

de Toulouse (p. 18). This is merely a mistranslation of the Latin, for there were no *sénateurs* or *sénats* at this time, but *conseillers* and *parlements*. Jean Bertrand mentioned on page 9, is without doubt Jean Bertrandi, first president of the Parliament of Paris, who administered the oath of office to the *conseillers* of Toulouse.⁷

J. L. G.

Das Handschriftenverhältnis des Covenant Vivian. By WILLY SCHULZ. Halle, 1908.

This volume includes a discussion and classification of the nine manuscripts available of the *Covenant Vivien* (the author's spelling *Vivian* is an affectation. The better title, as Mr. A. Terracher has shown, is *Chevalerie Vivien*)¹. In the course of his argument, the author has to cite many passages from the MSS. It is noted with regret that these citations are full of errors. He was evidently set to copying the MSS. without due previous training in paleography. If this supposition be correct, he is less to be blamed than those who allowed him to undertake such difficult work.

The following corrections of the author's readings are offered. On p. 16 and elsewhere, the reading should be *molt* (with a rare possibility at times of *mout*), instead of *moult*. The suggestion of: *Il li fera* is in every manner impossible. On p. 17, l. *Aerofles* for MSS. A and B. Under line 581, why is *gresles* given? One should read *grailles* and *ij grailles*. Line 476: from this text one could never tell the reading of the MSS. P. 18: A has *getes* in l. 1179. P. 20: second l. from the bottom: *il*, instead of *ils*; last l.: instead of *et son frere Laisnez*, read: *l'aisnez*; in same l., MS. D¹ has: *nez*. In the last l. of the note, the MS. has *jour*. P. 21: l. 483: *Enfondit* should be written *En fandit*, as in the MS.; similarly, here and wherever it occurs, *par mi*. In l. 484: *anfes*; 487: *mora* and *nes*. Under l. 475, *Malsorz* is followed in the MS. by a period, indicating that the name is abbreviated. This should be shown. The full name was undoubtedly meant to be trisyllabic. In l. 615, MS. A has *perse*, not *perce*. P. 22: several of the readings of the MSS. for lines 464 ss. are erroneous. For example: l. 464: MS. A has *halt*, and in l. 468, *mora*; B, in this same l. has *corones* and not *couronnes*; E has in l. 465 the abbreviation for *Jhesu*, not *Jehus*, and has *vous*; in l. 469, this MS. bears *asis*, not *assis*; MSS. d have, in l. 468: *leur . . . escrie*, and the first l. quoted from D¹ has *vous*. P. 23: often one cannot tell from what MS. the text is given, as here for l. 1045 ss. It is safe to say, however, that, in the first verse cited one should read *Guillaumes*, and, in the last, *cuens*. P. 24: under ll. 1595, 1596, if the author is going to read *enfressi* for B, he should read *entrecci* for D¹; the reading for D² is: *Tout le porfent*, and for B, *detrenche*; in the last l. but one on the page, the words should be *ainssi, vous*. P. 25: the discussion of *i uoit* (or *voit*) and the nominativ case is due to a mistaken reading by the author, who took *iuoit* (*juoit*) for *i uoit*, thus seeing difficulties that are not in the text. MS. D²

⁷ Cf. the documents of 1549 and April 15, 1551, in *Bibl. Nat. Mss. fr.*, 4402, pp. 55 and 90, and also Buche, *ibid.*, 1894, p. 328. For Pierre Forcadel, see the article of Dr. R. L. Hawkins of Harvard in the *Rev. d'hist. litt.*, 1905, pp. 663-5.

