

The "Ancren Riwe"

Author(s): G. C. Macaulay

Source: *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Jan., 1914), pp. 63-78

Published by: [Modern Humanities Research Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3713428>

Accessed: 25/06/2014 07:52

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Modern Humanities Research Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Modern Language Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE 'ANCREN RIWLE.'

PROSPECTS have been several times held out of a new edition of the *Ancren Riwle*, the most important prose text of the earlier Middle English period. There seems, however, to be no immediate likelihood of getting it; and meanwhile we are dependent upon the text edited by Morton for the Camden Society as long ago as 1853, based upon a manuscript which departs widely from what seems to have been the original form of the text. A considerable number of difficulties are to be found in Morton's text which can be removed by collation of the other manuscripts, but these have never been made available for critical purposes. Morton, indeed, gave a certain number of various readings from two of them, and sometimes proposed an emendation of the text on the basis of these readings, but his collation is very unsystematic, and the manuscript which presents by far the most accurate text was not seen by Morton, and has never been utilised at all, so far as the public is concerned.

I have recently made a complete collation of this manuscript (Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 402) with Morton's text, and propose to publish a selection of the results, together with the readings of all the other thirteenth century manuscripts in the passages dealt with. This collation has the practical effect of removing most of the textual difficulties, and of setting right in a good many instances the connexion of sentences and the punctuation. In addition to this, attention will be especially called to several passages of considerable interest which are found in the Corpus manuscript, and to some extent in others, but have never as yet been printed.

As a preliminary to this textual work, I propose to investigate the relation of the English *Ancren Riwle* to the existing French and Latin versions.

I.

THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE.

Morton, in the Preface to his edition, stated that a manuscript copy of the *Ancren Riwle* in Latin and another of the same book in French had formerly existed among the Cotton MSS. (Vitellius E. vii and F. vii), but that both these had been destroyed in the fire of 1731. This statement has been repeated by others, and apparently no regard has been paid to the fact that many of the manuscripts reported as destroyed in that fire, or so damaged as to be useless, have in recent years been very carefully and skilfully restored. As a matter of fact MS. Cotton, Vitellius F. vii may be said to have been completely restored; that is, all the leaves of it exist, and though they are shrunk and to some extent discoloured, the writing upon them may, I think, be almost completely made out, except in the case of a line or two at the top of each page. The other book mentioned (Vitellius E. vii) has suffered far more severely, and only a part of it has been to any extent restored. Moreover, the existing leaves are so much damaged that it is impossible to read the book continuously anywhere, and we can only judge of its nature by such fragments as we are able to make out.

Let us deal first with the French book, Vitellius F. vii.

This is a folio of 164 leaves measuring on an average now about $8\frac{1}{2}$ inches in height, but formerly more, written in two columns to the page, 43 lines to the column, in a good hand, probably of the beginning of the fourteenth century. The article with which we are concerned occupies the first part of the volume, ff. 1—70. The treatise which these leaves contain is identical with that which we have in English under the name of *Ancren Riwle* (or *Ancrene Wisse*). The two books indeed correspond so minutely, that it is impossible not to feel that one must have been directly translated from the other. It should be mentioned, however, that at a certain point in the French book there is a considerable omission, evidently caused by loss of leaves in the manuscript from which it was copied. On f. 31 the text passes without any visible break from p. 166, l. 10, to p. 208, l. 11, of Morton's edition, the transition being effected, without regard to sense, as follows: 'lessez le siecle ceo dit il et venez a mei cest la fin ouekes coment la ceue point et vistement fueiez vous ent a veoir ceo qe vous soiez enuenimee.' The amount that is omitted would about correspond to the contents of eight leaves in a manuscript of the same form as this, and it is reason-

able to suppose that a whole quire had been lost in the book which the copyist had before him.

In a case of this kind the *a priori* probabilities are of course in favour of the supposition that the English was translated from the French; and this presumption is greatly strengthened by the occurrence of so many French words in the vocabulary of this early text. It is true that the French manuscript which we possess is later in date than the thirteenth century copies of the English *Ancren Riwle*; but it is clearly not an original, as is proved by the omission mentioned above, and it may be very far removed in date from the original. The language is not consistently of one period, but shows some older Anglo-Norman forms, together with others which are later, and have been influenced by central French. Whatever language, however, may have been first adopted for the book, we may say with some confidence that it was written in England¹.

The evidence that the English text is actually a translation from the French is, I think, convincing. A considerable number of passages may be cited in which it seems clear, for one reason or another, that the French has a better claim to be regarded as the original than the English. I select some of these, giving references always to the page and line of Morton's text, which for convenience I cite in the quotations.

P. 24, l. 11: 'entour cel heure come len chante messe en toutes religions,' and a few lines lower, 'quant prestres seculiers chaudent lour messes.' The English text looks like a misunderstanding of this, 'abute swuch time also me singeð messe in alle holi religiuns,' and below, 'hwon þe preostes of ðe worlde singeð hore messen.' In the original of course the distinction is between the regular and the secular clergy; and perhaps this may be intended in the English version.

