Durham E-Theses

An Edition of the middle English romance: Richard Coeur de Lion

Schellekens, Philida M.T.A.

How to cite:

Schellekens, Philida M.T.A. (1989) *An Edition of the middle English romance: Richard Coeur de Lion*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/6564/

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a link is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the full Durham E-Theses policy for further details.

An Edition of the Middle English Romance:

Richard Coeur de Lion

by Philida MTA Schellekens

VOLUME TWO

Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of English.

University of Durham.

1989

16 OCT 1992

Abstract

Philida Schellekens

An Edition of the Middle English Romance: Richard Coeur de Lion

This PhD thesis consists of an edition of four versions of RCL from the following manuscripts: MS Auchinleck, Advocates 19.2.1; MS Arundel 58, College of Arms; MS Egerton 2862, British Library; MS Douce 228, Bodleian Library, which are printed side by side in vol. 1.

The text is accompanied by a full critical apparatus consisting of an Introduction, Notes, Glossary and Index of Names. The Introduction gives a description of the four manuscripts, discusses the affiliation of the four versions - with reference to the texts not printed where necessary - and deals with the language of the original text and that of the four versions.

The dialect, style and use of historical sources indicate that the text of RCL, as found in ADEL, is made up of a core part, which originated in the South East, and at least nine interpolations.

Internal evidence points to a date of composition of post 1250.

As far as it is known, there is no one major source for RCL, nor is there evidence to prove the existence of an AN original. The main sources of the romance are the *Itinerarium Peregrinorum* and Ambroise's *Estoire de la Guerre Sainte,* but others are also found.

The core part of the romance consists of a sober, historical narrative in which Richard I is portrayed as a military hero fighting the Saracens during the third crusade. Although much material was added subsequently, the focus on Richard and his military prowess remains the same, producing a narrative with a narrow, unsophisticated focus, in which the antipathy towards the French rather than the Saracens is striking.

To Andy

Declaration

The work described in this thesis has not been submitted for any other degree. It is the original work of the author except where acknowledged by reference.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without her prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

Contents

Preface

This research topic has proved to be interesting but very substantial. As a consequence, it has threatened to engulf me on several occasions and I am very pleased to be able to submit it now. The core of the work is formed by the transcription and comparison of the seven versions of the romance of *Richard Coeur de Lion*, of which four, texts L, D, A and E, have been selected for print in Volume One. Volume Two provides an examination of these versions, their manuscripts, language, sources and dating. Quotations from all manuscripts are based on my own transcriptions apart from text C, where the readings were taken from Karl Brunner's edition. Since there are so many surviving versions, all with their own idiosyncrasies, and since the potential for locating sources has by no means been exhausted, I hope that this work will serve as a foundation for further study. There is also scope for examining further, with the help of concordances, when and by whom the various interpolations were written. Although reference is made to the putative KA group throughout the text, it has been impossible to make an indepth study of the relationship of this putative group and RCL.

Abbreviations

Versions of *Richard Coeur de Lion* printed here and their sigla[1]:

L	MS Auchinleck, Advocates 19.2.1, National Library of Scotland	ff.	326–327.
(SA	MS University of St. Andrews' Fragment MS PR 2065 R4	ff.	1–2.
Ed	MS University of Edinburgh 218, Div 56	ff.	3–4.)
A	MS Arundel 58, College of Arms	ff.	252–275.
D	MS Douce 228, Bodleian Library	ff.	1–40.
E	MS Egerton 2862, British library	ff.	1–44.

Other versions of *Richard Coeur de Lion* referred to:

C	MS Gonville and Caius College 175/96, Cambridge	ff.	1–98.
H	MS BM Harley 4690, British Library	ff.	106–115.
B	MS BM Additional 31042, British Library	ff.	125–163.

AM	*Arthour and Merlin*, EETS 268 and 279, ed. O. Macrae-Gibson
Ambroise	*L'Estoire de la Guerre Sainte*, ed. G. Paris
AN	Anglo Norman
Brunner, RCL	*Der Mittelenglische Versroman über Richard Löwenherz*, ed. K. Brunner
Captivity Episode	ll. 35-732, shared by texts D, A and H, of which D and A are printed in vol. 1
Core Text	those parts of the text written in the original SE/Kentish dialect
DNB	*Dictionary of National Bibliography*
E1	the first passage E, ll. 2469-2806.
E2	the second passage E, ll. 3289-3806
EETS	*Early English Text Society*
EML	East Midlands
EStn	*Englische Studien*
Itin	*Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi*, Rolls Series 38
JEGP	*Journal of English and Germanic Philology*
Jentsch	Jentsch. *Die me. Romanze Richard Coeur de Lion und ihre Quellen*, EStn 15
KA	*Kyng Alisaunder*, EETS 227 and 237, ed. G. V. Smithers
MD	Middle Dutch
ME	Middle English
MED	*Middle English Dictionary*
MLN	*Modern Language Notes*
NM	*Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*
N&Q	*Notes and Queries*
OE	Old English
OED	*Oxford English Dictionary*
OF	Old French

---

[1] The sigla used here follow Brunner's.

ON	Old Norse
Paris, Amb	Paris' Introduction to *l'Estoire de la Guerre Sainte*
Paris, Rom	Paris, *Le Roman de Richard Coeur de Lion*, Romania 26
PMLA	*Publications of the Modern Language Association*
RCL	the romance of *Richard Coeur de Lion*
SE	South-East
SML	South-Midlands
SW	South-West
WML	West-Midlands
WS	West-Saxon
Z	Scribe Z in MS Arundel 58

acc.	accusative
adj.	adjective
adv.	adverb
assev.	asseveration
coll.	collective
comp.	comparative
conj.	conjunction
dat.	dative
exclam.	exclamation
her.	heraldic
imp.	imperative
impers.	impersonal
inf.	infinitive
int.	interjection
n.	noun
nom.	nominative
os.	oneself
pa.t.	past tense
pl.	plural
pp.	past participle
prep.	preposition
pr.p.	present participle
pr.t.	present tense
pron.	pronoun
refl.	reflexive
sg.	singular
so.	someone
subj.	subjunctive
sup.	superlative
v.	verb

Editorial Principles

Where a corrupt form has been emended, the emendation appears in square brackets in the text. Both the original and the emended form are given in the footnotes at the bottom of the page.

If text has been supplied in square brackets without reference to an original form in the footnotes, the manuscript reading is defective. This is common especially in E, where the first fifteen folios are imperfect, and also in L in the St. Andrews and Edinburgh fragments.

Letters which are partly visible are printed in round brackets. If the text is illegible but the number of letters missing can be calculated, *full points* indicate their number. Where it is impossible to determine the number of letters missing, the approximate space has been left blank.

Expansions are printed in italics and word-division has been regularised; punctuation has been supplied.

If an initial is lacking in the text but a guide letter is visible, the letter is printed as part of the text. Initials and paraphs found in the four edited versions are not marked in the text[2].

The spelling of **i/j** has been modernized with **i** for vowels and **j** for consonants; the distribution of **u** and **v** has been preserved.

Yogh can represent both ȝ and long-tailed **z**; where it represents the latter, it is printed **z**.

Since the spelling **ff** forms a distinguishing feature of the scripts of Moille and Z in A[3], it has been preserved in our text.

y representing 'th' has been printed as 'þ'.

Corrections and expunctions made in the texts by the scribe are not recorded, unless they have a bearing on the text or are of special interest.

† signifies a word or passage corrupt beyond convincing emendation.

---

[2] Texts A and L, e.g. 977, 1390, and D and E, e.g. 3807, 4147, have some initials and paraphs in the same place at the beginning of new episodes, but no overall significant pattern can be detected. There are strong parallels between the capitals found in text A and the intended capitals in text H, where the scribe left space for them at the beginning of the line, e.g. 731, 955, 1031 etc.

[3] For scribes Moille and Z in MS Arundel 58, see p. 14 ff.

The Manuscripts

Advocates MS 19.2.1

This manuscript is also known as the Auchinleck Manuscript after Alexander Boswell of Auchinleck, who presented it to the Faculty of Advocates in 1744[4]. The manuscript bore the pressmark W.4.1. until about 1840[5] after which it was given the number 19.2.1.

The manuscript contains one of the earliest and most extensive collections of Middle English texts, almost entirely written in verse, apart from a list of Anglo-Norman barons. The majority of the items is made up of romance material, for many of which Auchinleck provides the earliest extant text; for some the unique version.

Kölbing's assessment that there are 44 items[6] in the manuscript has generally been allowed to stand, although many scholars after him[7] rightly point out that his division of the couplet and stanzaic parts of *Guy of Warwick* into items 22 and 23 is doubtful, because in the Auchinleck manuscript itself the item was given only one title and number. In consequence, one item number given by Kölbing must be considered superfluous.

Pearsall[8] remarks on the date of the manuscript: 'On palaeographical evidence, the manuscript is now unanimously assigned to the period 1330-40, and this date is confirmed by the addition, at the end of the text of the *The Anonymous Short English Metrical Chronicle* (item 40), in this manuscript only, of a reference to the death of Edward II and a prayer for 'þe ȝong king edward' (f. 317r[b]), who succeeded in 1327.'

Scribe 1, who was responsible for the large majority[9] of the extant material in Auchinleck and wrote in a clear textura hand, also wrote the text of RCL on ff. 326-7. He was one of six scribes who are known to have contributed to the manuscript[10]. His is not a current script, as the strokes which make up the letters are often individually visible and minims are formed separately. It is compact with ascenders and descenders not much larger than the body of the letters. Sometimes ascenders are splayed at the top. Apart from the ascender of **d** and the descenders of **y** and **h** the script is very upright.

---

[4] D. Pearsall comments on p. vii in the Introduction to *The Auchinleck Manuscript* Facsimile Edition, 1977 (Pearsall was responsible for pp. vii-xi and xvi-xxiv and Ian Cunningham for pp. xi-xvi): '[Boswell's] signature with the date 1740 appears on a paper flyleaf and a record of the gift is at the foot of f. 1.'

[5] Pearsall, Facsimile Introduction, p. vii.

[6] E. Kölbing, *Vier Romanzen Handschriften*, EStn 7 (1884) p. 179.

[7] A. Bliss, *Notes on the Auchinleck manuscript*, Speculum 26 (1951) p. 658, note 3; G. Guddat-Figge, *Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Middle English Romances*, p. 126, note 9; Cunningham and Mordkoff, *New Light on the Signatures in the Auchinleck Manuscript*, Scriptorium 36 (1982) p. 281, note 1.

[8] Pearsall, Facsimile Introduction, p. vii.

[9] Cunningham, Facsimile Introduction, p. xv, calculates that he wrote 72 % of what survives.

[10] According to Kölbing (EStn 7 (1884) pp. 178-91) five scribes worked on Auchinleck while P. Robinson ('A Study of Some Aspects of the Transmission of English Verse Texts in Late Medieval Manuscripts', Unpublished Thesis 1972, pp. 128-31) maintains that there were four. There can be little doubt, however, that Bliss' conclusion (Speculum 26 (1951) pp. 652-3) that there were six is correct. Bliss provides a comparison of both his own and Kölbing's assessment of the various scribes. He also comments that 'the only hands which bear even a superficial resemblance to each other are those of scribes 1 and 6' and he proceeds with a list of characteristics which distinguish the two. Yet it is these two scribes, 1 and 6, which Robinson believes were one and the same (and also 2 and 4).

There are few suspension and abbreviation marks in the text; the Tironian 'et' sign is used throughout and scribe 1 ends every line with a *punctus*.

Biting can be observed between letters such as **h, b, þ** and **d**, and **o** and **e**; also in the combination **pp**.

f and *ſ* do not drop below the line and both upstrokes are very straight. A separate cross-stroke at the top of the stem can often be observed for both.

ſ and 8-shaped **s** occur in initial and final position, but *ſ* is more common than **s**. Only *ſ* is found medially.

t: the topstroke remains below the cross-stroke unless it occurs in **tt** position, when the topstroke of the second **t** will rise above it.

c and **t** are not always distinguishable, especially when the crossstroke of **t** does not extend to the left of the topstroke. The fact that these two letters can be similar may have contributed to readings of þ*urch* for þ*urth* 'through'[11]. Apart from the spelling **th** in þ*urth*, it is rare in L, with other examples found only in *Arthour* 18, *Lethenard* 836 and *the* 2112[12].

r has its normal rounded form but when it is preceded by **o**, 2-shaped **r** is used.

g is 8-shaped and drops slightly below the line.

ʒ is used in the text for both palatal and velar /g/ and for the voiceless fricative except in the words *douhter*, e.g. 1327 and *douhti*, e.g. 30.

a is always of the double compartment variety.

i often has a hair stroke over it.

e in final position has an upward stroke coming out from the loop.

The text was checked and corrections were made probably by scribe 1 himself, e.g. in 1778 *dromond* the **r** is a later correction; in 2095 *bi* was expuncted in L before *his*; in 1254 *swere, re* was added above the line in darker ink.

Auchinleck is a parchment manuscript measuring 250 × 190 mm. Since running numbers of items are often trimmed away[13], and since both St Andrews and Edinburgh fragments measure respectively 263 × 200 mm. and 260 × 200 mm, the size of the manuscript must originally have been larger. As Cunningham comments, the fragments may represent the original size of the manuscript[14]. Macrae-Gibson[15] also observes that 'at least 6 mm. has been cropped at the top, as can be seen from part of the strip which survives of the leaf following f. 72 and which was evidently folded in when the manuscript was trimmed.'

The writing space is generally ± 200 × 150 mm. Double columns are found throughout, apart from the first and last items and the list of Norman barons on f. 105v-107r. There are 44 lines to the column with the exception of the material written by scribe 2 and the first 15 folios written by scribe 3[16]. Full ruling in ink was applied by the scribe who was to write the

---

[11] See Bliss, Speculum 26 (1951) p. 658, note 5.

[12] R. Jordan, *Handbook of Middle English Grammar: Phonology*, transl. E. Crook, p. 185 comments that the spelling <th> is found scattered in early ME but that it becomes more frequent only from the second half of the fourteenth century.

[13] Guddat-Figge, p. 121.

[14] Cunningham, Facsimile Introduction, p. xi, who suggests that the manuscript must have been cropped after the folios had been removed.

[15] O. D. Macrae-Gibson, AM p. 35.

[16] See T. Shonk, *A Study of the Auchinleck Manuscript: Bookmen and Bookmaking in the Early Fourteenth*

gathering, on both sides of the unfolded sheets[17].

At the time when it was last rebound in 1971, Cunningham was able to observe the manuscript. He states[18] that at least two bindings precede ᵗʰᵉ ᵖʳᵉᵛⁱᵒᵘˢ ᵒⁿᵉ. The previous binding dated probably from the 1820s and there must have been at least one other binding before that. Cunningham[19] was also able to observe that 'at one time, perhaps originally, the volume had been sewn on six raised cords.' In the 1820s binding the volume was sewn on 'five single recessed cords, the first four and last six leaves being oversewn'[20].

The manuscript consists of 331 folios and 14 stubs. In addition, several leaves have been discovered elsewhere: two bifolia in St Andrews University Library, two in Edinburgh University Library and one in London University Library. It is defective at both ends and since the first surviving item has the contemporary numeration vi, five preceding items must have been lost at the beginning of the manuscript. It is impossible to tell how much space these might have occupied.

The items were numbered with contemporary roman numerals written in the centre of the upper margin of each recto[21]. Both Cunningham[22] and Shonk[23] suggest - probably correctly - that they were written by scribe 1. Shonk also concludes from the position of the miniature and the placement of the item number at the top of the right hand column on f. 72r that the numeration was added after the illumination had been finished[24]. Many of these numerals were cropped later. The item number for RCL, lvi, is visible on the recto of each folio at the top of the page in both the Auchinleck manuscript and the fragments.

Most of the items have titles, and Cunningham[25] comments rightly that they were probably added as an afterthought, since the scribes leave no space for them. Shonk[26] is right in saying that apart from the titles written by scribe 3 and that of the *Liber Regum Angliæ* 'all the extant titles are in the hand of scribe 1.'

The scribes left instructions for rubricators as to the rubrication and decoration in the manuscript, which, as Shonk[27] observes correctly, 'was decorated as a unit after the completion of the writing'. The scribes also left space for miniatures[28] and capitals, and indicated where paraphs were needed. These instructions follow a general pattern. However, not all leave the same space for capitals, which in the work of scribe 1 are two lines high and do not intrude in the text.

Blue-filled lombards with red infillings and flourishes occur at the beginning of each item and

Century, Speculum 60 (1985) p. 78.

[17] See Cunningham, Facsimile Introduction, p. xiv, who gives diagrams of the ruling of the various scribes.

[18] Cunningham, Facsimile Introduction, p. xvi.

[19] Cunningham, *Notes on the Auchinleck Manuscript*, Speculum 47 (1972) p. 97.

[20] Ibid.

[21] See Cunningham, Facsimile Introduction, p. xiv.

[22] Cunningham, Facsimile Introduction, p. xiv.

[23] Shonk, Speculum 60 (1985) pp. 84-5.

[24] Shonk, Speculum 60 (1985) p. 85.

[25] Cunningham, Facsimile Introduction, p. xiv.

[26] Shonk, Speculum 60 (1985) p. 87.

[27] Shonk, Speculum 60 (1985) p. 78.

[28] But compare f. 72 where the scribe must have forgotten to allow for the miniature.

as indicators of major divisions within a narrative[29]. Of these Shonk[30] observes rightly that they were all produced by the same artist. In the work of scribes 1, 3 and 5[31] the first letter of the line is separated from the rest of the line by a column of ± 4 mm., and is picked out in red ink.

As far as the guide marks to paraphs of scribe 1 are concerned, he indicates them by a single line stretching to the right. The two stanzas at the beginning of RCL[32] are indicated by a capital and a paraph respectively. The line where the format changes from tail-rime to couplets is marked by a capital. Shonk observes that 'paraphs were made by at least three different rubricators; ... Moreover, they appear to have done their work gathering by gathering'[33]. They alternate between blue and red but not always in strict order.

The majority of the items were originally preceded by a miniature[34] but not many are extant. Either whole folios containing illuminations were removed or, in the case of 13 folios, only the miniature was excised. The miniatures which are left in the manuscript indicate that they are probably the work of the same craftsman[35]. Robinson[36] notes that Dr. J. J. G. Alexander has identified the illuminations as 'a later product of the Queen Mary Psalter *atelier* which operated in the first half of the fourteenth century'. She also remarks that 'the figures have the long slender bodies and feminine faces characteristic of the work of this *atelier*, which contrasts with the work of most of its English contemporaries where virility is the chief characteristic.' Typical of the work from this workshop is the 'burnished gold and diapered background'.

Despite the inclusion of miniatures, which, as Pearsall says, 'is a sign of some ambition'[37], Auchinleck is a relatively plain work. The miniatures are small and Auchinleck 'does not compare with the sumptuous French and Latin texts being produced for the court figures at the time.[38]' As Robinson comments, it is likely that Auchinleck was produced 'to appeal to some prosperous bourgeois'[39].

The text of RCL is one of five items in which the miniature has been preserved[40]. It depicts Richard standing at the prow of a ship at the siege of Acre, battle-axe in hand[41], measures 42 × 68 mm. and spans a single column.

On the question of signatures, Cunningham and Mordkoff[42] have detected many more than had been known hitherto. They state that 'the conclusion remains that there is no comprehensive system of signatures on the Auchinleck Manuscript. It should be borne in mind however that there is no reason to expect that the signatures done during production of a fascicular

---

[29] See Robinson, Thesis, p. 78.

[30] Shonk, Speculum 60 (1985) pp. 80-1.

[31] See Cunningham, Facsimile Introduction, p. xv.

[32] See Verse pp. 76-8 below.

[33] Shonk, Speculum 60 (1985) p. 78.

[34] See Cunningham, Facsimile Introduction, p. xv.

[35] See Shonk, Speculum 60 (1985) p. 81.

[36] Robinson, Thesis, p. 135.

[37] Pearsall, Facsimile Introduction, p. viii.

[38] See Shonk, Speculum 60 (1985) p. 81.

[39] See Robinson, Thesis, pp. 70-1.

[40] See Cunningham, Facsimile Introduction, p. xv.

[41] A reproduction of this miniature can be found in R. Loomis, *Richard Coeur de Lion and the Pas Saladin in Medieval Art*, PMLA 30 (1915) fig. 7.

[42] Cunningham and Mordkoff, Scriptorium 36 (1982) pp. 280-292.

manuscript will be in sequence straight through since fascicles could have been rearranged - or dropped or added, for that matter - in compilation, obscuring what was perhaps at an earlier stage in the manuscript's development a logical sequence of marks.' Dr Doyle has noted that 'the quire marks do seem to be by more than one hand'[43].

Not all quires have catchwords and scribes 2 and 6 either did not write any, or they were cropped. According to Bliss[44], the vast majority of the 37 catchwords surviving in the manuscript are by the hand of scribe 1. Shonk[45] disputes this analysis, and states that all catchwords are by this scribe. He sees this as another indication that scribe 1 was the editor of the manuscript. It is hard to be sure whether all or nearly all catchwords were applied by scribe 1, but the surviving ones indicate that scribe 1 had overall, if possibly not absolute, control over the production of the manuscript. This argument is supported by the fact that catchwords by scribe 1 'are not only to following portions by other hands but also within portions by other hands, which is the best sign of supervision'[46].

Various schools of thought have emerged as to how the manuscript came into existence. In the first place the debate has centred around the question of whether the manuscript was produced in a scriptorium. Loomis postulated that Auchinleck had been written in a scriptorium based in London[47]. This idea has generally been followed by all scholars but there is nothing to suggest that Doyle and Parkes' theory[48] that the stationer gave parts of an exemplar to be copied to independent scribes cannot apply here. It cannot be doubted, however, that the scribes must have collaborated, because an overall layout is imposed on the manuscript; illumination and rubrication are consistent; two scribes write in one gathering more than once.

It is also agreed that scribe 1 had an important part to play in the production of the manuscript itself. Apart from copying three quarters of it, he wrote the titles and numbers of the items, and also nearly all the catchwords, when they can be found. Shonk interprets these features as evidence of the role of scribe 1 as editor and bookseller[49], and it seems logical that a man who wrote so much of the text himself would assume overall responsibility as well.

Agreement is not universal on the question of whether the manuscript was ordered in advance or whether the future owner could choose from fascicles which were already in existence. Shonk[50] is strongest in his assertion that the manuscript was preplanned, whereas Robinson[51], Pearsall[52] and Cunningham and Mordkoff[53] favour the idea of fascicle production. Generally speaking, there is no evidence that fascicles were produced except on commission, and in the case of

---

[43] From a private communication.

[44] See Bliss, Speculum 26 (1951) p. 657.

[45] Shonk, Speculum 60 (1985) pp. 82-4.

[46] From a private communication from Dr. A. I. Doyle.

[47] Laura H. Loomis, *The Auchinleck Manuscript and a Possible London Bookshop of 1330-40*, PMLA lvii (1942) pp. 595-627.

[48] Doyle, A. I. and Parkes, M. B., *The Production of Copies of the Canterbury Tales and the Confessio Amantis in the Early Fifteenth Century* in *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts and Libraries*: Essays presented to N. R. Ker, pp. 197-8.

[49] Shonk, Speculum 60 (1985) pp. 71-91.

[50] Shonk, Speculum 60 (1985) pp. 77-8.

[51] Robinson, Thesis, pp. 34-5 and 134-5.

[52] Pearsall, Facsimile Introdution, p. ix.

[53] Cunningham and Mordkoff, Scriptorium 36 (1982) pp. 290-1.

Auchinleck it would seem a costly and risky affair for a bookseller to run his business this way. On the other hand, items were numbered after the manuscript had been illuminated and the signatures in the manuscript do not make up a coherent pattern[54]; the space left for capitals varies from scribe to scribe[55].

As far as the composition of the manuscript is concerned, Bliss and Pearsall have allowed for 52 quires in it[56]. Each quire must have consisted of eight folios, apart from quire 38 which takes up 10 leaves[57]. Cunningham[58] follows Bliss[59] in his assertion that the following quires are missing: quire 15; quire 39 together with an indefinite number of following quires; quires 49-51 with possibly an indefinite number of following quires[60].

The quire preceding RCL is compiled with the *Alphabetical Praise of Women* and RCL begins at the start of a new one. Shonk[61] comments that this is typical of Auchinleck: 'the scribe, with filler material readily available, desired to begin major romances on new gatherings'. Since the catchword *Lord Jhesu Crist of glorie* on f. 325v refers to the beginning of RCL *Lord Jhesu, King of glorie*, we know that RCL and the preceding item are in the correct sequence; the next catchword 'þe Sarrazins seyʒe þai' on f. 327v indicates that the text was intended to be continued[62].

RCL is found in quire 48 but only the outer bifolium of ff. 326 and 327 is left in the manuscript itself. A further two bifolia were recovered from elsewhere and one bifolium has been lost. The text of RCL indicates that the folios containing RCL material are positioned in the following sequence:

1.   f. 326
2.   Edinburgh University Library MS 218
3.   lacking
4.   St Andrews University Library MS PR 2065 R4
5.   St Andrews University Library MS PR 2065 R4
6.   lacking
7.   Edinburgh University Library MS 218
8.   f. 327.

As far as the gap of f. 3 is concerned, 4×44 lines of text (or 176 lines) are missing. This number is very close to the number of lines which are found in the other versions between the

---

[54] See pp. 9-10.

[55] This could be interpreted either as a sign of idiosyncrasy natural in the Middle Ages or as a sign that the control of scribe 1 was not absolute.

[56] Bliss, Speculum 26 (1951) pp. 655-6, and Pearsall, Facsimile Introduction, pp. xix-xxiv.

[57] In Bliss' calculation (Speculum 26, 1951 pp. 655-6) quire 38 contained eight leaves and quire 39 two leaves. When the manuscript was rebound in 1971, Cunningham was able to see that these two quires formed in fact one quire of ten leaves (see Cunningham, Speculum 47 (1972) p. 96). In the Introduction to the Facsimile of 1977, pp. xii-xiii, Cunningham maintains Bliss' numbering and quire 39 has been designated as part of the missing, larger quire section.

[58] Cunningham, Facsimile Introduction, pp. xii-xiii.

[59] Bliss, Speculum 26 (1951) pp. 655-6.

[60] For an estimation of the loss of quires after quire 48, see p. 12.

[61] Shonk, Speculum 60 (1985) p. 77.

[62] See also Note 2132-3.

last line of the Edinburgh fragment, 1047, and the first of the St Andrews fragment, 1225. It can therefore be said with great certainty that f. 3 would have followed the text between 1047 and 1225 closely.

In the case of the gap of f. 6, another 176 lines are missing between the St Andrews fragment and the Edinburgh fragment. This coincides almost exactly with the number of lines supplied by the other versions, since they run from 1593 to 1770. So again we can assume that L would have been very similar indeed to the other versions, even though the number of lines in the combined versions is slightly larger than those lacking in L because of the extra lines supplied in A.

After the end of RCL, a loss of three quires was postulated by Bliss[63]. He based this allocation on the assumption that the romance was a uniform text which continued for 4200 lines from the end of text L[64]. However, as an investigation of the language and style of RCL will show, it is unlikely that this is the case. Many interpolations, e.g. the two passages E (2469-2808 and 3289-3806) and the final part of the text (4377-5251) were probably added to RCL at a later stage than the production of the Auchinleck manuscript in 1330-40. Since we do not know what material might have been incorporated into RCL by the time Auchinleck was written, it is impossible to say how much space RCL took up in the L text. However, it can be said with a fair degree of certainty that it would have been much less than the amount estimated by Bliss.

Of the two bifolia . containing a fragment of RCL, one is now kept in St Andrews University Library as MS PR 2065 R4. It was used as a cover for what must originally have been a blank paper book dating from the seventeenth century, which was bought by Thomas Tullideph who was attached to the University of St Andrews from 1734 to 1777[65]. He filled the notebook, to which the bifolium was permanently attached, with his own material on the Evangelists[66]. The outside of the Auchinleck fragment, ff. 1r and 2v, has been badly rubbed and stained through handling, whereas the reverse, ff. 1v and 2r, was protected on the inside. In order to fold the parchment around the notebook, its corners were cut[67]. Smithers appears to imply in his article *Two Newly-Discovered Fragments from the Auchinleck Manuscript*[68] that the side

---

[63] Bliss, Speculum 26 (1951) p. 656.

[64] The figure of 4200 lines following on after the end of text L must have been based on a calculation of the continuation of the C text in Brunner's edition: L ends at 2957 in Brunner and C at 7212.

[65] George Bushnell, head librarian at the University Library, relates how Tullideph was appointed Professor of Divinity in 1734. In 1739 he was promoted to the Principalship of St Leonard's College, and when this college fused with the College of St Salvator, he became the first Principal of United College at St Andrews and died in 1777. Interestingly enough, Bushnell believed that Tullideph had acquired the blank paper books from a namesake Thomas Tullideph, who was supposed to have been a general dealer. There can be little doubt that these two men were one and the same and it is quite likely that Bushnell thought it impossible that a Professor of Divinity might also have dabbled in book dealing. According to Bushnell, Thomas Tullideph the booktrader bought manuscripts and books from Lady Balcarres. Bushnell speculates that Tullideph may have bought the whole of the Auchinleck manuscript from her, but there is no evidence of this.
Apparently Bushnell's predecessor acquired three notebooks for the Library at an Edinburgh auction in 1916, because they were Tullideph's. One of them had the RCL fragment as a cover. (From George Herbert Bushnell, *The Auchinleck Manuscript in the University Library* in *College Echoes*, SRC Magazine, St Andrews Committee, vol. lx, no. 4, March 4, 1949, pp. 12-13; also a private communication from Mr. R. N. Smart, Keeper of Manuscripts, St Andrews University.)

[66] Tullideph's notebook is kept in St Andrews University Library as MS BS 2387 T8 D34.

[67] See the St Andrews fragment in the Facsimile Edition.

[68] G. V. Smithers, Medium Ævum, 18 (1949) p. 2.

which was pasted down suffered the most damage. This cannot be true for the direction of the folds of the bifolium indicates otherwise; also, handling and rubbing would have damaged the outside of the folio rather than the part which was protected inside.

The other fragment of the L text is found in MS University of Edinburgh 218. Its history is unknown beyond the fact that it was once in the possession of David Laing. In his edition of *A Penni Worth of Witte*[69], Laing states that he had forgotten that he had had it in his possession for some time but that he recognised it as belonging to the Auchinleck manuscript when he saw a copy of Turnbull's edition of *Owain Miles* of 1837. He then secured two more leaves, which were part of *The Life of Adam*, now also in Edinburgh University Library. The latter must have formed the cover of another of Tullideph's note books, for Laing states that they were bought by a Professor at the University of St Andrews before the middle of the eighteenth century. It is quite possible that the fragment of RCL kept at Edinburgh University Library also came from Tullideph's collection, but Laing does not comment on it.

The Auchinleck Manuscript itself is mentioned for the first time in 1765, in *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*, by Thomas Percy [70]. It was first described by Walter Scott in his edition of *Sir Tristrem* of 1804[71].

The entire manuscript was written in the London area, but Auchinleck itself and all its fragments were first recorded in Scotland. This includes University of London Library MS 593, which was acquired from Miss Winifred A. Myers 'whose source was a Scots one of undisclosed identity'[72].

For the names of early owners or readers, see Cunningham[73]. The name *Walter Brown* is found 'written on the St Andrews Fragment in a hand of the seventeenth century[74]'. It is very likely that this name was added before the St Andrews Fragment was separated from the main body of the manuscript, as it is also found among a list of members of the Browne family on f. 107 dating probably from the sixteenth century[75].

Some names appearing on the list of Norman barons on ff. 105v-107r are also found in RCL. Laing[76] mentions that the name *Longespée*, which is found in the L text, in 934 as *Longspay*, is included in the list of barons. The name of the Earl of *Ferrers* also occurs both there and in L in 1905 as *Ferres*. Five names appear in the list of barons and in RCL, but not in the L text: *St. John* in 5168; *Wateruile* (on f. 106r) and *Wateuyle* (on f. 107r) in 5166; *Pipard* in 4737; *Sir Fouke*, in e.g. 126, and *Sir Thomas*, in e.g. 183, occur below each other on 106r[a]. These names appear in the later additions only.

---

[69] D. Laing, *A Penni Worth of Witte*, p. iii.

[70] T. Percy, *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*, vol. iii, pp. 374-5; the passage of RCL quoted by Percy on pp. 356-7 was taken from the Wynkyn de Worde edition of 1528 at the Bodleian Library.

[71] W. Scott, *Sir Tristrem*, appendix iv, pp. ciii-cxxii.

[72] G. V. Smithers, *Another Fragment of the Auchinleck Manuscript* in *Medieval Literature and Civilisation, Studies in Memory of G. N. Garmonsway*, p. 192.

[73] Cunningham, Facsimile Introduction, pp. xv-xvi.

[74] Smithers, Medium Ævum 18 (1949) p. 2.

[75] Dr. A. I. Doyle has noted that Cunningham's provisional dating of the script on f. 107 as fifteenth century cannot be correct. He thinks that 'the hand is sixteenth rather than seventeenth century, but certainly not fifteenth' (from a private communication).

[76] Laing, *A Penni Worth of Witte*, p. xv.

MS Arundel 58 is held in the Library of the College of Arms. The manuscript consists of 342 parchment leaves, measuring 230 × 344 mm. The text of RCL is written on ff. 252–275, in double columns of 70-80 × 250-257 mm.; there are 38 lines per column[77].

RCL was written by two scribes: ff. 252-264 (ff. 3-8 of quire 32 and the whole of quire 33) by Robert Moille[78] and ff. 265-75 by the second scribe, designated 'Z'. One hand precedes Moille and hence his is the second hand in the manuscript and that of scribe Z, who wrote the rest of RCL, is the third.

Moille's script dates from the second half of the fifteenth century, while Z's hand dates from the middle of the fifteenth. The two hands are written in similar Secretary script but Moille's script is more compact and rounder, whereas that of Z is spikier and more angular with a straighter duct; it also has longer ascenders and descenders.

Scribe Z also shows much more variation in the formation of his letters than Moille, who normally uses one form only, e.g. **r** is always short, and single compartment **a** is always used.

Influence of Anglicana is visible in Z with its long **r** without a shoulder and its two compartment **a**, but Secretary single compartment **a**, short **r** and '2' shaped **r** are also found. Both his **f** and $\int$ have a pronounced hook at the top and tend to have a long downstroke. $\int$ occurs mainly medially and in the combination $\int$**t** whereas short **s** of various shapes is found in initial and final position. A thin hairstroke occurs over **i**, particularly when it is found in minim environment.

Both Moille and Z have a stroke through the ascender of **h**, if it is found next to **c**, **g** or **t** at the end of a word; they also share the '8' shaped **g** typical of Anglicana.

Moille has a mixture of þ and **th**, whereas Z uses **th** throughout.

Moille's **y** has a very oblique flourish and is normally dotted. His ascenders of **h, k, f, l** and $\int$ curl in sharply. The upstroke of **t** normally touches the crossstroke. $\int$ is used in initial and medial position, short Secretary **s** when final.

Moille uses **ff** more often than Z. In the latter it is only found at the beginning of a line, a personal name or the word *fflum*. With Moille **ff** is also found in the middle of the line where capitalisation is not needed[79].

r followed by suspended **e** is very common in Moille but rare in Z. The expansion mark for (ur) is common in both scribes; it is found in words like *to(ur)nament* and *yo(ur)* but also in *brod(ur)* and *wed(ur)*.

There are two suspension marks to denote the plural ending of a noun in text A. The first and most common one is attached to the word and has a loop on the right hand side. The second one is very similar to the suspension mark for **con**; it is found separately from the word.

Moille provides running headings in Bastard Secretary script with various abbreviations for *Primus* on the recto and *Richard* on the verso side. When scribe Z takes over, this practice is

---

[77] Apart from 261v, a+b with 40 lines and 265vb with 39. In the latter case, the second scribe to contribute to RCL must have decided to add an extra line so that riming couplets were not split between columns (the first scribe, Robert Moille, obviously did not mind this).

[78] See p. 16.

[79] Since the spelling **ff** is a feature which distinguishes Moille and Z, it has been retained in the text (see also p. 5).

discontinued.

Moille does not indicate the rimes at all, but Z marks rimes with pointed braces.

Capitals are executed in the same style throughout the manuscript. They are drawn in blue ink, are enclosed with red borders and trailing flourishes, and take up the space of two lines and approximately seven letters. Since the script of Z is slightly reduced compared with that of Moille's, its capitals are proportionately smaller. Guide letters for capitals are nearly always visible.

Alternating red and blue paragraph marks are found throughout the text, more commonly in Z than in Moille. Since there is no red ink on its facing side, the mark found on *morwe* and *we*, lines 1399-1400, both on f. 259r^b, shows that the rubricator worked on the manuscript before it was bound.

Signs of pricking are found on ff. 267-275 (but not on f. 273); also on f. 257, which shows pricking along an obliquely slanted line, and f. 264, where pricking marks are found in the middle of the page[80].

MS Arundel 58 is based largely on the *The Metrical Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester*[81], which is itself derived from various sources like Geoffrey of Monmouth, William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon. Arundel is not a simple version of the Metrical Chronicle, however, as it consists of a mixture of prose and verse, with material composed out of texts such as *The* Brut , Geoffrey of Monmouth and William of Malmesbury, although some sources have not and possibly cannot be identified[82]; Wright remarks that the verse in Arundel[83] is 'a garbled version of Robert of Gloucester', and Hearne[84] 'found not only the Language of Robert of Gloucester to be altered throughout in it, but the Work quite changed in several respects, by having some passages transposed, others omitted and divers inserted that were never written by Robert of Gloucester'. Arundel is not therefore a manuscript of romances, like Auchinleck or Egerton, but a manuscript of chronical history into which the text of RCL has been incorporated. It shares this position with Harley 4690, which falls into the same category.

The text of RCL itself, which takes up 3691 lines, runs from 252r^a to 275e[85] in the Arundel manuscript. No lines on Richard's life were maintained from Robert's Chronicle, probably because the 193 lines which Robert devotes to the life of King Richard I[86] give only a summary account and lack the detail[87] found in the romance. After Robert's last line on the reign of King Henry II[88], three items, including RCL, were added to Arundel before the manuscript returned to Robert's Chronicle with its opening line on King John[89].

---

80 Pricking is also found before f. 103 and the quire starting at f. 242.

81 *The Metrical Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester*, ed. W. Wright, Rolls Series 86, vol. i and ii.

82 See W. H. Black, *Catalogue of the Arundel Manuscripts in the Library of the College of Arms*, p. 104.

83 W. Wright in his introduction to *Robert of Gloucester*, vol. i, p. xlvi.

84 Thomas Hearne, *Robert of Gloucester's Chronicle*, vol. i, pp. lii-liii.

85 For 275 column *e*, see p. 16.

86 Rolls Series 86, vol. i, v. 9904-10097.

87 W. Wright, Rolls Series 86, vol. i., pp. xxx-xxxi, comments that 'it is almost impossible to say what authority the writer followed in his brief summary (9938-10097). The circumstances which he mentions are to be found in the longer narratives of Roger of Wendover and Roger of Hoveden, and sometimes in the Annals of Waverly.'

88 Rolls Series 86, vol. ii, v. 9903.

89 Rolls Series 86, vol ii, v. 10,098.

The romance of RCL is preceded by a prose passage which gives an account of Richard's coronation at Westminster and the preparations for the crusade. This prose passage is entitled *Richard Erle of Putanencium* and runs from $250v^a$ to $251v^a$, which contains only three lines of prose. The next column, $251v^b$ is empty, probably because RCL was considered a major item which deserved a new leaf. The end of RCL is followed by almost two and a half folios of prose on King John, after which the text reverts to Robert of Gloucester.

RCL lacks the first folio (f. 3 in the quire), which was probably cut out because it contained an illumination at the beginning of the romance. It was removed, without leaving a visible stub, before the modern foliation[90] was introduced[91]. The missing folio could have contained a maximum of 152 lines[92], but if there was an illumination on the first folio, the possible maximum number of lines should be reduced. It is impossible to say how much space the illumination might have occupied but the equivalent number of 133 lines found in the D text may well indicate that the illumination took up 20 lines.

The last folio of the romance lacks half its leaf and hence a maximum of two columns of text was lost. Of the remaining half leaf, which is foliated as 275^e in the manuscript, the recto side is filled with text, its verso being left blank.

The inscription 'hic incipit Robertus Moille' is found on f. 99r, on the second folio of a quire of six folios[93], on which a new hand is introduced. The scribe who wrote this inscription must have expected that his name would be trimmed at the binding stage, for it appears just below the signature **n 2** at the bottom of the page. Although it was indeed partly trimmed away, enough of it remains visible to identify it as the hand of the scribe who wrote the main body of the text. Moille must have started writing on f. 99 and continued up to f. 264, after which scribe Z took over and finished the text of RCL. At f. 276, at the beginning of the item on King John, Moille's hand appears again and continues up to the end of the life of King Henry III on f. 303.

Two other features of the manuscript are also due to the change of scribe on f. 99. In the first place, the table of contents attached to the beginning of the manuscript only reaches as far as *the lettre of Boniface* (f. 4v) which appears in the text on f. 99^{94}. This has interesting implications for the *Petegreu* on f. 1v, because the date of August 5 1448, mentioned in it, must refer to the involvement of the scribe writing prior to Moille, rather than the date at which the whole manuscript was completed. Robert Moille was obviously not interested in continuing the table and let it lapse. He also discontinued writing folio numbers at the bottom of the page after a shortlived attempt from ff. 108-119.

These points suggest that there was no overall editorial supervision of this manuscript and that the individual scribes must have had control over their particular section of the manuscript.

---

[90] The modern foliation dates from around 1700.

[91] A similar situation is found between ff. 303-4, where the first folio of the new item was also cut out, but here the stub is visible.

[92] Each column contains 38 lines.

[93] According to the contemporary foliation, no leaves are missing.

[94] F. 99 in the modern foliation corresponds to **cvi** in the contemporary foliation; see also p. 17.

The structure of Arundel 58 is as follows:

1. The first part of the manuscript consists of 334 leaves. Ff. 1-4 contain an introduction and contents list to the manuscript and are followed by ff. 5-334 which consist of a series of lives of the English kings from Queen Albion to Edward III. They are introduced on f. 1r: 'the tabile offe cronycul offe Engelonde fro quene Albion the furste erthely creature that entriede in to this londe yn to kyng Richard the Secunde'. The life of the last king, Edward III, is chronicled as far as the battle of Halidown-hill in 1332[95] and since the reign of his successor, Richard II, begins in 1377, 40 years of Edward's life are missing. It is impossible to tell from the manuscript if the text was to be continued up to Edward's death, for the final folio of the last quire, f. 334, was cut out and hence there is no catchword.

   There is no doubt that ff. 5-334 form one unit. Apart from quire 15, which consists of ten leaves, folios are grouped in quires of eight and catchwords are nearly always in place. The layout of the manuscript remains constant with double columns for the prose sections and single ones for verse[96]. Furthermore many quires show signs of signatures. Throughout the 42 quires of this part of the manuscript the following system is visible: initially the quires are numbered from **a** to **z**, followed by **&** and 'con', after which double letters are used running from **aa** to **rr**. The only irregularity in this manuscript is found in quires 14 and 16, in which the inner bifolia of ff. 107-8 and 125-6 were interchanged.

   The manuscript contains a contemporary foliation running from **i** to **cxxvi**, which is found at the bottom of the recto of the leaf. This corresponds to the modern foliation of 5-119. The discrepancy between the two figures arises because the table of contents found in ff. 1-4 was not included in the contemporary pagination and also because several leaves are missing. After f. 119 only the modern foliation is found.

2. The second part of the manuscript consists of ff. 335-342, which contain a series of poems attributed to Lydgate[97]. Each short poem on the Kings of England from William the Conqueror to Henry VI[98] is acompanied by a portrait in the form of a medallion, many of which have been excised. According to Guddat-Figge[99], this part was probably bound with the manuscript later on. However, the first item on f. 1v, which is part of the introductory pages, refers directly to this part of the manuscript: 'a petegreu ffro William Conquerour of the Crowne of Engelonde lynnyally descendyng vn to kyng Henre the vj in the end of thys boke lymned in ffygurs. Thys boke *with* hys Antecedens and consequens was ful Ended the vj day offe August the ȝere of oure lorde a MCCCC xlviij And the yere of oure souerayn Lorde kyng Harry the vj aftt*er* the

---

[95] See W. H. Black, *Catalogue of the Arundel Manuscripts*, p. 109.

[96] Apart from RCL which is written in double columns. This was possible because the lines in the romance are much shorter than those of the chronicle.

[97] See W. H. Black, *Catalogue of the Arundel Manuscripts*, p. 110 and W. F. Schirmer, *John Lydgate*, pp. 236-7, who accepts this attribution and dates the poem 'shortly after 1442'. In the opinion of Dr A. I. Doyle the script of ff. 335-342 is very similar to that of manuscripts produced at Bury St. Edmunds from the late 1420s to 1440s. Since John Lydgate was a monk at Bury St Edmunds .   . (see W. F. Schirmer, p. 10), the locality provides a potential link with the manuscript.

[98] The last event in the final poem describes Henry VI's coronation in France in 1431.

[99] Guddat-Figge, pp. 215-7.

conquest[100] the xxvj[101]. This implies that ff. 335-42 were already in existence when the first scribe wrote f. 1v[102] and that these folios were always intended to be placed at the end of the manuscript.

There are several marginalia to the text of RCL, nearly all of which consist of a repetition of names or events mentioned in the text, combined with the underlining of these names in the manuscript itself. These marginalia are mostly by the same hand as the one found at the bottom of f. 252r[103]. No significance can be attached to them nor can their origin be traced. However, a few marginalia deviate from this pattern: the comment at the top of 252r *The herauldes make proclamatone* is in a different hand, which is not found in the margins of RCL again. It is an exceptional addition to the manuscript, referring to 1177-8, slightly later in the text. Another, which is now illegible, has been erased in the margin of f. 263r[b] alongside line 2064. There are also two little drawings, on f. 259r, a drawing of Richard's axe, and on 266v, a drawing of St. George's coat of arms.

Although the MS bears the pressmark **HDN 58**[104], it was not part of the group of manuscripts donated by the Duke of Norfolk in 1672[105] as items 55-64 in the Norfolk Collection at the College all came from elsewhere. There is evidence that Arundel 58 had been in the possession of the College for at least 40 years before the arrival of the Norfolk Collection, for John Weever refers to it in his *Ancient Funerall Monuments* of 1631[106] as 'A Manuscript in the Herald's Office'. He frequently quotes from the manuscript, most often from the short rimes on the Kings of England on ff. 335-42[107], but also from three passages in RCL[108], and it is likely that he did not realise that none of these passages were by Robert. Black comments that the manuscript belonged to John Weever himself [109], probably because he was misled by Weever's affectionate and apparently proprietary references to Robert of Gloucester[110]. According to Hearne[111] even earlier use was made of this Chronicle by John Stow, the antiquary and chronicler, who published prolifically between 1560 and 1605. Stow mentions Robert of Gloucester among his sources for the various editions of his *Chronicles* but it has been impossible to determine if he used Arundel.

It is not known how much before 1631 the manuscript entered the College of Arms and it has proved impossible to trace the origins of this manuscript further. In the earliest catalogue in the College[112] the descriptions of the manuscripts are too vague to enable positive identification of

---

[100] 'after the Norman conquest'.

[101] The date of 1448 coincides with the 26th year of king Henry's reign, who succeeded to the throne in 1422.

[102] Ff. 1-4 are in the same hand as ff. 5-98.

[103] It has not been possible to verify W. H. Black's attribution of these notes in the *Catalogue of the Arundel Manuscripts*, p. 104 to John Weever, the author of *Ancient Funerall Monuments*, see also below and footnote 106.

[104] **HDN** stands for Henry Duke of Norfolk.

[105] See W. H. Black, *Catalogue of the Arundel Manuscripts*, pp. 99-132. Guddat-Figge, p. 217 states incorrectly that this MS was donated by the Duke of Norfolk.

[106] John Weever, p. 60.

[107] See the description of ff. 335-42, pp. 17-18.

[108] Pp. 318-9, ll. 4057-8, 4727-44 and 5157-68.

[109] Black, *Catalogue of the Arundel Manuscripts*, p. 104.

[110] For instance Weever, p. 134 'of which my old author' and p. 181 'my old MSS (sic) further speakes.'

[111] Thomas Hearne, *Robert of Gloucester's Chronicle*, vol. i, p. liii.

[112] *A Cathalogue of all the Bookes remayning in the Office of Armes directed by Alphabet to euery severall prese*

18

Robert of Gloucester's Chronicle. The closest description is found on p. 28 under pressmark **M**: 'Item a booke in parchment of the Cronicles of Kinges and others in English'. In 1690, after the Great Fire of London and the reorganisation of the press marks the manuscript is mentioned for the first time in the second catalogue[113] under 'Third Shelf, Eighth Press' as number 15: 'Robert Gloucester MSS'. Later, when printed books and manuscripts were separated, Arundel 58 was added to the Manuscript Section of the Norfolk Collection.

Douce 228

This manuscript, catalogued in the Bodleian Library as S.C. 21802, is defective at both ends and contains only one item, the romance of Richard Coeur de Lion. Its provenance is not known but since the dialect and the armorial bookplate of *Francis Blomefield, Rector of Fersfield in Norfolk 1736* both point to Norfolk, it is quite likely that the manuscript originated there.

The text is written in one hand in Current Anglicana with Secretary features dating from the late fifteenth century in a bold and utilitarian script. Anglicana features include: '8' shaped *g*; double compartment **a**, when **a** occurs at the beginning of the word, but Secretary single compartment **a** in the middle.

Ascenders tend to be still large and hooked especially in **f** and *f*. However, **d, h, l** and **b** are often found with small topstrokes. The descenders of **f**, *f*, long **r**, **p** (and occasionally **h**) are long and straight. The downstroke of **h** normally curves sharply inwards whereas **y** and **y** shaped þ, which are virtually indistinguishable, curve sharply to the right. When **d, f, g** and **t** are found at the end of a word, they end with a hooked, downward flourish. At the end of a word, **m** and **n** have a flourish looping back over it.

Short **s**, which is found in final position only, is mostly of the Anglicana type.

In initial and medial position, mostly long **r** is used but, when **r** is final or in the environment of **o**, Secretary **r** and '2' shaped **r** are common.

ff occurs frequently in the text, not only at the beginning of the line and in personal or place names but also elsewhere.

Only reversed **e** is found, which can cause confusion between **o** and **e** and occasionally also between **e** and **d**. A hair stroke occurs over **i**, especially in minim environment.

There are two suspension marks to denote a plural noun or genitive ending: the first is attached to the end of the word and has a loop on the right hand side; the second is like the suspension mark for 'con' and is found detached from the word.

The text was checked fairly carefully by the scribe and corrections and expunctions are found throughout. Note also that in 2284-5 the scribe reversed the lines, which was corrected by the notation of **b** and **a** in the margin.

Douce 228 is very plain and as Guddat-Figge[114] comments 'written in a clear but not beautiful hand'. There is no decoration to be found and initials were not executed even though in a few

---

by *A. B. C. A° 1618 the First of february*, L11, part 2, pp. 1-29, probably by Samson Lennard.

[113] *A Catalogue of the Books printed and MSS in the Heralds Office*, May 1690, p. 23.

[114] Guddat-Figge, p. 264.

places space[115] was left for them. Guide letters are always visible. There are no paragraph marks or running titles. The rimes are indicated by braces.

The text takes up 40 folios. It is preceded by four numbered flyleaves with one unnumbered leaf between the first and second, and it is followed by one flyleaf at the end. There is no indication whether it was meant to stand by itself or whether it originally formed part of a larger compilation.

The manuscript consists of paper measuring ± 288 × 100 mm. The text is written in single columns of ± 235 × 65 mm. The paper is not ruled and single bounding lines, which run the length and the width of the page, are marked in ink at the top and bottom of the page and at the left hand margin. The number of lines per page varies greatly, from 38 to 47, probably because of the lack of ruled lines.

Folio numbers have been supplied in a modern hand on the recto of each leaf. Up to f. 3v line references are also found. They must have been added after the manuscript was repaired, since on f. 2v and f. 3v they are written on the backing which was applied to the folios.

The manuscript consists of four quires. The first quire consists of 10 folios, with a probable loss of two before the text was written, while the second and third consist of 12 folios. The final quire is incomplete, with only six folios, probably all single leaves, extant.

Catchwords are found at the end of the first three quires on ff. 10v, 22v and 34v. The first and second catchwords refer correctly to the following text but the third is followed by the wrong folio, f. 35. This intrudes between ff. 34 and 36, when its proper place is between ff. 39 and 40. It cannot be deduced from the binding whether this mistake was made by the scribe or by the binder. The manuscript ends on f. 40, or on f. 6 in the final quire. Since the other quires contain 12 leaves, another six may have made up the final one, too. Certainly, the fact that f. 40 was filled completely indicates that it was probably intended to continue.

There is a lacuna in the text between 3956 and 4147, which cannot be due to the loss of folios in the D text, since the gap occurs in the middle of f. 36r. Since these lines encompass the fairly well delimited episode of the taking of Daroun, they were either dropped by D or its predecessor(s), or they were never part of the D branch in the first place. The former is more likely as all the other versions, including E, share this part[116].

The paper sheets which made up this manuscript were folded into an abnormal ('agenda') quarto format. They contain watermarks of three distinct types, usually present on the second of each four folios. In quire 1 the watermark is in the shape of a *tête de boeuf*, in quire 2 an anchor, and in quires 3 and 4 a half wheel with spokes [117]. The *tête de boeuf* in the first quire is positioned slightly to the left of the middle, it being visible on the bifolia of ff. 2 and 6 and on ff. 5 and 9, but more so on ff. 2 and 5. This quire contains 5 bifolia of which two display the watermark and three do not. Since every sheet of paper would have produced two bifolia, one with a watermark and one without, it is very likely that one bifolium with the watermark has gone missing[118]. It must have been removed before the text was written, as no gaps can

---

[115] The space left for capitals measures two lines × four characters.

[116] See also Note 3957.

[117] Since these watermarks are not at all clear and many are difficult to observe because they are spread across bifolia, it has proved impossible to establish parallels with C. M. Briquet's watermarks in *Les Filigra nes*.

[118] Note that the other two complete quires contain 6 bifolia.

be observed in the narrative. Quire 2 consists of six bifolia, on three of which the watermark of an anchor is found. It is contained within the bounds of ff. 12, 13 and 16, the watermark being upside down on f. 13. In quire 3 a half wheel with spokes is found on f. 23 (with overlap on f. 34), on f. 26 and on f. 30. The watermark on f. 30 is the only one in the second half of this quire. The final quire is incomplete, with only one half wheel found upside down on f. 39.

The manuscript is in the format of the holsterbook. The wear on the margins and the first and last folios of Douce is consistent with heavy use and the manuscript may well have been carried around in a holster. Guddat-Figge[119] gives the most concise account of this format and the development of the terminology surrounding it. She comments that Geoffrey Ivy[120] was among the first to use the term 'holsterbook[121]' and cites W. H. Black's description of the format: 'A very tall and narrow folio volume, consisting of 161 leaves of paper of the largest size folded down the length of the sheet'[122].

M. E. Barnicle's[123] theory that there is a particular connection between the format of the holsterbook and their exclusive use by medieval minstrels is very doubtful, since holster books contain a great variety of subject matter[124]. In the case of this particular text the connection is even more unlikely, since there are six other versions, all produced in the normal quarto format.

Apart from the name of *Francis Blomefield*[125], other names of book collectors are also found in the binding: Thomas Martin of Palgrave, Dr. Richard Farmer and Francis Douce[126]. The last left the manuscript to the Bodleian Library on his death in 1834. The binding also contains a note by Kölbing in which he recognises the Douce text as belonging to the RCL group.

Egerton 2862

Egerton 2862 is a parchment manuscript of 148 folios, measuring 170 mm. × 280 mm.; it was written by one scribe towards the middle of the fifteenth century and contains seven items, all of which are romances: 1) Richard Coeur de Lion, 2) Beues of Hampton, 3) Sir Degarre, 4) Florens and Blanchefloure, 5) the Batell of Troye, 6) Amys and Amylion, 7) Sir Eglamour[127].

The text was written in an Anglicana hand with some Secretary features. The script is well spaced and easy to read, and the angle is almost upright. The letters are separated and rounded

---

[119] Guddat-Figge, pp. 30-6.

[120] G. S. Ivy, *The Bibliography of the Manuscript Book* in *The English Library before 1700*, p. 64, note 71.

[121] Guddat-Figge, p. 30.

[122] *A Descriptive, Analytical, and Critical Catalogue of the Manuscripts Bequeathed by Elias Ashmole*, col. 106. This is Black's description of no. 61, 'a collection of Metrical Romances, Lays and other Poems in Old English'. Dr A. I. Doyle has pointed out that it was actually folded down the width of the sheet (or the length of the leaf).

[123] *The Seege or Batayle of Troye*, EETS 172 (1927) p. xiv.

[124] Compare Guddat-Figge, pp. 31-2; Ivy, p. 64, note 71; George Kane, *Piers Plowman: The A Version*, p. 11, note 2; R. H. Robbins, Book Review of Rigg's Edition of *A Glastonbury Miscellany of the Fifteenth Century*, Anglia 89 (1971) pp. 141-2.

[125] See also p. 19.

[126] See also Madan, *Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, vol iv, part ii, p. 562 and Guddat-Figge, p. 264.

[127] All but item 5 are incomplete and 3 and 7 are mere fragments. See N. Jacobs, *The Egerton Fragment of Sir Degarre*, NM 72 (1972) p. 86.

with biting relatively rare.

Ascenders and descenders are not very long and give the script a compact appearance; ascenders are curved but descenders are straight, apart from **y** and **h**. At the end of a word, **n** tends to have a loop curving down but not at the end of the line, where it curves up. Occasional flourishes appear at the end of a word, especially after **m, n, g, k** and **d**.

The shape of **a** is the clearest indication of the influence of Secretary; it is invariably written as single compartment **a**; usually the topstroke is higher than the main body of the letters.

Short **r** is the most common but long **r** is found occasionally; in the combination 'or' the **r** is nearly always 2-shaped.

∫ is used in initial and medial position and short kidney-shaped **s** in final position, sometimes with the top left open.

In **t** the topstroke goes well beyond the cross-stroke.

On f. 25r the first examples of **e** are found with the end-stroke looping round to the top of the letter; this form occurs occasionally further in the text.

g is of the two compartment, Anglicana type.

'Þ' is normally written unless a capital is needed, in which case **th** is used; 'ʒ' is used rather than **gh** medially and finally.

There is no punctuation in RCL, mistakes are few and corrections were made by the scribe.

The manuscript was ruled in ink and the single columns on each side take up the same space on the recto and verso of the folio. There are 40 lines per page throughout (but the scribe copies two lines of verse on one line twice on f. 32r and once on ff. 41r and 41v). Horizontal bounding lines across the margins are found at the top and bottom of the page throughout the manuscript. The title of the item is written at the top of the page by another, mid fifteenth century, hand.

Up to f. 97 prickmarks are occasionally visible, after which pricking becomes much more common, with the exception of the last quire, where there are no marks at all. Apart from the fact that many margins were cut out, the top and bottom of the pages were also cropped. The numbering in a modern hand on the verso of each folio has been trimmed in places, which must have occurred when the manuscript was last bound, before it was acquired by the British Museum.

From the execution of the text and the quality and size of the parchment, it would appear that the manuscript was produced by a professional scribe for a wealthy patron. Yet it is plain in appearance, there are no illuminations or paragraph marks and capitals were never executed. The first letter in the top line is often elaborated with cadel ornament, more frequently near the beginning of the manuscript than later. Much of this decoration was subsequently cropped.

The manuscript consists mainly of quires of four bifolia and catchwords are normally in place. The romance of *Richard Coeur de Lion*, which is found at the beginning of the manuscript, takes up six quires (ff. 1-44) and is defective at both ends.

The structure of the manuscript appears to be as follows:

Folio*	Quire**	Defects and Anomalies	Items
1-3	1 $[j^8]$	Lacks 1-3 (bef f. 1), 7 and 8 (after f. 3).	Richard 1-44
4-10	2 $[k^8]$	Lacks 8 (after f. 10).	
11-14	3 $[l^8]$	Lacks 1 (before f. 11), 3-5 (after f. 11).	
15-22	4 $[m^8]$		
23-30	5 n^8		
31-38	6 o^8		
39-45	7 p^8	Lacks 7 (after f. 44); one blank leaf was inserted at a later stage	Beues 45-94 + 96
46-53	8 q^8		
54-61	9 $[r^8]$		
62-69	10 s^8		
70-77	11 $[t^8]$		
78-85	12 v^8		
86-93	13 x^8		
94,96	$[y^?]$		
95,97	$[z^?]$	Jacobs (NM 72 (1971) p. 86) remarks that this fragment of *Sir Degarre* was bound not only in the middle of *Beues* but also in reverse order, as 97 precedes 95 in the romance. He estimates (p. 86) that three folios would have preceded the beginning of *Sir Degarre* in Egerton. The catchword on f. 95 indicates the end of a quire. I have been unable to ascertain how much text was lost after f. 95.	Sir Degarre 95+97
98-105	14 $\&^8$	De Vries, *Floris and Blancheflur*, p. 5 estimates that one folio was lost before f. 98 (but it could have been as many as two).	Florens etc. 98-111
106-113	15 'con'^{8}		Batell etc. 112-133
114-121	16 1^8		
122-129	17 2^8		
130-134	18 3^8	Lacks 4-6 (after f. 134); f. 134v is a ruled blank.	
135-142	19 $[4^8]$		Amis etc. 135-147
143-148	20 $[5^6]$	There are only six folios with the catchword on f. 148.	Sir Eglamour 148

* Current numbering

** Signatures without brackets are found in the quire; those in brackets are not visible.

It can be deduced from the state of the signatures that eight quires (a^8 to h^8) are wanting before f. 1. Since the manuscript, as it stands, contains only romance material, it is likely that the items in the preceding quires were of a similar nature. This would have made Egerton a very substantial collection of Middle English romances.

Folios 1-12 are badly damaged by damp. It is most likely that at one point the quires preceding RCL were detached and that the exposed manuscript was subsequently damaged. The folios missing from quires 1-3 were probably discarded later, because they had become illegible.

Quire 1 lacks 3 folios, which would have taken 240 lines to fill, before the first extant folio. Since the E version of RCL begins very late compared with the other versions[128], it is likely that RCL took up space not only in the first three folios of quire 1 but also in preceding quires:

---

[128] D, which is the closest of all texts to E, begins 883 lines earlier; C 1857 lines.

if E agreed with D, the text would have taken up 8 folios; if with C, it would have taken up 20.

It can be seen from the table that there are two gaps of two folios and one gap of three folios in the first three quires: in quire 1 two leaves are missing after f. 3 (the equivalent of 162 lines in D); in quire 2 one folio is missing after f. 10 and in quire 3 one folio before f. 11 (the equivalent of 160 lines in D); the third gap is also found in the third quire and is harder to calculate, as the first six lines of the cannibal episode, which is only present in B and C otherwise, are found at the bottom of f. 11v. It is hard to be sure how faithfully E would have followed BC. If the passage which descibes Richard's cannibalism (78 lines in C) is added to the lines which are found in the captivity episode, they make up 244 lines, or just over 3 folios. Since three leaves need to be accounted for in the third quire, it is likely that this textual analysis is correct.

The evidence provided by the manuscript itself confirms the textual analysis. In the first place ff. 1-3 were trimmed identically and much more heavily than the rest of the manuscript. Secondly, no catchwords can be found at the end of the first two quires, because both final folios were lost. In the third quire no catchword can be found, either, but the binding shows that it must have ended on f. 14, which is badly torn. The first extant catchword is found on f. 22v, at the end of the fourth and first complete quire. Thirdly, the lacunae found in the first three quires and the fact that ff. 1-7 consist of single leaves bound with the manuscript, indicate that up to f. 11 all leaves are single. Although it is hard to be sure, f. 11 and f. 13 do appear to make up the first complete bifolium. Finally, one leaf is missing at the end of RCL, which may have been filled in line with either A or C, which run on for 40 and 12 lines respectively.

