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**FEMINA**

**INTRODUCTION**

The trilingual text of the early fifteenth-century *Femina* is preserved in a single manuscript version, Trinity College, Cambridge, B.14.40. It has been edited only once, by W.A. Wright, for the Roxburghe Club (Wright 1909). In the course of the past century it has been the object of studies of differing depth by Paul Meyer (1903 pp.43ff.), E.J. Arnould (1939 pp.1-9), J. Vising (1942-3 pp.195-208), and W. Rothwell (1998, 2000). It is referred to also by D.A. Kibbee (1991 pp.75-78) and Andres Kristol (1994 p.73, n.11).

Although presented as a continuous whole, *Femina* is, in fact, made up of three independent parts taken from different earlier works, followed by a fourth section composed by the scribe himself that derives its material from the first section. This first and major component of the text is an abridged and grossly inaccurate copy of one of the manuscripts of Walter of Bibbesworth’s *Tretiz* (Rothwell 1990), followed by two much smaller additions of a quite different character, one of them an extract from *Urbain le Courtois* (Parsons 1929) and the other ‘borrowed’ from Bozon’s *Proverbes de bon enseignement* (see Arnould 1939 pp.4-8), each of the three parts being clearly separated from the others by a break in the text. At the end of the Bibbesworth section the scribe writes: ‘And now y ende here my resoun’ (p.83), prefacing the start of his new theme with the Latin: ‘De moribus infantis’; ten pages later he moves on to his third section, with the words: ‘Querez Catoun pur autorité, Secheþ Catoun for authorite’. After concluding his moral teaching in this third section with the hope that his readers might come into the joy of God and sealing it with ‘Amen’, he nevertheless embarks immediately on the fourth section, the only part of the work that is his own creation, a tripartite exposition of the French vocabulary used in his first section. These pages are set out in three columns under the Latin headings: *Linia scripcionis*, *Regula locucionis* and *Regula construcccionis*. The first column contains a list of French words in roughly alphabetical order, the second one spells them as the scribe thinks they should be pronounced, and the third column translates them into English. Only at the end of this section does he finally bring his work to a conclusion – ‘Qui scripsit carmen sit benedictus Amen. Explicit ffemina nova’.

The traditional view of *Femina* as simply a late copy of Bibbesworth, with two disparate appendages, is both inadequate and inaccurate. Whilst the Bibbesworth section is by far the longest of the three, it needs to be regarded as part of the larger picture rather than as a self-contained unit. The key word which situates the whole work in its true context is found in the scribe’s Latin introduction at the very beginning of the book where he states that he will teach his students to use French *rethorice* (see Baldwin 1959), and the same word occurs again just below this in his Latin rubric to the first chapter which deals with the names of animals. This single word *rhotorice* is a clear indication that the work is not to be approached from the same angle as Bibbesworth’s original *Tretiz*. Although its title and the opening words of the text proper addressed to ‘Beau enfant’ might suggest that *Femina* was intended for a mother training her children in the acquisition of French in the same way that Bibbesworth’s *Tretiz* had set out to do a century and a half earlier, the two works diverge right from the start. Bibbesworth’s Introduction in French to the Cambridge version of his *Tretiz* composed explicitly for ‘madame Dyonise de Mountechensi’ (Rothwell 1990, p.3) states unequivocally that his instruction is aimed at teaching children from birth onwards the French vocabulary that they will need to carry out the operations of estate management such as ploughing, sowing and reaping, together with the techniques of brewing and building a house. He provides them with the terminology relating to the equipment that they will have to handle and the names of plants, animals and birds that they will come across in their daily lives. The first lines of *Femina*, however, reveal a quite different aim, announcing that its teaching of
French will be directed towards enabling the young to speak well in front of wise men. This is what lies behind the term *rhetorice*. *Femina* copies Bibbesworth, but uses his material to different ends, presenting it in a Latin framework starting with the Introduction and continuing with the individual paragraphs of each part being headed by a Latin phrase describing their contents. Together with the moralising nature of the two later parts this shows that its instruction was directed towards not only the linguistic, but also the social formation of an age-group classed as *juvenes* in the Introduction, young people belonging to a different stratum of society from that envisaged by Bibbesworth in earlier times.

All Bibbesworth’s linguistic material is concrete and practical, without any reference to moral teaching, and there is no trace of Latin. *Femina*, on the other hand, belongs both in form and in spirit with the works of the *dictatores*, the Oxford Schoolmen such as Thomas Sampson, whose model letters in French and Latin in the second half of the fourteenth century taught an aspect of French that had little to do with the vocabulary of life in the English countryside, but concentrated on a quite different register of the language, focusing not on individual words belonging to specific areas of the lexis and grouped together accordingly, such as parts of the body, of a house or a cart, but rather on locutions, phrases and sentences appropriate to correspondence between students and parents, guardians, tutors, members of the clergy, officials and the like. Whilst Bibbesworth’s teaching of French was envisaged as taking place within the family circle, the instruction provided by Sampson and his colleagues was based on the schoolroom, its aim being to train the future administrators of England in the linguistic skills they would need to further their careers in the multilingual society of their day, and it would use the learning of French to inculcate good social behaviour (see Hunt 1994) at the same time. The scribe of *Femina* conflates the two approaches, the Latin setting of his work and his moralising sections showing a clear affinity with the Schoolmen, but by using Bibbesworth’s thirteenth-century text as the basis for the greater part of a teaching manual intended for a quite different readership in a different age and for a different purpose he has clouded the issue for modern scholars, who have not recognized the essentially dual nature of the work. Additionally, the provision of a full translation in Middle English has led to *Femina* being viewed linguistically as the final stage in the passage from helping the reader by giving a sprinkling of glosses to ‘difficult’ French words, as found in the earlier Bibbesworth manuscripts, to a later situation where readers needed to have recourse to a complete version of the text in their own language as the knowledge of French steadily declined in England. The scribe’s own catalogue of errors would, inadvertently, reinforce this view. However, decades before *Femina*, another much abridged and free adaptation of Bibbesworth, the *Nominale sive Verbale* (Skeat 1906), had been equipped with a full accompanying Middle English translation, whilst, on the other hand, the All Souls (O) manuscript of Bibbesworth, roughly contemporaneous with *Femina*, still retains the system of the random gloss. So there is no straight line of increasing glossarial content from the earlier to the later copies of the Bibbesworth text. Moreover, in its fourth section composed by the scribe, with its list of words and their pronunciation, *Femina* shows links with yet another strand of language learning in later medieval England, the grammatical texts such as the *Orthographia Gallica* (Johnston 1987) and the *Liber Donati* (Merrilees and Sitarz-Fitzpatrick 1993; see also Rothwell 2001). The work cannot, therefore, be regarded as no more than a late copy of Bibbesworth: it must be treated as being *sui generis*.

*Femina*, then, is a trilingual manual of the early fifteenth century intended to teach French, along with good manners, to the rising generation of educated Englishmen, but it would be unwise to accept it uncritically at its face value. The scribe’s command of the three languages he uses is uneven. As an Englishman providing linguistic instruction to his compatriots his Middle English must be accepted as it stands, but his Latin and his French need to be examined separately. This may be readily appreciated by reference to his abundant use of abbreviations. His familiarity with the routine, didactic Latin of the medieval teacher is
amply demonstrated by the way in which he uses abbreviations in his Latin headings to the paragraphs. These abbreviations often take the place of almost the whole word, so that he is clearly counting on his readers to be in a position to reconstruct a limited number of Latin terms in common use in the schoolroom from just one or two characters fully formed. His use of abbreviations in French, however, is quite different. Here they tend to represent just one or two letters, and he does not take for granted the ability of his readers to reconstruct French words in the same way that he did for Latin. More importantly, his many errors in the interpretation of ordinary French terms, even when the Bibbesworth text he was copying is clear, reveal incontrovertibly that he was far from competent in the language. This is particularly evident in his copying of those sections of the Bibbesworth text which deal with specialized areas of the lexis such as trees, flowers, crops, parts of the body, of a cart or a plough, and the technical terms connected with brewing or house-building. This vocabulary is in sharp contrast with the circumscribed, non-technical words that form the basis of his Latin material. Time and again the scribe commits gross errors in all these registers (Rothwell 1998). What is more, his ignorance is not confined to these ‘difficult’ technical areas: for example, his fourth section translates *maintenant* as ‘hand holdynge’ (p.112.24) in Middle English. To sum up, his overall mishandling of the Bibbesworth text provides little evidence to suggest that he had any substantial contact with the French of France.

This scepticism regarding the linguistic competence of the scribe is reinforced by a study of his two pronunciation guides, the one consisting of individual words given at the foot of each page purporting to provide the correct pronunciation of words selected from the text on that page, and then the second column of his fourth section which is devoted specifically to the pronunciation of a much larger number of words in alphabetical order. It is inherently unlikely that someone could legitimately set himself up as an authority on the pronunciation of French when incapable of understanding correctly the basic text that he is copying. Unsurprisingly, an examination of these guides reveals both of them to be less than authoritative. Although the scribe puts on average about half a dozen words at the bottom of each page with his own version of their pronunciation, thus giving a total of over five hundred items, this number is illusory, many of the examples being repetitions of a restricted number of everyday terms that are listed again and again, rather than genuine new material. Moreover, some of his ‘correct’ pronunciations are manifestly wrong, and he even contradicts himself in a number of cases. To take a small sample of these points in order: ‘eet’ (as the pronunciation of *est*) appears many times at the foot of the page, on p.1 and again on pp.2, 4, 11, etc.; ‘fet’, ‘fere’ and other parts of this verb figure almost as regularly as *est*; ‘deus’ (for *deux*) occurs on p.3 and again on p.4; ‘veut’ (for *voet*) is present on p.11 and also p.12, etc. Incorrect pronunciations in the guide based on an inadequate command of French verbal morphology include the following: the form *devient* (present tense) in the text is said to be pronounced ‘devint’ at the foot of p.31, *tient* is given as ‘teint’ in the pronunciation guide on p.32 and p.39, *covient* as ‘covint’ on p.34 etc., *vient* is said to be pronounced ‘vint’ on p. 45, but is left as ‘vient’ on p.2. A morphological peculiarity present in verbs up and down the text is the ending ‘-mis’ in the first person plural – *purroms* being said to have the pronunciation ‘purromis’ (p.8), *alom* as ‘alommis’ (p.27), *diom* as ‘diommis’ (p.28), etc. Some cases of this peculiarity are difficult to establish with certainty on account of the scribe’s less than clear orthography in respect of minims, so that the reader is tempted to interpret the forms charitably as having the ending ‘-oums’, but a number of them have a clearly marked ‘i’. A clear case of error outside the verbal system is his claim on p.58 that the musical *vieile* is pronounced ‘vile’, and other similar examples taken from the fourth section are given below. In the matter of contradictions, the common *bien* is said to be pronounced as ‘bein’ on p.97 and ‘beyn’ on p.100, but is given as ‘been’ on p.93 and even ‘bien’ on p.92, with the plural forms ‘beins’ on p.90, ‘benez’ on p.95 and ‘benis’ on p.101, whilst the pronunciation of *rien* is given as ‘rein’ on p.24, ‘reyn’ on p.100, ‘ryin’ on p.59 and ‘reen’ on pp.87, 88, 93. On occasion, the guide merely repeats the form set down in the body of the text, thus nullifying
the purpose of the guide. For example, in addition to *vent* referred to above, the pronunciation of *corps* is given as ‘corps’ on p.12, but ‘cors’ on p.23. The scribe’s belief that ‘s’ before a consonant always drops in pronunciation leads him to give ‘senetre’ as the pronunciation of *senestre* (p.4), ‘estyle’ for the written *estile* (p.8), ‘ereche’ for the written *espreche* (= ‘stretches’, after sleep) (p.10) and ‘miniteres’ for *ministres* (p.14), etc..

Moving from the footnotes to the fourth section of the work dealing expressly with spelling and pronunciation, *countee*, translated as ‘a shire’, and *counte*, translated as ‘a Erl’ (p.106.15 & 16), are linked by lines going out from each of them in the spelling column on the left, meeting and crossing at a *dictur* in the middle between this column and the second column given over to pronunciation, thus postulating a common pronunciation for the two. The lines then proceed to cross again as they pass to the third column on the right-hand side of the page, which gives the meaning in English, thus linking the two words once again, this time semantically. The inference can only be that the one can be used for the other. *Grues* (plural) and *grieve* are similarly linked, even though the Middle English ‘a cran’ is given for the plural *grues* and ‘a feldfare’ for *grieve* (p.110.5 & 6). *Neger* is linked to *nager* by this system of crossing lines and *dictur*, but their meanings are reversed in the Middle English column on the right of the page, *neger* being translated as ‘to Rowe’ and *nager* as ‘to snowe’ (p.113.18 & 19). This linkage is used again in the entries *piere* and *peer*, the scribe affirming that *piere* is pronounced ‘pere’ and means ‘a faþer’, whilst *peer* immediately below is similarly pronounced and means ‘a ston’ (p.114.7 & 8). The case of the ‘king’, the ‘queen’ and the ‘frog/toad’ is more confused. The forms *roy* and *roigne* are linked by the crossing lines and *dictur*, being translated respectively as ‘a kyng’ and ‘a quene’, although it is difficult to imagine that the two could possibly be interchangeable, but ‘quene’ is followed by ‘*Sed royne sic scriptum est* a tadde’ (p. 115.11-13). The scribe ought to have linked his *roigne* (‘queen’) with his *royne* (‘tadde’ = modern English ‘toad’), although *raine/reine*, etc. in medieval French means a ‘frog’ (Latin *rana*), not a ‘toad’ (medieval French *crapaud/crapaut*, etc.). The treatment of the dog and the cat is even more complicated. The Picard *chien* (‘*secundum pikardiam*’) and the Parisian *chaan* (‘*secundum parisiun*’) in the spelling column are claimed to be pronounced ‘cheen vel chann’, with the English translation ‘an hound’ (p.106.7), but in the body of the text the form *chiens* is said to be pronounced ‘chein’, with the Parisians calling it ‘chan’ (p.3.9). The Picard *chiet* (‘*secundum pikardiam*’) and the Parisian *chiat* (‘*secundum parisiun*’) are both said to be pronounced ‘cheet vel chaat’, with the English translation ‘an kat’ (p.106.8). In the body of the text, however, the *cheat* is said to be pronounced ‘chat’ (p.6.13). Elsewhere in the spelling column of the fourth section a *messuere/messnere* (depending on the interpretation of the minims), a *messiere* and a *messier*, denoting respectively ‘a houswyf’, ‘helewogh’ (i.e. ‘wall’) and ‘a hayward’, are all linked by the scribe’s crossed lines, ‘*dictur*’ and ‘*eodem modo*’ in the pronunciation column, indicating a common pronunciation for all three (p.112.17-19). However, what the scribe must take to be *messuere* if it is to have a similar pronunciation to *messiere* and *messier*, ought to be read as *messnere* (derived from the root *meson*, etc.) and is clearly feminine, whilst the masculine ending in *messier* must signal a different pronunciation.1 In the text itself the ‘housewife’ *messuere/messnere* and the ‘wall’ *meisere, meissere* and *meissiere* are correctly feminine, but the ‘hayward’ has both masculine and feminine forms – *messier* and the plural *messieres* (pp.70.9-71.5). These examples are fairly straightforward and chosen deliberately to avoid the more complicated cases.

---

1 The Cambridge University Library MS of Bibbesworth reads: *Mes il i ad messer e mesere […] Ly messere* (M.E. ‘haiward’) *ad li chaumpe en cure* (G vv.945-947), but the All Souls MS uses *messer* twice in this sense (O f.338vb).
Method of Edition

The manuscript is written in a single column of 24 lines to a page, with two lines of French followed by two lines of translation into English. For ease of comprehension, in the present edition the Middle English translation is set directly opposite its French equivalent, thus making twelve lines per page as a general rule. The frequent interpolation of Latin rubrics, however, means that on a number of pages in the manuscript the French-English content is reduced below the usual 24 lines of text, so, in order to preserve the facility enabling the reader to compare the two linguistic versions at a glance whilst maintaining the integrity of the page references to the manuscript, some pages in the edition end with a line or couplet in one language whose corresponding line or couplet in the other language is set at the top of the following page. For the sake of convenience in reproducing the text, in the scribe’s guide to pronunciation at the foot of each page, his identifying letters ‘a, b, c’ etc. are placed to the right of the relevant words, not above them as in the manuscript. The acute accent has been added to distinguish between e and è, and ‘z’ is distinguished from the Middle English ‘yogh’, although the scribe does not differentiate them clearly in either French or English. The characters u and v have been separated in the transcription according to their vocalic or consonantal role, but the scribe does not consistently make this distinction. Similarly, i and j have been separated. On occasion the shape of the abbreviation used by the scribe is not transparent, but all the expansions are set in italic in the transcription, so that they may be compared with the manuscript in case of doubt. The scribe uses a capital letter to introduce each line in the body of his text, except where the first word of the line begins with ‘f’, where ‘ff’ is used. In his final three-column section setting out the spelling, pronunciation and English equivalents of the French words in the text he uses a random mixture of upper and lower case initial letters. When a ‘yogh’ or a ‘thorn’ begins a line, he does not differentiate clearly between upper and lower case, so lower case has been used throughout the edition in these instances. Since the text of the first section of Femina is often corrupt owing to the scribe’s inadequate understanding of his Bibbesworth original, the relevant words or passages are explained and corrected by reference to several of the Bibbesworth manuscripts.

In the body of the text the different medieval languages are indicated by different colours and scribal expansions are marked by italics. In the Introduction and footnotes quotations in Middle English (and from the scribe’s pronunciation guide) are in roman type, those from Anglo-French and Latin in italic, while expansions of scribal abbreviations in the Middle English text and pronunciation guide are marked by italics but underlined in the other languages.

Scribal Abbreviations

The abbreviations of Latin words are sweeping and in a different category from those in French or English, as was mentioned above. For example, in the opening line of the text feia is twice to be read as femina, with the superscript bar after the final a running back over the letters to indicate both the missing m and n. Placed over the last four characters of mascelio the bar makes it into masculino and feio into feminino (p.13.3). Likewise, seia and setanda (p.34 rubric) with a superscript bar become semina and seminanda, scbr becomes scribitur. A superscript i over t indicates tibi (p.94.9), but on p.95.11 the same word is written as t with a bar through it. A superscript o over m indicates modo; gm with an o over each character is to be read as quomodo; a superscript m over s is to be read as secundum (p.3 pronunciation note). A character resembling r or z attached to the final letter of a word is to be read as uia in quia, as et in docet or debet (p.2 rubric) – although debet is also rendered on the same page by a simple d followed by this character – and as ue or ues in ideoque/ideoques, solonque/solonques, etc. The final two characters of eorum are indicated by a downward
slanting line, whilst an upwards slanting line attached to the final t of a Latin word makes capit into capitis. These examples are not meant to exhaust the range of the abbreviations in Latin, merely to illustrate their complexity and the scribe’s attitude towards his text. With all Latin words the reader is assumed to be able to reconstruct the correct form, irrespective of the nature or extent of the abbreviation(s) used, a clear indication of the kind of audience for whom Femina was intended.

The scribe uses abbreviations in French and English words extensively all through his work, but not consistently either as regards the symbols themselves or the meanings attaching to them. Given the variations in spelling in both languages in the medieval period, this is hardly surprising. Only the phonologist attempting to use spelling as a pointer to pronunciation needs to be disturbed by this diversity so long as the semantic content of the words is not compromised. More than one symbol is used in Femina to carry a particular sense and the same symbol can be used to represent more than one meaning. Also, the abbreviation is otiose in a number of instances and, especially when used as a bar through the final h or l of a word, it is difficult to determine in some cases whether it is to be regarded as marking an e or is to be ignored as being otiose. For example, the superscript bar over the first n in ensemement (p.2.1) and over the final letter of ‘town’ (p.7.10) are definitely otiose; the stroke through the final letters of ‘assell’ in the pronunciation guide may or may not indicate a missing ‘e’ (‘asselle’), since the pronunciation is given as ‘assel’ without a stroke through the ‘l’, and when set through the final letter of ‘fyssh’ on pp.114.12 the same stroke indicates er (fyssher), in conformity with the A-F peschour which it is translating. Yet in the previous line er has been indicated by the usual superscript hook between n and e in the ME ‘synere’ (= ‘sinner). On p.115.21 the same form ‘fyssh’ with the same bar through the final letter could logically indicate es, since it translates the A-F rayes, or be otiose. The Middle English for ‘right’ is given as ‘ryȝt’ on p.4.8, ‘ryȝtth’ on p.69.6, ‘ryȝt’ with a bar through the ‘h’ on p.73.11 and as ‘ryȝtth’ again with a bar through the ‘h’ on p.80.3. On p.95.10 the French veir en verité is rendered in Middle English by ‘soþ in sothe’[sic], whilst on p.99.9 & 10 the Latin verum is translated as ‘þe soþe’. On p.49 the same abbreviation sign is used to represent r in the French flour and English ‘flours’ (l.10), also in the French odours and English ‘odours'(l.11), but must be read as ur in pur (l.12). Elsewhere, the sign normally used to indicate ri is found representing ui in auguioun (p.70.4). Further details of such ambiguities are set out more fully below.

This lack of consistency in the use of abbreviations is not restricted to the Femina scribe, although he may well be more prone to inconsistency than others in his profession. Modern editions of medieval French texts tend to supply few details of the scribal practice behind their printed forms, often merely stating that abbreviations have been resolved in accordance with standard procedure. This formula covers a multitude of sins and gives the impression that there was a universally accepted system in which each abbreviation corresponded to a particular letter or sequence of letters. Short of examining the manuscripts of printed editions, an exercise that is possible only with varying degrees of difficulty, the validity of this approach may be checked by looking at any of the few texts which print the abbreviations rather than resolving them. The authoritative Statutes of the Realm (Anon 1810-1828) and the Rotuli Scotiae (Anon. 1814-1819) are two such texts whose importance would exclude any possibility of scribal ignorance and which cover the period of Femina. For the various resolutions attaching to individual abbreviations in the former text see my Ignorant Scribe and Learned Editor: Patterns of Error in Editions of Anglo-French Texts (Rothwell 2004). Examining only two pages of the latter (vol.2, pp.142-3, dated 1398) it may be seen that a hook over ts gives tres, but when used a few lines farther down over Waut it must be read as meaning Wauter; yet this same er is indicated on the line above Wauter by a bar through the b of Robert; mane with the superscript hook over the e makes manere, yet psent below it with
the same hook between $p$ and $s$ expands into *present* (p.142). Similarly, on p.143 a superscript $r$ in *p'ort* is to be read as *purport*, whilst in $s's$ it expands to *sires*. This exercise could be greatly extended by being applied to the whole of these voluminous texts, but even such a small sample shows clearly that the idea of a one to one relationship between abbreviation and full word is untenable.\(^2\) Nor is such variation limited to the ‘decadent’ later Anglo-French. To take just one example arising from *Femina* on p.3.3, dealing with the different terms applied to groups of animals and birds, the scribe writes *ccieles* in French with a superscript hook between the two $c$ forms and gives the Middle English translation as ‘teles’ (i.e. ‘teals’). Godefroy (2.362b) has a headword *crecele*, with the variants *cresselle* and *cercelle*, glossed in modern French as *crécérelle* (‘kestrel’). Yet three out of his four quotations in this entry have forms beginning not with *cre*, but with *cer*. In his *Complément* under *cercelle* (9.19a), glossed as ‘oiseau aquatique qui ressemble au canard’ (i.e. ‘teal’), only one of the four quotations given actually has the form *cercelle*, the others being *chierchielle*, *cerceulles* and *cerseulles*. This quotation containing *cercelle*, unfortunately, is an erroneous repeat of his entry under *crecele* (2.362b) referred to above, and clearly means ‘kestrel’, not ‘teal’, so that Godefroy has no quotation which actually attests the headword *cercelle* meaning ‘teal’, although he does have alternative spellings of the word correctly based on the *cer*- rather than the *cre*- form. Under his *crecerelle* ‘émouchet, oiseau de proie du genre fauçon’ (9.241c-242a) is a quotation from the second half of the sixteenth century: ‘Crecelle […] que nous appelons cresserelle’, which would provide an apposite quotation for his *crecele* ‘kestrel’ entry. These examples show not only that, as Tobler-Lommatzsch point out (2.1035), the forms for ‘kestrel’ and ‘teal’ are sometimes confused (‘irrig verwechselt’), but they also raise the suspicion that this confusion may on occasion result from the varying, but unexplained, resolution of an abbreviation on the part of editors whose editions were used by the lexicographers. If this were the case, the reader has no means of knowing, because it is not standard practice to signal abbreviations in editions of medieval French texts. In the case of the ‘teal’, the Owen edition of Bibbesworth (Owen 1929 v.233) and the *Nominale* (Skeat 1906 v.832) have the correct form in *cer*- and it is spelt out in full as *cersillez* in the All Souls ms. (f.333rb), but the ANTS Plain Texts edition prints the incorrect form *creceles* (Rothwell 1990 v.234). Whilst the possible confusion regarding *er* and *re* in the case of a little-used word such as *cercele* may not be very important, it is quite a different matter when the same abbreviation might be used for either *ester* or *estre*.

Considered from the standpoint of the medieval reader, however, such variability in the values attaching to scribal abbreviations must have been far less important than it has been made out to be by modern philologists. If the varying abbreviations in medieval texts had not been transparent they would not have been used by the scribes, since the primary purpose of any text is to convey information. Only when the form of a communication is given precedence over its meaning does the precise shape of an abbreviation assume importance. Just as the variable spelling of unabbreviated words evident throughout medieval manuscripts poses problems only for those who seek to access the speech of past ages through the surviving written testimony, similarly the variability of abbreviations may be recognized without it necessarily disparaging the works in which it is found. With this in mind, the following is a summary of the probable values of the abbreviations found in *Femina*, along with some examples of their resolution in the present edition. As mentioned above, English expansions are italicised and French expansions are underlined.

**The superscript bar indicates:**

a) *e* as in ‘sheep’ (p.2.8), ‘kepet’ (p.12.8), *ben* or *bien* (p.22.3), *ung* (p.27.2), ‘wyne’ (p.27.4)
b) *en* as in *bealment* or *naturalment* (p.2.2)
c) *et* in *letrez* (p.57.6)

\(^2\) For evidence of a similar state of affairs in Latin see Wright (2000).
d) *m* as in *homme* (p.2.2), etc.
e) *men* as in *commencez* (p.88.8)
f) *n* as in *naturalmente* (p.2.2), ‘gardyn’ (p.8.11), ‘messyyngwhat’ (p.39.6), ‘gendreþ’ (p.97.6)
g) *as* in *pas* (19.5), (but the same letters as in *pas* are denoted by the superscript hook at p.19.10)
h) over *q* it indicates (i) *e* or *ue*, to give *qe* or *que*, or (ii) *i* or *ui*, as in *qi* or *qui* (*qi* is given in full on p.1.6 and as *q* with a superscript *i* further down the same page on l.10)
i) over *r* it indicates *ost* in *vostre* (p.27.12)
j) over *a* in *chaymbre* it indicates *u* (p.57.9). This is probably due to carelessness.
k) It may also be otiose, as over the first *n* in *ensemnt* (p.2.1)

The bar through the stem of *b* indicates:
a) *er* in *bercere* (p.12.1), *erberes* (p.52.11); *er* or *re* as in *berzy*/bre*byz* (p.2.8)
b) *ef* in *bref* (p.85.6)

The bar through the stem of *h* indicates:
a) *ar* in *charuer* (p.67.3), *charetter* (p.67.11), *charue* (p.68.10)
b) *e* in the final letter of *tresche* (p.10.8), the first *e* being represented by the superscript *e*
c) *er* as in ‘hertez’ (p.2.3), ‘herber’ (p.11.2), ‘archer’ (p.62.1), ‘Wherof’ (p.18.6), ‘Wherwit’ (p.67.4), ‘Where’ (p.70.10)
d) It may also be otiose as in ‘hath’ (p.1.10), ‘buss’ (p.5.12), etc.

The bar through the stem of *p* indicates:
a) *ar* in *parlerez* (p.1.3)
b) *er* in *perdryz* and ‘perdryz’ (p.2.7)

A superscript hook indicates:
a) *e* as in ‘hyre’ (p.10.10), ‘pe’ (p.39.11), ‘forpe’ (p.67.8), *dylyte* (100.2), ‘delyte’ (p.100.2), *littiere* (p.112.2)
b) *er* as in *cervy* (p.2.3), *literate* (pp.32.8), ‘water’ (pp.15.3 & 42.3), *crever* (p.42.8), etc.
c) *re* as in *apprendre* (p.1.1 & 12.10), *apres* (p.10.4), *precious* and ‘precious’ (p.15.4), *preche* and ‘precheþ’ (p.10.5) etc.
d) *as* in *pas* (pp.19.5, 33.12, 34.2, 46.10). (Cf. *pas* with a curved superscript bar and a dot below it on p.50.9)
e) *r* in ‘forþ’ (p.44.10)
f) *ot* or *ost* in *votre/vostre* (p.102.13)
That the interpretation of the symbol is left to the reader is clearly shown on p.9.11 where it is used differently in two adjoining words, firstly as *er* in *espicer* and then *re* in *prent*.

A superscript *a* (often imperfectly formed) indicates:
a) *a* as in the instruction *enfaunt debet scribi enfant* (p.2.)
b) *an* in *devant* (p.7.9)
c) *ra* in ‘cranes’ (p.2.5), *praiser* (p.61.8), *ffraiel* (p.79.4), *graunt* (p.83.4)
d) *ur* as in *naturalmente* (p.2.2), *surcieles* (p.15.8), *esturnyz* (p.2.9)

A superscript *e* indicates:
a) *e*: the first *e* in *tresche* (p.10.8) is represented by the superscript *e*, the final *e* by a bar through the stem of *h*
b) In *crever* (p.42.8) *er* is represented by a superscript *e* and *re* by a superscript hook
c) *re* in ‘grehoundes’ (p.4.3 & 5), *tress* (pp.4.4 & 36.2), *prent* (p.5.14), *prestre* (p.10.5), ‘prest’ (ME) (p.10.5), ‘preyse’ (p.61.8), *plastre* (p.71.13) (Cf. the ME ‘plaster’ using the same symbol on p.72.1.), ‘gendreþ’ (p.97.6), etc.
d) e or ue when over q to read qere or quere (p.7.9), qert or quert (p.8.8). (Cf. quert in full p.7.4)

A superscript o indicates:

a) o in droyt (p.69.6)
b) ro in droit (p.5.5), quystron and ‘quystron’ (p.5.11), groule (p.6.9), trovez (p.43.6), ‘frogge’(p.43.6)
c) roi in droit (pp.64.2 & 67.9)
d) ur in pur (p.70.9)

A superscript r indicates:

a) r in jourys (p.84.10), ‘jour’ (pp.85.9 & 86.3 )
b) er in vers (p.89.9)
c) ra in franceis (1.2), or ‘praye’ (p.6.2), although this could equally well be read as ‘preye’
d) re in ‘frensh’ (p.1.2)
e) ri in en primer (p.1.9), grivez (p.2.6), trippe and ‘trippe’ (p.2.8)
f) ru in pur (p.70.9)

A superscript t indicates:

a) at in ‘zat’ (p.1.5). There are many instances of this.
b) eth or ith in ‘understandeth’ or ‘understandith’ (p.23.1), ‘slepth’ or slepith’ (p.46.11), ‘wexeth’ or ‘wexith’ (p.51.6)
c) it in petit (p.24.4)

A hook through the stem of p indicates:

a) er in ‘properly’ (pp.6.1, 66.3 & 74.6 ), ‘properlyche’(p.66.3)
b) re in proprement (pp.8.5, 66.3)
c) ro in properly’(p.6.1.), ‘properlyche’ (p.66.3), proprement (p.8.5), proschein (p.31.6), promittez (p.93.14), aproche (p.94.16)

The abbreviation attached to a final g has been resolved as ue to give donque, illeoque, solonque, tanque, these words having a variety of possible spellings.
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**Manuscripts of Bibbesworth’s Tretiz referred to by abbreviation in the present edition:**
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**Dictionaries referred to by abbreviation in the present edition:**


Liber iste vocatur femina quia sicut femina docet infantern loqui maternam sic docet iste liber juvenes rethorice loqui gallicum prout infra patebit

Capitulum primum docet rethorice loqui de assimilitudine bestiarum

1

Beau\textsuperscript{a} enfant\textsuperscript{b} pur apprendre

2

En frances\textsuperscript{c} devez bien\textsuperscript{d} entendre

Coment vous parérez bealment\textsuperscript{e}

3

Et devant lez sagez naturalment.

Ceo\textsuperscript{f} est\textsuperscript{g} veir qe vous dy.

4

Hony est il\textsuperscript{h} qi n'est\textsuperscript{i} norry.

Parlez tout\textsuperscript{k} ditz com affaités,\textsuperscript{l}

5

Et nemy come dissafaités.\textsuperscript{m}

Parlez en pr\textsuperscript{m}i\textsuperscript{o}mer de tout assemblé

6

Dez bestez\textsuperscript{n} qi Dieu\textsuperscript{o} ad formé

ffayre chyld for to lerne

In frensch 3e schal wel understande

How 3e schal speke fayre

And afore ñyze wyzem en kyndely.

That ys soth ðat y 3ow say.

Hony\textsuperscript{3} ys he ðat ys nat tauȝth.

