

III.—BISHOP GROSSETESTE'S "CASTLE OF LOVE".

BY R. F. WEYMOUTH, ESQ., M.A.

Among the numerous works of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln from 1235 to 1253, is the religious poem which is the subject of the present notice. The original appears to have been written in Norman French, and there is a copy of this in MS. Bodl. 399 bearing the title "Romance par Mestre Robert Grosseteste". Another copy in MS. Laud. 471 is inscribed, "Ce est la vie de D. Jhesu de sa humanite, fet e ordine de Saint Robert Grosseteste, ke fut eveque de Nichole". In like manner the elaborately executed copy which exists in the Brussels library is entitled, "Vie de doux Jesu Christ". In other MSS. the title is "Carmen de Creatione Mundi"; and again in others "Chasteau d'Amour". In the copy published by the Caxton Society from the MS. in the library of Corpus Christi College Oxford, the opening lines are:—

Ky bien pense bien puet dire
 Sanz penser ne peut suffire.
 De nul bien fet comencer
 Deu nus doint a li penser.
 De ki. par ki. en ki sunt?
 Touz les biens ki sunt el mund.

In course of time more than one version of the poem was made into English. Of the origin of one of these—the one edited by Mr. M. Cooke for the Caxton Society from MS. Eg. 927—we have the following account. "In the name of the fader and the son and the haly gast. Here begynnes a romance of englische of the begynnyng of the world. and of al that a lewed man has nede for to knawe for hele of soule. this romance turned a munk of Sallay out of a French romance that sir Robert Bisschop a lyncoln made, and eked mikel therto, as him thought spedeful to edeficacion &c." It opens thus:—

Who so wele thinkes wele may saye
 For of gode thoghtes comes gode dedes aye
 God send us thoght to his plesyng
 In whos fre wil hynges all thyng
 He is god and lord of myȝtes mast
 The fader and sone and haligast.

An *entirely different* version is the one, with which alone Warton was acquainted, in the Vernon Manuscript in the Bodleian, fo. 292b. to 296. It bears the following heading:—

Her byginet a tretys
 Dat is yclept Castel off loue
 Dat bisschop Grosteyt made y wis
 For lewede mennes by houe.

Of this text there is another copy in the British Museum, Additional MSS. no. 22283, beginning at fo. 84 b. col. 2. The commencement is as follows:—

Dat good pencheþ. good may do.
 And God wol helpe. him perto
 For nas neuer. good werk wrouht.
 Wt oute beginynge. of good pouȝt.
 No neu^r was wrouht. non euel ping
 Þt euel pouht. nas þe biginnyng.

It will serve to show how closely this is copied from the poem in the Vernon MS. (or the latter from this one, or both from some more ancient manuscript), if I point out the few points of difference that exist between them within the limits of this passage, which may be taken as a fair sample of the whole. In the Vernon MS. the first line has penkep for pencheþ, the second line has “par to.” with a stop. In l. 3, “wrouȝt”. In l. 4, “beginninge” is not contracted, and has an *i* in the last syllable; and the stop at the end is omitted. In l. 5 there is the better reading “ne” for “no”; we have “wrouȝt” again, and “pouȝt” in the next line; and in both of these lines the Vernon MS. writes “vuel” for “euel”. In all the other details of spelling, punctuation, capitals, and even contractions, there is no difference between the two MSS. And it is so throughout; and curiously enough, in the only passage (I believe) in which *th* is substituted for the older *p*, it is found in both manuscripts the same. The passage is l. 998,

For heore dede. al to *lyth*.

It is evidently this same text, though greatly modernized and corrupted, which has been printed for private circulation by Mr. Halliwell. “The text of this edition,” the reader is told, “is chiefly taken from a manuscript in private

hands;" but unfortunately we are not informed to what extent the editor has allowed himself to depart from the authority or authorities which he "chiefly" followed, and I regret to learn from Mr. Halliwell that he has entirely lost sight of the MS. from which this text is in the main derived. The first six lines, as printed by Mr. Halliwell, are as follow:—

He that good thenketh good may do,
 And God wille helpene him ther-to;
 For ther was never good werke i-wrowght
 Withoute begynnyng of good thowght,
 Ne never ther was wrowght none evyl thyng
 But evyl thowght wes begynnyng.

If however we would compare this text with that of the two MSS. already referred to, this passage is an unfair specimen, as being exceedingly favourable. This will soon become evident as we proceed with that comparison, which is the object now proposed.

