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To

Sir William S. McCormick

SCHOLAR, MAN OF AFFAIRS, AND GENEROUS FRIEND
Adam scriven, 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
Preace.

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 H₂, 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 Camsall 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. (+ GgH₃). 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 attention 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 presentation of demonstrable facts, and more or less conjectural interpretation 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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A superscript numeral after the designation of a MS. indicates the portion of the MS. written by a given hand. Thus, H23 indicates the portion of H2 written by the third hand.
The Textual Tradition of Chaucer's Troilus.

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. 1 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.

TEXT. TRAD.
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 × 7½ 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 $\alpha\gamma$ 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. 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 $pow$ 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 $z$, and occasionally by $gh$. Only rarely is $z$ 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 and Corpus.

Campsall (Cl).

The property of Mrs. Bacon-Frank, of Campsall Hall, Doncaster. A vellum MS. 12 × 8½ 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.
2. 137 omitted.
3. 1324–1337, stanzas 190, 191, in αγ 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 th interchangeably with th, though not at the beginning of a line. It does not use the character ʒ. 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., 12½ × 8½ 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.
2. 137 omitted.
3. 1228 omitted, space left at end of stanza.
3. 1324–1337, stanzas 190, 191, in αγ.
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 þ is not used. Initial y is always written þ; but þ 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 Troylus 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. 442–476, five stanzas, omitted.
5. 1114–1169, eight stanzas, omitted.
6. 1266, 1267 transposed.
7. 1324–1337, stanzas 190, 191, in \(\beta\) position.
8. 1779–1785 after 1813.
9. 137, 138 transposed.
10. 153, 154 transposed.
11. 750–756, stanza 108, in \(\beta\gamma\) position.
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
5. 1256, 1257 corrupt:

Hath thus withdrewe 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 β type, akin to the β portions of H₂. H₂Cx agree with γS₁ as against JRH₄ 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 β.

**Digby 181 (Dig).**

Bodleian, MS. Digby 181. A paper MS., 11½ × 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.
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. 1157–1233 omitted. The loss corresponds to one leaf, which again seems to have been missing in the original.
2. 1157 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 $S_2$, with which it shares innumerable corruptions besides many others of its own. Dialectally, also, it shares the peculiarities of $S_2$.

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.
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(e) is 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 × 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.
1. 86 omitted, no gap.
1. 122 all but first word by corrector.
1. 582–595 repeated over page and deleted.
1. 654 all but first word by corrector.
1. 890–896, stanza 128 omitted, no gap.
1. 1044–2. 84 missing, two leaves cut out.
2. 616 omitted, no gap.
2. 1146 omitted, no gap. Caret in margin.
2. 1233–1239 repeated over page and deleted.
2. 1384–1388 by corrector.
2. 1460 omitted, but supplied by scribe at foot of page, with proper place indicated.
3. 1–56 missing, leaf cut out.
3. 571 all but first word by corrector.
3. 957 omitted, line left blank.
3. 1223, 1224 by corrector.
3. 1324–1337, stanzas 190, 191, in αγ position.
3. 1693–1695 by corrector; 1693, 1694 transposed.
3. 1807–4. 112 missing, two leaves cut out.
4. 307–322 by corrector.
4. 410, 411 in a order.
4. 728 after 721, and whole stanza awkwardly revised in accordance with the shift.
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 y order, but 61 corrupt: And ofte sche syhede & seyde allas.
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 a 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 purgh, and pow for pough, and, on the other hand, such spellings as douztele 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. Wele 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 p 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 αγ 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.
The Authorities.

$H_1$ is consistently a $\gamma$ MS. In its readings it is closest to $CpS_2Dig$. Dialectally and orthographically it varies very little from $Cp$, save that it often writes $sch$ for $sh$ and occasionally uses the character $p$, 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 $\gamma$ original.

Harleian 3943 ($H_2$).

British Museum, MS. Harleian 3943. A vellum MS., $10\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ 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 $H_2^3$ on new leaf.
2. 148 erased to leave space between stanzas.
3. 484–490, stanza 70, omitted, no gap.
4. 498–567 by $H_2^3$ on new leaf.
5. 26 by $H_2^3$ in space left blank.
6. 29–42, two stanzas, after 49.
7. 250 by $H_2^3$ in space left blank.
8. 509 omitted, line left blank.
9. 1083, all but first word, by $H_2^3$ in space left blank.
10. 116, 117 transposed.
11. 1079–1638 by $H_2^2$.
12. 1251 by $H_2^3$ in space left blank.
13. 1265 by $H_2^3$ at end of stanza, proper place indicated.
14. 1289–1428, twenty stanzas, missing, two leaves lost.
15. 1546, end, and 1547 by $H_2^3$ in space left blank.
16. 1596 corrupt: $pat he of his modir borne wesse$. 

3. 1597 after 1603.
3. 1744-1771, Troilus's hymn to love, omitted, no gap.
4. 197-406 by H₂. From 407 to end by H₂³.
5. 940 and 942 exchanged.
5. 1498-1499. An additional line, Feruidus ypomedon timidique in gurgite versus, 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 α 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 sl, uses ʒ 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 beep, 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; sif, 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) ante 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 ʒ. Instances of this confusion are doughtles for douteles, 4. 430; truwjth 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 (H₂).**

British Museum, MS. Harleian 1239. A vellum MS., 15¾ × 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 depreyue*, 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 $H_3$ is both composite and "mixed." From the beginning of the poem through 2.1033, the portion written by hand 1, $H_3$ is a $\beta$ MS. of a type closely similar to Cx. $H_3$Cx agree with $\gamma S_1$ against JRH$_4$ in the series of striking variants beginning at 2. 701; $H_3$Cx also share many minor variations. In this portion of $H_3$, more particularly in Book II, there are, however, occasional indications of contamination with a $\gamma$ MS. of the same type as A. From 2.1034 to 3.1095, $H_3$ is fundamentally a $\gamma$ MS. of the same type as A; but in Book III it not infrequently deserts the $\gamma$ reading, and shows occasional contamination with $\beta$. From 3.1096 to 4.299 it is again a $\beta$ MS., with only slight traces of $\gamma$ contamination. With line 300 of Book IV, $H_3$ becomes an $\alpha$ MS. and so continues to the end of the poem, though a $\beta$ reading appears in 4.322, and in the latter part of Book V there are again indications of contamination with $\gamma$. In its $\alpha$ portion, $H_3$ presents a text at a stage of revision not far removed from that found in Ph. $H_3$Ph omit the free-choice soliloquy entire. Between lines 1301 and 1442 of Book IV, $H_3$ 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 $\gamma$ constituent.

Throughout, the text of $H_3$ 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 $hough$ for $how$ and $pow$ for $pogh$. The definite article is usually written $tho$ instead of $the$. The character $j$ is used for initial $y$; $p$ is used only rarely. $Sch$ is written for $sh$. The

TEXT. TRAD.
second hand is characterized by a very erratic treatment of the letter h; we find such spellings as wye, wias, where, whoo for we, was, were, woe, 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 gwyech. 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 3 and p 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 staball, discordabull, litull, anodur. Sch is written for sh. 3 and p 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., $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ 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 bridle & labour from even til morn.
2. 643, 644 transposed. 644 corrupt: the coloures & knoulech who so riht demyth.
3. 953-980, four stanzas, after 1008.
4. 1692 repeated after 1699 and deleted.
5. 1324-1337, stanzas 190, 191, in αγ position and again in β position.
6. 1770, 1771 transposed, proper order indicated.
8. 953-1085, free-choice soliloquy, omitted, no gap.
9. 1498-1499, Latin argument of Statius, omitted, no gap.
10. 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 h, 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 (H₃).**

British Museum, MS. Harleian 4912. A vellum MS., 11 ½ x 7 ½ 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 onyle

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 spiritgh, despitgh, wighth 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 ɔ is not used; and p 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 × 6½ 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.
3. 1324–1337, stanzas 190, 191, in β 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 GgH₂, 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 ŋ is used only very rarely, and then for initial y; p is used in the abbreviation of *put* and very rarely in writing the definite article. The first person pronoun is regularly *ich* before a vowel, and the adverbal suffix *-ly* becomes *-isch* 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 (1h).

MS. Phillipps 8250, the property of T. Fitzroy Fenwick, Esq., Cheltenham. A paper and vellum MS., $8\frac{3}{8} \times 5\frac{7}{8}$ 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 ay 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 a 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:

   And pat to late is me now to repente
   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 a MS. except for the passages added later, on inset leaves, in the margin, etc., which are from a γ MS., akin to $H_1$. The scribe copied an a 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 $H_2$. The text of Ph is very closely related to the portions of $H_2$ 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 $H_2$. The weak vowel of inflectional syllables is nearly always $i$ or $y$. The guttural continuant is written $gh$. The character $3$ is used for initial $y$, and $p$ is used interchangeably with $th$.

**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.
1. 890-896, stanza 128, omitted, no gap.
2. 1-49, proem, omitted, no gap.
2. 1069 omitted, no gap.
2. 1446 by scribe in margin.
2. 1750-1751. Between 1750 and 1751 we read:

```
Compleined ek heleyne of his siknes \ Vacat
And feithfully / that pitee was to heere

For ye must outher / chaungen your face
That is so ful of mercy and bountee
Or elles must ye do this man sum grace
For this thyng folweth of necessytee
As sothe as god ys in his magestee
That crueltee / with so benigne a chier
Ne may not last / in o persone yfere
```
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 chaunyen. 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 Deiphlebus. 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,¹ but rather to call attention to the fact that the remaining lines of the stanza are missing. Vaeat 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抄ist 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 vaeat 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, H₄, 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 agh and naght for oght and noght. Nor does the orthography vary significantly. The characters p and 3 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 β 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 $\beta$.

**Selden B 24 ($S_1$).**

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 $\beta$ position.
4. 39, 40 in $\gamma$ order.
4. 750–756, stanza 108, in $\beta\gamma$ position.
5. 1857–1862 partly lost by tear at bottom of fol. 118.

$S_1$ presents a mixed or collated text, based on a $\gamma$ MS. akin
to AD and a $\beta$ MS, which is of the same general type as Cx
and the $\beta$ portions of $H_3$. In Book I and up to line 617 of
Book II it shares virtually all the $\gamma$ readings, and shows only
slight traces of $\beta$ influence. In the remainder of Book II it
shares only occasionally in distinctive $\gamma$ readings; but between
701 and 1113, where JRH$_4$ separate from the other $\beta$ MSS., $S_1$
agrees with $\gamma H_3 Cx$. In Book III it shares in some fifteen $\gamma$
readings and in over sixty $\beta$ readings, with stanzas 190, 191 in
the $\beta$ position. In Book IV it shares in twenty-four $\gamma$ readings,
but has stanza 106, which $\gamma$ omits. In Book V it shares in
twenty-four out of thirty-five $\gamma$ readings, but has lines 60, 61 in
the $a\beta$ order. It would seem that the method of its scribe-editor
was to take a $\beta$ MS. and “correct” it to $\gamma$ 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 *sc*, 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 $\ddot{z}$ only as initial $\gamma$, and $p$ only in the abbreviation of
*p*at.
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 $\gamma$ is usually superfluous. As an authority for $\beta$, it can be used only with great caution.

Selden, Supra 56 ($S_2$).

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 $\alpha\gamma$ position.
4. 39, 40 in $\gamma$ order.
5. 46 after 43 and again in proper place.
6. 708–714, stanza 102, omitted, no gap.
7. 750–756, stanza 108, in $\beta\gamma$ position.
8. 60, 61 in $\gamma$ order.
9. 694, second half, and 695, first half, omitted by telescoping.

$S_2$ is throughout a $\gamma$ MS., closely related to the fragmentary Dig. Though singularly free from omissions and transpositions except those characteristic of the $\gamma$ group, $S_2$ is in its readings very corrupt. A large part of these corruptions, since shared by Dig, are due to the $S_2$Dig parent. Dialectally $S_2$ 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 same regularly takes the place of hem. Haffe or hafe is regularly written for haue. In 3. 282 we find beseka for besche. Long open o, however, is written o. The character 3 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.