Spekeþ alwey as man ytauth,\textsuperscript{4}

And nat as man untauth.\textsuperscript{5}

Spekeþ fyrst of manere assemble alle

Of bestes ðat God hath ymaked

\begin{tabular}{llllll}
\textbf{a} & Beau & d\textit{ebet} & legi & beu & \\
\textbf{b} & enfant & e & ce & \\
\textbf{c} & fraunceys & f & toutdiz & \\
\textbf{d} & bein & g & eet vel eyztt & \\
\textbf{e} & belement & h & jil & \\
\textbf{f} & ce & i & neot & \\
\textbf{g} & eet vel eyztt & j & afetes & \\
\textbf{h} & jil & k & toutdiz & \\
\textbf{i} & neot & l & afetes & \\
\textbf{j} & jil & o & du & non dieu & \\
\textbf{k} & toutdiz & p & & \\
\textbf{l} & afetes & q & & \\
\textbf{m} & dissafet & r & & \\
\textbf{n} & beetz & s & & \\
\textbf{o} & du & & & \\
\textbf{p} & & & & \\
\textbf{q} & & & & \\
\textbf{r} & & & & \\
\textbf{s} & & & & \\
\textbf{t} & & & & \\
\textbf{u} & & & & \\
\textbf{v} & & & & \\
\textbf{w} & & & & \\
\textbf{x} & & & & \\
\textbf{y} & & & & \\
\textbf{z} & & & & \\
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{3} The \textit{o} in \textit{Hony} in the French is clear, and the ‘e’ in the Middle English ‘Heny’ is equally so, a mark of either carelessness or ignorance. The ME ‘hevy’ meaning ‘apathetic, lethargic’ is not appropriate here. The sense demands ‘Hony’ i.e. ‘ashamed’.

\textsuperscript{4} There is a clear omission mark over the ME ‘y’, but the sense requires ‘y tauth’ rather than ‘ys tauth’. The scribal separation ‘y tauth’ has been corrected here and in similar cases later in the text.

\textsuperscript{5} The first letter of ‘untauth’ is ‘v’, but the writer uses both ‘u’ and ‘v’ forms without a clear distinction. Similar alterations have been made to the forms in the pronunciation guide written ‘Beav’ (a) and ‘dv’ (o) in the manuscript.
Et dez oseaux\textsuperscript{a} ensemant And of bryddys also
Parler doyt homme naturalment. Speke schal a man kyndely.

Ubi autem iste literæ rubie supra scribuntur semper pronosticant quomodo id verbum pronunciatur, quia multociens gallicum uno modo scribitur & alio pronuncietur ut sic beu debet scribi beau, enfaut debet scribi enfaut sine .u. Ideoque semper scrutatae ubi dicte literae sunt scriptae .s. rubie literæ & eas quere in hoc margino huius libri te docent qualiter dicta verba leguntur.

Primez ou cervez sount\textsuperscript{b} asemblé ffyrst when heretz beþ assembled
4 Un herde donque\textsuperscript{c} est\textsuperscript{d} appelï, And herde ãanne hyȝt ys appeled,
Dez grues ensy un herde, Of cranes also an herde,
6 Et dez grivez sanz .h. erde. And of feldfares wiȝoute .h. erde.
Nyé dez fesauntz, coveye dez perdryz, A nye of fesauntes, a coveye of perdryz,
8 Damé dez alowez, trippe dez berbyz,\textsuperscript{e} A dame of larkes, a trippe of sheep,
Soundre dez porks\textsuperscript{f} & esturnyz,\textsuperscript{g} 7 A dame of larkes, a trippe of sheep,
10 Beveye\textsuperscript{h} dez heronez & pipe dé oseaux,

\begin{tabular}{llll}
  \text{a} & Oseus & \text{b} & sount cum .u. \\
  \text{e} & eturnyz & \text{c} & eet & \text{d} & pors
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{6} This could be read as donques, the abbreviation not being specific to one spelling, but the forms without s are more common. This applies also to jesque, soloque and tanque throughout the text. The scribe however spells illeoges (with the pronunciation given as ‘illeqes’) on p.110.21, and illeogues on p. 118.5.

\textsuperscript{7} The abbreviation mark in the final word can indicate either \textit{re} or \textit{er} and both \textit{brebis} and \textit{berbis} are found in A-F. The form \textit{cervez} in line 3 does not permit of an \textit{re} equivalent.

\textsuperscript{8} MS Beveye. Bibbesworth MSS have the following forms: Bevee (A f.300vb), Beveye (O f.333ra), Beveie (B f.95v).
A sondre of hogges & of stares,  

A beveye⁹ of herones, a pipe of bryddys,  

Greyle dez geleynez, turbe dez cercieles⁷,  

A greyle of hennes, a turbe of teles,  

Lure de ffaukones & puselez.  

A lure of ffaukones & damezelez.  

Eschele⁸ dit homme en batayle,  

An ost seyþ a man¹¹ in batayle,  

ffusoun dit homme de vyf amayle,  

ffusoun seyþ man of quyk bestayle,  

Haraz dit homme dez poleynez,  

Haras seyþ man of coltys,  

ffolye dit homme dez vileynez,  

ffoleyse seyþ man of chorlys,  

Summe du ble, summe du bienez,  

Summe of corn,¹² summe of goud,¹³  

Mace d’argent, sume¹⁴ dez fuez,¹⁵  

Mas of selver, sume of fier,  

Mut dez chiens en venerie.  

A mut of houndez in veneorie.  

Et de corner après d vous⁶ die.  

And after to blowe y shal say.  

Mut dez chiens vous dirrez  

Mut dez chiens vous dirrez  

Qatre vint¹⁶ racchez¹⁷ ensemble couplez  

deux & deux.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>cercieles</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>echel</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>chein secundum</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>apre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>vou</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>deus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁹ MS ‘deveye’. See note to p.2.10.

¹⁰ As on p.1.8 the same abbreviation mark would allow either cercieles or crecieles.

¹¹ MS ‘aman’.

¹² The bar over the final letter of ‘corn’ may be otiose or represent ‘corne’.

¹³ MS ‘of summe goud’, but faint marks indicate a scribal correction.

¹⁴ MS fume in both French and English.

¹⁵ The French fuez and ME ‘fier’ are both incorrect. Femina here makes nonsense out of a perfectly clear statement in the Bibbesworth MSS denoting a heap of manure: G has fimere des feins (ME ‘mork’) (v.233); A femyr (ME ‘mochil’) de fens (f.300vb); C femier de fens (ME ‘dyngehep of dynge’) (f.4vb).

¹⁶ Qatre vint or quater vint (only the initial Q and the t of the first word are formed, modern French quatre-vingt), is here confused with vingt-quatre, ‘xxiij’.

¹⁷ The form ‘racchez’ used in both French and English (p.4.2) is an ME word (OED rache), the French for ‘hunting-dog’ being brachet.
A mut of houndes ye shul say.

xxiiij racchez ycoupled to gedere.

A lese of grehoundes ys ynamed

When .iij. en lese beþ to gedere,

And a bras of grehoundes ys

When ij en lese beþ to gedere.

A brut of barones shal man name,

A ffrape clerkes wít ryzt devere,

Aray seyþ man of knyþtys.

A route seyþ man of squiers.

Of rebaudes also a route,

And of oxen also wíouté doute.

A parte senestre leverers menez.

---

18 The ampersand here makes no sense and is contradicted by the ME translation. The preposition de or par would give the sense ‘rightfully’. Bibbesworth C f.4vb has par.

19 The scribe is confusing ensy and aussi, as the ME shows.
And of o[n] þyng take ȝe hede.

On þe left half grehounde dez ledez.

A companye of ladies ȝe schal say,

And of gees also ȝe schal do,

ffor on frensch þey holdeþ of ry\th.

þe maister\bd baldely holdeþ þerto.

3yf ȝe wylleþ parfytyly

Compaignie\a dez damez dirrés,

Et dez owes ensy ferrés,

Qar en\bd franceys\b tenent de droit.

Le maistre\bd bauldement\d lettroit.\bd

Si vous\' volez parfitement

Parler devant\bd\b bon gent

Il y ad suffler, venter & corne

Dount la resoun fait\' a saver.

Le fieug suffle le quystron\b \i. suffice proprie venter,

Le vent vente par my le bousson,\bd

Suffler,

Mez le venour proprement corneie

Quant\i chas prent pur quer preye.

---

20 MS un.

21 The same abbreviation of a superscript hook is used for both the French and its ME equivalent ‘maister’.

22 The meaning of lettroit is not clear. It has been transcribed as such because it is meant to rhyme with droit and has the same superscript o over the t. The ME ‘holdeþ’ might suggest the French le tendroit.

23 After ‘maister’, ‘ma’ is crossed out.

24 The form of devant lacks one character, having the letters dent with a superscript a, so that it could be ‘de[v]ant’ or ‘deva[n]t’. The sense is not in doubt.

25 MS ‘When’.

26 Corner is clearly out of place here. It ought to be at the end of l.13 in French. The scribe sets the three French words for ‘to blow’ one below the other to the right of the text, marked off by a vertical stroke.

27 The first o in bousson is superscript and marked by a caret sign.

28 Reference ‘e’ is repeated in the MS.
Quomodo appelluntur secundum eorum voces

Ore\(^{30}\) oyez naturalment

4 Dez besteza le diversement.
Chescun\(^{b}\) de eux\(^{c}\) & chescune

6 Solonque\(^{32}\) qe sa nature done.
Homme parle, ours braye

8 Qi desmesure ceo\(^{d}\) affraye.\(^{33}\)
Lyon romyt, greue groule,

10 Vache muche & courtre\(^{35}\) groule,
Chyval hinist,\(^{e}\) allowe chaunt,

12 Colure jerist\(^{f}\) & cok chaunt,
Cheat\(^{8}\) minoie, serpent cifflie,

a betez   b checun   c eus   d ce
  e hinit   f jerit   g chat

But þe huntere properly corneþ & bloweþ
Whanne chas he taket for to seche praye.\(^{29}\)

Now hereþ kyndely
Of besteþ þe\(^{31}\) diversite.
Every of hem he & sche .i. maul & femaul
After þat har nature 3evyb.
Man spekeþ, bere brayeþ
Lyon romyb, Cran\(^{34}\) graulyþ,
Kow loweþ, hasyl bloweþ,
Hors neyeþ, larke syngþ
Coluere jurrut & cok syngþ,

\(^{29}\) The same abbreviation is used for the ‘ra’ in ‘praye’ as in ‘braye’ and ‘affraye’ in ll.7 and 8.
\(^{30}\) MS Ove makes no sense.
\(^{31}\) MS ‘de’.
\(^{32}\) This could be read as solonques, the abbreviation not being specific to one spelling, but forms with s are more common. This applies also to donques, jesques and tanques throughout the text.
\(^{33}\) MS de mesure ceo affraye; this makes no sense and the scribe shows his failure to understand his model here. The syntax of the verse is unacceptable. Ceo (pronunciation guide ‘ce’) must be read as the reflexive pronoun se (modern French s’effrayer), with the adverbial phrase a desmesure ‘exceedingly.’ This, however, upsets the metre, which could be preserved only by using the adjective demesuré incorrectly for the adverb demesurément. The readings in Bibbesworth MSS cause no difficulty of either syntax or sense: G has Ki a desmesure se desraie (v.249), A Saun resoun sovent se deraye (f.300vb), C Qe a desmesure se desrae (f.5ra), etc...
\(^{34}\) The first letter of ‘cran’ is in upper case.
\(^{35}\) The superfluous first r in courdre, unsupported by the Bibbesworth MSS or the Nominale (Skeat 1906), is another indication of the scribe’s inadequate command of French.
Kat mewep, addere cissit or fliet proprē,
Asse rugeþ, swan reflieþ,
þe fox38 & þe hound bayeþ,
Whanne þe huntere secheþ hys pray,
Goos jangleþ, gandre gralleþ.

Lowe & le chienb baye þe fox & þe hound bayeþ,

Quantf the venour quert sa praye,
Owue jangle, jars39 jaroyle,
But me haþ garoyle & jaroyle.

Mez il ad garoyle & jaroyle.
La difference dire jeoþ voyle:
þe difference telle y wyl:

L’ane jaroyle en la ryver
Quant le ffauskoun volaunt ly quere,
Whanne þe ffauskoun fleynge hire secheþ,
But afore a town31 in werre

Mez devant40 une villeen gere
Homme fiche sou baner42 en terre
A man stikþ hys baner in grounde
ffor þe barbycan to defende

De le saulte qu þe homme voeuf rendre.43

---

56 The MS has retyne and a superscript mark above the y, but it is difficult to interpret this to give a recognized form of the verb. Bibbesworth and the standard dictionaries provide many spellings along the lines of rechaner, but none with an additional syllable in the middle.

36 MS retiflie.
37 ‘Fox’ is an elementary error for ‘wolf’.
38 MS sars.
39 See note to p.5.8 concerning devaunt.
40 A bar over the ‘n’ of ‘town’ may be otiose or intended to give ‘towne’. (Cf. ‘toune’, p.8.11.)
41 The Femina scribe does not deal with garoyle (l. 6), but his baner is to be read as its incorrect equivalent. Bibbesworth G twice gives the nearest ME gloss ‘trappe’ for garoile and garoil (vv. 263 & 268), supported by B f.96v and C f.5rb. Ò erroneously glosses jaroille by ‘postgate’ (f.333va) and garoil by ‘postgate’ (f.333vb). For a complete explanation of the term see the masterly treatment by Möhren (2000), especially pp.158-162, proving incontrovertibly that the garoil is a palisade. Only in one detail is Möhren in error. Not having the Ò manuscript and relying on the Owen edition of Bibbesworth, he interprets ‘stekes’ as a noun ‘stakes’ when it is a verb glossed by afiche.
42 Reference ‘e’ is repeated in the MS. The forms are set down in the wrong order, but the scribe indicates the error by adding an insertion mark before each of them.
46 As elsewhere, redirrroms here is the future tense of raler, ‘to return’, not of redire, ‘to repeat, say again’.
47 Having misunderstood redirrroms in the previous line, the scribe mistranslates ou as ‘when’, instead of ‘where’, as also on p.74.
48 Coile: the ME equivalent ‘crowkeþ’ is clear, but the French is not. Bibbesworth G v.273 has coaule, C f.6vb koaille. Continental French appears not to have had a similar verb, the modern coasser being attested only in the mid-sixteenth century.
49 Plunison = plungun. The word appears again on p.60.3 in the form plaisoun. The plungun is a diving bird (see AND plungun and OED ducker4)
50 The verb here has been transcribed as poume, but the succession of minims would permit of the alternative readings ponme, ponnie, pounie or even ponuie, since the scribe does not dot his i. The normal form of the infinitive in both continental and insular French is pouner (<Latin ponere). Bibbesworth G has ad pouné (v.280).
51 The bar over the final letter of the ME ‘gardyn’, absent from its French equivalent, has been ignored.
52 The final example from p.7, ‘veut’, is repeated in the pronunciation guide before the first entry on p.8.
53 ‘parrouns’ could be read as ‘parroumis’.
54 Reference ‘e’ is repeated in the MS.
Et qui trop se avante outre resoun
A la gelyne serra compaignoun,
Qar plus se avante pur un oeff
Qe pur sa arure fait le boet.
Et quant le gelyne commence a russille[re]
Et moustre a trippeler,
Dez oeff luy donez le germoés,
Noun pas quex sount estergulés.
Barbyz baley, dame balee,
Et le espicer a prent sez mers de balee.
Pur trop veylez homem baale.
A soum servant sa chose bayle,
þat hen cokkeþ, rekleþ & kakleþ.
And he þat to moche antyþ hym above resoun
To þe hen he schal be felawe,
þanne for hys erynge doth þe oxþ.
And cheweþ þat sche wyl syzste a brod,
Of eyren þe han tahþ to russille
But nat þo[s] þat beþ adle.
Schep bletþ, ladys hoppyþ,
The spicer takeþ hys mers out of hys bale.
ffor overmuche waak man gonþe baale.

55 The ME has three verbs in this line, with the first, ‘cokketh’, being a mistranslation of the French adjective hupé, ‘crested’ (T-L 4.1230-31). Bibbesworth G v.282 reads: ‘a henne coppet’ (OED copped). The Femina scribe has read hupe incorrectly as pres.ind.3 of huper ‘to shout’ (Godefroy 4.529b, T-L 4.1231).
56 The ‘a’ in ‘above’ is written over the ‘y’ of ‘him’.
57 The form printed as ‘hanne’ to make sense appears as ‘Draue’ in the MS.
58 The final ‘l’ of ‘russill’ has a bar through it, hence the reading ‘russille’ in line with the corresponding French russille, but it could be otiose.
59 Trippeler is a diminutive of treper, literally ‘to dance’, here ‘to dance about’, ‘be agitated’.
60 The ME ‘stren’ (OED stren vb.) shows that the Femina scribe is following Bibbesworth O rather than the other MSS which recommend the removal of the germ of the egg, e.g. G v.205: Mes remuez la germinoun (ME ‘sterene’), i.e. ‘remove the germ of the egg’; B f.95r: la germe en ouçtez; C f.4va: le germe (ME ‘the striene’) en oustez. In contrast, O f.333vb advises that fertilized eggs be fed to the hen, not addled ones: Des oëfs (ME ‘egges’) luy donez gemyz (l. germé; ME ‘stremede’), Non pas que sont estergulez (ME ‘adel, rotyne’).
61 As elsewhere, Femina is not following Bibbesworth G here: estergule occurs in B f.96v, C f.5va and O v.333vb, suggesting again the source(s) of Femina.
62 After pur the infinitive veylez is required, not what appears to be an imperative veylez.
63 The scribe adds the French baale immediately after the ME ‘gonþe’. Bibbesworth G v.289 reads: Par trop veiller home baal with the ME gloss ‘gones’, i.e. ‘yawns’.
64 Reference ‘d’ is repeated in the MS.
65 Reference ‘g’ referring to ceo ought to read ‘ce’, used as the reflexive pronoun se.
To his servant his ynge he takeþ,
And wit baleys men swypþ.

Regardez qe la sale soit juncheie.
Tak hede þat þe halle be rysshet.

Aprés a dormer homme espreche, b
After sleppe man rakslet,

Le prestre c en la glyse preche,
þe prest in þe chyrche 66 precheþ,

Le pischeor d en la ryver peche,
þe fysser in þe ryver fyssþeþ,

Ové soun rey ou soun eche.
Wyþ hys nett oþer wit hys hook.

Regardez qe la sale soit juncheie. Tak hede þat þe halle be rysshet.

Aprés a dormer homme espreche, b
After sleppe man rakslet,

Le prestre c en la glyse preche,
þe prest in þe chyrche 66 precheþ,

Le pischeor d en la ryver peche,
þe fysser in þe ryver fyssþeþ,

Ové soun rey ou soun eche.
Wyþ hys nett oþer wit hys hook.

Quant la povere femme mene le tresche,
þe poure womman ledþþ þe daunce,

Melour serroyt en mayn le besche, e
Beter schold be in hand a spade,

Qar ele n’ad a vivere 67 forþ[e]s 68 le besche
ffor she nap to lyve by but hyre spade

Pur payn querer, bribe ou lesche, f
ffor bred to gete, loof oþer lasse.

Moun chael g le baele lesche.
My welpe þe panne lyckþ.

Ore donez ceo chaele a flatier h 69

---

66 The final ‘e’ of ‘chyrche’ reflects the bar through the final ‘h’ of the word, because the form ‘cherche’ is given in full on p.109.12.
67 The superscript hook in vivere is misplaced, being set after the first v instead of before the final e.
68 The abbreviation sign has been omitted from forps.
69 MS aflatier.
Now 3yf ṭat welpē lape

Et il estb flatour qī soīt70 flater And he ys a flaterour ṭat can flaterē

Et lez gentzqī voiēt5 espulipers.5 And ṭis folk ṭat wyle byglyle.

Hoc capitulum docet de proprietatibus infantis

Quaunt enfantf est primer neezg Whenn a chyld ys fyrst ybore

Covienth q’îl soīt malloeez.î Hit behovyb71 ṭat hyt be swadyd.

Puis en soun biersk ly cozech After in hys cradel hym leyþ

Et be[r]cere luy purveiez. And a rokkester hym purveyþ.

Quant enfant comeence72 a chatoner, Whenn a child bygynneþ73 to crepe,

Et einz q’îl sache as piés1 aler And erē he conne on feet go

Et il bave de sa nature, And he dreveleþ of hys nature,

Pur sez drapsm saver de baveure ffor hys cloþys to save ffram drevelynq

---

70 Soīt is to be interpreted as the pres. ind. 3 of saver, not the pres. sbj. 3 of estre.
71 MS ‘behovyþ’. This separation occurs elsewhere in the text, e.g. on pp.29.12, 36.8 etc. and so will not be mentioned on every occasion.
72 MS comente, but the confusion of c and t is widespread and the MS form cannot stand.
73 MS ‘bygynneþ’. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>French</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q’ele face un bon bavere.</td>
<td>And after when he bygynynþ to go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Et voluntes luy mesmes voet enpaluer, Pur mal maym &amp; male blesure</td>
<td>And gladly wyle hymself byslobbe, But kep in suerte.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ffaitez a gars luy d garder sure</td>
<td>Make a boy hym kepe sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mez gardez en suerté.</td>
<td>But kep in suerte.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mettez ly apprendre langage.</td>
<td>Put hym to lerne langage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Come primez il doit soun corps discrere</td>
<td>How fyrst he shal hys body discrere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

74 The English has ‘by slobbe’.
75 At this point Bibbesworth G v.18 says that a boy or girl (Garszoun ou garce) ought to follow the toddler so that he does not fall over. Femina’s phrase luy garder sure is an attempt to render li deit suire in Bibbesworth (le deit sure (ME ‘VOlwen’) (C f.2rb), luy doit suire (ME ‘folwe’) (O f.331 rb)). Femina takes the infinitive sui(v)re for the adjective sur and uses it adverbially to mean ‘safely, in safety’. The infinitive garder in Femina would appear to come from a misreading of Bibbesworth’s Garszoun.
76 The scribe’s chie ceo must be read as chiece, but cannot be altered in the printed text without losing the references to two items in the pronunciation guide. This verse gives clear proof of the scribe’s incompetence in French. Most of the Bibbesworth MSS use two verb forms here, e.g. G v.19 has cece glossed as ‘stomble’ and chece glossed as ‘falle’ etc.. Femina invents a verb cepper unknown to Godefroy and T-L for the first of these (an error for coppe?) and then divides the form chieux (sbj.pres.3 of chair < cadere) into chie (< caccare?) and the demonstrative pronoun ceo = ce.
77 The bar through the ‘ll’ might indicate ‘falle’.
78 MS garduz. If the MS form is to be retained, the auxiliary seit/soit would need to be added before garduz.
79 Bibbesworth says E quant il encurt a tel age Qu’il[/] prendre se poet a langage, i.e. ‘when a child reaches such an age that he can be set to learn languages …’ (G vv.21-2), but Femina alters tele age to graunt age and so gives ‘gret age’ in ME.
80 The repetition of corps in the pronunciation guide has been referred to in the Introduction.
Et pur ordre garder de moun & ma

And for order to kepe of mon and ma

Toun & ta, son & sa, i. masculino & feminino,

Toun & ta, soun & sa, for ma souneb

Quia ma sonat feminino, moun masculino,

To femynyn gendre & moun to masclyn,

Cy qe en parlé soit bien apris

So þat in speche he be wel lerned

Et de nule homme escharnis.⁸¹

And of no man ys scorned.⁸²

Capitulum de partibus capitis

Di ma teste b ou moun chief, c

I say myn heved & myn heved,

Et la greve de moun chief.

And þe shode of myn heved.

featez la greve a tou lever,

Make þe shode at þyn upprist .i. in capite,

Et manger la grive a tou lever.

And ete þe feldfare at þyn dyner.

J’ay lez cheveus recercelez.

I have þyze crips lokkys.

Moun toop vous pric qe estouncez. e

My toop y praye þat þe shere.

En vostre cheif vous avez toop, ⁹¹

a echarnys ⁹² b tezite ⁹³ c cheef d vou
e etoncez f cheef

⁸¹ MS ‘man’.
⁸² MS ‘y scorned’.
⁸³ An otiose superscript bar over ou has been ignored.
⁸⁴ ‘Myn’ has a superfluous superscript bar in both cases.
⁸⁵ ‘Myn’ has a superfluous superscript bar.
⁸⁶ ‘þyn’ has a superfluous superscript bar.
⁸⁷ Manger sic, not mangez.
⁸⁸ ‘þyn’ has a superfluous superscript bar.
⁸⁹ Toop has a superfluous superscript. bar in French and ME.
⁹⁰ That the clear second t in estouentez is to be interpreted as a c is shown by the pronunciation form at the foot of the page.
⁹¹ Toop has a superfluous superscript bar.
⁹² The scribal etharnys is clearly an error for the well-attested e(s)charnys.
⁹³ The scribe has written ‘c’ over ‘tezite’ in the pronunciation guide and ‘b’ over ‘cheef’.
In your heved ye havyþ a top,
In þe trouȝh cast þe toup,
And hecheleþ of flex þe toup.
Of þe wenne takeþ þe toup.
I have also myn brayn panne,
Myn forhed also & myn brayn,
Myn pol wit þyse templez,
And þyse ministers seþ man templez.
3oure byholdyne ys gracious
But 3our eyþe ys spaduous.
Of þe eye cast out þe spaduynge,
And of þe nose also þe droppynge.

94 (L1.1-7): ryme appears to be the scribe’s misreading for the rue of his Bibbesworth source, sometimes spelled as rue in A-F, thus identical in form with rime, a mistake leading to getez instead of juez (Bibbesworth G v.37), rue & jueh (C f.2va), etc.. The Bibbesworth text is referring to playing at top in the street: Femina at this point reads as nonsense.
95 All forms of top/toup and tup in these verses in both French and English are given superscript bars.
96 The bar through the final letter of ‘trouȝh’ has been ignored.
97 ‘Wenne’. This is ‘win’ in the sense of ‘conflict’, ‘struggle’ (OED), referring specifically to winning the ram at the wrestling-match. This shows that Femina is not based on the G MS of Bibbesworth, where the incorrect gloss ‘winde the yarn’ is given (v.38).
98 ‘Panne’ is spelled as ‘paune’.
99 The scribe is yet again confusing ensy/ainsi with aussi.
100 ‘Myn’ in all cases in ll.6-7 has a short superscript bar.
101 MS ‘by holdyne’.
102 The form ‘eyþe’ used as a singular noun is to be compared with ‘eye’ on l.11.
103 The clear spelling chatie must be read as chacie.
104 The final s/z of the French nés/nez has apparently led the scribe to regard the noun as a plural form, hence the ungrammatical plural article dez.
Much ys worth\textsuperscript{105} ðe rubye ywryte by .B.,
But lytyl ys worth he ywryte by .P.
Water ys rupye goyng fraun nosez,
But rubie ys a precious stoun.
Of ðe eye ys al saff ðe appyl
3yf ðe eye led be goud & fayre.
In ðyse eye ledes bêp ðese heres.
Of ðe eyez bêp ðe browys.
Also have ðe by goud resoun
ij nostrels & a gristlon.
3e haveþ la lire & le levere, balaunce &
þe hare
þe book also & þe lyppe.

2 Mez poy vault il escript par .P. Ewe est rupye issant de neas,\textsuperscript{a}
But lytyl ys worth he ywryte by .P. Water ys rupye goyng fraun nosez,
3yf ðe eye led be goud & fayre.
In ðyse eye ledes bêp ðese heres.

4 Mez rubye est precious piers. Del eul est tout saf le purnel\textsuperscript{106}
But rubie ys a precious stoun.
Of ðe eye ys al saff ðe appyl
3yf ðe eye led be goud & fayre.
In ðyse eye ledes bêp ðese heres.

6 Si la papire soit boun & beal.\textsuperscript{b} En lez papires sout lez cielez.\textsuperscript{c}
Of ðe eye ys al saff ðe appyl
3yf ðe eye led be goud & fayre.
In ðyse eye ledes bêp ðese heres.

8 Amount les eulez sout lez surcieles.\textsuperscript{d}
Auci\textsuperscript{e} avez vous par bone resoun
Also have ðe by goud resoun
ij nostrels & a gristlon.

10 Deux\textsuperscript{f} narrys & un tendron. Vous avez la lyre\textsuperscript{107} & le levere,
3e haveþ la lire & le levere, balaunce &
þe hare
þe book also & þe lyppe.

12 Le lyvere ensy & le luyere. Le luyre est qe enclose lez dentez,\textsuperscript{g}

\textsuperscript{a} The bar through the final ‘h’ of ‘worth’ has been ignored and many of the further instances of its presence will not be commented on.
\textsuperscript{b} The ambiguity of the abbreviation means that purnel could be read as prunel.
\textsuperscript{c} Lire in French and ‘lire’ in ME are glossed by ‘balaunce’, which is originally French and used here as English. Lire is an adaptation of the Latin libra and is attested in Godefroy (4.773c) only once as libre in a fifteenth-century glossary. This encourages the supposition that the scribe was associated with the dictatores. For a more detailed examination of lines 11ff. see Rothwell (1998), p.65.
\textsuperscript{d} The form ecrip is erroneously repeated in the MS from the previous page.
The lyppe ys þat encloset þe teþ, 
 þe hare in buss̄h̄109 hym holdþ witynne, 
 þe balance serveþ in marchaundyse, 
 þe boke us techeþ to cleryze. 

Le levre en boys soy tienta dedeinz, 
La lyre110 ser(i)þ en marchaundyse, 
Le livere noz print al clergize. 
En le bouscheb amount111 est pallet 
In þe mouþ on heyʒgh ys þe palet 
To taste ʒour þynges foule oþer clene, 
And þyse ladyes beþ ful besy 
ffor wel to wassh hare knowes. 


Pur taster vous chosez orde ou nett, 
Et lez damez sount ententivez 
C’est113 la chesoun pur certeigne e 
Pur aver le melour aleyn. 
Ele ad col, gorge & mentoun 
Dount le franceysd est comoun. 
Desoubz e116 la longe (ys þe)117 est furchele, 

a teint b bouche c certeyne d franceys cuw .u. 

109 The final ‘h’ in ‘buss̄h̄’ has a bar through it, which might indicate the spelling ‘busshe’. This is found again in ‘heyʒgh’ on 1.5 and ‘wasshe’ on 1.8.


111 MS a mount.

112 In Bibbesworth, to give themselves sweet breath the ladies clean their gums – gingives (ME ‘gomes’) (G v.70), gencives (ME ‘gomys’) (B f.93r), gengives (ME ‘goumes’) (O f.331vb), etc. – not, as here, their knees – genoius (ME ‘knowes’ = ‘knees’).

113 A superscript abbreviation mark attached to the initial C normally indicating a missing ra, ru etc. has been ignored.

114 ‘Chyn’ has a superfluous superscript bar over the end of the word.

115 ‘When’ for Dount indicates again the scribe’s inadequate grasp of basic French grammar, leading to nonsense in his ME translation.

116 MS De soubz.

117 The ME ‘ys þe’ is to be disregarded.
Under þe tongue ys þe furche,118
1 Oos furche en Fraunce l’em apele.
Boon furcheb119 in Fraunce me clepeþ.
Dedeinz120 le gorge estâ gargate,
Witynne þe prote ys þe gargule,
Et plus parfounde121 la gistb le rate.
And more deppere so lyþ þe ryngboun.

De anteriori parte capitæs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>Oos furche en Fraunce l’em apele.</th>
<th>Under þe tongue ys þe furche,118</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dedeinz120 le gorge estâ gargate,</td>
<td>Boon furcheb119 in Fraunce me clepeþ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Et plus parfounde121 la gistb le rate.</td>
<td>Witynne þe prote ys þe gargule,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

118 ‘Fork of the throat or breast’ (OED). Bibbesworth G v.79 has fourcele and glosses ‘kanelbon’ (i.e. clavicle), C f.3rb has similarly fourcele (ME ‘canebon’). The simple form fourche is not attested in the dictionaries of medieval French in this sense.

119 ‘Boon furcheþ’ shows the mingling of A-F and ME with the French fourché being given an English past participle ending.

120 MS De deinz.

121 MS ‘par founde’.

122 MS dent. The pronunciation guide at the foot of the page gives ‘devaunt’.

123 MS ‘messeleres’ glosses a part of the MS (it is impossible to be sure which is intended) are Bibbesworth’s messeleres, ‘molar teeth’ (G v.89).


125 The ME ‘foreteþ’ here must be read as ‘teeth’, Bibbesworth G v.90 has dens foreins, C f.3va reads denz foreyns (ME ‘forotheth’). It looks very much as though the scribe of Femina has miscopied his source, putting donqz for denz or dentz. The final word quere in this verse is grammatically incorrect, the 2nd person singular of quer(r)e being queres, which would be needed to fit with tu and the ME ‘sekyst’, and be in line with meffalls[ere]s.

126 MS De south.

127 The French filet and its English equivalent ‘fylet’ both raise questions. TL under filet (3.1851) give just one quotation for the sense of ‘Zungenband’, taken from Bibbesworth A, adding ‘(auch nfz.)’. The Petit Larousse (1924) lists this meaning, without providing an example, but it is absent from other dictionaries of modern French as well as from Godefroy. So there is, in effect, no attestation of this sense in medieval continental French. In England, the OED (filet) gives the meaning ‘The “string” of the tongue. Obs’, but its only supporting quotation is dated ‘a 1693’. The word is found in the 14th-century A-F Nominale (Skeat 1906 v.31). It is clear that it must have been current in both England and France from the thirteenth century for it to have been used by Bibbesworth, the Nominale and then by Femina in English as well as French.

128 The kakenole is glossed in Bibbesworth G v.94 as ‘rime of hernes’ and in C f.3va as ‘the rime of the brayn’. It is found in insular French much earlier than this, however, in the twelfth-century Li Quatre Livre des Reis (Curtius 1911) as kachevels (p.11.19).
Et desouth le orayle avez gernoun. And under þe ere 3e havyþ heer.

A lez espaulez a avez blasoun. At þe schulers 3e have a schulderboun.

Desoub k129 le chart gist e le essel. Under þe carte lyþ þe 3extre.

Desoub le bras avez huissel. Under þe arme 3e have a putte.

Le char130 chivage en le chare þe fleyssh rydeþ in þe char

Dount lez hommes fount lour eschar. d Wherof men makeþ har skoryn.

Sur le montayn crust e131 le broyl. Uppon þe hulle groweþ þe myst.

Desoub 129 le chart gist le essel. Under þe carte lyþ þe 3extre.

4 Le char130 chivage en le chare þe fleyssh rydeþ in þe char

6 Dount lez hommes fount lour eschar. d Wherof men makeþ har skoryn.

5 Le char130 chivage en le chare þe fleyssh rydeþ in þe char

Sur le montayn crust e131 le broyl. Uppon þe hulle groweþ þe myst.

