



Llyfrgell Genedlaethol Cymru
The National Library of Wales
Aberystwyth



Cylchgronau Cymru
Welsh Journals Online

Awdur
Author

Morgan Watkin.

Teitl erthygl

"The Black Book of Chirk and The
Orthographica Gallica Anglicana :"

Article title

Teitl cylchgrawn
Journal title

Cylchgrawn Llyfrgell Genedlaethol Cymru
National Library of Wales journal

Rhifyn
Issue

Cyf. 14, rh. 3 (Haf 1966), p. 351-360.

url

Crëwyd a chyhoeddwyd y fersiwn digidol hwn o'r cylchgrawn yn unol â thrwydded a roddwyd gan y cyhoeddwr. Gellir defnyddio'r deunydd ynddo ar gyfer unrhyw bwrpas gan barchu hawliau moesol y crewyr.

The National Library of Wales has created and published this digital version of the journal under a licence granted by the publisher. The material it contains may be used for all purposes while respecting the moral rights of the creators.

JISC

Noddir gan
Lywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Sponsored by
Welsh Assembly Government



THE BLACK BOOK OF CHIRK
AND
THE ORTHOGRAPHIA GALLICA ANGLICANA

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE BLACK BOOK OF CHIRK ON THE
BASIS OF ITS OLD FRENCH GRAPHICAL PHENOMENA

THE *Black Book of Chirk*, the earliest form extant of the Welsh language version of the Welsh Laws is beyond a doubt whatsoever a reproduction. The Welsh Laws in their pristine form go back far beyond the reputedly oldest exemplar of continuous Welsh prose. The syntax of the manuscript has been termed above reproach but its orthography, quite unlike anything transmitted to us by any contemporaneous script, has been a perplexity to generations of Welsh scholars and many have racked their brains attempting to ascertain its *raison d'être*. Timothy Lewis, the compiler of the codex vocabulary, *A Glossary of Mediaeval Welsh Law*, was at a loss to conceive an hypothesis to account for its disconcerting spelling. (Manchester University Press, 1913). To Dr. Gwenogvryn Evans, who published a facsimile of the work, its orthography was 'a notable exception to all rules' (*The White Book Mabinogion*, XII, note). Sir John Morris-Jones described its graphies as 'peculiar' ('Taliesin', *The Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion*, XXVIII, 46). All three scholars, I need hardly say, regarded the manuscript from the standpoint of the Welsh language and from that angle, we must confess, it is unique in the catalogue of Welsh Mediaeval manuscripts that are still extant.

The glaring variety of its symbols were presumed in the *Ancient Laws and Institutes of Wales* by Aneurin Owen to have been the handiwork of a monk who was not so skilful in Welsh as in other languages, but Timothy Lewis' verdict that it has 'a faultless syntax' appears to put the foreigner out of court and to conjure up problems which make it hard to propound a theory for its seemingly random orthography. Nevertheless, it would be desirable to arrive at some decision respecting the nationality of the scribe whose unusual orthography has been the subject of so much speculation. The possession on his part of a faultless Welsh syntax is not necessarily incompatible with his being a foreigner. I know several foreigners who could pass muster as native Welshmen.

If this is possible nowadays, it was certainly within the bounds of possibility in the relatively calm time of the transcription of the Chirk codex. A perfect Welsh syntax is, therefore, attainable by any outsider who is sufficiently gifted linguistically and industrious enough to pay the price for it. We might conclude then that our scribe could well

be a foreigner who, hearing his Welsh partner read the text before the two collaborators (these scribes often worked in pairs), wrote down what he heard in a variation of the language that seems to have been the *lingua franca* of the age, the *orthographia gallica anglicana*, a notation evolved over the border in Anglo-Saxon England and not as is generally thought in a spelling peculiar to Welsh literature itself.

In this question of nationality, is there anything else that can help us to throw more light on the subject? Assuming that the scribe was a Welshman, as I have done, with a Franco-Norman education, is it not surprising to find him again and again writing with an *a* rather than with an *e* or *y*, the symbols in vogue at the time, the sound [oe or ə] before *m*, *n*, *v*, and *f* as in *kamry* (*Cymry*), *camaraef* (*Cymraes*), *kamrit* (*cymryt*), *kantaf* (*cyntaf*), *kafreth* (*cyfreith*) and *kastal* (*cystal*), etc.? The sound in such a combination was never an [a] in literary Welsh or in any dialect that we know. Why then an *a* to stand for the vowel [oe or ə]? I know of no reason which would induce an educated thoroughbred Welshman to have recourse to *a* in such cases. On the contrary, there is something not dissimilar to it in Old French. In the XIth and XIIth centuries the *a* before a nasal never rhymed with an ordinary *a* + any consonant and is homophonous only with *a* + nasal. There is also something not very unlike it in Worcestershire Anglo-Saxon where *a* + nasal is written as an open *o*. Thus we have *mon*, *con*, *onswere*, *nome*, *home*, *lone* for *man*, *can*, *answere*, *name*, etc.