¹ The author, however, has recently made a careful defense of the title as he gives it: *vid. Zeitschrift für französische Sprache*, XXXV (1910), pp. 171-178.

bears: *Jooit Bertrans et ses oncles Guillelme*, and not: *I uoit Bertran*, etc., and B has: *Li quens Guillelmes* (or *Guillaumes*) *juoit a l'eschequier*, and not *L. q. G. i uoit* (or *voit*), etc. P. 33: the word *mes* has been omitted (perhaps by the printer?) from the line cited under 314^a; two lines further, instead of *frans* the two MSS. mentioned have *serjanz* and *serjant* (*i* being of course transcribed *j*). P. 35: in the three lines from MS. E, *teste* is to be corrected to *tieste*, and *Guiborc* to *Guibors*. P. 36: in the third l., read: *chite*. P. 38: in the third l. of poetry cited, the author has corrected *del* to *des* without indicating the fact. P. 39, in the first l. quoted one should read *adire* as a single word, similarly on p. 44. P. 42: under l. 1877, A has *cel*, not *del*, and E has *rirai . . . capler*, not *irai . . . chapler*. P. 43: under ll. 539-41, *parmi* and *enmi*, as elsewhere, might better be written *par mi* and *en mi*; the hyphen in *Inde Superior* is contrary to the genius of the language, and is doubly objectionable in Old French; in the last l. cited, the MS. bears *missaudor*. P. 44: under l. 590, it is preferable to read *consuit* (similarly in the second l. on the page), and *del*, instead of *de le*; the MS., it is true, contains an error, the scribe having apparently taken the initial *t* of *tranchant* for a *c*, but in no case can one read: *de le*; the reading of E is *aprese*, and not as given. Under ll. 690, 691, A has: *cant il meurt . . . regreteis*; the spelling *houme* near the middle of this page calls for some comment. The author has repeatedly assimilated a nasal in the abbreviation to the following consonant. He should adopt a consistent practice, whatever it is. In the reading from B near the bottom of the page, the MS. has *Voir*, not *Voire*. P. 45: the reading for l. 395 is given thus: B(E: . . . *el vrai roi Jehu Crist*, which is neither the reading for B nor for E. The first of these MSS. has: *le vrai roi Jhesu Crist*, and the second: *el crois Jhesu Cris*. In the middle of this page is found the form *Arverne*; from what MS.? I do not know any MS. with this form; even if there be one, why go so far afield to seek such an untypical form? Is it because the more barbarous the spelling, the more learned it is supposed to be? Under 654^a, *vne* should of course be *une*, and is probably an error of the printer. A little farther on, under the reading of E, the MS. bears *sanglent*, and the fourth l. from the bottom of the page should have *estei* (reading of A), or *este* (that of C). P. 46, l. 699: if the reading here is from A, the last word in the l. should be *prei*. C, to be sure, has *pre*. The reading of B as given here should bear *Franchois*. P. 47: in the fourth l. on the page, the text of B has *verites*. In the following l., one should read *poons*, and in the l. below that, *dou ge* is preferable to *douge*. Under l. 1014, the abbreviation indicates *quest*, that is: *qu'est*. P. 49: instead of: *elme a la coife doree*, the MS. mentioned bears: *hiame, tante coife doree*. P. 50: ll. 459, 460: B has *arives*, not *armes*. P. 51: in the second l. the word should be *tenrement*. In the reading given for l. 665, E has *gieron*; the words *la tente*, under l. 856, should be *sa tente*, according to C. The argument concerning the verb in l. 1087 (cf. p. 65) is absolutely valueless. Besides, the MSS. cited under the rubric Ex have all the nominative case for the past participle. P. 52: under B, the text bears: *He Gerars*, and this l. is followed by one which the author omits for some reason: *Vos me devies le secors amener*. The omission should have been indicated. P. 53: the fifth l. on the page reads in the MS.: *A tant e vos lor*. The fact that the line is unintelligible is hardly a reason