8 En bas terre e est f tout foitz bon soil. In low lond ys alway goud soyl.

Entre pledours132 move le toyl. Bytwyn pldours ys meved strif.

10 Le vent de bijs greve le oyl. þe wynd of þe eest greweþ þe eye.

Aprés g gele vient k remoyl. After ffrost comeþ þawe.

12 Aprés August h chiet le foyl. After August falleþ þe leff.133

129 The scribe’s pronunciation guide here refers only to the second part of the composite preposition, since he separates the word into ‘de’ and ‘south’.

130 As indicated by the ME glosses, the homonyms le char and le chare represent the modern French la chair and le char, with the first of these being used figuratively to mean ‘people’.

131 The form ‘crust’ spelled out in full in the pronunciation guide supports the reading crest, normally found as a preterite form, rather than the usual present indicative form crest. The ME reads ‘greweþ’ with a clear superscript ‘e’, as found on l.10 below in greve.

132 The form and position of the abbreviation would point to pldours in both languages, but in view of the scribe’s lack of precision in positioning his abbreviation signs the usual pldours has been chosen.

133 The scribe inserted the couplet about the fall of the leaves in both French and English between the French and the English verses about the thaw after the frost, but rectified his error by putting ‘a’ before ‘Aprés August chiet le foyl’ and ‘b’ before ‘Aprés gele vient remoyl’. The present edition simply moves ‘After ffrost comeþ þawe’ to be alongside its French counterpart.

134 Reference ‘e’ is repeated in the MS.
Cestez\textsuperscript{a} parolez icy jeo coil. \hspace{1.0in} Swych speches here y gadere.

Q’est le chesoun vous dire jeo\textsuperscript{b} voyl, \hspace{1.0in} What ys \pe chesoun 30w y wyl say, ffor muche to acorde\textsuperscript{135} in spekynge
Pur mutz\textsuperscript{c} acorder en parlaunce \hspace{1.0in} And to discorde in varyynge.
Et discorder en variance.\textsuperscript{d}  

Adhuc de corpore

Il n’est pas mister a discrire \hspace{1.0in} Hit ys non\textsuperscript{136} nede to discrire
Le fraunceys qe chescun\textsuperscript{e} sciet\textsuperscript{f} di[r]e, \hspace{1.0in} \pe frensh\textsuperscript{137} \hat every man can say, Of wombe, rugge ne chyne,
De ventre, de doos ne de chyne, \hspace{1.0in} Of shuldres, armez ne brestboun, But y make \pe shewynge\textsuperscript{139}
Dez espaulez,\textsuperscript{g} bras ne petrine, \hspace{1.0in} Of shuldres, armez ne brestbou
Mez jeo face\textsuperscript{138} le mustresoun\textsuperscript{h} \hspace{1.0in} Of shuldres, armez ne brestboun, But y make \pe shewynge\textsuperscript{139}
De chose [qui]\textsuperscript{140} n’est pas\textsuperscript{141} cy comun. \hspace{1.0in} Of \pe yng \hat ys nat so comune. Out of \pe yng shulders goth \pe yse armez,
Dez espaulez issint lez bras, \hspace{1.0in} Out of \pe yng shulders goth \pe yse armez,
Coutes ne mayns ne lessom\textsuperscript{142} [pas].

\begin{table}[h!]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{llll}
\hline
a & cetez & b & ie \\
& checun & & muz \\
& & f & seit \\
& & g & epaulez \\
& & & h & moutresoun \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{135} MS ‘a corde’.
\textsuperscript{136} A superscript bar extending over the whole of ‘non’ has been ignored.
\textsuperscript{137} There is a bar through the final letter of ‘frensh’ which has been ignored.
\textsuperscript{138} The pr.sbj. 3 face should be fut. ind. 3 ferai, or frai, as in Bibbesworth G v.85.
\textsuperscript{139} MS ‘swewynge’.
\textsuperscript{140} French syntax needs the addition of qui (or qi) between chose and n’est.
\textsuperscript{141} The abbreviation sign used by the scribe in pas is that usually found for er or re.
\textsuperscript{142} A superscript bar over the end of lessom has been ignored. The missing negative particle pas is present in the Bibbesworth versions, e.g. G v.112.
Elbowes ne handez leve we nouth.
I hurd dondere, how he donede, \(^{143}\)
Whereof þe ale pershede en tonne.
But for to be in al certayn,
3ow y say of þe wrest of þe hand,
þe paume výþynne, þe clouth wítoute,
And þe fust ys þe hand cloos.
And þe galle beryþ þe longhe \(^{146}\)
To travers hys felawe.
And on handful þat 3e havyþ in hande,
þat ys þe hand ryȝth ful.
And bothe þyse handes fulle

\(^{143}\) The French noun *tonnre* ‘thunder’ and the ME ‘dondere’ are acceptable, but the ME verbal form ‘denede’ in the MS should probably read ‘dondrede’ (i.e. ‘thunders’). The scribe fails to recognize the verb as impersonal, using the personal ‘he’ rather than ‘it’. Used correctly, *comment* would introduce an interrogative exclamation: the Bibbesworth MSS use *veir* (G v.586) or *voyre* (C f.8vb) ‘truly’, ‘indeed’ at this point. The ‘how’ in ME should translate the French *comme* (exclamation) rather than *comment*.

\(^{144}\) *Piert* is spelled out in full and the pronunciation guide gives *pirt*, but the sense of the ME is ‘perishes’ (= ‘goes bad’). This use of *perdre* is not recorded in the dictionaries, but T-L gives a sense ‘verloren gehen, zugrunde gehen’ (7.733). The correct form is probably *perit* from *perir*, which would tie in with the ME.

\(^{145}\) The form in the manuscript is *de deniz*, the place of the *i* clearly marked by having a mark over it.

\(^{146}\) This verse is completely mistranslated, as may be seen by comparison with Bibbesworth C f.3rb: *ly feel fert du poynoun* (ME ‘knockel vust’) *A travers son compagnoun*. O f.332rb also has a similar phrase. The sense is: ‘the wicked man strikes his companion with his clenched fist’; but in *Femina* the adjective *fel* ‘wicked’ used as a noun is taken as meaning *fiel* ‘gall’; then *fert*, pres. ind. 3 of *ferir* ‘to strike’ is misread as part of the Latin verb *ferre*, hence the erroneous ‘beareth’; finally *poignoun*, a form of *poign* unattested elsewhere, is read as a form of *poumon*, thus producing the ME ‘longhe’. The complete phrase in *Femina* is just nonsense. See Rothwell (1998), p.66.

\(^{147}\) *A travers* is an adverbial location, literally ‘across’, but is misunderstood in *Femina*, being taken as the preposition ‘to’, with *travers* read as a French infinitive, presumably a form of *traverser*. Again, the result is nonsense.

\(^{148}\) The dot to mark the *i* is clearly over the final minim, which would give *plenis*, but *pleyn* in l.11 shows the correct spelling.
In frensh men clepeth galeynes.
But more ys worth a lytyl handful
Of gyngefere wel ytried

De Gyngefere ben trié
penne beth a hundred galeynes

De filaun[d]res toutez pleines.
Of gossomer al fulle.

Une cost del un costee
A reb of a syd

Avoit Adam par Dieux ousté
Hath Adam by God uttake

Quant dame Eve primez fist.
When dame Eve fyrst he made.

Ne porta charge lieu q’il gist.
Hyt bare no charge in place þere hyt lay.

En my lyeu del ventre est umbil
In mydde place of þe wombe ys þe navyl
Et par desouth est le penil.
And by under þere ys þe share.

Quisez & nagez ové le ffurchure
Thies & buttokkes forth wit twyste

ffount grant ese pur chevachure.

---

149 The initial letter of ‘gyngefere’ is not recognizable as ‘g’, but may be a deformed upper case, matching the French.

150 The Bibbesworth text at this point reads: *Qe cent galeyns*, the sense in Bibbesworth G v.123 (see also C f.3rb, B f.93v, etc.). The Femina scribe appears to have omitted cent from the French, but keeps it in the ME. The term *galeyn* in the sense of ‘handful’ is unattested.

151 MS *filaumres* without a d but with a superscript hook before the r.

152 The bar through the ‘b’ of ‘reb’ may indicate a form ‘rebe’ or ‘rebbe’, the word having many spellings.

153 The bar over the final letter of ‘When’ could indicate ‘Whene’ or ‘Whenne’, but the word has been left in the form found on p.4.4.

154 The sense is that the spare rib did not bear a load, was not an essential part of the body and so could be removed with impunity. The French *lieu* is to be understood as *la ou* ‘where’, and the corresponding ME ‘there’ changed to ‘where’.

155 The *ffurchure* is the fork in the body.

156 Bibbesworth G v.135 uses ‘clift’ (i.e. ‘cleft’) here. ‘Twist’ and ‘cleft’ are synonymous in ME.

157 *Chevachure* is set down as three separate words *chev a chure*. 
Doth gret eze for rydynge.

Shankes & knowes 3e shal knowe.

Hyt ys no miste þat to 3ow þey be touched.

But in legges 3e have sparlure,

And as brayn159 hyt ys þer uppon

Of better strength the men161 hym assureþ

And þyþ þe shynbon be witoute hurt.

And þyze garteres 3e havyþ also.

ffor swych a lernynge y 3ow say.

Of þylke men of þe garteres

So com þe usage of þe garteres.

Also 3e havyþ þyse anknees,

---

158 The French may be read as l’assure or la ssmare. It is read as assure in Kristol (1995) pp.4.13 and 78.9; in Bibbesworth G v.145 the form is la zure and in C f.3vb le assure, which again points to this version being, perhaps, the source of Femina. For ‘sparlure’ see OED sparllie, the form used in Bibbesworth C f.3vb.

159 Brayni/’Brayn’ in both A-F and ME is to be understood as ‘brawn’ (muscle).

160 Read se assure.

161 Sic. for ‘man’, as also in l.10.

162 MS Par.

163 The scribe fails to understand Bibbesworth’s distinction in G between karrez (v.139) and garrez (v.141) (ME ‘hammes’ in both cases) on the one hand and his gareters (ME ‘garthors’) (v.141) on the other. He is explaining the difference between the modern French jarret and jarretière. This failure is responsible for the nonsense in l.10 in both French and ME.

164 The text and the pronunciation guide have the same form vient/‘vient’, but elsewhere ‘veint’ is found in the pronunciation guide on p.18 and ‘vint’ on pp.45 and 46.
2 Keville faita homme ferme estier, b Ankne makeþ man faste stande,  
Et la kiville fait le carpenter. And þe treen pyn makeþ þe carpenter.  
4 Plante ad homme, urtil & talon, Sole haþ man, too & hele,  
Dount le frauncés est comoun. Wher, of þe frensh ys comyn.  
6 Dedeinz le corps c si ad chescun d homme Witynne þe body haþ every man  
Coer, fay & poignonen, 166 Herte, lyvere & longhen,  
8 Splen, bowel & reynonen, 167 Mylthe, þarme & kydeney,  
Stomak, veyne, nerf envyronen. 168 Stomake, veyne, synues al aboute.  
10 Et ne obliez pas noun vessie And forzytteþ 169 nat þe vessie .i. a  
Qe al ventre fait e grant aie, þat to þe wombe dop gret helpe,  
12 Puis qe la uryne est aquiloun. 171 After þat þe uryne ys ygadred.  
Ne lez roynez ne obliom.

a. feet b. eyzttyr c. cors d. checun

e. feet

---

165 MS ‘When’. This error occurs frequently in the ME text.
166 Poignone is an error for pomoun, as found in Bibbesworth G v.158, C 3vb, etc.
167 Reynone appears to show a Germanic plural ending grafted on to a spurious French term adapted from reins in order to obtain a rhyme with the equally mythical poignone above. Cf. the correct roynes in 1.13.
168 The scribe’s error in 1.8 brings in its train the erroneous envyrone for environ.
169 MS ‘for gytteþ’.  
170 The spurious ME ‘vessie’ has to be translated into the genuine English ‘bladdere’.
171 The French in this verse reveals the scribe’s ignorance of the basic syntax of the language. Bibbesworth G v.163 reads: Pur ceo que urine la quiloms (‘because we gather there urine’), where la is the adverb of place ‘there’; C 3vb has Pusque l’urine i aquilloms. Femina reads la as the definite article marking urine. This misunderstanding in Femina leads to aquiloun (the abbreviation sign over q is that which usually indicates ri) being misinterpreted as a past participle instead of as fourth person present indicative of (a)cuillir. A more competent scribe would surely have taken his cue from the present indicative obliom in 1.13. A further error concerns the mistranslation of the causal Puis qe by the temporal ‘After’.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>Ore ne fault</em>(^{a}) <em>rien</em>(^{b}) <em>mez fel</em> <em>par noun</em> <em>Dedeynz le corps</em>(^{c}) <em>qe</em>(^{172}) <em>ad homme.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ne þe reynes forgæte ze nouȝth. Now fayleþ nouȝth but þe galle by name Witynne þe body þat hap a man.(^{173})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De vestura infantis <em>capitulum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Vestez vous ové voz draps</em>,(^{d}) <em>petit enfant.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Chaucez voz braiez, petitez &amp; grantz.</em>(^{e})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>Mettez le chaperon,覆ercez le chief.</em>(^{f})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>Ové une correye vous seintez.</em>(^{g})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>A vous ne di ne ceyntés,</em>(^{177})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>De la seinture le pendant</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passe <em>par my le mordant.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cloþe 30w <em>wit 3our cloþys,</em> lytyl chyld.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doþ on <em>3our breche,</em> hosyn &amp; shon.(^{175})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Put on þe hoth, kovere þe hed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tache <em>3our botnes fram on ende to oþer.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wit a gyrdyl gyrde 30w.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To 30w y say nat wexe wit chyld,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By cause þat woman ys by man wit chyld,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And wit a seynture she ys ygurd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{a}\) MS qi-

\(^{b}\) MS ‘aman’.

\(^{d}\) *Vestez vous ové voz draps* shows an anglicized syntax.

\(^{e}\) The French *petitæ & grantz* is ‘translated’ by the completely different ‘hosyn & shon’. The Bibbesworth MSS are clear: *Chaucez vos gauns, souleres e brais* (G v.184), *brais, soulers & gaunz* (C f.4ra), etc.. See Rothwell (1998), p.67.

\(^{f}\) *Derechief* means ‘also’ here, rather than ‘from one end to the other’.

\(^{g}\) This line makes sense only if *ne ceyntés* is read as *enceyntés*. As usual, the Bibbesworth MSS have the correct form: *Ne di pas ‘vous enceintez’* (G v.188), ditto (C f.4ra), etc..
Ensy doyt le mordant & le hardyloun.

Passer par tru de\textsuperscript{180} subiloun.

Si jeone\textsuperscript{a} enfant tien[t]\textsuperscript{b} la mayn.

Primez al matyn vers la payn, Une brybe\textsuperscript{182} donque luy donez,

Ou une lesshe si pluis n’aavez.

Mez sy vous luy donez dez ouefs,\textsuperscript{c}

Ensy lez atirés a soun oeps.\textsuperscript{d}

Oustez\textsuperscript{e} le chale eynz q’il hume,

Le tru\textsuperscript{184} & la albume,\textsuperscript{f}

Et luy donez le moel\textsuperscript{g}

Qy a homme seyn est bon morsel.

---

\textsuperscript{178} MS ‘de pendant’.

\textsuperscript{179} Ensy means ‘thus’, not ‘also’, which is aussi. See l.10.

\textsuperscript{180} MS le. Bibbesworth’s description of a belt is clear: D[e]la ceinture le pendaunt Passe parmi, trespase le mordaunt (ME ‘bokel’); E aussi deit li hardiloun (ME ‘tonge’) Passer par tru de subiloun (ME ‘bore of a nalfin’) (G vv.192-94). So there are four parts – pendant, buckle, tongue and the hole made by the awl. The pendant goes through the buckle and the tongue goes through the hole. Femina makes both the buckle and the tongue go through the hole. Also, the ME in l.4 does not make sense: ‘hool & al’ should be ‘hool of the al’.

\textsuperscript{181} The scribe is here confusing the verbs tenir ‘to hold’ and tendre ‘to stretch out, hold out’. The sense is ‘stretch out’ (estent in Bibbesworth G v.195), so the reading here ought to be tent.

\textsuperscript{182} (Ll.7-8) In the French the two sizes of bread to be given to the child are bribe and lesshe, the former being the larger. Bibbesworth MSS have bribe (ME ‘lompe’) and lesche (ME ‘szyvere’, i.e. ‘sliver’) (G vv.197-8), bribe (ME ‘lompe’) and lesche (ME ‘schive’) (O f.333ra), etc.. Both bribe and lesche are well attested. The Femina scribe has apparently copied the French correctly, but has used the French term ‘lesche’ as a ME gloss for bribe.

\textsuperscript{183} As in l.4, Ensy is wrongly translated as ‘also’.

\textsuperscript{184} The scribe uses tru here for Bibbesworth’s entruit (G v.202), entruit, glossed ‘rime’ (C f.4rb), etc.. He had used the same word for ‘hole’ in line 4 above.
And hym ʒeuyf þe zelke

2
Mez le germe\textsuperscript{185} vous enostez.
That to a man hool ys a goud morsel.
But þe stren ʒe out caste.

4
Ren ne vault,\textsuperscript{a} bien vous sachez.
Noþyng hyt ys worth, wel ʒe know.

Dez pommes vous di ensement
Of þyse apples y say ʒow also

6
Le manere & affaitement.\textsuperscript{b}
þe manere & þe affement.

Ouste\textsuperscript{c} lez stykes & la parure\textsuperscript{d}
Cast away\textsuperscript{186} þyse steles & þe parure

8
Et luy donez la morsure.
And hym ʒeuyf þe body.

Lez pipiners engetez,
þize cores cast out,

10
Et lez pipeims enplantez.
And þyze kerneles setteþ.

De diversitate nominum

Veyez, si vient devant vous
Seth, here comeþ afore ʒow

12
Un chivaler\textsuperscript{187} tout rous
A knyþth al red
Qi a chival sore est monté.

\begin{tabular}{llll}
 a & vawt & b & affetement \\
 c & ouztthes & d & parure \\
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{185} MS gerne.
\textsuperscript{186} MS ‘a way’.
\textsuperscript{187} The abbreviated form of chivaler means that it could equally well be read as chevaler, but chival in l.13 is spelled out in full.
Escue de goulez il porte, A sheld of red goulez he beruþ,
Une launce rouge en l’une mayn, A launce red in on hand,
De vyn vermoyn soun bouche est plein, Of wyne red hys mouth ys ful,
Et ne mange de pesoun And he eteþ no ffyssh
Mez haryng soor qi ad noun. But heryng red by name.

De eodem

Jeoc veie une roigne sanz roy I sawe a quene wyþoute kyng
Pur une reyne fayre grant affray, ffor a tadde made gret affray,
Et en my la realme la roy And in myddys þe reme of þe kyng
Est un ryom fait pur un rei. Ys a fore ymad for a nette.

Hoc capitulum docet de proprietatibus campi

Ore aloms as prees & champs Now go we to mede and feld
Pur norrer nostre enfantnez.

\[\begin{array}{cccc}
    & a & e & i \\
    ecu & bouche & reme & enfantnez cum \\
    ec & ie & fe & alommis \\
    d & fere & g & h
  \end{array}\]

---

188 The abbreviation mark on the first word resolved as e is the superscript bar normally used to indicate a missing n or m.
189 The same phenomenon as in 1.3 is found in ‘wyne’.
190 MS ‘wyþ oute’. (L.1.7-10) These lines are an attempt to render Bibbesworth’s demonstration of the homonyms rei ‘king’ or ‘net’, reine ‘queen’ or ‘frog/toad’ and the near-homonyms realme ‘kingdom’ (with forms such as reume, ream, etc.) and reyn ‘furrow’. *Femina* begins reasonably enough, although the English past tense ‘made’ as a gloss for the French infinitive fayre (1.8) cannot be correct. The text, however, goes badly wrong in 1.10. Bibbesworth says that the queen (reyn) is agitated on account of a frog (reyn) that is sitting in a net (rey) in a furrow (reoun) in the middle of the king’s (rey) realm (reume) (G vv.318-21). *Femina* loses the sense of the second part of this, saying that in the middle of the king’s realm is a furrow made for a net. See Rothwell (1998), pp.67-8.
191 MS ‘y mad’.
192 The form alommis is clear, with the dot over the i, but is not credible as a pronunciation for the common aloms. See also pp.28, 43, 44, 45, etc..
193 ‘Chams’ has been read here despite a clear dot over an ‘i’ which would give the nonsensical ‘chanis’.
194 The correct form ‘enfandnez’ has been read despite the apparent ‘c’ instead of ‘t’.

---
Une faux fauche un ambinge de pré.

De faucyl est garbe & javel aucy.

Voz javelez en garbeþ liez.

En trosseus voz garbez mettez.

Un varrot de pois suis arechez,

Et lez feves en warrot liez.

Mez il n’ad myster que vous dioms.

De totele maneres dez blez lé nounz,

Del sigle, d’orge ne frument,

De totle manere cornes þe names,

Mez d’autre’ semaile que crest

Qi cotivers multe displé.

ffor to norshe oure chyldryn.

A syde moweþ a swad of þe mede.

Of swad ys sheff & shoffe also.

3oure shoffez in sheffez byndþp.

In truszez 3our sheffez putteþ.

A waze of pesyn uppon recheit,

And þyse beins in wazes byndþp.

But hyt ys noon ned þat 3e say.

Of al manere cornes þe names,

Of rye, bere ne whete,

þat comune beth to al folk.

But of oþer seyth þat growþ

a faws b trosseus c diommis
d nounz e dautre f cret
g mut h diplet

195 ‘Swad’ (‘swathe’) is used correctly to gloss ambinge, an attempt to render Bibbesworth’s andenne (ME ‘swathe’) (G v.328), aundeyne (ME ‘swath’) (C f.6ra), andene (ME ‘swath’) (O f.334rb), etc. However, the same ‘swad’ is also used erroneously to gloss faucyl, Bibbesworth’s ME ‘sikel’ (G v.329), giving total nonsense. The scribe’s error lies first in his omission of Bibbesworth’s initial De in l.2 (‘With a scythe mow […]’), leading to his failure to interpret Bibbesworth’s siez (ME ‘rep’, modern English ‘reap’) (G v.329), syez (C f.6ra), etc. as the imperative of sier ‘to reap’. In writing est he shows that he thought the verb was part ofestre. His failure to understand the instrumental sense of De in l.3 (‘with’) completes the mess. This is yet another example of the his tenuous grasp of elementary French syntax.

196 The final letter of garbeþ is unmistakably the ME thorn, but cf. garbez immediately below.

197 The ME fails to express the indirect object vous in the French: instead of ‘no need that you say’, the translation should be: ‘no need for us to tell you’.

198 As in l.4 above, the final letter of totele is the ME thorn.

199 A superscript bar over the end of nounz is otiose and has been ignored.

200 A superscript bar over the o in cotivers has been ignored.

201 This is in line with ‘alommis’ in the pronunciation guide on p.27.
Reveray il\textsuperscript{203} crest & le betoyl,  
Le hayson\textsuperscript{204} auxc\textsuperscript{a} & le noiel,\textsuperscript{b}  
le blaverole & le maw auxci,  
Charoyle & autres qe ne vous di,  
Qar trop i averoie ore a fayte\textsuperscript{c}  
Se toitez semiacez vous dusse trahere.\textsuperscript{207}  
Mez quant temps\textsuperscript{d} est karier,\textsuperscript{208}  
Bonez chartes\textsuperscript{209} faitez\textsuperscript{e} charger.  
Le charter ad sa riorte,  
Mez charuers\textsuperscript{210} le auguillon porte,  
Et le\textsuperscript{211} charter coviennent q‘il porte  
Ové luy\textsuperscript{h} toutfoitez\textsuperscript{b} sa ryorte.

\textsuperscript{203} The scribe has miscopied his model here. \textit{Reveray il} should read \textit{L‘iverai i} as in Bibbesworth \textit{G} v.340 or \textit{Le yveray i} as in \textit{C} f.61rb (modern French \textit{ivraie} ‘rye-grass’). Both vocabulary and syntax in \textit{Femina} are faulty.

\textsuperscript{204} \textit{Le haysoynig} is \textit{Le azoun} (ME ‘thar’) in Bibbesworth \textit{G} v.341, \textit{Le hazoun} (ME ‘tar’) in \textit{C} f.61rb, modern English ‘tare’, ‘wild vetch’, i.e. ‘wyld facche’ as in \textit{Femina}.

\textsuperscript{205} ‘Le hocke’ is ‘the mallow’, the French definite article being an error for ‘\textit{pe}’.

\textsuperscript{206} The personal pronoun ‘I’ is missing from the ME, whether as a result of an omission or a faulty imitation of the French \textit{di}, personal pronouns not being obligatory before verbs in medieval French.

\textsuperscript{207} The clear MS \textit{De} at the beginning of this line is an error for \textit{Se} (i.e. \textit{Si} ‘if’). If unamended, the line makes no sense, but the scribe compounds his error by his ME translation ‘Of’. The form \textit{trahere} (i.e. \textit{traire}) is aphetic for the \textit{retrere} found in Bibbesworth \textit{G} v.345 (ME ‘to telle’).

\textsuperscript{208} The French needs \textit{de} before \textit{karier} to make the syntax acceptable.

\textsuperscript{209} An otiose superscript \textit{i} between the initial \textit{c} and \textit{h} of \textit{chartes} has been ignored.

\textsuperscript{210} The plural \textit{charuers} (ME ‘plowmen’) would call for a plural verb, but this would spoil the rhyme. Bibbesworth \textit{G} v.902 has the correct singular \textit{carruer}.

\textsuperscript{211} The impersonal verb \textit{co(n)venir} requires a dative, i.e. \textit{Au charter covient}.

\textsuperscript{212} MS ‘\textit{be hovy}\textit{p}’.
Dount il ad double entendement

Quo tout gent ne savent nient.

En la grange voz blez movez.

Dehors la grange voz blez tassez.

Qar un mow est dit en grange

Et un tasse dehors la grange.

En grange gardez vous de hareits,

Es champs vosotre blez d’autere bestes.

En sale chauntez lez gestez

Pur obliere lez grevez molestez,

Mez si vous priez gentz a vous festes,

P[ri]ezcez ceu... qi sount en enqestez

Wyþ hym al way hys whyppe.

When of me hath double understanding

þat alle folk knowe nouzth.

In þe graunge zoure cornes moweþ.

Wypoute þe grange zour cornes tasseþ.

ffor a mowe ys seyd in graunge

And a tas witoute grange.

In þe graunge keþe sow fram þys eilez,

In feld zour corn fram oþer bestes.

In halle 3e shulle synge þyse gestez

To forȝete þyse grevous hurtes,

But ȝyf ȝe praye folk to zour festes,

213 This line offers a clear pointer towards the source of Femina. It is found only in the C and O MSS of Bibbesworth: Dount ci a double entendement (C f.6rb); Dount y ad double entendement (O f.334va). Moreover, both C and O situate this line immediately after the one referring to the carter’s whip, not later, as is the case in Femina. The ‘double sense/meaning’ refers to the difference between the carter with his whip and the ploughman with his goad. The scribe of Femina uses the impersonal construction il ad, but mistranslates Dount as ‘When’ instead of ‘Where’ (i.e. ‘whereof’).

214 The ostensibly French verb mower and the noun mowe are, in reality, not French at all, but English. They occur in Bibbesworth G in the form muez (ME ‘mouwe’) (v.350) and moye (ME ‘reke’) (v.352), in C muwez (ME ‘mouwe hyt’) and moye (ME ‘mouwe’) (f.6rb). See OED mow s.b.  ꞌ3 ‘A heap or pile’, and mow v. ꞌ2 ‘to put in mows’.

215 MS De hors.

216 MS ‘Wyþ ȝoute’, as elsewhere.

217 The stroke after the final letter of hareit must be read as an s if it is to match the plural bestes in the following line. The hareits are Bibbesworth’s arestez (ME ‘anenes, eylez’) (G v.356), the prickly ‘awn’ or ‘beard’.

218 The bar through the stem of the initial letter of ‘barne’ could indicate er as well as ar.

219 The superscript hook over the final e of autere must be read as er, not re, since this latter reading would produce autre, but, given the scribe’s freedom in his use of abbreviations, perhaps it indicates just r, giving autre.

220 The final ‘n’ of ‘corn’ has a bar over it, so it could be read as ‘corne’ (cf. ll. 4 & 5).

221 MS ‘for ȝete’.
Pray hem þat ben in enquestes
ffor hare malice þat ben so redy.

De arte pistoris

Quant vostre blé est bien batu,
When þour korn ys wel ythrosse,
Puis venté & bien molu,
After ywynwyd & wel ygrounde,
Par le moulere devient farin
By þe grindynge comeþ mele
Et donque pain proschein matyn.
And þen bred nyxt on morwe.
Auxcy de grayn devient flour
Also of corn comeþ flour
Par le bolenge del pistour,
By þe buntynge of þe bakere,
Et par la bolenger est severé
And by þe buntere ys deceveret
La flour & furfre q’est si clere.
þe flour and bran þat ys so clere.
As voz chivalez lez fourfre donez
To þour hors þis bran ȝeyþ
Et ové ewe teev le flour medlez,
And wyþ water warm þe flour medleþ.

a pretes b devint c prochein d aucy

e pitour f qeet
32

Et vostre paste\textsuperscript{232} ensy pesterez.  
And your paste also kned hyt.

2  
Ové une rastuer\textsuperscript{a} vostre auge mundez.  
Wit a dowryb your trow make clene.

Mez il\textsuperscript{b} y ad rastuer & rastel\textsuperscript{233}  
But me haþ a ryb & a rake 
\textit{et} servent de divers myster.  
\textit{pat} serven of divers\textsuperscript{234} myster.

4  
Le pistour tient\textsuperscript{d} le rastel,  
\textit{be} bakere holdyb \textit{he} oven rake, 
\textit{et} servent de divers myster.  
\textit{pat} serven of divers\textsuperscript{234} myster.

5  
Mez rastuer fait\textsuperscript{e} le auge beal.\textsuperscript{f}  
But \textit{he} ryb makeþ \textit{he} throw clene.
Chaufeze le four ové fugere  
Hett \textit{he} ovyn\textsuperscript{235} wyn spayes 
Sy vous fault\textsuperscript{8} bone lytere.  
Lytere & liette\textsuperscript{236}e sout divers, 
Lyttere & liette\textsuperscript{237}e sount divers, 
Lytere & liette\textsuperscript{237}e sout divers, 

8  
Le faultour\textsuperscript{238} littere littere\textsuperscript{239} fauche.  
\textit{he} mowere straw mowep. 
Pur eze en littere\textsuperscript{240} homme chivauche.  
For eze en littere men\textsuperscript{241} rydyp.

\textsuperscript{232} The final \textit{e} of \textit{paste} is problematic, the downward oblique slash used to represent it is often otiose. Here the example of Bibbesworth \textit{G} v.386 is followed. On p.33.9 the scribe spells out ‘paste’ in his English.
\textsuperscript{233} By inverting \textit{rastuer} and \textit{rastel} the scribe destroys the rhyme. Bibbesworth \textit{C} has \textit{rastel} & \textit{rastuer} rhyming with \textit{mestier} (f.6va) and \textit{O} the same apart from \textit{mester} instead of \textit{mestier} (f.334vb).
\textsuperscript{234} The abbreviation in ‘divers’ is placed at the end of the word, literally ‘divser’.
\textsuperscript{235} A superscript bar over ‘oven’ is otiose and has been ignored.
\textsuperscript{236} The orthographical difference between the two homonyms is an invention of \textit{Femina}.
\textsuperscript{237} The presence of ‘souët’ in the English shows the extent of the scribe’s copying from one language to the other.
\textsuperscript{238} The \textit{faultour} here is Bibbesworth’s \textit{faucheour}, glossed ‘mouwer’ in \textit{G} v.400. The form ‘fautoi’ in the pronunciation guide shows that the \textit{Femina} scribe was not just making a spelling error: the correct word is unknown to him.
\textsuperscript{239} Repetition \textit{sic}.
\textsuperscript{240} The erroneous \textit{lutere} in Wright’s edition has found its way into the first edition of the \textit{Anglo-Norman Dictionary}.
\textsuperscript{241} The plural ‘men’ is clear. Cf. p.33.2.
Mez ceo est littere\textsuperscript{242} sanz fayle

But þat ys littere wynpoute\textsuperscript{243} fayle

Q’en douce\textsuperscript{a} ffronc homme dit payle.

þat in douce\textsuperscript{244} franc man clepet wombechaf.

Paile & pale\textsuperscript{245} sount divers

Chaf & smal chaf beþ divers

Quart de grain sount severez.

Whanne of grayn þey beþ severed.

Et si paile ne est pas,

And 3yf straw ne be nouȝth,

Pernez donque le pesas.

Takeþ þanne þis\textsuperscript{246} straw.

Et quant le four est chaufé

And whenne þe oven ys hoot

De\textsuperscript{247} pele soit le past entré.

Wit þe peyle be þe paste yput yn.

Quart vostre past est mys\textsuperscript{b} en four

Whanne \emph{3our} past ys put in oven

Et le pistour prent soyour,\textsuperscript{248}

And þe bakere takeþ reste,

En dementiers le mesure\textsuperscript{249}

Rechelys out of mesure

Ne serra trop pas nonchalure.\textsuperscript{250}

Lat nat hyt be to muche ybake.\textsuperscript{251}

\textsuperscript{a} douce \quad \textsuperscript{b} myis

\textsuperscript{242} As at the foot of p.32, Wright has misread \emph{luttere} for the clear \emph{littere}.

\textsuperscript{243} MS ‘wyþoute’.

\textsuperscript{244} MS ‘doute’ with a clear ‘t’.

