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ABSTRACT

From *Poésie* to *Poetry: Remaniement* and Medieval Techniques of French-to-English Translation of Verse Romance, explores the use of *remaniement*, the art of rewriting, as the method preferred for vernacular translations of genres such as romance. A thorough history of the practice's principles are given, drawing on comments from Classical rhetoricians, patristic writers, authorities of the *artes poeticae*, and mediaeval translators employing the procedure. A textual analysis of the Middle English *Amis and Amiloun* follows, utilising a broadly structuralist approach which compares each individual episode and 'lexie' with its Old French and Anglo-Norman predecessors. This examination demonstrates *remaniement* to be the method used to translate the romance, highlighting both the important debt owed to the francophone traditions as well as the use of dynamic interpretation to lend the work salience to an English audience. A subsequent linguistic examination includes a new definition of formulae based on prototype theory which utilises mental templates to identify occurrences. This permits the recognition of over 3000 instances of formulaic diction, many of which can be traced back to native pre-Conquest traditions, as can certain aspects of verse and structure. What emerges, therefore, is a composite work heavily indebted to continental and insular French sources for content and some aspects of style, but largely readapted to lend it appeal to an early fourteenth-century Anglophone audience. The thesis therefore clarifies the establishment and use of *remaniement*, provides a detailed example of its use, and in doing so reveals the true extent of the oft overlooked debt owed to francophone traditions in creating English romances. By way of setting these dimensions into a wider context, the conclusion suggests such translations had a general effect on the development of a new insular style, setting standards for the independent creation of works in English as that language continued to re-establish itself as an accepted medium for literary expression.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE

The purpose of this dissertation is two-fold. Its primary intention is to demonstrate the extent to which Anglo-Norman (AN) and Old French (OF) sources affected the development of the fourteenth-century Middle English (ME) romance, *Amis and Amiloun*. The significant impact of continental and insular French writings on the development of non-scholastic secular English literature has long been under-appreciated, perhaps due to the tendency to view each vernacular's "popular" literature in isolation. This contributes to a sense that each one developed independently, and though it is true that every vernacular tradition incorporated certain defining characteristics in its particular literary corpus, it is a mistake to underplay the degree to which they interrelate. This study therefore contains an exhaustive comparison of the Middle English romance with its predecessors, providing irrefutable evidence that the ME is heavily indebted to its OF / AN forerunners. It is hoped that this examination may shed some light on the important role of Anglo-Norman and Old French traditions on English literature in one instance, and that such an analysis can stand as a model for future investigations of a similar nature.

In order to carry out such a study, an understanding of medieval attitudes towards translation is required. Furthermore, especial consideration needs to be given to vernacular translations relating to genres such as romance. Despite numerous studies relating to medieval translation, relatively little has been attempted in respect to translations dealing with the so-called "popular" genres. Most studies of medieval translation focus more on the nature of didactic, hagiographic or scientific translations than that of works whose purpose was considered primarily entertainment. More so than in other genres, the elements lending cultural salience needed to be respected in these "folk translations," also known as *remaniement*, if they were to be acceptable to the target audience. Though perhaps less affected by scholarly proscriptions and prescriptions than other types of translations, throughout Europe they nevertheless appear to have been effected according to certain norms. The second aim of this dissertation, therefore, is to identify and define the nature of *remaniement* as the preferred method for creating "translations" of "popular" literature.
1.2 PREVIOUS SCHOLARSHIP AND THE NEED FOR THE PRESENT STUDY

The place of Anglo-Norman literature in relation to that of medieval English has long been relegated to the sidelines. The tendency has usually been to view Middle English literature in a vacuum as though it were an autochthonous entity which sprang wholly formed on these shores from the post-Conquest inhabitants of England. At best, it is occasionally related to the Old English corpus from which it does indeed inherit much and whose influence is certainly considerable. However, the influence of Norman culture in Britain played just as significant a part in respect to vernacular literature as it did in every other aspect of life after 1066, and is worthy of much more consideration than it usually receives.1

This position especially holds true for the verse romances produced ca. 1300-1450. Of the roughly 105 extant verse romances in English, the vast majority of them have French antecedents.2 Until about the middle of the twentieth century, however, this connection was generally ignored if not flatly denied. Because their subject matters dealt with native Anglo-Danish or Celtic British heroes, legends such as King Horn, Havelok the Dane and Sir Perceval of Galles were often (and perhaps somewhat jingoistically) considered to be derived from local traditions or lost native Urtexts.3 This view entirely overlooked the clear connections with the Anglo-Norman Roman de Horn, Gaimar’s section on Havelok in Estorie des Engleis and the Anglo-Norman Lai de Havelok, and Chrétien’s Conte du Graal. It also seems to ignore the fact that a large number of continental French romances deal with Arthurian legends, and that nearly one half of all the Anglo-Norman romances relate stories of local English heroes, presumably for insular francophone audiences.4

---

1 The Elizabethans, at least, did seem to give some acknowledgement to the Norman inheritance. In Book I, Chapter 31 of Arte of English Poesie, published in 1589, Puttenham states: “I will not reach above the time of King Edward the Third and Richard the Second [1327-77-99] for any that wrote in English metre, because before their times, by reason of the late Norman conquest, which had brought into this realm much alteration both of our language and laws...so as beyond that time there is little or nothing worth commendation to be found written in this art.” Quotation taken from Burrow, p. 119.

2 Estimations of the number of romances existing vary between 95 and 115; this discrepancy is due to the different views of various scholars, some of whom would classify certain texts as independent romances while others hold them to be different versions of the same romance.

3 Such perceptions even affected works such as Amis and Amiloun, whose story is said at the outset to have happened “beyond the sea,” and whose very name indicates the heroes’ foreign origins. As Calin points out, “it was widely assumed, and still is—for those who believe that the theme of friendship is older and more authentic than the Christian elements—that the Middle English Amis and Amiloun and its Anglo-Norman source Amis e Amiloun are more primitive and closer to the lost Urtext than any of the other extant French and Latin versions.” pp. 429-30. This is exactly the stance taken by Leach in his introduction: “My findings are that the story of Amis and Amiloun is fundamentally the testing of the fidelity of two friends, that other elements, such as the hagiographic, are intrusive, and that the sources of the original chanson de geste can definitely be indicated...The English version is not derived from any Anglo-Norman version extant, but from a version earlier than any of these.” p. xx. As Chapter Three of this thesis demonstrates, however, the Middle English version is indeed derived from a version very close to the Anglo-Norman KLC group, and even draws on information from the Old French version. In that, it proves Calin’s assumption that there is “no reason whatsoever to credit the hypothesis that the insular romances preserve a more primitive or authentic version of the legend than the continental narratives and/or that Amis and Amiloun itself must have been derived from a lost Anglo-Norman model and would represent the oldest, most authentic stage.” p. 484.

4 Calin notes, “All but two of the extant Middle English romances with English heroes goes back to preceding Anglo-Norman romances.” p. 430. Furthermore, in Insular Romance, Crane indicates that though not all of the English versions survive, at some point almost all of the Anglo-Norman romances were translated into English. Ramsey underscores the influence of
The fact is that most of the material for the Matter of Rome and the Matter of Britain were treated in French before being turned into English. In addition to La3amon’s *Brut*, Wace’s *Roman de Brut* also inspired such works as the *Seige of Troye*; the *Seige of Jerusalem* derives from Roger d’Argenteuil’s *Bible en français*; *Kyng Alisaunder* is indebted to Thomas of Kent’s *Roman de toute chevalerie*. As far as Arthuriana is concerned, the stanzaic *Morte Arthur* and the alliterative *Morte Arthure* both are derived from *La Mort le roi Artu*. A verse *Arthur* draws heavily on Wace again. Chrétien’s *Yvain* inspired *Ywain and Gawain*, while other tales of this knight, such as *Golagarus and Gawain*, the *Gest of Sir Gawain*, and to some extent *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* appear indebted to the *Perceval Continuations*. Even Lancelot’s succession to Gawain as most favoured knight can arguably be traced to Chrétien’s *Le Chevalier de la Charrette*. The English *Lai le Freine* is transparently a translation of Marie de France’s work by the same name, while her *Lanval* was Englished twice, once as *Sir Landevale* and also by Chestre as *Sir Launfal*.

Many other romances, and especially those dealing with the Matter of England, are likewise direct translations or adaptations. These include *Guy of Warwick*, *Beues of Hampton*, *Floris and Blancheflur*, *Ipomadon*, *Partonope of Blois*, *William of Palerne*, *Le Bone Florence of Rome*, and of course, *Amis and Amiloun*. Rare indeed are the romances such as *Aethelston* which seem to have no Anglo-Norman or French antecedents, but even they show some gallic influence. Despite this preponderance of evidence, however, traditionally very little study has been made of the Anglo-Norman influence on the English verse romances. Until quite recently, their place in relation to the Middle English romances was, if acknowledged at all, generally relegated to a footnote before delving into an ontological study of their anglicised descendants. As late as 1963, Legge sardonically noted, “Anglo-Norman literature has not been ignored in the past, for of necessity, it receives casual mention in every general history of Old French literature.... Writers on English literature have been slower and more grudging than those on French to acknowledge the existence and relevance of Anglo-Norman literature.”

Only in the last century has Anglo-Norman received much attention. Initially the focus was largely on language itself, which is perhaps not surprising as an understanding of language is a natural prerequisite for study of the literature. Before his early death in the first decade of the century, Menger produced his study of the insular dialect, treating French-language literature on the English literary culture by stating, “Although the earliest romances are all in the French language, a number of them originated in England or the English court. These Anglo-Norman works include some of the most famous and the most influential of the romance stories: *Tristan*, *Lanval*, *Amis et Amiles*, *Gui de Warewe*. It would be foolish if not impossible to try to distinguish them between the Anglo-Norman and continental tradition during the earliest period.” p. 5.
phonology and morphology specifically. Pope improved on his work in 1932, adding orthography in *From Latin to Modern French with Especial Consideration of Anglo-Norman*, which became the standard study of the language. The same author also addresses versification in her introduction to *La Seinte Resureccion* (1943), as had Waters fifteen years earlier in his introduction to *St Brendan*. After them came scholars who sought to identify the impact of this Old French dialect on the English which surrounded it. Prins’s 1952 *French Influence on English Phrasing*, examining turns of phrase which seem borrowed at some recent or distant point from French; it was followed ten years later by Orr’s *Old French and Modern English Idiom* which sought to eliminate the archaisms of his predecessor, and “concentrate on the real *calques*, i.e. words and phrases that are of genuine Anglo-Saxon components, but foreign in use and construction,” in order to show just how much Old French still affects modern English syntax.

All of these works retain their value in Anglo-Norman studies, and have been helpful in this thesis both in producing the edition of the Anglo-Norman Karlsruhe text found in the appendix as well as in chapter four’s examination of the use of formulae in the Middle English *Amis and Amiloun*. Nevertheless, in and of themselves, they do not do much to demonstrate the indebtedness of Middle English literature to Anglo-Norman, merely paving the way for studies such as this one. Orr himself acknowledges his work as a stepping stone, declaring “it would be a great satisfaction to the writer if, as a result of this and Professor Prins’s study, closer co-operation ensued between the Departments of French and of English language in our universities.”

Of Anglo-Norman literature itself, the situation has been even more bleak. As Legge comments, “The study of Anglo-Norman literature is in a less satisfactory position than the study of the language.” Schofield’s *English Literature from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer* gives one of the earliest comments on its relation to English, and “is still useful if treated with discretion.” A somewhat less favourable attitude to the subject appears in a short chapter of Wilson’s 1939 *Early Middle English Literature*. This literature was more fully addressed in Vising’s *Anglo-Norman Language and Literature*, which despite being nearly eighty years old is still one of the better authorities on the subject. The same can be said for Walberg’s *Quelques aspects de la littérature anglo-

---

7 Orr, p. vi.
8 Roques, 1926, Foulet and Speer, 1979, and Marx, 1991 were also useful in understanding the differences between editing Anglo-Norman/Old French texts and formulating a schema.
9 Orr, p. i.
10 Legge, p. 2.
normande (1936), and Legge's *Anglo-Norman in the Cloisters: The Influence of the Orders on Anglo-Norman Literature* (1950), though the latter author does recognise that both these works are chiefly concerned with religious writings; her later *Anglo-Norman Literature and its Background* deals with the subject more generally, and is of tremendous use to the student wishing to become familiar with the entire scope of writings in the language. In fact, the only significant drawback to any of these latter books is that their avowed purpose is to present studies of Anglo-Norman literature specifically, not necessarily its influence on Middle English.

More recently, some works have been produced which attempt to study Anglo-Norman literature within a more critical framework. Vinaver's introduction to *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory* (1947) provides a detailed examination of Malory's sources and examines his treatment of them in producing his massive compilation of disparate Arthurian legends. Muscatine gives a similar treatment to Chaucer's reliance on French sources in *Chaucer and the French Tradition* (1957), as does Wimsatt in *Chaucer and the French Love Poets* (1968). Additionally, numerous articles and shorter works focusing on the writings of these and other medieval English authors have demonstrated the emerging recognition of Anglo-Norman literature's place in English studies.

Perhaps more importantly, the last fifteen years have seen the production of two extremely useful surveys relating Middle English literature to its Anglo-Norman and Old French sources generally, Crane's *Insular Romance* (1986), and Calin's *The French Tradition and the Literature of Medieval England* (1994). Even at this late date, however, both authors are able to lament the dearth of adequate study. Calin's preface diplomatically asserts: "earlier generations of scholars in English studies, working within their own domain and producing...the finest corpus of practical criticism of medieval texts anywhere in the world, were inevitably too busy to attend to the French sphere."\(^{13}\) Though encouraged that Anglicists have begun to break into this 'fair field needing folk', he laments that, "Unfortunately, given the functioning of highly specialized scholarship in our universities, it takes time for a major shift in consciousness to reach all people in the profession."\(^{14}\)

As to non-scholarly vernacular translations, there also appears to be a lack of adequate study despite the recent advancements it the study of translation. Recent years have seen a boom in translation history; Rita Copeland, George Steiner and Louis Kelly to cite but a few have each produced outstanding volumes. All of these sources have been

\(^{13}\) Calin, p. ix.
\(^{14}\) Calin, p. ix.
helpful, but in many ways were directed rather more towards the evolution of theory than focusing on the implementation of translation itself. Furthermore, in such diachronic, diatopic surveys as Kelly’s and Steiner’s, it is impossible to dwell overmuch on translations of any one particular genre at any one particular time, and their chief interest is not the Middle Ages as much as the astounding developments of the last two centuries. While Copeland does indeed focus on the Middle Ages, she herself acknowledges that “my arguments do not necessarily extend to the emergence of ‘popular’ translation in genres such as the lai or the metrical romance from one vernacular language into another.” Such translations, however, form the very focus of this examination.

One scholar who has looked at such translations is Karen Pratt. In a few short articles she has addressed the practice of remaniement, generally relating it to German translators of French romance. One can observe from her various brief examples that in many ways their procedures and those of the Middle English translators of French-language romances bear some striking resemblances. It seems therefore that whether or not guided by scholarly dictates – or even cognisant of them – both sets of vernacular translators of “popular literature” were following a set of accepted procedures. There is a need to expound on these procedures and place them in a larger context outside the few German and Dutch translators mentioned by Pratt. Pratt herself acknowledges the lack of adequate scholarship stating, “Although remaniement…was a craft widely practiced by vernacular poets in the Middle Ages…there is a dearth of precise theoretical pronouncements on this activity in the vernacular literature.”

This thesis therefore hopes partially to fill these gaps. It addresses the practice of remaniement, providing a more in-depth elucidation of its techniques, origins, and examples of its use. Then through an exhaustive examination of Amis and Amiloun in respect to its gallic predecessors, establishes remaniement as the practice whereby the English version was created, demonstrating the debt this one Middle English author owes to his francophone predecessors. It is hoped that the methods employed here can be similarly applied to other studies of medieval English verse romances to further enhance modern scholarly understanding of the Anglo-Norman/Old French - Middle English continuum, and an understanding of remaniement generally.

15 Copeland, p. 5.
16 In her 1901 Guide to Middle English Metrical Romances, Billings mentions that in translating the romances, “as a rule, the English versifier follows his original with fidelity from incident to incident, but in doing so he often speaks from his own English point of view. He adapts his original to his audience by abridgement, by the more frequent use of direct discourse, by the introduction of popular features, occasionally by the addition of a passage of some length, and, less frequently, by the use of another authority.” p. xi. Though her comment has many merits, it suffers from being rather too vague. No specific examples are cited, no mention is made of the extent of such changes, and no hypothesis is provided concerning how these adaptations might occur. This thesis seeks to validate the veracity of Billing’s generality through an exhaustive examination of Amis and Amiloun which addresses all such particulars.
1.3 METHODOLOGY, AIDS AND OBJECTIVES

The following chapter begins with an overview of vernacular translation theories as understood by medieval redactors and a look at their actual practices. In a study of this kind such an examination is indispensable, for the differences between our modern understanding of translation and that of the medievals, particularly in respect to ‘popular’ literature such as romances, are profound. Throughout Europe, translation was viewed not so much as a method of rendering a copy which captured the exact nuances of thought and style of the original author, but rather as a tool for creation of new works based on those thoughts, often quite loosely. It was, within certain limits, accepted and even encouraged for the translator to redevelop the story to lend it more salience to the target audience. Through examples gleaned from various septentronial and occidental authors, the chapter demonstrates that such practice was pandemic in the “Latin West”; this situation comes as no surprise given that the ‘regulations’ governing translation utilised by the educated elite (of which, one may assume, anyone capable of writing formed a part) were largely inherited from the Latin authorities.

However, the intended audience of these same ‘popular’ works would not necessarily form part of that elite. Their interests would be driven less by an international zeitgeist united by Latin learning than by appreciation of their own local customs, culture, language and traditions. Vernacular translators sympathetic to this situation would of course tailor their redactions to suit the tastes of the audience for whom they were writing. It is even possible or even likely that they shared in their audiences’ sentiments, and that their approach to translation was directed not so much by first-hand knowledge of scholarly dictates concerning the practice as much as observation of contemporary translations which conformed to those dictates. Regardless of the directives they followed

---

17 Pratt, p. 1.
18 The third chapter of Venuti’s The Translator’s Invisibility, entitled Nation, examines nineteenth-century ideals of “foreignizing” or “naturalizing” translations; the author quotes Goethe in this chapter as saying, “The translator who attaches himself closely to his original more or less abandons the originality of his nation, and so a third [meaning] comes into existence, and the taste of the multitude must first be shaped towards it.” p. 99. Thus, even as late as Goethe, the importance of adapting translations to make them appeal to the target audience was recognised. Venuti’s chapter is primarily concerned with the role of nationalism specifically in translation, for which there exists a significant body of study. Over a century ago, ten Brink noted in the first volume of History of English Literature that English romances from French sources evolve with each new telling, so that “in the mouth of theseggers, therefore, the form of these poems diverged even more from the original text.” He further claims that in these new tellings one can see “how national and popular characteristics could manifest themselves in such poetical imitations.” pp. 235-6. More recently, Tiller’s unpublished thesis, Performing History: Historiography and the Role of the Translator in LaSamon’s Brut, addresses the place of nationalism as a motivator for LaSamon’s adaptation of material in his translation of Wace’s Brut. The present thesis is less concerned with the role of nationalism specifically than in adaptation for the purpose of cultural sensitivity generally, though it does briefly address aemutlatio in Chapter 2. Furthermore, emphasis is more on the methods whereby change was effected than an examination of specific motives. The method of analysis used here could be applied to other works where the purpose of re-creation was driven less by nationalism than simply cultural salience. Though this work is primarily concerned with Anglo-Norman/Old French translations, it could have uses in further elucidating translations from other languages, such as Chaucer’s use of Boccaccio’s Filostrato in writing Troilus and Criseyde. In one short article, Troilus and the Filostrato, N. S. Thompson calls this work a rifacimento, and then goes on to expound on many methods employed by Chaucer. Most of these would allow him to be identified as a remanieur, and further examination in this light might prove worthwhile. In the meantime, it could be suggested that Chaucer, known to
in selecting their methods, in practice they were undertaking not the art of translation as we understand it, but remaniement, the art of rewriting.

Chapter Three outlines the probable relationship of the extant manuscripts in the secular cycle of the Amis and Amiloun legend, of which the English version forms a part. Despite the hesitation of some scholars to acknowledge it, textual evidence existing in these manuscripts demonstrates their close relationship to one another. Brief descriptions of the manuscripts, their contents, and the relevant texts of Amis and Amiloun is provided, and based on that information a new schema is formed. This schema is used as a guide to selecting the most suitable texts for the textual examination: the Middle English Auchinleck version (edited by Leach), The Old French Colbert version (edited by Dembowski), the Anglo-Norman London version (edited by Fukui), and the Anglo-Norman Karlsruhe version (previously unedited, for which reason an edition has been undertaken for this thesis and can be found in the appendix).

The fourth chapter provides an exhaustive critical examination of these four texts, demonstrating every detail in the Middle English borrowed from its predecessors, and each point of deviation. It conclusively shows the Middle English redactor’s reliance on the previous three traditions, as well as noting alterations and indicating the use of material from outwith those sources. As the conclusion to the chapter explains, the redactor’s methodology is entirely in accord with the techniques posited in the second chapter.

Chapter Five examines the poetic diction of Amis and Amiloun. It is chiefly concerned with the use of formulaic expressions which, as the chapter demonstrates, constitute over 60% of the poem. The majority of formulaic expressions are easily recognised by even the casual reader of Middle English. Many are of such high frequency that they are used ironically in Chaucer’s satirical Sir Thopas to indicate that by the time of his writing they have become clichés. Nevertheless, their use in a work that purports to be a translation is significant because they draw on a body of stock phrases found throughout the whole corpus of medieval English verse romances. This ease of recognition has led to the need for an entirely new concept. Previous definitions of the formula often proved too constraining, leading to the elimination of a high proportion of formulaic expressions in any count. The new definition proposed in this chapter using “mental templates” allows the recognition of all occurrences of formulae.

---

19 All scholars have agreed that the Anglo-Norman and the Middle English versions form part of a single group, but some older scholarship, which still carries some authority, fails to recognise just how closely the extant versions are related.

20 This fact is most clearly evidenced by the section of “orphans,” those formulae that occur only once in Amis and Amiloun and which have therefore been cross-referenced for other occurrences in the MED (see appendix).
Using this definition, a ‘concordance’ of all formulae in Amis and Amiloun has been made listing all 3126 instances, corresponding to over a hundred “mental templates.” It is interesting to note that some of these formulae existed in English a century or more before being found in Amis and Amiloun, others are found only afterwards, and the first occurrence for a third portion is found elsewhere in MS Auchinleck, with which Amis and Amiloun was produced. Of this last group, Möller has demonstrated that many of those found in Guy of Warwick were actually translations from Gui de Warewick. Thus, one can recognise in the formulae of Amis and Amiloun a debt to both Gallic and native traditions as well as an influence on the future style of English writing.

In a similar vein, the verse structure itself is examined. Auchinleck has been called “the fount of the twelve-line tail rhyme” for it is here that this verse form, later to become a common arrangement in English literature, is first employed on any scale. It is neither entirely “Germanic,” nor is it directly derived from any French style, but seems to draw some aspects from each. Thus, even the verse structure does have some relevance in this study.

The Conclusion in Chapter Six synthesises all of the material presented in Chapters Two through Four and views it in the light of ideas concerning reception. It relates each step of the redactor’s practice as outlined in Chapters Four and Five to the concepts of translation as explained in Chapter Two. An explanation is given as to why such methods would be considered desirable for the purposes of reception. Furthermore, the evident success of translations such as Amis and Amiloun is explored, for by being emulated they seemed to have an impact on the general establishment of a new “insular style,” itself the product of a blending of Anglo-Norman, Old French and Germanic traditions.

21 Found in appendix.
22 See Chapter 3.
CHAPTER II: MEDIEVAL ATTITUDES TOWARDS TRANSLATION

II.1 INTRODUCTION

It is not the purpose of this chapter to give an exhaustive treatment of the history of translation, but merely to provide an outline of trends leading to the development of established translation methods from the late twelfth to the early fourteenth centuries.

What follows in this chapter then is a brief overview of translation practice from Late Antiquity to the Middle Ages. It begins by examining the views of early church fathers in respect to religious translations and exegesis, as well as classical rhetoricians in respect to secular translation. The second part relates these views to the establishment of the medieval artes poeticae, which were primarily concerned with the art of writing in general, but which address translation as a component thereof. Though claiming to adopt techniques suggested by the Romans, these translations differed significantly in that they were usually intralingual re-adaptations focusing more heavily on elegance of expression than textual fidelity. This posed problems for self-styled inheritors of this tradition whose need to provide interlingual translations led them either to redefine established methods, or to claim adherence to the model while actually employing rather different techniques. The chapter culminates with quotations from versifiers actually producing vernacular translations, examining both their stated methods, their actual practice, and the reception such adaptations enjoyed. The conclusion then recapitulates, pointing out how medieval translators of romance were heirs to all these various and often contradictory views, and why, therefore, translation as they understood it was essentially remaniement, the art of rewriting; it was an art of which translation formed a part, but which was very different from any modern understanding of the term.

II.2 FROM "TRANSLATIO" TO TRANSLATION

It seems important, therefore, to begin by differentiating between modern conceptions of translation and medieval translatio. Modern thought can be said to begin in 1813 when Schleiermacher first attempted to place the question of translation within the more general framework of theories of language and the mind in his essay Ueber die verschiedenen Methoden des Uebersetzens.1 This essay marked the first attempt to rationalise the disparate views of literalists, whose strictly linguistic model of translation demanded it be nothing more than the dry dissemination of data, and those of dynamists who advocated a
more interpretative approach often allowing for dramatic re-creation of material. Though some controversy still exists today between hermeneutic theorists and those promoting a linguistic model of translation, few today would suggest that either technique is entirely adequate without the other;\(^2\) as Govaert notes, no matter what a modern translator’s theory, his practice must have the essential elements of both views.\(^3\) It is this middle way between the two schools of thought that those of us living at the beginning of the twenty-first century most often think of as “good translation”; one that preserves the original author’s sense as closely as possible, but in which necessary adaptations have been made in order to compensate for cultural or linguistic differences that divide different language communities.

II.3 THE CLASSICAL INHERITANCE

II.3.1 Introduction

Prior to 1813, however, it was largely left to individual translators to formulate personal methods of proceeding, and most treatises concerning translation are based on their authors’ own experiences. This empiricism was nevertheless tempered to some extent by the discourses of certain Latin authorities who were fairly well polarised into two groups, translators of and commentators on sacred texts on one side, and classical rhetoricians on the other. This section provides a cursory examination of both views, citing some of the more influential quotations most widely referenced in the Middle Ages. The conclusion then demonstrates the inadequacies of both modes as prescribed methods of vernacular translations in the Middle Ages as the reasons for translating had changed quite radically.

II.3.2 The Patristic Tradition

The religious commentators, such as Jerome, Augustine and Boethius, were generally very conservative in their methods. They were no doubt somewhat influenced by Old Testament tradition wherein many cabbalists argued that the very words themselves, their order and even that of their letters formed part of the sacred mystery.\(^4\) To some extent the Christian tradition itself had adopted this belief; John’s Gospel begins by stating, “ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν  

\(^1\) See Steiner, pp. 248-9, 500. Steiner gives an exhaustive outline of the history, theory and practice of translation in his fourth chapter, and in his select bibliography organised chronologically. Such interests are, however, outwith the scope of this study, and space prevents all but a brief overview of translation theory and practice.

\(^2\) See L. Kelly G., p. 34.

\(^3\) Govaert, p. 436.
In Revelations, the saint further warns to tread very carefully when interpreting scripture:

And as far as scripture was concerned, these words were well heeded. Boethius particularly adhered to this patristic model, applying it as well to philosophical translations, writing:

Secundus hic arreptae expositionis labor nostrae seriem translationis expediet, in qua quidem uereor ne subierim fidi interpretis culpam, cum uerbum uerbo expressum comparatumque reddiderim. cuius inceptio ratio est quod in his scriptis in quibus rerum cognitio quaeritur, non luculentae orationis lepos, sed incorrupta ueritas.

Such translations certainly had their flaws in that the literal word-for-word renderings often made the product unintelligible. Augustine himself notes this predicament, but nevertheless declares that this type of translation had a particular validity in providing a “true” version to compare against other translations where the effort to interpret the sens may have altered original meaning:

---

4 See Zimler, Last Kabbalist of Lisbon, especially chapter three and specifically p. 66.
5 John, 1: 1. Greek NT 1550. [In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.] The footnote to this verse in Scofield Study Bible (from which all English biblical quotations are taken) notes, “(1:1) Greek Logos (Aram. Memra, used as a designation of God in the Targums, i.e. Aramaic translations of the OT).” p. 1267. [In principio erat verbum, et verbum erat apud Deum, et Deus erat verbum. - Joannis: Bibla Latina Vulgata.] 6 Revelations, 22: 18-19. Greek NT 1550. [For I testify to everyone who hears the words of the prophecy of this book: If anyone adds to these things, God will add to him the plagues that are written in this book; / and if anyone takes away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part from the Book of Life, from the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.] [Contestor enim omni audienti verba prophetiae libri hujus: Si quis apposuerit ad haec, apponet Deus super illum plagas scriptas in libro isto. / Et si quis diminuerit de verbis libri prophetiae hujus, auferet Deus partem ejus de libro vitae et de civitate sancta, et de his, quae scripta sunt in libro isto. - Apocalypsis: Bibla Latina Vulgata.] 7 Boethius, In Isagogen Porphyrii, p. 135. [This second work, a readily accessible exposition, will clarify the text of my translation, in which I fear that I have incurred the blame of the “faithful translator,” as I have rendered it word for word, plainly and equally. And here is the reason for this procedure: that in these writings in which knowledge of the matter is sought, it is necessary to provide, not the charm of a sparkling style, but the uncorrupted truth.] Translation from Copeland, p. 52. 8 John Scotus Erigena roundly excuses such problems in the preface to his translation of De caelis et hierarchia: “Si vero obscura minusque apertam praecedentia interpretationem seriem iudicaret, videant me interpretum huius operis esse, non expositorem.” PL 122:1032. [If someone should find the text of the aforesaid translation obscure or impenetrable, let him consider me the translator of this work, not its expositor.] Translation from Copeland, p. 52.
Sed quoniam et quae sit ipsa sententia, quam plures interpretes pro sua quisque faculitate atque iudicio conantur eloqui, non apparett, nisi in ea lingua inspiciatur quam interpretatur, et plerunque a sensu auctoris devius aberrat interpres, si non sit doctissimus, aut linguarum illarum ex quibus in latinam scripturam pervenit, petenda cognitio est aut habendae interpretationes eorum qui se verbis nimis obstrinxerunt, non quia sufficient, sed ut ex eis libertas vel error dirigatur aliorum, qui non tam verba quam sententias interpremando sequi maluerunt.\(^9\)

This same statement, however, underscores Augustine’s contention that such translations do not by themselves suffice (\textit{non quia sufficient}); in so stating he lends tacit consent to the side-by-side existence of sense-for-sense translation. This idea is given fuller credence earlier in the same work when he explains, “Duae sunt res quibus nititur omnis tractatio scripturarum, modus inveniendi quae intellegenda sunt et modus proferendi quae intellecta sunt.”\(^10\) In other words, Augustine believes it is not enough simply to gather Scriptural knowledge, but that one must also find the means to transmit it. Such a statement suggests that merely parroting literally what one has read is not enough; some skill in explaining clearly in one’s own words is also required.

Jerome likewise seems to have contradictory views on the subject. He explains in his famous letter to Pammachius:

\begin{quote}
ego enim non solum fateor, sed libera uoce profiteor me in interpretatione Graecorum absque scripturis sanctis, ubi et uerborum ordo mysterium est, non uerbum ex uerbo, sed sensum exprimere sensu.\(^11\)
\end{quote}

Thus, like Augustine, he seems to see the value in both approaches to translation. However, he is very careful to point out that each has its place. Word-for-word translation seems to be the only acceptable course to take when dealing with scripture;

\(^9\) Augustine, \textit{De doctrina christiana}, 2.13.19. [Since the meaning which many interpreters, according to their ability and judgement, seek to convey is not apparent unless we consult the language being translated, and since many translators err from the sense of the original authors unless they are very learned, we must either seek a knowledge of those languages from which Scripture is translated into Latin or we must consult the translations of those who translate word for word, not because they suffice but because by means of them we may test the (laxity) or falsity of those who have sought to translate meaning as well as words.] Robertson’s translation.

\(^10\) Augustine, \textit{De doctrina christiana}, 1.1. [There are two principles on which every treatment of Scripture depends: the means of discovering what is to be understood, and the means of setting forth that which has been understood.] Robertson’s translation.

\(^11\) Jerome, Epistula 57, CSL, 54:508. [In fact, I not only admit but openly declare that in the translation from Greek texts (except in the case of sacred Scripture, where the very order of the word is a mystery) I render the text, not word for word, but sense for sense.] Hubbell’s translation, p. 365.
it is, however, to be avoided when dealing with secular works where sense-for-sense is to be sought, and in that respect he has deferred to "master Cicero." Jerome becomes even more vitriolic against word-for-word translations further along in the text when he quotes Evagrius of Antioch:

ex alia in aliena linguam ad uerbum expressa translatio sensus operit et ueluti laeto gramine sata strangulat...hoc igitur ego uitans ita beatum Antonium te petente transposui, ut nihil desit ex sensu, cum aliquid desit ex uerbis. alii syllabas aucupentur et litteras. tu quaeres sententias.12

That this quotation advocating sense-for-sense translation comes from the preface to a hagiographic work makes one tend to wonder how firmly Jerome held his own conviction that sacred matter should only be translated word-for-word. It seems he was wavering a bit in his beliefs, and as his frequent allusions to Cicero and Horace suggest, was to some extent drawn towards the camp of the rhetoricians even where sacred writings were involved. Certainly one must recognise that his magnum opus, the Vulgate Bible, is not at all as stilted as Jerome implies it should be if actually translated word-for-word; its diction was clear enough to allow it to serve as the only authentic text for the Roman Catholic Church well into the twentieth century.13 On that basis alone, one could conclude that Jerome did not entirely conform to his word-for-word dictate where scripture was involved.

There are dangers, however, in associating Jerome definitively as a Ciceronian, as many scholars, medievals in particular, have sought to do. Though he may not have followed the letter of his law, he certainly followed its spirit. Jerome always seems to struggle between stagnant literalness and flowing interpretation: "Si ad uerbum interpraetor absurde resonat; si ob necessitatem aliquid in ordine, in sermone mutauero, ab interpraetis uidebor officio recessisse."14 In practice, therefore, he seems to seek a middle way by trying to bend the target language into presenting the original sense as closely as possible without wrenching it into entirely unnatural positions. As Cuendet points out, "Cicéron et Saint Jérôme ont attent le but qu’ils

12 Jerome, Epistola 57, CSEL 54:511. [A translation given word for word from one language to another conceals the sense, even as an overgrown field chokes the seeds...I have rendered this life of St. Anthony, at your request, and I have avoided such literalisms; in changing the language I have not changed the sense. Let others strive after letters and syllables; you seek after the meaning.] Hubbell’s translation.

13 This is especially remarkable given that Jerome finished his translation around 405, and it was not declared the only official authority for the Latin Bible until the Council of Trent in 1546.

14 Preface to Eusebius’s Chronicle, PL, 25b. [If I translate word for word it sounds silly; if by necessity I change some aspect of word order or diction, I will seem inadequate to the task of the translator.] Translation from Copeland, p. 47. I prefer, however, Pratt’s translation of “ridiculous” for absurde (p. 3).
What Jerome ultimately does then, is make himself the type of translator today view as a “good” one.

II.3.3 The Rhetoricians’ Tradition

However, despite the admiration he received throughout the Middle Ages, Jerome’s practical model was not to last. Perhaps this was partly due to his own frequent quoting of Cicero, Horace and other classical rhetoricians, whose authority on matters of rhetoric, grammar and verse formed the basis of the medieval *artes poeticae*. By citing them as frequently as he does, they became the authority of the authority, and it was largely their philosophies on rewriting which came to form the basis for medieval translation practice. But as shall be explained, these theories were no closer to the modern concept of practical, accurate translation than the patristic model, “erring” instead (from a modern standpoint) in the opposite direction.

Generally speaking, the rhetoricians were little concerned with transmitting the content of their source, for the bilingual education enjoyed by these Romans made such a function unnecessary; anyone who wished had simply to look to the original to find out what it said. Instead, it was a way of competing with Greek culture. Among the Romans, Greek language and literature held such great prestige that they could be said to feel their own Latin inferior, and consequently translation was frequently used by students to improving their skills in Latin oratory and composition through emulating the eloquence of Greek masters. As such, they practised more of what Copeland calls “interlingual imitation” than translation as moderns understand it.

A quotation from Quintilian indicates just how early such bilingual education began, and how “free” the translations were expected to be:

Igitur Aesopi fabellas, quae fabulis nutricularum proxime succedunt, narrare sermone puro et nihil se supra modum extollente, deinde eandem gracilitatem stilo exigere condiscant; versus primo solvere, mox mutatis verbis interpretari, tum paraphrasi audacius vertere, qua et breviare quaedam et exornare salvo modo poetae sensu permittitur.  

---

15 Cuendet, p. 400.

16 Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, 1.9.2. [Their pupils should learn to paraphrase Aesop’s fables, the natural successors of the fairy stories of the nursery, in simple and restrained language and subsequently to set down this paraphrase in writing with the same simplicity of style: they should begin by analysing each verse, then give its meaning in different language, and finally proceed to a freer paraphrase in which they will be permitted now to abridge and now to embellish the original, so far as this may be done without losing the poet’s meaning.] Butler’s translation.
Thus, children not long out of the nursery, presumably at an age when most modern children are only learning to write their mother tongue, were instructed first to translate then to paraphrase (*tum paraphrasi audacius vertere*), and though expected to follow the poet’s meaning, were encouraged to abridge (*breviare*) and embellish (*exornare*). The purpose of such *amplificatio* and *abbreviatio*, however, dealt not so much with translation itself, but with the use of translation as a rhetorical tool. Nevertheless such practices were later to be adopted by medieval commentators as desirable elements of a “good” translation.

For older students Cicero gave similar advice, teaching by example as his preface to translations of Demosthenes’s and Aeschines’s speeches attests:

> nec converti ut interpres, sed ut orator, sententiis idem et earum formis tamque figulis, verbis ad nostram consuetudinem aptis. In quibus non verbum pro verbo necessae habui redgere, sed genus omne verborum vimque servavi.17

His focus, then, is on imitating the general style and force of the language in applying them to Latin, retaining only the *figures* of thought. Copeland notes here Cicero argues “not for conserving the source, but for appropriating and displacing the authority of the original so as to invent a model of Atticism within *Latinitas*.”18

Cicero himself says very nearly that in *De finibus*:

> Quid si nos non interpretum fungimur munere, sed tuemur ea quae dicta sunt ab iis quos probamus, eisque nostrum iudicium et nostrum scribendi ordinem adiungimus? quid habent cur Graeca anteponant iis quae et splendide dicta sint neque sint conversa de Graecis?...Quosdi Graeci leguntur a Graecis, iisdem de rebus alia ratione compositis, quid est cur nostri a nostris non legantur?19

Essentially Cicero is advocating not merely translation, but what Steiner calls “‘transfiguration’ – where the intrinsic weight and radiance of the translation eclipse

---

17 Cicero, *De optimo genere oratorum*, 5.14-15. [And I did not translate them as an interpreter, but as an orator, keeping the same ideas and the forms, or as one might say, the “figures” of thought, but in a language which conforms to our usage.] Hubbell’s translation. Jerome quotes this passage in Epistle 57.

18 Copeland, p. 45.

19 Cicero, *De finibus*, 1.2.6. [And supposing for our part that we do not fill the office of a mere translator, but, while preserving the doctrines of our chosen authorities, add thereto our own criticism and our own arrangement: what grounds have these objectors for ranking the writings of Greece above compositions that are at once brilliant in style and not mere translations from Greek originals?...If Greek writers find Greek readers when presenting the same subject in a different setting, why should not Romans be read by Romans?] Rackham’s Translation.
that of the source."\(^{20}\) He advises *amplificatio* and rearrangement to take the best that the Greek tradition has to offer and Latinise it. What is most striking about this advice is that it is not just fables or oratory being addressed, but rather philosophical tracts where one presumes it is the information contained rather than the style which is valuable.\(^{21}\) It seems then that there was an ulterior motive to Cicero's agenda; he not only wished Roman students to produce worthy Latin literature, but also to take what was available in the Greek tradition and improve it to such an extent that its value outweighed that of the original.\(^{22}\)

Horace likewise condemns overly faithful translations with arguably the same purpose. In a famous passage from his *Ars Poetica*, quoted repeatedly in medieval commentaries, he asserts:

\[
\text{publica materies privati iuris erit, si} \\
\text{non circa vilem patulumque moraberis orbem} \\
\text{nec verbo verbum curabıs reddere fides} \\
\text{interpres, nec desilies imitator in artum} \\
\text{unde pedem proferre pudor vetet aut operis lex.}\(^{23}\)
\]

Though his intent is perhaps more altruistic than Cicero's in that he does not advocate supplanting the exemplar as much as modifying it so that admiration due to the original does not fall to the redactor, the advised treatment remains the same: change, alter, adapt; make something new of old material.\(^{24}\) Here once again the "good" translator is one who recreates the source into a new original.\(^{25}\)

---

20. Steiner, p. xvi.
21. Even when Cicero does believe strict preservation of sens is paramount, he remains inflexibly against word for word translations if it is at all possible to change them: "Nec tamen exprimi verbum e verbo necesse erit, ut interpretes indiserti solent, cum sit verbum quod idem declarat magis usitatum." Cicero, *De finibus*, 3.4.15. [Though all the same it need not be a hard and fast rule that every word shall be represented by its exact counterpart, when there is a more familiar word containing the same meaning. That is the way of a clumsy translator.] Rackham's translation.
22. Quintilian also advocated such a practice, generally called *aemulatio*, in the *De institutione aratoria*, 10.5.4: "Neque ego paraphrasin esse interpretationem tantum volo, sed circa eosdem sensus certamen et aemulationem." [And I do not mean by 'translation' merely a paraphrase, but struggle and rivalry over the same sense.] L. Kelly's translation, p. 241, endnote 3.
23. Horace, *Ars poetica*, 131-5. [Public material will be private property if you do not linger over the common and open way, and if you do not try to render word for word like a faithful translator, and if, as an imitator, you do not throw yourself into narrow straights from which shame or poetic law will not let you escape.] Copeland's translation, p. 29. Copeland notes the difficulties of the language employed here, citing it as the reason for her departure from the Loeb translation. I would further change her "if" to "unless" for "si."
24. The Latin verse passage is particularly difficult, and there have been various interpretations; however, regardless of Horace's intended meaning, the interpretation provided here seems to be the one followed by the medieval overly faithful translations, particularly when treating "common matter" such as traditional tales or epics, cause the *interpres* to receive undeservingly the credit due the original author. See § II.4.2., below.
25. Quintilian in his *Institutio oratoria* advises more clearly: "quam nunc consummari potissimum oporteat, cum tanto plura exempla bene dicendi superant quam illis, qui adhuc nonne sunt, contigerunt. Nam erit haec quoque laus eorum, ut priores superasse, posteriores docescisse dicantur." *Institutio oratoria*, 10.2.28. [...]and it is now above all times that such perfection should be attained when there are before us so many more models of oratorical excellence than were available for those who have thus far achieved the highest success. For this glory also shall be theirs, that men shall say of them that while they surpassed their predecessors, they also taught those who came after.] Butler's translation.
II.3.4 Conclusion: Successful Obsolescence

These quotations provide some idea of the rhetoricians’ methodology and their reasons for it, but perhaps Seneca best explains just how different the result should be:

Hoc faciat animus noster: omnia, quibus est adiutus, abscondat, ipsum tantum ostendat, quod effecit. Etiam si cuius in te comparebit similitudo, quem admiratio tibi alius fixerit, similem esse te volo quomodo filium, non quomodo imaginem; imago res mortua est. 26

This indicates the extent to which Cicero’s “figures of thought” and Quintilian’s “[original] meaning of the poet” were expected to be reflected in the redaction, and standing at the beginning of the twenty-first century, it’s easy to conclude: “not very much.” But given the declared aims of the rhetoricians, such translations were not just adequate but desirable. The admiration they gained by producing such translations led their pattern to be followed well into the Renaissance if not all the way to the modern period. 27

To a large extent, however, medieval need for translation no longer conformed to that of the rhetoricians, nor for that matter to that of the Church Fathers. The rhetoricians were translating primarily from Greek into Latin with an eye to improving their own writing skills and, to some extent, create a Latin literature that could compete against the prestigious Hellenistic one that they were emulating; the patristic writers were not so much concerned with style, but instead sought to achieve exacting precision in the transmission of meaning. They were not bothered if that led to stylistic difficulties or deficiencies in the result. In both situations such complications were but a detail since translation was merely a tool for study rather than an end in itself; any intended recipient (if any were intended at all) was expected to be an equally well-educated member of the bilingual intelligentsia who could verify the sources. Pliny the Younger puts it succinctly in a letter to a friend:

Quaeris quemadmodum in secessu, quo iam diu frueris, putem te studere oportere. Utile in primis, et multi praeципunt, vel ex Graeco in Latinum vel ex Latino

26 Seneca, Epistula, 84.8. [This is what the mind shall do: it should hide away all the materials by which it has been aided, and bring to light only what it has made of them. Even if there shall appear in you a likeness to him who, by reason of your admiration, has left a deep impress upon you, I would have you resemble him as a child resembles his father, and not as a picture resembles its original; for a picture is a lifeless thing.] Gummeire’s translation.
27 Many if not most of the works of Chaucer, Shakespeare, and others were themselves re-adaptations. To some extent the legacy continues today; with Mists of Avalon (1982), Marion Zimmer Bradley stands at the end of a long line of adapters of Arthurian legends stretching back over a millennium and including Malory, Chrétien de Troyes, Marie de France, La3amon, Wace, and Geoffrey of Monmouth.
If the second sentence is directed towards rhetoricians, the third and fourth are directed towards patristic writers. The first sentence, however, presupposes an adequate enough ability with both languages for their use as a recreational, albeit educational, pastime. It is by and for such people that the classical theories of translation were produced. The prestige of such authorities caused these models to be retained, however, long after the function for which they were promulgated had changed as shall be demonstrated in the rest of this chapter.

II.4 The Medieval Heirs:

II.4.1 Artes Poeticae

The end of the twelfth century saw the beginning of the production of numerous works addressing the artes poeticae. These treatises were essentially textbooks which codified the rules governing “good writing,” by which was meant Latin verse. The artes were the culmination of centuries of interpretation of rhetorical poetic dicta concerning the production of such writing, enarratio poetarum. Put crudely, they developed from the seven rhetorical circumstantiae (summaries, or circumstances) to be covered in expository composition: quis, quid, cur, quomodo, ubi, quando, and unde, or “who,” “what,” “why,” “in what manner,” “where,” “when,” and “by what faculties.” By the Middle Ages these circumstantiae were sometimes identified as: persona, res, causa, tempus, locus, modus, and facultas, and it is probably these nominative titles rather than the interrogative forms from which the terms of the artes poeticae developed.

28 Pliny the Younger, Epistulae, 7.9.1-3. [You ask me what course of study I think you should follow during your present prolonged holiday. The most useful thing, which is always being suggested, is to translate Greek into Latin and Latin into Greek. This kind of exercise develops in one a precision and richness of vocabulary, a wide range of metaphor and power of expression, and moreover, imitation of the best models leads to a like aptitude for original composition. At the same time, any point which might have been overlooked by a reader cannot escape the eye of a translator. All this cultivates perception and critical sense.] Radice’s Translation.

29 Remigius of Auxerre refers to them as such in his accessus to his commentary of Martianus Capella’s De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii. There is evidence that even until the fifteenth century, Remigius, Geoffrey of Vinsauf and the classical authorities were actively references by translators. Johnson notes that in Bokenham’s translation of the Legendys of Hooly Wummen, the author continues to apply the circumstantiae associated particularly with Remigius, but reduces them to four in order to harmonise them with the Aristotelian “Four Causes” (i.e. causa efficiens – the efficient cause, the author; causa materialis – the material cause, the subject; causa formalis – the formal cause, the form including structure, style and literary procedure; causa finalis – the final cause, the objective of the text and of the author). p. 105-6. Furthermore, Johnson
The millennium of extrapolative discourse explaining the appropriate techniques for handling the *circumstantiae* drew forth from them specific areas of critical focus in regard to authoritative verse production. Among the most important of these were: *inventio, elocutio, disposito, memoria*, and *actio*. Being rather straightforward, the last three terms (arrangement of structure, recollection, and performance / delivery respectively) need no further comment here. *Elocutio*, or oratorical delivery, deserves a note because it was under this heading that, along with many other “rhetorical colours,” *amplificatio* and *abbreviatio* were frequently classified, each itself comprised of several sub-categories. *Inventio*, however, deserves some inspection because having undergone numerous reinterpretations it is the easiest to misunderstand, but was nevertheless indispensable as the key function of classical rhetoric and later served as a guiding principle of the *artes poeticae*.

In the classical *artes rhetoricae*, *inventio* had primarily a heuristic role in that the author was expected to discover his own arguments for himself. In Cicero’s words (or at least, words attributed to him), “Inuentio est rerum uerarum et veri similium excogitatio que causam probabilem reddant”[sic].30 This definition in no way limits novelty, and one presumes that in “thinking things up” a certain amount of creativity was expected. It was with this understanding of *inventio* that Pliny had advised translation to his friend, for “it leads to an aptitude for original composition.”31 In *De doctrina christiana*, however, Augustine reconstitutes that meaning when he linked the *modus inveniendi* (the means of discovering, properly part of *inventio*) with the *modus proferendi* (the means of setting forth, properly part of *elocutio*).32 In doing so, he reorients *inventio* completely. Since *De doctrina christiana* concerns itself with exegesis, and since the patristic view of exegesis is that nothing new should be added, Augustine forbids the formation of new arguments and relegates *inventio* merely to restating what is already found in textual authority. Though the term still deals with forming an argument, its identification with the *modus interpretandi* strips it of its heuristic function and relegates it to a strictly hermeneutic one in which, paradoxically, the only way forward is through *amplificatio* and *abbreviatio*. Thus *inventio* becomes subsumed to *elocutio*.

Ironically, while rejecting most of the methodology prescribed by the patristic commentators, statements by the medieval authorities on *artes poeticae* show that in respect to *inventio* they deferred to Augustine. Some contend that the part he plays is still

notes that the narrator paraphrases Jerome’s “per cola et commata” as “clause by clause” in line 18 (p. 107), and mentions Geoffrey of Vinsauf directly in ll. 85-88 (p. 109). See also § II.4.3 for Alfred’s knowledge of Remigius.

30 *Pseudo-Cicero, Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 1.2.3. [Invention is thinking up things that are true or at least realistic to make your case plausible.] Caplan’s translation.

31 See § II.3.4., footnote 28, above.
relatively minimal. Even Copeland notes, “While the late medieval artes poetriae carry the imprint of Augustine’s exegetical rhetoric, they are also – or even primarily – the products of classical preceptive traditions of rhetoric, that is, the legacy of Cicero... and Quintilian, along with the poetic precept of Horace’s Ars poetica.” This may be true, however the important part played by inventio within the artes poeticae indicated a fundamental change in the treatment of material. One must therefore treat with caution statements such as Pratt’s declaring that “biblical translation theory is something of a red herring when applied to the translation of courtly romances in the vernacular,” for as shall be seen below, this fusing of two incongruous traditions which utilised translation for different purpose set some precedence for translation practices which ultimately did have some bearing on the manner of treating “popular” vernacular literature.

II.4.2 Intralingual Latin Translation: Geoffrey of Vinsauf and Matthew of Vendôme’s Advice on Remaniement

The blending of traditions in the artes poeticae created something of a quandary for anyone trying to adhere to the contradictory injunctions against creating new material on the one hand (patristic tradition) and not to say what was said before on the other (rhetorical tradition). It was probably a result of confusion on the matter that a flurry of manuals concerning the subject were produced around the turn of the thirteenth century. One of the more influential authorities, Matthew of Vendôme, addresses the paradoxical situation in Ars versificatoria (c. 1175), generally recognised as the first significant assertion of the artes poeticae.

Matthew acknowledges that the ancients had created new works, but determines that doing so had been a necessity for them due to the limited amount of source material on which they could rely:

Antquis siquidem incumbebat materiam proteelare quibusdam diversicruitis et collateralibus sententiis, ut materiae penuria poetico figimento plenius excuberos in artificiosum luxuriaret incrementum. Hoc autem modernis non licet. Vetera enim cessauere novis supervenientibus

32 See § II.3.2., footnote 10, above.
33 Copeland, p. 160.
34 Pratt, p. 15.
35 Matthew of Vendôme, Ars versificatoria, 4.5. [It was indeed incumbent upon ancient authors to expand their material with digressions and other material only slightly related to their topic, so that their sparse material, then abounding in poetic figures, might swell into an artificial luxuriance. This practice, however, is not allowed to modern authors: for new advances put an end to old practices.] Gaylon’s translation.
Therefore, though it had been permissible for the ancients to develop new topics, medieval writers were bound to work solely with topoi inherited from the past. While maintaining this conviction, he goes on to declare that overly faithful translations are equally reprehensible:

Igitur materiae pertractate sententiis erit a modernis collateraliter insistendum, verbis permutatis et variato dictionum matrimonio, ne, si verba authentica et easdem junceturas aliquid in proprium velit vendicare, penuriae sensus possit deputari.36

Thus, while confined to working exclusively with “traditional materials,” the medieval writer was simultaneously forbidden to maintain the “words and expressions” of the exemplar. Judging from Matthew’s statement, to do so was “to appropriate for [one’s] own use the original words and constructions,” a charge tantamount to that of plagiarism.

Writing a few decades later, the Englishman Geoffrey of Vinsauf reaches the same conclusion in Documentum de modo et arte dictandi et versificandi. He draws attention to the lines from Horace’s Ars Poetica where he warns that “public material will be private property,”37 concluding: “Vilis est locus qui omnibus patet. Et vile est in illo loco morari in quo omnes moram faciunt.”38 Dwelling in the place where everyone else has dwelt is “shameful,” but straying from the well-marked path is simply not permitted. This state of affairs raises some perplexing questions: How does one proceed then? How does one say the same thing in a different way without inventing new analogies?

In the section of the Ars entitled “De executione materie” [sic], Matthew puts forward a possible solution, drawing heavily on the rhetorical tradition. He begins by immediately restating his condemnation of repeating material verbatim:

Sequitur de executione materiae, in qua quidam male disciplinati solent plerumque delirare et a semita doctrinali turpiter exorbitare, qui in scolastico exercitio fabulas circinantes poeticas verbum verbo sigillatim

---

36 Matthew of Vendôme, Ars versificatoria, 4.15. [Therefore, modern authors will have to concern themselves with equivalent statements in traditional materials, changing words and expressions. Otherwise, anyone wishing to appropriate for his own use the original words and constructions might be assumed to want good sense.] Gaylon’s translation, p. 104.

37 See § II.3.3., footnote 23, above.

38 Geoffrey of Vinsauf, Documentum, 2.3.137. [Vile is the place in which everyone treads, and vile it is to loiter in that place where everyone has lingered.]
Shortly thereafter, he provides a suggestion for varying the material through the use of *elocutio*, particularly *abbreviatio* and *amplificatio*: “Debent enim minus dicta suppleri, et inconcinna in melius permutari, superflua penitus aboleri.”40 Taken together, these quotations seem to draw directly from Quintilian’s advice “to paraphrase Aesop’s fables...now to abridge, now to embellish,” and Horace’s admonishment, “do not try to render word for word like a faithful translator.”41 From a standpoint of style this counsel was sufficient for like Quintilian and Cicero, Matthew was promoting good writing, not dissemination of information.

In the *Documentum* and the *Poetria Nova*, Geoffrey expresses similar ideas. On the one hand he advocates *abbreviatio*: “non debemus ibidem immorari circa digressiones vel descriptiones, sed breviter locum illum illum materiae translire.”42 On the other, he advises an aspect of *amplificatio* which he labels *interpretatio*:

Sed variet vestes et mutatoria sumat;
Sub verbis aliis prae summar resume; repone
Pluribus in clausis unum; multiplice forma
Dissimuletur idem; varius sis et tamen idem.43

It is this aspect of *interpretatio* to which *inventio* has largely been consigned. No longer is one to discover one’s own arguments, but is simply to restate the old ones in various guises. However, despite the caution to be “varied and yet the same,” there is always some element of subjectivity in how the translator interprets the source. As Louis Kelly notes, “The essential variable is what the translator sees in the original, and what he wishes to pass on.”44 No matter how closely a redactor attempts to follow the sens of the materia, some discrepancy will invariably emerge whenever elements of the original are altered. In changing the words, phrasing, and especially

---

39 Matthew of Vendôme, *Ars versificatoria*, 4.1. [What follows concerns the working out of the material, an area in which the poorly instructed often act like fools and wander shamefully away from the narrow path of true learning. In school exercises they grind out stories, ransacking poems word for word for images, just as if they were setting out to write a verse commentary upon their authors.] Gayton’s translation, p. 100.
40 Matthew of Vendôme, *Ars versificatoria*, 4.2. [Things about which too little has been said in the sources ought to be filled out, awkward passages ought to be revised into something better, and superfluous ones omitted entirely.] Gayton’s translation, p. 100.
41 See § 11.3.3., footnotes 16 and 23 respectively. It is an interesting irony that in condemning appropriating the words of others, Matthew does exactly that.
42 Geoffrey of Vinsauf, *Documentum*, 2.3.133. [We must not linger in the same place with (its) digressions or descriptions, but abbreviate that place of subject-matter.]
43 Geoffrey of Vinsauf, *Poetria Nova*, 3.1.1, vv. 222-5. [Let it vary its robes and assume different raiment. Let it take up again in other words what has already been said; let it reiterate, in a number of clauses, a single thought. Let one and the same thing be concealed under multiple forms - be varied and yet the same.] Nim’s translation, p. 24.
44L. Kelly, p. 227.
by either deleting material the translator sees as unnecessary or adding details for clarification, the translator infuses his own conception of the subject into the work, which may indeed be different from that of the original author.

It’s important to remember, however, that the linguistic environment of Geoffrey and Matthew certainly had some bearing on their vociferous vilification of overly direct translations. Given that these treatises on style were aimed at the production of Latin verse, and that the knowledge of Greek had largely disappeared in the Middle Ages, such advice was focused not so much on interlingual translation as it had been for the Romans, but rather on intralingual Latin-to-Latin translation. Undoubtedly, Roman versifiers could depend on Greek-to-Latin interlingual translation itself to partially fulfil the role of diversification due to syntactic, lexical and metaphoric discrepancies between the languages. As that aspect was lacking in the unilingual “translations” which concerned Geoffrey and Matthew, one is consequently not surprised by their insistence on variation; not to vary the material would simply be copying.

As mentioned in the previous section and the introduction to this one, the stated aim of Matthew and Geoffrey was not translation specifically, but to instruct in the writing of good verse generally. Thus, the majority of both works is largely given over to the whole process of literary creation, with a heavier coverage of style generally than of translation specifically. Furthermore, though no doubt cognisant of ancient interlingual translation, for them the term was conceived of as intralingual, even when borrowing classical references to it. Thus, though proclaiming adherence to the rhetoricians’ strictures for executing translation, their needs required a different interpretation of those methods involving greater variation.45 Coupled with a shift in the meaning of *inventio* (indispensable for preventing translation from becoming “plagiarising” according to medieval conceptions)46 from a Ciceronian one permitting the discovery of new arguments to the Augustinian model which forbids it, the practical implementation of translation was somewhat different. It was limited to restating the *materia* of the original using different words and *topoi*, but ones which had to be drawn from the existing literary corpus. So much repetition of material already in the common domain coupled with a *de facto* moratorium on originality meant that the only realisation of *inventio* was through * abbreviatio and amplificatio*.

---

45 See Smith, *An Historical Study of English*, especially Chapter Four for a discussion of connotative variance among synonyms with the same denotation.

46 See paragraph 2 of this section.
Despite all efforts, it is inconceivable that such a technique would not to some extent affect the sens of the materia. Essentially, Matthew and Geoffrey were encouraging writers to translate by starting with a mental picture of the work they sought to produce, and, given their own interpretation of the meaning, identify places where it could be abridged or expanded with commonplace recurring poetic concepts or formulae – i.e. elaborate loci using topoi. In this, it seems they were not advocating translation as it is perceived today, but remaniement, the entire reworking and re-interpretation of a text. And, as shall be seen below, remaniement did indeed became the working model for the translation of Amis and Amiloun.

II.4.3 Interlingual Latin to Vernacular Translation: King Alfred’s Treatment of the Sacred and the Secular

Until this point the discussion of translation has necessarily focused on Latin as the target language simply because, apart from some very brief statements in prologues and epilogues concerning objectives and techniques, there is very little in the way of precise theoretical pronouncements on the practice of medieval vernacular translation. This section will examines some of the statements that do exist from one English translator, demonstrating both the reliance on the historical traditions as a formal model, as wen as how that model had become obsolete since the functional needs of translation had changed.

The first aspect which warrants some mention is perhaps the changed linguistic situation which initiated translations into the vernacular. As explained, Matthew and Geoffrey wrote for an educated minority fluent in Latin, telling them in Latin how to “translate” from Latin into Latin. The problems this would pose for anyone attempting an interlingual translation of any sort are evident. However, the situation was actually more complex when translating from Latin into the vernacular, for in truth Latin was often beyond the understanding of even the literate elite. Already in ninth-century England, some three hundred years before Matthew and Geoffrey, Alfred expresses concern on the decline of Latin knowledge throughout his kingdom in the preface to his translation of Gregory the Great’s Pastoral Care:

Swæ clæne hio [i.e. learning] wæs oðfeallæn on Angelcynne ðæt swiðe fæawa wær on behionan Humber

47 The medievals themselves must certainly have been aware of this. One can only conclude that, since the focus was chiefly on style, and since the medieval versifiers had just as much mastery of their Latin sources as the Romans had had of their Greek ones, this could be to some extent forgiven if the intent was judged to be “good.”
48 Douglas Kelly describes the result as materia propinqua: “a combination of materia, topical additions and links that eliminate lacunae.” D. Kelly, p. 192.
49 See Pratt, p. 1.
50 See § II.4.2, paragraph 5.
He then goes on to say that even though churches may be filled with good books, the clergy benefit very little from it because “hie næron on hiora agen geōiode awritene.” It is precisely because of this lack of Latin that Alfred directs a wide-scale programme of translating Latin works into English.

His reasons for the initiative and his intended means of carrying it out deserve some quotation at length for they elucidate Alfred's own understanding of the history of translation, its use, the extent of Latin fluency among his people, and how he himself understands translations to be undertaken:

Da gemunde ic hu sio æææ æae
There are several interesting points in this passage on which to reflect. First, Alfred begins by noting that the “law” was found first in Hebrew, then translated into Greek, then into Latin, and then parts of it into various vernaculars of various peoples. His insistence that the Latins translated “it all” and the Greeks “all the books” is most likely a reference to the Septuagint and the Old Latin version respectively, in which all the books of the Bible were reproduced. His reference to other parts being translated into other languages suggests a possible knowledge of missionaries such as St Cyril and St Methodius who created a Slavonic version of the scriptures for the Moravians. This underscores his understanding of interlingual translation of sacred texts, and a possible familiarity with the patristic tradition.

He then concludes that such a programme of translation would be desirable in England where, though Latin has declined, “yet many knew how to read English.” Here he makes it clear that the clergy who no longer benefit from the riches of their libraries are not simply unlettered clerics, they are in fact educated, but their “literacy” is limited to the vernacular. Rather than attempting a wide-scale re-introduction of Latin, however, Alfred thinks it best to translate into English for their benefit, and, as he states later, for the benefit of all in every diocese in the kingdom in perpetuity. The priority in such translations would therefore be dissemination of information reflecting as nearly as possible the materia of the original in order to eliminate the need to learn Latin to consult the exemplar. Thus, neither of the classical traditions would be entirely acceptable as each presupposes a working knowledge of Latin for the intended recipients.

Alfred then names four churchmen who have taught him to translate “sometimes word for word, sometimes sense for sense.” Here he seems to be striking the balance that Jerome sought in many of his translations, and given that Alfred’s words are borrowed directly from Epistle 57, one can easily deduce that these advisors knew the saint’s writings and passed it on to their sovereign. However, what seems to be forgotten is that in the very same sentence, Jerome warns this practice is not valid “in the case of sacred Scripture, where the very order of the word is a mystery.” Thus there is evidence even

manifold cares of this kingdom to translate this book into English which is named Pastoralis in Latin, and “Pastor’s Book” in English, sometimes word by word, sometimes sense by sense, just as I learned it from Plegmund my archbishop, and from Asser my bishop, and from Grimbold my mass-priest, and from John my mass-priest. When I had then learned it, so that I understood it and so I could most intelligibly interpret it, I translated it into English.]

54 ‘...ond to aelcum bispocstole on minum rice wille a ne osendan...Ond ic biobiode on godes naman ðet nan mon ðene astel from ðere boc no do, ne ða boc from ðæm mynstræ — unscuð hu longe ðer swæ gelerede biscepas sien, swæ swæ nu...For ðy ic wolde hitte his ealneg æt ðære stowe wearn.” Alfred, On the State of Learning in England, p. 7, II. 77-83. [and to each bishopric in my kingdom I want to send one...And in God’s name I forbid that any man take the book mark from the book, nor the book from the minster — [it is] unknown how long there will be such learned bishops as now...therefore I would desire that that they were always at that place.]

55 See § II.3.2., footnote 11.
before Matthew and Geoffrey of the muddling of the patristic and rhetorical traditions, and a misappropriation of Jerome’s adherence to certain rhetorical traditions for secular works and its misapplication to all sorts of writing.

Alfred’s closing further indicated the degree to which the separate patristic and rhetorical models were melded to produce a new understanding of the translation process. In words that presage the *remaniement* advocated by Matthew and Geoffrey, Alfred says that *after* he learned the book so that he could understand it and interpret it, *then* he translated it. Thus, even for a sacred text, Alfred admits infusing his own understanding of the text into his redaction. In his preface to Boethius, he also acknowledges the room for misinterpretation in such a process. After recounting the same word-for-word and sense-for-sense method, he states:

> ond nu bit ond for Godes naman he halsað ælne þara þe þas boc rædan lyste, þæt he for hine gebidde, ond him ne wite gif he hit rihtlicor ongite þonne he mihte, for þam þe ælc mon sceal be his andgites mæde on be his æmettan sprekan þat he spreð ond don þæt þæt he dep. 56

Alfred therefore acknowledges that each man comes to an understanding of a text through his own abilities, and that it is quite possible that someone understands the original better than he. In essence, he admits that his translation could be false.

Whitelock notes the extent to which the translation (from a modern point of view) is indeed false:

> The translation is free, and there are many additions...Throughout the work, passages are added in explanation of classical references and of early views of the universe, several of them coming from a Latin commentary similar to the one which survives in later manuscripts and is ascribed to Remigius of Auxerre. This shares with the English version many references which used to be viewed as Alfred’s own. 57

In Alfred’s “free” translation, he was not above including lengthy explanatory passage, and it seems that many of them were lifted from other works whose focus lay at some distance from that which he purported to translate. This accords with Matthew’s

---

56 Alfred, *From King Alfred’s Translation of Boethius* in Sweet’s Anglo-Saxon Reader, p. 9, ll. 10-14. [And now he [Alfred] asks in God’s name and implores each of those who desires to read this book, that he pray for him [Alfred] and not to blame him if he [reader] understands it more correctly than he [Alfred] could, because each man must speak what he speaks and do what he does according to the measure of his own understanding and leisure.]

57 Whitelock, p. 8.
injunction to “fill out, revise, and omit,” as well as following his stricture to only utilise existing *topoi*. It therefore shows that the understanding of *inventio* as defined by the *artes poeticae* was fully formed some centuries before Matthew’s writings. It also demonstrates how such borrowing could affect the *sens* of the *materia*, thus making Alfred more of a *remanieur* than a translator.

Although Alfred certainly could not know of Matthew and Geoffrey’s work, it seems that he adopted the methods they were later to advocate for intralingual translations and used it for interlingual ones. And even if there is no sure evidence that Matthew or Geoffrey knew of Alfred’s translations, it is clear that at least some of their contemporaries did. What is important is that they all seem to be making the same claims of fidelity to the source, but then suggesting what today would be considered sweeping changes, and implementing those changes in translations. One could very easily conclude, therefore, that these techniques, along with their discrepant assertions, had become a standard procedure for actual translation procedures.

**II.4.4 Interlingual Vernacular to Latin Translation: Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Creation of Sources**

Before moving on to look at comments of vernacular-to-vernacular translators of romance, it seems worthwhile to pause for a glance at the vernacular-to-Latin translation (or the claim thereof) of another Englishman, Geoffrey of Monmouth. Geoffrey is perhaps the first writer to use the word “*transferre*” as a term for translation, and in his dedication to *Historia regum Britanniae* he gives some hints as to how the translation came about:

> Cum mecum multa et de multis saepius animo revolvens, in historiam regum Britanniae inciderem, id mirum contuli, quod infra mentionem quam de eis Gildas et Beda luculentu tractatu fecerant, nihil de regibus qui ante Incarnationem Christi inhabitaverant, nihil etiam de Arturo ceterisque compluribus qui post Incarnationem successerunt repperissem, cum et gesta eorum digna aeternae laudis constarent et a multis populis quasi inscripta locunde et memoriter praedicaretur. Talia mihi et multotiens cogitanti de taliis, obtulit Walterus, Oxinfordensis archidiaconus, vir in oratoria arte atque in exoticis historis eruditus, quendam Britannici

---

58 See §II.4.2., footnote 40.
59 See §II.4.3., paragraph 7.
60 This is especially the case since Alfred lists at least four scholars who advised him to translate in this fashion. See footnote 52, this section.
61 Wace, for example, says in his *Brut*: “Une lei escrit e trova, / Marcienne l’apela l’on / Sulunc le language breton. / Li reis Alved, si cum l’en dist, / Translata la lei e escrist.” II. 3342-8. [A law was written and founded / which was called “Mercian” / according to the British language. / King Alfred, as it is said / translated the law and wrote it.]
Thus, in line with the dictates of the age, Geoffrey insists that his material is not new but came from a written source, and emphasises the autorité of the source by saying it was given to him by a reputable historian and orator. He claims merely to have translated it in order to set forth the valiant achievements of British kings “whose deeds are worthy of eternal praise,” but whose stories were largely neglected in Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* and the *De excidio et conquestu Britanniae* of Gildas. In short, Geoffrey is also translating (or at least claiming to do so) in a like manner to that later advocated by Geoffrey of Vinsauf and Matthew of Vendôme in that he uses it to eliminate the lacunae existing in the previous histories, and in doing so he too is practicing remaniement more than translation.

Prior to finding his source however (a remarkable coincidence given the amount of thought he had given to the subject before that lucky event), Geoffrey notes that these deeds “were entertainingly told from memory by many people as if they had been written down.” Durling observes that this claim indicates Geoffrey’s belief that “oral tradition can be authentic and, once it has been transcribed into a book, can contribute to authoritative history.” It seems possible therefore, if not likely, that Geoffrey’s “British book” was nothing more than an invented pretext for writing down these stories which other historians, not having found the dubious written source, felt obligated to neglect.

Even among his contemporaries the existence of the *liber vetustissimus* was in enough doubt to leave Geoffrey open to various charges. In the *Prooemium* to his *Historia Rerum Anglicarum*, William of Newbergh displays his mistrust of an authentic source, and thereby Geoffrey’s reliability, by writing:

-Gaudfridus hic dictus est, agnomen habens Arturi, pro eo quod fabulas de Arturo, ex priscis Britonum figmentis

---

62 Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Historia*, 1.1. [While turning over many things in my mind, I happened upon the history of the British kings. It seemed astonishing that, beyond such mention of them as Gildas and Bede had made in illustrious treatises, I found nothing concerning the kings who had lived before the Incarnation of Christ, nothing either of Arthur and of the many others who succeeded [him] after the Incarnation, although their deeds are worthy of eternal praise and they were entertainingly told from memory by many peoples as if they had been written down. While I was repeatedly thinking these thoughts about these matters, Walter, Archdeacon of Oxford, a man learned in the art of eloquence and in foreign histories, brought me a certain very old book written in the British language which, from Brutus, first king of the Britons, down to Cadwalader son of Cadwallon, set forth the deeds of all of them in elegant style and in continuous order. Induced by his request...I took pains to translate his book into the Latin tongue.] Robert Durling’s translation in N. Durling, p. 16.
63 See § II.4.2., footnote 48.
64 Durling, p. 17.
sumptas et ex proprio auctas, per superductum Latini
sermonis colorem honesto historiae nomine palliavit.65

William is not alone. Many other historians of the age considered Geoffrey something of a
charlatan, accusing him of "a number of sins, among them distortion of the truth, self-
aggrandizement, and fraudulent use of translation."66 However, despite such accusations,
which certainly could not have passed completely unnoticed, the Historia enjoyed wide
success. It served as the basis for Wace’s Roman de Brut, which in turn was the source
for La3amon’s Brut. Considering the acceptance of the Historia in face of such open
disbelief in its source, it is not unlikely that other translators would chose to handle
material in a similar fashion: claim a written source, but rely on memory or orality to
supplement whatever was lacking in lettered records.

II.5 THE REMANIEURS: COMMENTS OF INTRALINGUAL VERNACULAR TO
VERNACULAR TRANSLATORS OF ROMANCES

II.5.1 Introduction
Whether or not individual translators of medieval romance had any personal
knowledge of the patristic writers or the rhetoricians, Geoffrey of Vinsauf or Matthew
of Vendôme, Alfred of Wessex or Geoffrey of Monmouth, it is evident that in the
practical applications of translation they drew heavily and variously from their
traditions.67 Poets were praised for using amplificatio and abbreviatio as the
commentators on the artes poeticae advised; they would re-interpret works and fill in
gaps with information gleaned outside their exemplar as Alfred did; they would
sometimes follow Geoffrey of Monmouth in simultaneously claiming fidelity to a
written source which no one else seemed to find while alluding to being the first to
write out a known story. In all this, they were adhering to the rhetoricians in inventing
something new while asserting (and perhaps as far as they were concerned, obeying)
the patristic tradition’s dictum to change nothing at all. This section will examine
some of the comments of vernacular romance translators from throughout Europe to

65 William of Newbergh, Prooemium to Historia Rerum Anglicarum in Chambers’s Arthur of Britain, p. 274-5. [He was
called Gaudefridus with the nickname Arutus because, taking up the myths about Arthur from the early figments of the British
and increasing them with some of his own, he cloaked them with the virtuous name of history, casting over them the color of
the Latin language.] Durling’s Translation, p. 31.
66 Durling, p. 9. In her endnotes on p. 31, she states, “The mixed reception of the Historia in the twelfth century is well
known.” She then gives a number of references where this reception is demonstrated.
67 It is known, or at least claimed, that Chaucer was familiar with Poetria Nova. When discussing his use of Filostrato for
Troilus and Criseyde, Wallace claims that Chaucer took to heart Geoffrey of Vinsauf’s admonition that writing a poem should
be like building the foundations of a house, and that in translating the author had to take pains to lay the foundation in such a
way that he could build his own structure upon that foundation according to his own skills and reflecting his own abilities: “it
is quite clear that Chaucer pondered for years on the design and theme of Troilus before setting his hand to the task of
composition... Chaucer’s obeisance to the Poetria Nova at this point... functions as a private critique of the Filostrato and as
something of a personal manifesto.” See Chaucer and the Early Writings of Boccaccio, p. 104; see also Thompson, Troilus
show just how widespread such procedural applications concerning translations were accepted.

II.5.2 New Needs

One thing they all seemed to realise, even if they never baldly expressed it, was that their needs with respect to translation had changed. For the most part they were dealing with secular matters in the vernacular, not Scripture, annals or philosophical treatises. Furthermore, though their audience might very well be bilingual, their intent was to render the *materia* intelligible to the monolingual members of the target-language society:

L’estoire d’Alixandre vous veoi par vers tretier  
En romans qu’a gent laie doie auques profiter

Thus, the need for translation no longer corresponded to that promulgated by the *artes poeticae*. The intended audience was not expected to be able to verify the sources as were those of the Romans or the *artes poeticae*, and therefore it was an interlingual dissemination of *materia* that was paramount, not verbal elegance.

Benoît de Sainte-Maure notes the added complication this might cause:

Mais li latins dit e conprent  
Od somme, od glosse, ce m’est vis,  
Ou romanz ne peut estre mis  
Choses motues; pour ce m’est gref.

Here Benoît recognises the inherent complexity of languages whereby something easily expressed in one language is not so easily rendered in the other. In order to make such renderings, the translator must fully understand the original meaning, and be adept enough in the target language to find a corresponding way of saying it.

In his *Brut*, such obstacles lead Wace into refusing to translate Merlin’s Prophecies from Geoffrey’s *Historia* claiming he cannot decipher the meaning:

68 Though the subjects were often historical, they were more ludic in purpose than straightforward chronicles arranged as a series of annals like the Anglo-Saxon *Chronicles*.

69 *Roman d’Alexandre*, 1.30-1. [I want to versify the history of Alexander for you in verse so that lay people may also profit (read it).] A later quotation from the fifteenth century, but one that is perhaps equally valid due to its origins in the composition of an actual Middle English verse romance, comes from *Partonope of Blais*, whose redactor says: “I am comawndyt of my souereyne / Thys story to drawe, fulle and playne, / Be-causse yt was fid vynknowthe and lytel knowe, / From frenche ymne-to yngedysche, that beter nowe / Hyt my3th be to euer-y wy3hthe.” II. 2333-39.

70 Benoît, *Chronique*, II. 25832-35. [But Latin says and comporteth with summary, with gloss, it seems to me, many things which cannot be put into “romance”; for this I am sad.]

71 For example, “Gemütlichkeit” or “Schadenfreude” describe situations English-speakers can comprehend, but which the English language is not entirely adept at describing as succinctly as German.
Ne vuil sun livre translater
Quant jo nel sai interpreter;
Nule rien dire ne vuldreie
Que si ne fust cum jo dirrie.72

Thus, Wace indicates his understanding that it is the materia itself that is essential, not simply ornamental diction. However, what is particularly interesting is that, like Alfred, Wace believes it is important to interpret the work, not just to translate it. One is not surprised, therefore, that he too provides a somewhat “free” translation, altering the sens of the materia, and even the materia itself, to reflect how he thinks it should be understood. Therefore, Wace too is not so much a translator as a remanieur.

II.5.3 Old Tools: Artes Poeticae

Though the importance of materia was gaining wider recognition, the attention to oratorical refinement was not entirely abandoned. Deference to the methods expounded by the artes poeticae retained currency, and adaptations of the sort advocated by Geoffrey of Vinsauf and Matthew continued to attract admiration, even in inter-vernacular translations. In his excursus to Tristan, for example, Gottfried von Straßburg praises Hartmann von Aue for adorning his stories with poetic diction:

Hartmann der Ouwaere,
ahi, wie der diu maere
beid'üzen unde innen
mit wOrten und mit sinnen
durchvärwet und durchzieret!
wie er mit rede figieret
der äventiure meine!73

This very nearly encapsulates a quotation from the Poetria Nova, in which Geoffrey encourages just such a treatment: “Sed brevis aut longus, se semper sermo coloret / Intus et exterius.”74 Similarly, in his Middle Dutch translation of the French Florie et Blancheflor, Diederic van Assenede restates the necessity for amplification and abbreviation:

---

72 Wace, Brut, 7539-42. [I do not want to translate his book when I do not know how to interpret it; I wish to say nothing that is not exactly as I ought to say (8).] Durling notes that Wace’s motive may actually be to avoid repeating material so strongly associated with Geoffrey of Monmouth, and thereby draw attention away from his source and instead focus on his own skills. That may be true, but the fact remains that he was able to use linguistic difficulties as a plausible excuse for not translating.

73 Gottfried von Straßburg, Tristan, ll. 4619-25. [Hartmann von Aue, ah, how he colours and ornaments the story thoroughly, both externally and internally, with words and ideas! How he uses the art of diction to bring out the meaning of the story.] Pratt’s translation, p. 16.
Both Geoffrey and Matthew urge such ornamentation through *amplificatio* and *abbreviatio*. Although there is no way of knowing whether Diederic, Hartmann or Gottfried actually knew of Matthew or Geoffrey of Vinsauf, statements indicate that the methods suggested by the masters of the *artes* were nevertheless firmly entrenched and widely followed. The problem facing translators, therefore, was to proceed in a fashion that fulfilled the accessibility upheld in *Alexandre*, overcame the difficulties noted by Wace and Benoit, while still paying homage to the aesthetic values demanded by the *artes poeticae*.

### 11.5.4 Additional Tools: Knowledge of Earlier Translations

Given such difficulties, perhaps the easiest ways of making a tolerable translation would be to look at others already deemed acceptable and adopt what worked while avoiding what did not. This practice seemed to have not been uncommon. Wittlin observes that Spanish redactors often worked with the aid of Italian translations of *De civitate dei* in producing their own versions of Augustine. While translating the above work, Diederic apparently relied on a German translation to aid him with the French. This must certainly have simplified the task, for the Spanish of the former and the Dutch of the latter were certainly closer to the Italian and German versions respectively than to the French or Latin originals. However, though technically interlingual, reliance on such closely related sister languages approaches the intralingual; furthermore, Burdant suggests that utilising existing translations in the target language frequently occurred also: "la pratique de la composition est telle que l'on n'hésitera pas, à l'occasion, à utiliser ouvertement une version préexistante, ce qui peut être une solution de secours et de facilité." Thus, at least in respect to the romances, the rhetorical method inherited through the *artes poeticae* would be particularly apt. One would therefore expect the redactors intentionally to vary their *sens* somewhat more than in pure interlingual translations, with the ironic consequence that the *materia* they maintained to be too difficult to render accurately was ultimately changed anyway.

---

74 *Poetria Nova*, III, II. 742-3. [Whether it be brief or long, a discourse should always have both internal and external adornment.] Nims’s translation, p. 42.
75 Diederic van Assenede, *Floris ende Blanchefloer*, II. 19-21. [One must shorten and lengthen the tale, if one thinks to bring it to verse and to render the adventure.]
76 See Wittlin, *Traduction et commentaires*.
77 Pratt, p. 21.
78 Burdant, p. 132.
79 See § II.4.2., paragraph 6.
More to the point in this thesis is Diederic's translation of *Floris and Blaunchefleur*. Pratt argues:

Some of the innovations to the French model which Diederic's and Fleck's versions share are not attributable to a common source, for there is too much stemmatic evidence against this. I have therefore argued...that Diederic, who composed his poem around 1260, knew of Fleck's romance dated circa 1220, and drew on it both for some fairly insignificant details and for some substantial additions to the model.  

If such is the case, and her argument is extremely convincing, then Diederic has ingeniously circumvented the stringent requirement for a written source. Though there is one, he does not rely on it directly, but only his memory of it. He even comes close to admitting this is what he has done when he make reference to other books besides the exemplar early in the poem:

Dat was al waer, ons en bedrieghe  
Dese boec ende andre, daer wi inne  
Al vinden ghescreven haer minne.  

Given the vagaries of memory, it is probably less reliable as an authority than orality, for the common *memoria* of the jongleurs tends to “misremember” less frequently than an individual. In reality, then, his source is even less trustworthy than that of Geoffrey of Monmouth’s if the latter’s *liber vetustissimus* was indeed a sly cover for oral traditions.

Nevertheless, one can understand Diederic’s compulsion to translate in this way. Having heard the story before, he had a set idea about it in his mind. When those ideas were contradicted in his exemplar, he was not above utilising what he “knew” to be the truth about the story and “correct” it. If instead he favoured the exemplar’s version, he could reject what he had heard before. At every step, he could rely on both accounts to furnish details he found worthy of elaboration or reject the trivialities he judged negligible. Thus, instead of trying to reproduce exactly what the exemplar says he relies on his *memory* of another written account to eliminate *lacunae*, and improve it through *amplificatio* and *abbreviatio*. Diederic probably thought this practice provided a “good” translation in that it told what he believed to be the “truth” about the story; but in doing so

---

80 See Pratt, pp. 21-2, where she lists many examples to support her view.
he infuses it with his own understanding of the material which, of course, vary from that of the original author. Thus, instead of translating what he actually does is create a new variant, and thereby he too becomes a remanieur. 82

II.5.5 More Tools: Extra-Exemplar Borrowing, Orality and Memory

Apparently Diederic was not alone in relying on information found outside the exemplar to give a fuller account. Though such a practice might cause discrepancies between the work intended to be reproduced and the final product, it was often considered the preferable course in that many considered it to provide the most accurate account of the story. As Geoffrey of Waterford remarks in his translation of Secrets des secrets:

Souvent i metterai autres bonnes paroles, les que tot ne soient mie en cel livre, al mains sunt en autres livres d'autoritei, et ne sunt pas mains profitable ke celles qui en cel livre sunt escrites. 83

He, therefore, openly admits his use of other books to supplement the “facts” in his exemplar. He is recommending not simply a direct translation but one that is “most truthful” by providing details left out in the exemplar. By making himself the judge of what “truth” to say and what “falseness” to repress, however, he is also practicing remaniement for his truth evidently differed from that of his source, and he therefore tells a slightly different story.

Though not confessing it outright, Gaimar suggests he goes even further:

Geffrai Gaimar cel liuere escrit,
Les translad anfes i mist,
Ke li Waleis ourent leisse. 84

Gaimar’s claim of “putting in what the Welsh left out” with no reference to sources suggest that, instead of reaching for another book like his Waterford namesake, he admits doing what Diederic is only charged with: relying on his personal knowledge of the story. Furthermore, Gaimar makes no allusions whatsoever to “other books” as Diederic does. Though he is understandably careful not to declare it openly, his

---

81 Diederic, Floris ende Blandefloer, 282-4. [This was all true, unless we are deceived by this book and others in which we have found a complete account of their love.] Pratt’s translation, p. 22.
82 There is clear evidence of such a procedure in many minor details of the Middle English Amis and Amiloun, in terms of both plot and style; it is evident that the translator was relying on not just the AN version in making his reduction, but was in fact using other versions of the story, and most clearly the OF was influential in filling out many of the details.
83Quoted from MS B.N. fr. 1822 by Burdiant, p. 116. [Often I will put in other good words which are not in that book at all, but which are at hand in other books of authority, and are no less expedient than those which are written in this book.]
complete lack of any source for the details he inserts could easily be construed as a veiled reference to unrecorded folk knowledge. Even if it were not the case that he drew from the common memoria for his information, which he more than likely did, he would still be considered a remanieur for the simple reason that, like Geoffrey of Monmouth, Diederic of Assenede, Geoffrey of Waterford, Wace and others, he deliberately introduces his own understanding of the history into his redaction, thereby creating a new adaptation of materia.

II.5.6 The Authority of the New Creations
Ultimately, however, it seemed that as soon as any new adaptation was made, it became an autorité simply by having been written. Wace, for example, was undoubtedly aware of the scepticism surrounding the Historia, but nevertheless decided to translate it. Elsewhere, however, he refuses to actively authenticate a story by writing it out himself if he has no written source for it. In Roman de Rou, for example, Wace writes:

A jugleours oif en m’effance chanter
que Guillaume fist jadiz Osmont essorber…
ne sai noient de ceu, n’en puiz noient trover,
quant je n’en ai garant n’en voil noient conter. 85

Nevertheless, Wace must have known that the history of Norman dukes could not have had written sources back into antiquity (Rollo only arriving in France c. 912), and that the written sources he was using must have been recounted orally first. There is also an element of “the author doth protest too much” in Wace’s claims; there is always the possibility that this translator of Geoffrey of Monmouth follows his example here in creating a source for the rest of his story. Regardless of whether he actually did or not, the fact remains that his works, just like Geoffrey’s, became accepted authorities. It seems therefore that medievals accepted the premise that once a story was written it then became authentic.

II.6 CONCLUSION
Thus it appears that throughout western Europe, despite what at first glance may seem incongruous and discrepant claims concerning the treatment of materia, medieval translators of verse romance into the vernacular generally adhered to certain well established practical norms. Apparently there was a general consensus that dissemination

84 Gaimar, L’estoire, II. 6460-2. [Geoffrey Gaimar wrote this book. He translated them, put in deeds which the Welsh had left out.]
85 Wace, Roman de Rou, II. 1361-7. [In my childhood I heard jongleurs sing / that William had long ago overcome Osmond... / I know nothing of this, I can find nothing of it, / when I do not have confirmation, I want to recount nothing of it.]
of information in the exemplar had finally emerged as an important aspect of translation, not just imitation of elegant diction for the purpose of emulation. However, this was not interpreted as a requirement for strict textual fidelity as it is understood today. Just as the artes poeticae had drawn on outdated classical dictates for their translations, the vernacular translators drew in their turn on the artes, appropriating the need for an emulation of elegant style alongside the desire for “accuracy.” Furthermore, this accuracy was not limited to direct reproduction of the original’s materia and its sens, but all available sources touching on the theme of the material could be gleaned in order to give the “most truthful” redaction. Though recognised written sources continued to hold the greatest validity as autorités, rigid reliance solely on such sources meant that information existing in the common memoria of orality or folk knowledge, or even the private memory of the individual, would be omitted. Certain statements hint that the value of this information was often equated with that of books, and that the incorporation of such information was undertaken through slyly omitting citation of sources, or even perhaps falsifying them. However, all seemed to recognise that once these additions found written form, they fully acquired the requisite form to serve as an unquestionable authority. In due course, they in turn could then be used for re-interpretation, and re-amalgamation with other sources, perpetuating the evolution of the stories which can only occur if what the medievals called “translation” is in fact remaniement.

86 Indeed, it seems to be this type of falsifying of sources, and elaboration of them, that Chaucer parodies in Sir Topas.
CHAPTER III: THE TEXTS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP

III.1 BACKGROUND OF THE LEGEND

The story of Amis and Amiloun, a legend whose appeal is now largely confined to literary scholarship, for centuries was of widespread interest throughout Europe. The earliest written reference to the tale is an eleventh-century summary in Latin verse by Radolfus Tortarius, which begins: "Historiam Gallus, breviter quam replica, novit, / Novit in extremo litore Saxo situs." Given that Radolfus was a monk of Fleury writing about 1090, his use of the past tense to describe how well the story was known among such distant peoples underscores the geographical and temporal extent to which the legend was known. Written records demonstrate that interest continued to grow throughout Europe for another seven centuries. No fewer than thirty-three manuscripts of the tale exist in such diverse languages as Welsh, Hungarian, German, and Old Norse. In fact, almost every language of Europe can contribute at least one version of the story, suggesting it had some degree of universal appeal that reaches its zenith between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries, and which does not appear to wane appreciably until the seventeenth.

In the course of the story’s development two distinct branches evolved, the romantic cycle and the hagiographic. The former is essentially secular, the focus being a didactic study of ideal friendship, while the latter grafts on religious elements and presents the companions as pious martyrs. There had been some degree of controversy over which of the cycles emerges first, but it is now generally accepted that the romantic cycle is the older of the two, of which Radolfus’s summary is the earliest example. The Christian elements emerged later, and there is some evidence to suggest that the oldest of the hagiographic versions, the Vita Sanctorum Amici et

---

1 Ad Bernardum in Rodulfi Tortarii Carmina, p. 260, ll. 117-8. Radolfus was a monk in the Abbey of Fleury who produced a series of letters in Latin verse entitled Epistolae ad diversos. The second of these, a letter to one Bernardus and therefore referred to as "Ad Bernardum," uses the A&A story as an example of friendship. The version has been printed three times, by Hofmann in 1882, de Certain in 1855, and by Ogle and Schullian in 1933, from which this quotation is taken. Leach provides the following translation of it in his appendix: “The Gaul knew the song that I tell briefly; the Saxon knew it too in his fur dwelling." p. 101.

2 Leach, p. v; he also lists 32 manuscript versions on pp. ix-xiv. Asher notes that even this list is incomplete, citing one further German version on p. 21.

3 For the relationship between hagiographic and secular aspects in various versions see Leach, pp. xiv-xxii, and Hume, pp. 89-107.

4 Bedier first sought to answer this question in 1917 by examining the oldest three versions of the legend, that of Radolfus, the Vita, and the Old French chanson de geste. He concluded that they are essentially the same story, each derived independently from a lost French original, and that any further effort to divulge the source or original of the story was a waste of time. The best one could hope for was to recognise that “sous cette forme, l'histoire d'Amis et d'Amiloun est une legende a la fois foedale et chrétienne.” p. 342. This was to some degree in accord with Kolbing's original impressions (p. cxxx I), though he had been unaware of the existence of RT. Later, Huet expressed agreement with Bedier, stating of the Vita: “c'est l’imitation fidèle et consciente d’un antique chanson de geste.” p. 162. Leach, however, convincingly rejects these ideas, determining that the romance cycle was the first to emerge, "the hagiographic and Christian motifs in the story of Amis and Amiloun are then late." p. xxii.

5 In addition to Leach’s determination (p. xxii, cited above), Rosenberg and Danon note that “[the religious component] remains of secondary interest, a well-developed graft.” p. 8.
Amelii (ca. first half of 12th century) was a direct adaptation from Radolfus's account. In turn, it seems the Vita became the ultimate source for the hagiographic cycle, into which the majority of the extant versions of the story are classified. The much smaller romantic version is limited to the aforementioned Ad Bernaurdim of Radolfus Tortarius, a thirteenth century Old French chanson de geste, an Anglo-Norman poem surviving in three manuscripts, and a Middle English romance found in four versions. It is the relationship of these romance versions, particularly that of the Anglo-Norman to the Middle English, which concerns this study.

III.2 THE TEXTS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP

It seems prudent to begin by examining the extant versions of the secular cycle of the legend and their modern editions in order to provide the reader with some background to the story and to justify the selection of base texts used in this study. This chapter therefore begins with a brief look at each of the relevant manuscripts, noting the accuracy each copyist dedicated to his task; whether, for example, he strove for accuracy in a professionally produced text, or if he was rather more careless, penning passages for his own personal pleasure and not overly concerned about being precise. A short examination is also made of the rest of the manuscripts' contents, and, together with the information concerning the individual versions, one can determine the probable audience and purpose of each copy's production. Along with each version, a listing of existing modern editions is given, noting the advantages and disadvantages of each.

The conclusion then establishes the probable relationship of the various versions based on manuscript evidence. This permits the determination of the best manuscript versions to use for an examination of the translation practices from Old French/Anglo-Norman. Once established, the modern editions of these manuscript versions are likewise scrutinised to ascertain which are best for this study.

---

4 Leach cautions, however, that "It is obvious from Radulfus Tortarius' poem that he is summarizing a longer piece; for this and other reasons his poem is not the source of the later versions of Amis and Amilem." p. xxii. As this thesis concerns itself only with the development of the English version of the story and its relationship to French and Anglo-Norman sources, this question is not addressed here.

1 Leach states, "[T]here can be no doubt as to [the hagiographic versions'] relationship. The Vita Sanctorum Amici et Amelii (12th century) is the immediate or ultimate source of all the hagiographic versions." p. xvi. Rosenberg and Danon also note this version is "apparently the immediate, or at least the not very remote, source of all subsequent hagiographic tales." p. 3.

5 So called because it takes the form of a letter written by the monk to his friend Bernardus, but generally referred to as "RT".

6 There are three other romance versions known: a fifteenth century French miracle play in MS B.N. anc. f. 820, ii, ff. 1va-

---
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III.3 MANUSCRIPTS

III.3.1 The Middle English Version: Amis and Amiloun

Four Middle English versions of the legend survive. 11


D) Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 326 (Bodelian 21900), ff. 1ra-13vb.


MS Auchinleck

The Auchinleck version is generally considered to be the best of the ME versions, despite severe mutilation to the manuscript in order to plunder the illuminations. As a result, all of 48rb and 48va are lost, as is the first half of 48vb. Similar cutting has likewise rendered only the first to third letter in column 61ra legible, while all of 61rb and 61va are lost, as is the first half of the lines in 61vb. As 49ra begins with stanza 9 (line 97), and the text is generally arranged in parallel columns of 44 lines per page, one can surmise that the first nine lines of the poem were on 48vb, the rest of the column being taken up by illumination. Thus, lines 1-53 and 2441 - 2508 are lost completely, while lines 54-97, and 2397 - 2440 are partially lost. The text itself, however, is written in a neat, uniform hand with no notable scribal peculiarities; it was obviously copied quite carefully, the only notable error being the omission of stanza 177 (lines 2113 - 2124). Based on palaeographical evidence, scholars agree that it was written around the second quarter of the fourteenth century, probably around 1330. 12

The manuscript itself is a miscellany containing secular and religious works, but it is dominated by romances in English. Alongside Amis and Amiloun are found Floris and Blauncheflur, Sir Orphee, Beues of Hamtoun, King Alisaunder, two versions of Guy of Warwick (which seem to have exerted some influence on Amis and Amiloun) as well as Horn Childe and Maiden Rimnild among others. The quality of the book suggests it was intended for someone of appreciable wealth, though not, perhaps, nobility, and the content reflects the tastes of an aspiring middle-class seeking works in its native tongue. Interest and appreciation for the French heritage, however, is demonstrated by the inclusion of

11 Kolbing provides a study of the language, placing it in the East Midlands.
12 Leach, p. xc; Pearsall and Cunningham, The Auchinleck Manuscript, p. vii.
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English versions of *Lay le Freine* and *Roland and Vernagu*, an Anglo-Norman introduction to a series of macronics, and the Battle Abbey Role list of Norman barons. Significantly, nearly all of the romances are also based on AN or French sources. As to the manuscript itself, Kölbing provides a thorough description of it, while the introduction to the facsimile by Pearsall and Cunningham provides more up to date and easily accessible information.

**MS Egerton**

Egerton is perhaps the second most important ME version due to its early production, few evident errors in transcription, and its inclusion of the portions missing from MS Auchinleck. It is written in a late 14th century cursive hand which is easily readable despite small, crowded lettering. Other than eight places where the scribe left space for decorated initial letters to be added (which was never done), there is no attempt to punctuate or mark stanzas. Nevertheless, the scribe's effort to be accurate is attested by the bracketing together of rhyme pairs throughout, with the exception of ff. 141v and 143r - 147v. Unfortunately, some lines are difficult to read due to faded ink and damage by mould, and the loss of two folios following 145 prior to foliation deprives us of 332 lines.

Much like Auchinleck, Egerton reflects a strong interest in English romances, and there is much overlap in content; the first four works are: *King Richard, Bevous of Hampton, Sir Degare, Florence and Blanchfloure*, while *Amys and Amylion* appears as the sixth. The fifth and seventh items are *The Batell of Troys* and a fragment of *Sir Eglamour* respectively, neither of which appears in Auchinleck. Thus, the entire manuscript is exclusively dedicated to romances. Known as MS S due to previous ownership by the Duke of Sutherland, a complete description of the manuscript is provided by Kölbing, and in the *Catalogue to Additions to the Manuscripts in the British Museum*.

**MS Douce**

Douce is the only ME version of the story to come to us in its entirety (i.e. legible throughout), but due to scribal error, it contains only 2395 of the full 2508 lines of the text. Though there are a number of scribal peculiarities, the handwriting is clear, and is

---

13 On p. x of their introduction, Pearsall and Cunningham briefly discuss the speculation upon a lost series of English romances centring on Charlemagne and Roland based on this work and on *Otner* which immediately follows it. See also Warpole, *Charlemagne and Roland and The Source MS*, and Smyser.


16 Leach provides the manuscript's providence on p. xci of his edition.


18 Warner, p. 238.

19 Leach, p. xci; Le Saux 20.
attributable to the last half of the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{20} The scribe occasionally misinterprets the exemplar, reverses, omits and repeats lines. There is no punctuation or indication of stanzaic breaks, and lines drawn to connect rhyme words on 1r lead Leach to conclude that “the scribe did not realise that his poem was made up of twelve-line stanzas.”\textsuperscript{21} Six stanzas found in Auchinleck are omitted altogether, but this is most likely the fault of the exemplar as they are included in neither Harley nor Egerton, and it is unlikely that a scribe who was ignorant of the twelve-line stanzaic construction would be led into such regular omission of stanzas.\textsuperscript{22} In her edition of this manuscript copy, Le Saux inserts isolated lines from Auchinleck, while including the stanzas in her apparatus. However, she concludes that “these ‘missing’ lines and stanzas in no way detract from the coherence of the Douce version,”\textsuperscript{23} and that her providing them is only for the sake of completeness.

The remainder of the manuscript is taken up by a short poem of 42 lines written in six seven-line stanzas. It is in a later hand than the Vita de Amys & Amylion which precedes it, and is attributed to the late fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{24} It is likely that this Marian lyric was included simply to take up empty space at the end of the work. Falconer provides a full description of the manuscript, and another can be found in Catalogue of the Douce Collection.\textsuperscript{25}

\textit{MS Harley}

Harley provides an incomplete version of the story, here entitled Amys and Amelyoun at the end of a miscellany containing Latin histories, household accounts, medical treatments, and a version of Mandeville’s Travels. It has only lines 1-890 and 1013-1058 of the poem, in which are “many careless and ignorant mistakes.”\textsuperscript{26} Leach attributes this to the book having been given to a certain butler named Wyllym Cressett, who was expected to use the many blank pages after the Latin works for inventories, but also included items of his own choosing. Since the poem breaks off at points which do not correspond to stanza breaks, it is possible that whoever wrote it (probably Cressett himself) did not know that the poem was divided into stanzas, or possibly, simply did not care. Given such a lack of attention or concern, it is not surprising to find so many errors in what was ostensibly a personal work written for Cressett’s private enjoyment. There is a full description of the manuscript in Ward’s catalogue, where interestingly, he notes that references to Hereford

\textsuperscript{20} Leach, p. xciii.
\textsuperscript{21} Leach, p. xciii.
\textsuperscript{22} None of these are found in either of the other two versions, whereas stanza 177 (170 in Douce), which is omitted in Auchinleck, is preserved here.
\textsuperscript{23} Le Saux, p. 20.
\textsuperscript{24} Leach, p. xcii.
\textsuperscript{25} A complete description of the manuscript can be found in Catalogue of the Douce Collection, 1840, p. ccccvi, and in Falconer, p. iv and p. 596.
\textsuperscript{26} Leach, p. xcii.
(f. 139) and Dynder (f. 69) suggest the manuscript was in Cressett’s possession around
Hereford, linking it geographically to AN MS London.

Editions
To date there have been four editions of the ME text. The earliest, by Henry Weber in
1810, is based on Auchinleck with the missing portions supplied from Douce and a single
reference to Harley, while Egerton was unknown to Weber. No reference has been made
to this work in this study, as it has been superseded by subsequent editions.

The second, Kölbing’s 1884 critical edition, is chiefly based on Auchinleck, but it
suffers from the same problems in terms of a composite text deduced from all the versions
as does his AN text described below, and is likewise not readily available. Still, Kölbing’s
apparatus makes it possible to deduce the original text of all the versions, and his
introduction provides a great deal of detail concerning the phonology, stylistics and source
of the poem, though this is often a rather laborious pursuit, the reader being often
hampered by his liberal use of abbreviations and archaic German spellings.

The third edition, produced by Leach in 1937, is still recognised as the standard
reference for the poem. It too is based on Auchinleck, supplemented chiefly by Egerton,
with one reference to Douce for the missing 177th stanza. Here too is a full apparatus and
a thorough treatment of the sources and development of the story. Leach provides an
extensive list of manuscripts containing romance versions of the legend (to which this
study is confined) in Latin, Old French, Anglo-Norman and English, as well as a list
containing the hagiographic version of which “almost every language of Europe can
furnish at least one.” Asher notes that even Leach’s list is incomplete, omitting, for
example, the Engelhard of Konrad von Würzburg. Nevertheless, the list is accurate
enough for our purposes, focusing only on the relationship of the OF, AN and ME
versions, which are listed as items 2, 3, and 4 respectively.

The fourth edition, by Le Saux in 1993, is based on one manuscript only, that of
Douce. Though not as important as either Auchinleck or Egerton, the Douce text does
have the advantage of being the only complete extant text, though corrupt in places and
shorter than Auchinleck due to the absence of the lines and stanzas described above.
While maintaining that “these ‘missing’ lines and stanzas in no way detract from the

27 Ward, p. 667.
28 The text of Amis and Amiloun is found in vol. 2, pp. 367-474.
29 Leach has been unfairly criticised for the lack of philological detail in his introduction, but he states clearly in his preface, “I
have not made a study of the language, because I wanted to devote the space to the study [of sources and development].
Furthermore, Kölbing’s account of the language is adequate and trustworthy.” p. v.
30 Leach, p. x.
31 Asher, p. 21.
coherence of the Douce version,"\(^{32}\) Le Saux nevertheless supplies the lines from Auchinleck for the sake of completeness, while including the stanzas in her apparatus, which indicates only places where the printed text does not follow that of the manuscript.

\(^{32}\) Le Saux, p. 20.
III.3.2 The Anglo-Norman Version: *Amis e Amilun*

The Anglo-Norman version of the story exists in three manuscripts.33

K) Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 50, ff. 94vb - 102ra.


C) Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek 345 (olim Durlac 38), ff. 52ra-61vb.

*MS Cambridge*

By all accounts, the Cambridge account is believed to be the oldest of the three AN versions. Köbbing believes it could not have been written much after 1200,34 but based on more recent evidence, Fukui and others date it more towards the second half of the century.35 A full description of the manuscript is provided in James's catalogue of the manuscripts in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

*MS London*

Chronologically, this is the second of the three AN versions to emerge. Based on the script, a neat textura hand written in double columns of 42 lines each, Fukui judges it to have been written around the turn of the 14th century, shortly before the assembly of the volume between 1320 and 1330.36 It does not deviate significantly from the Cambridge version, and due to its availability through the Plain Text Series of the Anglo-Norman Text Society, it is here the preferred of the two synoptic versions for comparison with MS Karlsruhe and the English versions of the story. Robson provides an exhaustive description of the manuscript itself in his edition of *Fouke Ie Fitz Waryn*.

*MS Karlsruhe*

The Karlsruhe Manuscript is the most recent AN version of the story, dating from the end of the thirteenth century.38 It has generally been considered to be grossly inferior to the other two versions in terms of literary quality, demonstrating many corrupted readings, and at some points, scholars have even questioned the scribe's competence in French. It is also severely damaged, the central battle scene and the ending of the poem being

---

33 Note the rather confusing traditional labelling of the Cambridge manuscript as "MS K" and the Karlsruhe manuscript as "MS C".
34 Köbbing, p. ixiv.
35 Fukui, p. 1.
36 Fukui, p. 1.
38 Fukui, p. 1.
completely lost.\textsuperscript{39} It is significantly different from the earlier versions, having "not only a considerable amount of rewriting, but also numerous and sometimes lengthy interpolations."\textsuperscript{40} For our purposes, these deviations are significant in that they show an evident parallel with the later English versions.

\textbf{Editions}

The AN version of the poem has only been published twice before in modern times. Kölbìng produced a critical edition of the text in 1884, included in the edition of the English version from which his publication takes its name, the sixteenth-century Latin \textit{Vita Amici et Amelii carissimorum}, and the seventeenth-century Icelandic \textit{Amicus Rimur ok Amílius}.\textsuperscript{41} Though it is the only critical edition of the poem ever published, in many respects it is inadequate for the needs of the modern researcher. As Fukui notes, "[Kölbìng] adopted the solution of a composite edition of the London and Cambridge versions, taking the former as his base MS but not hesitating to correct its readings and alter its spellings as and when he saw fit. Besides not conforming, therefore, to the scientific requirements of a modern edition, Kölbìng's edition has by now also acquired the additional disadvantage of having become more or less inaccessible."\textsuperscript{42}

In an effort to rectify some of the inadequacies of Kölbìng's critical edition, Fukui produced a transcription of MS London for the Plain Text Series of ANTS in 1990. This is essentially a diplomatic edition of the text, with no apparatus whatsoever, and the briefest of introductions. Fukui justifies these limitations by noting that his version "is intended to complement, not to replace, Kölbìng's critical text."\textsuperscript{43} It does provide a clear text which is easily accessible, but its value to the researcher is nevertheless dependant upon using it in conjunction with Kölbìng's text.

As this thesis focuses on the examination of translation, adaptation and transmission of the legend among the OF, AN, and ME texts, it became necessary to create a similar edition based on MS. Karlsruhe, for which no edition existed. An edition by the present author is therefore provided in the appendix parallel to the London version.

\textsuperscript{39} See text in appendix.
\textsuperscript{40} Fukui, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{41} Besides the late date of these last two poems, which puts them outwith the scope of this study, they are also properly classified in the hagiographic cycle of the legend, and therefore not applicable to this examination of the development of the romance cycle. Briefly, however, the Latin version is that of Paris MS Bibliothèque Nationale, ancien. f. lat. 6188, f. 48, and the Icelandic is that of Stockholm MS Royal Library, Paper Codex, AM., chart. 2609'. Rather more relevant would have been the inclusion of the 204-line eleventh-century Latin verse summary of the story by Radulfus Tortarius, in Vatican Library MS 1357. This manuscript is a series of letters entitled \textit{Epistolae ad diversos}, of which the second provides the earliest surviving reference to \textit{Amis} and \textit{Amiloun} in any language. It was, however, unknown to Kölbìng at the time, who therefore assumed the \textit{Vita} to be the original source. It is printed by Certain and Hofmann, and more recently by Ogle and Schullian. Leach provides a translation in his edition.
\textsuperscript{42} Fukui, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{43} Fukui, p. 1.
III.3.3 The Unique Old French Version: Ami et Amile

*MS Colbert*

The Old French version of the story is found solely in:

Paris MS Bibliothèque Nationale ancien 7227 (Colbert 658), ff. 93ra-111rb.

Dembowski attributes all works in this manuscript to the second half of the 13th century, probably written by various scribes in the same bookshop; the entirety of Ami et Amile, however, is the work of one individual. It is written in parallel columns of approximately 44 lines each, beginning on 93ra, at the bottom of which is written in a 17th century hand: *Le Roman d'Amis et d'Amile*. The scribe was apparently very careful in his production, usually placing a point after the caesura, and often another after the seventh or eighth syllable, indicating the scrupulous attention paid to metre. The first line begins with a large “O” in blue and red, each subsequent laisse being identified by an enlarged initial letter in either red decorated with blue or blue decorated with red.

*Ami et Amile* is the third of five items in the manuscript, the other four being the Paris Roland, Gaydon, Jourdain de Blaye, and Auberi le Bourguignon in that order. In content, therefore, all the works appeal to the same tastes, and indeed they are presented as inter-related chronology. The evil seneschal Hardret appears in Gaydon as well, where he is presented as a family member of Ganelon, the traitor from Roland; it appears that to some extent *Ami et Amile* was influence by the Roland, much as the English Amis and Amiloun in MS Auchinleck seems to have been influenced stylistically by Guy of Warwick.

*Editions*

This version of *Ami et Amile* was first published alongside Jourdain de Blaye by Konrad Hofmann in 1852. Three years latter he published a second edition which purported to correct some transcription errors in the first, suppressing all accents and capitalisation, though it was still criticised as needing more emending.

Subsequently, fragments of the poem were printed in anthologies of 1905, 1920, and 1965, but it was not until 1969 that Dembowski published his version which remains the standard.

---

44 Though Leach attributes it to the first half of the century on p. x, and more specifically dates it ca. 1200 on p. xix.  
45 Dembowski, p. vii.  
46 Though the scribe seemed to understand the principles of metre, he seemed rather less adroit at handling assonance. See Dembowski, p. viii, and Schoppe, fase. 1, p. 39.  
47 vv. 2227-2370 by Constans, pp. 60-2.
v. 2917-3207 by Bartsch and Wiese, pp. 53-6.
v. 2892-2971 by Henry, pp. 63-6.
III.4 CONCLUSION: RELATION OF THE MSS AND THEIR SUITABILITY FOR THIS STUDY

Leach provides a detailed history of the legend's origins and a specific examination of the relationship of the Middle English manuscripts. He determines that no one of them is the source for any other. He concluded, however, that there is enough evidence to provide the following schema:

```
O French Original
 /|
Z  \
 /\  
Y Auchinleck
 /\  
X Harley
 /\  
\ /  
Douce Sutherland
```

Loomis demonstrates an even closer correlation between Auchinleck and MS Z. She agrees that “certain scribal errors and omissions in the Auchinleck version testify that it cannot be the exemplar for these other manuscripts itself,” but then draws attention to Möller’s 1917 thesis in which some 595 lines of Amis and Amiloun are shown to parallel the phraseology of the stanzaic Guy of Warwick. The fact that so many of these lines are reproduced in subsequent versions of Amis and Amiloun suggests that they must have been in the original; since Guy2 was evidently produced specifically for Auchinleck, this original Amis and Amiloun must have been produced at about the same time, and the Auchinleck version copied directly from it. As Loomis notes:

No other text is consistently so close to the stanzaic Guy, and this is precisely what we should expect if Amis, A, was the first, and so, presumably, the closest copy of the original English version. In the nature of things it can hardly have been anything else, for the original cannot have been composed until the stanzaic Guy was complete, and the stanzaic Guy...was specifically made for the Auchinleck.

---

50 Loomis, particularly 613 ff. See also Kolbing, Kleine Publication, 447ff.
51 Möller, pp. 47-105. The stanzaic Guy is also referred to as Guy2 to differentiate it from a version in couplets known as Guy1 in the same manuscript.
52 Loomis, p. 621; Möller, p. 87.
53 Loomis, p. 621.
On this basis, Loomis hypothesises that MS Z was something of a "rough draft" produced in the same bookshop as Auchinleck, and apart from a few scribal errors, was very nearly identical in content to Amis and Amiloun. Since "[t]hese Auchinleck romances were copied from texts of translators, of workers with texts, not with tradition or invention," there seems no reason to dismiss her claim or to believe that the scribe of the Auchinleck manuscript did any significant rewriting to what was in all likelihood the original English translation. On this basis, it seems that Auchinleck is the version most nearly mirroring the original translation, and given the evidence from the previous section concerning the care of the Auchinleck scribe, MS A is undoubtedly the best version for this examination.

Leach meanwhile further explains that it is possible to be somewhat more definite about the French original, designated MS O:

the source of the English story is a version that belongs to the Anglo-Norman group...It was not one of the extant versions, but one very close to them, especially to C....The proof is there that the English is a translation or redaction of a version very close to the KLC group, and that consequently the English and the KLC group must be considered as a unit. 55

MS O can probably be more narrowly defined. It cannot actually be Karlsruhe (C) as the later date of that copy rules out such an option. Furthermore, in the course of this study it becomes evident from the number of times that Auchinleck (A) agrees with Cambridge/London (K-L) against Karlsruhe that Auchinleck's exemplar (Z), shared some similarities with the K-L group which were not passed on to MS C. However, the overwhelming number of correspondences with Karlsruhe against K-L suggest that MS C must have been in the same tradition as O. The fact that C is so close to A in so many particulars despite the C scribe's relative unreliability, suggests that schematically C must indeed be very close to O, perhaps even being a copy of it.

Some of the most compelling evidence for the close relationship between Auchinleck and Karlsruhe comes from a simple comparison of the rubrication in the former with the ornamented letters marking laisse divisions in the latter. Until now, such a comparison has not been possible due to Kölling's omission of such details in his apparatus and a lack of any edition of Karlsruhe. However, the edition of Karlsruhe in this thesis and Leach's indication of rubrication in his edition of Auchinleck now permit such an examination.

54 Loomis, p. 607.
Of the twenty-six instances of rubrication in Auchinleck, fifteen of them fall at the same place in the narrative where a decorated letter is found in Karlsruhe. Only two such correlations exist between Auchinleck and London. Furthermore, of the remaining nine rubricated letters with no correlation in either AN manuscript five occur in passages which would be found on the missing leaves of Karlsruhe, leaving open the possibility that originally possibly as many as twenty such correlations were shared.

For their part, K and L are very close; London is in fact so close to Cambridge despite the roughly century and a quarter that intervened between their compositions that one could arguably conclude that London descends directly from Cambridge, except that there are some incidences in which Karlsruhe agrees with the one against the other. On this basis, it therefore appears that L and K must have shared a common source, here designated MS V.

It is impossible for V and O to be the same manuscript. There are too many discrepancies between C and K-L for O to be the exemplar for the latter group; Fukui observes: "The Cambridge MS preserves a text close enough to that of London MS to show that the later Karlsruhe version contains not only a considerable amount of rewriting but also numerous and sometimes lengthy interpolations." Given that many of these alterations also appear in Auchinleck, they must have also existed in an earlier O. Nevertheless, Karlsruhe does share several hundred lines with K-L, indicating that O and V could not be too distantly related. They must have descended from the same source, O, perhaps through several adaptations, and V conceivably more directly. On the basis of this evidence, the following schema can be proposed for the Anglo-Norman manuscripts:

---

55 Leach, p. xcvi.
56 These occur at II. 133, 337, 409, 517, 613, 673, 721, 901, 973, 1009, 1105, 1141, 1189, 1249, 1297, 1453, 1501, 1525, 1573, 1633, 1197, 2053, 2101, 2197, 2365, 2425.
57 That is to say, the rubrications in Auchinleck occur at the beginning of the same episodic divisions or subdivisions where Karlsruhe has a decorated letter. These occur at Auchinleck II. 133, 337, 517, 613, 901, 973, 1009, 1105, 1249, 1453, 1501, 1573, 1633, 1197, 2053, corresponding to Karlsruhe II. 53, 263, 393, 445, 689, 767, 785, 843, 947, 1204, 877, 1280, 1318, 1594, 1730 respectively. Additionally, there are many decorated letters in Karlsruhe which do not correspond to a rubricated initial in Auchinleck, however they do overwhelmingly correspond to places in the narrative where Auchinleck makes a stanza division.
58 Auchinleck, I. 409 and I. 1525, corresponding to London I. 205 and I. 778 respectively. It should also be added that in both cases a decorated letter does occur quite nearby in the Karlsruhe narrative, one at I. 351 and the other at I. 1248, either of which could be argued to be a very near correspondence. See appendix for relative placement of rubrications and decorated letters in the texts and/or cross-referencing with episodic divisions.
59 Fukui, p. 1.
Given this history, it would seem best to proceed with a copy of Cambridge and a copy of Karlsruhe. Unfortunately, neither is readily available. However, Fukui’s edition of London is easily accessible, and the apparatus of Kölling is adequate enough for providing the variants from Cambridge. The evident need for Karlsruhe, however, and the difficulty of Kölling’s text (which Fukui notes “[does not conform]...to the scientific requirements of a modern edition”),60 has led me to make an edition of the Karlsruhe text which is presented in a parallel format with Fukui’s London edition in the appendix. This thesis therefore examines Fukui’s edition for the K-L, deferring to Kölling’s edition where there are significant discrepancies, and uses my own edition for examination of Karlsruhe.

The final version which deserves to be examined is the Old French *Ami et Amile*, for as will be seen in chapter three, it too plays a part. There is only one manuscript available, that in the Bibliothèque Nationale edited by Dembowski. Fortunately it is adequate for the purposes of this dissertation, for as Calin notes, “the Anglo-Norman romancer adapted a chanson de geste, perhaps the very one that is extant.”61 On that basis, it is possible to allow this version to stand for the hypothesised MS W in this study.

Taking these editions of the chosen manuscript versions, the following chapter provides an exhaustive treatment of the *Amis and Amiloun* legend, showing all the points of correspondence and deviation between the English version and its Old French and Anglo-Norman forerunners.

60 Fukui, p. 1.
61 Calin, p. 484.
CHAPTER IV: LITERARY EXAMINATION

INTRODUCTION

Purpose
Having established medieval attitudes towards translation in Chapter Two, it is now time to look at those methods in practice as demonstrated in *Amis and Amiloun*, and doing so substantiates conclusions drawn in Chapter Three regarding the probable relationship of the texts. Such an examination also allows one to fully realise the extent of the Middle English version's debt to the Anglo-Norman/Old French tradition. As stated in the Introduction, traditionally little connection has been made between Middle English verse romances and their French-language predecessors. This may partially be due to differences in style which have permitted scholars to categorise the Anglophone versions and their Gallic forerunners as separate genres. As Pearsall notes, "True courtly romance had no real vogue in English, since the audience which could appreciate it, at the time when it was fashionable, was French-speaking...The audience of the Middle English romances is a primarily lower-middle-class audience, a class of social aspirants who wish to be entertained with what they consider to be the same fare, but in English, as their social betters. It is a new class, an emergent bourgeoisie, whose tastes were assessed with professional expertise by the compilers of the Auckinleck MS."¹ Though perhaps less direct, Ramsey alludes to the same need of the translator to adapt his material to appeal to the audience's tastes: "the writers take it for granted that the audience of the French romance is noble and educated; they understand that by writing in English they are addressing a wider audience (*not* an essentially different audience); they interpret the differences between the older and the newer audiences as being differences in rank and education as well as language."² The emergent dichotomy has permitted many scholars to be content to overlook the importance of the relationship. Doing so, however, runs the risk of underestimating the significant role of the French tradition in forming the English one. English was just re-emerging as a medium for literary expression, and it is natural that the authors writing in the language would be influenced by the French tradition which had long dominated as the acceptable vehicle for vernacular expression.³ Any influence,

¹ Pearsall, *Development of Middle English Romance*, p. 12. Pearsall's recognition that MS Auchinleck, in which *Amis and Amiloun* is first recorded, makes that romance especially suited for a study such as this one.
² Ramsey, *Chivalric Romances*, p. 10-11
³ In *Development of Middle English Romance*, Pearsall further noted: "...popular romance...may be seen as the primary extant literary manifestation of the newly enfranchised vernacular." p. 12. Thus, not only is *Amis and Amiloun* a good example of romance for this study, but the selection of romance itself is valuable for an examination of the early influence of the French tradition on Middle English literature generally.
however, is bound to be slightly obscured by the different aims of the redactors, who must necessarily handle the material differently if they wished it to find favour with the target audience. This was especially the case for Amis and Amiloun, for as Le Saux observes, "...some works present greater difficulties to the translator than others. The Middle English romance of Amys and Amylion must undoubtedly be counted among these." As such, Amis and Amiloun is ideally suited to demonstrate the methods used to execute such changes, while at the same time establishing that the legend nevertheless remains French at its base.

What follows, therefore, is an exhaustive comparison of the Auchinleck text with its Old French and Anglo-Norman sources. It demonstrates unequivocally that the imprint of the earlier versions is ever present, and that the redactor did indeed hold to the ideals of his age when it came to translation practices; material is frequently abridged or expanded, embellished with borrowings from various traditions, and in some instances unattested information is added by the redactor. What results, therefore, is not so much a translation as that term is understood today, but a new version of the story, allowing the redactor to be identified from a modern point of view as a master remanieur.

Methodology
Each development in the plot of the ME is viewed beside its Anglo-Norman and Old French predecessors to identify every point of agreement and divergence among the versions. The examination is not limited to the "black and white" issues of parallels in structure, plot development, names and events, but also more subtle issues such as characterisation and narrative colouring which have an important role in forming overall perceptions. As explained in the previous chapter, the texts of Leach's edition of ME Amis and Amiloun, Fukui's edition of AN Amis e Amilun, the edition of Karlsruhe made for this thesis, and Dembowski's edition of the OF Ami et Amile are used. The comparisons themselves are made by separating the poem into sections and subsections based on Rosenberg and Dannon's observation that the Old French chanson de geste falls quite clearly into five divisions:

1. Birth and baptism; mutual quest and encounter
2. Life at Charlemagne's court—
   a. demonstration of chivalric valour, causing Hardret's enmity; Ami's marriage, departure, return, and new departure

4 Le Saux, From Ami to Amys, p. 111. It should be mentioned that Le Saux's spelling of the characters' names reflects that found in MS Douce, which formed the basis of her recent edition of the romance. This paper, however, continues to use the orthography provided in Leach's edition, which remains the standard.
5 Rosenberg and Dannon, p. 18-19.
b. Belisaunt’s seduction of Amile, Hardret’s betrayal, plan for judicial combat
c. reunion of Ami and Amile and exchange of identities

3. The judicial combat –
a. Amile at Blaye
b. the combat
c. the false betrothal
d. reunion of Ami and Amile in Blaye and new separation

4. Ami’s leprosy and wandering –
a. Ami at Blaye
b. wandering
c. arrival at Rivières and reunion with Amile

5. Ami’s new life –
a. the cure
b. voyage to Blaye and Jerusalem; return and death together

Though in comparison with the AN and ME versions there is some need for revision of details, on the whole this structural division serves as a good basis for the examination.

The following chart demonstrates how these episodes collate in the individual versions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old French</th>
<th>A-N (London)</th>
<th>A-N (Karlsruhe)</th>
<th>ME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 laisses 1-13 (ll. 1-207)</td>
<td>lines 1-30⁷</td>
<td>lines 1-66</td>
<td>stanza 1-11 (ll. 1-132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a laisses 1-13</td>
<td>lines 1-30</td>
<td>lines 1-66</td>
<td>stanza 1-5 (1-60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b laisses 1-13</td>
<td>lines 1-30</td>
<td>lines 1-66</td>
<td>stanza 6-11 (61-132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 laisses 14-60 (208-1096)</td>
<td>lines</td>
<td>lines</td>
<td>st 12-95 (113-1140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a laisses 14-34</td>
<td>lines 31-250</td>
<td>lines 67-114</td>
<td>st 12-28 (133-336)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b laisses 35-47</td>
<td>lines 251-464</td>
<td>lines 115-784</td>
<td>st 29-84 (337-1008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c laisses 48-60</td>
<td>lines 465-546</td>
<td>lines 785-864⁸</td>
<td>st 85-95 (1009-1140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Laisses 61-102 (1097-2050)</td>
<td>lines 527-792</td>
<td>lines 865-1247⁹</td>
<td>st 96-128 (1141-1536)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a laises 61-67</td>
<td>lines 527-546</td>
<td>(missing)</td>
<td>st 96-99 (1141-1188)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b laisses 68-84</td>
<td>lines 547-677</td>
<td>(missing)</td>
<td>st 100-115 (1189-1380)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c laisses 85-92</td>
<td>lines 678-759</td>
<td>lines 865-1203¹⁰</td>
<td>st 116-121 (1381-1452)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d laisses 93-102</td>
<td>lines 760-792</td>
<td>lines 1204-1247</td>
<td>st 122-128 (1453-1536)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 laisses 103-141 (2051-2763)</td>
<td>lines 793-1066</td>
<td>lines 1248-1748</td>
<td>st 129-175 (1537-2100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a laises 103-123</td>
<td>lines 738-899</td>
<td>lines 1248-1523</td>
<td>st 129-149 (2101-1788)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b laisses 124-135</td>
<td>lines 900-915</td>
<td>lines 1524-1541</td>
<td>st 150-155 (1789-1860)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c laisses 136-141</td>
<td>lines 916-1065</td>
<td>ll. 1542-1748¹¹</td>
<td>st 156-175 (1861-2100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁷ Such as inversion of the main characters, differences in names of individuals and locations.
⁸ In all three Anglo-Norman versions, there is no actual “mutual quest and encounter.” The characters are simply presented as already at the duke’s court.
⁹ This section ends imperfectly.
¹⁰ This section begins imperfectly.
¹¹ This section begins imperfectly.
In examining each of these sections, special attention is paid to areas of correlation and divergence between the ME (Auchinleck) and the AN (London and Karlsruhe) versions. Each of these divisions can be further sub-divided into between one and thirteen individual episodic developments for a total of eighty, each of which is analysed in turn. This examination is largely in the structuralist traditions, the method employed being very similar to that used by Barthes in S/Z. Though space prevents the minute analysis of every specific ‘lexie’ (i.e. unit of meaning) individually, every episodic development is analysed and related to its predecessors.  

The title and place in the narrative of each episode can be viewed in the table of contents as well as in a chart in the chapter conclusion where line numbers are provided.

---

12 For a brief discussion of Barthes’s methods, which is adequate enough for the purposes of this thesis, see Barry, *Beginning Theory*, p. 50.
DIVISION 1: Introduction and Arrival at Court

Proem

The first six lines of the English *Amis and Amiloun* parallel the first six of the AN texts in that both call the audience to hear a tale. Both versions use the first person for this introduction, calling to mind the recitation of memorised verse by scops, bards and jongleurs. Though probably ultimately derived from the oral tradition, here it is simply a conventional introduction adopted as formula for a written medium; the fact that neither is an actual oral composition is attested to by the poems themselves. London almost immediately reveals that the author is recounting a story “Sicom en escrit le trouvay,” while Karlsruhe states “Si ai en escryt le trouay.” The English poem also refers to written sources, that it is faithfully recounting a story “[i]n geste as we rede,” and later refers to its own recitation saying: “In ryme y wille you rede ryght.” Though perhaps the respective authors may have intended for the poems to be read out loud, both were the product of a literate environment, and neither attempts to deny the fact.

It is not necessarily the case, however, that the ME adopted this convention from the AN, for such introductions are just as much a part of the native English tradition as they are of French. In both traditions such usage would correspond to what Brewer recognises as “the speaking voice,” a feature which an audience, whether readers or listeners, would expect as an introduction to a tale. Thus its use is to be expected rather than remarked upon, and in itself does not indicate a relationship.

13 D.S. Brewer notes the common use of oral techniques in written poetry of the Middle Ages. In Chaucer particularly, he finds use of the speaking voice, hyperbole, formulae and set phrases, sententiousness, repetition with variation, and metonomy. See Brewer, *Chaucer’s Poetic Style*. Other enlightening articles on this subject include Lord’s *Oral Composition and ‘Oral Residue’ in the Middle Ages*, which examines the development of literary formulae derived from orality throughout medieval Europe, and Lindahl’s *The Oral Overtones of Late Medieval Romance*, which comments on such subjects in relation to this genre specifically; a more detailed study is made by McGillivray in *Memorization in the Transmission of the Middle English Romances*. Ultimately, however, the place of orality is outwith the scope of this study.

14 London, l. 6. Though Fukui’s edition is the source for all quotations from MS London, his is essentially a diplomatic edition, and therefore reference to this version are indicated by the name of the manuscript rather than the editor. This practice also facilitates comparisons with MS Karlsruhe, edited by the present author, which is likewise referenced. Quotations from the Middle English, however, are referenced by the editor’s name as the different editions sometimes have different readings, and the most frequently referenced edition, that of Leach, is a composite edition. The Old French of Dembowski is likewise referenced.

15 Karlsruhe, l. 24. If, Leach, l. 27. Although as a rule the preferred text of the ME version in this thesis is that of Auchinleck, here we are forced to rely on Sutherland due to the damage sustained by MS A. It is worth noting, however, that only Sutherland ever uses the word “geste,” all other versions preferring the word “romance.” It is therefore likely that MS A read “romance” where we here have “geste,” but as that portion of the manuscript is lost, it is impossible to say with certainty.

16 Le Saux, l. 38. This line take from Le Saux’s edition based on MS D. MS A, the base of Leach’s edition reads: “In ryme y wol rekene ryght.” l. 38.

17 Brewer, p. 228.

18 For more information on the common use of oral techniques in written poetry of the Middle Ages, see Brewer.
There are, however, specific points where the ME does seem to have borrowed directly from the AN tradition. The description of the main characters is one such example. The ME cites that they are:

...two barons of grete bounte  
And men of grete honour;  
Her faders were barons hende,  
Lordinges com of grete kynde  
And pris men in toun and tour.20

This is much like the AN which states:21

| Mult furent de vassallage, | Moust furent de grant vassalage, |
| Gentils e de haut parage, | Gentils e de grant parage; |
| Fyz estoient de .ii. baruns. | Fiz estoient de barons. |

(K. 27-29) (L. 9-11)

Though both versions suggest that the boys were “well-born barons,” there are nevertheless some noteworthy divergences.

First, the word “baron” has slightly different connotations in ME than in AN where it usually means “honourable gentleman” rather than being a title. Though it is tempting to say that the signifié is easily borrowed from the AN despite the signifiant being somewhat different, it should not be disregarded as a simple oversight.22 It is likely that the ME redactor, being proficient in both languages, was aware of the difference and consciously chose to raise the status of his characters for effect.

Secondly, the English version focuses more intensely on the fathers as individuals while the AN version dismisses them simply as Amis and Amiloun’s immediate predecessors, symbols of heritage but not important in their own right. By regarding the fathers as worthy individuals themselves, the ME underscores the perception that the boys are the products of a noble lineage and not simply “self-made men.” To emphasise that point, the ME further notes that they are born barons rather than receiving the title as recompense for loyal vassalage.

These transformations are not simply accidental but appear to be intentional adaptations which lend the characters greater appeal. Medieval perceptions of knighthood

20 Leach, I. 5-9.
21 Although references to quotations are generally given in footnotes, references to the two Anglo-Norman versions are noted in brackets immediately following the texts quoted because the versions are so close that it would be difficult to tell at a glance which is which. For the sake of clarity, I have deviated from calling MS Karlsruhe “MS C,” and have instead labelled it as “K.” A vertical line between the Karlsruhe and London texts indicates points where there is significant deviation in the content of parallel lines.
22 For a discussion of these terms, see Baldinger.
were shifting, well-bred gentility superseding battlefield bravery as the ideal. This was particularly the case in fourteenth-century England where more and more the elite was eschewing the acquirement of status by conquest as their Norman forebears had done, preferring inherited rank instead.\footnote{See Chibnall.} Therefore, making the protagonists "to the manner born" would reflect a change in society as well as being reflective of the new societal norms.

Another interesting parallel between the ME and the AN is the description of the boys' similarity:

\begin{verse}
In al þing þey were so lyche 
Þer was neither pore ne ryche, 
Who so beheld hem both, 
Fader ne moder þat coulþ say
Ne knew þe hend children tway 
But by þe coloure of her clop.\footnote{Leach, I. 91-6.}
\end{verse}

\begin{verse}
Lé.ii. cors taunt resembleient 
Que si en vu lu aundui estoient, 
Ne est om ke eus avisast 
Que par semblance les severast 
Ne par cors ne par fazoun, 
Par reen si par la robe noun. 
\end{verse}

\begin{verse}
De cors de visage bien resembleyent: 
Si de une robe vestu estoient, 
N'est home el mound qe les avisast 
| Qe l'un de l'autre descverast. 
\end{verse}

(K. 47-52)

Here is evidence of direct borrowing from the AN tradition. Though the OF too goes to some length to express the similarities between the boys: "\textit{Il s'entresamblient de venir et d'aler / Et de la bouche et dou vis et dou nés,}"\footnote{Dembowski, I. 39-40. \textit{[They were alike in every way. They had the same eyes, the same nose and mouth.]} All translations (unless marked with an asterisk, in which case it is my own) are from Rosenberg and Danon.} the specific citing of the inability of anyone to tell them apart save by their clothing is unique to the AN-ME group. It is the first of many clear examples in which the ME echoes the words of its predecessors so closely that it would be hard to dismiss it as coincidence.

There is further evidence which points to the Karlsruhe tradition specifically as a source. The proem to the ME version says not only that this is a tale of great friendship, but also that there are hardships visited upon the protagonists:

\begin{verse}
To here of þese children two 
How þey were in wele and woo 
Ywys it is grete doloure.\footnote{Dembowski, I. 25-28.}
\end{verse}
Only the ME and Karlsruhe make such references this early in the narrative. Karlsruhe begins with eighteen lines for which there is no parallel in London or Cambridge, in which it is indicated that this is also a story of loss, pain, and misery. More compelling is the specific mention that this is a romance of "si grand dolour":

Troverez vus un romaunz  
De .ii. chivalers, si fyns amaunz;  
L’uns Amys l’autre Amilioun,  
Qe pus Deu suffri passiun;  
Ne fu trové si leal amour,  
Ne pur leauté si grand dolour.

Again, this seems too close to be coincidence. Not only does the ME have the same mention of suffering as Karlsruhe, but even uses the same language. This signals a particular indebtedness.

But there are also points where the ME diverges from the AN. For example, toward the end of the second stanza the English poet says he will reveal "in what lond þei were born," and the reader is subsequently told in the first line of the second stanza that the place of origin was Lombardy. This information is not in the AN version, though the poet insists it is "in romance as we reede." The fourth stanza of the ME then provides further information about the children’s birth which the AN neglects. One reads, "Bothe þey were getyn in oo ny3t / And on oo day born a-ply3t." If the AN, generally considered to be the immediate predecessor of the ME version, makes no comment whatsoever on Amis and Amiloun’s births coinciding, where does the English author cull his information? One possibility is the Old French Ami et Amile which makes just such references.

Early in the narrative, the OF states, “Engendré furent par sainte annuncion / Et en un jor furent né li baron”; Several lines later, it re-emphasises that “En une nuit furent il engendré.” The Old French also mentions that they were baptised on the same day, and, the ME makes an allusion to baptism in line 45 which, when the editor’s punctuation is removed, is ambiguous:

26 Leach, l. 10-12.  
27 All in Karlsruhe, l. 9.  
28 Karlsruhe, l. 6.  
29 Karlsruhe, l. 1-6.  
30 Leach, l. 21 and l. 25 respectively.  
31 Leach, l. 27.  
32 Leach, l. 40-1.  
33 Dembowski, l. 13-14. [They were conceived on the feast of the Annunciation / and the barons were born on a single day.]  
34 Dembowski, l. 22. [They were conceived on one night.]  
35 Dembowski, l. 23.
Here the baptism could refer to either Amis or Amiloun, depending on whether a punctuation mark is placed at the end of line 44 or line 45. Though line 45 receives a semicolon from Leach and a full stop from Le Saux, perhaps the ambiguity of the original text was intentional, referring to either Amis or Amiloun, or both at the same time. Another compelling coincidence is the OF version’s statement that “A Mortiers gisent.”

Though today in the administrative region of Biella-Vercelli, Mortara is traditionally a part of Lombardy, the region listed as the birth-place in the English version. Thus, both the ME and OF versions share references to baptism, synchronous conception and birth, as well as Lombardy, none of which appears in the AN. It seems clear that the English author relied on sources outside the AN to supplement his version, and in these instance it appears that he relied on the Old French. The possibility of such a relationship has received little comment in the past, but as the rest of this study demonstrates, there is compelling evidence to support it.

This is not to say, however, that it is in any way identical with the continental version. In fact, it deviates from that work more broadly than it does from any of the AN versions. For example, when mentioning the christening, the OF makes a point of the boys being sent to Rome where Pope Yzorez serves as their godfather. It is also he who bestows the cups upon them before returning them to the homes in Berry and Auvergne. In the ME they are both from Lombardy, and Amiloun himself later has the cups made.

Thus, though the ME does seem to borrow some information from the OF, it does not incorporate all available information, and in some cases actually contradicts it. One possibility is that the redactor only incorporated that which seemed relevant to him, suppressing a great deal of information. Another view, and the one that seems to be most fully supported by this examination, is that he was aware of the OF version but did not actually have a copy of it before him. Thus, he was relying on memory to supply additions to the redaction he was making with the use of an exemplar in the AN tradition. Such treatment is perfectly in line with methods suggested for translators as expressed in Chapter Two.

This does not mean, however, that everything shared by Karlsruhe and the OF appears in the ME. There are passages where the ME redactor omits information found in

---

36 Leach, l. 43-6.
37 Dembowski, l. 15. [They lie at Mortara.]
those versions, and in at least one case, this causes the appearance of agreement with London/Cambridge over those versions. Such is the case when the ME states that the tale recounts how “In cort þere þey were,” which mirrors the London-Cambridge: “Q’en la court un counte estoient.” In both of these instances, the lord whom they serve remains anonymous. In Karlsruhe, however, it is made quite clear whom they serve: “Qui a la court Charlis estoyent,” and in this respect it reflects information in the OF where: “Il servirent a Paris a Charlon.” If the ME is truly reliant on the Karlsruhe tradition for the majority of its information, why has this information been suppressed? It is possible that it was not in the exemplar, but this seems unlikely given the numerous correspondences Karlsruhe and the ME share. Rather more likely, the exemplar was very close to Karlsruhe, and the redactor intentionally decided to omit these references to the Matter of France. Calvin has one suggestion: “Authors of romance, especially insular authors of romance, will suppress Charlemagne, Charlemagne’s wars, pilgrimage roads, and the lineage of traitors.” Perhaps in order to make the legend correspond to the tastes of the implied target audience, therefore, the information has been deleted.

In the first few lines of the ME, therefore, one sees indications that the redactor was indeed translating using methods suggested as acceptable in Chapter Two. He has paraphrased the information in his sources, and clearly borrowed some identical information which indicates a connection to the AN versions, especially Karlsruhe. Furthermore, there is evidence of material culled from other sources, in this case the OF tradition which supplied certain details the redactor found worthy of inclusion though they did not appear in his primary source. The wide divergence between the OF and ME, especially in consideration of the relative closeness of the ME and the AN, supports the view that these details were recalled rather than being directly before him. There is also evidence of the redactor intentionally suppressing information which was quite likely in his sources. Again, such treatment was considered part of the editorial prerogative of the “translator” in order to tailor the narrative to the tastes of his intended audience and other writings indicate that such handling was considered acceptable in both theory and practice. Thus from the very beginning the redactor reveals that his method of translating deviates

38 Leach, I. 18.
39 London, I. 7. London and Cambridge are so close that it is not necessary to provide quotations from both. Therefore, for the sake of brevity, all quotations are from the London version, which can also be found in the appendix parallel to Karlsruhe.
40 Karlsruhe, I. 25.
41 Dembowski, I. 17. [They served Charles at Paris.]*
42 Calvin, p. 484. One reason for such treatment may be that inclusion of such details might serve to distance the audience rather than include them. In The Englishing of the Comic Technique, Hosington notes: “Although perhaps fairly familiar with some courtly romances, [an English audience] would have been less well-read than their Anglo-Norman predecessors and, of course, less knowledgeable about feudal values and social conventions.” p. 249. Thus, it is logical to conclude that reference to such matters, particularly if inserted as if the audience were expected to know them when they actually did not, would not find favour. As such, it is logical that a redactor would chose to omit them.
greatly from any conception of what is considered “acceptable” today, but places him well in line with his contemporaries, allowing him to be identified as a *remanieur*.

**Arrival at Court**

As the ME comes to recounting the boys’ actual arrival at court it introduces a feast which appears in no other versions of the *A&A* story. The English version states: “In ṭat tyme.../ A duk wonyd in ṭat lond,” and he decides that “A ryche fest he wolde make / Al for lhesu Cristes sake.” As such, he sends word far and wide requesting the presence of all “erles, barouns, fre and bond, / And ladies bry3t in boure.” The use of the demonstrative articles in lines 61-2 (“in ṭat time” / “in ṭat lond”) makes clear that the duke’s feast is to be held in an area and at a period already established; the only possible choice, then, is Lombardy when Amis and Amiloun are twelve years old. It is therefore natural that their fathers be in attendance, for – like the duke – they are men of renown in the area. Twelve being an appropriate age for a noble youth to enter another household as a squire, it is logical that the fathers take their sons with them. By incorporating such incidental detail into his narrative, the ME redactor adapts the story to reflect the cultural norms of his target audience, and this makes the boys’ lineage and character more believable to the intended audience.

At the feast, all eyes are on the boys. Young and old “gan hem beholde,” and all remarked on their beauty. The only ones who do not seem impressed are the boys themselves. Here the ME shares certain elements with London:

```
When ṭey were comyn, 3ong and olde,
Mony men gan hem byholde
Of lordynges ṭat pere were,
Of body how wel ṭey were ṭy3t,
And how feire ṭey were of sy3t,
Of hyde and hew and here;
And al ṭey seide with-out lesse
Fairer children ṭan ṭey wesse
Ne sey ṭey neuer 3ere.

As autres ne fesoient unke semblaunt
De companie tant ne quant.
Ceus de la court avoint envie
De lour estre e de lour compaynie,
Q’amerent entre eus tant fierement,
E de eco se coroucent sovent.

(L. 19-4)
```

In the ME, the boys are objects of universal admiration at the feast, but there is no mention of their own thoughts; it is as though they were unaware of the people around them and

---

43 The AN does contain a feast scene, but it is at the knighting of the boys, not at their introduction. Though the ME poet may have been inspired by such a feast, it does not appear at this stage in any other version.
44 [Leach, II. 61-62 and II. 67-68 respectively.](#)
45 [Leach, II. 65-66.](#)
46 [Based on I. 25 (In Lumbardy, y understond) and I. 58 (When ṭey were twel 3ere olde).](#)
47 [The fathers are described as “pris men in toun and toure,” I. 10, and the duke likewise is “prys in toun and toure,” I. 63.](#)
48 [Leach, I. 77.](#)
49 [This again come up in section D, the departure, II. 277-88, stanza 24.](#)
the effect their presence causes. In the AN the boys are so greatly admired that others actively seek to join their company and are angered when they are excluded from it (21-4).

Again, the boys notice neither the suitors nor the general stir of which they are the centre. They have time only for each other, and though they share a strong bond (something not possible at this stage in the ME as they have not yet met), this friendship seems devoid of any intoxicating affection. In both the ME and the AN, it is as though the young men possess some quality so remarkable that other people cannot fail to be impressed by it, but to which they themselves are either oblivious or immune.51

Thus, it seems that the ME borrows the sentiment of these lines from the AN, but places it in an arrival episode which does not exist in the original. The London reference is simply an introductory endophoric allusion of what is to come. That version provides no mention whatsoever as to how the boys appear at court, simply picking up the thread in medias res, stating: “Leals furent envers lor seygnur, / Bien le portent a honour”52 as an antecedent it relies on earlier lines: “Q’en la court un counte estoient / E des armes li servoient,” to clarify who their lord is, and gives no explanation as to how these two juvenceals came to be at his court.53 Karlsruhe is only slightly more expressive. In a laisse which does not appear in the London-Cambridge version, it states as a preliminary that the boys loved each other as brothers:

Cil dui vallet, dont voil parler,
Taunt ce pristrent entreamer,
A si forte fraternité
Que de quanque furunt unques né.

(K. 53-6)

It then implies that because of their great loyalty to each other they were taken into Charlemagne’s court:

Ne fu trové si leal amour,
Ne pur leauté si grand dolour,
De tote maneris de encumbres,
Cum avent a cé chivalers.
Charlis le fort emperere
En sun tens out une manere
Ke nul home en sa court serioyt
Que a la table serviroyt

51 There is a good deal of literature on the nature of the bond between the two which can be found in Gaunt’s Gender and Genre in Medieval French Literature, Gilbert’s unpublished doctoral thesis, and my own Image of Male Love and Fidelity. However, such studies are essentially outwith the scope of this thesis.
52 London, II. 7-8.
53 London, II. 31-32.
54 Leach, II. 76-84.
Though it still falls short of the ME's full account of the boys' arrival, Karlsruhe is more informative than the London-Cambridge group in justifying the boys' appearance there. There is also one other interesting correlation; Karlsruhe calls them "valet" – a term London-Cambridge never uses – suggesting that they have not yet attained full knighthood.\(^{54}\) This is significant because the ME, despite its insistence on their baronial status, makes a similar distinction when they come to court; the duke, impressed with the boys, asks of their fathers:

...lete her tvay sones fre  
In his seruise wip him to be,  
Semly to fare bi his side;  
& he wald dubbe hem kni3tes to.\(^{35}\)

The clear implication here is that they are not yet full knights, a sentiment that is not readily discernible in London-Cambridge.

Thus, ME appears to draw from the AN in explaining the impression the boys make on those around them and especially from Karlsruhe in respect to their status, but correlations do not come from parallel portions of the texts as none of the AN versions has an actual arrival episode. Karlsruhe credits their presence there as a result of their great loyalty to one another, while London-Cambridge does not explain it at all. The ME on the other hand, dedicates six stanzas to the event, with vivid descriptions of a feast that lasts a fortnight, courtiers enamoured with the youths, and the duke's subsequent request to retain them in his household. This occurs in no other version of the story. In the OF and the AN – and even RT for that matter – the boys seek service at the lord's court; there is no feast, they are not taken their by their parents, nor are they requested to remain. Such a reworking of material is a fairly typical example of remaniement in practice.

But what inspired the English poet to include such an episodic innovation? Though the fuller account does lend greater credibility to the overall piece by establishing a history for the characters, it is clear from the AN that such foregrounding is not an absolute necessity for literary coherence. In some respects, it seems that an answer may again be found in the Old French, where the boys' arrival at court receives an even fuller treatment than in the ME. After being knighted when they are fifteen the boys leave their

\(^{54}\) Karlsruhe, I. 53.  
\(^{35}\) Leach, II. 115-18.
respective homes in search of each other, undertaking circuitous journeys through Burgundy, Gascony, all of Italy and as far as Jerusalem. After seven years, and with the helpful directions of a pilgrim and a boy herding sheep and pigs, they finally catch up with one another in a field on the road to Apulia. They embrace (180-82), pledge lasting friendship (200), and rush off to Paris to join Charlemagne (204). There the king is preparing for war, and as such, "Il les retient volentiers et a certez, / Car molt les vit biaus homes" (206-07). Thus, the OF, like the ME, provides a detailed background which explains the boys arrival at court.