I. Here the first point to be noted is that in very numerous instances an older or less familiar word has been changed in H¹ to a newer or commoner one. Compare, for example, ll. 9, 10,

p^r O God art. and p^rilli *hod*.
 And p^reo persones. In *onhod*.

which is the reading of A and V, with

That oone God art in *trinite*,
 And thre persons in *unite*.

(In quoting H, I copy accents and all as given by the printer.) And l. 14,

p^rat *kineworpe* kyng. art vs above.

with

That *crowynd* kyng ys us above.

And ll. 209 seqq.,

Lucifer. gon wel lyke p^ro.
 p^ro Adam was. *bi swiken* so.

¹ In the remainder of this paper A will stand for the text as contained in Add. MSS. 22283, V for that in the Vernon MS., H for that printed by Mr. Halliwell, Fr. for the Old French poem as edited by Mr. Cooke from the Corpus Christi MS., and Fr. 2. for the other French text also edited by Mr. Cooke from Harl. 1121. The lines quoted are those of A, unless otherwise specified.

For alle þe Fendes. hedden *onde*.
 Þæt he scholde come. to þæt Blisful londe.

with

Lucyferē con well lyke tho,
 That Adam had *trespast* so,
 For alle the fendes hadyn *hocoŵre*
 That mon shuld wonyn in the blessed honowre.

So H changes *goodschipes* (l. 16) into *goodnesses*, *at sprong* (l. 152) into the simple form *spronge* (indeed H ignores the prefix *at* altogether), scholde *pole* pulke doom (l. 180) into shulde *have* the same dome, po he Godes heste *at seet* (l. 235) into tho he Goddys heste *breke*, *þeuwe* (l. 245) into *servaunt*, *studefastschipe* (l. 282) into *studfastnes*, *be siht* (l. 311) into *insyht*, *milce* (l. 328 and several other places) into *grace* or *swetnes*, *vnwreste* (l. 335) into *gret synne*, *þr mīde* (l. 374) into *therwith*, *swipe I. lome* (l. 435) into *wondur sone*, *at stonden* (l. 493) into *stonden*, *we be clepeþ* (l. 498) into *we clepyn aȝeyne*, *dep polyen* (l. 590) into *suffre deth*, *forschip-pyng* (l. 638) into *forshapon thyng*, *deruen* (l. 674) into *harme*, *rihtfulnesse* (l. 800) into *ryhtwesnes*, *pouste* (i. e. power, l. 860) into *hed* (i. e. head), *wreyh* (l. 916) into *kend*, *sauhten* (l. 931) into *make at oon*, *ententifliche* (i. e. attentively, l. 953) into *soone*, *polmodnes* (l. 983) into *pacyens*, *godschipe* (l. 984) into *mekenesse*, *vnworþ* (l. 1110) into *unworthy*, *wandrepe* (l. 1113) into *wondur*, *hou fynliche* in herte god louep þe (l. 1130) into *how truly* in hert God loved the, *vnwresteschipe* (l. 1141) into *gret gult*, *atter* (l. 1148) into *galle*, *otewyse* (l. 1149, where this word is no doubt equivalent to the A.S. *atelic* and the *ateliche* of the Owl and Nightingale) into *unlawfull*, *woke* (l. 1151) into *evyll*, *tipelynge* (l. 1178) into *halfondele*, *mungen* (i. e. mention, l. 1191) into *say*, *redes mon* (l. 1223) into the simple noun *mon*, *burīels* (l. 1282) into *towmbe*, *sonenday* (= A.S. *Sunnan dæg*, l. 1404) into *Sonday*, *mis-bileuenesse* (l. 1426) into *misbeleve*, *glīt* (l. 1450, = glideth or proceedeth, speaking of the Holy Ghost) into *precedit*, *eft I. boren* (l. 1457) into *twyes boryn*, *vnwrestliche* (l. 1464) into *unkyndely*, the *forme mon* (l. 1473) into the *first mon*; and many more instances might be added to the list.

II. In all of these, however, the general sense of the passage is preserved, or not greatly disturbed, but in many cases the writer seems quite to have failed to apprehend the true sense of the words before him, which therefore he had little scruple about changing, sometimes making sad nonsense by doing so. Take for example ll. 28 seqq. of A,

.... vche mon ouhte. w^t al his mihte
Lof song syngen. to god þerne.
 W^t such speche. as he con lerne.
 No monnes mouþ. ne beo *I. dut*.
 Ne his leodene. *I. hud*.