Another consideration which seems to militate against the scribe's Welshness is the *h* that he employs in the diphthongs as well as the doubling of the vowels. To Welshmen the characteristic mark of a Welsh diphthong is the gradual passage from the initial element to the final element without the organs of speech ever remaining in a fixed position. In the diphthong [ai], for instance, there exists scientifically a series of sounds between the various shades of [a], the shades of [e], before we come to that of [i]. But these different sounds do not produce a distinct impression on our ears. We only perceive the direction of the movement and the sense of variation. On the contrary, our Chirk codex scribe seems to hear a succession of two independent expiratory acts such as we sometimes in South Wales perceive in the North Welsh [eu] or as we hear in *caïman* or *Hanoï* in Modern French, a fragmentation between the two elements where our scribe puts in an *h* to mark the hiatus which he perceives. There are many such *h*'s in *the Black Book of Chirk*: *ahuft*, 'August' (*Awst*), *nahud* (*nawdd*), 'protection', *mahurth* (*Mawrth*), 'March', *nehuat* (*neuadd*), 'hall', *clehuo* (*clywo*), 'he bears', *entehu* (*ynteu*), 'he', *trhelleu* (*troelleu*), 'wheels', *myhu* (*myw*), 'cow', *dyhu* (*Duw*), 'God', *kefrehit* (*kyfreith*), 'law', etc.

Another trait which appears to mark the non-Welsh nationality of the scribe is the manner he often notes the spirant [θ] with an *f* as in

reif (*reith*), 'law', *eilgueif* (*eilgueith*), 'the second time', *tranoef* (*tranoeth*), '(on) the morrow'; etc. The spirants [θ] and [ð] are customarily articulated by drawing together the tip of the tongue and the back surface of the upper incisors so that the latter somewhat oversteps the lower edge of the teeth. By placing the tongue at the same point we can very well produce a sound not dissimilar to *f*. According to Jespersen, the specific difference between *f* and [θ] comes in effect not from the position of the tongue but rather from the form of the opening (cf. O. Jespersen, *Lehrbuch der Phonetik*, p. 35, Leipzig, 1904). The sign *f* is a natural enough symbol to express the sibilant nature of the sound a French scribe would perceive and it reminds us of the commonplace rendering *surd* for *third* of the untrained Frenchman of to-day.

Again one of the proofs positive of the mastery of Welsh syntax is the correct employment of what we term the *Initial Mutations*. Already in the early years the Ancient Britons regarded the breath-group as the unit of speech to a greater extent than did other races and made phonetic changes within the whole group when the syntactical connexion was very close. Thus, Latin *gubernaculu(m)* and *lepore(m)*, for instance, would become *gouvernail* and *lievre* in Old French, etc., but these words would undergo no change initially with their partners within the breath-group on account of the sounds that preceded or followed them. On the contrary, *k*, *p*, *t* between vowels or between a vowel and a sonant would in Welsh become *g*, *b*, *d*, or, to use the grammatical term, would undergo the *Soft Mutation*; the nasal *n* following an explosive would have the explosive assimilated to it in position and we would get the *Nasal Mutation*, or again in word-composition an explosive followed by a tenuis would give us the *Spirant Mutation*. These changes have persisted to this day and they constitute one of the difficulties of the language and the acid proof of its right use. As we shall see later the *Black Book of Chirk* offers hundreds of instances of the Anglo-Saxon barred *d*'s which, as we know, had the value of [ð]: *hyd*, 'a stag', *a ðeueyt*, 'will say', *arðercauael*, 'to augment, raise, increase, fine or price usually by a third', etc. I have examined these bars and every time the bar occurs it stands for an [ð]. It follows, therefore, that whether the writer was a native or a foreigner, he certainly knew the language well as his mastery over the *Soft Mutation* is ample proof. The other mutations of the manuscript I have looked at and have found conformable to contemporaneous texts.