\textsuperscript{245} \textit{Femina} inherits the mythical pair of homonyms \emph{paile} and \emph{pale} directly from Bibbesworth. \textit{G} v.404 has \emph{pail} (ME ‘chaf’) and \emph{paille} (ME ‘stre’); \textit{C} f.6vb and other MSS follow suit. At least the terms in Bibbesworth make sense, the huskins of grain being different from the stalks, but it is difficult to imagine a valid difference between ‘chaff’ and ‘small chaff’. This may reflect the difference between the scribe’s possible background in the Schools and Bibbesworth’s familiarity with the countryside.

\textsuperscript{246} The clear ‘þ’ in ‘þis’ is a scribal error for ‘p’, the sense calling for Bibbesworth’s ‘pese stre’ (\textit{G} v.407) to match the French \emph{pesas} ‘pease straw’ (AND \textit{pesaz}).

\textsuperscript{247} The first word in the MS here is a clear \emph{Qe}. Wright (1909) emends silently to \emph{Oue} (i.e. \emph{Ové}), but \emph{De} is more probable, involving only a change of initial letter and is in line with the \emph{Du} of Bibbesworth \textit{G} v.409, \emph{De la} of \textit{O} f.334vb, etc..

\textsuperscript{248} The MS has \emph{soyour}. Since \emph{i} and \emph{y} and \emph{e} and \emph{j} are often interachable, \emph{y} has been substituted here for the normal \emph{sojour} as found in Bibbesworth \textit{G} v.411, etc..

\textsuperscript{249} The last two lines on this page are a mess from the point of view of both the French and the English. The scribe’s failure to read correctly the \emph{mesnere} (ME ‘housewyf’) in Bibbesworth \textit{C} f.6vb or \emph{messnere} (ME ‘housewife’) in \textit{O} f.335ra, if he was indeed using one of these MSS as his source, leads him to write \emph{mesure}, i.e. ‘measure’. This in turn calls for a rhyme in \emph{–ure}, hence \emph{nonchalure}. The correct noun \emph{mesnere} rhymes with the feminine adjective \emph{nonchalere} in Bibbesworth, but there is no adjectival form ending in \emph{–ure}, so \textit{Femina} here makes no sense. Furthermore, the scribe fails to translate into English the French of l.11. Instead, his ‘translation’ is an attempt to render just the one word \emph{nonchalure} of l.12 (‘Rechelys out of measure’, i.e. ‘immeasurably reckless’), after which he makes up a line (12) that does not correspond to the French at all. The meaning in Bibbesworth is that whilst the baker is baking, the housewife will not be idle. \textit{O} f.335ra has \emph{nounchalere} glossed by ‘ydell’.

\textsuperscript{250} MS \emph{nonch allure}.

\textsuperscript{251} MS ‘y bake’. 
Semina seminanda

Ore alez a semer vostre lyois,
Now goþ to sowe 3our flex,
Et ne obliez pas vostre chanere, And forçete nouȝt ȝoūre ȝempe,
Qar de lyois vous avez lez busceaux ffor of flex ȝe have ȝyze hoppes
Et de chaneare lez cordeaux. And of hempe ȝyze cordez.
Vostre lyn en temps sarchez, ȝoure flex in tyme wedŷ, And after in tyme drawe hyt uppe,
Et puis en temps sustreyez, And after þe sonne drye hyt,
Et donque en une putte reheitez, And after to bete hyt ȝe forseþ,
Et puis al solayl le secchez, And wît þat in wynter ȝe hetuþ.
Et puis a batre vostre forcez, Pur tout saver mult serroît beal.
Et ovê ceo en yvere vostre eschaufez. f And þanne in a putte reke hyt,
Pur tout saver mult serroît beal.
Et ovê ceo en yvere vostre eschaufez. f And wît þat in wynter ȝe hetuþ.
Gesir vous coviènt al pissel ffor al to knowe muche hyt were fayr.

---

252 The form chanere is probably an error for chanvere.
253 The final ‘e’ of ‘hempe’ here and in I.4 is problematic. The ‘p’ has an omission bar over it, but this may be otiose.
254 The transcription busceaux rather than Wright’s (1909) busteaux is supported by ‘buceus’ in the pronunciation guide. The perennial difficulty of making an unambiguous distinction between c and t is present in the Bibbesworth MSS as well as Femina, but Bibbesworth G v.417 uses the form bucheaus (ME ‘filax bolles’).
255 The chaneare of Femina looks like a misreading of chanver as in Bibbesworth O f.335ra.
256 Sarchez is a misreading for sarcler as in Bibbesworth G v.419 (ME ‘wede hit’), etc..
257 The ‘French’ putte is a form of puits. Bibbesworth B f.98v has puz, C f.7ra puiz. Forms similar to that in Femina are attested elsewhere in A-F (see AND puz1). The origin of the term (Latin puteus) means that the Femina scribe can use the same word in both French and ME. Reheitez seems to be a misreading for a form of the modern French technical term rouir. Bibbesworth MSS have various spellings for this (see AND rehaer), but Femina appears to be confusing it with rehaier ‘to gladden’.
258 The sense is that the prepared flax will eventually be used in clothing to keep people warm in winter. This interpolation is not found elsewhere in the Bibbesworth corpus.
259 Gesir (ME ‘Ley’) is a misreading of Bibbesworth C f.7ra which uses Seir i.e. ‘sit’. The housewife ‘lying’ at the swinglestock would achieve nothing.
260 Reference ‘a’ is repeated in the MS.
Ley hyt byhovyþ to þe swynglingstoke
ffor wel to swyngle 3oure flex,
ffor elles shal be þer noon ende.
And wharne atte swynglingystone hyt haþ hys deute,
þanne 3e shulle go to rybbe,
And after anoun ryȝt to ecchele,
And after a dystaf 3e purveyþ
And ordeyne 3ow a spyndylle
pat to craft have we shold.
And þe wherwe lat nayle.
More at þis tyme uel y 3ow nat say,
But 3ett y shal shewe a diversyte
Dount chescun n’est mye avisé.

2 Pur byen escucher le lyn,
Qar autrement n’ert ja fyn.
4 Et quant al pessel ad soun dever,
Donque irrés a rastuer,
6 Et puis tantost d serencez,
Et puis un knole vous purveiz
8 Et ordeynés vous un fusoun
Qi al art aver duissom.
10 Et le virel en failli.
Pluis al ore ne vous di,
12 Mez unquore monstrat un diversité
Dount chescun n’est mye avisé.

---

261 MS ‘by hovyþ’.
262 Escucher is an early example of the modern French écoucher. The Bibbesworth MSS have escuger (G v.425 and T f.125v), escucher ou esteonger (l. escouger) (A f.301vb), esquecher (O f.335ra), etc.. Although the modern English ‘to scutch’ clearly comes from the French, it is not attested until much later.
263 The scribe has confused the French homonyms fin = s.’end’ and fin = a. ‘fine’. His error makes nonsense of the verse.
264 The sense here must be along the lines of: ‘And when the swinglestock has done its job, Go ..’, but the syntax is not clear either in Bibbesworth or here.
265 MS ‘a noun’.
266 The ME ‘ecchele’ is Bibbesworth’s ‘hechele’, the modern English ‘hackle’. The scribe changes the syntax in mid sentence, irrés a rastuer (noun) running on to serencez (verb). This is because he misses out a verse in Bibbesworth, where the rastuer is followed by E la serence (= noun, ‘the hackle’) dunt pernez E vostre lyn serencez (G vv.430-32). A f.301vb and T f.125v have the same pattern as G, but O f.335ra omits the verse containing the noun serence, thus providing another hint as to the possible source of Femina.
267 The scribe’s knole is a strange spelling for conoil (Bibbesworth G v.433, etc.).
268 Femina differs from the Bibbesworth text here and so falls into error, the scribe using fusoun ‘abundance’, modern French foison, in order to get his rhyme with duissom, instead of the correct fusil ‘spindle’, as his ME shows.
269 The scribe leaves his source and writes ungrammatical nonsense in order to establish a rhyme. Bibbesworth warns against forgetting the fusil ‘spindle’ and the virel ‘whorl’ (G vv.434-5, etc.), but, whilst the ME in Femina reflects this, the French can make sense only if modified to read ne instead of en, giving Et le virel ne faille, ‘and let not the whorl be lacking’.

a ecucher b quant cu[m] u ponitur pro quando
c rater d tauntouzth
e vou f monrai
g checun
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>De <em>treis</em> chosez <em>serit</em> le <em>fusille</em>.(^{272})</th>
<th>When(^{270}) <em>everyman</em> ys nat <em>awysed</em>.(^{271})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Le fil est filé ové le <em>fusille</em>,</td>
<td>Of iijs <em>bynges</em> <em>servyp</em> <em>þe</em> <em>spindelle</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Et puis le <em>coilou</em>(^{274}) <em>fert</em> le <em>fusille</em>,</td>
<td><em>þe</em> <em>þred</em> ys <em>ysponne</em> <em>wit</em> <em>þe</em> <em>spyndele</em>,(^{273})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Et blé est molue <em>par</em> le <em>fusille</em>.</td>
<td>And <em>after</em> flynt <em>smyteþ</em> <em>þe</em> <em>spyndele</em>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Quant <em>vostre</em> fil est filé</td>
<td>And <em>com</em>(^{275}) <em>ys</em> <em>grounde</em> <em>wit</em> <em>þe</em> <em>spyndele</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Et <em>vostre fusille</em> est <em>p[ar]remplé</em>,(^{276})</td>
<td><em>Whanne</em> <em>3our</em> <em>þred</em> <em>ys</em> <em>isponne</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A la <em>trayle vous</em> <em>coviens</em>(^{b}) <em>aler</em></td>
<td>And <em>3our</em> <em>spindelle</em> <em>ys</em> <em>yfoold</em>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Et puis <em>irrés</em> a la <em>vauler</em>(^{277})</td>
<td>To <em>þe</em> <em>reel</em> 30w <em>byhovyp</em> <em>to</em> <em>go</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Com de <em>fileie</em> est la <em>manere</em>.</td>
<td>And <em>after</em> <em>3e</em> <em>shulle</em> <em>go</em> <em>to</em> <em>þe</em> <em>3arynwynder</em>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>Pondez tantost</em>(^{e}) <em>après</em>(^{e}) le <em>traul</em>,</td>
<td>As <em>of</em> <em>spymynge</em> <em>ys</em> <em>þe</em> <em>manere</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Et <em>pues</em> <em>après</em> <em>tistier</em> le <em>veil</em>.(^{279})</td>
<td><em>Weyþe</em> <em>anoun</em> <em>after</em> <em>þe</em> <em>3arn</em>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Et la <em>tisteresse</em>(^{f}) <em>quant</em> <em>parrubblé</em> <em>ad</em></td>
<td>And <em>after</em> <em>anoun</em> <em>wef</em> <em>þe</em> <em>web</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{270}\) The translation of *Doun* (‘of which’) by ‘When’ is incorrect.

\(^{271}\) MS ‘a wyysed’.

\(^{272}\) The final *e* of *fusille* here and below is problematic, the bar through the final *l* being used elsewhere in the text without any real meaning.

\(^{273}\) The final ‘e’ of ‘spyndele’ is problematic, but the form ‘spindelle’ above suggests perhaps that the bar through the final *l* is not otiose.

\(^{274}\) The word transcribed as *coilou* looks more like *coilon*, which would make no sense here. It is intended as a form of *caillow* (‘flint’), Bibbesworth *G* v.441 *cailloun* (ME ‘flint’).

\(^{275}\) MS ‘corn’.

\(^{276}\) The MS reads *pemple*, the bar through the stem of the initial *p* being missing.

\(^{277}\) *vauler* is Bibbesworth’s *voidere*, ME ‘yarnewynde’ (*G* v.447 etc.), a skein-winding reel. See Livingston (1953).

\(^{278}\) The scribe has failed to read his source correctly here. Bibbesworth says that when the thread is spun the spinster should go to the yarnwinder *Pur voider après le traul* i.e. ‘to empty the reel’ (*G* v.449), *Pur vaudeer...* (*C* f.7rb), etc. *Pondez in Femina* is a made-up quasi-Latin form intended to mean ‘weigh’as is proved by the ME ‘*weyþe*’.

\(^{279}\) The French and English here do not match. The French follows Bibbesworth: *E puis après tistrer le veil* (*G* v.450), & *pus après tister le voyl* (*C* f.7rb) etc. (‘And then I want to weave it’), but the ME is a command.

\(^{280}\) *Checun* is a repetition of the last pronunciation note on the previous page.
And þe webestere whanne worpyng she

Tantost lez tromes ele vaudrat. Anoun hyre tromes she wyndèh uppe.

Ore ay vous di qant apent Now y have yseyd how muche longeþ

florisp[r]is soulement. Outtake þe sley onlyche.

Ars braciatricis

Ore serroit a saver Now hit schal be to wyte

Del art a bresser & brasyr, Of crafft to mylde & to brewe,

Coment homme fait servoise How man makeþ ale

Pur noz ostez faire bien al ese. ffor oure gestez to make wel at eze.

Une keve large primez pernez A keve large fyrst takeþ

Et vostre orge enfoundrés, And zour bere aȝoteþ,

Et quant il est bien enfoundré And whanne hyt ys wel y3ote

Et la ewe est (soit) discouelé, And þe water be late out,

---

281 The ME translation ‘worpyn’ follows Bibbesworth B f.99r perru (ME ‘vorpyn’) and C f.7rb perru (ME ‘yworpen’) i.e. ‘thrown’, but the origin of the French remains unclear.

282 Tromez represents Bibbesworth’s trames (ME ‘spooles’) (G v.454), tremes (ME ‘pinnes’, with ‘speoles’ in the margin) (C f.7rb), tremes (ME ‘spoles’) (A f.301vb and T f.125v), tremous (ME ‘lones’, i.e. ‘looms’) (O f.335rb). Trame in both medieval and modern French means the threads, not the spool. See OED tram sb.1.

283 Vaudrat is Bibbesworth’s voidra (G v.454), veudera (ME ‘winden’) (C f.7rb), veudera (B f.99r), veudra (O f.335rb), i.e. ‘wind off, empty’.

284 ‘longeþ’ = ‘belongeth’.

285 ‘lalme’ is an erroneous spelling for la lame, the ‘slay’.

286 ‘Serroit’, confirmed by the English ‘shal be’, shows that Femina is following Bibbesworth C here: desore serroit a saver (f.7rb), rather than G: Ore ferreit bien a saver (v.461).

287 Enfoundrés does not mean ‘to pour’, the sense of ‘aȝoteþ’. Bibbesworth MSS translate correctly by ‘steep’ – G v.468 ‘stepe’, C f.7va ‘stiepe’ and ‘istipeed’, etc..

288 Either est or soit is redundant. Discouelé is Bibbesworth’s ‘laden outh’ (G v.470), where the imperative seit is used.
Moundez donque un soler

2 Et veiez que²⁸⁹ soit bien laler,²⁹⁰
Et la cocherez vostre blé

4 Tanque q’il soit bien germé.
Et donque tu appelleras

6 Brese qe avant blé nomas.
Le bres donque ové voz maynez mewez²⁹²

8 En mounceles²⁹³ ou en renges,
Et puis portez en un corbeil

10 Pur ensecher al torayl,
Qar corbeil ou corbylon

12 Vous servira tout al fusoun.

Make clene þanne a soler
And loke þat hyt be wel yswopud,
And þere 3e shalle ley 3oure corn²⁹¹
ffor to hyt be wel acome.
And þanne þu schalt clepe
Malt þat afore corn was named.
þat malt þanne wit your hand meweþ
In hepes ρɛɾ in rowes,
And after bērœp in a leep²⁹⁴
ffor to drye at þe host,²⁹⁵
ffor leœp ðœp basket
3e shal servise al at lust.

²⁸⁹ MS qI.
²⁹⁰ Laler is an error for balé, ‘swept’.
²⁹¹ Here and in l.6 ‘corn’ has a bar over the final ‘n’.
²⁹² Mevez = ‘stack’ as shown by the ME ‘meweþ’, but the French is a borrowing from the English going back to Bibbesworth G muez (v.350) and movez (v.477).
²⁹³ The MS reading is clearly mounteles.
²⁹⁴ ‘Leep’ has a superscript bar right across it. This has been ignored in the light of ‘leep’ without any abbreviation sign at l.11.
²⁹⁵ Here again Femina appears to be following C ‘at the hoste vel kulne’ (f.7va), rather than G ‘kulne’ (v.480).
Puis serra le breys molu
Et en eue chaude tout enbu,
Et donque voz lessez decurre tant
En un coverel mayntenant
Desque\(^a\)\(^297\) plein soit un doige beal,\(^b\)
En un coverel mayntenant
Desque\(^a\)\(^297\) plein soit un doige beal,\(^b\)

After shal þe malt be grounde
And in water warm al ydraweþ,
And þanne ȝe shal let hyt renne so
In a coverel\(^296\) anoon
Into þat ful be a droweþ fayre,
And after put hit aȝen in a messyngwhat
Into þe browestere in herte holdýþ
þat hit be wort at hire talent.
And after þe wort she shal take
Of whete oþer bere wheþer she hath,
And by þe\(^300\) berme & þe wort
Wherof\(^301\) more & more men sotileþ

---

[^296]: MS *poverel*. The scribe may be confusing *pocenet* and *coverel* here.
[^297]: The abbreviation at the end of *Desque* is repeated as a separate word between *Desque* and *plein*, presumably giving *Desque que*.* Cf. a not dissimilar grammatical error in l.7 *Jesse qi*.  
[^298]: This is English, not French. Bibbesworth G v.487 has *brescerece*, O 335va *brasseresse*, B 99v *braceresse*.  
[^299]: The phrase *en cuer tient* and its ME gloss are proof that the scribe has yet again failed to understand the Bibbesworth source. G v.487, O f.335va, etc. have *entent*, i.e. ‘until the brewster sees/understands that she has sufficient wort’.  
[^300]: The abbreviation sign over the first ‘þe’ is the superscript hook, quite different from the normal superscript ‘e’ found over the second ‘þe’.  
[^301]: MS ‘When of’. 
Par droit dever du bercere,\footnote{The abbreviation mark through the initial letter of \textit{bercere} is normally used to indicate \textit{er}. In this case, if it is to match the ME, it needs to be read as \textit{ra}, giving the substantivated infinitive \textit{bracere} ‘brewing’, the ME ‘browinge’. Cf. \textit{Par droit dever de brasserie} (ME ‘brewyng’) (Bibbesworth O 335va).} \footnote{MS ‘When of’}. 

Dount tout deviser ne say mye. \footnote{Cf. \textit{issint} (‘thus’) (Bibbesworth G v.495). The usual form of the word is \textit{issi}, which the \textit{Femina} scribe has incorrectly interpreted as \textit{icf} = ‘here’.} 

Mez tout yci\footnote{‘In to’ = ‘until’}. de art en art \footnote{\textit{Heit} may be either ‘he has’ or ‘there is’, i.e. \textit{il y ait}.} 

Chescun\footnote{\textit{‘In to’} = ‘until’}. autre en sa part \footnote{‘In to’ = ‘until’}. 

Tanque q’il eit\footnote{\textit{Qar} translates as ‘For’ rather than ‘That’ in ME.} bone servoise \footnote{The verb \textit{ebire} is not French, but a Latinism formed on \textit{ebiare}, as is the noun \textit{ebiresse} in ll.9 and 11 and on p.41.1.} 

Dount homme devient\footnote{The scribe completely fails to understand the Bibbesworth text, where the sense is that drunkenness makes a nobody – \textit{homme mesconnu} – be noticed – \textit{aver merk} (G v.504). \textit{Femina} takes its translation of \textit{mers} by ‘derke’ (i.e. ‘dark’) from \textit{O} f.335ra, presumably confusing \textit{mers} with \textit{neirs}. The whole line is nonsense.} si bien a eise, \footnote{The scribe completely fails to understand the Bibbesworth text, where the sense is that drunkenness makes a nobody – \textit{homme mesconnu} – be noticed – \textit{aver merk} (G v.504). \textit{Femina} takes its translation of \textit{mers} by ‘derke’ (i.e. ‘dark’) from \textit{O} f.335ra, presumably confusing \textit{mers} with \textit{neirs}. The whole line is nonsense.} 

Qar luy mesmez\footnote{\textit{Qar} translates as ‘For’ rather than ‘That’ in ME.} ad perné tant \footnote{\textit{Aroié} and ‘hoz’ mean ‘hoarse’}. 

Chescuna autre en sa part 

Q’il ebire\footnote{The verb \textit{ebire} is not French, but a Latinism formed on \textit{ebiare}, as is the noun \textit{ebiresse} in ll.9 and 11 and on p.41.1.} maintenant. \footnote{The verb \textit{ebire} is not French, but a Latinism formed on \textit{ebiare}, as is the noun \textit{ebiresse} in ll.9 and 11 and on p.41.1.} 

Ebiresse tient layez hommez & clerkys.\footnote{Dronkenesse holdeþ lewed men & clerkys.} 

Nulle\footnote{Cf. \textit{issint} (‘thus’) (Bibbesworth G v.495). The usual form of the word is \textit{issi}, which the \textit{Femina} scribe has incorrectly interpreted as \textit{icf} = ‘here’.} autre count fait\footnote{\textit{In to’} = ‘until’.} si mers.\footnote{\textit{In to’} = ‘until’.} 

Ebiresse fait homme chatoner, \footnote{\textit{Qar} translates as ‘For’ rather than ‘That’ in ME.} 

Et homme aroié\footnote{The verb \textit{ebire} is not French, but a Latinism formed on \textit{ebiare}, as is the noun \textit{ebiresse} in ll.9 and 11 and on p.41.1.} fayt hautt\footnote{The verb \textit{ebire} is not French, but a Latinism formed on \textit{ebiare}, as is the noun \textit{ebiresse} in ll.9 and 11 and on p.41.1.} huper. 

By ry3th deute of browynge, 

Whero\footnote{‘In to’ = ‘until’.} al devisne ne can y nat. 

But al here \textit{fram craft in craft} 

Every oþer in hys part 

In to\footnote{‘In to’ = ‘until’.} hyt be goud ale 

Whero\footnote{\textit{Pat} = ‘himself hath ytake so muche’.} man bycomeþ so wel at eze, 

\textit{Pat}\footnote{\textit{Pat} = ‘himself hath ytake so muche’.} hymself hath ytake so muche 

\textit{Pat} he wexit dronke anoun. 

Dronkenesse holdeþ lewed men & clerkys. 

Noun oþer knoweþ hyt makeþ so derke. 

Dronkenesse makeþ man to crie, 

And man hoz hyt makeþ heyze to crie. 

\begin{tabular}{llll}
\hline
a & checun & b & devint \\
\hline
e & nule & f & feet \\
\hline
c & memez & g & hautt \\
\hline
d & clerks \\
\end{tabular}
Ebiresse fait face du brykon. Dronkenesse makeþ þe visage of a myx
fful red wyþoute vermyloun.

Et donque dit homme par seynt George And þannte seyþ man by seynt Gorge
þat over mucho he hæþ dronke fat of bere,

Qi trop ad bu du grece d’orge,
þat hym byhovyþ go to reste,

Qi luy covie d’aler a repose,
By cause þat he may do noon oþer þynge.

A cause qe ne puet faire altre chose.

Ad prendendum pisces

Si assaver volez la manere 3y£ know þe wylle þe manere

Coment pissher devez en vivere, How fyssh menshal in ryvere,
Ryver est proprement nomé Ryver ys properly ynamed

Ou ewe vif est trové. Wher water ys quyk yfound.

Ove esponger primez espougez, Wyþ a sponge fyrst led out,

Et donque pissoms enqurere. 321

311 MS fate for face.
312 The pronunciation guide at the foot of the page shows that ters is to be read as tres, although spelt out in full.
313 Qi needs to be either Q’il or Qe grammatically and semantically.
314 MS literally grete, but the superscript e runs down into the t/c.
315 Qi needs to be Q’il. See l.4.
316 The same abbreviation is used in altre and ‘oþer’, so either altre or alter is possible.
317 Vivere means ‘fish-pond’, not ‘river’.
318 MS When for Wher.
319 MS Qe.
320 Since the same form is used for n and a, it is possible to read either esponger or espouger here. Various Bibbesworth MSS have the correct verb espucher, espouger, etc. (e.g. espuchez ME ‘laden hout’, G v. 517).
321 As so often, Femina follows the Bibbesworth B, C, O group of MSS here. Whilst G has Car du peisson la ne faudrez (v.518), C has Si du peissoun i querez (f.8ra), O Si de peschon y querez (f.335vb), etc.
And þan ne fyssh secheþ.

Et si vous⁹ failez en tiel estank,
Alez tantost⁹ al ewe corant.⁵

Alez donque sanz delay
Ou ewe est en batonay,

Et la pisshez ové nase,
Ou petit rey ou trové est grase.

Y1 y n’ad nase & crevere auxci,⁴
Comune frauncés ad chescun.⁶

Le nase est menement overez,³²⁸
Mez plus large parties assez

Ad le crevere, pur quoy jeo dy.
Nulle autre variance est en luy.

And ȝyf ȝe fayle in swych a pond,
Goþ anoun to water rennyge.³²²

Goþ þanne wyþoute delay
Wher³²³ water ys in batonay.i. moor,
And þere ȝe shulle fysshen wit a zene,
Ou .i. oþer lite nett when founde ys gras.³²⁵

Me haþ redde & zene also²³⁶
Comune frenshe to every man.

þe zene ys lytyl openid de forains,
But more large partiez ynow³

Hath þe reddere, for why y say.

---

322 If the scribe’s superscript bar is moved back from its position over the first ‘e’ to being over ‘yg’ it would give the correct ‘rennyge’.
323 MS ‘When’.
324 The scribe has simply copied the French and glossed it into ME.
325 The scribe does not understand his model. Bibbesworth G v.525 is clear: Ou petite rei ne trove grace ‘where a little net is useless’, literally, ‘does not find grace’. MSS B f.100r, C f.8ra and O f.335vb all have similar lines.
326 The negative in French is contradicted by the English ‘lytyl’, whilst Bibbesworth G v.528 has the correct menuement. The sense is that the seine has small holes, so the intrusive French de forains (‘on the outside’) in the ME is both gratuitous and incorrect.
327 The clear chescuun should read chescuni.
328 The scribe mistranslates overez. The meaning is ‘worked’, as shown in C f.8ra oeeverez glossed as ‘wrouht’.
329 Menement means ‘moderately’, contradicted by the English ‘lytyl’, whilst Bibbesworth G v.528 has the correct menuement. The sense is that the seine has small holes, so the intrusive French de forains (‘on the outside’) in the ME is both gratuitous and incorrect.
329 Parties is an error for pertuis ‘holes’ (sc. in the net). C f.8ra has pertuz glossed as ‘purles’, cf. OED Thirl sb.¹.
330 The crevere (modern French crible) is here correctly translated by ME ‘riddle’.
331 This note is placed in the MS at the beginning of the pronunciation guide on the next page.
Noun oper variaunce ys in hym.

Now say we azen to he matere
pat of fysshynge 3ow y shal say.

he botme of he zene torn upsedoun,

he ordure witynne cast hyt out.

pe botme of pe zene torn upsedoun,

he ordure witynne cast hyt out.

pe botme of pe zene torn upsedoun,

he ordure witynne cast hyt out.

pe botme of pe zene torn upsedoun,

he ordure witynne cast hyt out.

pe botme of pe zene torn upsedoun,

he ordure witynne cast hyt out.

pe botme of pe zene torn upsedoun,

he ordure witynne cast hyt out.

pe botme of pe zene torn upsedoun,

he ordure witynne cast hyt out.

pe botme of pe zene torn upsedoun,

he ordure witynne cast hyt out.

pe botme of pe zene torn upsedoun,
Et quant vous venez al verde tenayl\textsuperscript{343} into another tyme.

Ou le pastour est ové l’amayl,\textsuperscript{344}

Puis en boys alez soubz l’umbray[l],\textsuperscript{346} Passez donque par le horayl.

Yl y ad horail par .h. escript

Et orail sanz .h. dit.

De south le horayl soy kevere le laroun,

Et ové orayl oit chescun\textsuperscript{b} homme.

Mez qu’ez passomz\textsuperscript{c} avant,\textsuperscript{348}

De la tenayl\textsuperscript{349} serra\textsuperscript{350} disant,

Pur ceo\textsuperscript{d} q’yl y ad plusours de sens

Et plusours dez deferens.

\[\text{a suz} \quad \text{b checun} \quad \text{c passoumis} \quad \text{d purce}\]

---

\textsuperscript{341} MS ‘In to’.

\textsuperscript{342} MS ‘a noþer’.

\textsuperscript{343} Tenail is an error for terail ‘balk, ridge of unploughed land’. Whilst Bibbesworth G v.548 (similarly A and T) reads vert terail (ME ‘grene balke’), B f.101r, C f.8rb and O f.336ra have tenail, showing yet again the affinity between Femina and this group of MSS as opposed to the basic G MS.

\textsuperscript{344} MS ‘la mayl’.

\textsuperscript{345} MS ‘When’.

\textsuperscript{346} Umbrail is the usual form (Bibbesworth G v.550), also umbrail (B f.101r), oumbrail (C f.8rb), ombraille (O f.336ra).

\textsuperscript{347} MS ‘wode shave’.

\textsuperscript{348} This line should read: Mez einz qe […].

\textsuperscript{349} As in l.2 (where it is translated as ‘bank’), the scribe’s tenayl (ME ‘balk’) is an error for terail.

\textsuperscript{350} If serra is not simply an error for serai, it will have to be construed as an impersonal verb-form meaning ‘it will be said’.
And manye differensez.

2 Tenail est & tenoun
   Et tenayles d’autre\textsuperscript{a} appareil.
   Handele þere ys & tenoun
   And tenayles of oþer apparaile .i. tongues.

4 Lez cultoviers tienent\textsuperscript{b} le tenoun,
   Et parmy\textsuperscript{351} le tenayl\textsuperscript{352} passe prodom.\textsuperscript{353}
   þyse tylyers holdyn þe handle,
   And þoru þe balk passeþ þe goudman.

6 Mez tenayles servent de carbuns\textsuperscript{354}
   En yver quant a fyeu\textsuperscript{c} syoms,\textsuperscript{d}
   But tongues serveþ for colez
   In wynter wherme by þe fier we sitte,

8 Et al fevere serit de custoume\textsuperscript{e}
   Quant\textsuperscript{f} le martyl fiert \textsuperscript{g} al clume.
   And to þe smyth þey serve of custum
   Whan þe hamer smytþ on þe anfeld.\textsuperscript{355}

De tempore yemis

10 Ore pluit, ore geb,\textsuperscript{356}
    Ore remoyle, ore regele.
    Now hyt reyneþ, now hit f"rest,
    Now hyt Þaweþ, now hit fresuþ æzen.

12 Par le geb avoms\textsuperscript{g} glas,
    Et de geb vient\textsuperscript{357} verreglas\textsuperscript{358}
    Par le geb avoms glas,
    Verreglas.
By fforst we havyþ glas
And of glas comeþ verreglas.
fforst & reyn doun fallynge
fforst & reyn doun fallynge.
Maken þe way over hurtynge.
Maken þe way over hurtynge.
Now hit snewet, now hit sletuþ.
In myn mouth comeþ a flade of snow.

359 MS ‘verre glas’. The scribe uses the French glas and verreglas as though they were English terms. Bibbesworth C f.8va has glaz glossed by ‘ys’ and vereglaz glossed by ‘ysickel’. The pairs in O f.336rb are glace/’yce’ and verglace/’slidernes’.
360 MS ‘de ge tant’. The scribe has failed to recognize the verb neuter deguter, literally ‘to drip’, as in the Bibbesworth MSS, e.g. deguttant (G v.578), degoutaunt (B f.101v, C f.8va), using instead the verb active degeter ‘to throw down’, etc..
361 The final letter of chemyn has an otiose superscript bar.
362 The scribe has misunderstood Bibbesworth, where the French reads lidaunt and the ME gloss ‘szlidinde’ (i.e. ‘slippery’) (G v.579), lydaunt (ME ‘sliden’) (C f.8va).
363 MS remoie. Bibbesworth G v.580 has cymeie (ME ‘sletes’), O f.336rb has cemoe (ME ‘sletis’), C f.8va cemoye (ME ‘slieteth’).
364 The form piert given in full, together with pert in the pronunciation guide, are forms of perdre ‘to lose’. The Bibbesworth MSS use empier ‘to make worse’ – e.g. enpire (G v.581), empyre (C f.8va), empire (B f.101v). However, the ME ‘persheþ’ would suggest that the scribe was trying to use a form of perir, a verb neuter which would destroy the syntax.
365 ‘Swych’ may be read as ‘Swyche’ if the bar through the ‘h’ is intended to be ‘e’.
366 A superscript bar over ‘myn’ is otiose.
367 MS qi.
368 The scribe’s gele destroys Bibbesworth’s play on homonyms grele (ME ‘haileth’) and grele (ME ‘smale’) in G vv.584-5. O f.336rb reads: Nous avons gresle (ME ‘hail’) puis grele (ME ‘hasles’) Gros (ME ‘greet’) non pas trop grele (ME ‘smal’). The relevant terms in C f.8vb are greele (ME ‘haylep’) and trop greele (ME ‘oversmal’).
369 CEf vint on pp.45.13 and 46.7.
In wynter when þe weþer chaungeþ
And þe tyme bycomeþ so strange

Qe homem ne peut le suffre
And þat man nat suffre hyt
ffor distresse of wynter

Dount l’avez la mayn estomé
Wherefore þe haveþ þe hond so komelet

Qe pur la freydure ne poyez mye
þat for cold þe may nouȝth
Dez deiez faire la capinole.
Wit fyngers make þe hok .i. cumulare.

Multþ ore vault sur plume mole
Muche now ys word on reyn nesshe
Seer pres de fieul divers le karole
Sitte by fyer aȝeynes cole

Chaperon & vestuez de blaverole
Hod & cloþ of blew,
Ou de quyler la primerole.

