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Huon d’Auvergne, in Italian Ugone d’Alvernia, is one of the few remaining unedited Franco-Italian texts. There are three manuscript witnesses, a manuscript fragment, and a later Italian prose version. These versions contain different plot episodes and the language of the texts is italianized to varying degrees. Certain episodes have aroused greater interest within the scholarly community; for example, Huon’s trip through hell has been analyzed and transcribed in its various versions. However, one complete episode, generally ignored and even maligned, has never been published, though it presents a great interest for the modern-day reader: that of Nida and her confrontation with Charles Martel.¹

¹ A synoptic edition of the entire text has been announced by Günter Holtus and Alessandro Vitale-Brovarone (Wunderli and Holtus, “La renaissance,” p. 15, also announced separately in Holtus, “L’État,” p. 155 and Vitale-Brovarone, “De la Chanson,” p. 393). Both have said that they have not progressed in the project (personal communications, 2001-2004). For a list of all published selections from all three manuscripts, see Möhren (“«Huon d’Auvergne>,” pp. 313-15, note 7); specifically for the Berlin ms., see also Morgan, “Passion” (I), p. 70, note 11). Library catalogue descriptions for the Padua ms. are Andrea Donello et al. (I Manoscritti, p. 14) and Andrea Coi (Catalogus 29, col. 2). The history of the Berlin ms. is documented in Helmut Boese, Die lateinischen Handschriften.
The tradition

The existence of the story of Huon d’Auvergne is documented from the twelfth through the sixteenth centuries. Versions have survived only in the Italian peninsula, though references to the story appear elsewhere. Guiraut de Cabrera mentions the “bon Alvernatz Ugon” in his Ensenhamen of the late twelfth century, and Andreas Capellanus refers to “Ugone Alverniae” in De amore (c. 1235). But there are questions about whether these in fact refer to Huon d’Auvergne. Recently found, too, is what seems to be a reference to Huon in a fifteenth-century English letter (Breeze, “Sir John Paston”). However, Italian records of Huon are more prolific than elsewhere; library inventories frequently list what seem to be versions of Huon d’Auvergne. In the 1407 Gonzaga inventory from Mantua, for instance, number 21 “Ugo de Alvernia” is generally identified with the Berlin manuscript (Braghirolli, “Les manuscrits,” p. 508). In the fifteenth-century Visconti-Sforza inventories, “Carolus Martellus” appears three times (1459, 1488, 1490) and in Estensi inventories appear “Alvernasco” (1436), “Alvernaschus” (1488) and “Karlo Martelo” (1436); all are presumed to be copies of Huon d’Auvergne.²

² For the Sforzi-Visconti inventories, see Maria Grazia Albertini Ottolenghi (“La Biblioteca dei Visconti e degli Sforza”), Giuseppe Mazzatinti (“Inventario dei codici della Biblioteca Visconteo-Sforzesca”) and Antoine Thomas (“Les manuscrits français et provençaux des ducs de Milan au Château de Pavie”). The continual appearance of the same text means that it was valued and kept on hand, not destroyed or given to someone else. Other manuscripts were not so fortunate. For the Estensi inventories, see Adriano Cappelli (“La Biblioteca Estense nella prima metà del secolo XV”) and Pio Rajna (“Ricordi di codici francesi posseduti dagli Estensi nel sec. XV”).
The manuscript witnesses

Of the surviving texts, two manuscript witnesses are in excellent condition; the third is severely damaged by fire. The first chronologically is Berlin Kupferstichkabinet 78 D 8 (olim Hamilton 337, abbreviated B), dated at the end of the text itself to 1341. Its 84 parchment folios contain 12225 lines of mostly mono-rhymed laisses. B is complete though it contains a ten-page, single folio insert (Morgan, “Passion” (I), pp. 68-69; Stengel, “Eine weitere,” pp. 35-36) that contains one version of the Nida (there called Ynide) story. That ms. is illuminated and rubricated. The language is very close to Old French of the same era. Mainone mentions that Stengel completed a transcription of this ms. (“Laut- und Formenlehre,” p. 5), but it is not published. The Ynide/Nida segment has appeared in print (Morgan “Passion” [II]).

The second version is in Padua, Biblioteca del Seminario Vescovile Cod. 32 (abbreviated P), dated by scholars to the second half of the fourteenth century or first half of the fifteenth. It consists of 117 paper folios, 5690 lines. It is missing the initial folio and the last folio (ending on a recto) is torn in the middle, thus removing portions of the final few lines. There are forty spaces left for illumination within the text that were never filled, though the rubricator did color laisse-initial capitals; the capitals from I V through the end alternate red with blue decorations in the form of pen flourishes and blue with red pen flourishes (though the alternation is not consistent). Pio Rajna transcribed the text by hand in a notebook now preserved at the Biblioteca Marucelliana in Florence with his papers (Bib. Marucelliana Carte Rajna XII.M.101). 3 Giacon’s 1960-61 thesis is supposed to be a critical edition of this text, but it is unpublished and not generally available to the public. P’s language is italianized, containing typical Italian vocabulary, spellings and syntax,

---

3 The Rajna papers are catalogued in Fabia Borroni, Le Carte Rajna della Biblioteca Marucelliana: Catalogo e Bibliografia (for the specific citations of these notebooks, see pp. 138 and 166).
especially outside of the rhyme where French-based forms still predominate.\(^4\)

Turin Biblioteca Nazionale N.III. 19 (abbreviated T), originally of 181 folios, is dated at the end of the text to 1441. It was severely damaged in the 1904 Turin Biblioteca Nazionale fire. Pio Rajna also transcribed it longhand in its entirety in a notebook now preserved in Florence (Bib. Marucelliana Carte Rajna XIX.15). According to Möhren, all selections from the Turin ms. published in this century derive from the Rajna transcription (“«Huon d’Auvergne»,” p. 316). Meregazzi has called the language extremely careless, full of errors: “[…] il testo di T nelle condizioni attuali lascia supporre l’opera di ammanuensi che, non avendo conoscenza della lingua francese, copiavano macchinalmente, fraintendendo, storpiando, italianizzando […] trascurato nel metro e nella lingua, non poteva che servire a girovaghi cantastorie” (“Ugo d’Alvernia,” pp. 63-64). Ludovisi, too, in comparing T to B, speaks of the “ridicola e fenomenale ignoranza del trascrittore rispetto alla grafia ed alla lingua del testo che aveva dinanzi” (“Ugo d’Alvernia,” p. 9).