The manuscript must have been disbound at some stage and many leaves lost. Those saved at the beginning were loose before they were secured by guarding, or rejointing if they were in pairs. It is possible that the latter was not always done[129] with regard to text and original gathering.

Quires 1-18 (up to f. 134) are identical in layout, with the text written in single columns of 70 to 100 mm. wide and 200 to 215 mm. long, but quires 19 and 20 are different, with a format of double columns. Quire 19 with its red riming braces contains the only evidence of rubrication found in the manuscript[130]. There is no evidence of signatures in the last two quires nor is there a catchword in quire 18 to connect it with the following item, so we have no proof that the current order of these quires is that in which the manuscript was first executed.

It remains a mystery why the scribe should have copied ff. 94-97 on inferior membrane, since quires 14 to 18 are meant to follow them, according to the signatures. One would expect the substitution of inferior quality only if the better membrane had run out. Perhaps the scribe ran out of good quality parchment while he was copying *Sir Degarre* and *Beues* simultaneously with *the Batell of Troy*, but there is no proof of this. It is also possible that quires 14-20 were originally intended to be placed at the beginning of the manuscript. This would account for the introduction of the lesser quality membrane at what would then be the end of the manuscript. The manuscript contains several marginalia, all in hands later than the manuscript itself[131].

---

[129] The sewing, where visible, is not a reliable guide.

[130] The rimes in quire 20 are not marked even though the layout is the same.

[131] Richardson, *Sir Eglamour of Artois*, EETS 256 (1965) p. ix. There is one fifteenth century jotting of a letter on f. 12r.

The most interesting ones are found on f. 73v 'By me Thomas waker of lyttell belinges' and on 127r 'By me Thomas waker'[132], which link the manuscript with Little Bealings in Suffolk. The geographical position of this place name and the plotting of the dialect of this manuscript in McIntosh's Atlas[133] point very much to the same area in SW Suffolk.

Little can be said about the provenance of the manuscript. Attached to it is an undated letter from Captain Lord Mark Robert Kerr adressed to General John Leveson Gower (d. 1806), the owner of the manuscript at the time, but it is not known how the manuscript came into his possession. The General must have passed the manuscript on to the first Duke of Sutherland, which is witnessed by a note on the back of the last flyleaf: 'This book was given by General. L Gower to the Marquis of Stafford my father – Sutherland'.
In 1906, when it was sold to the British Museum, the manuscript was still part of the Duke of Sutherland's library at Trentham Hall in Staffordshire, which is why it is also known as the *Trentham* manuscript.

Rationale for Printing the Four Texts L, A, D and E

There are seven extant manuscripts of *Richard Coeur de Lion*, one fragment and two early printed editions of *Wynkyn de Worde* from 1509 and 1528[134]. Four of the manuscript versions have been selected for print in this edition for the following reasons: L is the earliest and most historically accurate version, which represents the dialect of the author of the core text most closely of all texts.
D holds a central position in the group AHDE and it is the only text in this group which shares particular readings with each of the other versions individually. It also gives the fullest account of the captivity episode, which it shares with texts H and A.
E shows strong parallels with D especially and with group ADLH in general, yet it also shares material found otherwise only in BC.
A has been chosen as the more representative text in the group AH, of which it provides the fullest and most reliable witness.

Of the versions not edited here, C has already been printed in full in Karl Brunner's edition of *Richard Löwenhertz*. Robert of Thornton's B version follows C closely but is very idiosyncratic in its treatment of the text. Since it frequently adds and varies elements of the text, it is the least reliable witness to the development of RCL.
Text H is both shorter and less reliable than text A, hence the preference for A in the edition.

---

[132] This hand dates from the second half of the 16th century.

[133] McIntosh, *Atlas*, vol. 3, p. 485. His findings are based on the analysis of *The Seege or Batayle of Troye*, EETS 172 (1927).

[134] The fragment found in MS Badminton 704.1.16 has not been included in the discussion here, because it is very short and resembles the D text quite closely (see N. Davis, *Another Fragment of Richard Coeur de Lion*, N&Q 214 (1969) pp. 447-52); nor the two printed editions of *Wynkyn de Worde*.

The Affiliation of the Texts

The survival of seven texts and one fragment[135] suggests that the romance of RCL was very popular in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Since, generally speaking, only a proportion of texts from the Middle Ages tends to survive, it is likely that the extant versions of RCL represent only part of the original body of texts. The relationship between the texts themselves points to the same conclusion, as no text is the direct source of another[136] and no two texts are copied from one source. This implies that for every surviving text there is at least one that was lost.

With so many intermediate versions assumed to be missing, it is very difficult and potentially dangerously speculative to draw up a stemma. The problem is compounded by the fact that a good deal of cross-fertilisation must have taken place between the texts[137]. However, the following observations can be made:

1. The original version written in the dialect of Kent/SE has been lost.

2. **L** is the oldest version and its surviving 1050 lines present the core text most clearly. Yet L is not uncorrupted, as evidenced by its lack of 21 lines between 734 and 735[138] and its inclusion of two tail-rime stanzas in 1–24, which are not intrinsic to the text[139]. BC, which present the lines found between 734-5 and the original format of 1–24, must have followed a source other than L[140]. The occurrence of several scribal errors in L, e.g. in 792, 985, 1019 and 1371 confirm that L cannot have been the original text.

3. **D** and **E** form a group, designated δ in Brunner[141]. They provide many readings which are peculiar to these texts, e.g. the couplet in 4147-8 is unique to DE; DE 975 and 2169-70 form groups against ABCL and ABC respectively; the same couplet is found in A 2885-6 and BC 3753-4 on the one hand and DE 2881-2 on the other; the rime *sadel:fader* 3214 is probably corrupt.

The following readings are found only in DE[142]: *Messene* in 1144; D *to sauȝt with*, E *sauȝtle* 1525; *knyȝtes* in 2150 (compare 2183 where the correct form *knyches* 'bundles of hay' is found); *on euery baner* 2180; both texts lack *siluer* in 3256; *nertheles* for *Nablus* 3275; *schuld it held* 4228; *Lucypryde* 4238.

Yet though D and E are closely related, they cannot have been copied from one another. A major difference is found in the fact that D lacks the two passages E, which take up lines 2469-2806 and 3289-3806, and also lines 3957-4146 and 2951-2. In places either D or E will follow the

---

[135] MS Badminton 704.1.16

[136] See also p. 29, footnote 157.

[137] The most obvious example of this can be found in E, which follows D quite closely apart from the two E passages 2469-2806 and 3289-3806, which it shares with B and C.

[138] See Note 734-5.

[139] See Verse pp. 76-8.

[140] Unfortunately no comparison can be made between L/BC and the other versions, for A, D and H belong to a group of MSS which do not give any details of the events preceding the crusade; E begins too late to throw any light on the beginning of RCL.

[141] The following abbreviations are used in Brunner: α: B and C; β: A and H; γ: L, D and H; δ: D and E. These groups are discussed in Brunner, RCL p. 13.

[142] These and further examples form a sample only; for further evidence see also the Notes.

majority reading while the other text deviates [143]. Unique readings in E include: *Palky* 1575; *men ynow* 1711; *glowyng quarells* 1740; *Symond* 1784; *polboon* 3246; *how coward, screwe*,*aslepe!* 3945; *myster-man* 4327; *renoun* 4370; *lyf* 4554. E also moved 2411-50 to 3770-3806. Unique readings in D include: *levauns:vemauns* 1067; *wyt* and *itynt* 1133; *flyt* 1214; *ebarombyle* 1712; *brast* 1716; *to chip schuld wynne* 1795; *wyse* 1972; *gyrdilwon* 3184; *þey bleddyn* 3211; *your on syde* 3850; *kyng John* 4263. D alone is confused about the identity of *Trenchemere* (see also Note 1681).

4. **D** and **A** and to some extent **H**[144] share the following features: AHD share the misreading of S for F in *Samagous* in 252[145]; A and D 260 form a group against BC 638; all three texts lack the subject *he* in 893; they alone include the references to the *irissh knife* in 577-8 and 611-2[146]; they share *sone*, a corruption of *some*[147] in 663 and also *of hastyng* in 1655. In DA only are found *emperire* in 1570, *scheppard/sherward* in 2302[148] and *and heye stedes* in 3079.

Divergence of AH *from* D can be observed in lines 707-732, which are part of the captivity episode and are lacking in BC. Their sequence is as follows: lines 707-14 D only, 715-6 ADH, 717-24 AH, 725-30 D only, and 731-2 ADH [149].

5. **A** and **H**, designated group β in Brunner, are very closely related. Lines found in A and H alone include 421-2, 717-24 and 1244-5; lines lacking in both include 254, 849,˜885[150]; reversal of lines in A and H is found in 917-8[151].

They share many corrupt readings of which the following are a sample: 485 A *with egre mode*, H *with grete mode*; 969 A *styrelles*, H *stirells*; 1170 A *s/e/souns*, H *sesounes*; 1336 A *stode and pley*, H *stode and pley*; 1349 A *do lete se armes swythe*, H *lette see myne armes swythe*; 1504 A *double þer byfore*, H *dowbelle ther byfore*; 1742 A *fuyre*, H *fuyre*; 1769-70 reversal of the rime words A *barells:quarells*, H *barelles:quarelles*; 1833 A *piped Saracenus*, H *pyped Saraȝyns*; 1836 A *abondoun*, H *abawndoune*; 1838 A *see*, H *see*.

Yet despite their great similarity A and H cannot have been copied from each other. It is particularly clear that H cannot have been the source of A because H lacks many lines, mostly couplets, e.g. 629-30, 635-6, 1033-4, 1174-5, 1270-1 and 1767-8.

There are a few instances where A (and sometimes also D) provides a corrupt reading which is rendered radically differently in H: in 279 A *a sebelie* and D *in sepelye* are replaced by *sekurlye* in H; in 674 A *his wikked hefd it shalle away* and D *his wykkyd dedys /h/e schul abeye* are rendered in H: *y wold they were hennes away*; 837-8 A lacks the rime-word *write*, while H gives *me ys done to vnderstonde/of the nowbell men of þys londe*; in 910 A misreads *meny* for *mercy*, which obscures the sense of the line, and which H varies with *and felle on knee yn thatt tyde/and to the kyng thus he seyde*; in 928 H improvises *be awrekede sone in haste* on A and C *wende by*

---

[143] This is relevant especially in the case of D, which shows both a close relationship with E and parallels with A (and H).

[144] Note that H ends early, at 1939.

[145] Compare B and C 630 *Ffamagos.*

[146] Compare B and C 1036-7, and B and C 1070-1.

[147] There is no BC reading.

[148] Compare C 3252 *coward.*

[149] See also Brunner, RCL p. 145.

[150] See also Brunner, RCL p. 13.

[151] H also changes 918 substantially: *for youre menne beth leyde on hepe.*

Cristes fast and D *spare for Cristes faste*; in 960 A *his maners*, a corruption of *mariners*, is replaced by H *barones*; in 1391 A *a veleyne a tourre* is corrupt, compare the unique reading in H: *kyng of honowre*. Some lines were omitted, possibly because their original was unacceptable to H, e.g. 260, 1276-7, 1715-8, 1775-6 and 1865-6.

It would appear from this evidence that H probably copied from a text closely related to A and that H rewrote or deleted readings which had become incomprehensible.

H is the more corrupt of the two texts, confirming that A could not have been copied from it, e.g. *to the emperour a knyght gan renne* 423 (leaving the riming line intact); *also* instead of *bo* 'both' 691; *and lete compyle a letter/to þe kyng of the londe theere* 797-8; *erles and lordes of townes* 808; *þe kyngys sone spake full sone/and seyd: 'for Goddes love in trone'* 815-6; *þerunder* for *þe foþer* 858; *yn trew trest* for *þo kest* 867; *atte the tyme of Crystyssmasse* 901; *downes* for *toune* 912; *adowne þey leyde on the sonde* 1070; *galeys* for *naues* 1232; *bothe schippes and eke barges* 1233.

Equally, H could not have been copied directly from A, e.g. A lacks lines 1248-52 altogether, while H has the following readings: 1248 *he cleped forthe Steuen and Syr Willam*; 1249 *and Syr Roberte of Turneham*; 1250-51 are lacking; 1252 *'Gothe' he seyde, 'to the emperour.*

Text A also displays several unique readings: 366 A *greff*, H *gryth* ; 705 A *kyng or page*, H *by alle ys parage*; 932 A *com afterward*, H *afterwarde*; in 1064 A the verb is lacking, H *to take*; 1108 A *he myghten gude fay*, H *he myght notte yn gode feye*; 1378 A *to leue her clothe*, H *he lyvered clothe*; 1871 A *barouns*, H *barbicannes*.

6. **L, D** and **E** form group γ in Brunner. They share two couplets in close proximity: 1811-2 and 1819-20, which are lacking in A, B and C and which are quite possibly later additions. L and D (E is lacking) form a group in 1246-7 against AHBC 1244-5.

7. Miscellaneous: **A, H** and **C** share four lines between 1659 and 1662 (C 2483-6), of which the second couplet is a repetition of 1657-8 (see the Notes); **D, E** and **H** lack *mone* in 1615; A and B share 4905-6 (compare C 6925); **L** and **A** both lack the subject *he* in 1773; **L** and **H** share the corrupt reading *breþer* in 792; **D** *theyse* and **C** *theyso*, found in 3133, are very similar[152].

It has not been possible to investigate the relationship between BC and ADELH[153] in detail, but it is clear that BC incorporate much more - and almost certainly later - material than ADELH[154]. It must also be said that, where L and C share material, they are often remarkably close in their readings and that as far as the core text is concerned, they are normally the most reliable and authoritative texts.

It can be seen from these examples that the links between the texts are many and varied and that the many similarities and deviations discussed so far create great problems when an attempt is made to incorporate all the evidence in a stemma[155]. Karl Brunner tried to do this in his edition of the C text[156] but his approach was not entirely successful. He is correct in

---

[152] These readings may have come about independently.

[153] Groups *a* and *b* in Brunner.

[154] For instance, the Cassodorien episode (see footnote 333, p. 59) and Richard's revenge in Germany.

[155] A good example of the integration of material is found in 2399-2470. In short succession there are passages shared by ACDE, DA, DAE and EC.

[156] Brunner, RCL pp. 11-17.

stating that no manuscript is the source of any other[157] and his grouping of similar versions is accurate[158]. However, his representation of the relationship between the texts is incomplete, because he charted only the similarities between groups α, β, γ and δ[159]; he acknowledged the unique position of E[160] but did not touch on the similarities discussed under 4. and 7; he overemphasised the relevance of 6, where the evidence is relatively scarce; he also ignored the fact that where L and C share episodes they are often remarkably close[161].

The main obstacle to constructing a family tree for RCL - an approach which depicts the vertical descent of manuscripts - is found in the fact that the addition of new material is spread out over different branches. It has consequently proved more productive to look at the horizontal layers of the text and to establish which parts of the texts belonged to the core text and which parts were added subsequently. The evidence which the rimes and the presence or absence of interpolations provide is crucial to this approach. The differences between the versions can be acknowledged, while at the same time shared episodes are recognised. For instance, both the close textual similarity of text L and the central portion of text C can be demonstrated for the core text, while the mass of material in C can be demonstrated to be later additions. The unique make-up of text D, which is the latest version but which lacks three major parts found in many of its earlier affiliated texts, is revealed. The composition of E, with both its strong similarities with D and its augmentation with the two episodes E1 and E2, can also be

---

[157] Brunner, RCL p. 11: 'Keine Hs. ist die Quelle einer andern'.

[158] Brunner, RCL pp. 13-14.

[159] Norman Davis has also queried Brunner's conclusions: 'The descent of the text cannot have been as clear-cut as Brunner's stemma makes it'. N&Q 214 (1969) p. 451.

[160] See Brunner, RCL p. 14.

[161] Neither is there any evidence to support Brunner's contention on pp. 23-4 that C is the most authoritative text. Yet Brunner himself acknowledges on p. 23 : 'Schon im 13. Jahrhundert entstand die Überarbeitung der Auchinleck-Hs. Bald darauf die Fassung *b* [LEDAH], während *a* [BCW], das uns erst in Hss. des späten 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts entgegentritt, seine grossen Erweiterungen wohl erst in etwas späterer Zeit erhielt'. The dominant reason for his categorisation of the versions was probably the desire to show C, which he chose to print as his base text, in the best possible light. There is no doubt that its readings are often authoritative; on the other hand much material which is clearly not part of the core text was interpolated later. Apart from the greater length of BC, the nature of these enlarged versions may also have influenced Brunner. After all, they do answer better to the idea of 'romance', in that the interpolations contain more romance features than the original part of RCL. This may explain why Brunner tried to prove that most of the later material was part of the original text, even if by doing so he ignored an important criterion he gave himself: 'Die in mehr als einer Hss.-Gruppe nicht überlieferten Stellen sind schon hiedurch als Einschubverse gekennzeichnet' (RCL pp. 20-1). He accepted only Richard's revenge in Germany (which is not found in our texts) and the passages E1 and E2 as later material (RCL, pp. 19 and 21). He rejected the material in the core text which contains information on Eleanor and Berengaria, Richard's mother and wife, as a reworking of the text, thereby freeing the way for accepting the Cassadorien episode - which is only shared by B and C - as original (RCL, pp. 18-19). He also preferred the BC version of Richard's pilgrimage and emprisonment in Vienna and regarded the captivity episode as abridged (RCL, pp. 21-2).

Finally, he refused to accept text L as testimony to the development of the core text and the interpolations (RCL, p. 18). While Brunner is right that L is not perfect and contains errors and gaps, this does not mean that its evidence is invalid, overall. His conclusions went largely in the face of earlier work on RCL, for example one of its first editors, George Ellis, and later Paris (Ellis, *Specimens of Early English Metrical Romances*, vol. 2, p. 180, and Paris, Rom p. 356) came to the conclusion that the captivity episode was not based on fact; it is surprising that Brunner, RCL pp. 17-19, should have expressed doubt about this analysis. Roger Loomis refuted many of Brunner's arguments in his review of the edition (Roger Loomis, *Der Mittelenglische Versroman über Richard Löwenhertz*, JEGP 15 (1916) pp. 455-66).

demonstrated by this method.

This approach leaves room for investigation of shared material as well as observation of details within the episodes. It also allows for the possibility that scribes or authors had editorial control in the choice of their material; that texts were not invariably copied uncontaminated; and that episodes from different manuscripts were introduced to new texts. This process must have played a role in the evolution of RCL, because there is hardly one version without new, added material.

Language

In this chapter an attempt will be made to give an outline of the dialectal features found in RCL, which appears to be a compilation of a core text and the work of many interpolators. Section I will concentrate on the evidence of the rimes in the original text, the interpolations, and the implications for the postulated authorship of the various parts. In Section II the dialects of the four individual texts L, A, D and E will be discussed.

Several components have contributed to the identification of the core text and the material added to it. Of these, the rime evidence discussed below has played an important part in this process but other features also testify to the probable structure of RCL, for example the style of the narrative, the use of historical sources, the presence or absence of romance motifs and descriptions, and in the case of ll. 1-24 and 5204-47 the use of a different format. These and other elements are discussed on pp. 59-78. Other evidence, such as the distribution of the vocabulary, is more difficult to quantify, particularly since there can be extensive disparity in the variants presented by our scribes. If it were possible to run a concordance on RCL, however, I believe that the boundaries of the episodes postulated here would be confirmed. Finally, a close aquaintance with the text gives one a sense, nebulous though this may be, of the identity of a particular part.

As far as the linguistic evidence is concerned, an attempt has been made to classify some of the salient features typical of a particular author. These have been described in terms of linguistic features but should be seen as typical of the author rather than of a particular area. In many cases rimes have been preserved by all or nearly all scribes, in others the surface level of the texts is different from the underlying rime which has to be reconstructed. Evidence from the versions not printed here is called upon to support the argument where necessary, in particular from the C text.

The division of the rimes into linguistic categories is not always sufficient to determine which author was responsible for a particular part of the text. For instance, while the presence of rimes with the reflex of OE **y** is indicative of core text versus interpolated material, not all rimes which display a SE/Kentish reflex can be considered written by the original author. An example of this is found in *s het* 4584[162], from OE *scyttan*, which occurs once as a rime-word in our text, in a passage which is almost certainly not core text material. *S .het* also occurs five times in interpolated material found in BC and hence it is probably not a safe diagnostic for the core text. The presence of *dent* as a rime-word also needs qualification in this context. Apart from two examples in core text 1041 and 1822, where it may be indicative of a SE/Kentish environment because it is found in core text material, it also occurs outside it in 4248 and in C 421 and 4351[163].

Another problem in the text is illustrated by the use of the rime-word *sword*, which, apart from one certain form *sward* and one *swerd/sward* variant, only occurs in a series of *sworde:lorde/ worde* rimes, two probably in the core text, and five in later interpolations[164]. This is striking because one might have expected evidence of WS *swurd* as most in line with other dialect evidence.

---

[162] See footnote 192, p. 36.

[163] Jordan confirms that the distribution of *dent* is wider than the SE; see footnote 190, p. 36.

[164] See pp. 38 and 40.

The spelling *sword* has been designated as mainly a Northern variant by some grammarians[165] and yet here we have a series of *sword* rimes in a Southern/Midlands environment. Two things ought to be taken into consideration here: in the first place, the distribution of *sword* may well have been wider than a narrowly defined area, and secondly, authors who wrote particularly in verse must have had preferences for vocabulary items as well as for dialect forms when they were composing verse. They must have had something like a riming dictionary in their heads with a limited language selection. This idea reinforces the notion expressed above that, particularly when rime evidence is examined, it is important to remember that it may be typical of a potential author rather than a potential dialect.

Finally, only a minority of the rimes are dialectally significant and they do not always occur conveniently at the point where two distinct sections meet.

Ten authors, including the author of the core text, have been identified, but others may well have been involved in the composition of RCL. There can be no doubt that more authors contributed to B and C than to A, D, E and L, because B and C contain material not found in our texts.

The boundaries of some of the interpolations are easily detectable because their rime evidence is conclusive, the episodes are clearly defined and not shared by all texts. For instance, there is clear evidence that the captivity episode (35-732) and the two passages E1 (2469-2806) and E2 (3289-3806) were written by three different authors. Between 2951-3288 and after 4228, however, a different pattern emerges where at times a passage can be defined on the basis of the rime evidence, but where in some passages rimes from different dialects are found together. In addition, the final part of the romance is particularly difficult to classify because of a lack of distinctive dialect characteristics. Consequently, the conclusions as to origin are sometimes tentative, but the balance of probability is that the author of the core text came from the SE and that he was not the only author of RCL.

A résumé of the dialect characteristics for the ten postulated sections is given below, while a more detailed discussion of the diagnostic criteria can be found on pp. 36-43.

1. The Core Text

    The original author wrote in the dialect of the SE. He was responsible for episodes 1-34[166], 733-2410, 2807-2950, 3085-3154, 3807-4146 and 4309-4378. These episodes will be referred to as 'the core text', even if not all manuscripts are represented[167].

    The dialect features which distinguish these parts of the text include: SE/Kentish e for OE y; rime-words with the Southern ending *-ind/-end* in *þousind* and in the present participle; the WS rime-word *scholde*; *slen* 'to kill' from OE *slēan*. The adverbial ending *-lich* and the plural pronoun *he* support a mid-thirteenth date of composition[168].

---

[165] For instance Jordan, pp. 98 and 111.

[166] Since L 1-24 form an adaptation from 12 riming couplets into two tail-rime stanzas, not all lines in this passage can be said to be by the hand of the original author and ll. 4-6, 7-12, 16-7, 21 and 24 must be considered additional. For a more detailed discussion of the format of the riming couplets, which are found in BC, and of the additional material in L, see pp. 76-8.

[167] L and E lack a significant amount of text, but where the other versions share the same SE/Kentish dialect criteria in the rimes, it is assumed that these portions were written by the original author.

[168] See p. 72 ff.

2-10 The Interpolations

Interpolated material is found throughout the text. It is characterised by a lack of SE/Kentish language and by the presence of Anglian/Northern features[169].

2. 35-732 The Captivity Episode

These lines form the first interpolation in the text. Its characteristics are: <i/y> as the reflex of OE y; the adverbial ending -ly; the rime-words *slon* 'to kill' derived from ON *slá* and the presence of pp. *slawe*; the rime-word ʒ*ing* 'young'. Its dialect features point to the Midlands area, while the contents of the narrative indicate a Lincolnshire provenance[170].

3. 2411-68 The Chess-Playing Episode

This short passage does not display any distinctive dialect features but is in all probability a later addition to the text[171].

4. 2469-2806 E1

Rime-words typical of this passage include: the reflex <i/y> from OE y; an example of the present participle -*ande*; rimes in -*old* from OE unbroken *ald*.

5. 2951-3288 (1= 3085-3154) Richard Advances Towards Jerusalem

The rime evidence is contradictory but points to the presence of core text material which was amplified by another author. On the one hand, the Southern ending -*ynd* is found in *thousynd* in 3085, 3110 and 3130. On the other hand, Midlands and Northern features occur in the following lines: the reflex <i/y> from OE y in *lythe:kythe* in 2975 and *Saladyn:tyne* in 3236; the Northern rime *fleande:flingande* found in all texts except A in 3239; the rime-word *sword* found twice in 2962 and 3147; the pp. *slawe* in 3249 as a rime-word with *lawe*.

It must be concluded that the passage containing the Southern rimes probably formed part of the original description of the battle of Arsuf and that the passages with Northern features are later additions. It is impossible to be sure of the exact boundaries of the core text but 3085-3154 make up a reasonably coherent narrative (A 3155-62 being a repetition of 3127-34). However, more lines may have been included in this episode[172].

6. 3289-3806 E2

This episode is typified by: two examples of the reflex <i/y> from OE y; rimes in þ*ousand* and in -*old* from OE unbroken *ald*; the rime-words ʒ*ode* 'went' and SW aʒ*ee* 'again'.

7. 4147-4228 The Gatris Episode

This story was probably added later. Indicators of this are the lack of SE/Kentish rimes; the rime *kyng:ʒyng* in 4167, which is only found otherwise in the captivity episode[173], and an unusually high number of rimes on OF words, e.g. 4151-2, 4155-6, 4158 etc.[174]

---

[169] When reference is made to dialect differentials derived from OE phenomena, the OE dialect criteria are referred to by their traditional terminology of West-Saxon, Kentish and Anglian.

[170] See Note 183.

[171] See also the discussion on p. 62.

[172] See also p. 62-3.

[173] See p. 40.

[174] See also p. 73.

8. 4229-4308 Richard Warned of John's Intentions

The rimes in 4229-4308 indicate a non-SE background: the reflex <i/y> in *pryde* 4238, riming with *wyde* in DA and *syde* in E; text E Anglian *(adredde)fledde* in 4241 (compare BC 6313-4 *bystedde: fledde*) and *(sword)in* 4299. In the rime *dent:verament* 4248, *dent* does probably not indicate a SE origin, because it is found distributed outside that particular area[175].

9. 4309-5203 (1=4309-78) Richard's Final Exploits

Lines 4309-78 bear the hallmark of core material through the following rimes: Kentish/SE *hert:stert* in 4309; the adverbial ending *-liche* in the rime *apertelyche:ryche* in 4313; Southern endings in *fynde:pousinde)in* 4348 and in *wende:slepende)in* 4378.

In between 4379 and 4399 an interpolator probably took over, since in 4399 *care:sare* is found and in 4403 *slon:fon*; in 4461 the rime *ferly:trye*. Otherwise distinctive dialectal evidence is scarce in lines 4379-5204. One example of a potential SE/Kentish rime is found in 4584 *sket:s het* from OE *scyttan*, but this particular rime is probably not indicative of a Southern origin[176]. In addition, the following couplet has the rime-word *slawe* in a rime with *prawe*.

Other evidence points to the Midlands, with three rimes in <i/y> from OE *y* in 4746, 5006 and 5134; one rime in Anglian (or potentially SE) *adred:bysted* 4681; also three rimes in pp. *slawe* in 4521, 4586 and 5142.

It is impossible to determine whether 4379-5203 are the work of one or more interpolators because of the lack of distinctive dialect evidence.

10. 5204-5247 Epilogue

These lines display no distinctive dialect features. They are taken as a later addition independent of the preceding text, because they are only found in text A and because they contain an unusual mixture of Verse and Prose[177].

The Order of the Dialect Characteristics Discussed

The dialect characteristics of the original text and the four versions A, D, E and L are discussed as follows: points 1-11 deal with the reflexes of OE y, $\ae$, $\ae_1$, $\ae_2$, $\breve{e}a$, $\bar{e}a$, $\breve{e}o$, $\breve{e}$, $\breve{\imath}$, $\bar{o}$, $\bar{u}$ respectively; point 12 deals with the various spellings for 'thousand'; 13 with the forms for *slon/slen* and further ON evidence, and point 14 with OF. 15-18 discuss nouns, pronouns, verbs and adverbs respectively[178].

The four texts A, D, E and L are each introduced by a section describing scribal habits and more general points.

The four manuscripts ADEL and as far as can be ascertained the assumed original authors all have certain linguistic features in common typical of the Southern dialect:
OE $\bar{a}$ is spelled <o> throughout RCL in all texts, e.g. *stone* 675, 3014 in the middle of the line; in rime position *ston:on* 3880, *stones:for þe nones* 1872. *gost* is only found in riming position, nearly always paired with *ost*, e.g. 1881, 3042.

---

[175] See p. 31 and 36, footnote 190.

[176] See p. 31 and p. 36, footnote 192.

[177] See pp. 66 and 69, footnote 394, and Note 5204.

[178] The features discussed under these headings concentrate on distinctive forms.

OE ă before the lengthening consonants -**nd** becomes o in the four texts, e.g. in the middle of the line *lond* 773, 1516; *stond*, 382, 1677; and *hond* 1850, 3169[179]. In riming position only Southern forms are found and although rimes are made up by pairing words in the same category, e.g. *lond:vnderstond* 819-20; *Ingelond:sond* 4531-2, the consistency of the o spellings suggests a provenance South of the Humber[180].

OE ă before a nasal remains mostly **a** in the middle of the line, e.g. *mani, many* 1014, 1450, with some examples of *mony* in the E text, e.g. 2475, 2487; *man* is found throughout the text with one exception in text E *mon* in 1894; L and A have *fram*, e.g. 1779, 1897, whereas D and E have *from*, e.g. 1666, 1779. Since rimes like *Vrban:man* 747-8 and *þanne:man* 1679-80 clearly indicate a rime in ă and no rimes in *mon* are found in RCL, rimes made up with the pa.t. of class III or IV verbs, e.g. *man:vndernam* 379-80, *man:cam* 443-4, *ran:man* 1314-5 LA, probably indicate a Southern origin.

In text L the change from ĭ to ē in open syllables has not yet taken place, e.g. *iuel* 856, *cite* 830 and *pite* 745; E and A show a mixture of both ĭ and ē, e.g. *yuelle* A 2834, *euel* A 3992, *pite* E 1910, *petee* E 2872. D has ē almost exclusively, e.g. *evyl* 460, *petee* 513, *cete* 1826, *preso n* 582 and *Sere* 4285. However, the rimes in words like *cite* and *pite* do not give an indication of the quality of the stressed syllable, since the rime is on the second syllable, e.g. *se:cete* 255-6, *cite:entre* 1011-2 and *clare:cite* 1825-6; *meyne:pite* 1909-10 and *we:pite* 4513-4.

<**au**> is the normal reflex of OF nasalised **a** in all four texts, e.g. L 10-11 *fraunce:destaunce*, D 47 *signyfiaunse* and A 796 and E 3790 *distaunce*. Sometimes <**a**> is found, e.g. D 796 *Franse:distanse* and A 891 *distance* in a rime with *fraunce*.

---

[179] There are very few exceptions: E 3571 *lande-wayes*; D 224 *stande*; A 454 and E 2712 *stant*; D 472 *hand*; D 2870 *handes*.

[180] Apart from E 2870-1 which changes the line. For evidence of lengthening before **ld** in *-old* and *-eld*, see pp. 41-2.

Section I

The Language of the Original Text and the Interpolations

This section is divided into three parts: the dialect characteristics of the core text, of the interpolations, and of those features common to both.

Evidence Found in the Core Text

1. The strongest indication as to the dialect of the original version is found in the SE/Kentish reflex of OE **y**. This influence is visible in rimes of the type *kest:best* 867 and *slen:ken* 875. The four texts retain these SE/Kentish vowels to a varying degree, with text L preserving these spellings most consistently of all, e.g. in 867 *kest:best* and 987 *trecastel:hel* [181].

There are 22 pairs of rimes based on SE/Kentish vowels in the text, of which 20 are indicative of the original core text, and two, in 4248 and 4584, are probably not. They are found in 744[182], 867, 876[183], 988, 1041[184], 1049[185], 1132, 1276[186], 1741, 1822, 2044[187], 2209-10[188], 2384, 2950, 3856, 3884 (and 3872 A)[189], 4013, 4074 and 4080, (4248)[190], 4310[191] and (4584)[192]. This result is similar but not identical to Roger Loomis' findings in his review of Brunner's edition

---

[181] See the Dialect Descriptions for L on p. 45; A on p. 48-9; D on p. 53; E on p. 55.

[182] There is variation in the rimewords with L *seþ:keþ* against BC *siþþe:kiþþe* (C 1319). Since L is the earliest of the three texts and since it is the most conservative, it probably represents the earlier spelling. It is more likely that the later texts BC levelled out the SE spelling than that L introduced it of its own accord.

[183] *ken* is the SE reflex of pl. OE *cy* 'cows'; for *slen* see p. 38.

[184] The rime-word *dent*, found in 1041 and 1822, cannot be accepted as indicative of SE/Kent without comment because it also occurs outside a Kentish/SE environment; compare also footnote 190 and Jordan, p. 67, who comments that *dent* is used as a rime-word up into the North and that a rime in *dent* cannot be taken as strictly SE.

[185] The original rime may well have been *pelt:beheld* but compare C 1931-2 *pulte:behulte* (the rime in AH *vnfolde:byholde* was probably introduced to avoid an unacceptable rime).

[186] This rime could either be made up of A and L *lere:answere*, with *lere*, a Kentish form derived from OE *lyre* 'loss', or D and C 2127 *lore:answore* in which *lore* is derived from OE *lor* 'loss'. Both words refer to the loss of the treasure on board the ships mentioned in 1240. Since both L and A tend to faithfully copy SE/Kentish forms in rime position, it is likely that they represent the original rime.

[187] The original rime is not totally certain but since all texts (including C 2778) share *lere* 'loss', it has been included here.

[188] The rime-words *stere* and *on fere* in 2209-10 are both derived from OE *y*. Since all texts except B give the SE form *stere*, it has been assumed that they are SE/Kentish forms.

[189] The original rime was *prede:nede* (compare also C 5971), with E *tyde* a later insertion.

[190] It is likely that the use of *dent* in the rime *dent:verament* 4248 is not indicative of a SE/Kentish origin of the text, because *dent* was not exclusive to the SE (see also footnote 184). The validity of this surmise is reinforced by the fact that there are two rimes in *dent* in the C text *dente:lente* in C 421 and *dent:ment* in C 4351. These two rimes fall outside the core text and are not found in our versions.

[191] In the case of *stert* in the rime *stert:hert*, it is possible that it was derived from the hypothetical OE *styrtan* rather than as the regular SE representative (see OED under *start*: 'the occurrence of *sterte* in early Northern English .... points to the existence of a form ? OE * *steortian*, ? *stiertan'*).

[192] The rime *(sketd:schet)* could be indicative of SE/Kentish but, since *schet* is found five times outside the original part of the text (see R. Loomis, JEGP 15 (1916) p. 463) and never within it, the form *schet* is probably not a safe diagnostic for the core text.

36

of RCL[193]. The distribution of these rimes shows that there are no examples of SE/Kentish reflexes in the rimes in the captivity episode, in the two passages E, or in the material following 4310[194].

There are a few examples of potential rimes in <i/y> from OE y within the original text, but they are rare and not certain: 749[195], 1814[196], 1974[197], 2072[198] and 2936[199]. For examples of OE y in the interpolations, see p. 40.

2. The rime *euen:hauen* 'haven' 1807 (shared by all four texts) points to SE origin because æ in OE *hæfen* must have had typical lOK raising to ĕ (both words would have been lengthened subsequently to ę̄).

3. The rime *schaþe* 'sheath':*scaþe* 'harm' 1298, based on a SE/Kentish rime for $æ_1$ preceded by a palatal, becomes /ā̧/ in SE/Kentish and /ę̄/ everywhere else except AB language. L accepts the rime in /ā/ but A and D prefer the more common *scheþe*[200].

ʒare 'year' 1936 is found in A and L only (DE change the line). Smithers[201] states that this form 'is characteristic of the KA group but otherwise exceedingly rare'.

In the rime *drade:made* 4021 evidence is visible of the shift of $æ_1$ to ā which is found in the SE Midlands, especially Essex[202]. 4021 is the only example of this type of rime in RCL, whereas Smithers counts 'at least 8 examples' in KA[203].

---

[193] R. Loomis, JEGP 15 (1916) pp. 455–66. For instance, the rime *swere:in fere*, which Loomis found in C 6825, is of SE/Kentish origin but A and E lack it, probably due to an eyeslip because the following rime in 4807–8 also ends in *-ere*. Loomis designated the rime ʒerne:erne 1441 as SE/Kentish but ʒerne 'eager' is the regular development of OE ʒeorn. There is no evidence that *ʒyrn from palatalised *ʒiern took root in lOE (Campbell, *Old English Grammar*, § 251).

Two rimes in /e/, 2383 *kenne:menne* and 3856 *lyst:best*, are found in our texts but not in the C text: 2383 formed part of the passage 2377-89 lacking between C 3324 and 3325, which was probably left out because lines 2377 and 2389 resemble each other very closely. Since the lines found in A and D introduce the capture of the hostages and the date in 2387 appears to be historically correct (see Note 2387), it is likely that 2377-89 formed part of the original text. As far as 3856 is concerned, it occurs in the passage 3829-3861, which is lacking in BC (see Brunner, RCL p. 381-2). It is not clear why these lines are wanting there.

Loomis decided that two rimes in *ment:dent* in C 1372 and 4351 were part of the core text. He cannot be right in this, because both rimes occur in BC only, in episodes which are not historical. In addition, *dent* is probably not a rime-word indicative of SE usage (see footnote 190).

[194] With the exception of 4584.

[195] The rime *sinne:winne* in 749-50 could have been derived from OE *synne* riming either with *winnan* 'to win', or with OE *wynn* 'joy', in which *to winne* means 'to their joy' (see also Notes 3104); in the latter case the original rime was in SE/Kentish *e*.

[196] It is not certain that the rime *swift:lift* constitutes an original rime, for C lacks both this couplet and the preceding one, and without them makes good sense (see C 2630- 2633).

[197] Since these verbs are derived from OE *pytan* and *knytan*, the original rime could have been in SE/Kentish *e*.

[198] All texts share *b(i)liue:behiue* 'beehive' but an original SE/Kentish rime cannot be excluded, for the MED records the form *b(i)leve*. Hence the original rime could been *bileue* and SE/Kentish *beheue*.

[199] *Gautire:myre* 'swamp, bog' is probably the original rime, yet *Gautere:mere* cannot be excluded. The spelling *Gauter* is the norm in the text (see for instance 1997) and confusion of *myr* and *mere* 'pond, lake' from OE *mere* is possible (compare also Notes 2935 and 5003).

[200] Since in L the spelling <c> is used for /k/, e.g. *ascaped* 1371 and *score* 1933, and /ʃ/ is always spelled <sch>, L *scaþe* 'harm' must be derived from ON *skaði*.

[201] Smithers, KA p. 48.

[202] See Jordan, p. 81.

[203] Smithers, KA p. 47.

4. The rime *eight:knyght* in 2401-2 AD must be based on the raising to /ī/ of the vowel in OE *ǣht* 'goods, wealth'. The influence of Kentish is visible in this, as only there was æ raised to close ē[204] and subsequently to /ī/. Smithers notes that this form is also found in KA 3880, in *Confessio Amantis* 7307 and *The Seven Sages of Rome* 1091-2[205].

5. *sex:wex* inf. 2029 shows a rime based on Anglian *sex* and the historically regular type *wex*[206]; the vowel of the rare form *woxe* in the rime *woxe:oxe* 2022 either came about through shift of stress or through the influence of the class IV pp.[207]. Smithers[208] states: '*Woxe* pp. occurs alongside *wexe* in other SE documents'.

7. In addition to two occurrences of *sword* as a rime-word in core text 1213 and 3147, *sward* is found, too. Of this form Jordan[209] comments that the change of short unrounded e to a occurred in the fourteenth century '- in the North probably somewhat earlier - in ML and South its characteristic effect occurs only in the fifteenth century'. Although *sward* is used as a rime-word within the core text in L 12, it is not part of the original composition, but was added when the riming couplets of 1-24 were reworked into riming stanzas[210]. Consequently, the form *sward* does not necessarily form a distinctive dialect characteristic. In the case of the rime *swerd:mydward* 1055-6, found in DHBŒ but not A, which has *Richard:mydward*, either the original rime was *sward:mydward* or possibly *swerd:mydwerd* with lengthening of ea before **rd** to ę̄[211].

8. *tale:fale* 1861 is shared by A, L and C 2698. *fale* 'many' says Jordan[212] is 'a worthwhile criterion of the SW (probably up to Kent)'.

9. *sex:wex* 2029 is based on a rime of Anglian *sex* and the inf. *wex*[213].

12. The text contains a number of rimes of the type *behinde/finde:thousinde*, which depend on the ending *-ind* in 'thousand'. These rimes are found in the core text alone, in 879, 2010, 2363, 2869, 3085, 3110, 3130[214] and 4348[215].

13. Three rimes based on *slen* from OE *slēan* are found in the core text: *slen:ken* in 875, *fle:sle* in 2272 and *sle:be* in 4127[216]. One example occurs outside the core text in 5176 *slee:bee*[217].

14. There are a number of rimes where originally OF /ȳ/ rimes with OF /ū/. Already in OF and

---

[204] See Campbell, § 310-1.

[205] Smithers, KA p. 43.

[206] See Smithers, KA p. 48.

[207] See Karl Brunner, *An Outline of Middle English Grammar*, §69, note 21, and Note 2021.

[208] Smithers, KA p. 48.

[209] Jordan, pp. 98-9.

[210] See p. 76-8.

[211] Jordan, p. 89.

[212] Jordan, p. 102, remark 2.

[213] See also *wex/wox* under æ.

[214] 3158 A equals 3130 DE.

[215] For *þousand* as a rime-word in E2, see p. 57.

[216] 1310 A, C and D *slen:aȝen* is probably not the original rime, as *flen* is recorded in L, H and B. The variant *slen* probably came about because of confusion of f and *f*.

[217] The rime in E *sle:bee* 5176 is confirmed by C 7177 *slee:bee*, so A *me:be* is likely to be corrupt. For *slon* see 40.

AN there is proof that /ȳ/ had become /ū/, but it appears to have been particularly popular in ME. Brunner [218] attributes /ū/ for /ȳ/ to a lower class rendering of the sound, and Jordan[219] notes that 'the /ū/ pronunciation in the mouths of French speaking Englishmen is also ridiculed in OF'. The following rimes point to this pronunciation: 2133 A and 4045 AE *messauntere:toure* the rime in /ū/ has been obscured by unrounding of /ȳ/ before *r* to /e/ in *messauntere*; 2133 D *doure: toure*; in 1995 *nevou:vertu* the /ȳ/ in *vertu* is rimed with /iu/ in *neveu*.

16. There are three possible instances of the OE plural pronoun *he* as a rime word. The first example in 274 A (and H) is not at all certain because of variant readings in the other texts. Compare A *into Almayne þan ryden he* with D *in Almayn þei must sone be*, and with C 652 *in Alemayne, þe palmeres þre*. The second example occurs in 1759 *lepyn he* and the third in 1830 *weren he*. These are also supplemented by different rime-words in some of the texts, probably as rationalisations[220].

The use of the plural pronoun *he* indicates a date of composition before ON *þey* replaced it. This could have happened as late as the fourteenth century; compare the use of *he* in Havelok, which Smithers dates at no later than 1310[221], and that of *hi* in Dan Michel's *Ayenbite of Inwyt*, which dates from 1340[222].

17. Three rimes demand the pres. part. ending *-ynde* or *-ende*, which in our texts is rejected mostly in favour of later *-yng*: 1191 *fynde:seylyng*, 1734 *behynde:seylyng* and 4378 *wende:slepynde*.

Two rimes in RCL depend on the preservation of the weak class II ending of the verb: *warni: robri* in 1259 from OE *warnian* and *Henry:gouerny* in 2313. Both occur in the core text, are unlikely to be features of the North and East Midlands dialects and broadly indicate a Southern origin[223].

18. Rimes in the adverbial ending *-lich* are only found in the core text, apart from one example in 2773 *suche:sekerlyche*[224] in the first passage E. They occur in 919[225], 2059, 2151, 2197, 2881, 3989, 4035 and 4313[226]. For the later ending *-ly* see p. 41.

Points 1, 2, 3 and 4 indicate a SE/Kentish origin of the core text while the treatment of æ in *man* pl. and *aʒan* points to the Essex-London area; points 7, 12, 16, 17 and 18 support the contention of a post mid-thirteenth century date of the original text[227].

---

[218] K. Brunner, *An Outline of Middle English Grammar*, p. 30, remark 2.

[219] Jordan, p. 209.

[220] The reading in 1759 is shared by texts D and A. E, B and C (see Brunner's note to 2581) change the line, probably because the form *he* was not acceptable any more. In 1830 A, L and C 2646 preserve the reading, whereas D, E and B change the line, probably for the same reasons as in 1759.

[221] Smithers, *Havelok*, pp. lxiv-v; also p. lxxxii where he comments that pl. *he* is found in the middle of the line and once as a rime-word.

[222] Dan Michel, *Ayenbite of Inwyt*, ed. P. Gradon, EETS, vol. 23, 1965.

[223] See Wright, § 415.

[224] In *suche:sekerlyche* the original rime-word must have been *s(w)ich(e)*, a Southern form, see McIntosh, vol. 4, pp. 18-19.

[225] The ending in *manliche:hastiliche* could be either in *-lich* or in *-ly*; LADH share the former, BC 1801 the latter.

[226] Since in 1194, 1885 and 2161 both rime-words are adverbs/ or adjectives the original endings cannot be ascertained, but the spellings found in our texts indicate earlier *lich*, in DA 1194 *sodeyneliche:hougelyche* (against E *sodeynly: hydously*); *sikerliche:dedliche* in 1885; and *hastiliche:gentilyche* in 2161.

[227] See p. 72.

Evidence found in the Interpolations:

1. The SE reflex of OE y is the only certain reflex in the core text and is found exclusively in it[228], whereas the additions to RCL show the <i/y> rime[229]. Four examples are found in the captivity episode in 68, 109, 222 and 376; seven in the first passage E: 2497, 2535, 2557, 2631, 2651 and 2801; two in the second passage E: 3743 and 3770, and four throughout the other interpolations: 2976, 3236, 4238, 4746[230] and 5006[231].

3. Shortening of $\bar{æ}_1$ is rare in RCL and evidence of WS or Anglian origin is found only outside the core text and the captivity episode. Two rimes in the passages E1 and E2 give graphic evidence of WS shortening: *radden:dradden* (both derived from $\bar{æ}_1$) in 2589 and *ladde:rad* in 3323 (which combines shortened $\bar{æ}_1$ with $\bar{æ}_2$). Also found in E2 is graphic evidence of Anglian influence in *dred:gred* 3543 from OE *grædan* 'to cry out'.
The Anglian/SE rimes *adrad^{de}fledde* and *dred:bysted* occur in later interpolations, in 4241 and 4681 respectively[232].

7. The reflex of OE $\bar{e}o$ is generally <e> in our texts, both in the middle of the line and in rime position, e.g. *swerd. (es)* 1024 and 4299; *hert* 1802 and 2124; *erthe* 3093 and 3283[233]. However, in rime position these words are rare, apart from a series of *sworde* riming with *lorde* or *worde*[234]. Two examples are found in core text 1213 and 3147; otherwise they occur in the later interpolations: 2962, 3147, 4299, 4713 and 4991. No rimes in *sword* are found in the captivity episode or in the two passages E, nor is *swerd* found as a rime-word in the text.

9. The rime ȝ*ing:king* is found twice in the captivity episode in 536 and 651, and once in the *Gatris* episode in 4167. Whether ȝ*ing* is taken to be a Northern form[235], or whether, as Jordan[236] says unrounded y before palatals is found 'chiefly in the Southwest' with 'i after palatal ȝ further disseminated', this form was probably introduced in RCL because of its riming qualities.

13. Pp. and inf. forms, derived from *slo(n)* from ON *slā*, occur four times in the captivity episode, in 425, 446, 558 and 670[237]; the only other example is also found outside the core text, in 4403 *slon:fon*. Rimes based on the pp. *slawe* occur, all but 1478 outside the core text: 458, 487, 2755, 3249, 4521, 4586 and 5142[238].

---

[228] Only two possible SE rime-words are found outside the core text, but their confinement to the SE is disputed, see p. 36 and also footnotes 190 and 192.

[229] For potential examples of the reflex <i/y> in the core text, see p. 37.

[230] The rime *Saladyn:tyn* in 4745-6 is confirmed by B and C 6769-70 *Saladyne:tyne*, so text E *man:sowdan* must be considered corrupt.

[231] Brunner, RCL, pp. 39-40, and R. Loomis, JEGP 15 (1916) pp. 463-4, have far more examples, because C has more interpolations than any of texts ADEL.

[232] E avoids these rimes and inserts WS forms even if this destroys the rime.

[233] Only two *sword* spellings are found in our versions: 3147 D *suord* and 1213 A *swordes*. *Hert* is the only form of this word found in our texts. Only the spelling *erthe* is found but note the only occurrence in rime position of *erthe:worthe* in 3283-4, where the original rime was probably *erthe:werthe* but where *orthe:worthe* is also possible.

[234] For *sward* as a rime-word see p. 38.

[235] See Campbell, § 176, and Brunner, RCL p. 39.

[236] Jordan, p. 70.

[237] However, A and D have *sle* in the middle of the line throughout the text e.g. *sle* 572 and *sle* 610.

[238] The two rimes in pp. *sleyn* are corrupt (3216 A) or a later addition (322⁴ A).

18. The later adverbial ending *-ly* is found outside the core text, in the captivity episode *hastly:cry* 177, *cry:hastily* 233 and *hastily:lady* 501; in 4461 *ferly 'splendidly':trie*, which is found in D, E, and C 6515.

None of the interpolations shows the SE/Kentish rimes present in the core text and generally speaking the influence of the Midlands dialects is more pronounced, see points 1, 7 and 13. The adverbial ending *-ly*, discussed under 18 points towards a later date of composition.

Dialect Characteristics Common to the Core Text and the Interpolations:

2. The reflexes *þore* and *þare* from OE *þær* occur in several rimes, in the captivity episode in 249, 665 and 698, and in the core text in 1154, 1599, 1798, 2395, and also in the Gatris story in 4221. No examples are found in the two passages E1 and E2 or in the interpolations of 2951-3288[239] and 4479-5247.

10. I-mutation of OE *a* followed by a nasal produces *a* in *man* 'men'. This spelling originates in East Saxon and is called the Essex-London development by Smithers[240]. This rime-word is found both in the core text and all later interpolations except the captivity episode. The actual form appears in L 748 *Vrban:man*, D 2811 *man:tan* and 5170 A *sowdan:man*. In 3313, 4302, 4406 and 5170 it is difficult to say whether the rime was based on *than:man* or *then:men* but in the 1st + 4th examples A writes the East Saxon form. Otherwise *man* is rejected in favour of *men* in our texts, even if this means breaking up the rime, e.g. *men:began/þan* 1737, *men:swan* 2673 and *wan:men/þan* 4469.

For the rimes *man:aȝan* 1156 and *sowdan:aȝayn* 5180 compare Smithers[241], who gives examples of the distribution of *a* from OE *æ* + *gn* in KA and states that these forms are specifically Essex-London in distribution. 1156 is found in the core text and 5180 in the final interpolation.

5. The WS/Kentish and Anglian reflexes *ẹ* and *ō* of OE *ǣ* before *ld* are found in many rimes throughout the text, both in the core text and in the interpolations. In some cases Anglian(including Midlands) *ō* from unbroken *a* is used, e.g. *told* 1033 and 2003, *holde* 1588 and 1865, usually in response to a rime-word from the same category, e.g. *bold, cold* and *þold* 'suffered'[242]. In other cases WS *ẹ* is used to create a rime, e.g. *helde* 413, 1516 and 3002 to rime with *scheld, ȝelde* and *telde* from OE *teldian*; also *aqueld* 1761 to rime with *held*[243], *welde* 4162 with *elde* 'old age' and *(telde)* 3307 with *felde*.
Some rimes work in either two WS or two Anglian forms: in 1102 the WS reflex *aquelde:itelde* is found. Elsewhere the Anglian forms *tolde:solde* 1501 and 2019, *(vn)folde:beholde* 2645 and 2915, *holde:tolde* 3437 are preferred. In 4227 there is evidence of either reflex: D *weld:held* and

---

[239] The original rime in 3019 was probably not *þare:Lazare* which is shared by D and E but A *there:Offere*/C 4938 *Lafere*.

[240] Smithers, KA p. 47.

[241] Smithers, KA p. 47.

[242] Even though *bold* and *cold* were originally subject to the same *ea/o* variation, the WS reflex is not found anywhere in the text, so for these words the Anglian forms are treated as 'fixed'.

[243] The pa.t. form *held* found in E, A and H is more likely to constitute the original reading than D pp. or C 2584 inf. *held*.

E *wold:hold.*

No clear pattern of distribution emerges in ADEL or the interpolations. However, in the two passages E only Anglian rimes occur, apart from the rime in 3307 *(telde)felde.*

8. There are many rimes in ę̄ based on OE ēo, ē and OF ē, e.g. *thre:we* 325 and *pete:be* 513. Also found are rimes of historical ē̦ and ę̄, in which ę̄ was raised to ē̦. In the first place raised ę̄ may be the reflex of ǣ₂, a phenomenon indicative of the SE[244]. The most common rime-word in this group is *se* 'sea'. It occurs most commonly within the core text with seven examples between 1667 and 1923. Outside the core text one example is found in 3821, two occur in the captivity episode 255 and 273, and one in 4906 in the final interpolation[245]. The other rime-words in ǣ₂ occur outside the core text: *dele* 'deal' rimes with *lele* in the captivity episode 80; *brede* with *spede* in 4577; and *lere* with *here* in 4865 in the final addition to the text. *Dele* is also found three times with late shortening of ę̄ to ĕ riming with *welle* 6 5Q, *byfelle* 1192 and *speciel* 151?. In *haluendele:walle* 3868 early shortening of ǣ to ǣ̆ must have produced ă necessary to rime with *walle*. This is not typical of Kentish and unusual in the core text. The rime *castelle:walle* 1867 cannot be explained satisfactorily.

Secondly, rimes typical of Angl.-Kentish are found, in ǣ₁ riming with ē̦. This type is found throughout the text but not in E1 or E2[246]. *Dede* 'deed' riming with ē̦ is found most often, in 315, 1045, 1467, 1823, 3458 and 4709. Other rimewords include *were* riming with *here* 289, *dere* 1965, and *manere* 34C4; *ferede* and *felawred*[247] riming with *stede* 2057, *wedes* riming with *stedes* 308C and *shep* riming with *swep* in 4990 and *lep* in 5152.

Finally, a group of rimes is found throughout RCL with the reflex of ēa and ē̦, mainly where ēa is followed by a dental. Miss Mackenzie[248] was the first to point out that several texts from the SE contain examples of the reflex of ēa riming with ē̦ (but only from OE ē or ēo and never from lengthened e). Miss Fischer[249] responded to Mackenzie's article that all ME ę̄ rimes with ē̦ in the SE, regardless of their OE origins, especially before dentals, but not before s. Examples of this type are found in RCL in the noun *dede/deth* 'death' riming with *stede* in 1895, with *mede* in 2219, and with *beth* in 4683 A; in the adjective *dede* riming with *nede* in 1812 and *brede* with *fede* in 2667[250].

This leaves five rimes of ę̄ and ē̦ unaccounted for in RCL: *hep:kep* 917; Anglian *reme* riming with *flem* in 1356 L and *tem:hem* 4971 A; *sle:be/the*[251] in 4127 and *slen:ken* 875[252], four of which are found in the core text and one in the final interpolation. Fischer regards these as impure

---

[244] See Wright, § 52.

[245] 4906 looks like a later expansion of the text and it is only shared by AB. The lines in the C text (6925-6) were supplied from B.

[246] In E 2595 the opposite is found in the rime *were:forbere*, a rime in ę̄.

[247] The final element in both nouns is OE *ræden.*

[248] Barbara Mackenzie's *A Special Dialectal Development of OE ēa in Middle English*, EStn 61, 1927 pp. 386–92.

[249] Erna Fisher, *AE. ēa im Südostmittelenglischen und die Heimat des Südlichen Octavian*, Estn 64 (1929) pp. 1-19.

[250] However, if ēa is followed by s, raising does not take place in *les* and *hes* as the rime-word *pes* from OF *pais* has ę̄, e.g. *pres:les* 2303, *les:pes* 4183 and *hes:pes* 4953.

[251] The rime in 4127 was probably *sle:the* rather than *sle:be* compare C 6206.

[252] For *ken*, see also the discussion under under OE y, point 1.

rimes[253] but Dobson [254] argues that ME poets would not have used 'inexact or analogical rimes'. He prefers to think that there were 'variant pronunciations'. Since three of these rimes end in a nasal, there may be a case for an addition to Fischer's theory that the reflex of OE ēa followed by a dental (but not s) or a nasal rimes with ę in the SE.

11. In three rimes, the original rime-word must have been *scholde*, which is sometimes represented in our texts as *s(c)hulde*: *schulde:golde* in the captivity episode 677, and core text 1138 *mold:shulde* and 1963 *gold:schold*. It is difficult to assign definite territories to *scholde* and *schulde*, but the former appears to be most dominant in the SE and West ML[255].

13. *ware*, of ON origin, occurs twice in the core text: *ware:chaffare* 1657 (and 1661 where A repeats the rime)[256] and (ware)care 2269. Other examples are found in the final interpolation: *ware:care* 4725, *ware:bare* 4881 and *yare:ware* 4769 A. There is one example where *wore*, also of ON origin, forms a rime with *afoore* in 3535 in E2[257]. Note also *hoore:byfore*, found in 4872, in which *hoore* is based on ON *hār* 'hair'[258].

15. There are only a few rimes which can give us information about the plural endings of nouns. They are found in the core text and two of the interpolations. In the core text: *slen:ken* 'cows' 876, *sen:ben* 'bees' 2068 [259]; *flon* (from OE *flā*) riming with *ston* in 1354; and one possible example of an endingless plural *oþer:broþer* in 791[260]. In the captivity episode, the rime *frende* 'kinsmen':*wende* is found twice in 180 and 239; in 5151 *lep:shep*[261].

17. There are three rimes in which the Northern and Midland ending -s is found for the pr.t. 3rd pers. sg. One example occurs in the core text 3961 *tas:þas* and two in E2 3647 *telles:belles*[262] and 3757 *ros:gos*[263].

---

[253] Fisher, EStn 64 (1929) p. 9.

[254] E. J. Dobson, *English Pronunciation 1500-1700*, vol. ii, § 108, note 2.

[255] McIntosh, vol. 1, dotmap 159.

[256] Note that the original rime could have been *were:chaffere*.

[257] A has the greatest tolerance for these rimes, whereas DE prefer *were*. There is no evidence of *ware* in the middle of the line.

[258] See Wright, § 166.

[259] These rimes could originally have been endingless (see Brunner, RCL p. 44).

[260] The evidence in 791-2 is mixed, with a preference in L, B, and H for the corrupt pl. rime-word *breþer*, while A and C 1674 indicate through the pl. verb that *broþer* is to be taken as a pl. noun. However, the sg. verb and *brodyr* in D show that it is possible that a sg. construction was intended here and that the line meant 'and each of them kissed the other and became (his) sworn brother there'.

[261] A and E appear to be uneasy with *shep* as a plural, since they rephrase the line into *as hit were shep*.

[262] The E scribe appears to have tried to also add the Southern ending in the unemended reading *tellethes*.

[263] The vowel in *gos* is due to levelling of the stem vowel.

43

Section II

Text L

Two factors complicate analysis of the language of the scribe who copied the L version of RCL. In the first place, the emergence of a standard literary dialect can be perceived in his work, with many of the forms recorded typical of a wide area spanning the South and South Midlands. This distribution becomes even more apparent through the dot maps in McIntosh' *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediæval English*[264]. Secondly, assessment of manuscripts such as Auchinleck is complicated by the fact that there are so few surviving contemporary texts from the same area[265]. It is difficult to determine from the evidence of the L text alone what the exact nature was of the dialect of its scribe[266], since the rime evidence, discussed below, indicates that he followed the text of RCL closely. However, Samuels[267] was able, within the larger framework of the Auchinleck manuscript, to conclude that on linguistic grounds there seems no doubt that the dialect of this scribe is from the greater London area.

The spelling system of the L scribe is remarkably uniform and compared to McIntosh' Language Profile 6510 of Auchinleck[268] shows a more consistent and narrower band of variants.

There are a few examples in RCL of double spellings for long vowels: <ee> in *see* 'to see' 1843 and 'sea' *[se]*, and <ii> in *wiif* 740, *kniif* 1269 and 1298, *liif* 739 and 762, *Riis* 830, and *periil* 921[269]. Yet forms like *kniff*, e.g. 1270 are the norm. In 830 *Riis*, which has a long vowel, is rimed with *ywis*, which is short.

The distribution of <h> and <ȝ> 'gh' is narrowly defined, with <h> found only in the words *d(o)uhti*, e.g. 30 and *douhter*, e.g. 1327. Elsewhere <ȝ> occurs, e.g. *drouȝ* 1009, *þouȝt* 795, *diȝt* 1177, and *mistauȝt* 847.

There is a preference for Southern palatalised <ȝ>, e.g. *ȝaf* 750, yet Anglian *gate* occurs in 943. Palatal <c>, characteristic of the South, is found in words like *breche* 1239, *diche* 1869, *miche(l)* 1026, *swiche* 696, and in adverbial endings, e.g. *dedliche* 1886. For variation between *ich* and *y* ' I', see p. 46.

Both in *adreynt* in 1775 and *bleynt* in 1270, e + the group -nct become <eint>; compare DE *drenched*. Similarly e + /nʃ/ becomes <eins> in *Freyns*, e.g. 872 and 889[270]. The spelling of the rime-words *peyine:cheyine* in 1799-1800 is unusual.

The spelling <tv> for **tw** occurs in L, e.g. *atvo* 1375, *tvelue* 2035, *tventi* 1367 and the verb *tvingled* 1296.

o- spellings are found in initial position in words like *oȝa(i)n*[271] 'again(st)' e.g. 922; *oway* 740,

---

[264] A. McIntosh, *Linguistic Atlas*, vol. 1.

[265] See also Smithers, KA p. 43.

[266] For scribe 1, see p. 6 ff.

[267] Samuels, English Studies 44 (1963) p. 87.

[268] McIntosh, vol. 3, pp. 305-6, whose analysis is based on parts of *St Mergrete, St Katerine, Guy of Warwick* and *Sir Orfeo*.

