Agnant. W, *Androwe de Montagu*.

P. 30, l. 26, Mangon. W, *dauauger*; O, *dauauches*.

P. 30, l. 27, Deyneŕ. W, *dygnan*; O, *dinant*.

P. 32, l. 10, lyve. W, *woman*; R, *femme*. We should probably emend by reading *love*.

P. 33, l. 3, for they had hym in theyr conceyte, *had* is subjunctive for *should have*. Cf. W, *to the ende that they sholde haue hym in the more fauour*. A semi-colon or period should follow *grace*.

P. 33, l. 8, that . . . taken, follows R, *Et puis leur dist apres quilz auvient petitement aduise*; W mistranslates, *after that he had awysed hym a little*.

P. 33, l. 22, thre. W, *two*; R, *deux*.

Douce Fr., p. 34, l. 4, dyuers gyftis, dyuers is evidently a corruption of *dyners*. W and R concur in D's reading.

P. 34, l. 5, draghtes. W, *signes*; R, *signe*.

P. 36, l. 7. W, *y' is foly to sette her herre* [sic *herte*] *so on fledde folke*, an interesting translation of R's *gens de vollaiges*.

P. 36, l. 26, x. W, *a two*; R, *xv*.

P. 37, l. 13, putt fro. W, *benymme*.

P. 39, l. 29 ff. I give the text of the quatrain from R:

Chant des oyseaulx ne nulle ioie.
Ne me¹ puet² reconforter,
Quant celle que³ tant amoye⁴
⁵ Me veult delle⁶ estranger.

P. 40, l. 9, wretyn in this wyse. R, *vnes lettres escrites en lettre de fourme*; W, *wryten in foure*, an absurd mistranslation.

P. 40, l. 33, swerd. W, *swerde with the gyrdell of golde & the crowne of golde*.

P. 41, l. 23, rede toune. W, *vyle ronge* by error for R's *ville rouge*.

P. 41, l. 34, Bellacion. W, *brylaunson*; R, *bellencon*.

P. 54, l. 1, Boloys. W, *bloys*.

P. 54, l. 2, Guyllem de Roches. W and R, *damp Martyne*.

P. 54, l. 4, Rosylyon. W, *Robert de resylylon*; R, *tybault de roussilon*.

P. 55, l. 22, Averenses. W and R, *Osteryche*.

P. 55, l. 23, Barry. W and R, *bar*.

P. 55, l. 24, Mount Bernard. W, *Mountibelyart*.

P. 55, l. 26, Savye. W and R, *savoye*.

P. 56, l. 1, Bellacon. W, *Belenson*; R, *bellencon*.

¹H, F, O; R omits.

²O, *puët*.

³H, *que ie*.

⁴O, *iamois*.

⁵H, *Si me*.

⁶O, *du tout*.

P. 59, l. 18 ff. R, *Si commencerent menestrelz a sonner de toute manieres et heraulx a crier que len eust pas ouy dieu tonner, que tout le bois retentissoit.*

I have not happened upon this conceit outside of Chrétien. Cf. Yvain (Foerster, l. 2348 ff.):

Li sain, li cor et les buisines
Font le chastel si resoner
Qu' an n'i oïst Deu toner.

P. 60, l. 14, Ponthus. W adds with R, *& his hors al whyte with a grete rede rose that betokened his lady.*

P. 61, l. 11 f. As W explains, because Ponthus thought that Bernard should have had the prize Monday.

P. 65, l. 14, messe-booke. W, *holy gospels*; R, *saincte euangiles.*

P. 65, l. 27, thre or foūr. W and R, *two or thre*; so p. 66, l. 13.

P. 70, l. 26, Henry. W, always *Harry.*

P. 72, l. 4, Droyte Voy. W reads always, perhaps, by a printer's error, *driot voyce*; so p. 91, l. 20 and 104, l. 17.

P. 74, l. 27, demaunded hym. W, *resoned hym*; R, *la* (sic) *raisonna*, read *l'araisonna.*

P. 76, l. 1, grete rumour. W, *rygour*, omits *grete*; R, *grant guerre.*

P. 80, l. 20, is not myche worthe—misses the point. W, *is onely but selfewyllfulnes of hertes of grete lordes*; R, *le debat nest pas chose fors de grans seigneurs.* This is the necessary introduction to Ponthus' words on the duty of princes.