The Barbieri fragment of nineteen folios, now at the Archiginnasio of Bologna, number 3429, contains 59 laisses, 1264 lines; the portion of a

\(^4\) I have verified folio numbers of B and P with the mss. themselves. There are errors in earlier descriptions, both in the number of folios and the line numbers. Ludovisi gives 5694 lines for P (“Ugone d’Alvernia,” p. 4); Holtus gives 5658 (“L’État actuel,” p. 155). Having created a table folio by folio for all line numbers and transcribed the entire text, the total 5690 (which includes the two lines written together at 4747-48 as two lines, but does not include the expunctuated line that begins folio 105\(^\text{R}\)), is correct. I have recently verified the Turin ms. reading and compared it with Rajna’s nineteenth-century transcription. His handwriting is difficult, and the nature of note-taking—inserts at the edge of pages, multiple numbers in pencil—makes his transcriptions less than simple to interpret. I will submit the P version of the Ynide/Nida story for publication soon.
single episode therein is related to P and to Andrea da Barberino (Bartholomaeis, “Discesa”; DeBenedetti, “Intorno”). The segment takes place in hell, well after our episode, and is therefore not of direct interest here.\footnote{Bartholomaeis, “La Discesa,” publishes the entire segment and comments upon its relation to P; DeBenedetti, “Intorno,” corrects Bartholomaeis. I have not yet compared their readings with the ms.} Our final witness, Andrea da Barberino, a Florentine, wrote the prose \textit{Ugone d’Alvernia} at the end of the fourteenth or beginning of the fifteenth century (ed. Zambrini). Zambrini divides Andrea’s work into four books, of 16, 20, 63 and 17 chapters, respectively. Later versions of \textit{Huon d’Auvergne} do not interest us here; both written and printed versions in ottave appear (for examples, see Anglade, “Un manuscrit” and Allaire, “Considerations,” pp. 186-87).\footnote{Andrea da Barberino includes a similar version of our episode in Book I, Chapters 9-11 (Zambrini, vol. 1, pp. 108-27), concluding with a few lines in Book 4, Chapter 4 (Zambrini, vol. 2, 193-99). Allaire has found three new witnesses of Andrea’s \textit{Ugone d’Alvernia}, so the Andrea da Barberino portion of the tradition is due for revision, especially since two mss. are missing the hell segment (“Considerations,” pp. 185-86).} Andrea da Barberino’s version is helpful, however, to reconstruct the missing portion of P, as will be evident in the summary of manuscript contents.

\section*{The plot}

The story of \textit{Huon d’Auvergne} can be divided into five major episodes, not all of which appear in all versions. Each episode can be divided into shorter segments that vary between versions. The presence or absence of episodes divides the witnesses into two families. P, the Barbieri fragment and Andrea da Barberino stand in contrast to B/T. Both P and Andrea da Barberino begin with the story of Sofia, Charles Martel’s daughter (not present in B or T). Sofia is Charles Martel’s daughter, and like Potiphar’s wife, she falls in love with Ugo, the son of
her husband’s deceased best friend. She persuades her husband to go hunting, leaving Ugo behind. She invites Ugo into her chamber, and, when he refuses her attentions, she plots with her maid to frame him for attempted rape. Ugo, however, succeeds in vindicating himself, and Charles Martel has his daughter burned for her crime. This episode does not appear in B or T; in P, the initial folio or folios are missing, though what remains in the ms. follows Andrea’s version.

All versions contain the three central episodes that include Ugo and Nida/Ynide at Charles Martel’s court (when Charles falls in love with her and decides to get rid of her husband Ugo by sending him on an impossible mission) and Ugo’s travels. Charles Martel holds court in Paris. In P, this takes place during *Pasqua florie* (l. 1551). For Ascension, the women form a procession to honor the saints, and Charles sees and falls in love with Nida. He approaches her, but she does not answer his appeals. Charles is miserable, and he calls Sandin, his jongleur, who forms a plot to get Ugo away from Nida. Charles Martel calls Ugo to him and complains that all rulers obey him and send tribute except Lucifer. Charles then sends Ugo to hell to get tribute from Lucifer. Ugo has no idea of the reason for this obligation in the Padua version. He returns home with his family and retainers and prepares for his departure. He leaves Nida’s brothers (Baldoin and Thomas) in charge of his goods, land (Alvernia), and wife (Nida) (ll. 1845-917).

Ugo’s voyage can be subdivided into two segments, before and after Ynide’s defense of Alvernia and herself from Charles Martel. Ugo initially travels through various Mediterranean lands seeking the entrance to hell. When Ugo departs from Alvernia, in the P version he visits France, Provence, Hungary, Germany, Rome, Muncibel (=Etna), San Iocopo, the Land of Ssemaconio, Galicia, Armenia, and Egypt.

While Ugo is lost on the Tigris River, the action turns to Nida in Alvernia, the story contained in this brief selection (ll. 2171-404).

---

7 I will use the versions of names in the Padua ms. in a standardized form except where historical names are involved, such as names of kings.
Charles Martel sends one messenger, Sandin, to Nida. Sandin performs on the harp for her brothers and is rewarded before conveying his message to her. She makes him swear faithfulness to her, then exits, ostensibly to get him a gift. Instead she recruits her brother Baldoin, who returns to Sandin, pulls out one of his eyes and his tongue, cuts off his nose, then sends him back to Charles Martel. Upon Sandin’s return to court, Charles immediately calls up an army to attack Alvernia. There Charles fights Nida and her men without success. Charles returns to Paris when his barons counsel him that he cannot succeed, and “Con lla contessa fe triegua una staxon” (l. 2376).

Returning to Ugo, the text continues the tale of his travels, during which he finds supernatural creatures, both human and animal (ll. 2377-3730). He finally enters hell with the aid of a devil (disguised as a pilgrim), Aeneas, and William of Orange. Whereas P normally abbreviates episodes with respect to B/T, the visit to hell in P is quite lengthy: it is 1799 lines (3731-5530, ff. 76^V^-113^V). After the grand tour of hell, Ugo receives Lucifer’s tribute, including a ring and a litter (ll. 5548-52; 5581-84) that he takes back to Charles Martel. When Charles Martel receives his tribute, he puts on the ring and sits on the litter, at which point devils carry him off to hell (where Lucifer has been preparing a realm for him, ll. 5611-52). P ends with Ugo building churches, hospitals, and a monastery. The fifth and final episode, the siege of Rome, does not appear in P. In the other versions (B/T/Andrea da Barberino), the French go to aid the pope against a Saracen invasion of Rome upon Ugo’s insistence. There Ugo is killed in single combat and his wife dies shortly after his corpse is returned.

The three manuscripts and the prose version all present a Nida segment. As for the Huon text in general, the B and T versions are similar, while Andrea da Barberino’s plot line is closer to P. The B version is 1364 lines on folios 33^R^-41^V (ll. 4704-6067; folio 42 is blank) in the Berlin ms. (Morgan, “Passion” [II]). Rajna’s transcription of T for the same segment goes from line 4595 to line 5741 (Carte 71^V^-88^V in his transcription), for 1147 lines. The Padua version is quite short in
comparison to the B/T text; on folios 45\textsuperscript{R} through part of 49\textsuperscript{V}, 234 lines complete the episode to the end of a laisse (2171-404), though the actual events surrounding Nida end at line 2374 (206 lines). Meregazzi summarizes the longer B/T version: “in B e T invece la scena si complica con una serie di personaggi e di discorsi che ritardano inutilmente l’atteso epilogo dell’azione [...].” She shortly thereafter characterizes the segment in B and T as “noiosa prolissità” (“Ugo d’Alvernia,” p. 11).