P. 40, l. 12: 'Dame seinte marie pur icele grant ioie qe parempli toutes les autres · quant il vous receut en sa tresgrande ioie'; that is, 'for the sake of that great joy which fulfilled all the rest' etc. The English text has 'uor þe ilke muchele blisse þet fulde al þe eorðe,' where 'eorðe' is probably a corruption of 'oðere.' One manuscript indeed has 'alle þeode' corrected later to 'alle oþere².' The French text gives the sense that is required, and cannot have been derived from the English, with the misleading word 'fulde.'

P. 50, l. 1: 'Pur iceo mes trescheres soeres le mielz qe vous unqes

¹ The passage corresponding to p. 82, l. 13 is written at the top of a column, and for the most part cannot be made out, but the word 'Angleterre' seems to be pretty distinctly visible.

² MS. Cotton, Cleop. c. vi.

poez^r gardez voz ouertures^r tout soient eles petites.' English: 'Uorþui mine leoue sustren, þe leste þ̅ ȝe euer muwen luuieð our þurles, al beon heo lutle.' There seems here to have been a confusion in the translator's mind or eye between 'mielz' and 'meinz,' and he made the best he could of 'gardez' accordingly.

P. 66, l. 11: Noiez pas nature de geleyne · la geleine quant ele ad ponus(?) ne...fors iangler · me qe gaigne ele de ceo · vient la chawe... li told ses oees et deuoert toutz dunt ele dust mener auant pigons vifs. Tout ausi la chawe denfer le diable, etc.¹ English: 'Nabbe heo nout henne kunde. þe hen hwon heo haueð ileid, ne con buten kakelen. And hwat bigit heo þerof? Kumeð þe coue anonriht 7 reueð hire hire eiren, 7 fret al þ̅ of hwat heo schulde uorð bringen hire cwike briddes: 7 riht also þe luðere coue deuuel,' etc.

In the first place 'Noiez pas' means 'Do you not hear?' (i.e. 'Have you not heard?'), an expression which occurs also elsewhere in this text in introducing illustrations². This seems here to have been confused with 'Neietz pas,' 'Do not have.' Then as to the rest of the sentence, the French seems to throw light on what has hitherto been a difficulty in the English text, namely the use of the word 'coue.' In the French, 'chawe' and 'chawe' are clearly substantives, and stand for the name of a bird, that which is given in Godefroy with the forms 'choe,' 'choue,' 'chave,' 'cave,' 'kauwe,' meaning 'owl' or sometimes 'jackdaw' ('monedula'). (I leave aside the question whether these are actually all forms of the same word.) Probably in the original French text the word may have been 'caue' or 'kaue,' and 'caue' is the form found in the better English manuscripts. In any case the meaning is clear in the French and obscure in the English, apparently from a misunderstanding. The French says that when the hen cackles, the jackdaw comes and devours her eggs; and so the 'jackdaw of hell,' the devil, comes and devours the good works of the anchoress who chatters about them. In the English text there has apparently been a confusion between 'caue' as the name of a bird (unknown in English) and the adjective 'caue' from OE 'cáf.' The fact that an adjective was understood by some readers in both places is shown by the substitution in one manuscript³ of 'ȝeape' in the earlier clause and of 'luðere' in the later, for 'caue.' The expression 'jackdaw of hell' may be paralleled from other passages of the *Ancren Riwle*, e.g. 'corbin of helle,' 'cat of helle.'

¹ This passage is difficult to read, and I cannot make it all out with certainty.

² E.g. 'Me surquide sire^r noyez vous qe dauid lami dieu,' etc. (p. 56, l. 10).

³ Cotton, Titus D, xviii.

P. 128, l. 23: 'ausi le fet entre multes ascune maluree recluse,' 'so do some unhappy recluses among many': that is, a few of the many that there are. The English is 'ase deð, among moni men, sum uniseli recluse,' which is meaningless.

P. 136, l. 13. 'Si auant come ele puit seit Iudith cest viue dure,' 'let her so far as she can be Judith, that is live hardly.' The English has 'ze, uor so heo mei beon Iudit, þet is libben herde'; but the expression 'uor so' is not justified by the sense, for the preceding sentence has no reference to any conduct like that of Judith, whose example is introduced here as an additional point.

P. 138, l. 5: 'si tost come ele sent qele trop ensuagist,' 'as soon as she feels that it has grown too fat.' English, 'so sone heo iueleð þet hit awilegeð to swuðe.' The idea of fatness in reference to the 'fat calf' spoken of above is more appropriate than that of wildness, and it looks as if there had been some confusion of the rare word 'ensuagir' with some such supposed verb as 'ensauuagir,' 'to grow wild.'

