

**THE
FRANCO - ITALIAN
ROLAND**

G ROBERTSON - MELLOR

the 1990s, the number of people aged 65 and over in the United States is projected to increase from 20 million to 35 million, and the number of people aged 75 and over from 10 million to 15 million (U.S. Census Bureau 1997).

As the number of people aged 65 and over increases, the number of people aged 75 and over will increase at a faster rate. The number of people aged 75 and over is projected to increase from 10 million in 1990 to 15 million in 2010, an increase of 50%. The number of people aged 85 and over is projected to increase from 2 million in 1990 to 4 million in 2010, an increase of 100% (U.S. Census Bureau 1997).

As the number of people aged 75 and over increases, the number of people aged 85 and over will increase at a faster rate. The number of people aged 85 and over is projected to increase from 2 million in 1990 to 4 million in 2010, an increase of 100%. The number of people aged 95 and over is projected to increase from 0.5 million in 1990 to 1 million in 2010, an increase of 100% (U.S. Census Bureau 1997).

As the number of people aged 95 and over increases, the number of people aged 100 and over will increase at a faster rate. The number of people aged 100 and over is projected to increase from 0.1 million in 1990 to 0.2 million in 2010, an increase of 100% (U.S. Census Bureau 1997).

As the number of people aged 100 and over increases, the number of people aged 105 and over will increase at a faster rate. The number of people aged 105 and over is projected to increase from 0.01 million in 1990 to 0.02 million in 2010, an increase of 100% (U.S. Census Bureau 1997).

As the number of people aged 105 and over increases, the number of people aged 110 and over will increase at a faster rate. The number of people aged 110 and over is projected to increase from 0.001 million in 1990 to 0.002 million in 2010, an increase of 100% (U.S. Census Bureau 1997).

As the number of people aged 110 and over increases, the number of people aged 115 and over will increase at a faster rate. The number of people aged 115 and over is projected to increase from 0.0001 million in 1990 to 0.0002 million in 2010, an increase of 100% (U.S. Census Bureau 1997).

As the number of people aged 115 and over increases, the number of people aged 120 and over will increase at a faster rate. The number of people aged 120 and over is projected to increase from 0.00001 million in 1990 to 0.00002 million in 2010, an increase of 100% (U.S. Census Bureau 1997).

As the number of people aged 120 and over increases, the number of people aged 125 and over will increase at a faster rate. The number of people aged 125 and over is projected to increase from 0.000001 million in 1990 to 0.000002 million in 2010, an increase of 100% (U.S. Census Bureau 1997).

THE
FRANCO-ITALIAN ROLAND

(V4)

edited by

GEOFFREY ROBERTSON-MELLOR

Salford 1980

The whole of this volume is copyright, subject to the usual provision for short illustrative quotations in criticism and other work. (c) Geoffrey Robertson-Mellor 1980.

Printed by the University of Salford Reprographic Unit.

FOREWORD

The publishing history of what is, after Digby 23, the most important of the *Roland* manuscripts has been singularly unfortunate. It is the aim of the present edition to present a definitive text, emended to the minimum possible extent, and to present the MS reading, whether in text or footnote, accurately whenever this is decipherable. It does not attempt to supply missing or illegible words or to postulate the size of probable omissions. Punctuation, diacritics, and spacing are used to present the most *probable* interpretation of established readings, but no attempt has been made to provide a continuous translation. The text is often unclear or ambiguous, and a translation would imply a false clarity and unambiguity.

The line-numbering of all editions except Gasca Queirazza has been retained, and no numbers have been allocated to omissions, since in only one case (948-949) can the size of this omission be accurately estimated. Folio references are given as in Mortier *i.e.* as page references starting on Folio 69r of the MS.

A detailed study of Franco-Italian would be inconsistent with the purpose of this edition, and I hope to produce such a survey shortly, covering all the corpus of F.I. The information provided in the

Introduction is only intended to facilitate reading of the text. The notes do not seek to provide a variorum edition - either the present edition presents the same reading as previous editions, or it does not. If it differs, it is because the present editor believes previous renderings to be in some way faulty, and there is no need to labour the point. The MS reading is in all cases indicated.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD	v
INTRODUCTION	
Content of the poem	vii
History of the Manuscript	x
Modern Editions	xii
Description of the Manuscript	xvi
The Linguistic Situation	xx
Principles of Transcription	xxi
Orthographic Conventions	xxiv
Language	xxvi
Grammar	xxviii
Positional Doubling	xxx
TEXT	1
SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	241
GLOSSARY	251
INDEX OF NAMES	255
0-V4 CONCORDANCE	279
COMPARATIVE TABLE OF LINE NUMBERS	295