In H this passage stands thus:¹

Uche mon awght with all is myȝt,
 (this line being connected with what precedes)

Looryng to synge to Good full þorne,
 With syche speche als he con lorne;
 No mones ay ne be *adrede*,
 Ne his ledone shall not be *hed*,
 To herien God &c.

Here absolute nonsense has been substituted for a clear and consistent sense, simply because the copyist was unacquainted with the words *lof song*, which is the A.S. *lofsang*, Germ. *lobgesang*, a song of praise, *i-dut* = shut, from A.S. *dyttan*, and *i-hud* = A.S. *gehyden*, hidden. In l. 49 H reads—

But ther werene fowre systren *i-boren*
 For a prisoner that wes for-lorene,

where—to say nothing of the *e* unlawfully attached to *weren* and *forloren*—the *i-boren*, which is perfectly unmeaning here, stands for *to-boren* as rightly given in A and V. The word clearly means divided against one another, at war. *I-coren*, i. e. chosen, puzzled the writer of H, in l. 203,

Carefuliche. he hap *I. coren*.

He therefore changed the expression into—

Carfullyche he hath *hym boryne*.

In ll. 289 seqq. A reads—

¹ Possibly however it was not precisely so in the MS. Mr. Halliwell—whose courtesy, when I called upon him some four years since to make some inquiries relative to this poem and the sources of the text, I have great pleasure in acknowledging—informed me that the first two or three pages of the MS. were in so bad a condition that he was under the necessity of filling up some lacunæ conjecturally.

Foure douȝtren. hedde þe kyng.
 And to vchone. *sunderlyng*.
 He ȝaf a dole. of his fulnesse.
 Of his miht. &c.

H makes this, though one would suppose the sense was plain enough,—

And foure dowghtryne hede this kyng,
 And to uche *he wes lovyng*, &c.

The reading of Fr. is—

Quatre fillies ot ceu rei
 A chescune dona *par sei*.
 Son afferant de sa substance
 De son sen. de sa puissance.

Lines 441, 442 in A are—

For Pees bi leueþ. In no londe.
 Wher þat is werre. *nuy. and. onde*.

This H facetiously turns into—

For Pes ne bydyth in no londe,
 Ther as werre is *nyjh-honde*.

Fr. does not help us much here. Mr. Cooke prints—

Kar peis ne demeuret nne
 En guerre ne en atie.

Here *une* is evidently an error for *mie*, ne ... *mie* in Old French being equivalent to ne ... *pas*; but as to *atie*, I can find no trace of such a word. In Fr. 2. these lines are omitted. (Mr. Furniwall suggests its connexion with the A.S. *hatian*, to hate, *hate*, *hête*, hate, hatred, &c., so as to mean *hatred*.)

The phrase *sauȝt and some* occurs three times (or oftener) in A and V, viz. in

- l. 459, I. am þi douȝter. *sauȝt and some*.
- l. 518, But my sustren. ben *sauȝt and some*.
- l. 550, And pees. and Riht cussen. &. be *sauȝt & some*.

In the first of these we find in H “and of the i-nome”; in the second, “at oone”; and in the third, “sawght sone”. The *some*, however, is doubtless very good English. It has escaped the notice of our lexicographers as yet, but the A.S. *som* = agreement, concord, shows plainly what the O.E. adjective in this phrase means.

In Fr. we have the following lines (387-392, corresponding to 475-480 of A)—

Mes purquei serroit asise
 Ne verite ne justise.
 Se pur la peis nun garder
 Justice nad autre mester.
 Mes ke la peis soit sauvee
 Serrai jo doncs refusee.

In A the passage stands as follows, only I will take the liberty of punctuating for once.

Ac what is hit euer pe bet
 pat Riht and Soþ ben i-set,
 Bote heo witen wel pe Pees?
 Rihtes *mester* hit is and wes
 In vche dom pees to maken;
 Schal I þenne be forsaken?

Here there can be little doubt the translator understood the *mester* of the original poem in the sense of *mestier*, or in modern French *métier*, and that he was right in so taking it. H however (p. 21) gives us, changing the pronoun also,—

Ryhtes *maystur* sheo is and wes.