P. 150, l. 13: 'perd la moestesce de la grace dieu,' 'loses the moisture of the grace of God,' the appropriate form of expression, as the metaphor is of the drying up of a branch. The English is 'forloseð þe swetnesse of Godes grace,' which is vague and conventional.

P. 222 (last line): 'prisent et eshaucent l'amoyne qele fet.' The original reading of the English here is 'herieð 7 heueð up þe elmesse þ heo deð.' This use of 'hebben up' in the sense of 'extol' will hardly be found except as a translation of 'exaltare' or 'eshaucer,' and the change to 'zelped of' in the Nero version of the text indicates that it was felt to be awkward.

P. 230, l. 10: 'Seinte Marie come forement se prist a ces porcs,' 'Saint Mary, how violently it acted on those swine.' The original reading of the English text is 'Seinte Marie, swa he stonc to þe swin,' a somewhat unusual expression, which arises, I am disposed to think, from a misreading of 'prist' as 'puist,' the preterite of 'puir.'

P. 286, l. 27: 'To much felreolac kundleð hire ofte. Vreo iheorted ze schule beo. Anker, of oðer freolac, haueð ibeon oðerhwules to freo of hire suluen.' This as it stands is nonsense. The French is needed to explain it. 'Trop grant franchise engendre cest souent · franche de queor deuez vous estre: Recluse nest daltre chose franche · ad ascune foiz estee trop franche de lecheresse sei meismes.' (The last words are corrupt and should be perhaps 'trop franche de legeresce de sei meismes.') This means, with reference to the practice of collecting alms by recluses, 'It often produces too great freedom. Free of heart

ye ought to be; but a recluse must not be free of any other thing. Sometimes a recluse has been too free of her own person.'

P. 288, l. 23: 'foð on ase to winken 7 forte leten þene ueond iwurðen.' This seems to come from the misunderstanding of the French: 'comence aici come de cloigner de lesser lenemi couenir,' 'begins also to incline to allow the enemy to come to terms.' The word 'cligner' ('cloigner') is the same as 'cliner' (Lat. 'clinare') and was used in French of the thirteenth century for 'to incline' or 'to close the eyes.'

P. 318, l. 3: 'Sire ceo fu fet od tiel homme · 7 nomer donqe · ou moigne ou prestre ou clerc · 7 de cel ordre · vne femme espouse ⁊ lede chose a femme tiele come ieo sui.' The English is, 'Sire, hit was mid swuche monne ⁊ nemnen þeonne—munuch, preost, oðer clerk, and of þet hode, iwedded mon, a loðleas þing, a wummon ase Ich am.'

The French here (except for 'vne femme espouse' for 'vn homme espous,' caught from three lines above) makes good sense and accounts fairly for the English, which in itself is very unsatisfactory.

P. 416, l. 25: 'Kar dunqe lui couendra penser del forage la uache del louer le pastour de querre la grace de mosser¹ · mandir le quant il les enparke · 7 nepurquant rendre les dampnages.' English, 'Vor þeonne mot heo þenchen of þe kues foddre, and of heorde-monne huire, oluhnen þene heiward, warien hwon me punt hire, 7 zelden, þauh, þe hermes.' It must often have struck readers of the English as a strange assumption that the anchoress would be under the necessity of 'cursing' the hayward for impounding her cows. The word 'warien' no doubt arises from a misunderstanding of 'mandir' as 'maudire.' However, the 'n' is quite plain, and the word is perhaps for 'mandier' (i.e. 'mendier'), 'to entreat,' or 'supplicate'.²

P. 420, l. 6: 'seez od chaudes kueleles.' In reading the English one is struck by the awkwardness of the expression 'beoð bi warme keppen.' The French of course means 'sit with warm head-coverings on,' and 'seez' has evidently been mistaken for 'seiez'.³

Against the cumulative effect of such passages as these there is very little that can be opposed on the other side. It may be argued

¹ The word 'mosser' in the French is probably, as M. Paul Meyer suggests to me, for 'messer,' 'messier' (the officer whose duty it was to keep cattle from trespassing on vineyards or other crops), and precisely corresponds to the English 'heiward.'

² It must be observed, however, that the ordinary form 'mendiant' occurs on f. 67 (cf. p. 414, l. 10).

³ Actually 'seez' occurs as present subjunctive of 'estre' in the passage corresponding to p. 378, l. 27; but 'soiez,' used repeatedly as imperative just below this, p. 380, ll. 4, 7, is the usual form; and this was no doubt earlier represented by 'seiez' (or 'seietz').

perhaps that the French text contains some words which would be more likely to occur in a translation from English than in an original work. For example we find the words 'housewif' and 'huswiferie'; 'ele nest pas housewif' (f. 67 v^o), 'Recluse qad anmaille resemble housewif sicome fu Marthe' (f. 68), 'huswiferie est la part Marthe' (f. 67 v^o). There is no reason, however, why these words should not occur in Anglo-Norman as written in England. They have not hitherto been recorded, but 'hosebaunde' and 'husbonderie' are found. Besides these we have 'kappes' ('chaudes kuueles qe l'en appelle kappes' f. 68), a word which is here definitely introduced as English, though it might very well occur in French, and near the same place 'wimple,' which is Anglo-Norman for 'guimple.'

