The Textual Tradition of Chaucer's Troilus
The Textual Tradition of Chaucer's Troilus

By

ROBERT KILBURN ROOT, Ph.D.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, JOHN L. CADWALADER
PRECEPTOR IN ENGLISH, IN PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

LONDON
PUBLISHED FOR THE CHAUCER SOCIETY
BY KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO., LTD.,
BROADWAY HOUSE, LUDGATE HILL, E.C.
AND BY HUMPHREY MILFORD, OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS,
AMEN CORNER, E.C., AND 29–35 WEST 32ND STREET, NEW YORK.
1916 for the Issue of 1912.
To

Sir William S. McCormick

SCHOLAR, MAN OF AFFAIRS, AND GENEROUS FRIEND
Adam scriveyn, if ever it thee bifalle
Boece or Troilus to wryten newe,
Under thy lokkes thou most have the scalle,
But after my making thou wryte trewe.
So ofte a daye I mot thy werk renewe,
Hit to correcte and eek to rubbe and scrape
And al is through thy negligence and rape.
PREFACE.

The textual study of Chaucer's *Troilus*, which is now offered to students of the poet's works, was begun a number of years ago by Sir William S. McCormick, then professor in the University of St. Andrews. Very important public services to the cause of British university education compelled him to abandon the work to which he had already given a great amount of time and labour. When, in the summer of 1913, I undertook its completion, Sir William McCormick most generously put at my free disposal all the collations and notes which he had accumulated. To him, therefore, my debt is so great that adequate acknowledgment is impossible. In whatever value this study may possess, his share is a large one. For the use I have made of the materials turned over to me, and for the conclusions reached, I must, of course, accept sole responsibility. Much of the work I have inevitably had to do over again from the beginning, since only so could I hope to control the many elements which make up a problem of extraordinary complexity. I have, however, been saved many months of labour by the virtually complete collations of seven of the unprinted MSS., and of Caxton's edition, which Sir William McCormick had made. Repeatedly, also, I have availed myself of suggestions found among his papers. It gives me pleasure to acknowledge, also, the helpful advice of my friend and colleague, Professor Gordon Hall Gerould, who has read my book in manuscript.

It may make easier the understanding and appraisal of the results of this study if I indicate briefly the procedure which I have followed. I had, to begin with, the diplomatic prints of seven of the *Troilus* MSS. published by the Chaucer Society. Extensive comparisons of these prints with the MSS. have shown that they are in general to be trusted. Wherever I found reason to distrust a printed reading, and wherever important results
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depended on its accuracy, I have had recourse to the original. In an appendix to this volume I have listed all corrections of the Chaucer Society prints which have come to my notice. I have had in my possession a complete and very careful transcript of MS. Harleian 2392 (H₄), made some years ago for Dr. Furnivall. This also I have extensively verified. The collations made by Sir William McCormick are so detailed as to be virtually transcripts. His method was to take the text of one of the printed MSS., and alter it in the margin and between the lines in accordance with the readings of the MS. in question. Thus the readings of H₄ were indicated over the print of Gg, those of R over the print of J, those of Cx over H₃, those of Ph over H₂, those of A, D, and S₁ over Cl. Usually, though not always, the collation has extended even to matters of spelling. These collations I have in large part verified; and I have repeatedly had recourse to the MSS. themselves where any doubt arose. For the text of Thynne I have used the photographic facsimile. Two of the MSS., S₂ and Dig, I have myself collated, but only in part; since, as will be seen, their readings are seldom important. A partial collation has served to indicate unmistakably their membership in a large family, of which they constitute a very corrupt sub-group. Finally, I have had the Specimen Extracts from all otherwise unpublished authorities recently issued by the Chaucer Society. By these means I have been able to have before me at a glance the virtually complete testimony of all the scattered authorities, so that it has been possible to carry on much of the work at three thousand miles remove from the actual documents. I have, however, personally examined every page of every MS. concerned.

The investigation of the MS. relations has been based on a minute examination of about 2500 lines chosen from all parts of the poem, after a more cursory comparison of the authorities in their entirety. The lines chosen for careful study include: (1) the stanzas printed in the Chaucer Society's volume of Specimen Extracts; (2) the whole of the soliloquy on free choice in Book IV; (3) all lines in which there is a significant variation found in two or more MSS.; (4) all lines in which there is a variation, however slight, affecting the two main types of text α and β, or the important group designated as γ. For each of these 2500 lines I have prepared a separate card, containing the whole line as found in the Campsall MS. (chosen as a convenient basis of
comparison); and on this card I have noted all variant readings unless merely orthographical, found in any of the MSS.

I have regarded as significant variations all those where the agreement of two MSS. in a variant reading could not readily be explained as due to coincidence. It must be remembered that in the tradition of a Chaucerian poem one great influence making for corruption operated equally on nearly all scribes of the fifteenth century. This was the linguistic change which rendered mute many unaccented syllables, which in Chaucer’s usage preserved full metrical value. Consequent upon this was a general ignorance of Chaucer’s metre. Such variations, therefore, as the insertion or omission of which before that, or that after which or how, and in general the insertion or omission of colourless words not vital to the sense, I have usually regarded as not significant. In the same category I have put variations which consist in simple transpositions of words and phrases within the line, particularly when the transposition results in the substitution of a normal for an inverted order. Such variations must, of course, be taken into account when one comes to the final constitution of a critical text; but on them one cannot safely base any argument for MS. relation, unless the cases of agreement between two or more MSS. in such readings are very numerous.

The problem of presenting the results of my study in such form as to make them most readily comprehensible to the reader has not been an easy one. Because of the length of the poem, and the shifting character of some of the authorities, it has seemed best to present the evidence for each of the five books in a separate chapter, and then to resume the whole in a concluding chapter. This method has the disadvantage of broken continuity as regards single aspects of the discussion; but I am convinced that it makes for greater clearness.

In citing variant readings, the method is this: First is given the reading of the group of MSS. under discussion, followed by all variants of MSS. within the group. Then follows the reading of the rest of the MSS., with all variants which may conceivably have any bearing upon the main variation. When a reading is cited as that of more than one MS., it is spelled according to the MS. first named. Unless the variant reading under discussion is that of a group which includes Cl, the reading given as that of the rest of the MSS. is in the spelling of Cl. So far as possible,
a cited reading is quoted from one of the MSS. printed entire; and
the MS. chosen is in every such case the first one available in the
following order of preference: Cl, Cp, H₁, J, H₂, Gg, H₃. A
dagger (†) before the line-number of a variant cited indicates that
the reading in question is manifestly corrupt. An asterisk (*)
indicates a striking case of variation due to authentic revision.
When a reading given as characteristic of a group of MSS. is found
also in other MSS. outside the group, the fact is indicated by
printing after the cited reading the designations of these other
MSS., enclosed in parentheses and preceded by the plus sign,
e.g. (+GgH₅). A minus sign similarly used, e.g. (−AD),
indicates that the MSS. designated desert the reading of the group
for that of the rest of the MSS. When the designation of a MS.
is enclosed in parentheses without other indication, e.g. (Cp), it
means that the MS. omits the passage under discussion. The
line-numbering adopted is that of Skeat's edition.

In work such as this, where even a momentary lapse of atten-
tion entails risk of error, I cannot hope wholly to have escaped
the pitfalls. I have, however, taken every precaution to avoid
inaccuracy; and I feel confident that any slips which have escaped
me in revision are not so serious as to invalidate the conclusions.
The conclusions themselves are of two sorts: the reasoned presenta-
tion of demonstrable facts, and more or less conjectural interpreta-
tion of the facts. Of the soundness of the first sort I can feel some
confidence; of that of the second the reader must be the judge. I
could not avoid the duty of attempting explanations, even where
the way was most doubtful. In any event, I have presented the
full evidence; and that cannot be without value. In the not very
distant future I hope to publish a critical edition of Troilus, for
which such a study as the present is an indispensable preliminary.

The task has been a long and a very exacting one; but it has
been at every stage full of interest. The textual critic of Chaucer
has always this reward, that in helping to recover the exact
wording of the poet's lines he is sure of the approbation of an
author who ended the greatest of his completed works with a
prayer for his poem—

that non miswryte the,
Ne the mysmetre for defaute of tonge.

December 1915.
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Cl: Campsall MS., Doncaster.
✓Cp: Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS. 61.
Cx: Caxton's edition.
D: Bishop Cosin's Library, Durham, MS. V. II. 13.
Dig: MS. Digby 181, Bodleian.
Fil: Boccaccio's Filostrato. (References are to book and stanza in the Moutier edition.)
Gg: Cambridge University Library, MS. Gg. 4. 27.
H₁: MS. Harleian 2280, British Museum.
H₂: MS. Harleian 3943, " "
✓H₃: MS. Harleian 1239, " "
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Th: Thynne's edition of 1532.
α: the earliest, unrevised text, and collectively the MSS. which in any given passage present this text.
β: the final, revised text, and collectively the MSS. which in any given passage present this text.
γ: a lost MS. derived from the archetype before the revision was yet complete, and collectively the MSS. derived from this original, i.e. Cl, Cp, H₁, S₂, Dig, A, D (and sometimes also S₁ and H₃).
†: indicates that a reading is manifestly corrupt.
*: indicates that the variation in reading is clearly due to authentic revision.

A superscript numeral after the designation of a MS. indicates the portion of the MS. written by a given hand. Thus, H₃ indicates the portion of H₂ written by the third hand.
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CHAPTER I.

THE AUTHORITIES.

Of the many MSS. which may once have been written of Chaucer's *Troilus* there have survived to us, so far as is known, but sixteen, and of these two are incomplete. Besides the MSS., two early printed copies present texts which are independent of the existing MSS., and therefore rank with the MSS. as authorities. These are the *editio princeps* printed by Caxton about 1483, and the first collected edition of Chaucer's works, edited by Thynne in 1532. The editions of Wynkyn de Worde, 1517, and Pynson, 1526, are reprints of Caxton, and have no value as authorities. Thynne made use of Caxton; but his main reliance was a MS. now lost. Subsequent editions are based on Thynne.

To evaluate these eighteen authorities, to determine so far as may be their relation to one another and to Chaucer's original, and to show how they are to be used for the establishing of a critical text, is the purpose of this volume. This problem is enormously complicated by the fact, for which abundant evidence will be presented in the following chapters, that the existing MSS. derive, not from a constant and uniform authentic text, but from a text which underwent extensive alterations and revision at the hands of the poet himself. Certain of the MSS. derive from Chaucer's original, while still in its first unrevised form, to which we shall give the designation *a*; others from the final revised version of this original, which we shall call *β*. At a time when the work of revision had been only partially done, while the

1 There are in addition three short MS. fragments of no critical value, see p. 31.
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original was in a state midway between \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \), there was derived a MS., the ancestor of about half of the total number of existing MSS., including many of the most beautiful and carefully written. To this family of MSS., or rather to its lost original, has been given the designation \( \gamma \).

A further element of complication is introduced by the fact that several of the MSS. are composites, based for part of the poem on an exemplar of \( \alpha \) type, let us say, and for another part on an exemplar of \( \beta \) type. A result of this is that the MSS. which bear witness to the \( \alpha \) text in Book I are not the same which bear witness to it in Book III, nor yet in Book IV. The symbol \( \alpha \), then, does not designate a constant group of MSS. but a state of Chaucer's text, attested now by this group of MSS., now by that, and so with \( \beta \). The \( \gamma \) group, it will be found, is very nearly constant.

In the case of one of the MSS., \( H_2 \), the composite character of the volume is patent to our eyes. It is the work of four different scribes, one of whom we see to have been a repairer. He found a defective MS., itself the work of two different scribes, which he then patched up, supplying lost leaves, filling out lines left blank, finishing an unfinished quire, and ultimately calling in the aid of still another scribe to complete the volume. The repairer and his associate used as their exemplar a MS. of different type from that which had served for the earlier scribes. With the variations of handwriting before our eyes, the changes from one type of text to the other are easy to follow. If, however, instead of \( H_2 \) we had only a MS. copied from it, we should have before us but the writing of a single scribe, a MS. apparently homogeneous, but in reality the composite \( H_2 \). Such a MS. we actually have in Gg, the work of a single scribe, but descended from what was probably a composite similar to \( H_2 \). Or a scribe may have had access to more than a single exemplar, and transferred his allegiance from one to another midway in his task.

In some cases we are offered the still more confusing phenomenon of a "mixed" or "contaminated" text, where a MS. copied from one exemplar has been "corrected" by reference to another. When these corrections have been made in the actual MS. before our eyes, they cause no trouble. More often they lie back of the existing MS., somewhere in its line of descent. On Plate I. of the Chaucer Society's volume, The Manuscripts of Chaucer's
Troilus, may be seen a striking example of contamination, where the "correction" is made in the existing MS.

In this introductory chapter we shall describe and characterize each of the eighteen authorities for the text of Troilus. For fuller bibliographical descriptions the reader is referred to the Chaucer Society's volume, The Manuscripts of Chaucer's Troilus, where will be found also collotype facsimiles of the various handwritings. Here the description is concerned primarily with textual matters. In the case of each MS. is given a full list of all omissions and transpositions involving at least an entire line. In anticipation of the results reached in later chapters, the chief aspects of its affiliation are noted. Dialectal peculiarities are recorded; and any striking orthographical characteristics are mentioned. It has not seemed necessary to treat this last matter with any fullness of detail, since the Chaucer Society has already printed specimen extracts from all of the MSS. not printed entire, and from Caxton and Thynne.

The MSS. are described in the alphabetical order of their designations.

Additional 12,044 (A).

British Museum, MS. Additional 12,044. A vellum MS., 10 x 7\(\frac{1}{2}\) in., of 113 leaves, which contains only Troilus. It is in two hands, both of the fifteenth century. A later hand has throughout made corrections and supplied missing lines. The first hand has written up to line 1709 of Book III, and the second hand has completed the volume, which is, however, defective at the end.

Omissions, etc.

1. 890–896, stanza 128, omitted, no gap.
2. 914, 915 transposed.
3. 528, 529 transposed.
4. 734 (second half), 735 by later hand over erasure.
5. 295–364, ten stanzas, omitted, no gap. Due to the loss of a leaf in the AD original (see p. 137).
6. 927–931 by later hand in space left blank.
7. 1078 by later hand.
8. 1208 by later hand over erasure.
9. 1209 by later hand in space left blank.
3. 1229, 1230 transposed.
3. 1324–1337, stanzas 190, 191, in $a\gamma$ position.
3. 1447 by later hand in space left blank.
3. 1591, 1592 transposed.
4. 39, 40 in $\gamma$ order.
4. 430, 431 by scribe over erasure.
4. 526–532 by later hand in space left blank.
4. 708–714, stanza 102, omitted, no gap.
4. 750–756, stanza 108, in $\beta\gamma$ position.
4. 1024 by later hand over erasure.
4. 1430 after 1433.
5. 60, 61 in $\gamma$ order.
5. 1138, 1139 transposed.
5. 1541–1750 missing, three leaves lost.
5. 1821–end missing, leaf lost.

A is throughout a $\gamma$ MS., closely related to D, save for lines 1345–1414 of Book III, a passage omitted by D, which the scribe of A has supplied from a MS. akin to GgH$_5$. Of the omissions and transpositions noted above, however, apart from those characteristic of the whole $\gamma$ group, only the omission of 3. 295–364 is shared by D. It introduces many corrupt readings, frequently omitting words not necessary to the sense but required by the metre. The second hand is somewhat more guilty in the matter of corruptions than is the first. Neither scribe understood Chaucer’s metre.

The first scribe apparently did not preserve in his speech the guttural continuant $gh$. In 1. 625, for example, we find $pohw$ for $pogh$; in 1. 617 $Hough$ for $How$; in 2. 1120 $ought$ for $out$. The weak vowel in inflectional syllables, though normally $e$, is often written $i$. The character $p$ is used interchangeably with $th$, but only in pronominal forms.

The second scribe has no difficulty with the guttural continuant which he indicated by $3$, and occasionally by $gh$. Only rarely is $3$ used for initial $y$. $Sch$ is regularly written for $sh$. The weak vowel is occasionally $i$ or $y$. He regularly writes $frome$ for $from$, and $schulde$ for $sholde$. The character $p$ is used interchangeably with $th$, but more commonly in pronominal forms.

The readings of A, or of the AD parent, can be used to check those of ClCpH$_1$ in reconstituting the $\gamma$ original. In some instances, however, the AD parent has corrected $\gamma$ readings.
Campsall (Cl).

The property of Mrs. Bacon-Frank, of Campsall Hall, Doncaster. A vellum MS. $12 \times 8\frac{1}{4}$ in., of 120 leaves, which contains only Troilus. It is beautifully written in one hand of the early fifteenth century, and was executed for Henry V. while Prince of Wales, i.e. between 1399 and 1413.

Omissions, etc.

1. 890-896, stanza 128, omitted, no gap.
3. 1324-1337, stanzas 190, 191, in aγ position.
4. 39, 40 in γ order.
4. 708-714, stanza 102, omitted, no gap.
5. 60, 61 in γ order.

Cl is consistently a γ MS., somewhat closer in its readings to AD than are CpH₁S₂Dig. Dialectally and orthographically it varies but little from Cp and H₁. It uses ð interchangeably with th, though not at the beginning of a line. It does not use the character j. Though remarkably free from gross blunders, it introduces a considerable number of trivial variations in which other MSS. outside the γ group, notably R, occasionally share. These agreements seem always to be fortuitous; for the variations are too trivial to warrant the hypothesis of contamination. Despite occasional lapses, it is an authority of high value for a reconstitution of the γ original.

Corpus (Cp).

Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS. No. 61. A vellum MS., $12\frac{1}{4} \times 8\frac{7}{10}$ in., of 151 + 2 leaves, which contains only Troilus. It is beautifully written in one hand of the early fifteenth century.

Omissions, etc.

1. 890-896, stanza 128, omitted, no gap.
3. 137 omitted.
3. 1228 omitted, space left at end of stanza.
3. 1324-1337, stanzas 190, 191, in aγ.
3. 1576-1582, stanza 226, omitted. Stanza 225 is the last on a leaf which is the last of a quire. The beginning of 1576, *I passe al that which*, is written at the foot of the page (fol. 87b) as a catchword. The stanza was, therefore, present in Cp's original.

4. 39, 40 in γ order.
4. 491-532, six stanzas, omitted, no gap.
4. 708-714, stanza 102, omitted, no gap.
4. 1388, second half,-1409, first half, omitted, no gap. An error of anticipation by which stanza 199 is "telescoped" into stanza 202.

5. 60, 61 in γ order.
5. 1233-1274, six stanzas, omitted, no gap.

Cp is consistently a γ MS. throughout. In its readings it is closest to H1S2Dig. Save for the omissions noted above, it presents the γ text with a high degree of purity. Though not always consistent in preserving the weak e of inflectional syllables, it approximates in this and in other respects, grammatical and metrical, to Chaucer's known usage. In orthography, also, it shows a high degree of consistency. The character ṣ is not used. Initial y is always written ъ; but ъ is never used except with this value. The guttural continuant is consistently represented by gh. The vowel of inflectional syllables is regularly e. Adverbial -ly becomes -lich, and the first person pronoun ich, before a vowel.

With the closely similar H1, Cp is of the highest importance for the reconstitution of the γ original. All things considered, it is probably the best basis for the constitution of a critical text.

**Caxton's Edition of 1483 (?) (Cx).**

Caxton's edition of *Troilus and Cresede* is a small folio of 120 leaves, of which the first and the last two are blanks. The volume bears no date, but was probably printed in 1483. Four copies are known to exist. Two are in the British Museum, one in the library of St. John's College, Oxford, and one in the John Rylands Library, Manchester. Besides these there is a fragment of eight leaves in the British Museum.¹ Of the two copies in the

British Museum, one lacks a few leaves. For my collations I have used the other British Museum copy, which is perfect.

**Omissions, etc.**

1. 111, 112 transposed.
2. 148–154 corrupt.
3. 449–504, eight stanzas, omitted.
4. 785–812 after 840, an eight-stanza leaf of the MS. copy reversed.
5. 890–896, stanza 128, omitted.
6. 904–931 after 959, again a leaf of the MS. reversed.
7. 246–301, eight stanzas, omitted.
8. 328–329 transposed.
9. 1079–1081 corrupt. (See Specimen Extracts.)
10. 1377 corrupt:

In that maner for no maner gynne

3. 133 reads:

Yow for to serue / lyke as ye wyl deuyse

3. 316–320 corrupt. (See Specimen Extracts.)
4. 342–476, five stanzas, omitted.
5. 1114–1169, eight stanzas, omitted.
6. 1266, 1267 transposed.
7. 1324–1337, stanzas 190, 191, in β position.
8. 1779–1785 after 1813.
9. 137, 138 transposed.
10. 153, 154 transposed.
12. 1277–1279 corrupt:

Not withstandyng the Grekes grete route
Doutyth not / it must nedes be so
By veray resons more than one or twoo

5. 70, 71 transposed.
6. 341 corrupt:

And though bitwene yow were neuer no strif

5. 348 corrupt:

Withoute wordes or blowyng oute aloft

5. 1243 omitted. After 1244 a corrupt line:

For sorowe of whiche / almost ther he deyde
The Authorities.

5. 1256, 1257 corrupt:

Hath thus withdrawe your hert / & love from me
This is the cause of your long absence

5. 1498. Fourth and fifth lines of Latin argument of Statius transposed.

5. 1812, 1813 corrupt:

How he was slayne / alas al to rathe
The folk of Troye to moche harme & skathe

5. 1829 after 1832.
5. 1831 after 1828.

A glance at the list of omissions, etc., just given will serve to show how careless was Caxton's work as editor of Troilus. He must have printed from a single corrupt and defective MS., without even noticing that certain leaves were missing and others reversed. Had he made any pretence at collating it with another copy, some of the omissions and spurious lines would have been corrected. What we have, then, is a printed copy of a single lost MS.; and Caxton's carelessness has resulted in giving to the modern critic a text which, however corrupt, is at least not "edited," and hence is more valuable than the excellently edited text of Thynne. Caxton's MS. was consistently of the $\beta$ type, akin to the $\beta$ portions of $H_3$. $H_3$ Cx agree with $\gamma S_1$ as against JRH$_4$ in a series of striking variants in lines 701-1113 of Book II.

Throughout the poem Cx is very corrupt. Words are omitted; words and phrases are transposed—to the serious detriment of the sense and the utter confusion of the metre. Cx is particularly erratic in its treatment of final e. It has, however, no distinctive traits of dialect or orthography.

Despite its corruptions, Cx is an important witness to the text of $\beta$.

Digby 181 (Dig).

Bodleian, MS. Digby 181. A paper MS., $11\frac{1}{3} \times 8$ in., of 93 + 4 leaves, which in addition to its fragment of Troilus contains a miscellaneous collection of poems by Chaucer, Lydgate, Hoccleve, etc. The Troilus fragment is written by one hand of the fifteenth century. It ends in the middle of a page with line 532 of Book III.
Digby and Durham.

Omissions, etc.

1. 152 after 154, proper order indicated in margin.  
2. 776–1083 omitted. The loss corresponds to two leaves; but, as there is no mutilation of the MS., the leaves were apparently lost in Dig's original.

1. 890–896, stanza 128, omitted, no gap.
1. 955, 956 omitted, no gap.
2. 776–1083 omitted. The loss corresponds to two leaves; but, as there is no mutilation of the MS., the leaves were apparently lost in Dig's original.

2. 1419 by scribe in margin.
3. 89 by scribe in margin.
3. 533–end of poem missing.

Dig is throughout a γ MS., closely related to S₂, with which it shares innumerable corruptions besides many others of its own. Dialectally, also, it shares the peculiarities of S₂.

Durham (D).

Bishop Cosin’s Library, Durham, V. II. 13. A vellum MS., 11 × 7 in., of 111 + 5 leaves, which contains, besides Troilus, Cupid’s Letter by Hoccleve and a poem of five seven-line stanzas. Troilus is written in one hand of the fifteenth century, save for a few lines, 5. 151–154, 184–188, which are by a different scribe. Another contemporary hand has made corrections; and a modern hand has supplied in the margin a number of omitted lines.

Omissions, etc.

1. 222 omitted, no gap.
1. 231–384 missing, two leaves lost.
1. 684 omitted, no gap.
1. 720 omitted, no gap.
1. 890–896, stanza 128, omitted, no gap.
1. 1048 omitted, no gap.
2. 396 by scribe in margin.
2. 514 written twice, first deleted.
2. 695, 696 written three times (though second time only four words of 696). The four superfluous lines were stricken out in blue by the rubricator.
2. 1032, 1033 omitted, no gap. Supplied in margin by modern hand.
The Authorities.

2. 1215, 1216 by later hand in space left blank.
2. 1262 repeated after 1263.
3. 165 omitted, no gap.
3. 257 omitted, no gap.
3. 295–364, ten stanzas, omitted, no gap. Apparently a leaf was lost in D's original.
3. 438 omitted, no gap.
3. 676 omitted, no gap.
3. 800 omitted. Line 799 is at foot of page.
3. 809 omitted. Loss indicated by rubricator.
3. 1171, 1172 by scribe in margin.
3. 1245 after 1215, but deleted and then written in proper place.
3. 1324–1337, stanzas 190, 191, in αγ position.
3. 1339 repeated again after 1443, but deleted.
3. 1345–1414, ten stanzas, omitted, no gap. Again a ten-stanza leaf missing in D's original.
3. 1551, 1552 transposed.
4. 39, 40 in γ order.
4. 550 by scribe in margin.
4. 708–714, stanza 102, omitted, no gap.
4. 1035 omitted. In its place 1041 with last two words omitted. Line 1041 again, complete, in proper place.
4. 1397 by scribe in margin.
4. 1426 written twice, first time deleted.
4. 1488 after 1485.
5. 60, 61 in γ order.
5. 136, 137 by scribe in margin.
5. 151–154, 184–188 by different hand in space left blank.
5. 814 written twice, first time deleted.
5. 1172, 1173 written twice, second time deleted.
5. 1396, 1397 omitted, no gap. Supplied by modern hand in margin.
5. 1749 after 1745, but deleted, and written again in proper place.
5. 1802, 1803 transposed, but corrected in margin.

D is throughout a γ MS. closely related to A. Of the many instances of omission and transposition just given, however, only
two, the omissions of 3. 295–364 and 3. 1345–1414, are, apart from those characteristic of the whole γ group, shared by A. The text of D is rather more corrupt than that of A.

Dialectally it has no very marked peculiarities. We find, however, awne for owne, e.g. 2. 652; 5. 565, and ar for er. Should be regularly written for sholde. The character p is used interchangeably with th; but the character ʒ is not employed.

**Cambridge, Gg 4. 27 (Gg).**

Cambridge University Library, MS. Gg 4. 27. A vellum MS., 12 3/4 x 7 5/8 in., of 516 leaves, which contains a miscellaneous collection of Chaucer's works. It is written in one hand of the first half of the fifteenth century. The volume has been mutilated by the cutting out of illuminated leaves.

**Omissions, etc.**

1. 1–70 missing, leaf cut out.
2. 86 omitted, no gap.
3. 122 all but first word by corrector.
4. 582–595 repeated over page and deleted.
5. 654 all but first word by corrector.
6. 890–896, stanza 128 omitted, no gap.
7. 1044–2. 84 missing, two leaves cut out.
8. 616 omitted, no gap.
10. 1233–1239 repeated over page and deleted.
11. 1384–1388 by corrector.
12. 1460 omitted, but supplied by scribe at foot of page, with proper place indicated.
13. 1–56 missing, leaf cut out.
14. 571 all but first word by corrector.
15. 957 omitted, line left blank.
16. 1223, 1224 by corrector.
17. 1324–1337, stanzas 190, 191, in αγ position.
18. 1693–1695 by corrector; 1693, 1694 transposed.
19. 1807–4. 112 missing, two leaves cut out.
20. 307–322 by corrector.
21. 410, 411 in α order.
22. 728 after 721, and whole stanza awkwardly revised in accordance with the shift.
The Authorities.

4. 806–833 omitted, no gap.
4. 953–1078, free-choice soliloquy, except last stanza, omitted, no gap.
4. 1090 omitted, line left blank.
4. 1477 by corrector.
4. 1667–5. 35 missing, leaf cut out.
5. 60, 61 in γ order, but 61 corrupt: And ofte sche syhede & seyde allass.
5. 187 omitted, no gap.
5. 194 omitted, line left blank.
5. 257 corrupt: And for that for anon he dede awake, by contemporary hand, not that of corrector, in space left blank.
5. 384 all but first word by corrector.
5. 411 by later hand in space left blank.
5. 571, 572 transposed.
5. 578 by scribe at foot of page, proper place indicated.
5. 713–719 omitted, no gap.
5. 881 omitted, line left blank after 882.
5. 922 omitted, line left blank after 924.
5. 1011 all but first word by corrector.
5. 1069 after 1071, but proper place indicated.
5. 1702–end missing, four leaves cut out of MS.

The text given by Gg is of composite character. It is closely related to the fragmentary H₅, which ends with 4. 686, and the account to be given of it applies also to H₅. In Book I, Gg (and H₅) is consistently a β MS., somewhat closer in its readings to J than to the other β MSS. In Book II its β character continues through line 63. From 64 to 1210 it presents a “mixed” text, predominantly α in character but with frequent β readings. It shares, however, in none of the distinctive JRH₄ readings so numerous between 701 and 1113. Beginning at 2. 1210 and extending into Book III, it resumes its β character with clearly marked relationship to J. At line 399 of Book III (with one earlier instance in 243) Gg becomes definitely and consistently an α MS., and so continues till the end. As an α MS. it presents the text at the same stage of revision as does the α portion of J. This is particularly marked in its treatment of the free-choice soliloquy. See below, pp. 216–220.
The text of Gg is exceedingly corrupt, the corruption most commonly taking the form of a transposition of words, or the omission of a word not necessary to the sense, to the utter confusion of the metre. Some of these corruptions are shared by H₅; but many others are not.

There are also a number of dialectal and orthographical peculiarities to be noted. The scribe does not preserve with any consistency the guttural continuant, which he writes ȝ or h. We find regularly pour for þurgh, and pow for þough, and, on the other hand, such spellings as dousteles for douteles (5. 1149). He is also uncertain as to the value of h in the combination wh. He usually writes wich for which, and we find wheper for weper (4. 1374). Occasionally ho is written for who. There is a strong tendency to substitute e for short accented i, e. g. sek for sik, and dede for dide. Welë is consistently written for wol. The weak vowel of inflectional syllables, however, is regularly i or y. Another peculiarity is the regular use of the forms myn and pyn instead of my and pi. Sch is always written for sh. The character ð is used interchangeably with th. The character ȝ is used both as guttural continuant and as initial y.

The corruptions of Gg can be in large part eliminated by comparison with H₅; and the reconstituted GgH₅ original is a very important witness to a, particularly in Book III, where the only other authority is H₂Ph.

Harleian 2280 (H₁).

British Museum, MS. Harleian 2280. A vellum MS., 9½ x 6¾ in., of 98 + 1 leaves, which contains only Troilus. It is written in one hand of the middle of the fifteenth century, which has supplied glosses, usually in Latin, and has made a number of corrections.

Omissions, etc.
1. 890–896, stanza 128, omitted, no gap.
2. 1324–1337, stanzas 190, 191, in aγ position.
3. 39, 40 in γ order.
4. 708–714, stanza 102, omitted, no gap.
5. 750–756, stanza 108, in βγ position.
6. 60, 61 in γ order.
7. 1345–1428, 12 stanzas, missing through loss of a leaf.
H1 is consistently a γ MS. In its readings it is closest to CpS2Dig. Dialectally and orthographically it varies very little from Cp, save that it often writes sch for sh and occasionally uses the character þ, chiefly, however, in pronouns and pronominal adverbs. Comparatively free from corruptions of its own, it is an authority of the first importance for a reconstitution of the γ original.

Harleian 3943 (H2).

British Museum, MS. Harleian 3943. A vellum MS., 10 1/4 x 5 5/8 in., of 116 leaves, which contains only Troilus. It is written in four hands, all of the fifteenth century, of which the first and second seem distinctly earlier than the other two. Hand 1 has written 1. 71–497, 1. 568–3. 1078, 3. 1639–4. 196. Hand 2 has written 3. 1079–1638, from which, however, 1289–1428 are lost. Hand 3 has written 1. 1–70, 1. 498–567, 4. 197–406, and has supplied missing lines in the parts written by hands 1 and 2. Hand 4 has written from 4. 407 to the end of the poem. It would seem that the scribe of hand 3 found an unfinished and defective MS., the work of hands 1 and 2, which he restored and corrected, subsequently turning over the task of completing the work to the scribe of hand 4.

Omissions, etc.

1. 1–70 by H2 on new leaf.
1. 148 erased to leave space between stanzas.
1. 484–490, stanza 70, omitted, no gap.
1. 498–567 by H2 on new leaf.
2. 26 by H2 in space left blank.
2. 29–42, two stanzas, after 49.
2. 250 by H2 in space left blank.
2. 509 omitted, line left blank.
2. 1083, all but first word, by H2 in space left blank.
3. 116, 117 transposed.
3. 1079–1638 by H2.
3. 1251 by H2 in space left blank.
3. 1265 by H2 at end of stanza, proper place indicated.
3. 1289–1428, twenty stanzas, missing, two leaves lost.
3. 1546, end, and 1547 by H2 in space left blank.
3. 1596 corrupt: þat he of his modir borne wesse.
3. 1597 after 1603.
3. 1744–1771, Troilus's hymn to love, omitted, no gap.
4. 197–406 by H₂³. From 407 to end by H₂⁴.
5. 940 and 942 exchanged.
5. 1498–1499. An additional line, Feruidus ypomedon timidique in gurgite mersus, found in no other MS., appended to the Latin argument of Statius.
5. 1807–1827, Teseide passage, omitted, no gap.

The composite nature of H₂ is clearly reflected in the character of its text. The portions written by hands 1 and 2 are consistently an a MS., very closely related to Ph. The portions written by hands 3 and 4 are from a MS. closely related to H₄, which presents α readings in Book I and β readings in the rest of the poem.

Throughout, the text of H₂ shows many corruptions and metrical perversions. Dialectal and orthographical characteristics vary with the several hands. The scribe of hand 1, who is also the scribe of Ph, exhibits the same habits of spelling that are seen in Ph. Hand 2 writes sch for sh, uses z or gh for the guttural continuant, and regularly writes ij for long i (e.g. lijf, 3. 1476; sijke, 3. 1170, 1172). The weak vowel of inflectional syllables alternates between e and i. A Southern form, we heep, is found in 3. 1095. Hand 3 regularly uses the Northern pronominal forms, their, them. In 4. 216 it writes shulde for sholde to detriment of the rime. Short accented e tends to become i (wirke, 4. 237; silf, 1. 537, 4. 245), and the weak inflectional vowel is usually i. It is very uncertain in its treatment of final e, regularly writing (as does also hand 4) arte for art and frome for from. Hand 4 is marked by confusion as to the value of the guttural continuant which it writes either gh or z. Instances of this confusion are doughtles for douteles, 4. 430; trought for trouthe, 4. 445; nouth for nought, 4. 498; Route for Roughte, 4. 431. The weak vowel is regularly e, but occasionally i.

H₂ is an important witness to a in the first three books, and after 4. 196 to β.

Harleian 1239 (H₉).

British Museum, MS. Harleian 1239. A vellum MS., 15½ x 5¾ in., of 107 leaves, which contains, besides Troilus, selections
from the *Canterbury Tales*. The text of *Troilus* is written by three hands. Hand 1 has written from the beginning of the poem through 2. 1033; hand 2 has written 2. 1034–3. 1603, 3. 1758–end; hand 3 has written 3. 1604–1759. Lines 1758, 1759 of Book III are thus written by both hand 2 and hand 3. The selections from the *Canterbury Tales* are by a fourth hand.

**Omissions, etc.**

1. 379–630 missing, two leaves lost.
2. 890–896, stanza 128, omitted, no gap.
3. 904–973, ten stanzas, omitted, no gap.
4. 1663, 1664 transposed.
5. 266 omitted, space left blank.
6. 276 omitted, no gap.
7. 738 omitted, no gap.
8. 767, 768 transposed.
10. 1294, second half, and 1295, first half, omitted, no gap.
11. 1324–1337, stanzas 190, 191, in β position.
12. 1371, 1372 transposed.
13. 1387–1393 omitted, no gap.
14. 1542 omitted. In its place 1544, which is found again in its proper place.
15. 1664 omitted, no gap.
16. 1750 omitted, no gap.
17. 1758, 1759 repeated on next leaf, where new hand begins.
18. 82 omitted, no gap.
19. 179, 180 transposed.
20. 267–273, stanza 39, after 280. After 267, a spurious line, *As thou wyl woste from Ioye thus me depyue*, made up out of 268 and 269.
21. 359 omitted, no gap.
22. 383 omitted. In its place a corrupt repetition of 378.
23. 410, 411 in a order.
24. 563 omitted, no gap.
25. 621 written twice.
27. 953–1085, free-choice soliloquy, omitted, no gap.
28. 1147–1153 omitted, no gap.
29. 1204 omitted, no gap.
5. 225–231 omitted, no gap.
5. 382 after 379.
5. 556, 557 transposed.
5. 655, 656 omitted. In their place 662, 663, which are written again regularly.
5. 1071 omitted, no gap.
5. 1642 omitted, no gap.

The text presented by H₃ is both composite and "mixed." From the beginning of the poem through 2. 1033, the portion written by hand 1, H₃ is a β MS. of a type closely similar to Cx. H₃Cx agree with γS₁ against JRH₄ in the series of striking variants beginning at 2. 701; H₃Cx also share many minor variations. In this portion of H₃, more particularly in Book II, there are, however, occasional indications of contamination with a γ MS. of the same type as A. From 2. 1034 to 3. 1095, H₃ is fundamentally a γ MS. of the same type as A; but in Book III it not infrequently deserts the γ reading, and shows occasional contamination with β. From 3. 1096 to 4. 299 it is again a β MS., with only slight traces of γ contamination. With line 300 of Book IV, H₃ becomes an α MS. and so continues to the end of the poem, though a β reading appears in 4. 322, and in the latter part of Book V there are again indications of contamination with γ. In its α portion, H₃ presents a text at a stage of revision not far removed from that found in Ph. H₃Ph omit the free-choice soliloquy entire. Between lines 1301 and 1442 of Book IV, H₃ has a series of unique readings which seem to represent a stage more primitive even than that of Ph. At the end of Book V, however, it contains regularly the Teseide stanzas, derived apparently from its γ constituent.

Throughout, the text of H₃ is exceedingly corrupt, the commonest type of error being omission of short words. No one of the three scribes has any understanding of Chaucer's metre. Dialectal and orthographic characteristics vary with the several hands. Hand 1 usually ends the third indicative singular in es, and occasionally has u for long close o. In spite of these Northern traits, he is now and then doubtful about the guttural continuant, writing ough for how and pow for pogh. The definite article is usually written tho instead of the. The character ʒ is used for initial ʃ; ʒ is used only rarely. Sch is written for sh. The
second hand is characterized by a very erratic treatment of the letter h; we find such spellings as wyche, whas, where, whoo for we, was, were, woo, and on the contrary were for where. Is is written for his, and hooke for ooke. Wyche or wych is regularly written for which, though occasionally we find qwynch. There is a tendency to substitute i for short e, e.g. frynde for frende, shitte for shette. These characteristics appear throughout the work of hand 2, but are commoner in the first half of the poem. The characters ʒ and Ƿ are not used. Sch is occasionally written for sh. The third hand, which writes only 155 lines, is much more careless than are the other two, and is very eccentric in spelling. Characteristic spellings are stabull, discordubull, litull, anodur. Sch is written for sh. ʒ and Ƿ are not used.

The chief value of H₃ lies in its testimony to an early stage of a in the fourth book. Its readings are also important in lines 701–1033 of Book II, where with Cx it supports γS₁ as against JRH₄.

**Harleian 2392 (H₄).**

British Museum, MS. Harleian 2392. A paper and vellum MS., 8½ x 5¾ in., of 145 + 2 leaves, which contains only Troilus. It is written in one hand of the middle of the fifteenth century, which has also supplied a large number of marginal notes in Latin.

_Omissions, etc._

1. 222 corrupt: and bridie & labour from even til morn.
1. 643, 644 transposed. 644 corrupt: the colours & knoulech who so riht demyth.
2. 953–980, four stanzas, after 1008.
2. 1692 repeated after 1699 and deleted.
3. 1324–1337, stanzas 190, 191, in ay position and again in β position.
3. 1770, 1771 transposed, proper order indicated.
4. 953–1085, free-choice soliloquy, omitted, no gap.
5. 1498–1499, Latin argument of Statius, omitted, no gap.
5. 1807–1827, Teseide passage, omitted, no gap.

H₄ presents a composite text, the genesis of which cannot with certainty be determined. In Book I it is very definitely a. It
contains stanza 128 omitted by all other MSS. save H₂Ph, and shares with H₂Ph in a very large number of α readings. In trivial variations, however, it shows relationships, possibly accidental, with β, particularly with R. In Book II it is a mixture of α and β, with the α element decreasing in importance as the book proceeds. Between 701 and 1113 it shares with JR in a number of striking variants, the character of which is discussed on pp. 126–128. In Book III it becomes distinctively a β MS. and so continues to the end, sharing in virtually all the β readings of Book III and consistently avoiding the many α readings of Book IV. Its “mixed” character, however, does not end with Book II. H₄ contains stanzas 190, 191 of Book III twice over, once in the α position with α readings, and again in the β position with β readings. It contains Troilus’s hymn to love, 3. 1744–1771, which is omitted by H₂Ph. It omits the free-choice soliloquy in Book IV, an α characteristic not shared by the closely related H₂⁴. With H₂ it omits the Teseide passage in Book V; and with R omits the Latin argument of Statius. For discussion of these peculiarities see pp. 157, 219–221, 244, 247, below.

Throughout, H₄ is closely related to the portions of H₂ written by hands 3 and 4; and the common parent, H₂H₄, stands somewhat nearer to R than to the remaining β MSS. There are a considerable number of agreements in trivial variations, possibly due to accident, with Cx and with the β element of H₃.

The text has no marked dialectal peculiarities. The weak vowel of inflectional syllables appears interchangeably as e, i, or y. The guttural continuant is regularly written ū, rarely gh. Long close e is occasionally written ie.

Though marred by many corruptions in phrase and in metre, H₄ is purer than H₂ or R. It is of the utmost importance as a witness to α in Book I; and, after J ceases to be a β MS. in Book IV, H₄ becomes our best witness to β.

Harleian 4912 (H₄).

British Museum, MS. Harleian 4912. A vellum MS., 11½ × 7½ in., of 76 + 1 leaves, which contains only an incomplete copy of Troilus ending with 4. 686. It is written in one hand of the fifteenth century, with many corrections by the same or by a contemporary hand.
The Authorities.

Omissions, etc.

1. 890–896, stanza 128, omitted, no gap.
2. 953–1029, eleven stanzas, omitted, no gap.
3. 743–749 omitted, no gap.
3. 620 omitted. After 618 a spurious line: And ledyn vs alle bothe low and hye is written in its place, and the order then indicated as 618, 619, spurious line, 621. Lines 617, 618 read:

But a fortune thorow gret goddis
O influence of thin heuenys onlye

3. 663, 664 transposed, correct order indicated in margin.
3. 1054 after 1056, order corrected in margin.
3. 1324–1337, stanzas 190, 191, in ay position.
3. 1338–1344, stanza 192, omitted, no gap.
3. 1525 over erasure.
4. 39, 40 in γ order.
4. 314, 315 after 308.
4. 410, 411 in a order.
4. 441 omitted. In its place 448 written and deleted. Line 448 again in proper place.
4. 687—end of poem missing; but part of 687 is written as a catchword at the foot of page.

H₅ is throughout closely related to Gg, and its type of text is that already described in the account of Gg. It shares many of the corruptions of Gg and has also many others of its own—transposition of words and phrases, omission of unimportant words, etc.

Like Gg, H₅ does not understand the value of the guttural continuant, which it writes gh. We find such spellings as spirityh, despitgh, whigth for white; thowe for though, owght for ought, row for rough. Ho is frequently written for who. The vowel of inflectional syllables is i or y. The character ʒ is not used; and þ is used only in pronominal and adverbial forms. A Northern form beris is found in 1. 946.

H₅ is of use chiefly for supplying deficiencies and checking errors in Gg.

St. John's College, Cambridge, L. 1 (J).

St. John's College, Cambridge, MS. L. 1. A vellum MS, 10 × 6\(\frac{3}{4}\) in. of 121 leaves (+ 8 leaves added later at end), which
contains *Troilus*, and in a sixteenth-century hand at the end of the volume Henryson’s *Testament of Criseide*. *Troilus* is written in one hand of the fifteenth century, which has also supplied a few marginal notes in Latin. Throughout the volume a seventeenth-century hand has written in corrections, taken apparently from Speght’s edition of 1602.

Omissions, etc.

1. 890–896, stanza 128, omitted, no gap.
2. 536, 1307, 1308 by scribe over erasure.
3. 53, 54 transposed.
4. 1324–1337, stanzas 190, 191, in β position.
5. 750–756, stanza 108, in α position.

Though written in a single hand, and homogeneous throughout in orthography, the text of J falls into two sharply defined parts. From the beginning of the poem through line 430 of Book IV, J is consistently a β MS. Between 430 and 438 it becomes an α MS. and so continues to the end. In its β portion, the text of J shows certain affinities with R. Between lines 701 and 1113 of Book II, JRH₄ present a series of striking variants which are discussed below, pp. 126–128. A connection also exists between J and the β constituent in the “mixed” text of GgH₅, which is most clearly marked after line 1210 of Book II.

In its α portion J presents the text in the same state of revision as Gg (here consistently an α MS.). This is most strikingly shown in its treatment of the free-choice soliloquy (see pp. 216–221). J and Gg, however, are independently derived from the α original.

In both portions, the text of J is remarkably free from gross blunders. It has no marked dialectal peculiarities, and in orthography is strikingly similar to Cp. The weak vowel of inflectional syllables is normally e, but i is occasionally found. The character ʒ is used only very rarely, and then for initial y; þ is used in the abbreviation of *pat* and very rarely in writing the definite article. The first person pronoun is regularly *ich* before a vowel, and the adverbial suffix -ly becomes -lich before a vowel.

Because of its freedom from corruptions, its consistent orthography, and its fair approximation to Chaucer’s metre, J is an authority of very great importance—as a witness to β in Books I–III, and to α in the last two books.
The Authorities.

Phillipps 8250 (Ph).

MS. Phillipps 8250, the property of T. Fitzroy Fenwick, Esq., Cheltenham. A paper and vellum MS., 8\(\frac{3}{4}\) × 5\(\frac{1}{4}\) in., of 325 leaves, which contains besides Troilus a miscellaneous collection of pieces in prose and verse. It is written throughout in one hand of the early fifteenth century.

Omissions, etc.

1. 820–822 omitted, 813–815 repeated in place of them.
2. 26 by scribe in margin.
2. 29–42, two stanzas, after 49.
2. 250, 509, 537 by scribe in margin.
2. 1083 by scribe in space left blank.
3. 116, 117 transposed.
3. 292 by scribe in space left blank.
3. 1251 omitted.
3. 1324–1337, stanzas 190, 191, in αγ position.
3. 1375 by scribe in space left blank.
3. 1744–1771, Troilus's hymn to love, by scribe on inset leaf.
4. 410, 411 in α order.
4. 790 by scribe in space left blank.
4. 953–1085, soliloquy on free choice, by scribe on inset leaves.
5. 1070, 1071 read:

\[\text{And pat to late is me now to repente}\]
\[\text{To this y wil be trewe in myn entente}\]

5. 1377 by scribe in space left blank.
5. 1807–1827, Teseide passage, by scribe on inset leaf.

Ph is throughout an α MS. except for the passages added later, on inset leaves, in the margin, etc., which are from a γ MS., akin to H₁. The scribe copied an α MS. and then, after his copy was completed, supplied its deficiencies from a γ MS. Though he repaired the omissions of his original, he did not correct its many scribal blunders. The text of Ph is corrupt in its readings and sadly "mis-metred" by an almost complete ignorance of the syllabic value of final e, and by many transpositions of words and phrases.

The hand which has written Ph is identical with the first hand of H₂. The text of Ph is very closely related to the portions of H₂ written by hand 1 and hand 2, with which it shares a great
number of corrupt readings. Despite these corruptions, the testimony of $H_2$Ph is of very high value in determining the text of $a$, particularly in the first three books.

Ph has no marked dialectal traits. In orthography it is virtually identical with the first hand of $H_1$. The weak vowel of inflectional syllables is nearly always $i$ or $y$. The guttural continuant is written $gh$. The character $z$ is used for initial $y$, and $p$ is used interchangeably with $th$.

**Phillipps and Rawlinson.**

**Rawlinson Poet. 163 (R).**

Bodleian, MS. Rawlinson Poet. 163. A paper MS., $11\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{4}$ in., of 115 leaves, which contains, besides *Troilus*, the unique copy of Chaucer's *Rosamund*. It is written in four hands, all of the fifteenth century. Hand 1 writes 1. 1-700; 2. 118-433, 1044-1113; 3. 1373-end of poem. Hand 2 writes 1. 701-2. 117; 3. 306-912. Hand 3 writes 2. 434-1043; 2. 1114-3. 305. Hand 4 writes 3. 913-1372. Each scribe has written marginal notes in English and in Latin. The volume seems to be the work of a group of associated copyists.

**Omissions, etc.**

1. 281-350 missing, leaf torn out.
2. 890-896, stanza 128, omitted, no gap.
3. 1-49, proem, omitted, no gap.
5. 1069 omitted, no gap.
6. 1446 by scribe in margin.
7. 1750-1751. Between 1750 and 1751 we read:

\[\text{Compleined ek heleyne of his siknes} \quad \text{Vacat}\]
\[\text{And faithfully / that pitee was to heere} \quad \text{\textit{For ye must outher / chaungen your face}}\]
\[\text{That is so ful of mercy and bountee} \quad \text{\textit{That is so ful of mercy and bountee}}\]
\[\text{Or elles must ye do this man sum grace} \quad \text{\textit{Or elles must ye do this man sum grace}}\]
\[\text{For this thyng folweth of necesytee} \quad \text{\textit{For this thyng folweth of necesytee}}\]
\[\text{As sothe as god ys in his magestee} \quad \text{\textit{As sothe as god ys in his magestee}}\]
\[\text{That crueltee / with so benigne a chier} \quad \text{\textit{That crueltee / with so benigne a chier}}\]
\[\text{Ne may not last / in o persone yfere} \quad \text{\textit{Ne may not last / in o persone yfere}}\]
The Authorities.

The first two lines are 1576, 1577 repeated. The word *vacat* is in a contemporary hand, possibly that of the scribe. The complete stanza is found in no other known MS. of *Troilus*.

3. 1-49, proem, omitted, no gap.
3. 1212-1246, five stanzas, after 1099 and again in proper place with somewhat different readings.
3. 1324-1337, stanzas 190, 191, in β position.
3. 1406 omitted, no gap.
4. 1-28, proem, omitted, no gap.
4. 52, 53 transposed, correct order indicated.
5. 402, 403 after 394, but deleted and repeated in proper place.
5. 419 omitted, no gap.
5. 421-560, twenty stanzas, missing, two leaves lost.
5. 656 by scribe in margin.
5. 843-910, missing, leaf torn out.
5. 1498-1499, Latin argument of Statius, omitted, no gap.

R is throughout the poem consistently a β MS. of the same type as the β portions of J and H, with which it shares a series of distinctive readings between lines 701 and 1113 of Book II. In minor variations it shows agreements now with this MS., now with that, particularly with J, with H, and with Cx. In no case, however, is the evidence strong enough to justify the hypothesis of close relationship, especially in view of R's unique characteristics—the omission of proems and the presence of the additional stanza—which point to an independent line of descent. These peculiarities of R must be considered in detail.

For the omission of the proems to Books II, III, and IV no certain explanation can be given. At first glance one might suggest that R was derived from Chaucer's original at a time when these proems were not yet written; but such a supposition flies in the face of all the evidence. R is consistently a β MS., and as such must derive from the original in its latest, fully revised stage. It contains the free-choice soliloquy, the *Teseide* passage, and the Boethian hymn to love, the first two of which, and probably the third also, were not present in Chaucer's earliest draft. On the other hand, the proems are regularly found in all the α MSS. Nor can one see any reason for believing that the omission of the proems was due to the deliberate choice of the
scribe in order to avoid interruption of the story. Only in the
case of Proem III can the interruption be regarded as in any way
inartistic. A possible explanation might be that in the common
original of all the MSS. these proems were written on inserted
loose leaves, and that these leaves were lost before the time when
R was derived.

No less interesting is the problem offered by the unique stanza
found between lines 1750 and 1751 of Book II, printed in the
list of omissions, etc., above. There is no reason to doubt the
genuineness of this stanza. In grammar and in rime it accords
with Chaucer's known usage. The first line, indeed, is metrically
deficient in the fourth foot; but this may easily be due to scribal
omission of a monosyllable, perhaps now, after chaungen. The
manner of the lines is distinctly Chaucerian; and their substance
is entirely appropriate, as spoken by Pandarus to Criseyde.

The proper place for the stanza is not at all easy to determine.
As it stands in the MS., it concludes a speech of Pandarus to
Criseyde spoken as he is leading her to the side of Troilus's sick-
bed in the house of Deiphebus. The three stanzas which constitute
this speech, apart from the added stanza, begin with an appeal
to Criseyde to remember in what exalted company she is, and how
sad is the plight of Troilus. She is solemnly conjured not to slay
him (stanza 248). She must not waste time, and particularly such
a favourable opportunity, "while folk is blent" (stanza 249). If
a lady is too coy, she will attract attention, and the gossip thus
aroused will spoil all. Therefore come along and bring him to
health (stanza 250). Then follows in R the unique stanza, which
insists on the incompatibility of cruelty with the kindliness of
Criseyde's face. In stanza 251 Chaucer addresses "loueres that
ben here." It is plainly out of keeping where it stands. It could,
however, with some appropriateness come between stanzas 248 and
249. Its thought resembles a good deal that of three stanzas
(lines 330-350) near the beginning of Book II; and the stanza
could suitably enough come after stanza 49 (line 343).

But what of the two lines, Compleined ek heleyne, etc., which in
R precede the unique stanza? They are lines 1576, 1577, the
first two lines of stanza 226, and have no conceivable connection
with their new context; nor could the unique stanza possibly
belong in the immediate neighbourhood of stanza 226. The word
vacat written opposite these lines in the margin (whether by the
scribe or by some one else I cannot with certainty decide) is not intended, I think, to cancel the lines, but rather to call attention to the fact that the remaining lines of the stanza are missing. *Vacat* is apparently equivalent to *caret*.

The most plausible explanation I can suggest to fit all the circumstances is this: Chaucer wrote the stanza with the intention of inserting it at some place in Book II, perhaps after stanza 248. He used a discarded piece of paper or parchment, at the top of which had already been written the first two lines of stanza 226. These lines he did not take the trouble to erase, nor did he indicate clearly the precise position of the new stanza. The copyist found this added slip between the leaves of his exemplar, and incorporated it bodily at the place where it appears in R. Some one, troubled by the two floating lines, wrote *vacat* opposite them. That the stanza was an afterthought gains some slight corroboration from the fact that it corresponds to nothing in Boccaccio.

These striking peculiarities of R, the omission of the proems and the added stanza, indicate very clearly that R has descended from the common original along an independent line of descent, and that the readings which it shares with other MSS., notably J, H, and Cx, were already present in the common original. Had there been anything like consistent editing or contamination, R would certainly have added the missing proems. If the suggestions I have offered towards an explanation of the peculiarities be given any weight, they would indicate that R was derived latest of all surviving MSS.

That R stands at the end of a somewhat long line of descent is suggested by its many corrupt readings. The commonest form of corruption is the omission or insertion of a small word to the utter confusion of metre. The corruptions are present about equally in the work of each of the four scribes. None of the scribes shows any marked dialectal peculiarities beyond a tendency shared by them all to write *ough* and *naght* for *ogh* and *noght*. Nor does the orthography vary significantly. The characters p and j are not used. The second and third hands occasionally write *sch* for *sh*. The weak vowel in inflectional syllables is either e or y (i).

It is most unfortunate that the text of R is so full of minor corruptions, since it is the only MS. which presents a *ß* text from

---

1 It was so interpreted by Professor McCormick, who first discovered the unique stanza: *Furnivall Miscellany*, p. 297.
beginning to end. It is in any event an important witness to the text of β.

Selden B 24 (S₁).

Bodleian, MS. Selden B 24. A paper MS., $10\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{5}{8}$ in., of 231 leaves, containing, besides Troilus, a miscellaneous collection of English and Scottish verse of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Among the twenty-one pieces which make up its contents is the unique copy of the Kingis Quair. The first 209 leaves, including the whole of Troilus, are by one scribe, probably a Scotchman named James Graye. The MS. was executed not earlier than 1489.

Omissions, etc.

1. 890–896, stanza 128, omitted, no gap.
2. 1175, 1176 transposed, correct order indicated in margin.
3. 1324–1337, stanzas 190, 191, in β position.
4. 39, 40 in γ order.
5. 1857–1862 partly lost by tear at bottom of fol. 118.

$S_1$ presents a mixed or collated text, based on a γ MS. akin to AD and a β MS, which is of the same general type as Cx and the β portions of H₃. In Book I and up to line 617 of Book II it shares virtually all the γ readings, and shows only slight traces of β influence. In the remainder of Book II it shares only occasionally in distinctive γ readings; but between 701 and 1113, where JRH₄ separate from the other β MSS., $S_1$ agrees with γH₃Cx. In Book III it shares in some fifteen γ readings and in over sixty β readings, with stanzas 190, 191 in the β position. In Book IV it shares in twenty-four γ readings, but has stanza 106, which γ omits. In Book V it shares in twenty-four out of thirty-five γ readings, but has lines 60, 61 in the aβ order. It would seem that the method of its scribe-editor was to take a β MS. and “correct” it to γ readings, thoroughly at the beginning, and thereafter only spasmodically.

Though the text of $S_1$ has superficially a Scottish cast from the consistent writing of quh- for wh-, and su- for sw-, its only other Northern traits are the use of thair and thame in the plural third person pronoun and the spelling maid for made. It uses the character ʒ only as initial y, and ʒ only in the abbreviation of pat.
The text is remarkably free from gross blunders; and the scribe evidently had a fairly good ear for Chaucer's metre. Despite its very considerable virtues, its "mixed" and "edited" character greatly diminishes the value of its testimony. Its witness to γ is usually superfluous. As an authority for β, it can be used only with great caution.

Selden, Supra 56 (S₂).

Bodleian, MS. Selden, Supra 56: A paper MS., $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{8}$ in., of 106 + 1 leaves, which contains only Troilus. It is neatly written in one hand. The colophon gives the date of its transcription as 1441.

Omissions, etc.

1. 890–896, stanza 128, omitted, no gap.
2. 955, 956 omitted, no gap.
3. 1324–1337, stanzas 190, 191, in αγ position.
4. 39, 40 in γ order.
5. 46 after 43 and again in proper place.
6. 708–714, stanza 102, omitted, no gap.
8. 60, 61 in γ order.
9. 694, second half, and 695, first half, omitted by telescoping.

S₂ is throughout a γ MS., closely related to the fragmentary Dig. Though singularly free from omissions and transpositions except those characteristic of the γ group, S₂ is in its readings very corrupt. A large part of these corruptions, since shared by Dig, are due to the S₂ Dig parent. Dialectally S₂ is strongly marked by Northern forms. The third sing. pres. indic. regularly ends in -es or -is, long close o is usually represented by u, and pame regularly takes the place of hem. Haffe or hafe is regularly written for haue. In 3. 282 we find beseke for besche. Long open o, however, is written o. The character ʒ is used for initial y, and interchangeably with gh for the guttural continuant. The character p is used in pronominal forms. The MS. has a sadly "mismetred" text.

S₃, or S₂ Dig, is occasionally of use in determining a γ reading where the remaining evidence is confused. But with the generous attestation of γ, the evidence of S₂ is seldom necessary.
Thynne's Edition of 1532 (Th).

In Thynne's folio of 1532, the first collected edition of Chaucer's works, Troilus fills fols. 170–218, and part of fol. 219a. Judged by sixteenth-century standards, and even by those of a later date, Thynne's text of the poem merits high praise. It is very free from careless blunders; and in a great majority of the lines Chaucer's metre is perfectly preserved. It marks a great advance over the text of Caxton and the reprints by Wynkyn de Worde and Pynson. The modern critic, however, can use Thynne's text only with great caution. It is a "mixed" or "contaminated" text, based on a collation of several authorities, and incorporates not infrequently readings which seem to be editorial emendations.

Thynne's authorities were at least three: (1) Caxton's edition; (2) a γ MS. closely akin to CpH₁S₂; (3) a MS. which was of the α type at least in Books I and II.