As the script was put together in all probability in a North Wales monastery, it would not be too much perhaps to regard the scribe as a Welshman born and bred and not a foreigner.

We are then left with the question – Is there a tenable explanation of the spelling before us? I was already persuaded there was, and that it was found in part at least in 1919. In that year, I read a paper before

the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion, in London, stating that I was at a loss to see any solution of the problem within the precincts of Welsh scholarship, but that it resided in my view rather in the Franco-Norman orthography that our fathers had employed several centuries ago. The eccentricities could in my estimation be satisfactorily explained only if we paid due regard to the long contact they had had with these foreigners. Assuming that the scribe was a Welshman who, having been educated in a French-speaking monastery and continuing to move among the invaders had become more at home perhaps in their ways than in his own, I demonstrated that the peculiarities of his spelling could be found in the orthography that the invaders had framed in learning to write the words they met in the early years in this country. In this belief I devoted to the elucidation of the subject the greater part of 'The French Linguistic Influence in Mediaeval Wales' (*Trans. of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion*, 1919-20), the article in the *Mélanges Loth* (Rennes, Plihon et Hommay, 1927), and a part of the chapter on *Orgraff* ('Orthography') and in my *Ystoria Bawn de Hamtwn*, Caerdydd, Prifysgol Cymru, 1958).

Thus the spelling which had caused so many heartaches to Welsh scholars was in part, at any rate, found to be nothing more or less than indubitable Old French traits applied to the transcription of a Welsh text. I referred these French traits direct to their Old French equivalences and took no cognisance of the spelling I have called *orthographia gallica anglicana* evolved and practised over the border by the Anglo-Saxons. I looked upon this as an independent variation upon a similar theme and having with the Chirk codex no *direct* connexion whatsoever. But there, I believe, I was in error for there are native Anglo-Saxon symbols in the *orthographia gallica anglicana* which have seemingly been reproduced in the writing of the Chirk version. I draw attention to them underneath.

The eccentric spelling-scheme of the *Black Book of Chirk* has hitherto been regarded as peculiar to the copyist or copyists of the manuscript and a writing possibly *sui generis*. True it is that there exists among our Welsh documents nothing like this incongruous medley that long baffled the imagination of so many investigators. I myself, for a long while, I must admit, thought like all the others did. It was a mystery and perhaps insoluble to Welsh scholarship. To-day I am convinced that the old current view is an entirely fallacious deduction. It is no matter in dispute that in consequence of the Norman Conquest the invaders had to find some sort of amalgam of spelling based on the differentia of Old French and Old English when they wished to jot down the names of Anglo-Saxon place-names and the like in their new realm. The practice must have gone on for a long time and some of the symbols employed have been recorded here and there in Early

English texts. Thus, *Peri Didaxeon* and *Herbarium Apuleii* of the XIIth century have left us many instances of the $f = [\theta]$ which we discussed above (cf. Willy Schlemilch, *Berträge zur Sprache und Orthographie Spätaltenglische Sprachdenkmäler der Übergangszeit 1000–1150*). But the first published document on a major scale was the *Liber Censualis* or *Domesday Book*, the appearance of which in 1086 embodied the result of the enquiries made concerning the taxable property of the new country (see F. Hildebrand, 'Ueber das franz. Sprachelement in Liber Censualis' 1086 in the *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, pp. 358–362). As the conquerors settled down and learnt to speak English the new spelling doubtless continued; it continued at least throughout the XIth and the XIIth centuries. A marked result of these centuries was the interest and pride the conquerors began to take in the history of their new home. Wace, one of the most proficient poets of the XIIth century, had told them in French about King Arthur, and coming to regard Britain as their own home, and the history of Britain as their own history, they became more and more patriotic and anxious to know more about their new patrimony. An English monk, Lazamon, having this feeling and urged by the nascent patriotism of his people, determined towards the end of the XIIth century to turn into English Wace's great work in order that everybody could appreciate the story of the wonderful King Arthur of Britain. His book of 32,000 lines was the outcome and, in manuscript A, was an extremely full harvest of graphies and the best example in existence of what I have dubbed the *orthographia gallica anglicana*. For an account of this spelling mixed with the North Worcestershire dialect we must consult the poem of Lazamon of Lower Arley (see Adolf Luhmann, *Die Überlieferung von Lazamons Brut*, Niemeyer, Halle, 1906); the *Old English Homilies*, I; the Whiteney version of the *Reguli S. Benedicti*, edited by A. Shröer of the beginning of the XIIIth century; *The English Poems* from the Shropshire or Herefordshire Manuscript Digby 86 at the end of the XIIIth (cf. *Böddeker Atlenglische Dichtungen*, VIII, Jacoby, Diss.) and *The Life of Jesus* from the Gloucestershire Laud Manuscript 108 at about 1300.