One more point should be mentioned. On p. 240 of Morton's edition we have six lines of rhyming English verse in the long metre of the *Poema Morale*. The substance of these is given in the French version in prose: 'Pensiez souent od douleur de voz pecchez · pensez de la dolorouse peine denfer de les ioies de ciel · pensez de vostre mort demeisne · de la mort nostre seignour an la croiz,' etc. The fact that the English version of this is in metre and rhyme may fairly be taken to prove that here the English is the original. I take it, however, that these lines are not by the author of the *Ancren Riwe*, but are a quotation both in the French and the English versions, that the French writer, who was no doubt an Englishman, turned them into French prose when he adopted them for his purpose, and that the English translator, being familiar with the original, quoted them as verse. Something of the same kind probably occurred as regards the English proverbial saying which occurs on p. 96, 'euer is þe eie to the wude leie,' which appears in the French as 'touz iours est loil aloeur de bois,' but was naturally given in English in its popularly current form.

It may be observed that the French text, as we have it, contains four of the longer passages which are found in the Corpus MS. but not in Morton's text, though some of these are rather differently placed. Other variations are as follows: on p. 412, l. 26 ff., the directions about meat and drink are somewhat more elaborate in the French than in the English texts, the usages of the Canons of St Augustine and of the Benedictines being particularly cited: the play upon the words 'eiðurles' and 'eilþurles,' p. 62, l. 18, belongs, as may be supposed, to the English only, and so also does the explanation of the word 'tristre,' p. 333, l. 28: such an expression as 'þis is þet Englisch,' p. 272, l. 22, is

represented by 'C'est le francoys.' It may be noted that on p. 318, l. 7, where Morton's text has 'eode oðe pleouwe ine chircheie,' but where the older reading is 'Eode o ring i church zard,' the French has 'alai en carole en cimitiere.' In general, as will be seen later, the French text supports what seem to be the original readings, as opposed to those of the manuscript followed by Morton.

From this we turn to the Latin version represented by MS. Magd. Coll. Oxford, 67, and by the remains of MS. Cotton, Vitellius E. vii. This latter book, as we have said, has suffered very severely by the fire and only a small portion of it has been in any degree restored. In Smith's Catalogue (1696) Article 6 of this manuscript is thus described: 'Regulæ vitæ Anachoretarum utriusque sexus scriptæ per Simonem de Gandavo, Episcopum Sarum, in usum sororum.' Directly after this follows the title of the treatise *De Oculo*. But the British Museum Department of MSS. possesses a copy of this early catalogue with manuscript additions made before the fire, from which we learn that the book consisted altogether of 196 leaves, that Art. 6 began on f. 61 and extended to f. 133, where a new article began, described as 'Regula anchoritarum ex superiore (ut videtur) extracta.' Thus Art. 6 of Smith's Catalogue is given as consisting of two separate articles. What the extent of the second of these two was we do not know, because the indication of the leaf at which the next article begins has been cut off by the binder¹. But this article, the treatise *De Oculo* ascribed to Robert Grosseteste, which concluded the volume, must have occupied at least forty-five leaves of the manuscript, and therefore cannot have begun much later than f. 150. It seems pretty certain from the remains which exist, that the article which extended from f. 61 to f. 133 was the Latin version of the *Ancren Riwele*, and the shorter treatise which followed it was one written for anchorites of the male sex, and independent of the other, not extracted from it, as suggested in the manuscript additions to the catalogue. Altogether of these two treatises thirty-nine leaves are represented in the existing volume, numbered at present ff. 13—25 and 27—53². The last five leaves, ff. 49—53, do not belong to the *Ancren Riwele*, but no doubt to the treatise which followed it. We have therefore portions of thirty-four leaves of the *Ancren Riwele* in its Latin version, some fairly

¹ For information with regard to these manuscript additions to the catalogue I am indebted to Mr J. P. Gilson, Keeper of the Manuscripts.

² f. 26 has been placed among these by mistake, being a leaf of the treatise *De Oculo*, while ff. 33, 34 are two portions of the same original leaf.

well preserved, others mere fragments, in which it is difficult to make out more than a few consecutive words, and at present these leaves are very far from being arranged in the proper order, though here and there we find several consecutive¹. The Latin version which we have here is the same as that of the Magdalen College manuscript, with one important difference. The Magdalen MS. omits the eighth part, dealing with 'the External Rule' (or with 'Domestic Matters' as it is headed by Morton), but the Cotton MS. contained this, and considerable portions of it are preserved on ff. 45—48, which correspond roughly to pp. 408, 20—426, 14 of Morton's edition. The Cotton MS. seems to be of the former half of the fourteenth century, while the Magdalen College book can hardly have been written much earlier than 1400. It may be assumed that Smith found at the beginning of it the ascription of authorship to Simon of Ghent which he cites in his catalogue. The same ascription occurs, as is well known, in the Magdalen manuscript.

