Layamon : an attempt at vindication

LAȝAMON

AN ATTEMPT AT VINDICATION

G. J. VISSER

LAȝAMON
AN ATTEMPT AT VINDICATION

LAȝAMON

AN ATTEMPT AT VINDICATION

ACADEMISCH PROEFSCHRIFT

TER VERKRIJGING VAN DEN GRAAD VAN DOCTOR IN DE LETTEREN EN WIJSBEGEERTE AAN DE RIJKS-UNIVERSITEIT TE UTRECHT, OP GEZAG VAN DEN RECTOR-MAGNIFICUS Dr. H. BOLKESTEIN, HOOGLEERAAR IN DE FACULTEIT DER LETTEREN EN WIJSBEGEERTE, VOLGENS BESLUIT VAN DEN SENAAT DER UNIVERSITEIT TEGEN DE BEDENKINGEN VAN DE FACULTEIT DER LETTEREN EN WIJSBEGEERTE TE VERDEDIGEN OP VRIJDAG 12 JULI 1935, TE 1 UUR

DOOR

GERARD JOHANNES VISSER

GEBOREN TE UTRECHT

VAN GORCUM & COMP. N.V.
ASSEN

TO MY DEAR PARENTS

VOORREDE.

Bij de voltooiïng van dit proefschrift is het mij een voorrecht mijn dank te mogen betuigen aan allen die op enigerlei wijze aan de tot stand koming ervan hebben medegewerkt.

Mijn gevoelens van grote dank en bewondering gaan in de eerste plaats uit naar U, Hooggeleerde VAN HAMEL, Geachte Promotor, wiens bezielende colleges in Keltisch, Oud-Noors, Oud-Engels, Gotisch en Vergelijkende Taalwetenschap steeds een bron van genot vormden, en wiens brede wetenschappelijke kennis en immer vriendelijke hulpvaardigheid mij tot lichtend voorbeeld zullen strekken.

Ook U, Hooggeleerde FIJN VAN DRAAT, ben ik meer dank verschuldigd dan ik hier wens uit te spreken. Gij hebt mij ten allen tijde met raad en daad willen bijstaan en geen moeite was U ooit te groot. Uw leerzame colleges en Uw belangstelling in mijn werk zal ik niet licht vergeten.

Aan U, Hooggeleerde SWAEN, breng ik gaarne dank voor de lessen in de Engelse Litteratuur die ik van U mocht ontvangen, terwijl ik niet wil nalaten te vermelden dat de Heer M. G. VAN NECK mijn eerste wankele schreden op het pad der Engelse studie geleid heeft.

Hefyd y mae yn wir bleser gennyf dalu diolch cynnes i'r ATHRO DAVID EVANS, COLEG ABERYSTWYTH, am ei wersau mewn Gymraeg, ein sgwrsus clyd a phob caredigrwydd a gefais oddiwrtho a'i deulu ef, pan aroswn dan ei dô. Bydded i'r heniaith flodeuo a chynhyddu!

Tenslotte nog een woord van oprechte erkentelijkheid aan Mej. Dr. E. J. GRAS en het personeel van de Utrechtse Universiteitsbibliotheek voor hun hoffelijke medewerking.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

Among the first writers in English to give us the early history of the Britons and their great leader, King Arthur, was a simple English country-priest, named Laȝamon, about whose life and occupations posterity knows no more than he chose to tell us in his poem. Every reader will be acquainted with these scanty facts. More important than his private life, however, is the problem how he came by his sources and what these sources were. Laȝamon himself professes to have used the following three works:

a) 'The English book that Saint Bede made.'
b) A Latin book 'that Saint Albin made and the fair Austin who brought baptism in hither.'
c) A French book by a clerk named Wace.

In the allegation of his sources, however, Laȝamon seems merely to have followed the common medieval custom, which in these cases aimed at impressiveness rather than veracity. In fact, it is generally assumed that practically the only use he made of these pretended sources was that of Wace. It is however equally certain, that the English version cannot be a literal translation of the Wace-text as edited by M. Le Roux de Lincy (Rouen 1836-'38). For this there are too many deviations and elaborations. It is this very fact that has led some scholars to look for outside (in casu Welsh) influence in the work of our poet, whereas others have strongly opposed this view.

The first recorded opinion on Laȝamon's sources and the date at which he composed his work, is to be found in the Preface to Sir Frederic Madden's excellent edition of the

Brut (1847) [1]). He is firmly convinced of Welsh influence, observing that the Wace-text 'is enlarged throughout' in such a manner that Laȝamon may justly be considered 'not as a mere translator, but as an original writer', after which he gives an enumeration of the more remarkable of Laȝamon's additions. The date of the poem was fixed by him at 1205.

The next scholar who occupied himself with the question is Richard Wülcker [2]), who tried to found Madden's suggestion that Laȝamon had Welsh sources, and who demonstrated the fallacy of the pretended Latin sources. Moreover, he endeavoured to establish Laȝamon's indebtedness to the Old English Beowulf, however, without much show of probability. Suggestive as the work is, it presents a deplorable confusion in the use of the terms *Celtic* and *Welsh*, for which the author was afterwards taken to task by his compatriot Imelmann.

A subsequent investigator was A. C. L. Brown [3]), who produced various arguments to corroborate Wülcker's view, in which he was, however, not very successful.

The most profound and detailed study on the subject was written by Rudolf Imelmann [4]). This scholar strongly repudiated all Welsh influence and made a hypothetical Wace-Gaimar compilation Laȝamon's one and only source, thus denying him all independent elaboration except in a very few minor instances. His opinion has become largely accepted and may be found again in such authors as J. D. Bruce [5]) and E. K. Chambers [6]). In the eyes of the present writer, however, Imelmann is too dogmatic in precluding

---

[1]) Laȝamon's Brut, a Poetical Semi-Saxon Paraphrase of the Brut of Wace, by Sir Frederic Madden, London 1847.

[2]) In Paul und Braune's Beiträge, III, 524-555.

[3]) In an article: Welsh Traditions in Laȝ.'s Brut (M. Ph. I, 95-103).

[4]) In his book: Laȝamon, Versuch über seine Quellen. Berlin 1906.

[6]) Evolution of Arthurian Romance I, 31.

[5]) Arthur of Britain, p. 105.

the possibility of literary contact between the Welsh and the English in the Middle Ages, and besides in laying too much stress on trifling and often only superficial similarities between Laȝamon and certain French Bruts. Lastly, his work suffers from inconsistency, now ascribing an elaboration to Laȝamon's source, now to Laȝamon's invention, according as it fits in with his theory. On the other hand Imelmann's treatment of the Laȝamon problem is so thorough and circumstantial, that our own study could not but become in large part a criticism of Imelmann's theories. This may bring down upon us the reproach of one-sidedness. However, we shall feel justified in repudiating any such blame, as, for one thing, very little of the necessary sources has been made accessible by publication, and for another, future Laȝamon scholars will find a more objective basis by our application of a more severe test to Imelmann's doctrine.

A study of a quite different nature is Miss Frances Lytle Gillespy's Layamon's Brut: A Comparative Study in Narrative Art [1]), whose aim is best explained by the following quotation: 'Dr. Imelmann's theory makes all the more necessary a discussion and comparison of the narrative technique of Layamon and Wace. Source-hunting or determining per se has no part in the present discussion. But if the Germanic elements in Layamon's work are found to be considerable, if certain consistent differences in spirit and narrative workmanship are shown to be probably responsible for a large proportion of the greater bulk of the English poem, if the differences between the two works appears to be due to artistic selection and elaboration and not to any mere dovetailing of two accounts, and finally, if it is shown that Layamon's work contains occasional 'purple patches', to which there is nothing even remotely comparable in the French work, it may help to disprove an attempt to find all the elements of the English Brut in a Wace-version,

---

[1]) Univ. of Cal. Publ. in M. Ph. III, 361 ff. (1916).

or in a Wace-version plus something of the same general texture as the versions we have' [1]). This attractively planned and executed study is in our opinion most convincing.

The articles by J. W. Hales [2]), H. L. D. Ward [3]), and H. C. Wyld [4]) contribute nothing new to the question, the first two being in agreement with Madden, the third stressing Laȝamon's English character and his superiority over Wace in diction.

J. D. Bruce, besides commenting on the three names Argante, Meleon and Oriene [5]), which he reduces to French sources, devotes some pages to the discussion of Laȝamon's Brut, in his invaluable work The Evolution of Arthurian Romance [6]). He accepts Imelmann's hypothesis: 'In the light of recent research, it is no longer open to doubt that this assumption (i.e. of Welsh influence) was mistaken and that Layamon was merely following an expanded (French) version of Wace, now lost' [7]).

R. H. Fletcher also devotes two articles to the Middle-English poet, the one [8]) treating the question if Laȝamon made any use of Geoffrey's Historia, to which Fletcher gives a negative answer, saying that Wülcker's conclusion (i.e. G. not used) 'must still be admitted to be very likely correct'. The other treatise is contained in his extensive study Arthurian Material in the Chronicles, [9]) in which he comes to the following conclusion: 'It (i.e. L.'s Brut) is for the most part a paraphrase of Wace's Brut, with possibly

---

[1]) Opus cit. 372 f.
[2]) Dict. of Nat. Biogr. under Laȝamon.
[3]) Cat. of B. M. Romances I, 268.
[4]) Rev. of Engl. Stud. VI, nº. 21, 1-31.
[5]) M. L. N. XXVI, 65.
[6]) Ev. of A. R. I, 27 ff.
[7]) idem I, 29.
[8]) P. M. L. A. XVIII, 91 ff.
[9]) Harvard Studies and Notes X, 147-166.

a few insignificant touches from Geoffrey. But Laȝamon treated his original with the greatest freedom. He doubled its bulk by additions, mostly literary and original with himself. These rarely consist of entire episodes; they are almost always details. In his whole treatment he shows that he was a real poet of vivid imagination, and a thorough medieval Saxon. For the courtly French tone of Wace's poem he substitutes the less elegant but more sturdy Saxon tone. To this general atmosphere corresponds his conception of Arthur and his warriors, from which is altogether eliminated the romantic knight-errant idea of Wace. Yet Layamon's Merlin is really more supernatural than Wace's, and he shows some other signs of slight influence from current romance or Welsh stories, besides certainly taking from them his important accounts of the institution of the Round Table and of Arthur's disappearance. From the general stock of Teutonic saga he adds the connection of Arthur and his arms with the elves.'

H. B. Hinckley's article [1]) is more especially concerned with the date at which Laȝamon's Brut was written. Hinckley namely tries, on insufficient grounds however, to establish a new and much earlier date for the Brut than the generally accepted year 1205. He says [2]): 'From data already given, one may assign the completion of Laȝamon's Brut to almost any date between 1157 and 1165. The comment on the Peter's Pence points, very indecisively, to the latter date. The language and textual tradition may, with greater probability, be held to favor 1160 or even an earlier date. There is nothing that definitely points to the period from 1166 till 1172 (inclusive); and a later date than 1172 is not worth considering.'

Finally there are a number of text-criticisms, viz. those by

---

[1]) Anglia LVI, 43-58.

[2]) p. 55.

Zessac [1]), Trautmann [2]), Luhmann [3]) and Rudolf Seyger [4]), of whom the last-mentioned proves that the A-text is older in style and language than the B-text. His conclusion is that A and B have a common source X, which cannot be the oldest text, but in its turn goes back to the original. The compiler of the B-text was a man with a sense for order and reform. He tried to convert the epic poem of the A-text into something more compact and matter-of-fact, in the style of Wace.

For further literature see Bibliography.

---

[1]) Die beiden Handschriften von Laȝamon's Brut und ihr Verhältnis zu einander, Breslau Dissertation, 1887.

[2]) Anglia II, 153 ff.

[3]) Die Überlieferung von Laȝamon's Brut, 1905.

[4]) Beiträge zu Laȝamon's Brut, Halle Dissertation, 1912.

CHAPTER I.

THE DATE OF COMPOSITION.

As the author himself was not so obliging as Wace, who tells us exactly in what year his poem was written, we are left to infer the date by other methods. Madden observes that we can only go by some scant internal evidence, such as the ruined state of the city of Leicester, the change of pronunciation from *Eoferwic* to *York*, which is stated to have taken place 'not long before', a passage on the Rome-feoh or Peter-Pence and a reference to Queen Eleanor. Let us first consider what Laȝamon has to say about the city of Leicester. In I, 123 and 124 we read that Bladud's son Leir made a noble burgh named Kaer Leir.

> Kaer Leir hehte þe burh
> leof heo wes þan kinge.
> Þa we an ure leod-quide
> Leirchestre clepiaþ.
> Ȝeare a þan holde dawen
> heo wes swiþe aþel burh.
> & seoððen þer seh toward
> swiðe muchel seorwe
> þat heo wes al for-faren
> þurh þere leodene uæl.

Madden is of opinion that these lines no doubt refer to the destruction of Leicester by the forces of Henry II under the Justiciary Richard de Lucy in the year 1173, whereas Hinckley objects that Laȝamon would never have spoken of a condition immediately preceding 1173 as *'ȝeare a þan holde dawen'*. But we have only to think of people just after

the Great War yearning back for 'those good old times before the war', to realise that this argument is not conclusive. If in the latter case a space of some ten years was apparently sufficient to justify the expression, why not then in Laȝamon's case, where the distance is one of circa 30 years, if we suppose the work to have been written about 1205? Besides, the English text is clearly but a florid translation of Wace's *jadis*, just as *purh pere leodene uæl* is an imaginative expansion of the French *grant destruison*. In the question of the Rome-feoh Madden undoubtedly made a mistake. The lines in question read as follows:

þe king his fet custe
and faire hine igrette.
& eft þat ilke feoh ȝete
þat Inne king dude ære.
& swa hit hafeð istonde
æuer seoððe a þisse londe
drihtē wat hu longe
þeo laȝen scullen ilæste. III, 286.

From this last exclamation Madden infers that Laȝamon wanted to express a doubt as to the continuance of the payment. Imelmann, however, rightly pointed out [1]), that we are entitled to no such conclusion, that the lines could only mean that at the time when Laȝamon wrote his Brut, the Rome-feoh was still being paid without any prospect of a near abolition. The lines in fact are nothing but an exclamation of impatience that could have been uttered at any time, and is completely neutral with regard to duration. Consequently the Brut must have been written either in or before 1205, at which time King John and his nobles resisted the payment.

Lastly there is the reference to Queen Eleanor. In his introduction Laȝamon says of the copy of Wace:

---

[1]) op. cit. p. 9 ff.

& he (= Wace) hoe ȝef þare æðelen
Aelienor þe wes Henries quene
þes heȝes kinges. I, 3.

Madden says of this [1]): 'It would appear quite certain, that such an expression could not have been used, had Henry then been living, and this will bring us to the year 1189. But we may perhaps advance a step further and fairly presume that Eleanor herself was then dead; and as her decease took place at an advanced age in 1204, the date will correspond very accurately with the time when the Rome-feoh was forbidden.'

Hinckley combats Madden's interpretation of the verb 'wes' on the ground of the sequence of tenses, and maintains that 'in reality the verb "was" is perfectly ambiguous on this point.' Even granting that 'wes' might have been a result of the Consecutio Temporum, the passage seems to admit of only one construction, viz. that Eleanor was already dead at the time.

Moreover, we venture to differ from Hinckley when he says that Laȝamon must have written before 1173, when Queen Eleanor joined a political rebellion against her husband, and was consequently imprisoned. He suggests that Laȝamon would not have called her the noble Eleanor after this intermezzo, and adduces Gaston Paris' judgement of an apparently similar case (Wace's Geste des Normands), but overlooks, as a matter of fact, that in reality the circumstances are entirely different. Gaston Paris tried to demonstrate that Wace could not have written his eulogy on Henry and Eleanor in 1174, *immediately* after the Queen's disgrace. But Laȝamon, as Madden supposed, wrote in 1205 under King John's reign, which makes all the difference. At that time there was nothing to keep him from describing the Queen as noble. Besides, we must not lay too much stress on the word *noble*. It is probably little more than an

[1]) Preface XIX.

epitheton ornans. Weighing the evidence, it seems fairly certain that Laȝamon wrote his Brut early in the year 1205 or very shortly before. [1])

---

[1]) Imelmann quotes a sentence from a letter from King John to Reginald of Cornhill (29 April 1205): 'Mittas etiam nobis statim visis litteris Romantium de Historia Angliae.' Imelmann refers these words to Laȝamon's work, in opposition to the Abbé de la Rue and Le Roux de Lincy who refer them to Wace. But considering the hurry of the king to get the book and the fact that Wace's Brut was fifty years old at the time, it is much more likely that King John asked for the newly finished work of Laȝamon.

CHAPTER II.

LAȝAMON'S LATIN SOURCES.

Laȝamon himself tells us that he employed an English book by Bede and another in Latin made by Saint Albin and the 'fair Austin'. This must necessarily arouse suspicion, as Bede always wrote in Latin and Austin, who died in 604, and Albinus, Abbot of St. Austins at Canterbury who died in 732, can hardly have collaborated, so that Madden suggests as a plausible solution, that Laȝamon wrongly ascribed the Anglo-Saxon version to Bede and the Latin text of the Ecclesiastical History to Albin and Austin. Wülcker agrees with Madden and justly observes that Laȝamon's attribution of the A.-S. translation to Bede is not so surprising as it may appear at first, for the translator mentions himself nowhere, and the text begins with: *Ic Beda Cristes ðeow and mæssepreost sende gretan ðone leofastan cyninȝ* .... etc. Further Wülcker endeavours to prove, that Laȝamon ascribed the Latin text to Austin and Albin. However, we need not discuss the plausibility of this, as Wülcker concludes further on that Laȝamon made no use of the Latin text at all, not even for the story of the Anglo-Saxons at Rome, which, as he shows, differs in a good many details from that given in Bede. Far from being based on Bede, Laȝamon actually contradicts him in a number of episodes which Laȝamon did not take from Wace. As for the story of the Anglo-Saxon slaves, it must have reached Laȝamon orally. Wülcker is undoubtedly right in his conclusion, which has remained unimpugned to the present day.

Another question that we have to face in this connection is: Did Laȝamon make any use of Geoffrey's Historia? *A priori*

there seems no reason why Laȝamon should not have been acquainted with this epoch-making work that has left its traces on so many medieval poems and chronicles. To attribute the L.-G. agreements to the hypothetical French Brut-version is merely shifting the difficulty without much warrant. Why should that which seems quite natural in a French poet be deemed impossible in the English priest? Here as elsewhere, investigation suffers from the fact that only one Wace-text has been published so far, so that the possibility always remains that another Wace-text may give the necessary information and show that Laȝamon was merely following Wace. Variances, however, will be restricted to occasional proper names and single lines, but not affect entire episodes, for in that case we should have to assume an improbably large disparity between the various W.-texts. Wülcker denies Geoffrey's influence and is like Fletcher of opinion, that the prophecies of Merlin that we find in L. and G. while missing in W., may have reached Laȝamon through the separately circulating 7th book of the Historia, while Fletcher suggests as an additional probability that the prophecies passed from G. into general lore and thence to Laȝamon. Imelmann does not believe in this sort of agreement between L. and G., but supposes that Laȝamon's hypothetical Norman source was responsible for these Geoffrey reminiscences. He is of opinion that all L.-G. parallels occurring also in other Bruts, are *ipso facto* invalid to prove an L.-G. connection. For those however who do not believe in his theory, this doctrine does not carry much weight. As we proceed, we shall accordingly consider the agreements without feeling bound by Imelmann's premise.

1) L. I, 27 *mid Grickisce fure* = G. I, 7 *graeco igne.* W. l. 327 *grans fus.* There are of course two possibilities: either the printed W.-text is here corrupt, or else Laȝamon has consulted Geoffrey. Considering everything it would not surprise us if the first were the case, although the passage is of course not conclusive in itself.

2) L. II, 509 and G. IX, 9 mention Lot's two sons — Gawain and Modred —, W. II, 69 knows only the first. Imelmann (p. 87) says: 'Hier kann eine Wace-hs. leicht einen Zusatz erhalten haben' ..... 'Im übrigen wäre es wohl Laȝamon zuzutrauen, dasz er von selbst auf jenen Zusatz kam.' The most logical conclusion is that here we come across a Geoffrey-reminiscence.