His use of these authorities is not the same throughout the poem. In Book I, where the main line of cleavage is between α on the one hand and βγ on the other, he found Cx and his γ MS. in virtual agreement. He gave, particularly in the early part of the book, precedence to Cx. In the first 202 lines my collations show 24 instances in which Th has a reading otherwise peculiar to Cx. Of these instances the most striking is the transposition of lines 111 and 112. In 47 ThCx read selfe for soule; in 86 openly for generally with H₃R; in 95 And for For; in 96 And wyst neuer for As she pat nyst; in 101 Most fayrest lady where α reads So fair was none, and βγ Nas noon so faire; in 104,5, And therwith was she so parfyte a creature As she had be made in scornyng of nature. Other cases of agreement are found in 56, 76, 86, 88, 91, 98, 106, 108, 110, 162, 163, 165–168, 198, 202, 238, 324, 563, 634, 648, 747, 764. In Book I, Th shares very few of the distinctive γ readings. The only instances are 143, 539, 720, 880, 960. It contains, however, a considerable number of α readings. Most important is the fact that Th contains the genuine, though perhaps cancelled, stanza 128 otherwise found only in H₂PhH₄. Other α readings are found in lines 78, 82, 85, 176 (a conflation of α and β), 195, 259, 274, 276, 393, 540, 640, 755 (conflation), 773, 796, 1029. These readings are recorded in the list of α readings in Book I, pp. 35–53. They are derived neither from H₂Ph nor H₄, but from a lost MS. of the same type.
In Book II the proportion of distinctive \( \gamma \) readings is much greater. Such readings are found in lines 87, 110(+ \( a \)), 176, 221, 283, 403(+ \( JR \)), 406, 745, 768( + JGgH\( _5 \)), 937, 950, 956, 960, 1093, 1113, 1143, 1152( + J), 1156, 1202, 1291, 1316, 1439, 1585(+ \( H_4 \)), 1590, 1602, 1746, that is to say in about half of the instances. Th has readings characteristic of \( \gamma H_3 Cx \) in 703, 825, 897, 908, 923, 1018, 1083–1085, 1095–1097. Characteristic Cx readings are much less frequent than in Book I. Instances, none of them very striking, are found in lines 2(+ \( H_4 \)), 41, 86, 97, 130(+ \( H_3 A \)), 512, 1118, 1164(+ \( A \)). In the first eight hundred lines are found a few \( a \) readings: lines 46, 603, 646, 675, 679, 734–735, 738, and with \( aJRH_4 \) against \( \gamma H_3 Cx \) in 701 and 792. In 736 Th reads: I thyynke eke howe he worthy is to haue, a conflation of \( a\gamma H_3 Cx \) and \( JRH_4 \). In 1426 Th reads No more of this to speke, an hypermetrical conflation of the \( \gamma \) reading, No more to speke, and that of the remaining MSS., No moore of this.

In Books III–V the text of Th is to all intents and purposes consistently of the \( \gamma \) type. It contains all the distinctive \( \gamma \) readings save in a half-dozen cases, all in Book III, where a simple error is corrected. Th avoids, however, the confusion of \( \gamma \) as to the point where Book IV begins (see pp. 182, 183), and contains stanza 102 of Book IV omitted by \( \gamma \). This stanza has apparently been derived from a source akin to \( H_2 H_4 \). The \( \gamma \) MS. used by Thynne is of the type represented by \( CpH_1 S_2 \), nearest perhaps to \( S_2 \), with which it shares distinctive readings in a number of lines, e.g. 4.128, 4.362, 4.474. Throughout these three books continue occasional instances of agreement with Cx, always in trivial variations. Th consistently avoids the distinctive \( \beta \) readings, regularly given by Cx, which are so numerous in Book III. The only exception, probably accidental, is in 3. 1466, where the variation is a simple transposition in order. In 4. 156 Th reads Abode what other lorde
wolde to it sey, an hypermetrical conflation of \( \beta \) and \( a\gamma \). There are no instances in the last three books where Th has adopted an \( a \) reading.

That Th is an edited text the evidence, as summarized above, makes abundantly clear; though, as he progressed through the poem, the editor has more and more accepted the authority of his \( \gamma \) MS. Since we possess such generous MS attestation for the readings of \( \gamma \), the modern critic will have little occasion to consult Th save for its \( a \) readings in Books I and II, and then only when
Fragments.

the α MSS. are at variance. Even in these cases Th must be used cautiously. Though its α readings seem to be of independent derivation, there is always the suspicion that what we read may be due to editorial emendation.

In the following chapters I have adduced the Th reading only now and then, when it seems to have peculiar significance.

Fragments.

Three brief fragments of Troilus must be mentioned. Three stanzas, 3. 302–322, incorporated into a short poem in the rime royal, of which they constitute stanzas 4–6, are found in Cambridge University Library, MS. Ff. 1. 6, fols. 150b, 151a. One stanza, 1. 631–637, with the title “Pandare to Troylus,” is found in Trinity College Cambridge, MS. R. 3. 20, fol. 361a. The MS. is written by Shirley. Two strips of vellum, found in a book-binding, which contain longitudinal sections from 5. 1443–1498, are described in the Appendix to the Report of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society, Vol. VI (1887), pp. 331–335. There are no variant readings in these passages which enable one to determine the genealogical affiliations of these fragments; but the last does not share a γ reading in 5. 1449. None of these fragments is of any value to the textual critic.

By way of making clearer certain matters already stated in this introductory chapter, I shall conclude by giving two tables, of which the first presents the varying complexion of the MSS. of “composite” character, and the second the changes of handwriting which occur in certain MSS.
## MSS. of Composite Character

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$H_2$</th>
<th>$H_4$</th>
<th>$G_2$</th>
<th>$J$</th>
<th>$H_3$</th>
<th>$S_1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>$a(\beta)$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\gamma(\beta)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>$\beta(a)$</td>
<td>$a(\beta)$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$1033$</td>
<td>$\gamma(\beta)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$398$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\gamma(\beta)$</td>
<td>$\beta(\gamma)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$a$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta(\gamma)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$196$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$299$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>$a(\gamma)$</td>
<td>$\beta(\gamma)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# MSS. IN MORE THAN ONE HAND.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$H_2$</th>
<th>$A$</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$H_3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>$H_2^3$ 1-70</td>
<td>$A^1$</td>
<td>$R^1$ 1-700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H_2^1$ 71-497</td>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2$ 701-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H_2^3$ 498-567</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$H_3^1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H_2^1$ 568-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>$H_2^1$</td>
<td>$A^1$</td>
<td>$R^2$ 1-117</td>
<td>$H_3^1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$R^1$ 118-483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$R^3$ 474-1043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$K^1$ 1044-1113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$K^3$ 1114-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$H_3^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>$H_3^1$ 1-1078</td>
<td>$A^2$</td>
<td>$R^3$ 1-305</td>
<td>$H_3^2$ 1-1603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H_2^2$ 1679-1638</td>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2$ 306-912</td>
<td>$H_3^3$ 1604-1759(sic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H_2^1$ 1639-</td>
<td></td>
<td>$R^4$ 913-1372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$R^1$ 1373-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>$H_2^1$ 1-196</td>
<td>$A^3$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$H_3^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H_2^3$ 197-406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H_2^4$ 407-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>$H_2^4$</td>
<td>$A^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$I^1$</td>
<td>$H_3^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CHAPTER II.

**THE MANUSCRIPT RELATIONS IN BOOK I.**

By far the most striking series of variant readings in Book I is that in which $H_2$Ph$H_4$ agree as against the combined testimony of all the other MSS. The readings peculiar to this group are in several cases manifestly corrupt; but in a much larger number of cases they offer variants perfectly acceptable in themselves, and so divergent as to point unmistakably to an hypothesis of deliberate revision. Moreover, a comparison with Chaucer's Italian source, *Filostrato*, shows that the readings of $H_2$Ph$H_4$ are closer to the Italian, and hence presumably more original.

*Text. Trad.*
Most important is the fact that these three MSS. contain a stanza, number 128 in the modern editions (ll. 890–896), which is found in no other MS. It is included by Thynne, but omitted by Caxton. Pandarus has just learned that the lady for whose love Troilus is languishing is no other than his own niece Criseyde. He bids him be of good cheer, for his lady is both “gentle” and fair (stanza 126). She is bounteous of her estate and glad, friendly of speech, gracious in well doing, perfect in her savoir faire, and more than royal in the honour of her heart (stanza 127).

Then follows in $H_2\text{Ph}H_4$ the following stanza:

[128]

And for pi loke of good comfort pow be;  
For certeinly the firste poynt is this  
Of noble corage and wele ordeyne,  
A man to have pees wip hym self y wis;  
So oghtist thow for noght but good it is  
To love wele, and in a worthy place;  
The oght[e] not to clepe hit hap but grace.

Stanza 129 begins:

And also thenk, and ßerwip glade the,  
That seth pi lady vertuous is al,  
So folowith hit ßat ßer is some pite.

Troilus is therefore to guard her good name, and at the same time to hope for her favour.

There is nothing in grammar, metre, or style to cast the slightest doubt on the genuineness of stanza 128. It has the unmistakable ring of Chaucer’s manner. Moreover, the first words of stanza 129, “And also thenk, and ßerwip glade the,” though not inappropriate without 128, gain in effect from the balance furnished by the first line of 128. On the other hand, stanza 128 cannot altogether escape the charge of digression. Both before and after, Pandarus is speaking primarily of Criseyde, and is basing his hope for Troilus on the qualities of his niece’s character. Stanza 128 turns from Criseyde to moralize on the “first point” of a noble and well-ordered heart in the lover rather than in his mistress. If we cannot doubt the genuineness of the stanza, we equally cannot but recognize that its absence leaves no appreciable gap, but rather serves to unify the passage. It will be shown presently that there is good reason to believe that
H₂PhH₄ represent a first edition of the poem, and that the remaining MSS. give us the text in a revised form. If so, the excision of the stanza may be due to deliberate revision. This possibility is at least strong enough to make us cautious about arguing for a close relationship of the remaining MSS. on the basis of their omission of the stanza.

We must now consider in detail the long series of variant readings which mark the agreement of H₂PhH₄, and characterize in Book I the type of text to which has been given the designation a.

H₂PhH₄ (a).

2. That was kyng Pryamys sonne of Troye (+ H₅)
   Rest : That was pe kyng. . . .
   (Cx om. That was pe; Gg lacking)

A nine-syllable line.

*9. Thou cruel wighte that sorowist euer yn peye
   Rest : Thow cruel furie sorwyng euere yn peye
   (R om. euere)

_Furie_ is a more specific word, and prevents a repetition in line 13, where all MSS. read _wight._

*12, 13. For wel it sitt . . .

_Vnto a wofull wighte a drery fere
   (H₂₃ chere for fere)

_Rest : A woful wight to han a drery feere
   (A om. second a)_

The form of line 14, _And to a sorrowful tale a sory cheere,_ suggests that the a reading is more original.

17. Pray for spede though that I shulde sterve
   (H₂₃ om. that)
   _Rest : . . . al sholde I perfor sterue_

*19. But natheles myght I do yit gladnesse
   (H₄ yit myhte I do)
   _Rest : . . . if pis may don gladnesse_

*24–28. Remembre you for olde passid heuynesse
   For goddis love and on aduersitee
   That other suffren thynke how somtyme _pat ye_
   Fownde how love durst you displesse
   Or ellis ye wonne hym with to grete ease
The Manuscript Relations in Book I.

(24: Ph of for for; H₄ on old heuynesse; 25: H₄ in for on 26: H₄ om. pat; 27: Ph Foundyn; H₄ middle of line illegible; 28: H₂³ it for hym; om. to)

Rest:
Remembre yow on passed heuynesse
That ye han felt and on þe aduersite
Of other folk and þenketh how pat ye
Han felt þat loue dorst yow displesse
Or ye han wonne hym with to gret an ese

(24: H₅ of for on; Cx in for on; 25: H₃ of for on; Cx in for on; 26: Cl fok for folk; 27: R Han felt how þat loue; Cx how for þat; 28: H₅ Or ellis ye haue, an inserted above by later hand; RCx om. an; Gg lacking for entire passage)

Throughout this passage the variation between a and the remaining MSS. is so considerable as to point clearly towards conscious revision. We can, moreover, trace some of the steps of this revision. Line 24 in a is hypermetrical. In the original of a, olde had apparently been revised to read passid; but in H₂³ and Ph both adjectives are retained. The H₄ scribe has omitted passid. In line 26, also, H₄ has improved a hypermetrical line by omitting þat. R and Cx have retained the earlier how in line 27, and have omitted in 28 the added an. Still more striking is the conflate reading of H₅ in line 28. In the original of H₅ the line had been revised by deleting ellis and inserting haue; but H₅ fails to notice the deletion of ellis. Like R and Cx it fails to reproduce the inserted an.

*33. He yeve me myghte . . .
Rest: That I haue myght . . .

34. Some peyn or woo suche as his folke endure (H₂³ lovis for his; H₄ om. his; Ph & for or)
Rest: Swych peyne and wo as loues folk endure (Cx servantis for folk)

The reading of H₂³ seems to be a conflation; but the evidence is confused by the fact that H₄ omits his (or lovis). H₂³ forsakes the a reading entirely in lines 57, 58. The a reading, as found in Ph, is perfectly satisfactory; but the reading of the remaining MSS. is more definite and artistically preferable.
Readings of $H_2 Ph H_4$ (α).

*36. Praith for them that eke ben dispiered
(Ph eek that; Ph disespeyred)

Rest: And byddeth ek for hem pat ben despeyred
($H_3$ om. ek for; ClCpJ desespeyred)

The agreement of $H_2^3$ and Ph compels us to accept *that eke* as the reading of the α original, which $H_4$ has correctly emended. With the longer form *disespeyred* found in Ph, the α line is metrically satisfactory. Note that this longer form of the word is also found in ClCpJ to the detriment of the metre. Compare lines 29 and 43.

*43, 44. And biddith eke for them pat ben at ese
In love that god them graunte perseueraunce

Rest: That god hem graunte ay goode perseueraunce
($Cx$ graunt hem; A *om. ay*)

*45. And sende them myght their loves so to plese
(+ $ClH_1$ $ADS_1$) ($ClH_1S_1$ for to plese)

Rest: And sende hem myght hir ladys so to plese
($H_5(Gg)Cx$ for to please; R *om. so*)

The change from *loves* to *ladys* was apparently to avoid repetition with *loue*, the revised reading in 46. For a discussion of the γ reading in this line, see below, p. 69.

46. That it to hem be worshipp and plesaunce
($H_2^3H_4$ That it be to them)

Rest: That it to loue . . .
(D *om. it*; Cx *is for it*)

52. Now herkeneth ech with goode entencion
($H_2^3$ Nowlistenythe euery wight with; P everych *for ech*)

Rest: Now herkeneth with a goode entencioun
($Cx$ *om. a*)

The α reading seems to be corrupt. *Ech* or *everych* would demand the singular *herken*, but all the other imperatives in this passage are in the plural. *Herken ech* could easily give rise to *herkeneth*; or perhaps *ech* developed by dittography from the last syllable of *herkeneth*.

54. In whiche ye shall the double sorowe here (+ $Cx$)

Rest: . . . ye may . . .
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57, 58. \( \text{H}_4 \text{Ph} \) Knowe thyng is how that the grekes stronge
With armys in a thousand shippys went
(\text{Ph} \text{Knowyn})

Rest : Yt is wel wist . . .
In armes with . . .

\( \text{H}_2^3 \) abandons the a reading. The Italian \textit{Nell' armi forti}, \textit{Fil.} 1. 7, suggests that \textit{In armes} is the original reading. If so, \textit{With armys} must be an error of the a scribe; but the difference is too trifling to constitute clear evidence.

†61. And in dyuere wise and in on Intent (+ R + Cp)
(\( \text{H}_4 \) way \textit{for} wise, assent \textit{for} Intent; \( \text{Cp} \) \textit{om. first} And)

Rest : omit second in

A hypermetrical line, presumably due to scribal error. \( \text{Cp} \) has apparently introduced \( \text{in} \) independently to compensate for the loss of \textit{And}. The agreement of \( \text{R} \) may be fortuitous; but cf. 27, 28, where \( \text{R} \) retains a readings.

63. . . . thay diden all their peyn (+ \( \text{H}_5 \))
(\( \text{H}_2^3 \) \textit{om. all}; \( \text{Gg} \) \textit{lackinge})

Rest : . . . wroughten . . .
(With line 71 hand 1 of \( \text{H}_2 \) begins, and continues through 497.)

78. Wherfor to departe al softely (+ Th)
(\( \text{H}_4 \) \textit{Wherfore}; \textit{Th} \textit{om. al})

Rest : For which for to departen softely
(GgD \textit{om. second for}; \( \text{Cx} \) he thought \textit{for second for};
\( \text{H}_8 \) \textit{shortly for softly})

If we accept the trisyllabic \textit{Wherefore} of \( \text{H}_4 \) (cf. Kittredge, § 88) the reading of a is metrically normal. The Italian \textit{Per che} . . . \textit{dipartirsi}, \textit{Fil.} 1. 9, may equally well give us \textit{Wherfor} or \textit{For which}.

82. Dede hym bothe worship and servise (+ Th)
(\( \text{H}_2 \text{Ph} \) \textit{om. bothe})

Rest : Hym deden bothe . . .

*83. Hopyng in hym kunnyng hem to rede

Rest : In trust \textit{pat} he hath . . .
(\( \text{H}_5 \) \textit{hadde}; \( \text{Cx} \) \textit{had})
Readings of \( H_2PhH_4 \) (a).

The reading is closer to the Italian, *Da lui sperando sommo e buon consiglio*, *Fil*. 1. 9. *Hopyng in hym* is a rather bald translation. The reading of the remaining MSS. is more idiomatic.

*85.* Grete rumour gan when it was ferst aspyed (+ Th) (Ph was *for* gan; Th rose *for* gan)

Rest: The noyse vpros . . .

The reading is again nearer the Italian: *Fu romor grande*, *Fil*. 1. 10. The *was* of Ph is closer to *Fil.* than the *gan* of \( H_2H_4 \); but the very close relationship of Ph and \( H_2^1 \) as against \( H_4 \) (see below, p. 54) compels us to accept *gan* as the reading of *a*. Note the conflate reading of Th.

*87–91.* That Calkas traytour fled was & alyed

\( \{ \begin{align*} H_2 & \text{ To her foos & woldyn fayn be wrokyn} \\
Ph & \text{ To her foos & wyllyn to be wroken} \\
H_4 & \text{ With here foos & wilned to be wroken} \\
\end{align*} \)

\( \{ \begin{align*} H_2 & \text{ On hym pat had his troupe pus falsly brokyn} \\
Ph & \text{ On hym pat falsly had his troupe brokyn} \\
H_4 & \text{ For he was fals & his surance broken} \\
\end{align*} \)

(89) And sworyn pat he & al his kin at onys (H_4 They *for* And)

(91) \( \{ \begin{align*} H_2Ph & \text{ Were worthy brent bope fell and bonys} \\
H_4 & \text{ Weel worthi were brent be bothe fell & bonys} \\
\end{align*} \)

Rest: That Calkas traytor fled was and allyed (γ traytor fals fled was; \( H_3 \) was fledde)

\( \{ \begin{align*} H_2 & \text{ With hem of Grece and casten to ben wroken} \\
S_1 & \text{ shoop for to ben; } R \text{ cast hem; } Cx \text{ To } for \text{ With} \\
\end{align*} \)

(88) With hem of Grece and casten to ben wroken (S_1 shoop for to ben; R cast hem; Cx *to* *for* *With*)

(89) On hym pat falsly hadde his feith so broken (A hadde his feith so falsly broken; S_2 Dig Of *for* On; Gg hadde falsely)

(90) And seyden he and al his kin at onys (H_4 Gg sayden *pat* he)

(91) Ben worthi for to brennen fel and bones (CxH_h to be brent; H_1 alle fel and bones; D for to bren flesh; Gg *om.* for; Cx *Were* worthy to be brent bothe felle and bonys)

The variations in this passage between \( H_2, Ph, \) and \( H_4 \) are so considerable that it is impossible to reconstruct with any certainty
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the reading of a in 88, 89, and 91. I should conjecture that 88 and 89 real:

To her foos & wilned to be wroken
On hym pat falsly had his troupe broken;

and that the a reading of 91 has been preserved by Cx:

Were worthy to be brent bothe felle and bonys

We must assume that these lines were confused in the original of H₂PhH₄. As compared with a, the remaining MSS. show a clear case of revision. One may note the greater definiteness gained by With hem of Grece, and perhaps also in casten as compared with wilned.

*93–96. Vnknowyng of this fals & wikked deede
(H₂ cursyd for fals & wikked; Ph om. fals &)

(94) His doghtir which pat lyvid in grete penaunce
(H₂ Ph om. which)

(95) For of her lyf she was perfor in drede
(H₂ om. of)

(96) Ne in al pis world she nyst what to rede
(H₂ nyst not)

Rest:

(93) Al vnwist of pis fals and wikked deede
(GgH₅Cx om. Al; D Al men wiste; H₃ the for pis)

(94) His douhter which pat was in gret penaunce
(ADS₁ liued for was)

(95) For of hire lyf sche was ful sore in drede
(H₃ ful ofte; D ofte for ful sore; S₁ sory and full of drede; Cx And for For)

(96) As she pat nyst what was best to rede
(S₁S₂Dig wist nat; H₃ om. pat; Cx And wyste nevere what best was to rede)

Al vnwist is hardly an improvement on the Vnknowyng of a. It must mean "not informed of," as though from wissen, O.E. wissian, "to point out"; ordinarily it means "unknown," cf. Troil. 2. 1294; 3. 603, 770, 789. Note that GgH₅ and Cx approximate to the a reading by omitting Al, and that ADS₁ preserve the a reading in 94. In 95 the a reading, perfor, seems to be a clear case of error, due to misreading ful sore. In 96, on the other hand, we have a deliberate revision.
98. Of any friend to whom she durst make hire mone

Rest: ... she dorst hire mone

(ClS, D, Dig, Cx she dorst make hire mone; R was best to mone)

If we read durste, which is grammatically correct, the a reading is entirely satisfactory.

101. So fair was none for ouer euery wight

(R. om. ouer)

Rest: ... for passyng euery wyght

Since H. omits ouer, it may be that this is an H. Ph. emendation, and that passyng had been omitted by the a original.

*104. As doth a perfite heuenly creature

Rest: As is an heuenysh parfit creature

(γ As doth; Cx And ther wyth was she so perfyte a creature)

γ fails to incorporate the first part of the revision.

*108. Wel ny oute of her wyt for pure fere

Rest: ... for sorwe and fere

110. Byfor Hector on knees she fell a doun (+ CxTh)

Rest: On knees she fil byforn Ector a doun

(GgH. On kneis before ector sche fel adoun)

*111. With chere & voys ful pytous & wepyng

Rest: With pitous voys and tendrely wepynge

(R Whych petowe wys)

The Italian, E con voce e con vista assai pieta, Fil. 1. 12, marks the a reading as more original.

*118. ... lete 3our fadir tresoun gone

To sory hap ...

Rest: Forth with mischaunce

Filostrato (1. 13) reads lascia con la ria ventura Tuo padre andar. Sory hap translates ria ventura more literally than does mischaunce. Perhaps a should read With sory hap.

123. As fer forth as y may enquire & here (+ R)

Rest: As fer as I may ought enquire ...

(H. om. I)
And she hym thankyd oft in humble chere

Rest: ... with ful humble chere

Fil. 1. 14: Ella di questo il ringraziò assai.

... if it had be his wille (+GgH₅)

Rest: ... and it hadde ben his wylle

(R. om. and)

†130, 131. Thurgood in al & eke with yong & olde
   (H₂ Thurgout in al with yong & eke with olde;
   Ph god for good; with for second &)
   Ful wel bylovyd & folk wele of her tolde

Rest: Kept here estat and bothe of yong and olde
   (A. om. first and; H₅ om. of)
   Ful wel beloued and wel men of here tolde
   (H₅ Ful wel hir louid; A And wel beloued ful wel;
   D men wel; Cx om. wel)

The a reading in 130 seems indefensible.

I rede not perfor y lette hit gone

Rest: I rede it nought ...

... al vnsoft
   (H₄ as vnsofte)

Rest: ... no thing softe

143, 144. For why it were a long digression
   Of my matere ... 
   (H₄ it were of to long discuscioun)

Rest: For it were heere a long digression
   Fro my matere ... 
   (γ + H₅ om. heere; S₁ For quhy it were a; R right
   for here, GgH₅AH₃Cx For for Fro)

Since Gg reads here, the agreement of H₅ with γ must be accidental. For further discussion of this line see p. 61.

†150, *151. The old vsage nold they of troy lettyn
   (H₄ For al nolde thei of troye lette)
   As for to honour her goddis and to loute
   (H₂Ph her god and to loutyn; H₄ om. second to)
Readings of $H_2^2PhH_4^4 (a)$. 43

Rest: Hire old vsage noi de pei not letten
(Cx Yet for alle thyre vsage wolde; ClH_1AR wolde)
As for to honoure hire goddes ful deuoute
(Cx To worship and honour their goddis; R Ne for
As, the for to; Gg god)

Line 150 in a is hypermetrical if one gives proper syllabic value
to vsage and nold(e). Note the connection between $H_4$ and Cx.
Line 151 is perfectly satisfactory; the rime words are aboute and
doute. For loute in the sense of bowing down to an idol, cf.
*Monk's Tale* 3352.

157. ... of ioly veer þe pryme
Rest: ... of lusti ver þe pryme
$(H_5$ of forsing ver)

159. In meny wyse shewyd as y rede
Rest: In sondry wyses...
$(GgH_5RCxH_2D$ wyse)

The line seems to be due to *Fil. 1. 18, E in diversi atti mostran
loro amori*, though Boccaccio is speaking of *ogni animale* and not
of *Li troian padri* (or *Pronti i Troiani* in ed. 1789). If so,
*In sondry wyses* is the more original reading, and the weaker word
meny must be charged to the a scribe.

*163–167. In general went euery manere wight
That thryfty was to heryn her servise
$(H_4$ tristi, the for her)
And pat so meny a thousand lusty knyght
So meny a fressh mayde & lady bryght
$(H_2$ lady & maydyn)
Ful wele byseyn the meste meyne & leest
$(H_2$ the moost & eke þe leest; $H_4$ mene)

Rest: In general þere went many a wight
(D many worthy wight; Cx Generally)
To herkenen of Palladion seruyse
$(γ$ þe seruyse; $H_3GgH_5R$ Palladions)
And namely so many a lusti knyght
$(RCxS_2Dig$ *om. so; R a lusty gentyll knyght; $H_5$
yong for lusti)
So many a lady fresch and mayden bright
$(Cx$ And for So; $H_3$ mayden fresche and lady dere)
Ful wel arayed bothe meste and leste
(J bothe pe meste and pe lest ; H₃ tho moste ; R om. wel ; H₁Cp bope most meyne and lest ; Cl bothe meene meste ; A men bothe mest ; D bothe moste menne ; S₁ bothe most mene)

In this passage there is clear evidence of revision. To herkenen of Palladion seruyse, in 164, is more definite than the a reading, and more in keeping with the pagan background. The change in 163 seems to have been dictated by the dropping of the phrase, That thrifty was, crowded from the line by the long word Palladion. In 167 we can see the very method of revision. The line in a, misunderstood and emended by H₂, and perhaps also by H₄, who writes mene instead of meyne, must mean that all the knights and ladies who thronged the temple were goodly to look on, both the great retinues of important personages and the more modest trains of the less distinguished. Criseyde's meyne is mentioned in 2. 614, and that of Troilus in 5. 526. The a line was then revised to read bothe meste and lest by changing the to bothe and by deleting meyne. The scribe of the γ original made the change to bothe, but failed to delete meyne. Cp and H₁ retain this erroneous γ reading with the spelling meyne. In the parent of A and D meyne became menne or men, and A attempted an ingenious emendation. S₁ changes to mene, and Cl to meene with transposition of order. The parent of S₂ and Dig emended the hypermetrical line by dropping meyne, and so S₂ Dig present the correct revised reading. J and H₃ have correctly deleted meyne, but have wrongly kept the original pe in addition to bothe of the revised reading.

*169. Among pe which was Cryseyda
(H₂ was this Cryseyda)

Rest: Among pese opere folk was Criseyda.
(R ther was)

The Italian, Tra' quali fu . . . Griseida, Fil. 1. 19, marks the a reading as more original. The revised reading gains in definiteness.

*176. As she was as pei seydyn everychon
(H₂Ph echeon)

Rest: As was Criseyde as folk seyde euerichone
(GgH₃ om. second as ; S₂DigCx ychone)
Again, the a reading is less definite. Th reads they sayden with a.

183. Davn Troyllus . . .
Rest: This Troilus . . .

195. . . . a lord she slepith soft (+ Th)
(H 4 o lord)
Rest: . . . god wot . . .

199. . . . have folk . . .
Rest: . . . folk han . . .

*202, 203. O verrey folys may ye no thing se
Kan none of yow yware by other be
(H 4 war)
Rest: O verrey foles nice and blynde be ye
Ther is not oon kan war by oper be
(Cl loues for foles; Gg om. O, om. nice, bat can for
kan; Cx blynde and nyce; ClCpJ nys; in Cp
the n of nys has been erased)

*206–209. But trowe ye not pat love po lokyd row
(H 4 not ye, om. po)
For pat despite & shope to bene ywrokyn
(Ph shop how; H 4 shapid to be wrokyn)
Yes certein lovis bow was not ybrokyn
(H 2 certis; H 4 for loues bowe)
For be myn heed he hit hym atte fulle
(H 2 at pe)
Rest: At which pe god of loue gan loken rowe
(Cl to loken)
Right for despit and shop for to ben wroken
(H 5 DCx om. for; H 3 hope)
He kyd anoon his bowe nas not broken
(Cl And for He; D toke anon over erasure; S 1 his
bowe that nas nat; H 3 to-broken; RCxH 3 H 5 was)
For sodeynly he hit hym atte fulle
(Cl Ful for For, at pe for atte)

A clear case of conscious revision. As in 202, 203, a declarative statement replaces a rhetorical question. In 208 and 209 the revision is in the direction of greater definiteness.
Daun Troylus...

Rest: This Troylus...

Cf. line 183.

But aldai faylith that that folys wenden

(R_h2 pes for second that; Ph pe for second that; H2Ph wenyh; H4 fool is wende)

Rest: ... ðyng ðat...

... as my feris drawe (+ AD)

Rest: ... with my feres drawe

(Cl felawes; R om. my; Gg hyse over erasure by corrector)

... ðat ... (+ R)

Rest: ... þis ...

... men may it se

(R_h4 om. it)

Rest: ... men shal it se

Ne gruchith not to love for to be bond

(R_h4 greuith)

Rest: Refuseth not ...
and $H_5$ have the unsyncopated form with *and*, and that $R$ agrees with $H_2$. In 259 we have three distinct readings, of which the $\gamma$ text stands midway between $a$ and $\beta$. Perhaps, as in 167, $\gamma$ failed to incorporate the full revision. In 259 $Th$ reads *Nowe foloweth him* with $a$.

261. ... of whom $y$ told

Rest: ... of which I tolde

†272. His eye perceyvid and so depe hit went

Rest: His eye perced ...

(ClCp procede; $S_2$Dig proceeded; Cp sighte for eye; $R$ departed; Gg His ey3en perseydyn)

A clear error in $a$, as is shown by the Italian: *L'occhio suo vago giunse penetrando*, Fil. 1. 26. The error of Cl, Cp, $S_2$Dig may be due to misinterpreting a scribal abbreviation.

274. $H_2$ And sodenly wax wondur sore astonyd

Ph And sodenly wox for wondre astoned

$H_4$ And sodenly for wondyr he wex astoynd

$Th$ And sodaynly for wonder wext astoned

Rest: And sodeynly he wax perwith astoned

$H_4$ has apparently preserved the authentic $a$ reading. $H_2$ is certainly corrupt. Ph presents a possible reading if we supply *he* before *wox*.

276. O verrey god poght he wher hast pou wonyd (+ Th)

(H$_4$ om. god)

Rest: O mercy god ...

†327. And al his chere & speche he vnournith

(H$_2$ speche & chere; Ph Vnornith, V of Vnornith corrected; $H_4$ For for And, yit he mourned)

Rest: ...

(H$_6$ so for also)

A clear case of error.

*342. But told y which were $pe$ worst y leve

(Ph whiche; $H_4$ But told I which were as I leeue)

Rest: But tolde I yow $pe$ worste poynt I leeue

The revision may be due to a desire to avoid repetition of phrase with the preceding line, *But pat is not $pe$ worste as mot I the*, and to secure greater definiteness. Note that the $a$ line has
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only nine syllables, since dissyllabic *whiche* is justifiable only in the plural (Kittredge, § 78, ten Brink, 254).

*344, 345.* But take pis *pat* 3e louers oft escheue
For good or done of good intencion
*(H₄ with *for* of)*

*Rest:* Or elles don of *good* entencioun
*(H₅ doon hit)*

The revision avoids the repetition of *good*, and the somewhat awkward phrase *escheue For good*.

348, 349. And *set if* she for *oper* encheson
Be wrope *set* shalt *pow* have a groyn anon
*(H₄ om. set in 348)*

*Rest:* . . . pan shalt *pow* . . .
*(Gg that *for* shalt)*

The a reading seems to be corrupt. Apparently *set* is repeated from 348.

†373. Ne myght for so *goodly* on be borne
*(Ph *has corrected to lorne over erasure)*

*Rest:* . . . be lorn
*(H₅ *om. be; H₅ *forlorn)*

A clear case of error. The Italian reads: *Poter per cotal donna esser perduto*, Fil. 1. 35. The rime word in 375 is *vpborne*.

393. And of this song not only his *sentence (+ Th)}
*(H₂ pis sentence; Ph his song)*

*Rest:* And of *his* song nought only pe *sentence*
*(GgH₅ pe song; A this song; R his sentence; D content)*

The a reading seems to be corrupt. Note the variants within each group.

*395.*

*H₂* But eke save *pat* our spechis differens
Ph But eke save *pat* yn our speches be difference
*(yn and be *inserted above)*

*Rest:* But pleyly *saue* oure *tonges* difference
*(Cl *tonge deference)*

H₂ and Ph are plainly corrupt, and H₄ is not very metrical. Perhaps the unrevised reading was: *But eke sauf yn our spech is difference*. 
403. If he be wykked ...

Rest: If it be ...

The pronoun refers to love. In 401 all MSS. read he, which falls under the rime. All except AD and $H_2Ph$ read hym in 405, where AD read it, and $H_2Ph$ repeat the noun love.

†407. $H_2Ph$ And if y yn myn owne lust brenne

$H_4$ And if in myn awyn lust I brenne

Rest: And yf vat at myn owene lust I brenne

(S₂ Dig om. yf; AD om. at; A om. I)

The Italian, S’a mia voglia ardo, Petrarch, Sonn. 88, confirms the reading at. Yn may be due to scribal anticipation of myn. a has dropped vat to the injury of the metre. The $H_2Ph$ parent has transposed the pronoun y, perhaps with the idea of improving the disordered metre.

424. 3ow ponk y lord vat have broght me to pis

(H₄ which for vat)

Rest: ... han me brought ...

(Gg brouthe me, omitting han)

The a reading is probably due to scribal transposition; for the natural prose order would more readily be substituted for the poetical order than vice versa.

452. By night or day by wysdom or folye (+ GgH₅)

(H₅ be it wisdom)

Rest: ... for wysdom ...

†462. My lif is lost ...

(H₂Ph Al my lyst is lost)

Rest: And lyf is lost ...

(A And myn lif; D And luf)

The preceding line reads My dere herte alias myn hele and heve, and the context demands And in 462. My must be explained as caught from the preceding line by scribal error. Note the conflate reading in A, which points to contamination.

483. That al pe grekis as pe deth hym dred

(H₄ That alle grekis)

Rest: That pe Grekes ...

The a reading avoids a nine-syllable line. Al has, however, no support from the Italian, which reads: Che gli Greci il tenean.
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come la morte, Fil. 1. 46. Though Chaucer doubtless wrote nine-syllable lines, he would hardly arrive at one by deliberate revision. We must assume either that the a reading is original and that the remaining MSS. are corrupt, or, on the authority of the Italian, that the nine-syllable line is authentic, and the a reading a case of scribal emendation. Since a is frequently corrupt, I incline to the second hypothesis.

(With 498 begins again hand 3 of H₂, and continues through 567)

532. More than on of whos foly men Ryme
   \( H₂^3 \) he for on
   \( R e s t : \) More \( \text{an} \) \( \text{pat} \) fol . . .
   \( \text{(CpA that folk; S}_2 \text{Dig the folk; RCx a fool)} \)

540. These wordis and full many an other mo \( (+R+H₅+Th) \)
   \( H₂^3 H₄H₅ \text{ om. an} \)
   \( R e s t : \) . . . ful manye an oper to

564. PhH₄ . . . and don his corage wakyn
   \( H₂^3 \) . . . and his courage wake
   \( R e s t : \) . . . and his corage awaken

\( H₂^3 \) has dropped \text{don}, but keeps \text{wake} instead of \text{awaken}.
(With line 568 begins again \( H₂^1 \), and continues to the end of the book.)

582. Pandare that ny malt for wo & roupe
   \( R e s t : \) This Pandare \text{pat} neyght malt . . .
   \( J \text{pat wel neyght malt; Gg pat wol ner mast; } H₅ \text{pat wel ner malt) } \)

JGgH₅, which insert \text{wel}, though reading \text{This}, suggest that the original reading of a may have been \text{Pandare that wel ny malt}.

629. Ther as he felle that loke cowd wyde
   \( H₄ \text{lookyn coude) } \)
   \( R e s t : \) . . . coude loke wyde

*A640. Ne no man wote what gladnes is y trow
   \( (+ JGgH₅ + Th) \).
   \( R e s t : \) Ne no man may be inly glad I trowe
   \( R \text{ueryly glad}; S}_2 \text{Ioly gladde}; \text{Dig non for no man) } \)
A clear case of revision, in which JGgH₅ retain the a reading.
644. \( H_2Ph \) As men may se so thes clerkis demith
\( H_4 \) The coloures & knoulech who so riht demyth
\( H_4 \) has transposed 643 and 644. Its reading is a
cumbersome attempt to supply a line missing in its
original.)

Rest : As men may se and so pe wyse it demeth
\( (Gg \text{ om. it}) \)

†678. \( \ldots \) pogh pat y wist
\( (H_4 \text{ om. pat}) \)
Rest : \( \ldots \) if ich it wyste
\( (R \text{ and } for \text{ if}) \)

The context clearly demands if rather than pogh. The \( a \)
original has repeated pogh from the preceding line.

715. A god wil pou art not agast of me
Rest : If god wole \( \ldots \)

*755. But lete me myn infortune waylyn
\( (H_4 \text{ my fortune bewaylyn}) \)
Rest : But suffre me my myschef to by-wayle
\( (D \text{ om. my} ; \text{Cp om. to} ; \text{H}_5 \text{ for to}) \)

The \( a \) reading is perfectly satisfactory. For infortune cf.
\textit{Troil.} 3. 1626, 4. 185. One can see no motive for the revision.
Th reads : \( \text{But suffre me my fortune to bewaylen.} \)

*773. Why no parde sir quod this Troylus (+Th)
\( (H_2Ph \text{ om. this}) \)
Rest : No certes broper quod pis Troylus
\( (A \text{ seide for quod} ; \text{Cp om. pis}) \)

The \( a \) reading is somewhat more dramatic. The revised reading
is more concise and avoids the repetition of \textit{why} in 774.

†786. As sharp as doth the Sicipus in helle
\( (Ph \text{ Ciciphus} ; \text{H}_4 \text{ Sitiphus}) \)
\( \ldots \) he Ticius \( \ldots \)
\( (\text{ClRH}_5 \text{ pe for he} ; \text{H}_3 \text{ tho for he} ; \text{H}_1 \text{Cx om. he}; \text{S}_1 \text{ he Theseus} ; \text{Gg he which is}) \text{(Th he Tesiphus}) \)

The context, which speaks of the vultures rending his stomach,
makes it clear that Tityus and not Sisyphus is meant. Cf.
\textit{Boethius} 3. m 12. 29, where the name is spelled \textit{Ticius}, and, for
Sisyphus, Duchess 589, with Skeat's note. It is not impossible that the error in a may be due to the poet himself.

†794. And wantrowist to telle of þi sorowis smert (Ph tellyn; H₄ And wondist to tellyn)

Rest: For wantrust tellen of þi sorwes smerte (D untrust; Cx woundis for sorwes; H₅ To noon tellyn of þy sorwe and smerte)

A clear case of error. Not only is the a reading unmetrical; but the context clearly demands a noun and not a verb. I know of no authority for such a verb as "wantr Owen."

796. As mych as speke o word ye more or lesse (+ Th) (H₂Ph om. ye; H₄ to speke)

Rest: . . . a resoun more or lesse (Cl lasse)

831. . . but if pow fynd it so (+ GgH₅; Gg om. if)

. . . but pow it fynde so (A hit for but)

890–896. Stanza 128 (+ Th)

Rest: Omit stanza.

For a discussion of this stanza see p. 34.

938. . . whil þat y lyve

Rest: . . . whil I leue (D whan for whil; S₁ quhill I may lyve)

*949. The lilie wexith white smothe & soft

Rest: The rose waxeþ swote smothe and softe (ClCpH₁DS₁ and smothe and softe; Gg swete saュery & softe)

The a reading seems preferable. The adjectives "smooth" and "soft" apply better to the lily than to the rose. Moreover, the rose is more naturally contrasted with its own thorns than with the "foule netle rough and pîkke" growing next it. But the change seems to be deliberate.

976. For þis have y herd seyd of olde lerid (+ R) (H₂Ph sey; H₄ om. herd; H₂ old)

γ + J . . . of wyse lered (Cl ylered)

Gg(H₅) . . . of leryd

H₃ . . . ofte herde sey and lerede

Cx . . . herde seyd oft of lered.
Readings of $H_2PhH_4$ (a).

Olde lerid is preferable to the somewhat tautological wyse lerred of $\gamma$ and $J$. Apparently the scribe of the common original first wrote wyse and then altered it to olde. $\gamma$ and $J$ failed to note the correction. $H_3$ and Cx misread olde as ofte. Gg omitted the word.

†1014. Now blisful Venus now help or yat y sterve

Rest: *Omit second* now

The a reading is hypermetrical.

1029. . . . pan do right as pe lest (+ Th)

($H_4$ thanne, *om. right*)

Rest: . . . now do right as pe leste

(Cl riøt; A now *for right*)

An examination of the long list of readings which characterize $H_2PhH_4$ reveals a number of significant facts.

(1) That $H_2PhH_4$ are descended from a common ancestor, not Chaucer's original, is shown by their agreement in a number of readings manifestly corrupt, *i.e.* 61, 272, 327, 373, 407, 462, 678, 786, 794, 1014.

(2) Of the remaining $H_2PhH_4$ readings, some present but a slight variation, such as a simple transposition in word-order or a trifling substitution, which could be explained as a scribal corruption. Others, however, involve so considerable a difference in phrasing that the variation can be explained only as due to deliberate revision. In many instances we are presented with alternate readings both of which are not only possible, but in spirit and manner thoroughly Chaucerian. The readings which point clearly to deliberate revision are marked in the list with an asterisk. It is, of course, possible that the slighter variations may be due to such a cause.

(3) A comparison with Chaucer's Italian originals shows that in a number of instances $H_2PhH_4$ present a reading closer to the source than that of the remaining MSS. The reverse of this is true only when $H_2PhH_4$ are manifestly in error. Since it seems fair to assume that revision will normally result in a freer rather than a closer following of the source, this fact points towards the conclusion that $H_2PhH_4$ present the earlier and unrevised text of the poem. This conclusion is corroborated by the fact that $H_2PhH_4$ are the only MSS. which contain the obviously genuine stanza 128 (cf. above, p. 34).
(4) The variants which characterize H₂PhH₄ are not evenly distributed throughout the book. Of the 93 variants, including cases of manifest error, 72 occur in the first 500 lines, and 59 in the first 300 lines. This fact further confirms the hypothesis of deliberate revision, since variations due to scribal carelessness or caprice would normally be scattered throughout the extent of the work. 

(5) Certain MSS. outside this group, notably GgH₅ and - R, occasionally share in the readings of H₂PhH₄. In one striking instance, line 640, the reading of H₂PhH₄ is shared by JGgH₅.

We must now consider the relations existing between the MSS. which constitute this group of H₂PhH₄. And here it must be remembered that H₂ is not homogeneous. The first and the eighth folios of H₂, including lines 1–70 and 498–567, are in a different hand from that which has written the rest of Book I. They are by hand 3, which has also written lines 197–406 of Book IV. (See The MSS. of Chaucer's Troilus, p. 17.) Though H₂¹ and H₂³ are both throughout Book I a MSS., H₂¹ is closely related to Ph, while H₂³ is cognate in origin with H₄.

The close relationship of H₂¹ and Ph has already been to some extent illustrated by the variants given in the long list of a group readings. Any one who will compare line by line the two MSS. through the stanzas included in the Chaucer Society's volume of Specimen Extracts will be struck at once by the remarkable similarity in spelling. Even more significant is the fact that the two MSS. are the work of the same scribe. Of the truth of this statement the reader may convince himself by examining the facsimile pages given in The MSS. of Chaucer's Troilus (Plates IX and XVIII). I have minutely compared the facsimile of Ph with the corresponding lines in H₂¹, and the facsimile of H₂¹ with the corresponding lines in Ph. This comparison of identical words, usually of identical spelling, leaves no doubt in my mind that the copyist is one and the same. There are, to be sure, trifling differences, but only such as can be readily understood from the fact that H₂, a vellum MS. throughout, is more carefully executed than Ph, the greater part of which is written on paper. Ph lacks the illuminated stanza initials and the stanza spacings which are found throughout H₂. Thus, for example, the scribe uses two forms of the letter h, one of which ends in a firm downstroke with a tendency to turn at its conclusion to the right, while the
other ends with a free flourish to the left. Each of these forms is present both in \( H_2 \) and in Ph; but the former greatly predominates in \( H_2 \), while the latter is characteristic of Ph.

The close relationship of \( H_2 \) and Ph is attested by their agreement in a great number of characteristic readings, a large proportion of which are manifestly corrupt. These agreements I shall illustrate by the following list of representative examples. A complete list would fill many pages, and could serve no useful purpose.

\[ H_2 \] Ph.

(\( H_2 \) begins with line 71)

†76. For wele wist he byfor \( \text{at} \) Troy shold

\( \text{Rest} : \) ... by sort

An error due to the confusion of \( f \) and long \( s \).

†119. Dwellith whil 3ow good lyst in troy

\( \text{Rest} : \) Dwelleth with vs whil ...

†153. ... pe tyme

Of appareille whan clopid is the mede

\( \text{Rest} : \) Of Aperil ...

A curious error apparently due to the suggestion of clopid.

181, 182. Symple of beryng \& deboner of chere

With a ful seure lokyng \& a manere

\( \text{Rest} : \) Symple of atyr and debonaire of chere

With ful assuryd lokyng and manere

(\( H_4 \) a seemly for assuryd; Gg answered)

†197. I have herd told of 3our lyvyng

\( \text{Rest} : \) I haue herd told pardieux of ...

235, 238. That love is he \( \text{at} \) althing can blynd

For may no man vndo pe lawe of kynd

\( \text{Rest} : \) ... may bynde

For may no man fordo ...

(\( H_5 \) undo)

†268. This Troylus with euery wight about

\( \text{Rest} : \) ... of euery wyght ...

(Ch\( H_5 \) and for of; \( H_4 \) on for of)

The Italian reads or \( d'uno \) or \( d'altro \), Fil. 1. 26. The context also demands of.
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†286. She shewyd wele pat men myght in her gesse

Rest: Omit She

H₂Ph have clumsily emended an authentic nine-syllable line. The subject of shewyd is pe pure wyse of here menyge in 285.

406. For more thurst y the more pat y drynk (H₂ thrust)

Rest: For ay purst I pe more pat I it drynke (H₄RA om. it)

†409. . . wherto pan y pleyne

Rest: . . . wherto pleyne I penne

A manifest error. The rime word is brenne.

423. pe spiryt which that oght euere youris be

Rest: Mi spirit which pat aught youre be

(H₄ ay for pat; H₁S₂ Dig om. pat; Gg pe wheche; H₅ om. which)

The reading ay in H₄ gives some support to euere in H₂Ph. It is possible that the a original may have read: My spiryt which oght euere youris be, or My spiryt which ay oghte youris be. The Italian, omai L’anima è tua che mia esser solea, Fil. 1. 38, lends no support, however, to such a conjecture.

425, 426. But whethir goddes or woman she is

Y wis y note . . .

Rest: But wheþer goddesse or womman I wys

She be I not . . .

(GgH₅ om. She be)

The error of GgH₅ in omitting She be seems to be connected with a revision of the H₂Ph reading into that of the remaining MSS. Perhaps this should be regarded as an authentic a reading not shared by H₄.

†465. Ne in his desire non oþir fantasye bred

Rest: . . . fownes . . .

(D foules; H₄R sownes; Cp fewnes; H₅ other brede; S₂Dig fode no(r) brede)

The word fownes (= fawns) in this strange metaphorical use has bred many corruptions.

†471. That Ector or his brethyryn dedyn (+ D + H₅)

Rest: . . . his opere breþeren . . .
Opere has been dropped because of the similarity of the following word. The same error has been made independently by D and H₅. The Italian reads: Ch' Ettore e gli altri suoi frate' faceano, Fil. 1. 45.

†496. Ne seymd hit as she of hit roght
Rest: ... as fat she of hym roughte
(γ + Gg om. as; H₃Cx lacking)
The context demands hym. The line is metrically deficient.
(Lines 498–567 are written by hand 3.)

†612. And for pe love of god the cold care
Rest: ... my cold care
The context demands my.

†632. But hit makith sharp kervyng toles
Rest: But yet it maketh ...
(S₁F₂ And 3it)
A nine-syllable line.

642. Eke white by blak shame by worthines
Rest: ... by shame ek worthinesse
(A eke shame by; S₂Dig Also shame be)

†646. That y have in love so oft assayed
Rest: I pat haue ...

665. Pat his craft ne cowd his sorowis bete
(H₂ bet)
Rest: That al his craft ...

†739. To no man for why fat he so ferd
Rest: To neuer no man for whom ...
(CICpH₁S₁H₃ om. no; AH₄Cx Neuer to no man;
R Neuer to man; H₅ To neuer a man)
Note the uncertainty of the MSS. as to the word-order, due perhaps to an attempt to improve the metre.

747. Eke it is craft some tyme to seme fle
(H₂ sle for fle)
Gg Ek it is a craft for summe sumtyme to fle
Rest: Ek som tyme it is a craft to seme fle.
(H₄H₃Cx om. a)
For thy with 

rest: For 

clH1S2Dfro 

trist pow pat y told it in her ere 

rest: Dorstestow . . . 

pow mayst alone here wepe knele " cry (+ Cx) 

rest: . . . crie and knele 

A clear case of error, since the rime word in 808 is Fele. Cx changes Fele to espye.

Wer it my sustir for wham pow makist pis sorow 

rest: Were it for my suster al pì sorwe 

And some wold monche her brede alon 

rest: . . . here mete allone 

(GgH5 vary) 

Thes faytours . . . 

rest: These loueres . . . 

957. Be diligent & trew and alwey hide (+ RCx) 

rest: . . . ay wel hide 

(H4 ay weel yede) 

That pow my lady desiryn shold 

rest: That to my lady I desiren sholde 

(Gg om. to; H5 bat I my lady desyre shulde) 

That pow is repeated from 1031.

And in þe toun his name sprong for ay 

1078. So goodly was & gat hym so mych grace 

þat ðech wight hym lovid þat lokyd in his face 

rest: And yn þe toun his manere þo forþay 

(A his name sprang in fay; H3 to fore ay; Cx he holdeth ay) 

So goodly was & gat him so yn grace 

(A such for so yn; H5 his for yn; Gg lacking) 

That ðech hym louede . . . 

(A That euery man louede hym) 

Line 1076 is meaningless; 1078 is hypermetrical. The agreements of A with H2Ph must be explained as due to contamination.

The trustiest and on the best knyght (+ R) 

rest: The priftieste . . .
The list of readings in which $H_2^1$ and Ph agree might have been extended indefinitely; but the representative examples given above are sufficient to show that $H_2^1$ and Ph are descended from a common original, and that this original must have presented a very corrupt text. In a great majority of cases the characteristic readings of this pair of MSS. are manifestly erroneous. In no case have we any sufficient ground for supposing that the variation is due to intelligent revision. Closely related as are $H_2^1$ and Ph, each is guilty of numerous corruptions of its own; so that neither can be regarded as the source of the other. For example, $H_2$ omits stanza 70 (lines 484–490) which is given by Ph; and Ph omits the first three lines of stanza 118 (lines 820–822), repeating in their place the first three lines of stanza 117, an error not shared by $H_2$.

In the two passages written by hand 3, $H_2$ is unmistakably related to $H_4$. This relationship is attested by the following readings:

$H_2^3H_4$

† 4. Frome wo to wele and affirwarde oute of Ioye
   Rest: ... and after out of Ioye

10. ... the sorye Instrumente
   Rest: ... sorwful ... 

20. $H_2^3$ ... or my love availe
    $H_4$ ... or my book availe
   Rest: ... and his cause auayle
   (A this for his; Cx lady for cause)

† 63. Full besyly thay diden all their peyn
   ($H_2^3$ om. all)
   Rest: By Parys don ... 

The Italian, *Di vendicar l'oltraggio e la rapina Da Paris fatta*, *Fil.* 1. 7, supports the reading of the remaining MSS. The reading of $H_2^3H_4$ must be regarded as a scribal variation, due perhaps to a dislike for run-on lines.

68. Knew well that Troy distroied shulde be
   Rest: ... sholde destroyed be

498. But than felte Troilus suche wo (+ R)
   ($H_4$ fell)
   Rest: But þanne felt þis Troylus ...
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500. Was this pat she hym had I-loued so
(H₂³ in love for I-loued)

Rest: ... som wyght hadde loued so
(Ph euer for som)

† 536. The deth for I will while pat my liff may laste
(H₄ om. pat)

Rest: Omit will. (R wyl for while)

Will is anticipated from the next line.

546. ... his sorowe gan multiply (+ GgH₅)

Rest: ... his wo ... 

† 547. Bewaillyng thus in his chambre allone
(H₄ By wakyng)

Rest: ... yn his chambre pus allone
(D om. pus)

The transposition is greatly to the detriment of the metre.

† 558. God saue them pat haue besieged our toun (+ Gg)

Rest: ... byseged han ...

Again the metre is disarranged.

These agreements, of which a number are cases of manifest error, serve to establish the common descent of H₂³ and H₄ from an already corrupt original. It must be noted, however, that H₂³ has in several instances incorporated, presumably by contamination, readings of the β type. See lines 34, 57 and 58, 564 already discussed in the main list of a readings. An examination of the variants given in that list, and in the H₂³H₄ list above, will show that neither H₂³ nor H₄ is derived from the other.

The relations now established within the group of a MSS. may be graphically represented thus:

```
O
  /|
  a|
 /|
H₂¹ Ph H₄ H₂³
```
ClCpH₁S₂DigADS₁ (γ).

O indicates Chaucer's original in its unrevised form, and a a copy of that original. It is obvious that a may be reconstructed by the agreement in any line of H₂¹ or Ph with H₄ or of H₄ or H₂³ with Ph. Where the two branches of a are in conflict, recourse must be had to the testimony of the MSS. outside the group, and to the general principles of transcriptional probability. It must be noted, however, that in the latter part of Book I particularly there is some sort of a cross relation between H₄ and β, notably with R and Cx, the nature of which will be discussed later on (see pp. 81–83).

We now must consider the MSS. which present the text in its later revised form. Here it will be convenient to begin with the numerous and intrinsically very important group to which has been given the designation γ. It consists of Cl, Cp, H₁, S₂, Dig, A, D, and (throughout Book I) S₁. These eight MSS. are associated by their agreement, as against the remaining MSS. (including a), in a series of variant readings which is presented in full in the list which follows:

ClCpH₁S₂DigADS₁ (γ)

†87. That Calkas traytor fals fled was and allyed
With hem of Greece . . .

Rest: Omit fals (H₃ was fledde)
A hypermetrical line, due, perhaps, to a misreading of fled and to a subsequent correction.

†143. For it were a long disgression (— S₁, + H₆)
(H₁ discrecioun)
H₂PhH₄S₁ For why it were . . .
JGgH₃Cx For it were here . . .
R For it were right . . .
A nine-syllable line, emended by S₁. The agreement of H₅ I regard as fortuitous, since the closely related Gg reads here. For further discussion of this line see p. 42.

†162. And to pe temple yn al here goodly best wyse
(— CpS₂Dig)

Rest: Omit goodly (R om. al)
A hypermetrical line, corrected by CpS₂Dig.
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164. To herkenen of Palladion pe seruyse
   β To herkenen of Palladions seruyse
      (JCx Palladion)
   a That thryfty was to heryn her servise

† 167. Ful wel arayed bothe most meyne and lest
      (Cl meene meste; A men bothe mest; D menne;
       S₁ mene; S₂ Dig om. meyne)
   β ... bothe mest and lest
   a ... the meste meyne & leest
A corrupt conflation of a and β, corrected by S₂ Dig. For a full discussion of the line see above, p. 44.

† 198. Ye louers and youre observaunces
       (A and of youre)
      Rest: ... and your lewed observances
       (Ph and of; Cx and eke)
A four-stress line.

259. To folwen hym pat so wel kan yow lede
   β To folwen loue pat yow so wel kan leede
   a Now folowith hym pat so wel may 3ow lede
Again γ stands midway between α and β, as though it had failed to incorporate the full revision.

† 261. Of pis kynges sone of which I tolde (+ GgH₅)
      Rest: As of this kynges sone . . .
A scribal error, accidentally shared by GgH₅.

324. He streyght anoon vnto his paleys turneth (+ Cx)
      Rest: . . . the paleys . . .
The Italian reads: al palazzo tornossi, Fil. 1. 32.

386. And ouer all pis yet muche more he poughte
      Rest: And ouere al this muchel moore he thought
       (PhH₄ om. al; RH₄ full mochell; H₃ lacking)
The γ reading is metrically preferable; but the reading without yet is possible.

442. So muche day by day his owene pought
      Rest: . . . day fro day . . .
The Italian reads: Tanto di giorno in giorno, Fil. 1. 41.
487. ... bothe euen and morwe

Rest: ... on eue and morwe

(H₄ om. on; GgH₅ Ph on euy and on morwe; H₂H₃ Cx lacking)

495. But wel I rede ...

Rest: But wele rede I ...

γ substitutes a normal word-order.

†496. Ne semed it pat she of hym roughte (+Gg)

(A on for of; S₂ Dig om. Ne, thought for roughte; Dig 3it for it)

Rest: ... as pat she of him roughte

(H₂ Ph as she of hit roght)

The line in γ is metrically deficient.

502. For which ...

(Cl For such)

Rest: For pat ...

(JGgH₅ For pat cause).

539. pough neuere more þyng ye me byhete

(CpS₂ Dig heete for byhete)

Rest: ... no thing more ...

(R Thogh that thing ye more me behete; H₅ how neuere þyng herafter)

563. ... don his wo to falle (+R)

(S₂ Dig euelle for wo; Cl om. to)

Rest: ... don his sorwe falle

(H₂³ to do for don his)

565. But wel he wiste ...

Rest: But wel wist he ...

Again γ substitutes a normal word-order.

628. I haue myself ek seyn a blynd man go

(AS₂ Dig seen ek)

Rest: I haue my seluen seyne

(H₂ PhH₄ H₅ RCx myself)

649. Ek þe ne oughte not ben yuel apayed

(S₂ Dig Also þou ought noght to be; D to for not)

Rest: And ek the noughte nat ...

(H₂ PhH₄ And eke þow oghtest not; GgH₅ And ek þou not; H₅ R the aught not; Cx the not ought)
Remede and red by erbes she knew fyne (— S₁)
(Cl erbess)

Rest: ... he knew ...
(RH₄ couth; H₅ kenewe he; Gg he knyt)

An error, corrected by S₁. The pronoun refers to Phoebus.

And sith I am he that pou tristest most
(Cl sithen, yn whom for that; D omits line)

Rest: And seist I am ...
(Gg And seyst pou pat I am; H₄ And seist that I am; H₃ on whom for that; H₂ PhCx om. that)

Sith is repeated from 719.

... wepe and crie and knele (+ J)

Rest: Omit first and

And she wol quyte pat pou shalt not fele
(A quyte wole; S₁ quyte so pat)

Rest: And she wol quyte it that ...
(R om. And; Cx shal for wol, om. that; H₃ the for it)

In γ the transitive verb quyte is without an object.

Of pat word toke hede Troylus

Rest: And of that word ...
(Gg pys for that)

A nine-syllable line.

3e so pow seyst ...

Rest: Ye so seystow ...

Again γ substitutes a normal word-order.

For of good name and wysdom and manere (— AS₂ Dig)

Rest: Omit first and
(S₂ Dig goddis for good)

... swote and smothe and softe (— AS₂ Dig)

Rest: Omit first and
(a white for swote; Gg saury for smothe)

Note that in two cases AS₂ Dig depart from γ in exactly the same construction.

But he pat departed is yn euery place
(S₂ Dig euere)

Rest: But he that parted is ...

A scribal error to the detriment of the metre.
976. For pis haue I herd seyd of wyse lerde (+J) (Cl ylered)
   a + R . . . of olde lerid
Gg(H₅) Omit wyse
H₃ . . . ofte herde seyd and lerede
Cx . . . herde seyd oft of lered
For a discussion of this line see above, p. 52.

1000–1001. That pow shalt be þe beste post I leue
Of al his lay and most his foos to greue
(— DS₁) (Cl best)
Rest: . . . and moste his foos greue
(JRS₁ and moost his foos ay greue)
The reading to greue is supported only by γ. It is due to a mis-
understanding of the line. The context requires not the superlative
most, but the verbal form moste (=must). For the dissyllabic form
see Kittredge, p. 330. In the present passage only H₃ and Cx read
moste, the rest most or moost. The reading of JRS₁ is due to an
attempt to repair the metre.

1002. Ensample whi se now þese wyse clerkes
(Cl ye for now; Dig om. now; S₂ says for se; S₂ Dig pe wyse)
Rest: . . . grete clerkes
Wyse is apparently a scribal substitution due to the influence of
whi se.

1012. But hotter weex his loue and þus he seyde
Rest: . . . and thanne he seyde
(Ph þo for thannæ; H₄ om. he)

1050. . . pat þis auuant . . . (+H₃)
Rest: Omit þat

1057. To here þat to þe deth me may comaunde (— DS₁)
(A second to inserted later)
Rest: . . . may me . . .

1064. And fynde a tyme per-to and a place (+JCx)
A om. second a)
Rest: . . . a space
(H₄H₅ om. second a)
The phrase tyme and space occurs in Cant. Tales, Prologue 35.
J and Cx agree with γ in substituting a more familiar locution.

