

prepared « vair » was sometimes called « rampaille ». An assemblage in alternate « squares » of bluish backs and white bellies of *vair* was called « gros vair » (sometimes « grand vair ») or « menu vair » (> Lat. *minutus varius*, Engl. *meniver* and *miniver*), according to the size of the squares; at least, such is the definition of these terms given both by MONET and FURETIÈRE in the 17th cent.; FAUCHET's description, according to which the « squares » of the « menu vair » were alternately made of ermine and « gris », though somewhat different, confirms that « gros vair » and « menu vair » were not in themselves the names of particular furs (cf. V. GAY, *Glossaire archéologique*, s. v. « écureuil », « gris », « menu vair », « vair », « rampaille »).

YULE says (Y, II, 483) : « *Vair*, so often mentioned in mediaeval works, appears to have been a name appropriate to the fur as prepared rather than to the animal. This appears to have been the Siberian squirrel called in French *petit-gris*, the back of which is of a fine grey and the belly of a brilliant white. In the *Vair...* the backs and bellies were joined in a kind of checquer... ». EVANS, *Pegolotti*, 432, also regards *vaio* as « a quality of fur », and suggests that *vair* and *gris* are the back and belly respectively of the skin; in heraldry *vair* is a pattern of dove-tailed azure and argent. YULE's view and EVANS's is not confirmed by mediaeval use, where *vair* is decidedly the name of the animal as well as of its fur. Rubrouck (*Wy*, 166, 271) says « *portant varium et grisium* » and « *moneta Rutenorum communis sunt pellicule varii et grisii* », which shows that *vair* and *gris* were different; on the other hand, it seems probable that the *gris* is the modern « *petit-gris* » and the *vair* also is certainly a squirrel. This, however, is not the view adopted by the various translators of Rubrouck. HAKLUYT (BEAZLEY ed., 185, 306) gives « ermines and gray fures »; ROCKHILL (44, 202), « *vaire and minever* », but concludes in a note that the animals meant must be « marten and grey squirrels »; MALEÏN (p. 66), « ermines and squirrels »; HERBST (4, 180), « variegated, grey... furs » (explaining that no one knows what Rubrouck really meant); RISCH (p. 25), « marten and *petit-gris* »; VAN DEN WYNGAERT (*Wy*, 166), while mentioning MATROD's « *vair and petit-gris* », thinks probable that « squirrels and ermines » are intended. But MATROD's rendering seems to be the only correct one. The only difficulty is to distinguish between « *vair* » and « *gris* », both being squirrels; they seem to have been mixed up by BUFFON under the name « *petit-gris* ».

That the *vair* was a squirrel, and really the name of the animal, is moreover established by a well-known work which Rubrouck's translators failed to adduce, the *Codex Cumanicus* (KUUN ed., 97; my readings are taken from the facsimile *Codex Cumanicus* published by GRØNBECH, Copenhagen, 1936, 43 a), where we find *vari* rendered *xyngaf* in Persian, *tein* in Turkish; then *venter de vari* (= « belly of *vair* ») without translation; and afterwards *scoyrol*, rendered *siagingiaf* in Persian, *caratein* in Turkish; « marten » (*martori*) comes a little later, correctly rendered *sausar* in both Persian and Turkish. The Persian words intended are *سنجاب* *sinjāb* and *سیاه سنجاب* *siāh-sinjāb*, the Turkish ones, *täyin* and *qara-täyin*, meaning in both languages « squirrel » and « black squirrel » respectively. There is no reason to doubt that the distinction thus made by the *Codex Cumanicus* is in agreement with mediaeval usage; the « *vair* » was the light coloured squirrel, the « squirrel » properly so called was the dark squirrel.

The problem of the « ercolin » is more difficult. YULE (Y, II, 483), merely on account of a phonetic analogy, had thought of Rubrouck's « arcali », Mong. *arçali* (Turk. *arqar*), the *Ovis Poli*, but this was clearly a wild shot, since this moufflon of Central Asia does not occur in more northern