INTRODUCTION

CONTENT OF THE POEM

The V4 *Roland* consists of 6011 lines, as against the 4002 of the Oxford M.S. The difference does not however result from a consistent dilution of the kind found in V7 and Chateauroux. In fact the story up to the final departure from Saragossa is on exactly the same scale as Digby 23 (V4 3848 lines, O 3683) and in large measure follows it closely. Certain passages are unique to V4 e.g. 1 - 7, 283 - 295, 364 - 368, 572 - 577, 1166 - 1171, 2576 - 2611, and many others do not have any base in O. V4 also provides the justification for reordering O 280 - 330 and 1467 - 1670.

At 3848 the versions diverge, and V4 contains a unique version of the *Prise de Narbonne* (3849 - 4417), clearly related to the poems in the *Cycle de Guillaume* (including some final short lines), the precise relationship of which to the *Guillaume* cycle remains obscure.

From this point on the parallel is with V7/Cx for the long account of the death of *La belle Aude* (4418 - 5423), sandwiched between two escapes of *Ganelon* from

his captors (4480 - 4707 & 5508 - 5593), and the final trial and execution (5594 - end). Long winded though this third section may be, it is still much more condensed than the riming version, but shows signs of being derived from an original which rimes rather than assonates. Knowing as we do the mediaeval inclination towards expansion, it seems unlikely that it is derived directly from V7 itself, and the fact that V7 is in French and almost identical with Châteauroux makes it even more unlikely that V7 is an expansion of V4. The two versions must therefore share a direct or indirect common ancestor, but the usefulness of either for correcting the other is considerably less than that between O and the first part of V4.

HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPT

There is a general concensus among editors that the MS known as V4 (Fr IV = 225) of the Marciana dates from the later Trecento, and is of Italian origin like the other MSS described in the Gonzaga catalogue. The Italian element in the language is not inconsistent with a similar date of composition - certainly, however odd the language may seem at first sight, it shows no archaic features. The strongest argument against a late date is the uncanny resemblance between the content of O and that of the first two thirds of V4, which becomes proportionately more puzzling as the lapse of time between

the dates of composition increases. The corresponding Italian problem - the length of time necessary for the classical Italian epic to evolve - is much less serious. This could have been a relatively rapid process, like that of Arthurian literature in France in the Twelfth Century, and in any case it could well have begun long before Franco-Italian breathed its last.

The present editor has a preference for a composition date in period 1250 - 1275, but arguments of mathematical symmetry - half way between that of O and that of the first recorded existence of the MS - probably weigh heavily. This period, which is that of the first flush of Italian literature in the vernacular, is almost certainly the earliest at which the poem could have come into existence in its present form, and is probably too early, even though the epic matter had almost certainly reached Italy by the Fourth Crusade (1204), if not before. Probabilities are, however, not facts, and facts are totally lacking which would enable any precise dates to be established.

The Gonzaga catalogue

On April 26 1407 a catalogue was made of the books in the library of the Gonzaga family, of which a full account is given by Braghirolli and Meyer in *Romania IX* (1880), p.511 ff. It is clear that there was already a considerable body of literature in Franco-Italian, and indeed the Gonzaga library is the source of a very high

proportion of the surviving MSS in it.

No. 41 of this catalogue contains, already bound together, the mildly Italianised *Aspremont* and the Franco-Italian *Roland*, which under the name of V4 it still contains. Slight differences suggest that the two works may originally have had an independent existence e.g. the *Aspremont* has rubrics to each *laisse*, whereas the *Roland* has none, and six miniatures as opposed to one, but it seems more probable that these differences are accidental products of the scriptorial process, and that the two were bound together from the start.

Subsequent history

In 1708 Ferdinando Carlo di Gonzaga died, and his library was sold. Our MS was bought by Giovanni Battista Recanati, who in his turn left it, on his death in 1734, to the Marciana, where it has remained ever since, classified first as Codex IV CIV3, and now as 225. Its first official mention is in the Zanetti catalogue of 1741 - to which, incidentally, the existence of the Gonzaga catalogue was unknown.