F
An examination of the list of \( \gamma \) group readings, 33 in all, just given, makes clear the following facts:

1. That the MSS. of this group are descended from a common ancestor, not Chaucer's original, is shown by their agreement in a number of readings which are manifestly erroneous. The clearest cases of error are indicated in the list by a dagger (†).

2. Of the variant readings not manifestly corrupt, none is of such a character as to suggest intelligent revision. Their trivial character is in striking contrast with the variants exhibited by \( \alpha \). Often transcriptional probability makes against them, e.g. in the substitution of a normal for an inverted word-order in 495, 565, and 834. In only one line, 386, is the \( \gamma \) reading preferable to that of the remaining MSS.; and there the alternative reading, though metrically less smooth, is quite defensible.

3. In several instances, lines 143, 167, 259, \( \gamma \) occupies a position midway between \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \). It would seem that the \( \gamma \) original failed to incorporate the whole of an indicated revision.

Within the group of \( \gamma \) MSS. a close relation exists between \( S_2 \) and Dig, both of which are clearly copies of a very corrupt descendant of the \( \gamma \) original. This relationship, already illustrated by the variants given in the list of \( \gamma \) readings above, may be further exemplified by the following list of representative readings selected from among a great number of similar instances. There is hardly a stanza in which the relationship is not exhibited. No useful purpose would be served by making this list complete.

\[ S_2 \text{Dig.} \]

119. \( \ldots \) whil you good thynk \( \ldots \)

Rest: \( \ldots \) good list \( \ldots \)

†327. Omit alle.

Rest: And alle his chere \( \ldots \)

†388. And what arte myght gare hire to loue be soght

Rest: And what to arten hire to loue he soughte

†465. \( S_2 \) No he desyred none oper fode no brede

Dig: No he desired no nothire food nor bred

Rest: Ne yn hym desir noon opere fownes bredde

(H5 Ne hym desyred noon other brede)

For other variants on this line cf. above, p. 56.
Readings of $S_2$ Dig and of AD.

†485. And made his mete his foo & eke his drynke sorow
(Dig om. his foo)

Rest: And made his mete his foo and ek his sorwe
(Cp. foo inserted by later hand)

†531. I shal be scornyd a thousand time

Rest: I shal by Iaped ben a . . .

592. To take a parte of wo . . .

Rest: To entreparten wo . . .

616. And late me dye . . .

Rest: And lat me sterue . . .

†631. A whetstone es no brynnynge Instrument

Rest: . . . no keruyng Instrument.

†806. . . . opyn here . . .

Rest: Thou mayst allone here . . .

That neither $S_3$ nor Dig is derived from the other is proved by the fact that each is guilty of corruptions where the other preserves the correct reading. Cf. the readings in lines 610, 620, 624, 640 in Specimen Extracts.

Less striking in its manifestation, but nevertheless unmistakable, is the relationship existing between A and D. This relationship is attested by the following agreements:

AD.

†38. And for hem . . . (+ $S_2$)

Rest: And ek for hem . . .

94. . . . pat lived in gret penaunce (+ $S_1 + a$)

Rest: . . . pat was . . .

†124. And she hym thanketh . . . (+ $H_3$)

Rest: And she hym ponked . . .

The Italian reads Ella di questo il ringrazio, Fil. 1. 14.

205. . . . is nought pis . . . (+ Gg$H_5 + H_3$)

Rest: . . . is pis nought . . .

224. . . . as my feeres drawe (+ a)

Rest: . . . with my feeres drawe
(Cl felawes)
The Manuscript Relations in Book I.

405. That cometh of it . . .
    Rest: . . . of hym . . .
    (H₂Ph of love)

407. Omit at
    Rest: . . . at myn owene lust
    (α yn myn owne lust)

†409. If harme agree me . . . (+ H₄)
    Rest: If harme agree me . . .
    (H₅ angre; Cx angree)

The Italian reads S’a mal mio grado, Petrarch, Sonnet 88.

†490. A That the hot fire of loue hym for brende
    DS₁ . . . so sore hym brende
    Rest: . . . hym brende.
    (H₅ hym ded brende)

688. And paraunter ;it . . .
    Rest: And yet paraunter . . .
    (GgH₅Cx parauenture)

797. . . . of no thyng list recche
    Rest: . . . lest of no lyng recche
    (H₄ list of lif nothyng rechch)

808. . . . shouldest pou . . . (+ GgH₅)
    (A xuldest)
    Rest: . . . shaltow . . .

†878. . . . for Iesus name . . . (+ R)
    (DR Ihus; A His over erasure)
    Rest: . . . for Ioues name . . .

943. Wolde now . . .
    Rest: Now wolde . . .

†972. Or honur hast . . .
    Rest: Or ouer haste oure bope laboure shende
    (Gg Or for euere hast pou; H₅ lacking)

988. . . . ay be redy
    Rest: . . . be ay redy
    (H₃CxGg(H₅) be al redy; H₂ al day be redy; Ph alway be redy.)
It will be noticed that the variant readings in which A and D agree are of a very trivial character, such as simple transpositions and the omission or alteration of single words. Into such errors it is easy for a scribe to fall, however pure the text before him. So obvious are many of the errors that in several instances they are shared independently by unrelated MSS. Only in lines 94 and 490 is there any question of conscious contamination. We should not be justified in arguing a relationship of A and D on such evidence were it not that the instances are fairly numerous, and that the relationship is attested later in the poem by evidence much less equivocal. The common ancestor of A and D was a \( \gamma \) MS., singularly free from corruptions other than those it inherited from the \( \gamma \) original.

Finally, before leaving the \( \gamma \) group, must be considered a series of instances in which two or more of the units which make up \( \gamma \) agree in a reading not shared by the remainder.

**Scattering Agreements of \( \gamma \) MSS.**

45. \[\text{CpS}_2 \text{Dig} + \beta \]

And send hem myght hire ladies so to plese

\[\text{ClH}_1 \text{ADS}_1 + \alpha\]

\[\ldots \text{hire loues so to plese}\]

(\[\text{ClH}_1 \text{S}_1 \text{H}_5 \text{Cx for for so} ; \text{R om. so} ; \text{H}_1 \text{loueres}\])

To explain the division of the \( \gamma \) MSS. between the \( \alpha \) and the \( \beta \) reading we must assume that the \( \gamma \) parent first wrote the unrevised reading, *loues*, and then corrected to *ladies*, but without making the correction clear, and that \[\text{ClH}_1 \text{ADS}_1\] failed to notice the correction.

†98. \[\text{ClS}_2 \text{Dig} + \text{Cx}\]

Of ony frend to whom she dorst make hire mone

\[\text{(Cx And nyst to whome she durst make her mone ; S}_2 \text{Dig om. hire)}\]

**Rest**: Omit make. \( (\text{R was best to mone ; a om. hire})\)

The \( \gamma \) original must have contained both *make* and *hire*, probably with *make* marked for deletion. \[\text{S}_2 \text{Dig chose make} \] rather than *hire*, while Cl-retained both words. Note that \( \alpha \) omits *hire*. *She durst mone* would have been perfectly satisfactory. In Cx this whole stanza, and the next, is so extensively altered, that one cannot safely argue from any of its readings. Its agreement with Cl may well be due to accident.
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168. ClS₂ Dig Ye bope for the seson and for pe feste  
(S₂ Dig om. Ye)  
H₂ Ph + H₅ + A ... & eke for pe feest  
(H₅ ek inserted above)  

Rest: ... and pe feste  
(Cx om. Ye; and the hye feste)  

The repetition of *for* from the earlier part of the line is so easy an error that it may well have been made by several scribes independently. It would look as though the *γ* original read *for pe feste* with *for* marked for deletion. Note the *γ* reading in 167.

†234. CpS₂ DigS₁ To seruen loue . . .  

Rest: To scornen loue . . .  

Though *seruen* is certainly wrong, it is at first glance very plausible, and the two words are closely similar in form. The *γ* original may have first written *seruen*, and then corrected it to *scornen*.

253. CpH₁ And sith it may . . .  
S₂ Dig And now sith it may . . . (Dig A for And)  

Rest: Now sith it may . . .  

Lines 250, 251, 252, 254 all begin with *And*. The *γ* original must have written *And*, and then corrected to *Now*.

†272. ClCpS₂ Dig His eye procede . . .  
(Cp sighte *for* eye; S₂ Dig proceded)  

Rest: . . . perced . . .  

For further variants see p. 47. The error could easily arise from misreading an abbreviation.

497. ClAD Nor of his peyne . . .  

Rest: Or of his peyne . . .  

516. CpH₁ S₂ Dig + H₂ And held vs . . .  

Rest: That held vs . . .  

†532. CpS₂ DigA More than that folk of whos folie men ryme  
(S₂ Dig the folk)  

Rest: . . . pat fol . . .  
(RCx a fool; H₄ Ph on of whos foly; H₂ he of whos foly)  

We must assume that D has corrected an obvious error.
539. \[\text{CpS}_2\text{Dig} \ldots \text{ye me heete} \]
\[\text{Rest :} \quad \ldots \text{ye me byhete} \]

†614. \[\text{CpS}_2\text{Dig} + \text{GgH}_5 + \text{RHH}_4 \text{For harmes myghten fallen...} \]
\[\text{H}_4 \text{that myht fallyn} \]
\[\text{Rest: For harmes myghte folwen...} \]

The Italian, \textit{Che noia men potria seguire}, \textit{Fil. 2. 8}, establishes \textit{folwen} as the correct reading. The error is so easy a one that several scribes may well have fallen into it independently.

†767. \[\text{ClCpH}_1\text{S}_2\text{Dig} + J \text{Dorstestow pat I tolde in hire eere} \]
\[\text{(Cl telle for tolde)} \]
\[\text{ADS}_1\text{RCxH}_2\text{Ph} \quad \ldots \text{that I tolde it...} \]
\[\text{GgH}_5\text{H}_3\text{H}_4 \quad \ldots \text{pat I told hyre...} \]

The context requires \textit{hyre} rather than \textit{it}; for the next line supplies a direct object for \textit{tolde}. Apparently the \(\gamma\) original dropped \textit{hire}. \(\text{ADS}_1\) then wrongly emended the defective line by supplying \textit{it}, the erroneous reading of \(\text{H}_2\text{Ph}\) and \(\text{RCx}\). \(J\) has independently fallen into the \(\gamma\) error.

†984. \[\text{ClA And yet...} \]
\[\text{Rest : As yet...} \]

The agreement of \(\text{Cl}\) and \(\text{A}\) may well be fortuitous. Otherwise, we must assume that \(\text{D}\) has corrected an obvious slip.

In the list of readings just given the most frequent combination is that of \(\text{Cp}\) and \(\text{S}_2\text{Dig}\); but we are not justified in arguing from this evidence for a closer relationship between any two of the units which make up the \(\gamma\) group. Rather we must assume that the \(\gamma\) original contained a number of corrections, and that in this line or that individual \(\gamma\) MSS. failed to incorporate the correction. These cases do not at any rate invalidate the evidence on which the existence of \(\gamma\) is based.

We have now to consider the MSS. belonging to the group which we have called \(\beta\). They are: \(J, \text{Gg, H}_5, \text{H}_3, \text{R, and Cx, all the MSS.}, \text{that is, which have not previously been classified under} \alpha \text{or}\ \gamma\). (With them, as will be seen presently, is occasionally associated \(\text{H}_4\), a MS. which normally presents \(\alpha\) readings.) These MSS. agree as against \(\alpha\) in presenting the revised readings, and in avoiding the numerous errors of the \(\alpha\) original, and agree as against \(\gamma\) in avoiding the readings which constitute that group. It will be remembered that in the case of several revised readings
\( \gamma \) incorporates only part of the revision. In these cases, then, \( \beta \) alone presents the correct revised reading. These cases, already fully discussed, are found in lines 45, 104, 143, 164, 167, and 259. If we have been correct in concluding that the \( \beta \) reading in these lines is the authentic revised text, we can, of course, base no argument for the relationship of the \( \beta \) MSS. on these agreements. Apart from these lines, there are very few instances in which the \( \beta \) MSS. agree in a variant reading as against the rest. I have been able to find but a half-dozen, most of which are far from striking. The list of them follows.

\[ \text{JGgH}_5\text{H}_3\text{RCx (}\beta\text{)} \]

60. Assegeden wel ten yer or they stente \((+ \text{H}_2^3)\)

\[ \text{Rest : } \ldots \text{ neigh ten yer } \ldots \]

Note that \( \text{H}_2^3 \) adopts the \( \beta \gamma \) reading in 34, 57, 58, 564, where \( \text{Ph} \) and \( \text{H}_4 \) present an unrevised text. Perhaps, therefore, \textit{wel} is a revision reading not incorporated by \( \gamma \). The variation is so slight, however, that the substitution may well be due to scribal carelessness.

71. So when \( \text{pat} \) kalcas knew by calculynge

\[ \text{(H}_5^5 \text{pat whan ; Cx om. pat)} \]

\[ \text{Rest : } \ldots \text{ this Calkas } \ldots \]

347. And deme it harm by hir opynioun \((-\text{Cx})\)

\[ \text{(R lacking)} \]

\[ \text{Rest : } \ldots \text{ yn hire opinyoun} \]

361. And thought ay so on hir with outen lette \((+\text{H}_4)\)

\[ \text{(Gg so ay on hire ; H}_5^5 \text{ om. so)} \]

\[ \text{Rest : } \ldots \text{ ay on here so } \ldots \]

\[ \text{(H}_2^2 \text{Ph on her so ay ; S}_2^2 \text{Dig om. so)} \]

†585. Hath ben or this \ldots \(-\text{Cx, + D})\)

\[ \text{(Gg er for or ; H}_3^3 \text{ lacking)} \]

\[ \text{Rest : Hath ben or is } \ldots \]

\[ \text{(S}_1^1 \text{ his for is)} \]

719. \ldots gyle \((-\text{Cx})\)

\[ \text{Rest : } \ldots \text{ wyle} \]

These variants are of a very trivial sort, such as may easily occur independently in several MSS. In 347 R is lacking, and in
585 H₃. In 347, 585, and 719 Cx deserts the β reading. The evidence for a common descent of the β MSS. from some MS. other than Chaucer's revised original, if not negligible, is at least far from convincing.

Before seeking further evidence, it will be convenient to notice the close relationship existing between Gg and H₅, which is attested by the following selected list of agreements:

GgH₅

(Lines 1–70 are lacking in Gg owing to the loss of a leaf.)

†93. Unwyst of þis false & wekede dede (+ Cx)
Rest: Al vnwist . . .
(a Vnknowyn ; D Al men wiste)

GgH₅ have changed the Vnknowyn of a to Unwyst, but have failed to add Al. Note that Cx shares the error.

176. As was Crisseyde folk seyde euerychone
(Gg fok)
Rest: . . . as folk seyde . . .
(a as þei seydyn).

186. Byholdynge alle þe ladyis . .
Rest: Byholdynge ay þe ladyis . . .
(H₄ om. ay)

197. I haue pardeux herd of þoure lyuynge
(Gg herd inserted above line ; H₅ herd pardeux)
Rest: I haue herd told pardieux . . .
(H₂ Ph om. pardieux)

280. . . . his forme pleyinge chere
(H₅ formest ; Gg pleynynge)
Rest: . . . his firste . . .
(H₄ his herte with iapyng cheer)

350. Now wel is hym . . .
Rest: Lord wel is hym . . .
(H₄ And wel)

†426. Omit She be
Rest: She be I not which þat ye do me serue
(H₂ Ph var. See above, p. 56.)
But J|anne felt his troylys so |meche wo
(Gg fel to for felt; H5 so inserted above later)
Rest: ... such wo

†502. For pat cause he jouste his herte |blede
(H5 his herte ded blede)
Rest: For pat hym pought he felt his herte blede
(γ For which; J For pat cause; RH4 he thought; H5Cx lacking)
The GgH5 reading is clearly wrong. In GgH5 the construction
requires the preterite bledde, but the rime words are drede and
hede, with long close e. H5 tries to emend by writing ded blede.
Note that J shares in the error of writing For pat cause, but
retains he |felle. Cf. below, p. 77.

592. ... god disport
(H5 good; Gg second writing of stanza good)
Rest: ... glad desport

†611. ... for now hast jou myn wo
Rest: ... wostow ...
(R I wot)

†623. How del mayst jou bryngyn me to blysse
(H5 dell)
Rest: How deuel ...
(A om. deuel)

†719. Gg And sey jou wilt it do for no gyle
H5 And as pow wolist I do it for no gyle
Rest: And sithe pow wost I do it for no wyle
(JH3R gyle; H4 And weel thou wost I am with oute wyle)

†914. Gg And some wolde frete meche here mone alon
H5 And some wolde frete and be hemself alone
Rest: And some wolde mucche here mete allone
(Cl wole; H2Ph brede for mete; A he meten)

†938. And neuere more wele iape whil I leue
(H5 wole I iape)
Rest: And I shal neuere more whil I leue
(For a reading see p. 52.)
Iape is taken over from line 937.
(Lines 953–1029 are lacking in H5.)
1032. \( \text{pat myn lady I desyryn schulde} \)
\( (H_5 \text{ pat I my lady}) \)
Rest: That to my lady I desiren shoelde
\( (H_2Ph \text{ pow for to my, om. I}) \)

(Lines 1044–1092 are lacking in Gg.)

The readings just given, the list of which might be considerably extended, make clear that Gg and H\_5 are descended from a common ancestor, a lost MS. of the \( \beta \) type marred by a good many corruptions. Each, as may be seen from the variants given above, has independently attempted to emend the more obvious corruptions. Each has also introduced new corruptions of its own.

No other relationship, such as that which exists between Gg and H\_5, can be established between any other MSS. of the \( \beta \) group. I at first suspected a closer relationship between R and Cx; but in support of such a relationship I have been able to gather no stronger evidence than that presented in the following list of agreements, which I give by way of contrast to the clear evidence for the relationship of Gg and H\_5.

**RCx**

27. Han felt how pat loue . . .
\( (Cx \text{ om. } \text{pat}) \)
Rest: Han felt pat loue . . .
\( (a \text{ Fownde how love}) \)

R and Cx retain *how* from the unrevised *a* reading. Cf. above, p. 36.

53. For now I wol got . . .
Rest: For now wol I gon . . .
\( (H_2Ph \text{ For I will now go}; H_4S_2Dig \text{ For I will go}) \)

†56. . . . or he deyde
Rest: . . . er she deyde

The context shows that the pronoun refers to Criseyde.

†67. *Omit* pat (+ H\_2\^3PhDig)
Rest: That in science so expert was pat he

165. *Omit* so (+ S\_2Dig)
Rest: And namely so many . . .
\( (a \text{ And pat so meny}) \)
375. *Omit and*

*Rest:* Al were it wist but yn prys and vp born

849. . . . anon fortune . . . (+ Gg)

. . . fortune anoon . . .

(H₂Ph *om.* anoon)

957. . . . & alwey hide (+ H₂Ph)

*Rest:* . . . . and alday hide

(H₄ & ay weel yede)

The strange variant *yede* in H₄ suggests that α may have read *alwey*.

The evidence of this list is quite insufficient to support any argument for a relationship between R and Cx. In several cases the variant consists in retaining an H₂Ph reading. In every case the variant is so trifling that the error can well have been made independently by R and Cx, both of them copies which bristle with corruptions of a much graver sort. Moreover, this evidence, such as it is, is contradicted by that which we shall see in the next list.

If there is no clear evidence of relationships among the β MSS. other than that between Gg and H₅, there is, none the less, a considerable number of instances in which two or more β MSS. agree as against the rest. But, as in the case of the scattering agreements among the γ MSS. already recorded, the combinations are perpetually shifting. These scattering agreements must now be considered.

**Scattering Agreements of β MSS.**

86. H₃RCx . . . . and openly was spokyn

*Rest:* . . . . and generally was spoken

The Italian reads *generalmente, Fil.* 1. 10.

106. JR + H₂Ph . . . . herde al day . . .

*Rest:* . . . . alday herde . . .

109. JGgH₅H₈ In widewis habit blak of samyt broun

*Rest:* In widewes habit large . . .

The contradiction between *blak* and *broun* would seem to mark this reading as an error. The Italian, *In abito dolente, Fil.* 1. 12, does not help us. The phrase *In widewes habite blak* is found in 170, where the Italian reads *in bruna vesta, Fil.* 1. 19.
144. $H_3C\times GgH_5 + A$ For my mater... 
Rest: 
Fro my mater... 
(a Of my mater)

195. $JGgC\times S_1$ ... she slepeth ful softe 
Rest: 
... she slepeth softe 

*Ful* has been anticipated from 196. The error may well have been made independently. Note that $H_5$ omits *ful*.

204. $H_3GgH_5 + H_2Ph$ ... caste vpe his browe 
Rest: 
... pe browe

205. $H_3GgC\times$ ... wele spoken 
Rest: 
... wysly spoken 

Again $H_5$ has corrected the $GgH_5$ reading.

249. $GgH_5R + H_4$ ... most confortid & esed 
Rest: 
... conforted most and esed 

($H_2$ om. most; $S_1$ conforted and most esed)

399. $JRC\times$ ... ye may it fynden heere 
Rest: 
... he may...

($H_3$ lacking)

†502. $JGgH_5$ For pat cause hym thought... 
Rest: 
For pat hym pought...

($\gamma$ For which; $RH_4$ he thought; $H_3C\times$ lacking)

587. $GgH_5C\times$ ... swich a care 
Rest: 
... so gret a care 

Swich is repeated from 586.

†603. $GgH_5RC\times S_2Dig$ Loue a\"zens whiche...
Rest: 
Loue ayens pe which...

†614. $GgH_5R + H_4 + CpS_2Dig$ For harmys my\"tyn fallyn...

($H_4$ that myht fallyn)

Rest: 
... folwen...

($H_3$ lacking)

The Italian reads *seguire*, *Fil.* 2. 8. See above, p. 71.

†630. $JGgH_5$ A fool may ek a wisman gyde 
(J kyde)

Rest: 
... a wys man ofte gide 

(Cl ek ofte a wys man; $D$ eke may; $H_3$ lacking)

672. $GgH_5H_3C\times R + H_4$ Omit yet ($GgH_5$ I can; $Gg$ pat for pyn) 
Rest: But to pyn help yet somewhat kan I seye
681. J\textsubscript{H}\textsubscript{3}CxR + H\textsubscript{4} And tel me plat now what is thenchesoun  
\textit{(J tenchesoun)}

\textbf{Rest:} \textit{Omit now}

(\textit{Cl pyn enchesoun; AS\textsubscript{1} Ph pe enchesoun; Gg pyn entencioun; H\textsubscript{5} py sorowe soun; Cp But for And})

Since \textit{plat} is a monosyllable (cf. \textit{Pardoner's Tale} 648, where it rimes with \textit{that}) the metre requires either \textit{now} or \textit{pe enchesoun}. Probably \textit{now} is a \(\beta\) correction not adopted by GgH\textsubscript{5}.

737. JGgH\textsubscript{5} + H\textsubscript{4} + Cl . . . no worde . . .

\textbf{Rest:} . . . no thyng . . .

\textit{Worde} is repeated from 736.

757. JGgH\textsubscript{5}R + H\textsubscript{4} For oother cure . . .

\textbf{Rest:} Nor oper cure . . .

\textit{(ACx Non; H\textsubscript{2} PhD Ne)}

Line 756 begins with \textit{For}.

767. H\textsubscript{5}GgH\textsubscript{5} + H\textsubscript{4} . . . I tolde her in hir ere

\textit{H\textsubscript{2} PhRCxADS\textsubscript{1} . . . y told it . . .

\(\gamma + J\) \textit{Omit first her.}

For a discussion of this line see above, p. 71.

\[\dagger\] 768. JGgH\textsubscript{5} \textit{Omit pi self}

\textbf{Rest:} Thi wo sith pow darst not pi self for feere

\[\dagger\] 832. JH\textsubscript{3} Cx . . . or pat I be ful longe

\textbf{Rest:} . . . or pat it be . . .

\[\dagger\] 874. H\textsubscript{5} Cx + H\textsubscript{4} \textit{Omit fo}

\textit{(H\textsubscript{5} I-called)}

\textbf{Rest:} Than is my swete fo called Criseyde

We must assume either that Gg has corrected the error, or, more probably, that H\textsubscript{5} has independently made the same error as Cx and H\textsubscript{4}.

\[\dagger\] 907. JGgH\textsubscript{5} The sholde neuere in loue han tid thus fayre a grace

\textit{(Gg pere for The; H\textsubscript{3} lacking)}

\textbf{Rest:} \textit{Omit in loue}

\textit{In loue} is repeated from 906.

\[\dagger\] 976. H\textsubscript{3} For this haue I ofte herde seyd and lerede

\textit{Cx . . . herde seyd oft of lered}

\(a + R\) For pis have y hered seyd of olde lered

\(\gamma + J\) . . . of wyse lered

\textit{Gg(H\textsubscript{5}) . . . herd seyd of leryd}

See the full discussion of this line on p. 52 above.
988. $H_2CxGg(H_5)$ ... be al reddy
Rest: ... be ay reddy

(A D ay be; $H_2$ al day be reddy; Ph alwey be reddy)

1001. JR + $S_1$ ... and moost his foos ay greue

Rest: Omit ay

(ClCp$H_1S_2$DigA hise foos to greue)

For discussion of this line see above, p. 65.

1007. $H_3Cx$ And strenget feithed as I vnderstonde

(Cx be as)

Rest: ... feyped ben I vnderstonde

The $\beta$ original must first have written as and then corrected to ben. $H_3$ has failed to notice the correction; Cx has taken both be and as.

†1024. $H_3Cx$ Lest that the Churle falle owte of the mone

($H_3$ at for that)

Rest: Lest pat pe Cherl may falle out ...

(Cl wole for may; $H_2$Ph om. pat)

Cherl is properly monosyllabic. (O.E. ceorl.)

1057. $JH_3$ Til hir ...

Rest: To here ...

Of the various combinations recorded in the list just given that of $JGgH_5$ is the most strikingly attested. The combination is found in lines 502, 630, 737, 768, 907; and in all but the third of these instances the reading is manifestly corrupt. The combination of $JGgH_5H_3$ is found in 109, and $JGgH_5R$ in 757. Moreover, both J and Gg$H_5$ are found in a number of other combinations. In 767 and 976 J is associated with $\gamma$. We have already noticed the tendency of Gg$H_5$ and of R to retain a readings. In one striking instance, line 640, an a reading is retained by $JGgH_5$ (see above, p. 50). Unless we are to assume a far-reaching process of contamination, an improbable assumption when the variants in question are for the most part so trivial in character, there is but one reasonable explanation of these phenomena. The $\beta$ original must have been a MS. into which had been written a number of corrections. In many cases these corrections must
have been indicated in such a fashion that a careless scribe was in
danger of overlooking them, and consequently of copying the
erroneous readings. From this MS. are descended along inde-
pendent lines of transmission the five units which compose $\beta$: 
GgH$_5$, J, R, H$_3$, and Cx. In one line an uncorrected reading was
taken over by the ancestors of H$_3$ and of Cx, in another by the
ancestors of J and of GgH$_5$, etc. To a confused reading in the
$\beta$ original may also be due some of the unique variants, found
only in a single extant MS., which are so frequent in MSS. of the
$\beta$ group. Moreover, since individual units or combinations of
units of the $\beta$ group occasionally retain a readings, we must
assume that these a readings were found in the $\beta$ original, but
corrected between the lines, or in the margin, to the normal $\beta$
reading.

It will be remembered how few are the instances in which all
six of the $\beta$ MSS. agree in a reading against the rest. Indeed,
the evidence on which we are justified in associating them into a
single group is only that of the scattering agreements just given.
It will follow, then, that the $\beta$ original was so carefully corrected
that, with its corrections, it presents a text virtually free from
manifest corruptions. Such a successful correction must have
been the work of a very careful and intelligent editor. All the
facts can be best accounted for on the hypothesis—to be discussed
later—that the $\beta$ original was fundamentally an a MS. in which
had been made all the changes required by the revision, and in
which all the errors of its original scribe had been carefully
corrected.

From this same revised and corrected $\beta$ original was apparently
derived also the $\gamma$ original. $\gamma$, it will be remembered, fails at
times to incorporate the whole of a revision, precisely as do indi-
vidual units of $\beta$. In the list of $\gamma$ readings will be found a number
of instances in which the $\gamma$ reading is shared by one or more $\beta$
MSS. These instances are exactly analogous to those in which
two or more of the $\beta$ units agree in a variant reading as against
the rest. It would appear, then, that the $\gamma$ original is to be
regarded, throughout Book I, as a $\beta$ MS. This very important
conclusion must be discussed at full length after we have had a
chance to appraise the evidence furnished by the remaining
books.

The conclusions at which we have arrived as to the relationship
of the MSS. in Book I may be graphically presented in the following form:

O\textsuperscript{1} represents Chaucer's original autograph, of which \textit{a} is a copy. O\textsuperscript{2} represents a copy of the original autograph, carefully corrected, and then extensively revised.

The only serious evidence which tends to impair the correctness of this conclusion is found in the vagaries of H\textsubscript{4}. Though H\textsubscript{4} shares in all the significant \textit{a} readings, it shows a tendency, more marked in the latter part of Book I, to associate itself with MSS. of the \textit{b} group. In the list of scattering agreements of \textit{b} MSS. (pp. 76-79) H\textsubscript{4} agrees with two or more \textit{b} MSS. in the following lines: 249, \textsuperscript{+}614, 672, 681, 737, 757, 767, \textsuperscript{+}874. In no case is the variant \textit{a} a very striking one; but the number of instances is considerable. Moreover, there are a number of lines in which H\textsubscript{4} agrees with a single \textit{b} MS. against the combined testimony of all the remaining MSS. These cases are presented in the following table:

**Scattering Agreements of H\textsubscript{4}**

\textsuperscript{+}200. H\textsubscript{4}H\textsubscript{3} \ldots the kepyng of dotances

Rest:

\ldots which doutances

235. H\textsubscript{4} The fredam of your herte to hym make thrall

R \ldots hertes maken-thralle

Rest:

\ldots hertes to hym pralle

The reading of H\textsubscript{4} is a conflation of the normal reading and R.
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386. $H_4R$ And ouer al this ful moche more he thought

$\gamma$ . . . yet mucho more . . .

Rest: Omit ful

(Ph om. al)

This line is discussed above, p. 62.

405. $H_4Cl$ . . . may me so goodly thinke

Rest: . . . may to me saury thinke

(R may me so saury)

Note the connection with R. The substitution of *goodly* for *sauory* in $H_4$ and Cl must be regarded as an accidental coincidence.

498. $H_4H_2^3R$ Omit pis.

Rest: pis Troylus.

Cf. above, p. 59.

613. $H_4Cx$ . . . I tolde it neuer to no mo

(Cx om. to)

Rest: . . . to mo

725. $H_4Cx$ . . . he laide his ere

Rest: . . . he lente his eere

($H_2PhGg$ bent)

833. $H_4$ To peces ellis do me drawe & sethe the honge

Cx And ellis to pecis do me drawe and honge

Rest: To pieces do me drawe and sithen honge

(A om. sithen; Gg sythe me honge)

884. $H_4R + D$ Of hir estat ne gladder of hir speche

(D ne of hir speche)

Rest: . . . ne gladder ne of speche

(Cl ne a gladder; $H_2PhCx$ om. second ne; $H_1S_1$ nor for second ne)

889. $H_4R$ A kyngis herte bi heris semyth a wrecche

Rest: . . . semeth by hires . . .

($H_2PhGgH_3A$ by her; D to hir)

Though none of these variants is very striking, taken together they suggest some sort of a cross-relation between $H_4$ and R and $H_4$ and Cx. In the only case, line 498, where $H_2^3$ exists, it also goes with R, so that the relation may be assumed to involve the $H_4H_2^3$ parent. $H_2^3$ agrees with R in line 57 in reading *how*
instead of how pat, a trifling agreement, and with $H_3$ and $S_1$ in line 5 in reading I parte you froye instead of I parte froye. In both these cases $H_4$ is normal. For the present we must be content to record this cross-relation without an attempt at explanation.

CHAPTER III.

THE MANUSCRIPT RELATIONS IN BOOK II.

The MS. relations in Book II present a problem of peculiar complication, much more difficult of solution than that offered in Book I. Though the variant readings in which two or more of the MSS. agree are very numerous, they are for the most part of a rather trifling character. Very few are the instances in which there is clear ground for regarding the variation as due to deliberate revision. Such clear revision readings as exist occur between lines 701 and 1113. Moreover, several MSS., notably GgH$5$ and $H_4$, alternate in their allegiance between $H_2 Ph$ on the one hand, and the $\beta$ group on the other, to such an extent that the distinction between $a$ and $\beta$ is all but obliterated. Of the three main groups, $\gamma$ alone maintains its integrity. It is represented by the same MSS. as in Book I, save that at about line 617 $S_1$ ceases to belong to the group, and that at line 1034, where a new handwriting begins, $H_3$ joins it.

It will be convenient, then, to begin by presenting the list of variant readings which characterize $\gamma$. It is as follows:

$$\text{ClCpH}_1 S_2 \text{DigAD} [S_1] [H_3]$$

(After line 617 $S_1$ ceases to be regularly a $\gamma$ MS. Its occasional agreements with $\gamma$ after that point are specifically noted. $H_3$ becomes regularly a $\gamma$ MS. at line 1034.)

37. \ldots or alwey o manere

Rest: \ldots ne alwey \ldots

(JH$3$ nor alwey)

39. If pat pei ferd yn loue \ldots (+ Cx)

(ClCx om. pat)

Rest: Yif that men ferde \ldots
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51. . . blew and white and rede (− S₂ Dig S₁, + J)
Rest: Omit first and. (H₂ Ph var.)

69. . . Tireux . . .
(H₁ Tryeux; A Cireux)
Rest: . . . Tereus . . .
(J Tereux; H₃ Terous; H₅ Terius; H₂ Ph Thereus)

†86. With al youre faire bok & al þe companye
(Cp and al the faire compaignie; S₁ om. al; A the for youre)
Rest: Omit faire
(Cx om. first al; R eek for second al; H₅ youre for þe; H₄ & your companye)

A hypermetrical line in γ.

87. Ey vnclé myn welcome . . .
(D A for Ey)
Rest: Ey vnclé now . . .
(GgH₅H₄ om. now)

133. As help me god I not not what ye mene (− S₂ Dig, + H₃)
(S₁ I wote nat; A I not what it may mene; D I not what þat ye mene)
Rest: . . . I not what ye meene
(Gg as I not what; R So helpe me god as I not what)
Since not is monosyllabic, the αβ reading is metrically deficient.
Gg and R have attempted an emendation. Note the uncertainty in γ.

176. . . . no more . . .
Rest: . . . no thing . . .
(GgH₅H₄ nouȝt)

192. He myght haue wondred vpon Troylus
Rest: Omit He
γ has emended a nine-syllable line.

224. . . þus faire an auenture (− S₂ Dig)
(DS₁ so faire)
Rest: . . . so glade . . .
(H₅ S₂ Dig om. an)

†239 Y wys vnclé quod she grant mercy (− S₂ Dig, + H₃)
Rest: I wis my vnclé . . .
Readings Characteristic of $\gamma$. 85

272. There as . . . ($-S_2$Dig)

Rest: Wher as . . .

283. But yf . . .

Rest: And if . . .

286. But right his verray sloupe . . . ($-S_2$Dig)

Rest: . . . his owne slouthe . . .

The context favours owne rather than verray.

309. Now good Em for goddes loue I prey

(Cp And for Now)

Rest: Now my good Em . . .

(GgH$_5$ om. good)

A nine-syllable line in $\gamma$.

383. But alwey good nece . . .

Rest: But good nece alwey . . .

†406. Nece I bidde wisse yow no more sorwe

Rest: Omit Nece

A hypermetrical line in $\gamma$.

†432. I se ful wel pat ye sette lite of vs

(D on for of)

Rest: Omit ful

465. For myn estat lyth now in Iupartie

(Cl now lyth; $H_1$ in a Iupartye; $S_2$Dig in partye)

Rest: . . . lith in a Iupartye.

(JGgH$_6$PhCx om. a)

491. But may I truste wel pertro quod he

(Cl trust; D wel trust; A om. wel)

Rest: . . . to yow quod he

(H$_5$ om. wel)

508. In with pe paleys gardyn . . . ($-DS_2$Dig)

(H$_1$ In whiche)

Rest: With in . . .

516. And I perafter gan . . . ($-AD$)

JR And I afer gan . . .

AD And after gan I . . .

H$_2$Ph And yn a fere gan . . .

Rest: And I afer gan . . .
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Apparently JR alone retain the correct reading. See below, p. 119.

591. O mercy . . .
  Rest: A mercy . .

†597. . . . he was glad . . . (— AD, + H₂Ph)
  Rest: . . . so he was glad . . . (A as he; Gg how he; H₅ that he)

†617 For oþer wey is to the yate noon
  (ClDig is þer to the yate)
  Rest: . . . fro the yate non
  (J is ther fro; H₄ fro the yates is there non)
  The context makes clear that the correct reading is jro.
  (After line 617, S₁ ceases to be normally a γ MS₅)

†737 Of al þis ilke noble town þe þryftiest (— S₂Dig)
  (A om. al)
  Rest: Omit ilke.
  (JRH₄ Of wommen in this world)

†745 Al wolde I pat noon wuste of þis þought
  (S₂Dig Al þif I wolde)
  Rest: . . . no man . .

801. And coyte hem þe þey seyn noon harm of me
  (H₁ hym for hem; AS₂(Dig) hem that sey)
  Rest: And coyte hem þat they seyn . . .
  (Gg om. they)

808. No þyng nacheueth . . .
  (ClD ne acheueth)
  Rest: No thing acheueth . . .
  (H₂Ph eschewip)

†815. . . . þere made many a wente
  (AD þere made þei; S₂(Dig) þer made þei)
  Rest: . . . they maden many a wente

816. Flexippe she . . . (+ S₁)
  Rest: Flexippe and she . .

91. The parfit blysse of loue why nay y wys (+ J)
  (D we for why)
  Rest: Omit why. (S₁ nay nay)
Readings Characteristic of $\gamma$.

†904. The dayes honour and pe heuenes heighe (-AD, +R)
(CpH$_1$ heye; S$_2$(Dig) hye heuenes ye; R hye)

Rest: the heuenes eye

937. ful faste (+ S$_1$)

Rest: so faste

943. and seyde lord so ye swete (- AD, + H$_2$ Ph)

Rest: Omit so

947. They spedde hem fro pe souer vnto bedde (+ S$_1$)
(ClAD om. pe)

Rest: and to bedde
(H$_2$Ph from her soper to her bed)

949. vpon his way he spedde (- DS$_2$(Dig))

Rest: him spedde
(H$_3$ here wey hem spedde; J spede)

†950 But Troilus poughte his herte bledde

Rest: But Troilus pat thought . . .
(H$_2$PhH$_4$GgH$_5$ om. But)

956. At short wordes pow shalt trowe me

Rest: truste in me
(H$_2$PhH$_4$ trust to me; RH$_5$ trust on me; Gg trostyn
in me; S$_1$ trusten me)

960. I haue . . . (- AD, + H$_3$)

Rest: . . . haue I . . .

963. And also . . .

Rest: And therto . . .

†977. A pousand Troyes who so pat me yaue (- AD)

Rest: A thousand Troyes . . .

The Italian reads: se donate Gli fosser mille Troie, Fil. 2. 81.

1005. Of myn owene hond write here right now (+ J)

Rest: Right of myn owene honde write her right now
(H$_2$PhH$_4$ write her now; Cx wryte to her now; S$_1$ to
hir; H$_5$ wryte hir as now)

1009. . . wil . . . (+ S$_1$)

. . . shal . . .

(At line 1034, with a change in handwriting, H$_3$ becomes a
$\gamma$ MS.)
1055. Of here hond...

Rest: Right of hir hond...

Cf. line 1005.

†1109. ... lok alwey ye fynde (— H₃)

Rest: ... lok alwey pat ye fynde

(GgR pat ye alwey fynde)

1113. For which I come to telle yow newe tidynge (- AH₃)

(Cl I am come; H₁ om. to; DS₂ Dig and for to)

Rest: For which come I to telle yow tidynge

(JH₄ For whi; R For thy; H₃CxH₅S₁A I come; H₉ to bringe you tydinges; H₅ and telle yow suche thingis; R to telle new tydinges)

If telle is given its full value as a disyllable, the γ reading is hypermetrical. Newe has apparently crept into the line from 1112. The participation of R in the reading new, and the variations of the other MSS., suggest that the confusion lies back of the γ original, and point to an error, subsequently corrected, in the common original of β and γ. Note the uncertainty as to I come or come I.

1143. ... pe grettest wonder

Rest: ... pe moste wonder

(All but H₄Gg most)

1202. And held hise hondes vp and sat on knowe (+ S₁)

(Cl honde; D hond; S₂(Dig) vp his hondes)

Rest: ... and fel on knowe

(H₅ & knelid lowe)

1225. She wolde fayne...

Rest: She wolde ay fayn...

(H₅ ay be fayen, be inserted above)

1240. But ye han played tyraunt...

Rest: ... the tirant...

(H₄ the ryrawnt)

1280. ... but for hire lakked routhe (— ADH₈)

(Dig om. lakked)

Rest: ... hir lakk of routhe

(H₄Cx om. hir; R the for hir)
Readings Characteristic of \( \gamma \).

\[ \text{†1291.} \quad \text{And whi for shame and it were ek to soone (} + \ S_1) \]
\( \text{(H}_5 \text{ eke it were)} \]

Rest: And whi for speche . . .
\( \text{(H}_2 \text{Ph For why; J om. ek; Cx eke it were; H}_5 \text{ for speche yt were not to don; H}_4 \text{ And whi for this} \)
\& that dowey my downe)

The context makes clear that \textit{for speche} is the correct reading.

\[ \text{1316.} \quad \text{Yf pow do forth with al pi besynesse (} + \ S_1) \]

Rest: So pat thow do forth with thy bysynesse
\( \text{(H}_2 \text{PhGg om. with; H}_4 \text{ weel for with; J al inserted} \)
\( \text{above by contemporary hand; R So thow thyself do forth thy bysynesse)} \]

\[ \text{1344.} \quad \ldots \text{he wrot somewhat . . .} \]
\( \text{JRCxS}_1 \text{H}_5 \ldots \text{he somewhat wrot . . .} \)
\( \text{(J what inserted above by scribe)} \)
\( \text{H}_2 \text{PhH}_4 \text{Gg . . . sunwhat he wrote . . .} \]

\[ \text{1347.} \quad \text{And after pat pese dees turnede on chaunces (} - \text{ AD)} \]
\( \text{(H}_3 \text{ om. pat, fallen for turnede; Dig And after this is tornyd)} \)

Rest:
\( \ldots \text{his dees . . .} \)
\( \text{(J hise; A dedes)} \)

\[ \text{1387.} \quad \text{And . . . (} - \text{ H}_3) \]
\( \text{(S}_2 \text{Dig For . . .)} \)

Rest:
\( \text{But . . .} \)
\( \text{(H}_4 \text{ As . . .)} \)

\[ \text{1394.} \quad \text{But Troylus yet telle me yf pe lyste (} - \text{ AD)} \]
\( \text{(S}_2 \text{Dig om. yet; H}_1 \text{ pat for yet)} \)

Rest:
\( \ldots \text{now telle me . . .} \)
\( \text{(H}_2 \text{PhS}_1 \text{ om. now; Gg telle me now; AD telle now me; R om. me; S}_1 \text{R if pat the lest)} \)

\[ \text{1395.} \quad \text{A ping now which pat I shal axen pe (} - \text{ D, } + \ S_1) \]
\( \text{(H}_3 \text{ om. pat)} \)
\( \text{H}_2 \text{PhH}_5 \text{ A thing which y shal axyn pe (H}_5 \text{ at pe)} \)
\( \text{Gg A ping which pat I schal axens pe (axens corrected for axens)} \)
\( \text{RCx A thing the which pat . . .} \)
\( \text{J . . . which pat I schal now . . .} \)
\( \text{H}_4 \quad \ldots \text{which I shal now . . .} \)
\( \text{D . . . pat I shal now . . .} \)
In this line and in 1394 we have characteristic examples of the confusion which is frequent in Book II. In each line we must assume that in the original of all the MSS. the position of now had been transposed, with the result that certain copies of this original adopted one order, others another, and that still others omitted the word altogether. In 1394 the original omitted now as did also H₂Ph. Yet is a correction written into the original and so transmitted to ClCpH₁H₃; the reading of AD seems to be a lucky emendation of the deficient line.

1426.  No more to speke ... (+ S₁)
Rest:  No moore of this ...

1429, 1430. But telle me, pow þat wost alle þis matere,
How I myght best auaylen, now lat se (+ S₁)
(H₁ me inserted above by scribe; S₁D of for alle;
A how þou wost of this matere; H₃ myght I)
Rest: But telle me how, thow woost of this matere,
It myght best anaillen, now lat se

(H₂Ph how for þou wost; R how for thow knowest
this; Cx But tel me for thou wost thyss; Gg wolt
for wost; H₄ om. of; R It myght her best; H₂Ph
now availyn; H₄ om. It; Cx I myght hyr best)

Since myghte is properly a disyllable, the reading is slightly less metrical. The reading of A:

But telle me how þou wost of this matere
How I myght best auailen ...

would indicate that the trouble in the original began by prefixing How to line 1430. The repetition of how, preserved by A, was then corrected by substituting þou þat for how þou. Note that DS₁ preserve of instead of alle. The parenthetical thow woost of this matere led in H₂Ph and R to a scribal insertion of for, and in Cx to the substitution of for for how.

1439. ... to here cause ... (+ S₁)
Rest: ... in hir cause ... (Cx om. in)

1493. ... and forth gan for to wende (— H₃)
Rest: ... and forth he gan to wende
(Cx om. and)
Readings Characteristic of \( \gamma \).

†1504. But wel wot I \( \text{pow} \) art now \( \text{yn} \) drede (\( - \text{H}_3 \))

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Cl yow for } \text{pow} & \\
\text{H}_2 \text{PhH}_4 \text{RCx} & \ldots \text{ in a drede} \\
\text{(H}_4 \text{ om. in; Cx om. now)} & \\
\text{JGgH}_5 \text{H}_2 \text{S}_1 & \ldots \text{ pat thow art now in drede}
\end{align*}
\]

The \( \gamma \) reading is metrically deficient. Again we seem to have a correction made in the common original, a deletion of \( \alpha \) and an insertion of \( \text{pat} \), only partially incorporated in \( \gamma \).

†1585. To preyse a man and with prys hym reyse (\( + \text{H}_4 \))

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Rest:} & \quad \ldots \text{ and vp with pris } \ldots \\
\end{align*}
\]

The \( \gamma \) reading is metrically deficient.

1590. Herde al \( \text{pis} \) \( \text{pyng} \) Criseyde \( \text{wel} \) \( \text{ynowh} \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(S}_2 \text{Dig thyngis)} & \\
\text{Rest:} & \quad \text{Herde alwey this } \ldots \\
\text{(Gg om. pis; Cx Herd al this; H}_4 \text{ This herde alwey)} &
\end{align*}
\]

1602. Omit it (\( + \text{Cx} \))

1624. To ben hire helpe . . .

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Rest:} & \quad \text{To be hir fremd } \ldots \\
\text{(H}_2 \text{PhS}_1 \text{ fremdes)} &
\end{align*}
\]

†1663. He wole me telle . . . (\( - \text{ADH}_3 \))

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Rest:} & \quad \text{He wol yow telle } \ldots \\
\text{(GgRH}_4 \text{ it for yow)} &
\end{align*}
\]

The context makes clear that \( \text{yow} \) is the correct reading.

1665. . . of \( \text{pis} \) entent (\( - \text{H}_3, + \text{S}_1 \text{Cx} \))

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Rest:} & \quad \ldots \text{ of his entente}
\end{align*}
\]

†1669. And seyde ywys ye moste alweyes aryse

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(H}_3 \text{ And seid alweys ye wyst ye must aryse)} & \\
\text{Rest:} & \quad \ldots \text{ algate arise}
\end{align*}
\]

The context shows that \( \text{algate} \) is correct.

1746. And pough . . .

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Rest:} & \quad \text{That thogh } \ldots
\end{align*}
\]

In the list just given, a number of instances have been cited in which one or more of the \( \gamma \) MSS., notably \( \text{AD} \) and \( \text{S}_2 \text{Dig} \), fail to support the \( \gamma \) reading. A few other cases of partial \( \gamma \) readings, all of a trivial character, may be noted. In 221 \( \text{CpH}_1 \text{S}_2 \text{DigS}_1 + J \) omit and. In 1013 \( \text{CpH}_1 \) substitute \( \text{it} \) for \( \text{ne} \) (omitted by \( \text{H}_3 \) and \( \text{R} \)). In 1181 \( \text{ClCpH}_1 \text{D omit hym} \). In 1517 \( \text{CpH}_1 \text{S}_2 \text{DigH}_3 \).
begin the line with *And*, ClAD + $S_1 + H_2 Ph$ with *So*, and the remaining MSS. with *Soone*. In 1649 ClH$_1$ omit *hym*.

Within the $\gamma$ group, the close relationship of $S_2$ and Dig, already noted in Book I, has been illustrated by the variants given in the list of $\gamma$ readings. From among a multitude of additional instances may be noted the following: In 57 $S_2$ Dig omit *wyse*; in 225 omit *for love of god*; in 449 read *dyed* for *starf*; in 653 omit *lo*; in 678 omit *good*; in 1116 read *Whiche pat* for *With pat*; in 1240 read *alle* for *neigh*; in 1311 read *And bourded thus* for *Yburyed pus*.

A close relationship within the $\gamma$ group between A and D is attested by the following readings, in addition to those already cited among the variants in the list of $\gamma$ agreements:

**AD.**

21. ... *wel juge* ... (+ Cx)
   *Rest*: ... *Iuggen wel* ...

159. *Omit* pat (+ J)

185. ... *what he doth* (+ $H_4$)
   *Rest*: ... *pat he doth*

189. *Of men* ... 
   *Rest*: *Of hem* ...

206. ... *frenshepe* ... (:+ $S_1$)
   *Rest*: ... *felawship* ...

209. His *leue tok* ... (+ $S_1$)
   *Rest*: He *tok his leue* ... 
   ($H_3$ Cx Toke of hem leue)

211. ... *wery so soone* (+ $H_4$)
   *Rest*: ... *pus wery soone* 
   ($H_5$ *pus wery so soone*; $H_2$ Ph werysom)

225. ... *for the loue of god* ... (+ $H_4$)
   *Rest*: ... *for loue of god* ...

248. ... *fremde* ...
   *Rest*: Lat *be to me youre frende manere speche* 
   (Cl *om. to me, frendly*; Gg frendely; $H_5$ fraynyd; 
   $H_3$ this frende; $S_1$ fryed; $H_4$ freend this maner 
   of speche; RCx *lacking*)
The context makes clear that *fremde* is correct. This reading, in which AD alone present the true form of the word, must be regarded as a happy emendation on the part of the AD parent MS. Th reads *fremed*.

267. ... this ...

*Rest*: ... þus ...

292. A ... longer of it process make

D ... of it lengere proceso make

*Rest*: ... lengere proceso of it make

(RH₅ om. of it; H₂PhH₄H₃ to yow for of it; Cx lacking)

347. *Omit* þat wight.

489. *Omit* Ne

497. Why nay ...

*Rest*: Why no ...

522. *Omit* hym

664. ... that it was routhe (+ H₄)

(D is for was)

*Rest*: ... it was a rouþe

(H₂PhH₅ it were routhe; Gg it were a reuthe)

692. *If* it were so ...

*Rest*: If it so were ...

851. That is ... (+ S₁)

*Rest*: This is ...

905. ... and þis ...

*Rest*: ... al þis ...

(RIH₄ and all this; R has deleted and)

1152. Ne wheþer ... (+ S₁)

*Rest*: Or wheþer ...

(ClCpH₁H₃ + J And wheþer)

1168. *Omit* so

1298. ... monthes two (+ S₁)

(A monthes thre, with change of rime in 1296)

*Rest*: ... yeres two

1312. ... so help me ...

*Rest*: ... helpe me so ...
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1552. To ben here frend with al his ful myght (+ H₃)
Rest : To ben here fulle frend with al his myght

1755. Fully to day . . .
Rest : Fully to dye . . .
(H₂PhGgH₅ dethe)

1757. . . . may . . .
Rest : . . . shal . . .

The evidence presented above makes it clear that the conclusions arrived at in Book I as to the character of γ hold also for Book II: that the MSS. of this group are descended from a common ancestor, not Chaucer's original; that in this common ancestor had been made a number of corrections which individual MSS. of the group fail to incorporate; that none of the readings characteristic of the group is of such a character as to warrant us in assuming deliberate revision; and that within the group S₂Dig and AD constitute sub-groups. We may also notice the frequent cases in which S₁ or H₄ agree with AD, but an attempt to account for these agreements must be deferred till later.

The close relationship noted in Book I between H₂ and Ph is equally clear in Book II. It may be illustrated by the following selected list of representative examples:

H₂Ph.

14. Omit out
Rest : But out of latyn . . .
A nine-syllable line.

†26. H₂ Line written by later hand in space left blank.
Ph Line written by later hand in margin.

†29–35. Stanzas 5 and 6 follow stanza 7. This cannot be a correct order, since line 49, the last line of stanza 7, is clearly meant to conclude the proem and introduce the second book. The common original of H₂Ph may be descended from a MS. in which these stanzas were written in the margin. Were they, perhaps, a later addition? The sense is complete without them.

35. . . . no wondur thyng
Rest : . . . no wonderynge
†51. That al flouris fresshyn grene and rede

Rest: That fresshe floures blewe white and rede

(ClCPH₁AD + J blew and white)

†60. Hit made his hewe al day ful grene

Rest: ... a day ful ofte grene

(R ful often pale & grene; Cx ful oft a day grene)

†130. Hit shold be some iape I trowe y-wis

Rest: ... is pis

(H₂Cxₐ hit ys)

Hit shold be completes the sense of 129. H₂Ph was misled by the running over of the sense, and attempts to make a unit of 130.

147. To axen ... (H₂ aske)

Rest: Nor axen ... (RCx Ne axen)

170. But be myn heed ...

Rest: But be my troufe ...

305. ... to 3ow be now as newe

Rest: ... as now be to yow newe

(H₄Cx be now as)

380. And couere 3ow ...

Rest: And wre yow ...

(H₁ were; others wry, wrye, wri, wrie)

408. And she bygan to wepe right anone

(Ph. om. right)

Rest: ... to brest a wep anoon

(A a wepyng; DCxH₅ to wep; GgS₁ and wepe; R on wepe; H₂ to breste on and wepe)

Though the H₂ reading is in every way a possible one, the omission of right by Ph suggests that right is an emendation by H₂ to repair a line made defective by the loss of to brest. Note that DCxH₅ read to wep.

†421, 422. What is pis al pe ioy & al pe fest

Pat 3e of so made ...

(Ph om. pis)

Rest: What is pis al pe ioye and al pe feste

Is pis youre red ...

(Cl pat for first pis)
The Manuscript Relations in Book II.

509. Line omitted by H₂ and space left blank. In Ph the line is added in the margin.

Rest: ... rome ...

516. ... renny ... (Ph renne)

Rest: ... rome ...

663. ... panour ... (Ph corrected over erasure to faour)

Rest: ... faour ...

729. Now set y a cas thus ywys

Rest: Now set a cas pe hardest is ywys
(Cl wys for ywys; R om. is; H₄ Now I sette cas the hardest is this)

745. As wold y ...

Rest: Al wolde I ...

(S₂Dig Al 3if I wolde)

816. ... Tarke and Anteigne

Rest: ... Tarbe and Antigone
(ClCpH₁S₂(Dig) Tharbe)

850. And pankyd be pow god ...

Rest: And ponked be ye lord ...

(JGgH₄R thow for ye; Cx the for ye; H₅ om. lord)

God is repeated from 848, where the pronoun is yow.

912. And voydyd were po pat voyd shold out

(Ph voydyn shul out)

Rest: ... pat voyden oughte

(Gg wooldyn; H₅ voden corrected to volden; owth)

The rime words in 914, 915 are broght and poght.

1083. Line written later in space originally blank, in H₂ by hand 3, in Ph by the scribe. For full discussion of this important line, see below, p. 110.

1104. What manere wynd gydith 3ow hidir here

Rest: ... wyndes gydeth yow now here

(S₂Dig of wyndes; H₄RCx wynd; D loue for wyndes H₄R now you; A om. yow; Gg om. now)

1105. Omit Ioly

Rest: Tel vs youre Ioly wo and youre penance

1130. ... and seyd hym till

Rest: ... and seyde scryt ne bille

(H₄ shewith no bill; H₅ scryt inserted above)
1155. And in her bosom doun þe lettre cast

Rest: ... down the lettre he thraste

(γGgH₅ þe lettre doun; H₄RCx om. he; Dig caste)

The agreement of Dig with H₂Ph must be fortuitous. Note that H₄RCx omit he.

1196. How like ye þe lettre þat he wrote

Rest: How liketh yow þe lettre þat ye wot

(H₄ that ye of wot)

Either reading is intrinsically possible, and the Italian, chente Ti par lo scriver dell’ amico mio, Fil. 2. 118, offers no clear guidance. The phrase þat ye wot is more in keeping with the general tone of Pandarus’ insinuating manner. The rime word in 1197 is I not.

1286. Lete be ʒour nycete ...

Rest: Lat be youre nice shame ...

(H₅ nycete shame; R nyce fare)

The conflate reading of H₅ (we must assume that the closely related Gg, which reads nyse schame, has corrected an obvious error) points to a common ancestor in which an original nycete was altered to read nyce shame. Perhaps nycete should be regarded as an authentic a reading.

†1347. And after þat his dees turnyd in good chaunces

Rest: ... turnede on chaunces

(H₃ fellen; H₄ turned ascance)

†1434. Come vnto ʒour hous her pleyntis to devise

Rest: Com vnto yow ...

1513. ... to nyght ...

Rest: ... ouer nyght ...

1554. As to pray ...

Rest: As for to bydde ...

Pray is repeated from 1553.

†1621. ... tarien

Rest: ... varyen

Tarien is anticipated from 1622.

1677. ... ful hertily

Rest: ... right hertely

(H₄D om. right)
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Of the 34 instances of H₂Ph agreements just given, by far the greater number are clear cases of error, for which the responsibility need not be traced back of their common ancestor. In seven cases (305, 850, 1083, 1104, 1155, 1286, 1677) the reading of some of the remaining MSS. suggests that the confusion lies further back. In some eight instances H₂Ph present a possible variant reading, but the variation is of a trifling character. The only instance in which we have anything which looks in the least like a revision reading is 1286.

Line 26, as we have seen, has been written by H₂³. The relationship of H₂³ and H₄, already noted in Book I, is attested in this line by the reading And did as well, where the remaining MSS. read And sped as well.

It will be convenient to present next the evidence for the continued relationship in Book II of Gg and H₅. This relationship is attested by the fact that GgH₅ appear together in certain combinations to be discussed later, and by a considerable number of agreements in error, of which the following list gives a representative selection.

GgH₅.

(Lines 1–84 are lacking in Gg.)

†97. It is of loue . . .

Rest: Is it of loue . . .

139. . . . ne in pe toun of troye

Rest: . . . yn al pe toun . . .

154. . . . & pe grekys yerde

Rest: . . . and grekes yerde

†221. Omit yet

†246. . . . I schal 3ow beseche

Rest: Omit schal

†307. Omit tryng

†461. What men wolde of it don . . .

Rest: . . . deme . . .

†663. Omit most.

†839. . . . onwörpi . . .

Rest: . . . vnwery . . .
Readings of GgH₅.

†840. Gg pat euere was with harm vice disteyned
H₃ pat euere was and lest with vice disteynyd

Rest: ... and lest with harm desteyned
(ClH₄AH₃H₂Ph disteyned; H₄ disseynd)

Gg has incorporated a correction, but in most clumsy fashion.

†856. ... pow he fele in his herte distres

Rest: ... yn it distresse

†1024. I wot pou nylt dyneleche ne mystileche endite
... it digneliche endite
(J clerkissly; R papally; H₄ clergaly, om. it; Cx clerkly)

†1265. Omit all

1598. ... hem pouzte ... (H₅ though)

Rest: ... hem oughte ...

†1687. ... quod pe queyne elyne

Rest: ... quod Eleyne pe queene
(R heleyn tho the queene)

The rime word in 1686 is sustene which GgH₅ and other MSS.
spell susteyne.

For the relationship of the γ MSS., of H₂Ph, and of GgH₅, the evidence is clear and unmistakable, despite the not infrequent cases in which the work of a corrector has intervened to confuse the characteristic readings. But beyond these three relationships nothing is clear. Various relationships, based on community of readings, seem to establish themselves, only to be demolished by the evidence of other agreements which flatly contradict the hypotheses. The more one attempts to educe order from the chaos, the greater becomes the confusion; so that in the end one is compelled to regard this confusion itself as the most important evidence on which to build any theory of ultimate relationship. Such a theory I shall presently venture; but for the moment I wish the reader to recognize the extent of the confusion. To this end I shall present a number of tables to illustrate the more striking examples of apparent relationship.