**Need for an edition**

There are a number of reasons that unpublished portions of *Huon d’Auvergne* should appear in print. From 1878 to 1964, the first eighty-six years after the discovery of *Huon d’Auvergne* fragments, twenty-three articles appeared about *Huon*, primarily summaries or short segments of text.\(^8\) In the next period of critical activity, from 1970 to 2004, thirteen articles have appeared; these follow four trends. One is discussion of *Huon d’Auvergne* in relation to national literature, either French (Owen, *Vision of Hell*; Bennett, “Guillaume d’Orange”) or Italian (Allaire, “Considerations”; Delcorno Branca, *Romanzo cavalleresco*). A second is primarily linguistic (Holtus, “Considerazioni”; Möhren, “«Huon

d’Auvergne”); and a third consists of socio-cultural commentary (Vitullo, “Orality, Literacy” and Chivalric Epic). Fourth is discussion of the Franco-Italian text and its narrative structure (Morgan, “Chrétien de Troyes” and “Passion of Ynide” [I]). It is problematic, however, to analyze a text from a linguistic, literary, or socio-cultural point of view when only the author-critic has a copy of the text. The critic must then constantly summarize the text since the content is unavailable to others, and any analysis remains unverifiable. The three almost-complete manuscript witnesses are individual enough in their form and content to merit publication (like Chanson de Roland versions O, V⁴, and V⁷). Extant summaries follow earlier cultural taste (e.g., Meregazzi, quoted above). Furthermore, given their differing contents, none can be classified as “best text”; each presents linguistic and narratival features of interest. In the current climate of interest in late developments of the chanson de geste and recent publication of such works, this is a small contribution to the field in hopes of increasing visibility of Huon d’Auvergne, attracting an editor for at least one complete manuscript in the tradition, and providing documentation for secondary criticism.

**Previous publications of P**

P has never been published in its entirety. Approximately two-thirds has appeared in portions throughout various journals and other

---

9 One could also distinguish a central chronological phase with a series of anthologizing or encyclopedic works, from the 1940s to c. 1974, including Viscardi, Letteratura franco-italiana; Vidossi and Arese, “Huon d’Auvergne”; Labie-Leurquin, “Huon d’Auvergne”; and Delcorno Branca, Romanzo cavalleresco medievale.

10 See for example, Kibler, “La ‘Chanson d’aventures’”; Cook, “Unity and Aesthetics”; and Suard, “Chanson de geste traditionnelle.”

11 E.g., La Belle Hélène (ed. Roussel); Tristan de Nanteuil (ed. Sinclair); and L’histoire de Charlemagne (ed. Keller).
publications. Ludovisi published 1539 lines (folios 1-32\textsuperscript{R}, ll. 1-1539 in *Ugo d’Alvernia*, pp. 53-97) together with a few separate (unnumbered) lines preceding commentary, some lines of which differ from the following complete transcription.\footnote{Ludovisi’s numbering, where it is given outside of the initial lines, does not agree with mine; for example, he cites l. 1520, “El manda […]” on folio 31, where I count l. 1526. In fact, though he supposedly transcribes ll. 1-1539, he in fact omits ll. 835-39 (still allowing for them in the count), omits l. 1063 since it repeats l. 1060 (but keeps l. 1268 though it repeats l. 1267 and l. 1494 though it repeats l. 1493), and, finally, he skips ll. 1383-84 and does not allow for these in the count. Thus he in fact ends on l. 1542 in the total count. See Appendix 2 for a list of all P lines published with their locations.} Crescini published 245 miscellaneous (unnumbered) lines in an appendix to an article (“Orlando nella *Chanson de Roland*: Appendice,” pp. 44-69); Meregazzi published 359 lines (“Prete Gianni,” pp. 56-69; our ll. 2508-866, numbered from 1-360 [this last incorrectly; it is in fact l. 359] in her article); Renier published 144 unnumbered lines (“Discesa,” pp. XXXIII-XXXVII; ll. 3731-874, where he includes only the folio location); Stengel published 483 lines (“Keuschheitsprobe,” pp. 687-713; ll. 2867-3338) and 980 lines (“Höllenfährt,” pp. 5-56, 68-70; our ll. 3875-4795 and 4796-857), following B’s text, thus by his count lines 6553-7147 and lines 9118-10525n (sic); Bartholomaeis published 48 unnumbered lines (“Discesa,” pp. 12-13, ll. 3964-96 and 4816-839), for a total of 3700 out of 5690 lines in the ms., or approximately 65%. There is some overlap; Holtus also edits lines 1-109 (“Considerazioni,” pp. 50-53). For full details, see Appendix 2. The Nida segment, lines 2171-404, has never appeared in print, with the exception of one line that Crescini published in his summary of the manuscript, line 2404 (“Orlando nella *Chanson de Roland*: Appendice,” p. 56).
Norms for the transcription

Numbering the lines of this transcription is not without a certain difficulty. Though there is no complete available edition, we seek here to present the position of the segment and make discussion of it possible with minimal explication. To this end, the lines are numbered according to the total number of manuscript lines up to this point, though three are in fact repetitions of previous lines. All lines have been included in the count here, even where there are repetitions in the text; thus, in examining the manuscript folio by folio, the reader will find the same number of lines as recorded here, though an editor might wish to remove three lines where these are repeated: lines 1063 (=1060); 1268 (=1267); and 1494 (=1493). Note that all these examples occur near rubrics; the last two, in particular, are the first line of one laisse initially copied as the last of the preceding laisse. These three are the only such errors in the manuscript, though other errors (two lines written as one, ll. 4747-48; an expunctuated line at the top of f. 105^R, not clearly visible as expunctuated in the microfilm) can also cause difficulty in counting lines and caused differences in line count on the part of earlier critics.

As is standard in transcription, folio numbers are also included. To simplify the presentation, total manuscript information about each folio and number of lines is not given here, though it has been prepared.

The goal in editing this segment of P is to render the text readable to modern eyes while maintaining philological accuracy. Transcription of Franco-Italian is problematic, because it is not a standardized language and contains forms related both to Old French and to Italian. While most editing practices follow the best of Old French or Italian editing practice, it is recognized that Franco-Italian (F-I) has special needs; thus the École nationale des chartes specifically distinguishes the need for care upon certain phenomena in editing F-I, such as the treatment of the cedilla (Veillard and Guyotjeannin, *Conseils pour l’édition des textes médiévaux*, p. 23). Holtus’s *Aliscans*, published in 1985, is the golden standard against which all subsequent editions of Franco-Italian have
measured themselves: for example, DiNinni’s *Prise de Pamplune* (pub. 1992) and Beretta’s V^4 *Chanson de Roland* (pub. 1995) both cite it as their model for aspects of their editions (DiNinni, p. 38; Beretta, p. 377). Holtus prints all resolutions of abbreviations in italics, uses the acute accent and the grave accent, and emends for sense, annotating those corrections. He also uses dieresis according to meter. Beretta does not print abbreviation resolutions in a different typeface and uses the apostrophe extensively, together with both acute and grave accents; DiNinni uses italics to mark resolved abbreviations but does not use dieresis. All editors resolve abbreviations following complete forms in the manuscripts with which they are working on what Holtus calls the statistical principle (*Aliscans*, p. XXIII). Corrections are clarified either through a note or through the use of parentheses in the text (*Aliscans*, p. xxv). The raised dot is used with enclitic pronouns that form a graphic unity with a preceding word or in cases of syntactic doubling. (This we have expanded to use with articulated prepositions, which Holtus and others do not.)

Modern punctuation and capitalization, as used in the modern romance languages, aids comprehension. Each verse begins with a capital, which is kept here conventionally. Other capitals have been added to adjectives referring to nationalities or regions and to proper names of people or geographical regions. Periods that usually set off numbers in the manuscript, though not a modern usage, have been retained, as in Holtus’s *Aliscans*.