At first glance there seems to be very little in common between the versions. In the English, the boys are led to a duke’s feast where they are taken into the house as young squires, while in the OF they are already knights who have quested for seven years before arriving ready for battle. But there is one interesting correlation in both: the citing of specific ages. The OF notes that after their baptism and return home, "Puis ne se virent devant quinze ans passéz / Tant que il furent de nouvel adoubé." Presumably, therefore, their quest began when they became knights at fifteen. The ME, on the other hand, has them enter the court as twelve-year-olds where they will become knights when they come of age. Interestingly, this occurs three years later, when like in the OF, they are fifteen:

> Po pai were fifteen winter old,
> He dubbed bope po bernes bold
> To kni3tes in ūat tide.57

It would be hasty to say that the age of dubbing was borrowed directly, for in both cultures fifteen was widely held to be an age at which knighthood could be attained. However, it is noteworthy that in these two version the age is provided at all while in the AN it is wholly absent. Although frequently there are modifications made in respect to the exact amount of time to lapse, this attention to chronological detail is in fact one aspect that is common to the ME and the OF. Both are punctilious in relating the amount of time to pass between incidents. This attention to the flow of natural time is one characteristic which it appears the ME redactor found admirable in the OF tradition and emulated it in his own version.

There also seems to be a correlation between the ME and the OF in respect to narrative time. The AN, as noted, provides only the briefest treatment to the arrival scene, whereas it comprises a significant portion of one of the five division of both the ME and

56 Dembowski, II. 36-37. [Then they did not see each other again until after fifteen years had passed, until they were newly dubbed.]
57 Leach, II. 163-65.
the OF. As Rosenberg and Danon note of the OF, "Each division is marked towards its end by a significant reunion of the two heroes; these major points of convergence, in fact, occur at regular intervals of approximately forty laisses (11-12, 54-55, 96-97, 139-140, 177) and thereby imprint the theme of union and friendship upon the very rhythm of the poem." Though the ME reunions do not convergence quite as neatly (stanzas 11, 93, 121, 178, 209), they do break the various division into separate episodes much more neatly than do any of the AN versions.

Conclusion
It seems that the ME relies on supplementary information in the OF tradition to augment the limited materia of the AN's arrival episode to establish it as a full division. As with the OF, but unlike the AN, the ME provides a full explanation of how the boys came to court. It also appears to have adopted the OF tradition's practice of referencing natural time in the narrative. But in terms of actual content, this portion of the story is highly original. Rather than incorporate long wanderings on pilgrimage roads - which, as stated, were routinely suppressed by insular authors of romance - after which the companions arrive as twenty-two year old knights at the court, the redactor has created a new history for the youths. Instead, as was common in medieval England, they arrive as twelve-year-old pages/squires at court where they must wait until coming of age to be knighted. Though certain salient sentiments and implications are retained, such as the striking similarity of the characters, non-essential incidentals are freely adapted. The redactor continues to take what he views as important to transmit in his exemplar, augments with extra-exemplar information, and re-interprets it to provide a new version intended to appeal directly to his intended audience. In short, he shows himself as a remanieur.

58 see Tuchman, p. 52.
59 Leach, stanzas 6-11 (II. 61-132), and Dembowski, laisses 3-13 (II. 44-207) respectively.
60 Rosenberg and Danon, p. 19.
DIVISION 2A: Together at Court

Introduction

This portion of the ME shows indebtedness to all versions including OF. Though there is some deviation in ME from the specific subsections listed in the beginning of the chapter (based on Rosenberg and Danon’s division of the OF), they nevertheless remain a suitable frame on which to base comparisons. Each episodic development of the ME will be examined in turn, pointing out adherence to and deviation from the sources.

Life at Court

Stanza 12 begins the account of Amis and Amiloun’s life together at court. Unlike the OF and AN which deal with such issues earlier in the narrative, the ME needs first to establish the boys’ relationship and status as knights before presenting issues of chivalric valour, the seneschal’s emnity, and separation. They are therefore presented residing at court together and sharing mutual experiences. Provision of these shared events are necessary in order to justify their great friendship expressed in the remainder of the stanza:

So wele þo children loued hem þo,  
Nas neuer children loued hem so,  
Noiper in word no in dede;  
Bitvix hem tvai, of blod & bon,  
Trewer loue nas neuer non,  
In gest as so we rede.  

This reflects the description of their friendship in Karlsruhe ll. 53-60,62 except that it omits any reference to “si grand dolour” which comes as a test of their friendship. Thus the ME accentuates only positive aspects of their devotion rather than expressing its constancy in the face of hardship.

The stanza nevertheless shares particular correlation in two details with a specific line in Karlsruhe which states: “Ore sunt li dui amaunt mountez.”63 Here is an allusion to riding, as in ME 136, as well as a reference to the boys as “dui amaunt,” a term which it may be argued, is more applicable to lovers than to loved ones.64 Much the same ambiguity is expressed in the ME, particularly ll. 142-43, which is likewise a description

---

61 Leach, II. 139-44.  
62 These lines are provided in previous section.  
63 Karlsruhe, II. 79.  
64 Although amaunt mounted could be read as “mounted up,” the tautology is unnecessary and the interpretation as “loved [ones] mounted” or even “beloved [ones] mounted” is equally possible. It is quite likely that the ambiguity is an intentional play on words.
often found useful for the expression of physical love. It seem likely that the ME redactor expanded the thought of a single line into a stanza, including a specific reference to equestrianism and an ambiguous reference to lovers/loved ones based on the Karlsruhe example. Further examples of the ME using language well suited for lovers to express the depth of friendship comes in the following stanza:

(13) On a day pe childer war & wi3t
Trewepes to-gider ̄hai gun pli3t,
While ̄hai mi3t liue & stond
Pat bohe bi day & bi ni3t,
In wele & wo, in wrong & ri3t,
Pat ̄hai schuld frely fond
To hold to-gider at eueri nede,
In word, in werk, in wille, in dede,
Where pat ̄hai were in lond,
Fro pat day forward neuer mo
Failen oper for wele no wo:
Þer-to ̄hai held vp her hond.66

Even today such language is reminiscent of traditional Christian wedding vows, and without a doubt a contemporary audience would see the same likeness with that current in their own day:

I .N. take the .N. to myn wedded wyf,
to haue and to holde from pis day forward,
for beter, for wers, for richer, for porere,
for fayrere, for fowlere, in seknes and in helthe,
til deth vs departe, 3if holy chirche it wil ordeyne:
and therto I plithe þø myn trewthe.67

Thus, what appears in the AN as a somewhat dubious reference has been expanded in ME to contain less ambiguity, defining the characters in amorous terms.68

Though it is uncertain what such a description is meant to imply (whether it is using “lovers’ language” to describe a purely homosocial situation or, possibly, as a parody which makes fun of the characters or undermines their relationship), it is not out of place in the ME where the characters are often portrayed in terms of traditional

65 See Ford, *Bitwix hem tvas of blade and bone*.
66 Leach, II. 145-56.
67 *English Fragments from Latin Service-Books*, pp. 5-6. It may also be worth noting that the OF uses similarly ambiguous terms, saying “A Mortiers gisent,” I. 15, where “gisent” denotes lying down, but often has a connotation of doing so as lovers. At their reunion, it also says: “Par tel vertu se sont entr’acolé / Tant fort se baisent et estrangment soif, / A poi ne sont estaing et définé; / Lor estrier rompent si sont cheii el pré.” II. 179-82. [[The two met] in such tight an embrace, so mighty was their kiss and so tenderly did they clasp each other, that they almost fainted dead away: their stirrups snapped and they fell together on the ground.] Perhaps the ME was drawing on the example of the OF for his inferences, which though different, might be related to his misinterpretation of the OF, or again, a parody of it.
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male/female relationships. Throughout the narrative, the ME redactor constantly elaborates on the evidence provided in earlier versions to polarise the characters at opposite ends of the gender continuum and displaying their friendship in the context of courtly lovers rather than traditional male companions. This demonstrates the element of subjectivity in amplificatio as set out in the introduction, in that the redactor infuses the work with new implications through the addition of details which are different from that of the original author.

**Become Knights and Receive Offices**

The fourteenth stanza then establishes them as knights, allowing the ME narrative to “catch up” with the AN and OF. This dubbing occurs in the third tercet of the stanza (164-66), the remainder being chiefly dedicated to describing the duke’s great affection for the boys and his generosity towards them:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pe douke was blipe & glad of chere,} \\
\text{\textasciitilde{a}i were him bo\textasciitilde{a} leue & dere,} \\
\text{Semly to fare bi his side. [...]} \\
\text{& fond hem al \textasciitilde{a}t hem was nede,} \\
\text{Hors & wepen & worply wede.} \end{align*}
\]

This description is carried along into the first half of the following stanza (15), which similarly states:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{at riche douke, he loued hem so,} \\
\text{Al \textasciitilde{a}t pai wald he fond hem \textasciitilde{a},} \\
\text{Bo\textasciitilde{a} stedes white & broun,} \end{align*}
\]

This is not unlike a brief description in London which says: “Lour trova si com il voleint; / Hautement lour feste teneint,” however, a much more similar passage is found in Karlsruhe for which there is no corresponding passage in London/Cambridge:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Lur trove en quanque lur apent,} \\
\text{Grand honur lur feste tient,} \\
\text{Ore sunt li dui amaunt mountez,} \\
\text{A haute estage honurez,} \\
\text{En dreit de lour seignour Charloun,} \end{align*}
\]

---

69 The possibility of such interpretations are presented in Gaunt, and in relation to A&A specifically in Ford, Bitwix hem twai.
70 The AN and OF presentation of this status is taken as a fait accompli, and thus is more fully discussed in section 1 dealing with the introduction to the versions.
71 Leach, ll. 160-7.
72 Leach, ll. 169-71.
Ke en eus se fye plus ke en nul hom,
& pur la grandime affinité
De amur, ke en eus had trové. 74

In terms of the duke’s generosity, Auchinleck accurately reflects the sentiments of the AN versions, and especially Karlsruhe in terms of the duke’s love, the specific citing of gifts, and, as previously noted, reference to horsemanship.

Similarities with AN continue to emerge in the remainder of the stanza with the duke bestowing offices on the companions; Amis is “made his chef botelere,” while Amiloun is “made chef steward in halle.” 75 This bears a strong resemblance to the AN which states:

Fait de syre Amys sun boteler,
Ke asez se pout en lui fier,
E de sun frere sire Amilloun
Fait seneschal de sa mesoun
E marechaus de la sale sur touz.

(Ke 85-89)

In all three versions, Amis becomes “butler,” while Amiloun is variously “seneschal” or “justizier” and “marechaus/mestre mareschal.” The ME shows a general indebtedness to the AN tradition in that it borrows directly the sentiment of the duke actively creating the offices. Each is made (fait/fist) into his office directly by the lord. 76 A special affinity with Karlsruhe is demonstrated in that “seneschal,” a title not given in London, is the closest semantic equivalent to “steward,” while the mention of “in halle” reflects Karlsruhe’s “de la sale,” also absent in London. 77 This passage is therefore a clear demonstration of the ME’s reliance on the AN for content in that it provides nearly identical information as the AN (lacking in all other versions), utilising the nearest semantically equivalent verb in the same active voice with the same subject and object, to bestow essentially the same offices while employing very nearly the same vocabulary.

**General Opinion of the People, the Duke, and the Steward**

In stanza 17, however, there is some slight deviation. The ME expresses how much the duke and all the people loved the pair:

---

74 Karlsruhe, II. 79-84.
75 Leach, II. 188 and 191 respectively.
76 The omission of Karlsruhe’s “Charloun” can be attributed to the previously mentioned suppression of the matter of France in insular romances.
77 It is interesting that in both the ME and Karlsruhe Amis and the traitor are “seneschals” or “stewards,” a title omitted in London/Cambridge. It seems further relevant that the ME spelling “botelere” is remarkably close to Karlsruhe’s “boteler” (as opposed to London’s “botiler”), particularly as the signifié of this *fous ami* has slightly different signifiant in the two language.
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In respect to the duke's feelings, this does represent another correlation with Karlsruhe that is absent in London/Cambridge:

Le rei les hath mout cher tenus,  
Si lur mustre si grand amur.79

However, in Karlsruhe the amity of the people as a whole is lacking, the lord's affections resulting instead in enmity:

Dount se coroucent li plusur.  
Si tenent entre euz si fort envie  
De la tre fine compagynye  
Si l'enpleient durement,  
E li senechaus nomement  
Sur touz autres l'esguayte hounte;  
Ce est tota la force de cunte.  
Il les surquert a tele envie  
Que tota manere felounye  
Que unques compasser savoyt  
A ce .ii. chivalers fesoyt.  

(K. 96-106)

Nevertheless, it seems that the passages are related; both see fit to express the attitudes of the people at large at precisely the same point in the narrative: just after gaining offices, concurrently with the duke's affection and immediately before mention of the steward's envy.80 The ME redactor has replaced a negatively charged description of the boys with a positive one by exchanging a reference to hostility with one of general high regard. It should be mentioned that the negativity of Karlsruhe seems to be an expansion of the OF,

Since the borrowing is evidently homophonic rather than synonymy, it is likely that the ME redactor would adopt the target word without attempting to significantly alter the orthography.  
79 Leach, ll. 196-204.  
79 London, ll. 94-95.  
80 This Karlsruhe reference resembles one from London II. 21-24 (quoted above), though its placement is narratively aligned with ME while London has no reference to the duke or the seneschal when the people's attitudes are addressed.
where only the seneschal shows hostility; interestingly, this will occur in the ME as well, showing another possible connection with the OF.

The "Noble" Traitor and his Animosity

But the ME cannot perform the same transformation in respect to the steward, making him entirely reprehensible:

\[
\text{Pan hadde pe douke, ich vnderstond,} \\
A chef steward of alle his lond, \\
A douhti kni3t at crie, \\
\text{pat euer he proued wip nipe \& ond} \\
\text{For to haue brou3t hem bope to schond} \\
\text{With gile \& trecherie.} \\
\text{For \textit{p}ai were so gode \& hende,} \\
\text{\& for pe douke was so wele her frende,} \\
\text{He hadde pe-er-of gret envie;} \\
\text{To pe douke wip wordes grame} \\
\text{Euer he proued to don hem schame} \\
\text{Wip wel gret felonie.}^{81}
\]

Here again there are analogies with Karlsruhe ll. 96-106 (quoted above). In both versions, the steward’s envy is a direct result of the fine qualities of the companions and their relationship with their lord; in both, his envy (ME “envie” = AN “envie”) drives him to cause them dishonour (schond/schame = hounte), using guile and treachery (trecherie/felonie = felounye). In terms of situation, then, as well as some specific aspects of vocabulary, the ME again displays parallels with Karlsruhe.

There remains, however, one anomaly in the ME that deserves consideration; if the seneschal is such an evil individual, why is he characterised as “a dou3ti kni3t at crie”?

Again, a possible answer can be found in the AN, particularly Karlsruhe. In a later passage the seneschal is described thus:

\[
\text{Li reis ad seins un seneschal} \\
\text{Ke mut est feal e desleal,} \\
\text{E si est il de haute parentee,} \\
\text{Hardré est cist feloun nomee;} \\
\text{Nevuz au riche duc Milloun,} \\
\text{E cosin germein Guenylloun,} \\
\text{Celui ke trai Oliver,} \\
\text{Roland e cé .xii. per.} \\
\text{Mut l’en avynt ben du linage –} \\
\text{Cum tut li autre du parage –} \\
\text{Estre feloun e tretour}
\]

\[
\text{Le counte ad seignz un seneschal} \\
\text{Qe mout est feloun e desleal} \\
\text{E si est de mult grant parenté.}
\]

(L. 79-81)

---

81 Leach, ll. 205-16.
Car feloun sunt si aunsessour.

(K. 215-26)

The first two lines of these quotations show similarities to ME stanza 18, and the seneschal’s characterisation as “feal & desleal,” “feloun & tretour” have echoes throughout the ME stanza. The ME lacks only the elaborate lineage of traitors. It has however picked up the description’s positive aspects, for although it is a family of traitors it is a prestigious one; the redactor simply compresses what is admirable into line 207 while eliminating the lineage.

One other detail also merits attention. In the final tercet of stanza 18, the ME says that the seneschal denounces Amis and Amiloun to the duke. Here one finds a possible affinity with the OF. In the fifteenth laisse of OF, the “guileful” seneschal, “Hadré le losengier,” attempts to convince their lord to reward Ami and Amile poorly, and to lodge them some distance away. His efforts warrant reproach from the lord who responds:

“Hadré...cuer avéz de felon,
Qui me blasmez anzdouz les compaignons. […]
Aléz arriere, tournéz vos d’entor noz,
N’ai soing de vos losenges.”

Though the ME is not nearly as detailed (and in fact, could not be so on this point as the OF and the ME diverge widely in respect to content in this subdivision, and Hardret’s words would be completely out of context), it may very well be that the ME redactor simplifies an event given some significance in the OF in order to retain the idea of the seneschal disparaging the loyal companions. It is interesting that only the ME and OF present this image of the seneschal pouring poison into the duke’s ear.

Amiloun’s Decision to Depart

In stanza 19-20, the ME again falls back on the AN. News reaches Amiloun of his parents’ death, prompting him to request leave to return home. Though London alludes to Amiloun remaining until parental demise, it says only that “Amillion demorra / Atant qe
While these lines have an immediate parallel in Karlsruhe 107-8, this latter text provides additional information which suggests a further influence on the ME. Immediately, “Au rei Charlis se est venu,” just as in the ME “To þat douke he went him þan.” The Karlsruhe Amiloun then explains to his lord that:

“Mut me est venu message fort, 
Qe moy dist moun pere est mort; 
Ce me nuncie vn messager.”

just as the ME states:

A messanger þer com þo […]
& seyd hou dep hadde fet him fro
His fader & his moder al-so.

No other version directly mentions the messenger. Such repeated coincidences in detail, though minor, do suggest a direct relationship between the ME and Karlsruhe.

One other interesting aspect of correlation is that the ME and Karlsruhe alone utilise direct discourse for this encounter, and in the organisation of the conversations there is a parallel. In both instances Amiloun speaks first, eliciting a polite reply from his lord:

“Pat riche douke, comly of kende, 
Answerd o3ain wiþ wordes hende…” (K. 137)

The duke then expresses his remorse at losing Amiloun, and assures his vassal that he will remain an ally:

“Ac 3if euer it bifalle so 
Pat þou art in wer & wo 
& of mine help hast nede, 
Saueliche com or send þi sond, 
& wiþ al mi powere of mi lond 
Y schal wreke þe of þat dede.”

Mes si vus avez de mei afere –
Seit en pes ou en guere –
Mandez le mei hardiement
E tant cum mei dure ou ou argent,
Ne vus faudrai ne dotez mie.”

(K. 147-51)

---

87 Karlsruhe, L 115. [He goes to King Charlemagne.]
88 Leach, I. 224.
90 Leach, Il. 218-21.
91 Although there is direct discourse in the OF, the situation is so dissimilar that it constitutes an entirely different episode. There, the departing companion leaves for Blaye to accept the hand of Lubias, Hardret’s niece, as recompense for the traitor’s attempt to have the companions killed in battle, and Charlemagne oversees the arrangements.
92 Leach, Il. 229-30.
Though this latter quotation does have a direct parallel in London, it is only as a subsequent paraphrase of subjects covered in the discussion. Of the conversation itself, London says only:

Quant Amillioun sout pur veir  
Qe son pere fuy affyné,  
De son seignur le counte ad pris congé.  
(L. 50-52)

It entirely omits 99 intervening lines from Karlsruhe and subsequently recounts only five others. In terms of content, therefore, ME again displays kinship with the AN, and in terms of organisation, the use of direct discourse, order of material and at least one common collocation, it is more closely akin to Karlsruhe than to London/Cambridge.

However, there is also an apparent affinity with London absent in Karlsruhe. One finds in the ME that Amiloun believes “he most hom wende, / For to resaiue his 1nd.,” The implication is that his right of succession is not entirely secured, but must be defended. London mirrors this sentiment by stating:

Qe li covient garder sa terre  
Qe nul li fist treson ne gere,  
Ne qe autre heyr n’i entrast  
Ne ses droitz amenusast.  
(L. 53-56)

Here, too, there is the subtle implication that Amiloun’s inheritance must in some way be safeguarded. Though this can easily be dismissed as simple coincidence, one may wonder whether there is some relationship here. It is possible that the redactor, using an exemplar in the tradition of Karlsruhe was nevertheless aware of the London/Cambridge tradition, and, much as it appears has been done in respect to the OF in various instances, incorporated it in the narrative.

93 Leach, II. 235-40.  
94 These are London, II. 60-4: “Mes s’il eust od ly affere, / Fuist ceo en pees ou en guerre, / Maundast a ly hastivement, / E il od force de sa gent.”  
95 The remaining unaccounted line is: “Destourber ne vont son honur,” I. 60, which corresponds to Karlsruhe: “Ne place due de maegante / Ke vostre honour fast desturbe.” II. 143-4.  
96 Leach, II. 227-28.  
97 Such a conclusion is not spurious. Though there is always the possibility that his exemplar did contain this detail, it is demonstrated that the redactor certainly knew something of the Old French version, and it is likely that he had heard other accounts of the story as well. It is therefore a likely conclusion is that familiarity with the story led to admiration for it, admiration led to copying, and in copying the redactor endeavoured to include what he thought “best” of the various accounts he heard.
Introduction of the Cups

The remainder of this section shares many subtle points with the OF, particularly the early introduction of the identical cups. In stanza 21, Amiloun refrains from going directly to Amis, instead charging a goldsmith to make two rich cups as tokens of their parting:

Pan was sir Amiloun ferli wo
For to wende sir Amis fro,
On him was al his pou3t.
To a gold-smite he gan go
& lete make gold coupes to,
For þrehundred pounde he hem bou3t. 98

Since the cups shall later serve as a means of recognition between the pair, this early digression to explain their origin is an improvement on all versions of the AN where they simply appear at the critical moment, wrenching the plot. 99 But this event is also foreshadowed in the OF: just after baptism, their godfather, Pope Yzoréz, gives the infants gifts including:

Et a chascun fist un hannap donner
Fait a mesure, et tant font a loer
Que en un mosle furent andui ouvré. 100

Though the ME and the OF present widely diverging accounts of the origins of the cups, they are consistent in providing them with an early introduction which alleviate a later plot-wrench to justify their appearance. Evidently the ME redactor, recognising the need to suture a lacuna which left the cups’ presence unaccounted for in the AN tradition, emended the legend by presenting them prior to the companions’ separation. There is every possibility that his doing so was directly influenced by the OF, the only other version of the story in any language to have this timely presentation. Though the specifics are different, the concept is the same in that in both cases the narrative is streamlined.

Distress at Prospect of Separation and Desire to Depart Together

As Amiloun readies himself to leave, the ME turns to Amis, greatly distressed at the departure of his friend in stanza 22; of particular note are the following lines:

Sir Amis was so ful of care,

98 Leach, ll. 241-46.
99 Though this event does not occur in the AN, there is a correlation in the AN with the description of the cups which links the ME to Karlsruhe (see Division 4C).
100 Dembowski, ll. 29-31.
For sorwe & wo & sikeing sare
Al-mest swoned þat fre. 101

This quotation mirrors one in London:

De plur ne se poet tenir,
Car moult li greve le departir. 102
(L. 71-72)

In Karlsruhe, however, it is Amiloun who is the more disconcerted:

Car ne say certis coment viveroye,
Si de vus unqes m’en aloye.
(K. 175-56)

But although their respective positions are changed – Amis being the more stolid of the pair in Karlsruhe as opposed to London and ME – it does not appear that ME is aligned with London against Karlsruhe. There are too many similarities in the passage as a whole, and this last quotation specifically, to draw such a conclusion. First, in degree of urgency it conveys a similar sentiment as that of Amis:

"Bot 3if y may wip mi broþer go,
Mine hert, it brekeþ of þre!" 103

One sees here that separation will be intolerable for the speaker whereas previous quotations display simply distress and surprise at the departure. In ME and Karlsruhe, separation is expressed as an unacceptable circumstance which will prove detrimental to the speaker. Secondly, the quotations occur in the same context of a conversation which does not take place in London. In ME, the exclamation occurs while Amis is seeking permission from the duke to leave with Amiloun:

To þe douke he went wip dreri mode
& praid him fair, þer he stode,
& seyd, "Sir, par charite,
3if me leue to wende þe fro." 104

101 Leach, II. 256-58.
102 Though it is difficult to determine the subject from this quotation, its context makes it clear that it is Amis and not Amiloun.
103 Leach, II. 263-64.
104 Leach, II. 259-62.
In Karlsruhe it is the same conversation, but the speaker is changed to Amiloun and Amis becomes the addressed:

"De une chose vus requer,
Qe ove moi vordiez aler
A moun pays en Lumbardye
Ou moy mener tote ma vie."

(K. 171-74)

It is of little consequence that the respective stances of the characters are changed. The request remains a plea for Amis's departure, an issue which arises in no other version of the poem. It is unlikely that such a subject would emerge independently in the two versions, and must indicate some sort of relationship.

In both versions, the request subsequently meets with refusal. In the ME, the duke protests that:

"Were 3e bope went me fro,
ßan schuld me waken al mi wo,
Mi ioie were went oway."

(K. 190-93)

Likewise in Karlsruhe, Amis refuses the offer due to a sense of fidelity to their lord:

"Ne voyle deu de mageste,
Ke unke me venist tel meschance,
Ver meun seignur, le rei de France,
Ke sun servise unqe guerpiroye"

(K. 190-93)

Though the speakers are different, the motivation is the same; deference to the lord's wishes that prevents Amis from leaving.

Thus, though in one instance it is Amis who is the more heart-broken (begging the duke for permission to go with Amis) while in the other it is Amiloun (begging Amis to go with him), the premise of the proposal is the same (Amis's departure), as are the arguments for it (physical pain caused by separation), and the reasoning for its decline (fidelity to the lord). In light of this, it would be erroneous to overplay any significance in the protagonists' respective change in attitude towards the departure, particularly as it is evident that separation causes some degree of anxiety for both characters in all versions.

Leach, II. 271-73.

This quotation is a small part of a much longer passage in which Amis expresses his sense of duty to Charlemagne (II. 187-204). The full text can be found in the appendix.
Furthermore, it is an interesting point that the character who remains behind, Amis in AN and ME, corresponds to the Amile of OF, while the departing character Amiloun corresponds to OF Ami. This reversal of names is the most elemental factor which permits one to see the close relationship of ME to AN against OF or any of its predecessors. Given that there is evidence to show the ME redactor had knowledge of the OF, it stands to reason that inversions of characterisations might present themselves in the English version.107

Departure and Separation

Riding Out

Further evidence of the OF's influence can be detected in the departure scene. Though the duke ultimately refuses Amis permission to depart with Amiloun, he does permit him to ride one day's journey with his companion:

So douhti kni3tes, in þat tide
þat ferd out of þat toun,
Al þat day as þai rade
Gret morning boþe þai made,
Sir Amis & Amiloun,
& when þai schuld wende otvain,
Wel fair to-gider opon a plain
Of hors þai li3t adoun.108

This joint departure is absent in AN, but occurs twice in OF:109

De la ville issent par la porte ferree,
Passent les terres et les amples contrees
Desci a Blaivies n'i ont resnes tyrees.110

and:

Parmi la porte issent de la cite,
Li cuens Amiles les convoia asséz
Une grant lieue, puis s'en est retornéz.111

107 There is also the possibility that the inversion was entirely intentional, given that the ME seems to have a stronger sense of gender differentiation between the two characters than in other versions. Amiloun is always displayed as a "manly" hero - questing, engaging in battle, acting as "champion." Amis, on the other hand, can often be identified with "the other," or more specifically, the "female." Questing tires him, he eschews hunting, refuses to do battle, and he is incapable of functioning as a champion, needing to be championed himself. The inversion of the characterisation might therefore be an intentional alteration on the part of the redactor to make the characters conform more fully to the role ascribed to them by the redactor.

108 Leach, II. 281-88. In the OF, Ami departs twice; once he goes to marry Lubias, and, when she insults Amile, he returns for seven years before departing again to rejoind her. These two departures are conflated into one in AN, and to some degree the ME.

109 Dembowski, II. 483-85. [They rode out of the town through the iron gate and galloped ahead through the countryside, never pulling in the reins until they Reached Blaye.]
Both ME and OF thus provide vignettes of the companions leaving the town together and riding far from court, a scene that is absent in the AN.

**Reaffirmation of Troth-Plight**

The ME also shares with the OF a reaffirmation of the friendship plight:

(25) When ūai bope a-fot li3t,
Sir Amiloun, ūat hendi kni3t,
Was ri3t-wise man of rede
& seyd to sir Amis ful ri3t,
"Broñer, as we er trewþe-pli3t
Boþe wiþ word & dede,
Fro þis day forward neuer mo
To faily oþer for wele no wo,
To help him at his nede,
Broþer, be now trewe to me,
& y schal ben as trewe to þe,
Also god me spede! […]
Bot euer do trewþe & no tresoun
& þenken on me, sir Amiloun,
Now we asondri schal wende."\(^{113}\)

As emotional as the parting is in the AN, there is never an incident where the characters ask to be remembered (þenken on me=ne m’oubliez), verbalise their need for loyalty (trewe=loiautés), and life-long mutual support (Fro þis day forward=tout mon vivant; help=aide) as they do here in the ME and OF. There, they simply offer warnings and general advice, after which, amid tearful embraces:

Li uns vayt vers sun pays,
L’autre remeint assez pensyfs.

(K. 247-48)

Li un s’en va ver son pays,
Li autres remeint tristes e pensyfs.

(L. 111-12)

But in that counsel there are again analogies shared by the ME and AN. Amiloun’s admonition to always remain upright and loyal to the duke presents information provided only in Karlsruhe and the ME:

Be nou3t o3ain þi lord forsworn,
& 3if þou dost, þou art forlorn
“Merci, beu frere, pur Deu amur,
Mut me avez forte mater moustré.

\(^{111}\) Dembowski, II. 583-85. [They left the city through the gate, Count Amile going with them as far as a league before turning back.]\(^{112}\) It is important to remember the inversion of characters in the OF; thus Amile’s accompanying Ami part of the way in the OF is analogous to ME/AN Amis accompanying Amiloun part of the way.

\(^{112}\) Dembowski, II. 552-60. ["Noble friend," said good Amile… "But one thing I want to tell and charge you with, lord companion, that you do not forget me." And the count replied, "There is no need to speak of it. I pledge you all loyalty and mutual aid between us as long as I might have life!"]

\(^{113}\) Leach, II. 289-309.
Amiloun instructs Ami to always be scrupulous in his behaviour (ME 307 = K. 96), particularly in respect to his lord (ME 304 = K. 99-100). Then there is also the issue of the steward, which in terms of content could emerge from any of the French versions, but seems most aligned with the OF:

```
&E bro¤her, 3ete y þe forbede
þe fals steward falaverede,
Certes, he wil þe schende!"115
```

Mais une chose voz voil je bien montrer,
Que ne preingniész compaignie a Hardré.
Tot voz avroit souduit et enchanté
Et tel hontage et tel blasme alevé
Que ne seroit a nul jour amendé."116

What makes this ME passage most remarkable is its relative brevity in comparison with the other versions. Only three lines are used for a caution which is given five in OF (561-65), seventeen in London (78-94), and twenty-five in Karlsruhe (211-36). A great deal of material is deleted.117 Amiloun tells Amis only to beware, the steward will shame him, but says nothing of the seneschal's evil character.118 This again seems to reflect the ME's greater emphasis on positives, and a tendency to downplay what is negative, but also

---

114 Leach, ll. 304-07.
115 Leach, ll. 310-12.
116 Dembowski, li. 561-5.
117 Perhaps the redactor did not want to dwell too long on the "evil" aspects of the seneschal, thus allowing more room to focus on the "goodness" of his main characters. It is true that, a few epithets excepted, the evil of characters is not directly expressed but inferred through contrast with the goodness of the companions.
118 In the OF and ME the warning immediately follows the admonitions to be remembered. Also, OF says the steward/seneschal will bring "hontage" (ll. 64), just as the ME says he will bring "shame." The AN versions, on the other hand, focus only on the steward's great "felounie," warning Amis not to befriend him because his reputation will be stained by association (London), or because no good can come when friends betray one another (Karlsruhe).
shows analogies with the OF which likewise focuses more on the seneschal's ability to
cause harm than his inherent treachery.

**Presentation of Cups**

Yet another correlation with the AN comes up just before the departure when Amiloun
presents the cups and asks Amis to pick one:

As þai stode so, þo breþeren bold,
[Sir Amiloun] drou3 forþ tvay coupes of gold,
Ware liche in al þing,
& bad sir Amis þat he schold
Chese wheþer he haue wold,
Wiþ-outen more duelling,
& seyd to him, “Mi lewe broþer,
Kepe þou þat on & þat ober,
For goded loue, heuen king;
Lete neuer þis coupe fro þe,
Bot loke her-on & þenk on me,
It tokneþ our parting.”

Though the timely presentation is absent, the description of the cups and the circumstances
surrounding the bestowal does show similarities with the AN tradition, especially
Karlsruhe. At the critical recognition scene when the cups are finally produced, London
says:

Amis une coupe avoit
Ke mout ferement amoit,
Car Amillioun, qe tant amoyt,
Cele coupe li donait.

(L. 956-59)

Other details allow one to pinpoint the Karlsruhe tradition more immediately, as the
following reading indicates:

Quant sire Amys servoyt au roy
Al houre ke fut botiller
Si serui Charles du mester,
.ii. coupes fyt il fere al houre
De une taylle, de une forgoure.
Celui dui hanap tant resembleient
Ke si en une mayn esteyent,
N'est hom, ke tant de overayne sust
Qe l’un de l’autre juger peust.

119 Leach, ll. 313-24.
Thus one reads in Karlsruhe, just as in ME, that not only does Amiloun give a cup to Amis (1647), but that he does so when still a butler in court (1637-39), that he personally had them made (1658), he does so specifically for the purpose of them being parting tokens (1548), and that they were to think of each other when they looked at them (1650-51). Furthermore, the descriptions of the cups are startling alike:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{\& bope were of o wi3t,} \\
& \text{\& bope of o michel, ypli3t;} \\
& \text{Ful richeliche pai were wrou3t,} \\
& \text{\& bope \& wai were as liche, ywis,} \\
& \text{As was Sir Amiloun \& sir Amis,} \\
& \text{\& per no failed ri3t nou3t.}^{120}
\end{align*}
\]

They have the same dimensions (wi3t, \textit{taylle}), and are indistinguishable (ME: 250-51; Karlsruhe: 1642-45). So although the redactor uses the OF’s narrative tool of early introduction for the purposes of foreshadowing, the details of the actual exchange, provenance and likeness of the cups is undoubtedly borrowed from the Karlsruhe tradition.\(^{121}\)

\(^{120}\) Leach, II. 247-52.

\(^{121}\) It is very unlikely that the borrowing would be the other way around (ME>Karlsruhe). The narrative superiority of the early introduction is evident, and a Norman redactor would not weaken the narrative by omitting it. It therefore makes one wonder whether the OF antedates the AN (a point that is outwith the scope of this examination, but does merit some word). Legge notes: “When this tale was first made the subject of an Old French poem it was probably in the form of a \textit{chanson de geste}. A late twelfth-century poem of this kind does indeed exist, but it cannot be the earliest form of the story and is very likely later than the Anglo-Norman romance.” p. 116. In any case, it is evident that the OF and the AN were in existence at the time of the ME’s writing, for the English redactor takes the “best” of what is available among those version to incorporate it into its version. Legge further notes, “\textit{Amis e Amilou} treats the story in quite independent fashion [than the OF] and must be derived from some earlier version. This was probably also Anglo-Norman, and the source of the Middle English poem, which resembles it more closely than it does the French poem, but preserves or reinstates primitive features which have been refined away in the Anglo-Norman romance.” p. 116. In her examinations, however, she seems to focus only on AN L-K, excluding Karlsruhe (C) which does continue to have many of these “primitive” features. It is also noteworthy that Leach (p. xxvi) thinks the OF is more courtly than either the AN or ME. This examination demonstrates, however, that in many respects the ME is more courtly than either the AN or OF. Legge later says, “even the earliest of the Anglo-Norman manuscripts which has come down to us appears to be reminiscent of a version which differed from that which preceded the \textit{chanson de geste}. In view of this fact, and the existence of more than one Latin version, the exact relationship of all the extant forms of the legend will probably never be clarified.” p. 121. Nevertheless, it does seem that the relationship of the ME to the OF and AN versions can be clarified, for it is evident that the English version borrows information from those traditions, much of which is not shared between them. It shows especial affinity with Karlsruhe in many points, but occasionally agrees with London against Karlsruhe. This would suggest a source which derived from a common source of both of them, but which was actually neither of them.
Final Departure

Separation

The ultimate separation scene in the first half of stanza 28 again reveals correlation with the AN. Just as the ME companions have a tearful departure, so do they in the AN:

(28) Gret sorwe þai made at her parting
& kisten hem wilþ ei3en wepeing,
Þo kni3tes hende & þre. 122

Atant ses sunt entrebeysé,
Plurent e crient de pité.

(K. 237-38) (L. 103-04)

And likewise, there is mention of one departing and the other remaining:

Aiper bitau3t oþer heuen king,
& on her stedes þai gun spring
& went in her iurne. 123

Li uns s’en vait, l’autre remaint,
Ke dolourousement se playnt.
Li uns vayt vers sun pays,
L’autre remeint assez pensyfs.
Ne sout de doel ke fere poyt,
Mes vers la court sei returneyt.

(K. 245-50) (L. 111-14)

There is nothing particularly noteworthy about these similarities, despite their order, their mention of tears, and the reference to riding in the ME and London. However, such descriptive colouring is largely formulaic and could easily be the natural product of the English tradition to capture the spirit of the scene provided in the exemplar.

Amiloun’s Marriage

The remainder of the stanza does provides important narrative information which betrays a link to earlier traditions. In mentioning Amiloun’s wedding almost immediately upon returning there is an unambiguous recount of information in the OF:

Sir Amiloun went hom to his lond
& sese it al in to his hond,

122 Leach, II. 325-7.
123 Leach, II. 328-30.
that his elders hadde be,
& spoused a leuedy bri3t in bour
& brou3t hir hom wi gret honour
& miche solemnpete.\textsuperscript{124}

The narrative implies that Amiloun wastes no time in marrying as soon as he returns home, and the same sense of urgency is found in the OF:

Lubias treuvent soz le pin en la pree,
Isnellement l'ont au monstier menee;
L i gentiz hom l'a ileuc espousee.\textsuperscript{125}

Though the AN versions do later report the wedding, its early reference is shared only by the ME and the OF. It is also noteworthy that neither the ME nor the OF make much mention of the bride, whereas the AN versions dedicate between eleven and sixteen lines to flattering her.\textsuperscript{126} In terms of placement, presentation and descriptive detail, therefore, the ME seems to be aligned with the OF in this scene by downplaying the importance of the bride and her desirability.

\textit{Conclusion}

In terms of content, little of which appears in the ME is new; almost all events and references can find a parallel in earlier versions. The most evident observation that can be made is that there is a slight reordering of material and a liberal attitude towards borrowing from outside the exemplar. This partially suggests the redactor's sense of "freedom" in treating his material. More suggestive of this treatment but perhaps less noticeable at first glance are the subtle changes in presentation which have no solid precedent. For example, the polarisation of the characters as good or bad (the companions and the steward), and perhaps as masculine or feminine (Amiloun and Amis). He also takes at least one opportunity to "English" the redaction, borrowing general sentiments from the earlier versions but inserting details to which the intended audience could relate, such as the age for knighthood. Such an attitude towards handling of material has clear precedent in the methods set out by the \textit{artes poeticae} and show the redactor as an inheritor of those ideals. He provides a "paraphrase" of the story, deleting what he deems extraneous, borrowing from outside the exemplar to provide details he feels lacking, and treating all material fairly freely, emphasising or diminishing the importance of details as

\textsuperscript{124} Leach, II. 331-6.
\textsuperscript{125} Dembowski, II. 486-8. [There they found Lubias under a pine tree in the meadow. Wasting no time they led her to the church, and there the gentle knight wed her.]
\textsuperscript{126} London, II. 170-80 and Karlsruhe, II. 305-20 respectively.
he sees fit. He therefore demonstrates himself to be a “good” translator according the criteria of his age, but in modern eyes one would have to recognise him less as a translator and instead as a skilful *remanieur*. 
DIVISION 2B: Seduction, Betrayal and Plan for Combat

Introduction to Section

This section is greatly expanded in the ME when compared with either London/Cambridge or the Old French. What is given 265 lines in the Old French, 214 in London/Cambridge and 670 in Karlsruhe receives 672 in the Middle English. Length alone would therefore suggest a closer relationship with Karlsruhe than the other versions. Nevertheless, numerous additions and deletions of material, sometimes found in other versions and sometimes not, attest to the continued free adaptation of material.

The Steward's Temptation

Introductory Stanza

The ME begins with a short digression in stanza 29 which has antecedents in neither AN nor OF. Speaking in the first person plural, the narrator instructs the audience to turn away from Amiloun and his wife in their country and to focus on Amis (337-40). The stanza's central tercets then tells that all the courtiers praise Amis's return and laud him. This praise provides a foil for the final three lines which recount how the steward alone “wip nipe & ond” seeks to betray Amiloun.\(^{127}\) Though this brief expansion consists primarily of formulae and provides no new details, as a narrative device it does present an improvement over previous version by signalling a clear episodic division which sign-posts events by reminding the audience of the existing situation and hinting at events to come.

First Encounter with Steward

The ME then catches up with its predecessors by providing an immediate encounter with the steward. One reads in stanza 30:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ban on a day bifel it so} \\
\text{Wip he steward he met } \tilde{h} \tilde{o}, \\
\text{Ful fair he gret } \tilde{h} \tilde{at} \tilde{f}r.\end{align*}
\]

Though in narrative time this happens soon after the separation, in terms of real time line 349 suggests that there is a lapse between the return of Amiloun and the steward’s approach. In this, the ME shows a greater affinity with Karlsruhe than OF or London, both of which imply the meeting is immediate:

\(^{127}\) ll. 346-8; quotation from l. 347.
Vait s’en Amis l’i cortois et l’i fiers;
Amiles est a Paris repairiéz,
Puis s’en entra l’i ber en un vergier,
Au dos l’i sieult Hadréz l’i losengiers.  

Quant Amis de palmisoun levoit,
Vers la court sei retorneyt;
Sitost com en la porte entra,
Li seneschal l’i encontra.

(L. 113-16)

Karlsruhe, however, also demonstrates a lapse of time:

Mes vers la court sei returneyt.
Si s’est en sa chambre alé
Si destreint e si maleisé
Qe de langor e de peyne;
En lyt se teent un quinzaine,
Ke ren ne manga, ce dyt l’escrit.
Mes quant asuagez est un petyt,
E qe il se sente auqes a alleggez,
Hors du lyt s’est lors levez,
En la sale tantost ala;
Le seneschal l’i encontra.

(K. 250-60)

It is also noteworthy that like the ME, Karlsruhe provides an interpolation which describes an emotional state. The main difference is that the focus in the ME is on the outsiders’ view towards Amis, while Karlsruhe focuses on that character’s inner turmoil. Nevertheless, both succeed in providing an emotional backdrop before moving on to episodic developments which move the plot forward. Such background has the effect of making the events more real. That the focus in the ME is on the joys others have in Amis’s return, while Karlsruhe recounts his despair, is characteristic of the ME’s tendency to downplay hardships and focus on more joyful features, but it seems probable that the ME redactor borrowed both the time delay and the dynamic characterisation from the Karlsruhe tradition.  

Steward’s Proposal

In the encounter itself, the ME follows AN in its deviation from OF.  

“Sire Amys,” fet il, “ben veinant!”

Si[re] Amis,” dit il, “bien veignant!”

128 Leach, ll. 349-51.
129 Dembowski, ll. 588-91.
130 Nevertheless, it must be recognised that the ME does go to great lengths to demonstrate Amis’s distress over the separation, and Karlsruhe ll. 252-5 does bear a striking resemblance to ME ll. 256-8. The major difference is that in Karlsruhe it is internalised, whereas in ME it is expressed outwardly. By borrowing the sentiment in Karlsruhe, then externalising it in ME, the redactor succeeds in making the character less stoic, and consequently “weaker” in his portrayal.
131 The OF has the seneschal accept Ami’s proposal simply to be on good terms as he cannot offer him pledged companionship, and it is implied that the offer and its acceptance are what lead to Ami’s downfall.
ME likewise has the steward open the discussion in a similar vein, again with reference to the departed Amiloun and a display of empathy for Amis’s sorrow:

“Sir Amis,” he seyd, “pe is ful wo
For þat þi brō̂per is went þe fro,
& certes, so is me.”

Then, however, the ME takes a more severe route. Whereas the AN seneschal pretends to understand that Amis cannot replace Amiloun, and therefore requests only to be a substitute, the ME steward seeks to replace Amiloun altogether:

“Ac of his wendeing haue þou no care,
3if þou wilt leue opon mi lare,
& lete þi mornig be,
& þou wil be to me kende,
Y schal þe be a better frende
þan euer 3ete was he.”

His proposal continues into the following stanza (31), were even a new truth-plight is requested:

“Sir Amis,” he seyd, “do bi mi red,
& swere ous bôpe brôpherhed
& pли̂t we our treŵhes to;
Be trewe to me in word & dede,
& y schal, so god me spede,
Be trewe to þe al so.”

The ME follows AN in having the steward express friendly empathy with Amis over his companion’s departure and likewise uses the absence to justify his own proposal for friendship. But in the English, the request is more forceful. By stating that he can be a
better friend (359) and requesting a formal oath of friendship which supersedes that of Amiloun’s (361-6), the steward maligns Amiloun’s memory and attempts to erase it. Though superficially this demonstrates him as a more malevolent character than his AN counterpart, it also characterises him as less crafty and less refined. This is not surprising. Just as the ME eclipsed the noble status and lineage of the steward, it also deletes qualities which might be deemed admirable in his portrayal. Much as the focus on the loyal companions is always “good,” that of their antagonists is always “bad.” The ME admits few shades of grey, preferring thing to be polarised as black or white, good or evil, joyous or lamentable, as this treatment demonstrates. 136

**Amis’s Rebuff**

Not surprisingly, Amis response in the ME is a definitive, yet initially polite, no:

Sir Amis answerd, “Mi treuþe y pliþt
To sir Amiloun, þe gentil kniþt,
þei he be went me fro.
Whiles þat y may gon & speke,
Y no schal neuer mi treuþe breke,
Noiþer for wele no wo.

For bi þe treuþe þat god me sende,
Ichaue him founde so gode & kende,
Seþen þat y first him knewe,
For ones y pliþt him treuþe, þat hende,
Where so he in warld wende,
Y schal be to him trewe;
& 3if y were now forsworn
& breke mu treuþe, y were forlorn,
Wel sore it schuld me rewe.
Gete me frendes whare y may,
Y no schal neuer bi niþt no day
Chauenge him for no newe.”137

The AN Amis also rebuffs the seneschal, but his choice of words is less conciliatory while at the same time he manages to end his refusal by dangling a carrot intended to give the seneschal some hope:

---

135 Reducing it to one line instead of several (see division 1a).
136 Though the focus with the companions is usually joyous when together, their separation and events which occur during it are often sorrowful. One other noteworthy polarisation is the masculine-feminine one. Simon Gaunt notes that in chansons de geste there is usually a masculine-feminine continuum, but that within masculinity, there is a degree of alterity permitted. Olivier and Roland, for example, are both the ideal masculine prototype, but their masculinities are different, and one can be defined in terms of the other. In A&A, however (particularly ME), there is no alterity. One is either masculine or feminine. Where Amiloun succeeds in fulfilling masculine roles, Amis fails in almost every respect and can be viewed as a feminine character.
137 Leach, I. 367-84.
He says that his heart is abandoned to Amiloun whom he shall always love, and that no other could replace him. Rather unflatteringly, he begins by telling the seneschal that his friendship can never be reciprocated, but ends by saying that if the seneschal wished to be loyal to him, he will treat him as kindly as his honour permits; though one may wonder whether it is not rather back-handed, is still something of a consolation.

Thus, where Amis's loyalty in the ME remains uncompromising, the rebuff itself is slightly more friendly in that it is a general one rather than personal, and it does not belittle the steward by implying that he individually is unworthy of friendship. Such consideration tends to display the ME Amis at once as less aggressive than his AN counterpart while remaining more mindful of his pledge to his companion.

The Steward's Reaction and its Consequences

Not surprisingly, the steward reacts angrily:

\[ \text{He says that his heart is abandoned to Amiloun whom he shall always love, and that no other could replace him. Rather unflatteringly, he begins by telling the seneschal that his friendship can never be reciprocated, but ends by saying that if the seneschal wished to be loyal to him, he will treat him as kindly as his honour permits; though one may wonder whether it is not rather back-handed, is still something of a consolation.} \]

Thus, where Amis's loyalty in the ME remains uncompromising, the rebuff itself is slightly more friendly in that it is a general one rather than personal, and it does not belittle the steward by implying that he individually is unworthy of friendship. Such consideration tends to display the ME Amis at once as less aggressive than his AN counterpart while remaining more mindful of his pledge to his companion.

The Steward's Reaction and its Consequences

Not surprisingly, the steward reacts angrily:

\[ \text{He says that his heart is abandoned to Amiloun whom he shall always love, and that no other could replace him. Rather unflatteringly, he begins by telling the seneschal that his friendship can never be reciprocated, but ends by saying that if the seneschal wished to be loyal to him, he will treat him as kindly as his honour permits; though one may wonder whether it is not rather back-handed, is still something of a consolation.} \]
Again, the ME redactor has chosen to emphasise the hostility of the steward, having him openly declare himself Amis’s enemy. The AN seneschal is more subtle. There is no threat in Karlsruhe or London, only explanation:

Le seneschal tut coy se tient,  
E de fyn yre tut pale devient;  
Pense ke il se vengerá  
Si tost cum tens e lu verra.  

Li seneschal ataunt se tint,  
| Qe d’anguisse pale devint;  
Purpense sei q’il se vengereit  
| Sitost com son leu verreyt.

(K. 287-90)  
(L. 143-46)

Vengeance is contrived but not declared; in fact, the seneschal exerts a great deal of effort maintaining self-control and betraying no hostility. Though this may make him appear more deceptive, it can be construed as a respectable characteristic befitting a man of breeding. It is therefore an attribute which the ME denies him. Nevertheless, he is so enraged that he grows pale with anger, and this physical manifestation is adopted by the ME in lines 385-86. The ME has therefore borrowed what it finds suitable and relevant, while altering details to make it conform to this new point of view.

Interestingly, only the ME has Amis return the ill-will. After the steward’s tirade, the youth retorts: “Sir, þer-of 3iue y nouȝt a slow; / Do al þat þou may!”139 Though such an invitation to hostility is not in strict accord with the general character of the ME Amis, the redactor must have found it necessary to supply it even though it occurs nowhere else. Only in ME are the threats of the steward vocalised, therefore it is only in that version that they can be rebutted. And they must be rebutted. For Amis to receive such threats and not respond to them would portray him as a character who tolerates unseemly behaviour and antagonism. By responding as he does, he not only demonstrates that he will not abide such behaviour, but also that he will not partake in it. He himself issues no counter-challenge, indicating he neither fears his adversary, nor will he deign to act as he does.

The ME concludes this episode much as it begins it, with a single stanza (34) which sign-posts the importance of the encounter in the context of the whole story:

Al þus þe wrake gan biginne,  
& wip wretþe þai went atvinne,  
þo bold bernes to.  
þe steward nold neuer blinne  
To schende þat douhti kniȝt of kinne,  
Euer he proued þo.  
þus in court to-gider þai were  
Wip wretþe & wip loureas and chere

139 Leach, II. 395-96.
Wele half a 3ere & mo,
& afterward opon a while
de steward wip tresoun & gile
Wrou3t him ful michel wo.140

It expresses that they parted company yet continued to inhabit the same court for over half a year. During that time, the steward never stops scheming how to avenge himself, and most importantly, the stanza ends by saying that the steward will ultimately inflict harm on Amis. More than simply foreshadowing, this stanza foretells how events in this episode will precipitate future events and gives a brief overview of them. Here again there is a similarity with AN, particularly Karlsruhe:

Ore vus dirra de sire Amys,
Qe a la court est tut soul remys;
Asez servi de sun dever,
Allaz cum fort desturber
Saunz deserte le est destiné.
Unques, ce croy, ne fu trové
De un home ke tant de hounte avoyt
Par sl feloun e mal aguait. [...]  
Seignurs, en tant vus lerroms,
E de sire Amys vus diroms,
Ke fu demuré ov sun seignour
E meuz le servi des jour en jour.
E tant cum il le meuz servi,
Le seneschal le plus le hay;
De sun benfet aveit envie,
Mes Amys nele aparcut mye.

(K. 291-98, and 321-28)  

Amis lessa le temps aler,
Ala e fist son mester;
Servi le counte com il soleyt,
E le counte mout li amoyt:
Od sei le tint plus privé
Qe nul autre de sa meinsé.

Ore lerray de Amyllioun ester,
E de sir Amys vus voil counter,
Qe fuit demore od son seygnur
E meuz li servi de jour en jour.
Taunz com Amis meuz li servet,
Le seneschal plus li haët;
De son benfait avoit envie,
Mes Amys ne l’apairç[u]st mye.
(L. 147-52 and 181-88)

Both London and Karlsruhe end the episode by having Amis return to his duties of serving his lord, and, after a lengthy digression which returns to Amiloun,141 by stating that the better he served the better the lord loved him, thus increasing the animosity of the seneschal. However, Karlsruhe alone among the AN versions alludes directly to the harm which will come to Amis (296-98), and the ME redactor, recognising the narrative superiority of such sign-posting, adopts it in the English narrative.

140 Leach, il. 397-408.
141 This passage itself is quite interesting and it can be viewed in parallel text in the appendix (K. 291-320/L. 153-180). Of the thirty-odd lines in each text, there are only seven parallel lines shared between the versions. These shared lines refer to Amis becoming the leader of a company of barons, of whom there were never less than seven (K) or ten (L) around him; they also refer to his people counselling him to take a wife, and he therefore marries a noble woman (a parallel with ME; see section 1B). It is evident in both versions that the marriage is a political alliance, something Amiloun does to pacify his people, not a marriage based on love. Quite simply, she fits the bill. She is beautiful, of noble lineage (her father being either a count (L) or the duke of Pavia (K)), and through her Amiloun increases his inheritance. Karlsruhe calls her Ozille, and explains that she is "male & rampouse," and "Desnaturele a sun seignur."
Belisaunt’s Temptation

The Feast

As the ME poem moves towards the next episode, it again diverges momentarily from the AN to preface a great feast in the duke’s court:

So in a time, as we tel in gest,
Þe riche douke lete make a fest
Semly in somers tide;
Þer was mani a gentil gest
Wip mete & drink ful onest
To serui by ich a side.
Miche semly folk was samned þare,
Erls, barouns, lasse & mare,
& leuedis proude in pride.
More ioie no miȝt be non
Þat þer was in þat worply won,
Wip blisse in borwe to bide. 142

This is a digression from the AN which introduces Belisaunt before briefly mentioning the feast, but an effective one in that it sets the scene of events to come, something the AN neglects to do. By presenting a new locus at this point, the ME demonstrates narrative superiority to its predecessor by signalling a break between the previous episode and the one following. This stanza is another sign-post, so it is not surprising that the overwhelming majority of lines are entirely formulaic. 143 Nevertheless, the very mention of the feast alleviates the need to wrench the plot at a crucial moment to introduce a relevant event, making the entire course of events more believable. 144

Belisaunt’s Introduction

With stanza 36, the ME again falls in line with the AN by introducing the duke’s daughter:

Þat riche douke, þat y of told,
He hadde a douhter fair & bold,
Curteise, hende & fre. 145

The AN says of her:

142 Leach, II. 409-20.
143 Though there are some common details between the ME and the AN which will be examined below.
144 Throughout the poem, the AN tends to introduce material only as it is needed. As such, there often is a wrenched plot which makes the story less credible. The ME frequently improves on these lacunae by digressing to explain details which foreshadow events to come.
145 Leach, II. 421-23.
It is interesting that in the initial introduction of the character, the AN focuses on the love of the duke for his wife and daughter, while in the ME there is no emotional attachment made to her nor any mention of her mother. It also omits the following reference to her allure to other men:

Princis e ducs la desireyent...  
Deus countes la desirent...  
(K. 334)  
(L. 194)

Instead, she is simply described in terms which, though complimentary, are such commonplace formulae that they verge on being clichés when it comes to describing a young noblewoman. To an extent, the ME dehumanises her, preventing the audience from recognising her potential as an individual worthy of affection.

In the descriptions, however, there is some analogy with the AN; one reads:

In al þat lond nas þer non yhold  
So semly on to se,  
For sche was gentil & auenaunt.  

In AN, she is likewise genteel and the most beautiful woman in the land:

Mut fut gent la damoysele  
Mout fut gentile la damoysele  
En tote France ne out plus bele.  
En une realme ne out plus bele.

146 More so than in the AN, the ME tends to minimise the role of women in the narrative, perhaps in order to prevent their potential to become "life-partners" to the companions. Amiloun's wife is hardly mentioned, and Belisaunt's description is condensed a great deal. As a rule, male-female relationships, which might provide a model for the companions to follow, are minimised, and the focus of description when discussing the wives of the pair is on their "bad" characteristics rather than the good. The only women who are expanded upon in the ME are the mothers of the two companions (not mentioned in the AN), apparently because, in the role of mother, they present no threat, and it is furthermore in the role of mother that Belisaunt is shown at her best.

147 See also below, where any reference to desirability is put into her own mouth.

148 For most of the first half of the narrative, Belisaunt is simply a stock character, "the wooing woman" or "Potiphar's wife." In this role she is nothing more than a typical young temptress, much as Hardre! is a stock character by being the traitorseneschal.

149 Leach, II. 425-27.
The ME also follows the AN in providing her with numerous ladies in waiting:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Wip leuedis & maidens bri3t in bour} \\
\text{Kept sche was wip honour} \\
\text{& gret solemnitie.}^{150}
\end{align*}
\]

Which corresponds to:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{La damoisele fu ben gardé;} \\
\text{Compaynes out a grand plente} \\
\text{Des damiseles du pays} \\
\text{En sa chambre out .ix. ou .x.;} \\
\text{Par parfoumer sa volunte} \\
\text{De contredire nel sunt osee.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{La damoysele fuit bien gardé:} \\
\text{Compaignes out a grant pleinté} \\
\text{Des dameseles del pais} \\
\text{En sa chambre noef e dis,} \\
\text{Qe touz fesoient sa volonté} \\
\text{De countredit n’en ad parlé.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{La damoisele fu ben gardé;} \\
\text{Compaynes out a grand plente} \\
\text{Des damiseles du pays} \\
\text{En sa chambre out .ix. ou .x.;} \\
\text{Par parfoumer sa volunte} \\
\text{De contredire nel sunt osee.}
\end{align*}
\]

Worth noting is the relative brevity of Belisaunt’s description in the ME as opposed to the AN. This is particularly significant given that it is the tendency of the ME to elaborate descriptions rather than contract them. Though the relationship of the ME to AN is evident in the specifics (beauty, gentility, ladies in waiting), as well as in their order of mention, the ME redactor has left out details portraying Belisaunt as loved and desired, contracting into a single stanza a character sketch which is comprised of 22 lines in the AN. It appears that the ME redactor deliberately marginalizes Belisaunt, much as is done with Amiloun’s wife.

Perhaps the most striking discrepancy between the ME and AN descriptions of the duke’s daughter is her name. In this stanza (36) it is said:

\[
\text{Hir name was cleped Belisaunt,} \\
\text{As 3e may lîpe at me.}^{151}
\]

The AN, however, neglects to say her name in her general description, waiting until just before she tempts Amis, at which point one reads:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Nomer vus porra la pucele:} \\
\text{Les uns l’apelent Mirabele} \\
\text{Mes Flurie estoit nomé} \\
\text{Au muster ou fut baptisé.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Nomer vous dey la pucele} \\
\text{Son dreit noun est Mirabele,} \\
\text{Mes Florie fust apelé} \\
\text{De ceux qe furent de sa meinsné.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[^{150}\text{Leach, II. 430-32.}\]
\[^{151}\text{Leach, II. 428-29.}\]
Here again, there is evidence of the OF tradition. She is introduced in that narrative as soon as the companions come to court, as joyful as her father at their arrival: \[152\]

\[\text{Liés en fu Charles et sa fille par non,}
\text{C'est Belissans a la clere fason.}\] \[153\]

Thus it is again evident that, though the ME redactor relies chiefly on the AN for the basic plot, specific details are borrowed from the OF tradition. \[154\]

**Amis's Appearance at the Feast**

The first half of stanza 37 returns to the feast prefaced in stanza 35, and in doing so, it keeps the order of narration given in AN by alluding to it after introducing the duke's daughter. Again, these six lines are chiefly formulaic, but effective in redirecting the audience to the scene of events, and like the AN, they allude to the status of the guests:

\[\text{Pat fest lasted fourten ni3t}
\text{Of barouns & of birddes bri3t}
\text{& lordinges mani & fale.}
\text{Per was mani a gentil knight}
\text{& mani a seriaunt, wise & wi3t,
To serue po hende in [hale].}\] \[155\]

\[\text{Tanke paraventure avynt}
\text{Ke le reis une feste tynt}
\text{Par un jour de le Assencioun;}
\text{La out assemble tant baroun.}\]

\[\text{(K. 347-50)}\]

\[\text{Un jour par aventure avint}
\text{Qe li quens une feste tynt}
\text{Par un jour de l'Ascensioun;}
\text{La fuit assemble maint baroun.}\]

\[\text{(L. 207-10)}\]

The ME retain the mention of the word *barouns*, and like the AN, the feast is also held by the lord of the court and it takes place in the summer. \[156\]

In both the ME and the AN, the feast provides the setting in which Amis is finally observed individually, and where he draws the court's general admiration: \[157\]

---

152 It must be added that just as she is given a better treatment in the AN than the ME, she also receives a kinder description in the OF than the AN.

153 Dombowski, II. 226-27. [Charles was glad and his daughter, the beautiful Belissant, was delighted.]

154 It is likely that, given the delay the AN has in providing the name, the ME redactor simply inserted a name with which he was already familiar from a prior knowledge of the tale, but which was not his exemplar.

155 Leach, II. 433-8.

156 The AN version puts the feast at the Ascension, while the ME says originally "in somers tide" (411). As the Ascension is always the fortieth day after Easter, the feast would always be in summer; it is of little consequence that the ME festival lasts 14 days instead of one, given that the ME is fond of making feasts last a fortnight (and, as the linguistic section attests, such a period of time usually provides a good formula, so the span may be due to poetic conventions as much as narrative ones).

157 Though of course, this is more fully foreshadowed in the ME where the initial appearance of the two youths draws the attention of the whole court and all participants at the duke's original festival.
Pan was the boteler, sir Amis,
Ouer al yholden flour & priis,
Trewely to telle in tale,
& douhtiest in eueri dede
& worþliest in ich a wede
& semliest in sale. 158

The analogies with the AN are clear:

Both begin by referring to him by his title (butler = botiller); both refer to his
dress (& worþliest in ich a wede; En un dyapre vestu estoyt/De un drap vestu esteit), and
both identify him as the “prize” of the assembly (Ouer al yholden flour & priis; Des
chivalers fu mud preysez/Des chivalers fuit moult prisé).

It is interesting that, though the ME refers to Amis as being the most handsome
knight, his description in this respect is emphasised much less than in the AN. The word
“semliest” is much less intensive than any of the French adjectives used (beaus/beuz/bel).
Furthermore, the ME mentions it only in one line (444), whereas the AN first makes a
general observation of his attractiveness (K. 355-56/L. 215-16), then comments that the
courtiers all say among themselves they have never seen someone more handsome (K. 357-
58/L. 217-18); finally even the lord himself agrees with this general perception (K. 359-
60/L. 219-20). The end of the description again reflects on the overall perception of the
assembled baronage (K. 361-62/L. 221-22). In this there is a feature which shared with
London. Unlike Karlsruhe, both the ME and London mention that his beauté surpasses
that of all others in the “sale.” Such similar phrasing indicates that the exemplar must
have contained this description but it had not been passed to to Karlsruhe. 159

158 Leach, II. 439-44.
159 Cambridge is the same as London.
The ME also recasts Amis's role, skewing it away from that of a server and more towards one of the served. There is no mention of him serving his master or holding his cup for him (K. 352; 354/L. 212; 214), duties which the ME is implied are carried out by “mani a seriaunt” for those “hende in hale” (437-38), among whose numbers Amis is surely to be counted. Rather he is “douhtiest in eueri dede” (442); in this passage his appearance is changed from simply a functionary whom people observe admiringly while he works to a more exalted level where, though still handsome in appearance, his behaviour reflects a higher status and more knightly pursuits.  

Belisaunt Learns of Amis

The beginning of stanza 38 ushers the guests out of the banquet before turning to Belisaunt who, presumably absent from the events, inquires of her ladies:

“So god 3ou sped,
Who was hold þe dou3tiest kni3t
& semlyest in ich a si3t
& worpliest in wede,
& who was þe fairest man
þat was yholden in lond þan,
& dou3tiest of dede?”

Without pause, they reply:

“It is sir Amis, þe kinges boteler:
In al þis warld nis his per,
Noiper in toun no tour.”

This dialogue again shares similarities with the AN:

Tanke venue est la novele
En la chaumbre a le damoyse
Du botiller ke taunt fut beaus
E si tré gentifs damiseus,
E ke il estoyt teu chivaler
Ke en tote France ne avoyt per.
(K. 363-68)

Est venuz la novele
En la chaumbre a la damoisele
Del botiler qe tant eurt beaus
E tres gentil dameyseals,
E q’il fuit tant bon chivaler
Q’en la court n’out son per.
(L. 223-28)

---

160 Though it still seems to be the case that the ME emasculates him to some extent in passages where actual deeds of valour or carried out (or not carried out as is more often the case). It may well be that passages such as this in the AN caused the ME redactor to perceive him more as a romantic “chevalier” than a rugged “knight-at-arms,” causing the character to be portrayed much less like a “knight,” but still raising him to the equivalent social level.

161 Leach, II. 450-6.

162 Leach, II. 463-5.
Though the ME has expanded the dialogue by peppering it with many formulae, the basic thrust of the plot remains the same. In both cases the maiden does not see Amis directly, but must learn of him after the fact through either inquiry (ME) or by news reaching her in her chamber (AN). There are also some notable particulars. In both ME (464) and AN (K. 368/L. 228), he is said specifically to have no “per.” The choice of an identical lexical selection at the same place in the stories suggests a direct textual relationship. In this instance, the relationship seems to be closer to Karlsruhe than London. By stating “in al þis warld,” ME strikes nearer the mark of Karlsruhe which says “in all of France” than London which says simply “in all the court.” Furthermore, though both ME and AN refer to Amis as butler at this point, only ME refers to the status of the lord as well by calling Amis “þe kinges boteler”(463). Though his lord’s title is not given in any of the AN versions, elsewhere Karlsruhe consistently refers to him as “roy,” king, whereas London only ever calls him “quens,” count. For the ME redactor to call him “king” at all might suggest a mental slip whereby he accidentally inserted the status of the lord so often provided in the exemplar.163

Belisaunt Falls in love

Immediately upon hearing of Amis, Belisaunt falls in love without even setting eyes on him:

Belisaunt, þat birddde bri3t,  
When þai hadde þus seyd, ypli3t,  
As 3e may listen & lipe,  
On sir Amis, þat gentil kni3t,  
Ywis, hir loue was al ali3t,  
Þat no man mi3t it kîpe.164

Such feelings for Amis based on reputation alone is exactly what occurs in the AN; as soon as Florie hears of him, she falls in love:

La pucele en pryst tendrour,  
Tanke vers lui getta sa amur.  
(K. 369-70)

La pucele en prist tendrour  
Qe tant vers li ad getté s’amour.  
(L.. 229-30)

The ME also shares with the AN her lovesickness:

163 It may be added that this status is generally avoided as it recalls the Matter of France, which as already demonstrated, is often suppressed in insular romances. Along these lines it is also relevant that “France” has been changed to “world” for the same reasons.  
164 Leach, II. 469-74.
Wher þat sche seǐe him ride or go,
Hir þouȝt hir hert brac atvo,
þat hye no spac nouȝt wiþ þat bliþe;
For hye ni miȝt niȝt no day
Speke wiþ him, þat fair may,
She wepe wel mani a siþe.

Þus þat miri maiden 3ing
Lay in care & loue-morning
Boþe bi niȝt & day;
As y ȝou tel in mi talking,
For sorwe sche spac wiþ him no þing,
Sike in bed sche lay.165

Si asprement le prist amer,
Ke ele ne pout boyvre ne manger.
(K. 371-72)

Si forment comensa a amer
Q’ele ne pout boyvre ne manger.
(L. 230-31)

Though the ME lengths the telling of her infatuation, the additions are for the most part
formulaic repetitions which serve primarily as a narrative device for prolonging the tale
while fulfilling the requirements of the verse structure.166 Little if anything relevant is
added which would augment or detract from the general idea inferable by the audience.
The plot and its structure is borrowed directly from the AN.

In both ME and AN, it then falls to others to tend to a withdrawn Belisaunt/Florie,
asking her the cause of her distress:

Hir moder come to hir þo
& gan to frain hir of hir wo,
Help hir 3if hye may.167

Se compaygnes ke ov li erent,
Pur quei ce fut, la demanderent.
(K. 373-74)

Les damoyseles qe od li erent
Purquei ceo fuy ly demanderent.
(L. 233-34)

In both versions, the maiden refuses to reveal her love for Amis and waves off her
comforters claiming there is nothing to be done:

& sche answerd wiþ-outen wrong,
Hir pines were so hard & strong,
Sche wald be loken in clay.168

165 Leach, II. 475-86.
166 Note that the description breaks evenly into 6 tercets; the first two tell of her love, the last four describe her lovesickness.
167 Leach, II. 487-9.
Though it is true that some of the details are altered, the sens of the material remains the same. Though Florie does not claim she will die as Belisaunt does, the protestation of the latter should be understood as idiomatic rather than literal; it is no more likely that she will be "loken in clay" than "hir hert brac atvo." It simply reveals that she is more vocal about the extent of her distress than Florie; nevertheless, both remain languid and unwilling to reveal the cause of their anguish. Nor is it of much consequence that in the AN version her companions tend to her while in the ME it is her mother. As is later demonstrated, in both versions the mother and the companions play a role, and in both versions, it is ultimately the mother who sets forth the cause of action which will alleviate the maiden's sorrow. The most that can be made of this slight adaptation is that the ME, taking into account events to follow, acknowledges the prudence of foreshadowing those events and allows the mother to enter the picture at an initial stage to (again) prevent wrenching the plot by introducing her later when the intervention of a personage with her authority is required.  

169

Amis's Absence from the Hunt

It then follows that the duke leads the men of his court on a hunt:

(42) Þat riche douke in o morning  
& wip him mani a gret lording,  
As prince prout in pride,  
Þai di3t him wip-outen dueling,  
For to wende on dere-hunting,  
& busked hem for to ride.  

This event too occurs in exactly the same place in the AN, form which it is clearly taken:

Tantke li roys un jour ala  
En boys, juer en venerie,  
E ove li grand chivalrie.  

(T. 380-82)

168 Leach, II. 490-2.  
164 In this the ME is again narratively superior to the AN.

169
And, just as in the AN, Amis is the only male to remain behind:

When þe lordinges euerichon  
Wæro gæt ouf of þat woltli won—  
In herd is nouȝt to hid—  
Sir Amis, wiþ-outen les,  
For a malady þat on him wes,  
At hom gan to abide.¹⁷¹

At first it seems that the ME is more in line with the London tradition than Karlsruhe. Though in both versions he remains behind, it is only London which blames illness as the cause:

Si ke en court ne ad un remys  
Des chivalers for sire Amys,  
E cil remeint pur estimer,  
Car ne afert mye a botiller  
Estre absent, hors du court,  
E nomement la ou pres souort.  
(K. 383-88)

A l'ostel n'i out nul remis  
Des chevalers for sire Amis,  
E il remist pur maladie.  
(L. 243-45)

Karlsruhe justifies Amis’s absence from the hunt by attributing it to dedication to his office. This make the character appear stronger; a knight should participate in such pursuits as hunting and riding to arms, and the only real justification for abstaining from such pursuits would be the urgency of other duties deriving from one’s office. Consequently, the London Amis (as well as the ME) appear somewhat more “effete” than their Karlsruhe counterpart.¹⁷² However, in the first half of the following stanza, ME alludes to exactly the same purpose for remaining behind as that used in Karlsruhe:

When þo lordinges were out ywent  
Wip her men hende & bowes bent,  
To hunte on holtes hare,  
Þan sir Amis, verrament,  
He bileft at hom in present,  
To kep al þat þær ware.¹⁷³

While the others are hunting, ME Amis, like his Karlsruhe counterpart, is taking care of “al þat þær ware.” He too, it now appears, missed the hunt to tend to his office. Either

¹⁷⁰ Leach, II. 493-8.  
¹⁷¹ Leach, II. 499-504.  
¹⁷² This is one aspect that is being addressed in a forthcoming paper by the present author, “Contrasting the Identical: Differentiation of the ‘Indistinguishable’ Characters of Amis and Amiloun.”  
¹⁷³ Leach, II. 505-10.
both explanations were provided in the exemplar, or the ME redactor attempts to cover all bases by paying homage to both traditions, combining material in the tradition of Karlsruhe and London.\textsuperscript{174}

**Belisaunt Goes into the Garden**

Once again, the ME provides a change of scene to provide the stage for new developments. The second half of stanza 43 shifts to Amis in the garden, languishing under a tree:\textsuperscript{175}

\begin{quote}
\begin{verbatim}
\textbf{Pat hendi kni3t bipou3t him ßo,}
In-to ße gardin he wold go,
For to solas him ßare.
Vnder a bou3 as he gan bide,
To here ße foules son ßat tide,
Him ßou3t a blisseful fare.\textsuperscript{176}
\end{verbatim}
\end{quote}

It is here where Belisaunt first approaches Amis and confesses her love. There is no antecedent for the garden scene in London,\textsuperscript{177} but Karlsruhe contains a lengthy interpolation which does mention it (402-32). Therein she goes to her mother requesting permission to wander alone in the garden to alleviate her suffering:

\begin{quote}
\begin{verbatim}
"E dame!" ele di, "su dolente
De un ague ke en chef m’est monté
Dount au quer su mauméné,
E a couste, e a flancs,
Ke tut me tremble char e saunks.
Dount tut sui, dame, en desperance!
E si, dame, ne le presyez agrevaunce,
Le congé veir demandase
Si ke en desport m’en alase
Our prendre le eyr de matyn
Tut soule ci en gardyn,
Si croy ke le meuz me avendra!"
\end{verbatim}
\end{quote}

(K. 408-19)

Her mother, wishing her daughter’s recovery, responds affirmatively:

\begin{quote}
\begin{verbatim}
\textbf{As mentioned previously, it is probable that the redactor was familiar with several versions of the story. On a second note, even with the just cause Karlsruhe provides for Amis’s absence, it still suggest that his failure to attend the hunt is a fatal error for him: "Alias! cum fet a regreter, / Car il ne set mye Ie encombrer, / Ke li est frechement en venant; / Unques ne oystes ce croy de tant." Il. 389-92. The implication is that his oversight in not attending the hunt is a breach of duty as a knight, and one for which he will have to pay the consequences. Nothing of this sort is suggested as blatantly in the ME, and in this respect it seems more reminiscent of AN London. It is also particularly notable that London and ME both use the same word for illness: “malady” and “maladic.” It is unlikely that such a lexical similarity would be simply a coincidence, especially following on the similarity of “sale,” above. Clearly, the ME exemplar shares some characteristics with London as well as Karlsruhe, implications of which are addressed more fully below.}
\end{verbatim}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{174} As mentioned previously, it is probable that the redactor was familiar with several versions of the story. On a second note, even with the just cause Karlsruhe provides for Amis’s absence, it still suggest that his failure to attend the hunt is a fatal error for him: “Alias! cum fet a regreter, / Car il ne set mye Ie encombrer, / Ke li est frechement en venant; / Unques ne oystes ce croy de tant.” Il. 389-92. The implication is that his oversight in not attending the hunt is a breach of duty as a knight, and one for which he will have to pay the consequences. Nothing of this sort is suggested as blatantly in the ME, and in this respect it seems more reminiscent of AN London. It is also particularly notable that London and ME both use the same word for illness: “malady” and “maladic.” It is unlikely that such a lexical similarity would be simply a coincidence, especially following on the similarity of “sale,” above. Clearly, the ME exemplar shares some characteristics with London as well as Karlsruhe, implications of which are addressed more fully below.

\textsuperscript{175} It ought to be noted that the first half also provides an effective closure for the previous episode.

\textsuperscript{176} Leach, Il. 511-16.
"Hee, fylle!" fet ele, "Flurye, 
Ja mar pensez de maladye, 
Mes alez la, ou vus plerra;
Vus dedyre ça e la
Parmy e par tut un gardyn, 
E pus prendre un supe en vyn 
Pur sustenance de la servele."
(K. 423-29)

The ME alters some of the details of the scene; Belisaunt is too ill to rise out of her bed so her mother and many ladies come to her:

(44) Now, hende, herkeneb, & 3e may here 
hou ṭat ṭe doukes douhter dere
Sike in hir bed lay.
Hir moder come wip diolful chere 
& al ṭe leuedis ṭat ṭer were,
For to solas ṭat may. 178

Here the ladies, who earlier played a part in the AN, are brought to play their part in the ME as well; it is implied that they support the mother's encouragement for Belisaunt to take a walk outside to raise her spirits when she says:

"Arise vp," sche seyd, "douhter min, 
& go play ṭe in to ṭe gardin
حتياج semly somers day;
ᵗᵉʳ may ṭou here ṭᵉ foules song
Wip ioie & miche blis among,
ᵗᵉᵳ come schal wende oway." 179

Heeding her mother's words, Belisaunt does as she is bid:

(45) Vp hir ros ṭat swete wi3t,
In-to ṭe gardine sche went ful ri3t 
Wib maidens hende & fre.  
ᵗᵉ somers day was fair & bri3t, 
ᵗᵉ sonne him schon purch lem of li3t, 
ᵗᵉ ṭat semly was on to se. 
Sche herd ṭᵉ foules gret & smale, 
ᵗᵉ swete note of ṭᵉ ni3tingale 
Ful mirily sing on tre." 180

177 London says only that: "E la damesele ne targa mye: / De sa dame prist congé, / E ele tantost li ad doné." II. 246-8.
178 Leach, II. 517-22.
179 Leach, II. 523-28.
180 Leach, II. 529-37.
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Here there is a discrepancy with AN. None of the Norman texts ever say that she actually goes into the garden at all, and it is implied that her request to do so is merely a ruse to permit her to seek Amis illicitly in his own chambers:181

Florie, quant ad le conge,
Asez est joiouse e lee,
Tote soule san chambere
S'en aloyt de gre sa mere
Parler a Amys, qe tant ama.

(K.433-37)

Florie, quant le congé en eust,
S'a hasté plus que ele pust;
Ove une soule chambere
Ala par congé de sa mere
Parler a Amys que ele ama.

(L. 253-57)

The OF, however, clearly suggests that the meeting occurs in the garden. Immediately after Hardret leaves Amiles,182 an event which happens “Puis s’en entra li ber en un vergier”185 Belisaunt approaches:

La fille Charle, Belyssant au vis cler
Tout en plorant vint au conte parler.184

She warns him against Hardret, then shortly thereafter declares her love.185 It thus appears that the ME has again done a great deal of borrowing from various sources. The instructions of Belisaunt’s mother for her daughter to enter the garden seem to be a direct adaptation from the Karlsruhe tradition, with the change that she is sent into it rather than making a request to go. That the encounter actually occurs in the garden is apparently borrowed from the OF. Combined, these two elements make for a much more likeable Belisaunt: the AN Florie seems deliberately devious; the OF Belisaunt seems rather forward and less than heartbroken. By comparison, the ME Belisaunt who enters the gardens with no expectations of encountering the object of her affections instead seems thrown to the event by fate; indeed, she remains despondent until she actually encounters him:

Ac hir hert was so hard ibrou3t,

181 Leach notes: “The English varies considerably from KL and C in handling this incident. The difference is due to the originality of the English poet...[In C] Florie goes to her mother and tells her of her malady (though not of its cause) and asks leave to go all alone into the garden ‘to take the air.’ Her mother gives her permission, and suggests she sip a bit of wine. But the girl deceives her mother and goes to Amis’ room instead.” p. 119, note to lines 505-89. Though Karlsruhe does not explicitly say she does this, when read alongside London it would seem that she does so, and the ambiguity of Karlsruhe on this point allows one to easily interpret the text as Leach has done.

182 It is important to remember that the characters of Amis and Amiloun are inversed in the OF.

183 Dembowski, I. 590. [Then the good man went into a garden.] 184 Dembowski, II. 609-10. [Charles’s daughter, the bright-faced Bellisant came all in tears to speak to the count]

185 Though Belisaunt’s first concern here is to warn Amis against the seneschal, it is immediately afterwards that she approaches him to declare her love saying: “Sire, dist elle, je n’aimme se voz non.” II 628. [My lord, I love only you.] The beginning of the laisses says this occurs while Amis is outside: “Li cuens Amiles avale le donjon, / Devant lui vint la fille au roi Charlon.” II. 623-24. [Count Amile was coming down from the tower; the daughter of king Charles came over to him.] Given the ambiguity of laisses similaires, it is conceivable that these events occur at the same moment.
Then her joy at seeing him is so overwhelming that she cannot prevent herself from declaring her love:

(46) & so þat mirie may wip pride 
Went in-to þe orchard þat tide, 
To slake hir of hir care. 
Þan seyþe sce hir Amis bise, 
Vnder a bouȝ he gan abide, 
To here þo mirþes mare. 
Þan was sce boȝe glad & bliþe, 
Hir ioie couþe sce noman kþe, 
When þat sce seiþe him þare; & þouȝt sce wold for noman wond 
Þat sce no wold to him fond & tel him of hir fare. 187

The sudden and spontaneous need of Belisaunt to speak with Amis at this chance encounter allows one to forgive her the transgression, and by making her a pawn to circumstances the ME redactor briefly succeeds in making her a more likeable character with greater depth.

**The Encounter between Amis and Belisaunt**

**Belisaunt reveals her love**

In the course of their meeting, however, Belisaunt is portrayed in a less than commendable light as desire for reciprocation of her feelings descends into threats and ultimatums, all of which more or less follows the course of events in the AN. She begins by dismissing the ladies accompanying her:

(48) þat mirie maiden sone anon  
Bad hir maidens fram hir gon & wip-drawe hem oway. 188

The dismissal of the ladies is an anomaly since the AN Florie was either unattended (K. 345) or had with her one lady whom (presumably) she trusted (L. 255). That she does so

---

186 Leach, II. 538-40.  
187 Leach, II. 541-52.  
188 Leach, II. 565-67.
in the ME is another indication of the spontaneous nature of her plight, and again contributes to making her a more likeable individual.

She then immediately reveals her love to Amis:

& when þai were to-gider al-on,  
To sir Amis sche made hir mon  
& seyd opon hir play,  
"Sir kniȝt, on þe mine hert is brouȝt,  
þe to loue is al mi þouȝt  
Boþe bi niȝt & day;  
þat bot þou wolt mi leman be,  
Ywis, min hert brekeþ a þre,  
No lenger libben y no may."

In this, the ME text follows the AN fairly closely:

Tant il parla, tant il demora,  
Ke tut sun corage descovri,  
E dyt ke pur le amur de lui  
Murrout, si il ne ut de li pité.  

(K. 438-41)

Tant parla e taunt demora  
Qe tot son corage discovery:  
E dit pur l'amur de luy  
Morust, s'il n'eust de li pité.  

(L. 258-61)

The most striking similarity here is that in both instances Belisaunt/Florie makes the claim that without Amis's love, she will die. One difference, however, is the manner in which his love should be demonstrated. The AN requires only that he have pity on her, presumably suggesting that Amis reciprocates her desires. The ME, however, makes a formal request that he become her "leman," a semi-official relationship. That such is her intention is demonstrated more fully in the following stanza where she asks for a love pledge from him:

(50) "þou art," she seyd, "a gentil kniȝt,  
& icham a bird in bour briȝt,  
Of wel heiȝe kin ycorn,  
& boþe bi day & bi niȝt  
Mine hert so hard is on þe liȝt,  
Mi ioie is al forlorn;  
Pliȝt me þi trewþe þou schalt be trewe  
& chaunge me for no newe  
þat in þis world is born,  
& y pliȝt þe mi treuþe al-so,  
Til god & ðeþ dele ous ato,  

189. Leach, II. 568-76.

190. Though this is a fairly common conceit in both ME and AN romances generally, it is nevertheless striking here that such an allusion occur at the same moment for the same reason in the different versions.

191. Leach, I. 574. It is interesting that "leman" is more often used to refer to women than men.
Y schal neuer be forsworn."\textsuperscript{192}

Her request that he never love another and her own assurance that she will never forsake him underlines the formality of her request. She is seeking a binding affirmation of his loyalty to her and her alone, albeit \textit{sub rosa}.\textsuperscript{193} This device is purely a development of the ME redactor, and again it succeeds in portraying her more favourably.\textsuperscript{194} Though her request is undoubtedly forward, it nevertheless conforms to the ideals of courtly love more stringently than the AN. In this, she still seems to be exhibiting behaviour suited to a lady of her station.\textsuperscript{195}

\textit{Amis's first refusal}

Feeling himself in a quandary, Amis first refuses quite courteously on the basis of their difference in station, she being the heir of the land while he is merely a landless knight:

\begin{quote}
(51) Pat hende kni3t stille he stode \\
& al for þou3t chaunged his mode \\
& seyd wip hert fre, \\
"Madame, for him þat dyed on rode, \\
Astow art comen of gentil blode \\
& air of þis lond schal be, \\
Bilpenke þe of þi michel honour; \\
Kinges sones & emperour \\
Nar non to gode to þe; \\
Certes, þan were it michel vnri3t, \\
Þi loue to lain opon a kni3t \\
þat nap noijber lond no fe.\textsuperscript{196}
\end{quote}

This stanza represents yet another elaboration of the AN in which the narrator says only that he responds as one who has no need for further skill in rhetoric:

\begin{quote}
Amys, quant le ad escote \\
Amis, quant l'ad escoté,
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{192} Leach, 577-88.

\textsuperscript{193} There are two issues to mention here. First, it was common in the thirteenth century for a couple to be considered married solely on the basis of their own pledge to one another without the necessity of witnesses. This request comes close to such a proposal (a point which the ME audience would presumably recognise), and in that it differs significantly from the AN where no such "troth-plight" is requested. Second, the words Belisaunt uses mirror those between Amis and Amile very closely; in this, she can also be viewed as a threat to that relationship as much as the steward is. In support of such a hypothesis, it is worth noting that in the OF, the request of the seneschal and that of Belisaunt are equated as being the same: there she says: "Biaus sire Amile, dist la franche meschinne, / Je voz offri l'autre jor mon service / Dedens ma chambre en pure rna chemise. / Bien voz seiistez de m'arnor escondire. / Envers Hardre nel feistez voz mie." Ii. 612-6. ["Good lord Amile," said the noble young woman, "the other day in my room, dressed only in my shift, I offered you the service of my love. You knew quite well how to decline my offer. Yet you have responded very differently to Hardre."] See also, Ford, \textit{The Image of Male Love and Fidelity}, and Gilbert's unpublished thesis.

\textsuperscript{194} Or, indeed, even her OF counterpart, who says: "Sire, dist elle, je n'aimme se voz non. / En votre lit une nuit me semoing. / Trenout mon cors voz metrai a bandom." Ii. 628-9. ["My lord, I love only you. I'll invite myself into your bed one night, and my whole body will be yours."] The AN, by not requiring any sort of love-pledge, somewhat implies the desire for a similar kind of liaison on Florie's part. The whole development shows a change from lust to passion to unrequited love.

\textsuperscript{195} Though by appearing as a rival to Amiloun, she is viewed rather less favourably.

\textsuperscript{196} Leach, Ii. 589-600.
Quidoeit ele fust desue,
De ben respoundre se purpensoit,
Cum celui ke talent ne avoit.

(K. 445-48)

Quideit que ele fuit devee [...] De respoundre se purpensoit
Com celi qi talent ne aveit.

(L. 265-70)

The ME provides a demonstration of this skill when Amis says he must decline her offer because he is not worthy of her. It is interesting that the ME redactor puts into Amis’s mouth words that occur only as a general observation in earlier in the AN: “Princis e ducs la desireyent”;198 or “Deus countes la desiren.”199 While such statements are made by the narrators in the AN, and therefore must be accepted as truthful, one might wonder if it is simply flattery in the ME, especially since the AN says she actually is desired while the ME Amis says only that she would make a suitable match. Perhaps the ME redactor is trying to subtly call her desirability into question. Though a subtle change, it is one which an audience could remark, thus both calling Belisaunt’s desirability into question and actually demonstrating Amis’s firm diplomacy in refusing her.200

It also demonstrates a possible relationship with the OF. There too the companion speaks for himself in the first person rather than through a narrator’s commentary, and the same reasons for refusing the liaison are given as are those in the ME:

“Ja voz demande li fors rois d’Arragon
Et d’Espolice Girars li fiuls Othon,
Qui mainne an ost plus de mil compaignons.
Ne les panriéz por tout d’or de cest mont,
Et moi voléz qui n’ai un esporon
Ne borc ne ville ne chastel ne donjon,
Onques ne vi mon feu ne ma maison!”201

Here, as in the ME, Belisaunt hears that men more noble are better choices for her, and that he who has no lands or estates does not measure up. Though the exact words are not identical, the sentiment is the same, and the fact that it is both the mention of men of higher status as well as the companion’s own relative poverty suggests a link with the OF tradition.

197 Lines 267-8 from London are suppressed here as they have no corresponding lines in Karlsruhe, and they shall be discussed below.
198 Karlsruhe, I. 335.
199 London, I. 195.
200 The actual formula itself is also remarked as being borrowed more directly from Guy of Warwick than as a translation of the AN duke and princes. See Chapter Five.
201 Dembowski, II. 632-38. [You are sought by the mighty king of Aragon and by Girard of Spoleto, the son of Otto, who heads a host of more than a thousand comrades-in-arms. You would not take them for all the gold in the world – how can you want me? I have not a single spur, no town or city, no castle or tower. I have never had my own hearth or house.]
But then come particulars which again point to the AN. Amis further comments that if anyone were to find out it would be the end of them both, and that as a vassal of her father he would be betraying his lord by having such a relationship:

(52) “& 3if we schuld þat game biginne, & ani wiþt of al þi kinne Miþt it vnndergo, Al our ioie & worldes winne We schuld lese, & for þat sinne Wreþþi god þer-to. & y dede mi lord þis deshonour, Þan were ich an iuel traitour; Ywis, it may nouþt be so. Leue madame, do bi mi red & þenk what wil com of þis dede: Certes, no þing bot wo.”

In these two supporting responses, one clearly sees the influence of the AN tradition:

Amys, quant le ad escote Quidoit ele fust desue,
De ben respoundre se purpensoit, Cum celui ke talent ne avoit, Tant mesprendre vers sun seignur. Este vus Flurie, a grand irrour.

(K. 445-50)

Amis, quant l’ad escoté, Quidéit que ele fuit devee Qe ele pout pur bounte descouverir Sa volonté e son désir.
De respoundre se purpensoit Com celi qi talent ne aveit Q’il mesprist vers son seignur. Estez vous Florie par grant errour!

(L. 265-72)

Though both versions mention that such a liaison would be a slight to the lord, London like the ME further notes that dishonour could come from the union. This similarity indicates another instance where the exemplar must have shared information with London/Cambridge that did not reach Karlsruhe.

Overall, however, the ME manages to adapt the material and make it more courtly. Rather than flatly saying such wilful desire will bring shame, implying that the feelings are shameful and so is the one who conceives them, ME Amis says only that their reputations might be tarnished if they were discovered; though a subtle change, this seems to suggest that having the desires is not shameful, only that the world at large would not understand and they therefore must be repressed. This again demonstrates the redactor’s ability to borrow lose ideas from the AN and mould them to suit his needs, in this case by providing a rather more courtly image of Amis through refining his eloquence.

Leach, II. 601-12.
Belisaunt's Response

Belisaunt's response, however, is decidedly uncourtly. She begins by taunting Amis and comparing him to a priest:

(52) *pat mirie maiden of gret renoun*
Answered, “Sir kni3t, þou nast no croun;
For god *pat bouȝt þe dere,
Wheþer artow prest or þer persoun,
Ôþer þou art monk Óþer canoun,
*Pat prechest me þus here?*

She then declares that he never should be a knight, but rather a monk:

“þou no schust haue ben no kniȝt,
To gon among maidens briȝt,
þou schust haue ben a frere!
He þat lerd þe þus to preche,
Þe deuel of hell þichim biteche,
Mi þroþer þei he were!”

There is a similarity here with the AN which likewise calls Amis's status as a knight into question, but instead of accusing him of being a priest it compares him to a miscreant or a heretic:

“*Certes ne estes pas chivaler,*
Recreaunz estis, & laner.”
(K. 461-62)

“*Certes n'estes pas chevaler!*
Mescrevaus estes e laner!”
(L. 283-84)

The subtle change from a non-believer to a man of the cloth must have certain implications relating to the conceptions of clergymen in England at the time of the redaction. Florie's comparison with “recreaunz/mescrevaus” and “laner” suggest uncourtly behaviour on Amis's part. Belisaunt's comparison with “prest,” “monk,” “canon” and “frere” on the other hand, suggests that he is entirely sexless, and in that it has the effect of not only making him appear unknighthly, but also unmanly. In effect, she emasculates him in order not only to insult him as Florie does, but also to humiliate him.

In addition to what the ME changes, it is interesting what it omits. Prior to this accusation in the AN, Florie gives the following monologue:

203 Emphasis added in the following quotations.
204 Leach, II. 613-8.
205 Leach, II. 619-24.
She calls into question why she ever loved such a man, declaring that she will not be able to have a high heart until she is avenged on him for having shamefully refused her.207 She then remind him that she is desired by all men of rank, each of whom she has refused. This must be accepted as truth for the narrators say as much after telling go the nobles who desired her:

Princis e ducs la desireyent

Deus countes la desirent,

Qe a femme la voleyt,  

E esposer la volieron,  

Mes ele a trestouz respondi:  

Mes ele a trestouz respoundi

Ne vouzt uncore aver mari.  

Ne vouzt uncore aver mary.

(K. 335-38) (L. 195-98)

AN Belisaunt is objectively acknowledged as desirable but AN Amis does not mince his words in refusing her; in the ME, on the other hand, references to Belisaunt’s desirability are largely omitted, but she is nevertheless refused in the most noble manner possible. Given her reasoning and the less courtly manner in which she was refused, AN Belisaunt has more of a reason for such a tirade than her ME counterpart. “Florie” therefore is acting with more just cause than Belisaunt, justifiably feeling herself intentionally slighted and unwilling to let it pass with impunity.208 But, as has been observed above, AN Florie is portrayed as rather more sly and conniving than ME Belisaunt, much as the AN seneschal is in comparison with the ME steward. Consequently one could argue that ME Belisaunt is unable to contain her outrage at being rejected by Amis much as she had been incapable of containing her previous joy when finding him in the garden. Following such a train of thought it is perhaps possible to sympathise with her more easily.

206 It is interesting, however, that both sets of appellations are related to religion.

207 One can easily see why AN Florie would come to such a conclusion when it is recalled that in the AN Amis makes none of the remarks about himself that suggest he did not deserve her. His remarks, therefore, instead seem to be chastising her for her unseemly behaviour.

208 Though again, it must be realised that Belisaunt has been heretofore portrayed as a more emotional character than Florie, who instead seems more conniving.
No matter how one evaluates the actions, it is undeniable that in both ME and AN Florie/Belisaunt reacts harshly. In addition to stating that she wants vengeance in the AN, she goes on to state:

"Un play feloun vus bastiray,
E a moun pere le diray
Cum vers lui estes de moy forfait,
Si serrez a cheuas destrait,
Ensi serray de vus vengez!"

(K. 463-67)

The same idea is found in the ME where AN Florie’s allusions are given an actual description:

(53) "Ac," sche seyd, "bi him þat ous wrou3t,
Al þi precheing helpeþ nou3t,
No stond þou neuer so long.
Bot 3if þou wilt graunt me mi þou3t,
Mi loue schal be ful dere abou3t
Wil þines hard & strong;
Mi kerchef & mi clopes anon
Y schal torende doun ichon
& say wil þichel wrong,
Wil strengeþ þou hast me todrawe;
Ytake þou schalt be þurch londes lawe
& dempt hei3e to hong!"209

It appears that the redactor, well understanding Florie’s meaning, decides to give voice to them in the ME: whereas AN Florie only threatens to say he has “forefait” her and thereby her father, ME Belisaunt openly declares that she will tear her clothes and claim Amis raped her. In this, the ME creates a stronger and more lasting image for the audience. It is clear how the redactor develops the veiled threat in the AN to a detailed one in the ME, but in doing so there is a degree of subjective interpretation which does actually have the result of the redactor’s own conception of the event being firmly imposed on the English version.

In this episode, the redactor does much reinterpreting in handling Amis’s encounter with Belisaunt. Although his status as knight is retained, by comparing him to a priest instead of an atheist the redactor shifts the way Belisaunt views Amis, and thereby the audience as well; he ceases to be characterised as a harsh outlaw, but rather as an effete courtier. Her threats are then given none of the justifications which warrant them,

209 Leach, ll. 625-36.
turning them from the vengeful words of a proud, haughty woman into the rantings of a highly-strung emotional one. By giving voice to the threat Florie insinuates, the ME redactor clarifies exactly the predicament in which Amis finds himself, and in doing so infuses the narrative with his own interpretation of what that threat might be.\textsuperscript{210}

\textit{Amis's Response}

Amis then debates to himself what to do:

\begin{verbatim}
(54) ðan stode ðat hendy kni3t ful stille,  
& in his hert him liked ille;  
No word no spac he þo;  
He þou3t, "Bot y graunt hir wille,  
Wiþ hir speche sche wil me spille,  
Er ðan y passe hir fro;  
& 3ıf y do mi lord þís wrong,  
Wiþ wilde hors & wiþ strong  
Y schal be drawe al-so."  
Løþ him was ðat dede to don,  
& wele løper his liif forgon;  
Was him neuer so wo.

(55) & ðan þou3t, wiþ-outen lesing,  
Better were to graunt hir asking  
ðan his liif for to spille.\textsuperscript{211}
\end{verbatim}

Here there is again a relationship with Karlsruhe. Of such self-reflection, London says only:

\begin{verbatim}
Amis mout se purpensa;  
Le un mat e l’autre mout dota.  
(K. 291-92)
\end{verbatim}

Karlsruhe, however, has another long interpolation which resembles the internal debate of the ME in both structure and content:

\begin{verbatim}
Amys estroit se purpensa:  
L’un mal e l’autre mut dota;  
Pensoit, “Si jœ la preigne  
E li rois de ce me ateigne,  
Honi sui a remenant;  
E si ne m’i assente niant  
Par unt de teu mal me brace
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{210} It is fairly evident that the ME redactor's interpretation is correct, but as far as a literal interpretation goes, one cannot say with absolute certainty what Florie’s threat actually suggests.

\textsuperscript{211} Leach, ll. 637-51.
One sees that the format in Karlsruhe and ME is the same; Amis counsels himself in the first person, realising that if he does as she requests, her father will have him killed, but that if he does not, she will denigrate him with perhaps the same result. In both versions he quickly surmises that the most disastrous course would be to refuse her outright, and he therefore determines it is better to submit to her wishes. Taken altogether, it seems highly unlikely that the similarities between the two instances are purely coincidental, and it therefore appears evident that the ME has borrowed the details of the scene from an exemplar in the Karlsruhe tradition.

To some extent, these similarities are continued in Amis’s verbal response. He says to Belisaunt:

> pan seyd he to ðat maiden 3ing,  
> “For godes loue, heuen king,  
> Vnderstond to mi skil.  
> Astow art maiden gode & trewe  
> Bïpenk hou oft rape wil rewe  
> & turn to grame wel grille,  
> & abide we al ðis seuenni3t,  
> As icham trewe gentil kni3t,  
> Y schal graunt þe þi wille.”

In the AN, he likewise tries to divert her from her course, but by taking a somewhat different route:

> Atant la chere enhaunsa,  
> E baudement la respondi:  
> “Damoisele, pur Deu merci,  
> Vostre amy sui e serray,  
> E vostre chivaler tant cum viveray;  
> Corteisement ly respondi:  
> “Damoisel, pur Deu mercy,  
> Vostre amy suy e serray,  
> E vostre serjant tant com jeo viveray.

212 Leach, ll. 652-60.
In one particular there is a resemblance; in both AN and ME, Amis opens by invoking God. Thereafter, however, things are quite different. In AN, he protests that he is already her friend and loyal champion and ever shall be, claims that he would never wish to dishonour her by knowing of her bodily, and then reminds her that they would be completely disgraced if such a relationship became known. In this, the ME is quite different. There, Amis pressures Belisaunt to consider the repercussions of the actions and the shame that results just from performing them; his focus is on the shamefulness of them in deed, not simply on how they are perceived. He then requests her to wait a week before proceeding, in the clear hopes that she will come to her senses in the interim.

To some extent, the ME Belisaunt is asking for what the AN Florie already has. She asks for an official declaration from him that he will act as her friend and champion, something the AN Amis claims he already is and shall be. This underscores that the AN Florie is less concerned with such stylised declarations, and more desirous of physical companionship. But the ME Belisaunt does indicate that she desires this too, however, her emphasis on the troth-plight as a prelude to any such encounter marks her as somewhat more of a courtly lover; though she wants him to become her “leman,” it is only on the condition that he fulfils all the requisite niceties that such a role entails, not merely physical gratification. In this, the ME redactor has again produced a rather more courtly version of the story than that found in the AN predecessor.

Belisaunt’s Retort, Amis’s Acquiescence, and their Leave-Taking

In both AN and ME, Belisaunt finally bends Amis to her will, though through somewhat different means. In ME, she tells him:

(56) Þan answerd þat bird bri3t
& swore, “Bi ihesu, ful of mi3t,
þou scrapest nou3t so oway.
bi treuþe anon þou schalt me pli3t,
Astow art trewe gentil kni3t,
þou schalt hold þat day.”

213 Leach, II. 661-66.
She traps him by throwing his own words back at him: “Y schal graunt þe þi wille,” and demanding that, as he has tentatively agreed to do as she wishes, he may as well immediately pledge his troth. This puts her into a position of power allowing her later to hold him to his “duties” as a lover. The AN Florie takes a different approach:

“Oustez, pur deu!” fet Flurie,
“Nus le froms si privement,
Nostre voler, nostre talent,
Qe nul ne le savera de mere nee.”

(K. 500-03)

“Hostez, hostez!” ceo dit Florie,
“Nous le froms si privémen
Touz deus a nostre talent
Ne[l] savera home de mere nee.”

(L. 304-07)

Here one reads that she simply convinces him that no shame will come to them from the affair because they will undertake it so secretly that none will ever know about it. Just as before the AN Amis was less concerned about the actual immorality of the situation than how it may affect their reputations, here he finds Florie’s guarantee of their safety enough to persuade him, and he immediately agrees. Thus it appears that ME Amis is trapped by his own vows into becoming a reluctant lover whereas his AN counterpart is more easily—if less chivalrously—convinced by the assurance of impunity.

Finally before separating, Amis fulfils Belisaunt’s request:

He graunted hir hir wil þo,
& pliȝt hem trewþes boþe to,
& seþen kist þo tvai.
Into hir chaumber sche went ogain,
Pan was sche so glad & fain,
Hir ioie sche couþe no man sai.215

In the AN they do likewise, but with slightly modified behaviour:

Tant unt dyt e tant parlee
Qe il sunt a un de tel afer,
Si unt devisez la manere
Coment e quant se assemblerunt.

(K. 504-07)

One sees that the ME once more stands on ceremony somewhat more than the AN, having both parties pledge their truths and sealing the pact with an (innocent?) kiss prior to Belisaunt joyfully returning to her chamber. The AN instead shows Amis convinced of the

214 Leach, I. 660.
215 Leach, II. 667-72.
safety of the affair, after which no pledges are made but simply plans relating to how and when they can carry out their design to become physical lovers unperceived. Clearly, the whole encounter of the ME is steeped in the courtly love tradition more so than the AN.

In this encounter as a whole, the ME redactor re-invents both Amis and Belisaunt, presenting them as much more refined characters than they are in the AN. ME Belisaunt pines for her lover, is relieved from her distress only by the sight of him, and then she is so overcome by her love that she cannot refrain from confessing it. Her later ultimatum can then be attributed to emotional desperation. AN Florie, though equally love-sick, is able to use deception to rise from her bed and steal to him, deliver her terms and then upon refusal, reacts through proud indignation rather than deep-set heartache. The ultimatums themselves differ in the respect that Florie clearly wishes only physical gratification and has no interest in Amis's pledge to her as friend and knight, whereas Belisaunt demands exactly such a pledge before she can proceed to view herself truly as his lover, meeting the full requirements of a courtly love liaison. For Amis's part, in the ME his refusal stems directly from not wishing to act in a shameful manner to either Belisaunt or his lord, her father. In the AN, however, his major concern is not the immorality of the proposal, but the consequences of being caught. Finally, the ME couple separate happily enough with the simple agreement that they are lovers, while in the AN they linger to devise how and when they might come together again more intimately.

The Steward's Plotting

The Steward's Trap

At this point in the narrative, the ME undergoes a great deal of development and reworking of subject matter which bears little resemblance to the AN. It begins in stanza 57, with the duke's return:

(57) Sir Amis þan wip-outen duelling,
For to kepe his lordes coming,
Into halle he went anon.
When þai were comen fram dere-hunting
& wip him mani an hei3e lording
in to þat worply won,
After his douhter he asked swiþe;
Men seyd þat sehe was glad & bliþe,
Hir care was al agon.
To eten in halle þai brouþt þat may,
Ful bliþe & glad þai were þat day
There is no mention of the return in the AN, and the ME’s inclusion of it is a significant improvement in the narrative for tying up loose ends. The duke’s pleasure at his daughter’s recovery and the ensuing feast, a typical event after a hunt in the English tradition, then allows the steward to perceive the couple’s love:

(58) When þe lordinges, wiþ-outen les,
Hendelich were brouȝt on des
Wiþ leuedis briȝt & swete,
As princes þat were proude in pres,
Ful richeliche serued he wes
Wiþ menske & mirþe to mete.
When þat maiden þat y of told,
Among þe birdes þat were bold,
Per sche sat in her sete,
On sir Amis, þat gentil kniȝt,
An hundred time sche cast hir siȝt,
For no þing wald sche lete.

(59) On sir Amis, þat kniȝt hendy,
Euer more sche cast hir eyȝe,
For no þing wold sche spare.
Be steward ful of felonie,
Wel fast he gan hem aspie,
Til he wist of her fare,
& bi hir siȝt he perceiued þo
Þat gret loue was bi-tvix hem to,
& was agreued ful sare.

This is handled quite differently in the AN:

Alias! Q’encusé serrount,
Car tut l’estut un vassal
De la meigne le seneschal,
Qe a ses syres le va counter,
Tant cum il put espieiter.

(K. 508-12)

Alias! Q’encusé serrount,
Car tut l’estut un vassal
De la meigne le seneschal,
A son seignur le ala counter
Sitost com il poet espieiter.

(L. 312-16)

The ME redactor has made two significant alterations. First, he emphasises Belisaunt’s love to the extent that she is unable to keep her eyes from Amis. Though it is said that

---

216 Leach, ll. 673-84.
217 Thus, this again indicates the redactor’s determination to make the story conform to the tastes of his target audience. Though it does appear that the feast is held because of the daughter’s recovery, it could also be interpreted that the feast would take place anyway, and her recovery is simply the excuse for her to attend (something she did not do at the last feast). In any event, it would have struck a ME audience as perfectly normal, if not expected, for a feast to follow a hunt, regardless of the excuse used to justify it. See also *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*.

218 Leach, ll. 685-705.
“gret loue was bi-tvix hem to,” the emphasis remains always on Belisaunt. This reverses the usual arrangement of courtly lovers in which it is more typical for the male to be the one who keeps his lover idolised on a pedestal. By omitting any clear reference to amorous behaviour on the part of Amis, the redactor leads the one to surmise that he is not moved nearly as much as she, and is indeed acting against his will in their liaison.\(^{219}\) Secondly, it is through these glances, not the intervention of a servant, that the steward perceives their love.\(^{220}\) By omitting the AN reference to vassals of the seneschal/steward, the ME humbles him somewhat, just as it did by neglecting to mention his lineage when he was introduced. Thus, in the ME Amis and Belisaunt are shown in a somewhat more favourable light, the steward rather less so.

In both versions, the relationship between Amis and Belisaunt shows the steward how he can strike at Amis.\(^{221}\) The ME says:

\[
& \text{Bope wip tresoun & wip gile}  \\
& \text{Bring hem in to care.}\(^{222}\)
\]

And shortly thereafter it also says:

\[
& \text{pe steward for wretpe sake}  \\
& \text{Brou3t hem bope in ten & wrake,} \\
& \text{Wel iuel mot he \textit{brieu}.}\(^{223}\)
\]

Likewise in the AN, the seneschal recognises this weakness:

\[
\text{Le seneschal esteit mut lee,}  \\
\text{Car ben quidoit estre vengee.}  \\
\text{Le seneschal fut molt lee;}  \\
\text{Ore quideit bien estre venge.}  \\
\text{(K. 513-14)}  \\
\text{(L. 317-18)}
\]

In this there is accord between the AN and the ME. Nevertheless, at this point the ME redactor sees fit to augment the material provided in the exemplar to make a fuller tale. The AN immediately has the seneschal witness the affair once the relationship is perceived:

\[\text{219 Given his previous reluctance to become her lover in word, and his subsequent reluctance to do so in deed, one might truly wonder whether Amis is trapped into the situation against his will.}\]

\[\text{220 Perhaps this implies that she is not only responsible for the situation, but also for its discovery.}\]

\[\text{221 The intervening lines again refer to Belisaunt’s attraction to Amis: “Pus, ywis, pat miri may / Ete in halle wip gamen & play / Wele four days oper fue, / pat euer when sche sir Amis say, / Al hir care was went oway, / Wele was hir o fue. / Wheit \textit{pat} he sat or stode, / Sche biheld opon \textit{pat} frely fode, / no stint sche for no strie.” II. 709-17. This has the effect of underscoring that it is her behaviour, not Amis’s which causes their downfall. It is also a typical restatement of the situation which lends so much to the ME narrative in foreshadowing events and building suspense.}\]

\[\text{222 Leach, II. 706-08.}\]

\[\text{223 Leach, II. 718-20.}\]
De cestui vaillant botiller,
Tut lour estre vait espyer.

(K. 515-16)

De vostre corteis botiler;
Tot lour estre fist espier.

(L. 319-20)

The ME, however, takes a more circuitous route, introducing another hunt and another temptation:

(61) Pat riche douke opon a day
On dere-hunting went him to play,
& wiþ him wel mani a man;
& Belisaunt, þat miri may,
To chaumber þer sir Amis lay,
Sche went, as sche wele kan.²²⁴

By again having Amis remain home from the hunt, the ME redactor underscores the impressions made in his previous non-attendance (that he falls somewhat short of his role as a knight by not undertaking martial pursuits), and just as he was tempted then, so is he now. It tends to suggest that, had Amis been a better knight, he may never have fallen into such dire consequences. In any case, there does seem to be some tenuous links with the OF. First, there is the image of Belisaunt sneaking into Amis’s bed-chamber, wholly omitted in the AN, but which also occurs in the OF. There, “Belissant” first counsels herself:

Or ne lairai ce que je voil ne face,
Ainz nulle fame ne fu onques si aspre,
Que anquenuit an son lit ne m’en aille,
Coucherai moi desoz les piauls de martre.²²⁵

She then carries out what she was determined to do:

A mienuit toute seule se lieve,
Onques n’i quist garce ne chamberiere. […]
Au lit le conte s’i est tost approchie
Et sozleva les piauls de martre chieres
Et elle s’est léz le conte couchie,
Moult souavet s’est deléz lui glacie.²²⁶

²²⁴ Leach, II. 721-26.
²²⁵ Dembowski, II. 655-58. [I will not be stopped from doing what I want to do: no woman has ever been as determined as I! I will go to his bed tonight. I will lie down among the pelts of marten on his bed.]
²²⁶ Dembowski, II. 664-72. [At midnight all alone she arose; she woke no servant or chambermaid to help her...found her way to the bedside of the count. She lifted a corner of the precious marten cover and, slipping in, lay down beside the count.]
Though the sense of the scene is rather different, Belisaunt being much more motivated to fill her desires like the AN Florie, the OF and the ME both share the image of Belisaunt sneaking into Amis’s bed.  

It is also noteworthy that the steward spies on the couple from the adjoining room:

& þe steward, wiþ-outen les,
In a chaumber bisiden he wes
& seþe þe maiden þan
In-to chaumber hou sche gan glide;
For to aspie hem boþe þat tide,
After swiþe he ran.

Here again, there is a similarity with the OF, in which he is also in the next room when he becomes aware of their tryst:

Ainz qu’il eüst l’autre rencommencie,
Les oit Har drez de la chambre ou il iere.

Third, both the ME and the OF have a conversation pass between Amis and Belisaunt before their relationship as lovers is consummated. In the ME, she tells him the week is passed and she has come to redeem the promise:

(62) When þat may com in-to won,
Sche fond sir Amis þer al-on,
“Hail,”sche seyd, þat leuedi briþt,
“Sir Amis,”sche sayd anon,
“Þis day a seuenniþt it is gon,
Þat trewþe we ous pliþt.
Þerfore icheam comen to þe,
To wite, astow art hende & fre
þe ðe þe gentil kniþt,
Wheþer wiltow me forsake
Or þou wilt trewely to me take
þe ðou biiþt?”

Once again, Amis tries to dissuade her, claiming that as he is simply a poor man, he is not fit to be her mate:

(63) “Madame,” seyd þe kniþt ogain,
"Y wold þe spouse now ful fain
& hold þe to mi wiue;
Ac 3if þi fader herd it sain
þat ich hadde his douhter forlain,
Of lond he wald me driue.
Ac 3if ich were king of þis lond
& hadde more gode in min hond
þan oþer kinges fiue,
Wel fain y wald spouse þe þan;
Ac, certes, icham a pouer man,
Wel wo is me o liue!"231

Belisaunt responds that she can make him a rich man, whereupon they become lovers:232

(64) "Sir kni3t," sayd þat maiden kinde,
"For loue of Seyn Tomas of Ynde,
Whi seystow euer nay?
No be þou neuer so pouer of kinde,
Riches anou3 y may þe finde
Bope þi ni3t & day."
þat hende kni3t bipo3t him þan
& in his armes he hir nam
& kist þat miri may;
& so þai plaid in word & dede,
þat he wan hir maidenhede,
Er þat [she] went oway.233

Though it is a very different conversation that passes between them in the OF, it is worth
viewing it. When Belisaunt crawls into Amile's bed, he awakens and asks who she is,
saying that if she is married or the daughter of his lord, she must leave:

Li cuens s'esveille, toute mue la chieres
Et dist li cuens: "Qui iez tu, envoisie,
Qui a tele hore iez deléz moi couchie?
Se tu iez fame, espeuse nosoîe,
Ou fille Charle, qui France a en baillie,
Je te conjur de Deu le fil Marie,
Ma douce amie, retorne t'an arriere."234

231 Leach, ll. 745-56.
232 This agreement does not seem to be rooted in greed on Amis's part, but rather his belief that if she were to make him rich, he
would then be worthy of her.
233 Leach, ll. 757-58.
234 Dembowskii ii. 673-79. [The count awakened, all confused, and said: "Who are you, full of passion, coming into my bed at
such an hour? If you're someone's wife and truly married, or the daughter of Charles who rules France, I beg you, my sweet
friend, by God the son of Mary, let me be and go back."]
To these words Belisaunt makes no response, allowing Amile to believe that she is a servant-girl or chambermaid, with whom he has no compunction about having his way; then the OF provides a most vivid description of the ensuing passion.

Clearly the scenes are constructed differently, but there remain important similarities. Only in the ME and the OF does Belisaunt sneak into Amis's chamber, and only in those versions is the steward/seneschal in the next room. Only in the ME and the OF is there a discussion before a sexual relationship occurs, and in both instances the youthful companion is reluctant to have such a relationship with the daughter of his lord.

It is true that the OF handles the entire situation very differently from the ME, and any single instance could be overlooked. Taken altogether however, it appears unlikely to be simple coincidence. Instead, it seems the ME redactor first incorporates the temptation scene provided by the AN, where similarities of detail clearly suggest a relationship. Some minor details in that first scene (such as the garden location), however, are borrowed from the OF, suggesting some latent familiarity with that version. Such familiarity also appear in the second scene, where few of the specific details are in accord, but the general sense of events are shared. It is as though the redactor, wishing to make his narrative as complete and accurate as possible, uses a version of AN as the base text, but augments it heavily with excerpts, events, and some minor points remembered (or misremembered as the case may be) from the OF tradition.235

The Steward's Report

The ME heavily augments the report of the steward, first by recording exactly how he discovers them:

(65) & euer þat steward gan abide
Al-on vndir þat chaumber side,
Hem for to here.
In at an hole, was nouȝt to wide,
He seiȝe hem boȝe in þat tide
Hou þai seten yfere.
& when he seyȝe hem boȝe wip siȝt,
Sir Amis & þat bard briȝt,
Þe doukes douhter dere,
Ful wroȝt he was & egre of mode,
& went oway, as he were wode,
Her conseil to vnskere.236

235 This also has the result that where both the AN and OF have one scene each, the ME has two, one based chiefly on the AN tradition, the other based chiefly on that of the OF. Many minor details (particularly from the OF) are altered to make them all accord.
236 Leach, II. 769-80.
Here again one sees similarity with the OF in having the steward in the next room. Of this discovery the AN says only:

| E quant veent le jour ke il unt dyt,                  | Qant vint le terme q'avoint dit,                        |
| Lors se assemblunt a grand delyt,                    | Il ensembleront od grant delit:                        |
| E ja rel estut escuntrre dyre                         | Par grant duçour s'entrebeiserent,                    |
| Du ju de amur i ad matire.                           | De amour parlerent e juwerent.                        |

(D. 517-20)                                              (L. 321-24)

These lines permit the audience to note that the steward perceives what is occurring, but not how. In this, the ME (like the OF) demonstrates a narrative superiority in providing details to make the whole story more believable. The details themselves, however, spring entirely from the imagination of the redactor.

The next event is the steward’s actual report. OF this, the AN says simply:

| Sanz plus de prolonge attraire                       | Par grant duçour s'entrebeiserent,                   |
| De lour assemblé a ke faire,                         | De amour parlerent e juwerent.                      |
| Mes quant Hardré seet la covine                      | De autre chose ne dira[i] mie;                      |
| Entre Amys e la mescheyne                           | Ne croy pas q’il y avoit vilaynie.                 |
| Demeintanant au roy ala                              | Le seneschal, quant sout la covine                   |
| E tut lur overe le counta.                           | Entre Amis e la meschine,                           |
| Ore sunt ly dui amant trahi!                         | L’endemain vint tot a hounte:                      |
| Si Jhesu n'eut eu merci                               | Acounté est tot lor œvre al counte.                |

(K. 521-28)                                              (L. 323-30)

The ME, however, needs to take into account some of its previous plot additions, so it incorporates the return of the duke from his second hunt as a prelude to the steward’s treachery:

(66) When þe douke come in to þat won
þe steward o3ain him gan gon,
Her conseyl forto vnwrain.238

He then continues:

“Mi lord, þe douke,” he seyd anon,
“Of þine harm, bi Seyn Jon,
Ichil þe warn ful fain;
In þi court þou hast a þef,

237 This is fairly typical of the ME, which always seems to tie up loose ends, whereas the AN is quite happy to overlook them.
238 Leach, ll. 781-83.
It is never stated what the steward says to the duke in the AN, though there is a passage provided in the OF which like the ME is in first person. However, this structural likeness is evidently simply coincidental, for in the OF it is not the youthful companion who is the direct object of the seneschal’s malice, but rather Belisaunt. By not naming the culprit, the duke is put in a position of having to ask, at which point the steward betrays Amis:

The ME elaborates this entire episode, the redactor dedicating three stanzas (36 lines) to what amount to only eight lines in the AN. The inclusion of specific details are in some instance necessary to account for previous alterations in the narrative, but in doing so, the narrative is fleshed out with specifics which brings the entire episode to life and makes it more believable. All of these additions spring directly from the mind of the redactor, and it makes for a more appreciable narrative.

The Duke’s Wrath

The ME duke immediately takes the steward’s words for the event and attempts to attack Amis:

---

239 Leach, II. 784-92.

240 In the OF, Hardret does betray Amile in his report, alleviating his lord from having to ask the culprit to be named as in the ME, but Belisaunt is clearly the victim of his wrath: "Hardret li dit: "Sire drois empererez, / Je voz apors noueules effraees. / Li cueus Amilies ta fille a vergonde, / Enz en un lit l’ai reprinse prouvee. / Rois, fist l’ardore, la poudre en soit ventee. / Par Deu, morte an doit iestre.” II. 726-33. [Hardret said: “Sire, true Emperor, I have dreadful news for you. Count Amile has dishonoured your daughter: I caught her with him in the same bed. Have her burned at the stake, lord, and let her ashes be thrown to the wind. For this, by God, she must be put to death.”]

241 Leach, II. 793-804.
The AN, however, provides a different treatment in that he first mulls over the consequences of the event which has been related to him, as though not able to believe what he has heard:

Charles de ire estoit enfie, Ne parla mot de une louee, Mais au drain dyt, “Jhesu merci, Si cist traitres me as honi, Ke tant amay e tince si cher, En qui se put home ore affer? Si ad tro grand descovene; Ma fille est pute devenu; Ele est honue e je trahi; Cist traître tant var le vi!”

(K. 529-38)  

L. 331-40)

It seems incongruous to him that the butler whom he has loved and held so dear could betray him by treating his daughter as a *pute*, and it is only the realisation of this possibility (or the anger that the idea causes him) that arouses his desire for vengeance:

“A touz jours averay reprover, Si ne me say de lui venger!”

(K. 539-40)  

(L. 341-42)

Even in this realisation, however, the duke expresses disbelief, calling into question the seneschal’s report:243

“Est se voir, sire seneschal, Je crye ke dyt l’avez pur mal.”

(K. 541-42)  

(L.343-44)

This is a situation which never occurs in the ME, nor (for obvious reasons) does the seneschal’s protestations to the veracity of his statements:

Sire le seneschal respond: “Sire,” le seneschal responde,
"Par celui ke fyt tut le mound,
Si il le vut ver moy nier,
Cum leu chevaler le voil prover;
E cil ke de nus ke ert vencu,
Seit detret e pus pendu."

(K. 543-48)

“Par celui que fist le mound,
S’il le velt denier,
Com leal chevaler le voil prover,
E cil que de nous est vencu
Soit detret e puis pendu!”

(L. 345-50)

The ME redactor omits the lord’s questioning of the seneschal/steward to avoid this very retort, for indeed, the seneschal speaks the truth. He has caught Amis and Belisaunt together, and his oath invoking “he who made the world” is valid. Not wanting to show the steward so clearly in the right, the redactor omits questioning his word in order to avoid the very convincing argument for its credibility. Thus, the focus is shifted to the seneschal/steward’s treachery in betraying another member of the court and causing discord rather than demonstrating him as an ally of the moral right.244

The AN then includes a further incident not included in the ME. Rather than going directly to Amis, the lord, now convinced, goes to his wife:

& dit ly roys: “Ore vaut meyns!
Cist play mei est assez vylayne.”
A teles a la chambra ala,
La reine sur sun lyt trova.

(K. 549-52)

E dit li quens: “Ore vaut meins!
Ceste play m’est laid e vileins.”
Atant en la chambre entrat,
La dame sur un lit trovat.

(L. 351-54)

To her, he disparages not only Amis, but also his daughter:

“He, dame!” fet il, “Vus ne savez
Quele fille vus avez!
Ja est ele femme du mester,
E ce vus fet nostre botiller.
Pur nostre honour hounte nus rend,
Trahi nus ad hounteusement
Car nostre fylle ad afolé,
Ore lui doint Deux mal destine!
E si avera il, si jioe vive tant,
De hounte nel ert nul garant,
Car detret ert e pus pendu,
E la puteine ars au fu!”

(K. 553-64)

“Dame,” dit il, “ne savez
Quele fille vus avez!
Ele est ja femme de mester,
E ceo ad fait nostre botiler.
Pur nostre bien hounte nous rend:
Tray nous ad malement,
Qe nostre fille ad trahy e affolé.
Deu li doint male destine!
Si avra il, si jioe vive tant;
Ne li ert nul de mal garrant.
Tut ert detret e puis pendu,
E la pute arse en fu!”

(L. 355-66)

His anger is directed mainly at the butler, who has repaid honour with dishonour by defiling his daughter, and he therefore hopes that God will punish him and vows to have him hanged. Interestingly, he also derides his daughter, saying she has lowered herself to

---

244 The seneschal’s words are also later put into Amis’s mouth when he later requests trial by combat as is shown below.
becoming the woman of a low man (mester), calls her a whore and threatens to burn her. Such suggestions of culpability on Florie/Belisaunt’s behalf are omitted in the ME.245

It is only at this point, the lady speechless, does the lord angrily seek Amis as he did immediately in the ME:

La reine ne seest ke dyre,
Mes lui rei de rancer e de ire.
Devont plus ner ke carboun,
Tost se saust hors de mesun,
Si encontre sun botiller.
A ki il sout tre ben parler.

(K. 565-70)

La dame ne sout quoy dire.
Le counte de mal ard e d’yre,
Devint plus noyr ke carboun.
Tost sailli hors de la mayson,
Si encontra le botiller.
A li soleit trop beal parler.

(L. 367-72)

It is also noteworthy that he does so in order to “really give him a piece of his mind” rather than strike first and discuss later.

Upon approaching Amis in the AN the lord challenges his vassal by recounting the charge against him and warning him of the consequences:

Des oilz sur li forment royla,
E sire Amys esmerueilla;
“Hee,” fet il, “Deu te maudie,
Par tei est ma fylle honye!
Mes tu n’en iras de ren riant!
La mort te vait mult prochant!”

(K. 571-76)

Les oils sur ly forment roylla.
Amis moult se merveilla.
‘Fel,’ fait il, ‘Deu vous maudie!
Ma fille est par vous honye.
Mes vous ne irrez ja riant;
La mort vous va ja approchaunt!’

(L. 373-78)

This provides AN Amis with a chance to explain himself, an opportunity not afforded to his counterpart in the ME where the duke comes out swinging without naming his reason:

“Sire,” fet Amys, “vus dite mal!
Joe sui vostre chivaler leal!
E si nul vus ad de moy acunté –
Si noun ben e leauté ...”

(K. 577-80)

Jeo suy vostre chivaler leal;
Si nul vous ad de moy counté
For que dreit a verite...”

(L. 379-82)

In the ME, the unchallenged Amis acts quite differently. Instead of standing his ground, he immediately turns and flees:

245 It seems fitting that such is the case. In the ME she was previously demonstrated as simply a victim of her emotions, whereas in the AN she was granted a certain craftiness in her dealings, suggesting some greater cognitive abilities. One may argue that, such being the case, it is fitting that she shares in the guilt and punishment in the AN. It is likewise true that in the ME, where she has been portrayed as a simple woman driven only by her emotions and not her intellect, that she shares no responsibility. Instead, she is relegated to the role of “Potiphar’s wife,” who is therefore not responsible for her actions (or at least, her actions are in line with her stock character type, and therefore forgivable). In reducing her like this, the ME redactor succeeds in sidelining her as an actual threat to the Amis-Amiloun relationship, making her a personal test to Amis, but not a possible threat to their companionship in the same way as the steward.
In-to a chaumber sir Amis ran þo
& schet þe dore bi-teven hem to
For drede his heued to hide.
þe douke strok after swiche a dent
þat purch þe dore þat fauchon went,
So egre he was þat tide. 246

Consequently, this leads to two important deviations in the characterisation of the ME Amis. First, and most obviously, he has demonstrated cowardice in the face of combat rather than rising to defend himself; just as he refused to accompany the other men of the court on the two previous hunts, he now refrains entirely from undertaking battle. Time and time again, the ME portrays Amis shunning the activities proper to knights, a characteristic of him that the ME audience could not fail to recognise. Secondly, it prevents Amis from lying directly to his lord as his AN counterpart has done. In this he does demonstrate some modicum of moral superiority. Taken altogether (and remembering previous events), one might well wonder if the ME Amis is being punished not so much for his faithlessness to his lord, but rather for his failure to live up to knightly precepts. 247

The ME then contains a passage absent from the AN in which the courtiers attempt to restrain the duke:

(69) Al þat euer about him stode,
Bisou3t þe douke to slake his mode,
Boþe erl, baroun & swain;
& he swore bi him þat dyed on rode
He nold for al þis worldes gode
Bot þat traitour were slain. 248

This deviation is important in that it suggests the general mood of the court towards Amis; they are on his side, wishing the best for him. 249 The duke, unquenchable in his ire, retorts:

"Ich haue him don gret honour,
& he hap as a vile traitour"

246 Leach, ll. 811-16.
247 It is when Amis refrains from the first hunt that he is first approached by Belisaunt; if he had gone hunting, the incident would never have occurred. It is on the second hunt that he is again approached by her and forced to adhere to his promise; again, if he had been at the hunt, the incident would never have occurred. In both instances, he is loath to acquiesce to her wishes, so much so that Belisaunt even suggests he lacks a suitable interest in women. This is in contrast with the AN Amis who is only concerned that the deed remain secret. In the AN, then, the blame lies squarely at the feet of Amis who behaves dishonourably, doing what he knows he should not do, but is nevertheless willing to do; the ME Amis, on the other hand, fails by not adequately defending himself against the temptation of a woman (something a knight should be able to do), ultimately performing a deed from which he wishes to refrain.
248 Leach, ll. 817-22.
249 This is an important realisation for later when none will stand as surety for him.
These words ring familiar in that they very nearly recall those of the AN lord to his wife as seen above (K. 557-9/L. 359-61). He then continues by voicing his intent:

"Y nold for al þis worldes won
Bot y miȝt þe traitour slon
Wiȝ min hondes tvain."

Rather than having the duke turn to his wife the redactor decides to show the general attitude of the court. Presumably the wife would share her husband’s shame and therefore become an immediate ally, but the courtiers who are not directly affected by Amis’s relationship with Belisaunt instead seek to quell their lord’s rage. This at once underscores the anger of the duke, but also suggests that the deed is perhaps not as damning as his fury would suggest. Again, one may wonder whether it is Amis’s weakness, not his deed, which is leading to his downfall.

From behind the strong door, Amis finally requests trial by battle:

(70) “Sir,” seyd sir Amis anon,
“Lete þi wretþe first ouergon,
Y pray þe, par charite!
& 3iȝ þou may proue, bi Sein Jon,
þat ichtaue swiche a dede don,
Do me to hong on tre!
Ac 3iȝ ani wiȝ gret wrong
Haþ lowe on ous, þat lesing strong,
What bern þat he be,
He leiþp on ous, wiþ-outen fail,
Ichil aproue it in bataile,
To make ous quite & fre.”

This is essentially an expansion of the same challenge issued in the AN:

“Baudementis mei defenderay,
Devant vus ou ke deveryay!”
(K. 582-83)

“Moult bien me defenderay
Devant qe jeo denieray.”
(L. 383-84)

The main difference is that by offering to undergo trial by combat the ME Amis neither denies nor admits guilt. Though he implies his innocence by saying that whoever accuses
him is lying, he conditions the declaration by stating that such is the case if it is "wip gret wrong." The statement is intentionally ambiguous. It can suggest "if one is acting with great malice" and is evidently meant to be taken as such. It could also, however, be taken to mean "if one is incorrect," in which case he is stating the truth, for if the accusation were false then it would indeed be a lie. Such an intricacy of diction, known as the plait wretched, formed a part of medieval rhetoric frequently used in legal pleading to mislead the proceedings intentionally, shifting attention away from the accused, and putting the onus on the accusers to prove their position. It has an analogy in the OF; when Amile hears the charge against him, he replies:

Dist li cuens: "Sire, menaciéz sui assez.
Cent dehais ait en viaireet el nés
Qui m'en encuse, s'il ne le weult monstrer..." 254

That Amile's statement is intentionally misleading is attested by Hardret's response:

"Par Deu, Amiles, bien iestez apansez.
Ja de voir dire ne seréz prins prouvéz." 255

Whether or not the use of such circumlocution is borrowed from the OF, its use in the ME certainly casts Amis in a different light. Here he is not an outright liar as in the AN, but rather a very clever deceiver who is able to mislead his opponent by twisting the truth.

The Formal Challenge

Amis Agrees to Combat

Penned in by his statement, Amis is further questioned by the duke as to his willingness to endure trial by combat:

(71) "3a," seyd pe douke, "wiltow so,
Darstow in to bataile go,
Al quite & skere 3ou make?" 256

---

253 A plaites wrenche is literally a "dispute's trick." These could take many forms in legal arguments, ranging from trying to anger the opponent into making a mistake or retort with a stultiloquium (a vicious pleading for which a fine was imposed) to providing technically truthful oaths which were intentionally designed to be misleading, as here. Such tricks of dispute can be noted in the Owl and the Nightingale and other contemporary debates. See Garby's Introduction to O&M, Black's Law Dictionary, and Gobel, Felony and Misdemeanor.

254 Dembowski, II. 754-56. [The count said, "Sire, this is a grave charge. And the man who accuses me — may a hundred curses be heaped upon his head if he fails to prove its truth!"

255 Dembowski, II. 758-59. ["By God, Amile, you're a clever one! You will certainly never be caught in the act of telling the truth!"

256 Leach, II. 841-43.
Having no options, Amis immediately agrees, and throws down his glove for the challenge:

“3a, certes, sir!” he sey’d þo,
“& here mi gloue y 3iue þer to,
He lei3e on ous wiþ wrake.”257

Here is an inversion of the AN where it is the seneschal who throws down his glove first:

Le seneschal atant i vent
E le gaunt en sun poin tent;
Tendi avant en noun de gage
Cum home de grand vassalage...

(K. 583-86)

Le seneschal atant se vint
E son gaunt en son poing tint,
E tendist en noun de gage
Com home de grant vasselage...

(L. 385-88)

It is true, however, that the ME reproduces the willingness of the seneschal/steward to partake in the trial immediately afterwards:

Þe steward stirt to him þan
& seyd, “Traitor, fals man,
Ataint þou schalt be take;
Y sei3e it me self þis ich day,
Where þat sche in þi chaumber lay,
3our noipher it may forsake!”258

E dyt ke oue lui se combatereit,
E la chose vers lui provereit.

(K. 587-8)

E dit que od li combat[er]eit
E la verité provereit.

(L. 389-90)

The ME does provide a fuller treatment by having the steward speak in first person to reiterate his case, but there is very little tampering with the actual content. It simply provides a deeper treatment of the issue, heightening the suspense of the situation, and lending a degree of narrative superiority though restating the facts in dialogue.

The ME then sign-posts events by restating positions and providing a formal exchange of oaths:

(72) Þus þe steward euer gan say,
& euer sir Amis seyd, “Nay,
Ywis, it nas nou3t so!”
Þan dede þe douke com forþ þat may,
& þe steward wiþstode al way
& vouwed þe dede þo.259

257 Leach, II. 844-46.
258 Leach, II. 847-52.
259 Leach, II. 853-58.
This is an expanded version of the agreement made between the two in the AN, which is limited to a single line:

Li un vers l’autre tendi li gant.  
Li un contre l’autre tendi son gant.  
(K. 591)  
(L. 393)

The ME has simply expanded the text, providing more detail via a first-person statement and suggestion of dialogue. Such sign-posting and reiteration are characteristic of the ME, lending greater depth to the narrative, and presumably greater audience appeal.

The ME then inserts a tercet concerning Belisaint’s view of the situation which does not follow at this point in the AN:

Be maiden wepe, hir hondes wrong,  
& euer swore hir moder among,  
“Certain, it was now3t so!”

This passage may at first appear as a rather negligible aside, but it is important in demonstrating a link with Karlsruhe, the only other version in which the daughter makes an appeal to her mother:

Flurie estroit se purpensa  
De angwuyse ne seet qe dirra,  
Mes vers sa mere ses oils tresturne  
Ke asses est pur lui pale e mourne,  
E dist parole de grand peine:  
“E reyne de France, Eleyne,  
De tut le mounde la plus gentille,  
Ne veez vus ci vostre fylle  
Ke a teu destreit sui demenez  
Assez il pert ke poy amez?  
Ne veez ce chivaler e moy,  
Ke vers moun seignur, le roy,  
Sumus encusez a teu tort  
Dount destiné nus est la mort?  
En vus, dame, gyst nostre aye,  
Nostre mort, e nostre vie?  
Au rey, dame, vus alez  
E le chivaler demaundez  
Dekes a un certein jour,  
Si asuuagez la grand dolour,  
Ke de ci pres nus est bastie!”  
(K. 645-65)

260 Leach, ll. 859-61.
It is true that this passage is much condensed in the ME, and that Floriel/Belisaunt’s attitude is altered. In the AN, she is apparently willing to admit to her misdeeds and begs her mother to aid Amis. This is not the situation in the ME where she flatly denies the deed. However, it is still a link between the versions, but the difference in length as well as stance suggests that it is not a direct link, but rather they are derived from some common source which the ME has minimised while Karlsruhe has expanded it.\textsuperscript{261}

The stanza then closes with the duke giving formal assent to the proceedings, settling the matter temporarily:

\begin{verbatim}
Pan seyd pe douke, “Wip-outen fail,
It schal be proued in batail
& sen bitven hem to.”\textsuperscript{262}
\end{verbatim}

In this, the ME picks up with the narrative structure of the AN which has the same essential formal closing by the lord:

\begin{verbatim}
Le rei les gagis prist atant.
E passent donce du barnage...
(K. 592-93)

Lei quens [les] rescuest atant.
E doncqe jugga le baronage...
(L. 394-95)
\end{verbatim}

Thus, in narrative structure, one again recognises the connection between the AN and the ME in the settling of terms between Amis and the steward.

**Amis finds no Pledges of Surety**

The first three tercets of stanza 73 sets the date of the impending battle for the following fortnight, then describe the problem Amis has finding a second, while the steward finds a score or more:

\begin{verbatim}
(73) Pan was atvix hem take pe fi3t
& sett pe day a fourtenni3t,
Pat mani man schuld it sen.
Pe steward was michel of mi3t,
In al pe court was per no wi3t,
Sir Amis borwe durst ben.
Bot for pe steward was so strong,
Borwes anowe he fond among,
Tventi al bidene.\textsuperscript{263}
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{261} Furthermore, the passage in Karlsruhe (II. 595-678) does not occur in the same section as in the ME, but rather forms part of a much larger interpolation of some 83 lines not in London.

\textsuperscript{262} Leach, ll. 862-64.

\textsuperscript{263} Leach, ll. 868-73.
The AN likewise indicates that Amis can find no one to stand as surety for him while his foe finds plenty, but it provides rather different reasons:

London suggests that Amis finds no seconds because the lord so hates him that none dares to speak up. Karlsruhe, however, suggests that none wish to oppose the seneschal due to his noble lineage. In neither case does anyone find fault with Amis per se, but no one wished to join him against such powerful adversaries. In the ME, however, the cited reason is not status, but physical prowess. This may well point to a source aligned with Karlsruhe. Unlike London, in which no one comes to Amis’s aid because of the lord’s antagonism, in both ME and Karlsruhe it is the steward/seneschal whom the courtiers wish not to oppose. As stated previously, the ME redactor frequently attempts to limit the influence of the steward by suppressing any reference to his lineage. It is therefore simple enough to shift his power from one of influence to sheer brute force. He thereby remains the reason for the courtiers’ timidity but is stripped of the respectability he has in Karlsruhe.

It is important to recognise that in no version is there a general belief in Amis’s guilt or ill will towards him. Karlsruhe clarifies this point in stating:

Mult vait dunke fort a sire Amys,  
Unques mes ne fu tant esbays;  
Ne seet en mounde ke porra fere... 
(K. 605-57)

---

264 Although London says that some had doubt or fear, these sentiments could be due to their lord’s ire.
London later provides a similar sentiment:

Plusors aveient de ly pité,
Mes li sire fust tant yrré
Qe la n'out home taunt hardi
Qe oseit un mot parler pur ly.

(L. 413-16)

The ME redactor, however, throws a twist in the final tercet of the stanza which might at first suggest that all are not on Amis's side:

Pan seyd þai alle wip resoun,
Sir Amis schuld ben in prisoun,
For he no schuld nowhar flen. ²⁶⁶

That the courtiers wish him in prison might suggest that they are against him but this interpretation is countered by earlier instances where they try to prevent the duke from attacking the knight.²⁶⁷ The explanation for such an inconsistency might again lie in the ME's strict adherence to courtly formalities. The courtiers' insistence that Amis be imprisoned does not necessarily suggest that they are aligned against him, but rather that in the absence of surety proper procedure dictates that that is what ought to be done. Such an interpretation finds later support in their rejoicing when Amiloun (disguised as Amis) defeats the steward. Therefore the most that can be said about this anomaly is that it is a necessary prerequisite to set the stage for the ladies subsequent stepping forward on Amis's behalf.

**Belisaunt and her Mother as Surety**

Amis's support eventually comes from an unusual source when Belisaunt puts herself up as surety in the following stanza:

(74) Pan answerd þat maiden bri3t
& swore bi Ihesu, ful of mi3t,
þat were michel wrong,
"Takeþ mi bodi for þat kni3t,
Til þat his day com of fi3t,

²⁶⁵ This is also another instance of the ME redactor showing Amis failing in a knightly capacity. The lack of confidence the courtiers have in his fighting underscores their belief that he is not actually a "fit" knight, a point that the ME audience would not fail to recognise.
²⁶⁶ Leach, II. 874-76.
²⁶⁷ Not to mention the just cited instance of their lack of standing for him being a direct result of their fear of the steward rather than their dislike for Amis.
An even more unexpected ally is then found in Belisaunt's mother:

(75) Hir moder seyd wip wordes bold
pat wip gode wil als sche wold
Ben his borwe al-so,
His day of bataile vp to hold,
pat he as gode kni3t schold
Fi3t o3ain his fo.
Pus þo leuedis fair & bri3t
Boden for þat gentil kni3t
To lain her bodis to.
Þan seyd þe lordinges euerichon,
Þat oper borwes wold þai non,
Bot graunt it schuld be so.269

It is perhaps understandable that Belisaunt, being a party to the affair and having particularly strong feeling for Amis, should behave in such a way but it seems bizarre that her mother also comes into the situation. Her doing so, however, shows a possible connection with the AN, for in both London and Karlsruhe she does exactly the same thing. After Florie's tearful plea to her mother in Karlsruhe,270 the queen steps forward with the same offer:

E la reine tote enlermie
Veet a sun seignur suspitant,
A genuz se met meintenan
E dyt a pitouse voys oye:
"Mun seignur, rei de seignurie,
Sur touz reis des cristeins, ke say,
De une reen vus requeray:
Ce chivaler, sire, vus demand,
Pur un certein covenand
Ke seit, sire, a nostre ordeinance;
Ja mar de lui eyez dotaunce!
En peryl le preng du damage,
Veez ci moun cors en ostage."

(K. 666-78)

268 Leach, ll. 877-888.
269 Leach, ll. 889-900.
270 Karlsruhe, ll. 650-65; see above.
Though London lacks the emotional petition of Florie, there too her mother offers herself as *ostage*:\(^{271}\)

La dame ne se pout tenir  
Ne pur vivere ne pur morir;  
Devant le counte se genula  
E le chivaler demaunda:  
En hostage pur li serret,  
En son plegge devendreit.  

(L. 417-22)

That the ME retains this event can only be a result of its occurrence in previous versions. There is no practical purpose for her support in the ME, unlike the AN where the mother is a necessary ally so that she can later grant Amis *congé* to seek out Amiloun.\(^{272}\) Her presence is simply a vestige of previous versions, and her inclusion can only be justified by the ME redactor's attempt to provide the most complete rendering possible.

But if the mother's presence reflects fidelity to the AN, one must then question the role of the daughter in the ME. Though her presence may be more logical, she is never offered as surety in the Norman versions. She does, however, perform this service in the OF. Just as the emperor is about to strike Amile's head because he finds no hostages, the mother intervenes offering herself and her children:

"Sire, dist elle, mal feriéz et pechíe.  
Si il voz plaist, le franc conte laissiéz;  
Mes cors meísmez le voldra ostaigir,  
Et Belyssans por cui la bataille iert,  
Beuves mes fiz qui moult fait a prisier.\(^{273}\)"

As with previous corollaries with the OF, this is not identical. It is the mother who speaks for them both, and along with her daughter her son is offered as well. Nevertheless, this is the only other version in which both mother and daughter stand as Amis's pledges. It is

\(^{271}\) Both versions make it clear that it is the mother speaking in the following lines (where they again align themselves briefly) in which the king/count responds:

"Voyre," fet ly reis, "volez ensi,  
& loe leunements vus di  
Qe si il fuat de la baytale,  
Le jugement averez vus saun faile,  
Qe a votre fylle est ordinee!"  
(K. 679-83)

That he is speaking to his wife is demonstrated by his reference to "your daughter" in K. 683 and L. 427.

\(^{272}\) This role is later taken over by Belisaunt in the ME.

\(^{273}\) Dembowski, II. 797-801. [No, my lord, what a wicked and sinful thing! I beg you spare the worthy count; I'll pledge myself as hostage, and so will Belissant, on whose account the combat will take place, and so, too, my son Beuvon, whose valour is well known.]
likely that the ME redactor recalls the situation from previous familiarity with a version in the OF tradition and incorporates it into the narrative. Along the way, Beuvon is forgotten (an understandable omission as he never plays a particularly active or important role), and much of the role the mother plays in later developments in the AN become ascribed to Belisaunt in the ME.274 It is possible that the redactor believed that the AN erred in presenting the mother in such roles, and attempts to correct the error by redistributing them to Belisaunt in the redaction.275 As a result, what ultimately emerges is a version which flows more logically, with Belisaunt being the primary ally of Amis, while the complicity of her mother is a result of maternal obligation to her daughter.276

Amis’s Concern for Belisaunt

At the end of the following stanza (76) is a brief digression which demonstrates Amis’s concern for Belisaunt:

Of his liif ʒaf he nouʒt,
Bot of þe maiden so michel he þouʒt,
Miʒt noman morn mare.277

There is no corollary to this in London, however Karlsruhe provides a possible source in a long interpolation (occurring earlier) where Amis reflects on Florie and his love for her:

“He Deus!” fet il, “roy de dretyure,
Mervayle qe le sen me dure
Qe ne devence yv farygez.
Quant teu doel est abauondonez
A la plus bele creature
Ke unqes fu fet du humene fugure.
Ja est par mei si mal mené,
Tant mar a sun vs fu né,
A mal heure requist m’amur –
Car aumdui murrum hui ce jour –
E reen ne m’est de mes maus demene
Ainz est pur lui tote ma peine.”

(K. 629-40)

The Karlsruhe Amis is completely distraught on account of Florie. He sees her as the most beautiful creature ever given human form, grieves for her sorrow, and takes full

274 Such as granting Amis leave in the AN.
275 Which supports the idea that information from the OF was simply remembered (or disremembered as the case may be) for it is the mother who grants congé in the OF as well.
276 This perhaps demonstrates a cultural difference; in the AN, it seems, it is necessary for the mother as lady of the house to grant leave, while Amis is able to take it from Belisaunt in the ME.
277 Leach, II. 910-12.
responsibility for leading her into the situation; nothing can be more distressing to him than her distress. Certainly these sentiments are greatly contracted in the ME, but there too it is made clear that he attaches little value to his own life, his chief concern being the lady. What is omitted, however, are the obvious signs of love expressed in Karlsruhe. The resulting impression is that ME Amis’s concern for Belisaunt stems not from affection but from a chivalrous sense of obligation. Also omitted are any declarations of culpability such as those provided in Karlsruhe, making the sense of obligation appear that much more noble. By making duty rather than sentimentality the impetus for Amis’s loyalty, the ME distances Amis from Belisaunt in terms of emotion and thereby surpasses the AN in terms of courtliness by making his motive one of magnanimity rather than one of jealousy. Again, the ME becomes more courtly than its predecessors.

Amis Realises his Dilemma and Devises a Solution

The first two thirds of stanza 76 then demonstrate Amis’s concern about the oath he must make before fighting the steward. He realises that he must perjure himself, and consequently cannot expect to win:

\[(76)\] When þai þad don, as y 3ou say,  
& borwes founde wip-outen delay,  
& graunted al þat þer ware,  
Sir Amis sorwed niȝt & day,  
Al his ioe was went ȝaway,  
& comen was al his care,  
For þat þe steward was so strong  
& hadde þe riȝt & he þe wrong  
Of þat he opon him bare. 280

The following stanza continues the sentiment, emphasising his concern and focusing the audience’s attention on his plight:

\[(77)\] For he þouȝt þat he most nede,  
Ar þat he to bataile ȝede,  
Swere an op biforn,  
Þat al so god schuld him spede  
As he was gîltes of þat dede,  
Þat þer was on him born;  
& þan þouȝt he, wip-outen wrong,  
He hadde leuer to ben anhong

278 Though he shares responsibility for the situation, the ME goes to great lengths to demonstrate that Belisaunt, not Amis, is the instigator of the relationship, and it puts him in the position of a victim rather than an accomplice.

