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PREFACE

The treatise *de Nugis Curialium* of Walter Map is preserved in a single manuscript\(^1\) of the end of the fourteenth century in the Bodleian Library, MS. Bodley 851. A detailed description of the contents, which I owe to the great kindness of Mr. R. L. Poole, Keeper of the Archives, will be given in due course. It may be prefaced by a few remarks upon the provenance and externals of the volume.

It comes from Ramsey Abbey. On the verso of f. 6, facing the beginning of the *de Nugis*, is a finely executed drawing in delicate stippled work and pale colours of which the central part consists of the word *Wellis* in large gothic letters formed out of ribbons or scrolls and placed on a label. The top of the *W* is prolonged to the left and inscribed *Iste liber constat fratri Iohanni de (Wellis)*, and the concluding words *monacho Rameseye* are written on the tops of the two *l*s which are similarly prolonged to *L* and *R*. On *L* is a rock on which sits a lion, his back turned to *R*, and his head, twisted round, looking to *R*. Round his neck is a chain which passes through the uprights of the *W* and is secured in the centre of the *R* portion of that letter. Out of a round hole in the rock a spring of water gushes up and flows to *R*. On *R* in the water stands St. Christopher bearing the Child Christ on his shoulders and

\(^1\) Wright, in his earlier volume (*Poems of W. Mapes*, p. ix, note), speaks of another MS. of the *de Nugis* as being at Merton College. I think there is a confusion here with a copy of the *Policraticus*. 
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looking up at Him. The Child bears an orb with cross. The
saint is bare legged and has a cap on his head with broad
turned-up band; he holds an eel-spear which is threaded through
the convolutions of the s of Wellis and passes down into the
water.

Below the picture is pencilled the name Whyttynton.

I may add that neither of the fragmentary catalogues of the
Ramsey Library which are printed in the Chronicon Ramesiae
(Rolls Series) is of late enough date to contain any note of our
manuscript.

It belongs no doubt to the last quarter of the fourteenth
century. It is in double columns of forty-two and forty-one
lines. The hand is not bad, but not of the easiest. In
one or two places, most notably on f. 39 b (p. 125), the ink has
become seriously blurred owing to the presence of a bad spot
in the vellum. There are two main volumes, the second being
the Piers Plowman, in which several scripts appear. The text
of the de Nugis is not certainly, though it is for the most part,
in one hand. The aspect of the first few pages is different from
that of the main body of the text: on f. 33 a there is a marked
irregularity in the script. The rubrics are in a different style
from the text. The verses on f. 5, Vernat eques, and the Comedia
deca Geta, are by a single scribe.

A contemporary of the scribe\footnote{I think the corrector was the scribe of f. 74.} has gone over the text and has
inserted in the margin some omitted words and also some
various readings. The latter are introduced with an al., for
alias or aliter, or perhaps alius exemplar (v. s. q.). They are
most considerable in the Dissuasio Valerii ad Ruffinum (pp. 143
sqq.), which we know to have been current apart from the rest of
the treatise. It is reasonable to suppose that in this case the
variants came from other copies and were not mere conjectures;
and the same, I am inclined to think, applies to the bulk of the others.

The scribe has on the whole not dealt badly with the rather difficult text which he had to copy. An inspection of my foot-notes will give a sufficient idea of his proneness to error.

A leaf of our manuscript is gone after f. 7 (see p. 5); and one was wanting in its archetype further on (see p. 102). Possibly, too, another was gone near the end (see p. 218).

The following is Mr. Poole's description of the manuscript:


f. 1 contains the various press-marks assigned to the MS. at different times. The following is the ascertained order of them, kindly furnished by Mr. H. H. E. Craster, sub-librarian:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probable order of entry</th>
<th>Press-mark.</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>M. 5. 4. Art.</td>
<td>1601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Y. 1. 14. Th.</td>
<td>cir. 1614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Arch. B. 95</td>
<td>cir. 1625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Arch. B. 52</td>
<td>cir. 1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Arch. C. 29</td>
<td>cent. xvii 1st half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>MS. Bodley 851</td>
<td>1761</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MS. is numbered 3041 in the Catalogi MSStorum Angliae et Hiberniae of 1697.

f. 1 v. [In a sixteenth-century hand.]

Saepè sub incultis reperitur gemma lapillis,
Saepe cadus vilis nobile nectar habet.