Modern word division, according to standard Old French and Italian editing practices, is followed where possible. However, the two languages differ in orthographical practice for word division. Furthermore, word division in the manuscript is not consistent, so it cannot be used as a guide. Of course, word division and lexeme division do not coincide in modern languages either. Thus one finds *bien que* (two words) in French and *benché* (one word) in Italian for “although,” where both forms are reflexes of common etymons.

*Olifant*
Though word division follows modern standards, orthography used by the scribe(s) is kept. The distinction is made between $u$ / $v$ and $i$ / $j$ for the modern reader. $J$ is associated with multiple phonemes, but it appears in this manuscript only in two cases. In the first case, it appears as the analogue of the modern Italian /$\lambda$/ in seven lexemes, reflexes of Latin LI + vowel: con(s)seo, consseo, etc; meraveja, meravejans; vojo; pavejon; vejardo; bataja and maja (Modern Italian consiglio; meraviglia; voglio; padiglione; vegliardo; battaglia; maglia). In the second case, there is no modern Italian equivalent for verdojans; this is OF verdoiant, where $j$ represents the semi-vowel, and therefore, a consonantal value in contrast to the vowel $i$. $J$ is not kept where it designates the final $i$ after $i$ (see Veillard and Guyotjeannin, Conseils, p. 24). There are fewer problems with the use of $v$. $U$ is the vowel and $v$ the consonant. This gives us, for example, Alvernia and vete, but una, vuy, and çubler.

**Diacritical marks**

The only written diacritical mark in the manuscript is the cedilla, which is maintained. As is traditional, other written accents in the edition are added as well, the grave and the acute. I do not use dieresis because syllable count is problematic and approximate in this text.

1. **C with cedilla.** $C$ has been left where found and not added where none was present in the manuscript; a characteristic of northern Italian texts, its appearance is of linguistic and paleographical interest. The scribe is inconsistent in using it before a palatal vowel, and, while reasons for inconsistency are not apparent in this small sample, it is a characteristic of the scripta and therefore does not represent an error.

2. **Acute accent.** Acute accent is used only on -$e$.
   a. The acute is used on the second person plural indicative or imperative forms from the first conjugation like parlè, lassè (ll. 2303, 2229) and the various second person plural verb endings -$ê$ (e.g., future serê, l. 2192).
b. Similarly, words stressed on the final syllable of the same structure: *a(s)sé* (ll. 2354, 2365) is the only example in this brief selection. There are certain words where accentuation is unclear between French and Italian, e.g., *indrie* (ll. 2208, 2349, 2363): is it *indréè* (like OFr *indreit*) or *indrie* (like *dritto*)? To these we do not add the accent.

c. A few single-syllable words also bear the acute to distinguish them from other single-syllable words; in this short segment, *né* for the adversative conjunction in contrast to the pronominal particle *ne* (e.g., l. 2274 vs. l. 2277). These usages again follow Holtus and subsequent editors of F-I texts.\(^{13}\)

3. **Grave accent.** Grave accent is added to tonic final vowels -*a*, -*e*, -*i*, -*o*, -*u*. Oxytone nouns ending in stressed final vowels appear with a grave accent as in Italian (*cità*) and, similarly, oxytone future tense endings for the third person (*averà*, *arecorderà*, etc.). The oxytone past participle of first conjugation verbs also appears with a grave (*tornà*) and, in two cases, an oxytone third person perfect (*lassà*, l. 2298, *montà*, l. 2345). The grave accent also designates the past tense of verbs ending in -*e*: *andè*, *avè*, *potè*. Oxytone third person perfects of the third conjugation are also designated with a final grave (e.g., *partì*, l. 2297).\(^{14}\) Final stressed -*o* of the ending appears with a grave accent (e.g., *averò*), as does the Italian-style third-person perfect of the regular first conjugation (e.g., *Intrò*). For past

---

\(^{13}\) Beretta gives nearly four pages of distinctions between lexemes by apostrophe and written accent (*Testo Assonanzato*, pp. XXVIII-XXXI). To avoid confusion, we avoid apostrophe use as much as possible.

\(^{14}\) For the difficulty of distinguishing which tense is intended there—the reason for which I sometimes do not specify perfect or imperfect—see Mussafia, *Macaire* (p. XIII).
participles in -u it is also used: the single example here is vegnù (l. 2270). Following Italian usage, in single syllable words, the grave distinguishes between apparent homonyms, especially between verbs and other words with the same spelling: à (‘[he] has’) from a (preposition), è (‘[he/she/it] is’) as opposed to e (‘and’), ò (from the verb ‘to have’) versus o, ‘where’; può (‘[s]he can/is able’) as opposed to puo (‘then’). Where an accent distinguishes lexemes, the accented form is the verb.

4. **Apostrophe.** Apostrophe is used to designate the elision of a vowel, used here for:
   a. conjunction plus subject pronoun, subject, or article before a subject, beginning with vowel (or, should it occur, h, which it does not here): Ch’el, etc.
   b. article plus following adjective or noun beginning with a vowel: l’altrier, etc.
   c. object pronoun followed by verb beginning with vowel or followed by another pronoun beginning with a vowel: s’en, l’amo, etc.
   d. preposition followed by vowel: d’Alvernia, etc.

5. **Raised dot.** Raised dot is used for the elision of two lexemes where the second begins with a consonant:¹⁵
   a. preposition + article before a consonant: a·l, de·ll, etc. (before a vowel they are written separately with an apostrophe [e.g., su l’elmo]).

---

¹⁵ In Modern Standard Italian, the equivalent is frequently an assimilation resulting in a doubled consonant: alla, nella, etc. Of course, es existed in Old French as well and is still found in fixed expressions today: ès lettres. Smith includes my usages under b., “simplification de double consonne” and “autre assimilation avec simplification” (“Conseils,” p. 556).
b. in cases of assimilation: for example, _elle_ (l. 2201); _no'l_ (l. 2295), etc.

c. verb + object pronoun attached: e.g., _contar-li_ (l. 2182).

**Emendations**

All emendations appear in angle brackets and at the bottom of the page with an explanation. In the 234 lines transcribed here, there are fifteen examples. The scribe was easily distracted; there are examples of anticipating a following word (ll. 2224, 2385) and _sauts du même au même_ (ll. 2316, 2301, 2350).

The scribe also reverses letters (l. 2312), repeats words (ll. 2209, 2373) and makes what seem to be errors in placing abbreviation marks or forgetting them (ll. 2301, 2329). Emendations are for the usual sorts of errors/difficulties in distinguishing downstrokes (n/v, l. 2172; ran/uran, l. 2206) or between penstrokes e/o (ll. 2172, 2203). The final emendation could be a reading difficulty, a scribal error not completely corrected (l. 2392). As this is a short segment, the sample contains few emendations, but the errors and problems are representative of the text as a whole. A major criticism of Holtus’s edition has been the amount of emendation: one in five lines emended (Holden, Rev. of _Aliscans_, p. 333). The ratio here is 15 in 234 lines, about 1/16.

**Abbreviations**

Resolutions of abbreviations are printed in italics so that the reader can clearly tell where the resolution has been made. I have resolved these abbreviations following the most frequent form found unabbreviated. Because of the tradition of linguistic study related to Franco-Italian, it is necessary to mark such resolutions for the reader (compare Holtus, _Aliscans_, pp. XXIII-XXIV). There are only six abbreviations found in this short selection; by frequency, these are:

1. slash on downstroke of _p_: vowel+ _r_; e.g., ll. 2178, 2345, 2361,

_Olifant_
for twenty-two examples.