Again, Fr. has the lines (1027 seqq., corresponding to 1051 seqq. of A),—

E si de toi puissance noie
 Quide tu donc tolr ma proie.
 Nai. le covenant est fermez
 E en la grant cort *cyrografez*.

Or in a modern form thus: "Et si je n'ai pas de pouvoir sur toi, prétends-tu donc me ravir ma proie? Non: la convention est confirmée, et *chirographie* dans la grande cour." No doubt the learned bishop, whom Matthew of Westminster and Matthew Paris both declare to have been an excellent Greek scholar, was thinking of the *χειρόγραφον* of St. Paul (Epistle to the Colossians, 2. 14), when he wrote down the word which I have so uncouthly modernized. For *chirographer* is not, I believe, a recognized French word, and I cannot find either in Kelham or elsewhere that *cyrografe* ever was such; but Grosseteste may well have derived it for himself from the New Testament, for his acquaintance with the Sacred Scriptures is very manifest, and that too in many passages where the translator has not understood

the allusion. If now we turn to A, the passage above quoted appears in this form:—

Paub I. nabbe. miht. ouer pe
Weneston mi preye. to bi nyme me.
Nai for þat forward. þorw. Sop. and. Riht.
Faste i god^s court. is *congraffet* a pliht.

So it stands also in V, but in H (p. 46) the last two lines are thus metamorphosed:—

Nay! for that foreward, sothe and ryht,
Fulle faste in Goddys court thei *con it dyht*,
That wo so breke Goddys hest, &c.

where at least the *con-* of the earlier text is retained. What these lines in H mean, it may remain for the ingenious to determine.

Another passage in H (pp. 57, 58) which seems not very intelligible is the following:—

Therefore this vertu no mon telle con,
Of his myht ne of his strengthe how it geth,
But *as mon that aryvede flet*,
Sumwhad towchin I chull fonde
Of that that I may nnderstonde.

But the sense that *ought* to be conveyed is clear enough when we turn to Fr. (ll. 1283 seqq.):—

Pur ceo ne pent dire nus hom
Son grant poeir ne sa force
Meis *come en rougant l'escorce*, &c.

c'est à dire, comme en rongant l'écorce, a sense which comes out clearly enough in A (lines 1304 seqq.), where the poet promises, keeping up the same figure, just to touch on the surface, to peel the rind, of his lofty theme.

But as a mon. þe Rynde flep.
Sūwhat touchen. Ichulle fonde
Of þat Ich may. vndurstonde.

My last example of this kind of blunder, though many more might be cited, is from l. 1448, where A has,—

Þat heo by leuen i godes sone. þt is in him.
And þat vche mon. *folwede* him.
In þe Fader. and in þe sone. also.
And in þe holigost. &c.

The first two of these lines, though confirmed by V, appear

to be corrupt; yet there can be no doubt that *folwede* here = baptized, A.S. *fullode*. So it is in Fr., ll. 1424 seqq.—

Kil en le fiz deu creussent
E baptizes touz feussent.
El nun del pere e del fiz
E del seintisme esperiz.

But in H the passage stands thus:—

That they shuld be-levyn in God Allmyght,
And his lawes *folewyn*, as hit is ryght,
In the Fadur nome &c.

Yet where the participle of the same verb occurs seven lines lower down, H 1460, p. 64, it seems to have been rightly understood.

3ef he *i-folewed* be and be good lyfe,
Thawgh he dye, his soule shalle be in no stryfe.

III. The next point to be noticed relates to the inflexions of words, certain old forms being either wholly rejected in H, or rarely and exceptionally retained.

Thus there are in A and V the plurals *soulen*, *pynen lawen*, *serwen* (= sorrows), *kuynden* (= natures), *weeden*, *deden*, *tymen* (in V, l. 1403), which are all changed in H into *sowles*, *lawes*, *kyndys*, *tymes*, or put in the singular.

The verbal plurals in *-th* which occur now and then in A and V, are commonly kept by H, though in H 824, p. 36, we have—

And *kepyn* these castel so welle,
where the earlier text reads,—

And *witeþ*. pis Castel. so wel.

And the form *habbeth* is almost always turned into *han*, as in—

- l. 462. Mi two sustren. me *habbeþ* forsake.
- l. 565. 3e *habbeþ* I. herd. as ich ou tolde.
- l. 1217. 3e *habbeþ* I. herd. of swete Jhū.