$S_2$, or $S_2$Dig, is occasionally of use in determining a $\gamma$ reading where the remaining evidence is confused. But with the generous attestation of $\gamma$, the evidence of $S_2$ 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 \( \gamma \) MS. closely akin to \( \text{CpH}_i \text{S}_2 \); (3) a MS. which was of the \( \alpha \) 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 \( \alpha \) on the one hand and \( \beta \gamma \) on the other, he found Cx and his \( \gamma \) 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 \( \text{H}_2 \text{R} \); in 95 *And* for *For*; in 96 *And wyst neuer* for *As she pat wyst*; in 101 *Most fayrest lady* where \( \alpha \) reads *So fair was none*, and \( \beta \gamma \) *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 \( \gamma \) readings. The only instances are 143, 539, 720, 880, 960. It contains, however, a considerable number of \( \alpha \) readings. Most important is the fact that Th contains the genuine, though perhaps cancelled, stanza 128 otherwise found only in \( \text{H}_2 \text{PhH}_4 \). Other \( \alpha \) readings are found in lines 78, 82, 85, 176 (a conflation of \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \)), 195, 259, 274, 276, 393, 540, 640, 755 (conflation), 773, 796, 1029. These readings are recorded in the list of \( \alpha \) readings in Book I, pp. 35–53. They are derived neither from \( \text{H}_2 \text{Ph} \) nor \( \text{H}_4 \), 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(\(+\ JGgH_3\)), 937, 950, 956, 960, 1093, 1113, 1143, 1152\(+\ J\), 1156, 1202, 1291, 1316, 1439, 1585\(+\ H_3\), 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 thynke eke hore 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 lordes 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
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>$\alpha$</td>
<td>$\alpha(\beta)$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\gamma(\beta)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>$65$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>$\beta(\gamma)$</td>
<td>$617$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>$\beta(\alpha)$</td>
<td>$\alpha(\beta)$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\beta(\gamma)$</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\gamma(\beta)$</td>
<td>$\beta(\gamma)$</td>
<td>1095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>$\beta(\gamma)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\beta(\gamma)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>$\alpha(\gamma)$</td>
<td>$\beta(\gamma)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Composite MSS.

**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></td>
<td>$R^1$ 1-700</td>
<td>$H_3^1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H_2^1$ 71-497</td>
<td>$A^1$</td>
<td>$R^2$ 701-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H_2^3$ 498-567</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>$R^1$ 118-433</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$R^3$ 454-1043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$H^1$ 1044-1113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>$H_2^1$ 1-1078</td>
<td>$A^1$</td>
<td>$R^3$ 1114-</td>
<td>$H_3^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H_2^2$ 1079-1638</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H_2^1$ 1639-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>1708</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>$H_2^1$ 1-196</td>
<td>$A^2$</td>
<td>$R^1$</td>
<td>$H_3^2$</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>$I^1$</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 $H_2^2$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 $H_2^2$Ph$H_4$ are closer to the Italian, and hence presumably more original.

---

TEXT. TRAD. D
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 $H_2PhH_4$ the following stanza:

[128]

And for $pi$ loke of good comfort $pow$ be;
For certeincly the firste poyn[t is this
Of noble corage and welordeyne,
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 elepe hit hap but grace.

Stanza 129 begins:

And also thenk, and $perwip$ glade the,
That seth $pi$ lady vertuous is al,
So folowith hit $pat$ $per$ 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 $perwip$ 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
$H_2\text{PhH}_4$ 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 $H_2\text{PhH}_4$, and characterize in Book I the type of text to which has been given the designation $a$.

$H_2\text{PhH}_4$ ($a$).

2. That was kyng Pryamys sonne of Troye ($+H_5$)

Rest: That was $\text{pe}$ kyng. . . .

(Cx om. That was $\text{pe}$; Gg lacking)

A nine-syllable line.

*9. Thou cruel wighte that sorowist euer yn payne

Rest: Thow cruel furie sorwyng euere yn payne

(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

($H_2^3$ chere for fere)

Rest: A woful wight to han a drery feere

(A om. second a)

The form of line 14, And to a sorwful tale a sory cheere, suggests that the $a$ reading is more original.

17. Pray for spedle though that I shulde sterve

($H_2^3$ om. that)

Rest: . . . al sholde I perfor sterue

*19. But natheles myght I do yit gladnesse

($H_4$ yit myhte I do)

Rest: . . . if pis may don gladnesse

*24–28. Remembre you for olde passid heuynnesse

For goddis love and on aduersitee

That other suffren thynke how somtyme pat ye

Fownde how love durst you displese

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. ſat; 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 ſe aduersite
Of other folk and ſenketh how ſat ye
Han felt ſat loue dorſt yow displeſe
Or ye han wonne hym with to greſt 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 ſat loue; Cx
how for ſat; 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 ſat. 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 $H_2 Ph H_4$ (a).

*36. Praith for them that eke ben dispeired
(H$_4$ eek that; Ph disespeyred)

Rest: And byddeth ek for hem pat ben despeyred
(H$_3$ om. ek for; ClCpJ desespeyred)

The agreement of $H_2$ and Ph compels us to accept that eke as the reading of the a original, which H$_4$ has correctly emended. With the longer form disespeyred found in Ph, the a 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 perseuerance

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

*45. And sende them myght their loves so to plesa
(+ CH$_1$ADS$_1$) (CH$_1$S$_1$ for to plesa)

Rest: And sende hem myght hir ladys so to plesa
(H$_5$(Gg)Cx for to please; R om. so)

The change from loves to ladys was apparently to avoid repetition with love, 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$_2$H$_4$ 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$_2$ Nowlistenythevery wight with; Ph everych for ech)

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

The a 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. \( H_4 \) Ph Knowe thyng is how that the grekes stronge
With armys in a thousand shippys went
(Ph Knowyn)
Rest: Yt is wel wist ...
In armes with ...

\( H_2 \)\(^3\) abandons the \( a \) reading. The Italian Nell' armi forti, Fil. 1. 7, suggests that In armes is the original reading. If so, With armys must be an error of the \( a \) scribe; but the difference is too trifling to constitute clear evidence.

\( \dagger 61. \) And in dyuere wise and in on Intent (+ R + Cp)
\( (H_4 \) way for wise, assent for Intent; \( C_p \) om. first And)
Rest: omit second in

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

63. ... thay diden all their peyn (+ \( H_5 \))
\( (H_2 \)\(^3\) om. all; \( G_g \) lacking)
Rest: ... wroughten ...
(With line 71 hand 1 of \( H_2 \) begins, and continues through 497.)

78. Wherfor to departe al softely (+ Th)
\( (H_4 \) Wherfore; Th om. al)
Rest: For which for to departen softely
\( (G_g D \) om. second for; \( C_x \) he thought for second for;
\( H_3 \) shorhtly for softely)

If we accept the trisyllabic Wherefore of \( H_4 \) (cf. Kittredge, § 88) the reading of \( a \) is metrically normal. The Italian Per che ... dipartirsi, Fil. 1. 9, may equally well give us Wherfor or For which.

82. Dede hym bothe worship and servise (+ Th)
\( (H_2 \) Ph om. bothe)
Rest: Hym deden bothe ...

*83. Hopyng in hym kunnyng hem to rede
Rest: In trust pat he hath ...
\( (H_5 \) hadde; \( C_x \) had)
Readings of $H_2PhH_4$ (a).

The α reading is closer to the Italian, *Da lui sperando sommo e buon consiglio*, Fil. 1. 9. *Hupung 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 α 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 α. Note the conflate reading of Th.

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

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

(89) \[ \begin{aligned} & H_2 \text{ On hym pat had his troupe pus falsy brokyn} \\ & Ph \text{ On hym pat falsly had his troupe brokyn} \\ & H_4 \text{ For he was fals & his surance broken} \end{aligned} \]

(90) And sworyn pat he & al his kin at onys (H$_4$ They *for* And)

(91) \[ \begin{aligned} & H_2Ph \text{ Were worthy bren bope fell and bonys} \\ & H_4 \text{ Weel worthi were bren be bothe fell & bonys} \end{aligned} \]

Rest: That Calkas traytor fled was and alyed (γ traytor fals fled was; H$_3$ was fledde)

(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$_1$Gg sayden *at* he)

(91) Ben worthi for to brennen fel and bones (CpH$_5$ to be bren; H$_1$ alle fel and bones; D *for* to bren flesh; Gg *om.* for; Cx Were worthy to be bren 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
the reading of a in 88, 89, and 91. I should conjecture that 88 and 89 read:

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 $H_2 PhH_4$. 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
(H$_2$ cursyd for fals & wikked; Ph om. fals &)

(94) His doghtir which pat lyvid in grete penaunce
(H$_2$ Ph om. which)

(95) For of her lyf she was perfor in drede
(H$_2$ om. of)

(96) Ne in al pis world she nyst what to rede
(H$_2$ hyst not)

Rest:

(93) Al vnwist of pis fals and wikked deede
(GgH$_5$ Cx om. Al; D Al men wiste; H$_3$ the for pis)

(94) His douther which pat was in gret penaunce
(ADS$_1$ liued for was)

(95) For of hire lyf sche was ful sore in drede
(H$_3$ ful ofte; D ofte for ful sore; S$_1$ sory and full of drede; Cx And for For)

(96) As she pat nyst what was best to rede
(S$_1$ S$_2$ Dig wist nat; H$_3$ 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 GgH$_5$ and Cx approximate to the a reading by omitting Al, and that ADS$_1$ 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.
Readings of $H_2PhH_4$ (α).

98. Of any friend to whom she durst mone

Rest: ... she dorst hire mone

(CIS₂DigCx 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 every wight

(H₄ om. ouer)

Rest: ... for passyng every wyght

Since $H_4$ omits *ouer*, it may be that this is an $H_2Ph$ emendation, and that *passyng* had been omitted by the a original.

*104. As doth a perfect heunely 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

(GgH₅ On kneis before ector sche fel adoun)

*111. With chere & voys ful pytous & wepyng

Rest: With pitous voys and tendrely wepyng

(R Whych petowe wys)

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

*118. ... lete your fadir tresoun gone

Rest: Forth with mischaunce

Filostrado (1. 13) reads *lascia con la ria Ventura Tuò 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 enquere & here (+ R)

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

(H₁ om. I)
124. And she hym thonkyd oft in humble chere  
   *Rest*: . . . with ful humble chere  
   *Fil. 1. 14*: *Ella di questo il ringraziò assai.*

125. . . . if it had be his wille (+GgH₅)  
   *Rest*: . . . and it hadde ben his wylle  
   (R om. and)

†130, 131. Thurgh good in al & eke with yong & olde  
   (H₂ Thurgh out 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.

133. I rede not perfor y lete hit gone  
   *Rest*: I rede it nought . . .

137. . . . al vnsoft  
   (H₄ as vnsofte)  
   *Rest*: . . . no thing softe

143, 144. For why it were a long disgression  
   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 lettnyn  
   (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 $H_2PHH_4$ (a).

Rest: Hire old vsage nolde pei not letten

(Cx Yet for alle thygr vsage wolde; ClH$_1$AR wolde)
As for to honoure hire goddes ful deoute
(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 pe pryne
Rest: ... of lusti ver pe pryne
(H$_5$ of forsing ver)

159. In meny wyse shewyd as y rede
Rest: In sondry wyses ...
(GgH$_5$RCxH$_2$D 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 every manere wight
That thrifty was to heryn her servise
(H$_4$ tristi, the for her)
And pat so meny a thousand lusty knyght
So meny a fresh mayde & lady bryght
(H$_2$ lady & maydyn)
Ful wele byseyyn the meste meyne & leest
(H$_2$ the moost & eke pe leest; $H_4$ mene)

Rest: In general pere went many a wight
(D many worthy wight; Cx Generally)
To herkenen of Palladion seruyse
(γ pe seruyse; $H_3GgH_5$R Palladions)
And namely so many a lusti knyght
(RCxS$_2$Dig om. so; R a lusty gentyll knyght; $H_5$
 yong for lusti)
So many a lady fresh and mayden bright
(Cx And for So; $H_3$ mayden fresche and lady dere)
Ful wel arayed bothe meste and lest
(J bothe pe meste and pe lest; \(H_3\) tho moste; \(R\) om. wel; \(H_1\)Cp bope moste meyne and lest; Cl bothe meene meste; A men bothe mest; D bothe moste menne; \(S_1\) bothe moste 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 thryfty 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 \(H_2\), and perhaps also by \(H_4\), 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 \(\gamma\) original made the change to bothe, but failed to delete meyne. Cp and \(H_1\) retain this erroneous \(\gamma\) reading with the spelling meyne. In the parent of \(A\) and \(D\) meyne became menne or men, and \(A\) attempted an ingenious emendation. \(S_1\) changes to mene, and Cl to meene with transposition of order. The parent of \(S_2\) and Dig emended the hypermetrical line by dropping meyne, and so \(S_2\)Dig present the correct revised reading. \(J\) and \(H_3\) 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
(\(H_2\) was this Cryseyda)

Rest: Among pe se 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 euerychon
\((H_2Ph\) echeon)  

Rest: As was Criseyde as folk seyde euerychone
\((GgH_5 \text{ om. second as} ; S_2\)DigCx 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 opher 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 lovys bow was not ybrokyn

(H\(_5\) 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\(_5\)D)Cx 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.
215. Daun Troylus...

Rest: This Troylus...

Cf. line 183.

217. But alday faylith that that folys wenden
(H₂ pes for second that; Ph pe for second that; H₂Ph weny ; H₄ fool is wende)

Rest: ... pyng fat ...

224. ... as my feris drawe (+ AD)

Rest: ... with my feres drawe
(Cl felawes; R om. my; Gg hyse over erasure by corrector)

225. ... fat ... (+ R)

Rest: ... pis ...