Besides the three units, γ, H₂Ph, and GgH₅, there remain the following MSS.: H₄, J, R, Cx, S₁ (normally included in γ up to line 617), and H₃ (normally included in γ from line 1034). We must deal, then, with eight units, and between lines 617 and
10033 with nine units. With nine units, the number of possible combinations of two, three, or four units is 246; and of this number of possible combinations a large proportion actually occurs; but certain combinations are much more frequent than the rest. We shall begin by illustrating certain combinations in which $H_2Ph$ constitute one of the units, since here, if anywhere, we should expect to find traces of a readings. The combination $H_2PhH_4$, so strikingly attested in Book I, may be illustrated by the following list of readings—

$$H_2PhH_4.$$ 

5. \[... \text{pis} ... \ (+ D)\]  
   \text{Rest}: \[... \text{pe} ... \ (H_3 \text{om. } \text{pe})\] 
20. Ne wondrip not ...  
   \text{Rest}: \ No wonder is ...  
22. \[... \text{pis} ... \]  
   \text{Rest}: \[... \text{pat} ... \] 
33. And penkyth pus ...  
   \text{Rest}: \ And penketh so ...  
35. \[... \text{me semith it} ... \]  
   \text{Rest}: \[... \text{but it is me} ... \]  
   \text{H}_3H_5 \text{ to me } ; \ Cx \text{ unto me it is } ; \ GgR \text{ lacking}\) 
40. \[... \text{in opyn delyng} ... \]  
   \text{Rest}: \[... \text{in opyn doyng} ... \]  
   \text{Delyng seems to be a preferable reading.}\] 
46. \[... \text{al is done} ... \ (+ \text{Th})\]  
   \text{Rest}: \[... \text{al is seyd} ... \] 
48. \[... \text{as y have begun} \]  
   \text{Rest}: \[... \text{syn I haue begonne} \]  
   \text{H}_3 \text{ sithen it is begonne} \] 
57. This Pandare ...  
   \text{Rest}: \ That Pandarus ...  
217. Whil pat pei two had ...  
   \text{Rest}: \ Whil they two hadde ...  
   \text{Cl Whil pat pey hadde} \]
Readings of \( H_2PhH_4 \):

292. ... processe to yow make \( (+H_3) \)

Rest: ... proces of it make

\( R{H_5} \) om. of it; \( A \) of it process; \( D \) of it lengere proces)

†330. \( Omit \) whiche \( (+H_3) \)

\( Cx \) om. \( pat \)

†349. \( Omit \) pere \( (+Cx+Cp) \)

\( JGg \) ne \( for \) pere

376. ... pank & pris ... \( (+A) \)

Rest: ... prys and pank ... 

398. To late y was ware ...

\( Ph \) was y ware

Rest: To late ywar ...

454. ... eke pat might fal ... \( (+J) \)

Rest: ... pat myghte ek fallen ...

\( H_5A \) om. \( ek \)

512. So aftir pat ...

Rest: Soone after that ...

588. \( pat \) mighty god ...

Rest: Ther myghty god ...

\( H_5Cx \) All my\(\ddot{y}\)ti god

675. To like hym po ...

Rest: To lyke hym first ...

713. \( H_2 \) Now were y a fole ... 

\( Ph \) Now were y not wys ...

\( H_4 \) I were not wis ...

Rest: Now were I wys ...

\( R \) Were I than wis

†758. \( Omit \) yf

783. ... sit wepe & think \( (+Cx) \)

\( H_4 \) sitte & wepe or thynke

Rest: ... wepe and sitte and pynke

\( Gg \) or \( for \) second and; \( A \) these words in much later hand)
The readings noted above present in every case variations of a very trifling sort, in striking contrast to the clear revision readings of \( H_2 \)Ph\( H_4 \) in Book I. Though among these variant readings there are few cases of unmistakable error, the \( H_2 \)Ph\( H_4 \) reading is nearly always inferior. It will be noted that nine of the 27 instances noted fall within the first 57 lines, and that all but five fall before line 1000.

In the list of \( H_2 \)Ph\( H_4 \) readings just given there are a number of instances in which Cx shares in the variant reading. We may next consider a number of instances in which a variant reading is presented by \( H_2 \)Ph and Cx.

\( H_2 \)PhCx.

\( \dagger354. \) \textit{Omit} alle

\( 677. \) Made love wipin her hert for to myne (\(+ H_3 + S_2 \)Dig) 
(Ph to enclyne; Cx in \textit{for} wipin)

\textit{Rest}: \textit{Omit} hert 
(R in her inwardly)

Without \textit{hert}, the line is possible, though somewhat halting, if we give full dissyllabic value to \textit{made} and \textit{love}. With a properly dissyllabic \textit{herte}, \textit{made} and \textit{love} must be read as monosyllables. The reading of \( S_2 \)Dig must be attributed to contamination.

\( \dagger899. \) \textit{Omit} here
Readings of $H_2PhCx$.

†964.  $H_2$ Algate sumwhat $y$ have lessid $pi$ sorow  
Cx Algate one foote is lissed of thy sorowe  

$Rest:$  Algate a fot is hameled of $pi$ sorwe  
($H_5$ shortid $for$ hameled)  

Note that Ph does not share the error. The agreement of $H_2$  
and Cx in reading $lessid$ or $lissed$ may be coincidence.

1429.  

$...$ how for $pou$ woost $...$ ($+ R$)  
($Cx$ om. how; $R$ knowest)  
$JGgH_5H_4 + A$ $...$ how thow woost $...$  
$\gamma(- A)S_1$ $...$ pow pat wost $...$  

See above, p. 90.

1442.  

$...$ her othir frendis sustenaunce ($+ R$)  

$Rest:$  
($H_1$ generaunce)  

1452.  

$...$ bothe o tyme & oper  

$Rest:$  
($Cl$ ek and; $H_4$ ofte tyme & othir)  

1519.  

And be $...$ ($+ A$)  

$Rest:$  

1561.  

But god & Pandare wist non what this mente ($+ R$)  
($H_2Ph$ it ment; $R$ she mente)  

$Rest:$  
($ClH_4AS_1H_4$ what al; $GgH_5$ he ment)  

In three of the instances just given $R$ agrees with $H_2PhCx$.  
In the following lines we find agreements of $H_2Ph$ and $R$.  

$H_2PhR$.  

†425.  

$Omit$ fyn  

649.  

Cryseyd anon gan al his chere aspyen  
($H_2Ph$ $pe$ chere)  

$Rest:$  
Cryseyde gan $...$  

Cryseyde is regularly four syllables.  

694.  

$...$ hert $...$ ($+ JH_3 + S_2$Dig)  

$Rest:$  
$...$ pought $...$  

1546.  

$H_2Ph$ $...$ he held alwey $pe$ wise  
$R$ $...$ alwey his gyse  

$Rest:$  
$...$ he held forth ay $pe$ wyse  
($H_5$ all $for$ ay; $DH_2$ om. ay; $Cx$ forth his gyse)  

Note the cross connection between $R$ and $Cx$.  

103
Much more significant than the agreements between $H_2 PH H_4$, $H_2 PH Cx$, and $H_2 PH R$, are those existing between $H_2 PH$, $Gg H_5$, and (usually) $H_4$. These agreements are recorded in the following list.

$H_2 PH Gg H_5 H_4$.

15. 

Rest: 

†64. $H_2$ The swallow Songe with a sorowful lay

(Songe by hand 3 in space left blank)

Ph The swallow proynge . . .

(proynge later in space left blank)

$H_5$ The swallowe morning . . .

(Gg lacking)

$H_4$ The swallowe song . . .

Rest: The swallowe proigne . . .

In the common original of these MSS. the name *Proigne* must have been illegible. $H_2 PH$ left a blank, later filled in $H_2$ by the scribe of $H_2^3$ from an exemplar closely related to $H_4$ (see above, p. 60, for the relationship between $H_4$ and $H_2^3$), and in Ph by the original scribe from an independent source. The reading of $H_4$ (and $H_2^3$), *Song*, is a guess on the part of the scribe, as is also *morning* of $H_5$ (presumably shared by Gg from which the leaf has been cut out) suggested apparently by the word *sorrowful*. Note, however, that both *Song* and *morning* bear some resemblance to the correct reading, *Proigne*, a fact which points towards the presence of an illegible form of the word in the common original. In 65 $H_2 PH H_4$ read *his waymenting*, though in 66 all the MSS. correctly give the feminine pronoun, *she*.

83. 

Rest: omit al

85. Ma dame quod Pandare . . . (+R)

Rest: Quod Pandarus ma dame . . .

*115. 3e make me by Iovis sore adrad

(H_5 Iouas)

Rest: By god ye make me right sore adrad

We seem to have here a case of deliberate revision; but note the more pagan tone of *Iovis*. In 113 all MSS. read *god forbede*. 
139. And 3e wist it ...
   (H₄ wiste not)
Rest: And ye it wyste ...

178. As he þat is ...
   (- H₄)
Rest: Than he þat is ...

190. 3e sey right wele ...
   (- H₄)
   (H₅ om. right)
Rest: Ye sey right soth ...

226. Shal y now wytyn ...
Rest: Shal I not wete ...

†291. Takiþ it ...
   (- H₄)
   (Gg Tache it; H₅ Take hitt)
Rest: Cache it ...

Take is repeated from 289.

331. ... þat noble worþi knyght
   (Gg nobele & worþi; H₄ worthi nobil)
Rest: ... þat noble gentil knyght
   (Cx om. gentil)

384. Omit So

†411. H₂Ph Alas what shold straunge folk to me don
   GgH₅ ... straunge men ...
Rest: Alas what shulde straunge to me done
   (H₃CxR a strange; H₁ folke inserted above later)

The H₂PhGgH₅ readings are hypermetrical.

458. And men be cruel ...
Rest: As men ben cruel ...

*478, 479. Ne love a man þat can no wight ne may
   Aȝens his wille ...
   (H₂PhGg Ne love no man)
Rest: Ne loue a man ne kan I not ne may
   Ayens my wil ...
   (AR om. second ne; D nor for third ne; Cx his wyl)
   Note that Cx retains hys in 479.

500. For love of god ...
   (- H₄, + JR)
Rest: For his loue ...
   (H₄ For the loue)

The reading For his loue gives a nine-syllable line.
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503.  
H₂Ph    Kan he wel speke of love y pray
Gg      Can he wel speke of loue I 3ow preie
Cx      ... quod she I yow prey

Rest : Kan he wel speke of loue quod she I preye
(H₄ om. wel)

Apparently Gg presents an original reading (altered in H₆). Loue is to be read as dissyllabic, the normal elision being prevented by the pause in sense. This was then revised for the sake of greater clearness by introducing quod she and omitting 3ow. H₂Ph has incorporated only half the alteration. Cx has kept both quod she and yow. The revision must have been made in the original before the H₂Ph and the Cx ancestors were written.

510.  
So for to spekyn ...
(H₄ Lo; H₂ forth we for for to; Gg fer)

Rest : Right for to spoken ...

†521.  
Omit now (+ RCx + A)

†592.  
Omit nought (− Gg, + Cx)

597.  
3e lord ...
(− H₄)

Rest : And lord ...
(H₃RCx A lorde)

598.  
... & neuere she ne stente ...
(H₂Ph om. ne)

Rest : ... no lengere she ne stente
(D anone for no lengere; H₃ wolde sche stynt)

603.  
And wax sumdele astonyed ...
(+ Th)

Rest : And was somdel astonyed ...
(R sumdele was; A somewhat)

646.  
Whan he so herd pe peple on hym crien ...
(H₄ herde so; Th upon)

Rest : Whan he pe peple vpon hym herde cryen
(Cx crye vpon hym herden; S₂ Dig on for vpon; A originally wrote Whan to pe peple on hym herde cryen, then deleted to and inserted so before on)

664.  
... it were ...
(− H₄)

Rest : ... it was ...

667.  
... how might pis be ...
(− H₄)

Rest : ... how myght it be
We have here a clear case of revision. That the $H_2\text{PhGgH}_5$ reading is the earlier is suggested by the Italian:

\begin{quote}
Io non conosco in questa terra ancora
Veruna senza amante, e la più gente,
Com' io conosco e veggo, s'innamora,
Ed io mi perdo il tempo per niente;
E come gli altri far non è peccato,
E non può esser da alcun biasimato. (Fil. 2. 70.)
\end{quote}
The revised reading brings the lines into closer relation with 732. With 735 compare 1. 686. The cynical tone of the revised reading may have led to the alteration noted in A.

*736, 737. $H_2 PhGgH_5 + \gamma H_3 CxS_1$:

I thank eke how he able is to have
Of al this noble toun the thriftyest
($H_2 PhGgA$ able he is; $H_5$ he is abyll, And for I; Cx
om. eke; $GgH_5 CpH_1 H_3 S_1$ for to haue; $\gamma$ pis ilke
noble town)

$JRH_4$ Ek wot I wel he worthy is to haue
Of wommen in this world the thriftyeste
($H_4$ Yit for Ek)

Again a clear case of revision. Note that in 736 $H_2 PhGgH_5 + A transpose able.$

*738. $H_2 PhGgH_5$ That woman is so she her honour save
($H_5$ pat sche) (+Th)

$\gamma H_3 CxS_1$ To ben his loue so she . . .
(A he for she)

$JRH_4$ As ferforth as she may . . .

We have here three distinct readings, all of which seem authentic. Note that the $\gamma H_3 CxS_1$ reading stands midway between the other two.

*760, 761. $H_2 PhGgH_5 + \gamma H_3 CxS_1$:

And pogh pat y myn hert set at rest
Upon pis knyght pat is the worthiest
($H_5$ to reste; Cx in rest; Ph om. the)

$JRH_4$ Vnwist to hym pat is pe worthyeste
(J of hym)

The reading of $JRH_4$ gains some sanction from the Italian:

Io sarò saggia, e terrò si celata
La voglia mia, che non sarà saputo
Ch'io aggiassa mai nel cuore amore avuto (Fil. 2. 69);

but as it stands it makes poor sense. Possibly we should read Vnwist, on hym pat is pe worthyeste; but I am inclined to regard the reading as not authentic, and the Italian parallel, which is, after all, not very close, as a coincidence.
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*792.  \( H_2PhGgH_5 + JRH_4 \) How oft tymen may men rede & se ( + Th)

\( H_4 \) om. tyme

\( \gamma H_3Cxs_1 \) How ofte tymen hath it yknowe be

( Cl knowe)

The rime word in 794 is se, so that the reading of \( H_2 \), etc., makes an identical rime.

813.  \( H_2PhGgH_5 + \gamma H_3Cxs_1 \) Adoun pe staire . . .

\( JRH_4 \) And doun . . .

825.  \( H_2PhGgH_5 + JRH_4 \) Gan on a troian lay to syngyn clere

\( H_5 \) om. on; R to for a; \( H_4 \) Gan of a troian say and synge cler)

\( \gamma H_3Cxs_1 . . . \) a Trojan song . . .

\( A \) om. a)

859.  \( H_2PhGgH_5 + \gamma H_3Cxs_1 \) . . . for . . .

\( JRH_4 . . . \) lo . . .

896.  \( H_2PhGgH_5 + H_4RCx . . . \) if it be foul in hell

\( Gg \) if if it be; \( H_4 \) if ouht faile in hell)

Rest: . . . is it foule yn helle

(Cl ful)

*897.  \( H_2PhGgH_5 + JRH_4 \) Cryseyd þerto no þing her an-

swerde

\( H_2Ph \) her no þing; \( H_4 \) om. her; \( JH_5 \) no thing therto;

\( H_5 \) ne for her)

\( \gamma H_3Cxs_1 \) Criseyde vnto þat purpos nought answerede

\( S_1 \) lyte for nought)

*908.  \( H_2PhGgH_5 + JRH_4 \) And white þingis gan to wexe donne

\( H_5 \) whit; \( H_5 \) And wt þyng gan waxe dym & dunne)

\( \gamma H_3Cxs_1 \) And white þynges waxen dymme and donne

Note the conflate reading of \( H_5 \).

910.  \( H_2PhGg + H_4Cx . . . \) home went . . .

\( H_2 \) went home)

Rest: . . . in went . . .

Note that \( H_5 \) deserts the reading of Gg.
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*922, 923.  $H_2$PhGgH₅ + JRH₄:
Of love which pat made his herte gay
Hym herkenyd she . . .
(H₅ om. pat; H₂Ph her hert, Her for Hym; Gg That
for Hym by corrector over erasure)
$γH_3$CxS₁ Of loue pat made hire herte fressh and gay
That herkened she . . .
(H₃ om. hire; S₁ full fressh)

His in the first reading refers to the bird who is singing his lay; hire in the second refers to Criseyde. H₂Ph change the reference.

945.  $H_2$PhGgH₅ + JRH₄Cx omit hym
950.  $H_2$PhGgH₅H₄ Troylus pat pought . . .
Rest: But Troilus pat poughte . . .
($γ$ om. pat)

A nine-syllable line.

1018.  $H_2$PhGgH₅ + JRH₄ . . . be ware pat pow eschewe
$γH_3$CxS₁ . . . be war and faste eschuwe

*1083.  $H_2$Ph line omitted
GgH₅H₄ But pat was infenit for ay & o
(JR enfeyned; H₅ Infynyth)
JR But pat was endles for ay and o
$γH_3$CxS₁ But pat was endeles with outen ho

In H₂ And was written at beginning of line by scribe and rest of line left blank. In this blank hand 3 has written the reading of H₄. In Ph the $γ$ reading has been written later by original scribe in space left blank.

*1084.  $H_2$PhGgH₅ + JRH₄ And how he wold . . .
(H₅ om. how; H₄ But how)
$γH_3$CxS₁ And seyde he wolde . . .

*1085.  $H_2$PhGgH₅ + H₄R And his adew made and gan it folde
(H₄ And thus an eend made; R he made; Ph to for it)
$γH_3$CxS₁ + J And radde it ouer and gan pe lettre folde

This line and the two preceding offer peculiar complications. The variations seem clearly to be due to revision. In 1083 the omission of the line by $H_2$Ph points to a confused reading in the original of their common ancestor; and JR present a reading half
way between that of Gg and that of γ. In 1085 J leaves RH₄ and gives the γ reading. It should be noted that from line 1034 H₃ is regularly a γ MS.

*1093. H₂PhGgH₅ + JRH₄ This Pandare vp þerwip & þat be tyme (H₅ tho with)
γH₃CxS₁ This Pandarus tok þe lettre and þat by tyme (H₃ om. þe lettre; Cx right for and þat)

The γ reading is nearer the Italian. The Moutier ed. reads: Pandaro presa la lettera pia N’ando verso Griseida. Fil. 2. 108. In the Paris ed. of 1789 the passage reads: Pandaro prese lo scritto d’amore, E corse tosto ver Griseida (3. 41). This greater approximation to the Italian may well be accidental.

*1095–1097. H₂PhGgH₅ + JRH₄:
And seid slepe þe and it is pryme
And gan to iape & seyd þus myn hert
So fressh is it thogh love do it smert
(J slepe ye yit and; H₄ thus a myn herte; J it is;
H₅ om. it; H₂Ph om. do; H₄ do me sterte)
γH₃CxS₁ And faste he swor þat it was passed pryme
And gan to Iape and seyde ywys myn herte
So fressh it is alþough it soore smerte
(Cl þat is was passed; H₁ Ioye for Iape; Cl so for
soore; S₂ alle þif; Dig alle þof)

We have here a clear case of revision; but there are no certain grounds for determining which is the more original version. The H₂Ph reading, with its direct discourse, is more dramatic and vigorous.

1108. H₂PhH₅ + RS₁ . . . as þogh her herte brest
(H₂Ph hert to-brest)
GgH₄ . . . & þougte . . . (H₄ shouht)
γH₂Cx + J . . . it pought . . .
(DCx hir þought)

The confusion is of a sort plainly due to scribal carelessness; and the change is so easy that the agreements may well be fortuitous. The H₂Ph reading seems to be correct.

1113. H₂PhGgH₅ + γH₃CxS₁ For which . . .
JRH₄ For whi . . .
(R For thy)
(After 1113 the agreements of JRH₄ abruptly cease. In the rest of this list the reading first given is again that of H₂PhGgH₅H₄, unless otherwise specified.)

1119. Of his wordis . . .
   *Rest:* Of pat he spak . . .
   (Cl ṭey spoke)
   A nine-syllable line.

1120. He seyd þus . . .
   *Rest:* He seyd here þus . . .
   (A And seide)

1142. H₂ Pandare þan bygan for to stare
   Ph Pandare gan þan for to stare
   GgH₅H₄ Pandarus gan vpon hire for to stare
   *Rest:* This Pandarus gan on here for to stare
   (R om. for)

1156. And seyd cast it now awey anone
   *Rest:* And seyde here cast it now away anoon
   (γ now cast it; H₁ om. it; J om. now; R cast it not awey; Cx caste it fast awey; H₅ alwey; Cl or noon)
   This variant is exactly like that in 1120.

†1201. . . . pe medis . . .
   *Rest:* . . . to medes . . .

1211. . . . at pis tyde . . . (− H₅ + J)
   *Rest:* . . . at pis tyme

1321. Lord oft . . . (+ J)
   *Rest:* But ofte . . .

1352. . . . was alwey . . . (+ A)
   (H₄ was ay)
   *Rest:* . . . alwey was . . .

1356. H₂PhGg om. for rouþe

1383. H₂PhCx . . . fal at ones
   Gg . . . falle al at onys
   *Rest:* . . . come al at onys
   *Fal* is repeated from *fallyng* in 1382. H₅ has corrected.

1399. om. Now (+ J)
1455. \( H_2Ph \) .. vs more help to crave
\( GgH_5H_4 + J \) .. his helpe more craue
\( (H_5 om. his, helpis; H_4 to craue) \)

Rest: .. his helpes for to craue
\( (Cx his help now for to craue) \)

1754. \( H_2PhGgH_5 + RCx om. ryght \)

†1755. Fully to dethe .. \((- H_4)\)

Rest: Fully to dye (dye)

An error due to confusion of \( \mathfrak{p} \) and \( y \).

In the long list of readings just given we may note the following significant facts:

(1) That there is only one trivial case before line 64, and that after 1211 the cases are very few and not very striking. In four of the agreements beginning with 1211 J shares.

(2) That beginning at 701 and extending through 1113 there are a number of striking cases in which the MSS. divide into three groups: \( H_2PhGgH_5 \), JRH_4, and \( \gamma H_5CxS_1 \); and that these three groups pair off, two against one, in all three of the possible combinations. Within this area fall nearly all the cases of clear revision readings.

(3) That in very few instances do \( H_2PhGgH_5H_4 \) present a reading that is manifestly corrupt.

Explanation of these facts must be deferred till further evidence has been presented.

We shall next consider a series of readings in which \( H_2Ph \) agree with \( \gamma \).

\( \gamma H_2Ph. \)

21. A blynde man .. \(( + H_4Cx)\)

Rest: A blynde wight ..

22. Ye knowe .. \((- S_1 + H_4)\)

(A He knew)

Rest: I knowe ..

31. .. Wolfe deuyse \(( + H_4)\)

Rest: .. can deuyse

110. Do wey youre barbe .. \(( + H_4)\)

Rest: Do wey your wympel ..
Either word fits the metre, and the sense is identical (cf. N.E.D. s.v. barb). Barbe seems to be the less common word, occurring only here in Chaucer, and therefore is presumably authentic.

124. \[\gamma \text{Cx I am of Grekes so ferd } \mathfrak{p} \text{at I deye} \]
(Cx the Grekis)
\[H_2 \text{Ph} H_4 \text{ om. so (} H_2 \text{Ph pe grekis; } H_4 \text{ afferd)} \]
\[J \text{Gg} \mathfrak{R} \ldots \text{ fered so } \ldots \text{ (Gg aferid)} \]
\[H_5 \ldots \text{ so of Grekis aferd } \ldots \]

The confusion as to so points to a correction in the common original of all the MSS.

438. \[\text{ClCpH}_1 \text{AS}_2 \text{Dig If } \mathfrak{p} \text{at I mente harm or ony vylonye} \]
\[\text{H}_2 \text{PhS}_1 \quad \text{If } y \text{ mente harme or ony vilany} \]
Rest: \[\text{Yif } \mathfrak{p} \text{at I mente harm or vilenye} \]
\[(H_4 \text{ om. } \mathfrak{p} \text{at; D vices written and deleted before vilenye)} \]
\[\gamma \text{ has combined the reading of } H_2 \text{Ph and of } J, \text{ etc., and consequently presents a hypermetrical line, which } S_1 \text{ corrects by dropping pat, and D by dropping ony. Note that } H_4 \text{ omits both pat and ony.} \]

636. \[\ldots \text{ so weldy semed he } (+ H_4 S_1) \]
Rest: \[\ldots \text{ so worthy } \ldots \]
Weldy, as the more uncommon word, is presumably correct.

1026. \[\ldots \text{ or craftily } \mathfrak{p} \text{ow it wryte } (+ S_1) \]
\[(H_3 \text{ om. it)} \]
Rest: \[\ldots \text{ ne craftiliche thow wryte} \]
\[(R \text{ om. thow; Cx it for thow)} \]

1068. \[\ldots \text{ these loueres } \ldots (+ S_1) \]
Rest: \[\ldots \text{ ye loueris } \ldots \]
\[(J \text{ the for ye)} \]

1314. \[\ldots \text{ sent right now, } \ldots ( - D, + R) \]
\[(H_3 \text{ now ryght send)} \]
Rest: \[\ldots \text{ right now sent } \ldots \]

1517. \[\text{ClADH}_2 \text{Ph } + S_1 \text{ So after } \mathfrak{p} \text{at } \ldots \]
\[(D \text{ so afterwarde)} \]
\[\text{CpH}_1 S_2 \text{DigH}_3 \text{ And after that } \ldots \]
Rest: Soone aftir pat
Readings of $\gamma H_2 Ph.$

1616. Vpon here fo . . . (+ $S_1 Cx$)
   Rest: Vnto hir foo . . .
   (GgH$_5$ On to)
   Vpon is clearly the correct reading.

1665. And pey pat no ping knewe . . . (+ Cx)
   (H$_2$ pe for pey; Cx she for pey)
   Rest: And they pat knownen no thing . . .
   (R knew; H$_4$ know; $S_1$ knewe)
   The $\gamma H_2$ reading is better metrically.

1705. . . . into an herber grene (+ $S_1$)
   Rest: . . . and in an herber grene
   (Cx and into)
   Into is clearly correct.

It is to be noted that in a number of cases in the list just given $\gamma H_2 Ph$ preserve a correct reading where the other MSS. have fallen into error. This would seem to point to some relationship between GgH$_5$, J, R, Cx, H$_4$, and H$_3$. Repeatedly, too, we find two or three of these six units agreeing in a variant reading against all the rest. These agreements must now be illustrated. We may begin with the combinations involving H$_4$, R, and Cx.

$H_4 RCx.$

†2. $H_4 Cx$ omit o wynd.

†14. $H_4 Cx + H_5$ . . . I write
   Rest: . . . it write
   (A I it write)

†96. $H_4 R$ . . . tell vs
   Rest: . . . telle it vs

143. $H_4 RCx$ omit pat.

305. $H_4 Cx$ . . . be now as to you new
   Rest: . . . as now be to yow newe
   (H$_2$ Ph to 3ow be now as newe)

462. $H_4 Cx$ . . . wisly forto pley
   Rest: . . . slely for to pleye
   (R sleightfully; H$_1$ sleughtely)

†508. RCx . . . gardyn paleys . . .
   Rest: . . . paleys gardyn . . .
   (H$_2$ Ph paleys in a gardyn)
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†585.  H₄R + D omit pan

Rest: . . . pan is . . .

(H₂Ph is pan)

589.  H₄ Nay nay therof speke not a ha quod she

R  Nay nay there of ne spake not I quod sche

Rest: Nay perof spak I not ha ha quod she

(H₂ om. Nay; Cl om. ha ha)

597.  RCx + H₃ A lord . . .

γJH₄  And lord . . .

H₂PhGgH₅ 3e lord . . .

†644.  H₄Cx + H₃ omit And

†653.  H₄R omit right

†724.  H₄R omit certeyn

†752.  H₄R . . . in lusti ese

Rest: . . . in lusty lese

864.  H₄Cx . . . to looke . . .

Rest: . . . to se . . .

†905.  H₄R . . . & al this

(R has deleted and)

Rest: . . . al pis . . .

(AD and pis)

1162.  RCx No than wol I so that ye wol endite

(Cx om. second vol)

Rest: No panne wol I quod he so ye endite

(H₂H₄ so pat ze; S₁ quod he wole I; A so ye wol endite)

†1280.  H₄Cx omit hire; R the for hire.

†1286.  H₄Cx omit second youre.

1455.  H₄R She nedith not . . .

H₂PhCx So nedith not . . .

Rest: It nedeth nought . . .

1546.  RCx . . . gyse

Rest: . . . wyse

1644.  RCx + S₁ Crysseide anon my lady . . .

Rest: omit anon
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†1715. $H_4 R$ ... my ladies twyne
   Rest : ... my lorde twyne
   Ladies is repeated from 1714.

1741. $H_4$ Sekirly ...
   Cx And sikerly ...
   Rest : Secundelich ...
   (H₅ Sertaynly)

   In the list of readings just given there are two instances, lines 597 and 644, in which $H_3$ is associated with Cx. The following list presents a series of other instances in which $H_3$ and Cx are in agreement. Of these all but the last come before the point (line 1034) where $H_3$ becomes a $\gamma$ MS.

   $H_3 Cx.$

130. ... som Iape I trowe it is (+ A)
   Rest : ... is ðis
   (H₂ Ph ywis)

154. That was the wal of Troie ...
   (H₃ tho wal)
   Rest : That was ðe townes wal ...

593. ... that helmed is with stele
   Rest : ... of stel
   (R in stele)

†613. Omit right

924. That at the last ... (+ Cl)
   (H₃ tho last)
   Rest : Til at the laste ...

945. ... go we where the liste
   Rest : ... do we as ðe lestes
   (GgH₅H₄ R 3e for ðe; S₁ when the lestes; D you for ðe)

†978. ... god so me wisse and saue
   Rest : ... god so wys me saue
   (H₅ so wisse me and saue, om. god; JR god so my soule saue)

980. ... oute sterte (+ H₅)
   Rest : ... to sterte
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†1398. Ywys my dere brother Deiphebus quod he
(Cx Deiphebe, om. quod he)

Rest: omit dere

This list of $H_3$Cx agreements, and also the preceding list of $H_4$RCx agreements, could be much extended; but the examples given serve to illustrate sufficiently the character of the variations. They are all of a trivial character, and might be regarded as accidental were they not so numerous.

In the following list are presented a few instances in which Cx agrees with $S_1$. They are confined to the latter part of the book, and are not numerous.

$S_1$Cx.

1079. And preyde hir...
Rest: And pat she sholde...

(Gg But pat; $H_5$ Besechyng hir; ClJ wold)

1672, 1673. . . . she gan disport

As she best coud of sorowe him to confort

Rest: . . . to recomforte

As she best kowde she gan hym disporte

(CpH1ADH3 to disporte)

1701. $S_1$ He preyde tham bothe . . .
Cx He prayed hem bothe anon . . .
Rest: He preyede hem anoon . . .

(GgH5JH2 preied hem faste)

1712. $S_1$ Into pe chambre on hie and pat in hye
Cx Vnto the chambre aloft and that on hy
Rest: Into pe grete chambre and pat yn hye

($H_5$ on for yn)

We have already recorded a series of striking agreements of JRH4 found between lines 701 and 1113 (see above, pp. 107–111). We must now present a list of agreements, more trivial in character but fairly numerous, between J and R, in which $H_4$ does not share.

JR.

253. . . . hir look down for to caste (+ $H_3$)

($H_3$ om. for to)

Rest: . . . hire eyen down to caste

($H_2$PhD om. to; A adoun hire eyen caste; Cx lacking)
Readings of $S^C_x$ and of JR.

403. ... growe ... (+ $\gamma$)

Rest: ... waxen ...

$(H_2 Ph wox)$

516. And I afer gan romen to and fro

$(J$ gan for to romen ; $R$ affer)$

$H_2 Ph$ And yn a fere ...

$GgH_5 H_4 H_3 Cx$ And I aftir ...

$\gamma - AD$ And I perafter ...

$AD$ And after gan I rome ...

In this line JR alone preserve the correct reading. That afer is correct is clear from the context. The metre, moreover, demands that the stress fall on the second syllable. The Italian, in Moutier's ed., reads, Io non gli era vicin, Fil. 2. 57. (The Paris ed. presents at this point a very different text, which materially alters the details of Pandaro's story.) It is hard to see why all the remaining MSS. should have bungled so simple a line. The corruption must have been introduced by "Adam Scriveyn" in his first copy of the poem from Chaucer's autograph.

†568. ... pat neuere sith ...

Rest: ... neuere sith pat ...

$(H_4 H_5 om. pat)$

†656. And with that worde ...

Rest: And wip pat pought ...

$(H_2 Ph$ And for pat poght)$

The context makes clear that pought is the correct reading.

745. ... my thought

Rest: ... pis pought

†751. ... of myn estat

Rest: ... after myn estat

$(Cx$ for $for$ after)$

775. ... by oother folk ...

Rest: ... in oher folk ...

814. Into hir gardyn with hir neces thre

Rest: Into pe gardeyn ...

$(H_2 Ph a gardyn)$

864. ... on hym ...

Rest: ... on it ...
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925. ... right ther ...

Rest: ... right po ...

(Cx om. po)

† 978. ... god so my soule saue

Rest: ... god so wys me saue

(H_2 Cx god so me wisse and saue; H_5 so wisse me and saue)

A hypermetrical line.

1083. ... endles for ay and o

GgH_5 H_4 (H_2 Ph) ... enfeyned for ay & o

γH_3 CxS_1 ... endeles with outen ho

For a discussion of this line, see above, p. 110.

1091. And seide I wis a blisful destyne

Rest: And seyde lettre ...

(Gg And seyde a blysful desteny parde)

A possible reading. Since 1090 reads: He kiste po pe lettre, the repetition of the word lettre is quite unnecessary.

1147. To yow a lettre wolde I brynge or take

Rest: Wold I a lettre to yow brynge or take

(H_4 Yf I wolde a letter; Cx And I a lettre; γ vnto.)

It may be noted that, save for the first two instances, and in those instances other MSS. share the reading, all these agreements are in the parts of Book II written by the third hand of R. But, though this hand writes from 1114 to the end of the book, the agreements stop with 1147. In 1526 JR read she shal the fully ther conferme, where γ omits the, GgCx omit ther, H_2 Ph read fully the, omitting ther, and H_5 reads pere pe fully. Here the confusion must have arisen from the mistaking of pe for a contracted pere, and the mistake must lie back of any immediate common original of J and R.

Beginning with line 1210 there is a considerable number of instances in which J agrees with GgH_5; and in four of these agreements H_4 also shares. Earlier in the book occur two instances of JGgH_5 + R.

JGgH_5.

551. ... he for loue was pale and wan (+ R)

Rest: ... for wo ...

For loue is repeated from 550.
1164. And Pandare gan at hym self to Iape faste (+ R)
(R at hymself gan Iape faste)

Rest: And he gan...
(H₄ And she gan eek himself iape faste)

Apparently a gloss has been taken into the text. The reading of JGgH₅ is hypermetrical; but R presents a satisfactory line. Note that the corrupt H₄ also omits to.

1210. Now for the loue of god...

Rest: Now for pe loue of me...

1292. To graunt hym yit so grete a liberte (+ Cₓ)

Rest: To graunten hym so gret a liberte
(H₂ PhA graunt; H₄ line entirely corrupt)

1333. Right so encreseth hope...
(+ D)

Rest: . . . encres of hope...
(H₄ thencre)

1383. . . makith it...

(H₅ makit hym)

Rest: . . . doth it...

Though JGgH₅ agree in reading makith, later in the line Gg agrees with H₂ PhCx in reading falle instead of come. See above, p. 112.

1433. And preyen...
(+ H₄)

Rest: To prayen...

1455. . . . hise helpis moore craue (+ H₄)

(Gg helpé; H₅ om. his; H₄ to craue)

Rest: . . . his helpes for to craue
(Cₓ . . . his help now for to craue)

1550. To ben good frend...

Rest: To ben good lord...

1596. But for o fyn...
(+ H₄)

Rest: For for o fyn...

(H₁ glosses quia propter. H₂ Ph For o peyn; Cₓ for al is for a fyne)
Finally, we must record a number of scattering agreements, which may serve further to illustrate how confused are the relationships which the MSS. bear to one another.

Scattering Agreements.

21. (Gg)H₅H₄ ... demyn ...
   Rest: ... Iuggen ...
   (R lacking)

117. H₃ It sat me wel bette ay ben in a cause
     Cx It sit me wel bet to ben in a cause
     H₄ It sat me ay weel bet to be in a cause
     H₅ It sit me bet ay to ben in a cause (a inserted above)
     Rest: It sat me wel bet ay in a cause
     (Cp satte; H₁J sate; R sat to me; ClH₁J om. a)

The reading of γH₂Ph, etc., is metrically satisfactory, if we give proper dissyllabic value to the subjunctive satte. Ben is not required by the sense, which runs on to the next line.

†141. GgH₅H₄ ... wel more ...
   Rest: Omit wel

159. γ(− S₂Dig)JR ... al vertu ...
   Rest: ... euery vertu ...
   (S₂Dig euere; Gg vertu every corrected to vertu euere)

296. H₃H₄ + AD omit wel
     (Gg 3it for wel; Cx lacking)
Scattering Agreements.

357. Gg þour myn a bek
H₅ . . . advice
R . . . doyng
Cx . counsayl
H₂Ph . . . abettyng

Rest . . . abet

(H₄ habit ; JD abit)

These may well be independent attempts to emend a rare word not understood by the scribe.

434. JRH₄H₃ . . . were . . .

Rest . . . is . . .

461. H₄S₁ . . . wil deeme of it . . .

Rest . . . wolde of it deme . . .

(Cl of it wold deme ; Cx wyl it deme ; GgH₅ don)

466. H₄Cx + Ph + Cl And eek myn emys lyf lith in balauns

(H₄ loure for lyf)

H₂GgH₅R . . . lyf in a balaunce

(H₂ om. a)

Rest . . . lif is in balaunce

(S₂ Dig is now in balaunce)

Lith has been repeated from 465, For myn estat lith in (a) Iupartye. Either Ph has introduced the word independently or, more probably, H₂ has dropped it because of its similarity to lyf. It is just possible that we have here the traces of an authentic revision. The reading of GgH₅R is entirely possible.

485. GgS₁ . . . pis mater . . .

Rest . . . pis proces . . .

Since H₅ does not share the Gg reading, one must conclude that the agreement of GgS₁ is due to coincidence in independent error.

†535. H₄H₅ . . . grounded
Gg . . . foundit

Rest . . . Isounded

(Ph woundid ; A Iswoulde)

†640. GgH₅R . . . with swerdis & with macis

Rest : omit seconil with

751. GgH₅H₄ Omit it
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768. JGgH₅γS₁... hir soule...
Rest: ... her hert...

822. H₄S₁ I benched weel and sondid alle the weies
H₃ I benched wel and sanded new atte tho weyes
Rest: I benched newe and sondon alle pe weyes
(γPhR And benched)
Note the conflate reading of H₃.

953. JRH₃Cx + A... be stille...
Rest: ... ly stille...

1024. J ... clerkisly endite
H₄ ... clergaly...
Cx ... clerkly...
R ... papally...
GgH₅ ... dyneleche ne mystileche...
Rest: ... digneliche...

JH₄Cx would seem to have substituted a gloss. The reading of GgH₅ must be similarly explained. The reading of R is a curious blunder which I am at a loss to explain.

1172. JGg And gan som of hir woumen for to calle
H₄H₅ ... in to call
H₂Ph ... her wymmen call
Cx ... hir wymmen to calle
R And som of hir women gan she calle
γS₁ And gan som of hire women to hire calle

We have here clear proof of corruption or confusion in the common original of all the MSS. Apparently H₂Ph present the uncorrected error.

†1249. R Cum riding with his companie in feyrr
Cx ... wyth his people in feere
H₅ ... with his folk in fere
Rest: ... with his tenpe some yfere
(H₁ tenthe sonne; A tensum; D twelue some; H₃ tenteth some; H₂Phx somme; H₄ with the tensom; Gg tensum; J tente somme)

These are apparently independent attempts to explain a rare construction.
Conclusions.

†1487. GgCx ... in his owene propere persone
H₄H₅ ... in his awyn persone

Rest:
... yn his propre persone

Owene is repeated from 1486. H₅, and probably also H₄, have corrected a hypermetrical line by omitting propere.

1553. JRS₁ But swich a need was it
(R that for it)
ADCx ... a nede it was

Rest: Omit it

†1666 H₄RCxH₅ omit pei
Gg sche for pei

Gg has corrected the GgH₅ reading preserved by H₅.

Unless we are to assume a most thoroughgoing process of contamination, which the comparatively trivial character of most of the variations makes improbable, but one explanation can be given for the phenomena of Book II. In Book I, it will be remembered, the β MSS. present evidence to prove that they are descended, each along its independent line of descent, from a common original which contained a great many corrections and alternative readings. Such an hypothesis can alone explain the manifold and baffling interrelations of Book II. If we find H₂Ph agreeing in this line with GgH₅, in the next with γ, in the next with R or Cx or J, we are forced to assume that each of the units, H₂Ph, GgH₅, γ, H₄, J, R, Cx (and H₃ and S₁ when not included in γ), is derived independently from a MS. whose readings were confused by repeated corrections and alterations. In this MS., then, were present in many lines alternative readings; and the text was in such a condition that a scribe might easily, through inattention, copy the cancelled reading instead of the substitute, or might incorporate into his copy part of the original reading and part of the correction. Of such conflate readings we have seen many examples in the lists given above; and every conflation of this character is evidence in support of the hypothesis just presented.

But, though virtually all possible combinations of the several MS. units are illustrated, there is one combination which is more strikingly attested than the others, that of H₂Ph with GgH₅ (during the first 1200 lines of the book); and with H₂Ph and GgH₅ is frequently found H₄. We have seen that in Book I H₂Ph and H₄ present earlier, unrevised readings; in the later
books we shall find GgH₂ associated with H₂Ph in presenting unrevised readings. Up to line 1200, then, where the character of its readings is changed, GgH₂ derives from the common parent of all MSS. at a stage in its existence not far removed from that at which H₂Ph is derived. That is to say, H₂Ph and GgH₂ are both derived before the parent MS. received all of its corrections and alterations. We must conceive of this parent MS. as subject to a continuous process of minor corrections and alterations coincident in time with the period during which the various existing MS. units were successively derived.

Through the greater part of the book these corrections and alterations are of a very trivial character. Only in one restricted portion of Book II, i.e. between line 701 and line 1113, are there any cases of extended revision; but within these four hundred lines the instances of deliberate revision are both numerous and striking. They will be found on pp. 107–111 above.

The readings of these four hundred odd lines present the most baffling problem which the writer of this study has encountered; and he cannot pretend to any satisfactory solution. He must perforce content himself with stating the situation, and suggesting a not impossible explanation.

There are over a score of readings, of which most are striking cases, which point to deliberate revision. On the basis of these readings the MSS. divide sharply into three groups: H₂PhGgH₂, γH₃CxS₁, and JRH₄. It is to be noted that S₁ ceases to be a γ MS. after line 617, and that H₂ does not become a γ MS. until line 1034. Through the whole passage, then, γ has the independent support of S₁ and Cx, and through three-quarters of the passage of H₃ as well. We cannot assume that S₁, H₃, and Cx incorporate through some accident or contamination readings of γ origin; for a glance will show that the γH₃CxS₁ readings in this passage are not at all of the colourless sort which throughout the poem characterize the γ original, and which point consistently towards scribal corruption rather than authentic revision.

In one couplet, lines 734, 735, H₂PhGgH₂ present what seems to be an unrevised reading as against all the rest. In two instances, lines 703 and 738, there are three separate readings which characterize respectively H₂PhGgH₂, γH₃CxS₁, and JRH₄, with the γH₃CxS₁ reading occupying a place midway in character between the H₂Ph and the JRH₄ readings. Somewhat similar is
the situation in line 1083, where, however, H₂Ph omit the line and JR occupy a place midway between GgH₅H₄ and γH₃CxS₁. In lines 721, 731, 736–7, 760–1, 813, 859, 1113, JRH₄ agree in a variant reading as against all the rest. In lines 701, 792, 825, 897, 908, 922–3, 945, 1093, and 1095–7 γH₃CxS₁ agree in a variant reading as against all the rest; and to this list may be added line 1085 in which J agrees with γH₃CxS₁. It is this last set of readings which makes the problem so difficult. Were it not for them, we should have a situation not unlike that in Book III, where the latest revised state of the text is represented by JRH₄Cx, and where γ is generally in accord with α. We should say that H₂PhGgH₅ represent the earliest state of the text; that after these units were derived a certain amount of revision took place, and that these revisions are found in γH₃CxS₁; that, further, after these units also were derived, other revisions were made which are found only in the MSS. of latest derivation, i.e. J, R, and H₄.

But if we turn to the lines in which γH₃CxS₁ present the variant, we shall find that the γH₃CxS₁ reading seems to be the later revised reading. In 792 a bad rime is avoided; in 908 there is an added idea. In general the γH₃CxS₁ reading is preferable; in a few instances, e.g. 897, 922–3, it seems to be a second thought, not completely fused with the context. Even though in line 1093 the γH₃CxS₁ reading is somewhat nearer the Italian, this cannot alone counterbalance the presumption that H₂PhGgH₅ represent an earlier state of the text.

If the γH₃CxS₁ readings represent a later, revised text, how is one to explain the fact that they are not found in JRH₄? We must assume that a revised reading, made after the derivation of H₂PhGgH₅, is adopted by γ, by H₃, by Cx, by S₁, and is then rejected by J, by R, by H₄. For outside of this passage there is no evidence that J, R, and H₄ are related by descent from any common original other than the common original of all the MSS. In some way, then, these revisions must have been cancelled or lost in the common original before J, R, and H₄ were derived. How or why, I cannot say. Since there seems to be no reason for a deliberate, authentic cancelling of the revisions, one will look for some mechanical cause. Since the phenomenon we would explain occurs nowhere else in the poem, we must find a mechanical cause which should deprive the parent MS. of its
revision readings during these four hundred lines, and nowhere else.

It is to be noticed that all of the lines concerned fall within the space of sixty stanzas; that is to say, of six leaves with five stanzas to the page, or five leaves with six stanzas to the page. The loss of the $\gamma H_3 Cx S_1$ revision readings by JRH$_4$ may have happened in some such way as this: From the common original and archetype which Chaucer kept in his own possession were derived $H_2 Ph$ and $GgH_5$. Next, certain revisions were made in the margins or between the lines, and these revisions were incorporated in $\gamma$, in $H_3$, Cx, and $S_1$. Then an accident to the MS. caused the destruction or loss of five or six leaves containing stanzas 100–159, lines 694–1113. Their place was then supplied in the archetype by reference to a copy of the poem, not otherwise represented by any existing MS., which had been derived later than $H_2 Ph$ and $GgH_5$ (since it must have contained the revised reading in 734, 735), but before the $\gamma H_3 Cx S_1$ revisions were made. In this substituted copy new revisions were made in lines 731, 736–8, and perhaps also in 703 and 760, 761; though in these two cases I suspect that we have rather a scribal corruption in the MS. from which the substituted leaves were copied. The JRH$_4$ readings in 721, 813, 859, and 1113 would surely be regarded as of merely scribal origin. Line 1085, in which J shares the $\gamma H_3 Cx S_1$ reading in a striking variant as against $H_2 Ph GgH_5 + H_4 R$, and 1083 where $H_4$ agrees with $GgH_5$, would be regarded as cases of contamination.

The explanation just given is pure hypothesis. All that can be said for it is that it explains the facts and is not inherently improbable. All that I should care to assert is that JRH$_4$ have failed to get the revision readings in this passage, and that after the fashion just suggested a plausible explanation can be devised.

CHAPTER IV

THE MS. RELATIONS IN BOOK III

The MS. relations in Book III present a striking contrast to those in Book II. In the early part of the book, to be sure, the confusion of the preceding book continues; traces of deliberate
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revision are very scanty, and the boundaries between $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are hard to trace. But from about line 400 to the end of the book we have a clear division between $\alpha$, represented by $H_2PhGgH_5$, and $\beta$, represented by JRH$\beta$Cx, illustrated by a long list of striking divergences, many of which are unmistakably due to deliberate revision. In these instances $\gamma$, as we shall see, usually gives $\alpha$ readings; but not infrequently it stands with $\beta$. $H_3$ and $S_1$ are sometimes found with $\beta$, sometimes with $\alpha\gamma$.

It will be convenient, however, to defer consideration of these more important readings until we have established for Book III the familiar groups $\gamma$, $H_2Ph$, and $GgH_5$.

$\gamma$ includes, as always, MSS. ClCpH$\beta$S$\eta$DigAD. With $\gamma$ are repeatedly associated $H_3$ and $S_1$; but since these two MSS. show many striking characteristics of the $\beta$ group, they cannot be regarded as an integral part of $\gamma$. In the list of $\gamma$ readings which follows, their adherence to $\gamma$ is in each instance specifically stated. It is to be noted that the fragmentary Dig ends at line 532.

ClCpH$\beta$S$\eta$DigAD($\gamma$).

†49. To which who nede hath god hym brynge ($+H_3$)

Rest: To which gladnesse . . .

A clear case of error; $\gamma$ is metrically deficient.

84. . . . is . . . ($+H_3$)

Rest: . . . was . . .

90. His resones . . . ($+H_3$)

Rest: Hise wordes . . .

(Gg$H_5^5$R His werkis)

Wordes is certainly a better reading. Cf. 97 and 100.

†101. As feythfully . . . ($+H_3$)

Rest: As ferforthly . . .

(JGg ferforthlich)

The context makes clear that ferforthly is correct.

†110. If with my deth youre herte may apese ($+H_3S_1+Cx+H_2$)

(H$2$ y may 3our hert apese)

Rest: . . . yowre wreththe may apese

(Ph 3our wrath may y apese; Gg 3oure wrepe I may apese)

The $\gamma$ reading is clearly erroneous. Herte is repeated from 109.

Text. Trad.
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But note that Cx, as well as $H_2S_1$, read herte. The agreement of $H_2$ I regard as coincidence, since Ph reads wrath. $H_2$PhGg (but not $H_6$) read $y$ may or may $y$.

111. But syn pat ye . . .

Rest: For sithen ye . . .

(H$_3$R For syn that)

The context strongly favours For rather than But.

†119. . . er pat ye wende (+ $H_4$)

Rest: . . . er ye wende

(J er we wende; Cx or we hens wende)

A hypermetrical line.

130. . . som tyme frendly on me se (+ $H_3 + H_4$)

(H$_1$ freshely)

Rest: . . . frendly somtyme . . .

($H_2$PhH$_5$ om. frendly; $H_2$ on me rue and se; Gg frenli sumtyme)

The omission by $H_2$PhH$_5$ (corrected by Gg) suggests that the confusion already existed in the original of all the MSS.

†136. Omit I ($-$ AD)

158. . . but seyde hym softly (+ $H_8$)

(H$_3$ ful softly)

Rest: . . . but seyde hym sobrely

(Gg sekyrly)

188, 189. With outen hond me semeth pat in pe towne

For this merueyle I here eche belle sowne ($-$ AD)

(S$_2$Dig Of pis marvelle I here pe belles soune)

Rest: . . . pat in towne

For this miracle . . .

I see no reason to regard merueyle as a deliberate revision. It is a simple case of scribal substitution. Since AD read myracle, we must assume that the reading was corrected in the $\gamma$ original.

203. . . . right as I yow deuyse (+ $H_2$)

JGg . . . right as thow wolt deuyse

$H_5$ . . . right as I woll deuise

$H_2$PhCx . . . right as y devise

$H_4$ . . . right as thei devise

$R$ . . . right as I the deuyse
The common original of all the MSS. must have been confused in this line.

230 \ldots mery chere \( (+ H_3) \)

*Rest: \ldots blissful cheere*

\[ *256. \] Al sey I nought \( po \) wost wel what I mene \( (+ H_3S_1) \)
R Al seye I noght thow wost what I wolde mene

*Rest: Thow wost thi seluen what I wolde meene\[
\( (H_2Cx \) what \( pat \) y wold mene)\]

We have here apparently a revision reading not adopted by \( JH_4Cx \). Note that \( R \) agrees with \( \gamma \) only in the first half of the line. The reading \textit{wel what I mene} must be regarded as merely a \( \gamma \) variant.

301. Al seyde men soth \ldots \( (+ H_3S_1) \)
\( (AD \) lacking\)

*Rest: Thogh men soth seide \ldots*

319. That \textit{set} bihyghte hem neuere \ldots \( (- Cl, + H_3) \)
\( (AD \) lacking \); \( H_3 \) There thai behight hem\)

*Rest: That neuere yit behight them \ldots\[
\( (Cx \) That neuer yit in ernest nor in game)\]

354. \ldots liketh \ldots \( (AD \) lacking)\]

*Rest: \ldots listeth \ldots*

\[ \dagger412. \] Omit me

427. \ldots his gode gouernaunce \( (+ H_3S_1) \)

*Rest: \ldots his wyse gouernaunce*

438. \ldots This \ldots \( (- A) \)
\( (D \) omits line)\]

*Rest: That \ldots*

459. Wolde of hem two \ldots \( (+ H_3) \)
\( H_2PhGgH_5 \) Wold in \( \textit{his speche} \ldots \)
\( JRH_4(Cx)S_1 \) Wolde on this thing \ldots \)
\( (R \) of \textit{for on})\]

For discussion of this line see below, p. 148.

461. \ldots grace \ldots \( (+ H_3S_1 + R) \)

*Rest: \ldots space \ldots*

The context favours \textit{space}. See below, p. 148.
512. . . pat . . . (+ H₃S₁)

Rest: . . . which pat . . .

(JGgH₅ om. pat)

(With line 532 Dig ends.)

535. . . gret ordenaunce (+ H₃S₁)

Rest: . . . his ordenaunce

(Gg his puruyaunce)

536. . . and perto his aray (− AD, + H₃)

(H₃ ther to and; S₂ pare with his Aray)

Rest: . . . and therto al the aray

(Cx and eke al the aray)

Though the reading his in this line seems intended to compensate for the loss of his in 535, ADS₁ which read gret in 535, read al the here. Gret does not seem appropriate to the context.

537. Yf pat he were myssed . . .

Rest: That yif pat . . .

(H₃ And yf that; H₄ That yif he)

558. Ne lengere don him . . . (+ H₃)

(H₃ Ne lenger hym doon)

a Ne done hym lenger . . .

βS₁ Ne make hym lenger . . .

For discussion of this line see below, p. 148.

589. He swor hire yis . . . (+ H₃S₁)

(Cl om. hire)

Rest: He swor hir this . . .

(Cx tho for this; H₂PhH₄ om. this)

The confusion between yis and pis is very easy. Either word suits the context.

†623. At the goddes wyl . . . (− AD)

Rest: Omit At

At makes the line hypermetrical, and disturbs the sense. The goddes wyl is the subject of execut was in 622. The scribe of the γ original regarded al as the subject.

636. For be my trouthe . . .

H₃S₁ And by myrought . . .

Rest: Now by my trowthe . . .

For is repeated from 635.
692. . . . wight . . . (+H₃S₁ + R)

Rest: . . . man . . .

†722. Omit O (−H₁)

In S₁ the interjection, O, which begins a stanza, is made a twoline illuminated initial. Apparently the γ original planned for such an initial which was never executed. Hence the loss of O, corrected, however, by H₁.

†758. Omit thus (+H₃ + R)

810. . . . perof . . . (+H₃S₁ + R)

Rest: . . . of pat . . .

(H₅ of pis)

†838. Thow mysbeleued and enuyous folye (−AD)

Rest: Omit and

859. How pis candele in pe straw is falle (+Cx)

(CpD the for pis; A pis for pe; Cx dyde falle)

Rest: How is this candel in the straw I falle

(GgH₅H₃ falle)

A nine-syllable line in γ.

880. But of malis if pat I shal nought lye (+H₃S₁)

(H₁ of for if)

Rest: Omit pat

A nine-syllable line in αβ.

913. Ne . . . (+H₃S₁)

Rest: And . . .

†931. A dulcarnon . . .

(Cl At altered to A)

Rest: At dulcarnoun . . .

(H₂Ph Bulcarnon)

1073. . . . and . . .

Rest: . . . or . . .

1119. And . . .

Rest: So . . .

1153. She bad hym pat to telle . . .

(H₁ Sho bad him for to tel pat)

a pat badde sche him to telle . . .

(Gg om. hym)

βH₃S₁ This bad she hym to telle . . .

(H₃ Thus; Cx lacking)
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†1157.  Hym . . . (—CID)
  Rest:  He . . .
  An obvious error corrected by Cl and D.

1165.  For by pat god pat bought vs bope two (+]H₃)
  Rest:  . . . wroght vs . . .

1192.  . . . hym . . . (—Cl)
  (S₂ hir)
  Rest:  . . . it . . .

1202.  But . . .
  Rest:  And . . .

1203.  . . . the blysful goddes seuene (+ S₁)
  Rest:  . . . the bryghte goddes seuene

†1268.  . . . pat lest kowde deserue
  (A beste)
  Rest:  . . . pat coude lest . . .
  The transposed order in γ injures the metre.

†1291.  CpH₁S₂ As thus I mene 3e wol 3e be my steere
  (H₁S₂ fere)
  ClPh(H₂) . . . pat ye wolde be my stere
  (Ph pat inserted above; H₂ lacking)
  GgH₅ADS₁ . . . he wil 3e ben myn stere
  (Gg om. he)
  JRCx . . . he wol pat ye ben my steere
  H₃H₄ As thus he wyll how that ye be my stere
  Line 1290 reads:  Syn god hath wrought me for I shal yow serve,
  which requires the reading he wol in 1291.

1373.  Lord trowe ye a coueytous or a wrecche (—A, + J)
  (J or a by corrector; D lacking)
  Gg omits or
  AH₂RH₃ omit or a
  Ph(H₂)H₄CxS₁ . . . trowe ye that a coueytous wrecche
  (S₁ a wrecche)
  The correct reading is not easy to determine. If we read a
  wrecche, coueytous must be regarded as a noun, which seems
  unlikely; but a coueytous wrecche is unmetrical unless we read
  coueytouse. The final e is found in none of the MSS., and cannot
  be grammatically justified after the indefinite article. Perhaps the
  correct reading should be:  Lord trowe ye that coueytouse wrecche,
which is perfectly suited to the context and the metre. Note that PhH₄CₓS₁ read that a.

1394. ... of whom ... (— A, D lacking)

Rest: ... of which ...

1402. Of any ping ... (— A, D lacking)

Rest: Of any wo ...

1422. ... al my plesaunce (— Cl, + S₁)

Rest: ... and my plesaunce

†1482. Syn pat desir ryght now so biteth me

(Cl brenneth ; H₁ bitleth)

Rest: ... streyneth me

The Italian reads: Sì mi strigne il disio, Fil. 3. 46. The Cl reading, brenneth, seems to stand midway between streyneth and biteth.

1486. Were it so ...

Rest: Yit were it so ...

(Cx Yf it were so)

A nine-syllable line in γ.

1488. ... so fermely

(A fermently ; D fervently)

Rest: ... as fermely

(H₅ fervently)

1524. And with swych wordes as his herte bledde

Rest: And with swich voys as though his herte bledde

(J thoght, blede ; H₅ om. though)

1525. He seyde farewell my dere herte swete

(Cl myn herte and dere swete)

Rest: Omit my

(H₅ has γ reading, but whole line is written over erasure.)

1595. An hundred sithe he gan pe tyme blysse

(Cl A hondred ; Cll and gan)

a An hundrid tymes and gan pe tyme blesse

(GgH₅ tyme for tymes)

βH₃S₁ A thousand tyme and gan the day to blisse

(H₄CₓS₁ tymes ; H₃ gan he day blisse ; S₁ pe day gan blysse)

For discussion of this line see below, p. 172.
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1617. ... he hym answerde
Rest: ... he thus answerde
(H₃ and thus him answerd)

Note the conflate reading of H₃.

1660. ... that Troilus (− Cla, + S₁)
Rest: ... this Troilus

†1675. Omit ek (− A, + H₃S₁)

†1702. Omit allas (− S₂A)

†1708. ... don here sacrifice (− A, + S₁)
Rest: ... don hym sacrific

The pronoun refers to the sun. All MSS. correctly read hym in 1707.

1723. ... was of hym ... (+ S₁)
Rest: ... of hym was ...

1748. Loue pat knetteth lawe of companye (+ H₃S₁)
(H₁ knettheth; H₃ kennyth; H₁S₂ and for of)
Rest: Loue pat enditeth ...
(H₅ endith; Cx endueth; R endyth written and deleted before endyth; H₂ omits entire passage; Ph has the γ reading, but entire passage later on inset leaf.)

The original of this line is the Hic fidis etiam sua Dictat iura sodalibus of Boethius, Book 2, Metre 8. But the next line of Chaucer, And couples doth in vertu for to dwelle, translates Hic et coniugii sacram Castis nectit amoribus, which in the Latin immediately precedes. Chaucer translates the passage thus: This Love ... knitteth sacrament of mariages of chaste loves; and Love endyteth lawes to trewe felawes. Here we have both knitteth and endyteth. The γ reading cannot, therefore, be dismissed as a scribal corruption. Both knitteth and endyteth must have been written by some one familiar with the source, and this person can hardly be other than Chaucer himself. Apparently Chaucer first wrote knetteth and then changed to endyteth, which is the proper word in the context. The scribe of the γ original copied knetteth.
Readings of $S_2$Dig. 137

1754. Holden a bond perpetuely durynge ($+ H_3 S_1 + H_4$)  
(H$_3$A aboute for a bond; H$_3$ doyng)  
Rest: Holde in a bond . . .  
(H$_2$ lacking; Ph Holdyn yn a bonde, passage later on inset leaf)  

That the $\gamma$ reading is correct is proved by the Latin, *Foedus perpetuum tenent*, Boeth., Book 2, Metre 8. The error of $aB$, however, is of a sort very easy to fall into.

Within the $\gamma$ group the same sub-groups are maintained that we have already noted in Books I and II. Up to the point where Dig ends, line 532, its close relation to $S_2$ continues unbroken. By way of attestation I have selected the following typical cases:

$S_2$Dig.

57. . . . gan his hert . . .  
Rest: . . . his herte gan . . .  

†231. To cule . . .  
Rest: To tale . . .  
(DCx To talke)  

†300. . . . be alle abbe  
Rest: . . . ben a labbe  
(H$_2$Ph blabbe; H$_4$ to labbyn)  

†306. . . . vertew  
Rest: . . . vntrewe  

†311. Me to loue and sey . . .  
Rest: Here loue and seyth . . .  
(Cx And sayth certeyn)  

†400. Be . . .  
Rest: But . . .  