3) Likewise in the following instance, where G. VI, 17 and L. II, 227 agree against W. I, 352 in representing the men sent after Merlin as arriving tired before Carmarthen. For comparison we subjoin the three texts:

G. VI, 17: *Fatigati autem itinere sederunt in circo. exploraturi quod querebant.*

L. II, 227

þas cnihtes weoren weri
& an heorte swiðe særi.
& seten adun bi þan plaȝe
& bi-heolden þas cnauen.

W. I, 352

Devant la cité, à l'entrée,
Avoit d'enfans grant aünée;
Là erent venu por joer,
Cil les prisent à esgarder.

Imelmann's remark 'Hier kann L.'s Vorlage G. näher gestanden haben' is hardly satisfactory, resting as it does on mere hypothesis. On the contrary, the conclusion seems inevitable that L. here drew on G.

4) G. VI, 18 and L. II, 233 represent Merlin's mother as speaking of the maidens in her chamber and of the beauty of the youth who came to her. Imelmann observes: 'Dem entspricht R. f. 71*a*.' [1]) Even so, it is much more likely, in view of the other L.-G. agreements, that L. is here indebted to G.

5) L. II, 288 like G. VIII, 10 implies decidedly that Aurelius did not know of Merlin until Tremorien mentioned him, while Wace's language does not convey that impression.

Imelmann suggests the following W.-lines as a possible source: W. I, 383 *Li rois voloit Merlin veoir — Et oïr valt de son savoir.* But as these lines merely express the king's determination to summon the wizard and profit by his great knowledge, G.'s influence is patent.

6) L. II, 289 and G. VIII, 10 say that Aurelius sent messengers for Merlin all over the kingdom, whereas according to Wace he sent at once to the right place; and L. and G. agree that Merlin often visited or bathed in his favourite fountain, while Wace professes not to know where it is. Imelmann draws attention to R. f. 74*a*:

> Sil feit quere par le pais ....
> Icist ont ia tant erre
> Ke dan Merlin ont troue.

and what is said there about Galabes. So much may be observed here, that L. differs so entirely from W., R., and G. on this point, that he must have given full rein to his imagination or have used a Welsh tale. Not only is the L.-text much more digressive, but it also gives some facts not found in any of the other three manuscripts. For instance, when the knights find Merlin sitting by the brim, they tell him they are the agents of King Aurelius. So far L. may be based on G., but what follows then is found nowhere else. The knights promise Merlin silver and gold if he will come with them to the king, but Merlin answers that he does not care for gold; he has enough himself. Hereupon follows his silence and when he speaks for the second time, it is to say that he knew of the knights' coming, and that he was also acquainted with Aurelius and Uther. He prophesies the king's early death, after which he is ready to accompany the knights. It is clear that neither W. nor G. nor R. are sufficiently elaborate here to justify the assumption that they formed the basis for

---

[1]) R. = MS. Regius, 13 A XXI (Brit. Mus.).

Laȝamon's translation. Personally we have no doubt that Laȝamon in this episode is expanding Wace in his usual vivid and imaginative manner, besides consulting Geoffrey (VIII, 10: Galabes quem solitus fuit frequentare).

7) Both G. and L. state that when Gorlois was killed, he had sallied out of the castle, while W. implies the contrary. Imelmann remarks [1]): 'Wace unterscheidet sich in dieser Episode auch sonst stark von G.; so in den worten womit der vermeintliche Gorlois seine Anwesenheit in Tintagel erklärt (II, 27 f):

> Del castel sans congié tornai
> Si que à home n'em parlai
> Ne dis mie que fors ississe ....

Vielleicht glaubte ein Bearbeiter, der G. kannte, diese Begründung plausibler zu machen, wenn er den echten Gorlois einen Ausfall machen liess. — L. II, 381 lässt Uther-Gorlois sagen:

> Ich and þas tweie cnihtes
> leopen ut of þan fihte.

Davon hat weder G. noch W. etwas; und ebenso steht L. allein mit Uther - Gorlois' Drohung, sich zu rächen, wenn Uther nichts von Versöhnung wissen wolle. Da also L. innerhalb desselben kurzen Abschnittes einmal mit G. gegen W., einmal mit W. gegen G., und ein drittes mal gegen beide geht, so deutet dies nicht auf drei von ihm vereinigte Quellen, sondern auf eine einzige; und Benutzung G.'s ist somit auch durch dieses Argument nicht erwiesen.' That in some lines L. goes against G. and W. is not surprising, as this is often the case where L. sees his chance to digress and vivify. Imelmann's conclusion is but evading the question and shifting the difficulty to a French Brut in which we should have to take for granted a combination of sources

[1]) p. 89.

which Imelmann deems impossible in L. Apart from the fact that the present writer fails to see where (as Imelmann avers) L. should go with W. against G. in this episode, it is clear that L. borrowed here from G.

8) G. says that in ascending the hill at the battle of Badon, Arthur lost many of his men. L. states that he lost five hundred, while Wace does not speak of any loss at all. Here also G.'s influence is apparent, and not invalidated by Imelmann's objection that L. often mentions a definite number in contrast to Wace, because G. and L. both mention a fact that is absent in Wace.

9) Fletcher is of opinion that the following passage in L. is based on G. VII, 3: *Timebit Romulea domus ipsius saevitiam.*

L. III, 79 f.

þa wæs mid soðe ifunde
þat Mærlin sæide whilen
þat sculden for Arðure
Rome ifullen afure
and þa wal of stanen
quakien and fallen.

This is repeated L. III, 116 f.:

þa wes hit itimed þere
þat Merlin saide while
þat Rom walles sculden
ȝein Arðure to-uallen.

Imelmann objects: 'Dass G. hier nicht direkt benutzt wurde — schon der Umfang der verglichenen Stücke spricht dagegen — lässt sich vielleicht so beweisen: L. III, 112 f. berichtet von Arthur's höhnischer Botschaft an die Römer; er würde alsbald nach Rom reiten,

and Rome walles rihten
þe ȝare weoren to-fallen.

Diese Botschaft steht, auch dem Wortlaute nach, in deutlicher Beziehung zu jener Prophezeiung. W. II, 218 hat

nichts davon. Aber L. stimmt in dieser Episode zu M. A. Nun hat M. A. auch eine Mitteilung an die Römer; sie sollen ihre Mauern gut verstopfen. M. A. und L. können hier nicht unmittelbar zusammenhängen; Zufall kann die Aehnlichkeit nicht erklären. Also geht M. A. hier auf L.'s Quelle zurück, d. h. L. hat G. nicht zum Vorbild' (p. 90). It is noteworthy that Imelmann contradicts himself here to a certain extent, because on p. 55 of his work, where he discusses a possible L.-M. A. relation, he asserts: '„Die Ueberbringer der Leichname raten den Römern, ihre Mauern gut zu verstopfen." Davon ist bei L. mit keinem Worte die Rede. L. spricht von den Mauern die Arthur wieder aufrichten wolle; besteht hier Zusammenhang zwischen L. und M. A. so wird er durch die Quelle zu erklären sein.' Apparently he realises himself that the two texts have nothing in common and that the supposed connection is extremely dubious. In fact, there is no reason why the hypothetical source should be brought up again. Finally, even if there were an agreement L.-M. A. here, it would prove nothing for the later passage. It cannot be doubtful that Fletcher has proved his point.

10) L. III, 137.

> þa wes hit itimed þere
> þat Merlin seide while:
> Aerm wurðest þu Winchæstre,
> þæ eorðe þe scal forswalȝe;
> swa Merlin sæide
> þe witeȝe wes mære.

G. VII, 4. *dic Guyntoniae, absorbebit te tellus.* Imelmann objects that even if L. is based on G. here, the connection L.-G. would only be proved for the 7th book, 'und dann könnte viel eher ein Wace-Bearbeiter darauf verfallen sein, daraus zu schöpfen.' As there seems to be no coercive reason for this last hypothesis, this example also tends to cement the theory of a L.-G. relation.

Imelmann adduces one instance that must serve to show that we need not assume a separate source for every prophecy of Merlin not occurring in Wace.

L. III, 145 f.

> Bute while wes an witiȝe
> Merlin ihate;
> he bodede mid worde,
> his quiðes weoren soðe,
> þat Arður sculde ȝete
> cum Bruttes to fulste.

Imelmann refers to W. II, 230: *De là vendra, encor puet vivre.* It would have been desirable for him to have shown this understanding of Laȝamon's method of elaboration consistently. At any rate there is a great measure of probability in his suggestion. But we must not forget that the belief in Arthur's return was wide-spread at the time, so that Laȝamon had almost certainly heard of it in the place where he lived. We are consequently inclined to assume oral tradition in this case.

Here follow a few L.-G. parallels collected by Imelmann for the purpose of showing that L. is not based on G., but on the hypothetical French Brut.

1) L. I, 82 *Geomagoges lupe.*

G. I, 16 *Lamgoemagot, i.e. saltus G.*

Imelmann says: 'W. I, 57 kennt den Namen des Hügels nicht, wohl aber R. und M. B., die beide Beziehungen zu L. haben.' If Laȝamon has not gathered the name from W. l. 1177 f.: *La faloise ot le nom et a — Del gaiant qui là trébuça* (i.e. of *Goemagot*, whom W. mentions before), it is very likely, considering the other L.-G. agreements, that Laȝamon here also speaks on the authority of G. His *lupe* is sufficiently explained as a translation of G.'s *saltus.*

2) 'L. I, 181, G. II, 17 haben in der Erzählung von Dunwallo Molmutius eine Berufung auf Bücher, die von diesen Fürsten handeln. Wace I, 110 vacat, aber Tysilio 497 bietet sie. Da jedoch dieser Text wohl nicht direkt auf G. basiert

ist, vielmehr normannisch vermittelt, so erklärt sich das Zusammengehn von L.-T. und daher G.-L. unschwer.' As far as the present writer knows, Imelmann is the first to come out with the bold conjecture that Tys. is based on a Norman Brut. On the contrary, the Welsh Brut is evidently a translation of G., apart from certain additions and omissions of its own. Brut Gr. ab A. has the same allusion and yet has never been suspected of French influence. Imelmann's reasoning is far-fetched and unconvincing and G.'s direct influence is obvious, just as in the next example that Imelmann gives. [1])

3) The following two parallels alleged by Imelmann may be reduced to paraphrases of the W.-text, L. I, 205 being based on W. I, 126 ff. and L. I, 425 ff. on W. I, 246.

4) L. III, 295 states that Cadwaladr was at Rome for a period of four and a half years, whereas G. and W. mention no time. Imelmann's explanation that Laȝamon calculated the time of his sojourn from B. A.'s exact statements on Cadwaladr's government and the duration of the dearth, must be left for what it is: an improbable hypothesis. Laȝamon makes quite a number of definite statements of his own which are found nowhere else. Unlike Wace, who is always ready with his characteristic *ne sai*, Laȝamon is continually colouring his narrative, adding bits of information and inserting definite numbers wherever they make for greater reality. From a historical point of view Laȝamon is probably not so conscientious as Wace, but he possesses undoubtedly a greater and more vivid poetic talent. In view then of this Laȝamon idiosyncrasy, we feel justified in ascribing the number under discussion also to its influence. At any rate, Imelmann is completely and curiously mistaken, when he wants to back up his opinion by establishing a close agreement between L. and B. A. in the following lines about Cadwaladr's death:

---

[1]) L. I, 183, G III, 1, Br. Tys., p. 497.

L. III, 295:

elleoue dazes biforen Maize
he ferde of þisse liue.

B. A.: *he .... died the* 12 *kalend of May.*
with which Imelmann strangely compares only:
W. II, 297:

Al disetisme jor d'avril
Issi del terien escil.

We wonder why he did not insert the preceding line in W. *'onze jors devant mai mourut'*, which is obviously L.'s source.

Another Latin work that Imelmann compares with L., is the Historia Britonum ascribed to Nennius. Imelmann is of opinion, that no use has been made of Nennius and that Lazamon 'neben seinem normannischen Vorbild keinem lateinischen Texte gefolgt ist und auch nichts erfunden hat.'

L. II, 63, speaking of Maximian setting out for Armorica, has:

forð he gon liðen
ut of þissen leoden,
he makede him seluen muchel clond,
ne isæh he næuere eft þis lond.

Nennius (ed. San-Marte, 44): *Hi sunt Brittones Armorici, et nunquam reversi sunt huc usque in hodiernum diem.*

Imelmann gives a rather fanciful explanation. He quotes a Welsh triad [1]) and the Welsh tale of Macsen Wledig [2]),

---

[1]) Red Book I, 298: *Pann aeth llu y lychlyn .... A'r eil a aeth gan Elen luydawc a maxen wledic hyt yn llychlyn, ac ni doethant byth y'r ynys honn.* (Imelmann erroneously quotes II, 298).

[2]) Red Book I, 89: *Seith mlyned y bu yr amherawdyr yn yr ynys honn. Sef oed deuawt gwyr ruuein yn yr amser hwnnw. Pa amherawdyr bynnac a drickyei yg gwladoed ereill yn kynnydu seith mlyned, trickyei ar y orescyn, ac ni chaffei dyuot y ruvein dracheuyn.*

and says: 'Da nun aber dieser kymrische Text nach normannischer Quelle bearbeitet sein dürfte, so wird der Anklang an L. ebendaher rühren, d.h. L. keinen Zusammenhang mit Nennius haben.' That L. is not based here on Nennius could be proved in a shorter and less devious manner: L. is namely speaking of Maximian, whereas Nennius refers to the Armorican Bretons. The last two lines of the L.-quotation are probably nothing but a dramatic addition, the very last line presumably being added for the sake of rhyme. The connection between L. and the two Welsh texts is extremely questionable; especially the second quotation has little or no bearing on the L.-text, as it speaks of a Roman custom of no longer accepting an emperor who had stayed for more than seven years abroad, which, if anything, is the opposite of what we read in L.

Next comes L.'s interesting account of Oswald's death at the hands of the treacherous Penda, of which G. and W. know nothing. Nennius has: *Sanctum Oswaldum Regem occidit per dolum .... Ipse victor fuit per diabolicam artem.* Imelmann rightly observes that L. cannot be based on Nennius, as the latter does not offer the details of the treachery. But Nennius shows that there existed a tradition of Penda's treason, with which Laȝamon was evidently acquainted. It would seem to have been of a hagiographical nature, although we have not traced it in any of the transmitted Vitae Oswaldi. Symeon of Durham's Vita has indeed: *Sancto igitur Oswaldo ibi securius residente, et nil adversitatis ingruendum metuente, ex improviso cum exercitu pagano Penda supervenit, et sanctum regem belli funere praevenire sategit. ..... Penda igitur aggregata paganorum manu non modica, subito prodiit ad certaminis aream et una cum sancto Christianissimoque rege gentem trucidavit Christianae fidei copiosam,* which shows, it is true, some resemblance to L., but is not nearly elaborate enough to be looked upon as L.'s source.

Lastly Imelmann brings up the Brutus Abbreviatus,

written by a monk of Battle Abbey, who (according to Imelmann's conjecture) did not use L., but a Norman Brut. However, the evidence in favour of a L.-Br. Abbr. connection must be deemed inadequate, as all the parallels submitted can be explained by W. and G.

First Imelmann wants to connect L.'s description of Argallo's wandering in exile with the line in Br. Abbr. *Argallo autem in magna miseria vitam duxit.* We cannot understand why Imelmann looked so far from home, when he could have found every necessary basis in ll. 3559-3570 of the Wace-text, which lines, considering Laȝamon's usual tendency towards elaboration, agree remarkably closely with the English text. As to the fact that both L. and Br. Abbr. mention the meeting of Argallo and Elidur as taking place at a hunt, so does G. III, 17. Besides, it is clear that L. in this episode once more lets his imagination revel. For instance, he is the only one to make Argallo put on a disguise and inquire of a kinsman where the king is. Therefore it is by no means unlikely, that he inferred from Wace's *Dedens le bois de Galatère - Agar Elidur encontra* the fact that Elidur was hunting. What other use had the ancient kings for a forest? We are therefore inclined to assume independent activity on the part of Laȝamon or borrowing from G. III, 17.

In the next instance we are again surprised by the fact that Imelmann resorts to a Welsh text (Tys. 522) to explain a L.-statement that obviously finds its source in W. It is about the sending of Maximian to England. Br. Abbr. f. 8*b* has: *Dioclecianus imperator misit in britanniam Maximianum herculem.* Imelmann says[1]): 'Dasselbe berichtet L. II, 28; aus G. V, 5 und W. I, 264 konnte er das nicht schlieszen.' But W. I, 264 says quite clearly: *Ce fu par Dyoclétian - Qui envoia Maximian - Par crualté et par anjuire - Por toz les crestiens destruire.*

Lastly, in the question of Vortimer being poisoned by

[1]) p. 96.

Rowena, Imelmann cites Br. Abbr. f. 10*a* to prove that this text also seems to assume that Rowena poisoned Vortimer personally, but what Br. Abbr. gives is no more than can be found in G. VI, 12 and W. I, 239, and can certainly not have served as Laȝamon's source for the poison-episode, without crediting him with an equal amount of independence and imagination, as when we suppose him to have elaborated Wace.

Summarizing, we find that Laȝamon made no use of any Latin works, except to some extent of Geoffrey's Historia, a book so famous in its day that this need hardly surprise us. Furthermore, it has been shown in the preceding section, that certain apparent L.-Nennius and L.-Br. Abbr. parallels do not point to a Norman source, but are either fictitious or reducible to G. or W.

CHAPTER III.

LAȝAMON AND HIS WELSH SOURCES.

WITH AN EXCURSION ON SOME OF THE PROPER NAMES.

Fortunately for the Laȝamon-controversy, there is at least one point on which all can agree, viz. that Wace's Roman de Brut is not, like the other sources mentioned by Laȝamon, a faked source, but the real source of the English Brut, i.e. the real principal source. There is much additional matter that must be otherwise explained, and here it is, that Laȝamon's imagination and his possible Welsh sources come in. We have already mentioned the fact that scholars like Madden, Wülcker, Brown and Gillespy were inclined to assume, that Laȝamon was not a mere slavish translator, but a man of some artistic antiquarian interest and independence, who, to a certain extent, drew on Welsh tradition. This is *a priori* not an unlikely contention, considering Laȝamon's residence on the Welsh border. We have also seen, that later investigators like Imelmann, and on his authority J. D. Bruce and E. K. Chambers, assumed a more sceptical attitude, (probably the outcome of their dislike of the once prevalent Celtomania), and denied any Welsh influence at all. Now it will perhaps not be unfit, to discuss at the outset this vital question: Can Welsh influence at all have been operative in an English author, in view of the hatred between the Welsh and the English nation? Imelmann follows Zimmer's lead [1]) in supposing

[1]) In Gött. Gel. Anz. 1890, p. 791 and Preuss. Jahrb. vol. 92, p. 431 and 433.

the two peoples to have been implacable enemies without any intercourse, which would necessarily imply the absence of Welsh influence. This uncompromising attitude needs some modification. First of all, it must be clear, that the Saxon invaders did not cross the North Sea in the troublesome company of wives and children, which, in order to ensure, the perpetuation of the race, made it necessary for them to marry British women [1]). These intermarriages, of which for instance the one between Rowena and Vortigern is a famous example, probably account for some Welsh-sounding names of the Saxon kings [2]). In this connection, we also find valuable support in a source as old as the Beowulf, where the name of Hroðgar's Queen, *Wealhpeow* (Beowulf 612 etc.) obviously means 'British captive or servant', so that the inference suggests itself, that she was of British race. Apart from these arguments there are others, alleged by J. Loth, E. Windisch and Major P. T. Godsal. In the latter's book The Conquest of Ceawlin we find on p. 197: It is evident that as long as the invaders were heathens, and worshippers of Woden, they drove out the Welsh, and would have nothing to do with them or their place-names; whereas we know that after they had become Christians, they mingled readily with the Welsh, and used their place-names to a very great extent.

---

[1]) Cf. Lappenberg: England under the Anglo-Saxon Kings I, 158: 'From the circumstance that the Anglo-Saxons had to pass over in ships to the country destined for their future home, it follows that they brought with them but few women and children; and as Vortigern had no repugnance to an union with the daughter of Hengest, it is probable that the German warriors with the exception perhaps of a few of noble race, would not disdain to unite themselves with the British women. If thereby the natives soon became intermingled with the strangers, still the latter, in virtue of the almost exclusive advantage of the male line with respect to inheritances, would not find such marriages prejudicial to their political independence.'