279 Of course there is also the fact of obligation, for he has sworn his allegiance to Belisaunt, however he does demonstrate some genuine concern for her, but more as someone under his protection than someone for whom he has love.

280 Leach, II. 901-9.
Amis's present concern regarding a future false oath supports previous conclusions that although he has been deliberately misleading, he has not yet lied *de facto*. It also underscores a belief in the divine justice meted out in trials by combat, a situation which London never mentions at all, and one which Karlsruhe only hints at: 282

Amys en sa chambre ala,
Assez de doel, & de yre en a,
Ses mauz comence a regrater.

(K. 695-97)

Though these lines suggest that Amis regrets the deeds which have led to the present situation, there is no particular concern over any future oath he will have to make denying his liaison. Although it is possible that such falsity is encompassed by his regret (for in the AN he has indeed already lied), it receives hardly any emphasis. His remorse stems primarily from deeds which have led to his present misfortunes (and those of Florie, already cited as his main concern) than worry over forswearing himself. Such evident belief in the power of divine justice and recognition of the formality of oaths again shows the highly courtly nature of the ME redaction.

While pondering his dilemma, Amis is again approached by Belisaunt in the garden: 283

(78) So it bifel opon a day
He mett þe leuedi & þat may
Vnder an orchard side. 284

Belisaunt asks the cause of his distress, telling him to have no fear for she will make sure he is well equipped:

“Sir Amis,” þe leuedy gan say,

281 Leach, II. 913-24.
282 Though the AN makes it clear that Amis is greatly distressed over the situation, and must have some concern over a false oath to justify his desire to seek Amiloun, at no point does any version of the AN cite such concern directly (whereas the ME dedicates 30 stanzas to it), and at all times Amis demurs over the cause of his concern.
283 There is certainly some symbolism to be found in the numerous garden encounters. It could represent a Garden of Love, or conversely the dangers of being under a “Yrne-tree.” Though such investigations are outside the scope of this study, it could well be argued that regardless of how they interpreted it, a medieval English audience would recognize some of the symbolic significance implied by so many garden references, and that therefore their inclusion could be another example of the redactor tailoring his narrative to suit them.
284 Leach, II. 925-7.
“Whi mornestow so wiþ-outen play?
Tel me þat soþe þis tide.
No drede þe nouȝt,” sche seyd þan,
“For to fiȝt wiþ þi foman,
Wheþer þou wilt go or ride,
So richeliche y schal þe schrede,
Par þe neuer haue of him drede,
Þi bataile to abide.” 285

This again shows connections with a portion of Karlsruhe which has no analogy in London:

“Sire chivaler,” fet ele atant,
“Qe vus est, ke ensi desmentez,
Pus qe la condicioun savez
Qe en noun paryl vus ay plevi –
Ja mar seyez vus esbay!
Ayns lessez tote kuwardie!
Venges serroms, ne dotez mye,
Du mauveis seneschal
Ke nus ad brace teu bataest!”
(K. 718-26)

Just as in the ME, Karlsruhe Amis is rhetorically asked the cause of his distress, then told to have courage for he shall be victorious. Such structural similarity is again beyond the realms of coincidence. There are, however, two major differences. First, the mother, not her daughter, is speaking. Such an alteration is apparently the decision of the redactor to “correct” the narrative by assigning a role to Belisaunt in the ME which is perceived as being mistakenly ascribed to the mother in AN. 286 The other difference is the omission of cowardice (kuwardie), an attribute which Florie mother in the AN clearly sees in Amis. 287 Although ME Belisaunt’s reassurances do suggest she realises Amis’s distress stems from a fear of losing the battle, the omission of such a characteristic suggests his fear is not so much for the loss of life, but rather the loss of honour which his death will imply. By placing the importance of bodily health below that of reputation, the courtly nature of the ME is again accentuated.

The highly courtly nature of the ME is again displayed in Amis’s response:

(79) “Madame,” seyd þat gentil kniȝt,
“For Ihesus loue, ful of miȝt,
Be nouȝt [wroþ] for þis dede.

285 Leach, II. 928-36.
286 See above.
287 Line 723 of Karlsruhe, quoted above, which is translated as “therefore abandon all cowardliness.”
Though he admits he is afraid to fight, he cites the need to make a false oath as the cause of his distress, once more emphasising his belief in divine justice. The Karlsruhe Amis, however, is determinedly evasive over the cause of his concern, stressing only that it is not on account of cowardice:

“A dame!” ce dyt sire Amys,
“Par le fys deu ke en croyss fu mys,
Pur kuwardie ne le di joc pas.”

(K. 727-29)

He then immediately requests leave to visit his “brother” to advise him of the situation, leading one to believe he only seeks advice:

“Mes si moun frere suit le cas
Mult lui serroit fort le message;
Car nel tendreit champ, ne boscage,
Ne aime reen ke Deu formast
Ke moun estast visitast;
E si nus grever ne quidase,
Le congé, dame, vus demandase
Ke a lui puse returner.
Mun meschef le dei nuncier
Car ja ne er certis de quer hetee,
Tanke avery ov lui parlé.”

(K. 730-40)

The ME Amis is more straightforward about his motive, telling Belisaunt exactly how Amiloun can help them when she asks whether there is any hope:

(80) Pan seyd pat leuedi in a while,
“No mai per go no noper gile
To bring pat traitour doun?”
“3is, dame,” he seyd, “bi Seyn Gile!
Her wino ðenne mani a mile

Leach, II. 937-48.
The ME Amis takes Belisaunt completely into his confidence, admitting he needs Amiloun to undertake battle for him. Though one might conclude this to be Karlsruhe Amis’s (ulterior) motive as well, he never bluntly admits it. The AN Amis is therefore more deceptive. He has already lied about the tryst with Belisaunt, and cannot be truthful to her concerning his plans to disentangle himself. Though one may argue that ME Amis is also deceptive by planning to substitute his friend for himself, he is at least honest about it to Belisaunt. This is more than simply “honour among thieves.” His decision reflects a well attested course of action which can be honourably taken when one finds oneself in such a situation. Oaths are made before God, who will allow combatants to win their trial as long as their oaths are literally true; God is not deceived by substitution or wretched plaits. As long as one makes no attempt to lie to the deity, it is of little consequence if the human onlookers who witness the oath are incidentally fooled. By choosing this course of action, Amis is in the good company of other heroes of Middle English legends whose examples may have inspired the redactor to direct the youth in this direction. His honesty about it with the maiden further suggests the acceptability of his decision, unlike the AN Amis who undertakes the deed covertly.

Amis Receives his Leave and Departs

When ME Amis explains his plan Belisaunt immediately assents, giving him leave and promising to make excuses for him:

(81) “Sir Amis,” že leuedi gan to say,
“Take leue to morwe at day
& wende in þi iurne.
Y schal say þou schalt in þi way
Hom in to þine owhen contryay,
þi fader, þi moder to se;
& when þou comes to þi broþer riȝt,
Pray him, as he is hendi kniȝt
& of gret bounte,

289 Leach, II. 949-60.
290 Leach notes that the idea of the “Tricked Ordeal” had long precedent in European literature (pp. Ixxxv-Ixxxvii), and Burlingame provides numerous analogies with the Eastern tradition (see The Act of Truth). Among others are that of Tristan and of Lancelot in Launcelot del Lac. One might note a variation of the tricked ordeal in Gawain and the Green Knight.
Pat he pe batail for ous fong
O3ain pe steward pat wip wrong
Wil stroie ous alle þre.” 291

This differs from the AN response, where the mother calls his character into question by expressing mistrust of him: 292

La reine, quant ce escute,
De se dys aukes se doute,
Si le respond, “Beau sire Amys,
Traer me volez ce m’est avys.
Car si vus ne venez a nostre jour,
Ne savez ben, ke moun seignour
Pur vus ad ma mort jouré?”

Ele li dist: “Beau sir Amys,
Traihir me volez, m’est avys!
Si vous ne venez a tel jour,
Vous savez bien qe mon seignur
Pur vous ad ma mort juré.”

(K. 741-47) (L. 439-43)

Though Amis convinces her that he would not abandon her to such a fate, the very suggestion that he might do so indicates that (unlike the ME Amis) he is not above suspicion. 293 The ME Belisaunt, on the other hand, understands very well that Amis harbours no traitorous intent, even voicing recognition that his plan is intended to save her mother as well. The ME redactor thus shows Amis in the best light, omitting any reference suggesting untrustworthiness, making the ME Amis appear as better thought of than his AN counterpart. 294

The ME then shows Amis vigorously undertaking his journey:

(82) A morowe sir Amis made him 3are
& toke his leue for to fare
& went in his iurnay.
For noping nold he spare,
He priked þe stede þat him bare
Bope ni3t & day.
So long he priked wip-outen abod
Þe stede þat he on rode
In a fer cuntray

291 Leach, II. 961-72.

292 It is with the lady’s response that Karlsruhe and London again fall into sync with one another. The previous 59 lines of Karlsruhe (684-742), which have clear analogies in ME as demonstrated above, correspond to just eleven lines in London (428-38) which are not so interesting in comparison, but are provided here for inspection: “La dame lermist pur pité, / Prist Amis en plevine; / Moult fu dolente la meschine. / Amis se retret e purpensa / Com celi qe grant mester en a. / De son frere li sovyn; / Tantost a la countesse vynt, / Conge li ala demaunder / Qe a son frere velt aler; / Son enuy monstrer li voult, / E ala qe mult se redut.”

293 Though it is true that the ME Amis suspected of having a relationship with Belisaunt (and thereby suspected of treason against his lord), this is the result of a formal accusation being made against him, not the result of a simple mistrust. Importantly, it is not yet proved, either. The suggestion is that people are more willing to believe the ME Amis than the AN Amis, and as such, it appears that the ME Amis is fighting to prove the steward wrong whereas his AN counterpart is fighting to prove himself right. A subtle distinction, but one worth noting.

294 Karlsruhe Amis convinces the lady in II. 748-66, and London Amis in II. 444-46. As these conversation have no direct bearing on the ME, they are not quoted here, but they can be read in the appendix. It is interesting that the AN versions follow the OF in this respect, something entirely omitted in the ME.
Was ouercomen & fel doun ded;
Po coupe he no better red,
His song was, "Waileway!"

(83) & when it was bifallen so,
Nedes a-fôt he most go,
Ful careful was þat kniȝt.
He stiked vp his lappes þo,
In his way he gan to go,
To hold þat he behiȝt.295

The AN is slightly different in that it underscores the secrecy of the departure more strongly than the ME:

Amys, quant le congé ad prys,
Tantost s’est en chemyn mys;
Sanz garsoun, saunz esquier
Car ne ala pas cum chivaler,
Ayns ala cum peleryn.
Unqes ne fyne seir ne matyn,

Mes tuz les .viii. jours ensi ala
Ou les travaus ke il endura.

(K. 767-74)

Atant congé ly dona,
E un palefroy mounta
Saunz garsoun e saunz esquier;
N’ala pas com chivaler
Mes ala com pelrin.
Ne fina unke soir ne matyn,
Poy mangea e mains beust,
Si ne dormist nule nust.
T ouz les noitz issi chevaucha,
Qe onke de nuyt ne se reposa,

(L. 447-56)

Though the ME does show Amis leaving by himself, the AN reference to going without a page or squire is omitted, as is his disguise as a pilgrim.296 It is true that ME Belisaunt has already assured Amis that she will pretend his departure is to visit his parents, but it is noteworthy that such deceitful intentions are shifted from the knight himself to the lady. Furthermore, the ME eliminates any aspect of subversiveness in the departure itself, instead focusing on the hardship of the journey and Amis’s hardiness in its undertaking; the ME redactor adds small details, apparently from his own imagination, which aid in creating this impression: riding his horse to death, then struggling along on foot as best he can. Overall, the redactor creates the impression that the ME quest is rather more admirable than that in the AN through its omission of deceit and additions which are admirable to a knight.297

Certain aspects of the quest, however, show clear dependence on the AN where details regarding Amis’s fatigue, its timing and location are concerned:

295 Leach, ll. 973-90.
296 This may show a latent influence from the OF tradition, in which Amile is outfitted as a questing knight and is accompanied in his departure by Beauvon. See Dembowski, laisse 47.
& al Ḟat day so long he ran,
In to a wilde forest he cam
Bitven Ḟe day & Ḟe niȝt.
So strong slepe ȝede him on,
To win al þis warldes won,
No ferþer he no miȝt.298

Tant ke vers une vesparré
En un grand boys est entré
Ou teu somoi lu es venu
Au poy du palefrei est cheu,
Par unt lui covent donc dormer,
En vys li fust ke il dut morer.

(K. 775-80)  (L. 457-60)

Just like the AN, the ME mentions Amis entering a forest sometime between day and night, roughly the time of AN vespers, when he is overtaken by sleep. These similarities continue as Amis succumbs to his fatigue:

(84) þe kniȝt, þat was so hende & fre,
Wel fair he layd him vnder a tre
& fel in slepe þat tide.
Al þat miȝt stille lay he,
Til a-morwe men miȝt yse
þe day bi iche a side.299

Desouz un arbre se cocha,
E sun cheval ja reigna;
Dormi ke mut fu travaylés,
E sun cheval ke fu meseylés.

(K. 781-84)  (L. 461-4)

Just as he finds himself sleeping under a tree in the AN, so does he in the ME. Some details are then altered, such as omission of reference to his horse and the depth of his sleep elaborated, but these are mere incidentals. The fatigue of the journey itself remains intact, as does the important issue of falling asleep under a tree at a particular time of day.300 The retention of so many details of the journey clearly demonstrate that the redactor worked with a copy closely resembling the AN, but the alteration of details show

297 The ME is much like London in that it omits any definitive reference to time, while Karlsruhe clearly indicates the journey lasts eight days. This detail is so minor, however, that it cannot be assumed to suggest any greater affinity with London over Karlsruhe.
298 Leach, II. 991-96.
299 Leach, II. 997-1002.
300 As noted in a previous footnote, trees and gardens do seem to have some symbolic significance. Generally speaking, it was held to be foolish to fall asleep under a tree, especially during the day, as it invited misfortune or interference by the “faries.”
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that the redactor was not above freely interpreting the information available to provide a more courtly image of Amis.

**The ME Conclusion**

The final six lines of stanza 84 finish off the entire episode of Amis’s predicament by placing it in the context of the story as a whole through an allusion to Amiloun, whose departure initiated the sequence:

Pan was his brôper, sir Amiloun,
Holden a lord of gret renoun
Ouer al þat cuntre wide,
& woned fro þennes þat he lay
Bot half a iorne of a day,
Noiþer to go no ride. 301

By closing with Amiloun, the ME comes full circle, reintroducing the companion in whose absence Amis suffered ignominy, and whose reappearance shall ultimately lead to his vindication. Such sign-posting does not occur in the AN, and its use in the ME is a narrative improvement made by the redactor to both signal an end to the section as well as hint at the reunion to follow.

**Conclusion for Section 2B**

This division more than any other exhibits the manner in which the redactor reinterprets his material to create a new version. Some of these, such as the post-hunt feast, are evident efforts to provide the audience with events that conformed to their own cultural norms and which they would therefore expect and admire. Other changes are more subtle, but must certainly have been wrought for the same purpose.

One such change is that the characters become more two-dimensional. Despite his failure to live up to ideals Amis is invariably “good” in his intent while the steward is irredeemably “evil.” Belisaunt is predictable as “the wooing woman” or “Potiphar’s wife.” Perhaps it is because the players are so often portrayed as stock characters that some early scholars identified the ME as a more “primitive” version of the story. However, in many respects these simplifications allow the narrative to become more courtly. For example, while being coerced into the affair with Belisaunt, ME Amis is more concerned with behaving correctly than with getting away with behaving inappropriately; afterwards he is capable of being deceptive but unable to lie directly; furthermore, his concern for Belisaunt stems more from duty towards his lady than selfish
desire. That ME Amis thus becomes a more "stereotypical" courtly lover is not surprising given that, as Calin notes, "Authors of romance will introduce or amplify love motifs."\textsuperscript{302} Such strict adherence to courtly precepts would not be as credible in the more "human" AN Amis whose behaviour is less exemplary.\textsuperscript{303}

There are also stylistic improvements. The narrative flow is regulated by numerous "sign-posts" which recapitulate events, separate episodes, and foreshadow future developments. The majority of these have no precedent in earlier versions and their inclusion provides a more sophisticated structure than earlier traditions. Undoubtedly, the redactor would not make such changes if he thought the audience would not accept them. One must therefore conclude that such narrative techniques had some vogue in early fourteenth-century England.

Nevertheless, at its core the story remains indebted to its French-language predecessors. The influence of the Karlsruhe tradition is evident, and more so than elsewhere, correlations with London/Cambridge. This suggests the mixed nature of the exemplar which must have contained details from both traditions that were not passed down to the extant versions. Though less influential, traces of the OF tradition are also discernible suggesting a passing knowledge of that tradition. The redactor draws from all these traditions, combines them with native elements and packages them in a new narrative style designed to appeal to his audience.

\textsuperscript{301} Leach, II. 1003-08.
\textsuperscript{302} Calin, p. 484.
\textsuperscript{303} In many respects, the treatment of source material in \textit{A&A} resembles that of the ME redactor of \textit{Ipomedon} as observed by Hosington in her article, \textit{The Englishing of the Comic Technique in Hue de Rote\'s Ipomedon}. Throughout her article, Hosington notes changes the redactor makes in order to adapt this work to his, in her opinion, less courtly audience. In many respects, however, it seems these changes actually render the work more courtly. He removes bawdy sexual allusions (p. 251-52), deletes criticism of (and in fact, any reference to) homosexuality (p. 252-53), omits misogynistic characterisation (p. 253-54), and tones down the ironic treatment of the power of love (p. 254-55).
**DIVISION 2C: Reunion and Departure**

*Amiloun’s Dream*

The ME follows the AN in shifting immediately from Amis succumbing to sleep in the forest to Amiloun’s simultaneous wakening by *unruhigen Träumen.*

(85) As sir Amiloun, þat hendi kni3t,  
In his slepe he lay þat ni3t,  
In sweuen he mett anon  
þat he sei3e sir Amis bi si3t,  
His broþer, þat was treweþe-pli3t,  
Bilapped among his fon;  
Purc a bere wilde & wode  
& oþer bestes, þat bi him stode  
Bisett he was to slon;  
& he alon among hem stode  
As a man þat couþe no gode;  
Wel wo was him bigon.

In the AN, Amiloun is also safely asleep in his bed when this *somnium* rouses him:

Ore seignurs, plest vus entendre!  
Haute mervaylle poez vus atendre;  
Amylloun en sun lyt gysoyt  
De leez sa femme se dormeit;  
Si lui vynt en avysiun  
Ke sire Amys, sun compaignoun,  
De un lyoun fu asailly,  
Ke lui fu morteus enemy.  

(K. 785-92)  

(L. 465-70)

The most striking deviation in the dream vision is that the lone lion of the AN (and the OF) becomes a bear accompanied by other beasts in the ME. In both cases, however, Amiloun recognises the portentions of such vicious beasts attacking his companion and leaps from bed in an anxious state. The AN states:

Ou sung seult fu effrayez  
Si saut sus cum fu forsenez;  
Del sounge fu moult effraé  
E tost sus sailli com home desvee.

---

304 There is a particular correlation in structure between Karlsruhe and ME Auchinleck at this point. The ME indicates that a new section begins at this point with the use of a decorated capital “A” while Karlsruhe (as well as OF) takes the opportunity to begin a new laisse. London, however, makes no such break.

305 Leach, II. 1009-1020.

306 Here there does seem to be a slight variation from the AN; the ME dream is specifically called a “sweuen,” which C. S. Lewis notes as being the term preferred in Middle English for the type of dream classified by Macrobius as a *somnium* which “shows us truths veiled in an allegorical form.” The AN’s use of the words “avysium” and “avisioun” is more suggestive of the *visium*, a useless sort of dream including nightmares, and which is generally referred to as a “dream.” See Lewis, p. 63-64.
The ME correlation to these lines comes in the opening lines to stanza 87:

(87) As swiþe he stirt vp in þat tide,
þer nold he no leng abide,
Bot diþt him forþ anon, 307

Here is the same sense of urgency and concern spurring Amiloun to action. However, while the AN makes this an immediate reaction, stanza 86 of the ME represents a digression in which the character’s actions appear less hurried:

(86) When sir Amiloun was awake,
Gret sorwe he gan for him make
& told his wiife ful säre
Hou him þouȝt he seiȝe bestes blake
About his broþer wiþ wriþ wrake
To sle wiþ sorwe & care,
"Certes,"he seyd,"wiþ sum wrong
He is in peril gret & strong,
Of blis he is ful bare."
& þan seyd he,"For soþe ywis,
Y no schal neuer haue ioie no blis,
Til y wite hou he fare."308

Here there is evidence of influence from the OF on several counts. First is Amiloun’s manner of waking; instead of “swiþe he stirt up” as described in the following stanza, line 1021 suggests a more leisurely waking, as though he managed to sleep for some time after having his dream. Secondly, when he does wake his mood is not an aggressive one of excited madness as in AN, but rather a defensive one of fright:

Si voz dirons d’Amis son compaingnon
Qui fu a Blayies en sa maistre maison.
Jut en son lit dont d’or sont li pecol.
Au matinnet quant clers parut li jors
Cort a s’espee, car moult ot grant paor.309

A third correlation is the description of the dream to the companion’s wife as well as the image of Amis defending himself (as in ME 1016-7), neither of which occur in AN:

---

107 Leach, ll. 1033-35.
108 Leach, ll. 1021-32
109 Dombrowski, ll. 855-59. [(and we will] tell of his friend Ami, who was in Blaye in his bit house. He was sleeping in his bod, which stood on guilded legs. In the morning at the first light of day, he was suddenly frightened and jumped up for his sword.)
"Dame, dist il, entendéz ma raison:
Anuit sonjai une fiere avison,
Que je estoie a Paris a Charlon,
Si combatoit li ber a un lyon.
En sanc estoit desci a l’esperon."

In lines 1030-2, ME shares one more parallel with OF that is absent in AN in declaring his intentions to go to his friend:

Dist li cuens: “Damme,...
Par cel apostre c’on quiert en Noiron Pré,
Je ne lairoie por les membres coper
Que je n’i aille, quant li jors parra cler.”

The ME does, however, agree with the AN against the OF in omitting any direct mention of the beast turning into the seneschal or of Amiloun (OF Ami) slaying him. Though other parallels with the OF suggest direct knowledge of that source, and therefore the likelihood of the redactor knowing these details, it is typical of the ME redactor to avoid such a direct interpretation, preferring instead symbolic foreshadowing and literary suspense.

Amiloun's Departure

In stanza 86, the ME again comes (somewhat) into line with the AN:

(87) As swipe he stirt vp in pat tide,
Per nold he no leng abide,
Bot di3t him forp anon,
& al his meine bi ich a side
Busked hem redi to ride,
Wip her lord for to gon;

London and Karlsruhe also show the entire court readying themselves in the middle of the night to accompany their lord on his journey:

Tost apele sez chivalers, Tost appela ses chevalers,
Ses sergauns, e ses esquiers, Ses garsouns e ses esquiers,
Si les fet touz metre les ples, | Touz lour fist mettre lour seules;
Unqes ne dyt autre noveles, Unke ne lour dist autrune voile,
Mais ke il irra visiter Mes dist q’il voleit visiter

110 Dembowski, II. 866-70. ["Madam," he said, "listen to this. Last night I had an awful dream that I was in Paris with Charles; Amil was struggling bravely with a lion and was up to his spurs in blood."]
111 Dembowski, II. 889-92. [The count said: "Lady,...by the apostle we call pope in Rome, not all the gold in this world could stop me from going off to my friend as soon as the day is bright."]
112 Leach, II. 1033-38.
Sun frere, ke il pout tant amer.
Trusser les fet a my le nuyt,
As autres ne fu pas dedut,
Mes cele nuit e tant i errerunt
(K. 795-803)

Son frere qe tant pout amer.
Trusser s'en vount en mynuyt;
As autres ne fuist pas deduit.
En cele nuit e tant errerent
(L. 473-81)

After waiting till morning, the OF similarly says:

Au main se lieve, si vest ses meillors dras,
Ses chevaliers richement conrea,
Insilement en son chemin entra. 313

However, there is a significant difference between the ME and the AN/OF version in one particular: in the latter, it is the lord who rouses his men, while in the ME they take it upon themselves to make their preparations. This detail would be easy to overlook if it were not for the following lines in the ME where Amiloun actually forbids them from accompanying him:

& he bad al bat per wes,
For godes loue held hem stille in pes,
He bad hem so ich-chon,
& swore bi him bat schop man-kende,
Per schuld no man wip him wende,
Bot himself al-on. 314

In the following stanza, Amiloun restates this injunction as a final word of departure:

Al his folk he gan forbede
Pat non so hardi were of dede,
After him noilper go no ride. 315

The only possible correlation to this is in the AN where Amiloun, having told of his intentions to visit his “brother,” refuses to provide any further information concerning the urgency of his mission (Karlsruhe 798, 802; London 476, 480). However, it is doubtful that the ME redactor misunderstood this passage, it is rather more likely that he intentionally altered it. 316

313 Dembowski, II. 897-99. [In the morning he rose and put on his best clothes; he had his knights handsomely equipped and swiftly set out on his way.] It is worth mentioning that the ME also notes Amiloun’s attentive dressing in line 1045 and that the AN does not mention it all, but this is such a common motif that it is very likely only coincidence.
314 Leach, II. 1039-44.
315 Leach, II. 1048-50.
316 One possible reason will be explored in the following section.
Amiloun Seeks and Finds Amis

Discovers a Knight in the Forest

In the quest itself, however, the ME follows the AN very closely; in three lines, each version mentions Amiloun riding through the night in a forest in which Amis is sleeping:

So al þat niȝt he rode til day,
Til he com þer sir Amis lay
Vp in þat forest wide.317

Mes cele nuite tant i errerunt
Ke parmy le boys passerent
Ou sire Amys reposereit.
(K. 803-05)

En cele nuyt tant errerent
Qe parmy le boys passerent
Ou sire Amis reposeit.
(L. 481-83)

Immediately following, he sees Amis and goes to wake him:

Pan seiȝe he [a] weri kniȝt forgon
Vnder a tre slepeand alon;
To him he went þat tide.

(89) He cleped to him anon riȝt,
"Arise vp, felawe, it is liȝt
& time for to go!"318

Here again is correlation with the AN, particularly London:

Amyllouns, quant le aperceit,
Sa gent fet il passer avant,
E cil attent nepurquant
De sun frere saver volent,
Queu chose illukis le chaiseit.
(K. 806-10)

Sire Amillioun primes le veit;
Tost est cele part torné,
Tendrement l'ad esveillé.
E sa gent passerent avant,
E [i]l entendí nepurquant;
De son estre saver voleit.
(L. 484-89)

Thus, like ME, London refers not to Amiloun's "brother," but to "a being," and like ME, it is in London that Amiloun is shown waking his companion. However, in these particulars there is another possible source with even more correlations, the OF.

The OF also has Ami recognise Amile in the field, though he pretends to his men not to know him:

317 Leach, ll. 1051-53.
318 Leach, ll. 1054-59.
Li cuens Amis, qui son compaignon quiert,
Bien le connut el pré ou fu couchiéz.
Dist a ses homes: “Descendéz ci a pié,
Si laissiez paistre un petit vos destriers.
Un paissant voi en cel pré couchié,
G’irai veoir qu’il fait la ne qu’il quiert.\(^{319}\)

This feigned anonymity and the mention of a "peasant" could be what led the ME redactor into choosing the words of line 1054. Furthermore, it is only the OF that is in accord with the ME in having Amiloun jostle Amile/Amis awake, addressing him as an inferior, and commanding him to rise due to the lateness of the hour:

\[
\text{De son poing destre le hurte sor Ie bu,}
\text{Puis li a dit: "Vassal, car levéz suz!}
\text{Car li vespres aproche.}^{320}\]

Thus, the ME has generally followed the AN, but it seems to have somewhat embellished it with details from the OF. It has also made an omission of some note; perhaps in order to avoid the awkward treatment of what to do with the retainers in this episode, the ME redactor opted to leave them out entirely in the previous episode despite having shown them at the ready. This tends to cast a different light on Amiloun, portraying him more as a knight errant on quest than a high lord leading a cavalcade. Here one sees how \textit{amplificatio} and \textit{abbreviatio} affects the \textit{sens} of the \textit{materia}.

\textbf{Recognition}

Upon waking, Amis recognises his companion immediately:

\[
\text{Sir Amis biheld vp wib his si3t}
\text{& knewe anon hat gentil kni3t,}
\text{& he knewe him al-so.}^{321}\]

This is somewhat different from Karlsruhe which has a lengthy interpolation concerning Amis’s bewilderment at being roused by the din of men and horses, ending with: “Tut le rehete le corage / Quant le conoist par Amiloun.”\(^{322}\) Nor is it much like London which

\(^{319}\) Dembowski, II. 943-48. [Count Ami, who was seeking his friend, recognized him in the field where he lay. He said to his men, "Dismount here and let your horses feed a while. I see a fellow lying in that field. I'll go see what he is doing there and what he is about.”]
\(^{320}\) Dembowski, 968-70. [He put his right hand on the other's chest and shook him, then said, "Vassal, wake up! It's almost evening.”]
\(^{321}\) Leach, II. 1060-62.
\(^{322}\) Karlsruhe, II. 821-22.
says simply: “Fu la joie, fu la pité, / Quant l’un od l’autre est aquointé!”

Again, the closest analogue is the OF: “Li cuens Amiles se dressa contremon, / Bien reconnut Amison compaignon”

This sharing with OF is continued in their immediate reaction. The ME says, “kist hem bope to,” while Amis et Amile says “Entre ses bras le prinst de tel randon, / Plus de cent fois li baisa le menton.” Though the ME adapter has chosen to omit the subservient “chin kiss” frequently found in French epic poetry, it is still closer in content than either London or Karlsruhe, neither of which mentions kissing at all. Once again, it seems the ME has made use of knowledge of the Old French tradition.

**Ami Relates his Woes**

After their meeting and mutual recognition, London/Cambridge proceeds directly to Amiloun’s solution; Karlsruhe, however, inserts two laisses totalling 32 lines in which Amis explains the situation, and the ME loosely follows it.

Upon waking, Amiloun asks his friend how he came to be in the field and the reason for his obvious distress:

“Brofer,” he seyd, “whi listow here
With pus mornand chere?
Who hap woru3t þe þis wo?”

Amis acknowledges his distress, but abstains from immediately stating its cause:

(90) “Brofer,”seyd sir Amis þo,
“Ywis, me nas neuer so wo
Seþþen þat y was born,”

In its interpolation, Karlsruhe has a similar scene in which Amis makes a vague comment concerning the hardships facing him:

“He!” fet il, “beu compaignoun!
Cum me est ore bel avenu!
Car si de mes grefs fus apareu,
Mut en usez merveile graund;
Unques ne oistes ce croy de tant!”

---

324 Dembowski, II. 971-72. [Count Amile straightened up. How well he knew his companion Ami!]
325 Leach, I. 1065.
326 Dembowski, II. 973-74. [He threw his arms around him and kissed his chin a hundred times.]
327 Leach, II. 1066-68.
328 Leach, II. 1069-71.
329 Karlsruhe, II. 822-26.
Though the particulars of incredulity do not emerge in the ME, the adoption of generalities is in accord with the usual practice of the redactor in building suspense by forestalling the full revelation.

Karlsruhe then proceeds with Amis recounting his affair and its disastrous result:

E lors le prent a retraere
Tretut le gros de cel afere,
Cum il as feté la folye
Par abettement de Flurie,
Maugré le sun mut a envyz,
E cum la bataille ad enpris. 330

Though Amis protests he acted somewhat under duress (l. 831), he at least takes responsibility for his actions. The ME, however, provides a slightly different treatment:

“For seppen pat pou was went me fro,
Wip ioe & michel blis al-so
Y serued mi lord biform.
Ac þe steward ful of envie,
Wip gile & wip trecherie,
He hap me wrou3t swiche som.”331

Here, Amis insists that he never ceased to serve his lord loyal, and that the envious, guileful, treacherous seneschal is the cause of all his woes. This could have two interpretations. Either the redactor is trying to show Amis in a favourable light by skirting over the character’s own responsibility for his dilemma, or such an obvious blind-spot is intended to highlight the character’s inability to recognise that responsibility.332 In either case Amis’s character is cast in a different light than in the AN, and the story is reinterpreted.

At this point in both the ME and Karlsruhe, Amis solicits his friend’s advice:

“Si sui,” fet il, “venu vus quere,
Cunseil aver de cel afere.” 333

“Bot þou help me at þis nede,
Certes, y can no noþer rede,
Mi liif, it is forlorn!”334

330 Karlsruhe, II. 827-32.
331 Leach, ll. 1072-77.
332 For a more thorough examination of the latter point, see my forthcoming article, Differentiating the Identical.
333 Karlsruhe, II. 833-4. This request is restated in II. 840-2.
334 Leach, ll. 1078-80.
This request prompts ME Amiloun to inquire why the seneschal would act thus, a request the Karlsruhe Amilioun need not make, having already had the particulars recounted to him:

(91) "Broper," seyd sir Amiloun,  
"Whi hap þe steward, þat feloun,  
Ydon þe al þis schame?"  

It is only after the question that ME Amis mentions his affair with Belisaunt and the ensuing battle, but even then he continues to cite the seneschal as the main culprit in the situation:

"Certes," he seyd, "wip gret tresoun  
He wald me driuen al adoun  
& hap me brouȝt in blame."  
Þan told sir Amis al þat cas,  
Hou he & þat maiden was  
Boȝe to-gider ysame,  
& hou þe steward gan hem wrain,  
& hou þe douke wald him haue slain  
Wip wretȝe & michel grame.  

(92) & al-so he seyd, ypliȝt,  
Hou he had boden on him fiȝt,  
Batail of him to fong,  

Despite his ultimate admission to his illicit romance, he continues to diminish his own responsibility by blaming the steward, someone whom the AN Amis never mentions in this respect. Again, ME Amis appears different from AN Amis.

Though the details vary greatly, in many ways the ME reflects the sens of the OF. There too Amile abjures responsibility, blaming circumstances and the seneschal:

Et Belyssans qui le cors ot adroit,  
Trestoute nue se coucha avec moi,  
Si enchaï, je n'en sai autre roi,  
Si m'escouta Hardrez li maleois.  
Au matinnet m'en ancusa au roi.  
Bataille ai prinse au traitor sans foi.  

335 Leach, II. 1081-83.  
336 Leach, II. 1084-95.  
337 Dembowski, II. 983-88. ["And there was Belissant, who brought her beautiful body all naked into my bed. And so it happened — I couldn't help it! But that accursed Hardret spied on me. Early the next morning, he denounced me to the king, and now I am bound to do battle with the faithless traitor."]
Only in the ME and the OF does Amis attempt to shift blame to the seneschal, mentioning the latter’s revelation of the liaison to the lord. It is also only in these two versions that Amis mentions his inability to find surety; the ME states:

\[\text{& hou in court was & no wi3t,} \]
\[\text{To saue & tvay leuedis bri3t,} \]
\[\text{Durst ben his borwe among,}^{338}\]

The OF gives a slightly fuller account, the knight stating:

\[\text{"Mais des ostaiges ne poije nul avoir,} \]
\[\text{Quant la roîne me pleja endroit soi,} \]
\[\text{Bueves sez fiz qui est preuz et cortois} \]
\[\text{Et Belissans qui le cors a adroit."}^{339}\]

The number of striking similarities indicates some knowledge of *Ami et Amile* by the ME redactor, but the particulars are so widely divergent between the OF and the ME that it is very unlikely that he had an actual copy of it before him. Instead, it seems more likely that he had a passing knowledge of it, perhaps from having heard or read it before, and that he recalled certain details lacking in the AN which he felt it important to include.

Amis closes his plight by coming to the crux of his dilemma. In order to save himself and his hostages, he must win his battle against the steward. Before fighting, however, he must swear his innocence. As he is actually guilty of the charge against him, he cannot win the fight if he makes such an oath:

\[\text{& hou he most, wip-outen faile,} \]
\[\text{Swere, ar he went to bataile,} \]
\[\text{It war a lesing ful strong;} \]
\[\text{"& forswn man schal neuer spede;} \]
\[\text{Certes, &-fore y can no rede,} \]
\[\text{‘Alas’ may be mi song!}^{340}\]

This has a superficial similarity to Karlsruhe where Amis likewise recognises the difficulty of the situation:

\[\text{Ne say certis lequel mei seit,} \]
\[\text{Car pur fere certein espleit} \]
\[\text{Quant a l’alme ver nostre Sire} \]

---

338 Leach, II. 1096-98.
339 Dembowski, II. 989-92. ["I could find no hostage, when suddenly the queen pledged me her very self; then her son Beuvon, who is valiant and brave, and Belissant, who is so lovely."]
340 Leach, II. 1099-1104.
Amis does here say that he does not know what will become of him (835), nor how he can have success (836-37), but finally declares that he does not want "to swear or lie for to do so is not proper in itself" (838-39). Such concern over decorous behaviour is not a concern of ME Amis, only extrication from a difficult situation. Here again, there is a correlation with the OF. There, Amile declares:

Ja n’i serai mais des mois esgardéz.
Hom qui tort a combatre ne soit doit.
Or voldroie mors iestre. 342

Thus, the chief concern of ME Amis and OF Amile is not so much how to “do the right thing” as it is for Karlsruhe Amis, but rather how to face an impossible situation. In this, it again seems that the ME as borrowed a sentiment from the OF, and incorporated it into a story which is clearly being translated from an AN version.

Exchange of Identities and Separation

As Karlsruhe catches up with London after its interpolation, the ME falls fully back in line with the AN to show Amiloun taking control of the situation:

(93) When þat sir Amis had al told,
Hou þat þe fals steward wold
Bring him doun wip mode,
Sir Amiloun wip wordes bold
Swore, “Bi him þat Judas sold
& died opon þe rode,
Of his hope he schal now faile,
& y schal for þe take bataile,
Þei þat her wer wode; 343

The only significant difference is Amiloun’s recognition of Amis’s culpability and his own innocence:

Ore le respond Amilloun
Parole de vive resun:
“Beau frere, pus ke avez forfait,
E vuus le serment ussez fet,

Donke li dit sir Amillioun
Paroles de mult grant resoun:
“Beau frere, quant avez forfait
E le serment avez feté

341 Karlsruhe, II. 835-39.
342 Dombowski, ii. 1015-17. [They (i.e. the hostages) will never see me again. A guilty man cannot do combat. I wish I were dead!]
343 Leach, ii. 1105-13.
Though only a slight change, this does demonstrate an important shift in the handling of material. The AN Amis recognises his friend’s guilt, but his ME counterpart, and indeed, the ME narrator, are content to accept Amis’s contention that his guilt is simply a technicality, and that true shame lies with the steward who unchivalrously exposed him. Nevertheless, in the following stanza Amiloun does allude to this situation, declaring:

“\& y schal swere so god me spede
As icham giltles of þat dede,
Þat he opon þe bare."\(^{344}\)

Thus, the ME does faithfully incorporate the material from the AN, changing it slightly through *amplificatio* to portray Amis in a slightly more favourable light.

ME Amiloun then boasts that he will defeat the steward:

“3if y may mete him ariȝt,
Wip mi brand, þat is so briȝt,
y schal sen his hert blode!”\(^{345}\)

This declaration accurately reproduces the sentiments of the AN, in which he openly calls it vengeance:

“Jeo moy <...>fy en la grace Dé
Qe de feloun serroms vengé,
Ke nus quidoyt aver trahi.”

(K. 852-55)  
“Jeo espoir par la grace de Dé
Qe del feloun serrom vengé,
Qe vus quideit aver hony.”

(L. 503-05)

Importantly, one does note that in Karlsruhe this vengeance is aimed against “he who thought to have betrayed us” while in London it is against “he who thought to shame you.” The ME is closer to the sentiments of Karlsruhe in that both deride the steward for his shameful actions, as opposed to London which only mentions his bringing to light Amis’s shortcomings.

\(^{344}\) Leach, ll. 1120-22  
\(^{345}\) Leach, ll. 1114-16.
The ME Amiloun then instructs his companion to change clothes with him so that they may assume one another’s identity:

(94) “Ac broþer,” he seyd, “haue al mi wede, & in þi robe y schal me schrede, Riþt as þe self it ware;” 346

The AN states likewise:

“Trez touz mes chivalers ke sunt ci Ov vus ore demorrunt; E a ma court ov vus irrount; Car quant averoms robes chaungé, Si quiderunt il pur verité Ke vus seiez lour seignur;”

(K. 856-61) 347

“Mes chivalers qe sunt icy Od vous desoremés demorront; A ma court od vous irrount. E quant nous averoms robes chaungé, Donqe quideront de verité Qe vous seiez lour seignur.”

(L. 506-11)

The only real difference between the ME account and that of the AN is the omission of any mention of Amiloun’s knights, an unnecessary detail in the ME as there Amiloun is unaccompanied. 347 ME Amiloun does note, however, that in each other’s clothes, they may easily pass for one another:

Anon þo hendi kniþtes to Alle her wede chaunged þo, & when þai were al 3are, þan seyd sir Amiloun, “Bi Seyn Gile, þus man schal þe schrewë bigile, þat wald þe forfare!” 348

Thus, the ME appears to follow the AN relatively closely in this scene, using abbreviatio only to omit the unnecessary mention of Amiloun’s retinue.

Amiloun’s final instruction before parting relates to how Amis should conduct himself with his companion’s wife:

(95) “Broþer,” he seyd, “wende hom now riþt To mi leuedi, þat is so briþt, & do as y schal þe sain; & as þou art a gentil kniþt, þou ly bi hir in bed ich niþt, Til þat y com ogain,

346 Leach, ll. 1117-19.
347 see Amiloun’s Departure, above.
348 Leach, ll. 1123-28.
& sai þou hast sent þi stede ywis
To þi broþer, sir Amis;
Þan wil þai be ful fain,
Þai wil wene þat ich it be;
Þer is non þat schal knowe þe,
So liche we be boþe tvain!"349

In this, the ME is again faithful to the AN:

"E si vus requer par grand amur
Qe de ma femme facez atant,
E en fet, e en semblant," […]
(K. 862-64)

"Si vous requer par amur
Qe de ma femme facez atant,
En fet e en semblant,
Come jeo memes iceo fuisse,
Qe ele encheson ne troesse
Qe illoke est autre de moy;
Car jeo vous dy en bone foy
Qe ele [est] mout aparcevante!"
E sire Amist trestut le graunte.
(L. 512-20)

Both versions imply that in order to convincingly pass as Amiloun, Amis has the blessing of his friend to sleep with his wife.350 This is a change from the OF, where Ami expressly forbids Amile to do so:

"Sire compains, en ma chambre entréréz,
Et Lubias si fera autretel.
Li siens services voz iert abandonnez,
Sire compains, et voz le refuséz.
Biaus chiers compains, bonne foi me portez
Et voz ramembre de la grant loiaute,
Que li uns l’autre se doit bien foi porter."351

Given the ME redactor’s already attested familiarity with the OF, it is a certainty that this deviation would have been known. However, instead of deferring to the OF as he often does when details clash, he has decided to follow the AN. This has several important implications. First, it demonstrates that Amiloun places his relationship with Amis above that of even his wife, and presumably, above anyone else. Secondly, it will later permit Amis to demonstrate his own loyalty to Amiloun by finding a means to avoid cuckolding his friend, thereby preserving the integrity of his marital relationship and his honour.

349 Leach, II. 1129-40.
350 Karlsruhe does not omit these details, but due to four missing folios at this point it is not possible to provide a reading. However, at this point Karlsruhe seems to follow London very closely, and presumably will do so for at least the next six lines.
351 Dembowski, II. 1086-92. ["Dear friend, go to my room and Lubias will do the same. She will offer you her womanhood, and you will refuse it, my dear friend. Good companion, remain faithful to me and remember the great loyalty that each of us has sworn to the other."]
DIVISION 3A: Amis in Amiloun’s Court

Departure

This section begins with Amis and Amiloun’s separation, each travelling away in guise of the other:

(96) And when he hadde þus sayd, ypliȝt,
Sir Amiloun, þat gentil kynȝt,
Went in his iurnay,
& sir Amis went hom anon riȝt
To his broþer leuedi so briȝt,
Wip-outen more delay.352

This is not unlike the AN London version, except for the omission of a benediction for Amiloun in his journey:

Lour robes ount trestot chaungé,
E AmyUioun s’en est alé;
Tut soul va saunzcompainie.
Ore Deus li soit en aye
E doigne q’il puisse bien fere!
Grant chose enprent pur son frere!
Amys remaint od la meisné,
Cum li sire e envoyé.353

The OF has no significant differences other than Amile’s address to Ami’s troops, an event unneeded in the AN/ME where his character (Amiloun) is unaccompanied. Unfortunately Karlsruhe has no equivalent passage for comparison in this section due to the missing leaves.

The detail most remarkable in the passage is line 528 of London, “as the lord [Amiloun] sent him.” The implication is that Amis is in some respect subservient to Amiloun. Though the ME never makes any such reference, it does often give the appearance of a difference in level between the two.354 It is possible that the ME redactor picked up on small “hints” such as this one in the AN, and incorporated them in his own text with an equal degree of subtlety.

352 Leach, II. 1141-6.
354 see Ford, Differentiating the Identical.
Amis's Acceptance by Amiloun's Household.

Ami returns to Amiloun's court, explains that he has sent his horse to his brother, and is accepted by all as Amiloun:

& seyd hou he hadde sent his stede  
To his broþer to riche mede  
Bi a kniȝt of þat cuntray;  
& al þai wende of sir Amis  
It had ben her lord, ywis,  
So liche were þo tvay.

(97) When þat sir Amis hadde ful 3are  
Told him al of his care,  
Ful wele he wend þo,  
Litel & michel, lasse & mare,  
Al þat euer in court ware,  
Þai þouȝt it hadde ben so. 355

This represents an expansion of AN London in which it is only said that all thought he was Amiloun on sight:

E quiderount trestouz pur voir  
Qe ceo fuit lour dreit seignur. 356

Like ME, the OF does give more detail, but mostly concerns itself with the relief of Amiloun's men at finding their lord, and their delight at returning to Blaye. It does not, therefore, seem to have any direct bearing on the ME. It would be interesting to know what Karlsruhe originally said since it is given to "lengthy interpolations," and is likely to have also contained some of the information furnished in ME. Unfortunately, any such hypothesis is merely speculation.

There is no direct account in the ME of Amiloun's wife's belief that Ami is definitely her husband, such a fact apparently being subsumed in lines 1156-59, above. In London, this is very clearly expressed in lines 531-2, and is alluded to in laisse 62 of the OF where she initially feels slighted by Ami on his arrival. 357

There is one passage in London which, though not corresponding to the same episode in ME, does appear elsewhere in the English version. In explaining why Amiloun's household was so willing to accept Amis as their lord, it states:

355 Leach, II. 1146-58.  
356 Leach, II. 529-30  
357 Interestingly, it is also in this laisse where Amile "punches her in the nose just as his companion told him to do," and tries to attack her until his men intervene: "Li cuens l'antent, a poi n'enraige vis, / Hauçe la paume, enz el nès la feri, / Com ses compains li ot conté det dit." Dembowski, II. 1132-4.
Les deuz furent issi d'un semblant
Ne crerrieit home ja si parcevant
Qe l'un de l'autre sout deviser,
Si par noun les oist nomer,
Ne par cors ne par fasçon,
Par riens, si par la robe noun. 358

This passage bears a striking resemblance to ME stanza 8 in which it is said: "So lyche þey were bop of sy3t," and that no one could tell them apart "But by þe coloure of her clop." 359 Such similarity of description, despite its different placement, seems to be more than simple coincidence, and does show some influence from the AN tradition on the ME in stylistic terms if not episodic.

**The Sword of Chastity**

The episode in which Amis lays a sword between himself and his friend's wife at night carries traces from both the OF and AN traditions. It begins with Amis, offering no explanation, placing the sword in the bed between them:

& when it was comen to þe ni3t,
Sir Amis & þat leuedi bri3t,
To bed þai gun go;
& whan þai were to-gider ylayd,
Sir Amis his swerd out braid
& layd bitvix hem tvo. 360

In this, the ME adheres to the scenario put forth in AN London:

Amis, quant il se ajousta,
Leez la dame se coucha;
Sa espeic nue entre eus posa. 361

The lady's initial reaction similarly follows course; the AN states, "La dame de ceo s'enmerveilla," 362 and in much the same vein the ME says:

(98) þe leuedi loked opon him þo
WroÞlich wip her ei3en tvo,
Sche wend hir lord were wode. 363

---

358 London, II. 533-38.
359 Leach, II. 88 and 96 (from MS Sutherland).
360 Leach, II. 1159-62.
361 London, II. 539-41.
363 Leach, II. 1165-67.
It is here, however, that the ME again diverges from the AN which closes the scene with no further explanation than:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{A la dame ne voleit parler,} \\
\text{Desques al matin al lever.} \\
\text{Chescune nuyt issi se contint} \\
\text{Desques Amyllioun a meson vynt.} \quad \text{364}
\end{align*}
\]

Amis refuses to offer any reason for his behaviour, the wife asks no questions, and the audience is told in closing that such remained the situation until Amiloun's return. The situation is actually somewhat different in the ME, which again mirrors the OF in many particulars.

The first point of interest actually occurs in line 1166 (quoted above), where the ME lady is described as "wroplich." In this, there is a correlation with laisses 64-5 the OF. In these laisses, Lubias is said to be initially frightened that Amile is going to kill her, then flies into a rage (i.e., wrath) threatening to tell her kinsmen and get the bishop to give her a separation from her husband.\textsuperscript{365} Though the details are rather different, the event does lead to a discourse between the two in both versions which does not occur in the AN. In the ME the conversation begins with Amiloun's wife asking,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{"Sir," sche seyd, "whi farstow so?} \\
\text{pus were pou nou3t won to do,} \\
\text{Who hap changed pi mode?} \quad \text{366}
\end{align*}
\]

The questions itself seem to have some distant relation with that of OF Lubias: "Sire, dist elle, ou m'avéz voz trouvee?"\textsuperscript{367} Though it does not appear that the ME redactor borrowed any specific information from the OF at this point, it does seem likely that the familiarity with an exchange in the OF led him to include one in his own redaction loosely based on that of his continental predecessor.

Such a conclusion finds much more support when ME Amis's/OF Amile's response are viewed together. The ME Amis excuses his behaviour by blaming an illness which prevents him from touching the lady:

\textsuperscript{364} London, II. 543-46. 
\textsuperscript{365} Dembowski, II. 1164-76. This too seems rather less courtly than the ME or even the AN, again calling into much doubt any determinations such as that of Leach that the ME preserves an older, less courtly version of the poem. 
\textsuperscript{366} Leach, II. 1168-70. 
\textsuperscript{367} Dembowski, I. 1169. \[Sire, what have you found (wrong) with me?\]
"Dame," he seyd, "sikerly, 
Ich haue swiche a malady 
Ɂat mengep al mi blod, 
& al min bones be so sare, 
Y nold nouȝt touche þi bodi bare 
For al þis warldes gode!"368

This explanation draws directly from the OF tradition:

"Ce fu l'autrier que je fui a Charlon, 
Que il tenoit sa cort a Mont Loon, 
Moï dist uns mires, qui iert de Besanson, 
Qui me donna et herbes et puisons 
Que en mon cors avoie grant frison, 
Et que a fame n'eusce habitacion 
Ne compaignnie tel com avoir doit on, 
Ainz m'en tenisse trente jors a bandon. 
Se nel faisioie, je sui sans garison."369

In both, an illness is the stated reason for Amis' refusal to perform, but while the ME offers only generalities, the OF version gives a much more detailed, and thereby more plausible, explanation. Though the particulars are different (as they often are when working from memory), the scenes bear too striking a similarity to be dismissed as simple coincidence. The deficiency in the ME might (again) be explained by the redactor adopting information recalled from memory of this source though it probably did not exist in his exemplar.370

The ME closes the scene with a stanza of recapitulation:

(99) þus, ywis, þat hendȝ kniȝt
Was holden in þat fourtenniȝt
As lord & prince in pride;
Ac he forȝat him neuer a niȝt,
Bitvix him & þat leueði brieȝt
His swerd he layd biside.
Þe leueði þouȝt in hir resoun,
It hadde ben hir lord, sir Amiloun,
Þat hadde ben sike þat tide;
Per-fore sche held hir stille þo
& wold speke wordes no mo,
Bot þouȝt his wille to abide.371

368 Leach, ll. 1171-76.
369 Dembowski, ll. 1193-1201. [Only the other day, when I was with Charles as he was holding his court at Laon, a doctor from Besançon gave me herbs and potions for a great fever in my body and told me for thirty whole days I should not lie with a woman or take a man's pleasure; if I do, I remain unhealed.]
370 There is also much information in the OF completely omitted in the AN and the ME; Lubias's charge that Amile has tried to seduce her, Amile's thought that all women are untrustworthy, and his false-oath to kill Amile (i.e. himself) when he sees "him." See stanza 67, ll. 1216-27.
371 Leach, ll. 1177-88.
As with so many point of episodic division, the ME redactor “sign-posts” the events of his story by restating the situation that currently exists before moving on. This again represents a stylistic improvement over all previous version in preparing the audience for a shift in scene, just as is done at almost every other turning point in the story.
DIVISION 3B: The Combat

Amiloun's Arrival

Much as a conclusion stanza closes the previous section concerning Amis in Amiloun's guise, this section in which Amiloun impersonates Amis begins with an introduction stanza setting the scene:

(100) Now, hende, herkenep, & y schal say
Hou þat sir Amiloun went his way;
For noþing wold he spare.
He priked his stede niþt & day,
As a gentil kniþt, stout & gay,
To court he com ful 3are
þat selue day, wip-outen fail,
þat was ysett of batail,
& sir Amis was nouþt þare.
þan were þo leuedis taken bi hond,
Her iuggement to vnderstoned,
Wip sorwe & sikeing sare.372

The direct address of the author/reader in the first line signals the start of a new episode, and the rest of the stanza provides the setting. In this, it is not entirely unlike the AN:

Ore lerrom de Amis ester;
De sir Amillioun voloms parler.
Le jour vint qe fuist assis
Entre le seneschal e Amys.

(L. 547-50)

The AN narrator also uses direct address, and likewise says that Amiloun arrives on the day of battle. But there are some innovations in the ME that have no precedent. In the last three lines, the ME piques the audience's interest by alluding to the pitiful situation of the ladies (information that will later be elaborated upon in its chronological place), and, most interestingly, in the brief description of Amiloun's trek in lines 1190-4.

These five lines present something of a foil to the two and a half stanzas dedicated to Amis outward journey.373 Where Amis found the journey exceedingly arduous, and indeed was unable to complete it entirely, Amiloun completes it easily in a single undertaking. Though Amis's difficulty is also expressed in the AN, the addition of details

372Leach, ll. 1189-1200.
373Stanzas 82-84a, ll. 973-1002. See division 2b.
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relating the ease of Amiloun's travel underscores a dichotomy between the heroes, one that is subtly developed throughout the ME redaction.

Both versions then proceed to the steward's demand for justice. The AN states:

Le seneschal se fist armer,
Puis demaunda le botiler;
E quant il ne pouz estre trové,
La dame fuit pris e durement lié,
E la pucele ensement.
Grant pité avoient la gent:
Plurent e pleignent lour beaute.

L. 551-57

Likewise, the ME portrays the steward prepared for battle, and, finding no champion, calls of the ladies to be burned:

(101) Þe steward houed opon a stede
Wip scheld & spere, bataile to bede,
Gret bost he gan to blawe;
Bifor þe douke anon he 3ede & seyd, "Sir, so god þe spede,
Herken to mi sawe!
Þis traitour is out of lond ywent;
3if he were here in present,
He schuld ben hong & drawe;
Þerefore ich aske iugement,
Þat his borwes be to-brent,
As it is londes lawe.\footnote{Leach, ll. 1201-12.}

The main difference between the versions is the steward's direct discourse, a device used much more effectively in the ME than the AN. In detail, the ME redactor is also careful to include the steward's insistence that such a judgement is an inevitable legal requirement. This point has relevance later in the description of the lord's attitude towards such an event. It is also remarkable that the ME, usually so courtly, omits the AN reference to the crowd lamenting the loss of such beauty. Again the redactor has decided to marginalize the female characters so that their plight does not overshadow that of the main characters.

As to the burning itself, the AN lord appears just as inclined to see the blaze as his steward:

Li quens, que mout fuit irré,
Ala hastaunt lour jugement,
E si jura grant serement
Qe il memes les verreit arder.
(L. 558-61)

He “hastily” gives his judgement, and makes a great oath that he will see them burn.375

The ME version is somewhat different:

(102) pat riche douke, wiþ wreþe & wrake,
He bad men schuld þo leuedis take
& led hem forþ biside;
A strong fer þer was don make
& a tonne for her sake,
To bren hem in þat tide.376

Though the duke is likewise angered, it is not clarified whether that anger is directed
towards the ladies themselves (as it most clearly is in the AN), or towards the steward’s
eager insistence. Given that “land’s law” requires the event in the ME, and that in the AN
it appears to be under the lord’s autocratic authority to dictate an outcome, the best
interpretation would be that the ME lord’s direction to build a pyre is a reluctant one. He
therefore appears rather more compassionate, and by consequence, the steward appears
more despicable. Such two-dimensional characterisation does have the effect of making
the ME more courtly in portraying the steward as the embodiment of all that is detestable,
and it is against this loathsome character that the heroes struggle.

Immediately before the pyre is lit, Amiloun’s arrival (as Amis) calls a halt to the
events:

Þan þai loked in to þe feld
& seþe a kniþt wiþ spere & scheld
Com prikeand þer wiþ pride.
Þan seyd þai euerichon, ywis,
“3onder comþe prikeand sir Amis!”
& bad þai schuld abide.377

Seeing the fire, he increases his pace and chastises the duke for allowing events to progress
so quickly:

375 It is also worth mentioning that in the OF the lord is similarly inclined. The very morning of the contest he orders an
elaborate execution place to be built where his wife and daughter will be “dismembered, burned, and their ashes scattered to the
wind,” a description he unflinchingly relates to his wife without a trace of regret in lais 68. However, in the following stanza,
it is stated that “the king felt some regret and Hardret was light-hearted.” Though this may have had some bearing on the ME,
the overall attitude of the OF suggests any influence would have more likely been one of a harsh, vengeful lord. It is possible
that a similar stance might have been taken in the exemplar, which would have been revealed in the Karlsruhe tradition.
Unfortunately it is impossible to verify this hypothesis due to the missing leaves in Karlsruhe. It must be assumed, therefore,
that the position taken in the ME is entirely the creation of the redactor.
376 Leach, II. 1213-18.
377 Leach, II. 1219-24.
In all this, the ME follows the AN very closely:

Ataunt virent vener un chevaler
Qe vers eux fist grant aleure,
Paignant plus qe amblure;
Del feu q’il vist fut grantment effraé
E de les dames eust grant pité.
‘Sire,’ dit il, ‘jeo suy venu!
Dount vous sert tot cee fu
Qe pur les dames fait esteit?
Trop vilaine roste serreit!
Armes me fetes tost bailier
Pur cestes dames deliverer!
Jeo deffrendray nostre dreit.’

(L. 562-73)

Even Amiloun’s words show more than a passing resemblance to the AN. In both he addresses the duke directly (ME 1228/AN 567), says “I am come!” (ME 1231/AN 567), that a “roast” is “unchivalrous” (ME 1235-6/AN 570), and declares his intentions to save the ladies (ME 1232-3/AN 572). Thus, the event itself as well as the very means of expressing it bear too close a resemblance to be considered coincidental. The ME is clearly drawing on the AN tradition.

In preparing for battle itself, however, the ME again diverges. He is lead indoors by the ladies who outfit him handsomely and is wished well by the entire assembly:

(104) pan ware þo leuedis glad & blipe,
Her ioie coupe þai noman kiþe,
Her care was al oway;
& seppen, as 3e may list & lipe,
In-to þe chaunber þai went aswiphe,
Wip-ouren more delay,
& richeliche þai schred þat kni3t
Wip helme & plate & brini bri3t,
His tire, it was ful gay.
& when he was opon his stede,
þat god him schuld saue & spede
Mani man bad þat day.380

In the AN, it is the lord himself that outfits him and offers him words of encouragement:

Le quens, quant le chevaler veit,
Bien quideit qe ceo fuit Amys;
De cors resemblast e de vis.
Bons armes demaunda
E li memes le chivaler arma.
En son corage fust bien paié
Quant ad le chivaler si bien armé.
Puis li dist suef en son oraille
Qe, s’il pout deffellre la bataille,
Sa fille a femme ly dorreyt
E de tote sa terre heir li freit.
(L. 574-84)

Here the AN lord is so eager to see the good name of his wife and daughter upheld that he promises to make their champion his heir and son-in-law if he can overcome the steward. This prize is saved in the ME for after the battle, where it comes more as a spontaneous gift of gratitude. This lends a more courtly aspect to both men; Amis, because he is battling for the good cause and not for any rewards it might reap, and the lord because he avoids the deception played on the others present by whispering in the hero’s ear. Though such stylistic nuances lend the ME version a slightly different air, in terms of episodic arrangement and structure, it follows very closely that of the AN.

The Divine Warning

It is in this episode that the ME redactor has made the most evident change, not so much in the warning itself, but it its placement and referent. In the ME, a voice comes to Amis saying he will be stricken with leprosy within three years if he undertakes this battle, and that as a result he will become friendless:

(105) As he com prikand out of toun,

380 Leach, ll. 1237-48.
Com a voice fram heuen adoun, 
Pat noman herd bot he, 
& sayd, “Dou kniȝt, sir Amiloun, 
God, ṭat suffred passioun, 
Sent ṭe bode bi me; 
3if ṭou ṭis bataile vnderfong, 
pollo schalt haue an euentour strong 
Wip-in ṭis 3eres ūre; 
& or ṭis ūre 3ere ben al gon, 
Fouler mesel nas neuer non 
In ṭe world, ṭan ṭou schal be!

(106) Ac for ṭou art so hende & fre, 
Ihesu sent ṭe bode bi me, 
To warn ṭe anon; 
So foule a wreche ṭou schalt be, 
Wip sorwe & care & pouerte 
Nas neuer non wers bigon. 
Ouer al /lists world, fer & hende, 
pollo ṭat be ṭine best frende 
Schal be ṭi most fon, 
& ṭi wiȝf & alle ṭi kinne 
Schul fle ṭe stede ṭatow art inne, 
& forsake ṭe ichon.”

In all versions of the AN (as well as the OF) the voice warns Amis that he shall become a leper if, after he has already won the battle disguised as Ami, he falsely marries Belisaunt/Florie in the name of his friend.

Nuncie lui est un encumbrer 
Par une voys ke lui est venue, 
Dount nul alme est apareceu, 
Qe lui dyt suef en l’oraylle: 
“Sire Amylloun ceste esposalye, 
Qe vus avez ci enprys, 
De une chose vus garnyz; 
Jeo vus aporte une novele: 
Qe si vus prenez la damoysle, 
Ainz qe .ii. aunz seient passes, 
Si vyl leprus certis serrez, 
Ke vus ne trovezz homme vivant, 
Ke vere vus voil tant ne quant; 
E si vus teyndra la maladie 
De si treforte leprosie 
Autre .ii. aunz entiers.”

Oyst une voiz que li disoit: - 
Qe nul ne oist fors li noun - 
‘Lessez, lessez, sire Amillion! 
Jeo vous di certeine novele: 
Si vous esposez la damaoisele, 
Einz qe soint .iii. anz passez, 
Après de ceste leprouz serrez. 
Avant mes unke si laid ne fust 
Home, com dire bien le poet.’

(L. 712-20)

(K. 956-71)

381 Leach, Il. 1249-72.
In most respects the ME shares the same format: a bodiless voice tells him that if he performs a certain action, within a set number of years he will become a leper, and that as a result, he will be abandoned by all. The ME shares with Karlsruhe a special affinity in the specific mention that this voice was audible only by Amiloun, and its immediate reiteration. The main differences are the inclusion in the ME of various references which signal this warning as divinely decreed (ME ll. 1250, 1253, 1262), the foreshadowing of abandonment by his wife and family (l. 1270), as well as a hint at mistreatment by Amis (ll. 1266-67). But such additions, certainly the work of the redactor, are suggested by the AN; drawing them out simply permits the heightening suspense.

The most striking deviation is the stated cause of these consequences. In the ME Amiloun will be punished for not clarifying his true identity before declaring his (truthful) innocence of the accusation, whereas in all other previous versions the punishment comes for actually lying about his identity before taking wedding vows in his friend's name. The reasons for this change in the ME have been variously explained. Leach says that "This warning in the English comes before the fight and consequently the leprosy is punishment for false swearing - a much more logical and artistic motivation." That certainly seems the most logical conclusion to a modern interpreter, but the idea of a "tricked ordeal" has long precedence in medieval literature.

In similar scenes wherein the oath-taker tells a literal truth that deceives everyone present the speaker always does so with impunity. The idea is that the audience is tricked, and thereby justice thwarted, but that there is no attempt to trick God himself, and therefore there are no consequences to be suffered. It also seems to ignore the rather long lengths Karlsruhe goes to in order to demonstrate this very point; there it is implied that Amiloun has no trouble declaring he is innocent, but when he must state his name before the altar in order to marry he is deeply vexed as he knows to do so is to be forsworn. But perhaps when Amis and Amiloun was being translated the logic of

---

382 There is also a discrepancy between ME and Karlsruhe in one respect: Karlsruhe say two years whereas the ME and London both say three. The best explanation for this discrepancy is that the exemplar said three as well, and that in the transcription to Karlsruhe (or an intermediary), two was accidentally supplied.
383 Furthermore, later in the Karlsruhe narrative (ll. 1013-31), Amiloun does demonstrate his belief that the message is divinely sent in addressing his concerns over it to God.
384 Leach, I. 125.
385 See, for example, Tristan and Yseult, Launcelot del Lac, or Life of Virgilius.
386 See Leach, loccit-loccoii. Dannenbaum comments: "In both epic and romance, numerous instances of equivocal oaths in judicial ordeals are not considered to be sinful because the ordeal tests not the whole human situation, but simply the sworn statements made by the participants. In the case of a literally true though functionally deceptive oath, it is not God and Justice who are being tricked, but simply the human onlookers. As a result, in medieval literature the equivocal oath becomes a locus for permissible resistance to social pressure in deference to personal allegiances." Insular Tradition, p. 620. See also Kratins, Chivalric Romance or Secular Hagiography, p. 351.
387 See Karlsruhe edition in the appendix, ll. 587-92 and particularly 913-46. The OF also makes quite a point about Ami's oath of innocence. Holding his arm, Hardret declares "this vassal, whose hand I hold here, I found in bed with Belisaunt." II. 1419-21. In OF, there is no warning before the wedding, but only after where Ami is told what to expect for bigamy.
Leach’s view was already beginning to enjoy some measure of acceptability. It therefore seems understandable that the redactor would change the particulars in his version in order to reflect the changing sensibilities of his audience.

As for the reaction of Amiloun to the prophesy, the English resembles the AN, and particularly Karlsruhe:

(107) Pat kniȝt gan houe stille so ston & herd bo wordes euerichon, Pat were so gret & grille.
He nist what him was best to don, To flen, oþer to fiȝting gon;
In hert him liked ille.
He þouȝt, “If y beknowe mi name, Pan schal mi broþer go to schame,
Wip sorwe þai schul him spille.
Certes,” he seyd, “for drede of care
To holde mi treuþe schal þouȝt spare,
Lete god don alle his wille.”

London portrays Amiloun as instantly resolved in his decision to continue, hoping for the best and unflinching in his determination not to let Amis’s shame be discovered:

Amillioun l’ad bien entendu,
E la prist sicom son dreu,
Mes pur ceo ne vout lesser,
Mes la resceit come sa mullier.
Ne voleit qe eus furent aparceu
Coment son frere eust deceu.
(L. 721-26)

Karlsruhe, however, also includes the knight’s shock and internal conflict:

Quant le message lui est venu,
Si auqe en fust esperdu,
Ne se doit nul hom esmerveiller;
Tut coy ce estiet lui chivaler;
Colour sovent chaunge e mue
De angunse sue e tresue.
(K. 977-82)

It is only after evaluating the situation that Amiloun decides to proceed. He first determines that above all he cannot allow Amis to be shamed:

388 Leach, ll. 1273-84.
389 Karlsruhe give a rather lengthy interpolation in ll 984-1012. The shock is also expressed in ll 972-6. Immediately after the quotation given above, the lord recognises his distress and allows Amiloun to postpone the ceremony while he goes to pray.
390 The following two quotation are parts of a longer prayer of 28 lines in ll. 1013-31.
“Pur mei cheityf nel di jeo nent,
Eins le face pur moun frere Amys,
Car si cele overe ne eye eschevys,
Tut en vein ay travayllé,
De quanqe ay en lui overé.”
(K. 1014-18)

and that he is willing to accept any consequence God decides to visit upon him as a result.

“Ja seit si vile leprousie,
Peine, poverté, ou maladie,
De cete chose ne lui faudray!
En vus seit, moun sire Deu verray,
Qe en vostre mauneye moy met adés,
Coment ke deveyngne après!”
(K. 1026-31)

Thus, the redactor incorporates key elements lacking in London but which are present in Karlsruhe. It is likely that these details were present in the exemplar, and probable that the description was just as long as Karlsruhe’s. But while the ME redactor chooses to include these elements, thus showing the human side of Amiloun through his indecisiveness, he abbreviates them to a length that approximates that of London. Consequently, Amiloun is made to appear even more dedicated to his friend through his quick resolve to act on his friend’s behalf despite the burdensome fate it will incur for him.

Before going into the combat itself, the ME again makes us of a recapitulation stanza to summarise the situation and clarify the conditions of battle:

(108) Al þe folk þer was, ywis,
þai wend it had ben sir Amis
þat bataile schuld bede;
He and þe steward of pris
were brouȝt bifor þe iustise
To swere for þat dede.
Þe steward swore þe pople among,
As wis as he seyd no wrong,
God help him at his nede;
& sir Amiloun swore & gan to say
As wis as he neuer kist þat may,
Our leuedi schuld him spede.391

391 Leach, II. 1285-96.
The first tercet restates that all the assembly believes sir Amiloun to be sir Amis, and the second shows them being brought forward to make formal oaths before the assembly. The third relates the steward’s oath, in which he “said no wrong.” Technically true if he accuses Amis by name, but false if (as in OF), he accuses the knight before him. As for Amiloun’s vow in the final tercet, his too is technically true if he says he personally never kissed Belisaunt, but false if he says Amis never kissed her. As the actual words of the respective oaths are never given, the ME remains somewhat ambiguous. In this, it is not unlike the AN where the scene receives only two lines: “Le un l’autre desaffient / Qe entre eus nul amur ne eyent.” In the AN, however, these vows play only a small roll, for Amiloun is not to suffer leprosy for violation of this oath, only later for the false betrothal. For that reason the ME redactor supplies just enough information to allow the audience to deduce the deceptive literal truths that are made which allow Amiloun to win the battle. After which the combat episode can commence.

The Battle

Not surprisingly, the first half of the following stanza also provides an introduction:

(109) When þai hadde sworn, as y 3ou told,
To biker þo bernes were ful bold
& busked hem for to ride.
Al þat þer was, 3ong & old,
Bisou3t god 3if þat he wold
Help sir Amis þat tide. 

The audience is reminded that oaths have been made, the combatants are outfitted, and the people hope the best for “Amis.” Here there is a slight discrepancy between the ME and the AN in which part of the crowd sides with the steward (after the battle, London says, “Les uns chaunterent, les autres plorent” (l. 677)). There is, however, no internal conflict in the ME. Though earlier Amis was able to find no seconds, that was due to fear of the steward’s great strength and perhaps to some extent belief in Amis’s guilt. But as the efforts of the courtiers in trying to quell the duke’s anger shows, none of them are actually inimical towards Amis/Amiloun. Despite any faults or misdeeds (of which they certainly have their share), the companions are irreproachably “good” and their antagonists are therefore irredeemably “bad.”

With that sentiment reiterated, the battle begins, once more following the outline of the AN. It begins:

---

392 London, II. 587-88.
On stedes þat were stiþe & strong
þai riðen to-gider wiþ schaftes long,
Til þai toschiuerc bi ich a side;
& þan drouȝ þai swerdes gode
& hewe to-gider, as þai were wode,
For nopin þai nold abide.\textsuperscript{394}

In the AN, too, they begin on horseback, first shattering their lances then continuing with swords, neither side gaining an immediate upper hand:

\begin{quote}
Lour launces ount as coups brusé
E si sunt outrepassé.
A cel encountre tant firent bien
Qe l'un ne l'autre ne perdit ren.
Amillioun vint par corucer,
Par ire tret le branck d'asser.
\end{quote}

(L. 601-06)

In both versions the battle lasts until noon:

\begin{quote}
Fram morwe to none, wiþ-outen faile,
Bitvixen hem last þe bataile,
So egre þai were of mode.\textsuperscript{395}
\end{quote}

(L. 647-48)

Moreover, just as in the AN, Amis kills the steward's horse then dismounts to continue fighting:

\begin{quote}
(111) Sir Amiloun, as fer of flint,
Wiþ wretþe anon to him he wint
& smot a stroke wiþ main;
Ac he failed of his dint,
þe stede in þe heued he hint
& smot out al his brain.
þe stede fel ded doun to grounde;
þo was þe steward þat stounde
Ful ferd he schuld be slain.
Sir Amiloun liȝt adoun of his stede,
To þe steward a-fot he ȝede
& halp him vp ogain.
(112) “Arise vp, steward,” he seyd anon,
“To fiȝt þou schalt a-fot gon,
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{393} Leach, ll. 1297-1303.
\textsuperscript{394} Leach, ll. 1304-8.
\textsuperscript{395} Leach, ll. 1318-20.
In this portion there are some slight differences in presentation but none of them implies any contradiction. In the ME, Amiloun accidentally kills the steward’s horse; in the AN it is unclear whether this is accidental, but he is called courtly for dismounting in order to save the other horse. In the ME his desire to help the seneschal to his feet so that they can fight on equal footing makes him courtly; in the AN, he likewise wants to fight “peer to peer.” In sum, the minor variation in presentation are entirely overshadowed by the similarities in significant details which show a debt of the one version to the other.

The steward’s final defeat also shows similarities. In the ME, neither appears to be winning until the steward deals Amiloun a harsh shoulder wound. Amiloun is so angered by this that he retaliates and kills the steward on the spot:

(113) þe steward & þat douhti man
Anon to-gider þai fiȝt gan
Wiþ brondes briȝt & bare;
So hard to-gider þai fiȝt þan,
Til al her armour o blod ran,
For noping nold þai spare.
þe steward smot to him þat stounde
On his schulder a gret wounde
Wiþ his grimly gare,
þat þurch þat wounde, as ȝe may here,
He was knowne wiþ reweli chere,
When he was falled in care.

(114) þan was sir Amiloun wroþ & wode,
Whan al his armour ran o blode,
þat ere was white so swan;
Wiþ a fauchoun scharp & gode
He smot to him wiþ egre mode
Al so a douhti man,
þat euen fro þe schulder-blade
In-to þe brest þe brond gan wade,
Þurch-out his hert it ran.
þe steward fel adoun ded,

396 Leach, II. 1321-44.
Sir Amiloun strok of his hed,
& god he þonked it þan.\textsuperscript{397}

The same order of event occurs in the AN:

\begin{quote}
Ne savoit [nul] del chaump juger
Lequel fuit meillour chevaler.
Amillioun fust bien anuié
Qe la bataille ad tant duré;
Un coup li voudra ja donner
Qe li deit par dreit grever.
Mes le seneschal primes li ferist,
Qe son coup tres bien apparist:
La healme del coup enbarra,
Qe Amillioun fort estona.
Ore poet trop attendre:
S’i l ne sache le coup rendre,
Li autre s’en irra gabbant.
E sire Amillioun atant
Ferir li vint par tel ayr
Qe le feu fist tresaille,
Qe le healme fust tot purfendant.
En la cervele cola le brank,
E l’oraiUe od tote la face
Voler fist enmi la place.
Le braz od le brank trencha;
Desque en la haunche le branc cola.
En cel champ fu ben venge.
\end{quote}

(L. 651-73)

The seneschal’s blow stuns Amiloun, and thinking his adversary might “go away laughing” if he cannot return the punishment, Amiloun deals him the fatal stroke. There is even some correspondence in the location of the wounds. True, in the ME Amiloun is wounded in the shoulder whereas in the AN he is struck on the head, but in both versions he retaliates with two blows, one from the arm/shoulder into the body (ME 1363-4/AN 671-2), and a death blow severing the head or part of it (ME 1367/AN 667-70). The main difference is that the trenchant violence of the AN has been attenuated in the ME: instead of “the sword slicing through the brain and making the ear fly off with the whole face,” the steward simply has “his head struck off.”

It is characteristic of the ME that the degree of violence is diminished. The AN graphically describes the battle whereas the ME tends to give generalities and focus on the courage and stamina of the two knights. This is also one of the few places where the ME, usually so verbose, abridges its source reducing to eighty-four lines what the AN says in...
ninety-one. Such treatment clearly contradicts the views of older scholarship which sought to depict the ME as a more primitive version of the story as this again indicates a move towards more refined courtly values.

And in signalling the end of the episode, the ME again sign-posts the closing with a conclusion stanza:

(115) Alle þe lordinges þat þer ware,
Litel & michel, lasse & mare,
Ful glad þai were þat tide.
þe heued opon a spere þai bare;
To toun þai di3t hem ful 3are,
For nöping þai nold abide;
þai com o3aines him out of toun
Wip a fair processioun
Semliche bi ich a side.
Anon þai ladde him to þe tour
Wip ioe & ful michel honour,
As prince proude in pride.

Here an entire stanza is produced out of two lines from the AN:

Ore finist la bataille.
Les uns chaunterent, les autres plorerent.

(L. 676-7)

This is the method of expansion more generally utilised in the ME. It is also noteworthy that the redactor has made two significant alterations. The first concerns the placement of the steward’s head on a spear in line 1372. Such a detail would appear to be an inconsequential addition by the redactor were it not for the very same event’s occurrence in the OF when the king commands, “Desor un pel soit sa teste ferue.” This is exactly the sort of striking detail that the redactor would have remembered from past knowledge of the OF and incorporated into his version even though the event had no place in his AN redaction. The second change (alluded to previously) concerns the celebration of all the witnesses instead of just part of them. This change can indeed be attributed to the redactor. Though this two-dimensional characterisation may be considered less refined than the more realistic portrayal of the AN, it is again a typical treatment in order to maintain the infallible ideal of Amiloun. In any case, the stanza itself is effective in

397 Leach, II. 1345-68.
398 ME = Leach, II. 1297-1380 as opposed to AN = London, II. 587-677.
399 Leach, II. 1369-80.
400 Dembowski, I. 1753. [Let his head be impaled on a post.]
marking the end of a scene, showing the combatants moving away from the locus of action, and in that does represent a technical improvement over older versions.
DIVISION 3C: Reunion, Separation and Marriage

As the table in the introduction to the chapter demonstrates, this section of the ME conflates material composing two separate episodes and part of a third in the OF, divisions which the AN versions retain. Recognition of this fact is enough to indicate that the redactor treats the material rather freely at this point, and to a large extent, this is the result of abbreviatio. The ME reduces to 156 lines the 386 lines of Karlsruhe (which is already missing the beginning of the episode) and 115 of London. Many details are changed. The false betrothal/marriage, for example, never actually takes place, and the influence of the OF can be seen in the handling of this situation. Nevertheless, the redactor still includes enough material found in the AN versions, particularly Karlsruhe, to suggest continued reference to sources within those traditions.

Duke's Offer of Land and Daughter

The ME redactor begins by carefully sign-posting events, making effective use of recapitulation and development to indicates another scene shift. The first tercet of stanza 116 shows a move of location and provides background for events that will occur in the following episode:

(116) In to þe palais when þai were gon,
    Al þat was in þat worðli won
    Wende sir Amis it ware.401

The move from the battlefield to the court is reiterated, as is the people's belief that Amiloun is Amis. It is only after these elements have been introduced that the action of the episode itself can begin in the rest of the stanza.

Immediately upon arrival at court the lord expresses his intention to make this "Amis" his heir and son-in-law:

"Sir Amis," seyd þe douke anon,
"Bifor þis lordinges euerichon
Y graunt þe ful 3are,
For Belisent, þat miri may,
Þou hast bouþt hir ful dere to day
Wip grimli woundes sare;
Per-fore y graunt þe now here
Mi lond & mi douhter dere,

401 Leach, ll. 1381-83.

195
The offer itself made in 1390-92 is much the same as that made in London before the battle:

Puis li dist suef en son oraille  
Qe, s’il pout def fendre la bataille,  
Sa fille a femme ly dorreyt  
E de tote sa terre heir li freit.  

(L. 581-84)

Though the prize in the ME has been shifted from a promised incentive to a spontaneous gift of gratitude, the prize itself is exactly the same: the king’s daughter and all his lands. Due to the missing leaves it is impossible to know just how Karlsruhe handled these events, but given that this stanza does share many particulars with that version which are not included in London, it is possible that Karlsruhe presented the grant in a manner similar to that of the ME.

Some shared details which are evidenced after the continuation of Karlsruhe include the duke’s recognition of “Amis’s” valour, as in ME 1387-89:

Cist chivaler ci enpresent  
De un teu debat estoyt suspris  
Ke, si Ie meus ne ust eschevys,  
Ja ne ust Ie hounte recoverie.  

(K. 882-5)

Then, just as in ME 1385, he has the grant confirmed before the assembled barony:

E pur ce Ie vus dy en comoun  
Qe ma fylle en durray,  
E de grand tere eir le fray  
De ,vi. countés veir e demy  
Au jour de oy serra seisy  
En temoinaunce de vus barouns;  
Pur ceo vus fys ce somouns.”  

(K. 888-94)

This is very different from London’s treatment in which the duke makes no such declaration to his lords, instead recounting the events to his daughter and asking for her

---

402 Leach, ll. 1384-92.
consent (L. 689-700). In consequence, one can again recognise a particular indebtedness to the Karlsruhe tradition.

More interesting is the omission of many details and even events from the AN, such as the arrival of the barony (K. 865-76), and their verbal consent (K. 895-98). Of particular note is the omission of the false betrothal/marriage. In both AN versions the betrothal itself never takes place as Amiloun is led immediately to the church for the actual wedding ceremony. In London, Amiloun quickly overcomes any hesitation caused by the angelic warning. In Karlsruhe his concern is more pronounced and there is a need to temporarily delay the ceremony until he can regain his composure. Nevertheless, Amiloun is forced to make a false vow before the altar in both cases. This is not the case in ME, however, where nothing more occurs than the duke's promise to marry his daughter to "Amis," and the actual wedding is delayed until after Amis returns. In this, there is a slight similarity to the OF.

In Ami et Amile, Ami is quite literally forced to betroth himself to Belisaunt by the king. He tries several times to extricate himself from the situation as laisse 89 demonstrates:

Nostre empereres fu moult fiers et nobles,
Ibelielement fait venir les reliques,
Sur une table la chasce saint Denise,
Des Innocens i ot bien jusqu’a quinze.
Ou voit le conte, se li commence a dire:
“Sire vassax, venéz jurer ma fille.”
Et dist li cuens, “Volentiers, biaux douz sire,
Mais je serai venus de Blaivies primes,
Dou compaingnon cui j’ai ma foi pleve,
Par tel couvent que voz m’orrozja dire,
Que reverai dedenz jor quarantisme.
Lors ferai ce qu’il voz plaira, biaux sire.”
Et dist li rois: “Ainsiz ne di je mie.
Laissiez Ami, voz n’irez ores mie,
Qu’il est preudom et chevaliers nobile,
Si sera bien de voz la compaingnie.”
Et dist li cuens: “Dont jurrai je folie.
Puis quel voléz, or jurrai vostre fille.
Si m’art Dex et ces saintes reliques
Qui sor cel paile sont coucheies et mises,
D’ui en un mois, se Dex me donne vie,
A son conmant iert espoussee et prinsse.”
Et dist li rois: “Ce ne voz di je mie,
Ainz la panréz, frans chevaliers nobile.”

403 See quotation from London, II. 721-26 in previous division.
404 See reference to Karlsruhe, II. 977-1031 in previous section.
Envis le fait, mais ne l’ose désirer.  

The king rejects the knight’s promise to return in forty days for the betrothal, as well as his carefully worded pledge that “one month from today she will be taken in wedlock” with the omission of any reference to the groom’s identity. Ultimately, and against his will, he is forced to say that he will marry her. The wedding itself, however, does not occur until after Amile and Ami have retaken their proper identities and this is the course later taken by the ME.  

While the ME redactor adheres to the AN tradition in not complicating the history with both a betrothal and a wedding, it seems that his knowledge of the OF, already demonstrated in numerous instances, prompted him to follow that tradition’s method of placing the marriage after the resumption of identities. In this way he is able to avoid the awkward course of logic Karlsruhe must take to legitimise the union and which London never rectifies at all. Coupled with the decision to shift the angelic caveat from one against false betrothal/bigamy to one against false witness (which may have actually been an ipse post facto result of this new arrangement), the ME redactor streamlines his narrative and produces a more coherent and convincing story.  

The following stanza is then a recapitulation which also ties up loose ends to eliminate lacunae:

(117) Ful bliþe was þat hendi kniþt
& þonked him wiþ al his miþt,
Glad he was & fain;
In alle þe court was þer no wiþt
þat wist wat his name it hiþt,
To saue þo leuedis tvain,
Leches swiþe þai han yfounde,
þat gun to tasty his wounde
& made him hole ogain,

---

405 Dembowski, ii. 1775-99. [Our emperor was noble and stern. He sent at once for the relics and had them set out on a table; there were those of St Denis and nearly fifteen of the Holy Innocents. He turned to the count and spoke: “Vassal, come pledge your troth to my daughter.” And the count answered: “With pleasure, my good Lord, but only after I have come back from Blaye and the companion to whom I have sworn fidelity. I promise you I shall return in forty days, good sire, and then I shall do as you wish.”

The king said: “That is not what I desire. You have no need to go see Ami beforehand; he is a worthy man and a noble knight, and your friendship with him will surely not suffer.”

The count thought to himself: “Then I must make a false vow.” And he said: “Since you wish it, I shall take my oath before your daughter. So help me God and the holy relics which are set out before me, one month from today, if God grants me to live, she will be, by His command, taken in wedlock and married.”

But the king said: “That is not what I mean. You will take her in wedlock, worthy and noble knight!” The count dared refuse no longer and, with a heavy heart, he pledged his troth.] Of incidental interest is the fact that in Karlsruhe, Amiloun is led to the Church of the Holy Innocents for the wedding ceremony, much as Ami is forced to betroth himself before relics of the Holy Innocents.

406 Examined more fully below.

407 In Karlsruhe there is a lengthy interpolation after the marriage in which Amiloun reveal his true identity (K. 1094-1129). In order to give the marriage between Amis and Belisaunt later validity, he reassures her that her belief that she was marrying Amis, and the fact that God himself was not fooled when Amiloun falsified his identity at the altar, makes the union legitimate; he then asks her leave so he and Ami can resume their true identities (1130-65).
The first tercet confirms Amiloun’s joy at the outcome of events, the second reconfirms the belief of all that he is Amis, and the fourth notes that without exception they share in his joy. This last detail once more underlines the amity all have for the heroes, a sentiment not always present in the AN or OF, but invariable in the ME. Line 1398 implies that the ladies are aware of Amiloun’s true identity, a situation that does not exist in the AN, but a necessary adjustment to eliminate internal discrepancy in the ME where the ladies have always been aware of the substitution. Finally, lines 1399-1401 cure Amiloun of his wounds, an addition that had no relevance in the AN where the steward’s blow caused no injury. Thus in the space of a single stanza the ME redactor skilfully adjusts the narrative to provide coherence and remove any discrepancies that may have crept into the version due to his rearrangement of material.

Reunion of the Heroes and Separation

The recapitulation of the previous stanza signals the beginning of a new episode, the return of Amiloun to his own land. It begins with a transition stanza in which Amiloun requests leave from the duke who accedes to his wishes and offers him an escort which is refused:

(118) On a day sir Amiloun di3t him 3are & seyd þat he wold fare 
Hom in to his cuntry 
To telle his frendes, lasse & mare, 
& oþer lordinges þat þere ware, 
Hou he had sped þat day. 
þe douke graunted him þat tide 
& bede him kni3tes & miche pride, 
& he answerd, “Nay.” 
Ter schuld noman wip him gon, 
Bot as swiþe him di3t anon 
& went forþ in his way.409

In this stanza as well, there are some points reminiscent of Karlsruhe. Though in that version Amiloun’s declared intentions are to see about his friend “Amiloun,” he does make the request directly to the duke (ll. 1180-1196), and the duke readily concedes with an offer of fifteen knights (ll. 1197-1203).410 London abbreviates these details, saying only:

408 Leach, ll. 1393-1404.
409 Leach, ll. 1405-16.
410 Due to the passages great length, it is not reproduced here, but it can easily be found in the appendix.
E puis dit q’il prendra congé.
Quant il eust le congé pris,
E seignurs ove ly desqe a dis,
En son pais s’en est alé.

(L. 756-59)

Thus although there is a great deal of abbreviation, the ME nevertheless follows the sens of the materia found in Karlsruhe in respect to Amiloun’s congé.

The next two stanzas briefly recount Amiloun’s return home, his explanation of the situation to Amis, and their exchange of clothes:

(119) In his way he went alone,
Most þer noman wip him gon,
Noþer kniþt no swain.
Þat douhti kniþt of blod & bon,
No stint he neuer at no ston
Til he com hom ogain;
& sir Amis, as y þou say,
Waited his coming euéri day
Vp in þe forest plain;
& so þai mett to-gider same,
& he teld him wip joie & game
Hou he hadde þe steward slain,

(120) & hou he schuld spousy to mede
Þat ich maide, worþli in wede,
Þat was so comly corn.
Sir Amiloun liþt of his stede,
& gan to chaungy her wede,
As þai hadde don biforn.
“Broþer,” he seyd, “wende hom ogain.”
& tauþt him hou he schuld sain,
When he com þer þei worn.
Þan was sir Amis glad & biþe
& þanked him a þousand sþe
Þe time þat he was born.411

This passage provides essentially the same particulars as Karlsruhe and London, even though the AN versions do reveal some significant variation in phraseology vis-à-vis one another:

Ore est sire Amyloun alee
Qe ne resest sun journé,
Deqes en sun pay est venuz;

411 Leach, ll. 1417-40.
Mes quant Amy est aperceuz
De la venue sire Amylloun,
La veysssez joy a fussoun,
Greyngnur ne fu mes recounté,
En un chaumbre sunt aundui alee,
E lour robes chaungent atant;
Si n’est nul apercevaunt
De lour afere, plus ne meyns.

(A. 1204-14)
(K. 1204-14)

The only significant correlation with one AN version over the other is the passing mention
of Amiloun’s speedy return voyage itself which again suggests a heavier reliance on the
Karlsruhe tradition. Where the ME redactor does show his own creativity is in the final
six lines in which Amiloun instructs Amis to “wend home again” and “teaches him what
to say.” Such an address has the effect of placing Amis in a subordinate position to his
“brother,” underscoring a disparity that is subtly developed throughout the ME narrative.
Though the version never explicitly differentiates between the two in terms of station,
Amiloun is consistently portrayed as primus inter paras.412 This impression is further
realised through Amis’s obsequious thanksgiving in the final tercet and the beginning of
the next.

Prior to separating, Amis addresses Amiloun, promising to render him aid if it is
ever needed:

“Broher,” he seyd, “3if it bitide so
Pat þe bitide care Øper wo,
& of mine help hast nede,
Sauelich com Øper sende þi sond,
& y schal neuer lenger wipstond,
Al so god me spede;
Be it in periil neuer so strong,
Y schal þe help in ri3t & wrong,
Mi liif to lese to mede.”413

The address itself has no direct correlation in any of the earlier versions, but may have
been suggested by a passage describing Amis’s new found prosperity more directly
interpreted five stanzas later. However, it bears a striking resemblance to the duke’s words
to Amiloun on his original parting:

“Ac 3if euer it bifalle so
Pat þou art in wer & wo

412 Much as in the tradition of Roland and Olivier, Achilles and Patroclus, or David and Jonathan.
413 Leach, II. 1444-52.
& of mine help hast nede,
Sauliche com or send þi sond,
& wip al mi powere of mi lond
Y schal wreke þe of þat dede.\textsuperscript{414}

In this, it seems an inversion of the "relative hierarchy" existing between the companions as detailed above. Though this does represent a turning point for Amis (who now becomes duke and lord through marriage, and who will later provide succour to Amiloun) it also demonstrates the ME redactors heavy use of formulaic language in particular situations, a subject more fully explored in chapter five. It is more likely this stylistic use of language that prompts the redactor to choose these words rather than any sudden inversion of the characters' positions.\textsuperscript{415} Just as in the previous instance, this direct discourse is effective in signalling the end of one section before moving on to new developments.

\textit{Amiloun at Home}

The episode begins with an introductory half stanza in which the companions separate and Amiloun returns home:

(122) Asonder þan þai gun wende;
Sir Amiloun, þat kniȝt so hende,
Went hom in þat tide
To his leuedi þat was vnkende,
& was ful welcome to his frende,
As prince proue in pride.\textsuperscript{416}

The redactor has chosen to differentiate between the attitude of the "unkende" wife and the welcome by his "friend."\textsuperscript{417} Such a characterisation is entirely logical given the wife's future behaviour, but such immediate defamation does not occur in AN. This unflattering characterisation is not only typical of the ME in showing characters as "black or white," however, but it is also reminiscent of the OF in which Lubias is always portrayed in a sinister light.

In the remainder of the stanza Amiloun and his wife resume their marital relations:

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{414} Leach, ll. 235-40.
\item \textsuperscript{415} See Ford, \textit{Differentiating the Identical}, which outlines how even as care-giver, Amis is fulfilling a "feminine role" in respect to Amiloun's "masculine" one.
\item \textsuperscript{416} Leach, ll. 1453-58.
\item \textsuperscript{417} It is noteworthy that MSS S & D change "unkende" to "rich and kende"; however, as already explained, Auchinleck is nearest the original interpretation, so its word selection takes precedence.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
In hir armes he gan hir kis
& made his ioie & michel blis,
For nofing he nold abide.418

This foregrounds his wife’s inquiry concerning the sword Amis had habitually placed
between them at night, permitting Amiloun to know of his friend’s loyalty. In London her
question is prefaced simply by “Com il en son lit gisoit, / Sa bele dame a li disoit,” while
Karlsruhe entirely omits the preface as well as the question. The OF, at least, does
provide a similar preface (albeit to a somewhat different conversation) which occurs at the
same point in the narrative and is just as descriptive as this ME preface:

Li cuens Amis s’en est aléz couchier,
Dejouste lui Lubias sa moilliier.
Quant gabi ont asséz et delitié
Et tout ont fait quantque an lit aifert,
La male damme l’en prinst a arraisnier.419

Though it is not very likely that the ME redactor had an OF exemplar in front of him, it is
possible that he remember such a scene from that version and shifts it to introduce the
conversation concerning the sword, a logical arrangement.

Stanza 123 then presents the question itself:

(123) Pe leuedi astite asked him þo
Whi þat he hadde fafn so
Al þat fourtenni3t,
Laid his swerd bitven hem to,
þat sche no durst nou3t for wele no wo
Touche his bodi ari3t.
Sir Amiloun bipou3t him þan
His broper was a trewe man,
þat hadde so done, apli3t.420

In London, the same question leads to a similar realisation:

“Me diez par amour de moy
Car jeo vus aime en bone fey -
Ta espee nue meistes entre nous,
Sire, purquei le feistes vous?”
“Dame, jeo [ne] le dirrai mes;

418 Leach, II. 1459-64.
419 Dembowski, II. 2003-07. [Count Amis went to his bed; beside him lay his wife Lubias. Once they had enjoyed and
delighted each other and done all that a man and wife may o, the wicked woman began to speak.] In OF, the conversation
which follows is one in which Lubias accuses Amile of having used a cross-bow to “cheat” in the battle with the steward.
There is at this point no need for the sword to be addressed because the previous stanza has already clarified the issue.
420 Leach, II. 1465-73.
In both, the wife’s question leads to Amiloun’s understanding of his friend’s complete fidelity. This quality is more praiseworthy in the ME, however, because Amis had been given permission to sleep with her in order to maintain their ruse. Such treatment is characteristic of the ME in order to underscore the companions’ loyalty to one another. It is interesting, however, that in the AN this conversation does not occur in Karlsruhe, generally much closer to the ME than London, but this does not necessarily mean that the actual exemplar also omitted the scene. Given that the occurrence in London and Cambridge is so similar to that of Auchinleck, it is possible that the exemplar contained it as well, but that Karlsruhe itself is a defective version of that tradition in its omission.421

One important issue where the ME redactor does make a significant change is in Amiloun’s reaction. As seen above in London 803-4, he flatly refuses to give his wife any explanation. In the ME, however, he immediately tells her everything:

“Dame,” he seyd, “ichil þe sain & telle þe þat soþe ful fain, Ac wray me to no wiȝt.”

(124) þe leuedi astite him fraint gan, For his loue, þat þis warld wan, Telle hir whi it ware. Þan astite þat hendy man, Al þe soþe he teld hir ðan, To court hou he gan fare, & hou he slouȝ þe steward strong, Þat wiȝ tresoun & wiȝ wrong Wold haue his broþer forfare, & hou his broþer, þat hendi kniȝt Lay wiȝ hir in bed ich niȝt While þat he was þare.422

There is no correspondence to this speech in any of the earlier versions, and it must be assumed to be the creation of the redactor. It is a useful addition, however, in that it prefaces the wife’s tirade against her husband for slaying the steward, technically an innocent man. The wife’s anger itself also serves an important function in creating internal coherence through its allusion to Amiloun’s misdeed:

---

421 It is also possible that the ME redactor adapted his scene from the OF, however, given that London/Cambridge are so much closer in detail than the OF, such a hypothesis is not as likely.
Her rage complements the shift of leprous punishment from retribution to false marriage/betrothal to falsified oath-taking prior to battle. Thus the ME redactor lends further support to his decision to utilise the angelic warning in the way he has. It is perhaps specifically in order to provide this support that he chooses to have Amiloun admit the truth to his wife. This unprecedented alteration furthermore gives the wife later justification for abandoning her husband when he becomes a leper, a situation which has no justification at all in previous versions.\textsuperscript{424} Thus, by providing an excuse for the wife’s ill-will, the redactor has created a link to eliminate lacunae within the earlier versions, while at the same time creating internal support for his own previous alterations, and thereby producing a more coherent and overall believable narrative.\textsuperscript{425}

In closing the stanza, and incidentally closing the episode, Amiloun tries to justify his actions:

\begin{quote}
"Dame," he seyd, "bi heuen king, Y no dede it for non oher ping Bot to saue mi broser fro wo, & ich hope, 3if ich hadde nede, his owen liif to lesse to mede, he wald help me al-so.\textsuperscript{426}
\end{quote}

Importantly, he never denies that his false oath was "unright" as the wife chastised, only that he gave it for magnanimous reasons. Though one may therefore argue that Amiloun has behaved "uncourtly" through conspiring to kill an innocent man, several factors seem to nullify such a conclusion. First, the steward’s actions, though technically justifiable, were inspired by malice whereas Amiloun’s were altruistic. Secondly, the warning itself coming \textit{before} the deed; Amiloun’s decision to proceed indicates his understanding that he will suffer for it, his willingness to accept this punishment, and most importantly, that his

\textsuperscript{422} Leach, II. 1474-88.
\textsuperscript{423} Leach, II. 1489-94.
\textsuperscript{424} In fact, the OF notes this bizarre situation. It goes to some length explaining that as a wife, Lubias should do all in her power to protect Ami and hide his leprosy from the world instead of abandoning him because of it. Perhaps remembrance of this \textit{non sequitur} also led to the ME redactor’s treatment.
\textsuperscript{425} As explained in Chapter 2, elimination of lacunae was considered to be a duty of the good translator.
\textsuperscript{426} Leach, II. 1495-1500.
intention is to aid his friend, not simply to “trick” justice. Ultimately, therefore, Amiloun’s actions are even more courtly and this is especially apparent when one recalls the OF/AN versions. In OF, there is no “warning” per se, only a premonition of what is going to happen after Ami has already performed the deed for which he will be punished. In the AN, Amiloun is coerced into giving a false betrothal, though he is invariably reluctant to do so. Only in the ME does he willingly perform a deed for which he knows he will suffer, but does so gladly for the sake of his friend.

Amis at Court

It is after the resumption of identities and Amiloun’s encounter with his wife, largely an interpolation of the redactor, that the ME returns to provide information concerning Amis. In the AN, this information is given immediately after the departure, the thread of the story following Amis long enough to conclude his story entirely before leaving off and turning to Amiloun saying:

Ore lerrons de Amys ester,  
Assez ad de quanqe ad mester,  
Si vus diray de Amylloun.  

(K. 1248-50)

Ore vodrom de Amis lesser,  
Qe assez ad dount il ad mester.  
Vus dirrai de sire Amillioun...  

(L. 793-95)

The ME, as demonstrated, instead follows Amiloun in order to show his conflict with his wife. Only after that information is provided does he return to Amis, telling of his new elevated status:

(126) Al þus in gest as we sain,  
Sir Amis was ful glad & fain,  
To court he gan to wende;  
& when he come to court o3ain  
Wîp erl, baroun, kni3t & swain,  
Honoured he was, þat hende.  
Þat riche douke tok him bi hond  
& sesed him in alle his lond,  
To held wîp-outen ende;  
& seþpen wîp ioie opon a day  
He spoused Belisent, þat may,  
Þat was so trewe & kende.427

Though the order has changed, in many respects this initial description is still reminiscent of the AN:428

427 Leach, ll. 1501-12.  
428 Note that Karlsruhe 1234-35 corresponds to London 777-78, but that Karlsruhe 1236-37 corresponds to London 771-72.
Like the AN, the ME has Amis inherit all the lands of the duke, becoming a lord of several lands due to his marriage with Belisaunt. The main change in the ME is the mention that “upon a day” they were married. As previously mentioned, in the AN there is never an actual marriage between the couple, Amiloun having taken his friends part in the ceremony beforehand. This is a crucial rearrangement to legitimise the marriage between Belisaunt and Amis, and to eliminate any falsified ceremony.

In the next stanza, the wedding feast itself is described:

(127) Miche was þat semly folk in sale,
ðat was samned at þat bridale
When he hadde spoused þat flour,
Of erls, barouns, mani & ðale,
& oper lordinges gret & smale,
& leuedis bri3t in bour.
A real feast þai gan to bold
Of erls & of barouns bold
Wip iole & michel honour;
Ouer al þat lond est & west
Þan was sir Amis helden þe best
& chosen for priis in tour.429

In placing the wedding after the resumption of identities, there is a hint of the OF, for though in that version there is a false betrothal the wedding itself is completely legitimate.

Ami brings her back to Blaye with him and presents her to Amile, saying:

"Je voz ai mort Hardré vostre anemi,

429 Leach, Il. 1513-24.
Si voz amaing Belissant au cler vis.
Voz la panrez, que li rois le m’a dit."430

In the next laisse, there is mention of a feast following the celebration itself:

La nuit le laissen descii a l’aube clere,
Que Belissant ont au monstier menee.
Li cuens Amiles l’a iluic espousee.
El palais montent sans nulle demoree,
Grans noces firent li fil des franches meres,
Com li cuens prinst la damme.431

Thus, the ME follows the example of the OF in having a lawful wedding, and in following it by a feast. There is also evidence of Karlsruhe in the ME’s description of the celebration. As may be remembered, in Karlsruhe 865-76 the duke calls a great assembly which fills the city of Paris.432 It is this baronage to whom he proposes the wedding. Then after the wedding, there is a feast on such a scale that the narrator can hardly describe it:

Li reis, il tient feste plenere
Un quinzaine tote entere;
Assez i urent robes donés,
Tant menestra i sount feffez.

Seignurs, qe auques avez veu
Un usage est en vein tenu
Trop de jaungle mettre en geste
De la richesce ke om fest a feste,
De lour viande grand pompe attraire,
Mes joe ne ay curé a qe faire.

(K. 1064-73)

430 Dembowski, II. 1945-47. ["I have killed Hardret your enemy for you, and now bring clear-faced Belissaunt. You will marry her, as the king has told me."]
431 Dembowski, II. 1966-74. [They parted that night until daybreak, when Belissant was led to the church and count Amile wed her. With no delay everyone then went to the castle, and all those worthy mothers’ sons made a great feast for the count and his bride.]
432 The quotation referred to is:

La boyste prent le chemyn choysé,
Ja sojorun ne delay presné,
Par deqes amant qe il ad surflays
Les countrés e les pays
De quanqe apent a sun message.
Este vus venu si grand barnage
Vers la cite de Parys
De les ii. moys encomplys
Qe en tote la vile, ce dy la geste,
A chival, ne chamayl, ne autre beste,
Ne ust hom place voyde trové,
Qe une n’eut le ust herbergé.
Thus, though the redactor has followed the OF in respect to the order of events, he has relied on information in the Karlsruhe tradition to fill out the details of the narrative.

In the final stanza, the ME redactor then mentions the death of the duke which secures Amis in his status and possessions:

(128) So wip-in þo 3eres to
A wel fair grace fel hem þo,
As god almi3ti wold;
Pe riche douke dyed hem fro
& his leuedi dede al-so,
& grauen in grete so cold.
Þan was sir Amis, hende & fre,
Douke & lord of gret pouste
Ouer al þat lond yhold.
Tvaï childer he bi3at bi his wiue,
Pe fairest þat mi3t bere liue,
In gest as it is told.433

Here there is a connection with London for which there is no correspondence in the other versions:

Tant qe le counte enmaladi.
E quant longtemps out languï,
Morust e a Deu rendist s’alme;
E tost aprês morust la dame.
Quant mortz furent pere e mere,
Il ne eust soer ne frere
For sout la dame qe Amis aveit,
Pur ceo les terres recevoit.

(L. 785-92)

Both mention the death of Belisaunt’s parents as the final event which secures Amis’s succession. Although London provides much more detail, there does seem to be a connection between these traditions. More interestingly, the ME adds additional information in the final tercet concerning Amiloun’s children. Though of no immediate relevance, such mention presents no contradiction to Amis’s new-found situation, and indeed could be thought of as supporting it. Furthermore, such a convenient early allusion prevents later need to wrench the plot by introducing them at a crucial moment when their presence is required.

433 Leach, ll. 1525-36.
Conclusion

Here above all the redactor has treated his material freely, but nevertheless the hallmarks of previous versions exist. It is difficult to reckon which, if any, is closest to the actual exemplar. In many instances it seems to have a strong affinity with Karlsruhe, as it has tended to do throughout the narrative. At some points, it seems to have borrowed ideas from the OF tradition, adapting it rather freely, as though done from memory more than actual reliance. Most interestingly, there are portions that bear more of a resemblance to London than any other version. This is particularly the case in the central battle scene, which is missing from Karlsruhe. There are, however, other points as well where the ME and London agree against the other versions, heretofore a rare occurrence. This may suggest that the exemplar, most certainly in the Karlsruhe tradition, contained the information but that Karlsruhe itself was defective in lacking it; or, it might imply that as with the OF, there was a passing knowledge of an additional version upon which the redactor relied.

In any case, it is undeniable that in some respects he has intentionally created "improvements" to the work. His shifting of the leprosy from punishment for false marriage/betrothal to false witness is the prime example, and the resulting necessity for rearranging of information thereafter. In many respects his treatment has indeed provided what today would be considered a "superior" version in terms of narration. He eliminates lacunae existing in previous versions while endeavouring to provide links which prevent their occurrence in his own version. He constantly signals shifts in the narrative with recapitulation in conclusion and introductory verses or entire stanza. He even manages to foreshadow events which come well after the episodes currently recounted. His entire handling of the material therefore, including additions, abridgements and other alterations, all conform to the strictures suggested for a remanieur.
DIVISION 4A-B: Amiloun at Home

Leprosy

This section commences with a transitional half stanza which summarises Amis’s position and directs the audience’s attention to Amiloun:

(129) Pan was pat kni3t of gret renoun
& lord of mani a tour & toun
& douke of gret pouste;
& his bropher, Sir Amiloun,
Wip sorwe & care was driuen adoun,
Patre was hende & fre.\textsuperscript{434}

The remainder of the stanza then relates the cause of being “driven down,” the divinely ordained leprosy:

Al so pat angel hadde him told,
Fouler messel \textsuperscript{par} nas non hold
In world \textsuperscript{pan} was he.
In gest to rede it is gret rewpe,
What sorwe he hadde for his treupe
Wip-in \textsuperscript{po} 3eres \textsuperscript{pre}.\textsuperscript{435}

Apart from some insignificant stylistic changes, this is not very different from the AN version of events:

Ore l’aproche la maladie
De si treforte leprosie
Ke tut comence la pel crever,
E tut la face a burgouner.

(K. 1260-63)

Ove sa feme tant demorra
Qe tot son pel ly arracha.
Si malade e si laid devint
Qe checun pur mesel li tint.

(L. 807-10)

The most notable change is that Karlsruhe focuses on the disfigurement itself and London refers to the reaction of the lady and the court while the ME, though mentioning Amiloun has become “the foulest leper,” provides the additional detail of the disease resulting from his “truth,” i.e., his lie which stemmed from his fidelity to his friend. The ME also repeats the reference to a three-year period mentioned in the warning. In relating these particulars, the ME redactor links this event directly back to previous episodes, thereby providing a more coherent narrative.

\textsuperscript{434} Leach, II. 1537-42.
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The following stanza (130) then provides information concerning the mistreatment Amiloun suffers due to his illness:

(130) & er þo þre 3ere come to þende
He no wist whider he miȝt wende,
So wo was him bigon;
For al þat were his best frende,
& namelicke al his riche kende,
Bicom his most fon;
& his wiȝf, for soþe to say,
Wrouȝt him wers boþe niȝt & day
Þan þei dede eueриchon.
When him was fallen þat hard cas,
A frendeleser man þan he was
Men nist no-whar non.

The first tercet provides an element of foreshadowing, suggesting that Amiloun will soon be forced from his home, a linking detail absent in earlier versions. The second refers to the disloyalty of his retainers in light of his disease, and the third to the even more felonious disloyalty of his wife. The final tercet them summarises the position, naming him the “most friendless” man in the world. Though these points do have some similarity with the London version in the quotation above (807-10), in terms of detail it is more aligned with one of Karlsruhe’s interpolations:

Si malades e laiz devent
Qe checuns pur meseaus le tynt.
Ses chivalers lui vnt guerpy,
E ses serjauns reveley,
E sa femme nomement
Pur autres hayr le prent.
Si lui despyse de jour en jour;
Ore la mandye cyl seignur
Ke fyt ciel, tere, e mer,
Car unqes ne oyst hom parler
De femme a marri si contrarie!
Lui meseaus, ke ne set, qe fere,
De plus en plus s’enmaledyt
E si teriblement enlaydyt,
Qe en curt ne ad villeyus ne veylle
Qe une foyz rewarde le voylle.

(K. 1264-79)

435 Leach, II. 1543-8.
436 Leach, II. 1549-60.
Here again is the image of first the court’s disloyalty, then the wife’s, and finally, a note of divine nature of the punishment as seen in ME 1543. It is not inconceivable that this signals yet another connection between Karlsruhe and the ME.

This similarity to Karlsruhe is maintained in the first tercet of the following stanza, referring directly to the wife’s treachery:

(131) So wicked & schrewed was his wiif,
Sche brac his hert wi~outen kniif,
Wi~ wordes harde & kene,437

La dame ke tant fu vilayne
E des mauz tretote playne,
Sun mari ad a teu despyst
Ke mes ne le suffra, ce dyt,

(K. 1280-3)

However, after this point ME wife begins to chastise her husband for bringing the condition upon himself through his dishonest dealings in the combat against the steward:

& seyd to him, “Pou wreche chaitif,
Wip wrong þe steward les his liif,
& þat is on þe sene;
Þer-fore, bi Seyn Denis of Fraunce,
Þe is bitid þis hard chaunce,
Daþet who þe bimene!”
Wel oft times his honden he wrong,
As man þat þenkeþ his liif to long,
Þat liueþ in treye & tene.438

This divergence has no precedent in the French versions, and its inclusion here demonstrates the redactor’s skill at story-telling; the reference justifies the wife’s initial anger on learning of the exchange of identities, and gives support to the belief that this punishment is for false witness, making the redactor’s change from retribution for false marriage/betrothal more credible.

Taken together, these three stanzas clearly illustrate the redactor’s technique. They demonstrate his practice of combining elements from his exemplar with those of his own creation in order to provide a coherent, logical narrative full of internal links which make the story more believable. Though not far off from the AN version, it is nevertheless a new adaptation which in terms of style and content may be said to surpass those of the original.

437 Leach, II. 1561-3.
438 Leach, II. 1564-72.
Amiloun Removed from Court; Introduction of Amoraunt

Driven Away from the Table

As Amiloun’s condition worsens, he is finally forced from his position of honour:

(132) Allas, allas! þat gentil kniȝt
þat whilom was so wise & wiȝt,
þat þan was wrouȝt so wo,
þat fram his leuedi, fair & briȝt,
Out of his owhen chaumber a-niȝt
He was yhote to go,
& in his owhen halle o-day
Fram þe heiȝe bord owey
He was ycharged al-so
To eten at þe tables ende;
Wald þer no man sit him hende,
Wel careful was he þo.\(^{439}\)

Here again there is a striking parallel to Karlsruhe, especially in the specific mention of being forced from his own chamber:

Si prés de sez oyls mover,
Mes une chambre lui fait lever
Eins un gardyn si povrement
Pur prendre solaz de la gent.
(K. 1284-7)

There are also parallels with London in the mention of the wife refusing to sleep beside him and his banishment from the table:

La dame li tint trop en despit:
Ne voleit entrer en son lit,
Ne voleit auxi od lui parler,
Ne od li beivre ne manger.
(L. 811-14)

Although the specific detail concerning the room is identical to Karlsruhe, the general sentiment is so close to London that it is difficult to pinpoint exactly which tradition is being followed. The best that can be assumed is that the exemplar contained information from both traditions, but that it was actually closer to Karlsruhe in terms of specifics.

\(^{439}\) Leach, ll. 1573-84.
Driven Away from the Court

The uncertain allegiance of the ME to the AN sources is further evidenced when it comes to Amiloun's banishment from court. The ME shares some points in common with both AN versions, but also has discrepancies with each, and again introduces some entirely new information:

(133) Bi þan þat half 3ere was ago
þat he hadde eten in halle so
Wip gode mete & wip drink,
His leuedi wax ful wroþ & wo
& þou3t he liued to long þo –
Wip-outen ani lesing –
“In þis lond springep þis word,
Y fede a mesel at mi bord,
He is so foule a þing,
It is gret spite to al mi kende,
He schal no more sitt me so hende,
Bi lhesus, heuen king!”

(134) On a day sche gan him calle
& seyd, “Sir, it is so bifalle,
For solpe, y telle it te,
þat þou etest so long in halle,
It is gret spite to ous alle,
Mi kende is wroþ wip me.”
þe kni3t gan wepe & seyd ful stille,
“Do me where it is þi wille,
þer noman may me se;
Of no more ichil þe praye,
Bot of a meles mete ich day,
For seynt charite.”

(135) þat leuedi, for hir lordes sake,
Anon sche dede men timber take,
For nóþing wold she wond,
& half a mile fram þe gate
A litel loge sche lete make,
Biside þe way to stond.
& when þe loge was al wrou3t,
Of his gode no wold he no3t,
Bot his gold coupe an hond.
When he was in his loge alon,
To god of heuen he made his mon
& þonked him of al his sond.440

Most of these sentiments are found in both AN versions:
In all three versions, it is thought Amiloun “lives too long” (ME 1589; K. 1288; L. 815), though ME is closer to London in that it is the wife who thinks this instead of the court generally as in Karlsruhe. All share mention of the passage of half a year to a year (ME. 1585; K. 1295; L. 817), though London and Karlsruhe are arguably the same in that he “suffers that year” in his hut while in ME it is “more than half a year.” Finally, Amiloun is ultimately removed to a hut at the edge of town in each version (ME 1609-18; K. 1300-1; L. 832-4), but here all three provide slightly different circumstances.

In Karlsruhe, the lady banishes him and orders a garrison to guard him in the hut. In London, he is abandoned by all his knights except for “the son of a count whom he had raised,” both of whom are thrown out of court together. In the ME by contrast, the lady appeals to Amiloun, saying that all her kin are angry with her for keeping a leper, and in that version alone does Amiloun himself come to a solution, offering to leave the court if his wife will provide him a meal each day.441 There is clearly some adaptation, but it is very difficult to determine which tradition is being followed.

One point that London presents which is initially overlooked in Karlsruhe and ME is introduction of the loyal young retainer. He is subsequently introduced in the ME in stanzas 136-37:

441 Leach, II. 1585-1620.
In-to þat loge when he was diȝt,
In al þe court was þer no wiȝt
Þat wold serue him þare,
To saue a gentil child, ypliȝt,
Child Owaines his name it hiȝt,
For him he wepe ful sare.
Þat child was trewe & of his kende,
His soster sone, he was ful hende;
He sayd to him ful ȝare,
Ywis, he no schuld neuer wond
To seruen him fro fot to hond,
While he oluies ware.

Pat child, þat was so fair & bold,
Owaines was his name ytold,
Wel fair he was of blode.
When he was of tveleue ȝere old,
Amoraunt þan was he cald,
Wel curteys, hend & gode.
Bi his lord ich niȝt he lay
& feched her liuere euer day
To her liues fode.
When ich man made gle & song,
Euer for his lord among
He made dreri mode. 442

This introduction after the fact has a parallel in Karlsruhe, and in both AN versions he is credited with the same loyalty as found in the ME:

Ore est moune sire Amylloun 0, misires Amyllioun,
Mys a moule povere leuresoun. Mis estes a povre garisoun!
Jadis fu sire e seignur; Jadis fu sire e seignur;
N'est merveiye si il ad dolour! Nest pas merveiye s'il ad dolour.
La mort desire plus ke la vie La mort desire plus qe la vie;
Quant ne ad solaz ne compayngnye; Nul solas ad ne compaignie:
Ne n'ad home a ki parler, N'ad home a qui parler,
Ne a ki se dolours put mustre, Ne a qui poet son dolur moustrer,
Fors un enfant, ke lui servoyt − Fors a l'enfant que ly serveit.
Fys de un baroun estoit −
Qe ove lui estoit demurrez;
Owayns fu l'enfant nomez.

(K. 1306-17)

The most significant difference is that in both AN versions the child is a loyal page while in the ME he is Amiloun's "sister's son." This indicates a fundamental shift in

441 It is also only the ME that makes allusion to the cup. As explained in division 2A, the cups are entirely omitted in the AN until they are required as a recognition sign later in the narrative. Here again the ME redactor is careful to make continuous reference to important details which give the story overall coherence and credibility.

442 Leach, ll. 1621-44.
perceptions. Though there was long standing precedence for noble youths to enter service at another court around the age of seven, the redactor has chosen to invoke the avuncular relationship, usually regarded as the strongest tie that can exist between two generations of men; it is indeed a more "primitive" characteristic of the ME, but one which is found in the Germanic and romantic traditions alike. In presenting the youth as Amiloun’s nephew, the redactor more firmly legitimises the boy’s loyalty to his lord.

A particular correlation with Karlsruhe is the initial mention of the boy’s name immediately after introducing him as in the ME. London does not name him until much later, but when it does, it gives the same alias as that found in ME:

Le noun vous dirray de l’enfant:
La gent l’appelent Amorant,
Mes Uwein fuit son dreit noun.

(L. 880-2)

Karlsruhe never actually mentions the name “Amoraunt,” though it comes close when (as also emphasised in ME) it tells of his refusal to leave Amiloun, and remaining with him night and day:

Cist enfes qu vus dy, Owayns,
Fu si leaus e si certayns,
Si natureus ad sun seyngnur
Qe unques ne volleyt, nuit ne jour,
De sire Amilloun departyr,
Ja tant meschefs le veyt suffryr;
Ains se tient tut sun vivant
Si tretut fyt sun comand;
Car unke ne oyst home parler
De un fant Amur si cler.

(L. 1318-27)

Again, however, the various discrepancies and analogies are so intertwined that it is impossible to clearly ascertain which AN version is closest to ME. The order of things follows Karlsruhe, but the specific details are more in line with London.

One point where London and Karlsruhe agree against the ME is in the omission of some eighty-six lines which introduce Amiloun’s son, Florentin, a character who also appears in the OF under the name of Girard. In both the OF and Karlsruhe, anger over Amiloun’s son’s loyalty is the primary cause of his wife’s eventual decision to withhold all

443 In many older traditions, the relationship between a man and his sister’s son was usually conceived of as being stronger than even that between a man and his own son. This is the relationship of Roland to Charlemagne, Gawain to Arthur, Ospak Glumsson and Skeggj Gamlason to Grettir, Hoskuld Njalson to Ingaid, etc.
food and succour to her husband. It is therefore an excellent device for advancing the plot by explaining the wife's actions. Why, then, would the ME redactor chose to omit it? At first glance, it would appear that it simply did not occur in his exemplar, and that therefore he must have been using a version closer to London. However, given the already demonstrated knowledge of the OF, it could also be concluded that he intentionally decided to suppress what he judged to be "extraneous" material.

This point of view finds support when one observes how Florentin's presence would unnecessarily complicate the plot. In the OF, Girard reappears at the end of the narrative where he inherits Blaye from his father. Such a situation would be "undeserving" in the AN or ME because, despite Florentin's desire to be loyal, it is Amoraunt that has really "earned" to be heir through suffering with his lord. In the OF, this is not an issue since Ami is accompanied by servants whose station bars them from being inheritors. London avoids the complication by never naming an heir, but in so doing it leaves "loose ends." The ME redactor's decision to eliminate the son altogether, make Amoraunt a nephew to a childless Amiloun, and transferring all aspects of Florentin's loyalty to Amoraunt allows him to provide a deserving blood-relation as inheritor, thereby avoiding awkward discrepancies while allowing him to "tie up" the loose ends.

The next two stanzas demonstrate how the ME redactor skilfully shifts the cause of the lady's ire from Florentin's love to Amoraunt's loyalty:

(138) Pus Amoraunt, as y 3ou say,
Com to court ich day,
No stint he for no striue.
Al þat þer was gan him pray
To com fro þat lazer oway,
þan schuld he the & þrieue.
& he answerd wib milde mode
& swore bi him þat dyed on rode
& þoled woundes fiue,
For al þis worldes gode to take
His lord nold he neuer forsake
Whiles he ware oliue.

(139) Bi þan þe tvelmoneþ was al gon,
Amorant went in-to þat won
For his lordes liueray;
þe leuedi was ful wrop anon
& comaunde hir men euerichon
To drive þat child oway,
& swore bi him þat Judas sold,
þei his lord for hunger & cold

---

444 laisie 113.
Dyed þer he lay,
He schuld haue noijper mete no drink,
No socour of non oþer þing
For hir after þat day.445

Here Amoraunt has the same dedication to Amiloun as in London and Karlsruhe, but whereas his behaviour had no consequences in those version, in the ME it prompts the lady to withdraw food from her husband. In London her decision is given no more justification than:

Amillioun com plus viveit,
Tant plus leid deveneit.
La dame par tant defendi
Qe nul ne fut si hardi
Qe de rien li regardast,
Ne que manger li donast.

(L. 844-49)

This reason is hardly convincing since he has already been banished out of her sight. Though Karlsruhe provides adequate motivation through Florentin's love, for reasons already explained the ME redactor sees fit to eliminate his character. However, by attributing the fidelity of an expunged son to an attested nephew, the ME redactor both avoids the lacunae existing in London and the awkward conflict of interest that would have resulted as in Karlsruhe.446 Such a treatment based largely on abbreviatio could easily be undertaken with nothing more than a copy very much like Karlsruhe.447

Amoraunt Relays the News

In the following stanza, the ME follows the AN by having Amoraunt relate the news:

(140) þat child wrong his honden tvain
& weping went hom again
Wip sorwe & sikeing sare.
þat godeman gan him frain
& bad him þat he schuld him sain
& telle him whi it ware.
& he answerd & seyd þo,
"Ywis, no wonder þei me be wo,
Mine hert, it brekeþ for care;
Þi wiif hâþ [sworn] wiþ gret mode

445 Leach, II. 1633-56.
446 Due to the imperfect ending of Karlsruhe, it is impossible to know just how this situation was handled.
447 In support of this opinion, it is worth referring back to the ME redactor's omission of other particulars in Karlsruhe such as the lineage of felons, etc.
Both Karlsruhe and London have the same revelation:

Owayns a la court estoyt
Qe de manace escotoyt
Au bordel s'en veent currant:
"He sire," fet il, "pur Deu le grand,
Fort novele vus aporte,
Ja ad la dame sur la mort
Defendu par tut en fyn,
Ke vallet, vavasour, ne meschin,
Nus aporte mes a manger!"
(K. 1424-32)

Though the particulars are more fully related in the AN, the sentiment of the ME is exactly the same, the particulars having already been recounted in the lady's speech. Nevertheless, the fact that Amoraunt brings the news from the court to Amiloun and relates it through direct discourse is evidently more than coincidental.

There is, perhaps, also a particular correlation between ME and London in that Amoraunt is called "child" in both (ME. 1669; L. 850). If so, the special affinity shared between these versions is continued in the following half-stanza where Amiloun reflects of his fate:

(141) "A god help!" seyd þat gentil kni3t,
"Whilom y was man of mi3t,
To dele mete & clop,
& now icham so foule a wi3t
Þat al þat seþ on me bi si3t,
Mi liif is hem ful lop."449

This passage mirrors the reaction in London, for which there is no direct correspondence in Karlsruhe:

"Jhesu, le fïz seinte Marie,
Com longes me durra ceste vie?
Jeo solei aver grant tresour,
Estre servi d'argent e d'or,
Ore suy tant demené
Qe de ma vie est grant pité.
Si jeo de feim morir deveray

---

448 Leach, II. 1669-80.
449 Leach, II. 1681-86.
De mei memes force ne fray.”
(L. 856-63)

In both Amiloun reflects of his former power and wealth, contrasting it with his present state. In Karlsruhe, He only laments: “He Deu,” fet il, “moun fys cher! / Mud i ad donke mau sojour!” This sentiment, however, is in no way contradictory to the ME or London reaction, simply telescoped. Thus, though it might well seem that the ME is more bound to the London tradition in this particular passage, it is equally plausible that, given as he is to expansion, the redactor has just added some well attested stock phrases to pad out the narrative.

The second half-stanza, in which Amiloun decides they must beg their bread, shows a very slight similarity to Karlsruhe:

“Sone,” he seyd, “lete þi wepeing,
For þis is now a strong tiding,
Þat may we se for soþ;
For, certes, y can non oþer red,
Ous bihouþ to bid our brede,
Now y wot hou it goþ.”

Karlsruhe likewise presents a determination to seek their needs outside the domain:

“Veire,” fet il, “moun seignur,
Alums tost hors de cete vile!”
(K. 1435-36)

It is clear that if the ME redactor does make use of this sentiment, it is very much abbreviated and drastically recast. In Karlsruhe it is Amoraunt who suggests begging, while in the ME it is Amiloun. Furthermore, this suggestion meets with very different consequences in the following lines. It nevertheless remains, however, that only in these two versions does the suggestion of seeking alms follow Amiloun’s lamentations which come as a direct result of Amoraunt’s news.

**Interim Wandering**

After this passage, however, ME diverges from its sources quite radically. Karlsruhe begins a dialogue in which Amiloun claims he is too ill to move, and vainly begs Owein, “son and heir of a baron” to return to court (K. 1437-59). In London, Amoraunt simply

---

450 Karlsruhe, ll. 1433-34.
451 It is also possible that this situation was provided in the exemplar, but that it was not passed to Karlsruhe.
452 Leach, ll. 1687-92.
states he would rather die than leave (L. 864-9). In both, the boy says he would rather suffer with the lord than be emperor (K. 1460-3; L. 870-1). Each concludes with a passage in which they tearfully regard each other, lamenting their state:

Quant l’un ad l’autre regardé
Plurend e dicerent lur dras,
Sovent se clayment cheytyfs las;
Pleinent le grand chivalerie,
E la honour, e la seygnurie,
Ke sire AmiUoun out eu,
Qe ore est a niant devenu.
(K. 1467-73)

Quant l’un l’autre ad regarde,
Mout est entre eux grant pité:
Plurent e decirent lour draps,
Sovent se clayment cheifit e las;
Plein[en]t de grant chivalrie
Le honur e la seignurie
Qe sire Amillioun avoit eu,
Qe ore est devenu.
(L. 872-79)

There is no corresponding reaction in the ME. Instead, the redactor inserts five stanzas recounting an interim wandering through the lord’s own lands which has no precedent.\(^{453}\) They first go to a market town where the prosperous population is happy to provide for them. They build a hut at the edge of the town and beg alms from those going to market. After four years, however, a famine strikes and the people have nothing more to give them. They reflect on their poverty and think how the lady, not five miles away, still has plenty.

This addition is entirely the work of the redactor, and it suffers from being contradictory. Though it does serve an important function in extending their suffering temporally, it is clearly not as well though out as the majority of the redactor’s additions. The original implication is that the pair leaves the realm entirely, thus satisfying the lady’s decree that no help be given to them. It is inconceivable that after her command four years could pass in which they were continuously accorded food and shelter within an hour’s ride from court. The audience would therefore assume that this “cheeping town” in which they build a hut must be free-town well outside her jurisdiction. Such a scenario must have been the redactor’s original intent. After this interim period of relative prosperity, however, the redactor sees the need to push the pair on their way to the ultimate reunion with Amis, and therefore devises to a famine. This provides the impetus, but the means are still lacking.\(^{454}\) At this point, therefore, the redactor turns back to the example in the AN where the lady gives them just enough aid to send them on their way.

---

\(^{453}\) Leach, stanzas 142-6, ll. 1693-1752.

\(^{454}\) Given the redactor’s understandable reluctance to demonstrate Amiloun’s ability to travel as easily as he does after four years, he would not want them to simply walk away under their own power.
**Lady Gives them Asses and Commands them Never to Return**

In this episode, the ME returns to the example provided by the AN, picking up the thread exactly where it left off for the interim wandering. Seeing no other course, Amiloun sends Amoraunt to ask for aid from his wife:

(147) On a day, as þai sete alon,  
þat hendi kniȝt gan meken his mon  
& seyd to þe child þat tide, –  
“Sone,” he seyd, “þou most gon  
To mi leuedi swiþe anon,  
þat wonþ here biside,  
Bid hir, for him þat died on rode,  
Sende me so michel of al mi gode,  
An asse, on to ride,  
& out of lond we wil fare  
To begge our mete wiþ sorwe & care,  
No lenger we nil abide.”

This passage clearly draws on information in the AN:

“Owayns,” ce dyt Amylloun,  
“Pur Deu entendez ma resun!  
Pus ke ensi est de le aler  
N’ad desire qe parler,  
Ayns ouvekis moy vivere volez  
En message a la dame irrez,  
Si la dites baudement  
Qe de le demurer ne moy plest nent  
Ayns su prest le pays vuder,  
Saunz jammés ce croy returner.  
Mes ne pus voyr aler a pee,  
Priez la dame par charité  
Ke ele me face un asne aver  
En qi me puse chivacher,  
E de une repast par la journé,  
Si seít ele en fyn quite clamé.”

(K. 1474-89)

Donque li dist sire Amyllioun:  
‘Oweyn, a la dame irrez,  
Nostre conge de li prendrez.  
Hors de cee paiz irroms  
A plus tost que nous pooms.  
Mes jeo ne puis aler a pié;  
Priez a lui par charité  
Qe ele me face une ane doner  
Qe jeo puisse chivacher.’

(L. 883-91)

In all versions Amiloun uses direct discourse, sends Amoraunt to the lady, and requests a mount with which he may depart never to return. In London the mount requested is a horse, while in ME and Karlsruhe, it is an ass. Though this may seem an insignificant

---

455 In doing so, it is slightly closer to Karlsruhe, for it is between the above quotation in which the pair tearfully regard each other and the request of an ass that London inserts the three lines which introduce Owein’s names. This, however, seems to be an accidental correlation more than anything else, and does not in any way detract from the continuity of narrative time.

456 Leach, II. 1763-54.
detail, it would certainly have had particular connotations in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries as a mark of status. As such, it might well indicate a particular connection between Karlsruhe and the ME.457

Such affinity with Karlsruhe also appears in the following two stanzas. In all versions Amoraunt makes the request and is provided for accordingly, but in London the entire episode condensed into six lines:

L'enfant a la dame ala,
Son message li counta.
Ele li fist un asne aver,
E pus sus les seintz jurer
Qe mes en le pais [ne] vendreit
De l'hure qe issi serreit.

(L. 892-97)

Karlsruhe, however, provides thirty-seven lines which recount Amoraunt’s actual request and the lady’s reaction:

Owayns est averty e sage
Si s’en vait fere la message;
Vynt a la dame si s’engenoyle:
“Ma dame,” fet il, “dire vus voylle
Pur ce ke lui meseaus a bordel,
Ne semble ke fust bon ne leal
Qe vers lui ussez trop gros quer,
Le pays dyt ke vut voyder;
Mes aler ne put certes a pee,
Si vus requer par charité,
Qe una asne lui facez aver
En ki se puse chivacher,
E de un soul repast ausi
Si vus aquites tut de lui.”

Quant la dame oy l’enfaunt
Teles noveles aportant,
Onques mes ne estoyt si lee,
De joye get une grand risé
Ke tut la sale rebounde;
Le fiz Marie la confounde!

“Certes,” fet ele, “un asne avera,
E de une repast certes ne faudra
A teles ke tanost s’en aylle;
E dites lui la diffinaylle,
Ke si mes en pays remeyngne

457 It must be noted, however, that later London also substitutes an ass.
This account is much more like that found in the ME than is London's version:

(148) Amoraunt to court is went
Bifor þat leuedi fair & gent,
Wel hendeliche seyd hir anon,
“Madame,” he seyd, “verrament,
As me[s]sanger mi lord me sent,
For him-self may nou3t gon,
& praieste wiþ milde mode,
Sende him so michel of al his gode
As an asse to riden opon,
& out of lond we schulen yfere,
No schal we neuer com eft here,
þei hunger ous schuld slon.”

(149) þe leuedi seyd sche wald ful fain
Sende him gode asses tvain,
Wiþ þi he wald oway go
So fer þat he neuer eft com again.
“Nat, certes, dame,” þe child gan sain,
“þou sest ous neuer eft mo.”
þan was þe leuedi glad & blipe
& comaund him an asse as swiþe
& seyd wiþ wretþe þo,
“Now 3e schul out of lond fare,
God leue 3ou neuer to com here mare,
& graunt þat it be so.”

It is true that the ME softens the lady's brutality, but doing so is characteristic given that the redactor often refines his narrative. More to the point are the similarities shared. In both, Amoraunt's request and the lady's response are given in direct discourse, but dedicate a few lines to the lady's internal joy, and in both she tells them to leave and never return. If the exact words are not adopted, it does seem likely that the structure at least owes a debt to the Karlsruhe tradition.

These similarities with Karlsruhe continue in the next stanza in which Amoraunt returns to his lord, explains the situation, gets him mounted and they depart:

(150) þat child no lenger nold abide,
His asse astite he gan bistride
& went him hom again,

458 Leach, ll. 1765-88.
& told his lord in that tide
Hou his leuedi proude in pride
Schameliche gan to sain;
Opon þe asse he sett þat kniþt so hende,
& out of þe cite þai gun wende;
þer of þei were ful fain.
Þurch mani a cuntre, vp an doun,
Þai begged her mete fram toun to toun,
Boþe in winde & rain.459

This passage has no correspondence in London, but is found in Karlsruhe:

L’enfaunt ove le asne returna,
Ke au meseal revynt e counte.
Amillouns cele asne mounte
Tut saunz sele e sauns estru,
Assez de meschef est encurru;
Ors du pays si s’en vount,
Jammés ce quidunt ne revendrunt.
  (K. 1517-23)

Such attention to detail, and specific correlation of those details in both particulars and their order, again suggests a connection which places ME closer to Karlsruhe than to other versions. The only significant alteration is the last tercet of ME, which is necessary to fill out the stanza, but also has a linking effect, signalling not only the end of the episode in their departure, but introduces a following episode in which their wanderings in foreign land actually begins.

Foreign Travels

The pertinent details of the ME stray little from those of the AN, the redactor merely rewording expressions with no significant alteration of meaning. For example, the first half-stanza of the episode expresses their hardship:

(151) Ouer al þat lond þurch godes wille
þat hunger wex so gret & grille,
As wide as þai gun go;
Al-mest for hunger þai gan to spille,
Of brede þai no hadde nouþt half her fille,
Ful careful were þai þo.460

The AN likewise tells that in their wandering they very nearly starve and can find no one to give them food:

459 Leach, ll. 1789-1800.
The only notable changes are the decision to naturalise French sous to English shillings, and reference to the cup. Throughout the narrative, the redactor is always careful to keep the cup with Amiloun so that its later appearance at the crucial moment is not an
unexpected surprise. In general, however, the ME varies information from the AN very little, and once again it would be very difficult to refute his reliance on the AN.

Following, the ME adds another small episode of two and a half stanzas not found in the AN or the OF. In these lines, Amoraunt is said to actually carry Amiloun on his back through "deep country" for over half a year. They often fall, and endure a harsh winter. In this detail there is perhaps a hint of Karlsruhe which say: "Ben a .iii. quarters dele un an, / Ou il suffirent si grand haan," however, this mention in the AN comes after the purchase of a wheel-barrow in which Amiloun is transported. The reference to being physically carried is certainly the work of the redactor, but even in this nothing added that in anyway contradicts the sense of the AN. It is simply *amplificatio*, drawing heavily on the stock of formulaic expressions, to heighten the sense of desperation.

In the final half of stanza 155, the ME again comes into line with the AN. In this passage Amoraunt, too weak to carry Amiloun further, buys a cart:

\[
\text{Al her catel þan was spent,}
\text{Saue tvelf pans, verrament,}
\text{Þerwip þai went ful 3are}
\text{& bou3t hem a gode croude-wain,}
\text{His lord he gan þer-in to lain,}
\text{He no mi3t him bere namare.} \text{465}
\]

This reflects the same purchase made in the AN immediately after selling the ass and buying food:

\[
\text{Estre ce Owayns fet fere}
\text{Sur deuz roeles un cyvere}
\text{Qe de sez deuz meyns le put chacer;}
\text{Amylloun fet dedeyns cocher,}
\text{A meuz qe unkes sout lui esa}
\text{De liu en autre liu amens.}
\]

(K. 1534-39)

\[
\text{Estre ceo lour fount fere}
\text{Sur deus roes une cyvere}
\text{Qu'il pout sei meismes enchacer.}
\text{Amillion fist dedeinz cocher,}
\text{A plus q'il pout li eysa,}
\text{De long en long li enmena.}
\]

(L. 910-15)

Though there are some adjustments made to justify the purchase (i.e. attributing it to Amoraunt's weakness, a narrative device analogous to that of the introduction of famine cited above), there is little in the way of actual alteration of the plot. Again, the ME is undoubtedly taking information from a source very much like the AN.
Conclusion

Though the ME redactor does introduce a number of changes and adjustments to his narrative, it is evident that he nevertheless relies on a version of the story very close to the AN, and particularly Karlsruhe. The interpolations introduced largely serve to heighten a sense already present in the AN, or to eliminate lacunae existing in those versions. The omission of certain passages or details likewise serves to eliminate "extraneous" information which weighs down the plot and presents later complications. Certain elements are "naturalised" to make them appeal more directly to an English audience. Ultimately, therefore, in this section the redactor again has demonstrated his skill as a remanieur, using amplificatio and abbreviatio to "improve" his narrative, while tailoring the material to suit it to the tastes of his target audience.
**DIVISION 4C: The Reunion**

**Arrival**

After having bought a cart the ME continues with Amoraunt leading his master to Amis’s court:

(156) Pan Amoraunt crud sir Amiloun
Purch mani a cuntre, vp & doun,
As 3e may vnderstond;
So he com to a cite toun,
Per sir Amis, he bold baroun,
Was douke & lord in lond.466

The arrival itself draws somewhat on older traditions in being almost accidental for there is no stated intent to seek out Amis prior to their arrival.467 This situation accords with the AN which says:

E quant il urent longtens alez
E mult de teres compassez,
Si se aprochent un pays
Ou sojourne li quens Amys.

Par la terre tant alerent
Qe feym e me[s]aise troverent,
Desques eus vindrent el pais
Ou sojorna le counte Amys.

(K. 1542-45) (L. 916-19)

The ME also resembles the AN in never clarifying explicitly that Amiloun and Amoraunt know whose court they have reached. However, Amiloun is not surprised later when Amis appears, and that he most likely knows where he is is implicit in the following lines:

Pan seyd þe kni3t in þat tide,
“To þe doukes court here biside
To bring me þider þou fond;
He is a man of milde mode,
We schul gete ous þer sum gode
Purch grace of godes sond.”468

Nevertheless, this is far from the reaction one would expect. He neither rejoices to be at his “brother’s” court, or even mentions his name. In terms of content, this passage also bears some similarity to one in Karlsruhe in which an old gentleman tells them they are at the court of an unidentified “great [man]”:

---

466 Leach, II. 1861-6.
467 Though, it ought to be noted, in the OF there is originally an intent to find Amile in Rivières; however after becoming disoriented in a boat sailing from Mont-St.-Michel, they do not realise they are at Amile’s court when they finally arrive.
"Par ma fey," fet un prudome,
"Ja orrez vus la dreyte summe,
Veez vus la ce beau manere?
Ne say a ki le deit nomer,
Mes un grand i est demurez
Qe unques greyngnur charitez
Ne fyst un home pur Deujoe croy!"
"Aloms dunke la, par ma foy!"
Ce dyt l'enfaunt Amylloun,
"Tel home encontrar i purrum
Qe par cas nus put valer."
E lors s'en vunt au maner.

(K. 1566-77)

Though here it is Amoraunt who speaks instead of Amis, both versions contain an oath by God and (ME. 1872, K. 1572), and the expectation of food through the nameless lord's charity (ME. 1870-1, K. 1571, 1575-6). Furthermore, despite the implication that the pair do not know where they are, Amiloun is likewise not surprised to see Amis when he appears, and other situations hint that he does indeed know where he is.

Another correlation with Karlsruhe occurs in the following stanza where Amiloun demands anonymity:

(157) "Ac, leue sone," he seyd þan
"For his loue, þat þis world wan
Astow art hende & fre,
Þou be aknowe to no man
Whider y schal, no whenes y cam,
No what mi name it be."
He answerd & seyd, "Nay."

This bears a strong resemblance to the following lines in Karlsruhe:

Mes il ne se sount apareus;
Car, sachez, si il le ussent seu;
La porte ne ussent aproché
Pur tut l’oor ke unques fu fermé.
Mes il vient nepurquant.

(K. 1546-50)
The main difference between these accounts is that the ME Amiloun does not want to be identified, while the Karlsruhe Amiloun would not wish to enter the court if he knew where he was. Here there is a possible mistranslation. Though "il ne se sount apareus" is best rendered as "they did not realise [where they were]," it could be misconstrued as "they did not make themselves known." Three explanations are available: (1) The redactor may have misunderstood his exemplar, (2) the exemplar was worded just differently enough to give this second meaning, or (3) he intentionally decided to change it. In any case, the ultimate sentiment remains the same: Amiloun is unwilling to appeal openly to Amis for aid. It seems likely that this sentiment, regardless of how misinterpreted it has become, does owe something to the Karlsruhe tradition.

The remainder of the stanza continues to reflect the AN as Amiloun comes among the poor:

To court he went in his way,
As 3e may listen at me,
& bifor al ooper pouer men
He crud his wain in to pe fen;
Gret diol it was to se. 473

Again, there is a parallel in Karlsruhe found in no other versions:

Oawayns vet chasaunt le cyvere
Souz le pendaunt de un bruere
De poueraylle i contre gent,
Ce dist l’estorie, ben .ii. cent.

(K. 1556-59)

Both these version make explicit reference to Amiloun in his cart being wheeled among the other beggars. Given the amount of information in the stanza as a whole it would be difficult to deny a connection between the ME and the Karlsruhe tradition.

The two stanzas which follow, however, are largely the work of the redactor. In stanza 158 Amis goes in procession from the church back to the court, the beggars drawing aside to let him pass:

(158) So it bifel þat selue day, –

472 London gives a different sentiment: "Ne sciet, qe eus veit, qu’il sount; / Si eus fuissernt en la cort commuz, / A grant honor serreint receuz." ll. 926-28. Though this does present the pair as unidentified as in the ME, there is no mention of an effort to hide their identity, nor would they be reluctant to appear before Amis. In fact, in London it seems to be a aside whereas in Karlsruhe and ME it is an integral part of building the plot. Thus, overall, the ME tends to resemble Karlsruhe more than London.

473 Lench, ll. 1880-84.
Wip tong as y 3ou tel may, —
It was midwinter tide,
Țat riche douke wip gamen & play
Fram chirche com ûe ri3t way
As lord & prince wip pride.
When he com to ûe castel-gate,
Pe pouer men ûat stode ûer-ate
Wîp drour3 hem ûer beside.
Wîp knîtes & wîp seriaunce fale
He went in-to ûat semly sale
Wîp ioe & blis to abide.474

Only in the mention of the poor around the gate is there a resemblance to the AN:

Prês de la porte seuz sunt mys… Pres [de] la porte se sount mis…
(K. 1578) (L. 928)

The rest of this stanza consists of a string of formulae linked together with the exception of
line 1889. It is interesting to note, however, that this line can be read as a cataphoric reference to Belisaunt’s procession back from the church after Amis slays his children. Only this allusion to the church and that of the beggars by the gate carry any significant meaning, the rest of the stanza being essentially “filler.” However, these lines which individually have no particularising force are woven together so skillfully with a single image taken from the AN and another created by the redactor that they succeed in building up a unified image, demonstrating the skill of the redactor and suggesting how he manipulates his material.

Stanza 159 then tells of the customary feast in the duke’s hall:

(159) In kinges court, as it is lawe,
Trumpes in halle to mete gan blawe,
To benche went ûo bold.
When ţai were semly set on rowe,
Serued ţai were opon a þrowe,
As men miriest on mold.
Țat riche douke, wîp-outen les,
As a prince serued he wes
Wîp riche coupes of gold,
& he ţat brou3t him to ţat state
Stode bischet wîp-outen ûe gate,
Wel sore of-hungred & cold.475

474 Leach, ll. 1885-96.
475 Leach, ll. 1897-1908.
No such scene appears in the AN, but there is nevertheless an interesting similarity. Where the ME demonstrates the customs of the land "as it is law," the AN Amoraunt ponders what it may be:

E lui enfes est avertys,  
E forment eynme sun seynur  
Vait demandant tut entour  
Des poveres le estre de la tere,  
E la custome, e la manere.  
(K. 1579-8)

E l’enfant, qe bien fust apris  
E moult ama son seignur,  
Ala demandant tut entour  
Des poveres estres e les maneres  
E les custumes de les terres.  
(L. 929-33)

It is not unimaginable that the redactor turns Amoraunt’s idle curiosity of "customs and manners" into a vignette of what they actually are. In doing so, he creates a typical English image that would appeal to his audience, one attested to as being not far from the reality, and one which appears elsewhere in contemporary English literature. Again, his adeptness at interpreting and developing his source material is demonstrated.

Amis’s Sergeant Notices Amoraunt

After arrival, Amoraunt is perceived by Amis’s knights:

Les chivalers ke alerent juauns  
E les poveres regardauns,  
Virent l’enfaunt bel e parcru,  
E si ankes en fust vestu,  
Gentils homme resembleryt.  
(K. 1584-88)

Les gentils homes, qe alere[n]t juaunt  
E les povres regardant,  
Veu ount l’enfant bel e parceu,  
E [s’]il fuit auke vestu,  
Gentil home resemblereit.  
(L. 934-8)

This scene is retained in the ME:

(160) Out at þe gate com a kniȝt  
& a seriaunt wise & wiȝt,  
To plain hem boȝe yfere,  
& þurch þe grace of god almiȝt  
On sir Amiloun he cast a siȝt,  
Hou laiȝ he was of chere.  
& seþen biheld on Amoraunt,  
Hou gentil he was & of fair semblaut,  
In gest as 3e may here.  
Þan seyd þai boȝe, bi Seyn Jon,  
In al þe court was þer non  
Of fairehed half his pere.  