MODERN EDITIONS

Quotations

(which often quote the first and last few lines without realising that they belong to different poems).

1) La Curne de Sainte Palaye saw the MS on one of his trips to Italy and quotes the last 9 lines. (B.N., Fonds Moreau 1678, notice 2077).

- 2) Francèsque Michel, in his pioneering edition of O (1837) quotes beginning and end from an unknown 'illustre étranger'.
- 3) Paul Jacob (= Paul Lacroix) 1839 - First 2 and last 9 lines + *explicit*.
- 4) I. Bekker, *Die altfranzösischen Romane des Sankt Marcus Bibliothek* (Berlin 1841) - v.v. 1 - 10 and last 9 v.v. + *explicit*.
- 5) Jean Louis Bourdillon, *Le poème de Roncevaux, traduit du roman en français* (Dijon 1840). Sporadic, often inaccurate, quotations.
- 6) Adalbert Keller, *Romvart* (Mannheim 1844). v.v. 1 - 200 and last 9 v.v. + *explicit*. Inaccurate.
- 7) F. Genin, *La Chanson de Roland* (1850). Quotes several hundred lines as part of process of establishing text.
- 8) Mussafia, *Handschriftliche Studien* (Wien 1863). Established clearly the inaccuracy of all previous work.

Editions

- 9) Conrad Hoffmann announced in 1866 an edition of O, with the text of V4 at the foot of the page. The first 13 of 14 fascicules were printed, dated 1868. Hoffmann then withdrew the work, before publication. He made his readings available to Müller, Gautier, and Paris. The Marciana possesses what must surely be almost the only copy of the printed text in bound form, with the pathetic comment inside the front cover, by G.M. Thomas: *opus in fine deficit, deficietque!*

The reading of the MS appears to be fairly accurate, but there is no attempt at all at elucidation or emendation (Hoffmann was primarily concerned with O), abbreviations are silently resolved, MS spacing is ignored, and there is neither punctuation nor use of diacritics.

10) Eugen Kölbing, *La Chanson de Roland, genauer Abdruck der venetianischer Handschrift IV* (Heilbronn 1877). The first printing of the complete text, this is a diplomatic edition, and Kölbing meticulously distinguishes between the various forms of abbreviation, and attempts to reproduce the MS spacing. It is in fact only the first stage of an edition.

11) *Corrections to Kölbing*. Corrections were published by Suchier *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie I* (1877), Mussafia, *Z.R.P. III* (1879), and Kölbing himself *Z.R.P. V* (1881). With the exception of Stengel, later references to Kölbing ignore these items.

12) Raoul Mortier, *La version de Venise IV* (1941). Vol. 2 of the series of texts of the *Roland* published by La geste francor. Regrettably the form in which V4 is currently known to most mediaevalists today. There is little point in repeating what was said only too well about this publication by Gasca Queirazza in his own edition, but a warning against attempting to use the photographic prints of the first 39 pages is necessary. In their own way these are just as bad as the printed text which follows them, and are unusable for establishing anything more than the position of a line or laisse on the page.

13) Giuliano Gasca Queirazza, *La chanson de Roland nel testo assonanzato franco-italiano* (Serie L'oriafiamma, Rosenberg & Sellier, Torino, 1955). The first edition to give an accurate and usable text. Slanted towards Italian orthographic use, and therefore giving a misleading impression. Introduces an idiosyncratic numbering system, and postulates unjustified numbers of missing lines. The accompanying translation, while sometimes helpful, often imparts a false certainty to obscure or ambiguous passages. The scholarly apparatus is invaluable, and includes for certain crucial lines Variorum treatment.

14) Louis Demaison, *Aymeri de Narbonne*, (1887), quotes from relevant part of V4.

15) A. Viscardi, *Letteratura franco-italiana* (Modena 1941) quotes, inexactly, 1852-82, 1911-31, 2372-2409, & 2526-2557 from Kölbing.

References and Studies

16) Editions of O refer to V4 as follows:

Miller (Göttingen 1863, 1878) - Hoffmann

Gautier (1^o-6^o - 1872 ff.) - Hoffmann

(7^o 1880) - Kölbing (edition)

Stengel (Leipzig 1900) - Kölbing (edition and corrections)

Jenkins (1924) - Kölbing (edition)

Hilka (1926, 1942) - " "

Bédier (1927) " "

Bertoni (ed. maior 1936) - Kölbing, and M.S.