In the last of these places, H gives (l. 1224, p. 54),—

Whan I herd now of swete Jhesu;

but this is evidently a typographical error, or a mistake in copying, for “*3e han i-herd*”, the printed text giving no consistent sense¹.

¹ Another case in which the participial prefix has been taken for the

The forms of the pronouns also are very commonly modernized in H; especially *she*, *it*, and *they* are frequently—the last of these almost invariably—substituted for the older forms. Thus H, ll. 379, 380, p. 17, stands thus—

That þof *sheo* may with here mylde speche

Savyn alle that *she* wolle for besechyn;

where in each line *heo* is the older reading. In H 688 sq. (p. 30) we read,—

Ne no tonge may *it* telle,

Ne thougt *it* thenk, ne mowth *it* spelle;

where the earlier text has,—

Ne no tonge. ne may *hit* telle.

Ne pouht þenche. ne mouþ spelle.

Yet *hit* occurs most frequently in H, and *it* appears in many instances when, as in the line last quoted, there is no corresponding word in A or V. But this corruption of the text oftenest occurs in the pronoun of the third person plural, which in Old English is usually *heo* or *he*, from the A.S. *hi*. In A we have, ll. 281 seqq.—

Of on wille. *heo* weoren bo.

And of on studefastschipe. also

Of on fulnesse. *heo* weoren out riht.

And boþe *heo* weoren. of on miht.

In H (p. 13) this becomes,—

Of oone wyllle *they* were boo,

And of oone studfastnes also;

first personal pronoun, as in *I herd* just quoted, occurs in H, l. 651, p. 28, where

Ne shap therto non nes,

As byforen *I red* wes;

is printed instead of

As byforen *i-red* wes.

A gives—and we may notice in passing that H has here mistaken even the common word *schaft* = creature—

Ne no schaft þorw him. miht lees.

As bi foren. *I. rad* wes.

And no doubt the reading in the MS. of H is much the same, yet the meaning of the line is pretty clearly, “as was before explained”. Fr. and Fr. 2. are very obscure:

Kar en defaute nest pas fet

Com avant vous ai retret.

Of oon volnes *they* were ful ryȝt,
And bothe *thei* werene of on myȝht.

In like manner *ich*, which is found frequently, perhaps most commonly in A and V, is in H always turned into *I*, and *Ichabbe*, as in l. 967,

And *Ichabbe*. I. wust wiȝ winne.
ȝe ȝreo lawen. wt outen synne.

becomes in H

And *I* have kept with wyne &c.

As to adjectives used attributively: the rule that an *e* should be appended before plural nouns, or if any determinative precedes the adjective, is generally observed in A and V, often violated in H. For example, on p. 51 of H we have "*alle* his face" where A has *al*, "*gret* boffetys" where A has *grete*, "*unlawfull* werk us", "*evyll* thowghtys" where A has *woke*, "*syche* peyne" (which can hardly be satisfactorily accounted for by the fact that *peine* is feminine in French), "*seche* a frynde" where A has "*such* frendschipe". But H offends most commonly in the word *alle*—doubtless because the word is so common. It cannot be affirmed that we find no errors in the use of this word in A or V; for instance A has—

In *al* ȝe lymes. ȝat haȝ ȝe mon.

where both V and H have *alle*; but this is evidently a mere accident. (When A and V have the often repeated phrase "*alle* ȝing", this is not an error: *ȝing* in Old English was doubtless the same in the plural as in the singular, as it was in Anglo-Saxon in the nom. and acc.¹, like *wif*, *cild*, *beorn*, and some other nouns). But H is by no means fastidious on this point. Such expressions as "*alle* this volnesse", "*alle* that was of his begynnynge", "*alle* seche wyt", "*alle* syche wone", are of continual occurrence; while by the side of these we find "*all* we that of him come", "*all* tho that of hem two spronge", and in H l. 879, p. 38, we have "*all* thyng".

It may also be observed here that uninflected words in H are often modernized, where A and V retain the ancient

¹ See Deut. 32. 47, Mark 7. 8, both quoted by Bosworth.

forms. *All* is an example: *al* occurs, I think, only once throughout H (l. 830, p. 36). Others are *thrall*, *shall*, *will*, *well*, &c. with the *l* doubled; *worship*, *lordship*, *frensship*, without the final *e*; *fully*, *unkyndely*, *pacyently*, for *-liche*; (but *trewelye* in one place in A and V); *gostly* for *gostlich* (or *-liche* with a determinative, as in l. 839); *ené*, *gloteiné*, *mystré* (?) for *-y* or *-ie*; and lastly, the prefix *be* for *bi* passim.