[2]) e.g. the well-known Cerdic, whose very existence has been questioned on account of his Welsh name, and Ceadwalla, who was even for some time in league with the Anglian king Penda.

For instance, the whole of Flintshire and part of Denbighshire, up to Wat's Dyke, was conquered and occupied by the English, during, or shortly before, the time of Offa, and we find numbers of old Welsh place-names remaining in these districts, though interspersed with English ones.'

And again (p. 219): 'The value of willing Welsh labour must have been increasing every year, as the conquest extended, and the overworked colonists were less and less able to get any assistance in tilling their lands and tending their cattle. We cannot doubt that as the conquest extended towards Wales, more and more Welshmen were employed by the Angles. The Welsh are good servants and almost always loyal to good masters, and owing to their numerous tribal divisions, had learned quickly to transfer their allegiance to the strongest side. The chief division in the Welsh border has always been the Men of the Hills versus the Men of the Plains. Thus a Welshman who had settled down peaceably in the service of an Angle settler, would be likely to give him warning if he knew that a raid was to be expected from the mountains; he did not want the home that fed him, broken up, or the cattle he tended taken away. In these ways a large admixture of Welsh blood must have come about near the borders of Wales.'

J. Loth makes the following statement [1]):

'Il faut remarquer que les traditions brittoniques devaient s'être conservées chez des populations du Wessex entièrement saxonisées au point de vue de la langue, mais où la fusion des éléments celtiques et saxons s'était faite pacifiquement, par exemple en Somerset, où le brittonique était encore parlé couramment au VII-VIII[e] siècle. J'ai eu occasion d'ailleurs de montrer à plusieurs reprises que les rapports entre les Anglo-Saxons et les Brittons n'avaient pas eu le caractère d'implacable hostilité qu'on leur a trop souvent attribué' [2]).

---

[1]) In the Introduction to: Les Mabinogion, Paris 1913.

[2]) cf. Rev. Celt. XIII, 485-488.

E. Windisch [1]) says: 'Zimmer's Theorie dasz der Sachse nichts vom Britannier und der Brittannier nichts vom Sachsen annahm, gilt höchstens bis ins 10 Jahrhundert. Selbst auf kirchlichem Gebiete beobachten wir Annäherung: nur im Cymrischen finden wir für Pfingsten sachlich dieselbe Bezeichnung wie im Angelsächsischen: Sulgwyn, d.i. "weiszer Sonntag" wie Englisch whitsuntide.'

Again (p. 60): 'Ihm (= Caduallo) folgte sein Sohn Cadwalladrus ..... dessen Mutter eine Halbschwester des Penda von Mercia war. Dieses Verhältnis veranschaulicht wie Britanni und Saxones doch im Laufe der Zeit verschmolzen sind.'

Lappenberg I, 151: 'The districts called by the Saxons those of the Sumorsætas, of the Dornsætas (Dorsetshire) and the Wilsætas were lost to the kings of Dyvnaint at an early period; though for centuries afterwards a large British population maintained itself in those parts among the Saxon settlers, as well as among the Defnsætas, long after the Saxon conquest of Dyvnaint, who for a considerable time preserved to the natives of that shire the appellation of the "Welsh kind".'

A. H. Krappe in Anglia LVI, 1 Heft p. 101-104, A Welsh Animal Tale in England, discusses the origin of an English song about the owl and traces it to a Welsh origin. He says in conclusion: 'It would seem then, that we are dealing with a Celtic, i.e. Brythonic tradition, current no doubt, not only in the Principality proper, but in the adjoining countries of England in which, down to Shakespeare's time, the Welsh language was still commonly spoken and in which Welsh traditions were no doubt still a living force.'

J. H. G. Grattan, in Rev. of Engl. Stud. VI, no. 21, p. 88 f. reviewing R. E. Zachrisson's Romans, Kelts and Saxons in Ancient Britain, says: 'There appears to be no doubt

---

[1]) Das Kaiserliche Britannien in: Abh. der Kön. Sächs. Geselsch. der Wissensch. Bd. XXIX N°. VI, p. 244.

that the linguistic evidence set forth in this useful little treatise, supports the historical and archaeological evidence in favour of the view that some fusion of the British and Saxon races took place between the battle of Mount Badon and the onslaught of Ceawlin. In the author's own words: in the western areas "the number of British survivors must have been much larger than in the East. In point of fact, the only theory that reconciles all the clashing evidence is that the Britons were not exterminated but absorbed by the Saxon conquerors. Their civilisation vanished, but the race remained".'

This may suffice to show that *a priori* Welsh influence cannot be considered impossible or even improbable. In fact, Madden is rather definite [1]): 'That Laȝamon was indebted for some of these legends to Welsh traditions not recorded in Geoffrey of Monmouth or Wace, is scarcely to be questioned and they supply an additional argument in favour of the theory that the former was not a mere inventor.'

The following three arguments are used by the advocates of Welsh influence:

a) Laȝamon corrects not only some Anglo-Saxon names in Wace, but in Celtic names too he often gives a better form than Wace.

b) Laȝamon gives some episodes and names in connection with Wales that are not found in G. or W.

c) Laȝamon sometimes changes the aspect of the story in favour of the Britons and against the Saxons.

In the first case we are on slippery ground, as Imelmann has demonstrated, for the Wace-text edited by Le Roux de Lincy is only one out of a number of texts, some of which often prove to have better readings than the published one, not to mention the fact that Le Roux's editorship was far from satisfactory, because he not infrequently misread

---

[1]) Preface to Laȝamon's Brut, XVI.

the names. Wülcker, who strongly advocates Welsh influence, bases himself in this case upon a few names like L. (A-text) *Wenhauer*, L. (B-text) *Gwenayfer*, W. *Genievre*, G. *Ganhumara*, Brut Tys. *Gwenhwyfar*; L. *Howel*, W. *Hoël*, G. *Hoëlus*, Brut Tys. *Howel*; L. *Modred*, W. *Mordred*, G. *Modredus*, Brut Tys. *Medrod*, in the last case unfortunately proving the very opposite of what he intended, for *Modred* cannot be a Welsh name, as Zimmer has pointed out [1]). In spite of this slip however, there can be no doubt that in some names L. keeps very close to the Welsh forms, e.g. in *Gwenayfer* and *Kai* (W. *Genievre*, *Kex*; Welsh *Gwenhwyfar*, *Kai*), but it is noteworthy that this remains practically confined to a few well-known names like the ones just mentioned. In the majority of cases L. agrees with Wace against the Welsh Bruts. For instance in the enumeration of the children of Efroc (L. I, 114; W. I, 76; G. II, 8) L. agrees closely with W. and has not a single Welsh name among them. As no W.-MS. has as yet provided us with perfect equivalents of the first-mentioned Welsh names, it would appear most likely that Laȝamon was acquainted with the Welsh names of the principal characters figuring in the Arthurian stories, because he had probably heard tales about them. Not knowing Welsh, he would only remember the names of those characters that stood out conspicuously, while he forgot or never heard the names of the rest, and so followed W. meekly there.

But not only is Wülcker convinced that Laȝamon consciously rectified Welsh proper names, he also shows himself convinced that Laȝamon worked up tales of Welsh origin into his poem. 'Es kann wohl kaum ein Zweifel sein, dasz Laȝamon viele derselben mündlicher Überlieferung verdankt.' With this we touch upon the mootest point in the question of L.'s sources. Let us consider the following 'Celtic' (i.e. Welsh) traits advanced by Wülcker:

---

[1]) Z. f. frz. Spr. u. Litt. XII, 254 ff.

1) The satirical songs on the Welsh king Carric by his own subjects (L. III, 155).

2) The satirical songs on Octa and Ebissa by the soldiers of Uther Pendragon (L. II, 397).

3) The many additions to the story of Arthur: his birth attended by elves, the story of the Round Table, his weapons, and the story of his death and translation to Avalon.

In illustration of the first point we subjoin the respective passages in L. and W.

L. III, 155.

Þa com an of his cunne
Carric wes ihaten.
And nom þisne kinedom:
and mid seorȝen wunede þer on.
Snel cniht wes Carric:
ah he nes noht iseli.
Þat wes for unleoden:
spilden al his þeoden.
Þeos king wes aðel Bruttisc mon:
hux and hoker me warp him on.
heo for-lætte Carriches
& Kinric hine cleopede.
And ȝet on feole bocken:
his nome me swa writeð.
Folc hine gunnen hænen:
folc hine gune hatien.
and hoker loð sungen:
bi laðen þan kingen.

W. II, 235.

Quant cil fu mors et enfuis
Si fu après lui rois Caris.
Puis fu Ceris rois de la tere,
Mais tote la perdi par guere;
Dolans fu et maléuros,
Et à tole gent anuios.

As may be expected, Imelmann's views on this point differ widely from Wülcker's. First of all, he rightly rejects

a hypothesis forwarded by Brown, that Kinric should be an English corruption of the Welsh word *Cymraeg* [1]). Apart from the fact that *Cymraeg* indicates only the Welsh language, while *Cymro* is used for Welshman, the stress in *Cymraeg*, originally a trisyllable [2]), falls on the last syllable in modern Welsh and there would be no reason for the stressed *ae* (at Laȝamon's time probably only the *a* was stressed) to pass into *i*, so that corruption as advocated by Brown is out of the question [3]). Imelmann contends that Cinric (Carric) is not a Welsh king at all, and assumes on the authority of Stephens and Zenker that Geoffrey's prototype of Carric viz. Careticus is none but the first West-Saxon king Cerdic, who had a son called Cinric. The couple Carric-Kinric has, according to Imelmann, been taken from Gaimar, or at least a work based on Gaimar, and has been misunderstood by Laȝamon. We read in the former's Estorie des Engles l. 819 ff.:

.... Certiz od son navire
(Ariva a Certesore
Un moncel ki pert uncore)
La ariva il e son fiz;
Engleis lapelerent Chenriz.

And again l. 873 ff.:

Quinz anz regna li reis Certiz;
Apres sa mort regna Chenriz
(Fiz fu Certiz, mult guereia
E grant peis a sei turna)
E les Bretons mult le haeient
E sovent rancone li fesaient.

---

[1]) Probably Brown meant to suggest: *Cymreig* = pertaining to the Welsh.

[2]) According to J. Morris Jones (A Welsh Grammar, p. 35) the *Cym|rá|eg* as a trisyllable persisted in the 15*th* century:

Cymro da i **Gym|rá|eg,**
Cymered air Cymru deg.
(Guto'r Glyn, flourished 1450-80)

[3]) See on this: G. J. Williams ac E. J. Jones, Gramadegau'r Penceirddiaid (Caerdydd, 1934), pp. 34, 95.

Imelmann says (p. 100 f.): 'Es ist nun noch denkbar, ein flüchtiger Leser habe die erstgenannte Stelle so gedeutet, als sei Chenriz nur ein andrer Name für Certiz gewesen; wurde nun Certiz mit Galfrid's Careticus zusammengebracht, so konnte auch Chenriz in einen Brut hereinkommen ... Ein solches Versehen könnte auch Laȝamon begegnet sein; aber da die ganze Episode nach Ausweis der darin vorkommenden Namen auf eine normannische Vorlage weist, so wird man auf jene Möglichkeit nicht allzuviel Gewicht legen dürfen. Indirekt gewinnen wir damit eine Stütze für die Annahme, Laȝamon habe auch seine Quellenangaben nicht direkt aus Gaimar, mithin dessen Werk selbständig nicht benutzt.'

There are a few serious objections to this theory. First one fails to see what there is particularly Norman in the names Carric and Cinric, especially in the latter. Further, L. has *Carric*, W. *Carris* and *Charic*, Gaimar on the contrary *Certiz*. Again, Gaimar tells quite a different story from L., and in ll. 873 f., clearly shows Certiz and Chenriz to be two different persons. Accordingly, it is impossible that a hypothetical W.-Gaimar compiler should have made such a blunder as to take the two for one and the same person, notwithstanding the explicit lines just mentioned. Lastly, if Imelmann were right, we should expect to find the same story in works such as Brut d'Angleterre, Robert of Brunne, Pierre Langtoft, Waurin. It will be seen from the texts printed above, that L. cannot be based on Gaimar or Wace, nor on a compilation of the two, as there would be no reason for a French compiler to commit a mistake of identity. There remain only two possibilities: either Laȝamon must have invented the whole, or he must draw upon Welsh tradition, and as invention seems out of the question, Welsh influence remains. In spite of Stephen's assertion [1]) that Welsh history knew no such king as Caredig, it is noteworthy that the name

---

[1]) Literature of the Kymry, p. 308.

Ceredic (*Ceretic*) occurs frequently [1]), just as the name *Caradog* [1]), while in one of the triads a certain *Kerric y Gwyddyl* (Kerric the Irishman) is mentioned [2]). The Annales Cambriæ give under the year 616 the following entry: *Ceretic obiit.* There can be no doubt that this is the same king that is meant by Geoffrey's *Careticus*, who was in his turn the prototype of Wace's *Charic.* As this Careticus was a lover of civil war and therefore hateful to God and the Britons [3]), it is by no means impossible that there existed mocking songs about him, and even a nick-name, probably the Welsh word *cynnhrig* meaning 'aboriginal', may have been applied to him derisively by the Saxon part of the population. This appellation does not offer the difficulties of the change Cymraeg-Cinric, as it is practically identical in pronunciation with the name Cinric [4]). In this episode we find consequently a clue for oral Welsh tradition.

Concerning the jeering song of Uther's soldiers on Octa and Ebissa, Imelmann makes a most remarkable mistake. He says [5]): 'Auf s. 546 kommt Wülcker auf keltische Sagen die La3. aus mündlicher Überlieferung herangezogen haben soll. Dasz er kymrisch konnte, wird zu Unrecht vorausgesetzt; und wer sollte ihm die Lieder „die doch nur Kelten überliefern konnten" übersetzen? Zwei Stellen sollen Wülcker's Ansicht stützen: die Cinric-Episode (III, 155) *und das Spottlied der Sachsen auf Uther* (*II, 397*). Dieses aber ist im Keime schon bei G. W. vorhanden, La3. hat nur ausführlicher, und in direkter Rede, was G. in indirekter berichtet.' We cannot but suppose that Imelmann, like Homer, was nodding when he wrote this, for Wülcker as well as La3amon are not referring to a taunting song sung by the Saxons, (which occurs earlier

---

[1]) Loth's Mab. Index.

[2]) Loth Mab. II, 263.

[3]) Amator ciuilium bellorum invisus deo et britonibus. G. XI, 8.

[4]) For another interesting article on the name, see A. Anscombe's contribution: ‚The name of Cerdic' in Y Cymmrodor XXIX, 151-203.

[5]) p. 19.

in the story), but to a satire by the British soldiers on the Saxon chiefs. Imelmann's argument may therefore summarily be dismissed. Neither W. (II, 33 ff.), nor G. (VIII, 23), nor again the Welsh Bruts Tysilio and Gruffydd ab Arthur mention any satirical songs on the part of Uther's soldiers. The conclusion is unavoidable that Laȝamon here shows himself an independent adapter of his source, with an eye for dramatic effect.

Speaking about the additions to the story of Arthur, Imelmann avers [1]): 'Dasz ... diese Züge in Widerspruch zu aller bekannten welschen Tradition stehen, hat Zimmer unzweifelbar gemacht.' We shall see in how far this can be considered right. The elves at Arthur's birth bestowing several gifts upon him, occur nowhere else. Ten Brink [2]) wants to ascribe them to Germanic, Imelmann to Breton tradition. However, the imaginative Welsh are not and have never been without fairy-tales either, so that the probability is that Laȝamon draws here upon oral Welsh tradition, as he also does in the story of the Round Table [3]).

Likewise, Laȝamon is the first Germanic author in whose work we find mention made of Argante, the Queen of Fairy-land, to whom Arthur is conveyed to recover from his deadly wounds. This story is found neither in G. nor in W., but it does occur in G.'s Vita Merlini, where the Fay's name is *Morgen* [4]). This name is undoubtedly the origin of the form Argant(e) and not, as Imelmann suggests, the Celtic stem *argento-*, *arganto-* [5]). Welsh provenance of the name at least is therefore certain, and not only of the name, as may be concluded from the following passage in Giraldus Cambrensis' Speculum Ecclesiae (c. 1216), which affords proof that the

---

[1]) p. 19.

[2]) Gesch. der Engl. Litt. I, p. 223.

[3]) cf. p. 38 f.

[4]) For an explanation of the name Morgen, see J. Loth, Rev. Celt. XIII, 496 f. and F. Lot, Romania XXVIII, 321 ff.

[5]) cf. Bruce's article in M.L.N. XXVI, 65 ff.

Welsh had a tradition of their own about Arthur's death, with which Laȝamon may very well have been acquainted:

.... *Arthuro ibi mortaliter vulnerato, corpus eiusdem in insulam Avaloniam, quae nunc Glastonia dicitur, a nobili matrona quadam eiusque cognata et Morgani vocata, est delatum, quod postea defunctum in dicto coemeterio sacro, eadem procurante, sepultum fuit. Propter hoc enim fabulosi Britones et eorum cantores fingere solebant, quod dea quaedam phantastica, scilicet et Morganis dicta, corpus Arthuri in insulam detulit Avalloniam ad eius vulnera sanandum. Quae cum sanata fuerint, redibit rex fortis et potens ad Britones regendum, ut ducunt, sicut solet* (ch. IX).

Britones is used twice in the same context. We are therefore entitled to assume that it has the same meaning in both sentences, and as *ad Britones regendum* can only mean 'to govern the British, i.e. the Welsh', the first Britones must have the same meaning, which justifies our above-mentioned conclusion. Besides, the above quotation makes the impression of being first-hand knowledge, which would imply at least one visit to the country in question. Now Gerald was a born Welshman, author of an Itinerary and a Description of Wales, whereas, though we know that he studied in Paris for some time, there is no direct evidence that he ever visited Brittany. This strengthens us in our conviction that his reference to *fabulosi Britones et eorum cantatores* must be aimed at his Welsh countrymen.

Returning to the name Argant(e), it remains to be determined whether it can be a Welsh (or English) corruption of Morgant, or must needs be French. If we consider how the name became *Urganda* in Spanish and *Organie* in the Dutch Merlin, it is hard to see why such a corruption could not have occurred in Welsh or English. The *e* of Argante is not such a decisive proof of French origin as is sometimes supposed. It ought to be borne in mind that the two extant Laȝamon-texts are not to be equated with the archetype, but represent

a copy of it [1]). In this respect it is significant that L. gives three forms: Argant, Argante and Argane, so that there is a possibility of a copyist changing an original *e*-less form into a more normal-looking form with *-e*. This hypothesis gains in probability through the fact that in all other accounts of Arthur's death and translation besides Laȝamon, except where she is nameless, the fay is called Morgan, or some such form with *M*, whereas it is only in the Roman de Troie that we find the name without the initial *M*, e.g. as *Orua, Orna, Oua, Orains, Ornains, Oruain, Ornais* etc., forms which could never have produced Laȝamon's Argant(e).

Bruce believes [2]), that the passage in L. concerning Arthur's translation to Avalon, may have been suggested to the author of the expanded Wace by the Vita Merlini, but thinks it was more probably drawn directly from Celtic tradition. In view of the fact, however, that immediately after Geoffrey's work became known, the Welsh literary activity increased tremendously, we maintain that it is all but certain, that Welsh tales reached the English priest in Worcestershire which he was not slow to turn to account [3]).

Another interesting point is Laȝamon's narrative of the institution of the Round Table [4]). According to L., at a great feast on Yule-day, there arose a fierce quarrel among the guests because *Aelc hafede an heorte — leches heze — and lette pat he weore — betere pan his iuere*. Feeling ran high, it came to a fight, loaves and bowls filled with wine were thrown about, and a hand-to-hand fight began. At this

---

[1]) cf. R. Seyger op. cit. p. 70.

[2]) Ev. of A.R. I, 33 note 73.