It seems still to be considered possible in some quarters that this Latin version is the original, and that the English *Ancren Riwele* was derived from it². The argument to that effect by E. E. Bramlette, in *Anglia*, vol. xv, pp. 478—498, deserves attention, because it is evidently founded upon a careful study of the Magdalen College manuscript, or rather of the copy of it furnished to him by Kölbing. We cannot, however, accept his conclusions. He has succeeded in invalidating a few of Morton's arguments, but he is far from having established, or even rendered probable, the thesis which he maintains. As, however, he is the only upholder of that view whose arguments are worth much attention, I think it right to deal with his points *seriatim*.

First as to his criticism of Morton. (1) He is right in saying that we cannot draw conclusions from the use of 'Rykelotam' or 'kykelotam' in the Latin text³, until we know something more of the history and meaning of the word. His own theory about it is very improbable. (2) It is perhaps true that 'kagya' might have been used for 'cage' without the influence of the English. (3) It is probable that 'tale' on p. 226, l. 14, does mean 'narratio' and not 'numerus'; and (4) it seems likely 'herboruwe,' p. 340, l. 12, really corresponds to the Latin 'herbarium,'

¹ I have succeeded in identifying all the leaves except f. 13, which is a very small fragment, with no very significant words legible.

² Wanley threw out the idea, probably on a rather cursory inspection of the Cotton MS. No doubt, on ascertaining that the Latin and the English corresponded generally to each other, he assumed without further investigation that the Latin was the original.

³ It is uncertain which of these forms we actually have, for the 'R' and the 'k' of the English MSS. are not distinguishable with certainty. Probably it is 'Rykelotam,' because the English MSS. for the most part have 'rykelot,' which is no doubt the true reading. The French text has 'rigelot.'

by confusion of form. Finally (5) it is clear that the reading 'sum of hore' (for 'sum of ham'), p. 222, l. 31, cannot here be sustained. The true reading is 'sum hore¹.' But beyond this Bramlette scores nothing with any certainty against his opponent. The most important points remain practically untouched. The quotation in English of the proverb 'Euere is the y3e to þe wode ly3he' (p. 96); the use of the English word 'hagges' (p. 216), to which may be added 'packes' (p. 168); the correspondence of 'uoraci' to 'urakele' (p. 204), of 'audire' to 'vren' (p. 286), and of 'corpus' to 'bode,' which seems to be the true reading of the English text (p. 400), are all strongly in favour of the view that we have here a Latin translation from the English and not the reverse; and Bramlette's suggestion to account for some of these, as well as for other difficulties, viz. that the Latin text which we have has freely incorporated glosses written in the margin of an earlier manuscript, is extremely improbable. We shall not easily find Latin manuscripts of the thirteenth or fourteenth century with English glosses, and the Magdalen MS., though it has mistakes, certainly does not suggest the idea of being carelessly written or grossly corrupt. The text corresponds closely with that of the earlier Cotton MS., so far as we are able to compare them, and we must assume that it fairly represents the original, except as regards the avowed omission of the eighth part.

As regards the saying 'Euere is the y3e' etc., Bramlette says it is quoted in English because it is a proverb. He does not seem to realise how very unusual it is to find proverbs quoted in English in an original Latin book of that period. Incidentally it may be observed that his explanation of the expression 'wode ly3he' is quite an impossible one².

The word 'hagges' (represented by 'heggen' in Morton's text) might well be found difficult by a Latin translator. Instead of being, as Bramlette says, 'too common a word not to have been understood by every one' it was in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries very unusual. This place is in fact the only instance which has been found of its occurrence in the English of the thirteenth century, and there seems to be only one example of it known in the fourteenth; moreover, its exact meaning in these early instances is uncertain. The French

¹ The French text however has no equivalent of the clause, but after 'houswif de sale' proceeds 'quide qele bien face sicome fols' etc. The scribe of the Pepys MS. evidently felt that there was some awkwardness in the introduction of the 'meretrix' idea, and endeavours to explain it by an antithesis between 'the devil's whore' and 'the spouse of Christ.' I am disposed to think that 'sum hore' means after all 'one of them.'

² In the case of another English saying quoted the text is hopelessly corrupt, viz. p. 62, l. 18, 'in anglico bene dicitur. Eyje et herdes. id est scheuen. quia multum id est multum dampnum multis fecerunt.' All that we can say is that Bramlette's explanation must certainly be wrong.

here has 'cels seet estries,' but a Latin translator of the English might well hesitate.