Mez cueri de femme est si mole
Oþer to gadere þe primerose.
Quat biaux bacheler l’acole,
But þe herte of a woman ys so nesshe

Qe sovent al bret parole

---

372 Both grammar and rhyme call for suffer.
373 The definite article before avez is otiose.
374 The rhyme would call for the form estomi as in Bibbesworth MSS.
375 ‘Wher’ has been substituted for MS ‘When’, the ‘n’ being indicated by the usual superscript bar.
376 Capinole is a form of campernole, ‘a little bell’, the reference being to bending the fingers into the shape of a bell. The ME ‘hok’ is clear enough, but the scribe’s Latin ‘cumulare’, presumably for ‘cumulare’, does not fit the case. Glosses in the Bibbesworth MSS use forms of the modern English ‘mould’.
377 MS pluine (there is a superscript mark for i over the third minim of m), translated by ‘reyn’; however, the sense, which the scribe has failed to understand, requires plume.
378 Divers is a form of devers, ‘by’, ‘beside’.
379 Karole is ‘the dance’, misunderstood by the scribe as ‘cole’ (i.e. ‘coal’). Bibbesworth G vv.605ff. says that in winter he would prefer to sit on a soft cushion by the fire rather than be dancing (out of doors) with corn-flowers round his hat.
380 Femina puts chaperon ‘hod’ (i.e. ‘hood’) instead of chapeu (‘hat’), then destroys the sense by inserting the ampersand, thus making vestuez into a noun instead of a past participle, the mistake being confirmed by the ME gloss which likewise has the ampersand.
381 Femina puts chaperon ‘hod’ (i.e. ‘hood’) instead of chapeu (‘hat’), then destroys the sense by inserting the ampersand, thus making vestuez into a noun instead of a past participle, the mistake being confirmed by the ME gloss which likewise has the ampersand.
382 ‘Cloþ of blev’ as a translation of vestuez de blaverole (‘decked with cornflowers’) completes the catalogue of scribal errors.
383 MS tuer.
384 MS la cole.
385 Only the characters br with a bar through the stem of b have been written. The expansion is based on the corresponding ME translation ‘short’.
386 The first letter of ‘ettomé’ is not clear. To read ‘étomé’ would mean interpreting the first ‘t’ as an ‘e’.
2 Whanne fayr man hyre byholdyþ,\textsuperscript{387} 
ffemme folle le recole.

4 \textit{pat} ynow\textsuperscript{388} at short speche
Jeo\textsuperscript{e} ay or le verolez 
I have now þyze pokkys
Et les rubeux\textsuperscript{b} ové roles\textsuperscript{390}
And þyze red rowes
6 Et facent\textsuperscript{391} ore lez placez folez 
And makeþ now þyze plac[e]z foule 
Et lez folez lez karolez. 
And þyze folez þyze karoles.
8 Mez pur apandre ceux\textsuperscript{c} innocens
But to teche þyze innocentes 
De virolez vous di plus de sens, 
Of virole 3ow y say mo wyttys, 
10 Pur ceo q'yl y ad virole, verol & varole
ffor \textit{pat} me haþ virole, verol & varole
Qe soutnt de divers escole.\textsuperscript{d}
\textit{pat} beth of divers scolys.
12 La virole\textsuperscript{392} le mambre\textsuperscript{393} garde
\textit{pe} virole \textit{pe} haft kepyþ 
Du cotel du mal mussarde, 
14 Et le virole\textsuperscript{394} le face enpire
\begin{tabular}{llll}
\textit{a} & \textit{ie} & \textit{b} & \textit{rebeus} \\
\textit{c} & \textit{ceus} & \textit{d} & \textit{ecole} \\
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{387} The ME gloss ‘byholdyþ’ is an error for ‘embraces’.
\textsuperscript{388} The ME gloss ‘ynow’ (‘enough’) for sovent is an elementary error.
\textsuperscript{389} Recole is mistranslated, as was acole: it means ‘embraces in return’.
\textsuperscript{390} The scribe has completely failed to understand his model here. Bibbesworth says that he wishes to God that loose women had faces full of small-pox and the male rascals (ribaus) had measles (les rugeroles, ME ‘maselinges’) (G v.620-22); the latter would then cease their embracing and the former would leave their dancing and avoid unsavoury places. Neither the vocabulary nor the syntax of Femina in this passage makes sense, the scribe turning Bibbesworth’s rugeroles into rubeux ové roles, although several MSS have clear ME glosses, e.g. ‘meselys’ (B f.102r), ‘maesles’ (C 9ra), ‘meselynges’ (O f.336va), etc.. The form ‘rebeus’ in the pronunciation guide is a senseless invention on a par with the rest of the passage.
\textsuperscript{391} The key error here is the form facent, a misreading in Femina of forms of laisser found in the Bibbesworth MSS. There are no grounds for introducing a subjunctive here, where the Bibbesworth MSS have a conditional or future tense, so Femina offends against both lexis and syntax.
\textsuperscript{392} Virole here is the modern French virole and is the etymological origin of English ‘ferrule’, the guard that prevents the fool from cutting himself with his knife.
\textsuperscript{393} The Bibbesworth MSS have maunche instead of mambre (G v.630, B f.102r, C 9ra, O f.336va), meaning that the ferrule protects the handle of the evil wrongdoer’s knife, whilst Femina would mean that it protects the limb of the wrongdoer from his knife.
\textsuperscript{394} This virole is the modern French vérole ‘pox’ that disfigures the face.
49

De chescun a fool & sage sire.

4 Mez ceo b est un varole pur veire
Qi de cholet cret c de nature.

6 Une verme est q’est d verde est 396 de coloure.
En fraunce e varole est nomé.

De nominibus herbarum

8 Le jour devient f beau & cler.
Aloms h en auste 398 pur juer

10 En verger ou sout lez florues 399
Dount issent lez doulez k odours,

12 Erbez auxci pur medicine.
Et lour nouns jeo l voile devine 402

Of þe knyff of þe lyther grom,
And þe pockes þe face enpersheþ
Of every foul & wyseman,
But þat ys a wort worim 395 for soþ
þat of wortys groweþ by kynde.
A worim hyt ys þat grene ys of colour.
In fraunce a varole he ys named.

Be þe day bycomeþ 397 fayr & cler.
Go we in somer to playe
In erber wher 400 ben þyze florues
Wher 401 of gon out þyze swete odours,
Erbez also for medicine.

395 The ‘wort worim’ is a caterpillar. Bibbesworth C f.9ra glosses varole as ‘a grene wort worm’.
396 The three-fold repetition of est destroys the syntax. The simplest way to restore good sense would be to read quest as que.
397 MS ‘by comeþ’.
398 Auste (ME ‘somer’) is not found in this passage in the main Bibbesworth MSS. It can mean ‘August’, ‘summer’, ‘autumn’ or ‘harvest’ in medieval French, but here its pronunciation is given as ete, clearly the modern été.
399 In all the cases of florues, odours on pp.49 and 50 the strict interpretation of the abbreviation sign would give flourus, odourus.
400 MS ‘when’.
401 MS ‘When’.
402 Syntax is sacrificed here to rhyme. Bibbesworth G v.643 has Dunt les noms ci vous divine ‘Whose names I tell you here’. Femina replaces the pronoun vous by the active verb form voile, thus juxtaposing two active verbs and destroying the sense. The ME reflects the Bibbesworth original rather than the incorrect Femina version.
And here namez y wylle divine.

fflour de rose, flour de lys,
Lyz pur royne, rose pur pitz.

Also 3e havyþ þyze sorele,
Et pur la teste vault la pareele.

And for þe heved ys worth þe dokke.

Parele þer ys, parel & pareux.
De toez manerez dez oseaux.

Of alle manere of bryddys

When couple ys of male & female,
Ceo est un parel & non pas parele,

þat ys a payre and nouȝth a dokke,
Qar ambedeaux souȝt pareux nomez

ffor boþe togedere þey beþ named

After þat togedere þey be in neste.

Qe ne soit mye oblier

3ytt to flourys y wyl go.
Yl y ad flour de sworcye, Me ṣh flour of ṣe rode,  ṣat hyt be nat forȝete
Qe as lez eulez fait grant b aie, ṣat to eyen dop gret helpe, Primerose & primeveire,
Qe moustrent en temps de veire.  ṣat shew with hem in tyme of somer,
Et la consoude cret auxci, And ṣe dayesye wexith also,
Comune erbe est a chescun. Comune erbe ys to every man.
Ermoysse auxci troverez, Mugwort also ȝe shal fynd,
Et plantayne si lez querez. And waybred ȝyf se seche.
Mez si vous trovez en vostre erber But ȝyf ȝoω fynde in erber
Ameroke ou glocomer, Merche ȝeρ clote,
Lez arasshez ové un bisacu, Hym rasep uppe wit a mattok.
Et plantez chloet en lour lieu.9

---

407 MS ‘for ȝete’.
408 MS swortye. This is a form of surcie, etc. ‘marigold’.
409 The scribe appears not to know that the definite article is contained in as, making his lez superfluous.
410 Bibbesworth G v.649 and also the ME here show that the reflexive pronoun se has been omitted before ‘moustrent’.
411 Veire means ‘spring’, not ‘summer’, as in O f.336vb where it is glossed as ‘tyme comyng’. Cf. p.49.9 where autste is translated as ‘somer’.
412 In order to secure the rhyme, chescun should read chescuni, as indicated in the pronunciation guide below.
413 The scribe’s confusion of c and t produces glocomer here instead of glutomer. The source of Femina is suggested again by the translation of this term. Bibbesworth G v.672 translates only ameroke (‘maythe’), but C provides a translation also for its gletouner ‘clote’ (f.9va) and B similarly has gletoner ‘clote’ (f.102v).
En verger ou arbers cressent,
And setteþ wortes in hare place.

Pur charge du frut plusours415 abessent.
In erber wher414 trees wexyþ

Pomer, perysyr & seryser,
ffor charge of frut manye b(l)oweþ.416
ffirene, jonet & pruner,
Appiltre, peretre & cherytre,

Ceneiler qe ceneilez porte,
Assh,417 brom & plowmtre,
ffourder qe fourdeynez porte
Haweþorin418 þat hawes beruþ,

Et glenter420 porte lez piperongez
Sloþorin419 þat sloez beruþ
Et creker qe porte lez crekez roundez.
And þe bolace tre þat beruþ þe bolacez round.

Auxci3 avez lez coigneres
Also þe havyþ þys coigne treys
En plusours dez vergers,
In manye of þes erberes,

Dount il y ad diversite grant,
Wher of421 me hap diversite gret,
Et multez ne savent quant.

a aucey

414 ‘Wher’, MS ‘when’.
415 As on pp.44 and 49, the abbreviation here and in l.11 could be resolved to give either plusours or, more strictly, plusours.
416 ‘Bloweþ’ is an elementary error for ‘boweþ’.
417 The bar through the ‘h’ here and on p.54.2 might be read as e (i.e. ‘Asshe’), rather than as otiose.
418 MS ‘Hawe þorin’.
419 MS ‘Slo þorin’.
420 Et glenter or glentre corresponds to Et glentier in Bibbesworth B f.102v, rather than the Eglenter of G v.681 or Eglentier of C f.9vb.
421 ‘Wher of’, MS ‘When of’.
Lez seignoires fount leur naifes coigner. And manye knowe nat how manye. 

En leur ceaths pur chastiser, hyse lordes doth hyse bondemen in stokkys

Et pernez le coigne, abatez le coigner; In hare kyves for to chaste,

Et copez un coyne du coigner. And takep þe quynz, smytt doum þe coynetre,

Et coignier est il ensement And hakkeþ a wegg of þe coynetre.

Qi fait moneye de bone argent. And a coyner ys he also

Et autres arbres souont auxcl. Pur aprendre chescuny:

Pur aprenestre chescunye. And oþer trees þer beþ also.

Biux, paulmer & arrable, Box, palmer & mapyl,

Qi creste multfoiz er terre arable, þat makeþ moneye of goud sylver.

Et la hiusse, y creste auay en verger, And holim wexþp also in orchard,

Qy poy vault pur edifier.

And holim wexþp also in orchard,

---

422 The scribe does not translate the verb coigner, ‘to put (violently), thrust’, Bibbesworth coigner (ME ‘stocken’) in B f.102v, koigner (ME ‘stocken’) in C f.9vb, coigner (ME ‘to sitte’) in O f.337ra.

423 An unidentified and apparently unfinished word ‘ch-‘ stands between ‘hare‘ and ‘kyves‘.

424 MS cepe. The emendation is supported by Bibbesworth G v.694 coupez and by the ME ‘hakkeþ’ here.

425 MS ‘al so’ here and in ll.8, 12 and p.54.2.

426 The dot over the i in Biux is clear, showing that the scribe does not know the French for ‘box’ (buit in Bibbesworth G v.699, buys in O f.337ra, huis in B f.103r, huis (ME ‘box’) in C f.10ra, etc.).

427 The dot over the i in hiussie is clear, showing that the scribe does not know the French for ‘holly’ (houce in Bibbesworth G v.702, huise (ME ‘holine’) in O f.337ra, huce (ME ‘hulner’) in B f.103r, haise (ME ‘holin’) in C f.10ra, etc.).

428 Reference ‘e’ is repeated in the MS.

429 Reference ‘f’ is repeated in the MS.
2  Et le lorme\textsuperscript{430} il\textsuperscript{431} crest aucey,  \textit{þat} lytyl ys worth to buld. 
Comune arbre a chescuny.\textsuperscript{a}  And þe elle hyt growyþ also, 
4  Saal, chene & yff,  Comune tre to every man. 
De quelle franceis\textsuperscript{b} n’y ad strif.  Wethy, assh\textsuperscript{432} & hw, 

\textit{De nominibus avium}

6  Quant\textsuperscript{c} de verger avoms\textsuperscript{d} le choys,  Of wych frensh haþ no strif.
Ore aloms\textsuperscript{e} jewer en boys  Of wych frensh haþ no strif. 
8  Oyer le russinole le gale\textsuperscript{433}  When of orchard we havyþ þe choys, 
Qy melour chaunte\textsuperscript{434} qe huwayn en sale.  Now go we to pleye in wode 
10  Et mellour chaunte le maweys en bossoun  To here þe note of þe nyȝtyngeale 
Qe le sors\textsuperscript{436} in measoun.\textsuperscript{f}  þat beter syngeþ þanne dop þe owle in halle. 
12  En braunche seet la merele,  And better syngeþ þe ðroostyl in þe buss\textsuperscript{435} 
En mareis demurrat\textsuperscript{437} la herele.  þanne þe rethemous in þe hous. 

\begin{itemize}
\item a checuny
\item b frauncyeys cum u
\item c quaunt cum u pro
\item d avoumis
\item e alommis
\item f mesoun
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{430} The definite article in the French \textit{l’orme} has been agglutinated to the noun and a second article attached, giving \textit{le lorme}. The translation of \textit{le lorme} (= \textit{l’orme}) by ME ‘elle’ (= ‘elder’) is incorrect, the correct form being the slightly different ‘elm’.

\textsuperscript{431} The agglutinated \textit{l} of \textit{il} is incorrect, the sense being ‘there’ (i.e. \textit{il} = \textit{y}).

\textsuperscript{432} ‘Assh’ is an error for ‘oak’.

\textsuperscript{433} Syntax here would demand \textit{de le or du russinole}. Cf. \textit{Oir de rusinole le gal} (Bibbesworth B f.103r), \textit{Oir du russhignole le gal} (C f.10ra), \textit{Oiez de le riussinole le gale} (O f.337rb). All these appear to be corruptions of Bibbesworth G v.713 \textit{Ou la russinole, the nichtingale, Meuz chaunte […]}. 

\textsuperscript{434} \textit{Chaunte} is written above ‘syngeþ’.

\textsuperscript{435} ‘Buss’ is like ‘assh’ on p.52.5, ‘fyssh’ on p.56.1 and ‘dysch’ on p.56.12.

\textsuperscript{436} \textit{Sors} is a truncated form of \textit{chauf sorriz}, ME ‘bat’, as in Bibbesworth G v.716, etc..

\textsuperscript{437} The form transcribed as \textit{demurrat} is not clear, but the sense is ‘dwell’.
In braunche sett þe þrosshe, 438

In mareis duellyþ þe shełldrake.

3ytt 439 have 3e þe star,

And þe bryd by name wodelarke.

In owen dwellyþ þe creket.

Unquore avez le ffylaunder,

Þyse fysshes wit fynnes swymmeþ.

Et le oysel par noun chalandre.

ffynes & wyngez be divers,

En four maynt le salemandre.

Discordynge seyen þyze clerkes.

In eyle & elez souwt divers,

Wit fynnes swymmeþ þyze fysshes,

Eyle & eylez paunde. 441

And wit wynges fleeþ þyse sparyes.

Et ové elez volent les mussoms.

Also we havyþ to drowne, swymme,

En discordanþ lez clerks. b

rowe & snowyne,

Ové eiles nownt lez pissoms,

Wherof 444 þe resoun ys to wyte.

Et ové elez sout divers,

En mear e naee le pissou.

En mear est noez mult f prodom. 445

a dishordanþ cum u b clerks
c avoumis d feet
e meer f mut

438 The French merele is merle with the abbreviation sign over the wrong letter and is wrongly translated. Bibbesworth G v.717 has the correct ME ‘osel’, with ‘hosel brid’, ‘oselbrid’ and ‘oolsel brid’ in other MSS.

439 The French unquore means ‘in addition’, whilst ‘3ytt’ implies contrast.

440 The plural definite article before a singular noun and verb is an elementary error.

441 The scribe’s ‘swymmeþ’ is incorrect. Bibbesworth G v.729 glosses paunde as ‘flakerers’, C f.10rb as ‘bat’ (i.e. beats, flaps). The verb may be a form of paumoier (Godefroy 6.47c-48b).

442 Ens is a misreading of Bibbesworth’s Ausi (G v.739), as the ME ‘Also’ testifies.

443 The homonyms naer and noer, ideally from Latin nature and necare, are not clearly separated in medieval French. See Rothwell (1976).

444 MS ‘When of’.

445 The text here and in the pronunciation guide is very difficult to read accurately, being written over an earlier text. The form given as noez in l.14 is in conformity with the infinitive forms set out in l.11, but the reading is conjectural.
In zee swymmep þe fyssh.
In zee ys drowned many goudman.
And witt ores shal man rowe

En batil ou est bon mariner.
In boot wher ys a goud mariner.

Mais en yvere veioms néger
But in wynter we seyth snowe

Et lez amphee environ voler.
And þyze fladis aboute ñle.

Avoms auxci b espandre ñ & espeandre,a
We havyþ also espandre & espeandre,

Espandre ensemet & pauandre.
Espandre also & pauandre.

Il espande conseil d’amy
He sheweþ consel of a frend

Qi discovere ne doit a nullyd,
þat discovere ne shold to no man,

Et l’enfant multfoith f espeande
And a chyld ofte tyme shedeþ

Hors de esquilb souv viande.
Out of hys dysch hys mete.

Et ové eilez paunde pissoun

quant vif en rey lubb purnoun

---

a vioums449 b aucy c espandre d nuly
e lenfraunt cum u f mutfoiz g equyl h ly

---

446 MS ‘when’.
447 MS ‘a boute’.
448 From here to the bottom of the page the scribe is attempting to separate into four spellings and four different meanings two medieval French verbs, espandre and espeudre. The former covered the senses ‘to spread’ (of seed, information, etc.), ‘to spill’ (of food, etc.), which survives in modern English as ‘to spawn’; the latter meant ‘to spell’, the more ‘normal’ form espelir giving the modern French épeler and the modern English ‘to spell’. The widespread similarity of scribal n and u is in part responsible for the resulting confusion that is present in both the Bibbesworth MSS and Femina. Like the Bibbesworth MSS, the scribe of Femina has no difficulty with espandre meaning ‘to spread’ (information) or ‘to spill’ (food), but the form pauandre is not sure (see note to p.55.6).
449 MS ‘vioumis’.
And wiforns swympene þe fyssh
Whanne quyk in nett hym we takeþ.

But to spele ys a speche
þat clerks usen in hare scole.

And þyt þey spele kyndely,

Alle þyze letres to geder þey takeþ.
3yt to bryddys say we aþen,

Wher452 more lerne þere we mowe.

In chambre & oþer placez also

Peyncith man þat bryd wodekok,

And þe rowddok also.

And hyt hæþ double entendement

L’une est oisel, l’autre forester.

---

450 *Espeandre* has a clear n, but, since there is no regularly observed difference between the scribe’s n and his u, this could be read as the correct *espeaudre* ‘to spell’. Consequently, *espaudent* in l.5 could be read as *espaudent*. This whole homonymic mix-up is an artificial exercise in both Bibbesworth and *Femina*.

451 As noted earlier (p.8.2), the form *redirroms* is derived not from *dire*, but from *aler*, i.e. ‘we return’.

452 MS ‘When’.

453 The MS has *aillous*, with an omission mark over the ou. This mark usually represents ur, but, if read as simply r here, would give the more common *aillours*. Since the scribe’s use of superscript marks is not regular, it would be wrong to postulate a genuine form *aillours* from this one occurrence. Cf. *pledours* on p.18.9, *plusours* on p.44.12, *floures* on p.49.10 and *plusours* on p.52.2.

454 MS Ly. The initial capital L is confirmed by an identical letter in the next line.
Me haþ vërrëder & verëdir, ðe on yþ a brydd, ðat ðëp er a forëster.

Qar par luy a vole le vërrëder, ðëfëre by hym fëlée ðe ruddok, fëore by hym fëlée ðe ruddok,

Et ceo b vit bien le vërrëdir. And ðat seeth wel ðe forëster. And ðan he comeþ a wrenne

Et donque vient c une reistele And ðan ne comeþ a wrenne ffleynge abouþ a stok.

Volant enviroun un trass[e]le. 456 And ðach wel ÷e wrenne

Et mult d e plëst e un petit reistele And much hit plesuþ a lytyl wrenne

Avironer un grant f trasselle To go abouþ a gret stok

Qe ascun f beal b touche du vële i ðan eny fayr touch of ðe vyþele

Ou le note d’une fistele. 458 Oþ ðër ðët ðëf of ðë pipe.

Unqore avez un mussenge 3ytt have 3e on hekemose

Qi 459 lez haires ou boys renge. 3yf ðyze heges in wod 3e seche.

Dilacez vostre renge

Si renger voleþ le mussenge.

a ly b ce c vint d mut 460
e pleet f graunt cum u g acun h beel
i vile

455 The text in this and the following line makes no sense, because the scribe has misunderstood the Bibbesworth text. G says that par cy vole le vereuder, i.e. ‘the wren flies over here’, and par la voit li forester, i.e. ‘over there goes the forëster’ (vv.757-8). The Femina scribe has not recognized the opposition between par cy and par la and has taken voit as part of the verb ‘to see’ instead of as an attested form of the present indicative of aler.

456 Bibbesworth G vv.760 and 762 has tresel and trescel respectively, glossed in both cases by ‘stoëc’. O f.337va has tressel twice spelt in full and glossed by ‘stakke’, but B f.103v has trussel and C f.10a also has trussel, glossed by ‘schocke’. The continental French form is tassel (Godefroy 7.654b and T-L 10.132). The abbreviation sign in Femina could be interpreted as indicating ru as well as ra.

457 The French mult ought to be a comparative – meuz, as in Bibbesworth G v.761, and the corresponding ME ‘much’ ought to be ‘more’.

458 Fistele gives further evidence of the scribe’s preoccupation with Latin, being a form of fistula. The Bibbesworth MSS have the normal Old French frestele.

459 MS Si, which error has brought with it the erroneous ‘3yf’ of the ME. Bibbesworth G v.766 reads Ki, whilst O f.337va spells Que in full.

460 ‘Mut’ has been added above the line.
Ungryd\textsuperscript{461} jour swerd gyrdy\textsuperscript{462}

3yf 3e wyle seche þe he kemose.

Also 3e have þe goddyskuow \textsuperscript{463}

And also þe goldfynch.

3ytt have we þyze botterfliez

Yf e wyle seche þe he kemose.

Also 3e have þe goddyskuow \textsuperscript{463}

And also þe goldfynch.

3ytt have we þyze botterfliez

Qe volunters volount par chardoms

And in þyze breres also

Et en lez rouncexe\textsuperscript{c} ensemement

Qe prende pommes qe chient jus.

Mugez\textsuperscript{466} & wybez ne fouunt mye,

Qar ils ayment plus la urtie.

\textsuperscript{461}‘Ungryd’ sic.

\textsuperscript{462} Bibbesworth G v.767 ‘gurdel’.

\textsuperscript{463} The link between Femina and the B and C versions of Bibbesworth is again shown here in the ME for ‘ladybird’, both these MSS having ‘godescow’ (B f.103v), ‘godeskow’ (C f.10vb), whereas G has ‘rede fleye’ (v.769) and O ‘wodechou’ and ‘litel body’ (f.337vb).

\textsuperscript{464} If the scribe’s orthography were to be slavishly followed, the text would read pampilonis, rhyming with \textit{chardoms}>chardonis. However, he sometimes places a dot over a letter that cannot be read as ‘i’, so here the dot has been disregarded to give pampiloms, which itself is somewhat removed from the more usual papiloun, etc..

\textsuperscript{465} The form grissilour is read by Wright (1909) as grissiloun, but this does not rhyme with sojour in the following verse and, in any case, the word has the same superscript abbreviation mark as curtilagez, denoting either or or r, not the one used to denote a missing n. Bibbesworth G v.775 has grissilou (ME ‘greshop’), O f.337vb griselour, etc..

\textsuperscript{466} Mugez is a form of mouches as used in Bibbesworth G v.779.
ffliez ne gnattez ne dōp nouȝth,  
ffor þey love better þe netle.  
Also we havȝ henede & doke.  
In ryver þey have hare dwellynge.  
In mores duellyþ þyze lepewynkes,  
In toynes þe þyze lanez.  
In graunge we usen þe wanne,  
And þe envious haþ þe hate.  
Here comþ fleyng þe wylde goos.  
A brandgoos to hym ys felawet.  
And much ys worþ a brandgoos yrosted  
Muche betere þan þe fleþ of a rook

a avoumis  b vilez  c usoumis  d vint  
e ly  f mut  g vaut  h acun

---

467 Ensy is again an error for Ausi. See also p. 69.5  
468 Pluisoun ‘dolke’ is not accurate. The form plusoun is a distortion of the A-F plungun (cf. p.8.9). Bibbesworth G correctly glosses plounoun as ‘doukere’ in v.278 and plunjoun similarly in v.781. C has ane (ME ‘enede’) and plounczoun (ME ‘teal’) (f.303vb), O has ane (ME ‘duk’) and plungeon without gloss (f.333vb). Ane is the ‘duck’ and plungeon etc. the ‘coot’ or ‘diver’. See AND plungun and OED ducker1.  
469 Bibbesworth G v.782 has [v]yvere, i.e. ‘pond’, instead of Femina’s ryver.  
470 Socier means literally ‘associated’ hence ‘accompanying’ in this context. Bibbesworth O f.338rb has ‘compaigner’. The use of the -ier ending rather than -ié of the adjectival past participle is demanded by the rhyme with roser. Ouwe roser is an accepted compound noun ‘wild goose’.  
471 The faulty syntax here reveals again the inadequacy of the Femina scribe’s knowledge of French. The Bibbesworth MSS have syntactically correct entries, e.g. E meuz serroie de un blareth pu (G v.789), Miex serei de blareth pu (B f.104r), Et mieux serroye de un blaret pu (C f.11ra), all meaning ‘I would be better fed on a coot’. Additionally, there is no mandate in the French for the ME ‘yrosted’. The Bibbesworth MSS vary in their interpretation of brallet, only B taking it to mean a ‘brend gos’, whilst for A it is a ‘balled cote’ (i.e. ‘coot’), for C a ‘bernak’, for O a ‘corneraunt’ and T a ‘belled gos’.  
472 The initial letter of cygoin is a clear crossed t, but tygoin makes no sense.
And more ys swyfter a swalue

Et le api a la severounde

Prent le mussoun & le arounde.

Et le oisel qi ad noun bibikaz

Pres la ryver est pris en las.

Chauant de cokkow en esté avoms.a

Pur praiser ceo ne tendoms.b

Mez plus vaultc pel de ffoun

Que chaunt d’asyne⁴⁷⁴ ou de poun.

Mez du poun la bealee⁴⁰ cowe

Est dilitable a la vewe.

Mez pluis ayme archer penne de poun

And more ys swyfter a swalue

þan eny snyte⁴⁷³ þat ys in world.

And þe bee⁴⁷⁴ at þe hous efze

Takeþ þe sparue & þe swalue.

And þe bryd þat haþ name beke

By þe ryver ys take in gin.

Song of kokkow in somer we have.

To preyse þat take we noun hede.

But more ys worþ þe skyn of a foyn⁴⁷⁵

þan songe of asse oþer of pown .i. pave

But of þe pokok þe fayr tayl

Ys dilatable to þe sy3the.

a avoumis   b tendoumis   c vaut   d dayne

e bele   f echeker

⁴⁷³ The cigogne is a ‘stork’, not a ‘snipe’.

⁴⁷⁴ The absurdity of the bee capturing sparrows and larks in the eaves of a house has been pointed out elsewhere (Rothwell 1998). The Femina scribe has yet again failed to understand his model, his form apie clearly coming from the Latin apis. The Bibbesworth texts have no mention of the bee, giving severoundel (G v.793), ceverowndel (B f.104r), severoundel (O f.337vb), ceveroundel (C f.11ra), etc., with ME glosses ‘busche net’, ‘sparo net’ and ‘sparewenet’. Obviously, it is the net that captures the birds, not a ‘bee’.

⁴⁷⁵ The form ‘foyn’ is questionable, because it is written as ‘foyn’ with a superscript bar that usually denotes a missing ‘n/m’. This has been ignored as otiose.

⁴⁷⁶ As in ‘foyn’ (l.9 above), paun has over its final two letters the superscript abbreviation mark that usually denotes a missing ‘n/m’, but here it would appear to be otiose.
But more love þe archer þe penne of þe pakok
þan in cheker a mat of þe paun.477

De nominibus animalium

Jeo³ veie un grant toisoun, 478
I saw a gret brok,

Et guerpy479 ad sa mansion
And hap forsake480 hys dwellyngplace

Pur le fein481 d’un gopyl
ffor þe stynke of a vox

Qi luy ad mysb en exil.
þat hym hap put owte.

Et hony soit le mal putoys,
And wo be þe evyl putoyse,482

Si soit en villec ou en boys.
þat he be in toun or wode.

Et mal aventure a luy soyt.
And evyl aventure to hym be.

La grete483 gelyne a lua,f retrait.484
þe grete hen to hym he draweþ.

Mez plus vaulte un belete
But more ys [worþ]485 a keme

Pur fayrf ma graunge de ratouns nete
To make my graunge of ratones clene

Qe toutz les taupes jesch a Paris

a  ie          b  mijs           c  vile           d  ly
 e  vaut       f  fere          g  taupes          h  jeque

477 As at the foot of the preceding page, ‘paun’ has a superscript abbreviation mark which is here ignored.
478 The form toisoun for ‘badger’ is not attested elsewhere, more normal forms being teissun, tes(s)un, etc.;
Bibbesworth G v.805 has tesschom, C f.11rb teyssoun, O f.338ra tesson, etc.
479 The p is not fully formed, but the alternative guerry makes no sense.
480 MS ‘for sake’.
481 Fein is from finus, ‘excrement’.
482 The normal ME for the ‘pole-cat’ is ‘fulmard’, ‘fulymard’ in Bibbesworth G v.809. The scribe appears to be simply copying the A-F putoys with his ‘putoyse’.
483 Although it might be possible to read the t of grete as a c, the superscript e prevents the correct reading grace i.e. grasse (‘fat’) being adopted here, as in Bibbesworth G v.812. This is confirmed by the ME, where there is a very clear ‘t’ and an equally clear superscript ‘e’. The scribe has yet again failed to understand his source.
Bibbsworth says that the polecat does not worry, providing that he has a fat hen to his delight. As so often,
Femina writes nonsense, to the effect that the polecat draws to himself the ‘great’ hen, creating a French feminine adjective grete in the process.
484 The locution a son reheit is unknown to the scribe. The Bibbesworth MSS provide the correct translation in
ME, glossing reheit as ‘gladi(i)ng’, ‘gladdyng’ or ‘gladhinge’.
485 The ME ‘worþ’ has been added to account for the French verb vault.
De proprietatibus bige

Le charet jeo voile discrive

Of þe cart y wyl discrive

Et mettre yci en nostre livere.

De lez roos vous di primour,

Of þe whyles ȝow y say fyrst,

Et puis dé bendeux\(^488\) que souzt entour.

And after of þyze bendes þat beþ aboute.

En lez bendez que souzt de fer

In þese bondez þat beþ of yre

Sount lez chantez entoTZ de fer.

Beþ þyze spichez\(^489\) ytachet of yre.

En lez jauntez\(^490\) entrten lez raes,

In þe fleghes\(^491\) entrten þese spokes,

Et de solayl\(^492\) issent lez rayes.

And of þe sonne goþ out þese sonnebemes.

Mez lez raes en le charret

But þese spokes in þe cart

En lez moaux\(^4\) est lour resset.

In þese navez\(^493\) ys hare resset.

\(^a\) tapines \(^b\) dicrê \(^c\) bendeus \(^d\) mous

---

\(^486\) ‘Henne’ = ‘hence’ (MED *henne*).

\(^487\) MS *sount*.

\(^488\) (Ll.6ff.) The parts of the wheel involved here are the outer iron bands, the rim, the spokes and the hubs. In A-F these are represented by *bendeux/bendes, chantez/jauntez, raes and moaux*; their ME equivalents are ‘bendes/bondez’, ‘fleghes’, ‘spokes’, ‘navez’. The *Femina* scribe apparently imagines that his *chauntez* and *jauntez* are separate words with different meanings, whereas *chauntez* is no more than a spelling variant of *jauntez*, the alternation of initial c(h)/j being frequently found in the French of England.

\(^489\) ‘Spichez’ (i.e. ‘spokes’) is wrongly used to translate the French *chauntez* in l.8.

\(^490\) The beginning of *jauntez* is illegible.

\(^491\) The ME ‘fleghes’ is a form of ‘fellowes’.

\(^492\) The beginning of *solayl* is illegible.

\(^493\) MS ‘namez’.
Lez moaux gisent entre⁴⁹⁴ le roof,⁴⁹⁵ ðese navez⁴⁹⁶ leggeþ witynne ðe wheyle, Rhygth as ðe zelk of an ay.