476 See also: Leach, p. 128, note to line 1897; Gawain and the Green Knight, l. 116; Cleanness, l. 1401-02.  
477 Leach, ll. 1909-20.
Both versions mention the poor being observed by the nobility and the consequent recognition of Amoraunt’s beauty among them. Each also attributes the same adjective “gentil” to him. The only mentionable difference is the ME reduction of “the knights” to a single “sergeant,” a possible reason for which becomes clear in the following two stanzas:

(161) āe gode man gan to him go, 
& hendeliche he asked him þo, 
As 3e may vnderstond, 
Fram wat lond þat he com fro, 
& whi þat he stode þer þo, 
& whom he serued in lond. 
“Sir,” he seyd, “so god me saue, 
Icham here mi lordes knaue, 
þat liþ in godes bond; 
& þou art gentil kniȝt of blode, 
Bere our erand of sum gode 
Þurch grace of godes sond.”

(162) āe gode man asked him anon, 
3if he wald fro þat lazer gon 
& trewelich to him take; 
& he seyd he schuld, bi Seyn Jon, 
Serue þat riche douke in þat won, 
& richeman he wald him make; 
& he answerd wiþ mild mode 
& swore bi him þat dyed on rode 
Whiles he miȝt walk & wake, 
For to winne al þis warldes gode, 
His hende lord, þat bi him stode, 
Schul he neuer forsake.478

The sergeant’s approach is similar to that of one of the knights in the AN:

Un chivaler assei Ie appelloyt,  Un de eux ly appeleyt, 
Si lui demaundoyt si il vout servir, Demaundast s’il vout servir. 
E l’enfaunt get un suspyr, E il getta un grant suspir; 
E dyt ke il avoyt un seyngnur Cil dit q’il out un seignur 
Ke il ne lerra pur le emperour. Q’il ne lerreit pur estre emperor. 

(K. 1589-93) (L. 939-43)

The reduction of several observers, of whom only one acts, to a single knight who does both simplifies the plot and creates more unity of thought in its development; this may account for the difference between the ME and AN. Such an alteration is essentially inconsequential as it causes no significant discrepancy between the versions. It becomes

478 Leach, II. 1921-44.
even more insignificant when the number of shared features it totalled. In addition to knight(s) regarding paupers, and notice of Amoraunt’s gentility, both version tell of the knight’s approach, his offer of service, Amoraunt’s identification of leprous Amiloun as his lord, and his refusal to abandon him. These essential features are certainly drawn from the AN tradition, linked together by numerous formulae which expand the ten lines into thirty-six in the ME without changing the sens of the materia.

The initial reaction of the sergeant also shares characteristics with the AN:

(163) þe gode man wende he hadde ben rage,
Or he hadde ben a fole-sage
þat hadde his witt forlorn.479

Amoraunt’s sanity is likewise questioned in both Karlsruhe and London:

Qe se fust lui unt demaundez,
Mes si tost cum lui unt avizez,
Celui, ke i cleyme seignur,
Saches, ke tretut lui plusur
L’unt tenu a pur sotye,
E lui auquant de la meynye
Unt grand pité de l’enfant.

(Q. 1594-1600)

Rather than having pity for him, however, the ME allows the sergeant to ponder Amiloun’s former status:

Oper he þou3t þat his lord wip þe foule visage
Hadde ben a man ofhei3e parage
& of hei3e kinde ycorn.480

Here is another possible correlation with Karlsruhe not found in London:

Cestui meseaus ke sur nus quert
N’est pas ateus cum apert!”

“Car si poveres fust d’estat,
Ja ne ust il ore un tel hanap;
Si il fu roy ou emperour,
Tenyr le pust a grand honour.

(K. 1682-87)

479 Leach, II. 1945-47.
480 Leach, II. 1948-51.
It must be said that there are some differences in placement and relevance to the plot. Such consideration occurs in Karlsruhe only after the knight has seen Amiloun’s cup, and it leads him to believe that the leper must actually be a high-born spy. There is no reason to think, however, that the redactor could not have advanced such a notion in his own version while dismissing the unfortunate conclusion. And in both cases the idea drives the retainer back to Amis to express his astonishment.

Knight Mentions Amoraunt to Amis

The ME again appears indebted to Karlsruhe for the details of this episode of which London dedicates but a single line: “Al counte Amys ount countè.” 481 The ME, however, recounts the report in three and a half stanzas, each of which bears the imprint of the Karlsruhe tradition.

In the final six lines of stanza 163, the knight tells his finding to Amis:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Per-fore he nold no more sain,} \\
\text{Bot went him in to pe halle agin} \\
\text{Pe riche douke biforn,} \\
\text{“Mi lord,” he seyd, “listen to me} \\
\text{Pe best bourd, bi mi leuete,} \\
\text{Pou herdest seppen pou were born.”} 482
\end{align*}
\]

The parallel with six lines from Karlsruhe is striking:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{En la sale cza e la,} \\
\text{Tant ke lui quens Amys l’escota;} \\
\text{Si les demaundoyt demeintenant} \\
\text{Qe co e dunt il doyllent tant.} \\
\text{“Ha sire!” coe dit un chivaler,} \\
\text{“Merveylles orrez vus parler...”}
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{(K. 1602-07)}\]

Both mention the knight sauntering back into the hall and finding himself before Amiloun. In neither version does he appear to rush; His initial silence in the ME suggests perplexity, and the following two lines imply a sense of pensive wandering which simply lead him to Amiloun to whom he can disclose his astonishment. Karlsruhe likewise says that he wandered “here and there” in court until Amiloun asks what is troubling him. In both cases the knight responds with direct address introduced by a vocative and tells the

481 London, I. 949.
482 Leach, II. 1951-56.
lent he has a fantastic story. It appears that not only the style, but also the nuance of the Karlsruhe tradition are incorporated into the ME.

The next two stanzas then corresponds to four lines in AN where the knight begins his story:

Si a la porte ad un enfant –
Plus bel ne vi en moun vivaunt –
Si sert a un plus vüllepon
Qe unques vi jœ de mes oyls.

(K. 1608-11)

This mention of a beautiful youth serving a foul leper is expanded into 24 lines in the ME but adds nothing pertinent to the description:

(164) Pe riche douke badde him anon
To telle bi-form hem euerichon
Wiþ-outen more duelling.
“Now sir,” he seyd, “bi Seyn Jon,
Ich was out atte gate ygon
Ri3t now on mi playing:
Pouer men y sei3e mani þare,
Litel & michel, lasse & mare,
Bope old & 3ing,
& a lazer þer y fond;
Herdestow neuer in no lond
Telle of so foule a þing.

(165) “Be lazer líp vp in a wain,
& is so pouer of mi3t & main
O fot no may he gon;
& ouer him stode a naked swain,
A gentiler child, for sope to sain,
In world no wot y non.
He is þe fairest gome
Þat euer Crist 3af cristendome
Or layd liif opon,
& on of þe most fole he is
Þat euer þou herdest speke, ywis,
In þis worldes won.”483

Just as the AN Amiloun was forced to ask for the man’s thoughts (K. 1604), the ME Amiloun does so here (ME. 1957-59). The knight then explains that he was at the gate, and saw among the lepers one more vile than any he had ever encountered who was accompanied by an equally beautiful youth. Though the redactor rearranges the order of

483 Leach, II. 1957-80.
presentation and expands the dialogue through repetition and formulae, nothing except Amoraunt’s nudity is added, and the point neither develops further nor causes disruption of the plot. The overall impression is that the ME redactor uses information in the Karlsruhe tradition and “improves” it through *amplificatio* to add more substance to his account.

Finally, the knight relates his offer and Amoraunt’s refusal:

(166) *Panseyd pe riche douke again,*
“What foly,” he seyd, “can he sain?
Is he madde of mode?”
“Sir,” he seyd, “y bad him fain
Forsake pe lazer in pe wain,
Pat he so ouer stode,
& in pi seruirse he schuld be,
Y bihete him bope lond & fe,
Anou3 of warldes gode;
& he anwerd & seyd þo
He nold neuer gon him fro;
Þer-fore ich hold him wode.”

In Karlsruhe the same offer is made and the same reaction follows.

De l’enfaunt m’en prist pité,
E a grand yre m’i fui alee;
Si le demaundoy si il voloyt
Meillour servise si il le trovoyt.
E lui enfes me respondi
Qe un seignur avoyt choysi,
Qe il ne lerra pur vivaut.”
(K. 1612-18)

Though Amiloun’s question in the first tercet and the reiteration of the knight’s determination in the last line are additions, they again cause no alteration to the plot, and the ME stanza can be seen to have links with these seven lines from Karlsruhe.

Though, as with previous sections, the redactor has made heavy use of *amplificatio*, chiefly through the use of non-particularising formulae, the correlations are remarkable. As all of these parallels exist only in the ME and Karlsruhe, it is further evidence of the redactor’s use of an exemplar in the Karlsruhe tradition.

---

Amis Rewards Amoraunt's Loyalty

Instead of considering the boy mad as does his knight, the AN Amis realises that Amoraunt's steadfastness is actually loyalty:

"He Deus!" ce [dit] li quens ataunt,
"Mult ad ore en lui leal amur,
E leaument eyme sun seignur!"
(K. 1619-21)

The ME Amis makes a similar declaration, couching it with numerous explanatory variables to make his conclusion more tenable:

(167) Pan seyd þe douke, "Pei his lord be lorn,
Par auentour, þe gode man hāp biforn
Holpen him at his nede,
Oþer þe child is of his blod yborn,
Oþer he hāp him ðopes sworn
His liif wip him to lede.
Wheþer he be fremd or of his blod,
Þe child," he seyd, "is trewe & gode,
Also god me spede.
3if ichim speke er he wende,
For þat he is so trewe & kende,
Y schal quite him his mede!"485

This verbalised recognition, lacking in London, is shared between Karlsruhe and the ME, the latter of which expands the three lines into an entire stanza. Though the redactor goes to the trouble of providing reasons to make the declaration plausible, the declaration itself is not changed.

Where a real change does occur is in the actual reward. The ME states:

(168) þat douke astite, as y 3ou told,
Cleped to him a squier bold
& hendelich gan him sain:
"Take," he sayd, "mi coupe of gold,
As ful of wine astow miȝt hold
In þine hondes tvain,
& bere it to þe castel-3ate,
A lazer þou schalt finde þerate
Liggeand in a wain.
Bid him, for þe loue of Seyn Martin,
He and his page drink þis win,
& bring me þe coupe again."486

Here is the appearance of his own recognition cup, for which the audience is well prepared. Though sharing the same detail of calling a servant to bestow his gift (a point not explicitly made in London), the AN Amiloun begins with a different offer:

Ataunt apele sun aumener  
Si lui comaunde tantost doner  
.xii. deners de la moneye.  

(K. 1622-24)

After this monetary donation there is a rather long digression in Karlsruhe which explains the custom of providing food to the poor each day (K. 1625-29), and Amis’s determination to have a portion of each of his meals sent to the leper and the boy (K. 1630-35). Only then does Karlsruhe regress to give a twenty-line history of the cups (K. 1636-5).487 London makes a similar digression. Upon hearing of the pair, Amis has his butler deliver half of each plate to the leper and boy (L. 950-5), then follows a brief and unconvincing explanation of the goblets (L. 956-60). Without these introductions the AN versions are forced to devise an alternative original gift, something the ME redactor has no need to do, having been careful enough to provided an early introduction analogous to that of the OF.488

After these digressions, however, both AN versions give a report that is reminiscent of that made in the ME:

Quant lui quens ad a poy mange,  
Sun botiller ad apelle:  
“Prenez vallet,” fet il, “coe vyn,  
Si le aportez au fraryn,  
Le povere meseal a la porte,  
Mes la coupe me reporte!  
En s’esqueJe Ie vyn versez  
E ma coupe me reportez!”

(K. 1656-63)

Quant le counte ad pres mangé,  
Son botiller ad appelé:  
“Pernez ma coupe od tot le vin,  
Si l’aportez a cee frarin,  
Au povres qu tant est mesaysé.  
Mes le hanap soit bien gardé:  
En son esqueil le vin versez,  
E ma coupe me reportez!”

(L. 970-77)

Here there are two points in common with London and an additional one with Karlsruhe. The duke uses direct speech to tell a servant “take my cup full of wine” (ME 2008-9, K. 1658, L. 973), orders him to give to the poor leper “at the gate” (ME. 2011-2, K. 1661),

486 Leach, ll. 2005-16.
487 See appendix for these quotations. The quotation regarding the cup can also be seen in Division 2A where it is shown to share many similarities with the ME history.
488 Incidentally, the OF handles the recognition scene much differently. Whereas in the AN/ME Amis assumes the leprous cup-bearer must be a thief, in Ami et Amile, Amile realises immediately that it is Ami.
and makes a special reminder to “return the cup” (ME. 2016, K. 1661-3, L. 975-7). Even in a scene so drastically altered, the influence of the AN tradition can still be seen.

The ME redactor retains integral details of the narrative as they are found in the AN, but is able to dispense with extraneous side events. His early use of amplificatio in introducing the cups and making continuous reference to them permits him to condense into a single gesture two such “spontaneous” favours awkwardly separated by a meal. This use of abbreviatio also eliminates the lacuna created by the gift of money in Karlsruhe, which is never resolved.489 This restructuring improves the style of the story, demonstrating the redactor’s adherence to the principles established for a remanieur’s treatment of material.

**The Reunited Cups**

When the servant carries the cup of wine to the leper, Amiloun immediately draws out its twin:

(169) Þe squier þo þe coupe hent,  
& to þe castel-gat he went,  
& ful of win he it bare.  
To þe lazer he seyd, verrament,  
“Þis coupe ful of win mi lord þe sent,  
Drink it, 3iue þou dare.”  
Þe lazer tok forþ his coupe of gold,  
Boþe were 3oten in o mold,  
Riþt as þat selue it ware,  
þer-in he pourd þat win so riche;  
þan were þai boþe ful yliche  
& noiþer lesse no mare.490

As one might expect, the same event occurs in the AN:

Le vallet ke servyt a counte,  
Quant entent ce ke an mounte,  
Prent la coupe, si la enporte  
A povere mesel a la porte;  
E quant cil vener aparzoit  
Hors de sun seyn sa coupe treyt,  
E l’autre le vyn i getta.  

(E. 1672-78)

Le povres, qe mesel fuit en vein,  
Prist sa coupe hors de son sain,  
E l’autre la vist, si s’esmerveilla.  
(L. 978-82)

As one might expect, the same event occurs in the AN:

The ME adds details such as the servant’s address and the mention that the cups were “gotten in one mould,” but essentially this is the same scene as the AN: the servant

489 e.g., what happens to the gift.
delivers the wine, Amiloun presents his cup, and the wine is poured into it. The similarity with the insular French version continues in the beginning of the next stanza in which mention is made of the servant’s astonishment:

(170) Þe squier biheld þe coupes þo,
First his & his lorde al-so,
Whiles he stode hem biforn,
Ac he no coupe neuer mo
Chese þe better of hem to,
So liche bope þai worn.

These words are not much different from those of the AN:

Mes la coupe muld regarda,
E pensoyt il: "Coment put ce estre?
Ce .ii. hanapes fyst un mestre!"

(K. 1679-81)

La coupe durement regarda;
Pensa cil: 'Coment poet estre
Ces deus hanaps fist un mestre!'

(K. 983-85)

In both, the squire looks at the cup and realises they are identical. The realisation that “one master made the two cups” in the AN is probably responsible for the paraphrase in ME 2023. The shifting of this detail does not detract from the fact that the order of events remains correspondent, and is therefore further evidence of direct reliance of the ME on the AN tradition.

The servant’s reaction links the ME closely to the Karlsruhe tradition which has an interpolation not existing in London. The ME servant:

In-to halle he ran ogain,
"Certes, sir," he gan to sain,
"Mani gode dede þou hast lorn,
& so þou hast lorn þis dede now;
He is a richer man þan þou,
Bi þe time þat god was born."

This reference to Amiloun being “a richer man” than Amis is reminiscent of the Karlsruhe servant’s initial reflection that the leper is not what he appears and might be a king or emperor. The servant’s second deduction is that he must be a spy in disguise:

Mes coment certes ke nuls en die,

490 Leach, II. 2017-28.
491 Leach, II. 2029-34.
492 Leach, II. 2035-40.
493 Karlsruhe, II. 1682-87. See appendix or Amis’s Sergeant Notices Amoraunt, above.
Such a conclusion is also found in the ME after Amis disabuses him of thinking the leper is richer:

(171) þe riche douke answerd, “Nay, 
þat worþ neuer bi niþt no day, 
it were oþaines þe lawe!” 
“3is, sir,” he gan to say, 
“He is a traitor, bi mi fay, 
& were wele worþ to drawe.”

Thus, Karlsruhe and the ME correspond in the servant first wondering if Amiloun is actually high-born then concluding that he must be a spy or a traitor to the court. Such a situation occurs in no other versions and is another indication of the ME’s debt to the Karlsruhe tradition.

After making such conclusions Karlsruhe falls back in line with London to show the knight finally explain the reason for his belief to Amis:

This order is again followed by the ME:

The details of the ME knight’s description, with its mention of the leper’s cup being identical to that of the lord he is addressing, is obviously much closer to Karlsruhe than to

---

494 Leach, II. 2041-46.
London's generality: "he went back and told the count about the cup." Once again, a connection seems probable.

Amis's Wrath

Amis's first reaction is to express his understanding that only he and Amiloun have such cups:

(172) "Now, certes," seyd sir Amis þo,  
"In al þis world were coupes nomo  
So liche in al þing,  
Saue min & mi broþers al-so,  
Þat was set vi tvix ous to,  
Token of our parting."496

This statement has an analogy in Karlsruhe's recent introduction of the cups, which also occurs in this episode:

Dunt l'un a sei tynt en baundoun  
E l'autre dona Amilloun  
En remembrance de lour departyr,  
Si ke de lui deit sovener  
Quant la coupe regardast,  
Qe l'un ne l'autre ne ubbliast.  
(K. 1646-51)

Thus, at this point, only Karlsruhe and the ME make direct reference to the cups being a symbol of separation.497 In the ME, this speech is also an anaphoric reference to Amiloun's original words upon offering a cup to Amis.498 Restating it here creates a sense of unity in the narrative, the vessels playing a part in both their original separation and final reunion.

Amis then expresses his belief that the leper must have murdered Amiloun and stolen the cup:

& 3if it be so, wip tresoun  
Mine hende broþer, sir Amiloun,  
Is slain, wip-outen lesing.  
& 3if he haue stollen his coupe oway,  
Y schal him sle me self þis day,
Bi lhesu, heuen king!"499

London also mentions theft, but Karlsruhe gives an equally damning diatribe against the leper:

"He Deus," fet il, "c'est un truaunt, Un ribaud, barouns, futys Qe felounement fut garnys Par akun autre privé laroum." De Amillioun donçe li sovent: 'Bien sai', fait il, 'verraiment, De mon frere l’ad emblé.'

(K. 1711-14) (L. 990-92)

The specific accusation of murder may also have a link to Karlsruhe where it is acknowledged that Amis would never part with the cup no matter what the circumstances.

Amys le garde endroyt de lui, E Amilloun le soen ausi, Qe unkes par meschef ke il out, De lui sa coupe suffrir ne pout.

(K. 1652-55)

Thus, only death could deprive him of it. Again, such well developed references occur only in Karlsruhe and the ME. Though there does seem to be some rearrangement of material, most if not all of the conclusions made in ME have precedents in Karlsruhe; this indicates the redactor’s practice of starting with a mental image of the work and then paraphrase it, a technique offered by Quintilian and retained in the Artes Poeticae. Thus, here is more evidence of the redactor’s practice of remaniement.

Amis Attacks Amiloun

Amis’s attack in the ME is directly drawn from that of the AN tradition in which London and Karlsruhe are in accord:

(173) Fram þe bord he resed þan & hent his swerd as a wode man & drouþ it out wip wrake, & to þe castel gat he ran; In al þe court was þer no man þat him miȝt atake. To þe lazer he stitt in þe wain & hent him in his honden tvain & sleynt him in þe lake, & layd on, as he were wode, & al þat euer about him stode

499 Leach, Il. 2059-64.
Gret diol gan make.500

In the AN, he also jumps from the table, runs to the leper, throws him from the cart into a puddle,501 and cannot be stopped by the knights around him:

Outre la table se saut atant
A cestui povere vynt currant,
E tant l'en ad feru du pee
Qe en la bowe est il versé.
   Ces chiualers eurent adés,
Qe lui sivunt mult de pees
E ke retenyr le voleyn;
Mes pur chose ke unke saveyent,
Ne le porreyent asuager,
Qu il ne le voleit ilues tuer.

(K. 1726-35) (L. 994-1003)

Here again is evidence of the ME redactor’s reliance on the AN tradition.

The next stanzas (174) is rather more problematic, bearing much more evidence of free translation. The AN version first say that after Amis beats the leper, he then commands him to be thrown in prison.502 This is omitted in the ME. The AN then says:

Car a sun frere ceo dyt maundereoyt,
E la verité en queroyt
Cum sun hanap ust perdu
E cum a lui fust avenu.

(K. 1740-43) (L. 1008-11)

This questioning does come in the ME, Amiloun referring to his brother and demanding to know how the leper came to posses the goblet:

(174) “Traïtour,” seyd þe douke so bold,
“Where haddestow þis coupe of gold
& hou com þou þer to?
For bi him at Judas sold,
Amiloun, mi broþer, it hadde in wold,
When þat he went me frot.”503

After this bit of correlation the ME Amis then provides an unexpected response:

500 Leach, II. 2065-75.
501 In the AN, “bowe” can be translated as either “a ditch,” or better, by mud, sludge, or figuratively, the gutter. In the ME this has become a lake, but the sense remains intact (a dirty wet depression), and the change may be explained by the need of a rhyme.
503 Leach, II. 2076-82.
“3a, certes, sir,” he gan to say,
“It was his in his cuntray,
& now it has fallen so;
Bot certes, now þat icham here,
þe coupe is mine, y bou3t it dere,
Wip ri3t y com þer to.”

Karlsruhe says only that Amiloun is deeply touched by hearing Amis show such a great sign of love and loyalty:

```
E quant lui meseaus Amilloun
En si out retrere sun noun,
E nomer si grand signe de amur,
A peyne pust parler de dolour
Qe de fyn doel le quer ne le sent.
```

(K. 1744-48)

In London these five lines are condensed into two, after which Amis asks to be beheaded instead of imprisoned:

```
Quant Amyllioun li oist nomer,
De dolur pout son quer crever:
‘Sire,’ dit, ‘par la foy qe vus devez
A Amillioun, qe tant amez,
Ne me facez enprisoner,
Mes le chef me faites tost trencher.
Mes certes ai jeo trop vesqui;
Trop bien ai la mort deservi.’
```

(K. 1012-19)

Unfortunately it is impossible to know whether a similar scene follows in Karlsruhe because it ends imperfectly at line 1748. What can be deduced is that, as in the ME, Amis refuses to identify himself in both AN versions, thereby aggravating Amis’s wrath. In that respect, the ME does show some correlation with the AN versions.

The ME then ends this episode with a recapitulation stanza:

```
Pan was þe douke ful egre of mod;
Was noman þat about him stode
þat durst legge on him hond;
He spurned him wip his fot
& laid on, as he were wode,
Wip his naked brond,
```

504 Leach, l. 2083-88.
This restatement of the situation adds no new details, merely restating Amiloun's anger, his violence towards the leper, and his insistence on knowing the truth of the cup. The mention of his "naked sword" may have a correlation with London's mention of his request for one (l. 1021), but may just as well be an addition by the ME redactor. Such an insertion does not contradict the sense of the materia as found in the AN, and is suitably placed in such a stanza to underscore the extent of Amiloun's exasperation, setting the scene for the discovery of the leper's true identity and the turn from vengeful anger to compassionate love and charity.

**Conclusion**

It must be noted that in this section the material is generally handled much more freely than in other sections, however the numerous points of correlation, particularly between Karlsruhe and the ME, strongly suggest continued reliance on an exemplar in that tradition. It is interesting that in points of divergence, there is not the same degree of correlation with the OF version as there has been in previous instances. Some of these additions may be related to formulaic insertions, many of which are drawn from other English texts as shall be demonstrated in the following chapter. It is also again evident that the ME redactor handles his material very carefully, making use of *abbreviatio* and *amplificatio* to eliminate lacunae and streamline his narrative. Many of his changes make anaphoric reference to earlier adaptations, "tying up loose ends" and justifying earlier adaptations. All of these changes are the sort of "improvements" advocated by the *artes poeticae*, again identifying the redactor as a translator in the tradition of *remaniement*.

---

505 Leach, ll. 2089-2100.
DIVISION 5A: The Cure

As mentioned in the previous section examination, Karlsruhe’s imperfect ending at line 1748 leaves nothing for further comparison relating to Amiloun’s new life. However, the London text and the OF do provide a complete account of the narrative, so for the sake of completeness the next two divisions in the ME will be examined alongside these texts.

*Amoraunt Reveals his Lord’s Identity*

The ME moves directly to Amoraunt’s revelation of Amiloun’s identity:

(176) Child Amoraunt stode þe pople among
& seye his lord wip wound & wrong
Hou reweliche he was di3t.
He was boþe hardi & strong,
þe douke in his armes he fong
& held him stille vp-ri3t.
“Sir,” he seyd, “þou art vnhende
& of þi werkes vnkende,
To sle þat gentil kni3t.
Wel sore may him rewe þat stounde
Þat euer for þe toke he wounde
To saue þi liif in fi3t.”

There is an additional stanza following, omitted in Auchinleck and here provided from Douce, which clarifies the exact identity even further:

(177) “And ys thi brother, sir Amylioun,
That whilom was a noble baroun
Bothe to ryde and go,
And now with sorwe ys dreue adoun;
Nowe god þat suffred passioun
Breng him oute of his wo!
For the of blysse he ys bare,
And thou yeldyst him al with care
And brekest his bones a two;
That he halp the at thi nede,
Well euell aquitest thou his mede.”

Though this stanza is lacking in Auchinleck (already demonstrated as the closest version to the original English redaction), the similarity of language and style suggests that it most likely was in the original and its omission in the production copy was a scribal error. In any case, the sentiment of these two stanzas is roughly the same as that found in London:

506 1.eaeh, ll. 2101-12.
Mais l'enfant avant saillist:
Uwein, qi ne poet suffrir
Qe son seignur deust morir,
En haut cria: 'Mercy, mercy!
Puir icel Deu qe onqe ne menti
E qe en croiz suffri passioun,
C'est mi sires, sire Amillioun!
Sire quens, remembrez, Amys,
Com vous li soleiez amer jadis.
Grant bosoigne li ad icy chacé.
Si le occiez, vous fetes pecché.'

(L. 1027-37)

In both the AN and the ME, Amoraunt refuses to permit Amis to mistreat Amiloun further (ME 2101-6, L. 1027-9), and in direct speech calls for Amis to stop and reveals his master's identity (ME 2107-13, L. 1030-3). In both he begs for his master not to be "killed" and tells Amis he would be wrong to do so (ME 2107-9, L. 1037). Most indicative of a direct translation is the appeal to "God who suffered passion" in both (ME 2116, L. 1031-2). It is evident that in these particulars the ME is again indebted to the AN tradition.

Where the ME deviates from the AN is in a brief passage of seven lines in the latter which occurs immediately before turning to Amoraunt.506 In these lines Amis agrees to Amiloun's request to be beheaded instead of imprisoned. As mentioned in the previous division, this request does not occur in the ME, and therefore inclusion of such a response is not warranted. However, since such details do not occur in what remains of Karlsruhe either, it might suggest another example of correlation with that tradition.

Amis's Recognition and Remorse

Upon hearing Amoraunt's revelation, Amis is immediately moved from wrath to remorse:

(178) When sir Amis herd him so sain,
He stirt to þe kni3t ogain,
Wiþ-outen more delay,
& biclept him in his armes tvain,
& oft, "Allas!" he gan sain;
His song was "Waileway!"
He loked opon his scholder bare
& sei3e his grimly wounde þare,
As Amoraunt gan him say.
He fel aswon to þe grounde
& oft he seyd, "Allas þat stounde!"

507 Leach, ll. 2113-24. (Supplied in Leach from Douce, ll. 2012-23.)
Again, there are numerous details shared with the AN:

Quant le counte ceo oist,
Tost estendu a terre chaist:
Bate ses mains, ses cheveuz detire,
Sa vie hiet, sa mort desire,
La hure maudist q'onqe fu nee,
Quant pecché l'ad ensi encombré
Qe son frere desconusseit
Qe touz biens li fesoit.
Trestouz plurent de pité.
Amis s'est tot adrescé,
Plus de cent foiz li ad beisé,
Tot ensi com ert de tay levé.

(L. 1038-49)

London is somewhat more sever than the ME in having Amis tear out his hair and wish himself dead, but his remorse is clearly evidenced in both versions. Furthermore, there are at least two striking parallels: both versions begin by saying “when the count heard,” and in each Amis falls to the ground in grief. The main difference is in the ME mention of Amis looking at the shoulder wound he has dealt his friend. This is certainly an addition of the redactor which provides cohesion by referencing Amis’s acknowledgement of the sever wounds he has dealt, an issue the AN never addresses. Again, the ME demonstrates narrative superiority over previous versions.

Such effective narrative techniques are also seen in the following capitulation stanza which concludes the episode:

(179) “Allas,” he seyd, “mi ioie is lorn,
Vnkender blod nas neuer born,
Y not wat y may do;
For he saued mi liif biforn,
Ichauhe him 3olden wip wo & sorn
& wur3t him michel wo.
“O bropher,” he seyd, “par charite,
Pis rewely dede for3if þou me,
Þat ichauhe smiten þe so!”
& he for3aue it him also swiþe
& kist him wel mani a siþe,
Wepeand wip ei3en tvo.510

509 Leach, II. 2125-36.
510 Leach, II. 2137-48.
Here again, the redactor summarises the situation, recounting Amis's regret, the debt he owes Amiloun, his request for forgiveness and Amiloun's willingness to give it. The exchanges of kisses from London 1048 is also mentioned in the last two lines which demonstrate their mutual love and commitment to each other, setting the scene for the next episode in which Amiloun is cared for in Amis's court.

**Belisaunt's Recognition and Care for Amiloun**

The ME initially begins much like the AN with Amis carrying his friend inside:

\[
\begin{align*}
(180) & \text{Pan was sir Amis glad & fain,} \\
& \text{For ioie he wepe wip his ain} \\
& \text{& hent his brober pan,} \\
& \text{& tok him in his armes tvain,} \\
& \text{Ri3t til he come in-to pe halle o3ain,} \\
& \text{No bar him nober man.}^{511}
\end{align*}
\]

Though abbreviated to a single line, London has a similar description which also mentions Amis taking Amiloun “in his arms”:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Entre ses braz li ad apporte,} \\
\text{En sa chambre li ad couche.} \\
\text{(L. 1050-51)}
\end{align*}
\]

The main point of deviation is that the ME simply takes him into “hall” while London takes him into “chamber.” At first this seems a negligible difference, but it has a significance which re-emerges later in the episode which, though similar to the AN, reveals many points of rewriting.

One main point of divergence is the ME’s immediate introduction of Belisaunt:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Þe leuedi þo in þe halle stode} \\
& \text{& wend hir lord hadde ben wode,} \\
& \text{O3aines him hye ran.} \\
& \text{“Sir,” sche seyd, “wat is þi þou3t?”} \\
& \text{Whi hastow him in-to halle ybrou3t,} \\
& \text{For him þat þis world wan?}^{512}
\end{align*}
\]

In London this introduction is delayed for nine lines in which Amis cares for his friend alone for several days.\(^{513}\) Then when she is introduced it is said only that she cared for him as if she were his sister:

\[^{511}\text{Leach, II. 2149-54.}\]
La dame sovent a ly est alé,
Qe li ama molt de fin quer
Comme si ele fust sa soer.
(L. 1059-61)

The only other version in which Belisaunt asks such a question is the OF:

Et Belissans la bele o le vis cler
Voit son seignor, sel prent a apeller:
"Qui est cil, sires? Gardéz nel me celéz,
Que je voz voi si grant loie mener."  514

Though the lady’s tone is slightly different in the ME and the OF, the former having her question her husband’s state of mind for bringing in a leper while in the second she realises he must be someone special, the question itself is the same. Such differences in tone could be accounted for by the redactor, recounting Belisaunt’s question from previous knowledge of a continental version and deciding to include it, forgetting her attitude towards the leper and “correcting it” to a reaction which seemed most natural to him. Such treatment is already demonstrated in earlier episodes, and there is no reason why it should not be the case here.

The likeness to the OF continues as Amis explains the situation:

(181) “O dame,” he seyd, “bi Seyn Jon,
Me nas neuer so wo bigon,
3if þou it wost vnnderstond,
For better kniȝt in world is non,
Bot al-most now icaue him slon
& schamefully driuen to schond;
For it is mi broþer, sir Amiloun,
Wip sorwe & care is dreuen adoun,
Pat er was fre to fond.”  515

The OF also provides direct discourse beginning with a vocative in which the leper is identified:

“Damme, dist il, par sainte charité,
C’est mes compains que je doi mout amer,
Qui me garist de mort et d’afoler.”  516

512 Leach, ll. 2155-60.
513 i.e. London, ll. 1050-58.
514 Dembowski, ll. 2746-49. [And the beautiful clear-faced Belisaunt saw her lord and called to him, "Who is this, lord? Do not keep it from me for I see he brings you great happiness.”]
515 Leach, ll. 2161-69.
Again there are some minor differences. The OF Ami reflects on Amile's previous help while the ME Amiloun recounts his own shameful behaviour. And again, these variations can be explained by the ME redactor working from memory rather than a text. He provides the introduction, an easily recalled important point, but changes the incidental particulars, which have very little bearing on plot development. As a clarifying point, an addition which does improve the story, Amis makes it absolutely clear whom he refers to by mentioning Amiloun by name in the third tercet. Though this point is not preceded, it in no way discredits the hypothesis that the redactor has the OF tradition in mind.

Correlation with the OF continues in Belisaunt's reaction. In the ME it is said:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{be leuedi fel aswon to grounde} \\
& \text{& wepe & seyd, "Allas pat stounde!"} \\
\text{Wel sore wren} & \text{gand hir hond.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
(182) \text{As foule a lazer as he was,} \\
\text{be leuedi kist him in pat plas,} \\
\text{For nopin wold sche spare,} \\
& \text{& oft time sch seyd, "Allas!"} \\
\text{bat him was fallen so hard a cas,} \\
\text{To liue in sorwe & care.}^{517}
\]

Though Belisaunt’s grief in the first tercet here, a conclusion of the previous stanza, is unprecedented, such an addition can again be attributed to the redactor and does make sense in the context of the plot. More interesting are the next six lines which show a direct parallel to the OF:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Belissans l'oit, joie prinst a mener,} \\
\text{Adont le baise, sel prent a acoler,} \\
\text{Baise visage et la bouche et le nés.} \\
\text{Forment en font grant joie.}^{518}
\end{align*}
\]

Just as in the ME, Belisaunt kisses the leper all over, again a point that could be easily remembered given its significance, while her joy over seeing him becomes sorrow for his condition. Though the emotion has changed, in both cases it is a result of love and compassion for Amiloun (OF Ami), thus providing continuity, and again it is a possible link to the OF tradition.

\footnote{Dembowski, II. 2750-52. ["Madam," he said, "in the name of holy charity this is my friend, whom I love very dearly, my companion, who saved me from death and destruction."]}

\footnote{Leach, II. 2170-78.}

\footnote{Dembowski, II. 2753-56. [Belissant heard and was overjoyed; she embraced him and kissed him, kissed his face and his mouth and his nose. What joy there was that evening!]}
The second half of stanza 182 seems to be a blend of traditions. In the ME, Belisaunt takes Amiloun to her chamber, bathes him, dresses him, and puts him to bed:

Into hir chaumber she gan him lede
& kest of al his pouer wede
& baped his bodi al bare,
& to a bedde swiþe him brouȝt
Wip cloþes riche & wele ywrouȝt;
Ful bliþe of him þai ware.519

What first strikes the reader is the similarity to London 1051 cited above: “En sa chambre li ad couché.” What becomes even more striking is that the following deeds, here performed by Belisaunt, are a paraphrase of those actions performed by Amis in London which the ME neglected:

Bainer li fist e seignier,
Con son corps li fist garder,
Servir le fist tot a talent
De viande e de boivre ensement.
E li memes a li vet
Chescun jour sis foiz ou sept;
Tant com pout l’ad conforté.

(L. 1052-58)

The only details lacking in the ME are mention of food and drink, and dressing him six to seven times a day.520 Nevertheless, the sentiment is the same, and the specific details suggest a reliance on the AN tradition for the deeds performed, but the actor is changed. In the ME this becomes Belisaunt, again suggesting a correlation with the OF wherein Belisaunt assures him he will always have a place with them.

La fille Charle se mist a genoillons.
“Ahï!,” dist ele, “gentiz fiuls a baron!” […]
Ne gerrez mais en lit s’avec noz non.521

Here it is clearly implied that it is Belisaunt who is to be the primary care-giver, and this is also the case in the ME. Given the previous similarities in Belisaunt’s introduction and reaction, it does seem possible that the redactor recounted this point as well and adopted it into his narrative, but in doing so, followed exactly the list of actions as recounted in the

519 Leach, II. 2179-84.
520 Dressing his wounds, presumably.
521 Dembowski, II. 2757-62. [Charles’s daughter knelt before him. “Ah,” she said, “noble son of an honorable man! With us you will never again want for a bed.”]
AN tradition. There seems to be no other explanation for shifting Amis’s actions to his wife. The most plausible explanation, therefore, is that the redactor consciously chose to take what he believed where best parts of both traditions and blend them in his own.522

The final part of this episode is, unsurprisingly, a conclusion stanza:

(183) & þus in gest as we say,
Tvelmoneþ in her chaumber he lay,
Ful trewe þai ware & kinde.
No wold þai nick him wiþ no nay,
What so euer he asked ni3t or day,
It nas neuer bihinde;
Of euerich mete & eueri drink
þai had hem-selue, wiþ-outen lesing,
þai were him boþe ful minde.
& biþan þe tvelmonþ was ago,
A ful faire grace fel hem þo,
In gest as we finde.523

Within this recapitulation stanza, usually used to simply sign-post, there is some information found in the AN. The mention of “meat and drink” hearkens back to a previous line in the AN earlier noted as omitted, and other points seem to draw from a short conclusion section in the AN itself:

Plus ne li poet fere companie.
Treis anz demena tele vie;
De ses eses ass[e]z avoyt
Tant com il memes desiroit.

(L. 1062-65)

In both, Amiloun is given anything he desires, and both make mention of a passage of time, though this is changed from three years to one. Such a change does not seem warranted for any metrical reason, but the is always the possibility that an exemplar in the Karlsruhe version would also have one year instead of three.524 There is probably a lost precedent somewhere, for in both the beginning and the end of this stanza the redactor emphasises that the particulars of his story are “found in gestes.”525 Though certainly a

522 There is the possibility that this episode was similarly handled in Karlsruhe, but without the missing sections it is impossible to say.
523 Leach, ll. 2185-96.
524 Of this time period, the OF says nothing. It is true that the ME says that Amiloun and Amoraunt wandered about for three years before reaching the court, and if the redactor had earlier misappropriated that timespan, the reduction here could be to even the difference up, ultimately, however, the very specific time is not important as much as understanding that it was more than a few days, weeks or months, and less than decades or generations.
525 Though it is also possible that in using this formula twice in one stanza, the redactor is “protesting too much.”
conventional tag, it has been demonstrated that throughout this episode, as well as the narrative as a whole, the redactor does indeed rely on earlier information.

**The Oraculum**

The ME dream vision again combines elements from both the AN and OF traditions. In London, the “voice” addresses only Amis; in the OF, the “angel” appears only to the leper. In the ME, the voice of an angel comes to them both, and particulars in the English version are shared with both French traditions.

The ME commences by following the AN tradition in which the oraculum appears to Amis:

(184) So it bifel opon a ni3t,
As sir Amis, þat gentil kni3t,
In slepe þou3t as he lay,
An angel com fram heuen bri3t
& stode biforn his bed ful ri3t
& to him þus gan say:
3if he wald rise on Cristes morn,
Swiche time as Ihesu Crist was born,
& slen his children tvay,
& alien his [broþer] wiþ þe blode,
Purch godes grace, þat is so gode,
His wo schuld wende oway. 526

The points in common with London are compelling:

Quant passa le temps issi,
Oe li quens une noyt dormi,
Une voiz oy qe li disoit
Qe Amillioun trop bien garreit
S’il en fist mettre cure
[Des] deus fiz de sa gendrure:
Si les enfantz tuast
E Amillioun en le saunk bainast,
Si sain devendreit com pessoun.
(L. 1066-74)

Both begin with the passage of an indeterminate period of time, refer to a certain night when Amis was sleeping, and reception of a divine message. In both messages, Amis hears that if he kills his children and bathes Amiloun in their blood, the leper will be cured. Even the order of these detail is shared between the two versions, again suggesting a link.

526 Leach, II. 2197-208.
The points of deviation in the ME can easily be explained. The “voice” of the AN becomes an angel in the ME. This change does not originate with the redactor, but is also found in the OF as shall be seen below. The mention of Christmas day, however, does not appear in any of the French versions. It is a development of the redactor, and a characteristic one in that it eliminates lacunae by explaining Amis’s subsequent delay. His few days of pondering the situation in the ME is a divinely ordained postponement, not mere hesitancy as in earlier traditions. Thus, Amis’s loyalty to his friend appears just as unswerving as Amiloun’s when he was forced to swear falsely in the battle with the steward.

The next stanza then presents the three days of inner turmoil Amis suffers in forcing to chose between his friend and his children:

(185) Pus him þouȝt al þo þre niȝt
An angel out of heuen briȝt
Warned him euer more
3if he wald do as he him hiȝt,
His broȝer schuld ben as fair a kniȝt
As euer he was biforn,
Ful bliȝe was sir Amis þo,
Ac for his childer him was ful wo,
For fairer ner non born.
Wel lœp him was his childer to slo,
& wele lœp his broȝer forgo,
Þat is so kinde ycorn.

This three-day delay, already excused by the introduction of Christmas, also has a precedent in the AN:

Quant veu avoit l’avisiooun
E de cel sounge resperi,
‘A, Deu!’ dit il, ‘qu onqne ne menti,
Doine qe voir soit mon sounge.
Mes ore, soit voir ou mensounge,
La merveile voiz voil prover.
Pur mes enfanz ne voil lessen.
Mout avera fait bone jorne
Si par lour saunk poet estre sauné.’

527 Even a second’s hesitation would be enough to draw criticism. In Le Chevalier de la Charrette, for example, Launcelot’s hesitation of a mere moment before mounting the cart, a dishonourable position for a knight but one that he took for the sake of Guinivere, is enough to invoke the queen’s anger against him. Malory adopts the scene in his version where Launcelot’s delay of “two whole steps” is enough to prevent Guinivere from talking to him afterwards. It is of little consequence that Launcelot willingly humiliates himself in the eyes of everyone for the sake of the queen; that he did not do so immediately is enough to discredit the nobility of his actions. Presumably the ME redactor sees the same fault in earlier versions of A&A, but wanting to retain Amis’s inner turmoil as well as his conversation with Amiloun, he devises the Christmas motif to delay the action without bringing censure on Amis.

528 Leach, II. 2209-20.
Here as well Amis is unsure what to do, not certain if his dream is an oraculum (voir) or an epialtes (mensonge).\textsuperscript{529} He then reflects that if their blood might save Amiloun, then the sacrifice is justified. The English presents the same situation. In first mentioning the dream then following it with Amis's reflections, the ME again follows the AN tradition.

At this point the ME departs from the AN tradition and grafts on an episode from the OF. Where London next say Amis simply decides "one day" to perform the deed, the ME turns to Amiloun who receives the oraculum as well:

\begin{verbatim}
(186) Sir Amiloun met pat ni3t also
Pat an angel warned him bo
& seyd to him ful 3are,
3if his bro3er wald his childer slo,
Pe hert blod of hem to
Mi3t bring him out of care.\textsuperscript{530}
\end{verbatim}

This is much the same as in the OF, in which the angel foretells of all the household going to church except Amile who will come to see Ami. Ami is instructed to tell him of the cure at his arrival:

\begin{verbatim}
Lors li diras que Dex li weult mander
Que, s'il voloit ses anfans decoler,
Ses douz biaus fiz que il puet tant amer,
Et te feist dou sanc ton cors laver,
Ainsiz porroiez garir et repasser.\textsuperscript{531}
\end{verbatim}

Ami struggles with this knowledge throughout the night and when Amile arrives at first light and asks how he fares, Ami simply answers that he shall be well if it is God's will:

\begin{verbatim}
Li cuens Amiles vint a son compaignnon,
Veillant le treuve, si l'a mis a raison:
"Amis, biax frere, et comment voz est dont?"
Amis respon: "Ne ferai se bien non,
Se Dex le weult de gloire."\textsuperscript{532}
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{529} According to Macrobius's definitions for dream types (derived from the Oneirocritica of Artemidorus), an oraculum is a vision in which "the dreamer's parents or some 'other grave and venerable person' appears and openly declares the future or gives advice." An epialtes, the nightmare, is simply a type of visum, a non-veridical species of dream which has no real meaning. Such divisions of dreams and determination of their meaning was considered very important in the Middle Ages, and is often described in medieval literature. See Lewis, The Discarded Image, pp. 63-4.

\textsuperscript{530} Leach, ll. 2221-26.

\textsuperscript{531} Dembowski, ll. 2804-08. [Then you will tell him that God has sent word of your cure: if he were willing to behead his children, those two fine boys that he loves so much, and then bathe your body in their blood, you would be healed and made well.] For mention of the household departing for mass on the next day and Amile's visit being predicted, see ll. 2779-803.

\textsuperscript{532} Dembowski, ll. 2821-25. [Count Amile went to his companion's room. He found him awake and greeted him: "Ami, dear brother, how are you today?" Ami answered, "I shall be well if God Almighty wills it."]
His reluctance to mention the dream and consequent response that his fate is in God’s hands is exactly the same in the ME:

A morwe sir Amis was ful hende
& to his broþer he gan wende
& asked him of his fare;
& he him answered o3ain ful stille,
“Broþer, ich abide her godes wille,
For y may do na mare.”

Such strong correlation clearly indicates another connection between the OF and ME versions.

This similarity with the OF is carried over into the following stanza in which Amiloun continues to hesitate before finally announcing his news:

(187) Al so þai sete to-gider þare
& speke of auentours, as it ware,
þo kniȝtes hende & fre,
Þan seyd sir Amiloun ful 3are,
“My broþer, y nil nouȝt spare
To tel þe in priuete
Me þouȝt to-niȝt in mi sweuen
Þat an angel com fram heuen;
For sooþe, he told me
Þat þurch þe blod of þin children to
Y miȝt aschape out of mi wo,
Al hayl & hole to be!"

The ME abbreviates to four lines (2233-6) what the OF recounts in three laisse (ll. 2842-906) but leaves nothing out. Where the OF dwells on Ami’s long-winded, repetitive procrastination, the ME briefly states that they spoke at length about adventures and knights – the medieval equivalent of discussing the weather. The leper’s reluctance to speak is just as clear in ME as in the OF, but the redactor has made effective use of *abbreviatio* to state succinctly what the OF says at length. Nevertheless, the *sens* remains analogous enough to betray a connection.

When Amiloun reveals his version of the dream, Amis momentarily ponders the choice before him:

---

533 Leach, II. 2227-32. For mention of Ami’s inner struggle and the circumstances of Amile’s arrival, see II. 2811-20.
534 Leach, II. 2233-44.
535 It is also worth remembering that the redactor probably had no copy of the OF before him. If he had, he too may have stated at length what he here says briefly. However, the OF is so verbose and repetitive that the idea one would retain from having
This is the same decision put to Amile in the OF, and it is similarly evaluated:

Li cuens l’entent, si commence a plorer,
Ne sot que faire, ne pot un mot sonner.
Moult li est dur et au cuer trop amer
De ses douz fiuls qu il ot engendrez,
Com les porra ocirre et afoler!
Se gens le sever, nus nel porroiet tener
C’on nel feist et parre et vergonder.
Mais d’autre part se prent a porpanser
Dou conte Ami que il pot tant amer
Que lui meifmeze en lairoit afoler
Ne por riens null ne le porroiet veer,
Quant ses compains puert santé recouvrer.537

Both Amis and Amile have ambivalent feelings in face of their dilemma, and given that the order in which they evaluate choices is the same in both narratives, it again suggests a connection. Such a conclusion is particularly compelling when one realises that no parallel exists in the AN.538 But the ME does have some significant changes. Amile has temporal concerns such as shame and earthly punishment; Amis is concerned about the spiritual problem posed by infanticide. In this, his dread of performing the deed is akin to that of Amiloun in taking a false oath. But just as Amiloun’s evaluation was a reflection more than hesitation (for in both cases the outcome is predetermined) so is Amis’s. Furthermore, elevating the choice to one between fidelity to a comrade and possible damnation raises the value of the selections made in the ME. The ME redactor has therefore both balanced the friends’ relative quandaries and increased the merits of their resulting actions.

536 Leach, II. 2245-50.
537 Dembowski, II. 2917-28 [The count heard and began to weep. He did not know what to do; he could not utter a word. He was stung, and sadness filled his heart: how could he kill, how could he slay those two sons that he had fathered? If it were known, who could guard him from punishment and shame? But then he thought, too, of Ami whom he loved so dearly: how could he let him be doomed and deny him help, just when his friend was so close to a cure?]
538 The AN Amis never hears the news from his friend, never thinks about what to do in his presence, and never evaluates the situation in these terms; his choice is between deciding whether it is worth killing his sons for a cure that might not work as he is not certain whether the dream is an oraculum or a visum.
The end of the stanza concludes the episode by re-introducing to the Christmas mass:

So it bifel on Cristes ni3t,
Swiche time as Ihesu, ful of mi3t,
Was born to saue man-kunne,
To chirche to wende al þat þer wes,
Þæi di3ten hem, wiþ-outen les,
Wiþ ioie & worldes winne. 539

This is the time appointed for Amis’s actions, and therefore sets the scene for the following episode. The redactor is entirely responsible for the implementation of such a sign-posting device, and it again demonstrates his skill in improving the narrative without affecting the development of the plot.

_Amis Slays his Sons_

Stanza 189 introduces the new episode by restating information from the preceding closing and setting the scene for action:

(189) þan þai were redi for to fare,
þe douke bad al þat þer ware,
To chirche þai schuld wende,
Litel & michel, lasse & mare,
þat non bileft in chaumber þare,
As þaiwald ben his frende,
& seyd he wald him-selue þat ni3t
Kepe his broþer þat gentil kni3t
þat was so god & kende.
þan was þer non þat durst say nay;
To chirche þai went in her way,
At hom bileft þo hende. 540

Amis, resolute in his decision, ensures that the entire household goes to church for the mass, leaving him alone with Amiloun and the children. Amis’s evident intent effectively foreshadows following events, and is a narrative improvement over the AN which only mentions that he and his wife went to matins one morning, prayed for a cure, and Amis suddenly withdraws to the room where his sons were sleeping. 541

There are also noteworthy details shared with the OF; in the angel’s original words to Ami he predicts:

539 Leach, II. 2251-56.
540 Leach, II. 2257-68.
Demain iert feste que on doit celebrer,
Li diemenges pour la gent reposer.
Au matinnet doit on aler orer
Por le service et la messe escouter.
Tu n'iras pas, ainz voldras sejomer,
Mais Belissans ira o le vis cler;
Et ses maris, qui tant te puet amer,
Cil te venra veoir et esgarder.542

Only the ME and OF mention the entire house attending mass save these four essential characters. There is also a correlation concerning the importance attached to this mass; it is not just any Sunday, but a special feast day which becomes Christmas in the ME. The redactor makes one important change, making Amis himself the perpetrator encouraging everyone to go to church instead of leaving the situation a preordained part of the oraculum. Despite this difference and the description’s shift to a new location in the ME, however, there remains enough similarity between these versions to determine another link. The redactor clearly incorporates information from previous knowledge of the continental tradition into his version.

In stanza 190 the action begins with another digression that originates with the redactor:

(190) *pe douke wel fast gan aspie*
*Pe kays of pe noricerie,*
*Er ān ān schuld gon,*
& priueliche he cast his e13e
& aparceiued ful witterlye
Where ān ān hadde hem don.
& when ān were to chirche went,
Ān sir Amis, verrament,
Was bileft al-on.
He tok a candel fair & bri3t
& to ān kays he went ful ri3t
& tok hem oway ichon.543

The mention of Amis searching for keys is unique to the ME version, and probably stems from the OF mention that after the slaying Amile locks the door behind him.544 The addition does not impair the narrative in any meaningful way, but eliminates a lacuna in a

542 Dembowski, II. 2796-803 [Tomorrow a great day of celebration must be observed, a Sunday for everyone to rest. They shall go to hear matins in order to listen to the mass. You shall not go, but rather stay here, but bright-faced Belissants will go; her husband, who loves you so much, he will come to see and comfort you.] This quotation comes in laisse 144, immediately before the quotation given above, when the angel commands Ami to tell Amile how to cure the leprosy.
543 Leach, II. 2269-80
544 Dembowski, II. 3032-33; quoted below.
previous version and works as a book-end for compartmentalising this episode and the
next. Immediately after killing the boys and before bathing Amiloun, Amis relocks the
door, then after Amiloun is cured, the next episode begins with Belisaunt searching for the
keys. Amiloun’s search for the keys underscores his premeditation and relocking the door
signals his realisation that his deed is reprehensible. Thus, the keys emphasise Amiloun’s
fidelity to his friend as well as providing a highly developed narrative frame for the plot.

Once Amiloun has the keys, he repairs to his sons’ room where he finds them
sleeping:

(191) Alon him self, wip-outen mo,
Into þe chaumber he gan to go,
þer þat his childer were,
& biheld hem boþe to,
Hou fair þai lay to-gider þo
& slepe boþe yfere. 545

This is not different from the AN:

Atant Ie counte s’est repaire,
En une chambre est entré
Ou les deus enfanz dormerent.
(L. 1090-92)

The OF also says essentially the same:

Quant voit qu’il est laienz bien esseuléz,
C’or porra faire toutes ses volentéz,
S’espee prent et un bacin doré,
Dedens la chambre s’en est moult tost aléz
Ou li anfant gisoient léz a léz.
Dormans les treuve bras a bras acoléz. 546

If anything, the OF is more closely aligned to the ME in showing forethought in Amile’s
preparation of a sword and basin. Such subtle similarities between these versions
continues throughout the scene.

As Amiloun looks on his children, he is momentarily overcome with grief:

þan seyd him-selue, “Bi Seyn Jon,
It were gret reweþe 3ou to slon,
þat god haþ bouȝt so dere!”

545 Leach, II. 2281-86.
546 Dembowski, II. 2960-65.

266
His kniif he had drawen þat tide,
For sorwe sleynt oway biside
& wepe wip reweful chere. 547

He verbally acknowledges the horror of what he is about to do, then cries out loud and weeps openly. 548 This is different from the AN where he goes immediately into action:

Le pere [n’]eust de ses ðiz pité:
Ambedeus ad le chef trenché. 549
(L. 1094-95)

In the OF, however, he also gives them a tender look and has the same momentary misgiving:

Moult doucement les avoit resgardéz,
Tel paor a que chetz est pasméz,
Chiet lui l’espee et li bacins doréz. 550

ME Amiloun’s grief continues in the following stanza:

(192) þan he hadde wopen þer he stode,
Anon he turned oþain his mode
& sayd wip-outen delay,
“Mi broþer was so kinde & gode,
Wip grimly wounde he schad his blod
For mi loue opon a day;
Whi schuld y þan mi childer spare,
To bring mi broþer out of care?
O, certes,” he sayd, “nay!
To help mi broþer now at þis nede,
God graunt me þer-to wele to spede,
& Mari, þat best may!” 551

The first line here suggests that Amiloun draws away from the children to weep before proceeding. 552 This might have a connection with the OF in which he faints. In both he briefly stops and must recommence. And in both, he again weighs the pros and cons. Just as here he ponders out loud that his dedication to his friend is more important than the lives of his children, so Amile does in the OF:

547 Leach, II. 2287-92.
548 Leach notes that sleynt hurled, from OE slecen, p. 129.
549 Fukui’s addition of the negative particle is questionable. It is possible that Amis did actually have pity for his children, but nevertheless was steadfast in his intent to kill them. Even so, his concern certainly lacks the profound sorrow described so vividly in the OF and ME.
550 Dembowska, III. 2967-70.
551 Leach, II. 2293-304.
Quant se redresce dist com hom perceúz:
"Ahi! dist il, chaitis! com mar i fuz,
Quant tes anfants avraz les chiés toluz!
Mais ne m'en chaut, quant cil iert secорrus
Qui est des gens en grant vilté tenuz
Et comme mors est il amentetiz.
Mais or venra en vie."553

Once more the ME appears to drawn on the OF tradition.

A degree of congruity between the OF and ME continues as Amis carries out his deed. Resolved, he cuts their throats and drains their blood into a basin:

(193) No lenger stint he no stode,
Bot hent his kniif wip dreri mode
& tok his children þo;
For he nold nou3t spille her blode,
Ouer a bacine fair & gode
Her þrotes he schar atvo.
& when he hadde hem bope slain,
He laid hem in her bed oagain,
- No wonder þei him were wo--
& hilde hem, þat no wi3t schuld se,
As noman hadde at hem be;
Out of chaumber he gan go.554

Then in parting, he locks the door behind him:

(194) & when he was out of chaumber gon,
þe dore he steked stille anon
As fast as it was biforn;
þe kays he hidde vnder a ston
& þou3t þai schuld wene ichon
þat þai hadde ben forlorn.555

Though the ME suppresses a long segment of the OF in which one boy awakens and offers his neck, the actual killing is reminiscent:

Quant ot ocis li cuens son fil premier
Et li sans fu couléz el bacin chier,
La teste couche deléz le col arrier,

552 see Leach, note, p. 129.
553 Dembowski, II. 2975-81. [When he recovered his senses, he said: "AmiIe, wretch that you are, born to behead your own children! Yet want does it matter, if my deed will rescue a man who is scorned by the world and regarded as dead? Now he will be brought back to life!"]
554 Leach, II. 2305-16.
555 Leach, II. 2317-22.
Puis vient a l'autre, haue le brant d'acier,  
Le chief li tanche tres parmi le colier,  
Le sanc reciut el cler bacin d'or mier,  
Et quant l'ot totu, si mist la teste arrier.  
Les douz anfans couvri d'un riche tapis chier,  
Hors de la chambre ist li cuens sans targier,  
Moult par a fait ls huis bien verroillier.\textsuperscript{556}

The AN says only:

\begin{quote}  
Ambedeus ad le chef trenché;  
E le sanc de eux ad quillé  
E Amillioun dedeinz ad envolupé.  
\end{quote}

(L. 1095-97)

Thus, it is evident that the ME redactor must have had knowledge of events in the OF, for his version shares numerous aspects with it: mention of the knife and the slaughter itself, collecting the blood in a basin (particularly striking as the ME uses the same word as the OF), tucking in the lifeless bodies, and locking the door after him. The AN notes none of these details; it is implied that Amiloun catches the blood in a cloth, and though it here says he beheads them, he later claims to have strangled them.\textsuperscript{557} An OF-ME correlation is therefore undeniable.

\textit{Amiloun's Blood Bath}

Upon fleeing the scene of his children's slaughter, Amis takes the blood to his friend:

\begin{quote}  
To his broper he went hem þan  
& seyd to þat careful man,  
"Swiche time as god was born,  
Ich haue þe brou3t mi childer blod,  
Ich hope it schal do þe gode  
As þe angel seyd biforn."\textsuperscript{558}  
\end{quote}

Amile is horrified that Amis killed his children on his behalf:

\begin{quote}  
(195) "Broper," sir Amiloun gan to say,  
"Hastow slayn þine children tvay?  
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{556} Dembowski, II. 3024-33. [When the count had slain his first son and let his blood run into the precious bowl, he laid the head beside the neck and stepped over to the other child. He lifted the steel sword and brought it down on the neck, collecting the blood in a gleaming bowl of pure gold and then put the head back. The count covered the two boys with a rare and costly carpet and hurried out of the room, bolting the door behind him.]

\textsuperscript{557} Leach notes, "In the French the blood is caught in a linen cloth, in the English in a basin." p. 129. It is hard to say why exactly he deduced the cloth is linen, but that Amiloun "envelops" Amis in the blood rather than bathe him does suggest the blood is in a cloth of some kind. Strangling is mentioned in London, I. 1113.

\textsuperscript{558} Leach, II. 2323-8.
Allas, whi destow so?"
He wepe & seyd, “Waileway!
Ich had leuer til domesday
Haue liued in care & wo!"

Such a scene finds no place in the AN, but is present in the OF:

Au conte Ami est Amiles venus
Qui jut malades entre les ars voulus,
Le bacin tint plain de sanc et desus,
Dou sanc ses fiuls cui il avoit toluz
Les chiés des cors et copéz par esuz.
Or se demente et dist “Las! tant mar fuz
Que tu venis en terre.”

Also present in both versions is a reply from the healthy companion which demonstrates his lack of remorse if such an act can save the leper. The ME Amis states:

Pan seyd sir Amis, “Be now stille;
Ihesu, when it is his wille,
May send me childer mo.
For me of blis hou art al bare;
Ywis, mi liif wil y nou3t spare,
To help pe now per-fro.”

And the OF Amile similarly replies:

“Baus sire Ami, or poez bien lever!
Se par tel chose puet voscore cors saner
Et Dex de gloire voz weult santé donner,
De mes douz fiuls que je ai decoléz
Ne plaing je nul, foi que doi saint Omer.”

Their precise reasons the father gives for not mourning vary slightly, but the fact remains that in both cases, the loss of the sons is easily compensated for by the restoration of the lepers health.

As to the bathing itself, the ME is quite different from either London or the OF:

(196) He tok þat blode, þat was so bri3t,
& alied þat gentil kniȝt,
þat er was hend in hale,
& seȝhen in bed him diȝt
& wreiȝe him wel warm, apliȝt,
Wip cloþes riche & faie.563

The OF provides a long scene in which Amile washes every part of Ami’s body, whereupon he is cured immediately.564 In London, he is cured as soon as he feels the blood.565 Here, however, Amiloun simply redresses his brother and goes to pray for him and his departed sons:

“Broþer,’he seyd, “ly now stille
& falle on sleþe þurch godes wille,
As þe angel tōld in tale;
& ich hope wele wip-outen lesing,
Ihesu, þat is heuen king,
Schal bote þe of þi bale.”

(197) Sir Amis let him ly alon
& in to his chapel he went anon,
In gest as 3e may here,
& for his childer, þat he hadde slon,
To god of heuen he made his mon
& preyd wip rewely chere
Schuld saue him fram schame þat day,
& Mari, his moder, þat best may,
þat was him leue & dere;
& Ihesu Crist, in þat stede
Ful wele he herd þat kniȝtes bede
& graunt him his praier.566

Though both London and the OF also have a dressing scene and then a return to the church, it is significant that in those versions Amiloun/Ami is well enough to go as well.567 He is, in fact, entirely healthy. The change must be attributed to the redactor, probably to heighten the audience’s suspense. It also lends a touch of “realism” to the admittedly fantastic scenario; though a suspension of disbelief is certainly required to swallow the story as a whole, having a cure that takes time to effect a result is more credible than a miraculous immediate restoration. For both reasons, therefore, this alteration can be construed as an improvement in the narrative. The final stanza also functions as a

563 Leach, ll. 2341-6.
564 see Dembowski, ll. 3061-67 and ll. 3074-79.
565 London, ll. 1098-1101. Line 1098-99 read: “Sitost com le saunc senti, / De son grant mal est il garri.” Here, “senti” could also mean “smell.”
566 Leach, ll. 2347-64.
567 Dembowski, ll. 3087-113; London, ll. 1103-04.
recapitulation of the episode, restating the main events and signalling their close by the
shift in location.

Restoration of Amiloun and the Children

Just as the slaughter of the children is introduced with a search for keys, so is the
discovery of their restoration:

(198) Amorwe astite as it was day,
Pe leuedi com home al wip play
Wip kni3tes ten & fiue;
Pai sou3t pe keys per pai lay;
Pai found hem nou3t, pai were oway,
Wel wo was hem o-liue. 568

Here it is their mother who searches, the life-giver as opposed to their father who took
their life. Not finding them, she is approached by her husband who confesses he has the
keys and must speak with her privately:

Pe douk bad al pat her wes
Pai schuld hold hem still in pes
& stint of her strive,
& seyd he hadde pe keys nome,
Schuld noman in pe chaumber come
Bot him self & his wiue. 569

He then reveals to her what he has done:

(199) Anon he tok his leuedi þan
& seyd to hir, “Leue leman,
Be bibe & glad of mode;
For bi him þat þis warld wan,
Boþe mi childer ich haue slain,
Þat were so hende & gode;
For me þou3t in mi sweuen
Þat an angel com fram heuen
& seyd me þurch her blode
Mi broþer schuld passe out of his wo;
Þer-fore y slou3 hem boþe to,
To hele þat frely fode.” 570

568 Leach, II. 2365-70.
569 Leach, II. 2371-76.
570 Leach, II. 2377-88.
The circumstances surrounding this revelation in the ME are different from those in any other version. In both the OF and AN, Belisaunt discovers what has taken place only after rejoicing Amiloun's new health and thus seeing the proof of the treatment. Perhaps for the same reason, Amis/Amile is content to tell her in public with no need of secrecy. It is therefore all the more extraordinary that Belisaunt reacts as she does in the ME:

(200) Ġan was ġe leuedi ferly wo
& sei3e hir lord was al-so;
Sche comfort him ful 3are,
“O lef liif,” sche seyd ḷo,
“God may sende ous childer mo,
Of hem haue ḷou no care.
3if it ware at min hert rote,
For to bring ȝi broþer bote,
My lyf y wold not spare.
Schal noman oure children see,
To-morrow schal ȝey beryed bee
As ȝey faire ded ware!”

Though grief-stricken, her first concern is to comfort her husband, and she too sanctions the death of her children if it might save Amiloun's life. She then offers to participate in hiding her husband's felony, reasoning that God may send them more children if it is his will. This astonishing demonstration of faith has nothing in common with the OF (where she tears out her hair and runs immediately to the boys' room), but it does bring the narrative back in line with the AN tradition:

```
La dame ses meins a Deu tendi
E mout graces li rendi,
Donqence commence pur fere joie:
‘Jhesu Crist, le fiz seinte Marie,
Si li plest, par son poer
Nous porra enfauatz doner.
Si Amyllioun perdu eussez,
Jaməs tel autre ne averez.
De les enfauzn plus n’enpensoms:
Si Deu velt, bien lê recoveroms.’
(L. 1114-23)
```

571 Leach, II. 2389-400. From line 2397 forward, Sutherland is supplied to account for the destroyed portions of Auchinleck. However, the partial line endings and beginnings that do remain in Auchinleck indicates that the two versions follow the same course.

572 Dembowski, II. 3183-86. This is Belisaunt's reaction immediately after Ami tells her and the assembled church not to rejoice for he has murdered their sons, and that they must first mourn them before striking of his (and ironically, Amile's!) head in II. 3153-67. Though she too later swears she would have "held the basin" is she had been advised of her husband's intent, such an oath comes safely after discovering the children miraculously returned to life.
The English Belisaunt’s phenomenally understanding attitude and rationalisation that they
can have more children certainly must be drawn from the AN tradition for it is too
remarkable a correlation to be coincidence. Nevertheless, the redactor has made her
behaviour all the more astonishing by placing it before she sees proof of the treatment’s
effectiveness.

It is only in the following stanza that Amiloun’s recovery is realised:

(201) Pus þe lady faire & bryȝt
Comfort hur lord with al hur myȝt,
As þe mow vnderstond;
And seth þey went boþ ful ryȝt
To sir Amylion, þat gentyl knyȝt,
þat ere was free to fonde.
When sir Amylion wakyd þoo,
Al his fowlehed was agoo
þrouȝ grace of goddes sonde;
þan was he as feire a man
As euer he was ȝet or þan,
Se þe he was born in londe.\textsuperscript{573}

This may have a correlation with the AN tradition which says:

Atant la parole ount lessé
E le service Deu ount escoté.
Après la messe vint a mesoun;
Joïouse est ele pur Amyllioun.
(L. 1124-27)

It is possible that the redactor misread “mesoun” for “leper” instead of “house,” in which
case the ME is following the AN. If such were the case, then it would account for his
decision to leave Amiloun out of the church when Amis revealed his news so as to
eliminate a lacuna of Belisaunt both seeing him there, then going back to see him. In any
case, her joy over finding him healed despite her loss remains intact, and therefore the two
version are in accord.

Finally, they go to see the children alone together where they discover them
miraculously healed:

(202) þan were þey al blip,
Her ioy couþ noman kyth,
þey þonked god þat day.
As þe mow listen and lyth,

\textsuperscript{573} Leach, II. 2401-12.
Into a chamber they went swyþ,
þer þe children lay;
With-out wemme and wound
Hooþ and sound þe children found,
And layen to-geder and play.
For ioye þey wept, þere þey stood,
And þanked god with myld mood,
Her care was al [away].

Here again, the ME seems indebted to the AN tradition. London states:

Amys donqe ove la dame ala
En la chambre ou les enfanz lessa.
Les enfantz furent estranglés,
E tot vifs les ount trovez!
En lor lit s’entrebeyserent,
Del ray del solail s’enjoieren.

(L. 1128-33)

Other versions of the story, including the OF, have the children playing with an apple but ME and London have them recumbent and at play. Furthermore, in London and ME the discovery is a private affair whereas it is very public in the OF. Given the redactor’s demonstrated knowledge of the OF, one can conclude that here he has deliberately decided to follow the AN tradition.

Conclusion

This division again demonstrates a blend of traditions in the ME. Though due to the loss portions of Karlsruhe (the tradition to which the redactor is most often indebted) it is impossible to say with absolute certainty what was in the working exemplar (an impossibility, it must be added, that would have existed in any case). Nevertheless, one can easily deduce portions where the redactor is clearly following one French tradition or the other. What is most interesting is his occasional effort to harmonise the two in a single story for there are places where he relies on both, using his skill as a story-teller in his own right to rectify discrepancies. Such treatment is entirely in line with the precepts of the artes poeticae in order to produce not the most faithful translation, but the most truthful. In the same vein, he is not above leaving out details that either seem extraneous and have no bearing on the plot or which complicate it unnecessarily. And again, he provides “improvements” by compartmentalising his episodes, signalling their beginnings and ends,

574 Leach, II. 2413-24.
575 For example, the apple is in RT and the Celtic version as well. Leach interprets AN to mean the children were playing with the sun-beam, but I believe it to be read as they were playing together in bed with the sun shining on them.
and occasionally delays action to heighten suspense and interests. He also attempts to give more "believable" interpretations of fantastic events where doing so makes the story more credible without sacrificing the essential elements of spiritual mysticism. Through all of this, he produces a new variant of the story instead of simply translating what is before him, and therefore again demonstrates himself to be a remanieur.
DIVISION 5B: Return and Death

In this final division the redactor interprets his material more freely than usual. Although there is evidence that both French traditions are represented, much material that would seem desirable is omitted. Much of the information that can be traced to previous versions is combined in such a way as to entirely change the sens of the original materia of both. Furthermore, there are developments which have no precedent, and for which the redactor alone is responsible.

Ami/oull's Return

Stanza 203 opens the episode with the healed Amiloun eager to return home “to his country,” much as he was wont to do earlier in the narrative at his first separation from his friend:

(203) When sir Amylion was hool & Êere
And wax was strong of powere
Boþ to goo and ryde,
Child Oweys was a bold squyer,
Blithe and glad he was of chere,
To serue his lord beside.
Pan saide þe kny3t vppon a day,
He wolde hoom to his contray,
To speke with his wyf þat tyde;
And for she halp him so at nede,
Wel he þou3t to quyte hur mede,
No lenger wold he abyde.576

The passage appears to be based on one in AN where he likewise wishes to return:

Sire Amillioun, quant fust sanê
E de son grant mal nettê,
Sitost com porra prist congê,
En son pais s’en est alê.

(L. 1136-39)

However, some important elements are include which again betray the influence of the OF tradition. In that version too, the cured knight is eager to return home and see his wife, a motive missing in the AN:

Or a Amis a Amile parlé:
“Sire compains, il me vient en pansé

576 Leach, ll. 2425-36.
Qu’aillé veoir ma famme.”

The second tercet returns to Amoraunt, the youthful companion who led him to his brother’s court, a mention neglected in the AN as his basic function in the plot has already been served. Though the OF never makes any direct mention of this character, it does provide a similar scene in which Ami shows gratitude to the loyal retainers who had accompanied him:

Sez douz bons sers n’i a oubliez.
An icel jor que il fu repassé,
Les fist ansdouz chevaliers adoubéz.

In the AN and ME, Amoraunt represents a conflation of these two retainers and Girard, Ami’s loyal son who was prevented from accompanying him. Much as the son Girard later becomes Ami’s heir in the OF, the nephew Amoraunt will become Amiloun’s heir in the ME and the AN. A lacuna exists in the AN, however, in that Amoraunt is never mentioned between his arrival at Amis’s court with Amiloun and his sudden reappearance back in Amiloun’s court when he is named successor. By following the OF example of mentioning the travel companion, a character who is at once both the loyal retainer and the heir, the ME redactor eliminates this lacuna and presents a more hermetic narrative.

The following stanza demonstrates that Amis has no intentions of allowing his companion to return unaccompanied:

...(204) Sir Amys sent ful hastely
After mony kny3t hardy,
Pât dou3ty were of dede,
Wel fyve hundred kene and try,
And other barons by and by
On palfray and on steed.
He preked both ny3t and day
Til he com to his contray,
Pêr he was lord in lede.
Pân had a kny3t of pât contre
Spoused his lady, bry3t of ble,
In romaunce as we rede.

577 Dembowski, II. 3270-72. [Then Ami spoke to Amile: “Noble companion, the thought comes to me that I should go to see my wife.”]
578 Dembowski, II. 3265-67. [He did not forget his two good servants. On the same day that he was cured he had them both dubbed knights.]
579 See Division 4A-B.
580 Leach, II. 2437-48.
The first two tercets shows the friend readying a host, and the third mentions Amiloun's arrival back in his land. It is implied that Amiloun accompanies him, and in this the ME is in accord with the OF version, and it improves upon the AN versions where the lady simply hears after the fact that Amiloun has returned with AmiS. Variation occurs in the mention of an army. This foreshadows event to come later in the narrative which are neither foreshadowed nor achieved in the earlier versions, all of which is invented by the redactor. The final tercet then mentions that the lady is "spoused," and this has a parallel in the AN. After hearing her husband has returned, she has fear because of this:

Quant la dame aveit oy
Qe son seignur estoit garri
E q'il revint el pais
E od li le counte Amis,
Tel ad el quer dolur
Qe unque femme ne out greignur.
Donge se tint enfyn honie:
Ne quideit pas q'il fuit en vie.
Pur cec fut tot appareillé
Q'en le mois deust estre esposé.
(L. 1140-49)

This is not mentioned in the OF. Thus, where the first stanza seems to rely more heavily on knowledge of the OF tradition, this one seems indebted to that of the AN.

The redactor then mentions his sources, the gestes which supply his information; what is most remarkable about his claim is his subsequent account of events which are not found in the extant AN or OF versions, and the similarities which do exist combine to give a different sens to the materia:

(205) But þus, in romaunce as y 3ow say,
þey com hoom þat silf day
þat þe bridal was hold;
To þe 3ates þey preked with-out delay,
Anon þer began a soory play
Among þe barouns bold.583

No other version mentions a marriage planned for the date, and though the AN does mention them descending on the gate, they do so in stealth, not in such a manner as to raise the apprehensions of the assembled barony. In fact, the sleeping courtiers are not even aware of their arrival:

581 See London, II. 1143, and Dembowski, II. 3279-80.
582 As the next stanza indicates, "spoused" here means engaged and not married.
Car un jour par matyné
Les deus countes sunt venuz
E a la porte descenduz,
Qe nul fut aparcevant
De lour venue tant ne quant.
La meisnee fust endormie;
De lour venue ne saveint mie.

(L. 1159-65)

At this point in the AN, the lady is already aware of their presence in the land, but in the ME she only learns of it from a page after they arrive:

A messengere to þe hal com
And seide her lord was com hom
As man meriest on molde. 584

Here the narrative seems to borrow from the OF tradition:

Parmi les rues le va uns més nuncier
Et as barons par trestout acointier
Qu’Amis est sains revenuz et haitiéz.
Or le puet on trouver enchiés Gautier.
Jusqu’au palais ne se volt atargier,
A Lubias le conte sans noisier. 585

Lubias is shocked: “Lubias l’oit, prent soi a merveillier,” 586 as is the lady in the ME:

Þan wox þe lady blew and wan,
Þer was mony a sory man,
Bop 3ong and olde. 587

But there is no mention of an inn in the ME, nor of concern of “young and old” in the OF. In fact, the people in the OF celebrate in the inn with them and are glad of their lord’s return. Overall, it seems that this stanza does draw on information from both the AN and the OF, but combines them in a confused and disordered manner. Such treatment might be necessary to combine all the information the redactor wanted to mention for the various traditions into a comprehensive whole. It also would not be a surprising occurrence if, as

583 Leach, II. 2449-54.
584 Leach, II. 2455-57.
585 Dembowski, II. 3373-78. [A messenger went through the streets bearing the news to all that Ami had returned healthy and well, and that he was at the inn of Gautier. He soon reached the palace and, without much ado, gave the news to Lubias.]
586 Dembowski, I. 3381. [At this, Lubias was struck with wonder.]
587 Leach, II. 2558-60.
this thesis holds, the redactor was working solely from memory of one account, the OF. Thus, despite a possible desire of the redactor to provide a “true” and “faithful” account, his interpretation actually results in a new version. Once again, the translator appears as a remaineur.

What follows is an entirely unprecedented battle scene in which the companions attack the assembly, driving out the disloyal barons:

(206) Sir Amys and sir Amylion
And with hem mony a stout baron
With kny3tes & squyers fale,
With helmes & with haberyon,
Þey went in to þe hale.
Al þat þey þere araú3t,
Grete strokes þe þey cau3t,
Boþ grete and smale.
Glad and blyþ were þey þat day,
Who so my³t skape away
[And fle fro that bredale.]588

In the OF, the people as a whole rejoiced over his return; while there is an assembly in the AN, it is the courtiers wakened their lord’s arrival who immediately demand and receive his pardon:

Sa gent fist tot assembler,
Chasteleins e chivalers,
Serjanz, vadlet e esquieres.
Touz devant li venerent;
Merci crier touz penserent.
Son maltalent lour pardona,
Od sei les tint e les ama.

(L. 1171-77)

Here is an example of an intentional alteration on the part of the redactor. Though this image may have inspired the redactor’s decision to have a battle, it is not in accord with the earlier version. For whatever reason, the redactor has reinterpreted the events of the story and yet again rendered a new version of events.

After the battle Amiloun banished his wife to a hut not unlike the one in which he was sequestered years before:

(207) [When thei had with wrake

588 Leach, ll. 2461-72. Line 2472 is supplied from Douce.
Droue oute both broun and blake]
Out of þat worthy woon,
Sir Amylyon for his lady sake
& grete logge he let make
Bop of lym and stoon. 589

This differs from the French versions in which she is sent to the same hut in which Amiloun was confined.590 This may have been done for metrical reasons more than anything else, and though the general sense is retained, a certain amount of poetic justice is lost. This nuance is recaptured, however, in the remainder of the stanza where the wife is forced to spend the rest of her life in isolation living on crusts just as Amiloun had:

Þere-yn was þe lady ladde
And with bred and water was she fed,
Tyl her lyue-days were goon.
Þus was þe lady brou3t to dede,
Who þerof rou3t, he was a queede,
As 3e haue herd echoon. 591

Here again, one might see the influence of both French traditions. She is fed as is Lubias in the OF:

De livrison avréz tant seulement
Un quarteret de pain et ne mie trop grant.592

But in the OF, Ami quickly forgives her and fetches her back. Living out her life in the lodge is more in accord with the AN:

La fu la dame durement lié.
Jamés de illoeç ne pouf issir;
La demora desqe al morir.

(L. 1213-15)

Though Amiloun's harsh resolve in the ME is therefore more akin to that of London, the redactor includes nothing like the long diatribe against her, nor the warning that such a fate should serve as an example to other faithless wives. Regardless of the misogynist overtones, the AN Amiloun's speech is both moving and effective, and the narrator's addendum does lend his decision some amount of divine justification which gives the AN a

589 Leach, II. 2473-78.
590 Dembowski, II. 3424-26; London II. 1186-1207.
591 Leach, II. 2479-84.
592 Dembowski, II. 3446-47. [For food, you will have no more than a scant quarter loaf a day, or even less than that.]
more developed quality lacking in the ME. Overall, however, it can be seen that the redactor is again freely combining elements from both French traditions.

**Amoraunt’s Inheritance, Amiloun’s Departure and Death**

His wife having been punished and his land and sovereignty restored, Amiloun promptly abdicates his regained position:

(208) Æn sir Amylion sent his sond
To erles, barouns, fre and bond,
Bøð feire and hende.
When þey com, he sessed in hond
Child Oweys in al his lond,
Þat was trew and kynde. 593

Here the ME is again in accord with the AN and OF:

Li cuens Amis, qui moult ot le cors gent, Owein l’enfant bien teffa:
Son fil Girart adoube maintenant, De tote sa terre li herita,
Se li donna trestout son tenement Qe bien aveit deservy.
Et a ses sers donna grant chasement. 594 (L. 1228-30)

The ME is superficially closer to London in granting everything to Amoraunt, but is not entirely unlike the OF in which Amoraunt’s single character corresponds to the combined roles of the serfs and the son. The second half of the stanza does bring it closer to the OF, but nevertheless, modifications exist:

And when he had do þus, ywys,
With his brother, sir Amys,
Aþen þen gan he wende.
In muche ioy with-out stryf
To-geder ladde þey her lyf,
Tel god after hem dide sende. 595

The AN says only that Amis lived a long time after:

En bone vie longtemps vesqui;
En bienfaitz se pena.

(L. 1231-32)

---

593 Leach, II. 2485-90.
594 Dombowski, II. 3459-62. [Count Ami, so handsome and healthy, now dubbed his son Girard a knight and gave his holdings into his hands; to his two serfs he gave a large estate.]
595 Leach, II. 2491-96.
While the OF also includes a departure with the companion:

Et li baron ne se targent noiant,
De Blaives murent au main a l’ajornant
Por aler au Sepulcre.\textsuperscript{596}

Although the ME includes no mention of a pilgrimage it seems probable that the redactor nevertheless draws inspiration from the OF in having them depart together.

After their departure, the OF inserts a short laisse recounting their voyage to and from the Holy Land. On returning in the final laisse, the audience is told:

Par Lombardie ont lor voie tornoee,
Retorner voldrent arriere en lor contree.
Parmi Mortiers on lor voie tornoee,
La lor prinst maus par bonne destinnee.
Ileuc transsirent, c’est veritez prouvee.
Li pelerin qui vont parmi l’estree,
Cil sevent bien ou lor tombe est posee.\textsuperscript{597}

The AN version has a slightly different version:

Aprés sa mort a Deu ala;
Amis, son frere, ensement.
Moult se amerent fierement.
E bone fut la compagnie.
Lor corps gisent en Lombardie,
E Deu fait pur eus grant vertuz:
Les voegles ver, parler les mutz.

(L. 1233-39)

Not surprisingly, the ME gives a third account which though different in some respects, still allows its adherence to these traditions to be discerned:

(209) Anoon þe hend barons tway,
þe y let reyse a feire abbay
And feffet it ri3t wel þoo,
In Lumbardy, in þat contray,
To senge for hem tyl domesday
And for her eldres also.
Boþ on oo day were þe dede
And in oo graue were þey leide,

\textsuperscript{596} Dembowski, ii. 3469-71. [Then the barons wasted no time; the next day at dawn, they started on their way from Blaye to Jerusalem and the Holy Sepulcher.]

\textsuperscript{597} Dembowski, ii. 3492-98. [They traveled through Lombardy on their way back home. They took their way through Mortara, and their good destiny brought them to their end. There they passed away, as we have heard. Pilgrims on the road well know the tomb where they lie buried.]
The dedication of an abbey serves the same function in demonstrating their piety as the OF pilgrimage, and while miracles at their tombs are not mentioned as in the AN, they are still remembered afterwards in the masses sung for them in perpetuity. On this basis one could conclude that the particulars in the ME are loosely based on events appearing in the other traditions. All three versions are in accord on one specific issue, Lombardy as the place of their burial. On this point at least, the ME very clearly seems to draw on what has come before.

Conclusion

The purpose of this final division is essentially to tie up the loose threads left in the narrative and provide a dignified final end for Amis and Amiloun. Perhaps for that reason the redactor felt justified in handling his material so freely. The important incidents which demonstrate the extent of the friends' devotion to each other had already been demonstrated. Despite the liberal application of *abbreviatio* and *amplificatio*, however, one still comes away from a reading of the ME with the same impression of the story as one would have after reading the OF or the AN. Thus, though the *sens* of the *materia* may well have changed in individual episodes or scenes, the overall impression is that they remain the same for the account as a whole, which is recognisably still the same story. To this extent, therefore, the redactor has provided a "faithful account," but does so by experimenting with the material more as he sees fit than by giving a literal translation of any of his sources. In this, the redactor can once again be recognised as a master *remanieur.*

---

598 Leach, II. 2497-2508.
CHAPTER CONCLUSION

The analysis demonstrates that most of the information in the ME can be directly attributed to previous versions of the story. As the following chart shows, 1818 lines have some direct correspondence to an earlier version. 709 lines have parallels shared with both Karlsruhe and London-Cambridge, the majority of which are almost identical in the AN versions, but of which 92 lines are closer to Karlsruhe and 19 are closer to London-Cambridge. Furthermore, an additional 298 lines have correspondences only with Karlsruhe. Though there are also 348 lines with a parallel only in London-Cambridge, it ought to be recognised that 311 of these come from portions of the narrative which are lost in the Karlsruhe manuscript, leaving open the possibility of a much higher percentage of correspondence with the latter. Nevertheless, this does mean that at least 56 lines are shared between the ME and London-Cambridge only. Thus, it seem likely that the exemplar was in the KLC tradition, and though much closer to Karlsruhe, nevertheless retained some details which were passed to London-Cambridge but omitted in the later AN version.

Additionally, there are 332 lines attributable to the OF version, of which 72 are an expansion of an episode limited to 28 lines in the original. Another 30 lines are shared with OF and Karlsruhe, 21 of which are closer to the OF. Then there are 72 line which have similarities with OF and London-Cambridge, but of these 57 occur in portions missing in Karlsruhe. Finally, 91 lines have correspondences in all the French-language versions, but of these 40 are closer to the OF while only 3 resemble Karlsruhe. Though many of these lines are significantly altered in the ME their resemblance to the OF is evident, and it clearly suggests a connection between the OF and the ME. The differences can be attributable to the redactor working from memory of the OF version rather than an actual exemplar, a practice which Chapter Two points out was practised if not always claimed in the Middle Ages.

It must be noted that even where lines in the ME can be related to parallel lines in earlier versions, they are generally reworked to varying degrees by the redactor so that it is very rare for such lines to be exact semantic equivalents. Such free interpretation was another widely accepted (if not encouraged) practice for medieval translators. There are also 407 line attributable directly to the redactor, in some cases introducing new developments, such as a number of hunt-feasts which have no precedent and which would
conform to fourteenth-century English ideals of courtliness. Most of these interpolations, however, are simply narrative improvements which regulate the flow of the narrative, sign-posting events by summarising the end of one episode and setting the scene for the next. There are also numerous areas where the redactor abridges his information, leaving out details that occur elsewhere, but which the redactor apparently determined to be extraneous and therefore omitted. Again, such practices were viewed favourably in the Middle Ages, and were expected in producing a “good translation.”

The relationship to Karlsruhe is demonstrated clearly through numerous specific details, such as common collocations, correlations of events and order of occurrence. Less frequently, relationships with London/Cambridge and OF are also demonstrated by the same criteria. The fact that ME sometimes agrees with these other versions against Karlsruhe demonstrates knowledge of information in them. It therefore appears that the ME redactor was working with an exemplar in the KLC tradition, one very close to Karlsruhe but containing details shared with London-Cambridge. The infrequent correlations with OF against all three of these versions suggests that the redactor had some familiarity with that tradition as well, but the remarkable divergences from the OF history suggest that he most certainly did not have it as an exemplar. More than likely, he had heard or read a version of the story as recounted in Ami et Amile from which he recalled details which he found superior to those of AN, and was content to use them.

All points of correlation and deviation are outlined in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>Karlsruhe</th>
<th>Lon/Cant</th>
<th>OF</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Division One: Introduction and Arrival at Court</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Proem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boys are well-born barons</td>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>27-9</td>
<td>9-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a story of “great dolour”</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in court they were</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>born in Lombardy</td>
<td>21 &amp; 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simultaneous birth</td>
<td>40-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simultaneous baptism</td>
<td>43-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2) Arrival at Court</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voyage to the duke’s court</td>
<td>61-132</td>
<td></td>
<td>180-207</td>
<td>different story, same intensity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boys are identical</td>
<td>76-84</td>
<td></td>
<td>19-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duke accepts them as pages</td>
<td>115-8</td>
<td>53 / 57-67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knighted at fifteen</td>
<td>93 / 163-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>36-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Division Two: (A) Together at Court</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3) Life at Court</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depth of friendship</td>
<td>139-44</td>
<td>53-60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on horseback</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“lovers’ terms”</td>
<td>142-3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>troth-plight</td>
<td>145-36</td>
<td></td>
<td>traditional English vow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duke’s love for the pair</td>
<td>160-7</td>
<td>79-84</td>
<td>37-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

599 Fewster notes that the borrowings from Guy are particularly apparent in the three feast scenes, all of which are additions in the ME. She clarifies, however, that though Amis certainly borrows from Guy, these lines are “distinctive of romance, rather than of a particular text;” she goes on to note that “Guy itself uses the most typical and formulaic features of romance language. Amis quotes lines not unique to Guy but shared across romance: Guy is a useful fund of romance tail-rhyme style at this point. Amis uses what is very much a shared romance style: its borrowings are formulaic and generic.” p. 65.

600 In the chart, if two or more of the French-language works has a correlation with the English, the one which is demonstrably closer to the ME appears in bold.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Duke gives them offices</td>
<td>186-91, 85-9, 39-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Amiloun as seneschal/steward</td>
<td>191, 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;in hall&quot;, &quot;de la sale&quot;</td>
<td>191, 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>General Opinion of the People, the Duke, and the Steward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Duke and people admired</td>
<td>196-204, 96-106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Duke especially loves them</td>
<td>202-4, 94-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Steward envies them</td>
<td>205-16, 96-106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The &quot;Noble&quot; Traitor and his Animsity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The Noble Decision to Depart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Early reference to cups</td>
<td>241-6, 29-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Distress at Prospect of Separation and Desire to Depart Together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Introduction of the Cups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Departure and Separation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Riding Out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Reaffirmation of Truth-Plight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>cups brought out and exchanged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Description of cups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Final Departure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Separation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ride in separate directions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>cups brought out and exchanged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Description of cups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Final Departure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>tears of departure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>cups brought out and exchanged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Description of cups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Index of the Cups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sign-posting introductory stanza</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>First Encounter with Steward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Steward's Proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Amis's Rebuff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Steward's Reaction and its Consequences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Belisaunt Learns of Amis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Belisaunt's Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Belisaunt wonders who was best</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Belisaunt's Appearance at the Feast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Belisaunt is admired by all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Belisaunt Learns of Amis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Page numbers are approximate and may vary.
24) BelisalUlt Falls in Love
falls in love without seeing him 469-74 369-70 229-30
she is lovesick 472-86 371-2 230-1
ladies ask about her illness 487-9 373-4 233-4
hopeless, she sends them away 490-2 375-9 235-9
25) Amis’s Absence from the Hunt
all men go hunting 493-9 380-2 240-2
Amis the only male left in court 499-504 383-5 243-5
Amis has duties to attend 505-10 386-8
26) BelisalUlt Goes into the Garden
a garden setting is provided 511-6 408-19
mother sends Beiisaunt to garden 523-8 423-9
Beiisaunt meets Amis in garden 538-40 609-10
The Encounter between Amis and BelisalUlt
27) BelisalUlt Reveals her Love
she tells Amis she loves him 568-76 438-41 258-61
she asks him to be her “Ieman” 577-88
28) Amis’s First Refusal
he cannot accept her proposal 589-600 445-8 265-70
a match for “dukes and princes” 586 335 195
he says shame could come from it 601-12 445-50 265-72
29) BelisalUlt’s Response
she questions his masculinity 613-24 416-2 283-4
she threatens to accuse him of rape 625-36 463-7 285-9
30) Amis’s Response
Amis weighs his choices 637-51 469-87 291-2
tries to dissuade her due to shame 652-60 488-99 293-303
31) BelisalUlt’s Retort, Amis’s Acquiescence, and their Leave-Taking
Belisaunt convinces Amis 661-6 500-3 304-7
He agrees and they part 667-72 504-7 338-11
The Steward’s Planting
32) The Steward’s Trap
Introductory Stanzas 673-84
post-hunt feast 685-96
steward perceives their love 697-705 508-12 312-6
he realises how to trap Amis 706-8/718-20 513-4 317-8
a second hunt 721-3
Belisaunt sneaks to Amis’s room 724-6 655-8/664-7
steward spies from next room 727-32 692-3
Conversation before consummation 733-68 673-9
33) The Steward’s Report
steward has confirmation 769-80 517-20 321-4
duke returns 781-3
steward tells all 784-804 521-8 323-30 728-33
34) The Duke’s Wrath
angered duke begins pursuit 805-10 590-40365-70 341-2/367-72
duke attacks 826-8 529-70 331-72
courtiers try to restrain duke 823-5 549-64 351-66
Amis requests trial by combat 829-34 582-3 383-4
Amis careful words denial 834-40 754-9
The Formal Challenge
35) Amis Agrees to Combat
glove thrown down 841-6 583-6 385-8
inverson of who throws first
steward eager for challenge 847-52 587-8 389-90
formal exchange of oaths 851-8 591 393
Belisaunt’s point of view 859-61 645-65
duke makes formal arrangements 862-4 592-3 394-5
36) Amis Finds no Pledges of Surety
support for steward but not Ami 868-73 593-604 395-406
37) BelisalUlt and her Mother as Surety
Belisaunt and mother offer selves 877-900 606-78 417-22 797-801
38) Amis’s Concerns for BelisalUlt
Amis expresses concern 910-12 629-40
39) Amis Realises his Dilemma and Devises a Solution
does not want to fight forsworn 901-9/913-24 695-7
Belisaunt tries to reassure him 925-36 718-26
her mother in Karlsruhe
explains fear to fight forsworn 937-48 727-9
says he must turn to Amiloun 949-60 730-40
40) Amis Receives his Leave and Departs
he is granted leave by the lady 961-72 | 741-66 | 439-46
leaves in his journey 973-90 | 767-74 | 447-56
the travels and his fatigue 991-6 | 775-80 | 457-60
falls asleep in forest 997-1002 | 781-84 | 461-4

41) The ME Conclusion
recapitulation and sign-posting 1003-8

Addition of redactor

Division Two: (C) Reunion and Departure

42) Amiloun's Dream
he dreams beasts attack Amis 1009-20 | 785-92 | 465-70
realises friend in trouble 1072-90/1003-5 | 793-4 | 471-2
leisureed walking followed by fear 1021-2 | 855-9
 tells his wife of dream 1023-6 | 866-70
determined to see about his friend 1030-2 | 889-92

43) Amiloun's Departure
knights prepare to ride with him 1033-8 | 795-803 | 481-3
Amiloun determined to go alone 1039-44 | 798;802 | 476;480

ME is significantly altered

44) Amiloun Seeks and Finds Amis
he dreams beasts attack Antis 1010-3 | 803-5 | 484-9
realises friend in trouble 1021-3 | 822-6
 tells of trouble with steward 1072-7 | 827-32
mentions he has no surety 1096-8 | 835-9
reveals problem of oath 1109-1104 | 843-52 | 502

45) Recognition
Amiloun instantly recognised 1105-13 | 843-52 | 493-502
they embrace with a kiss 1106-5 | 971-2

46) Amis Relates his Woes
Amis vaguely alludes to sorrows 1072-7 | 827-32 | 983-8
ME takes less responsibility
Amis tells full story when asked 1081-95 | 827-32 | 983-8

47) Exchange of Identities and Separation
Amiloun takes Amis's place 1105-13 | 843-52 | 493-502
Amiloun boasts to defeat steward 1114-6 | 852-55 | 503-5
Amiloun says to change clothes 1117-9 | 856-61 | 506-11
Amiloun notes their likeness 1123-8 | 856-61 | 506-11
Amis told to sleep with wife 1129-40 | 862-4 | 512-20

Division Three: (A) Amis in Amiloun's Court

48) Departure
Amiloun rides into forest 1051-3 | 803-5 | 481-3
seen Amis and wakes him 1054-6 | 806-10 | 484-9
 tells him "the hour is late" 1057-9 | 968-70

49) Amis's Acceptance by Amiloun's Household
all accept Amis as Amiloun 1147-58 | 852-30 | 529-30
ME differs significantly

50) The Sword of Chastity
Amis's sword separates the bed 1159-62 | 853-42 | 539-41
the lady is shocked 1165-7 | 854-57 | 542
lady is "wretched" 1166 | 855-61 | ME differs significantly
lady asks why he does this 1168-70 | 855-61 | 516
Amis's response 1171-6 | 856-61 | 519
recapitulation and sign-posting 1177-88 | 857-61 | 521-8

Division Three: (B) The Combat

51) Amiloun's Arrival
scene setting and sign-posting 1189-1200 | 857-61 | 547-50
steward prepares for battle 1201-12 | 851-57 | (impt)
duke has pyre built 1213-18 | 858-61 | (impt)
Amiloun arrives and halts events 1219-26 | 852-73 | (impt)
Amiloun prepares for battle 1237-48 | 854-84 | (impt)
ME significantly altered

52) The Divine Warning
angel tells Amiloun of leprosy 1249-72 | 956-71 | 712-20
Amiloun still resolved to fight 1273-84 | 977-82 | 721-6
recapitulation and sign-posting 1285-96 | 866-71 | ME altered and amplified

53) The Battle
scene setting and sign-posting 1297-1303 | 867-71 | 1756
battle begins on horseback 1304-8 | 868-71 | 601-6
they battle until noon 1318-20 | 869-71 | 647-8
Steward's horse killed; Amiloun dismounts to fight evenly 1321-44 | 870-71 | 615-8
Steward imposes Amiloun's resolve 1345-68 | 871-73 | (impt)
mechanism
victory and sign-posting 1369-80 | 872-73 | 676-7
steward's head on spear 1372 | 873-80 | 1756
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### Division Three: (C) Reunion, Separation and Marriage

#### 54) Duke's Offer of Land and Daughter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene Setting and Sign-Posting</th>
<th>1381-3</th>
<th>Addition of Redactor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duke's praise of Aminis' value</td>
<td>1387-9</td>
<td>882-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke's offer of land and daughter</td>
<td>1417-60</td>
<td>1204-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation and Sign-Posting</td>
<td>1393-1404</td>
<td>Addition of Redactor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 55) Reunion of the Heroes and Separation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene Setting and Sign-Posting</th>
<th>1405-10</th>
<th>1180-96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duke's offer of an escort refused</td>
<td>1411-16</td>
<td>1197-1203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation and Sign-Posting</td>
<td>1453-8</td>
<td>799-806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke's offer of an escort refused</td>
<td>1411-16</td>
<td>1197-1203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation and Sign-Posting</td>
<td>1453-8</td>
<td>799-806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 56) Amiloun at Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene Setting and Sign-Posting</th>
<th>1501-12</th>
<th>1234-7</th>
<th>771-84</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wife asks about sword</td>
<td>1459-64</td>
<td>2003-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation of Home Situation</td>
<td>1459-64</td>
<td>2003-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation of Home Situation</td>
<td>1459-64</td>
<td>2003-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation of Home Situation</td>
<td>1459-64</td>
<td>2003-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 57) Amis at Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene Setting and Sign-Posting</th>
<th>1513-24</th>
<th>1064-73</th>
<th>1945-7/1966-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wedding Feast</td>
<td>1513-24</td>
<td>1064-73</td>
<td>1945-7/1966-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation and Sign-Posting</td>
<td>1513-24</td>
<td>1064-73</td>
<td>1945-7/1966-74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 58) Leprosy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene Setting and Sign-Posting</th>
<th>1537-42</th>
<th>Addition of Redactor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leprosy arrives</td>
<td>1543-8</td>
<td>807-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation of Leprosy</td>
<td>1543-8</td>
<td>807-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation of Leprosy</td>
<td>1543-8</td>
<td>807-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation of Leprosy</td>
<td>1543-8</td>
<td>807-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 59) Amoraunt Relays the News

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene Setting and Sign-Posting</th>
<th>1562-44</th>
<th>1306-17</th>
<th>835-43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amoraunt tells of banishment</td>
<td>1585-1620</td>
<td>1288-1305</td>
<td>815-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation of Amoraunt Relays the News</td>
<td>1585-1620</td>
<td>1288-1305</td>
<td>815-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation of Amoraunt Relays the News</td>
<td>1585-1620</td>
<td>1288-1305</td>
<td>815-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation of Amoraunt Relays the News</td>
<td>1585-1620</td>
<td>1288-1305</td>
<td>815-34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 60) Driven Away From Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene Setting and Sign-Posting</th>
<th>1577-8</th>
<th>1284-7</th>
<th>850-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forced from the Table</td>
<td>1579-84</td>
<td>811-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation of Driven Away From Court</td>
<td>1579-84</td>
<td>811-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation of Driven Away From Court</td>
<td>1579-84</td>
<td>811-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation of Driven Away From Court</td>
<td>1579-84</td>
<td>811-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 61) Divisive Wanderings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene Setting and Sign-Posting</th>
<th>1602-06</th>
<th>1524-32</th>
<th>856-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build hut and beg in market town</td>
<td>1633-56</td>
<td>880-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation of Divisive Wanderings</td>
<td>1633-56</td>
<td>880-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation of Divisive Wanderings</td>
<td>1633-56</td>
<td>880-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation of Divisive Wanderings</td>
<td>1633-56</td>
<td>880-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 62) Foreign Travels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene Setting and Sign-Posting</th>
<th>1655-60</th>
<th>1534-9</th>
<th>910-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recanto's travels to Anis's court</td>
<td>1678-1800</td>
<td>1517-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation of Foreign Travels</td>
<td>1678-1800</td>
<td>1517-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation of Foreign Travels</td>
<td>1678-1800</td>
<td>1517-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation of Foreign Travels</td>
<td>1678-1800</td>
<td>1517-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 63) Arrival

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene Setting and Sign-Posting</th>
<th>1763-64</th>
<th>1474-89</th>
<th>883-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amoraunt sent to ask lady's aid</td>
<td>1765-88</td>
<td>1490-1516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation of Arrival</td>
<td>1765-88</td>
<td>1490-1516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation of Arrival</td>
<td>1765-88</td>
<td>1490-1516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation of Arrival</td>
<td>1765-88</td>
<td>1490-1516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 64) Amoraunt's Sergeant Notices Amoraunt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene Setting and Sign-Posting</th>
<th>1858-60</th>
<th>1554-9</th>
<th>916-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sell ass to buy food</td>
<td>1861-6</td>
<td>856-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation of Amoraunt's Sergeant Notices Amoraunt</td>
<td>1861-6</td>
<td>856-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation of Amoraunt's Sergeant Notices Amoraunt</td>
<td>1861-6</td>
<td>856-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation of Amoraunt's Sergeant Notices Amoraunt</td>
<td>1861-6</td>
<td>856-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 65) The Reunion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene Setting and Sign-Posting</th>
<th>1909-20</th>
<th>1584-88</th>
<th>934-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knight sees Amoraunt's beauty</td>
<td>1921-44</td>
<td>1589-93</td>
<td>939-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Page(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight suspects Amoraunt mad</td>
<td>1945-7, 1594-1600, 944-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight suspects Amis to be great</td>
<td>1948-51, 1682-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67) Sergeant Mentions Amoraunt to Amiloun
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knight goes back into hall</td>
<td>1999-20, 1584-88, 934-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amis asks, and he tells about it</td>
<td>1957-80, 1608-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tells of offer and refusal</td>
<td>1981-92, 1612-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68) Amis Rewards Amoraunt's Loyalty
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>he recognises loyalty isn't crazy</td>
<td>1993-2004, 1619-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amis sends out his cup of wine</td>
<td>2005-16, 1656-63, 970-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

69) The Reunited Cups
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amiloun draws out his cup</td>
<td>2017-28, 1672-8, 978-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sergeant astonished</td>
<td>2029-34, 1679-81, 983-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>says Amiloun richer than Amis</td>
<td>2035-40, 1682-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suggests Amiloun is a spy</td>
<td>2041-6, 1688-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tells Amis about cup</td>
<td>2047-52, 1700-6, 986-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

70) Amis's Wrath
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>runs and throws leper in mud</td>
<td>2065-75, 1726-15, 994-1003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demands where leper got cup</td>
<td>2076-82, 1740-1, 1008-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiloun does not explain</td>
<td>2083-8, (impft) (1012-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recapitulation and sign-posting</td>
<td>2089-2100, (impft)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Division Five: (A) The Cure
72) Amoraunt Reveals his Lord’s Identity
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tells Amis it is Amiloun</td>
<td>2101-24, (impft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amis's Recognition and Remorse</td>
<td>2125-36, (impft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they kiss</td>
<td>2147, (impft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recapitulation and sign-posting</td>
<td>2137-48, (impft)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

73) Amis's Wrath
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>says only Amiloun has that cup</td>
<td>2053-8, 1646-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leper must be murderer and thief</td>
<td>2059-64, 1652-5, 1711-4, 990-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

74) Belisaunt's Recognition and Care for Amiloun
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amis carries Amiloun inside</td>
<td>2149-54, (impft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belisaunt asks why he does this</td>
<td>2155-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amis explains it is Amiloun</td>
<td>2161-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belisaunt faints with sorrow</td>
<td>2170-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belisaunt kisses Amis all over</td>
<td>2173-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belisaunt takes Amis into chamber and tends to him</td>
<td>2179-2184, (impft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recapitulation and sign-posting</td>
<td>2185-96, (impft)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

75) The Oraculum
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oraculum appears to Amis</td>
<td>2197-208, (impft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amis's three days of turmoil</td>
<td>2209-20, (impft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leper receives oraculum</td>
<td>2221-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friend asks leper how he fares; leper says he is in God's hands</td>
<td>2227-32, 2821-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leper hesitant to tell of dream</td>
<td>2233-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amis briefly considers choices</td>
<td>2245-50, 2917-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>close with Christmas mass</td>
<td>2305-16, 3024-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enters room and finds sons asleep</td>
<td>2317-22, 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

76) Amis Slays his Sons
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all at mass but the companions</td>
<td>2297-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ami searches keys to nursery</td>
<td>2269-80, (impft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enters room and finds sons asleep</td>
<td>2281-6, (impft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overcome with grief to kill them</td>
<td>2287-92, 2967-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>briefly withdraws for composition</td>
<td>2293-304, 2975-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cuts throats, drains blood in basin</td>
<td>2305-16, 3024-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grabs in bodies, parts, locks door</td>
<td>2317-22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

77) Amiloun’s Blood Bath
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amis takes blood to leper</td>
<td>2323-8, 3036-8, 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiloun is horrified</td>
<td>2329-34, 3048-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amis not to worry about it</td>
<td>2335-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amis washes Amiloun</td>
<td>2341-6, (impft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amis says lie still then goes pray</td>
<td>2347-64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

78) Restoration of Amiloun and the Children
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belisaunt searches keys</td>
<td>2365-70, (impft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asks Amis, they speak privately</td>
<td>2371-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he admits what he has done</td>
<td>2377-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he says God can send more kids</td>
<td>2389-400, (impft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discover that treatment worked</td>
<td>2401-12, (impft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finds boys restored in room</td>
<td>2413-24, (impft)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Division Five: (B) Return and Death
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79) Amiloun’s Return

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amiloun decides to go home</td>
<td>2425-36</td>
<td>(imptf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remainder of Amoraunt</td>
<td>2428-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiloun wants to see wife</td>
<td>2431-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amis returns with Amiloun</td>
<td>2437-45</td>
<td>(imptf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the lady is “spoused”</td>
<td>2446-8</td>
<td>(imptf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their arrival a bad sign for many</td>
<td>2449-54</td>
<td>additon of redactor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ride to the gate</td>
<td>2452</td>
<td>(imptf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a messenger tells the lady</td>
<td>2455-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lady is stunned</td>
<td>2458-60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>battle some</td>
<td>2461-72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wife banished to hut</td>
<td>2473-8</td>
<td>(imptf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>she lives out life there</td>
<td>2479-84</td>
<td>(imptf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fed on crusts and water</td>
<td>2480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

80) Amoraunt’s Inheritance, Amiloun’s Departure and Death

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amis abdicates to Amoraunt</td>
<td>2485-90</td>
<td>(imptf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the friends live out lives together</td>
<td>2491-6</td>
<td>(imptf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endow an abbey to pray for them</td>
<td>2497-2508</td>
<td>(imptf)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ultimately, therefore, the redactor produces an entirely new legend in which he picks and chooses what is to his liking from all the information available to him, shortening and lengthening as he sees fit to produce a “more complete” and “better” version. In doing so, he conforms to general practices which seemed to have found common acceptance. Much as Hosington observes of Partonope of Blois, this is “a translation in which unusually close renderings exist side by side with paraphrase. The author has mingled respect for his source text with a freedom that enabled him to produce a romance that is in fact a poem in its own right.” Not surprisingly, this procedure also resembles that observed by Mills in Guy of Warwick, where it appears that “before proceeding to any detailed rendering of the words of the Anglo-Norman, the translator would first have broken down that source into passages, each sufficiently coherent in it’s subject-matter to serve as the basis for an effective tail-rhyme stanza. Where the original material was of a very limited extent, and could not convincingly be expanded by his unaided powers of invention, it was supplemented by material from cognate texts already in Middle English, whether consulted or remembered.” There is also a likeness to Ipomedon, in which “the English translator shows himself capable of striking a balance between preserving the substance of his French original and creating a poem that can be enjoyed in its own right on account of its lively style, [and] successful handling of the tail-rhyme stanza.” Each of these translations at once conform to the established methods

---

601 To some extent, this reveals a similarity with the translation of Partonope de Blois, in which Hosington notes, “All the while shielding behind a declaration that he is translating closely, which of course he is not in this instance, he injects a personal note that throws into question the ‘truthfulness’ of the French Narrator’s account.” See Partonope de Blois and its Fifteenth-Century English Translation, p. 237. Though the Middle English redactor of A&A never makes declarations as to the fidelity of his source (other than the occasionally reference to what he has “found in geste”), his practice betrays a similarity to that of the Partonope translator.

602 Hosington, Partonope and its Translation, p. 252.

603 Mills, p. 221. In A&A, the “cognate text in Middle English” from which the redactor appears to have borrowed most regularly is actually Guy, and it has been hypothesised that the two works were executed by the same translator(s). More interesting is the fact that the A&A redactor also borrows from an Old French version, which apparently was remembered rather than consulted.

604 Hosington, The Englishing of the Comic Technique, p. 259.
set forth in the artes poeticae and each can therefore be recognised as an example of remaniement, but the mark of the French originals can always be discerned by the careful reader no matter how effectively they been “Englished.”

It should furthermore be noted that in Amis and Amiloun not only have the individual episodes been recast to lend the legend appeal to the audience, but the entire structure of the tale is packaged in a format that corresponded to the “typical” arrangement of a Middle English romance. Fewster mentions that the structure of Amis and Amiloun shares many similarities with other English romances she examines. She observes: “Middle English Romance is typically structured around the adventures of a single knight: the resolution of the knight’s initial displacement marks the close of the text. So in Octovian, Isambras, Emare, Lai le Freine, Sir Orfeo, and so on, closure is signalled by re-union with a lost family; in Beues, Horn, and Havelok, closure is the regaining of the hero’s lost kingdom.”

Though Amis and Amiloun deals with two knights, their adventures are generally recounted separately, and closure is signalled both by reunion and regaining a lost realm. Fewster further recognises that the Middle English pattern “is quite opposite from...the effect created by interlace structure, as discussed by critics dealing with Old French romance narratives,” because “Middle English metrical romances tend not to be interlaced.” This is particularly interesting in examining Amis and Amiloun, for in the Old French narrative – which the redactor has been demonstrated to know – is interlaced, or at least inter-related, with Roland and Gaydon which come before it in the manuscript, and with Jourdain de Blaye and Auberi le Bourguignon which follows it. All five works together can be read as an extended chronicle. Such interlacing is nowhere present in the ME, one example of which being the previously mentioned omission of the steward’s lineage. In fact, Amis and Amiloun so fully reflects the archetype of a Middle English romance that Fewster selects it to stand as her example for her chapter on romance style; it contains all the “shared generic” motifs typical of the genre, including character portrayal, development and structure of the plot, and language reflective of romance in general.

The redactors “improvements,” however, are not limited simply to literary content, for there is also an important linguistic component which needed to be addressed. The following chapter examines these issues, such as the employment of a new verse style, the

605 Fewster, p. 19.
606 Fewster, p. 21.
607 MS BN 860 fr (ancien 7227, ancien Colbert 658).
608 For example, Hardret in the OF is related to Ganelon, Roland’s traitorous step-father in the Chanson. It has already been noted how the ME redactor omits these references to the lineage of traitors, as indeed frequently happened with all interlacing information touching on the Matter of France.
609 See Fewster, pp. 50-81.
role of alliteration, parataxis and stress, and most importantly, the reliance on formulaic language. These elements of style were clearly also intended to provide the audience with a format which would be familiar to them, and which would therefore have some appeal due to their appreciation of a form already known to them and apparently admired. All together, these elements reflect the emergence of a new insular style which was to have long-standing influence on the development of English literature through Chaucer and beyond.
CHAPTER V: POETIC DICTION, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO FORMULAE

V.1 INTRODUCTION:

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the poetic diction used by the redactor in creating his version. The role of stress, parataxis and alliteration are treated briefly, demonstrating the retention of elements from pre-Conquest poetry in the relatively “new” innovation of the tail-rhyme stanza. The important role of the formula receives a fuller treatment, beginning with the development of a new definition of the formula based on prototype theory utilising the “mental template.” This permits the identification of all formulae in the text, revealing the extent to which formulaic diction is used. A selection of these formulaic expressions, listed in the appendix in their entirety, is then examined in order to demonstrate the redactor’s reliance on both native Germanic and Romance traditions. The conclusion then demonstrates how the redactor’s method harmonises the various influences into a homogeneous whole, forming part of a new insular style.

V.2 GENERAL COMMENTS ON VERSE

Though in terms of content Amis and Amiloun owes a great debt to its Anglo-Norman and French predecessors, there is no doubting that this is a characteristically English work. As demonstrated in the last chapter, the redactor “anglicises” his version by making certain changes which would lend it greater appeal to an English audience. Perhaps more telling than the contextual changes is the adoption of a new verse form which would be equally acceptable. As Brewer notes, “No poet could stand up in his pulpit before the audience, as medieval poets did, if he was not prepared to use a poetic language with which his audience was reasonably familiar, and which it could be expected to understand and even to like.”¹ As such, there is nothing remarkable in the redactor finding a new verse and organisation better suited for the English version.

V.2.1 Comments on the Redactor’s Employment of the Twelve-Line Tail-Rhyme Stanza

The redactor therefore employs the twelve-line tail-rhyme stanza, later to become so common in Middle English romances. The verse form has a rhyme structure of a,a,b,c,c,b,d,d,b,e,e,b where iambic four-stressed couplets (a,c,d,e) alternate with a single iambic three-stressed lines (b).² Though this verse form is today considered “typical” of

² It ought to be mentioned that A&A uses the more confining form of this verse structure in which the A-lines and C-lines share the same rhyme.
Middle English romances, it is worth mentioning that it was not much employed before *Amis and Amiloun*. It first occurs on any notable scale in the Auchinleck romances, and the manuscript itself is sometimes referred to as the fount of the structure. Much study has been made of the verse in the past and there is very little new ground to cover concerning its employment generally, but a few points regarding the redactor’s use in this poem and how it would affect translation are worth mentioning.

First of all, this structure is entirely unlike the assonating decasyllables organised into laisse of the Old French or Anglo-Norman, and though it does share rhyme and octosyllabic lines with the latter, the employment of iambic feet and regular variation of line length are improvements for a stress-timed language like English. It has also been noted that changing from couplets to stanzas increases the difficulty of translation for “the stanza-form brought with it a very definite need to shape the story-material, whether by abbreviation or by amplification.” As Mills observes when comparing the stanzaic and couplet versions of *Guy of Warwick* with the original French, “The presence of four tail-lines in every stanza makes impossible as long-sustained an equivalence of sense with the original as can be found in the couplet version. What is more, the distribution within the stanza of lines of the original that are precisely rendered will vary considerably from one stanza to the next.” As *Amis and Amiloun* shares many commonalities with the stanzaic *Guy* – its predecessor in Auchinleck – one can assume that the same situation would hold true here, as indeed the previous chapter demonstrates.

Ultimately, however, the use of stanzas in a strophic organisation rather than the stichic laisses of the French-language versions provided the redactor with a means of better organising his material. Each stanza operates as a vehicle for a single episode or situation complete with a transitional opening, development and a conclusion. Except in direct discourse (where there is little differentiation in function between the b lines and the couplets) the b lines always serve a special function, primarily as “fillers” which complete each tercet. Usually they offer a conclusion to developments in the couplet, less frequently a comment by the redactor. They are often independent clauses, often highly formulaic.

---

3 Mills, p. 219.
4 Mills, p. 216-17.
5 Though the OF version does attempt to contain episodic developments into each laisse, the laisses themselves can vary greatly in length, sometimes containing several developments at once whereas the ME limits it to one, or more rarely two. Retention of this organisation in the AN, having abandoned the assonance which unified laisses in the OF, is anachronistic. The divisions vary between versions, and are thus scribal rather than authorial, the individual copyist therefore determining for himself where an episode begins or ends. Incidentally, Chapter Three points out how the rubrication in Auchinleck corresponds to decorated letters in Karlsruhe.
6 Such as “princes proude in pride” (I. 1380), “Worjjest in wede” (I. 435), or referring to the source, “In geste as so we rede” (144). It is noteworthy that these highly conventional lines are usually alliterative; it seems to suggest some continuity with an older pre-Conquest literature based on alliterative long lines that often employ conventional tags from which these and many other examples from the alliterative revival may well be descended directly or indirectly.
Some may argue this interrupts the narrative flow rendering the plot somewhat stilted. Such criticism neglects the fact that this organisation with heavy employment of formulae was not the product of unskilled versifiers struggling to force the words to conform to the metre, but that the structure was designed to meet the expectations of the audience for whom the redactions were produced. As Fewster notes, "the associative value of romance formulae suggest that to emphasise the metrical function is misleading: accounts of their metrical role place an emphasis on the needs of composition, which has in the past been extended to the assumption that a certain 'flabbiness' in romance writing was the result of the demand of metre. However, these lines can be considered instead from the viewpoint of the information they offer to the reader: formulae are the small-scale features which are fixed enough as to be easily recognisable – the fact that these lines are repeated in romance means that they evoke a context of romance." Thus, the use of such structure actually appealed to the audience by providing them with a style which was familiar and which they appreciated. Furthermore, the delayed narrative flow does help to build dramatic intensity and vividness, and at least one early scholar judged it to have a "tirade effect generally pleasing."9

Though irregularity is sometimes ascribed to a lack of skill or corruption, it actually relieves the monotony that would result from an unnaturally isochronous rhythm and often appears intentional to achieve a certain effect. Many acausal lines, for example, are used deliberately for emphasis; particularly so in exclamations beginning with direct discourse: "Hail," she said, pat leuedi bri3t.11 Sometimes a series of acausal lines are used to speed up the narrative. Occasionally a stanza begins with an accented first syllable to show a break in the narrative, and a series of headless lines can also be used to mark off a narrative unit. The b-line is sometimes acausal for emphasis or to mark a contrast. Other metrical variations also follow a regular pattern. When anapaests occur, they are usually after the caesura, and very rarely in the first foot. Though much more rare, the same can be said for spondees. Some lines contain

---

7 Ramsey, for example, in commenting generally on the Middle English adaptations of French-language romances, says: "To turn from the French to the English romances is to go from one world to another. The English romances lack, almost totally, the grace, the sophistication, the development, and the courtly atmosphere of their French counterparts: the worst of them are the least sort of translation or crude popularizations. One often wonders why the English translator even bothered to write in verse." p. 10. It is perhaps true that the earlier romances lack some of the elegance later infused into Middle English literature by the likes of Chaucer, but as the rest of this paragraph demonstrates, these romances would have found acceptance by their target audiences for the very reasons Ramsey derides them.

8 Fewster, p. 12

9 Leach, p. xcix.

10 Il. 78, 879, 905, 965, 1126, 1468, 1560, 1855, &c.

11 Il. 785, 795, 823, 1604, 1681, 2008, 2036.

12 Il. 7811, 887, 1597, 1669, 1681, 2077.

13 Il. 263, 302, 409, 425, 530, 607, 635, 809, 993, 1184, 1681, &c.

14 E.g. Il. 337, 912.

298
five feet instead of the required four, and rarely, three. Frequently, the b-lines have an extra fourth stress. All of these variations help the redactor to regulate the flow of the narrative and achieve foregrounding effects.

V.2.2 Evidence of Indebtedness to Old English Metre

V.2.2.1 The Role of Stress

The use of iambs themselves, though strictly speaking not characteristic of Old English poetry, does have a link with the older native tradition in underscoring the importance of stress in metre. Of equal relevance is the regular use of a caesura. In four-stressed lines the caesura is almost always in the middle, breaking the lines into two units of two metrical feet. This is reminiscent of the Old English line where two verses, each containing two stresses, are separated by a central caesura. All regular a, c, d and e lines in A&A follow this model, their four iambs separated by a caesura corresponding exactly to the prototypical type B line of Old English verse. These form the largest percentage of lines in the poem.

V.2.2.2 Parataxis

Also characteristic of Old English is a heavy use of parataxis as opposed to hypotaxis. Such structures are also found in the Middle English text. Except in direct discourse, and even then frequently, most of the lines are clausal and almost always end-stopped. It is not unusual to find them linked with no conjunction (asynthetic parataxis) for half a stanza or more, as in lines 679-84:

After his douhter he asked swipe;
Men seyd þat sche was glad & bliþe,
Hir care was al agon.
To eten in halle þai brou3t þat may,
Ful bliþe & glad þai were þat day
& þonked god ichon.

Frequently one finds syndetic parataxis on the same scale, as in lines 442-4 or 2071-6:

---

15 e.g. II. 259, 1790.
16 e.g. II. 715, 893, 1400. Leach holds that all instances of three stresses instead of four are corruptions, but I am not convinced. To me it seems to have the effect of intentionally speeding up the narrative.
17 e.g. II. 156, 159, 177, 213, 240, 249, 477, 734, &c. Almost a hundred of these.
18 Though iambs do occur regularly as B-type verses in Old English poetry, their presence seems to be stylistically motivated. The most common in Old English, the A-lines, is basically trochaic. This reflects the grammatical structure of Old English, a synthetic language which, at least in the earliest period, seems to have flavoured inflections as opposed to the use of prepositions and determiners as found in the later more analytic phases of the language.
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Hypotaxis is relatively rare.

**V.2.2.3 Alliteration**

Also shared with OE is the frequent use of alliteration. Leach claims that this frequently results from the use of what he calls a "romantic formula" rather than a conscious attempt of the author, and therefore it is difficult to determine where it is deliberate. In itself, the use of such formula would indicate a connection to the older tradition, but as every stanza contributes several instances of alliteration, it is doubtful that the redactor was unaware of its heavy employment. He certainly does not attempt to avoid it. Furthermore, much as Kane observed in regard to Langland's use of the device, "it is not material whether he consciously chose the alliterative combination; by virtue of its existing it is functional."\(^{21}\)

At least 168 lines have three or more instances of alliteration,\(^{22}\) such as "How þey were in wele and woo" or "As princes prout in pride."\(^{23}\) Sometimes alliteration is combined with parataxis to produce lines such as "Of hyde and hew and here" or "In word, in werk, in will, in dede."\(^{24}\) Such constructions are conspicuous enough to suggest the redactor was aware of the extent of alliteration in his redaction.

**V.2.2.4 Formulae**

Leach's observation that one often finds romantic formulae in the poem is certainly worth discussing. Even the casual reader of romances will note that there is a high proportion of formulaic expressions in the poem. In examining the formulae it became evident that their percentage was much higher than imagined, and the majority of the remainder of this chapter is dedicated to an examination of the formulae.

\(^{19}\) In b-lines, the caesura is usually after the first stress, but sometimes not in direct discourse. Overall, there is very little variation.

\(^{20}\) The subject is in the previous line.

\(^{21}\) Kane, p. 60

\(^{22}\) See "List of Alliterative Lines" in appendix.

\(^{23}\) See lines 11 and 168 respectively. These lines inverse the Old English rule of having one to two stressed syllables before the caesura alliterate with no more than one stressed syllable after it. This is a convention employed by the redactor throughout, but it in no way lessens the fact that he certainly appears to have a taste for alliteration.
V.3 A NEW CONCEPTION OF POETIC FORMULAE BASED ON PROTOTYPE THEORY AND THE MENTAL TEMPLATE.

While cataloguing formulae in Amis and Amiloun, it became apparent that many of the existing definitions for identifying them were not up to the task. Because certain figures of speech failed to meet all the criteria set forth by these definitions, they were excluded from the list of formulae despite being clearly formulaic in construction and use. The problem was not so much that these figures of speech failed by not adhering rigidly to the definitions, but rather that the definitions themselves failed by being so rigid that they could not adequately identify all formulae. Only the most perfect examples would pass the test. The basic fault seemed to lie in the fact that most of those definitions relied solely on structure, and in doing so frequently overlooked the semantic purpose which initiated the formulae’s creation and application. It seemed that a new way of recognising formulae was needed. Recent work on prototype theory which post-dates the original definitions’ development seemed to offer a solution.

The aim of this chapter, therefore, is to demonstrate how prototype theory can be used to provide a new way of looking at a formula by using examples primarily from Amis and Amiloun. It first examines some of the inadequacies of earlier definitions where rigid adherence to structure fails to take into account the component of “fuzziness” in the creation and use of formulae. It then proposes how prototype theory can be used to account for this fuzziness. A group of essential features is formed, which are differentiated from the attributes which have often formed part of earlier definitions, but which are essentially commonly occurring accidentals. Note is made of how the correlation of these essential features and accidental attributes fully instantiate the core prototype of a formula, and to which previous definitions were confined. Next are examined the variations on such constructions which, though more distant from the prototype core, can nevertheless readily be identified as formulae as well. Finally, the similarities between the examples of formulae at the prototype core and their related constructions somewhat more distant from the core are examined in order to establish mental templates, by which all formulae can be identified.

V.3.1. Difficulties in Proposing a Definition for Formulae, and Inadequacies of some Standard Definitions.

Though recognising a formula is a relatively simple task, coming up with a definition for the term often poses some difficulty. As Johnson responded to Boswell when asked to

24 Lines 81 and 152 respectively.
define poetry, "it is much easier to say what it is not. We all know what light is; but it is not easy to tell what it is." And indeed, various scholars have come up with various definitions to suit their particular needs. For many this seems not only acceptable, but even necessary, for as Diamond points out, "the poetic formula is, of course, entirely different in every tradition because of the varying demands of meter and syntax." But it appears that perhaps there are some underlying constants which might allow one to identify all occurrences of a formula in any literature.

Traditionally, all definitions postulated for any particular literature have incorporated that originally established by Parry in his analysis of Homer's *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*: "a group of words which is regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given essential idea." Though this provides a good foundation, the need for more precision is evident. In *Amis and Amiloun*, for example, one is no longer dealing with a highly formalised poetry in Greek hexameters, but the koine verse of a language whose orthography is not entirely fixed, whose morphology leans more toward the analytic than the synthetic, whose verse structure utilises a variety of meters incorporating rhyme, alliteration and to some extent assonance. As such, it seems crucial to define more clearly the elements by which a formula can be identified.

Duggan establishes just such an amended definition for Old French verse in his study of the *Chanson de Roland*: "a phrase co-extensive with the hemistich and substantially identical with another phrase in the poem...can be regarded as a formula." Though he fits the new definition to the language and verse style to which it is to be applied, it may be argued that he adheres to it rather too rigidly. He permits variation within a formula only if it affects closed class words, or in the case of terminal words in the second hemistich, alternative lexical selections for open class words which "express the same essential idea but which are endowed with assonantal flexibility through the substitution of semantically equivalent (I hesitate to say 'synonymous') words." Duggan himself acknowledges that this excludes a number of "stylized word combinations" which straddle caesuras or line endings, such as "des Francs de France" in line 804, but not in line 177. In the study of Middle English poetry such as *Amis and Amiloun*, however,
this definition would prove inadequate in that it would eliminate combinations such as "pat (leuedi/maiden) bri3t," while permitting its semantic equivalent, "pat bri3t (leuedi/maiden)." From a structural point of view, such strict application of a rule appears to be not only acceptable, but an absolute necessity for technical cohesion.31

Unfortunately, from a semantic point of view it puts the letter of the law before the spirit, blinding the reader from noting coherence in the architecture of the language except where it coincides with cohesion in structure.32 If the purpose of a rule such as Duggan’s is to aid in identifying structural formulae in order to demonstrate semantic accord between various parts, then such strict adherence to the rule tends to defeat its intended purpose when that application eliminates some of the semantic equivalents.33

Kay slightly amends Duggan’s definition, allowing “some variety in prefixation and inflexion,” as well as “variation in word order.”34 She defends her changes by noting the need to include semantic equivalents as variations of the same formula (as in the Middle English examples above), which are either recorded separately by Duggan, or in some instances, not recorded at all.35 Though her new definition permits a bit more flexibility in formula recognition, Kay herself notes that it is still “somewhat stringent.”36

It would admit the above Middle English selections as a formula, for example, but it would still omit the Old French. The requirement that a formula correspond completely to a hemistich prevents some highly stylised and evidently formulaic turns of speech from being classified as formulae.

31 Duggan argues that this point is negligible because it excludes only a small proportion of the possible formulae, and also that “when jongleurs used repeated phrases, they almost always did it using complete hemistich, and not fractions thereof.” p. 8. Nevertheless, jongleurs, being humans and not machines, would be quite capable of making minor modifications to a formulaic structure in order to suit the particular needs of any given situation. This might include changing a subject or object (insert "lord" for "lady"), or even combining elements from various formulae in new constructions.

32 For a full discussion of architecture of language (as opposed to simply structure), see Burnley, Language in A Guide to Chaucer’s Language, particularly Chapter 9, The Architecture of Chaucer’s Language, pp. 201-26. Briefly, structure can be thought of as a means of describing strictly the grammatical unity of a given text or utterance, while architecture can be thought of as taking into account the semantic aspect of such expressions as well. Burnley defines it thus: “It is better considered as a texture, an ‘architecture’ of associations, wrought by the social values its users and his audience perceived in it, and by their recognition of properties to verbal contexts, technical discourse, literary genres, or familiar situations.” p. 155. For example, cohesion refers to grammatical and syntactic continuity in structure provided to a text through devices such as conjunction, substitution, ellipsis, and reference (p. 79). Coherence, however, takes into account particular levels of meaning conveyed by such structures which extend beyond mere grammar and syntax; reference, for example, can be either anaphoric or cataphoric, referring forward or backwards in the text. Such reference is entirely endophoric, in that all aspects can be gleaned from the text itself. Of equal importance, however, is exophoric reference relating "outside the text to a political, cultural, or other set of circumstances, or to features of the immediate physical situation.” p. 81. The relevance of formulae is perhaps more pronounced as an exophoric reference, for formulaic use would necessarily put the audience in mind of other works — in terms of both meaning and style — in which the formulae were encountered.

33 Duggan is not entirely responsible for this problem. Such irregularity is clearly the result of the limits imposed on him by the use of first generation computers in making concordances and forming collations. Unlike the human brain which permits lateral thinking, computers are incapable of making exceptions to rules unless they are programmed to do so. To programme in all the exceptions to the rules hypothesised by Duggan would have been impossible, and the task is still onerous enough to be distasteful. We often do not know what exceptions need to be programmed in until we encounter them. Having no intuition, the computer cannot alert us to possibilities. They can sort information structurally, but it is still up to us to analyse it semantically. Fortunately, today it is easier to generate a variety of sorting classifications which simplifies the task of analysis.
This half-line requirement is particularly unsuited to Middle English verse such as *Amis and Amiloun*, which uses the common twelve-line tail-rhyme stanza with its combination of tetrameter and trimeter lines. Though the A, C, D, and E lines clearly contain a caesura, such a division is not always readily apparent in the B lines which contain only three feet. Nor is it the case that a repeated phrase in English verse must necessarily correspond to a hemistich in order to be a formula. Even of the highly structured Old English verse style which always contained a caesura, Diamond notes:

Most formulas in Old English poetry make a whole verse, but some are only one measure of a verse, while some are a verse pair (a typographic line), a verse trio (half of one typographic line with the preceding or following typographical line), or a run-over verse pair (the second half of one typographical line and the first half of the following one).

A definition such as Duggan and Kay’s would fail to include many of the epithets, compounds, kennings and verbal tautologies of Old English (or Homeric Greek, for that matter) which are clearly recognised as formulaic by current scholars. In many instances it would also exclude the Middle English analogues which descended from the Old English tradition, such as “*heuen bri3t*” or “*answerd o3ain*.” Furthermore, it would omit single-word formulae such as “*anon*,” “*alas*,” and “*andswaru*” which have a real place in Old and Middle English poetry. Though the requirement of a correspondence to a hemistich might simplify the job of compiling the formulae, it is an artificial aid, in that it frequently causes the compiler to disregard bona fide formulae and formulaic constructions.

---

38 *Amis and Amiloun* employs a verse structure common to many Middle English romances (e.g. *Syr Tryamoure*, *Syr Lawful*, and *The Erle of Toloue*) and is therefore a useful particular for such a general study. Each twelve-line stanza utilises tail-rhymes in an AABCCBDDBEEB structure (though in *Amis and Amiloun*, the A and C rhymes are usually identical). The B lines contain three iambic feet while the other lines are iambic tetrameters. As such it is impossible to identify a hemistich in the B lines because any half-line division would separate the central metrical foot, as would be the case in another commonly employed English verse-line, the pentameter.

39 Diamond, p. 232. Diamond uses the term “verse” in its technical capacity meaning a hemistich in Old English poetry.

40 Though the use of epithets and repetition was carried over into Middle English from Old English, it is important to bear in mind the diverse function of the such usage in the two literatures. Old English poetry, much like Homeric Greek, is conceived of as being the product of oral composition. Formulae served a particular mnemonic function in such compositions which became obsolete in literate communities, such as that which existed in medieval Britain, where their retention was more a matter of style which soothed the audience and simplified the author’s job by providing him with ready made stock phrases. For more detail on this subject, see Lord.

41 “*Heofonbeorhf*” and “*beorht beacen godes*” are both attributed in OE poetry. See Hall, p. 177, and Lester, p. 59. Diamond notes the particular proclivity for the use of “*andswaru*” in formulae on p. 231.

42 Diamond notes that “many formulas consist of a single word. A word must be regarded as a formula when it regularly occurs in the same metrical situation.” p. 231; the validity of this statement is recognised even by Duggan who defers to Diamond where Old English verse is concerned.
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What, then, constitutes a formula? It does not need to be a hemistich, it does not necessarily need to be a group of words, it does not even need to be repeated. Absence of repetition in a single poem does not necessarily mean the word or group of words was never repeated for the same effect elsewhere in the author’s writings or in even in literature of his age. Such a definition would by default cause the omission of all *hapax legomena* which form a substantial part of the attributed Old English vocabulary.\(^4\) Though these conditions are handy guidelines for identifying a formula, they are simply characteristics which generally result from a construction being formulaic, not intrinsic qualities which make the construction a formula.\(^4\) Unfortunately, it is difficult to identify exactly what these qualities are.

V.3.2. Towards a New Conception of Formulae Based on Prototype Theory.

Nagler suggests that formulae are “the actualisation of a central Gestalt... which is the real mental template underlying the production of all such phrases.”\(^4\) Without getting into the intricacies of generative grammar pursued by Nagler, one can nevertheless recognise that he has a point. There are some criteria which allow the identification of certain stylistic constructions as formulae, while dismissing other lexical selections as clichés, aphorisms, epigrams, or other turns of phrase. A formula can usually be identified simply by elements of its construction, even when these elements are not in strict accordance with rules of a proposed definition (such as evidence of repetition). Unfortunately, many definitions are too narrow to include all formulae, but the extensive alteration required to permit inclusion of all possible variations could easily result in a definition so broad that it becomes ambiguous. There must be some middle ground, and it seems that an approach based on Nagler’s observation is the best method of approaching it: determine what inherent qualities cause the creation of the formula, rather than what secondary results tend to (but do not necessarily have to) emerge from that realisation.

The spirit of this approach is completely in line with the classical methodology promulgated by Aristotle (and aspired to by Duggan and others) in identifying what a thing is based upon its essential parts. Aristotle, however, cautions against confusing the *essence*, which is “all parts immanent in things which define and indicate their

\(^4\) “*Gulp-bord*” (war shield) and “*gulp-bill*” (war sword) both occur frequently in Old English poetry, and their formulaic quality is attested. By comparison, “*gulp-helm*” (war helmet) and “*gulp-sweord*” (war sword) are unique, but they were clearly formed in accordance with the same principles by which the former two formulaic expressions were generated. Furthermore, their absence elsewhere means only that no other examples of the constructions survived, not that they were never used in other works.

\(^4\) It is rather like being German. Speaking German is usually the result of being German, but it does not make one German (many second and third generation *Gastarbeiter* who reside in Germany but have no right to citizenship will attest to that); not does not speaking the language make one any less German (numerous Russian-speaking *Umseidler* from the former Soviet Union demonstrate this by exercising their “right to return,” some after centuries in Russia).
individuality,” and the incidental accidents, which mean “that which applies to something and is truly stated, but neither necessary nor usually.” It is the confusion of the accidental and the essential that leads to the failure of many definitions: that a formula must be a half-line; it must be more than one word; it must be repeated. As is known to anyone who has ever penned a few lines of metrical poetry, the human mind does not invariably produce verse which conforms in every respect to a prescribed set of rules. The same can be said for anyone who has ever misremembered a poem or a jingle and supplied missing words or verses with incorrect but syntactically and semantically acceptable variations. In the latter case, the metre is often altered due to the inclusion of too many or too few syllables, and sometimes one is amused to discover a conflation of two separate sets of lyrics. Nothing is more natural. It is the repeatability, not the repetition itself, that is a characteristic of formulae. So if the machinery which produces a formula (the brain) permits such a great deal of variation and revision in the creation of its product, it is therefore a mistake not to accommodate such variation in that product’s definition.

This was not perceived of as an option for Duggan who believes that any definition must of course be definitive. His intentions are good in that they generally conform to the orthodox procedure of Aristotelian categorisation to which he aspires: establish a category with clearly delineated boundaries, defined in terms of a conjunction of necessary and sufficient binary features, in which all members of the category have equal status. Unfortunately, there are few essential binary features to a formula, so Duggan was forced to compensate by selecting prominent accidental characteristics on which he imposed binary restrictions. At about the same time, however, the classical method used by Duggan was being challenged by the likes of Wittgenstein, Labov and Rosch, who demonstrated that categorisation is not always so clear cut. How is it, for example, that we manage to recognise chess, football, tossing dice, and a child bouncing a ball against the wall as various types of “games”? Why do the majority of people select “chair” as the best example of “furniture” when their other options are “desk,” “shelves,” and “bed”? At what point does a cup become a bowl as its width is increased and its handle reduced; if stretched upward, at what point does it become a vase? Different persons give different answers for different reasons, and in the case of the cup-bowl-vase

---

46 Nagler, p. 270.
47 Tredennick, §5.8.1.
48 Tredennick, §5.30.1.
49 see Taylor on classical approach to categorisation, pp. 23-4.
50 see Wittgenstein, pp. 31-3.
51 see Rosch, p. 229.
example, the same person often gives different answers when the content of the vessel is changed. It seems that at various times alternative sets of criteria are used to formulate judgements about the same object. Clearly, categorisation is not as precise as the classical approach would lead us to believe; there is often a good deal of "fuzziness" involved.

In relating these observations directly to linguistics, Taylor established that choices regarding lexical selection and usage are usually characterised not by the recognition of clear cut features as prescribed by the classical approach to categorisation, but rather by evaluating the extent to which any particular conception conforms to a mental archetype based on a varying number of attributes. He concedes that there are cases where the classical approach is useful in that the presence or absence of certain salient features will definitively include or exclude an item in or from a category, but that frequently categorisation is realised by recognition of an imprecise number of characteristics, some of which can be essential, but not all of them need be. This process of measuring an individual item against a standard image of any given category is known as prototype theory. As Taylor puts it, "The prototype can be understood as a schematic representation of the conceptual core of a category. On this approach, we would say, not that a particular entity is the prototype, but that it instantiates the prototype. It is the nearness or distance from the core prototype, which may itself be abstractly conceived, that permits us to deem an item within or outwith a particular category. These prototypes are not always reducible to binary features or even invariable attributes, and in a statement reminiscent of Nagler's observations of the origins of formulae, Taylor stresses that "cognitive structures often need to be understood more as holistic, gestalt configurations, rather than as attributes in a bundle."

III. Identifying the Essential Features and Non-Accidental Attributes which Instantiate the Prototype of a Formula.

Definitions such as Duggan's, Kay's and Parry's are valid for recognising only the most perfect examples which completely instantiate the prototype, but they dismiss perfectly acceptable forms which are clearly related but are further distanced from the prototype core. If one wants to locate all the formulae, one needs a definition that allows us to compensate for the "fuzziness" of the structure. This cannot be done by selecting the most common accidental characteristics (such as usually resulting in a hemistich) and imposing binary qualifications on them (saying that they must do so). Rather, one needs to establish

52 see Labov, pp. 340-73.
53 Taylor, p. 59. Italics in the original.
54 Taylor, p. 60.
a set of essentials, which may be quite meagre, and supplement them with other non-
accidental attributes which characterise formulae.

To establish the essentials, one may begin by slightly revising Parry’s original
definition to conclude that a formula is a group of words or a single word which is or can be
regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given idea. This
reveals four essential parts: (1) it is made of words; (2) it has a particularly useful
metrical structure; (3) it expresses a given idea; (4) it is essentially repeatable. But the
inadequacies of such a definition have already been established in that it is too broad, and
the above italicised amendments to it accompanied by the omission of the “essential”
aspect in the given idea hardly compensate for the deficiency. What is next required then
is a group of attributes which help to clarify (rather than limit) the definition further.
These attributes can best be identified by examining each of the individual essential
features in turn.

III A. Made of Words

(1) A Formula is made of words. The veracity of this statement is so evident that at first
it may not seem worth considering. However, it is an improvement over the original
definition which seems to imply that more than one word is required. Though perhaps
ideally several words will be employed, it is only that numerous words more fully
instantiate the ideal of a formula, much as a phrase is popularly expected to contain a
number of lexical units. An elementary survey of grammar reveals, however, that a single
word can constitute a phrase just as well. The noun phrase “the most delicious chocolate
cake” can be effectively reduced to its headword and still stand as a complete phrase in its
own right, permitting one to say: “\( \text{vp(Let NP(Them) eat) NP(cake))} \)” So it is with a formula.
The number of words is irrelevant so long as it composes a single unit of thought, and it
does appear that this unit of thought must correspond to a phrase. It is only that the
general perception of a formula, the ideal prototype, contains more than one word, but this
is nothing more than a frequently occurring non-essential attribute.

III B. Useful Metrical Structure

56 Furthermore, the requirement that a formula be composed of more than one word would severely limit their use in
agglutinative languages (such as Turkish, Finnish or Japanese) and polysynthetic languages (such as many Eskimo dialects).
In Eskimo, for example, the English sentence, “He wants to acquire a big boat,” can be rendered by the single word
“\( \text{angyaghlangyugtuq} \).” Though such examples are rare in English, there is the case of certain (if somewhat unlikely) words
formed in an analogous manner, such as the old example of “antidisestablishmentarianism.” See Crystal, p. 90 and p. 293.
57 It is also worth noting that not every word can be used as a formula. “Cake,” for example, would not prove suitable.
Though it can constitute an acceptable phrase, it lacks other essentials which would render it formulaic, specifically a
(2) A formula must have a particularly useful metrical structure. A poet would have at his or her disposal a cache of constructions which he or she could employ in any metrical situation. If, for example, a poet concludes the main thought of a particular situation or event halfway through a line and simply needs a "filler" to reach the end of the line. Depending on other constraints of the chosen verse (such as assonance, rhyme or alliteration), the versifier may select from an abundance of phrases that will do the job. Amis and Amiloun is replete with examples along this model such as \textit{pat hendy kni3t} and \textit{answerd o3ain}. Each is suitable for providing two iambic feet which will complete the tetrameter in A, C, D, and E lines, as is the case five times for the former example,\(^{58}\) and twice for the latter.\(^{59}\) Frequently, these formulae can be transposed to the beginning of a line if desired, permitting another sound structure to take the final position, as is done five times and two times respectively.\(^{60}\) In either case, the formulae are useful for filling out the metre.

But it is the metrical utility, not conformity to a hemistich, that makes these examples formulae. Otherwise one would have to exclude occurrences of these examples in medial position, such as "\textit{pan stode pat hendy kni3t ful stille,}"\(^{61}\) or "\textit{& he him answerd o3ain ful stille.}"\(^{62}\) Likewise, one would not be able to include such examples were they to occur in trimeter B lines which have no medial caesura to define the hemistich. Clearly, however, if a formula is indeed a formula its identity as such should not change simply because its location is shifted. It is still functioning in the same metrical capacity, and as such its intrinsically formulaic quality remains intact.

It is furthermore not the case that a formula even needs structural conformity with a hemistich. Frequently part of a formula exceeds the hemistich boundary by one or more syllables as is the case with "\textit{in his armes tvain,}"\(^{63}\) and "\textit{also god me spede.}"\(^{64}\) Despite their lengths, they fulfil the function of a formula by filling out the line in exactly this same manner as two iambics. Likewise, a formula may actually be less than a full hemistich. In nine instances the poet uses the three syllable construction "\textit{bi Seyn Jon}"\(^{65}\) to finish a line, which despite being one syllable short of a hemistich nevertheless

\(^{58}\) In lines 290 (\textit{Sir Ami/oun, pat hendy kni3t}), 1009 (\textit{As sir Ami/aun, pat hendy kni3t}), 1177 (\textit{pus, ywis, pat hendy kni3t}), 1393 (\textit{ful bihte was pat hendy kni3t}), and 1486 (\textit{& how his bropher, pat hendy kni3t}).

\(^{59}\) In line 121 (\textit{he riche barouns answerd again}), and with slight variation of tense, line 457 (\textit{Her maidens gan answere again}).

\(^{60}\) In lines 511 (\textit{pat hendy kni3t bipou3t him jJan}), 589 (\textit{pat hende kni3t stille he stade}), 763 (\textit{pat hende kni3t bipou3t him jJan}), 1063 (\textit{pat hendy kni3t, sir Ami/oun}), and 1754 (\textit{pat hendy kni3t gan meken his mon}) for the former and 230 (\textit{Answerd o3ain wip wordes hende}) and 266 (\textit{Answerd o3ain wip wordes hende}) for the latter.

\(^{61}\) Line 637.

\(^{62}\) Line 2330.

\(^{63}\) Lines 2128, 2152. (\textit{armes} does seem to be pronounced with two syllables in this poem)

\(^{64}\) Lines 8, 32, 956, 1336, 1918, 1936, 1960, 2050, 2161, 2287.

\(^{65}\) Lines 785, 832, 956, 1336, 1918, 1936, 1960, 2050, 2161, 2287.
functions adequately as a formula, as do the two-syllable constructions “ful 3are,” “ful stille,” “ful ri3t,” and “ful fain.” All of these examples display a metrical construction that the poet finds useful for filling out the metre, and as such their formulaic function should not be denied to them simply because the poet needed slightly more or less than a full hemistich to complete his line.

Nor does a formula always need to consist of more than one word. In more than twenty cases, the poet completes a line by taking a rather innocuous “anon” to its end. This single word is just as much an iamb as “ful 3are” &c., regardless of its monolexical form. In some instances where an “-on” ending is not suitable, the poet shifts the word to the beginning or middle of the line where its metrical utility does not impair the rhyme scheme. It nevertheless continues to fulfil a formulaic role in preserving the metre of the line in which it is included, and taken all together, the word is thus used thirty-one times. Nor is “anon” alone in having this function. Other words, particularly adjectives and adverbs, can be similarly used, such as “alas,” “astite,” or even the monosyllabic “swipe,” providing various endings to suit particular rhyme requirements when an extra iamb is required at the end of a line.