Roncaglia (Laisses scelte 1940) } - probably Kölbing.

(Complete 1947). }

Segre, (Ricciardi, 1971) - K., Mortier, Gasca Queirazza.

Brault (Pennsylvania U.P., 1978) - Mortier.

The following studies remain useful:

17) P. Rajna in *Il Propugnatore* 1871 (quotes some 70 lines)

18) Adolf Keller, *Die Sprache der venetianer Roland V4* (Dissertation, Calw 1884). Comes to the somewhat surprising conclusion that the Italian element in the language is that of Rovereto!

19) W. Foerster, *Rolandsmaterialien* (Heilbronn 1886). Quotes from Kölbing edition.

20) R. Heiligbrodt, 'Concordanztabelle zum altfranzösischen Rolandsliede' in *Altfranz. Biblioth. hsg. v. Wendelin Foerster*, Band VII. Fundamental, in spite of Mortier, for cross-references.

21) M. Wilmotte, *Le manuscrit V4 de la Chanson de Roland* (1937) - originally given as paper in 1932? Although Wilmotte is known by his signatures to have consulted the MS in both 1925 and 1936, his quotations appear to be from unemended KÖlbing.

22) J. Horrent, *La Chanson de Roland dans les littératures française et espagnole au moyen-âge* (1951).

23) G. Mellor, Review of Mortier V4 in *Modern Language Review* XLV (1950).

24) G. Mellor, 'Some Comments on the Text of the Franco-Italian Roland', in *M.L.R.* LXI, (1966).

Further bibliographical information

Apart from the bibliography in Gasca Queirazza, further information will be found in the *Bulletin* of the Société Rencesvals (1958 ff.) and the Catalogue of the exhibition prepared by the Marciana on the occasion of the Second Conference of the Société Rencesvals in Venice in 1961, as well as in the comprehensive study of Franco-Italian which I hope shortly to publish.

The Duggan bibliography of the *Roland** unfortunately arrived too late to be consulted.

DESCRIPTION OF THE MANUSCRIPT

The portion of the MS occupied by the *Roland* begins on Folio 69r of the volume, and occupies 60 sides = 30 folios. In principle each page contains 100 lines in two columns of 50. The first page however only contains 98 lines, because of the space taken up by the illuminated initial, and 58 & 59 contain 108, while the final page has less than the full hundred. In addition there are several instances of repetition,

* J.J. Duggan, *A Guide to Studies on the 'Chanson de Roland'*. Research Bibliographies and Checklists, 15. (Grant & Cutler, London, 1977), and subsequent revisions.

one whole line (2255) written in the margin, and one false start (5969A), all of which affect the relationship between line-count and page count. Each page of the edition represents a quarter-page of the MS.

Page 1.

Contains the only illumination of the whole text. This is clearly intentional since there are no blank spaces anywhere for the rubricator to fill. There are two figures, one dressed in red and grey, one in diapered blue, against a blue background. They are not identifiable as any two specific characters in the story, and in fact belong in the *Aspremont* story. (See Supplementary Notes)

In addition, there is a leaf ornament round three sides of the text. This feature is also confined to the first page..

Initials of laisses

These are written as hanging letters, in alternate red and blue, with fine lines of the other colour. The sequence of colours is not always strictly kept, particularly when changing from recto to verso e.g. *L* of *L'enperer* (p.1) and *Ç* of *Çarle* (p.2) are both red; *Trepin* 2, *Segnur* 3 blue; *Dist* 5a *Dist* 5b red. Towards the end the red or blue infilling has not always been inserted, and there are also occasional smears. The rubricator sometimes inserted the wrong initial (e.g. 5969B) although the correct letter had been indicated in the margin by the main scribe.* The swash of these letters frequently obscures parts of the basic text.

Initials of lines

These invariably have a vertical red line through them. In microfilm (and in Mortier's plates) this is indistinguishable from the black of the letter, but in the MS is quite clear, and offers no difficulties. The first line of a *laisse* has this initial as well as

*Line 3979

the rubricator's initial, and is indicated accordingly in this edition. The rest of the line is usually separated from its initial by a space.

Capitals

Proper names occurring in the body of the line may be given a small or large initial letter, and if large this may also have the vertical red line e.g. *Hollāt* 706. This is not carried out consistently, and suggests that whether line initials were written in column before, or after, the main text, or simultaneously with it, the red stroke was certainly added after, and only inserted into the main text when the scribe was sufficiently alert to spot the proper name as he worked down the column.