Toutdroit com le moel⁹ del oof. On ys mad to bere gret charge, Un est fait⁰ pur grant charge porter, ⁴⁹⁵ þat oþer for gret goud mete.

Et luy⁵ autre pur bon manger. Mez en le moel gist l’essel, But in ðe nave⁴⁹⁷ lyþ þe zextre, Mez en le moel gist l’essel, But in þe nave⁴⁹⁷ lyþ þe zextre, ryght as ðe zelk of an ay.

Toutdroit com le moel⁹ del oof. Rhygth as ðe zelk of an ay.

Un est fait⁰ pur grant charge porter, ⁴⁹⁵ þat oþer for gret goud mete.

Et luy⁵ autre pur bon manger. Mez en le moel gist l’essel, But in ðe nave⁴⁹⁷ lyþ þe zextre, ryght as ðe zelk of an ay.

Un est fait⁰ pur grant charge porter, ⁴⁹⁵ þat oþer for gret goud mete.

Et luy⁵ autre pur bon manger. Mez en le moel gist l’essel, But in ðe nave⁴⁹⁷ lyþ þe zextre, ryght as ðe zelk of an ay.

Un est fait⁰ pur grant charge porter, ⁴⁹⁵ þat oþer for gret goud mete.

Et luy⁵ autre pur bon manger. Mez en le moel gist l’essel, But in ðe nave⁴⁹⁷ lyþ þe zextre, ryght as ðe zelk of an ay.
En le mear naent lez raies,                  In þe ze swymmeþ þese rayes i. pisces,
Et vers lez faires veignant lez raies.         And toward fayres comeþ rayes i. vestura.
Auxci avoms essel & assel,                   Also we havyþ essel & assel,
Et la tierce parole huisselle.                And þe thrydde word huisselle.
Le chart gist sur le assel,                  þe cart lyþ on þe zextre,
Et en le moel gist le essel.                 An[d] in þe nawe lyþ þe 3ex.
Mez le huisselle avez vous                   But þe armhole505 have 3ow
En vostre bras par desoubz. d                In 3our armez bynethe.506
En lez lymoms vat le lyme[n]our              In þe lymones goþ þe lymener
Et en dos porte sou[n] dosser,                And on hys rugge he beruþ hys rygrope,
Et al ventre le venter,                      And at þe wombe hys womerope,508
Et a la cowe le vauner.                      And at þe tayl þe taylrope.

a meer                                        b avoumis   c git    d souz

505 MS ‘arm hole’ with a superfluous fourth minim in ‘arm’.
506 MS ‘by nethe’.
507 The MS could be read as either lymoms or lyonis. Wright (1909) chose the latter, presumably on account of the strange but clear ‘avoumis’ in the pronunciation guide at the foot of the page. If the scribe did indeed mean lyonis, his knowledge of French was even worse than might be suspected. In the final word on this line the superscript abbreviation sign for n has been omitted. Bibbesworth has a perfectly straightforward verse – En lymons (ME ‘thilles’) veet li limouner (ME ‘thille hors’) (G vv.873-4).
508 MS ‘wombe rope’. 
8 Qe a ventre porte 512 le lemen. 513
Le traser 515 od le braserole 516
10 Qi lez lymons brace a cole 517
Devant lez bracerolez sount bilettes
12 Taylez de coteaux 519 ou hachettes.

A mydwyff & a wombope me hap.  
pey beth as freensh me hap seyd
Venteree ys properlyche ynamed
A womanpat in toofe dwellyp
To helpe in cas here neybore,
Whanne she shal lygge in gesyne. 511
But properly seyp man ventrer

The final word divers ruins the rhyme, metre and sense of this line. Most of the Bibbesworth MSS follow the gist of G: Divers cum vous orrez ja (v.878), but O has the unsatisfactory Que ont entre eux difference sa (f.338va), which may have influenced Femeina. It looks as though the intrusive divers ought to come after ‘seyd’ in the ME.

The rhyme calls for a past participle demorré, but there is no auxiliary verb. This error is caused by the scribe introducing en ville in place of Bibbesworth’s auxiliary est to give the correct est demorré (G v.880). C f.11vb and O f.338va follow G here.

The ME ‘gesyne’ is a good illustration of the penetration of French into the lexis of English, especially from the fourteenth century. Bibbesworth G v.882 has ME ‘childing’, C f.11vb and O f.338va ME ‘childbedde’.

The scribe uses the standard abbreviation for par in error for por, giving parte instead of porte.

Lemer lacks a syllable: it must be read as lemener (for the usual limoner, as in Bibbesworth G v.884 lymoner).

Having made this error in French, the scribe goes on to repeat it as ostensibly a ME term.

The scribe’s French form traser shows yet again that he is following the Bibbesworth B, C and O group of MSS – traicier (B f.104v), traver (C f.11vb), trasier (O f.338va). G has the normal French tracies (v.885), A trases (f.304rb) – T-L trait ‘Zugstrick, Strang’ (10.510). The ME gloss ‘trays’ in Femeina and Bibbesworth B and C shows that the French form in –er used in these MSS is aberrant and has not passed into English.

The braserole here and the plural braceroles in 1.11 mean the ring(s) through which the traces pass. The Bibbesworth MSS use the word, G vv.885 and 887 without any ME gloss, A glossing it as ‘henekes of trays’ (f.304rb), B ‘eye of the trayse’ (f.104v), C ‘the eye of the trase’ (f.11vb), etc., so the meaning is not in doubt. Yet T-L (1.1105) does not provide a gloss for the term, but gives three quotations in which it must have quite different senses, the first referring to a noble lady’s apparel, the second from Bibbesworth meaning ‘embracing’, the third also from Bibbesworth, this time in the present equine sense and taken from A. The reference from T-L to Godefrey 1.715c is no less confused, the single gloss ‘camisole de nuit’ being set above first the Bibbesworth quotation in which braceroles means ‘embraces’, and then another which probably refers to an ornamental band on a lady’s night-dress and a third in which it certainly cannot mean ‘camisole de nuit’, being applied to children and given the adjective magnifiques.

The scribe’s brace a cole is nonsense. The simplest correction would be to use the form in Bibbesworth C f.11vb Oe les lymons embrace (ME ‘bicluppeth’) & acole (ME ‘halseth’). G v.886 uses the aphetic cole for acole, reading Ki les lymons embraye e cole (ME ‘bicluppes’). Acoillir here means ‘to receive, take in’.

MS ‘brasyngeyez’.

Coteaux is a plural form of cotel/c(o)ujetel.

The ME ‘ycorve’ means ‘carved’ (see OED carve v.).

Reference ‘c’ occurs twice over this item at the foot of the page, placed over both coteaux and coteus.
Lez coilez du chivales portent eisselez,

Escolers de quyer ové lour hosselez. Coleres of leþyr wite berynghamez.

Et si le charuer ad sa riorte And gyf þe carter have hys whype

4 Dount lez chivalez en cours resorte, Wherwitt pyze hors in cours he resortez,

Donque ad tout qe a luy appent, þanne hath he al þat hym bylongeþ,

Et assez suffit si luy tient. And ynought hit suffizeþ he hym holdeþ.

Mez pur estre c plus sachaut, But to be more conyngge,

8 Vous dirai eynez qe passe avant, 3ow more y shal say here y passe forþe,

Le droit a fayre a chareiter, þe ryztth to do to þe carter,

10 Et ensement le charuer. And also to þe godeenye.531

Le charetter le styrle avera, þe kartere þe horscombe shal have,

12 Dount lez chivalez correiera. Wherwitt hys hors he shal correye.

---

522 Coilez is a plural form of col, not to be confused with coiles ‘testicles’.
523 The singular article with a plural noun is a blatant error.
524 Escolers are ‘scholars’, not ‘collars’.
525 The forms eisselez and hosselez are made-up words based on the ‘standard’ astele/estele, basically a stick and here the ‘hame’ which supports the horse-collar. Bibesworth G vv.889-890 has esceles (ME ‘hambrowes’) and osseles (ME ‘homes’), whilst other MSS have similar forms unattested elsewhere. See Rothwell (2002).
526 MS ‘When wite’.
527 ‘corus’.
528 Tout que should be tout ce que.
529 This line makes no sense as it stands. Bibbesworth B reads: Que a taunt suffit qui que l’entent (f.105r), C similarly: Qe en taunt suffist qui que l’entent (f.12ra), i.e. ‘For it (sc. what I have said) is sufficient for anyone who understands it’; O reads: Qu’en tant suffist (ME ‘is ynoughe’) que l’entent (ME ‘understode’) (f.338va), i.e. ‘For it is sufficient for him to understand it’. Femina has confused tient (<tenir) and entent (<entendre), hence ME ‘holdeþ’ instead of ‘understands’.
530 The superscript abbreviation is the normal one for a, but in view of the scribe’s lack of precision in his use of abbreviations it has been expanded as ai, as on p.64.12.
531 The A-F and ME do not correspond here. The ME ‘godeenye’ means ‘goading’. Bibbesworth G v.902 says that the ploughman carries la aguilloun (ME ‘gode’), but Femina does not mention this, yet introduces the term ‘godeenye’ completely out of context.
532 MS ‘When wite’.
Et le bover ne teigne a gas

2 Pur 533 bien ffroter sez bestez 534 ové cordas 534
Einz q’ils 535 b souunt bien 535 enbeverez.

4 Mez al soir souunt waiez. 535
Waier yl 535 ad proprement,

6 Si dit l’auctor que ne ment,
Qar beof 535 & chivalez souunt waiez

8 Et totez autres bestes lavez.
Puis q’ore sufft du charret,

10 De la charue ore me entremet.
En la charue avez vous

12 Diversez 537 nouns & merveilous.

And þe oxeherde holdeþ hyt no trifle
ffor wel to firote hys oxen wit a waze
Ere þey be wel ywatered.
But at even þey shal be wel wasshe.
A wayre me hath properly,
So seþ þe aotor þat lyþ nat,
ffore oxen & hors beþ ywatered
And al oþer bestes ywasshe.
After 536 þat hyt suffizeþ of þe cart,
Of þe plow now y wyl me entremette.
In þe plow have 3e
Divers namez and merweylous.

---

533 The sense of ll.1-2 is that the cowherd must not neglect to rub down his animals with a wisp of hay/straw before they are watered. The scribe of Femina, however, goes wrong in terms of both syntax and vocabulary. Whilst the Bibbesworth MSS use the normal Que and a subjunctive after the injunction not to neglect the work, Femina has Pur and an infinitive.

534 Rubbing down animals with abrasive cord material as in the French would not be a good idea, but the ME ‘waze’, i.e. wisp of straw, etc., shows that the sense is clear. The scribe has misread his source yet again: Bibbesworth B has torcas (f.105r), C torkaz (f.12ra), O torkas (f.338va), all giving clear glosses meaning ‘wisp’. G has torbas, probably a spelling error for torkas (v.906).

535 Waiez, glossed here as ‘wasshe’, is translated as ‘watered’, as opposed to lavez ‘wasshe’. As usual, Femina is following the Bibbesworth MSS B, C and O. B gives waiez ‘wasched’ (f.105r), but opposes the animals to which the verbs are applied rather than the terms themselves, saying that cheval & boef sunt waiez Et totes autres bestes lavez, i.e. waer is a synonym of laver applied specifically to horses and cattle. C f.12ra and O f.338va follow suit. Bibbesworth G likewise makes the distinction between the animals to which the terms are applied (vv.911-12), but erroneously glosses waiez in v.908 as ‘watred’. This gloss ought to be attached to enbeverez in v.907.

536 The causal Puisqwe is erroneously translated by the temporal ‘After’.

537 The second e is inserted above the line.
Primez le chieff\(^a\) & le penoun,  
ffyrst þe heved & þe foot,

2 Donque\(^{538}\) le manuel & le tenoun.  
þanne þe handle & þe styte.
Par desoubz\(^b\) gist le oriloun,  
Bysythe\(^{539}\) lyhe þe ryȝtthe,\(^{540}\)
Et plus amount\(^{541}\) est l’eschecoun.\(^d\)  
And more above lyhe þe shelfryȝtthe.\(^{542}\)
Le soche ensy & le fсмер\(^{543}\)  
þe cultor also & þe shar

6 Avera le charue de droyt dever.  
Shal þe plow have of ryȝtth deute.
En longe la charue gist la haie,  
In longes þe plow lyþ þe beem,
8 Qi vient\(^c\) de boys ou de haye.  
þat comeþ of wode or of hegge.\(^{544}\)
Unqore avez un mallet,  
þyt have a maylet,
10 Et un mondeloun pur faire\(^f\) luy\(^e\) nette.  
And an gretstaf to make hyt clene.
Lez boofs portent lez jue  
þyze oxen beryþ þyze 30kes
12 Pur cristienx & pur Jewes.  
ffor cristien men & for Jewes.

\([^a\) cheif\(b\) souz\(c\) gijt\(d\) lechecoun\(e\) vint\(f\) fere\(g\) ly\(h\)\]
Et par lez acoms\textsuperscript{545} fichez en juez\textsuperscript{546} And by þese bowes ystyket in 3okes

2 Sount\textsuperscript{547} lez beofs si forts\textsuperscript{548} artés\textsuperscript{549} Beþ þese oxen yforset so harde

Qy\textsuperscript{550} lez\textsuperscript{551} covient\textsuperscript{a} maugré loure þat hem byhovyp maugre hem

4 Par l’augloun eschuer\textsuperscript{b} errour. By þe gode eschue errour.

Ad edificandum domos

Si vous\textsuperscript{c} avez ou\textsuperscript{552} penser 3yf 3e have in þou3th

6 Measoun\textsuperscript{d} ou chambre pur\textsuperscript{553} edifier, Howz or chamber for to buld,

Il covient\textsuperscript{e} al comencement Hyt byhovyþ at þe fyreste

8 Pur fayre\textsuperscript{f} un boun foundement, To make a goud foundement,

Et plus\textsuperscript{554} pur lever le misere, And more to rere uppe þe helewoghes,

10 Dount femme est dit messnere. Whereof\textsuperscript{555} a womman ys sayd houswyf.

Il y ad messier & meissere, Me haþ messier & meissere,

12 Entenduz en divers manere.

---

\textsuperscript{545} Acoms (read a[r]couns?) is intended to be the arsons (ME ‘oxebowes’) of Bibbesworth A f.304va, arzouns (ME ‘3ocbowes’) of B f.105v, arzouns (ME ‘3ocbowen’) of C f.12rb, arzouns (ME ‘oxe bowhes’) of T f.131v.

\textsuperscript{546} MS enques.

\textsuperscript{547} MS Dount. This spelling error is not the only mistake here.

\textsuperscript{548} The adjectival agreement on forts, used adverbially, is ungrammatical.

\textsuperscript{549} To make sense, artes must be read as artés, the past participle of arter ‘to constrain’, as confirmed in Bibbesworth O f.338vb arzecz (ME ‘constreynd’), but this destroys the rhyme. Femina has altered the word-order in Bibbesworth, where the past participle fermés ends the line and rhymes with arzecz (G vv.933-4).

\textsuperscript{550} Read Q’y[ll].

\textsuperscript{551} The use of the accusative lez with covient, instead of the dative leur/lour, is found in Bibbesworth and elsewhere in A-F.

\textsuperscript{552} The preposition en might be expected here, being normally used with penser and found in the Bibbesworth MSS, but the initial o is very clear, with the second letter being indiscriminately n or u. The word must be either a misspelling of en or the compound preposition en le > ou. In either case, the sense is not altered.

\textsuperscript{553} Pur here and in ll.8 and 9 is an Anglicism, representing the English ‘to’. The Bibbesworth MSS do not use a preposition at all before the infinitive and follow covient by que and a finite verb.

\textsuperscript{554} Bibbesworth G v.941 has the correct puis ‘then’, not plus ‘more’.

\textsuperscript{555} MS ‘Whenof’.
Understand in divers manere.

Lez messierez ount lez champs en cure,
Mez meissiere fait le measoun sure.

Ceo est le mure qi enclose le court,
Mez ceo est meissiere ou couple la zhourt.

Et un pareye est ensemment.
De l’une part & de l’autre prent. And a wal hyt ys also.

Sur la meissere en travers outre. On þe woghe in travers above.
Amoun le celer mettez poutre. Above þe celer put a poudre.

La poutre en sale doit homme poser
Et le poutre ensy en soler,

And on þese gystez þe planchys
De bord ou plastre bien pavyé.

---

556 The past participle entenduz would call for ‘understood’.
557 The scribe has paraphrased the French in his English, but without getting the French right. Bibbesworth reads: E mesere ou coumble aourt (v.944), and this is made more explicit by C: & ceo est mesiere ou coumble (ME ‘roof’) ahourt (ME ‘sattle to’) (f.12va), i.e. ‘and it is a wall to which the roof is attached’. The scribe of Femina fails to recognize the verb aerdre ‘to be attached (to)’.
558 The verb prendre here follows the Bibbesworth MSS and means ‘to reach, stretch’ (T-L 7.1759-60), but the Femina scribe interprets it as ‘to take’, which makes no sense.
559 MS ‘a bove’. Similarly in the following line.
560 The scribe of Femina does not understand the two meanings of poutre and so fails to grasp the play on homonyms set out in the Bibbesworth original as conveyed by MSS A, C and G. The first meaning of poutre is ‘beam’, the second ‘foal’, but the Femina text has merely the ME calque ‘poudre’ in both cases, so that the lines 9-11 make no sense until read with the Bibbesworth texts to hand. G reads as follows: Sur la mesere en travers outre. Amont le celer mettez le poutre. Au pilier desouz le poutre De chevestre liez le poutre (vv.949-52), i.e. ‘On the wall right across Put the beam on top of the cellar. Tie the foal with a halter To the pillar below the beam.’ The first poutre is glossed by the ME ‘wivertre’. A does not diverge from the overall sense here, glossing the first poutre as ‘wivetre’ and the second as ‘file’ (i.e. ‘filly’) (f.304va). C uses ‘bem’ to gloss the first poutre (f.12rb) and later puts ‘wyver tres’ (f.12va), with the second sense (‘foal’) glossed as ‘filye’ (f.12va).
561 MS plantye.
562 MS ‘planthys’ or ‘plannthys’. Ll.11-12 fail to render the precision in Bibbesworth, who states clearly that: en vostre soler desuz le poutre Trestuz les seillouns mettez outre, i.e. ‘in your upper room on top of the beam set all your rafters’. The form transcribed as plancyé could, of course, be read as plancye, but this would bring the reading pavye and so an infinitive pavir instead of paver.
Sur la meissiere lez trahes mettez.

De deux a chiveroms un couple facez.

Qi ferme estera sur le meissere

Par kiville & par terere.

Donque ne fault comble par noun.

De tout amount le measoun

Covient d’aver un longe gwenchuron

Dount le couple est plus suor.

Mez pur plus avant parler,

Vous ne devez o[b]lier

Et vous covient d’aver brenchoms

De cloams f fychez a voz measonez.

---

561 The *couple* is a pair of rafters going up from the walls and meeting at the top to secure the roof, although the OED under *couple* sb.8 defines it as ‘One of a pair of inclined rafters or beams that meet at the top and are linked at the bottom by a tie […]’. Like *Femina*, Bibbesworth O uses the word for both French and English (f.339ra).

562 MS. forme.

563 *De tout* is probably an error for *Et tout*.

564 The form *gwenchouron* is not found elsewhere. Bibbesworth G has *genchour* glossed as ‘pantre’ (v.963); C f.12vb has *guenchour* (ME ‘pantreo’); O f.339ra *gwengeor* (ME ‘furtst’). The sense ‘purlin’, ‘cross-beam’ is indicated by the glosses and it would appear to be connected with the verb *guenchir*.

565 MS ‘When’.

566 The copulative *Et* is out of place and should be *Que* as in the Bibbesworth MSS to make good sense.

567 The form *brenchoms* follows Bibbesworth C f.12vb *brenchouns* (ME ‘lappen’) and O f.339ra *brenchouns* (ME ‘lathyns’). Bibbesworth G has *grenchouns* (ME ‘lathyes’) at v.969. None of these forms is found in the dictionaries.

568 The form *cloams* (see AND2 *clou*) said to be pronounced as ‘clays’, is shown by the ME gloss to mean ‘nails’, so is a spelling error for *clous*, and its pronunciation ought to be given as ‘clous’. Bibbesworth G gives the normal *clous* at v.970. O f.339ra uses the past participle *cloufeuchés*, glossed as ‘nayles’ and without the *de* of *Femina*. 

---

Of bord or plaster wel ypavyd.

On þe woghes seþ zoure bemez.

Of tuo rafters a couple makeþ

Þat faste shal stande uppon þe woghe

By þe treyn pyn & by þe wymbyl.

Þanne fayleþ nouȝth but rof by name.

Al abowe þe hous

Hyt byhovyþ to have a long lyene

Wher of þe couple ys more suer.

Butte for more farther to speke

3e shulle nauȝth forȝete

And ȝow byhovyþ to have latys
Wyþ naylez ynayled to ȝoure house
And stantyz to walle also.
ffor swich a lernynge yzow say,
ffor me hþ trenchoms & trenchesoms,
Wher573 of discord ys of namez.
ffor stantiz bþp mad to housez,
And trenchoms makyn hors dye.

And in hors þey bþp namely
When þey eten evyle.577

qytte be hyt wel to wyte
þat in ryȝth of an hous to make

Of deute hyt byhovyp to be

---

571 Trenchoms are the modern English ‘transoms’. Bibbesworth G has trenchons at vv.971 and 975, glossed as ‘splentes’ and ‘splentres’. The OED knows of no link between the Latin transtrum and the modern English form ‘transom’. See Rothwell (1998), pp.77-8.

572 The clear superscript bar over nouns has been ignored.

573 MS ‘When’.

574 This line is incomplete and makes no sense in either French or English. Bibbesworth G makes good sense, having: Car trenchons sunt (ed. sunt) a mesoun eese (v.975); O f.339ra follows suit.

575 The sense is that colic occurs especially in horses. The ME gloss in Bibbesworth G v.976 is ‘gnawinges’.

576 Ou is being used here where quant is needed.

577 The ‘v’ is a superscript correction.

578 Endroit means ‘as regards’ and is followed in correct French by de, as in Bibbesworth G v.980. The ME ‘in ryȝth of’ is a literal translation of each part of the French word.

579 MS afaire in one word and ‘afere’ in the pronunciation guide.

580 Estre is incorrectly used here in place of y avoir or a clause qu’il y ait....

581 The initial letter of laumeire is an incorrect agglutination of the definite article. The French word is aumeire, as is found in Bibbesworth MSS and is made plain at the top of the next page.
The homonyms aumeire and ameire are taken from Bibbesworth and their juxtaposition is not found elsewhere. In the sense of 'lover' aumeire may be a mistake for fumere, found as meaning 'smoke-hole' in a building contract of 1384 in Salzman (1952) p.465.

In the absence of the word at the rhyme it is impossible to tell for certain whether we are dealing with fume or fumé. See The Anglo-Norman Voyage of St Brendan (Short and Merrilees 1976), Notes to vv.1166 and 1170.

MS 'Whe', with a clear superscript abbreviation mark for 'm/n' over the 'e'.

The scribe does not provide a ME translation for viaire, giving simply 'viande' to cover both viande and viaire in A-F. Bibbesworth G v.988 does not give a ME gloss for either term, but C glosses viaire as 'lyflode' (f.13ra), i.e. 'food, victuals'. O translates viaunde as 'mete' and viareie as 'drynke' (f.339rb). T-L's sole attestation of the word (11.385) is taken from Bibbesworth.

Even if prendre here were to be interpreted as a spelling error for pendre, with the superscript abbreviation mark read as e rather than re, the ME 'take' would still betray the scribe's failure to understand his Bibbesworth model. C has pendre (f.13ra) and O pender (f.339vb). Obviously, the door is to be 'hung', not 'taken'.

The initial Et is an error for En.

Verteil in T-L 11.332 is glossed as 'Wirbel der Spindel (= 'swivel'); 'Spund' (= 'bung'), 'Wasserwirbel, Strudel' (= 'whirlpool').

The repetition of the incorrect 'l' for 'j' indicates that the scribe did not know the word.
Ore faitez cleket & serrure,
Et donque est le measoun tout sure.

Mondez le measoun, coilez jonchez,
Mettez la table, donque covered la.

Ameynz qu se soyt estable.
De unne nape covered le haut table,

Et la secunde auxcei coverez
De blauce nape si vous avez.

Et si la sale soyt trop salee
N’est mye a preyser en sale.

Pluis vault blauce nape mult usé
Qe la novel mult enbowé.

3yff tuo twystez we have.
Now makep clyket & loke,
And Ḧanne ys Ḧe hous al seker.
Make clene Ḧe hous, gadere rysshen,
Leye Ḧe table, Ḧanne kevere hyre.
Anon Ḧat hyt by do.
Wyth a cloth kevere Ḧe hey3he table,
And Ḧe secunde also kevere
Wyb whyt naperie 3yf 3e have.
And 3yf Ḧe halle be over fflowle
Hyt ys nat to preyse in halle.

More ys worth why3t cloþ yused

---

594 MS jambe. The ME ‘rysshen’ shows that ‘rushes’ is the intended word.
595 The sense would appear to be ‘Let it (sc. the table) at least – au moins – be stable’. Bibbesworth G does not have this at all, so Femina must again be following a version akin to C: Au meins que ce point soit estable (f.13rb), or the less accurate O: Que meins que cest point soit estable (f.339rb). The ME version of this line does not reflect the presumed sense.
596 Sale and its ME gloss ‘halle’ are totally out of place here: the Bibbesworth MSS have the expected nape (G v.1029, C f.13va, O f.339rb).
597 The final word salee (ME ‘fflowle’), meaning ‘salty’, not ‘dirty’, ought to be sale to rhyme with sale in l.11. Here again, the Bibbesworth MSS have no difficulty. The final t of trop, when read together with the strange ‘pronunciation’ advice that the word should be pronounced as trop, would suggest, not for the first time, that the scribe’s familiarity with real French was not great. He probably meant that trop is to be pronounced ‘tro’.
598 The final ‘p’ of ‘trop’ is uncertain. Cf ‘тро’ on p.80.4.
Lavez hanopez, moundez esquilez,\(^a\) 
Lez anglez copez jespue\(^b\) as ascieles.\(^b\)

Alé a quystron’ ové toun\(^c\) havet 
Et estreiez le hagyz du posnet.

Et mettez a\(^d\) vostre veile ruche 
Desouth\(^d\) voz potz, \(^e\) non pas la luche.

Alez a luchere ové la luche, 
Et priez la dame que ta\(^f\) coiffe luche.

Mez a la ruche\(^g\) redirroms\(^g\) 
 Ou plusz apren dre y parroms.\(^g\)

La ruche\(^h\) servira de aeps,\(^h\) 
 Ou noz vioms’ voler lez dees.\(^i\)

\(^a\) panne þe newe muche enboweþ. 
\(^b\) Wassh coppez, make clene dissches, þys angles swope into corneres. 
\(^c\) Go to þe quystron wyþ þyn fleshok 
And draweþ out þe hagys of þe posnet. 
And put to 3oure olde hyve 
Above 3our pottes, nat þe ladyl. 
Go 3e\(^j\) to þe slykestere wit þe slykston, 
And pray þat dame þat she þy coyfe [slyke].\(^j\)

\(^d\) This line makes no sense in French and its ME ‘translation’ is totally aberrant. Bibbesworth \(\mathbf{G}\) reads: *Coupés des cysours dé umbles* (= ongles: ME ‘nailes’) les eles (v.1034); \(\mathbf{C}\) *coupez les ongles* (ME ‘the nailes of the vingres’) *du sqe as cieles* (‘wortewales’ in margin) (f.13va); \(\mathbf{O}\) *Et ongles* (ME ‘nailes’) *coupés desqes a cieles* (ME ‘wertwales’) (f.339rb). The sense in all three is that the finger-nails should be cut down to the agnails. The problem in *Femina* is *eles* (ME ‘agnails’) which, when run together with the preposition *a* and the definite article *les* to give *as*, produces the agglutinated form *ascieles*, quite outside the competence of the scribe, who guesses that it means ‘corners’ and also fails to understand *copez* ‘cut’, translating it as ‘sweep’. The total result is gibberish.

\(^e\) The MS reads *tout*, not *toun*. This line makes sense only if the intrusive preposition *a* is removed. Bibbesworth \(\mathbf{G}\) has the simple command: *Va t’en, quistroun, ou (= ’wit’) toun havez* (ME ‘leysshock’) (v.1035); \(\mathbf{C}\) likewise reads: *Va t’en quistroun* (f.13va), and \(\mathbf{O}\) *Et va tu quistroun* (f.339vb). The ME of *Femina* – ‘Go to the quistroun’ – shows that the scribe has not understood his model.

\(^f\) Here again, the intrusive preposition *a* in 1.6 must be taken out if any sense at all is to be achieved. Bibbesworth is illustrating words of similar form but different meaning, and recommends that the old bee-hive (*ruche*) be put under the cooking-pot to help the fire, not the ladle (*luche*). The *Femina* scribe fails to understand the sense and would have the hive placed ‘above’ the pot, which would not greatly serve the cooking process.

\(^g\) MS ‘Goze’.

\(^h\) MS *la*.

\(^i\) The final word ‘slyke’ is correct, but lies under a large blot.

\(^j\) See note to 1.10, above.

\(^k\) The form *aeps* (‘bees’) is a Latinate form peculiar to *Femina*. The Bibbesworth MSS use *ees*, the form usually found in continental French (T-L 3.783-85).

\(^l\) *Dees* seems to be a plural form peculiar to the Bibbesworth texts, made perhaps from the preposition *de* and the noun *ees* (plural of *ee*, ‘bee’).

\(^m\) Reference ‘b’ is repeated in the MS.

\(^n\) The first ‘i’ in *rediroumis* is a superscript correction.
Where we se fle þe swermez.

2 Un par soy synglement
On by hym selffe syngerly
A hony be est proprement,
An hony bee ys properly,
4 Et proprement un dez dees And properly on of þys bees
En Anglysh est a swarm of bees.
In Englys ys a swyrm of bees.
6 Et ceoa est un ree du meal nomé And þat ys a combe of hony ycalled
Qe en ruche fount lez aeps de gré. þat in hywe makyn þyze bees of gre.

De proprietatibus nominum

8 Requilez bon gent a manger. Prayeþ goud folk to mete.
Si poez vous mesmez aloser. So may zow ze self aloze.
10 Trenchez cest payn q’est pare. Kerveþ þis bred þat ys pared.
Lez bisilez soient pur Dieu doné. þis parelez be for God y3yve.
12 De coteal trenchez sez biseaux. De quyler manguoms’ ceus meaux.

a ce b meel c vou d memez
b biseus d du e cotel f biseus
i mangoumis g ceus k meyez h biseus

613 MS ‘When’ (spelt out in full).
614 The use of the same abbreviation for ‘er’ and ‘re’ means that ‘properly’ here and on the next line could equally well be read as ‘properly’.
615 Femina miscopies Bibbesworth here. G reads: E proprement un dees de ees En engleis est a suarme of bees (vv.1049-50), whilst C has un de des ees (f.13va) and O de des ees (f.340ra).
616 MS Equilez. Bibbesworth G v.1053 has Requillez at this point. The scribe would appear to be following the C MS of Bibbesworth, where the initial R is separated from the rest of the word, written as R ecoillez.
617 Elementary syntax as well as rhyme requires an infinitive at the end of the line.
618 Bisilez is shown by the pronunciation guide ‘biseus’ and the form biseaux in l.12 to be no more than a spelling. The Bibbesworth MSS have biseaus (G 1056 and 1057), byseaus (C f.13vb), beseaux (ME ‘trenchers’) and biseaux (ME ‘paryngs’) (O f.340ra). Godefroy 1.652c is wrong in translating bisiaus as ‘pain bis’. The sense is as given by T-L Bisel 1.980, i.e. ‘Brotabfall’. This word shows the extent of Walter de Bibbesworth’s command of French.
619 The form þis could be both singular and plural.
620 Bibbesworth G v.1056 biseaux, glossed as ‘paringes’.
621 The personal sez is here confused with the demonstrative cez.
Wyþ knyff kerve ze þis crommez.
To gydere ete we þis myez.  

ffrusshez le payn chaude de f(l)our. 
ffrusshez .i. brekeþ þis bred hot of owyn. 

brussez les oos du venour. 
brusseþ þis bones of þe hontere. 

ffreignez covenant de discovenant. 
brékeþ çe corde de nusance. 

Cy vient un garsoun tout sclavoté. 
Here comeþ a boy al bysquyrt. 

Bien luy apert d’istre harlote. 
Hym semeth wel to be a harlot. 

Et plusours ad dez esclavos 
And manye he hath of squyrtis 

A cause qe il ne feut a chival doos. 
Bycause he whas nat on a hors bak. 

ffaim sale nape & table gracious. 
Make foul naperie & table gracious. 

ffait sale nape & megre table. 

---

622 The scribe mistakes the noun guylter ‘spoon’ (p.77.13) for the verb usually spelt as cuillir, but which is found also as quill(ler) ‘to gather, collect’, etc..  
623 Having translated the French biseaux ‘parings’ wrongly as ‘crumbs’ in l.1, the scribe uses the French mies ‘crumbs’ as a ME noun ‘myez’ to render the French meaux in p.77.13, which is itself an aberrant form of mies ‘crumbs’. 
624 A superscript bar over the n of payn has been ignored. 
625 The translation of flour by ME ‘owyn’ shows that the scribe has confused four ‘oven’ with flour ‘flour’. A dot above the l may be taken as a deletion sign. The Bibbesworth MSS have fourn or four. 
626 The rhyme would demand either sclavoté/harlote or sclavoté/harlöté, but neither pair is possible. Sense calls for an adjectival past participle sclavoté ‘splashed’ and a noun harlote ‘vagabond’. The ME past participle ‘bysquirt’ and the noun ‘a harlot’ confirm this. The Femina scribe has departed from the Bibbesworth text where esclavoté rhymes with mustré and esclaves with esclas (G vv.1069-72). O f.340ra has esclavote and moustré. Femina alone has ‘harlote’. 
627 French syntax would not tolerate a cheval doos. This faulty syntax is again caused by the scribe’s failure to follow Bibbesworth. 
628 MS ‘By cause’. 
629 As in the line above, the scribe appears to be using another unacceptable syntactical construction here, de mesoun sous, in which sous is not French, but Latin – sus = ‘sow’. The meaning is: ‘Dung which comes out of the sow’s house’. This is confirmed by the ME ‘hoggys hous’. The French sous represents the more common soil ‘muddy pool, dung-hill’ (T-L 9.768; AND soil). Bibbesworth C f.13vb reads: Fiens estreit de puaunt sous (ME ‘of stinkende pludde’). The sense of II.11-14 is that manure is dirty, but a good fertilizer producing food, whilst grass is clean but does not help to feed people. See Rothwell (1998), p.79. 
630 MS decrè.
And erbe þat groweþ at þe dore of þe stable

Make whýþt naperie & lene table.