245. ... men may it se
(H₄ om. it)

Rest: ... men shal it se

255. Ne gruchith not to love for to be bond
(H₄ greuith)

Rest: Refuseth not ...

*257–259. Betir is pe wand fat bowyn wole & wynd
(H₄ bond for wand)

Than fat that brestith þerfor y 30w rede
(Iph brest; H₄ wil breste)

Now folowith hym fat so wele may 30w lede

Rest: The yerde is bet þat bowen wole and wynde
(A bende for wynde; S₁ threde for yerde; R That for The, bynde for wynde; CpH₃ Tho for The)

Than þat þat brest and þerfor I yow rede
(A now for yow; Gg breystyt; H₅ brestith; Dig brekis; R bresteth, om. and)

To folwen loue þat yow so wel kan lede
(γ To folwen hym þat so wel kan yow lede; R Rede for lede)

The a reading in 258 would seem to be due to scribal corruption. The parent MS. dropped and. H₂ has patched up the metre by substituting the unsyncopated form brestith; H₄ has attained the same object by reading wil breste. But note that Gg
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 told

†272. His eye perceyvid and so depe hit went

Rest: His eye perced ...

(ClCp procede; $S_2$Dig proceded; 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 astoyned

$Th$ And sodaynly for wonder wext astoned

Rest: And sodeynly he wax þerwith 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 þoght he wher hast þou 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: ... also he borneth

(H$_5$ so *for* also)

A clear case of error.

*342. But told y which were þe worst y leve

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

Rest: But tolde I yow þe worste poynyt I leeue

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

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

Rest: Or elles don of good entuncion
(H₃ doon hit)

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

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

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

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

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

Rest: . . . be lorn
(H₃ 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 *vborne*.

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*)
H₄ But eek sauf that in our spech is difference

Rest: But pleynly saue ourte tonges difference
(Cl tongue 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 H₂Ph read hym in 405, where AD read it, and H₂Ph repeat the noun love.

†407. H₂Ph And if yyn myn owne lust brenne
H₄ And if in myn awyn lust I brenne

Rest: And yf pat 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 pat to the injury of the metre. The H₂Ph parent has transposed the pronoun y, perhaps with the idea of improving the disordered metre.

424. 3ow ponk y lord pat have broght me to pis
(H₄ which for pat)

Rest: ... han me brought ...
(Gg broute 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 allas myn hele and hewe, 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 dreed
(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 temean
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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
   (H₂³ he for on)
   Rest: More pan pat fol . . .
   (CpA that folk; S₂ Dig the folk; RCx a fool)

540. These wordis and full many an other mo (+R +H₅ +Th)
   (H₂³H₄H₅ om. an)
   Rest: . . . ful manye an oper to

564. PhH₄ . . . and don his corage wakyn
   H₂³ . . . and his courage wake
   Rest: . . . and his corage awaken

H₂³ has dropped don, but keeps wake instead of awaken.
(With line 568 begins again H₂¹, and continues to the end of the book.)

582. Pandare that ny malt for wo & roupe
   Rest: This Pandare pat neigh malt . . .
   (J pat wel neyght malt; Gg pat wol ner mast; H₅ pat wel ner malt)

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

629. Ther as he felle that loke cowd wyde
   (H₄ lookyn coude)
   Rest: . . . coude loke wyde

*640. Ne no man wote what gladnes is y trow
   (+ JGgH₅ +Th).
   Rest: Ne no man may be inly glad I trowe
   (R uerryly glad; S₂ Ioly gladde; Dig non for no man)
A clear case of revision, in which JGgH₅ retain the a reading.
Readings of $H_2PhH_4$ (α).

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
clumsy attempt to supply a line missing in its
original.)

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

†678. ... pogh pat y wist
($H_4$ om. pat)

Rest: ... if ich it wyster
(R and for 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 wol... .

*755. But lete me myn infortune waylyn
($H_4$ my fortune bewaylyn)

Rest : But suffre me my myschep to by-wayle
(D om. my ; Cp om. to ; H₅ for to)

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

*773. Why no parde sir quod this Troylus (+ Th)
($H_2Ph$ om. this)

Rest : No certes broper quod pis Troylus
(A seide for quod ; Cp om. pis)

The a reading is somewhat more dramatic. The revised reading
is more concise and avoids the repetition of why in 774.

†786. As sharp as doth the Sicippus in helle
(Ph Ciciphus ; $H_4$ Sitiphus)

... he Ticius...

(CIRH₅ pe for he ; $H_3$ tho for he ; $H_1$Cx om. he ;
$S_1$ he Theseus ; Gg he which is) (Th he Tesiphus)

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

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

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

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

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 ḷat ṭy lyve

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

*949*. The lilie wexith white smothe & soft

*Rest*: The rose waxep swote smothe and softe
(ClCpH₁DS₁ and smothe and softe ; Gg swete sauery
& softe)

The α 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 πikke*" growing next it. But the change seems to be deliberate.

976. For pis 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 leryld

H₃ . . . ofte herdse seyd and lerede

Cx . . . herd seyd oft of lered.
Olde lerid is preferable to the somewhat tautological wyse lered of γ and J. Apparently the scribe of the common original first wrote wyse and then altered it to olde. γ and J failed to note the correction. H₃ and Cx misread olde as ofte. Gg omitted the word.

†1014. Now blissful Venus now help or þat y sterve
Rest: Omit second now
The a reading is hypermetrical.

1029. . . . þan do right as þe lest (+ Th)
(H₄ thanne, om. right)
Rest: . . . now do right as þe leste
(Cl ript; A now for right)

An examination of the long list of readings which characterize H₂PhH₄ reveals a number of significant facts.

(1) That H₂PhH₄ 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 H₂PhH₄ 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 H₂PhH₄ present a reading closer to the source than that of the remaining MSS. The reverse of this is true only when H₂PhH₄ 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 H₂PhH₄ present the earlier and unrevised text of the poem. This conclusion is corroborated by the fact that H₂PhH₄ are the only MSS. which contain the obviously genuine stanza 128 (cf. above, p. 34).
(4) The variants which characterize \( H_2 \text{PhH}_4 \) 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 GgH\(_5\) and R, occasionally share in the readings of \( H_2 \text{PhH}_4 \). In one striking instance, line 640, the reading of \( H_2 \text{PhH}_4 \) is shared by JGgH\(_5\).

We must now consider the relations existing between the MSS. which constitute this group of \( H_2 \text{PhH}_4 \). And here it must be remembered that \( H_2 \) is not homogeneous. The first and the eighth folios of \( H_2 \), 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 \( H_2^1 \) and \( H_2^3 \) are both throughout Book I a MSS., \( H_2^1 \) is closely related to Ph, while \( H_2^3 \) is cognate in origin with \( H_4 \).

The close relationship of \( H_2^1 \) and Ph has already been to some extent illustrated by the variants given in the long list of \( \alpha \) 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 \( H_2^1 \), and the facsimile of \( H_2^1 \) 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 \( H_2 \), 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 \( H_2 \). 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 þat Troy shold
(Ph þat Troy by for)
Rest: ... by sort
An error due to the confusion of $f$ and long $s$.

†119. Dwelith whil 3ow good lyst in troy
Rest: Dwelleth with vs whil ...

†153. ... þe tyme
Of appareille whan clopid is the mede
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
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
Rest: I haue herd told pardieux of ...

237, 238. That love is he þat althing can blynd
For may no man vndo þe lawe of kynd
Rest: ... may bynde
For may no man fordo ...
($H_5$ undo)

†268. This Troylus with eucry wight about
Rest: ... of eucry wyght ...
(Cl$H_5$ 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.
She shewyd wele þat men myght in her gesse

Rest: Omit She

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

For more thurst y the more þat y drynk

Rest: For ay þurst I þe more þat I it drynke

(Ḥ₂ thrust)

(Ḥ₄RA om. it)

... wherto þan y pleyne

Rest: ... wherto pleyne I þenne

A manifest error. The rime word is brenne.

be spiryt which that oght euere youris be

Rest: Mi spirit which þat aught youre be

(Ḥ₄ ay for þat; Ḥ₁S₂Dig om. þat; Gg þe wheche; Ḥ₅ om. which)

The reading ay in Ḥ₄ gives some support to euere in Ḥ₂Ph. 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 e tua che mia esser sola, Fil. 1. 38, lends no support, however, to such a conjecture.

But whethir goddes or woman she is

Y wis y note . . .

Rest: But whethir goddesse or womman I wys

She be I not . . .

(GgḤ₅ om. She be)

The error of GgḤ₅ in omitting She be seems to be connected with a revision of the Ḥ₂Ph reading into that of the remaining MSS. Perhaps this should be regarded as an authentic a reading not shared by Ḥ₄.

Ne in his desire non oþir fantasye bred

Rest: . . . fownes . . .

(D foules; Ḥ₄R sownes; Cp fawnes; Ḥ₅ other brede; S₂Dig fode no(r) brede)

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

That Ector or his brethryyn dedyn (+ D + Ḥ₅)

Rest: . . . his opere breperen . . .
Opere has been dropped because of the similarity of the following word. The same error has been made independently by D and H$_5$. The Italian reads: *Ch' Ettore e gli altri suoi frate' faceano*, Fil. 1. 45.

†496. Ne semyd hit as she of hit roght

*Rest:* . . . as *fat* she of hym roughte

$\gamma$ + Gg *om. as;* H$_3$Cx 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 . . .

$(S_1F_2$ And *3it*)

A nine-syllable line.

642. Eke white by blak shame by worthines

*Rest:* . . . by shame ek worthinesse

$(A$ eke shame by; *S_2* Dig Also shame be)

†646. That y have in love so oft assayed

*Rest:* I *pat* hane . . .

665. *fat* his craft ne cowd his sorowis bete

$(H_2$ bet)

*Rest:* That al his craft . . .

†739. To no man for why *fat* he so ferd

*Rest:* To neuer no man for whom . . .

$(CICpH_1S_1H_3^* om. no;* AH_4$Cx Neuer to no man;

R Neuer to man; $H_5$ To neuere 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

$(H_2$ *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.

$(H_4$H$_3$Cx *om. a)*
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†748. For thy with yn effect men huntith fast

Rest: For þyng which yn effect ... (ClCpH₁S₂Dig Fro þyng)

†767. Trist pow þat y told it in her ere

Rest: Dorstestow ...

†806. þou mayst alone here wepe kncle & cry (+ Cx)

(Ph wepe and knele)

Rest: ... crie and knele

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

†860. Wer it my sustir for wham þou makist þis sorow

Rest: Were it for my suster al þi sorwe

914. And some wold monche her brede alon

Rest: ... here mete alone

(GgH₅ vary)

926. Thes faytours ...

Rest: These louerės ...

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

Rest: ... ay wel hide

(H₄ ay weel yede)

†1032. That þow my lady desiryn shold

(Ph þow corrected to y)

Rest: That to my lady I desiren sholde.

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

That þow is repeated from 1031.

†1076. And in þe toun his name sprong for ay

1078. So goodly was & gat hym so mych grace

þat eche wight hym lovid þat lokyd in his face

Rest: And yn þe toun his manere þo forþ þay

(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 eche hym louede ...

(A That every man louede hym)

Line 1076 is meaningless; 1078 is hypermetrical. The agreements of A with H₂ Ph must be explained as due to contamination.

1081. 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 afterwarde 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 auailie

Rest: ... and his cause auayle

(A this for his; Cx lady for cause)

† 63. Full besly 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 destroyd be

498. But than felte Troilus suche wo (+ R)

($H_4$ fell)

Rest: But panne felt pis 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 yyl for while)

Will is anticipated from the next line.

546. ... his sorowe gan multiply (+ GgH₅)
       Rest: ... his wo ...

†547. Bewaillyng thus in his chambr alleone
       (H₄ By wakyng)
       Rest: ... yn his chambr pus alleone
       (D om. pus)

The transposition is greatly to the detriment of the metre.