2. straight titulus: n: e.g., passion (l. 2177), for 15 examples.

3. undulating titulus: r; Paris (l. 2372), presse (l. 2345), intorn (l. 2402), for three examples total.

4. short downstroke above the line between two letters: r + vowel/vowel + r: primie (l. 2361), deforerie (l. 2373), for two examples.

5. long s with round cross-stroke: ser: serventi (l. 2254), for one example.

6. chr (there is a line over the entire three letters): chavalier (l. 2205), for one example.

Footnotes on each page annotate difficulties in reading the manuscript, emendations and alternate readings offered by Rajna’s transcription where they occur. Unusual lexemes, interesting constructions, or possible questions are also addressed as needed. Because the episode is so short—only a little over 4% of the text, 234/5690 lines—and the entire text of P is not yet available, this is not the place for an extensive lexical commentary, and it cannot offer a complete glossary of all terms.16

16 I would like to express my thanks to Gloria Allaire for a careful close reading before the final submission of this paper. I also thank the two anonymous readers for their suggestions and feedback. Any errors or infelicities of style remain, of course, my own.
Olifant
(45R) Un puocho de lui qua laseron,
A puocho d’<o>ra nu li tro<v>eron¹
Quando luogo e tenpo seron.
De Carlo Martello nui si ve diron,
Como lo manda ad Alvernia lo bufon,
Colui che Sandin aveva non.
Dio lo confonda che sofri passion,
Che per so conssejo lo re Carlon
Si manda Ugo a la scura maxon,
Per queerir trabuto a Lucifero lo felon.
Sandin s’en anda a•lla dona de•l conte Ugon
A contar•li de•l re so talento e so bon,
Ch’el penssa per consejo si gran tradisson.
Charlo Martelo disse a Sandin lo bricon,
“Ora t’en va a•lla dona e no far demoraxon;
E da mia parte conta•li la raxon,
Como io l’amo plui de cossa de•l mon,

¹ Ms: troneron. <o>ra: unclear vowel.
E come io ò per questa caxon²
Mandado ell sso signor a•lla perduta maxon.
E se questo può trar a finixon,
Tanto oro e arçente a ti daron,³
Che a•lla toa vita seré rico hon;
Mai çublar non avè si rico don⁴
Or t’èn va, e no far demoraxon.”⁵
[Laissa 70] Va ss’ende lo çublar, e no fe demorer,⁶ 2195
Una arpa presse, ch’èl saveva ben soner
(45⁷) E oltri strumenti presse, ch’èl saveva ben soner.
Amantinente in lo camin avè intrer;
Tanto andè per boschi e per river,
Ch’èl vete de Alvernia lo gran terer,
E vete la cità e•lle tore per intrer.⁷

² come: the final letter has a cross-stroke and for this reason we render it “è” though it is difficult to distinguish from an o. Rajna: como. caxon: should be caxon for rhyme, but the vowel is clearly an a in the ms.
³ Rajna: argento.
⁴ Rajna: gublar.
⁵ e no: Rajna reads esso.
⁶ Va: initial in blue, decorated with red. Rajna: gublar.
⁷ tore: the final letter was an r, and changed to an e.

Olifant
Tanto andè avanti lo malvassio liçer

Ch’el è vegnu a le porte, d<e>ntro avè intrer.  

Vene a•lla plaça, su•l pallaço avè monter,<sup>9</sup>

Puo si andè a•lla corte como chavalier.<sup>10</sup>  

A si g<ran> meraveja saveva d’una arpa soner,<sup>11</sup>

Baldoin e Thomas li fe molte robe doner.

Mo a•lla fin, ch’el voleva indrie torner,<sup>12</sup>

Elo <andè> a dona Nida a conter e a parler<sup>13</sup>

E a çella damente si•lli prexon:<sup>14</sup>  

“Madona,” diss elo, “anch’io sia çubler,

De Carlo Martelo io sson messaçer,

<sup>8</sup> d<e>ntro: e added above the line, between d and n, a later correction.

<sup>9</sup> Rajna reads all ç’s as g’s. This will not be noted further unless he varies from this practice.

<sup>10</sup> chavalier: cf. ll. 109, 221, etc., where complete form reads chavalier, chvaliere.

<sup>11</sup> g<ran>: ms. reads guran; the central r seems to have been altered also, possibly from c.

<sup>12</sup> Mo: the vowel seems unclosed, as elsewhere in the ms. for “o”s after an initial consonant.

<sup>13</sup> Ms: ande ande; we have removed one for sense.

<sup>14</sup> Ms: açelladamente. Word division is unclear here. damente seems to mean “demand”. prexon: from the verb pregare, “to pray, to beg”: literally, “[…] and so of her he begged and prayed her […].”
E so anbaxada, non ve die celer.

Molto grando amor el presse en vuy l’altrier,\textsuperscript{15}

E per vuy el non può dormir ni posser.

E Ugo, vostro siere, ello avè mander

In tal luogo che may non averà torner.

Sovradit e le cosse, e disse de vui amer.”

Quando la dona oldi cussì parllar lo çubler,

De gran dollor si prende a sospirer.

Ma de niente no l’à ver luy mostrer,

Como dona savia si•lli respoxe arer.

(46\textsuperscript{R}) Dixe la dona, “Amigo, me poss’io in ti fider,

Ch’el <ni> me tradisse ni incegner?”\textsuperscript{16}

“Si ben, madona,” responde lo liçer,

“Per la mia fe, non ve convien doter,\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{15} There is a line over the \textit{vuy} in the ms., possibly the attack stroke of the \textit{v} but not in general characteristic of this ms.; the \textit{v} was altered from an earlier letter, perhaps \textit{d}.

\textsuperscript{16} Anticipation: \textit{m} (with three downstrokes) caused the scribe to omit the preceding \textit{ni} or \textit{ne}. \textit{incegner}: there was a change in the ms.—the scribe clearly scraped the folio (so the original letter is not visible) and corrected; the \textit{c} does not have a cedilla.

\textsuperscript{17} \textit{doter}: Rajna reads \textit{voter}.

\textit{Olifant}
E s’ell ve plaxe ve l’averò çurer.”

Responde la dona, “Vui parllé como ber.

Or me lassé un puoco perpensser,

Che un gran don li vojo mander

*Per* la mia perssona plui afider e afiner.”\(^{18}\)

In lla camera lo lassa a•lla celler,

E vene in lla ssalla su•l maistro soler.

Amantinente domanda Baldoin se frer,

E in plorant tuto li va conter:

Ço che li aveva dito lo çubler,

E como ell era de Carllo messaçer.

Quando Bbaldoin l’intende, molto se presse a irer

De ll’anbassata che à dito lo maufer.

[Laisse 71] Baldoin vete plançer so seror tendremant\(^{19}\)

*Per* lo so signor ch’è andado in tal tormant.

“Suor,” diss elo, “no ve temé niant;

Vui non podé aver nul destorbament:

Tanto ch’io sia vivo, non abié nessun spavant

\(^{18}\) _e afiner_: the ink on e is very dark on the lower portion.  