Takeþ 30man in 3oure slyttes

Of haryng red of þe frayel red.

Byfore 3e have slyttyes,

And bysyde þe þe gores.

Two gromez renneþ gret sped.

At every word þat on flafflet

And þat oþer may nat speke

A word witoute snefflynge.

And alway he sneflyþ.

Unneþ ys he worth a pese.

---

631 See freel Godefroy 4.134a and OED Frail sb.¹
632 The ‘e’ is a superscript correction.
634 Geroms (l. gerouns), modern French giroum, presumably one on each side of the body. Here, as in Bibbesworth, it is used to mean a side piece of clothing, but its true meaning is that of a pointed piece going down from the waist to the knees. Godefroy glosses escors by ‘giron’, so the two were apparently not clearly distinct one from the other.
635 Garsoms, like geroms (= gerouns above), probably lacks a minim to make it into garsouns.
636 The ME is incorrect here. The sense of the French is that two grooms are chasing great prey; the Femina scribe has misunderstood chacent and also pray.
637 Baylai is an error for balbeye, glossed by ME ‘wlaffeþ’ in Bibbesworth G v.1078, balbye (A 305rb), babeie (B f.106r), etc.. Together with the errors in ll.13 and 14 this is yet another indication of the scribe’s defective knowledge of French.
638 MS ‘al way’.
639 Ayle, literally a ‘clove of garlic’, and ‘a pese’ are expressions of minimal worth.
640 MS escaper. The correct escoper (ME ‘spete’) is used in Bibbesworth G v.1093, etc., and as escoper by the Femina scribe himself on the very next page.
641 MS esternier. The correct esternuer (ME ‘snese’) is used in Bibbesworth G v.1094, etc..
Me havyþ to couþthe & to spete,

Remynge, spwynge & spetynge.

A man shal couþthe of ryþthe

þat over moche of ale haþ ydronke.

Ynewþ he shal spete.

And he þat smakkeþ, swolleþ or takeþ,

A gret rebaud hym put to ete,

ffor respyn he mot fulwel,

Oþer spwe muche maugré hym.

But he þat fnoze may ynowþ,

Hool he ys & hath moisture.

I of womman have yhurd disceyt gret

642 'Remynge' means 'crying' rather than 'belching', correctly rendered by Bibbesworth's 'bolke' in G v.1094, 'bolk' in B f.105v.

643 MS 'Aman'.

644 The sequence of tenses here is wrong. The imperfect indicative bevoyt ought to be the present beit as in Bibbesworth G v.1096 or the perfect a bu to match 'haþ ydronke'.

645 There are two verbs here, not three, muche being a noun 'fly', not a verb, giving the sense: 'he who swallows or tastes a fly [...]'. Bibbesworth G has mouche (ME 'fleye') (v.1099), C musche (ME 'vleyhe') (f.13vb), O 'fliegh' (f.340rb).

646 Femina's verbs 'smakkeþ' and 'takeþ' are both wrong, masche ou gouste in Bibbesworth G v.1099 having the ME glosses 'cheuwes' and 'suolwes', i.e. chews and swallows.

647 The Femina scribe has misunderstood his source here. The French gate is a 'jar' or 'bowl', and gouste is a form of the adverb juxte, etc., meaning 'nearby' (O f.340rb jouste, ME 'byside'). Femina takes gouste to be the third person present indicative of the verb gouster 'to taste', hence 'eat'.

648 Estemer or estenier for esternuer.

649 Bibbesworth G v.1094 has esternuer and ME 'snese'.

650 This line and its ME translation are badly wrong. San = sain (adjective) ought to read santé 'health' and the verbal form ad = ('he has') should be the prefix a(d)- of aleggement ('relief'). Bibbesworth G v.1104 reads: Saunté est e aleggement, C f.14ra has Sauntee est & allegement, B f.106r Sancté est & alleggement. The sense of the text is that frequent sneezing after swallowing a fly brings relief.

651 This is a clear error for oy ('I heard'), 'yhurd' in the ME. This error is caused by the scribe mangling his source. Bibbesworth G v.1089 reads: Mes de femmes ai dedeing grant, with dedeing glossed as 'horer', but Femina substitutes disceyt ('disceit') for dedeinge ('disdain, contempt'), whilst maintaining the verb oy and destroying the sense.

652 The plural verb se forcent ought to be the singular s'efforce ('strives') to accord with the singular femme and 'womman', but the ME at the top of the next page also gives a plural 'hem'. Yet again, the perfectly clear Bibbesworth text – femmes [...] se aforcent (G v.1090) – has been miscopied to the detriment of syntax and sense.

653 The present participle parlaunte ought not to have a feminine adjectival agreement. Given the scribe's indistinct c/t forms, the word could be read as the noun parlaunce, but the ME 'spekynghe' would argue against this. The Bibbesworth G text reads 'En parler[...] f' (v.1091).

654 MS ableseré.
In speyynge alway to lypse,
ffor hare lovez more to plese.

A ʒoman of þe newe get
þat cometh fram a greit feste

Of þe feste me haþ ytold
As hare servise was arayde.

Witoute bred & witoute goud ale
Ne shal man at feste be wel at eze.

But of oþer þynge hyt ys to wyte
Of þe cours þat was ffyrst:

þe heved of þe boor yarmed
And þe groyn wel ybanereth.

---

655 The same superscript sign for ur is used over Pur and also over soun instead of the usual bar over the n.
656 The ME ‘lovez’ should read ‘lover’, but the final character is identical to that of aimez in the French.
657 For ‘get’, see OED jet sb. ‘fashion, style, mode, manner’. This may be a figurative use of the French get/jet ‘pousse nouvelle d’une branche’ (Godefroy 10.41c), or ‘Münze, Geldstück’ (T-L 4.1638), i.e. ‘coinage’.
658 The ME ‘As’ is incorrect, the meaning of Com being ‘How’.
659 Bibbesworth G v.1114 has Des cours k’il uren, but Femina alters the plural verb uren to a singular feut, without altering the plural indefinite article Des or Dê to match the now singular noun cours.
660 Cours has been given in the light of the full cours in the ME, but the MS reads couͤs with an abbreviation sign above the o.
Puis venesoun ové fromente, 661
Et puis autre8 diversité,
Dez grus, pouns & cignez,
Chiveraux, b porceles & gelinez.
Puis avoient conies en graved, 662
Tresbien6 en sugre enfoundré.
Puis y oun6 autere fusoun of rost,
Chescun d’eux en autre cost, 665
ffesantz, dasciez666 & perdryz,
Gryves, alows & toutz6 rostiz,
Brayon, crispis & friture,
Ové zugre roset en temperure.

Aftter venesoun wyyp fromente,
And after oþer diversite,
Of663 cranés, pokokys & swanes,
Kydes, pygges & hennes.
After þey hadde conies in gravey,
fful wel in zeugre yfoundret.
After þey hadde oþer fusoun of rost,
Every tuo in oþer side,
ffesantez, wodekockes & perdryches, 667
ffeldfares, larkes & alle yrostud.
Brawoun, crispis669 & freturys
Wit zeugre roset in temperure

661 Fromente could be read as frumenté, farmené or furmenté, given the plural role of the abbreviation.
Similarly, ME 'fromente' could be interpreted as 'trumente' etc..
662 There is no i in 'vensoun'.
663 The plural indefinite article has not been recognized by the scribe, yet another pointer to his inadequate grasp
of French.
664 The French present tense oüft is at odds with the preceding imperfect avoient and the ME 'hadde', so the clear
superscript bar extending over the whole word may be regarded as otiose, giving out.
665 This line makes little sense in either French or English. The ME 'two' means that the scribe has read deu as
'two' rather than the correct d’eux. Bibbesworth writes: Chescun de eus autre en couste (G v.1128), i.e. 'each
one next to (i.e. 'following') the other'. B f.106v gives a similar sense; O similarly makes this sense plain:
Chescun cours autlre (ME 'þe toþer') en coste (ME 'side') (f.340ra). Femina ought to read: Chescun d’eux
autre en coste, but the scribe did not know enough French to get it right.
666 The initial letter of dasciez is an agglutination, totally out of place. Bibbesworth G v.1129 gives the correct
form asciez (ME 'woddekoches'), O f.340a ascies (ME 'wodecoks'), etc..
667 The ME reads 'perdrythes', but the 't' is clearly intended to be 'c'.
668 The 'u' in 'rostud' is unmistakable.
669 MS 'cuspis'.
Macez, quibibz & clouez gilofrés, Macez, quibibz & cloves giloffrés, And of oþer spicez ynow3.
Et dez autres espicèz a assez. And of oþer spicez ynow.
Et quant b la table fuist e ousté, d And whanne þe table was yled,670
Grant poudre ové bon draggé, Gret poudre wyþ goud dragge,
Et d’aultur e nobleye fuist fusoun. And of oþer nobley was fuson.
Et ore finie icy ma resoun. And now y ende here my resoun.

De moribus infantis

Ore nurture jeo f voile aprendre Now nurture y wyl teche
8 A totez qe sount d’age tendre, To al þat ben of age tendre,
Et pur verité je vous g di An for soth671 y zow say
Hony est il qe n’est h norry. Heny672 is he þat ys nat tau3th.
Ore escotez, moun chier fitz, k Now take hede, my dere sone,
Coment jeo voile qe soiez norrys.

a epicèz b qaut cum u pro c feut d ouztthe
quando 671 e dautre f nie g vou h nett
i cheer k fiz

670 The contradiction between the table being ousté and ‘yled’ is absolute.
671 The bar through the final letter of ‘soth’ may be otiose or represent ‘e’, both forms being attested.
672 This is a repetition of the error on p.1.6.
673 The imprecision of the scribe’s abbreviation is unhelpful here. The form ‘quant’ in l.3 is indisputable – ‘qant’ with a superscript ‘u’ over the first letter, so his pronunciation form must logically give the A-F form with ‘-aunt’ instead of ‘-ant’ (i.e. ‘quaunt’), but there are only four minims with a badly-formed ‘a’ or ‘u’. See p.85.
How y wyle þat ye be norshet.
I wyl at þe fyrst
þat 3e be lowe & ful of goudnesse.
Be 3e also fre & bonere
Witoute myssaynge & mysdoynge,
And a faire porter amongez folk,
Nat to hye, but menelych.
Of alle folk 3e shal be more yloved
And wijs 3e shal be alosed.
12 A nulle homo me q’estk vivant,
Al dayz y pray 3ow þat 3e be wyse,
And þat 3e make noon outrages
To noman þat ys levynge,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>je</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>docour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>mediz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>mefere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>bele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>troq secundum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>haut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>vou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>nulez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>quosdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>qeet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>enfant cum u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Et quant\textsuperscript{a} vous serrez entre le gent
Gardez vostre lange sagement.

4 Et sy avez ascun\textsuperscript{b} enchesoun
\textit{Pur} demonstrer\textsuperscript{c} vosotre resoun,

6 Court & bref soit vosotre langage
Et le muz serrez amé du sage.

8 Et quant voilez parler
Et vosotre resoun demonstrer,

10 Et si vous soiez aresoné
De jeone\textsuperscript{d} homme ou de eigné,

12 Luy entendez bien, ne soiez hastiz.
Et quant serront passez tout lour ditz\textsuperscript{e}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{a} quant\textsuperscript{682} cum u pro
\item \textsuperscript{b} acun
\item \textsuperscript{c} demontrer
\item \textsuperscript{d} june
\item \textsuperscript{e} diz
\end{itemize}

Ne azens womman ne chyld.
And whanne 3e shul be amongez folk
Kepe 3oure tonge wysly.
And 3ye 3e have eny enchesoun
ffor to shewe 3oure resoun,
Short & lytyl be 3oure langage
And þe bettere 3e shall\textsuperscript{680} be loved of þe wyze.
And whanne 3e wyl speke
And 3oure reson shewe,
And 3ye 3e be aresonet
Of 3ong man ne of old,
Hym understandyp\textsuperscript{681} wel & be nat hasty.

\textsuperscript{679} The form \textit{demonstrer} here and in l.9 could equally well be read as \textit{demoustrer}.
\textsuperscript{680} The bar through the final letter of ‘shall’ could give ‘shalle’.
\textsuperscript{681} The sense is ‘listen’, not ‘understand’.
\textsuperscript{682} As on p.83 the scribe must be making a distinction between the ‘continental’ form \textit{quant} and the ‘insular’ form \textit{quaunt}, but there are only four minims and a superscript letter, which would have to be interpreted as ‘au’.
<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>En my lour front regardez ly.</td>
<td>And whanne þey be passed al hare speche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voz pieces(^a) &amp; mayns ne croulez,</td>
<td>In myddys þe ðe ffront hem byholdyþ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mez sagement &amp; sanz misdiz(^b)</td>
<td>ȝour feet &amp; handez ne waggeþ nat,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respoignez(^c) a tout lour ditz.</td>
<td>But wysly &amp; witoute myssaynge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pur Dieu(^d) amour soiez bonere</td>
<td>Ansuere to al hare saynge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Et cointez &amp; sagez pur bien(^e) faire,(^f)</td>
<td>For godyslove beth bonere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Et de beale(^g) affaitement.(^h)</td>
<td>And quynte &amp; wyse for wel to do,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pur bien acoynter ové le gent</td>
<td>And of fayre affaitement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ne soiez pas dissafaitez.(^i)</td>
<td>ffor wel to be acoynet wit þe folk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeo(^k) voile qe soiez affaitez,(^l)</td>
<td>Ne be þe nouth unmaad.(^684)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ffrank, bonere &amp; curteys</td>
<td>Y wyl þat þe be maad,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Et pur bien parler en Franceys.</td>
<td>ffre, bonere &amp; curtays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{683}\) Correct grammar would demand *le front*, not *lour front*, and the rhyme would demand *les*: *croulez* at the end of the line, so the line ought to run: *En my le front regardez les.*

\(^{684}\) MS ‘un maad’, with the first ‘a’ added later by the scribe.
And for wel to speke in ffrenshe.\textsuperscript{685} ffor muche hyt ys langaget wel ypveysed Of gentyl man & wel yloved.

ffalsede & fals folk On\textsuperscript{686} alpyng y sow defende.

Ne nevere at 3oure wyle Ne havyþ in herte eny pride,

ffor hyt ys uppemest of alle eveles And heved of synnez criminalez.

And goþ alway\textsuperscript{688} amongez\textsuperscript{689} folk

---

\textsuperscript{685} The final ‘e’ of ‘ffrenshe’ may not be intended, being a bar through the final $h$ which elsewhere is otiose.

\textsuperscript{686} The Femina scribe translates sur wrongly here, but correctly as ‘above’ at p.88.6.

\textsuperscript{687} French grammar would require a subjunctive here – aiez.

\textsuperscript{688} MS ‘al way’.

\textsuperscript{689} MS ‘a mongez’.

\textsuperscript{690} Faytement here appears to be a noun, an aphetic form of affaitement ‘good manners, decorum’ (cf. p.26.4 where affetement means ‘preparation’). Neither Godefroy nor T-L has this aphetic form, but it is found in Studer and Evans (1924) p.86.459 in the sense of ‘power, virtue’. The ME translation as ‘afetement’ at p.89.1 would suggest that the French here may be an error for afaitement.

\textsuperscript{691} The reference ‘b’ is repeated in the MS.
To here & lerne afetement.

Et soiez de bea\textsuperscript{a} conteig[n]ment
Et portez vous\textsuperscript{b} mesnemen\textsuperscript{t},
And be 3e of faire conteinement
And be 3e menely,

Et ne soiez pas\textsuperscript{692} envyous,
Ne plein d’ire ne anguissous.
And be 3e nat envyous,

Unquore vous prie sur tout rien
Qi\textsuperscript{693} de pecché vous gardez bien,
\textit{3ytt y pray 3ow above al þynge}
\textit{þat of synne 3ow keþe well},

Et en chescun\textsuperscript{e} rien qe commencez
De la fyn toutfoitz purpensez.
And in every þynge þat 3e bygynne
Of þe ende alway\textsuperscript{695} thenkeþ.

Et soiez tout jour bon cristien.
And beth al day\textsuperscript{696} a goud cristynman.

Amez Dieu\textsuperscript{g} sur tote rien.
Love God above\textsuperscript{697} al þynge.

Dote Dieu & seynte eglyse.
Dowte God & holy cherche.

Amez luy\textsuperscript{b} byen & soun service.

\textsuperscript{a} beel \textsuperscript{b} vou \textsuperscript{698} reen \textsuperscript{d} been
\textsuperscript{e} checun \textsuperscript{f} crityen \textsuperscript{g} du \textsuperscript{h} ly

\textsuperscript{692} The abbreviation sign above \textit{p} is that used to indicate \textit{er} or \textit{re}, but only \textit{pas} makes sense here.
\textsuperscript{693} \textit{Qi} without abbreviation is for the grammatical \textit{Qe/Que}.
\textsuperscript{694} The superscript bar over \textit{m} could, of course, represent either \textit{en (comencez)} or \textit{men (comencez)}.
\textsuperscript{695} MS ‘al way’.
\textsuperscript{696} \textit{Tout jour} must be translated either literally as ‘every day’ or as one word, the modern \textit{toujours}, ‘always’.
\textsuperscript{697} MS ‘a bove’.
\textsuperscript{698} The ‘b’ and ‘vou’ have been inserted above the line by the scribe.
Le muz vous avendra a toutz a iours.
A tote gentz faitez honours.  

Et ore retenez ceo de moy.
Ovesque lez bonez vous metray.  

Tout jour serrez le muz sachant,  
Le muz amé, le plus vailant.  

Et vous covent d’estre amable
Vers tout gent & compaignable,

De beal porte vers chescun homme,
De beal semblant, ceo est la somme.

Et as femmes faitez honours
En vostre vie a toutz jours

Love hym wel & hys servise.
þe better shal þe come to al dayes.
To all folk do þe honour.
And now holde þat of me.

Wit þese goudmen þe melde.

Al day þe shal þe more konne,
þe better loved, þe more yworth.

And þow byhowyp to be amyable
Agaynez al folk & compaignable,

Of faire porte agaynes every man,
Of fayre chyre, þat ys þe best.

And to womman do þe honours
In your live at al dayes, And to a womman namely
When she ys nornset & ytauȝth, ffor of hem comen þys pruesses,
ffor de ys nornset & ytauȝth, þis honours & þis hyȝnessez,
þis joyez & þis goudes al to on, Wherfore myn awyis ys
He þat of hem hym makeþ hate. Nevere shal ȝe se hym wel achiye.
ffor wych þyng þe þat of hym makeþ hate. Nevere shal ȝe se hym wel achiye.
þat to a goud womman ȝe be frend, And witoute folye & synne

a daffetement b deus c beins d eus
e ly f ie g vou h facete
2 Mez de une chose vous^a^ bien gardez.
Jammez en femme ne^719^ affiez
3 But of on þynge take 3e wel hede.
Neve re in womman ne trestuþ
4 Pur sa valour ne pur sa priþ
Sanz bon conseyl de vous amyz,
ffor hyre valoure ne for hyre priþ
5 Et jammez en vostre vie
Ne vous avantez de vostre amye.
Witoute goud conseyl of 3our frendes,
6 And nevere in 3oure lyve
Et vostre vie
Ne avante^720^ 3ow naþ^721^ of 3our love.
7 And when 3e wyl speke
Et vostre vie
And 3our resoun shewe
8 And when 3e wyl speke
Et quânt^b^ vous voilez parler
And vostre vie
And when 3e wyl speke
9 And when 3e wyl speke
Et vostre resoun demonstrer;^c^ Ne avante^720^ 3ow naþ^721^ of 3our love.
10 And when 3e wyl speke
Veiez q’il^d^ soit resoun,
Witoute myssaynge & chydynge.
11 And when 3e wyl speke
Sanz mysditz^e^ & tension.
Witoute myssaynge & chydynge.
12 And when 3e wyl speke
Portez vous^f^ bien entre la gent,
Bere zowe wel amongez folk
Et toutfoitez^g^ menement,

---

^a^ MS en.
^b^ The ‘t’ in ‘avante’ is, strictly speaking, ‘c’ in the MS, but the sense is clearly ‘avante’.
^c^ The ‘g’ in ‘naþ’ has been inserted as a superscript.
^d^ The ‘And’ is superfluous.
And al way menely,

Ne trop haut\(^a\) ne trop\(^b\) bas,
Qe l’em ne face de vous gas.

Amez armez & chivalex\(^c\)
S[i]\(^{725}\) vous lez avez bonez & bealez.\(^d\)

Si terre\(^e\) devez doner,
Pensez pur\(^{726}\) bien\(^f\) exploiter.

Si\(^{728}\) vous dorrez tout al comencement,
Manger & boier ffrenchement

A prodez hommez du pays,
Robes & chivalex du prys,

Et as\(^732\) lez vaylaunet chivalers
Chivalez, vilez\(^g\) & maneres,

And to þes vaylaunt knyztthez

\(^{723}\) A crossed out character like a ‘j’ between ‘men’ and ‘ne’ has been ignored.

\(^{724}\) The superscript omission mark over the final character of ‘skorn’ has been ignored.

\(^{725}\) S[i] here is the single letter S with a superscript flourish, whereas in l.6 it is written as S with a similar flourish, but also an i, whilst at l.8 it is written as Si without any abbreviation sign.

\(^{726}\) MS bur. The preposition pur after penser is an Anglicism.

\(^{727}\) Exploiter here means ‘to act’, rather than ‘to fulfil’.

\(^{728}\) Si here cannot be read as ‘þyf’, because it is followed by a main clause. It must be the emphatic ‘So’, as on p.93.8.

\(^{730}\) The scribe has inserted ‘zeve’ above the line.

\(^{731}\) The phrase tout al comencement means ‘right at the outset’.

\(^{732}\) A superscript ‘e’ over the first ‘e’ of ‘gedemen’ has been ignored.

\(^{733}\) As noted above (pp.51.3 and 64.8), the scribe appears to be unaware that as is a contraction of a les.
Et a lez damez beaux jewés, And to þes ladyes fayre jewelez, Cotez de say, fy[r]maux dorrez, Cotez of say, brochys of gold, Et a bourdez & damyselez And to minstralez & damyselez Symplez garlandez & chossez bealez. Symple garlandez & þyngez fayre. Chose ascon foitz est a doner, Thynge oþerwhyle ys to 3yve, Et ascun foitz a retener. And oþerwhyle to wyþhold.  

Dandum etenim aliquid est cum tempus postulat aut res
736 To 3eve for sothe þynge ys
Whan tyme askþ or pynge.
Pur Dieu gardez vous bien, ffor god kepe 3ow well
Ne promitez nulle rien

a beus b firmaus c acunfoiz d du
e been f nule g reen

---

733 MS asconfoitz.
734 MS ascunfoitz.
735 MS ‘oþer whyle’ and ‘wyþ hold’.
736 This and the following line in English translate the Latin immediately above.
737 MS ‘of’.
738 The bar through the final ‘ll’ of ‘well’ has been treated as otiose.
739 MS ‘by hoteþ’.
Sur esperance\textsuperscript{a} d'autry.

Par venture n'est\textsuperscript{b} prest\textsuperscript{c} a luy,\textsuperscript{d}
Qar mult\textsuperscript{e} promittere\textsuperscript{741} & rien doner,
Ceo fait\textsuperscript{f} le fool multe conforter.\textsuperscript{743}
Si vous\textsuperscript{g} désirés pur sagez aloser\textsuperscript{744}
Sis choses désirez en vostre\textsuperscript{h} cuer.
Cez sount com l'autor dit,
Et en latyn sount escript.\textsuperscript{h}
Si sapiens fore vis, sex cerna\textsuperscript{745} que tibi mando:

Quid loquieris & ubi, cur, cui, de quo, quomodo, quando.

3yf þu wylt be wyse syx þu kepe
þe whych to þe y hote:
What þu speke & when, of what,
To wham, why, how, whanne.

Et sur tout rien jeo\textsuperscript{i} vous requere

Qe orgoyle n’aproche vostre cuer.

---

\textsuperscript{a} esperance cum u

\textsuperscript{b} neet

\textsuperscript{c} preet

\textsuperscript{d} ly

\textsuperscript{e} mit

\textsuperscript{f} feet

\textsuperscript{g} votre & vetre

\textsuperscript{h} escript

\textsuperscript{i} je

\textsuperscript{740} The scribe misunderstands the past participle prest ‘loaned’, taking it as the adjective ‘ready’.

\textsuperscript{741} The infinitive promittere is a Latinism.

\textsuperscript{742} MS ‘by hote’.

\textsuperscript{743} The same abbreviation sign is used in French at the end of donner, conforter and multe, interpreted as –er in the first two cases and –e in the third. It is also used in the ME ‘confort(ér)’, where it is out of place. The noun confort/‘confort’ in both French and English would make more sense, but would destroy the rhyme in French.

\textsuperscript{744} As the ME ‘to by holde’ shows, aloser in 1.5 needs to be read as estre alosé.

\textsuperscript{745} The Latin is probably cerna, the second person singular of the imperative of cernere ‘to have regard to’, rather than cerva = serva from servare, ‘to save, abide by’, etc..

\textsuperscript{746} Reference ‘f’ is repeated in the MS.
And above al þyng y 3ow byseche

Il³ distrut⁴ totez vertuez

Et ouste⁵ d’omme lez bonez duez.

Si homme ad bienz⁶ & sois sachant,⁷

Bien formé & vailaunt,⁸

Si orgoile soit en luy,⁹

Toutz⁸ sez bienz il⁹ ad perdy,

Com en escripture¹ est trové

Et est veir en verité.

Si tibi copia seu sapiencia, formaque¹ detur,

Sola superbia destruit omnia si comitetur.

Et ne soiez courrious

Et de tensiones gardez vous.¹

And pat pride aproche nat 3oure herte.

Hyt distroiep alle vertues

And casteþ fram man þis goud thewes.

3yf man hap goud & be connynge,

Well yfourmed & vailaunt,

3yf pride be in hym,

And al hys goudes he hap ylost,

As in wrytte hyt ys yfounde

And hyt ys sop in sothe.

3yf plente wyþ shappe to þe be 3eve,

Only pride distryeþ alle 3yf he þerto be put.

References:

747 MS ‘by seche’.
748 The Latin forma is to be read as ‘handsome appearance’ (DMLBS).
749 The ME does not translate the Latin sapiencia.
750 Reference ‘b’ is repeated in the MS.
Ne be nat courrious,\textsuperscript{751}

And of chydynge kepe 30w.

Mult\textsuperscript{a} est beale\textsuperscript{b} vileinie

Muche hyt ys a fayre veleynie

D’estre\textsuperscript{c} vencuz en tensorye.

To be overcome in chydynge.

A ceo\textsuperscript{d} concorde Catoun \& dit\textsuperscript{e}

To þat acordeþ Catoun \& seyþ

En les vers com est escripte:\textsuperscript{f}

As in þis verse hyt ys ywryte:

Contra verbosos noli contendere verbis.

Sermo datur cunctis, animi sapiencia paucis.

Aȝeins word men střif nat wit wordis.

Parole est doné a chescuny,\textsuperscript{g}

Word ys ȝeve to every man

Mez sachance\textsuperscript{h} n’est\textsuperscript{i} en luy\textsuperscript{k}

But connynge ys nat in hym

Qy en parolez est estrîvour,\textsuperscript{l}

þat in word ys a stryvour,

Et jammes ne vendra al honour.

And nevere shal he com to honour.

Une chose uncquore jeo voile vous dire.

Ne soyez jammès plein de yre.

\textsuperscript{751} The French courrious means ‘angry’. The scribe appears to think that it means ‘curious’.

\textsuperscript{752} MS sachante, the correct form is given in the pronunciation guide.
On þynge 3yt I wyl 30w teche.

2 Be 3e never ful of wrathe.

Hatie toutfoitz\(^a\) il\(^b\) engendre.

Hate\(^753\) alway he engendrep.

Concordaunce amour veut rendre.

Concordaunce love wyl zelde.\(^754\)

Ira odium generat; concordia nutrit amorem.

6 Whrathe hate gendreþ; acord norsheþ love.

Veiez qe ne soiez losenger

Loke 3e be no losenger

8 Vers dame ne vers seignour secunda,

Agaynes lady ne lord,

Et s’ils desirent qe vous\(^e\) moustrez\(^d\)

And 3yf þey desyre þat 3e shewe

10 Toutz lez malz qe vous savez,

Alle þis evelez þat 3e knowe,

Ne pensez mys\(^755\) eux\(^e\) en paier,

Ne þenkeþ nou3th hem to paye,\(^756\)

12 Mez pur bien\(^f\) dire sans grever.

But for to say wel witoute grevance.

Pur Dieu\(^g\) ne vous acostomez\(^g\)

For goddys love acostome 3e na3t

14 D’escharner\(^h\) homme qe vous poiez.

To skorne man 3yf 3e may.

---

\(^{753}\) This pair shows the influence of one language on the other. The medieval French aa\(tie\)/aatie is not completely synonymous with haange/haine ‘hatred’, being glossed in Godefroy (1.10) as ‘provocation, déf, querelle, animosité […]’, but it would seem that the presence of the native English ‘hate’ had an effect on the meaning of the word in A-F. Whilst it means ‘zeal, eagerness’ along continental lines in Jordan Fantosme’s Chronicle (Johnston 1981) from the twelfth century – ardent lu païs chascun d’els par atie (v.1724), it is stronger than ‘animosity’ in The Life of Saint John the Almsgiver (Urwin 1980), where it means ‘hatred’ – mult est grant la deverie, E mult est forte cele actie (l. attie) Que maufez unt vers nus enpris (vv.5947-9).

\(^{754}\) The French rendre means ‘to (give in) return’.

\(^{755}\) Mys is an error for mye.

\(^{756}\) The French paier is used here in the sense of ‘to please, satisfy’ (AND paier).

\(^{757}\) Reference ‘g’ is repeated in the MS.
Tout q’il soit povres & boseignous,

3ou3gh he be poure & nedy,

Ou q’il ne soit si beauxa come vous,
Or 3yf he be nat as fayre as 3e,
Si prodomme ne si vailaunt,  
So fayr man ne so vailaunt,
Ne si curtais ne si sachant,
Ne so curteis ne so conynyge,
Ja pur ceo ne luy escharnez,
Neve re for þat hym ne scorneþ,
Qar par escharner bien sachez
ffor by scornynge 3e knowe well
Ne serrez jammez alosé,
Ne shal 3e nevere be aloset,
Mez hay multe & rebetté.
But hatyd muche & rebatud.  
Catoun le sage e[n]seigne & dit
Catoun þe wyzemæ te[c]heþ & seyþ
Et en sou livere divine & myt:
And in hys boke divineþ & puttyþ:
Corporis exigui vires conte[m]pere noli

Dyspize þu nat þe body of a lytyl man.

Le petit corps d’ascun homme

Ne escharnez, ceo est le summe.

a  beus  b  vailaunt cum u  c  ce  d  ly
e  mut  f  cors  g  dacun  h  eet

758 Q’il is inserted between and above Tout and soit.
759 Rebetté is a form of reboter ‘to rebuff’. The ME equivalent would be ‘rebowte’ rather than ‘rebatud’, a past participle of the French rebattre.
Et tout q’il soit enpoverés  
Unequore ne luy\(^e\) escharnez.  
Paupertatis\(^61\) onus pacienter ferre memento

Ne soiez hastiz ne irrés.

Toutfoitz\(^b\) de ceo bien vous gardez.  
\(^{763}\)Iratus rerum nescit discernere verum.

3yt chyld take hede

Et un poy aprendrez\(^764\)  
Qe en scripture\(^e\) j’ay trové

Et en latyn translaté.  
\(^{765}\)Qui s[c]it laudatur, qui nescit vituperatur.

He þat can ys to preyse, he þat can nat ys to dyspyze.

\(^a\) ly  
\(^b\) toutfoiz  
\(^c\) fiz  
\(^d\) ecotez

\(^{760}\) After ‘skorn’ is a ‘þ’ crossed out.

\(^{761}\) The abbreviation sign interpreted as \(\text{i}s\) here is identical to that used to represent \(\text{us}\) in \text{Iratus} in l.9.

\(^{762}\) MS ‘Al way’.

\(^{763}\) In the left margin, before \text{Iratus} there is \text{poete} in a smaller hand (also in l.15 below).

\(^{764}\) The future tense does not fit with the imperative \text{escotez} in the previous line or the ME ‘take hede’.

\(^{765}\) As for l.9.
Quy bien entent & sovent lytt
Prow avera & dlyytte.
He þat wel entendeþ & youth redeþ
Prow he shal have & delyte.

766 Inicium sapiencie timor Domini.

Le sage dit en souv livere
Qe comm[en]cement de bien& vivere
In þy bygym[n]ge767 dred God,
þat þe bygymynge of goud lyf

768 In bonis sit cor tuum in diebus
juventutis tue & a corde tuo amove maliciam.

In goud þynges be þy herte
In þe dayes of þyn769 3onghed

770 The ME has an otiose superscript bar over the ‘yn’ of ‘þyn’ and omits the preposition ‘in’ before ‘juvente’ which is necessary to make good sense.

And fram þyn herte evyl to putte.

771 The single preposition de is being used to perform two syntactic functions. Correct syntax would require: 
devez mettre vostre entente de vous retraire de toutz pecchez.