In the passage on p. 204, where we have in the English 'et tisse urakele worlde' and in the Latin 'a uoraci mundo,' it is clear that 'urakele' (i.e. 'frakele') meaning 'dangerous' or 'treacherous' gives the meaning that we want, and that 'uoraci' is quite beside the mark. Again on p. 286 'uren' ('vren') supplies the meaning required, and connects both with what goes before and with what follows, 'Redunge is god bone,' 'Leccio est bona oracio.' It is probable indeed that this is not a case of misunderstanding, but thus the Latin translator, scandalised by the recommendation to pray less and read more, which is contrary to the usual teaching, but quite in harmony with the sound common sense of the *Ancren Riwle*, deliberately wrote 'audire' rather than 'orare.' Bramlette's suggestions as to the word 'vren' in the English text are quite inadmissible. The 'uri' of the Corpus and Cleopatra MSS. and the 'preyen' of the Vernon text shew quite clearly what the word is with which we have to do.

The correspondence of 'bode' and 'corpus' (p. 400) depends upon variation of text in the English manuscripts. The question, however, is not at all of the 'body' of the lover, but of his 'offer,' as anyone must see who reads the passage; and the reading 'bode' given in the Nero MS. is probably the true one, in spite of the fact that the rest agree in 'bodi.' The reading of the French text appears to be 'encontre mon ofre.'

The positive evidence which Bramlette adduces as favouring Wanley's view does not in fact help it much. He notes especially the following: (1) P. 2, l. 22, 'isti dicuntur boni autonomatice,' where the Magdalen MS. has 'Isti dicuntur boni anachorite.' Here the true reading is almost undoubtedly 'antonomasice' (the Corpus MS. has 'antomasice') meaning 'per antonomasiam,' i.e. by substitution of this for their true name. The reading 'anachorite' is a senseless corruption. (2) P. 8, l. 22, 'þe isihð þene gnet 7 swoluweð þe vlige,' where the Latin has 'colantes culicem et tamen glutientes camelum.' Here the sober sense of the author was unable to accept the oriental hyperbole, and changed the saying into what seemed a more reasonable form, suggesting the idea of straining the midges out of the drink, but swallowing the much larger flies. On the other hand the Latin translator, who is always particular about the fulness and accuracy of quotations, naturally returns to the camel, and adds the Biblical reference. The originality lies with the English (or French) author, and is not in the least

suggestive of a translation. (3) P. 64, ll. 15—20. The difficulty is solved by the punctuation of the Corpus manuscript (which is also that of all the rest except Morton's), 'mid godes dred. To preost on earst Confiteor,' etc. It is evident that two kinds of visitors are thought of, and that the whole of the latter part of the passage refers to an interview with a spiritual adviser. (4) P. 66, ll. 9—15, the word 'coue' (or 'kaue') is to be accounted for in a different manner, as we have seen. (5) P. 70, ll. 12—15, the Latin version only shews that the translator was acquainted with the original passage of Anselm, which we should expect from what we know of him otherwise. (6) P. 72, l. 8, Bramlette assumes that the abbreviation used here stands for 'sentencie': it might just as well be for 'Seneca¹,' and he neglects the stop after the word. As to the saying not being found in Seneca's writings, that is the case with a very large number of the sayings which were fathered upon him. (7) P. 124, l. 13, the word 'aerem' in the Latin is right, and the best manuscripts of the English text have 'eir.' (8) P. 140, ll. 7—9. No argument can be founded on this passage, so far as I can see. (9) P. 232, l. 16, 'fastigia' is right, no doubt; but it is also the reading of the best English manuscripts. (10) P. 234, l. 2, Bramlette says that 'he seið' in this position is unintelligible. The only fault is in the punctuation: 'The third reason why thou shouldest not be quite secure is, he saith, because security produces carelessness.' This use of 'vor' is quite established. The person referred to is, no doubt, St Augustine, who has been quoted just above in support of the second reason. The author of the Latin version characteristically supplies a reference, though not one by which this latter passage can easily be found². (11) From the passage quoted under this head no inference can be drawn. (12) P. 254, l. 21, 'þe brune of golnesse,' represented in the Latin by 'flamma odii.' Hatred, no doubt, is the main subject, and is typified by Samson's foxes, which had their tails tied together and their heads averse, but the fire-brand at the tail has an additional significance, which the Latin fails to bring out. (13) P. 290, l. 24, the expression used in the Latin 'in ara crucis' was, as Bramlette shews, an established one, and may well have been used by a learned translator, though it did not occur in the text which he was translating. (14) P. 296, l. 13, 'þe sparke þet wint up,' corre-

¹ It is not quite the regular abbreviation of either, but would be understood by the context. The French text has written in full, 'Seneca. Ad summam volo,' etc.