P. 81, l. 31, stedes. W adds with R, *& syxe coursers.*

P. 82, l. 11, Corbatan. W and R, always *Corboran.*

P. 84, l. 8, Fireague. So O, *Feragu*; but W, *Feragne*, and R, *Ferragny.*

P. 84, l. 22, voyde place. W, *grete way.*

P. 86, l. 1. R, *La nef fu a merueilles grande et painte et ystoriee*; W, *y^e shyppe was passynge grete and wele poynted.* Both English versions appear to have misunderstood the

description of the decorated ship, unless *pointed* is an error for *paynted*.

P. 86, l. 9, Coffyrs and trunkes. W, *hutches and these grete cofers*; R, *huches*.

P. 89, l. 5, Mounte Belyard. R, *Montbliart*.

P. 90, l. 21, fonde of Guenelete. W, *affonned on G*. I do not know the word, are the *n*'s misprints for *u*'s? R, *affole*.

P. 90, l. 30. It is perhaps worth while to have this certainly comprehensive description in all the versions. W, *for men saye y' he hath many euyll condycyons/& also he is aged and corsyous and lame and dronklew*; R, [il] *est si gras si viel des monnyacle et yurongue*.

P. 97, l. 30, make his berd. I do not know this expression in the sense of give one a beating. It usually means to outwit, as in the *Reves Tale*, l. 176,

Yet can a miller make a clerkes berd,

also, *Wife of Bath's Prolog.*, l. 361,

Yet could I make his berd, so mote I thee.

P. 98, l. 22, gallerye. So R; W, *tresounce*. Bradley-Stratmann has only one instance of the word, *Pr.*, P. 502.

P. 100, l. 31, by x and x. W with R, *by .xx. by .xxx.*

P. 102, l. 12, Doule. W, *Dueyl*; R, *dueil*.

P. 103, l. 26, As Gode live, etc. I should have emended *Gode* to *goode*, cf. W, *Ponthus sayd y' good lyfe gyue hym god as to his lorde*, following R.

[P], *lui dist que bonne vie lui donnast dieu comment a son souuerain sires*.

P. 106, l. 28, conne you thonke. W continues, *for that ye haue done so well for his soule/for all his frendes shall thanke you & gyue you grete pryce*. *Ponthus sayd thynges that ought to be shall fall/ye ought not for to be full gladde ye shall haue none dower by cause ye set neuer fote in his bed with him/& thus he bourded with her & talked of many dyuers thynges*. *And than he wente to the kynge*, etc. All this in R.

P. 108, l. 2. W adds that they should assemble *at the toure of derbendell fast by the thalamount*; R, *talemont*, and further expands the passage, following R.

P. 110, l. 23, *gyftes*. W substitutes for the following sentence, *And then came Guyllam de roches a good knyghte Paraunt de rochefort/the lorde de douay, Pyers de donne, Gerarde de chateau goutyer, Johñ melcurier with the herupoys. Of the manceaus/beaunmount la vale, Sygles de doncelles and other of the countre of mayne. Of Tourayne baussay mayle hay and of other tourangeaus. Of poytw/the vycount of toures/the erles brother of marche/maulyon chastemur/la garnache & dyuers other*. The list is not in R.

P. 111, l. 12, any *pouere man*. W omits *pouere*; R, *Sil trouast aucuns pour scauoir lestre du pays*. D has apparently doubly translated *pour*, or it may have been repeated in D's original, once as *pouere*, "poor," and again as the preposition.

P. 112, l. 5, and *caste—othre*. W, *wepete bothe two*; R, *pleurent tous deux lun sur lautre*.

P. 112, l. 28–30. This speech is Sir Patrick's in W. The Earl first sees Pollides and gives the command with l. 31 ff.

P. 115, l. 14, *to-stowpe*?

P. 115, l. 17, *ay to*. W, *a two*, probably the original reading.

P. 116, l. 13, *Herupoys*. W, *Herupoys, Hubert de craon, Pyers de chennulle/& of knyghtes Thybault de bryse, (H. de M. as in D), Eustace de la poyssonier*.