L’aotor dit quy vostre entente
þe autor seyþ þat 3our entente

Et bonez oouprus772 user & fairef.

De771 toutz pecchez vous retrahere
Of alle synnez 3ow to widrawe

766 In the left margin before Inicium is Salamon in a smaller hand.
767 The second omission sign for ‘n’, necessary over the second ‘y’, is omitted.
768 In the left margin before In is Salomon in a smaller hand.
769 The bars over ‘þyn’ in ll.11 & 14 have been regarded as otiose.
770 The ME has an otiose superscript bar over the ‘yn’ of ‘þyn’ and omits the preposition ‘in’ before ‘juvente’ which is necessary to make good sense.
771 The single preposition de is being used to perform two syntactic functions. Correct syntax would require: 
devez mettre vostre entente de vous retraire de toutz pecchez.
772 The form oouprus is another indication of the scribe’s Latinizing tendency.
And goud werkys use & doo shal 3e.

Qui odit correpcionem incipiens erit quia melius est a sapiente corigi quam stultorum verba adulari.

He þat hatyþ undernymynge unwyse he for beter ys

Of wyze to be corectud þan of folys in wordys to be shamed.

Si vous haiez d’estre repris 3yf 3e hate to be uptake

Ne serrez jammez bien apris. Ne shal 3e never be wel yloved.

Pluis vault tensoun de verdisour More ys worth chydyng of a trewe seire

Qe beal disceyt de faux mentour. þanne fayr disceit of fals liere.

Elimosina purgat peccatum & facit intrare in vitam eternam.

Almesdede purgyþ synne

And makeþ men to enter everlastyng lyf.

Bon est estre almoigner Goud hyt ys to be a almessevere

Dez bienz qe purrez gaynere Of goudes þat 3e may gete

Dez voz pecchez remission ffor 3owre synnes remission

Et vie pardurable en guerdon. And lyf everlastynge to mede.

Vis habere magnum imperium impera te & habebis magnum honorem.

fere c vou d detre a vaut
b beel c faus d benis

773 MS ‘be’.
774 The ME ‘shamed’ as the translation of adulari is erroneous.
775 The ME ‘yloved’ as the translation of apris is erroneous.
776 MS eterna.
777 The ‘u’ is a later scribal insertion.
778 MS ‘he’.
779 The pronunciation guide is as set out here, with the references out of sequence, c and d repeated, and the initial fere a repetition of the last word in the guide on p.100.
Si vous disirez grand honour
And ſtu shalt have muche honour.
Et dignitez d’emperour,
And dignitez of emperour,
Emperour en droit nomer
Emperour in ry3th ys named
Quy luy mesme sciet justicer.
Pat hymſelf can justifie.
Ore priez Dieud issint puisseſez fines
Now prayeſ God so 3e may end
Qe a sou joye purrez vener.
Pat to hys joye 3e may kome; so be hyt. Amen.

La Rule q’est ensuant enseigne ensement coment vous scriverez vostre fauxceys & ce est en la primer Rule la ou il dit bis rule pat ys shewynge techeſ Also how 3e shal wryte 3our freſh And pat ys in þe furſt Rule þete where hyt seȳp

Regula scripit[n]is
En le i leu prochein ensevant a part senestre la ou il dit
Regula locucionis
si com est escript en mesme la rule en tiel manere lirrez vostre franceys & issint une rule enseigne a scriver & l’autere a liere

Amen

780 The French in this line is incorrect, having no finite verb. It ought to read: Emperour on doit nomer or: Emperour est en droit nom[é].
781 MS ‘hym self’.
782 The French in this line is incorrect. The conjunction que has been omitted between Dieu and issint.
Et en le tierce lieu q’est devisé la ou il dit

2 Regula construccio

ceste rule enseigne le englysh dez voz parolez de ffranckeys et en
tiel manere la primer Rule enseigne pur scrivere, la seconde pur
lire, la tierce pur entendre et ensement enseigne plusours\footnote{As earlier in the text (p.18.9 \textit{pledours} and p.52.2 \textit{plusours}) the superscript abbreviation sign often denoting \textit{ru} (as in “\textit{3our}” below) has been interpreted as simply \textit{r} to give the normal \textit{plusours} rather than \textit{plusourus}.}
differencez du ffranckeys.

4 Regula scripccionis

In þe seconde place nyxt folwynge on þe lyft syde þere where
hyt seyþ

6 Regula locucionis

as hyt ys wrytyn in þe same rule in whych manere shal ȝe rede
3our frensch & so on rule techeþ to wryte and anoþer\footnote{MS ‘an oþer’}. to rede
And in þe iij place þere where he seyþ

8 Regula construccio

þat rule techeþ þe englyse of ȝour wordez of frensch & in swhych
manere þe fyrste Rule techeþ to wryte, þe seconde to rede, þe
þryde to understand. And also hyt techeþ manye dyfferencez of
frensch.

10 Incipit autor hoc kalendare per A

Et ordine cum suis sequentibus finit.

12 Cest kalender commence\footnote{The clear \textit{t} in \textit{commence} has been read as \textit{c} to make sense.} par A

Et ordinelment finist ové sez ensuantez

\footnote{783}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Linia scripcionis</th>
<th>Regula locucionis</th>
<th>Regula construccionis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Avant vel avaunt</td>
<td>Avaut cum u legetur</td>
<td>To fore s. tempus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ascun homme</td>
<td>Acun home</td>
<td>Eny man sine E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ascune femme</td>
<td>Acune femme</td>
<td>Et cum E servit feminino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Auter homem</td>
<td>Aulter homme</td>
<td>An oher man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Autere femme</td>
<td>Aultere femme</td>
<td>An oher woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alours, e</td>
<td>Eodem modo legetur</td>
<td>he same manere oher placez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Auxci</td>
<td>Auci</td>
<td>cum u &amp; non .u. also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ameire</td>
<td>Eodem modo</td>
<td>he same manere almerye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Aumaire</td>
<td>Amayre</td>
<td>A lover for smoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aeps</td>
<td>As</td>
<td>A bee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ascies</td>
<td>Acies</td>
<td>A wedeloke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almes vel almes</td>
<td>Ames vel ame</td>
<td>Soulys or soule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Aidant</td>
<td>Aidanum cum u</td>
<td>Helpynge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aloms</td>
<td>Alommis</td>
<td>go we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Aleigne</td>
<td>Aleine</td>
<td>Goynge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affiez</td>
<td>Eodem modo</td>
<td>Trestuþ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Assel</td>
<td>Assel</td>
<td>A sadel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essell</td>
<td>Essel</td>
<td>A 3extre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Avient</td>
<td>Avint</td>
<td>Hyt happyþ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrable</td>
<td>Eodem</td>
<td>A mapyl tre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Arable</td>
<td>Eodemi</td>
<td>Lond arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apeine</td>
<td>Eodem</td>
<td>Unneþe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Acier</td>
<td>Acer</td>
<td>steel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

786 The superscript bar over ‘m’ has been read as denoting ‘me’ rather than simply ‘m’, and as ‘em’ in the following line.

787 The first ‘e’ in ‘femme’ is a later superscript scribal addition.

788 The abbreviation sign for er and re being the same, both auter homme and autre homme are possible.

789 The abbreviation mark over the te of Aute here is identical to that after Aut in the previous line. If interpreted similarly as er it gives Autere, but if read as a simple e it would give Autre. The interpretation re is excluded here as it would give Autre.

790 The scribe misunderstands what is the modern French ailleurs, the meaning of the detached e being unclear.

As on p.103.2, the abbreviation for ru has been read as a simple r in the French.

791 The scribe uses a clear v in cum v, but an equally clear u in non .u. also. The modern aussi had at least 16 different spellings in Old French (Godefroy 1.238b) in all forms with u and several without it.

792 The plural form ascies is treated as a singular. Ascie means ‘snipe’.

793 The ME should read ‘wodekoke’.

794 The noun aleine ‘breath’ is here confused with alant, the present participle of aler.

795 ‘Trestuþ’ = ‘trusts’.

796 The scribe is confusing selle ‘saddle’ with asselle, the modern aisselle, ‘armpit’.

797 The claim that avient, the present tense of avenir, is pronounced ‘avint’, past historic tense, reveals a fundamental ignorance of French grammar.
Arsevesq | Arseveq | A ershebisshope
---|---|---
Almoigner | amenir | an almes Serena
Ambedeux | ambedeus | bope to

A servit dativo casui | ut a mou Cher amy | as to my dere frend
del pro accusativo in | ut ad villam ibo | to towne y shal go
singulares

As eidem in plurali | ut ad villas ibo | to townys y shal go
del pro apud | ut datur apud london | I geve at londone

Bien | ben | wel
Beau | beu | fayre
Bel homne | beel | fayr in masculino
Beal femmee | bele | fayr in feminino

Bousche | bouche | a mouth
Bleise | eodem modo | to lypse
Biis | eodem modo | est
Baas | eodem modo | west
Boseigne | boseyne | neae
Baale | bale | happy
Bale | eodem modo | a bagge of pyper .i. bale
Baleie | eodem modo | to blete
dicturus
Baile | eodem modo | to gone for sleep

Baayle | bayle | to take byng to kepe
Baylye | eodem modo | to swope
Bevez | eodem modo | drynge
Be | eodem modo | aske

---

798 The Latin dare is used here in the administrative sense of ‘to give, issue’ a document, but the Latin passive ‘it is given/issued’ is rendered by an active verb-form in English.
799 Bas or abas as a cardinal point is dialectal, taken from the position of the evening sun and often linked with amont ‘east’. Medieval maps had east at the top (cf. Mount on p.112.21).
800 The scribe apparently mistakes baale from the verb baler ‘to dance’ for an adjective, ‘dancing’ (?), hence ‘happy’.
801 I.e. ‘to yawn from sleepiness’. The ME form could be read as either ‘sleep’ or ‘slepe’.
802 This is the A-F verb bailler (AND2).
803 I.e. ‘to sweep’.
Bauley\(^{804}\) eodem modo to flafly in ore
2 Bavure eodem modo dreflynge
Blesure eodem modo an hurte
4 Beers bers a cradel
Bersere eodem modo a rokkestere
6 Blaunque vel blank eodem modo whyȝt

Chien secundum pikardiam
Chaun secundum cheen vel chaun An hound
parisium\(^{805}\)

8 Chiet secundum pikardiam
Chiat secundum cheet vel chaat an kat
parisium\(^{806}\)

Chiere chere diere
Chief cheef a heved
Coer vel cuer sic cuer a herte
12 Ceost cest þat ys
Corps cors a body
14 Coste cote a syde
Countee eodem modo a shire

16 Counte\(^{807}\) eodem modo a Erl
Conustre conutre to knowe
18 Ce ce þat
Chescun checun everych
20 Coteal cotel a knyf
Compaignoun compainoun\(^{808}\) a felawe
22 Combien combeeen a felawe or how moche

\(^{804}\) Bauley is an error for baubeie ‘stammer’ (Bibbesworth G v.1078).
\(^{805}\) The ‘Parisian’ spelling chaan is not recorded elsewhere.
\(^{806}\) Both the ‘Picard’ spelling chiat and the ‘Parisian’ cheet for the modern chat are absent from the dictionaries.
\(^{807}\) The forms countee and counte are no more interchangeable in pronunciation than in meaning. Further examples of this kind of error will not be commented upon in every case.
\(^{808}\) Since the scribe has not dotted his i, the word could be read as ‘companioun’, more English than French.
| Covent | covint<sup>809</sup> | hyt byhovyp
| Ceaux vel ceus | ceus | ðylke
centier<sup>810</sup> | center | to make wyþ chyld
| Coigner | coyner | a coyntre<sup>811</sup>
| Coigne | cown | a weccch
dicitur | dicitur | a koynour to make money
| Coignier | coynour | a wodelarke
| Chalandre | Chalaundre cum u | a swych on
| Ceal in feminino ceale | cel in feminino cele | a swych on
| Cigne | cyne | a swan
| Chatoner | eodem | to crepe
| Chastell | Chatel | a castel
| Chivaux | chivaus | a hors<sup>812</sup>
| Chickier | cheker | a cheker
| Ch[a]mpe | Chaumpe cum u | a feld
| Doos | dos | a rugh
| Deis | eodem modo | ffyngres
| Deinz | eadem | wyþynne<sup>813</sup>
| Doulee | douce | Swete
| Demonstre | demonstre | shewe
| Defaitez | defetez | unmad<sup>814</sup>
| Dieux vel dieu | deu | god
| Demande | demaunde | aske
| Draps | dras | cloth
| Destre<sup>815</sup> | detre | to be

---

<sup>809</sup> As mentioned earlier in the cases of *vient*/*vint* (pp.45.13 and 46.7) and *avient*/*avint* (p. 104.20), the scribe does not recognize the different tenses here.

<sup>810</sup> *Centier* is an aphetic form of *enceinter*.

<sup>811</sup> Modern English ‘a quince tree’.

<sup>812</sup> The scribe fails to recognize the plural form of the noun.

<sup>813</sup> MS ‘wyþ ynne’.

<sup>814</sup> MS ‘un mad’.

<sup>815</sup> The preposition *de* is agglutinated to the verb.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dame</td>
<td>a lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disme</td>
<td>a tenth part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Devant vel devaunt</td>
<td>to fore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Estre</td>
<td>to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Eistier</td>
<td>to stande</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Esglise</td>
<td>a cherche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Eschuere</td>
<td>to eschue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Estable</td>
<td>stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Esmond</td>
<td>emound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Eysles</td>
<td>wynngges of bryddes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Espandre</td>
<td>discovere consayl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Espeandre</td>
<td>spele letrrys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

As on the previous page, the preposition *de* has been agglutinated to the infinitive. The verb is *ester*: see l.10. The scribe appears not to understand this elementary grammar.

The scribe’s *dam* is the French *daim*, with the ME ‘deo’ lacking the final ‘r’ (or abbreviation for ‘r’) which would give the attested ‘deor’ (= ‘deer’).

The scribe wrongly assumes that the *s* before a consonant is always suppressed.

Cf. *destre* at the foot of the previous page.

The final ‘er’ of ‘older’ is conjectural, because the scribe’s *d* has the same ‘tail’ as the *d* at the end of *eadem* in l.2, and as the final letters of *Esmond*, ‘edmound’ and ‘emound’ in l.18.

It is unclear whether the modern French *étable* (noun) or *stable* (adj.) is intended.

The *a* in *eadem* is unmistakable.

The *a* in *eadem* is unmistakable.

The **n** in *espeandre* is clear, but the derivation of the word (*expellere*) and its subsequent form in French *épeler* call for *u* from a vocalized *l*. T-L (*espelir* 3.1173-75) gives the infinitive *espeandre* and numerous examples of verb forms such as *espeaut*, *espiaut*, *espeust*, etc. all with *u*. See also AND2 *espeleir*. 
| 2 | Enfaut | enfaut cum u | a chyld |
| 3 | Esteant | esteaunt cum u | benyge |
| 4 | Ebriesse | eodem modo | dronknesse |
| 5 | Erde | eadem | a herd of feldfares |

Sed herde cum h scriptus dicitur a herd of cranes oper of deer

| 6 | Fuist vel sic | feiit\textsuperscript{826} | was |
| 8 | fist | fíz\textsuperscript{827} | dede |
| 10 | fitz | eodem modo | a sone |
| 12 | fils | eodem modo | a dred\textsuperscript{828} |
| 14 | filz | eodem modo | sones in plurali |
| 16 | feu | eodem modo | fier |
| 18 | feim | eadem modo | honger |
| 20 | fume | eodem modo | Smyche of fier |
| 22 | faire | fere | to do |
| 18 | fauxceté | fauseté | falsede |
| 20 | femme | eodem modo | a woman |
| 22 | fusil | eodem modo | a spyndele |
| 24 | forspris | forpris | outake\textsuperscript{829} |
| 24 | forque | forque | butte |

Grant vel grant,\textsuperscript{830} grant sed sic legetur graunt cum u sonante gret

\textsuperscript{825} The ME is a spelling error for ‘beynge’ (i.e. ‘being’).
\textsuperscript{826} The form ‘feiit’ must be for ‘feut’ or ‘fuit’.
\textsuperscript{827} ‘Fízth’ represents the aspiration instead of the sibilant s.
\textsuperscript{828} The ME ‘dred’ is the modern English ‘thread’, equivalent to the French fil, not fils.
\textsuperscript{829} MS ‘ou take’.
\textsuperscript{830} The repetition of grant must be an error.
\textsuperscript{831} The abbreviation sign is misplaced, being situated between the t and e.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graunde</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>in feminino genere gret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guerre</td>
<td>gere</td>
<td>werre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gist</td>
<td>gyth</td>
<td>lypb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilliam</td>
<td>eodem modo secundum parvisium</td>
<td>William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grues</td>
<td>grues</td>
<td>a cran833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gryve</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>a feldfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groule</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>crenez croulet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grooule</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>hassil waget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garoile</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>a baner in warre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galeine</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>a handful aliquarum rerum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelyne</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>a hen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huys</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>a dore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huissel</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>a [a]rmeputte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huy</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>pys836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homme</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>a man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hupé</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>clocky837 as a hen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herde</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>a herd of cranes oper dere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hony</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>heny838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huissie</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>holun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horaile</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>wodeshave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illeqes</td>
<td>illeqes</td>
<td>þere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeo</td>
<td>je</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeoune</td>
<td>june</td>
<td>ʒonge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jameys</td>
<td>jammmez</td>
<td>nevere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

832 The ‘th’ in ‘gith’ is, like ‘fizth’ on the previous page, an attempt to render an aspiration instead of the sibilant.
833 Confusion of singular and plural.
834 The idea that grue and grive can be pronounced in the same way does not enhance confidence in the scribe’s understanding of French, either spoken or written.
835 Ll.7 and 8: Bibbesworth (G v.250-51) distinguishes between grouler (for the crane) and crouler (for the hazel), as do C f.5ra, and B f.106r, but the former verb is unknown elsewhere. Femina has chosen the unattested verb and applied it to both the bird and the tree.
836 The ME gloss for huy should probably read ‘pys day’.
837 Hupé does not mean ‘clocky’ i.e. ‘broody’, ‘clucking’ of a hen. It means ‘crested’, ME ‘coppet’ as in Bibbesworth G v.282, also A f.300vb ‘coppid’, C f.5rb ‘coppede’, etc. (OED copped).
838 The past participle of honir used as an adjective ‘shamed, disgraced’ has been made into a ME form ‘heny’ unknown in this sense elsewhere (see p.1.6).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ici</th>
<th>eodem modo</th>
<th>here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Jambez</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>legs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaroilez</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>grillet or janglep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Jaroile</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>a queket839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keville</td>
<td>kevile</td>
<td>a ankne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Kyvylle</td>
<td>kyvyle</td>
<td>a treyn pyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kant</td>
<td>secundum antiquos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Kar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Keyne</td>
<td>eodem</td>
<td>an Ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liege</td>
<td>lige</td>
<td>a lyge man to be kynge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Leal</td>
<td>leel</td>
<td>trewe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loial840</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>lawful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 lieu</td>
<td>lw</td>
<td>a place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luy</td>
<td>ly</td>
<td>hym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 luchere</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>a slykestere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luche</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>a hyve841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 lyvere</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>a booke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lyvere</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>a lyppe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 levere</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>a hare, leverer a grewhond842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lire</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>a balaunce843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 layne</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>wolle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liez</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>byndeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 lyre</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>to rede</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

839 'a queket’ = ‘a quacking’, the noise of the duck (Bibbesworth G v.263 ‘quekine’).
840 The scribe does not understand that leal and loial are variants of the same word, both of them able to mean ‘true’ and also ‘lawful’.
841 As in the body of the text (p.76.10 & 12), luche (‘ladle’) and ruche (‘hive’) are confused by the scribe.
842 The second gloss here ‘leverer a grewhond’ is repeated on the following page.
843 The Latinism lire = ‘balance’ has been commented on elsewhere (note to p.15.11).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line</th>
<th>word</th>
<th>correct</th>
<th>notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lesche eod</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>to lykke $^{844}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>littiere</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>straw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lettere</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>a lyter that men ryde yune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>lyttire eod</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>wombe straw $^{845}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lange</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>a thonge $^{846}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leverer</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>a grehound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>laas</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>wery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mesmez</td>
<td>memez</td>
<td>he same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mult</td>
<td>mut</td>
<td>muche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>mesditz</td>
<td>mediz</td>
<td>myssay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mesfaire</td>
<td>mefere</td>
<td>mysdo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>miere</td>
<td>mere</td>
<td>he same (sic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mear</td>
<td>meer</td>
<td>he zee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>mounde</td>
<td>mounde cum u</td>
<td>he wordle (sic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>moel</td>
<td>mool</td>
<td>he zulk of a zey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>moal</td>
<td>mool</td>
<td>he nave of a wheyl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>messiere</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>a houswyf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>messier</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>helewogh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>multfoitz</td>
<td>meutfoiz</td>
<td>a hayward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mount</td>
<td>mount cum u</td>
<td>many tymes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>mays</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>North $^{848}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mesque</td>
<td>meque</td>
<td>butte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>maintenat</td>
<td>maintenaunt cum u</td>
<td>butte $^{849}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maintenant</td>
<td>maintenaunt cum u</td>
<td>hand holdynge $^{850}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^{844}$ French grammar would require either *lescher* ‘to lykke’ or *lesche* ‘lykkes’.
$^{845}$ *Littiere* and *Lyttire* in 1.4 are the same word.
$^{846}$ ME ‘thonge’ is an error for ‘tonge’.
$^{847}$ As in the body of the text, this was probably read as *messuere*, thus making an approximate homonym.
$^{848}$ *Mount* or *amont* as a cardinal point usually means ‘east’, being the counterpart of *abas* ‘west’, medieval maps having east at the top (cf. *Bas* on p.105.15).
$^{849}$ *Mesque* usually means ‘provided that’.
$^{850}$ The scribe appears not to know *maintenant* in the normal sense of ‘now’.
\[\begin{array}{lll}
\text{meinz}^{851} & \text{eodem modo} & \text{lasse} \\
\text{maior}^{852} & \text{eodem modo} & \text{more} \\
\text{mesgre} & \text{megre} & \text{lene} \\
\text{measoun} & \text{mesoun} & \text{a hous} \\
\text{mesdre}^{853} & \text{medre} & \text{best} \\
\text{Nient} & \text{neint} & \text{nat} \\
\text{Nest} & \text{neet} & \text{nys nat} \\
\text{Nees} & \text{nes} & \text{ybore} \\
\text{Neiff}^{854} & \text{eodem modo} & \text{Snow} \\
\text{Naif} & \text{eodem modo} & \text{a bondeman} \\
\text{Nase} & \text{eodem modo} & \text{a þewe, a reddryre}^{856} \\
\text{Nease} & \text{nees} & \text{a nose} \\
\text{Nascie} & \text{nacie} & \text{snefel of þe noze} \\
\text{Nasciere}^{857} & \text{naciere} & \text{to snefly} \\
\text{Naer} & \text{eodem modo} & \text{to swymme} \\
\text{Noer} & \text{eodem modo} & \text{to drowne} \\
\text{Nager}^{858} & \text{eodem modo} & \text{to rowe} \\
\text{Nager} & \text{eodem modo} & \text{to snowe} \\
\text{Nadgars} & \text{nagars} & \text{.i. noviter} \text{newely} \\
\text{Oilez} & \text{eulez} & \text{eyen} \\
\text{Oraylez eren} & \text{sed horaylez cum h} & \text{wodeshave} \\
\text{Oos} & \text{ous} & \text{a bon} \\
\text{Ops} & \text{use} & \text{werke}^{859}
\end{array}\]

---

851 The dot marking the \(i\) is above the penultimate character, hence, strictly speaking \textit{meniz}. The meaning is ‘less’.

852 \textit{Maiour} is an adjective, ‘greater’.

853 \textit{Mesdre} is not attested as a form of \textit{mieldre} ‘better’.

854 \textit{Naif} and \textit{neiff} (usually the ‘boat’ and the ‘snow’) which can share the same spelling and pronunciation, with \textit{naif} (‘bondman’ \(<\text{latin}\)) being two-syllabled, normally with a diaeresis over the \(i\).

855 Bars through the final ‘\(f\)’ of ‘nyff’ and over the ‘\(p\)’ of ‘shyp’ have been ignored.

856 A \textit{nase} is a ‘fishing-net’ or ‘strainer’; ‘þewe’ is an attempt to render ‘\(ʒ\)ene’ (‘seine’), the ME yogh being used, as generally in this text, as the \(z\) which is often used in Old French for \(s\). The scribe’s ‘reddryre’ is a form of ‘riddle’.

857 The erroneous final \(e\) in \textit{nasciere}/\textit{naciere} may indicate the scribe’s Latin roots.

858 II. 18 and 19. The verbs are reversed, \textit{nager} meaning ‘to row’ and \textit{neger} ‘to snow’.

859 This page shows that the scribe’s contact with French is more written than oral.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>oeff</td>
<td>oof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ore</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>oor</td>
<td>i. modo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>oseaux</td>
<td>aurum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>onoure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>oousté</td>
<td>ouzté</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pierre</td>
<td>pete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>peer</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>preigne</td>
<td>preyne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>pecché</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pecchour</td>
<td>pechour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>peschour</td>
<td>peshour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>poigne</td>
<td>poynne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>poune</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>poun</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>poet vel peut</td>
<td>peut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pus</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>parele</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parele</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>puisse</td>
<td>puse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>par</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>pryszth</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pryszth</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

860 The French plural forms are not matched in English.
861 The scribe’s handling of the French for ‘father’ and ‘stone’ reflects yet again his ignorance of the language.
862 The ‘er’ ending is indicated merely by a stroke through the final ‘h’ of ‘fyssh’ which is often otiose. Cf. the same ‘er’ represented by a superscript hook in the line above, and in ‘affter’ in l.16 (below).
863 The normal form in A-F for ‘pawn’ is poun (see Hunt 1985). The scribe’s form poune means the ‘pea-hen’.
864 The strange spelling in the first column is meant to reflect the pronunciation of the word (eodem modo), but it is not attested. The form prist in the third column is the normal spelling.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prestre</td>
<td>p[r]etre</td>
<td>a brest(^{865})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qunt(^{866}) vel quant</td>
<td>qunt</td>
<td>how moche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quant</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>whanne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quele(^{867})</td>
<td>eodem modo in f(\text{\textit{eminino}})</td>
<td>what (\text{\textit{rynge}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sed legetur quele in masculino &amp; neutro genere regula non fallit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que conjunctio qu(^{868}) vel qui relativum</td>
<td>(\text{\textit{be wyche oper \textit{pat}}})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queux</td>
<td>queus(^{869})</td>
<td>(\text{\textit{be wyche men}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryen</td>
<td>reyn(^{870})</td>
<td>(\text{\textit{rynge}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roialme</td>
<td>reme</td>
<td>a kyngdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>real(^{871})</td>
<td>reel</td>
<td>(\text{\textit{rynge}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roy</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>a kyng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dicitur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roigne</td>
<td>royne</td>
<td>a quene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sed royne</td>
<td>sic scriptum est</td>
<td>a tadde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>royn(^{872})</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>a shorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rubie</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>a preciouse ston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dicitur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rupie(^{873})</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>a drop of (\text{\textit{ryn nose}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rastuer</td>
<td>ratuer</td>
<td>a dow(\text{\textit{zgh rybe}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rastelle</td>
<td>ratel</td>
<td>a owyn rake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raes</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>spokys of weylez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rai(\text{\textit{es}})</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>sonne bemez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dicitur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raayes</td>
<td>rayes</td>
<td>ray fyssh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ray</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>ray clo(\text{\textit{pe}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saietez</td>
<td>setez</td>
<td>arwen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sale</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td>an halle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{865}\) The form ‘brest’ is not attested in English for ‘priest’.

\(^{866}\) Ll. 2 and 3: the difference in spelling between the French reflexes of \(\text{\textit{quanto}}\) and \(\text{\textit{quando}}\) is theoretical.

\(^{867}\) Whilst the masculine and feminine singular forms were originally identical in Old French, the form was \(\text{\textit{quel}}\), not \(\text{\textit{quele}}\), which later became the feminine form as opposed to the masculine \(\text{\textit{quel}}\).

\(^{868}\) The scribe seems to be saying that the conjunction can be \(\text{\textit{que}}\) or \(\text{\textit{qui}}\), with the relative being \(\text{\textit{qui}}\). A-F used both forms for the relative, but only \(\text{\textit{que}}\) for the conjunction.

\(^{869}\) The incorrect ‘reyn’ is on a par with \(\text{\textit{neint}}\) for \(\text{\textit{nient}}\) on p.114.6.

\(^{870}\) The reduced form ‘reme’ given as the pronunciation appears to be English (see OED \(\text{\textit{realm}}\)).

\(^{871}\) The ME ‘\(\text{\textit{rynge}}\)’ as an error for ‘king’, when the preceding and following words are ‘‘kyngdom’ and ‘‘kynge’’, is compounded by the scribe’s belief that \(\text{\textit{real}}\) is a noun rather than an adjective.

\(^{872}\) The homonyms here are not \(\text{\textit{ray}}\) and \(\text{\textit{roigne}}\) as indicated by the scribe’s lines and his \(\text{\textit{dicitur}}\), but \(\text{\textit{royne}}\) the ‘queen’ or ‘toad/frog’ and, as far as pronunciation goes, also \(\text{\textit{royn}}\) ‘mange, scab’.

\(^{873}\) The dictionaries provide no evidence of a confusion of \(\text{\textit{rubie}}\) and \(\text{\textit{rupie}}\), nor is there any case in the Bibbesworth MSS.
| 2   | [cut out] | sale  | sale  | foul ober felthe$^{874}$ |
|     |          | seel  | seel$^{875}$ | a seel in wexe |
| 4   |           | salutz vel | saluz$^{876}$ | salt |
|     | soubz    | south | south | under |
| 6   | sur       | codem modo | trechere | .i. supra above |
|     | Treschiere | trehonuré | trehonouré | ful dere |
| 8   | treshonouré | treshonuree | sic in feminino genere | worshshepful$^{877}$ |
|     | tresreverent | tresreverent | tresreverent | worshshepful lady |
| 10  | tresexcelent | tresexcelent | tresexcellent | ful exolent |
|     | Tresgracious | Tresgracious | tregacious | ful gracious |
| 12  | Tresnoble | Tresnoble | trenoble | ful noble |
| 14  | Trespuissant | Trespuissant | trepuiissant | ful my3thy |
|     | Trehaut | Trehaut | treaut | ful hei3gh |
| 16  | Tresdouté | Tresdouté | tredouté | ful doutous |
|     | Tresresonable | Tresresonable | ttreeresonable | ful resourable |
| 18  | Tout puissant | Tout puissant | eodem modo | Almy3thy |
|     | Tressage | Tressage | tresage | ful wyz |
| 20  | Tout | Tut | Tut | al |
| 22  | Tant vel tant | Tant vel tant | taunt$^{878}$ cum u | so moche |
|     | Tesmoigne | Tesmoigne | temoyne | wetnesse |
| 24  | Tantost | Tantost | tantouzth | a noon ry3th |
|     | Trop | Trop | secundum quosdam trof | over moche |

$^{874}$ The French *sale* cannot be used as both adjective and noun.

$^{875}$ The scribe does not recognize that ‘selez’ is a plural form.

$^{876}$ As in l.3, the plural form is not recognized as such.

$^{877}$ The ‘o’ in ‘worshshepful’ is a superscript scribal addition.

$^{878}$ *Tant* is probably meant to be *Taunt*. The pronunciation column gives ‘taunt’ spelt out in full, but with also the superscript omission mark for a.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Word 1</th>
<th>Word 2</th>
<th>Word 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Taulpes</td>
<td>molles</td>
<td>.i. talpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tenailles</td>
<td>cole\footnote{879}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tenailes</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tenailes</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tresque</td>
<td>treque</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>vint</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>vaut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>vostre vel vote</td>
<td>votere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>veout vel veult</td>
<td>veut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>viande</td>
<td>viaunde cum u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ville</td>
<td>vile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>vieiles</td>
<td>veilez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>veile</td>
<td>eodem modo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>veile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>virole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>virole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>verol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>verreder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>vanelles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>venelles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\footnote{879} The English gloss is wrong. Bibbesworth says that tongs are used for coals (G v.568), not that tenailles = `coals’. \textit{Femina} gives the correct meaning in the next line.

\footnote{880} Tenailles `balkes’ is not a homonym of tenailles `tonges’, but an error for terrailles, as in Bibbesworth G vv.561 and 567. Bibbesworth B f.101r and C f.8rb make the same error as \textit{Femina}.

\footnote{881} The scribe’s superscript bar over the first ‘n’ in ‘nonnes’ has been ignored. A faint letter ‘y’ has been inserted above the line in ‘wel’ to give ‘weyl’.

\footnote{882} A French infinitive ending in –el is an impossibility. The required form is probably venteler/ventuler.

\footnote{883} The forms virole, varole, verol are not all pronounced alike, as the scribe’s \textit{dicitur} would suggest.

\footnote{884} Verder and verreder are not homonyms, despite the scribe’s \textit{dicitur}. 

\footnote{879} The English gloss is wrong. Bibbesworth says that tongs are used for coals (G v.568), not that tenailles = `coals’. \textit{Femina} gives the correct meaning in the next line.
ventrere  \hspace{2cm} eodem modo \hspace{2cm} a mydwyf


2 ventrer  \hspace{2cm} dicitur  \hspace{2cm} eodem modo \hspace{2cm} a wombe rope

Haec litera X non hic intitulatur quia alie litere capiunt eius sonum in dictamine gallico prout inferius patet scripturis

4 Yvere  \hspace{2cm} eodem modo \hspace{2cm} wynter

y aliquando ponit ur pro sy aliquando pro illeques aliquando pro nomine demonstrativo ut jeo y serra y vous pleast a y. cestez & cetera ut patet in regula diccionis s. la regula.

6 Raro invenitur haec litera Z in principio verborum ffrancorum nisi sit in propris nominibus locorum

Qui scripsit carmen sit benedictus Amen

Explicit ffemina nova