\(^{19}\) Initial in red with decorations.
E vu e nostro frar lo conbatant.\textsuperscript{20} 2245

Ma colui che tal ambassada va contant

De•l so mestier averà el mierito si grant,

Che el se n’arecorderà tutto el so vivant.”

(46\textsuperscript{V}) Baldoin vene a•lla camera, ni no demorant;\textsuperscript{21}

Intrò dentro, si trova lo seduant 2250

Che de la dona aspetava el pressant.

\begin{flushright}
\textit{Olifant}
\end{flushright}

\textsuperscript{20} \textit{vu}: should this read \textit{mi}? There are four lines without connectors. Here, perhaps “don’t you (all) be afraid, you and our brother the fighter.” If it reads \textit{mi e vostro}, \textit{conbatant} would be a verb: “I and your brother, we’ll fight him,” interpreting \textit{conbatant} as “conbaton,” a first-person plural form. Notice that rhymes in \textit{-ant} and \textit{-ans laisses} here are more problematic than elsewhere (Appendix 2); furthermore, \textit{-on(t)/-en(t)} in F-I appear as third-person singular and plural as well as first person singular and plural (cf. Beretta, \textit{Il Testo assonanzato sub voce combatant} [435]). The use of \textit{mi} as subject, on the other hand, is not documented. \textit{frar}: one of only three appearances of this combination of letters in the entire ms., the others being in ll. 2289 and 2383 (where it is an error of anticipation).

\textsuperscript{21} \textit{ni no}: multiple downstrokes with no connectors; the division is unclear, though \textit{no} is clearly connected. Should it read \textit{ni no} \textit{<fa>}, given the scribe’s tendency to anticipate? Cf. ll. 2185, 2194, 2195, 2289, and 2356 where a form of \textit{far(e)} appears with a form of \textit{demor-}, and appears primarily with \textit{demor-} throughout the ms. There are also two places where \textit{a} appears before a form of \textit{demor-} (where the form is not present perfect) and one with \textit{fo} (l. 2285, below). The scribe was clearly having difficulties at this point; notice the problems also with l. 2245 just above.
E Baldoin no va plui duxiant: 22
De l’ambassata li fe dar lo pagamant: 23
Per do serventi el manda amantimant: 24
Eli vene da•llui senca nul tardamant. 2255
Un ochio fe trare a•l çublar primirant,
Puo li fe trar la lengua in prexant,
– Perch’ello aveva fatto tal parlamant–
E de ssu•lla faça lo naxo insenbemant: 25
Puo li disse, “Torné•ve•ne indriedo tosto, isnelament, 2260
A•l vostro siere che qua v’à mandant,
E da mia parte si•lli averì contant
Che tal è lo don e•llo pressant,
Che mia seror li va mandant, 26
(47R) E per un puoho, fel traito, ch’io no v’apant. 2265

22 duxiant: for indugiant, “hesitating”; compare Modern Italian indugiare.
23 From ll. 2251-2256, there is a crease in the ms. page that runs from the second a of ambassata down to Puo between the P and u.
24 Rajna changes the order of these lines; he skips l. 2251, and places it after 2253. amantimant: Rajna reads amantinant.
25 There is a blank space in the central portion of the page (about 10 lines’ space), left for illumination. This is the only such space in the episode here transcribed.
Può dire a Carlo ch’el so penssier li è falant:
Tuto quelo ch’el à penssado li è tornà a niant.\textsuperscript{27}

Lo çublaro se parte, coroçosso e dolant;
Tanto s’en va per monte e per pendant,
Ch’el è vegnù a Paris o Carllo l’aspetant. \footnote{Lo visso li mostra, e la lengua insema\textsuperscript{28}nt.}

Lo visso li mostra, e la lengua insema\textsuperscript{28}nt.

Quando Carlo ço vete, de lui fo molto dulant,
Ma ello non ssaveva chi lli à fato quel destorbant,
Ch’el çublaro non può parlar né dir niant.

Unde el çura a Dio, lo pare onipotant, \footnote{Che de questa ovra farà tal vendegamant,}

Che de questa ovra farà tal vendegamant,

Che mille homeni ne morirà a tormant.

[\footnote{Laisse 72} Quando Carlo lo vete cussi conçans,\footnote{S’ell à dollor, no ve andé merje\textsuperscript{29}ans.}]

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{26 Catchwords at the bottom of the folio: “e per un puoco.”}
\footnote{27 niant: the a was changed, seemingly from an n.}
\footnote{28 Lo visso: Rajna reads Nonssa. Initial l’s have a double stroke in this ms., causing difficulties in reading. Cf. ll. 2298, 2308, 2331, and 2394. The only exception is l. 2319, where the L is just below the laisse-initial capital.}
\footnote{29 Initial in blue with red. conçans: Italian conciato, “reduced to such a state.”}
\end{footnotes}
El çura a Dio, pare onipotens, 2280
Che Alvernia serà bruxada a•l fuogo ardans.
Non volse conssejo de piçoli ni de grans:
El fe asenblar so homeni e so çans.
Con plui de xxx.\textsuperscript{m} monta in l’auferans;\textsuperscript{30}
De Paris esse, non fo demoramans; 2285
Tanto à chavalcedo per monti e per pendans
Ch’eli vene ad Alvernia, a•lla porta davans;\textsuperscript{31}
Tende e pavejon fe tender per lo cans.
Quando Baldoin l’intende, el no fe demoramans:\textsuperscript{32}
So fradelo apella ben e dolçemans. 2290
(47\textsuperscript{V}) “Frag,” dix elo, “a nui cresse gran tromans.\textsuperscript{33}
Charlo Martelo, che lo cuor Dio crevans,\textsuperscript{34}

\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{30} xxx.\textsuperscript{m}: \textit{m} is above the xxx (not postpositioned, but literally on top of it). we represent this throughout by use of the superscript.
  \item \textsuperscript{31} \textit{davans}: the final letter was changed from \textit{t. vene}: Rajna writes \textit{vie} above the line for \textit{vene}.
  \item \textsuperscript{32} There is white paper tape in the ms. over the beginning of ll. 2289-90; the letters are thus fuzzy in the microfilm but clearly readable in the ms.
  \item \textsuperscript{33} \textit{tromans}: \textit{tormento}, a typical metathesis of \textit{r}. Cf. ll. 2595, 2849, 4773, etc.
  \item \textsuperscript{34} \textit{crevans}: final letter changed from \textit{t}.
\end{itemize}}
Si n’à asidiadi per mal intendiment:
Nostra seror vuol aver a•l so talans.”
Disse Tomas, “Io no•l temo nians.
A mi me par de despartimans:
Quando Ugo se parti primieramans
La dona ne lassà, la tera e•l caxamans, 35
Che nui la guardesemo da tuta çans;
Coardi seremo se nui no la defendons. 2300
Or p<ren>der<e>mo le arme e•l guarnia<ma>ns 36
Si ensiremo fuora a•l torniamans.”
Elo responde, “Vui parlé saviamans.”
Chi doncha vedesse anbido inse
P
ms:

36 37

35 La: Rajna reads Lla.
Ms: perdermo, with an abbreviation line over the first r. Ms: guarnians: another example of a saut, ma omitted because of preceding downstrokes + a.
37 anbido: preceded by al crossed out.