P. 116, l. 18, *Hardenyr*. W and O, *Ardenne*.

P. 116, l. 20, *William*. W and O, *Rycharde*.—Pamell. W, *Paynell*; O, *panel*.

P. 119, l. 16, *vowes to the pope*. The detail is neither in W nor R. I do not know of any other instance of vowing to the pope at a feast. It appears that we should read *po* and regard the ceremony as a peacock vow.

P. 135, l. 8, our author need not have known Chrétien's

P. 136, l. 20, a twenty. W and R, *a twelve*.

P. 140, l. 7, Chateawbreaunce. W, *chateau bryaunt*.

P. 146, l. 6, so shuld ye wors reioys. W, *wherof ye sholde reioyse*; R, *Et lamour donc vous deueries iouyr*. D mistranslates the clause.

P. 146, l. 9, withdrawe it. I. e., you would not be able to recall her fancy (*plesaunce*) from her lover, when you would do so.

P. 149, l. 17, Malle. W, *Mailles*.

NAMES OF PERSONS AND PLACES.

The names of minor characters in the story are omitted; also such common names as *Spayne, Fraunce, Englund*, when the modern, geographical equivalent is obvious. An interrogation point indicates that I have not been able to identify the name. The variants from W, given in the notes, should always be consulted for the longer lists of names in the text.

Amroy, *error for Auray near Vannes*, 96, 30.

Andrewe, *see Landry*.

Aniou, Duches of, 24, 5.

Aragon, 1, 6; *Arragonne, Kyng of*, 121, 32.

Armoric, *for Armorica, Brittany*, 9, 17.

Auncenys, Geffray d', Ancenis, 116, 12.

Aurences, Vicecounte d', Avranches *in Normandy*, 24, 3; *error for Fr. Auteriche*, 55, 22 (*see note*).

Avyon, Ralond de, *error for Dinan*, ? 29, 6 (*see note*).

Babilon, Sultan of, 1, 10; *Babilone*, 117, 31.

Baniers, Ser William de, ? 55, 25.

Bausy, Hondes de, ? 149, 17; *Vaucay, Lorde*, 29, 24.

Bellacion, *another name for the "Welle of Mervells"*, 41, 34; *Bellacon*, 56, 1.

Boloys, Tybould de, Blois, 54, 1.

Breales, a Saracen, 29, 3; *Fr. Broalis*.

Breselyn, *forest of, Broceliande*, 39, 16; *Breselyne*, 40, 12.

Breste, 24, 21.

- Bretayn, Brittany, 10, 5; *Lille Bretayn*, 9, 17; *L. Bretayne*, 9, 25; *Bretane*, 41, 19; *Bretan*, 70, 15; *Pety Bretan*, 82, 14.
- Brice, Huberd de, *perhaps Brézé, Anjou*, 116, 14.
- Brodas, *son of the Sultan of Babylon, conquerer of Galicia*, 3, 10; 4, 12; 112, 32. W, *Broadas*.
- Burgon, king of, 89, 7; *Burgone*, 89, 4; *Duke of B.*, 103, 6 (footnote); *Burgonne*, 101, 31. *His brother Guy B.*, 105, 33.
- Canterbury, Archbishop of, 81, 28; *Bishop of*, 83, 14.
- Castellyon, Châteaugiron, *Brittany*, 61, 19 (note).
- Chastameny, Gauter de, ? 30, 24 (note).
- Chateawbreauce, *Geffray de*, Châteaubriant, *Anjou*, 140, 7.
- Chasteau Gouteṛ, Chateau-Gontier, ? 24, 6 (see note).
- Corbadan, *a Saracen*, 29, 3.
- Corbatan, *son of the Sultan, invader of England*, 82, 11; 84, 11. W and R, *Corboran*.
- Cornewale, King of, Cornwall, 77, 6; 87, 11.
- Couleigne, Corunna *in Galicia*, 2, 12; *Couleign*, 2, 21; *Colleyyn*, 110, 32; *Coleigne*, 10, 23; *Colloigne*, 94, 27; 111, 2; *by false etymology, Columpne*, 116, 26; 117, 19.
- Creton, Craon, *Normandy*, 28, 28 (note).
- Crusses, Graue de, ? 116, 19.
- Dace, Earl of, *error for Douglas*, ? 96, 3 (footnote).
- Dancen, *Geffray*, ? 28, 15.
- Dampdenis, *Englished in W as Syr Denys*; O, *dādenis*, 3, 25.
- Danion, Vicounte, *error for Donges*, ? 28, 14 (note); *Geruast D. error*, 29, 24 (note).
- Darcy, Earle of, *error*, ? 96, 2 (footnote).
- Daunges, Vicount of, Donges, *Brittany*, 60, 16; 139, 3.
- Destrue, Erle of, Asturias, *Ponthus' uncle*, 7, 14; 111, 15; *Desture (as in W and R)*, 137, 7.
- Deyneṛ, Hubberd de, Dinard, 30, 27.
- Dole, Rauland de, Dol, 24, 30; *Lady of Doule*, 102, 12; *Pier' de*, 30, 25.