² He says 'sicut dicitur in glosa epistole ad rom.' He has just above given us a reference to Augustine 'in glosa i ad Cor. 8,' which proves to be a comment on that text in the treatise *De Trinitate*.

sponding to 'Sintilla que accendit.' The idea in the English text is of a spark going up the chimney and alighting on the thatch, which for a time smoulders, and then breaks into flame. The Latin expression gives good enough sense, but 'accendit' is probably for 'ascendit,' a common confusion, as Bramlette shews¹.

The rest of the argument depends upon comparison of the two texts with a view to passages omitted or inserted. Passages are found in the Latin which are not in the English text as edited by Morton. A good many of these are simply citations from the Bible or the Fathers, which the author of the Latin text was apt to supply when he saw an opportunity: many of them, however, are to be found in other texts of the English *Ancren Riwele*. As regards passages which are not purely of this character, some of the most important are found in other English texts, especially the Corpus MS. This is the case, for example, with that which Bramlette quotes in full as the longest (coming after p. 198, l. 30); and also with those referred to as occurring at p. 96, l. 20; p. 98, ll. 9, 16, 17; p. 200, l. 22; p. 202, l. 2; p. 284, l. 17. In other cases, as p. 96, l. 1, the argument is confused or destroyed by the introduction of irrelevant quotations in the Latin version. It must be observed that in several cases Bramlette counts his passages twice, under the head of citations, and also as independent portions of the text, e.g. p. 118, l. 20, where the passage of forty words which he notes as original is entirely composed of quotation; and much the same is true of p. 302, l. 14, where the Latin version has a reference to the parable of the Prodigal Son in place of the rather obscure allegory of Jacob and Judah in the English text, and of p. 324, l. 8, where the Latin version quotes in illustration two hexameter verses of common occurrence, 'Crux, aqua, confiteor,' etc. This disposes of nearly all the passages mentioned by Bramlette, except the first two, one at p. 34, l. 12, where in place of an omission of many pages a few reflections are put in about attendance at public worship, with conventional references to the Pharisee and the Publican and Noah's raven and dove; and the other at p. 82, l. 17, where we have a passage of

¹ One more passage may be mentioned, which is referred to incidentally by Bramlette, viz. p. 60, l. 2 'ase mon seið, þu schalt acorien þe rode: þ is acorien his sunne. Hund wule in bliðeliche,' etc. That is, 'as the saying is, thou shalt feel the smart of the cross, thou shalt smart for his sin. A dog will readily enter,' etc. The Latin has 'pro alterius crimine punietur,' leaving out 'ase mon seið, þu schalt acorien þe rode, þ is,' and for a very simple reason probably, viz. because these were not contained in the English text which he had before him. They occur, in fact, so far as I know, only in the Nero MS. The translator then introduces the succeeding proverb with the words 'vulgariter dicitur,' which is a very natural insertion. There is no question therefore of the transference of 'ase mon seið' or its equivalent from one clause to another.

sixteen lines about Christ and Antichrist, truth and falsehood, of which I do not know the origin, but which is sufficiently commonplace in idea. On the whole the passages in the Latin which do not appear in the existing English manuscripts are such as a translator with a taste for quotation might naturally add to his text.

The case is very different with the passages which are found in the English but not in the Latin. Setting aside the absence of the eighth part in the Magdalen MS., which, as we have seen, is due to a scribe, we have the almost total suppression of the first part, which must have occurred in the Cotton MS. also¹. This part, which occupies more than sixteen pages in Morton's edition (pp. 14—48, even numbers only), is reduced to two pages of the manuscript, the pages of which contain somewhat more than those of the Camden Society book. It is obvious that this disproportionate brevity cannot have been intended by the original writer, though from the nature of the contents of the first part it is easily intelligible that a translator should omit or abbreviate it. Then secondly, most of the passages are wanting in the Latin which contain personal references to the sisters, as p. 2, l. 10; p. 4, l. 14; p. 48, ll. 2—4; p. 50, ll. 20—24; p. 84, ll. 22—25; p. 114, ll. 24—116; p. 116, ll. 2—10; p. 192, ll. 11—27; p. 216, l. 24; p. 286, ll. 26—29; p. 288, l. 3; p. 308, ll. 14—16. Of these passages one, that on p. 192, is absent from most of the English manuscripts; but in the other cases we seem to see a systematic attempt to get rid of the personal character of the address²; and this is accompanied by another difference of some importance between the two texts. Whereas the English *Ancren Riwele* is addressed exclusively to women, the Latin endeavours, rather awkwardly, to adapt itself to men also: e.g. (p. 64), 'Cum ad loquitorium accedit religiosus vel religiosa etc...fiunt magistri eorum quorum deberent esse discipuli. Cum enim recesserit is qui venit dicit iste vel ista uerbosus vel uerbosa.' An absurd instance is p. 6, l. 14, where we have 'quidam senes et turpes de quorum casu minus timetur.' This attempt is not consistently carried through, and for the most part the Latin, like the English, has to do with anchorites of the female sex; but so far as this principle is departed from, it is clear that there is an

¹ In MS. Vitellius E. vii the Latin version of the *Ancren Riwele* occupied seventy-three leaves, of which thirty-four are represented in the existing remains. By a simple calculation founded upon the contents of these leaves we find that the text of the first seven parts cannot have been materially longer than that of the Magdalen MS., and hence it is practically certain that the first part was similarly treated in this copy.