[269] J. Smith, *Linguistic Features of Some Fifteenth-Century Middle English Manuscripts* in *Manuscripts and Readers in Fifteenth Century England*, p. 112, notes that these spellings 'suggest the East Central Midlands, stretching into parts of East Anglia.'

[270] Note also *Inglis* in 1034.

[271] The spelling *ogain* is also found in AM but not in KA, see French, JEGP 45 (1946) p. 128. M. L. Samuels

oside 1900 and *oseyl* 1928.

Both <er> and <ar> spellings occur in *er* 1363 and *ar* 1416; otherwise words appear to develop particular spellings: *arliche* 1537, *erchebi chop* 1857, and *starling* 2042.

'Through' is consistently spelled þ*urth*, e.g. 12[272].

Text L has a tendency to drop initial **h** in words of French origin, e.g. *onest* 901, *air* 'heir' 741, and *omage* 1539.

French influence can be seen in the spelling of *stiele* in a rime with *wele* in 1023, 1366 and 1951, in which <ie> is an AN spelling for native $\bar{e}$[273].

1. In rime position, L preserves the SE/Kentish reflex of OE **y** best of all texts, e.g. *kest* 'kissed':*best* 867, *tre-castel:hel* 987 and *slen:ken* 'cows' 875. In the middle of the line, both Kentish and Southern forms are found, e.g. *(o)fer* '(on) fire' 1829, 1830, 1834, and *wild-fire* 1020 and 1828; *dint* 12, and *kist* 791 and 1851. This mixture indicates that L was familiar with SE forms but was probably not from this area himself. Apart from *ofer*, which may have been a preferred spelling, he appears to favour the more neutral **i** forms in the middle of the line.

2. All texts, including L, reject Kentish *heven* 'harbour' 1808 and substitute *haven*, presumably because of the unfortunate homophonic clash with *heven* 'heaven'.
   The reflex **a**, typical of Essex-London[274], is found in *pans* 'pence', which is used consistently in the text, e.g. 2026, and *man*, which is found once in 748 as the plural for 'men'. Otherwise *men* is used.

3. Shortening of $\bar{æ}_1$, typical of the WS dialect, is only found once in *ladde* 1435.
   The WS variant *rady* 'ready' occurs in 1399; Anglian/Kentish *redi* in 1278.

5. L faithfully copies the original rimes in WS/Kentish $\bar{e}$ or Anglian $\bar{\rho}$ from OE **ĕa + ld**, apart from *yheld:yþold* 1865, where a WS form is wrongly inserted. *yseld* 1502, which forms part of an incomplete rime - 1501 is illegible - also suggests a preference for the WS form. Otherwise Anglian rimes are copied without change, e.g. 2019. In the middle of the line mixed distribution is found, with WS forms more common.
   Only WS <-ey(ʒ)> is found from OE **ĕa + g**, e.g. *sey(ʒ)e* 'saw' 1845 and 1899; and *leyʒing* 'laughter' 1237[275]

6. The reflex of OE **ēa** before χ is <ei> in the form þ*ei* 'though' in 1393, which was probably chosen to solve the problem of homonomy of 'they' and 'though' by careful distinction of the spellings þ*ai* and þ*ey*[276]. The þ*ei* spelling is found throughout England, but particularly in the WML[277].
   OE *-ēah* is spelled < *-eyʒe*> in L, e.g. *eyʒen* 1296 and *heyʒe* 'high' 929. Yet there is evidence that this was a convention only, since in rimes like *yseye* 'saw' :*crie* 1451, the pronunciation

---

in *Some Aplications of Middle English Dialectology*, English Studies 44 (1963) p. 87, note 8, remarks that '*oʒain(s)* is a very rare form in Southern texts.'

[272] See Bliss, Speculum 26 (1951) p. 658, note 5.

[273] See Jordan, p. 83, remark 1.

[274] See p. 41.

[275] See Wright, p. 55.

[276] See M. L. Samuels, *Linguistic Evolution*, p. 71).

[277] McIntosh, vol. 1, dotmap 201.

must be /ī/.

9. L has only the Anglian variant in *sex*, e.g. 969; *sexten*, e.g. 913; and *sexti*, e.g. 1933.

11. *schuld* is used throughout text L, apart from one instance of *schold* in a rime with *gold* in 1964[278].

12. The OE ending *-end* in 'thousand' is the most common, e.g. 876, but *-ind* is found once as a rime-word in 879. ON influenced *-and* is found once, in 1983, in the middle of the line.

14. The spelling of <ou> in words like *sour* 'sure', e.g. 1430, and *douk* 'duke', e.g. 756, indicates that in L OF /ȳ/ and /ū/ have fallen together.
   In L *destrue:anoye* 2055 either *destruien* was influenced by the doublet *anoien/enuien* [279] or because of confusion between the two forms of the verb 'to destroy' [280], *destroien* from *destrŭcere* and *destruien* from *destrūcere*[281]. 2055 *destrue* would have the spelling of the latter and the pronunciation of the former.

15. In text L, the plural of nouns is usually formed in '-es'. Plurals like *doggen* 996 are rare, but there are some examples of the genitive without '-s': *king Baudewine sone* 742 and *þemperour steward* 1284[282] and *þemperour douhter* 1408. Mustanoja remarks that the use of a proper name or a personal noun without *-s* is mainly a Northern feature[283]. The first two examples may have been influenced by the fact that the noun following the gen. begins with s. In *for Mari loue*, shared by A and L 1317, we have an example of a fossilised feminine ending.

16. The OE pronouns have been retained apart from the third person plural where invariably the ON borrowing *þai* is used. *Ich* 'I', e.g. 27, is found, when followed by a word beginning with a vowel, and *y*, e.g. 821, when followed by a consonant. The accusative form of *we* is *ous*, e.g. 919, never *vs*. There are a number of contracted forms of *ich* and the following word, eg. *icham* 1406, *ichil* 29, *ichim* 1259; one with *þou* in *woldestow* 1586. Compare also *nis* 1425, and *nas* 1361 for 'ne is' and 'ne was'. The definite article is also found in contraction in *þemperour*, e.g. 757 and *þerl*, e.g. 759. *A* and *an* are used for the indefinite article, whereas *o* and *on* are used for the cardinal number 'one'.

17. OE weak class II inf. endings are preserved in forms like *sayly* 1810 and *wondy* 928 and also in the 1st person verb form *warni* 1259. The preservation of these endings indicates a Southern origin for text L. Otherwise the distinctive spellings of this class of verbs have been levelled out, e.g. the pr.t. pl. form *makeþ* in 7[284]. OF verbs whose stem ends in a consonant are assimilated into weak class II verbs and show *i* in the inf., e.g. *armi* 930, *avengy* 752 and *mini* 2093.

   There is a great variety of forms for the imp. pl., e.g. 993 *drisses* and 994 *kestes*, which are

---

[278] See also p. 43.

[279] See K. Luick, *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache*, § 417.3.

[280] Jordan, p. 215, remark.

[281] Dobson, vol. ii, § 255, note 1. prefers the latter explanation.

[282] This reading is shared by by A, D and L.

[283] T. Mustanoja, *A Middle English Syntax*, p. 72.

[284] See Wright, § 415.

Northern, and 995 *scheteþ*, which is typical of the Midlands and South. Compare also 975 *armi*, which is unmarked, and in the next line *holdeþ*.

The prefix *a-*, which is nearly always meaningless, is often found in OE verbs like *aquel* 1916, and *agramed* 846, and in OF verbs like *apoisoun* 1916.

There are only three present participles in L: *seyland*, which occurs twice in 1233 and 1923, and *flinging* which occurs once in 1978. L lacks the passages which contain rimes in *-ynde/ende*. The past participle retains *y-* from OE *ge-*, which is typical of the SE and SML[285]. Infinitive forms in *y-* also occur, e.g. *ycrie* 981 and *yhere* 26, which Jordan remarks[286] is typical in infinitives after verbs like *myȝt*, but there are also examples in L of *-ge* in the declined verb: *yher* 1863, imp.; *yseyȝe* 989, 3 sg. pa.t.; and *yseye* 1451, 3 pl. pa.t.

18. There are many adverbial phrases consisting of *a-* and *o-*, which are weakened forms of the OE prepositions *on* and *in*, plus a noun, e.g. *amorwe* 829, *amidward* 1808, *atvo* 1375, and *olond* 1848, *oniȝt* 1401, and *ofer* 1830. *An* and *on* plus noun form similar adverbial phrases, e.g. *an heye* 1396 and *tales on Englis* 1034. The adverbial phrase *afine* 777 is of OF origin. The weakened form *o* of the preposition *of* is used in *þe king o Fraunce* in 1849 and *a tale o schrewed auentours* in 1861-2. Like the original text, L has *-lich(e)* only - and not *-ly* - as the adverbial ending, e.g. the rime *sodeynlich:sothlich* in 1194 and *hastilich* in 1259 in the middle of the line.

Text A

Text A differs from the other texts in two respects: its dialect is SW rather than SE and there are two scribes, who wrote in a very similar script and dialect, rather than one. The first, Robert Moille, was responsible for ll. 1-2344 [287]. At this point, l. 2345, the second scribe, to be called Z, took over and completed RCL.

Several differences in spelling distinguish the writing of Moille and scribe Z. <Þ> is the norm in Moille, whereas in Z <th> is the most common by far, with only four examples of <þ>: *þerfore* in 2345 (the first line copied by Z), *leteþ* in 2382, and *þat* and *þerunder* in 4218.

There is also a tendency for Moille to maintain post-tonic e at the end of a word, which is even added where it would not have been part of the OE word, e.g. *ayene* 478, *bade* 585, *adoune* 1014. Scribe Z does not do this, e.g. *ayen* 3850, *bad* 2868, *adoun* 2922.

The spelling <uy> is found in Moille only, in the words *fuyre* 401, 403 etc. and *huyde* 'skin' 2015. Both are SW reflexes of OE *y*. <uy> is also used in the rime-words *suyn̊cropuyr̊* of OF descent in 1430-31.

The following forms are characteristic of and mutually exclusive in Moille and in Z:

1. Moille:
ich; nom. *þou, þow*; dat./acc. *yow* 'you'; *worlde, thour(u)gh, brother, (an)other, myche(lle)*; *Goddes, thousand, yeve*.

2. Z:

[285] See Jordan, p. 145.

[286] See Jordan, p. 145.

[287] See also the Description of the Manuscript on pp. 14 ff.

y; nom. *thugh*; dat./acc. *yogh* 'you'; *wordle, thurgh, brothur, (an)othur, much(el)*; *Godes, thousend/t, yiue.*

But despite these differences Moille and Z can be remarkably alike, and since their dialect and spelling are very similar, they will be treated together unless it is stated otherwise.

Both share forms characteristic of SW spelling practices: *hii* 'they', e.g. 366 and 2396[288]; *hure* 'their', e.g. 239 and 2434; and *dude* 'did' 390 and 2442.

Other SW <u> spellings occur throughout the text, in words like: *thuder* 'thither' 227, 2943 etc, *marbul* 4189, *that ulke*, 2951 and *thulke* 'the same' 286, 4237 etc. <u> also occurs in word endings in Z, e.g. *brothur* 3206, *anothur* 2824, *lengur* 3932, *lardur* 4079, and *whathur* 'whether' 503*6*. It is found in pl. noun endings in Moille but not in Z, e.g. *kyngus* 368, and *shippus* 783; also in the rare verbal endings in Z *makuth* 493*7* and *restust* 3913.

togadre, found in 2921 is typical of the SW[289], and also *aye* 'again', which occurs once as a rime-word in 2432 and once in the middle of the line in 4307[290].

Both Moille and Z tend to represent /ʃ/ after a vowel as <ssh>, e.g. *flessh* 282 and 3218, and *Englissh* 890 and 3194. Note also *disshonour*, 1111 and 1241, and *dissonour(re)*, 1319 and 1444. **e** + the palatal group **-nct** becomes <-e(i)nt> in *adreynt* 1775. *Blent* in 1270 is probably a scribal error for *bleint*.

Two curious spellings are found shortly after Z has taken over: *wrth* 2422 'worth', and *wlt* 2423, 2nd pers. sg. pr.t. of *willen*. Comparable spellings are found in the *Owl and the Nightingale*, e.g. *wlt* 499, *wrþ* 548, and *wrs* 34. It is not clear whether <o> or <u> spellings are to be inferred, but compare *wolte* 520 and *worth* 4402.

A often has <gh> or <ȝ> rather than the later spelling <w> found in D, e.g. *yargh:nargh* 4803, yet there is evidence that velar ȝ was being vocalised, e.g *brouten* 696, *not:broght* (pp.) 527, and *inough:rowe* 1659. The back spellings *hogh* 3978, and *smyghte*, the imp. form of *smiten* 411, suggest that both velar and palatal ȝ had become silent.

There is some evidence of devoicing at the end of the word, especially of **d** in *thousent* which occurs six times in Z, between 3077 and 4139. Devoicing of *-ed* in weak pa.t. verbs occurs in *thonket* 722, *wolte* 520 (otherwise *wolde*), and in the rime *telte:dwelte* 3001. Syncope and devoicing are found in *gurt* 3170 from OE *gyrdan.

Atte, an assimilated form of 'at the', is found throughout the text, e.g. *atte turnament* 218, but *att*, ɑnoᵗʰɛr‚ variant spelling of 'at', is only found in Z, except possibly the expression *att laste* in 4615, which could be scanned as *so átt(e) láste* or *só att láste*.

Devoicing of **v** to **f** at the end of the word is found in the rimes *wif:arif* 1182 and *silf:twelf* 3177; also in the verb *saf* 578 in the middle of the line.

Examples of initial voicing of **f** are found in *vif* and *vifty* which occur in 960 and 2169, and 1637 and 1951 respectively. *Uorþe* is found once in 245. These examples occur in Moille only and are typical of the South. *fenge* 963 'to avenge' and *fesselle* 1963, again found in Moille, possibly show devoicing at the beginning of the word; on the other hand they may be back spellings[291].

1. Although the dialect of A differs in many ways from the original SE dialect in which RCL was

---

[288] Note that the change of scribe occurs in l. 2344.

[289] McIntosh, vol 1, dotmap 540, p. 439.

[290] *Aye* without final **n** is typical of the SW, see McIntosh, vol 1, dotmap 231, p. 362.

[291] **f** in *fenge* may be a scribal error influenced by *fonde*, which follows it.

written, text A preserves spellings of the SE rimes remarkably well, e.g. *kest:best* 867. It is interesting that A should retain these forms rather than D and E, which are both from the SE. The explanation for this may lie in the fact that e spellings are also found in the SW[292].

The text shows clearly that the Kentish reflexes of OE y are usually preserved in the rimes, while in the middle of the line SW forms are found. Where A rejects the Kentish rimes, SW vowels are mostly substituted, e.g. *fuyre* 2210, *luste* 3856, and *lardur:on fur* 4079. In three cases <i/y> spellings are found: *hille* in 988 and 4013, and *dynt* in 1132. In the middle of the line, SW forms are the norm, e.g. *dunt* 2355, *hulle* 3076, and *furst* 1885. Other forms include *hud* 'hid' 1599, *gurt* 3170 from OE **gyrdan*, *sulle* 'to sell' and the adverb *dure* 'dearly' 4784; *pulche* 4782 from OE *pylece*, *lufte* 4043 from OE *lyft* and *knut* 1974 from OE *knyttan*. The pa.t. of the verb 'to do' is nearly always *dude*.

2. A retains Essex-London *pans* 'pence' in 2026, 2027, 2029, 2035 and 2036. It also preserves the rime-word *man*, the plural for 'men', remarkably well, e.g. in 4302 and 5170. There are a few exceptions in 1738 *bygan:men*, and in 2811 where *men* is made to rime with *taen*, a pp. with the stress on the second syllable (compare D *man:tan*). East Saxon *shipman* is also found in 4960, which is part of an interpolation.

3. The reflex of shortened $æ_1$ is predominantly WS a in the middle of the line, e.g. *lad* 1614, *dradde* 2347 and *radde* 546. The only rime in $æ_1$ in A is based on Angl.-Kentish: *dred:bysted* 4681.

5. While no WS forms are found in the middle of the line, A follows the original rimes in *-eld* and *-old* from OE ĕa + ld, with the exception of *aquelde:itolde* 1102, a rime which could either be formed in ǭ or ę̄ but where Anglian *itolde* was probably inserted later. In 2915 the original rime based on ēa is changed into one based on ēo. In 1049 the rime was changed, probably to avoid the unacceptable Kentish/WS rime *pelt:beheld*[293]. The doublet from OE *eldo/yldo* causes two different spellings for 'to wield', WS *welde* to rime with *elde* in 4227 and *wielde* to rime with *ylde* in 4162. The <ie> spelling in *wielde* may have been influenced by AN <ie> for /ē/, of which there is one other example in *stielle* 1024.

In the case of OE ea + χ, WS forms are mostly found: *sey* 'saw' 331, 506 etc. (once in 5022 Anglian *saw*) and *lighhyng* 1237[294].

6. The reflex of i-mutated ēa is mainly SW /ȳ/ e.g. *hure*, 246 and 4154, and *hurde* 'to hear', 1438 and 2349, and *stule* 'steel' 4209, but Anglian forms do occur as well and are mainly found as rime-words.
A tends to have doublets for words derived from OE *ēah*, e.g. *heyh* 2457, *heȝe* 1507, and *high* 'high' 1122, . etc. The spelling *eyren* 1376 and normal *iren* 1720 from OE *īren*, and *galeys:boterflyes* 1691 and *an hygh:neigh* 1729 imply that <ey> is a back spelling because ey had become ī.

7. OE ēo is mainly unrounded to <ē> but there are 14 examples of <eo> spellings to be found throughout the text, e.g. *beoth* 'we are' 1673, *beon* 'bees' 2068, *deor* 'deer' 3230, and *eorles* 3858.

---

[292] See McIntosh, vol. 4, pp. 204-5.

[293] See the Original Dialect p. 36.

[294] See Wright, p. 55

The retention of <eo>, /ø/, is typical of the SW, yet the rime *charite:beo* 1518 and the spelling of *heo* 'he' 2071 indicate that <eo> was probably more a spelling habit than an indicator of the pronunciation /ø/[295].

Raising of /ø/ from OE ēo is also shown in forms like *huld(e)* 'held' 1449 and 2945 etc. and *fulle* 'fell' 3232. *Fulled*, pa.t. 'fell' 5024 must be due to confusion with the pa.t. of 'to fill'. *Sturne* 1728 and 2976, from i-mutated **eo**, is another form typical of the SW.

eo + **w** yielded <iw>, e.g. *trywe* 'true' 2434 and *triwes* 'truce' 5180 and also <ew> e.g. *trewe* 214 and *trewes* 2281, *treuthe* and *reuthe* 1609-10.

8. Both Moille and Z show variation in <e> and <i>. This vacillation is found in the rimes, e.g. *hurdes:ywys* 4105, *iwys:hethenesse* 2299, *Braundes:pris* 247, *Gaters:pris* 4157[296], and *Acres:blys* 2887.

Z rimes *kyng* in 3095 and *kynge* in 5140 with the form *geng* 'army', which evidently he preferred over the later, ME variant *gyng*, which must have made up the original rime. Another example of a corrupt rime is found in *silf:twelf* 3177 with *silf* of lWS origin.

The opposite tendency is found in *thekke* 1355, from OE *þicce*. *Thenke* in the rime *thenke:drinke* 293 may be due to confusion with *thenken* 'to think' and *senk* 'sink' 1200 may have been influenced by the transitive OE verb *sencan*.

The OE forms *selke* and *seluer* 678, 3256 etc. and ON *silk* etc. and *siluer* 3254 and 1634 etc. are found side by side, the latter in Moille only. The form *selke* appears once in a rime with *mylke* 575.

Note also *lis* 2939 for *les*, pa.t. of 'to lose', and *dithes* 4449, the gen. of 'death'.

Since the normal spelling for the pl. form 'saw' is *seye* in A, *isayen* in a rime with *ascrien* 1451 is puzzling and may be a backspelling.

9. WS *six* is the norm in both Moille and Z and is used in 2029 *sixe:onwexe*, thereby creating a corrupt rime. However, Anglian *sexti* is found in Moille in 1219, and *sexty* and *sexti* in 2149 and 2174.

The normal spelling for 'ditch' is *diche*, 2059 etc, especially when it is used as a rime-word. Yet between 4007 and 4035 *duch(es)* is found five times, the last time in a rime with *sycourliche*. This would imply that <u> may have been a spelling convention only[297].

10. *goude* 'good' occurs five times in Moille. It is probably an attempt to differentiate between /ō/ and /ǭ/ rather than an indication of the transition to /ū/[298]. The form *gude* is recorded once in 1108 but otherwise the spelling is *go(o)de*.

11. ū can be represented by <ou> or <u>, e.g. 2955 *doutus:perillous*, 851 *suche:crouche* and 676 *house:Jhesus*.

Moille alone uses *shuld(e)*, which he also inserts in the three rimes where *scholde* is required, in rimes with *golde* and *molde* in 677, 1139 and 1964. *Shold(e)* is found mainly in Z, with six examples of *shold(e)* in Moille in 362, 695, 706, and 2216.

---

[295] Note also that the spelling of OF *ue* had fallen together with OE *ēo*. This can be seen in *meoble* 4472, and the various spellings for 'people' *pople, puple* and *peple*.

[296] Compare D and C 6233 *Gatris:pris*.

[297] For other examples of <u> spellings in A, see p. 48.

[298] See Jordan, p. 84.

12. In Moille only Scandinavian influenced *-and* is found for 'thousand', even when rimed with *windes* 2009. In Z *thousend/thousent* is most common but *thousynd* is also found twice in a rime with *byhynd* in 2869 and 3157.

14. The spelling of *destroye:annye* 2055 can be explained by the existence of the doublet *anoien: enuien*[299], for OF /yi/ had become /ī/ already in AN [300].

16. A is the only text in which both the OE pronoun *hii*, e.g. 366, 2400, and ON *they*, e.g. 176, occur for the nom. plural. For the rest of the declension only OE forms are found, e.g. *her(e)*, e.g. 1237, *hure*, e.g. 239, and *hem*, e.g. 197.

17. There are three examples of the syncopated 3rd person sg. pr.t.: *stant* 454, *sent* 2289 and *halt* 4272. Text A makes use of the the historic present more than any other text, e.g. *thonketh* 1426, *graunteth* 4183, and *conforteth* 4860.

    The pres. part. ending is always *-yng* or *-ing*, even when the original rime was in OE *-end* or *ind*, e.g. *fynde:sailyng* 1190. In 1734 A changes the line to avoid such a rime.

    Contractions of *ne* + verb are common and are found throughout the text, e.g. *nere* 2022, *nas* 1075 and *nadde* 2340. They are typical of the South and WM[301].

    There is one example of the preservation of the ending *-y* characteristic of the weak class II verb in *blery* 2866; note also *journy* 853 and *crouny* 4268 of OF descent.

    In Moille quite a few verbs maintain **a-** for the OE prefix **ge-** or **a**, e.g. *ahelde* pa.t. of *gehealdan/ahealdan* 1207 but also *asaued* pa.t. 1205 from OF *sauver* and *aselid* pp. 4484 from OF *seeler*.

    Moille reversed some verbal endings: *lithe* 685 'lieth', *amayde* 537 (riming with *betrayed*) and *cried* 1316 (riming with *abide*). It is not clear if they had any phonetic significance.

18. A uses both adverbial suffixes *-lich* and *-ly* in the middle and at the end of the line, e.g. the rimes *sodeynlich:sothlich* 1194 and *hastely:cry* 177; in the middle of the line *grymliche* 1243 and *hendely* 1266.

Text D

The dialect and spelling of D place it firmly in Norfolk. Apart from features characteristic of this area, a mixture of Northern and Southern forms is also found.

OE words beginning with **wh** are spelled <qw>, e.g. *qwanne* 119, *qwere* 164, *qwat* 98, *qwo* 859, *qwyle* 1154, and *qwyth* 'white' 113. This spelling practice is typical of the North and EML[302]. Forms like *wo(so)* 'who(ever)' 1117 and 1118, *whoso* 1709 and *the whilis* 'while' 1670, are exceptions to the rule. Words derived from OF are normally spelled <qu>, e.g. *quarelle* 1015, with the exception of *qweynt* 4155. Sometimes <u> is used for **w** in words of non-French origin, e.g. *suylke* 1588, *suord* 3147, *tuenty* 879, and *tuenkelyd* 1296.

Loss of *w* is indicated in *to(o)* 'two', e.g. 277 and *ato* 'in two' 1375, and also in *qod* 'quoth', e.g.

---

[299] Luick, § 417.3.

[300] See also the Description of Dialect L on p. 46.

[301] Mustanoja, p. 339.

[302] See Jordan, p. 179.

225.

The following words are spelled with <w> for /h/ in initial position: *wow* 'how' 1791 (and probably also *wou* 4193), 1976 *wo(m)ward* 'homeward', 2030 *wost* 'host' and 2959 *wond* 'hand'. The spelling of <w> for <h> preceding ǭ is more common than that preceding ọ̄[303] for which evidence is found from the early fifteenth century onwards. The OED notes that the pronunciation *wom* covered a wide area.

Spelling evidence points to the labialisation of χ to **w** when following back vowels, e.g. *nowt* 50, *thow* 1425 'though', *throw* 1070 'through', *tow* 1128, *ifrawt* 1673 and *brout* 1161. These <w> spellings are commonly found in East Anglia[304]. There is even one example where ȝ is added unnecessarily: *douȝte* 2213 'doubt' showing clearly that *ouȝ* is [ou].

<f> spellings for original χ are rare, apart from *þof* 'though' 1101 etc, which is typical of the North.

Sometimes there is evidence of the survival of [ç] following a front vowel, e.g. in *knyhtes* 36 and *knyȝtes* 890, but usually the spelling is <th> or <t>, e.g. *knyth* 37, *knyt* 68 and *lyth:myth* 469–70, which are typical of the Norfolk area.

The rime-word *ȝelde* 4161 D 'old age' could have been influenced by *ȝeld*, the Kentish variant of the adjective, but it is more likely to have been part of 'a widespread but sporadic tendency for a glide [j] to develop before the long front vowels ẹ̄ and ę̄ ...... the process of development of the [j] glide clearly begins before 1400'[305]. ȝ is also found in *mediȝerde* in 4245, probably because it was derived from OE *geard*, not from *eorþe*.

The spelling <th> for /t/, characteristic of the Norfolk dialect, is found in D, e.g. *qwyth* 'white' 113 and 576, *þespith*, the noun 'despite' 1103 and 1536, the imp. *smyth* 470, and also *dreynth* 1710, pp. of 'drenchen'. Its rime-word *afeynth* 1709 may show the same phenomenon or be due to syncope of *afeynteth*. The reverse of this, i.e. the spelling <t> for /th/ is also found, which, like further examples of variation in <th>, appears to be idiosyncratic to the scribe: *tet* 'teeth' 1268, *hat* 'hath' 1864, and *det* 'death' 2446. Þ*hout* (from OE *þyncan*) appears in 2236, and in 2900 (from OE *þencan*); *þhrow* 'through' in 671 and 4424, and *þath* in 2067.

<th> is also written for /d/. This vacillation occurs mainly at the beginning of the word in *thorst* 397, *þelay* 400 and in *þespith* 1103, 1343 and 1536. *There* in 286, which is probably an alternative form of A *dere* 'dear, expensive', must also belong to this category. The reverse is also found: *dennys* 257, *dore* 665, *clodes* 1475, *dus* 347, *dusse* 1544 and *ford* 3852 and variants like *oþer* 1496, and *oder* 732, *broþer* 4306, and *broder* 912 occur side by side.

There are quite a few examples of intrusive <h> in D, e.g. *hore* 602, *heuyn* 527, *hete* 396, *heyerne* 517, *hopenyd* 637 and *haut* 4311 (from *owen*). Note also *harm* 626 and 627, and *arm* in 633 and 2355 with the **h** expuncted; *hassis* 4334, and *asse* 2040 with the **h** expuncted. The only example of a dropped **h** is found in 3113 *is* for 'his'. Jordan[306] notes that 'severe alterations of the *h* writing in accented syllables rest in general upon French influence.'

<ch> occurs beside <sch>, e.g. *chew* 'show' 136, *chip* 1177, *chep* 1078 'ship', *cheld* 1295, *chotчn* 1351 and *chenchip* 'disgrace' 3104. <sh> does not occur in D, hence the emendation of *settyn*

---

[303] See Dobson, vol. ii, § 431, note 3, and the article on **wh** under that digraph in the OED.

[304] McIntosh, vol 4, pp. 83 and 98-9.

[305] Dobson, vol. ii, p. 993 ff.

[306] Jordan, p. 178.

to *schettyn* 'to close', in 943.

The spelling *xal* 'shall', a form exclusive to East Anglia[307] cannot count as a diagnostic criterion, because it only occurs once in 2308. *Schal* is used otherwise.

<scl> for <sl> occurs three times in words of OE origin: *scleve* 607, the infinitive *sclein* 1310 and pp. *sclayn* 4253[308].

Some features, associated with the North, are found in spellings such as *gud*, which occurs six times, e.g. 148, alongside more common *good*, e.g. 61. The distribution of *os*[309], e.g. 42, alongside *as*, e.g. 37, is about equal. Of Scandinavian origin is <g> in words like *ageyne*, e.g. 166, and *(for)gaf*, e.g. 1552; also the spelling of *ilke* 'each', e.g. 1060, *mekyl* 'much', e.g. 68, and *swylke* 'such', e.g. 388[310]; *kerke* in 48, *kyrke* in 1599, and *dyk* 1873 beside *dych* 2197.

1. The reflex of OE *y* is spelled predominantly <y> both in the rimes and in the middle of the line. However, there are some SE forms e.g. *heddyn* 'hid' 2083, *ffellyn* 'to fill' 2152, and *knette* 2870 from OE *knyttan*. SE/Kentish *fere* 'fire', e.g. 401 is found in the middle of the line and *ferst*, e.g. 55, occurs more often than any other variant. In *pult:beheld* 1049 *pult* is probably a SW variant of SE/Kentish *pelt* (from OE *pyltan*).

2. D rejects all rimes with Essex-London *man* for 'men', apart from *man:tan* 'taken' 2811.
Both pa.t. forms *kest*, e.g. 1020 and 1828, and *kast*, e.g. 1613 and 1956, from ON *kasta* occur side by side. The vowel in the former is due to analogy with *lesten* according to Luick[311]. However, d'Ardenne[312] states that the variation between these forms is probably due to the transference of the verb to Strong Class VII and the analogy of verbs such as *wax*, pa.t *wex*. This started in the North and gradually spread to the South.
The spelling *gres* 'grass' in 3209 is another example of vacillation of <e> and <a>.

3. East Saxon influence can be seen in *lat(e)*, 1 sg. pr.t. $\overset{subj.}{\vee}$ 2382 and adhortative/imp. 2376 of 'to allow'[313]. $\ae_1$ is retracted to $\bar{a}$ in a small area in the SE with Essex as its centre[314]. For *latting* 'hindrance' see Note 1800.
The reflex of shortened $\ae_1$ is Angl.-Kentish e only, e.g. *dredd* 2347[315].

5. The WS/Kentish reflex of OE *ēa* plus **ld** is found twice in the pp. *aqueld* 'killed' in 1102 and 1761, which D rimes with the WS pp. *iteld* 'told' and *held*. There are only three other examples of WS rimes in D: pr.t. *held:scheld* 413, *weld:held* inf. 4227 and ꝫ*elde:bewelde* inf. 4161. In all other rimes Anglian $\bar{\rho}$ occurs. In two of these, D rimes *hold* inf. with the two forms ꝫ*old* inf. 1515 and *told* inf. 3001 which cannot be derived from OE *geldan* and *teldian* respectively.
In the middle of the line, *weld* 4489 is the only WS form, otherwise Anglian forms are found.

The reflex of OE *ea* before χ is Anglian *au*, e.g. *saw* 81 etc. and *lawyng* 'laughter' in 1237.

---

307 See McIntosh, vol. 4, pp. 38 and 40-1.
308 See Jordan, p. 189.
309 See McIntosh, vol. 4, pp. 61 and 313.
310 *swyche* 306 and *siche* 4620 are probably corrupt (see Notes).
311 Luick, § 382, anm. 2.
312 S. d'Ardenne, Þe *liflade ant te Passiun of Seinte Iuliene*, EETS 248 (1961) p. 161.
313 The imp. form *lat* is also found in Chaucer, see *The works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. F. N. Robinson, p. 960.
314 See Luick, § 362.
315 See Jordan, p. 78.

8. In the rime 1145 DE *Messene:bone*, *bone* is derived from ON *bōn*, whereas the original rime-word must have been OE *bēn*.

   D has the spelling <ey> not only for words derived from OE *ēh* but also for some derived from OE and OF *ī*, e.g. *heyerne* 'iron' 517. In rimes such as *hey:glory* 1031, *galey :Surry* 1613, and the backspelling *reyde:cheyde* 1122, the pronunciation must have been /i/, showing that the value of *ey* and *i* had become identical.

9. i is lowered to e in *tuenkelɥd* 'to twinkle' 1296, *splentes* 'splints' 3097, and *chep* 'ship' 1078. In the latter case lowering is possibly due to the influence of /ʃ/[316].

   Anglian *sex* 'six' is much more common than WS *six*.

11. D has *schulde* only, even where *scholde* is required to create a rime in 677, 1139 and 1964.

12. D uses only the ON influenced ending *-and* in *þousand* 879, 3110 etc, even where the OE ending *-ind* is needed.

15. Both Southern *-es* and Northern *-is/ys* occur as plural endings of nouns but plural nouns without *-s* are also found: e.g *erle* 808, 832 etc, *(f)frend* 217 and 225; *Grifoun* 976, *massengere* 1282, *quarelle* 1740 and *mule* 4463.

    besand 4545 falls into a different category for it is an unchanged plural[317].

17. Apart from the rime-words in 2245-6 (texts A and D only) which consist of syncopated forms of the Southern pr.t. ending *-eth*: *ryth:smyth* (compare A *rit:slyt*), another example is found in *sent* in 2289.

    The devoiced form *hat* 3rd sg. pa.t., is found in 3113, compare normal *had*.

    D is the only text to tolerate the pres. part. ending: *-ynd(e)* next to later *-yng* and Northern *-and*, e.g. *rydynd* 2162 and the rime *fynd:seylynd* 1191. Yet in 1734 *behynd:seylyng* is found. Rimes in *-and* are also found: *fleand:flyngand* 1977, *ernand:brennand* 3087 and *fleand:flyngand* 3239.

    The pp. prefix *i-* is often retained, e.g. *icallyd* 642, *icome* 728, and *iwent* 4530.

    a for 'to have' occurs once in 1986. This form is very common in Norfolk.

18. In the rimes both adverbial suffixes *-lyche* and *-ly* are used, e.g. *sodeynelyche:hougelyche* in 1194 and *hastly:cry* in 177; in the middle of the line only *-ly* is found, e.g. *deply* 1243.

---

[316] See Jordan, p. 62.

[317] See Mustanoja, p. 58.

E is not characterised by dialect features which point to a specific area of provenance. Anglian and WS features occur side by side with more evidence of the former than the latter. McIntosh et al.[318] place its dialect in Suffolk.

Double spelling are encountered in words like *woo* from OE *wā* 1545, *hooly* from *hālig* 1788, *hoom* from OE *hām* 2493; *good* from OE *gōd* 1102; *boody* from OE *bōdig* 2200, and *moony* from OE *mŏnig/mănig* 1022, both with lengthening in open syllables; *deeth* from OE *dēaþ* 1748, *heed* from OE *hēafod* 2554, and *sheet* 4608, 4610-11, pa.t. of 'to shoot', probably a borrowing from pa.t. *scēat*, see Note 4608; *feet* from OE *fēt* 3640, and *sheed* 3211 from OE *scēd*, pa.t. of 'to shed'; the spellings *woon*, pp. of *winnen*, *soon* 'sun' 3549-50 and *ycoom* 3578, indicate lengthening of *ŭ* to *ō*[319], as do *wooman* 1165 and *woolde*[320] 2856; *maad* from OE mᾱcₒdₒl870, *maane* from OE *mōna* 3477, and *glaad* from OE *glæd* 1874[321]. *feen* 'fen' 5008, found in a rime with *men* is the only clear case in E of <ee> for a short vowel, possibly because of an eye-slip from *heethen* in the previous line.

Double consonants are used to indicate a preceding short vowel, mainly in OF words, e.g. *assayle* 1702, *appertelyche* 4313, *assure* 2160, and *asspye* 3976, but this is not done consistently, e.g. *aspye* 4370.

Words like *arow* 'arrow', e.g. 3244, *folowed*1898, and *morow* 1548, are always spelled with a parasitic vowel in between **r, l** and **w**.

The form *donyde* occurs twice in the identical couplets 3093 and 4581. Since this form is derived from OE *dynian*, o for u was probably written because of minim surroundings as in *sonne* 3349. The only other form of this verb is found in *dening* in 5041, which is a SE spelling.

There is variation in the spelling of final syllables in rimes like *kechoun:Saryzyn* 2707 and *wepon:lepen* 3203.

1. The reflex of OE *y* is spelled <y/i> in text E, both in the middle and at the end of the line. Rimes like *dynt:quitement* 1132 and *lardere:afire* 4079 show that original SE/Kentish e is rejected. Yet in *smert:hert* 4096, the SE reflex of OE **hyrtan*, an early borrowing from OF *hurter*, is preserved.

   There is some evidence of SW influence in the rime *dure* 'continue':*fure* 3639 (E only) and in a few words in the middle of the line: *hulle* 3076; *fulle* 'to fill' 2152 and *fullyde* 'filled' 4035. Similarly rounding of OE *y* is also found in *russhes*, e.g. 4006, yet *rysshes* 4019 and *risshes* 4024 also occur. In *lust* 'fancied':*wist* 2631, the original rime-word must have been *list*. Since *lust* was probably influenced by the noun, it is not necessarily SW.

   Apart from *swyche* in 1936, 'such' is always spelled *suche*. This causes problems in the rimes in 1481, 2773 and 3455, where original *s(w)iche* was ousted.

2. *Aʒee* is found four times and always in rime position: with *citee* in 3370, *tree* in 3732, *be* in 3792, and with *meyne* in 4304. The first three examples occur in the second passage E; in

---

[318] McIntosh, vol. 3, p. 385, analysed the language of *The Seege or Batayle of Troye*.
[319] J. Fisiak, A Short Grammar of Middle English, p. 28 ff.
[320] For *woolde*, see Dobson, vol. 2, pp. 462-3.
[321] For ME *glād*, see Wright, p. 52.

the last example, which is part of the interpolation 4429-4308, E probably changed the line[322]. *Aȝee* with its final *n* lacking, is typical of the South-West[323].

In *seide:heued* 3479 the underlying rime is *sęde:hede*. E rejects the form *sęde*, most characteristic of the South (where palatal ȝ was lost before *d*, causing lengthening of the preceeding vowel æ); also *hede* in favour of *heued*, the unsyncopated form.

E does not maintain the East Saxon rime-word *man* as the plural for 'men', which it replaces by *men*, e.g. in 1738 and 2673 (E only), and in 2811-2 where it also rewrites the riming line, possibly because this feature did not extend to Suffolk.

There are two examples in E where OE æ is written as <e>. The infinitive *wesshe* occurs in 2667, in the middle of the line, of which Jordan [324] comments that it probably goes back to OK *wescan*. The second example is found in 3263 *(þey) hed*, from OE *hæfde*. This form gets full stress in the line, so the spelling cannot be explained by its position. It is likely that the scribe made an error, but alternatively *hed* could be an OK form.

In the rime *best:kest* 3604, the rime demands the variant form *kest* from *casten* from ON *kasta*[325].

3. For evidence of WS shortening of *æ₁* in the passages E and also of the Angl./Kentish reflex see p. 40.

In the middle of the line, E has predominantly WS forms e.g. 1614 *lad*.

5. E has a high proportion of Anglian reflexes of OE *ĕa + ld* in its rimes and rejects several WS/Kentish ones. As a consequence, only two WS rimes are retained: *queld:held* in 1761 and *telde:helde* in 3002. Although in *aquelde:tolde* 1102, both an Anglian and a WS rime are possible, it is probable that the E scribe inserted Anglian *tolde* rather than WS *aquelde* for the potential form *aquolde*. In 4161 E corrupts the rime of *elde:welde* by replacing *elde* by its variant spelling *ylde*.

All rimes in the passages E1 and E2 are Anglian, apart from the rime *telde:felde* 3307, where the E scribe inserted Anglian *tolde* 'counted' and rimed it with the corrupted form *folde* for OE *feld* 'field'.

There are no WS forms to be found in the middle of the line. In *laughe:neghe* 2597 E prefers Anglian *laughe* over the original Southern rime-word *leghe*.

In the middle of the line the pa.t. of 'to see' is mostly Anglian *saw(e)* but where the rime demands it Southern variants are used, e.g. *nyȝe:sye*, 2188 and *nyȝe:syȝe*, 2704. In *seye:hee* 3727 *seye* 'saw' is derived from WS *seh* which developed a front glide to /ei/ and was raised to /ī/ in the second half of the fourteenth century[326].

/ē/ in *he* was raised to /ī/ during the Great Vowel Shift in the fifteenth century. This rime, which occurs in E only, indicates that E2 was written much later than the core text.

6. The reflex of OE *ēa + χ* is Anglian **au + ȝ**, e.g. *þauȝe* 1393, 'though'.

7. *ȝede* (from OE *geēode*) occurs seven times in E, twice as a rime-word where *ȝode* would be

---

[322] There is much variation in the rime of the couplet, A and D have *mene:te* 'draw' and C 6375 *meyne:hee*.
[323] McIntosh, vol. 1, dotmap 231, p. 362.
[324] Jordan, p. 50, remark 2.
[325] See also the Description of the D Dialect, point 2, pp. 50-1.
[326] See Jordan, p. 120.

expected: *stoode:ʒede* 3681 and *ʒede:blood* 3741. The form *ʒode* is either due to accent shifting after palatals which is especially common in the NML and the North[327] or to shift of stress in *ēode* itself and consonantalisation of the first element. These rimes occur only in the second passage E.

8. There are several examples in E of the raising of **e** to **i** before **l**: *behilde* 2600 (beside *behelde*), *hilde* 1599 and 3926 (beside *helde* and *holde*), pa.t. *hilp* 4432 (beside *halp*), and *silue* 3177 (beside the much more common *self*). *Ʒis* 4285 'yes' is due to raising because of the position of **e** between ʒ and a dental. *Wynde* from 'wenden', which rimes with *hende* 3303 and *ende* 5182 respectively, may be due to raising of **e** before covered **n**. On the other hand, it may have been caused by a hypercorrection of the SE reflex of OE **y** or by semantic confusion between *wenden* and *windan*, on the pattern of *brengan/bringan*.

E has a mixture of spellings for lOE *-ēh*, e.g. 'high' is always spelled *high*, e.g. 1159 but 'eye' always *ey(ʒ)e*, e.g. 1133. Compare also *galey:skye* 1827 and *slyʒe:eyʒe* 2865 which shows that **ēh** and **ī** have indeed fallen together.

Messene:bone 1144 shows that the original OE rime-word *bēn* was ousted in favour of ON *bōn*.

9. WS *six* and *sixty* are usual, apart from 4342 where the Anglian form *sexty* is found.

11. E has *shuld* in the middle of the line, but *shold* where the rime necessitates it in 1139 and 1964[328].

12. E only uses the ending *-and* in *þousand*, even when the ending *-ind* is needed to create a rime. In 2870 the riming line was rearranged and in 3085 and 3110 *thousind:behind/find* was changed to Northern *þousand:vnderstond*.

In 3321, 3739 and 3761, all in passage E2, the rime *vnderstonde:þousande* is found. This evidence points to a Northern dialect for E2[329].

13. *syluer*, e.g. 1181, from ON <u>silfr</u>, is the normal spelling in E but *seluer*, from OE *seolfor, siolfor*, occurs once in 4336. *sylk*, from ON *silki*, e.g. 1479, is the only variant found in E.

or 'before', e.g. 1776, is also of Scandinavian origin and the only form found.

14. In *doyse* 'dais' in 2573, the Central French spelling <oi> is found, whereas Norman French /ę/ is required to form a rime with *prese* 'assembly'.

15. All texts form the gerund by adding *-yng* to the verb stem with one exception: *batayleng* 1953 (E only), which rimes with *comyng*.

16. If the indefinite article is followed by a noun beginning with a consonant, it is written *a*, e.g. 1138, if it is followed by a vowel or **h**, it is written *an*, e.g. 1432. *Oon* is mostly used for the pronoun, e.g. 1124, but it also occurs as an adjective before nouns beginning with a vowel or a consonant, e.g. 1543 and 3075. The adjective *oo* only occurs before a consonant, e.g. 1556.

The weakened form 'me' for 'man', followed by a singular verb, occurs in 1141.

---

[327] Jordan, p. 112.

[328] In 1139 *schold* **ol** has been supplied.

[329] Compare also *honde:grennande* in 2549 in E1.

17. The pr.t. 3rd pers. sg. is normally represented by *-eth* but the contracted form *sent* from 'sendeth' is found in 2503 (E only); it is also found in the rime *sent:present* in 3405. This contraction is characteristic of southern dialects.

The pres. part. ending in E is predominantly *-yng*. E rejects two rimes in *-ynd* and has *-yng* instead in *fynde:saylyng* 1191, *behynd:seylyng* 1734; in *wende:slepynge* 4378 E rejects a rime in -<u>ende</u> [330]. Northern *-and* occurs once in the middle of the line: *flyngand* 2898. It is also found in *flewande:flyngande* 3239, which is an original Northern rime. The rime *honde:grennande* 2549, which is found in the first passage E, is another rare Northern rime in RCL.

18. E uses the adverbial suffixes *-ly* and *-lych(e)* at the end of the line, e.g. *sodeynly:hydously* in 1194 and *sekerlyche:dedelych* in 1885. In the middle of the line *-ly* is found only, e.g. *erly* in 1537.

---

[330] The variation between *-yng* and *-ynd* may also have influenced the rime *kyng:Inde* 2651; the original rime *kynde:Inde* has been restored.

The Original Text and the Interpolations

RCL is a compilation of episodes built on an historical core, which can be recognised by its Kentish/SE rimes[331]. It is represented in all seven versions, but does not survive unrevised or without additional material in any of them. In some versions the additional material makes up a considerable portion of the text, in others revision is relatively minor, for example the two tail-rime stanzas in L 1-24. Much of the added material is found in more than one version, in which case the texts can be grouped together accordingly. This process of accretion also gives some indication of the hierarchy of the versions, Ryding's maxim[332]: '.... whenever two or more manuscripts exist for a single story, the later ones tend to be the more extensive' being generally borne out by the versions of our text. For example, the DA episode, which is found in texts A, H and D, and also the two passages E1 and E2, found in C, E and to some extent in B, display the characteristics of interpolated material. On this basis, texts B and C must come even later in the development of the romance, since they include episodes not found in the other versions, such as the episode which describes how Henry, Richard's father, found his wife Cassadorien[333].

The investigation of the rimes[334] has shown that at least ten authors had a hand in the composition of our four texts. Sometimes it is easy to see where one author left off and the next one started, at other times the introduction of new material is harder to detect. A discussion follows below of the narrative and style of the core text and the nine identified interpolations in texts L, D, A and E.

1. The Core Text

The core of the romance takes up ll. 1-34, 733-2410, 2807-2950, 3085-3154, 3807-4146 and 4309-4378. It is distinguished from the interpolations through its factual content and its parallells with the historical sources Itin and Ambroise[335], a plain style of narrative and a vocabulary largely derived from Germanic stock[336]. There are few stylistic devices typical of romance, such as romantic motifs and descriptions of banquets, decoration and hunting scenes. Also absent are, in Smithers' terms, 'seasonal headpieces'[337] apart from one single example in 2891 *a lytyl before seynt Johnys tyde/qwanne ffoule begynne to chyde*. Here the reference to nature, which is very plain indeed, is not followed by 'a general remark about true love'[338], but forms an introduction to one of Richard's military exploits. The absence of headpieces in RCL is

---

[331] See pp. 36-9.

[332] W. Ryding, *Structure in Medieval Narrative*, p. 63.

[333] In this interpolation, C 35-240, the story is told '*How Kyng Richard was gete and bore* (C 36) and how King Henry's envoys were despatched to find him the most beautiful bride on earth. When they finally found Cassodorien on a magic ship, they brought her and her father to Henry's court. Despite the fact that Cassodorien had an aversion to the Eucharist, the couple were married and produced two sons, Richard and John, and a daughter, Topyas. Fifteen years later Henry was challenged by one of his knights, who complained that his queen avoided attending full Mass and who wanted to force her to stay throughout. Henry agreed but when the Host was raised, Cassodorien escaped through the roof, taking her daughter Topyas with her.

[334] See p. 31 ff.

[335] See p. 73-5 and the Notes.

[336] See p. 73.

[337] Smithers, KA p. 35 ff.

[338] Smithers, KA p. 36.

in marked contrast to 'the astonishing profusion (namely no less than 27 in KA)' in KA and AM[339]. Moreover, there is little use of direct speech in the core part of RCL, a favourite medium in some of the later interpolations.

Finally, the origin of the short passage 3829-61, which is found within the core text 3807-4146, is in doubt because it is not based on historical fact (see the Notes) nor is it shared by BC. On the other hand, it does contain one SE/Kentish rime *(lest/best* in 3856.

2. 35-732 The Captivity Episode

This passage stands out from the other interpolations in several respects. In the first place, the relationship between the texts which contain it is unusual. Generally speaking, if the versions of RCL share a particular interpolation, they will follow it faithfully, maybe adding or omitting a few lines here and there. The captivity episode is different in this, as its versions do not run in tandem all the time. Instead there are two distinct groups, ADH versus BC[340]. Sometimes lines are found in both groups, e.g. the opening passage of D 35-60 corresponds to C 269-294; more often the same events are described but in a different manner, e.g. D 63-70 and C 295-313. This pattern is repeated throughout the episode. Even in lines DA 380-536/C 752-926, which are undoubtedly related, there is more variation than one would normally expect. Of the two groups, BC tend to be more expansive and their descriptions are usually longer, e.g. C 443-590 in which *Thomas of Multon* repeats the events at the tournament described earlier in C 250-425.

Since lines shared by all versions alternate with lines which are different, and since some passages are paraphrases of each other, the two groups were probably derived from a common ancestor[341]. It is difficult to say which of the two is closest to the original material, but the expansiveness of BC may account for its different format and hence may be the later redaction[342].

Secondly, the narrative framework of the captivity episode is provided by the inversion of two major events in Richard's life - his involvement with the third crusade and his subsequent capture in Vienna[343]. However, the author of this episode interpreted these historical facts very broadly and even Richard's imprisonment does not escape unaltered. After all, Richard was captured not by the King of Almayn but by Leopold of Austria (see Note 275). Nearly all the other components of the narrative are fictional, such as many of the place-names in the catalogue of 243-68, the names and adventures of the King of Almayn and his children Ardour and Margery. The adventures of Sir Thomas and Sir Fulk are not based on historical fact either. It is possible that the author of the captivity episode was inspired to include their names in the narrative, because he knew them or their families and because, like these knights, he came from Lincolnshire[344].

Thirdly, the tale of Richard's imprisonment was used by the author of the captivity episode

---

[339] Smithers, KA p. 36.

[340] Neither D, A or H retain the text from the beginning: D starts at 35, A at 167 and H at 152.

[341] Some lines, e.g. 61-2 and C 305-6, are identical but occur in a different environment; others, e.g. 35-6 and 304-5, echo each other.

[342] Brunner, RCL p. 21, comes to a different conclusion and identifies BC as the original and AD, the captivity episode, as the shortened version. This would go against the trend of expansion in RCL.

[343] See also Paris, Rom p. 356, and R. Loomis, JEGP 15 (1916) p. 458.

[344] See also Note 183-5.

60

to incorporate a string of motifs commonly found in medieval romance. In this respect the captivity episode is radically different from the main body of the text, apart perhaps from the two passages E1 and E2 and the Gatris story, although the density of the romance elements is much higher in the captivity episode. If the importation of these elements raises expectations of sophisticated material in RCL, the reader will be disappointed, because the author of the captivity episode uses the romance motifs to a prosaic and in many ways unconventional end. The first motif is found in the description of the tournament which Richard, in the role of the unknown hero, attends for three days, each day in a different coloured attire. This motif also occurs in *Cligès, le Chevalier de la Charrett e, Ipomedon* etc.[345] Normally, the occasion of the tournament enables the knight to compete for the hand of the lady, but here the courtly motif is transformed into a showcase for Richard's strength. It also allows the author to introduce Richard's two travelling companions on his secret voyage, Thomas of Multon and Fulk Doyly. As regards Richard's disguise as a pilgrim in 237-8, R. Loomis[346] comments that it recalls the story of *Guy of Warwick*.

In 366-420, the motif, known as 'Pluck buffet', is incorporated in Richard's exchange of blows with the King's son Ardour. It is also recorded in sources like *Fled Bricrend, Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* and *The Turk and Gawain*[347].

The treatment of Margery, the daughter of the King of Almayn is unusual, because she plays an active part in the narrative. The other female characters in RCL are all Richard's relatives and receive scant attention: in 1162-71 the arrival of Richard's mother Eleanor and his bride Berengaria is described; in 1208 ff. the shipwreck of Joan and Berengaria's ship; and in 1623-31 Richard and Berengaria's wedding. They play no part in the narrative otherwise.

Margery's role is reminiscent of the figure of the enamoured Muslim princess, who falls in love with the captured Christian knight and feeds and protects him[348]. In the captivity episode, however, the motif of the enamoured princess is not introduced to provide an opportunity to expound the nature of love. It is true that an attempt is made at a courtly exchange between knight and lady in 503-10, but the conversation quickly turns to basics, because Richard is more interested in food than in talk of love (511-2). The affair is consummated without much ado in 529-30, and Richard leaves Margery behind with equal ease when his ransom has been paid[349]. Although this episode uses elements typical of courtly love, it neglects to explore the feelings of the male and female protagonists, nor does it provide a stimulus for the hero to prove his love for the lady by valiant acts. Instead it provides the setting for Richard's second challenge. The fight with the lion (609-40) enables the author to extoll Richard's courage and strength once more. This passage expounds the epithet 'Coeur de Lion', which Richard must have attracted either during his life or shortly after his death[350]. Apart from possible influence from the biblical stories of Samson and David, medieval parallels are also found, e.g. *Le Mule sans*

---

[345] See also Brunner, RCL pp. 61-2.

[346] R. Loomis, JEGP 15 (1916) p. 465.

[347] See also B. Broughton, *The Legends of Richard I Coeur de Lion*, pp. 120-2.

[348] D. Metlitzki, *The Matter of Araby in Medieval England*, p. 161 ff. and also pp. 171-5, where sources like *Sir Beues* and *Sir Ferumbras* are discussed.

[349] Only text D voices concern about *Margery's* future after Richard's departure in 707-14, while in BC (C 1237-42) we are told that *Margery* is to remain with her mother.

[350] For the epithet 'Coeur de Lion' and other sources where Richard is depicted or described as such, see Notes 621 and 642.

Frein and *Guy of Warwick*[351].

3. 2411-68 The Chess-Playing Episode

These lines are in all probability a later addition to the text. It is significant that BC do not contain them, since a lacuna in other versions usually points to a later addition. Secondly, they follow immediately after the end of a core text episode, and their first line 2411 *Sone þere-aftyr ffel a chaunce* provides the type of link which an interpolator might well use as an introduction to additional material [352]. Finally, the tone and the extended use of direct speech set these lines apart from the core text. The passage does share with the core text the fact that some elements are historically verifiable, for instance Philip's departure (2435-6) and the appointment of the Duke of Burgundy as his successor (2439).

4. 2469-2806 E1

There is no reference to historic events or characters in this episode, which forms an addition shared by E and C, and B partly, and is clearly not historical. Its subject matter is unusual, too, in that it concerns a diplomatic rather than a military encounter between Richard and the Saracen envoys. Its style is ornate and courtly with lists of food, drink and treasure, e.g. 2626-7 and 2699. If the gruesomeness of the cannibalism is disregarded, there is no violence at all and its motto can be summarised as 'Into Ingelond wille we not goon,/til they [the Saracens] ben ete euerych oon!' (2685-6).

5. 2951-3288 (1= 3085-3154) Richard Advances Towards Jerusalem

These lines are found in texts A, B, C, D and E, and their riming evidence[353] indicates that they probably constitute a later episode, which was expanded from core text 3085-3154. Its rimes are Southern and indicate that the core text probably contained a description of the battle of Arsuf and the death of Jacques d'Avesnes[354], while the rime-words surrounding them show that a later interpolator expanded the original story. The adaptation was not entirely successful, particularly in the narrative concerning Jacques, with in 3163 the announcement of his death, followed by the report in 3215 that Richard went out to rescue him. There are also two descriptions of Richard's revenge, in 3165-3214 and 3225-51.

The exact boundaries of the core text are not certain, but a division does appear to be called for because of the rime evidence. The first line of the putative core episode, 3085, follows the last of the previous core episode, 2950, reasonably well. The last line of the putative core text, 3154, was probably originally followed by 3807, which describes Richard's return to Acre.

The author of the later material must have based his account on Itin and/or Ambroise, but he embroidered on the facts presented in these two sources, e.g. Richard camped at Haifa (see Note 2992) but he did not take the town. The names of *Sir Braundis*[355] (see Note 2981) and of *Robert of Turnham* (see Note 1248) are not found in Itin or Ambroise. The catalogue of towns razed by Saladin, which is found in Itin (p. 280) and Ambroise (v. 6841-6866), is followed

---

[351] See Note 621.

[352] The analysis of this particular passage is complicated by the fact that E lacks 2411-50 and that parts of 2423-2450 are found in E 3779-3806 (see Notes 2414 and 3770). However, the sequence in DA is in the right order.

[353] See p. 33.

[354] See Note 3105.

[355] Sir Braundis' name is only found outside the core text.

broadly but many details are inexact or wrong (see Note 3007-3026).

The reference to *castel Pilgrim* dates the additional material to post 1218 (see Note 3019 and p. 71 ff.).

A rare reference to the motif of the hunt is found in 3202 *os grehondis don wyth þe haryn.*

6. 3289–3806 E2

This passage is also found in B and C, apart from 3289-3304, which occur only in text E and appear to provide an introduction to E2, incorporating some elements from BC 5189-5384, which are otherwise lacking in E. E2 contains the fictitious siege of Babylon, in which Philip betrays the Christian cause (3289-3397), followed by the tale of the magic horse (3398-3769) and finally an account of Philip's departure (3770-3806), which corresponds to 2414-50[356].

Unlike the first passage E, the second is much more martial, one of its hallmarks being the depiction of armour in terms of decoration, e.g. 3607-16[357] and 3663-4.

The tale of the magic horse was probably developed from an event described in Itin and Ambroise (see Note 3422). The latter part of this episode is confusing, because the preparations for the duel with Saladin and the encounter itself are interspersed with an account of a battle between Christians and Saracens. Cohesion is threatened further by the introduction in 3704 of the inhabitants of an unknown town, who are besieged by Richard[358]. The muddled nature of this episode could be due to an amalgamation of various tales. On the other hand, the reference in 3731 to the spear across the horse's neck points back to 3595-6, which would indicate that the passage was probably written by one author.

Historical personal and place-names, like Richard, Philip and the *sowdan*[359] are rare in this episode; others are not historical at all: *Babyloyn* 3290 and 3298, *Longespay* 3696, *ffouk Doly* and *of Multoun Thomas* 3700.

7. 4147–4228 The Gatris Episode

The Gatris episode must have been inserted early on in the development of RCL, since it is shared by texts ADEBC[360]. Apart from the dialect characteristics in this episode, other features also distinguish it. In the first place, the plot differs from the usual format of battle scenes. Here Richard proves his superiority by decapitating a marble statue[361] rather than by killing Saracens. The decapitation scene may have been inspired by *Beues of Hamtoun* (see Note 4147-4228). Secondly, the style is much lighter, e.g. 4226 where Richard is shown to have a sense of humour. Richard's behaviour is different from his normal harsh self, and he invites the inhabitants of the town to convert to Christianity if he decapitates the statue. This tolerance is rare in RCL and is only echoed in the second passage E 3759-66 where the Saracens are also given a chance to convert. It may have been introduced in the interpolations because of a growing awareness that conversion was preferable to killing. Finally, the relative frequency

---

[356] See Notes 2414 and 3770.

[357] In this passage 3607-8 are virtually identical to 115-6 in the captivity episode. It is impossible to determine whether the captivity episode borrowed from E, or vice versa, or whether these lines came about independently (see also Note 115-6).

[358] Richard's leniency in allowing the Saracens to convert is also found in the Gatris episode, see below.

[359] See Note 3289.

[360] The L text, had more survived of it, could have thrown light on the time of introduction. H finished earlier, at 1939.

[361] The ruler of Gatris is too old to defend the town so he pretends that this statue represents its leader.

of minstrel style tags such as *herkenyth lordinges* 4147; *herkenyth wel* 4153; and *herkenyth now* 4164 is not typical of the core text and points to a later addition.

8. 4229-4308 Richard Warned of John's Intentions

This episode is shared by texts A, B, C, D and E, and its dialect evidence is mainly non-SE[362]. Many of the place-names and personal names are either unknown or placed in the wrong context, e.g. *Castel Pilgrim* 4236 and [*Baldwin*] 4253, but despite these inaccuracies, RCL shares some details with Itin and Ambroise (see Note 4249-56).

The passage contains the first (4261-4288) and second (4293-4308) messages from England to warn Richard of John's intentions; a third is found in 4479-96[363]. These messages were probably inspired by sources like Itin and Ambroise (see Note 4481), who report the arrival of an envoy on two separate occasions: that of the Prior of Hereford in April 1192 and of John d'Alencon on May 29. The former complained to Richard of the actions of Richard's brother John and the latter reported that John was in league with Philip of France, but neither conveyed the message found in the three passages in RCL that John had decided to become king.

In contrast, the two envoys in RCL 4481-2 are named as the bishop of Chester and the abbot of St. Albans, but it is very unlikely that the bishop of Chester and the abbot of St. Albans were the actual messengers, in particular the bishop of Chester, because he was a strong supporter of John Lackland (see Note 4481-2).

In the first passage (4261-88) RCL is correct in stating that the chancellor had been seized by John[364]. In the third passage, 4491-2 may refer to the fact that Philip invaded Normandy while Richard was in prison in Germany (see Note 4492) or to Ambroise's reference (v. 9459) to Normandy as a particular troublespot. The first and third passages show no specific dialect evidence while the third has relatively many OF rime-words.

9. 4309–5203 (1=4309-78) Richard's Final Exploits

It is likely that this part of the romance is of a composite nature. In the first place, four Kentish/SE rimes are found at the beginning of this episode, which indicates that these lines were probably part of the core text[365]. Secondly, a change of dialect is found in the middle of the tale describing the capture of the caravan[366] which ends at 4478, and the first couplets to point to a change of author are found in 4399-4400 and 4403-4. There are various possibilities to account for the structure of this episode: it could have been written either by the author of the core text or by an interpolator[367] or be a mixture of the two. That the latter is quite likely is indicated by the introduction of *a spye* in D 4405 and *a Sarasyn* in A. It is impossible to be sure of the authorship of these lines, particularly after 4378 but, since the dialect characteristics

---

[362] See the Description of the Dialect, p. 34.

[363] It is interesting that none of the three envoys appears in core text 4309-78. Another brief reference to the envoys is made in 4531-4, in which a spy reports to Saladin that Richard has received news from England.

[364] Compare Ambroise vv. 8536-7.

[365] It is interesting that the B text, which follows the text up to 4308, then drops it for several hundred lines to pick it up again at 4639, leaving a blank column on f. 160r. There is no obvious explanation for the lacuna, but it is possible that Robert of Thornton intended to insert some material, possibly an abridged version, from another text. What is clear is that B 4308 and 4639 would not have made a coherent sequence.