[3]) Imelmann's statement is debatable when he says on p. 26: 'Morgan spielt im Kymrischen Volksglauben keine Rolle,' for this is based on Zimmer's limitation of *Britones* to *Bretons* in the passage quoted on p. 35. This limitation, however, is by no means generally accepted and in our opinion erroneous, as we have already endeavoured to prove.

[4]) L. II, ll. 22736 ff.

juncture, the son of Rumaret, king of Winet, who was a hostage at the court of Arthur, begged the King and Queen to retire, as he would bring these *uncuðe kempen* to heel. When he had killed seven men, and the fight had become general, the king and a hundred noble knights appeared again in full armour to quell the disturbance, and Arthur inflicted a terrible punishment on the man that started the fight. His next of kin, too, were put to death and Arthur proclaimed that any of his folk that should ever again disturb the peace, should be drawn to pieces by horses. After that, all present swore an oath never to break the peace again; the dead were buried, and the guests sat down to the board again:

Birles þer þūrgen
gleomē þer sungen
harpen gūnē dremen
duȝeðe wes on selē.

And this state of bliss went on for fully seven nights. *Seoðden hit seïð in pere tale — pe king ferde to Cornwale,* and there came to him a crafty workman, who offered to make a table that could seat 1600 men and more, and yet Arthur could carry it with him. At this table all would be of equal rank. In four weeks' time the work was completed and a banquet was held in honour of it.

Þis wes þat ilke bord
þat Bruttes of ȝelpeð.
And sugeð feole cunne lesinge
bi Arðure þan kinge.
Swa deð auer alc mon
þe oðer luuien ne con.
Ȝif he is him to leof
þenne wule he liȝen
and suggen on him wurðscipe
mare þenne he beon wurðe.
Ne beo he no swa luðer mon
þat his freond him wel ne on. L. II, 541.

Madden in his note (III, 383) says: 'This tradition respecting the Round Table wholly rests with Wace, for Geoffrey is perfectly silent respecting it, which is the more extraordinary, since there is no reason to doubt the assertion of the former, that the Britons had many marvellous stories about its institution .... It is by no means improbable that in the narrative of the English poet one of these popular traditions on the foundation of the Round Table may have been preserved, since it would appear hardly credible that the whole should be a mere invention of the writer.'

In J. D. Bruce's opinion 'This passage has nothing to correspond to it in the extant text of Wace's Brut, but, in view of the Irish parallels, must be accepted as undoubtedly derived ultimately from Celtic tradition' [1]). In accordance with his general conception of the provenance of the Arthur-legends and on the authority of Imelmann's work he inclines to the opinion that the story is of Armorican origin. However, as we hope to expose below, this is extremely improbable.

In our opinion Madden's view can be proved to be correct. The fact is that nobody except Fletcher seems as yet to have observed that Laȝamon himself avers openly in this episode that he is following a tale. That this was an orally delivered story is established beyond doubt by other passages where Laȝamon refers to his sources as *summe bokes* [2]), *beoð on beoken* [3]), *pere Aenglisce boc* [4]), *feole bocken* [5]), so that if he had followed a book here, he would have had no reason to change his expression. His words *seoðden hit seiþ in pere tale* are capable of only one construction, viz. that he was recording one of the many fabulous tales current about the Round Table in his time. That this was not a French but a Welsh or anglicized Welsh tale is evident from

[1]) Ev. of A.R. I, 84.
[2]) II, 597.
[3]) I, 181.
[4]) II, 27.
[5]) III, 155.

the rough-and-tumble spirit in which it is written. The courteous manners of a later age are absent in this vulgar brawl in which loaves and winecups are thrown about and in which the relentless, cruel punishments suggest an earlier and more barbarous age than that of the medieval French Bruts or court-romances. Our conclusion is consequently that Laȝamon presents us here with a Welsh tale in English garb.

The next problem to confront us is the names occurring in Laȝamon's description of Arthur's armour [1]). For instance L. calls Arthur's helm *Goswhit*, a name which occurs nowhere else. Madden, Wülcker and Brown conceive this to be the translation of a Welsh name corresponding to *Goose-white*, because so many Welsh names connected with Arthur are composed with *-white* (Welsh: *gwyn*, fem.: *gwen*), e.g. *Prydwen*, Arthur's ship, *Gwenhwyfar*, his wife, *Carnwenhan*, his dagger. But when Brown places *Wynebgwrthucher*, Arthur's shield, also among this group, he is slightly mistaken, the name meaning *face* (wyneb) *of evening* (gwrthucher). Imelmann rejects their thesis that the name Goswhit occurs nowhere else, as 'unbewiesen und nie beweisbar'. It is characteristic of Imelmann's attitude that he applies tests to the work of others that he never dreams of applying to his own. Because Imelmann is forced to make everything fit into his Norman theory, he supposes in this case also that the name was introduced by a Norman elaborator of Wace, and suggests as its origin the Cymric word *gospeith* = glittering, polished (Mod. W. *gosbaith*) [2]). This last supposition is indeed extremely probable, in fact, much more so than the theory of a translation from the Welsh, as the name *Goswhit* would then be a unicum among all the others which have remained untranslated. Accepting therefore

[1]) L. II, 463 f.

[2]) Imelmann's other hypothesis 'blosse Verderbnis läge näher, wenn man von der bretonischen Form für *gwydd* ausginge: *goaz*, *gwaz* (> *gos-*) founders of course on the fact that the Breton for *white* (= *gouenn*) could never have been corrupted into *whit*.

Imelmann's theory of corruption, we differ however in opinion as to how this corrupted form reached Laȝamon. The transition *þ* > *w* in *gospeith* > *goswiht* points to a written tradition in insular handwriting. So the cause of corruption was undoubtedly one of manuscript and not of oral tradition, but the name probably came to Laȝamon's knowledge by means of the latter. In any case, however, we are bound to recognize an independent Welsh trait in this name.

Another crux offered us by L. is the name of the smith of Carmarthen who made Arthur's spear [1]). His name was *Griffin*. Brown's assumption that this must be a corruption of *Gofan* (older *Goban*), the Celtic magic smith, by way of an intermediate phase *Gaban* can hardly be maintained, for as Imelmann rightly observes [2]): 'In Gaban eine Form des Brittischen namens zu sehn hindert der Umstand, dass dieser das im Irischen bewahrte *b* längst zu *f* (*v*) erweicht hatte, als der Zauberschmied den Brown Gobban, Gofan and Govan nennt, den Übergang, "into general Arthuriantradition" hätte erleben können' [3]). Imelmann thinks that like other details which Laȝamon took from the Wace-Gaimar version, he must have found this name also in his Norman source. But even supposing this for a moment to be true, on the strength of some similarities in treatment of the source between L. and some Anglo-Norman Bruts, the inference would be unwarranted that a l l deviations in L. must needs

---

[1]) L. II, 576.

[2]) p. 32.

[3]) In the following passage from the Polistorie del Eglise de Christ de Caunterbyre adduced by Brown as cited by Fletcher (P.M.L.A. XVIII, 90), *gaban* is evidently a corruption of the French Galand (O.N. Völundr):

> Ieo su forte trenchaunte e dure,
> gaban me fist per mult grant cure,
> XIII anns auoyt ihesu crist
> Kaunt galan metrempa e fist.
> (inscription on Gawain's sword.)

have been present in his source. The name Griffin is best explained as a Latin or Anglo-Saxon corruption of the Welsh name *Gruffydd* (Engl. *Griffith*). In the Descriptio Kambriae for instance we find: *Griphinus (Gryffydd) filius Resi et Resus filius Griphini qui hodie praeest*, while the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle also mentions the name *Griffin* a number of times [1]). It is at all events very well possible, that Laȝamon is here indebted to an oral Welsh tradition about the maker of Arthur's sword, whose name he anglicized in the same way as his Old English forebears.

But not only does Laȝamon add proper-names in the parts connected with Arthur, we also find names unexpectedly cropping up in other places, where Wace either fails to give a name or gives a different one. Among these the following present themselves: *Adionard, Anster, Delgan, Galarne, Gerion, Lador, Meleon* and *Oriene*. As to the name Adionard, (G. *Dinoot*; Brut Tys. *Dynawd*; W. *Dyonos*). We consider Imelmann's explanation of it undoubtedly correct [2]), but in the case of Anster [3]), Gormund's father, who is nameless in G. and W., it seems to us a somewhat hazardous supposition to identify him with Gormund himself, who, on his conversion in 879, received the name of *Aethelstan*. Imelmann points out that this name in French writers was sometimes corrupted into *Alstagnus, Alstemus, Alestang*, but recognizes himself that there is an undeniable distance between these forms and Laȝamon's reading, 'doch dürfte er noch gerade gering genug sein, um eine Identifikation, und damit die Anerkennung der über die Herkunft von Anster aufgestellten Behauptung zu empfehlen. Eine Schwierigkeit ist der Umstand, dasz Anster bei Laȝ. nicht Gormund selbst bezeichnet. Aber da

---

[1]) Anglo-Saxon Chron. ed. B. Thorpe, I, 302 has: *Griffin se Norperna cyng*; id. I, 316: *Griffin se Wylisce cing*.

[2]) Imelmann p. 24 f.

[3]) L. III, 156.

der Dichter die ganze Episode in der Normannischen Vorlage gefunden haben musz, so gehört auch jene Schwierigkeit, wenn sie wirklich eine ist, dieser Vorlage an' [1]). Is it not stretching credulity a little too far, to accept the change of Aeðelstan into Anster? Moreover, is it likely that a French compiler of Wace-Gaimar should be so well versed in Anglo-Saxon history that he knew of Gormund's other name, and at the same time so muddle-headed as to apply this name to Gormund's father? It seems hardly possible. *Anster* rather seems to stand for *Anscar(ius)*, a viking-name like Gormund (O.N.*Asgeirr*, *Osgār* etc) [2]). Laȝamon perhaps borrowed the name from a Geoffrey MS. that had it, or else may be held himself responsible for the introduction.

Another curious name in this episode is that of Gormund's brother *Gerion*, whom G. does not mention at all and who in W. has no name [3]). L. speaking of Anster has [4]):

> he hafde sonen tweien,
> snelle cnihtes beien:
> Gurmund hehte þe eldere
> and Gerion hehte þe ȝeongere.

Imelmann wants to connect this Gerion with *Gurim*, younger brother of Rollo in Dudo, while Rollo is a near relative of *Guthorm's* (= Gormund) in Hugo de Fleury. As, according to Zenker, there was a popular tradition which linked up Gormund and Rollo, Imelmann deems the conclusion 'perhaps' justified, that Gerion and Gurim are variants of one and the same name which should have passed from Norman tradition into L.'s source. However, the connecting thread of popular tradition seems rather slender in this case,

---

[1]) p. 26.

[2]) For a good discussion of Gormund see Th. M. Chotzen's article: Gormont d'Irlande et Iseult, in Rev. Celt. XLV, 272 ff.

[3]) W. II, 237: *A un sien frère le donna — A un son frère jonéor.*

[4]) III, 156.

and though we will not disguise the fact that a theory of corruption also has its assailable points, we venture to submit that Gerion may be a corruption of *jonéor* (see p. 42, note 3.).

For the name *Lador* [1]), Imelmann offers two explanations: *a*) L.'s source had the name already. *b*) L. misread the W.-text: *Uns sien niès ot après l'onor* [2]). Imelmann's suppositon that Laȝamon may have corrupted *l'onor* into *Lador* is untenable, as Laȝamon translated similar expressions quite regularly in other places [3]). A mistake like this, improbable in an English priest, must be deemed wholly impossible in a Norman writer. Yet we find Imelmann writing: 'Dergleichen aber kann auch schon einem normannischen Schreiber passiert sein; und so kommen wir auch auf diesem Wege zu der Annahme, Laȝ. folge hier wie sonst, nur einer Wace-version und keiner andern Quelle.' Now it is a curious fact, that L. is not the only text to confer a name on Gorbonianus' son, e.g. MS. Cotton Vesp. D. IV, f. 132*b* gives *Regin*, Matthew Paris' Chronica Majora I, 170: *Regnavit Regin, Gorboniani filius*, as the editor remarks: 'apparently for Regni diadema suscepit.' Br. Gr. ab A.: *Ac gwedy marw Elydyr War y deuth Rys vap Gorvynyawn yn vrenyn* (p. 495). Brut Tys.: *Ac yn y ol ynte y gwnaythbwyt Gorviniaw y vab ynte yn vrenin* (p. 448). It is evident from these various names, that the confusion with regard to Gorbonian's son was fairly wide-spread, and this can only be explained by a general desire to fill up the lacuna in G.: *Defuncto itaque Eliduro suscepit Gorboniani filius regni diadema.* The mistakes in the Welsh Bruts are probably due to misreading of the Latin text, while Lador is presumably a corruption of the name *Elidurus*, either by Laȝamon or by a French writer. Perhaps the W.-M S. employed by Laȝamon, had a note in the margin giving the name as an afterthought.

---

[1]) L. I, 292.

[2]) W. I, 175.

[3]) cf. W. I, 174; I, 161; I, 157; I, 180; I, 231, and the corresponding translation in L.

The son of Modred that fled to Winchester is mentioned in L. [1]) as *Meleon*, whereas he has no name in G. and W. According to Imelmann this Meleon is a Norman corruption of the Welsh *Maelgwn* (< *Maglocunus*), who appears in L. III, 153, as *Malgus* (W. II, 235 and G. XI, 7 *Malgo*). Phonetically this is possible, but the similarity in fate between the two is extremely slight. Maelgwn, according to Brut Tysilio, dies in the church of a convent after he has seen the yellow plague through a hole in the church-door, whatever that may mean, and Meleon dies at Winchester. Moreover, as Bruce has pointed out [2]), the name Meleon occurs also in the Mort Artu [3]) as *Malehaus* or (in ms. Royal 19 C. XIII) as *Melehan*, so that there can be no doubt that L. took this name at least from a French Brut, probably a younger W.-text [4]).

Imelmann observes on the name *Oriene* [5]) (Octaves' daughter given in marriage to Maximian), that it cannot be said with certainty if the name is due to a corruption of *roine* in

> Et oir le face de son règne,
> Si sera sa fille roine. W I, 275.

but that the name does not agree with Welsh tradition at any rate, as the Welsh Bruts etc. give the name as Helen. A more plausible interpretation may be found in Bruce's article [6]), where Oriene is explained as a French corruption

---

[1]) III, 150.

[2]) M.L.N. XXVI, 68.

[3]) p. 255.

[4]) This does not imply that we accept Imelmann's theory unconditionally. We only wish to admit that it is fairly certain that Laȝamon used another W.-text than the one printed, but we maintain at the same time, that Laȝamon worked this text in his own way, and added to it whenever he saw fit.

[5]) L. II, 55.

[6]) M. L. N. XXVI, 69.

of the Welsh name *Orwen* which occurs in the Latin Romance Vita Meriadoci [1]).

L. I, 191 gives the name *Delgan* to Aelfing's daughter, unnamed in G., W., and the Welsh Bruts. Imelmann identifies these two persons with a certain king Elsung and his daughter *Odilia*, who appear in the Wilkina-saga. Imelmann assumes that G. knew this saga, and had the name in an original version now lost. 'La3. wird aber unabhängig von seiner normannischen Vorlage seine Delgan (schon die Form deutet darauf) nicht habben gewinnen können; kymrische Vermittlung ist jedenfalls ausgeschlossen, und Galfrid hat der Dichter nicht herangezogen' [2]). We venture to suggest that Delgan does not look specially French and has not even the feminine ending *-ne* to support the claim of its French descent. Considering that in chapter II it has been shown that La3amon drew straight from Geoffrey in places, the possibility is that La3amon found the name in a Geoffrey-MS. unknown to us, rather than that a French MS. should have furnished the name.

Lastly, Imelmann may be right in his explanation of the name *Galarne*)[3], Brian's sister, as a Frenched form of Kymric *galar* (sorrow), on account of the ending *-ne*. But this does not justify his conclusion that therefore the whole episode with Pelluz and the recognition of the would-be pilgrim is based on a French text. Imelmann's assumption would be better founded, if W. did not mention Pelluz and Brian's sister at all, but the frame of the episode, in which the two just mentioned characters figure, is found in W. II, 273 upon which La3amon embroidered to his heart's content, and to which he also added the name Galarne.

A few more names, like *Cadal* [4]), *Gille Callaet* [5]), *Gille*

[1]) p. 352.
[2]) p. 28.
[3]) L. III, 237.
[4]) L. II, 116.
[5]) L. II, 142 f.

Caor [1]), occurring in L., are ascribed by Imelmann wholesale to the Norman source, because 'Jüngere Brut-versionen lieben Aufzählungen exotischer Namen', and 'Als Laȝ. schrieb wurden gerade irische Verhältnisse durch französische Darstellungen bekannt' [2]). But L. has more names than only exotic ones[3]), and furthermore it is a little obscure why Imelmann reckons only Normans capable of introducing new names into the story. As a matter of fact, on the next page Imelmann admits, that it would not do to assume that Laȝamon should have limited his reading to Wace's Brut and never have heard of other similar works. 'Deshalb soll die Möglichkeit nicht bestritten werden, dasz hier und da eine Einzelheit in seiner Dichtung, besonders Namen, anderswoher übernommen ist' [4]). It cannot be said that Imelmann has disproved Laȝamon's independence in introducing new names.

---

[1]) L. I, 429.

[2]) p. 36.

[3]) cf. Malgod, Aldolf, Aelcus, Escol, Ethelbald, Aelfwald, Joram, Anster.

[4]) p. 37.

CHAPTER IV.

LAȝAMON AND HIS NORMAN SOURCES.

If L. can be shown to have many points in common with other French chronicles derived from Wace or Gaimar, while differing on these points from Wace, the odds are that L. as well as these Chronicles go back to a common source, viz. a Wace-Gaimar compilation. This induced Imelmann to collaterate Laȝamon's Brut with the so-called Brut d'Angleterre, an 'in England verfasste Prosaauflösung einer verlorenen, aber dem überlieferten Wace unverkennbar nahestehenden normannischen Reimchronik. In seinen „brittischen" Partien kann daher B. A. als eine jüngere Wace-version bezeichnet werden' [1]). As this chronicle has not been published, we can base our judgment of its significance for the L.-problem only on the passages quoted by Imelmann. Nor was Caxton's translation accessible to us, though we did lay hands on The Brut or the Chronicles of England, vol I, E. E. T. S. no. 131, which is also a Middle English translation of the Brut d'Angleterre. We found it disagreeing from L. on so many essential points, that the two works cannot possibly be referred to a common source. As it is our aim to test possible agreements and not to establish the existence of differences (which would moreover fill a separate volume), we shall abstain from giving the latter here. Incidentally it may be remarked, that B. A. belongs to the 15th century and is consequently two centuries later than Laȝamon's Brut.

The first comparison given by Imelmann is that of the

---

[1]) p. 37.

Leir-episode [1]), which affords a typical instance of the way in which he forces the facts into the strait-jacket of his theory. For instance: 'Dem Aganippus erwidert Lear auf seine Werbung:

> Ac ȝef þu heo wult habben —
> for mæide heo is hende —
> ich heo wulle þe biwiten
> and senden heo þe in ane scipe
> mid seoluen hire claðen;
> of me nafð heo na more.

Zwar sagt W. I, 88:

> Et Leir la li otroia
> Oltre la mer li envoia
> Ses fille et ses dras solement
> N'i ot altre apparellement.

Aber bei L. ist der Zug von den Kleidern geschickter als eine Bedingung Lear's verwendet. Eine solche Bedingung setzt die Antwort des Aganippus in B. A. voraus: „qu'il ne demanda ren for son cors soulement et sa vesture".' But even a cursory glance at the Wace text (I, 88) will show that the condition was actually there.

> Leir n'avoit mie oblié
> Coment sa fille l'ot amé;
> Ains l'ot bien sovent ramenbré
> Et al roi de France a mandé
> Que tot son raine a devisé
> Et à ses deus filles doné;
> La moitié à la primeraine
> Et l'autre après à la moiaine,
> *Mais se sa fille li plaisoit*
> *Il li donroit, plus n'i prandroit.*

---

[1]) L. I, 133 ff; W. I, 88.

It is obvious that the last two lines contain in germ Leir's condition on which Imelmann based his assumption. Again compare:

W. I, 88:

Al roi Léir de recief mande
Que nul avoir ne li demande,
Mais seul sa fille li otroit
Cordéille, si li envoit.