- Dorbendelle, *tour* of, *Derbendelle near Talmont (Vendée)*, 110, 19 (*see p. 5*).
- Doune, *Piers de*, ? 149, 14.
- Douncelles, *Lorde*, 30, 21; *Oliver' de*, 116, 18.
- Ellious, *Sidone's maid*, 14, 2; 68, 9; *Elious*, 14, 7; *Ellyous*, 15, 7; 127, 23. *Fr. Eloix*.
- Fireague, *a Saracen*, 84, 8 (*see note and p. 18*).
- Galice, *Galiccia*, 2, 11.
- Galyce, *error for Galos (Gaulish Britons)*, 24, 29 (*note*).
- Gener, *elder of the English king*, 73, 8; *Gener'*, 74, 11; 136, 22; *Geneuer'*, 137, 18; *Geneuer*, 143, 16; 144, 8.
- Gloucestre, *Earl of*, 95, 36; 140, 15; *Duke of*, 138, 16; 139, 1.
- Gloucestre, *Rolande*, 72, 30.
- Guenelete, *Treacherous companion of Pontius*, 34, 19; 63, 11; 88, 31; 97, 21; 124, 11 (*see p. 18*).
- Hampton, *English port*, 70, 22.
- Henry, *younger son of the king of England*, 70, 26; 84, 12.
- Herland, *seneschal of Brittany, Pontius' guardian*, 10, 19; 38, 29; 90, 19; *Herlande*, 10, 3; 13, 10.
- Hungary, 57, 8.
- Huguell, *king of Brittany, Sidone's father*, 9, 25.
- Ireland, *king of*, 76, 22; 77, 21; *Irelond*, 76, 4, 21; *Irlond*, 76, 2.
- John, *elder son of the king of England*, 83, 2; 84, 9.
- Karodas, *son of the sultan of Babylon, invader of England*, 27, 16, 25; 28, 27; *Carodas*, 18, 22; *Karados*, 27, 10. W and R always *Karados*.
- Lay Forest, *Amaulry de*, ? 116, 17; *Hulland de La Foryste*, 30, 25.
- Lay Garnache, *John de*, ? 116, 16.
- La Hay, *Fresell de*, ? 30, 23.
- Lay Poys, *Eustace de, for La Possonnière Maine*, 116, 15 (*note*).
- La Roche, *Bernard de, Brittany*, 29, 32; 43, 4, 19; *Barnard*, 31, 17; *Guylyam de*, 28, 29; *G. de Roches*, 24, 7; 29, 5; 110, 23; *Roger' de*, 24, 30.