The relationship of A and D is strongly attested by the fact that both omit lines 295-364. This omission of ten stanzas points to the loss of a leaf in the common ancestor of A and D. In A the gap is in the middle of a page; fol. 45$^b$ contains lines 274-294, 365-378 without any indication of the omission. In D the gap exactly corresponds to a leaf. Line 294 is at the bottom of fol. 41$^b$ and 365 at the top of 42$^a$, but the quire has its full quota of eight leaves. The relationship is further evident in the fact that in a number of instances, recorded in the list of $\gamma$
readings, AD together depart from the γ reading. But this is not all. In D there is a second gap of ten stanzas, lines 1345–1414, without any corresponding mutilation in the MS. Fol. 54a contains lines 1309–1344 and 1415–1418, with no indication whatever that anything is missing. Obviously a ten-stanza leaf was missing in D's original. In A the ten stanzas are found regularly in their proper place; but during these stanzas the character of A's text changes. In these seventy lines there are three clear γ readings, lines 1373, 1394, 1402; but in none of these γ readings does A share. (See above, p. 134.) Moreover, in this same passage A shares in α readings in lines 1348, 1389, and 1390. (See below, p. 154.) In 1351 AHs omit Joyle, and in 1365 AHs read neure for nought. It is plain that the ten stanzas were missing also in the original of A, but that the scribe of A, discovering the loss, supplied them from a MS. of the α type closely related to GgHs.

Further proof of relationship is given in the list of readings which follows, in which is also illustrated a connection between AD and S1 and AD and H3. With line 1709 begins the second hand of A; but there is no corresponding change in the character of the text.

AD, S1, H3.

16. AD omit pat
33. AD + H2Ph... may ...
   Rest:... kan ...

124. ADHs + H2Ph omit panne
160. ADS1 omit And
   (Cl But for And)

193. AD... 3ow ...
   Rest:... pe ...

200. A... 3e may haue layser ...
   S1... may 3e haue leiser ...
   Rest:... haue ye a layser
   (H4 om. a)

1 Between the two lost leaves in the AD ancestor intervened fourteen leaves; so that the loss might conceivably be the first and last leaves of a quire of 16.
Readings of AD, S₁, H₃.

242. AS₁ For sorewe ...
    Rest: For loue ...

263. AH₃ ... ful nygh ...
    Rest: ... wel nygh ...
    (R om. wel)

†450. AD That in pis mene while ...
    aγ That in pis while ...
    βS₁ This mene while ...
    AD present a conflate reading.

†462. ADS₁ ... pis ping ...
    *Rest: ... here speche ...
    (H₃ hire Porpos)

†503. ADS₁ ... me lyst ...
    Rest: ... hym lyst ...

†690. DS₁H₃ ... daunce
    Rest: ... traunce
    (H₂ taunce)

756. DH₃ ... rise to here ...
    Rest: ... ryse and heren ...
    (H₄ ne for and)

799. AD ... wordes ...
    ClS₁ ... þynges ...
    Rest: ... wonder ...

884. ADS₁ ... þerwith shal ye ...
    Rest: ... ye þerwith shal ...

1096. AD ... 'and ...
    Rest: ... but ...

1137. AH₃ ... syke mennes ...
    Rest: ... syke folkes ...

1156. AD ... soothly ... (Λ soth)
    Rest: ... shortly ...

†1174. ADH₃ omit first pat

1183. DH₃ + H₂Ph ... dere herte
    Rest: ... swete herte

1308. DS₁ But ...
    Rest: And ...
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1451.  \( \text{AS}_1 \) ... hid ...  
Rest: ... stole ...

1526.  \( D \) ... saune and sound ...  
\( \text{H}_3 \) ... sounde and sauf ...  
Rest: ... sound and soone ...  
(\( \text{H}_5 \) son and sownd; \( \text{Gg} \) om. sound and)

†1531.  \( \text{AD} \) omit hard

1744.  \( \text{AH}_3 \) ... se and erth ...  
(\( \text{H}_3 \) see and of erthe)  
Rest: ... erpe and se ...

†1754.  \( \text{AH}_3 \) Holden aboute ...  
Rest: Holden a bond ...  
(\( \text{GgH}_5 \text{JRCx[Ph]} \) Hold in)

\( \text{pe} \) wey

1768.  \( A \) ... no wight ne oute wyste  
\( \text{H}_3 \) ... they wey no wyght ne oute wyste  
Rest: ... no wight \( \text{pe} \) weye out wyste  
(Cx out \( \text{pe} \) wey wyst)

A clear proof that \( \text{H}_3 \) is deriving from a MS. like \( A \). In \( A \) \( \text{pe} \) wey, originally omitted, is written above \( \text{no wight} \) without further indication. Note also \( \text{ne oute} \).

1778.  \( A \) ... all to terede ...  
\( D \) ... all tered ...  
Rest: ... altered ...

As in Books I and II, there is also a series of scattering agreements between two or three of the \( \gamma \) MSS., which points to the presence of corrections or alternative readings in the \( \gamma \) original. The more important of these agreements are given in the following list:

Scattering Agreements of \( \gamma \) MSS.

91.  \( \text{ClCpH}_1 \) I yow wole telle ...
Rest: I wol yow telle ...

†258.  \( \text{CpH}_1 \) ... gentileste ...
Rest: ... gentilesse (or gentilnesse)

259.  \( \text{CpH}_1 \) ... ben shal ...
Rest: ... shal ben ...
Scattering Agreements of γ MSS.

293. \( \text{CpS}_2 \text{Dig} \) Han euere thus...
\( \text{H}_1 \text{H}_3 \) Han euere this...
Rest: Han euere yet...
(H\(_2\) om. yet; \(\beta\) varies)

†450. \( \text{CpH}_1 \text{S}_2 \text{Dig} \) ... which...
Rest: ... while...

†527. \( \text{ClCpS}_2 \text{Dig} \) From...
Rest: Of...

†558. \( \text{CpH}_1 \) ... cape
J ... kape
Rest: ... gape

585. \( \text{CpH}_1 \) ... whiche as...
Rest: ... whiche \(\beta\)at...
(R om. \(\beta\)at; \(\text{H}_5\) the whiche)

†595. \( \text{ClAD} \) ... vnto \(\beta\)e souper...
Rest: ... to soper...

†699. \( \text{CpH}_1 \text{S}_2 \) As stille as stoon...
Rest: And stille as ston...

†827. \( \text{CpH}_1 \) ... 3e woot...
Rest: ... he wot...

†876. \( \text{CpH}_1 \text{S}_2 + \text{H}_2 \text{Ph} \) omit \(\beta\)at

928. \( \text{CpH}_1 \text{S}_2 \text{A} \) ... grace hadde...
(A passage written by later hand in space left)
Rest: ... hadde grace...

1291. \( \text{H}_1 \text{S}_2 \) ... fere
Rest: ... \\(\beta\)tere

†1419. \( \text{ClAD} + \text{GgH}_5 \) ... afterward...
(D after \(\beta\)at)
Rest: ... estward...

1552. \( \text{CpH}_1 \) ... she...
Rest: ... he...

1621. \( \text{CpH}_1 \text{S}_2 + \text{Gg} \) ... take now nat a grief
Rest: ... tak it...

1805. \( \text{CpH}_1 \text{S}_2 + \text{Cx} \) ... Ire Enuye...
Rest: ... enuye Ire...
(AS\(_1\)J enuye and ire; \(D\) om. Ire)
Of the combinations noted above, the commonest are \( \text{CpH}_1 \) and \( \text{CpH}_1 \text{S}_2 \text{(Dig)} \); but several other combinations are present. It is to be noted, however, that AD enters into combination only with Cl.

From the evidence presented it is clear that the \( \gamma \) MSS. are descended from a common ancestor, not Chaucer's original; that this original was frequently corrupt; that in it had been written a number of corrections, not incorporated by all of its descendants; that AD frequently desert the readings of this original; and that \( \text{H}_3 \) and \( \text{S}_1 \) spasmodically have \( \gamma \) readings. The variant readings which characterize \( \gamma \) are, when not cases of manifest error, of a trifling sort, so that in only two or three cases at most have we any ground for regarding them as due to authentic revision.

We must now consider the agreements of \( \text{H}_2 \text{Ph} \). The instances I have collected are very numerous; but I shall give only the most striking cases. Though lines 1079–1638 of \( \text{H}_2 \) are by hand 2, the close relationship with Ph is not broken.

\[ \text{H}_2 \text{Ph.} \]

†13. And in \( \text{pis wrik} \ldots \)
\( \text{Rest:} \) And in \( \text{pis world} \ldots \)
(\( \text{ClAS}_1 \) word)

†98. \ldots mercy my dere hert
\( \text{Rest:} \ldots \) mercy swete herte
A hypermetrical line.

†137. \ldots eke to al myn offence
(Ph \text{vn}t\text{o} al)
\( \text{Rest:} \ldots \) egal to myn offence

†199. \ldots \text{per y-now}
\( \text{Rest:} \ldots \) \text{per with he lough}

†220. That yaf ful lightly of \( \text{pe pace} \)
\( \text{Rest:} \) That gan ful lyghtly of the lettre passe
(\( \text{H}_1 \) ful lightly gan; \( \text{H}_3 \) lightfully; \( \text{GgH}_5 \) \text{pis lettere}; \( \text{H}_4 \) That tenquire aftir the lettre was desirous)

†265. \ldots help her out of blame
\( \text{Rest:} \ldots \) kep hire out of blame

304. \ldots \text{pe tyme pat y was born}
\( \text{Rest:} \ldots \) \text{pe day} \ldots
(\( \text{GgH}_5 \) \text{at euere}; \( \text{JH}_4 \) \text{pat day})
And al þe rehetyng of his sikes sore

Rest: ... þe richesse ...

(H₄ tresour; Cx thoughtis)

The Italian reads: I sospir ch’egli aveva a gran dovizia, Fil. 3. 11.

Right as thyn own ...

Rest: Right as pi sclaeu ...

(GgRH₄ knaue; H₅ as I can; A felawe; Cl knaue, kn corrected)

... al þogh he come late

Rest: ... pat lone al come it late

... lettre ...

Rest: ... epistel ...

(GgH₅ pistil)

And seyd y suppose that he were there

γS₁ + J And seyde Nece I pose þat he were

GgH₅ And seyde what I pose that he were

(Gg by corrector; H₅ And he sayde, suppose)

H₃Cx And seyd nece I pose that he where there

H₄R And scide nece I pose that he ther wer

(H₄ I suppose he ther were; R om. seide)

There must have been confusion here in the common original.

Note that GgH₅ read what for Nece. Line 569 reads: And axed hym yf Troylus were there.

... Mancalus ...

Rest: ... Tantalus ...

... an honge payn

Rest: ... an huge rayn

Goth yn anone ...

Rest: The wyn anon ...

(H₅ Let all alone; Cx The wyn was brought; H₃ To wyn anon)

Your wymmen all y dare vndirtake

Slepe þat for hem men myght þis house myne

Rest: Yore wommen slepen all I vndertake

So þat for hem the hous men myghte myne

(H₅ I dar vndirtake; R this hous; A om. the hous; H₃ transposes 767 and 768)
The reading of $H_5$, *I dar undirtake*, suggests that the $H_2$Ph reading may originally have stood in the common ancestor of $H_2$Ph and Gg$H_5$; but the $H_2$Ph text of 766 is metrically deficient, and can hardly be authentic. We must assume that Gg has omitted *dar* for the sake of the metre.

882. Ye done hym neīper good ne gentilnesse  
Rest: Ye neīper bounte don ne gentilesse  
(H$_5$ bote; JRH$_4$ wisdom; Cx Neyther 3e wysely don)

†946. ... quod Pandare ...
Rest: ... quod he ...

1062. ... comith ...
Rest: ... folweth ...

1063, 1064. ... and eke men rede in story  
Rest: ... and reden ek in storyes  
That after sharpe shoures ben victories
(With line 1079 begins the second hand of $H_2$. There is a noticeable change in spelling; but there is no break in the close relationship of $H_2$ and Ph.)

†1136. pis list nece I ne seruep here of nouȝt  
$\gamma H_3 S_1$ This lyght nor I ne seruuen ...
Gg  pis list ne I seruyn ...
$H_5$  This lyght ne seruit ...
$\beta$  I nor this candel seruen ...
(R me thynk this candel serueth; Cx lacking)

†1187. He hir in hise armes to him fast hent  
Rest: He here in armes faste to hym hente

†1251. Ph omits line. In $H_2$ line added later by hand 3

†1261. Bemenyng loue pou holy god of pingis  
Rest: Benyngne loue thow holy bond of thynges  
($H_5$ Beyng, O holy bond; $H_4$ Hemane loue)

†1283. ... is felt perynne  
Rest: ... is felt in me  
(Gg by me by corrector; $H_5$ in me corrected)

Apparently Gg$H_5$ originally had the corrupt reading of $H_2$Ph. The rime word in 1285 is *benygnyte*.

(Lines 1289–1428 are lacking in $H_2$)
†1465. Wel mowen manye men pe dispise
(Ph om. mowen, owzt inserted later before mony)

Rest: And seyde o fol wel may men pe dispise
(Cx om. o)

1504. ... herte ...

Rest: ... brayn ...

†1600 ... pe firy feende of helle

Rest: ... flood ...

(With line 1639 begins again hand 1 of H2.)

†1679. ... hem two ...

Rest: ... hem bope ...

1744–1771. Troilus's song to love is omitted by H2 and added later on an inset leaf in Ph. For discussion of this passage see p. 155.

1779. Out of Troy an haukyng wold he ride

Rest: In tyme of trewe ...

The Italian reads: Ne' tempi delle triegue egli uccellava, Fil. 3. 91.

†1783. Felt his lady fre her wyndow doun

Rest: Ful ofte his lady from hire wyndow down

†1818. Me my boke now ende y in pis wise

Rest: My priddle book ...

(H3 fierde)

The list of H2Ph readings might be indefinitely extended. Those given above serve to show that the two MSS. are descended from the same corrupt original. Usually the characteristic reading is manifestly erroneous; never have we clear grounds for regarding the variant as authentic.

In the following list are given representative readings to establish the continued relationship in Book III of GgH5.

GgH5.

†74. ... quod he ... (+ R)

Rest: ... quod she ...

TEXT. TRAD.
†171, 172. 3e schal no more han soveraynte of me 
In loue . . .
(Gg seurete)

Rest: Ye shul nomore haue soueraynte 
Of me in loue . . .
(H₂ Ph Of my love)

277. . . wolde on it gaure & crie 
(H₅ on pat)

Rest: . . . wolde vpon it crye 
(γ vpon it wolde ; H₄ wolde on me pleyne & cry ; R 
wolden on yt)

357. bat gladere was pan ony man in troye 
(H₅ of troye)

Rest: That gladder was þere neuere man yn Troye 
(H₄ wight for man ; H₂ none for man)

†457. . . al day & swich a fere 

Rest: . . . alwey and in swych fere

683. Gg . . . & low & gan to loute 
H₅ . . . and lowe gan to lowte

Rest: . . . and gan ful lowe lowte 
(H₂ Ph to lout)

756. Let hem not rysyn . . .

Rest: Lat no wight rysen . . .

†970. Of deynte . . .
(H₅ As deynte)

Rest: Of duete . . .

†1071. . . so streynede him . . .

Rest: . . . to streynye hym . . .
(Cx straynith for to streyne)

†1123. . . whan he bet to a wake 
(H₅ bet to wake)

Rest: . . . whan he gan bet a wake 
(H₁ om. bet)

†1202. . . al hot . . .

Rest: . . . al hool . . .
Readings of GgH₅.

†1413.  It ny was be set . . .
(H₅ ner)
Rest: It was byset . . .

†1565.  Gg For þat ȝe ben . . .
H₅ For suche þat ȝe ben . . .
Rest: Fox þat ye ben . . .

†1768.  . . . hond . . .
Rest: . . . bond . . .

During the early part of Book III GgH₅ continue, as in the latter part of II, to associate with now this, now that, MS. of the β type. Thus in 90 they read werkis with R instead of wordes; in 178 JGgH₅H₃ read al my ful myght, where the rest omit ful; in 266 JGgH₅Cx read kepe for saue; in 391 GgH₅R₄ read knaue for scluue. But about line 400 (with one earlier instance in 243) begins a very striking series of readings in which GgH₅ agree with H₂Ph. To this combination we must give very careful attention; since it is of great importance to determine the character of these H₂PhGgH₅ readings.

H₂PhGgH₅(a).

243.  . . . with al my wit . . .
Rest: . . . with al my myght . . .

399.  Hit is not one . . . (+ J)
Rest: It is not so . . .
(Cx It is not bawdry)

401.  . . . as þe lest (+ H₄)
Rest: . . . what þe lyst

433.  From eche in that as ferre as is the cloude
He was . . .
(H₅ From whiche)
Rest: From euery wyght . . .

The a reading, though awkward, is at least defensible  In that must refer to þis matere of 432.

439.  . . . þe most parte . . . (+ RCx)
Rest: . . . þe more part . . .
The Manuscript Relations in Book III.

*459. ... in pis speche ...
(H₅ his)
βS₁ ... on this thing ...
(R of)
γH₃ ... of hem two ...

We have here one of the rare instances in which a, β, and γ present three distinct readings. The γ reading, however, I regard as a scribal corruption, since all MSS. read or to it ley an eere in the second half of the line, and in γ this it must go back for its reference to line 456.

461. ... space ... (+ JH₄)
Rest: ... grace ...
(Cx lacking)

The context favours space as the correct reading. It is also the durior lectio.

524. Ne ...
(H₅ Nor)
Rest: And ...
And is clearly preferable; but Ne, though awkward, is not impossible.

*543. Or þat the god ouȝt spak out of the tre
(H₂ Ph om. ouȝt)
Rest: Er þat Apollo spak out of the tre
(A ought for out; H₄ that tre)

This seems to be a deliberate revision. The name Apollo is mentioned in 541 and 546; so that the revision, if it is one, is hardly necessary.

549. Lo sone vpon þe chaungyng of the mone
(H₂ Ph vp chaungyng)
Rest: Right soone ... 

558. Ne done hym lenger ...
γH₃ Ne lengere don hym ...
βS₁ Ne make hym lenger ...

The γ reading seems to be a simple case of transposition. The revision, if any, is between αγ and β.
*598. And of her wymmen wele a nyne or ten
(H$_2$Ph om. of; GgH$_5$ om. a)
Rest: And opere of here wommen nyne or ten
(D om. opere; H$_3$ of hir fayr wommen)

599. But who is glad . . .
Rest: But who was glad . . .

*601. Thurch out an hole wip yn a litil stewe
(Gg of a lityl stewe; H$_5$ a lytyll hole of a stewe)
Rest: Thurch out a lytel wyndowe in a stuwe
(Cx om. out; D fewe for stewe)

612. . . pat best coupe devise (+ H$_3$)
Rest: . . that koude best deuyse

The $\beta\gamma$ reading is metrically better.

621. I mene it now for she gan home to hye
(H$_5$ om. to)
Rest: This mene I now for she gan homward hye
(ClAD om. now; D can hem ward)

*626. pat madyn such a reyne fro hevyn a vale
(Gg heue)
Rest: That swych a rayn from heuene gan a vale

629. At which Pandare lough . . .
Rest: At which pandare po lough . . .
(R that logh; Cx lough tho)

642. H$_2$ + D . . . frendly wip a frendis chere
Ph . . . prevy . . .
Gg H$_5$ . . . frely . . .
Rest: . . . gladly . . .

651. . . seth pat $\exists$e woly1 dwell (+ J)
(Gg syn $\exists$e wele with me dwelle; H$_5$ om. seth)
Rest: . . . syn pat yow lyst to dwelle
(Cx om. to)

694. And . . .
Rest: But . . .

696. Whan pat he wist . . .
Rest: Whan pat he sey . . .
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699. . . more let
Rest: . . . lenger lette
(H₄ any lett)

712. Now seynt Venus . . .
Rest: Yit blisful Venus . . .
(H₄ om. Yit; Cx That for Yit; D Ye for Yit)

In 705 ayH₃ read Now blysful Venus, while βS₁ read Now seint Venus.

†717. . . . cumbrid or let . . .
(H₅ encumbryd)
Rest: . . . combust or let . . .
(Cl combest; A combrest)

That combust is the correct reading is proved by Chaucer's Astrolabe, Pt. 2, § 4, 33. Cumbrid is apparently due to the suggestion of let.

751. . . . seid . . . (+ R)
Rest: . . . asked . . .

776. I mene as love a nothir in pis while (+ H₄R)
(Gg wyse for while)
Rest: I mene as loue an oper in pis mene while
(S₁ om. pis; DCx pe for pis)

The reading of γH₃S₁JCx is clearly wrong. The introduction of a second mene before while is a very easy mistake. It is just possible, however, that we have here a revision bungled by the scribe. As love an oper in pis mene while, would suit metre and context perfectly. The corruption must have existed in the common original, but apparently not till after H₂PhGgH₅ were derived from it.

819. . . . long here
(Gg longe here by corrector)
Rest: . . . alwey here

821. . . . how so . . .
Rest: . . . or how . . .
(R om. how)
Hit nedith more...

Rest: Wel more nede is it...

I pray to god y neuer more have ioy (+ H₃)

Rest: I bidde god I neuere mot haue Ioye

Is nedeles...

Rest: Is causeles...

... tho... (+ J)

Rest: ... Ianne...

... for...

Rest: ... syn...

... clepid...

Rest: ... called...

... wrecchis nel hit lere

Rest: ... wrecches wol not lere

This Troylus on knees sone hym set

Rest: ... ful sone on knes hym sette

The α reading is metrically deficient unless one reads a dissyllabic kneës or knowes; but in Troil. 3. 1592 the word has dissyllabic value in all the MSS. (CpH₁AJ read knowes, GgS₁ kneis, ClH₅CxH₄R knees, and H₅ know). Cf. also Prioress’s Tale 1719 and Franklin’s Tale 1025. In Gower the word is regularly monosyllabic, knees. It is a monosyllable in 1080.

H₆Ph And þogh she shold anon have be dede

H₅ And þow she anon shulde haue ben ded

Gg Leaves line blank.

Rest: Ne pough men sholden Smyten of here hed

(S₁ pough þat)
The a reading as given by $H_2\text{Ph}$ and by $H_5$ is metrically indefensible. The deliberate omission of the line by Gg would indicate that the scribe found it marked for correction in his exemplar. If we supply $\textit{bat}$ after $\textit{pogh}$ and adopt the order of words given by $H_5$, the line becomes admissible; but I am strongly of the opinion that the a reading is a scribal corruption, and that the $\beta\gamma$ reading is alone authentic.

†962. $H_2\text{Gg}H_5$ And seyd nece how wel lord can he knele

Ph And seyd lord how longe wil ye knele

Rest: And seyde nece se how this lord kan knele

($H_3$ $\text{om. se}$; $H_1$ $\text{om. kan}$; $H_4$ doth knele)

Again the a reading is corrupt. The clumsy attempt of Ph to improve upon it indicates that the scribe found it unsatisfactory. It is possible that the line originally stood: $\textit{And seyde nece how wel this lord kan knele}$, and that it was then revised to read as in $\beta\gamma$. Note that $H_3$ omits se.

989. $\ldots$ no wight $\ldots$

Rest: $\ldots$ no man $\ldots$

†1014. $\ldots$ her $\ldots$ ($-\text{Ph}$)

Rest: $\ldots$ his $\ldots$

Ph has corrected an obvious slip. The pronouns $\textit{he}$ and $\textit{hym}$ are found in all MSS. in 1013, and $\textit{hym}$ again in 1015. All refer to $\textit{Ielosye}$.

1041. $\ldots$ clepe $\ldots$

Rest: $\ldots$ calle $\ldots$

Cf. line 933.

1046. $\textit{Wher$ ye wil} $\ldots$

($H_2\text{Ph Wher ye wil}$; Gg wolde)

Rest: $\textit{Wher so yow lyste} \ldots$

($Cx\text{ Whether so}$; $R\text{ Wher so euer}$; $\text{A om. yow}$)

The $\beta\gamma$ reading is preferable; but the a reading is possible.

1063. $\textit{Folk sene} \ldots$

Rest: $\textit{Men sen} \ldots$

($H_3\text{ For men seyn}$)

The reading of $H_3$ looks like a conflation, with $\textit{Folk}$ changed to $\textit{For}$. 
H_{2}PhGgH_{5} (α).

1067.  Eke it pought hym . . .
Rest: For it poughte hym . . .

1079.  . . . his heede (+ H_{3}R)
Rest: . . . pe hed

1082.  . . . sche pat schulde his daiȝt
(Gg he)
Rest: . . . his sorwes lyghte
(H_{3} om. lyghte)
Though the α reading is not impossible, I suspect that it is
due to a scribe.

†1084.  þus seide he þet god woot of þis game
(Gg god wot þit)
Rest: Than seyde he þus god wot þat of þis game
(H_{4}R om. þat; Cx grame)
The omission of þat, which H_{4}R share with α, is certainly an
error.

†1086.  Therwith for sorwȝ so his hert swette
(H_{2}Ph þat for so; H_{2} swelt; Gg schette; H_{5} swett)
Rest: Ther with þe sorwe so his herte shette
(A om. þe; Cx of for so; H_{3} so in his herte; D soo
his sorow of his herte; R his sorwe to his herte)
The context makes clear that shette and not swette is the correct
reading. Note that Gg has emended to schette. The reading for
is, however, entirely possible.

1127.  Wole Troillus do þus alas for schame
Rest: What Troylus wol ye do þus for shame
(A om. ye; H_{4} thus fy for shame)
The βγ reading, with its direct address, is more effective; but
the α reading is perfectly satisfactory.

1153.  þat badde sche him to telle . . .
(Gg om. him)
γ  She bad hym þat to telle . . .
(H_{1} for to tel þat)
βS_{1}H_{3} This bad she hym to telle . . .
(H_{3} Thus)
I regard γ as a mere scribal variant of α. The difference
between α and β is trivial.
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1163. ... answeride him ... 
Rest: Omit him.

1250. Hir snowe whit proote ... (+ H₃R)
(H₂Ph On hir)
Rest: Here snowyssh prote ...

†1288. Omit heyghe. (− Gg, + H₃)

Gg has corrected a defective line. The omission by H₃ suggests that the word had been added later in the common original of all the MSS.

1348. ... we ben ... (H₂ lacking) (+ A)
Rest: ... ye ben ...
(D lacking)

†1388. ... as longe ... (H₂ lacking) (+ H₄)
Rest: ... al so longe ...

1389. As hadde myda for his coueytise (H₂ lacking) (+ A)
Rest: ... ful of coueytise
(D lacking)

The a reading is distinctly preferable. Cf. lines 1390, 1391.

1390. ... as hote & as stronge (H₂ lacking) (+ AH₄)
Rest: ... as hoot and stronge
(H₃D lacking)

1406. Omit For (H₂ lacking) (− Gg)

1512. For I am youres ... (− Gg)
(H₅ youre)
Rest: For I am þyn ...

1554. At suche a pliȝt ... (− H₅)
Rest: In swych a plyt ...

1595. An hundrid tymes ...
(GgH₅ tyme)
γ An hondred sithe ...
βH₃S₁ A thousand tyme ...
(H₄CₓS₁ tymes)

I regard γ as a scribal variation of a; but see below, p. 172.
Troilus's Hymn to Love.
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*1643. ... al day pis ping ... (+ A)

(H₅ al wey ; GgA pis ping al day)

Rest : ... pis mater ofte ... 

(H₄ ofte this mater)

1707. H₂PhGg + A ... so to rise

H₅ + H₃ ... for to ryse

Rest : ... pus to ryse

1793. ... he lorn had euery wight

(Ph he loue had of euery ; H₅ he lorn hald)

Rest : ... he lost held euery wyght

Besides the agreements noted above, instances of H₂PhGg, without H₅, are found in lines 175, 186, 338, 901, and of H₂PhH₅, without Gg, in 75, 159, 870, 1049, 1132. These cases are all trivial.

An examination of the readings recorded in the long list just given makes clear the following facts:

(1) There are a few cases, indicated by a *, where the character of the variants is such as to justify the hypothesis that H₂PhGgH₅ present an unrevised authentic reading.

(2) In a majority of the 65 cases the H₂PhGgH₅ reading is in every way possible, and may be an unrevised authentic reading.

(3) In a number of cases, indicated by a †, the H₂PhGgH₅ reading is clearly corrupt; and in several other cases it is probably corrupt.

From these facts we must conclude that H₂Ph and GgH₅ were derived from the common original of all the MSS. in its unrevised, a state. The few corrupt readings in which they share, most of them of a trivial character, can best be explained as errors in Chaucer's own archetype copy which had escaped correction at the author's hand. Were H₂Ph and GgH₅ descended from a common ancestor, other than Chaucer's archetype, we should expect to find, as in the case of the γ MSS., a much greater degree of corruption. We should, moreover, on such a theory, expect GgH₅ to agree with H₂Ph in omitting the Boethian hymn to love, a discussion of which must next concern us.

Troilus's Hymn to Love.

The most striking a variant in Book III is one in which GgH₅ do not share, the omission, namely, of the four stanzas, lines 1744-
1771, which contain the triumphant song of Troilus in praise of love, the ideas of which are taken from Boethius, Book II, metre 8. In $H_2$ the stanzas are omitted without any indication of their loss. In Ph they have been added later, though by the original scribe, on an inset leaf with proper indication of their place in the body of the text. The source from which Ph has drawn the stanzas is clearly a MS. of the $\gamma$ type closely related to $H_1$. In 1748 Ph reads *Knyttith* with $\gamma$ instead of *endileth*; and in 1755 *rosy carte* with $H_1$ instead of *rosy day*.

Since these stanzas are omitted only by $H_2$ Ph, we should at first glance regard the omission as due to the carelessness of the scribe who wrote their corrupt common ancestor. But it is hard to see how precisely these four stanzas should have been overlooked. There is nothing in the context to mislead the scribal eye into a sin of anticipation; nor with a loss of four stanzas can we suppose the careless turning of a leaf. Moreover, line 1743, *And pan he wold syng in pis manere*, clearly requires that the actual words of the song follow. It is inconceivable that so beautiful a passage should deliberately have been omitted. The probabilities favour the hypothesis that the passage did not yet exist in Chaucer's original at the time the $H_2$ Ph ancestor was derived.

This probability is greatly strengthened by an examination of the sources. In this part of Book III Chaucer is following closely the text of *Filostrato*. In stanza 73 of Book III Boccaccio says that Troilo began, *Lietamente a cantare in cotal guisa*, and there follows a song in honour of love, which in general character is a good deal like the song which Chaucer puts in the mouth of his Troilus. But the song in *Filostrato* Chaucer had already used for the proem to Book III, and plainly it could not again be used here; so its place was supplied by adapting a hymn to love out of the second book of Boethius. Apparently this substitution did not immediately occur to him; and for a time line 1743, *And pan he wold syng in pis manere*, was followed by a blank space. During this state of the text the ancestor of $H_2$ Ph must have been derived.

If so, how are we to explain the presence of the passage in Gg$H_5$? Two explanations suggest themselves. Either the ancestor of Gg$H_5$ supplied the omission later from another source, as does Ph before our eyes; or the passage had been added in

---

1 See *The MSS. of Chaucer's Troilus*, Plate XVIII.
Chaucer's original before the GgH₅ ancestor was derived. As between these two explanations the evidence does not permit of any decision. In 1751 GgH₅ have the corrupt reading unstable of JH₄ instead of stable. This would point towards the first explanation. That Gg was derived later than Ph is shown by their treatment of the free-choice soliloquy of Book IV.¹ This would furnish corroboration for the second hypothesis. In either event it seems clear that Chaucer's text existed for a time without the Boethian hymn to love.

Readings Characteristic of β.

The most important series of divergent readings in Book III is that which characterizes β, readings in which JH₄RCx agree as against α and γ. With these β MSS. are sometimes associated H₃ and S₁, which in other lines, as we have seen, are associated, now one, now both, with γ. So varying are H₃ and S₁ in their allegiance that it will be necessary to specify their readings in each of the instances presently to be discussed.

The most significant β variant has to do with the position of two stanzas, numbered 190 and 191 (lines 1324–1337) in Skeat's edition. In JRCx they are moved down to a position between stanzas 202 and 203 (according to the standard numbering), that is to say, they become lines 1401–1414. In this arrangement H₃ and S₁ agree. H₄ has the two stanzas in both positions. In these two stanzas, as we shall see, there are a number of distinctive β readings. H₄ has the two stanzas in the αγ position with αγ readings, and then repeats them in the β position with β readings. Moreover, JH₄RCx + H₃S₁ give a variant reading of line 1415 which suits it to a position immediately after the transposed stanzas, and JH₄RCx + H₃ a variant reading of 1323 which immediately precedes the stanzas in αγ. In S₁ the stanzas have been moved, but 1323 has not been revised. In H₄, which has the shifted stanzas in both positions, 1323 has the β reading. These revisions of individual lines are discussed in due place in the list which follows. They bear important evidence to the deliberate nature of the shift. What motive may have led to this shifting of the stanzas is not clear. They contain the author's reflections on the story, and in either position interrupt the flow of the narrative. That the αγ position is the earlier is shown by the echo of telle

¹ See below, pp. 216–221.
from line 1323 to the first line of the shifted passage. Moreover, had the β text been the original, there would have been no occasion for revising line 1415.¹

We must now give the variant readings which characterize the β group. It will be noticed that they are much more frequent after line 400.

\[ \text{JH}_4 \text{RCx}(\beta). \]

58. \[ \begin{align*}
\text{JCx} & \ldots \text{and sor for to sike (Cx sore)} \\
\text{R} & \ldots \text{and often sore sike} \\
\text{H}_4 & \ldots \text{gan ofte forto sike} \\
\text{H}_3 & \ldots \text{and short gan to syke} \\
\text{Rest :} & \ldots \text{and short for to syke}
\end{align*} \]

The β original must have been confused, since its descendants are so uncertain of the reading.

80. \[ \ldots \text{to hir seye (}- \text{H}_4\text{)} \]

\[ \text{Rest :} \ldots \text{to it seye} \]

82. \[ \ldots \text{he was} \ldots \text{(}- \text{J}\text{)} \]

\[ \text{Rest :} \ldots \text{he wex} \ldots \]

*269. For neuere was there wight I dar wel swere

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{CX yit for ther; H}_5 \text{ pat for ther; H}_4 \text{ Ne neuer was ther wiht I durste swere)} \\
\text{Rest : For pat man is vnborne dar I swere}
\end{align*} \]

(Cp I dar wel swere)

A clear case of revision, in which, however, R retains the earlier reading. GgH₅ do not become definitely a until about line 400 (see above, p. 147).

*293. Han written or this as yit men teche vs yonge

(J men yit; H₄ alwey for or this)

\[ \text{Rest : Han euere yet prouerbed to vs yonge} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{H}_2 \text{ om. yet; Ph prouerbyd 3et ; H}_1 \text{H}_3 \text{ this for yet ;} \\
\text{CpS}_2 \text{Dig thus for yet ; S}_2 \text{Dig pise 3onge)
\end{align*} \]

¹ One is tempted to seek for some connection between the shifting of stanzas 190 and 191 by β and the loss in the AD ancestor (see p. 138) of lines 1345-1414. But no such connection seems to exist. The loss in the AD ancestor is of a single leaf with ten stanzas. Eleven stanzas intervene between the two positions of the shifted stanzas. The loss of lines 1289-1428 in H₃ is due to mutilation of the existing MS.
... man ... (− H₄)

Rest: ... wyght ...

But rather wolde I dye ... (+ S₁)

(J That for But; H₄S₁ die I wolde)

Rest: That raper deye I wolde ...

(Gg(H₅) What for That)

Note that J reads That with αγ and that H₄S₁ keep the αγ word-order.

... doost me ... (− H₄, + S₁)

(Cx hast me)

Rest: ... me dost ...

I nyl nat seyn that thogh he laye ful softe (+ S₁)

(J om. ful; S₁ though pat; Cx lacking)

Rest: Nyl I nought swere al pough he lay softe

The αγ reading is unmetrical unless we read laye, a dissyllabic subjunctive. This form, laye, is found only in J, which departs from β by omitting ful.

And ... (+ S₁)

(Cx lacking)

Rest: Ne ...

This ... (+ H₃S₁)

(Cx lacking)

Rest: That ...

And ... (+ S₁)

(Cx lacking)

Rest: But ...

This mene while ... (+ S₁)

(Cx lacking)

Rest: That in pis while ...

(CpH₁S₂Dig which for while; AD That in pis mene while)

Note the conflate reading of AD.

In euery thing ... (+ S₁)

(Cx lacking)

Rest: So as þey dorste ...
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Wolde on this thing or to it leye an eere (+ S₁)
(R of for on; H₄ thynges; Cx lacking)
a Wolde in pis speche . . .
γH₃ Wolde of hem two . . .

The γ reading can hardly be authentic, since, with the plural hem two, it must refer back to line 456.

As Cupido wolde hem a space sende
(J Cupide; R hem a grace wold sende; Cx lacking)

Rest: As pat Cupido wolde hem space sende
(H₅ And pat; γH₃S₁ grace)

For the reading grace see above, p. 148.

hir thoght . . .
(Cx lacking)

Rest: . . . she poughte . . .
(Cp he thought)

this fir (− Cx)

Rest: . . . þe fyr

wight . . . (+ S₁)

Rest: . . . man . . .

*490. Ne bar hym bet to don his frend to spede

Rest: Ne bar hym bet þan he with outen drede

The β reading is distinctly preferable.

That euery word or look or sonde or cheere
(R That euere looke or euery sond or chiere; Cx om. second or)

Rest: . . . or sonde or lok or chere

(H₂Ph sond or word or loke; GgH₅ soun; Gg om. first or; H₅ om. second or)

*503. An hondred vers . . .

Rest: Neigh half þis bok . . .

A clear case of revision in the interest of accuracy. Neigh half þis bok is a long limit for even a love letter.

As I haue seyd . . . (+ S₁)

Rest: As I haue told . . .

alwey . . .

Rest: . . . euere . . .

(H₅ om. euere)
*518. Hadde as hym thought . . (+ S₁)

Rest: Hadde out of doute . .
(Gg Lad for Hadde ; H₅ And for Hadde)

525. That thoughte he . . (+ S₁)

(Cx He thought)

Rest: That wyst he . .

528. Thus . . (+ S₁)

Rest: Now . .

529. . . bothe wild and tame (+ H₃S₁)

Rest: . . . bope fremed and tame

(H₂PhGg frend)

This substitution of a familiar for a less familiar word looks like a scribal corruption, perhaps due to the incorporation of a gloss. However, the change may be due to authentic revision.

544. To telle hym whan the grekis sholden flee

(J pat for the ; H₄ om. the)

Rest: To telle hym next whan grekes sholden fle

(H₂Ph whan pat pe grekis ; Gg whi pe grekys ; DS₁ whan pe grekes)

The readings of H₂Ph and Gg suggest that the line may first have stood: To telle hym next whan pe grekes sholde fle. This was then emended by γ by dropping pe (note, however, the reading of DS₁), and later by β by dropping next.

*546. But prey appollo pat he wolde hym spede

(R wel for wolde ; H₄ wil for wolde)

Rest: . . . helpen in pis nede

(H₂PhD help hym in his nede ; H₃ that he helpe ;
H₅ to helpen)

554. Whan he was there . . (+ S₁)

Rest: Whan he was come . .

(Cl whanne)

555. . . at hym self . . (+ S₁+D)

Rest: . . . of himself . .

558. Ne make hym lenger . . (+ S₁)

a Ne done hym lenger . .

γH₃ Ne lengere don hym . .

(H₃ hym doon)

I regard the γH₃ reading as a scribal transposition of a.
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*568. And she agayne gan to hym for to rowne
(H₄Cx om. first to; H₄ on game for agayne)
Rest: Soone after pis she gan to hym to rowne
(Cl to hym she gan; Cph₁S₂AH₃ she to him gan;
S₁ Soon after that she gan unto him rowne;
H₂PhH₅H₃D om. second to)

573. . . men sholde . . . (+ S₁)
Rest: . . men myght . . .

578. . . soth therof . . . (+ H₃S₁+AD)
(H₄ there for therof; S₁AD a soth)
Rest: . . therof soth . . .
(Cl pere for therof; H₅ om. therof)

*579, 580. But pat she graunted with hym for to go
Withoute awayt . . . (+S₁)
(Cx Wythoute nayeng)
Rest: But pat with outen awayte with hym to go
She graunted hym . . .
(H₂Ph But þerwith out with hym to go, Ph inserts
more after out; H₅ withowte more; H₁ om. outen;
GgH₅ it for second him)

*588. . . for I do as yow liste
(J pat yow liste)
Rest: . . and do now as yow lyste
(H₁ om. and; Gg riʒt for now; H₅ ye luste)

591. . . fel and boones (+H₃S₁)
Rest: . . soule and bones

Fel and boones seems a much more appropriate reading. Soule
is apparently an error of "Adam Scriveyn" not corrected till β.

*593. . . what shold I lenger dwelle
(J longe telle)
Rest: . . what sholde I more telle
Note that J only partially incorporates the β reading.

*604. But now to purpos . . . (+ S₁)
Rest: But to þe poynyt now . . .
(Gg om. now)
†607, 608. And after to the soper alle and some
When tyme was to soper they hem sette (+ S₁)
(R And afterward to souper . . . When it was tyme
faste they hem sette; H₄ tyme it was; Cx they be
sette)

Rest: And after to þe souper alle and some
When tyme was ful softe þey hem sette
(Cl, hym for hem; D And after þat to souper, hem
þei; GgPh om. þe)

A clear case of error. β has repeated soper. Note the
emendation of R.

635. For Nece this is youre owen hous parde (+ S₁)
(J om. is)

Rest : For whi . . .

659. . . . shal . . .

Rest : . . . wol . . .

*668. And al with Inne shal your seluen be (+ S₁)

Rest: And þere I seyde . . .

(Gg þere be sydyn; H₅ þere he seyde)

A revision in the interest of greater clearness.

*672. Than is it tyme for to gon to reste (+ H₃S₁)

(R om. for; H₄ That it is tyme for you goth to rest)

Rest : So go we slepe I trowe it be þe beste

(A To go; H₂Ph om. So; H₅ and trowe later altered
to y trowe; H₂ it is)

673. There was no moore . . . (+ S₁)

Rest : There nys no more . . .

(H₂PhH₅AD is)

*677. And alweye in this meene while it ron (+ S₁)

(S₁ so it roon)

Rest: And euere mo so sternelych it ron

(Gg to sterneliche; D stronglich)

702. Of al this thing . . .

(H₄ om. Of)

Rest: Of alle pis werk . . .
Now seint venus thow me grace sende (+ S₁)
(R Now Venus pray I pat thow)

Rest: Now blysful Venus . . .

In 712 a reads seynt venus where γ and β read blissful Venus.

Here at this litel trappe dore . . . (+ S₁)
(R a for this; J lite)

Rest: . . . secre trappe dore . . .

That for to holden longe a man in honde (+ H₃)
(RCx a man longe)

Rest: . . . holde in loue . . .

Gan therwith al aboute hir herte colde
And with a syk she sodeynly answerde (+ S₁)
(Cx om. al; H₄ al hir herte to colde

Rest: Gan sodeynly aboute her herte colde
And with a syk she sorwfully answerede
(H₁ line 800 over erasure; D om. line 800; H₂PhCl ful for she)

O brotel wele of worldly Ioye vnstable (+ S₁)
(JRH₄ o wordly Ioye)

Rest: . . . of mannes Ioye . . .

Ye neyther wisdom don ne gentilesse
(Cx Neyther ye wysely don)

Rest: . . . bounte . . .
(H₅ bote; H₂Ph Ye done hym neijer good ne)

The reading wisdom is a distinct improvement, serving as it
does to balance folie of 879.

Omit pat (— J)

. . . and this mater on honde (+ S₁)
(Cx & haue this mater in hande)

Rest: . . . and pat we han on honde
(GgH₃ ye han; H₅ we be; A in honde)

Note the conflate reading of Cx.

. . . al be . . .

Rest: . . . ben alle . .
(S₁H₅ om. alle)

She myghte . . . (+ S₁)

Rest: She kowde . . .
971. But wel wot I ...
   (Cx But wele I rede)
Rest: But wel fynde I ...
   (H₃ I fynde)

1011. So causeles ...
   (+ S₁)
Rest: Thus causeles ...

1019. And he pat ...
   (+ S₁ + AD)
(R om. he)
Rest: And who pat ...
   (GgH₅ And ho at)

1096. ... alwey at the laste ...
   (+ H₃S₁)
Rest: ... certeyn at pe laste
   (Ph om. pe)

1101, 1102. I wis yowr owne Troilus is lorn
   Allas ...
   (+ H₃S₁)
Rest: Allas youre owne Troylus is lorn
   I wys ...
   (H₂ our; Gg om. owne)

1115. They gan toroke and ek his tempes twyne ...
   (+ H₃S₁)
(Cx lacking)
Rest: ... and wete his temples twyne

1136. I nor this candel seruen here of naught
   (R Me thynk this candel serueth; Cx lacking)
Rest: This lyght nor I ne seruen ...
   (H₂Ph nece for nor; H₃ and for nor; Gg þís lýþt ne I
      seruyn; H₅ þís lyygh ne seruitt)

1141. ... his candele ...
   (- R, + H₃ + Gg)
(Cx lacking)
Rest: ... pe candele ...

1153. This bad she hym to telle ...
   (+ H₃S₁)
   (H₃ Thus; Cx lacking)
   α pat badde sché him to telle ...
   (Gg om. him)
   γ She bad hym þat to telle ...
   (H₁ Shô bad him for to tel þat)
I regard γ as a scribal variant of α.
166  *1163, 1177. Criseide answerde . . . (+ H₃S₁)
     (Cx lacking in 1163)
     Rest: And she answered . . .

      Precisely the same variation is found in 1163 and 1177.
1214. . . . al day . . . . (+ H₃S₁)
     Rest: . . . often . . .

     Lines 1212–1246 are written twice in R, once in their proper
     place on fol 57ᵃ, and earlier, between lines 1099 and 1100 on
     fols. 54ᵇ and 55ᵃ. In the earlier occurrence line 1214 has the ay
     reading.
1218. . . . now his cure (− H₄, + H₃)
     Rest: . . . al his cure
1225. . . . when it comth to the nede (+ H₂S₁)
     (H₄RCx om. the)
     Rest: . . . yf it comth to pe nede
     (H₁ of for yf; Cl come; H₅ to com to nede)
1239. . . . and tolde al hir entente (+ H₃S₁)
     (H₄ & told him al hir entente)
     Rest: . . . and told hym here entente
     (Gg tok)

      Note the conflate reading of H₄.
1245. Is . . . . (+ H₃)
     Rest: Was . . .
1258. And nexte yow ymeneus I the grete (+ H₃S₁)
     (Cx om. yow; H₃ om. I)
     Rest: And nexte pat . . .
     (Cl pe for pat)

      Yow must refer to Love and Venus, addressed earlier in the
      stanza; but the construction is, to say the least, awkward, and I
      suspect that the β reading is corrupt.
1260. . . . pat . . . . (+ H₃)
     Rest: . . . which . . .
1264. And . . . . (+ H₃)
     Rest: For . . .
1280. . . . whom . . . . (+ H₃S₁)
     Rest: . . . whiche . . .
1283. . . . this . . . (+ H₃)
        (H₄ thos)
Rest: . . . pat . . .

*1284. That am vnworthy to yow lady bright (+ H₃)
        (H₃ vn to you; Cx to yow my lady)
Rest: . . . to so swete a wyght

1295. Ne do no thing pat do yow displesaunce (+ H₃S₁)
        (H₄ I for Ne; R thing vnto 3owr displesaunce)
Rest: . . . pat yow be displesaunce
        (Gg pow be over erasure; H₅ be to yow)

1307. For this suffiseth which pat seyde is heere (+ H₃S₁)
        (H₄ om. pat; Cx is sayd)
Rest: For it suffisith pis pat seyd is here
        (Gg vnficep; Ph pat pat is seyd; H₂ lacking.)

1316. They felte in loue . . . (− R, + H₃)
Rest: Felten in loue . . .
        (R Felten the loue)

*1323. That is so heygh pat no man kan it telle (+ H₃)
        (H₃ so high is; Cx om. it)
Rest: . . . al ne kan I telle.

The revision is connected with the shifting of stanzas 190 and 191 in β.¹ Line 1323 is the last line of stanza 189. In ay it is immediately followed by the line, But soth is pough I kan not telle al, which echoes al ne kan I telle. Note that S₁, though it shifts the stanzas, does not alter this line; and that H₄ has the β reading though it has the two stanzas here as well as in their β position.

*1324. But how al thogh I kan nat tellen al (+ H₃)
        (J thoght)
        S₁ But al be it pat . . .
Rest: But soth is pough . . . (+ H₄ first copy)
        (H₁ pat thought)

This is the first line of the shifted stanzas. Note that the first copy in H₄, in the ay position, retains the ay reading.

¹ See above, p. 157.
168 The Manuscript Relations in Book III.

*1327. . . the gret of his sentence (+ $H_3S_1$)

Rest: . . . al hoolly his sentence (+ $H_4$ first copy)

(Ph as for al; $H_2$ lacking)

The revised reading is a more accurate statement of the fact.

1329. . . any thing . . . (+ $H_3S_1$)

Rest: . . . ony word . . . (+ $H_4$ first copy)

*1334. And putte hem hool in yowr discrecioun (+ $H_3$.

($J$ & for in; Cx And I putte)

Spl And put tham alle . . .

Rest: . . . And putte it al . . . (+ $H_4$ first copy)

(A in al 3oure)

Note the conflate reading of $S_1$.

1348. That this . . . (— Cx, + $H_3$)

Rest: That it . . .

(Gg om. it)

1354. . . this wo (+ $H_3$)

Rest: . . . swych wo

(A al þe wo)

1360. And wel a thousand tymes gan he sike (+ $H_3S_1$)

($J$ thouusand)

Rest: . . . an hundred tymes . . .

The Italian reads *mille sospiri*, Fil. 3. 37. This would seem to mark the $\beta$ reading as more original; but since the overwhelming weight of evidence points the other way, the closer approximation of $\beta$ to the Italian must be regarded as fortuitous.

1362. For sorwe . . . (+ $H_3$)

Rest: For wo . . .

1367. . . hir auenture (+ $H_3$)

($H_3$ her inserted above later)

Rest: . . . pis auenture

1382. . . clepyðn . . . (+ $H_3$)

Rest: . . . callen . . .
*1392, 1393. To techen hem pat couetise is vice
   And loue is vertu thogh men halde it nyce
   (H₃ lacking)

Rest:  To techen hem pat pey ben in pe vice
   And louneres nought al pough pey hold hem nyce
   (PhH₅ om. first pey; H₁ han for ben; S₁ pough pat
   men holde; Ph wyse)

Note that S₁ incorporates part of the β reading in 1393. A
striking case of revision in the interest of greater clearness.

1395. . . . ful assured . . . (+ S₁)
   (Cx fully; R assented)
   H₃ . . . bothe assured . . .

Rest:  . . . wel assured . . .

1399. . . . al pat heunynesse (+ H₃)
   (H₃ their besinesse)

Rest:  . . . al swych heunynesse

*1415. Whan pat the Cok . . . (+ H₃S₁)
   (R om. pat)

Rest:  But whanne pe kok . . .

The Italian reads Ma poiìch' e' galli . . . udìro Cantar, Fil. 3.
42, which marks the ay reading as more original. The change
was dictated by the shifting of stanzas 190 and 191, which in
the β position immediately precede this line. The last line of
stanza 191 (line 1337) reads in all the MSS.: But now to purpus
of my raper speche. It was necessary, therefore, to avoid the
repetition of But.

1418. . . . and outhe hir stremes throwe (+ H₃)
   (J stremyes)

Rest:  . . . bemys . . .
   (H₁ bemye)

Either word is possible. See Skeat's glossary s.v. streem.

1431. . . . thy blake weeke (+ H₃S₁)

Rest:  . . . pi derke weeke

Only two lines before occurs the phrase O blake nyght; so that
the repetition of the word in β is not very happy.
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*1437–1439. Thow rakel nyght ther god makere of kynde
   For thow so downward hasteth of malice
   The corse and tooure emysperie bynde (+ H₃)
   (R om. so, the hastef, he the bynde; H₄Cx Thi cours)

   Rest: The for þyn hast and þyn vnkynde vice
   So faste ay tooure hemyspere bynde
   (Cp om. second þyn; D and for þin; H₂Ph vn to þoure
   emyspery)

   I have not recorded the many spellings of hemyspere. Note
   that H₄Cx misunderstand corse (= curse), and regard Thi cours
   (= course) as the object of hasteth. Such a reading does not
   allow for the following and.

1440. That neuer mo . . . (− Cx, + H₃S₁)
   (R euermo)

   Rest: That neuere more . . .

*1441. For thorugh thy rakel hying out of Troye (+ H₃S₁)
   (J lying; S₁ with for thorugh)

   Rest: For now for þow so hyest out of Troye
   (H₂Ph For now þou hiȝest so; Gg om. so; H₅ For
   be cause þou so fast hiest)

1451. . . . loue and nyght . . . (+ H₃)

   Rest: . . . nyght and loue . . .

1455. . . . what sekist thow in this plase (+ H₃)
   (J om. in; R here written and deleted before in)

   Rest: . . . why sekestow þis place

1464. . . . wolde he chide (+ H₃S₁)

   Rest: . . . gan he chyde

1466. That hast al nyght the dawynge by thy side (+ H₃)

   Rest: . . . þe Dawyng al nyght . . .

1470. I prey to god . . . (+ H₃S₁)
   (H₃ And for I)

   Rest: I bidde god . . .

*1473. The verray roote . . . (+ H₃S₁)

   Rest: The welle and rote . . .
   (H₂ þe well of roote; A wile)
The antithesis between dove and eagle is so much more obvious, that at first sight one is inclined to regard the hawk as due to scribal blundering. But the eagle and the night-hawk are also traditional foes. Pliny says, *Nat. Hist.*, 9. 24, "Nocturnus accipiter... bellum internecivum gerit cum aquila, coherentesque sepe prenduntur.” Since clearly justifiable, the *durior lectio*, haukes, has every claim to be regarded as authentic. The reading dowues may be either Chaucer’s first writing of the line, or an error due to “Adam scriveyn,” not corrected till after the derivation of a and γ.

1514. ... or now ... (+ H₃)

Rest: ... er pis ...

1538. But slepe ne may noon in his herte synke (− J)

(Cx om. ne; H₄ ther for ne)

S₁... ne may pere non ...

Rest: ... ne may pere ...

(H₂Ph No sleep may pere; H₅ there ne may)

Note the conflate reading of S₁. H₃ and J have the aγ reading.

*1561. That som of vs for god our hede may ake (+ H₃)

(J hir hede; H₃ his hede; Cx That somme of vs our hedis ought to ake)

Rest: ... I trowe here hedes ake

1563. This bright morwe ... (+ H₃)

Rest: This mery morwe ...

(ClCp murye; Cp mury; H₂ mey)

Though all the β MSS. read a monosyllabic bright, we must assume the weak form brighte, which is grammatically correct and necessary for the metre.
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1576. which nedeth naught to seye (+H₃ +D) (J naugh; R which is not goodly for to seye)
Rest: . . . chargeth . . .

1582. . . . hoolly . . . (+H₃)
Rest: . . . fully . . .

*1595. A thousand tyme and gan the day to blisse (+H₃S₁) (H₄CxS₁ tymes; H₃ gan he day blisse; S₁ pe day gan blysse)
a An hundrid tymes and gan pe tyme blysse (GgH₅ tyme; H₄Ph blesse)
γ An hundred sithe he gan pe tyme blysse (CID and gan)

I take the γ reading to be a scribal emendation intended to avoid the repetition of tyme in a. In β the same purpose is attained by substituting day to for the second tyme. The change to thousand is characteristic of β. Cf. above, line 1360.

†1600. H₄ contoun; R coichyton; Cx Cochita; H₃ conciton; J flagitoun, flag over erasure.
Rest: Fro Flegiton the fery flood of helle (H₅ om. Fro; H₁ flagitoun; Cp flegtoun; A flityon; H₂Ph feende of helle)

The various readings of the β MSS. seem to be variations of Cocytus. Note that in J the word has been corrected, so that we are justified in inferring that J originally read some form like that in R or H₃. Phlegethon is peculiarly the "fiery flood," so that Cocytus is hardly correct. Moreover, the β MSS. make the word end in n rather than s. This is the only instance in Chaucer in which either river is mentioned. Styx is mentioned in Troil. 4. 1540, as the put of helle. It is possible that the mistaken change may be due to Chaucer.

1621, 1622. God help me so but take it naught a grief For loue of god be war of this myschief (+H₃S₁) (R at grief; H₃ on greefe, For the love; R tak hede of this)
Rest: That I shal seyn be war of this myschief (Cl of of for of this; A such for this)

The revision, if it is such and not a scribal corruption, is not a
very happy one, since *take it naught a grief* seems to need the *ay* reading to complete its meaning.

1632. Thou art at ese holde the now theryn (− J, + H₃)  
(H₃ And holde; H₄ now hold the; R writes and erases a w before now)  
\[\text{Rest} : \quad \ldots \text{and holde pe wel per Inne}\]

Note that H₃ retains *and*, and that R started to write *wel*. J keeps the *ay* reading.

1639. \[\ldots \text{god biforn (− Cx, + H₃)}\]
\[\text{Rest} : \quad \ldots \text{god to form}\]

*1645. By god \ldots (+ H₃S₁)\]
\[\text{Rest} : \quad \text{God wot} \ldots \]

1665. This tale was ay \ldots (+ H₃S₁ + AD)  
(Cx alwey; H₃ euer)  
\[\text{Rest} : \quad \text{This tale ay was \ldots}\]
(H₂Ph om. ay; H₅ was euere)

†1685. J drede; RS₁ wo; H₄ ioie; Cx care  
\[\text{Rest} : \quad \text{Agon was euer} \text{ay sorwe and euer fere}\]
(H₃ om. second euere)

The β MSS. are uncertain in their reading. Note that H₃ omits *euer*. It is clear that in the β original the word *sorwe* was either lacking altogether or had become totally illegible.

1720. \[\ldots \text{ay withouten drede (+ H₃)}\]
\[\text{Rest} : \quad \ldots \text{alwey out of drede}\]

1746. Love which \[\text{pat with an holsom alliance (− Cx)}\]  
\[\text{Rest} : \quad \text{Love} \text{pat with} \ldots\]
\[\text{(H₅ pat which with)}\]

1795. \[\ldots \text{by right (− J, + H₃)}\]
\[\text{Rest} : \quad \ldots \text{of right}\]
\[\text{(A a right)}\]

The list of β readings has been a long and tedious one; but it was necessary to record it in its entirety, trivial cases with striking cases, because only so can the character of this important group be determined. A study of the list reveals the following significant facts.

(1) Of the 129 instances recorded, a large number seem to be due to deliberate revision. I have marked with an asterisk 36
cases which seem to me clearly of this character; but the presumption must be in favour of deliberate revision in every case where the β reading is not obviously corrupt.

(2) In a number of instances one of the four regular β MSS. gives the αγ reading, where the other three present a β variant; but this phenomenon is not found in the case of any of the striking readings of the sort which I have marked with an asterisk.

(3) In a few instances one of the four regular β MSS., or H₃, or S₁, presents a conflate reading combined of αγ on the one hand and of β on the other. The most striking instance of this is the fact that H₄ has the shifted stanzas (190 and 191) written twice, in the αγ position and again in the β position.

(4) In a very few instances, lines 608, 922 (?), 1600 (?), 1685, the β reading is corrupt.

(5) S₁ shares in a majority of the β readings throughout Book III, but less consistently in the latter part of the book. H₃ shares only occasionally in β readings before line 1096; after that it shares in nearly all of them.

For such a series of facts there is but one probable explanation: JH₄RCx are descended from a common original, which must have been a MS. originally of αγ type extensively altered by corrections and revisions in the margin and between the lines. In individual cases a single β MS. has failed to incorporate one of these revisions, and has instead copied the original unrevised reading which would still be perfectly legible on the page. In this MS. there remained uncorrected a few, though a very few, scribal errors.

Of the nature of the participation of H₃ and S₁ in the readings of β we can more profitably speak in another place (see p. 181).

Within the β group no sub-group can be established. With the exception of J all of the β MSS., including H₃ and S₁, are full of careless errors involving sense or metre, such as simple cases of transposition or the omission of single words. When two MSS. are continually guilty of this sort of carelessness, it is inevitable that in the course of 1800 lines there should be not infrequent cases in which they coincide in the same trivial error, particularly when the same basis of error, an imperfect understanding of Chaucer's metre, is present in each. We consequently find agreements in trivial errors of R and Cx, of H₄ and Cx, of H₄ and R, and less frequently agreements involving the carefully written J. Especially frequent are such agreements between H₃ and Cx. No
useful purpose would be served by recording these trivial agreements in full. In the following list I have given a few specimens of these agreements, including the few instances which may be regarded as at all significant.

**Scattering Agreements of \( \beta \) MSS.**

64. \( H_4Cx \ldots \) that he wepte . . .  
Rest: . . . as he wepte . . .

131. \( H_3Cx \) And that ye souffren . . .  
R And that ye vouche sauf . . .  
\( H_4 \) And if that ye agreue . . .  
\( H_2Ph \) And \( \hat{p} \)at ye agreyn . . .  
Rest: And \( \hat{p} \)anne agree . . .  

We have here a variant reading which is certainly not coincidence. Clearly there is some connection between \( H_3 \) and Cx in this line. Note also the reading of R. The reading \( \hat{p}at \ ye \) instead of \( \hat{p}anne \), as in \( \gamma S_1 JGgH_5 \), is an \( a \) reading preserved by certain \( \beta \) MSS., a phenomenon already illustrated in another list.

185. \( J \) O mortal god . . .  
\( H_4 \) Thou mortal god . . .  
\( GgH_5 \) O inmortal god . . .  
Rest: Inmortal god . . .  