†558. God saue them pat haue besieged our toun (+ Gg)
       Rest: ... bysegd 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
```
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 \( H_2^1 \) or \( \text{Ph} \) with \( H_4 \) or of \( H_4 \) or \( H_2^3 \) with \( \text{Ph} \). 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 \( H_4 \) and \( \beta \), notably with \( \text{R} \) and \( \text{Cx} \), the nature of which will be discussed later on (see pp. 81–83).

We must now 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 \( \gamma \). It consists of \( \text{Cl, Cp, H}_1, S_2, \text{Dig, A, D, and (throughout Book I) S}_1 \). 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:

\[
\text{ClCpH}_1S_2\text{DigADS}_1(\gamma)
\]

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

Rest: Omit fals \( (H_3 \text{ was fledde}) \)
A hypermetrical line, due, perhaps, to a misreading of \textit{fled} and to a subsequent correction.

†143. For it were a long disgression \(- S_1, + H_5 \)
\[ (H_1 \text{ discrecioun}) \]
\[ H_2^4 \text{PhH}_4S_1 \text{ For why it were . . .} \]
\[ \text{JGGH}_3^4 \text{Cx} \text{ For it were here . . .} \]
\[ \text{R} \text{ For it were right . . .} \]
A nine-syllable line, emended by \( S_1 \). The agreement of \( H_5 \) I regard as fortuitous, since the closely related \( \text{Gg reads here} \). For further discussion of this line see p. 42.

†162. And to \( \text{pe temple yn al here} \) goodly best wyse
\[ (- \text{CpS}_2^2 \text{Dig}) \]

Rest: Omit \textit{goodly} \( (\text{R om. al}) \)
A hypermetrical line, corrected by \( \text{CpS}_2^2 \text{Dig} \).
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164.  To herkenen of Palladion pe seruyse  
β  To herkenen of Palladions seruyse  
(JCx Palladion)  
α  That thryfty was to heryn her servise

†167.  Ful wel arayed bothe most meyne and leste  
(Cl meene meste ; A men bothe mest ; D menno ;  
S₁ mene ; S₂ Dig om. meyne)  
β  . . . bothe mest and rest  
α  . . . the meste meyne & leest

A corrupt conflation of α and β, corrected by S₂ Dig. For a 
full discussion of the line see above, p. 44.

†198.  Ye louveres and youre observaunces  
(A and of youre)  
Rest :  . . . and your lewed observaunces  
(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  
α  Now folowith hym pat so wel may sow 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 euyn and on morwe; H₃H₃Cχ 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; S₂Dig om. Ne, thought for roughte; Dig 3it for it)
   Rest: ... as pat she of him roughte
   (H₂Ph 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 pynge me byhete 
   (CpS₂Dig heete for byhete)
   Rest: ... no thing more ... 
   (R Thogh that thing ye more me behete; H₅ pow 
   neuere pynge herafter)

563. ... don his wo to falle (+R)
   (S₂Dig 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 
   (AS₂Dig seen ek)
   Rest: I haue my seluen seyne 
   (H₂PhH₄H₅RCχ myself)

649. Ek pe ne oughte not ben yuel apayed 
   (S₂Dig Also pou ought noght to be; D to for not)
   Rest: And ek the noughte nat ... 
   (H₂PhH₄ And eke pou oughtest not; GgH₅ And ek 
   pou not; H₂R the aught not; Cχ the not ought)
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†661. 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.

720. 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; H₂PhCx om. that)

Sith is repeated from 719.

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

Rest: Omit first and

†808. And she wole 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.

820. Of pat word toke hede Troylus

Rest: And of that word . . .

(Gg pys for that)

A nine-syllable line.

834. ʒe so pow seyst . . .

Rest: Ye so seystow . . .

Again γ substitutes a normal word-order.

880. For of good name and wysdom and manere (− AS₂Dig)

Rest: Omit first and

(S₂Dig goddis for good)

949. . . swote and smothe and softe (− AS₂Dig)

Rest: Omit first and

(a white for swote; Gg sauery for smothe)

Note that in two cases AS₂Dig depart from γ in exactly the same construction.

†960 But he pat departed is yn eucry place

(S₂Dig 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 lered (+ J)
(Cl ylered)
a + R ... of olde lered
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 pe beste post I leue
Of al his lay and most his foos to greue
(− DS₁) (Cl best)

Rest : ... and mooste 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 po for thanne; H₄ om. he)

1050. ... pat pis auant ... (+ H₃)

Rest : Omit pat

1057. To here pat to þe deth me may comaunde (− DS₁)
(A second to inserted later)

Rest : ... may me ...

1064. And fynde a tym pe-to and a place (+ JCx)

Rest : ... a space

(H₄ H₅ 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.
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 ($\dagger$).

(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. \text{... whil you good thynk ...}

Rest: \text{... good list ...}

\dagger327. \text{Omit alle.}

Rest: \text{And alle his chere ...}

\dagger388. \text{And what arte myght gare hire to loue be soght}

Rest: \text{And what to arten hire to loue he soughte}

\dagger465. \quad \text{S}_2 \quad \text{No he desyred none oper fode no brede}

Dig \quad \text{No he desired no nothire food nor bred}

Rest: \text{Ne yn hym desir noon oper fownes bredde} \\
(H_5 \quad \text{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 brynnyng Instrument

Rest : . . . no keruyng Instrument.

†806. . . . opyn here . . .

Rest : Thou mayst allone here . . .

That neither $S_2$ nor Dig is derived from the other is proved by
the fact that each is guilty of corruptions where the other pre-
erves 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 pounked . . .

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

205. . . . is nought pis . . . ($+ GgH_5 + H_3$)

Rest : . . . is pis nought . . .

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

Rest : . . . with my feres drawe

(Cl felawes)
405. That cometh of it ...

Rest: ... of hym ...

(H₂ Ph of love)

407. Omit at

Rest: ... at myn owene lust

(a 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 hote fire of loue hym for brende

DS₁ ... so sore hym brende

Rest: ... hym brende.

(H₅ hym ded brende)

668. And parauenture zit ...

Rest: And yet paraunter ...

(GgH₅ Cx parauenture)

797. ... of no thyng list recche

Rest: ... lest of no pytng recche

(H₄ list of lif nothyng recch)

803. ... shouldest þou ... (+ GgH₅)

(A xuldest)

Rest: ... shaltow ... 

†878. ... for Iesus name ... (+ R)

(DR Ihus; A Iis over erasure)

Rest: ... for Ioues name ... 

943. Wolde now ...

Rest: Now wolde ...

†972. Or honur hast ...

Rest: Or ouer haste our bope laboure shende

(Gg Or for euere hast þou; H₅ lacking)

988. ... ay be redy

Rest: ... be ay redy

(H₅ Cx Gg(H₅) be al redy; H₂ al day be redy; Ph alwey 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 γ MS., singularly free from corruptions other than those it inherited from the γ original.

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

Scattering Agreements of γ MSS.

45. CpS₂ Dig + β And send hem myght hire ladies so to plese
ClH₁ ADS₁ + a
(CIH₁S₁H₅Cx for for so; R om. so; H₁ loueres)

To explain the division of the γ MSS. between the a and the β reading we must assume that the γ parent first wrote the unrevised reading, loues, and then corrected to ladies, but without making the correction clear, and that CIH₁ ADS₁ failed to notice the correction.

†98. ClS₂ Dig + Cx Of ony frend to whom she dorst make hire mone
(Cx And nyst to whome she durst make her mone; S₂ Dig om. hire)

Rest: Omit make. (R was best to mone; a om. hire)

The γ original must have contained both make and hire, probably with make marked for deletion. S₂ Dig chose make rather than hire, while CI retained both words. Note that a 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 CI 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 lone ...

Rest: To scornen lone ...

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: ... percede ...
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. CpS₂Dig ........ ye me heete
Rest: ........ ye me byhete

†614. CpS₂Dig + GgH₅ + RH₄ For harmes myghten fallen ...
(H₄ that myht fallyn)
Rest: For harmes myghte folwen ...

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

†767. ClCpH₁S₂Dig + J Dorstestow pat I tolde in hire eere
(Cl telle for tolde)
ADS₁RCxH₂Ph ........ that I tolde it ....
GgH₅H₃H₄ ........ pat I told hyre . . .

The context requires hyre rather than it: for the next line supplies a direct object for tolde. Apparently the γ original dropped hire. ADS₁ then wrongly emended the defective line by supplying it, the erroneous reading of H₂Ph and RCx. J has independently fallen into the γ error.

†984. Cla And yet . . .
Rest: As yet . . .

The agreement of Cl and A may well be fortuitous. Otherwise, we must assume that D has corrected an obvious slip.

In the list of readings just given the most frequent combination is that of Cp and S₂Dig; but we are not justified in arguing from this evidence for a closer relationship between any two of the units which make up the γ group. Rather we must assume that the γ original contained a number of corrections, and that in this line or that individual γ MSS. failed to incorporate the correction. These cases do not at any rate invalidate the evidence on which the existence of γ is based.

We have now to consider the MSS. belonging to the group which we have called β. They are: J, Gg, H₅, H₃, R, and Cx, all the MSS., that is, which have not previously been classified under α or γ. (With them, as will be seen presently, is occasionally associated H₄, a MS. which normally presents α readings.) These MSS. agree as against α in presenting the revised readings, and in avoiding the numerous errors of the α original, and agree as against γ in avoiding the readings which constitute that group. It will be remembered that in the case of several revised readings
γ incorporates only part of the revision. In these cases, then, β 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 β reading in these lines is the authentic revised text, we can, of course, base no argument for the relationship of the β MSS. on these agreements. Apart from these lines, there are very few instances in which the β 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.

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

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

Rest: \(\ldots\) neigh ten yer \(\ldots\)

Note that \(\text{H}_2^3\) adopts the βγ reading in 34, 57, 58, 564, where Ph and H₄ present an unrevised text. Perhaps, therefore, \text{vel} is a revision reading not incorporated by γ. The variation is so slight, however, that the substitution may well be due to scribal carelessness.

71. So when \(\text{pat kalcas knew by calculynge} \) (H₅ \(\text{pat whan} ; \text{Cx om. pat})

Rest: \(\ldots\) this Calkas \(\ldots\)

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

(R lacking)

Rest: \(\ldots\) yn hire opinyoun

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

(Gg so ay on hire ; H₅ om. so)

Rest: \(\ldots\) ay on here so \(\ldots\)

(H₂ Ph on her so ay ; S₂ Dig om. so)

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

(Gg er for or ; H₃ lacking)

Rest: Hath ben or is \(\ldots\)

(S₁ his for is)

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

Rest: \(\ldots\) 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
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585 H₃. In 347, 585, and 719 Cx deserts the $\beta$ reading. The evidence for a common descent of the $\beta$ 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 $H_5$, which is attested by the following selected list of agreements:

$GgH_5$

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

†93. Unwyst of $\beta$is false & wekede dede (+ Cx)
   (Gg Onwost)
   Rest: Al vnwist . . .
   (a Vnknowyng ; D Al men wiste)

$GgH_5$ have changed the Vnknowyng 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 $\beta$i seydyn).

186. Byholdynge alle $\beta$e ladyis . .
   Rest: Byholdyng ay $\beta$e ladyis . . .
   ($H_4$ om. ay)

197. I haue pardeux herd of 3oure lyuynge