L. I, 136:

ne bidde ich nanne maðmes:
me seolf ich habben inoȝe.
bute þat mæiden Cordoille:
þēne hæbbe ich mine wille.

B.A. *qu'il ne demanda ren for son cors soulement et sa vesture.*

and it appears very clearly that L. is in closer agreement with W. than with B. A.

In the next example, it is evident that L. and B. A. are two entirely independent elaborations of the W.-text. Leir has gone from Goneril to Ragau, but here he meets with an even worse treatment, which makes him lament:

W. I, 92:

Caitif moi, dist-il, mar i vinc,
Se vix sui là, plus vils sui ça.

L. I, 144:

Ich wes at Gornoille....
mid þritti cnihtes
þe ȝet ich mihte libben
ah þenne igonne liðen
ich wende swiðe wel to don
ac wurse ich habbe underfon.

B. A. Cott. f. 86*b*: *Donq se dementa leyr troþ malement et dist en plorant: allas, fest il, qe onqs ving en ceste terre; enqore me vausist il meux auer demore od ma premere fille.*

The same holds good of L. I, 158, W. I, 98 and B. A. Cott. f. 87*a*.

L. I, 149:

> Leir ferde to þere sæ
> mid ane alpie swein.
>
> Forð wende þe king Leir
> nauede he bute ēne swein.

B. A.: *et enuea son esquier a la reyne.*

W. l. 2029: *Un escuier a envoie.*

On this flimsy evidence Imelmann wants to connect L. and B. A., though it is clear that L. is much more emphatic than B. A. Probably G. II, 12 was responsible: *Quo indicato commota est cordeilla & fleuit amare. quesiuitque quot milites secum haberet Qui respondit neminem habere excepto quodam armigero qui foris cum eo expectabat.*

On p. 44 Imelmann says: 'L. I, 294 Iwallo regiert 7 Jahre; bei Caxton 8 (Hss. vacant). Stimmen diese Angaben auch nicht genau überein, so zeigen sie doch eine der L. und B. A. gemeinsamen Eigentümlichkeiten, nämlich die Einfügung bestimmter Zeitangaben.' It is interesting to compare with this what the same writer says on p. 89: ' "G. says that in ascending the hill at the battle of Badon, Arthur lost many of his men, and L. that he lost five hundred, while Wace does not speak of any loss at all". Eine solche — *nicht einmal genaue* — Übereinstimmung ist schwerlich beweiskräftig.' But then, we wonder, why should it be 'beweiskräftig' in the case of L. and B. A.? Not to mention that L., in relating the battle of Badon, gives not only a number, but also a fact that is passed over by Wace.

The agreement between L. I, 350 *þat me Euerlin fordo, no þer slæ ne na aho* and B. A. *et iura qe Euelin serroit pendu* is purely fortuitous, and due to a *cliché* of the English poet, coupled with a more or less conscious desire for rhyme. Other passages may be pointed out in the English Brut where

the same phrase occurs without a corresponding phrase in W. [1]).

The omission of the isolated fact that Nennius killed Labienus (W. I, 198) in L. and B. A. may be an independent trait of good taste in story-telling. The episode is wholly undramatic and practically irrelevant.

L. I, 425 ff. tells us about the Picts in search of wives and the introduction of Irish speech into Scotland:

L. I, 425

þurh þa ilke wifmen
þa þer wuneden longe
þat folc gan to spelien
Irlondes speche,
and auer seoðden þa laȝen
wunieð a þan londe.

W I, 247

De Bretaigne feme requisent
Et li Breton lor escondisent.
Et cil en Irlande passerent
Et de là femes amenèrent.

Imelmann quotes B. A. as a source: *Mes il ne auoient nule femmes entre eus ne les britons ne voleint doner lur filles a les estrange genz et pur ceo alerent outre en Irlaund et amenerent femmes oueq eus de cele terre et les espu(s)erent. Mes les hommes ne sauoient entendre le langage des femmes, ne les femmes ne sauoient entendre le langage des hommes; et pur ceo parlerent ensemble com s(c)otz; par out il furent apele primes (scots?), mais þ(ui)s par variance et changes de langes furent il apele scottes, escoz en franceis. Et tuz iours serront il issi apelez les hommes de cele terre.* Imelmann himself admits that L. and B. A. differ, in that according to L. the language spoken in Scotland is originally Irish, and besides, L. is much shorter. 'Trotzdem wird man nicht daran zweifeln, dasz er seinem normannischen Brut hier folgte.' We do not see the cogency of

[1]) cf. L. II, 527: *and ziſ he mihte aſon — he wolde hine slænoðeran-hon;* L. III, 266: *ziſ he wolde Oswy don — oðer slæn oðer a-hon.*

this reasoning. Can Laȝamon not have been familiar with this fact because of his general culture? In the saga of the foundation of Gloucester he also shows a certain knowledge of the history of his country.

L. II, 40 tells us that Constantin's three uncles and his mother were at Rome. B. A. Cott. f. 96*b* relates that Constantin took his uncles and his mother to Rome. W. I, 269 f. says of him:

D'aler à Rome s'apresta,
Archiers et chevaliers mena.
Trois oncles que sa mère avoit,
Que il amoit mult et creoit
Mena à Rome por chierté.
— — — — — — — — — — — —
— — — — — — — — — — — —
Dont fu Costantins emperère,
Et Hélaine sa bonne mère
En Jherusalem trespassa.

The conjecture presents itself that *que* in l. 5830 of our published W.-text (the third line of our quotation) is a mistake for *et*. By this assumption all difficulties are removed. In the alternative case Laȝamon was probably at a loss what to do with the good lady when her son and his uncles had gone to Rome, so he made her follow them. Besides, the three last quoted W.-lines may have put him on the track. Constantin was Emperor of Rome, so it would be quite natural to infer that Helena *trespassa* from Rome to Jerusalem.

The next passage treats of Constantin's succession to the throne of Britain. Imelmann (p. 47) says: 'L. II, 109. Aldroein verspricht Guencelin Hilfe durch seinen Bruder Constantin; er empfiehlt ihn und sagt:

makieð hine lauerd
ouer al Brutlondes ærd.

G. W. haben von solcher Aufforderung nichts. Aber B. A. macht Constantin's Wahl zum König zur Bedingung für die Gewährung der Hilfe.' Imelmann probably overlooked

G. VI, 4: *trado tibi constantinum fratrem meum & duo milia militum ut, si deus concesserit ut patriam a barbarica irruptione liberet, sese diademate illius insigniat. ..... Illum tibi cum prefato numero committere non diffugiam si placet ut recipiatur (i.e. as king) ..... grates egit archiepiscopus uocatoque constantino ei in hec uerba arrisit. Christus vincit ..... Ecce rex britannie deserte.* This passage explains both L. and B. A., and forms an additional argument in favour of the theory that Laȝamon consulted the Historia.

On the subject of Constantin's death by traitor-hands L. II, 116 f. says:

> þe swike set adun
> alse he wolde holden run
> & he bah to þan kinge
> alse mon dæð of runinge.
> He igrap ænne cnif swiðe long
> & þene king þermid ofstong.

B. A. Cott. f. 100*a* has: *qe fist semblant de parler od le Roy en sa oraille et le occist tant tost de un long cotel.* According to Imelmann 'G. W. haben weder vom Flüstern, noch vom langen Messer etwas.' It is clear however that *holden run* is the translation of W. l. 6610 *Come s'il volsist consellier*, and as to the long knife, that is a mere elaboration for the sake of rhyme of W.'s *Un cotel avoit.*

A similar case we meet in Imelmann's next example (p. 47): 'L. II, 228 läszt Dinabuz sagen, Merlin's Mutter sei "an hore" gewesen. W. I, 353 vacat. Aber Cott. f. 104*b*: *tut sache hom qui est vostre mere.* But in W.'s lines 7560-7570 we find every intimation necessary to suggest to Laȝamon his rather blunt way of putting the situation [1]).

---

[1]) L. II, 228: *þi moder wes an hore — for nuste heo næuere þene mon — þat þe streonde hire on.*

W. I, 353: *Jà ton père ne nomeras — Ne tu nel'sés, ne ne saras; — Ainc ton père ne connéus — Ne tu ainc père n'en éus.*

The episode of the murder of Aurelius by the Saxon Appas (L. II, 315 ff.) offers an unconvincing parallel between L. and B. A. L. makes Appas say that he will go to his inn and speak with his men, and that at midnight he will return with other healing medecine. In. B A. the traitor says that he would go out into the field till the king should wake up. W. II, 6 says merely: *Ensi fu mors, ensi fini — Et li traitres s'anfui.* G. VIII, 14 has: *Interea nefandus proditor ille inter unum & alium elapsus in curia nusquam comparuit.* Here was an excellent opportunity for a later Brut to elaborate G. or W. Consequently the motivation of the traitor's disappearance is in itself nothing surprising, and only if the two accounts are entirely identical are we entitled to the assumption that they have the same source, in other words L. is here obviously unrelated to B. A.

Imelmann (p. 48): 'L. II, 334 f. Uther erschlägt Pascent persönlich. G. W. sagen nichts davon. B. A.: *"il memes de sa main demeyne occist pascent le fiz vortiger".*'

This is a mere detail of a long passage (L. ll. 18022-18121) that Laȝamon enlarged from about fifteen lines in W. (II, 8f.). Madden III, 366 says of this passage: ' ... the amusing details of Laȝamon as well as the dramatic structure of the narrative, are entirely wanting (i.e. in Wace)', and he refers especially to Laȝamon's description of Irish warriors being fully corroborated by the testimony of contemporary writers. In such a leisurely elaboration, where everything is dramatized, it is only natural that Laȝamon should glorify Uther by making him kill Pascent in person. If L. agreed throughout this long passage closely with B. A., we should be entitled to claim a connection, which is, however, impossible under the present circumstances.

In the next example also, Imelmann commits the fundamental error of basing a connection on almost a single word (i.c. horses), which procedure, we must repeat, is especially to be condemned in judging a poet of Laȝamon's type. Here are the passages. Arthur says after his defeat of Childric:

ȝisles ich wulle habbē
of hæxten his monnen.
hors & heore wepnen
ær heo heōne wenden.
and swa heo scullen wræcchen
to heoren scipen liðen.

Soon after, Childric and 24 of his noble knights come to Arthur:

heo bi-tahten heore hors
and heore burnen.
scaftes & sceldes.
& longe heore sweordes.
al heo bi-læfden
þat heo þer hæfden.

B. A. Cott. f. 111*b* has: *et se rendirent à Arthur en ceste furme qil preist lur cheuaus , armes et quanque il eussent, et qil purreient aler tut a pe senglement a lur neefs.*
W. II, 48 f.

Consel prisent quel plait feroient,
Lor robe et lor armes lairoient;
Lor nés solement retanroient,
Et al roi ostage donroient.

Arthur accepts the covenant:

Lor nés lor a totes rendues
Et lor armes a retenues;
Et cil s'en sont mis a l'aler (i.e. en la mer).
Sans robe et sans armes porter.

Obviously, L. is a coloured translation of W., and the

coincidence of the horses proves absolutely nothing in this context.

L. III, 87 ff. Arthur exhorts his host before the battle against the emperor Luces. He says:

> And þis beoð þa for-cuðeste men.
> of alle quike monnen.
> hæðene leode.
> godd heo seondeð laðe.
> ure drihten heo bi-læueð
> and to Mahune heo tuhteð.
> & Luces þe kæisere
> of godd seolf naueð nane care.
> þat hafueð to iueren
> haðene hundes
> goddes wiðer-iwīnen.

Imelmann remarks: 'Dazu stellt sich B.A.: *"Alloms, si les requeroms asprement en le nom de deu et occirons paens et chrestiens aussi que se sunt doné a eux pur destruire chretiens, et deus nos eydera qar nostre est le droit. Eoms en deu bon esperance et ſesom issi que les enemis de la christianité seient morz et confunduz a lhonnur de deu et que home puisse dire grant bien de nostre chevalerie"* (Cott. f. 117*a*). Diese Stelle aber ist aus W. II, 206 geflossen; es ist wohl nicht anzunehmen, L. und B. A. haben unabhängig die Verschiebung in einem andern Zusammenhang vorgenommen.'

Although it cannot be denied that both L. and B. A. go back to W. II, 206, it will be seen on comparison, that the respective passages are independent elaborations of W. B. A. for instance makes no mention of Mahun. Both L. and B. A. probably used a W.-MS. that had transferred Hiresgas' speech (II, 206) to Arthur (II, 193) for greater impressiveness. This theory is supported by the fact that L. in this episode substitutes the name *Riwaððlan* (*Beduerres suster sune — of heze Bruttes he wes icume*) for Wace's Hiresgas, so that he is evidently following another W.-text than the printed one, i.e. if he is not inserting knowledge of his own.

In the anecdote of Pope Gregory and the Anglo-Saxon prisoners at Rome, L. III, 180 ff, according to Wülcker and Imelmann, differs from Bede's account (II, 1) on the following points:

1) In L. Gregory is already Pope; Augustin is sent to England immediately after the meeting between Gregory and the Anglo-Saxons.

2) In L. the meeting is not at the forum; the prisoners are not questioned themselves (this is an error, because they are).

3) Bede does not mention their number; in L. there are three.

4) In L. Gregory inquires only after their native country and makes therefore only one pun.

Imelmann (p. 49): 'Diese Züge finden sich im wesentlichen auch in B. A. : *"Et issi demorerent longement qil ne auoient roy corone ne christianté ne tindrent, mes demorerent paens longe (men)tens. Tant que saint Gregorius estoit apostoille de Rome et oit parler de Engleterre et auoit veu enfanz de la nacion en la cite de Rome qe furent durement beaus de face et de cors; et il se delita en eus regarder et demanda donq il estoient et de queu nacion; et home li dist qe de Engleterre, et engleis furent appelez, mes paens furent et tote la terre de Engleterre si fu paene, donq dist saint Gregorius*: : *'Allas, fest il, genz engleis qe ont mult de angle, ben deussent estre chretiens.' Et enuea seint Austin en engleterre od quarante compaignons".'* (Cott. f. 121*a*).

Though it is quite clear that there are too many differences for L. to be based directly on Bede II, 1, yet it must be equally apparent, that the same difficulty obtains in the case of L. and B. A. First, B. A. like Bede says nowhere that there are only three Anglo-Saxons. Second, in B. A. as in Bede, Gregory does not question the slaves themselves, but *home li dist*. Third, the Anglo-Saxons' statement that they will accept baptism, if they are freed, is found in L. only. Fourth, in L. the pope inquires not only after their law

and land, but also *of pissere leodene kinge*, which is of course a reminiscence of the pun on King Aella. Fifth, L. is the only one to tell us that Gregory set the Anglo-Saxons free and baptized them. It will need no further argument, that the disparity between L. and B. A. is hardly less important than that between L. and Bede, so that we cannot agree with Imelmann's supposition that L. and B. A. have a common source. Now it is to be observed, that L.'s account strongly bears the stamp of oral tradition: the story has been simplified, the subtle points have dropped out, and the frame-work has been nicely padded up. That the story enjoyed great popularity is neither doubtful nor surprising, and is even testified by Bede II, 1. We believe therefore, that Laȝamon took the story from oral tradition, while B. A., which is in somewhat closer agreement with Bede, may or may not be based on popular tradition.

In his next chapter, Imelmann discusses the Mort Arthur, a 14th century English poem usually ascribed to the Scot Huchown, and its relation to W. and L. Imelmann observes that Arthur 's dream of Modred's treason occurs in: 1) L. III, 117 ff., 2) Malory ed. Sommer III, 383 f., 3) Le Morte Arthur, E. E. T. S. LXXXVIII, 96, stanzas 398-400., 4) Vulgate Lancelot, Sommer III, 266 f. He remarks that nos. 2 and 3 are based, according to J. D. Bruce, on the Vulgate Lancelot, resp. its source, and proceeds to give as his opinion, that L. must be based on a Wace-version influenced by the Lancelot. This theory he supports by the following points:

1) 'Zufall in der Aehnlichkeit ist ausgeschlossen.' At the same time Laȝamon's account of the dream is so different from the other three, so simple and archaic and so little romantic, that he must have found it in a Brut, not in a Romance.

2) An essential trait of the dream in L. cannot hail from the Lancelot, but only from the 7th book of the Historia. This is a reference to L. ll. 28064-28080, where Arthur is seized by a lion, taken into the sea and brought to land again

by a fish, which lines may be based on G. VII, 3 *Catuli leonis in aequoreos pisces transformabuntur* and G. VII, 4 *Orietur in illis leo humano cruore turgidus. Fiet deinde piscis in aequore.*

Now if we compare the contents of the dream and the time at which it occurs, we shall at once realize that borrowing is out of the question [1]).

Laȝamon then, tells us that Arthur is still in Burgundy when having the dream. He knows nothing yet of Modred's treason, when a Knight comes to him with tidings about it. Throughout the night Arthur lies talking to this messenger, but the latter will not tell him the situation. In the morning Arthur looks exceedingly ill and on being asked the cause by his knights, explains that he has had a foreboding dream (which is rather contrary to the previous statement that he has been talking all night). He dreamt that men raised him upon a hall, which he bestrode as if he were on horseback, while Walwain sat before him, sword in hand. Then approached Modred with a great host and began to hew down the posts of the hall, while Wenhaver, his queen, drew down the hall with her hand. The hall fell to the ground and so did the two occupants. Arthur broke his right arm, Walwain both his. Nothing daunted, however, Arthur took his sword in his left hand and smote off Modred's head, after which he proceeded to cut the queen to pieces and put her in a black pit. His people fled and Arthur all at once found himself wandering over the moors. Suddenly a golden lion approached over the downs, seized him and

---

[1]) To quote Madden III, 406: 'This long passage affords us one of the most striking instances of amplification that occurs throughout the poem. The narrative of the dream, and the dramatic character given to the subsequent conversation between Arthur and the messenger, as well as the address of Arthur to his nobles, and the indignant speech of Walwain, are all due to the imagination of the English paraphrast, and fairly support his claim, in this and other instances, to the rank of an original writer.'

dragged him into the sea, where the waves separated them. Finally Arthur was brought to land by a fish, at which he awakes, trembling as if on fire. Then, after some discussion, the messenger tells him that his dream was true, and that Modred has taken Wenhaver to be his queen.

The dream, as it is found in Malory and Le Morte Arthur, happens under quite different circumstances and is of an entirely different nature. Arthur has heard of Modred's treason and crosses to England. On his way to Wales he stops at Salisbury, where a great many knights join him and his cause. There is to be a battle after the Trinity feast. Upon Trinity Sunday at night the King dreams that he sits in a chair fastened to a wheel above a hideous deep black water, wherein are all manner of serpents, worms and wild beasts. Then the wheel turns, Arthur falls into the water and every beast takes him by a limb. At this juncture he cries for help and is awakened by his knights.

We see from this, that time and place as well as conditions differ materially in the two versions, in fact, so much so that any attempt to prove a connection must appear unsafe. The dream as related by Laȝamon clearly falls into two parts:

1) Arthur sits on the ridge of the hall, is pulled down by Modred and Wenhaver, and takes a barbarous revenge.

2) Arthur's wanderings and meeting with the lion and the fish.

The first is an intelligible allegory and was probably invented by Laȝamon himself, the second is obscure and possibly based on G. VII. Though the reason for this curious combination is hard to find out, it would be just as strange in a French as in the English work. The clearly archaic and rude flavour of the story, added to the fact that it is found nowhere else, favours the hypothesis that Laȝamon is the inventor of it. Influence of the Prose-Lancelot on Laȝamon's French Brut-version is hardly probable, in view of the fact that 'no one has ever claimed for the Lancelot an earlier

date than the last decade of the twelfth century — generally it is dated later —' [1]), so that, under the most favourable circumstances, Laȝamon's French version ought to have been influenced and written between 1200 and 1205, and then passed straight to England. Finally, should there be any connection in the fact that L., as well as two or three other works, make mention of a dream, this would entail similarity of contents. As, however, the English priest's work is far superior (by its introduction of dramatic premonition and the finer use of allegory), there can exist no two opinions as to Laȝamon's vindication.