The new *orthographia gallica anglicana* was indeed a very composite affair constructed as best people could to meet the needs of the times. It is, as I said before, principally based on the differentia of Old French and Old English, but it comprised other ingredients as well. It had taken over from Latin some letters that were common to both languages and had borrowed from Anglo-Saxon a number of old signs and combinations, namely, the barred d [ð], the digraph uu (w), and the f with its voiced value [v]. These non-French elements in the spelling, as I said, I did not treat specifically in the writings mentioned on the orthography of the codex. A symptom I did not notice was the barred d [d̄] employed to express the voiced spirant. Nor did I pay any special attention to

the *uu* (*w*). The *f* I thought, wrongly as I believe now, found its way into our Welsh spelling *via* the French influence. I did not notice the barred *d* until very recently nor, be it said, did any of the previous workers upon the codex see it at all at any time, the reason being no doubt the faintness of the bars compared with the thick, resolute hand that wrought the script. The existence of these bars is indisputable, but they are so faint in some cases that you have to look very closely for them. Nevertheless, hundreds of instances occur but they lie mostly to the right only of the shaft and not across it as you would expect to see them. Generally they take the form of a fishing hook with the head turned upwards (*d'*) with the hook turned to the left but resting on the right of the down-stroke of the letter. Only a few have the stroke right across the stem. They appear to be coeval with the script and to have been touched in lightly when the scribe was finishing or had finished the folio. They are to be seen on every page and on some there are as many as two dozen (cf. pp. 6a and 6b).

The *uu* (*w*) the codex employs freely: *peduuar* 12a, *dyyuallu* 6b, 9b, *kecuuin* 23a, *ciluuif* 24b; etc., etc.

The *f* [*v*] came into Welsh, I think now, through the intermediary of the *orthographia gallica anglicana* we have talked about or possibly it had penetrated the Welsh language in the early Anglo-Saxon period.

The new *orthographia* as we have observed, had by the end of the XIIth century produced an extensive text of many thousands of verses of Lazamon, etc., and the question arises here what connexion the copyist had with the monasteries over the border. Lower Arley, Lazamon's country, is in Worcestershire on the Severn not far from Bewdley and Shropshire, Herefordshire and, maybe, Gloucestershire, were at that time partly Welsh-speaking. Did our scribe know of the activities of the monasteries that had employed and continued to employ the mixed script? The *uu* (*w*) and the *d* = [ð] cannot be referred *direct* to Old French sources and *f* = [*v*], as we have seen, is more likely to have come in *via* Anglo-Saxon than through Old French, but these symptoms figure in the codex as they do in the *orthographia gallica anglicana* and must, it seems, have been taken from the latter.

Let us at long last address ourselves to the chronology of the Welsh variation of the *orthographia gallica anglicana* as it appears in the Chirk codex script.

According to the name it bears, the *Black Book of Chirk* was probably once the property of Chirk Castle. But certain of the laws it enacts, being peculiar to the district of Arvon or Caernarvonshire, it is likely that it was written further west, probably in the monastic establishment of Bangor. Like many other manuscripts of great value it passed to Hengwrt and Peniarth and is safe henceforward at the National Library of Wales at Aberystwyth. The author of the *Ancient Laws and Institutes*

of Wales attributed its composition to the early part of the XIIth century (cf. *Preface*, XXV). Dr. Gwenogvryn Evans, on the contrary, dissuading from that view, expressed the opinion that it had been written about 1200, a conclusion espoused without a word of comment by Sir John Morris-Jones (*A Welsh Grammar*, XXIV). These opinions according to the Old French data supplied by the text itself are completely false conclusions, as we shall see in examining the following testimonies which lead us to a much later period.

Let us proceed to these facts. We shall first of all take the *c = f* which we encounter several times. We note *blyckyn*, 'shell' on p. 13a and on p. 49a we see *pycgaut*, 'fish'. Then there is *guycscou*, 'to put on (an article of clothing)' on p. 8b, etc.