   (Gg herd inserted above line; $H_5$ herd pardeux)
   Rest: I haue herd told pardiux . . .
   ($H_2$Ph om. pardiux)

280. . . . his forme pleyinge chere
   ($H_5$ formest ; Gg pleynynge)
   Rest: . . . his firste . . .
   ($H_4$ his herte with iapyng cheer)

350. Now wel is hym . . .
   Rest: Lord wel is hym . . .
   ($H_4$ And wel)

†426. Omit She be
   Rest: She be I not which $\beta$at ye do me serue
   ($H_2$Ph var. See above, p. 56.)
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498. But þanne felt þis troylys so meche wo
(Rest: ... such wo)

†502. For þat cause he þouȝte his herte blede
(H₅ his herte ded blede)
(Rest: For þat hym þought he felt his herte blede
(γ For which; J For þat cause; RH₄ he thought;
H₃Cx 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 þat cause, but retains he felte. Cf. below, p. 77.

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

†611. ... for now hast þou myn wo
(R: I wot)

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

†719. Gg And sey þou wilt it do for no gyle
(H₅ And as pow wolst I do it for no gyle
(Rest: And sithe þow 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.)
Readings of RCx.

1032. \( \text{pat} \) myn lady I desyryn schulde
(\( H_5 \) \( \text{pat} \) I my lady)

\textit{Rest}: That to my lady I desiren sholde
(H\textsubscript{2}Ph \textit{pow} \textit{for} to my, \textit{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 \( \text{pat} \) loue . . .
(Cx \textit{om. pat})

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

R and Cx retain how from the unrevised \( \text{a} \) reading. Cf. above, p. 36.

53. For now I wol gon . . .

\textit{Rest}: For now wól I gon . . .
(H\textsubscript{2}Ph For I will now go; H\textsubscript{4}S\textsubscript{2}Dig For I will go)

\dagger 56. . . . or he deyde

\textit{Rest}: . . . er she deyde

The context shows that the pronoun refers to Criseyde.

\dagger 67. \textit{Omit} \( \text{pat} \) (+ H\textsubscript{2}PhDig)

\textit{Rest}: That in science so expert was \( \text{pat} \) he

165. \textit{Omit} so (+ S\textsubscript{2}Dig)

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

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

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

(H₂ Ph om. anoon)

957. ... & alwey hide (+ H₂ Ph)

*Rest*: ... and ay wel 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 H₂ Ph 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. H₃ RCx ... and openly was spokyn

*Rest*: ... and generally was spoken

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

106. JR + H₂ Ph ... herde al day ...

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

109. JGgH₅ H₈ 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. \(H_3C_xGxH_5 + A\) For my mater... 
Rest: For my mater... 
(a Of my mater)

195. \(JGgCx + S_1\) ... she slepth 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. \(H_3GgH_5 + H_2 Ph\) ... caste vpe his browe 
Rest: ... pe browe

205. \(H_3GgCx\) ... wele spoken 
Rest: ... wysly spoken

Again \(H_5\) has corrected the \(GgH_5\) reading.

249. \(GgH_5 R + H_4\) ... most confortid & esed 
Rest: ... conforted most and esed 
\((H_2\ om. most; S_1\ conforted and most esed)\)

399. \(JRCx\) ... ye may it fynden heere 
Rest: ... he may... 
\((H_3\ lacking)\)

†502. \(JGgH_5\) For pat cause hym thought... 
Rest: For pat hym pought... 
\((\gamma\ For\ which; RH_4\ he\ thought; H_3Cx\ lacking)\)

587. \(GgH_5Cx\) ... swich a care 
Rest: ... so gret a care

Swich is repeated from 586.

†603. \(GgH_5RCx + S_2Dig\) Loue a\textsc{en}s whiche... 
Rest: Loue ayens pe which... 

†614. \(GgH_5R + H_4 + CpS_2Dig\) For harmys my\textsc{tyn} fallyn... 
\((H_4\ that\ myht\ fallyn)\)
Rest: ... folwen...

(H_3\ lacking)

The Italian reads \textit{segue}, \textit{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 
\((Ck\ ofte\ a\ wys\ man; D\ eke\ may; H_3\ lacking)\)

672. \(GgH_5H_3CxR + H_4\) Omit yet (\(GgH_5\ I\ can; Gg\ pat\ for\ pyn) 
Rest: But to pyn help yet somewhat kan I seye
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681. JH₃CxR + H₄ And tel me plat now what is thenchesoun (J tenchesoun)

Rest: Omit now
(Cl pyn enchesoun; AS₁Ph pe enchesoun; Gg pyn entencioun; H₅ py sorowe soun; Cp But for And)

Since plat is a monosyllable (cf. Pardoner’s Tale 648, where it rimes with that) the metre requires either now or pe enchesoun. Probably now is a β correction not adopted by GgH₅.

737. JGgH₅ + H₄ + Cl ... no worde ...

Rest: ...

Worde is repeated from 736.

757. JGgH₅₉R + H₄ For oother cure ...

Rest: Nor oper cure ...

(ACx Non; H₃PhD Ne)

Line 756 begins with For.

767. H₃GgH₅ + H₄ ... I tolde her in hir ere

H₂PhRcxADS₁ ... y told it ...

γ + J Omit first her.

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

†768. JGgH₅ Omit pi self

Rest: Thi wo sith pow darst not pi self for feere

†832. JH₃Cx ... or pat I be ful longe

Rest: ...

or pat it be ... 

†874. H₅Cx + H₄ Omit fo

(H₅ l-called)

Rest: Than is my swete fo called Criseyde

We must assume either that Gg has corrected the error, or, more probably, that H₅ has independently made the same error as Cx and H₄.

†907. JGgH₅ The sholde neuere in loue han tid thus fayre a grace

(Gg pere for The; H₃ lacking)

Rest: Omit in loue

In loue is repeated from 906.

†976. H₃ For this haue I ofte herde sey and lerede

Cx ... herde seyd oft of lered

a + R For pis have y herd seyd of olde lerid

γ + J ... of wyse lered

Gg(H₅) ... herd seyd of leryd

See the full discussion of this line on p. 52 above.
Scattering Agreements of $\beta$ MSS.

988. $H_3CxGg(H_3)$  
$\text{Rest:} \quad \ldots \text{be al redy}$

$(AD\text{ ay be;} \ H_2\text{ al day be redy; } Ph\text{ alwey be redy})$

1001. $JR + S_1$  
$\text{Rest:} \quad \text{Omit ay}$

$(ClCpH_1S_2DigA\text{ hise foos to greue})$

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

1007. $H_3Cx$ And strengest feithed as I vnderstonde  
$(Cx\text{ be as})$

$\text{Rest:} \quad \ldots \text{feyped ben I vnderstonde}$

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  
$(H_3\text{ at for that})$

$\text{Rest:} \quad \text{Lest pat pe Cherl may falle out} \ldots$

$(Cl\text{ wole for may;} \ H_2\text{Ph om. pat})$

$\text{Cherl is properly monosyllabic. (O.E. ceorl.)}$

1057. $JH_3$ Til hir \ldots

$\text{Rest: To here} \ldots$

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$^5$H$^3$ is found in 109, and JGgH$^5$R in 757. Moreover, both J and GgH$^5$ are found in a number of other combinations. In 767 and 976 J is associated with $\gamma$. We have already noticed the tendency of GgH$^5$ 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 indepen-
dent 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 $\alpha$ readings, we must
assume that these $\alpha$ 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 $\alpha$ 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
Conclusions.

of the MSS. in Book I may be graphically presented in the following form:

O\(^1\) represents Chaucer's original autograph, of which \(a\) is a copy. O\(^2\) 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 \(H_4\). Though \(H_4\) shares in all the significant \(a\) readings, it shows a tendency, more marked in the latter part of Book I, to associate itself with MSS. of the \(\beta\) group. In the list of scattering agreements of \(\beta\) MSS. (pp. 76–79) \(H_4\) agrees with two or more \(\beta\) MSS. in the following lines: 249, \(†614, 672, 681, 737, 757, 767, †874\). In no case is the variant a very striking one; but the number of instances is considerable. Moreover, there are a number of lines in which \(H_4\) agrees with a single \(\beta\) MS. against the combined testimony of all the remaining MSS. These cases are presented in the following table:

**Scattering Agreements of \(H_4\).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Text. Trad.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200.</td>
<td>(H_4H_3)</td>
<td>the kepyng of dotances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rest:</td>
<td>... which doutances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235.</td>
<td>(H_4)</td>
<td>The fredam of your herte to hym make thrall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>... hertes maken·thralle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rest:</td>
<td>... hertes to hym pralle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The reading of (H_4) is a conflation of the normal reading and R.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Manuscript Relations in Book I.

386. $H_4R$ And ouer al this ful moche more he thouht
   ($H_4$ om. al)
   $\gamma$ ... yet muche 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)

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 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 H₃ and S₁ in line 5 in reading I parte you froye instead of I parte froye. In both these cases H₄ 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 GgH₅ and H₄, alternate in their allegiance between H₂Ph on the one hand, and the β group on the other, to such an extent that the distinction between α and β is all but obliterated. Of the three main groups, γ alone maintains its integrity. It is represented by the same MSS. as in Book I, save that at about line 617 S₁ ceases to belong to the group, and that at line 1034, where a new handwriting begins, H₃ joins it.

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

ClCpH₁S₂DigAD [S₁] [H₃]

(After line 617 S₁ ceases to be regularly a γ MS. Its occasional agreements with γ after that point are specifically noted. H₃ becomes regularly a γ MS. at line 1034.)

37. ... or alwey o manere
   Rest : ... ne alwey ...
   (JH₃ nor alwey)

39. If pat pei ferd yn loue ... (+ Cx)
   (ClCx om. pat)
   Rest : Yif that men ferde ...
The Manuscript Relations in Book II.

51. ... blew and white and rede (− S₂ Dig S₁, + J)
Rest: Omit first and. (H₂ Ph var.)

69. ... Tireux ...
(H₄ Tryeux; A Cireux)
Rest: ... Tereus ...
(J Tereux; H₃ Terous; H₅ Terius; H₂ Ph Thereus)

†86. With al yowre faire bok & al þe companye
(Cp and al the faire compaignie; S₁ om. al; A the for yowre)
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 vncle myn welcome ...
(D A for Ey)
Rest: Ey vncle 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 nouʒt)

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

224. ... þus faire an auentre (−S₂ Dig)
(DS₁ so faire)
Rest: ... so glade ...
(H₅S₂ Dig om. an)

†239 Y wys vncle quod she grant mercy (− S₂ Dig, + H₃)
Rest: I wis my vncle ...
272.  There as ... \((-S_2^D\text{ig})\)
    Rest:  Wher as ...

283.  But yf ...
    Rest:  And if ...

286.  But right his verry sloupe ... \((-S_2^D\text{ig})\)
    Rest:  ... his owne slouthe ...

    The context favours *owne* rather than *verray*.

309.  Now good Em for goddes loun 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 wisshe 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^D\ig in partye)
    Rest:  ... lith in a Iupartye.
    (JGgH_5\ PhCx om. a)

491.  But may I truste wel *perto 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 ... \((-DS_2^D\ig)\)
    (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 after gan ...
The Manuscript Relations in Book II.

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 o[er weye is to the yate noon

(CIDig 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 þro.

(After line 617, S₁ ceases to be normally a γ MS.)

†737 Of al þis ilke noble town þe þyftiest (— S₂Dig)

(A om. al)

Rest: Omit ilke.

(JRH₄ Of wommen in this world)

†745 Al wolde I þat noon wyse of þis þought

(S₂Dig Al þif I wolde)

Rest: . . . no man . . .

801. And coye hem þey seyn noon harm of me

(H₁ hym for hem; AS₂(Dig) hem that sey)

Rest: And coye hem þat they seyn . . .

(Gg om. they)

808. No þyng nacheueth . . .

(CID ne acheueth)

Rest: No thing acheueth . . .

(H₂Ph eschewip)

†815. . . . þere made many a wente

(AD þere made þei; S₂(Dig) þer made she)

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)
†904. The dayes honour and ye heuenes heighe (-AD, +R) (CpH₁ heye; S₂(Dig) hye heuenes ye; R hye)

Rest: 
... the heuenes eye

937. 
... ful faste (+ S₁)

Rest: 
... so faste