Concerning the two knights surviving with Arthur after the battle of Camlan, it may be observed that the tradition that others beside Arthur survived, is not only to be found in the prose-Lancelot, but also in the Welsh triads [2]), so that there is no need to assume for certain, that this item reached Laȝamon through French channels. This seems to be corroborated by the fact that L. does not name the knights, whereas the French version calls them *Lucans li boutelliers* and *Gyfles*. Undoubtedly Laȝamon would never have omitted an opportunity to insert a couple of names. It seems to us that Laȝamon is following an oral tradition, the same tradition probably that underlies Walter Map's statement in the prose-Lancelot. For Map, as the name already indicates, (Welsh: *map* = *son*) was of Welsh descent. He speaks about the Welsh as: *Compatriote nostri Walenses* [3]) and of himself as living on the marches of Wales (*marchio sum Walensibus* [4])). Therefore it is quite conceivable that Laȝamon and Map, who were contemporaries and were both living on the Welsh marches, introduced the same tradition independent of each other.

---

[1]) Ev. of A. R. I, 369.
[2]) cf. Madden III, 409.
[3]) Walter Map: De Nugis Curialium II, 20.
[4]) ib. II, 23.

Imelmann, p. 58, cites the episode of Gawain's death in L. III, 131 and M. A., as pointing to a common French source, i.e. for M. A. the Lancelot, for L. a Wace-version influenced by the Lancelot. L. tells us that Arthur lands in Romney, where he is awaited by Modred; some fight on shore, some launch their spears from the ships. (thus far L. agrees with W.). Walwain goes before and clears the way. He slays eleven thanes, among whom Childric's son, and is subsequently killed himself. In M. A. Gawain jumps into the water and makes an attack in which he is killed by Modred. W. ll. 13495-13507 tells us about a sally from the boats and says: *Ocis i fu Gavains ses niés.* Is it too fantastic to suggest that L. and M. A. are mutually independent elaborations of W.?

Lastly, we are prepared to assume with Imelmann that some names of pagan deities, as e. g. *Apollin* and *Tervagant* (L. II, 157), may have crept into a W.-MS., but this need not have been a Wace-Gaimar version [1]). For the rest, it would be nothing strange if Laȝamon, being a priest, had heard or read of these heathen gods and introduced them of his own accord. In this he would concur with Robert Mannyng [2]).

In his next chapter Imelmann discusses the Middle English romance of Arthur and Merlin (E), which according to him goes back to a French version, representing an intermediate stage between Wace and Robert de Boron. However, as Bülbring has shown [3]), E. cannot lay claim to representing

---

[1]) It may be observed here, that Imelmann is inconsistent, when he says at the end of this chapter about the contents of the younger Wace-version: 'Dasz dieser Inhalt aber aus mehr als einer litterarischen Quelle geflossen ist und schon deshalb die Arbeit der Redaktion einem einzelnen Manne — der Normannisch schrieb — zuzuschreiben ist, wird in den nächsten Abschnitten darzulegen sein.' This is clearly in conflict with his previously expressed opinion that medieval writers (i.c. Laȝamon) used only one source.

[2]) cf. p. 90.

[3]) Engl. Stud. XVI, 251 ff.

such a stage, and the L.-E. parallels, impugnable already, lose consequently all value.

Neither do we think has Imelmann succeeded in providing a convincing proof of a common source for Jean de Waurin's Chroniques et istoires and Laȝamon's Brut (ch. VIII).

Wn. 174 *Adjonet, Ajonet* — L. II, 67 ff. *Adionard* can prove nothing except that both committed the error of attracting the preposition *à* to the name.

Wn. 177 in relating Gratian's death has: *sy sassamblerent une foiz une grant tourbe de villains lesquelz lespierent a un passage, ou ilz le misrent tout par pieces et par morseaux.* L., on the other hand, has a long story of 75 lines to tell about the rising of the churls of East-Anglia under their leaders Eðelbald and Aelfwald. They ask the nobles where the king is and are told he is hunting. Then all except two hide themselves. These two lure the king towards them by promising to show him a wonderful boar, and when he comes, they kill him: *þus Gracien þe king — ut wende an hontinge.*

G. VI, 1 has: *Catervis factis irruerunt in eum plebani et interfecerunt,* which W. I, 290 renders as:

> Et li vilain s'acompagnièrent
> A grant torbes, si s'en vengièrent,
> Tot l'ont par pièces detrancié,
> Comme mastin leu esragié.

It must be clear, that neither Wn., nor G. nor W. can have been the type of L.'s highly dramatic passage. Accordingly we suggest that Laȝamon was here inserting an old English tradition, which would account for the anachronism of the two Anglo-Saxon names.

That 'L. und Wn. bisweilen Namen einschallen, wo G. und W. schweigen' does not prove much as long as the names are not identical. It is merely a trait which they have in common with most of the later Arthurian works. Imelmann's example: 'Wn. 425 Manussa, roy de Babillonie; L. III, 104

nennt Gecron Sohn des Admirals von Babylonien. G. W. haben hier überhaupt keinen Namen' carries no weight whatever. The only point of agreement between the two works that remains, is a detail from the Hirelgas and Evelin episode: L. and Wn. both intimate that Hirelgas was i n t e n t i o n a l l y killed. This one concurrence in two such large works can, however, hardly vindicate Imelmann's theory.

Chapter IX of Imelmann's work discusses MS.Reg. 13 A. XXI (British Museum) = R., which contains Wace's poem. Some 7000 lines however, from l. 52 to Arthur's birth are wholly different from W., and it is this part of the manuscript that Imelmann compares with L. Before discussing it, we wish to emphasize the fact, that this MS., which breaks off at Arthur's birth, offers no points of comparison for the subsequent period, which deprives it of a great deal of its value, since the additions in L. are especially then numerous and important for our purpose. The paralells given by Imelmann are in some cases of slight significance, whilst in others the quotations do not convey the right impression [1]).

R. 44*b*.

Idunc venent a gades,
U sunt les postes hercules.
Trestut i durent periller
Tant i trouent sereine de mer.
Quant il ne poent suffrir la guere
Hastiuement traent a tere.

L. I, 56 f.

---

[1]) In the first example (p. 66 f.) given by Imelmann without comment, it is difficult to see where exactly the L.-R. agreement must be sought. On the contrary, as the present writer sees it, L. is in clear agreement with W. (cf. for example: W. *Grant merveille li a samblé* = L. *seolcuð him puhte*).

þa comen heo to þan bunnen
þa Hercules makede....
þat weoren post(l)es stronge....
heo drowen toward hauene,
to þan londe heo ferden.

From these two passages Imelmann infers an 'Anklang L.-R.', however, on flimsy grounds. The fact is that Imelmann, by leaving out a great many lines, gives an entirely wrong impression of the L.-text, which agrees virtually much more closely with W. than with R. It is clear that the first three lines of the L.-quotation are a free translation of W. ll. 727-733:

Siglé ont et passé mult près
Des bornes que fist Herculès,
Une colombe qu'il fiça;
Ce fu uns signes qu'il mostra
Que de si là avoit conquis
Où il avoit ces piler mis.

After this, L. like W. narrates the story of the Sirens. The seafarers effect a hazardous escape and proceed on their way. After a while, the man at the helm sights Spain, and then only follow the lines which in Imelmann's quotation have such a deceptive effect (ll. 1352-1355):

Heo drowen toward hauene
haleðes weoren bliðe.
To þan londe heo ferden.
þer heo leof folc funden
feouwer þrum ferden.

It will be obvious, that these lines form a free translation of Wace's:

Et joste Espagne trespassèrent.
Là trouvèrent, à un rivage,
Des Troyens de lor lignage
Quatre grans générations.

The point to be observed is that this landing, made after the escape from the Sirens, differs essentially from the one in R., where it takes place under the compulsion of the Sirens, in other words L. is based on W. here.

The following five parallels are wholly unconvincing and due to a purely accidental similarity in the choice of words between L. and R., while it is evident that in every case L. is a more or less free translation of W.

R. 56*b*.

> Kar euelins lui tolt lespée
> Si len donat mortel colee.

This agrees in so far with L., that it represents Hirelgas as purposely killed and not accidentally as in W. But in L. Euelin does not snatch the sword from his opponent, but from a man who just passes, which agrees fairly well with G. IV, 8. Imelmann himself observed this also, but because in his opinion L. had made no use of Geoffrey's Historia, he attributed this trait to L.'s Norman source.

On p. 70 Imelmann says: ' L. II, 61 erzählt die Gründung von Coningsburh durch Conan Meriadoc, wovon Wace schweigt. Die Stadt wird später (II, 264) wiedergenannt, als Hengest dahin flieht. Bei dieser Gelegenheit macht R. 72*b* die Notiz, die aus dem früheren Zusammenhang hierher geraten zu sein scheint:

> (A son chastel donc sen turnat)
> Ke kair conan apelat;
> Conengesburc nous lapelom.

The supposition that this remark should be based on an earlier passage is untenable. Firstly, R. does not mention the building of Coningsburg any more than W., and secondly, the above-quoted lines are but an expanded translation of W. l. 7971: *A Cimigesbur vint pognant* (other MSS. :*Comangerburc, Coninghebort*). The line in R. *Ke Kair conan apelat* was probably taken from G. VIII, 5 *oppidum Kaerconan*

quod nunc Cunungeborg appellatur. There is nothing that points to this R.-passage having been transferred from an earlier place. Laȝamon probably threw in this item from his own knowledge, just as he did in the case of the foundation of Gloucester.

Imelmann continues 'L. II, 72 f. antwortet Adionard in direkter Rede auf Conan's Gesuch, W. I, 284 gar nicht. R. 64*b* hat das Gesuch selbst in direkter Rede:

Li reis coneins mariodoc
Salue son ami dionot.
Ore te prie io par amur
Ta fille me dune a uxor
E si menveiez muillers
A mes barons (e) a mes terres.

Das Gesuch ist bei L. gleich kurz. Eine Antwort darauf fehlt auch in R. Aber es heiszt hier:

Sachez que mult en fut lez
Dionetes cum vit le bref.
Sa fille lui ad apreste
Ke vrselete fust apele.

Damit vergleiche, was L. unmittelbar auf die Antwort folgen läszt: *þa ȝarkede Adionard .... his dohter Ursaele.*

Though this sounds rather plausible, it will be seen on closer scrutiny, that there can be no question of L.-R. agreement here.

1) In L. Conan merely sues for Athionard's daughter, and does not ask for a great number of maidens to give in marriage to his soldiers, as in G., W. and R.

2) In L. Athionard gives a fairly long answer to Conan's suit, and promises to send his daughter and all the women that Maximian gave him.

þider heo scullen liðen
ȝif heo wulleð libben.
oðer ich heom wullen alle for-don
& bi þan tittē an-hon.

R. and W. agree against L. in having no response to Conan's application, nor does it seem likely that Laȝamon found this answer in any French Brut. The stark language makes us suspect that he is elaborating in his own Germanic way.

3) L. differs from R. in having the suit (like W.) in indirect speech [1]).

4) L. does not say in so many words that Adionard was glad at the request, while the lines about the equipment of his daughter need not be traced to R., but may find their origin in W. l. 6162 f.: *Cil li a sa fille envoié — Et a grant riquèce otroié.* Besides, it is perfectly natural that Adionard should prepare his daughter for the voyage, so that a periphrastic poet, as L. undoubtedly was, might even have inserted it without any clue in the W.-text to lead him on.

Here follows the last example of this chapter [2]):

---

[1]) L. l. 11922 ff.: *Conan sende to þis ærd — to þan eorle Adionærd.*
& bed þat he him ȝeue — his dohter to quene.
W. l. 6150 ff.: *Ains a fait Clionos requerre,*
Qui en garde avoit Engleterre,
Que il sa fille li donast.

[2]) Imelmann's last example but one need not be discussed, as it must be obvious to anyone who approaches the question without bias, that there is absolutely no need to look for a source outside Wace.

W. II, 22.
Une semaine i avoit mis
Que il ne pot le castel prendre

R. 77*b*.
Ut iurs i sunt plenerement.

L. II, 360.
Fulle seouen nihte
þe king mid his cnihten
bilæi þene castel.

Suchlike petty verbal resemblances can never afford any reasonable clue. If Imelmann had discovered a parallel to the description of the love-scene just mentioned, the Argante-episode, the description of the storm befalling Ursele and her maidens, it would have carried conviction, which trifles like these do not.

W. II, 26:

En Tyntaeol le soir entrèrent,
Cil qui connoistre le quidèrent
Les ont receus et servis
Et la nuit durement jois.
Mult par estoient bien venu
Et a lor seignour l'ont tenu.

R. 77*b*:

Al chastel si sunt venut
Un poi devant qu'anuté fut.
Li porters vit li duc venir,
Mult tost li veit la porte ouerir
Bien quidat que co fust li sire.
Si n'el osat contre dire.

L. II, 373:

heo comen to þas castles ȝæte
& cuðliche cleopeden:
Undo þis ȝæt essel.
þe eorl is icumen here
Gorlois þe læuerd:
& Britael his stiward
and Jurdan þe burcniht:
we habbeoð ifaren al niht.
þe ȝæteward hit cudde ouer al:
& cnihtes urnen uppen wal:
and speken wið Gorlois:
and hine icneowen mid iwis.
þa cnihtes weoren swide whæte
and wefden up þa castles ȝæte.

On comparing these passages we see that the only fact L. and R. have in common, is the appearance of a gateward. The differences between L. and R. are:

1) R. has no request to open the gate, L. has.
2) In R. the porter opens the gate, in L. he calls the

knights, by whom the gate is opened. In W. Uther and his company are received by *Cil qui connoistre le quidèrent.*

Further it is to be observed, that L. has greatly elaborated the love-episode between Uther-Gorlois and Ygerne. W. is very concise:

> Li rois à Ygerne se jut
> Et Ygerne la nuit conçut
> Le bon roi, le fort, le séur
> Que vous oës nomer Artur.

But L. [1]) spends more than 50 lines in giving us a charming picture of Ygerne's graceful innocence, by insisting several times that she did not know of Uther's deceit. Again, in L. Uther-Gorlois explains his presence by saying:

> and ich æm bi nihte
> bi-stole from þan fihte.
> for æfter þe ic wes of-longed,
> wifmonne þu ært me leofuest.

If we now compare G. VIII, 19, we shall see that L. is in substantial agreement with it: *Commansit itaque rex ea nocte cum ygerna. & sese desiderata uenere refecit. Deceperat namque illam falsa specie quam assumpserat. Deceperat etiam ficticiis sermonibus quos ornate componebat. Dicebat enim se egressum esse furtim ab obsesso oppido ut sibi tam dilecte rei atque oppido suo disponeret. Unde ipsa credula nichil quod poscebatur abnegauit.* Here we have another instance to corroborate the view that Laȝamon did make use of the Historia.

In his tenth chapter Imelmann considers the so-called Münchener Brut (M. B.), which is a French Brut-fragment ending with the Leir-episode, and supposed by Gröber to represent the lost part of Gaimar's Brut, the so-called

---

[1]) ll. 19015—19068.

Gaimar I. Imelmann's aim is twofold: first he wants to prove a connection between M. B. and R. as well as between M. B. and L.; secondly, he is out to prove that R. is based on Gaimar, and L. on a compilation of Wace-Gaimar. His opening statement defeats its own purpose: 'Da Laȝ. zu R. resp. dessen Vorlage in Beziehung steht, zo musz diese noch dem 12. Jahrhundert angehören. Nach 1155 hatte eine dem Brut des Wace Konkurrenz machende Reimchronik nach Galfrid wenig Aussicht auf Erfolg. So ist von vornherein wahrscheinlich, dasz der durch R. repräsentierte Brut schon vor 1155 unabhängig von Wace gedichtet wurde.' Obviously the same argument would apply to Wace's Brut, if before it a similar work had been composed, and in consequence Imelmann's argument becomes futile.

Let us now consider the parallels given by Imelmann in proof of an M.B.-R. connection.

M. B. 441:

VII mil estoient bacheleir
Ki pooient armes porteir
Estre femes et estre enfanz
Dunt il n'estoit encor nus granz.

R. 41*b*:

VII mil furent combatanz
Estre femmes e enfanz.

Imelmann observes: 'Hier scheint R. aus M. B. verkürzt.' However, it may be argued with equal probability, that R. gives here an abridged version of W. I, 10:

Entr'ax avoit bien six milliers
De bons et de prous chevalliers
Estre geudes, estre sergans,
Et estre fames, et enfans.

M. B. 3556:

Puis que Leir fut enterreiz
N'est il mie lonstens passeiz
Qu'Aganippus est devieiz
Ki rois de France estoit clameiz.

R. 49*b*:

Entre itant morut Aganippus
Reis de France qui tant fud pruz
Puis quant Leir fust deuiez
En leycestre est enterrez.

This example proves, if anything, that R. and M. B. have no common source. M. B. gives first Leir's death and a long description of the funeral preparations, after which follows Aganippus' death as related in the lines quoted. R. however, inverts the order of events [1]).

Next we come to the M.B.-L. parallels. Imelmann alleges M. B. 91 ff.:

Si cum l'ystorie nos devise,
Quant *Menelaus* out Troie prise....
Fui s'en sunt de Troie fors....
Pyrrus mena Helain en Grecie.

and says: 'Wace nennt Menelaus nicht, obwohl er an M. B. anklingt ... Aber La3. I, 4 spricht von Menelaus quene.' If we compare the full texts of W. and L., we shall again come to the conclusion, that there is no need to assume a source different from W.

W. I, 1 ff.:

Si com li livres le devise
Quant *Griu* orent Troie conquise
Et *escillié tot le pais*
Por la venjance de Paris
Qui de Gresse ravi Hélaine,
etc.

---

[1]) The other two examples belong to the category of insignificant verbal resemblances without any conclusive force.

L. I, 4 ff.:

þa *Grickes* hefdē Troye
mid teone bi-wone.
& *þat lond iwest*
& þa leoden of-slawen
& for þe wrake-dome
of Menelaus qene
and Elene was ihoten
alðeodisc wif.
þa Paris Alixandre
mid pret wrenche bi-won.

It appears that L. mentions Menelaus only accidentally as Helena's husband, as everyone (even an English country-priest) who is at all acquainted with the legend of Troy, may be supposed to know. However, the essential point is, that L. and W. agree against M. B. in mentioning the Greeks as the ravagers of Troy.

M. B. 533 ff:

Quant Pandras ot lit l'escrit
Forment s'est iriez, puis a dit:
Mult me desturbe en mun corage
Dunt est venue iceste rage
Qu'il ainc orent cel hardement
De moi mandeir teil mandement.

L. I, 21 ff:

þe king nom þat writ on hond,
& he hit wroðliche biheold ....
þa he alles spac,
mid þræte he spilede ....

Obviously the only agreement is between *iriez* and *wroðliche* which is nothing wonderful. The W.-text is here as follows:

W. I, 13:

Li rois a le brief escoté;
Grant merveille li a samblé
Que li Troyen se révelent
Et que de francise l'apelent.
Fol hardiment, ce dit, ont pris;
Et en fole oevre se sont mis.

The lines left out in Imelmann's quotation of L. happen to agree very well with W. After *biheold* we read:

seolcuð him þuhte
swulcere speche.
þa he alles spac
mid þræte he spilede
To wroþer heore hele
habbeð heo such werc idon.

In other words, an M.B.-L. connection is not proved by this example. Nor is such the case in the following lines, describing how much trouble the Sirens caused to the voyagers:

M. B. 1280 ff:

(les Seraines) *Ki mult lur funt ahans et paines*
— — — — — — — — — —
Mais *nonporquant* par grant labor
Sunt eschapei d'icel estor.

L. I, 57:

þa mereminnen heom to swommen
on alchare sidan;
swiðe heo heom letten
mid luðere heora craften.
Neðelas Brutus at-bræc ....
his scipen runden swiðe ....

Not M. B. but W. ll. 734, 750, 751, 769, 770 form the basis for *swiðe heo heom letten* [1]). As for the word *neðelas*, it fits so obviously into the course of the story, it is so perfectly natural here, that we need not be surprised to find it in the French as well as in the English text. We daresay one could

---

[1]) W. l. 734.
(Seraines) Qui lor nés ont mult destorbées
l. 750, 751.
Par mainte fois as nés s'aerdent
Et tant les tiènent et demorent ....
l. 769, 770.
A lor nés entor s'aeerdoient
A bien près noier nès feisoient.

find more of these verbal similarities, but should not our common sense warn us not to attach any importance to them in cases where they are so self-evident as in the present?