[366] See Note 4309.

[367] There are a large number of occurrences of direct speech in this episode, which normally indicates the presence of interpolated material in RCL.

do point to core text output between 4309-78, these lines have been designated core material and the lines following them as a later addition.

4479-5203 occur in A, E, B and C (D stops at 4624). Dialectal evidence is scarce throughout[368] and since the only potential SE/Kentish rime *sket :s het* in 4584 is probably not indicative of that area[369], it can be assumed that the final part of RCL is not by the hand of the writer of the core text. It cannot be totally excluded, however, that some parts originally belonged to it. It is also possible that more than one interpolator contributed material to the text.

4479-96 contain the third message from England that John was about to usurp the throne, while 4497-4510 tell of Richard's preparations before he left the Holy Land. It is possible that these lines constituted the end of the original version of the romance, and that they were reworked to enable the interpolator to continue with his story.

4511-5203 distinguish themselves by the extensive use of direct speech, e.g. 4527-42, 4727-46, 4769-90, 4910-30, 4947-64 etc. There is even a couplet reporting the reaction of the Saracens in Arabic[370]! Equally, the density of the use of public address is unusual, and reminiscent of KA[371] rather than of RCL: in 4513-4 A and E[372] *Off Saladyn now speke we*, 4695-4696 *Herkeneth to my tale sothe/þauȝ y swere ȝow noon othe*, 4861 *but ȝe shul here of þe morowe* and 4865-66 *And þo þat wille þis bataile lere,/hende herkeneþ and ȝe shul here!* Finally, the second quotation is followed by a catalogue of heroes in 4697-4706[373]. These features appear to indicate the activity of a new author, but it is impossible to be sure of this for lack of rime evidence. The names of Richard's companions reinforce the notion that non-core text material is found here, in passages like 4731-37, 5055-56, 5086-9 and 5165-68, in which hardly any names can be placed in a historically accurate context. For example, *Sir Bertram Braundis* is not recorded in historical sources; *Robert of Turnham* had stayed behind in Cyprus (see Note 1248); *Sir Pipard* did accompany Richard on the crusade (see Note 4737) but there is no record in Itin or Ambroise that he was at the siege of Jaffa; *Robert of Leicester* was not inside Jaffa, but fought with Richard to free it (see Note 473₁)[374].

4511-5203 give an account of Richard's final skirmishes with Saladin before his return to Europe. A few historically verifiable events make up the broad outline of the narrative, such as the rescue operation to help the inhabitants of Jaffa[375]. Much detail is distorted, however, e.g. Richard saved the Earl of Leicester, not Henry de Champagne, as RCL reports in 5023 and 5064 (see also the Notes). The romance retained the fact that the Christian camp was attacked in the morning (4937-8) but deviates from Itin's description (p. 413) of the Saracens' surprise attack as a move to try and capture Richard. In RCL, Richard is formally challenged by Saladin (4870-4904) but choses to ignore his warning (4907-30), and is only saved by the intervention of an angel (4947-64). Through the device of the divine intervention, the author combines

---

[368] See p. 34.
[369] See p. 36, footnote 192.
[370] See also Note 4809-10.
[371] Smithers, KA p. 28.
[372] D 4511-2 is probably a later variation, compare also C 6561-2.
[373] See also pp. 67-8.
[374] For the other names mentioned in these passages see the Notes. Nearly all are unknown.
[375] Compare Itin p. 404 ff.

warning of imminent battle with the command to return to England. Consequently, Richard is justified in breaking off his crusade before he has conquered Jerusalem. The author must have been preoccupied with getting Richard's return to England justified, but by doing so created a situation in which from a military point of view Richard looked foolish to ignore Saladin's warning.

10. 5204-47 Epilogue

These lines, which are only found in A, contain a description of Richard's death in France in 1199. Since their format and sources set them aside from the preceding text[376], they were probably added by another, later interpolator. The mixture of verse and prose in text A is not surprising, as both these formats are found throughout the Arundel manuscript. It is very likely that the redactor(s) of the manuscript added prose passages as an introduction and epilogue to the romance, which serve to place the imported material on Richard's life in a larger context[377]. If Arundel itself was the original compilation, Moille was responsible for the introduction and scribe Z for the epilogue.

The Nature of the Romance

RCL is usually classified as a 'romance', although often with some hesitation, since it does not fit easily into any standard definition. Apart from the general question of 'whether the romance can be indeed regarded as a genre at all[378], RCL probably lacks the courtly element more than any other romance. This is especially true of its core part, which distinguishes itself from other romances in that it is based on historical events and in that its protagonist is not a mythical hero but a verifiable historical character whose life is quite well documented. Consequently, it resembles historiography rather than romance. RCL is similar to a romance like *Horn* and to a lesser extent *Havelok* in its unsophisticated treatment of the subject matter, but it differs from them in its structure. After all, the structure of *Havelok* and *Horn* is determined by the motifs of the lost kingdom and the love of the princess, while the narrative of RCL is devoid of such elements. It is only through its many later additions that RCL acquired more of a 'romance' flavour.

RCL is active rather than reflective, centres on warfare rather than on courtly matters, and is by no means sophisticated. Its hero-worship of Richard is coupled with a frank relish for battle scenes, a taste for gruesome details and a lack of didacticism.

Except for the captivity episode, literary motifs and conventions commonly associated with medieval romance are rare in RCL, while within the captivity episode, the attempt to incorporate them is rarely successful. L. H. Loomis' observation[379] that 'It [RCL] is so militant that it seems almost untouched by courtly or chivalric influence' is indeed correct. Descriptions of objects are generally rare in RCL, so that, for instance the description of Saladin's pavilion (3253-60) stands out, not because it is lavish but because it is there. In this respect RCL differs

---

[376] See also p. 75 and Note 5204.

[377] See p. 16 and p. 69, footnote 394.

[378] P. Gradon, *Form and Style in Early English Literature*, p. 269.

[379] L. Loomis, *Medieval Romance in England*, p. 154.

from KA[380], in which descriptions are common.

The interpolations are, generally speaking, more descriptive but they are never lavish and it is all the more shocking that the banquet at which the heads of Saracens are served is described the most elaborately (see 2566 ff).

Violence pervades the romance and is often instigated by Richard himself. He is portrayed as absolutely fearless and is nearly always found in the thick of the battle. Even when he is not fighting, he radiates violence and is often blunt in his personal dealings with people. He smashes a table in 925, crushes a loaf of bread in frustration in 4908, kicks the Duke of Austria in the chest in 3898 and threatens to break the Duke's banner in 3916. Historically speaking, there is some justification for the portrayal of Richard as a headstrong man. Some of his actions were indeed detrimental to the war effort; for example, when he turned his allies Philip of France and Leopold of Austria against him, with the result that they returned to Europe and took their troops with them. Richard was also to suffer the consequences of his actions personally, through his capture by Leopold and the invasion of Normandy when he was in prison. Although RCL incorporates these facts into the narrative, they are never depicted as shortcomings on Richard's part. In any case, the authors are not interested in Richard's motives, but focus on his actions, i.e. almost exclusively on his military feats. The result of this is a picture of an active hero rather than a reflective one.

Since combat is such an important topic, the text is dominated by descriptions of battles, which are mostly described not in terms of general combat but through Richard's feats. He personifies the action and when he wins, the Christians win, e.g. 1743-1761, 4825-38 and 4977-92. This pattern is reinforced by the lack of success in battle while Richard is ill in 2195-2260, but victory as soon as he recovers.

Our texts display a frequent divergence of numbers of troops, e.g. 1216-19 and 3077-91, where hardly a number is shared by the different versions.

Descriptions of armour are plentiful but short, and concentrate on the usefulness of the weapons rather than their splendour, e.g. the descriptions of *Mat-Griffon* in 967-970 and of Richard's axe in 1364-7. Otherwise, objects and events are rarely depicted, and in the wedding of Richard and Berengaria in 1631, RCL passes up an excellent opportunity to provide a description of the wedding-feast. There is no description of any festivities and in the next line the story returns straight to warfare.

Lists of heroes and place-names are found throughout RCL, e.g. in core text 753-60 a list of noblemen accompanying Philip of France; in E1 2724-9 a list of Saracen princes beheaded by Richard; in 2817-24, 3051-6 and 4559-68 three very similar catalogues of Middle Eastern countries[381]; other lists occur in 3061-71 and 4887-94.

The device of the list of romance heroes is found twice in RCL, in L 13-18 and AE 4697-4706. In both examples Richard's status is impressed on the reader by a comparison of his exploits with those of other famous heroes, while in 4697-4706 Richard is explicitly preferred to any other protagonist. Similar catalogues can be found in *Sir Thopas*[382] and in an article on *Sir*

---

[380] Smithers, KA p. 29 ff.

[381] See Note 2817-24.

[382] See F. N. Robinson, *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ll. 897-902. Canterbury Tales, Frag. B²

67

Thopas by L. Loomis[383], who cites examples from *Cursor Mundi, Launfal, Speculum Vitae, Squire of Low Degree* and the *Laud Troy Book*. It is interesting that in the latter King Richard is himself included as a hero.

The first list, found in L 13-18, forms part of a reworked tail-rime stanza[384] and is unlikely to have been written by the author of the core material. However, every name found in L occurs also in BC: *Rouland and Oliuer* L 13, C 11; *Alisaunder and Charlmeyn* L 15, C 13; *Ector* L 16, C 19; *Danys le fiz Oger* L 17, C 16; *Arthour and Gawayn* L 18, C 14. On the other hand, L has lost *Turpyn* C 16, *Achilles* C 19 and also the reference to *Troye men* C 17. The names found in texts LBC can be divided into two groups: the first belong to the matter of Charlemagne, the second to material of Greek origin.

The second list, found in 4697-4706, is much more mixed. Apart from reference to Greek heroes such as *Alysander* 4699, *Ettor* 4704, *Jasyn and Ercules* 4705, *Enneas and Achilles* 4706, English and French romance heroes are also included, e.g. *Pertenop* 4698, *Charlemayn* 4699, *Arthor and Gawayn* 4700, *Launcelet de Lake* 4701, *Beues and Gy* 4702 and *Octauyan* 4703.

As far as the ideal expressed in RCL is concerned, it is not so much that of courtly love and chivalry as the triumph of the Christian faith over Islam, which is achieved through military means. There are other romances in which military confrontation between Christians and Saracens dominates the narrative, and romances like *Beues of Hamtoun* and *The Sowdone of Babylone* which, as Metlitzki says 'barely fit a definition of romance'[385], are similar in this aspect. RCL shares with these works the belief that can be summarised by the famous line in *La Chanson de Roland*: 'paien unt tort e chrestiens unt dreit'[386], and yet Metlitzki's argument that they are 'essentially vehicles of fanatical propaganda in which the moral ideal of chivalry is subservient to the requirements of religion, politics and ideology' [387] does not quite apply to RCL. Certainly, these elements are present in the romance, but rather than an essential component, they provide the framework within which the action is carried out. The setting of the crusade provides a convenient backdrop for Richard's pursuits and also its justification, because, as a Christian king fighting the heathen Saracens, the justness of his actions need never be questioned[388]. In RCL the Saracens are treated as honorary knights who fight bravely and Richard is invariably courteous to their envoys even if he does serve them the heads of their relatives[389]. However, apart from the awareness that pork is forbidden to Muslims[390], there is very little exploration of Muslim religion and culture.

In contrast to the treatment of the Saracens in RCL, the French are routinely portrayed as villains and as inherently untrustworthy. In fact, one might be forgiven for thinking that the French in general, and Philip of France in particular, were the enemy. A good example of this is found in the passage 4625-4860, in which the inhabitants of Jaffa ask for Richard's help.

---

[383] L. H. Loomis, *Sir Thopas* in *Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, pp. 556-9.

[384] See pp. 76-8.

[385] Metlitzki, p. 160.

[386] See *La Chanson de Roland*, ed. J. Bédier, v. 1015.

[387] Metlitzki, p. 160.

[388] In the rare case where the justness of Richard's actions might be queried, divine ordinance removes all doubt; compare Note 2878 on the killing of the hostages taken at Acre and Note 4945 on Richard's return to England.

[389] See 2530 ff.

[390] See Note 2221.

Itin reports that both Richard and Henry of Champagne set out immediately (see Note 4641) but that Henry was delayed at Caesarea and only arrived after the battle. In RCL 4655-72, however, the reason given for Henry's absence is that he was a coward, 4677-8 *I shal neuer, for þy loue,/ trist to Frenssh man, by God aboue!* This is historically inaccurate. Richard thought highly of his nephew, Henry[391], who stayed with Richard when Philip returned to France and who even transferred to his service[392].

Other examples of hostility towards the French are found in the conflict at Messina, 887 ff., where both the *Griffouns* and the French are consistently described as the enemies (see Note 901), and in 3323-90, where the disdain for the French is particularly evident. In this episode Philip negotiates a truce with the beleagered citizens of Babylon while Richard is still besieging it from the other side. The text does not mince words in its description of Philip: 'he loved no crownes to crake/ but tresoure with tresoun to take' (3385-6).

The portrayal of the French as treacherous and weak is found throughout RCL and of the examples cited above, the first one is part of the final episode, the second of the core text and the third of the passage E2. The first two have some basis on historical fact whereas the third is wholly fictitious.

However strong the pro-Christian and anti-French impulses may be, they are secondary to the main purpose of RCL. At the heart of its narrative lies the desire to portray Richard as a hero, which is one aspect in which RCL is very like many other romances[393]. The role of Richard as the hero is narrowly defined, since the romance restricts itself solely to his adventures as a crusader without an attempt to give an account of his life or even his reign[394]. His prowess is emphasised by the devices of amplification and embellishment. In contrast the role and importance of other historical personages is constantly diminished, thereby increasing Richard's stature by implication. This is particularly achieved through the descriptions of French inferiority [395]. The text also tends to credit Richard personally for any successes that the crusaders might have, e.g. 1813-20, in which Richard himself cuts the chain across the harbour at Acre.

Through King Richard's growing popularity, probably fuelled by the romance of RCL itself, more and more material accumulated around the original story of the core text. The aim of RCL, right from its inception, was to portray Richard as a hero, which in the core text was achieved by giving a sober, historical account emphasising Richard's valour as a military commander. This aim was maintained even when new episodes were introduced, but the means by which it was achieved changed[396]. As more material accrued, RCL moved from a historical account

---

[391] See Runciman, vol. iii, p. 28.

[392] Henry transferred to Richard's army because Richard was a much more generous paymaster than Philip, see Richard of Devizes' *Cronicon*, p. 42.

[393] D. Mehl, *The Middle English Romances of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Romances*, p. 17.

[394] See also Jentsch, p. 179. This delimitation must have appeared artificial to the author(s) of both the prologue in text A, which describes Richard's coronation and the preparations for the crusade, and the epilogue, which gives details of Richard's death (see also p. 16, p. 66, and Notes 5204 ff.).

[395] See also p. 68 ff.

[396] Compare for instance the description of the tournament and the fight with the lion in the captivity episode. The wooing of Cassodorien (C 35-240, see also footnote 333, p. 59), is the only passage in which Richard is not at the centre of the tale. Since it is shared by BC only and is not found in our versions, it must be a late addition to the text. Its author may have included it to add new interest to a romance whose original motivation had

to a more fictional one, and the character of Richard developed from a historical role towards that of a folk hero. Outside RCL, the culmination of this trend is found in the association of Richard with Robin Hood[397].

The need to show Richard in the best possible light must also have dictated the insertion at the beginning of the narrative of Richard's fictional voyage and capture at Vienna (35-732). It is unlikely that this was done accidentally, because by bringing Richard's humiliating capture by Duke Leopold forward, the author avoided an unsuitable end to the romance. In addition, he shaped his material in such a way that it became a framework for a series of triumphs for Richard. He changed its character by introducing folk and romance motifs celebrating the victorious hero, like the 'Pluck Buffet' episode, the wooing of the king's daughter and the killing of the lion[398].

Throughout the text, the character of Richard holds the narrative together, and without him at the centre of every episode, the romance would lack cohesion. Yet the disadvantage of repeated amplification is obvious in the text, the narrative becoming more and more shapeless in the process. To the modern reader RCL appears to be a string of unconnected episodes, but this probably did not greatly concern the contemporary audience, as nearly every version of RCL contains new material.

We shall never know how far the taste for new material originated from the audience or whether the various interpolators anticipated and even created new interests. As Derek Pearsall says '.. it is characteristic of the purveyor of popular entertainment to run before his audience'[399]. Since more and more fabulous material was added to RCL as time went on, it must have been understood by both audience and authors that amplification was desirable. This process of accretion is one of the most fascinating aspects of RCL, because it gives an indication of the development of popular taste in a fairly low-brow text during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

The evidence as to how medieval compilers might have regarded RCL in its entirety is mixed[400], since this romance is found in two major romance collections, MS Auchinleck and MS Egerton 2682 (and in Caius College MS 175 which contains some romance material), and also in two historical manuscripts, College of Arms 58 and MS Harley 4690. The inclusion of RCL in these manuscripts, particularly the fact that RCL was used to amplify Robert of Gloucester's *Chronicle*, is interesting and indicates that the boundaries between historiography and romance were not clearly defined.

---

become dissipated or outmoded.

[397] See Child's *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, vol. 3, pp. 220-222: *The King's Disguise and Friendship with Robin Hood.*

[398] See also pp. 61-2. Jentsch (p. 236) comments that the sole purpose of the inversion of the historical events was to introduce the lion episode, but this alone cannot provide an explanation, since that episode could equally have appeared within the captivity episode at the end of RCL.

[399] Pearsall, *The Development of Middle English Romance*, Medieval Studies 27 (1965) p. 100.

[400] See also Guddat-Figge, p. 37.

The Date of Composition of RCL

In trying to determine when RCL was written, it must be borne in mind that this is a composite text, to which at least ten authors contributed. Consequently, it is impossible to give one date of composition for the entire text, and for most of the interpolated material no indication has been found as to when it might have been written. As far as the original part of RCL is concerned, there is no conclusive evidence to prove when exactly it was written, but there are certain indicators to the time of its composition. First of all, since the earliest version of the text is found in the Auchinleck manuscript, which has been dated from 1330-40, the composition of the original text must predate it[401]. Secondly, the internal evidence suggests a date of composition of the core text of at least 50 years after Richard's death in France in 1199, and of almost 60 years after Richard's involvement in the Holy Land[402]. The evidence is based on several examples in the text where personal and place-names are found to be anachronous. Most occur in the core text, some in the interpolations, but often they are found in more than one part of the text.

1. *John de Nele*, castellan of Bruges is found three times in the text in 1992, 3105 and 5086. The first two examples occur in the core text and the latter in the final interpolation. *John* was a Flemish knight, who arrived at Acre at the end of 1202, three years after Richard's death[403].

2. *Castel Pilgrim*, which is found twice in 3019 and 4236, was built in 1218[404]. Both instances are found in interpolations, so this date post quem can only apply to them.

3. The most important evidence in the text is found in the appearance of three noblemen, who cannot possibly have been Richard's companions, because they are associated with the crusade led by King Louis IX in 1249. These are the 'Earl of *Artays*', who was King Louis' brother, *William Longespée*, the Earl of Salisbury, and the Earl of *Richmond*[405]. They took part in the fourth crusade and fought at the Battle of Mansourah in 1250. The Count of Artois and William Longespée were killed in battle, while the Earl of Richmond died of his wounds on the way home[406]. This battle became famous throughout Western Europe and is commemorated in an AN poem with William Longespée as its hero (see notes 934). It is likely that the names of these noblemen who fought in a later crusade were incorporated in the text of RCL to enhance the heroic qualities of the text[407] or possibly because the distinction between the third and seventh crusade had become blurred. In either case this would presuppose a date later than that of 1250.

   Of these names, *William Longespée* is found most often and throughout RCL: twice in the core text, in 934 and 4059, once in a late interpolation in 2951, once in E2 in 3696, and once in the

---

[401] For the discussion of the fact that L cannot be the original text, see p. 26.

[402] Richard's involvement with the crusade lasted from his arrival at Acre on 8 June, 1191 to his departure on 9 October 1192; he died in France in March 1199 (Runciman, vol. iii, pp. 47 and 74-5).

[403] See Note 1992 and Runciman, vol. iii, p. 101.

[404] See Robin Fedden and John Thomson, *Crusader Castles*, p. 90 and also Note 3019.

[405] For the Earl of *Artays*, see Note 760; for *William Longespée*, Note 934, and for the Earl of *Richmond*, Note 1338.

[406] See G. Cokayne and V. Gibbs, *The Complete Peerage*, vol. 10, p. 803.

[407] Compare R. Wadsworth, who states in *William Longespée*, Neophilologus, vol. 56, 3 (1972) p. 271, note 3, that RCL and the AN poem 'share a markedly similar attitude to their crusading material'.

final interpolation in 5047.

The name of the earl of *Artais* is found once in the core text in 760; that of the earl of *Richmond* twice in the core text, 1338 and 4059, and once in the final interpolation in 5056.

4. The final reference concerns *Janine of Pleyn Speyn.* This name occurs in core text 1908, in the passage in which the archbishop of Pisa reports that *Janyn* was killed at Acre before Richard's arrival. It is possible that this name refers to James I, King of Aragon, who fought the Saracens in Spain in the 1220s and 1230s, and attempted a crusade to the Holy Land in 1269[408]. If by *Janine*, James I was indeed meant, the inclusion of his name would indicate a thirteenth century date of composition. It is not possible to be more exact, since James I had such a long career.

Of these points, the third is the most crucial to the dating of the earliest part of RCL. Since the names of the three noblemen mentioned under 3 are all found in the core text, it is very likely that the core text of RCL was composed sometime in the second half of the thirteenth century, after the Battle of Mansourah[409].

The treatment of other historical events in RCL confirms this. Although the text preserves many details remarkably well, it does not appear to be a first hand account. It is hard to imagine, for instance, that a contemporary of Frederick Barbarossa would have reported that the Emperor died at Acre (see Note 1907).

From a historical point of view, the composition of RCL would have suited the reign of Edward I particularly well. Both Richard and Edward were crusader-kings and had disputes with Kings of France called Philip, both were strong-willed and well-known for their military skills. RCL would also have suited the mood of the nation with its nascent nationalism and growing awareness of an English identity.

Sources of RCL

1. A Possible OF Original Text

It has been generally accepted in the past that RCL is a translation from an OF, probably an AN, original[410]. An AN rather than an OF source for RCL was postulated because the English version is so very anti-French. It is indeed true that an AN source might have required less adaptation, because it could have been expected to treat Richard more favourably than a continental French source[411]. Proof of the existence of an OF original text has been sought in the following references in RCL:

10 L *Romaunce make folk of Fraunce*;
19 L þis romaunce of Frenys/(23 C) In Frenssche bookys þis rym is wrouȝt;
3192 AC the Frenshe/D the romance/E the gest sey, he slogh a hundred;
5014 AE as hit is in ffrensh founde.

---

[408] See Note 1908.

[409] Paris (Rom p. 385) puts the date of the Kentish translation of the postulated AN original at the end of the thirteenth century, but does not give reasons for his conclusions; R. Loomis (JEGP 15 (1916) p. 456) gives a date of 1250.

[410] Jentsch, p. 246; Paris, Rom p. 368; Brunner, RCL p. 17; and R. Loomis, JEGP 15 (1916) p. 458 ff.

[411] Yet one cannot be certain even of this, as the example of Ambroise's *Estoire* shows, where the hero is Richard and not Philip of France.

The validity of this evidence must be seriously in doubt. Three of the examples cited above must be discounted, because they do not occur in the core text. Consequently, they could not have been added by the postulated translator. Line 10 was added to the original text by a later reviser[412], and 3192 and 5014 are found in later interpolations[413] The references to a French source were probably added to give prestige and verisimilitude to the text, but in the case of the third and fourth examples, it cannot be excluded that the passages in which they occur were derived from French sources.

This leaves the example in 19, which is also the most complicated. In L *þis romaunce of Frenys [be] wrouȝt*, the subject must be an undeclined plural noun, which refers to the romances discussed in 13–18 rather than to RCL itself. This reading is part of the reworked lines 1-24, though, and its authority must be questioned. Text C *In Frensshe bookys þis rym is wrouȝt* and text B *In Fraunce bokes thies rymmes men wrote* are split between a possible reference to RCL in text C on the one hand, and a definite reference to the preceding romances in B on the other. It must be concluded from the evidence in the three versions LBC that in this line a French source for RCL is not certain from a textual point of view, and that none of the four examples cited above proves the existence of an OF text.

Finally, the inclusion of the names of *Longespée* and the Counts of Artois and Richmond in the core text would indicate a date of composition for this part of the text of post 1250, a late date for an AN poem[414].

As far as external evidence is concerned, there is no trace of an OF original text from which RCL could have been translated, as an extant text or even contemporary references are lacking. It will be clear from the discussion above that there is no conclusive evidence to prove the existence or nonexistence of an OF original but that the balance appears to be tilted against an OF source. The same view was put forward as long ago as 1837 by Laing, one of the earliest editors of RCL[415].

This conclusion is confirmed by the text itself in its choice of vocabulary. There is some evidence of OF influence in the use of battle cries, e.g. *Sus, seignours, as armes tost* in 2192, but on the whole the vocabulary used in RCL presents a picture of English rather than French influence, with one exception in the *Gatris* episode (4147-4228), which shows a strikingly high proportion of OF rime-words[416]. In its lack of a significantly high proportion of OF loan-words RCL contrasts sharply with KA in particular and the KA-group in general[417].

2. *Itinerarium* and *Ambroise*

While there is no evidence of a direct source for RCL, several influences can be traced. It must be borne in mind, however, that this is a composite text and that the authors of the core text and subsequent interpolators would have drawn on many different sources.

The texts with which RCL has most in common are undoubtedly the *Itinerarium Peregrinorum*

---

[412] See pp. 76-8.
[413] See also pp. 33-4.
[414] See pp. 71-2 ff. and also R. Loomis JEGP, 15 (1969) p. 456.
[415] Laing, *Owain Miles, Richard Coeur de Lion*, p. 4.
[416] Further research could be done on this.
[417] See Smithers, KA pp. 56-7.

et Gesta Regis Ricardi[418] and Ambroise's *Estoire de la Guerre Sainte*[419]. Their parallels with RCL were charted by Jentsch and Paris[420]. Historical events can often be traced broadly to both sources but, since RCL puts its own idiosyncratic interpretation on virtually all material, it is usually impossible to identify a particular event closely with either text.

Itin and Ambroise themselves can be very close, and the relationship between these texts has caused much discussion[421]. Hubert and La Monte[422] sum up the relation between them most clearly: 'The more carefully one scrutinizes these two works, the more clearly one perceives two things: first the poem of Ambroise cannot be a translation from the Itinerarium; second, the Itinerarium cannot be a translation from Ambroise. Yet the two works are obviously and undeniably related in some fashion'. The earlier study of Edwards agrees: 'The close correspondences between them can therefore be explained only in one way: they are related indirectly, and they must both have been independently derived from an ultimate common original.'[423] Both refute the conclusion reached by Paris[424] that the Itinerarium is a translation of the Estoire.

Many historical events in RCL are also referred to by Itin and Ambroise, e.g. 1495-6 the horse *Fauel*; 1913 the Saracens poison the water supply; 2011 the famine in the Christian camp; 2032 the collection for the poor; 3007-26 the castles razed by Saladin; 4309 the capture of the caravan. Some events are confirmed by Itin alone, e.g. 692-3 the donation of the chalices towards Richard's ransom; 1037 the entrance into Messina; 1939 the encounter between the Christians and the Saracens; 2429 Philip's (feigned) illness; 2935-40 the archbishop's wagon.

No direct historical parallels can be found between RCL and Ambroise without Itin also being present as a source, which leads one to surmise that Itin or a like-minded source was consulted rather than Ambroise. The investigation of parallels between RCL, Itin and Ambroise has not been exhaustive, so conclusions must be tentative, but a pattern of correspondence with Itin emerges which observes the boundaries of the core text and to some extent episodes 2411-68, 2951-3288 and 4229-4308. The correspondence between Itin and the core text is in itself not surprising, since the core text is the most historically accurate part of RCL and many of the interpolations, for instance the captivity episode and the first passage E, are almost totally fictitious.

One curious parallel between RCL and Itin deserves mention here. In 765-8 L reports erroneously that Richard was crowned at Winchester. It probably derived this idea from Itin[425], because Itin confused Richard's crownwearing at Winchester with his coronation at Westminster.

---

[418] Ed. W. Stubbs, Rolls Series 38.

[419] Ed. G. Paris, 1897.

[420] *Die me. Romanze Richard Coeur de Lion und ihre Quellen*, ESt 15 (1891) pp. 161–246 and *Le Roman de Richard Coeur de Lion*, Romania xxvi (1897) pp. 353-393.

[421] See Paris in his introduction to *L'Estoire de la Guerre Sainte par Ambroise*, 1891; K. Norgate, *The Itinerarium Peregrinorum and the Song of Ambrose*, English Historical Review 25 (1910) pp. 523–47; J. G. Edwards, *The Itinerarium Regis Ricardi and the Estoire de la Guerre Sainte* in *Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait*, 1933, pp. 59-77; Hubert and La Monte, *The Crusade of Richard Lion-Heart*, pp. 4-18.

[422] Hubert and La Monte, p. 10

[423] Edwards, op. cit. p. 68.

[424] See Paris' introduction to Ambroise's *Estoire de la Guerre Sainte*, pp. l-lxxvi.

[425] Itin, p. 446. See also Note 765-8.

If RCL tends to have more historical parallels with Itin than with Ambroise, RCL and Ambroise are more similar in tone. Whereas the Itinerarium gives a general, historically accurate picture of the third crusade, the aim of Ambroise and RCL is to depict King Richard as a hero. As a consequence, they are more fictional in their approach and concentrate on any action that involves Richard to the detriment of other characters. For example, RCL and Ambroise share the hostile depiction of Conrad de Montferrat[426], and a major event like Frederick Barbarossa's death receives scant or no attention in Ambroise and RCL[427].

3. Other Sources[428]

a. In the Core Text

The influence of Roger of Howden[429] is found only in the core text, in the meeting between Richard and Tancred (see Note 830) and in the episode in which the steward's nose is cut off (see Note 1305). The name *Trenchemer* must also have been derived from this Chronicle (see Note 1655).

The appearance of the two justices may originate in the Chronicles of either Roger of Howden or Richard of Devizes (see Note 1124).

The phrasing of 883-6 with its placement of Philip inside and Richard outside Messina is probably also due to Richard of Devizes (see Note 883).

John Bromton's *Chronicon* or its predecessor must have influenced the account of Richard's quarrel with the Duke of Austria (see Note 3874).

b. The passage E1 (2469-2806)

The subject of the cannibal tale may well have been inspired by two OF sources: Richard Le Pèlerin's *La Chanson d'Antioche* and Adémar de Chabannes' *Chronique* (see Note 2469).

c. The passage E2 (3289-3806)

The description of the combat with Saladin resembles Walter of Hemingburgh's *Chronicon* and Pierre de Langtoft's *Chronicle* (see Note 3634).

d. 5204-47

The final passage describing Richard's death occurs in A only. It is unusual in RCL, in that it has identifiable sources for many of the details. Various chroniclers report on Richard's final days (see Note 5204), while Itin and Ambroise do not. The name of the soldier who shot Richard (5223) and also the date on which Richard was wounded (5220) were probably borrowed from Ralph of Diceto. Walter of Hemingburgh shares the placename *Gailard* with 5211.

---

[426] RCL 1877, 1884, 2298 etc.; Ambroise, e.g. v. 4111 ff. and v. 5409 ff.

[427] See Note 757.

[428] This section charts the material which has been collected so far. Further research may well provide more sources.

[429] *Chronica*, Rolls Series 51.

RCL consists of riming couplets with four stresses to the line throughout the text, with the exception of ll. 1–24 in text L, which are made up of two tail-rime stanzas of the type *aab, aab, ccb, ddb* and are clearly an adaptation of the original riming couplets by a later reviser. It is impossible to say whether he had plans to rework RCL completely, but if he did, he abandoned his task very quickly. The changes forced by the different format are most easily visible in a comparison of L and BC, which maintain the original couplets[430]:

1 L Lord Jh*esu*, King of glorie,

   B Lorde Jh*esu* Criste, Kyng of glory,

   C Lord J*esu*, Kyng off glorye,

2 L swiche auentour *and* swiche victorie

   B the faire grace and the victorye

   C Whyche grace *and* uyctorye

3 L þou sentest king Richard!

   B þat thou sent to kynge Richerde,

   C þou sente to Kyng Rychard,

4 L Miri it is to heren his stori

5 L *and* of him to han in memorie

6 L þat neuer no was couward!

   B þat neu*er* in his lyue was funden cowerde!

   C þ*at* neu*er* was founde coward!

   B It is righte gude to heryn in jeste

   C It is ful good to her*e in* jeste

   B off his prowesche and his noble conqueste.

   C Off his prowesse *and* hys conqueste.

   B Also full*e* fele romance men makis nowe,

   C ffele roma*un*ses men make*n* newe,

   B of gude knyghtis þ*at* were stronge *and* trewe,

   C Off goode kny3tes, stronge and trewe;

   B of þaire dedis men redys romance

   C Off her*e* dedys men rede roma*un*ce,

   B bothe in [Y]nglonde and eke in ffraunce,

   C Boþe in Engeland *and in* ffraunce:

7 L Bokes men makeþ of Latyn,

8 L cle[r]kes witen what is þ*er*in,

9 L boþe Almaundes *and* Pikard.

10 L Roma*un*ce make folk of Frau*n*ce

11 L of kni3tes þat wer*e* in destau*n*ce,

---

[430] ll. 1-24 in both texts.

12 L þat dyed þurth dint of sward:

13 L of Rouland, of Oliuer
   B of duke Rowlande and of S*ir* Olyuere
   C Off Rowelond, *and* off Olyuer,

14 L *and* of þe oþer dusse-per,
   B and also of eu*ere* ylke a duggepere,
   C And off eu*ery* Doseper;

15 L of Alisander *and* Charlmeyn
   B of Alexandere and of S*ir* Gawayne
   C Off Alisa*undre*, *and* Charlemayn;

16 L *and* Ector, þe gret werrer,

17 L *and* of Danys le fiz Oger,

18 L of Artho(u)r *and* of Gaweyn.
   B of kyng Arthure *and* of S*ir* Charlemayne,
   C Off kyng Artho*ur*, and off Gawayn,

   B how they weren gude and also curtayse;
   C How þey wer*e* knyght*es* goode *and* c*ur*teys;

   B of bischope Turpyn *and* S*ir* Ogere Danays,
   C Off Turpyn, and of Oger Daneys;

   B and also of Troye men redis in ryme,
   C Off Troye men rede i*n* ryme,

   B whate werre was there i*n* olde tyme;
   C What werre þ*er* was i*n* olde tyme;

   B of Ectoure and also of Achilles
   C Off Ector, *and* off Achylles,

   B and whate folkes were slayne þ*er* i*n* þ*at* prese.
   C What folk þey slowe i*n* þat pres.

19 L Ac þis (r)omau*n*ce of Frenys [be] wrouȝt
   B In ffraunce bokes thies ry*m*mes men wrote
   C In Frenssche bookys þis rym is wrouȝt,

20 L þat mani lewed no knowe nouȝt
   B bot in Ynglys lewede men knewe it note.
   C Lewede men ne knowe it nouȝt -

21 L in gest as so we seyn.

22 L Þis lewed no can Freyns non
   B Lewede men kan ffraunce righte none
   C Lewede men cùne ffrensch non,

23 L among an hundred vnneþe on,
   B amanges ane hundrethe vnnethes one,
   C Amo*n*g an hondryd vnneþis on -;

24 L in lede is nouʒt to leyn.

The tail-rime reviser seems to work mechanically. He maintains the first couplet in both stanzas and forces the second couplet apart by inserting a third couplet in between its lines, with the result that the rime in the second couplet forms the refrain throughout the stanza. In the first stanza the reviser rejects the next six lines, which are reworked completely in 7–12. In the second, the next six lines are also omitted, but 19–20 and 22–23 are incorporated, and 21 and 24 introduced to supply the refrain. The added lines, e.g. 9–12[431], 21 and 24, sit awkwardly between the original couplets.

A change of metrical structure is not unique to RCL and is found in other medieval romances, e.g. *Roland and Vernagu, Sir Ferumbras, Guy of Warwick* and *Bevis of Hampton*[432]. However, RCL is different from the examples mentioned above in that in this romance we have two tail-rime stanzas, which are demonstrably an adaptation of original couplets. The reason for the change of metre is not known, but, since several of the romances which show variation of riming patterns are found in the Auchinleck manuscript, it is possible that the scribe who copied RCL derived his inspiration from them.

Rime

On the whole the four versions follow the original rimes reasonably closely and they tend to deviate only if a particular rime presents an unacceptable dialectal feature. However, text A is an exception with its free treatment of the rimes, e.g. *smote:ouerlope* 471 (compare D *met:ouerset*) and *to:sey* 479 (compare D *tweye:seye*). In addition, A sometimes omits single lines, e.g. 1959 and 2067.

Assonance is very rare in RCL, except in the captivity episode, in which two examples dependent on **m/n** are found close together, *undernam:man* 379, *man:cam* 443. Another example of assonance occurs in the captivity episode in 363 *vnderfonge:honde*.

RCL and the Putative KA Group

Smithers in his introduction to KA[433] postulated the existence of a KA group 'because I believe that all are the work of a single author (or so we may say at least of those parts of SS[434] and RCL that are contained in the Auchinleck MS., as of KA and AM).' As far as the relationship between KA, AM and SS is concerned, I refer to the evidence produced by Smithers and Macrae-Gibson in their editions of KA and AM. In the case of the relationship of RCL with these texts, the following points must be considered: RCL was very probably not produced by one author[435], with even in the version of RCL in Auchinleck probably the work of more

---

[431] For instance, the rare form *sward* in 12 is added by the interpolator.

[432] See Kölbing, *Sir Beues of Hamtoun*, EETS Extra Series 46 (1885) p. xi, and Brunner, RCL pp. 25-6.

[433] Smithers, KA p. 41.

[434] *The Seven Sages of Rome*, ed. Karl Brunner, EETS vol. 191, 1933.

[435] See p. 31 ff. and p. 59 ff.

than one author[436]; the evidence for common authorship of RCL as well as the three others appears to be thin and I can only agree with Macrae-Gibson's assessment[437] that 'RCL is in all probability of distinct authorship'. This statement can now be refined to: there are at least 10 authors in RCL in the material contained in the four texts ADEL, while more authors again contributed to texts BC.

References to KA and AM, documenting their relationship with RCL, are found throughout this volume, but the following points indicate that RCL is unlikely to have been written by the author of the KA group.

1. The dialectically distinct variants presented by Smithers[438] as both being found in KA are not closely matched in RCL. The most important of these to RCL is the distribution of the e or i/y reflex of OE y. While Smithers maintains that both forms occur in KA, in RCL the distribution of these is divided into e in the core text and i/y in the interpolations[439]. Other items also set RCL apart: KA *dade, sade* beside *dede, seide*, RCL *seide, sayde*, e.g. 1127, except one example of *drade* in 4021; KA *want* beside *went*, RCL *went*. Only *man* pl. occurs beside *men* both in KA and RCL; both Anglian and WS/Kentish reflexes of OE æ + ld are found in KA and RCL, but it is interesting that the form *beld* cited by Smithers does not occur in RCL.

2. AM, KA and *The Seven Sages of Rome*[440] are demonstrably translations from OF source texts, whereas there is no indication that the core text of RCL was derived from an OF original[441].

   In contrast to Smithers observation 'the most striking lexical feature of KA is the unusual number of French words in [KA]'[442], and Macrae-Gibson on AM 'many words and phrases taken over or adapted from French'[443], RCL displays a low frequency of French loan-words throughout its text, except in the Gatris episode[444].

3. While there has been no opportunity to study AM, KA and *Seven Sages* in depth, the tone and style of RCL appear to set it apart from the other texts. Rhetorical figures are rare in RCL but not in KA and AM, while descriptions are not common in RCL, except in the field of armour and battle, where they are of a different type[445]. The use of 'headpieces' is common in AM and KA, while only one example is found in RCL[446]. One can only agree with Macrae-Gibson's assessment: 'What has chiefly convinced critics of common authorship is extensive similarity in style of composition and in phraseology. The evidence on the first point is not particularly strong in the [case] of RCL'[447].

---

[436] See pp. 76-8.

[437] Macrae-Gibson, AM p. 75.

[438] Smithers, KA p. 41.

[439] See pp. 36-7 and 40.

[440] AM p. 2, KA p. 15, *Seven Sages*, p. xiii ff.

[441] See pp. 72-3.

[442] Smithers, KA p. 56.

[443] Macrae-Gibson, AM p. 62.

[444] See p. 73.

[445] RCL p. 67, AM p. 69, KA p. 31 ff.

[446] KA p. 36, AM p. 70, RCL pp. 59-60.

[447] Macrae-Gibson, AM p. 68.

79

Bibliography

Ackerman, Robert W., *An Index of the Arthurian Names in Middle English.* Stanford University Press, 1952.

Adémar de Chabannes, *Chronique*, ed. Jules Chavanon. Paris: Picard, 1897.

The Alliterative Morte Arthure, ed. Valerie Krishna. New York: Burt Franklin & Co, 1976.

Ambroise, *l'Estoire de la Guerre Sainte*, ed. Gaston B. P. Paris (Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France). Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1897.

Ancrene Wisse, ed. Geoffrey Shepherd, parts Six and Seven. Manchester University Press, 1972.

Arthour and Merlin, ed. O. D. Macrae-Gibson. EETS vols. 268 and 279, 1979 and 1986.

Attwater, Donald, *The Penguin Dictionary of Saints*, 2nd ed. revised by Catherine R. John. Penguin Books, 1983.

The Auchinleck Manuscript, with an Introduction by Derek Pearsall and I. C. Cunningham. London: Scolar Press, 1977.

Ayenbite of Inwyt, ed. R Morris, nu Pq radon vol 1, EETS vol. 23, 1965.

Baugh Albert C., *The Middle English Romance, Some Questions of Creation, Presentation, and Preservation.* **Speculum** vol 42, 1967, pp. 1–31.

Barber, Richard, *The Devil's Crown, Henry II, Richard I and John.* London: BBC, 1978.

Bennett, H. S., *The author and his Public in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.* **Essays and Studies** vol. 23, 1937, pp. 7–24.

Bennett, J. A. W. and Smithers, G. V., *Early Middle English Verse and Prose*, 2nd ed. Oxford: O.U.P., 1968.

Beues of Hamtoun, ed. E Kölbing. EETS Extra Series vol. 46, 1885.

Black, William Henry, *Catalogue of the Arundel Manuscripts in the Library of the College of Arms*, (not published) 1829.

Black, William Henry, *A Descriptive, Analytical, and Critical Catalogue of the Manuscripts Bequeathed unto the University of Oxford by Elias Ashmole ....* Oxford: OUP, 1845.

Bliss, Alan J., *Notes on the Auchinleck Manuscript.* **Speculum** vol. 26, 1951, pp. 652–58.

Borland Catherine R., *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Western Medieval Manuscripts in Edinburgh University Library.* Edinburgh: University Press, 1916.

Boyd, Beverly, *Chaucer and the Medieval Book.* The Huntingdon Library, 1973.

Bridge, Anthony, *The Crusades.* London: Granada, 1980.

Briquet, C. M., *Les Filigranes*, 4 vols, Facsimile of the 1907 Edition, ed. A. Stevenson. Amsterdam: Paper Publications Society, 1968.

Broughton, Bradford B., *The Legends of Richard I Coeur de Lion*. The Hague: Mouton, 1966.

Brunner, Karl, *An Outline of Middle English Grammar*, tr. Grahame Johnston. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970.

Bushnell, George Herbert, *The Auchinleck Manuscript in the University Library*. *College Echoes*, SRC Magazine, St Andrews Committee, vol. 60, no. 4, March 4, 1949, pp. 12-3.

Cameron, Kenneth, *English Place-Names*, 3rd ed. London: B. T. Batsford, 1979.

Campbell, Alistair, *Old English Grammar*. Oxford: OUP, 1974.

Catalogue of Additions to the Manuscripts in the British Museum 1906-1910. London: William Clowes, 1912.

La Chanson de Roland, ed. Joseph Bédier, 3rd ed. Paris, 1927.

Le Chevalier au Cigne, ed. M. A. Borgnet, tome iii (Monuments pour servir à l'Histoire des Provinces de Namur, de Hainaut et de Luxembourg, ed. Baron de Reiffenberg). Bruxelles: M. Hayez, 1854.

Child, Francis J., *The English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, 5 vols. New York: Dover Publications, 1965.

The Complete Peerage, ed. George E. Cokayne and Vicary Gibbs. London: St. Catharine Press, 1910-1959.

Crane, Susan, *Insular Romance*. Berkely: University of California Press, 1986.

Crosby, Ruth, *Oral Delivery in the Middle Ages*. **Speculum** vol. 11, 1936, pp. 88–110.

Cunningham, Ian C., *Notes on the Auchinleck Manuscript*. **Speculum** vol. 47, 1972, pp. 96–98.

Cunningham, Ian C. and Mordkoff J. E. C., *New Light on the Signatures in the Auchinleck Manuscript*. **Scriptorium** vol. 36, 1982, pp. 280-292.

Dan Michel, *Ayenbite of Inwyt*, ed. P. Gradon. EETS vol. 23, 1965.

d'Ardenne, S. R., Þe liflade ant te Passiun of Seinte Iuliene. EETS vol. 248, 1961.

Davis, Norman, *Another Fragment of Richard Coeur de Lion*. **N&Q** vol. 214, 1969, pp. 447–52.

Denholm-Young, N., *Handwriting in England and Wales*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1954.

Dictionary of National Bibliography, ed. L. Stephen and S. Lee. Oxford: OUP, 1917.

Dobson, E. J., *English Pronunciation 1500-1700*, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.

Donaldson, E. Talbot, *The psychology of Editors of Middle English Texts* in *Speaking of Chaucer*. London: Athlone Press, 1970.

Doyle, A. I. and Parkes M. B., *The Production of Copies of the Canterbury Tales and the Confessio Amantis in the Early Fifteenth Century*, in *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts and Libraries*: Essays Presented to N. R. Ker. London: Scolar Press, 1978, pp. 163-210.

Edwards, J. G., *The Itinerarium Regis Ricardi and the Estoire de la Guerre Sainte*, in *Historical Essays in honour of James Tait*, ed. J. G. Edwards. Manchester, 1933, pp. 59-77.

Ellis, George, *Specimens of Early English Metrical Romances*, 3 vols, 2nd edition. London: Longman, Hurst etc., 1811.

Everett, Dorothy, *A Characterisation of the English Medieval Romances*, in *Essays on Middle English Literature*, ed. Patricia Kean. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

Fedden, Robin, *Syria and Lebanon*, 3rd ed. London: John Murray, 1965.

Fedden, Robin, and Thomson, John, *Crusader Castles*. London: John Murray, 1957.

Fell, Christine, *Unfrið: An Approach to a Definition*. **Saga-Book of the Viking Society**, vol. 21, 1-2, 1982-3, pp. 85-100.

Fisher, Erna, *AE. ēa im Südostmittelenglischen und die Heimat des Südlichen Octavian*. **EStn** vol. 64, 1929, pp. 1-19.

Fisiak, Jacek, *A Short Grammar of Middle English*. Warsaw: Panstwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1968.

Flasdieck, Hermann, *Über me. agān und Verwandtes*. **Beiblatt zur Anglia** vol. 34, 1923, pp. 121-8.

French, W. H. and Hale, Charles B., *Middle English Metrical Romance*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1930.

French, W. H., *Dialects and Forms in Three Romances*. **JEGP** vol. 45, 1946, pp. 125-132.

Gabrieli, Francesco, *Arab Historians of the Crusades*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984.

Geoffrey Chaucer, *The Works of –*, ed. F. N. Robinson, 2nd ed. London: OUP, 1974.

Gesta Abbatum Monasterii S. Albani, ed. Henry Riley. Rolls Series 28, vol. i. London, 1867.

Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi Abbatis, ed. William Stubbs. Rolls Series 49. London, 1867.

Gillingham, John, *The Life and Times of Richard I*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1973.

Gillingham, John, *Richard the Lionheart*. London: Book Club Associates, 1978.

Gradon, Pamela, *Form and Style in Early English Literature*. London: Methuen, 1971.

Griffin, Nathaniel E., *The Definition of Romance*. **PMLA** vol. 38, 1923, pp. 50-70.

Guddat-Figge, Ursula, *Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Middle English Romances,* (Münchner Universitäts-schriften Band 4). München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1976.

Havelok, ed. G. V. Smithers. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.

Heyworth, P. L., *The Punctuation of Middle English Texts* in *Medieval Studies for J. A. W. Bennett.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.

Hill, D. M., *Romance as Epic.* **English Studies** vol. 44, 1963, pp. 95–107.

Histoire Littéraire de la France, tom⁵ xxxi. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1893.

Hubert, Merton, and La Monte, John, *The Crusade of Richard Lion-Heart,* repr. ed. New York: Octagon Books, 1976.

Hudson, Anne, *Middle English* in *Editing Medieval Texts English, French, and Latin written in England,* ed. A. G. Rigg (Conference on Editorial Problems), 12th, 1977, pp. 34-57.

Israel, Atlas of –, published by Survey of Israel, Ministry of Labour, Jerusalem and Elsevier Publishing Company. Amsterdam 1970.

Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi, ed. William Stubbs, *Chronicles and Memorials of the Reign of Richard I,*Rolls Series 38. London, 1864.

Ivy, Geoffrey S., *The Bibliography of the Manuscript-Book,* in *The English Library before 1700,* ed. Francis Wormald and C. E. Wright. Athlone Press, 1958.

Jacobs, Nicolas, *The Egerton Fragment of Sir Degarre.* **NM** vol. 72, 1971, pp. 86–96.

Jentsch, F., *Die me. Romanze Richard Coeur de Lion und ihre Quellen.* **ESt,** vol 15, 1891, pp. 161–246.

Jentsch, F., *Zur Frage nach den Quellen der Mittelenglischen Romanze Richard Coeur de Lion.* **EStn** vol. 16, 1892, pp. 142–150.

John Bromton, *Chronicon,* ed. Twysden, *HistoriæAnglicanæscriptores x.* London, 1652.

Johnson, Charles, and Jenkinson, Hilary, *English Court Hand: A. D. 1066 to 1500,* 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915.

Johnston, R. C., *An Anglo-Norman Chronicle of the Crusade and the Death of King Richard I* in *Studies in Medieval French Presented to Alfred Ewert* ed. E.A. Francis. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.

Jones, Lesley Webber, *Pricking Manuscripts: The Instruments and Their Significance.* **Speculum** vol. 21, 1946, pp. 389–403.

Jordan, Richard, *Handbook of Middle English Grammar: Phonology,* transl. Eugene Crook (Janua Linguarum 218). The Hague: Mouton, 1974.

Kane, George, *Piers Plowman: the A version.* London: Athlone Press, 1960.

Kane, George, and Donaldson, E. Talbot, *Piers Plowman: the B Version*. London: Athlone Press, 1975.

Ker, Neil R., *Books, Collectors and Libraries: Studies in the Medieval Heritage*, ed. A. Watson. London: Hambledon Press, 1985.

Kyng Alisaunder, ed G. V. Smithers. EETS vols. 227 and 237, 1952 and 1957.

Kölbing, Eugen, *Vier Romanzen Handschriften*. **EStn** vol. 7, 1884, pp. 178-91.

Kölbing, Eugen, *Zu Chaucers Sir Topas*. **EStn** vol. 11, 1887-8, pp. 495-511.

Laing, David, *Owain Miles and Other Inedited Fragments of Ancient English Poetry*. Edinburgh, 1837.

Laing, David, *A Penni worth of Witte*. Edinburgh: Abbotsford Club, 1857.

Langlois, Ernest, *Table des Noms Propres dans les Chansons de Geste*. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1974.

Legge, M. Domenica, *Anglo Norman Literature and its Background*. Oxford:Clarendon Press, 1963.

Loomis, Laura Hibbard, *Medieval Romance in England*. New York: OUP, 1924.

Loomis, Laura Hibbard, *Sir Thopas* in *Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, ed. W. F. Bryan and G. Dempster. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941, pp. 486-559.

Loomis, Laura Hibbard, *The Auchinleck Manuscript and a Possible London Bookshop of 1330-1340*. **PMLA** vol. 57, 1942, pp. 595-627.

Loomis, Laura Hibbard, *The Auchinleck Roland and Vernagu and the Short Chronicle*. **MLN** vol. 60, 1945, pp. 94-97.

Loomis, Roger S., *Richard Coeur de Lion and the Pas Saladin in Medieval Art*. **PMLA** vol. 30, 1915, pp. 509-528.

Loomis, Roger S., *Der Mittelenglische Versroman über Richard Löwenhertz*. **JEGP** vol. 15, 1916, pp. 455-466.

Luick, Karl, *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache*, 1 vol. in 2 parts. Repr. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964.

Maas, Paul, *Textual Criticism*, translated by Barbara Flower. Oxford: OUP, 1958.

Mackenzie, Barbara, *A Special Dialectal Development of OE ēa in Middle English*. **EStn** vol. 61, 1927, pp. 386-392.

McIntosh, Angus, Samuels, M. L. and Benskin Michael, *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Middle English*, 4 vols. Aberdeen: University Press, 1986.

Macrae-Gibson, O. D., *Walter Scott, the Auchinleck Manuscript and MS Douce 124*. **Neophilo-logus** vol. 50, 1966, pp. 449–54.

Madan, Falconer, *Summary Catalogue of Western MSS in the Bodleian Library*, Nineteenth Century Collections till 1850, vol. iv, part ii. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897.

Matzke, John E., *The Legend of Saint George*. **PMLA** vol 18, 1903, pp. 99–171.

Mehl, D., *The Middle English Romances of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries*. London: Routledge and Paul, 1969.

Metlitzki, Dorothée, *The Matter of Araby in Medieval England*. Yale, 1977.

Moorman, Charles, *Editing the Middle English Manuscript*. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 1975.

Mustanoja, Tauno F., *A Middle English Syntax*, part i., **Mémoires de la Societé Néophilologique de Helsinki**, vol. 23, 1960.

National Library of Scotland, *A Summary Catalogue of the Advocates Manuscripts*, ed. Elspeth D. Yeo and Ian C. Cunningham. Edinburgh: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1971.

Norgate, Kate, *The Itinerarium Peregrinorum and the Song of Ambrose*. **English Historical Review** vol. 25, 1910, pp. 523–547.

Norgate, Kate, *Richard the Lion Heart*. London: Macmillan, 1924.

Needler, George H., *Richard Coeur de Lion in Literature*. Leipzig: Gustav Fock, 1890.

The Owl and the Nightingale, ed. Eric G. Stanley. Manchester University Press, 1960.

Paris, Gaston, *Le Roman de Richard Coeur de Lion*. **Romania**, vol. 26, 1897, pp. 353–393.

Parkes M. B., *English Cursive Bookhands 1250-1500*, OUP 1969, repr. Scolar Press, 1979.

Partonope of Blois, ed. A. T. Bödtker. EETS Extra Series, vol. 109, 1912.

Pearsall, Derek, *The Development of Middle English Romance*. **Medieval Studies** vol. 27, 1965, pp. 91–116.

Penttilä, Erkki, *Verbs Denoting Emission of Light*. **NM** vol. 59, 1958, pp. 161–172.

Percy, Thomas, *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*, 3 vols., ed. Henry B. Wheatley. New York: Dover Publications, 1966.

Pierre de Langtoft, *Chronicle*, ed. Thomas Wright. Rolls Series 47, vol. ii. London, 1866.

Ralph de Coggeshall, *Chronicon Anglicanum*, ed. Joseph Stevenson. Rolls Series 66. London, 1875.

Ralph de Diceto, *Opera Historica*, ed. William Stubbs. Rolls Series 68, vol. ii. London, 1876.

Richard Coeur de Lion: Der mittelenglische Versroman über Richard Löwenhertz, ed. Karl

Brunner. (Wiener Beiträge zur englischen philologie 42), Wien und Leipzig, 1913.

Richard le Pèlerin, *La Chanson d'Antioche*, transl. La Marquise de Sainte Aulaire. Paris: 1862.

Richard of Devizes, *Cronicon Richardi Divisensis De Tempore Regis Ricardi Primi*, ed. John Appleby. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1963.

Riley-Smith, Louise and Jonathan, *The Crusades: Idea and Reality, 1095–1274*, Documents of Medieval History 4. London: Arnold, 1981.

Ritson, Joseph, *Ancient Engleish Metrical Romanceës*, 3 vols. London: W. Bulmer, 1802.

Robbins, R. H., in a Book Review of A. G. Rigg's Edition of *A Glastonbury Miscellany of the Fifteenth Century*. **Anglia** vol. 89, 1971, pp. 140-3.

Robert of Gloucester's Chronicle, ed. Thomas Hearne, 2 vols. Oxford, 1724.

Robert of Gloucester, *The Metrical Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester*, ed. William Wright. Rolls Series 86. London, 1887.

Robinson, Pamela R., 'A Study of Some Aspects of the Transmission of English Verse Texts in Late Medieval Manuscripts', Unpublished Thesis. Oxford, 1972.

Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, ed. William Stubbs. Rolls Series 51, vols. 3 and 4. London, 1870.

Runciman, Steven, *A History of the Crusades*, vol. iii, *The Kingdom of Acre*, repr. ed. Cambridge University Press, 1966.

Rydyng, William W., *Structure in Medieval Narrative*. The Hague: Mouton, 1971.

Samuels, M. L., *Some Applications of Middle English Dialectology*. English Studies, vol. 44, 1963, pp. 81-94.

Samuels, M. L., *Linguistic Evolution, Cambridge Studies in Linguistics* 5. Cambridge: University Press, 1972.

Schirmer, W. F., *John Lydgate*, transl. Ann Keep. London: Methuen, 1961.

Scott, Walter, *Sir Tristrem*. Edinburgh, 1804.

The Seege or Batayle of Troye, ed. Mary E. Barnicle, EETS vol. 172, 1927.

The Seven Sages of Rome, ed. Karl Brunner, EETS vol. 191, 1933.

Setton, Kenneth M.,. *A History of the Crusades*, vol., ii *The Later Crusades 1189-1311*, ed. Robert L. Wolff and Harry W. Hazard. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.

Shepherd, William R., *Historical Atlas*, 2nd rev. ed. London: University of London Press, 1922.

Shonk, Timothy A., *A Study of the Auchinleck Manuscript: Bookmen and Bookmaking in the Early Fourteenth Century*. **Speculum** vol. 60, 1985, pp. 71-91.

Sir Eglamour of Artois, ed. Francis E. Richardson, EETS vol. 256, 1965.

Smith, Jeremy J., *Linguistic Features of Some Fifteenth Century Middle English Manuscripts*, in *Manuscripts and Readers in Fifteenth Century England*, ed. Derek Pearsall. Cambridge: Brewer, 1983, pp. 104–112.

Smithers, G. V., *Two Newly Discovered Fragments from the Auchinleck MS*. **Medium Ævum**, vol. 18, 1949, pp. 1–11.

Smithers, G. V., *Another Fragment of the Auchinleck Manuscript*, in *Medieval Literature and Civilisation*, Studies in Memory of G. N. Garmonsway, ed. D. Pearsall and R. Waldron. London: Athlone Press, 1969, pp. 192-210.

Smyser, H. M., *Charlemagne and Roland and the Auchinleck Manuscript*. **Speculum** vol. 21, 1946, pp. 275–88.

Survey of Palestine. Palestine of the Crusaders, no. 9 and 12. Jaffa, 1937 and 1944.

Visser, Theodorus T., *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*, 3 vols. in 4 parts. Leiden: Brill, 1963-4.

Vogel, Bertram, *The Dialect of Sir Tristrem*. **JEGP** vol. 40, 1941, pp. 538–44.

de Vries, F. C., *Floris and Blancheflur*, Doctoral Thesis. Utrecht, 1966.

Wadsworth, R., *William Longespée*, **Neophilologus** vol. 56, 1972, pp. 269–272.

Wallenberg, J.K., *The Vocabulary of Dan Michel's Ayenbite of Inwyt. A Phonological, Morphological, Etymological, Semasiological and Textual Study.* Uppsala, 1923.

Walter of Hemingburgh, *Chronicon*, ed. Hans Claude Hamilton, vol. 14, i. (The English Historical Society Publications). London, 1848.

Ward, Harry, L. D., *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum*, vol. i. London: William Clowes, 1883.

Weber, Henry, *Metrical Romances of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, 3 vols. Edinburgh: George Ramsay, 1810.

Weever, John, *Ancient Funerall Monuments*. London: printed by Thomas Harper, 1631.

West, Geoffrey D., *An Index of Proper Names in French Arthurian Verse Romances 1150-1300*. University of Toronto Press: 1969.

Wright, Joseph and Elizabeth, *An Elementary Middle English Grammar*, 2nd ed. London: OUP, 1928, repr. 1946.

Young, Karl, *The Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2 vols. Oxford: OUP, 1933.

Notes

Some bibliographic details which would take up inordinate space in the Notes have been curtailed to promote readability. Full details can be found in the Bibliography.

13-18   For the device of the catalogue of heroes, found here and in 4697-4706, see pp. 67-8.

19   The words þis *romance*, like their predecessor *romaunce* in l. 10, must be considered undeclined plurals, which here refer to the list of medieval romances in ll. 13-18. Consequently, the missing verb to be inserted in this line must be the pl. form *be*. For the readings of this line in B and C, see pp. 76-8.

22-3   In this passage the author deplores the fact that the laity do not know French, 'These uneducated, lay [men] do not understand French - amongst a hundred there is hardly one!' Brunner, RCL p. 70, concludes from these lines that the translator of the OF text was a cleric. The opening lines of AM, Auchinleck 9-29 only, also touch on the advantages of being able to read French, but nowhere is their author as censorious as RCL.

24   'among the people it cannot be concealed'.

33-4   These lines are similar, but not identical to AM, Auchinleck 1-2 *Ihesu Crist Heuen-King/Al ous grawnt gode ending.*

34+733   The order in which passages L 1-34, DA 35-732, L 733-768, and DA 769-770 appear in the edition runs parallel to the sequence of text C 1-1344. C has a much greater number of lines through the inclusion of additions such as C 35-238, which relates the marriage of Richard's father Henry to the mythical Cassadorien. The abrupt transition between L 34 and L 733 indicates that some lines were lost between them, but it is impossible to say how many.

37   The form *were* in D is probably dependent on *as*, i.e. 'as (if he were) a knight who was...' Other examples of the use of *auentoures* in romances like *Sir Degaré* and *Sir Eglamour* are discussed by L. Loomis in her article on *Sir Thopas* in *Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, pp. 547-550.

39   For the motif of the *Tournament and the Unknown Knight*, see p. 61.

40   In D *withowtyn ony kynggis lac*, *ony kynggis* is probably a corruption of *ony-kynnis* 'any kind of', and is emended accordingly. The reading in C 274 *was his horse without lacke*, which is substantially different from D, does not throw further light on the original reading of this line.

52   *bote* 'only' in *bote eytene foot long* changes the line from a boast into a statement of limit; compare C 286 *it was fourtene fote long.*

63-70   These lines form a broad paraphrase of texts B and C 307-318.

74   D *after strok þat was on* may well be corrupt; compare C 322 *and also his brandellet-bone* and B *and alswa of his schouldere-bane.*

84   D *anoder* refers back to *atire* in 38.

96   The illegible part of text D has been filled with *he helde* 'he went', which follows C 346. .

110   D is unique here and [*wy*]t has been supplied on the basis of two other occurrences of the form

wyt 'with'.