Author iste de seipso
sic loquitur capitae. 5.
Distinctionis 4æ. Nurgerum curialium

In remotissima posteritate mihi faciet authoritatem
antiquitas, quia tunc, ut nunc, vetustum cuprum praefetetur
au ro novello. &c. in eam sententiam. [See p. 158, ll. 17 sqq.]
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f. 2. A series of riddles. Inc.:  
  Si capud est currì / ventrem sibi iungeo volabit  
    Muscatum  
  Adde pedem comede / vel sine ventre bibe  

The last is  
  Simplex prelatus fuit odo òe gode vocatus  
  Pro bonitate modo manet in celestibus odo  
  At the side of the page are some English lines beginning  
  Be god & seint hillare  
  an clerk was full sar'.

f. 2 v. Verses, &c., Latin and French, hardly legible near the top.  
  e.g. Pauperis et regis communis lex moriendi  
  These are continued on f. 3, which ends  
    ¶ Pro meritis vite dedit illi laurea nomen.  
    Detur ei vite laurea pro meritis.

ff. 3 v. and 4 blank.

f. 4 v. Latin and English verses.  
Pedigree of affinity:
  tritavus | tritavia  
  trinepos | trineptis.

ff. 5 and 5 v. are filled with hexameters, apparently the Miles glorusus of  
Matthew of Vendôme. Inc. Vernat eques iam prima genis lanugo susurrat.

f. 6 blank.

f. 6 v. Iste liber Constat Fratri Ioanni de WELLIS Monacho Rameseye.

f. 7. Inc. In libro magistri Gauteri Mahap [Wright, de Nugis, p. 1.]  
  Above the line D. p. ninth and in a modern hand scrispis ista regnante  
  Richardo 1st, ut ipse innuit. cap. 5th. Distinct. 5th.
  After f. 7 a leaf is cut out. This was done before the present foliation  
  was made. The work ends on f. 72 v. with indicabit iusticiam  
  [Wright, p. 243]. Then follows a rubricated table of contents ending  
  on f. 73 v.: Explicit distinctio quinta libri Magistri Gauteri Mahap  
  de nugis curialium.

f. 73 v. Causa Excidii Carthaginiensem [in red]. Inc. Narrat Flaccens-  
  sius in hystoriis. Des. vt patet superius per ordinem. After which  
  there is a blank of more than three lines.
f. 74 (in the same quire). Inc. Porro sobrios viros / iuniores fratres / principes cocorum consequenter intitulas. Des. non attendant (f. 74 v.). 
Followed immediately, in a different hand, by Quis meo capiti dabit effundere?
Des. f. 75 v. (after two pages filled with other matter) ut spretis infinis letemur superis reatus dona veniam. Explicit processus martiris Ricardi scroup Eboracensis archiepiscopi [=Wright, Political Poems, 2. 114–118].
Fl. 75 v., 76 contain Examinacio sacerdotum propter concubinas. Inc. Olentes presbyteros omnes excitantes, with a line above Nouus rum Anglie deleted. [Cf. Wright, Poems of Mapes, p. 180.]
f. 77 blank (some scribbling).
f. 80 v. Inc. Sit deo gloria laus benedictio. Des. f. 81 v. Nec dolor coniugis habet remedium. (Wright, Poems of Mapes, pp. 77 ff. There are many variants. Lines 77–112 are placed after line 164. Then after a different stanza follow lines 121–140, 145–152. Then a new stanza, followed by lines 165–172, 177–180, 175–176, 181–200. Lines 201–212 are absent.)
f. 81 v. Inc. Si quis cordis et oculi. Des. occasionem oculo. (Wright, Poems of Mapes, 93–95)
Col. 2 is headed: Versus Magistri Michaelis Cornubiensis contra Magistrum Henricum Abrincensem coram domino Hugone abbate Westmonasterii et aliis.
Inc. Archipoeta vide quod non sit cura tibi de.
Des. Vt ratis in cautem minus in me scriba tu autem [sic] [f. 83 v. col. 1].
Des. Arcas certamen tamen hoc deus amplexit aurem [f. 85, col. 1].
f. 85, col. 2. Coram domino electo Wintoniens et episcoe rofensi.
Inc. Pendo poeta prius te diximus archipoetam.
Des. Vi sis conductus ductus fur ad fora lucro [f. 89, col. 1].
f. 89, col. 1. Inc. Pergama fiere nolo fato donais [sic] data solo.1

1 Cf. Ward's Catal. of Romances, i. 27 ff.
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Des. Vtbro pugnatur fit machina troia crematur. Explicit excidium Troia [f. 90, col. 2].

f. 90, col. 2. Prophecia cuinsdam de Domino Edwardo rege Anglie tercio post conquestum. [Above the line, in a modern hand, Scilicet Jo. de Bridlington.] Inc. Febribus infectus [as in Wright's Political Poems, i. 128, omitting the Expositio]. Des. carmina pendo [f. 94 v. = p. 211].

f. 94 v., col. 1. Inc. Gamlen camaraun anglis natum dabit agnum Qui dum senuerit tunc leopardus erit.