² It is not the case, as Bramlette suggests, that the personal remarks in the English version interfere with the connection and sequence of ideas, and so prove themselves to be additions.

interference with the original purpose. Finally, the style of the Latin version throughout is far more concise than that of the English, and often expresses with a dry scholastic brevity what is in the English more fully and agreeably set forth. There is for the most part a want of those amenities of style by which the *Ancren Riwele* in English and in French is happily distinguished, and humorous or characteristic touches are usually omitted. It would be strange indeed if a translator from the Latin in the thirteenth century had shewn so much independence and effected so great an improvement in his text as we should have to acknowledge here, if we supposed the Latin version of the Cotton and Magdalen manuscripts to have been the original either of the English or of the French text.

If it be concluded that the Latin is in fact a translation from the English, we may obtain confirmation of this view from many passages besides those cited by Morton: e.g. p. 94, l. 14, 'quarto propter ampliore[m] mercedem eternam. Sic enim disposuit deus,' etc., the connexion being entirely destroyed; p. 96, l. 19, 'pro morte sustinenda nollem feditatem aliquam cogitare erga te,' which surely no one would have written who had not the English 'uor te þolien deaðe' before him; in the passage added after p. 198, 'Maledicta et amens res. os tale magis fetet coram deo,' etc., where the English (Corpus MS.) is 'Me þinges amansede nuten ha þ hare song ant hare bonen to godd stinkeð fulre,' etc. p. 212, l. 16 'est protector cultellorum' for 'is his knifworpare.' Such variations as these, and the text is full of them, are more probably explained by supposing translation from the English with partial misunderstanding than in any other way; and the literal reproductions of passages such as we have on p. 318, l. 5, where the English text is unsatisfactory, points in the same direction. Moreover it is to be noted that the variations of the English manuscripts, when they are closely studied, are found to cast additional difficulties in the way of the theory of a Latin original. Mühe, for example, though a supporter of this theory, is driven by his examination of the Titus MS. to the most improbably complicated suggestions¹.

Finally, those who uphold this theory have to deal with the fact that the Latin version which we possess is definitely associated with the name of Simon of Ghent, bishop of Salisbury, who died in 1315. The attribution of authorship is not a mere casual one. It occurs as a rubric at the beginning of the text of the Magdalen MS., and was no

¹ In his dissertation *Über den im MS. Cotton, Titus D. xviii enthaltenen Text des 'Ancren Riwele,'* Göttingen, 1901.

doubt found in the original from which this manuscript was derived. 'Hic incipit prohemium venerabilis patris magistri Simonis de Gandauo, episcopi Sarum, in librum de vita solitaria, quem scripsit sororibus suis Anachoritis apud Tarente.' This ascribes authorship of the Latin book to one who lived too late to have been the author of the English; and we must suppose that he was at least responsible for this Latin version, here treated as an original book. It should be noted that the theory of the connexion of the *Ancren Riwle* with 'Tarente' depends entirely on this statement, and such a connexion must not be assumed with regard either to the English or the French texts. We know nothing of the family of Simon of Ghent, but it may be supposed that English was not the native language of his sisters, and they may well have understood Latin better. The partial adaptation of the book to the use of anchorites of the male sex also, was no doubt owing to a desire to make it more generally useful¹.

(*To be continued.*)

G. C. MACAULAY.

CAMBRIDGE.

¹ In declining the suggestion that the *Ancren Riwle* was originally written in Latin, we must not, of course, fail to note its obligations to earlier Latin books dealing with the same subjects, as for example the *Exhortatio ad Virginem deo dedicatam* by S. Caesarius, and especially Aelred's 'Epistola ad sororem inclusam,' which in fact is once referred to by name in the *Ancren Riwle* (p. 368), and from which several particular precepts seem to be derived, as the warnings against the possession of cattle, against large hospitality and almsgiving, and against keeping a school, the suggestion of caution in choosing an elderly and thoroughly trustworthy confessor, and some of the precepts about dress and adornment. The parts that deal with sins, confession and penitence naturally have something in common with other treatises on the same subjects; and the morals drawn from the supposed nature of the ostrich, the pelican and the night-raven are, more or less, the common property of medieval writers: see especially the treatise *De Bestiis* (Lib. I), printed in Migne's *Patrologia*, vol. CLXXVII.