Note the connection between \( J \) and \( GgH_5 \). Later in the line \( H_4R \) read \( thou maist \) where the rest read \( \hat{p}at \ mayst \).

242. \( H_3Cx \ldots \) euer more  
Rest: . . . alwey more

273. \( H_4Cx \ldots \) bothe in fere (Cx I fere)  
Rest: . . . eke yfere

302. \( H_4Cx \) For tonge . . .  
Rest: O tonge . . .

354. \( RCx \ldots \) for to pleye  
Rest: . . . best to pleye

367. \( H_3H_4 \ldots \) to the to be wrey  
Rest: . . . to \( \hat{p} \)e by wreye
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526. H₃CxS₁ And dredles . . .
    Rest: Omit And

627. RCxH₅ . . . euer y man & womman . . .
    Rest: . . . euer y maner womman . . .

724. H₄R . . . with thi rede cope
    Rest: . . . with þi blody cope

831. H₄Cx . . . sevirnesse . . .
    Rest: . . . selynesse . . .

968. H₅CxH₄ om. here.

1211. H₃RH₅ . . . I had not now ben here (H₃ nad not)
    Rest: . . . I were now not here
(CxA not now)

1313. H₃H₄ In suche gladnesse . . .
    Rest: Of swych gladnesse . . .

1383. H₃H₄ . . . I shal a rede
    Rest: . . . I shal yow rede
(Cx I shal now rede)

†1534. RCx om. real.

1548. JRH₃ + Gg . . . the selue wyse
    Rest: . . . ðe same wyse

1605. RCxS₁ Was . . .
    Rest: Saw . . .

1642. H₃H₄R . . . wrathin . . .
    Rest: . . . greuen . . .

1643. H₃CxRS₁ . . . stere
    Rest: . . . tere

Stere seems to be the correct reading, though it is found only in these four MSS. Tere must be explained as an error of "Adam scriveyn," not corrected till after a and γ had been copied. Note that JH₄ read tere.

†1647. H₃Cx om. first.

1649. H₄Cx + H₅ . . . I owe . . .
    Rest: . . . I shal . . .
Scattering Agreements of $\beta$ MSS.

1694. $H_3C_x \ldots$ that any hert may thinke

Rest: \ldots pat herte may by-jenke

1820. $H_3C_x \ldots$ lady swete

Rest: \ldots herte swete

The various combinations of $\beta$ MSS. recorded in the foregoing list make clear that the individual MSS. of the group are, barring possible contamination in this line or that, descended independently from their common ancestor. Such agreements of two or more in a variant reading as cannot be attributed to accidental coincidence must be explained as due to the fact that the $\beta$ original was a corrected and revised MS., and that consequently it offered to the eye of a scribe many alternative readings. That the $\beta$ original was of such a character is further proved by the fact that not infrequently an $a$ reading is retained by one or more $\beta$ MSS., as has already been shown in the list of characteristic $a$ readings given on pp. 147-155. Not only do we find $a$ readings reproduced in $\beta$ MSS., but, in a considerable number of instances, we discover $H_3Ph$ readings (not shared by GgH$_5$) reappearing in $\beta$ MSS. Illustrations of this phenomenon are given in the following list. As we should expect, the cases are more frequent in the earlier part of the book, before GgH$_5$ become a MSS. There are, however, not infrequent cases throughout the book.

$H_3Ph$ AND MSS. OF THE $\beta$ GROUP.

5. \hspace{1cm} $H_2Ph + H_4C_x H_3$ om. ay (R lacking)

53. $H_2Ph + H_4R \ldots$ myn hert dere

Rest: \ldots my lady dere

Compare line 1820, where $H_3C_x$ substitute lady for herte.

†65. $H_2Ph$ Aha god help quod Troylus so rewfully

Cx A ha god quod Troylus so sorowfully

Rest: A ha quod Troylus so rufully

84. $H_2Ph + C_x \ldots$ hert \ldots

Rest: \ldots wit \ldots

†116, 117. $H_2Ph + C_x$ transpose lines 116 and 117 to the detriment of the sense

TEXT. TRAD. N
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146. \[ H_2\text{Ph} + H_3\text{Cxs}_1 \] Receyve in gre . . .

Rest:

\( (H_4 \text{ Receyuyn I wil}) \)

168. \[ H_2\text{Ph} + H_4\text{RCx} \ldots \] no lengere pat 3e pleyn

Rest:

\ldots no lengere ye ne pleyne

193. \[ H_2\text{Ph} . . . \text{aiorne} . . . \]

Cx . . . adiourne . . .

\[ H_4 . . \text{adiure} . . . \]

Rest:

\ldots coniure . . .

205. \[ H_2\text{Ph} + H_3\text{Cxs}_1 \text{ om. right.} \]

†228. \[ H_2\text{Ph} + H_4\text{Cx} . . . \text{blyve} . . . \]

Rest:

\ldots lyne . . .

Blyve has been repeated from 225.

277. \[ H_2\text{Ph} + \text{JRCx} . . \text{al 3e peple} . . . \]

Rest:

\ldots al 3e world . . .

280. \[ H_2\text{Ph} + \text{JRCxH}_3\text{S}_1 . . \text{fordone} . . . \]

Rest:

\( (H_4 \text{ forlorn}) \)

*282. \[ H_2\text{Ph} + \text{JH}_4\text{RCx 3e pray y eft alpogh 3ow shuldest dey} \]

(PhCx thogh)

Rest:

Yet eft I 3e bysche and fully seye

\( (H_5 \text{ om. eft, om. 3e; D fully preye}) \)

A clear case of revision, in which GgH_{57}H_3S_1 present the revised reading, while all four of the regular β MSS. retain the unrevised reading of \( H_2\text{Ph} \). It is possible that the return to the original reading was deliberate, since this reading is distinctly preferable.

303. \[ H_2\text{Ph} + \text{JH}_4\text{RCx} \] Hath made ful meny a lady . . .

(J om. a)

Rest:

Hastow made many a lady . . .

Line 302 reads: \textit{O tongue allas so often here byforn}. The reading of \( H_2\text{Ph} \), etc., can be justified only if we take \textit{O} not as exclamatory, but as the numeral, one. Otherwise there is no
subject for *Hath*. *H₄Cx* read in 302 *For tonge*, and so obviate the difficulty.

329. \[H₂Ph + H₃ \ldots \text{wyse men} \ldots \]
Cx \[\ldots \text{wyse folk} \ldots \]

*Rest* :
\[\ldots \text{wyse} \ldots \]

487. \[H₂Ph + R \ldots \text{went} \]

*Rest* :
\[\ldots \text{was sent} \]

571. \[H₂Ph + H₃Cx \ldots \text{that he were there} \]
\[H₄R \ldots \text{that he ther wer} \]

(H₄ *om.* that)

*Rest* :
\[\ldots \text{that he were} \]

737. \[H₂Ph + R \text{ Art bow a gast lest she wole þe byte} \]

*Rest* :
\[\ldots \text{so that she wole} \ldots \]

(H₄ for that)

†786. \[H₂Ph + Cx \text{ omit right} \]

797. \[H₂Ph + JRCxH₃ \text{ How þat 3e sholden love on hatte horaste} \]

(H₂Ph shold, hat; H₃ atte; Cx *om.* hatte)

*Rest* :
\[\ldots \text{on þat hadde Horaste} \]

The reading *on þat hadde* gives a hypermetrical line. *þat* is not necessary to the sense, but the scribes may well have felt that it was necessary.

915. \[H₂Ph + H₄Cx \text{ Ye know wele eke he is 3our own knyght} \]

(H₄ *weel eek how he is*)

*Rest* :
\[\text{Ye knowe ek how it is youre owne knyght} \]

(Gg he is; H₅ 3e tweyne ek he ys; R *om.* owne)

Note that the reading *he for it* is shared by GgH₅. Note also the conflate reading of H₄.

930. \[H₂PhH₅ + R \ldots \text{wit} \ldots \]

*Rest* :
\[\ldots \text{mynde} \ldots \]

1009. \[H₂Ph + H₃ \ldots \text{good hert myn} \ldots \]
\[Cx + D \ldots \text{good hert} \ldots \]

*Rest* :
\[\ldots \text{good myn} \ldots \]

(Cl *loue for myn by corrector*)
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1094. $H_2 Ph + H_4 Cx H_3$ For al was hust but ...

$(H_2 Ph \text{ schitt for hust } ; H_3 \text{ And for but } ; H_4 \text{ for for but})$

Rest: But al was hust and ...

$(Gg \text{ for for and } ; H_5 \text{ om. and } ; D \text{ but for and})$

The confusion between but, for, and, points clearly to a corrected original.

1107. $H_2 Ph + Cx \text{ omit ful}$

R wel for ful

$Gg \text{ omits quod she ful}$

1241. $H_2 Ph + R$ (second copy of lines) $+ S_1$ ... can gesse

$H_3 Cx$ ... gan gesse

Rest: ... may gesse

1480. $H_2 Ph + H_3 Cx$ ... in pis place ...

Rest: ... yn pis plit ...

1487. $H_2 Ph + \gamma S_1$ ... youre humble seruaunt ...

$Cx$ ... your seruaunt ...

Rest: ... yowr owene seruant ...

Of the agreements recorded in the list just given some may well be due to accidental coincidence; but when the instances are so numerous, we must hesitate to dismiss them as merely accidental. Rarely are they of a character to warrant the idea of any deliberate revision. We must rather regard them as scribal blunders of very early date which have found their way not only into the ancestor of $H_2 Ph$, but also into individual MSS. of subsequent derivation.

The varied phenomena of Book III are capable of but one consistent explanation. From the poet's original autograph was made by a careless scribe such as Chaucer addresses in his familiar lines to "Adam" a "fair copy," the text of which was marred by repeated instances of scribal carelessness and stupidity. This copy was "proof-read" by the poet; and by numerous "rubblings" and "scrapings" the scribe's "negligence and rape" was "corrected," though in such fashion that the corrupt reading was in many passages still legible beneath the correction. From this corrected MS. was derived the original of $H_2 Ph$, and after line 400 the original of $Gg H_6$. It is, then, the MS. we have called the a original. Subsequent to the derivation of the $H_2 Ph$ original and the $Gg H_5$ original, the poet made a more thorough correction, eliminating such of Adam's corruptions as had before escaped his
Conclusions.

Eye (i.e. the cases of clear error shared by $H_2Ph$ and $GgH_5$), and introducing a number of minor revisions. From the "fair copy" thus recorrected and revised was next derived the original of $\gamma$. Using this already considerably corrected and revised copy of his poem as working basis, the poet then subjected Book III to a more thorough-going revision, which included the shifting of stanzas 190 and 191, and the introduction of the readings characteristic of the $\beta$ MSS. The original of $\beta$, then, is *materially* the same MS. as the $\alpha$ original, but with a text extensively altered by progressive corrections and revisions. In some passages this process of alteration seems to have resulted in a confused, if not illegible, text, to which the group errors of $\beta$ must be attributed. Since the $\beta$ original was *materially* the same MS. as the $\alpha$ original, we can understand how an individual $\beta$ MS. here and there copies the $\alpha$ reading, or the reading of $H_2Ph$ or of $GgH_5$, instead of the corrected or revised reading written in as a substitute for it. We can understand, also, how individual $\beta$ MSS. share a $\gamma$ reading. $H_3$ and $S_3$ must be regarded as contaminated MSS., "edited" by some later scribe on the basis of a $\gamma$ MS. of the type of $AD$ and a $\beta$ MS. of the type of $Cx$.

The conclusions reached in the study of Book III may be graphically represented by the following diagram, which shows the relations existing after line 400, when $GgH_5$ become $\alpha$ MSS.

![Diagram](image-url)

The broken line, $\alpha-\beta$, represents a single MS., progressively corrected and revised until its text becomes that designated as $\beta$. 
CHAPTER V.

THE MS. RELATIONS IN BOOK IV.

In Book IV the centre of interest shifts from the β MSS. back to the α MSS. In the early part of the book, to be sure, the characteristic β readings of Book III continue; but throughout the book the main line of cleavage is between α on the one hand and βγ on the other. In other words, γ nearly always gives the later, revised reading, as it does also in Book I.

There takes place, furthermore, in the course of Book IV a very striking realignment in the type of several of the MSS. Before line 400, as we shall see, H₂, with a change in handwriting, has become a β MS., closely related to H₄; while J and H₃ have deserted β for α. At line 686 H₅ abruptly ends. So that for the greater part of Book IV α is represented by JGgPhH₃, and β by H₂H₄RCx.

Readings Characteristic of γ.

The relationship of ClCpH₁S₂AD (γ) is maintained unbroken throughout Book IV. It is attested by a series of agreements which include not only variant readings, but a confusion as to the point at which Book IV begins, and the omission of a stanza, No. 102, which is necessary to the sense.

ClCpH₁ treat the first four stanzas of Book IV, i.e. the Proem, as part of Book III, and write after line 28 Explicit liber Tercius. Incipit Quartus Liber, in spite of the fact that in all of them line 26 correctly reads This ilke fey pe book me helpeth fyne. D presents exactly the same state of things, except that opposite line 1807 of Book III a contemporary hand, which is, I am inclined to think, that of the scribe, has written in the margin Prologus. There is, however, no initial, such as D uses to introduce proems and books, until the three-line capital at line 29. This correction in D came apparently from a MS. like S₂, which ends Book III with line 1806. There is in S₂ a rubric Explicit Liber Tercius, and line 1807 begins with a two-line capital (not executed). Before line 29 is a rubric Incipit quartus liber, and again space for a two-line capital. In A, books and proems were originally marked only by initials. Later, a corrector wrote book and proem
captions in the ordinary one-line stanza spaces. There is in A a two-line capital at line 29, but none at the beginning of Proem IV. The corrector has, however, supplied correct captions in both places. This error of γ is shared by Ph, which fails to indicate the beginning of the proem, and which writes in the margin opposite line 29 *Incipit liber quartus*. These marginal captions, and the running titles, which throughout Books I–IV are the only indications of the division into books, though written by the original scribe, are plainly an afterthought, and are derived, we may be sure, from the same γ MS. from which the scribe drew corrections and omitted passages. S₁ is perfectly normal in its treatment of Proem IV; but H₃, which does not become an α MS. until line 300, writes *My fierde booke* instead of *My pridde book* in 3. 1818, and at the end of Book III writes *Explicit Liber iiiij*¹. At the end of Proem IV, H₃ writes *Ord Sic explicit Liber quartus*. *Črt* (the Chaucer Society reprint wrongly gives it as *Lūt* or *Lṛt*) does not seem to be a recognized abbreviation. I take it to mean *certe* or *correcte*. In line 26 H₃ reads *Thys fyfle and laste boke.*¹

The omission of stanza 102, lines 708–714, is a clear case of error. The stanza is found in α and in β + S₁, and corresponds to stanza 84 of Book IV in *Filostrato*. Moreover, it is indispensable to the sense. It states the fact that Crisyeyle wept and sighed. Stanza 103 refers to this weeping and sighing as to a fact just stated.

The relationship of the γ MSS. is further attested by the list of variant readings which follows.

\[ \text{ClCpH₁S₂AD(γ).} \]

9. \[ \text{wipe} \ldots ( + S₁ + J) \]

\[ \text{Rest:} \ldots \text{wrye} \ldots \]

*Wripe*, from O.E. *wrigSan*, and *wrye*, from O.E. *wrigian*, are identical in meaning; and the written forms are so closely alike

¹ Though, in view of the explicit statement of line 26, the treatment of Proem IV as the end of Book III is certainly an error, it is possible that the confusion may be due in the first instance to a change of intention on the part of Chaucer himself. The first two stanzas of the proem are in part based on a stanza of *Filostrato*, which concludes the third book of Boccaccio's poem. Moreover, the logical connection between the beginning of Proem IV and the end of Book III is a very close one.
that an interchange is easy. In 2.906 the form wrye is definitely established, since it falls under the rime.

12. . . . myn herte right now . . . (— Cl)
(D myn herte gynneth now to bleede)

Rest: . . . right now myn herte . . .

39, 40. Ector & many a worpi wight out wente
Wip spere in hond and bygge bowes bente (+S₁+H₅)
(Cl on hond)

Rest: Transpose order of lines. (Gg lacking)

Either order is possible; but the arrangement of γ separates Wip spere in hond, etc., from armed bryght and shene of 38.

78. . . . or in what manere wyse (+H₃S₁+J)
(Cl for for in)

Rest: . . . and in what manere wyse
(Ph om. what)

The Italian reads e’il modo, Fil. 4. 6, which supports and. The substitution of and for or and vice versa is of frequent occurrence in the MSS.

†80. Ye han er þis wel herd it me deuyse
(A wele harde or this me deuyse, wele by corrector over erasure; D me herd it wele deuise)

Rest: . . . herde me yow deuyse
(R om. yow; H₄ me herd weel you; Cx herd me wel devyse; H₃ me herde or this you devise; S₁ wel herd me yow)

The line in γ is so awkward that it must be regarded as corrupt. Apparently the trouble began by the careless dropping of yow, as in R and Cx. The variations of the MSS. point to confusion in the common original.

88. . . . you lorde for to plese (— AD)

Rest: . . . my lordis yow to plese

163. And . . . (+S₁)

Rest: Or . . .

†191. . . . nede to folk . . . (— Λ)
(H₁ tolk for to folk; S₂ om. to)

Rest: . . . nede of folk . . .
Reedings Characteristic of γ. 185

197. ... trewe ... (+ S₁)
( A trew over erasure)

Rest: ... soth ... 

215. And fynaly ... 

α + S₁ But fynally ...

JRH₃ What fynaly ...

H₂H₄Cx That finally ...

220. Vnto ... (+ S₁)

Rest: Into ...

280. ... euere ...

Rest: ... alwey ...

295. What I may don ...

Rest: What shal I don ...

The Italian reads Che farò io, Fil. 4. 33. The γ reading is probably corrupt.

†317. ... pis ...

Rest: ... thilke ...

(J thilk ; H₃Cx that)

Thilke, with its full dissyllabic value, is necessary for the metre.

410. Yf pis be goodly she is glad and lyght (+ S₁)

H₃ ... thus is she glad and lyght

Cx ... she that is glad & lyght

Rest: ... þat is glade and lighte

Note the conflate reading of Cx, and apparently also of H₃.

484. But tel me now ... (+ S₁ + Cx)

α But sey me this ...

H₂H₄R But telle me pis ...

†498. Nay god wot ...

α Nay Pandarus ...

βS₁ Nay nay god wote ...

The γ reading gives a nine-syllable line.

532. ... and leue þi nyce fare (+ Cx)

PhS₁ ... pis nyce fare

GgH₅ ... þyn grete care

Rest: ... this nyce care

(H₄ al thi nyce care)
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The rime word in 531 is the verb fare, and the identical rime of verb and noun is entirely possible. The phrase nyce fare is found in Troil. 1. 1025; 2. 1144.

542. Al pis haue I my self yet pought ful ofte (+S₁+H₂R) 
(D eke for yet; H₂ ymagened yet ful ofte) 
Rest: Omit yet 
(J I thought)

If one reads my selue, as in GgH₃, yet is unnecessary.

570. I moste here honour leuere han pan me (+S₁) 
α I haue hir honour leuere yit than me 
β I must hir honour leuer saue pan me. 
(H₂ saue leuer; R kepe leuere)

The γ reading is intermediate between α and β.

608. Thenk ek how . . . (+S₁) 
(S₂ om. ek) 
Rest: Thynk how pat . . . 
(H₂H₄ om. pat)

657. . . . yn pis cas . . . (+S₁) 
Rest: . . . of this case . . .

†708–714. Omit stanza 102. 
The stanza is found in S₁. Cf. above, p. 183.

732. Into here chaumbre . . . 
Rest: Into the chaumbre . . .

The Italian reads Nella camera sua, Fil. 4. 86, which supports the γ reading; but the variation is trifling, and the closer approach of γ to the Italian may well be fortuitous.

773. That ilke day pat I from yow departe (+ S₁ + Ph) 
(Cl hym for yow) 
JH₃Gg . . . . I shal from yow . . . 
β . . . . I mote from you . . .

791. . . . Orpheus and Erudice . . . 
Rest: . . . Orpheus with Erudice . . .
Readings Characteristic of $\gamma$.

†854. This message which by me thi Troilus the sente

\(-\mathrm{ClA}, +\ H_4\)

(D \text{om. thi; } H_1 \text{ me for the; } S_2 \text{ This message which pat bi me Troilus sent})

Rest: Omit message

(a pat \text{for which; } Ph \text{This pat Troillus by me the sent; } H_2 \text{ The whiche by me your Troilus you sent})

A hypermetrical line, independently corrected by Cl and A. The participation of $H_4$ in this reading suggests that the error lies back of the $\gamma$ original. Perhaps Chaucer originally wrote \textit{This message which thi Troilus the sente}.

*882. For verray wo his wit is al awey (+ $S_1$)

Rest: As he pat shortly shapith hym to deye

(Ph shapith hym shortly; H$_2$H$_4$ As shortly he pat shapeth)

The Italian reads: \textit{Il qual del tutto in duol ne vuol morire}, Fil. 4. 102. The Paris ed. (5. 84) reads: \textit{Che cerca disperato di morire}. The $\alpha\beta$ reading is thus nearer the Italian, though the $\gamma$ reading might have been suggested by \textit{disperato} of the Paris ed. Moreover, the Italian rime \textit{dire: morire} is exactly translated by \textit{seye: deye}. On the other hand, the $\gamma$ reading offers a somewhat simpler sentence-structure. It has every appearance of being an authentic revision not incorporated by $\beta$.

907. For wel wot I it wole my bane be (+ $S_1$)

Rest: . . . I wot . . .

The $\alpha\beta$ order avoids the hiatus, \textit{I it}.

938. And what pat . . . (+ $S_1$)

Rest: And pat that . . .

($\beta$ + Ph \text{om. that})

1100. . . . a wonder (+ $S_1$)

(A and wonder)

Rest: . . . my wonder . . .

($H_2$ I merueyle)

1160. . . . noon oper red (+ $S_1 + Cx$)

Rest: . . . no maner red.

1252. . . . sorwful . . .

Rest: . . . woful . . .
The Manuscript Relations in Book IV.

1286. And...(+S₁)

Rest: But...

†1324. ofte tyme...(+S₁)

Rest:...often...

In γ the line is hypermetrical, unless ofte and tyme are both read as monosyllables. A omits !er.

†1373. Lo Troylus men seyn pat ful hard it is (+S₁)

(A O for Lo; D om. pat)

Rest: Omit ful

(H₃ But dere Troilus)

A hypermetrical line corrected by D. Ful is anticipated from 1374.

1449. swete herte

Rest:...deere herte

1493. my soule...(+S₁+Cx)

Rest:...the soule...

1494. may not...(+S₁)

Rest:...kan not...

1527. Omit hym (+H₅Gg)

1530. And...

Rest: Or...

1572. ſis dede (+J)

Rest:...that dede

1688. And...(+S₁)

Rest: But...

1697. sorwful...(+S₁+R)

Rest:...woful...

(H₄ ilke for woful)

With the single exception of line 882, none of the 44 γ readings recorded has the slightest claim to consideration as an authentic revision. In a number of cases the γ reading is certainly corrupt; in all the rest the variation is of a trivial sort. In a majority of the γ readings S₁ also shares. Frequently the γ reading is found also in Cx.

Besides the γ readings given above, the following cases must be recorded in which, within the group, two or more γ MSS. agree in a variant reading as against the rest.
Scattering Agreements of \( \gamma \) MSS.

189

261. \[ \text{ADS}_2 + S_1 \ldots \text{what haue } I \text{ pe agilte} \]

(Agilte)

Rest: \ldots \text{what haue } I \text{ pus agilte}

The Italian, *Che t'ho io fatto*, Fil. 4. 30, lends support to the reading of \( \text{ADS}_2 S_1 \); but this may well be fortuitous.

†459. ClCpH \ldots \text{I wil} \ldots 

Rest: \ldots \text{I wolde} \ldots 

462. CpH \_ \text{Now foule falle hire for thi wo and care}

D \ldots \text{pat for } \_ \text{ woo care}

ClH \_ \ldots \text{pat for } \_ \text{ woo hath care}

(Cl hath by corrector)

S \text{ for } \_ \text{ wold wo or care}

S \_ \ldots \text{pat for } \_ \text{ wold care}

A \ldots \text{for } \_ \text{ wo at care}

H \text{ for } \_ \text{ woo pat care}

H \_ \ldots \text{for } \_ \text{ that woll care}

J \ldots \text{pat for thy wo pat care}

The \( \gamma \) parent MS. must have been confused in this line; but the readings of \( H_5 \) and \( J \) show that the confusion existed farther back. The reading, *for thi woo pat care*, can be defended only if we regard *care* as singular subjunctive. We should expect an indicative; but the exigencies of rime may be responsible for the construction. Perhaps Chaucer wrote *Now foule falle hir for pe wolde care*.

470. AD \ldots \text{herte} \ldots 

Rest: \ldots \text{brest} \ldots 

(H \text{ body})

511. Cl(Cp)H \_ + JH \_ \text{Or with } \_ \text{ colde strok myn hete quench}

(H \text{ om. } \_ \text{ ; Cp. lacking})

H \_ \ldots \text{my herte hete quench}

Rest: \ldots \text{myn herte quench}

The Italian, *Che refrigerio il tuo colpo mi fia*, Fil. 4. 61, and the context support *hete*. The error was a very easy one.
The scattering agreements just given point, as in the earlier books, to the presence of corrections in the $\gamma$ original, rather than to any sub-relations within the group. Even the relation of $A$ and $D$, fully attested in Book III, ceases to be clear. The only $AD$ agreements I have found are included in the list just given. They are rather less striking than the agreements of $CpH_1S_2$. 
Readings Characteristic of a.

Throughout Book IV a is attested by a large number of variant readings, of which many are of a very striking sort; but the MSS. which give these a readings change as the book proceeds. During the first 196 lines a is represented, as in Book III, by $H_2$PhGg$H_5$; though, because of the mutilation suffered by Gg, this MS. lacks lines 1–112. At line 196 ends the portion of $H_2$ written by hand 1. Lines 197–406 are written by hand 3; and the rest of the poem is by hand 4. With line 197, where the new hand begins, $H_2$ ceases to be an a MS. For lines 197–298 a is represented only by Gg$H_5$Ph. At about line 300 $H_3$ becomes an a MS., and remains so till near the end of the poem; and between 430 and 438, J also joins the a group. With line 686 the $H_5$ fragment terminates. So that from line 687 a is represented by JGg$H_3$Ph. The continuity of a is maintained by Gg and Ph. So intimate is the relation of $H_2^1$ and Ph, that we can be certain that the lost conclusion (supplied in the existing MS. by $H_2^3$ and $H_2^4$) would have continued to present Ph readings; and the same is true of the defective $H_5$.

$H_2$Ph(Gg)$H_5$(a).

25. Thow cruel god eke fadir of Qwyrine (+ $H_3$)  
(H$_3$ to for of, gode for god)

Rest: Thow cruel Mars ek fader to Quyryne  
(A Mars over erasure; D om. ek; R lacking)

33. Omit ful (+ Cl)

37. . . pat day pei issen ment (+ J)  
(Ph issu; $H_2$ pat day pe pus ment; $H_5$ pat day of assignement)

Rest: . . . pei fighte mente  
($H_4$ fouhten)

The form issen (O.F. issir) is found only in J, which here retains the a reading. Ph reads issu, of which the reading of $H_2$ is a bungling corruption. A more ingenious corruption is given by $H_5$. Though the word issen is not common, it is found in the second sing. isset in Chaucer’s Boethius, 3, prose 12, 168. The reading gains some support from the Italian, Ettor . . . Incontro

---

1 Between 300 and 326, $H_3$ wavers between a and b.
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d' Greci uscì negli ampi piani, Fil. 4. 1. (The Paris ed. reads uscendo all' improvviso, 5. 1.) Moreover, the fact that isson is not a common word makes for its authenticity.

†51. H₂ Penestio; Ph Polestio; H₅ ponestes
Rest: Monesteo (H₃ Menestes)
In Filostrato, 4. 3, Moutier's ed. reads Menesteo, and the Paris ed., corruptly, Nesteo.

53. Or Polyte or the troian daun Riphio
(Ph ryphio; H₅ Ryffes)
Rest: Polyte or eke pe Troian daun Rupheo
(H₃ and eke; Cx om. daun; A omits line)

54. Or . . .
Rest: And . . .

62. Thurgh pe sege . . .
(H₅ Thorow pe assege)
Rest: Bope in passege . . .

93. . . out of toun . . .
Rest: . . out of Troye . . .

*102. I may her have for pat is doubtles
Rest: . . right sone doubtles
(H₃ soone or doubtles)

*105. . . am broght in wrecchidnes
Rest: . . haue al pis heuynesse
(H₃ distresse)

110. . . graunt . . .
(H₂ Ph grauntith)
Rest: . . yeue . . .
(With line 113 begins again Gg)

H₂PhGgH₅(a).

114. Apollo hath me told sikirly
Rest: Appollo hath me told it feythfully
(H₃ om. it; S₂ fulle for it)

The omission of it is clearly an error; but sikirly is quite as good as feythfully.
121. That madyn al þe wallis of þe toun (+ S₁)

Rest: Omit al
(CpH₁JR makeden; DS₂ maked)

130. ... on either cheke

Rest: ... by eyther cheke

131. ... mercy ...

Rest: ... socour ...

139. ... his safe conduyt hem sent (— H₅)

(II₂ her for his)

Rest: ... his saue garde sente

(Cl gard; H₃ his sone gan; H₅ his soue gard; R hym sente)

143. Gan þervpon ...

(H₂ þer vp for þervpon)

Rest: Let here vpon

(Cx Do for Let; S₂ þere opon)

151. ... welny with þo wordis deide

(H₂Ph þe for þo)

Rest: ... with þo wordes wel neygh deyde

(A myghe drede; RCxS₂ ful for wel)

*160. ... þe grauntyne with stonde

(H₂Ph grauntyng; H₅ to with stonde)

Rest: ... þeschaunge of here withstonde

161. þis cast he þo ... 

Rest: Ful faste he cast ...

173. ... told ... (H₅ omits word)

Rest: ... seyd ...

185. Omit it.

193. ... such fantasies ... (+ H₄R)

Rest: ... þo fantasyes ...

(H₃ that fantasye; D þi)

195. H₂ þat our wil ... 

Ph þat our voys ... (voys over erasure)

GgH₅ þatoure acord ...

Rest: That al our voys ...

(With line 196 ends H₂¹ and H₂ ceases to be an a MS.)

TEXT. TRAD.
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GgH₅Ph(a).

*212. To ʒilde anon for Antenore Crisseyde

Rest: For Antenor to yelden out Criseyde
(Ch vp for out)

215. But fynally . . . (+ S₂)
And fynaly . . .
JRH₃ What fynaly . . .
H₂H₄Cx'That finally . . .

222. . . . dede . . .
Rest: . . . bad . . .
(A had)

238. * In his distresse . . .
(Gg distreste)
Rest: In his woodnesse . . .
(H₄ Woodly werke began)

*246, 247. His eyʒen too . . .
So weptyn þat þey semyn welles tweye
(Gg weptyn)
Rest: Out stremeden as swyfte welles tweye

A clear case of revision. That a is the earlier version is shown by the Italian, Forte piangeano, e parean due fontane, Fil. 4. 28. Even closer is the reading of the Paris edition, Piangono st, che paion due fontane, 5. 24.

*258. þat wel onep þe body may suffysse
(H₅ myght)
Rest: That wonder is þe body . . .
(A wonder his; D wonder it is; H₄ wondis)

The Italian reads, Che'lı capo e'lı petto appena gli bastava, Fil. 4. 29.

262. How mayst þu þus for reuthe me begile (+ H₄)
(Ph myght thou; H₄ thus me begile)
Rest: How myghtestow for reuþe me bygyle

266. . . . so crewel . . . (+ H₄)
Rest: . . . þus cruel . . .
269. Whi wilt þou þanne of ioye me depreiue  
(Ph of pis ioy)  
Rest: Why wiltow me fro Ioye þus depreyue  
(ACx thus from Ioye me; H3 from Ioye thus me)  

286. . . pyn gery violence  
Rest: . . . þi greful violence  
(H1DS2JR gerful; Cp serful; S1Cx gyreful; H3 grevyll)  

290. How . . .  
Rest: What . . .  
The Italian reads, Come farà la mia vita dolente, Fil. 4. 33.  

294. . . pat it be repelyd (+ S2)  
(H5 that hit to be)  
Rest: . . . allas it be repeled  
(H2 me for be; Cx in lesse)  

295, 296. . . whil I may deure  
In wo in torment . . .  
(Gg turnement)  
Rest: On lyue in torment . . .  
(RCx Ay lyue in torment)  
The Italian reads, mentre la vita Durerà, Fil. 4. 34.  

297. . . mysauenture  
Rest: . . . disauenture  

298. Alone as I was born allas compleyne  
Rest: Allone as I was born ywys compleyne  
(Cl Allas for Allone; H3 Allas Allone ay as I was born; A I mote for ywys; DCx I wol for ywys)  

Note the conflate reading of H3 and of Cl.  

*300, 301. Ne heuenys lyȝt & pus I in derknesse  
Myn woful lyf wele endyn for distresse  
(H5 No for Ne; Ph om. Ne, as for &; Gg derknes)  
H3 Ne see no lyght And thus in derkenesse  
My sorowful lyfe wyl enden in distresse  
Rest: But ende I wil as Edippe yn derknesse  
My sorwful lyf and dyen in dystresse  
(R liuen for dyen; JH2 for destresse; Cx But euer wyl I as Edyppe in derknesse Lede my sorowful lyf & lyue in dystresse)
This is a clear case of revision; and, though the Italian gives us no help, it seems plain that the $\beta\gamma$ reading, with its classical reference, is the later version. One can, at least, see no reason why the reference to Oedipus should have been cancelled. $H_3$ presents what is virtually the $\alpha$ text, though it reads sorrowful for woful and in for for with $\beta\gamma$ and corrupts 300. Beginning at 326 it shares all the $\alpha$ readings; but in 306 and 322 it goes with $\beta\gamma$.

*306. Fle for\(p\) anon & do myn herte brest

Rest: Fle forth out of myn herte and lat it breste

(A Flee for pou\(t\)e; R om. forth; $H_3$ four\(\)th oute; Cx Flee fer oute of myn hert or it brest)

322. For thy no fors whan that the body sterue

(Lines 307–322 of Gg by corrector)

Rest: For \(p\)i no fors is pough \(p\)e body sterue

(J whan for pough; $H_2H_4RCxH_3$ For now no; D \(p\)is body)

Note that J retains whan from the $\alpha$ reading.

(With line 326 $H_3$ becomes consistently an $\alpha$ MS.)

$GgH_5PhH_3(\alpha)$. 326. And longe mote \(3e\) in ioye endeure

Rest: . . . mot youre lyf yn Ioye endure

327. And . . . (+ A)

Rest: But . . .

340. per\(w\)ith . . .

(Ph \(p\)at with)

Rest: For which . . .

($H_2H_4$ om. For)

341. . . sorwis . . . (+ $S_2$)

Rest: . . . peynes . . .

347. . . chaungyn . . .

Rest: . . . yelden . . .

The Italian render, Fil. 4. 43, supports the $\beta\gamma$ reading; but the closer approximation may well be accidental.

357. . . al aweye (+ $S_1Cx$)

($H_3$ alwey corrected to al awey)

Rest: . . . neigh aweye

(A now for neigh; D om. neigh)
358. But . . .
Rest: And . . .

*359. Ny dede for wo . . .
(H₃ omits line)
Rest: For sorwe of pis . . .
(Cx For sorow of herte)

*360. . . sorweful . . .
Rest: . . . woful . . .
The change to woful is necessitated by the revision in 359.

362. And . . .
Rest: But . . .
Cf. line 358.

*373. For crewel smert . . .
(H₃Ph hert)
Rest: Ney ded for smert . . .
Cf. line 359.

386. O in pis world . . .
Rest: For yn pis world . . .

388. Strengere . . . (+ Cx)
Rest: Straungere . . .
(H₄ Strangere)

397. . . fond . . .
Rest: . . . felte . . .

398. . . castyng of an eye
(Gg schaungyng of an eye)
Rest: . . . lokyng . . .

403. . . in a route
Rest: . . . yn som route

404. . . two or þre . . .
(Gg to)
Rest: . . . oone or two . . .

409. What on can synge . . .
Rest: Yf oon kan synge . . .
What must be regarded as exclamatory. Cf. 407.
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410, 411. 3if pis is fayr sche pat can good aryȝt
if pis be goodly pat is glad & lyȝt
(H 5 om. first pat; H 5 Ph hir good; H 3 first pat and
gode inserted above; Gg & ryȝt, is for be; H 5 the
other for second pat; H 3 thus is she gladde)
Rest: Yf pis be goodly pat is glad and lyght
And pis is fayr and pat kan good aright
(γS 1 she is glad; Cx she that is glad; J om. second is;
R of ryght)
Either order is equally possible. With the two lines beginning
identically, as in a, a scribal transposition is easy. I suspect,
however, that a is corrupt.

417. And þynk ...
(Gg þynge)
Rest: Thenk ek ...

430. . . . to make . . . (+ H 2)
Rest: . . . to don . . .
(With line 438 J becomes an a MS.)

JGgH 5 PhH 3.

438. To traysen hir pat trewe is vnto me (+ ClAD)
(Gg trostyn; H 5 trysyn, is to we; Cl trassen)
Rest: To traysen a wight that . . .
(H 2 truste; H 4 traist; RCx tray; S 2 trayne)

441. Or I so do . . .
(Gg om. so; H 5 illegible)
Rest: Er I pus do . . .
(D do pus; H 2 H 4 R Or I soo werche)

445. What Pandarus syn I haue hir behight
Rest: For Pandarus syn I haue troupe here hight
(CIS 2 syn pat; H 4 hir trouthe; H 2 H 4 plight; Cx syth
I hyr trouthe behight)

454. . . . for thy . . .
(H 3 therefore)
Rest: . . . for whiche . . .
(D wherfore; Cx for why)
464. ... man ...  
Rest: ... wyght ...

476. This wo ...  
Rest: My wo ...

484. But sey me this ...  
Rest: But tel me now ...  
(H2H4R But telle me pis)

492. ... yit fro thyn herte ...  
(H3 om. yit)  
Rest: ... out of þyn herte ...  

*498. Nay Pandarus ...  
Rest: Nay nay god wot ...  
(γ Nay god wot)

*499. But douteles for aught þat may bifalle  
Rest: For which for what þat euere may byfalle  
(H4 om. For which; D may euer)

The βγ reading is hardly an improvement.

*506, 507. Or deth me slowe I wolde han yuen hire  
But now his comyng ...  
(J is for his; H3 om. his)  
Rest: Er þow me slowe I wolde haue yeuen hire  
But now þi comynge ...  
(Cl here for hire)

The Italian, Morte, tu mi sarai tanto soave, Fil. 4. 61, with its direct address, is closer to βγ; but the change is very slight, and the greater approximation to Boccaccio may be merely accidental.

515. ... thanne ...  
Rest: ... so ...  
(D om. so, þen inserted above by later hand)

*537. ... lat this sorwe be  
Rest: ... wepynge ...

This phrase corresponds to three lines in the Italian:  
Caccia via il dolor, caccia via, caccia  
L'angoscia tua e li dolenti guai;  
Rasciuga il tristo pianto della faccia. Fil. 4. 65.

Sorwe would translate dolor, while wepynge would translate pianto.
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*560. He nyl for me his honour be repelled
(Gg nil not)

Rest: ... his lettre ...

The a reading gains some support from the Italian, per non romper le cose promesse, Fil. 4. 69.

*570. I haue hir honour leuere yit than me
(Gg om. hir; H₅ yet leuer)

γ₁S₁ I moste here honour leuere han þan me
β I must hir honour leuer saue þan me
(H₂ saue leuer; R kepe leuere)

†571. And in euery cas ... (— Ph)
(Gg Hadde for And)

Rest: omit And

A hypermetrical line, corrected by Ph.

*581. For why in loue is litel hertes reste
(H₃H₅ For while I lyue)

Rest: For as in loue is ther but litel reste
(H₄ om. as; γ per is; S₂ I loue)

The revision avoids repetition with herte in 580.

587. ... lat hem rowne
Rest: ... wol þey rowne
(R they wol)

588. For wonder last ...
Rest: Ek wonder last ...
(Cl A for Ek)

590. ... preciously ... (+ R)
(R preciently)

Rest: ... curteysly ...
(Cx curiously)

Both the context and the Italian, sottilmento, Fil. 4. 72, make against curteysly, which must be regarded as a corruption of curiously.

594. ... a lite in blame ...
(Gg om. a)

Rest: ... in blame a litel
*596. It is no rape in my dom ne no vice
   (GgPh iape; GgH₅ om. second no)
   It is no shame to yow . . .
   (CpH₁R vnto; D ne vnto you; S₁ to the)

598. . . . may . . .
   Rest: . . . myght . . .

602. And fleeth fro wrechches . . ( + Cx)
   Rest: And weyueth wrecches . .
   The Italian, e’timidi rifiuta, Fil. 4. 73, supports the βγ reading.

604. Thow shalt thy pees ful wel hirafter make (+ Cl)
   (PhH₅ om. ful; Ph her pees; H₅ heraftir wel)
   D Thou shalt þi selue þi pees ful wel herafter make
   Rest: Thow shalt thi self thi pees hereafter make
   Note the conflate reading of D.

617. . . . thus . . .
   Rest: . . . right . . .

630. . . . the deuyl haue hym . . .
   Rest: . . . spede hym . . .

*638. Pandare answerde of þat be as be may
   (H₃ as it may; H₅ as it be may)
   Rest: Why so mene I quod Pandarus al þis day
   (Cx Ryght so; H₂ quod Pandar I mene; H₁ om. al þis day)

*644. But any aungel tolde it in thyn ere
   (GgH₅ told it Þe in þyn ere; Ph told þe it)
   Rest: But if þat Ioue tolde it yn þin eere
   (H₂H₄ tolde it the in þine ere)
   A revision from Christian to Pagan colouring.

647. . . . why thow art thus gon
   (GgPh whedyr þou art thus gon)
   Rest: . . . whider þow art gon
   (H₄ whethir that thou art gon)

674. . . . biset . . .
   (Ph To troylus and þat so)
   Rest: . . . yset . . .
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680. ... in townes al aboute

Rest: ... in towne and al aboute

(R towns; Cx om. and; A om. al)

(With line 686 ends H₅.)

JGgPhH₃(a).

*691. The thridde answarde ...

Rest: Quod po pe pridde ...

(ClH₂ om. po; S₂ pan for po)

*696–698. For al this while hir herte on oother thyng is

God wot hir aduertence is elliswhere

(Gg tyme for while; H₃ was elles where)

Rest: For god it wot here herte on oper ping is

Here aduertence is alwey elys where

(Cx om. it; RCx audience; D His aduertance)

701. ... so ...

Rest: ... pus ...

702. ... thus gonne hir tales spende

(Ph gun pus; H₃ they for thus; Gg tal opende)

Rest: ... gonne alle here tales spende

*706. So pat she wende anon right for to dye

(Ph om. right)

Rest. So pat she felte almost here herte deye

(D hir herte almost)

717. ... from pat route

(H₃Ph the Route)

Rest: ... out of pat route

(H₂H₄ pe route)

*724. ... hir wordes ...

Rest: ... here tales ...

The Italian reads Parole, Fil. 4. 85.

733. ... for ded she gan to falle

Rest: ... she gan for ded to falle

(H₂H₄ for woo; Cx var.)
*736-742. After line 735, JGgPhH₃ have the stanza beginning  
_The salte teeris from hir eyne tweyne_ (stanza 108,  
lines 750–756 in Skeat’s edition). This order  
corresponds to that of the Italian, _Fil._ 4 87, 88.  
For further discussion of this shift see p. 221.

739. _Omit to_  
*747. Wo worth _pat_ day and namely _pat_ nyght  
(Ph om. and)  
Rest : Wo worth allas _pat_ ilke _dayes_ lyght

*750-752. The salte teeris from hir eyne tweyne  
Out ronne as shoure in april swithe  
Hir white breste she bet and for the peyne  
(H₃ from heyen tweyn; Gg of aprille _ful swyþe_;  
Ph in Aprill _ful swithe_)  
Rest : Therwith _þe_ terys from here _eighen_ two  
Doun fille as shour in aperill _swyþe_  
Here white brest she bet and for the wo  
(H₂ And therwith; Cp _om._ from; R _ful swythe_;  
S₁Cx _dooth swyþe_; Cp _om._ in; H₄ for _wo_)

These lines begin the stanza the position of which was changed  
by _βγ_. The change to _Therwith_ accommodates the stanza to its  
ews position. In R a word of three letters has been erased before  
teres. Perhaps the scribe started to write _salte_, and then noticed  
that it was marked for omission. Both in _a_ and in _βγ_, line 751  
is metrically deficient; even though we read _Aperill_ or _Aprille_ as  
trisyllabic. Perhaps the correct reading is _ful swithe_ as in PhGg  
and R. Note the emendation of _S₁Cx._

*757. What _shal_ he _don_ what _shal_ I _do_ also  
(Ph _y_ _for_ he, _he_ _for_ I)  
Rest : _She_ seyd how _shal_ he _do_ and _I_ also  
(D _I_ _for_ he, _he_ _for_ I)

This line begins the stanza which in _βγ_ immediately follows  
the shifted stanza. Since in the _βγ_ arrangement the shifted  
stanza, with its description of Criseyde’s actions, interrupts what  
in _a_ is a continuous speech of the heroine, the words _She seyd_  
become necessary to the sense. The revision in this line and in  
750 is, therefore, immediately involved with the shifting of the  
stanza.
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758. ... shal ... (+ RCx)
Rest: ... sholde ...

*762, 763. And corsed be pat day which that argyue
Me of hir body bar to ben on lyue
(Gg on for of)
Rest: O moder myn pat cleped were Arguye
Wo worth pat day pat pow me bere on lyue
(DCx clepet art; S1 called art; H4 R the day; Cx om second pat in 763)

The revision, with its direct address to Criseyde's mother, fits the lines better to 761, which reads in all MSS. O Culkas, fader, thyn be al pis synne (H4A the synne). In the Italian the address to the heroine's father is in 4.93 (Paris ed. 5.76). In the Moutier ed. the only parallel to 762, 763 is the line Deh or fuss' io nel nascere affogata, Fil. 4. 88; but in the corresponding stanza of the Paris ed., 5. 73, we find—

\[ Mal' abbia il giorno, che al mondo fui nata, \\
E che di me mia madre ebbe desio! \\
Quant' era meglio m'avesse affogata \\
Che nutrimento desse al corpo mio. \]

These lines correspond more nearly to a than βγ. (Neither the Paris ed. nor that of Moutier contain any hint of the name Arguye.)

767. ... or oother creature
(Ph of eny creature)
Rest: ... or lyues creature
(H2 a lyues; H4 lyuussh)

770. ... ertheles ...
Rest: ... roteles ...

773. ... I shal from yow departe (— Ph)
\[ β ... I mote from you departe \\
γS1Ph ... pat I from you departe \]
(Cl from hym)

775. Ther ...
Rest: Than ...

781. ... holden ...
Rest: ... setten ...
782. ... til þat deth me meete
   (Gg þey for deth)
Rest: ... ay til deth me mete
   (H₂R ay till þe dethe; DS₂ to for till)

788. For theygh ...
   (Gg For þy; Ph þei; H₃ theight)
Rest: For pough ...

*789, 790. Yit in the feld of pite out of peyne
   Ther pluto regneth ... (— Ph)
   (Gg ȝe for Yit)
Rest: That hight Elysos ...
   (Ph whole line in later hand)

793. ... yolden ...
Rest: ... chaunged ...
   Cf. line 347.

794. ... woful ...
Rest: ... sorwful ...
   (Cx om. sorwful)

809. ... this seruyse
   (Ph his; Gg lacking)
Rest: ... þat seruice.

*819. Of deth which þat for wo she gan desire
   (Gg lacking)
Rest: ... here herte gan desire

*820. ... for shame ... (Gg lacking)
Rest: ... for sorwe ...

The Italian reads Per vergogna, Fil. 4. 96 (Paris ed. per onta, 5. 79).

823. ... chambre ... (Gg lacking)
Rest: ... hous ...

*828, 829. Myn Em Pandare of Ioyes mo than two
   Was cause causynge first to me Criseide
   (H₃ woo for two; Gg lacking)
Rest: Pandare first of Ioyes mo þan two
   Was cause causynge vnto me Criseyde
*835. And every worldly Ioye . . .  
(J wordly; Gg wordely; H₃ wordes)  
Rest: And alle worldly blysse . . .  
(R And ek as; H₁ wordly)

843. . . sorwful . . .  
Rest: . . . woful . . .  
853. What . . . (— Ph)  
Rest: That . . .  
854. . . ṭat . . .  
Rest: . . . which . . .  
867. . . and oother Ioyes . . .  
Rest: . . . and ek here Ioyes . . .  
*868. . . and thus for hem she lith allone  
(Gg from hem)  
Rest: . . . and pus lith Criseyde allone  
(ClcPH₁DS₁ lith now Criseyde)  
876. . . I trowe wel . . . (+ RS₁)  
Rest: Omit wel.

881. . . worldly . . .  
(JGgH₃ wordly)  
Rest: . . . erpely . . .  
*891. And ek the beste as my wit kan comprehende  
(H₃ may for kan)  
Rest: As ferforth as . . .  
The a reading is hypermetrical.  
903. Now wys his sorwe . . .  
(GgPh Now Iwis; H₃ Ywis, omitting Now)  
Rest: Iwis this sorwe . . .  
(D Iwis so this; R thus; Cx his)  
*906. To sen hym in ṭat wo ṭat he is Inne  
Rest: To sen ṭat sorwe whiche ṭat he is Inne  
The Italian, di veder Troilo afflitto, Fil. 4. 105, supports the a reading.  
915. . . softly  
(Ph shortly)  
Rest: . . . hastely
923. That wot I wel and therfore yit I seye
   Rest: That know I wel and for pi . . .
   (R om. and ; D as for and ; Cx therfor)

924. Lat be this sorwe . . .
   Rest: So lef pis sorwe . . .
   (Cx So lete ; D To leue)

936. . . . of short auyumement (+ D)
   Rest: . . . in short . . .
   (H₄ at)

938. And pat that I kan helpe . . .
   (Ph om. that)
   Rest: And what pat I may helpe . . .
   (H₂H₄RCx om. what ; R helpe may)

*950–952. He fast made hys compleynt And hys moon
   Besyking hem to sende hym other grace
   Or fro thys worlde to doon hym some pace (—*JGg)
   Rest: Ful tendrely he preyde and made his mone
   To don hym sone out of pis world to pace
   For wel he pouhte per was noon oper grace
   (Cx om. second to ; JGgH₂RA nas for was)

We have here a clear case of revision, in which JGg have the βγ reading. We must assume that the revision was made before J and Gg were derived.

*953–1085. H₃Ph + H₄ omit the whole of the soliloquy on God's foreknowledge. Gg omits all except the last stanza. J originally omitted all but the last stanza (lines 1079–1085), leaving a blank space in which the omitted stanzas were later written by the original scribe. In Ph the passage has been added later by the scribe on inset leaves. For discussion of this matter see pp. 216–221.

*1093. Hastow nat lyued al thy lyf biforn
   (J of for al ; Gg oftyn in þyn lyf)
   Rest: . . . many a yer byforn
   (Cx many yere ; S₁ to forn ; Cl byfore)
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*1097. Kanstow nat thinken thus...
     (Gg non; Ph om. nat)
     Rest: Lat be and þenk right þus...
     (A om. right; Cx Here lete see & þynk on thy dysese)

1099. In loue also... (− Gg)
     Rest: Right so in loue...

*1113. Stynt al this thing...
     Rest: Distorbe al þis...
     (A To distorbe)

1123. ... hym moore (+ H₂Cx)
     Rest: ... it more

1124. But... (+ H₂H₄)
     Rest: And...
The Italian reads ma, Fil. 4. 113.

1129. ... sorwe...
     Rest: ... peyne
     (Cl peynes)

*1131. But hem in armes hente and softe kiste
     (Gg ofte; Ph sethins for softe)
     Rest: ... tok and after kyste
     (H₂ & oper kiste; H₄ & ech othir kiste; A afore kyste)

*1133. What for to don...
     Rest: Wher þat he was...
     (S₂ he wist was)

1134. GgPh... for sorwe & for wepyngge
     (Ph om. second for)
     H₃... for sorow And for sobbing
     Rest: ... for wo and for sobbyngge
     (A for woo of sobbynge)

Note that J agrees with βγ. The Italian, singhiozzi, Fil. 4. 115, supports the reading sobbynge.

*1138, 1139. So bittre teeris wep nat thurgh the rynnde
The woful mirra writen as I fynde
     (J thurght)
     Rest: So bittre teris wep nought as I fynde
The woful myrra þrough þe bark and rynnde
     (D om. teris; Cl pought; DCx om. second þe)
1165. ... in no cas...
Rest: ... in no ping...

1167. And ... 
Rest: But ...

1173. ... wipen of and dreye (— Ph)
Rest: ... wypen of ful dreye
(A of wypen)

1178. For aught he wiste and breth ne felte he non
(H₃ om. ne)
Rest: For aught he wot for breth ... 
(Cl for I wot; H₂H₄Cx om. for; R in for for)

1179. ... And pat...
Rest: And pis...

1183. As men don folk...
Rest: As men don hem...
(S₁ him)

1185. ... the shethe...
Rest: ... his shethe...

1190. ... no more he lyuen shulde (— J)
(Gg leue ne schulde)
Rest: ... he lenger lyuen sholde
(R no lenger lyuen he sholde; H₄ thei for he)

1194. ... kan...
Rest: ... may...

1199. ... and folowe hir spirit forth in hye
(Ph now in hye)
Rest: ... lowe or hye
(A hize or lowe; DS₂R and for or)

Forth in hye must mean "forth in haste," a more appropriate
idea than the "low or high" of βγ.

1209. Omit o.

*1214. ... herte myn...
Rest: ... lady myn...

The Italian reads dolce mio disiro, Fil. 4. 124. All MSS. read herte myn in 1216, which may explain the revision.
*1218. And he bigan conforte hir . .

Rest: And he bygan to glade here . .
(D And he begladded hir)

The Italian reads La confortò, Fil. 4. 124.

*1222, 1223. Ayein into hir herte al softe wente
So at the laste . .
(Gg Al softe to hire herte aȝyn it went; H₃ So that at laste)

Rest: Into here woful herte ayen it wente
But at pe laste . .

*1250. . . hir Ioyes alle lorn
(Gg bore for lorn; Ph forlorne; H₃ for Ioyes alle ylorn)

Rest: . . . al here blisse ylorn
(H₂H₄Cx om. here; D lorne; H₄S₂ forlorn)

*1251. Seying alias that euere they were born
(H₃ om. euere; Gg were þey)

Rest: Bywaylynge ay þe day þat þey were born
(A Bywaylynge cursynge, he for þey; D at for ay)

1284. . . . right to conclusioun
(H₃ to Ryght; Ph to þe conclusion)

Rest: . . . to my conclusioun

1289. Gg Makyng here . .
Ph Makyng ay here . .
H₃ Make here I shal . .

Rest: Makyng alwey . . . (+ J)

*1290. That in effect this thing þat I shal seye
(H₃ That doultles thys thing that in effect I sey)

Rest: That now þese wordes whiche þat I shal seye
(R om. That now, you seye; H₄ om. now; D om.
second þat)

*1294. For fynaly . . . (− H₃)

Rest: For yn effect

Cf line 1290.

1315. And thus . .

Rest: And panne . .
Readings of $H_2$Ph.

*1322. JGgPh That we shul eueremo togededere dwelle
(Ph wil; Gg delle)
$H_3$ That I may have a liberte to dwelle

Rest: So as we shulle togederes euere dwelle
(D om. euere; $H_4$ euermor)

1323. . . Ioye . . .
($H_3$ Ioyes)

Rest: . . . blyssse . . .

1332. Oonly but yf it my fader be
($H_3$ Al holy but yf)

Rest: But yf pat onlyche . . .
($H_2H_4$ om. yf; $S_2$ om. pat)

A nine-syllable line in a.

1336. JGgPh . . . as muche as it hath space
$H_3$ . . . as brode . . .

Rest: . . . as wyd . . .

1409. . . and ek . . . (—$H_3$)

Rest: . . . and jat . . .

1453. And . . . (—$H_3$)

Rest: For . . .

1478. Omit al.

1654. . . no thought . . .
($H_3$ no thing)

Rest: . . . no cause . . .

Within the group of a MSS. certain sub-groups may be established. Up to the point where $H_2^1$ terminates (line 196), the familiar relationship of $H_2$Ph remains unimpaired. We may note a few instances by way of proof.

$H_2^1$Ph.

38. But at pe day . . .

Rest: But on a day . . .
($H_5$ om. on)

†41. . . without eny lenger let

Rest: . . . withoute lenger lette
($BS_1$ anon withouten lette)
†55. . . for hem . . .  
Rest: . . . for harm . . .  
62. . . eke . . .  
Rest: . . . and . . .  
123. . . hem . . .  
Rest: . . . it . . .  
194. . . lo þus sey we . . .  
Rest: Omit lo

Up to the point where H₅ terminates, the relationship of GgH₅ is maintained. A few instances will suffice.

GgH₅.

206. Gg But þus it fel ryȝt in conclusioun  
H₅ But þus to fell to conclusioun  
Rest: O nyce world lo þy dyscression  
(Ph blinde for nyce)

248. þerwith the sobbis . . .  
Rest: The heyghe sobbes . . .  
(H₃ om. heyghe)

The Italian reads Gli alti singhiozzi, Fil. 4. 28.

473. . . out with proserpyne  
Rest: . . . down wip proserpyne

588. . . nyne dayis . . . (+ Cx)  
Rest: . . . nyne nyght . . .

As among JGgPhH₃, there seems to be a closer relationship of JGg on the one hand, and of H₃Ph on the other. For this the strongest evidence is the fact that H₃Ph omit the soliloquy on God's foreknowledge, lines 953–1085, entire (added later in Ph), and JGg omit only lines 953–1078 (added later in J), giving regularly the last stanza of the soliloquy, lines 1079–1085. A striking revision reading in which H₃Ph alone give the earlier reading, while JGg agree with βγ, lines 950–952, has already been given in the list of α readings above, p. 207. The evidence would seem to show that H₃ and Ph are derived from the α parent at an earlier stage than J and Gg. There are, however, instances of GgPh and of GgH₃. The agreements within the α group, most of them of a trivial character, are illustrated in the following list.
Readings of GgH₅.

Scattering Agreements of a MSS.

412. H₃Ph + RCx . . . full dere
Rest: . . . for dere
(H₄ at deere)

474. H₃H₅ . . . lyue . . .
Rest: . . . wonė . . .
(Gg wene; H₂ duelle)

496. JGgH₅ Or . . .
Rest: O . . .
(Cx Loo)

799. JH₃ How myghte it euere al red ben . . .
Rest: . . . yred ben
(H₁ yherd)

The Italian, Chi potrebbe giammai narrare a pieno, Fil. 4. 95, supports the reading al red.

842. GgPh + Cx om. pleynt.

876. Gg . . . er ṭis
J . . . al how over erasure
Rest: . . . al how

1144. GgPh . . . to lesse . . .
Rest: . . . to wayken . . .
(A waylen; DS₂ waken; H₁ woken; J weiken; H₂ makyn; H₄ make)

1208. JGg Thow Attrepos ṭat is ful reddy heere
(Gg antropos ṭat art)
Rest: And Attropes make reddy ṭow my bere
(H₂ pou me her ber; H₄ om. ṭow)

1228. JGg . . . he wolde therwith . . .
Rest: . . . ṭerwith he wolde . . .

1246. GgH₃ omit ful (CLR right for ful)

†1266. GgH₃ . . . herte . . .
Rest: . . . art . . .

1295. H₃Ph I wyl it doo . . .
Rest: That wol I don . . .

1366. H₃ cause for wey; Ph om. wey
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1451. J ... þat ich yow heere stere
Gg ... þat I here stire
Rest: ... þat I haue herd yow stere

1455. H₃Ph + H₄Cx ... fadyr ...
Rest: ... sire ...

1575. H₃Ph ... shyneth now ...
Rest: ... now shyneth ...
(H₂H₄ om. now)

†1628. GgPh omit a ping

1657. GgPh + H₂ Was neuere fals ne schal ...
(Gg by corrector)

Rest: Was fals ne neuere shal ...

With the exception of 1208, none of these instances is very significant. It is to be noted, however, that they are more frequent in the latter part of the book, where the a group readings cease.

Much more significant than these readings just given, is a curious list of cases, all falling between 1300 and 1442, in which H₃, alone and unsupported, presents a reading entirely possible and satisfactory, and so different from the reading of the remaining MSS. as to warrant the idea that deliberate and authoritative revision is responsible for the variation. The list follows.

Unique Readings of H₃.

*1301. As in thys cas lat dryue it outhe of mynde
Rest: To letten it lat it passe out of mynde
(H₂ lightly for lat it; Ph om. second it)

1302. ... fonde ...
Rest: ... shape ...

*1304. Ful cruelly oure hertis wolde anoye
Rest: Wol vs disese and cruwellyche anoye
(A trewliche; Cx gretyly)

*1312, 1313. Considereth now that tyme it is of trewe
Ye may not faille of myn estat to here
Rest: Syn wel ye wot þat it is now a truwe
Ye shul ful wel al myn estat yhere
(Cl ye wel; GgCx om. þat; H₄ om. a; H₂R of for al; H₄ om. al)
The $H_3$ reading is lent some support by the Italian, *Nel tempo delle tregue di venire Ci accò cagione, Fil. 4. 132.*

*1322.* That I may hane a liberte to dwelle  
*Rest:* So as we shulle to gedderes euere dwelle

*1325.* Of pourviaunce our counsel for to hide  
*Rest:* That for pe beste ...

(Cx 1s for That)

1336. ... as brode ...  
*Rest:* ... as wyd ...