Eighteen lines, ending

Hinc terrena spuens sanctus super ethera scandit.

f. 94 v., col. 2. De babione et croceo domino babionis... Inc. Incipit prefacio in libro babionis. Me dolor infestat foris iugiter omnis. Des. Sunt incredibilis uxor alumpna cliens [f. 97 v., col. 1]. (Wright, Early Mysteries.)

f. 97 v., col. 2. Speculum Burnelli merito liber iste vocatur dum sub specie stultorum vita notatur.

Inc. Suscipe paucha as in Wright, Anglo-Latin Satirical Poets, i. 11, but omitting lines Fluctuat in dubiiis, p. 97, to magnificare solent, p. 125. P. 129 is followed by p. 124. Hinc est quod to magn. solent, p. 125.

Then follows (f. 114, col. 2) Obfuit augmentum, p. 126, to deficiuntque cito, six lines on. After this

Talibus exemplis... spreta iacent.

Then: Burnelli dicta multo modamine facta Spermere qui querit semper asellus erit (f. 114, col. 2).

Then Moraltas speculi Burnelli. Dilecto in xpé [the Prologue, as on pp. 3-10].

Des. cauteriam admittunt. Explicit Amen (f. 115 v., col. 2).

f. 166. Inc. Corda superborum Scotorum destrue xpe [as in Wright's Political Poems, i. 42].

Des. Spes tua conamen victoria lux releuamen [f. 116 v., col. 2: collated by Wright].

1 See Hist. Litt. Fr. xxii. 48.
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f. 116 v., col. 2. Inc. Francia feminea pharisea vigoris ydea [as in Wright's Political Poems, i. 26–40].

Des. Gloria solamen sit æc in omnibus amen.

Explicit.

Three lines beginning O iuger [?] intrusor et sancte sedis abusor

[end of f. 118, col. 2].

f. 118 v. Apocalipsis Magistri Galleri Mahap super vita et moribus personarum ecclesiasticarum.

Inc. A tauro torrida. Des. fecisset lubrica [f. 120, col. 2, as in Wright, Mapes' Poems, 1–20].

f. 120 v., col. 2. Inc. Que noua prava nimis peiora nouissima primis

(four lines).

Inc. Incipit comedia de geta. Prologus. [C]armina composuit voluitque placere poeta. (Vitalis of Blois, Wright, Early Mysteries, 79: Hist. Litt. xxii. 41.)

Des. Birria gota (Geta) hominem se fore queque (cuncta) placent

[f. 123, col. 2].

f. 123 v. blank.

f. 124. Inc. In a somer sesoun wen softe was the sonne. [The handwriting changes on f. 139.] Des. To vs and alle cristin! god leue it so be falle amen. Explicit vita et visio Petri Plowman

[f. 140 v.]. [See Skeats Introd., p. lxxi.]

f. 141. Inc. Thus y robet in runset [Piers Plowman, pass. xi. of the C. text].

Des. tyly gan y wake. Explicit passus secundus de Dobest [f. 208].

f. 208 v., [Three lines scribbled, deleted partially.]

Celerarius vjs & viij d.

Prior sancti Yuonis iijs & viij d. [with other entries].

At the foot is written Non est in müdo. [End of volume.]

In the front board is a portion of an account relating to Ramsey. At the end are two leaves besides that glued to the board; they seem to contain parts of a legal treatise.

I see no reason to doubt that the John Welles who owned our manuscript was the rather famous John Wells, monk of Ramsey Abbey, and opponent of Wycliffe, who for thirteen years
xii
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was ‘prior studentium’ at Gloucester Hall, the Benedictine College of Oxford, and died at Perugia in 1388. This man studied at Gloucester Hall and proceeded D.D. in 1377. His opposition to the Wycliffite circle is the distinguishing feature in his career. Two stanzas in a song on the Council of London in 1382 (Wright, Political Poems, i. 260, Rolls Series) give a lively description of him:

Tunc primus determinans est Johannes Wellis
Istos viros reprobans cum verbis tenellis
Multum conversatus est ventis et procellis;
Hinc in eius facie patet color fellis.
   With an O and an I, in scholis non prodest
   Imago faciei monstrat qualis hic est.

Hic promisit in scholis quod vellet probare
Wyclif et Herford simul dictis repugnare;
Sed cum hic nescierat plus argumentare,
Nichol solvens omnia iussit Bayard stare.
   With an O and an I, Wellis replicabat;
   Sed postquam Nichol solverat, tunc Johannes stabat.