Montar a cavalo isnelamans.
Le porte fe avrir de mal tallans, 39

Olifant
Quando fono fuora a•l pra verdojans,
Eli arssalta l’oste da drie e davanss\(^40\)
Tende e pavejon, quente ne poprens,\(^41\)
Si•lle fa cacer e roverssar a•l ca<np>s.\(^42\)
E de la cente de Carlo fe dalmaço grans:
De .v.\(^m\) homeni el no fo vejardo ni infans\(^43\)
De quelli che inssi de•lla çitade d’Alvernia nians\(^44\)

\(^{38}\) The m is above the line over the v and slightly past it.
\(^{39}\) Rajna: Lle. Initial Ls are frequently double downstrokes, these are not double l’s.
\(^{40}\) davanss: the next-to-last letter was changed from t.
\(^{41}\) quente ne poprens: we accept here with pleasure the solution proposed by a reader of this article, where quente represents OFr ceintes “fences” and poprens “enclosures.” The text frequently uses parallel structures and this makes excellent sense here. My original thought was quente ne po prans: “as many as they could take” [Modern Italian “quanti ne possono prendere”], but there are no parallels for such a construction elsewhere in the m.s.: quente does not appear at all elsewhere though -nt- seems to represent -nd- (see damente above).
\(^{42}\) Ms: capns.
\(^{43}\) m over the v as usual.
\(^{44}\) nians: Rajna reads in ans. Again, downstroke division is difficult; mans “the big city” is possible, but makes less sense. My reading, as literal as is possible: “Of five thousand men there was neither an old man or child/ Of those who came out of the city of Alvernia, (not) a single one/ Who (he) did not strike his man dead or bloody.” nian(t) appears frequently in
Ch’eli no abata lo sso homo <mo>rto o sanglans;^{45}

(48\textsuperscript{R}) Quando Charlo lo vete, per puoco d’ira no fans.

[Laisse 73] Granda fo la bataja a quel començere;^{46}

La çente d’Alvernia se fa molto aprixiere:

Chi duncha vedesse la bataja dura e fere!  \hspace{1cm} 2320

Baldoin e Thomas non fano ça cativiere:

Cascun abate lo sso davanti l’inperere.^{47}

Quando Carlo lo vete, el penssa de dolor ragiere;

Per mal talento se fe so arme portere.

Veste l’osbergo e calça le ganbriere,^{48}  \hspace{1cm} 2325

Centa à lla spada, puo monta a destriere;^{49}

Brandisse la lança o llo fero fo d’ Açere.

El vete Tomaxo la via trapassere;

---

the text for “no one; nothing; not at all,” and frequently in rhyme position (cf. l. 2295 above), but man appears almost always as “hand(s).” The one exception in the entire ms. is l. 1899, where the rhyme is Carlo Man, a fixed expression.

^{45} <mo>rto: saut du même au même; there is only one mo due to the previous homo. Rajna: losso homorto.

^{46} Initial in red with blue decoration.

^{47} Rajna: Çascun.

^{48} osbergo: the b was changed from an o.

^{49} Centa: Rajna reads Genta.
El non volsse con lui longam<en>te tençonere.\textsuperscript{50}

Andèllo a ferir sovra lo scudo a quartere;

Lo scu li speça fin a\d sbergo doplere.\textsuperscript{51}

Quel fo tanto bona, maja non potè falsere;

L’asta fo grossa, ben la tene l’inperere,

O el volesse o no, lo fe a tera verssere.

Ça l’averave abudo Carlo \textit{per} prexonere,

Ma Baldoin lo ssecorsse, so ferere.

El tegniva la spada che ben trença l’acere;

Feri Carlo su l’elmo verçere

Che flor e piere fa çosso trubuçere:\textsuperscript{52}

Dio lo guari, che in carne no ll’avè tochere!  

Si grando fo llo colpo, tuto lo fe plegere;\textsuperscript{53}

Sovra l’arçon a sso malgrado ell niere.\textsuperscript{54}

\textsuperscript{50} Ms, Rajna: \textit{longamte} (missing abbreviation line).

\textsuperscript{51} Rajna: \textit{Llo scu}.

\textsuperscript{52} çosso: Old Italian \textit{giuso}, Modern Italian \textit{giù} ; OFr \textit{jus}.

\textsuperscript{53} Rajna reads \textit{flegere} for \textit{plegere}.

\textsuperscript{54} \textit{ell niere}: again, downstroke division is unclear, and the second \textit{l} appears altered ; “he bent over”? A reader suggests that this might be a form of \textit{chinare}, to bend over, bow. In that case, an emendation, perhaps to \textit{el <ch>inere} would be required, perhaps explicable by influence of
A•l ferir che fe Baldoin l’inperere,

Tomaso sallta suxo e prexe el so destriere.

Su l’arçon montà, ch’el non presse strievere;\(^{55}\)

Alora comença la bataja e li caplere.

La çente de Carlo comença sovra montere\(^{56}\)

E la çente d’Alvernia non li può plui durere:

O vollesse o no, convien indrie tornere,

Dentro in Alvernia per soa <vi>ta salvere.\(^{57}\)

Tomas e Baldoin, in cortexi cavalere,

Si fe la porta serare e lo ponte levere.

Omai elli non teme Carlo l’inperere:

Asé li porav•elo star, lui e suo cavaliere,

Che çamay la dona el non porà balire.\(^{58}\)

---

the preceding el. Rajna reads ell mere, but writes above o inere, so he too had doubts. niere appears one other time in the ms., at l. 4872, where it clearly means renier, “to deny,” as part of Ugon’s instructions from Guillaume about what to do when he encounters Lucifer. 

\(^{55}\) presse: Ms. pesse with abbreviation line over the e. Su: Rajna reads In; but see l. 2352 below with the same initial letter. The tenses of the sentence seem to be perfect, due to the form presse.

\(^{56}\) La çente: Rajna reads Lla çente.

\(^{57}\) Ms: tasalvere. This is a saut of some kind, skipping \(\nu\) + vowel because of the following vere.
Carlo Martello non fe ça demorie;\(^{59}\)

Un mexe e pluy à lla citade asidie,\(^{60}\)

Ch’el no li podeva intrar pan ni vin ni blie.

Quando el vete che d’lla dama non à nule sperie,

Ne de lie aver in tuta la so vie,\(^{61}\) 2360

Per lo conssejo d’i sso baroni plui primie

D’ella si ss’è despartie.

Indrie torna a Paris so citie,

E quella dona à in quieto lasie.

Assé lli fe guere d’inverno e d’istie; 2365

No lli valsse una poma porie,

Che quella dona fo de tal franchie

A•l so signor porta tel lietie,\(^{62}\)

---

58 balire: not a rhyme where rhyme is expected; it must originally have been -ere or -iere.

59 Initial in blue with red decoration. Carlo: the l was corrected from a c or e by overwriting.

60 pluy: Rajna reads plui. Cf. çamay above. Another characteristic of this scripta is the final stroke sometimes found after a word-final i that makes it difficult to distinguish between y and i. By examination of the ms. we have distinguished the clearest, as here.

61 lie: Modern Italian lei, “her”: “Nor to ever have her in his life.”