*1363–1365.* In hoste amonge the grekys euere in fere  
Hit nyl not bee and gode soo wysly Rede  
My soule as ye hane cause noon to drede  
*Rest:* Among po men of armes euere in fere  
For which as wysly god my soule rede  
I kan not sen wherof ye sholden drede  
(Cx om. euere; Ph so for as; R wherfore for wherof;  
$S_1$ ṭat 3e shuld drede)

The Italian reads (*Fil. 4. 135*)—

*Ed a che far tra' Greci mi terrebbe,*  
*Che come vedi son sempre nell' armi.*

This is on the whole nearer to $H_3$ than to the rest of the MSS., in spite of the fact that *men of armes* would seem to have been suggested by *sempre nell' armi.*

*1392, 1393.* To doo the wrathe of pryamus to passe  
Towardys hym and don hym stonde in grace  
*Rest:* Toward pe Court to don pe wrape pace  
Of Priamus ...  
(Gg cuntre; $H_1$ space)

The reading of $H_3$ is awkward but possible.

1402. Yif thys be les ...  
*Rest:* If ṭat I lye ...

*1404.* In myddys hys werk or bere hym fast on honde  
*Rest:* Makynge his sort and beren hym on honde  
(JGgPh$H_2H_4$ or beryn; R fast on honde)

Note that R agrees with $H_3$ in the phrase *fast on honde.*
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*1411.  Whan he from Delphos to the grekys sterte

Rest:  Whan he for fered out of Delphos sterte-

(Cl out of his Delphos; H₂ for drede; Gg out of
disples sterede)

*1442.  Shal I neuer as in thys worlde haue Ioye

Rest:  Ne shal I neuer haue hele honour ne Ioye

(H₂H₄ om. first Ne; Gg om. hele)

A nine-syllable line as it stands in H₃.  Presumably we should
read Ne shal I neuer.

One hesitates to pronounce authentic a series of readings found
only in a single MS., and that a MS. generally so corrupt as
H₃.  But most of the readings just given are of such a sort that,
were they found in the remaining a MSS., we should at once
regard them as variants due to revision.  Though the evidence is not
conclusive, the Italian is in two of these passages, lines 1312 and
1363, somewhat nearer to H₃ than to the other MSS.; so that
we should, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, take the
H₃ reading as the earlier unrevised version.  If one will look
back to the main list of a readings, he will see that in this part
of the poem there are no striking a readings except line 1322, and
that in 1322, and in several of the less striking readings, H₃
departs from JGgPh.  We shall see that in their treatment of
the long Boethian soliloquy of Troilus H₃ and Ph represent the
earliest state of the text.  I do not think we can avoid the
conclusion that in these unique readings of H₃ we have a record
of the text in its most primitive form.  In these lines, we must
then assume, the revision was made before J and Gg, and even
before Ph, were copied.

The Soliloquy on Free-Choice.

The most striking characteristic of a in Book IV is its omission
of the long soliloquy of Troilus on God’s foreknowledge and man’s
freedom, adapted from the fifth book of Boethius.  The passage
consists of 19 stanzas, stanzas 137–155, lines 953–1085.  During
this part of Book IV a is represented by JGgPhH₃.  Of these
MSS., H₃ lacks the 19 stanzas without break or indication of any
kind to mark their loss.  Stanza 136 is immediately followed
in the middle of a page by stanza 156.  In Ph the 19 stanzas
were also omitted; but after the MS. was completed, the scribe discovered the passage and added it on two inset leaves, with proper indication of its position between stanzas 136 and 156. In Gg all but the last stanza of the passage is omitted, without any indication of the loss, so that stanza 155 follows immediately upon 136. In J the whole passage is found, and in the hand of the original scribe; but after stanza 154 a blank was left of 16 stanza-spaces. Stanza 154 is at the foot of fol. 83\*a. Fol. 83\*b, with space for five stanzas, is blank. After fol. 83, a leaf, the twelfth of the seventh quire of twelve, has been cancelled. The first stanza-space on 84\*a is blank. Then comes stanza 155. With the ten stanza-spaces on the cancelled leaf, we have, then, 16 stanza-spaces originally blank between stanzas 154 and 155. At the bottom of fol. 83\*a, after stanza 154, is written in a contemporary hand: "her faileth thyng y^t/ is nat yt made." The writing of this note is smaller and less black than the writing of the text; but, so far as one can judge from the few words, it seems to be that of the scribe. The reader may form his own opinion on the matter by consulting the collotype reproduction of the page in the Chaucer Society's volume, The MSS. of Chaucer's Troilus. This note can hardly be correct as it stands. Though stanza 154 gets us only to the middle of the long Prose III in Boethius, and there is more of the discussion which Chaucer might have used, we cannot willingly admit that the poet ever planned to make this soliloquy longer than it is. Note and space presumably go back to an ancestor of the existing J. This ancestor must have left blank a space equal to 34 stanzas, with a note to the effect that the lacuna was for matter not yet composed. The 18 stanzas were then written in, leaving 16 additional blank spaces not used, and the note was not erased. J found this state of things and exactly reproduced it, save that the note "her faileth thyng, etc," is placed immediately before the blank. We must assume that blank and note have been taken over by J from an ancestor; since the existing J is through more than half its extent a β MS.

However this curious state of things came into being, two significant facts stand out: first, that the main body of the soliloquy, stanzas 137–154, are separated from the transitional stanza 155, which apparently existed in J's parent MS. before the 18 stanzas of soliloquy were supplied; and second, that an
early scribe bears witness to the fact that this Boethian soliloquy was a late addition. There must have been a scribe who knew authoritatively that space was to be left for an indefinite number of stanzas "not yet made."

That the soliloquy was indeed an afterthought we can infer from other evidence. Stanzas 136 and 156 fit together perfectly. In 136 Pandarus finds Troilus in a temple sorrowfully praying the gods to end his life. In 156 Pandarus addresses him at once, as we should expect him to do, and reproves and comforts him. Not only is the connection perfectly appropriate; the two stanzas, 136 and 156, are further bound together by the fact that they are based on a single stanza, 4. 109, in the Filostrato. As critics have already noticed, the introduction of the long soliloquy results in a considerable absurdity. As the text stands in \( \beta \gamma \), Pandarus finds Troilus at line 947, and does not speak to him till line 1086. Apparently Pandarus stands on the threshold throughout the long soliloquy, and does not come in till 1085.

The added passage of 19 stanzas consists of two parts: 18 stanzas of soliloquy, closely modelled on Boethius, and the transitional stanza, 155, not derived from Boethius. This division is emphasized by the fact that Gg omits the 18 stanzas, but has 155, and that in J 155 is separated from the rest by a space, and was presumably present in J's original before the 18 stanzas were supplied. We must consider carefully stanza 155. It is unmistakably intended to conclude the soliloquy, and is meaningless when found, as in Gg, without the 18 stanzas preceding. "Thanne seyde he pus," with which stanza 155 begins, is clearly intended to set this stanza against the soliloquy. It has no point as referred to stanza 136; for what Troilus says in 155 is virtually what we are told that he prayed in 136. We may note that in \( H_3 \) and Ph the concluding lines of stanza 136 are even nearer to the substance of 155. In these MSS. we read:

- He fast made hys compleynt And his moon
- Besyking hem to sende hym other grace
- Or fro thys worlde to doon hym sone pace

In stanza 155 Troilus prays:

- Rewe on my sorwe or do me deye sone
- Or bryng Criseyde and me fro pis distresse

(GgJCxDS\(_2\), and do me deye)
When stanza 155 is added, stanza 136 is made to end:

Ful tendrely he preyde and made his mone
To don hym sone out of pis world to pace
For wel he pouhte per was noon oper grace

This is the reading of JGg as well as of βγ.

Clearer evidence that stanza 155 refers back to the soliloquy is found in its reference to Troilus "Disputynghe with hym self in pis matere," which can hardly refer to anything in stanza 136. It seems clear, then, that stanza 155 has no meaning without the preceding soliloquy; and yet Gg and J both offer strong evidence that at one stage of its development the passage stood in Chaucer's original with 155 and without the 18 stanzas, 137–154. We must distinguish three stages. The first is that represented by H₃Ph, in which stanzas 136 and 156 followed uninterrupted as in *Filostrato*. It then occurred to Chaucer to give to Troilus at this point a Boethian discussion of free-choice and necessity. He began, not uncharacteristically, at the end, with the stanza of transition, No. 155, and altered the end of 136. But before he had done the rather difficult task of reducing the philosophical argument to seven-line stanzas, there was occasion to have made two new copies of the poem—the copies from which J and Gg are descended—and in these copies was included the new stanza, 155, and space was left for the "thing that is not yet made."

So far attention has been confined to JGgPhH₃. The whole free-choice passage, including stanza 155, is also omitted by H₄. Though H₂, here in its fourth handwriting, is closely related to H₄ throughout the last two books of the poem, the 19 stanzas are regularly given in H₂, and in R and Cx which with H₂H₄ here constitute β. For this omission by H₄ I can give no satisfactory explanation. Since the passage was at least planned before JGg were copied, and is present in γ, it must have been in existence when H₄ was derived. H₄, however, is throughout distinguished by its tendency to revert to α readings, notably in Book III, where it gives the shifted stanzas twice over, in their αγ position and in their β position. H₂H₄, moreover, with Ph, omit the *Teseide* passage in Book V. Since H₂ contains the passage, we must assume one of two hypotheses. Either the omission was made (through a misunderstanding, perhaps) by the common ancestor of
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$H_2 H_4$, in which case $H_2$ has derived the passage from some foreign source (as Ph does before our eyes); or the common original of $H_2 H_4$ contained the passage, and $H_4$ itself (or an intermediate ancestor) is responsible for the omission. For the first of these hypotheses, that $H_2$ has derived the passage from a source other than the common ancestor of $H_2$ and $H_4$, some evidence may be drawn from the character of its readings.

In the 19 stanzas under discussion there are only the most trivial variations of reading. There is not in the entire passage of 133 lines a single clear example of group variation. That the reader may see how little is the variation, I give in the following list all the cases in which two or more MSS. agree against the rest in a variation of any possible significance. The Ph readings are those of the inset leaves. We have already seen the reasons for believing that the passage is a later addition in $J$, or in $J$'s original.

**Variant Readings in the Free-Choice Soliloquy.**

957. JDS$_1$Cx I am for he nas; ClCpH$_1$A$H_2$Ph lorn waylawey; Rest lorn so weylaway

958. JPhD omit second comth

961. S$_2$ for signe; Ph purgh signe; Rest foresight

964. ClCpH$_1$S$_1$JPh desponeth; $H_2$RCxADS$_2$ disposeth

965. PhS$_2$ his for here

968. AR pei for per

970. CxS$_2$ omit men

973. $H_2$R whiche for whos

974. RCx omit men

975. ClS$_1$R And for Ne; S$_2$ om.

986. $H_2$DS$_2$ writen for wripen; Cx worchen

987. ClCpH$_1$ADJPh nere; $H_2$RCxS$_1$S$_2$ wer

989. JPhCx Vnsidefast and no certein for Vncerteyn and no stedefast; D om. stedefast

991. ADR omit cler

994. ClCx corsed wykkednesse for wikked corsednesse

998. JPhCx seyn it biforn; Rest omit it

1004. AS$_2$ not for to be for not to be

1006. $H_2$PhS$_2$ nedfully for nedely

1007. Ph that shul falle; D which shal falle; Rest whiche pat falle
From such a list as this no sure conclusions can be drawn. The evidence is contradictory, as must always be the case when the variations are of the trivial sort where so great a part can be played by accidental coincidences. We can at most say that Ph and J tend to associate together, as though derived from a similar source; and that in a number of instances, notably 986, 1016, 1043, H₂ is associated with S₂. From this latter fact it might be argued that the omission of the soliloquy was due to the H₂H₄ parent, and that H₂ has derived the passage from a source similar to S₂. But I feel that the evidence is not clear enough to warrant any conclusion in the matter.

The relation of a to the Boethius passage can be explained with some degree of assurance. We must be content merely to record that H₄ omits the passage, as we must merely record the omission of the proems in R.

The Shift of Stanza 108.

Less in importance, perhaps, but none the less a striking instance of revision, is the shifting of the stanza numbered 108 (lines 750–756), in the edition of Skeat. In JGgPhH₃ it comes
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immediately after stanza 105, i.e. after line 735; in $\beta\gamma$ it is moved down to the position which it occupies in Skeat's edition. In $\beta\gamma$ the first line of the stanza is changed to accommodate it to its new position, as is also line 757, which in $\beta\gamma$ immediately follows the stanza in question (cf. above, p. 203). There can be no doubt that the shift is a deliberate one; nor can there be any doubt which position this stanza originally occupied. In Boccaccio a single stanza, Fil. 4. 87, serves as source for the last three lines of stanza 105, for the shifted stanza, and for stanza 106; and the details are found in the same sequence as in the $a$ text of Chaucer. Stanza 88 of Boccaccio corresponds to stanza 107 in Chaucer. The $\beta\gamma$ position disturbs the order of Boccaccio by inserting a stanza of Criseyde's words between two stanzas which describe her conduct. What was the motive for the revision is not at all clear; and readers may well disagree as to which order, the original or the revised, is preferable. The $\beta\gamma$ arrangement succeeds better in co-ordinating words and deeds.

Readings Characteristic of $\beta$.

Besides the large number of instances in which $\beta\gamma$ agree as against $a$, there is a considerable number of cases in which the $\beta$ MSS. agree as against $\alpha\gamma$. The great majority of these cases are found in the first six hundred lines of the book; and the only striking cases of $\beta$ readings, of the sort which are so numerous in Book III, occur before line 170. During the early part of the book $\beta$ is represented by $JRH_4H_3Cx$. At line 197, with a new handwriting, $H_2$ joins the group. At about line 300 $H_3$ becomes an $a$ MS.; and $J$ goes over to $a$ at line 438. From there on $\beta$ is represented by $H_2H_4RCx$. In the early part of the book $S_1$ frequently has $\beta$ readings. After line 166 it is very rarely found with $\beta$. In the following list its participation in the $\beta$ reading is always specifically noted.

\[JH_4RCxH_3 (\beta).\]

7. \ldots a mowe (+ $S_1$)
   \(H_3 \text{om. } a\)
   Rest: \ldots pe mowe

29. \ldots tolde \ldots (\text{-- }J)
   Rest: \ldots seyd \ldots
*41, 42. ... anon withouten lette
Hir fomen in the felde hem faste mette
(R ful for hem; H₃ on the felde faste they mette)

Rest: ... withoute lenger lette
Here fomen in þe feld anoon hem mette
(S₁ anon withouten lette; H₂Ph any lenger; D om.
anoon; H₂PhDS₂ they met)

Note that S₁ has the β reading in 41 and the αγ reading in 42, thus repeating anon.

*57–59. But natheles a trewe was ther take
At grekys requeste and tho they gonnen trete
Of prisoners a chaunge for to make (− H₃, + S₁)
(H₄ neuertheles; RS₁ ther was; JH₄ At gret requeste;
H₄R gonne thei)

Rest: Of Pryamus was yeue at Grekes requeste
A tyme of trewe and þo þey gonnen trete
Here prisoneres to chaungen most and leste
(C₃Ph₁ a greke requeste; H₅(Gg)S₂ a gret request;
H₃ To pryamus whas yeven at his Requeste,
gan to trete; A than for yeue; D þen þei gan;
A touchynge for to chaungen.)

A clear case of deliberate revision. That β is less original is shown by the Italian:

Chiese Priamo triegua, e fugli data;
E cominciossi a trattare infra loro
Di permutar prigioni quella fiata. Fil. 4. 4.

Nearest to the Italian, however, is the reading of H₃, so that we must assume that H₃ here preserves Chaucer’s original version, which then underwent two successive revisions, each of which removed it further from the Italian. I suspect that we should read in both the later versions At grek requeste, since this form will best explain the various readings.

123. They wol eft brynge it ... 
(H₃ it eft bringe)

Rest: That þei wol brynge it ... 
(H₂Ph brynge hem)

124. Right for despit ...

Rest: Right in despit ...
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*126. The town shal yit be set upon a fire (+$S_1$) (H₄Cx on a fire)

Rest: The town of Troye shal ben set on fire (S₂ om. ben; Ph a fyre)

132. ... sikes soore (+$S_1$)

Rest: ... sorwes sore

140. ... streyght to Troye wente (−J)

(Cx ful streyghte; H₃ wende)

Rest: ... to Troye streyght pei wente (H₁ om. pei; H₅ om. streyght pei)

*156. Abood what oother lordes wolde saye (H₄ what that other)

Rest: Abod what lordes wolde vnto it seye (H₁ And for Abod; H₂PhGgH₅AD$S_2$ to for vnto)

*166. Yif thow debate it liste she be thy foo (+$S_1$)

(H₃ you; H₄R om. it; Cx Lest thow hyr wrath & she than be thy foo)

Rest: Lest for pi werk she wolde be pi fo.

(With line 197, H₂ becomes a β MS.)

JH₂H₄RCxH₃(β).

215. JRH₃ What ...

H₂H₄Cx That ...

a$S_1$ But ...

γ And ...

282. Nought rought I whiderward thow woldest steere

(J me inserted above by scribe before steere; H₃ Now Routh, om. woldest)

Rest: ... wheder pow woldest me stere

(Gg whedyr pat pou; Ph hit for me)

322. For now ... (−J)

Rest: For pi ...

(With line 326 H₃ becomes consistently an a MS.)

JH₂H₄RCx(β).

328. ... here (−H₄, + Ph)

Rest: ... pere
at the parlament

Rest: . . . in . . .

moot (− Cx)

Rest: . . . shal . . .

(With line 438 J becomes consistently an a MS.)

H₂H₄RCx(β).

werche . . . (− Cx)

Rest: . . . do . . .

now her now ther . . . (− Cx)
(H₄ now heere & there)

Rest: . . . now this now pat . . .
(A om. pat)

My deth . . . (+ Gg)

Rest: The deth . . .

But telle me pis . . . (− Cx)

a But sey me this . . .

γS₁ + Cx But tel me now . . .

Whi nelt pou helpe to doone redresse (− Cx)
(R nyltow, and for to)

Rest: Why nylt piself helpen . . .
(H₃ why nyltow thyselfen; H₅ nylt not, holly don redresse)

The reading of H₂H₄R is metrically deficient.

saue . . .

(R Kepe)

Rest: . . . han . . .

it . . . (− Cx)

Rest: . . . here . . .

is per but litell reste

γS₁ . . . per is but litel reste

a . . . is litel hertes reste

Omit neuere (+S₁; + PhAS₂)
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594. And rather be in blame a liteel stounde (+S₁)
γ ... in blame a lite yfounde
(Cl litel ; S₂ sound)
a ... a lite in blame Ifownde
(H₃ litel)

That the ay reading is more original is shown by tho Italian, "innanzi esser ripreso alquanto, Fil. 4. 72.

598. ... holde you ...
Rest: ... holden pe ...

†630. And dey ... (−Cx, +D)
Rest: A dieu ...

662. ... þes tidinges new (−Cx)
(H₄ all these tithyngis)
Rest: ... þis tale al newe
(GgPhH₃ om. al ; Cl of for al ; A trewe)

721. Omit eke (−R, +Gg)

734. ... thens neuer ... (+H₃Ph)
(H₃ there neuer)
Rest: ... neuere þennes

773. ... I mote from you departe
Rest: ... þat I from 3ow departe
(JH₃Gg I shal from yow ; Cl from hym)

868. ... lieth Cresseide Alone (+AS₂)
a ... for hem she lieth allone
Rest: ... lith now Criseyde allone

938. And þat I may helpe ... (R helpe may)
γS₁ And what þat I may helpe ... a And þat that I kan helpe ...
(Ph om. that)

948. ... no more ... (−R, +S₁, +H₃Ph)
Rest: ... no lenger ...
(Gg no þyng)
Within the group of $\beta$ MSS. there is an unmistakable relationship between $H_2$ and $H_4$. This relation, it will be remembered, was found in Book I, where two leaves of $H_2$ are written by the later, third hand. There the related $H_2^3$ and $H_4$ were $a$ MSS. Now they are both $\beta$. The change from $a$ type to $\beta$ type must then, have taken place in their common original. The relationship of $H_2$ and $H_4$ in Book IV, beginning with line 197 where $H_2^3$ begins, has already been attested in the variants recorded in the list of $\beta$ group readings above. It may be further illustrated by the following readings:

$$H_2 H_4 R C x \ (\beta).$$

1178. $H_2 \ldots$ brethe þan felte he non
$H_4 \ldots$ ne breth, felt he non
R $\ldots$ in breth ne felte he non
Cx $\ldots$ breth ne felte he none
$\gamma S_1 \ldots$ for breth ne felte he noon

1310. *Omit second* so (+ PhGg, + AD)
(Gg now for so; R parde for so)

1438. For which full oft ful pitously hir preid (– R, + J)
($H_4 C x$ he for hir)

Rest: $\ldots$ ful ofte he pitously here preyde
(GgRD ful ofte pitously he preyde;
Ph ful pitously he her prayde)

†299. $\ldots$ I son it $\ldots$
($H_4$ sonne)

Rest: $\ldots$ I seen it $\ldots$

312. $\ldots$ wepe fortl. $\ldots$

Rest: $\ldots$ wepen out $\ldots$

397. $\ldots$ in no seruise

Rest: $\ldots$ in my seruyse

445. $\ldots$ plight (+ $S_2$)

Rest: $\ldots$ hight

495. $\ldots$ it foryte $\ldots$

Rest: $\ldots$ þat foryte $\ldots$
Hit is no shame to you more than vise
Rest: ... ne no vice
(Cp om. ne; GgH\textsubscript{5}Cx om. no)

holde you full nyse
Rest: ... holden pe for nyce
(RCx you)

for woo ...
Rest: ... for ded ...

I do not feel that the Italian, *Erasi la dolente in sul suo letto Gittata stesa*, Fil. 4. 87, lends any support to the H\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} reading, since *for ded* corresponds to *stesa*, about as closely as does *for woo* to *dolente*.

was trew good & kinde
Rest: ... trewe was and kynde
(H\textsubscript{3} om. and)

ouer-renne ...
Rest: ... at-renne ...
(H\textsubscript{3} oute Renne; A atterne)

Men say *pe sufferaunt overcomth pe proude parde*
Rest: *Omit* *pe proude*
A hypermetrical line.

Less striking is the list of readings in which RCx agree as against H\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} and ay.

my sherte
Rest: ... here sherte

and your bounte
Cx ... & of your bounte
Rest: ... and of bounte

ful ney ...
Rest: ... wel neygh ...

he

Ay lyue in torment ...
Rest: On lyue in torment ...
(a In wo in torment)
301. . . . liuen in distresse
    Rest: . . . dyen . . .
    \(a\) endyn \(c\)

412. . . . ful deere \(+\ H_3 Ph\)
    Rest: . . . for dere
    \(H_4 \) at deere

\(\dagger\) 698. . . . audience . . .
    Rest: . . . aduertence . . .

1177. Omit and

There are a few cases, all of which may be coincidences, in which \(H_4 Cx\) agree in a variant reading:

\(H_4 Cx\).

517. Omit is

666. Omit right \(+\ H_3\)

896. . . . come here . . .
    Rest: . . . be here . . .

1451. Omit yet

1455. . . . fadir . . . \(+\ H_3 Ph\)
    Rest: . . . sire . . .

In 112 \(H_4 RCx\) read \textit{town and folk} instead of \textit{folk and town}; and in 305 the same MSS. read \textit{woful nest} for \textit{wo vnneste}.

The only closer relationship among the \(\beta\) MSS. is that of \(H_2\) and \(H_4\). The scattering agreements, when not due to coincidence, must be explained as due to the presence of alternate readings in the \(\beta\) original.

Of the \(\beta\) group readings, but few present striking variations, and those few are found before line 167. There are, however, no clear cases in which \(\beta\) is in error:

In Book IV the most striking series of variants is that which divides \(a\) from \(\beta_y\). In other words \(\gamma\) is, as in Book I, normally in possession of the later revised form of the text.

The relation of the MSS. throughout the greater part of the
book, i.e. after H₃ and J have both become a MSS., may be graphically represented by the following diagram:

The broken line, α . . . β, represents a single MS., in which successive revisions were made.

CHAPTER VI

THE MANUSCRIPT RELATIONS IN BOOK V

In Book V the MS. relations return to a condition similar to that which exists in Book II, where γ alone remains intact, and where the distinction between α and β becomes greatly confused. Save for the Teseide passage at the end of the book, which is omitted in H₂H₄ and Ph, and which may be a later addition, there is very little trace of any revision. With only two or three exceptions, the variations are of the trivial sort which can be recognized at once as due to the carelessness and ignorance of a scribe.

We shall begin by presenting the readings of γ. With γ is associated in a large number of cases S₁. Occasionally other MSS. share in a γ reading. The participation of S₁ or of other MSS. is in every case specifically noted.
Readings Characteristic of $\gamma$.

$\text{ClCpH}_1\text{S}_2\text{AD}(\gamma)$

†9.  
\begin{align*}
&\ldots \text{his bemes clere } (+ \text{H}_3 + \text{Cx}) \\
&\text{J(Gg)Ph } \ldots \text{cleene} \\
&\text{H}_2\text{H}_4\text{RS}_1 \ldots \text{shene}
\end{align*}

A clear case of error, since the rime words in 11 and 12 are grene and queene.

60, 61.  
\begin{align*}
&\text{And forth she rit ful sorwfully a pas} \\
&\text{Ther nys non oper remedye yn pis cas} \\
&(\text{Cl right for rit})
\end{align*}

Rest: transpose order of lines.

Though the order in $\gamma$ is not impossible, it seems fairly clear from the context that it is erroneous. The line, Ther nys non oper remedye, etc., comes more appropriately immediately after 59, But forth she mot for ought put may bylyde. There is a curious reflection of this transposition in Gg. In Gg the line, Ther nys, etc. (properly line 60) has been lost. In consequence the line, And forthe sche rauqt ful sorwefullly apas, becomes the fourth line of the stanza. To supply the missing line someone has put in as the fifth line of the stanza, And ofte sche syhede & seyde allas. All this points towards confusion in the common original of all the MSS. Perhaps the line Ther nys, etc., was in the margin. This would at any rate account for the transposition in $\gamma$ and the loss of the line in Gg.

63.  
\begin{align*}
&\ldots \text{swete herte} \\
&\text{Rest: } \ldots \text{deere herte}
\end{align*}

107.  
\begin{align*}
&\text{When pis was don } \ldots \\
&\text{Rest: When tyme was } \ldots
\end{align*}

115.  
\begin{align*}
&\text{That he nolde don his peyne and al his myght} \\
&(\text{S}_2 \text{ne wolde } ; \text{Cp. om. and}) \\
&\text{Rest: That he ny}l \text{don his herte } \ldots \\
&(\text{H}_4\text{RS}_1 \text{nolde } ; \text{H}_2 \text{wil})
\end{align*}

I can find no justification for the phrase don his herte, while don his peyne in the sense of "take trouble" is well attested. Herte must be anticipated from the next line. If herte is an error, it is a very early one, since it is found in all the MSS. except $\gamma$. We must assume that herte, the corrupt reading, stood
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in the common original of all MSS. and that the reading of γ is a scribal emendation, not improbably correct.

166. Ek I am not \( (+ S_1) \)
    Rest: Nor I am not . . .
    (J nam: H₂PhNe: GgRCx For)

242. . . pis sustene \( (+ S_1) \)
    Rest: . . . ek sustene

245. For langour . . . \( (+ S_1) \)
    Rest: For longynge . . .
    The context strongly favours longynge.

412. The folk wol wene . . . \( (+ S_1) \)
    Rest: The folk wol seyn . . .
    The Italian, diria l' uom, Fil. 5. 35, confirms the reading seyn.

†436. . . of heigh prowesse \( (+ S_1) \)
    Rest: . . . of heygh largesse
    The context shows that largesse is the correct reading.

495. Lat vs holde forth our purpos fermely \( (+ S_1, + Cx) \)
    (Cx forth holde; A om. oure)
    Rest: Omit forth
    Without forth we have a nine-syllable line, since attributive oure seems to be always monosyllabic.

565. Lo yondir saugh I niyn owene lady daunce \( (+ S_1) \)
    (Cl yende)
    Rest: . . . last my lady daunce
    (H₄ my lady last daunce)

613. . . shal . . .
    Rest: . . . wil . . .
    (S₁ lacking)

†711 Omit second ther \( (+ S_1) \)

924. Ye leuere þan be lord of Greces twelue \( (+ S_1) \)
    (Cl þe for be; H₁ ben a lord; A Grekys)
    Rest:
    . . . kyng . . .
    The Italian, Più volentier che re de' Greci adesso, Fil. 6. 22, supports the aß reading.

944. Ye wol me graunte . . . \( (+ S_1) \)
    Rest: T ye me graunt . . .
Readings Characteristic of \( \gamma \).

973. I trowe ek wel \ldots \ (\!-\! A, + S_1)

Rest: I trow it wel \ldots 

992. \ldots er \ldots ( + S_1)

Rest: \ldots yit \ldots 

\((H_2 R H_3 \text{ om. yit})\)

\(\dagger\)1006. And gan to syke & seyde O Troylus & Troye town

\((H_1 \text{ O Troilus town}; \ C_p D \text{ O Troie town})\)

Rest: \ldots O Troye town

A clear case of error in the \( \gamma \) original, rightly emended by \( C_p D \), and mistakenly emended by \( H_1 \).

1021. \ldots bedde \ldots ( + S_1 + H_3)

Rest: \ldots reste \ldots 

\((H_4 \text{ chamber})\)

1070. \ldots is now for me to rewe ( + S_1 + H_3)

\((C_l \text{ om. for}; \ A D S_1 \text{ is now me for})\)

Rest: \ldots it is now for to rewe 

\((R \text{ om. for}; \ P h \text{ is me now to repente})\)

1081. \ldots shold I \ldots ( - C_l, + J H_3)

Rest: \ldots myght I \ldots 

\((C_l G g \text{ myghty})\)

1163. \ldots right soth \ldots ( - A, + S_1)

Rest: \ldots ful sothe \ldots 

1168. \ldots dar I seye ( - A, + S_1)

Rest: \ldots soth to seye

1270. \ldots per is no remedy \ldots ( + S_1)

Rest: \ldots ther lith no remedy \ldots 

1295. \ldots of pat pou art in doute ( + S_1 + H_3)

\((H_3 \text{ of wych})\)

Rest: \ldots ther thow art now in doute 

\((J C x \text{ om. now}; \ H_2 \text{ in a doute})\)

1316. \ldots may \ldots ( + S_1 + H_3 + H_2)

Rest: \ldots shal \ldots 

1390. \ldots myn owen lady free ( - C_l, + S_1 + H_3)

Rest: \ldots myn hertes lady free
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1413. As ye . . . (+ $S_1 + Cx$)  
Rest: As she . . .

1449. . . þe bor . . . (+ $S_1 + H_3$)  
Rest: . . . this boor . . .  
(Gg boþe for boor; Cx om. boor)

1543. Thorough pursuaneunce . . . (+ $S_1$)  
Rest: By pursuaneunce . . .

1585. *Omit first pat (+ $S_1$)  
($H_3H_4Cx$ om. second pat)

1674. . . o lady myn Criseyde (+ $S_1 + H_3$)  
Rest: . . . o lady bright Criseide  
(Gg by scribe over erasure)

1775. . . she . . . (+ $S_1 + R$)  
Rest: . . . ye . . .

1806. Dispitously . . . (+ $S_1 + Cx$)  
Rest: Ful pitously . . .

†1809. . . þe seuen þe sperre (+ $S_1 + H_3$)  
JRCx . . . the viij sperre  
($H_2H_4$ omit the passage; Gg lacking; Ph on inset leaf has the γ reading)

The Italian reads: *Ver la concavità del cielo ottava. Teseide*,  
11. 1. See also Skeat's note.

These γ readings in Book V are of precisely the same character as those we have recorded in the preceding books. In several instances they are certainly corrupt; and in most cases probability, both inherent and transcriptional, makes against them. In no instance is there any ground for regarding the variation as due to deliberate revision by the author; though once, in line 115, γ has emended a corrupt reading in the common original of all MSS.

It is to be noted that from line 166 $S_1$ shares all the γ readings except one (line 1081), and that a doubtful case. Beginning with line 1021, $H_3$ shares in about half of the γ readings.

We have now to consider some scattering agreements within the group of γ MSS.
Scattering Agreements of $\gamma$ MSS.

12. Cp Syn that the sone I Troilus of Ecuba the queene
   Rest: Omit I Troilus
   (H$_1$S$_2$ + H$_4$ have gloss Troilus over sone; S$_1$ has gloss in margin)

Cp has taken into the text a gloss which must have stood in the $\gamma$ original. The I is the sign · which regularly introduces a gloss.

26. CpH$_1$S$_2$ . . . here to fore
    Rest: . . . here before
    (H$_3$ eke before)

†42. CpH$_1$S$_2$ . . . crye
    Rest: . . . drye

†55. A pore, D poor, for yore

88. Cp Of which the sone Diomede of Tideus took hede
    Rest: Omit Diomede
    (S$_2$D have gloss Diomede over Tideus; H$_2$ has gloss inmargin; H$_4$ diomedes for the sone of Tideus)

†208. AD + H$_2$H$_4$ . . . and eke Cipride
    Rest: Omit eke

Eke is taken over from the preceding line.

321. AD + Gg . . . on me . . .
    Rest: . . . of me . . .

335, 336. H$_1$S$_2$ . . . pe care
    . . . this fare
    Rest: . . . pe fare
    . . . pis care
    (A pe mone . . . pis care allone; Gg care corrected from fare)

522. H$_1$AS$_1$ + Gg . . . preyde
    (H$_1$ preyed)
    Rest: . . . seyde

†572. DS$_1$ Now goode swete herte . .
    Rest: Omit herte.

599. DS$_1$ + J . . . blisful god . .
    Rest: . . . blisful lorde . .
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733. ClCpH₁ AS₁ + JH₃ . . . po yonder wallys (H₃A the)

Rest: Omit po

750. S₁ . . . bytyde what may bityde

Rest: Omit may

943. A So pat or pat I departe . . .

D So pat or -r departe . . .

Rest: So er pat I . . . aparte . . .

(H₄ For for So; H₂ . . . r, om. pat)

993. AD I neuere er wroughte

Rest: Omit er

†1048. ClD omit kepren

1057. AS₁ + Cx . . . and eke . . .

Rest: . . . and on . . .

†1098 ClIH₁ omit so

†1153. ClCpH₁ . . . whan pat . . .

Rest: Omit pat

1193. AD + Ph . . . by est & ek by weste

Rest: . . . by west & ek by este

†1277. AD + Gg omit manner

1343. AD may sterne for masterte or me asterte

1393. ClCp(H₁) There for That

†1444. DS₁ + Gg omit come; Cl ek for come

†1792. ADS₁ + Cx Of Virgile . . .

(A O for Of)

Rest: Omit Of

1796. Cp Ne the this mytysmetre . . .

S₂ Ne pis mytysmetre . . .

Rest: Ne pe mytysmetre . . .

These readings just recorded point to the existence of corrections in the γ original. They also show, if not very clearly, the continued relationship of A and D, and the association with these two MSS. of S₁. As against ADS₁ we find CpH₁ S₂ agreeing in several cases in a variant reading. It is to be noted that Cl is present in very few of these combinations.
The long series of \( \alpha \) group readings in Book IV is, it will be remembered, found in the first 1300 lines of the book. After line 1336 there are but a handful of trivial cases. This is the condition which we find throughout Book V. There are but a score of \( \alpha \) readings in the whole book; and in a number of those either \( H_3 \) or Ph has deserted its affiliation. Moreover, the readings are of a very trivial character. In only two instances, lines 476(?) and 1502–1504, have we anything which points strongly towards revision; and in the second of these instances the \( \alpha \) reading is presented only by JGg. Further, it will be found that in the trivial readings of the group individual \( \beta \) MSS. frequently share. The list of \( \alpha \) readings follows.

\[
JGgPhH_3(\alpha).
\]

9. \( J(Gg)Ph \ldots hir bemy cleene \)
\( H_2H_4RS_1 \ldots his bemes shene \)
\( \gamma H_3Cx \ldots his bemes clere \)

The pronoun \( hir \) is clearly wrong; \( cleene \) in the sense of clear bright, is quite defensible. It would seem to be the source of the corrupt \( \gamma \) reading.

202. \ldots no wight \ldots
(Gg non man over erasure)

Rest : \ldots no ping \ldots

Wight suits the context better than ping.

476. \ldots and thennes wolde he wende

Rest : \ldots and seyde he wolde wende
(S_1 pat he wolde; Cx with pandare his frende)

523. \( Omit As (- H_3) \)

A nine-syllable line in JGgPh.

570. \ldots ful busily (- J, \(- R) \)

Rest : \ldots ful blysfually

Either reading is possible.

583. \ldots in my memorie (- Ph, \(+ H_2R) \)
(J momorie)

Rest : \( Omit my \)

My is necessary to the metre, since the rime words in 585, 586 show that we must accent \textit{memorie}. 

{Readings Characteristic of \( \alpha \).}
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†628.  *Omit* yet (+ R)
The line is metrically deficient without *yet*.

†629.  *Omit* right (− H₃, + Cx)
The line is metrically deficient.

652.  *Omit* ek (+ H₂)
A possible reading, since the plural *olde* is properly disyllabic.

†730.  . . . walles (− H₃, + D)
*Rest*: . . . halles
(H₃ lawlys)
A clear case of error, since all MSS. read *wallys* in 733.

885.  Nor . . . (− Ph, + H₂H₄)
(J Ne; H₂ Neuyr)
*Rest*: For . . .
(R lacking)
Nor seems a preferable reading. Note that *For* is found only in γS₁CxPh.

1028.  . . . causes . . . (− H₃)
*Rest*: . . . cause . . .
The Italian, *da queste cagion*, Fil. 6. 34, favours the plural *causes*.

†1103.  . . . tenthalyght (− Ph)
(J nynght for nyght)
*Rest*: . . . nynpe nyght
(R seluen nyght; A same nyght)
The context shows that *nynpe* is correct. Criseyde had promised to be back on the tenth day (4. 1595). She left Troy soon after prime (5. 15). Only nine nights would intervene between her departure and the day of her promised return.

1186.  *Omit* al (− Ph, + R)

1446.  And *fat* that Ioues of his purueiaunce (− H₃, + H₄)
*Rest*: *Omit* that.
A nine-syllable line in βγ.
1502-1504. JGg And how ypomedon with blody wounde
   And ek Parthonope in litel stownde
   Ben slayn and how Cappaneus the proude

Rest: And how ypomedon yn lytel stownde
   Was dreyn and ded Parthonope of wounde
   And also how Cappaneus pe proude

(Cl om. first how, y for yn; Cp a for yn; H₄Cx in a
   litel; H₃ dede And dreyn; H₂ om. of; H₃ And
   eke how kyng Cappaneus; Ph She told eke how;
   H₁ om. third And; Cx om. also)

Statius tells us that Parthenopaeus died of 'bloody wound' (Theb. 11. 883), and that Hippomedon was drowned (Theb. 11. 504 seq.); so that we must either regard the JGg reading as corrupt, or assume that Chaucer wrote the JGg lines from memory, and corrected later on reference to Statius's text.

1532. JGg She ches to dye and ek to gon to helle
   (Gg dep for to dye)
   Ph She chese for him to dye & eke goo to helle

Rest: She ches for hym to dye and go to helle

Note the conflate reading of Ph.

1570. Omit ay

1749. JPh That in ich estat is litel hertes reste
   H₃ That in suche thinge is . . .
   Gg lacking.

Rest: In eche estat is . . .

Within the group of a MSS. we find agreements of H₃Ph
   H₃Gg, GgPh, and JGg. Though most of these cases are of a
   trivial character, we must record those which may have any
   significance.

Scattering Agreements of a MSS.

154. H₃Ph + Cx . . . any creature

Rest: . . . euery creature

(D has the H₃Ph reading by later hand; H₂H₄ euery
   ooper)

217. GgPh omit right.

308. JPh + Cp swerd repeated from 307 for sheld.
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318. H₃Gg That certeinly I mot nedes dye
(H₃ must nedles)

Rest: Al certeynly pat I mot nedes dye
(H₂ That certeyn pat ; H₄ Al certeyn that)

342. Gg . . . myn owene lady dere
Ph . . . myn owne broper dere

Rest: . . . my leuc broper dere

364. H₃Ph . . . what that they meen

Rest: . . . what dremes mene

†407. GgPh Now rys vp . .

Rest: Omit vp

†469. H₃Ph . . . owne . .

Rest: . . . howue . .
(H₂ oughue ; H₁ howen ; A honde ; Gg enmy)

496. JGg + AS₁ . . . we . .

Rest: . . . ye . .
(H₃ he)

513. H₃Ph . . . tho doun of hors they lyght

Rest: . . . they doun of hors alighte
(ClGg of here hors ; Cp om. of hors ; H₂ light)

564. H₃Gg + Cx omit al

617. H₃Ph + RCx . . . ful ofte

Rest: Omit ful

†645. H₃Gg + Cx Thys songe when he hade songen sone
(Gg hade songe also sone)

Rest: This song when he pus songen hadde soone
(Ph wann pus sungyn had he ; H₄ om. pus)

The Italian reads, cantando così detto, Fil. 5. 67.

†655. J cleere corrected from cheere ; Gg clere by corrector in
text, and written in margin.

It would seem that Gg as well as J had originally written chere.

769. GgPh + Cx omit out; GgPh + H₂H₄S₁ glyde for
slyde.

946. H₃Gg . . . the wordes . . .

Rest: . . . his wordes . .

†1023. H₃Gg + RCx omit ay
Scattering Agreements of a MSS.

1071. Ph To this y will be trewe in myn entente
H₃ omits line
Rest: To Diomede algate I wol be trewe
Ph alters the rime word in 1070.

†1109. GgPh . . . þe walles wete
Rest: . . . the wawes wete

1167. JH₃ + D But I not how for Not I not how

1407. H₃Ph + A . . . vnethe my lyf .
Rest: . . . my lyf vneþe . . .
(Gg sif for lyf)

1454. H₃Gg + S₁ . . . with hys tuskes stoute
Rest: Omit hys

1510. GgPh . . . sche tolde hym þo
Rest: . . . she told ek þo
(D alsoo for ek þo; H₃ also for þo; A eke she told þo)

1526. GgPh . . . er to morwe
Rest: . . . yet to morwe

†1545. JGg . . . flitted
Rest: . . . smytted
(H₄ submitted; R sunmitted)

Flitted is wrongly repeated from 1544 (where Gg reads kyttilid).

1563. GgPh omit it

The scattering character of these agreements clearly precludes any intimate connection between any two of the a MSS. Rather the evidence points to alterations and corrections in their common original.

Readings Characteristic of β.

Equally colourless are the variant readings which characterize β, not one of which furnishes any ground for asserting authentic revision. The list of these readings follows:

$$H₂H₄R⁻Cₓ(β)$$

9. . . his bemes shene (― Cₓ, + S₁)
J(Gg)Ph . . . cleene
γH₃Cx . . . clere

Text. Trad.
The Manuscript Relations in Book V.

34. ... al wolde he not compleyne
   (H₂ he wolde him nat)
   Rest: ... al wolde he nought hym pleyne
          (H₃ al wolde hym not pleyne)

509. But natheles he Iaped bus & pleyde (+ H₃)
    (R lacking; H₂ Iaped he; H₃ forthe for bus)
   Rest: ... sayde

Pleyde is certainly correct; for all the MSS. have sayde as the
rime word in 506. Whether the slip was originally due to the poet
or his scribe, it remained uncorrected until after the γ original was
derived.

†632. The entencioun of his woo ... (− Cx, + H₃)
   Rest: Thencechon ...

The Italian reads, Chi ne fosse cagione, Fil. 5. 61.

732. Omit al (− Cx, + H₃ Ph)

941. And serue ... (+ Ph)
   Rest: To seruen ...

1020. ... light (− Cx, + Ph)
   Rest: ... bryghte

1029. H₂CxS₁ ... purpos fully ...
       R omit purpos
       H₃ omit fully
   Rest: ... fully purpos ...

1091. ... to loue hir ... (− R, + D)
   Rest: ... to wowe hire ...

1095. ... publisshed ... (− H₄, + Ph)
   Rest: ... punysshed ...

   (Gg ponschede)

Though at first sight published seems a preferable reading, more
careful examination of the context leads one to the conclusion
that Chaucer wrote punysshed. Criseyde's name has been punished
so widely that it is not necessary to chide the poor woman herself.
I regard published as an unauthorized correction. Note that H₄
reads punysshid, so that we must regard the H₂ reading as an
independent alteration to the reading of RCx. H₂H₄ both invert
the order, putting is after the participle.
1461.  . . . Lordes high . . .  
Rest:  . . . lordes olde . . .
(H₃ omits line)

†1540.  . . . he dryueth forth his Auenture (+ S₁ + H₃Gg)
Rest:  . . . drieth . . .

†1652.  Omit his (+ Ph)

1702.  \(H₄RCx + Ph\) . . . yit sende me . . .  
\(H₂\) . . . so sende me yet
Rest:  . . . me sende yet

1715.  Omit now (− H₄, + Ph)
(H₄ nou it is for it is now)
Within the group, the relationship of \(H₂\) and \(H₄\) is clearly attested. It will suffice to present only the more striking cases in which their readings coincide.

\(H₂H₄\).

50.  . . . cruell
Rest:  . . . fel . . .

84.  . . . lete me not dey
Rest:  . . . doth me not to deye
The Italian reads *non mi far morire*, Fil. 5. 12.

137.  . . . withoute more . . .
Rest:  . . . out of more . . .

†476.  The first day . . .
Rest:  The ferpe day . . .

†547.  . . . knowen of Housen All
Rest:  . . . crowne . . .
(R lacking)

†563.  \(H₂\) Paleis; \(H₄\) paleisis; Rest places

†989.  And ye in Armes bene besy day be day
Cl And ye in armes ben day by day
Rest:  And ye in armes bisy day by day

†1321.  That tunge tell can . . .
\(S₁Cx\) . . . can telle . . .
Rest:  Omit can.

1386.  Remorde for Commene.
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†1572. ... pou3t ... (+ Ph)
   Rest: ... soughte ...

1602. Omit why
   Apart from this relationship of $H_2H_4$, which is, however, occasionally broken, the $\beta$ MSS. fall into no recognizable subgroups. We may notice a few scattering agreements, of which only one is of any significance.

Scattering Agreements of $\beta$ MSS.

60. $H_2R + H_3$ soberly *for* sorwfully

89. $RCx + D$ his crede *for* pe crede

211. $H_4Cx + Gg$ walwith; $R$ waltryth; $J$ wheleth; $Ph$ swellith; Rest weyleth

236. $H_4Cx + Ph$ omit right

265. $H_2R$ peynes *for* sorwes

265. $RS_1$ peynes *for* sorwes

652. $RCx$ ek old *for* olde ek; $a + H_2$ om. ek

1082. $RCxS_1 + Ph + A$ right sory; $H_4$ ful sory; Rest sory

1083. $H_4CxS_1$ ... in any adversite
   Rest: Omit any
   $H_4CxS_1$ emend to avoid a nine-syllable line.

1203. $H_2Cx$ ymagin *for* Iuggen

1498. $H_4R$ omit the Latin summary of the *Thebais*; $H_2$ contains an additional line, *Feruidus ypomedon timidique in gurgite mersus*, not found in the other MSS.

1545. $H_4$ submitted, $R$ summitted, *for* smyttd

1790. $H_4RCx$ be thou *for* be

*1866. $H_2R$ Trine vnite vs from oure cruel foone
   Rest: Vs from visible and Inuysible foon
   This reading of $H_2R$ has every appearance of being genuine.

1868. $H_2R$ take *for* make
   Note that here and in 1866 $H_4$ and $H_2$ are at variance.
A problem of peculiar difficulty is offered by the fact that three MSS., H_2, H_4, and Ph, omit the three stanzas, lines 1807-1827, taken from the *Teseide* of Boccaccio (11. 1-3), which describe the flight to heaven of the soul of Troilus. In H_2 and H_4 the stanzas are omitted with no indication whatever of any lacuna. In Ph the original scribe has later supplied the passage on an inset leaf, and has at the proper place in the text indicated its position by the words, *Require ad hoc signum* ☐. Ph thus treats this passage exactly as it does the hymn to love in Book III, and the long soliloquy in Book IV.

The question immediately arises whether the omission of the passage by Ph marks it as a later addition, whether, in other words, Ph here presents an early α text. To this question, I fear, no satisfactory answer can be given. We must be content to state the problem in all its bearings, and at most to indicate probabilities. The evidence to be considered is of two sorts: (1) internal, derived from a study of the passage and its setting; and (2) external, derived from MS. testimony.

(1) A careful examination of the context does much to support the idea that the passage was an afterthought. The stanzas are in no way required by the context. Not only are they not implied in what precedes or follows; they are to some extent, at least, incongruous. Stanza 258 states the death of Troilus, and stanza 262, *Swich fyn hath lo pis Troylus for love*, etc., with its repeated insistence on the thought of death as the end-all of worldly greatness and worldly happiness, comes much more appropriately immediately after the statement of Troilus’s death, instead of after the very splendid account of his flight to heaven.

Of this flight to heaven there is not in the *Filostrato* the slightest hint. The ending of *Filostrato* is much simpler than that of *Troilus*, which seems to end several times over. Book VIII, as it is numbered in Moutier’s edition, tells of the sorrows of the deserted Troilo, of his battles, and of his death (stanza 27). Stanza 28 corresponds to stanza 262 of Chaucer; and, the poem now ended, the poet addresses young lovers and bids them distinguish faithful ladies from the faithless. Chaucer’s stanza 252 corresponds to Boccaccio’s stanza 26. Then come in Chaucer five stanzas explaining the purpose of the poem, appealing to ladies not to be
angry with him, and praying that the book may be carefully transcribed and understood. Then we have Chaucer's stanza 258, which corresponds to Boccaccio's 27. Then follow the three Teseide stanzas. After them comes Chaucer's stanza 262, which corresponds to Boccaccio's 28. Stanzas 263–265, addressed to yonge fresshe folkes, correspond in a general way to Boccaccio's 29–33. Chaucer then concludes with his address to Gower and Strode, and his prayer to the Blessed Trinity; while Boccaccio addresses eight stanzas to his own lady.

Chaucer's ending is, thus, a patchwork of many colours, from which the particularly purple patch of the Teseide passage can be removed with no injury to the fabric. This could not be done, it may be noted, with the five stanzas 253–257. Digression though they be, they are inseparably attached to the context (see line 1800).

(2) The passage is omitted by H₂, H₄, and Ph. We have seen that through Books IV and V H₂ and H₄ are descended from a common original; and in this original, we are justified in inferring, the Teseide passage was lacking. Between H₂H₄ and Ph, however, there is in this part of the poem no connection discoverable. It is in the highest degree improbable that three stanzas should be independently omitted by the mere carelessness of two separate scribes; and there is nothing in the stanzas themselves which could possibly lead to deliberate omission. The passage must have appealed to a medieval scribe quite as strongly as it appeals to us to-day. We are driven to assume that some particular reason existed for its omission in H₂H₄ and in Ph. Since we know that the particular reason in the case of the free-choice soliloquy was that the passage was a later addition, we are naturally led to the same hypothesis here.

Our difficulty is that Ph is the only MS. of the a type in which the passage is surely omitted. In the case of Gg we cannot be certain; since the mutilation of the MS. has involved the loss of everything after line 1701. Five leaves, which contained the end of Troilus and the first 36 lines of the Canterbury Tales, have been cut out. These leaves were, however, presumably cut out because of illuminations which they contained; and, since we have no way of estimating how much space was filled by illuminations, we cannot tell whether or not there was room for the three Teseide stanzas. There would seem though to have been no lack of space.
The missing lines of the two poems are only enough to fill three full leaves, while five are missing. Since J contains the stanzas in due order, we must assume that they were probably included in Gg.

In the case of the free-will soliloquy, it will be remembered, H₃ and Ph omit the passage entirely, while J and Gg have the last stanza. There was further evidence in Book IV that H₃ and Ph present the text in a slightly earlier state than do JGg. We should, then, regard the Ph text as representing the earliest unrevised version, provided only that it had the support of H₃. But the passage is found regularly in H₃.

The association of H₃ with the a MSS. is in Book V, and particularly in the latter part of the book, far from consistent. It deserts in a number of the group readings; in several instances it agrees with β as against αγ; and, beginning at line 1021, it shares in eight γ readings. Among these γ readings, one falls within the Teseide passage. H₃ agrees with γS₁ and the inset leaf of Ph in reading seventh sphere, where the Italian supports JRCx in reading eight. This fact is of peculiar significance, for it justifies us in believing either that the Teseide passage was added later from a γ source somewhere in the tradition of H₃, as we see it added before our eyes in Ph; or that in the latter part of the book H₃ has become again a hybrid MS. whose evidence can no longer be trusted in a matter of this kind. In either of these conclusions we find support for the hypothesis that Ph is presenting a primitive a state of text.

But if the omission of the Teseide stanzas in Ph is to be so explained, what is to be said of their omission by H₂H₄, which we have shown to be of the β group? It is here that we must recognize our lack of any satisfactory answer. We can merely point to the fact that the H₂H₄ parent is of a peculiarly composite character. In Book I it is definitely an a MS.; in Book II it wavers between a and β; in III, though overwhelmingly β in character, it has the shifted stanzas 190 and 191 twice over, once in the αγ position and again in the β position; in Book IV H₄ (and probably the H₂H₄ parent) agrees with a in omitting the free-choice soliloquy. Perhaps the Teseide passage, if added later, was written on a loose sheet, which the H₂H₄ scribe failed to notice, or to find.

We may conclude by saying that, in the absence of certain
Conclusion.

evidence, the probabilities both external and internal favour the hypothesis that the Teseide passage was not present in Chaucer's earliest draft of the poem.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

The length of the poem and the composite character of some of the MSS. have made it more convenient to treat each of the five books as though it were an independent unit. For each of the books the evidence has been presented, and certain tentative conclusions have been drawn. Obviously, however, the books do not in fact constitute independent units, but indissoluble parts of a larger unit; so that no explanation of the phenomena of one book can be valid which does not take into account all the other books as well. It is now time to resume in a single discussion the discussions of the separate books, and to seek an explanation which shall account for the varied phenomena of the whole, which shall show so far as may be through what vicissitudes the text has passed, and how in consequence we shall evaluate and use the several MSS. which have survived.

THE REVISION OF THE POEM.

No one, I trust, will have failed to recognize that the variations of reading which distinguish the MSS. of the a type from those of the β type are of a sort which can proceed only from deliberate and conscious revision. To make this clear beyond all doubt, one has but to review these variations in their entirety, and summarize the evidence which has been presented piecemeal in the preceding chapters.

In Book I a, represented by H₂PhH₄, contains a stanza, number 128 in the modern editions, which is obviously genuine, but which is not necessary to the sense.¹ This stanza is omitted by βγ. There are, moreover, nearly a hundred variations of reading which

¹ See above, pp. 34, 35.
differentiate \( \alpha \) from \( \beta \gamma \), of which a large number are of such a sort that each reading is not only possible, but entirely in accord with Chaucer's metrical and linguistic usage. Of the variant readings which characterize \( \alpha \), more than 63 per cent. are found in the first 300 lines, and more than 77 per cent. in the first 500 lines.

In Book II the distinction between \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) is not so clearly drawn. There are very few striking variations, except in the portion of the book beginning with line 701 and ending with 1113. Here we find \( \alpha \), represented by \( H_2 \text{PhGgH}_5 \), now agreeing with \( \gamma H_3 \text{CxS}_1 \) against \( JRH_4 \), and now with \( JRH_4 \) against \( \gamma H_3 \text{CxS}_1 \). For this state of things no satisfactory explanation can be given. An attempt at explanation will be found on pp. 126-128.

In Book III we have a very large number of cases of striking variation. In some, \( \alpha \) varies as against \( \beta \gamma \); in a much greater number of cases, \( \gamma \) is associated with \( \alpha \); and the variation is of \( \alpha \gamma \) against \( \beta \). All but a very few of these variations occur after line 400, from which point they extend to the end of the book. The \( \alpha \) type of text is represented by \( H_2 \text{PhGgH}_5 \); the \( \beta \) by \( \text{JR}_4 \text{RCx} \) with the irregular adherence of \( S_1 \) and \( H_3 \). The most significant case of revision in Book III concerns the position of the two stanzas numbered 190 and 191 in Skeat's edition. In \( \alpha \gamma \) they immediately follow line 1323; in \( \beta \) they are moved down to a position immediately preceding line 1415, and lines 1323, 1415, and the first line of the shifted passage are altered to suit the new relations.\(^1\) There is also evidence that Troilus's song to love, lines 1744-1771, omitted by \( H_2 \text{Ph} \), was not present in Chaucer's earliest draft of the poem.\(^2\)

In Book IV the series of striking variations continues up to about line 1450. In the great majority of cases \( \gamma \) agrees with \( \beta \) in presenting the revised reading; though in other instances \( \alpha \gamma \) are arrayed against \( \beta \). Between lines 1300 and 1442, \( H_3 \), which has become an \( \alpha \) MS., seems to present alone the earliest form of text.\(^3\) The most important revision concerns the long soliloquy on God's foreknowledge and man's freedom of choice, lines 953-1085. This passage was not even planned for in Chaucer's earliest draft of the poem. It is omitted by \( \alpha \) and also by \( H_4 \). Before two of the \( \alpha \) MSS., however, \( \text{Gg} \) and \( J \), were derived, the last stanza of the passage, lines 1079-1085, had been added in the common

---

1 See above, pp. 157, 158.
3 See above, pp. 214-216.
original. In a stanza 108, according to Skeat's numbering, follows line 735; in βy it comes just before 757, and the first line of the stanza and line 757 are altered to suit the new relations.

In Book V the striking variations in reading altogether disappear. There are at most two or three lines which point towards deliberate revision. The only significant case of revision has to do with the passage at the end of the book, lines 1807-1827, taken from the Teseide, which describes the flight to heaven of Troilus's soul. These stanzas, which are omitted by Ph and by H2H4, seem to be an afterthought. They are, however, present in J; and were probably present in the mutilated Gg—MSS. which derive from the second stage of a.

That in the case of such an added passage as the free-choice soliloquy, or the Teseide stanzas, we have to do with Chaucer's own revision of his work, no one, I think, will doubt. If this is admitted, it follows that the existing MSS. represent the text in more than one authentic recension. When, therefore, we find that the same MSS. which omit the free-choice soliloquy also shift stanza 108 of the fourth book, and revise two lines in order to fit it to its new context, there is strong ground for the presumption that this unmistakably deliberate and conscious variation is also due to the poet's own revision. If this is true for stanza 108 of Book IV, it cannot be denied that Chaucer's own hand is probably at work in the shifting of stanzas 190 and 191 of Book III, and the even more elaborate readjustment of phrasing which accompanies the shift. Every variation which is admitted to be a case of the author's revision increases the presumption that other variations are to be similarly explained.

That some, at least, of the variant readings which distinguish a and β are due to deliberate revision by some one or other is plain from the thoroughgoing character of the changes, which occasionally involve even the rime. It cannot be argued that these revisions may be merely successful attempts of some editor to repair scribal corruptions due to mere carelessness; for, if this were the case, we should expect that they would be distributed with reasonable regularity throughout the poem. But this is not the case. The striking instances of text-variation are concentrated in certain areas of the poem; namely, I. 1-300, II. 701-1113, and III.

1 See above, pp. 216-221. 2 See above, pp. 221, 222. 3 See above, pp. 245-248.
The Revision of the Poem.

400–IV. 1450. If the variations were due in the first instance to accident, this could not have happened. That this deliberate reviser was the poet himself cannot, perhaps, be absolutely proved; but the presumption is so strong as to remove any reasonable doubt. He was certainly a poet, and a poet who understood perfectly the principles of Chaucer's metre and grammar, who knew how to catch what we recognize as the poet's characteristic manner. If he was not Chaucer, it is hard to see what motive could have led him to take so much trouble, and hard also to explain how he succeeded in giving his revision such wide currency. That the a text was the original version, and hence necessarily by Chaucer, we know from the fact that it stands so much closer to the Italian than does β. We cannot suppose that Chaucer, or any one else, would so revise as to bring the text nearer to the Filostrato; since there is no attempt at, or pretence of, literalness of translation. If the β text is due to some one other than Chaucer, we should have to admit that only three MSS. have preserved the authentic text in Book I, and only four in Book IV. That would mean that all of the remaining MSS. are derived from a copy of the poem which had undergone extensive scribal editing. In so long a poem it would be very strange if this scribal editor was never guilty of bungling Chaucer's meaning. Such bungling, however, does not exist. Unless the omission of stanza 128 of Book I be regarded as an error—and I have shown reasons for refusing to put this interpretation upon it—there is no instance where βγ can be proved to be in error as against a correct reading in a.

The Character of γ.

In sharp contrast to the variations which distinguish a and β are those which characterize γ. These are (1) the omission of stanza 102 of Book IV, a stanza necessary to the sense;¹ (2) a mistake as to the place at which Book IV begins, by which Proem IV is treated as though it were part of Book III;² and (3) a long list of variant readings, of which a considerable proportion are clear cases of error, others are obviously inferior, and the rest, with very few exceptions, are of the trivial sort which normally originate with a scribe. The errors of γ obviously

¹ See above, p. 183. ² See above, pp. 182, 183.
cannot be attributed to Chaucer. It follows, then, that all the MSS. of this group are descended from a common ancestor which has not received Chaucer’s correction and sanction. Were we inclined to regard any reading peculiar to $\gamma$ as authentic, we should have to recognize that we were accepting it on the single authority of one MS., the $\gamma$ parent. Almost without exception, the $\gamma$ readings, unless supported by other MSS. outside the group, are of a sort which precludes any thought of authentic revision; for the changes involved are not beyond the reach of an ordinarily intelligent scribe. That they have their origin in accident rather than in deliberate intention is shown also by the fact that they are distributed evenly over the five books of the poem, in striking contrast to the limited areas into which are concentrated the variations which distinguish $\alpha$ from $\beta$.