IV. The inferiority of the text in H is also apparent in the great irregularity of the metre. The original French poem and the translation as given in A and V, are both written in what we should now call octosyllabic verse, except that neither French nor English poets six centuries since counted their syllables, like Racine and Pope. At any rate in the poems now referred to—as in Coleridge's *Christabel*—there are regularly four *accented* syllables in each line, though the whole number of syllables may be ten or eleven, at least in the English, or as few as six. Just such is the case with Chaucer, who has generally preferred a five-fold ictus in his *Canterbury Tales*, though the number of his syllables varies from eight to twelve: see for instance, in his description of the Friar, the second and fourth of these lines,—

It is not honest, it may not avaunce,
For | to de | len with | such | poraille,
But al with riche and sellers of vitaille.
And óver | al thér e | ny pro | fyt schulde | arise,
Curteys | he was | and low | e of | servise.

With this we may compare a passage from the French of the *Chateau d'Amour*:—

Un | enfant | nus | est nez
E | un fiz | nus est | donez.
Son | empi | re sos | tendra
E | son non | nome | serra. &c.

Here the initial unaccented syllable is dropped in every line, though in the great majority of the lines—see for instance those cited above—there will be found to be eight or nine syllables. And in the first of the lines just quoted the unaccented syllable of the third foot is also dropped. And just so in the earlier English text the initial syllable

is often wanting, and sometimes in each half of the line; for our poet often divides his lines with a strongly marked *cæsura*. Take for example the following, ll. 1329 seqq.—

To | þe Crois. | he | con come.
 And wol | de habbe. | his soule | I. nome
 Ac | he fayle | de. þe | Traitour.
 He was | a ba | ted. of | his tour.

In these lines we either have the normal quota of syllables, or a smaller number. Here are examples of lines with syllables in excess:—

l. 1336. *pidere* | for *hise*. | þat hed | de neode.

The A.S. *pyder* gives no authority for pronouncing the final *e* of *pidere*; but the *hise* is distinctly plural, so that the *e* may be, and probably ought to be, sounded, making the second foot of the line a tribrach with the ictus of course on the second syllable.

l. 1464. *Sikerliche*. | *vnwrest* | *liche*. | he dep.

Here the first foot is of three syllables, and the third only of one. We know that *siker* is not accented on the second syllable.

l. 1175. And þe fe | *lynge*. he | schal leo | sen an ende.

l. 1138. *Seppen* A | dam for | mest. sun | ne bi gon.

“Since Adam first began to sin”. *Sunne* being an infinitive may, and probably ought to, sound the last syllable. In these lines then we have a redundant syllable in both the first and the fourth foot. And some lines that occur are far more refractory than these, but their number is small indeed compared with those that we find in H, such as the following. I give the older readings also.

H. It to wonen and it to welde to syche ende.

A. To wonen. and welden. to such ende.

H. That to us sayd wysly,

A child is boren to us.

A. þat vs tolde. treweye.

A child þer is. I. boren to vs.

H. Whos name shalle byn.

V. Whos nome schal. I. nempned beon.

H. How the world made is.

A. How þe world. I. maked is.

H. Tho Adam and hys osprynge shulle hevynne aȝeyne fulfyllen.

A. And whon hit forþ com. al þe streon.¹

H. Fro that day to this.

A. From þat ilke day. to þis.

H. But for the wonnyng of him hit was not long.

A. For nis no wone. on him I. long.

These are all from the first ten pages of Mr. Halliwell's edition, and are by no means all that might be culled thence.

V. In H moreover lines are in several places inserted or omitted, apparently without the sanction of the earlier English text or of the original French. On p. 18 of Mr. Halliwell's edition are the lines—

And he dede thi hestes breke,

And oon him thou woldest by ryȝt be wreke;

to which there is nothing corresponding in A, V, or Fr. The omission of five lines before the last line but one on p. 22, is probably accidental, as the omission of an *odd* number of lines of course interferes with the rhyme. After l. 765, p. 33, H inserts—

For hoe may allerbest,

And hoe woll allerblyvest,

again without any discoverable authority. The same is the case with the distich on p. 44 with which H strives to mend the good bishop's theology, though it is very likely the latter would have resented the impertinence.