Wycliffe is quoted (in Fasciculi Zizaniorum, p. 239) as styling him ‘a certain black dog of the order of St. Benedict’. On p. 117 of the same volume he is found subscribing the sentence of William Berton, Chancellor of Oxford, condemning the Wycliffite doctrine of the Eucharist.

In July, 1387, he was sent as procurator by the presidents of the English Benedictines to Urban VI to plead for the release of the learned Norwich monk, Cardinal Adam Easton. His commission is printed in Raine’s Letters from Northern Registers (p. 423, Rolls Series). He was unsuccessful in his mission and died, as has been said, at Perugia in 1388. He was buried in the church of St. Sabina there, according to a note printed by Tanner from the Cotton MS. Otho. D. VIII. The
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portion of the manuscript in which this note occurs contains a chronicle of Ramsey Abbey.

Works are attributed to him by Bale. In the Index (p. 263) we have:

De socii ingratitudine lib. i. Inc. Salutem quam meretur aut mereri poterit? qui grato ingratus diligentem non d(i)igit;

and Epistolae quoque scripsit, ea etate eloquentes, 1368.

The source is given as Ex epistolis quorundam monachorum (by which is meant a collection of letters of monks of St. Alban's).

In the Scriptores (vi. 82) Bale adds to the above the following:

Pro religione privata lib. i.
Super clerii praerogativa lib. i.
Super Eucharistiae negotio lib. i.
Contra Nicolaum Herfordium lib. i.

and Contra Wicliff. de religione perfectorum.

The reference in Wood's Hist. et Ant. Oxon. i. 189 adds nothing save the opening words of the tract against Wycliffe.

Traces of acquaintance with the de Nugis Curialium in contemporary or later mediaeval writers are exceedingly scanty. Giraldus Cambrensis tells several of the same anecdotes as Map, but his language shows no sign of being borrowed. Peter of Blois treats some of the same themes. In Ep. 14 he dwells on the miseries of the courtiers who accompanied Henry II on his progresses. He calls them milites Herlewinei, a striking coincidence with Map (pp. 13, 186), but not necessarily more than a coincidence. In Ep. 95 he speaks, as Map does (p. 6), of the excesses of the Justiciary errantes vel itinerantes, the forestarii and vicecomites: again a topic quite likely to occur to two authors independently of each other. In Ep. 79, it is true, he borrows copiously from the Dissuasio Valerii ad Ruffinum (taking from it
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the instances of Phoroneus, Marius and Metellus, Lucília and Livia, Deianira, Valentinian, Canius, Pacuvius), but we know that the Dissuasio was current before and apart from the de Nugis. A perusal of Peter's letters leaves me with the impression that he had never seen the whole treatise.

It would be absurd to generalize from so very fragmentary a knowledge of English mediaeval literature as I possess. All I can say is that I can adduce no single instance of use of the treatise before the seventeenth century. Higden in the Polychronicon no doubt includes Walter, Archdeacon of Oxford, in his list of authorities, but there is nothing from the de Nugis in his text. Possibly he regarded Map as the author of the versified Itinerarium Cambriae, which he quotes almost in extenso.

No English mediaeval library catalogue contains an entry identifiable with the de Nugis. Neither Leland nor Bale had ever seen it. In short, its appearance in 1601 in the Bodleian Library seems to have been practically its first introduction to anything that could be called a public. It must soon have attracted some attention. Richard James made extracts from it and a transcript of it, now contained in Bodley MSS. James 14, 31, 39.1 Camden makes a few quotations from it in the

1 MS. James 14 contains the extracts, on ff. 81–136. They begin with Dolendum nobis est (3r)... multiplicantus (4r), continuing with Hos Hugo (5v)... non deleuit (5v). Non dico quin (6v)... aciem (6v). Mitiet etiam (6v)... tenere nequeo (8v). James sometimes epitomizes in a very few words the portions he omits; very occasionally he gives an illustration, e.g. on ‘French of Marlborough (246v)’ he writes in the margin ‘And French she spoke moste fetoys / After the scoole of Stratford at Bow. Chaucer in descriptione priorissae’. His last extract ends p. 136 et insaniorem partem (254v). It is followed by extracts from the Apocalypsis Goliae and other Goliardic poems.

MS. James 39 contains the first part of a full transcript of the text, prefaced by the note of ownership of John de Wells and a brief description of the pictorial device accompanying it. This volume goes as far as Dist. IV. i (140v) linx penetrans.