for not giving it as it stands. Under E, at the middle of the page, the second l. has in the MS. *reprendons*, and the l. following, *bons brans*; the last l. of this citation has a very serious blunder: instead of: *vos ert si grans*, the MS. bears: *u est la grans*. Under l. 1668, read: *Hui mais*. P. 54, l. 94 reads in A: *Et dus et princes, demoinnes et chases*. P. 55: l. 513 has: *bran . . . turs*; E has, as the last word in this l., *maris*, not *marsis*; the l. following has *viers*, and the word *paiens* printed by the author in the next l. is entirely lacking in the MS.; in the last l. here cited from this MS., *Paien* should be *Paiens*. The variants of B also include errors: the MS. has in the second l. *achier*, and in the third, *Paien*. Under l. 962, the order of words for MS. B is incorrect; it should be: *En la v. e.* P. 56: the last l. quoted from B in the middle of the page should have *esporon*; at the bottom of the page, the reading of A is: *qui li prist a torner*, and that of B has *glachant*. P. 58, first l.: read *deuommes*; under 1254^a, E has *ceval*; l. 1351, MS. E: the word is written *grefegne*. P. 59: last two lines: here and everywhere the abbreviation for *Jhesu* has been misread. P. 61: in the second l., the reading should be: *qu'est*; l. 792 ss.: the reading is not *James*, but *Ja mes*, as the syntax shows; *lignages* should be corrected to *linages*. P. 62: in the first l., the MS. bears *Guichars*. P. 63: under l. 1622 ss.: *bran d'acier*. P. 65: l. 1017: instead of *mes*, the word should be *nies*; in l. 1080, MS. E: read *onnore* or *ounore*. P. 69: from what MS. is the form *morrez* taken? Under 1165, E, the MS. has *biaus nies*. P. 72: l. 440: the MS. has *Biax* (or, of course, *Biaus*) *nies Gerart*; l. 390: the MS. bears *Viviens*, and does not have at all the words *se vos*. L. 626: the MS. has: *Viviens l'ot mais sa dolor*, and similarly the next l. includes errors, for MS. B has here: *Viviens l'ot, dolor en ot a chertes*. In the following l., one should read *suist*, and in l. 630, *Fiert lou . . . ensin se desraisne*; in l. 632, the MS. reads *fait*.

What shall be said of these many errors, whose number could easily be increast? Are they in part due to pure carelessness? It is not difficult to become confused among so many manuscripts, so much so, that I may have committed blunders in some of my readings given above. The author may excuse some of his omissions on the ground that it is impossible to offer all the variants, and this is of course perfectly correct. None the less, this much is certain: that the author's volume is, paleografically speaking, full of blunders. In many cases, these errors appear due to his inability to read the manuscripts; in others, however, he seems to have altered at will the real readings, which are so clear that he can not have mistaken them: for example, if l. 1877, cited on p. 42, reads in MS. E: *Et je rirai pries del estor capler*, why state that it reads: *Et je irai pries del estor chapler?*²

The author bases a classification of the manuscripts of the *Chevalerie Vivien* on such readings as he offers. Are his conclusions vitiated by the careless and defectiv treatment of the manuscripts? Can one build a firm structure on such insecure foundations? Unfortunately for the scientific standing of our studies, it is possible to erect a fairly strong building on such a foundation, but

² Professor H. Suchier says (*Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XXXIII, p. 49, note 2) that he possesses at Halle copies of all MSS. of our poem, except that at Cheltenham. One wonders if the citations given in the present volume are samples of the MSS. in his possession.

it must be done by avoiding too much weight on minute points. The author occasionally lays too much stress on such points, and his conclusions in these cases must be set aside, at least until they can be verified. In general, however, he draws his conclusions from broader data, and he shows no small skill in this sort of argument.

I agree with the author's statement that Gaudin le brun in *Aliscans* is a relatively late introduction,—a statement advanced by me years ago.³

Some valuable remarks concerning the *petit vers* are to be found on p. 14. . . . The force of the argument concerning the Saracen who brings news (p. 33) may well be doubted. . . . The author misunderstands (p. 46) the reasons why the hero's men decline to leave him? . . . The statement about the messenger (pp. 65, 66) is quite unwarranted, as also, in my opinion, the mention of Renoart in connection with the dream (p. 66). . . . The author's general conclusion concerning the text of the *Chevalerie* appears sound (p. 66), and the same may be said of his remarks about MS. A (pp. 67, 68). . . . In conclusion, let it be said that I am far from wishing to discourage Mr. Schulz from continuing his studies in the old epic. His defects are due to carelessness, and to lack of specific knowledge in certain lines. These are matters which time can cure, and we may yet see from his pen work that commands unqualified approval.

R. W.

³ P. 13, note.