- Lazynyen, Geoffrey de, Lusignan in *Poitou*, 25, 1; 31, 16; 43, 5; 50, 8; 107, 27; *Lazenyen*, 24, 9; *Lazygne*, 139, 17; 140, 8; *Lasigne*, 143, 33; 148, 7.
- Leon, Vicounte de, Lion-sur-Mer, 24, 28; 105, 10; *Herdy de Lyon*, 30, 26.
- Lyon, Ile of, I. d'Oleron, off *La Rochelle*, 110, 31 (*footnote*).
- Mahounde, 5, 6; *Mahown*, 1, 21.
- Malle, Hubberd de, ? *Touraine*, 149, 17.
- Mangon, John de, ? 30, 26 (*note*).
- Mauleon, Leonell de la, ? 139, 18; *Malleon*, 149, 16; *Maleon*, 25, 2; *Lernell* (?) *d. l. Mavelyon*, 24, 10. Mauléon in the *Basses Pyrenées* can hardly be the place.
- Mayne, Earl of, Le Mans, 24, 4 (*note*); Mayns, 28, 28.
- Morteyne, Erle of, Mortain, *Normandy*, 24, 4; 43, 8; 54, 11.
- Mounte Agnant, Andres de, Montaigu, ? *La Vendée*, 30, 24.
- Mounte Belliard, *Erle of*, Montbéliard, *Burgundy*, 60, 31; *Belliard*, 105, 34.
- Mountford, Monfort-sur-Meu near *Rennes*, 50, 20; *Lorde Maunford*, 143, 33; *Erle of Mountford*, 55, 24.
- Mounte Vyel, Gaciane of, Montreuil, 30, 22 (*note*).
- Namptes, Nantes, 110, 18.
- Northampton, Erle of, 77, 2.
- Oliver, *Herland's son*, 91, 7.
- Panell, La Haye-Pesnel, ? *Normandy*, 149, 12; *Guy Pamell*, 116, 20.
- Patrices, 6, 14; 8, 27; 111, 15; *Ser' Patryke*, 115, 24; 117, 8; *Patryk*, 117, 7.
- Peonny, John, *error for Panell*, 30, 20 (*note*).
- Peyters, Poitiers, 24, 8; *Petevynnes*, Poitevins, 25, 4.
- Poleyne, Poland, 57, 8.
- Pollides, *Ponthus' intimate and cousin*, 4, 4; 12, 31; 142, 11.
- Ponthus, in *Fr. usually*, in *Ger. always*, Pontus.
- Quyntyn, Monford, Breut de, ? 28, 16.
- Quynpartorentyn, for Quimpercorentin, modern Quimper. *St. Corentin* is its patron, 31, 1.

- Rays, Gautier de, *perhaps* Rai-Aube, *Normandy*, 28, 15;
Aubry de, 30, 27.
- Ree, Ile of, *off La Rochelle*, 133, 12.
- Rey, Ryoud de, 30, 26 (*see Rays*),
- Reyns, Rennes, 41, 22.
- Richemound, Earl of, 95, 36; 136, 22; 141, 33.
- Rochell, La Rochelle, 133, 13.
- Roches, *see La Roche*.
- Sages, William du, ? 116, 19.
- Sainte Iames in Galice, 149, 6.
- Sainte Malo de l'Ysle, 70, 1. *Seyncte Malewe*, 24, 21, *possibly an error for the Point de S. Mathieu near Brest*.
- Seynt Gyles, Barnaby de, *S. Gilles-sur-Vie, Vendée, ? or S. Gildas, ? Brittany*, 116, 13.
- Sidone, 15, 14; 16, 10; *Sidon*, 14, 1; *Sydon*, 12, 12; 15, 5; *Sydone*, 56, 23; 57, 12. *In W, Sydoyne, Fr. Sidoine*.
- Le Surdite de Droyte Voy, *Ponthus' nom de guerre in England*, 72, 3; 104, 17; *Surdyte*, 73, 17; 78, 8. *Surdite*, 79, 28.
- Susteny, *forest of, probably an error for Sucinio on the Morbihan*, 10, 5 (*see note*).
- Syen, Henry de, 116, 13.
- Sylle, *probably modern Sillé-le-Guillaume*, 24, 5; *Ranald de*, 25, 14 (*see note*); 30, 22.
- Tenull, Roland de, *error for Chemillé, ? 30, 23 (see note)*.
- Tesson, ? 116, 20; 149, 11, *possibly not a geographical name*.
- Tibeŕ, *king of Galicia*, 1, 4; Tyber, 3, 17. *Fr. Thibor; Ger. Tiburt*.
- Towars, Guy de, Thouars, 149, 16.
- Turnebeufe, *probably not a geographical name*, 30, 20.
- Valognes, Bernard de, *perhaps Valognes in Normandy*, 28, 15 (*but see note*).
- Vennys, Vannes in Brittany, 10, 32, etc.
- Vettry, Gerrard de, 139, 2; *Pers de Vettry*, 139, 2.
- Vitry, Edmund de, *Vitré in Maine, ? 24, 30*.
- Wales, *Earl of*, 83, 1.
- Welle of Aventures, 40, 12; *of Mervells*, 41, 33; 55, 32.
- Wylron, Lorde, *error for Villiers*, 30, 20.