MS. James 31 contains the remainder of the text, beginning: omnia exicio propriae
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Britannia, e.g. ed. Gough, 1806, i. 166, 267, 382: the last is borrowed from him by Burton (Anatomy, Part III, Sec. 2, Mem. 3, Subs. 4). Archbishop Ussher printed, in his book de christianarum ecclesiarum successione et statu (Opp. ii, p. 244), a portion of Dist. I. xxxi (pp. 60, 61) on the Waldenses. Several notes in the same work show that he had read a good deal of the manuscript. The interesting letters of Sir Roger Twysden in 1666 and 1669, mentioned first in Notes and Queries (1849, i. 76), and subsequently printed by Wright in his Preface, show that some scholars were alive to the interest of the text: ‘they say there is many stories of good worth, fit to bee made publick, in it.’

I have no doubt that between Twysden’s date and the publication of Wright’s edition in 1850, a number of references to the de Nughis would be discoverable: I have as a matter of fact found none, even in the works of Thomas Hearne.

In 1850, as has been said, the editio princeps was produced for the Camden Society by Thomas Wright. It will, I think, be worth while to quote from his Preface what little he says about the manuscript and about the preparation of his edition.

The manuscript is written in a very crabbed hand, and is filled with unusual contractions, which are often by no means easy to understand. In producing the present edition, I have had to contend with many disadvantages; the practice of the Bodleian Library, which does not allow its manuscripts to be lent out on any conditions, has rendered it impossible for me to collate the text myself with the original, and gentis, down to the end. It is followed by the capitula. Then follow: Improperium cuiusdam in monachos ex MS. Bibl. Bodl. Turstano ... Ebor. Archiep. T. Stampensis—et vivat de communi quod deus est. and: Fragmentum narrationum ex MS. Bibl. C.C.C. Oxon., namely the stories in MS. C.C.C. Oxon. 130, of which two are printed in this volume, p. 261. Hardy (Materials, ii. 485) mentions another manuscript, ‘Olim Clarendon 78,’ but this is a mistake. From Cat. MSS. Angl. et Hib. (iii. 14) we see that the book only contained a Mapesian poem.
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it has not always been in my power to consult, in cases of difficulty, scholars on the spot in whose opinion I could confide. In the latter portion of the work I have been more fortunate, and I have to acknowledge the kind attention and service in this respect which I have received from the Rev. H. O. Coxe, one of the librarians of the Bodleian Library, and the Rev. W. D. Macray, of New College. The difficulty I found previously in obtaining a satisfactory collation, combined with some other circumstances, has been the cause of a very considerable delay in the publication of the present volume, which was commenced several years ago.

To the delay just alluded to must be attributed any slight difference in the system of editing the text which may chance to be discovered between the earlier and latter parts of this volume. My principle has been to correct all those accidental corruptions of Latin orthography which arose merely from the ignorance or carelessness of monkish transcribers, but to retain most of those which were strictly mediaeval forms; and I think that perhaps in the latter part I have carried this process of purifying a little further than at first was intended. The business of an editor is to present his text, while he preserves its correctness, in a form as intelligible as possible to the general reader. With this principle in view, I have not hesitated to correct the corruptions of the manuscript, when that correction appeared evident, and I have added a few notes for the purpose of making the text somewhat more intelligible to those who may not have the advantage of an extensive acquaintance with the Latin literature of the middle ages. These notes might perhaps have been made more numerous; but for this deficiency, and for any errors of the text which may have escaped me, I must throw myself upon the indulgence of the reader.

THOMAS WRIGHT.

Brompton, Nov. 1850.

It is certainly the case that Wright’s text is perceptibly more correct towards the end of the Work. The earlier portion is disfigured by a number of what seem easily avoidable blunders. Yet I think that, considering the conditions under which he
worked, he deserves praise and not blame for the sum of his achievement. It would be ridiculous for me to pretend that I do not think my own text is better than his; but if I had had to depend upon even the best of transcripts, I am certain that many errors and faults—of which I hope there are now but few—would have survived in my pages.

As a matter of fact I have had the very great advantage of using a complete ‘rotograph’ of the treatise which has been procured for me by the kindness of the Delegates of the Clarendon Press; and by its help, coupled of course with personal consultation of the manuscript, I have been able to eliminate a great many errors from the old text. I believe that the student now has before him a record, complete in all essentials, of what the manuscript presents. I say, in all essentials, because I have not, except in the fewest possible cases, recorded the abbreviations. These are copious, as is usual in manuscripts of the date of this one. To have indicated the expansion of them by any typographical device would have entailed producing a quite unreadable page, and would have been a piece of pedantry in which, I hope, no scholar would have acquiesced.