943. 
... and seyde lord so ye swete (- AD, +H₂ Ph)

Rest: Omit so

947. 
They spedde hem fro ye souper vnto bedde (+ S₁) (ClAD om. ye)

Rest: 
... and to bedde
(H₂Ph from her soper to her bed)

949. 
... vpon his way he spedde (- DS₂(Dig))

Rest: 
... him spedde
(H₃ here wey hem spedde ; J spede)

†950 But Troilus poughte his herte bledde

Rest: But Troilus pat thought ...
(H₂PhH₄GgH₅ om. But)

956. At short wordes pow shal trowe me
(3₂ (Dig) And for At)

Rest: 
... truste in me
(H₂PhH₄ trust to me ; RH₅ trust on me ; Gg trostyn in me ; S₁ trusten me)

960. 
... I haue ... (- AD, + H₃)

Rest: 
... haue I ... 

963. 
And also ... 

Rest: 
And therto ...

†977. A thousand Troians who so pat me yane (- 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 owone honde write her right now
(H₂PhH₄ write her now ; Cx wryte to her now ; S₁ to hir ; H₅ wryte hir as now)

1009. 
... wil ... (+ S₁) 
... shal...

(At line 1034, with a change in handwriting, H₃ becomes a γ 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 3e alwey fynde)

1113. For which I come to telle yow newe tiddynges (— AH₃)

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

Rest: For which come I to telle yow tiddynges

(JH₄ For whi; R For thy; H₃CxH₅S₁A I come; H₃ to bringe you tydinges; H₅ and telle yow suche thingis; R to telle new tiddynges)

If telle is given its full value as a dissyllable, 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 his 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 tyrant ... (— AH₃ + S₁)

Rest: ... the tirant ...

(H₄ the ryrawnt)

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

(Dig om. lacked)

Rest: ... hir lakke of routhe

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

†1291. And whi for shame and it were ek to soone (+ S₁)
(H₃ eke it were)

Rest: And whi for speche . . .
(H₂ Ph For why; J om. ek; Cx eke it were; H₅ for speche yt were not to don; H₄ And whi for this & that dowey my downe)

The context makes clear that for speche is the correct reading.

1316. Yf pow do forth with al pi besynesse (+ S₁)
Rest: So pat thow do forth with thy bysynesse
(H₂ PhGg om. with; H₄ weel for with; J al inserted above by contemporary hand; R So thow thyself do forth thy bysynesse)

1344. . . he wrot somewhat . . .
JRCxs₁H₅ . . . he somwhat wrot . . .
(J what inserted above by scribe)
H₂ PhH₄ Gg . . . sumwhat he wrote . . .

1347. And after pat pese dees turnede on chaunces (− AD)
(H₃ om. pat, fallen for turnede; Dig And after this is tornyd)

Rest: . . . his dees . . .
(J hise; A dedes)

1387. And . . . (− H₃)
(S₂ Dig For . . .)
Rest: But . . .
(H₄ As . . .)

1394. But Troylus yet telle me yf pe lyste (− AD)
(S₂ Dig om. yet; H₁ pat for yet)
Rest: . . . now telle me . . .
(H₂ PhS₁ om. now; Gg telle me now; AD telle now me; R om. me; S₁ R if pat the lest)

1395. A ping now which pat I shal axen pe (− D, + S₁)
(H₃ om. pat)
H₂ PhH₅ A thing which y shal axyn pe (H₅ at pe)
Gg A pyng wich pat I schal axens pe (axens corrected from axens)
RCx A thing the which pat . . .
J . . . which pat I schal now . . .
H₄ . . . which I schal now . . .
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 γ original omitted now as did also H₂Ph. Yet is a correction written into the γ 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 pat wost alle pis mater,  
How I myght best auaylen, now lat se (+ S₁)  
(H₁ me inserted above by scribe; S₁D of for alle;  
A how pou wost of this mater ; H₃ myght I)  
Rest: But telle me how, thow woost of this mater,  
It myght best auailen, now lat se  
(H₂Ph how for pou wost ; R how for thow knowest this ; Cx But tel me for thou wost thys ; 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 dissyllable, the γ reading is slightly less metrical. The reading of A:

But telle me how pou wost of this mater  
How I myght best auailen . . .

would indicate that the trouble in the γ original began by prefixing How to line 1430. The repetition of how, preserved by A, was then corrected by substituting pou pat for how pou. Note that DS₁ preserve of instead of alle. The parenthetical thow woost of this mater 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 \( \gamma \).

\[ \dagger 1504. \]  But wel wot I \( \text{bow} \) art now yn drede \((- H_3)\)

(Cl yow for \( \text{bow} \))

\( H_2 \text{PhH}_4 \text{RCx} \) \(...\) in a drede

\((H_4 \text{ om. in} ; \text{Cx om. now})\)

\( \text{JgGh}_5 \text{H}_3 \text{S}_1 \) \(...\) pat thow art now in drede

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

\[ \dagger 1585. \]  To preyse a man and with prys hym reyse \((+ H_4)\)

Rest: \(...) and \( v p \) with pris \(...\).

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

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

\((S_2 \text{Dig thyngis})\)

Rest: \( \text{Herde alwey this } \) ...

\((\text{Gg om. pis} ; \text{Cx Herd al this} ; H_4 \text{ This herde alwey})\)

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

1624. \( \text{To ben hire helpe } \) ...

Rest: \( \text{To be hir frend } \) ...

\((H_2 \text{PhS}_1 \text{ frendes})\)

\[ \dagger 1663. \]  He wole me telle \(...) \((- ADH_3)\)

Rest: \( \text{He wol yow telle } \) ...

\((\text{GgRH}_4 \text{ it for yow})\)

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

1665. \( \ldots \text{ of pis entent} \) \((- H_3, + S_1 \text{Cx})\)

Rest: \( \ldots \) of his entente

\[ \dagger 1669. \]  And seyde ywys ye moste alweyes aryse

\((H_3 \text{ And seid alweys ye wyst ye must aryse})\)

Rest: \( \ldots \) algate arise

The context shows that \( algate \) is correct.

1746. \( \text{And } \text{bough} \) ...

Rest: \( \text{That thogh} \) ...

In the list just given, a number of instances have been cited in which one or more of the \( \gamma \) MSS., notably AD and \( S_2 \text{Dig} \), fail to support the \( \gamma \) reading. A few other cases of partial \( \gamma \) readings, all of a trivial character, may be noted. In 221 \( \text{CpH}_1 S_2 \text{DigS}_1 + J \) omit and. In 1013 \( \text{CpH}_1 \) substitute it for ne (omitted by \( H_3 \) and R). In 1181 \( \text{ClCpH}_1 \text{D omit hym} \). In 1517 \( \text{CpH}_1 S_2 \text{DigH}_8 \).
begin the line with *And*, ClAD + S₁ + H₂Ph with *So*, and the remaining MSS. with *Soone*. In 1649 ClH₁ omit *hym*.

Within the γ group, the close relationship of S₂ and Dig, already noted in Book I, has been illustrated by the variants given in the list of γ readings. From among a multitude of additional instances may be noted the following: In 57 S₂Dig omit *wyse*; in 225 omit *for louse 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 γ group between A and D is attested by the following readings, in addition to those already cited among the variants in the list of γ agreements:

**AD.**

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

159. *Omit pat* (+ J)

185. ... *what he doth* (+ H₄)
   *Rest*: ... *pat he doth*

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

206. ... *frenshepe* ... (⁻ S₁)
   *Rest*: ... *felawship* ...

209. His *leue tok* ... (+ S₁)
   *Rest*: He *tok his leue* ...
   (H₃Cx *Toke of hem leue*)

211. ... *wery so soone* (+ H₄)
   *Rest*: ... *pus wery soone*
   (H₅ *pus wery so sone*; H₂Ph *werysom*)

225. ... *for the louse of god* ... (+ H₄)
   *Rest*: ... *for louse of god* ...

248. ... *fremde* ...
   *Rest*: *Lat be to me youre frende manere speche*
   (Cl *om. to me, frendly*; Gg *frendly*; H₅ *fraynyd*;
   H₃ *this freinde*; S₁ *fryend*; H₄ *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:* ... *fus* ...

292. A ... longer of it process make

D ... of it lengere proces make

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

(RH$_5$ om. of it; H$_2$PhH$_4$H$_3$ to yow *for* of it; Cx lacking)

347. *Omit* fat wight.

489. *Omit* Ne

497. Why nay ...

*Rest:* Why no ...

522. *Omit* hym

664. ... that it was routhe (+ H$_4$)

(D is *for* was)

*Rest:* ... it was a roupe

(H$_2$PhH$_5$ it were routhe; Gg it were *a* reuthe)

692. If it were so ...

*Rest:* If it so were ...

851. That is ... (+ S$_1$)

*Rest:* This is ...

905. ... and *is* ...

*Rest:* ... al pis ...

(RH$_4$ and all this; R has *deleted* and)

1152. Ne whepher ... (+ S$_1$)

*Rest:* Or whepher ...

(CICpH$_1$H$_3$ + J And whepher)

1168. *Omit* so

1298. ... monthes two (+ S$_1$)

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

*Rest:* ... yeres two

1312. ... so help me ...

*Rest:* ... helpe me so ...
The evidence presented above makes it clear that the conclusions arrived at in Book I as to the character of \(\gamma\) 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 \(S_2\) Dig and AD constitute sub-groups. We may also notice the frequent cases in which \(S_1\) or \(H_4\) agree with AD, but an attempt to account for these agreements must be deferred till later.

The close relationship noted in Book I between \(H_2\) and Ph is equally clear in Book II. It may be illustrated by the following selected list of representative examples:

\[H_2 Ph.\]

14. \textit{Omit out}

\textit{Rest:} But out of latyn . . .

A nine-syllable line.

\[\text{†26. } H_2 \text{ Line written by later hand in space left blank.} \]

\[\text{Ph} \text{ Line written by later hand in margin.} \]

\[\text{†29–35.} \text{ Stanzas 5 and 6 follow stanza 7. This cannot be a correct order, since line 49, the last line of stanza 7, is clearly meant to conclude the proem and introduce the second book. The common original of } H_2 Ph \text{ may be descended from a MS. in which these stanzas were written in the margin. Were they, perhaps, a later addition? The sense is complete without them.} \]

35. . . . no wondur thyng

\textit{Rest:} . . . no wonderynge
†51. That al flouris fresshyn grene and rede
    \textit{Rest}: That fresshe floures blewe white and rede
    (ClCpH_A + J blew and white)

†60. Hit made his hewe al day ful grene
    \textit{Rest}: \ldots 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
    \textit{Rest}: \ldots is pis
    (H_3CxA hit ys)

\textit{Hit shold be} completes the sense of 129. \(H_2\) Ph was misled by the running over of the sense, and attempts to make a unit of 130.

147. To axen \ldots \(H_2\) aske
    \textit{Rest}: Nor axen \ldots \(RCx Ne\) axen

170. But be myn heed \ldots
    \textit{Rest}: But be my troupe \ldots

305. \ldots to 3ow be now as newe
    \textit{Rest}: \ldots as now be to yow newe
    \((H_4Cx be now as)\)

380. And couere 3ow \ldots
    \textit{Rest}: And wre yow \ldots
    \((H_1\ \text{were}; \text{others}\ wry, wrye, wri, wrie)\)

408. And she bygan to wepe right anone
    \((\text{Ph. om.}\ \text{right})\)
    \textit{Rest}: \ldots to brest a wep anoon
    \((A\ a\ wepyng; \ DCxH_5\ \text{to wep};\ GgS_1\ \text{and}\ wepe};\ R\ \text{on wepe};\ H_3\ \text{to breste on and wepe})\)

Though the \(H_2\) reading is in every way a possible one, the omission of \textit{right} by Ph suggests that \textit{right} is an emendation by \(H_2\) to repair a line made defective by the loss of \textit{to brest}. \textit{Note} that DCxH_5 read \textit{to wep}.

†421, 422. What is pis al pe ioy & al pe fest
    \textit{Rest}: \textit{pat} 3e of so made \ldots
    \((\text{Ph om.}\ \text{pis})\)

\textit{Rest}: What is pis al pe Ioye and al pe feste
    \textit{Is pis youre red} \ldots
    \((\text{Cl}\ \textit{pat for first pis})\)
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†509. Line omitted by H₂ and space left blank. In Ph the line is added in the margin.

516. . . remyn . . . (Ph renne)
Rest: . . . rome . . .

†663. . . pauour . . . (Ph corrected over erasure to pauour)
Rest: . . . pauour . . .

†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 . . .
(S₂ Dig Al 3if I wolde)

†816. . . Tarke and Anteigne
Rest: . . . Tarbe and Antigone
(ClC₇H₁S₂(Dig) Tharbe)

850. And pankyd be pow god . . .
Rest: And ¿onked be ye lord . . .
(JGgH₅R thow for ye; Cx the for ye; H₅ om. lord)
God is repeated from 848, where the pronoun is you.

†912. And voydyd were ¿o pat voyd shold out
Rest: . . . pat voyden oughte
(Gg wooldyn; H₅ voden corrected to volden; owth)
The rime words in 914, 915 are brought and poghht.

†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 ¿ow hidir here