There is a limited degree of versatility permitted in the longer formulae mentioned above as well. When, for example, “bi Seyn Jon” fits the metre but does not exactly conform to the rhyme scheme, it is simply a case of finding a suitable monosyllabic unit with lexical equivalency to replace the final word. By this process we find two cases of “bi Seyn Gile” and one of “bi Seyn Jame.” That the result is simply a variation rather than a new formula is rooted in the fact that the overall structure is essentially the same, and it retains the same given sense, an aspect that will be examined further below. Duggan is quite willing to accept lexical variations such as this because the change is in the final (i.e. rhyming or assonating) word of a formula in the final position of a line. But

---

66 Lines 75, 106, 123, 1023, 1153, 1194, 1373, 1386, 1629, 1857, 2223, 2236, 2391.
67 Lines 637, 1603, 2230.
68 Lines 292, 530, 1696, 2195, 2279.
69 Lines 745, 784, 1137, 1475, 1777, 1797.
71 Lines 664, 1061, 1123, 1204, 1322, 1346, 1378, 1610, 2294, 2377. The word also occurs in two other places, line 1057 (He cIeped to him anon riJt) and line 1144 (& sir Amis went hom anon ri3t); in these instances, however, it is an intrinsic part of a larger formula, “anon ri3t,” which cannot be reduced any further without destroying its paradigmatic integrity. See below for further explanation.
72 Line 1104.
73 Lines 1046, 1465, 1477, 1480, 1693, 1790, 2005, 2365.
74 Lines 679, 732, 1033, 1399, 1415, 1757, 1784, 2146, 2182. The pronunciation of final “-e” seems to be variable, apparently being pronounced in lines 679, 732, 1399, but not in the other instances. See following footnote.
75 Nor is it always the case that a single word need be polysyllabic in order to be used as a formula. Though such is usually the case, there is also the example of “Hwæt” in Old English verse, as at the beginning of Beowulf: “Hwæt we Gar-Dena // in gear-dægum” l. 1.
76 Lines 952, 1126.
77 Line 796.
his restrictions are excessively limiting, blinding us to examples such as "pat maiden bri3t"79 or "pat birde bri3t,"80 each of which occurs only once but are clearly variations on the well represented formula "pat leuedi bri3t."81 They also would exclude examples where the final word undergoes variation, but the formula is not in final position in the line. Just as one cannot deny a construction its formulaic utility simply because it is moved to a medial position in a line, it cannot be pretended that rules governing formulae change because of such shifts in location. If the variation is permissible in one place, it must be permissible in all.

Similarly, some formulae may be altered to permit wider metrical usage. The utility of "Also god me spede" has been noted, but what about instances where the poet judges this construction to be too long? It is a simple case of abbreviating the construction slightly to render "so god me spede," which is used six times.82 "In his armes tvain" undergoes a similar change with the final word being omitted in three instances to render "in his armes" twice and "in hir armes" once.83 Again, the basic sentiment is unchanged and the structure is only slightly altered. It can, however, still be readily identified as a variant of the same formula, thus dispelling the frequently cited "requirement" of metrical uniformity.

From a structural point of view, then, all that is required is something that can be "plugged in" to fit the metre, permitting simple modifications in order to maintain and facilitate structural cohesion with and throughout the verse. Taken by itself, this might seem to open up the definition of formula to permit any string of words which conforms to the metrical restraints of a poem, but of course that is not the case. It is the intersection of this structural utility with semantic acceptability that renders a formula viable. This semantic acceptability comes from a formula’s ability to express a given idea while remaining repeatable, essential elements which provide the key to separating a formula from the rest of the regular metre, and which are examined below.

III C. Having Meaning and Express a Given Idea.

It has been established that a poet had at his/her disposal a variety of tags that could be inserted into the poem to preserve its metre, and if necessary, provide a sound to assonate,
rhyme or alliterate. This is but a structural function of the formula. Of equal importance is its semantic function in imparting some meaning. In looking at the above examples, it is evident that each one of them has a particular meaning upon which there is no need to elaborate. One knows, for example, that "in his armes tvain" means "in his two arms," and that "answerd o3ain" means "answered back." These formulae are not selected willy-nilly and inserted haphazardly wherever they fit the metre, but they are slipped into the verse only in places where their inclusion makes sense. It is the rich barons, the rich duke, and Sir Amiloun who "answerd o3ain" in replying to someone, not an unaddressed hug speaking out of turn. Likewise, barons, dukes and characters embrace people "in his armes tvain," but that has no bearing on their manner of speaking to someone. These two formulae cannot therefore be used interchangeably, though either might suit the metrical structure of (x / x / ) needed by the poet. Thus, formulae have to be used in such a way that they not only fit the metrical structure, but also in a way that they make sense in the context supplied.

III D. Repeatable

Formulae's meaning lack a "particularising force," which makes them useful for describing a variety of situations. This allows them to be repeatable, and thus formulaic. The formula "in his armes (tvain)" provides a good example. Twice it is used to describe a sexual encounter, once between Amis and Belisaunt:

\[
\text{& in his armes he her nam,} \\
\text{& kist \textit{pat} miri may} \\
\text{& so \textit{pat} plaid in word \& dede,} \\
\text{\textit{Pat} he wan hir maidenhesd,} \\
\text{Er \textit{pat} [she] went oway.86}
\]

and another time between Amiloun and his wife:

\[
\text{Sir Amiloun \& \textit{pat} leuedi bri3t} \\
\text{In bedde were layd bside;} \\
\text{\textit{In hir armes} he gan hir kis} \\
\text{\& made his ioie \& michel bliss} \\
\text{For noping he nold abide.87}
\]

84 These examples also show an aspect of tautology which is often found in formulae. However, such repetition is another example of an accidental aspect, not an essential feature. Though it may be useful for alerting someone to the presence of a formula, it is not an essential feature, as every formula is not tautological.
85 Line 121, lines 230, 266, and line 2230 respectively.
86 Lines 764 - 8.
87 Lines 1460 - 4.
In two other instances, it is used to describe the brotherly embrace of the two main characters:

When sir Amis herd him so sain,  
He stirt to ðe kniȝt again,  
Wip-outen more delay, 
& biclept him in his armes tvain.$^8$  

and:

ðan was sir Amis glad & fain,  
For ioie he wepe wip his ain 
& hent his broper þan,  
& tok him in his armes tvain.$^9$  

In yet another instance, the formula is used to describe the fighting embrace which Amoraunt restrains duke Amis from killing the leper whom he does not recognise as Amiloun:

He was bope hardi & strong,  
Þe douke in his armes he fong 
& held him stille vp-riȝt.$^{10}$  

Clearly, the prepositional phrase always has the same basic meaning, but that meaning is not so specific that it can only be used in a very limited way, rather it can be applied to a number of discrete situations. In most instance it could even be done without and the meaning of the passages concerned remains intact. It is this aspect of a formula, having “little or no particularizing force” that makes it repeatable.$^{11}$

$^8$ Lines 2125 - 8.  
$^9$ Lines 2149 - 52.  
$^{10}$ Lines 2101 - 3.  
$^{11}$ Rosenberg and Danon, p. 12. In a work that came to my attention after this paper was finished (Traditionality and Genre in Middle English Romance, p. 9), Carol Fewster notes a similar situation, which she calls “conventional phraseology” in Aethelstan. In the first instance (ll. 67-72), the two sons of the “good erl of Stane” are described thus:

Pat on was fyffene wyntyre old, 
Pat oper þrytene, as men me told: 
In þe world was non here þere – 
Also whyt so lylyeþlour, 
Red as rose off þere colour, 
As bryȝt as blosme on bryere.

In the second instance (ll. 288-93), the phrase “as bright as blossom on (briarbough)” is used to describe a still-born childbirth which results from Aethelstan kicking his pregnant wife:

Soone withinne a lytyl spase  
A knaȝe-chyld þorn þer wase, 
As bryȝt as blosme on bowȝ.  
He was bope whyt and red;  
Of þat dynt was he ded –
IV. Alterations

In contrast with previous definitions whose rigidity prevented the recognition of variation in formulae, a definition based on prototype theory permits alteration for a variety of reasons. There may be lexical alterations due to constraints of rhyme and/or metre, or structural alterations which arise out of the need for grammatical or metrical cohesion. In either case, a formula remains identifiable so long as it continues to express the same given idea and has the same basic structure. This flexibility compensates for the “fuzziness” in formulae boundaries; it allows the recognition of not only perfect examples which completely instantiate the prototype core, but also their variants, further distanced from the core but nevertheless functioning in the same capacity and with the same success as the prototype.

IV A. Lexical Alterations for Rhyme and/or Metre

The same lack of particularising force examined above with “in his armes tvain” can be seen of the formula “bi Seyn Jon.” It is only ever used as an emphatic marker but never really adds or detracts from the meaning of the nine passages to which it is attached, as the first five examples here demonstrate:

Of þine harm, bi Seyn Jon,
Ichil þe warn ful fain.92

& 3if þou may proue, bi Sein Jon,
Þat ichaue swich a dede don.93

Y dorst wele swere bi Seyn Jon,
So trewe is þat baroun.94

For it were gret vilani, bi Seyn Jon,
A liggeand man for to slon.95

Þan seyd þai boþe, bi Seyn Jon,
In al þe court was þer non
Of fairehed half his pere.96

---

Hys owne fadyr hym slow3.

In this example as well, one sees that a lack of particularising force allows two variants of the same formula to be applied to entirely different situations.

92 Lines 785 - 6.
93 Lines 832 - 3.
94 Lines 956 - 7.
95 Lines 1336 - 7.
96 Lines 1918 - 20.
In the remaining four lines in which it occurs, it functions in much the same way as it does in these five situations.97 Though the formula itself has a specific meaning, in no case is it so intrinsically connected to the sense of the passage that it has a particularising force within the contexts where it is employed. Thus it has a given meaning while lending itself to being repeated in a number of situations.

This lack of a particularising force is also what permits a degree of variation within the formula itself. As explained above, when the rhyme scheme eliminates “Jon” as a suitable ending where the formula “bi Seyn Jon” would otherwise be acceptable in terms of context and metre, the final word of the formula can be altered to render “bi Seyn Gile”98 or “bi Seyn Jame.”99 Though St John, St James and St Giles were obviously different saints with different attributes, in the context of this poem those differences have little or no relevance. The thrust of the meaning in these constructions is not a specific appeal to any of the particular saints named, but rather the use of an oath-like construction in which the name of any recognised saint can be utilised. It is this synonymy, combined with the continuity of structure mentioned in the previous section, that allows us to recognise these separate constructions as variations of the same formula instead of separate and distinct formulae.100

IV B. Structural Alterations for Grammatical and/or Metrical Cohesion

As already demonstrated, there is some flexibility in the structure as well. This is usually the result of a need for grammatical or metrical cohesion. It is easy enough to recognise instances where the constraints of metre and/or grammar necessitate a slight change in a formula’s structure. Much as “so god me spede” can become “also god me spede” or “in his armes” can become “in his armes twain,” an extra syllable can be added to “bi Seyn Jon” by replacing the saint’s name (already identified as essentially immaterial) with that of another whose name is slightly longer. Such a process offers “bi Seyn Denis,”101 and the even more innocuous “bi Seyn Sauour.”102 Nor does the modification of the preposition itself for the sake of grammatical cohesion with the text impede our recognition of the result as another variation of the formula; “of Seyn Tomas,”103 and “of

---

97 Lines 1936, 1960, 2050, 2161, 2287.
98 Lines 952, 1126.
99 Line 796.
100 Though it could be the case that in other instances where different saints are appealed to for different reasons instead of indiscriminately as they are here, that they could indeed be viewed as separate formulae based on the same pattern. This is part of the complexity of the necessary requirements of having a given meaning as well as having repeatability. In the hypothetical situation just described the element of repeatability, though still present, would be limited in such a way that the appeals could not be utilised indiscriminately, and would therefore have to be viewed as separate.
101 Line 1567.
102 Line 459.
103 Line 758.
are equally acceptable alternatives for this one formula in which the basic sentiment is unchanged and the structure is only slightly altered.

By accepting this amount of variation, one can recognise sixteen occurrences of the formula instead of just the nine occurrences of "bi Seyn Jon" and two of "bi Seyn Gile." To those who would protest that this method of identifying the formulae is too loose, permitting such a wide variety of alternatives that they become difficult to identify, it might be worth remembering that the actual poet would have used such a method of alterations in devising and utilising the formula. Though "bi Seyn Jon" may indeed have been the dominate form, it would be absurd to argue that a versifier was incapable or wholly unwilling to amend the formula to different situations. At the base, it is always the same basic construction being used to impart the same given meaning in a variety of situations. This construction and its utilisation clearly mark it as formulaic, though in most instance it falls short of fully instantiating the ideal prototype which has two iambics and is repeated verbatim. But if one were to rely on such rules, we would be blinded to this particular formula altogether, for whenever four syllables are used they are not repeated verbatim, and where a form of the formula is repeated verbatim, it only ever contains three syllables.

V. The Mental Template

What can be recognised in all the forms of this formula is that the versifier is always using the same basic structure of \{[\text{prep}] + \text{Seyn} + [\text{proper name]}\}. This construction is the mental template. The poet seems to rely on such mental templates in forming and implementing all the formulae, and it is at this level that variations are permitted in order to allow the poet to match a formula to whatever constrains of metre and grammar, as well as rhyme, assonance or alliteration are present in the verse, provided the construction continues to impart the same basic meaning. In order to do this, it appears that one lexical element from the open-class words in the formula must appear in every occurrence. Here, for example, "Seyn" it that word. In every case, the connotation elucidated by that word causes the prepositional phrase to have the same denotation. In this respect it seems that "Seyn" is less a title which modifies a proper name, but rather that the proper name is functioning as a modifier to describe an aspect of "Seyn."

But it is not the case that the lexical constant need always be a headword. Take again the formula "pat leuedi bri3t." Four times in the poem it appears in this form.
exactly. But it also appears as "pat maiden bri3t" once,106 and another time as "pat birdde bri3t,"107 where the metre of the poem shows us that "birdde" is meant to be pronounced with two syllables, and the context makes it clear that the referent is a woman.108 Thus, these two unique occurrences have the same metrical identity as "pat leuedi bri3t," as well as imparting the same basic meaning of a lovely woman. It would seem therefore that the poet is utilising a mental template of \{pat + [+noun, +female, +human] + bri3t\}. But there are further variations. In three instances the noun is pluralized, with the result that the article becomes obsolete and is replaced with a preposition to produce "Wip leuedis bri3t,"109 "of leuedis bri3t,"110 and "of birddes bri3t."111 These prepositional phrases still impart the same basic idea as the noun phrase which is their root, and are clearly nothing more than variations of it. The mental template can therefore be revised to: \{[tagmeme] + [noun, +female, +human (+plurality)] + bri3t\}.

Further variations within this formula again demonstrate the mutability of the metrical identity as postulated above. There are two occurrences of "pat bird bri3t,"112 which are undeniably semantically identical to "pat birdde bri3t," the only difference being that they lack the additional syllable expressed orthographically as a "-de" ending on the noun.113 Nevertheless, they are clearly based on the same mental template, and in the lines where they occur they perform the same metrical function of filling out the metre and expressing the same given idea as the longer variants from which they emerge. There are also instances where the formula is lengthened to produce "among maidens bri3t,"114 and "po tvay leuedis bri3t,"115 each of which contains five syllables, but again is based on the same mental template, imparting the same meaning, and providing a metrically useful construction albeit different form that of the dominant form. It is worth noting that in this last example there are two determiners instead of a single unit. It seems that as a rule, closed class words can be interchanged indiscriminately, and that where it is grammatically permissible, their number can be increased without disturbing the structure of the template. Thus, formulae do not need to have the uniform metrical identity so many

105 Lines 735, 1160, 1181, 1460.
106 Line 877.
107 Line 469.
108 And, in fact, in this case the referent is the same woman (Belisaunt) as the leuedi mentioned in line 735.
109 Line 687.
110 Line 1235.
111 Line 434.
112 Lines 661, 776.
113 This variation also appears to occur indiscriminately in words regularly ending "-e," depending on whether or not its pronunciation is needed to preserve the metre.
114 Line 620.
115 Line 1097.
definitions seem to require. That is another accidental which one may find in the ideal prototype, but which clearly is a non-essential characteristic.

Additionally, these mental templates may occasionally overlap to produce larger formulaic constructions. There are four occurrences of the formula “bri3t in bour,” for example. As a rule, however, it occurs in conjunction with variations of the formula “pat lewed brie3t,” where the templates appear to overlap on “bri3t” to produce a conflation of the two formula, producing “a leuedy bri3t in bour,”117 “& maidens bri3t in bour,”118 and “& leuedis bri3t in bour.”119 And just as elements in a formula based on a single template may permit transpositions of its elements, so do these compound formula, which in this case also produce “pat bird in bour so bri3t,”120 and “a bird in bour bri3t.”121

This last example, “bri3t in bour” also demonstrates the ability of a formula to consist of more than one phrase. Grammatically parsed as $Ajp(bri3t)pp(in bour)$, one can see that it consist of an adjective phrase followed by a prepositional phrase. The two phrases are joined in a syntagmatic relationship which cements a particular given thought. For either phrase to occur without the other (or outwith another formula) would not impart the same given meaning, and in all likelihood either phrase would have a specific semantic function when used separately (as in “helmes bri3t”122). As such, breaking the syntagmatic unity of the construction into its separate paradigmatic components renders each resulting phrase non-formulaic. The same can be said of the example “answerd o3ain.” The verb phrase “answerd” clearly has an important semantic function as a predicator. Likewise, the adverb phrase “o3ain” also has some limited degree of force. But in the construction “answerd o3ain,” the adverb does not mean to imply that the speaker answers more than once, but only that he replies back to the original speaker. The

---

116 In a work that came to my attention after this paper was complete (Stylistic and Narrative Structure in Middle English Romances), Susan Wittig addresses what she calls “the substitution system” in Amis and Amiloun, describing it thus (p. 30): “the poet’s ability to vary the acoustical patterns of a twelve-line stanza by altering elements of the line and yet without altering the felt formulaic meaning of the whole phrase:

```
al thus in
  (romance
  raceket
  \geste
  \to rede is grete rewthe
```

Although she never uses the term, what she has struck upon is indeed an aspect of prototype theory at work in the formulae’s composition and employment, though a different approach, her “substitution system” allows the same realisation of variants of formulae which this paper proposes.

117 Line 334.
118 Line 430.
119 Line 1518. As Leach’s edition of the poem shows, there is also a probable occurrence in line 66, “And ladies bri3t in bour,” but in his edition based on MS Auchinleck, from which all quotations to Amis and Amiloun are taken in this piece, Leach has had to supply the first 96 lines from MS Sutherland. Though, MS Auchinleck does read “t in bour” where line 66 would appear, I have opted not to include this example in order to rely only on the actual available evidence.

120 Line 560.
121 Line 578.
sole justification for such a pleonasm seems to be its metrical utility. For either to be used separately would remove this metrical usefulness, and the separate components would lack the formulaic value they share as parts of a whole.

Thus, just as the formula can be "plugged in" to provide a suitable metrical pattern which fulfils a structural role, it must also have the ability to be "plugged in" contextually to fulfil a semantic role. And just as slight variations in closed class words are permitted to increase the metrical versatility of a formula, so can slight variations in the open class words be allowed to increase the lexical versatility. As a rule, the candidates for such alterations seem to be synonyms, co-hyponyms, or even in some cases antonyms. Thus, "leuedi" may be interchanged with "maiden," "birde" or "bird" without creating any significant variation. And it is the content of the formula which is largely important. It must bring to mind the same basic idea in a phrasal structure, and in order to do this, at least one lexical item remains constant.

VI. Contextual Limitations

This is not to say any lexical substitution within a formula is permissible as some substitutions do create a significant change in meaning. The examples "ful stille" and "ful 3are" provide an example. They do seem to be based on the same structural pattern, and they do share one fixed lexical element. However, "ful" is nothing more than an adverb of degree, and since the adjectives being measured have different connotations as well as denotations, they produce wholly different meanings. As such, they must be recognised as separate formulae. In some cases context must be considered in order to determine whether two different forms are independent formulae of variations. There could be instances where different saints are appealed to for different reasons instead of indiscriminately as they are in Amis and Amiloun. In such a hypothetical case, the various constructions "bi Seyn Jon" and "bi Seyn Denis" could indeed be viewed as separate formulae based on the same pattern.

In some situations, the element of repeatability might be limited because two variations may not be utilised indiscriminately. For example, there are thirty-three occurrences of the formula \([\text{tagmeme}]+[+\text{adjective}, +\text{positive}, +\text{courtly}]+\text{kni3t}\), divided into twenty occurrences of "[a/pat] gentil kni3t," nine of "[pat hendi kni3t," and four of "[pat [douhti/dou3tiest] kni3t." If one were to determine that the various adjectives lent the phrases significantly different meanings, then one would have to evaluate them as

122 Line 1312.
separate formulae. If as here, on the other hand, it appears that the slight variations in connotation were incidental and had no bearing on the denotation, then they could be evaluated as variants of the same formula. This is part of the complexity of the necessary requirements of having a given meaning as well as having repeatability. This does not, however, detract from the focus of this paper in terms of being able to identify whether or not specific structures are indeed formulaic.

VII. Conclusion.

What needs to be done in order to identify formulae, therefore, to identify the mental templates utilised by versifiers in order to recognise the formula and its variants. These templates contain all the essential elements required to form a formula and each of its variants. It must have a given meaning, and in order to do so, it must be composed of words organised in a paradigmatic or syntagmatic structure. That given meaning must be repeatable, which means that it must not have a particularising force. As such, they are often non-essential clausal elements such as adjective phrases, adverb phrases, or adverbial or adjectival prepositional phrases. They can, however, also be noun phrases or verb phrases. Though noun phrases are frequently appositives, these can often be used as subjects or objects as well; in these instances they have no more particularising force than a pronoun. As verbs, they usually describe a frequently occurring action whose function could be easily discerned from the context in their absence, and often they are conjoined with a tautological adverbial phrase in forming the complete formula. Non-essential interjections are also useful, particularly as one-word formulae. In all of these cases, it is less what is being said than how it is being said that is important.

What is meant by “how it is said” is that the repeatable given idea be couched in a construction that is metrically useful. This metrical utility need not be a static uniform identity, but change is permitted in the structure to facilitate integration into the syntax with respect to grammar, to the verse in respect of metre, rhyme, assonance or alliteration, or both if necessary. As long as it continues to meet the requirements of the template, it can be recognised as a variant of the dominate formula. In order to do this, it must contain at least one significant lexical selection from the open-class words. That word must bear the majority of the semantic force of the construction and must perform the same grammatical function in respect to the phrase's paradigmatic structure. In cases where more than one phrase is involved, this presence must be accounted for in each

---

124 The formula “wij drevi mode” (259, 2306), for example could be indentified as a variation of “wij milde mode” (1651, 1771, 1847, 1939), if one were to determine that the “mode” was the important aspect and the adjective merely incidental. See above.
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phrase, though it is possible for such a word to be shared between phrases. Thus, a
formula can be identified where it is arranged in a mental template that contains the
following four essentials: (1) one or more lexical units which are coextensive with
complete phrases; (2) arrangement in a metrically useful structure; (3) imparting a given
meaning; (4) which is repeatable due to a lack of particularising force.

Perhaps the reason we are most familiar with formulae of the sort identified by
Duggan, Kay and others is because such examples most fully instantiate the prototype. It
is much easier to recognise a formula which is repeated verbatim and which conforms to a
hemistich, much as it is easier to identify a cup which is twice as wide at its top as it is at
its base and to which a handle is attached. But just as we can recognise a cup with no
handle or one with a cylindrical or bowl-shaped body, we can recognise a formula that is
not repeated or which is longer or shorter than a hemistich. Just as we do not expect every
cup in a hand-painted service to be an exact reproduction of the original, we should not
expect every instance of a naturally generated formula to be a verbatim repetition. In both
instances, we can recognise that the same mental template initiates the creation of each
item produced. Despite limited variations among the individual cups – or among the
individual occurrences of formulae – each instance performs its respective functions
adequately, even when its form is at a slight distance from the prototype; just as each cup
can still hold coffee, each formula still completes the metrical line and thus serves the role
for which it was created by the poet. e in the fact that most of those definitions relied
solely on structure, and in doing

V.4 IDENTIFICATION OF FORMULAE USING THE MENTAL TEMPLATE AND
RECOGNITION OF NATIVE AND NON-NATIVE FORMULAE AND LOCUTIONS

V.4.1 Methodology

Based on the definition formulated in the previous section, the text of *Amis and Amiloun*
has been examined in order to determine the extent to which formulae are used in the work.
Using a TACT database programme, a full concordance of the text was created, then each
entry was examined to reveal where its co-occurrence with other words or in particular
grammatical structures indicated it was part of a formula. Due to non-standardised
orthography, each entry had to be examined individually as computers could not be
programmed to take in all the variations. Given the length of the poem this proved to be a
time consuming task, and it was further complicated by the existence of formulae that

124 i.e. as headword or dominant modifier.
straddle lines. Nevertheless, such a method eliminated the errors of omission that might arise in examinations such as Duggan's. The full list of formulae organised according to their mental templates can be found in the appendix, forwarded by an explanation of their arrangement and followed by a text of the poem indicating formulaic occurrences.

V.4.2 Result of Examination

The result of this examination revealed an astounding 3126 formulaic expressions in the 2508 lines. Of the 15,222 words in the text, 9419 form part of a formula. That means over 61% of the poem consists of formula. That percentage increases when the direct discourse is omitted. Only approximately 53% of dialogue is formulaic (2450 of 4557 words), compared to about 65% (6969 of 10,665 words) of the remainder of the text. Such a high percentage suggests that in composing the work, the redactor relied rather heavily on formulaic expressions, using it as a framework on which to hang developments in the plot which would differentiate this story from others in the genre. To support this theory, it may be noted that the text can be read and the basic plot line easily followed if one were to read it with the formula omitted.

Though only those formulae which do not occur elsewhere in the poem are cross-referenced with other works, a brief examination of the list of mental templates reveals that a high proportion of them are already familiar to anyone who has read Middle English romances. Many of these formula are so common, in fact, that by the end of the century one might say that they had become trite; Chaucer uses many of them in his satirical St

---

125 Just a few examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUCH TIME AS [SUBJ] WAS BORN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2204) Swiche time as Ihesu Crist was born.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2252) Swiche time as Ihesu, ful of roi3t,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2253) Was born to saue man-kinne.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LORD AND DUKE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1532) Douke &amp; lord of gret pouste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1558) A lord of man a tour &amp; touw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1539) &amp; douke of gret pouste;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOATHE HIM WAS...AND WELL LOATHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(646) Lob him was pat dede to don,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(647) &amp; welo lover his lif forgon,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2218) Wel lob him was his childer to slo,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2219) &amp; welo lover his broser forgo,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHEN THE LORDINGS WERE OUT Y-WENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(505) (43) When bo lordinges were out ywent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(459) When bo lordinges exschichon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(500) Were went out of last wordl won —</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

126 This is a conservative estimate. There may remain some expressions which are formulaic which were accidentally overlooked, or which the present writer was not able to verify and were therefore omitted in the present list. Nevertheless, it remains the case that the number of formulae is staggering.

127 This, as well as the different handling of b-lines in direct discourse, does suggest that direct discourse has a special function in the romances, a subject for further study.

128 Though outside the scope of this thesis, such a method is not unlike that which has been suggested for oral compositions, suggesting that writers of texts often continued to use methods employed by their illiterate predecessors. Further support for this view is provided below.
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For example, his “In Flaundres, al byond the see” (719), “Ful many a mayde, bright in bour” (742), and “For sothe, as I yow teUe may” (749), all in the fist hundred lines of the first fytte can each be found in Amis and Amiloun. Furthermore, those which were cross-referenced show that they are found elsewhere in the Middle English corpus. Thus, in producing his “translation” of a French work, the redactor draws extensively on a traditional stock of locutions, several extending back to the Old English period, ensuring that his product is a work which will not be alien to his anglophone audience. Again, he has “Englished” his redaction.

V.4.3 Direct French Borrowings

This is not to say that the redactor was above borrowing from his sources, for some of the formula in A&A resemble traditional French formulae as well. The numerous examples of “& [subj] said,” for example, bear a striking similarity to what Nichols labels the “discourse introduction formula” in Chanson de Roland. These formula, such as “Dist Blacandrins” or “Dient Paien,” tend to occur in the A-verse of an assonating Old French decasyllabic line, and then usually at the beginning of a laisse. Likewise in Amis and Amiloun, the semantically equivalent formulae tend to occur at the beginning of lines, and then frequently in the first line of a stanza.

Another example is the “swearing formula” in which an oath is made on a sword or in the name of a saint. Nichols notes that in Roland “ordinarily, the ‘swearing formula’ is found in the A-verse so that the oath sworn may follow in the B-verse.” This placement at the beginning of lines is rare in A&A, only occurring twice, each time in the long oath, “Bi Jesus, heuen king.” Seven times, however, it occurs in the end of a line beginning with a “discourse introduction formula.” Interestingly, this is exactly the situation found in the first example cited above by Nichols: “Dist Blancandrins: ‘Par ceste meie destre’.”

There are also places where the redactor seems to reproduce exactly what is the AN versions. In addition to the correlations noted in the previous chapter, some examples of correspondence of material occurring at the same place in the respective traditions are:

ME: ...it is great dolour. (12) K’ruhe: ...si grand dolour. (6)

129 See list of Mental Templates in appendix. Also worth mentioning is that Chaucer’s verse structure in a variation on the twelve-line tail-rhyme (Chaucer uses six-lines). It has been suggested that Chaucer actually handled the Auchinleck manuscript, and thus, perhaps, was directly influenced by it. Though Sir Thopas is a biting satire, one does not satirise that which is not well known, thus suggesting that the style of Amis and Amiloun and other romances in Auchinleck may have exerted such influence on later productions that they could be said to have become overused within a century.

130 Nichols uses these two examples from laisse IV, 47 and 61 on p. 13 of his paper.

131 Of 106 occurrences, 91 are at the beginning of a line, at least 14 of which are the first line of a stanza. The other 15 occurrences are all formulaically terminal. See mental template 4.3.1.36 in appendix.

132 Nichols, p. 16.

133 II. 1596 & 2064.

134 Chanson de Roland, l. 47. [Said Blancandrin, “By this, my right hand]
ME: by seyn... (various) (multiple) K'ruhe: Par seyn eglyse... (16)
ME: Let we sir Amiloun be... (337) London: Ore lerron de Amis ester.

Some borrowings are undeniably direct, such as the following which is the first recorded instance of the word “roast”:

ME: For, certes, it were michel vnri3t K'ruhe: Trop vilaine roste serreit! (570)
To make roste ofleuedis bri3t. (1234-5)

However, with all these borrowings, the redactor continues to anglicise the source. Though the odd French word might be borrowed, the tendency is to replace it with native English words. Ultimately, this creates new locutions which can in turn be borrowed by future writers and redactors, thereby increasing the stock-pile of phrases available as formulae.

V.4.4 Formulae Borrowed Indirectly from French

Amis and Amiloun also demonstrates that further borrowing is not merely hypothetical, for it contains formulaic expressions borrowed from French indirectly through other English works. It has long been noted that there is a particularly strong correlation between the language of A&A and that of the other romances found in MS Auchinleck. Most often, A&A is viewed beside Guy of Warwick, which as indicated in Chapter Three was probably written shortly before A&A; the similarities shared are striking enough for some scholars to conclude that both works were produced in the same London bookshop.135 Thus, it is not surprising to discover many of the same expressions shared by the poems. Perhaps the most comprehensive study of these correlations, largely forgotten today and extremely difficult to find due to historical events, is Möller’s 1917 doctoral dissertation from Albert University in Königsberg.

As noted in the introduction, Möller sets out to prove:

die unstreitig vorhandenen Beziehungen zwischen der strophischen Fassung des Guy of Warwick und der ebenfalls in der zwölfzeiligen Schweifreimstrophe verfassten Romanze “Amis and Amiloun” Beziehungen, die in einer Reihe wörtlicher Übereinstimmungen und zahlreichen deutlichen Ankängen im sprachlichen Ausdruck beider Dichtungen sich kundgeben.136

135 See Loomis.
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He identifies 410 examples of these “literal agreements and numerous clear echoes” between Guy and A&A; some of them are simply recognition of corresponding rhyme patterns:

**Amis & Amiloun:**
- Be riche barouns answerd ogain, & her leuedis gan to sain
- To þat douke ful 3are
- þat þai were bope glad & fain
- þat her leuely children tvain
In seruise wip him ware. 138

**Guy of Warwick:**
- Felice answered o3ain
- “Fader,” quap hye, “ichil þe sain
- Wip wordes fre & hende
- Fader”, quap sche, “ichil ful fyyn
- Tel þe at wordes tvain. 137

Many, however, are what would be considered formulae or a string of formulae:

**For Goddes loue in trinyte...** 139  
**For godes love in trinite...** 140

**On sir Amis, þat gentil kni3t**
- Ywis, hir love was al ali3t. 141

**On sir Gij, þat gentil kni3t**
- Y-wis, mi love is alle ali3t. 142

And still others are rhyming sets of formulae used together in units as in the following list of b-lines:

- þat were michel wrong,
- Batalie of him to fong,
- & hei3e on galwes hong. 143

- Wip wel michel wrong
- Batal of him to fong
- Or hei3e on galwes hong. 144

Though Möller never actually employs the term for his collocations, what he has found in the second and third set of examples are clearly formulae. Astonishingly, the last set of formulae conform to a precise hierarchical rule of usage themselves, and Möller provides several other examples. More so than in a linked formula (such as “bird in bower so bright” from “bird in bower” and “bower so bright”), this reveals a highly sophisticated arrangement that itself could be considered formulaic. 145

Unfortunately space does not here permit a fuller treatment; it should be mentioned, however, that such reoccurring rhymes have been noted (“withouten fail” is

---

138 Möller, p. 47.
137 Guy of Warwick, 9,1 (Möller’s reference, p. 50). [I so love the knight with a good heart / One of your loyal knights.]
139 Leach, l. 121-6.
140 Leach, l. 1.
141 Guy of Warwick, 47, 8 (Möller’s reference, p. 58).
142 Leach, 472-3.
143 Guy of Warwick, 9,7 (Möller’s reference, p. 51).
144 Guy of Warwick, 111, 12, 6, 9 (Möller’s reference, p. 63).
145 Möller does not hypothesise on the implications of this; his concern was primarily to establish a correlation between Guy and A&A.
almost always rhymes with "batail") and are an area for future research. It also poses a curious question whether the redactor consciously borrowed the formula in Guy as well as their hierarchical arrangement in rhyme structures, or if, more impressively, they were unconsciously linked in his mind. In either case, the existence of these formula in a similar organisation in two different works demonstrates the elaborate and highly organised structure of formulaic usage, suggesting again that it is not the story itself which is being ornamented with formulae, but that formulae form the framework upon which the story hangs.

Möller also notes that many of the "clear echoes" found in Guy of Warwick were actually translations from Gui de Warewick. For example, in the third pair of quotations provided above ("On sir Guy/Amis," &c) the correlation between A&A and Guy is evident. Möller maintains that the passage in Guy is a translation from the French version which states:

Sire tant aim ieo de bon coer
Un vostre leaus chevalier.146

Though this translation is not close enough to be considered direct, it certainly is closer to the passage in Guy than the corresponding passage from Ami & Amiloun is to the quotation in Amis and Amiloun:147

La pucele en prist tendrour
Tanke vers lui getta sa amur.
(K. 369-70)

La pucele en prist tendrour
Qe tant vers li ad getté s’amour.
(L. 229-30)

Thus, it could be argued that the translation from Gui to Guy provided a formula that the ME redactor of A&A found useful for translating his passage.

Möller provides sixteen other such examples of varying degrees of plausibility. Though the similarity of quotation between Guy and A&A is usually credible, the position that the translation from Gui to Guy is direct is usually rather more questionable. His first example, however, is an exception. As Guy travels through foreign lands back to Warwick, he thinks of Felice:

On a day sir Gij gan fond
& feir Felice he tok bi hond [...] & me is boden gret anour

146 Gui de Warewick, 4894-5 (Möller’s reference, p. 88).
147 Möller, who uses Kolbing’s version, lists this as ll. 227-8.
Without a doubt, this borrows phrasing and vocabulary directly from the source:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Pus a felice sen va} \\
\text{Et tot son estre li mustra} \\
\text{Cum Riches Roys et Emperors} \\
\text{Offert li ont granz honours} \\
\text{Et cum feu amé des pucesles} \\
\text{Filles as Ducs que erent beles.}^\text{149}
\end{align*}
\]

And such a phrase also occurs in *Amis and Amiloun* when Amis tries to dissuade Belisaunt in her affections for him:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Biþenke þe of þi michel honour;} \\
\text{Kinges sones & emperour} \\
\text{Nar non to gode to þe.}^\text{150}
\end{align*}
\]

There is no corresponding passage anywhere in the AN or OF tradition, and it is hardly worth while to postulate one in a lost exemplar. The phrasing in these examples is too close. It is evident that *Guy* borrowed from *Gui*, and that *A&A* borrowed from *Guy*. Thus demonstrating at least one instance of a formula with currency in the English tradition originally borrowed from French.

**V.4.5 Conclusion**

Use of the prototype theory to identify formulae allows one to more fully recognise the extent to which they are employed. Once the results are found, it is simple to compare them with formulae in other works, both in the ME corpus itself as well as relevant French-language works. This examination of *Amis and Amiloun* reveals that a significant percentage of its formulae already had currency in English, and could therefore be said to have appeal to the target audience due to their familiarity. Additionally, there are examples borrowed either directly or indirectly from French which — once written — also gain currency and increase the number of ready formula available to the composer or redactor of English writings. Such a process is analogous to that proposed in Chapter Two where authority for the incorporation of material comes from its being written. Here

---

149 *Gui de Warewick*, 4823-8 (Møller’s reference, p. 88).
150 *Leach*, II. 595-7.
the situation is simplified in that the formulae need only be translated, thus authorising their continued use in English through their new found existence in the English corpus.

It also appears that the formulae themselves play a more crucial role in building the narrative than is often assumed. More than half of the entire poem is formulaic. Much as these formulaic expression often overlap to produce larger units, they can also be combined into larger structural arrangements whose order is perhaps predictable. Such a heavy and apparently regular (or regularised) use of formula suggests that they provide a necessary framework which supports the non-formulaic events which render the story distinctive.

V.5 CHAPTER CONCLUSION

Though there are some linguistic innovations and foreign borrowings, the style of the poem remains intrinsically English. True, the verse shares rhyme with its Anglo-Norman predecessors, a convention that did not come into vogue until after the Conquest, but rhyme was not entirely unknown in Old English poetry. Cynewulf uses it in some passages, and it can even be found in the Battle of Maldon and of course The Rimes of the Poem. In any case it had already become an acceptable medium for English poetry before the fourteenth century. Much the same can be said for the octosyllabic lines. Though in the AN, there is nothing unusual about a line of such length in English, and with the additional employment of iamb they conform to a single line of Old English poetry consisting of two b-type verses. Furthermore, the heavy use of alliteration is also a characteristic of Old English verse, and one which was coming back into fashion. Though the tail-rhyme structure itself was innovative, it was so naturally suited to the cadence of English that instead of being a distraction it apparently enjoyed a great deal of acceptance as demonstrated by the number of later works which adopted the form.

The same can be said for the formula. The majority of formulae used have long standing in English, and those which are borrowed are adapted to fit their new English usage. There is not so much an attempt to heavily ornament the verse with French formulae, phrases or vocabulary as in the aureate diction of Lydgate, but rather an attempt to subsume the formulae imperceptibly into English. Thus, they do not eliminate items

---

151 Though the main point being made here is that the formulae form a larger part of the narrative than is usually realised, it ought to be recognised that often when its use seems chiefly related to metre, it nevertheless has a bearing on style as well. Mustanoja says as much when discussing the gan-periphrasis, a frequently occurring formula in A.E.A.: "even while using the gan-periphrasis mainly for metrical purposes, consciously or unconsciously the poet often achieves a special stylistic effect by means of this construction... We have good reason to believe that in addition to metre and rhyme other stylistic considerations play a certain role in a good poet's choice between the simple preterite and the gan-periphrasis." p. 612. Thus, formulae do play a very crucial role in forming overall perceptions in the story as well as fulfilling a metrical role.

152 Malden line 42: "Byrhtnoth mapelode, bord hafenode." [Byrhtnoth spoke, his shield uplifted]; also line 271 where it apparently replaces alliteration altogether: "Efre embe stunde he sealde sume wunde." [time and again he dealt some wound]. See also Lester, pp. 107-10, and E. G. Stanley.
from the stock of existing English formulae available, but increase the inventory, and thereby the redactor’s ability to “warp a word.”153 Amis and Amiloun demonstrates that this process occurs in its borrowings from Guy, and Chaucer’s satirical Sir Thopas demonstrates that within a few generations many of these formula were repeated often enough to be considered cliché.

Overall, therefore, the “feel” of the poem remains English. What is borrowed or innovated is naturalised to such an extent that it is not immediately conspicuous, blending rather than contrasting with the native elements. Over time, progressive merging of different traditions can develop into a new hybrid, and this synthesis can develop into a new standard. It is exactly such gradual grafting of foreign element which created the situation in which Amis and Amiloun was written, and in following the tendencies of earlier composers and translators the redactor continues the practice, helping to establish a new insular style.

153 The expression “warp a word” is used in the Owl and the Nightingale to explain the invention and creative implementation of formulaic diction in l. 45. Interestingly, it too is a formula borrowed from a foreign tradition and naturalised into English; as Bennett and Smithers mention in their notes on p. 265: “warp a word: a phrase probably belonging to the common Germanic poetic stock: cf. ON varpa orði. It occurs in St. Katherine and in later alliterative poetry.”
CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSION

Remaniement is a word rarely mentioned when discussing translation, though it is perhaps the best term to use if one wishes to differentiate between our modern concept and that held by the medievals. As Chapter Two explains, remaniement is essentially what was meant when medieval redactors claimed to be translating. This method evolved from the artes poeticae, themselves derived from the writings of the Latin church fathers and rhetoricians. Such a blend of traditions caused some difficulties by resulting in a double injunction against repeating exactly what was said before while simultaneously forbidding the creation of new arguments and expressions. In the earlier traditions, chiefly concerned with inter-lingual Latin to Greek translations, such a situation would not have been especially problematic as linguistic differences existing between the languages helped to distinguish the original from the copy. The artes, however, were chiefly concerned with intra-lingual Latin to Latin translation. Consequently it became commonplace for redactors to borrow topoi from other works and paraphrase extensively in order to vary their parole without adding information from outside the written corpus. Despite all efforts, such a practice would necessarily lead to differences between source and redaction due to the adaptor’s need to interpret the information. Until this point, however, such a situation had little consequence because translation had always been considered primarily a rhetorical tool, not a means of disseminating information. Any intended audience was expected to have as much competency in handling the original as the translator. When the need for dissemination of information became an important factor in translations between Latin and the vernaculars, or more significantly among the vernaculars themselves, these established practices were nevertheless retained. Thus, what resulted was not so much translation as that term is understood today, but rather remaniement, the art of rewriting.

The theoretical history of such practice is outlined in Chapter Two, substantiated by comments from rhetoricians and patristic commentators such as Quintilian, Cicero, Augustine and Jerome. That such methods received pedagogical acceptance in the Middle Ages is demonstrated through the writings of authorities on the artes such as Matthew of Vendôme and Geoffrey of Vinsauf. More compelling are the comments of actual translators which demonstrate that these procedures were considered ideals to uphold. Alfred the Great, chronologically posed between the Latin writers and the medieval authorities, mirrors the words of the former and presages the comments of the latter. The chapter also suggests some of the problems which emerged from such handling and observes various practices medieval writers used to overcome them. One option was to
interpret broadly the extent to which *abbreviatio* and *amplificatio* were permitted. Though he no doubt considered his translations faithful, Alfred clarifies, explains and borrows so much that his translations can hardly be considered accurate from a modern standpoint. Others claimed to uphold the ideals but the extent to which they adhered to them is questionable. From the beginning it has been wondered if Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *liber vetustissimus* was simply a fabrication to allow him to write previously unrecorded historical accounts existing only in common *memoria* or folk knowledge. Ultimately, however, such writers’ claims to conformity of the *artes*’ conventions indicate that the tenets did enjoy theoretical acceptance throughout the Middle Ages.

Even in less scholarly literature such as romance, efforts to at least appear to adhere to the regulations were maintained. Here especially the conflicting aims of stating nothing new while repeating nothing already stated caused complications, particularly as the importance of content was gaining ground on purely stylistic concerns. It is perhaps for this reason that some writers hesitated to translate what they felt incapable of expressing accurately. Sometimes this referred to difficulties in rendering ideas from one language into another; Benoît, Wace and the writer of the *Roman d’Alexandre* cite such worries, and in this they approach the chief concern of modern translators. Other times it apparently referred to giving the most truthful account of the stories; a major concern for Geoffrey of Waterford and Geoffrey Gaimar was that their exemplars left out information they believed important to include. They boldly announce the elimination of these *lacunae* in their works, a task the *artes* encourages, but as with Geoffrey of Monmouth it is uncertain whether their supporting sources were actually written. Though allusion to written authority remained important, in practice it was probably not as strictly followed as claims would lead one to believe.

Mentioning a written source seems to be becoming a formality; in any case once information was penned it gained credibility, as indeed the author of *the Owl and the Nightingale* jocularly notes: "Vor hit is sop – Alured hit seide, / An me hit mai ine boke rede!" Even Wace, who at one point refuses to write down tales he heard in childhood because they have no written source, had no scruples about retelling tales he must have at least suspected to originate from dubious sources. Other writers who admit to referencing books outwith their exemplar may have simply relied on their own memory of previous readings rather than consulting them at the time of writing. Pratt suspects Diederic van Assenene may have done so in producing *Floris ende Blancefloer*, and she can take comfort in knowing that such procedures did occur; as Chapter Four indicates, the

---

1 Il. 264-5.
redactor of *Amis and Amiloun* clearly supplements information from his Anglo-Norman exemplar with details drawn from memory of a continental version.

But concern with style and variation was not completely lost. Diederic asserts the need to lengthen and shorten his tales, and Hartmann von Aue is lauded for having done so. In the latter case it is particularly his art of diction and verbal ornamentation in appling *amplificatio* and *abbreviatio* that draws the praise. Despite any new recognition of the need for accuracy — the meaning of which could be variously interpreted — it did not supersede established methods of translating endorsed by centuries of acceptance. Rewriting remained an intrinsic part of any “good” translation; thus, translation was equated with *remaniement*.

It is perhaps because *remaniement* stood in for translation that the influence of the Anglo-Norman / Old French traditions on Middle English literature has so often been disregarded. The liberal attitude towards the handling of material which stemmed from the methods prescribed by the *artes* means that redactions do not always bear as striking a resemblance to the originals as modern eyes would expect. These differences are particularly enhanced in so-called “popular” literature such as romance. Unlike scholarly treatises, scriptural commentaries or chronicle histories, such literature was intended to have a more general appeal than the works aimed directly at an educated elite. As such, the need to adapt was greater, for every language interprets the world differently, and each vernacular culture has its own particular view of the world. Translations intended for the general public, particularly when their purpose was entertainment more than didacticism, would need to take that into account more than others.

Chapter Four gives an exhaustive demonstration of how these aims were achieved through the comparison of Middle English *Amis and Amiloun* with its Gallic predecessors. Some of the noted changes affecting plot developments, names and unprecedented events relate directly and overtly to cultural norms. Among these are the age of the boys when they enter the duke’s service and their later knighting when they turn fifteen. The inclusion of various hunts, absent in earlier versions, is a characteristic development in the English tradition and also represents an attempt at Anglicisation. More obvious is the substitution of shilling for sous. All of these adaptations are clearly intended to give the legend direct appeal to the target audience. Other changes affecting characterisation and narrative colouring are more subtle, but were initiated by the same desire to lend the legend salience to an insular Anglophone audience. For example, instead of being given true to life personalities wherein good and bad aspects are mixed, the players fill roles as predictable as pantomime *personae*. The evil steward is stripped of the few admirable qualities he has
in earlier versions; the leper’s wife is never anything but the epitome of a faithless spouse; Belisaunt, who begins as the prototypical wooing woman, later becomes the paragon of wifely virtue. In the latter case there is apparently no perceived need to justify the shift which allows her to perform two contradictory roles; evidently, producing characterisations was more important than creating characters. Generally speaking the players become so two-dimensional that one could say that they turn into stock characters, and such unsophisticated representation is one reason earlier scholars claimed the ME version represented an older tradition. However, such a view overlooks the fact that in many ways the ME version becomes more courtly as a result. As if in a fairy tale, good and bad are ever polarised, the characters of Amis and Amiloun never being anything but perfectly courtly, their enemies always remaining incapable of becoming so. It is also worth noting that such stilted characterisation enjoyed some degree of vogue in contemporary insular literature, and it is therefore probable that such characterisation reflects an intentional attempt to present the characters in a manner that would appeal to an English audience rather than a lack of skill.

And it must be admitted that the redactor is a skilful story teller. His arrangement of narrative structure, filled with sign-posting pauses that regulate the flow of events by dividing various developments into discrete episodes, is one such example of the narrative superiority of the ME version. Amplificatio and abbreviatio are adroitly employed to eliminate lacunae through the creation or omission of minor details or entire episodes. Some rearrangements, such as leprosy resulting from an intentional false oath before battle instead of an unwilling false betrothal, lend the ME a more logical arrangement of events. In a similar vein, the redactor attempts to give more “believable” explanations of fantastic events. Presumably these changes were intended to harmonise with the sensibilities of the early fourteenth-century English world view. Such reorganisation is therefore not only indicative of the narrator’s ability to tell a tale, but also identify him as a remanieur through his intention to rewrite the story.

Ultimately, however, the redactor’s story-telling skill stems from his abilities as a poet. He uses a verse structure particularly suited to English which was at once novel and familiar. The twelve-line tail-rhyme stanza was a relatively new innovation, but due to the

---

2 Furthermore, as Pearsall notes in Development of Middle English Romance, the aspects of the poem which remain fantastic still can find acceptance due to their presentation in a form that, due in a large part to its metre and conformity to other romance conventions, alleviates any need for strict accord with reality: "Amis and Amiloun is a thoroughly conventional adaptation from the French, a fine romance, beautifully shaped to the idealised illustration of friendship but never burdened by its didactic theme. The tail-rhyme form fixes the romance-convention absolutely, so that, with never a suggestion that the laws of romance are going to be violated, the poem can afford considerable elaboration of the genuinely affective parts of the story. In other words, though the events of the story are wildly improbable by realistic standards, the formal tradition is strong enough to inhibit any appeal to such standards, strong enough furthermore to allow a broadening and deepening of the area of human response, within the romance-convention, which makes of Amis a genuinely poetic experience." p.29.
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employment of iambics and a rhyme pattern particularly suited to English, it was not so strange as to prevent acceptance. There are also many characteristics reminiscent of Old English verse, such as parataxis, alliteration and especially the use of formula which deserves special mention. Chapter Five proposes a new method for identifying formulae based on the mental template which allows greater recognition of the extent of its employment. Use of this method permits the identification of over three thousand formulae in Amis and Amiloun’s 2508 lines. The majority of these expressions are easily recognisable by even the most casual reader of Middle English verse romances. Their use in Amis and Amiloun demonstrates a continuous link with the English cultural tradition in recounting a romance borrowed from Old French and Anglo-Norman sources.

All of these characteristics had probably remained present in folk literature after the conquest, and presumably their use in a literary work such as this would have lent it a general appeal to admirers of those traditions. The redactor also manipulates this format to regulate the flow of the narrative, much as the sign-posting additions mentioned in the previous paragraph. Each half stanza, or more often a whole one, contains a well-wrought episodic development making the narrative easy to follow. The combination of innovative and traditional elements conjoined in a well developed storyline would have permitted an English audience to admire the redactor’s talent without feeling alienated. It is in these respects that the ME version differs most dramatically in feeling and style from earlier versions, and where the redactor make the poem his own.

Nevertheless, despite such changes the influence of the French-language traditions is ever present. Though in some points of divergence it does appear that material springs directly from the mind of the redactor, some of which is highly original, often these instances rely heavily on formulae. For the most part one can easily recognise information drawn directly from an earlier French-language version. The content of more than half the lines is attributable to some earlier account. Most often these attributes are shared with the AN, particularly Karlsruhe, pointing to an exemplar in that tradition. Though generally speaking divergences are much wider, the OF also has an influential role. A significant number of details and incidents have correlations only with that tradition, but variance is so great that it appears unlikely that the redactor relied on it directly. It therefore seems evident that he was aware of such an account, but not having it before him drew on memory of it to augment his material. Where the earlier traditions vary among themselves, the redactor usually chooses to follow one or the other, but in some cases attempts to harmonise them using his expertise to rectify discrepancies. Most of the redactor’s interpolations do not add new material, but simply heighten a sense already
present in the AN or OF; likewise, a number of omissions look to be an attempt to eliminate "extraneous" information. Such an approach does create a new and distinct version, but at its base it is still intrinsically the same story. This demonstrates that the Anglo-Norman and Old French influence was considerable, but given the redactor's interpretative approach, much of the influence is hidden to the casual reader because the Middle English is not so much the work of a translator, but a remanieur.

It ought to be remembered that at the time of *Amis and Amiloun*'s writing, English was finally emerging from a period of dormancy in which it had been long overshadowed by French as an important medium for literary expression. It is natural therefore that English writers would turn to French and Anglo-Norman sources for inspiration. Possibly because the practical application of translation, remaniement, tends to obscure the relationship between source and product, this recognition has been ignored for too long. It is hoped that through this study, explaining the techniques of remaniement and demonstrating their application in producing the Middle English version of *Amis and Amiloun*, the extent of Anglo-Norman literature's influence can be grasped in at least one case. It is also hoped that the methods employed here can be applied to future analyses of other English verse romances to form a greater understanding of that impact more generally. As the verse romances of the late-thirteenth and early-fourteenth century were almost all drawn from Anglo-Norman or French sources, and they themselves provided a model for later works created entirely in English, such studies would be important in underscoring the role of Anglo-Norman and Old French in the formation of a new insular style which came to be identified as distinctly English.

Information in this thesis might also prove a stepping stone for further research concerning the role of formulae. Chapter Five indicates that there is still much work to be done concerning the hierarchical rules of usage in combining formula. It has also been mentioned that though most of the formulae used in *Amis and Amiloun* reflect native tradition, there are cases where they are apparently borrowed either directly or indirectly from French sources. By and large these are naturalised to such an extent that their origin becomes indistinguishable from those descended from pre-Conquest insular locutions, thereby replenishing the stock of formulae available in English. Applying the methods permitted by prototype theory for identifying formulae to Anglo-Norman literature would facilitate comparison with Middle English examples, perhaps further enlightening us to the extent of that literature's impact on the development of English style.

In a broader context, it is also hoped that this exploration focusing on a single Middle English tale's derivation from Anglo-Norman and Old French sources might form
the basis for future research not only on the development of Middle English literature, but
the medieval process of literary recreation generally. This analysis has demonstrated that
an understanding of remaniement reveals English literature's indebtedness to French-
language traditions in one instance, but it can also be turned to translations from other
languages. *Troilous and Creseyde*, for example, Chaucer's translation of Boccaccio's
*Filostrato*, appears to employ many of the same techniques, and given Chaucer's
familiarity with the verse romances, their method of translation may have served as an
example for him. Furthermore, much as this thesis's methodology can be turned to the
examination of other Middle English verse romances, so can it be used to explore similar
developments in other languages. To use the example of Chaucer again, they could be
applied to the French translation of his work, *Le Roman de Troye et de Criseida*. Such
studies would not only further elucidate the concept of remaniement and its practical
applications, but would also demonstrate the extent to which the various vernacular
traditions mutually affected each other. None of them developed in a vacuum, and though
each retained certain elements which reflected defining characteristic of their own
particular language community's cultural ideals and tastes, they still borrowed and
tendered among themselves. And as this thesis has shown, the means through which such
mutual sharing was carried out was less a practice of translation as it is understood today,
but remaniement, the art of rewriting.
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INTRODUCTION TO MENTAL TEMPLATES
ORGANISATION OF FORMULAE

The difficulties posed in identifying formulae also make them difficult to categorise. In some instances a formula is most readily identifiable by its useful metrical structure. In this situation a variety of lexical words can be inserted which may give entirely different meanings, but which clearly derive from the same mental template. In other cases it is the lexical components themselves which make the formula apparent through common collocations or tautologies. These formulae, however, can often be inserted into a variety of grammatical combinations which are likewise formulaic. As explained, it is generally a combination of factors which make a given expression identifiably formulaic, and therefore any single formulaic occurrence may instantiate the mental template of more than one formula at the same time. This overlapping can create ambiguities which make it difficult to present the formulae in a coherent list with a minimum of repetition.

As far as possible, the following list categorises the formulae according to the predominant factor(s) which lend them formulaic integrity. In the following table the first three head categories (1.Doublets, 2.Temporal, and 3.Exclamatory Phrases/Particles) are comprised of formulae whose specific lexical components seem to have the most importance in the template, while the fourth category (4.Grammatical) is composed of formulae in which the lexical components may vary greatly, but which depend on similar structures. Within these general categories can be found a variety of subcategories in which the formulae are further classified depending upon a variety of factors which delineate them further and differentiate the various mental templates.

The first category, “Doublets,” contains all formulae which are comprised of lexical “twins,” such as “blood and bone,” “blithe and glad,” “ride or go,” etc. As nouns only ever occur with nouns, verbs with verbs, and so forth, these easily identifiable formula are then subdivided by their parts of speech so that subsection 1.1 is labelled “Nouns,” 1.2 “Adjectives,” and 1.3 “Verbs.” Also included in this section are “neither...nor” (1.4), as well as “Triplets” (1.5) and “Quadruplets” (1.6) the latter two of which are composed of three and four common collocations respectively.

The second category, “Temporal” deals with time expressions such as “every day,” “on that day,” “upon a night.” The grammatical structure of these formulae appears to play an important function, so they are first subdivided according to that structure (2.1 [determiner] [time expression], 2.2 [adjective] [time expression], 2.3 [prep] [determiner] [time expression]). This order is chosen because, despite the difference in headwords, all the formulae in section
ORGANISATION OF FORMULAE
BY MENTAL TEMPLATES

2.1 appear more immediately related to one another than the “[adjective] [time expression]” formulae (such as “summer’s day” and “winter’s night”) or the “[prep] [determiner] [time expression]” formulae (“on a day,” “upon a night”). After this structural division, the formulae are then categorised by their headword (“day,” “night,” etc.), and finally by their adjectives, determiners, and/or prepositions. Thus, terminal “every day” (2.1.1) is followed by initial “each day” (2.1.2), after which are listed all occurrences of “[determiner] day” before beginning with the “[determiner] night,” “[determiner] tide,” and “[determiner] time” formulae.

Each of these are, as with “day,” further differentiated according to the determiners. The same sort of procedure is used in dealing with the adjectives and prepositions in 2.2 and 2.3.

The third head category, “Exclamatory Phrases/Particles” deals with interjective expressions such as “certes!” “ac!” or “godspeed!” They are listed alphabetically, and where necessary, further subdivided according to variation (i.e. “by Saint [name]” (3.9) is divided into “by Saint John” (3.9.2), and “by Saint James” (3.9.3), etc.), accompanying words (i.e. 3.3.1 “alas” and 3.3.2 “oft alas” under 3.3 “alas”), and/or placement (3.6 “anon,” for example, is divided into 3.6.1 for terminal occurrences and 3.6.2 for initial occurrences).

The fourth category, Grammatical, is the thorniest, and though it has the smallest number of general categories, has the largest number of formulae and therefore the largest number of subdivisions. Indeed, it would be possible to subsume all of the other head categories into this fourth one, but to do so would risk splitting up expressions in the above three wherein the value of the semantic meaning seems to outweigh that of the actual structure.

At first glance, the primary categorisation (i.e. 4.1 Independent Clause, 4.2 Relative Clause, 4.4 Prepositional Phrase, etc.) may seem overly simplified, and this impression even appears to some extent in the secondary categorisation (i.e. 4.4.1 [subj] [verb] [obj] [particle/prep], or 4.3.4 ([conjunction]) if [pronominal subject] [subjunctive auxiliary], etc.). Nevertheless, such generalisation allows for further specification of the mental templates, frequently extending down well beyond the tertiary level of categorisation. For example, “So egre he was pat tide” (816) and “So egre pai were of mode” (1320) both occur under 4.3.1.4.5.2.1.2 so eager they were; 4.3.1.4.5.2.1.2 itself occurs between 4.3.1.4.5.2.1.1 so deep was that country and 4.3.1.4.5.2.1.3 so alike[subj] [be], the latter of which contains such formulae as “So liche we be bope tvain !” (1140) and “So liche were bo tway” (1152). All three of these headings are found under the very generally named 4.3.1.4.5.2.1 [adj] [subj] [be], itself a division of 4.3.1.4.5.2 {[subj]} {[be]} {[adj]}. This last is one of the two components of 4.3.1.4.5 [subj] [be] [compliment], the final subdivision of 4.3.1.4 [be] [compliment], under 4.3.1 verb phrases & clauses. Other quite different formulae based on
the verb “be” are similarly listed, each subdivision further identifying the salient features of separate mental templates.

The final section, Orphans (5), lists those formulae which have only one occurrence in *Amis and Amiloun*. As previously explained, repetition is not a necessary aspect of formulae, only its ability to be repeatable. As evidence of repetition is, however, an excellent indication of formulaic expression, each has been cross referenced with other formulae from the MED to demonstrate their viability as actual formulae where possible. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to verify every apparent formulaic expression. Therefore, a list of “unattested” formulae follows at the end of the section of mental templates. As it seems best to err on the side of caution, only those formulae deemed unquestionable have been included, and it is possible that a few further viable examples exist in the text.

**USE OF DIACRITICS**

As the previous paragraphs demonstrate, certain diacritics are used in expressing the mental templates. Square brackets are used to indicate a part of speech or a verb tense; thus, “[be]” can mean “is,” “was” “are” “were” etc., while [possessive pronoun] can be “his,” “her,” “hir,” etc. Curly brackets such as { } indicate that the component contained may shift position. Parentheses indicate an optional component. Thus, the mental template 4.3.1.26 [possessive pronoun] joy {couth} ([pronominal subj]) no man kithe is an accurate expression to contain such various realisations as: (548) Hir ioie coupe sche noman kipe, (1238) Her ioie coupe hai noman kipe, (2414) Her ioy coup noman kyth, and the variant (672) Hir ioie sche coupe no man sai.

**LOCATING THE FORMULAE IN THE LIST OF MENTAL TEMPLATES**

As there are over 3000 formulaic expressions listed from *Amis and Amiloun*, any particular formula may indeed be difficult to find in the list despite the order provided. To facilitate the procedure, an index of formulaic occurrences is provided following the list of mental templates. The first column provides line numbers from the poem itself, and the second the specific mental template(s) to which the formula(e) in that line can be attributed. Though every effort has been made to list each formula only under the mental template which it most fully instantiates by determining the predominant factor which lends it formulaic integrity, there are of course times when a formula needs to be listed under more than one mental template. It is also not uncommon for a single line to contain more than one formula at a time. Thus, it is possible that a single line may correspond to several mental templates.

The text of *Amis and Amiloun*, taken from Leach’s edition, can be found following the index of templates. Formulae have been indicated by underlining.
CONTENTS OF MENTAL TEMPLATES

1. DOUBLETS
   1.1 NOUNS
       1.1.1 AMIS AND AMILOUN
       1.1.2 BLOOD AND BONE
           1.1.2.1 of blood and bone
           1.1.2.2 variant
       1.1.3 CARE AND POVERTY
       1.1.4 CARE AND WOE
       1.1.5 EARLS AND BARONS
       1.1.6 FATHER AND MOTHER
       1.1.7 FLOWER AND PRIZE
       1.1.8 GAME AND PLAY
       1.1.9 GUILE AND TREACHERY
       1.1.10 HUNGER AND COLD
       1.1.11 JOY AND (MUCH) BLISS
       1.1.12 JOY AND (MUCH) HONOUR
       1.1.13 JOY AND WORLD'S WIN
       1.1.14 KNIFE AND HAND
       1.1.15 KNIGHTS AND SQUIRES
           1.15.1 with knights and squires false
       1.1.16 LAND AND FEE
       1.1.17 LORD AND DUKE
           1.1.17.1 my lord, the duke (he said anon)
           1.1.17.2 duke and lord
       1.1.18 LORD AND PRINCE
       1.1.19 MEAT AND DRINK
       1.1.20 NIGHT AND DAY
           1.1.20.1 night and day
           1.1.20.2 both night and day
           1.1.20.3 both by night and day
           1.1.20.4 both by day and by night
           1.1.20.5 variants
       1.1.21 SHIELD AND SPEAR
       1.1.22 SORROW AND SICKING SORE
       1.1.23 SORROW AND CARE
       1.1.24 TOWN AND TOWER
           1.1.24.1 [adj] in town and tower
           1.1.24.2 variant
       1.1.26 TREASON AND GUILE
       1.1.27 TREASON AND WRONG (terminal)
           1.1.27.2 variant
       1.1.28 WELL AND WOE
           1.1.28.1 in well and woe
           1.1.28.2 for well nor woe
           1.1.28.2 variant
       1.1.29 WOE AND SORE
       1.1.30 WORD AND DEED
           1.1.30.2 variant
       1.1.31 WRONG AND RIGHT
           1.1.31.1 in {wrong} and {right}
           1.1.31.2 (I) had the right and he the wrong
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1.32 VARIOUS

1.2 ADJECTIVES

1.2.1 BLITHE AND GLAD
1.2.2 FAIR AND HENDE
1.2.3 FAIR AND BOLD
1.2.4 FAIR AND BRIGHT
1.2.5 FAR AND NEAR
1.2.6 FREE AND BOND
1.2.7 GLAD AND FAIN
1.2.8 GOOD AND HENDE
1.2.9 GOOD AND KEND/KIND
1.2.10 GREAT AND GRILLE
1.2.11 GREAT AND SMALL
1.2.12 HARD AND STRONG
   1.2.12.2 variant
1.2.13 HENDE AND FREE
1.2.14 LESS AND MORE
1.2.15 LEVE AND DEAR
1.2.16 LITTLE AND MUCH, LESS AND MORE
1.2.17 MANY AND FALE
1.2.18 QUITE AND FREE
1.2.19 RICH AND POOR
1.2.20 SHARP AND GOOD
   1.2.20.1 with a fauchon sharp and good
1.2.21 TRUE AND GOOD
1.2.22 TRUE AND KEND
1.2.23 UP AND DOWN
1.2.24 WISE AND WIGHT
   1.2.24.2 variants
1.2.25 YOUNG AND OLD
1.2.26 VARIOUS

1.3 VERBS

1.3.1 ANSWERED AND SAID + [PARTICLE]
1.3.2 LISTEN AND LITHE
1.3.3 RIDE OR GO
1.3.4 WEPT AND SAID
1.3.5 VARIOUS

1.4 NEITHERS

1.4.1 NEITHER [SYNONYM] NO [SYNONYM]

1.5 TRIPLETs

1.5.1 COURTEOUS, HENDE AND [ADJ]
   1.5.1.1 courteous, hende and good
   1.5.1.2 courteous, hende and free

1.5.2 GENERAL

1.6 QUADRUPLETS

1.6.1 EARL, BARON, KNIGHT AND SWAIN
   1.6.1.2 variant

2. TEMPORAL

2.1 [DET] [TIME]

2.1.1 EVERY DAY (TERMINAL)
2.1.2 EACH DAY (TERMINAL)
2.1.3 THIS DAY (TERMINAL)
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2.1.4 THAT DAY (TERMINAL)
2.1.5 EACH NIGHT
2.1.6 THAT NIGHT
2.1.7 THAT TIDE
2.1.8 SUCH TIME AS [SUBJ] WAS BORN
2.1.9 TOMORROW AS SOON AS IT WAS [DAWN]

2.2 [ADJ] [TIME]
2.2.1 [SEASON] [TIME]
   2.2.1.1 summer’s day
   2.2.1.2 [season] tide
2.2.2 ALL [DET] [TIME]
   2.2.2.1 all that day (terminal)
   2.2.2.2 all that night
   2.2.2.3 [prep/det] [det] fortnight
2.2.3 THAT SELF DAY

2.3 [PREP] [DET] [TIME]
2.3.1 ON A DAY (initial)
2.3.2 ON ONE DAY
2.3.3 UPON A DAY (terminal)
2.3.4 FROM THAT DAY FORWARD, NEVER MORE
2.3.5 (EARLY) IN A MORNING
2.3.6 (UP) ON A NIGHT
2.3.7 TO THE NIGHT
2.3.8 (SO) IN ([DET]) TIME
2.3.9 BY THE TIME
2.3.10 IN THAT TIDE
2.3.11 IN/UPON A WHILE (final position)
2.3.12 AFTER [DET] DAY
2.3.14 TILL DOMESDAY (terminal)

3. EXCLAMATORY PHRASE / PARTICLES

3.1 AC
3.2 AGAIN
   3.2.1 ANSWERED AGAIN
   3.2.2 SAID [SUBJ] AGAIN
3.3 ALAS
   3.3.1 ALAS
   3.3.2 OFT ALAS
3.4 ALSO
   3.4.1 ALSO (terminal)
   3.4.2 ALSO (initial)
3.5 AMONG
3.6 ANON
   3.6.1 ANON (terminal)
   3.6.2 ANON (initial)
   3.6.3 VARIANTS
   3.6.3.1 anon right
   3.6.3.2 swithe anon
3.7 APLIGHT
   3.7.1 APLIGHT (terminal)
3.8 AS SWITHE
3.9 BY SAINT (terminal)
   3.9.1 BY JESUS, HEAVEN’S KING
3.9.2 BY SAINT JOHN
3.9.3 BY SAINT GILES
3.9.4 VARIANTS
3.9.5 FOR LOVE OF SAINT —-

3.10 CERTES!

3.10.1 CERTES
3.10.2 VARIANTS

3.10.2.1 certain
3.10.2.2 ac, certes
3.10.2.3 for, certes
3.10.2.4 variant

3.10.3 CERTES (direct address)
3.10.4 CERTES, I CANNOT READ

3.10.4.2 variant

3.10.5 YES, CERTES ([VOCATIVE])!

3.11 EACH ONE

3.11.1 EVERY WHICH ONE
3.11.2 EACH ONE
3.11.3 VARIANT

3.11.3.1 the lordings, every which one

3.12 FOR SOOTH

3.12.1 FOR SOOTH (initial)
3.12.2 FOR SOOTH (terminal)
3.12.3 TELL (OBJ) THAT SOOTH
3.12.4 FOR SOOTH TO SAY
3.12.5 TELL FOR SOOTH
3.12.6 VARIANT

3.13 GODSPEED

3.13.1 (AL)(SO) GOD (DAT. PRON) SPEED
3.13.2 VARIANT

3.14 DAN (terminal)
3.15 DO (terminal)
3.16 VERRAMENT (terminal)
3.17 WAILEWAY (terminal)
3.18 YWIS [I KNOW]

3.18.1 YWIS (initial)
3.18.2 YWIS (terminal)
3.18.3 VARIANTS

3.18.3.1 thus, ywis
3.18.3.2 Ywis, it may not be so

4. GRAMMATICAL

4.1 INDEPENDENT CLAUSE

4.1.1 [SUBJ] [VERB] [OBJ] [PARTICLE/PREP]
4.1.1.1 general
4.1.1.2 [subj] loved them [particle]
4.1.1.3 [subj] asked him [particle]
4.1.1.4 God/Jesus sent thee [particle]
4.1.1.5 God leave [obj]

4.1.2 [ADV PHRASE] [CLAUSE]
4.1.2.1 {no further} {he} {no might}
4.1.2.2 so long [pronominal subj] [verb]
4.1.2.3 so it befell
4.1.2.4 so hard they hew (on helm)
4.1.2.5 against [dat obj pron] ([subj]) gan go

4.1.3 [obj] [subj] [verb]
4.1.3.1 a [adj] lodge [subj] let make
4.1.3.2 his name it hight

4.2 Relative Clause
4.2.1 THAT [subj] [prep] [verb]
   4.2.1.1 that he upon him bare
   4.2.1.2 that I of told
4.2.2 THAT [adj] [be] [prep phrase]
   4.2.2.1 that [adj] were [prep phrase]
   4.2.2.2 variants
4.2.3 [adverbial sub conj] [be-clause]
   4.2.3.1 for (that) [subj] [be]
   4.2.3.2 how [subj] [be]
   4.2.3.3 When [subj] [be]
   4.2.3.4 as [subj] [be]
   4.2.3.5 that [subj] [be]
   4.2.3.6 then [be] [subj] (usually initial)
4.2.4 [adverbial sub conj] [verb-clause]
   4.2.4.1 as [clause]
   4.2.4.2 before [clause]
   4.2.4.3 since (sethen)
   4.2.4.4 {that} {ever}
   4.2.4.5 by then the [time] was ago
   4.2.4.6 and then thought [subj]
   4.2.4.7 there [subj] [verb]
   4.2.4.8 when [subj] had [past participle]
   4.2.4.9 when [subj] comes
   4.2.4.10 when (that) [subj] sees
   4.2.4.11 when/that him was fallen hard case
   4.2.4.12 when/till all [poss pron] ran of blood
   4.2.4.13 when/till that [subj] come
   4.2.4.14 where that [subj] [verb]
   4.2.4.15 while they might [adj] and [adj]
   4.2.4.16 while he was alive
   4.2.4.17 defective variant
4.2.5 SO/THAT GOD [obj] SAVE

4.3 Verb Phrases & Clauses
4.3.1 Verb Phrases & Clauses
   4.3.1.1 abide
   4.3.1.2 answered
   4.3.1.3 (and/[subj]) bade [obj] (that) [subj] should
   4.3.1.4 [be] [compliment]
   4.3.1.5 beg
   4.3.1.6 began -- see “gan”
   4.3.1.7 besought god/jesus
   4.3.1.8 buy
   4.3.1.9 break
   4.3.1.10 bring
   4.3.1.11 busked them to ride
   4.3.1.12 [subj] cast [det] eye/sight
   4.3.1.13 change [obj] for no new
4.3.1.14 chosen for prize
4.3.1.15 clept to [reflexive sub]
4.3.1.16 come
4.3.1.17 dight [obj] yare
4.3.1.18 do by my read
4.3.1.19 eat in hall
4.3.1.20 fell
4.3.1.21 fight
4.3.1.22 go
4.3.1.23 grant
4.3.1.24 to hear the fowl
4.3.1.25 hold
4.3.1.26 [poss pron] joy {couth} ([pronominal subj]) no man kithe
4.3.1.27 lay in bed
4.3.1.28 he lies on us
4.3.1.29 light a-down
4.3.1.30 hem loved
4.3.1.31 [subj] make [poss. pron] moan
4.3.1.32 to plight truth
4.3.1.33 I pray you
4.3.1.34 he pricked ([det]) steed
4.3.1.35 save
4.3.1.36 say
4.3.1.37 see
4.3.1.38 send
4.3.1.39 seized {all} {{(land)}} {into hand}
4.3.1.40 and served his lord
4.3.1.41 sit [obj. pron] hende
4.3.1.42 [subj] smot to [obj]
4.3.1.43 spoused [det] lady
4.3.1.44 stint
4.3.1.45 swore by
4.3.1.46 take
4.3.1.47 tell
4.3.1.48 thank
4.3.1.49 think
4.3.1.50 token our parting
4.3.1.51 touch [poss. pron] body
4.3.1.52 understand
4.3.1.53 wend/went
4.3.1.54 wrought him much woe
4.3.1.55 wrung [poss. pron] hands

4.3.2 IMPERATIVE
4.3.2.1 be
4.3.2.2 be now still
4.3.2.3 be true
4.3.2.4 (Hende) hearkeneth

4.3.3 AUXILIARY
4.3.3.1 [subj.] gan [verb]
4.3.3.2 [subj] shall [verb]

4.3.4 ([conj]) IF [PRONOMINAL SUBJ.] +[SUBJUNCTIVE AUXILIARY]
4.3.4.1 ([conj]) if [pronominal subj.] may
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4.3.4.2 ([conj]) if [pronominal subj.] were
4.3.4.3 ([conj]) if [pronominal subj.] would
4.3.4.4 ([conj]) if [pronominal subj.] do
4.3.4.5 ([conj]) if [pronominal subj.] will
4.3.4.6 ([conj]) if [pronominal subj.] should
4.3.4.7 ([conj]) if [pronominal subj.] be
4.3.4.8 [variants with subjunctive main verb]

4.3.5 INFINITIVE PHRASES
4.3.5.1 [noun] to [infinitive]
4.3.5.2 [adv] to [infinitive]

4.3.6 FOR TO [VERB]
4.3.6.1 ([he] took [his] leave) for to fare
4.3.6.2 for to go
4.3.6.3 for to abide
4.3.6.4 for to ride
4.3.6.5 for to wende
4.3.6.6 for to solas
4.3.6.7 for to slay
4.3.6.8 variants

4.4 PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES
4.4.1 [PREP] [CONCRETE NOUN]
4.4.1.1 among the people
4.4.1.2 in geste/romance...
4.4.1.3 [prep] [corporeal]
4.4.1.4 [prep] [animate being]
4.4.1.5 for [genetive] [noun]
4.4.1.6 for [demonstrative] [noun]

4.4.2 [PREP] [ABSTRACT NOUN]
4.4.2.1 [prep] [location]
4.4.2.2 [prep] [time]
4.4.2.3 [prep] [concern]
4.4.2.4 with [abstract noun]
4.4.2.5 without [abstract noun] (terminal)
4.4.2.6 par [French noun]

4.4.3 [PREP] [OBJ] [RELATIVE CLAUSE]
4.4.3.1 [prep] him that Judas sold
4.4.3.2 [prep] him that died on rood
4.4.3.3 For God that bought dear
4.4.3.4 For [obj] that this world won

4.4.4 [PREP] [NOTHING]
4.4.4.1 [prep] none other thing
4.4.4.2 for nothing would [subj] [verb]

4.4.5 [PREP] [OBJ] [VERB]
4.4.5.1 (all that ever) about him stood
4.4.5.2 that by him stood
4.4.5.3 among him stood

4.4.6 OTHER PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES
4.4.6.1 by each a side
4.4.6.2 through the grace of god’s son
4.4.6.3 though hunger should us slay

4.5 NOUN AND ADJECTIVE PHRASES
4.5.1 [ADJ] [ADJ]
4.5.1.1 fairly woe
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4.5.1.2 full [adj]
4.5.1.3 together [adj]
4.5.1.4 michel [adj]
4.5.1.5 well [adj] (initial + clause
4.5.1.6 here beside

4.5.2 [noun] [relative complement]
4.5.2.1 God that suffered passion
4.5.2.2 an ass to ride upon
4.5.2.3 an angel come from heaven

4.5.3 [adj] [noun]
4.5.3.1 body bare
4.5.3.2 [male] bold
4.5.3.3 [noun] bright
4.5.3.4 [female] bright
4.5.3.5 careful man
4.5.3.6 doughty [male]
4.5.3.7 daughter forlain
4.5.3.8 false steward
4.5.3.9 freely food
4.5.3.10 fouler measle
4.5.3.11 gentle [noun]
4.5.3.12 God almighty
4.5.3.13 good man
4.5.3.14 great [noun]
4.5.3.15 grimly wound(s)
4.5.3.16 hard case
4.5.3.17 lessing strong
4.5.3.18 [male] hende
4.5.3.21 [adj] maiden
4.5.3.22 poor man
4.5.3.23 rich duke (usually initial)
4.5.3.24 that stound (terminal appositive)
4.5.3.25 unkind blood
4.5.3.26 years [number]
4.5.3.27 with words [adj]
4.5.3.28 and other [noble]
4.5.3.29 variants

4.5.4 [adj] [det] [noun]
4.5.4.1 all [det] [noun]
4.5.4.2 many [det] [noun]

4.5.5 [adj] [genitive] [noun]
4.5.5.1 the duke’s daughter dear
4.5.5.2 live’s food
4.5.5.3 heaven’s king
4.5.5.4 land’s law
4.5.5.5 world’s/worldy won
4.5.5.6 [poss. pron.] most foe

4.5.6 as/so [adj] a [complement]
4.5.6.1 so/as foul a [adj]
4.5.6.2 as fair a [noun]

4.5.7 [prep] [adj] [noun]
4.5.7.1 [prep] [adj] [noun]
4.5.7.2 [adj] [prep] [noun]
5. ORPHANS

4.5.8 [NOUN] OF [NOUN]
4.5.8.1 cup(s) of gold
4.5.8.2 duke of great pouste
4.5.8.3 (to) god of heaven (he made his moan)
4.5.8.3 variant
1. DOUBLETS

1.1 NOUNS

1.1.1 AMIS AND AMILOUN
(134) Child Amiloun & child Amis.
(177) Sir Amis & sir Amiloun.
(184) Sir Amiloun and sir Amis,
(251) As was Sir Amiloun & sir Amis,
(285) Sir Amis & Amiloun,
(2461) (206) Sir Amys and sir Amilion

1.1.2 When Amoraunt and Amiloun
(1813) (152) Pan Amoraunt & sir Amiloun,
(1861) (156) Pan Amoraunt crus sir Amiloun

1.1.3 BLOOD AND BONE

1.1.2.1 of blood and bone
(60) So faire of boon and blood.
(142) Bitvix hem tvai, of blod & bon.
(1420) bat douhti kni3t of blod & bon.

1.1.2.2 variant
(344) Men blisced him, bope bon & blod.

1.1.3 CARE AND POVERTY
(1265) Wip sorwe & care & pouerte
(1722) & liued in care & pouerte

1.1.4 CARE AND WOE
(2334) Haue liued in care & wo !
(1445) Pat he bitide care oper wo.

1.1.5 EARLS AND BARONS
(65) After erles, barouns, fre and bond.
(86) Erl. baron, squer, ne kny3t.
(98) Wip erles & wip barouns bold,
(416) Earls, barouns, lasse & mare,
(460) Of erls, barouns, kni3t & swain.
(819) Bope erl, baroun & swain;
(1505) Wip erl, baron, kni3t & swain,
(1516) Of erls, barouns, mani & fale,
(1520) Of erls & of barouns bold
(2486) To erles, barouns, fre and bond.

1.1.6 FATHER AND MOTHER
(94) Fader ne moder pat coup say
(221) His fader & his moder al-so
(226) His fader & his moder hende
(966) bi fader, bi moder to se;

1.1.7 FLOWER AND PRIZE
(440) Ouer al yholden flour & priis,
(468) & chosen for priis & flour.

1.1.8 GAME AND PLAY
(710) Ete in halle wip gamen & play
(1888) Pat riche douke wip gamen & play

1.1.9 GUILE AND TREACHERY
(210) With gile & trecherie.
(1076) Wip gile & wip trecherie,

1.1.10 HUNGER AND COLD
(1908) Wel sore of-hunered & cold.
(1664) Pei his lord for hunger & cold

1.1.11 JOY AND (MUCH) BLISS
(257) Wip ioie & miche blis among.
(1073) Wip ioie & michel blis al-so
(1031) Y no schal neuer haue ioie no blis.
(1463) & made his ioie & michel blis,
(1896) Wip ioie & blis to abide.

1.1.12 JOY AND (MUCH) HONOUR
(1379) Wip ioie & ful michel honour,
(1521) Wip ioie & michel honour.

1.1.13 JOY AND WORLD’S WIN
(604) Al our ioie & worldes winne.
(2256) Wip ioie & worldes winne.

1.1.14 KNIFE AND HAND
(208) Pat euer he proued wip nibe & ond
(347) Ever he proued wip nibe & ond

1.1.15 KNIGHTS AND SQUIRES
1.1.5.1 With knights and squires
(2463) With kny3tes & squers fale,
(1894) Wip kni3tes & wip seriaunce fale

1.1.16 LAND AND FEE
(600) Pat nap noiper lord no fe.
(1988) Y bihete him bope lond & fe,

1.1.17 LORD AND DUKE
1.1.17.1 my lord, the duke (he said anon)
(784) "Mi lord, he douke," he seyd anon.
(1228) "Mi lord he douke," he seyd anon.

1.1.17.2 duke and lord
(1532) Douke & lord of gret pouste
(1866) Was douke & lord in lond.
(1538) & lord of mani a tour & toun
(1539) & douke of gret pouste;

1.1.18 LORD AND PRINCE
(1179) As lord & prince in pride;
(1890) As lord & prince wip pride.

1.1.19 MEAT AND DRINK
(101) [With meet and drynke, meryst on mold]
(413) Wip mete & drink ful onest
(1587) Wip gode mete & wip drink.
(1666) He schuld haue noiper mete no drink.
(1707) Bope of mete & drink;
(1727) & beged hem mete & drink also.
(1739) bat wald 3if hem mete no drink.
(1742) Ac mete no drink no gat he non,
(2191) Of euerich mete & eueri drink

1.1.20 NIGHT AND DAY
1.1.20.1 night and day
(904) Sir Amis sorwe ni3t & day.
(1192) He priked his stede ni3t & day,
(2189) What so euer he asked ni3t or day.
(478) For hye ni mi3t ni3t no day
1.1.20.2 both night and day
(978) Bope ni3t & day.
(1556) Wrou3t him wers bope ni3t & day
(1750) & liued in ioie bope ni3t & day.
1.1.28.2 for well nor woe¹
(155) Failen oper for wele no wo;
(296) To faily oper for wele no wo,
(372) Nober for wele no wo
(1469) bat sche no durst nou3t for wele no wo
1.1.28.2 variant
(236) bat bou art in wer & wo
1.1.29 WOE AND SORÉ
(257) For sorwe & wo & sikeing sare
(2141) Ichauhe him 3olden wip wo & sor"n
1.1.30 WORD AND DEED
(364) Be trewe to me in word & dede,
(766) & so ðai plaid in word & dede,
(296) Bope wip word & dede.
(141) Nober in word no in dede;
(152) In word, in wrek, in wille, in dede.
1.1.30.2 variant
(197) Al ðat hem sei3e wip word & bou3t,
1.1.31 WRONG AND RIGHT
1.1.31.1 in {wrong} and {right}
(149) In wele & wo, in wrong & ri3t.
(1451) Y schal þe help in ri3t & wrong.
1.1.31.1.1 variant
(1492) & seyd, "Wip wrong & michel vnri3t
1.1.31.2 (I) had the right and he the wrong
(908) & hadde þe ri3t & he þe wrong
(940) Ich hau3e wip wrong & he ri3t.
1.1.32 VARIOUS
(103) þer was mirpe & melode
(197) Al ðat hem sei3e wip word & bou3t,
(482) Lay in care & love-morning
(587) Til god & deb dele ous ato,
(1315) So hard þai hewe on helme & side,*
(1642) When ich man made gle & song,
(1743) Nober at man no wise,
(2102) & seve his lord wip wou3 & wrong
(2419) With-out hemme and wound
(2464) With helmes & with haberyon,*
(2506) And for her trewþ and her godhede
1.2 ADJECTIVES
1.2.1 BLITHE AND GLAD
(160) þe douke was blipe & glad of chere,
(547) Pan was sche blipe glad & blipe,
(680) Men seyd þat sche was glad & blipe,
(683) Ful blipe & glad þai were bat day
(1237)(104) þan ware bo leuedis glad & blipe,
(1402) þan were þai al glad & blipe
(1438) þan was sir Amis glad & blipe
(1783) þan was þe leuedi glad & blipe
(2379) Be blipe & glad of mode;
(2470) Glad and blyþ were þey bat day.

¹ Related also to “well woe.”
1.2.2 FAIR AND HENDE
(1267) Ouer al bis world, fer & hende.
(2487) Bob feire and hende.
1.2.3 FAIR AND BOLD
(74) And her sones feire and bolde
(422) He hadde a douhter fer & bold.
(1633) Pat child, pat was so fer & bold.
1.2.4 FAIR AND BRIGHT
(532) Be somers day was fer & bryt,
(895) bus bo leuieds fer & bryt.
(1576) Pat fram his leuedi, fer & bryt.
(2278) He tok a candel fer & bryt.
(2401) bus be lady faire & bryt.
1.2.5 FAR AND NEAR
(200) Ouer al be lond fer & nere
1.2.6 FREE AND BOND
(65) fer and bond
(65) After erls, barouns, fre and bond.
(2486) To erls, barouns, fre and bond.
1.2.7 GLAD AND FAIN
(124) pat bai were hope glad & fain
(671) Pan was sche so glad & fain.
(1395) Glad he was & fain;
(1502) Sir Amis was ful glad & fain.
(2149) (180) Pan was sir Amis glad & fain.
1.2.8 GOOD AND HENDE
(16) And how they were good & hend
(211) For bai were so gode & hende.
(1230) Pat er bohe gode & hende.
(343) For pat he was so hende & gode.
(2382) Pat were so hende & gode;
1.2.9 GOOD AND KEND/KIND
(374) Ichaue him founde so gode & kende.
(2265) Pat was so gode & kende.
(2296) "Mi brother was so kind & gode.

1.2.10 GREAT AND GRILLE
(1275) Pat were so gret & grille.
(1802) Pat hunger wex so gret & grille.
1.2.11 GREAT AND SMALL
(535) Sche herd he foules gret & smale.
(1517) & oher lordinges gret & smale.
(2469) Bob grete & smale.
1.2.12 HARD AND STRONG
(491) Hir pines were so hard & strong.
(630) Wip pines hard & strong.
(1840) Pat winter com so hard & strong.
1.2.12.2 variant
(2104) He was bohe hardi & strong.
1.2.13 HENDE AND FREE
(189) [For he was hend and fre,]
(327) bo kni3tes hende & fre.
(423) Curteise, hende & fre.
(531) Wip maidens hende & fre.
(563) Wip worde bohe fre & hende
(740) To wite, astow art hende & fre
(997) (84) be kni3t, pat was so hende & fre.
(1261) Ae for hou art so hende & fre.
(1531) Pan was sir Amis, hende & fre.
(1542) Pat ere was hende & fre;
(1830) Curtays, hende & fre.
(1875) Astow art hende & fre;
(2235) bo kni3tes hende & fre.
1.2.14 LESS AND MORE
(416) Ers, barouns, lasse & mare,
(1408) To telle his frendes, lasse & mare.
(2028) & nother lesse no mare.
1.2.15 LEVE AND DEAR
(161) bai were him bohe leve & dere.
(2361) Pat was him leve & dere.
1.2.16 LITTLE AND MUCH, LESS AND MORE
(1156) Litel & michel, lasse & mare.
(1370) Litel & michel, lasse & mare.
(1964) Litel & michel, lasse & mare.
(2260) Litel & michel, lasse & mare.
1.2.17 MANY AND FALE
(435) & lordinges mani & fale.
(1516) Of ers, barouns, mani & fale.
1.2.18 QUITE AND FREE
(840) To make ous quite & fre.
1.2.19 RICH AND POOR
(92) ber was neither pore ne ryche,
(196) Wip riche & power so wele bai wrou3t,
1.2.20 SHARP AND GOOD
1.2.20.1 with a fauchon sharp and good
(808) Wip a fauchon sharp & gode.
(1360) Wip a fauchen sharp & gode
1.2.21 TRUE AND GOOD
(655) Astow art maiden gode & trewe
(2000) be child," he seyd, "is trewe & gode.
1.2.22 TRUE AND KEND
(1512) Pat was so trewe & kende.
(1627) Pat child was trewe & of his kende.
(1846) Ful trewe he was & kinde of blod
(2003) For pat he is so trewe & kende,
(2490) Pat was trew & kynd;
1.2.23 UP AND DOWN
(1699) So long bai went vp & doun
(1798) Purch mani a cuntre, vp an doun.
(1862) Purch mani a cuntre, vp & doun.
1.2.24 WISE AND WIGHT
(437) & mani a seraunt, wise & wi3t;
(1574) Pat whilom was so wise & wi3t;
(1910) & a seraunt wise & wi3t.
1.2.24.2 variants
(145) (13) On a day he childer war & wi3t
(182) For pat bai were so war & wiis
1.2.25 YOUNG AND OLD
(76) When they were comyn, 30ng and olde.
(1300) At pat ber was, 30ng & old.
(1650) ban schuld he the & briue.*
(1713) Hem loued old & sing.
(1738) bat her was noiber eld no sing
(1965) Bope old & sing,
(2460) Bob 3ong and olde.

1.2.26 VARIOUS
bright
(687) Wip leuedis bri3t & sweete,
(2465) With swerd bri3t and brown.
whole
(2244) Al hayl & hole to be !"’
(2420) Hool and sound pe children found,
(203) When sir Amylion was hool & fere
strong
(644) Wip wilde hors & wip strong
(1028) He is in peril gret & strong,
(1303) On stedes þat were stiffe & strong
(1828) Amoraunt wex strong & bold,
brown
(171) Bope stedes white & brown,
(2465) With swerd bri3t and brown.
(2474) Droue outhe both brown and blake]
(2458) Pan wox þe lady blew and wan.
bare
(1347) Wip brondes bri3t & bare;
(345) þat euer him gat & bare.
fair
(1766) Bifor þat leuedi fair & gent.
(2309) Ouer a bacine fair & gode
wood
(1015) Burch a bere wilde & wode
(1357) Pan was sir Amiloun wrōp & wode,
various
(427) For sche was gentil & auenaunt.
(596) Kinges sones & emperour
(616) Wefer artow prest oer person,
(617) Ober þou art monk oer canoun.
(631) & mi kerchef & mi clopes anon
(947) Pan liif & soule icam forlorn;
(1193) As a gentil kni3t, stout & gay.
(1209) He schuld ben hong & drawe;
(1412) & bode him kni3tes & mich phiode,
(1522) Ouer al þat lond est & west
(1561) So wicked & schrewed was his wiif,
(1563) Wip wordes harde & kene.
(1588) His leuedi wax ful wrōp & wo
(1734) As þai com to & fro.
(1843) þe way was so depe & slider.
(2187) Ful trewe þai ware & kinde.
(2346) Wip clopes riche & sole.
(2411) As euer he was 3et or þan,
(2440) Wel fyve hundred kene and try.
(2441) And other barons by and by

1.3 VERBS
1.3.1 ANSWERED AND SAID +
[PARTICLE]
(1675) & he answerd & seyd bo.
(1879) He answerd & seyd. "Nay."
(1990) & he answerd & seyd bo
1.3.2 LISTEN AND LITHE
(99) As 3e may listen & lipe,
(471) As 3e may listen & lipe,
(1240) & seiben, as 3e may list & lipe.
(2416) As 3e mow listen and lyth.
1.3.3 RIDE OR GO
(475) Wher þat sche se3e him ride or go,
(933) Whefer þou wilt go or ride,
(1008) Noiper to go no ride.
(1050) After him noiper go no ride.
(2115) Bothe to ryde and go,
(2427) Bop to goo and ryde,
1.3.4 WEEPED AND SAID2
(2171) & wepe & seyd. "Allas bat stounde !"’
(2332) He wepe & seyd. "Waileway !
1.3.5 VARIOUS
(147) While þai mi3t liue & stond
(1941) Whiles he mi3t walk & wake.
1.4 NEITHERS
1.4.1 NEITHER [SYNONYM] NO
[SYNONYM]
(87) Neither let ne loothe.
(92) ber was neither pore ne riche.
(141) Noiper in word no in dede;
(372) Noiper for wele no wo.
(465) Noiper in toun no tour;
(600) þat nap noiper lond no fe.
(1008) Noiper to go no ride.
(1050) After him noiper go no ride.
(1419) Noiper kni3t no swain.
(1666) He schuld haue noiper mete no drink,
(1738) þat ber was noiper eld no sing.
(1743) Noiper at man no wise.
(2028) & noiper lesse no mare.
1.5 TRIPLETs
1.5.1 COURTEOUS, HENDE AND [ADJ]
1.5.1.1 courteous, hende and good
(51) Curtaise, hende, and good;
(1638) Wel curteys, hend & gode.
1.5.1.2 courteous, hende and free
(423) Curteise, hende & fre.
(1830) Curtays, hende & fre.
1.5.2 GENERAL
(81) Of hyde and hew and here;
(167) Hors & wepen & worlwy wede,*
(819) Bope eri, baroun & swain;
(1244) Wip helme & plate & brini bri3t.*

2 See also “answered/said.”
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1.6 QUADRUPLETS

1.6.1 EARL, BARON, KNIGHT AND SWAIN

(460) Oft erls, burouns, kni3t & swain.

1.6.1.1 variant

(86) Erl, baroun, quyuer, ne kny3t.

2. TEMPORAL

2.1 [DET] [TIME]

2.1.1 EVERY DAY (TERMINAL)

(1424) He lete after sende bat day.

2.1.2 EACH DAY (TERMINAL)

(850) Y selue day.

2.1.3 THIS DAY (TERMINAL)

(798) He rode til day.

2.1.4 THAT DAY (TERMINAL)

(2415) He rode til day.

2.1.5 EACH NIGHT

(1639) Bi his lord ich ni3t.

2.1.6 THAT NIGHT

(1010) In his slepe he lay pat ni3t.

2.1.7 THAT TIDE

(111) Cleped to him bat tide.

2.2.1.1 summer’s day

(525) Bis ich day.

2.2.1.2 variants

(962) "Take leue to morwe at day.

2.2.2.3 {prep/det} {det} [TIME]

2.2.3 THAT

(1885) Bis ich day.

2.2.4.1 ON A...VISUALIZATION.

(1887) Pat selue day.

2.3.1 ON A DAY (initial)

(1451) On a day he childer war & wi3t.
LIST OF MENTAL TEMPLATES

(1405) *On a day* sir Amiloun di3t him 3are (1668) For hir *after bat day.*
(1597)(134) *On a day* sche gan him calle (2333) I had leuer *til domesday*
(1753)(147) *On a day,* as pai sete alon, (2501) To senge for hem *tyl domesday*
(349)(30) *Pan on a day* bifel it so

2.3.2.2 ON ONE DAY
(41) And *on oo day* born a-plý3t,
(2503) Bed *on oo day* were þey deede

2.3.2.2.2 variants
(40) Bed þey were geten *in oo my3t*
(2504) And *in oo grewe* were þey leide,

2.3.3 UPON A DAY (terminal)
(721)(61) Bat riche douke *upon a day*
(925)(78) So it bifel *upon a day*
(1510) & sebben wip ioie *upon a day*
(1807) *Ban seyd* þe kni3t *upon a day,*
(2298) For mi loue *upon a day;*
(2431) *Ban sai3e* þe knyt *upon a day.*

2.3.3.2 variants
(1579) & *in his owhen halle o-day*
(1388) *Bou hast* bou3t hir fu3l dere *to day*

2.3.4 FROM THAT DAY FORWARD,
NEVER MORE
(154) *Fro bat day* forward neuer mo
(295) *Fro his day* forward neuer mo

2.3.5 (EARLY) IN A MORNING
(493) (42) *Bat riche douke in a morning*
(1815) *Erliche in a morning*

2.3.6 (UPON) A NIGHT
(2197) (184) So it bifel *upon a ni3t,*
(2251) So it bifel *on Cristes ni3t,*

2.3.7 TO THE NIGHT
(1459) & *when it was comen to* þe ni3t,
(1159) & *when it was comen to* þe ni3t,

2.3.8 (SO) IN ([DET]) TIME
(61) (6) *In bat tyme,* y vnderstonde,
(409) (35) So *in a time,* we as tel in gest,
(1705) (143) So *in bat time,* ich vnderstoned,

2.3.9 BY THE TIME
(1440) *Pe time bat he was born.*
(2040) *Bi te time bat he was born."

2.3.10 IN THAT TIDE
(165) To kni3t3s *in bat tide,*
(281) So douhti kni3t3s, *in bat tide*
(773) He se3e hem bope *in bat tide*
(1033) (87) As swipe he stirt vp *in bat tide,*
(1218) *To bren hem in bat tide,*
(1455) Went hom *in bat tide*
(1792) & told his lord *in bat tide*
(1867) *Ban seyd* þe kni3t *in bat tide.*

2.3.11 IN/UPON A WHILE (final position)
(406) & afterward *apon a while*
(706) & *bou3t he schuld in a while*
(949) (80) *Ban seyd bat leuedi in a while.*

2.3.12 AFTER [DET] DAY
(393) *Euer after his day!*

3.1 AC
(235) Ac 3if euer it bifalle so
(301) Ac broper, ich warn þe biform,
(355) Ac of his wendeing haue hou no care,
(538) Ac hir hert was so hard ibrou3t,
(625) Ac, sche seyd, *"bi him bat ous wrou3t;*
(748) Ac 3if þe fader herd it sain
(751) Ac 3if ich were king of his lond
(755) Ac, certes, icham a pouer man,
(835) Ac 3if ani wip gret wrong
(922) Ac oft he bisou3t lhesu po,
(1075) Ac þe steward ful of envie,
(1117) Ac broper, he seyd, "haue al mi wede,
(1180) Ac he for3at him neuer a ni3t,
(1261) Ac for hou art so hende & ßre,
(1324) Ac he failed of his dint.
(1476) Ac wray me to no wi3t;"
(1742) Ac mete no drink no gat he non,
(1811) Ac certes, bat schal neuer be sold,
(1873) Ac, leue sone," he seyd ban
(2032) Ac he no coube neuer mo
(2216) Ac for his childir him was ful wo.

3.2 AGAIN

3.2.1 ANSWERED AGAIN
(121)(11) Be riche barouns *answerd oga1n,*
(230) *Answerd o3ain* wip wordes hende
(266) *Answerd o3ain* wip wordes hende
(457)(19) Her maidens *gan answerd oga1n*
(2230) & he him *answerd o3ain ful stille.*

3.2.2 SAID [SUBJ] AGAIN
(745) (63) *Madame," seyd he kni3t oga1n,*
(1981) (166) *Pan seyd be riche douke oga1n,*
(see also, "said though" and "said anon")

3.3 ALAS

3.3.1 ALAS
(1104) *'Alas' may be mi song!"
(1573) (132) *Alas, alas! bat gentil kni3t;*
(1680) *Alas; hou schal we fare?"*
(2124) *Alas, whi fairest thou so?"
(2137) (179) "Alas;," he seyd, "mi ioie is lorn,"
(2171) & wepe & seyd, *"Alas bat stウンde!"
(2331) *Alas, whi destow so?"

4 These represent instances where a formula consists of a single word which has no particularising force, being either a tautology or an adjective of little importance, usually used at the end of a line to fill out metre and/or to provide a rhyme. Often such particles are incorporated into larger formulae, but this does not diminish their independent function (as those larger formulae are indeed reliant on the particle's particular use); thus they are listed here.
3.3.2 OFT ALAS
(1841) "Alas! it was his song.
(2129) & oft, "Alas!" he gan saun.
(2135) & oft he seyd, "Alas bat stounde!"
(2176) & oft time sch seyd, "Alas!"

3.4 ALSO

3.4.1 ALSO (TERMINAL)
(221) His fader & his moder al-so
(236) Be trewe to be al-so.
(248) & y pli3t be mi treube al-so.
(645) Be trewe to be al-so.
(586) Ben his borwe al-so.
(1062) & he knewe him al-so.
(1073) Wib ioie & michel blis al-so.
(1343) Y schal fi3t a-fot al-so.
(1500) He wald help me al-so.
(1529) & his leuedi dede al-so.
(1581) He was ychargeth al-so.
(1712) & for he child was fair al-so.
(1727) & begged hem mete & drink also.
(1731) Pat child & he al-so.
(1820) His asse he ladde wip him also.
(2030) First his & his lorderes al-so.
(2056) Saue min & my bropers al-so.
(2221) Sir Amiloun met bat ni3t also.
(2370) & sei3he lird was al-so.
(2502) And for her elders also.

3.4.2 ALSO (INITIAL)
(300) Also god me spede!
(942) Al so god me spede.
(944) Al so god me spede in bataile, al-so.
(994) Also god me spede.
(1449) Al so god me spede.
(1582) Al so a douhti man.
(1585) Al so pat angel hadde him told.
(2233) (187) Al so pai sete to-gider bare.
(916) Pat al so god schuld him spede.
(1093) & al-so he seyd, ypli3t.

3.5 AMONG
(527) Wib ioie & michel blis among.
(860) & euer swore hir moder among.
(872) Borwes anow he fond among.
(1098) Durst ben his borwe among.
(1643) Euer for his lord among.
(1823) Per wip pai bou3t him mete among.

3.6 ANON

3.6.1 ANON (terminal)
(448) Pat miri maide gan aske anon.
(565) Pat mirie maiden sone anon.
(631) Mi kerchef & mi clopes anon.
(675) Into hallo he went anon.

(736) "Sir Amis," sche sayd anon.
(784) "Mi lord, be douke," he seyd anon.
(829) (70) "Sir." seyd sir Amis anon.
(1011) In sueen he mett anon.
(1035) Bot di3t him forb anon.
(1228) "Mi lord be douke," he seyd anon.
(1263) To warn be anon.
(1333) "Arise vp, steward," he seyd anon.
(1384) "Sir Amis," seyd be douke anon.
(1660) Be leuedi was ful wrohp anon.
(1757) To mi leuedi swipe anon.
(1767) Wel hendeliche seyd hir anon.
(1933) & gode man asked him anon.
(1957) Be riche douke badde him anon.
(2318) Per dore he steked stille anon.
(2354) & in to his chapel he went anon.

3.6.2 ANON (initial)
(1123) Anon bo hendi kni3tes to.
(1346) Anon to-gider hai fi3t gan.
(1378) Anon pai ladde him to be tour.
(1610) Anon sche dede men timber take.
(2294) Anon he turne o3ain his mode.
(2373) (199) Anon he tok his leuedi pan.
(2453) Anon her began a soory play.
(2479) (209) Anon he hend barons tway.

3.6.3 VARIANTS

3.6.3.1 anon right
(1057) (89) He cleped to him anon ri3t.
(1144) & sir Amis went hom anon ri3t.

3.6.3.2 swipe anon
(1415) Bot as swipe him di3t anon.
(1757) To mi leuedi swipe anon.

3.7 APLIGHT

3.7.1 APLIGHT (terminal)
(41) And on oo day born a-ply3t.
(248) & bope of o michel, ypli3t.
(470) When pai hadde bus seyd, ypli3t.
(1093) & al-so he seyd, ypli3t.
(1141) And when he hadde bus seyd, ypli3t.
(1473) Bat hadde so done, apli3t.
(1489) (125) Be leuedi was ful wrohp, ypli3t.
(1624) To saue a gentil child, ypli3t.
(2345) & wrei3e he wel warm, apli3t.

3.8 AS SWITHE

3.8.1 AS SWITHE (terminal)
(1033) (87) As swipe he stirt vp in bat tide.
(1415) Bot as swipe him di3t anon.
(1784) & comand him an asse as swipe.
(679) After his doughter he asked swipe.
(1241) In-to he chaunber hai went aswipe.
(2146) & he for3aue it him also swipe.

3.9 BY SAINT (terminal)

3.9.1 BY JESUS, HEAVEN'S KING
(662) & swore, "Bi thesu, ful of mi3t.
(878) & swore bi thesu, ful of mi3t.
(1596) Bi thesu, heuen king!"
(2064) Bi thesu, heuen king!"
3.9.2 BY SAINT JOHN
(785) "Of hine harm, bi Sevn Jon.
(832) & 3if hou may prove, bi Sevn Jon.
(956) Y dorst wele swere bi Sevn Jon.
(1336) For it were gret vilani, bi Sevn Jon.
(1918) Pan sayd hae bohe, bi Sevn Jon.
(1926) & he sayd he schuld, bi Sevn Jon.
(2050) In his world, bi Sevn Jon.
(2161) (181) "O dame," he sayd, "bi Sevn Jon.
(2287) Pan sayd him-selue, "Bi Sevn Jon.
3.9.3 BY SAINT GILES
(952) "3is, dame," he sayd, "bi Sevn Gile !
(1126) Pan sayd sir Amiloun, "Bi Sevn Gile.
3.9.4 VARIANTS
(459) bat sope bi Sevn Sainou;
(796) "Sir," sayd he steward, "bi Sevn Jame.
(1567) her-fore, bi Sevn Denis of Frawnce,
3.9.5 FOR LOVE OF SAINT ----
(1680) For seynt charite."
(758) "Sir," for laue of Seyn Tomas
Certes, y can no rede
(270) Certes, he seyd, "nay !
(1027) "Certi" he seyd, "wip sum wrong
(1084) "Certi," he seyd, "wip gret tresoun
(1282) "Certi," he seyd, "for drode of care
(2036) "Certi, sir," he gan to sain.
3.9.4 CERTES, I CANNOT READ
(948) Certes, y can no rede."
(1079) Certes, y can no nober rede.
(1102) Certes, her-fore y can no rede.
(1690) For, certes, y can non ober red,
3.10 CERTES!
3.10.1 CERTES
(312) Certes, he wil he schende!"
(598) Certes, ban were it michel vnr3t,
(948) Certes, y can no rede !
(1079) Certes, y can no nober rede,
(1103) Certes, her-fore y can no rede.
(612) Certes, no ping bot wo."
3.10.2 VARIANTS
3.10.2.1 certain
(861) "Certain, it was nou3t so !"
3.10.2.2 ac, certes
(755) Ac, certes, icham a pouer man,
(1811) Ac certes, pat schal neuer be sold,
(354) & certes, so is me.
3.10.2.3 for, certes
(790) For, certes, he is a traitour strong,
(1234) For, certes, it were michel vnr3t
(1690) For, certes, y can non ober red,
3.10.2.4 variant
(2086) Bot certes, now pat icham here,
3.10.3 CERTES (direct address)
(270) Certes," he seyd, "nay !
(1027) "Certi," he seyd, "wip sum wrong
(1084) "Certi," he seyd, "wip gret tresoun
(1282) Certes," he seyd, "for drode of care
(2036) "Certi, sir," he gan to sain.
3.10.4 CERTES, I CANNOT READ
(948) Certes, y can no rede.
(1079) Certes, y can no nober rede.
(1102) Certes, her-fore y can no rede.
(1690) For, certes, y can non ober rede.
3.10.4.2 variant
(983) Do coupe he no better red.
3.10.5 YES, CERTES (IVOCATIVE)!
(844) "3a, certes, sir!" he seyd bo.
(2083) "3a, certes, sir," he gan to say.
(1781) "Nat, certes, dame," he child gan sain.
(2053) (172) "Now, certes:" seyd sir Amis bo.
(2301) O, certes," he seyd, "nay !
3.11 EACH ONE6
3.11.1 EVERY WHICH ONE
(449) Of her maidens euerichon
(499) When he lordinges euerichon
(898) Pan sayd he lordinges euerichon.
(1222) Pan sayd hae euerichon, ywis,
(1226) He priked among hem euerichon,
(1274) & herd bo wordes euerichon,
(1274) & herd bo wordes euerichon,
(1557) Pan hae de euerichon.
(1661) & commaunde hir men euerichon
(1958) To telle bi-forn hem euerichon
3.11.2 EACH ONE
(632) Y schal torende doun ichon
(684) & bonked god ichon.
(1041) He bad hem so ich-chon.
(1272) & forsake he ichon."
(2280) & tok hem oway ichon.
(2321) & hon3t hae schuld wene ichon
(2484) As 3e haue herd eechoon.
3.11.3 VARIANT
3.11.3.1 the lordings, every which one
(499) When he lordinges euerichon
(898) Pan sayd he lordinges euerichon.
(1385) "Bifor his lordinges euerichon
3.12 FOR SOOTH
3.12.1 FOR SOOTH (initial)
(42) For soth with-out lesyng
(1599) For sope, y telle it te.
(2241) For sope, he told me
3.12.2 FOR SOOTH (terminal)
(90) I tel 3ow for soothe--
(802) Y se3e it me self, for sope,
(1689) Pat may we se for sop;".
(1030) & han sayd he, "For sope ywis.
3.12.3 TELL (OBJ) THAT SOOTH
(930) Tell me bat soothe his tide.
(1475) & telle se bat sope ful fain.
3.12.4 FOR SOOTH TO SAY
(1555) & his wiif, for sope to say,
(1747) & his leue, for sope to say.
(1973) A gentiler child, for sope to sain,

* Although 1. 1222 ends in "ywis," it is still considered a true occurrence, as "ywis" itself is always terminal, and "every which one" is better placed nearer its antecedent (though, grammatically, these "ywis" and "every which one" could change position).
3.12.6 VARIANT

(2506) And for her trewph and her godhede

3.13 GODSPEED

3.13.1 (AL)(SO) GOD (DAT. PRON) SPEED

(231) & seyd, "So god me sped, (300) Also god me sped. (365) & y schal, so god me sped. (450) & seyd, "So god 30u sped, (916) Pat al so god schuld him sped, (942) Al so god me sped, (944) Al so god me sped in bataile, (1120) & y schal swore so god me sped (1205) & seyd, "Sir, so god be sped, (1247) Pat god him schuld saue & sped (1341) & seyd, "So god me sped, (1449) Al so god me sped; (2001) Also god me sped.

3.13.2 VARIANT

(1296) Our leuedi schuld him sped. 7

3.14 PAN (terminal)

(204) Mest he loved hem ban, (224) To pat douke he went hem ban (391) Y warn he wele, "he seyd ban, (455) Pat was yholden in lond ban, (729) & sel3e pe maide ban (754) Wel fain y wald spouse pe ban; (763) Pat hende kni3t bipou3t him ban (847) be steward stirt to him ban (931) No drede pe nou3t, " sche seyd ban, (1348) So hard to-gider hai fl3t ban, (1368) & god he ponked it ban, (1471) Sir Amiloun bipou3t him ban (1481) Al be sope he teld hir ban, (1873) (157) "Ac, leue sone, " he seyd ban (2065) (173) Fram pe bord he resed ban (2151) & hent his broder ban, (2323) To his broder he went hem ban (2377) (199) Anon he tok his leuedi ban

3.15 bo (terminal)

(199) So wele pe children loved hem bo, (170) Al pat hai wald he fond hem bo, (173) Alle pe lond spac of hem bo, (218) A messanger pe com bo (350) Wip pe steward he met bo, (394) Sir Amis answerd bo, (402) Euer he proued bo, (487) Hir moder come to hir bo (511) Pat hendi kni3t bipou3t him bo, (639) No word no spac he bo: (667) He graunted hir hir wil bo, (703) & hi hir si3t he parciuel bo  

7 "Our Lady" refers to the Virgin Mary.

(811) In-to a chaumber sir Amis ran bo (844) "3a, certes, sir!" he seyd bo, (858) & vouwed pe dede bo, (922) Ac oft he bisou3t thesu bo, (988) He stiked vp his lappes bo, (1069) (90) "Brober," seyd sir Amis bo, (1124) Alle her wede chaunged bo, (1155) Ful wele he wend bo, (1165) (98) be leuedi loked opon him bo (1186) Per-fore sche held hir stille bo (1465) (123) be leuedi astite asked him bo (1526) A wel fair grace fel hem bo, (1584) Wel careful was he bo, (1589) & pou3t he liued to long bo -- (1675) & he answerd & seyd bo, (1711) For he gode man was so messaner bo, (1740) Wel careful were hai bo, (1785) & seyd wip wretbe bo, (1806) Ful careful were hai bo, (1819) Amoraunt went to tou bo, (1922) & hendeliche he asked him bo, (1925) & whi pat he stode per bo, (1990) & he answerd & seyd bo, (2029) (170) be squier biheld pe coupes bo, (2053) (172) "Now, certes," seyd sir Amis bo, (2195) A ful fair grace fel hem bo, (2215) Ful blihe was sir Amis bo, (2222) Pat an angel warned him bo (2285) Hou fair hai lay to-gider bo (2307) & tok his children bo; (2392) "O lef lif," sche seyd bo.

3.16 VERRAMENT (terminal)

(508) ban sir Amis, verrament, (1768) "Madame," he seyd, " verrament, (1856) Saue twelf pans, verrament, (2020) To pe lazer he seyd, verrament, (2276) ban sir Amis, verrament, 3.17 WAILEWAY (terminal)

(984) His song was, "Waileway!" (1852) Of his song was "Waileway!" (2130) His song was "Waileway!" (2332) He wepe & seyd, "Waileway! 3.18 YWIS [I KNOW]

3.18.1 YWIS (initial)

(12) Ywis it is grete doloure (473) Ywis, hir loue was al ali3t, (575) Ywis, min hert brekeb a bre, (1070) "Ywis, me nas neuer so wo (1236) Ywis, 3e eren vnkende," (1494) Ywis, it was iuel ydo! " (1630) Ywis, he no schuld neuer wond (1676) "Ywis, no wonder pei me be wo, (2339) Ywis, mi liif wil y nou3t spare, 3.18.2 YWIS (terminal)

(43) bat oon baroun son, ywis (133)(12) bus war bo hende childer, ywis, (250) & bohe hai weren as liche, ywis,
LIST OF MENTAL TEMPLATES

(800) Euer he hap ben traitour, ywis.
(1030) & ban seyd he, "For sohe ywis,
(1135) & sai hun hast sent þi stede ywis
(1285)(108) Al he folk þer was, ywis.
(1151) It had ben her lord, ywis,
(1222) ban seyd bai uerichon, ywis,
(1179) bat euer hun herdest speke, ywis,
(2491) And when he had do bus, ywis.

3.18.3 VARIANTS

3.18.3.1 thus, ywis
(709)(60) bus, ywis, bat miri may
(1172)(99) bus, ywis, bat hendy kniȝt

3.18.3.2 Ywis, it may not be so
(609) ywis, it may nouȝt be so.
(855) Ywis, it nas nouȝt so !"

4. GRAMMATICAL

4.1 INDEPENDENT CLAUSE

4.1.1 [SUBJ] [VERB] [OBJ]

4.1.1.1 general
(170) Al þat þai wald þe fond hem þo,
(1041) He had hem so ich-chon,
(1442) Sir Amis oft þonked him þo
(2222) Þat an angel warned him þo

4.1.1.2 [SUBJ] loved them [particle]

4.1.1.2.1 [SUBJ] loved them [particle]
(139) So wele þo children loved hem þo,
(140) Nas neuer children loved hem so,

4.1.1.3 [SUBJ] asked him [particle]

4.1.1.3.1 [SUBJ] asked him [particle]
(1465)(123) be leuedi astite asked him þo
(1922) & hendeliche he asked him þo,
(1933)(162) be gode man asked him anon,

4.1.1.4 God/Jesus sent thee bode by me
(1253) God, þat suffered passiouen,
(1254) Sent be bode bi me;
(1262) thesu sent be bode bi me,

4.1.1.5 God leave [OBJ]

4.1.1.5.1 [OBJ] leave [OBJ]
(339) God leue hem wele to fare --
(1787) God leue þou never to com here mare,

4.1.2 [ADV PHRASE] [CLAUSE]

4.1.2.1 [no further] [he] [no might]

4.1.2.2 so long [pronominal subj] [verb]

4.1.2.2.1 so long [pronominal subj] [verb]
(1979) So long he priked wiþ-outen abod
(991) & al þat day so long he ran,
(1699) So long hþai went vp & doun

4.1.2.3 so it befell

4.1.2.3.1 so it befell
(2251) So it bifele on Cristes niȝt,

4.1.2.3.2 variant
(349) (30) Pan on a day bifele it so

4.1.2.4 so hard they hew (on helm)

4.1.2.4.1 so hard they hew (on helm)
(1312) So hard þai hewere on helmes brieȝt
(1315) So hard þai hewere on helme & side,

4.1.2.4.2 variant
(1348) So hard to-gider þai fiȝt ban,

4.1.2.5 against [dat obj pron] (subj)[gan go

4.1.3 [OBJ] [SUBJ] [VERB]

4.1.3.1 a [adj] lodge [subj] let make

4.1.3.2 his name it hight

4.2 RELATIVE CLAUSE

4.2.1 [SUBJ] [PREP] [VERB]

4.2.1.1 that he upon him bare

4.2.1.2 that I of told

4.2.2 [ADJ] [BE] [PREP PHRASE]

4.2.2.1 that [adj] were [prephrase]

4.2.2.2 variants

4.2.3 [ADVERBIAL SUB CONJ] [BECLAUSE]8

4.2.3.1 for (that) [subj] [be]

4.2.3.1.1 for (that) [nominal subj] was/is

4.2.3.2 variants

4.2.4 For þat bi brober is went be fro.

8 The verb is most often a form of "to be," however, as there are some variants which use different verbs (albeit only as variants of the formula), the general part of speech is preferred. Note, however, that the majority of these examples could also occur under "[BE]."
LIST OF MENTAL TEMPLATES

(907) For hat be steward was so strong
(1711) For he gode man was so messaner bo,
(1712) & for he child was fair al-so,
(1552) For al hat were his best frende,

4.2.3.1.2 for that they were
(182) For hat hai were so war & wiis
(199) For hai were so blie of chere,
(211) For hai were so gode & hende.

4.2.3.1.2.2 variants
(124) Pat hai were bohe glad & fain

4.2.3.1.3 for (that) he was
(189) [For he was hend and fre.]
(343) For hat he was so hende & gode,
(2003) For hat he is so trewe & kende.

4.2.3.1.4 for she was
(427) For sche was gentil & auenaunt.

4.2.3.1.5 for it were
(1234) For certes, it were michel ymri3t
(1336) For it were gret vilani, bi Seyn Jon,

4.2.3.2 how [subj] [be]

4.2.3.2.1 (and) how they were [compliment]
(11) How hey were in wele and wu
(16) And how hey were good & hend
(19) And how hey were made kni3t
(20) And how hey were trouh ply3t,

4.2.3.2.2 how [adj] they were...
(14) & how ymrouth hey were of kynd,
(80) & how feite hey were of sy3t
(17) & long he becom frend
(79) Of body how wel hey were py3t,
(194) Hou lail he was of chere.
(1916) Hou gentil he was & of fair semblaut,
(2103) Hou reweliche he was di3t.

4.2.3.2.3 variant: so [adj] they were...
(54) So mylde hey were of mood;
(88) So liche hey were both of sy3t
(816) So egre he was hat tides.
(1320) So egre hai were of mode.

4.2.3.2.4 and how [subj] [verb] (initial)
(1090) & hoo be steward gan hem wrain,
(1091) & hoo he douke wald him haue slain
(1099) & hoo he most, wip-outen faile,
(1096) & hoo in court was her no wi3t,
(1429) (120) & hoo he schuld spouisy to mede
(1483) & hoo he slou3 pe steward strong,
(1486) & hoo his broper, hat hendi kni3t
(2079) & hoo com pou her to ?
(1190) Hou bat sir Amiloun went his way;

4.2.3.3 When [subj] [be]

4.2.3.3.1 when [nominal subj] was
(253) (22) When bat sir Amiloun was al 3are,
4.2.3.5.2.1 lordings/ladies were
4.2.3.5.2 variant: [compliment] that there were
4.2.3.5.2.1 the duke bade all that they were
4.2.3.5.2.2 all that there were/was
4.2.3.5.2.2.1 the duke bade all that they were/was
4.2.3.5.2.2.2 all [det] [subject] that there were
4.2.3.5.2.2.3 variants
4.2.3.6 then [be] [subj] (usually initial)10
4.2.3.6.1 then was [subject]
4.2.3.6.1.1 then was Sir Amis
4.2.3.6.1.2 then was Sir Amiloun
4.2.3.6.1.3 then was that/those lady/ladies
4.2.3.6.1.4 then was the duke
4.2.3.6.1.5 then was that knight
4.2.3.6.1.6 various
4.2.3.6.2.1 then were they (all/both)
4.2.3.6.2.2 various
4.2.4.1 as [clause]11
4.2.4.1.1 as I you [verb]
4.2.4.1.1.1 as I you say

10 This section provides an excellent example of how formulae can overlap (and incidentally, one example of the difficulty in categorizing them). The majority of these examples are followed by adjective complements such as "glad and blithe" or "fairly woe" or "eager of mood"; however, the subjects are often change, "glad and blithe," for example, refers to "she," "Sir Amis," "those ladies," and "the lady." In two cases "eager of mood" has the same subject, "the duke," thus the extended formula: "was he douke egre of mode" could itself be counted as an independent formula, of which 385, 553, and 1715 could be viewed as variants.

11 All of these are expression of the author directly to his audience.
LIST OF MENTAL TEMPLATES

(70) Muche folk, as y 30w saye,
(901) (76) When hae had don, as y 30w say,
(1423) & sir Amis, as y 30w say,
(1645) (138) bus Amoraunt, as y 30w say,
(1849) (155) bus Amoraunt, as y 30w say,
(2449) But þus, in romance as y 30w say.
4.2.4.1.1.2 variant
(37) (4) þe children-þis names, as y 30w hyȝt.

(89) And of waxing, y 30w þyȝt--
4.2.4.1.1.2 as y 30w tell may
(1839) As y 30w tel may.
(1886) Wip tong, as y 30w tel may. --
4.2.4.1.1.3 as y 30w told
(1297) When bai hadde sworn, as y 30w told.
(1826) For ﬁue schilling, as y 30w told.
(2005) (168) Pat douke astite, as y 30w told.
4.2.4.1.1.3.2 variants
(100) Fourtenniȝt, as we was told.
(484) As y 30w tel in mi talking.
(1599) For sobe, y telte it te.
4.2.4.1.1.4 In geste as it is told
(1536) In gest as it is told.
(409) (35) So in a time, as we tel in gest.
4.2.4.1.2 as we read
4.2.4.1.2.1 in geste/romance as we read
(27) In romance as we reede.
(2448) In romance as we rede.
(144) In gest as so we rede.
4.2.4.1.2.2 variants
(2196) In gest as we finde.
(447) In boke as so we rede.
(1729) (145) Pus in gest rede we
(1546) In gest to rede it is gret rewe.
4.2.4.1.3 in geste/romance as we say
(1501) (126) Al þus in gest as we sain.
(2185) (183) & þus in gest as we say.
4.2.4.1.3.2 variant
(409) (35) So in a time, as we tel in gest.
(2449) But þus, in romance as y 30w say.
4.2.4.1.4 as you may hear
4.2.4.1.4.1 in geste as you may hear
(157) (14) Pus in gest as 3e may here.
(1917) In gest as 3e may here.
(2355) In gest as 3e may here.
4.2.4.1.4.2 as you may hear
(24) Herkenep 3e mow here.
(187) Sir Amis, as 3e may here.
(517) Now, hende, herkenep, & 3e may here
(1534) Pat purch þat wounde, as 3e may here.
4.2.4.1.4.3 variant
(2484) As 3e have herd echoon.
4.2.4.1.5 as you may understand

(1863) As 3e may vnderstond;
(1923) As 3e may vnderstond.
(2403) As 3e mow vnderstond.
4.2.4.1.6 as you may listen and lithe13
(99) As 3e may listen & lithe.
(471) As 3e may listen & lithe.
(1240) & sehen, as 3e may list & lyfe.
(2416) As 3e mow listen and lyth.
4.2.4.1.6.2 variant
(429) As 3e may lyfe at me.
(1881) As 3e may listen at me.
4.2.4.1.7 as [subj] [be] guiltless of that deed
(917) As he was giltes of þat dede.
(1121) As icham giltes of þat dede.
4.2.4.1.8 as it is law
(1212) As it is londes lawe."
(1897) (159) In kings court, as it is lawe.
4.2.4.2 before [clause]
4.2.4.2.1 ere than/that [subj] [verb phrase]
(642) Er ban y passe hir fro;
(768) Er bat [he] went oway.
(2271) Er þan þai schuld gon,
4.2.4.2.2 and ere this/those three year
(1258) & or þis þre þere ben al gon,
(1549) (130) & er þo þre þere come to þende
4.2.4.2.3 that ere was [adj phrase]
(2169) Pat er was fre to fond."
(2343) Pat er was hende in hale,
(1359) Pat er was white so swan;
(1542) Pat er was hende & fre;
(2406) Pat er was fre to fonde.
4.2.4.3 since (sethen)
4.2.4.3.1 and sethen [subj] [verb]
(669) & sethen kist þo tvai.
(2344) & sethen in bed him diȝt
4.2.4.3.2 sethen [that] [subj] was born
(1071) Sethen þat y was born;
(1956) Pou herdest sethen þou were born."
(2412) Sep he was born in londe.
4.2.4.3.2.2 variant
(1072) For sethen þat þou was went me fro,
(1915) & sethen biheld on Amoraunt,
(1240) & sehen, as 3e may list & lyfe,
(1510) & sehen wip ioe upon a day
4.2.4.4 [that] [every]
4.2.4.4.1 that ever (initial)
(208) Pat ever he proud wip niþe & ond
(345) Pat ever him gat & bare.
(712) Pat ever when sche þir Amis say.
(1976) Pat ever Crist 3af cristendome
(1979) Pat ever þou herdest speke, ywis,
(2111) Pat ever þe þe toke þe wounde
(2136) Pat ever he bode þat day.
4.2.4.4.2 ever that

13 MS Egerton, from which lines 27 and 2448 are supplied, consistently uses "romance" where Auchinleck uses "geste." It can therefore safely be assumed that in Auchinleck lines 27 and 2448 would have read "geste" as well.

13 see also, "Listen and Lithe" under "Doublets."
4.2.4.3 ever he proved
(208) Pat euer he proued wip nibe & ond.
(347) Euer he proued wip nibe & ond.
(215) Euer he proued to don hem schame.
(402) Euer he proued bo.

4.2.4.5 by then the [time] was ago
(1585) (133) Bi ban half 3ere was ago.
(2194) & bilan be tvelmonb was ago.

4.2.4.6 and then thought [subj]
(919) & ban bou3t he, wib-outen lesing.
(2248) & ban bou3t he, bi heuen king.
(2245) ban bou3t he douk, wib-outen lesing.
(2194) & bilan he tvelmonb was ago.

4.2.4.7 there [verb]
4.2.4.7.1 there 
4.2.4.7.2 there 
4.2.4.7.2.2 there

4.2.4.8 when [subj] [past participle]
4.2.4.8.1 when [subj] [past participle] done
(901) (76) When had don, as y 3ou say.
(2491) And when he had do bus, yew.
(470) When had done bus seyd, ypli3t.
(1141) And when he had bus seyd, ypli3t.

4.2.4.8.3 variant
(205) Pan hadde he douke, ich vnsternd.
(1105) (93) When bat sir Amis had al told.
(1297) When hadde sworn, as y 3ou told.
(1515) When he hadde spoused pat flour.
(2311) & when he hadde hem bope staine.
(2473) (207) [When thei had with wrakel]

4.2.4.9 when [subj] comes
4.2.4.9.1 when [det] [subj] come into (that)
(733) (62) When pat may com in-to won.
(781) (66) When he douke come in to bat won.

4.2.4.9.2 when [pronominal subj] come
(967) & when hou comes to bi broder ri3t.
(1437) When he com ber bei won.
(1891) When he com to be castel-gate.
(2488) When bey com, he sesed in hond

4.2.4.9.2.1 when he come (home) to court again

4.2.4.9.2.3 into [obj] [when they were [past part.]
(193) In to her seruise when bai were brou3t.
(289) (25) When bai bope a-fot li3t,
(1381) In to be palais when bai were gon.

4.2.4.9.2.4 when the lords should gone
(445)(38) Pan be lordinges schudlen al gon
(109)(10) Pan be lordinges schuld forp wende,

4.2.4.9.3 when it was come to the night
(1139) & when it was come to be ni3t.
(1459) & when it was come to be ni3t.

4.2.4.10 when (that) [subj] sees
(549) When bat sche sey3e him bare; 
(554) When sche sey3e were he stode,
(712) bat euer when sche sir Amis say,

4.2.4.11 when/that him was fallen hard case
(1558) When him was fallen pat hard cas,
(2177) Pat him was fallen so hard a cas.

4.2.4.12 when/till all [poss pron] ran of blood
(1349) Til al her armour o blod ran.
(1358) Whan al his armour ran o blode.

4.2.4.13 when/till that [subj] come
(881) Til bat his day com of ri3t,
(1052) Til he com per sir Amis lay
(1134) Til y com again.
(1422) Til he com hom again;
(1700) Til hai com to a shepeing-toun.
(2444) til he com to his contray.
(2213) Riu3t til he come in-to he balle o3ain,

4.2.4.14 where that [subj] [verb]
(475) Wher bat sche sey3e him ride or go,
(344) Pan sey3e sche sir Amis biseide,
(1054) Pan sey3e he [a] weri kni3t forgon

4.2.4.15 while they might [adj] and [adj]
(147) While pat mi3t liue & stond
(1941) Whiles he mi3t walk & wake.

4.2.4.16 while he was alive
(1632) While he olues ware.
(1656) Whiles he ware olive.

4.2.4.16.2 variant
4.3.1.1 abide

see “[auxiliary] [verb]”

4.3.1.2 answered

4.3.1.2.1 answered [particle]

4.3.1.2.1.1 answered though

(394) Sir Amis answerd bo.

(1675) *he answerd & seyd bo.*

(1879) *He answerd & seyd, "Nay."*

4.3.1.2.1.2 variant

(990) *& he answerd & seyd bo*

4.3.1.2.1.2 answered again

(121)(11) *De riche barouns answered again.*

(230) *Answerd o3ain wip worordes hende*

(266) *Answerd o3ain wip worordes hende*

(457)(39) *Her maidens gan answerd again*

(2239) *& he him answerd o3ain ful stille,*

4.3.1.2.2 then answered

(661) *(56) Pan answered bat bird bri3t*

(877) *(74) Pan answered bat maiden bri3t*

4.3.1.2.3 and s/he answered

(490) *& siche answerd wip-outen wrong.*

(1651) *& he answerd wip mild mode*

(1939) *& he answerd wip mild mode*

(2230) *& he him answerd o3ain ful stille,*

4.3.1.2.4 answered “nay”

(1413) *& he answered, "Nay."

(1879) *He answerd & seyd, "Nay."*

(2041) *(171) De riche douke answered, "Nay."

4.3.1.3 (and/[subj]) bade [obj] (that) [subj] should*16

(316) *& bad sir Amis bat he schold*

(1214) *He bad men schulde bo leuedis taketh*

(1224) *& bad pai schuld abide*

(1673) *& bad him bat he schuld him sain*

4.3.1.4 [be] [compliment]

4.3.1.4.1 it [be] [adj phrase]*17

---

*16 see also “As [clause]” under “Grammatical.”

*17 For this and the following two examples, see also “answered and said” under “Doubtless.”

*18 Here is a perfect example of the mental processes involved in producing a formula. None of these examples are identical, however they all correspond to the same mental template, which (as a result of the great deal of variation) at first appears somewhat fuzzy; nevertheless, the idea and the structure of each example conforms to the same rules.

4.3.1.4.2 that is so bright

(1115) *Wiþ mi brond, bat is so bri3t.*

(1103) *To mi leuedi, bat is so bri3t.*

(2341) *He tok þat blode, bat was so bri3t.*

4.3.1.4.3 that is so [adj] corn

(1431) *Pat was so comly corn.*
4.3.1.4.3.2 strong

4.3.1.4.4 there [be] [compliment]\(^{18}\)

4.3.1.4.3.2.2 (because) the steward was so strong

4.3.1.4.5.1.3 [subj] [be] [past part]

4.3.1.4.5.1.1.1 I sethen (that) [subj] was born

4.3.1.4.5.2 {subj} [be] [adj]

4.3.1.4.5.2.1.3.1.2 variants

4.3.1.4.5.2.2 [subj] [be] forlorn

4.3.1.4.5.1.3.2 variant

4.3.1.4.5.3.2.2 (by) the time that [subj] was born

4.3.1.4.5.2.3 such time as [subj] was born

---

\(^{18}\) The initial placement of these formula is important in differentiating it from simply grammatical constructions (such as "A strong for per was don make" (1216)).

---

4.3.1.4.3.1.4 that were so hende

4.3.1.4.3.2 [subj] was so strong

4.3.1.4.3.2.1 was so strong

4.3.1.4.3.2.2 (because) the steward was so strong

---

(2220) Pat is so kinde ycorn.

(112) Po tvy barouns, pat were so hende.

(2382) Pat were so hende & gode.

4.3.1.4.3.2 [subj] was so strong

(1822) & while pat derp was so strong.

4.3.1.4.3.2.2 (because) the steward was so strong

(871) Bot for he steward was so strong.

(907) For pat he steward was so strong

4.3.1.4.4 there [be] [compliment]\(^{18}\)

4.3.1.4.4.1 there was

(92) Per was neither pore ne rych.

(103) Per was mirche & melodey

4.3.1.4.4.2 there was many a [adj] [noun]

(412) Per was mani a gentil gest

(436) Per was mani a gentil knight

(2459) Per was mony a sory man.

4.3.1.4.4.3 then/that there was

(419) Pon per was in hat worthy won.

(918) Pat per was on him born;

(1738) Pat per was nother eld no 3ing

4.3.1.4.5 [subj] [be] [compliment]

4.3.1.4.5.1 [subj] [be] [past part]

4.3.1.4.5.1.1 [subj] was born

4.3.1.4.5.1.1.1 sethen (that) [subj] was born

(1071) Sebben bat y was born;

(1956) Pou herdest sebben bou was born."

(2412) Seh he was born in londe.

4.3.1.4.5.1.1.2 such time as [subj] was born

(2204) Swiche time as Ihesu Crist was born.

(2325) "Swiche time as god was born,

(2252) Swiche time as Ihesu, ful of mi3t,

(2253) Was born to saue man-kunne.

4.3.1.4.5.1.3 (by) the time that [subj] was born

(1440) Be time pat he was born.

4.3.1.4.5.1.2 [be] driven a-down

(1085) He wald me driuen al adoun

(1541) Wib sorwe & care was driuen adoun.

(2116) And now with sorwe vs drewe adoun;

(1686) Wib sorwe & care is driuen adoun.

4.3.1.4.5.1.3 [subj] [be] forlorn

(305) & 3if pou dost, pou art forlorn

(380) & breke mi treube, y were forlorn.

(947) ban liif & soule icham forlorn;

(1080) Mi liif, it is forlorn !"

4.3.1.4.5.1.3.2 variant

(1072) For sebben hat bou was went me fro

4.3.1.4.5.3.2.2 (by) the time that [subj] was born

(1440) Be time pat he was born.

4.3.1.4.5.3.2.3 such time as [subj] was born

(2204) Swiche time as Ihesu Crist was born.

(2325) "Swiche time as god was born,

4.3.1.4.5.1.4 [poss pron] care [be] gone

4.3.1.4.5.1.5 [poss pron] care was all away/gone

(681) Hif care was al agon.

(1239) Her care was al away;

4.3.1.4.5.1.6 heart is brought

(538) Ac hir hert was so hard ibrou3t,

(571) "Sir kni3t, on be mine hert is brou3t.

4.3.1.4.5.2.1 [adj] [subj] [be]

4.3.1.4.5.2.1.1 so deep was bat cuntray;

(1482) So depe was bat cuntry;

(1853) So depe was bat cuntry.

4.3.1.4.5.2.1.2 so eager they were

(816) So egre he was pat tide.

4.3.1.4.5.2.1.3 so alike [subj] [be]

4.3.1.4.5.2.1.3.1 so like [subj] [be] (both)

{two/twain)

(88) So lyche bey were both of sy3t

(1140) So liche we be bope tvain!

(1152) So liche were bo tvy.

4.3.1.4.5.2.2 [subj] [be] fifteen winters old

(163) bo bei were fifeen winter old.

---

\(^{19}\) See also "went away."

\(^{20}\) See also "went away."

\(^{21}\) See also "in all thing."
4.3.1.9 break
4.3.1.9.1 break my truth
(371) Y no schal neuer mi treuhte breke.
(380) & breke mi treuhte, y were forlorn.
4.3.1.9.2 my heart, it breaks in three
(264) Mine heri, it brekeb of prel!"
(575) Twis, min hert brekeb a pre.
4.3.1.9.2.2 variants
(476) Hir brou3t hir hert brac atvo.
(1677) Mine hert, it brekeb for care;
(1562) Schi brac hir hert wib-outen kniif.
(2121) And brekest his bones a two;
4.3.1.10 bring
4.3.1.10.1 bring [obj] into/out of care/sorrow
4.3.1.10.1.1 to bring him into care
(348) To bring him in-to care.
(708) Bring hem in to care.
4.3.1.10.1.2 to bring him out of care
(2226) Mi3t bring him out of care.
(2300) To bring mi brober out of care ?
4.3.1.10.1.3 variants
(2118) Breng him oute of his wo !
(1233) & bring hem out of bende,
(2249) His brober out of sorwe bring.
4.3.1.10.2 brought them
4.3.1.10.2.1 brought them both
(209) For to haue brou3t hem bope to schond
(719) Brou3t hem bope in ten & wreake.
4.3.1.10.2.2 brought them enough
(1709) & brou3t hem anou3 to hond
(1714) & brou3t hem anou3 of al gode;
4.3.1.11 busked them to ride
(498) & busked hem for to ride.
(1037) Busked hem redi for to ride,
(1299) & busked hem for to ride.
4.3.1.12 [subj] cast [det] eye/sight
(695) An hundred time sche cast hir si3t,
(698) Euer more sche cast hir ev3e,
(1913) On sir Amiloun he cast a si3t,
(2272) & priueliche he cast his ei3e
4.3.1.13 change [obj] for no new
(384) Chaunge him for no newe,"
(584) & chaunge me for no newe
4.3.1.14 chosen for prize
(468) & chosen for priis & flour.";
(1524) & chosen for priis in tour.
4.3.1.15 cleft to [reflective sub]
(111) Cleped to him bat tide
(1057) (89) He clefted to him anon ri3t,
(2006) Cleped to hir a squier bold
4.3.1.16 come
4.3.1.16.1 come again 22

22 This example demonstrates the difficulty in relying solely on computers for identifying formulae; even if a programme were
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(276) & com o3ain bis day !
(1134) Til bat y com o3ain.
(1780) So fer bat he neuer eft com o3ain.

4.3.1.16.2 variants
(341) When he com hom to court o3e.
(2153) Rist til he come in-to be halle o3ain,

4.3.1.17 dight [obj] yare
(487) Hir moder come to hir bo
(520) Hir moder come wip diolful chere

4.3.1.18 do by my read
(361) (31) "Sir Amis," he seyd, "do bi mi red,
(610) Leue madame, do bi mi red

4.3.1.18.2 do [obj] (detl) shame
(215) Euer he proued to don hem schame
(794) "Who hap," he seyd, "don me pat schame"
(1083) "Don be al his schame ?"

4.3.1.19 eat in halle
(628) To eten in halle pai brou3st pat may,
(710) Ete in halle wip ganen & play
(1586) Pat he hadde eten in halle so
(1600) Pat pou etest so long in halle.

4.3.1.20 fell
4.3.1.20.1 fell down dead
(982) Was ouercomen & fel doun ded;
(1327) Be stedde fel ded doun to grounde;
(1366) Be stedward fel adoun ded.

4.3.1.20.2 [subj] fell (aswoon) to ground
(1327) Be stedde fel ded doun to grounde;
(2134) He fel aswone to be grounde
(2170) Pe lewedil fel aswone to grounde

4.3.1.21 fight
4.3.1.21.1 to fight with [detl] [enemy]
(932) "For to fi3t wip bi foman.
(960) To fi3t wip hat feloum."

4.3.1.21.2 together they fight gan
(1346) Anon to-gider pai fi3t gan
(1348) So hard to-gider pai fi3t gan.

4.3.1.22 go
4.3.1.22.1 thou shalt a-foot go
(1334) "To fi3t hou schalt a-foot gon,
(1342) Now hou schalt a-foot go.

4.3.1.22.2 [imperative] no one with him go
(1414) Ter schuld noman wip him gon,
(1418) Most per noman wip him gon.

4.3.1.22.3 variant
(986) Nedes a-foot he most go.

4.3.1.23 grant
4.3.1.23.1 grant it should be so
(900) Bot graunt it schuld be so.
(1788) & graunt pat it be so.

4.3.1.23.2 [subj] grant (lobj) [poss. pron] will
(640) He pou3t, "Bot y graunt hir wille,"
(660) Y schal graunt he bi wille."
(667) He graunted hir hir wil bo,
(2364) & graunt him his praiere.

4.3.1.24 to hear the fowl
(515) To here be foules son bat tide,
(526) Per may pou here be foules song
(535) Sche herd be foules gre & smale.

4.3.1.25 hold
4.3.1.25.1 hold as [subj] behight
(744) & hold as hou bihi3t ?""
(990) To hold pat he behi3t;

4.3.1.25.2 hold him still in peace
(1040) For godes loue held hem stille in pes.
(2372) Pai schuld held hem stille in pes

4.3.1.26 [poss pron] jay [couth] (pronominal subj) no man kihe
(548) Hir ioie coube sche noman kibe,
(1238) Her ioie coube pai noman kibe,
(2414) Her ioi coub noman kythe.

4.3.1.26.2 variant
(474) Dat no man mi3t it kibe.
(672) Hir ioie coube no man sai.

4.3.1.27 lay in bed
4.3.1.27.1 lay [prep] her in bed each night
(1133) Bou ly bi hir in bed ich mi3t,
(1487) Lay wip hir in bed ich mi3t

4.3.1.27.2 sick in bed (subj) lay
(486) Sike in bed sche lay.
(519) Sike in hir bed lay.

4.3.1.27.3 lay beside
(1182) His swerd he layd biseide.
(1461) In bedde were layd biseide.

4.3.1.28 he lies on us
(838) He li3he on ou3, wip-outen fail.
(846) He li3ne on ou3 wip wrake."
4.3.1.29 light a-down
(288) Of hors pai li3t adoun.
(1064) Of his stede li3t adoun.
(1330) Sir Amiloun li3t adoun of his stede,
(1432) Sir Amiloun li3t of his stede.
(1817) & when he kni3t was li3t adoun.

4.3.1.30 hem loved
(198) Hem loved mani a man;
(1713) Hem loved old & sing.

4.3.1.31 [subj] make [poss. pron] moan

4.3.1.32 to plight truth
(293) "Brother, as we er trewe-ple3t
(363) & ple3t we our trewe to;
(367) Sir Amis answerd, "Mi trewe y ple3t
(376) For ones y ple3t him trewe, bat hende.
(583) Ple3t me bi trewe bou schalt be trewe
(586) & y ple3t be mi trewe al-so.
(664) Bi trewe mon bou schalt me ple3t.
(668) & ple3t hem trewehe bope to,
(738) Pat trewe we ouz ple3t.

4.3.1.33 I pray you
(3) I pray low, par amoure.
(795) Tel me, y pe pray !
(831) Y pray be, par charite !
(1606) Of no more ichil he praye.

4.3.1.34 he pricked (det) steed
(977) He priked be stede pat him bare
(1192) He priked his stede ni3t & day.

4.3.1.35 save
4.3.1.35.1 to save those two ladies
(1097) To save bo pay leuedis bri3t.
(1398) To save bo leuedis tvain.

4.3.1.35.1.2 variant
(923) He schuld save hem bope to.

4.3.1.35.2 to save mankind
(303) To save al man-kende.
(2252) Was born to save man-kumne.

4.3.1.36 say
4.3.1.36.1 said
4.3.1.36.1.1 and said (initial)
(220) & seyd hou dep hadde fet him fro
(231) & seyd, "So god me speede.
(261) & seyd, "Sir, par charite.
(267) & seyd wip-outen delay.

(387) & seyd, wip-outen delay,
(450) & seyd, "So god 3ou speede,
(458) & seyd, "Madame, we shuld he sain
(570) & seyd opon hir play.
(591) & seyd wip hert fre.
(848) & seyd, "Traidour, fals man,
(1147) & seyd hou he hadde sent his stede
(1205) & seyd, "Sir, so god he spede.
(1341) & seyd, "So god me speede.
(1406) & seyd bat he wold fare
(1492) & seyd, "Wip wrong & michel vnri3t
(1598) & seyd, "Sir, it is so bifalle,
(1785) & seyd wip wreche bo.
(2374) & seyd he hadde he keys nome,
(2385) & seyd me purch her blode
(2663) & seyd he wald him-selue hat ni3t
(2098) & seyd, "Pef, pou schalt be slawe,

4.3.1.36.1.1.1 and said to + [pron./ind. obj.](initial)
(229) & seyd to sir Amis ful ri3t,
(319) & seyd to him, "Mi leve broper,
(1564) & seyd to him, "Dou wreche chaftif,
(2223) & seyd to him ful 3are,
(2378) & seyd to hir, "Leue leman.
(1755) & seyd to be child pat tide, --
(2324) & seyd to bat careful man.

4.3.1.36.1.1.2 variants
(2171) & wepe & seyd, "Allas bat stounde !
(2332) He wepe & seyd, "Wailewey !

4.3.1.36.1.1 then said [subject](initial)
(652) Pan seyd he to pat maiden 3ing.
(862) Pan seyd he douke, "Wip-outen fail.
(874) Pan seyd pat alle wip resoun,
(898) Pan seyd he lordinges euerichon.

4.3.1.36.1.1.3 to save to those two ladies
(1126) Pan seyd sir Amiloun, "Bi Seyn Gile.
(1222) Pan seyd tai euerichon, ywis.
(1807) Pan seyd he kni3t opon a day.
(1867) Pan seyd he kni3t in bat tide,
(1918) Pan seyd he bope, bi Seyn Jon.
(1981)(166) Pan seyd he riche douke again.
(1993) Pan seyd he douke, "Bei his lord be lorn,
(2236) Pan seyd sir Amiloun ful 3are.
(2287) Pan seyd him-selue, "Bi Seyn Jon.
(2335) Pan seyd sir Amis, "Be now stille;
(1030) & seyd he, "For sope ywis.