62 lietie: “loyalty,” lialté; Rajna’s reading is unclear.
(49\textsuperscript{R}) Avanti se llaserave tute le membre colpere  

E in llo fuogo ardere e bruxie\textsuperscript{63}  

Che a\textbullet\textit{Il so signor ella fesse falsie.}  

Charlo s’en torna a Paris so citie,  

De \textltit{<ço ch’e>l aveva fato puo deforrie}.\textsuperscript{64}  

[Laisse 75] Carlo Martelo, che Dio dia malicion,\textsuperscript{65}  

Si retorna a Paris, soa maxon;  

Con lla contessa fe triegua una staxon.  

Or laseremo de Carlo, si diremo de Ugon,  

Como ello s’en va \textit{per} lo flume abandon  

In llo batel, sença nul compagnon.  

\textit{Per} la vertude de Dio e de\textbullet\textit{I so non},  

S’en va lo batelo plui corant ca sagiton.  

No aveva mariner se no solamente Ugon,

---

\textsuperscript{63} \textit{bruxie}: the next-to-last \textit{i} is written over an \textit{e}. Rajna reads \textit{bruxare}.  

\textsuperscript{64} Ms: \textit{De ço che ço che} (scribal repetition). Deforrie: the ms. reads \textit{deforie} with an abbreviation line like an apostrophe above between the \textit{r} and \textit{i} (cf. l. 2361, \textit{pmie}). The meaning of the line seems to be “About that which he had done then he went crazy.” \textit{puo} appears in this ms. either as the equivalent of Modern Italian \textit{può}, “he can,” or Modern Italian \textit{poi}, “then.”  

\textsuperscript{65} Initial in red with blue decoration.
Vella ni remo che la nave conduxon.

Ugo reguarda so bon destier guascon;

Tuto lo ve tremar e <far> gran fregesson.\textsuperscript{66} \hfill 2385

“Chavallo,” diss ello, “de tu no me ssa miga bon;\textsuperscript{67}

In tal luogo semo o è el mar profon.

Qui no è erba, ni spelta no avon;

No me sso conssiar como la faron.

S’io fosse in tera, a poço o a mon,\textsuperscript{68} \hfill 2390

No lli intrerave per tuto l’or de\•l mon.

No sso qu<e> far; a Dio se comandon,\textsuperscript{69}

Che in la verçene presse unbraxon.”

La nave s’en va, non fe arestaxon,\textsuperscript{70}

(49\textsuperscript{V}) Fina a una citade a•lle coste d’un mon. \hfill 2395

Quando la nave fe arivaxon,

Ela no fe ni remor ni ton.

Ugo inssi fuora, lui e•l sso arangon;

\textsuperscript{66} Ms: frar gran fregesson, anticipation of fregesson in frar.

\textsuperscript{67} tu: Rajna reads tti.

\textsuperscript{68} poço: Modern Standard Italian poggio; OFr pui, “hill; mountain.”

\textsuperscript{69} qu<e>: ms. reads quae with the e at the end malformed; it seems to be a correction a correction of the a.
El trasse la spada, si fe un palo reon,
La nave liga a•lla riva de•l fon.  2400
Ugo monta su•l sso arangon;
Quando ell fo a caval, el sse guarda intorn.
El no vete algun che consejo li don;
A Dio se rende, e a sen Simon.\textsuperscript{71}  2404

\textsuperscript{70} Rajna: \textit{Lla nave}.
\textsuperscript{71} Crescini includes this line (p. 56).
Appendix 1

Rhymes in Padua, Ms. del Seminario Vescovile 32, 45^-49^v

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laisse no.</th>
<th>rhyme</th>
<th>no. of lines</th>
<th>line nos.</th>
<th>non-rhymes in laisse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>-on</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2169-2192</td>
<td>1 (-an)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>-er</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2193-2237</td>
<td>1 (-on)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>-ant</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2238-2275</td>
<td>2 (-ent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>-ans</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2276-3215</td>
<td>2 (-ens) 1 (-ent) 1 (-ons) 1 (&lt;np&gt;s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>-ere</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2316-2353</td>
<td>1 (-ire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>-ie</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2354-2371</td>
<td>1 (-ere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>-on</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2372-2402</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>7 laisses</td>
<td>6 rhymes</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>2169-2402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: Laisse 69 is 27 lines long, with 3 lines on 44V. There are no irregularities of rhyme in those three lines.
Appendix 2

Lines published: P

Line numbers include ALL lines in the ms. (ll. 4747+4748 are counted as two although written on a single line). Not all are complete lines.

1-1539 (Ludovisi, pp. 53-97); really 1-1542 EXCEPT: 835-839 (missing but counted); 1063 (in footnote); 1383-1384 (omitted and not counted) = 1535 (1542 minus 8)
   1-3 (Ludovisi, p. 39)
   1-11 (Crescini, p. 45)
   1-108 (Holtus, pp. 50-51)
   24-86 (Crescini, pp. 45-47)
   90-138 (Ludovisi, pp. 15-16)
   92-98 (Crescini, p. 47)
   109-121 (Crescini, pp. 47-48)
   128-143 (Crescini, p. 48)
   146-149 (Ludovisi, p. 16)
   151-156 (Ludovisi, p. 16)
   154-165 (Crescini, p. 49)
   754-756 (Crescini, p. 50)
   906-911 (Crescini, p. 50)
   1152-1153 (Crescini, p. 51)
   1246-1252 (Crescini, p. 51)
   1393-1394 (Ludovisi, p. 41)
   1393-1394 (Crescini, p. 51)
   1473-1475 (Ludovisi, p. 41)
   1492-1493 (Crescini, p. 52)
   1496-1498 (Crescini, p. 52)
   1503-1409 (Crescini, p. 52)
   1520-1522 (Ludovisi, p. 14)
   1528-1530 (Ludovisi, p. 42)
1534-1536 (Ludovisi, p. 13)
1543-1551 (Crescini, pp. 52-53); 1543 (Crescini, p. 44) = 9
1762 (Crescini, p. 53) = 1
1900 (Crescini, p. 54) = 1
2060-2069 (Ludovisi, p. 48) = 10
2096-2099 (Crescini, p. 54) = 4
2139-2145 (Crescini, p. 55) = 7
2404 (Crescini, p. 56) = 1
2508-2866 (Meregazzi, pp. 56-69) = 359
  2561 (Crescini, p. 57)
  2708-2711 (Ludovisi, p. 11)
  2720-2722 (Crescini, p. 57)
  2795-2796 (Crescini, p. 57)
2867-3338 (Stengel K, pp. 687-713) = 472
  2880-2889 (Crescini, p. 58)
  2950 (Crescini, p. 58)
  3013-3018 (Viscardi, p. 134)
  3026-3033 (Crescini, p. 58)
  3050-3055 (Crescini, pp. 58-59)
  3050-3067 (Viscardi, pp. 136-37)
  3118-3122 (Crescini, p. 59)
  3288 (Crescini, p. 60)
  3291-3294 (Crescini, p. 60)
  3371-3372 (Crescini, p. 60) = 2
  3648-3650 (Crescini, p. 61) = 3
  3676-3677 (Crescini, p. 61) = 2
3731-3874 (Renier, pp. XXXIII-XXXVII) = 144
  3731-3742 (Ludovisi, p. 6)
  3735-3737 (Möhren, p. 319)
  3739-3740 (Möhren, p. 319)
  3811-3823 (Ludovisi, p. 12)
  3823 (Crescini, p. 62)
  3832-33 (Crescini, p. 62)
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