111   D *stoure* is used as an adverb meaning 'fiercely', derived from the OE adj. *stor*.

115-6   *Vpon his crest a dowe wyth/in signyficacyoun of þe holy Spyrith* is very similar to the couplet found in 3607-8 *on his crest a culuer white/þat signified þe hooly Spiryte*. Both couplets are part of a description of armour found in an introduction to a joust. 115-6 are only found in the D text, and 3607-8 only in E, so it is impossible to determine if these lines could have been derived from each other. Since the E text only starts at 975, it cannot be excluded that E may have originally contained the captivity episode, and consequently that E 3607 could have borrowed these lines from D (see also pp. 23-4).

123   The error in D *vpon doun* for *vp and down* is typical of a copying error made because the text was read out to the scribe. This would imply that D, which is unique here, is not the original version of this passage.

136   The imperative *chew* is a variant spelling of 'to show'. More examples of <ch> spellings can be found on p. 52-3.

142   *keme*, e.g. 247, and *kemyn*, e.g. 194, 195, are the regular forms in D of the 3rd pl. pa.t. of *comen*, which are modelled on the regular pa.t. of class IV verbs, e.g. *stelen-stal-stelen*. However, it is likely that here *keme* is a subjunctive form rather than the pa.t.

153   The castle at Salisbury, mentioned in the text, may well be Clarendon, for it was one of the Royal Palaces nearby (see Henry Weber's *Metrical Romances*, vol. iii, p. 352).

155-6   D interchanged the rime-words *set* and *met* (compare H *togeder mette:a stroke he sette*). This causes problems with the meaning of D *together set*.

165   Since in *Dolyt* the addition of 't' is an erroneous scribal correction, (compare 126 *Doly*), it has been deleted in the text.

167   The D scribe writes *fesst* for *ferst* and also *fusst* for *furst* in 2167; both have been emended.

183-185   The names of *Thomas of Multon* and *Fouke Dolye* are only found in the later, romantic additions to RCL. These two knights play a great role in the tournament at Salisbury and the subsequent secret pilgrimage. There is no doubt that both men were contemporaries of Richard but they are not known to have accompanied him on the crusade.

H. Ward, *Catalogue of Romances in the BM*, vol. i, p. 946, identified them as Thomas Multon and Fulk de Oyri: 'Thomas Multon was doubtless the Lord of Moulton in Lincolnshire, who was the ancestor of the Multons (afterwards the Dacres) of Gillesland in Cumberland, and the Multons of Egremont. He and Fulk de Oyri are mentioned together, in the Historiæ Croylandensis Continuatio, as two of the lords of Holland in Lincolnshire, who were opposed to the Abbot and Monks of Croyland in the years 1189-1190: etc.' Ward continues: 'His companion in this Romance, 'Sir Fuke Doly', might naturally be supposed to be a member of the family De Oilli or D'Oyley; but no Fulk occurs in the records of that family later than 1150. It seems not improbable that he was the Fulk de Oyri mentioned above, who was seneschal to the Earl of Albemarle at the close of the 12th century: etc.'

Neither *Thomas* nor *Fulk* are mentioned in Itin or Ambroise. It is unlikely that they played a historical part in the crusade because, when these two companions occur in RCL, they appear in an environment of fictitious place and personal names, e.g. the catalogue of place-names

in 252-68, and the names of the main protagonists, e.g. *Ardour* and *Margeryce*. Jentsch, p. 233, came to the same conclusion: 'Ausserdem muss es befremden, dass die beiden ritter nur in denjenigen theilen der romanze handelnd auftreten, welche völlig unhistorisch sind.'

As far as the reason for the inclusion of these knights is concerned, it would appear likely that its author inserted them because he came from the same area and had a personal connection with their family (see Paris, p. 358, and R Loomis, JEGP, 15, p. 462). The dialect features of this episode would not contradict this (see p. 33.).

186   Text A (and also H) changes from indirect to direct speech in this line and substitutes *me* for *hem*. A uses direct speech more than any other text (compare also 209 and 1317); this mode of speech was often used in Middle English to create an effect of liveliness.

195-7   In A the subject is changed from the singular to plural and back to the singular, while the other texts keep a singular subject throughout. The change in A causes problems in 197.

208   Text A has three forms which consist of a verb ending in *-y* followed by *-yng* with ousting of one *y*: 208 *gaynsayng* and 731 *pleyng* and 1978 *fleyng*. The first two forms are gerunds while the latter is a pr.p.

211   D *a bok·* is corrupt, compare A (and also BCH) *the boke* 'the Bible'.

21⁴   The D scribe appears to have been confused about the reading of this line, as *thre* is probably a repetition of *thre* found in 213, instead of e.g. text A *trewe*. In addition, D expuncted *there* in *alle there thre*.

224   In text D *wyth* and *myth* 'might' have been transposed.

227   The MED states that *cert* is only found as a rime-tag and gives examples from AM 5331 and 7271; KA 1357 and 5794; Libeaus 141 and Launfal 297. The latter is the only example to rime *in sert* with *hert*. The combination *for cert* is unique to RCL, and is shared by texts A, H and D.

230   *wax* is not found as a variant form of *was* (compare also Mcintosh, vol. 4, p. 36) and hence it has been emended.

244   In D *him ariuyd*, the pronoun *him* is a dative of interest used with a verb of motion.

243-268   The description of Richard's secret pilgrimage to the Holy Land forms part of a later romantic addition to RCL (see Introduction p. 60.). Relatively few elements survive in it of Richard's historical journey to Palestine and his imprisonment on the way back home. Neither Itin (p. 443 ff.) nor Ambroise (vv. 12307-23.) pay much attention to Richard's imprisonment in Vienna and there is no other historical source to which the treatment found in RCL could be attributed. The place names mentioned in this passage are mostly historically incorrect. The itinerary given in 243-256 echoes the route which Richard followed on his way to the Holy Land, although Sicily is left out in the text. The list of names in 257-268 contains a few places which we know Richard visited, such as *Cesar* 259, *Betanye* 262 and *Jafes* 267, but others Richard never passed through, notably *Jerusalem* 261 and *Bedlem* 262.

The remaining place-names are not historical (see Jentsch, p. 240): *Sudan Turpy* 263 A (compare H *Sudran Tuppye* and C *Sudan Turry*); *Ebedie* 264, *Tolloureyt/Taberet* 268 and *Torquan/Archane* 268. *Archane* may be a corruption of *Archas*, a fortified town near Tripoli, and *Taberet* may be a corruption of Tiberias, in medieval literature known as *Tabarie* (see R.

Loomis, JEGP 15 (1916), pp. 456-7). *Orgoilous* 265, the name of a castle, is also found in Arthurian Verse Romance (see West, *French Arthurian Verse Romances 1150-1300*, pp. 39 and 126) but there, too, its location is uncertain.

252 A and D share the corrupt reading *Samagous* for Famagusta, which has been emended in both texts (see also p. 27).

258 The Old City in Cairo was also known as 'Babylon', and the text refers to this city rather than to the Old Testament Babylon.

260 No text has a satisfactory reading of this line. A and D share *wys and war*, which is possibly the equivalent of a MDu expression *wis en waer* 'truly'. A *ofcomen* must be a 3rd pl. pa.t. form of the rare verb *ofcomen* 'to depart, go away'. The reading in BC *Off Nynyve þey were ware* looks like a rationalisation.

269 D *welke* is the pa.t. of OE *wealcian*, class VII, 'to roll', which in ME took on the meaning of 'to go, travel'.

275-6 The treatment in RCL of Richard's capture by the *king of Almayn* is broadly reminiscent of his historical imprisonment by Leopold of Austria and Henry VI of Germany. However, the details of the particular events in RCL are not based on history at all and the emnity between Richard and the Duke of Austria, which has a historic basis and is dealt with in Notes 3874 and 5212, has been allowed to colour the relationship between Richard and the *king of Almayn*.

279 This line is found in A, D and H only and its ending is obscure. D *in sepelye* and A *a sebelie* may well conceal a placename but they are too corrupt to decipher. H, or its ancestor, changes the line, probably because it was incomprehensible: *they touke her ynne sekurlye*.

281 Text A *brought in* (*a gos*) is probably a corruption of *broughten*.

283 Text A *for* is an unusual spelling for 'fire'.

285 It is not clear what *to stamp the wose* means. Either *to stamp* indicates that Thomas was grinding grapes for verjuice, sometimes advised as a sauce for goose, or it means 'to pound in a mortar', in which case Thomas may have ground parsley and garlic with the goose dripping he had caught in a dripping pan. There are recipes for such sauces in the Ménagier and in other cookbooks of the period according to Constance Hieatt (who provided the information contained in this note in a private communication). She quotes 'a fairly typical goose sauce in a fifteenth century French MS, BN Lat 6707: Pour rost d'oyes, la Saulse D'ause De Bresbant. Il fault broyer les aux et mectre cuire les moyonx (= miscopy 'moyoux'?) d'eufz. Et broyer tout ensemble et couler, et du verjust, et pou de pain.'
R. Loomis (JEGP 15 (1916) p. 465) suggests that 'the roasting of the fowl may be a variant of the tradition found in the semi-historical *Livre d'Eracles*', but gives no source.
D *stampid was* shows that this line is not just problematical today.

291 George Ellis, *Specimens of Early English Metrical Romances*, vol. ii, pp. 191-2 remarks on the disturbance of Richard's meal: 'This strange story is alluded to by *Petrus d'Ebulo*, a writer of the twelfth century, in his historical poem *De Motibus Siculis, et Rebus inter Henricum VI et Tancredum Gestis*'. He quotes: 'Cæsaris ut fugeret leges, tuus Anglia princeps,/Turpis, ad obsequium turpe, minister erat./*Quid prodest versare dapes? servire culinæ?*/Omnia quæ fiunt Cæsar in orbe videt.'

306 *Swyche* in text D must be used in error for *whyche* rather than as a form meaning 'such', since only Northern *swylk* 'such' is found in D.

317 The D scribe had problems with *command* at the beginning of the text, in 317 and 361 *comawdyd* and also 376 *comawndment*, where **n** was written above the line. After 376 the verb is always spelled with **n**.

332 Moille, the first scribe of the A text, must have overlooked the words *he seyd*, which have been supplied.

334 D *abeynt* for *abey(en) it* is a scribal error which would have occurred most easily if the text was read out to the scribe.

343 Since *nem(p)nen* is a weak verb, the tense marker *d* has been added to *nempne* in the A text. For the addition of *him* in A, compare H *the emperour named hym king by name* and also D *the kyng callyd Richard be name*.

344 Broughton, *The Legends of King Richard I Coeur de Lion*, pp. 93-7, remarks that the origin of the epithet *taylard* or *caudatus Anglicus* has never been proved decisively. Its source was probably a legend about St. Augustine, first described by William of Malmesbury in his *Gesta Pontificum*. In this legend the devil incited the inhabitants of *a town* in Dorset against St. Augustine: they tried to harm him and attached rayfish tails to his clothes. They sprouted tails as a divine retribution.
The English in general were described as *tailed* as early as the 12th century, while Richard of Devizes was the first to use this epithet for Richard's men particularly (see Broughton, pp. 95-6). *Taylard* and *tayled* are used as a pejorative term throughout RCL but it is not clear if its association with fish tails is always apparent to the authors/scribes, e.g. *Goþ hom, dogges wiþ ʒour tayl* 948.

347 'you/ your barons do not appear to be dressed accordingly'.

353 There is a point in manuscript A after *goth*.

357 D *ffor his loue þe dere bowt* is an example of *apo koinou* construction with the subject *that* inferred (see Visser, *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*, vol. i, §18).

359-60 D carries the most likely meaning here: 'You may yet happen by chance to travel widely (yourself)'. In A the subject has been changed to *we*.

363-4 Note the assonance in the rime *vnderffong:hond*.

366 In the past a distinction has been made between *gryth* as a technical term meaning 'the King's special peace/protection' and *frith* 'national peace'. However, Christine Fell remarks in her article *Unfriþ: An approach to a Definition* in Saga-Book of the Viking Society vol. xxi (1982-3) p. 91: 'By the time we find it in Middle English it is absolutely clear that *grið* has taken over all the ranges of meaning that dictionaries and commentators have insisted should be associated rather with *frið*...... if *grið* did enter the language with a more precisely determinable semantic range than *frið*, that precision was very rapidly eroded.'

376 A, H and D are substantially different from B and C, which have the look of a later adaptation, e.g. C 748 *erly or late, loude or styll*. A *dede* must be an error for *bede*; compare D and H *comawndment*.

382 *Darst þu* 'if you dare......'.

386 Since no example can be found in the MED of the prep. **in** in A *grauntyd him in that forward*, this expression must be considered unique; compare *grantyd hym þat forward* and C 758 *granted to that forward*.

388 There is much variation in this line with C *an eere cloute*, DB *a nere clout*, A *a egre clout* and H *a swithe sore clout*. Of all the versions, C gives the best reading here, D and B show confusion about the division of *an* and *ear*, and A and H replace the adjective.

389 In A the rime-words *oute* and *sprong* have been reversed. This error was probably caused through the influence of the previous rime *prout:clout*.

391 The name *seynt Gemelyne* is obscure and may well be a corruption of 'St. Helena', see D *seynt Elyne*.

393-4 The rimes in A *lough:wogh* and D *low:now* are probably a corruption of *loughe:wille ynough*, which is found in H. A *wogh* has been emended to *wille inogh*. D *low:now* indicates that the pronunciation of OE /w/ and /χ/ had become indistinguishable. In the middle of the line the D scribe copied *the kyng on him low* first and added *sone* later. He then forgot to add the genitive ending *-es* to *kyng*, which has been restored in the text.

401-4 There is no obvious reason why Richard should have waxed his hand. One can only surmise that this was meant to strengthen Richard's hand in some way.

414 'I would not wish to bear shield ever again'.

418 *a*, found in text A only once, probably represents a weak form of the pronoun *he*. It may occur here because of the influence of the following word *aswowe*.

421-2 These lines are found in A and H only (H 254-5); both versions share the imperfect rime *buffet:part*.

426 In A *now hau I non*, *hau* is a unique form of the 1st pers. sg. pres. indicative.

427-8 Versions A, D and H are all different and what must have been the original rime *swowe:drowe* was lost. A, D and H share the variant *suown* in a rime with *drowe*, while B and C have different lines altogether, e.g. C 803-4 *wiþ þat worde he fyl to grounde,/as man þat was in woo ibounde*.

434 D *þe dede was* is a corruption of A, B and C 812 *he dede was*.

451 In D *Allas, þat me was born*, the pronoun **me**, which was probably retained from the previous line, has been emended to *sche*.

471-2 These lines are clearly corrupt in text A. Its rime *smote:ouerlope* is imperfect and the verb *ouerlope*, which from the context was probably intended to mean 'fell over', makes least sense of all texts.

475 *the* 'they' occurs sporadically in A, e.g. 666, 3011 and 3043, but far more common are the OE -derived 3rd pers. pl. forms *hij* and *he*.

480-1In text A, *cheke-bon* is the object and *him* the dative of inalienable possession of the verb *smote*.

495 There is no historical evidence for the name *Margeryce* (see also the Introduction p. 60).

501 D repeats *sche seyde* from the previous line.

506 Text A *þow sey to me* is a corruption of 'to say to me' found in D (and H).

508 There is a point between *al* and *most* in manuscript A, probably to distinguish these two separate words from *almost*; compare the other versions *of al men/thing*ʸ*I the loue.*

511-2 The time-span of three days referred to in 511 does not appear to be consistent. In 394-6 Ardour strikes Richard and orders him to be fed. The next day Ardour is killed (399-420) and the king orders that Richard should be kept in prison (485-6). *Before þe non* (497), either the same day or the next, Margery visits Richard who complains that he has not had any food or drink for three days (511-2). This sequence can only work if a time-gap is assumed between 492 and 493.

515-6 The verb *comawndyd* in 515 is followed by a dependent clause which contains the subjunctive form 3rd pers. sg. *were* (see Mustanoja, pp. 454-5). In A 516 *hee* the second *e* was added afterwards, probably because the scribe was unhappy with the combination of the single pronoun *he* and the form *wer* .

The change of the rime-word in D 516 to *alle* forced a rime with *snalle*, a rare variant of *snelle*.

525 *seynt* was dropped in A before *Semoune*.

527 *hym* in *forgat hym yt nowt* may be found in D because of an eyeslip from *hym* in the next line.

538 *I am betrayid*, 'I have been betrayed'. Perfect tenses in the passive are rare in ME and became established only towards the end of the fourteenth century (See Mustanoja, p. 440). Compare also 1454 *we beþ bitreyd and ynome.*

553-4 This couplet is found in DAH only and its rime *castel:jaylere* is imperfect. In addition, Margery does not seem to go to the jailer but to the jail.

558 The inf. form *slo*, found in both text A *how they hadde dampned hym to slo* and H *hough þeygh had demed hym to slo*, is an example of the use of to + inflected active inf. for the passive (Mustanoja, pp. 519-20). D *how he was thrat to be slo* is proof of the introduction of the periphrastic passive inf., which Mustanoja, p. 520, says 'gains ground in late ME, but its progress is slow, and the active form remains in use even today'. The form *slo* as the pp. is not otherwise found in text D.

567-70 The reason for Richard's reluctance to elope is legalistic in a narrative which clearly has not paid attention to the law so far, for instance on the king's part: the unjust arrest (343-50) and the plot to murder a prisoner (541-4); on Richard's part: the killing of Ardour (480-2) and the seduction of the king's daughter (529-30).

The motive expressed in text D 570 *greve* that Richard feared prosecution by the king makes better sense than text A *agreve*, but D reflects less heroically on Richard's character.

611-2 These two lines, which are found in A, H and D only (compare C 1070-1), were probably added later. They contain the information that Richard did not only take kerchiefs to fight the lion but also a knife. Roger Loomis, in his article *Richard Coeur de Lion and the Pas Saladin in Medieval Art* (PMLA 30 (1915) p. 521), describes one of the bosses in Norwich Cathedral, dated 1420-8, where Richard is depicted grasping a dagger in his outstretched hand.

R. Loomis describes three pictorial representations of Richard's fight with the lion (PMLA 30,

1915, pp. 509-528). The first is found on one of the Chertsey tiles dating from 1270-80 and Loomis argues convincingly that Richard Coeur de Lion is depicted here rather than Samson. The second picture is located in the Peterborough Psalter, of which Loomis contends that the figure tearing out the lion's heart is Richard, because it has a beard, is wearing a crown and has its arm thrust down the lion's throat (p. 520-1). Loomis dates the manuscript at the end of the thirteenth century. The third example is found on one of the bosses of Norwich Cathedral and dates probably from the 1420s (p. 521). The first and second examples show that the legend of the killing of the lion had probably attached itself to Richard's name by the late thirteenth century.

618 D *cheynes* must be corrupt, compare A and C 1076 *pawys*.

621 There may have been parallels in the author's mind between the lion episode in RCL and the biblical characters of David (1 Samuel 17, 34-37), Daniel in the Den of Lions (Daniel, 6) and of Samson (Judges 14, 5-6). As *David*, Daniel and Samson were figures of Christ, Richard's moral and religious virtues may be hinted at here.

622 D *raunsed* is probably a nasalised pa.t. form of *rasen* 'to slash (at)'.

642 The association with the emblem of the lion was a sign of great esteem in the Middle Ages and Richard acquired the epithet 'Coeur de Lion' as a tribute to his braveness in battle. This epithet may well have originated from references like: *in dede lyoun, in þouȝt lepeard* found in 1347. Kate Norgate (*Richard the Lion Heart*, p. 34) remarks that it was used within eight years of Richard's death in the *Estoire de la Croisade* l. 2310: *Le preuz reis, le quor de lion*. Other heroes to acquire a similar epithet include Henry the Lion, Duke of Saxony, who is mentioned in RCL 756. In RCL the epithet 'Coeur de Lion' is found for the first time in the episode shared by A and D. This later addition to the text answers a more basic interpretation of 'Lion-Heart', Richard just having killed a lion while imprisoned by the *king of Almeyn*. According to D and A 638, Richard's name is due to the fact that Richard cut out its heart. Broughton, p. 117, discusses various examples of the fight against a lion, e.g. *La Mule sans Frein* and *Guy of Warwick*.

655 The indirect object *me*, found in D and H, is lacking in A. This is probably due to a scribal error.

659-60 The rime *blyþe:alyue* can be taken as an example of assonance but the original rime must have been *blyue:alyue*, which is found in H.

663-4 A, D and H share the corrupt rime *sone:wolcome*, which indicates a common source for these three texts (see also p. 27). *Sone* probably arose through interference of the preceding rime *sone:vndone*. The original rime, which is still recognisable in D, must have been *alle and some:welcome*.

670+679 The king's conventionally wicked intent to keep Richard in prison conflicts with his urge to get rid of him as quickly as possible.

670 D *v(us)* is a rare form of 'us' recorded in the OED as dating from the fourteenth century. Dobson (vol. ii, $ 431, note 5) remarks that 'Margaret Paston's spelling *vus* 'us' certainly does not show initial [w]........ it may be an example of doubled u to show length or mere dittography.'

674 This line is found in A, D and H and it is corrupt in all three texts to the point where it is

impossible to reconstruct the original. D *his wykkyd dedys [h]e schul abeye* has possibly the best reading. In the A text *his wikked hefd* must be a pars pro toto for 'Richard', while H *y wold they were hennes away* is radically different.

677 A *fullyng shuld* is very unusual, for although the ending *-inge* is used occasionally for the inflected infinitive in the South, here one would expect an uninflected gerund (see Mustanoja, pp. 512-13).

685-6 There are many rimes of the type *prison:ramsom* in D, e.g. 715 and 1256. The original ending of the word *ramsoun* in these rimes is only found once in D 1387.

692-3 The reference to the donation of chalices towards Richard's release is historical, for as Itin (p. 443) reports, a significant share of the ransom came from church donations: 'Accipiebantur calices ab ecclesiis, et vasa aurea vel argentea in usus ecclesiasticos sacrata'.

692 A and D both have a non-introduced clause of condition with inverted word order and the subjunctive verb *were/ner* (see Mustanoja, p. 470).

699-700 'King Richard swore by Saint John that he would have two for one', i.e. that he would get his ransom back twice over.

705 A *as he was kyng or page* is corrupt. D is the only text with a comparable line: *be his heye parage.*

713 In D *comyht* pr.t., the reversed spelling has been allowed to stand since there are so many variations in the representation of **th**.

717-730 717-24 A and 725-30 D form alternative endings to the captivity episode. These lines are not found in any other version and it is impossible to determine which text provides the original ending.

718 Text A *and alle bothe ffrendes come to* is corrupt, and it is difficult to decide on the original reading. It could have been 'his two friends arrived, too,' compare H *ys too frendes*, but also 'all his friends came to meet him'.

727 D *ouernome* must be derived from *nimen* 'to travel'; the combination with *ouer* is unique.

732 A (and H) *Kyng Richard dud anoþer þyng* is probably the original reading with D *dyth hym hors and oder thyng* a corruption.

733-4 *douke Miloun* has been identified as Guy de Lusignan and *douke Renaud* as Reynald de Châtillon (Jentsch, p. 196 and Paris, Rom. pp. 362-3). Paris (Rom p. 362, note 6) remarks that *Miloun* is a scribal error for *Guion*, but it occurs in B and C 1287 alike and is repeated in BC 1299, so may be an original corruption.

734-5 L 733-752 describe the events leading up to the defeat at Hattin, after which the third crusade was organised. The text lacks 21 lines between 734 and 735, which BC have retained and which are printed below. Since this passage is missing in L, it can be stated with certainty that neither B nor C could have been copied from the Auchinleck MS; the lacuna also proves that L is not the original text.

L 734 differs from BC either because the text was already defective when L copied it or because the scribe's eye wandered as he began a new column in L (326r^b).

734 L *and* douke Renaud a bold baroun

1278 B was lorde *and* a full*e* bolde baroun

1288 C Was lord þat stou*n*de, a bold barou*n*.

1279 B and mawgre the sowdane þ*at* londe he helde

1289 C Mawgre þe Sawdon þ*at* lond he heeld,

1280 B bothe w*ith* sper*e* (and) eke w*ith* schelde.

1290 C And weryd it weel w*i*þ sper*e* and scheeld.

1281 B He and þ*e* doughety erle Reynawde

1291 C He, *and* þe douȝty Erl Renaud

1282 B wele ofte þay gaffe þ*e* sowdane assawte,

1292 C Wel offte*n* gaff hy*m* wol hard assaut,

1283 B and *wele ofte righte* in pleyne batayle

1293 C And wol offte*n* i*n* playn batayle

1284 B þay slewe his knyghtys *and* grete pedayle

1294 C þey slowe knyȝtes *and* gret putayle

1285 B of the Sarazenes þat misbyleuyde,

1295 C Off Sarezynys þat mysbeleuyd:

1286 B and theratt the sowdane was sore agreuede.

1296 C þe Sawdon was sore agreuyd.

1287 B Bot lystenys nowe of a tresou*n*e stronge

1297 C Lystenes off a tresou*n* strong

1288 B of the erle Rosse was þam amonge,

1298 C Off þe Eerl Roys þ*at* was hem among,

1289 B to whome þ*e* duke of Melou*n* tristede mekill*e*

1299 C To whom Mylou*n* tryste mekyl:

1290 B and he was treyto*ur*, false (and) fekylle!

1300 C And he was *trayto*ur fals *and* fykyl;

1291 B Þ*e* sowdane full*e* preualy vnto hy*m* sent

1301 C þe Sawdon stylly to hym sente,

1292 B and highte hym golde, londis *and* rent

1302 C And behyȝte hym land *and* rente,

1293 B þ*e* Cristyn folkes for to bytraye,

1303 C The Crystene hoost to betraye*n*;

1294 B when he mayn wyn þam to his paye,

1304 C Whan*ne* he hadde wu*n*ne hem, to paye*n*

1295 B of golde full*e* many a thowsande pownde;

1305 C Off gold many a þousand pou*n*de;

1296 B and the erle hym grauntede hy*m* i*n* þ*at* stownde.

1306 C þe eerl grauntyd hym þat stounde.

1297 B Anothir treytour highte Markes fferaunt,

1307 C Anoþer traytour, Markes fferaunt,

1298 B he wiste of that ilke conaunt

1308 C He wyste alsoo off þat comenaunt.

1299 B and he hade parte of þat golde þat þe erle toke

1309 C He hadde part of þe gold þe eerl took,

1300 B and aftirwarde his Cristyndom forsoke.

1310 C And afftyrward Crystyndome forsook.

735 L Þurth tresoun of þe counte Roys

1301 B and thus þe tresone of þe Erle Rosse

1311 C Þus þorwȝ tresoun of þe Eerl Roys

735 Jentsch (p. 196) and Paris (Rom p. 363) have identified þe counte Roys as Raymond of Tripoli, who is also described as a traitor in Itin (pp. 13-14). (Brunner, RCL p. 52 names erl Roys as Reginald of Kerak, which must be an error, for in the index erl Roys is correctly identified as Raymond).

736 After the battle of Hattin in 1187 much territory in the Kingdom of Jerusalem was lost and also the relic of the Holy Cross.

737-740 RCL is correct in stating that both Guy and Reynald were taken prisoner at the battle of Hattin. Guy was indeed released and Reynald was killed by Saladin (see Itin pp. 25 and 16).

741-742 The Duke Miloun/Guy de Lusignan (see Note 733-4) was not King Baldwin's son but his brother-in-law. Baldwin IV, King of Jerusalem, made Guy baili in 1183 because of his ill-health. Baldwin had no children himself and his nephew and heir, Baldwin V, was only five years old. When both Baldwins died, Guy and his wife seized the throne (Brunner, RCL p. 54 mistakenly states that Guy was married to Baldwin's widow).

743-4 Contrary to the statement in RCL that no one knew what became of Guy de Lusignan, Guy continued to play a vigorous part in the history of the crusade. However, in RCL his name does not appear again.

747 It is not clear which pope is meant by þe holy pope þat hiȝt Urban. Urban III died of grief a few days after the news of the defeat at Hattin had reached him and it was his successor, Gregory VIII, who called for the third crusade. It is possible that RCL confused Urban III and the famous Urban II, who inspired the first crusade.

749-50 For the rime sinne:winne, see p. 37, footnote 195.

753-60 The list of noblemen accompanying Philip of France to the Holy Land is not historically accurate. RCL lists correctly the names of some French knights, but also those of Germans, none of whom accompanied Philip. By contrast Itin (p. 92-3) is much more accurate in supplying a list consisting mainly of French noblemen and bishops.

754 The meaning of L bateyle is superior to B and C 1330 vytayle.

755 Theobald, count of Blois, was one of the knights who set out with Philip and his name is

mentioned by RCL, Ambroise and Itin alike.

Hugh, Duke of Burgundy, is mentioned by both Itin (p. 147) and Ambroise (v. 293) as one of Philip's knights at the start of the crusade, at Vézelay.

756 The Duke of Austria did not travel with Philip of France but, having made his own way to the Holy Land, arrived early in 1191 (Runciman, vol. iii, p. 32 and note 3).
The name of the þe douk of Sessoyne must refer to Henry the Lion, Duke of Saxony, who was Frederick Barbarossa's main rival in Germany. When the Emperor decided to go on the crusade, he forced Henry into exile at the English court (Runciman, vol. iii, p. 10) and consequently Henry did not travel to the Holy Land at all.

757 The reference to the German Emperor cannot be   historical, for Frederick Barbarossa was drowned in Cilicia before Philip and Richard had even set out from Vézelay (Riley-Smith, The Crusades: Idea and Reality, p. 20). RCL makes no reference to Frederick's tragic death apart from line 1907, where the emperor's death is reported erroneously as having taken place at Acre. Ambroise also gives scant attention to this event (see Hubert and La Monte p. 81, note 10) but Itin (pp. 55-56) gives a very full report indeed.

759 In Itin (p. 147) and Ambroise (v. 295) the count of Flanders is mentioned at the start of the crusade as one of Philip's companions at Vézelay.
There is no historical evidence for the existence of the Earl of Coloyn.

760 By the Earl of Artays must have been meant Robert of France, Count of Artois (the spelling of Artays is confirmed by B and C). Louis of France created this title in 1237 for his brother Robert, who accompanied the King to the Holy Land in 1249 and was killed in the battle of Mansourah in 1250. The inclusion of his name in RCL indicates that its author must have mixed up characters of the third and fourth crusades and consequently that the original text of RCL was written some time after 1250 (see also the Introduction p. 72). Brunner, RCL p. 462, identifies the count but does not draw any conclusions as to the dating of the text.
There is no historical evidence for the existence of þerl of Boloyn nor is he mentioned in Itin or Ambroise. However, he does occur as one of Richard's companions in the Pas Saladin (see R. Loomis PMLA 30 (1915) p. 527) and perhaps the inclusion of his name in RCL was derived from this source.

765-8 The coronation of Richard, which is referred to in this passage, took place at Westminster on September 3, 1189 (Itin p. 142; Runciman, vol. iii, p. 7) and not at Winchester as stated in 768. Confusion about the location may have arisen because a crown wearing took place at Winchester after Richard's return from the crusade. It is likely that RCL borrowed this detail from the Itinerarium, which reports that after Richard's return from the Holy Land 'in Octavis Paschæ coronatus est Wyntoniæ, agente divina Huberto Cantuariæ archiepiscopo' (Itin p. 446); BC only mention a royal feast. In heruest after þe Natiuite in 765 probably refers to the Nativity of the Virgin Mary on September 8.

775 D ageyn wedyr and ageyn wyndes is corrupt; compare L, A, B and C 1431 oȝaines Godes wiþerwines.

787-1171 Griffoun from OF Grifon is described in the MED as 'a Greek person'. In this episode it refers to the population of Messina, which was mainly Greek.

798 'that proved not a wise thing for him to do'.

801 and 804 The titles of Tancred, King of Sicily, and of his father Roger, Duke of Apulia, have been split here between Tancred, who is erroneously presented as King of Apulia, and Tancred's son Roger as King of Sicily. Crown Prince Roger did not succeed his father, for he was dispossessed in 1194 by Henry VI of Germany (see K. Setton, *A History of the Crusades* vol. ii, p. 41 and Note 1164-5).

812 The **d** in L *ywarned* was added above the line, probably by the scribe himself.

822 The construction of L is complicated but shows the best sense: 'as far as he is concerned war will never betide you!', *tit* being the contracted form of *tideth* from OE *tidan* 'to happen'. The other versions have different readings of this line, probably because their scribes had difficulty in understanding it. C maintains the same construction but replaces *were* with *dere* and *tit* with 2nd. pers. sg. *tides*. H changes the line completely to *he ne schall suffer no dawngere*. D leaves the couplet out altogether. A has become meaningless because of confusion over the position of the two pronouns in the sentence. It may have meant 'that no loss will befall you because of him', but this reading is not certain.

826 'and what he thinks will be known to you'.

830 The meeting between Tancred and Richard is not mentioned in Itin or Ambroise but it does occur in Roger of Howden's Chronica (Rolls Series 51, vol. iii, pp. 97-8). While RCL states that Richard and Tancred met at *Rys* 'Reggio', Roger gives Catania as the meeting place. In reality the two kings did not discuss a treacherous letter sent by Philip Augustus but the succession to the Sicilian throne and the dowry that was owed to Richard's sister Joan (see also Notes 1159-65).

836 The name of St *Lethenard*, found in L, is likely to be a corruption of the Saint's name of St Leonard, which occurs in all other texts. St Leonard was revered by crusaders, 'who looked on him as the patron saint of prisoners.' (*The Penguin Dictionary of Saints*, Donald Attwater, p. 212).

842 The original rime *pilgrim:peynim* is shared by L and C 1724; A (and H) and D change the second rime-word to *Saracyne* and *payne* respectively.

843 The A scribe probably wrote *that* instead of *than* because the former occurs in the next line.

856 LDBC share *procoure* 'to bring (sth) on (so)' which is more satisfactory than A *profer* 'to offer, present'.

858 *and on himself falleþ al þe foþer* 'but the whole burden comes to rest on himself'.

871 The quality of the Edinburgh fragment is reasonable, apart from f. 1r (ll. 871-958) and to some extent also 2v (ll. 1859-1946), which are very faint, especially at the top of the folio.

879 Since the abbreviation *ml*, found in A, is found in a rime with *fynde*, it must have been pronounced *thousinde*.
The suspension mark for **n** over *bene* in A cannot be expanded. This is not the only place in A where suspension is indicated, but where it is impossible to expand.

883-6 Jentsch (pp. 224-5) found a parallel of these lines in Richard of Devizes (Appleby's edition p. 16): 'Metatusque est rex Angliæ castra extra civitatem, quoniam rex Franciæ receptus jam

100

fuerat ...... intra muros'.

886 D *in hous* is corrupt, compare the other versions *vnder the hous.*

893 D and A both lack *he*, found in the other versions, to indicate a change of subject from Philip to Richard. It has been restored to both texts.

897 This line is heavily abbreviated in A and is followed by *ic wote what*, which was later expuncted. The scribe must have been under the illusion that two lines of verse had to be written on one line, possibly because his exemplar indicated it.

898 In text A *to* was inserted above the line, probably in the same hand.

901 RCL refers to Christmas twice, in 901 and 1159. Between these lines the battle of Messina is described, in which the romance combines the following two historic incidents: Messina was taken on October 4, 1190 (see Itin p. 163); fighting broke out on Christmas day between the Pisans and the Genoese, and the English (see Itin p. 174). In RCL the fighting parties are different. They consist of the English on the one hand and the French and Griffons on the other. This is historically inaccurate, for although Philip of France supported the Sicilians, he never took part in the fighting against Richard.

902 There are several examples in A of the expansion for **ur** followed by **r**, e.g. 902 *hono(ur)red*, 1319 *dissono(ur)re*, 1381 *emp(er)o(ur)r*, 1391 *a to(ur)r* and 1988 *souco(ur)ryng.*

903 *mani erl* must be the subject in L *mani erl and [his] barouns/was sett in his pauilouns*, for the verb is singular.

907 L retains the probable original construction *com ern*, which is rejected by the other versions. *Com* followed by a plain infinitive of manner is not uncommon in early ME (see Mustanoja p. 536), but the infinitive is replaced by the pr.p. eventually. This trend is shown in D *rennyng*. A drops *ern* completely, while B and C 1789 replace it with *there*.

927 The spellings of the rime are divided here: *hest:fest* in L and *hast:fast* in AD. Since there was a doublet *haste:heste* in OF, whereas there was only one form *fest* 'feast', L must represent the original rime. *Haste* subsequently established itself as the dominant form in ME, possibly because the OF loanword was itself borrowed from Germanic *haisti*, OE *hæst*. The rime-word *fast* in A and D may have been influenced by doublets like *haste:heste* and *masse:messe*.

928 L *wondy* 'to hesitate, refrain' fits the context better than A and C 1810 *wende* 'to go', D *spare*, H *be awreked* and B *lett*, as it is clear from the text that Richard is eager to fight even on Christmas day.

934 There appears to be confusion between the third and fourth Earls of Salibury, who were both called *William Longespée*. William the Elder became third Earl of Salisbury in 1198 by marriage with Ela/Isabel, heiress to the Earldom of Salisbury. He was probably the illegitimate son of Henry II. There is no evidence that he accompanied Richard to the Holy Land and he died in 1226 (*The Complete Peerage*, vol. 11, pp. 379-81, and also DNB vol. xii, pp. 115-8). His son, the younger Longespée, went on a crusade twice, the first time between 1240 and 1242, the second time with King Louis in 1249. He was killed in the famous battle of Mansourah in Egypt in 1250 and his death is the subject of an AN poem found in BM MS Cotton Julius A. V. Both father and son were well known in their time and the author could easily have confused

101

the dates and exploits of these two noblemen. (See also the Introduction pp. 71-2).

R. Loomis, (PMLA 30 (1915) p. 527) identified William Longespée, who is also mentioned as one of Richard's companions in the *Pas Saladin*, as 'the fourth Earl of Salisbury, who distinguished himself in the Seventh Crusade and in honor of whom an Anglo-Norman romance was written'. Both Loomis (JEGP 15 (1916) p. 456) and R. Wadsworth (Neophilologus 56 (1972) p. 269) note Brunner's error, RCL pp. 468-9, in claiming that the William Longespée in RCL is William the Elder. Brunner did not try to provide dates and historical background for the characters in RCL and consequently did not realise that there were discrepancies in the text.

935 There is no evidence that any of the Earls of Hereford went on the crusade nor does the name appear in Itin or Ambroise.

Forms like *Leycetre* and *Leycetir*, found in A and D respectively, occur also in 1619 D, 4039 A and 4059 A.

942 D *schame* has been emended to *schaþe* 'harm', derived from OE *sceaþa*; the other versions' *scaþe* is derived from ON *scaði* (see also p. 37, note 200 on *scaþe*).

959 The rime-word *[...]aners* in text L is defective and almost certainly corrupt; compare the other versions *conselers*.

960 L and D *þe pors* and H *vif portes* refer to the 'Cinque Ports', the five seaports of Hastings, Sandwich, Dover, Romney and Hythe. The MED (Cink Pors) comments 'in return for extensive privileges these ports furnished the chief part of the English Navy'.

961 In L *Lordinges, ʒe be wiþ me*, be was inserted above the line. The construction itself is one of *apo koinou*: 'Lords, you [who] are with me!' (see Visser, vol. i, §18).

962 A *youre* is corrupt, compare the other texts *oure*; also A *youre* in 994 rather than *her* 'their'.

966 The meaning of the pl. form *naciouns* is 'country' (see MED 1b). It must be the original rime with *Griffouns* and is found in all versions L, A, B, H and C 1848, except D. Since D has a number of the undeclined pl. nouns (see p. 54), forms like *Grefoun* and *nacyoun* are not unusual in this text.

974 *Mate-griffoun* or 'Slayer of Greeks' was a wooden siege tower, built at Messina (Runciman, vol. iii, p. 39). It was only used against the Sicilians and further mention in the text that it was also employed against the Saracens, e.g. 2064 and 2105, are historically incorrect.

981 L *ycrie* is an unattested inf. form; compare the parallel construction in C 1863 *men myght here crye*.

994 D *castith* was written as one word from which h was subsequently expuncted, and which has been presented in the text as *cast it*. The scribe may have copied this imperative form from his exemplar but rejected it subsequently. There is only one other line in D containing imp. forms in **-ith**: 1464 *smytith* and *sleith*.

1003 L *lassee* shows assimilation of *lat see* 'let us see'; *cum* is the imp. form of *comen*.

1007 D has lost part of the line, compare ACL 'they began to defend and the English to assail'.

1010 In D first *fleddyn* was written and expuncted, then *fellyn and flowe* were written instead; Compare the other versions *fast þai slowe*.

102

1014 D *can* for *gan* 'to begin' is typical of Northern poetic usage (see Jordan, p. 172).

1015 *with* denotes instrumentality here, 'by the use of, by the action of'.

1020 *wild-fire* or *fyr gregeis* (1767), as it was also known, was a highly inflammable mixture used in siege warfare. Of its components Geoffrey Shepherd, *Ancrene Wisse*, p. 65, remarks 'There were numerous recipes for the manufacture of incendiary mixtures, but naphta, pitch and sulphur were the basic ingredients'. He continues: 'It was encountered by the Western armies in the third crusade (1189-92) but had been known, at least by repute, earlier in the century'.
It is interesting that the author gives a description of the French throwing Greek fire during the battle of Messina, when historically speaking they had not yet been introduced to it.
D *to oure boure* and E *to our toure* are corruptions of *out of the tour*.

1031-2 The rime in text D *hey-glory* is corrupt, where the other texts give *houe-gloue*. For the spelling *hey:glory*, see p. 54.

1034 The phrase *tales in/on English*, found in A and D, is rendered *tail of Englýsh* in text A.

1037 Itin (p. 161) is in agreement with RCL, for it also states that Richard entered Messina through an unguarded gate.
a yate on 'a single gate' occurs in text A.

1046 L lacks 176 lines, or the equivalent of one folio, between 1046 and 1226 (see also the Description of Manuscript L, p. 11).

1051 A similar expression to *os þe grehounds strekid out of les* is found in AM, Auchinleck, l. 9028 *so grehound doþ out of les*.

1056 A *kaf* has something written above the word, which may well be a correction, but is now illegible. In the text *kaf* has been emended *karf*; the prep. **in** has been supplied to *in the midward*.

1060 A (and H) *and yaf hem Goddes cours vppon her þan* are different from D, B and C 1940 *and let in comyn ilke a man*.

1064 The only part of the line that can be established with certainty is the subject *French and Griffouns* because the rest of the line shows considerable variation: D, E and C 1942 have *bane* as a rime-word, but A, B and H have *skhame*. There is also a great variety of verbs: D and C *casche* (inf.); B *tholed* (pa.t.); E *tok* (pa.t.); H *to take* (inf.). A, which lacks a verb, has been emended following H.

1067 D *leuau(n)s:vemau(n)s* deviates from A and E *levours:vigours*. The MED cites D as its only example under *levauns* and the meaning 'levers, crowbars' is given tentatively. *Vemauns*, which is not recorded in the OED, must be a variant of OF *vehemence*. The earliest example of *vehemence* is dated at 1529, so the example in the D text must predate it by at least thirty years (see also p. 19).

1070 The A line is corrupt and *þouȝth* has been emended to *þourȝth*, which gives A the following reading: 'they died through God's ordinance'.

1081 Compare D *kyl* 'to kill' with C 1959 *ken* 'to show', which makes better sense.

1087-9 A has three lines riming together: *loue:loue:aboue*. The first line ending in *loue* must be due to an eyeslip; compare D 1085-6. It is interesting that both BC 1967 and A 1088 share the word

103

viage, which implies that there was a common ancestor.

1094-1103 The subject in this passage must be *Richard*, though this is not always clear from the text.

    1100 In D þ*at he schulde greue tho, ne* and *hym* have been supplied in the text, compare C *bad hym nought greue him tho.*

    1115 A *ffauer* 'aid, do (s.o.) a favour' is used ironically here.

    1124-5 The names of *Sir Margarite* and *Sir Hewe Pimperise* are found in various sources but in RCL their treatment is unique. Both names are based on historical characters. The former is based on *Margaritus of Brindisi*, count of Malta and Cefalonia, who was the admiral of the Navy under King William of Sicily; the latter on that of *Jourdain du Pain*, who was the commandant of Messina under Tancred (see Hubert and La Monte, p. 54, notes 46 and 47). The trouble between Richard and Margarit and Jourdain is best described by Roger Howden (Rolls Series, vol. iii, p. 57) and Richard of Devizes (*Cronicon*, p. 22).

In RCL *Sir Margarite* and *Pimperise* have been transformed into French justices who chide Richard after his quarrel with Philip (1104-1119). The reason why this might have happened is explained by Jentsch, p. 199 '[Der dichter] will einen neuen beweis geben von der tücke und treulosigkeit der Franzosen den Engländern, besonders aber Richard Löwenherz gegenüber.'

    1133 The meaning of D *wyt* is not clear, presumably it means 'wit, sense' but it is almost certainly a corruption of *eye*, found in the other versions.

    1140 *ternis and quernis* is an expression derived from dice-playing in which the two words mean a double three and four respectively. Its figurative use in RCL is unique and its meaning must be that Richard rained blows on his opponent.

    1145 The reading for A *hadde a bone* is an error for the other versions *badde a bone*. Since *haven a bone* means 'to receive a favour' rather than 'to ask for one', it has been emended.

    1159-60 The English army stayed in Messina from Michaelmas 1190 until after Lent (Itin p. 174). According to RCL, Richard stayed in Messina to wait for the arrival of his bride Berengaria, while in reality he wanted to negotiate a financial settlement for his sister Joan who was the widow of the previous king of Sicily (Jentsch pp. 200-1).

    1164-5 Richard's sister Joan is described here as 'the wife of King Roger' when in fact she was the widow of King William of Sicily. It is likely that this mistake arose through the complicated family tree of the kings of Sicily, and that the author of RCL assumed that Tancred succeeded his father, whose name was indeed Roger. In reality he succeeded his uncle William (see Setton, vol. ii, p. 58 and Runciman, vol. iii, p. 37 and also Note 801).

    1168 A *precous* has an expansion mark for **n** over **u**, which has been ignored because of the rime with *spouse*. Both *precous* and *precouns* 'precious' are forms attested in the MED.

    1170-1 The DE rime *sesoun:Grefoun* must be original, with *Grefoun* as an undeclined plural (compare also the rime in 911-2). In A *s/e/souns:Griffouns* and H *sesounes:Griffouns* the plural ending -s was added to *Griffouns* and *sesouns* was adopted to restore the lost rime.

    1176 Philip left Messina on March 30 and Richard followed him on April 10 (Brunner, RCL p. 52, notes 4 and 5).

    1179 The reading *deytit* in D is not certain, but it is probably a variant form of *diȝten* found in A,

E and H. For the spelling *t* for *ght* in *deytit*, see p. 52).

1178-81 These lines are remarkably similar to 1631-4. The use of *forth* twice in the line in D 1180 is repeated also in 1633; compare E and C (2045 and 2459) *forth toward Acrys he wolde*.

1185 In D *sene*, the scribe first wrote *yene* and wrote *ſ* over *y* later. In E the ending of the line is corrupt, while A changes the couplet (found in 1182-3) altogether.

1193 Compare D *selcouth*, which is also found in B, and *wonder*, shared by A and H, with C *sorowfull* which is much more appropriate.

1194-1209 Three ships were indeed wrecked before they could reach the south coast of Cyprus, and the fourth, carrying Joan and Berengaria, managed to anchor off Limassol (see Runciman, vol. iii, p. 43).

1200-1 These lines, which are found in AEBC alike, are lacking in D.

1212-1478 In this episode *Griffouns* refers to the inhabitants of Cyprus regardless of their ethnic origin (see also Note 787-1171).

1214 D *flyt* must be a corrupted form of the i-mutated form of OE *sleaht* 'slaughter' (compare the other versions *slaughter*) and it has been emended to *slyt*.

1216-19 Not all versions report the same number of casualties and prisoners, but there is enough agreement between the versions to establish the original figures for the three categories: 1600 prisoners were killed, 500 imprisoned and 60 score (1200) prisoners were taken naked. In 1216 A, B, C and H state that 1600 were killed, with the exception of D, which has the figure of 5000. In 1217 all versions agree on the figure of 500 prisoners. In 1218-9 B, C, D and H state that 60 score naked prisoners were also taken. A, however, changes this couplet, so that 60 score becomes the total of men lost rather than the number of prisoners taken naked.

1217 *brought* in A 1216 also provides the verb in the next line.

1229 For *þat* supplied in L compare C 2084 *weder that wolde the emperour*.

1230 Text D *the fyrst day afterward* is a corruption of LAH and C 2085 *þe þridde day*.

1245+47 A, H and C 2100 *It sholde abye the emperoure* may be a paraphrase of L and D 1247. Both A and H appear to have lost the subject *it*, which must have become incorporated into the verb: A *abygged* and H *abyggedde*. It may well have been lost when the text was read out from one of the common ancestors of A and H. A has been emended *abygge [it]*.

1248-1252 A is the only text - E is defective here - to lack these five lines, probably because the rime-word *emperour*, which occurs both in 1245 and 1252, caused the scribe to overlook them. Since these lines are found in H, it cannot have been copied directly from A.

1248-9 The names of the three envoys *Sir Stephen, Sir William* and *Sir Robert of Turnham* are unique to RCL and cannot be found anywhere else (see Jentsch, p. 201). While it has proved impossible to identify the first two knights, the third, Robert of Turnham, accompanied Richard as far as Cyprus, where he was left in charge after the defeat of Isaac Comnenus (Runciman, vol. iii, p. 46). Consequently, his appearance from line 2982 onwards cannot be based on fact.
There is a bewildering variety of spellings for *Turnham*: text E *Dereham* 2982, *Doreham* 4057, 4736 and 5167; text D *Turham* 1249 and 2982; text A *Turcam* 2982 and *Turkham* 4736; *Turnham*

occurs otherwise. All variants, except for *Dereham* and *Doreham*, must be due to either the loss of the expansion mark for *n* or the misreading of *k* for *h*. All have been emended.

1251 The reading *k.t*^in L^is not at all certain but it cannot be **w**.... as read by G. Smithers (Medium Ævum 18 (1949) p. 4). Note the reading *wyse* in D.

1272 This line is illegible in L, for the parchment was folded across this line to make a book-cover. See the Description of the Auchinleck MS. p. 12-13.

1284 The steward's behaviour in 1284-1606 is justified on two accounts. In the first place in RCL any action in support of Richard is justified (see p. 68 ff.). Secondly, the steward's chivalrous defence of Richard's envoy is answered by the heinous behaviour of the emperor, who cuts off his nose. Finally, the steward's feudal treachery in 1321-31 is more than balanced by the emperor's further misbehaviour in 1560-5.

1290-1 L *þou hast gret wo* 'you are in the wrong' must be the original reading and D *þu hast don wow* 'you have done wrong' appears to be a rationalisation. In either case *wo(w)* is derived from OE *wōh* 'wrong, evil' to rime with *inow* from OE *genōh*.

1304 Compare LDBC *of evil trist* 'whom one cannot trust' with A *with vvel triste* 'untrustworthily'.

1305 The source of this episode in which the emperor cuts off the steward's nose may well have been Howden (Rolls Series, vol. iii, p. 110):
'Iratus vero imperator propter hunc sermonem, percussit eum cum cultello quem tenebat, et amputavit nasum eius qui consilium illud dederat: post prandium ille, qui percussus fuerat, abiit ad regem Angliæ, et adhæsit ei'.

1310 The reading of L *flen*, H *fleen*, and B *flane*, is probably superior to D *sclein*, A *slen*, and C *slayne*, because the meaning 'to sKin alive .' fits the context better than 'to kill'.

1315 D *of many a manne* is corrupt; compare AL *of no man*.

1317-1320 A uses direct speech again (see also 186 and 209) rather than the indirect speech found in the other versions.

1334 In A *hyghed*, the **y** is a correction in different ink.

1336 LDC *and fond king Richard pleye* is rendered *Richard stode and pley* in A and H.

1338 The *earl of Richmond* is found neither in Itin nor Ambroise. When this name occurs in RCL, it is never found in a historical context, nor can the names of Richmond's companions be verified: in 1338 the Earl is portrayed playing chess with Richard; in 4059 he fights alongside (amongst others) Robert of Turnham and Longespée, in 5056 alongside Bertram Braundis and Robert of Turnham (for Robert of Turnham see Note 1248-9, for Bertram Note 2981 and for Longespée Note 934).
The Complete Peerage, vol. 10, pp. 791-804, makes it clear that there is only one candidate for *the erl of Richemonde*: Piers de Brayne, who was made Earl of Richmond in 1218/9 (the last holder of the title before him was Conan IV, Earl of Richmond between 1146 and 1171). Piers went on a crusade twice in his life, the first time as the leading crusader to Palestine in 1219, the second time as a companion to Louis IX. He was wounded at the battle of Mansourah and died at sea in 1250. Two of his fellow travellers to Mansourah have also found their way into this romance: *the Earl of Artois* (see Note 760) and *William Longespée* (see Note 934).

1347 The reading of L *in dede lyoun, in þouȝt lepeard* is echoed by C *2194 in dede lyon, in thought lybarde* and B *in dedis as a lyoun, in thoghte as a leberde.* This reading must be original, while D, A and H are corrupt. D has *in dede of lioun, and of lebbard*, while A and H attempt to repair the line: A *that het Richard Quere de Lyon*, H *that hight Richard Conquer de Lyoune.* The phrase found in L, C and B may have contributed to the establishment of the epithet 'Coeur de Lion' (see also Note 642).

1349 A *do lete se armes swythe* is corrupt; compare LDBC *setteþ us to lond swyþe.*

1351 'many a long-boat was moved out quickly'. The spelling of *flot* and *flod* is due to confusion between *flote* 'boat' or 'river' and *flod* 'stream, river'. Note the intransitive verb in A rather than the passive.

1353 The endings of a strong verb have been attached to the weak verb *armen* from OF *armer* in D pa.t. *armyn*, and also in 1719 where *armyn* is the past participle.

1353 L and D *wiþ her vinteyners* 'together with their officers'.

1355 Both L and D are defective towards the end of the line: L lacks the l in *hayl ston* and D lacks *hayl* altogether; it also has *slon* for *ston.*

1371 L *þe Griffouns owas fast ascaped* is corrupt, possibly because the scribe was confused by the other examples of final -s found in the line. Smithers' emendation: *the Griffoun so was fast ascaped* (Medium Ævum, 18 (1949) p. 7, l. 2218) is not satisfactory because pl. *Griffouns* is followed by a pl. verb in all versions, apart from A *many Griffoune hym ascaped*; all texts but A share the word *away*, compare D, C 2218 *The Griffons awaye faste rapped* and B *þe Griffouns faste away fro hym raykede*; all versions use an active construction; finally, the position of *so* in the Smither's emendation is awkward. Here *owas* has been emended to *oway.*

1373 'that they against their will remained behind'.

1378 This line probably refers to 1218-9, where it is reported that the surviors of the shipwreck were stripped naked when they were taken prisoner. Another example of the same motif is found much later in 2406, which repeats that clothes were delivered to the prisoners, this time at Acre. No reference to this motif is found in Itin or Ambroise.

1391 No meaning can be attached to A *a veleyne a tourre*, which must be a corruption of *Limacour* 'Limassol', found in the other versions.

1397 L, A, H, B and C 2240 *enemie* form a group against D and E *velony.*

1406 The meaning of *bisay*, found in ADHEL, is 'to (mis)treat'; compare the example given in the MED under *bisen* 4b: Rolle, Meditation on the Passion (2) 47/20 *þe Iewis hauen so beseen þee, þat þou art liker a messel þan a clene man.* C 2249 has the reading *shente* and B changes the line completely.

1432-6 The other texts have four lines ending in *ight*, but E has only three, with 1433 missing. It is impossible to see from the defective line 1436 E, whether it was meant to rime with 1435.

1441-2 Text A introduces two new rime-words *can:horne*, which create an imperfect rime. 1441 *asaile ye can* is an example of a non-introduced clause of condition, but without inverted word order (see Mustanoja, p. 470).

107

1458 The oath *bi swete Jhesus*, uttered by the *Griffouns*, could indicate that the author understood the Griffons to be Christians (see also Note 1212), or it could be used here simply as a common-place oath used to create a rime with *ous*.

1485-6 In ADE *worschip* probably means 'honour', derived by Richard from this deed; the meaning of L *don worþschip* is probably 'to value hugely'. The readings of 1485-6 L and D are not totally satisfactory, for the pl. pronoun *hem* refers to a sg. antecedent *pauiloun* in 1480.

1491 Something was written above the line in D in between *fflordyt(us)* and *besaunt(es)*, but it is impossible to decipher. Since *fflordytus* is a corrupt form - which has been emended to *floreyntus* - it may well have been an attempt to rectify this word.

1495-6 RCL, Ambroise and Itin all mention the horse *Fauel*. In Itin (pp. 199, 274 and 307) it is referred to as *equo favello (Cyprio)*, *favellus* meaning 'bay-coloured'. In Ambroise (v. 1844) and in RCL *Fa(u)vel* is the proper name of the horse, which as Jentsch (p. 202) remarks, is a common name for horses in the Chansons de Gestes. RCL alone states explicitly that Richard captured *Fauel* from the Emperor of Cyprus. In Itin it is only implied: on p. 199 the Emperor Comnenus tries to escape on *Favel* and on p. 274 Richard rides it during the siege of Acre. The name of the second horse mentioned in RCL is not given in either Itin or Ambroise, but Ambroise states that two horses were left behind by the Emperor. In RCL it is called *Lyard* meaning 'horse, spotted with white or grey' (from OF *liart*). In RCL Richard rides *Lyard* only after *Favel* has been killed.

1501 In D *mli* is written above the line with a line drawn through *li*. The scribe appears to have accidentally combined the abbreviations *ml* for '1000' and *li* for *libra*; compare E *a þousand pound*.

1503-4 'his men had seven times as much as they had lost before'. Note that A (and H) have lost *he had*.

1514-8 The verb *sent/send* in 1514 must be the 3rd pers. sg. syncopated form from *sendeth* 'he sends'. This form and the change of verb to the 1st pers. sg. in 1515 caused confusion, which resulted in the interpretation of *youre Emperour and your King* in A, B and C 2351 as the object rather than the subject of the sentence.

1525 DE deviate from the other versions *goþ and siggeþ ʒour emperour* and change the line to *to sauʒt wyth ʒoure emperour*, *saughten with* meaning 'to reconcile (o.s.) with (s.o.)'. E *sauʒtle* is corrupt and has been emended.

1556 Text A *CCC* is probably a scribal error for *ete*, which is found in L, B and C 2390, rather than for *set(e)* in D, E and H. This type of error implies at least one stage of copying since the last transmission by dictation.

1570 Note that both D and A write *emp(er)ire* which has been emended. This form is also found in D 3056.

1575 In RCL L *Paskasy*, D *Paskye*, E *Palky* and AH *Paskasie* is the name of one of the retainers of the Emperor of Cyprus, who is also the uncle of the Emperor's steward. There is no evidence that this name is historical and BC 2409 do not give a personal name at all.

1578 D and E both have strange spellings for 'whom'. E *whont* has been emended to *whom*. D *qwen*

108

may be related to *hwen*, found in the Lambeth Homilies (see the OED *whom* 2b), with the <qw> spelling for 'wh' common in D and typical of Norfolk (see also p. 51). *Qwen* cannot be a form of 'when', because in the D text only the variant *qwanne* is found for this word.

1581 The ending '-yn' in D *enchesyn* is not attested, but since it is found in the middle of the line, it has been allowed to stand. See also Note 3083 for E *syclatyn* and Note 2707 for E *kechoun*, which have comparable variation in a rime-word.

1585 The unusual spelling *tho(ur)ugh* is found twice in A in 1585 and 1620.

1593 Between 1593 and 1770, 176 lines or the equivalent of one folio are missing in L (see also p. 12).

1599 Either AH *citee* or BC 2433 *towne* represent the original reading here, with D *kyrke* a variation which can be explained by the practice in the Middle Ages of allowing lawbreakers to seek sanctuary at some churches. The D text must have seen the emperor as a villain in need of protection.

1615 D, E and H have all lost the reference to the moon in *by Hym that made mone and sterre*.

1617 The word *res* is only found in text A. Here *res* 'deed, action' and in 2414 *res* 'anger' are derived from OE *ræs*, but the etymology and meaning of *res* in 2153 and 4036 are not certain.

1618 Text D is very confused for three reasons: *he Richard* was written at the beginning of the line; *w(ith)owtyn les* was written and expuncted; *setty(n) þe lond in pes* has a plural verb when the singular is called for. In this text *he* has been deleted and *setty(n)* has been emended to *sett[e]*.

1621 Both A and H lack the subject *he* in this line.

1627-8 Richard married Berengaria on 12 May 1191 in Limassol. While RCL states that the couple were *crownnyd him þer emperour/and here empryse*, it was in fact Berengaria alone who was crowned Queen of England (Itin, p. 195-6).

1646 The loss of the pl. ending in D *had* spoils the scansion of the line.

1647 Jordan (p. 209) comments that in text A *auenteur* the spelling <eu> for OF /ȳ/ is typical especially of the EML.

1653 D has the rare SW spelling *ffurre* in this line.

1654 In A *saugh*, **gh** was corrected, but probably in a different hand.

1655 The name *Alayn Trenchemere* is also found in Roger Howden's *Chronicle* in two later episodes. It is first mentioned, when Richard was a hostage in Germany 'Alano Trenchemer, gubernatore suæ navis' (Rolls Series, vol iii, p. 206), and secondly on his return from captivity (p. 235). This name does not occur in either Itin or Ambroise.
A, D and H share *of hasting*, a phrase not recorded in the MED, which must have arisen through confusion of the particles *of/on/in*, e.g. C 2479 *in haste* and B *one hastynge*.

1659-62 These lines form a later addition shared by A, H and C only. 1659 shows much variation and no one version makes sense: A *as tyd and men inough*, C 2483 *Aleyn quyk and men inowe* and H *Aleyne had tyde and men ynoghe*. All three versions rime *rowe* with the later ME form *inowe*. Lines 1661-2 are a repetition of 1657-8.

1663-4 Text A (and also H) is corrupt because it replaced *stod* found in D, B and C 2487 with *answerd*

to.

1674 The word riming with *ifrauȝt* must have been *auȝt* (compare C 2498) from OE *awiht, aht,* but ADE all opt for the spelling *(n)ouȝt* from OE *(n)owiht, (n)oht.*

1681 D appears to confuse *Aleyn Trenchemer*, Richard's captain, and the *latymere*, the interpreter on board the dromond, between 1675 and 1685. This is apparent in 1675 *þe Aleyn*, and in 1681 where *Trenchemer* is mistakenly reported to be the speaker. Here *latemer* must be meant, so it has been emended.

1711 Text E *men ynow* is corrupt; compare the other versions D and C 2535 *and leydyn to* 'and worked hard'; B *layed into*, A *leyde tough*, H *leyde tow*. The fact that texts A *tough* and H *tow* rime with *rombelowe* indicates that /w/ and /χ/ had become indistinguishable.

1712 The sailor's cry *heualow rombelow* is found in E and A, while D *ebarombyle* is probably a corruption. For other examples of this refrain, which was popular with sailors, see J. Ritson *Ancient Engleish Romanceës*, vol iii, pp. 352-3.

1715 The D scribe mistakenly copied *galey* here rather than the correct word *dromond* found in EAB and C 2539.

1716-7 'The galley tore out a large part at the back [of the dromond] with its prow'. The addition of *brast* in D 1716, which made the line meaningless, has been deleted from the text.

1719 For *armyn*, pp., see Note 1353.

1729-30 The spelling of the rime *fley-nhy* in text D from OE *flēah* and *nēah* indicates that the distinction between **ey** and **i** had become meaningless (see p. 54).

1740 E *glowing quarells* must have come into existence through the reversal of *quarelle flowin* and the replacement of **g** for **f** in *flowen*. Since there is no way of emending this line satisfactorily without major alterations to the text, it has been allowed to stand.