4.3.1.36.1.2 [vocative] [subj] said (initial)
4.3.1.36.1.2.1 "Sir," s/he said
(1168) "Sir," sche seyd, "whi fardstow so ?
(1927) "Sir," he seyd, "so god me saue.
(2107) "Sir," he seyd, "pou ait vnhende
(2158) "Sir," sche seyd, "vat is "bi pou3t ?
(796) "Sir," seyd he steward, "bi Seyn Jame.
(82970) "Sir," seyd sir Amis anon.
(352) "Sir Amis," he seyd, "pe is ful wo
(361) "Sir Amis," he seyd, "do bi mi red.

---

27 The irregular form "hem" for a nominative pronoun suggests that this structure is a set formulaic construction.
28 See also "gan."
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(1384) "Sir Amis," seyd he douke anon.
(752)(64) "Sir kni3t," seyd bat maiden kinde, 
4.3.1.36.1.2.2 "Brother," he said
(1066) "Brother," he seyd, "whi listow how (1139) "Brother," he seyd, "wende hom now ri3t
(1435) "Brother," he seyd, "wende hom again." (1444) "Brother," he seyd, "3if it bitide so
(2347) "Brother," he seyd, "ly now stille 
(1117) "Ac brober," he seyd, "haue al mi wede, (2143) "O brober," he seyd, "par charite, 
(1069)(90) "Brother," seyd sir Amis bo, 
(1081)(91) "Brother," seyd sir Amiloun.
4.3.1.36.1.2.3 "Dame," he said
(1171) "Dame," he seyd, "sikerly, (1474) "Dame," he seyd, "ichil he sain (1495) "Dame," he seyd, "bi heuen king, 
(2161)(181) "O dame," he seyd, "bi Sevn Jon.
(952) "3is, dame," he seyd, "bi Sevn Gile !
4.3.1.36.1.2.4 "Madam," he said
(1768) "Madame," he seyd, "verrament, (745)(63) "Madame," seyd be kni3t again, 
(937)(79) "Madame," seyd bat gentil kni3t, 
(458) & seyd, "Madame, we shuld pe sain
4.3.1.36.1.2.5 "Son," he said
(1687) "Sone," he seyd, "lete þi wepeing, (1756) "Sone," he seyd, "pou most gon 
(1873)(157) "Ac, leue sone," seyd ban 
4.3.1.36.1.2.6 "My Lord," he said
(1954) "Mi lord," he seyd, "listen to me 
(784) "Mi lord, be douke," he seyd anon, 
(1228) "Mi lord be douke," he seyd anon, 
4.3.1.36.1.2.7 variants
(577)(50) "Pou art," she seyd, "a gentil kni3t, 
(756) "Sir Amis," sche seyd ban, 
(2000) Pe child," he seyd, "is trewe & gode, 
(2077) "Traitour," seyd be douke so bold, 
(2020) To be lazer he seyd, verrament, 
4.3.1.36.1.3 [affirmation] [subj] said (initial) 
(841)(71) "3a," seyd be douke, "wiltow so, 
(1027) "Certes," he seyd, "wib sum wrong 
(1084) "Certes," he seyd, "wib gret tresoun 
(1282) "Certes," he seyd, "for drede of care 
(2053) (172) "Now, certes," seyd sir Amis bo, 
(2301) O, certes," he seyd, "nay ! 
(844) "3a, certes, sir!" he seyd bo, 
(952) "Jis, dame," he seyd, "bi Sevn Gile !
4.3.1.36.1.4 [subj] said particle (terminal) 
4.3.1.36.1.4.1 s/he said then(terminal) 
(391) Y warn þe wele, "he seyd ban, 
(931) No drede þe nou3t," sche seyd ban. 
(1873)(157) "Ac, leue sone," he seyd ban 
(2392) "O lef liif," sche seyd bo. 
4.3.1.36.1.4.2 s/he said anon (terminal) 
(736) "Sir Amis," sche seyd anon, 
(784) "Mi lord, be douke," he seyd anon, 
(1228) "Mi lord be douke," he seyd anon, 
(1333) "Arise vp, steward," he seyd anon, 
4.3.1.36.1.4.3 said, "nay!" (terminal) 
(854) & euer sir Amis seyd, "Nay! 
(1879) He answeard & seyd, "Nay." 
(2301) O, certes," he seyd, "nay ! 
4.3.1.36.1.4.4 said [subj] again 
(745) (63) "Madame," seyd be kni3t again, 
(1891) (166) Pan seyd be riche douke again, 
4.3.1.36.1.4.4.1 [subj] said 
(889) (75) Hir moder seyd wib worudes bold 
(367) Sir Amis answeard, "Mi treupe y pli3t 
4.3.1.36.2 to say for sooth 
(1555) & his wiif, for sophe to say, 
(1747) & his leuedi, for sophe to say, 
(1973) A gentiler child, for sophe to sain, 
4.3.1.36.3 [exclamation] subj said 
(2137) (179) "Allas," he seyd, "mi ioie is lorn. 
(735) "Hail." sche seyd, bat leuedi bri3t, 
4.3.1.36.4 [imperative] subj said 
(523) "Arise vp," sche seyd, "douhter min. 
(2008) "Take," he said, "mi coupe of gold, 
4.3.1.36.4.1 [interrogative] subj said 
(794) "Who hab," he seyd, "don me bat schame ? 
4.3.1.37 see 
4.3.1.37.1 see them both 
(773) He seiyse hem bope in bat tide 
(775) & when he seye3se hem bope wib si3t, 
4.3.1.37.2 see [obj] by sight 
(775) & when he seye3se hem bope wib si3t, 
(1012) Bat he seiyse sir Amis bi si3t.
4.3.1.37.3 I see it myself 
(802) Y seiyse it me self, for sophe, 
(850) Y seiyse it me self pis ich day.
4.3.1.37.4 and [see] [poss. pron] lord 
(2102) & seye his lord wip wou3 & wrong 
(2390) & seye hir lord was al-so; 
(2456) And seide her lord was com hom 
4.3.1.38 send 
4.3.1.38.1 (savelich come or) Send [his] sound29 
(64) Frely he let [sende his sonde]. 
(238) Savelich com or send bi sond, 
(1447) Savelich com oper sende bi sond, 
(2485) (208) ben sir Amilyon sent his sond 
4.3.1.38.2 send [obj] so michel (of all [poss. pron] good) 
(1760) Sende me so michel of al mi gode. 
(1772) Sende him so michel of al his gode 
4.3.1.38.3 send [ind obj] children more 
(2337) May sende me childer mo. 
(2393) "God may sende ou3 childer mo, 
4.3.1.38.4 send [poss pron] steed

29 The last word provides such a useful rhyme that in at least one instance this orthography is used (with presumably the same pronunciation) to mean "son" (i.e., (222) purch he grace of godes sond).
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(1135) & sai þou hast sent bi stede ywis
(1147) & seyd hou he hadde sent his stede
4.3.1.39 seized {all} {land} {into hand}30
(332) & sesed it al in to his hond.
(1508) & sesed him in alle his lond.
(2488) When bey com, he sesed in hond
(2489) Child Owys in al his lond.
4.3.1.40 and serve his lord
(1987) & served his lord wib mild mode.
(1980) Served his lord bophe mi3t & day
(2430) To serve his lord beside.
4.3.1.41 sit [obj. pron] hende
(1853) Wald þer no man sit him hende.
(1595) He schal no more sitt me so hende.
4.3.1.42 [subj] smot to [obj]
(1421) No stint he (or no striue,
(1583) No lenger stint he no stade,
32 Notice that in three of the four occurrences, this formula is accompanied by “for to fare”: thus, “take his leave for to fare” could also be considered a larger combination formula. (See also, “For to [verb].”)
33 See also “for sooth” under “Exclamatory.”
4.3.1.44 stint
4.3.1.44.1 no stint [subj] for no strive
(717) no stint sche for no strife;
(1647) No stint he for no strive.
4.3.1.44.2 variant
(2373) & stint of her strive.
4.3.1.44.2 stint at no stone
(1225) (103) Sir Amiloun gan stint at no ston,
(1421) No stint he neuer at no ston
4.3.1.44.2.2 variant
(2305) (193) No lenger stint he no stode.
4.3.1.45 swore by
4.3.1.45.1 swore by him that died on rood
(388) & swore, bi him hat dyed on rode:
(820) & he swore bi him hat dyed on rode
(1652) & swore bi him hat dyed on rode
(940) & swore bi him hat dyed on rode
(1109) Swore, “Bi him hat Judas sold
(1110) & died opon he rode.
4.3.1.45.2 swore by Jesus, full of might
(662) & swore, “Bi þesu, ful of mi3t,
(878) & swore bi þesu, ful of mi3t.
4.3.1.45.3 swore by him that Judas sold
(1109) Swore, “Bi him hat Judas sold
(1663) & swore bi him hat Judas sold.
4.3.1.45.4 variant
(1042) & swore bi him hat schop man-kende.
4.3.1.46 take
4.3.1.46.1 take by hand

30 2488-89 is a doublet justifying 332 and 1508 as variants of the same mental template.
31 Many of these are also partially in prepositional phrases such as “by/for him that died on rood,” etc.
32 Notice that in three of the four occurrences, this formula is accompanied by “for to fare”: thus, “take his leave for to fare” could also be considered a larger combination formula. (See also, “For to [verb].”)
33 See also “for sooth” under “Exclamatory.”
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(1113) pei bat her wer wode;
(1167) sche wend hir lord were wode,
(2156) & wend hir lord hadde ben wode,

4.3.1.49.5 and then though [subj]
(919) & ban hou3t he, wip-outen wrong,
(2248) & ban hou3t he, bi heuen king,
(2245) ban hou3t be dou3, wip-outen lesing.

4.3.1.49.6 think on me
(308) & henken on me, sir Amiloun,
(323) Bot loke her-on & hen on me.

4.3.1.49.7 variant
(649) (55) & ban hou3t, wip-outen lesing.

4.3.1.50 token our parting
(324) It tokneb our parting;" (2058) Token of our parting;

4.3.1.51 touch [poss. pron] body
(1470) To sche his bodi ari3t.
(2181) & baped his bodi al bare.

4.3.1.52 understand
4.3.1.52.1 I understand
(25) (3) In Lumbardy, y vnderstond,
(61) (6) In hat tyrne, y vnderstonde,
(205) ban hadde pe douke, ich vnderstond,
(1705) (143) So in hat time, ich vnderstond.

4.3.1.52.2 as you may understand
(1863) As 3e may vnderstond;
(1923) As 3e may vnderstond,
(2403) As 3e now vnderstond;

4.3.1.53 wend/went
4.3.1.53.1 went away
(131) & token her leue & went oway,
(779) & went oway, as he were wode,
(768) Er bat [he] went oway.
(1848) Walde he nou3t wende oway.

4.3.1.53.1.1 joy was went away
(273) Mi ioie were went oway.
(905) Al his ioie was went oway.

4.3.1.53.1.2 care was went away
(713) Al hir care was went oway.
(528) Bi care schal wende oway." 

4.3.1.53.2 went [pron.] fro
(262) 3if me leue to wende pe fro,
(242) For to wende sir Amis fro,
(269) Wold 3e bohe now fro me wende ?
(271) Were 3e bohe went me fro.
(353) For bat bi brober is went pe fro,
(369) bei he be went me fro.
(642) Er ban y passe hir fro;
(1072) For sebben bat jou was went me fro.
(1991) He nold neuer gon him fro;
(2082) When bat he went me fro !

4.3.1.53.3 wend/went home
4.3.1.53.3.1 wend/went home again
(1435) "Brother, he seyd, "wende hom again."
(1670) & weping went hom again
(1791) & went him hom again.

4.3.1.53.3.2 wend/went home anon right
(1129) Broth, he seyd, "wende hom now ri3t
(1144) & sir Amis went hom anon ri3t

4.3.1.53.4 went/went in [poss. pro] journey
(255) To wende in his iurne.
(275) Wende wip him in his iurne
(330) & went in her iurne.
(963) & wende in bi iurne.
(975) & went in his iurny.
(1143) Went in his iurny.

4.3.1.53.5 to [obj] [subj] went
(224) To bat douke he went him ban
(259) To be douke he went wip dreri mode
(555) To him sche went, bat sweete,
(1056) To him he went bat tide.
(2323) To his brober he went hem ban

4.3.1.53.6 went again/anon
(670) Into hir chaumber sche went again,
(675) Into halle he went anon.
(2354) & in to his chapel he went anon.

4.3.1.53.7 he went him then
(224) To bat douke he went him ban
(2323) To his brober he went hem ban

4.3.1.53.8 went full right
(530) In-to be gardine sche went ful ri3t
(1696) & in her way pai went ful ri3t
(2279) & to be kays he went ful ri3t
(2404) And seth pev went bob ful ri3t

4.3.1.53.9 to church wend/went
(2254) To chyrche to wende al pat her wes,
(2259) To chyrche pai schuld wende,
(2267) To chyrche pai went in her way,
(2275) & when pai were to chyrche went.

4.3.1.53.10 (went) in [poss. pron] way
(964) Y schal say pou3t in bi way
(989) In his way he gan to go,
(1416) & went forp in his way.
(1417) (119) In his way he went alone,
(1696) & in her way pai went ful ri3t
(1880) To court he went in his way,
(2267) To chyrche pai went in her way.

4.3.1.53.10.2 variants
(1190) Hou pat sir Amiloun went his way;

4.3.1.54 wrought him much woe
(408) Wrou3t him ful michel wo
(2142) & wrou3t him michel wo.

4.3.1.55 wrung [poss. pron] hands
(859) be maiden wepe, hir hondes wrong,
(1570) Wel oft times his honden he wrong,
(1669) (140) bat child wrong his honden tvain
(2172) Wel sore wrengand hir hond.

4.3.1.56 quite [poss pron] mede
(36) Ful wel quyte her mede.
(2084) Y schal quyte him his mede !" 
(2123) Well euell aquitest thou his mede,
(2435) Wel he pou3t to quyte hur mede,
4.3.1.57 hang on tree/gallows
(834) Do me to hung on tree!
(888) & hung on galwes hung."

4.3.1.58 let (be) [poss pron] weeping
(1687) "Sone," he seyd, "lette bi wepeing.

4.3.1.58.1 variants
(830) "Lette bi wrethe first ouergon, (357) & lette bi morning be.

4.3.1.59 let make [obj]
(1687) Do me to

4.3.1.60 come pricking
(1249) (105) As he com prikand out of toun.
(1221) Com prikeand per wib pride.
(1223) "Sonder compeh prikeand sir Amis !"

4.3.1.61 slake ([obj]) of [poss pron] care/mood
(543) To slake hir of hir care.
(818) Bisou3t pe douke to slake his mode.

4.3.1.62 change [poss pron] mood
(590) & al for pou3t changed bi mode
(1170) Who hap changed bi mode?"

4.3.1.63 hold on the day
(884) & dar nou3t holden vp his day,
(892) His day of bataile to hold, 4.3.1.64 a messenger come
(2455) A messengere to be hal com
(218) A messenger per com bo

4.3.2 IMPERATIVE
4.3.2.1 arise up
(523) "Arise vp," sche seyd, "douther min, (1058) "Arise vp, felawe, it is li3t
(1332) (112) "Arise vp, steward," he seyd anon, 4.3.2.2 be now still
(2335) Pan seyd sir Amis, "Be now stille; (2347) "Brober," he seyd, "ly now stille

4.3.2.3 be true
4.3.2.3.1 be true to [dat. pro.]
(298) Broper, be now trewe to me,
(299) & y schal ben as trewe to be,
(364) Be trewe to me in word & dede,
(366) Be trewe to be al so."

4.3.2.3.2 [subj] shall be true
(378) Y schal be to him trewe; 4.3.2.4 (Hende) hearkeneth
(583) Pli3t me bi trewe bouschalt be trewe

4.3.2.4 (Hende) hearkeneth
(2) Al bat ben hend herkenip to me,
(24) Herkeneph and 3e mow here.
(280) Hende, herkeneph! Is nou3t to hide,
(517) Now, hende, herkeneph, & 3e may here (1189) Now, hende, herkeneph, & y schal say

4.3.3 AUXILARY
4.3.3.1 [subj] gan [verb]
4.3.3.1.1 [subj] gan [verb]
4.3.3.1.1.1 they gan
(132) To her owen cuntres bai gun fare.
(146) Trewepes to-gider bai gun pli3t.
(329) & on her stedes bai gun spring
(1310) Wip waichouns felle bai gun f3t
(1804) Al-mest for hunger bai gun to spille.
4.3.3.1.1.2 he gan
(1022) Gret sorwe he gan for him make
(1048) Al his folk he gan forbede
(1203) Gret bost he gan to blawe;
(1790) His asse astite he gan bistride
(1859) His lord he gan per-in to tain,

4.3.3.1.1.3 [noun] gan
(77) Mony men gan hem byholde
(495) The children gan hen bryne,
(397) Al bus he wrake gan biginne.
(448) Pat miri maide gan aske anom
(457) Her maidens gan answere again
(793) Pe riche douke gan sore agrame:
(1225) Sir Amiloun gan stint in ston.
(1273) Pat kni3t gan houe stille so ston
(1603) Pe kni3t gan wepe & seyd ful stille,
(1364) In-to he brest be brand gan waide,
(1672) Pat godeman gan him frein
(1898) Trumpes in halle to mete gan blawe,
(1400) Pat gun to tasty his wounde

4.3.3.1.1.2 [subj] gan say
(2129) & of, "Allas !" he gan sain;
(2122) & her leuedi gan to sain;
(853) Bus he steward euer gan say;
(2133) As Amoraunt gan him say.

4.3.3.1.1.2.1 [vocative] [subj]
(354) Pat godeman gan him sain;
(436) Pat kni3t gan houe
(1794) Amoraunt gan him say.
(2129) As Shawnepes to-gider gan say;
(2133) As Amoraunt gan him say:

4.3.3.1.1.3 [noun] gan say
(928) "Sir Amis," he leuedy gan say,
(961) "Sir Amis," he leuedi gan to say,
(2329) (195) "Broper," sir Amiloun gan to say,

4.3.3.1.1.3 [vocative + affirmation] [subj] gan say
(2044) "3is, sir," he gan to say,
(2036) "Certes, sir," he gan to sain,
(2083) "3a, certes, sir," he gan to say,
(1781) "Nat, certes, dame," he child gan sain,

4.3.3.1.3 [subj] gan go
(172) Pat in what stede bai gun go,
(1161) To bed bai gun go;
(1803) As wide as bai gun go;
(244) To a gold-smitehe bai gun go

34 The antecedent for "bat" is "leachers" in the previous line.
35 The subject, "hou his leuedi," is in the preceding line.
36 The subject, "pat douke," is in line 2005 (three lines before).
37 The subject, "an angel," is in 3200 (three lines before).
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4.3.3.1 [subj] Amorant oft to town gan go
4.3.3.1.1 Amorant oft to town gan go
4.3.3.1.2 & Amorant oft to town gan go
4.3.3.1.3 Amorant oft to town gan go.
4.3.3.1.3.1 Amorant oft to
(1741)(146)
4.3.3.1.3.2 {Into/Out of} chamber [subj] gan go
4.3.3.1.3.3 (1453)(122) Asonder
(2316)
4.3.3.1.4 
4.3.3.1.5 [subj] gan abide
4.3.3.1.5.1 (769)(65) & ever bat steward gan abide
4.3.3.1.5.2 under a
4.3.3.1.5.3 [subj] gan abide
4.3.3.1.6 [subj]
4.3.3.1.7 [subj] gan [obj] verb
4.3.3.1.7.1 {subj} Vereliche
(1745) Reweliche
(1754) bat hendi kni3t
4.3.3.1.8 how [subj] gan [verb]
4.3.3.1.8(2) In weele and woo how bey gan wynd
(730) In-to chawmer how sche gan glide;
(1482) To court how he gan fare,
(1090) & hou be steward gan hem wraen.
4.3.3.1.9 [acephelous subj] gan [verb]
4.3.3.1.9.1 & gan to frayn hir of hir wo,
(1794) Schameliche gan to sain;
(1597)(134) & hendelich gan him sain;
(2076) Grot diol gan make;
(2202) & to him püs gan say.
4.3.3.1.10 [compliment] gan [verb]
4.3.3.1.10.1 well fast gan aspy
(701) Wel fast he gan hem aspie
(2269)(190) he douke wel fast gan aspie
4.3.3.1.10.2 feast gan hold
(97)(9) Pat riche douke his fest gan hold

18 The subject, "Sir Amis," is in 502 (three lines previous).
19 The subject, "moper," is in the preceding line.
20 The subject, "hii his leed," is in the preceding line.
21 The subject, "pat douke," is in line 2005 (three lines before).
22 The subject is in the previous line.
23 The subject, "an angel," is in 2200 (three lines before).
4.3.3.2.9.3 [subj] would not for all this world's won/good
(821) He nold for al his worldes gode
(826) Y nold for al his worldes won
4.3.4 ([conj]) if [pronominal subj.]
+ [subjunctive auxiliary]
4.3.4.1 ([conj]) if [pronominal subj.] may
(263) Bot 3if y may wip mi broder go,
(489) Help hir 3if hye may;
(832) & 3if pou may prove, bi seyn Jon,
(1114) 3if y may mete him ar3t,
(1232) For to sauen hem, 3iue v may,
4.3.4.2 ([conj]) if [pronominal subj.] were
(379) & 3if y were now forsworn
(751) Ac 3if ich were king of his lond
(1208) 3if he were here in present,
(2395) 3if it were at min hert rote,
4.3.4.3 ([conj]) if [pronominal subj.] would
(1934) 3if he wald fro latzer gons
(2203) 3if he wald rise on Cristes morn,
(2212) 3if he wald do as he him hi3t,
(1301) Bisou3t god 3if pat he wold
4.3.4.4 ([conj]) if [pronominal subj.] do
(305) & 3if pou dirst, pou art forlorn
(643) & 3if v do mi lord his wrong,
4.3.4.5 ([conj]) if [pronominal subj.] will
(356) 3if pou wilt leue opon mi fare,
(628) Bot 3if pou wilt graunte me mi 3ou3t,
4.3.4.6 ([conj]) if [pronominal subj.] should
(601)/52 & 3if we schuld pat game biginne,
4.3.4.7 ([conj]) if [pronominal subj.] be
(2059) & 3if it be so, wip tresoun
4.3.4.8 [variants with subjunctive main verb]
(557) Bot 3if hye spac pat frely fode,
(946) & 3if y swere, icham forsworn,
(955) & 3if y dirst to him gons,
4.3.5 infinitive phrases
4.3.5.1 [noun] to [infinitive]
4.3.5.1.1 battle to bede
(1202) Wip scheld & spere, bataile to bede,
(1287) pat bataile schuld bede;
4.3.5.1.2 battle to fong
(885) Bataile of him to fong,
(970) bat he batail for os fong
(1095) Batail of him to fong,
(1255) 3if pou his bataile vnderfong,
4.3.5.1.3 help to need
4.3.5.1.3.1 and of my help has need
(237) & of mine help hast nede,
(1446) & of mine help hast nede,
4.3.5.1.3.2 help [obj] at ([det]) need
(297) To help him at his nede,
(959) He wold help me at his nede,
(1078) Bot pou help me at his nede,
(1293) God help him at his nede,
(1995) Holpem him at his nede,
(2122) That he help the at thi nede,
(2302) To help mi broher now at his nede,
(2434) And for she help him so at nede,
4.3.5.1.4 be nought to hide
(280) Hende, herkenenep ! Is nou3t to hide,
(501) In herd is nou3t to hide --
4.3.5.1.5 their counsel to undo
(780) Her conseil to vnskere.
(783) Her consel/for to vnworain.
4.3.5.1.6 life to lose to mede
4.3.5.1.6.1 his own life to lose to mede
(958) His owhen liif to lese to mede,
(1499) His owhen liif to lese to mede,
4.3.5.1.6.2 my life to lose to mede
(1452) Mi liif to lese to mede."
4.3.5.2 [adv] to [infinitive]
4.3.5.2.1 free(ly) to fond
(29) And had two ladys free to fond,
(1339) bat kni3t was ful fre to fond
(1708) bat folk was ful fre to fond
(2169) bat er was fre to fond."
(2406) Pat ere was free to fond.
4.3.5.2.1.2 variant
(150) Pat pai schuld frely fond"45
4.3.5.2.2 Seemly to fare
(117) Semly to fare bi his side;
(162) Semly to fare bi his side.
4.3.5.2.3 seemly on to see
(426) So semly on to se.
(534) Pat semly was on to se.
4.3.5.2.3.2 variant
(452) & semlyest in ich a si3t
4.3.6 FOR TO [VERB]
4.3.6.1 ([he] took [his] leave) for to fare
(107) pai token her leue forto fare
(254) He tok his leue for to fare,
(974) & toke his leue for to fare
(2257) (189) Pan pai were redi for to fare,
4.3.6.2 for to go
(1038) Wip her lord for to gon,
(1059) & time for to go "
(1695) Di3t hem for to gon,
4.3.6.3 for to abide
(159) Wip pat douk for to abide;
(278) po bold bernes for to abide

44 See also "that frely food."
45 See also "by each a side."
4.3.6.5 For to wende
(242) For to wende sir Amis fro.
(497) For to wende on dere-hunting.

4.3.6.6 For to solas
(513) For to solas him pare.
(522) For to solas pat may:

3.6.7 For to slay
(1337) A littered man for to slay,

3.6.8 variants
(105) Her craftes for to kiphe;
(186) In his court for to be;
(209) For to have brou3t hem bophe to schond
(228) For to resaiue his lond.
(561) Com wip him for to mete,
(651) Daf his liif for to spille.
(674) For to kepe his lorde coming,
(731) For to aspi3 hem bophe pat tide,

771) Hem for to here.

4.3.6.10 For to ride
(277) (24) When bai were redi forto ride,
(498) & busked hem for to ride.
(1299) & busked hem for to ride.

4.3.6.4 For to wende
(24) When bai were redi for to wende, redi for to wende.

4.4.1.1 [prep] [concrete noun]
4.4.1.1 among the people
(1291) Be steward swore be pople among,
(2101) Child Amoraunt stode be pople among.

4.4.1.2 in geste/romance...
4.4.1.2.1 in geste/romance as we read
(27) In romance as we reede.
(2448) In romauence as we reede.
(144) In gest as so we rede.

4.4.1.2.1.2 variants
(2196) In gest as we finde.
(447) In boke as so we rede,
(1729) (145) Bus in gest rede we

4.4.1.2.1.3 in geste as you may hear
(1501) (126) Al bus in gest as we sain.
(2185) (183) & bus in gest as we sain.

4.4.1.2.1.4 variant
(409) (35) So in a time, as we tel in gest.
(2449) But bus, in romauence as y 3ow say.

4.4.1.2.3 in geste as you may hear
(157) (14) Bus in gest as 3e may here.
(1917) In gest as 3e may here.

---

4.4.1.3 [prep] [corporal]
4.4.1.3.1 in arms
4.4.1.3.1.1 in [poss. pron] arms
(2105) Be douke in his armes he fong
(764) & in his armes he hur nam.
(1462) In his armes he gan hur kis.

4.4.1.3.1.2 in his two arms
(2128) & biclept him in his armes twain.
(2152) & tok him in his armes twain.

4.4.1.3.3 in heart him liked ill
(638) & in his hert him liked ille.
(1278) In hert him liked ille.

4.4.1.3.2 with two eyes
(1166) Wrope hem wip her esi3n twen.
(2148) Wepeand wip esi3n twen.

4.4.1.4 [prep] [animate being]
4.4.1.4.1 [prep] steed
4.4.1.4.1.1 in what steed
(172) Pat in what stede bai gun go.
(175) In to what stede bai went.

4.4.1.4.1.2 upon (det) steed
(1046) & lepe astite upon his stede.
(1201) (101) Be steward houed upon a stede.
(1246) & when he was upon his stede.

4.4.1.4.1.3 [flight (adown)] [off his steed]
(1064) Of his stede li3t adoun.
(1330) Sir Amiloun li3t adoun of his stede.
(1432) Sir Amiloun li3t of his stede.

4.4.1.4.1.3.2 variant
(288) Of hors bai li3t adoun.

4.4.1.4.2 on Sir Amis/Amioun
(472) On sir Amis, bat gentil kni3t.
(694) On sir Amis, bat gentil kni3t.
(697) (59) On sir Amis, bat kni3t hendy.
(1913) On sir Amiloun he cast a s3t.

4.4.1.4.3 with him many a...
(494) & wip him mani a grete lording,
(677) & wip him mani an heil3e lording
(723) & wip him wel mani a man;

4.4.1.5 [prep] [det] [nouns]
4.4.1.5.1 [to] [det] [person]
(368) To sir Amiloun, be gentil kni3t,
(2405) To sir Ami/oun, bat gentyl kny3t.
(219) To sir Amiloun, hende on hond.

---

4.3.6.4 for to ride
(277) (24) When bai were redi for to ride,
(498) & busked hem for to ride.
(1299) & busked hem for to ride.

4.3.6.5 For to wende
(24) When bai were redi for to wende, redi for to wende.

---

"For to kiphe" is consistently used in Auchinleck as a variation of "for to ride." It can therefore safely be assumed that in Auchinleck lines 27 and 2448 would have read "geste" as well.
(569) To sir Amis she made his mon
(1331) To be steward a-fat he 3ede
(244) To a gould-smith he gan go
((1322) Wib wrethe anon to him he wint)

4.4.1.5.1.1 to his brother
(1145) To his brober leuedi so brei3t,
(1148) To his brober to riche mede
(2228) & to his brober he gan wende
(2323) To his brober he went hem ban
(967) & when hou comes to bi brober ri3t,
(1136) To bi brober, sir Amys;

4.4.1.5.1.2 with his brother
(263) Bot 3ify may wib mi brober go,
(2492) With his brother,

4.4.1.5.2 for [poss pron] sake
(68) Al for thes Christes sake
(718) & he steward for wrethe sake
(1217) & a tonne for her sake,
(1609) (135) Pat leuedi, for hir lorde sake,
(2476) Sir Amylyon for his lady sake

4.4.1.5.3 for [poss pron] love
4.4.1.5.3.1 his love
(302) For his love, pat bar be croun of born
(887) For his love to todrawe
(1478) For his love, pat his warld wan,
(1874) "For his love, pat his world wan
(2298) For mi love open on a day;

4.4.1.5.3.2 for God's Love
(321) For godes love, heuen king;
(653) "For godes love, heuen king,
(1040) For godes love held hem stille in pes,
(1703) & bad here mete for godes love,

4.4.1.5.3.3 for Jesus' love
(398) "For thes louse, ful of mi3t.

4.4.1.5.4 of [poss pron] fare
(552) & tel him of hir fare,
(702) Til he wist of her fare,
(2229) & asked him of his fare;

4.4.1.5.5 of his blood
(1996) Ope be child is of his blod yborn,
(1999) Wheber he be fremd or of his blod.

4.4.1.5.6 through god's will
(1801) Ouer al hat lond hurch godes will
(2348) & falle on slepe hurch godes will.

4.4.1.5.6.2 variants
(890) Pat wib gode wile als sche wold
(1284) Lede god don alle his wille.
(2231) "Brober, ich abide her godes wille.
(2336) hesu, when it is his wille.

4.4.1.6 for [demonstrative] [noun]
4.4.1.6.1 for [det] deed
(939) Be nou3t [wrop] for his dede.

4.4.1.6.2 for all this world's good
(556) & þou3t, for alle his warldes gode,
(821) He nold for al his worldes gode
(1176) For al his warldes gode!
(1654) For al his worldes gode to take
(1719) For al his worldes gode;

4.4.1.6.2.2 variant
(142) For to winne al his worldes gode,
(1899) Anou3 of warldes gode;

4.4.2 [prep] [abstract noun]148
4.4.2.1 [prep] [location]
4.4.2.1.1 [prep] [det] [location]49
4.4.2.1.1.1 in all the court was there no wight
(85) (8) In al be court was her no wi3t,
(869) In al be court was her non wi3t,
(1396) In al be court was her no wi3t
(1622) In al be court was her no wi3t

4.4.2.1.1.1.2 variants
(1919) In al be court was her non
(2069) In al be court was her non
(1096) & hou in court was her no wi3t,

4.4.2.1.1.2 in all [det] land
(59) In al be londe were noon so bolde,
(425) In al hat lond nas per non yhold
(1508) & sesed him in alle his lond,
(2489) Child Oweys in al his lond

4.4.2.1.2.2 variant
(173) Alle be lond spac of hem bo,

4.4.2.1.3 over all [det] land
(137) Ouer al be lond pan were bai priis
(200) Ouer al be lond fer & nere
(1522) Ouer al hat lond est & west
(1533) Ouer al hat lond yhold.
(1801) Ouer al hat lond purch godes wille
(1005) Ouer al hat cuntre wide.

4.4.2.1.3.2 variant
(206) A chev steward of alle his lond,

4.4.2.1.4 in/over all this world
(2054) "In al his world were coupes nomo
(464) In al his world nis his per,
(1267) Ouer al his world, fer & hende,

4.4.2.1.2 [prep] [det] [location]
4.4.2.1.2.1 under a [location]
4.4.2.1.2.1.1 under a [obj] side
(927) Vnder an orchard side,
(770) Al-on vndir hat chambre side,
4.4.2.1.2.1.2 under an [arbor]
4.4.2.1.2.2.1 under a bough
(514) Vnder a bow3 as he gan bide.

48 Semantically, these formulae are closely related to those of [ADJ] [NOUN] and ([PREP]) ([ADJ]) [NOUN];

49 Note that all of these formulae are prepositional phrases whose structures are often identical to those of temporal formulae, or others, ("in all things," for example).

50 See also "land/country."
(545) *Vnder a bou*3 he gan abide.

4.4.2.1.2.2 under an orchard side

(927) *Vnder an orchard side,*

4.4.2.1.2.3 under a tree

(998) Wel fair he layd hym *vnder a tre*

(1055) *Vnder a tre* sleapeand alon;

4.4.2.1.2.4 on a tree

(537) Ful mirlly sing on *tre*;

(834) Do me to hong on *tre*!

4.4.2.1.2.2 in [poss pron] court

(186) *In his court for to be;*

(787) *In bi court* pou hast a pef,

4.4.2.1.2.2 variant

(1381) (116) *In to be palais* when bai were gon,

(1897) (159) *In kinges court,* as it is lawe,

(234) *Pat of mi court* out 3ede.

4.4.2.1.2.3 in [det] chamber

(728) *In a chaumber* bisiden he wes

(851) Where bat sche *in bi chaumber lay,

(2186) Tvelmonep *in her chaumber* he lay,

(2375) Schuld noman *in be chaumber* come

4.4.2.1.2.4 into [det] chamber

(670) *Into his chaumber* sche went again,

(811) *In-to a chaumber* sir Amis ran bo

(1241) *In-to be chaumber* bai went aswipe,

(2179) *Into to chaumber* he gan to go,

(2282) *Into be chaumber* he gan to go,

(2417) Into a chaumber *he* went swyp,

(730) *In-to chaumber* hou sche gan glide;

4.4.2.1.2.4.1 variants

(1621) (136) *In-to bat loge* when he was di3t,

(2354) & in to his chapel he went anon,

4.4.2.1.2.5 (in)to his country

(274) *Bi brother schal* in to his cuntre;

(338) Wip his wiif *in his cuntre* --

(2084) "It was his *in his cuntre,

(1748) Woned *in bat cuntrey*

(2500) In Lumberdy, *in bat cuntrey,

(2444) Til he com *to his cuntrey.

4.4.2.1.2.5.2 variants

(132) *To her owen cuntrey* bai gun faire.

4.4.2.1.2.5.3 home into his country

(965) *Hom in to hine owhen cuntrey,*

(1407) *Hom in to his cuntrey*

(2432) He wolde *hoom to his cuntrey.

4.4.2.1.2.5.3.2 variants

(331) Sir Amiloun went *hom to his lond

4.4.2.1.2.6 into the garden

(512) *In-to be gardin* he wold go,

(524) & go play *he in to be gardin

(530) *In-to be gardin* sche went ful ri3t

(542) Went *in-to be orchard* bai tide,

4.4.2.1.2.7 into (fidei) hall (again/anon)

(675) *Into halle* he went anon.

(1952) Bot went him *in to be halle* again

(2035) *In-to halle* he ran again,

(2153) Ri3t til he come *in-to be halle* o3ain,

(2466) he went *in to be hale.*

(806) *He ran to halle,* as he were wode,

(2455) A messengere to be hal com

(1579) & in his owen halle o-day

(1898) Trumpes in *halle* to mete gan blawe,

(2155) Be leuedi *in be halle* stode

(2159) Whi hastow him *in-to halle* ybrou3t,

4.4.2.1.2.8 in [det] world

(585) *Bat in his world* is born,

(1260) *In be world,* pan bou schal be !

(2050) *In his world,* bi Seyn Jon,

4.4.2.1.2.9 in [det] land

(26) Whilom biefel *in bat lond,

(62) A duk wonyd *in bat lond,

(1591) *In his lond* springeb his word,

(1706) Gret plente was *in bat lond,

(1967) Herdestow neuer *in no lond

(1748) Woned *per in bat cuntrey

4.4.2.1.2.9.2 variants

(22) And in *what lond* bei were born

(981) *In a fer cuntrey

4.4.2.1.2.10 of that country

(1149) Bi a kni3t *of bat cuntrey;

(1723) & as bat folk *of bat cuntrey

(1733) Bi he folk *of bat cuntrey,

(2446) Pan had a kny3t *of bat contre

4.4.2.1.2.11 of (fidei) land

(239) & wip al mi powere *of mi lond

(346) Saue he steward *of bat lond,

(594) & *air of his lond* schal be,

(751) Ac 3if ich were king *of his lond

(750) Of *lond* he wald me drue.

4.4.2.1.2.11.2 variant

(206) A chef steward *of alle his lond,

4.4.2.1.2.12 of (fidei) town/city

(282) bat ferd *out of bat town,

(1249) (105) As he com prikand *out of town,

(1375) Bai com *o3aines him* *out of town

(1796) & *out of be cite* bai gun wende;

(1833) & bare him *out of bat cite;

4.4.2.1.2.13 out of the gate

(1907) Stode bischet *wip-outen be gate.

(1909) (160) Out *at be gate* com a kni3t

4.4.2.1.2.14 to the castle gate

4.4.2.1.2.14.1 and to the castle gate he [verb]

(2018) & to be castel-gat he went,

(2068) & to be castel *gat he ran,

4.4.2.1.2.14.2 to the castle gate

(1891) When he com *to be castel-gate,

(2011) & bere it *to be castel-3ate,

4.4.2.1.2.14.2.2 variant

(2452) To be *3ates* bai preked with-out delay.

4.4.2.1.2.15 till a cheaping-town

(1700) Til bai com *to a chepeing-taun.

(1816) bai went him *til a chepeing-taun,

4.4.2.1.3 [prep] [location]

4.4.2.1.3.1 [prep] chamber
4.4.2.1.3.1.1 out of chamber
(1786) "Now 3e schul out of lond fare.
4.4.2.1.3.5 in Lombardy
(25)(3) In Lombardy, y understand.
(2500) In Lombardy, in bat contray.
4.4.2.1.3.6 in world
(1545) In world þan was he.
(1974) In world no wot y non.
(1644) For better kni3t in world is non,
4.4.2.1.3.7 out at gate
(1612) & half a mile from he gate
(1961) Ich was out atte gate ygon
4.4.2.2 [prep] [time]
see “temporal”
4.4.2.3 [prep] [concern]
4.4.2.3.1 to bring him into care
(348) To bring him in-to care.
(708) Bring hem in to care.
4.4.2.3.2 to bring him out of care
(2226) Mi3t bring him out of care
(2300) To bring mi brober out of care ?
4.4.2.3.2.2 variants
(2118) Breng him out of his wo !
(1233) & bring hem out of bende.
(2249) His brober out of sorwe bring.
4.4.2.3.3 out of woe
(2118) Breng him out of his wo !
(2243) Y mi3t aschape out of mi wo.
(2386) Mi brober schuld passe out of his wo;
4.4.2.4 with [abstract noun]
4.4.2.4.1 general
(2059) & 3if it be so, wib tresoun
(2366) pe leuedi com home at wib play
4.4.2.4.2 with pride (terminal)
(541) (46) & so bat mirie may wip pride
(1221) Com prikeand per wip pride.
(1890) As lord & prince wip pride.
4.4.2.4.3 with ([lad] of degree) wrong (terminal)
(632) & say wip michel wrong,
(835) Ac 3i fani wip gret wrong
(1027) “Certes,” he seyd. “wib sum wrong
(1484) Pat wip tresoun & wip wrong
4.4.2.4.3.1 variant
(971) O3ain þe steward þat pat wip wrong
(2102) & seye his lord wib wou3 & wrong
(2494) In muche ioy with-out stryf
4.4.2.4.4 with wrath
(398) & wip wretbe þat went atvinne,
(404) Wip wretbe & wip loureand chere
(1092) Wip wretbe & michel grame.
(1322) Wip wretbe a noon to him he wint
(1213) Pat riche douke, wip wretbe & wrake.
(1785) & seyd wip wretbe bo.
4.4.2.4.5 with wrake
(846) He leie3e on ous wip wrake.”
(1025) About his brober wip wrake

51 Related to “eat” under “verbal.”
(2067) & drou3 it ou wib wrake,
(1213) bat riche douke, wib wrake & wrake,
(2473) (207) [When thi had wif wrake
4.4.2.5 without [abstract noun]
(terminal)
4.4.2.5.1 without less(ing)
(42) For soth wif-out lesyn;
(82) And al pey seide wif-out lesse
(202) & be riche douke, wip-outen les,
(502) Sir Amis, wip-outen les,
(649) (55) & ban bouat, wip-outen lesing,
(685) (58) When he lordinges, wip-outen les,
(272) & pe steward, wip-outen les,
(1590) Wip-outen ani lesing --
(1902) Pat riche douke, wip-outen les,
(2061) Is slain, wip-outen lesing,
(2192) pai had hem-sele, wip-outen lesing,
(2245) ban bouat pe douke, wip-outen lesing,
(2255) pai di3ten hem, wip-outen les,
(2350) & ich hope wele wip-outen lesing,
4.4.2.5.2 without duelling
(318) Wip-outen more duelling,
(496) pai di3ten him wip-outen duelling,
(673) (57) Sir Amis ban wip-outen duelling,
(1818) Wip-outen ani duelling,
(1959) Wip-outen more duelling,
4.4.2.5.3 without delay
(267) & seyd wip-outen delay,
(387) & seyd, wip-outen delay,
(2452) To be 3ates pey preked wif-outen delay,
(902) & borwes founde wip-outen delay,
(1146) Wip-outen more delay,
(1242) Wip-outen more delay,
(2127) Wip-outen more delay,
(2295) & seyd wip-outen delay,
4.4.2.5.4 without fail
(838) He le3b on ous, wip-outen fail,
(862) Pan seyd be douke, "Wip-outen fail,
(943) For y mot swere, wip-outen faile,
(1099) & hou he most, wip-outen faile,
(1195) Pat selue day, wip-outen fail,
(1318) Fram morwe to none, wip-outen faile,
4.4.2.5.5 without wrong
(490) & sche ansawrd wip-outen wrong,
(919) & ban bouat he, wip-outen wrong,
(1837) (154) bus Amoraunt, wip-outen wrong,
4.4.2.5.6 without end
(306) Euer more wip-outen ende,
(1590) To held wip-outen ende;
4.4.2.5.7 various
(929) "Whi mornestow so wip-outen play?
(979) So long he priked wip-outen abod
(1562) Sche brac his hert wip-outen knif,
(1907) Stode bischet wip-outen be gate,
(2494) In muche ioy wip-outen styrf
(2281) (191) Alon him self, wip-outen mo,
(2419) With-out wemme and wound
4.4.2.6 par [french noun]
4.4.2.6.1 par charite
(261) & seyd, "Sir, par charite,
(831) Y pray be, par charite !
(2143) "O broder," he seyd, "par charite.
4.4.2.6.2 par amour
(3) I pray 3ow, par amore,
4.4.2.6.3 par aventure
(1994) Par aventure, he gode man hab biforn
4.4.2.6.4 variants
(1608) For senvt charite."
(1955) be best bourd, bi mi leuwte.
(2045) "He is a traitor, bi mi fay.
(2238) To tel pe in priuite
4.4.3 [PREP] [OBJ] [RELATIVE CLAUSE]
4.4.3.1 [prep] that
(1109) Swore, "Bi him pat Judas sold
(1663) & swore bi him pat Judas sold,
(2080) For bi him at Judas sold.
4.4.3.2 [prep] him that died on rood
(388) & swore, bi him pat dyed on rode:
(592) "Madame, for him pat dyed on rode,
(820) & he swore bi him pat dyed on rode
(1652) & swore bi him pat dyed on rode
(1940) & swore bi him pat dyed on rode
(11109) Swore, "Bi him pat Judas sold
(1110) & died open on rode.
(1759) Bid hir, for him pat died on rode.
4.4.3.3 For God that bought dear
(615) For god pat bouat be dere.
(2289) Pat god hab bouat so dere !"
4.4.3.4 For [obj] that this world won
(1478) For his love, pat bis world wan,
(1874) "For his love, pat his world wan
(2160) For him pat his world wan ?"
4.4.4 [PREP] [NOTHING]
4.4.4.1 [prep] none other thing
(1496) Y no dede it for non Ober bing
(1667) No socour of non Ober bing
4.4.4.2 for nothing would [subj] [verb]
4.4.4.2.1 for nothing would
(699) For no bing wold sche spare.
(976) For no bing he nold abide.
(1191) For no bing he nold abide.
(1350) For no bing he nold abide.
(2175) For no bing wold sche spare.
4.4.4.2.2 for nothing would [subj] abide
(807) For no bing he nold abide.
(1047) For no bing he nold abide.
(1308) For no bing he nold abide.
(1374) For no bing he nold abide;
(1464) For no bing he nold abide.
4.4.4.2.3 for nothing would [subj] wond
(1611) For no bing wold she wond.
(2097) For no bing wald he wond,
4.4.4.2.4 variants
(696) For no bing wald sche lete.
4.4.5 [PREP] [OBJ] [VERB]
4.4.5.1 (all that ever) about him stood
(817) (69) Al pat ever about him stode.
(2075) & al pat ever about him stode
(2090) Was noman hat about him stode
4.4.5.2 that by him stood
(1016) & ober bestes, pat bi him stode
(1943) His hende lord, pat bi him stode.
4.4.5.3 among him stood
(1018) & he alon among hem stode
(2101) Child Amoraunt
4.4.6 OTHER
4.4.6.2 through
(1377) & al his meine
(1305) Til
(1002) Pe
(1932)
4.4.6.2.2 variants
(1812)
4.4.6.3 though hunger shuld me slo.
(414) To seruise wib him ware.
(247) & seyd to sir Amis
(301) & to
(2279) & to he kays he went fal ri3t
(2404) & seth beyd went boi ful ry3t
4.4.6.6 in(to) ((poss pron) service) (with him [be])
(116) In his seruise wib him to be,
(126) In seruise wib him ware.
(193) (17) In to her seruise when hai were brou3t.
(1987) & in bi seruise he schuld be,
4.5 NOUN AND ADJECTIVE PHRASES
4.5.1 [ADJ] [ADJ]
4.5.1.1 fairly woe
(241) (21) Pan was sir Amiloun ferli wo
(2389) (200) Pan was be leuedi ferly wo
4.5.1.2 full [adj]
4.5.1.2.1 full bithie (initial)
(2184) Ful blype of him hai ware.
(2215) Ful blype was sir Amis bo.
(1393) (117) Ful blype was pat hendi kni3t
4.5.1.2.2 full careful (initial)
(987) Ful carefull was pat kni3t.
(1806) Ful carefull were hai bo.
4.5.1.2.3 full dear (medial)
(629) Mi loue schal be ful dere about3t
(1388) bou hast bou3t hir ful dere to day
4.5.1.2.4 full fain (terminal)
(246) "Y wold be spouse now ful fain
(786) lebl he warn ful fain.
(1137) Pan wil hai be ful fain.
(1475) & telle he pat sode ful fain.
(1502) Sir Amis was ful glad & fain.
(1777) (149) be leueled seyd sche wale ful fain
(1797) Per of bei were ful fain.
4.5.1.2.5 ful fair (initial)
(351) Ful fair he gret pat fre.
(564) Ful fair he gan hir grete.
(2195) A ful fair grace fel hem bo.
4.5.1.2.6 full free (to fond) (terminal)
(1339) bat kni3t was ful fre to fond
(1708) Pat folk was ful fre to fond
4.5.1.2.7 full glad
(1502) Sir Amis was ful glad & fain.
(1371) Ful glad hai were bat tide.
4.5.1.2.8 full hende (terminal)
(1628) His soster sone, he was ful hende;
(2227) A morwe sir Amis was ful hende
4.5.1.2.9 full michel [noun]
(408) Wrou3t him ful michel wo.
(1379) Wip ioie & ful michel honour.
4.5.1.2.10 full richly (initial)
(249) Ful richliche hai were wrou3t,
(689) Ful richliche were he wes
(1045) (88) Ful richliche he gan him schrede
4.5.1.2.11 full right (terminal)
(292) & seyd to sir Amis ful ri3t.
(530) In-to he gardine sehe went ful ri3t
(1696) & in her way hai went ful ri3t
(2201) & stode biforn his bed ful ri3t
(2279) & to he kays he went ful ri3t
(2404) & seth beyd went boi ful ry3t
4.5.1.2.12 full sore (terminal)
(705) & was agreeued ful sore.
(1626) For him he wepe ful sare.
(1854) His bones wex ful sare.
4.5.1.2.13 full still (terminal)
(637) (54) Pan stode bat hendy kni3t ful stille.
(1603) Pe kni3t gan wepe & seyd ful stille.
(2230) & he him answerd o3ain ful stille.
4.5.1.2.14 full true (initial)
(1846) Ful treqe he was & kinde of blod
(2187) Ful trewe pai ware & kinde.
4.5.1.2.15 full well (initial)
(797) Ful wele y can be tel his name,
(1155) Ful wele he wend bo.
(2363) Ful wele he herd pat kni3tes bede
(36) Ful wele quitred her mede.
4.5.1.2.16 full woe (terminal)
(408) Wrou3t him ful michel wo.
(352) "Sir Amis," he seyd. "pe is ful wo
(1588) His leueled wai ful wrop & wo
4.5.1.2.17 full wroth
4.5.1.2.17.1 [det] lady wax/was full wroth [particle]
(1489) (125) *be leuedi was ful wroth, ypli3t*
(1588) *His leuedi wax ful wroth & wo*
(1660) *be leuedi was ful wroth unon*

4.5.1.2.17.2 variant
(778) *Ful wroth he was & egre of mode.*

4.5.1.2.18 full yare
(75) *To court bey come ful 3are.*
(106) *Opon pe fittenday ful 3are*
(123) *To bat douke ful 3are*
(1023) *& told his wiif ful 3are*
(1153) (97) *When bat sir Amis hadde ful 3are*
(1194) *To court he com ful 3are*
(1373) *To touñ pai di3t hem ful 3are.*
(1386) *Y graunt pe ful 3are,*
(1629) *He sayd to him ful 3are,*
(1857) *Werwip pai went ful 3are*
(2223) *& seyd to him ful 3are*
(2236) *Pan seyd sir Amiloun ful 3are,*
(2391) *Sche comfort him ful 3are.*

4.5.1.2.18.2 variant
(1125) *& when hai were al 3are,*

4.5.1.3 together {adjJ
4.5.1.3.1 {when they were} together alone
(568) & *when hai were to-gider al-on,*
(1254) *When hai were to-gider al-on.*

4.5.1.3.2 both together
(1844) Of *times bohe to-gider*
(1089) *Bohe to-gider vsame.*

4.5.1.3.3 together same
(1089) *Bohe to-gider vsame,*
(1426) & *so pai mett to-gider same,*

4.5.1.3.4 various
(1029) *Of blis he is ful bare,*
(1298) *To biker bo bernes were ful bold*
(2089) *Pan was be douke ful egre of mod,*
(1704) *Ful iuel coube pai ñer-on,*
(1329) *Ful ferd he schuld be slain.*
(1245) *His tire, it was ful gay.*
(2437) (204) *Sir Amys sent ful hastely*
(1686) *Mi liif is hem ful lohp.*
(413) *Wip mete & drink ful onest*
(1379) *Wip ioe & ful michel honour,*
(2027) *Pan were pai bohe ful yliche*
(2193) *Pai were him bohe ful minde.*
(537) *Ful mirily sing on tre;*
(1101) *It war a lesing ful strong;*
(1457) & *was ful welcome to his frende,*
(2273) & *apareciued ful witterlye*

4.5.1.4 michel {adjJ
4.5.1.4.1 michel unright
(1234) *For, certes, it were michel vnri3t*
(598) *Certies, bai were it michel vnri3t,*

4.5.1.5 well {adjJ
4.5.1.5.1 well evil might s/he thrive
(720) *Wel iuel mot he briue.*
(1752) *Wel iuel mot sche briue!*

4.5.1.5.2 well fair
(287) *Wel fair to-gider opon a plain*
(998) *Wel fair he layd him vnder a tre*
(1526) *A wel fair grace fel hem bo,*
(1635) *Wel fair he was of blode.*

4.5.1.5.3 well fast gan aspy
(701) *Wel fast he gan hem aspie."
(2269) (190) *be douke wel fast gan aspy*

4.5.1.5.4 well/full careful {be} [subjJ though
(1584) *Wel careful was he bo.*
(1740) *Wel careful were hai bo.*
(1806) *Ful careful were hai bo.*

4.5.1.5.5 well hendelich
(195) *Wel hendeliche pai bigan;*
(1767) *Wel hendeliche seyd hier anon.*

4.5.1.5.6 well sore {subjJ} [objJ rue
(381) *Wel sore it schuld be rewe.*
(2110) *Wel sore may him rewe bat stounde*

4.5.1.5.7 well woe was {dative pron} alive
(714) *Wele was hir o liue.*
(756) *Wel wo is me o liue!*
(1746) *Wo was hem o liue;*
(2370) *Wel wo was hem o-liue.*

4.5.1.5.7.2 variant
(1020) *Wel wo was him bigan."

4.5.1.6 here beside
(1758) *bat woner here beside,*
(1868) "To be doukes court here beside"

4.5.2 {NOUN} [RELATIVE COMPLEMENT] {ill}
4.5.2.1 God that suffered passion
(1253) *God, bat suffred passioun,*
(2117) *Nowe god bat suffred passioun*

4.5.2.2 an ass to ride upon
(1773) *As an asse to ridden opon,*
(1761) *An asse, on to ride,*

4.5.2.3 an angel come from heaven
(2200) *An angel com from heaven bri3t*
(2240) *Pat an angel com from heaven;*
(2384) *Pat an angel com from heaven*
(2210) *An angel out of heaven bri3t*

4.5.2.3.2 variant
(1250) *Com a voice from heaven adoun,*

4.5.3 {ADJJ} {NOUN} {ill}
4.5.3.1 body bare
(1175) *Y nold nou3t touche bi bodi bare*
(1470) *Touche his bodi ari3t;*
(2181) & *baped his bodi al bare.*
LIST OF MENTAL TEMPLATES

4.5.3.2 [male] bold

4.5.3.2.1 bernes bold
(164) He rubbed the po bernes bold
(278) Po bold bernes for to abide
(399) Po bold bernes to.
(1298) To biker po bernes were ful bold
(102) To glad pe bernes blithe;

4.5.3.2.2 barons bold
(98) Wher erles & with barouns bold.
(152) Of erls & of barouns bold.
(2454) Among pe barouns bold.
(1865) Per sir Amis, be bold baroun.

4.5.3.2.2.2 variant
(434) Of barouns & of birddes bri3t

4.5.3.2.3 brethren bold
(313) (27) As ha stode so, po breferen bold.

4.5.3.2.4 squire bold
(2006) Cleped to him a squier bold
(2426) Child Oweys was a bold squier.

4.5.3.2.5 variant
(954) Mi broper, sir Amiloun.
(1003) Pan was his broper, sir Amiloun.
(1136) To hi broper, sir Amis;
(1540) & hi broper, Sir Amiloun.
(2060) Mine hende broper, sir Amiloun.
(2113) "And ys thi brother, sir Amylioun,
(2167) For it is mi broper, sir Amiloun,
(2492) With his brother, sir Amy.
(2081) Amiloun, mi broper, it hadde in wold,

4.5.3.3 [noun] bright

4.5.3.3.1 heaven bright
(2200) An angel com fram heuen bri3t
(2210) An angel out of heuen bri3t

4.5.3.3.2 helm bright
(1244) Wip helme & plate & brini bri3t.
(1312) So hard bai hewe on helmes bri3t

4.5.3.3.3 sword bright
(2465) With swerd bri3t and broun.

4.5.3.4 [female] bright

4.5.3.4.1 lady/ladies bright

4.5.3.4.1.1 lady/ladies bright
(735) "Hail," she seyd, pat leuedi bri3t.
(1160) Sir Amis & pat leuedi bri3t.
(1181) Bitvix him & pat leuedi bri3t.
(1235) To make roste of leuedis bri3t;
(1460) Sir Amiloun & pat leuedi bri3t

4.5.3.4.1.2 variants
(1097) To saue po roy leuedis bri3t;
(1130) To mi leuedi, pat is so bri3t.

52 The alliterative quality of this formula seems to have
particular significance, therefore "bernes blithe," "barons bold" and
"brethren bold" are considered variations of it.

53 There is no reason that this "split formula" should be any less
acceptable than a "split infinitive" in a language like English.
It is based on the same mental template, and it is only an artificial
coerunce than suggests all formulae must be entirely
undivided.

(1145) To his broper leuedi so bri3t,
(2247) Spoused his lady, bri3t of bie,

4.5.3.4.1.2 lady/ladies bright in bower
(66) And ladies bri3t in bower;
(1518) & leuedis bri3t in bower.

4.5.3.4.2 bird bright
(334) & spoused a lewed brie3t in bour
(430) Wip leuedis & maidens bri3t in bower

4.5.3.4.3 maidens bright
(839) An angel out of bower (so) bright
(560) Sei3e pat bird in bower so bri3t
(578) & icham a bird in bower bri3t,

4.5.3.5 careful man
(223) Pat was bat kni3t a careful man.
(2324) & seyd to pat careful man.

4.5.3.6 doughy [male]

4.5.3.6.1 doughy knight
(207) A douhti kni3t at cri,
(281) So douhti kni3tes, in bat tide
(401) To schende pat douhti kni3t of kinne,
(451) Who was hold pe douhti kni3t
(1420) Pat douhti kni3t of blod & bon.

4.5.3.6.2 a doughy man
(1345) (113) be steward & pat douht man
(1362) Al so a douht man.

4.5.3.7 daughter forlain
(749) Pat ich hadde his douhter forlain,
(792) bi douhter hap forlain!"
(825) Mi douhter forlain;

4.5.3.7.2 variant
(801) He hap forlain pat may.

4.5.3.8 false steward
(311) Be fals steward felawerede,
(1106) Hou pat be fals steward wold

4.5.3.9 freely food
(57) To beholde pat freky food;
(557) Bat 3if hve spac pat freky fode;
(716) Schi bihel on pat frely fode,
(2388) To hele pat frely fode."  

4.5.3.9.2 variant
(135) In court frely to fed,
(150) Pat pat schuld frely fond4

54 See also "free to fole."
4.5.3.10 fouler mease
(1259) Fouler mesel nas neuer non
(1544) Fouler mesel bar nas non hold

4.5.3.11 gentle [male]
4.5.3.11.1 gentle [male]
4.5.3.11.1 [det] gentle knight
(368) To sir Amioun, _bat gentile kni3t_,
(559) & as tite as _bat gentil kni3t_.
(577) (50) "bou art," she seyd, "a gentil kni3t._
(694) On sir Amis, _bat gentil kni3t_,
(741) & holden _a gentil kni3t_,
896 Boden for _bat gentil kni3t_.
(937) (79) "Madame," seyd _bat gentil kni3t_,
(1061) & knewe anon _bat gentil kni3t_,
(1132) & as bou art _a gentil kni3t_,
(1142) Sir Amioun, _bat gentil kni3t_,
(1193) As _a gentil kni3t_, stout & gay,
(1493) _bou slou3_3 per _a gentil kni3t_.
(1573) (132) _Allas, alas!_ _bat gentil kni3t_.
(1681) "A god help!" seyd _bat gentil kni3t_.
(1694) _be child & bat gentil kni3t_.
(1930) _& bou art gentil kni3t_ of blode,
(2109) To sle _bat gentil kni3t_.
(2198) As _a gentil kni3t_,
(2264) Kepe his _broper bat gentil kni3t_
(2342) & _alied bat gentil kni3t_.
(2405) To sir Amylion, _bat gentyl kni3t_.

4.5.3.11.1.2 true gentle knight
(659) As icam _trewed gentill kni3t_,
(665) _Astow art trewed gentil kni3t_.
4.5.3.11.1.3 gentle child
(1624) To _saue a gentili child_, vpli3t,
(1973) _a gentiler child, for sope to sain_.
4.5.3.11.2 gentle (of) blood
(593) _Astow art conen of gentil blode_,
(1930) _& bou art gentil kni3t_ of blode.
4.5.3.11.2 variants
(1635) _Wel fair he was of blode_.
(1846) _Ful trewe he was & kinde of blod_.

4.5.3.12 God almighty
(1527) _As god almi3ti wold; _
(1912) _& burch be grace of god almi3ti_.

4.5.3.13 good man
(1711) For _be gode man_ was so messaner bo. 
(1717) (144) Pan _wex be gode man_ fote so sare
(1921) (161) _Pe gode man gan_ to him go. 
(1933) (162) _Pe gode man_ asked him anon,
(1945) (163) _Pe gode man_ wende he hadde ben rage,
(1994) _Par auentour, be gode man_ hab biforn
4.5.3.13.1 fairest man
(454) & _who was be fairest man_
(461) _be fairest man_ & _mest of main_.

4.5.3.14 great [noun]
4.5.3.14.1 great dole

(1884) _Gret diol it was to se_.
(2076) _Gret diol gan make_.

4.5.3.14.2 great bounty
see "of [great [noun]]" under "[prep] [adj] [noun]"

4.5.3.14.3 great doleur
see "of [great [noun]]" under "[prep] [adj] [noun]"

4.5.3.14.4 great honour
see "of [great [noun]]" under "[prep] [adj] [noun]"

4.5.3.14.5 great pouste
see "of [great [noun]]" under "[prep] [adj] [noun]"

4.5.3.14.6 great renoun
see "of [great [noun]]" under "[prep] [adj] [noun]"

4.5.3.14.7 great spite
see "it [be] great [noun]" under "it [be] [adj] [noun]"

4.5.3.14.8 great wroth
see "it [be] great [noun]" under "it [be] [adj] [noun]"

4.5.3.15 grimly wound(s)
(1316) Purch dent _of grimly woundeds wide_,
(2297) _Wib grimli wounde_ he schad his blod
(2132) & _sei3e his grimly wounde_ pare,
(1389) _Wib grimli woundes_ sare;

4.5.3.16 hard case
(1558) _When him was fallen pat hard cas_,
(2177) _Pat him was fallen so hard a cas_.

4.5.3.17 lessing strong
(836) _Hab lowe on ous, pat lesing strong_.
(1101) _It war a lesing ful strong; _

4.5.3.18 [male] hende

4.5.3.18.1 barons hende
(7) _Her faders were barons hende_.
(28) _Two barouns hendo wonyd in lond_.
(112) _Do tvay barouns; bat were so hende_.
(2497) (209) _Anoon be hend barons tway_.

4.5.3.18.2 [two] [noun] [hende]55
(28) _Two barouns hendo wonyd in lond_.
(21) _Ofer her hend ladyes two_
(95) _Ne knew be hend children tway_.
(112) _Do tvay barouns, bat were so hende_.
(123) _Anon be het kni3tes to_
(1638) _Wel curteys, hend & gode_.
(2497) (209) _Anoon be hend barons tway_.

4.5.3.18.3 [det] hende children
(95) _Ne knew be hend children tway_.
(133) (12) _Bus war be hend childre_, ywis,
(158) _be hend childre in cuntre were_.

4.5.3.18.4 [det] hende (terminal)56
(376) _For ones y pili3t him treube, pat hende_.
(1506) _Honoured he was, pat hende_.
(2268) _At hon bileft be hende_.

---
55 See also "two."
56 The terminal placement of this particular formula is important (as is its function as a preceded complement) in order to prevent it from having a particularising force. Thus, examples such as "To serve be hende in [halfe]" (438) are eliminated.
LIST OF MENTAL TEMPLATES

4.5.3.18.5 (det) {knight} {hende}
(290) Sir Amiloun, *bat hendi kni3t*,
(327) *po kni3tes hende* & fre.
(511) *Pat hendi kni3t* bibou3t him bo.
(589) (51) *Pat hende kni3t* stille he stode
(637) (54) *pan stode* *bat hende kni3t* ful stille.
(697) (59) On sir Amis, *bat kni3t* hende.
(763) *Pat hende kni3t* bibou3t him ban
(968) Pray him, as he is *hendi kni3t*
(997) (84) *be kni3t*, bat was so hende & fre.
(1009) (85) As sir Amiloun, *bat hendi kni3t*,
(1063) *Pat hendi kni3t*, sir Amiloun,
(1123) Anon *po hendi kni3tes to*
(1177) (99) *bus*, *ywis*, *bat hende kni3t*
(1392) (117) *Ful bibe* was *bat hendi kni3t*
(1454) Sir Amiloun, *bat kni3t* so hende,
(1486) & *hou his broper*, *bat hendi kni3t*
(1754) *Pat hendi kni3t* gan meken his mon
(1795) Opon *be asse* he sett *bat kni3t* so hende,
(2235) *po kni3tes hende* & fre.

4.5.3.18.6 variant
(1480) *Pan astite* *bat hende mon*,
(2438) After mony *kni3t* hardy,

4.5.3.21 | (adj) maiden

4.5.3.21.1 that may
(522) For to solas *bat may*:
(682) To eten *bat may*,
(801) *He hab forlai* *bat may*.
(856) *Pan dede* pe *duke* com *fort* *bat may*,
(926) He *mett* pe *leuedi* & *bat may*
(1295) As *wis* as he *neuer* *kist* *bat may*,
(1511) He *spoused* Belisent, *bat may*,

4.5.3.21.2 that merry maid(en)
(613) (52) *Pat mirie maiden* of *gret renown*
(565) (48) *Pat mirie maiden* Some *anon*
(448) *Pat miri maide* gan *aske* *anon*

4.5.3.21.3 that merry may
(652) *Pan seyd he* to *bat maiden 3ing*,
(481) (41) *bus* bat *mirti maiden 3ing*

4.5.3.21.4 that maiden young
(709) (60) *Pas*, *ywis*, *pat miri may*
(724) & *Belisaunt*, *bat miri may*,
(765) & *kist* bat *miri may*;
(1387) *For Belisent*, *bat miri may*.
(541) (46) & *so* bat *mirie may* *wipe* *pride*
(479) Speke *wip* him, *bat fair may*.

4.5.3.21.5 Mary, that best may
(2304) & *Mari*, *pat best may*!"
(2360) & *Mari*, his moder, *bat best may*,

4.5.3.22 poor man
(755) *Ac*, *certes*, *icham a power man*,

(1892) & *bifor al qiper power men*
(1963) *Pouer men* y sei3e mani jare,

4.5.3.23 rich duke (usually initial) 58

4.5.3.23.1 that rich duke
(97) (9) *Pat riche douke* his *fest gan* hold
(169) (15) *Pat riche douke*, he *loued hem* so,
(181) (16) *Pat riche douke* haddle of hem pris,
(410) (40) *be riche douke* *le* *make* a *fest*
(421) (36) *Pat riche douke*, bat *v of told*,
(493) (43) *Pat riche douke* in o *morning*
(721) (61) *Pat riche douke* *opon a day*

4.5.3.23.2 that rich duke, comely of kind
(110) *Pat riche douke* *comly of kende*,
(229) (20) *Pat riche douke*, *comly of kende*,
(265) (23) *Pat riche douke*, *comly of kende*.

4.5.3.23.3 that rich duke, without less
(202) & *be riche douke*, *wip-uten* les,
(1903) *Pat riche douke*, *wip-uten* les.

4.5.3.23.3 variant
(121) (11) *be riche barouns* *answerd* *again*,

4.5.3.24 that stound (terminal appositive)
(1328) *Po* *was* *be steward* *bat stounde*
(1351) *be steward* *somt* to *him* *bat stounde*
(2110) *Wel sory* *may* him *rew* *bat stounde*,
(2135) & *off* seyed, "*Allas bat stounde!*"
(2171) & *wepe & seyd*, "*Allas bat stounde!*"

4.5.3.24.1 and the steward (initial)
(718) & *be steward* for *wret* *sake*
(727) & *be steward*, *wip-uten* les,
(857) & *be steward* *wipstode* a *way*

4.5.3.24.2 variant
(191) He *made* chef steward in halle,
(206) A *chef steward* of *alle* his lond.

4.5.3.25 unkind blood
(389) "*Pou traitour, unkinde blod*,
(2138) *Vinkender blod* nas *never* born.

4.5.3.26 years [number]
(217) (19) *So wip-in* *po 3eres to*
(1257) *Wip-in* *his 3eres fye*;

58 Though some may argue that “that may” carries a great deal of lexical meaning, this particular form does display some essential formulaic aspects; its terminal placement always has relevance in producing suitable rhymes, and in all occurrences it is used tautologically, being either an appositive or at least preceded by an antecedent.

59 The forms “that rich duke comely of kind” and “that rich duke, without less” are examples of the use of separate formulae in conjunction to form larger formulae.
4.5.3.27 with words [adj]
4.5.3.27.1 with words bold
4.5.3.27.2 with words hende
4.5.3.27.3 variants
4.5.3.28 and other [noble]
4.5.3.28.1 [detJadjj
4.5.3.29 variants
4.5.3.29.1 two [nouns]
4.5.3.29.1.1 two hands
4.5.3.29.1.2 in [poss. pron] hands twain
4.5.3.29.1.3 in [poss. pron] arms twain
4.5.3.29.1.4 [det/adj] two barons
4.5.3.29.1.4.2 variants
4.5.3.29.2 [adj] [adj] [noun]
4.5.3.29.2.1 much seemly folk
4.5.3.29.3 [poss pron] [appositive]
LIST OF MENTAL TEMPLATES

4.5.3.29.3.1 [poss. pron] brother, sir Amis/Amiloun

(954) Mi brother, sir Amiloun.
(1003) Pan was his brother, sir Amiloun.
(1136) To bi brother, sir Amis;
(1540) & his brother, sir Amiloun.
(2060) Mine hende, brother, sir Amiloun.
(2113) "And ys thi brother, sir Amiloun.
(2167) For it is mi brother, sir Amiloun.
(2492) With his brother, sir Amys.
(2081) Amiloun, mi brother, it hadde in wold.

4.5.3.29.4 singles

(1628) His soster sone, he was ful hende;
(1864) So he com to a cite town,
(2378) & seyd to hir, "Leue leman, & nameliche

4.5.4 [ADJ] [DET] [NOUN]

4.5.4.1 all [det] [noun]

4.5.4.1.1 all [poss pron] care/joy

(713) Al hir joye was went away.
(905) Al his joye was went away.

4.5.4.1.2 all his mean

(192) To di3t al his meyne.
(1036) & al his meyne bi ich a side

4.5.4.1.2.2 variant

(1620) & bonked him of al his sond.

4.5.4.1.3 all [det] folk

(1048) Al his folk he gan forbidde
(1285) (108) Al be folk ber was, ywis.

4.5.4.1.4 all that ever

(817) (69) Al bat ever about him stode.
(1157) Al bat ever in court ware.
(2075) & al bat ever about him stode

4.5.4.1.5 (of) all [poss pron] kin

(53) Alle her kyn was of hem blyb,
(602) & ani wi3t of al bi kinne
(1710) Of al kines bing:
(1270) & bi wiif & alle bi kinne
(1553) & nameliche al his riche kende;
(1594) It is gret spite to al mi kende.

4.5.4.1.6 with all [poss. pron.] might

(1394) & bonked him wiip al his mi3t;
(2402) Comfort hur lord with al hur my3t.

4.5.4.1.7 of all ((poss. pron.)) good

(1760) Sende me so michel of al mi gode,
(1714) & brou3t hem anou3 of al gode;
(1772) Sende him so michel of al his gode

4.5.4.1.8 for all this world's good

(556) & hou3t, for alle his warides gode,
(821) He nold for al his warides gode
(1176) For al his warides gode!'
(1654) For al his warides gode to take
(1719) For al his warides gode.

4.5.4.1.8.2 variant

(1942) For to winne al his warides gode,

(1989) Anou3 of warides gode;

4.5.4.1.9 of all [poss pron] weed

(1117) "Ac broder " he seyd, "have al mi wede,
(1124) Alle her wede chaunged bo.
(2180) & kest of al his pour wede

4.5.4.2 many [det] [noun]

4.5.4.2.1 (through) many a country, (up and down)

(1798) Purch mani a cuntre, vp an doun,
(1862) Purch mani a cuntre, vp & doun.

4.5.4.2.2 (there was) many a gentil [noun]

(412) ber was mani a gentil gest
(436) ber was mani a gentil knight

4.5.4.2.3 (and with him) (lady) many a

((adj)) lording

(494) & wip him mani a gret lording.
(677) & wip him mani an heiz3e lording
(723) & wip him wel mani a man;

4.5.4.2.4 many a man

(198) Hem loued mani a man;
(723) & wip him wel mani a man;
(1248) Mani man bad bat day. 63
(867) Pat mani man schuld it sen. 64

4.5.4.2.5 many a sithe

(108) & bonked him mani a sibe.
(480) She wepe weI mani a sibe.
(2147) & kist him wel mani a sibe.

4.5.4.2.6 variants

(437) & mani a seriaunt, wise & wi3t.
(953) Her wonhe hennes mani a mile
(1538) & lord of mani a tour & toun
(2462) And with hem mony a stout baron
(2459) Per was mony a sory man.

4.5.5 [ADJ] [GENETIVE] [NOUN]

4.5.5.1 the duke's daughter dear

(518) hou pat be doukes douther dere
(777) De doukes douther dere.

4.5.5.1.2 variant

(1391) Mi lond & mi douther dere.

4.5.5.2 live's food

(1641) To her lifes fode.
(1725) Pai gat hem lives fode.

4.5.5.3 heaven's king

4.5.5.3.1 by Jesus, heaven's king 65

(1596) Bi Ihesu, heuen king! "
(2064) Bi Ihesu, heuen king! "

4.5.5.3.2 variants

(35) And perfere Ihesu, heuyn-king. 66

63 The singular form "man" following a clearly plural adjective marks this example as a variant of the formula.

64 Ibid.

65 See also "exclamation."

66 Related to "that ever (initial)."
LIST OF MENTAL TEMPLATES

(128) & bisou3t hesus, heuen king,
(2351) Ihesu, bat is heuen king.

4.5.5.3.2 by heaven's king
(1495) "Dame," he seyd, "bi heuen king,
(2248) & pan bou3t he, bi heuen king.

4.5.5.3 heaven's king
(321) For godes loue, heuen king;
(328) Aifer bitau3t oper heuen king.
(655) For godes loue, heuen king.

4.5.5.4 land's law
(635) Ytak how schalt be purch londes lawe
(886) Do me pan londes lawe
(1212) As it is londes lawe.

4.5.5.5 world's worthy won

4.5.5.5.1 in [det] worthy/world's won
(419) pan her was in bat worl clwyd, won
(678) in to bat worl clwyd, won,
(1382) Al bat was in bat worl clwyd won

4.5.5.5.2 variants
(1937) Serue pat riche douke in bat won,
(1658) Amorant went in-to bat won

4.5.5.5.2 wend/went out of that worthy won
(446) & wende out of bat won,
(500) Were wend out of bat won.

4.5.5.5.2.2 variant
(1701) Fiue mile out of bat won,
(2475) Out of bat worthy won,

4.5.5.5.3 when [subj] come into (that) won
(733) (62) When bat may com in-to won,
(781) (66) When he douke come in to bat won

4.5.5.5.4 all this world's won
(826) Y nold for al his worlclwyd won
(995) To win al his worlclwyd won,
(2380) For bi him pat bat his world won.

4.5.5.5.4.2 variant
(604) Al our jov & worlclwyd winne
(2256) Wip joive & worlclwyd winne
(1874) "For his love, bat his world won

4.5.5.5.5 [subj] would not for this world's won/good
(821) He nold for al his worlclwyd gode
(826) Y nold for al his worlclwyd won

4.5.5.6 [poss. pron.] most foe
(1269) Schal be bi most fon.
(1554) Bicom his most fon;

4.5.6 AS/SO [ADJ] A [COMPLEMENT]

4.5.6.1 so/as foul a [noun]

4.5.6.1.1 so foul a thing
(1593) He is so foule a hing,
(1968) Telle of so foule a hing.

4.5.6.1.2 so foul a [person]
(1264) So foule a wreche how schalt be,
(1684) & now icham so foule a wi3t

(2173) (182) As foule a lazer as he was,

4.5.6.1.1 variant

4.5.6.2 as fair a [noun]
(2213) His broder schuld ben as fair a kni3t
(2410) Pan was he as feire a man

4.5.6.2.2 variant
(50) Fairer were newer noon on lyve.

4.5.6.3 heart so hard
(538) Ac hir hert was so hard ibrou3t.
(581) Mine hert so hard is on pe li3t,

4.5.7 {[PREP]} {[ADJ]} {[NOUN]}

4.5.7.1.1 of [adj] [noun]

4.5.7.1.1.1 of great [noun]

4.5.7.1.1.1.1 of great bounty
(5) Of two barons of grete bounte
(183) & holden of bounte.
(969) & of grete bounte.

4.5.7.1.1.1.2 of/with great honour
(6) And men of grete honoure;
(72) With myrth [and] grete honour.
(335) & brou3t his hrom wip grete honour
(431) Kept sche was wip honour
(823) "Ich hauwe him don grete honour.

4.5.7.1.1.3 of great pouste
(1532) Douke & lord of grete pouste
(1539) & douke of grete pouste.

4.5.7.1.1.4 of great renown
(47) Pat was a childe of grete renoun
(613) Pat mirie maiden of grete renoun
(1004) Holden a lord of renoun
(1537)(129) Pan was bat kni3t of grete renoun
(180) Pan gat hem grete renoun.

4.5.7.1.1.5 of high kin y-corn
(759) Of wel hei3e kin ycorn,
(1950) & of hei3e kinde ycorn.

4.5.7.1.1.5.2 variant
(48) And com of hy3e ofspring.

4.5.7.1.1.6 variants
(8) Lordinges com of grete kynde
(185) He sett hem bobbe in grete office.
(216) Wip wel grete felonic.
(432) & greet solenmnty 63
(835) Ac 3if ani wip gret wrong
(1084) "Certes," he seyd. "wip gret tresoun
(1678) Bi wip haph [sworn] wip grete mode

4.5.7.1.2 in all [noun] 64

4.5.7.1.2.1 in all thing
(34) And trew weren in all thing,
(9) In al hing het wey were so lyche
(315) Were liche in al hing.

63 The preposition "wip" is in the previous line.
64 Note that many of these formulæ have lexical correlations which place them elsewhere as well; "in all [det] [location]," for example, can be classified under "locative" as well.
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(2055) So liche in al ping.
4.5.7.1.2.1.2 variant
(1710) Of al kines ping;
4.5.7.1.2.2 in all [det] [location]
see “Locative”
4.5.7.1.3 with [adj] [noun]
4.5.7.1.3.1 with [adj] mood/cheer
4.5.7.1.3.1.1 with dreary mood
(259) To be douke he went wib dreri mode
(2306) Bot hent his knyf wib dreri mode
(1644) He made dreri mode.
4.5.7.1.3.1.2 with mild mood
(54) So mylde he my were of mood;
(1651) & he answerd wib milde mode;
(1771) & praieste wib milde mode.
(1847) & serued his lord wib mild mode.
(1870) He is a man of milde mode.
(2423) And banked god with mild mood.
4.5.7.1.3.1.3 with eager mood
(385) (33) Pe steward ban was egre of mode.
(778) Ful wroop he was & egre of mode.
(805) (68) Pan was be douke egre of mode.
(1361) He smot to him wib egre mode.
(1320) So egre ban were of mode.
(2089) Pan was be douke ful of egre of mode;
4.5.7.1.3.1.3.2 variants
(1509) (110) bo gomes, bat were egre of si3t,
(1678) Bi wiif haf [sworn] wib gret mode.
(1983) Is he made of mode?"
4.5.7.1.3.1.4 with [adj] cheer
4.5.7.1.3.1.4.1 with ruelf cheer
(1355) He was known wibrewel chere.
(2292) & wepe wib ruelf chere.
(2358) & preyd wib ruelwe chere
4.5.7.1.3.1.4.2 variants
(404) Wib wrethpe & wib tourend chere
(520) Hir moder come wib doulf chere
4.5.7.1.3.2 with bright brond
(1115) Wib mi brond, bat is so britis,
(1347) Wib brondes britis & bare;
4.5.7.1.3.3 with [adj] eyes
4.5.7.1.3.3.1 weeping eyes
(326) & kisten hem wib ei3en wepeing,
(2148) Wepeand wib ei3en tvo.
(2150) For ioe he wepe wib his a3n
4.5.7.1.3.3.2 with two eyes
(1166) Wroplich wib her ei3en tvo.
(2148) Wepeand wib ei3en tvo.
4.5.7.1.3.4 with [noun] [adj]
4.5.7.1.3.4.1 with words [adj]
4.5.7.1.3.4.1.1 with words bold
(889) (75) Hir moder seyd wib wordes bold
(1108) Sir Amiloun wib wordes bold
4.5.7.1.3.4.1.2 with words hende
(230) Answerd o3ain wib wordes hende
(266) Answerd o3ain wib wordes hende
4.5.7.1.3.4.1.2 variants
(563) Wib worde bohe fre & hende
(214) To be douke wib wordes grame
(1563) Wib wordes harde & kene.
(197) Al hat hem se3e wib word & hou3t,
4.5.7.1.3.5 with clothes rich
(2183) Wib clothes riche & wele wrou3t;
(2346) Wib clothes riche & fale.
4.5.7.1.4 on deer hunting
(497) For to wende on dere-hunting,
(722) On dere-hunting went him to play,
4.5.7.2 [adj] [prep] [noun]
4.5.7.2.1 [adj] of cheer69
(15) Pan was be children bold of cheere,
(1914) Hou laib he was of cheere.
4.5.7.2.2 blithe of (mood/cheer)70
(199) For bai were so blibe of cheere.
(553)(47) Pan was bat may so blibe o mode,
(1715) Pan was be child blibe of mode.
4.5.7.2.3 blithe and glad of (mood/cheer)71
(160) Pan douke was blipe & glad of cheere,
(2379) Be blipe & glad of mode;
(2429) Blithe and glad he was of cheere.
4.5.7.2.4 comely of kende
(110) Pat riche douke comly of kende
(229)(20) Pat riche douke, comly of kende,
(265)(23) Pat riche douke, comly of kende.
4.5.7.2.4.2 variant
(14) & how vynkouth bey were of kynd
(1431) Pat was so comly corn.
4.5.7.2.5 doubtful in deed
(33) Pat do3ty were of de de,
(178) For dou3ty were of de de,
(442) & dou3ty were of de de,
(456) & dou3ty were of de de,
(466) He is dou3ty.
(2439) Pat do3ty were of de de.
4.5.7.2.6 full of [noun]
4.5.7.2.6.1 (Jesus) full of might72
(662) & swore, "Bi lhesu, ful of mi3t,
(878) & swore bi lhesu, ful of mi3t.
(938) "For lhesu loue, ful of mi3t,
(2252) Swiche time as Ihesu, ful of mi3t.
4.5.7.2.6.2 full of wine
(2009) As ful of wine astow mi3t hold
(2019) & ful of wite it bare.
(2021) "Pis coupe ful of wite mi lord he sent,
4.5.7.2.6.2.2 variants
(256) Sir Amis was so ful of care,

69 Note that lexically, these formulae are also related to those such as “with dreary/eager/mild mood,” “with ruelf cheer,” etc.
70 Note that lexically, these formulae are also related to those such as “with dreary/eager/mild mood,” “with ruelf cheer,” etc.
71 Note that lexically, these formulae are also related to those such as “with dreary/eager/mild mood,” “with ruelf cheer,” etc.
72 See also “religious” – in every case, “Jesus” is an antecedent to this particular form.
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(700) be steward ful of felonie.
(1075) As be steward ful of envie.
4.5.7.2.7 gentle (of) blood
(593) Astow art comen of gentil blode
(1930) & bou art gentil kni3t of blode.
4.5.7.2.7.2 variants
(1635) Wel fair he was of blode.
(1846) Ful trewe he was & kinde of blod
4.5.7.2.8 merriest in world
(101) [With meet and drynke, meryst on mold]
(1902) As men meryst on mold.
(2457) As man meryst on molde.
4.5.7.2.9 [noble] proud in pride
(120) As lordines proude in pride.
(168) As princes prout in pride.
(417) & leuedis proude in pride.
(495) As prince prout in pride.
(1380) As prince proute in pride.
(1458) As prince proute in pride;
(1793) Hou his leuedi proude in pride.
4.5.7.2.9.2 variants
(688) As princes hat were proute in pres.
(1179) As lord & prince in pride;
(1890) As lord & prince wip pride.
4.5.7.2.10 seemliest in sale
(444) & semliest in sale.
(1513) (127) Miche was hat semly folk in sale.
4.5.7.2.10.2 variant
(1895) He went in-to hat semly sale.
4.5.7.2.11 sick in bed ([subj]) lay
(486) Sike in bed sche lay.
(519) Sike in hir bed lay.
4.5.7.2.12 worthy in weed
(30) Pat worthy were in wede;
(138) & worhiest in wede.
4.5.7.2.13 michel of might
(868) Pe deuel of helle ichim biteche,
(1282) Certes," he seyd, "for drede of care
(1288) He and be steward of pris.
4.5.7.2.13 [nouns] of [noun]
4.5.8.1 cup(s) of gold
(314) [Sir Amioun] drou3 for3 tvay coupes of gold.
(1810) Sawe mi riche coupes of gold.
(905) Wi3 riche coupes of gold.
(208) "Take," he sayd, "mi coupes of gold.
(2023) Pe lazer tok for3 his coupes of gold.
(2078) "Where haddestow his coupes of gold.
4.5.8.2 duke of great pouste
(1532) Douke & lord of gret pouste.
(1539) & douke of gret pouste;
5. ORPHANS

5.1 joy

(1427) & he teld him wip ioie & game

Havelok (LdMisc 108) 2963: Hauelok bilefte wit ioie and gamen In engelond.

For ioie he wepe wip his ain

Orfeo (Auch) 592: For ioie þai wepe wip her eþe þat hem so sounde y-comen seiþe.

5.2 main

(1323) & smot a stroke wip main;

Tristrem (Auch) 2390: Vrgan smot wip main..Tristrem smot ogayn.

(1970) & is so pouer of mi3t & main

Thrush & N. (Dgb 86) 90: Ihesu crist 3af mi3t and main And strengþe for to fi3tte.

5.3 maker

(2209) (185) bus him þou3t al bo þre ni3t

WPaL (KC 13) 669: Bus William þou3t witterly, and wi3tly wip þat ilk..he wend to have lau3t þat ladi loveli in armes.

(625) "Ac," sche seyd, "bi him þat ous wur3t,

St.Greg. (Auch) 163/951: Herkenep aBe þat hep hendi [Cleo: hendy]

Ofpe pape þat dyed pan.!

In al pe londe were noon so bolde,

Havelok (LdMisc 108) 64: He was engelondes blome; Was non so bold lond to rome, þat durste upon his [menie] bringhe Hunger, ne here wicke þinghe.

5.4 ten

(2367) Wip kni3tes ten & tue;

*St.Marg.(2) (Trin-C B.14.39) 33: From asie to auntioge, bet miles tene ant fiue..he hiede him.

(719) Brou3t hem boþe in ten & wrake,

KTars (Vrn) 35/66: Jesus þat dy3ed on þe treo, Let me neuere þat day iseo, A tiraunt for to take...Arst 3if him wan [Auch: tene] and wrake!

(1572) Pat liuep in treye & tene.

Nicod.(l) (Add 32578) 728: Be luwes 3ede by one assent..A newe bargayne 3it haue þai ment þat sulde turne þaim to trye & tene.

5.5 various

(2) Al þat ben hend herkenib to me,


In al þe londe were noon so bolde,
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a1300(a1250) Bestiary (Arun 292) 412: De sipes dat arn on se fordriuen, loð hem is ded & lef to liuen.
a1325(c1250) Gen.& Ex.(Corp-C 444) 340: So manie times ghe him scroðt, Queðer so him was lef or loðt.

(167) Hors & wepen & woribly wede.
c1330(?a1300) Tristrem (Auch) 173: He bad his kni3tes lele Com to his somoun Wip hors and wepenes fele And rered goinfaynoun.!

(176) To iustes oþer to turnament

c1330(?a1300) Arth.& M.(Auch) 2624: Per was iustes & turnamens Swiþe noble verramens.

(185) He sett hem boþe in gret office,
c1300 SLeg.Becket (LdMisc 108) 244: Pis holi Man was itomed .. To a gret office [Corp-C: offis] of þe world.

(203) Of alle þe men þat olieue wes
c1300 Body & S.5(LdMisc 108) p.55: Þey alle þe men þat ben o lyves Weren prestes..And alle þe maidenes and þe wyves Wydewes..And miþte suweche fyve Ais is in werld of alle þinge..Ne schulde us into blisse bringe.

(219) To sir Amiloun, hende on hond,
c1275(?a1200) Lay. Brut (Clg A.9) 1227: Wel heo him biihite & hendiliche hire hond on his heued leide.
c1325 Ichot a burde in houre (Hrl 2253) 60: Þis hende hap hent in honde on huerte þat myn wes, ant hire knyhtesme han so soht, Sykyng, Sorewyng, ant Þoht.

(287) Wel fair to-gider opon a plain

c1450(?1436) Siege Calais (Rome 1306) 135: On a thursday, The Erle of Morteigne made afrray At Saint Peters on the playn.

(291) Was riþt-wise man of rede

c1300 Havelok (LdMisc 108) 180: Wis man of red, wis man of dede.!

(336) & miche solemnete.

(355) Ac of his wendeing haue þou no care,
c1330(?a1300) Tristrem (Auch) 2705: þer of haue þou no care..Y nil desiri na mare Bot at þine owen wille.

(370) Whiles þat y may gon & speke,
c1330(?a1300) Arth.& M.(Auch) 1027: No schal þer neuer no iustise þe bidelue o non wise, No in erfe þi bodi reke [Linl: forto wreke], þerwhiles y may gon and speke.

(373) (32) For bi þe treuþ þat god me sende,
c1300 SLeg.Kath.(LdMisc 108) 203: Bi þe treuþ þat i schal to Mahon, heo ne schullen so non­more!

(373) (32) For bi þe treuþ þat god me sende,
(a1393) Gower CA (Frf3) 4.11: He wol his time borwe And wissheth after, 'God me sende.'

(382) Gete me frendes whare y may,
c1450(?a1400) Siege Milan (Add 31042) 1378: Gett the a currour whare þou may.

(386) Al-mest for wreþe he wex ner wode
c1330(?a1300) Arth.& M.(Auch) 300: Þo Fortiger it vnderstode, For wreþe he wex neiþe wode; It was no wonder, forsoþe to say, For þai dede him after gret tray.

54
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(644) Wip wilde hors & wip strong
cl300 SLeg.(LdMise 108) 482/71: Wilde coltes and strongue he liet fette.

(666) tou schalt hold pat day.
a1400 Cursor (Trin-C R.3.8) 23176: He were wis pat mou3t Studfastly holde pis day in tou3t.

(715) Wher pat he sat or stode,
c1300 Body & S.(5) (LdMise 108) p.41: Gast..Were was i bi wode or wey3e, Sat or stod or dide ou3t mys pat i ne was ay under hin ey3e?

(1041) He bad hem so ich-chon,
?c1200 Orm.(Jun 1) 8124: He badd himm brinngenn ænne cnif..& he þa toc itt sone..& wolde himm selffenn mirþrenn.

(1092) Wip wretþe & michel grame.
c1330(?c1300) Guy(1) (Auch) 4345: In swiche wretþe & grame anou3, His gode swerd wip strengþe he drou3.

(1244) Wip helme & plate & brini bri3t,*
c1400(?c1390) Gawain (Nero A.10) 204: Weþer hade he no helme..ne no plate þat pented to armes.
c1330 Horn Child (Auch) 173: Eueriche strete & eueri sty Glised per þai riden by Of her brinis bri3t.

(1273) (107) þat kni3t gan howe stille so ston
(cl300) Havelok (LdMisc 108) 928: Hauelok sette him dun anon Also stille als a ston.

(1310) Wip fauchouns felle þai gun to fi3t.
c1540(?a1400) Destr.Troy (Htrn 388) 10306: Achilles..With a fauchon fene..flange at the knight, Slough him full slawthy with sleght of his hond, And hade of hede vnndur horse fete.

(1311) Wip strong strokes of michel mi3t,
c1330 Degare (Auch) 358: [He] stronge strokes on him gerd.
c1380 Firumb.(l) (Ashm 33) 842: Pe strong strok awey to bere, is bodi a-side he felde, & ferlich til him a rod a-gayn.

(1315) So hard þai hewe on helme & side,*
**c1450(c1400) Sultan Bab.(Gar 140) 1349: He raught a stroke to Ferumbras; On his helme it gan down glyde; It brast his hawberke at þat ras And carfe hym throughe-oute his syde.

(1316) purch dent of grimly woundes wide,
The Towneley plays
(cl1385) Chaucer CT.Kn.(Manly-Rickert) A.1755: They..sawe hir blody woundes wide and soore.
The Judgement
a1400(?c1300) LFMass Bk.(Roy 17.B.17) 226: He stegh til heuen with woundis wide thurgh thurgh his pouste.

(1318) Fram morwe to none, wip-outen faile,
?c1450 Recipe MS Bühler 21 in SML. Baugh (Mrg B 21) 293: [E]ufras is..A lytyl, smal gres..In metys & drynyks if he be doon, He is medecynabyl bope morwe & noon; He castyth wel to eye his syth.

(1321) (111) Sir Amiloun, as fer of flint,
c1390 I wolde witen (Vrn) 3: þis world..fareþ as a foules fliht.

(1324) Ac he failed of his dint,
c1330 Otuel (Auch) 486: He failede of his dent, & smot roulondes gode stede.
LIST OF MENTAL TEMPLATES

(1359) Pat ere was white so swan;
The Canterbury tales
a1400 SMChron.(Add 19677)  536: De ilke kyng Apelstan Hadde a soster so white so he swan.

(1491) Wib speche bitvix hem to,
a1375 WPal.(KC 13)  622: What man so ich mete wiþ or mele wiþ speche, me þinkes everich þrowe þat barn is þat oper.

(1527) As god almiþti wold;
c1330 Degare (Auch) 537: Do was he ifallen negh3; But as God Almiþti wold, De schaft brak and miþt nowt hold, And Degarre his cours out ritte, And was agramed out of his witte.

(1631) To seruen him fro fot to hond,
a1225(?a1200) Trin.Hom.(Trin-C B.14.52)  61: Gif he..us crokeo on fote ooer on honde oOer on alle ure limes binimeð us ure hele.
c1330 St.Kath.(2) (Auch) 222: He bad..bind hem fot & hende [vr. feet & hande].

(1650) ban schuld he the & briue,
a1475 Russell Blk.Nurt.(Hrl 4011)  4: An vshere y Am..pat enioyethe to enfornme & teche alle þo thatt wille thrive & thee.

(1661) "A god help!" seyd þat gentil kniþt,
a1500(a1460) Towneley Pl.(Hnt HM 1)  30/248: Bot if god help amang, I may sit downe daw To ken.

(1682) "Whilom y was man of miþt,
a1500 Det peruynkkle (MdstCKS Ul82.Z1) p.257: Man of mightt, that al hed ydyght An knowys heuery wronge, Into de blysse dow ws wysse.

(1683) To dele mete & cloþ,
a1250 Ancr.(Nero A.14)  195/31: Of drunch and of mete and of cloø..beøø large tounward ham..vor so deø þe wel bloweø.

(1702) & sore wepeand fro dore to dore,
c1300 SLeg.Fran.(1) (LdMisc 108) 116: In a þrowe From dore to dore he bad is mete.

(1735) So pat in þe ferþ 3ere
c1300 SLeg.(LdMisc 108)  177/8: De furste feste pat in þe 3ere comez we cleeoiez 3eres-dai, Ase ore louerd was circumeiset In þe giwene lay.

(1800) Bobe in winde & rain.
c1330(?a1300) Arth.& M.(Auch)  3799: Him þou3t water, winde, and rain In her teþ was hem o3ain Her palouls ouerþrewæ þe þonder.
a1400(a1325) Cursor (Vsp A.3)  23667: Pine..þat godd has giuen us for vr sin Als hat and Cald and rain and wind.

(1884) Gret diol it was to se.
c1440(a1350) Isumb.  157: The myschevous poverta that they were inne, Grete dole it was to see.
c1450(?a1400) Quatref.Love (Add 31042)  180: It was grete dole for to see, When he scholde blenke

(1943) His hende lord, þat bi him stode,
a1375 WPal.(KC 13)  1103: Pempeur..3af hem hors & armes as an hend lord schold.
c1400(?c1380) Cleanness (Nero A.10)  613: Hende Lorde, 3if ever þy mon upon molde merit disserved, Lenge a lyttel with þy lede, I lo3ly biseche! 

(2120) And thou yeildyst him al with care 
c1330(?a1300) Tristrem (Auch)  3342: Tristrem. . .Awrake him [young Tristrem] al wiþ care; þer he slou3 in fiþt Fiftene kniþtes and mare; Wel louwe he dede hem liþt Wiþ diolful dintes sare, Vnsounde.
LIST OF MENTAL TEMPLATES

(2343) bat er was heng in hale,
c1325 Byrd one brere (KC Muniments 2.W.32) 5: Hic am so blipe, so bryhit, brid on brere, quan I se pat hende in halle.

(2442) On palfray and on steed.
c1330(?a1300) Arth.& M.(Auch) 311: Pai..were al redi forp to go O3aines her foman..Sum on gode hors of priis, Sum on palfray and on stede, and sum on fot.
(c1385) Chaucer CT.Kn.(Manly-Rickert) A.2495: To the paleys rood ther many a route Of lorde vpon steedes and palfreys [vr. palfreyis].

(2464) With helmes & with haberyon,
c1380 Firumb.(1) (Ashrn 33) 675: Hur helmes & haberions pay to-rente.

(2478) Bop of lym and stoon.
?c1200 Orm.(Jun 1) 16285: Swa þe33 stodenn..To wirrken þo þe temmple, þatt dra3henn swerd wass inn an hannd, & lim & stan inn õberr.
5.6 unattested

(4) What sum-tyme fel be3ond he see
(38) In ryme y wol rekene ry3t
(48) And com of hy3e ofspryng,
(84) Ne sey bev newer 3ere.
(89) And of waxing, y3ou ply3t--
(130) & oft pai bonked be douke bat day
(136) To ride an hunting vnder riis;
(179) Wip scheld & spere to ride on stede,
(190) & sir Amiloun of hem atte
(235) Ac 3if euer it bifalle so
(202) For his loue, bat bar be croun of born
(229) & on her stedes pai gun spring
(354) &, certes, so is me.
(355) Ac of his wendeing haue hou no care,
(370) While y may gon & speke,
(377) where so he in world wende.
(386) Al-mest for wrebe he wex ner wode
(418) More ioie no mi3t be non
(492) Sche wald be loken in clay.
(558) bat time no wold sche lete.
(570) & seyd upon hir play.
(529) (45) Vp hir ros bat swete wi3t,
(879) Pat were michel wrong.
(1183) Be leuedi hou3t in hir resoun.
(1226) He priked among hem euerichon.
(1283) To hold mi treube schal y nou3t spare.
(1322) Wip wretbe anon to him he wint
(1322) Wip wretbe anon to him he wint
(1653) & boled wounds fiue.
(1799) Pai begged her mete fram tow to tow,
(1836) Yblised mot he be.
(1900) When pai were semly set on rowe,
(1941) Whiles he mi3t walk & wake.
(1976) bat euer Crist 3af cristendome
(2188) No wold pai nick him wip no nav.
(2195) A ful fair grace fel hem bo.
(2217) For fairer ner non born.
(2234) & speke of auentours, as it ware,
(2383) For me hou3t in mi sweuen
(2394) Of hem haue hou no care.
(1260) In he world, pan hou schal be !
need
(151) To hold to-gider at eweri nede.
(166) & fond hem al bat hem was nede.
(913) (77) For he hou3t bat he most nede.
(1338) bat were yfallen in nede:"
(1498) & ich hope, 3if ich hadde nede.
(1728) When hem most nede at-stade.
ride
(136) To ride an hunting vnder riis;
(179) Wip scheld & spere to ride on stede.
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Here follows an index of the mental templates. The line numbers are given in the left-hand side of each column, and the specific number(s) of the mental template(s) corresponding to any formula(e) in those lines is provided in the right-hand side.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>4.3.2.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>4.3.1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>4.4.2.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.1.1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>1.1.24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>1.1.28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>4.2.3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>3.18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.1.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>1.1.28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>4.2.3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>1.2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>4.2.3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>4.2.3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>4.2.3.5.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>4.2.3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>4.2.3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>4.3.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>4.3.1.52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>4.4.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>4.5.5.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>4.2.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (31) | 4.5.3.29.1.9|
| (32) | 4.5.3.29.1.5.2|
| (33) | 4.2.2.1|
| (33) | 4.5.7.2.5|
| (34) | 4.5.7.1.2.1|
| (35) | 4.5.3.1.2.1|
| (36) | 4.5.1.2.15|
| (36) | 4.3.1.56|
| (37) | 4.2.4.1.1.1.2|
| (38) | 5|
| (39) | 4.3.1.47.4|
| (40) | 2.3.2.2|
| (41) | 2.3.2|
| (41) | 3.7.1|
| (42) | 3.12.1|
| (42) | 4.4.2.5.1|
| (43) | 3.18.2|
| (47) | 4.5.7.1.1.1.4|
| (48) | 4.5.7.1.1.1.5.2|
| (48) | 5|
| (49) | 4.3.3.1.1.3|
| (50) | 4.3.1.4.5.1.5.1|
| (50) | 4.5.6.2.2|
| (51) | 1.5.1.1|
| (52) | 4.2.3.3.4|
| (53) | 4.3.1.4.5.2.3.1|
| (53) | 4.5.4.1.5|
| (54) | 4.2.3.2.3|
| (54) | 4.5.7.1.3.1.2|
| (55) | 4.2.3.3.4|
| (57) | 4.5.3.9|
| (58) | 4.2.3.3.4|
| (59) | 4.4.2.1.1.2|
| (59) | 5|
| (60) | 1.1.2.1|
| (61) | 2.3.8|
| (61) | 4.3.1.52.1|
| (62) | 4.4.2.1.2.9|
| (63) | 1.1.24.1|
| (64) | 4.3.1.38|
| (65) | 1.1.5|
| (65) | 1.2.6|
| (66) | 4.5.3.4.1.2|
| (68) | 4.4.1.5.2|
| (70) | 4.2.4.1.1.1|
| (71) | 2.1.4|
| (72) | 4.5.7.1.1.1.2|
| (73) | 4.2.1.2|
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(73)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(74)</td>
<td>1.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(75)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(76)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(76)</td>
<td>1.2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(77)</td>
<td>4.2.3.3.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(77)</td>
<td>4.2.4.9.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(78)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(79)</td>
<td>4.2.3.5.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(80)</td>
<td>4.2.3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(81)</td>
<td>1.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(82)</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(83)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(84)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(86)</td>
<td>1.1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(86)</td>
<td>1.6.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(87)</td>
<td>1.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(87)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(88)</td>
<td>4.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(88)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.1.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(89)</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(89)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(90)</td>
<td>3.12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(90)</td>
<td>3.12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(90)</td>
<td>4.3.1.47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(91)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.1.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(91)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(92)</td>
<td>1.2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(92)</td>
<td>1.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(92)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(94)</td>
<td>1.1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(95)</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(95)</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(95)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(95)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(97)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(97)</td>
<td>4.5.3.23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(98)</td>
<td>1.1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(98)</td>
<td>4.5.3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(99)</td>
<td>1.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(99)</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.1.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>2.2.2.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(101)</td>
<td>1.1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(101)</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(102)</td>
<td>4.5.3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(103)</td>
<td>1.1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(103)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(105)</td>
<td>4.3.6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>2.2.2.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(107)</td>
<td>4.3.1.46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(107)</td>
<td>4.3.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(108)</td>
<td>4.3.1.48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(108)</td>
<td>4.5.4.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(109)</td>
<td>4.2.4.9.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(110)</td>
<td>4.5.3.23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(110)</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(111)</td>
<td>2.1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(111)</td>
<td>4.3.1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(112)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.3.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(112)</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(112)</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(112)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(112)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>4.3.3.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(115)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(116)</td>
<td>4.4.6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(117)</td>
<td>4.3.5.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(117)</td>
<td>4.4.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(120)</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(121)</td>
<td>3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(121)</td>
<td>4.3.1.2.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(121)</td>
<td>4.5.3.23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(122)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(123)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(123)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(124)</td>
<td>1.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(124)</td>
<td>4.2.3.1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(125)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(126)</td>
<td>4.4.6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(128)</td>
<td>4.3.1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(128)</td>
<td>4.5.5.3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(130)</td>
<td>2.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(130)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(131)</td>
<td>4.3.1.46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(131)</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(132)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(132)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(133)</td>
<td>3.18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(133)</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(134)</td>
<td>1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(135)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(135)</td>
<td>4.5.3.9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>4.2.3.5.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>4.2.3.6.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>4.1.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>4.1.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>1.1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>1.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>1.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.1.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>4.4.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>1.2.24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>2.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>4.2.4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>1.1.20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>1.1.28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>1.1.31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>4.3.5.2.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>4.5.3.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>1.1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>1.6.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>4.2.3.5.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>2.3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>1.1.28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>4.4.1.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.4.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>4.3.6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>1.2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>4.3.5.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>4.4.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>4.2.3.5.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>4.5.3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>2.3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>1.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>4.1.1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>4.5.3.23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>4.1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>4.2.3.5.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>4.4.1.4.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>1.2.24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>4.4.1.4.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>1.1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.1.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>4.5.3.23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>1.2.24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>4.2.3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.1.1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>4.3.6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>1.2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>4.2.3.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>4.5.3.24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>4.5.4.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>4.2.3.3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>4.2.4.9.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>4.4.6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>4.5.1.5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>1.2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>1.1.30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>1.1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>4.5.3.27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.3.4.1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>4.3.1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEX OF MENTAL TEMPLATES AND LINE NUMBERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(198) 4.5.4.2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(199) 4.2.3.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(199) 4.5.7.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(200) 1.2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(200) 4.4.2.1.1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(202) 4.4.2.5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(202) 4.5.3.23.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(203) 1.2.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(203) 4.2.4.16.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(203) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(204) 3.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(204) 4.1.1.2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(205) 4.3.1.52.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(205) 4.2.4.8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(206) 4.4.2.1.1.3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(206) 4.4.2.1.2.11.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(206) 4.5.3.24.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(207) 4.5.3.6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(208) 1.1.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(208) 4.2.4.4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(208) 4.2.4.4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(209) 4.3.1.10.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(209) 4.3.6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(210) 1.1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(211) 1.2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(211) 4.2.3.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(212) 4.2.3.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(214) 4.5.3.27.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(214) 4.5.7.1.3.4.1.2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(214) 4.4.1.5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(215) 4.2.4.4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(215) 4.3.1.18.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(216) 4.5.7.1.1.1.1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(217) 4.5.3.26.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(218) 3.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(218) 4.3.1.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(219) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(219) 4.4.1.5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(220) 4.3.1.36.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(221) 1.1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(221) 3.4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(222) 4.4.6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(223) 4.2.3.6.1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(223) 4.5.3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(224) 3.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(224) 4.3.1.53.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(224) 4.3.1.53.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(226) 1.1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(228) 4.3.6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(229) 4.5.3.23.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(229) 4.5.7.7.2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(230) 3.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(230) 4.3.1.2.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(230) 4.5.3.27.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(230) 4.5.7.1.3.4.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(231) 3.13.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(231) 4.3.1.36.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(233) 4.3.1.4.1.4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(234) 4.4.2.1.2.2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(235) 3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(235) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(236) 1.1.28.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(236) 4.2.3.4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(237) 4.3.5.1.3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(238) 4.3.1.3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(239) 4.4.2.1.2.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(241) 4.2.3.6.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(241) 4.5.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(242) 4.3.1.53.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(242) 4.3.6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(243) 4.3.1.4.5.2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(244) 4.3.3.1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(244) 4.4.1.5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(245) 4.3.1.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(248) 3.7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(249) 4.5.1.2.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(250) 3.18.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(250) 4.3.1.4.5.2.1.3.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(251) 1.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(253) 4.2.3.3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(253) 4.2.3.3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(254) 4.3.1.46.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(254) 4.3.6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(255) 4.3.1.53.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(256) 4.5.7.2.6.2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(257) 1.1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(259) 4.3.1.53.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(259) 4.5.7.1.3.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(260) 4.2.4.7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(261) 4.3.1.36.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(261) 4.4.2.6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(262) 4.3.1.53.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(263) 4.3.4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(263) 4.4.1.5.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(264) 4.3.1.9.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(265) 4.5.3.23.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEX OF MENTAL TEMPLATES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND LINE NUMBERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(265) 4.5.7.2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(266) 3.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(266) 4.3.1.2.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(266) 4.5.3.27.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(266) 4.5.7.1.3.4.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(267) 4.3.1.36.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(267) 4.4.2.5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(269) 4.3.1.53.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(269) 4.5.3.29.1.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(270) 3.10.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(271) 4.3.1.53.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(271) 4.5.3.29.1.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(273) 4.3.1.4.5.1.4.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(273) 4.3.1.53.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(274) 4.4.2.1.2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(275) 4.3.1.53.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(276) 2.1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(276) 4.3.1.16.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(277) 4.2.3.3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(277) 4.3.6.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(278) 4.3.6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(278) 4.5.3.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(280) 4.3.2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(280) 4.3.5.1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(281) 2.3.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(281) 4.5.3.6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(282) 4.4.2.1.2.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(283) 2.2.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(285) 1.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(286) 4.2.3.3.2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(287) 4.5.1.5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(287) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(288) 4.3.1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(288) 4.4.1.4.1.3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(289) 4.2.4.9.2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(290) 4.5.3.18.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(291) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(291) 4.5.8.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(292) 4.3.1.36.1.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(292) 4.5.1.2.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(293) 4.3.1.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(294) 1.1.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(295) 2.3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(296) 1.1.28.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(297) 4.3.5.1.3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(298) 4.3.2.3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(299) 4.3.2.3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(300) 3.4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(300) 3.13.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(301) 3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(302) 4.4.1.5.3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(302) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(303) 4.3.1.35.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(305) 4.3.1.4.5.1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(305) 4.3.4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(306) 4.4.2.5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(308) 4.3.1.49.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(311) 4.5.3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(312) 3.10.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(313) 4.5.3.2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(314) 4.5.8.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(315) 4.3.1.4.5.2.1.3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(315) 4.5.7.1.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(316) 4.3.1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(318) 4.4.2.5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(319) 4.3.1.36.1.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(321) 4.4.1.5.3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(321) 4.5.5.3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(323) 4.3.1.49.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(324) 4.3.1.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(326) 4.5.7.1.3.3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(327) 1.2.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(327) 4.5.3.18.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(328) 4.5.5.3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(329) 4.3.3.1.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(329) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(330) 4.3.1.53.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(331) 4.4.2.1.2.5.3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(332) 4.3.1.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(334) 4.3.1.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(334) 4.5.3.4.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(335) 4.5.7.1.1.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(336) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(338) 4.4.2.1.2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(339) 4.1.1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(341) 4.2.4.9.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(341) 4.2.4.13.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(341) 4.3.1.16.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(341) 4.4.2.1.3.2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(342) 4.3.1.4.5.2.3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(343) 1.2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(343) 4.2.3.1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(344) 1.1.2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(345) 1.2.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(345) 4.2.4.4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(346) 4.4.2.1.2.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEX OF MENTAL TEMPLATES AND LINE NUMBERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(347) 1.1.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(347) 4.2.4.4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(348) 4.3.1.10.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(348) 4.4.2.3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(349) 2.3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(349) 4.1.2.3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(350) 3.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(351) 4.5.1.2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(352) 4.3.1.36.1.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(352) 4.5.1.2.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(353) 4.2.3.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(353) 4.3.1.53.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(354) 3.10.2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(354) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(355) 3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(355) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(356) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(356) 4.3.4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(357) 4.3.1.58.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(361) 4.3.1.18.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(361) 4.3.1.36.1.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(363) 4.3.1.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(364) 1.1.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(364) 4.3.2.3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(365) 3.13.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(366) 3.4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(366) 4.3.2.3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(367) 4.3.1.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(367) 4.3.1.36.1.4.4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(368) 4.5.3.11.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(368) 4.4.1.5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(369) 4.3.1.53.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(370) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(370) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(371) 4.3.1.9.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(371) 4.1.2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(372) 1.1.28.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(372) 1.4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(373) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(374) 1.2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(376) 4.3.1.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(376) 4.5.3.18.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(377) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(378) 4.3.2.3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(379) 4.3.4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(380) 4.3.1.4.5.1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(380) 4.3.1.9.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(381) 4.5.1.5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(382) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(383) 1.1.20.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(383) 4.1.2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(384) 4.3.1.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(385) 4.2.3.6.1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(385) 4.5.7.1.3.1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(386) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(386) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(387) 4.3.1.36.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(387) 4.4.2.5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(388) 4.3.1.45.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(388) 4.4.3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(389) 4.5.3.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(391) 3.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(391) 4.3.1.36.1.4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(393) 2.3.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(394) 3.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(394) 4.3.1.2.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(397) 4.3.3.1.1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(398) 4.4.2.4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(399) 4.5.3.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(401) 4.5.3.6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(401) 4.5.8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(402) 3.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(402) 4.2.4.4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(403) 4.4.2.1.3.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(404) 4.4.2.4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(404) 4.5.7.1.3.1.4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(405) 4.5.3.26.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(406) 2.3.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(407) 1.1.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(408) 4.3.1.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(408) 4.5.1.2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(408) 4.5.1.2.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(409) 2.3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(409) 4.2.4.1.1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(409) 4.2.4.1.3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(409) 4.4.1.2.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(409) 4.4.1.2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(410) 4.5.3.23.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(410) 4.3.1.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(411) 2.2.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(412) 4.3.1.4.4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(412) 4.5.4.2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(413) 1.1.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(413) 4.5.1.3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(414) 4.4.6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(415) 4.5.3.29.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(416) 1.1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INDEX OF MENTAL TEMPLATES AND LINE NUMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Numbers</th>
<th>Mentality Templates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(416) 1.2.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(417) 4.5.7.2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(418) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(419) 4.3.1.4.4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(420) 4.5.5.5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(421) 4.2.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(421) 4.5.3.23.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(422) 1.2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(423) 1.2.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(423) 1.5.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(424) 4.2.3.3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(424) 4.3.1.4.5.2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(425) 4.4.2.1.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(426) 4.3.5.2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(427) 1.2.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(427) 4.2.3.1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(429) 4.2.4.1.6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(430) 4.5.3.4.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(431) 4.5.7.1.1.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(432) 4.5.7.1.1.1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(433) 2.2.2.3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(434) 4.5.3.2.2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(434) 4.5.3.4.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(435) 1.2.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(436) 4.3.1.4.4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(436) 4.5.4.2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(437) 1.2.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(437) 4.5.4.2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(438) 4.4.2.1.3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(439) 4.2.3.6.1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(440) 1.1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(441) 4.3.1.4.7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(442) 4.5.7.2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(443) 4.5.7.2.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(444) 4.5.7.2.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(445) 4.2.4.9.2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(446) 4.5.5.5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(447) 4.2.4.1.2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(447) 4.4.1.2.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(448) 3.6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(448) 4.3.3.1.1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(448) 4.5.3.21.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(449) 3.1.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(450) 3.1.3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(450) 4.3.1.36.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(451) 4.5.3.6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(452) 4.3.5.2.3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(453) 4.5.7.2.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(454) 4.5.3.13.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(455) 3.1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(455) 4.4.2.1.3.4.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(456) 4.5.7.2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(457) 3.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(457) 4.3.1.2.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(457) 4.3.3.1.1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(458) 4.3.1.36.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(458) 4.3.1.36.1.2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(459) 3.9.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(460) 1.1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(460) 1.6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(461) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(461) 4.5.3.13.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(464) 4.4.2.1.1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(465) 1.1.24.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(465) 1.4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(466) 4.5.7.2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(467) 4.5.7.2.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(468) 1.1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(468) 4.3.1.1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(469) 4.5.3.4.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(470) 3.7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(470) 4.2.4.8.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(471) 1.3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(471) 4.2.4.1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(472) 4.4.1.4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(472) 4.5.3.11.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(473) 3.18.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(474) 4.3.1.26.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(475) 1.3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(475) 4.2.4.10.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(475) 4.2.4.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(476) 4.3.1.9.2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(478) 1.1.20.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(479) 4.5.3.21.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(480) 4.5.4.2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(481) 4.5.3.21.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(482) 1.1.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(483) 1.1.20.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(484) 4.2.4.1.1.3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(484) 4.3.1.4.7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(486) 4.3.1.27.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(486) 4.5.7.2.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(487) 3.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(487) 4.3.1.16.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(488) 4.3.3.1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(489) 4.3.4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INDEX OF MENTAL TEMPLATES AND LINE NUMBERS

| (490) | 4.3.1.2.3 | (526) | 4.3.1.24 |
| (490) | 4.4.2.5.5 | (527) | 1.1.11 |
| (491) | 1.2.12 | (527) | 3.5 |
| (492) | 5 | (528) | 4.3.1.53.1.2 |
| (493) | 2.3.5 | (529) | 5 |
| (493) | 4.5.3.23.1 | (530) | 4.3.1.53.8 |
| (494) | 4.4.1.4.3 | (530) | 4.4.2.1.2.6 |
| (494) | 4.5.4.2.3 | (530) | 4.5.1.2.11 |
| (495) | 4.5.7.2.9 | (531) | 1.2.13 |
| (496) | 4.4.2.5.2 | (532) | 2.2.1.1 |
| (497) | 4.3.6.5 | (534) | 4.2.2.1 |
| (497) | 4.5.7.1.4 | (534) | 4.3.5.2.3 |
| (498) | 4.3.1.11 | (535) | 1.2.11 |
| (498) | 4.3.6.4 | (535) | 4.3.1.24 |
| (499) | 3.11.1 | (537) | 4.4.2.1.2.1.2.4 |
| (499) | 3.11.3.1 | (537) | 4.5.1.3.4 |
| (500) | 4.2.4.17.1 | (538) | 3.1 |
| (500) | 4.5.5.5.2 | (538) | 4.5.6.3 |
| (501) | 4.3.5.1.4 | (538) | 4.3.1.4.5.1.6 |
| (502) | 4.4.2.5.1 | (539) | 4.3.1.4.5.2.4 |
| (504) | 4.3.3.1.5 | (541) | 4.4.2.4.2 |
| (505) | 4.2.4.17.1 | (541) | 4.5.3.21.4 |
| (508) | 3.16 | (542) | 2.1.7 |
| (510) | 4.2.3.5.2.2 | (542) | 4.4.2.1.2.6 |
| (511) | 3.15 | (543) | 4.3.1.61 |
| (511) | 4.3.1.49.3 | (544) | 4.2.4.10.2 |
| (512) | 4.4.2.1.2.6 | (545) | 4.3.3.1.5.2 |
| (513) | 4.3.6.6 | (545) | 4.4.2.1.2.1.2.1 |
| (514) | 4.3.3.1.5.2 | (547) | 1.2.1 |
| (514) | 4.4.2.1.2.1.2.1 | (547) | 4.2.3.6.2.2 |
| (515) | 2.1.7 | (548) | 4.3.1.26 |
| (515) | 4.3.1.24 | (549) | 4.2.4.10 |
| (517) | 4.2.4.1.4.2 | (550) | 4.3.1.49.2 |
| (517) | 4.3.2.4 | (552) | 4.4.1.5.4 |
| (518) | 4.5.5.1 | (553) | 4.2.3.6.1.6 |
| (519) | 4.3.1.27.2 | (553) | 4.5.7.2.2 |
| (519) | 4.5.7.2.11 | (554) | 4.2.4.7.2.2 |
| (520) | 4.3.1.16.2 | (554) | 4.2.4.10 |
| (520) | 4.5.7.1.3.1.4.2 | (555) | 4.3.1.53.5 |
| (521) | 4.2.3.5.2.1 | (556) | 4.4.1.6.2 |
| (521) | 4.2.3.5.2.2.2 | (556) | 4.5.4.1.8 |
| (522) | 4.3.6.6 | (557) | 4.3.4.8 |
| (522) | 4.5.3.21.1 | (557) | 4.5.3.9 |
| (523) | 4.3.2.1 | (558) | 5 |
| (523) | 4.3.1.36.4 | (559) | 4.5.3.11.1.1 |
| (524) | 4.4.2.1.2.6 | (560) | 4.5.3.4.2.2 |
| (525) | 2.2.1.1 | (561) | 4.3.6.8 |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(562)</th>
<th>4.1.2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(562)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(563)</td>
<td>1.2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(563)</td>
<td>4.5.3.27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(563)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.3.4.1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(564)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(564)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(565)</td>
<td>3.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(565)</td>
<td>4.5.3.21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(568)</td>
<td>4.2.3.3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(568)</td>
<td>4.5.1.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(569)</td>
<td>4.3.1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(569)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(570)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(570)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(571)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(572)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(573)</td>
<td>1.1.20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(575)</td>
<td>3.18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(575)</td>
<td>4.3.1.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(577)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(577)</td>
<td>4.5.3.11.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(578)</td>
<td>4.5.3.4.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(579)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.1.1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(580)</td>
<td>1.1.20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(581)</td>
<td>4.5.6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(582)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.1.4.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(583)</td>
<td>4.3.1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(583)</td>
<td>4.3.2.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(584)</td>
<td>4.3.1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(585)</td>
<td>4.2.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(585)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(586)</td>
<td>3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(586)</td>
<td>4.3.1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(587)</td>
<td>1.1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(588)</td>
<td>4.1.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(589)</td>
<td>4.2.4.7.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(589)</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(590)</td>
<td>4.3.1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(591)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(591)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(592)</td>
<td>4.4.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(593)</td>
<td>4.2.3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(593)</td>
<td>4.5.3.11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(593)</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(594)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(596)</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(598)</td>
<td>3.10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(598)</td>
<td>4.2.3.6.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(598)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(598)</td>
<td>4.5.1.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(600)</td>
<td>1.1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(600)</td>
<td>1.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(601)</td>
<td>4.3.4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(602)</td>
<td>4.5.4.1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(604)</td>
<td>1.1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(604)</td>
<td>4.5.5.5.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(608)</td>
<td>4.2.3.6.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(609)</td>
<td>3.18.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(609)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(610)</td>
<td>4.3.1.18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(612)</td>
<td>3.10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(613)</td>
<td>4.5.3.21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(613)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.1.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(615)</td>
<td>4.3.1.8.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(615)</td>
<td>4.4.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(616)</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(617)</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(620)</td>
<td>4.5.3.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(623)</td>
<td>4.5.8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(625)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(625)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(628)</td>
<td>4.3.4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(629)</td>
<td>4.3.1.8.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(629)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(630)</td>
<td>1.2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(631)</td>
<td>3.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(631)</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(632)</td>
<td>3.11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(633)</td>
<td>4.4.2.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(635)</td>
<td>4.5.5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(637)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(637)</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(638)</td>
<td>4.4.1.3.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(639)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(640)</td>
<td>4.3.1.23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(641)</td>
<td>4.3.3.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(642)</td>
<td>4.2.4.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(642)</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(643)</td>
<td>4.3.4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(644)</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(644)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(645)</td>
<td>3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(646)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(647)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(648)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.1.4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(649)</td>
<td>4.2.4.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(649)</td>
<td>4.3.1.49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(649)</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(651)</td>
<td>4.3.6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(652)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(652)</td>
<td>4.5.3.21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(653)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(653)</td>
<td>4.5.5.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(655)</td>
<td>1.2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(655)</td>
<td>4.2.3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(658)</td>
<td>2.2.2.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(659)</td>
<td>4.5.3.11.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(660)</td>
<td>4.3.1.23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(661)</td>
<td>4.3.1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(661)</td>
<td>4.5.3.4.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(662)</td>
<td>3.9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(662)</td>
<td>4.3.1.45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(662)</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(664)</td>
<td>4.3.1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(665)</td>
<td>4.2.3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(665)</td>
<td>4.5.3.11.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(666)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(667)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(667)</td>
<td>4.3.1.23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(668)</td>
<td>4.3.1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(668)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(668)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.10.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(669)</td>
<td>4.2.4.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(670)</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(670)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(671)</td>
<td>1.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(671)</td>
<td>4.2.3.6.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(672)</td>
<td>4.3.1.26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(673)</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(674)</td>
<td>4.3.6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(675)</td>
<td>3.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(675)</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(675)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(676)</td>
<td>4.2.3.3.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(676)</td>
<td>4.2.4.9.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(677)</td>
<td>4.4.1.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(677)</td>
<td>4.5.4.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(678)</td>
<td>4.5.5.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(679)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(680)</td>
<td>1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(681)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.1.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(682)</td>
<td>4.3.1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(682)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(682)</td>
<td>4.5.3.21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(683)</td>
<td>1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(683)</td>
<td>2.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(684)</td>
<td>3.11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(684)</td>
<td>4.3.1.48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(685)</td>
<td>4.2.4.17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(685)</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(687)</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(687)</td>
<td>4.5.3.4.1.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(688)</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(689)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(691)</td>
<td>4.2.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(694)</td>
<td>4.4.1.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(694)</td>
<td>4.5.3.11.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(695)</td>
<td>4.3.1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(696)</td>
<td>4.4.4.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(697)</td>
<td>4.4.1.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(697)</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(698)</td>
<td>4.3.1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(699)</td>
<td>4.3.3.2.9.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(699)</td>
<td>4.4.4.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(700)</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.6.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(701)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(701)</td>
<td>4.5.1.5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(702)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(703)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(704)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(705)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(706)</td>
<td>2.3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(706)</td>
<td>4.3.1.49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(707)</td>
<td>1.1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(708)</td>
<td>4.3.1.10.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(708)</td>
<td>4.4.2.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(709)</td>
<td>3.18.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(709)</td>
<td>4.5.3.21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(710)</td>
<td>1.1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(710)</td>
<td>4.3.1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(710)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(712)</td>
<td>4.2.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(712)</td>
<td>4.2.4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(713)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.1.4.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(713)</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(713)</td>
<td>4.5.4.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(714)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.1.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(714)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(714)</td>
<td>4.5.1.5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(715)</td>
<td>4.2.4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(715)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(716)</td>
<td>4.5.3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(717)</td>
<td>4.3.1.44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(718)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(719)</td>
<td>4.5.3.24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(719)</td>
<td>4.3.1.10.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(719)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(720)</td>
<td>4.5.1.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(721)</td>
<td>2.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(721)</td>
<td>4.5.3.23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(722)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(723)</td>
<td>4.4.1.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(723)</td>
<td>4.5.4.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(723)</td>
<td>4.5.4.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(724)</td>
<td>4.5.3.21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(725)</td>
<td>4.2.4.7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(725)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(727)</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(727)</td>
<td>4.5.3.24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(728)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(729)</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(730)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(730)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(731)</td>
<td>2.1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(731)</td>
<td>4.3.6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(733)</td>
<td>4.2.4.9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(733)</td>
<td>4.5.5.5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(735)</td>
<td>4.5.3.4.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(735)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(736)</td>
<td>3.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(736)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(736)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(738)</td>
<td>4.3.1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(740)</td>
<td>1.2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(740)</td>
<td>4.2.3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(741)</td>
<td>4.5.3.11.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(744)</td>
<td>4.3.1.25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(745)</td>
<td>3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(745)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(745)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(746)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(748)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(749)</td>
<td>4.5.3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(750)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(751)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(751)</td>
<td>4.3.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(751)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(754)</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(755)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(755)</td>
<td>3.10.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(755)</td>
<td>4.5.3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(756)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.1.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(756)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(756)</td>
<td>4.5.1.5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(757)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(758)</td>
<td>3.9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(762)</td>
<td>1.1.20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(763)</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(763)</td>
<td>4.3.1.49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(763)</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(764)</td>
<td>4.4.1.3.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(765)</td>
<td>4.5.3.21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(766)</td>
<td>1.1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(768)</td>
<td>4.2.4.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(768)</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(769)</td>
<td>4.2.4.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(769)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(770)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(771)</td>
<td>4.3.6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(773)</td>
<td>2.3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(773)</td>
<td>4.3.1.37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(775)</td>
<td>4.2.4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(775)</td>
<td>4.3.1.37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(775)</td>
<td>4.3.1.37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(776)</td>
<td>4.5.3.4.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(777)</td>
<td>4.5.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(778)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(778)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.3.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(779)</td>
<td>4.2.3.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(779)</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(780)</td>
<td>4.3.5.1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(781)</td>
<td>4.2.4.9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(781)</td>
<td>4.5.5.5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(782)</td>
<td>4.1.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(782)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(783)</td>
<td>4.3.5.1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(783)</td>
<td>4.3.6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(784)</td>
<td>1.1.17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(784)</td>
<td>3.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(784)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(784)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(785)</td>
<td>3.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(786)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(787)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(790)</td>
<td>3.10.2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(791)</th>
<th>1.1.27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(792)</td>
<td>4.5.3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(793)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(793)</td>
<td>4.5.3.23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(794)</td>
<td>4.3.1.18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(794)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(795)</td>
<td>4.3.1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(796)</td>
<td>3.9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(796)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(797)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(798)</td>
<td>2.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(800)</td>
<td>3.18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(801)</td>
<td>4.5.3.7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(801)</td>
<td>4.5.3.21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(802)</td>
<td>3.12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(802)</td>
<td>4.3.1.37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(806)</td>
<td>4.2.3.6.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(805)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.3.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(806)</td>
<td>4.2.3.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(806)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(807)</td>
<td>4.3.3.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(807)</td>
<td>4.4.4.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(808)</td>
<td>1.2.20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(809)</td>
<td>4.2.4.7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(809)</td>
<td>4.3.1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(811)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(811)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(812)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(816)</td>
<td>2.1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(816)</td>
<td>4.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(816)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(817)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(817)</td>
<td>4.5.4.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(818)</td>
<td>4.3.1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(819)</td>
<td>1.1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(819)</td>
<td>1.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(820)</td>
<td>4.3.1.45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(820)</td>
<td>4.4.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(821)</td>
<td>4.3.3.2.9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(821)</td>
<td>4.4.1.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(821)</td>
<td>4.5.4.1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(821)</td>
<td>4.5.5.5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(823)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(825)</td>
<td>4.5.3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(826)</td>
<td>4.3.3.2.9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(826)</td>
<td>4.5.5.5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(826)</td>
<td>4.5.5.5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(828)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(829)</td>
<td>3.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(830)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(831)</td>
<td>4.3.1.38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(831)</td>
<td>4.3.1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(832)</td>
<td>4.5.3.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(834)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(834)</td>
<td>4.3.1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(835)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(835)</td>
<td>4.4.2.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(835)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(836)</td>
<td>4.5.3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(838)</td>
<td>4.3.1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(838)</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(840)</td>
<td>1.2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(841)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(844)</td>
<td>3.10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(844)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(844)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(846)</td>
<td>4.3.1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(846)</td>
<td>4.4.2.4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(847)</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(848)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(850)</td>
<td>2.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(850)</td>
<td>2.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(850)</td>
<td>4.3.1.37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(851)</td>
<td>4.2.4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(851)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(853)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(854)</td>
<td>4.2.4.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(854)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(855)</td>
<td>3.18.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(855)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(856)</td>
<td>4.5.3.21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(857)</td>
<td>4.5.3.24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(858)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(859)</td>
<td>4.3.1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(860)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(860)</td>
<td>4.2.4.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(861)</td>
<td>3.10.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(861)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(862)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(862)</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(864)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(866)</td>
<td>2.2.2.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(867)</td>
<td>4.5.4.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(868)</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Template Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(869)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(871)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(872)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(874)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(877)</td>
<td>4.3.1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(877)</td>
<td>4.5.3.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(878)</td>
<td>3.9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(878)</td>
<td>4.3.1.45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(878)</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(879)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(881)</td>
<td>4.2.4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(884)</td>
<td>4.3.1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(885)</td>
<td>4.3.5.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(886)</td>
<td>4.5.5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(887)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(888)</td>
<td>4.3.1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(889)</td>
<td>4.5.3.27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(889)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.3.4.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(889)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.4.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(890)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(891)</td>
<td>3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(892)</td>
<td>4.3.1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(895)</td>
<td>1.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(895)</td>
<td>4.5.3.4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(896)</td>
<td>4.5.3.11.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(898)</td>
<td>3.11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(898)</td>
<td>3.11.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(898)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(900)</td>
<td>4.3.1.23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(901)</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(901)</td>
<td>4.2.4.8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(902)</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(903)</td>
<td>4.2.3.5.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(904)</td>
<td>1.1.20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(905)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.1.4.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(905)</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(905)</td>
<td>4.5.4.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(906)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(907)</td>
<td>4.2.3.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(907)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(908)</td>
<td>1.1.31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(909)</td>
<td>4.2.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(913)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(916)</td>
<td>3.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(916)</td>
<td>3.13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(917)</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(918)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(919)</td>
<td>4.2.4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(919)</td>
<td>4.3.1.49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(919)</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(922)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(922)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(922)</td>
<td>4.3.1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(923)</td>
<td>4.3.1.35.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(923)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(925)</td>
<td>2.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(925)</td>
<td>4.1.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(926)</td>
<td>4.5.3.21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(927)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(927)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.1.2.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(928)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.2.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(929)</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(930)</td>
<td>2.1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(930)</td>
<td>3.12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(930)</td>
<td>4.3.1.47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(931)</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(931)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(932)</td>
<td>4.3.1.21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(932)</td>
<td>4.3.6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(933)</td>
<td>1.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(934)</td>
<td>4.3.3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(937)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(937)</td>
<td>4.5.3.11.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(938)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(938)</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(939)</td>
<td>4.4.1.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(940)</td>
<td>1.1.31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(942)</td>
<td>3.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(942)</td>
<td>3.13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(943)</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(944)</td>
<td>3.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(944)</td>
<td>3.13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(946)</td>
<td>4.3.4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(947)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(947)</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(948)</td>
<td>3.10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(948)</td>
<td>3.10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(949)</td>
<td>2.3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(949)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(952)</td>
<td>3.9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(952)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(952)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(953)</td>
<td>4.5.4.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(954)</td>
<td>4.5.3.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(954)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INDEX OF MENTAL TEMPLATES AND LINE NUMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Number</th>
<th>Template Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(955)</td>
<td>4.3.4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(956)</td>
<td>3.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(958)</td>
<td>4.3.5.1.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(959)</td>
<td>4.3.5.1.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(960)</td>
<td>4.3.1.21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(961)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(962)</td>
<td>2.1.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(963)</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(964)</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(965)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(966)</td>
<td>1.1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(967)</td>
<td>4.2.4.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(968)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(969)</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(970)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(971)</td>
<td>4.3.1.46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(972)</td>
<td>4.3.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(973)</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(974)</td>
<td>4.3.3.2.9.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(975)</td>
<td>4.4.4.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(976)</td>
<td>4.3.1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(977)</td>
<td>1.1.20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(978)</td>
<td>4.1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(979)</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(980)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(981)</td>
<td>4.3.1.20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(982)</td>
<td>3.1.10.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(983)</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(984)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(985)</td>
<td>4.2.3.3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(986)</td>
<td>4.3.1.22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(987)</td>
<td>4.3.3.2.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(988)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(989)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(990)</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(991)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(992)</td>
<td>4.3.1.25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(993)</td>
<td>2.2.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(994)</td>
<td>4.1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(995)</td>
<td>1.1.20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(996)</td>
<td>4.5.5.5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(997)</td>
<td>4.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(998)</td>
<td>1.2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(999)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.3.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1000)</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1001)</td>
<td>4.4.2.4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1002)</td>
<td>4.3.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1003)</td>
<td>4.4.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1004)</td>
<td>4.5.1.3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1005)</td>
<td>4.4.5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1006)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1007)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1008)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1009)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1010)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1011)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1012)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1013)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1014)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1015)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1016)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1017)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1018)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1019)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1020)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1021)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1022)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1023)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1024)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1025)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1026)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1027)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1028)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1029)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1030)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1031)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1032)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1033)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1034)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1035)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1036)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1037)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1038)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1039)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1040)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1.2.1.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INDEX OF MENTAL TEMPLATES AND LINE NUMBERS

| (1040) | 4.3.1.25.2 |
| (1040) | 4.4.1.5.3.2 |
| (1041) | 3.11.2 |
| (1041) | 4.1.1.1 |
| (1041) | 5 |
| (1042) | 4.3.1.45.4 |
| (1042) | 5 |
| (1045) | 4.3.3.1.7 |
| (1045) | 4.5.1.2.10 |
| (1046) | 4.4.1.4.1.2 |
| (1047) | 4.3.3.2.6 |
| (1047) | 4.4.4.2.2 |
| (1048) | 4.3.3.1.1.2 |
| (1048) | 4.5.4.1.3 |
| (1049) | 4.5.8.4 |
| (1050) | 1.3.3 |
| (1050) | 1.4.1 |
| (1051) | 1.1.20.5 |
| (1051) | 2.2.2.2 |
| (1052) | 4.2.4.7.1 |
| (1052) | 4.2.4.13 |
| (1054) | 4.2.4.10.2 |
| (1055) | 4.4.2.1.2.1.2.3 |
| (1056) | 2.1.7 |
| (1056) | 4.3.1.53.5 |
| (1057) | 4.3.1.15 |
| (1057) | 3.6.3.1 |
| (1057) | 4.3.1.15 |
| (1058) | 4.3.2.1 |
| (1059) | 4.3.6.2 |
| (1061) | 4.5.3.11.1.1 |
| (1062) | 3.4.1 |
| (1063) | 4.5.3.18.5 |
| (1064) | 4.3.1.29 |
| (1064) | 4.4.1.4.1.3 |
| (1065) | 4.5.3.29.1.8 |
| (1066) | 4.3.1.36.1.2.2 |
| (1069) | 3.15 |
| (1069) | 4.3.1.36.1.2.2 |
| (1070) | 3.18.1 |
| (1070) | 4.3.1.4.1.4.4 |
| (1071) | 4.2.4.3.2 |
| (1071) | 4.3.1.4.5.1.1.1 |
| (1072) | 4.2.4.3.2.2 |
| (1072) | 4.3.1.4.5.1.3.2 |
| (1072) | 4.3.1.53.2 |
| (1073) | 1.1.11 |
| (1073) | 3.4.1 |
| (1075) | 3.1 |
| (1075) | 4.5.7.2.6.2.2 |
| (1076) | 1.1.9 |
| (1078) | 4.3.5.1.3.2 |
| (1079) | 3.10.1 |
| (1079) | 3.10.4 |
| (1080) | 4.3.1.4.5.1.3 |
| (1081) | 4.3.1.36.1.2.2 |
| (1083) | 4.3.1.18.2 |
| (1084) | 3.10.3 |
| (1084) | 4.3.1.36.1.3 |
| (1085) | 4.5.7.1.1.1.6 |
| (1085) | 4.3.1.4.5.1.2 |
| (1089) | 4.5.1.3.2 |
| (1089) | 4.5.1.3.3 |
| (1090) | 4.3.3.1.7 |
| (1090) | 4.3.3.1.8 |
| (1090) | 4.2.3.2.4 |
| (1091) | 4.2.3.2.4 |
| (1092) | 4.4.2.4.4 |
| (1092) | 5 |
| (1093) | 3.4.2 |
| (1093) | 3.7.1 |
| (1095) | 4.3.5.1.2 |
| (1096) | 4.4.2.1.1.1.2 |
| (1096) | 4.2.3.2.4 |
| (1097) | 4.3.1.35.1 |
| (1097) | 4.3.3.4.1.1.2 |
| (1097) | 4.5.3.29.1.6 |
| (1098) | 3.5 |
| (1099) | 4.4.2.5.4 |
| (1099) | 4.2.3.2.4 |
| (1101) | 4.5.1.3.4 |
| (1101) | 4.5.3.17 |
| (1103) | 3.10.1 |
| (1103) | 3.10.4 |
| (1104) | 3.3.1 |
| (1104) | 4.3.1.4.5.2.5.2. |
| (1105) | 4.2.4.8.3 |
| (1106) | 4.5.3.8 |
| (1108) | 4.5.3.27.1 |
| (1108) | 4.5.7.1.3.4.1.1 |
| (1109) | 4.3.1.45.3 |
| (1109) | 4.4.3.1 |
| (1109) | 4.3.1.45.1 |
| (1109) | 4.4.3.2 |
| (1110) | 4.3.1.45.1 |
| (1110) | 4.4.3.2 |
| (1113) | 4.3.1.49.4 |
## INDEX OF MENTAL TEMPLATES
### AND LINE NUMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Number</th>
<th>Mental Template</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>4.3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(115)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(115)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(117)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(117)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(117)</td>
<td>4.5.4.1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(118)</td>
<td>4.3.3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(120)</td>
<td>3.13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(121)</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(122)</td>
<td>4.2.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(123)</td>
<td>3.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(123)</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(123)</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(124)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(124)</td>
<td>4.5.4.1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(125)</td>
<td>4.2.3.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(125)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(126)</td>
<td>3.9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(126)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(129)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(129)</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(130)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(130)</td>
<td>4.5.3.4.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(131)</td>
<td>4.3.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(132)</td>
<td>4.2.3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(132)</td>
<td>4.5.3.11.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(133)</td>
<td>2.1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(133)</td>
<td>4.3.1.27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(134)</td>
<td>4.2.4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(134)</td>
<td>4.3.1.16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(135)</td>
<td>3.18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(135)</td>
<td>4.3.1.38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(136)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(136)</td>
<td>4.5.3.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(136)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(137)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(137)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.1.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(140)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(141)</td>
<td>3.7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(141)</td>
<td>4.2.4.8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(142)</td>
<td>4.5.3.11.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(143)</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(144)</td>
<td>3.6.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(144)</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(145)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1145)</td>
<td>4.5.3.4.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1146)</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1146)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1147)</td>
<td>4.3.1.38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1148)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1149)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1151)</td>
<td>3.18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1151)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1152)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.1.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1152)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1153)</td>
<td>4.2.3.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1153)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1154)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1155)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1155)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1156)</td>
<td>1.2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1157)</td>
<td>4.2.3.5.2.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1157)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1157)</td>
<td>4.5.4.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1159)</td>
<td>2.3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1159)</td>
<td>4.2.3.3.5.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1159)</td>
<td>4.2.4.9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1160)</td>
<td>4.5.3.4.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1161)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1162)</td>
<td>4.2.3.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1164)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1165)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1166)</td>
<td>4.4.1.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1166)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.3.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1167)</td>
<td>4.3.1.49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1168)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1170)</td>
<td>4.3.1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1171)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1175)</td>
<td>4.3.3.2.9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1175)</td>
<td>4.5.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1176)</td>
<td>4.4.1.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1176)</td>
<td>4.5.4.1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1177)</td>
<td>3.18.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1177)</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1178)</td>
<td>2.2.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1179)</td>
<td>1.1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1179)</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1180)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1181)</td>
<td>4.5.3.4.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1182)</td>
<td>4.3.1.27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1183)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1184)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1185)</td>
<td>2.1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1186)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INDEX OF MENTAL TEMPLATES AND LINE NUMBERS

| (1189) | 4.3.2.4  |
| (1189) | 4.3.2.3.2 |
| (1190) | 4.3.1.9.10.2 |
| (1190) | 4.2.3.2.4 |
| (1191) | 4.3.3.2.9.2.3 |
| (1191) | 4.4.4.2.1 |
| (1192) | 1.1.20.1 |
| (1192) | 4.3.1.34 |
| (1193) | 1.2.26 |
| (1193) | 4.5.3.1.1.1 |
| (1194) | 4.2.1.3.2.4 |
| (1194) | 4.5.1.2.18 |
| (1195) | 2.2.3 |
| (1195) | 4.4.2.5.4 |
| (1198) | 4.2.6.1.3 |
| (1198) | 4.3.1.46.1 |
| (1200) | 1.1.22 |
| (1201) | 4.4.1.4.1.2 |
| (1202) | 1.1.21 |
| (1202) | 4.3.5.1.1 |
| (1203) | 4.3.3.1.1.2 |
| (1205) | 3.13.1 |
| (1205) | 4.3.1.36.1.1 |
| (1207) | 4.4.2.1.3.4.2 |
| (1208) | 4.3.4.2 |
| (1209) | 1.2.26 |
| (1212) | 4.2.4.1.8 |
| (1212) | 4.5.5.4 |
| (1213) | 4.4.2.4.4 |
| (1213) | 4.4.2.4.5 |
| (1213) | 4.5.3.23.1 |
| (1214) | 4.3.1.3 |
| (1217) | 4.4.1.5.2 |
| (1218) | 2.3.10 |
| (1220) | 1.1.21 |
| (1221) | 4.4.2.4.2 |
| (1221) | 4.3.1.60 |
| (1222) | 3.11.1 |
| (1222) | 3.18.2 |
| (1222) | 4.3.1.36.1.1.2 |
| (1223) | 4.3.1.60 |
| (1224) | 4.3.1.3 |
| (1224) | 4.3.3.2.4 |
| (1225) | 4.3.1.44.2 |
| (1225) | 4.3.3.1.1.3 |
| (1226) | 3.11.1 |
| (1226) | 5 |
| (1227) | 4.3.3.1.4 |