GLOSSARY.

- Abowed, p. ptc. *bent, bowed*, 45, 9.
 Alblasters, *Arbalasters*, 83, 6.
 Ale, *ail*, p. ptc. *alyd*, 36, 25.
 Aloigne, Fr. *aloigner*, 63, 16.
 Alowed, p. ptc. *praised*, 30, 33. W, *praysed*; R, *eust grant loz*.
 Arased, p. ptc. *sprinkled*, 68, 10.
 Attempe, *tempt*, 64, 19.
 Aailed, *lowered* p. ptc., 10, 12.
 Avenaunt, *suitable*, 53, 21.
 Balengere, *a large row boat, etymologically, a whale-boat*, 2, 13;
 ballengers, 133, 23, etc.
 Batell, *a battalion*, 24, 28, etc., in b., in battle array, 27, 13.
 Bente, p. ptc. of bend, *bent, pitched* (of a tent), 41, 34.
 Beṛ, *a bier, or litter*; hors-beṛ, 50, 21.
 Boude, probably an error, *bow*, 42, 29.
 Celed, p. ptc. *hidden, concealed*, 93, 34.
 Chalanged, p. ptc. *opposed, refused*, 89, 29.
 Chaces, *coursing hounds*,? Fr. *chasses*, 4, 13.
 Cherty, *affection*, 136, 30.
 Comon, vb. *associate*, 147, 11.
 Comoners, probably *participants* in a tournament from the vb.
 comon, but the notes suggest deliberate coinage from the
 vb. *come on*, 139, 4, 33.
 Cosen, *for chosen* p. ptc., 53, 24.
 Cowardyue, *cowardly*, 27, 20.
 Cronocles, *coronets*, 108, 10.
 Dawyng, n. *Dawn*, 3, 7.
 Demaundes, *questions*, 10, 21; 16, 11; 16, 22.
 Devise, *spy out*, 24, 25. R, *espier*.
 Discesed, *died*, 150, 9.
 Discolored, *blanched*, 67, 6.
 Dismated, *dismayed* p. ptc., 29, 17.