1752 D 'and some fled the whole ship's breadth' is probably due to confusion of OE *bred* 'board' and *brædu* 'breadth', which caused D to insert *ffley* and to change the prep. *to* into *al*. The other versions read 'and some he split unto the ship's boards'.

1756 In text A *Ric(hard) aȝ Richard* has been treated as an uninflected genitive in line with *the emperour steward* 1284 and *Richard come* 4239.

1765 Both Itin (p. 206) and Ambroise (v. 2180) mention in their texts that there were 200 poisonous snakes on board, to which, as Paris (Rom p. 377) and Brunner (RCL p. 51) note 1, comment, RCL does not refer. They remark rightly that such a detail would have appealed to its author and hence it is likely that he probably did not have access to either source for this episode.

1773 Both L and A lack a subject here, possibly because *had he* was misinterpreted as *had(d)e*. This could most easily have happened if the scribe had the text read out to him.

1794 L *yfastned* is followed by the unusual preposition *in*, whereas the other versions have *at/to*. Scribe E wrote *yfesten* and *it* as two separate words, a misinterpretation of *yfestened*, possibly because the line was read out to him. *It* has been allowed to stand and has been joined with the verb to make a pp. ending.

1795 LBE and C 2615 share the correct reading *þat no schip schuld in winne*, while A, H and D are

110

corrupt. A and H change the line to *that no man shulde the toune wynne.* D *that non to chip schuld wynne* loses the contrast between the ships in and outside the harbour.

1798   D *loyn* is recorded in the MED as a pa.t. form of 'lay'.

1800   AEL share *letting* 'hindrance', from OE *lettan.* D *lattyng* was probably influenced by OE *latian*, weak verb II, 'to be slow, delay'. Both the OED and MED record *lat(t)en* as a variant form of *letten.*

1813-4   The original rime *swift:lift* is found in L, A, H, B, and C 2632. D *wyth* 'quickly':*fflyth* and E *swyfte:flyȝt* are both corrupt, but D even more so than E, since D has lost both rime-words whereas E changed only the latter.

1815-6   For a description of the miniature depicting Richard axing the chain across Acre harbour, see p. 9, footnote 41.

1833   L, D, E and C 2649 represent the original reading *tabours and hornes Sar zinays*, from which A and H deviate with *piped Saracenus.* In this reading the musical instrument *hornes* has to be implied.

1839-40   This couplet is shared by L, A, H, D and also E, which is so badly damaged that it cannot provide evidence of the original reading. A, H and D have the rime *pages:bondages/parages*, even though *bondage* and *parage* are collective nouns. L has the correct form *bondage* which creates an imperfect rime with *pages.* It is impossible to be sure what the original reading was and, since B and C lack ll. 1835-46 which includes this couplet, it may be part of a later addition.

1849   Text D *the kyng of Tars* and text E *the king of Grece* are corruptions of LAHB and C 2685 *þe king o Fraunce.*

1857   *Ubaldo Lanfranchi*, the Archbishop of Pisa, had been amongst the crusaders at Acre from October 1189 (Itin p. 74). His speech enables the author to recount the previous events of the siege of Acre.

1858   Contrary to Brunner's comment on this line (RCL, p. 471, under *Pyse*), Ubaldo did not offer Richard his services but said Mass for him.

1864   The timespan of *seven years* is a romantic device. In reality the siege had begun on 28 August 1189 when Guy de Lusignan set up camp at Acre, where Richard arrived on 8 June 1191, almost two years later (Runciman vol. iii, pp. 23 and 47). References to the same number of years are found in 1797 and 1855.

1865   A *iholed* is either a rare spelling of *holde*, or it could be the pp. of *helen* 'to conceal' from OE *gehelian.* Since the regular pp. of *helen* is *heled*, interference of the strong OE verb *helan*, pp. *holen*, may account for o in *iholed.*

1867-8   All texts produce 1867 similarly, apart from B, which expands to *no maner of halde ne castelle.* However, the riming line 1868 shows great divergence with LED *abouten ous, no tour, no wal*, which creates an unsatisfactory rime with 1867 *castel* (see p. 42). A, H and C 2704 form a second group *that ous (off) any warde fell*, the meaning of which is obscure. The sense might be 'from which any protection befell us' but the meaning of both *warde* and *fallen (off)* are a problem - the meaning of *of-fallen* 'to kill, defeat' is not suitable here.

111

1870 L *ous* is the direct object of *kepe*.

1877 Both the title and name of Conrad, Marquis de Montferrat, have been obscured. Conrad was a cousin of Philip Augustus and a rival to Guy de Lusignan, King of Jerusalem, who was supported by Richard. He was not popular with the crusaders because of his conduct at the siege of Acre and his subsequent negotiations with Saladin in 1191 (Brunner, RCL p. 66). Although one might not expect sympathetic treatment from a romance favouring Richard, the attacks on Conrad are harsh and untrue, e.g. in 1878 he is accused of having converted to Islam and in 2314 of embezzlement.

The expansion mark for *marquis* caused confusion in our four texts and various spellings occur. While in L 1877 it is unclear whether *Markes* is used as a title or a personal name, elsewhere the use of the personal name is implied. Generally speaking, the spelling *Marcus* is found but *Malcus, Malkous* etc. also appear in D and E, and *Martes* and *Martus* in A (1877 and 1884). D distinguishes between the personal name and the title by the use of *Malcus* for the former and *marchis* for the latter, e.g. 2331 þe *marchis* and 2350 *that Malkows schulde not be marchis.*

There is also confusion over Conrad's surname: in 1877 *Mon(t)feraunt* is found in all texts except E, otherwise *Feraunt* is used.

1881 Neither A 1881 *soundan* or A 1910 *thounsand* are attested anywhere, so they have been emended.

1889+1929 F. 10 of MS E is badly torn at the top.

1895-6 A has lost the contemporaneous aspect of this line by the use of *so* instead of *as* 'while'.

1896 According to RCL the horse that ran away belonged to an infidel, but compare Ambroise (vv. 2997-8) '*par un cheval qui eschapa/ a un Aleman quil chaça*'.

The name of the horse *Verybel* in D is undoubtedly a misreading of *befel.*

1898 *Cirsten* in L is a rare example of metathesis.

1899 The letters **ld** in A *forlde* are not certain, because they were smudged; this word has been emended to *folke.*

1905 *William de Ferrieres* is also mentioned in Itin (p. 73-4) and Ambroise (v. 3125). Itin records his arrival in Acre in 1189 and Ambroise his presence at its siege, whereas RCL reports his death in the year 1190 (*the Complete Peerage*, vol. 4, pp. 193-4).

1907 Frederick Barbarossa drowned on his way to the Holy Land, so the reference in RCL to the death of the *emperour of Almayn* at Acre cannot be historical (see also Note 757).

1908 *Janine, (erl) of pleyn Speyne*, is not mentioned in Itin or in Ambroise, nor is there is a contemporary figure of that name. Since all seven texts share this line, it must have been part of the original text. The only possible figure to present itself is James I, King of Aragon, who was king of Aragon and Catalonia and reconquered the Balearic Islands and the kingdom of Valencia from the Saracens in the 1220s and 1230s (see *the Encyclopedia Britannica*). Even though his territories could hardly be called *pleyn Speyne*, 'All Spain', James would probably have been the best known of the Spanish Kings in the Middle Ages. He was famous, not only for pushing back the Saracens, but also for attempting a crusade to the Holy Land in 1269. However, while on this expedition, he was forced to return to Spain after a devastating storm (Runciman, vol. iii, pp. 330-1).

1913 Itin (p. 72) and Ambroise (v. 3087 ff.) also state that Saladin poisoned the river at Acre.

1925 D *bred* is corrupt, compare the other versions *wild-fire*.

1939 Both Itin (p. 89) and RCL state that the encounter between Christians and Saracens took place on St. James' day on July 25 and Jentsch (p. 184) shows that there are close parallels between Itin (p. 90) and RCL in the treatment of this episode.
Texts A, H and B share *on a seynt James day*; no parallel examples can be found in ME.

1947-8 'They saw that the Saracens had ample provisions while we had a lack of all goods' is a more or less accurate rendering of all texts, except D, which has the corrupt verb *seydyn* 'they said'.

1951 L, A and C 2787 *fifty þousand* probably represent the true reading against D *ffyue hundrid*, E *ffyue þousand* and B *fourty thowsande*.

1956 L has lost the subject *men*, found in all versions (apart from A *folke*). Since there is no immediate antecedent to which *our* can refer, *men* has been restored to the text.

1967 *um* in text D *summe*² has six minims instead of five.

1970 There is a blob of ink over **e** in A *swerdes*.

1978 Both A and D misunderstand the expression *comen flinging* 'to come running, with a rush'. The D scribe clearly thought that *flyngand* meant 'hurling', for he provided an object *scharpe swerdis*, a corruption of *at schort wordes*, in 1979. Text A *fleyng* was originally written *pleyng* and the correction was made in very thick ink. *Fleyng* must be taken here as the pp. of *fleien* 'to pursue' (rather than *flen* 'to flee', see also Note 208).

1989 *þe douhti erl of Chaumpeyn* is Henry of Champagne, Count of Troyes, nephew of Richard I.

1991 L, D and C share *Randolf þe Glan(de)uiles*, a corruption of the OF particle *de*.

1992 The name of *John Ее Nele*, which is found here and in 3105 and 5086, is used anachronistically. *John de Nesle*, who was castellan of Bruges, arrived at Acre at the end of 1202 (Runciman, vol. iii, p. 101). His name does not appear in Itin or Ambroise. (The only other reference to the *Nesle* family occurs in Ambroise (v. 7515) but it concerns *Robert Neel*, of whom Hubert and La Monte (p. 294, note 20) report that *Robert* is not found in the family of the *Nesles*). There is no evidence that *John* had a brother *Miles*.

1994-7 *Hubert Walter*, Bishop of Salisbury, accompanied Richard on the crusade. He was not, as stated in RCL, Baldwin's nephew but his successor after Baldwin's death in 1190; he was elected Archbishop on his return to England in 1193 (DNB, vol. 28, p. 138).

2011 Both Itin (p. 124 ff.) and Ambroise (v. 4229 ff.) refer to the famine in the Christian camp and the eating of horse flesh.

2012 D must have misinterpreted the pa.t. of *seþen* 'to boil' as the adverb *sythyn* 'afterwards'.

2013 *with (gret) deynte* is used ironically: 'appetizingly, abundantly'.

2021-2 The original rime must have been *oxe:woxe*, which is found in L, A and C 2856 (see p. 38). D and B insert the historically correct pp. *waxe* from OE *geweaxen*, a class VII strong verb.

2023 According to the OED, *hunder* is a fourteenth century Northern spelling. The expansion mark for **n** over L *hunder* is superfluous, a rare mistake in L.
Both L *florin* and D *schelyng* are examples of the unchanged plural preceded by a numeral.

113

2025 *to sike þinges* must mean 'to ill folk'; the alternative reading 'for such things' is much less likely, since Northern *sike* 'such' is not found in our versions.

2030-1 The lack of a subject in L 2031 is probably due to an unexpressed subject *we* supplied out of *our* in 2030 rather than a scribal error (Mustanoja, p. 141). This older idiom was probably not recognised in the other versions and hence *derth* was replaced by *folk* in A, B and C 2864, and by *wost* 'host' in D. The verb was also changed from *weze* to *vnweze* 'to decrease'. D *vnderweze* 'to grow up' is inappropriate and has been emended.

2032 Both Itin (p. 134) and Ambroise (vv. 4428-33) confirm that money was collected for the poor.

2033 The spelling *diole* for OE *dal* 'a share' is an idiosyncrasy of scribe 1 in the Auchinleck MS but *dole* in 2038 shows that the usual form is also used. Macrae-Gibson, AM p. 84, note 692) remarks that no satisfactory explanation for *diole* has been put forward but that orthographic influence from OF plural forms such as *diaus, dieus* seems most plausible.

2063 Causative *don* is followed in L by *telt* and *arere*. Either *telt* is a scribal error or otherwise it might be an infinitive form with unvoicing of the final consonant: *teld* > *telt*. Compare Jordan (pp. 183-4) who states that 'in accented syllables loss of the voicing is limited to position after n, l, r and is found only in WM'. This would constitute an unlikely influence on L.

2068-86 There is a reference to insects in relation to Acre in *Le Chevalier au Cygne*, edited by M. A. Borgnet (tome III, p. 254, verse 26815), which describes how the victory at Acre was gained through the casting of beehives. Jentsch (p. 234-5) comments that *Le Chevalier* may well have derived this detail from RCL.

2071 L *comand* is the syncopated form of pa.t. *comanded*.

2074 The prep. in *sauted to* probably occurs in L because the scribe was confused about the doublet *sauten*. It can either be derived from OF *assauter* 'to attack' or from OF *salter* 'to leap'.

2084 A *non* must have wandered from the subject position, which it has in the other versions, to an adverbial position.

2094 *Maudit-colour* is a corruption of *Maudit Coloun*, a tower in Acre, which appears in Itin as *Turris Maledicta*. The reason for this name is explained in Itin, p. 75: 'nam argentei quibus Dominum Judas proditor vendibit, ibi facti fuisse dicuntur'. *Maudit-colour* is found in riming position and the surrounding text indicates how it became corrupted: the four lines 2091- 2094 rime in *-our* and are followed by two lines riming in *-oun*. This leads one to suspect that originally there was only one couplet in *-our* with compression of 2091-4 LDC on the lines of 2092-3 A, which is the only version to lack 2091 and 2094. 2095 serves obviously as a 'filler', so that leaves 2094 *Maudit-coloun* to rime with 2096 *adoun*.

2122-3 'The archers shot arrows at them/and the crossbowmen [shot] sharp bolts/ through legs and arms, head and heart'. L has only three stresses in 2122, as it lacks the object *arowes* found in ADBC (A records the equivalent of 2121-4 in 2107-10). The preposition *wiþ* in 2123 may have been added in ADBC because *smert* was taken as a verb rather than the adj. 'sharp'. *Gaynes* 'crossbow bolts' is replaced in C 2947 by the more familiar *quarell*.

2129-30 The original rime was probably *ther:conquerer* with the rare ending *-er* for OF *-our, eor*.

2132-3 Text L finishes at 2132. Its last line, which is found at the bottom of f. 327v, is followed by

the catchphrase: þe *Sarrazins seyʒe þai*. This catchphrase is related to, but different from the other versions; compare AD 2133 and also C 2957 *The Sarezynes myʒten nouʒt dour* and B *The Sarazenes than no lengare myghte dure* (see also p. 11).

2141 A is the only text to qualify *soudan* with *her*, which must be either the adj. 'pleasant, noble' or the comparative of 'high'.

2150 Both D and E mistakenly write *knyʒtes* for *knycches*, 'bundles of hay'.

2153 A differs from the other versions in the following respects: the other versions start a new sentence in 2153, whereas A continues with the infinitive construction; in text A *haue rede*, which the other versions render *take rede*, is obscure; finally, the meaning of *rey a res* in A is not clear, but *rey* may be an aphetic form of *arrai* 'troops in battle formation', and *res* could be a rare pl. form of OE *ræw* 'row'. The meaning of these words might therefore be: 'the troops in rows'. For other occurrences of *res*, see Notes 1617, 2414 and 4036.

2169-70 The appearance of the same rime *knyghtes:to alle rightes* in the three versions A, B and C 2994, which are not especially noted for their similarity, and the close textual relationship of D and E (see pp. 26-7), indicate that ABC share the original rime and that a later variant *y fynd:in Ynde* (E reading) was introduced in DE. *Hende* in D is the aspirated form of *Inde* (for aspiration in D, see the Dialect Description p. 52; compare also *ʒend* for *Inde* in 4570). E is defective in the spelling *closed* for *cloþed* 'armed, equipped'.

2171-2 This couplet is found in DEA, but lacking between B and C 2994-5. Since the surrounding text occurs in all five versions, 2171-2 may well form a later addition to the core text. It is likely that the phrase *so seth þe Latyn* was introduced because of its rime with *ffyn* in ADE, rather than as a reference to source material, but the latter cannot be excluded.

2180 D and E *on euery baner* is a corruption of *of baleyne*.

2221 This is the introductory line to the very curious episode in which Richard eats Saracen flesh. Unfortunately only six lines are preserved on f. 11v. in the E manuscript and the following three folios are lacking (see p. 24). The full episode is found in B and C 3041-3124, which tells how Richard fell ill during a battle in which the Christians were under great pressure. Nothing could cure him and consequently Richard was forced to withdraw from the fighting. While he was lying ill, he did not have an appetite for any food, except pork. Finally, one of Richard's retainers decided to kill and roast a Saracen, which Richard ate without knowing the source of the meat. He was immediately restored to health and went out to win the battle.
This episode was probably inspired by the references in RCL 2207-10 and 2233 to Richard's illness, which prohibited him from leading the troops, and to his subsequent recovery. It would appear that the author of the interpolated episode .. ˙ wove the amplified narrative with its miracle cure around the historical core. It must have been quite well known in the West that Muslims were not allowed to eat pork on religious grounds, for example Itin pp. 411-2 and C 3072-6, which states that pork was not to be had.

2253-4 These two lines are unique to D, in which the rime-word *wythsette* in 2254 is a corruption of *wythsitte* 'to resist, ward off' in a rime with *hytte*.

2287-2300 In these lines RCL describes the conditions for a truce proposed by Saladin, one of which was to make *Marcus Feraunt*/Conrad de Montferrat king of Syria (2297-2300). This may echo the

historical fact that Conrad negotiated with Saladin to reach a truce at a later stage. He was branded a traitor for this by Guy de Lusignan's supporters (see Paris, Rom p. 379).

2293+2463 *fflum, flym* and *flom* are all derived from OF *flum* (the form *flum* is also found in KA, B 3397 and B 7914). *flem*, which is found in D 2463, probably goes back to OE *fleam* but whatever the etymology, *flum/flem Jordan* means 'the River Jordan'.

2302 The words ʻA *sherward* and D *scheppard* are probably corruptions of *shreward* ʻa scoundrel', and have been emended accordingly. (compare also C 3252 *ffyle coward*).

2314-8 Itin (p. 26) attests that Henry II had donated 30.000 marks, and RCL (2314) £60.000, to the Templars and Hospitallers for the defence of Tyre, which was defended successfully by Conrad de Montferrat in 1187. There is no evidence to substantiate Richard's accusation that Conrad embezzled these funds and this passage shows the antagonism towards Conrad once again. For Philip and Richard's support of Conrad and Guy respectively, see Note 1877.

2317-8 The original rime is based on *Henry:gouerny* (see D and C 3267), in which the OF verb has been assimilated into weak class II verbs and ends in *i/y* (see p. 39). Text A is corrupt with its second stressed or half stressed syllable in *Henre* followed by *gouernye*, which is probably a corruption of *gouerne* with an unstressed vowel in the final syllable.

2344-5 Scribe Z takes over from Moille in the A text at line 2345 (see p. 16).

2387 Negotiations for the return of the hostages at Acre started at the beginning of August, when it was decided that the exchange of prisoners and payments would take place in three monthly instalments (Runciman, vol. iii, p. 53). Since the first exchange was planned for August 12 (Itin p. 240), the final payment would have been made in the middle of October. The date of Allhallows, mentioned in RCL, is quite close to this, as it is celebrated on November 1. Unfortunately the first exchange ran into difficulties and Richard had the hostages killed on August 20 (Runciman, vol. iii, p, 53).

2399 þe *holy Cros* was reputed to be in Saracen hands. Its return was demanded by Richard in exchange for the hostages at Acre (Runciman, vol. iii, p. 53).

2414-50 These lines, which are found in DA only, show remarkable parallels with E 3770-3806. Both passages describe the argument between Richard and Philip that caused Philip to return to France. In AD it is reported that they quarreled about who was to rule of þis lond ; in E Jerusalem. There can be no doubt that Acre is the correct placename and that the report is in the right chronological position in DA rather than E (see also Note 3770). Exact parallels are found between the following lines: DA 2423-8 and E 3779-84, DA 2429-2436 and E 3789-96, DA 2441-2 and E 3797-8, DA 2445-50 and E 3801-6.

2414 D *in Acres* seems superior to A *in a res* 'in a rage'. For other examples of *res* in text A, see Notes 1617, 2153 and 4036.

2429-31 DA and Itin (p. 236) both report on the reason for Philip's return. Itin states that Philip feigned illness, DA that he actually became ill.

2439 *in his stede* 'as his representative, successor'; when Philip returned to France he left the Duke of Burgundy in charge of the French army (Runciman, vol. iii, p. 52).

116

2469-2806 This is the second passage in which Saracen flesh is eaten (see also Note 2221). Lines 2469-2732 are found in EC only, thereafter B 2733-2806 also shares the text. This episode has strong resemblances to two OF sources which report a similar incident, which the author of the RCL interpolation may well have known. The first episode is found in *La Chanson d'Antioche* by Richard le Pèlerin (translated by la Marquise de Sainte-Aulaire, Chant V, p. 196 ff.) which dates from the 12th century. It describes how during the first crusade Peter the Hermit advises King Tafur to eat Saracen flesh in an attempt to prevent the starvation of the Christians. The second source, mentioned by Paris (Rom p. 359, note 4) and Brunner (RCL, p. 71) is an episode in Adémar de Chabannes' *Chronique* (ed. Jules Chavanon, p. 178) in which Roger, a Norman knight fighting in Spain in 1018, has a Saracen killed each day and pretends to eat him.

2497 Text E *M. Inglissh men louen ȝiftes* is corrupt beyond obvious emendation; compare C 3375, the only other text in which this line is found *men saye, Englyssche-men loue gyffte*.

2543 The ending of the pp. *stripe* resembles that of a strong verb, when in fact *stripen* is weak.

2549 The **h** in *whoot* is a correction, which the scribe wrote over **o**. This spelling is also found in 2636. According to the OED on the digraph <wh>, spellings <wh> for /h/ followed by **o** are found early in the fifteenth century.

2561-2686 Throughout the banquet, at which the Saracen envoys are served the heads of their relatives, descriptions of lavish entertainment are found remininscent of *the Alliterative Morte Arthure*, ll. 176-219. In both romances the hero-king provides entertainment for an enemy envoy.

2566 From both E *at þe þryd table* and C *syde table* it is clear that Richard sat on the dais with his retinue, whereas Saladin's messengers sat further away at a different table. Compare also 2702-3 in which the Saracen envoys report back to Saladin: *we were set at bord besyde/þat stood Richardis table nyȝe*.

2573 *doyse* 'dais', found in E, is a late form of *deyse*. The latter must have formed the original rime with *prese*.

2627-8 No satisfactory etymology or meaning can be found for *rythed* in the rime *rythed:blitheed* in the E text, and neither is the spelling *-eed* common in the pp. of *blithen* 'to rejoice'. A comparison with C 3505, the only other text to share these lines with E, shows that the original rime-words must have been *lyþe* 'pleasant' and *blyþe* 'merry, happy'. E has been emended accordingly.

2707 E *kechoun*, which is found in a rime with *Saryzyn*, has been emended in line with C 3585 *kechyn*. For other examples of variation of <ou> and <y>, see Notes 1581 and 3083.

2724 In this line the Moslem prince is called *of Nauerne*, a name otherwise reserved for *Berengaria of Navarre*, wife of Richard I.

2727-8 The corrupt rime in text E *Egypt:wept* is due to a misunderstanding of the rime-word found in C 3602 *þoo ylkon off vs hys eyen wypte*, in which *wypte* is the pa.t. of *wipen* 'to wipe'. E misinterpreted this verb form as the pa.t. of *wepen* 'to weep', which forced the inclusion of the prep. *with*.

2807-8 This couplet is only found in D and is unlikely to have been part of the core text. Consequently, *the thred day before þe vpsteying/of Jhesu Crist* probably does not refer to an historical date.

117

2817-24 This catalogue of place-names, found in D and A, with E lacking, is very similar to those found in 3051-6 and 4559-68. 2819-24 occurs in the core text, and 3051-6 and 4559-68 in interpolations. There is no indication where or when this material might have been introduced first and whether it spread to the other locations, or was introduced independently in all three. In all three instances the final couplet runs: *of grete Grece and of Tyre/ and of many another empire*. It is not clear what country was meant by the name *Sessoyne* in 2820, 3052 and 4562/4564, but since it appears as part of a list of countries mainly from the Middle East, it is quite possible that a genuine Middle East name is hidden. *Sessoyne* otherwise means 'Saxony' (compare also 756) and there is no evidence in the MED that this name was used otherwise. There are a few examples in D of the spelling *-onye* instead of *-oyne*: *Sesonye* 2820, *Cessonye* 3052 and *Borgonye* 3940; compare also *vitalye* in 1653.

2851-2 These lines are found in D and E only and neither version preserves the original sense perfectly. E has *sende* due to a change in the line to direct speech whereas D has lost the subj. ending *-e* in *sent*.

2862 *Where it was bycome* 'where it had gone' is a remnant of OE practice of using *wesan* with perfective, 'mutative' intransitive verbs (see Mustanoja, p. 500).

2878 The motif of the *angelic intervention* is found three times, in the core text in 2878, in the first passage E in 3466 and in the final interpolation in 4945. Paris' comment on the reason for the intervention in 4945 (see also Note 4945-64) is equally true of 2878: if an order from heaven precludes any potential criticism of Richard because he left Palestine before Jerusalem had been taken, neither is Richard to blame for the killing of the hostages at Acre because here, too, he acted on divine orders. For the angelic intervention in 3466, which does not provide divine justification, see Note 3466.

2879 D *sargnures*, which may be a confusion of *Sarazens* and *seignures*, has been emended to *seygnures*; compare also D 2192 *seygnuȝs*.

2880 There is much variation in this line. The original reading is represented by ABC *spareth (them) noght, byheuedith these*, while D and E are very different. D rimes *tues:dogges* with the stress on the last syllable. E is very corrupt with *touȝ*, an odd rendering of *tues* 'kill', riming with *peues*, which must be a corruption of *þeues* 'thieves'.

2881-2 Both D and E change from a passive to an active construction, which is probably a corruption of the original text as shown in 2885-6 A *and byheuedede hem hasteliche/and caste the bodies in a diche*.

2891-4 Richard led his troops out of Acre on August 22 and travelled towards Haifa with Saladin following him (Runciman, vol. iii, p. 54). RCL echoes these historical events but neither the date of departure or the capture of *Caifas* 'Haifa' in 2992 are accurate. In 2891 RCL states that Richard left *before seynt Johnys tyde qwanne ffoule begynne to chyde*, which must refer to the feast of St. John the Baptist on June 24. The reference to spring is the only example in RCL of a stock phrase commonly found in courtly literature. Here it is not used as a conventional introduction to a tale of love, but rather as the opening of a new episode in Richard's military campaign (see also p. 59-60).

2893 A has lost the expression *turnen pas* 'to change one's course, go', and has *turnde his ost to pas*

instead. By this is probably meant: 'he turned his host on the way'.

2896 There is no geographical evidence for the existence of a river called *Chalyn* near Haifa. However, Itin (p. 252) does mention that Richard's army travelled from the river *Achon* (or the river Kishon according to Stubbs, Itin p. 252) to Haifa on August 26, 1191.

2913 Since *werd* for 'world' is recorded in the OED, it has been left to stand in the D text.

2926 The reading of A *that many vndur his hond ther starf* is more likely to be original than DE *many an hethen hond þere starf*, because B and C 4850 have very similar readings to A. The DE version may have come about because of confusion of the homograph *hond* for OE *hond, hand* 'hand' and *hund* 'hound'.

2935-2940 This passage shows a remarkable resemblance to Itin (p. 250): 'Ibi cum a Turco quodam amputaretur manus dextra cum gladio quem strictum tenebat, cuidam Everardo homini episcopi Saresberiensis, ... ' For *Hubertus Gautyre*, see Note 1994-7.

2935-6 D and E rime *Gautire* with *myre* 'swamp, bog' from ON *mȳrr*. A, however, rimes *Gauder* with *muer*, which was probably influenced by *mere* 'lake, pond' from OE *mere*.

2937 *Saladyn sone* is a rare example in E of an inflectionless genitive.

2943-4 The rime appears to be *þat:late* E and C 4863, which A varies with *whate:late*. D changes the rime to *rate*, which may be an unattested form of *rathe*, introduced to rime with *late*.

2951-2 This couplet, which is found in AEBC, is wanting in D.

2969 The battle cry of *St. George* developed out of the need to emulate the French battle cry of *St. Denis* (see Broughton p. 105) and it became very popular during the third crusade (see Matzke, *The Legend of Saint George*, PMLA 18 (1903) p. 155). It is also found in Ambroise (vv. 6378 and 6433) and Itin (pp. 7 and 267).

2971-2 A description of St. George's dress consisting of white armour with a red cross, similar to the one found in RCL, is cited by Matzke (PMLA 18 (1903) p. 154) in the *Hierosolymitana Historia*.

2981 It has been impossible to verify *Sir Bertram Brandis*' existence nor does he appear in Itin or Ambroise. The epithet *the good Lombard* clashes with *Brandis*, because Lombardy is in the North and Brindisi in the South of Italy. For Robert of Turnham, see Note 1248.

2983-4 This couplet is only found in E.

2987-8 ABC share this couplet while DE lack it.

2992 According to RCL, *Cayphas* was captured by Richard's army, but this is not confirmed by Itin (p. 252) or Ambroise (v. 5845). Instead, they state that Richard passed Haifa on his way to Capharnaum and that he camped there, without giving any evidence that he took the town.

2999 Jentsch (p. 186) remarks that since there was more than one town with the name *Cæsarea*, the name *Cæsarea Palestinæ* was used for the town between Acre and Jaffa, which is here found abbreviated to *Palₐstyn* .

3007-3026 These lines contain a list of towns and castles razed by the Saracens in the year 1191. While Itin (p. 280) and Ambroise (vv. 6841-6866), which are virtually identical, also have this material, RCL shares some details with these sources, but does not follow them verbatim.

3012-4 RCL describes how *Mirabel* is destroyed, followed by *castel Calafyn*. Since *Mirabel* is 25 km south of *Calansua*, it is possible that by *Calafyn Calansua* was meant. However, there is no historical evidence for this, since this name does not appear in Itin or Ambroise.

There is much variety in the spelling of the place-name in 3013: D *Calafyn*, E *Salafyme*, A *Calasyn* and BC 4931 *Calaphyne*. The similarity of the letters f and ʃ must account for the f/s spellings. The m in E *Calafyme* was probably introduced to create a rime with *lym*. *Gyn* in text A 3014 is corrupt, since it is normally only used for temporary structures and not for castles. It is quite likely that BC are a closer witness of the original reading *made of gud engin* 'of good design'.

3016 At the time that the castles described in 3011-26 were razed, Arsuf was still safely in Christian hands and it was only destroyed later, after the battle of Arsuf (Brunner, RCL p. 57).

3019 Saladin could not have destroyed *Castel Pilgrim* in the year 1191, because the Templars only finished building it in 1218 (see p. 71), and it is not surprising that the reliable sources Itin and Ambroise do not include this name in the list of castles   razed. In RCL it is not only found in 3019 but also in 4236, and its inclusion in these episodes indicates that they were written after 1218.

3021 According to Paris (Rom p. 382, note 4) *seynt George Dirrayn* is based on: 'Saint-Georges, situé tout près de Rames .... s'appelait Saint-Georges de Rames etc'. It is more likely, however, that RCL combined the two names *Saint George* (St. George of Lydda) and *Ramleh*, which are found together in both Itin and Ambroise.

3023-4 RCL is wrong in stating that *Jerusalem* and *Bethlehem* were destroyed. In the case of *Jerusalem* the error was probably due to a misunderstanding of either Itin or Ambroise who both state explicitly 'omnia dirue, omnia prosterne, præter Crac et Jerusalem' (p. 280) and 'Chasteaus ne caseus ne cité,/ Que tot ne seit acraventé,/ fors e Crac e Jerusalem.' (vv. 6864-6). The name *Bethlehem* was undoubtedly used to create a rime with *Jerusalem*.

3025 *Maiden castel* (E reading) is probably a corruption of *Casel Maen*. This castle was destroyed by Saladin and rebuilt by Richard in 1191 (see Itin p. 280, and Ambroise vv. 6841-66), so RCL is wrong in stating that *Maiden Castel þey lete stonde*. The name *Mayden castel* may have been introduced here, because it is a well-established English place-name for various Iron Age forts, e.g. Maiden Castle in Dorset, Cheshire, Cumberland and Westmorland (K. Cameron, *English Place-Names*, pp. 115-6). Cameron also notes that 'though the exact sense of *maiden* is doubtful here, it may in fact mean 'impregnable' or denote a place which, like a maiden was 'inviolate'.

The reading in text D *many castelle* must be corrupt.

3026 It is impossible to explain *Horkeys/Herkys/Haucus londe* and no place-name can be found in either Itin or Ambroise to suggest what these variants might have been derived from.

3040 There are three different adverbs in this line: E, B and C 4958 *fast*, D *sweþe* and A *smere*. It is hard to say whether EBC present the original reading or A. EBC have the weight of numbers but the A reading *smere he logh* 'he laughed contemptuously, in scorn' is particularly appropriate. The last quotation for *smere* in the OED is dated at 1380 and this word may have been replaced in the other texts because it had become archaic. D *sweþe* is either a rare

120

form of *swithe* 'very much' or a corruption of *smere* in which confusion of **m** and **w** may have contributed to this form.

3044 Something was written over the first *a* of E *habaro(ur)*, which may well have been intended as an abbreviation for *r*, but is now illegible. In addition, the end of the word *habaro(ur)* may have been influenced by *Arsour*, which occurs in the same line. Since the infinitive of 'herberwen' is needed in the text, this word has been emended to *harbarow*.

3051-6 For the catalogue of place-names, see Note 2819-24.

3053+4565 ADEBC all share *Aufryk*, but otherwise have different rime-words: D *Bossye* (? Bosnia), E *Libie*, A *Auboge graundre* and BC 4971 *Bogye*. A 4565 is similar to 3054 and like *Auboge graundre*, the origin of *Aubone* is not known.

3059-60 These lines refer to the battle in *la Forest* near Arsuf in 1191 (see *the Atlas of Israel*, p. ix/10, published by Survey of Israel etc. 1970). Ambroise (v. 6096 and 6101) and Itin (p. 274) also refer to the 'Forest' but the name *Lessour* is not mentioned. In RCL this name was probably introduced to create a rime with *Archoure/Arsoure*, a place-name also found in 3037 and 3044.

3065 Both A and E have lost the expansion mark for [ro] in *Province*, and E has also lost the expansion for [n]. Both texts have been emended.

3070 In text E *fiȝht*, the scribe wrote *fit* first, added ȝ over the t, and then . *ht* to the word. The E scribe repeated the same process in 3637 *fiȝt*.

3079 A and D share *and heye stedes*, whereas E and C 4997 have *on high steedes*. D *long berdes* must be a corruption of *longe speres* found in ACE.

3083 E   *siclatyn* is an unattested form, which occurs in rime-position in a rime with *broun*; consequently, it has been emended to *siclatoun*. For other examples of <ou> and <y> variation, see Notes 1581 and 2707.

3085 *þousarid* has been emended to *þousand*, because -*and* is the only ending found in the D text (see also p. 54).

3087-8 D and E have changed the original rime-words from a pa.t. verb into a present participle: E *rennyng:brennyng* and D *ernand:brennand*; compare A *arnde* (pa.t. of *rennen* from OE *ærnan*) and *barnde* and also C 5005 *rende:brende*.

3096 Text D *with his men gynnyng* is corrupt and has been emended to *with his gyng*. E *batalyng* has lost the connection with *gyng* altogether.

3097 Note E *splyntes of stele* and D *splentes*. The type of error found in text A *plente of styl* would be more easily made from the D reading than from E.

3099 D *semyd* deviates from ACE *louyd*. The D reading must be: 'baron and knight suited him well, who could ....'.

3101 In text D *the first ost of* and the repetition of the preposition *of* in 3102 are corrupt and render the line meaningless. Both prepositions have been emended in line with A, E and C 5019-20 *the first bataile to* and *to* respectively.

3104 'to the disgrace and shame of the devil'. Many parallel constructions can be found in Old and Middle English, e.g. *þee to solas* in *Kyng Alisaunder* (in Bennett and Smithers' *Early Middle*

English Verse and Prose, p. 37, l. 266); *Anglen to fulste* 'a help for the English' in *Laȝamon* (op. cit. p. 157, l. 327) and *drihtin to lofe annd wure* in *Ormulum* (op. cit. p. 178, l. 106).

3105-6   *Jakes de Neys* is Jacques d'Avesnes, a Flemish knight (see Paris, Amb. p. 549 and Paris, Rom p. 366 and note 1), whose final battle and death are described in RCL 3105-3218, Itin pp. 275-6 and Ambroise vv. 6631-6682. In E both *John de Neles* and *Jakes de Neys* share the same surname *de Nyse*, perhaps because these knights had very similar names and were both from Flanders (see also Note 1992 for the chronology of John de Nesle). Text A *de Nles* has been emended in line with E and C 5023 *de Neles*.

      eschele 'battalion', to which D *oschelde* has been emended, forms a better rime with *de Neles* than ACE *pres*; it is likely that *eschele*, which is also found in AM (v. 7570), was ousted at an early stage because its meaning had become obscure.

3118   In text A *might* is an adjective 'great, powerful'.

3127-3134   These lines are only found in this position in D and E. In A the passage is found in 3155-3162.

3131-2   DE 3131, A 3159 and C 5049 are correct in saying that the Duke of Burgundy (see Note 755) was present at the battle of Arsuf (Runciman, vol iii, pp. 55-6), but there is no evidence of the existence of the Earls of *Coloyne* in DE 3132 or *Boloyn* in A 3160 and C 5050 (see Notes 759 and 760).

3133   The reading of *distres* in D is not certain and the first s lacks the topstroke. *Distres* could either be a corruption of A 3161 and C 5051 *deuers* 'duty' or of E *destreres*, which fits the context better.

      A 3161 *they so* and D 3133 *theyse* may well be a corruption of *þese*, found in C 5051.

3134   In E the word *payneneris*, which appears to be a combination of *pautener* and *painim*', has been emended to *pauteneris*.

3146   In D *Sarazynys*, z is not quite clear, probably because the scribe wrote y first and then z over it.

3152   Normally the pa.t. of weak verbs ends in *-ed*, but note *tofrussad* in A.

3165   D and E, which show confusion over the phrase *this is wrong*, have been emended.

3175-6   This couplet is remarkably similar to 4425-6.

      D *a merayle* is not attested anywhere, but since it occurs more often, and in more than one text (compare also E 3170 and 4556), it is treated it as an aphetic form of 'ameraile'.

3181-2   The variation in the spelling of the rimes D *hyng:feng* and A *heng:kyng* is due to the raising of e before a supported nasal to i (see Jordan, p. 60).

3184   D *gyrdilwon* is not attested anywhere; it could be analogous to the word *girdelstede* but on the other hand *won* from ON *van* means 'dwelling place', which is inappropriate.

3185-6   This couplet is only found in A, whereas 3187-90 only occur in DEBC.

3190   D *Ric* has been expanded to *Richardes* because it improves the metre.

3193-4   A has interchanged these lines.

3201   The subject *they* has been added to A on the assumption that the scribe was more likely to overlook *they* in *that they* in D, than *Richard* in *that Richard* in EBC.

3203-4 Since A, B and C 5112 share the rime *lepyn:grepyn*, it was probably the original reading, and D and E *wepon* and *brekyn* are likely to be corrupt. A *to hem grepyn*, which is also found in C, must mean 'they seized (to themselves)'.

3206 Text D *slow* must be an error due to repetition of *slow* in the previous line; compare the other texts which have *lost* in EBC 5114, and *les* in A.

3211 D *þei bleddyn* is almost certainly corrupt, for in the other versions the subject is *he*, referring to Richard, and the verb is *shedde* with *brain and blood* as its object. In D *þei* either refers back to *brayn and blod* with an intransitive verb or to the combatants followed by a transitive verb.

3213-4 3214 ABC *that bywep the child in the cradelle* forms a perfect rime with *sadelle*, while the riming line *and slayn þe sone and þe fader* in DE 3214 is based on assonance. The same rime is found in 4430 in which E and C share *sadel:cradelle* and D alone has *sadil:fader*.
This type of rime in *el:er* is only found in 3214 DE and 4430 D in RCL, but is common in the KA group, according to Bennett and Smithers in *Early Middle English Verse and Prose*, p. 279, note 83-4: 'Rhymes involving a discrepancy in a final unstressed syllable (and especially within the series -e: -ed, -el, -en, -er, -es, -eþ) are common in *Kyng Alisaunder* and the King Alisaunder group (*Arthour and Merlin*, *The Seven Sages of Rome* and *Richard Coeur de Lion*)'. The presence of only two potential examples of this type, both in interpolations, does not strenghten the argument that RCL is part of the putative KA group (see pp. 78-9).

3215 The corrupt rime-word *de Neim* in text A can be explained by the change in the riming line of 3216 to *sleyn*.

3239-40 For the rime *fleand:flyngand*, see p. 33.

3246 E *pol-boon*, which is not only unique in RCL but also in Middle English, must be a combination of *pol* from MDu *pol* meaning 'head, neck' and *bon* 'bone'.

3253-4 The pl. noun *pauilouns* in D, E and C 5158 forces a pl. -s onto the collective noun *sekelatoun*. The reading in text A *alle was the soudans pauilon [of] silk, sendel, of ciclaton* looks like a rationalisation.

3255 Text A is very corrupt here and has lost all meaning because the pp. *ischape* appears as *chapun* 'capon', and *as* appears as *al of*.

3256 Both D and E have lost *and siluer* from the line *of gold and siluer were the penselles* (see C 5160). A *and penselle*, which created a meaningless line, has been emended.

3259-60 In text D *lebardes:Richardes* both nouns carry expansion marks for -*es*. D deviates in this from EAB and C 5163, which all have s-less forms.

3261 Text D *bindon* is erroneous; the root vowel proper to the inf. has been inserted into the pp. form, perhaps because the scribe was confused about the exact place of o in *bindon*.

3265-8 This quatrain, which is lacking in BC, is only found in ADE.

3275-88 In this passage Richard has Jaques de Nesle's body brought back from the battlefield. A and D give the wrong place of burial, while E 3282 states correctly that Jacques was buried in Arsuf (compare Itin p. 277).

3275 *Gauter (Caunter* in 3837-8 E) was identified by Paris (Rom p. 380) as Garnier de Nablus, Master of the Hospital. Paris comments that both Itin and Ambroise name him as *Garnier de Napes* but that in these sources he appears in different circumstances.

3281 *ladden*, which has the pp. form in E, has been emended to SE Midlands *laden* because this verb appears in a string of infinitives.

3284 Text A *for that he was werthe* means 'because he deserved it'.

3289-3806 These lines, which make up the passage E2, are only found in EBC. In BC they are preceded by a long passage, C 5189-5382, which describes the siege and battle of *Nynive* and the combat between Richard, Sir Fouke and Sir Thomas, and three Saracen adversaries. The introductory passage in E 3289-3304 bears some slight resemblance to the earlier lines in C.

3289 According to Brunner (RCL pp. 72 and 472), the *Sowdan* in this episode is not Saladin. R. Loomis, JEGP 15 (1916) p. 457, disagrees with him: 'the interpolator is here taking over a well known story and is probably transferring directly the names that occurred in his source. But that Saladin is meant cannot well be doubted ...' Loomis' conclusion must be correct, but his reference to 'a well known story' cannot be substantiated. It is just as likely that the author of this interpolation introduced the term *Sowdan* himself.

3324 *Rad* is probably derived from OE *hraed* 'ready, eager' rather than from ON *hræddr* 'frightened', since there is no suggestion in the text that the French were too frightened to fight and since they initially besieged the Saracens on one side of the city. *Rad* may be a corruption of *bad* found in C 5404, the only other text to present this line: *ffor Phelip and hys men were badde*, which refers to the fact that Philip was criticized for accepting a truce with the Saracens without informing Richard, who was still fighting on the other side of the city (3379-3384).

3372 BC *with gret soun* fits the sense of the line better than E *w(ith) gret raunsom*.

3385 The *b* in E *bowed* is uncertain and the meaning of the word itself is not clear. Since the reading of BC *he louyd no crownes ffor to crake* makes good sense, E has been emended to *loued*.

3422 This episode probably grew out of a reference to an event described in Itin (p. 419) and Ambroise (v. 11543 ff.). Both relate how Saphadin, Saladin's brother, saw Richard without a horse at the siege of Jaffa and how he offered Richard two Arab ones. There is no suggestion of a ruse in either source (see also Brunner, RCL pp. 71-2).

3425+4412 E refers twice to the horse *Bayard* when presumably *Lyard* is meant.

3432 E *byn* is obscure, compare BC *wery*.

3466 In contrast to 2878 and 4945, the intervention of the angel does not provide divine justification here. In 3466 the angel gives warning of Saladin's ruse, without which Richard would undoubtedly have lost his joust with Saladin.

3477 The rime *maane:shame*, which is based on assonance, is probably not original; compare C 5561-2 *And trusse it ouyrthwert his mane/Alle þat he metes schal haue his bane.*

3500 The narrative contains a weakness here, because Richard is not told what the narrator tells the reader in 3460-5. In these lines we are informed that the horse, which Richard has just received, is a foal of Saladin's mare and that it will run towards her as soon as it hears its mother. Consequently, Richard cannot know that it is important to block the foal's ears with

wax.

3524 In E *brou3t* r is not very clear; it must have been inserted at a later stage.

3528 E **te** in *te oste* is attested in the OED as a twelfth to fourteenth century form.

3607-8 For a discussion of this couplet, see Note 115-6.

3634 The description of the combat between Richard and Saladin is not only found in RCL, but also in Pierre de Langtoft (Rolls Series 47, ii, p. 102) and Walter of Hemingburgh (*Chronicon*, vol. 1, p. 183), who are both early fourteenth century chroniclers. According to R. Loomis (PMLA 30 (1915) p. 513) Walter of Hemingburgh's account 'represents probably a much earlier tradition', but he does not explain what he bases this view on.

The battle between Richard and Saladin is the subject of two Chertsey tiles dating from 1270-80 (see R. Loomis PMLA 30 (1915) pp. 512-6). On the first tile Richard's shield is emblazoned with three leopards (compare also 1347 in which Richard is described as *in þou3t lepeard*) and his spear rests between the colt's ears. In RCL the position of the spear not clear. While it appears from 3475-7, 3595-8, 3683 and 3727-32 that Richard had a massive wooden shaft fastened across his horse's neck, he also appeared to hold a spear in his hand in 3614, 3665 and 3674.

On the second tile Saladin's only weapon, a falchion, can be seen - Saladin was lightly armed because he thought that it would be easy to kill Richard through *negromancye*. The broken stirrups and girth (compare 3669), the falling mare (compare 3670) and the Sultan's body thrown backwards (compare 3671-3) are also depicted.

3638 E *ire* is a corrupt variant of *air* 'haste, vigour'; compare text C 5744 *air*.

3641-2 The original rime must have been *blowe:throwe*, in which the vowel of the pp. was probably levelled out into the pa.t. plural, or alternatively OE *blēowon* could give *blowe* with shift of stress before **w** (see Jordan, p. 128).

3651-2 The rime *rang:lesyng* in text E is based on *runge*, pa.t. pl. of *ringen*, and on *lesunge* from OE *leasung*.

3689-92 The explicit comment declaring that the French are cowards is typical of the second passage E; compare also 3289-3397 where Philip betrays the Christian cause.

3698 *founde* in the rime *honde:founde* is a late spelling of *fond*, pa.t. singular of *finden*, which was influenced by the preterite plural.

3700 This line contains the only reference to *Fouk Doly* and *Thomas of Multon* outside the captivity episode. Here again the two heroes are encountered outside the core text.

3714 Note E *this* 'thus', from OE *þys*.

3741 *of empte sadelle* is an example of metonymy for 'riderless horses', found also in 3213.

3743-4 'They [the horses] ran around with great spirit, whoever wanted to could ride one!'

3755 In this line, which is unique to E, all nouns are found in the singular, apart from *barouns*. This is probably an error, since it is unlikely that the singular OF noun *barouns* is meant here.

3770 E 3770-3806 bears very close resemblance to DA 2414-2450, which is undoubtedly in the original position (see also Note 2414). The argument between Richard and Philip was not about

Jerusalem, as E states in 3772, but about who was to rule over Acre   . E
is also wrong about the date of Philip's departure, since he had already left Acre on July 31
(Runciman vol. iii, p. 52). Consequently, the date of November 1 (Allhallows), mentioned in
3796, cannot be correct.

3807 In D space was left at the beginning of the line for a capital, which was not filled in, and the
guide letter *t* is visible. The scribe must have confused t and þ, for he continued the word with
anne.

3815 In C 5939-40: 'þat neuere was non in Sarazyneys/so strong wrou3t, and of gret ryhcheys' both
rime-words have the stress on the final syllable: *Sarazyneys* 'the land of the Saracens' and
ryhcheys 'wealth'. Text A has lost the awareness that *riches* is a noun, for it is treated parallel
with an adjective. The two lines in A have been restored in line with C.

3826 A *ynogh* is used here as an adverb; compare D and C 5947 *ynowe men* in the previous line.

3829-61 This episode is not shared by BC, and many details in it are obscure, e.g. 3829 A *by drem* and
D *by brem* may have originally stood for a placename but are now unintelligible; E changes the
line. It is unlikely that the other unknown place-name *Torye* was four miles from Jerusalem,
as RCL states, since Richard did not get so close to Jerusalem.
In 3856-7 Richard is reproached for the fact that he followed advice to strike out towards
Chaloyne 'Ascalon', which is on the way to *Babiloyne* 'Cairo' (see Note 258). According to
RCL, this caused many noblemen to return to Europe in 3860. These events are probably
not based on fact, but may echo the dissent in Richard's camp over Richard's caution on his
approach to Jerusalem.

3848 A *sweyn and grom* has lost the contrast between the higher and lower ranks, compare DE *squier
and grom*.

3850 In order to restore sense to D 3*o(ur) on syde toward*, 3*our* has been emended to 3*ou* and *on
syde* is taken as the adverb 'aside'.

3871 A *grauntith* was added later to the MS, probably by the scribe himself. Note that the verb is
used in the historical present rather than the simple past tense.

3874 The quarrel between the Duke of Austria and Richard was not so much about the division
of responsibility as about prestige. Leopold, as leader of the German camp, wanted to fly his
banner over the conquered town but this was refused by the English (Runciman, vol. iii, p. 51).
This incident between Richard and Leopold did not take place at Ascalon, as RCL states, but
much earlier, at Acre. Paris (Rom p. 370) heaps scorn on Jentsch (pp. 227-8) for attributing
this passage to John Bromton, because the latter lived 100 years after the Auchinleck MS was
written. Yet there are remarkable parallels between RCL and John Bromton (see Jentsch), of
which the phrases *my fader was neither mason ne carpentere* and *quod pater suus nunquam
carpentarius vel latomus erat* are the most striking. Moreover, both sources give the place-name
of Ascalon rather than Acre. The DNB (vol. ii, p. 1313) questions the authorship of John
Bromton's Chronicle and cites T. D. Hardy that 'there is reason to believe that it was based
on a previous compilation'. The author of the core text may well have known of this source.

3898 A *byfore* is corrupt; compare DE *vpon* and BC *agayne the brest him smot*.

3900 Apart from the change of the subject *he* in the other versions to the object *hym* in A, and the

lack of a preposition preceding *stone*, its construction is different as well: 'so that [Richard] threw him headlong on a stone'; compare CDE 'he fell headlong on a stone'.

3913 Note the endings in D *restist* and also A *restust*, which is typical of the WM.

3918-37 3926-37 predict Richard's historical capture on Leopold's territory, particularly 3929 '*and þrow þe warnyng of a spye*'. However, the contention in 3932-37 that Leopold would have a hand in Richard's death is not based on historical fact and neither is the reference to Leopold as the defender of *Gailard* in 5212.

3926 DEC read: 'he kept his pledge all *too* well'. A has corrupted the line by exchanging the adverb *wel* for the adjective *good*.

3932 The construction *had he (haue) most ileuyed* is found in DE and C 6017. It is unusual in that *most* occurs here in a pp. construction rather than as a pr./pa.t. verb with *liven* 'to be permitted to live'. A *in ost* is probably an attempt to improve on *most*.

3933 Text E *for þe cursed gost* deviates from *þe holi gost* in the other versions. The E reading may refer to the Duke of Austria or to the devil, but it is probably an error.

3934 A changes the nouns in the list of rulers into the plural, which forces a plural ending also in *conquerours* in the next line.

3940 Philip Augustus returned to France without leaving any money to pay the French troops, because a large sum was expected from Saladin in exchange for the hostages at Acre. When the hostage deal fell through and the Saracens were killed, Richard lent the Duke of Burgundy 5000 marks (Itin p. 239). At a second request for money, Richard refused to give him any more (Itin p. 320), so the Duke was forced to leave because he could no longer afford to pay his troops.

3941 For the Earls of *Coloyn* and *Boloyn*, see Notes 759 and 760.

3945 E is very corrupt here with *how* a misspelling of *hom*, found in DBC, and *aslepe* an error for *and slepe*. The adverb *aslepe* has been taken as '[be] inactive'.

3950-5 Text A is defective in this passage because it incorporates the element *walle*, found in D 3955, into 3951. Its imperfect rime *Englessh:alleweis* in 3950-1 may well have been derived from *Englys:iwis*, which is found in BC 6035-6. Ll. 3952-4 are lacking in A.

3956 D *at strong plyȝth* is different from A and E *apliȝt*. The expression in D must mean 'in a strong, defendable state' although the usual preposition is '*in a plight*'.

3957 D lacks nearly 200 lines between 3957 and 4147 (see also p. 20). It is not clear if this gap occurred because material was dropped from the exemplar or whether it was never there in the first place. Since D is the only text to lack these lines and since they form a fairly well delineated episode, the indications are that the gap was not caused by scribal oversight. In D itself the lacuna occurs two lines from the bottom of 36r. It is interesting that C lacks 3957-64 but shares the rest of this episode (compare C 6041-6222).

3957-8 Although *Chaloyne* is the more common variant for 'Ascalon', here the rime is based on *C(h)aleyne* to rime with *peyne*. A accepts this form but E writes *Chaloyn*. Note that D also has *Chaleyne* once in 3862.

127

3959-60 These lines are only found in A and E, in which E *as I arst mende* makes more sense than A *as I euer mende*. A and E may well refer to 3851 where Gauter advises Richard to go to Babylon.

3964 The resemblance of text A *Femely* and B *Femaly*, texts which are not particularly closely related, indicates that they are probably closer to the form in the original text than E *Seboly* (C lacks 6041-6); this place-name has not been identified.

3968 The name of *castel Abathie/Albarie* is probably not historical. It does not occur in any of the other chronicles (see Jentsch p. 212).

3969 In A *Sarasines* is used as an adj. to qualify *castel*, but compare the other versions *of Sarasines* 'belonging to the Saracens'.

3975 E appears to have combined the phrases *every weyes* 'in every direction' and *by ech wey* into *by euery weyes*.

3984 E states that Richard reached Daron on St. John's day (either June 24 or December 27) and A that he arrived on St. James day (July 25), neither of which can be correct, since it can be deduced from Itin (p. 352) and Ambroise (v. 9176) that Richard arrived in Daron on May 17.

4007 In E the catchword at the end of the quire is *to fil* but the next folio starts with the Western form *to ful*.

4036 *res a res* may be a prep. phrase derived from OF *res a res/res et res*, 'as far as, up to', but it is not followed by a noun. For further examples of *res* in A, see also Notes 1617, 2153 and 2414.

4147-4228 This passage is fabulous and is not found in any of the historical sources. Although it is shared by ADEBC, it is probably not part of the original text (see pp. 33-4 and 63-4). The name of the town *Gatris* was probably borrowed from *Guadres* 'Gaza' and is confined to this episode. The decapitation of the marble statue may echo Beues' overthrow of Mahound (*Sir Beues of Hamtoun*, EETS, extra series 46, 48, 65 p. 68).

4153-4 The address to the public is shared by all texts, but the adhortation in 4147-8 is peculiar to D and E and almost certainly a later addition.

4193 D *aou* has been emended to *[w]ou* because **a** and **w** are more easily confused than **a** and **h**. For **w** for **h**, see p. 52.

4213 A *fetthe* shows confusion between *fecchen* and *fetten*. EBC have the pp. which is the same in both verbs. A and D use the inf. construction in which A combines **h** of *fecchen* and **tt** of *fetten*.

4228 King Richard granted the lord of Gatris the city for life, even if he *leuede [to] Adomus elde*, till the age of 930 years that Adam was reputed to be when he died (Genesis 5,6). Both A and C share *leuede Adomus elde*, which has been emended in A following B to *leuen* to *Adams elde*.

4237-8 Since the reading of the couplet in A *Lefrewide:prude* is paralleled closely by C 6309-10 and since both D and E show signs of rewriting, the original rime must have been based on the unrounded non-Kentish reflex of OE *y*. *Lefrewide* has been identified by Brunner, RCL p. 53, as *Castel des Figues*, which in RCL is described as three miles from *castel Pilgrim*. D and E *Lucypryde* must be a further corruption of the original name.

A has *a* and *b* written at the beginning of these lines because their order was reversed.

4239 *Richard come* is another example of the uninflected genitive in A, compare also 4321.

4243 Perhaps because the idea of surrender is unusual in this text, the D and E scribes tried to change this line to the contrary. The original sense must have been that the Saracens opened the gates and disappeared quietly through a small door.
E *shitte* has been emended to *vnshitte* in line with BC; D *settyn* to *settyn* **vp** 'to elevate, open' in line with A.

4249-56 Some details in this passage bear resemblance to Itin (p. 360-1) and Ambroise (vv. 9513-8), e.g. all three texts share the placename of Ybelin of the Hospital. Yet much of the material found in RCL cannot be verified: Ybelin was never taken by Saladin; the name *Baldwin* could either refer to one of the four kings of that name of Jersalem or to Baldwin of Ybelin, Lord of Ramlah, but none was killed by the Saracens. Note that the name *Baldwin* does not occur in either Ambroise or Itin.

4255-6 RCL, Ambroise (vv. 9514-8) and Itin (pp. 360-1) all refer to *Gebelin* 'Ybelin de l'Ospital' as the birthplace of St. Ann, mother of Mary. It is impossible to verify this, since no historical facts are known of St. Ann's life. Stubbs (Itin p. 360, note 6) believes that not the Mother of the Virgin is meant here but the mother of St. John, probably the Baptist.

4256 'Who was chosen (as mother) for our Lady'.

4263 Text D *þe kyng John* is corrupt, compare the other texts *his brother John.*

4282 Text A: 'who shall protect John against me!'.

4283-6 These lines, which are shared by DBEC, are found lacking in A.

4288 Text D *fair lesing* is a contradiction in terms.

4305 Note the various verbs for 'to cease': D/B *pesyn*, E *sesse* and A *abate.*

4309-4478 The capture of the caravan is based on historical fact (see Runciman, vol. iii, p. 68) and is described in Itin (p. 383-91) and Ambroise (vv. 10267-10592). The details of the Saracen who informed Richard about the convoy (4309-4410) may well have been inspired by Itin (p. 383-4) and Ambroise (vv. 10269-90), as they report that Bernard, king Richard's spy, spotted a caravan coming from Babylon; Ambroise tells us that Bernard was born in Syria (v. 10270).

4310 For the spelling *can* in E for 'began', see Note 1014.

4321+4324 Both DA *Saladin the soudoun* and DE *my(n) childryn and my wyff* are examples of the uninflected genitive.

4323-6 Text A lacks these lines, which are otherwise found in DE and C 6395-8.

4326 Since the reading of D *amo(n)* is not certain and its meaning is obscure, it has been emended to *anon.*

4327 The misreading of *myster-man* for *miscreant* caused the **t** to be dropped in the rime-word *Turmegan. Myster man* itself may have been influenced by the use of *mister* meaning 'occupation' and even 'kind', compare *all mister men wirkand wit handes* Cursor 27261 (see Mustanoja p. 86). It is more likely, however, that here its meaning is 'one who follows a certain profession'.

4359 E has *anoon þen* at the end of both 4359 and 4360; compare D and C 6432 *anon:eueric on.*

4370 D and C *roun* 'discussion' fits better than E *renoun.*

4377-8 The underlying rime was *wend:slepend.*

4409 Text A reads *a Sarasyn* 'in the language of the Saracens'; the other texts are very different: *as armes ȝare/ þe re.*

4433 D *hed*, which here can only mean 'helmet', is corrupt; compare the rime in E *hood-w(ith)stood.*

4449 The meaning of text A is clearest: 'many caught death's wound, that lived no longer, that would see Richard no more'. E and C are contradictory: 'many escaped with a mortal wound, that stayed no longer, they did not want to meet Richard anymore'.

4453-4478 These lines have an oblique stroke in front of them in the College of Arms manuscript.

4464 It is impossible to say whether CD *spyces* (C 6518) or E *peces* is the original reading. On the one hand, *peces* 'wine cups' is a relatively obscure word, which could well have been replaced by the more familiar *spyces*. On the other hand, two texts share *spyces* against one *peces.*

4471 Jentsch (p. 215) comments that *Betanie, (þat cete) noble* is a corruption of 'Betenoble' and 'Betenopolis', found in Itin, e.g. pp. 303 and 369. It may also have been influenced by the biblical place-name Bethany. Text A *Constantyn, the noble* may well be due to confusion with Constantinople.

4481-2 In RCL the messengers are the Bishop of Chester and the Abbot of St Albans, who were almost certainly not the historical figures sent to brief Richard on John's plans to become king. Paris (Rom p. 383) comments that Hugh, Bishop of Chester, would have been an odd choice for an envoy, since he was a strong supporter of John Lackland. The abbot of St Albans was Warin of Cambridge (1183-95). The *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii S. Albani*, Rolls Series 28, vol. 1, p. 194 ff. does not refer to Warin's involvement in politics, apart from the fact that Warin contributed to Richard's ransom by redeeming the monastery's chalices 'ut erat regi amicissimus' (p. 214). Neither Hugh nor Warin feature in Itin or Ambroise, who report the separate arrival of two other messengers instead: the Prior of Hereford (Itin p. 333 and Ambroise v. 8522) and John d'Alencon (Itin p. 358 and Ambroise v. 9439).

4488-90 The first three lines of D fol. 35ᵛ are defective, because the top of the page was cut off. The missing words have been supplied in a later hand,

4492 Philip of France invaded Normandy, Richard's fief, while Richard was in captivity in Germany (Itin p. 443 and Setton, p. 79).

4522 The description in 4522 DE, in which Saladin *betyth his goddes and cursith his lawe* out of frustration that Richard had captured his treasure (4453-67), is paralleled in *The Sultan of Babilon*, 2507-9, *Middle English Metrical Romance*, ed. W. French and C. Hale: *in ire he smote Mahounde,/ that was of goolde fulle rede/that he fille down to the grounde.* Compare also Hilarius, who describes in *Iconia Sancti Nicolai* how a pagan man, who was convinced of the magical properties of a statue of St Nicholas, left it in charge of his treasure. When he returned to find his wealth stolen, 'accepto flagello, tundebat Sancti Nicolai imaginem' (see K. Young, *the Drama of the Medieval Church*, vol. ii, pp. 491 and 341-2). Metlitzki (p. 163-4) comments on the behaviour of the emir in Orderic Vital's *Historia Ecclesiastica*: 'The emir finally acts the part inevitably assigned to him in medieval romance: his indignation expresses itself in curses against Muhammad, 'his God', and his faithless retinue'; also p. 189 ff. where she

gives further examples of this standard piece of behaviour of Saracen leaders in the romances. Text A 4517 *bad* pa.t. ' said a prayer to' is a corruption of *betyth, bete*, found in DE 4522. The C reading (6566) is *waryd* 'cursed'.

4546   D contains another *apo koinou* construction here, compare also Note 357.

4542+4555   For the reference to *tails*, see Note 344.