In the matter of spelling I have implicitly followed the manuscript, with its tricky use of u and v, its disregard of diphthongs, and all the other features which it is reasonable to expect in a fourteenth-century copy of a twelfth-century text. I believe it will be found that I have not been quite perfectly consistent in my expansions of abbreviations, in that I have sometimes written *quod* and sometimes *quia*; I have also sometimes expanded *mihi* (not *michi*), and have possibly treated *nichil* in a similar fashion. I hope confession of these shortcomings (the only ones of the kind of which I am conscious) will be taken as sufficient to condone them.

The punctuation, on the other hand, is my own. The manu-
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script has a system, and a very elaborate one, which may be best indicated by a transcript of a few lines:

(p. 202) Domine / nos rei ueritatem scimus / Sed tu nobis tam austerus es / et tam hispidum nobis dans supercilium / ut que vera scimus 'pre timore tuo dissimulare oporteat / Mansio tua / et biblis quam hic queris? est rauenne / Si vobis non displicet / camus ut illic inuenias? quod te credis hic uidisse /

I do not suppose that any one who wishes to make a study of the text would have welcomed the preservation of these highly confusing marks.

I have not hesitated to emend, or to introduce my emendations into the body of the text, when I felt confident of their correctness. The reading of the manuscript is, of course, always recorded in the foot-notes. I think it allowable, at this point, to put together a selection of passages in which I think that I have, either by recovering the reading of the manuscript, or by emendation, materially improved the text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>uannus. MS. manus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>et e conuero. W. et ergo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>fit causa. W. fit tam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>decipula. W. decupla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>The punctuation of cc. i ($\bar{f}in.$)-v differs much from that of W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>iusticiis . . . immiciores. W. inscitiis . . . immunitiores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>modici numeri. W. modici verni.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>quin. W. quidem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>me. W. vis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>modicitate. W. non dimidiate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>qua. W. gravi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>attemptant. W. acceptant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>animaduerterent. W. arma ducerent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 18   | 3    | stimulis. W. simul.
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PAGE  LINE
  18  24   nunc. W. nec.
  19  19   strenuo. W. facundo.
  21  8    turpauerunt. W. crepaverunt.
  24  2    innaturalius. W. did not decipher it.
        6   Unde cum. W. Unam tamen.
  25  3, 4  necessarium. W. victum.
         24   nec. W. nisi.
  26  6    pruritus. W. penitus.
         9   procuravit. W. praecavit.
  27  28   assunt ibi. W. assenti.
  30  18   vim. W. pacem.
  34  11   conulescentibus. W. qualescunque.
         20   sanctumque senatum Romane curie. W. suumque senatum ratione curiae.
  36  30, 1  quod turpe. W. quia tempore.
  37  15    semite. W. stricte.
         11   Cf. 55.
  45  27   sine causa proscribunt. W. sumtam praescribunt.
  46  8    sine causa. W. sive tam.
         9    Nero. W. vero.
  47  32   sine murmur. W. summi ratione.
  49  23   si cibi parcitas. W. si tibi peccas.
  54  15    potest. W. prout.
  55  25   in necessitate unccionis uel uiacici. W. in nec. mittendi viatici.
  57  1, 2  inualueruntque. W. maluerunt quia.
  58  2, 3  In Normannia non apparent. W. in Normanniam. Apparent.
  60  17    cifo. MS. in quo.
  64  1    racionem supplied.
  65  23    habui. W. hujusmodi.
  67  20    precatrici. W. peccatrici.
  71  27    Austcliuie. W. Austeline.
  73  13   Deheubard. W. de heulard.
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In the above selection—a very small one—I have picked out a fair number of specimens from the earlier pages, and, from the latter part of the book, a few only, representative of the places where the sense is materially affected. Any one who cares to examine Wright's text will easily add to their number. There are, besides, places in which gaps have been filled up, and very many in which the punctuation and division of sentences has been completely changed. Puzzles and corruptions remain, of course; but I do believe that the present text is a great deal more readable than the former one.
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The only other edition known to me of any part of the text (save the *Epistola Valerii ad Ruffinum*) is the series of extracts in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, vol. xxvii, pp. 61–74. These were collated with the manuscript by Dr. F. Liebermann, but some errors escaped even him. The passages are as follows, reference being made to the present edition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xvi. 2510–2614.</td>
<td>8517–19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv. 3710–4554.</td>
<td>xxiii. 9311–9610.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6052–6115.</td>
<td>xiii. 18518–23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. II. iii, iv. 6715–18.</td>
<td>Dist. V. i. 20317–21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 6715–18.</td>
<td>22020–2219.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The range of Map’s reading, as attested by his quotations, is not inconsiderable. He is, to begin with, saturated with the language of the Latin Bible. The borrowed phrases are noted in my margins so far as I have been able to detect them; but it is certain that I must have missed some. Biblical turns of language are employed by him on the most unexpected occasions, and sometimes display his impish humour in a rather shocking fashion.