The chronology of *c = f* on the French side is fortunately fairly definite. We do not see it before the middle of the XIIIth century. The first recorded instance is that cited by J. Vising from Roy. A. 21, verse 2718 (cf. *Purgatoire de Saint Patrice*, p. 11). It was taken from Gaimar's *Estorie des Engles selom la translacion Geffrei Gaimar* (see also *Romania*, XVIII, 311). In addition to *ce = se* in MS. Roy. A. 21, 1.2718 above we have *cemeines* for *semeines* in Lincoln MS., 1.5346 of the same work.

There are *cerf* and *ciecle* for *serf* and *siecle* in the *Vie de Saint Laurent*, verses 514 and 720. *The Song of Dermot and the Earl* offers *ces = ses* in lines 490 and 510 and *cis = six* in 1.1190; etc.

The equivalence of these two symbols, therefore, takes us again down to the middle of the XIIIth century.

Furthermore, at the time of the transcription of the codex the *au* of the third pers. sing. masc. of the Welsh prepositions and the ending of the verbal noun were turning into *o* (cf. *kyn keyfio*, 26a), but the tradition required that they should be represented in writing by *-au*. If then by chance the copyist slipped and jotted down *o* it was corrected at once to the traditional spelling. The scribe's customary way of correction was to add the correct letter or form immediately after the mistake and not to have much recourse to underdotting or crossing out as was done oftentimes in other texts: *atetb*, 'reply' 8b, *clodchyd*, 'bellringer', 11a, *euf*, 'he' 18a, *vueahf*, 'the largest', 26b, *huybobod* 31a, 'to know', *nedthod*, 'nests' 6a, *lladf*, 'was killed' 4a, *bronkegeghel*, 'girth' 3a. Then there are the more significant corrections: *ohonoau* of *o* + stem *ohon-* 19a—and the verb noun *keueyrhoau*, 'to arrange, order, prepare, repair'. The scribe has also supplied us with two Old French words which offer definite clues to their date: *hoseal*, 'a high leather boot' (in the French of this country) employed customarily in the plural (*hoseaus*) and declined according to the Old French two-case system as follows:

<i>hoseal</i> + <i>s</i>		<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plural</i>
	nom.	<i>hoseaus</i>	<i>hoseal</i>
	acc.	<i>hoseal</i>	<i>hoseaus</i>

The second is *estyuos*, 'a kind of Wellington boot with soft, supple tops'.

It was declined:

<i>estival</i> + <i>s</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plural</i>
nom.	<i>estivaus</i>	<i>estival</i>
acc.	<i>estival</i>	<i>estivaus</i>

It was the vocalisation of the *l* into back [*u*] that gave us *-als* > *aus* in the two numbers. Then in the XIIIth century the *au* was contracted into *o* and we had:

	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plural</i>
nom.	<i>estivoſ</i>	<i>estival</i>
acc.	<i>estival</i>	<i>estivoſ</i>

The scribe left *estyvoſ* in its colloquial form in full and began to do likewise with the other word, but when he was half through he had seemingly a little twinge of remorse and corrected the word to the literary ending, and it is this hybrid vocable that we have on folio 39a: *hofeoaus*.

Now fortunately the Old French chronology of *-aus* > *-os* is pretty well established. The change of *-aus* into *-os* took place in the middle of the XIIIth century. Pierre Fontaines whose *Conseil* has been dated by Suchier at 1255 has *fos* for *faus* < *falsum*. *Aiol* which, according to Voretsch, is attributed to the second quarter of the XIIIth century favours *orai* for *aurai*, 'I shall have' in l. 345. *Richard le biel*, a little later, gives *ossi* for *aussi*, 'also'. There is *bosme* for *bausme* in *Jehan et Blonde* of Beaumanoir and *omosne* for *aumosne* in *Manekine* dated by Gaston Paris about 1270. Cf. *Voyelles Toniques du Vieux Français*, p. 150.

You will remember that in the various articles on the orthography of the *Black Book of Chirk* which I wrote I did not specifically treat the vowels. But had I done so, I should have said that they showed the same Old French influence as the other parts of speech. In fact, the Old French vocalic traits are manifest on every hand. I give a few of them infra.

ay for *e* (or sometimes *y*): *ay*, 'her' 2a; *maydu* (*meddu*), 'to possess' 3a; *kaynat* (*kennat*), 'messenger' 5a; etc.

The contraction of *ai* to *e* in Old French dates from Gaimar (c. 1150): *terre: faire* (cf. *Voy. Ton. du Vieux Français*, 73).

e for *ei*: *anivel* (*aniveil*), 'animal'; *veckieu* (*veickieu*), 'bail, security' 18a; (1) *lesteryau* (*llesteiriau*), 'to obstruct, hinder' 24b.