4559-68   The catalogue of place-names found here is very similar to 2819-24 and 3051-6, with in 4559-4568 the addition of 4559-60, and 4563-4 echoing 4561-2. See Note 2819-24 for a discussion of the place-names.

4561 and 4893   *Ascaloyn* 'Ascalon' is found twice in 4561 DE and in 4893 E in a list of Muslim countries, where it is used as a rime-word. When the actual town Ascalon is meant in the text, *Chaloyne* is used, e.g. 3850.

4574   D *o qwon* is an odd spelling for *of whom*, similar to 1578 *quen*.
The form *sclaunder* in ADE, derived from OF *sklaundre*, indicates that the loss of k had not yet taken place (Jordan p. 225). There is one other example in our texts of the sk spelling in E 2678 *sklendere*.

4591   D and C share the correct reading: 'it seemed to have been lit from heaven'. Text A deviates by the lack of *be* which turns *light* from a pp. into a noun; E lacks the prep. *fro* which makes *heuyn lyȝt* into a compound noun: 'it seemed as if there had been light from heaven'.

4592   D and E 'so bright it was with shining swords' make the best sense here. A changes the line and is less clear: 'as if it had light from heaven from helmets that were so bright' i.e. 'the helmets shone as bright as the sun'. C 6626 *among þe swerdes þat were so bryȝt* is not satisfactory either.

4595   D and E: 'they seemed to spring from the earth' i.e. from everywhere.

4608+4610   The vowel in E *sheet* is normally only used in the sg. pa.t. Note also the confusion between the plural ending in *schotyn* and the prep. *in* in 4608 D.

4611   D and E *oure* is taken to mean 'ours', i.e. 'our men'.

4624   For the end of the D text, see p. 20.

4637   'the sultan will (only) engage in a small skirmish'.

4641   RCL gives the following version of the siege at Jaffa: when the inhabitants of Jaffa sent a message for help to Richard in Acre (4625-4638), Richard decided to send Henry de Champagne rather than go himself as '*he [Saladin] wyl make a lytel derray/ and anoon flee away!*' (4637-8). When Henry saw the mass of Saracen troops, he fled out of fear, whereupon Richard went to Jaffa by ship and defeated the Saracens.
Itin (pp. 404-9) gives a different account: Richard decided to sail from Acre straightaway and of the French, who mostly refused to join him, only Henry set out overland. However, Henry's passage was blocked at Caesarea and he arrived after Richard's victory at Jaffa (Itin p. 413). Jentsch (p. 218) and Paris (Rom p. 385) disagree on the reasons for the differing account in RCL. Jentsch' argument is more convincing, because the treatment of Henry de Champagne fits in well with the general description of the French as untrustworthy; according to Paris it is more likely to be due to confusion (see also the Introduction pp. 68-9).

4669 Text A *he sey neuer in non herde* is corrupt for two reasons. In the first place it lacks 'he said' at the beginning of the line and secondly *in non herde* is dubious, in which *herde* may have been influenced by *hirde* 'company, army'. The E reading *and seide he sawe neuer ne herde* is also shared by B and C 6699.

4697-4706 For a discussion of the list of romance heroes, which occurs here and in 13-18, see pp. 67-8. Its inclusion here may indicate the introduction of a new author.

4698 Text A *of Perse ne of Pene* is a corruption of *of Pertenop* , found in the E text.

4702 R. Loomis (JEGP 15 (1916) p. 457) is right in pointing out that neither E/A *Sydrake/Cidrak* nor BC *Vrrake* 'is appropriate in a list of romance heroes'. *Sidrach* is the name of a fabulous philosopher in an encyclopedic tract of the fourteenth century (Histoire Littéraire de la France, tom. xxxi, p. 285 ff). *Urake* is the sister of Queen Melior in Partonope of Blois, EETS 109, l. 6187 ff).

4703 *Otuan* is probably a corruption of *Octauyan*; compare OF *Otevien.*

4710 A and C *wighthede* is unique, as there is no evidence in ME of a noun derived from the adj. *wight* 'valiant, brave'. A lacks an adj. in between *so* and *wighthede*, and since the adverb *so* cannot modify a noun, *gret* has been added on the basis of the C reading: 6738 *and gret wyʒthede* 'an act of great prowess'.

4720+4749-52 There is no historical evidence that Richard presumed that Jaffa had been taken and that all defendants were dead, until he heard a tune played on the battlements (Jentsch, p. 218).

4723 Note the spelling of E *nowʒwhere.*

4733 *Robert of Leicester* could not have been inside Jaffa, because he was involved in the attack on the town (Itin p. 405).

4736 For *Robert of Turnham*, see Note 1248.

4737 *Gilbert Pipard* accompanied Richard on his journey to the Holy Land. He died at Brindisi in 1191-2 (*The Complete Peerage*, vol. 10, p. 527). His name is not mentioned in either Itin or Ambroise.

4757 The battle cry *or sus* 'now up' is an OF phrase, derived from the Latin *ad horam susum*. It is also found in 4967.

4771+4783 E 4771-76 is paralleled by A 4783-4788.

4791 The original rime is presented by A *lep:hep*, but compare E where the strong form *lep* has been replaced by weak *lept.*

4797 'to establish the validity, prove what I have done'

4809-10 In these lines an attempt is made to transliterate Arabic, for which it is impossible to establish an authoritative reading, because there is tremendous variation between the texts (compare also C 6830-31) due to the effect of copying unfamiliar material. It is even less possible to deduce whether these lines are based on actual Arabic.

4818 A *hemsylf* was probably originally 'hemself' with the 'y' written as a correction over the wrong 'e'.

4821-4 These lines are found in A only.

4870-4904 The arrival of two envoys from Saladin who warn Richard to return to the castle of Jaffa is not based on history. Itin (p. 413-4) reports that the Mamelukes and the Kurds approached the royal tent at midnight with the plan of capturing Richard. Instead, they started arguing and were overheard by a Genoese at dawn.

4883-4 The spelling of the rime-words *barans, scalans* may have been used because the scribe was not familiar with the expression *not yeuen two scalons* 'to care not a bit' (*scalans* is a variant given in the MED).

4895 *euery* in E makes no sense and the number *20.000* lacks a noun; compare A '300 kings' and C 6915 '200 knights'.

4902 E and C *sende after* makes much better sense than A *sey*.

4905-6 These lines are only found in A and B, from which C 6925-6 was supplied (see Brunner, RCL p. 434, note 6925).

4945-6⁴ Paris (Rom p. 384) comments that one can hardly expect a better excuse for the king of England to return to his own country than an order from heaven (see also Note 2878). In addition, the angel's warning may be intended to recall the warning to the Magi to return home via a different route to escape Herod's treachery.

4995 In both E *donge* and A *flonge* we have rare examples of the vowel of the singular form being levelled into the plural.

5003 E *myre* 'swamp' is preferable to A *mere* 'lake', because the meaning of *myre* is more appropriate and because it is repeated in *fen* in 5008; secondly the form *myre* is found in a rime with *sire* in 5005-6.

5010 *drinken of (s.o.'s) cup* is an ironic metaphor for 'to be killed'. This particular expression is unique to RCL, but compare the following quotations found in the MED: *Orm* 14380, 'Whanne I shall drinnkenn dæ∂ess drinnch Forr all mannkinn o rode'; *Mon may longe* 8, 'Nis king ne Quene þat ne sel drinke of dethis drench'.

5019 The emphatic phrase *I her do telle*, found in A, is a corruption of *herde*; compare E and C 7033.

5023 In Itin (p. 418) it is not *Henry de Champagne* who is in danger but the Earl of Leicester.

5037 The subject *him* of *shede*, found in E, B and C 7051, is missing in A and has been supplied in the text. Since A, B and C read 'with myght and mayn', it is likely that E *with mayn* is corrupt. Its omission of *my3t* may have come about because the same word occurs previously in the line as a modal verb.

5041-2 Since B and C 7055 have *more*, the rime-word in 5041 is more likely to have been text E *more* 'fen, marshland' from OE *mōr* than text A *mire*. Its rime-word is not certain either, though on the basis of strength of numbers it is more likely to have been C *ffore*, B *fure* than E *woore*.

5061-2 Only E and C 7069-70 provide this couplet in a passage otherwise shared by ABCE, so it may well be a later addition. The rime *boody:hardy* must be in the last syllable.

5077-8 This rime is found in A, B and C (C 7085-6) only. There can be no doubt that the word *castelett* was forced by the rime, since normally it means 'small castle or tower', which as a

description of Jaffa is hardly appropriate.

5085 Jentsch (p. 221) comments that the patriarch at Jaffa had managed to secure a truce with the Saracens til the next day and he had presented himself as a hostage to guarantee the deal (Itin pp. 402-3).

5086 Text E *the Neel*, as it has been emended, was corrected by the scribe, but the the original word and its correction are not altogether clear.

5087 Neither *William of Arsur* nor *Sir Gerard* can be identified, nor are they mentioned in Itin or Ambroise.

5099 Unlike Itin and Ambroise, RCL reports that Richard's horse *Fauel* was killed. This story may have been inspired by Itin (p. 419) and Ambroise (v. 11543-58) who state that Saphadin, Saladin's brother, gave Richard two Arab horses (see Note 3422). The author of these lines in RCL may have thought that Richard was given these horses because his own had been killed.

5127 Richard did not receive a wound in his arm in Palestine but this detail bears resemblance to 5225-6 which describes how Richard was fatally wounded by an arrow, which hit him in the shoulder.

5165 *Robert de Sablé* was one of Richard's knights and his envoy during the negotiations with Tancred. Later he became Master of the Templars (see Paris, Amb p. 562).
Text A *Robert Sakeuile* is corrupt and has been emended.

5166 The identity of *Robert de Wateruyle* (see p. 13) is uncertain and his name does not occur in Itin or Ambroise. *The Complete Peerage* (vol. 12, part ii, pp. 429-31) states that there were two *Roberts* in the Wateville family: the first one died probably in October 1217, the second before 1279 but neither went on a crusade. A and C *Willeam the Wateruile* cannot be traced at all. Note the presence of *the* rather than the OF particle *de* in *de Wateville*.

5168 None of the descendants of the families known as *St. John* (see p. 13) can be related to *John of St. John* mentioned in A and C. The first family was earlier known as *de Port* (*the Complete Peerage*, vol. 11, p. 321); the second was known originally as as *Saint Jean de Thomas* (*the Complete Peerage*, vol. 11, p. 340). Neither family had descendants alive during the third crusade and none went to the Holy Land. Alternatively *John de seynt John* may have been a master of the Hospitallers, but no evidence of this can be produced.

5178 A deviates from the text by replacing *here*, found in the other versions, with *vndurstonde* and also by the omission of *nought*, which has been supplied in the text.

5179 The formula in E and A '*thre yer, (thre monthes and) thre dawes*' is quite common in Middle English (see Brunner, RCL p. 54, note 1).

5204-47 These lines are found in text A only and describe Richard's return to Europe and his death on April 6, 1199 in an unusual mixture of verse and prose (see p. 66). Neither Itin nor Ambroise record Richard's siege of Châlus and his subsequent death but other chroniclers do, such as Ralph Coggeshall (Rolls Series 66, pp. 94-6) and Roger Howden (Rolls Series, vol. 51, iv, pp. 82-3). Text A 5223 states that the knight, who shot Richard, was called *Peris Besile*. This name is found in Ralph de Diceto, *Opera Historica*, vol. ii, p. 166 as *Petrus Besilii*. Ralph also gives the date of 26 March, on which Richard was wounded, in a similar way: '*vii ^{mo} kalendas*

Aprilis' (loc. cit.), compare A 5220 'the vii kln of Aprille'. Brunner, RCL p. 58, comments that the two accounts in RCL and the *Opera Historica* are otherwise unrelated.

Nearly all chroniclers are in agreement that Richard was killed at the siege of the castle of Châlus in the Limousin, which is not far from Limoges; compare A 5219 unemended *Lemones*. However, text A is confused about the exact location of the siege and introduces the name of *castel Gailard* in 5211, 5216 and 5218, probably because castle Gailard in Normandy was strongly associated with Richard. The only other text to introduce *Gailard* is Walter of Hemingburgh's *Chronicon*, (vol. 1, p. 226 ff.).

5212 Historically speaking, the Duke of Austria cannot have been the defender of Gailard/Châlus, but it makes sense within the framework of the narrative that Richard's worst enemy was given this role; compare also lines 3928-3937.

Glossary

The glossary is intended as a guide to words or aspects of words which are now obsolete. Words which are found commonly are not recorded here unless they occur in some unusual form or sense. References are selective and normally only include the first occurrence. L readings are noted first, followed by D, E and A in that order. In expressions the regularised infinitive form of the verb is given, e.g. *speken aboue* 'to speak aloud' 815, see below.

ʒ and y are treated together after **g**; th and þ are treated together after **t**; **u** and **v** are separated according to function.

For the abbreviations used here, see the List of Abbreviations on pp. 3-4.

a *pron.* he 418.

a *prep.* in 170; of 795, 1541; at 3047.

abated *pa.t* to diminish, cease 1120; *subj.* to stop 2655; – *bost* to humiliate, defeat 4646.

abide *v.* to stay, remain 597; to wait for 3003; to face (so) in combat 3036.

abigge, abeye *v.* to pay (the penalty) for something 334, *pa.t.* **aboughte** 286, *pp.* **abouʒt** 1247.

aboḅ̌ed *pp.* to bewilder, mystify 4519.

abondoune *adv.* at will, unchecked 1836.

aboute *prep. ben* – to be concerned, busy with 1580.

aboue *adv. speken* – to speak aloud 815.

abrod *adv.* widely 4100.

ac *conj.* but 19.

acord, ocord *n. bi on a* – by mutual agreement 1543; *ben at* – to be in agreement 1555.

acost *adv.* alongside 2455.

acount *v.* to give an account of 878.

acountynge *n.* counting 2403.

a del-way see **debliʔs.**

adradde, adred *pp. ben* – to be afraid, fear 4241, 4346.

adreynt, adrenchid *pa.t* to sink 1775; *pp.* to suffocate 2964, 4110.

afeynth *pres.* to be slow 1709.

affong *v.* to accept 2367.

aflne *adv.* in short 777; 3809.

a-forschippe *adv.* in the forward part of a schip 1816.

aforward *adv.* forward, ahead 1842.

afourne *prep.* in front of 1000.

agaste *v.* to frighten 996; *pp.* frightened, terrified 608.

ageyne, oʒain, aʒan, aʒen *prep.* against 64; towards 1849.

ageyne, oʒan, aʒe(n) *adv.* again, back 922.

ageynys, aʒenst *prep.* against 972, 3869.

ageyneward, aʒeward, oʒanward *adv.* again 1465.

aʒelde *imp. refl.* to surrender 5116.

ago *v.* to go 2922.

agramed *pp.* annoyed, enraged 846, 2079.

agreue *v.* to distress 570.

ahelde *pa.t* to save, keep 1207.

ahungryd, ofhungred *pp.* very hungry, famished 561.

aye, eye, heye *n.* an egg 2027.

air *n.* an heir 741.

aknowe *pp. ben* – to admit, reveal 826; 4169.

alblast, arblast *n.* a crossbow 995.

alblasters, arblasters *n.pl.* crossbowmen 938.

alþerlast, alder – *adv.* last of all 779; *–ferst* first of all 4791.

alle *n.* – *and some* one and all 1453.

allegate *adv.* all the time, unceasingly 4593.

alleweis, alwey *adv.* all the time 3967, 4029.

almyth *adj. God* – God almighty 131.

also, als *adv.* so 1586; – *blyve, sket, sone* at once 625.

136

also, als *conj.* as 880, 1635; as if 1830; when 1434.

alond see **olond**.

amayid *pp. ben* – to be dismayed 537.

ameraile, ammiraille, amural *n.* an emir, a Saracen chieftain 3176.

amyd(dis) *prep.* in the middle of 157, 4165.

amydward *prep.* in the middle of 1808.

among *adv.* all the time 3342, 3412.

amonges *prep.* among 832.

amorwe(n *adv.* in the morning 476.

amount *v.* to amount to 4856.

an *conj.* and 1380.

and *conj.* if 3842; but 1476.

aniȝt *adv.* at night 955.

an-long *adv.* along the length 4209.

annethe see **unnethe**.

anoye, annye *pr.t.* to annoy, harass 2056; *pp.* irritated 2079. .

anour *n.* respect, honour 1284.

anourd *pr.t.* to worship 902.

anto a contracted form of **and to** 266.

apeyer, appaire *v.* to slander 1115.

apliȝt *adv.* in faith, forsooth 2957; *siker* – truly, in faith 1434.

apoisoun *v.* to poison (so) 1916.

apparaille *n.* fighting equipment 1844.

ap(p)erteliche *adv.* frankly 4313.

aquel *v.* to kill 1916; *pp.* 1102.

ar(-) see **er(-)**.

arst *adv.* before 1503.

arape *adv.* quickly 1282.

araught *pa.t.* to get at, reach 1747.

arblast see **alblast**.

arere *v.* to set up 2064.

arere *adv. turnen* – to turn back 5055.

ariȝt *adv.* well, truly 3137.

aryse *pp.* to rise in hostility 4492.

armes *n.pl.* armour 2971; *as* – to arms! 1453.

armour *n.* a suit of arms 112.

arowe, yargh *adj.* frightened 4803.

arowe *adv.* in a row 2174.

arsoun, ersoun *n.* a saddlebow 3181, 5122.

aruwes, arowys, harueys *n.pl. hoked* – an arrow with a flat, barbed head 1015.

as, os *conj.* when 1201; as if 42, 924.

asauȝte *n.* an attack 1028.

aschamed *pp.* embarassed, annoyed 845.

ascrien *v.* to raise a battle cry 1452.

aseyl *pr.t.* to attack 997.

asen *v.* to see 3094.

askede, axed *pa.t.* to ask (for) 323, 2859.

asoiled *pa.t.* to absolve 749.

aspye *n.* a spy 3327.

aspied *pa.t.* to discover by spying 941; *pp.* to discover 533.

assayid *pa.t.* to test 168.

astode *pa.t.* to come to a stop 3186.

astore *v.* to stock a place with provisions 874.

aswow(n)e *adv.* in a swoon or faint 418, 427.

ateynt *pp.* OE *ātendan* to start to burn 4109, 4110.

ateynt *pp.* (OF ateindre) to exhaust 2963, 4936.

atened *ppl.* annoyed 2079.

atyme *adv.* at the time 901.

aþrowe *adv.* a moment later 2074.

atreyd *pa.t.* to trouble, distress (sb) 952.

atwo, at(v)o *adv.* in two 481, 1375.

auntre *n.* an adventure, event 359.

avaunced *pp.* to help, benefit 1777.

auenture *n.* danger 1647; *pl.* misfortune 1862; *par* – by chance, by fate 359.

aventoures *adj.* adventurous, in search of exploits 37; – **knyght** a knight-errant 221.

avie *pr.t.* to advise, inform 4923.

avise *v.* to examine 5221.

awondryd *pp. ben* – to be astonished at 3191.

awreke *v .* – *of* to avenge (so) on (sb) 550;

– *of* to avenge (os) on (sb) 899.

baleyne *n.* whalebone 2180.

bane *n.* death 1064; a killer 3909.

baner *n.* a battalion arranged under a particular banner 5092.

barbicane(s), barbyken *n.* the outer fortifications of a castle 1871; a fortified gate 3339.

bare *adj.* deprived of 4882.

barnage *n.* the body of retainers of a king 1554.

barelle *n.* a container filled with wildfire 1770.

barres *n.pl.* bars for bolting a gate 944.

basyn *n.* a helmet 1749.

bataile, batal *n.* a battle, combat 954; an army, battalion 1885.

bataylyng *ger.* combat, fighting 1953.

bathe *v . refl. + intr.* to wallow, be immersed 5008.

baudekynes *n.pl.* rugs of silk shot with gold 1962.

beaw *adj . – amys* fair friend 2329.

becauʒt *pp.* to catch, trap 1579.

beclosed *pp.* to surround 3580.

bede *v.* to propose, counsel 1357.

bedene *adv.* all together 2168; immediately 4174.

befalle *v. pa.t.* **bifel, befel** to happen 1896, 2002; – *in depe* to sink 1210.

befor(n) *adj.* in the presence of, before 666.

befor(n) *adv.* in advance 761; ahead 931.

begyle *v.* to deceive (sb) 1944; *pp.* to outwit, get the better of (sb) 2194.

behest *n.* a promise 1345.

behinde *adv. + pred. adj.* in the rear 1187; *ben* – to be at a disadvantage 1672.

behoueþ *3 pr.* ought 962; *you* – you have need of (sth) 1409.

belefte, beleued *pa.t.* to remain 716, 1373.

beleue *n.* religion 50.

ben, beon, beys *n.* bees 2068, 2078; – *hyues* beehives 2072, 2076.

ben *v. pr.t.* **arn, erun,** 341; **nis, nys** ne is 1425; *pa.t.* **ware, wore** 1657, 3536; **nas** ne was 1075; *ner(e)* ne were 692. – *to name* to be called 2317; *pp.* **ybe** 1854.

benam, bynome *pa.t.* to take away (sth) from (sb) 1466, 2938.

bendel(le) *n. her.* a narrow diagonal stripe, a bendlet 2160.

beneson *n.* a blessing 716.

benys, bene *n.pl.* beans 879.

bent, bende *pa.t.* to prepare for shooting 4017.

bere *v.* to carry 101; – *on* to accuse (sb) of (sth) 848; to wear, display 852; – *through* to stab, pierce 3666, 4423. *pa.t.* **bare** carried in pregnancy 2321; – *away* to thrust away 72; *pp.* **(i)bore, born** born; *ben – to man* to be born 443; *no man –* no man, nobody 206.

besauge *n.* a piece of armour protecting the armpit 73.

besaunt(es), basauntes, besauns *n.pl.* coins of Byzantium or Western Europe 1491, 2360.

beseke, beseche *pr.t. pa.t.* **besauʒt** to beg 2351, 2502.

besent *pa.t.* – *of* to send ⌐as messengers 2811. ⌐to ask

besette *v . –(aboute)* to surround (sb) 1876; – *time* to spend (one's) time 3853.

besyde *adv.* nearby, at the side 99; *a mile –* a mile from (sb) 1941.

beside(s) *prep. a litel –* nearby 4235.

best *adj. as n. with/of /in the –* of the best, finest kind 396, 868; *with the –* utterly 4375.

best *adv.* in the best way, most efffectively 4613.

beswyche *v.* to cheat 3875.

betake *pr.t.* to entrust (sb) with (sth)

138

1409; *pa.t.* **bitoke, bytaught** 773, 1508.

beþe *num.* bothe 875.

beþou3t *pa.t. refl.* to decide 4301; to think 5090; *pp.* **bethawt** *ben* – to intend 572.

betyde *v. ye may* – it may happen to you 359; to happen to (sb) 1922.

betyme *adv.* on time 4743; promptly 4917.

betokenyd *pa.t.* to mean, indicate 2138.

bete *pa.t.* (OE bēatan) – *trumpes, taburres* to play on a trumpet etc. 1833, 3641; to strike (sb, sth) 2508, 4517; – *doun* to destroy, raze 3009.

bet(t)e *pa.t.* (OE bēten) to kindle a fire 283.

better *adj. comp. ye were* – you would be better off 295.

bewelde *v.* to control (os), have freedom of action 4162.

bewray *pp., pa.t.* **bywrey** to cover 4662.

bi– see **be–**.

bi, be *prep.* of time: on 235A; of amount, degree: by 1482; from, through 1509; across 1923; through 1814; by means of, with 2830.

by *conj.* when 235D.

bicom *pa.t.* to go 744; *pp.* **become** 2862.

bye, beye, bigge *v. pa.t.* **bou3t** to buy 240, 1155, 2040.

biginne *v.* to take action 2117.

bygynnynge *ger.* the start of an undertaking 4308.

bihete, beheyt, byhote *1 pr.t.* to promise 1412; *2 pr. t* **behotest**; *pa.t.* **byhight** 406.

byheuedith *imp.* to behead 2880; *pa.t.* 2885.

biker, beker *n.* a skirmish, battle 1737; 1743.

biknawe *pp.* to reveal 826.

bisay, beseyn *pp.* to (mis)treat 1406.

bite *v.* to cut, slash 4978; *pa.t.* **bot,** pl. **betyn, bite** to sting 2924, 2086.

biteing *ger.* stinging 2114.

blaste *n. drawe* – to breathe 908.

blyue, biliue, blyuys *adv.* quickly, at once, immediately 318, 2071; *also* – immediately 644.

bysted *pp.* in distress 4682.

blaste *n. drawen* – to catch one's breath 908.

bla(u)ndener, blaunner *adj. as n.* a kind of fur, possibly ermine 4548.

bleynt, blenchyd, blent *pa.t.* to jump, flinch 1270.

blere *v .* – *eye* to delude (sb) 2866.

blithe *adj.* happy, at ease 228; *–of* pleased with 1043.

blythe *adv.* quickly, at once 659.

blood *n. leten* – to wound 2946.

blowe *v . pa.t.* **blowe, blew** of a trumpet: to sound 69; to sound a trumpet 2561; – *hard, faste* to breathe heavily 1268; to speak violently 4969.

bod *n.* an offer 2367

bodi *n.* a person 1289; – *and bones* flesh and bone, the whole body 1460.

bold *adj. be thou* – you may be sure 3487.

bonair *adj.* courteous, kind 834.

bondage *n.* the class of bondmen, the unfree 1840.

bondys *n.pl.* tenants and serfs 1839.

bon *n. bidden a* – to ask a favour, to beg 1145.

bord *n.* a table 2622; *at o* – at the same table 1556; a plank, board 999, 1663.

bordelle *n.* a border, edge 2160.

borow *n.* a guarantor, surety 2335; *taken to* – to take (so) as a surety 4131; *leten to* – to let (a prisoner) go when he has provided surety 4131.

borow *v.* to rescue, save 2483.

bost *n.* a noise 2456; threatening, a threat 3121.

bote *n.* deliverance 2838; rescue, help 5112.

139

boterflyes *n.pl.* anything significant 1692.

bounde, ibondyn *pp.* reinforced with metal 3261, 4461.

bowin *v.* to be submissive 4496.

brase *v.* to fasten (sth) 3597.

brede *n. in –* in width 4577.

brede *v . pa.t.* **bradde** to roast 2016.

breke, breche *n.* the wrecking of a ship 1220, 1239.

brekyn *v.* to shatter a weapon in combat 128; to break (sth) off, to cut short 1117; *pp.* **ibroke** 1609.

bren(n)en *v.* to burn 2144; *pa.t.* **barnde, brende** 3088, 4026; *pl.* **brent, brennyd** 1022; *pr. p.* 3088, 4609; *pp. as adj. – gold* pure gold 2495.

brestyn *v . pa.t.* **brust, brast, barst, brust, brostyn** to break, shatter 1132, 3180; *– out* to burst out 2078.

breþ *n.* vapour, fume 1919; smoke 4083.

brewe *v. – a drinke of wo/sorwe* to inflict great harm 4372, 4922.

briȝt *adj.* bright, shining 1925.

brochis *n.pl.* jewels, ornaments 1073.

bronde *n.* the beak of a ship 1717; a sword 4253.

brouke *v.* to enjoy 2629.

broun *adj.* of weapons: shining, polished.

burdyn *n.* a pilgrim's staff 237.

burieys, burgeys(ys) *n.pl.* citizens, freemen of a town 1386, 1392.

but, bot *conj. (no) –* no more than, only 853; unless 1311; and 1566; *– if* unless 2096; *ne –* only 692.

can *pr.t.* to know 22.

care *n.* distress, hardship 440; *haven –* to worry 4399; *without –* without fear 4399.

care *v. – for* to worry about (sth) 2681.

carkays, carcois *n.* the body of an animal slaughtered for meat 3265.

carter *n.* a driver, coachman 2939.

cas *n.* a situation 231; *at this –* in this situation, now 433; event, (mis)fortune 1193, 1922; *bi/thourgh what –* under what circumstances 1893.

casche *v.* to take 1064.

castel *n.* a castle, stronghold 154; a moveable tower used in sieges 967.

catels *n.pl.* property 1389.

cernel see **kirnels**.

certe *n. for –* forsooth, indeed 227.

certes, sert(es) *adv.* certainly 220, 1681, 2267.

certeynly *adv.* exactly, precisely 4398.

chaffare *n.* goods, mechandise 1658; *bien – to go* about one's business 1155.

chalange *v . – heritage* to claim as one's heritage 4773.

chalys *n.pl.* chalices 692.

charge *n.* a load 1975.

charged *pp.* to load 1652.

chasty *imp.* to subjugate (so) 895.

chateles *n.pl.* goods, property 1389.

chef *adj . – lord* an overlord 4478.

cheke-bon *n.* the lower jaw 419.

chepeinge *n.* the market (place) 887.

chepes *n.pl.* large numbers 1025.

chest *n.* strife, fighting 3285; disturbance 4512.

cheualrie *n.* a host of knights 2000.

chide, cheyde *v . – toward, with* to scold, criticize (so) 1123; to twitter 2892.

clar(r)e *n.* sweetened, spiced wine 1825.

cleyme *v.* to assert, declare 3413; *pr.t* 3413.

clos *n. – diche* a moat 2059.

cofers *n.pl.* trunks, treasure chests 1071.

coyl, culle, koyl *n.* the anus 950.

coint(ise) see **queyntise** .

colopes *n.pl.* pieces, slices of meat 2015.

come *n.* an approach, arrival 4239.

comfort *n. ben of good –* to be of good cheer 3546.

comforted, conforted *pa.t.* to encourage, exhort 4860; to refresh (with drink) 4869.

comyn, comon *adj.* general, comprehensive 2230; common 4489.

coming *ger.* an approach, arrival 1841.

comnawnt *n.* a pledge, agreement 212.

compasment *n.* plotting, scheming 4225.

compassyng *ger.* plotting, conspiring 4407.

compenable *adj.* hospitable 2565.

condit *n. saf* – safe-conduct 2640.

conjure *v.* to call up spirits 3449.

conseyl *n.* a plan (of attack) 962; *asken* – to seek advice 3296.

contek *n.* a conflict, quarelling 2403.

contre(y) *n.* an area, land 2224; *bi/in the* – in the area 4576.

cord *n.* a (hangman's) rope 2830.

cor(o)nal *n.* the head of a tilting lance 4211.

cors *n.* a band of knights 4983; *pl.* corpses, dead bodies 1913.

coruen, carue *pa.t.* to carve, cut 2015, 2734.

cost *n.* a bay 248; coast 3027; *bi a* – in a certain direction 1420; *bi another* – from another direction 3580; *on/in* – alongside 2455, 4576, 4842.

couhard *n.* a villain 5116.

count *v.* to give an account of 882.

countenance *n.* behaviour, conduct 4985.

countryng *ger.* a clash, battle 3341.

coupes *n.pl.* goblets, cups 1224.

cours *n.* a curse 1060.

cours *n. riden* – to make a charge 4215.

coursers *n.pl.* fast horses, chargers 4459, 4475.

courtasie *n. for thi/his* – if you/he please(d) 355, 3890.

couay *n.* a convoy 4365.

couenant, coumawnt *n.* a promise, agreement 212.

couertoure *n.* a quilt, a garment 1072.

couetis *n.* greed 3301.

craft *n.* cleverness 127; strength 4206.

crake *v. – croun* to split (so's) head open 3385.

crie *n.* crying, wailing 1890; *maken* – to make an announcement 178; *to resound* 233.

crie *v.* to summon 1001; to cry out, shout 947; to beg 1538; to declare, proclaim 2211.

croised, icroised *pp.* to pledge to go on a crusade 819, 1292.

croope *pp.* to crawl 2619.

cropuyre, crouper *n.* a cover for the hind quarters of a horse, a crupper 1431, 3648.

cro(i)s,crouche *n.* the Cross of Christ 736; *beren the* – to be a crusader 852.

croun *n.* the Crown of thorns 1088; *assev. by my* – 1540; the top of the head 3187; *don the* – *upon* to crown (os) 4488.

croupe *n.* the rump of a horse 3672.

crouste *n.* a crust of bread 4908.

culuer *n.* the image of a dove 3607.

curtaise *adj.* gracious, courteous 4734.

day, dawe *n.* a day 145, 2323; daylight, dawn 4881; *bi this* – today 295. *by my faderis* – during my father's reign 2309.

damage *n.* harm 1295; loss, desctruction 1929.

dame *n.* a dam 3463.

dartes *n.pl.* a javelin or spear 1739.

dawe *v.* to dawn, grow light 1477.

daweing, dawnnyng *n.* the dawn 580; *in þe* – at dawn 998.

deblis *exclam.* *a* –, *a del-wey* to the devil! 3902, 4379.

debonayre *adj.* courteous 834.

dede *n. don to* – to kill 544; *gen.* **dedes** *wonde* a lethal wound 60.

dede *adj.* *in/on ... be he* – may he die of ... 1812.

defaute *n.* *for /thurgh thy* – it is your fault that 4681.

defens *n.* *a knight of* – a warlike knight

4890.

defye *pr.t.* to challenge 4927.

deynte *n.* a delicacy 906L; *of eche/ grete* – of every kind of luxury 906DA.

dele v. – *with* to deal with (so) 80; *pa.t.* to distribute 2013; *pp.* **delt** 2013.

delful, doulful *adj.* sad 1861.

del(le) *n.* a portion, share 650; *bi michel* – by a large part, a great deal 1482.

deme *subj.* to judge 4339.

den *n.* a valley 4672.

denyd, donyde *pa.t.* to resound with din 3093, 4581; *pr.t.* **dyneth** 3093A.

denyng, dinnynge *ger.* the clamour, resounding 5041.

dent, dynt, dunt *n.* a blow 12; *without* – without striking a blow 1041.

depart *imp.* to divide 2700; *pa.t.* 2402.

der(r)ay *n.* wrongdoing, trouble 4495.

dere *n.pl.* wild animals 3230.

dere v. to hurt, harm 354.

dere *adv.* dearly 286.

derne *n.* a secret 171.

derþ *n.* scarcity, famine 2030.

despised *pp.* humiliated 966.

destrer *n.* a knight's horse 1489.

destrue, distroye v. to annihilate 2055.

des– see **dis–**.

deth *n.* *evil* – a fatal illness 1812; *for lyf or* – under no circumstances 3802.

deuers *n.pl.* *don* – to do (one's) duty 3161.

devise v. to inspect secretly 204.

diche, dyk, dek, duch *n.* a trench, ditch, moat 1869, 1873, 4020.

dyches *n.pl.* a plate, dish 1224.

dieu *n.* – *me gard* may God protect me 332.

dignyte *n.* *fon the* – to become king 766; *haven/beren the* – to be the ruler, to reign 2418; *lord of* – a leader of authority 4171.

dight, dyth, deytit *pa.t.* to prepare 1179; *refl.* to go 1786; to allot (a share) 2033; to command 3100; to predetermine

4508; *pp.* to be dressed 119, 4874; to be treated 729.

dishonour, deseynour *n.* a disgrace, insult 1241.

dispite *n.* a humiliation 2752; ill will 859; *don* – to insult, harm (so) 859; *tellen* – to revile (so) 1103; *in* – *of* in order to spite (so) 1536.

disspoylyd *pa.t. refl.* – *naked* to strip to the skin 1215.

distance *n.* armed conflict 11; *don a* – to cause trouble 796; a problem 812; a conflict 891; *without* – indisputably 1176.

distresse *n.* grief, suffering 1948L; want, scarcity 2234.

dyuerse *adj.* wonderful 222.

doyse *n.* a dais 2573.

dole, diole *n.* a share 2033.

dolour *n.* *in* – in a miserable state 1855.

dome *n.* destiny 3994; consent 4489; *to* – at (one's) command 4602.

don v. – *owt* to drive (so) out, expel 672; *refl.* – *to se* to start on a sea voyage, to embark 255; to cause (so) to do (sth), to have (sth) done 2063; – *bere/hadde* – *born* he let carry 998; *God do bote* God help (me) 3775; – *welle* to do the right thing 3901, 4899.

donge *pa.t.* – *upon* to deliver blows on 4995.

dool *n.* *maken* – to lament 4510.

doreyne v. to vindicate by fighting 5173.

dotaunce *n.* *haven* – to be afraid of 990.

double *adj.* *þre, seuen* – three, seven times as much 1255, 1504.

do(u)tous *adj.* terrifying 2955.

doune *n.* a hill 2455.

doun-riȝt(es) *adv.* outright 889, 1080.

doute *n.* *without/sans* – without doubt 2461; *for* – out of fear 1057; *for* – for fear of 2213; *in* – in danger 4050.

doutede *pa.t.* to fear 3988; *refl.* – *of* to be in doubt about (sth) 3730; – *of* to fear

3988.

dowe *n.* the image of a dove 115.

draynt, dreynt *pp.* to drown 1710; to overwhelm 2964, 4109. *pa.t. refl.* **drenched, dreynte** to drown 1760; to sink 1775.

drauȝt *n.* a blow with a sword 4062.

drawe *v, pa.t.* **drough, drow(ȝ)e** to pull, drag 1077; *refl* to go 590; – *up* to hoist (a sail) 1931; – *(with)* to draw (an arrow etc.) 1009, 2108 ; – *tharmes* to drag one's guts after having been disembowelled 2202; – *nere to* to go close to 4721. *pp.* **idrawe** to draw 1053.

dred *pa.t. (refl.)* – *of* to fear (sth) 2347, 3543; *pp.* **ben** – to be afraid 4681.

drede *n.* *it is* – there is a danger 2118.

dressyn *v.* to put in position 4205; *imp.* 993; *pa.t.* – *rigge/back to* to place (one's) back against (sth) 1746; *pp.* to arrange, serve 2658.

driue *v.* – *ageyns* to rush against, to attack 2985; – *of* to expel from 4554; *pa.t.* **drof, drogh** – *to the erthe* to knock (so) to the ground 630; *pp.* **idreue** to drive 3230.

dromond *n.* a large, fast ship, a dromond 1648.

dure *v.* to dare 3639; *pr.t* **dare, dourstest, der** 821, 4880, 4595; *pa.t.* **durst** 80.

dure, doure *v.* to endure, continue 2133, 2279.

dusse-per *n.* one of the twelve peers of Charlemayne 14.

dwelle *v.* to remain, stay 48; *subj.* to linger 187.

eche-dele *adv.* every part 1529.

efte *adv.* once more, again 2781.

egre *adj.* severe, fierce 388 ; *with* – *mode* 485.

eye *n.* *for loue ne* – for love nor fear 210.

eight *n.* wealth, possessions 2401.

eme, eyme *n.* an uncle 1577, 3879.

enchesoun *n.* a cause, reason 1581.

encombrere *n.* a hindrance 3730.

encountred *pa.t.* – *with* to encounter (so) 3644.

ender *adj.* *this* – *day* recently, the other day 864.

endyng-day *n.* the day of death 4090.

engyn *n.* a machine used for assaulting fortifications 4009.

enlonges *adv.* lengthwise 4209.

entaile *n.* *of riche* – lavishly ornamented 3605.

entent *n.* *with good* – with good will, faithfully 217.

er, ar *prep.* before 1416.

er, or *conj.* before 334; until 980.

erliche, arliche *adv.* early 1537, 2997.

ern *n.pl.* an eagle 1442.

errour *n.* *pickyd/peckyd* – to become angry 3896.

eschele *n.* a troop, battalion 3106.

ese *n.* *ben at* – to be comfortable 2613, 3820.

essoyn *n.* *without* – without delay 3297.

euen *adv.* straight, directly 1807; exactly 2877.

euere-(a)liche *adv.* unceasingly 1028.

eueriche *n.* every one 1432.

euerich-(a)-delle *adv.* completely, totally 1192, 1529.

euilyd *pa.t.* to become ill 2429.

fable *n.* *without* – truly 2177.

fay *n.* *par ma* – by my faith 220; *in good* – truly, assuredly 1108.

fayn, fawe *adv.* eagerly, willingly 329, 825.

fair *adv.* graciously 297; completely 2069.

fairer *adj. comp.* *þe were* – it would be more appropriate if you were 841.

faitour *n.* a deceiver 1297.

falle *v.* to fall, drop down 1014; – *down* to strike down 2050; to descend 858; *pa.t.* **fel** to strike down 59; – *(to)* it happened to (so) 1894, 2002; **fylle**,– *to* to turn to (so) 3379. *pp.* **falle(n), ifellyn** 4161, 3028.

falow, felowe *adj.* bay, reddish brown 2911.

fare *n.* a commotion 439; an approach 1837.

fare, fere *v.* to go, travel 250; *pr.t.* to approach 4410 A; *pa.t.* **ferd** to behave, act 1755, 2736; to seem 4590; to advance 4595 E, 4664;

fauchioun *n.* a large, broad sword with a curved blade, a falchion 2954.

fauer *v.* ironic: to aid, assist 1115.

fawe see *fayn, fein.*

febyl *n.* inferior food 398.

feche *v.* – *vp* to bring on deck 2072.

fein, fawe *adj.* eager, pleased 1283, 2492.

feynt *adj.* cowardly, sluggish 1709, 4156.

feynteþ *pr.t.* to be slow about (sth). 1811.

feyntys *n.* deceit, guile 4330.

fel *adj.* crafty, shrewd 2085.

felawred *n.* companionship 229; a company, group of knights 1048, 1959.

feld *n. in the* – in battle 71.

felde *pr.t.* to stoop, bend 413; *pp.* **folde** to fold 2645.

fele, fale *adj.* many 26, 1862.

felefold *adj.* many 1222.

felle *v.* to strike down 2055; *pa.t.* **felde, fellydyn, fulde** 223, 3015, 3022. – *(down)* to demolish 3019, 3022; to bring down (with a missile) 1016; *pp.* **fellyd, felde** 2096, 3028.

fen, feen *n.* a swamp 5008.

fend *n.* the devil, an enemy 1758.

fendyd *pa.t. refl.* to defend (os) 1023.

fenge, fonge *pa.t.* to succeed (to the throne) 766; to receive 1495; to seize 3182.

ferd *n.* a troop 2253.

ferd, ferthe *num.* the fourth 1206.

ferdyng *n.* a farthing 2042; *euery* – (to) the last penny 2388.

fere *n.pl.* companions 585.

fere *n.* a company 1677; *al in* – in a group, together 245.

ferly *adv.* splendidly 4461.

fers *adj.* proud, arrogant 387; strong, great 1793.

ferred *n.* a band of armed men, an army 1448, 1959; a company of people 2058.

fethe *v.* – *forth* to bring out 4213; *imper.* **fette** to fetch 2624; *pa.t.* 463; *pp.* **fet** 4213.

feute, fute *n. don* – to acknowledge one's feudal obligation 1553.

feuve *adj.* a few 682.

fye *excl. ma* – by my faith! 3902.

fille *n. al his* – to his heart's desire 530.

fille, felle *v.* to fill 677, 687; *pa.t.* **fulled** 4035; *pp.* **yflld, ifulled** 1494.

fyn *n. maken* – to pay ransom 2832; *a* – to the end 2850; *hauen* – to die 3113; death 4910; end 4932.

fin *adj.* pure 2024.

fythe *num.* the fifth 2729.

fiz *n. le* – the son of 17.

flee *v.* to flee , run away 564; to drive (so) away 672; *p.t.* **fley3e, fley, fled, flogh, flowe** 740, 3230, 1599, 2906, 1010; *pr.p.* **flewande, fleande** 1977, 3239; *pp. fled, (y)flowe, flon* 3302, 1473, 1960.

fle *v.* to fly 3359; *pr.t.* **fleeth** 1814; *pa.t.* **fley, fley3e, flew, flegh** 1133, 1271, 4095;

fley3en, flyis *n.pl.* bees 2086; *sg. worth a* – of the same value as a fly, nothing 2422.

fleing *ger.* the act of fleeing, flight 1891.

fleyng, flyande *pr.p.* to pursue 1978, 2898.

flem *n.* flight 1357.

flen *v. quic* – to skin alive 1310.

fliȝt *n.* to þe – for the flight 1446.

flinging, flyngand *pr.p.* to rush 3240; *comen* – to come running 1978; *pa.t.* *flonge,* – *on* to strike, beat (so) 2921, 4995.

flod *n.* the sea 1760; *salt* – the sea 242.

florines *n.pl.* gold coins 1491.

flogelle *n.* a wind instrument, probably a flageolet 4720.

flon *n.pl.* arrows for the longbow 1354.

fnaste *n.* breath 908.

fo *n.* an enemy 1101; *pl.* **fon** 752; **fomen** enemies 2055.

foysoun, fousoun, feison *n gret* – plenty, abundance 1968, 3266.

fonde *v.* to try 963, 5026; *imper.* 2425, 3781.

fonge *v.* to accept, receive 2367; *pa.t.* 1856.

foole *n.* a foal 3657.

for *prep.* for, because of 822; in spite of, regardless of 58, 1781.

for *conj.* if, whether 466, 660; because 487; *but –* 3242.

forarsun *n.* a pommel 3181.

forbarre *pa.t.* to withhold, deprive 2662.

forbere *v.* to refrain from 2596.

force *n. no – it is* it is not important 1425; *maken –* to be an effort 4984.

fore *prep.* in the presence of 666.

forgon *pp.* to lose 3432.

forhele *v.* to hide, keep secret 4395.

forlain *pp.* to seduce 540.

forlese *v.* to lose, forfeit 2839; *pp.* **forlore** 452; to lose (sight of) 1604.

formest *adv. sup.* first, in front 378, 464.

forstopped *pa.t.* to block (a road) 3571.

fort, forto *conj.* until 604, 4132.

for-þat *conj.* because 2263, 2790.

forþouȝt *pa.t. him –* he regretted 1603.

forthward *adv.* ahead, in front 1636.

forward *n.* an agreement 479; *maken /granten –* to make an agreement 386,

5194; *holden –* to fulfill the terms of an agreement 408.

forward *n.* the vanguard of an army 1842.

forward *adv.* hereafter 4808.

fote *n.* on *– of lond* the least bit of land 1541.

fot-hot *adv.* immediately 926.

foþer *n.* a burden 858.

foules, fooles *n.pl.* birds 881, 2892.

framed *pa.t.* to construct 987.

frape *v.* to strike 1703.

freychelyc *adv.* boldly 614.

ffrende *n.pl.* kinsmen 180.

fressh *v.* to revive, refresh 3221.

frische,fressh *adj. – to* eager to 1445.

frome *n. at the –* instantly, outright 2861.

fulfylle *v.* to finish, complete 36, 4308.

gables *n.pl.* heavy ropes 1199.

gaynes *n.pl.* arrows, crossbow bolts 2123.

gale *n.* speech, talking 2694.

game *n.* a tournament 133; delight 169; sport, contest 634; campaign 3300.

gapyd *pa.t.* to open the mouth wide 623.

gard *subj. so Dieu me –* as God preserve me 332.

geyned *pa.t.* to help, avail 2694.

geng, gyng *n.* an army 3096, 5139.

gent *adj.* noble 1575.

gerdilstede *n.* the waist 1751.

gessed *pp.* to guess, infer 2657.

gest *n.* ? a picture 3257.

gile *n.* a deceit, trick 610; *don –* to betray 1880;

gyle *v.* to deceive 1944.

gining *ger.* the beginning of a story 33; beginning 1935.

ginne *n.* a siege engine 2087; *with/throw –* by skilfull means 1787, 4317.

ginours *n.pl.* men operating siege engines 2104.

gyrde *pa.t.* to fasten the saddle on a horse 3495.

gyrdilwon *n.* ? the waist 3184.

girþes *n.pl.* belts, straps 3669.

gyse *n.* a disguise 203; custom 2747.

gladyng *ger. maken* – to rejoice 719.

gleyuys *n.pl.* lances, spears 1739.

glotoun *n.* a villain, wretch 3912.

gloue *n.* a glove 816, 1032; a pledge 2335.

gode *n. coll.* wealth, possessions 1076; goods 1776.

gome *n. taken* – to see to it that 2189.

gomfaynouns *n.pl.* knight's pennons 2163.

gonyd *pa.t.* to open the mouth wide 42.

gorgere *n.* armour covering the neck, a gorget 75.

gost *n.* a villain, devil incarnate 3933 E.

goth *pr.t. how* – *this* how can this be 4271.

gouerne *v.* to protect 5018, 5173; *pp.* 1584.

grace *n.* good fortune 150; forgiveness 1883.

grayde *adj.* ready 4363.

grame *n.* rage, anger 2079; disgrace, an indignity 3931.

graunted *pa.t.* to roar 2767.

graue *pp.* – *of* inlaid with 3610; to engrave 3616.

gred *pa.t.* to cry out 3544.

greym *adj.* angry 307 A.

greythed *pa.t.* to prepare 984; *imper.* **grethe** 4686; *pp. graiþed* 1965.

grent, grint *pa.t.* – *wiþ þe teþ* to gnash one's teeth 1268; to chew 2762; *pp.* **groundyn** sharpened 612.

grepyn *pa.t.* to take hold of 3204.

gretyng *pr.p.* to attack 4618.

greue *v.* to harm, trouble 49, 354;

grym *adj.* fierce 307.

grimly *adj.* severe, horrible 1468, 3505; dangerous, deadly 3112.

grise *v.* to fear 4780.

griseli *adj.* horrible 1468.

grist *n.* the gristle of the nose 1305.

grith *n.* peace, mercy 366; *with/in pes and* – with peaceful intent 1403.

grom *n.* a retainer, a knight's attendant 3702.

grounde *n. pl. gnowen þe* – to bite the dust, to die 3208.

gurt *pa.t.* to strike 3170.

ȝare, yare *adv.* quickly 4409, 4769.

ȝeeme *n. taken* – to take care 2577; *nimen* – to take note 2706.

ȝede *pa.t.* to go 57.

ȝeld, ȝolde, yulde *v.* to yield, surrender 1099, 1515, 2357; – *ageyn(ward)* to give back 1106, 1465; *pp.* **ȝolden** 2290.

ȝeme *v.* to guard 4340.

yened *pa.t.* to open the mouth wide 623.

ȝepe *adj.* cunning 2803.

ȝer *n. bi* – every year 1539; **ȝare** 1936.

ȝerd *n.* a wand carried as a symbol of authority 767.

ȝerne, ȝarne *adv.* eagerly 193; quickly 4243.

yeue *v.* to give 383; *imper.* **ȝif** 1004; *pa.t.* **gaf, yef** 388, 2406; – *batail to* to fight against 1004.

yonder *adj. this* – *day* recently, the other day 864.

half *n. bi/in the water* – on the landward side 977; *bi/in the lond* – on the seaward side 978; *in eyther* – on either side 2277; *in/on myn* – as far as I am concerned 2378, 2390.

half(n)endel *n.* a half, the (other) half 3868, 4671, 5122.

half-mark *n.* an English coin worth 6s 8d 2024.

halp, hilp *pa.t.* to help 2126, 4432; *pl.* **holpyn** 3196.

hals *n.* the neck 1753.

haply *adv.* by chance, unfortunately 5224.

hard *pa.t.* to hear 4944.

hard *adv.* tightly, firmly 607; quickly, fast 1334.

harnaise, hernyse, harnes *n.* army equipment, weapons 2407, 2938, 2941; baggage 2785, 3921.

hasted *pp.* to hurry 2989.

hastyng *ger. of* – speedily, in haste 1655.

havberkys, hauberges *n.pl.* a coat of mail 2363.

hauen *n.* a harbour, port 1279.

haue, han, haf, habbe, a *v.* 316, 5, 394, 1936, 1986; *pr.t.* **hau, hat, han** 426, 1864, 662; *pa.t.* **haudyn, hed** 2230, 3263; **nad(de)** ne hadde 966.

heuedyn *pa.t.* to behead 2872; *pp.* **heded** 4136.

hefd-panne *n.* the scull, the head 1131.

heiȝe *v.* *(refl.)* to hurry 983; *pa.t.* **heyȝed, hiede, hyghed** 1334, 2943.

held *pr.t.* to bend 413.

hele *v.* to cover with armour 1431; *pp.* to cover 5073.

helping *ger.* help, assistance 1345.

hende *adj.* *adv.* diligently, well 3304, 4866. ~pi qracious (lords)

hendelich *adv.* courteously 504.

hent *pa.t.* to receive 888; – *out* to pull out (a spear) 3674.

hepe *n.* an army division 917; *in/on a* –, *to hepes* in a pile 1026, 5003.

heraudes *n.pl.* criers, makers of proclamations 178.

herberw, harbarow *v.* to camp, stay 3044.

herde *adv.* vigorously 2735.

herytage *n.* (right of) inheritance 706; sovereignty 4785.

herken *imper.* – *of/toward* to listen, pay attention to 1400, 4719.

hert *n.* *in* – in his heart, deep down 608, 1562; *with* – *good* heartily 2603, with good cheer 4859; *to thin* – to you 4529.

her-vp *adv.* above this place 1037.

hes(t) *n.* a command, order 3286, 4953.

hete, hattyn, hote *v.* to be called 396, 974; *pr.t.* **hote, hitist** to promise 2319, 2381, 3512; *pa.t.* **hight, hyth, heyt** 495, 1125; **hete** to command 3596; *pp.* **hoten** 974.

heued, hed *n.* the head of a weapon 1366, 3171.

heuen *n.* – *kyng* the king of heaven 314; – *blys* bliss of heaven 1630; – *lyȝt* the light of heaven 4591.

hewe *n.* *chaunge* – to blanch 2592.

hewe *v.* to cut, chop 1376.

hye *n.* *in/on* – at once, immediately 186.

high *adj.* of sound: loud 5029; – *mydnyght* the middle of the night 4715.

hyyng, highyng *ger.* *in/on* – at once 301, 327, 4363.

himself *pron.* used as subject: he himself 860, 3603.

hok *n.* the catch on a crossbow 3244.

holde, held *v.* to hold, keep 408, 972; to keep (so) out 2368 A; *pr.t.* **halt** 4272; to offer, hold 3632; *pa.t.* to go, proceed 96; – *in honde* to rule 1622; to remain 3002; *pp.* to regard 1361; to continue 3937; – *fro* to conceal (sth) from (so) 1865.

holych *adv.* completely 405.

homage *n.* *beren, yelden* – to acknowledge allegiance to (so) 1515.

honde *n.* possesion, power 5175; *;1344* in (one's) hand 65; *wiþ strengþe of* – by force 799; *to his* – to him 806; *take on* – to undertake 1090; *wiȝt/dowti of* – strong in battle 1251, 1906; *through her* – at their hands 1070; *þrow our* – through us 671; *under* – captive 5025; *comen to* – to become available 3470.

honourance *n.* *to* – in honour of 3788.

hood *n.* a mail covering for the head 3185, 4433.

hore *n.* hair 4872.

hope *pr.t.* to think 4275.

horne *n.* *(pl.)* a horn or antler 1442; a

147

musical instrument 1833.

hougelyche *adv.* harshly, vehemently 1195.

hout *pr.t.* to think, consider 49.

houe *v.* to wait, linger 1031; *pa.t.* 78.

huyde *n.* the skin of an animal 2015.

hurdis *n.pl.* a wooden framework, a hurdle 999, 4105.

ybete *pp.* covered with precious metal 1494.

ycleped *pp.* to be called 933.

ycrie *v.* to cry 981.

ifere *adv.* together 245.

yflorist *pp.* to adorn 970.

ifrau(ȝ)t *pp.* loaded, laden 1649, 1673.

yherd *pp.* to praise 870, 2046.

yhere *v.* to hear about 26.

iholde *pp.* to regard (so) as (sth) 4158.

ileue *v.* to believe, trust 1680.

ylyche *adj.* like 1481, 3456.

ylyche *adv.* unceasingly 1028; such 2278.

ylde, ȝelde *n.* *fallen into* – to grow old 4161.

ymage *n.* a statue 4166.

in *adv.* inside 1457.

incomyng *ger.* *at* – when they entered 2403.

into *prep.* throughout 1002.

ire *n* anger 2767, 4907; vigour 3638.

iren *n.* *in* – *and stele* with all kinds of weapons 1720.

ysee *v.* to perceive 4789.

yþold *pp.* to suffer 1866.

ithree *adv* . *alle* – the three of them together 213.

itrayd *pp.* to betray 1454.

iwys *adv.* truly 139.

ywyte *v.* to find out 3073.

joye *n.* *maken* – *with* to receive, welcome (so) joyfully 196.

jorney *n.* business, aim 2657.

juggement *n.* a trial 1581.

juste *v.* to joust 139.

justes, jostes *n.pl.* jousts, tilting 175.

justice *n.* *coll.* high officials 1221; *n.pl.* judges 1121.

justyng *ger.* a tournament 720.

juwels *n. pl.* valuables, treasure 1388.

karkeys, carcois *n.* meat 3265.

kast, kest *pa.t.* to throw 1020, 1613; *imp.* **cast** to drive out, expel 895; to hurl stones, fire etc. with an engine 994; *after* – to rush, dash 1956; 1956. *pp.* **icaste** to place, arrange 607.

kelid *pp.* to refresh (os) by cooling 5217.

ken *n. pl.* cows 876.

kene *adj.* fierce, aggressive 387; brave 914; sharp 1739.

kenne, kynne, kunne *n.* *of ryche* – of rich stock 2384, 2755.

kep *n.* *taken* – to take notice 918; *þerof was ful lytel* – little attention was paid to this 4999.

kepe *v.* to guard 1638; to defend (os) 1870; *pr.t./pa.t.* to want, desire 414; to use 3442; *pa.t.* **kept** to guard, defend 2941.

kerchefs *n.pl.* a headdress 449; kerchiefs 627.

kerchis *n.pl.* a headdress 449; kerchiefs 575.

kertyl, kyrtelle *n.* a tunic worn under armour 613, 629.

keþ *n.* a place, country 744.

keuered *pa.t.* to protect 3142; to cover 3539.

kychon, kechoun *n.* a kitchen 2540, 2707.

kynde *n.* nature, instinct 45; kinsfolk 2651.

kynd *adj.* true, lawful 1594; proper 4206; – *blood* kinsfolk 2595.

kyndom *n.* the kingdom 4489.

kirnels *n.pl.* embrasures in a battlement

970.

kythe *v. strokes* – to deliver blows 2976; *imper.* – *on* to exercise (sth) on (so) 976.

knicches *n.pl.* bundles (of hay) 2150, 2183.

knitt, knut, knott, knette *pa.t.* to fasten (sth with a belt) 1974; *imper.* to tie with a rope 2870.

knokkyng *ger.* a blow, beating 888.

kungour *n.* a conger eel 2663.

kut to cut, chop 1365; *pa.t.* **kytte** 1461, 4542.

laghte, laught *pa.t.* – *deth/dethes wounde* to die 1748.

lay *n.* religion, faith 2310.

lande-wayes *n.pl.* a way over land 3571.

lasse, lesse *n.pl. (the) more and the* – people of every rank 930, 2039

lasse(e), lat se *expr.* let us see 1003.

latimer *n.* an interpreter, translator 1663.

lawe *n. of Cristen/hethen* – belonging to the Christian/pagan religion 1791, 3763.

leche *n. by his soule* – by the healer of his soul, Christ 1105.

lede *n.* a people, country 24, 4540.

leet *pa.t.* to grant, leave (sth) to (sb) 2439.

leye *1 pr.* to lay 4323; *3* **leggeth, leith** 5033; *pa.t.* **lay, leide, leyen, loyn** 493, 1461, 1798; to bet on (sth) 1339; – *on* to attack, strike 1464; – *to* to work hard 1711.

ley3þ, lyith *1 pr.* 820; *2* **lyist, lixt** to tell a lie 2302.

leit *pa.t.* to let, cause (sth) to be done) 4143, 4142.

lele *adj.* noble, brave 79.

lemman *n.* a loved one, darling 563.

leme *n. vpon* – on penalty of mutilation 4551.

leng *adv. comp.* longer 3226.

leyn (WS lēogan) to deny, conceal 24.

lepyn, lopyn *pa.t.* – *ouer þe bord* to jump

overboard 1759.

lere *n.*, (OE lyre) loss, harm 745.

les *n.* (OF laisse) *out of* – released from a leash 1051.

les (OE lēas) *n. withouten* – truly 4184.

les *adj.* disloyal 2304.

lese *v.* to lose 2515; *pa.t.* **les, lis, lore** 1030, 2939, 1903; *pp.* **lorn, lore** 452, 1933.

lesyng *ger.* a lie; *without* – truly (a rime tag) 346.

letyn, lett *v.* to hinder, stand in the way 210, 4584.

let(te) *n. withouten* – without delay 465.

letting *ger.* an obstacle 1800.

leuauns *n.pl.* ?levers, crowbars 1067.

leue *pr.* to believe 654.

leuyd, lafte *pa.t.* to lose 1030; to stay, remain 1448.

levours *n.pl.* crowbars, levers 1067.

liche *adj.* entitled to feudal allegiance 1594.

lyche *adj.* alike 3453.

lyche *prep.* like 3815.

lyf *n. bringen of* – to kill 1216; *comen to* – to survive 3234.

lifte *n.* the air 1814.

liftes *n.pl.* as much as a man can carry, a man's load 2498.

light, ly3t *pa.t.* – *adown* to dismount from a horse 1096; to fall 5053.

lighte *n. bi this* – (emphatic) truly 469.

li3tinges *n.pl.* flashes of lightening 2007.

lyketh *v. impers.* – *ylle, pa.t.* **lykyd** *not well* to be upset 1562.

lyme *n.* – *and stone* stone masonry 675.

listen *pr.* to listen to 33; *pa.t.* **lyst** 3856.

lite *n. a* – a little 580, 3221.

litel *adj. a* – *mile* a mile (as opposed to a great mile) 1941.

liteleþ *3 pr.* to become smaller, diminish 917.

lythe *adj.* calm, light 1670.

liuer v . – out of to deliver (sb) from (sth) 1377.

lof n. a loaf of bread 4907.

logged pp. to be encamped 2458.

loke v. – toward to look at 1608; impers. to guard, defend 1187; take care 2538.

lond n. comen/gan/to – to go ashore 252, 721.

londe-gate n. entrance overland to the city 1027.

longed v. impers. to yearn 282.

lordynges n.pl. lords, kings 961; knights 1453.

lordis n.pl. knights 1453.

lordlynges n.pl. polite form of address of the reader used by storytellers 3073.

lo(o)s n. a bad reputation 2642; good reputation 3274.

losengeres n.pl. rascals 2828.

loth adj. unwilling, reluctant 1809; loathsome 3919.

loude adv. – and stille under all circumstances, always 5195.

lo(u)gh, low pa.t. to laugh 393.

loure pr. to frown for fear and sadness 2616.

macche, maken. a match, an equal in a fight 636.

magnel see mangunel.

may pr. may 246; 2 sg. maist, mast, mayth 3482, 4356, 4377; 2 pl. mogh 2385; pl. mowe, mown 684; pa.t. myth, myght, myht, myghte could, might 88, 224, 2431 3923; 2 sg. mihtist 2415.

mayn n. power 4494; with might and – with great force 1818.

maister n. the chief of a group 3276.

ma(i)strye n. haven the – to win the victory 1889; of – who has ability, power 2298; with – by force 4267.

maken v. to make 1364; – it togh to show

reluctance 3039; refl. – wrothe to be angry 3154; refl. – boun to prepare (o.s.) 3542.

male n. a bag, a pouch 1973.

malencoly n. sorrow, anxiety 2655.

maletalent, mautalent n. foryeven – to give up one's anger 1552.

manas n. for – out of fear 4775; threat 4787.

manere n. in no(n) – in no way, not at all 187; no – not at all 366; in/on her – after their fashion 2157; bi no – by no kind of 4724.

mangunel, mangelons, magnel etc. n. a siege engine for hurling stones 993.

manlich adv. like a man, courageously 919.

manschippes n. pl . holden vp – to maintain (one's) spirits 976.

marchis n. a marquis 2331.

marine n. the seacoast, an area along the coast 2895.

mariner coll. n. a ship's crew 1207.

mariners n.pl. fighting sailors 960.

maris(sh) n. marshland, a swamp 4006.