The $\gamma$ original presents a state of the text, as regards revision, midway between $\alpha$ and $\beta$. In Books I and IV it gives usually the revised, or $\beta$ readings; in Book II it seems to give revised readings, though the evidence is not clear; in Book III it has in general unrevised, or $\alpha$ readings.

The assumption of critics hitherto has been that $\gamma$ presents a third and final state of revision, later than $\alpha$ and $\beta$; to quote from the Globe edition, “the $\gamma$ type represents a later copy, either carelessly corrected by the author, or collated by some hand after Chaucer’s death.”¹ For this conception of $\gamma$ I can see no justification. As was said a moment ago, there is no ground for assuming that the author had any hand in it whatever. Could we assume that Chaucer was in any way responsible, the “version” could not be later than $\beta$. For, if so, we should have to suppose that in Book III, and only there, Chaucer deliberately reverted to the unrevised text. For such a procedure no plausible reason exists. If, on the other hand, $\gamma$ is due to the collation of “some hand after Chaucer’s death,” the procedure of this editor must have been to collate an $\alpha$ MS. and a $\beta$ MS., and to choose now the reading of $\alpha$ and now that of $\beta$. Such a supposition would serve well to explain the not infrequent appearance in $\gamma$ of a conflate reading which combines elements both of $\alpha$ and $\beta$. But against this hypothesis there is a grave objection. If this early editor had before him a text of $\alpha$ and a text of $\beta$, we should expect that in his eclectic text the proportion of $\alpha$ readings to

¹ p. xli.
\( \beta \) readings would be very nearly constant in each of the books where revision has played a large part. But this is not the case. In Book I our hypothetical editor has adopted no \( \alpha \) readings at all; while in Book III he has taken most of them. In Book IV again he takes nearly all the \( \beta \) readings. Such a procedure would be incomprehensible. We are compelled to assume that the scribe of the \( \gamma \) original did not have access to the revised version of Book III.

Is \( \gamma \), then, like certain individual MSS. among those that have survived to us, notably \( H_2 \), of composite character? If so, it must be regarded as having also undergone a very extensive process of contamination. For, though in Book I it is pretty consistently of the \( \beta \) type, in Book III its text is a mixture of \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \). It is much simpler, and more in accord with all the facts, to explain its relation to \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) in another way. Plainly its position is between \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \). If it has in some passages the revised reading and in others the unrevised, we must assume that it derives from Chaucer's original at a time when some of the revisions had been made and others had not been made. If \( \gamma \) is to be regarded as a separate "version" or "edition," it is the second and not the third. The long list of revision readings in Book III, and extending into the opening stanzas of Book IV, found in \( JH_4RCx \) but not in \( \gamma \), and the scattered instances of the same sort found in the other books, represent the latest revision which the poem has undergone.

If, then, it is clearly recognized that the variations of \( \gamma \) are, unless otherwise supported, never to be regarded as authentic, the whole problem of revision is a good deal simplified. We have but one series of authentic revisions, those which distinguish \( \beta \) from \( \alpha \). The symbol \( \gamma \) stands, therefore, for a lost MS., the parent of a group of surviving MSS., and not, like \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \), for a state of the text.

**Genealogical Relations within the Main Groups.**

It is important that the reader clearly recognize that we have to do with two sorts of relationship among the MSS. Since the text of *Troilus* exists in more than one redaction, two or more MSS. may be associated by the fact that they present the text at the same stage of revision. Thus in Book III \( J, H_4, R, \) and \( Cx \) are associated as members of the \( \beta \) group, as presenting the revised or \( \beta \) readings; in Book IV \( J, Gg, Ph, \) and \( H_3 \) are similarly
associated as constituents of the \( \alpha \) group. Such association does not necessarily imply genealogical relationship; for the individual \( \alpha \) MSS. may be derived along independent lines of descent from Chaucer's own autograph in its first form, and the \( \beta \) MSS. independently from the autograph of his revised version. Genealogical relationship means common descent from an original other than Chaucer's autograph, and is proved by the participation of two or more MSS. in a series of manifest errors, so striking, or so frequent, that the agreement cannot be due to mere coincidence. Two or more MSS. so related will necessarily represent the same stage of text.

Of this genealogical character is the relationship existing between \( H_2^1 \) and Ph, between \( H_2^3 \) and \( H_4 \), and between Gg and \( H_5 \); though the evidence of relationship, particularly in the case of Gg and \( H_5 \), is occasionally confused by contamination. As soon as this relationship is established, two MSS., such as \( H_2^1 \) and Ph, weigh with the critic as a single MS., their common ancestor.

Of this genealogical sort also is the relationship existing among the \( \gamma \) MSS.—Cl, Cp, \( H_1 \), AD, \( S_2 \)Dig, and sometimes \( S_1 \) and \( H_3 \). They are descended from a common ancestor, neither Chaucer's autograph nor revised by Chaucer, a MS. which never passed under Chaucer's eye; and their combined testimony must weigh with the critic only as that of one MS., their lost original. It is of the utmost importance that this fact be clearly recognized. Since the \( \gamma \) group includes half of all the surviving MSS., and numbers among its members MSS. like Cl and Cp, beautifully executed and exceptionally free from errors of their own, there is danger lest it tyrannize over the critic's judgment, as it did in very fact over the judgment of Professor Skeat.

In contrast to the genealogical group, \( \gamma \), we have the group of \( \alpha \) MSS., which are associated primarily by the fact that they present the earliest, unrevised text of the poem. It is important to ask whether these \( \alpha \) MSS. are also related genealogically. Are they, perhaps, all descended from some one MS. of the unrevised text, not itself Chaucer's autograph? To establish such a relationship, one must find that the \( \alpha \) MSS. not only differ from those outside the group by presenting a different series of authentic readings, but that they also agree as against the rest in presenting readings which are manifestly corrupt. In Book I, where \( \alpha \) is represented by \( H_2^1 \)Ph and \( H_4 \), there are a number of cases of
manifest error; in Book II $H_2PhGgH_5[H_4]$, and in Book III $H_2PhGgH_5$, present a few readings that are manifestly corrupt; in Book IV $JGgPhH_3$ present no clear cases of error; in Book V of the very few $a$ readings four seem to be erroneous. But one conclusion is possible. The $a$ MSS. must be descended from a MS. not Chaucer's autograph, but a MS., none the less, which was singularly free from scribal corruptions, much freer for example than was the $\gamma$ original. It will best suit all the probabilities if one supposes that this MS. was made by a professional scribe directly from Chaucer's autograph, that it was corrected by the poet, and that it remained in his possession as an archetype from which other copies could be made.

In the case of the $\beta$ MSS., the evidence for any genealogical relationship is not clear. In the whole poem I have found but a half dozen cases in which all the $\beta$ MSS. agree as against the rest in a reading which is manifestly corrupt; and of these cases only three are striking. There is a clear case of scribal repetition in 3. 608. In 3. 1685 a word in the $\beta$ original was certainly illegible. In 3. 1600 has been wrongly substituted some form of the name Coeytus for the Phlegethon of $\alpha\gamma$. We find repeatedly instances where two or more $\beta$ MSS. agree in a reading certainly or probably corrupt; but these agreements are so varied and contradictory that, save between $Gg$ and $H_5$ and between $H_2^3$ and $H_4$, no closer relationship within the group can be established. Of these apparent relationships, the most striking is that of $J$ and $GgH_5$ in the parts of the poem where $GgH_5$ are $\beta$ MSS.; but $J$ frequently agrees with $R$, and $R$ with $H_4$ or $Cx$, and $H_3$ in its $\beta$ readings shows kinship now with $Cx$ and now with $H_4$. No one of these contradictory relationships is attested by evidence of the unequivocal sort on which is based the relationship of $H_2$ and $Ph$, of $Gg$ and $H_5$, of $S_2$ and $Dig$, or of the $\gamma$ MSS. as a group. The independent derivation of $R$ is indicated by the fact that $R$, and $R$ alone, omits the proems to Books II, III, and IV. Even stronger is the evidence furnished by the fact that $R$ contains a stanza, clearly authentic, found in no other MS. (For a discussion of these idiosyncrasies of $R$, see above, pp. 24–26.) We are driven to assume that the several $\beta$ units are derived along independent lines of descent from a common original in which had been made a great many alterations and corrections. This $\beta$ original, then, would in many lines offer
Conclusion.

more than a single reading to the eye of a copyist, and in other lines would present a confusing, if not illegible, text. Moreover, we repeatedly find an individual \( \beta \) MS. reverting to an unrevised \( \alpha \) reading, or giving a conflation of the revised and the unrevised. Most striking is the fact that \( H_4 \) has the shifted stanzas of Book III twice over, once in the \( \alpha \) position, and again in the \( \beta \) position. But one hypothesis will meet all the facts. The \( \beta \) original must have been an \( \alpha \) MS., most conscientiously corrected of its scribal errors, and revised and altered to give \( \beta \) readings.

The Method of Revision.

The whole process of revision can best be explained on some such hypothesis as the following:

When Chaucer had finished the composition of his poem, he turned over the rough draft to a professional scribe, who was commissioned to make a fair copy of it, precisely as a modern author may have his rough draft typed by a professional stenographer, that he may have a clean and legible copy for the printer. This copy, made by a scribe, would be sure to incorporate a good many errors. If the rough draft had been much worked over, it must frequently have presented to the scribe a confused and puzzling text, of which he made what he could. If this scribe was the "Adam scriveyn" of Chaucer's well-known stanza, we have Chaucer's own word for it that in "negligence and rape" he was true to the reputation of his craft. His copy, then, we may safely assume to have been in many passages corrupt, and to have needed the correcting hand of Chaucer, with much "rubbing and scraping." After it had been so corrected by the poet, copies were made from it for "publication." These copies were the ancestors of the MSS. of the \( \alpha \) type, i.e., \( H_3 \), \( H_2 \) Ph, GgH, \( H_4 \), in such parts as they are of the \( \alpha \) character. These MSS., then, are related by their descent from a copy of the poem made by a careless scribe, but corrected by the poet. The cases of manifest error shared by all the \( \alpha \) MSS. are to be regarded as due to scribal error which has escaped the author-corrector's eye. An error found in two or more \( \alpha \) MSS. may, in any case, be due to the fact that they were derived from the common original before this particular error was corrected, or that their ancestors failed to understand an indicated correction.

This archetype MS., as we may call it, remained in Chaucer's
possession as his own "official" copy, from which, perhaps, he read aloud to friends as we see him doing in the illuminated frontispiece of the Corpus MS., from which, as demand arose, new copies were made by "Adam," or some less negligent and rapacious scribe. As time went on, this archetype MS. would tend to free itself from such errors as had in the first instance escaped correction. But Chaucer was not content to correct scribal blunders. He was continually revising and rearranging his own work, and his method of recording such revisions would most naturally be that of writing the new line or phrase in the margin, or between the lines, of his own copy. With this double process of progressive revision and correction, the pages of the archetype MS. must have become at places a rather bewildering entanglement of alterations.

Almost immediately this revision must have begun. In Book IV there is a series of passages in which the most primitive readings are preserved only by H₃. Next in point of time comes the H₂Ph ancestor, which, like H₃, knows nothing of the free-choice soliloquy of Book IV. Before J and Gg were derived, the soliloquy had been planned; but only its concluding stanza of transition had been written, though a note warned the scribe that "here faileth thing that is not yet made." Next, after all the α MSS. had been derived, were made the many and elaborate revisions found in Book I and Book IV, and some of those found between lines 701 and 1113 of Book II. From the text in this state, with scribal errors eliminated and extensive revisions in the first and fourth books, was derived the original of γ. Finally, extensive revisions were made in the third book, of which the most striking is the shift in position of stanzas 190 and 191; and individual passages were revised in the fourth book. From the archetype MS., in its final state of revision, were derived last of all the MSS. belonging to the group which we have called β. These β MSS. (in Book III they are J, H₄, R, Cx) are, therefore, related to each other only in that they are derived from Chaucer's archetype in its latest stage of revision. The puzzling cross-relations which bind together now this set of β MSS., now that, may in part be due to mere accidental coincidence, or to deliberate contamination; many of them, however, must be traced to the confusion due to the repeated correction and revision of the archetype.
Conclusion.

If the $\beta$ MSS. represent the text in its revised form, the question immediately arises whether or not we can discover among these MSS. such grades of revision as are discernible in the case of the $\alpha$ MSS. Can one say that this MS. or that represents the $\beta$ text in a more or less advanced state of revision? No such conclusion is justified by the evidence. Between lines 701 and 1113 of Book II there are a number of striking instances in which Cx agrees with $\gamma S_1 H_3$ as against JRH$_4$ on the one hand, and $H_2^5 PhGgH_5$ on the other. For a full discussion of this puzzling passage the reader is referred to pp. 126–128 above. If the explanation there suggested is indeed correct, we must regard Cx and $H_2^5$, in so far as the latter is a $\beta$ MS., as derived earlier than JRH$_4$; but this explanation is hardly more than a surmise, and will not bear the superimposed weight of new deductions. The explanation ventured on p. 25 for the omission by R of the proems to Books II, III, and IV would place its derivation latest of all the surviving MSS.; but again the explanation is only conjecture. Apart from these considerations, nothing marks any one of the $\beta$ MSS. as earlier than the rest. Each of them reverts in this line or that to the unrevised reading, or shows a conflation of the revised and the unrevised; but no one of them does this more than the rest. It best agrees with all the established facts to regard all of the $\beta$ MSS. as derived after the authentic revision had ceased.

Precisely the processes which went on in Chaucer's workroom we cannot hope to reconstruct with any certainty of detail. Chaucer has himself drawn the curtain for a moment and let us see him "oft a daye" renewing the work of scribe Adam, correcting with much rubbing and scraping the results of Adam's negligence and rape. He has told us specifically that one of the works which called for his correction was *Troilus*. So much we have on certain evidence; the rest must be inferred from the readings of the existing MSS., and the inference can seldom be free from ambiguity. One cannot establish certainly the truth of the hypothesis just given; but one can assert with a high degree of probability that, if not precisely the processes assumed, something equivalent to them must have taken place. One can establish, so to speak, the "typical" truth of the supposition. For the hypothesis as I have stated it may be urged, first, that it assumes a perfectly natural and reasonable action, in no way repugnant to general
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probability nor to such facts as we know about the conditions of literary work in the later middle ages;¹ and, second, that better than any other hypothesis it explains the complicated phenomena presented by the existing MSS.

The essential point of the hypothesis is that all the surviving MS. units—H₂Ph, GgH₅, γ, J, R, etc.—are, save for incidental contamination, independently derived from an archetype MS. not written by Chaucer’s hand, but progressively corrected and revised by him. It means that the original of the β MSS. is materially, physically, identical with the original from which the α MSS. and the γ original were derived, despite the fact that its textual character has been so changed by progressive revisions, and its pages confused by repeated alterations.

The existence of this archetype will explain—and it is the only simple explanation I can find—the following series of facts, the truth of which has repeatedly been shown in the preceding chapters:

(1) The confusing and apparently contradictory cross-relationships found in Book V and in the greater part of Book II, i.e. in this line an agreement between H₂Ph and γ, in the next between H₂Ph and Cx or R, or between γ and J, etc. These agreements, usually in trivial variations, are found also in the other books, where, however, our attention is diverted from them by the striking cases of variation due to revision. Such cross-agreements are readily understood on the assumption of a common original, or archetype, which had been subjected to a thorough-going correction. Beneath or beside the correction, the corrupt reading would still be legible, and a scribe might easily fail to incorporate the correction.

(2) The not infrequent instances in which an α reading is found in one of the β MSS., where the other β MSS. have a revised reading. This phenomenon can be easily explained if the original of the β MSS. had both the unrevised and the revised reading in its text. It would mean that one scribe, either carelessly or capriciously, took the cancelled reading instead of the substituted revision.

(3) The occurrence in the γ original, and in individual β MSS. of conflate readings. These are to be explained on the theory

¹ See an article by the present writer on “Publication before Printing,” Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, 28. 417-431.
that an indicated revision was only partly understood by the scribe, who incorporated part of the revised reading and part of the unrevised. Of this phenomenon the most striking instance is the repetition in $H_4$ of the two shifted stanzas of Book III.

(4) The position of $\gamma$ midway between $a$ and $\beta$, sharing in some but not all of the revised readings. This is to be explained on the theory that the revisions had only partially been made at the time the $\gamma$ original was derived.

(5) The presence in the $a$ original of a number of obvious errors, and the almost total lack of manifest errors in the $\beta$ original. Side by side with the revision went a weeding out of scribal errors.

If some such hypothesis is not accepted, these phenomena can be explained only by supposing a very far-reaching process of contamination, so involved in its complications as to defy analysis. There is nothing inherently improbable about contamination except the trouble which some scribal editor must be assumed to have taken. Contamination undoubtedly plays its part in the textual tradition of *Troilus*; we can see it actually at work under our eyes in the existing MSS., where missing lines have been supplied later from a divergent source. But to explain the phenomena before us on the hypothesis of contamination, we must assume a more deliberate process, a sort of eclectic editing with the acceptance of one reading from this MS. and another from that. Had such a process of editing taken place, we should expect that the contamination would show itself particularly in the case of striking divergences. But this is not the case. It is rather in the trivial variations of reading that the cross-relationships exist. When the variation involves a whole line or more, the groups generally are distinct; all the $a$ MSS. present $a$ readings, and so with $\beta$. On any theory of contamination this is indeed hard to explain. On the assumption of a common archetype the explanation is simple. An alteration involving a whole line is less likely to escape the eye of a copyist than is one involving a single word or a few letters.

**The Number of the Versions.**

The question has been raised, in the introduction to the Globe edition, and in Professor Tatlock's *Development and Chronology of*
The Number of the Versions.

Chaucer's Works, whether we have two versions of the poem or three. If the theory I have advanced be accepted, this question will be approached from a different point of view. If the revision was progressive and cumulative, clearly each separate MS. unit may represent a new version. Within the limits of the a group three distinct stages are discernible. Though the readings characteristic of \( \gamma \) are, unless otherwise supported, to be regarded as not authentic, in one sense \( \gamma \) may be thought of as constituting a version, inasmuch as it presents the text at a time when the principal revision of Book III had not yet been made. The final version, which includes the sum of all the revisions, is given by the MSS. of the \( \beta \) group. In this sense one might speak of at least five versions. On the other hand, if one looks at an individual line, it is in only a very few cases that one finds more than two authentic versions. It will best serve the needs of an editor if he recognizes two versions: the unrevised \( a \) version, in which several minor stages are discoverable, and the revised \( \beta \) version. In \( \gamma \) he will recognize merely an intermediate stage between the two. Instances in which \( a \), \( \gamma \), and \( \beta \) present each a different reading are rare. In such cases the \( \gamma \) reading is usually corrupt or, what amounts to the same thing, due to an imperfect understanding of an indicated correction. These cases have all been discussed in the preceding chapters. The more noteworthy are: 1. 259; 2. 703; 2. 738; 2. 1005; 2. 1083; 3. 459; 3. 558; 3. 1153; 3. 1595; 4. 570. Of these cases the strongest is 2. 738.

Chaucer's Motive for Revision.

What was Chaucer's motive in this extensive revision of his text one cannot say with any certainty. The addition of the soliloquy on free-choice, and of the stanzas from Teseide which follow the soul of Troilus in its flight to heaven, enhance very appreciably the serious and philosophic tone with which Chaucer has overcast his story. Presumably that was the effect he desired to attain. But in the revision of individual lines and stanzas no consistent tendency is discoverable. These revisions have no bearing whatever on plot, character, or interpretation. They are changes in words rather than in ideas. In four passages—1. 9;

1 Professor Tatlock's discussion of the problem is avowedly based on insufficient data, and is throughout merely tentative. It rests on so many and such serious misconceptions that it is best to disregard it.
Conclusion.

1. 164; 4. 300; 4. 644—the revision is in the direction of heightening the classical colouring of the story. On the other hand, in 2. 115 the revision is in the other direction. Had Chaucer seriously set himself to the task of substituting pagan for Christian, he would hardly have stopped with the revision of four lines. His motive seems to have been merely the artist's desire to improve his artistry. Often we can see, or imagine that we see, the reason which compels this change or that. Sometimes the revision secures greater definiteness. Examples are: 1. 88; 1. 169; 1. 176; 1. 208, 209; 2. 897; 2. 908; 2. 1093; 3. 503; 3. 677; 3. 1327; 4. 706; 4. 1251; 4. 1290. Sometimes it removes an awkward phrase due to too close a translation of the Italian, as in 1. 83; 1. 85; 1. 111; 4. 37; 4. 246, 247. Often the revised reading is better suited to its context. Examples of this are: 1. 45; 1. 345; 1. 640; 1. 773; 2. 734, 735; 3. 442; 3. 490; 3. 568; 3. 598; 3. 668; 3. 882; 3. 1595; 4. 581; 4. 762, 763; 4. 891. In many other cases the change seems to be merely capricious. The shifting of stanzas 190 and 191 of Book III represents merely a change in judgment as to the best place to introduce into the narrative the two stanzas of reflection. Equally capricious is the shifting of stanza 108 of Book IV.

I have found nothing whatever in the revisions to suggest at what date they were made. The line, "Right as our firste lettre is now an A," 1. 171, which seems to refer to Richard's marriage to Anne of Bohemia, is already present in a.

Reconstitution of the Text.

If, then, it is admitted that the surviving MSS. derive not from a single and constant original, but from an original which was undergoing a progressive series of alterations and corrections at the hands of the poet himself, the task of the textual critic is the reconstitution not of a single authentic text, but of a text in more than one authentic recension. Since the revision was not done at one time, the number of these recensions is from one point of view more than two; but, as we have seen, the final result is that of a single recension. We shall ask of the critic, therefore, that he

1 Professor Tatlock's tentative suggestion (Development and Chronology, p. 15) that the substitution of shame for rape in 4. 596 has to do with the Cecilia Chaumpaigne episode seems to me quite fanciful.
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constitute the text at its two extremes of revision, in its \( \alpha \) form as it was first published, and in its \( \beta \) form with all authentic revisions incorporated. With the relations of the MSS. determined in all essential points, the task will not, save in a part of Book II, offer insuperable difficulties.

**The Text of \( \alpha \).**

There is but one MS. which represents the \( \alpha \) text consistently throughout the whole of the poem. This is Ph. It is a MS. in which some corrections have been made, and missing lines supplied, from a \( \gamma \) source; but these corrections, though made by the original scribe, are always easily recognizable by difference in ink or by a more cramped writing. Apart from these contaminations, made under our very eyes as it were, and hence not misleading to the critic, there is very little evidence of any deliberate "editing." But unluckily the text of Ph is exceedingly corrupt. It clearly stands at the end of a series of careless transcribings. There is hardly a stanza which does not contain a serious corruption, not to mention a total ignorance of the syllabic value of unaccented final \( e \). For nearly two-thirds of the poem the readings of Ph can be checked by those of \( H_2 \); but this aid is not very satisfactory. The first hand of \( H_2 \), which has written most of the \( \alpha \) portion of the MS., is the same as that of Ph; so that what we have are two copies made by the same scribe, and a very careless one he was, from the same corrupt original. When we have reconstituted the common original of \( H_2^1 \) and Ph, we have a text somewhat better than that of \( H_2 \) or of Ph, but one, none the less, which bristles with manifest errors. Fortunately we possess in nearly every part of the poem some other authority for \( \alpha \), by means of which the readings of \( H_2 \Phi \) can be checked.

In Book I \( \alpha \) is represented by \( H_2 \Phi \) and \( H_4 \). No reading can be regarded as a genuine \( \alpha \) reading unless it has the support of these two authorities. We should be justified in regarding as genuine the reading of \( H_2 \Phi \) or of \( H_4 \) alone, only if it also received the support of one or more \( \beta \) MSS. in a variant reading of a sort so striking that the agreement could not be regarded as fortuitous, or if it received unequivocal support from the Italian source. But no case exists in which one is at all tempted to regard a reading of \( H_2 \Phi \) or of \( H_4 \), not found in the other, as genuine. Conversely,
we must accept as belonging to the $\alpha$ original any reading in which $H_2 Ph$ and $H_4$ agree, even though the reading seems to be, or actually is, manifestly corrupt. Such a reading could be rejected only on the ground that the agreement of $H_2 Ph$ and $H_4$ was fortuitous. There are in Book I a number of readings in which $H_2 Ph H_4$ are corrupt; but it must be remembered that the $\alpha$ original is not Chaucer's autograph, but a copy of this autograph made by some "Adam scriveyn." The manifest errors of $H_2 Ph H_4$ are not more numerous than we should expect in such a copy, even after it had received a rather careful examination by the author.

In Book II, $\alpha$ gains the adherence of $Gg H_5$. This adherence begins near the beginning of the book—the first striking instance is in line 64—and continues to about line 1200. (From about 1200 to the end of the book, $Gg H_5$ present $\beta$ readings closely akin to those of J.) Throughout the book, $H_4$, which in Book III and thereafter is a $\beta$ MS., presents a mixed text, agreeing now with $H_2 Ph Gg H_5$, now with JR. As the book advances, the proportion of $\beta$ readings increases. We shall accept as authentic $\alpha$ readings those that are found in $H_2 Ph Gg H_5 H_4$. It is not easy to say what attitude should be adopted towards readings found in $H_2 Ph Gg H_5$ not supported by $H_4$ and in $H_2 Ph H_4$ not supported by $Gg H_5$. Of the latter the clearest cases are found in the first 57 lines, before $Gg H_5$ join the $\alpha$ group. After that point, the $H_2 Ph H_4$ readings are no more impressive than are the cases of agreement between $H_2 Ph$ and Cx, or $H_2 Ph$ and R. All the evidence goes to show that the common original was greatly confused. It would seem that this part of the poem had been elaborately revised before any of the existing MSS., even $H_2 Ph$, had been derived, and that to the confusion in the common original are due the puzzling cross-relations. It must, I think, be frankly recognized that for the first 700 lines of Book II no satisfactory reconstruction of $\alpha$ is possible. Virtually all of the striking cases of variant readings are found between lines 701 and 1113. Here we can safely constitute $\alpha$ on the basis of $H_2 Ph Gg H_5$. With these MSS. are associated sometimes $\gamma H_3 Cx S_1$, sometimes JR $H_4$. An attempt at explaining this eccentricity of JR $H_4$ has been made in an earlier chapter (see pp. 126-128); it need not here concern us, since in any case the reading found in $H_2 Ph Gg H_5$ must on the basis of all the evidence be regarded as the earlier unrevised reading. After line 1200
again, when GgH₅ revert to their β allegiance, the reconstruction of α becomes exceedingly difficult. A possible procedure here, and in the earlier part of the poem, before line 700, might be to regard as an α reading any reading of H₂Ph which has the support of two other MS. units. Since such an agreement of three units can hardly be fortuitous, the reading so supported must at least have been present as an alternative reading in the common original. However, we can have no assurance that the reading is authentically Chaucer's. I must repeat that the complete and satisfactory reconstitution of α in Book II is not possible.

In Book III we find for the first 400 lines a continuation of the conditions found in the last 500 lines of Book II, with very few striking variations of reading. In line 269 a striking α reading is given by H₂Ph + γR, in 282 by H₂Ph + JH₄RCx, and in 293 by H₂Ph + GgH₅γH₃S₁. From about line 400, however, the confusion clears up. GgH₅ become definitely α in their readings; and there begins a long list of striking variations, in the great majority of which γ retains the α reading. From line 400, then, we shall regard as an authentic α reading any reading found in H₂PhGgH₅. In most cases we shall have also the testimony of γ. By their omission of Troilus's hymn to love, lines 1744-1771, H₂Ph are indicated as of earlier derivation than GgH₅.

In Book IV α loses the adherence of H₂ after line 196, where the third hand of this MS. begins; so that from this point on the readings of the H₂Ph original must be inferred from Ph alone. But with line 326, H₃ becomes an α MS.; and with line 438, J also joins the α group. With line 686, H₅ ends; so that from here on the readings of the GgH₅ parent must be inferred from Gg. Looking at the book as a whole, we find that for lines 1-112, where Gg is missing, α is represented by H₂PhH₅, for 113-196 by H₂PhGgH₅, for 197-325 by GgH₅Ph, for 326-437 by GgH₅PhH₃, for 438-686 by JGgH₅PhH₃, and from 687 to the end by JGgPhH₃. For the greater part of the book, then, α has the testimony of four independent MSS. In their treatment of the free-choice soliloquy, PhH₃ represent an earlier stage than JGg; and between 1300 and 1442 H₃ has a series of unique readings, apparently authentic, which seem to represent a stage of the text earlier than that of JGgPh, a stage which might be described as pre-alpha. The distinctive α readings in Book IV are very numerous until after line 1300, when they become very infrequent.
In conclusion.

In the great majority of these cases, though not in all, γ shows β readings.

In Book V α continues to be represented by JGgPhH₃; but the distinctive α readings are very few in number, and are not striking. The only significant instances are in line 476, in 1502-1504, and in the omission by Ph of the Teseide passage at the end of the book. In lines 1502-1504, JGg alone present the α reading. From line 1021, H₃ takes on a mixed character, sharing in about half the γ readings. It is, therefore, an uncertain witness to α. Ph also frequently deserts the α reading, particularly in the latter half of the book. Throughout Book V we find very few striking variants. Instead we have, as in most of Book II, trivial variations and puzzling cross-relations of the MSS., which point to a confusion in the common original of all the MSS.

Save for part of Book II, then, we have always the witness of at least two independent MSS. by which to determine the reading of α.¹ Despite the shifting character of its attestation, the unity and continuity of the α text throughout the poem cannot be doubted. It is preserved by the steady and virtually unbroken adherence of the H₂Ph parent, and after Book II by that of Gg(H₃). Throughout the poem, the α text is indicated as the earlier version by its closer following of the Italian.

Of the α MSS., unfortunately, all but J are individually full of corrupt readings, and of metrical perversions due to scribal ignorance of Chaucer’s grammatical forms. In these ways J is very satisfactory; so that we must regret that J has not preserved the α text throughout the poem. For Books I and II, H₂Ph must serve as basis for a critical text of α. In Book III, where γ shares in most of the α readings, a critic wishing to reconstitute α might take γ as his basis. After line 438 of Book IV, he would probably choose J. The unsatisfactory character of the witnesses will necessitate a hybrid text.

The Text of β.

When we turn to the problem of reconstituting the β text, we are confronted with similar difficulties. For β we have throughout the poem two independent witnesses—R² and Cx. Both R and

¹ In Book I we have also the occasional adherence of Th. See above, pp. 29-31.
² R apparently deserts the normal β text in lines 701-1113 of Book II. See above, pp. 126-128.
Cx, however, are exceedingly corrupt; and either would furnish a most unsatisfactory basis for a critical text. For the first two-thirds of the poem, J is an excellent authority.

In Book I the β text is represented by JGgH₅H₃RCx, and in all but a few lines by γ also. In every single case where the variation is at all striking γ has the β reading.

In Book II, as we have seen, the relation of the MSS. is so confused that certain conclusions are out of the question. From line 64 to about 1200, GgH₅ desert β for α. After 1200, they are β MSS., frequently in agreement with J. H₄ presents a mixed text, a collation of α and a MS. akin to R. In the list of striking variants between 701 and 1113 it is associated with JR. In this passage, however, JRH₄ present an aberrant text, with a marked tendency to revert to α readings. The character of this JRH₄ text I have not been able to determine satisfactorily. The only safe procedure in Book II is to regard as genuine β readings only those which have the support of γH₉CxS₁. In a great majority of cases these authorities are supplemented by JR[H₄].

Throughout Book III, β is represented JH₄RCx. In the first 400 lines, where, however, there are hardly any striking variants, it has the support also of GgH₅. H₃ and S₁ present mixed texts, collations of β and γ. The γ group stands midway between α and β. In some sixty-five cases it presents β readings; in a much larger number of cases, including the great majority of the striking revisions, it has α readings. Repeatedly we find individual β MSS. reverting to the unrevised text. In line 256 we have what seems to be a genuine β reading given only by γH₃S₁R. In general, however, the β text can be established with a high degree of accuracy on the basis of J, the readings of which can be checked by the independent testimony of H₄, R, and Cx. Each of the four chief representatives of β—J, H₄, R, and Cx—is independently derived from the β original; so that a reading supported by any three of the four must be regarded as genuine. The β readings of S₁ seem also to have been independently derived; those of H₃ come from a source apparently akin to Cx.

In Book IV, β gains at line 197 the adherence of H₂; but as H₂ in its third and fourth hands is closely related to H₄, it serves as a check on H₄ rather than as an independent witness. At line 326, H₃ ceases to give even its intermittent β readings; and with line 438, J, hitherto the backbone of β, becomes an α MS. Through
Conclusion.

the greater part of the book, then, $\beta$ is represented by $H_2H_4RCx$. As in Book III, individual $\beta$ MSS. frequently revert to the earlier reading in the case of the less striking variations. In line 882 we have what seems to be a genuine revision reading given only by $\gamma S_1$. In a great majority of the variant readings, which in the first 1300 lines of the book are striking and very numerous, $\gamma$ presents the $\beta$ text. After the defection of $J$ at line 438, $\beta$ can best be reconstituted on the basis of $\gamma$; since $H_2H_4$, $R$, and $Cx$ are individually corrupt.

In Book V $\beta$ continues to be represented by $H_2H_4RCx$; though in the single important revision, the inclusion of the Teseide passage, $H_2H_4$ revert to the primitive text, otherwise represented only by Ph (and possibly Gg). Throughout the book, as also in the last third of Book IV, the variants are of a very trivial character. In all save a few unimportant and doubtful cases, the $\gamma$ text, purged of its distinctive $\gamma$ group readings, presents the poem in its final authentic form.

A critic wishing to reconstitute $\beta$ will find it his simplest procedure to use as his basis a corrected $\gamma$ text, save in Book III and the early part of Book IV, where $J$ must be given first consideration. Or he may base his text on $J$ so far as it is a $\beta$ MS., correcting it to $\gamma H_3Cx$ readings between lines 701 and 1113 of Book II, and substituting for it, after it goes over to $\alpha$, a corrected $\gamma$.

**The Text of $\gamma$.**

As has been abundantly proved, the distinctive readings of the $\gamma$ group have no claim to authenticity. A $\gamma$ reading, not otherwise supported, must in every case be regarded as of scribal origin; and in any case the combined testimony of all the $\gamma$ MSS. has only the authority of one MS., their lost original. This lost original, however, was a MS. of great importance. Its corruptions are, after all, but few, and these of a sort very easily corrected by the testimony of other authorities. It is not impossible that it was derived immediately from the common original; in any event it cannot be far removed. Though derived too early to include all of the poet’s final revisions, it has preserved and transmitted to certain of its descendants, with a high degree of accuracy, the text which Chaucer had himself corrected and in large part revised. Of all the surviving MSS., $J$ alone can rival in correctness of grammatical

---

1 We know that Cl, one of its descendants, was executed before 1413.
forms, and consequently in metrical smoothness, the text of the 
γ original as represented by Cl, Cp, and H₁. It is of the first im-
portance, therefore, that the critic should be able to reconstitute 
the γ original.

This is, fortunately, not a difficult matter. Throughout the 
poem, γ is represented by five independent MS. units—Cl, Cp, H₁, 
S₂, Dig, and AD. With such generous attestation, the critic will 
rarely need to call in the testimony of S₁ and H₃, whose adherence 
to the group is not constant. Moreover, S₁ is clearly an “edited” 
MS.,¹ skilfully emended by some editor with a good sense of metre, 
but ignorant of the syllabic values of Chaucer’s language; and H₃ 
is full of individual corruptions. For both MSS., too, the γ read-
ings have been derived from a source akin to AD, and hence not of 
independent authority. S₂ and Dig are individually corrupt, and 
are descended from a very corrupt parent. For finer matters of 
language and versification their evidence is nearly worthless. In 
more general matters their evidence, despite occasional instances of 
contamination, confirms that of the remaining MSS.; but the con-
firmation is usually superfluous. A and D are individually corrupt; 
but their common parent was very free from errors. Cl, Cp, and 
H₁ are singularly pure representatives of the γ original, diverging 
from one another but slightly even in orthography.

Though among the five units which compose γ no sub-groups 
can be established with any certainty, we find among the cross-
relations of this MS. with that in trivial variations a slight attesta-
tion for the connection of CpH₁S₂Dig as against ClAD, and of 
CpH₁S₂DigCl as against AD. In cases of the latter sort the AD 
parent may have corrected an error found in the rest. It will best 
suit all the facts if we conceive of the γ original as receiving, 
during the period when it was used as an exemplar, a few slight 
corrections and alterations. We shall then say that Cp, H₁, and 
S₂, Dig were derived before Cl, and Cl before AD. The presence in 
the γ original of such corrections will explain the chance associa-
tions of one γ MS. with another in trivial variations.

As basis for the reconstitution of γ, the critic will probably 
choose Cp, as freest from individual errors and most consistent in 
spelling. He will then correct Cp by reference to Cl, H₁ and AD. 
Any reading attested by three of these he will accept as a genuine

¹ Its edited character similarly lessens the authority of Th, which in the 
main presents a γ text.
Conclusion.

\( \gamma \) reading. In the rare cases where they divide two and two, he will call in the evidence of \( S_2 \text{Dig} \), and perhaps of \( S_1 \) and \( H_3 \).

When the \( \gamma \) original has been thus reconstituted, the next step is to purge it of corrupt readings—that is to say, of the readings peculiar to it alone, which, if our conclusions are correct, are due to scribal carelessness or "editing." No \( \gamma \) reading can be regarded as authentic unless supported by M.S. authority outside of the \( \gamma \) group; and since \( S_1 \) and \( H_3 \) so frequently share in \( \gamma \) characteristics, the support of either or both of these "mixed" MSS. is not to be regarded as significant. To this principle there can be but two exceptions—first, if \( \alpha, \beta \), and \( \gamma \) present three distinct readings; and second, if the \( \gamma \) reading is unequivocally marked as authentic by comparison with the source, or by similar evidence. Of the first of these exceptional situations there are very few instances; and in most of these the \( \gamma \) reading is recognizable as a variant of either \( \alpha \) or \( \beta \), or as due to the imperfect incorporation of a revision. In the few remaining cases we must assume that the line has undergone two successive revisions, and that \( \gamma \) represents the middle stage. Of the second there is but one clear case. In line 1748 of Book III where \( \gamma H_3 S_1 \) read \text{kneteth}, the remaining MSS. read \text{enditeth}. Since both words are found in Chaucer's source, Boethius, we must assume that the common original contained both readings.\(^1\)

If a \( \gamma \) reading is supported by one authority independent of \( \gamma \), we shall in general assume that the agreement is, if of a trivial sort, due to accidental coincidence, if more striking, to contamination.\(^2\) To this principle exception can be made only when the intrinsic claims of such a reading are very strong. In such a case we are forced to assume that other MSS. have reverted to an unrevised reading. There is, of course, always the possibility that a \( \gamma \) reading, supported by one independent witness, was present as an alternative reading in the common original. If \( \gamma \) has the support of two independent authorities, we must assume this to have been the case; but instances of this are not frequent.

The \( \gamma \) original so constituted, and so purged, will represent, as accurately as our evidence will permit, Chaucer's own archetype copy of the poem. Save in Book III, it will incorporate most of his final revisions.

\(^1\) See above, p. 136.

\(^2\) This does not apply to lines 701–1113 of Book II, where all the \( \beta \) MSS. save \( Cx \) have reverted to a modified \( \alpha \) text.

We have indicated the process to be followed in reconstituting $a$, $\beta$, or $\gamma$. It remains to consider what text a modern editor should print in a critical edition. Ideally he would choose to print either the $a$ text with a full set of $\beta$ variants, or vice versa. Preferably, I should think, he would choose the latter; since he would so give greater prominence to Chaucer's mature and final judgment, and would avoid the necessity of emending the uncorrected scribal errors of $a$. Practically, both of these choices are beset with great difficulty by the lack of any single MS. on which to base a text of either $a$ or $\beta$. To base one's edition on Ph, the only consistently $a$ MS., or on R or Cx, the only consistently $\beta$ authorities, would mean an almost complete rewriting of the basal MS. to bring it into linguistic and metrical conformity with Chaucer's known usage. Editing of this sort, which means a critical reconstitution in vacuo, is properly looked upon with distrust. It presupposes in the methods of textual criticism a mathematical certainty which is far from being justified, and in the editor a sureness of judgment and a confidence in his own conclusions to which he has no right to pretend. Chaucer's spelling we cannot hope to recover with any degree of certainty. A modern editor's guess at it will hardly be so satisfactory as is the spelling of a careful scribe of the early fifteenth century. Save for a beginner's text-book, normalized texts are of doubtful service. The critic will prefer to throw in his lot with one carefully chosen MS. He will choose a MS. as free as possible from individual corruptions, and the inheritor of a pure tradition, one in which contamination has not played a large part, a MS. reasonably consistent in spelling, and in its forms as close as may be to Chaucer's known usage, and one which is throughout the poem true to a single type of text. These conditions are best met by such MSS. as Cl, Cp, and $H_I$. Of the three, the choice will probably fall upon $C_p$. This basal MS. will first be corrected by the other $\gamma$ MSS., and then purged of its distinctive $\gamma$ readings. This purified $C_p$ text will be a consistent and unified presentation of Chaucer's archetype in its middle stage.

The disadvantage of such a text is that it will incorporate only part of Chaucer's final revisions. The $a$ and $\beta$ variants would, however, be given in every case in the list of variants at the foot of the page. The editor might without undue temerity venture upon
the further task of correcting his $\gamma$ text to $\beta$ readings, wherever these are capable of sure determination. Except in Book III the amount of this correcting would not be very great; and here the editor would find in $J$ a $\beta$ text not very different in spelling and forms from Cp. In every instance where his $\gamma$ text had been so "beta-ized," the $\gamma$ reading would, of course, be recorded in the notes. As between these two procedures the editor will have to make his choice.

Finally, I shall try to present graphically in genealogical form the conclusions reached in this discussion. The table is inevitably a complicated one.

The broken line, $a...\beta$, represents a single MS., Chaucer's own copy of the poem, progressively corrected and revised, until its text, originally $a$, becomes $\beta$. In the case of MSS. of composite character, the $a$ portion of the MS. is represented by underscoring the designation.
APPENDIX

CORRECTIONS OF THE CHAUCER SOCIETY
PRINTS OF TROILUS MSS.

Harleian 3943.

I. 652. For wel read wel.
II. 26. Line written by later hand.

64. Songe by later hand.

III. 1261. For Benienen read Bemenyn.

IV. 1340. in over line by scribe.
1352. it over line by scribe.

V. 940, 942. Lines exchanged in MS.

1343. me over line by scribe.
1359. eke over line by scribe.

Campsall.

I. 285. For meuyng read menynge.

387. Omit second hire.
465. For doon read noon.
559. For And read That.
632. For And read But.
664. For kyng read kying.
737. For but read And.
814. For of read for.

II. 101. For Layus read layus.

137. For that read pat.
260. is over line.
283. For And read But.
325. For throde read protie.
746. one over line, (?) later.
931. For And read But.

1442. opere corrected from operes.

1734. Omit which.

III. 1. At beginning of proem read: Incipit prohemium Terceij Libri.

630. For a read it.
801. For ful read she.
1039. & over erasure.
1094. For For read But.

1098. pis over line.
1392. pey over erasure by scribe.
1534. Real Palais corrected from Palais Real.
1568. After first you read he.

IV. 25. For of read to.

58. trete corrected from tretre.

438, 439. Lines originally transposed, but corrected in margin.

V. 7. For Lachesis read lathesis.

531. For dorres read dores.
667. on over line by scribe.
832. For enteched read enteched.

1482. For And read But.
1641. & over line by scribe.
1849. For vyces read rytes.
1859. For garde read goode.
1862 For And pe read And to pe.

Harleian 2280.

I. 72. All but first word over erasure.

398. so over line.
470. For charppe read sharpppe.

534. I erased before caught.
559. For And read pat.
598. Second it over line.

737. For But read And.
865. Omit the.

1067. he over line.

II. 57. his over line.

112. to over line.

207. able by scribe in margin.
283. For And read But.
300. For If read And.
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352. Omit that.
413. to and it over line.
428. ful over line.
441. to over line.
578. no over line.
749. Omit it; is under line, later.
764. when over line.
913. to over line.
1298. tweye corrected to two.
1299. serrone corrected to sermon.
1429. me over line.
1571. euere over line.
1655. a over line.

III. 270. Second pat over line.
561. Delete [lf. 51].
617. A word erased before wierdes.
770. as over line.
800. Line over erasure.
983. though he corrected from thought she.
1107. ful leuere were over erasure.
1225. it over line.
1344. reme written as though last word of line, not indicated as a gloss.
1814. sow over line.

IV. 60. with over erasure.
338. Line over erasure.
503. For soft read soth.
829. me over line.
1086. quod over line.
1611. wel over line.

V. 190. his over line.
239. fulle over line.
640. euere over line.
1290. it over line.
1465. on over line.
1467. For greekes read grekes.
1516. For she read sche. A word erased before sche.
1842. right over line.

Cambridge, Gg. 4. 27.

I. 297. q of quekyn by corrector over line.
329. wrype and self over erasure.
353. For he gan read be gan.
372. For gaine read game.

856. After wo, now over line by later hand.
921. for erased before to.

II. 159. euere corrected from every.
356. as over line by corrector.
865. it over line.
915. was by corrector in margin.
922. Line by scribe over erasure.
923. That by corrector over erasure.
970. Line at end of stanza, but with proper position indicated.
1065. litter in margin by contemporary hand.
1460. Line at foot of page with indication of proper place.

III. 844. is by corrector.
1436. For alway read awoy.

IV. 555. of erased before myn.
613. me over line.
717. sche by scribe in margin.
755. fyrst by scribe in margin.
1104. pu corrected from pus.
1220. a of glade over line by corrector.

V. 88. Tides corrected to Tedeus.
578. Line at foot of page with indication.
601. Second was marked for deletion.
1060. A word erased after for.
1069. Line at end of stanza with indication.

St. John's, Cambridge.

I. 208. For And read He.
356. he corrected.
858. Before vnwre read to.

890-896. Stanza 128, in margin by 17th cent. hand, has by trimming lost two or three letters at beginning of lines. The print emends without comment. Line 896 should probably read The ought for Men ought.
1028. it over line, later.
1054. Read yis (not italicized).
II. 299. Omit to.
349. For And read Yif.
380. euer corrected from every.
505. to over erasure by later hand.
508. with in by scribe over erasure.
655. hym have mercy by later hand over erasure; for and read &.
840. For destreyned read destyned.
924. For That read Til.
960. Omit first I.
1272. After hope, I written and erased.
1307, 1308. By scribe over erasure.
1316. After with, al over line by old hand, perhaps that of scribe.
1344. After som, what over line by scribe.
1465. After Nece read myn.
1621. it over line by scribe.
160. For But read And.
438. For This read That.
448. For That read This.
514. For And read As.
721. Adon by scribe over erasure.
731. tres sorores fatales / Cloto latesis & attropos / vnde cloto colum baiulat by scribe in margin.
831. be written and erased after May.
838. Omit and.
908. or over line by scribe.
933. Dulcarnon repeated by scribe in margin.
1022. For And read Of.
1066. Nota by scribe in margin.
1094. For For read But.
1119. For And read So.
1201. After in read his.
1373. ore corrected.
1415. Vulgaris Astrologer by scribe in margin.
1455. -st of sekist corrected by later hand.
1577. For an read &.
1600. flag- over erasure.

IV. 1. Three-line initial B.
134. who over line by scribe.
282. me over line by scribe.
435. Omit he.
455. me over line by scribe.
565. ded over erasure.
577. I by corrector.
595. a over line.
646. After to, the over line by early hand.
891. For first As read And.
1078. her failth thyng yt is nat yt made by early hand at foot of page.
1137. For in read is.
1286. For And read But.
1296. Omit for.
1345. day over line by scribe.
1397. Omit and.
1478. Omit al.
1530. For And read Or.
V. 93. he over line by scribe.
358. Nota de sompijs by early hand in margin.
435. de commendacione (?) regis Sarpedonis by scribe in margin.
lenis / by scribe in
corpus.

827. Troilus in spacioum / surgentes expli / cat arcus / mente gigas
eta / te puere. mix-
toque / vigore / nulli-
que secundus / virtutis
opis / by scribe in
margin.

1085. For And read But.
1317. Litera Troili by scribe in
margin.
1590. litera Criseidis by scribe
in margin.

Corpus.

I. 463. For dredres read dredes.
540. For manye read many.
632. For sharpe read sharpee.
693. Read: Thi wo to telle
and tel me if the list.
704. For for read wo.
875. For be read the.

II. 18. For seyde read Seyde.
540. For With read Wyth.
924. For That read Til.
1400. After of read it.
1415. For thankre read thank.

III. 1. Initial not executed.
833. For but read ful.
922. though corrected from
thought.
1593. Omit out.

IV. 717. she shoeld corrected from
sholde.
1394. Note should read [Most
of stanzas 199, all of
200 and 201, part of
202 omitted].

V. 16. Omit for.
831. steel corrected to stiel.
1548. Parodie glossed dura-
cioun.

Harleian 1239.

I. 57. No special initial in

MS.
110. For she read sche.
720. After he read on.

II. 50. For may read many.
139. For the read tho.

162. For sethe read fethe.
1080. For harpe read harper.
1053. For that that lorde read
that lorde that.
1632. Initial not coloured.

III. 232. No change in writing.
275. For thy read thys.
421. wel over line by scribe.
1608. For heers read heris.
1613. For wher read whey.
1744. For on read ouer.

IV. 28. For Lvt (or Lft) read
Cft (or Cf).
39, 40. Order of lines as printed.
179, 180. Order of lines as printed.
357. al away corrected from
alwey.
411. that and gode over line
by scribe.
417. selfe deleted before lyf.
422. Read: The new loue
oue chaseth labour or
other woo with oue
chaseth marked for
deletion.
593. by over line by scribe.
1247. in over line by scribe.
1534. For primum read pro-
missum.
1535. After second or f erased.
1564. After sorowe read ye;
before wolde, cowde
deleted.

V. 1. Ordinary stanza initial.
60, 61. Transpose order of lines.
The order is that
of J.

666. For Opon read Bpon.
(Illuminator has mis-
taken v, written in ink,
for b).
981. For doth read dothe.
1085. For And read But.
1246. nys over line by scribe.
1574. For his read hir.
1590. litera Crese[yde] by scribe
in margin.

Phillipps.

II. 1083. Line later by scribe in
space left blank.
1119. For wordis read woordis.
Appendix.

III. 257. *For had read have.*
292. *Line later by scribe in space.*
299. *For caust read canst.*
320. *Line regularly written:* That neure get behight hem pis ne that.

IV. 772. *For I read y.*
785. *For Myift read My hert.*
790. *Line later by scribe in space.*

V. 331. *sawe over line, later.*
1796. *For mismetre read mis-mettre.*
**LINE INDEX**

**TO CHAPTERS II—VI**

In each column the numbers at the left refer to book and line of *Troilus*, according to the line-numbering of Skeat's edition, those at the right to the pages of this volume.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book I</th>
<th>(Book I)</th>
<th>(Book I)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>130, 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43, 44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>37, 69</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>143, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>150, 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57, 58</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>163-167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>38, 59</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>181, 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87-91</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93-96</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
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<td>(Book I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>405 . 68, 82</td>
<td>646 . 89</td>
<td>1001 . 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406 . 56</td>
<td>649 . 63</td>
<td>1002 . 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407 . 49, 68</td>
<td>661 . 64</td>
<td>1007 . 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409 . 56, 68</td>
<td>665 . 57</td>
<td>1012 . 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423 . 56</td>
<td>668 . 68</td>
<td>1014 . 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424 . 49</td>
<td>672 . 77</td>
<td>1024 . 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425, 426 . 56</td>
<td>678 . 51</td>
<td>1032 . 58, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426 . 73</td>
<td>681 . 78</td>
<td>1050 . 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442 . 62</td>
<td>715 . 51</td>
<td>1057 . 65, 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452 . 49</td>
<td>719 . 72, 74</td>
<td>1064 . 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462 . 49</td>
<td>720 . 64</td>
<td>1076–1078 . 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465 . 56, 66</td>
<td>725 . 82</td>
<td>1081 . 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471 . 56</td>
<td>737 . 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>483 . 49</td>
<td>739 . 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485 . 67</td>
<td>747 . 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498 . 67</td>
<td>748 . 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490 . 68</td>
<td>755 . 51</td>
<td>100 . 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495 . 63</td>
<td>757 . 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 . 57, 63</td>
<td>767 . 58, 71, 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497 . 70</td>
<td>768 . 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498 . 50, 74, 82</td>
<td>773 . 51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 . 70</td>
<td>786 . 51</td>
<td>92, 113, 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502 . 63, 74, 77</td>
<td>794 . 52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516 . 70</td>
<td>796 . 52</td>
<td>100, 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531 . 67</td>
<td>797 . 68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532 . 50, 70</td>
<td>803 . 68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536 . 60</td>
<td>806 . 58, 64, 67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539 . 63, 71</td>
<td>808 . 64</td>
<td>94, 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540 . 50</td>
<td>820 . 64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546 . 60</td>
<td>831 . 52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547 . 60</td>
<td>832 . 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558 . 60</td>
<td>833 . 82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563 . 63</td>
<td>834 . 64</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564 . 50</td>
<td>849 . 76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565 . 63</td>
<td>860 . 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582 . 50</td>
<td>874 . 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585 . 72</td>
<td>878 . 68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587 . 77</td>
<td>880 . 64</td>
<td>94, 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592 . 67, 74</td>
<td>884 . 82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603 . 77</td>
<td>889 . 82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611 . 74</td>
<td>890–896 . 82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612 . 57</td>
<td>907 . 82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613 . 82</td>
<td>914 . 58, 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614 . 71, 77</td>
<td>926 . 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616 . 67</td>
<td>938 . 52, 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623 . 74</td>
<td>943 . 68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628 . 63</td>
<td>949 . 52, 64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629 . 50</td>
<td>957 . 58, 76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630 . 77</td>
<td>960 . 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631 . 67</td>
<td>972 . 68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632 . 57</td>
<td>976 . 52, 65, 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640 . 50</td>
<td>984 . 71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642 . 57</td>
<td>988 . 63, 79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644 . 51</td>
<td>1000, 1001 . 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 . 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 . 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 . 94, 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 . 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 . 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 . 92, 113, 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 . 100, 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 . 94, 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29–35 . 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 . 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 . 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 . 94, 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 . 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 . 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 . 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 . 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 . 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 . 84, 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 . 92, 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 . 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 . 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 . 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 . 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 . 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 . 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87 . 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89 . 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96 . 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97 . 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 . 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 . 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117 . 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 . 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 . 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139 . 98, 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141 . 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143 . 115</td>
</tr>
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<td>Line Index.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>(Book II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Index.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1095-1097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (Book II)  |     |
| 1314       | 114 |
| 1316       | 89 |
| 1321       | 112 |
| 1333       | 121 |
| 1344       | 89 |
| 1347       | 89, 97 |
| 1352       | 112 |
| 1356       | 112 |
| 1383       | 112, 121 |
| 1394       | 89 |
| 1395       | 89 |
| 1398       | 118 |
| 1399       | 102, 112 |
| 1426       | 90 |
| 1429       | 103 |
| 1429, 1430 | 90 |
| 1433       | 121 |
| 1434       | 97 |
| 1439       | 90 |
| 1442       | 103 |
| 1452       | 103 |
| 1455, 113, 116, 121 | 15 |
| 1487       | 125 |
| 1493       | 90 |
| 1500       | 102 |
| 1504       | 91 |
| 1513       | 97 |
| 1517       | 91, 114 |
| 1519       | 103 |
| 1526       | 120 |
| 1546, 103, 116 | 90 |
| 1550       | 121 |
| 1552       | 94 |
| 1553       | 125 |
| 1554       | 97 |
| 1561       | 103 |
| 1585       | 91 |
| 1590       | 91 |
| 1596       | 121 |
| 1598       | 99 |
| 1602       | 91 |
| 1616       | 115 |
| 1621       | 97 |
| 1624       | 91 |
| 1644       | 116 |
| 1649       | 92 |
| 1663       | 91 |
| 1665, 91, 115 | 14 |
| 1666       | 125 |
| 1669       | 91 |
| 1672, 1673 | 118 |
| 1677       | 97 |
| 1687       | 99 |
| 1688       | 122 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Book III)</th>
<th>177</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1691</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1696</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701</td>
<td>118, 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1715</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1733</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755, 94, 113</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book III</th>
<th>177</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>129, 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>129, 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116, 117</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171, 172</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188, 189</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>138, 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Line Index.

(Book III) | (Book III) | (Book III)
---|---|---
203 | 130 | 462 | 139 | 651 | 149
205 | 178 | 468 | 143, 160 | 656 | 143
220 | 142 | 484 | 160 | 659 | 163
228 | 178 | 487 | 179 | 668 | 163
230 | 131 | 489 | 169 | 671 | 143
231 | 137 | 490 | 160 | 672 | 163
242 | 139, 175 | 492 | 160 | 673 | 163
245 | 147 | 501 | 143 | 677 | 163
256 | 131 | 503 | 139, 160 | 683 | 146
258 | 140 | 508 | 160 | 690 | 139
259 | 140 | 512 | 132, 160 | 692 | 133
263 | 139 | 514 | 171 | 694 | 149
265 | 142 | 518 | 161 | 696 | 149
266 | 147 | 524 | 148 | 699 | 141, 150
269 | 158 | 525 | 161 | 702 | 163
273 | 175 | 526 | 176 | 705 | 164
277 | 146, 178 | 527 | 141 | 712 | 150
280 | 178 | 528 | 161 | 717 | 150
282 | 178 | 529 | 161 | 722 | 133
293 | 141, 158 | 535 | 132 | 724 | 176
300 | 137 | 536 | 132 | 737 | 179
301 | 131 | 537 | 132 | 751 | 150
302 | 175 | 543 | 148 | 756 | 139, 146
303 | 178 | 544 | 161 | 758 | 133
304 | 142 | 546 | 161 | 759 | 164
306 | 137 | 549 | 148 | 766, 767 | 143
311 | 137 | 554 | 161 | 773 | 164
319 | 131 | 555 | 161 | 776 | 150
329 | 179 | 558 | 132, 141, 148, 161 | 786 | 179
349 | 143 | 568 | 162 | 797 | 179
354 | 131, 175 | 571 | 143, 179 | 799 | 139
357 | 146 | 573 | 162 | 800, 801 | 164
367 | 175 | 578 | 162 | 810 | 133
371 | 159 | 579, 580 | 162 | 819 | 150
379 | 159 | 585 | 141 | 820 | 164
391 | 143, 147 | 588 | 162 | 821 | 150
396 | 159 | 589 | 132 | 827 | 141
399 | 147 | 591 | 162 | 831 | 176
400 | 137 | 593 | 143, 162 | 838 | 133
401 | 147 | 595 | 141 | 857 | 151
412 | 131 | 598 | 149 | 859 | 133
427 | 131 | 599 | 149 | 875 | 151
433 | 147 | 601 | 149 | 876 | 141
438 | 131 | 604 | 162 | 880 | 133
439 | 147 | 607, 608 | 163 | 882 | 144, 164
442 | 159 | 612 | 149 | 884 | 139
444 | 159 | 621 | 149 | 889 | 151
448 | 159 | 623 | 132 | 913 | 133
449 | 159 | 626 | 149 | 915 | 179
450 | 131, 141, 159 | 627 | 176 | 922 | 151, 164
455 | 159 | 629 | 149 | 924 | 151
457 | 146 | 635 | 163 | 928 | 141
459 | 131, 148, 160 | 636 | 132 | 930 | 179
461 | 131, 148, 160 | 642 | 149 | 931 | 133
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<th>Line Index</th>
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<th>166</th>
<th>1440</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>933</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1441</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>934</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1451</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>937</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>946</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1464</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>952</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>953</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>957</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>958</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1473</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>962</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>968</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1482</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>971</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1486</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>989</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1014</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1019</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1041</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1512</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1046</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1524</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1062</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>1525</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1063</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1526</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1063, 1064</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1067</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1071</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1538</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1073</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1079</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1084</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1086</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1094</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1096</td>
<td>139, 165</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101, 1102</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1107</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1115</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>135, 154, 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1119</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>145, 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1123</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1127</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1136</td>
<td>144, 165</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1137</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1621, 1622</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1141</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1153</td>
<td>133, 153, 165</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1156</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1157</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>155, 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1163</td>
<td>154, 166</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>1645</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1165</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1174</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1177</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1183</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1187</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1192</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1202</td>
<td>134, 146</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1203</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1211</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1214</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1707</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Line Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Book III)</th>
<th>(Book IV)</th>
<th>(Book IV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1708</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1723</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744-1771</td>
<td>145, 155</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754</td>
<td>137, 140</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>140, 147</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1773</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1779</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1783</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39, 40</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41, 42</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-59</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>192, 212</td>
<td>295, 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>300, 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>212, 223</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book IV)</td>
<td>(Book IV)</td>
<td>(Book IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594</td>
<td>200, 226</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>596</td>
<td>201, 228</td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>598</td>
<td>201, 226, 228</td>
<td>828, 829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>201, 226</td>
<td>867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>647</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>662</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>666</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>674</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>691</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>696-698</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>698</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708-714</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>717</td>
<td>190, 202</td>
<td>950-952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>953-1085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>723</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>1007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>732</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>733</td>
<td>202, 228</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>734</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>1113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>736-742</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>739</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750-752</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750-756</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>757</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>758</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>762, 763</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1138, 1139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>765</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>767</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773</td>
<td>186, 204, 226</td>
<td>1167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>775</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>781</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>782</td>
<td>190, 205</td>
<td>1179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>788</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>789, 790</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>791</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>794</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Index.</td>
<td>(Book IV)</td>
<td>(Book V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1572</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1628</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1697</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60, 61</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>1023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>1048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335, 336</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>1057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476</td>
<td>237, 243</td>
<td>1095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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