Calligraphy

The MS is in general extremely carefully written, and scribal errors very carefully expuncted or barred, with the correct version inserted superscript or in the margin as appropriate. In two places (2355 B,C,D and 5564 B,C the scribe has deleted duplicated lines by bracketing them between the two halves of the word *vacat*. A later hand (or the same scribe at a later date) has gone through the text adding a very fine hair-line (almost always invisible in Mortier's plates, difficult to see in microfilm, but clear in MS) to indicate *i* - not always accurately: the modern editor's difficulty in deciding between e.g. *Baivere* and *Baviere* is clearly not new!

Confusions

The following confusions are frequent, resulting from the basic script:

long s/ f

r, c, t (e.g. is 3363 *antesum* or *ancesum*?)

all minium letters - i, n, u, m

c, e, a, d, o

l, l, l

g, ç

and decisions have frequently had to be made on an arbitrary basis. Where the MS is in poor condition the problem has naturally been aggravated.

Gasca Queirazza suggests that there is a change of scribe after 4003. To this editor the change, if any, is more linguistic than scribal, and no change occurs in the problems of transcription as such.

Punctuation

The MS knows only the point, used, except by accident, at the end of every line, and functionally to mark off Roman numerals. The latter are retained: all other punctuation in the text is editorial.

Diacritics

1) Cedilla (ç). This symbol is frequent in the text, but seems to be indicated with a total lack of consistency, even when its phonetic value seems to be beyond dispute. In principle the MS reading has been respected in the transcription, except when *c* clearly = *dž* (*cor* = Fr *jor*, transcribed *çor*). The cedilla of initial *ç* is frequently obscured not only in microfilm, but in the MS itself.

2) Abbreviations a) Titulus (˘) is not always accurately placed, and in *pugn* may frequently be only a tail to the *g* rather than postpositive titulus. I have chosen to consider (˘) as a scribal error rather than a variant form of titulus.

b) R, R plus preceding or following vowel may be indicated (l) (~) (ʹ), as well as by barred p (p̄).

Further details are given under Resolution of Abbreviations (p. xxiii).

THE LINGUISTIC SITUATION

When the Arthurian matter was transported to England, the linguistic differences imposed immediate translation, so that Wace's *Brut* became Layamon's *Brut*, before it could be naturalised. In the Romance area the linguistic similarities of French and Italian meant that a certain amount of comprehension was possible even by people totally ignorant of the foreign language, and this must have facilitated the diffusion of epic material throughout the length and breadth of Italy. We do not need to be fervent disciples of Bédier to accept that the pilgrim routes must have been one of the main channels for this, and that the Fourth Crusade was also a possible means of transmission. Although oral transmission probably ceased shortly after 1200, written transmission undoubtedly continued, and French orthographical variants and dialect forms, of all periods, are clearly represented in our MSS.

Of these there are three varieties:

- 1) French originals copied in Italy, with scribal italianisms.
- 2) French written in Italy by Italians e.g. Rusticciano da Pisa or Brunetto Latini, which may be compared with the French of 'Stratford-atte-Bow' or of Gower.
- 3) Works written in a mixed language in which French and Italian forms are inextricably commingled, and about whose precise pronunciation e.g. nasalisation, final *e*, etc. we shall always be uncertain. It is to this that the term Franco-Italian (or Franco-Veneto) is more accurately applied. Its uncertainties and ambiguities do not prevent it from being a perfectly acceptable and accurate means of

communication. Let us not forget that Law-French, (*Hic jecit un brickbat sur le juge et narrowly mist hym*) served the purposes of legislation in England until well into the Seventeenth Century.

It is in this third kind that our text is written.

PRINCIPLES OF TRANSCRIPTION

The aim of this edition is 1) to produce a legible text, with the minimum of editorial interference (which means that pronunciation may not always be indicated); 2) to avoid an excessively French or Italian bias in the conventions adopted; 3) to suggest, as far as possible, the most probable meaning of the text; 4) to indicate the actual reading of the MS, in particular by the use of capital letters whenever abbreviations are resolved.