Rest: . . . wyndes gydeth ¿ow now here
(S₂ Dig of wyndes; H₄ RCx wynd; D loue for wyndes
H₄R now you; A om. you; Gg om. now)

†1105. Omit Ioly
Rest: Tel vs youre Ioly wo and youre penaunce

†1130. . . and seyd hym till
Rest: . . . and seyde scryt ne bille
(H₄ shewith no bill; H₅ scryt inserted above)
Readings of $H_2Ph.$

1155. And in her bosom down þe lettre cast

Rest: ... down the lettre he thraste

($\gamma GgH_5$ þe lettre down; $H_4RCx$ om. he; Dig caste)

The agreement of Dig with $H_2Ph$ must be fortuitous. Note that $H_4RCx$ omit he.

1196. How like ye þe lettre þat he wrote

Rest: How liketh yow þe lettre þat ye wot

($H_4$ 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 30our nycete ...

Rest: Lat be youre nice shame ...

($H_5$ nycete shame; R nyce fare)

The conflate reading of $H_5$ (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

($H_3$ fallen; $H_4$ turned ascance)

†1434. Come vnto 30our hous her pleynis to devise

($H_2$ 30our for her)

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

($H_4D$ om. right)
Of the 34 instances of $H_2^3 Ph$ 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 $H_2^3 Ph$ 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 $H_2^3$. The relationship of $H_2^3$ and $H_4$, 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 $H_5$. This relationship is attested by the fact that $GgH_5$ 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.

$GgH_5$.

(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 besche
  Rest: Omit schal

†307. Omit þyng

†461. What men wolde of it don ...
  Rest: ... deme ...

†663. Omit most.

†839. ... onworpi ...
  Rest: ... vnwery ...
Readings of GgH₅.

†840. Gg ṭat euere was with harm vice disteyned
H₅ ṭat euere was and lest with vice disteynyd

Rest: ... and lest with harm desteyned
(ClH₁AH₃H₂Ph distreyneyd; H₄ disseyneyd)

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 nyít dyneleche ne mystileche endite
... it digneliche endite
(J clerkissly; R papally; H₄ clergaly, om. it; Cx clerkly)

†1265. Omit all

1598. ... hem pouste ... (H₅ though)

Rest: ... hem oughte ...

†1687. ... quod pe quene 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
1033 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 \( H_2 Ph \) constitute one of the units, since here, if anywhere, we should expect to find traces of a readings. The combination \( H_2 PhH_4 \), so strikingly attested in Book I, may be illustrated by the following list of readings—

\[
H_2 PhH_4.
\]

5. \( \ldots \) pis \( \ldots \) (\(+\) D)

Rest : \( \ldots \) pe \( \ldots \) (\( H_3 \) om. pe)

20. Ne wondrip not \( \ldots \)

Rest : No wonder is \( \ldots \)

22. \( \ldots \) pis \( \ldots \)

Rest : \( \ldots \) pat \( \ldots \)

33. And penkyth pus \( \ldots \)

Rest : And penketh so \( \ldots \)

35. \( \ldots \) me semith it \( \ldots \)

(H\( _4 \) om. it)

Rest : \( \ldots \) but it is me \( \ldots \)

(H\( _3 H_5 \) to me ; Cx unto me it is ; GgR lacking)

40. \( \ldots \) in opyn delyng \( \ldots \)

Rest : \( \ldots \) in opyn doyug \( \ldots \)

Delyng seems to be a preferable reading.

46. \( \ldots \) al is done \( \ldots \) (\(+\) Th)

Rest : \( \ldots \) al is seyd \( \ldots \)

48. \( \ldots \) as y have begun

Rest : \( \ldots \) syn I haue begonne

(H\( _3 \) sithen it is begonne)

57. This Pandare \( \ldots \)

Rest : That Pandarus \( \ldots \)

217. Whil pat pei two had \( \ldots \)

Rest : Whil they two hadde \( \ldots \)

(Cl Whil pat pey hadde)
Readings of $H_2PhH_4$

292. ... processe to yow make (+ $H_3$)
   Rest: ... proces of it make
   (RH$_5$ om. of it; A of it process; D of it lengere proces)

†330. Omit whiche (+ $H_3$)
   (Cx om. þat)

†349. Omit þere (+ Cx + Cp)
   (JGg ne for þere)

376. ... þank & pris ... (+ Æ)
   Rest: ... prys and þank ...

398. To late y was ware ...
   (Ph was y ware)
   Rest: To late ywar ...

454. ... eke þat mighte fal ... (+ J)
   Rest: ... þat myghte ek fallen ...
   (H$_5$A om. ek)

512. So aftir þat ...
   Rest: Soone after that ...

588. þat myghty god ... (+ $H_3$)
   Rest: Ther myghty god ...
   (H$_5$Cx All myȝti god)

675. To like hym þo ... (+ Th)
   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 þynke
   (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.

†354. Omit alle

677. Made love wipin her hert for to myne \( (+H_3+S_2\text{Dig}) \)
(Ph to enclyne; Cx in for wipin)

Rest: Omit hert
(R in her inwardly)

Without hert, the line is possible, though somewhat halting, if we give full dissyllabic value to made and love. With a properly dissyllabic herte, made and love must be read as monosyllables. The reading of \( S_2 \)Dig must be attributed to contamination.

†899. Omit here
Readings of $H_2PhCx$. 103

†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$_5$H$_4$ + A . . . how thow woost . . .
$\gamma(-A)S_1$ . . . pow pat wost . . .

See above, p. 90.

1442. . . . her othir frendis sustenaunce (+ R)

Rest: . . . gounernaunce
($H_1$ gourenaunce)

1452. . . . bothe o tyme & oper

Rest: . . . o tyme and ek oper
(Cl ek and; $H_4$ ofte tyme & othir)

1519. And be . . . (+ A)

Rest: And lye . . .

1561. But god & Pandare wist non what this mente (+ R)
($H_2Ph$ it ment; R she mente)

Rest: . . . al what pis mente
(ClH$_1$AS$_1$H$_4$ 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$_3$ om. ay; $Cx$ forth his guyse)

Note the cross connection between R and Cx.
Much more significant than the agreements between \( H_2 \)Ph\( H_3 \), \( H_2 \)PhCx, and \( H_2 \)PhR, are those existing between \( H_2 \)Ph, Gg\( H_5 \), and (usually) \( H_4 \). These agreements are recorded in the following list.

\[
H_2 \text{PhGg}H_5H_4.
\]

15. \( \ldots \ldots \) nei\( p \)er have \( \ldots \) (Gg lacking)

Rest : \( \ldots \ldots \) have ney\( p \)er \( \ldots \)

†64. \( H_2 \) The swal\( \)ow Songe with a sorowful lay

(Songe by hand 3 in space left blank)

Ph The swal\( \)ow pro\( ygne \) \( \ldots \)

(pro\( ygne \) later in space left blank)

\( H_5 \) The swal\( \)we morning \( \ldots \)

(Gg lacking)

\( H_4 \) The swal\( \)we song \( \ldots \)

Rest : The swal\( \)we pro\( ygne \) \( \ldots \)

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. \( \ldots \) al pe geest (Gg lacking)

Rest : omit al

85. Ma dame quod Pandare \( \ldots \) (+R)

Rest : Quod Pandarus ma dame \( \ldots \)

*115. 3e make me by Iovis sore adrad

(\( H_5 \) Ionas)

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 ye wist it . . .  
(H₄ wiste not)  
Rest: And ye it wyste . . . 

178. As he þat is . . . (— H₄)  
Rest: Than he þat is . . . 

190. þe sey right wele . . . (— H₄)  
(H₅ om. right)  
Rest: Ye sey right soth . . . 

226. Shal y now wytyne . . .  
Rest: Shal I not wyte . . . 

†291. Take it . . . (— H₄)  
(Gg Tache it; H₅ Take hitt)  
Rest: Cache it . . . 

Take is repeated from 289.

331. . . þat noble worpi knyght  
(Gg nobele & worpi; 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: Allas 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  
Aþens his wilde . . .  
(H₂PhGg Ne love no man)  
Rest: Ne love a man ne kan I not ne may  
Ayens my wil . . .  
(AR om. second ne; D nor for third ne; Cx his wyj)  
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 H₅).  
\textit{Love} is to be read as disyllabic, the normal elision being prevented  
by the pause in sense. This was then revised for the sake of  
greater clearness by introducing \textit{quod she} and omitting \textit{3ow}.  
H₂Ph has incorporated only half the alteration. Cx has kept  
both \textit{quod she} and \textit{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 \textit{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 stent (− H₄)  
       (H₂Ph om. ne)  
\Rest: . . . no lengere she ne stente  
       (D anone \textit{for} no lengere; H₃ wolde sche stynt)

603. And wax sumdele astonyed . . . (+ Th)  
\Rest: And was somdel astonyed . . .  
       (R sumdele was; A somwhat)

646. When he so herd pe peple on hym crien (+ Th)  
       (H₄ herde so; Th upon)  
\Rest: When he pe peple vpon hym herde cryen  
       (Cx crye vpon hym herden; S₂Dig on \textit{for} vpon; A  
originally wrote When 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
670. . . neuere mot he the (+ RS₁)
(H₅ evill for neuere)
Rest: . . . mot he neuere pe

679. He wan her love . . . (+Th)
Rest: He gat here loue . . .
(H₃ gaf)

701. H₂PhH₄ + JR She þoght ferst þat . . . (+ Th)
GgH₅ Sehe þouSTE ek þis . . .
γH₃CxS₁ She þought wel þat . . .

*703. H₂PhGgH₅ And seyd þus al were it not to done
(H₅ þis for þus)
γH₃CxS₁ And thus she seyde al were it nought to
done
JRH₄ And also thought it were not to doone
(J here naught)

721. H₂PhGgH₅ + γH₃CxS₁ Seth hit is so . . .
JRH₄ Yif it be so . . .

*731. H₂PhGgH₅ + γH₃CxS₁ What dishonour were it vnto
me this
(H₅PhA to for vnto ; D þat for it ; Cx om. it)
JRH₄ What dishonour to myn estat is this

*734, 735. H₂PhGgH₅ Men lovyn wymmen al þis toun about
Be they þe wors why nay wipoutyn dout (+ Th)
(Gg þour al ; H₂Ph om. why)
Rest: Men louen women al bysyde hire leue
And whanne hem leste nomore lat hem leue
(ClJR a woman ; J no lengere for nomore ; γS₁ byleue
for second leue ; A has the H₂PhGgH₅ reading in a
late hand over erasure)

We have here a clear case of revision. That the H₂PhGgH₅
reading is the earlier is suggested by the Italian:

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 fur non è peccato,
E non può esser da alcun biasimato. (Fil. 2. 70.)
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. H₂PhGgH₅ + γH₃CxS₁:
I thenk eke how he able is to have
Of al this noble toun the thriftyest
(H₂PhGgA able he is; H₅ he is abyll, And for I; Cx om. eke; GgH₅CpH₁H₃S₁ for to haue; γ pis ilke noble town)
JRH₄ Ek wot I wel he worthy is to haue
Of wommen in this world the thriftyeste
(H₄ Yit for Ek)

Again a clear case of revision. Note that in 736 H₂PhGgH₅ + A transpose able.

*738. H₂PhGgH₅ That woman is so she her honour save
(H₅ pat sche) (+Th)
γH₃CxS₁ To ben his loue so she . . .
(A he for she)
JRH₄ As ferforth as she may . . .

We have here three distinct readings, all of which seem authentic. Note that the γH₃CxS₁ reading stands midway between the other two.

*760, 761. H₂PhGgH₅ + γH₃CxS₁:
And þogh þat y myn hert set at rest
Vpon þis knyght þat is the worthiest
(H₅ toreste; Cx in rest; Ph om. the)
JRH₄ Vnwist to hym þat is þe worthyeste
(J of hym)

The reading of JRH₄ gains some sanction from the Italian:

Io savò saggia, e terrò si celata
La voglia mia, che non savò saputo
Ch'io aggia mai nel cuore amore avuto (Fil. 2. 69);

but as it stands it makes poor sense. Possibly we should read Vnwist, on hym þat is þe 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.
*792. \( H_2 \text{PhGgH}_5 + JRH_4 \) How oft tyme may men rede & se (+ Th)

(H\textsubscript{4} om. tyme)
\( \gamma H_3 \text{CxS}_1 \) How ofte tyme 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. \( H_2 \text{PhGgH}_5 + \gamma H_3 \text{CxS}_1 \) Adoun pe staire . . .
JR\textsubscript{H4} And doun . . .

825. \( H_2 \text{PhGgH}_5 + JRH_4 \) Gan on a troian lay to syngyn clere

(H\textsubscript{5} om. on; R to for a; H\textsubscript{4} Gan of a troian say and synge clier)
\( \gamma H_3 \text{CxS}_1 \) . . . a Troian song . . .
(A om. a)

859. \( H_2 \text{PhGgH}_5 + \gamma H_3 \text{CxS}_1 \) . . . for . . .
(H\textsubscript{5} so)
JR\textsubscript{H4} . . . lo . . .

896. \( H_2 \text{PhGgH}_5 + H_4 \text{RCx} \) . . . if it be foul in hell
(Gg if if it be; H\textsubscript{4} if ouht faile in hell)

Rest: . . . is it foule yn helle
(Cl ful)

*897. \( H_2 \text{PhGgH}_5 + JRH_4 \) Cryseyd perno ping her an-
swerde

(H\textsubscript{2} Ph her no ping; H\textsubscript{4} om. her; JH\textsubscript{5} no thing thereto; H\textsubscript{5} ne for her)
\( \gamma H_3 \text{CxS}_1 \) Criseyde vnto pat purpos nought answerede
(S\textsubscript{1} lyte for nought)

*908. \( H_2 \text{PhGgH}_5 + JRH_4 \) And white pingis gan to wexe
donne

(H\textsubscript{2} whit; H\textsubscript{5} And w\textsuperscript{t} pyng gan waxe dym & dunne)
\( \gamma H_3 \text{CxS}_1 \) And white pynges wexen dymme and donne

Note the conflate reading of H\textsubscript{5}.

910. \( H_2 \text{PhGg} + H_4 \text{Cx} \) . . . home went . . .