But ȝef thei hem amende,

Of that they dude God afende.

On p. 51, after, They ȝevyn him galle to dryng, and eysile, H adds,—

The Jewes deden this to him for gret vylny,

Bote he suffred hit alle pacyently.

On the contrary after the second line on p. 53,

And so he overcome the batayle,

there are two lines wanting, as appears from A:—

Kuynde ne mihte þole. such peyne non

For þe fend ne miȝte. hit neuer leggē on.

¹ *Streon* is one of the words which H always changes, spoiling many a passage by doing so. Yet the writer seems to have had a dim notion of the meaning.

And the French is to the same effect:—

Tant ne peut diable charger,
Ne nature endurer.

But the longest passage which is contained in one of these English texts and not in the other, is at the end of the poem, where H has rightly retained upwards of 300 lines which are omitted in A and V. That this long passage is an integral part of the poem may be readily demonstrated. First, it is contained in both the French texts as published in the Caxton Society's volume. It is contained also in the English imitation of the Chateau d'Amour which forms part of the same volume. And lastly it is promised, though the promise is not fulfilled, in the introductory portion of A and V themselves. The subject of the 300 lines in question is well stated in the summary prefixed to the poem in Harl. 1121:—"coment [il est] prince du pees. de la fyn du siecle. del jour de iuyse. de les peines denfern. de les ioies du ciel;" and that it was intended to include this portion in the English translation in A and V, is sufficiently evident from the lines, 65 seqq., to which there is nothing in the French original to correspond:—

..... and prince of pes
Alle peose nomen. hou he wes.
3e schul I. heren. and I. witen.
And of domes dai. hou hit is I. writen.
And of heuene. we schulen telle.
And sumdel. of þe pyuen of helle.

Instead however of carrying out this design, A and V, at the end of the narrative of the ascension of Christ, abruptly take leave of their guide, and wind up in eleven lines for which they are not indebted to the French.

VI. It is but fair to H, which is right in this notable instance, to add that there are other passages here and there in which this text has preserved the true reading which A and V have lost. See for instance H 529, p. 23, where the divine Son addressing the Father says,—

And so thou me in thy werk *broughtest*,
the last word being *bouhtest* in both A and V.

In A 579 we read—

Herkneþ *vhone*. loue. and boxūnes.
Which Milce. and eke swetnes.
þat God from heuene alihte. *and* ches.
For O. *Mon*. þat he lees.
þritti ȝeer. he *liuede*. and eode.
To sechen on. In vncouþ peode.

With this, which is also the reading of the Vernon Manuscript, let us compare H (p. 25):—

Herkeneth *weche* love, wych bucsomnesse,
Whiche grace and whiche swetnesse,
That Good from hevyn to *alyht* ches,
For oon *sele shepe* that he les;
His fadur blysse he *leuede*, and ther fro ȝeode
To seche theke shepe in uncowthe ȝode.

This makes a good and consistent sense, except that the last word evidently ought to be *peode* as in A and V. We see now that the *vhone* of A must be *which*; that the *ches*, a transitive verb without an object, must get rid of the *and* before it and then govern *alihten* or *alihtē* as a dependent infinitive; that the *mon* must be exchanged for *shepe*; and—taking the Fr. also into consideration—that we must turn *þritti ȝeer he liuede* into *pe nīti nīne he leuede*. With the parable to which the bishop alludes, the English copyists were evidently unacquainted: not so, I venture to think, the translator himself. The French runs thus:—

Ore oez de si grant amur
Si grant pitie si grant ducor.
Ke deu du ciel descendi
Pur sowaylle¹ kil perdi.
Nonante noef i lessa
Pur une quere sen ala.

Or in English: "Hear now of so great love, so great pity, so great sweetness; that God descended from heaven for his sheep that he lost. He left there (the) ninety-nine, (and) went his way to seek one."

In l. 682 A and V have—

For smale Toures. þ^t beoþ abouten.

H is doubtless right in reading—

¹ = sa ouaille, or in the modern form, son ouaille, = suam oviculam.

Fourre smale toure (leg. toures) ther beth abowte.

Fr. runs thus:—

E nuirun ad quatre tureles
En tut le mund ni a sibeles.

That is, "Environ il a quatre tourelles: dans tout le monde il n'y a pas de si belles."