- Draght, *allurement, encouragement*, 75, 15; draghtes of loue, 34, 5.
 Drogman, *dragoman, interpreter*, 18, 24.
 Dunyon, *citadel, donjon* (fig. *protection*), 25, 21.
 Dystrakked, *distracted*, 129, 16.
 Enhautes, *exercises, follows*, 1, 20.
 Erst, *before*, W, 135, 16 (note), miswritten *herfte*, 67, 2.
 Farrome, a, *at a distance*, the weak dat. plu. of the adj. *feor*, 48, 31; farrom, 141, 15.
 Fir-hows, *building where there is a fire, dwelling house*, 18, 29; also in W.
 Forfeted, p. ptc. *done amiss*, 65, 4.
 Fouysch, *foolish*, 64, 1.
 Fylloy, *follow*, 39, 13.
 Gař, *make*, 77, 33.
 Garnysche, *provide, garrison*, 23, 23.
 Gaynstondyng, n. *opposition*, 3, 15.
 Gogle, *joggle, stagger*, 51, 11; gogylyng, 52, 18.
 Goweř, *a brooch*, ? 61, 12 (note).
 Grifyns, *falcons*, 4, 14.
 Gyrtelles, *for Kyrtelles*, 121, 27.
 H, initial, inorganic: *harme*, 28, 8; 29, 16; 68, 9; vn-h, 46, 16; *helboys*, 6, 5; *herely*, 5, 23; *holde*, 24, 27.
 Haviř, *Fr. avoir, possessions*, 144, 34.
 Labre, v. *labor*, 7, 1, etc.
 Langoure, *languish*, 68, 6.
 Laseř, *leisure*, 127, 34. Frequent in Barbour with this spelling.
 Lay, for Fr. *la* in proper names, 46, 8; 116, 15, 16 and 17.
 Lesse, *shorter*, 137, 22.
 Livelode, *patrimony*, 108, 30.
 Lovyng, *laudation*, 50, 7.
 Luges, *huts or tents*, 27, 9.
 Lugge, v. *lodge* Inf., 2, 24; p. ptc. *lugged*, 3, 2.
 Manhened, pret. *maimed*, 114, 29.
 May, for Fr. *ma*, *May dame*, 36, 32.

- Mokkyng, *mocking*, 12, 3.
 More, in the sense of *taller*, 48, 1.
 Neghtboures, *neighbors*, 23, 19; 81, 14.
 Nobylley, *nobility, splendor*, 53, 13.
 Norye, *foster-child or ward*, 13, 16.
 Pensy, *pensive*, 39, 27, etc.
 Pensynes, *pensiveness*, 37, 4.
 Perchen, *to pierce*, p. ptc. perched, 44, 13; 84, 15, etc.
 Peyns, *garments?* or *plumes, tufts?* 82, 1 (note).
 Pris, n. *praise*, 31, 16.
 Proloyne, *absent itself*, 66, 30.
 Protestacion, *protestation, solemn assurance*, 63, 23.
 Refrete, *refrain*, 39, 29.
 Refuse, *avoid*, R, *refuser*, 7, 33; cf. Barbour (glossary).
 Reiose, in the sense of *enjoy*, 132, 7.
 Repenyd, p. ptc. *repined*, 46, 28.
 Rokkette, *a small crag*, 95, 4; W and R, *roche*.
 Serve, *deserve*, 17, 3.
 Skale, *to scale* (a wall, etc.), inf., 2, 27; *scaled*, p. ptc., 10, 23; 94, 26.
 Somers, *sumpter beasts*, 97, 19.
 Strenghtes, *strong places*, 26, 30.
 Stufe, v. *provision*; pt. *stuffyd*, 5, 23; 124, 24; 128, 8, etc.; frequent in Barbour.
 Subarbes, *suburbs*, 134, 10.
 Suyd, p. ptc. *issued*, 43, 11.
 Symphonys, *musical instrument*, 44, 1.
 Tempe, *tempt, try*, 35, 2; *pret.*, 124, 19.
 The, *for they*, 2, 26; 69, 14; 86, 23; 100, 17; 119, 11; 129, 9; 130, 15; 135, 5.
 Titterē, *sooner*, 130, 12.
 Topp, *top* (nautical term), 6, 19.
 Trast, *trust*, 107, 18; *pret.* traysted, 89, 9.
 Vndretaken, p. ptc. *surprised*; R, *seurpris*, 27, 14.
 Unnes, *with difficulty*, 67, 8; 103, 3.

- Ure, *probably fortune, lot*, as frequently in Barbour, 131, 26 (note). The meaning *man*, A.S. *wer* suggested by the note is hardly possible.
- Voward, *van-guard*, 25, 9.
- Vyseŕ, *visour*, 21, 8, etc.; vyssouŕ, 41, 29, etc., *a mask*.
- Ware, for *vair, fur*, 141, 8.
- Wate, lay in, 21, 15, *lay in wait*.
- Warne, *direct, govern*, 96, 4.
- Wordle, for *world*, 38, 31.
- Wordly, 9, 30; 39, 30; 46, 29; 67, 16.

FRANK JEWETT MATHER, JR.