On two occasions he quotes Office Hymns. Of older church writers he cites by name Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory; and makes tacit use of Jerome’s treatise against Jovinian. The writers nearer his own time may be laid under contribution
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more copiously than I have seen. Those to whom there are plain allusions are Hildebert, Bernard, Geoffrey of Monmouth, Peter Comestor (the Historia Scholastica), the History of Pseudo-Turpin, not to mention the unidentified romances and sagas from which many of his longer stories are supposed to be derived.

More general interest attaches to his use of ancient secular authors. Of the poets Virgil, Horace, and Ovid are the favourites. He has also read Terence, Juvenal, Persius, Martial, Lucan, Pseudo-Cato, Claudian, and perhaps Statius. There are traces of the use of works of Cicero, of Caesar, Pliny, Solinus, Quintilian, Gellius, Apuleius, Martianus Capella, and express quotations from Boethius, Porphyry, Macrobius. An allusion to Tacitus (p. 45) is likely to be delusive: one to Livy (p. 204) is shadowy.

In addition to verbal citations account must be taken of the facts and names with which Map shows an acquaintance. He is familiar with a great deal of mythology, largely, no doubt, through the medium of Ovid's Metamorphoses: he has read of Alexander the Great, of Numa, perhaps in the Fasti, of Scipio, of Catiline, of the death of Julius Caesar, and of Nero and Vitellius. It is possible that for this knowledge he may depend upon Sallust, upon Suctonius, and upon some general history like that of Orosius.

It is natural to suppose that he was familiar with at least the Politricus of John of Salisbury, since he has borrowed the second title of that work as the sole title of his own. I have not been able to find that he has done more. The habit of classical allusion is common to both writers: one, at least, the story of Cicero and Terentia (p. 150), is told by both, but I cannot see that Walter has copied it from John.

I append a list of the sources, other than Biblical, to which I have found allusions in the text of the De Nugis curialium.
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Though I am far from supposing that it is complete, I doubt if the researches of future students will add any names of importance to it.

Apuleius, cf. 177³.
Augustine, Conf. i, (764), 248.
    ps-Aug. Sermon, 152.
Bernard, Epp. 38.
Boethius, Cons. Phil. 1, 253.
Cato, Disticha, 230.
Caesar, Bell. Gall., cf. 53.
Cicero (Auct. ad Herenn, 51).
    de Oratore, 151.
    de Senect., cf. 150.
    pro Archia, cf. 203.
Claudian, in Eutrop., 7.
    in Ruf. 139, 141.
Clement, Recogn. 156.
Didache, cf. 146¹⁸.
Gellius, 151, 152, 153.
Geoffrey of Monmouth, 140, 221¹.
Gregorius, S., 24.
Hildebert, 24.
Horace, Odes, 1¹⁶.
    Sat. 4, 53, 80.
    Epp. 26, 45, 144, 148, 211, 254.
    A. P. 4, 27, 115, 142, 158.
Hymns, 1, 37.
Jerome, Epp. 35.
    in Iovin. 150, 152, 155.
Juvenal, 52, 102, 142, 158, 197.
Livy, cf. 204¹⁰.
Lucan, cf. 23¹⁰, 203¹⁵, 204.
Macrobius, in Somn. Scip. 249.
Martial, 141, 142, 151, 159.
Martianus Capella, 156.
Ovid, A. Am. 46, 65, (137), 244.
    Am. 6, 102.
    Her. 45.
    Met. 14, 61 et al.
Persius, 9, 53.
    50, 150, 168²⁰.
Porphyrius, Isagoga, 1, 249.
Quintilian, cf. 151.
Solinus, 124.
Statius, cf. 167¹⁹.
Tacitus, Agr., cf. 45¹⁵.
Terence, Enn. 49, Phorm. 12.
Turpin, Historia, 101.
Unknown, 119¹⁸, 215⁵.
Virgil, Ecl. 34, 36, 41, 61, 135, 142, 148.
    Georg. 2, 85.
Vita Antonii, 79.
Vita Cadoci, cf. 72.
    (Vita Haroldi, cf. 217.)
xxiv
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As to the plan and date of the de Nugiis, nothing can be clearer than that there is no plan, and that the work was jotted down at various times, as the fancy struck the author. He himself says (14026) ‘Hunc in curia regis Henrici libellum raptim annotauit scedulis’. He undertook it, he says, at the instance of one Galfridus (134), who had asked him (1839) to put down in writing sayings and doings hitherto unrecorded, or anything conspicuously remarkable that had come to his knowledge. Wright (p. x) will have it that Galfridus had asked him to write a poem, but I think the ‘poetari’ of 1732 and the ‘philosophari’ of 134 are synonymous, and merely signify literary composition. At any rate Map, on p. 18, assumes that he is doing in this work what he had been requested to do.