M. B. 2768 ff.:

D'une rien fut en desturbier
Quar il n'out heir de sa muilier
Forsque trois files honoreies
De sens et de beautei loeies.

L. I, 124:

þe king hefde þreo dohtren
bi his drihliche quen;
nefde he nenne sune
— þerfore he warð sari —
þa manscipe to halden
buten þa þreo dohtren.

W. I, 81:

Trois files ot, n'ot nul altre oir
ne plus ne pot enfant avoir.

The superficial similarity between M. B.'s first and L.'s fourth line forms too slight evidence on which to base a relation. The hypothetical source that Imelmann is constructing here from W., M. B. and R., has about as much value as Schleicher's translation of Aesop's fables into Indo-Germanic.

M. B. 2784 ff.:

Mais cele avra meilor partie
Ki d'eles trois plus est s'amie,
Entresait vult primes savoir
U puet greinnor fiance avoir,
Et la quele plus l'amera,
En quele mains s'afiera.

L. I, 125:

Ac ærst ic wille fondien
whulchere beo mi beste freond
and heo scal habbe þat beste del
of mine drihlichen lon(d).

W. I, 82:

Mais primes voloit essaier
La quel d'eles l'avoit plus chier.
Le mius del siens doner volroit.
A cele qui plus l'ameroit.

It must strike the reader at once that L. certainly does not make the impression of a cross between W. and M. B. The entire first line in W. and L. is equivalent, while the remaining lines in L. are a free translation of W. Imelmann calls attention to M. B. *meilor partie* — L. *þat beste del*, which, as nobody can deny, agrees exactly; but after all is not there a greater resemblance between W. *le mius del siens* and L. *þat beste del of mine drihlichen lond*?

W. I, 82:

Gonorille li a juré
Du ciel tote la déité
Mult par fu plaine de boisdie —
Qu'ele l'aime mius que sa vie.

M. B. 2804 ff.:

Sire, fait ele, a moi entent,
N'i mentirai a essient.
Droiz est que tu aies m'amor,
Mes cuer t'aime par grant dulchor,
Si n'i a puint de fausetei;
Del ciel t'en jur la deïtei:
Assez plus aim lo cors de toi
Que je ne fac l'a(r)me de moi.

L. I, 126:

Leofe fæder dure,
swa bide ich godes are,
swa helpe me Apollin,
for min ilæfe is al on him } = R.
þat leuere þeo ært me æne }
þane þis world al clane;
þeou ært leouere þene mi lif; = W.
& þis ich sucge þe to seoðe,
þu mith me wel ileue.

Imelmann observes (p. 80): 'L. hat mit M. B. die direkte Rede, die Weitschweifigkeit, die Anrufung der Götter, die Beteurung der Wahrheit gemeinsam; dasz gleichzeitig Anklänge an W. und R. vorliegen, legt die Annahme nahe, auch hier beruhe L. auf einem Texte, der aus W. und einem andern Brut zusammengeschweiszt war.' As may be seen from the preceding as well as from numerous other examples, Laȝamon uses direct speech wherever he can; the first argument consequently collapses. Nor does the fullness of detail furnish any proof. W. often stands in the same relation to G. without ever having been suspected of following a different source. That M. B. and L. are independent elaborations is shown by the fact that not one line in the two passages is identical. As to the invocation of the gods, M. B. and W. agree and it is only L. who elaborates.

W. I, 83 Ragau says:

.... chertainement
Jo t'aim sor tote criature.

L. I, 127 f.:

Al þat is on liue
nis me swa dure
swa me is þin an lime
forðe min ahȝene lif.

'L. kann hier nicht aus W. geworden sein.' (Im. p. 80). Imelmann's conception on this point seems capable of considerable adjustment, if we remember what he says on p. 2 regarding the Kimbelin-Taliesin episode. At any rate, a comparison of the two texts informs us, that L. agrees with W. up to the words *þin an lime* etc., which are evidently an expansion of *t'aim*. Imelmann's supposition that Ragau's answer was taken from Gonorilla's in M. B., is both illogical and unnecessary [1]).

[1]) Imelmann's next example (condition for Cordeilla's marriage) we shall not here discuss, as this has been done on p. 48 f. L. *of alle mine londe* is not based on M.B. 2973. *N'i avra terre ne avoir* as Imelmann suggests, but on W. *tot son raine*.

Here follow Imelmann's next parallels; for the reader's convenience we add his marginalia:

W. I, 88:

Al roi Léir de recief mande
Que nul avoir ne li demande,
Mais seul sa fille li otroit,
Cordéille, si li envoit.

M. B. 2994:

Lo roi Leïr par els remande
Qu'od sa fille rien ne demande,
Mais la pucele seulement,
Quar asseiz a or et argent,
Possessiuns et grant poissance,
Sue est la tierce parz de France,
Ne li quiert eil que la meschine,
De li voldra faire roine ....

L. I, 136. ll. 3205 and 3209-3217:

Ich eam riche mon inoh	= M.B.
þat na mare ich ne recche;	
ac ich heo wulle habben	
to * hæʒere are quene.	= M.B.
Habbe heore fader al is lond,	
al his seoluer and is gold,	= M.B.
ne bidde ich nanne maðmes,	= M.B.
me seolf ich habbe inoʒe,	= M.B.
but þat mæiden Cordoille;	= M.B.
þenne hæbbe ich mine wille.	

We must first draw attention to the fact that M. B. is here in close agreement with G. II, 11: *Cumque id aganippo nuntiatum fuisset amore uirginis inflammatus, remisit iterum ad leirem regem. dicens se satis auri et argenti. aliarumque possessionem habere. quia terciam partem galliae possidebat. Se uero tantum modo puellam captare ut heredes ex illa haberet,* and as we know that Laʒamon occasionally referred to G. Imelmann's argument is much invalidated [1]).

[1]) Moreover, L. 3210 may have been suggested by W. 1875 f.; L. 3212 refers to Leir, M.B. 2997 however to Aganippus himself; L. 3213 and 3217 occur also in W. and are consequently of no value for Imelmann's argument.

Imelmann draws attention to M. B. 3005 f.:

> Li message furent creable
> Riche baruns, haut et raisnable.

and says: 'Bei Wace findet sich davon nichts.' Nor, as a matter of fact, do we find anything of the kind in L., who, if we may judge by his line *he sende eft to þisse londe* was translating W. *Al roi de reciet mande,* and is thus much shorter than M. B.

Finally Imelmann sees a confirmation of his views in the following:

W. I, 98:

> Puis a cing ans tenu l'onor,
> Mais ja ert veuve, sans signor.

M. B. 3555 ff.:

> Puis que Leïr fu enterreiz,
> N'est il mie luns tens passeiz
> Qu'Aganippes est devieiz,
> Ki rois de France estoit clameiz.
> Granz dols en vint a sa muillier
> Ki Bretanie ot a justisier.
> Cordeïlle fu en se honor,
> Cinc ans la tint par grant vigor,
> Garda la terre dulcement
> Et si regna paisiublement.

L. 1, 158 f.:

> And Cordoille heold þis lond
> mid hæȝere strenðe
> fulle fif ȝere
> quene heo wes here.
> þa while Francene king
> fæisiðe makede;
> and Cordoille com þat wourd
> þat heo was iworðen widewe.

Against the assumption of an L.-M.B. agreement points the fact that in M. B. Aganippus' death precedes Cordeille's reign in point of time, whereas both W. and L. relate the events in reversed order. Besides, the word *widewe* (= W.

veuve) does not occur at all in M. B. In view of other elaborations, it is not at all doubtful that L. is based here on W.

We hope to have shown in the preceding, that Imelmann's theory rests on insecure foundations, and can therefore not claim to be acceptable. The unequivocal result of our criticism relieves us of the necessity of further collating the sources mentioned in this chapter, with Laȝamon. We have seen that Imelmann's instances sometimes consist of petty verbal similarities of an entirely accidental kind, while at other times they are based on an imperfect representation of the W.-text, and at all times show a neglect of Laȝamon's own creative imagination and his use of Geoffrey's Historia. It is highly significant that Imelmann has been practically unable to furnish a single French parallel for the more important deviations and elaborations in the English work, such as the Kimbelin-Taliesin episode, the foundation of Gloucester, the voyage of Oriene and her eleven thousand companions, the rebellion of the churls of East-Anglia, Arthur's birth and his translation to Avalon, the account of Arthur's weapons, and numerous others. Accordingly we deem it rather bold to say (Im. p. 84): 'wir wissen woher die grösseren Einschaltungen des Englischen Dichters stammen, die besonders für die zentralen Partien seines Werkes charakteristisch sind,' implying that they hail from a twice elaborated Wace. Rather than trying to find perforce one single but unproved source for the English Brut, we should be content to return to the older opinions in a slightly modified form. For there is one more objection to the above-mentioned theory, viz. one of time. If we accept the view that first of all Wace and Gaimar were amalgamated and that this work was subsequently influenced by the French Tristan poem and the Prose Lancelot, the time meted out for this process is rather inadequate [1]). The composition

[1]) cf. p. 60 f.

R = MS. Regius 13 A XXI (Br. Mus) containing Wace's Brut.

of such a compilation would certainly have occupied a very considerable time, and it does not look very plausible, on the face of it, that two such voluminous works as the hypothetical Wace-Gaimar and Laȝamon's Brut should have been produced in a span of say five years. This argument is of essential value and must therefore not be underrated.

In his Nachprüfung, Imelmann tests his theory on a few points. It will appear, however, that a consistent application of this test proves fatal to it.

1) The Wace-Gaimar compilation must have had approximately the same bulk as L., e.g. in the Leir-episode W. has 403 lines, M. B. 817 and L. 831, and because much that W. and M. B. had in common, dropped out, the compilation need not have exceeded M. B., according to Imelmann. It will not be necessary to insist that this sort of argument is wholly futile. What, for instance, is the standard by which we are to judge the length? And, more important, if the number of lines accidentally agrees according to this vague standard, L. may very well prove to have inserted speeches, motives etc. that do not occur either in W. or M. B. In fact, this is actually the case in the Leir-episode as we shall see.

2) 'Peculiarities of the English Brut not to be explained by W. must find their origin in Gaimar.' Among these Imelmann reckons Laȝamon's predilection for direct speech, which he shares with M. B. But this would appear so natural in any paraphrast of Wace's rather dry chronicle, that Laȝamon certainly needs no French work to authorize him for doing so. Even the slightest importance we should be inclined to attach to it, is eliminated by the fact that M. B. and L. very often disagree in the use of direct speech [1]). The only reasonable conclusion is that L., though sharing a common tendency with other Bruts, is far from dependent on them.

[1]) In the W.- L.- M.B. parallels given by Imelmann there are two in which L. and M.B. have direct speech against W. indirect speech, but three where L. is the only text to give direct speech.

3) Traits in L. that are absent in W. and reducible to Gaimar, must reappear in representatives of the younger W.-version, e. g. Leir's condition, his rage over Goneril's treatment, etc.

W. I, 91.

Et li pères se desdaigna
Grant avillance li sambla
Qu'ensi l'avait-on fait descendre.

B. A. *Quant ceo fust fest leyr deuint si dolent qe sa condicion fu issi empeire et qom li tint si vil, qu'il ne sauoit qe dire.* (Cott. f. 86*a*).

M. B. 3090 ff.

Puis l'unt al roi Leïr mostrei
Ne li est pas venu en grei;
A poi que il de duel n'esrage
Trestoz tresmue en sun corage.

L. I, 142 f.

þis iherde Leir king
þar fore he wes swuþe wrah
þai ȝedede þe king
mid ȝemeliche worden.
and þus seide þe kinge
sorhful on mode:
Wa worðe þan monne
þe lond haueðe mid menske
and bi-tachet hit is childe
þe while þe he mai hit walden
for ofte hit ilimpð
þat eft hit him of-þincheð.

From these parallel passages we infer:

1) None of the French texts has direct speech, in fact B. A. observes that Leir does not know what to say.

2) M. B., no more than W., can be the text from which Laȝamon took the contents of Leir's speech. This is one of the many instances that go to refute Imelmann's thesis,

that M. B. (= Gaimar) is responsible for L.'s specimens of direct speech.

Again, Leir's anger with Ragau:

W. I, 92.

Caitif moi, dist-il, mar i vinc
Se vix sui là, plus vils sui ça.

B. A. *Donq se dementa leyr trop malement et dist en plorant: allas fest-il, qe onqs ving en ceste terre; enqore me vausist il mieux auer demore od ma premere fille* (Cott. f. 86*b*).

M. B. 3112 f.

Ot le li rois, mult fu huntous
Et corociez et anguissous.

L. I, 144 f.

þis iseh þe Leir king
wa wes him on liue
his mod him gon mengē
he morȝnede swiðe
and þas worde seide
mid sorhfulle laichen ....

Then follows a speech of 30 lines, an elaboration of the speech in W., in which Leir bewails his fate, and in which occur the lines: *ich wende swiðe wel to don — ac wurse ich habbe under-fon* (= W.). Leir's words in B. A. are likewise a paraphrase of W. Obviously the L. text cannot be compounded of W. and M. B. The two French texts together constitute 4 lines, whereas the English work is eleven times that length.

A few other points on which L. and M. B. differ in the Leir episode are here subjoined:

1) In L. Ragau is asked by Leir to speak out before the people; not so in M. B.

2) In L. Cordeille, after her father's harsh words, goes to her bower, where she sits sighing and shuns her father's presence; not so in M. B.

3) In L. we are first acquainted with Aganippus' suit for Cordeilla, after which we hear of the marriage of Cordeilla's sisters; in M. B. the order is the reverse.

4) In L. Aganippus' message to Leir says that he had heard from travelling men of Cordeilla's beauty and patience; in M. B. this is communicated to us before the suit.

5) In L. Leir's answer to the suit is in writing; not in M. B. In M. B. Leir says merely, that Cordeilla shall get no land or possessions, since her elder sisters are already in possession of them; in L. Leir justifies his harshness by giving an exposition of Cordeilla's conduct.

6) Gonorille's long speech to her husband about the trouble caused her by Leir and his retinue, is not in M. B. (nor in W.). Maglaun's answering speech to Gonorille, containing a reproof and an adhortation to let the old man enjoy the last years of his life in peace, has no equivalent in M. B., where we read on the contrary:

> Et quant li dus Maglaus l'entent
> Al sun conseil del tot s'asent.

7) In L. Leir makes a short speech on leaving Gonorille; not in M. B.

8) The conversation between Ragau and her husband Hemeri, in which this time L. makes the man more cruel towards Leir, is not to be found in M. B., nor do we meet there with Leir's complaint about his treatment at the hands of Ragau.

9) The apostrophe to Fortune, present in W. as well as in M. B., is omitted in L.

Imelmann's subsequent hypothesis that Laȝamon owed to Gaimar the information that Wace dedicated his Brut to Queen Eleanor, because this dedication occurs in none of the W.-MSS., must be left for what it is. We fail to see why L. could not be indebted to private information; he may have had friends at court, the man who procured him the copy of Wace may have been a courtier and communicated it to

him. Against Imelmann's theory also speaks the fact, that neither any extant work by Gaimar nor any of the French versions derived from the hypothetical W.-Gaimar compilation mention the dedication, whereas they would have had no reason to omit it, if it had been in the source.

Lastly, Imelmann wishes to find an independent witness to show that Laȝamon describes traditions varying from W. which could only have reached him through Norman channels, because they were only alive among Normans. For this purpose he turns to Helena, the victim of the Spanish monster that was defeated by Arthur. W. and G. call her Howel's niece, L. on the contrary Howel's daughter. Imelmann cites Paer's Chronique de Mont-St.-Michel (12th C.), where we read:

> Fille Hoel esteit le conte ....
> Auquanz dient que niece esteit
> Le roi Artur ....

Whether the young lady is regarded as Howel's niece or as his daughter, a certain relationship to Arthur must be implied, Howel being Arthur's nephew. A chronicler would not need to rely on any source in order to calculate this bit of information. Of course it is not precluded that the W.-MS. used by Laȝamon made Helena into Howel's daughter. In so far Imelmann may be right that Laȝamon's Brut shows independent Norman influence, but this need not imply a W.-Gaimar combination. Another possibility which we must always consider with a poet of Laȝamon's style, is that he simply changed the relationship on his own account, thinking that Arthur's fight would be better justified for Howel's daughter than for his niece. It must be remembered that the feeling of kinship was strong in Laȝamon. To quote Miss Gillespy: 'Wace probably had almost or quite as strong a feeling of the obligations imposed by family feeling as did Laȝamon, but one does not get the same impression of the extreme importance of kinship from his work. The difference is probably largely due to the vividly dramatic method of

presentation used by the latter,' after which Miss Gillespy illustrates her point by a few examples. An additional reason may be that Laȝamon probably had a dislike for long and complicated appellations, and as the Anglo-Saxon word *nift* (niece) does not occur in his vocabulary, he would probably have had to speak of Howel's sister's or brother's daughter which he may well have disliked.

A similar example is Arthur's contest with Frollo, about whom G. IX, 11 says: *Erat tunc gallia prouincia rome frolloni tribuno commissa quia eam sub leone imperatore regebat,* which W. II, 82 renders in the following terms:

> Gaulle avoit nom France, cel jor,
> Si n'i avoit roi, ne signor;
> Romain en demaine l'avoient,
> Et en demaine la tenoient.
> En garde ert à Frolle livrée,
> Et il l'avoit lonc tans gardée.

Laȝamon found this probably much too complicated and simplified matters by calling Frollo shortly King of France [1]). For the rest he agrees with W. in stating that France was called *Gualle* at the time, that Frollo was of Roman extraction and that each year he sent a tribute of money to Rome. This makes it clear that he was not following another source.

In order to prove that a French Brut of Laȝamon's type indeed existed at the time when Laȝamon wrote, Imelmann adduces André de Coutances' satirical Roman des Franceis (A), written, according to Gröber, before 1204, and drawing upon a Brut for the battle between Arthur and Frollo. Imelmann observes the following points which L. and A. have in common:

1) Both call Frollo king of France. The reason for this change has just been discussed.

2) Frollo is a coward; not so in Wace. In our opinion Laȝamon does not represent Frollo as a coward, but rather uses

[1]) cf. also the story of the Anglo-Saxon slaves at Rome, where Laȝamon makes Gregory into Pope.

his awe of Arthur in order to shed additional lustre upon the figure of the king. The L.-text makes it sufficiently clear to the reader that Frollo was strong and brave:

Strong mon wes Frolle
and sterc mon on mode. (II, 572)
Neoðeles wes Frolle
to fihte swide kene
muche cniht & strōg mon
and modi on heortē. (II, 573)
for beiē heo weoren cnihtes kene
ohte men and wihte. (II, 582)

This will suffice to show that Laȝamon had no intention to picture Frollo as a coward, but that the passage

for ȝif hit wuste Frolle
þat Arður him ȝettē wolde
þat he iȝirnd hafde
don he hit nolde
for a scip ful of ȝolde

must be considered as a glorification of Arthur rather than as a depreciation of Frollo [1]).

3) Arthur accepts the challenge in direct speech and fixes the next day for the duel. W. vacat. As has often been repeated, direct speech in younger versions proves nothing, unless the speeches are identical. That Arthur chooses the next day for the fight is self-evident and conditioned by the rules of vivid narration. We could hardly expect an elaborator to fix on the following week or the next day but one for such an important and urgent event.

4) L. and A. describe how Arthur and Frollo repair to the lists. L. II, 580 says that the men who brought each champion to the island

[1]) cf. also W. II, 84 vv. 10216—10220, G. IX, 11 and L. II, 547 where Arthur begs his men to:

.... bidden ure drihtē ....
þat he me iscilde
wið Frolle þene wilde
and mid his riht hōde
witeȝe me wið sconde.

alse þe king hehte
lette þene bat fusen
forð mid þan vðen.

A. 8:

Franceis qui devant lui estèrent
D'aler en l'isle le hasterent
A quelque paine l'i menèrent
Laissièrent le, si retornerent.