masuele n. a club, mace 3602.

mate adj. helpless, defeated 4801.

maugre prep. despite 3671.

me adv. more 1677.

mede n. a reward, compensation 316;for no – by no means whatsoever 953; to – as recompense 5104.

medlaye, myslay n. maken – to quarrel, dispute 1118.

mees n. food, dish 2598.

meyne, meyne n. an army, troops 1909; retinue 724.

meystrie n. haven – to win the victory 1889.

membraunce n. a memory, remembrance 4986.

memorance n. a remembrance 4986.

memorie n. han in – to remember 5.

mende *pa.t. as I* – as I mentioned 3959.

meoble *n.* (movable) wealth 4472.

meralle *n.* a Saracen lord 3170.

mercy *n. crien* – to beg for forgiveness (of) 1146, 1316.

meruail *n.* a feat 1847;*haven* – to be astonished 4196.

meschaunce *n. with* – may it confound him 3374.

messe, mees *n.* food, dish 2598, 2623.

mesure *n. withouten/out of* – huge 1648.

mete *n.* a dinner 234; *to her* – for dinner 281; *at* – at the table 323; meat 2018. *pl.* **metes** 1965.

mette, met *pa.t.* to engage in combat, to attack 55; – *with* to attack (e.o.) 71.

metyng *ger.* a meeting of adversaries 4617.

mychelle *n. for as* – *as* since, because 347.

myddel *n.* the waist 5120.

myddelerde *n.* the world 4390; *of* – in the world 4040; *for al this wide* – for all the wide world 4245.

myddis *n.* the middle 1808.

mydlay *n.* a quarrel, dispute 1118.

mydward *n.* the middle (of the chains) 1056.

myght *adj.* strong, effective 3118A.

mini *v.* – *up* to make a tunnel to enter (sth) 2093.

minour *n.* someone who undermines fortifications 2092.

minstralsye, menestraucie *n. coll.* musicians 1844; music, revelry 4724.

myrthe *n.pl.* **merthis** entertainment 290.

mysauntere, mesaunture *n. with* – unfortunately 2133, 4045.

myscreant *n.* a pagan, infidel 2379.

misdede *pa.t.* to do harm to (sb) 844; to misbehave 951.

mis(s)eyd *pa.t.* to insult 951.

myself *n.* I myself 3909.

mysse *n. haven* – to suffer the absence of 4455.

mystaughte *pp.* misinformed, misled 847.

mode *n.* rage 410; *piked* – to get angry 923; *with sterne* – in an uncompromising manner 410.

mold *n.* the top of the head, crest of a helmet 1138.

monyth *n.* for a month 1667.

mo(u)nde *n. of muche, riche* – of great value, richness 1488; *not half the* –, not half the value 1773; *with vois of* – in a loud voice, loudly 2927;*of* – powerful 4480.

mootes *n.pl.* specks of dust 3360.

more *n.* (OE mōr) a marshland, fen 5041.

more *n.pl. the* – *and the lasse* people of every rank 930.

mossardes, musardes *n.pl.* fools, idlers 992, 1003.

mosselle *n.* a mouthful 2599.

most *adj. sup.* highest 2097; greatest 2471.

most *adv. sup.* above all 3932; **mest** most 4614.

mot *n.* a (musical) note 4750.

mote *pr.t.* must 292; may 352; shall 4116; *2 sg.* **must**. *pa.t.* **moste, muste** must 292; should, ought 2350; could 2397.

naciouns *n.pl.* a country 966.

narow, nargh *adj.* narrow 4804.

naru, narow *adv.* carefully, hard 1474.

naueie *n.* a fleet of warships 1187; a ship 1232.

ne *conj.* nor 3125.

nede *n. for no* – because of any difficulty 147; despite necessity 953, 4623; for no need, without any necessity 1918; *at* – in times of need 1811; *haven to* – to need (sth) 2523; a time of crisis 4540.

nede(s) *adv.* of necessity, necessarily 1672

neghe *v.* to partake of 2598.

negremancy *n.* sorcery, witchcraft 3448.

ne(i)gh, ney(ʒe, ny(ʒe *adv.* nearly 60, 270, 762, 2187.

neyʒe, nye *prep.* near to, close to 1437.

ne(i)ther *conj.* neither 294, 1868.

nem(p)ned *pa.t.* to mention, call by name 343, 2846.

ner *conj.* nor 294.

ne(r)theles, natheles, narthelas *adv.* nevertheless 1372, 1547, 2991, 3145.

neuer *adv.* – *the mo* neither 3144; *were* – however 4621.

nevou, neveu, nevwe *n.* a nephew 1995, 2176.

nice *n.* foolish 1972.

nyme *imp.* to take, seize 319; – *ageyne* to approach (sb) 478; *pp.* ynome 1454.

no *conj.* nor 744.

nobleye, nob(u)lay *n.* wealth, treasure 1950; valour 2126; *coll.* the nobility of a country 3548.

noyder, no(y)þer *conj.* neither 2395, 4170, 4452.

noyse *n.* a quarrel, trouble 4508.

non *pron.* no one 81; nothing 436.

non *adj.* no 187.

non *adv.* not, not at all 22.

none *n.* midday 497.

nones *n.* *for the* – for the occasion 1364; as intens. adv.: indeed 1459.

noresshaunt *adj.* nourishing 2672.

notes *n.pl.* nuts 2029.

noþing *adv.* not, not at all 151.

nothyng *pron.* *for* – not for anything 2641.

nouʒt *n.* evil, an evil act 1246.

nouʒt, no(u)gh *adv.* not 20, 571, 2447.

nouthe *adv.* now 1584.

o *num.* one, the same 110, 809.

o *prep.* on 1834; of 1849, 1862.

of *prep.* during 172; from 960; by 1790.

ofcomen *v.* to depart 160 A.

ofer *adv.* + *pred. adj.* on fire 1830.

offryng *ger.* a contribution 3785.

ofsende *v.* to send for, summon 542, 5246.

ofsmetyn *pp.* to cut off 2204.

olond *adv.* gon – to go ashore 1848.

on *pron.* one person, one man 23.

on, un *prep.* – *ground* 668 ; in 1390.

on *num.* one, a single 54, 74; *a yate* – a single gate 1037.

oncurteyse, vn- *n.* an uncurteous, uncivil man 1272.

oniʒt *adv.* at night 1401.

onsounder *adv.* apart, asunder 4217.

ord *n. ende and* – end and beginning, all 1319.

ordeyne *v.* to direct 3100; to prepare 993; *pp.* to decide 200.

ordenynge *n.* preparation for battle 4937.

ordere *n. be* – in battle order 2157.

orgilous *adj.* fine, opulent 38.

orgoyl, orgulle *n.* pride, conceit 949.

os see as.

ospryng *n.pl.* descendants 2796.

ost *n.* an army 1001.

ostage *n. taken to* – to take hostage 2385; *in* – in custody as a hostage 2833; *pl.* hostages 2858; *coll.* hostages 2858.

ostagere *n. coll.* hostages 4316.

ostel *n.* a place of residence 1561.

ote *n.pl.* oats 3972.

oþer *conj.* or 688.

ouerlope *pa.t.* ? to fall over 472.

ouʒt *pron.* anything 2333.

ouʒt *adv.* at all 1674.

oute-take *prep.* except for, disregarding 507.

outreyd *pa.t. from* to run away from 1897.

ouer *prep.* directly above 1817; of time: after 3908; – *al thyng* above all 276.

oueral *adv.* everywhere 2136.

ouerheflyng *n.* a superior 1142.

ouerlyng *n.* a superior, overlord 1142.

ouernome *pp.* to overtake, travel 727.

ouerrauʒt *pa.t.* to catch 3146.

ouerseyled *pa.t.* to sail over, run down (a ship) 1932.

ouerset *pa.t.* to assail, overpower 472; *pp.* to beset 2936.

ouerspred *pa.t.* to deploy a military force throughout an area 3076.

ouerstert *v.* to escape, elude 3352.

ouertake *v.* to encounter 3242.

ouerthowte *impers.* he regretted 76, 1603.

ouerthrew *pa.t.* to fall headlong 3900 DE.

ouerthwart *prep.* across 3477.

outlawes *n.pl.* pirates 1189.

owe *pr.t.* ought 962; *pr.t.* **owe, houe** to owe 1275; *pa.t.* **auȝt, haut, owed** to owe 4311.

page *n.* a servant 705.

pay *n.* punishment in battle 3564.

payage *n.* a toll paid for passage from a place 2386.

paye *v.* to pay, strike 392; *pp.* **ben** – *with/of* to be pleased, satisfied with (sth) 827.

payement *n.* repayment (of a debt) 406; punishment in battle 4073.

paynym, peyynim *n.* a pagan, heathen 842; heathen lands 238.

paired, pered *pp.* to weaken, harm 5084.

paytrelle *n.* breast armour for a horse 3649.

palle *n.* a fine cloth, possibly satin 2699.

palmer *n.* a pilgrim, a crusader 203, 704.

panne *n.* a head, skull 1131.

pans *n.pl.* pence 2026.

paradys *n.* Christian heaven 750.

parage *n.* lineage, rank 705.

parayl *n.* fighting equipment 1844.

pared *pa.t.* – *off* to cut off 3187.

parlament *n.* a parley 2281.

parte *n.* an alotted space 422; *by fele* – *so riche* as many times as rich 1482.

parted *pa.t.* to depart 475; – *away* to go away, depart 176; to divide 2402.

partye *n.* an army, company 2409; share, portion 2422; *on both* – on both sides 3312; *on/in his* – in his section 3891.

pas, pays *n.* *maken, turnen* – to make one's way 300, 2893; *a good* – at good speed 3962.

passed *pp.* – *fram* to proceed beyond, get past 1779.

pautener *n.* a rascal, scoundrel 1702.

pauiloun *n.* a large tent used for military encampments and tournaments 790.

peces *n.pl.* wine cups 4464.

pedaile *n.* infantry 3309.

pe(e)s *adj.* peaceful 1098.

peyne, payne *n.* distress, hardship 1377; *with mechil/grete* – with great difficulty 165, 3957; *assev. bi Goddes* – by Christ's suffering 4493.

penaunce *n.* suffering 1866.

pensel, pencelle *n.* a small pennon attached to a lance 2163, 3083.

persh *v.* to die 3487.

pes *n.* *smiten* – to strike, demand silence 816.

pesan *n.* a piece of metal attached to the helmet which extends over the neck and upper breast 75.

pesoun, puse *n.pl.* peas 3972.

piȝt *pa.t.* to pitch a tent 788; *pp. of body* – well-built 3471.

pik *n.* a pilgrim's staff 237.

pylche *n.* a – *clout* a ragged pilch 4782.

pilers *n.pl.* pillars, columns 1794.

pilgryme *n.* a pilgrim, crusader 841, 1292.

piment, piemement *n.* sweetened, spiced wine 1825.

pine *n.* pain, punishment 1880, 2115.

pipe *n.* a pipe, flute 4720.

pyped *pa.t.* to play (sth) on a flute 1833.

pite *n.* sorrow, grief 745; *hauen* – *of* be merciful to 1094; *with gret* – pitiably, lamentably 1909.

pitt, putt *pa.t.* to push 1973.

play *n.* a joust, tournament 36, 219.

playn *n.* a field of battle 2147; *Jafes –* the plain of Jaffa 4644.

pleye *v .* *– at the ches* to play chess 1336.

pleyn, playn *v.* to complain 1143, 1307; *pa.t.* 892.

pleyne *adj .* *maken –* to raze 4021, to make level 3022.

plenere *adv . al –* in full 3974.

plente *n.* abundance, riches 1778; *with gret –* abundantly 905 ; *gret –* a large amount of 1771.

plight *pr.t.* to assure (so) 123, 167.

poynt *n.* *vp – to* just about to 1200.

poked *pa.t.* to nudge 2605.

pomelle *n.* a round globe at the top of a pavilion 3256.

porcioun *n.* a quantity 3375.

pors, portes *n.pl.* the five seaports of Kent and Sussex 960.

por(t)colys *n.pl.* a portcullis 1059.

porter *n.* a gate-keeper 300.

posterne *n.* a side gate 4244.

pouder *n.* dust 2958.

pouke *n.* an evil spirit 3658.

pouste *n.* *the fendes –* the power of the devil 3507.

pray *n.* *to –* as booty 574, 1949.

preche *v.* to speak, declare 1104.

precyous *adj.* beloved, dear 1168.

pres *n.* assembly, meeting 2303; battle 2574, 3106; *priken into –* to charge into battle 1052; *throughout þe –* through the thick of combat 1062.

presant, present *n.* *to/in –* as a present 864.

present *n.* *in –* being present 3406.

presenting *ger.* advice 1344.

presons, prisouns *n.pl.* prisoners 462, 2359.

prest *adj.* ready, eager 1399.

preue *v.* to prove (os) in action 3418, *pa.t.* 168; to prove 3723; to attempt 5035.

pride *n.* *with mekyl, gret –* in great splen-

dour 721; *a word of –* haughty words 3770.

prekyd, priked *pa.t.* to gallop 82, 1044.

prime *n.* the period between 6 and 9 AM 367.

pris *n.* fame 117; the best 3645, 3717; *hauen/ geten the –* to win the victory 140, 3935; *of –* excellent 248; *tellen/holden – of to* care nothing about, to despise 4272.

pris *adj.* outstanding 3935.

priue *adj.* confidential, secret 962; private, special 4303.

priuelich *adv.* discreetly 182, 191; secretly 1421.

procoure *imp.* to bring (sth) on (so) 856.

profer *imp.* to offer, present (so) with (sth) 856, 2786.

prossesse *n at short –* in short 2961.

proud, prout *adj.* arrogant 387.

pult *pa.t.* to place, put 1049; *– out* to thrust out, expel 4622.

purchas *n.* booty, spoil 2421.

puruey *imper.* to get 3475.

quarelle *n.* a bolt for a crossbow 1015.

quarre *adj.* square 790.

quarter *n.* a unit of measure, eight bushels 879; a piece broken away 1716.

quaþ, qod, quod *pa.t.* to say, exclaim 225,

queeme *n.* *serue to –* to serve (so) properly 2578.

queinte, coint *adj.* fine 112; crafty, clever 127.

queyntise, coyntyse *n.* a trick, a ruse 4163; *with/through –* by ingenious means 964; ornamental battle trappings for a horse 3599.

quelle *v.* to kill 1916.

quic *adj.* alive, *slen –* to kill 1310.

quic *adv.* quickly 1314.

quite *v.* to return 398; to release (so) 4315.

quit *adv.* freely 860.

quietement *adv.* entirely 1133.

quooke *pa.t.* to tremble 2617.

rabit, rabet *n.* an Arabian horse 1499, 2499.

rad *adj.* eager 3324.

ramped *pa.t.* of a lion: to stand on the hind legs with the front feet pawing 622.

ransoun, ramsom *n.* a ransom 686, 1257.

raundoun *n. with gret* - with great speed 1836.

raunsed *p.t.* to slash (at) 622.

raunsom *v.* to release (so) for a ransom payment 671; to pay ransom for 694.

rape *n. with/on* - quickly, in a hurry 1282.

rappyd *pa.t.* - *at* to strike (so) 1727.

raþe ? rate *adv.* quickly, soon, at once 941.

ravyn *n.* the figure of a raven 41.

reaume *n.* a domain 1622.

receyue *imper.* - *in/to* to accept into 3150.

recet, reset *n.* shelter, refuge 2987, 3030.

reche *imper.* to grant (access) 3150; *pa.t.* rauȝt, raghte to strike 1140, 4833; to take, seize 4061.

rede *n.* advice 543; *(refl.) taken to* - to make a decision 1927, 2032; *taken* - to adopt a course of action 4004; *by oure* - according to our advice 4899.

rede *v.* - *of* to read aloud about (so) 29; *so God me* - may God protect me 653; to advise 2488; *pa.t.* redyn, radden 546.

redy *adj. maken* - *way* to create a passage for 2184.

rey *n.* ? troops in battle formation 2153. *see note*

regne *n.* territory, land 840, 1622.

reke *v.* to go quickly, hasten 939.

rekkenyd *pa.t.* to enumerate, list 2836.

reme *v.* to cry out 1356.

remevyd *pp.* to renounce 2310.

renayed *pp.* to renounce 2310.

renge *n.* a line of knights ready for jousting 95.

renne, ern *v.* to run 104, 907; *pa.t.* yorne, vrn, yern, ronne, run 666, 945, 1836; *pp.* vrn 1039.

renoun *n. of (gret)* - esteemed, honourable 309, 641.

rent *pa.t.* to tear away 1717.

repe, ripe *v.* to cut, to gather 4006.

re(re)warde *n.* the rear of an army, rear guard 2267.

res (OE ræs) *n.* an action, deed 1617; rage 2414.

res (OE ræw) *n.pl.* ? rows 2153.

res a res (OF res a res) ? *prep.* ? as far as 4036.

resoun *n. a* - *bi* the reason for which 44; *telle, count the* - to give an account 882.

reue *v.* to take (sth) away from (so) 840; *pa.t.* reued, refte 1456, 2986.

reufulle *adj.* sorry, sad 1861.

reuly *adj. with* - *entent* sadly, in a wretched frame of mind 1551.

reuthe, ruthe *n.* a shame, a pity 3155; *haven* - to have mercy on 1610.

ryde *v.* to ride (on horseback) 64, *refl.* 4827; to charge 2245; *pr.t.* rit, ryth 2245, 3000; *pa.t.* rod, ride, reyde 95, 1122.

rigge *n.* the back of a person 1746.

riȝt *n.* justice, a due reward 896; *Goddes* - God's good cause 5173; *to alle riȝtes* in the best manner, fittingly 2170.

ryng *n.* a metal ring to suspend a weapon in 3734.

ryse *v. up* - to get up 476, 1726; *pa.t. ros* 603; to become strong 1194; to rise to the sky 1350; to get up and go 1566; *pp. ben iresyn* to be in rebellion 4492.

risshes, rixen, russhes *n.pl.* (the stalks of) rushes 4006, 4019.

robri *n.* booty, stolen goods 1258.

rof *pa.t.* to tear 629.

roghte *pa.t.* - *of* to care about 4938.

roode, roude *n.* the holy Cross 2841.

roþer *n.* a rudder 1198.

roume *adj.* broad, wide 1942.

roun *v.* to speak 1303.

roun *n.* aspien – to listen in on a conversation 4370.

rouninge *ger.* whispering in private 4345.

route *n.* an army, a retinue 1875.

rowe, rawe, rewe *n.* on *(a)* – in a row, in ranks 915, 2173, 3193.

rowe *adj.* raw 2551.

say *n.* silk 2160.

saile *v.* to assail 4042.

same *adv.* in *same* together 4259.

samite, samed, sanyt *n.* rich red fabric 1492, 2500.

sanape *n.* a piece of cloth put on top of a table cloth to protect it 2568.

sare *adj.* distressed 4400.

sare *adv.* see **sore**.

sau(ʒ)t *n.* an assault 1028, 1912.

sauʒt *adj.* in agreement 1809.

saue *prep.* except 3874.

sawe *n.* a story, tale 457; *pl.* information 1348.

scalons *n.pl.* shallots, anything at all 4884.

scaþe *n. don* – to harm (so) 942; *þat was* – that was a pity 3120

schal, schul *pr.t., 2nd* **shat** 4315; *3rd* **xal** 2308; shall, will 44; must (go) 674; *pa.t.* had to 677; would 2350; – *adoun* would go down 2922.

schame *n. don* – to inflict injury, disgrace 143, 370; *seggen* – to rebuke 344.

schapyn, ischaped *pp.* to portray 2179; to make in the shape of 3255.

schaþe, scheþe *n.* a sheath 1298.

schent, yschent *pp.* to mutilate 1313, 1578; to defeat, kill 2799, 2852.

schet, schotyn (OE sceotan) *pa.t.* to thrust 626; to rush, run 5093; *imp.* to shoot 995; *pp.* **schoten** 1351; – *out*

moved or sent out quickly 1351.

schet (OE scyttan) *pa.t.* to lock, bar 943; *pp.* **yshet** 4616.

scheten *n.pl.* sheets 2113.

schewe *v.* to produce 1321; *imp.* **chew** to show 136; to reveal 4373; *pp.* to display 3258.

schillinges *n.pl. of pans fiften* – pence to the value of 15 shillings.

^ schrewed *adj.* dangerous, terrible 1862.

sclaunder *n.* fame, report (used for the rime) 4574.

scoymes *adj.* squeamish 2633.

scour *n.* an attack 5044.

screwe *n.* a villain 3945.

scrip *n.* a pilgrim's satchel 237.

scrowe *n.* a scroll 2539.

seye, say *v.* to say 243, 161; *pr.t. sg.* **segge, sigge, seist, seit(h)** 1584, 1587, 3416, 738, 1096; *pr.t.* **pl.** *seyn* 21; – to say (sth) to (sb) 1274.

seyn *n.* a saint 836.

seke, seche *v.* to seek 1605; to visit 3844; *pa.t.* **souʒt, sawt** to search for, try to find 1474.

sekere *adv.* safely 4315.

selcouth *adj.* marvellous 1193.

selle, sulle *adhort.* to sell 4772, 4784; *pp.* **sold, yseld** 1502.

selue *adj. this ....* – the aforementioned 3177.

semblaunt *n.* an expression, look 2610; *maken sory* – to display an expression of sorrow 2744.

semeliche *adv.* handsomely 613.

sen *v.* to see 2067; to protect 1185; to judge 4903; *pr.t. 2nd* **sixte** 4903; *pa.t. pl.* **sey, saugh, sayn, isayen, sowin, (i)sye, (y)seyen, segh** 331, 1031, 1236, 1451, 1899, 2188, 2587, 4753; *pp.* **yseene** 3319.

sen *conj.* since 443.

sendel *n.* thin rich silk 1479; *pl.* pieces of

^ schreward , n , a scoundrel, rogue 2302.

silk 2164.

sende *v.* to send 181; – *after* to send for 542; – *to* to send a message to 1114, 3032; – *homage* to pay homage through a messenger 1539.

sengyl *adj.* without a cloak or armour 613.

seriaunt *n.* a servant 1611; *pl.* **seriauns** 2809.

sert *n. for* – indeed 227.

sert *adv.* certainly, indeed 2267.

sertes *adv.* certainly, indeed 220.

serue *v.* to deal with (so) 1586; – *with* to serve (sth) with (sth) 2547; – *of nouȝt* to be of no use 2250, 4594.

seruice *n.* the way in which food is served 2748; *dwelle in* – to keep one's job as a servant 520; *Goddes* – serving God by fighting the Saracens 2445, 3801.

sesy(n) *v.* to cease, stop 1086, 1147.

sesy *v.* – *into honde* to put into (so's) possesions 1321; *pa.t.* to take (possesion of) 1389.

sesoun *n. in swylk, þat* – at such a time, at that time 117

sethe *v.* to boil, stew 2542, 2762; *pa.t.* **soden, soþen** 2012.

seþ(þen), sithyn, suth *adv.* afterwards, subsequently 255, 743, 1487; then 1901

seþ(þen) *conj.* since 861, 897.

set(te) *pa.t.* to plant a blow 56; – *togeder* to meet, clash 155; – *up* to hoist a sail 251; *refl.* to apply oneself to 284; –*on* to put in control of 491; *adhort.* – *us to* let us proceed towards 1349; –*up* to open 4178, 4243; *pp.* **ysett, aseten** to be beset 2936.

sewe, siwe *inf. + adhort.* to follow 3168; *pr.t.* **seuiyth** *pa.t.* **suwed** 936.

shenship *n.* a disgrace 3104.

shilde *adhort.* to protect (from) 2518, 5031.

shille *adj.* loud, shrill 4944.

shiltron, shiltrom *n., n.pl.* **shiltrynges** a battle formation 3531, 3570.

shippe-breche *n.* a shipwreck 1220.

shoode *n.* the crown of the head 2710.

shrichynge *ger.* a shriek 4944.

side *n. on* – out of the way 1900; *bi/on ich, euery* – on every side, everywhere 2078; *on* – on the side of 5234.

signyfiaunse *n.* a meaning, significance 47, 3787.

significacioun *n.* a symbol, sign 91.

sikelatoun, seklatoun *n.* a cloth of gold 1479.

syke *v.* to feel sick 2730;

syked *pa.t.* to sigh 2593.

siker, seker *adj.* – *þu be* you can be sure 173.

sikerlich, sekerlyche *adv.* truly 120; undoubtedly 1885; steadily, firmly 128, 2060.

sycourliche *adv.* certainly, without doubt 4036.

syngeth *pr.t.* to tell in verse 2062.

sinke *v.* – *in body* to eat or drink, be absorbed 5232.

sirnam *n.* an epithet, title 973.

sythe *n.* a scythe 4838.

sithe *n. an hundred, many* – a hundred, many times 2994; *on* – once 4751; *pl.* **seþis, sides, sythes** 3141.

skape *v.* to escape 1283; *pp.* **schapid** 1371.

skele, skylle *n. ben* – *and resoun* to be just and wise 350; *with* – *and resoun* with judgment and wisdom 350; *by* – with skill, expertise 2162.

skere *adv.* altogether 4315.

sket *adv.* quickly, immediately 621.

skye *n. into þe* – throughout the sky 1002.

sklendere *adj.* slim 2678.

slauyn *n.* a pilgrim's mantle 237.

slaut *n.* slaughter 4597.

sle(n), sloo *v.* to kill 446, 572; –

doun(riȝt) to kill outright, annihilate 1080, 2928; – *vp* to kill outright 2761; *pa.t.* **slouȝ, slowe, sleed** 890, 1010, 1372; *pp.* **slayn, slawe, slo, islon** 539, 458, 558, 425.

slye *adj.* cunning, wily 2865.

slight *adv.* smooth 405.

slyt *n.* slaughter 1214.

slonge *pa.t.* to fling, hurl 4094.

smale *adv.* into small pieces 737.

smere *adv.* contemptuously 3040.

smert *adj.* sharp 631, 2109.

smert *adv.* heavily 4095; keenly 4860.

smertly, smartly *adv.* quickly 943;

smite *v.* to strike 398; – *on* to strike 470; to beat (a musical instrument) 2073; to wound or kill 5035. *pa.t.* **smote, smettyn** 471, 3092; *pp.* **ysmetyn, ysmyte**; to kill 2204; to fight a battle 3074.

smoke *n.* 4106.

snelle, snalle *adv.* quickly 515.

so *adv.* as 62.

so *conj.* – *that* provided that 2297.

socour *n.* assistance 1019; *don* – to give assistance to 1040.

socour *v.* to give military assitance 1414.

socoureing *ger.* help 1988.

sojour *n.* a delay 4732.

solas *n.* *maken* – to be glad, rejoice 232; comfort 1557.

somewhile *adv.* at some former time 1879.

sonde *n.* Christ's ordinance 722, 870; an invitation 806; message 4532.

sonde *n.* sand 2204.

sone *adv.* *swithe* – straightaway, immediately 340; *comp.* **soner, sunner, senner** 3993, 4490.

sonne *n.* *under* – *(schynyng)* on earth, in the world 1289.

sore *n.* grief, anxiety 4742.

sore, sare *adv.* sorely, badly 537, 1936.

sornoun *n.* an (alternative) name, an ep-

ithet 973.

soth *n.* the truth 161.

soth *adj.* true 4695.

sothe *adv.* truthfully 455.

souche *v.* – *on* to suspect (so) of (sth) 851.

soudan, sowdan, sowdyn *n.* a sultan 1874.

sowke *v.* to suck 3463, 3657; to suck one's lips as a sign of nervousness 2630.

sound *adj.* unharmed, without injury 667, 4140.

soune *n.* sound 1438; *in mery* – with gracious words 197.

sour, su(y)re, souour *adj.* trustworthy, reliable 1430; safe, secure 3828.

sour *adv.* dearly 1429.

space *n.* a period of time 4141.

speciel *n.* an associate, follower 1530.

spede *v. refl.* to be successful 4437.

sperrid *pa.t.* to bolt 4616.

spye *v.* to spy on 338.

spille *v.* to perish 688; to kill 4122.

spyt *n.* ill-will, malice 859; an insult, outrage 3920.

splentes, splyntes *n.pl.* strips of metal used to make armour 3097.

spoyled *pa.t.* to strip 1215.

spore *n.* *at a/the* – at full speed 2989; – *of gold* gilt spurs (the distinctive mark of a knight) 3167.

sprede *v.* to put up (a tent) 3811.

spring *v.* to jump 1802; *pa.t.* **sprang** to spread 3274.

springal *n.* a catapult for throwing heavy missiles 946.

stage *n.* a platform 4165; *pl.* levels, stories 969.

stanse *n.* a dispute, conflict 812, 891.

stark, sterk *adj.* strong, powerful 3082, 4047.

starling *n.* an English silver penny 2042.

stede *n.* *in o/ to þat* – in one place/ to

that place 809.

steep *adj.* brilliant 2737; loud 3944.

stefly *adv.* firmly 4398.

steke *pp.* to lock up 549.

steked *pp.* to stab 4056, 5103.

stere *n.* a star 1615.

stere *v.* to move 2209; *pa.t.* **stert, stirt, sturt** to rush 423; – *vp* to jump up 1566.

stered *pa.t. refl.* to fight valiantly 3138.

sterne *adv.* massively, forbiddingly 4193.

stert, sturt *pa.t.* to rush 423; – *vp* to jump up 1566.

sterue *v.* to die 2739; *pa.t.* **storuen** 2031.

steuene *n.* a voice 197.

stichele *n.* *by* – *nor by strete* neither by the stile nor in the street, nowhere 4452.

styed *pa.t.* to ascend 3509.

styffe, stef *adj.* strong 137, 1344.

stikid, stooke *pa.t.* to stab 3661, 5103.

stylly *adv.* quietly 3087.

stynt *n.* *wythowtyn* – without stopping, unceasingly 1741.

stonde *v.* – *to* to abide by 212; (with) stand 382; – *ageyn* to resist 1998; to remain secure 4903; *me* **stant** *no drede* I have no fear 2712;

stound *n.* a short time 4025; *on a* – 628; *in that* – then 2204; *no* – no longer 4450.

sto(u)pe *v.* to fall headlong 3671; *pr.t.* to bend, buckle 413.

store, stour *n.* provisions 874 A; *to his* – for his store 874 D; *myche* – plenty 1181.

store *v.* to stock with provisions 4502.

stoure *n.* a battle, fight 1019, 5044.

stoure *adv.* fiercely 111.

stoutelich, stutelich, stowtly *adv.* resolutely, bravely 936.

streyned *pa.t.* to tighten, erect 987.

strekid, stryked *pa.t.* to move quickly 1051, 1061.

strengþe *n.* *with* – *of hond* by force 799.

strengh *n.* (OE strengu) strength 964.

strete *n.* *be* – *and lane* everywhere 1063.

striue *v.* to fight 4276.

stroyed *pa.t.* to destroy 4438.

stroke *n.* *at a* – with one blow, instantly 1818.

suffer *v.* to endure 842; to tolerate 872; *imp.* allow (me) 2327, 2329.

surnum *n.* an epithet, title 973.

sus *adv.* up 2192.

swar *adj.* square 790.

sweyn *n.* a knight's attendant 3848.

swep *pa.t.* – *adoun* to cut down 4989.

suepis *n.pl.* the sweeping, swinging of the arm 1025.

swete *n.* *leuen, losen* – to lose one's life 5060.

swiche, swylke, suche *adj.* – *three, ten* three, ten times as much 696,4064; similar, alike 1481.

suik *v.* to prove false to, disappoint the expectation of 3875.

swykelle *adj.* treacherous 1415.

swiþe *adj.* very 1126; quickly 1669;

sworn *pp.* – *brother* two men bound to each other by oath 792.

swou, suown *n.* *in a* – in a faint 427.

tabours, tabers *n.pl.* a small drum 1833.

take, tan *v.* – *to* to go to 2196; *pa.t.tok* to commit, give 101; – *lond* to land, disembark 252; – *on* to act, proceed 1029; – *vp* to lift 1097; – *deth* to die 1920; – *leue at* to bid farewell 2437; *pp.* – *of* to take, seize from 1107.

tale, tail *n.* a story 1034; news 2693; *withouten* – countlessly, beyond counting 157.

targe *n.* *withouten* – without delay 1976.

targe *n.* a light shield borne by footmen 2180.

tarienge *ger.* *maken* – to linger, loiter 4667.

tasse *v.* to pile, heap 3268.

taxion n. taxation 690.
teldyn *v.* to pitch (a tent) 2063.

telle *v.* to count 878, 1501; to tell 1103; –

the resoun to give an account of 882; *pp.* **itelde; ytolde** 1103, 1501.

tem *n.* a race, stock 4971.

te(n) *v.* to go 3279, 4303.

tene *n.* trouble, harm 2456.

tere, tare *pa.t.* to tear 2015, 4730.

tharmys *n.pl.* bowels 2201.

þat *conj.* so that 1933, 2067; because 3284.

thede *n.* a people, nation 4539.

thei, thogh, þof, þoo *conj.* though 1393, 3894, 4853; *no wonder* – no wonder that 1393.

then *adv.* when 3239.

then(en) *adv.* from there 2143.

þenkeþ *pr.t.* to think 826.

þerate *adv.* there 944.

þerby *adv.* beside, near there 944.

þerwylys *adv.* in the mean time 3007.

therwith *adv.* in addition to that 2008.

þes, þis, theyse *pron.* these 22, 346, 2167, 3133.

þiderward *adv.* towards that place, there 1044.

þing *n.* something 1036; *through all* – thoroughly 276; *non other* – nothing else 2041; country 2818; *pl.* people, creatures 2025.

þynke, thenke *impers.* it seems (to me) 293, 352; it seemed (to us) 2018; *pa.t.* **þhout** 2236.

þo *pron.* those 751; them 878.

þo *adv./conj.* then 865; when 1368.

þouȝt *n.* an opinion, low regard 848; *in my/his* – in my/his mind, to my/himself 200, 1803.

þrowe, thrawe a moment 4097; *n. in/on a* –, *a litel* – a moment later 2074; *any* – at any time 3194.

tyde *adv.* quickly, immediately 2016.

tyde *v.* to happen (to so) 598.

tydlye *adv.* quickly, soon 1619.

tyght *pr.t.* to plan, intend 822; *pp.* 4508.

tyme *n. be/at/on this* – now 649, 817;

seuen – *dubbyl* 1504; *sen* – to be still alive 3923.

tyne *v.* to cease to have, to lose 3236; *pp.* **itynt** 1133.

tyre *n.* dress, apparel 86.

tyth, itight (OE *tyhtan*) *pp.* to go 271.

tobreke *v.* to break to pieces 3916; *pa.t.* **tobrake** 3680.

tobraste, tobarst, tobrestyn *pa.t.* to be shattered 419, 1203, 4606.

tocarf, tokerue *pa.t.* to cut to pieces 2925.

tocleued *pa.t.* to cleave asunder 1372.

todrowe *pa.t.* to tear to pieces 449.

tofore *prep.* ahead of, before 3119; before, in the presence of 5242.

tofraped *pa.t.* to strike apart 1370.

tofrusshed, tofrussad *pa.t.* to smash to pieces 3152, 4606.

togeders *adv.* together 234.

tohewe, toheugh *pa.t.* to cut to pieces 1385, 2925.

tollid *pa.t.* to attract (so's) attention 1032.

ton *pron.* the one 4481.

top *n.* – *ouer tayl* base over apex 57.

topcastel *n.* a platform on the mast of a ship from which missiles were hurled 1729.

torelle *n.* a turret 1016.

torent *pp.* to break, pull to pieces 3863.

toroof *pa.t.* to break 4908.

topsaile *n.* – *ouer* head over heels 5052.

torent *pa.t.* to rend in pieces 3863.

torkes *adj.* Turkish 3090, 3121.

toshake *v.* to shake to pieces 3894.

toshent *pp.* to destroy utterly 1313.

tost *adv.* quickly 2192.

totere *pa.t.* to break to pieces 1204; *pp.* **totore** to tear to pieces 4741.

touche *v.* to come into contact with 3577.

toun *n. a* – *of gold* 2516.

toward *prep. ben* – to be on the way to 1528.

trayde *pa.t.* to vex, trouble (s.o.) 952.

trappe *v.* to adorn a horse with trappings 1431.

trappour *n.* a strong covering for a horse 1431.

tre *n.* the wooden shaft of a spear 121.

tre-castel *n.* a movable tower made of wood 987.

tresour *n.* a treasure-chest, treasury 873.

trewes, triwes, trues *n.pl.* *crien/nimen/ taken* – to declare, make truce 2281, 5187; *asken* – to ask for truce 5180.

trye *adj.* choice, excellent 4338.

tryed *adj.* of metals: refined, purified 4336.

triste *n.* *with evil* – untrustworthily 1304; *of evil* – whom one cannot trust, untrustworthy 1304.

triste *v.* – *to* to trust 4678.

trompours *n.pl.* trumpeters 233.

trusse *imp.* to secure, fasten 3477; *pa.t.* to pack 3921.

tuel *num.* twelve 2035.

tues, twyes, touz *imp.* to kill 2879.

turels, tyrells *n.pl.* turrets 969, 1016.

turne *v.* – *ayein* to return 922; *pa.t.* to turn around 1902; – *to* to result in (sth) for (so) 3931.

turneys, torneys *n.pl.* coins from Tours 1491.

tvingled, twyncled *pa.t.* with *eyes* as subject: to blink 1296.

vnblyþe *adj.* not pleased, unhappy 3920.

vncharged *pp.* to unload 1776.

vnder *prep.* *above and* – overhead and below, everywhere 1838.

vnderfonge *v.* – *of* to receive (from) 363, 2348; *pa.t.* **vnderfeng** 1856.

vndernam *pa.t.* to perceive, recognise 379.

vnderstonde *v.* to receive intelligence 4722.

vndo *v.* to open 619.

unneþe, annethe, vnneþse *adv.* hardly, with difficulty 23, 908, 1650.

vnþankes *n.* *gen.* *her* – against their will 1373.

vp *imper.* to get up 4963.

vp *prep.* – *to* towards 3244.

vpon *prep.* on the coast, shore of 243, 2895; towards 1421; on penalty of losing (sth.) 4551.

vprist *n.* the resurrection 4118.

vpsteying *ger.* the ascension 2807.

vtmast, otmast *adj.* *sup.* the outermost 2097, 4104.

vttest *adj.* *sup.* furthest out 2127.

valour *n.* prowess 3038.

velayn *adj.* deficient in courtesy 2643.

vemauns *n.* vigour, great force 1068.

venge *v.* to avenge (os) 794.

veniance *n.* vengeance 1261.

ventaile *n.* the lower, movable part of a helmet 3606.

verament *adv.* truly 681.

verey *adj.* true 3980.

vertu *n.* courage, valour 1996.

vessel *n.* *coll.* plates, vessels 1963.

viage *n.* a pilgrimage 1088; journey, travelling 3846.

vinteyners *n.pl.* officers in command of 20 men 1353.

visage *n.* the face 1313.

vitaile *n.* supplies 1653; food, provisions 1666; *pl.* **vetailes** 2757.

uorþe *adv.* forth 245.

vrye *v.* to contort with pain 2113.

wage *n.* a reward 3558.

way *n.* *in his/her* – on his/their way 162, 193; *nimen, taken, henten the* – to go 163, 297, 189; *flen her* – to flee 1383; *verre* – a long way 1832; a manner 460, 1119; *al the* – continually 4030; a passage, path

5058.

waynes, wenes *n.pl.* wagons 5059.

waite *v.* to spy on 3976; *pr.t.* 4407.

waiteþ *pr.t.* to show, cause 859, 1880.

waite *n.* a trumpet player 2561; *pl.* watch-men, scouts 1451.

waiting *ger.* spying 3929.

walkyn *v.* to journey, travel 360; *pa.t.* **welke** 269.

wallyng *ger.* the walls 3877.

warant *n.* a guarantor, protector 2380, 2743; a guarantee 3685.

ward *n.* a guard, watch 491; *in saf* – in safeguard, secure 4901; *pl. helden no* – to fear not 893.

wardy *v.* to protect, guard 1638.

war(y)soun *n.* a reward 526.

warni *pr.t.* to inform, notify 1259.

warraunt *v.* to guarantee, pledge 4797.

wasseile *n. drinken* – *to* to kill 4798.

wauys, wawes *n.pl.* waves 1188.

wax, wex *v. p.t.* **wax, wex, wexid** 1379, 448, 3154; *pp.* **waxin, waxe, iwoxe, wexed** 2004, 2022, 4024; become, get 2004; *litel* – young 2022; increase 2030; – *fro grounde* to appear from nowhere 4596.

wed *n. to* – as a hostage 4619.

wede *v.* to go mad 4965.

wederward *adv.* wherever 1229.

wedes *n.pl.* clothes 3080.

wel, wol *adv.* very 121; *not* – not very much 1562; – *a ten myle* a full ten miles 3530.

welde, wielde, wolde *v.* to rule 4227, 4489; to use (a weapon) 4162 A; to be in control of (os) 4162 E.

wele-away *int.* alas 2772.

welmyd *pa.t.* to sink 1207.

wen *adv.* from where 1657.

wending *ger.* departure 1977.

wene *n. withouten* – without doubt 883.

weneþ *pr.t.* to think, believe 857, 4330; *pa.t.* **wende, went** 153, 857.

wepe *n.* weeping 1237.

were *n.* war 822.

we(r)re *v.* to fight 1616.

werrer *n.* a warrior 16.

werrour *n.* a warrior 31.

wers *adj. comp.* worse 1917.

weued *pa.t.* to try to attract one's attention by waving 1032.

weued *pa.t.* to come down 2200.

w(h)ate *adv.* quickly 2392, 4969.

whete, wite *n.* wheat 4079.

whete-rede *n.* straw 4467.

whider *adv.* – *þat* wherever 1229.

whiderward *adv.* – *euer so* wherever 2121.

while, wyle *n. in þat* – meanwhile 609; *þat* – at that time 3007 E; *the* – in the meantime 3007 A, while 5111.

whilis *n. the* – while 1670.

white *adj.* shining, burnished 1491, 2042.

whoot *adj.* hot 2549, 2636.

wide *adv.* widely 360.

wyghte *n.* a creature 591; *pl.* men 2037.

wiȝt *adj.* strong, courageous 1945; wyth *adv. quickly* 1813D.

wyȝtly *adv.* bravely 4437.

wil *n.* a deceit 872, 1585.

wille *n.* a wish, desire 289; *at/to* – at one's command, according to one's wish 375, 1643.

wil *pr.t.* shall 205; *pr.t.* **wol, welle, wlt** 306, 1515, 2423; **nel(le), nyl** ne wil 1277; **nulleth** ne willeth 1680; *pa.t.* **wolde** 100; **nold** ne wold 866; – *aye* to want to return 4304; – *her way* to go 4418.

winne *v.* to win, seize 1788; to regain 4227; *pa.t.* **wan**; – *up* to open 1059; – *in* to get in 1795; – *to* to get to 5146.

wynnyng *ger.* booty, spoil 3776.

wirche, werche, worche *v.* to make, cause 1725; – *wrake/wo* to do (so) harm 1280, 1725.

wise *n.* way 475; *in al* – in every way 519.

wisse *n. to* – for certain 3852.

wysse *v.* to show 2802.

wite *v.* to know 837; *pr.t.* **wot** 345; *pa.t.* **wist, wost** 532, 1509; **nuste** ne wiste 2862.

wite *v.* to blame (so) 397, 4980.

wite *v.* to guard, defend 4504; *pp.* 2305.

wyth *adj.* white 115.

wyth *adv.* quickly 1813.

wiþ *prep.* because of, by the action of 1015; by 911, 2268.

wiþerwines *n.pl.* enemies 775.

withalle *adv.* therewith, at the same time 2556.

withhelde *pa.t.* to preserve 1207; to keep in custody 1762.

wythsette *v.* to withstand 2254.

withturnde *pa.t.* *refl.* to turn around 2920.

witt *n.* *turnen to litle* – to result in little advantage 798.

wo *adj.* *him was* – he was distressed 1393; *him was wel and* – he had ups and downs 4543.

wod *pa.t.* to go through 4434.

wode *adj.* mad 42; *fers and* – ferocious 614.

woke *pa.t.* to stay awake 957.

wolcome *adj.* welcome 664.

won *n.* a number, quantity 2696, 2948, 3263; a choice, alternative 4839.

woned *pa.t.* to live 4250.

wonder *adj.* wonderful, marvelous 1193.

wonder *adv.* very 1242.

wondy *v.* to hesitate, refrain 928.

word *n.* *at on/the first* – at once 1593, 4185; – *and ende* beginning and end, everything 2850, 5183; *pl.* *at/with short* – in short, in a word 1212, 1979.

world, wordle *n.* *al þe* – everybody 2922; *gen.* **werdlys** 1883.

worrest *pr.t.* to ravage 3411.

worþe *n.* excellence 3284 D.

worth *adj.* *much* – highly esteemed 3284

E.

worth *pa.t.* to become 2429, 4103.

worþi *adj.* *ben* – to deserve 1467, 1596, to be held in esteem 3274.

worþschip *n.* *don* – to pay homage 1485 L; honour 1485 DAE; *pl.* respect 1238.

woundred *pp.* *ben* – to be astonished 4028.

wrake *n.* hostility, harm 1091, 1280.

wrange, wrong *pa.t.* to wring 451, 4730.

wrathe *adv.* angrily 2448.

wraþed *pp.* vexed, irritated 4952.

wreye, wrien *v.* to put trappings on a horse 1431; to cover (os) 2113; *pp.* to cover with armour 3603.

wreke *v.* to take revenge 794; *pp.* **wrokyn** 927.

wrothe, wrethe *n.* anger 3804, 3949.

Index of Names

Line numbers followed by * indicate that more information can be found in the Notes.

Abathie, Albarie 3968 ?

Aboger 2821 ?

Achilles 4706 Greek hero in the *Iliad* and the *Roman de Troye*.

Acres, Acre(sse), Acris 256, 1180, 1487, 1633, 1642, 1826 etc. a town on the coast of Palestine.

Alayne Trenchemere, 1655*, 1664, 1675 etc. Richard's helmsman.

Albo(o)n, St. –, 4482* St Albans.

Alianore see **Elianore**.

Alisa(u)nder 15, 2822, 3054 etc. Alexander the Great.

Alisa(u)ndrie, Alisaundre 2822, 3054* Alexandria.

Almaundes 9 German.

Al(y)mayn 274, 275*, 299 etc. Germany.

Almayn, Almeyn, the emperor of –, 757*, 1907* the emperor Frederick Barbarossa.

Anne, St. –, 4255* St. Ann, mother of Mary.

Apirous 266 ? Pireus.

Appolyn 2874, 3114, 4190 etc. Apollo, one of the gods of the Saracens.

Ar(r)abie, Arabe 2820, 3052, 4559 etc. Arabia.

Archane 268* ?

Archoure see **Arsour**.

Ardo(u)r 369*, 465, 471 name of the son of the German emperor.

Arsour, Archoure, Assure 3016, 3037, 3044, 3059 etc. Arsuf, a Crusader's port in Palestine.

Arsur, Arasoun see **Will(e)am**.

Artays, the earl of –, 760* Robert of Artois, brother of Louis IX of France.

Artho(u)r 18, 4700 king Arthur of the Round Table.

Ascaloyn, Ascholoyne, Ascolyn 4561*, 4893 Ascalon.

Auboge graundre, Aubone 3053*, 4565 ?

Aufryk(e) 2729, 2821, 3053 etc. Africa.

Austyn, St. –, 3774 St Augustin.

Babiloyne 258*, 2819, 3051 etc. Cairo.

Barberye 4560 a mythical Muslem country.

Baselles 4889 ? a corruption of **Bascle**, Basque.

Baudewine 742* Baldwin IV, king of Jerusalem.

Baudewine(s), Baudeuines 776, 1993, 1994 the Archbishop of Canterbury, died 19 November 1190 at Acre.

Baudewyn(ys) 4253* ?

Bayard 3425*, 4412 the horse **Bayard**.

Bedlem see **Betheleem**.

Be(e)ues 4702 hero in the romance of *Beves of Hampton*.

Beringer, Berenger 1162, 1169, 1182 etc. Berengaria of Navarre, wife of Richard I.

Bertram Brandis, the good Lumbard, 2981*, 4737, 5055 etc. ? one of Richard's knights.

Besile see **Peris**.

Betan(i)e, Betonye, Bytayn etc. 262, 4290, 4471* Beit Nuba.

Bethleem, Bethelem, Bedlem 262, 3024, 4957, 5201 Bethlehem.

Bloys, the duke of – 755*, Theobald, count of Blois.

Boloyn, the earl of –, 760*, 3160, 3941 ?

Bou(u)ent, Boueuent, Bowent 1567 Buffavento, a castle in the north of Cyprus.

Bo(s)sie 2821, 3053 ? Bosnia.

Braundes, Bra(u)ndis 247, 778, 2981 etc. Brindisi, a south Italian port.

Brandis see **Bertram**.

Bretayne, Breteyne 758, 1990 Brittany.

Bretayne 3953 Britain.

Brytayns 3953 British troops.

Burgoyne, the duke of –, 755*, 2439, 3940* etc. Hugh III, duke of Burgundy, cousin of Philip Augustus, died at Acre July 1192.

Bytany, Bytayn see **Betanie**.

Caifas, Cayphas 2894, 2992, 2996 Haifa, a coastal town in Palestine.

Calasyn, Calafyme, Calafyn 3013* ? Calansua, a castle north-east of Arsuf.

Caluarye Caluery 4957, 4958 Mount Calvary.

Canterbirie, Cauntirbery, Caunterbury see **Baudewine**.

Capadocy 4560, 4891 Cappadocia in Turkey.

Caunter see **Gauter of Naplus**.

Cecile, Cisyle see **Secile**.

Cesar(ie), Sesarye 259, 3015 Caesarea, on the coast of Palestine.

Cessoyne see **Sessoyne**.

Chalo(y)ne, C(h)aleyne 3850, 3862, 3958* etc. Ascalon, a walled town north of Gaza, refortified by Richard.

Chalyn 2896* ? a river in Palestine.

Champayn see **Henry**.

Charl(es) 4573 king Charlemagne.

Charlema(y)n, Charlmeyn 15, 4573, 4699 etc. king Charlemagne.

Chester, the bishop of –, 4481* the bishop of Chester.

Cidrak, Sydrake 4702* the author of *le Livre de Sidrac*.

Cipre(s) 250, 1191, 1221 etc. Cyprus.

Cisteaux, abbotes of –, 5247 abbots belonging to the Cistercian order.

Coloyne, the duke of –, 759*, 3132, 3941 ?

Co(n)stantyn 778, 4471* Constantinople.

Damaske, Damasse 2714, 3645 Damascus.

Damasour 2819 ? Damour, south of Beirut.

Danys see **Oger**.

Daro(u)n, Doroun 3977, 3985, 4007 etc. Daron, a coastal town south of Gaza,

Denis St. –, 1254, 2330 St. Denis, patron saint of the French.

Dereyne, Dirrain, Doreyn see **George**.

Doly, Doley see **Fouke**.

Doroun 4042 see **Daroun**.

Ebedie 264* ?

Ector, Ettor 16, 4704 Hector of Troy.

Egipciens 4891 the Egyptians.

Egipte, Egype 2727, 2818, 4559 etc. Egypt.

Egregyens 4887 a people of the Eastern Mediterranean, ? Aegeans.

Elianore, Alianore 1162, 1174 Eleanor of Aquitaine, mother of Richard I.

Ely 4703 name of a French knight.

Elyne, St. 391 St. Helena, mother of Constantin the Great.

Embociens 4889 ?

En(n)eas 4706 Aeneas of Troy.

Ercules 4705 Hercules, Greek hero in the Iliad.

Famagous 252* Famagusta, a port on the eastern side of Cyprus.

Fauel(le), Fauuel(le) 1496*, 2058, 2911 etc. the horse Favel, acquired by Richard during the campaign against the emperor of Cyprus.

Femely 3964* ?

Fera(u)nt see **Marcus**.

Fer(r)es, Ferers, the earl of –, 1905* William de Ferrieres, earl of Derby, died at Acre 1190.

Flaundres, the earl of –, 759* Philip of Alsace, count of Flanders, died at Acre June 1191.

Fouke Dol(e)y 126, 151, 185* etc. Fulk de Oyri.

Gage 2266 ?

Gailard 5211*, 5216, 5218 castle Gailard.

Gasco(u)ns, Gascoi(g)nes 2244, 3064, 3952 etc. troops from Gascony.

Gatris, Gaters 4151*, 4157, 4179 Gaza.

Gaut(i)er, Gautire, Gauder see Hubert.

Gauter, Caunter of Naplus, 3275*, 3838 Garnier of Nablus, master of the Hospital, died August 1192.

Gaweyn, Gawayn 18, 4700 Sir Gawain of the Round Table.

Gebelyn, Gebolyn, Gebylyn, Gabylyn 4249, 4289 Ybelin.

Gemelyne, St. – 391* ?

Gene, Jene 3067 Genoa.

Geneweys 3954 men from Genoa.

George, Jorge, St. 2969*, St. George, patron saint of England

George, Jorge, Seynt – · Dereyne etc, 3021* St. George de Lidda.

Gerard, Sir –, 5087* ?

Glan(de)uile(s) see Randolf.

Grece 1849 Greece. grete – 2823, 3055, 4567 Asia Minor.

Grif(f)ouns, Grefouns 787*, 940 etc. 1212* etc. the Greeks.

Grykkys, Greke(ssh) see 273, 4570 the Meditteranean see.

Gy 4702 the romance hero Guy of Warwick.

3end see Inde.

Haucus see Horkeys.

Henry, Henre 2317 Henry II of England, Richard's father.

Henry, Henre, Herry 1989*, 4643*, 4650, etc. Henry, Duke of Champagne, Count of Troyes, nephew of Richard I.

Herford, the earl of – 935* ?

Herkys see Horkeys.

Hewe, Huge Pimperise/ Penpetite/ Pempete 1125*, 1135 one of the two justices to call Richard a coward.

Horkeys, Herkys, Haucus lond 3026* ?

Hospitelers 2244, 2315, 3102 etc. members of the military order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem.

Hospitiler see Gauter of Naplus.

Huberd, Hubert 1997*, 2935, 5167 Hubert Walter, bishop of Salisbury and after Baldwin's death archbishop of Canterbury, accompanied Richard on the Crusade.

Huge see Hewe.

Inde 2170, 2511, 2652, 2826 etc. India, also 3end, Hende, Innie 260, 2170, 4570. – major 4887, 4892 Greater India.

Ipmadon, Ypomedon 4698 the romance hero Ipomadon.

Jaf(f)es, Jaffis, Japhes 267, 2452, 3017 etc. Jaffa, on the coast of Palestine, refortified by Richard in 1193.

Jakes, Jakis de N(e)ys 3105*, 3117, 3122 etc. Jaques d'Avesnes, who died at Arsuf in 1191.

Janyn, James, the earl of (pleyn) Spain, 1908* ? James I of Aragon.

Jason, Jasyn 4705 hero of Greek mythology.

Johan, J(a)han, J(h)on(e) 1165, 1182, 1208 etc. Richard's younger sister Joan, widow of king William of Sicily.

Joh(o)n, J(h)on 4263, 4272, 4279 etc. John Lackland, Richard's brother.

John de Nel(e), Neles 1992*, 3105, 5086 John de Nesle, castellan of Bruges.

John, preter –, 2826 a legendary Christian ruler in central Asia.

John, – de St. John 5168* ?

Jorda(y)n, flum –, 2293, 2463 the river Jordan.

Jubitere 3420 Jupiter, one of the Saracen gods.

Lancelot, Launcelet de Lake 4705 knight of the Round Table.

Lazare, castel –, 3020 a castle and nunnery close to Jerusalem, founded by Melisand, wife of Fulk of Anjou.

Lefrewide, Lucypryde 4237* ? Castel des Figues.

Leice(s)ter see Robert.

Lemoges 5219* Limoges.

Leonard, ? Lethenard St. 836* St. Leonard

Lessoure, the forest of –, 3060* ?

Lyard 1496*, 4412, 4822 etc. the horse Liard, taken at the same time as Favel.

Libie 3053 Libia.

Limacour, Lamasoure, Lemausour, Limasown, Lymatoun 1201, 1391 Limassol, port in the south of Cyprus.

Long(e)spay(n) see William.

Lucepryde, Lucypryde see Lefrewide.

Lumbard see Bertram.

Lumbardye 3066 Lombardy.

Lumbard(es) 3952, 4653, 4657 men from Lombardy.

Mahoun(d) 1878, 2742, 2816 etc. Mahomet, a Saracen god.

Maide(n) Castel 3025*, 5203 ? Casel Maien/ Moien near Yazour.

Malcus, Malkous see Marcus.

Maranfeld 4888 ?

Marcelly, Marcil 781 Marseilles.

Marcus, Markes, Malcus (Mon)fera(u)nt 1877*, 1884, 2298 etc. Conrad de Montferrat.

Margarite, Margerise Sir –, 1124*, 1130 one of the two French justices to call Richard a coward.

Margery(ce) 495* the daughter of the king of Almain.

Marrok 5049 Morocco.

Ma(s)cedoyne, Massydoyn 257, 3624 Macedonia.

Mat(e)-(de)-grifoun, Maude-griffoun 974*, 2064, 2105 etc. a wooden siege tower called 'the Slayer of Greeks'.

Maudit-colour/calour 2094* a corruption of Maudit Coloun, a tower in Acres.

Messene, Missene 786, 884, 1144 Messina.

Mighelle, St, 3430 St. Michael.

Mile(s) 1992 ? according to the text John

de Nel's brother.

Miloun, the duke –, 733*, 739 Guy de Lusignan.

Miltoun see Thomas.

Mirabel 3012 Mirabel, a castle east of Jaffa.

Mirabelyn, Morenelyne 2176 ? according to the text Saladin's nephew or cousin.

Monferaunt see Marcus.

Moriens 4888 the Moors.

Multoun see Thomas.

Naplus see Gauter.

Nauer(ner) see Beringer.

Nauerne 2724* ? Navarra.

Nazareth(is), Nazares 2460, 2988, 4957 etc. Nazareth.

Ne(e)l, Nele(s), de –, see John.

Neis, Nys, de –, see Jakes.

Normandye 4492* Normandy.

Octauyan, ? Otuan 4703 the emperor Octavian, protagonist in the OF romance Octavian and Florent and Octavian.

Offere 3020 ? probably a corruption of Lazare.

Oger, Danys le fiz –, 17 a corrupt rendering of Ogier le Danois, romance hero.

Oliuer 13, 4703 Roland's companion in the Chanson de Roland.

Oliuete 5202 the hill east of Jerusalem where Christ's arrest and Ascension took place.

Orgoilous, Orglyus 265* ?

Ospiteler see Gauter.

Ospitelers see Hospitelers.

Ostric(he) 3069 Austria.

Ostrike, O(i)strich, the duke of –, 756*, 3874*, 3886 etc. duke Leopold I of Austria.

Otuan see Octauian.

Palastine 2999*, 4660 Caesarea.

Pask(as)y 1575* one of the retainers of the emperor of Cyprus.

Pempete, Penpetite see Hewe.

Pene 4698* ?

Perce 2725, 3051, 4563 Persia.

Peris, – Besile 5223* the knight who wounded Richard mortally.

Perse 4698* ?

Pertenop 4698 the romance hero Partenopeus de Blois.

Peryus 266 ? Piraeus.

Philip 863, 2414, 2447, 3770* etc. Philip Augustus, king of France.

Pikard 9 from Picardy.

Pilgrim, Pilcrim, castel –, 3019*, 4236 Castel Pilgrim, a castle on the coast of Palestine.

Pimperise see Hewe.

Pipard, Sir –, 4737*, 5088 Gilbert Pipard.

Pise 1606 ? a town in Cyprus.

Pise, the archbishop of –, 1857* Ubaldo Lanfranchi, archbishop of Pisa.

Platoun, Ploton 4422 Plato, one of the Saracen gods.

Poyle 1666, 306 Apulia, in the south of Italy.

Poyle 801 see Tanker(d).

Prouince 3065 the Provence, in the south of France.

Que(o)r, Cor de Lyoun 642*, 1347, 1698 etc. 'the Lion-Heart', the epithet usually associated with Richard I.

Randolf de Glan(de)uiles 1991 Ranulf de Glanville, chief justiciar of England under Henry II, accompanied Richard on the Crusade and died at Acre in October 1190.

Renaud, duke – 734*, 737 Reynald de Châtillon.

Richemo(u)nde, the earl of –, 1338*, 4059, 5056 Piers de Brayne, earl of Richmond.

Richere, St. 4286 probably St. Riquier.

Riis, Rys 830 Reggio.

Rober(t), Robard of Turnham 1249*, 1269, 2982 etc. Robert of Turnham, one of Richard's knights.

Rober(t), Robard of Leice(s)ter 935, 1619, 4039 etc. Robert Fitzpernel, earl of Leicester, accompanied Richard on the Crusade.

Robert Sabouile 5165* Robert de Sablé.

Robert the Wateruile 5166* ?

Robinet 2088, 2100, 4015 etc. one of Richard's siege engines.

Rog(g)er 804*, 815 Roger, son of Tancred, king of Sicily.

Rogeris 1164* see Notes.

Rouland 13 hero of the Chanson de Roland.

Roys 735* Raymond II of Tripoli.

Sabouyle see Robert.

Safran(ne) 267 a Templar Castle east of Haifa.

Saladin 1874, 2141, 2143 etc. Saladin, the first Ayubid sultan, Richard's opponent in the third Crusade.

Salesbirye, Salesbury see William de Longspée.

Samary 2726, 4562, 4894 Samaria.

Sarras 2819 the place where the Saracens live.

Sathanas 5040 Sathan.

Sau(y)our, St. –, 1380, 1428, 2194 etc. God or Christ (often used in oaths).

Seboly 3964* ?

Secile, Cisyle 805, 3067, 3819 Sicily.

Semoune, St. – 525 St. Simon.

Sesary(e) see Cesar(ie).

Sessoyne, the duke of –, 756* ? Henry the Lion, duke of Saxony.

Ses(s)oyne 2820*, 3052, 4564 ?a country in the Middle East.

Solage 2266 ? a placename, compare Gage.

Spay(i)n see Janyn.

Steuen, Sir –, 1248 ?

Sudan Turpy 263* ?

Surri(e), Surr(e)y 736, 741, 1487 etc. Syria

Taberet 268* ?

Tanker(d) 797, 801*, 827 etc. Tankred of Lecce, king of Sicily.

Tars, the king of –, 1849 ?

Templers 2243, 3063, 3101 etc. members of the order of the Temple.

Termegant, Teruagant, Tyrmegaunt, ?Turmegan 1878, 4190, 4328 etc. a Saracen god.

Thomas of Multoun 183*, 285, 310, 3700* Thomas, lord of Multon from 1167-1201.

Thomas, St. – of Inde, 1671, 2427, 3783 St. Thomas the Apostle.

Tire 2823, 3055, 4567 Tyre in Northern Palestine.

Tolloureyt 268* ?

Toren, Toroun, Turoun 3018 Daron.

To(u)rkes, Turke(i)s 3089, 3121 Turks.

Torkeye, Turkie 2247, 4887 Turky.

Torquan 268* ?

Torye see **Turry.**

Trenchemer see **Alayne.**

Turnham see **Robert.**

Turry, Turrien, Torie 3829* ?

Tuskan, Toscan 3067 Tuscany.

Tuskans, Tuskaynes 3952 troops from Tuscany.

Verybel 1896* ? the name of a horse.

Vrban 747* Pope Urban III.

Walis 3954 Welshmen.

Wateruile see **William.**

Wateruyle see **Robert.**

Will(e)am of Arsur, Arasoun 5087* ?

Will(y)am de Long(e)spay 934*, 1248(?), 2951, 3696 etc. William Longespée, earl of Salisbury.

Willeam de Wateruile 5166 ?

Winchester 768* Winchester.