There are numerous and discrepant notes of time in the book, which I will attempt to collect.


xi. 1526. anno primo coronacionis nostri regis Henrici. Possibly in Henry II’s lifetime.

xii. 164. Portingalensis rex qui nunc uiiuit. The king is not named, and the reference is doubtful.


Bartholomew, bishop of Exeter, 1162–86.

Baldwin, bishop of Worcester, 1180–5 (?).

This seems to give a date between 1180 and 1185.

xiii. 194. Gischart de Beaulieu, father of Imbert, ‘cuin nunc cum filio suo conflictus est.’ Doubtful to me.

xv. 21. In or just after 1187.

xxii. 3320. Reginald, bishop of Bath: after 1174.

xxvi. 3424. The Lateran Council: 1179.

xxvii. 5520. Gilbert of Sempringham, ‘qui adhuc superest... centennis aut eo amplius.’ He died 3 Feb., 1189.

xxviii, xxix. 5610, 19. Henry II is spoken of as alive.
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DIST. I. xxx. 58. William, archbishop of Rheims (1176–1202), told a story to Map.

DIST. II. ii. 65. Map told a story to Hamelin, abbot of Gloucester (d. 1179).

iii. 65. Map was present at Limoges in 1173.

65. Johannes Albaemanus, at that time (1173) bishop of Poitiers, ‘qui nunc est Lugdunensis archiepiscopus.’ He was translated to Lyons in 1181, and resigned in 1193. This, then, was written down after 1181.

vii. 69. Girard la Pucelle began his teaching career at Paris in or about 1160.

xviii. 85. The chronology of this chapter is badly confused, but it appears to have been written after 1185: Lucius III (d. 1185) seems not to be the reigning pope (86).

xxiii. 95. Map knew Thomas à Becket as chancellor: i.e. before 1162.


xxviii. 19. ‘In the time of Roger, bishop of Worcester’: Roger died in 1180.

DIST. IV. i. 139. Map ‘wrote this page’ at Saumur in June, 1182 (really 1183). Wright (pp. ix–x) misrepresents this passage: ‘he says that he is writing on St. Barnabas’s day (the 11th of June), the same day on which the young king Henry died in 1182, evidently looking back to that event as being some time past.’ But what Map really says is that Henry died at Martel, ‘mense quo hanc paginam apud Salmurum scripsi, die S. Barnabe apostoli, anno ... 1182 (sic) et sue natuilitatis 27’. The plain meaning is that Henry died on June 11, and Map heard of it at Saumur later on in the same month. The year is wrong in the text.

139. ‘hodie,’ Henry II has commanded the young king’s body to be moved from Le Mans to Rouen. The Chron. Rotomagensis, cited by Stubbs on Benedict of
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Peterborough, i. 304, dates the burial at Rouen on July 22. Thomas Agnellus (in Rad. de Coggeshall, Rolls, p. 270) says that the body lay at Le Mans for thirty-four days. Map seems to be writing before the actual removal of the body, but after the order had been given. This will suit the end of June or beginning of July, 1183.

Dist. IV. ii. 14028. Map wrote this book by fits and starts at the court of Henry II.

v. 1528. Gilbert Foliot is now very old and nearly blind.

x. 17618. The sixth bishop of Hereford since the time of Alnodus, who bequeathed Ledbury North to the see, temp. Will. I, is now reigning.

xi. 1833. ’nunc hodie . . . electus est Lucius papa successor Alexandri tercii, qui (Lucius) fuerat anno preterito Hubaldus Hostiensis episcopus.’ Lucius III succeeded in 1181.

xiii. 18614, 18 etc. The first year of Henry II appears to be long past.

Dist. V. iii. 20618. The year 1187 is mentioned.

21818. Henry II ‘qui nunc regnat’ before 1189.

225. Reminiscences of 1179 when Map was on the way to the Lateran Council.

vi. 23710 sqq. Written after the death of Henry II who had reigned thirty-six years.

23820. Geoffrey Plantagenet is archbishop of York: he became so in 1191. His quarrels with his canons have begun.

24111. Richard I is king. The murder of the Marquis of Montferrat (Conrad, not Boniface) was in April, 1192.

24117. Henry II seems to be still living.

24317. Richard I ‘qui nunc regnat’.

24618 etc. Geoffrey Plantagenet is perhaps not yet archbishop.