We have the orthographic variant *ei* for *e* since the *Oxford Psalter* (c. 1170): *seit* < *sapit*, LXXII, II, LXXXVIII, 15. *The Cambridge Psalter* somewhat later offers *espeie* XLIII, 36, *incurveie* XXXIV, 15, etc. The heyday of the *e* > *ei* seems, however to have been the second half of the XIIIth century.

o = u: *pup = pop*, 'every' 34b; *idu = ? ido (= iddau)* 19b, 'to him'; *poe bennac*, 'whosoever' 26a; *petheonof = petheunof*, 'a fortnight'; *voet (vuyt)*, 'food' 7a; *duo (Duw)*, 'God' 17b.

The vowel *o* and *u* for [o] occur in the oldest French texts. (cf. *Voy. Ton. du Vieux Français*, p. 26).

ae for *e* *haep (hep)*, 'without' 18a; *aef (ef)*, 'he, him' 17b.

We have *ae* for *e* since the Cambridge Psalter:

paerre (pere), *fuiagent*, etc. (cf. *Voy. Ton. du Vieux Français*, p. 35).

ou for *o*: *diou (Duw)*, 'God' 17b.

The *ou* for *o* goes back to the middle of the XIIIth century. cf. *doun* below.

on for *am*: *pahon (paham)*:

There are instances of this exchange since the *Cambridge Psalter* (end of XIIth c.): *damne deu* (129) = *Oxford Psalter damne deu* < *domnum deum*: *visdomne* and *visdamne* < *vice dominum Cambridge Psalter*, 129; etc. (cf. *Voy. Ton. du Vieux Français*, p. 123).

u for *ui*: *ufteleau (wyftlau)*, 'to pledge, deposit a security', 17a 19b, 18a, etc.

We have cases since Wace (1160-1174); *frut = fruit*. Chardri (1210-1230) offers *lu (= lui)*: *vaincu* and *nut = nuit* < *noctem*; etc.

Here are some of the double vowels:

aa = a: *aac (ac)*, 'and', 10a; *panaac*, 'soever' 17b; *kefreihaaul*, 'lawful' 18a; *detfaaul*, 'legal, recognised by law', 20a; *haafdy*, 'summer house' 15a; etc.

Johan Vising quotes *paas* from *Disticha Catonis* of the XIIIth century, and Tanquerey cites *Baa* (Bath) and *laa (= là)*, the first under date 1276 and the second under 1324 (cf. *Anglo-Norman Language and Literature; Recueil de Lettres Anglo-Françaises*, p. XXXII.).

ee for *e*: *kemeell*, 'to compel, force' 19a; *deleet*, 'debt, claim, right' 19a.

We sporadically encounter double *e* as early as the work of Philippe de Thaün, but its greatest popularity was the second half of the XIIIth century. Tanquerey in his *Lettres* cites several from this period: *aseez* (281), *seet (sapit)* (1278-1282) and under 1309 we meet *peere (patrem)*; etc.

ii *kikiit*, 'as long as', 18b.

The Chirk codex makes a sparing use of double *i*'s.

The words *mespriis* and *diist* have been quoted, see *Romania*, XXXII 32, 33. The *Recueil de Lettres Anglo-Françaises* cites the doubling three or four times: *diit* in 1265, *hiü (ibi)* in 1274-8 and *fiüz* in 1272-91 cf. *Recueil* p. XXX.

- oo *amoot*, 'compact, a contract made in the presence of witnesses' zob; ? *amuot*, ib., *dooleur*, 'declaration, assertion'. Johan Vising cites *cool* for *col* and *oos* for *os* taken from Walter de Bibbesworth about 1300. *dooureth* 67.18, 'quarters, billeting' (during 'progress'), but they seem to be rare in French, and Tanqueray gives only *nooz* (= *nos*) in a letter dated 1274.

From the foregoing discussion two conclusions impose themselves. The first is that the orthography of the codex is a variation of the *orthographia gallica anglicana* evolved by the Anglo-Saxons over the border and not as we thought a spelling peculiar to a Welsh copyist or copyists. The second is that upon the evidence furnished by Old French phonetics and borrowed words the *Black Book of Chirk* was not effected before the first quarter of the second half of the XIIIth century; in other words, that it is younger by half a century than the date generally attributed to it by the authorities.

MORGAN WATKIN

Caerdydd