One instance more. In ll. 1393 seqq., A has—

He is vre Fader. ariht.
And so goodliche. vs haþ I. diht.
þat wt his blod. he vs *waked* of synne
And brongt vs out of wo. to winne.

For *waked* H reads *wassheth*; and that this is the right verb, though the wrong tense, is clear enough even before we appeal to the French—

Ke de son douz sanc nus *lava*.

This may suffice in the way of comparison of the text printed by Mr. Halliwell with those contained in the MSS. I have named.

It may be worth while to explain a little more fully the character of the so-called English Version of the Chateau d'Amour published by the Caxton Society from MS. Eg. 927. This will best be done by giving a brief outline of the contents of this poem and comparing it step by step with the French.

The first 14 lines are introductory, and bear a certain resemblance to the first 14 lines of the French. Lines 15 to 40 of the French are passed over in this version, in which lines 15 to 50 are "Of the begynnyng of the world", and lines 51 to 72 are "Of the losyng of the world thurgh synne", and in these portions there is again a certain resemblance—and that is all—to lines 41 to 204 of the French. Then follow in the English 74 lines "Of the ten commandments", of which not a word is in the French. The ten commandments, I may observe, are those of the Roman Catholic rituals of the present day, and not as in the 20th chapter of Exodus in our English Bibles; that is to say, the 2nd commandment is omitted, and the 10th is made into two. Line 147,

A kyng ther was of soverayne worthines,
and the 17 lines that follow, are a free translation of lines 205 to 234 of the French. Then follows the pleading of Mercy for the prisoner, and the arguments of "Sothfastnes" and of "Riȝtwysnes" against him, in 54 lines (175 to 228) loosely imitating 136 lines of the French. The next 22 lines are simply an interpolation. The sections which follow, headed "Here spake Pece", and "Here spak the kinges sone", 56 lines, answering to 86 of the French. The next 12 lines, corresponding to just 12 of the original, are a tolerably fair specimen of what was the "munk of Sallay's" notion of translating. The French, ll. 457 to 468, runs thus:—

Cil ki cest ensample entent
Purra ver apertement.
Ki ceste signefiance
Est en deu une puissiance.
De deu le pere est tute riens
Par deu le fiz sunt fet tuz bien
E en deu le seinz esperiz
Est tute riens acompliz.
Un deu sanz devisiun
Une sustance e plusiun.¹
La beneicon atrestuz doint
Ki cest escrit entendront.

This our monk renders:—

Who so redes this romance
Trowe in god with on substance
But on is god and persons thre
Non othir thing in god may be
For sisters that we before rede
Are four vertues in the godhede
To four doghters thai have lyknyng
For thai procure all gode doying
Bot all thai are on god of myȝtes mast
He is fader son and haly gast
If thou trowe this welle and stedfastly
Thou may have mede ay lastandly.

Then follows "Here spak the king"; but the speech has no existence in the French.

¹ *Plusiun*: sic in both MSS., but the meaning is not clear.

And so the quasi-translator continues, translating pieces here and there, inserting much and omitting more, till we come to line 878. Here four consecutive sections, 132 lines in all, are interpolated, the first treating of the fourteen "articles of trouth", the second "of the seven sacraments", the third "of the seven giftes of the haligast", and the fourth, which is very curious and interesting, "of antecristes commyng". The remaining sections are "Of the day of dome", "Of the paynes of helle", "Of the joyes of heaven", as in the French, which the writer condescends to follow a little more closely— not much— than he has done elsewhere. The concluding lines are:—

Here endes the myroure of lewed men

A munk made this myroure onlye for lewed mennes sake
Thou that wille se saul hele this thi myroure thou take.

I have not seen the MS. (Eg. 927) from which this "version" is taken, but to judge from the printed text I should think it very doubtful whether Mr. Cooke is right in calling this "a good specimen of the English of the XIIIth century". I should rather assign it to the latter half of the fourteenth century.

Nor can I assent to Mr. Halliwell's decision that the text which he has published, belongs to the early part of the fourteenth century, if he means to imply this when he says that "the translation was made" at that period. The translation indeed, as it existed in the old MS. or MSS. from which V, A, and H were all copied, may have been of that age or even older; but so very numerous are the corruptions and late forms and idioms in Mr. Halliwell's text, that I believe the now missing MS. which he has followed, must have been copied from a much older MS. by some person of little learning and less taste not before the fifteenth century.