Nomenclature

As the Index of Names reveals only too clearly, the MS reveals an almost incredible inconsistency. Full forms are retained as they stand; abbreviated ones are resolved as consistently as possible, except that in the case of one or two of the commonest names inconsistent resolution has been allowed to remain, as matching inconsistent full forms *e.g.* *GayNO* and *GayNES*; *NayMES* and *NayMON*. The MS reading is always clear.

Consonantal U and I

These have always been transcribed by *v* and *j* respectively. Note: *avrai*, *savrai* always; *io* or *jo* according to linguistic context.

Hiatus

Stressed *i* in hiatus is indicated *í*: *aíe*, except in the two common forms *paíñ* and *país*. Unstressed *i* in hiatus, and all *u*'s in hiatus bear the diaeresis: *aílle*, *aírie*.

Impure S.

No absolutely consistent solution to the problems offered by this is possible, since the French and Italian treatments of S + Consonant are completely different, and the fact that Franco-Italian is, for us, a purely written language means that many spoken distinctions are veiled by the orthography. Forms with and without a prothetic vowel occur when there is no possibility of a vocalic termination to the preceding word *i.e.* both forms are acceptable. Furthermore, MS spacing is inconsistent, and therefore offers no reliable guide.

The reading in the text is therefore largely subjective, depending on whether the general feel of the context seemed to be French or Italian. The following rules for HISPANIA* (probably the commonest of these words) in general apply to other words in Impure S:

Spagna

de Spagne

Spagne when preceded by consonant or vowel other than e

Espagne when initial e cannot be part of preceding word *e.g.*

en Espagne

The justification for *de Spagne* lies chiefly in the large number of *Spagna* and relatively large number of indisputable *Spagne* forms. *D'Espagne* can never be ruled out, however. Compare the lists in the Index of Names.

* where the vowel before *sp* is of course historically correct, and the word only joins the Impure S category as a result of false division.

Resolution of Abbreviations

Single initial capitals, and two initial capitals *at the beginning of a laisse* have their normal semantic function. All other capitals, whether single or multiple indicate resolution of an abbreviation according to the following system:

Titulus - M before labial, N before other consonant.

Finally N or M according to unabbreviated form.

N.B. *avoN* (French form) but *aveM* (Italian).

The MS use of *m* or *n* in full forms is inconsistent.

- *CON* or *COM*, according to same principle.

cū - *cūM* (as independent word).

~) - R plus any *required vowel* before or after
|)

m̄t - *mENT* (*mANT* when assonating with *ant*)

m̄potēt - *omNIpoteNt*

p̄ - *pER* when vowel medial

pRE, *pRO*, etc. when vowel final

p̄ūg, pūḡ - *pūgN* always. N.B. an apparent *pūg* occurs so often that the hook at the top of the *g* must be considered as the titulus.

ORTHOGRAPHIC CONVENTIONS

Note: The explanatory forms used in this list, and in the notes to the text may be in English, French, Italian, or Latin, and do not necessarily correspond in grammatical form. The criterion in all cases has been unambiguity of words used in isolation.

a	- AD; HABET
a'l	- HABET ILLE
a·l	- HABET ILLUM; (rare) AD ILLUM
anc(h)'o anc(h)oi)	- anche oggi, aujourd'hui,
anc(h)'ora)	maintenant
anc(h)ora, anc(h)oi	- encore, ancora
asà	- assai, assez
ça	- <i>Fr</i> ça
ça	- <i>It</i> già
che	- <i>all forms of Relative and Interrogative</i>
ché	- QUIA; (occasionally) QUID
chi	- <i>all forms of Relative and Interrogative</i>
chĭ	- QUIA
ch'il	- that he
chi'l	- who he
ché'l	- for he
che·l	- that him
ché·l	- for him
ch'ĕ·l	- (rare) QUI IN ILLUM
De	- God (<i>Initially</i> Dĕ)
dĕ	- god; DEBET
dĕ	- DEDIT
desor, desus	- dessus, dessous
de sor, de sus	- de sur, de sous
de)	- of
di)	
de', di'	- of the
dí	- day
dō	- DEBEO

e	- and
è	- is
e'	- EGO; ECCE; (rare) ILLE
el	- he
e'l	- and he; (rare) and the (NOM)*
e·l	- and him; and the (ACC)
è'l	- is he
è·l)	- in (to) him, in (to) the
i·l)	
fē	- FECIT; FIDES
huimēs	- aujourd'hui-meme
jamēs	- jamais
la'	- LAPUS
là)	- iLLAC, iLLic
lī)	
ma	- Fr mais
mā	- It mai, Fr jamais
mē)	- MEDIUM
mī)	
·n	- enclitic form of It ne Fr en
'n	- en post-vocalic
n'	- Fr ne pre-vocalic
nen	- may be n'en, ne·n (either unit negative and other genitive); nen = NON
ō	- UBI (Initially of question O)
po	- poi; posso
pò	- puote
por mē, por mī	- parmi
por mē, por mī	- per mezzo
quī	- QUA
quī'l	- that he, for he
quī·l	- that him, for him
sī	- SIC (tonic); siete
vē	- ven

* Used where Italian article *il* seems implied.