| (1227) | 4.4.1.5.1 |
| (1228) | 1.1.17.1 |
| (1228) | 3.6.1 |
| (1228) | 4.3.1.36.1.2.6 |
| (1228) | 4.3.1.36.1.4.2 |
| (1230) | 1.2.8 |
| (1232) | 4.3.4.1 |
| (1232) | 4.3.6.8 |
| (1233) | 4.3.1.10.1.3 |
| (1233) | 4.4.2.3.2.2 |
| (1234) | 3.10.2.3 |
| (1234) | 4.2.3.1.5 |
| (1234) | 4.3.1.4.1.1 |
| (1234) | 4.5.1.4.1 |
| (1235) | 4.5.3.4.1.1 |
| (1236) | 3.18.1 |
| (1237) | 1.2.1 |
| (1237) | 4.2.3.6.1.3 |
| (1238) | 4.3.1.26 |
| (1239) | 4.3.1.4.5.1.4.1 |
| (1240) | 1.3.2 |
| (1240) | 4.2.4.1.6 |
| (1240) | 4.2.4.3.2.2 |
| (1241) | 4.4.2.1.2.4 |
| (1241) | 3.8 |
| (1242) | 4.4.2.5.3 |
| (1244) | 1.5.2 |
| (1244) | 4.5.3.3.2 |
| (1244) | 5 |
| (1245) | 4.5.1.3.4 |
| (1246) | 4.2.3.3.3 |
| (1246) | 4.4.1.4.1.2 |
| (1247) | 3.13.1 |
| (1247) | 4.2.5 |
| (1248) | 2.1.4 |
| (1248) | 4.5.4.2.4 |
| (1249) | 4.4.2.1.2.12 |
| (1249) | 4.3.1.60 |
| (1250) | 4.5.2.3.2 |
| (1253) | 4.5.2.1 |
| (1253) | 4.1.1.4 |
| (1254) | 4.1.1.4 |
| (1255) | 4.3.5.1.2 |
| (1257) | 4.5.3.26.1 |
| (1258) | 4.2.4.2.2 |
| (1258) | 4.5.3.26.2 |
| (1259) | 4.3.1.4.5.1.5.1 |
| (1259) | 4.5.3.10 |
## INDEX OF MENTAL TEMPLATES AND LINE NUMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1260)</th>
<th>4.4.2.1.2.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1260)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1261)</td>
<td>1.2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1261)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1261)</td>
<td>4.2.3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1262)</td>
<td>4.1.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1263)</td>
<td>3.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1264)</td>
<td>4.5.6.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1265)</td>
<td>1.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1265)</td>
<td>1.1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1266)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.1.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1267)</td>
<td>1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1267)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1269)</td>
<td>4.5.5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1270)</td>
<td>4.5.4.1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1272)</td>
<td>3.11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1273)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1275)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1274)</td>
<td>3.11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1274)</td>
<td>3.11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1275)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.3.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1278)</td>
<td>4.4.1.3.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1281)</td>
<td>4.3.3.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1282)</td>
<td>3.10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1282)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1282)</td>
<td>4.5.8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1283)</td>
<td>4.3.3.2.9.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1283)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1284)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1285)</td>
<td>3.18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1285)</td>
<td>4.2.3.5.2.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1285)</td>
<td>4.5.4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1286)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1287)</td>
<td>4.3.5.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1288)</td>
<td>4.5.8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1290)</td>
<td>4.4.1.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1291)</td>
<td>4.4.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1293)</td>
<td>4.3.5.1.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1294)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1295)</td>
<td>4.5.3.2.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1296)</td>
<td>3.13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1297)</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1297)</td>
<td>4.2.4.8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1298)</td>
<td>4.5.1.3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1298)</td>
<td>4.5.3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1299)</td>
<td>4.3.1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1299)</td>
<td>4.3.6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1300)</th>
<th>1.2.25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1300)</td>
<td>4.2.3.5.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1301)</td>
<td>4.3.1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1301)</td>
<td>4.3.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1302)</td>
<td>2.1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1303)</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1304)</td>
<td>4.5.3.27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1305)</td>
<td>4.4.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1307)</td>
<td>4.2.3.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1308)</td>
<td>4.3.3.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1308)</td>
<td>4.4.4.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1309)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.3.1.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1310)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1310)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1311)</td>
<td>4.2.3.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1312)</td>
<td>4.1.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1312)</td>
<td>4.5.3.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1313)</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1313)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1315)</td>
<td>1.1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1315)</td>
<td>4.1.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1315)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1316)</td>
<td>4.5.3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1316)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1318)</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1318)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1320)</td>
<td>4.2.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1320)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1320)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.3.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1321)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1322)</td>
<td>4.4.2.4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1322)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1322)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1322)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1323)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1324)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1324)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1324)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1327)</td>
<td>4.3.1.20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1327)</td>
<td>4.3.1.20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1328)</td>
<td>4.5.3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1329)</td>
<td>4.5.1.3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1330)</td>
<td>4.3.1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1330)</td>
<td>4.4.1.4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1331)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1333)</td>
<td>3.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1333)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1333)</td>
<td>4.3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1334)</td>
<td>4.3.1.22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1334)</td>
<td>4.3.3.2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| (1336) | 3.9.2 |
| (1336) | 4.2.3.1.5 |
| (1337) | 4.3.6.7 |
| (1338) | 5 |
| (1339) | 4.3.5.2.1 |
| (1339) | 4.5.1.2.6 |
| (1340) | 4.3.1.46.1 |
| (1341) | 3.13.1 |
| (1341) | 4.3.1.36.1.1 |
| (1342) | 4.3.1.22.1 |
| (1342) | 4.3.3.2.1 |
| (1343) | 3.4.1 |
| (1345) | 4.5.3.6.2 |
| (1346) | 3.6.2 |
| (1346) | 4.3.1.21.2 |
| (1347) | 1.2.26 |
| (1347) | 4.5.7.1.3.2 |
| (1348) | 3.14 |
| (1348) | 4.1.2.4.2 |
| (1348) | 4.3.1.21.2 |
| (1349) | 4.2.4.12 |
| (1350) | 4.3.3.2.9.2.3 |
| (1350) | 4.4.4.2.1 |
| (1351) | 4.3.1.42 |
| (1351) | 4.5.3.24 |
| (1354) | 4.2.4.1.4.2 |
| (1355) | 4.5.7.1.3.1.4.1 |
| (1356) | 4.2.3.3.3 |
| (1357) | 1.2.26 |
| (1357) | 4.2.3.6.1.2 |
| (1358) | 4.2.4.12 |
| (1359) | 4.2.4.2.3 |
| (1359) | 5 |
| (1360) | 1.2.20.1 |
| (1361) | 4.3.1.42 |
| (1361) | 4.5.7.1.3.1.3 |
| (1362) | 3.4.2 |
| (1362) | 4.5.3.6.2 |
| (1364) | 4.3.3.1.1.3 |
| (1366) | 4.3.1.20.1 |
| (1368) | 3.14 |
| (1368) | 4.3.1.48.1 |
| (1369) | 4.2.3.5.2.1 |
| (1369) | 4.2.3.5.2.2.2 |
| (1370) | 1.2.16 |
| (1371) | 2.1.7 |
| (1371) | 4.5.1.2.7 |

| (1373) | 4.3.1.1.7 |
| (1373) | 4.5.1.2.18 |
| (1374) | 4.3.3.2.6 |
| (1374) | 4.4.4.2.2 |
| (1375) | 4.4.2.1.2.12 |
| (1377) | 4.4.6.1 |
| (1378) | 3.6.2 |
| (1379) | 1.1.12 |
| (1379) | 4.5.1.2.9 |
| (1379) | 4.5.1.3.4 |
| (1380) | 4.5.7.2.9 |
| (1381) | 4.2.3.3.6 |
| (1381) | 4.2.4.9.2.3 |
| (1381) | 4.2.4.1.2.2.2 |
| (1382) | 4.2.3.5.2.4 |
| (1382) | 4.5.5.5.1 |
| (1384) | 3.6.1 |
| (1384) | 4.3.1.36.1.2.1 |
| (1385) | 3.11.3.1 |
| (1386) | 4.5.1.2.18 |
| (1387) | 4.5.3.21.4 |
| (1388) | 4.3.1.8.1.1 |
| (1388) | 4.5.1.2.3 |
| (1388) | 2.3.3.2 |
| (1389) | 4.5.3.15 |
| (1391) | 4.5.5.1.2 |
| (1393) | 4.5.1.2.1 |
| (1393) | 4.5.3.18.5 |
| (1394) | 4.3.1.48.2 |
| (1394) | 4.5.4.1.6 |
| (1395) | 1.2.7 |
| (1396) | 4.4.2.1.1.1 |
| (1397) | 4.1.3.2 |
| (1398) | 4.3.1.35.1 |
| (1398) | 4.5.3.29.1.6 |
| (1400) | 4.3.3.1.1.3 |
| (1401) | 1.2.1 |
| (1401) | 4.2.3.6.2.1 |
| (1401) | 4.3.1.48.1 |
| (1403) | 4.5.4.2.5.2 |
| (1405) | 2.3.1 |
| (1405) | 4.3.1.17 |
| (1406) | 4.3.1.36.1.1 |
| (1407) | 4.4.2.1.2.5.3 |
| (1408) | 1.2.14 |
| (1409) | 4.2.3.5.2.1 |
| (1409) | 4.5.3.28 |
# INDEX OF MENTAL TEMPLATES AND LINE NUMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1410</td>
<td>2.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1411</td>
<td>2.1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1412</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1413</td>
<td>4.3.1.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1414</td>
<td>4.3.1.22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1415</td>
<td>3.6.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1416</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1417</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1418</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1419</td>
<td>1.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420</td>
<td>1.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1421</td>
<td>4.5.3.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1422</td>
<td>4.3.1.44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1423</td>
<td>4.2.4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1424</td>
<td>2.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1425</td>
<td>4.5.1.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1426</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1427</td>
<td>4.2.3.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1428</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1429</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1430</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1431</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1432</td>
<td>4.2.3.5.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1433</td>
<td>4.2.4.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1434</td>
<td>1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1435</td>
<td>4.2.3.6.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1436</td>
<td>4.3.1.48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1437</td>
<td>4.5.4.2.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1438</td>
<td>2.3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1439</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.1.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1440</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.1.3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1441</td>
<td>4.2.3.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1442</td>
<td>4.1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1443</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1444</td>
<td>1.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1445</td>
<td>4.3.1.5.1.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1446</td>
<td>4.3.1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1447</td>
<td>4.1.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1448</td>
<td>3.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1449</td>
<td>3.13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1450</td>
<td>1.1.31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1451</td>
<td>4.3.5.1.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1452</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1453</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1454</td>
<td>2.3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1455</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1456</td>
<td>4.5.3.1.3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1457</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1458</td>
<td>2.3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1459</td>
<td>4.2.3.3.5.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1460</td>
<td>4.2.4.9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1461</td>
<td>4.5.3.4.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1462</td>
<td>4.3.1.27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1463</td>
<td>4.3.1.1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1464</td>
<td>4.4.1.3.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1465</td>
<td>1.1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1466</td>
<td>4.3.1.31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1467</td>
<td>4.3.3.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1468</td>
<td>4.4.4.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1469</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1470</td>
<td>4.1.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1471</td>
<td>2.2.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1472</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1473</td>
<td>1.1.28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1474</td>
<td>4.3.1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475</td>
<td>4.5.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1476</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1477</td>
<td>4.3.1.49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1478</td>
<td>3.7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1479</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1480</td>
<td>4.3.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1481</td>
<td>3.12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1482</td>
<td>4.3.1.47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1483</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1484</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1486</td>
<td>4.4.3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1487</td>
<td>4.3.1.47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1489</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1490</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1491</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1492</td>
<td>4.2.3.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1493</td>
<td>1.1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1494</td>
<td>4.4.2.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1496</td>
<td>4.2.3.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1497</td>
<td>2.1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1498</td>
<td>4.3.1.27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1499</td>
<td>4.2.3.5.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>3.7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INDEX OF MENTAL TEMPLATES AND LINE NUMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.12</td>
<td>(1521)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.26</td>
<td>(1522)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.2.1.1.3</td>
<td>(1522)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3.6.1.1</td>
<td>(1523)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.24.2</td>
<td>(1524)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1.14</td>
<td>(1524)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.3.26.1</td>
<td>(1525)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>(1526)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.1.5.2</td>
<td>(1526)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.3.12</td>
<td>(1527)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1527)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.3.23.1</td>
<td>(1528)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.1</td>
<td>(1529)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.13</td>
<td>(1531)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3.6.1.1</td>
<td>(1531)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.17.2</td>
<td>(1532)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.7.1.1.1.3</td>
<td>(1532)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.8.2</td>
<td>(1532)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.2.1.1.3</td>
<td>(1533)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.4.1.1.4</td>
<td>(1536)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.1.2.4</td>
<td>(1536)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3.6.1.5</td>
<td>(1537)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.7.1.1.1.4</td>
<td>(1537)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.24.1</td>
<td>(1538)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.4.2.6</td>
<td>(1538)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.17.2</td>
<td>(1538)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.7.1.1.1.3</td>
<td>(1539)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.17.2</td>
<td>(1539)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.8.2</td>
<td>(1539)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.3.2.5</td>
<td>(1540)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.3.29.3.1</td>
<td>(1540)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.23</td>
<td>(1541)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.1.2</td>
<td>(1541)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.13</td>
<td>(1542)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.4.2.3</td>
<td>(1542)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.2</td>
<td>(1543)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.3.10</td>
<td>(1544)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.6</td>
<td>(1545)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.4.1.2.2</td>
<td>(1546)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1.4.1.2.2</td>
<td>(1546)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.1.2.1.2</td>
<td>(1546)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.3.26.1</td>
<td>(1548)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.4.2.2</td>
<td>(1549)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.3.26.2</td>
<td>(1549)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1.4.1.4.2</td>
<td>(1551)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1.4.1.4.3</td>
<td>(1551)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3.1.1</td>
<td>(1552)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The table entries correspond to specific mental templates and line numbers as indicated in the index.*
INDEX OF MENTAL TEMPLATES
AND LINE NUMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
<th>LINE NUMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1553)</td>
<td>4.5.4.1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1554)</td>
<td>4.5.5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1555)</td>
<td>3.12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1555)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1556)</td>
<td>1.1.20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1557)</td>
<td>3.11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1558)</td>
<td>4.2.3.3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1558)</td>
<td>4.2.4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1558)</td>
<td>4.5.3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1561)</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1562)</td>
<td>4.3.1.9.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1562)</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1563)</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1563)</td>
<td>4.5.3.27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1563)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.3.4.1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1564)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1567)</td>
<td>3.9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1570)</td>
<td>4.3.1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1571)</td>
<td>4.3.1.49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1572)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1573)</td>
<td>3.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1573)</td>
<td>4.5.3.11.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1574)</td>
<td>1.2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1576)</td>
<td>1.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1576)</td>
<td>4.5.3.4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1577)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1579)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1579)</td>
<td>2.3.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1581)</td>
<td>3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1583)</td>
<td>4.3.1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1584)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1584)</td>
<td>4.5.1.5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1585)</td>
<td>4.2.4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1586)</td>
<td>4.3.1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1586)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1587)</td>
<td>1.1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1588)</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1588)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1588)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1589)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1589)</td>
<td>4.3.1.49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1590)</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1591)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1593)</td>
<td>4.5.6.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1594)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1594)</td>
<td>4.5.4.1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1595)</td>
<td>4.3.1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1596)</td>
<td>3.9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
<th>LINE NUMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1596)</td>
<td>4.5.5.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1597)</td>
<td>2.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1597)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1598)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1599)</td>
<td>3.12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1599)</td>
<td>3.12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1599)</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.1.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1599)</td>
<td>4.3.1.47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1600)</td>
<td>4.3.1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1600)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1601)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1603)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1603)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1606)</td>
<td>4.3.1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1607)</td>
<td>2.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1608)</td>
<td>3.9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1608)</td>
<td>4.4.2.6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1609)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1610)</td>
<td>3.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1611)</td>
<td>4.4.4.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1612)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1613)</td>
<td>4.1.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1615)</td>
<td>4.2.3.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1618)</td>
<td>4.2.3.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1619)</td>
<td>4.3.1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1619)</td>
<td>4.5.8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1620)</td>
<td>4.3.1.48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1620)</td>
<td>4.5.4.1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1621)</td>
<td>4.2.3.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1621)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1622)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1624)</td>
<td>3.7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1624)</td>
<td>4.5.3.11.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1625)</td>
<td>4.1.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1626)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1627)</td>
<td>1.2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1628)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1628)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1629)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1630)</td>
<td>3.18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1631)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1632)</td>
<td>4.2.4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1633)</td>
<td>1.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1633)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.3.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1634)</td>
<td>4.1.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1635)</td>
<td>4.5.1.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1635)</td>
<td>4.5.3.11.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1635)</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INDEX OF MENTAL TEMPLATES AND LINE NUMBERS

| (1636) | 4.2.3.3.4 |
| (1638) | 1.5.1.1 |
| (1638) | 4.5.3.18.2 |
| (1639) | 2.1.5 |
| (1640) | 2.1.1 |
| (1641) | 4.5.5.2 |
| (1642) | 1.1.32 |
| (1643) | 3.5 |
| (1644) | 4.5.7.1.3.1.1 |
| (1645) | 4.2.4.1.1.1 |
| (1646) | 2.1.2 |
| (1646) | 4.4.2.1.2.5.2 |
| (1647) | 4.3.1.44.1 |
| (1648) | 4.2.3.5.2.2 |
| (1648) | 4.3.3.1.7 |
| (1650) | 1.2.25 |
| (1650) | 5 |
| (1651) | 4.3.1.2.3 |
| (1651) | 4.5.7.1.3.1.2 |
| (1652) | 4.3.1.45.1 |
| (1652) | 4.4.3.2 |
| (1653) | 5 |
| (1654) | 4.4.1.6.2 |
| (1654) | 4.5.4.1.8 |
| (1656) | 4.2.4.16 |
| (1658) | 4.5.5.5.1.2 |
| (1660) | 3.6.1 |
| (1660) | 4.5.1.2.17.1 |
| (1661) | 3.11.1 |
| (1663) | 4.3.1.45.3 |
| (1663) | 4.4.3.1 |
| (1664) | 1.1.10 |
| (1666) | 1.1.19 |
| (1666) | 1.4.1 |
| (1667) | 4.4.4.1 |
| (1668) | 2.3.12 |
| (1669) | 4.3.1.55 |
| (1669) | 4.5.3.29.1.1 |
| (1670) | 4.3.1.53.3.1 |
| (1671) | 1.1.22 |
| (1672) | 4.3.3.1.1.3 |
| (1673) | 4.3.1.3 |
| (1674) | 4.3.1.47.1 |
| (1675) | 1.3.1 |
| (1675) | 3.15 |
| (1675) | 4.3.1.2.1.1 |
| (1676) | 3.18.1 |
| (1677) | 4.3.1.9.2.2 |
| (1678) | 4.5.7.1.1.1.6 |
| (1678) | 4.5.7.1.3.1.3.2 |
| (1679) | 4.1.2.6 |
| (1680) | 3.3.1 |
| (1681) | 4.5.3.11.1.1 |
| (1681) | 5 |
| (1682) | 5 |
| (1683) | 5 |
| (1684) | 4.5.6.1.2 |
| (1686) | 4.5.1.3.4 |
| (1687) | 4.3.1.36.1.2.5 |
| (1687) | 4.3.1.58 |
| (1689) | 3.12.2 |
| (1690) | 3.10.2.3 |
| (1690) | 3.10.4 |
| (1693) | 2.1.9 |
| (1694) | 4.5.3.11.1.1 |
| (1695) | 4.3.6.2 |
| (1696) | 4.3.1.53.8 |
| (1696) | 4.3.1.53.10 |
| (1696) | 4.5.1.2.11 |
| (1697) | 4.3.1.5.2 |
| (1699) | 1.2.23 |
| (1699) | 4.1.2.2 |
| (1700) | 4.2.4.13 |
| (1700) | 4.4.2.1.2.15 |
| (1701) | 4.5.5.5.2.2 |
| (1702) | 5 |
| (1703) | 4.3.1.5.2 |
| (1704) | 4.3.1.53.2 |
| (1704) | 4.5.1.3.4 |
| (1705) | 2.3.8 |
| (1705) | 4.3.1.52.1 |
| (1706) | 4.4.2.1.2.9 |
| (1707) | 1.1.19 |
| (1708) | 4.3.5.2.1 |
| (1708) | 4.5.1.2.6 |
| (1709) | 4.3.1.10.2.2 |
| (1710) | 4.5.4.1.5 |
| (1710) | 4.5.7.1.2.1.2 |
| (1711) | 3.15 |
| (1711) | 4.2.3.1.1 |
| (1711) | 4.5.3.13 |
| (1712) | 3.4.1 |
| (1712) | 4.2.3.1.1 |
| (1713) | 1.2.25 |
| (1713) | 4.3.1.30 |
| (1714) | 4.3.1.10.2.2 |
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<p>| (1714) | 4.5.4.1.7 |
| (1715) | 4.2.3.6.1.6 |
| (1715) | 4.5.7.2.2 |
| (1716) | 4.3.1.58 |
| (1717) | 4.5.3.13 |
| (1718) | 4.1.2.1 |
| (1719) | 4.4.1.6.2 |
| (1719) | 4.5.4.1.8 |
| (1723) | 4.4.2.1.2.10 |
| (1724) | 2.1.1 |
| (1725) | 4.5.5.2 |
| (1726) | 4.3.3.1.3.1 |
| (1727) | 1.1.19 |
| (1727) | 3.4.1 |
| (1727) | 4.3.1.5.1 |
| (1728) | 5 |
| (1729) | 4.2.4.1.2.2 |
| (1729) | 4.4.1.2.1.2 |
| (1731) | 3.4.1 |
| (1732) | 1.1.3 |
| (1733) | 4.4.2.1.2.10 |
| (1734) | 1.2.26 |
| (1735) | 5 |
| (1738) | 1.2.25 |
| (1738) | 1.4.1 |
| (1738) | 4.3.1.4.4.3 |
| (1739) | 1.1.19 |
| (1740) | 3.1.5 |
| (1740) | 4.5.1.5.4 |
| (1741) | 4.3.3.1.3.1 |
| (1742) | 1.1.19 |
| (1742) | 3.1 |
| (1743) | 1.1.32 |
| (1743) | 1.4.1 |
| (1744) | 4.2.3.3.2.2 |
| (1744) | 4.5.1.3.1 |
| (1745) | 4.3.1.31 |
| (1745) | 4.3.3.1.6 |
| (1746) | 4.3.1.4.1.4.1 |
| (1746) | 4.3.1.4.5.2.3.2 |
| (1746) | 4.5.1.5.7 |
| (1747) | 3.12.4 |
| (1747) | 4.3.1.36.2 |
| (1748) | 4.4.2.1.2.5 |
| (1748) | 4.4.2.1.2.9 |
| (1750) | 1.1.20.2 |
| (1751) | 1.1.23 |
| (1752) | 4.5.1.5.1 |
| (1753) | 2.3.1 |
| (1754) | 4.3.1.3.1 |
| (1754) | 4.3.3.1.6 |
| (1754) | 4.5.3.18.5 |
| (1755) | 2.1.7 |
| (1755) | 4.3.1.36.1.1.1 |
| (1756) | 4.3.1.36.1.2.5 |
| (1757) | 3.6.1 |
| (1757) | 3.6.3.2 |
| (1757) | 4.4.1.5.1 |
| (1758) | 4.5.1.6 |
| (1759) | 4.4.3.2 |
| (1760) | 4.3.1.38.2 |
| (1760) | 4.5.4.1.7 |
| (1761) | 4.5.2.2 |
| (1762) | 4.3.3.2.8 |
| (1762) | 4.4.2.1.3.4.2 |
| (1763) | 1.1.23 |
| (1763) | 4.3.1.5.1 |
| (1764) | 4.3.3.2.5 |
| (1765) | 4.4.2.1.3.2.2 |
| (1766) | 1.2.26 |
| (1767) | 3.6.1 |
| (1767) | 4.5.1.5.5 |
| (1768) | 3.16 |
| (1768) | 4.3.1.36.1.2.4 |
| (1771) | 4.5.7.1.3.1.2 |
| (1772) | 4.3.1.38.2 |
| (1772) | 4.5.4.1.7 |
| (1773) | 4.5.2.2 |
| (1774) | 4.3.3.2.8 |
| (1774) | 4.4.2.1.3.4.2 |
| (1775) | 4.1.2.6 |
| (1776) | 4.4.6.3 |
| (1777) | 4.5.1.2.4 |
| (1780) | 4.3.1.16.1 |
| (1781) | 3.10.5 |
| (1781) | 4.3.3.1.2.1.2 |
| (1783) | 1.2.1 |
| (1783) | 4.2.3.6.1.3 |
| (1784) | 3.8 |
| (1785) | 3.15 |
| (1785) | 4.3.1.36.1.1 |
| (1785) | 4.4.2.4.4 |
| (1786) | 4.3.3.2.8 |
| (1786) | 4.4.2.1.3.4.2 |
| (1787) | 4.1.1.5 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Number</th>
<th>Mental Template and Line Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1788)</td>
<td>4.3.1.23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1789)</td>
<td>4.3.3.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1790)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1791)</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1792)</td>
<td>2.3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1793)</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1794)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1794)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1795)</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1796)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1796)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1797)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1798)</td>
<td>1.2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1798)</td>
<td>4.5.4.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1799)</td>
<td>4.3.1.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1799)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1800)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1801)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1801)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1802)</td>
<td>1.2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1803)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1804)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1806)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1806)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1806)</td>
<td>4.5.1.5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1807)</td>
<td>2.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1807)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1810)</td>
<td>4.5.8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1811)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1811)</td>
<td>3.10.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1812)</td>
<td>4.4.6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1813)</td>
<td>1.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1814)</td>
<td>1.1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1814)</td>
<td>1.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1815)</td>
<td>2.3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1816)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1817)</td>
<td>4.2.3.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1817)</td>
<td>4.3.1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1818)</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1819)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1820)</td>
<td>3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1822)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1823)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1826)</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1828)</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1829)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1830)</td>
<td>1.2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1830)</td>
<td>1.5.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1832)</td>
<td>4.3.1.1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1833)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1834)</td>
<td>4.5.3.26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1836)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1837)</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1839)</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1840)</td>
<td>1.2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1841)</td>
<td>3.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1841)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.5.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1842)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1843)</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1844)</td>
<td>4.5.1.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1846)</td>
<td>1.2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1846)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1846)</td>
<td>4.5.3.11.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1846)</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1847)</td>
<td>4.3.1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1847)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1848 )</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1849)</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1850)</td>
<td>1.1.20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1850)</td>
<td>4.3.1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1852)</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1852)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1853)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1854)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1856)</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1857)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1859)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1861)</td>
<td>1.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1862)</td>
<td>1.2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1862)</td>
<td>4.5.4.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1863)</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1863)</td>
<td>4.3.1.52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1864)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1865)</td>
<td>4.5.3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1866)</td>
<td>1.1.17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1866)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1867)</td>
<td>2.3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1867)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1868)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1868)</td>
<td>4.5.1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1870)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1872)</td>
<td>4.4.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1873)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1873)</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1873)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1873)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INDEX OF MENTAL TEMPLATES AND LINE NUMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Line Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>4.4.3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>4.5.5.5.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1.2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>4.2.3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>4.3.1.2.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>4.3.1.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>4.5.3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>4.5.3.14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>2.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>4.1.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>2.2.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1.1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>4.5.3.23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1.1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>4.4.2.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>4.2.4.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>4.5.3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>1.1.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>1.1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>4.2.3.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>4.5.3.23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>4.5.8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>1.1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1.2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>4.4.6.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>4.5.3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>4.3.1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>4.4.1.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>4.2.3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>4.2.4.3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>4.2.3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>4.4.1.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>3.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>4.5.3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>4.1.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>4.3.1.52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>4.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>4.2.3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>4.5.3.11.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>4.5.3.11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>4.4.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>3.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>4.1.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>4.5.3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>4.3.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>3.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>4.5.3.23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>4.5.5.5.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>4.3.1.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>4.3.1.45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>4.4.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1.3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>4.2.4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>4.3.6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>4.4.1.6.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>4.5.4.1.8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>4.4.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>4.5.3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.1.1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Template/Line Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>4.5.3.23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>4.4.2.6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>4.2.4.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>3.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>3.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>4.5.3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1.2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1.2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>4.5.6.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>3.12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>4.5.3.11.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>4.2.4.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>3.18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>4.2.4.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>4.5.5.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>4.5.3.23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.3.1.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>4.4.6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1.1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>4.4.1.6.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>4.5.4.1.8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>4.3.1.2.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>4.4.2.6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>4.5.3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>4.3.5.1.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1.2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3.13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1.2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>4.2.3.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>4.3.1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4.3.1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4.5.3.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4.5.8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>4.3.1.3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>1.2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>1.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.13.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.1.3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.1.3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>4.3.1.2.10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.2.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.2.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039</td>
<td>2.3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.1.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2041</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.1.3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2042</td>
<td>4.3.1.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2043</td>
<td>4.5.3.23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2044</td>
<td>1.1.20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2045</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.2.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2046</td>
<td>4.4.2.6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2047</td>
<td>3.9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2050)</th>
<th>4.4.2.1.2.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2051)</td>
<td>4.5.6.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2053)</td>
<td>3.10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2053)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2055)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2054)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2055)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.1.3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2055)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.1.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2055)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2056)</td>
<td>3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2057)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2058)</td>
<td>4.3.1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2059)</td>
<td>1.1.27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2059)</td>
<td>4.3.4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2059)</td>
<td>4.4.2.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2060)</td>
<td>4.5.3.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2060)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2061)</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2063)</td>
<td>2.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2064)</td>
<td>3.9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2064)</td>
<td>4.5.5.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2065)</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2067)</td>
<td>4.4.2.4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2068)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2069)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2071)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2072)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2074)</td>
<td>4.2.3.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2075)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2075)</td>
<td>4.5.4.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2076)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2076)</td>
<td>4.5.3.14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2077)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2078)</td>
<td>4.5.8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2079)</td>
<td>4.2.3.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2080)</td>
<td>4.4.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2081)</td>
<td>4.5.3.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2081)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2082)</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2083)</td>
<td>3.10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2083)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.2.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2084)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2086)</td>
<td>3.10.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2087)</td>
<td>4.3.1.8.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2089)</td>
<td>4.2.3.6.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2089)</td>
<td>4.5.1.3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2089)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.3.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2090)</td>
<td>4.4.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2093)</td>
<td>4.2.3.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2096)</td>
<td>4.4.4.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2097)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2097)</td>
<td>4.4.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2098)</td>
<td>4.4.5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2098)</td>
<td>1.1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2099)</td>
<td>4.3.1.37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2099)</td>
<td>4.4.2.4.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2099)</td>
<td>4.2.3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2099)</td>
<td>1.2.12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2099)</td>
<td>4.4.1.3.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2100)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2100)</td>
<td>4.5.3.11.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2101)</td>
<td>4.5.1.5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2101)</td>
<td>4.5.3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2101)</td>
<td>4.2.4.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2102)</td>
<td>4.3.1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2102)</td>
<td>4.5.3.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2102)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2102)</td>
<td>4.5.3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2103)</td>
<td>1.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2103)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2103)</td>
<td>4.5.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2104)</td>
<td>4.3.1.10.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2104)</td>
<td>4.4.2.3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2104)</td>
<td>4.4.2.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2105)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2105)</td>
<td>4.3.1.9.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2105)</td>
<td>4.3.5.1.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2105)</td>
<td>4.3.1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2106)</td>
<td>3.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2106)</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2107)</td>
<td>4.4.1.3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2107)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2107)</td>
<td>3.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2108)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2108)</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2109)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2109)</td>
<td>4.5.3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2109)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2110)</td>
<td>4.3.1.20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2110)</td>
<td>3.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2110)</td>
<td>4.5.3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2110)</td>
<td>2.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2111)</td>
<td>4.2.4.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2112)</td>
<td>3.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2113)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.1.4.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2113)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2114)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.1.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2138) 4.5.3.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2141) 1.1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2142) 4.3.1.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2143) 4.3.1.36.1.2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2143) 4.4.2.6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2146) 3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2147) 4.5.4.2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2148) 4.4.1.3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2148) 4.5.7.1.3.3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2148) 4.5.7.1.3.3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2149) 1.2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2149) 4.2.3.6.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2150) 4.5.7.1.3.3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2150) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2151) 3.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2152) 4.4.1.3.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2152) 4.5.3.29.1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2153) 4.2.4.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2153) 4.3.1.16.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2153) 4.4.2.1.2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2155) 4.4.2.1.2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2156) 4.3.1.49.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2158) 4.3.1.36.1.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2159) 4.4.2.1.2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2160) 4.4.3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2161) 3.9.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2161) 4.3.1.36.1.2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2162) 4.3.1.4.1.4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2162) 4.3.1.4.1.4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2164) 4.4.2.1.3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2167) 4.5.3.2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2167) 4.5.3.29.3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2168) 1.1.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2168) 4.3.1.4.5.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2169) 4.2.4.2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2169) 4.3.5.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2170) 4.3.1.20.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2171) 1.3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2171) 3.3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2171) 4.3.1.36.1.1.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2171) 4.5.3.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2172) 4.3.1.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2173) 4.5.6.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2175) 4.3.3.2.9.2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2175) 4.4.4.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2176) 3.3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2177) 4.2.4.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2177) 4.5.3.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2178) 1.1.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2179) 4.3.3.1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2179) 4.4.2.1.2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2180) 4.5.4.1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2181) 4.3.1.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2181) 4.5.3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2183) 4.5.7.1.3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2184) 4.5.1.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2185) 4.2.4.1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2185) 4.4.1.2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2186) 4.4.2.1.2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2187) 4.5.1.2.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2187) 1.2.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2188) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2189) 1.1.20.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2191) 1.1.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2192) 4.4.2.5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2193) 4.5.1.3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2194) 4.2.4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2195) 3.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2195) 4.5.1.2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2195) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2196) 4.2.4.1.2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2196) 4.4.1.2.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2197) 2.3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2197) 4.1.2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2198) 4.5.3.11.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2200) 4.5.2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2200) 4.5.3.3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2201) 4.5.1.2.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2202) 4.3.3.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2202) 4.3.3.1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2203) 4.3.4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2204) 2.1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2204) 4.3.1.4.5.1.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2204) 4.3.1.4.5.1.3.2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2205) 4.5.3.29.1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2207) 4.3.1.4.5.1.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2207) 4.4.6.2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2209) 2.2.2.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2209) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2210) 4.5.2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2210) 4.5.3.3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2212) 4.3.4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2213) 4.5.6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2215) 3.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2215) 4.5.1.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2216) 3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEX OF MENTAL TEMPLATES AND LINE NUMBERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2216)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2217)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2218)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2219)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2220)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.3.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2220)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.3.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2221)</td>
<td>2.1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2221)</td>
<td>3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2222)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2222)</td>
<td>4.1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2223)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2223)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2225)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2226)</td>
<td>4.3.1.10.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2226)</td>
<td>4.4.2.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2227)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2227)</td>
<td>2.1.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2228)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2228)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2229)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2230)</td>
<td>3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2230)</td>
<td>4.3.1.2.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2230)</td>
<td>4.3.1.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2230)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2231)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2233)</td>
<td>3.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2234)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2235)</td>
<td>1.2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2235)</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2236)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2236)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2237)</td>
<td>4.3.3.2.9.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2238)</td>
<td>4.4.2.6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2240)</td>
<td>4.5.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2241)</td>
<td>3.12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2241)</td>
<td>3.12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2241)</td>
<td>4.3.1.47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2243)</td>
<td>4.4.2.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2244)</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2245)</td>
<td>4.2.4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2245)</td>
<td>4.3.1.49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2245)</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2246)</td>
<td>4.3.6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2248)</td>
<td>4.2.4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2248)</td>
<td>4.3.1.49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2248)</td>
<td>4.5.5.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2249)</td>
<td>4.3.1.10.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2249)</td>
<td>4.4.2.3.2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| (2250) | 4.3.3.2.9.1 |
| (2251) | 2.3.6 |
| (2251) | 4.1.2.3 |
| (2252) | 4.5.7.2.6.1 |
| (2252) | 2.1.8 |
| (2252) | 4.3.1.4.5.1.1.2 |
| (2252) | 4.3.1.4.5.1.3.2.3 |
| (2253) | 4.3.1.35.2 |
| (2253) | 2.1.8 |
| (2253) | 4.3.1.4.5.1.1.2 |
| (2253) | 4.3.1.4.5.1.3.2.3 |
| (2254) | 4.2.3.5.2.2 |
| (2254) | 4.3.1.53.9 |
| (2255) | 4.4.2.5.1 |
| (2256) | 1.1.13 |
| (2256) | 4.5.5.5.4.2 |
| (2257) | 4.2.3.5.2.3 |
| (2257) | 4.3.6.1 |
| (2258) | 4.2.3.5.2.2.1 |
| (2259) | 4.3.1.53.9 |
| (2260) | 1.2.16 |
| (2261) | 4.4.2.1.3.1.3 |
| (2263) | 2.1.6 |
| (2263) | 4.3.1.36.1.1 |
| (2264) | 4.5.3.11.1.1 |
| (2265) | 1.2.9 |
| (2265) | 4.3.1.4.3.1.1 |
| (2266) | 4.2.3.6.1.6 |
| (2267) | 4.3.1.53.9 |
| (2267) | 4.3.1.53.10 |
| (2268) | 4.5.3.18.4 |
| (2269) | 4.3.3.1.10.1 |
| (2269) | 4.5.1.5.3 |
| (2271) | 4.2.4.2.1 |
| (2272) | 4.3.1.12 |
| (2273) | 4.5.1.3.4 |
| (2274) | 4.2.4.14 |
| (2275) | 4.2.3.3.2 |
| (2275) | 4.3.1.53.9 |
| (2276) | 3.1.16 |
| (2278) | 1.2.4 |
| (2279) | 4.3.1.53.8 |
| (2279) | 4.5.1.2.11 |
| (2280) | 3.1.12 |
| (2281) | 4.4.2.5.7 |
| (2282) | 4.3.3.1.3.2 |
| (2282) | 4.4.2.1.2.4 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2282)</th>
<th>4.4.2.1.3.1.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2284)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2285)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2286)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2287)</td>
<td>3.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2288)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2289)</td>
<td>4.3.1.8.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2290)</td>
<td>4.4.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2292)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.3.1.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2293)</td>
<td>4.2.4.7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2294)</td>
<td>3.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2295)</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2296)</td>
<td>1.2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2297)</td>
<td>4.5.3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2298)</td>
<td>2.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2299)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2300)</td>
<td>4.3.1.10.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2301)</td>
<td>4.4.2.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2301)</td>
<td>3.10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2301)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2301)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2301)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2301)</td>
<td>4.5.3.21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2305)</td>
<td>4.3.1.44.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2306)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.3.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2307)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2307)</td>
<td>4.3.3.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2307)</td>
<td>4.3.3.2.9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2307)</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2311)</td>
<td>4.2.4.8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2316)</td>
<td>4.3.3.1.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2316)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2316)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2317)</td>
<td>4.2.3.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2317)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2318)</td>
<td>3.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2321)</td>
<td>3.11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2321)</td>
<td>4.3.1.49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2323)</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2323)</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2323)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2324)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2324)</td>
<td>4.5.3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2325)</td>
<td>2.1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (2325) | 4.3.1.4.5.1.1.2|
| (2325) | 4.3.1.4.5.1.3.2.3|
| (2329) | 4.3.3.1.2.1     |
| (2330) | 4.5.3.29.1.5    |
| (2331) | 3.3.1          |
| (2332) | 1.3.4          |
| (2332) | 3.17           |
| (2332) | 4.3.1.36.1.1.2  |
| (2333) | 2.3.14         |
| (2334) | 1.1.4          |
| (2335) | 4.3.1.36.1.1.2  |
| (2335) | 4.3.2.2        |
| (2336) | 4.4.1.5.6.2    |
| (2337) | 4.3.1.38.3     |
| (2339) | 3.18.1         |
| (2339) | 4.3.3.2.9.2.2  |
| (2341) | 4.3.1.4.3.1.1  |
| (2341) | 4.3.1.4.3.1.2  |
| (2342) | 4.5.3.11.1.1   |
| (2343) | 4.2.4.2.3      |
| (2343) | 4.4.2.1.3.3    |
| (2343) | 5              |
| (2344) | 4.2.4.3.1      |
| (2345) | 3.7.1          |
| (2346) | 1.2.26         |
| (2346) | 4.5.7.1.3.5    |
| (2347) | 4.3.1.36.1.2.2 |
| (2347) | 4.3.2.2        |
| (2348) | 4.4.1.5.6      |
| (2349) | 4.3.1.47.5     |
| (2350) | 4.4.2.5.1      |
| (2351) | 4.5.5.3.1.2    |
| (2354) | 3.6.1          |
| (2354) | 4.3.1.53.6     |
| (2354) | 4.4.2.1.2.4.1  |
| (2355) | 4.2.4.1.4.1    |
| (2355) | 4.4.1.2.3      |
| (2357) | 4.3.1.31       |
| (2357) | 4.5.8.3        |
| (2358) | 4.5.7.1.3.1.4.1|
| (2359) | 2.1.4          |
| (2360) | 4.5.3.21.5     |
| (2361) | 1.2.15         |
| (2363) | 4.5.1.2.15     |
| (2364) | 4.3.1.23.2     |
| (2365) | 2.1.9          |
| (2366) | 4.4.2.4.1      |
| (2367) | 5              |
# INDEX OF MENTAL TEMPLATES AND LINE NUMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2368)</th>
<th>4.2.4.7.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2370)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.1.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2370)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.2.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2370)</td>
<td>4.5.1.5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2371)</td>
<td>4.2.3.5.2.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2372)</td>
<td>4.3.1.25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2373)</td>
<td>4.3.1.44.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2374)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2375)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2377)</td>
<td>3.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2377)</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2378)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2378)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2379)</td>
<td>1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2379)</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2380)</td>
<td>4.5.5.5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2382)</td>
<td>1.2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2382)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.3.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2383)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2384)</td>
<td>4.5.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2385)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2386)</td>
<td>4.4.2.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2387)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2388)</td>
<td>4.5.3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2389)</td>
<td>4.2.3.6.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2389)</td>
<td>4.5.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2390)</td>
<td>3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2390)</td>
<td>4.3.1.37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2391)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2392)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2392)</td>
<td>4.3.1.36.1.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2393)</td>
<td>4.3.1.38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2394)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2395)</td>
<td>4.3.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2396)</td>
<td>4.3.6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2397)</td>
<td>4.3.3.2.9.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2399)</td>
<td>2.1.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2401)</td>
<td>1.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2402)</td>
<td>4.5.4.1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2403)</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2403)</td>
<td>4.3.1.52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2404)</td>
<td>4.3.1.53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2404)</td>
<td>4.5.1.2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2405)</td>
<td>4.5.3.11.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2405)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2406)</td>
<td>4.2.4.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2406)</td>
<td>4.3.5.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2409)</td>
<td>4.4.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2410)</td>
<td>4.2.3.6.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2410)</td>
<td>4.5.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2411)</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2412)</td>
<td>4.2.4.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2412)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2412)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2413)</td>
<td>4.2.3.6.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2414)</td>
<td>4.3.1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2415)</td>
<td>2.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2415)</td>
<td>4.3.1.48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2416)</td>
<td>1.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2416)</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2417)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2419)</td>
<td>1.1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2419)</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2420)</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2422)</td>
<td>4.2.4.7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2423)</td>
<td>4.3.1.48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2423)</td>
<td>4.5.7.1.3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2424)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.5.1.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2427)</td>
<td>1.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2428)</td>
<td>4.5.3.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2429)</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2430)</td>
<td>4.3.1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2431)</td>
<td>2.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2432)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2433)</td>
<td>2.1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2434)</td>
<td>4.3.5.1.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2435)</td>
<td>4.3.1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2436)</td>
<td>4.3.3.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2437)</td>
<td>4.5.1.3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2438)</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2439)</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2440)</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2441)</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2441)</td>
<td>4.5.3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2442)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2443)</td>
<td>1.1.20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2444)</td>
<td>4.2.4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2444)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2445)</td>
<td>4.2.3.5.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2446)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2447)</td>
<td>4.3.1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2447)</td>
<td>4.5.3.4.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2448)</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2448)</td>
<td>4.4.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2449)</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2449)</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INDEX OF MENTAL TEMPLATES
### AND LINE NUMBERS

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2492)</td>
<td>4.5.3.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2492)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2494)</td>
<td>4.4.2.4.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2494)</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2497)</td>
<td>3.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2497)</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2497)</td>
<td>4.5.3.18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2497)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2497)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2500)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2500)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2501)</td>
<td>2.3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2502)</td>
<td>3.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2503)</td>
<td>2.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2504)</td>
<td>2.2.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2505)</td>
<td>4.5.3.29.1.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2506)</td>
<td>1.1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2506)</td>
<td>3.12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2507)</td>
<td>4.5.8.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2449)</td>
<td>4.4.1.2.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2450)</td>
<td>2.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2452)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.14.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2452)</td>
<td>4.4.2.5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2453)</td>
<td>3.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2454)</td>
<td>4.5.3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2455)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2455)</td>
<td>4.3.1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2456)</td>
<td>4.3.1.37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2457)</td>
<td>4.5.7.2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2458)</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2459)</td>
<td>4.3.1.4.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2459)</td>
<td>4.5.4.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2460)</td>
<td>1.2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2461)</td>
<td>1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2462)</td>
<td>4.5.4.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2463)</td>
<td>1.15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2464)</td>
<td>1.13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2464)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2465)</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2465)</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2466)</td>
<td>4.5.3.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2466)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2467)</td>
<td>4.2.3.5.2.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2469)</td>
<td>1.2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2470)</td>
<td>1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2470)</td>
<td>2.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2473)</td>
<td>4.2.4.8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2473)</td>
<td>4.4.2.4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2474)</td>
<td>1.2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2475)</td>
<td>4.5.5.5.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2476)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2477)</td>
<td>4.1.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2478)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2484)</td>
<td>3.11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2484)</td>
<td>4.2.4.1.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2485)</td>
<td>4.3.1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2486)</td>
<td>1.1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2486)</td>
<td>1.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2487)</td>
<td>1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2488)</td>
<td>4.2.4.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2488)</td>
<td>4.3.1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2489)</td>
<td>4.4.2.1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2489)</td>
<td>4.3.1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2490)</td>
<td>1.2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2491)</td>
<td>3.18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2491)</td>
<td>4.2.4.8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2492)</td>
<td>4.4.1.5.1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF ALLITERATIVE LINES
Some alliterative lines reminiscent of OE:
In rhyme ye wol reclame right
Per-to he dubbed Hor.
In word, in werk, in wilde, in dede,
Pat bobe bi day
To a goldsmith he gan go
Wib wretbe For bat bai were so war
For sorrow to help him at his nede,
Po bold bernes {or to abide
(Ful air he gret patfre.
For bat bi broder is went be fro,
Men blisced him, bobe bon
Pan ber was in bat worbly won,
Al-mest {or wrebe he wex ner wode
Pat treweley to telle in tale,
Of barouns & of birdes bri3t
Trewely to telle in tale,
& wende out of bat worbly won.
& seyd, "So god 3ou spede,
bat sope bi Seyn Sauour:
Be fairesst man & mest of main
Belisaunt, bat birde bri3t,
Ywis, hir lone was al ali3t,
Hir pou3t hir hert brac atvo.
For hve ni mi3t mi3t ni3t no day
As prince prout in pride.
Were went out of bat worbi won
To hunte on holtes hare,
Now, hende, herkeneb, & 3e may here
(hou pat he doukes douhter dere
Sei3e bat bird in bour so bri3t
& icham a bird in bour bri3t,
& bope bi day & bi mi3t
Til god & deh dele aus ato,
Answered, "Sir kni3t, jou nast no croun;
He pat lerd he pus to preche,
& in his hert him liked ille.
Wib wilde hors & wih strong
Wih menske & mirhe to mete.
no stint sche for no strenge:
po doukes douhter dere,
& went away, as he were wode.
"Sir," seyd he steward, "bi Seyn Jame,
Y set3e it me self, for sope.
For drede his heued to hide.
Pat pach he dore pat fauchon went,
(70) "Sir," seyd sir Amis anon.
"3a, certes, sir!" he seyd po.
"Sir, " seyd der Amis.
For he steward was so strong
M3it noman morn mare.
"For to fi3t wih bi foman.
So richeleche y schal he schrede.
Perfore icham aferd to fi3t.
"No mai per go no nober gile,
Pray him, as he is hendi kni3t
Til a-morwe men mi3t yse
Hou him pou3t he set3e bestes blake
To him he went pat tide.
& knewe anon pat gentil kni3t.
Who hap wrou3t pe his wo ?"
He wald me druen al adoun
Hou he had boden on himfi3t,
Who hath sent bi stede
Sure, certes,
worst pe his ward.
Seyd be steward, "bi Seyn Jame,
& seyd be steward, "bi Seyn Jame,
pat wih gode wil als sche wold
Sir Amis sorwed mi3t & day,
Al his ioe was went away.
For bat he steward was so strong
M3it noman morn mare.
"For to fi3t wih bi foman.
So richeleche y schal he schrede.
Perfore icham aferd to fi3t.
List of Alliterative Lines

(1341) & seyd, "So god me spede,
(1347) Wib brondes bri3t & bare;
(1350) For nobing nold ba3 spare.
(1357) (114) Pan was sir Amiloun wro3 & wode.
(1359) Pat ere was white so swan;
(1370) Litel & michel, lasse & mare,
(1380) As prince proude in pride.
(1419) Nober kni3t no swain.
(1447) Saulich com ober sende hi sond,
(1483) & hou he slou3 he steward strong,
(1506) Honoured he was, pat hende.
(1530) & grauen in grete so cold.
(1546) In gest to rede it is gret rewe,
(1550) He no wist whider he mi3t wende,
(1560) Men nist no-whar non.
(1561) So wicked & schrewed was his wiif,
(1570) Wel oft times his honden he wrong.
(1574) Pat whilom was so wise & wi3t.
(1588) His leuedi wax ful wro3 & wo
(1650) Pan schuld he the & briue.
(1671) Wib sorwe & sikeing sare.
(1691) Ous bihouejJ to bid our brede,
(1708) Pat folk was ful fre to fond
(1814) Wib sorwe & care & reweful roun
(1870) He is a man of milde mode,
(1902) As men miriest on mold.
(1935) & trewelich to him take;
(1941) Whiles he mi3t walk & wake.
(2072) & hent him in his honden tvain
(2083) "3a, certes, sir," he gan to say.
(2098) & seyd, "Pef, you schalt be slawe,
(2102) & seye his lord wip wou3 & wrong
(2122) That he halp the at thi nede.
(2125) (178) When sir Amis herd him so sain,
(2138) Vnkender blod nas neuer born.
(2149) Wepeand wib ei3en tvo.
(2159) Whi hastow him in-to halle ybrou3t,
(2188) No wold jJe nick him wip no nay,
(2190) It nas neuer bihinde;
(2195) A ful fair grace fel hem bo.
(2208) His wo schuld wende oway.
(2209) (185) Put him hous3 al h0 bre mi3t
(2260) Litel & michel, lasse & mare.
(2345) & wrei3e him wel warm, anli3t.
(2333) (197) Sir Amis let him by alon
(2360) & Mari, his moder, pat best may.
(2365) (198) Amorwe astite as it was day.
(2368) Pai sou3i he kays per bai lay.
(2419) With-out wemme and wound
(2441) And other barons by and by
(2457) As man meriest on molde.
(2467) Al bat pey bere arau3t,
(2474) Drowe oute both broun and blake.
(2485) (208) Den sir Amylion sent his sond
TEXT OF AMIS AND AMILOUN
The following text of Amis and Amiloun is taken from Leach’s edition with the addition of underlining to show formulae. Double underlining indicates that the word or words belong to more than one formula. Italicised lines show instances of three or more alliterative syllables.
TEXT OF AMIS AND AMILOUN SHOWING OCCURRENCE OF FORMULAE

(1) (1) For goddes loue in trinitye
(2) Al bat ben hend herkenip to me.
(3) I pray 3ow, par amore,
(4) What sum-tyme fel be3ond be see
(5) [Of] two barons of grete bounte
(6) And men of grete honoure;
(7) Her faders were barons hend, e.
(8) Lordinges com of grete kynde
(9) And pris men in toun and tyme;
(10) To here of be3e children two
(11) How bey were in wele and wooo
(12) Ywys it is grete doloure.

(13) (2) In weele and woo how bey gan wynd
(14) & how vnkouth bey were of kynd,
(15) be children bold of chere,
(16) And how bey were good & hend
(17) And how 3ong bey becrom frend
(18) In cort pere bey were,
(19) And how bey were made kny3t
(20) And how bey were troup ply3t,
(21) Be children bob in fere,
(22) And in what lond pere were born
(23) And what bey childrens name worn
(24) Herkenep and 3e mow here.

(25) (3) In Lumbardy, y vnderstonde,
(26) Whilom bifel in bat lond,
(27) In romance as we reede,
(28) Two barouns hend wonyd in lond
(29) And had two Jadyes free to fond,
(30) Pat worthy were in wede;
(31) Of her hend ladies two
(32) Twoo knaue childre gat pey poo
(33) Pat dou3ty were of dede,
(34) And trew weren in all bing,
(35) And perfore ihesu, heuyn-king,
(36) Ful wel quytet her mede.

(37) (4) Be children-is names, as y 3ou hy3t,

(38) In ryme y wol rekene ry3t
(39) And tel in my talkynge;
(40) Bob þey were geten in oo ny3t
(41) And on oo day born a-ply3t, 
(42) For soth with-out lesyng;
(43) Pat oon baroun son, ywys
(44) Was ycleped childe Amys
(45) At his crisitenryng;
(46) Pat oþur was clepyd Amyloun,
(47) Pat was a child of grete renoun
(48) And com of hy3e ofspryng.

(49) (5) The children gon þen bryue,
(50) Fairer were neuer noon on lyue,
(51) Curtaise, hend, and good;
(52) When þey were of 3eres fyue,

(53) Alle her kyn was of hem blyb,
(54) So mylde bey were of mood;
(55) When þey were seuen 3ere olde,
(56) Grete ioy every man of hem tolde
(57) To beholde pat frely foode;
(58) When þey were twel 3ere olde,
(59) In al be londe were noon so bolde,
(60) So faire of boon and blood.

(61) (6) In bat tym, y vnderstonde,
(62) A duk wonyd in bat lond,
(63) Prys in toun and toure;
(64) Frely he let [sende his sone],
(65) After erles, barouns, fre and bond,
(66) And ladies by3t in boure;
(67) A ryche fest he wolde make
(68) AI for Ihesu Christes sake
(69) Pat is oure sauyoure;
(70) Muche folk, as y 3ow saye,
(71) He lete after sende bat daye
(72) With myrth [and] grete honoure.

(73) (7) Thoo barouns twoo, pat y of tolde,
(74) And her sones feire and bolde
(75) To court bey come ful 3are.
(76) When bey were comyn, 3ong and oIde,
(77) Mony men gan hem byholde
(78) Of lordynge pat here were,
(79) Of body how vel bey were py3t,
(80) And how feire bey were of sy3t,
(81) Of hyde and hew and here;
(82) And al þey seide with-out lesse
(83) Fairer children þan þey wesse
(84) Ne sey bey neuer 3ere.

(85) (8) In al be court was ber no wy3t,
(86) Erl, baroun, squer, ne kny3t,
(87) Neither lef ne loothe,
(88) So lyche þey were both of sy3t
(89) And of waxing, y 3ou ply3t--
(90) I tel 3ow for soothe--
(91) In al þing þey were so lyche
(92) Per was neither pore ne rychy,
(93) Who so beheld hem both,
(94) Fader ne moder þat couþ say
(95) Ne knew þe hend children twav
(96) But by þe colour of her clob.

(97) (9) Pat riche douke his fest gan hold
(98) Wip erles & wip barouns bold,
(99) As 3e may listen & libe,
(100) Fourtenni3t, as me was told,
(101) [With meet and drynke, mervst on mold!]
(102) To glad be bernes blibe;
(103) Per was mirpe & melodye
(104) & al maner of menstracie
(105) Her craftes for to kiþe;
TEXT OF AMIS AND AMILOUN SHOWING OCCURRENCE OF FORMULAE

(106) Opon be fifteunday ful 3are
(107) pai token her leue forto fare
(108) & bonked him mani a sylpe.

(109) pan be lordinges schuld forp wende,
(110) pat riche douke comly of kende
(111) Clefted to him pat tide
(112) Bo tvay barouns, pat were so hende,
(113) & prayd hem al-so his frende
(114) In court pai schuld abide.
(115) & lete her tvay sones fre
(116) In his seruise wip him to be,
(117) Semly to fare bi his side;
(118) & he walde dube hem kni3tes to
(119) & susten hem for euer mo,
(120) As lordinges proude in pride.

(121) (11) Be riche barouns anwerd again,
(122) & her leuedis gan to saun
(123) To bat douke ful 3are
(124) Pat pai were bogo glad & fain
(125) Pat her leuely children tvain
(126) In seruise wip him ware.
(127) Pai 3aue her childer her blisceing
(128) & bisou3t ihesu, heuen king,
(129) He schuld scheld hem fro care,
(130) & oft pai bonked pe douke pe bat day
(131) & token her leue & went oway.
(132) To her owen cuntres pai gun fare.

(133) (12) Bus war bo hende childer, ywis,
(134) Child Amiloun & child Amis,
(135) In court frely to fed,
(136) To ride an hunting vnnder riis;
(137) Ouer al be lond ban were hai priis
(138) & worbiest in wede.
(139) So wele bo children loved hem bo,
(140) Nas neuer children loved hem so.
(141) Noipar in word no in dede;
(142) Bitvix hem tvai, of blod & bon,
(143) Trewer loue nas neuer non.
(144) In gest as so we rede.

(145) (13) On a day be childer war & wi3t
(146) Trewepes to-gider pai gun pli3t,
(147) While hai mi3t luie & stond
(148) Pat bogo bi day & bi ni3t,
(149) In wele & wo, in wrong & ri3t;
(150) Pat hai schuld frely fond
(151) To hold to-gider at eueri nede,
(152) In word, in werk, in wil, in dede,
(153) Where pat pai were in lond,
(154) Fro bat day forward neuer mo
(155) Failen opeer for wele no wo:
(156) ber-to pai held vp her hond.
(157) (14) Bus in gest as 3e may here,

(158) bo hende childer in cuntre were,
(159) Wib bat douke for to abide;
(160) Be douke was blibe & glad of chere,
(161) Pai were him bohe leue & dere,
(162) Semyly to fare bi his side.
(163) bo pai were fifteen winter old,
(164) He dubbed bohe bo bernes bold
(165) To kni3tes in bat tide.
(166) & fond hem al bat hem was nede.
(167) Hors & wepen & worthy wede.
(168) As princes prout in pride.

(169) (15) Pat riche douke, he loved hem so.
(170) Al bat pai wald he fond hem bo.
(171) Boge stedes white & broun,
(172) Pat in what stede pai gun go,
(173) Alle he lond spac of hem bo.
(174) Boge in tour & toun;
(175) In to what stede pai went,
(176) To jistes ober to turnament,
(177) Sir Amis & sir Amiloun,
(178) For douhliest in eueri dede.
(179) Wib scheld & spere to ride on stede.
(180) Bai gat hem gret renoun.

(181) (16) Pat riche douke hadde of hem pris,
(182) For bat pai were so war & wils
(183) & holden of gret bounte.
(184) Sir Amiloun and sir Amis,
(185) He set hem bohe in gret office.
(186) In his court for to be;
(187) Sir Amis, as 3e may here,
(188) He made his chefbotelere,
(189) [For he was hend and fre,]
(190) & sir Amiloun of hem alle
(191) He made chef steward in halle.
(192) To di3t al his meyne.

(193) In to her seruise when pai were brou3t,
(194) To geten hem los pat spared nou3t,
(195) Wel hendeliche pai bigan;
(196) Wib riche & pouer so wele pai wrou3t,
(197) Al pat hem sei3e wip word & boun3t,
(198) Hem loued mani a man;
(199) For pai were so blipe of chere,
(200) Ouer al be lond fer & nere
(201) Pe los of loue pai wan,
(202) & pe riche douke, wib-ouden les.
(203) Of alle be men pat oliue wes
(204) Mest he loued hem pan.

(205) Pan hadde he douke, ich vnderstond,
(206) A chef steward of alle his lond.
(207) A douhti kni3t at crie,
(208) Pat euer he proued wib nipe & ond
(209) For to haue brou3t hem bohe to schond
(210) With gile & trecherie.
TEXT OF AMIS AND AMILOUN SHOWING OCCURRENCE OF FORMULAE

(211) For bai were so gode & hende,
(212) & for he douke was so wele her frende,
(213) He hadde per-of gret envie;
(214) To be douke wip wordes grame
(215) Euer he proued to don hem schame
(216) Wip wel gret felonie.
(217) (19) So wip-in bo 3eres to
(218) A messanger per com bo
(219) To sir Amiloun, hende on hond,
(220) & seyd hou dep hadde fet him fro
(221) His fader & his moder al-so
(222) Purch he grace of godes sond.
(223) Pan was bat kni3t a careful man.
(224) To bat douke he went him ban
(225) & dede he him tnderstond
(226) His fader & his moder hende
(227) War ded,
(228) For to ruesaiue his lond.
(229) His fader & his moder hende
(230) Sir Amiloun, now
(231) Me nas neuer so wo for frende & of mine help hast nede,
(232) Ac 3if euer it bifalle so
(233) For to wende
(234) Saueliche com or send bi sond,
(235) & lete make gold coupes to,
(236) For prehundred pounde he hem bou3t.
(237) & bobe bai weren as liche, ywis,
(238) Ful richeliche 
(239) To wende in his iorne.
(240) He tok his leue for to fare,
(241) When bat sir Amiloun was al 3are,
(242) Ac broper, ich warn 3ifbou dost, bou art forlorn
(243) & bo breperen bold,
(244) As was Sir Amiloun & sir Amis,
(245) & bope of o michel, ypli3t;
(246) Full richeliche bai were wrou3t,
(247) & bope bai weren as liche, ywis,
(248) As was Sir Amiloun & sir Amis,
(249) Per no failed ri3t nou3t.
(250) (22) When bat sir Amiloun was al 3are,
(251) He tok his leue for to fare,
(252) To wende in his iorne.
(253) Sir Amis was so ful of care,
(254) For sorwe & wo & sikeing sare
(255) Al-mest swoned bat fre.
(256) To be douke he went wip dreri mode
(257) & praid him fair, per he stode,
(258) "Sir, par charite,
(259) 3if me leue to wende be fro,
(260) Bot 3if y may wip mi bropher go,
(261) & seyd, "Sir Amis, mi gode frende,
(262) Bot 3ify may wip mi brober go,
(263) Mine hert, it brekeb ofbre!"
(264) Mine hert, it brekeb ofbre!
(265) (23) bat riche douke, comly of kende,
(266) Answerd 03ain wip wordes hende
(267) & seyd wip-outen delay,
(268) "Sir Amis, mi gode frende,
(269) Wold 3e bobe now fro me wende?
(270) Certes," he seyd, "nav!
(271) Were 3e bope went me fro,
(272) Pan schuld me waken al mi wo,
(273) Mi ote were wend away.
(274) Bi bropher schal in to his cuntre;
(275) Wende wip him in his iurne
(276) & com 03ain his day!"
(277) (24) When bai were redi forto ride,
(278) Po bold bernes for to abide
(279) Busked hem redy boun.
(280) Hende, herkenep! Is nou3t to hide,
(281) So douhti kni3tes, in bat tide
(282) bat ferd out of bat toun,
(283) Al bat day as pai rade
(284) Gret morning bope pai made,
(285) Sir Amis & Amiloun.
(286) & when bai schuld wende otvain.
(287) Wel fair to-gider opun a plain
(288) Of hors pai li3t adoun.
(289) (25) When bai bope a-fot li3t,
(289) Sir Amiloun, pat hendy kni3t,
(290) Was ri3t-wise man ofrede
(291) & seyd to sir Amis ful ri3t,
(292) "Broper, as we er trewbe-pli3t
(293) Bope wip word & dede,
(294) Fro his day forward neuer mo,
(295) To faiily oper for wele no wo,
(296) To help him at his nede,
(297) He sate so, bo breperen bold,
(298) & benken on me, sir Amiloun,
(299) Bot euer do trewbe
(300) Also god me spede!
(301) (26) Ac bropher, ich warn pe biforn,
(302) For his loue, bat bar he croutn of born
(303) To saue al man-kende.
(304) Be nou3t o3ain pi lord forsworn,
(305) & 3if pou dost, pou art forlorn
(306) Euer more wip-outen ende.
(307) Bot euer do trewbe & no tresoun
(308) & pe forbede no tresoun
(309) Now we asondri schal wende.
(310) & bropher, 3ete y pe forbede
(311) Pe fals steward felawerede,
(312) Certes, he wil pe schende!"
(313) As bai stode so, bo brethren bold.
(314) [Sir Amiloun] drou3 forp tvay coupes of gold.
(315) Ware liche in al bing.
(316) & bad sir Amis bat he schold
(317) Chese wheper he haue wold,
(318) Wib-outen more duelling,
(319) & seyd to him, "Mi leve broper,
(320) Kepe jou pat on & y pat oper,
(321) For godes loue, heuen
(322) Bot loke her-on & benk on me,
(323) Chese wheper he haue wold,
(324) It tokneb our parting."
(325) (28) Gret sorwe
(326) & kisten hem wip ei3en wepeing,
(327) Po kni3tes hende & fre.
(328) Aiper bitau3t oper heuen king.
(329) & on her stedes bai gun spring
(330) & went in her urne.
(331) Sir Amiloun went hom to his lond
(332) & sesed it al in to his hond.
(333) pat his elders hadde be,
(334) & spoused a leuedy bri3t in bour
(335) & brou3t hir hom wib gret honour
(336) & miche solempnete.
(337) (29) Lete we sir Amiloun stille be
(338) Wip his wiif in his cuntre --
(339) & of sir Amis telle we;
(340) When he com hom to court
(341) & met it so
(342) Ful blibe of him God leue hem wele to fare -­
(343) For bat he was so hende
(344) & euer he proued wib nibe & ond
(345) Men blisced him, bope bon & blod,
(346) pat euer him wai3t & bare.
(347) Saue pe steward be a better frende
(348) To schende y jou3t a slo;
(349) (30) Pan on a day bifie it so
(350) Wip pe steward he met bo.
(351) Foul fair he gret pat fre.
(352) "Sir Amis," he seyd, "he is ful wo
(353) For pat hi broher is went pe fre.
(354) & certes, so is me.
(355) Ac of his wendeing haue hou no care,
(356) 3if hou will leue opon mi lare,
(357) & lete hi morning be.
(358) & hou wil be to me kende,
(359) Y schal pe be a better frende
(360) Pan euer 3ete was he.
(361) (31) "Sir Amis," he seyd, "do bi mi red,
(362) & swere ou bope brothered
(363) & pli3t we our trewe to;
(364) Be trewe to me in word & dede,
(365) & y schal, so god me spede.
(366) Be trewe to be al so."
(367) Sir Amis anwerd, "Mi treube y pli3t
(368) To sir Amiloun, be gentil kni3t.
(369) Pei he be went me fro.
(370) Whiles pat y may gon & speke.
(371) Y no schal neuer mi treube breke,
(372) Noiher for wele no wo.
(373) (32) For bi he treube bat god me sende.
(374) Ichauhe him founde so gode & kende.
(375) Sepben pat y first him knewe,
(376) For ones y pli3t him treube, bat hende.
(377) Where so he in warld wende,
(378) Y schal be to him trewe;
(379) & 3if y were now forsworn
(380) & breke mi treube, y were forlorn.
(381) Wel sore it schuld me rewe.
(382) Gete me frendes whare y may.
(383) Y no schal neuer bi ni3t no day
(384) Chaunge him for no newe."
(385) (33) pe steward ban was eggre of mode.
(386) Al-mest for wreb he wex ner wode
(387) & seyd, wib-outen delay.
(388) & swore, bi him bat dved on rode:
(389) "Pou traitour, vkinde blod,
(390) pou schalt abigge pis nay.
(391) Y warm pe wele," he seyd ban.
(392) "Pat y schal be bi strong foman
(393) Euer after pis day!"
(394) Sir Amis answerd bo.
(395) "Sir, per-of 3iue y nou3t a slo;
(396) Do al pat pou may!"
(397) (34) Al bus pe wrike gan biginne.
(398) & wip wrette pai went atvinne,
(399) Po bold bernes to.
(400) pe steward nold neuer blinne
(401) To schende pat douhi kni3t of kinne.
(402) Euer he proved bo.
(403) Bus in court to-gider pai were
(404) Wip wrette & wip lourear and chere
(405) Wele half a 3ere & mo.
(406) & afternoon opon a while
(407) pe steward wip tresoun & gile
(408) Wrou3t him ful michel wo.
(409) (35) So in a time, as we tel in gest,
(410) pe riche douke lete make a fest
(411) Semly in somers tide:
(412) Per was mani a gentil gest
(413) Wip mete & drink ful onest
(414) To serui by ich a side.
(415) Miche semly folk was sam ned
(416) Eris, barouns, lasse & mare.
(417) & leuedis proude in pride.
(418) More ioie no mi3t be non
(419) Dan per was in bat worlby won.
(420) Wip blisse in borwe to bide.
TEXT OF *AMIS AND AMILOUN* SHOWING OCCURRENCE OF FORMULAE

(421) (36) pat riche douke, pat y of told,
(422) He hadde a douhter fair & bold,
(423) Curteise, hende & fre.
(424) When sche was fitten winter old,
(425) In al bat lond nas þer non yhold
(426) So semly on to se,
(427) For sche was gentil & auenaunt,
(428) Hir name was cleped Belisaunt,
(429) He hadde a douhter fair
(430) For sche was gentil & auenaunt,
& gret solempnite.
(431) Kept sche was wib honour
(432) & gret solempnite.
(433) To serue
(434) O(barouns
(435) Ouer al yholden flour
(436) & douhtiest in eueri dede
(437) Trewely to telle in tale,
In boke as so we rede,
(438) & semliest in sale.
(439) & seyd, "Madame, we shuld
(440) Of
(441) Pe (airest man
(442) Pat
(443) In al bis warld nis his per,
& worbliest in eueri wede
Noiber in toun no tour;
He is douhtiest in dede
As 3e may listen & libe,
(444) As 3e may listen & libe,
(445) & douhtiest in dede ?"
(446) & wende out of pat wortli won,
(447) In boke as so we rede,
(448) Pat miri maide gan aske anon
(449) Of her maidens euerichon
(450) & seyd, "So god 3ou spede,
(451) Who was hold he douhtiest kniþt
(452) & semlyvest in ich a siþt
(453) & worbliest in wede,
(454) & who was he fairest man
(455) bat was yholden in lond þan,
(456) & douhtiest of dede ?"
(457) (39) Her maidens gan answere again
(458) & seyd, "Madame, we shuld he sain
(459) Pat sofe bi Seyn Saviour:
(460) Of erls, barouns, kni3t & swain
(461) be fairest man & most of main
(462) & man of most honour,
(463) It is sir Amis, he kinges boteler:
(464) In al þis warld ðis his per,
(465) Noijer in toun no tour;
(466) He is douhtiest in dede
(467) & worbliest in eueri wede
(468) & chosen for priis & flour."
(469) (40) Belisaunt, pat birdde briþt,
(470) When þai hadde þus seyd, ypli3t,
(471) As 3e may listen & libe,
(472) On sir Amis, pat gentil kniþt,
(473) Ywis, hir love was al aii3t,
(474) þat no man miþt it kibe.
(475) Wher þat sche seii3e him ride or go,
(476) Hir pouþt hir hert brac aþo.
(477) Pat hye no spac nouþt wip þat bliþe;
(478) For hye ni miþt niþt no day
(479) Speke wip him, pat fair may,
(480) She wepe wel mani a siþe.
(481) (41) Bus pat miri maiden 3ing
(482) Lay in care & loue-morning
(483) Bohe bi niþt & day:
(484) As y 3ou tel in mi talking,
(485) For sorwe sche spac wip him no þing,
(486) Sike in bed sche lay.
(487) Hir moder come to hir þo
(488) & gan to frain hir of hir wo,
(489) Help hir 3ifhye may;
(490) & sche answerd wip-outen wrong,
(491) Hir pines were so hard & strong,
(492) Sche wald be loken in clay.
(493) (42) Pat riche douke in o morning
(494) & wip him mani a gret lording,
(495) As prince prout in pride,
(496) þat diþt him wip-outen dueling,
(497) For to wende on dere-hunting,
(498) & busked hem for to ride.
(499) When þe lordinges euerichon
(500) Were went out of pat wortli won --
(501) In herd is nouþt to hide --
(502) Sir Amis, wip-outen les.
(503) For a malady þat on him wes,
(504) At hem gan to abide.24
(505) (43) When þo lordinges were out ywent
(506) Wip her men hende & bowes bent,
(507) To hunte on holtes hare,
(508) Pan sir Amis, verrament,
(509) He bileft at hom in present,
(510) To kepe al þat her ware.
(511) Pat hendþi kniþt bipoþt him þo,
(512) In-to þe gardin he wold go,
(513) For to solas him þare.
(514) Vnder a bou3 as he gan bide,
(515) To here þe foules son þat tide.
(516) Him þoþt a blissful fare.
(517) Now, hende, herkeneb, & 3e may here
(518) hou þat þe doukes douhter dere
to hunte on holtes hare,
(519) Sike in hir bed lay.
(520) Hir moder come wip dioful chere
(521) & al be leuedis bat her were.
(522) For to solas þat may:
(523) "Arise vp," sche seyd, "douhter min,

24 The subject, "Sir Amis," is in 502 (three lines previous).
TEXT OF AMIS AND AMILOUN SHOWING OCCURRENCE OF FORMULAE

(524) & go play be in to be gardin
(525) pis semly somers day;
(526) Per may pou here be foules song
(527) Wib ioie & miche blis among,
(528) Pi care schal wende oway."

(529) (45) Vp hir ros bat swete wi3t,
(530) In-to be gardine sche went ful ri3t
(531) Wib makidens hende & fre;
(532) be somers day was fair & bri3t,
(533) Pe sonne him schon purch lem of li3t,
(534) Pat semly was on to se;
(535) Sche herd be foules gret & smale,
(536) Pe sweete note of pe ni3ttingale
(537) Ful mirily sing on tre;
(538) Ac hir hert was so hard ibrou3t,
(539) On loue-longing was al hir bou3t,
(540) No mi3t hir gamen no gle.

(541) (46) & so bat mirie may wi3h pride
(542) Went in-to pe orchard bat tide,
(543) To here sche went ful ri3t
(544) Pei sey3e sche sir Amis biside,
(545) Vnder a bou3 he gan abide,
(546) To here sche sei3e were he stode,
(547) Bot 3ifhye spac bat frely fode,
(548) 03aines hir he gan wende,
(549) Ful fair he gan hir grete.

(550) (47) Pan was bat may so bli3e o mode,
(551) When sche sei3e were he stode,
(552) To him sche went, bat sweete,
(553) & pou3t, for alle bis wurdles gode,
(554) Bot 3if hye spac bat frely fode,
(555) Pat time no wold sche lete.
(556) & seyd as tite as pat gentil kni3t
(557) Sei3e bat bird in bour so bri3t
(558) Com wib him for to mete,
(559) O3aines hir he gan wende,
(560) Wib worde bope fre & hende
(561) Ful fair he gan hir grete.

(562) (48) Pat mirie maiden sone anon
(563) Bad hir maidens fram hir gon
(564) & wip-drawe hem oway;
(565) & when hai were to-gider al-on,
(566) To sir Amis sche made hir mon
(567) & seyd opon hir play,
(568) "Sir kni3t, on pe mine hert is brou3t,
(569) Pe to loue is al mi bou3t
(570) Bope bi ni3t & day;
(571) Pat bot bou wolt mi leman be,
(572) Ywis, min hert brek eup a bre,
(573) No lenger libben y no may.

(574) (50) "Dou art," she seyd, "a gentil kni3t,
(575) & icham a bird in bour bri3t,
(576) Of wel hai3e kin vorn.
(577) & bope bi day & bi ni3t
(578) Mine hert so hard is on pe li3t,
(579) Mi ioie is al forlorn;
(580) Pli3t me bi trewe &hou schalt be trewe
(581) & chaunget me for no newe
(582) Pat in his world is born.
(583) & y pli3t be mi trewe al-so,
(584) Til god & deh dele ous ato,
(585) Y schal neuer be forswn."
(628) Bot 3if hou wilt graunt me mi 3ou3t,
(629) Mi loue schal be ful dere abou3t
(630) Wip pines hard & strong;
(631) Mi kerchef & mi elopes anon
(632) Y schal tordenende doun ichon
(633) & say wip michel wrong.
(634) Wip strenge pou hast me todrawe;
(635) Ytak3 pou schalt be purch londes lawe
(636) & dempt hei3e to hong !

(637) (54) Pan stode bat hendy kni3t ful stille,
(638) & in his hert him liked ille.
(639) No word no spacc he po;
(640) He pou3t, "Bot y graunt hir wille.
(641) Wip hir speche schile wil me spille,
(642) Er pan y passe hir fro;
(643) & 3if v do mi lord his wrong,
(644) Wip wilde hors & wip strong
(645) Y schal be drawe al-so."
(646) him was pat dede to don,
(647) & wele lober his liifforgon;
(648) Was him neuer so do.

(649) (55) & pan pou3t, wip-outen lesing,
(650) Better were to graunt hir asking
(651) Pan his liif for to spille,
(652) Pan seyd he to bat maiden 3ing,
(653) "For godes lone, heuen king,
(654) Vnderstond to mi skille.
(655) Astow art maiden gode & trewe
(656) Bpenk hou oft rape wil rewe
(657) & turn to grame wel grille,
(658) & abide we al bis seuen3t,
(659) As icham trewe gentil kni3t,
(660) Y schal graunht be hi wille."

(661) (56) Pan answerd bat bird bri3t
(662) & swore, "Bi lhesu, ful of mi3t,
(663) Pou scrapsent nou3t so oway,
(664) Pi treube anon hou schalt me pli3t,
(665) Astow art trewe gentil kni3t,
(666) Pou schalt hold bat day."
(667) He graunted hir hir wil bo,
(668) & pli3t hem trewe3s bope to,
(669) & sebhen kist bo tvai.
(670) Into hir chaumber sche went again.
(671) Pan was sche so glad & fain,
(672) Hir ioie sche coupe no man sai.

(673) (57) Sir Amis pan wip-outen duelling,
(674) For to kepe his lordes coming,
(675) Into halde he went anon.
(676) When hai were comen fram dere-hunting
(677) & wip him mani an hei3e lording
(678) in to bat worldly won.
(679) After his douther he asked swipe;
(680) Men seyd pat sche was glad & blipe.

(681) Hir care was al agon.
(682) To eten in halle pai brou3t pat may.
(683) Ful blipe & glad hai were bat day
(684) & honked god ichon.

(685) (58) When he lordinges, wip-outen les,
(686) Hendelich were brou3t on des
(687) Wip leuedis bri3t & sweete,
(688) As princes bat were proude in pres,
(689) Ful richeliche serued he wes
(690) Wip menske & mirpe to mete.
(691) When pat maiden bat y of told,
(692) Among be birdes bat were bold,
(693) Per sche sat in her sete,
(694) On sir Amis, bat gentil kni3t,
(695) An hundred time sche cast hir si3t,
(696) For no bing wald sche lete.

(697) (59) On sir Amis, pat kni3t hendy,
(698) Euer more sche cast hir ey3e;
(699) For no bing wald sche spare.
(700) be steward ful of felonie,
(701) Wel fast he gan hem aspie,
(702) Til he wist of her fare,
(703) & bi hir si3t he parceiued bo
(704) bat gret loue was bi-tvix hem to,
(705) & was agreued ful sare.
(706) & bou3t he schuld in a while
(707) Bope wip tresoun & wip gile
(708) Bring hem in to care.

(709) (60) Pur, ywis, pat miri may
(710) Ete in halle wip gamen & play
(711) Wele four days opeer fiue,
(712) Pat euer when sche sir Amis say,
(713) Al hir care was went oway,
(714) Wele was hir o liue,
(715) Wher bat he sat or stode,
(716) Sche biheld opon bat frely fode.
(717) no stint sche for no striue;
(718) & be steward for wretbe sake
(719) Brou3t hem bope in ten & wrake,
(720) Wel iuel mot he briue.

(721) (61) Pat riche douke opon a day
(722) On dere-hunting went him to play,
(723) & wip him wel mani a man;
(724) & Belisaunt, bat miri may,
(725) To chaumber her sir Amis lay.
(726) Sche went, as sche wele kan;
(727) & he steward, wip-outen les,
(728) In a chaumber bisiden he wes
(729) & sete he maiden pan
(730) In-to chaumber hou sche gan glide;
(731) For to aspire hem bope pat tide;
(732) After swipe he ran.
(733) (62) When bat may com in to won, (734) Sche fend sir Amis her al-on, (735) "Hail," sche seyd, bat leuedi bri3t, (736) "Sir Amis," sche seyd anon. (737) "Bis day a seuenni3t it is gon, (738) bat trewe we ous pli3t. (739) Perfore icham comen to pe, (740) To wite, astow art hende & fre (741) & holden a gentil kni3t, (742) Wheeler wiltow me forsake (743) Or ous wilt trewely to me take (744) & hold as ous bihi3t ?"

(745) (63) "Madame," seyd be kni3t again. (746) "Y wold be spouse now ful fain (747) & hold be to mi wiue; (748) Ac 3if bi fader herd it sain (749) bat ich hadde his douhter forlain, (750) Of lond he wald me drie me. (751) Ac 3if ich were king of his lond (752) & hadde more gode in min hond (753) Pan o3er kinges fwe, (754) Wel fain y wald spouse be han; (755) Ac, certes, icham a pouer man. (756) Wel wo is me o fwe !"

(757) (64) "Sir kni3t," seyd bat maiden kinde, (758) "For loue of Seyn Tomas of Ynde, (759) Whi seystow euer eay ? (760) No be ous neuer so poer of kinde, (761) Riches anou3 y may be finde (762) Bope bi ni3t & day," (763) bat hende kni3t dipou3t him ban (764) & in his armes he hir nam (765) & kist bat miri may; (766) & so ous plaid in word & dede, (767) Bat he wan hir maidenhede, (768) Er bat [he] went oway.

(769) (65) & euer bat steward gan abide (770) Al-on vndir bat chaumber side, (771) Hem for to here. (772) In at an hole, was nou3t to wide, (773) He se3e hem bope in bat tide (774) Hou ous seten yfere. (775) & when he se3e hem bope wib si3t, (776) Sir Amis & bat bird bri3t, (777) be douhtes douhter dere, (778) Ful wro3h be was & egr of mode. (779) & went oway, as he were wode. (780) Her conseil to vnskere.

(781) (66) When be douke come in to bat won (782) be steward o3ain him gan gon, (783) Her conseyl fortio vnrain. (784) "Mi lord, be douke," he seyd anon.

(785) (67) "Of pine harm, bi Seyn Jon, (786) Ichil be warn ful fain; (787) In bi court pou hast a pef, (788) Bat hab don min hert gref, (789) Schame it is to sain, (790) For, certes, he is a traitour strong, (791) When he wip tresoun & wip won (792) bi douhter hab forlain !"

(793) (68) "Pe riche douke gan sore agrame; (794) "Who hab," he seyd, "don me be schame ? (795) Tel me, y be pray !" (796) "Sir," seyd be steward, "bi Seyn Jame, (797) Ful wele y can he tel his name, (798) Pou do him hong bis day; (799) It is bi boteler, sir Amis, (800) Euer he hab ben traitour, ywis. (801) He hab forlain bat may. (802) Y sei3e it me self, for sope, (803) & wil aproute biforn hem bope, (804) Pat hai can nou3t say nay !"
TEXT OF AMIS AND AMILOUN SHOWING OCCURRENCE OF FORMULAE

(837) What bern þat he be,
(838) He leiþ on ous, wip-outen fail,
(839) Ich aprœve it in bataile,
(840) To make ous quite & fre

(841) (71) "3a," seyd be douke, "wiltow so,
(842) Darstow in to bataile go,
(843) Al quite & skere 3ou make ?"
(844) "3a, certes, sire!" he seyd bo
(845) "& here mi gloue y 3iue her to,
(846) He leiþe on ous wip wrake."
(847) þe steward stirr to him pan
(848) & seyd, "Traitor, fals man,
(849) Ataint þou schalt be take;
(850) Y seiþe it me self his ich day,
(851) Where þat sche in þi chaumber lay,
(852) 3our noþer it may forsake !"

(853) (72) Pus be steward ever gan say.
(854) & ever sir Amis seyd, "Nay,
(855) Ywis, it nas nouþ so !"
(856) Pan dede þe douke com forþ þat may,
(857) & be steward wipstode al way
(858) & vouwed þe dede bo.
(859) þe maiden wepe, hir hondes wrong,
(860) & ever swore þe moder among,
(861) "Certain, it was nouþ so !"
(862) Pan seyd þe douke, "Wip-outen fail,
(863) It schal be proued in batail
(864) & sen bitven hem to.

(865) (73) þan was atvix hem take þe fiþt
(866) & set þe day a fourtenniþt,
(867) þat mani man schuld it sen,
(868) þe stewart was michel of miþt,
(869) In al þe court was her no wiþt,
(870) Sir Amis borwe durst ben,
(871) Bot for þe steward was so strong,
(872) Borwes anowe he fond among,
(873) Tventi al bidene.
(874) þan seyd þai alle wip resoun,
(875) Sir Amis schuld ben in prouson,
(876) For he no schuld nowhar flen.

(877) (74) þan answerd þat maiden briþt
(878) & swore bi lhese, ful of miþt,
(879) þat were michel wrong,
(880) "Takep mi bodi for þat kniþt,
(881) Til þat his day com of fiþt,
(882) & put me in prouson strong.
(883) 3if þat þe kniþt wil flen oway
(884) & dar nouþt holden vp his day,
(885) Bataile of him to fong,
(886) Do me þan londes lawe
(887) For his loue to be todrawe
(888) & heiþe on galwes hong."

(889) (75) Hir moder seyd wip wordes bold
(890) Pat wip gode wil als sche wold
(891) Ben his borwe al-so,
(892) His day of bataile vp to hold.
(893) þat he as gode kniþt schold
(894) Fiiþt oþain his fo.
(895) Pus bo leuedis fair & briþt
(896) Boden for þat gentil kniþt
(897) To laim her bodis to.
(898) Pan seyd þe lordinges euerichon,
(899) þat oper borwes wold þai non,
(900) Bot graunt it schuld be so.

(901) (76) When þai had don, as y 3ou say,
(902) & borwes founde wip-outen delay.
(903) & graunted al þat her ware,
(904) Sir Amis sorwed miþt & day.
(905) Al his ioie was went oway.
(906) & comen was al his care.
(907) For þat be steward was so strong
(908) & hadde be riþt & he be wrong
(909) Of þat he opon him bare.
(910) Of his liþ 3af he nouþt,
(911) Bot of þe maiden so michel þe þouþt,
(912) Miþt noman morn mare.

(913) (77) For he þouþt þat he most nede,
(914) Ar þat he to bataile 3ede,
(915) Swere an op biforn,
(916) Pat al so god schuld him spede
(917) As he was giltes of þat dede,
(918) Þat her was on him born;
(919) & þan þouþt he, wip-outen wrong,
(920) He hadde leuer to ben anhong
(921) Pan to be forswn.
(922) Ac oft he bisouþ lhese bo.
(923) He schuld saue hem bope to,
(924) þat þai ner nouþt forlorn.

(925) (78) So it bifel opon a day
(926) He mett þe leuedi & þat may
(927) Vnder an orchard side.
(928) "Sir Amis," be leuedi gan say,
(929) "Whi mornestow so wip-outen play?
(930) Tel me þat sobe his tide.
(931) No drede þe nouþt," sche seyd þan.
(932) "For to fiþt wip þi foman.
(933) Wherþ þou wilt go or ride.
(934) So richeliche þat schal be schrede.
(935) Parþ þe neuer haue of him drede,
(936) Þi bataile to abide."

(937) (79) "Madame," seyd þat gentil kniþt.
(938) "For lhese loue, ful of miþt,
(939) Be nouþt [wrop] for his dede.
(940) Ich haue þat wrong & he be riþt.
(941) Perfore icham aferd to fiþt,
(942) Al so god me spede,
(943) For y mot swere, wib-outen faile,
(944) Al so god me spede in bataile,
(945) His speche is falshed;
(946) & sif y swere, icham forsworn,
(947) ban liif & soule icham forlorn;
(948) Certes, y can no rede
(949) (80) pan seyd bat leuedi in a while,
(950) "No mat per go no noper gile
(951) To bring bat traitour doun ?"
(952) "Sis, dame," he seyd, "bi Sevn Gile !
(953) Her woned hennes mani a mile
(954) Mi broper, sir Amiloun,
(955) & sif y dorat to him gon,
(956) Y dorst wele swere bi Sevn Jon,
(957) So trewe is bat baroun,
(958) His owhen liif to lese to mede,
(959) He wold help me at bis nede,
(960) To fi3t wib bat feloun.
(961) (81) "Sir Amis," he leuedi gan to say,
(962) "Take leue to morwe at day
(963) & wende in bi iurne.
(964) Y schal say bou schalt in bi way
(965) Hom in to bine owhen cuntray,
(966) bi fader, bi moder to se;
(967) & when bou comes to bi broper ri3t,
(968) Pray him, as he is hendi kni3t
(969) & of gret bounte,
(970) Pat he be batail for ou3 fong
(971) O3ain he steward bat wip wrong
(972) Wil stroie ou3 alle hre."
(973) (82) A morowe sir Amis made him 3are
(974) & toke his leue for to fare
(975) & went in his iurnay.
(976) For nobing nold he space.
(977) He priked be stede pat him bare
(978) Bope ni3t & day.
(979) So long he priked wip-outen abod
(980) be stede pat he on rode
(981) In a fer cuntray
(982) Was ouerconen & fel doun ded;
(983) bo couple he no better red,
(984) His song was, "Waileway !"
(985) (83) & when it was bifallen so,
(986) Nedes a-fot he most go,
(987) Ful careful was pat kni3t.
(988) He stiked vp his lappes bo,
(989) In his way he gan to go,
(990) To hold pat he behi3t;
(991) & al pat day so long he ran,
(992) In to a wilde forest he cam
(993) Bitven be day & be ni3t.
(994) So strong slepe 3ede him on,
(995) To win al bis warlides won,
(996) No ferber he no mi3t.
(997) (84) be kni3t, bat was so hende & fre,
(998) Wel fair he layd him vnder a tre
(999) & fel in slepe bat tide.
(1000) Al bat ni3t stille lay he,
(1001) Til a-morwe men mi3t yse
(1002) be day bi ich a side.
(1003) Pan was his broper, sir Amiloun.
(1004) Holden a lord of gret renoun
(1005) Ouer al bat cuntry wide.
(1006) & woned fro pennes bat he lay
(1007) Bot half a iorne of a day,
(1008) Noijper to go no ride.
(1009) (85) As sir Amiloun, bat hendi kni3t.
(1010) In his slepe he lay bat ni3t.
(1011) In sweuen he mett anon
(1012) pat he sei3e sir Amis bi si3t.
(1013) His broper, bat was trewepe-pli3t,
(1014) Bilapped among his fon;
(1015) Purca a bere wilde & wode
(1016) & oper bestes, bat bi him stode
(1017) Bisett he was to slon;
(1018) & he alon among hem stode
(1019) As a man pat couple no gode;
(1020) Wel wo was him bigon.
(1021) (86) When sir Amiloun was awake,
(1022) Gret sorwe he gan for him make
(1023) & told his wiif ful 3are
(1024) Hou him pou3t he sei3e bestes blake
(1025) About his broper wip wrake
(1026) To sle wip sorwe & care.
(1027) "Certes," he seyd, "wip sum wrong
(1028) He is in peril gret & strong,
(1029) Of blis he is ful bare."
(1030) & pan seyd he, "For sobe ywis,
(1031) Y no schal neuer haue joie no blis,
(1032) Til y wite hou he fare."
For nobing he nold abide.
Pat non so hardi were of dede.
After him noiper go no ride.
So al pat ni3t he rode til day.
Til he com ber sir Amis lay
Vnder a tre slepeand alon;
"Arise vp, felawe, it is i3t
to bataile, " he cleped to him anon ri3t,
& he knewe him aI-so.
& kist hem bobe to.
"Ywis, For sebben bat bou was went me fro,
Sebben bat y was born;
Wib ioie
Brober," he seyd, "whi listow here
Wib gile
Ac
Bot
Certes, y can no nober rede,
Hou he bobe to-gider ysame,
Wib wretbe
Batail of him to fong,
To saue bo tvay leuedis bri3t,
Durst ben his borwe among,
& hou he most, wip-outen faile.

Swere, ar he went to bataile,
It war a lesing ful strong;
"& forsworn man schal neuer spede;
Certes, ber-fore y can no rede,
'Alas' may be mi song !"

When pat sir Amis had al told,
Hou pat he fals steward wold
Bring him doun wip mode,
Sir Amiloun wip wordes bold
Swore, "Bi him pat Judas sold
& died upon he rode,
Of his hope he schal now faile,
& y schal for he take bataile,
Bei pat her wer wode:
Sif y may mete him ari3t,
Wib mi brond, pat is so bri3t,
y schal sen his hert blode !"

"Ac brober," he seyd, "haue al mi wede.
& in pi robe v schal me schrede,
Ri3t as pe self it ware;
& y schal swore so god me spede
As icham gitle of pat dede,
Pat he opon be bare."
Anon bo hendi kni3tes to
Alle her wede chaunged bo,
& when hai were al 3are,
Pan seyd sir Amiloun, "Bi Sevn Gile,
Bis man schal pe schrew bigile,
Bis bat wald pe forfare !"

Brober," he seyd, "wende hom now ri3t
To mi leuedi, pat is so bri3t,
& do as y schal be sain;
& as pou art a gentil kni3t,
Pou ly bi hir in bed ich ni3t,
Til pat y com again.
& sai pou hast sent bi stede wwis
To pi brober, sir Amis;
Pan wil pai be ful fain,
Dai wil wene pai ich it be;
Per is non pat schal knowe pe,
So liche we be bope tvain !"

And when he hadde bus sayd, ypli3t.
Sir Amiloun, pat gentil kni3t,
Went in his iurnay,
& sir Amis went hom anon ri3t
To his brober leuedi so bri3t,
Wip-outen more delay,
& seyd pou he hadde sent his stede
To his brober to riche mede
Bi a kni3t of pat cuntry.
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Q.

(1150) & al þai wende of sir Amis
(1151) It had ben her lord, ywis,
(1152) So liche were þo tvay.

(1153) (97) When þat sir Amis hadde ful 3are
(1154) Told him al of his care.
(1155) Ful wele he wend þo.
(1156) Litel & michel, fasse & more,
(1157) Al þat euer in court ware,
(1158) þai þouȝt þit hadde ben so.
(1159) & when it was come to þe nyst,
(1160) Sir Amis & þat leuedi briȝt,
(1161) To þed þai gan go;
(1162) & whan þai were to-gider ylayd,
(1163) Sir Amis his swerd he layd biside.
(1164) & layd bitvix hem tvo.

(1165) (98) þe leuedi loked opon him þo
(1166) Wroþlich wip her eiȝen tvo.
(1167) Sche wend hir lord were wode.
(1168) "Sir," sche seyd, "whi farstow so ?
(1169) Þai were þouȝt neȝt won to do,
(1170) Who þab changed þi mode ?"
(1171) "Dame," he seyd, "sikerly,
(1172) Ich haue swiche a malady
(1173) Pat menȝeþ al mi blod,
(1174) & al min bones be so sere,
(1175) Y nold nouȝt touche bi bodi bare
(1176) For al þis wrulde gode !"

(1177) (99) þus, ywis, þat hendy kniȝt
(1178) Was holden in þat fourtenniȝt
(1179) As lord & prince in pride;
(1180) Ac he forȝat him neuer a neȝt,
(1181) Bitvix him & þat leuedi þriȝt
(1182) His swerd he layd biside.
(1183) þe leuedi þouȝt in hir resoun,
(1184) It hadde ben hir lord, sir Amiloun,
(1185) Pat hadde ben sike þat tide;
(1186) Per-fore sche held hir stille þo
(1187) & wold speke wordes no mo,
(1188) Bot þouȝt þis wille to abide.

(1189) (100) Now, hende, herkeneþ, & y schal say:
(1190) Houþat þir Amiloun went his way;
(1191) For no-bing wold he spare.
(1192) He priked his stede niȝt & day,
(1193) As a gentil kniȝt, stout & gay,
(1194) To court he com ful 3are
(1195) Pat selue day, wip-outen fail.
(1196) Pat was ysette of bataill,
(1197) & sir Amis was nouȝt pare.
(1198) þan were þo leuedis taken bi hond,
(1199) Her iugement to nnderstond,
(1200) Wip sorwe & sikeing sare.

(1201) (101) þe steward houed oppon a stede
(1202) Wip scheld & spere, bataile to bede,
(1203) Gret bost he gan to blawe;
(1204) Bifor þe douke anon he þede
(1205) & seyd, "Sir, so god be spede.
(1206) Herken to mi sawe !
(1207) Þis traitour is out of lond ywent;
(1208) Sif he were here in present,
(1209) He schuld ben hong & drawe;
(1210) Perefour ich aske iugement,
(1211) Pat his borwes be to-brent,
(1212) As it is londes lawe."

(1213) (102) þat riche douke, wip wreþe & wraþe.
(1214) He bad men schuld þo leuedis take
(1215) & led hem forþ þis bide;
(1216) A strong þer þer was don make
(1217) & a tonne for her sake,
(1218) To bren hem in þat tide.
(1219) þan þai loked in to þe feld
(1220) & seþe a kniȝt wip spere & scheld
(1221) þom priȝekand þer wip þrde.
(1222) þan seyd þai eueriȝon, ywis,
(1223) "Jonder comþe priȝekand þir Amis !"
(1224) & bad þai schuld abide.

(1225) (103) Sir Amiloun gan stant at no ston.
(1226) He priked among hem eueriȝon.
(1227) To þat douke he gan wende.
(1228) "Mi lord he douke," he seyd anon,
(1229) "For schame lete þe meðe, he gan won to do, "
(1230) Pat er bolþe gode & hende.
(1231) For ic am comen hider to-day
(1232) For to sauþen hem, þue v may,
(1233) & bring hem out of bende,
(1234) For, certes, it were michel vniȝt
(1235) To make roste of leuedis þriȝt;
(1236) Ywis, 3e eren vnkende."
(1253) God, bat suffred passioun.
(1254) Sent be bode bi me;
(1255) 3if pou biss bataile vnderfong,
(1256) Pou schalt haue an euentour strong
(1257) Wip-in bis 3eres bre;
(1258) & or bis bre 3ere ben al gon,
(1259) Foule mesel nas neuer non
(1260) In be world, pan bou schal be !
(1261) Ac for bou art so hende & fre,
(1262) Ihesu sent be bode bi me,
(1263) To warn be anon;
(1264) Foule a wreche
(1265) Wip sorwe & care & pouerte
(1266) Nas neuer non wers bigon.
(1267) Schul fle & busked hem for to ride.
(1268) To flen,
(1269) Schal be bi most fon,
(1270) & wiif & alle bi kinne
(1271) Schul flie pe stede patow art inne,
(1272) & forsake pe ichon."
(1273) (107) Pat kni3t gan houe stille so ston
(1274) & herd Po wordes uerichon,
(1275) Pat were so gret & grille.
(1276) He nist what him was best to don,
(1277) To flen, oper to fi3ting gon;
(1278) In hert him liked ile.
(1279) He pou3t, "3if y beknowe mi name,
(1280) Dan schal mi broper go to schame,
(1281) Wip sorwe bai schul him spille.
(1282) Certes," he seyd, "for drede of care
(1283) To hold mi treube schal y nou3t spare.
(1284) Lete god don alle his wille."
(158) Whan al his armour ran o blode.
(159) Dat ere was white so swan.
(160) Wib a fæchoun scharp & gode
(161) He smot to him wib egre mode
(162) Al so a douhti man.
(163) bat euen fro he schulder-blade
(164) In-to he brest he brond gan wade,
(165) Buch-out his hert it ran.
(166) He steward fel adoun ded,
(167) Sir Amiloun strok of his hed,
(168) & god he bonked it han.

(169) (115) Alle he lordinges bat her ware,
(170) Litel & michel, lasse & mare,
(171) Ful glad bai were bat tide.
(172) He heued opon a sperre bai bare;
(173) To toun bai di3t hem ful 3are,
(174) For nobing bai nold abide;
(175) Bais com o3aines him out of toun
(176) Wib a fair processiou
(177) Semliche bi ich a side.
(178) Anon bai ladde him to be tour
(179) Wib ioe & ful michel honour,
(180) As prince proude in pride.

(181) In to be palais when bai were gon,
(182) Al bat was in bat worblu won
(183) Wende sir Amis it ware.
(184) "Sir Amis," seyd he douke anon,
(185) "Bifor his lordinges euerichon
(186) Y graunt he ful 3are,
(187) For Belisent, bat mire may,
(188) Hou hast bous3t hir ful dere to day
(189) Wib grimli woundes sare;
(190) Per-fore y graunt pe now here
(191) Mi lond & mi douther dere,
(192) To hald for euer mare."

(193) (117) Ful bleibe was bat hendi kni3t
(194) & bonked him wip al his mi3t
(195) Glad he was & fain;
(196) In alle be court was per no wi3t
(197) Pat wi3t wat his name it hi3t,
(198) To saue bo leuedis tvain,
(199) Leches wi3fhe bai yfrounde,
(200) Pat gun to tasty his wounde
(201) & made him hole again,
(202) Pan were bai al glad & bleibe
(203) & bonked god a housand sipe
(204) Pat pe steward was sain.

(205) On a day sir Amiloun di3t him 3are
(206) & seyd bat he wold fare
(207) Hom in to his cuntray
(208) To telle his frendes, lasse & mare,
(209) & oter lordinges bat bere ware,
(210) Hou he had sped bat day.

(211) Pe douke graunted him bat tide
(212) & bede him kni3tes & michel pride
(213) & he answerd, "Nay."
(214) Ter schuld noman wib him gon.
(215) Bot as wi3pe he di3t anon
(216) & went forp in his way.

(217) (119) In his way he went alone,
(218) Most her noman wib him gon.
(219) Neifer kni3t no swain.
(220) Pat douhti kni3t of blod & bon,
(221) No stint he neuer at no ston
(222) Til he com hom again;
(223) & sir Amis, as y 3ou say,
(224) Waited his coming euery day
(225) Vp in fe forest plain;
(226) & so bai met to-gider same,
(227) & he told him wip ioe & game
(228) Hou he hadde pe steward slain,

(229) (120) & hou he schuld spousy to mede
(230) Pat ich maide, worblu in wede,
(231) Pat was so comly corn.
(232) Sir Amiloun li3t of his stede,
(233) & gan to chaungy her wede,
(234) As bai hadde don biforn.
(235) "Brober," he seyd, "wende hom again."
(236) & tau3t him hou he schuld sain,
(237) When he com ber bei worn.
(238) Pan was sir Amis glad & bleibe
(239) & hanked him a housand sipe
(240) Pe time bat he was born.

(241) (121) & when bai schuld wende ato,
(242) Sir Amis oft bonked him bo
(243) His cost & his gode dede.
(244) "Bropher," he seyd, "3if it bitide so
(245) Pat he bitide care ower wo,
(246) & of mine help hast nede,
(247) Sauelich com ower sende bi song
(248) & y schul neuer lenger wipstond,
(249) Al so god me spedes;
(250) Be it in periil neuer so strong,
(251) Y schal pe help in ri3t & wrong,
(252) Mi liif to lese to mede."

(253) (122) Asonder bai gun wende;
(254) Sir Amiloun, bat kni3t so hende.
(255) Went hom in bat tide
(256) To his leuedi bat was vnkende,
(257) & was ful welcome to his frende,
(258) As prince proude in pride;
(259) & when it was come to be ni3t,
(260) Sir Amiloun & bat leuedi bri3t
(261) In bedde were lawd beside;
(262) In hir armes he gan hir kis
(263) & made his ioe & michel blis.
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(1464) For nophy he nold abide.
(1465) (123) be leuedi astite asked him bo
(1466) Whi pat he hadde farn so
(1467) Al bat fourtenni3t,
(1468) Laid his swerd bitven hem to,
(1469) Pat sche no durst nou3t for wele no wo
(1470) Touche his boði ar3ti.
(1471) Sir Amiloun bajhou3t him ban
(1472) His bropher was a trewe man,
(1473) Pat hadde so done, apli3t.
(1474) "Dame," he seyd, "ichil be sain
(1475) & telle he pat sope ful fain,
(1476) Ac wray me to no wi3t."
(1477) (124) be leuedi astite him frain gan,
(1478) For his loue, bat bis warld wan,
(1479) Telle hir whi it ware.
(1480) Pan astite pat hendi man,
(1481) Al he sope he told hir hau,
(1482) To court hou he gan fare,
(1483) & how he slou3 he stewart strong,
(1484) Pat wip tresoun & wip wrong
(1485) Wold haue his bropher forfare,
(1486) & how his bropher, pat hendi kni3t
(1487) Lay wip hir in bed ich ni3t
(1488) While pat he was bare.
(1489) (125) be leuedi was ful wrob, vpli3t,
(1490) & oft missayd hir lord pat ni3t
(1491) Wip speche bitvix hem to,
(1492) & seyd. "Wip wrong & michel vnri3t
(1493) Bou slou3 þor a gentil kni3t;
(1494) Ywis, it was iuel ydo !"
(1495) "Dame," he seyd, "bi heuen king,
(1496) Ywis, it was iuel ydo
(1497) No dede it for non omer hing
(1498) Bot to saue mi bropher frô wo,
(1499) & ich hope, 3if ich hadde mede,
(1500) His owen liif to lesse to mede,
(1501) He wald help me aI-so."
(1502) (126) Al bus in gest as we sain
(1503) Sir Amis was ful glad & fain,
(1504) To court he gan to wende;
(1505) & when he come to court o3ain
(1506) Wip erl, baroun, kni3t & swain,
(1507) Honoured he was, pat hende.
(1508) Pat riche douke tok him bi hond
(1509) & sesed him in alle his lond,
(1510) To held wip-outen ende;
(1511) & sebben wip ioie opon a day
(1512) He spoused Belisent, pat may,
(1513) Pat was so trewe & kende.
(1514) Miche was pat semly folk in sale,
(1515) Pat was samned at pat bridale
(1516) Of erls, barouns, mani & fale,
(1517) & oher lordinges gret & smale,
(1518) & leuedis bri3t in haur.
(1519) A real feast pai gan to hold
(1520) Of erls & of barouns bold
(1521) Wip ioie & michel honour;
(1522) Quer al pat lond est & west
(1523) Pan was sir Amis helden he best
(1524) & choosen for prisi in tour.
(1525) (128) So wip-in bo 3eres to
(1526) A wel fair grace fel hem bo,
(1527) As god almi3ti wold;
(1528) be riche douke dyed hem fro
(1529) & his leuedi dede aI-so,
(1530) & grauen in grete so cold.
(1531) Pan was sir Amis, hende & fre,
(1532) Douke & lord of gret pouste
(1533) Quer al pat lond yhold.
(1534) Tvai childer he bi3at bi his wiue,
(1535) be fairest pat mi3t bere liue,
(1536) In gest as it is told.
(1537) (129) ban was pat kni3t of gret renoun
(1538) & lord of mani a tour & tour
(1539) & douke of gret pouste;
(1540) & his bropher, Sir Amiloun.
(1541) Wip sorwe & care was driuen adoun.
(1542) Pat ere was hende & fre;
(1543) Al so pat angel hadde him told,
(1544) Fouler messe! þar nas non hold
(1545) In world þan was he.
(1546) In gest to rede it is gret rewbe,
(1547) What sorwe he hadde for his treupe
(1548) Wip-in bo 3eres bre.
(1549) (130) & er bo bre 3ere come to þende
(1550) He no wist whider he mi3t wende,
(1551) So wo was him bignon:
(1552) For al bat were his best frende,
(1553) & nameliche al his riche kende,
(1554) Bicom his most for;
(1555) & his wif, for sope to say,
(1556) Wrou3t him wers bohe ni3t & day
(1557) ban pai dede euerichon.
(1558) When him was fallen pat hard cas,
(1559) A frendeleser man þan he was
(1560) Men nist no-whar non.
(1561) So wicked & schrewed was his wif,
(1562) Schi brac his hert wip-outen kniif.
(1563) Wip wordes harde & kene.
(1564) & seyd to him, "Pou wreche chaitif,
(1565) Wip wrong þe steward les his liif,
(1566) & þat is on þe sene;
(1567) Per-fore, bi Seyn Denis of Fraunce,
(1568) þe is bitit þis hard chaunce,
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(1569) Daibet who þe bimene !
(1570) Wel oft times his honden he wrong.
(1571) As man bat benkeþ his liſ to long,
(1572) bat liœþ in treye & tænc.

(1572) (132) Alias, alias ! bat gentil kniþt
(1574) Pat whilom was so wise & wiþt.
(1575) bat þan was wrouþt so wo,
(1576) bat fram his leuedi, fair & briþt.
(1577) Out of his owhen chaumber a-niþt
(1578) He was yhote to go,
(1579) & in his owhen halle o-day
(1580) Fram þe heþe bord owey
(1581) He was ycharged also
(1582) To eten at þe tables ende;
(1583) Wald þer no man sit þim hende,
(1584) Wel carefull was he bo.

(1585) (133) Bi þan bat half 3ere was ago
(1586) Pat he hadde eten in halle so
(1587) Wip gode mete & wip drink,
(1588) His leuedi was ful wroþ & wo
(1589) & houþt he liued to long bo
—
(1590) Wip-outen ani lesing —
(1591) "In bis lord springþ þis word,
(1592) Y fede a mesel at mi bord,
(1593) He is so foule a bing,
(1594) It is gret spite to al mi kende,
(1595) He schal no more sit me so hende,
(1596) Bi Ihesus, heuen king !"

(1597) (134) On a day sche gan him calle
(1598) & seyd, "Sir, it is so bifalle,
(1599) For soþe, y telle it te.
(1600) Pat þou etest so long in halle,
(1601) It is gret spite to ous alle,
(1602) Mi kende is wroþ wip me."
(1603) Pe kniþt gan wepe & seyd ful stille,
(1604) "Do me where it is þi wille,
(1605) Per noman may me se;
(1606) Of no more ichil he praye,
(1607) Bot of a meles mete ich day,
(1608) For seynt charite."

(1609) (135) Pat leuedi, for hir lordes sake,
(1610) Anon sche dede men timber take,
(1611) For noping wold she wound,
(1612) & half a mile fram he gate
(1613) A litel loge sche lete make,
(1614) Bise þe he way to stond.
(1615) & when he loge was al wrouþt,
(1616) Of his gode no wold he n0þt,
(1617) Bot his gold coupe an hond.
(1618) When he was in his loge alon,
(1619) To god of heuen he made his mon
(1620) & bonked him of al his sond.

(1621) (136) In-to bat loge when he was diþt,
(1622) In al he court was ber no wiþt
(1623) Pat wold serue him þare,
(1624) To saue a gentil child, ypliþt,
(1625) Child Owaynes his name it hiþt,
(1626) For him he wepe ful sare.
(1627) Pat child was trewe & of his kende,
(1628) His soster sone, he was ful hende;
(1629) He sayd to him ful 3are,
(1630) Ywis, he no schuld neuer wond
(1631) To seruen him fro lot to hond,
(1632) While he olues ware.

(1633) (137) bat child, bat was so fair & bold,
(1634) Owaynes was his name ytold,
(1635) Wel fair he was of blode.
(1636) When he was of tvelue 3ere old,
(1637) Amoraunt þan he was heald,
(1638) Wel curteys, hend & gode.
(1639) Bi his lord ich niþt he lay
(1640) & feced her liuere euer day
(1641) To her liues fode.
(1642) When ich man made gle & song,
(1643) Euer for his lord among
(1644) He made dreti mode.

(1645) (138) bus Amoraunt, as y 3ou say,
(1646) Com to court ich day,
(1647) No stint he for no striue.
(1648) Al bat ber was gan him pray
(1649) To com fro þat lazer oway,
(1650) Pan schuld he the & prize,
(1651) & he answerd wip milde mode
(1652) & swore bi him þat dyed on rode
(1653) & boled woundes fiue,
(1654) For al bis worldes gode to take
(1655) His lord nold he neuer forsake
(1656) Whiles he ware olue.

(1657) (139) Bi þan bat tvelmoneþ was al gon.
(1658) Amorant went in-to bat won
(1659) For his lordes lueray;
(1660) be leuedi was ful wroþ anon
(1661) & comaunde hir men euerichon
(1662) To driue þat child oway,
(1663) & swore bi him þat Judas sold,
(1664) Bei his lord for hunger & cold
(1665) Dyed þer he lay,
(1666) He schuld haue noiber mete no drink,
(1667) No socour of non ober hing
(1668) For hir after bat day.

(1669) (140) Pat child wrong his honden tvain
(1670) & weping went hom again
(1671) Wip sorwe & sikeing sare
(1672) Pat godeman gan him frain
(1673) & bad him þat he schuld him sain
[1674] & telle him whi it ware.
[1675] & he answerd & seyd bo.
[1676] "Ywis, no wonder bei me be wo,
[1677] Mine hert, it brekeb for care;
[1678] & wib gret mode
[1679] Pat sche no schal neuer don ous gode;
[1680] Allas, hou schal we fare "?

[1681] "A god help !" seyd pat gentil kniȝt,
[1682] "Whilom y was man of miȝt,
[1683] To dele mete & clob,
[1684] For
[1685] Pat al þat seþ on me bi siȝt,
[1687] For, certes, y can non ober red,
[1688] Now y wot hou it
[1689] To begge her brede, as
[1690] For be gode man was so
[1691] For al bis worldes gode;
[1692] As folk to chepeing
[1693] To mi leuedi swibe anon,
[1694] Be child & þat gentil kniȝt
[1695] Diȝt hem for to gon,
[1696] & in her way þai went ful riȝt
[1697] To begge her brede, as þai hadde tiȝt,
[1698] For mete no hadde þai none.
[1699] So long þai went vp & down
[1700] Til þai com to a chepeing-toun,
[1701] Fiue mile out of bat won,
[1702] & sore wepeand fro dore to dore,
[1703] & bad here mete for godes loue.
[1704] Ful iuel couþe þai þer-on.

[1705] (143) So in bat time, ich vnderstond,
[1706] Gret plente was in bat lond,
[1707] Boþe of mete
[1708] Pat folk was ful fre to fond
[1709] & brouȝt hem anouȝt to hond
[1710] Of al kines bing;
[1711] For þe gode man was so messaner bo,
[1712] & for þe child was fair al-so,
[1713] Hem loued old & 3ing,
[1714] & brouȝt hem anouȝt of al gode;
[1715] Pan was þe child blithe of mode
[1716] & lete be his wepeing.

[1717] Pan wex þe gode man fote so sare
[1718] þat he no miȝt no forber fare
[1719] For al bis worldes gode;
[1720] To þe tunes ende þat child him bare
[1721] & a loge he bilt him bare,
[1722] As folk to chepeing 3ode;
[1723] & as þat folk of þat cuntrey
[1724] Com to chepeing eueri day,
[1725] Þai gat hem liues fode;
[1726] & Amoraunt oft to turn gan go

[1727] & begged hem mete & drink also.
[1729] (145) Pas in gest rede we
[1730] þai duelled þere 3eres bre;
[1731] Pat child & he al-so,
[1732] & liued in care & pouerte
[1733] Bi he folk of þat cuntrey.
[1734] As þai com to & fro.
[1735] So þat in he fery 3ere
[1736] Corn bigan to wex dere,
[1737] Pat hunger bigan to go,
[1738] Pat her was noþer eld no 3ing
[1739] Pat wald 3if hem mete no drink,
[1740] Wel careful were þai bo.

[1741] (146) Amorant oft to toun gan gon,
[1742] Ae mete no drink no gat he non,
[1743] Noþer at man no wiuë.
[1744] When þai were to-gider al-on,
[1745] Reweliche þai gan maken her mon.
[1746] Wo was hem o liue;
[1747] & his leuedi, for soþe to say,
[1748] Woned þer in þat cuntrey
[1749] Nouȝt þennes miles fiue,
[1750] & liued in toþe boþe miȝt & day,
[1751] Whiles he in sorwe & care lay,
[1752] Wel iuel mot sche brue!

[1753] (147) On a day, as þai sete alon,
[1754] Pat hendi kniȝt gan meken his mon
[1755] & seyd to be child þat tide.

[1756] "Sone," he seyd, "þou most gon
[1757] To mi leuedi swipe anon,
[1758] Pat wonep here biside,
[1759] Bid hir, for him þat died on rode,
[1760] Sende me so michel of al mi gode,
[1761] An asse, on to ride.
[1762] & out of lond we wil fare
[1763] To begge our mete wip sorwe & care,
[1764] No lenger we nil abide."

[1765] (148) Amoraunt to court is went
[1766] Bifor þat leuedi fair & gent,
[1767] Wel hendeliche seyd hir anon.
[1768] "Madame," he seyd, "verrament,
[1769] As me[s]anger mi lord me sent,
[1770] For him-self may nouȝt gon,
[1771] Henderliche seyd hir anon,

[1772] Sende him so michel of al his gode
[1773] As an asse to ridden opon,

[1774] & out of lond we schulen yfere,

[1775] No schal we neuer com eft here,
[1776] Bei hunger ous schuld slon."

[1777] (149) be leuedi seyd sche wald ful fain
[1778] Sende him gode asses tvain,
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(1779) Wip þi he wald oway go
(1780) So fer þat he neuer eft com again.
(1781) "Nat, certes, dame," be child gan sain,
(1782) "Pou sest ous neuer eft mo."
(1783) Pan was be leuedi glad & bibe
(1784) & comound him an asse as swipe
(1785) & seyd wip wretþe bo,
(1786) "Now se schul out of lond fare,
(1787) God leue 3ou neuer to com here mare,
(1788) & graunt þat it be so."
(1789) (150) þat child no lenger nold abide,
(1790) His asse astite he gan bistride
(1791) & went him hom again,
(1792) & told his lord in bat tide
(1793) Hou his leuedi proude in pride
(1794) Schameliche gan to sain;
(1795) On þe asse he sott þat kni3t so hende,
(1796) & out of þe cite þai gun wende;
(1797) þer of þei were ful fain.
(1798) Burch mani a cuntrue, vp an doun,
(1799) þai beeged her mete fram toun to toun,
(1800) Bobe in winde & rain.

(1801) Quer al þat lond burch godes wille
(1802) þat hunger wex so gret & grille,
(1803) As wide as þai gun go;
(1804) Al-mest for hunger þai gan to spille,
(1805) Of brede þai no hadde nou3t half her fille,
(1806) Ful careful were þai bo.
(1807) ban seyd þe kni3t opon a day,
(1808) "Ous bihouep selle our asse oway,
(1809) For we no haue gode no mo,
(1810) Ac certes, þat schal neuer be sold,
(1811) Þei hunger schuld me slo."
(1812) For his lord he hadde grete care,
(1813) & at his rigge he di3t him 3are
(1814) & bare him out of bat cite;
(1815) & half a 3ere & sum del mare
(1816) About his mete he him bare,
(1817) Yblisced mot he be.
(1818) Bus Amoraunt, wiþ-outen wrong.
(1819) Bar his lord about so long,
(1820) As y 3ou tel may.
(1821) Pat winter com so hard & strong.
(1822) oft, "Alas!" it was his song.
(1823) So depe was bat cuntray;
(1824) þe way was so depe & slider,
(1825) Of times bope to-gider
(1826) Þai fel doun in þe clay.
(1827) Ful trewe he was & kinde of blod
(1828) & serued his lord wiþ mild mode,
(1829) Wald he nou3t wende oway.
(1830) (155) þus Amoraunt, as y 3ou say,
(1831) Serued his lord bope ni3t & day
(1832) & at his rigge him bare.
(1833) Of his song was "Waileway!"
(1834) So depe was bat cuntray,
(1835) His bones wex ful sare.
(1836) Al her catel þai was spent,
(1837) Saue twelf pans, verrament.
(1838) þerwiþ þai went ful 3are
(1839) & bou3t hem a gode croude-wain,
(1840) His lord he gan per-in to lain,
(1841) As he com to a cite toun,
(1842) To bring me þou fond.
(1843) Amoraunt, as y 3ou knowe
(1844) As 3e may vnderstond;
(1845) He crud his wain in to fen;
(1846) So depe was bat cuntray,
(1847) & serued his lord wiþ mild mode,
(1848) Wald he nou3t wende oway.
(1849) (156) þus Amoraunt crud sir Amiloun
(1850) Purch mani a cuntrue, vp an doun.
(1851) As 3e may vnderstond;
(1852) He is a man of milde mode,
(1853) As 3e may listen at me,
(1854) & bifor al ober pouer men
(1855) He crud his wain in to fen;
(1856) & at his rigge him bare.
(1857) Pat derp þai was ysold
(1858) & bou3t hem a gode croude-wain,
(1859) His lord he gan per-in to lain,
(1860) He no mi3t him bere namare.
(1861) (157) "Ac, leue sone," he seyd ban
(1862) Purch mani a cuntrue, vp an doun.
(1863) As 3e may vnderstond;
(1864) So he com to a cite toun,
(1865) Per sir Amis, þe bold baroun.
(1866) Was douke & lord in lond.
(1867) ban seyd þe kni3t in bat tide,
(1868) "To be doukès court here bisde
(1869) To bring me bider þou fond;
(1870) He is a man of milde mode.
(1871) We schul gete ous per sum gode
(1872) Purch grace of godes sond.
(1873) (159) "Ac, leue sone," he seyd ban
(1874) "For his loue, þat his world wan
(1875) Astow art hende & fre,
(1876) Dou be aknowe to no man
(1877) Whider y schal, no whenes yearn,
(1878) He anowe to no man
(1879) He answerd & seyd, "Nay."
(1880) To court he went in his way.
(1881) As 3e may listen at me,
(1882) & bifor al oher pouter men
(1883) He crud his wain in to þe fen;
(1884) Gret diol it was to se.

(1885) (158) So it bifel hat selue day, --
(1886) Wip tong as y 3ou tel may, --
(1887) It was midwinter tide,
(1888) Pat riche douke wip gamen & play
(1889) Fram chirche com be ri3t way
(1890) As lord & prince wip pride.
(1891) When he com to be castel-gate,
(1892) Pe pouer men pat stode þer-ate
(1893) Wipdrou3 hem per beside.
(1894) Wip kni3tes & wip seriaunce fale
(1895) He went in-to bat semly sale
(1896) Wib iote & blis to abide.

(1897) (159) In kinges court, as it is lawe,
(1898) Trumpes in halle to mete gan blawe.
(1899) To benche went þo bold.
(1900) When bai were semly set on rowe,
(1901) Serued þai were apon a prow, be
(1902) As men miriest on mold.
(1903) Pat riche douke, wip-outen les,
(1904) As a prince serued he wes
(1905) Wip riche coupes of gold,
(1906) & he þat brou3t him to þat state
(1907) Stode bischet wip-outen be gate,
(1908) Wel sore of-hungred & cold.

(1909) (160) Out at he gate com a kni3t
(1910) & a seriaunt wise & wi3t,
(1911) To plain hem þope ytere,
(1912) & burch be grace of god almi3t
(1913) On sir Amiloun he cast a si3t,
(1914) Hou laip he was of chere.
(1915) & seþen biheld on Amoraunt,
(1916) Hou gentil he was & of fair semblaut,
(1917) In gest as 3e may here.
(1918) Pan seyd bai bope, bi Seyn Jon,
(1919) In al þe court was her non
(1920) Of fairehed half his pere.

(1921) (161) Pe gode man gan to him go,
(1922) & hendeliche he asked him bo,
(1923) As 3e may vnderstond.
(1924) Fram wat lond þat he com fro,
(1925) & wip þat he stode þer bo,
(1926) & whom he serued in lond.
(1927) "Sir," he seyd, "so god me sau,
(1928) Icham here mi lordes knaue,
(1929) Pat lip in godes bond;
(1930) & bou art gentil kni3t of blode.
(1931) Bere our erand of sum gode
(1932) & pur3n grace of godes sond.

(1933) (162) Pe gode man asked him anon,
(1934) Sif he wald fro þat lazer gon
(1935) & trewelich to him take;

(1936) & he seyd he schuld, bi Seyn Jon,
(1937) Serue pat riche douke in bat won,
(1938) & richeman he wald him make;
(1939) & he anwered wip mild mode
(1940) & swore bi him þat dyed on rode
(1941) Whiles he mi3t walk & wake;
(1942) For to winne al his warldes gode,
(1943) His hende lord, þat bi him stode,
(1944) Schul he neuer forsake.

(1945) (163) Pe gode man wende he hadde ben
(1946) Or he hadde ben a folke-sage
(1947) Pat hadde his wit forlorn,
(1948) Ober he þou3t þat his lord wip þe foule
(1949) Hadde ben a man of hei3e parage
(1950) & of hei3e kinde vcorn.
(1951) Per-føre he nold no more sain,
(1952) Bot went him in to be halle again
(1953) Pe riche douke biforn,
(1954) "Mi lord," he seyd, "listen to me
(1955) Pe best bourd, bi mi leuete,
(1956) Hou herdest seþen bai were born."

(1957) (164) Pe riche douke badde him anon
(1958) To telle bi-forn hem guerichon
(1959) Wip-outen more duelling.
(1960) "Now sir," he seyd, "bi Seyn Jon,
(1961) Ich was out atte gate ygon
(1962) RI3t now on mi playing;
(1963) Pouer men y sei3e mani pare,
(1964) Litel & michel, lasse & mare,
(1965) Bope old & 3ing.
(1966) & a lazer þer y fond;
(1967) Herdestow neuer in no lond
(1968) Telle of so foule a bing.

(1969) (165) "Pe lazer lip vp in a wain,
(1970) & is so pouer of mi3t & main
(1971) fot no may he gon;
(1972) & ouer him stode a naked swain,
(1973) A gentiler child, for sope to sain.
(1974) In world no wot y non.
(1975) He is þe fairest gome
(1976) Pat euer Crist 3af cri3tendome
(1977) Or layd liif opon,
(1978) & of þe most folke he is
(1979) Pat euer þou herdest speke, wwis,
(1980) In þis worlds won."

(1981) (166) Pan seyd he riche douke again.
(1982) "What foly," he seyd, "can he sain ?
(1983) Is he madde of mode ?"
(1985) Forsake þe lazer in þe wain,
(1986) Pat he so ouer stode,


(2017) (169) þe squier þo þe coupe hent, (2018) & to be castel-gat he went. (2019) & ful of win he it bare. (2020) To be lazer he seyd, verrament. (2021) "Bis coupe ful of win mi lord þe sent, (2022) Drink it, 3iue þou dare." (2023) þe lazer tok þor þis coupe of gold, (2024) Bope were 3oten in ðo mold, (2025) Rßt as þat selue it ware, (2026) þer-in he pourd þat win so riche; (2027) Pan were þai bope ful yliche (2028) & noibor lesse no mare.

(2029) (170) þe squier bïheld þe coupes bo. (2030) First his & his lordes al-so, (2031) Whiles he stode hem biforn, (2032) Ac he no coupe neuer mo (2033) Chese þe better of hem to, (2034) So liche bope þai worn. (2035) In-to halle he ran agin, (2036) "Certes, sir," he gan to sain.


(2017) (169) þe squier þo þe coupe hent, (2018) & to be castel-gat he went. (2019) & ful of win he it bare. (2020) To be lazer he seyd, verrament. (2021) "Bis coupe ful of win mi lord þe sent, (2022) Drink it, 3iue þou dare." (2023) þe lazer tok þor þis coupe of gold, (2024) Bope were 3oten in ðo mold, (2025) Rßt as þat selue it ware, (2026) þer-in he pourd þat win so riche; (2027) Pan were þai bope ful yliche (2028) & noibor lesse no mare.

(2029) (170) þe squier bïheld þe coupes bo. (2030) First his & his lordes al-so, (2031) Whiles he stode hem biforn, (2032) Ac he no coupe neuer mo (2033) Chese þe better of hem to, (2034) So liche bope þai worn. (2035) In-to halle he ran agin, (2036) "Certes, sir," he gan to sain.

75 The subject, "pat douke," is in line 2005 (three lines before).
Text of Amis and Amiloun showing occurrence of formulae

(2088) Wip ri3t y com per to."

(2089) Pan was be douke ful egrc of mod;
(2090) Was noman bat about him stode
(2091) bat durst legge on him hond;
(2092) He spurned him wip his fort
(2093) & laiden, as he were wode.
(2094) Wip his naked brond,
(2095) & bi þe fet þe lazer he drou3
(2096) & drad on him in þe slou3;
(2097) For no hing wald he wond,
(2098) & seyd. "Def, pou shalt be slawe,
(2099) Bot pou wilt be þe sope aknawe,
(2100) Where þou þe coupe fond."

(2101) Child Amoraunt stode pe pople among
(2102) & seye his lord wip wou3 & wrong
(2103) Hou reweliche he was di3t.
(2104) He was bope hardi & strong,
(2105) Þe douke in his armes he fong
(2106) & held him stille vp-ri3t.
(2107) "Sir," he seyd, "þou art vnkende
(2108) & of þi werkes vnkende,
(2109) To sle þat gentil kni3t.
(2110) Wel sore may him rewe bat stounde
(2111) Pat euer for þe toke he wounde
(2112) To saue þi liif in fi3t.

(2113) "And ys thi brother, sir Amylioun,
(2114) That whilom was a noble baroun
(2115) Bothe to ryde and go.
(2116) And now with sorwe vs dreue adoun;
(2117) Nowe god bat suffred passionu
(2118) Breng him oute of his wo!
(2119) For the of olyssse he ys bare,
(2120) And thou yeldyst him al with care
(2121) And brekest his bones a two;
(2122) That he halp the at thi nede,
(2123) Well euell aqutest thou his mede,
(2124) Alas, whi farest thou so?"

(2125) (178) When sir Amis herd him so sain,
(2126) He stirt to þe kni3t again,
(2127) Wip-outen more delay,
(2128) & biclept him in his armes tvain,
(2129) & oft, "Alas!" he gan sain;
(2130) His song was "Waileway!"
(2131) He loket onop his scholder bare
(2132) & sei3e his grimly wounde þare,
(2133) As Amoraunt gan him say.
(2134) He fel aswon to be grounde
(2135) & oft he seyd, "Alas bat stounde!"
(2136) Pat euer he bode bat day.

(2137) (179) "Alas," he seyd, "mi ioie is lorn,
(2138) Fkender blod nas neuer born,
(2139) Y not wat y may do;

(2140) For he saued mi liif biforn,
(2141) Ichaue him 3olden wip wo & sorn
(2142) & wrou3t him michel wo.
(2143) "O broper," he seyd, "par charite,
(2144) Bis rewely deede for3if pou me,
(2145) Pat ichaue smiten þe so!"
(2146) & he for3aue it him also swipe
(2147) & kist him wel mani a sibe,
(2148) Wepeand wip ei3en two.

(2149) (180) Pan was sir Amis glad & fain,
(2150) For ioie he wepe wip his ain
(2151) & hent his broper han,
(2152) & tok him in his armes tvain.
(2153) Ri3t til he come in-to he halle o3ain.
(2154) No bar him nober man.
(2155) Þe leuedi þo in þe halle stode
(2156) & wend hir lord hadde ben wode.
(2157) O3aines him hye ran.
(2158) "Siri," sche seyd, "wat is þi pou3t?
(2159) Whi hastow him in-to halle ybrou3t,
(2160) For him bat þis world wan?"

(2161) "O dame," he seyd, "bi Seyn Jon,
(2162) Me nas neuer so wo bigon.
(2163) 3if þou it wost vnderstond,
(2164) For better kni3t in world is non,
(2165) Bot al-most now ichaue him slon
(2166) & schamely driuen to schond;
(2167) For it is mi broper, sir Amiloun,
(2168) Wip sorwe & care is dreuen adoun.
(2169) Pat er was fre to fond."
(2170) þe leuedi fel aswon to grounde
(2171) & wepe & seyd, "Alas bat stounde!"
(2172) Wel sore wrenghand hir hond.

(2173) (182) As foule a lazer as he was,
(2174) þe leuedi kist him in bat plas,
(2175) For nobing wold sche spare,
(2176) & oft time sch seyd, "Alas!"
(2177) Pat him was fallen so hard a cas,
(2178) To liue in sorwe & care.
(2179) Into hir chaumber she gan him lede
(2180) & kest of al his pouer wede
(2181) & baped his bodi al bare
(2182) & to a bedde swipe him brou3t
(2183) Wip clothes ri3e & wele ywrou3t;
(2184) Ful bi3e of him þai ware.

(2185) (183) & þus in gest as we say,
(2186) Tvelmonse in her chaumber he lay,
(2187) Ful trewe þai ware & kinde.
(2188) No wold pai nick him wip no nay,
(2189) What so euer he asked ni3t or day,
(2190) It nas neuer bihinde;
(2191) Of euerich mete & eueri drink
(2192) þai had hem-selue, wip-outen lesing,
TEXT OF AMIS AND AMILOUN SHOWING OCCURRENCE OF FORMULAE

(2193) Dai were him bope ful minde.
(2194) & bihan be telynge was ago.
(2195) A ful fair grace fel hem bo.
(2196) In gest as we finde.

(2197) (184) So it bifel opon a niȝt,
(2198) As sir Amis, bat gentil kniȝt,
(2199) In slepe þouȝt as he lay,
(2200) An angel com fram heuen briȝt
(2201) & stode biforn his bed ful riȝt
(2202) & to him þus gan say:’”
(2203) 3if he wald rise on Cristes mom,
(2204) Swiche time as Ihesu Crist was born,
(2205) & slen his children tvay,
(2206) & alien his [broþer] wip þe blode,
(2207) Purch godes grace, bat is so gode,
(2208) His wo schuld wende away.

(2209) (185) Puþ him þouȝt al þo þre niȝt
(2210) An angel out of heuen briȝt
(2211) Warned him euer more
(2212) 3if he wald do as he him hiȝt,
(2213) His broþer schuld ben as fair a kniȝt
(2214) As euer he was biforn,
(2215) Ful blipe was sir Amis bo,
(2216) Ac for his childer him was ful wo,
(2217) For fairer ner non born.
(2218) Wel lobb him was his childer to slo,
(2219) & wele lobb his broþer forgo,
(2220) Pat is so kinde ycorn.

(2221) (186) Sir Amiloun met bat niȝt also
(2222) Pat an angel warned him bo
(2223) & seyd to him ful 3are,
(2224) 3if his broþer wald hischilder slo,
(2225) þe hert blod of hem to
(2226) Mȝt bring him out of care.
(2227) A morwe sir Amis was ful hende
(2228) & to his broþer he gan wende
(2229) & asked him of his fare;
(2230) & he him answerd oȝain ful stille,
(2231) ”Broþer, ich abide her godes wille,
(2232) For y may do na mare.”

(2233) (187) Al so þai sete to-gider þare
(2234) & speke of auentours, as it ware,
(2235) Po kniȝtes hende & fre,
(2236) Pan seyd sir Amiloun ful 3are,
(2237) ”Broþer, y nil nouȝt spare
(2238) To tel þe in priuite
(2239) Me þouȝt to-niȝt in mi sweuen
(2240) Pat an angel com fram heuen;
(2241) For sohe, he told me
(2242) Pat purch þe blod of þin children to
(2243) Y niȝt aschape out of mi wo.

(2244) Al hayl & hole to be !"

(2245) Pan bouȝt þe douȝ, wip-outen lesing,
(2246) For to slean his childer so ʒing,
(2247) It were a dedli sinne;
(2248) & pan bouȝt he, bi heuen king,
(2249) His broþer out of sorwe bring,
(2250) For þat nold he nouȝt blinne.
(2251) So it bifel on Cristes niȝt,
(2252) Swiche time as Ihesu ful of miȝt,
(2253) Was born to saue man-kunne,
(2254) To chirehe to wende ali þat ber wes,
(2255) Pat diȝten hem, wip-outen les,
(2256) Wip ioe & worldes winne.

(2257) (189) Pan þai were redi for to fare,
(2258) Pe douȝe bad al þat ber ware,
(2259) To chirehe þai schuld wende,
(2260) Litel & michel, lasse & mare,
(2261) Pat non bileft in chaumber pare,
(2262) As þai wald ben his friende,
(2263) & seyd he wald him-selue þat niȝt
(2264) Kepe his broþer þat gentil kniȝt;
(2265) Pat was so god & kende,
(2266) Pan was þer non þat durst say nay;
(2267) To chirehe þai went in her way,
(2268) At hom bileft bo hende.

(2269) (190) Pe douȝe wel fast gan aspie
(2270) Pe kays of þe noricerie,
(2271) Er þan þai schuld gon,
(2272) & priueliche he cast his eiȝe
(2273) & apearciued ful witterlye
(2274) Where þat þai hadde hem don.
(2275) & when þai were to chirehe went,
(2276) Han þai Amis, verrament,
(2277) Was bileft al-on.
(2278) He tok a canel fair & briȝt
(2279) & to þe kays he went ful riȝt
(2280) & tak hem oway ichon.

(2281) (191) Alon him self, wip-outen mo,
(2282) Into he chaumber he gan to go,
(2283) Per þat his childer were,
(2284) & biheld hem boþe to,
(2285) Hou fair þai lay to-gider bo
(2286) & slepe boþe yfere.
(2287) Pan seyd him-selue, "Bi Seyn Jon,
(2288) It were gret reweful ȝou to slon,
(2289) Pat god haf bouȝt so dere !"
(2290) His kniȝf he had drawn þat tide,
(2291) For sorwe he sleynyt oway biside
(2292) & wepe wip reweful chere.

(2293) Han he hadde wopen her he stode,
(2294) Anon he turned oȝain his mode
(2295) & sayd wip-outen delay,

"The subject, "an angel," is in 2200 (three lines before)."
(2296) "Mi broper was so kind & gode.
(2297) Wib grimly wounde he schad his blod
(2298) For mi loue opon a day;
(2299) Whi schuld y þan mi childer spare,
(2300) To bring mi broper out of care?
(2301) O. certes," he seyd, "nay!
(2302) To help mi broper now at his nede,
(2303) God graunt me þer-to wele to spede,
(2304) & Mari, bat best may!"

(2305) (193) No lenger stint he no stode,
(2306) Bot hent his kniif wib dreri mode
(2307) & tok his children þo;
(2308) For he nold nou3t spiUe her blode,
(2309) Ouer a bacine fair & gode
(2310) Her protes he schar atvo.
(2311) & when he hadde hem bope slain,
(2312) He laid hem in her bed ogain,
(2313) No wonder þei him were woo-
(2314) & hilde hem, þat no wi3t schuld se,
(2315) As noman hadde at hem be;
(2316) Out of chaumber he gan go.

(2317) & when he was out of chaumber gon,
(2318) þe dore he steked stille anon
(2319) As fast as it was biforn;
(2320) þe kays he hidde vnder a ston
(2321) & þou3t þat schuld wene ichon
(2322) þat þai hadde ben forlorn.
(2323) To his broper he went hem ban
(2324) & seyd to þat carefull man,
(2325) "Swiche time as god was born,
(2326) Þi haue þe brou3t mi childer blod,
(2327) Þi hope it schal do þe gode
(2328) As þe angel seyd biforn."

(2329) "Broper," sir Amiloun gan to say,
(2330) "Hastow slayn þine children tvay?
(2331) Alas, whi destow so?"
(2332) He wepe & seyd, "Waileway!
(2333) Þi had lever til domesday
(2334) Haue liued in care & wo!"
(2335) Þan seyd sir Amis, "Be now stille;
(2336) Ihesu, when it is his wille,
(2337) May send me childer mo.
(2338) For me of blis þou art al bare;
(2339) Ywis, mi liif wil y nou3t spare,
(2340) To help þe now þer-fro."

(2341) He tok þat blode, þat was so bri3t,
(2342) & alied þat gentil kni3t,
(2343) Þat er was hend in hale,
(2344) & selpen in bed him di3t
(2345) & weel3e him wel warm, aplat,
(2346) Wib clothes riche & fale.
(2347) "Broper," he seyd, "ly now stille
(2348) & falle on slepe purch godes wille.

(2349) As þe angel told in tale;
(2350) & ichope wele wib-outen lesing,
(2351) Ihesu, bat is heuen king,
(2352) Schal bope þe of þi bale."

(2353) (197) Sir Amis let him ly alon
(2354) & in to his chapel he went anon,
(2355) In gest as 3e may here,
(2356) & for his childer, þat he hadde slon,
(2357) To god of heuen he made his mon
(2358) & preyd wib rewely chere
(2359) Schuld saue him fram schame þat day,
(2360) & Mari, his moder, þat best may,
(2361) þat was him lleue & dere;
(2362) & Ihesu Crist, in þat stede
(2363) Ful wele he herd þat kni3t3s bede
(2364) & graunt him his priare.

(2365) (198) Amorwe astite as it was day,
(2366) Be leuedi com home al wib play
(2367) Wib kni3t3s ten & fiue;
(2368) Pái sou3t be kays þer þai lay;
(2369) Pái found hem nou3t, þai were oway,
(2370) Wel wo was hem o-liue.
(2371) Be douk bad al þat þer wes
(2372) Pái schuld hold hem still in pes
(2373) & stint of her strieue,
(2374) & seyd he hadde þe keys nome,
(2375) Schuld noman in þe chaumber come
(2376) Bot him self & his wiue.

(2377) (199) Anon he tok his leuedi ban
(2378) & seyd to hir, "Leue leman,
(2379) Be blipe & glad of mode;
(2380) For bi þat þat his world wan,
(2381) Bope mi childer ich haue slan,
(2382) þat were so hende & gode;
(2383) For me þou3t in mi sweuen
(2384) Pat an angel com fram heuen
(2385) & seyd me purch her blode
(2386) Mi broper schuld passe out of his wo;
(2387) Per-fre y slou3 hem bope to,
(2388) To hele þat frely fode."

(2389) (200) þan was he leuedi ferly wo
(2390) & se3e hir lord was al-so;
(2391) Sche comfort him ful 3are,
(2392) "O lef liif," sche seyd ho,
(2393) "God may sende ous childer mo,
(2394) Of hem haue þou no care.
(2395) 3if it ware at min hert rote,
(2396) For to bring þi broper bote,
(2397) My lyf y wold not spare.
(2398) Schal noman ous children see,
(2399) To-morrow schal þey beryed bee
(2400) As þey faire ded ware!"
(2401) (201) Pus he lady faire & breth\n(2402) Comfort hur lord with al hur my\n(2403) As e mow vnderstond;\n(2404) And seth bey went bob ful ry\n(2405) To sir Amylion, pat gentyl kny\n(2406) pat ere was free to fonde.\n(2407) When sir Amylion wakyd poo,\n(2408) Al his fowlehed was agoo.\n(2409) Prou3 grace of goddes sonde;\n(2410) Pat he as feire a man\n(2411) As euer he was 3et or ban,\n(2412) Seb he was born in londe.\n(2413) (202) Pan were bey al blyp,\n(2414) Her ioy coub noman kyth,\n(2415) As e mow listen and lyth,\n(2416) Into a chamber\n(2417) Wit-out wemme and wound\n(2418) Her care was al [away].\n(2419) And banked god with myld mood,\n(2420) For ioye bey wept, bere bey\n(2421) And layen to-geder and play.\n(2422) When sir Amylion was hool\n(2423) And wax was strong of powere\n(2424) Child bob to goo and ryde,\n(2425) Blithe and glad he was of chere,\n(2426) To speke with his wyfbat tyde;\n(2427) And for she halp him so at nede,\n(2428) He wolde hoom to his contray,\n(2429) No lenger wold he abyde.\n(2430) After mony kny3t hardy,\n(2431) He preked both ny3t and day\n(2432) Til he com to his contray,\n(2433) Per he was lord in lede.\n(2434) On palfray and on steed.\n(2435) He preked both ny\n(2436) Til he com to his contray,\n(2437) Per he was lord in lede.\n(2438) After mony kny3t hardy,\n(2439) Pat dou3ty were of dede,\n(2440) Wel fyve hundred kene and try,\n(2441) Anoon he hend barons tway,\n(2442) On palfray and on steed.\n(2443) He preked both ny\n(2444) Til he com to his contray,\n(2445) Per he was lord in lede.\n(2446) Pat had a kny\n(2447) Spoused his lady, bre\n(2448) In romaunce as we rede.\n(2449) But bus, in romaunce as y 3ow say,\n(2450) Pat he as feire a man\n(2451) Pat he as feire a man\n(2452) To be 3ates bey preked with-out delay,\n(2453) Anon per began a soory play
(2454) Among be barouns bold.\n(2455) A messengere to be hal com\n(2456) And seide her lord was com hom\n(2457) As man meriest on molde.\n(2458) Pan wo\n(2459) Per was mony a sory man,\n(2460) Bob 3ong and olde.\n(2461) (206) Sir Amys and sir Amylion\n(2462) And with hem mony a stout baron\n(2463) With kny\n(2464) With helmes & with haberyon.\n(2465) With swerd breth\n(2466) Per went in to be hale.\n(2467) Al pat bey here arau3t,\n(2468) Grete strokes be\n(2469) Bob grete and smale.\n(2470) Glad and blyb were bey pat day.\n(2471) Who so my\n(2472) [And fle fro that bredale.]
(2473) (207) [When thei had with wrake\n(2474) Droue oute both broun and blake]\n(2475) Out of bat worthy woon,\n(2476) Sir Amylyon for his lady sake\n(2477) & grete logge he let make\n(2478) Bob of lym and stoon.\n(2479) Pere-yn was \n(2480) And with bred and water was she fed,\n(2481) Tyl her lyue-days were goon.\n(2482) Bus \n(2483) Who pefcr rou3t, he was a queede,\n(2484) As e haue herd echoon.
(2485) (208) Pen sir Amylion sent his sond\n(2486) To erles, barouns, fre and bond,\n(2487) Bob feire and hende.\n(2488) When bey com, he sesed in hond\n(2489) Child Owesys in al his lond,\n(2490) Bat was trew and kynde;\n(2491) And when he had do bus, ywys,\n(2492) With his brother, sir Amys,\n(2493) A3en \n(2494) In muche toy with-out stryf\n(2495) To-geder ladde \n(2496) Tel god after hem dide sende.
(2497) (209) Anoon he hend barons tway,\n(2498) Bey let reyse a feire abbay\n(2499) And feffet it ri\n(2500) In Lumbardy, in bat contray,\n(2501) To senge for hem tyl domesday\n(2502) And for her eldres also.\n(2503) Bob on oo day were bey dede\n(2504) And in oo graue were bey leide,\n(2505) Bob 3ong and olde.\n(2506) And for her trew\n(2507) And seide her lord was com hom
(2508) As man meriest on molde.
(2509) Pan wo\n(2510) Per was mony a sory man,\n(2511) Bob 3ong and olde.
TEXT OF *AMIS AND AMILOUN* SHOWING OCCURRENCE OF FORMULAE

(2507) be blisse of heuen be ye haue to mede,
(2508) bat lastep ever moo.

(2509) AMEN.
APPENDIX B: ANGLO-NORMAN AMYS E AMILIOUN

INTRODUCTION TO THE MANUSCRIPT

CONTENT

The manuscript contains seven items of which Amis and Amilioun is the last. Each work has been provided with a title by van der Hardt, onetime keeper of the Karlsruhe Library manuscript collection, and with the exception of Amis and Amilioun, all are works of Latin prose. The first is a late twelfth/early thirteenth-century work entitled Chronicon Anglo-Scoticum. The second is a late thirteenth-century Statuta Syndodalia. Third is a fifteenth-century work entitled Fragmentum similis argumentis. The fourth item is also from the fifteenth century, a hagiographic history of St. Agnetis. The fifth item is a fragment of religious treatise dealing with three of the seven deadly sins (avarice, gluttony and adultery) from the late fourteenth century, while the penultimate item, to which no date has been ascribed, is entitled Fragmentum de aliquot actibus. As their dates suggest, the individual items were not produced with the intention of being incorporated together, a fact that is further evidenced by the lack of continuity in the size of the various folios. Nevertheless, it would appear that the final product might have been intended for someone with interests in religious works and romantic histories. The fourth volume of the 1969 catalogue of Karlsruhe manuscripts provides a full manuscript description.

THE TEXT

The text is contained in folios 52ra - 61vb inclusively, running in two parallel columns of approximately 44 lines each. The physical beginning of the tale is indicated by the German words “Gallic Rhymtm. mutig” inscribed across the top of 52r in a modern hand. This does not, however, indicate the beginning of the narrative. The story itself is introduced on 59r, where a much older hand has inscribed across the top in letters now only legible under blue light “Romance de amys & amilioun.” A large “T” elaborately decorated in red ink begins the first word of the story, and another such rubricated initial letter “Q” with blue curliques appears at line 19. All other initial letters are rubricated in red throughout the manuscript, except on 60r and 61v, where they are plain, though initial letters on 60v and 61r are also decorated. The lack of decoration on 60r and 61v might account for the misalignment of the pages, though on them, as elsewhere, the points where initial letters should occur are indicated by a paragraph mark in the margin.
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Whatever reason there is for the present arrangement of the folios, the narrative now makes a circuitous course through them. From 59r it continues on to 59va and 59vb before jumping back to 52ra, from whence it continues in an orderly fashion until it reaches the bottom of 54vb. At this point the thread of the narrative picks up on 60ra and follows on to the end of 60vb, after which there is a gap in the story of some 352 lines, owing to two leaves missing between 60v and 61r, each of which can be assumed to have contained two columns of approximately 44 lines per page. At 61ra the story resumes in medias res and follows on to 61vb before again jumping back several pages to continue on 55ra. Thereafter, the story again progresses regularly until ending imperfectly at the bottom of 58rb.

It can therefore be concluded that at some point before the manuscript was foliated it had been carelessly bound or rebound in such a way that the original quiring was disrupted and a pair of leaves lost. An examination of the narrative’s progression, however, indicates that the original quiring must have been the following:

,59r, 52r, 53r, 54r, 60r, Xr, Xr, 61r, 55r, 56r, 57r, 58r

The four central leaves were removed, the two central-most becoming lost (X-X), while the other pair (60-61) were reattached at the end of the group. It may be that the lack of decoration on 60r and 61v (the “outer” pages of the two leaves) induced the compiler to leave this set for last. Meanwhile, folio 59 had been flipped around from its place at the beginning of the intact series, so that it now appears at the end of that series, after folio 58, and just before 60-61. Thus, we now have the following foliation:

,52r, 53r, 54r, 55r, 56r, 57r, 58r, 59r, 60r, 61r

Thus, the original quire of 12 leaves is now reduced to 10, leaving a significant gap in the narrative relating the battle between Amilioun (disguised as Amis) and the seneschal.

Due to irregularity in the number of lines per column, however, the exact number of lines missing is uncertain. Because of a large hole near the bottom of folio 52, 52ra and its reverse 52vb only contain 40 lines each (for further information, see “scribal corrections” below); 59ra & 59rb also contain only 40 lines, while each column on 56v and 57r contains 45. Interestingly, however, both columns on the back of this last page, on 57v, contain only 43 lines, and while 58va has the expected 44 lines, 58vb is curious in having 45. In total, therefore, there are 1748 lines in this version of Amis e Amilioun instead of the 1760 that might
be expected when one takes into account the missing 352 lines (which itself is only a hypothetical reckoning).