W. does not mention this. It cannot be denied that there is a certain resemblance here (apart from the fact that in L. *both* Kings *command* their helpers to leave), but it is merely a small item in a large passage (L. ll. 23649-23880) which Laȝamon elaborated from eight lines in W. For instance, in A. nothing is said about the preparatory prayers, Arthur's equipment (in which the smith Griffin appears) and people climbing halls, walls and towers to get a better view of the fight. This makes us suspect that the agreement referred to by Imelmann is of a purely accidental kind.

5) Imelmann p. 102: „L. II, 571 f. sagt Arthur, wer 'kneift' soll allenthalben als 'sconde' (recreant) gelten. Bei A. 9 fleht Frollo: Merci Artur beau sire — Je suis recreant, ne m'ocire." This example is beside the point, as the word 'recreant' is used in totally different places. In L. it is used with respect to the covenant, i.e. before the fight, in A. it occurs when Frollo asks for mercy, i.e. at the end of the fight. L. differs moreover in that Frollo is killed outright without making any speech at all.

We cannot say that Imelmann has succeeded, on the strength of these five points, to prove that A. presupposes a Brut-version that stood in very close relation to L.'s source and that determined it also in point of time.

In his chapter Anhänge, Imelmann discusses Robert Mannyng of Brunne's English translation of Wace, which was written after Laȝamon's Brut. That Robert Mannyng was acquainted with the latter work has been defended by

Zetsche [1]), but is summarily rejected by Imelmann. The Dictionary of National Biography says: 'In the earlier part Mannyng follows Wace with occasional insertions from Bede, Geoffrey and Langtoft,' to which should be added Dares Phrygius, as Mannyng himself admits (ll. 145 ff.). Imelmann is of opinion that Mannyng's work was based on the same compilatory source as Laȝamon, but fails to adduce sufficient proof for this thesis. For instance:

Manning ll. 5756 ff. (I, 202):

Eight & twenty flamins men tolde
— — — — — — — — — — — —
Þe Latyn calleþ temple flamins —
Somme of Mahoun & somme of Apollins,
Somme of Dyane, somme & of Berit. —
Two arche flaminus were þer ȝit;
At Londone was þer chef flamee
& at ȝork þat oþer se.
Þe oþere flamins in londe ware
Als þe bischopes sees now are.
Þyse temples of Maumetries
Þey turned (þem) alle fro eresyes
& halewode þem to Cristes werk.

W. I, 248 f. says that King Luces sent to the pope for preachers; he and his people were christened by Diuvan and his companion Matan, after which

Li dui evesque prééçoient
Et par les contrées aloient.
— — — — — — — —
Firent establir envesquies
Et desor ce arcevesquies.
Les envesquies ont compassées
Et les parosces devisées;
Les temples où li Deu estoient
Que li home paien croient
Ont saintefiés et mondés
Et à Deu servir consacrés.

[1]) Leipzig Dissertation, 1887, p. 6—23.

G. IV, 19: *Fuerunt tunc in brittannia XXVIII flamines set & III archiflamines quorum potestati ceteri iudices morum atque phanatici submittebantur. Hos etiam ex precepto apostolici ydolatriae eripuerunt & ubi erant flamines episcopos ubi archiflamines archiepiscopos posuerunt. Sedes autem archiflaminum in tribus nobilibus ciuitatibus fuerant. Lundoniis uidelicet atque eboraci & in urbe legionum.*

Imelmann contends that Mannyng's work cannot be based on W. and G., because the form *flamee* as well as the names of the heathen gods point to another Norman source, and as it is unlikely that Mannyng should have employed three sources for these few lines, Imelmann is back again at the hypothetical compilation. However, if we take into account that Mannyng also translated the Manuel des Pechiez, in which heathen gods also occur [1]), it becomes at once intelligible where he took the names from. Finally it cannot be surprising that Mannyng knew the nominative *flamee*. After all, it would be strange indeed, if his vocabulary was strictly confined to the words used by Wace, a point which Imelmann seems to lose sight of.

In corroboration of his view Imelmann quotes MS. Reg. 13 A. XXI, which, like Mannyng, has clearly drawn on Geoffrey, but does not give the names of the heathen gods, nor the information about the archbishops' sees at London and York, and so cannot possibly be alleged as representative of Mannyng's source. Nor are Imelmann's next parallels conclusive, as in each case Wace, and not R., was Mannyng's source. In the first instance, the line *He was large & curteys* should be added to Imelmann's quotation from Mannyng to make the connection with Wace obvious, and in the fourth:

---

[1]) e.g. Handlyng Synne, E. E. T. S. no. 119, pp. 145, 155 where *Termagaunt* (Fr. *Tervagant*) occurs, and ib. 164:

Þese Phylystyens þat hadde þe maystry
Beleued on Dagoun, a maumettry.

R. 77*a*: D(e) ki bealte fust mult grant fame
M. 9286: Of whas fairhede was speche ryf

we have only to turn to W. II, 19 to be satisfied:

Cortoise estoit et bele et sage
Et mult estoit de halt parage.
Li rois en ot oï parler
Et mult l'ot oïe loer.

In addition to these examples Imelmann submits the following two points:

1) Gaimar wrote of Jason and Troy, like Mannyng. This argument is disposed of by the fact that Mannyng knew Dares Phrygius, who mentions Jason.

2) M. and M. B., when speaking of the destruction of Troy, say that the Trojans fled from the field. W. says merely that *Enéas à quelque paine — De la grant ocise escapa.* Imelmann himself admits: 'Nun kann Manning die Vorgeschichte allerdings einem selbständigen Werke entnommen haben,' and as we have seen that this is actually the case, we shall be content to point out that even if this were not so, the parallel would have extremely little conclusive force. Summing up we may say that this chapter, no more than any of the preceding, succeeds in furnishing convincing proof of the existence of a Wace-Gaimar compilation.

CHAPTER V.

CONCLUSIONS.

In a summary of this investigation, the first conclusion we wish to submit to the reader and to emphasize strongly, is that Laȝamon does not belong to that class of translators (perhaps we had better say paraphrasers) that are content to render a foreign poem with the least amount of self-expression and deviation from their authorities. This humble English priest must on the contrary be considered as the most original, imaginative and artistic poet of his period, always on the alert for any opportunity to make his subject more lively and interesting. He is a man of broad sympathies, as is already shown by the very choice of his subject. We are perhaps not wholly justified in saying that his attitude is pro-British and anti-Saxon, but when the Britons are clearly wronged or when Christianity is at stake, his countrymen are not spared criticism of a frequently scathing kind. Obviously, he was guided by his religious faith, his sense of justice and charity rather than by the dictates of kinship.

Laȝamon made no use of Latin works except Geoffrey's Historia, which is not at all surprising, as there was perhaps no more popular and widely read book in England during the 12th and 13th centuries. He seems to have used the Historia as a book of reference by which to correct and amplify Wace, his principal Norman source (if we say: „principal" Norman source, we mean that Laȝamon must of course also have perused other Norman works, which, for instance, are responsible for the names of such heathen gods as Tervagant, Dagon and Apollin [1]). Wace's Roman de

[1]) cf. Madden III, 326 and 352.

Brut was elaborated by Laȝamon in a fashion entirely his own, while here and there introducing on his own account bits of information based on either English or British history. This, if nothing else, shows him to have been a man of wide antiquarian interests, whose intellectual level was certainly not so low as is commonly asserted of the priesthood of his time. We may imagine that he listened eagerly to any traditional tales of a more or less popular character that he heard in his neighbourhood, and they must have been plentiful. Some of these he wove into his story (e.g. Round Table fight, East-Anglian rebellion). Though probably unacquainted with the Welsh language, he must have collected stray bits and names of Welsh tradition from bi-lingual natives (e.g. about Arthur, his voyage to Avalon and his expected return), the reflection of which we find in his elaborations. Dependence on written Welsh tradition may be deemed out of the question in Laȝamon's case. It is *a priori* little probable that we should find in a Welsh Brut any of the purely romantic descriptions and digressions which Laȝamon excels in. The great majority of these, which, incidentally, have never been found again in any French work, we ascribe consequently to our poet's imagination and the rest to oral tradition.

To the Germanic side of Laȝamon's character we may attribute the whole spirit of the poem, which is thoroughly Anglo-Saxon and prone to emphasis, reiteration and parallelism, and for this very reason was the main cause that swelled Wace's 15000 lines to more than double their bulk. It is certain that Laȝamon was well-read in Anglo-Saxon poetry, as the many reminiscences of that style of poetry in his work betray. Whether or no he consciously imitated the Beowulf must remain an open question; at any rate it has not been settled by Wülcker's article. Personally we are inclined to agree with Miss Gillespy, who considers the points of resemblance of too vague and general a character to justify a conclusion being drawn from them. According to this

conception, those resemblances there are may safely be put down to reminiscences from Laȝamon's general reading in the literature of his forefathers. Lastly, as the Anglo-Saxon translation of Bede was not employed by Laȝamon, no definite written Germanic source for his work can be demonstrated.

Though the author is fully aware that the outcome of the present thesis is largely negative, he would beg his readers to remember as some sort of palliating circumstance, that negative work of this kind may sometimes be necessary, if seldom gratifying. In the present case, however, he did derive a certain amount of satisfaction from having been perhaps instrumental in re-establishing and re-asserting the literary merits of an obscure medieval English priest, who, had he lived about six centures afterwards, would have awoke one morning to find himself famous.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

André de Coutances, Roman des Franceis. Nouveau recueil de contes, dits, fabliaux et autres pièces inédites des XIII^e, XIV^e et XV^e siècles ..... mis au jour ..... par A. Jubinal, Paris 1839—42.

Anglo-Saxon Chronicle ed. by B. Thorpe, 2 vols., 2nd ed. by Ch. Plummer, Oxford 1892—99.

Annales Cambriae ed. by E. Phillimore in Y Cymmrodor IX, 141 and J. Loth, Les Mabinogion II, 370.

A. Anscombe: The Name of Cerdic. Y Cymmrodor XXIX, 151—203.

L. Bartels: Handschriften von Laȝamon's Brut, 1913.

Beda: Historia Ecclesiastica ed. C. Plummer 1896.

The same work in A. S. translation ed. by E. E. T. S. 2 vols., London 1890.

Robert de Boron: Le Roman de l'estoire dou graal ed. by W. A. Nitze, Paris 1927.

A. Brandl: Paul's Grundrisz II, 620—622.

P. Branscheid: Anglia VIII, Anzeiger 179—236.

B. ten Brink: Geschichte der Englischen Litteratur, 2 vols., Strassburg 1899.

A. C. L. Brown: Welsh Traditions in Laȝamon's Brut, M. Ph. I, 95 ff.

J. D. Bruce: Evolution of Arthurian Romance, 2 vols. Hesperia, Ergänzungsreihe VIII, IX, 1928.

J. D. Bruce: Some proper names in Layamon's Brut not represented in Wace or Geoffrey of Monmouth, M. L. N. XXVI, 65 ff.

Brut d' Angleterre: English translation printed by Caxton. Also anonymous English transl. in E. E. T. S.

E. K. Chambers: Arthur of Britain, London 1927.

TH. M. CHOTZEN: Gormont d' Irlande et Iseult in Rev. Celt. XLV, 272 ff.

DARES PHRYGIUS: Historia de excidio Troiae, ed. Ferd. Meister, Leipzig 1873.

R. H. FLETCHER: Arthurian Material in the Chronicles, Harvard Studies and Notes X, 147 ff.

Idem, Did Laȝamon make any use of Geoffrey's Historia, P. M. L. A. XVIII, 91 ff.

GEFFREI GAIMAR: L' Estorie des Engles ed. by T. D. Hardy and C. T. Martin for the Rolls Series, 2 vols., London 1889.

MISS F. L. GILLESPY: Layamon's Brut, A Comparative Study in Narrative Art, Cal. Univ. Publ. III, 361 ff.

GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS: Speculum Ecclesiae in Opera, ed. J. S. Brewer and J. F. Dimock.

MAJOR P. T. GODSALL: The Conquest of Ceawlin, London 1924.

J. H. G. GRATTAN: Review of English Studies VI, no. 21, 88 f.

J. W. HALES: Laȝamon, in Nat. Dict. of Biogr.

H. B. HINCKLEY: Anglia LVI, 43 ff.

HUGO FLORIACENSIS (Hugo de Fleury) Chronicon, ed. B. Rottendorf, Münster 1638.

R. IMELMANN: Laȝamon. Versuch über seine Quellen, Berlin 1906.

J. MORRIS JONES: A Welsh Grammar, Phonology and Accidence, Oxford 1913.

A. H. KRAPPE: A Welsh Animal Tale in England, Anglia vol. 56, 1 Heft, p. 101—104.

LAYAMON'S BRUT OR CHRONICLE OF BRITAIN; a Poetical Semi-Saxon Paraphrase of The Brut of Wace, now first published from the Cottonian Manuscripts in the British Museum, accompanied by a Literal Translation, Notes and a Grammatical Glossary by Sir Frederic Madden. 3 vols., London 1847.

J. M. LAPPENBERG: A History of England under the Anglo-Saxon Kings, transl. from the German by B. Thorpe, 2 vols., London 1881.

F. Lot: Morgue la fée et Morgan Tud, Romania XXVIII, 321 ff.
J. Loth: Les Mabinogion, 2 vols., Paris 1913.
Idem, Revue Celtique, XIII, 496 f.
Idem, Contributions a l' Etude des Romans de la Table Ronde, Paris 1912.
A. Luhmann: Die Überlieferung von Laȝamon's Brut, 1905. The same work 'nebst einer Darstellung der betonten Vokale und Diphthonge', 1906.
Robert Mannyng of Brunne's English Brut, E. E. T. S.
Idem, Handlyng Synne, E. E. T. S.
Walter Map: De Nugis Curialium ed. M. R. James in Anecdota Oxoniensia, Medieval and Modern Series, Part XIV, Oxford 1914.
B. S. Monroe: French Words in Laȝamon, M.Ph. IV, 559 ff.
Idem, J. E. Gc. Ph. VII, no. 1, 136 ff. (with bibliography up to 1907).
Thomas Malory: Le Morte Darthur, ed. H. O. Sommer, 3 vols., London 1889—91.
Matthew of Paris Chronica Majora ed. H. R. Luard. 7 vols., London 1872—83.
The Middle English Stanzaic Le Morte Arthur (Harleian MS. 2252) ed. by J. D. Bruce in E. E. T. S., Extra Series.
The Myvyrian Archaiology of Wales, collected out of ancient manuscripts, 3 vols., Denbigh 1870.
Nennius Historia Britonum ed. by T. Mommsen in Chronica minora saeculorum IV—VII.
John Jay Parry: The Vita Merlini, Univ. of Illinois Studies X no. 3, 1—137.
Peter of Langtoft: The Chronicle of — in french verse, from the earliest period to the death of King Edward I. ed. Th. Wright, London 1866—68.
K. Regel: Alliteration in Lajamon, Germanistische Studien I, 171 ff.
Idem, Spruch und Bild im Laȝamon, Anglia I, 197 ff.

R. SEYGER: Beiträge zu Laȝamon's Brut. Halle Diss., 1912.
TH. STEPHENS: The Literature of the Kymry, 2nd ed., London 1876.
THE HISTORIA REGUM BRITANNIAE of Geoffrey of Monmouth, with contributions to the study of its place in Early British History, by Acton Griscom, London 1929.
THE TEXTS OF THE BRUTS from the Red Book of Hergest, by Sir John Rhys and J. Gwen. Evans, Oxford 1890.
TRAUTMANN: Über den Vers Laȝamon's, Anglia II, 153 ff.
LES VIES DES SAINTS DE LA BRETAGNE ARMORIQUE, par Fr. Albert Legrand, de Morlaix, avec des notes ..... par Daniel-Louis Miorcec de Kerdanet, revues par M. Graveran, Brest 1837.
VITA SANCTI OSWALDI, by Symeon of Durham in Historia Dunelmensis Ecclesiae, Rolls Series.
VULGATE LANCELOT in H. O. Sommer's Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances, vols. III, IV, V.
WACE: Li Romans de Brut ed. by Le Roux de Lincy, 2 vols., Rouen 1836.
H. L. D. WARD: Discussion of Laȝamon's poem and its sources in Cat. of B. M. Romances I, 268 ff.
JEHAN DE WAURIN: Recueil des croniques et anchiennes istories de la Grant Bretaigne ed. by W. Hardy, London 1864—91.
WILKINA SAGA = Þiðriks saga af Bern. Udg. ved Henrik Bertelsen, Kφbenhavn 1905—11.
G. J. WILLIAMS AC E. J. JONES: Gramadegau'r Penceirddiaid, Caerdydd 1934.
E. WINDISCH: Das Keltische Britannien bis zu Kaiser Arthur, Abh. der Philol.-Hist. Klasse der Kön. Sächs. Geselsch. der Wissensch. vol. 29, no. VI.
T. WRIGHT: Laȝamon in Biographia Britannica Literaria, Anglo-Norman period, pp. 439—442, 1846.
R. P. WÜLCKER: Über die Quellen Laȝamon's, Paul und Braune's Beiträge III, 524 ff.
H. C. WYLD: Rev. of Engl. Stud. VI, no. 21, 1—31.

Idem, Studies in the diction of Laȝamon's Brut, Language vols. VI, IX, X.
A. Zessack: Die beiden Handschriften von Laȝamon's Brut und ihr Verhältnis zu einander, Breslau Diss. 1888.
A. W. Zetsche: Über den I Teil der Bearbeitung des „Roman de Brut" des Wace durch Robert Mannyng of Brunne, 1887.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.

A. = André de Coutance's Roman des Franceis.
B. A. = Brut d'Angleterre.
Br. Abbr. = Brutus Abbreviatus.
Br. Gr. ab A. = Brut Gruffydd ab Arthur, (in Myvyrian Archaiology).
Br. Tys. = Brut Tysilio, (idem).
Cat. of B. M. Romances = Catalogue of British Museum Romances.
E. = Arthur and Merlin (M. E. Romance).
E. E. T. S. = Early English Texts Society.
Engl. Stud. = Englische Studien.
Ev. of A. R. = Evolution of Arthurian Romance.
G. = Geoffrey's Historia Britonum, ed. Acton Griscom.
J. E. Gc. Ph. = Journal of English and Germanic Philology.
L. = Laȝamon's Brut.
M. = Robert Mannyng's English Brut.
M. A. = Mort Arthur (M. E. Romance).
Mab. = Les Mabinogion, transl. by J. Loth.
M. B. = Münchener Brut.
M. L. N. = Modern Language Notes.
M. Ph. = Modern Philology.
P. M. L. A. = Publications of the Modern Language Association.
R: = MS. Regius 13 A XXI (British Museum).
W. = Wace's Roman de Brut.
Wn. = Waurin's Chroniques et Istoires.

STELLINGEN.

I.

Aan de middeleeuwse Kymrische poëzie zijn argumenten te ontlenen voor vreedzame aanrakingen in de vroegste tijd tussen Kymry en Angelsaksen.

II.

De Kymrische naam van Brittannië (*Ynys Prydein*) bewaart de oorspronkelijke vorm; het Latijnse *Britannia* berust op klanksubstitutie door Caesar.

III.

De invloed van het Keltisch op de syntaxis en het idioom van de Engelse taal is duidelijk merkbaar.

IV.

De Engelse Progressive Form-constructie is van Keltische oorsprong.

V.

J. D. Bruce's stelling "When Marie de France and her contemporaries refer to *lais Bretons* as their sources, they have Brittany in mind, and their own lays are accordingly based on Breton stories, as far as they are of Celtic origin at all" is onjuist.

VI.

Ten onrechte zoekt R. A. Williams (The Finn Episode in Beowulf) verband tussen de Finn-episode en de Nibelungensage.

VII.

In Beówulf 1142 verandert Kemp Malone (Literary History of Hamlet I, 22) terecht *worold-rædenne* in *worold-rædende*.

VIII.

In Beowulf 1143 is *Hunlāfing* de naam van een zwaard (Axel Olrik, Heroic Legends of Denmark, p. 145 f.).

XI.

Hymiskviða 1,8 moet met Bugge gelezen worden: *þrkost hverjan*.

X.

De mededeling in The New Oxford Dictionary dat *Hoodoo* een woord van Amerikaanse oorsprong is, kan niet als juist beschouwd worden.