çusq̄UE, (in) tresq̄UE, (in) trosq̄UE (and unabbreviated forms) before vowel treated as under:

trosqu'a la riva
tresqua in Seragoça
trosqui a Perecoste
trosquia no l'o mort

LANGUAGE

Franco-Italian, sitting à cheval between two orthographical, phonetic and grammatical systems (three, if Venetian is to be considered as different from Italian) has an inherent ambiguity, or polyvalence. Ambiguity, if we postulate a unitary F.I. system, inadequately represented by graphic symbols. Polyvalence, if we accept the existence, side by side, on an equal footing, of alternative usages. For a full study of this, my forthcoming Linguistic Study should be consulted, and the information which follows must only be considered a working guide to the use of the text of V4.

Since odd Latinisms occur (e.g. *dicunt* 925) it is also possible to interpret forms like *sunt* in the same way, although these may equally well be of ultimate Anglo-Norman derivation. It would be futile to attempt to pursue this point further.

Pronunciation

It is by no means clear how far the Italianate forms were Venetian rather than Central - certain forms are clearly Central; (*santissimo*) and late into the bargain (*siamo* indicative); others therefore may be. Double consonants (*v. infra*) may be purely graphical for a Northern single consonant, or genuinely double as in Tuscan. Furthermore, forms which in a purely Italian context would be Venetian, in the F.I. context

may equally well be ascribed to French influence. Is *cent* = [t[̣]sent], [t_̣sent], or [s_̣ent]? All the possible solutions seem to impose themselves at different points in the text!

On certain points the MSS offer no help at all - the extent of nasalisation, if any, and its precise nature; the occurrence of mute *e*; voicing of intervocalic *s*; position of the tonic syllable when the word is not in assonance. While it is therefore possible to read the text with *a* pronunciation, there can be no guarantee of its final authenticity. As a matter of practical convenience the editor uses a fairly Central pronunciation for clearly Italian forms, since this differentiates them more clearly from French ones, but he would be far from claiming scientific justification for the result.

The following list must therefore be considered only as a statement of *equivalences*, not of absolute values.

- c - { in addition to its standard O.F. and Italian values,
 { may also = k (*cerir* 3130 = quérir)
 { d[̣]z (*cugar* 1678, *cure* 3819)
- ç - { ts, s (French, Venetian)
 { t[̣]s (*çante*)
 { d[̣]z, probably its commonest value
 { dz, as an alternative to d[̣]z in Italianate forms
 { (c.f. *palazzo*, *palagio*)
 { z? (*veçu* VEDUTUM 3160)
- g - i occasionally e.g. *verage*
- j - occurs as a graphic symbol in the MS ('*i lungo*')
 and is transcribed by *i*. Contrariwise *i* occasionally
 has the value [d[̣]z] and is then transcribed *j* - *messajer*.
- qu - has both French and Italian values
- x - { s[̣], d[̣]z (*palaxio*)
 { is/iz
- z - ts/dz

Note

The cedilla may be omitted where it seems required, (*çugar*) or inserted where it seems unnecessary (*çent*). The MS readings have been kept, and the modern, like the mediaeval, reader must supply the 'correct' pronunciation!

GRAMMAR

The fact that identical, or visually identical, forms may occur in the two parent languages with different functions, and that the nature of the immediate context rarely permits of certain allocation to one set or other of linguistic forms, means that precise analysis and parsing is often impossible. The most obvious example is that a form like *ama* can equally well be an Italian-based Present 3 (*ama*) or a French-based Preterite 3 (*amà*). It can, moreover, also be a Fr.It. Present 2, or Present 5 (which last may be an abbreviation of *amate*, and therefore oxytone, or Person 2 used for Person 5!) Metre rarely permits a decision even about stress incidence, except in rime-forms, which are subject to distortion anyway! Forms of this kind have in general therefore been left to stand without any indication of grammatical interpretation.