In spite of the problems and peculiarities discussed, Karlsruhe presents an interesting version of the actual story, which despite having portions missing from the middle and the end, is still some 400 lines longer than the 1240 lines of Fukui’s edition based on MS London, or the 1250 lines of Kölbing’s composite edition of MSS London and Cambridge. Within these lines are some episodes which share many details with the Middle English version which do not appear in the other Anglo-Norman versions. It is for these reasons that the Karlsruhe version, despite its obvious scribal flaws, deserves to be examined in its own right, and not simply relegated to the apparatus of its companion pieces, in comparison with which it is often held in low esteem.
EDITORIAL PROCEDURES

Orthography

The text has been altered as little as possible in order to preserve its individuality. However, where required, emendment according to standard procedures for Anglo-Norman texts does occur; thus, $u$ and $v$, and $i$ and $j$ are redistributed according to their consonantal or vocalic function. Spellings such as “ws,” “uus” and “wus” for “vous” are silently regularised to “vus” or “vuus” as appropriate. Some very unusual spellings, such as “eepos” for “eps” are also regularised, as are apparently Latinate forms such as “baudementis” for “baudement” and “vousisti” for “vousist”; these, however, can be found in the list of rejected readings in the appendix, where an example can also be found of a diplomatic transcription parallel with the edited text.

Punctuation

Modern punctuation has been added throughout to facilitate reading. Thus “l’autre” has been emended to “l’autre,” “s’est” to “s’est,” “ne,” to “n’en,” etc., as appropriate. This punctuation has been added silently. Editorial emendation such as replacing the manuscript’s “len faunt” with “l’enfaunt” are noted in the spacing appendix. Thus, the reader who wishes to know exactly what appears in the manuscript has only to delete the punctuation and consult the appendix.

Where necessary, and in accordance with standard editing procedures, an acute accent or a cedilla is provided to show tonic accents and to distinguish soft $c$ from hard.

Capitalisation

Majuscule letters have been retained where they occur at the beginning of lines. Proper nouns are capitalised, as are all sentence initial words and words beginning a section of direct discourse. In the few instances where what appears to be a capitalised letter form is used for something other than a proper noun, the beginning of a sentence, or a line-initial word in the manuscript, it is represented it in its minuscule form. It seems that such instances are simply flourishes which occur where space permits (such as the first line of a column), and they serve no grammatical purpose or indication of emphasis.
Section Breaks

Places where the scribe has indicated a laisse by providing either rubricated lettering (as at line 1 and 19) and/or placed paragraph marks in the left-hand margin of the text are indicated by a blank line preceding a line-initial letter in bold.

Abbreviation

Abbreviations have been expanded silently in accordance with general editing procedures for Anglo-Norman texts, though the example in the appendix of the "unedited" text parallel with the edited version text utilises the Middle English convention of indicating the expansions by the use of italics.
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*AMYS E AMILIOUN:*

THE TEXT OF

*MS KARLSRUHE 345, CODEX DURLAC 38.*

parallel with

*LONDON ROYAL 12. C. XII*
Trovez vus un romaunz

59ra

De .ii. chivalers, si füns amaunz;
L'uns Amyz l'autre Amilioun,
Qe pus Deu suffri passiun;
Ne fu trouvé si leal amour,
Ne pur leauté si grand dolour,
Si grand variaunce en merveille,
Si grand grace en bataile,
Si grand peyne ne si grand perte,
Si grand meseyse sanz deserte
De tote meraris encumbrers,
Cum avyant a .ii. chivalers,
Ne greygnur miracle après
Qe Iur fu destine adés,
Dount nus avums auctorite,
Par seynte Eglyse confermé,
En Iur legende de propre estoyre,
Par unt fet le mez acroyre.

Qui veut oyr romaunz de amur,
De leauté e de grand douzour,
En pes se teigne pur escoter!
Car de truflis ne voil parler,
Mes de .ii. juvenceus vous diray --
Si ai en escryt Ie trouay --
Qui a la court Charlis estoyent
E pur lur armes Ie servoyent.
Mult furent de vassallage,
Gentils e de high parage,
Fyz estoyent de .ji. baruns;
Si vus diray ben lur nuns:
Li uns avoyt Amyz a noun,
L'autre est appeJe Amillyoun.
Mult overist en eus dame Nature,
De corssage e de estature;
Tant furent beaus, ce dyt I'estorie,
Unques pus que ly rey de glorie
Fist primes home a sa semblance,
.ji. plus beaus de apparaunce
Ne furent en qui Iya joynt,
Ce dist l'escrit en chacun poyn:
De totes beautes qe hom sout juger
En eus .ii. pout hom trouer.
Seignurs, si plus vus ples entendre,
Haute merveile puez aprendre,
Qe vi de cé .ii. chivalers orrez;
Onques ne fu greygnur trouez!

Taunt s'amerent fierement
Que freres se firent par serement;
As autres ne fesoient unke semblaut
De companie tant ne quant.
Ceus de la court avoient envie
De leur estre e de leur compaynie,
Q'amérrent entre eus tant fierement,
E de cee se coroucent sovent.
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47 Lé .ii. cors taunt resembleient
48 Que si en vu lu aundui estoient,
49 Ne est om ke eus avisast
50 Que par semblance les severast
51 Ne par cors ne par fazoun,
52 Par reen si par la robe noun.

53 Cil dui vallet, dont voil parler,
54 Taunt ce pristrent entreamere,
55 A si forte fraternité
56 Que de quanque furunt unques né.
57 Ne fu trové si leal amour,
58 Ne pur leauté si grand dolour,
59 De tote maneris de encumbrers,
60 Cum avent a cé chivalers.
61 Charlis le fort emperere
62 En sun tens out une manere
63 Ke nul home en sa court seriöyt
64 Que a la table serviroyt
65 Si il ne fut chivaler adubbez,
66 De haute nurture ly vytnt saché.

67 Li dui vallet, ke tant sunt beaus,
68 Vers le roy sunt si tré leus
69 Qe pur ren ke pout avener
70 De roy ne sout nuls home les £lecher,
71 Ains le servirent leaument.
72 E cil ke lur leauté entent
73 Les rewarde a si haute franchise
74 Ke pur lur merite e lur servise:

75 Chivalers les fet a grand honour:
76 Tut lur addubbez e lur atour,
77 Lur trove, en quanque lur apent;
78 Grand honur lur feste tient.
79 Ore sunt li dui amaunt mountez,
80 A haute estage honurez,
81 Endreit de lour seignour Charloun
82 Ke en eus se fye plus ke en nul hom.
83 E pur la grandime affinité
84 De amur ke en eus had trové,
85 Fait de syre Amys sun boteler,
86 Ke asez se pout en lui fier,
87 E de sun frere sire Amillioun
88 Fait seneschal de sa mesoun
89 E marechaus de la sale sur touz,
90 Tant fu averty e prus.

91 De teu mester long tens servirent
92 E partut tré ben le firent.
93 Ben a .xiii. auns ou plus
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De cors de visage bien resembleyent: 25
Si de une robe vestu estoient, 26
N'est home le mounq leq les avisast 27
| Qe l'un de l'autre descieverast. 28

E si furent de une estature, 29
De une forme e de une nature. 30
Leals furent envers lor seygnur, 31
Bien le portent a honour; 32
Si les amast mult tendrement, 33
Honur les fist a lor talent. 34
Chivalers tour fist a grant honur: 35
Touz les ad dobbez en estour, 36
Lour trova si com il voleint; 37
Hautement lour feste teneint. 38

De Amys fist son botiler, 39
Car moult a ly puet affyer. 40
Amiillioun ne veit lesser: 41
De son hostel ly fist justizer, 42
Mestre mareschal sur touz (69rb) 43
Qi fort esteit e coragous. 44

De cel mester longtemps servirent 45
E par tot bien loé furent. 46
Le rei les hath mout cher tenus
Si Iur mustre si grand amur,
Dount se coroucent li plusur.
Si tenent entre euz si fort envie
De la tre fine compaygnye
Si l’empleient durement,
E li senecaus nomement
Sur touz autres l’esguaute hounte;
Ce est tote la force de cunte.
Il les surquert a tele envie
Que tote manere felouyne
Que unques compasser savoyt
A ce .ii. chivalers feosoyt.
Amilloun taunt i demurra
Ke sun pere momt ja,
Dount autre eir for lui ne aveyt;
Equant de veir nuncie I’estoyt
Si il se desmente a mervaylle --
Mes tut astuce <...>es se aparaylle --
A sun pays retourner,
Sun eritage visiter.
Au rei Charlis se est venuz,
Franchementes le rend saluz:
“Mun seignur,” fet il, “Emperer,
Cil ke fut cel, tere e mer,
Vus sauve, mun seignur Charlemayne,
E la royne vostre compayne.”
E ly rey plein de afeitement
Ses salu......le......ent
D......aft..................un vengrant
..........................est demeinemant.
“Queles noveles vus aportez,
59vb
Ke la chere si mourne avez?”
“Mon seignur,” ce dist Amilloun,
“Pur Deu, entendez ma resun!
Mut me est venu message fort
Qe moy dist moun pere est mort.
Ce me nuncie un messager
Ke freschement vent de outre mer,
E si grever vus ne quidase
Le congé si vus demandase
Qe visiter puse ma tere
Qe hom ne me face tresun ne guerre.”
Li reis respound curteisement,
Qui asez le eyme parfitement:
“Danz mareschaus, pus ke est issi
Qe vostre pere est fini,
Dount le eritage vus desendera
Par mei rethait ne vus ert ja.
Ne place Deu de magesté
Ke vostre honour fust desturbé
Par mei, beu sire Amilloun,
En mei trovezes dunces mau guerdon!
Mes si vus avez de mei afere --
Seit en pes ou en guere --
Mandez le mei hardiement
E tant cum mei dure or ou argent,
Ne vus faudrai ne dotez mie."
Veez ci large curteisy
du rei caunt a sun serjaunt;
Ne say coment serreit plus grand.

Le rei li ad par le mentun pris,
Si li beise v. foyz ou vi.,
Ke unqes ne seest arestous
E lors li congeie sanz plus
A si treforte amystee,
Ke quanq en court sunt demuré.
S’esmerveilent durement
Si l’en parleient privement,
E grand envie i aquillerent,
Ausi avant cum il osèrent.
Le chivaler s’en vet plerant,
E a sun frere vent meyntenaint
Si le <.>ne l’enchesun.
"Beu frere," ce dist Amiloun,
"Pur le Duz amur celuy
Qe pur nus en la croyz pendy,
De une chose vus requer,
Que ove moi vodriez aler
A moun pays en Lumbardye
Ov moy menner tote ma vie,
Car ne say certis coment viveroye,
Si de vus unqes m’en aloye.
Tant moy destreint vostre amur,
Que a tuz jours viveroy en langur,
Pus ke fussons departi.
E pur ce, beau frere, vus pri,
Ke vus preignez la seignureie,
Que quanq apent a moun barounie,
Ke me est descendu de eritage,
Le fyz Deu preigne en testimoniage,
Ke de trestut vuus seseray,
E cum seignur vuus serviray."

Amys respond a grand dusur:
"Merci, beu frere, pur Deu amur,
Mut me avez forte mater moustre.
Ne voyle Deu de mageste
Ke unke me venist tel meschance
Ver meun seignur, le rei de France,
Ke sun servise unqes guerpiroye,
Si de verité ne le savoye
Ke mes ne vousist de moun servise,
Ensi le mei ad nature aprise.
E ce ne fet mye a merveiller,
Si finaumtes me tient a quer,
La grand frachyse e le onur
Ke le rei nus fyst a jour
Quant les armes nus dona,
E nostre onour tant enaunca;
Ja nel me doynt Deux ublier,

Pur Deux, ne parlez de le aler!"

E derichef dist sire Amillyoun

Qe apoy ne perd sen e resoun,

E de fyn doel apoy ne arage

Quant chaunger ne put sun curage.

Asez se pleint e se desmente,

Mais au dreit dist pitousemente:

"Beau duz frere, pus ke ensi est,

Ke ove mei aler ne vuus plest,

Mes a tote fyns demurea ci,

Qe son pere fuy affyné,

De son seignur le counte ad pris congé,

Qe li covient garder sa terre

Qe nul li fist treson ne gere,

Ne qe autre heyr n’i entrast

Ne ses droitz amenusast.

Le counte fist de coo marriz,

Congé li done mes enviz;

Mes le conte fist com bon seynur,

Destourber ne vout son honur;

Mes s’il eust od ly affere,

Fuist ceo en pees ou en guerre,

Maundast a ly hastivement,

E il od force de sa gent

Vendroit a ly, ceo li jura.

Amyllioun ly mercya.

Atant del counte departi,

Si ala parler a son amy

Amys, q’estoit son compaignoun,

En bone foy saunz treson

De plur ne se poet tenir,

Car mout li greve le departir.

Donq parla sire Amillyoun

E dit: ‘Amis, beau compaignoun,

En bone foy saunz tresoun

A nostre seignur servy avom.

Pur vostre honor vus cri mercy,

De une chose soiez garni:

Le counte ad seignz un seneschal

Qe mout est feloun e desleal

E si est de mult grant parenté;
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227 Gardez vuus de sa felounie!
228 Si ne aiez a ly compaignye!

229 Car pys ne put ja avinyr
230 Quaunt compaignon vut autre trahir.
231 Tant cum ensemble en court fusums,
232 Ja mar sun mal deceroms,
233 Mes pus ke ore soie departi,
234 Mut vus ert fort enemi.
235 Ne say ke plus vus die atant,
236 Mais au fys Deu vuus comaunt!"
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227 Par quoi il vus pout grever.
228 Mes quant jeo serry departi,
229 Donke vus serra il fort enemy.
230 Gardez vus de sa felonie!
231 Ne aiez od li compaignie,
232 Car qui s'acompanie od feloun
233 Ne porra trover si mal noun;
234 Car piz ne porra avenir
235 Quant compaignon velt autre trahir.

237 Atant ses sunt entrebeysé,
238 Plurent e crient de pité.
239 Souz ciel ne ad ome ke la fist
240 Ke de lour doel pité n'en ust;
241 Paumez ses sunt cheuz a tere,
242 N'est ome ke moi vouisit crere
243 Si jioe lur deisse la moité
244 De doel ke entre eux unt mené.
245 Li uns s'en vait, l'autre remaunt,
246 Ke dolourousement se playnt.
247 Li uns vayt vers sun pays,
248 L'autre remeint assez pensyfs.
249 Ne sout de doel ke fere poyt,
250 Mes vers la court sei returneyt.
251 Si s'est en sa chambre alé
252 Si destreint e si maleeisè
253 Qe de langor e de peyne,
254 En luy se teent un quinzaine,
255 Ke ren ne manga, ce dyt l'escrit.
256 Mes quant asuwagez est un petyt,
257 E qe il se sente auqes a alleggez,
258 Hors du luy s'est lors levez,
259 En la sale tantost ala;
260 Le seneschal i encuntra,
261 Ke de amur lèy fyt semblant,
262 Mes unqes nel ama tant ne quant!

263 "Sire Amys," fet ii, "ben veinant!
264 De vus sui ore aler pensant,
265 E de moun sire Amylloun
266 Qe tant fut vus leal compaygnoun.
267 Unqes nul autre ne vollez amer,
268 Ne nul semblant de amur mustrer,
269 Mes pus qe ore se est departi,
Requer que soyez mon amy,
Mon ami e mon bien voilant.' (69vb)
Amis respuont aiant: 128
Sire seneschal, vostre amisté
En moy n'est si emploie 129
Que ne puisse nul autre amer 130
Quant talent me doint e voler. 131
Si Amilliouns soit alé, 132
Son quer me est abandoné, 133
E jeo ly aym e ameray; 134
Pur nul autre ne li lerray 135
Par [ceo] qu'il est chose esprové 136
Pur promesse saunz seurte. 137
Mes de taunt me poez crere 138
Qe, si vous eiez de moy affere, 139
Jeol vous fray od graunt doucour, 140
Sauve chescuny honur.' 141
Li seneschal ataunt se tint, 142
Qe d'anguisse pale devint, 143
Purpense sei q'il se vengereit 144
Sitost com son leu verreyt. 145
Amis lessa le temps aler, 146
Ala e fist son mester; 147
Servi le counte com il soleyt, 148
E le counte mout li amoyt: 149
Od sei le tint plus privé 150
Qe nul autre de sa meinsé. 151
Ore vous dirrai de sir Amiloun: 152
Quant vint a sa regioun, 153
La gent qe de sa terre furent 154
Od grant nobley li recurent; 155
Trestouz li firent hommage. 156
Ore poét il mener grant baronage! 157
N'ust od ly ja si privé 158
Q'il n'out dis chivalers de maisné. 159
Tant fuit de sa gent amé, 160
E lour ad trestouz doné 161
Bons chevaux e deners, 162
E robes a ses esquier. 163
E il memes si bel estoit 164
Qe tut le pays le disoyt 165
Si Deu mesmes le eust purtret, 166
Plus bon ne meuz [ne] serra fet. (70ra) 167
AMYS E AMILIOUN

MS. KARLSRUHE 345

305 Ses gens ke durement le amerent
306 A femme prendre li conseillerent.
307 E par leur conseil se marria
308 Une gentifs femme espousa.
309 Fyille au duc de Pavie,
310 A ly decend la seignurie
311 Del eritage, donk du duché,
312 Ozille esteit ele nomé.
313 Mut fut bele, ce dyt l'escrit,
314 Car de quanqe Deux unqe fyst;
315 Ne fiu creature plus bele
316 Si elle ust este bone e lele.
317 Mes mut fut male e rampouse
318 En checune poynt contriouse;
319 Desnaturele a sun seignur
320 Cum il apparuast a chef de tour.
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305 Sa gent durement l'amerent; 169
306 A femme prendre li consaillerent. 170
307 Par leur consaile se mariait: 171
308 Une gentile femme esposat 172
313 Qe fille d'un counte estoit, 173
314 E pere e mere perdu avoit; 174
315 Pur heritage la moyt; 175
316 Li fuit escheu del counté. 176
317 De beauté avoit le pris 177
318 Sour tous les dames del pais. 178
319 Bien furent entre eux couplez 179
320 De parage e de beautez. 180

321 Seignurs, en tant vus leeroms,
322 E de sire Amys vus diroms,
323 Ke fiu demurer ov sun seignour
324 E meuz le servji des jour en jour.
325 E tant cum il le meuz servi,
326 Le seneschal le plus le hay;
327 De sun benfet aveit envie,
328 Mes Amys nele aparcut mye.
329 Li rois une dame avoyt
330 Qe il assez tendremen amoyt;
331 Une fylle out de la dame
332 Qe il atant ama cum sa alme;
333 Mut fut gent la damoysele;
334 En tote France ne out plus bele.
335 Princis e ducs la desireyent
336 Qe a femme la voleyent,
337 Mes ele a tresquou respondi 53ra
338 Ne vout uncore aver mari.
339 En grand cherté la tynt li pere,
340 E mut la amoy ausi la mere.
341 La damoysel fue ben gardé;
342 Campaynes out a grand plenté
343 Des damiselay du pays
344 En sa chambre out .ix. ou .x.;
345 Par parfoumer sa volunte
346 De contredire nel sunt osee.
347 Tanke paraventure avynt
348 Ke le reis une feste tynt
349 Par un jour de le Assencioun;
350 La out assemblé tant baroun.

329 Li quens une dame avez 189
330 Q'il come sa vie ameit. 190
331 Une fille avoit la dame 191
332 Q'ele amoit come s'alme. 192
333 Mout fut gentile la damoisele, 193
334 En une reame ne out plus bele. 194
335 Deus countes la desireint, 195
336 E esposer la volirent, 196
337 Mes ele a tresquou respondi 197
338 Ne vout uncore aver mary. 198
339 A grant cherté le tynt le pere, 199
340 E mout l'ama auxi la mere. 200
341 La damoisele fuit bien gardé: 201
342 Compaignes out a grant pleinté 202
343 Des damiseles del pais 203
344 En sa chambre noef e dis, 204
345 Qe touz fesoient sa volunte 205
346 De countredit n'en ad parlé. 206
347 Un jour par aventure avint 207
348 Qe li quens une feste tynt 208
349 Par un jour de l'Ascensioun; 209
350 La fuit assemblé maint baroun. 210

53ra
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351 Este vus le mestre botiller
352 Qe ben avynt a sun mestre;
353 En un dyapre vestey estoyt,
354 La coupe devaunt le roy tenoit.
355 Mut fu beauz e alignez --
356 Des chivalers fu mud preyez --
357 Car tut en comoun le disoyent
358 Plus beaus chivaler veu ne avoyent.
359 E le roy memes sovent le dyt,
360 Unkes plus beuz chivaler ne vyt.
361 De sa beaute s'en vunt parlant
362 Quanque estoient, petit e grand.
363 Tanke estoit la novele
364 En la chaumbre a le damoyse
365 Du botiller ke taunt fut beaus
366 E si tre gentifs damiseus,
367 E ke il estoyt teu chivaler
368 Ke en tote France ne avoyt per.
369 La pucele en pryst tendrou
370 Tanke vers lui getta sa amur;
371 Se compaygnes ke ov erent
372 Se compaygnes ke ov li erent
373 Pur quei ce fut la demanderent;
374 E cele dyt que malade fu,
375 Mes ne sout dont l'estoit venu.
376 Si les comandoyt nepurquant
377 Qe ne la descoversent niant,
378 Les damoyseles qe od erent
379 Si ke en court ne ad un remys
380 Tantke li roys un jour ala
381 En boys juwer en venerie,
382 E ove li grand chivalrie.
383 Si ke en court ne ad un remys
384 Des chivalers for sire Amys,
385 E cil remeint pur estimer,
386 Car ne afer mye a botiller
387 Estre absent, hors du court,
388 E nomement la ou prese sorut.
389 Atlas cum fet a regreter --
390 Car il ne set mye le encombrer --
391 Ke li est frechement en venant;
392 Unqes ne oystes ce croy de tant.

53rb 53rb
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384 Des chevalers for sire Amis,
385 E il remist pur maladie.
386 Car ne afer mye a botiller
387 Estre absent, hors du court,
388 E nomement la ou prese sorut.
389 Atlas cum fet a regreter --
390 Car il ne set mye le encombrer --
391 Ke li est frechement en venant;
392 Unqes ne oystes ce croy de tant.

393 Nomer vus porra la pucele:
394 Les uns l’apelent Mirabele
395 Mes Florie estoit nomé
396 Au muster ou fut baptisé.
397 Florie estreit sa purpensa
398 Cudait de amur ke la tocha
399 A si treforte e longe grevaunce
400 Qe si plus tost ne ust allegaunce
401 En pard fut e en aventure.
402 “E!” fet ele, “si ad trop demure,
AMYS E' AMILIOUN

403  Si ne me face memes e ayder,"
404  A teles se prent mayyn lever
405  E vent tut dreit a sa mere
406  A contentannece de triste chere.
407  Asez se plein e ce desmente,
408  "E dame!" ele di, "su dolente
409  De un ague ke en chef m'est mounté
410  Dount au quer su maumené,
411  E a couste, e a flancs,
412  Ke tue me tremible char e saunks.
413  Dount tut sui, dame, en desperation!
414  E si, dame, ne le preysez agrevaunce,
415  Le congé veir demandase
416  Si ke en desport m'en alase
417  Our prendre le eyr de matyn
418  Tut soule ci en gardyn,
419  Si croy ke meuz me avendra!"
420  La reyne la regarda
421  E de doel gette un suspyr,
422  Car nature ne put mentyr.
423  "Hee, fylle!" fet ele, "Flurye,
424  Ja mar pensez de maladye,
425  Mes alez la, ou vus plerra;
426  Vus dedyre e la
427  Parly e par tut un gardyn,
428  E pus prendre un supe en vyn
429  Pur sustenance de la servele,"
430  Ore esgardez de quelle cautele
431  La damoysele ore se entremist:
432  Amur tut la venquist.
433  Flurie, quant ad le conge,
434  Asez est joouse e lee,
435  Tote soule san chambere
436  S'en aloyt de gre sa mere
437  Parler a Amys, que tant ama,
438  Tant il parla, tant il demora,
439  Ke tut sun corage descovri,
440  E dyt ke pur Ie amur de lui
441  Murrou, si il ne ut de li pité,
442  E ke ele fut de lui amé;
443  Car si l'amur de lui ne avoyt,
444  Jammés home ce dyst ne amuroit.
445  Amys, quant le ad escoté,
446  Quidoit ele fust desvé
447  De ben respondeur se purpensoit
448  Cum celui ke talent ne avoit
449  Tant mesprendre vers sun seignur.
450  Este vus Flurie a grand irour!
451  Le ramponoit e dyst, "Coment
452  Me avez ja fa teu marrement
453  Qe pus qe a vus ay doné m'amur?
454  Ja moun vivant après ce jour
455  Ne srayr de quer hatee,
AMYS E AMILIOUN

456 Si j’oe ne sei de vus vengee!
457 Cerces ore su ben honye
458 Quant mei deignez aver amye;
459 Tant princes, tanz dux me vut deygné,
460 E touz ay pur vus refusez!
461 Cerces ne estes pas chivaler,
462 Recreauanz estis e laner.
463 Un play feloun vus bastiray,
464 E a moum pere le diray
465 Cum vers lui estes de moy forfait,
466 Si serrez a cheuaus destrait,
467 Ensi serray de vus vengez!
468 A tant Flurie s’est tresturnez.

469 Amys estroit se purpensa: 53vb
470 L’un mal e l’autre mut dota;
471 Pensoit, “Si j’oe la preigne
472 E li rois de ce me ateigne,
473 Honi sui a remenant;
474 E si ne m’i assente niant
475 Par unt de teu mal me brace
476 Pur ren ke contre sace,
477 Jugez serroi a mauveise mort!
478 Mut il ad,” fet il, “convenant fort!
479 Coment que la bosigne va
480 De ambe parz peryl i a
481 Qe meuz me seit sertis, ne say,
482 Si la prenderay ou guerpiray.
483 Mes en eyde du fyz Marie
484 Coment ke me e rt cist giu partie
485 A l’eschap de ceste quere;
486 L’amur de la damoisele
487 Ne refusera joi ya!”
488 Atant la chere enhaunsa,
489 E baudement la respondi:
490 “Damoisele, pur Deu merci,
491 Vostre amy sui e serray,
492 E votre chivaler tant cum viveray;
493 Mes vers vus ne mesprendrei mye
494 Par unt vus ussez vileinie,
495 Ne de vostre cors huntage
496 De ceo prent Deu en testmoniage.
497 Car si ceo pout este aparecu
498 Qe de moy feissiez vostre dreu,
499 Ja fussez vus en fyn homye!”
500 “Oustez, pur Deu!” fet Flurie,
501 “Nus le froms si pivemt,
502 Nostre voler, nostre talent,
503 Qe nul ne le savera de mere nee.”
504 Tant unt dyt e tant parlee
505 Qe il sunt a un de tel afer,
506 Si unt devisez la manere
507 Coment e quant se assemblerunt.
508 Alias, car encusez serrunt
509 Car tut le seut un vassal
510 De la meigne le seneschal
511 Qe a ses syres le va counter
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>512 Tant cum il put aspleiter.</td>
<td>Sitost com il poet espleiter. [54ra]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513 Le seneschal esteit mut lee</td>
<td>Le seneschal fut molt lee;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514 Car ben quidoit estre vengee</td>
<td>Ore quideit bien estre vengé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515 De cestui vaillant botiller,</td>
<td>De vostre corteis botiller;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516 Tut lour estre vait espyer.</td>
<td>Tot lour estre fist esperier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517 E quant veent le jour ke il unt dyt,</td>
<td>Qant vint le terme q’avoint dit,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518 Lors se assemblunt a grand delyt,</td>
<td>Il ensembleront od grant delit:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519 E ja nel estut escontre dyre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520 Du ju de amur i ad matiere.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521 Sanz plus de prolonge attraire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522 De lour assemblé a ke faire,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523 Mes quant Hardre seet la covine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524 Entre Amys e la meschyne,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525 Demeintanant au roy ala,</td>
<td>Le seneschal, quant sout la covine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526 E tut lur overe le counta.</td>
<td>Entre Amys e la meschine,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527 Ore sunt ly dui amant trahi!</td>
<td>L’endemain vint tot a hounte:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528 Si Jhesu n’eut eu merci.</td>
<td>Acounté est tot lor oevre al counte.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529 Charles de ire estoit enfle,</td>
<td>Li quens fu de ire enflé,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530 Ne parla mot de une louee,</td>
<td>Ne parla mot une luwé.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531 Mais au drain dyt, “Jhesu mercei,</td>
<td>“Adonke,” dit il, “Deu mercy,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532 Si cist traitres me as honi,</td>
<td>Si ceo traitour m’ad issi hony,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533 Ke tunt amay e tince si cher,</td>
<td>Que tant amey e tant ting cher,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534 En qui se put home ore afier?</td>
<td>En qu'i me porrai afier?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535 Si ad treu grand descouveuen;</td>
<td>Si est grant desert venu: (71ra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536 Ma fille est pute devenu!</td>
<td>Ma fille est pute devenu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537 Elle est honue e ja trahi;</td>
<td>Elle est honue, jœu suy trahi;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538 Cist traitre tant mar le vi!</td>
<td>Cel fel traitre m’ad icy servy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539 A touz jours averay reprover</td>
<td>A touz jours avera reprover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540 Si ne me say de lui venger!</td>
<td>Si jœu ne me puisse de li venger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541 Est se voir, sire seneschal,</td>
<td>Est cœo voir, sire seneschal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542 Je croye ke dyt l’avez pur mal.”</td>
<td>Jœo quide que l’avez dit pur mal.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543 Sire le seneschal respond:</td>
<td>“Sire,” le seneschal respondu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544 “Par celui ke fyt tut le mound,</td>
<td>“Par celi qe figt le mound,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545 Si il le vut ver moy nier,</td>
<td>S’il le velt denier,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546 Cum leu chivaler le voil prouer;</td>
<td>Com leal chevaler le voil prouer,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547 E cil ke de nus ke ert vencu,</td>
<td>E cil que de nous est vencu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548 Sei detret e pus pendu.”</td>
<td>Soit detret e püs pendu!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550 Cist play mei est assez vlyains.”</td>
<td>Ceste play m’est laid e vileins.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551 A teles a la cham bra ala,</td>
<td>Atant en la chambre entrat,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552 La reine sur sun lyt trova.</td>
<td>La dame sur un lit trovat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553 “He, dame!” fet il, “Vus ne savez</td>
<td>“Dame,” dit il, “ne savez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554 Quele fille vus avez!</td>
<td>Quele fille vus avez!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555 Ja est e le femm du mester,</td>
<td>Ele est ja femme de mester,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556 E cœu ves fes nostre botiller.</td>
<td>E cœo de fait nos tre botiller.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557 Pur nostre honour hounte nus rend,</td>
<td>Pur nostre bien hounte nous rend:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558 Trahi nus ad hountousement</td>
<td>Tray nous ad malament,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559 Car nostre fylle ad afole,</td>
<td>Qe nostre fille ad trahy e affolé.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560 Ore lui doint Deus mal destiné!</td>
<td>Deu li doint male destiné!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561 E si avera il, si jeo vive tant,</td>
<td>Si avra il, si jœu vive tant;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562 De hounte nel evert nul garaut,</td>
<td>Ne li evert nul de mal garrant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
563 Car detret e pus pendu,
564 E la puteine ars au fu!"
565 La reine ne seest ke dyre,
566 Mes lui rei de rancour e de ire.
567 Devont plus ner ke carboun,
568 Tost se saust hors de mesun,
569 Si encontre sun bottiler
570 A ki il sout tre ben parer;
571 Des oiz sur li forment royla,
572 E sire Amys esmerueilla;
573 "Hee," fet il, "Deu te maudie,
574 Par tei est ma fylle honye!
575 Mes tu n'en iras de ren riant!
576 La mort te vait mult prochant!"
577 "Sire," fet Amys, "vus dite mal!
578 Joe sui vostre chivaler leal!
579 E si nul vus ad de moy acunte --
580 Si noun ben e leaute --
581 Baudement mei defendery
582 Devant vus ov ke deveray!"
583 Le seneschal atant i vent
584 E le gaunt en sun poin tent;
585 Tendi avant en noun de gage
586 Cum home de grand vassalage,
587 E dyt ke ove lui se combateret
588 E la chose vers lui proveiret
589 Est vus la grand assemblé
590 Des chiualers e de la mené.
591 Li un vers l'autre tendi li gant;
592 Le rei les gagis prist atant.
593 E passent donce du barnage
594 Pleggis trover, ou ostague,
595 Les comaunde li rei atant.
596 Au botiller vait donce malement
597 Car tant fut li roys vers lui irrez
598 Ke un soul n'est en court trovez
599 Ke un bon mot parler le osa.
600 Mes l'autre feloun assez trova
601 Des melliours donce du barnage
602 Car il fut venu de haut parage,
603 Fyz au roy, dux Milloun
604 De Loreigne, cum dyt avum.
605 Mult vait dunke fort a sire Amys,
606 Unqes mes ne fu tant esbays;
607 Ne seet en mounde ke porra fere,
608 "He!" fet il, "Dous debenaire!
609 "Unqes a nul leu chivaler
610 Ne avynt, ce croy, tel encumbrer.
611 Aslas, purquoye me hath Deus doné
612 Si malerouse destîné,
613 Quant ne ay en mounde parent ne amy
614 Qe moun plegg veigne issi
615 Contre un felun seneschal?
616 Car si lui reys ut fet teu gal
617 Qe ceste bateile porroy fere

La dame ne sout quoy dire.
Le counte de mal ard e d'yre,
Devont plus nor ke carboun.
Tost sailli hors de la mayson,
Si encontra le botiller.
A l'ole trop beal parler;
Les ois sur ly forment roylla.
Amis moulst se merveilla.
"Fel,' fait il, 'Deu vous maudie!
Ma fille est par vous honye.
Mes vous ne irrez ja riant;
La mort vous va ja approchaunt!
'Sire,' dist Amys, 'vus dites mal.
Jeo suy vostre chivaler leal; (71rb)
Si nul vous ad de moy counté
For que dreit a verité,
Moult bien me deffenderay
Devant qe jeo denieray.'
618 Meytenant saun plus retrere,
619 Plus ne requise voyr de lui,
620 Mes ore ne put pas estre issi;
621 Autre jour vont lui reis aver’!
622 A teles ce prent a plorer
623 De fyn doel le lernet les oilz
624 Tant l’est destreint doels;
625 Quant les gette vers Flurie
626 Si la veit entote enlermie,
627 E de reen ne la put ayder,
628 Ne nul ne ose autre regarder.

629 “He Deus!” fet il, “roy de dretyure,
630 Mervayle qe le sen me dure
631 Qe ne devence vyf aragez
632 Quant teu doel est abaundonez
633 A la plus bele creature
634 Ke unques fu fet du humene fugure.
635 Ja est par mei si mal mené,
636 Tant mar a sun vs fu né,
637 A mal houre requist m’amur --
638 Car aumdui murrum huie ce jour --
639 E reen ne m’est de mes maus demene
640 Ainz est pur lui tote ma peine.”
641 Atant reprent il a plorer,
642 E si treforment desmenter
643 Qe le regard fut mult pitous;
644 Unques ne oystez parler de plus.

645 Flurie estroit se purpensa 54vb
646 De angwuyse ne seet qe dirra,
647 Mes vers sa mere ses oils tresturne
648 Ke asses est pur lui pale e mourne,
649 E dist parole de grand peine:
650 “E reyne de France, Eleyne,
651 De tut le mounde la plus gentille,
652 Ne veez vus ci vostre fylle
653 Ke a teu destreit sui demenez
654 Assez il pert ke poy amez?
655 Ne veez ce chivaler e moy,
656 Ke vers moun seignur, le roy,
657 Sumus encuzez a teu tort
658 Dount destiné nus est la mort?
659 En vus, dame, gyst nostre aye,
660 Nostre mort, e nostre vie?
661 Au rey, dame, vus alez
662 E le chivaler demaundez
663 Dekes a un certein jour,
664 Si asuagez la grand dolour,
665 Ke de ci pres nus est bastie!”
666 E la reine tote enlermie
667 Veet a sun seignur suspirant,
668 A genuz se met meintenant
669 E dyt a pitouze voyz oye:
670 “Mun seignur, rei de seignurie,
671 Sur touz reis des cristeins, ke say,
672 De une reen vus regeray:
673 Ce chivaler, sire, vus demand,
674 Pur un certein covenand
675 Ke seit, sire, a nostre ordeinance;
676 Ja mar de lui eyez dotaunce!
677 En peryl le preng du damage,
678 Veez ci moun cors en ostage.”

679 “Voyre,” fet ly reis, “volez ensi?
680 E jeo leaumentis vus di
681 Qe si il faut de la bentanylie,
682 Le jugement averez vus saun falie,
683 Qe a vostre fylle est ordeinee!”
684 “Sire,” fet ele, “cum vus agree,
685 Tut issi serra moun sire cher.”
686 E dyt lui roys: “Dunke n’a qe parler.
687 Mene le la ou volez;
688 En vostre peryl receu l’avez.”

689 Ore est joyuse la reyne --
690 Qe aynz de anguish fyne --
691 Ne seeet ke fere ne ke parler;
692 Ov ly prent le chivaler
693 E sa fylle Flurie ausi,
694 Ke assez de mauz a eu pur lui.
695 Amys en sa chambre ala,
696 Assez de doel e de yre en a,
697 Ses mauz commence a regrater.
698 “Hee sire!” fet il, “Deu dreiturer,
699 Formour de tote creature!
700 Si moun frete sur la mesaventure
701 Ke si sudeineynd moy est monté,
702 Ne est home, ke seit, de mere nee,
Ke lui feroyt joye aver!"
Atant reprent il a plorer
E de mener si grand dolour,
Unqes ne oystes de greignour;
Tan ke un vallet le aparsout
Ke a la reine vent tut droit
E de chef en chef l’ad dyt
La plente ke Amys il fyst.

"Voyre!" fet ele saunz demurer,
"Dites le ke il me veigne parler!"
E cil revet ke ja ne fine.
"Venez, sire," fet il, "a la reyne
De vus certes ne say ke unt."
E sire Amys ke tant se doelt
A la reine vet meintienant.
"Sire chivaler," fet ele atant,
"Qe vus est, ke ensi desmondez,
Pus qe la condiicioun savez
Qe en moun paryl vus ay plevi --
Ja mar seyez vus esbay!
Ayns lessez tote kuwardie!
Venges serroms, ne dotez mye,
Du mauueis seneschal
Ke nus ad brace teu batesta!"
"A dame!" ce dyt sire Amys,
"Par le fys Deu ke en croyus fu mys,
Pur kuwardie ne le di joe pas;
Mes si moun frere suit le cas
Mult lui serroil fort le message;
Car nel tendreit champ, ne boscage,
Ne aime reen ke Deu formast
Ke moun estast visitast;
E si nus grever ne quidase,
Le congé, dame, vus demandase
Ke a lui puse returner.
Mun meschef le dei nuncier
Car ja ne er certis de quer hetee,
Tanke averay ov lui parlé.”

La reine, quant ce escute,
De se dys aukes se doute,

La dame lermist pur pité,
Prist Amis en pleivin;
Moult fu dolente la meschine.
Amis se retret e purpens;
Com celi qe grant mester en a.
De son frere li soyvint;
Tantost a la countesse vynt,
Congé li ala demaundier
Qe a son frere velt aler;
Son enuy monstreli li vout,
E ala qe mult se redu,
Si le respond, "Beau sire Amys,
Traihir me volez ce m’est avys.
Car si vus ne venez a nostre jour,
Ne savez ben, ke moun seignour

428 La dame lermist pur pité,
429 Prist Amis en pleivin;
430 Moult fu dolente la meschine.
431 Amis se retret e purpens;
432 Com celi qe grant mester en a.
433 De son frere li soyvint;
434 Tantost a la countesse vynt,
435 Congé li ala demaundier
436 Qe a son frere velt aler;
437 Son enuy monstreli li vout,
438 E ala qe mult se redu,
439 Si le respond, "Beau sire Amys,
440 Traihir me volez, m’est avys!
441 Si vous ne venez a tel jour,
442 Vous savez bien qe mon seignur
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Pur vous ad ma mort juré."

747 Pur vus ad ma mort jouré?"
748 "He dame," fèt il, "ne place Dee,
749 Ke unqes me venyst en penser
750 Teus tresuns ver vus compaser;
751 Ne a vus ne a nul home de vie.
752 Car ne fu pas certis chivalere
753 Aynz serroit fait de traitour.
754 Ja moy doynt Deus viver le jour
755 Qe me asentisse a tresun
756 Vers vus, dame, ne vers nul hom!"

757 "Ce croy jœ be," dyt la dame,
758 "Mays tut dys de boydy e blame
759 Sedoceret checu n sachen,
760 Pur vus nel di jœ nepurquant;
761 Mes pus qe si avant su mys
762 En perly pur vus, sire Amys,
763 En aventure plus moy metteray,
764 Le congé certis vus dorray.
765 Cee alez, quant vus vodrez,
766 En ver feit si vus revenez."

767 Amys, quant le congé ad prys,
768 Tantost s’est en chemyn mys;

769 Sanz garsoun, saunz esquier
770 Car ne ala pas cum chivaler,
771 Ayns ala cum peleryn.
772 Unqes ne fyne seir ne matyn,

773 Mes tuz les .viii. jours ensi ala
774 Ou les travaus ke il endura.
775 Tant ke vers une vesparre
776 En un grand boys est entré
777 Ou teu somoii il es venu
778 Au pou du palefrei est cheu,
779 Par unt lui covent donc dormer,
780 En vys li fust ke il dut morer.
781 Desouz un arbre se cocha,
782 E sun cheval ja reigna;
783 Dormi ke mut fu travayles,
784 E sun cheval ke fu meseyés.

785 Ore seignurs, ples vus entendre!
786 Haute mervaylle poez vus atendre;
787 Amylloun en sun lyt gysoyt
788 De leez sa femme se dorneit;
789 Si lui vyt en avysiun
790 Ke sire Amys, sun compaignoun,
791 De un lyoun fu asailly,
792 Ke lui fu morteus enemy.
793 Ou sunge mult fu effrayez

MS. KARLSRUHE 345
MS. LONDON ROYAL 12. C. XII

Dame," dist il, "par ma lealté,
"Dame," dist il, "par ma lealté,
Pur ma defaute ne murrez mie, 445
Pur ma defaute ne murrez mie, 445
Tant com je puisse aver la vie!" 446
Atant congé ly dona, 447
E un palefroy mounta 448
Saunz garsoun e saunz esquier; 449
N’ala pas com chivaler 450
Mes ala com pelrin. 451
Ne fina unke soir ne matyn, 452
Poy mangea e mains beust, 453
Si ne dormist nule nust. 454
Touz les noiz issi chevaucha, 455
| Qe onke de nuyt ne se reposa, 456
Tant qe vers une vespré 457
En un grant boys est alé. 458
60va

794 Ou les travaus ke il endura.
795 Tant ke vers une vesparre
796 En un grand boys est entré
797 Ou teu somoii lui es venu
798 Au pou du palefrei est cheu,
799 Par unt lui covent donc dormer,
800 En vys li fust ke il dut morer.
801 Desouz un arbre se cocha,
802 E sun cheval ja reigna;
803 Dormi ke mut fu travayles,
804 E sun cheval ke fu meseyés.

805 Ore seignurs, ples vus entendre!
806 Haute mervaylle poez vus atendre;
807 Amylloun en sun lyt gysoyt
808 De leez sa femme se dorneit;
809 Si lui vyt en avysiun
810 Ke sire Amys, sun compaignoun,
811 De un lyoun fu asailly,
812 Ke lui fu morteus enemy.
813 Ou sunge mult fu effrayez
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Si saut sus cum fut forsenez;  
Tost apelle sez chivalers,  
Ses sergauns, e ses esquiers,  
Si les fet touz metre les pareles,  
Unques ne dyt autre noveles,  
Mais ke il irra visiter  
Sun frere, ke il pout tant amer.  
Trusser les fet a my le nuyt,  
As autres ne fu pas dedut,  
Mes cele nuit tant i errerunt  
Ke parmy Ie boys passerent  
Amyllouns, quant le aperceit,  
Sa gent fet il passer avant,  
E cil attent nepurquant  
De sun frere saver volent,  
Queu chose illukis Ie chaseit.
Parole de vive resun:

"Beau frere, pus ke avez forfait,
Ja vouvel serment ussez fet,
Del serment ferrez encumbre.
Pun vous la bataille fray,
E le serment lealment juray

Je me doute qe pur pecche
Den serment serrez encombre.

Mes la vayllye pur vus fray,
E le serment avez feté,
Je me doute qe soye Amys.

Joe moy doute ke par peche
Du serment fussez encumbre.

E si quideront qe qe soit Amys.
Si quideront qe ie seiez lour seignur;
En fet e en semblant,
La dame, qe qe veu aveit,
Qe Amillioun fuit bien quideit.

Mes chivalers ke sunt icy
Qe de feloun serrom venge,
Qe del feloun serrom venge,
Qe vus quideit aver hony,
Mes chivalers qe sunt icy

Car sauf serement i mettray,
Os vus ore demorrunt;
A ma court od vus irrount.

De jooques ne forfys,
E si quideront qe seif Amys.

E quant nous averoms robes chaungé,
Qe vous seiez lour seignur.

Si siyou reque par grand amur
Qe de ma femme facez atant,
En fet e en semblant,

Car quant averoms robes chaungé,
Donce quideront de verité
Qe vous seiez lour seignur.

Ov vus ore demorrunt;
A ma court od vou irrount.

E a ma court ou vus irrount;
E quant nous averoms robes chaungé,

Car quant averoms robes chaungé,
Qe vous seiez lour seignur.

Si siyou reque par grand amur
Qe de ma femme facez atant,
En fet e en semblant,

Car quant averoms robes chaungé,
Qe vous seiez lour seignur.

Si siyou reque par grand amur
Qe de ma femme facez atant,
En fet e en semblant,

Car quant averoms robes chaungé,
Qe vous seiez lour seignur.

Si siyou reque par grand amur
Qe de ma femme facez atant,
En fet e en semblant,
Le seneschal se fist armer,
Puis demaunda le botiler;
E quant il ne pout estre trové,
La dame fuit pris e durement lié,
E la pucele ensement.
Grant pité avoient la gent:
Plurent e pleignent lour beauté.
Li quens, que mout fuit irré,
Ala hastaunt lour jugement,
E si jura grant serement
Qe il memes les verreit arder.
Ataunt virent vener un chevaler
Qe vers eux fist grant aleure,
Poignant plus qu'ame lure;
Del feu qu'il vist fut grantment effraé
E de lour damez eust grant pité.
'Sire,' dit il, 'jeo suy venu!
Dount vous sert tot ceo fu
Qe pur les damez fait esteit?
Trop vilaine roste serreit!
Armes me fetes tost bailier
Pur cestes damez deliverer!
Jeo deffendray nostre dreit.'
Le quens, quant il chevaler veit,
Bien quideit qe ceo fuit Amys;
De cors resemblast e de vis.
Bons annes demaunda
E li memes il chevaler anna.
En son corage fust bien paié
Quant ad il chevaler si bien armé.
Puis il dist suef en son oraille
Qe, s'il pout deffendre l'a bataille,
Sa fille a femme ly dorreyt
E de toute sa terre heir il freit.
Est venuz l'asemble;
Ore mes sourdra la medlé.
Le un l'autre desaffient
Qe entre eus nul amur ne eyent.
Ore s'en vount les chivalers
Qi mult sunt orguillous e fiers.
Ne avera mester de acord;
L'un hiet l'autre desq'a la mort.
Nul deigne a autre affier;
Chescun se prent a ferir.
Amillioun fiert il seneschal
D'un grant launce enpoignal
Panni l'escu peint de asur,
Mes il hauberc fuist fort e dur
Qe de mal il'ad garri.
Le seneschal il referri;
Lour launces ount as coups bruse
E si sunt outrepasé.
A cel encountre tant firent bien
Qe l'un ne l'autre ne perdit renow
Amillioun vint par corucer,
Par ire tret il brank d'asser;
Le seneschal ferir ala,
En le healme grant coups dona. 608
Mes le healme tant fort fu 609
Qe de la mort l'ad defendo. 610
Qe le coup ala descendant 611
Si chiet sur l'arsoun devanto; 612
Trestut trencha quir e fust 613
Com si rasour trenché le eust. 614
Parmy l'espaulde del chival 615
Cola le braunke en terre aval 616
Plus qe plein pé e demyi; 617
Le seneschal a terre chay. 618
Qe pout, quant son cheval li ment? 619
Del cop parlent durement: 620
Dist l'un a l'autre qe le chivaler 621
Ses armes sout trop bien porter, 622
Mes son coup est trop pesant. 623
Le seneschal se leve atao, 624
Qe dolent est e corucé 625
Quant combatre deit a pie; 626
A plus tost q'illo pout se vengereit, 627
E Amyllioun a pie se mettreit. 628
Mes il appareiet tost la manere, 629
Si ceo retret tost arere. 630
Tost descendi de son destrer; 631
Combatre voleit per a per, 632
Q'il n'eust de son cheval envie. 633
Tant fist il par sa cortesie: 634
Meuz a pie l'estut ferir 635
Que lessir son chival morir. 636
Le seneschal, qe nel pout amer, 637
Un grant coup li vint donner 638
Amount ei heaulme peint de flurs, 639
Qe tost abati les colurs. 640
Sur le senestre le coup descent, 641
Mailies trenchent plus de cent. 642
Bien pres passa le costé, 643
Mes la char n'ad pas toche. 644
Amyllioun, qe tant fu de vigour, 645
Meint coup li dona ceo jour. 656
La bataille ad bien duré 647
Desque noune fist passé. 648
Ly seneschal fist mout bien, 649
E sire Amillioun ne dota de rien. 650
Ne savoit [null] del chaump juger 651
Lequel fuit meillour chevaler. 652
Amillioun fist bien anuié 653
Qe la bataille ad tant duré; 654
Un coup li voudra ja doner 655
Qe li deit par dreit grever. 656
Mes le seneschal primes li ferist, 657
Qe son coup tres bien apparist: 658
La healme del coup enbarra, 659
Qe Amillioun fort estona. 660
Ore poet trop attendre: 661
S'il ne sache le coup rendre, 662
Li autre s'en irra gabbant. 663
E sire Amillioun atant 664
La boyste prent le chemyn choysé,  
Ja sojorun ne delay presé,  
Par deques atant qu' il ad surfays  
Les cuntrés e les pays  
De quanqe apent a sun message.  
Este vus venu si grand barnage  
Vers la cite de Parys  
De les .ii. moys encomplys  
Qe en tote la vile, ce dyt la geste,  
A chival, ne chamayl, ne autre beste,  
Ne ust hom place voyde trové,  
Qe une n' eut le ust herbergé.

Ferir li vint par tel ayr  
Qe le feu fist tresailler,  
Qe le healme fist tot purfendant.  
En la cervele cola le brank,  
E l' oraille od tote la face  
Voler fist enmi la place.  
Le braz od le brank trencha;  
Desque en la haunchne le branc cola.  
En cel champ fu ben vengé;  
Par li mes n' iert encusé.  
S' il chaist, n'est pas mervaille.  
Ore finist la bataille.  
Les uns chanterent, les autres plorerent.  
Les chevalers ja corerent,  
Mes le counte vient premer; (73ra)  
Atant se fist desarmer.  
S' il eust plaie li demaunda;  
Cil dist que mal n' en a:  
Plus est sain que pesson de mer.  
Atant li vount touz beiser:  
Sur touz li fist la dame joie,  
E la pucele totovoie  
Semblant li fist tant com osa,  
Car son pere mout dota.  
Le counte atant l' ad appelé:  
'Dy moy,' fait il, 'fille bele,  
Amys pur vous ad combatu,  
Son enemi ad confundu;  
Ly e vos ad aquité  
Del fait dount fuistes encusé.  
S' il vous velt esposer,  
Li porriez de quer amer?  
E ele respount mout simplement:  
'Tot soit a vostre talent!  
Si vus me volez marier,  
Jeo ne me deveroy pas corucer.'  
Dount fut comandé al baronage  
Qe eus feussent al mariage.  
L' endemain a terce sonant  
Touz furent, petit e grant,  
Les barons e les chevalers,  
Borges, sergeans e esquiers.  
Quant touz furent assemblé,  
La pucele fut amené
877  Quant le bannage i est venu,  
878  Lui roys ad parlement tenu:  
879  "Seignurs, barouns," se dyt Charloun,  
880  "Ja avez cy l'enchusun  
881  E la force du maundement:  
882  Cist chivaler ci enpresent  
883  De un teu debat estoyt suspris  
884  Ke, si le meus ne ust eschevys,  
885  Ja ne ust Ie hounte recoverie;  
886  Mes ore le ay promys e plevie  
887  Honurable garison,  
888  E pur ce le vus dy en comoun  
889  Qe ma fylle en durray,  
890  E de grand tere eir e fray  
891  De .vi. countés veir e demy  
892  Au jour de oy serra seisy  
893  En temoinaunce de vus barouns;  
894  Pur ceo vus fys ce somouns."  
895  "Sei se le vostre bandement!  
896  Endreit de vus ben le grantoms,  
897  Ja mar la chose se traversoms!"  
898  Charles le ad par le meyn pris  
899  E franchementes le ad seysys,  
900  E pus ove tretote se gens  
901  Au mustier vait des innocens;  
902  La ert afirme les espoysaylle.  
903  Des ore comence la mervelle  
904  Qe cil ke escoute ce q'il vus touche,  
905  Si grantera treben de bouche  
906  Qe de quanqe Deus unqe fy  
907  Pu le mounde establyt,  
908  Tel mervaylle ne oyst om  
909  Ne de si forte triboulacioun  
910  Qe ne avynt a cé compaygnouns,  
911  Q'en nostre estorye testemony avoms.  
912  Au muster des innocens  
913  S'en vient le rey e se gens,  
914  E de ducs, e de barouns,  
915  I assemblé si grand fusoms  
916  Ke a peyne hom le put numbrer.  
917  Li reys apele lui chivaler  
918  E sa fylle Flurie ausint.  
919  Le erseveke de Rayns i vint  
920  Qi, chapeleyns du mester serra,  
921  Les .ii. amis esposera.  
922  AIhus aprochent du muster  
923  Le prestre comence sun dever:  
924  Ses saumes dyt e oreysouns,  
925  E pus demaunde lour nouns;  
926  Ceo deyt hom fere a teu mester,  
927  Mes quant Amyl ce deit nomer  
928  Quant Amillioun deust son noun nomer,  
929  Mout qu purpensa durement:  
930  "A Deu," fet il, "omnipotent,  
931  Cum mei vent grand honesoun!  
932  Si joefust ci mouen noun
Mult moy serra grand cowardie
Si ne recouvre la velaynie,
Certes a tretut moun vivant.
E de autre part say ensement,
Si joc leur die moun dret noun
Li rei me ateyndra de tresun
Si savera tout nostre afere;
Nanyl meuz vaut uncore tere,
Qe lui rei suspecioun n'en ust
E de la cautele ce s'aparceust.
Car aunndui fussent donke honlys,
Flurie e moun frere Amys,
E ceo ne le feroy a nul feor,
Ains me lerroy vyf escorcher!

Seignurs qe de amur juger savez,
Si aute amur hoyer poez
Ke pus ke Deus suffri passioun,
Greignur amur ne oyst nul hom,
Greignur meschef, greyngnur poverte,
De meseyse a de tote parte,
Qe ne avynt a sire Amylloun

Oyst une voiz que li disoit:-
Qe nul ne oist fors li noun -
'Lessez, lessez, sire Amilioun!
Jeo vous di certeine novele:
Si vous esposez la damoisele,
Einz qe seint .iii. anz passez,
Aprés de ceste leprouz serrez.

Ju veuryon aporn uny novele:
Qe si vus prenez la damoysele,
Ainz qe .ii. aunz seient passes,
Si vly leprus certis serrez,
Ke vus ne troverez homme vivant,
Ke vere vus voil tant ne quant;
E si vus teyndra la maladie
De si treforte leprosie
Autre .ii. aunz entiers."

Oyst une voiz que li disoit:
Qe nul ne oist fors li noun -
'Lessez, lessez, sire Amilioun!
Jeo vous di certeine novele:
Si vous esposez la damoisele,
Einz qe seint .iii. anz passez,
Aprés de ceste leprouz serrez.

Quant le message lui est venu,
Si aües en fust esperdu,
Ne se doit nul hom esmerueller;
Tut coy ce estiet lui chivaler;
Colour sovent chaunge e mue
De angunse sue e tresue;
Tut outre perdi contenaunce.
Dunke Ie avise Ie rei de France,
“Filliole, par Deu ke vus est,
Acune chose vus desplest
Dount vus sentez sertes grevez,
Si vus pri ne mei seitt celez!”
“Sire rei!” fet il, “c’est verite,
Un ague me est en chef mounte
Dount mult sun certis a malese;
E beau sire, si ne vus despleye,
Vus pri ke attendez un pose
E en respyt metez la chose
Tanke cele ague soyt passez!”
E dit lui roys, “cum vus vollez
Beau duz filiol, ensi serra!”
Sire Amylloun lors se turna
E vent tut dreit devant la croiz,
Tremble le quer, lermens les oyls,
E dyt a pitouse pleynt privé:
“Hee sire Deu!” fet il, “roy benuré,
Ke pur nostre sauvacioun
Suffrites si forte passioun,
Tu sire, ke veis e entens
Les corages de tote gens,
A tei soul a la croy seynte,
Ma requête faz, e ma pleinte,
Qe ce cheytyf cors esgarrez
Endreit de tei seitt conseillez.
Beau sire Deu, omnipotent,
Pur mei cheytyf nel di jeo nent,
Eins le face pur moufr frere Amys,
Car si cele overe ne eye eschevys,
Tut en vein ay travayillé,
De quanqe ay en lui overé;
Pur nent me sui combatu
E de la dame le ay defendu.
Si nel aydasse plus avant:
Pur quei, Deu, feis tu tel convenaunt,
Qe cel hounte me aprochast?
Certis, pur nent me temptas,
Car pur ren qe m’enveras,
Ja seitt si vile leprousie,
Peine, poverté, ou maladie,
De cete chose ne lui faudray!
En vus seitt, moun sire Deu verray,
Qe en vostre mauneye moy met adés,
Coment ke deveyngne après!”
Quant cist chivaler Amilloun
Ensi ad feté sa oreysun,
En pes se saut maintenant
De la seynte croyz se seignant;
Si se est tost au roy revenuz
Ke pur lui fu mult esperduz;
Mes quant il le veit revener,
E la chere auqes recouerer,
Tantost lui est contrecurruz
E entre les beaus lui ad recuz.
Si le demande qe gentys:
"Coment vus est ore, sire Amys?
Poez uncore auqes meus?"
"Sire, oyl," fet il, "beny seít Deus!
Assez sui garryz des aguz!"
"La Deu merci!" ce dient tuz.

"Aloms dunke," ce dyt Charloun,
"E de la besoynge espleyton!"
E cil ke respond, "Volunter!"
Al huis revent du mouster
Ou les attest si grand clergie
E si grand some de chivalerye,
Qu si l'en vus deit la some
A grand mensonge le tendroit ome;
De richef dyt li chapeleins
Ke fu erceveske de Reyns:
"Qe est vostre noun, sire chivaler?"
E cil, ke mes ne vout celer,
Respond, "Sire, jœ ay a noun Amys!"
Le erseveske ke est avertys
E de le office assez sachant,
Si les espouse demeyntenant.

Avant mes unke si laid ne fust
Home, com dire bien le poet.'
Amillioun l'ad bien entendu,
E la prist sicom son dreu,
Mes pur ceo ne vout lesser,
Mes la resceit come sa mullier.
Ne voleit qe eus furent apareu
Coment son frère eust deceu.
La damoisele fuit ben paé
Quant ad baroun a volaté.

Li reis, il tient feste plenere
Le counte tynt feste plenere
Un quinzaine tote entere;
Une symaine tot entere;
Assez i urent robes donés,
Mout i furent des robes donez
Tant menestra i souant feffez.
Dont les menestrauz furent feffez.

Seignurs, qe auqes avez veu
Un usage est en vein tenu
Trop de jaungle mettre en geste
De la richesce ke om fest a feste,
De lour viande grand pompe attraire,
Mes jœ ne ay curé a qe faire;
Car assez i out brevement
E si ad ov mult meins ne apent
Ke ne fet a la court de France;
Pur ce lerray cele bobance
En nouchaler e en respyt,
Car en tant assez suffyt;
Mes au meins fet a saver
Le counte dona a ses esquiers
Les chivals e les destrers.
Ore vus dei jœ bien counter
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>ANGLO-NORMAN</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1081</td>
<td>Coment le fyrent a cocher:</td>
<td>Coment il firent a coucher:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1082</td>
<td>La dame ad sun dru acolé</td>
<td>La dame ad son deu acolé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1083</td>
<td>Par amur le ad souent beyssé,</td>
<td>E par amour sovent baisé,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1084</td>
<td>Car ben le quidoyt estre Amys.</td>
<td>E en quidoit ceo fu Amys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1085</td>
<td>Mes Amylloun, ke fut pansyfs,</td>
<td>Mes Amillioun, qu fu pensifs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1086</td>
<td>E ben entendy sun courage</td>
<td>Bien entendi en son corage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1087</td>
<td>Ke fere ne le vout hountage,</td>
<td>Fere ne li velt hountage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1088</td>
<td>Ne sun frene en tant trair,</td>
<td>De son compaignoun trahir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1089</td>
<td>Mes des parfunt get un suspyr;</td>
<td>Mout parfound getta un sospir,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1090</td>
<td>E ou le suspyr gyt longement</td>
<td>E el suspir geint forment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1091</td>
<td>La dame l’acole tendrement,</td>
<td>La dame l’acola tendrement,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1092</td>
<td>Si lui demaunde qu el pensoit,</td>
<td>Si li demaunda quoi pensoit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1093</td>
<td>E purquei ensi susprouyt.</td>
<td>E purquei tels suspirs getteit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1094</td>
<td>Adonke le respond Amylloun,</td>
<td>Donke dit sir Amillioun:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1095</td>
<td>Qe mes ne quert celer sun noun:</td>
<td>Ne vodra celer son noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1096</td>
<td>“Dame, pur Deu, tenez vus coy!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1097</td>
<td>Trop vus hastes, certes, sur moy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1098</td>
<td>Ne sui pas celui que quidez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1099</td>
<td>De vostre espeir failly avez:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>Ains le sui memes Amilloun,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101</td>
<td>Sun frene e sun compaygnoun,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1102</td>
<td>Ke ci me ad en sun noun transmys;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1103</td>
<td>Si ay le mester acumplys,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1104</td>
<td>Primes de par la bataylle,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1105</td>
<td>Ore par cel esposaylle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1106</td>
<td>Ke ja ne s’est nul apareceus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1107</td>
<td>For ke seulement Deu e nus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1108</td>
<td>A vus, ce croy, le pus counter,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1109</td>
<td>Joe croy ke vus voler &lt;..&gt; celer;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1110</td>
<td>E si face uncore sotie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>Ke si privé chose nuncie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1112</td>
<td>A femme pur peryl qu i gist;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1113</td>
<td>Car a ce ke le proverbe dyt:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1114</td>
<td>Meuz vaustis conseil descovert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1115</td>
<td>A cent mile homes estre apert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1116</td>
<td>Ke ne fut a une femme soule.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1117</td>
<td>Meint home ad blemie le boule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1118</td>
<td>E pur ce me doute de boydye;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1119</td>
<td>Mes pur vus, dame, me di joe mie:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1120</td>
<td>A vus deit home par dreit dever</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1121</td>
<td>Primez conseil nuncier,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1122</td>
<td>Car ne vus vent pas de parage,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1123</td>
<td>Aver la lange trop volage,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1124</td>
<td>Ne ventuse estre de parole,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1125</td>
<td>Car nurri estis de autre escole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1126</td>
<td>Ke n’est par resun cele rascaylle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1127</td>
<td>Ne deraume la communaylle.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1128</td>
<td>Deu, cum ad ben parfournys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1129</td>
<td>A grand honur conclus sun dys!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130</td>
<td>Quant Flurie entendy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1131</td>
<td>Qe de sun dru ad failly,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1132</td>
<td>Unqez tant ne vergoundoyt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1133</td>
<td>Qe si avant sun cors obligoyt,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1134 | Quant a un home mesconou | }
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1136 Ke un mot ne pout parler,
1137 Ne ne savoit, ou trover.
1138 Mes tant se esmaye e descounforte,
1139 Meus la vausist estre morte,
1140 Car de trespyn vergoyne
1141 De une part du lyt se alloyne;
1142 Si gist tota plast estendu,
1143 La vertue est tut escheveue,
1144 Donst Amyllouns assez se vise.
1145 Mes veez ci haute franchise,
1146 Cum il la prent a reheter:
1147 “Dame!” fet il, “lessez ester!
1148 Pur Deu, ne vus esmaez,
1149 Force de amur le fyst, sachez!
1150 Si fort vus prist le dart de amur
1151 Qe vertue vus toust e vigour.
1152 Amur totes resuns ravyst,
1153 Amur meint home eveuglyst,
1154 Amur semble blanche cornaylle,
1155 Amur fet meynte mervaylle,
1156 Amur vus ad vencue adés,
1157 E pur ce dame ne parlez mes!
1158 Se de joc ne preignez cure,
1159 Einz ubbliez tote espounture!
1160 Si vus requer sur toto reen:
1161 Ceste chose celeb ben,
1162 Car sachez demeyn matyn
1163 Mettre me voyl en chemyn
1164 Ke en moun pays m’en yrray,
1165 E vostre Amy enverray!”

1166 E l’endemeyn, saun plus targer --
1167 Quant le jour aparust cher --
1168 Le chivaler s’en est levez
1169 E la dame ad recunseillez:
1170 “Dame,” fet il, “joe m’en voys,
1171 Savoyr volun, ke vust lui roys,
1172 E si congé doner moy vut,
1173 Saunz plus targer aler m’estut.

1174 A Deu, ke ne vus parleray mes,
1175 Mes ke vus celez tut adés
1176 La chose ke a vus soul nuncie!”
1177 A tant li beise par curteysye,
1178 E pus après au roy ala
1179 E sagement le aresuna:
1180 “Beau pere,” fet il, “bon matyn
1181 Vus doynt Deus celestyen!”
1182 “Felio!” fet lui roys atant,
1183 “Beau jour vus doynt deus tut pusant!
1184 Qeles noveles vus aportes,
1185 Qe si matyn estes leuez?”
1186 “Sire,” fet il, “ne vus despleyse,
1187 Tant fu a neut a malese,
1188 Par merveille chance de sounge,
1189 Ne say si il est verroys ou mensunge,
1190 De moun frere sire Amylloun,
1191 Qe est en acun tribulacioun;
Dount jo ay le qer dolent,
Qe pur reen suz le fermament
Ne lerroy ke ne le visite,
Si moy ne desturbe mort subite,
E pur vus pri de congé!
Lui rey, ke lui ayme a grand cherté,
Respond: “Filiol, a nostre desyr,
Alez quant vus vent a pleysyr,
Car de tant ne vus voil travailler!
Mes pus ke ov force volez aler,
A quinze chivalers vus ev irrez,
Dount vostre honur ert enaunsez!”

Ore est sire Amylloun alee
Qe ne resest sun journé,
Deqes en sun pay est venuz;
Mes quant Amy est aperceuz
De la venue sire Amylloun,
La veysez joy a fussoun,
Greyngnur ne fu mes reccounté,

En un chaumba sunt auundui alee,
E lour robes chaungent atant;
Si n’est nul apercevaunt
De lour afere, plus ne meyns.
Amylloun, ke estut pleyns
De certeyn naturele amur,
Eps le defend a sojour,
Tanke il revynt a s’amye,
Ore esgardez grand curteysie,
E de franchise grand largesse,
De tote parz grand naturesse.

Amylloun e sun frere Amys
A teles se sunt departyz.
La veysez doel renoveler;
Aundui ne sesent de plorer.
Ne est meryelle, si il i ad dolour,
Car unques ne croy ke tel amur
Entre .i. chivalers estoit;
E atant cum plus de amur avoyt,
Plus fu forte la dolour.
Amy se prent a retour;
Unques ne finie dekes a s’amye,
Des ore encrest sa seignurie.

A plus tost qe Amys poeit,
AMYS E AMIIOUN
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1234 Ore est amez ci tenuz cher;
1235 Ne qert mes estre botiller
1236 Aynz est mountes a haut estage
1237 Qe encru lui est par mariage
1238 De treyz countez e demy,
1239 Dount lui rei l’en ad seysi.
1240 Ore put mener jouise vie
1241 Car ren i ad ke lui contredie,
1242 Aynz vet tretust a sun command,
1243 Chivaler, valet, e serjaund,
1244 Pur cez talenx acumplyr.
1245 E de sa femme a sun desyr
1246 Qe plus eyme qe ren du monde
1247 Car par lui tote sa joye habunde.
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1234 Congé ad pris, si s'en aloit
1235 En son pays vers s'amye
1236 Qe tant ama come sa vie.
1237 Ore est mout en astage,
1238 Car cru li est par mariage
1239 Grant seignurie e grant honur:
1240 De grant terres est il seignur,
1241 Si tost come li quens est fini.
1242 Ore est amé e tenu cher;
1243 N'estoet mes estre botiler.

1248 Ore lerroms de Amys ester,
1249 Assez ad de quanqe ad mester,
1250 Si vus diray de Amyloun
1251 Qe unqne e oystes de nul hom,
1252 Qe fu plus temptés sansz deserte,
1253 Par travail peyne ou poverte;
1254 Car ne put ertre defayllant
1255 Ce ke Deu lout dyt devant
1256 Al huis du muster ou estoit
1257 Ke si vil leprus devyndroit
1258 Qe home en munde ne trovast,
1259 Qe une foyz lui visitast.

1260 Ore l'aproche la maladie
1261 De si treforte leprosie
1262 Ke tut commence la pel crever,
1263 E tut la face a burgouner;

1264 Consailler fut fait e sire;
1265 Quantq’il voleit porreit dire.
1266 Tenu fut par tote la terre,
1267 Tant demeint grant affere.
1268 Sa femme ly aime tendrement,
1269 Si fist tot son commandement;
1270 Tant qe le counte enmaladi.
1271 E quant longtemps out langui,
1272 Morust e a Deu rendist s'alme;
1273 E tost après morust la dame.
1274 Quant mortz furent pere e mere,
1275 Il ne eust soer ne frere
1276 For sout la dame qe Amis aveit,
1277 Pur ceo les terres recevoit.
1278 Ore vodrom de Amis lesser,
1279 Qe assez ad dount il ad mester.
1280 Vus dirrai de sire Amillioun

1284 Ore lerroms de Amys ester,
1286 Ore l'aproche la maladie
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1265 Qe tant estoit leal compaignon.
1266 Com il en son lit gisoi,
1267 Sa bele dame a li disoit:
1264 Si malades e laiz devent
1265 Qe checuns pur meselui le tynt.
1266 Ses chivalers lui vnt guerpy,
1267 E ses serjauns revely,
1268 E sa femme nomement
1269 Pur autres hayr le prent.
1270 Si lui despyse de jour en jour;
1271 Ore la mandye cyl seignur
1272 Ke fyt ciel, tere, e mer,
1273 Car unques ne oyst hom parler
1274 De femme a marri si contrarie!
1275 Lui mesaus, ke ne set, qe fere,
1276 De plus en plus s’enmaledyt
1277 E si teriblement enlaydyt,
1278 Qe en curt ne ad villeyns ne veylle
1279 Qe une foyz rewarde le voylle.

1280 La dame ke tant fu vilayne
1281 E des maus tretote playne,
1282 Sun mari ad a teu despyst
1283 Ke mes ne le suffra, ce dyt,
1284 Si près de sez oyls mover,
1285 Mes une chambre lui fait lever
1286 Eins un gardyn si povrement
1287 Pur prendre solaz de la gent.
1288 Tant coevint qe il fu mort,
1289 E pur coe Ie defyt confort,
1290 Si ke de doel, e de pité,
1291 Serreit tantost devie.

1292 Quant lui mesaus fu chacez,
1293 E a si simple cunroy lyverez,
1294 En i suffri si grand haan,
1295 Tanke passoit la primer an.
1296 La dame jure derechef
1297 Pur reen ne put durer teu gref
1298 Qe lui mesaus seint si prés,
1299 Si fait chacer tut adés:

La dame li tint trop en despit:
Ne voleit entrer en son lit,
Ne voleit auxi od lui parler,
Ne od li beivre ne manger.
Meuz, ceo dit ele, veut morir
Qe a li vousist venir.
Cil soffri en cel an
Grant dolur e grant han.
Ses chevalers touz deportoient,
De hors la vile a un bordel!
Illeqes Ie fait aver hostel.
Un garsoun ele i assingnout
Que carier les fens soloyt;
Il le durra sa leveré,
Ensi Ie aveyt ele ordeyne.
Ore est moun sire Amylloun
Mys a moult povere leuresoun.
Jadis fu sire e seignur;
N'est merveylle si il ad dolour!
La mort desire plus ke la vie;
Ne n'ad home a ki parler,
Fors un enfant, ke lui servoyt --
Fys de un baroun estoyt --
Que ove lui estoyt demurrez;
Owayns fu l' enfant nomez.

Cist enfes qu vus dy, Owayns,
Fu si leaus e si certayns,
Si natureus ad sun seyngnur
Que unques ne volleyt, nuit ne jour,
De sire Amilloun departyr,
Ja tant meschefes le veyt suffryr;
Ains se tient tut sun vivant
Si tretut fyt sun comand;
Car unke ne oynt home parler
De un fant Amur si cler.

Seyngnurs, vus plest ore escoter!
Car ne fet pas a ubbler:
Sire Amille, quant fust baroun
De grand feerté, cum dyt avom,
Un fys avoyt il engendré
De ceste dame maluré;
Mult fu beaus cestui enfant
En checuin poynnt si tresaevent
Que si au ques en fust de age,
Ne croy que de ci en Cartage
Ust este un plus prudome;
Florentyns le appelieit hom.
Mes il ne out ke .vi. auns entiers,
 Quant a sun pere vynt l’encumbers.

La dame, a ceo ke dyt la geste,
Par un jour tynt une feste,
Si avoyt meme la jurné
Grand carole demené
En la vile des petyz clergouns;
Florentyn, le fys Amyllouns,
Purce ke fu haut enparentez,
En le devaunt est ordeynez.

Si vunt chauntan parmy la vile,
E si fust dunke sire Amylle
En sun bordel, ou il se estut,
E sun fyz vener aparceust
De pité prent a plurer,
Les lermes des oysl avaler:

“Florentyn,” feit il, “vens a moy,
Tu es moun fyz, certes ce croy,
E si aukes de ben entendisez,
Graund pité de moy ussez;
Maiis ci ove moy tener te porroy
Uncore mei serret a grand joye,
Coment qe unques me avensyst!”

Atant de plorer il reprist
E soun meschefa regreter.

Le jour comence a decliner,
Si aproche la vespree;
L’enfaunt est en courd demaunde,
Pur q’i prenen[t] grand noyse fere.
La dame le fet partut quere
De un e de autre, petyt e grand,
E lors se est venu avaut
Ausi cum fut un lavendere:

“Ma dame,” fet ele, “pec miere
Aley a bout de la vile,
Si vi l’enfaunt ov sire Amylle
Qe illoqes demurout grand pose,
Si enparlerent de meynte chose;
La dame par maualent dysoyt:
“Ore fetes le quere ja,
Certes moud cher en compara
Le amur du mauveys meseal,
Qe, diable, fut il a bordeal?”

L’enfaunt, qe tantost fu quys,
Du manaz moud fu marryz,
Si s’en vent vers mesun ploraunt.

“Hee,” dyt ele, “ribaud pauant,
Ou as tu tant demurrez?
Ja ne te ert garaud sachez,
Cestui mauveis meseal leprus!”
E lors leve la mayn sus
Si fert a tel irrour l’enfaunt
Qe as sez pez chet meytenaunt,
1394 E pus entre sez braz le prent
1395 Par yre e par mautalent.
1396 En sa chambre le aportout
1397 E de sez pez le defolout;
1398 Si bati flaunks e couustez,
1399 Tant fut de felounie en enflez,
1400 Qe mes ne manga ne bust,
1401 Mes dedenz lè .iii. jours murrust.
1402 E quant la dame ad si en fet,
1403 Si grand doel a sey ad tret,
1404 Qe de fyn yre e de hountage
1405 A poy tote sa vie ne arage;
1406 Car de ceste mesaventure
1407 Aquillist si grand espounture
1408 Qe ne fet cum defra la hounte.
1409 Mes aderreyn de cel acounte
1410 A qi rever nel set si noun
1411 Au cheytyfs meseal Amilloun,
1412 Car a lui jette le meschaunce
1413 E sur lui quert aver vengaunce:

1414 “He,” fet ele, “mauveys leprous,
1415 Par le sank Deu precious,
1416 Ne te i vaut mes sojourner!”
1417 E lors se prent a jurer:
1418 “Si nul desore seit si hardys
1419 De quanqe est en court remys,
1420 Qe mes a manger vus aporte,
1421 Ou de flé, ou de forte,
1422 Ja de la goule ne mangeray
1423 Tanke pendre le verryal!”
1424 Owayns a la court estoyt
1425 Qe de manace escotoyt
1426 Au bordel s’en veent currant:
1427 “He sire,” fet il, “pur Deu le grand,
1428 Fort novele vus aporte,
1429 Ja ad la dame sur la mort
1430 Defendu par tut en fyn,
1431 Ke vallet, vavasour, ne meschin,
1432 Nus aporte mes a manger!”
1433 “He Deu!” fet il, “moun fys cher!
1434 Mud i ad donke mau sojour!”
1435 “Veire,” fet il, “moun seignur,
1436 Alums tost hors de cete vile!”
1437 “Nanyl, beau fys!” fet Amyle,
1438 “Le mal me tynt si fort es peez.
1439 Qe loynz ne puse aler, säches!
1440 Messez, lessez moy ci demurrr,
1441 Mes, beau fyz, ne vus pus sufffrir,
1442 Tant de poverté ove mei aver;
1443 Ja n’aver ez vus unques le mester
1444 Od moy sufffrir tiele hosesoun;
1445 Ne este vus fys de baroun?
1446 Si serrez eyr de le eritage?
1447 Beaus fys Owayns, fete ke sage,
1448 Si returmee saunz demorer,
1449 Car deassez plus ne poynet aquer
Ton meschef qe tote ma peyne!
Ne meschaud de me maus demeyne,
Mes a tote fyns vus pri
Qe tantost alez vus de ci
E lessez moy ci soul morer,
Car en mey ne a recoverer!"
L'enfaunt lui ad res ponduz:
"Pur Deu, sire, qe dites vus?
Tut en veyn veir 'avez dyt
Car par le fyz Deu, Jesu Crist,
Amillioun com plus viveit,
Tant plus leid de veni.
La dame par tant defendi
Qe nul ne fut si hardi
Qe de rien li regardast,
Ne que manger li donast.
L'enfant, quant oycel comaund,
Ne sot ou quere lour vivre.
Tantost counta a son seignur,
E il dit: 'C'est mal dolur
Quant n'avom a boivre ne a manger;
Ne poums icy plus demorer.
Jhesu, le fiz seinte Marie,
Com longes me durra ceste vie?
Jeo solem aver grant tresour,
Estre servi d'argent e d'or,
Ore suy tant demene
Qe de rna vie est grant pite.
Si jeo de feim morir deveray
De mei memes force ne fray.'
L'enfant a soi don que appelast,
E il dont morir li essast,
E yl en son pais alast.
L'enfant res pondi par grant douçur:
'Merci Deu, mon seignur,
Meuz voyl od vous suffrir dolur
Quant l'un l'autre ad regardé
Quant l'un l'autre ad regarde,
Mout est entre eux grant pité;
Plurent e deciert leur draps,
Sovent se clai ent cheytyf e las;
Pleinent de grant chivalrie
Le honur e la seignurie
Qe sire Amillioun avoit eu,
Qe ore est devencu.
"Owayns," ce dyt Amyllioun,
"Pur Deu entendez ma resun!
Pus ke ensi est de le aler
N'ad desire qe parler,
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1478 Ayns ouvekis moy vivere volez
1479 En message a la dame irrez,
1480 Si la dites baudement
1481 Qe de le demurer ne moy plest nent
1482 Ayns su prest le pays vuder,
1483 Saunz jammés ce croy returner.
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Le noun vous dirray de l'enfant: 880
La gent l'appelent Amorant, 881
Mes Uwein fuit son dreit noun. 882
Donque li dist sire Amyllioun: 883
'Oweyn, a la dame irrez, 884
Nostre congé de li prendrez. 885
Hors de ceo pais irroms 886
A plus tost que nous pooms. 887
Mes jeo ne puis aler a pié; 888
Priez a lui par charité (74rb) 889
57va 890 891
57va

1484 Mes ne pus voyr aler a pee,
1485 Priez la dame par charité
1486 Ke ele me face un asne aver
1487 En qi me puse chivacher,
1488 E de une repast par la journée,
1489 Si seist ele en fyn quite clamé."

Owayns est averty e sage
Si s'en vait ferre la message;
Vynt a la dame si s'engenoyle:
"Ma dame," fet il, "dire vus voylle
Pur ce ke lui meseraus a bordel,
Ne semble ke fust bon ne leal
Qe vers lui ussez trop gros quer,
Le pays dyt ke vut voyder;
Mes aler ne put certes a pee,
Si vus requer par charité,
Qe una asne lui facez aver
En ki se puse chivacher,
E de un soul repast ausi
Si vus aquites tut de lui."

Quant la dame oy l'enfaunt
Teles noveles aportant,
Onques mes ne estoyt si lee,
De joye get une grand risé
Ke tut la sale rebounde;
Le fiz Marie la confounde!

"Certes," fet ele, "un asne avera,
E de une repast certes ne faudra
A teles ke tanost s'en aylle;
E dites lui la diffinylle,
Ke si mes en Pays remeyngne
Tut l'or de ci ke acompeygne
De male mort ne le garra!"
L'enfaunt ove l'asne returna,
Ke au mesal revynt e counte.
Amillouns cele asne mounte
Tut saunz sele e sauns estru,
Assez de meschef est encurru;

L'enfant a la dame ala,
Son message li counta.
Ors du pays si s'en vount,
Jammés ce quidunt ne revendrunt.
Owayns fust mult leal enfunt;
Pur Deu vait lour payn querant
Tanke en un pays sunt entre,
Ou il truvent si grand cherte,
Ke il n'i poaient hom trover
Ke ren lour vousist pur Deu doner.
Ne ren ne avoyent qe despendre,
Mes lour asne les covent vendre
Pur .vii. sou .viii. e maylle,
Dount il achaten lour vitaylle.
Estre ce Owayns fet fere
Sur deuz roeles un cyvere
Qe de sez deuz meyns Ie put chacer;
AmyUoun fet dedeyns cocher,
A meuz qe unkes sout lui esa
De liu en autre liu amens,
Ben a .iii. quarters dele un an,
Ou il suffirent si grand haan.

Ele li fist un asne aver,
E pus sus les seintz jurer
Qe mes en le pais [ne] vendreit
De l'hure qe issi serreit.
Hors del pais s'en vont;
Jamés quident qe revendrout.
Owein, le leal enfant,
| Lour viaunde va querant,
| Mes tant lour vint sur cherté
| De pain, vin e de blé,
| Qe donke ne poient home trover
| Qe rien lour voille doner.
| Einz ne pount plus entendre
| Q'il covient lor asne vendre
| Pur cink souz e diz e maille;
| De ceo acerton leur vitalle.
| Estre ceo lour fount fere
| Sur deus roes une cyvere
| Qu'il pout sei meisme enchacer.
| Amillion fist dedeinz cocher,
| A plus q'il pout li eysa,
| De long en long li enmena.

Par la terre tant alerent
Qe feym e me[s]jaise troverent,
Desques eus vindrent el pais
Ou sojorna le counte Amys
AMYS E AMILIOUN
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1568 Veez vus la ce beau manere?
1569 Ne say a ki le deit nomer,
1570 Mes un grand i est demurez
1571 Qe unques greyngnur charitez
1572 Ne fyst un home pur Deu joe croy!”
1573 “Aloms dunke la, par ma foy!”
1574 Ce dyt l’enfaunt Amylloun,
1575 “Tel home encontrar i purrum
1576 Qe par cas nus put valer.”
1577 E lors s’en vunt au maner.

1578 Pres de la porte seuz sunt mys,
1579 E lui enfes est avertys,
1580 E forment eyme sun seignur
1581 Vait demandant tut entour
1582 Des poveres le estre de la tere,
1583 E la custome, e la manere,
1584 Les chivalers ke alerent juans
1585 E les poveres regardauns,
1586 Virent l’enfaunt bel e parcr,
1587 E si ankes en fust vestu,
1588 Gentils homme resembleryot.
1589 Un chivaler assei Ie appelloyt,
1590 Si lui demaundoyt si il vout servir,
1591 E l’enfaunt get un suspyr,
1592 E dyt ke il avoyt un seygnur
1593 Ke il ne lerra pur le emperour.

1594 Qe se fust lui unt demaundez,
1595 Mes si tost cum lui unt avisez,
1596 Celui, ke il cleyme seignur,
1597 Saches, ke treut lui plusur
1598 L’unt tenu a pur sotye,
1599 E lui auquant de la meynye
1600 Unt grand pité de l’enfant,
1601 Si s’en unt muld entredoyllant
1602 En la sale cza e la,
1603 Tant ke lui quens Amys l’escota;
1604 Si les demaundoyt demeintenant
1605 Qe ce e dunt il doylent tant.
1606 “Ha sire!” coe dic un chivaler,
1607 “Merveylles orrez vus parler;
1608 Si a la porte ad un enfant --
1609 Plus bel ne vi en mouh vivaut --
1610 Si sert a un plus vyl leprous
1611 Qe unques vi joi de mes oyls.
1612 De l’enfaunt m’en prist pité,
1613 E a grand yre m’i fui ale;
1614 Si le demaundoy si il voloyt
1615 Meillour servise si il le trovoyt.
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Qe noble court illoeq tenoit
E moult grant ben fesoit.
La povere gent tot enviroun
Ala com a processioun.
Entre autres les deuz vount.
Ne sciet, qe eus veit, qu’il sount;
Si eus fuissent en la cort conuz,
A grant honur serreint receuz.
Pres [de] la porte se sount mis,
E l’enfant, qe bien fust apris
E moult ama son seignur,
Ala demaundant tut entour
Des povres les estres e les maneres
E les custumes de les terres.
Les gentils homes, qe alere[n]t juaunt
E les povres regardant,
Veu ouent l’enfant bel e parceu,
E [s’il] fuit ake vestu,
Gentil home resembleroit.
Un de eux ly appeleyt,
Demaundast s’il vout servir.
E il getta un grant suspri;
Cil dit q’il out un seignur
Q’il ne lerret pur estre emperor.
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E lui enfes me respondi
Qe un seignur avoyt choysi,
Qe il ne lerra pur vivaut."
"He Deus!" ce [dit] li quens ataunt,
"Mult ad ore en lui leal amur,
E leaument eyme sun seignur!"

Ataunt apele sun aumener
Si lui comaunde tantost doner
.xii. deners de la moneye.
Estre coe plus avaut l’otroie
Qe pur l’amur nostre seignur
A la court venge checun jour
A manger e a boyvere quere,
Tant cum demurt en ceste tere.
Le hour de noune fet aprocher
Qe lui quens irra manger;
E de checun mes ke l’em aportoyt
La moitë tut dys envoyt
Au meseal e a l’enfaunt,
Car de eus ad pitë graund.

Seyngnurs, escotez un poy!
Quant sire Amys servoyt au roy
Al hour ke fut botiller
Si serui Charles du mester,
.ii. coupes fyt il fere al hour
De une taylle, de une forgoure.

Celui dui hanap tant resembleient
Ke si en une mayn esteyent,
N’est hom, ke tant de overayne sust
Qe l’un de l’autre juger peust.
Dunt l’un a sei tynt en baundoun
E l’autre dona Amilloun
En remembrance de lour departyr,
Si ke de lui deit sovener
Quant la coupe regardast,
Qe l’un ne l’autre ne ubbliast.
Amys le garde endroyt de lui,
E Amilloun le soen ausi,
1654  Qe unkes par meschef ke il out,
1655  De lui sa coupe suffrir ne pout.
1656  Quant lui quens ad a poy mangé,
1657  Sun botiller ad apellé:
1658  "Prenez vallet," fet il, "coe vyn,
1659  Si le aportez au fraryn,
1660  Le povere meseal a la porte,
1661  Mes la coupe me reporte!
1662  En s’esquele Ie vyn versez
1663  E ma coupe me reportez!
1664  Car ne le dorroye vereyment
1665  Pur tut le or suz le firmament
1666  Tant moy destreynt J’amur mon
1667  frere.”
1668  Alias, cum fu forte e fiere
1669  La sudeyne mesaventure
1670  Qe a lur encontrer vynt si dure!
1671  Plus pitous ne fu unkes contez
1672  Le vallet ke servyt a counte,
1673  Quant entent ce ke an mounte,
1674  Prent la coupe, si la enporte
1675  A povere meseal a la porte;
1676  E quant cil vener aparzoit
1677  Hors de sun seyn sa coupe treyt,
1678  E l’autre le vyn i getta;
1679  Mes la coupe mult regarda,
1680  E pensoyt il: “Coment poet estre?
1681  Ce .ii. hanapes i)rst
1682  Cestui meseaus ke sur nus quert
1683  N’est pas ateus cum apert!”
1684  "Car si poveres lust d’estat,
1685  Ja ne ust il ore un tel hanap;
1686  Si il fu roy ou emperor,
1687  Tenyr le pust a grand honour.
1688  Mes coment certes ke nuls en die,
1689  Si croy joc meuze ke il seit espye
1690  Qe ceste court veut espoyer;
1691  Autre ne say de lui juger!”
1692  Sur ceste chose vait estudious
1693  Tanke en la sale est revenuz
1694  Dount lui quens est avisez
1695  E ferement lui ad demaundez:
1696  "Qe est ceo,” fet il, “ke tu diez,
1697  E dunt tu es si trepensyfs?”
1698  “Ha, sire,” fet il, “pur Deu merci!
1699  Mervaylles orrez vus de mi.
1700  Cestui meseaus, ou fu alez,
1701  Une coupe a, ceo sachez,
1702  Qe vostre coupe resemble tant,
1703 N'est home tant aparceyvant
1704 Si ambes en sa mayn tenoyt
1705 Ke l'un de l'autre jugeroyt,
1706 E de ceo, sire, fu taunt suspys!"
1707 Mes quant l'entent li quens Amys
1708 Grand pecce ne set ke dire,
1709 Mes durement après suspyre
1710 E dist forment suspirant:
1711 "He Deus," fet il, "c'est un truaunt,
1712 Un ribaud, barouns, futysf
1713 Qe felonement fut garnys
1714 Par akun autre privé laroun
1715 Des estres moun froun Amylloun!"
1716 E pus en tapisaunt s'en veent
1717 En acun liu, la ou il feste tynt,
1718 Par unt ad sa coupe emplé.
1719 "Mult troeve ci maudestine,
1720 Mal estrene e mal meschaunce
1721 Quant a ma court fyst demustrance
1722 Du larroun ke a mun froun ad fet;
1723 Ne voylle Deus ke fust retreyt
1724 A greyngnur delay ne assonye,
1725 Kar nouz preche novele vergoyne!"

1726 Outre la table se saut atant
1727 A cestui povere vynt currant,
1728 E tant l'en ad feru du pee
1729 Qe en la bowe est il versé.

1730 Ces chialers eurent adés,
1731 Qe li sivunt mult de pees
1732 E ke retenyr le voyeunt,
1733 Mes pur chose ke unke saveyent,
1734 Ne le porreyent asuager,
1735 Qu il ne le voleit ilues tuer.
1736 E quant batu l'ad e defelé,
1737 Tant ke li memes est allasé,
1738 Danke command ke hom le lyast
1739 E en presun le gettast;
1740 Car a sun frere cee dyt maunderoyt,
1741 E la verité en queroyt
1742 Cum sun hanap ust perdu
1743 E cum a lui fust avenu.
1744 E quant lui meseaus Amylloun
1745 En si out retrere sun noun,
1746 E nomer si grand signe de amur,
1747 A peyne pust parler de dolor
1748 Qe de fyn doel le quer ne le sent.

Quant Amyllioun li oist nomer,
De dolur pout son quer crever:
'Sire,' dit, 'par la foy qe vus devez
A Amillioun, qe tant amez,
Ne me facez enprisoner,
Mes le chef me faites tost trencher.
Mes certes ai jeo trop vesqui;
Trop bien ai la mort deservi.'
'Voir,' dist il, 'vous l'averz!
De vostre demaunde ja ne faudrez!
Tantost espeie demaunda,
E il memes dist q'il le tuera.
Tost l'espeie il fust baille,
Puis l'ad en haut leven,
E Amillioun le col tendist.
Mais l'enfant avant saillist:
Uwein, qi ne poet suffrir
En haut cria: 'Mercy, mercy!
Per icel Deu qe onqe ne menti
E qi en croiz suffri passioun,
C'est mi sires, sire Amillioun!
Sire quens, remembrez, Amys,
Com vous li soleiez amer jadis.
Grant bosoigne il ad icy chace.
Si Il e occiez, vous fetes pecché.'
Quant Il e counte ceo oist,
Tost estendu a terre chaist:
Bate ses mains, ses cheveus detire,
Sa vie hiet, sa mort desire,
La hure maudist q'onqe fu nee,
Quant pecché l'ad ensi encombre
Qe son frere desconusseit
Qe touz biens il fesoit.
Trestouz plurent de pite.
Amis s'est tot adresce,
Plus de cent foiz il ad beise,
Tot ensi com ert de tay levé,
Entre ses braz li ad apporté,
En sa chambre li ad couché.
Bainer li fist e seigner,
Con son corps li fist garder,
Servir il fist tot a talent
De viande e de boivre ensement.
E il memes a li vet
Chescun jour sis foiz ou sept;
Tant com pourt l'ad conforté.
La dame sovent a ly est alé,
Qe li ama molt de fin quer
Comme si ele fust sa soer;
Plus ne li poet fere companie.
Treis anz demena tele vie;
De ses eses ass[e]z avoyt
Tant com il memes desiroit.
Quant passa le temps issi,
Oe li quens une noyt dormi,
Une voiz oy qe li disoit
Qe Amillioun trop bien garret
S'il en fist mettre cure
[Des] deux fiz de sa gendrure:
Si les enfantz tuast
E Amillioun en le saunk bainast,
Si sain devendreit com pessoun.
Quant veu avoit l'avisinou
E de cel souinge resperi,
'A, Deu!' dit il, 'qe onqe ne menti,
Doine qe voir soit mon souinge.
Mes ore, soit voir ou mensouinge,
La merveile voiz voil prover.
Pur mes enfanz ne voil lesser.
Mout avera fait bone jorné
Si par lour saunk poet estre sauné.'
Un jour s'est par matyn levé,
E al matin est il alé;
Deu requist e son haut noun
A son frere doine garisoun.
La dame vint, qe bone fust,
Sovent Deu pur li requist.
Atant Ie counte s'est repaire,
En une chambre est entre
Ou les deus enfanz dormerent;
E doucement eux entreacolerent.
Le pere [n']eust de ses fiz pité:
Ambedeus ad Ie chef trenché;
E le sanc de eux ad quillé
E Amillioun dedeinz ad envolué.
Sitost com Ie saunc senti,
De son grant mal est il garri,
Qe en corps ne en face
De maladi ne apareust trace.
En Amis ne out qe regeir;
Une bone robe Ii fist vener
E a mouster puis li mena.
La dame, sitost com vew Ii a,
Pres de joie se palma;
Vint al seignur, si li demaunda
Si cee fuist sire Amillioun,
Coment il out sa garisoun.
'Dame, certes, jeo vus dirray,
Mes vous desconforteray.
Sachez, dame, que pur sa saunte
Voz deus fiz ai estranglé.'
La dame ses meins a Deu tendi
E mout graces li rendi,
Donque commence pur fere joie:
'Jhesu Crist, le fiz seinte Marie,
Si li plest, par son poer
Nous porra enfaunz doner.
Si Amyllioun perdu eussez,
Jamès tel autre ne averez.
De les enfaunz plus n'enpensons:
Si Deu velt, bien lé recoveroms.'
Atant la parole ount lessé
E le service Deu ount escoté.
Après la messe vint a mesoun;
Jouiuse est ele pur Amyllioun.
Amys donqe ove la dame ala
En la chambre ou les enfanz lessa.
Les enfantz furent estrangles,
E tot vifs les oint trovez!
En lor lit s'entrebeyserent,
Del ray del solail s'enjoierent.
Pere e mere, quant ceo virent,
A Deu graces en rendirent.
Sire Amillioun, quant fust saene
E de son grant mal netté,
Sitost com porra prist congé,
En son pais s'en est alé.
Quant la dame aveit oy
Qe son seignur estoit garri
E q'il revint el pais
E od li le counte Amis,
Tel ad el quer dolur
Qe unque femme ne out greignur.
Donqe se tint enfsyn honie:
Ne quideit pas q'il fuit en vie.
Pur ceo fut tot appareillé
Q'en le mois deust estré esposé.
Mes ore se claime lasse cheitive;
Moult luy poise qe ele est vive.
Ne saet ele pas quoi ele poet fere;
Si se met hors de la terre,
Ne la savera plus aider.
Donqe comencea a purpenser
Q'entre nonaynes se muscereit;
Son seignur ne verrait.
Mes ne li ert pas destiné,
Car un jour par matyné
Les deus countes sunt venuz
E a la porte descenduz,
Qe nul fut aparecevant
De lour venue tant ne quant.
La meisnee fusst dormie;
De lour venue ne saveint mie.
Quant la dame oi counter,
En une chaumbre se ala muscer;
Meuz velt estre pensuer
Qe de son seignur estre veue.
Sire Amillioun fist com leal bier:
Sa gent fist tot assembler,
Chasteleins e chivalers,
Serjanz, vadlet e esquiers.
Touz devant li venerent;
Merci crier touz penserent.
Son maltalent lour pardona,
Od sei les tint e les ama.
Donque fist sa femme demauner,
Car de li se veut venger.
Tant fuit quise q'elle fut trové,
Mes de pour se fuist muscé.
Sitost com vist son seignur,
Ele pauma de pour.
Le seignur la fist relever,  
Bel la comence a chastier:  
‘Dame,’ dit il, 'lessez ester!  
Ne deussez tel doil demener  
Pur ceo que sain sty revenu.  
Molt sty furst ben avenu,  
Si feussez tele com deussez estre,  
Par Jhesu, le roy celestre,  
Tourné me et a grant vilté  
Si jeo ne soie de vous vengé.  
Si fu[i] malades e defet,  
Pur ceo n'avoie jeo pas forfait,  
Qe vivre deusse bien du mien.  
Dame, sovenez vous del bien,  
Coment a manger me menastes  
E del pais m'enchaceastes;  
Puis feister jurer mon serjant  
Qe jeo ne deusse en mon vivant  
En ceo pais revener,  
Ne pur vivre ne pur morir.  
Suvenez vous del bordel  
[K'ja moy livrastes pur hostel.  
Celi averez tant com vous vivez;  
En noun de dowere Ie tenez!’  
Donke fist fere un turel:  
Petit fut mes molt bel,  
Si fut fort durement;  
De loinz le virent tose sa gent  
Outre tose tose cité;  
La fu la dame durement lie.  
James de illoec ne pout issir;  
La demora desqe al morir.  
Autre dames ensemple averont  
Coment lour seignurs lour garderont.  
Une garce la serveit  
Qe par une fenestre luy portoit  
Chescun jour sa liveré,  
Coment le counte out comandé.  
Un an vesqui e un jour;  
A drein morust pur dolor.  
Sire Amillioun fut molt prisé  
Qe autre peine n'ad liveré.  
Unke puis femme ne vout aver;  
Nul eyr out de sa mullier.  
Oween l'enfant bien teffa:  
De tose tose terre li herita,  
Qe bien aveit deservy.  
En bone vie longtemps vesqui;  
En bienfaitz se pena.  
Aprés sa mort a Deu ala;  
Amis, son frere, ensemend.  
Moult se amerent fierement.  
E bone fut la compaignie.  
Lor corps gisent en Lombardie,  
E Deu fait pur eus grant vertuz:  
Les voegles ver, parler les mutz.  
Tot ensi finist le sermoun  
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De sire Amis e de syre Amilioun.
Example of Edited and Unedited Text

The text in the left column shows the Karlsruhe text in a pure transcription (i.e., “i” and “j” or “u” and “v” not being reassigned according to their vocalic or consonantal usage, abbreviations are indicated by italics, all punctuation is removed, and none of the letters are respaced).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNEDITED TEXT</th>
<th>EDITED TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trouerez ws un romaunz</td>
<td>Troverez vus un romaunz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De II chialers si fys amauanz</td>
<td>De .ii. chialers, si fys amauanz;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luns Amys lautre Amilioun</td>
<td>L'uns Amys l'autre Amilioun,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qe pus deu suffri passiun</td>
<td>Qe pus Deu suffri passiun;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si fu trov si feal amour</td>
<td>Ne fu trové si feal amour,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne pur leaute si grand dolour</td>
<td>Ne pur leauté si grand dolour,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si grand variaunce en mervaile</td>
<td>Si grand variaunce en mervaile,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si grand grace en bataile</td>
<td>Si grand grace en bataile,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si grand peyne ne si grand perte</td>
<td>Si grand peyne ne si grand perte,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si grand meseyre sanz deserte</td>
<td>Si grand meseyse sanz deserte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De tote maneris encumbrers</td>
<td>De toute maneris encumbrers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum auyant a ce .ii. chialers</td>
<td>Cum auyant a .ii. chialers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne greynur miracle apres</td>
<td>Ne greynur miracle après</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qe lur fu destine a des</td>
<td>Qe lur fu destiné adès,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dount nus awms aucturite</td>
<td>Dount nus avyms aucturite,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par seynete eglyse conferme</td>
<td>Par seynete Eglyse confermé,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En lur legende de propre estoyre</td>
<td>En lur legende de propre estoyre,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par vnt fet le meuz a croyre</td>
<td>Par unt fet le meuz acroyre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qui veut oyr romaunz de amur</td>
<td>Qui veut oyr romaunz de amur,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De leaute e de grand douzour</td>
<td>De leauté et de grand douzour,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En pes se teigne pur escoter</td>
<td>En pes se teigne pur escoter!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car de truflis ne voil parler</td>
<td>Car de truflis ne voil parler,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mes de .ii. juuenceus/ws diray</td>
<td>Mes de .ii. juvenceus vus diray --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si ai en escryt le trouay</td>
<td>Si ai en escryt le trouay --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qui ala court Charlis estoyst</td>
<td>Qui a la court Charlis estoyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E pur lur armes le servoyent</td>
<td>E pur lur armes le servoyent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult furent de vassallage</td>
<td>Mult furent de vassallage,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentils e de haut parage</td>
<td>Gentils e de haut parage,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyz estoyent de II baruns</td>
<td>Pyz estoyent de .ii. baruns;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si ws diray ben lur nuns</td>
<td>Si vus diray ben lur nuns:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li vns auoyt Amys anoun</td>
<td>Li uns avoyt Amys a noun,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L'autre apelleit om Amiloun.</td>
<td>L’autre apelleit om Amiloun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult ouerist en eus dame nature</td>
<td>Mult overist en eus dame Nature,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De cossage c esterature</td>
<td>De cossage e de estature;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tant furent beaus ce dyt lestorie</td>
<td>Tant furent beaus, ce dyt l’estorie,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vnques pus que ly rey de glorie</td>
<td>Unques pus que ly rey de glorie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fist primes home a sa semblance</td>
<td>Fist primes home a sa semblance,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.ii. plus beaus de apparaunce</td>
<td>.ii. plus beaus de apparaunce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne furent en qui ly aioynt</td>
<td>Ne furent en qui ly aioynt,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce dist l'escrit en checun poynyt</td>
<td>Ce dist l’escrit en checun poynyt:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De totes beautes qe hom sout iuger</td>
<td>De totes beautes qe hom sout iuger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En eus .ii. pout hom trouer</td>
<td>En eus .ii. pout hom trouer,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seignurs si plus ws plest entendre</td>
<td>Seignurs, si plus vus plest entendre,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haute merueile poez aprendre</td>
<td>Haute merveille poez aprendre,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qe vi de ce .ii. chialers orrez</td>
<td>Qe vi de ce .ii. chialers orrez;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onques ne fu greynur trouer</td>
<td>Onques ne fu greynur trouez!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le .ii. cors taunt resembleient</td>
<td>Le .ii. cors taunt resembleient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que si en vu lu aundui estoient</td>
<td>Que si en vu lu aundui estoient,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne est om ke eus avisast</td>
<td>Ne est om ke eus avisast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que par semblance les severast</td>
<td>Que par semblance les severast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne par cors ne par fazoun</td>
<td>Ne par cors ne par fazoun,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par reen si par la robe noun</td>
<td>Par reen si par la robe noun.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cil dui vallet dont voil parler | Cil dui vallet, dont voil parler, |
<p>| Taunt ce pristrent entre amer | Taunt ce pristrent entreamer, |
| A si forte fraternite | A si forte fraternité |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNEDITED TEXT</th>
<th>EDITED TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Que de quant furunt vnques ne</td>
<td>Que de quanque furunt unques né.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne fu troue si leal amour</td>
<td>Ne fu trouvé si leal amour,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne pur leaute si grand dolour</td>
<td>Ne pur leauté si grand dolour,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De tote maneries de en cumbrers</td>
<td>De toute maneris de encumbrers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum auent a ce chialers</td>
<td>Cum auent a cé chivalers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlis le fort emperere</td>
<td>Charlis le fort emperere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En sun tens out yne manere</td>
<td>En sun tens out une manere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke nul home en sa court serioyt</td>
<td>Ke nul home en sa court serioyt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que a la table serviroyt</td>
<td>Que a la table serviroyt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si il ne fut chivaler adubbez</td>
<td>Si il ne fut chivaler adubbez,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De haute nurture ly vyt sachez</td>
<td>De haute nurture ly vyt sachez.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li dui vallet ke tant sunt beaus</td>
<td>Li dui vallet, ke tant sunt beaus,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vers le rey sunt si treleus</td>
<td>Vers le rey sunt si tre leus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qe pur ren ke pout auener</td>
<td>Qe pur ren ke pout avenir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De roye ne sout nuls home les flecher</td>
<td>De roye ne sout nuls home les flecher,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ains le seruirenleantement</td>
<td>Ains le seruirenleantement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E cil ke lur leaute entent</td>
<td>E cil ke lur leauté entent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les rewarde a si hautefranchise</td>
<td>Les rewarde a si haute franchise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke pur lur merite e lur servise</td>
<td>Ke pur lur merite e lur servise:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chialers les fet a grand honour</td>
<td>Chialers les fet a grand honour:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tut lur addubbez e lur atour</td>
<td>Tut lur addubbez e lur atour,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lur troue en quanque lur apent</td>
<td>Lur troue, en quanque lur apent;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand honour lur feste tient</td>
<td>Grand honour lur feste tient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ore sunt li dui amaunt montez</td>
<td>Ore sunt li dui amaunt montez,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A haute estage honurez</td>
<td>A haute estage honurez,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En dreit de leur seignour Charloun (59va)</td>
<td>Endreit de leur seignour Charloun 59va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke en eus se fye plus ke en nul hom</td>
<td>Ke en eus se fye plus ke en nul hom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E pur la grandime affinite</td>
<td>E pur la grandime affinité</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De amur ke en eus had troue</td>
<td>De amur ke en eus had troué,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fait de syre Amys sun boteler</td>
<td>Fait de syre Amys sun boteler,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke asez se pout en lui fier</td>
<td>Ke asez se pout en lui fier,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E de sun frere sire Amilloun</td>
<td>E de sun frere sire Amilloun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fait seneschal de sa mesoun</td>
<td>Fait seneschal de sa mesoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E marechaus de la sale sur touz</td>
<td>E marechaus de la sale sur touz,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tant fu averti e prus</td>
<td>Tant fu averti e prus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De teu mester long tens servirent</td>
<td>De teu mester long tens servirent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E partut treben le firent</td>
<td>E partut tre ben le firent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben a .xiij. auns ou plus</td>
<td>Ben a .xiii. auns ou plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le rei les hath mout cher tenus</td>
<td>Le rei les hath mout cher tenus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si les mustre si grand amur</td>
<td>Si lur mustre si grand amur,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doukt se coroucent li plusur</td>
<td>Doukt se coroucent li plusur,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si tenent entre euz si fort enuie</td>
<td>Si tenent entre euz si fort enuie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De la trefine compaygne</td>
<td>De la tre fine compaygne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si len pleient durement</td>
<td>Si l’enpleient durement,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E li senechauz nomencl</td>
<td>E li senechaus nomencl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sur touz autres esguayte houte</td>
<td>Sur touz autres l’esguayte houte;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce est tote la force de cunte</td>
<td>Ce est tote la force de cunte.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il les sur quert a tele en uie</td>
<td>Il les surquert a tele enuie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que tote manere felouneye</td>
<td>Que tote manere felouneye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que vnques compasser savoyt</td>
<td>Que vnques compasser savoyt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A ce .ii. chialers fesoyt</td>
<td>A ce .ii. chivalers fesoyt,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amilloun taunt i demurra</td>
<td>Amilloun taunt i demurra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke sun pere morut ia</td>
<td>Ke sun pere morut ja,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dount autre eir for lui ne auyet</td>
<td>Dount autre eir for lui ne auyet;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E quant de veir nuncie lestoyt</td>
<td>E quant de veir nuncie l’estoyt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEDITED TEXT</td>
<td>EDITED TEXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si il se desmente ameruaylle</td>
<td>Si il se desmente a mervaylle --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mes tut astuce &lt;...&gt;es se aparaylle</td>
<td>Mes tut astuce &lt;...&gt;es se aparaylle --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sun pays retourner</td>
<td>A sun pays retourner,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun eritage visiter</td>
<td>Sun eritage visiter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Au rei Charlis se est venuz</td>
<td>Au rei Charlis se est venuz,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchementes le rend saluz</td>
<td>Franchementes le rend saluz:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mun seignur fet il emperer</td>
<td>&quot;Mun seignur,&quot; fet il, &quot;Emperer,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cil ke fut cel tere e mer</td>
<td>Cil ke fut cel, tere e mer,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ws sauve mun seignur Charlemayne</td>
<td>Vus sauve, mun seignur Charlemayne,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E la royne vostre companye</td>
<td>E la royne vostre companye.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E ly rey plein de afiteiment</td>
<td>E ly rey plein de afiteiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ses salu.....le......ent</td>
<td>Ses salu.....le......ent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.....af..............un vengrant</td>
<td>D.....af..............un vengrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.....................est demeinemant.</td>
<td>.....................est demeinemant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quelles noveles uus aportez (59vb)</td>
<td>&quot;Quelles noveles vus aportez,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke la chere sa mourne auez</td>
<td>59vb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon seignur ce dist Amilloun</td>
<td>&quot;Mon seignur,&quot; ce dist Amilloun,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pur deu en tendez ma resun</td>
<td>&quot;Pur Deu, entendez ma resun!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mut me est venu message fort</td>
<td>Mut me est venu message fort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qe moy dist moun pere est mort</td>
<td>Qe moy dist moun pere est mort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce me nuncia vn messenger</td>
<td>Ce me nuncia un messenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke freschement vent de outre mer</td>
<td>Ke freschement vent de outre mer,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E si grever uus ne quidase</td>
<td>E si grever vus ne quidase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le conge si ws demandase</td>
<td>Le congé si vus demandase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qe visiter puse ma tere</td>
<td>Qe visiter puse ma tere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qe hom ne me face tresun ne guerre</td>
<td>Qe hom ne me face tresun ne guerre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li reis respend curteisement</td>
<td>Li reis respend curteisement,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qui asez le eyme parfitement:</td>
<td>Qui asez le eyme parfitement:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danz mareschaus pus ke est issi</td>
<td>&quot;Danz mareschaus, pus ke est issi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qe vostre pere est fini</td>
<td>Qe vostre pere est fini,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dount le eritage uus desendera</td>
<td>Dount le eritage vus desendera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par mei rethahit ne uus ert ia</td>
<td>Par mei rethahit ne vus ert ja.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne place deu de mageste</td>
<td>Ne place Deu de mageste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke vostre honour fust desturbe</td>
<td>Ke vostre honour fust desturbé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par mei beu sire Amilloun</td>
<td>Par mei, beu sire Amilloun,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En mei trouesz dunces mau guerdon</td>
<td>En mei trouesz dunces mau guerdon!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mes si uus auez de mei afere</td>
<td>Mes si vus avez de mei afere --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seit en pes ou en guere</td>
<td>Seit en pes ou en guere --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandez le mei hardiament</td>
<td>Mandez le mei hardiament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E tant cum mei dure or ou argent</td>
<td>E tant cum mei dure or ou argent,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne uus faudrai ne dotez mie</td>
<td>Ne vus faudrai ne dotez mie,&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veez ci large curteisy</td>
<td>Veez ci large curteisy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du rei caunt a sun seriaunt</td>
<td>Du rei caunt a sun seraunt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne say coment serreit plus grand</td>
<td>Ne say coment serreit plus grand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le rei li ad par le mentun pris</td>
<td>Le rei li ad par le mentun pris,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si li beise .v. foyz ou vi.</td>
<td>Si li beise .v. foyz ou .vi.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke vques ne seest arestous</td>
<td>Ke vques ne seest arestous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Lors li congeie sanz plus</td>
<td>E lors li congeie sanz plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A si treforte amystee</td>
<td>A si treforte amystee,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke quam en court sunt demure</td>
<td>Ke quam en court sunt demure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ses mervieilent durement</td>
<td>S‘esmerveilent durement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si len parleient priuement</td>
<td>Si l’en parleient privement,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E grand en vie iaquillerent</td>
<td>E grand envie iaquillerent,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aussi auant cum il oserent</td>
<td>Aussi avant cum il oserent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le chualer sen vet plerant</td>
<td>Le chualer s’en vet plerant,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MS. KARLSRUHE 345**
E asun frere vent meyntenaint
Si le <.>ne len chesun
Beu frere ce dist Amilloun
Pur le duz amor celuy (52ra)
Qe pur nus en la croyz pendy
De une chose ues requer,
Qe oue moi vodriers aler
A moun pays en Lumbardye
Ou moy mener tote maly
Car ne say certis coment viveroye
Si de vus vnques men aloye.
Tant moy destreint vosstre amor
Qe atuz iours viveroy en langur
Pus ke fussoms departi.
E pur ce beau frere ues pri
Ke quoque apent amoun barounie
Ke me est ascendu de eritage
Le fyz deu preigne en testmoniage
Ke de trestut wus seseray
E cum seignur wus serviray.

Amys respond agrand dusur 167
Merci beu frere pur deu amor
Mut me auez forte mater moustre
Ne voyle deu de mageste
Ke vnke me venist tel meschance
Ver meun seignur le rei de France
Ke sun servise vnque guerpiroye,
Si de verite le ne sauvoye
Ke mes ne vousisti de moun servise
Ensi le mei ad nature aprise
E ce ne fet mye amerverueil
Si finaumentes me tient a quer
La grand franchyse e le onur
Ke le rei nus fyft aiour
Quant les armes nus dona
E nostre onour tant en aunca
Ja nel me doynt deux ublier
Pur deux ne parlez de le aler
E derichef dist sire Amilloun
Qe apoy ne perd sen e resoun
E de fyn doel apoy ne arage
Quant chaunger ne put sun curage
Asez se pleint e se desmente
Mais au drein dist pitousemente.

Beau duz frere pus ke en si est
Ke oue mei aler ne wus pliest
Mes mes atote fyns demurea ci
De une chose seiez garni
Li reis ad seins vn seneschal
Ke mut est feal e desleal
E si est il de haute parentee
Hardre est cist feloun nomee
Ventiz au riche duc Milloun
E cosin germein Guenylloun

Amys respond a grand dusur:
"Merci, beu frere, pur Deu amur,
Mut me avez forte mater moustre.
Ne voyle Deu de mageste
Ke unke me venist tel meschance
Ver meun seignur, le rei de France,
Ke sun servise, unque guerpiroye,
Si de verité, ne le sauvoye
Ke mes ne vousisti de moun servise,
Ensi le mei ad nature aprise.
E ce ne fet mye a merveiller,
Si finaumentes me tient a quer,
La grand franchyse e le onur
Ke le rei nus fyst a jour
Quant les armes nus dona,
E nostre onour tant en aunca;
Ja nel me doynt Deux ublier,
Pur Deux, ne parlez de le aler!"
E de fyn doel apoy ne arage
Quant chaunger ne put sun curage.
Asez se pleint e se desmente:
Mais au drein dist pitousemente:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNEDITED TEXT</th>
<th>EDITED TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Celui ke trai Oliver</td>
<td>Celui ke trai Oliver,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland e ce xij. per</td>
<td>Roland e ce xij. per.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mut len auynt ben du linage</td>
<td>Mut len auynt ben du linage --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum tut li autre du parage</td>
<td>Cum tut li autre du parage --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estre felou n e tretour --</td>
<td>Estre felou n e tretour --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car felou surni sa aunsessor</td>
<td>Car felou surni sa aunsessor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si ne aiez a ly compaignynye</td>
<td>Si ne aiez a ly compaignynye!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car pys ne put ja auynt</td>
<td>Car pys ne put ja auynt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quant compaignynut autre trahir</td>
<td>Quant compaignynut autre trahir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tant cum ensemble en court fusums</td>
<td>Tant cum ensemble en court fusums,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ja mar sun mal decoroms</td>
<td>Ja mar sun mal decoroms,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mes pus ke ore soie departi</td>
<td>Mes pus ke ore soie departi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mut uus ert fort enemi</td>
<td>Mut uus ert fort enemi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne say ke plus uus die atant</td>
<td>Ne say ke plus uus die atant,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mais a fys deu uus comaun</td>
<td>Mais a fys deu uus comaun!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atant ses sunt entre beyse</td>
<td>Atant ses sunt entrebeysé,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plurent e crient de pite</td>
<td>Plurent e crient de pite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Souz ciel ne ad ome ke la fost</td>
<td>Souz ciel ne ad ome ke la fost,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke de lour doel pite nen vst</td>
<td>Ke de lour doel pite nen vst;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paumez ses sunt cheuz atere</td>
<td>Paumez ses sunt cheuz atere,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nest ome ke moi vousist crere</td>
<td>N'est ome ke moi vousist crere,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si ioe lur deis la moite</td>
<td>Si ioe lur deis la moite,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De doel ke entre euz vnt mene</td>
<td>De doel ke entre euz vnt mene,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li vns sen vait lautre remaint</td>
<td>Li vns sen vait lautre remaint,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke dolourouusement se playnt</td>
<td>Ke dolourouusement se playnt,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li vns vayt vers sun pays</td>
<td>Li vns vayt vers sun pays,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lautre remeint assez pensysfs</td>
<td>L'autre remeint assez pensysfs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne sout de doel ke fere poyt</td>
<td>Ne sout de doel ke fere poyt,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mes vers la court sei returneyt</td>
<td>Mes vers la court sei returneyt,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si sest en sa chambre ale</td>
<td>Si s'est en sa chambre ale,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si destreint e si maleeise</td>
<td>Si destreint e si maleeise,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qe de langor e de peyne</td>
<td>Qe de langor e de peyne,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En lyt se teent vn quinzaine</td>
<td>En lyt se teent vn quinzaine,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke ren ne manga ce dyt l'escrit</td>
<td>Ke ren ne manga, ce dyt l'escrit,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mes quast asuage est vn petyt</td>
<td>Mes quast asuage est vn petyt,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E qe il se sente augez a alleggez</td>
<td>E qe il se sente augez a alleggez,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hors du lyt sest lors leuez</td>
<td>Hors du lyt sest lors leuez,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En la sale tantost ala</td>
<td>En la sale tantost ala;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le seneschal i encuntra</td>
<td>Le seneschal i encuntra,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke de amur ly fyt semblant</td>
<td>Ke de amur ly fyt semblant,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mes vnqes nel ama tant ne quast</td>
<td>Mes vnqes nel ama tant ne quast,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sire Amys fet il ben veinant</td>
<td>&quot;Sire Amys,&quot; fet il, &quot;ben veinant!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De uus sui ore aler pensant</td>
<td>De uus sui ore aler pensant,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E de moun sire Amylloun</td>
<td>E de moun sire Amylloun,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qe tant fut uus leal compaygnoun</td>
<td>Qe tant fut uus leal compaygnoun,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vnqes nul autre ne vollez amer</td>
<td>Unqes nul autre ne vollez amer,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne nul semblant de amur mustier</td>
<td>Ne nul semblant de amur mustier,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mes pus qe ore se est departi</td>
<td>Mes pus qe ore se est departi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requer ke seiez moun amy</td>
<td>Requer ke seiez moun amy,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moun dru e moun ben voillant</td>
<td>Moun dru, e moun ben voillant!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E sire Amys respondu atant</td>
<td>E sire Amys respondu atant:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Sire seneschal, vostre amysté</td>
<td>&quot;Sire seneschal, vostre amysté</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En moy ne ert ia employé</td>
<td>En moy ne ert ia employé,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qe vn autre asseb ben amase</td>
<td>Qe vn autre asseb ben amase,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Scribal Corrections in the Manuscript**

The scribe himself has seen fit to make 32 corrections of his own in the manuscript which are listed here below.

55) fratemite] fratemete. The “e” has had an “i” written directly on it, complete with a characteristic “hook” suspended above the letter to leave no doubt of the “i.”

119) The “r” in Charlemagne has been added. There is a caret below the line between the “a” and the “l,” and a regular “r” inserted above the former.

130) The word “pere” is added in same manner as “r” in “Charlemagne” in line 119.

205) A hole appears in the MS where the final word “Amiloun” was first written. It has been rewritten just after the line in the margin between the columns as “amillo,” immediately below which it is completed with “on.” It looks as though there was a regular hole in the parchment which was located below the line, but which split further after the text was written (perhaps as it dried), thus requiring the word to be resupplied. The ink is somewhat lighter, suggesting it was supplied after the initial writing, though the hand appears to be the same.

206) The same hole which affects 205 has an impact on this line as well. The last word, “resoun” is completely illegible due to the hole, and has been resupplied below the line, just to the right of the hole, in the same manner as the final word in line 205.

282) 1st “e” in “seurete” is inserted above line as a correction.

318) The “t” in “contriouse” is inserted above the line.

337) Between “Mes” and “ele” there was originally an “a,” which is visible under blue light, but it seems that the scribe rubbed it out on purpose as it detracted from his meter.

383) The word “ne” is added above the line in the space between “court” and “ad.”

569) The ending “llcr” in “botiller” is a correction from either “e” or “c.”

634) In the MS., “humene” is “mene,” and there is a caret between the space between “du” and “mene,” above which “hu” is written in what appears to be the same hand.

635-6) These two lines are inverted in the MS., and they have been changed to reflect the order in which they should appear; the scribe has made it obvious that this is how he wants it to be read by writing “b” in the margin before line 635 and “a” in the margin before 634. He obviously caught his line slip when the next line didn’t rhyme.

653) The “de” in “demenez” is inserted above line with a caret below, all in the same hand.

775) The “vers” in “vesparre” is added above line with a caret below.

779) The “t” in “couent” is added above the “en,” but its place at the end is indicated by the caret below the line.

868) The “r” in “countres” is added to “countes” above the line with a caret below.
977) In the MS, “message” is originally “massage,” but the “a” is rubbed out and an “e” is placed above it.

1011) The second “e” in “esgarrez” is a correction from “a.” The word is originally written as “esgarraz,” but a dot it written under the letter and an “e” inserted above it.

1026) The “i” in “leprousie” is inserted above the line between the “s” and the “e.” There is no caret or point.

1160) The “su” in “sur” is a correction, but it is impossible to tell from what.

1202) The “en” is added above “irrez,” with a caret below the line between “uus” and “irrez.”

1205) The “re” in “resem” is inserted above the line.

1210) The “ne” is inserted above the “fu.”

1266) The “e” in “guerpy” is supplied above the word with a caret below.

1293) The “si” inserted above line with a caret below.

1298) The “u” in “meseaus” is added above the word with a caret below.

1343) The “y” in “tynt” was originally an “e” which has been written over.

1352) The “e” in “estut” is inserted above the line.

1371) The construction “atent” originally followed “uenu,” but has been stricken through, and replaced with “auaunt.”

1440) The word “lessez” is inserted above the line with a caret below.

1460) In “demorir,” “de” is added above the line with a caret below.

1467) The suffix “re” in “regarde” is inserted above line.

1470) The “e” in “Pleinenf’ is added above the “i.”

Interesting Scribal Errors Retained in the Text

There are some errors of the scribe or his exemplar which have been retained in the text.

33) “dame nature” is a corruption of “de une nature,” found in MS London. The scribe has had to rework the rest of the line to make “dame nature” make sense.

281) “cher” is most likely meant to be “chose.”

537) “honue” is no doubt a slip for “honce.”

697) aregrater - a regreter; the abbreviation is most definitely “ra,” but scribe probably meant “re.” The original spelling has been left, however, as the meaning is easily discernible.
ADDITIONAL NOTES
Mistakes, Corrections, and Rejected Readings

782) In writing: “& sun cheual ia reigna” scribe may have made an error. Kölbing says nothing about a variation, but his text says “E sun chival i aresna,” which is different! MS. L says “[E sun chival] a vne raym lya”

799) In “Mais ke il irra visiter,” Kölbing notes the variation of “ke iil” (his MS transcription provides “kil”), but does not point out that where he has “voleit,” this MS has “irra.”

975) The “il” in “Car mult il fu mal enploye” is retained instead of editing to “li.”

1307) The construction “moun pouere” is a corruption of “moult pouere,” but it is retained in the text to show divergence.

1327 & 1464) The form “fant” is retained instead of editing to “enfant” because the meaning is clear.

Rejected Readings

In the few instances where it has seemed prudent to reject a reading due to obvious scribal error, the original text can be deduced from the list of textual emendations here below.

897 Endreit| En dreit
899 le meyn| le meyn
900 seysys| sey sys
902 innocens| in nocens
911 a ce| a ce
913 innocens| in nocens
917 a peyne| a peyne
934 Si ne| Si ne
945 a nul| a nul
953 asiire| a sire
955 a lus| a lus; de moyst| de moyst
961 enprys| en prys
973 e velile| e velile
975 employe| en ploye
993 a malese| a malese
1002 le quer| le quer
1003 a pitouse| a pitouse
1009 a la| a la
1012 Endreit| En dreit
1031 deveyngne| de veyngne
1060 a noun| a noun
1062 de le| de le
1071 a feste| a feste
1073 a qe| a qe
1076 a la| a la
1080 a saver| a saver
1090 ou le| ou le
1091 l’acole| l’acole
1116 a une| a une
1127 deramej| de raume
1129 A grand| A grand
1134 a un| a un
1146 a reheter| a reheter
1162 demeyn| de meyn
1165 enverray| en verray
1166 l’endemeyn| l’en demeyn
1176 a uus| a uus
1187 a neut| a neut; a malese| a malese
1197 a grand| a grand
1198 a nostre| a nostre
1199 a pleysyr| a pleysyr
1203 enunsez| en unsez
1219 a fessoun| a fessoun
1217 a soiour| a soiour
1218 a s’amy| a s’amy
1222 e sun| e sun
1226 i ad| i ad
1231 a retour| a retour
1232 a s’amy| a s’amy
1233 encrest| en crest
1236 a haut| a haut
1237 encru| en cru
1238 demy| de my
1241 i ad| i ad
1242 a sun| a sun
1260 l’aproche| la proche
1263 a burgouner| a burgouner
1274 a marri| a marri
1276 s’enmaledyt| s’enmaledyt
1277 enlaydyt| en lay dyt
1282 a teu| a teu
1300 a un| a un
1305 Ensij| En si
1307 a moun| a moun
1312 a k| k
1313 a k| k
1316 ove lui| ove lui
1317 l’enfant| l’enfant
1322 departyr| de partyr
1323 le ye| le ye
1329 a ubbler| a ubbler
1332 engendrer| en genbre
1336 au qes| au qes
1341 a sun| a sun
1342 a ceo| a ceo
1348 emparentez| en parentez
1354 a plurer| a plurer
1356 vens a | vens sa
1361 a grand| a grand
1364 a regreter| a regreter
1365 a decliner| a decliner
1367 L’enfaunt| L’enfaunt
1368 q’| q’
1370 e grand| e grand
1371 e grand| e grand
1374 a bout| a bout
1375 l’enfaunt| l’enfaunt
1378 i sey| i sey
1379 mautilent| mautilent
1383 a bordeal| a bordeal
1384 L’enfaunt| L’enfaunt
1392 a tel| a tel
1393 as sez| as sez
1395 mautilent| mautilent
1401 dedenz| dedenz
1409 a derreyn| a derreyn
1412 a lui| a lui
1416 te i| te i
1417 a jurer| a jurer
1420 a manger| a manger
1424 a la| a la
1425 de manace| de manace
1432 a manger| a manger
1434 i ad| i ad
1438 es peez| es peez
1444 Od| Qe
1452 a too| a too
1456 L’enfaunt| a nului
1465 a nului| a nului
1466 en faunt| en faunt
1473 a niant| a niant
1478 ouvekis| ouvekis
1479 a la| a la
1484 a peel| a peel
1492 a la| a la
1494 a bordel| a bordel
1498 a pee] apee
1504 l'enfaunt] lenfaunt
1517 L'enfaunt] Len faunt; ove le] oule
1521 encurr] en curru
1523 revendrunt] reuen drunt
1537 dedeyns] de deyns
1558 i contre] icontre
1563 a manger] amanger
1569 a ki] aki
1570 i est] i est
1574 l'enfaunt] len faunt
1575 encontrer] en contrer; i purrum] ipurrum
1581 entour] en tour
1586 l'enfaunt] len faunt; parcru] par cru
1591 l'enfaunt] len faunt
1598 a pur] apur
1600 l'enfant] len fant
1601 entredoyllant] entre doyllant
1605 ço e] coe
1608 a la] ala
1609 bel ne] belne
1610 a un] aun
1612 De l'enfaunt] Del enfaunt
1613 a grand] agrand
1633 en voyt] enuoyt
1634 a l'enfaunt] alen faunt
1652 endroyt] en droyt
1654 meschef] mes chef
1656 a poy] apoy
1664 ne le] nele le
1669 a lur] alur; encontrer] en contrer
1673 entent] en tent; ce ke] ceke
1674 enporte] en porte
1675 a la] ala
1678 i getta] igetta
1688 en die] endie
1707 l'entent] len tent; li quens] liquens
1721 a maj] ama
1722 a mun] amun
1736 defele] de fèle
1740 a sun] asun
1743 a lui] alui
1745 Ensi] En si
Illegible Points in the Manuscript

107) “i” – supplied from Kolbing - is not even clear with blue light, though it may have been visible when Kolbing viewed the text.

111) Kolbing believes the line says “Si il se desmente ne a meruaylle.” The “se” remains uncertain (and Kolbing does mark it as “(fragl.)”), but there does seem to be an abbreviation mark after “il.” Also, Kolbing does not note anything between “desmente” and “ne,” but there is quite a large gap between the words and the surface appears rough in the microfilm, suggesting something has, perhaps accidentally, been rubbed out but blue light does not provide anything.

112) Again, a difficult line due to damage. Kolbing says: “Mes tut astuce ...s se aparaylle.” The third word remains uncertain. Under blue light, an “e” is evident before the “s.”

122-4) Kolbing says:

\[\text{Ses salu}.................\]
\[.................... e grant\]
\[........ est demeinemant\]

Under blue light, I find:

\[\text{Ses salu}....le....e(a/n)d\]
\[D.....aft.....ve(r/n)grant\]
\[...............est demeinemant\]

166) The second word, “a,” is illegible even under blue light.

167) In “Si li .......... l’enchesun.” (“-ne” is visible under blue light.)

246-251) Under blue light, these faded lines are much clearer. Only those portions in brackets are difficult.

\[\text{Ne [sout] de doel ke fere poyt,}\]
\[\text{Mes vers la court sei returneyt.}\]
\[\text{Si s’est en sa chambre ale}\]
\[\text{Si destreint & si [maleise]}\]

332-4) The damage caused by the hole has become greater since Kolbing examined the MS. With blue light, however, the following is revealed (portions in brackets lost):

\[\text{Qe il atant ama cum sa alme;}\]
\[\text{Mut fut g[ent] la damoysele;}\]
\[\text{En [tote France] ne out plus bele.}\]

337) Kolbing notes “Danach ein buchst. ausradirt,” perhaps referring to a letter rubbed out between “Mes” and “ele.” Under blue light, an “a” is revealed.

591) « [Li vn] vers lautre tendi li gant. » This line is obscure. Kolbing says it says “Li uns”; I agree with “li,” but this scribe prefers “v” to “u” for initial position.
ILLEGIBLE POINTS IN THE MANUSCRIPT

624) Tant lest destreint [.....] doels; the space feels rubbed out, but nothing shows under blue light, and letters from other side show through.

833) S[i sui] fet il venu uus quere--looks like “Si ia”

853) Joe moy [.....] fy en la grace de: Nothing under blue light, but something clearly rubbed out.

892) A[u iour de] oy serra seisy

893) En te[mo]inaunce de uus barouns

912) Q’e[n] nostre [e]storye testimony auoms

914) Kolbing has this line as “S’en vunt le rey & se gens,” but blue light reveals the verb to be “vient.”

915) Kolbing has “& de [ducs] & de barouns”; blue light reveals the problem word to be “dx” or “de” followed by a clear “s” (the letter in question looks much like a lowercase greek alpha rotated 90° clockwise)

938) Li rei me ateyndra de tresun: does not look like “me,” more like “ne”+ ??. The ?? could be “de” or “ch.” there is a very faint “de” below the line, only visible under blue light.

943-5) Car a[undui] fussent donke honys
Flurie [e] [mou]n frere Amys
& ceo ne [le] [f]eroy anul feor
Ains me leroy vyf escorcher

952) De meseyse [a] de tote parte: the “a” is either “a” or “e”; looks like “B.”

1067) Tant menestra[us] i sount feffez: no “us” in MS even under blue light.

1107) Joe croy ke uus voler [..] celer

1416) De quamque est en court rem[ys]

1548) A uentre <...> ensement en hurtant

1549)Ausy <.....> us le uout mener

1698) Ha sire fe[ti] pur deu merci
APPENDIX C: SYNOPSIS

Old French: Ami et Amile

Ami and Amile are conceived at the same moment and born on the same day. Ami is the son of the count of Clermont, while Amile’s father is from Bourges. Their parents are told by an angel of the great friendship the two boys will share, and they are both sent to Rome to be baptised, and where Pope Yzoré serves as their godfather. The pope gives his godsons identical drinking vessels by which they will later recognise one another. The two boys look so alike that none can tell them apart. They grow up separately, Amile in Berry, Ami in Auvergne. At fifteen, on the same day, they leave their parents and seek each other out. After long questing, they find one another, pledge eternal friendship, and go to serve Charlemagne.

The traitorous Hardré is jealous of the two companions and he plots against them with Charlemagne’s enemies, but he is caught in his own trap, and in order to protect himself and keep the peace, he offers them the hand of his niece Lubias, dame de Blaye. Charlemagne, wishing to establish concord among his vassals, presses for the marriage. Amile refuses her hand, but Ami accepts, and goes to Blaye. The marriage is a disaster, with Lubias doing everything in her power to destroy the friendship between the two companions.

Meanwhile, Belisaunt, Charlemagne’s daughter, falls madly in love with Amile. One night she creeps into Amile’s bed, where he allows himself to be seduced, believing her to be a chambermaid. Hardré, however, discovers the two lovers and denounces them to Charlemagne. Amile is called to defend himself in a trial by combat, which he cannot win due to his guilt. None in the court will take his side nor stand as hostage for him, until the queen offers herself and her two children, Belisaunt and her son Buevon. Amile decides his best hope is to get Ami, who is identical to him, to undertake the battle in his place. Alerted by a dream, Ami begins the trek to Paris. He meets Amile half-way, trades places with him, and continues on to Paris to do battle. Ami continues on to Blaye where Lubias mistakes him for her husband. In order to avoid committing adultery, Ami first feigns illness, then places a bare sword in the bed between them, a symbol of chastity.

Arriving at Paris, Amile declares his innocence, engages Hardré in a judicial combat which lasts one full day and part of the next. He finally kills Hardré. Charlemagne, delighted by the outcome of the trial which proves his daughter’s innocence, commands that she and the

---

78 In RT, Ami is from Blaye, and Amile is from Clermont.
79 There is no mention of the pope or Rome in RT.
80 Gaufier, king of Poitiers in RT.
81 Hadré = Adradus in RT.
82 The lineage of traitors descend from the house of Blaye in this tradition.
83 Belisaunt = Belisardis in RT.
84 RT dedicates the majority of his summary to describing the battle. He inserts an interesting detail; Belisardis gives Ami a sword of her father’s which had belonged to Roland, who had received it from Charlemagne.
victor be married immediately. An angel warns Ami that he will be stricken with leprosy if he consents. 85 Nevertheless, in the name of Amile, he accepts the engagement with Belisaunt, and he then takes her to Blaye where Ami and Amile can once again change clothes and resume their proper identities. Amile then marries Belisaunt, and the couple continue to Riviers, which she brings to him as her dowry.

Some time later the angel’s prophecy comes true, and Ami gets leprosy. Lubias, ashamed of his leprous condition, separates from him and drives him from the palace. The starving Ami is tended only by his loyal son, Gérard, whom Lubias soon has imprisoned, allowing Ami to retain only two loyal servants who lead him to his godfather in Rome. He is well received by the pope, but soon Yzoré dies, and Ami is forced to begin his wanderings again. He goes to Clermont, where his brothers mock him and refuse to recognise him. No longer able to walk, Ami is led away by his two servants, and eventually arrives at the sea near Mont-Saint-Michel. In order to pay for his passage, one of the servants sells himself to the ferrymen, among whom a quarrel breaks out, and they kill each other, thus leaving Ami and the servants stranded in the sea. The current carries them to Riviers (2480-2686), where thanks to the cup, Ami is recognised by Amile. 86

Amile tends to his companion lovingly, but to no avail, and Ami becomes increasingly unwell. An angel appears to the leper, telling him that he can be cured if his companion bathes him in the blood of his own sons. 87 Ami tells Amile the angel’s advice, and after a short but anguishing period of indecision, Amile kills his children, collects their blood, and bathes Ami in it. Ami is completely cured, and when the weeping Belissant goes into her children’s room, she discovers them in perfect health. 88 (2687-3192)

After great public celebrations, Ami returns to Blaye accompanied by Amile. He first exiles Lubias, then very quickly decides to pardon her. He generously rewards his two servants, dubs Gérard a knight, and cedes Blaye to him. (3193-3469)
The two companions then make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem to atone for their sins, and on their return voyage, they fall ill and die in Mortara, where they are buried. (3470-3504)

85 There is no connection in RT between the leprosy and the false marriage.
86 RT does not mention this detail.
87 In RT, it is doctors who tell Amile.
88 RT ends here.
Anglo-Norman: Amys e Amillyoun (London)

Amys and Amillyoun are both the sons of barons, and greatly resemble one another. They make an oath of brotherhood to one another, and serve their lord loyally. They receive different offices in the court, Amillyoun becoming a marshal while Amys becomes the butler. Amillyoun is called home at the death of his father to take up his lands. Before leaving, he warns Amys against the seneschal, and reminds him to remain loyal to their lord.

After parting, Amys meets the seneschal, who offers his friendship, but is rebuffed. Meanwhile, Amillyoun gets married in his own lands. At a banquet in the lord’s court, the count’s daughter Mirabele, whom everyone calls Florie, falls in love with Amys. She tries to seduce him, but citing loyalty to his lord, Amys refuses her. She threatens to tell her father that he dishonoured her if he will not let her have her way, so he agrees to meet with her secretly. Unfortunately, the seneschal overhears their conversation, and denounces them to the court the day following their rendezvous.

Amys is forced to defend their innocence in trial by combat. The countess stands as surety for him, and gives him leave to consult Amillyoun. That night he falls asleep under a tree while Amillyoun, alerted by a dream, wakes and sets out in the middle of the night to find his friend. He discovers Amys under the tree, and ascertaining the situation, changes clothes with his companion whom he sends back to his wife, while he continues on to the count’s court. Amillyoun instructs Amys to behave just as if he truly were Amillyoun, even suggesting his companion sleep with his wife to avoid her suspecting anything, but Amys instead places a sword in the bed between himself and Amillyoun’s wife.

Meanwhile, Amillyoun arrives at the court just in time to save Florie and her mother from the flames. He defeats the seneschal in battle, and the count, delighted at the outcome, orders that Florie marry her champion. When going to the church where the wedding will take place, a voice comes to Amillyoun, telling him that if he goes through the ceremony, he will become a leper within three years. Seeing no way of avoiding the marriage without disclosing his true identity, Amillyoun decides to go through with it. He reveals his true identity to Florie, then meets up with Amys so that the two can again change their garments and assume their proper identities. At home, Amillyoun learns from an off-hand comment of his wife, who is kept uninformed of the switch, that Amys had remained chaste during his stay.

Within three years, Amillyoun becomes a leper. His wife throws him out and he is abandoned by everyone save the young son of a family member. These two are forced to live in a hovel on the edge of town where the boy, named Uwein but called Amorant, cares for Amillyoun. Eventually the boy goes to ask Amillyoun’s wife for an ass with which they can
make their way out of the jurisdiction. She provides one, and the two part. They live for a while as beggars, but soon famine limits the charity they receive. The ass is sold to buy food, and Amorant carts Amillyoun around in a wheelbarrow.

They eventually make their way inadvertently to the original court, where Amys has succeeded his father-in-law. One of the courtier notices Amorant's handsome appearance among the beggars, and offers to take him into service, but the boy refuses. Astounded that the child preferred to remain with a beggar, the story is relayed to Amys. Amys is so touched by the boy's loyalty that he has half of each of his courses sent to the pair.

When serving them wine, the butler is amazed to see that Amillyoun has a cup that is identical to that of his lord. The detail is reported to Amys, who assumes the cup was stolen, and therefore runs out and begins to beat the leper whom he does not recognise as his lifelong companion. When asked to explain his possession of the cup, Amillyoun replies by requesting a quick death. Amorant, however, reveals his master's true identity, and Amys takes in his companion and tries to nurse him.

One evening a vision comes to Amys telling him that if he kills his children and bathes Amillyoun in their blood, his friend will regain his health. Amys beheads his children and restores Amillyoun's well-being. Their mother, Florie, tearfully accepts her husband's deed, and gives thanks for Amillyoun's recovery. After attending mass, she goes to their nursery where she discovers her children playing in the sunshine.

Amillyoun returns to his own lands, where his wife is about to remarry. He locks her away in a tower where she dies a year and a day later. Amys ends his life in piety after making Amorant his heir. He and his sworn brother Amillyoun are buried together in Lombardy.
SYNOPSES

Middle English: Amis and Amiloun

In Lombardy, Amis and Amiloun were conceived and born on the same day, both the sons of great barons. At twelve, their fathers take them to a feast at the duke's court where they were so alike that people could only tell them apart by their clothing. The duke is so impressed by the boys that he asks for them to remain, promising to knight them when the time comes. The parents give their permission, and the boys quickly become friends and swear an oath of friendship. (stanza 1-12; 1-132)

They are dubbed knights at fifteen, the duke furnishing them with horses and arms, and makes Amis his butler while Amilioun becomes his steward-in-hall. The duke and all the people love and praise the pair, except the steward, who is envious of them and plots against them. (1-216)

Amiloun is soon called home by the death of his parents, and with a heavy heart the duke allows him to leave, promising to always be his ally if he needs support. Amiloun goes to have two identical cups made, while the distressed Amis begs the duke to be allowed to leave with his companion. The duke does not wish Amis to leave, but allows him to accompany Amiloun on his journey for a single day. The pair ride along sorrowfully; Amiloun reaffirms his friendship troth, and warns Amis against the steward. He then gives Amis one of the cups as a token of friendship. They part in sadness, and Amiloun continues on his way, takes possession of his lands and marries. (217-336)

Amis's reputation continues to grow, and the steward offers his friendship. Amis rebuffs him, answering that he is already plighted and he will hold to his old friend. The enraged steward threatens Amis, and Amis taunts him. The steward then begins planning his revenge. (337-408)

At a banquet where all the court is assembled, Amis is held to be the prize of all the company. Belisaunt, the duke's daughter, asks who was the fairest at the feast, and her chambermaids tell her of Amis. She becomes love-sick and tells her mother, who tries to comfort her, that she will soon be dead.

One day the duke and all the men of the court go hunting, save Amis who remains behind feeling ill. He goes into the garden and sits under a tree. In order to raise her daughter's spirits, Belisaunt's mother instructs her to go into the garden, which despite its beauty, does nothing to cheer her up until she sees Amis. She goes to him and confesses her love, asking Amis to plight his troth to her. Amis objects, citing their difference in station and his loyalty to her father. She taunts him, calling him a priest, and says she will claim that he dishonoured her if he does not consent to her wishes. Amis weighs his options, realising that if
SYNOPSES

he denies her, she will destroy him, but if he consents, the duke will destroy him. He asks her to wait a week, and when she refuses, he plights his troth to her. (409-672)

Returning from the hunt, the duke is delighted by his daughter’s recovery and has a feast. Belisaunt gazes at Amis so intently that the steward perceives her love. When the duke leaves on another hunt, Belisaunt goes to Amis, and is followed by the steward. Again, Amis tries to rebuff her gently, but she presses him and they become lovers. The steward, meanwhile, spies on them through a hole, and reveals their relationship to the duke upon his return. The duke flies into a rage and tries to attack Amis, who locks himself into a room. From behind the locked door, Amis requests trial by combat, the steward accepts the challenge, and the duke sets the date for the trial. (410-864)

Amis can find no one to stand for him as surety against the stronger steward, until Belisaunt and her mother offer themselves. Despite their intentions to equip him exceedingly well, Amis is distressed because he realises he is in the wrong. He begs leave to seek out Amiloun’s help, and goes to find his companion. Exhausted, he falls asleep under a tree a half-day journey from Amiloun’s territory. Amiloun, alerted by a dream, leaves alone in the middle of the night and finds Amis asleep. Amis explains the situation, the two exchange garments, and Amiloun returns to the duke’s court in the guise of Amis, while Amis goes to Amiloun’s court impersonating his friend. (411-1140)

Amis is accepted as Amiloun in the court, and at night, he places a sword between himself and Amiloun’s wife, feigning an illness for a fortnight. Meanwhile, Amiloun (as Amis) arrives at the duke’s court just in time to prevent Belisaunt and her mother from being burned. As he prepares for battle, a voice from heaven tells him he will become a leper if he goes through with the trial-by-ordeal. Not wanting to abandon Amis, he battles and defeats the steward. The duke, supposing him to be Amis, grants him his daughter and his lands. When he is well enough to travel, he returns home where he and Amis resume their proper identities. Amis returns to the duke’s court, and that night Amiloun kisses his wife in bed, whereupon she asks him about the sword, thereby revealing to him that Amis had been a faithful friend. Amiloun explains the deception, and his wife grows angry, scolding him for doing wrong. (1140-1500)

Back in court, Amis and Belisaunt are officially married, and within two years he succeeds the duke and has two lovely children. Meanwhile, Amiloun contracts leprosy. His wife tells him he has only himself to blame for killing the steward, and eventually drives him from the house. He takes up residence in a small hut where only his nephew Owaines continues to serve him. Eventually, the lady orders no more food to be given to them, and they become beggars. At first, people take pity on them, but soon a famine makes such generosity
scarce. The lady agrees to give them an ass if they leave the country and never return, and they wander through many lands. Eventually they are forced to sell the ass for food, and Amiloun, unable to walk, is carried on his nephew’s back. With their last 12 pence they purchase a pushcart in which Owaines, also called Amoraunt, pushes his uncle around until one day they arrive at Amis’s court. (1501-1872)

Amiloun and Owaines gather outside the gates with the other beggars, where they are noticed by one of Amis’s knights. He asks the handsome youth whom he serves, and inquires whether he would not rather serve Amis when Owaines indicates his uncle. The knight is surprised that Owaines remains loyal to the beggar, and tells Amis of the astonishing sight. Amis decides to reward the boy for remaining true, and sends his cup full of wine to the pair. The squire is surprised to see the leper pull forth an identical cup, and reports it to Amis. Amis, realising it is Amiloun’s cup, rushes out and attacks the leper, whom he supposes has stolen the cup. Owaines restrains Amis, and reveals Amiloun’s true identity. Amis embraces his bedraggled friend and takes him inside where he and Belisaunt tend to him. (1873-2184)

For a year they take care of Amiloun as best they can, then an angel appears to both friends, telling them that the leprosy can be cured by a bath of Amis’s children’s blood. On Christmas night, when the household is in the church, Amis cuts the throats of his sleeping children, collects their blood, covers their bodies and locks the door to their nursery. He bathes his friend, prays for him and for the children. The next morning he tells Belisaunt what he has done, and she accepts his decision, saying that God can send them more children. They meet Amiloun, who is fully restored, and when they go to the nursery, they discover the children unhurt. (2185-2424)

Amis accompanies Amiloun when he journeys back to his country where he finds his wife about to remarry. They win the ensuing battle, and Amiloun commands her to be placed in a little hut and fed on bread and water. He makes his nephew lord of the land and returns home with Amis. They eventually die on the same day and are buried together in the abbey they have built at Lombardy. (2425-2508)