Singular/Plural equivalence. In addition to the possible 2/5 equivalence mentioned above, the 3/6 equivalence is even more frequent. This is of course by no means confined to F.I. texts, but proliferates in them to such an extent that it is not impossible to claim that there is no effective distinction between the two.

S. The fact that *s* in Italian has no grammatical function, that final *s* in French was fast becoming silent, and that the O.F. case system was almost certainly not understood by the F.I. writers meant that this letter is useless either as a case or number marker.

L. This letter, which in context can only be separated from preceding or following words by an arbitrary editorial decision, has a plethora of functions all derived from ILLE. There is no graphical phonetic distinction between *ch^è'l*, *che·l*, *ch^é'l*, and *ch'è·l*, and the context by no means invariably permits an unquestionable decision.

Finally, transition between French and Italian usage may take place not only between lines, but inside lines, phrases, and even words! The reader must be prepared for an incessant series of linguistic gear-changes between one set and the other!

Final syllables, when clearly identified, have been rendered as under:

à	-	Past Participles: <i>amà</i>
a	-	Pr. Ind./Pr. Subj.) 2, 5 Imperative)
a	-	It. Pr. Ind./Pr. Subj. 3 (6); Fr. Pret. 3
è	-	It. Pret. 3 (when clearly not Present)
és	-	Pr. Ind. 5 (<i>avés</i> = <i>aveç</i> , <i>avez</i>)
ès	-	Past Subj. 1, 2, & 3

Future Terminations - no accent except for Person 5/2?)

in *i* - *avrí* but *avra*

Note: *a*, *e*, *i* as genuine Person 5 terminations represent an apocopated form, and were written by some older scholars, e.g. Mussafia, as *ama'*. Where identification is indisputable, *à* would however seem preferable e.g. *amà* for *amate* as *podestà* for *podestate*. Confusion with past participial forms is almost impossible.

POSITIONAL DOUBLING

Although the Italian element of F.I. is usually assumed to be Northern (and indeed the term *Franco-veneto* is frequently applied to it) geminated consonants clearly occurred, and were indeed generated in it. These are indicated in the text by a standard division of words, with the double symbol instead of the single e.g. *enn a, va ss'apoçer.*

The following list of examples contains only instances where no alternative explanation of the double consonant seems possible.(LIST 1) (There are naturally many examples of inherited double consonants, which would have remained so in Central, if not Northern, Italian).

List 2 contains some of the more striking examples of double consonants which theoretically could be etymological, but only as Tuscan-derived.

LIST 1

340	vostro mala lle
402	va ss'apoçer
456	Fa·sse guardare
471	
622	Là sson negé
860	ne ssera redoter
995	mallor passoit al port
2454	la collor perdue
2461	batailes campalles
2593	ardeNt callors
2680	Li enperer enn a pris
2726	e ffu e fflaMbe
2817	comeNça a ssiglé
3021	E' sso asé che Çarlo no m'ataNt
4756	FraNçe enn a molt mERcié

4958 E poi la llasera
4992 leveNt e llasse li plurer
4 de lleç un piller
5375 a lloi d'empeoreor
5409 e ssa granT geNt
5562 Va·ss-en
5778 Va·ss a ferir

LIST 2

549 e ve lla don
970 ne lles esceres
993 entresqU'a ll'or
2611 illoes
2977 Tel dol ell a
3031 ell a fato
3140 Si lli a asolti
3144 " " " lassé
4208 Bien serí pro se lla porei tansé!
4697 che nu lle renderoN
4703 E lla belle Aude
4786 Ce lli dona RollaNt
5056 Ne lla bella Aude
5702 e lla josté

FOOTNOTES

- | | | |
|-----------------|---|---------------------------------------------|
| <i>abba</i> | - | Alternative rendering of undisputed reading |
| ? <i>abba</i> | - | Possible alternative reading |
| <i>abba?</i> | - | Possible emendation |
| MS <i>abba</i> | - | Text emended |
| MS <i>abba?</i> | - | Reading doubtful; text emended |

References to Mortier are indicated M, to Gasca Queirazza Q.
R indicates final word of a line, which may have been subject
to Rime alteration (R.A.)

MS forms quoted in notes are given diplomatically.

No abbreviations are indicated in emended forms.