(H\textsubscript{2} went home)

Rest: . . . in went . . .

Note that H\textsubscript{5} deserts the reading of Gg.
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*922, 923. $H_2PhGgH_5 + JRH_4$:  
Of love which pat made his herte gay  
Hym herkenyd she . . .
(H$_5$ om. pat; $H_2$Ph her hert, Her for Hym; Gg That for Hym by corrector over erasure)

$\gamma H_3CxS_1$ Of loue pat made hire herte fressh and gay  
That herkened she . . .
(H$_3$ om. hire; $S_1$ full fressh)

His in the first reading refers to the bird who is singing his lay; hire in the second refers to Criseyde. $H_2$Ph change the reference.

945. $H_2PhGgH_5 + JRH_4Cx$ omit hym

950. $H_2PhGgH_5H_4$ Troylus pat pought . . .

Rest: But Troilus pat poughte . . .
($\gamma$ om. pat)

A nine-syllable line.

1018. $H_2PhGgH_5 + JRH_4$ . . . be ware pat pow eschewe

$\gamma H_3CxS_1$ . . . be war and faste eschuwe

*1083. $H_2Ph$ line omitted

GgH$_5H_4$ But pat was infenit for ay & o
(Gg enfeyned; H$_5$ Infynyth)

JR But pat was endles for ay and o

$\gamma H_3CxS_1$ But pat was endeles with outen ho

In $H_2$ 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 $H_4$. In Ph the $\gamma$ reading has been written later by original scribe in space left blank.

*1084. $H_2PhGgH_5 + JRH_4$ And how he wold . . .

(H$_5$ om. how; $H_4$ But how)

$\gamma H_3CxS_1$ And seyde he wolde . . .

*1085. $H_2PhGgH_5 + H_4R$ And his adew made and gan it folde

(H$_4$ And thus an eend made; R he made; Ph to for it)

$\gamma H_3CxS_1 + J$ 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 $\gamma$. In 1085 J leaves RH$_4$ and gives the $\gamma$ reading. It should be noted that from line 1034 H$_3$ is regularly a $\gamma$ MS.

*1093. $H_2PhGgH_5 + JRH_4$ This Pandare vp & pat be tyme

(\(H_5\) tho with)

$\gamma H_3 Cx S_1$ This Pandarus tok pe lettre and pat by tyme

(\(H_3\) om. pe lettre ; Cx right for and \(\dot{t}\)at)

The $\gamma$ reading is nearer the Italian. The Moutier ed. reads: Pandaro presa la lettera pi\'a 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. $H_2PhGgH_5 + JRH_4$:

And seid slepe 3e and it is pryme
And gan to iape & seyd \(\dot{t}\)us myn hert
So fressh is it thogh love do it smer (\(J\) slepe ye yit and ; \(H_4\) thus a myn herte ; \(J\) it is ;

\(H_5\) om. it ; \(H_2Ph\) om. do ; \(H_4\) do me sterte)

$\gamma H_3 Cx S_1$ And faste he swor \(\dot{t}\)at it was passed pryme
And gan to Iape and seyde ywys myn herte
So fressh it is al\(\acute{f}\)ough it soore smerte
(Cl \(\dot{t}\)at is was passed ; \(H_1\) Ioye for Iape ; Cl so for soore ; \(S_2\) alle 3if ; Dig alle pof)

We have here a clear case of revision; but there are no certain grounds for determining which is the more original version. The $H_2Ph$ reading, with its direct discourse, is more dramatic and vigorous.

1108. $H_2PhH_5 + RS_1$ . . . as pogh her herte brest

(\(H_2Ph\) hert to-brest)

GgH$_4$ . . . \& \(\acute{p}ou3\)te . . . (\(H_4\) shouht)

$\gamma H_3 Cx + J$ . . . it pought . . .

(D\(\acute{C}\)x hir pought)

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 $H_2Ph$ reading seems to be correct.

1113. $H_2PhGgH_5 + \gamma H_3 Cx S_1$ For which . . .

JRH$_4$ 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 that he spak . . .

(Cl pey 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 away anone

Rest: And seyde here cast it now away anoon

(γ now cast it; H₁ om. it; J om. now; R cast it not away; Cx caste it fast away; H₃ alwey; Cl or noon)

This variant is exactly like that in 1120.

†1201. . . þe medis . . .

Rest: . . . to medes . . .

1211. . . at þis tyde . . . (− H₅ + J)

Rest: . . . at þis tyme

1321. Lord oft . . . (+ J)

Rest: But ofte . . .

1352. . . was alwey . . . (+ A)

(H₄ was ay)

Rest: . . . alwey was . . .

1356. H₂PhGg om. for roupe

1383. H₂PhCx . . . fal at ones

Gg . . . falle al at onys

Rest: . . . come al at onys

Fal is repeated from fullyng in 1382. H₅ has corrected.

1399. om. Now (+ J)
1455. \( H_2Ph \ldots \) vs more help to crave
\( GgH_5H_4 + J \ldots \) his helpe more craue
(H\(_5\) om. his, helpis; H\(_4\) to craue)

Rest:
\( \ldots \) his helps for to craue
(Cx his help now for to craue)

1754. \( H_2PhGgH_5 + RCx \) om. ryght

†1755. Fully to dethe \ldots \((- H_4)\)

Rest: Fully to deye (dye)

An error due to confusion of \( j \) 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: \( H_2PhGgH_5, J RH_4, \) and \( \gamma H_3CXS_1 \); 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 \ldots \( (+ H_4Cx) \)
Rest: A blynde wight \ldots

22. Ye knowe \ldots \( (- S_1 + H_4) \)
(A He knew)
Rest: I knowe \ldots

31. \ldots Wolfe deuyse \( (+ H_4) \)
Rest: \ldots can deuyse

110. Do wey youre barbe \ldots \( (+ \Pi_4) \)
Rest: Do wey your wympel \ldots
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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. \( \gamma \text{Cx I am of Grekes so ferd pat I deye} \)
(Cx the Grekis)
\( H_2 \text{Ph}H_4 \text{om. so } (H_2 \text{Ph } \text{pe grekis } ; H_4 \text{ aferd}) \)
\( JGgR \ldots \text{ fered so } \ldots \) (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. \( \text{ClCpH}_1\text{AS}_2\text{Dig} \text{ If pat I mente harm or ony vylonye} \)
\( H_2 \text{PhS}_1 \text{ If y ment harme or eny vilany} \)
Rest : \( \text{Yif pat I mente harm or vilenye} \)
\( H_4 \text{om. pat ; D vices written and deleted before vilenye} \)
\( \gamma \) has combined the reading of \( H_2 \text{Ph} \) and of \( J, \text{ etc., and consequentlly presents a hypermetrical line, which } S_1 \text{ corrects by dropping pat, and D by dropping ony. Note that } H_4 \text{ omits both pat and ony.} \)

636. \( \ldots \text{ so weldy semed he } (+ H_4S_1) \)
Rest : \( \ldots \text{ so worthy } \ldots \)
Weldy, as the more uncommon word, is presumably correct.

1026. \( \ldots \text{ or craftily pow it wryte } (+ S_1) \)
\( H_3 \text{om. it} \)
Rest : \( \ldots \text{ ne craftiliche thow wryte} \)
\( R \text{om. thow ; Cx it for thow} \)

1068. \( \ldots \text{ pese louveres } \ldots \) (+ \( S_1 \))
Rest : \( \ldots \text{ ye louveris } \ldots \)
\( J \text{ the for ye} \)

1314. \( \ldots \text{ sent right now } \ldots \) (\( - D, + R \))
\( H_3 \text{ now ryght send} \)
Rest : \( \ldots \text{ right now sent } \ldots \)

1517. \( \text{ClADH}_2\text{Ph } + S_1 \text{ So after pat } \ldots \)
\( (D \text{ so afterwarde}) \)
\( \text{CpH}_1S_2\text{DigH}_3 \text{ And after that } \ldots \)
Rest : \( \text{Soone aftir pat } \ldots \)
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 knowen 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. \(H_4R + D\) omit pan

Rest: ... pan is ...

\((H_2Ph\) is pan\)

589. \(H_4\) Nay nay therof speke not a ha quod she
R Nay nay there of ne spake not I quod sche

Rest: Nay therof spak I not ha ha quod she

\((H_2\) om. Nay; Cl om. ha ha\)

597. \(RCx + H_3\) A lord ...
\(\gamma JH_4\) And lord ...
\(H_2PhGgH_5\) 3e lord ...

†644. \(H_4Cx + H_3\) omit And

†653. \(H_4R\) omit right

†724. \(H_4R\) omit certeyn

†752. \(H_4R\) ... in lusti ese

Rest: ... in lusty lese

864. \(H_4Cx\) ... *to looke ...

Rest: ... to se ...

†905. \(H_4R\) ... & 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 wol)

Rest: No panne wolde I quod he so ye endite

\((H_2H_4\) so pat 3e; S_1 quod he wolde I; A so ye wol endite\)

†1280. \(H_4Cx\) omit hire; R the for hire.

†1286. \(H_4Cx\) omit second youre.

1455. \(H_4R\) She nedith not ...
\(H_2PhCx\) So nedith not ...

Rest: It nedeth nought ...

1546. \(RCx\) ... gyse

Rest: ... wyse

1644. \(RCx + S_1\) Crysseide anon my lady ...

Rest: omit anon
Readings of $H_4 \text{RCx}$ and of $H_3 \text{Cx}$.

1715. $H_4 \text{R}$ ... my ladies twyne

Rest: ... my lorde twyne

Ladies is repeated from 1714.

1741. $H_4$ Sekirly ...

Cx And sikerly ...

Rest: Secundelich ...

(H$_5$ 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.

$H_3 \text{Cx}.$

130. ... som Iape I trowe it is ($+ A$)

Rest: ... is þis

(H$_2$ Ph ywis)

154. That was the wal of Troie ...

(H$_3$ tho wal)

Rest: That was þe townes wal ...

593. ... that helmed is with stele

Rest: ... of stel

(R in stele)

†613. Omit right

924. That at the last ... ($+ Cl$)

(H$_3$ tho last)

Rest: Til at the last ...

945. ... go we where the liste

Rest: ... do we as þe lest

(GgH$_5$H$_4$R 3e for þe; S$_1$ whan the lest; D you for þe)

†978. ... god so me wisse and saue

Rest: ... god so wys me saue

(H$_5$ so wisse me and saue, om. god; JR god so my soule saue)

980. ... oute sterte ($+ H_5$)

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; $H_5$ Beschychg 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

(Cp$H_1ADH_3$ to disporte)

1701. $S_1$ He preyde tham bothe . . .

Cx He prayed hem bothe anon . . .

Rest: He preyede hem anoon . . .

(Gg$H_5JH_2$ preied hem faste)

1712. $S_1$ Into þe chambre on hie and pat in hye

Cx Vnto the chambre aloft and that on hy

Rest: Into þe grete chambre and þat yn hye

($H_5$ on for yn)

We have already recorded a series of striking agreements of JR$H_4$ 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 $S_1Cx$ and of JR.

403. ... growe ... ($+ \gamma$)

Rest: ... waxen ...

$\text{(H}_2\text{Ph wox)}$

516. And I afer gan romen to and fro

$\text{(J gan for to romen; R afer)}$

$\text{H}_2\text{Ph} \quad \text{And yn a fere ...}$

$\text{GgH}_5\text{H}_4\text{H}_3\text{Cx} \quad \text{And I aftir ...}$

$\gamma \quad \text{AD} \quad \text{And I þerafter ...}$

$\text{AD} \quad \text{And after gan I rome ...}$

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 Mou-tier'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 ...

$\text{(H}_4\text{H}_5 \text{om. pat)}$

†656. And with that worde ...

Rest: And wip pat þought ...

$\text{(H}_2\text{Ph And for pat þoght)}$

The context makes clear that þought is the correct reading.

745. ... my thought

Rest: ... þis þought

†751. ... of myn estat

Rest: ... after myn estat

$\text{(Cx for for after)}$

775. ... by oother folk ...

Rest: ... in ower folk ...

814. Into hir gardyn with hir neces thre

Rest: Into þe gardeyn ...

$\text{(H}_2\text{Ph a gardyn)}$

864. ... on hym ...

Rest: ... on it ...
925. ... right ther ...

Rest: ... right po ...

(Cx om. po)

†978. ... god so my soule saue

Rest: ... god so wys me saue

(H3Cx god so me wisse and saue; H5 so wisse me and saue)

A hypermetrical line.

1083. ... endles for ay and o

GgH5H4(H2Ph) ... enfeyned for ay & o

γH3CxS1 ... 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

(H4 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, H2Ph read fully the, omitting ther, and H5 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 GgH5; and in four of these agreements H4 also shares. Earlier in the book occur two instances of JGgH5 + R.

JGgH5.

551. ... he for loue was pale and wan (+ R)

Rest: ... for wo ...

For loue is repeated from 550.
Readings of JGgH₅.

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 ye loue of me . . .

1292. To graunten hym yit so grete a liberte (+ Cx)

       Rest: To graunten hym so gret a liberte
       (H₂PhA graunt; H₄ line entirely corrupt)

1333. Right so encresseth hope . . . (+ D)

       Rest: . . . eneres of hope . . .
       (H₄ thencrest)

1383. . . makith it . . .

       (H₅ makit hym)

       Rest: . . . doth it . . .

   Though JGgH₅ agree in reading makith, later in the line Gg agrees with H₂PhCx in reading falle instead of come. See above, p. 112.

1433. And preyen . . . (+ H₄)

       Rest: To prayen . . .

1455. . . . hise helpis moore craue (+ H₄)

       (Gg helpe; H₅ om. his; H₄ to craue)

       H₂Ph . . . vs more help to craue

       Rest: . . . his helpes for to craue

       (Cx . . . his help now for to craue)

1550. To ben good frend . . .

       S₁ To ben good lord . . .

       Rest: To ben a frend . . .

1596. But for o fyn . . . (+ H₄)

       Rest: For for o fyn . . .

       (H₁ glosses quia propter. H₂Ph For o peyn; Cx for al is for a fyne)
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1688. \[\ldots\] yif it your wille be \((+ S_1)\)
\((H_5 \text{ om. it})\)

*Rest*: \[\ldots\] and it youre wille be
\((Cx \text{ yit for it})\)

1691. \(JR\) Yif \(\mathfrak{p}\)at ye vouch sauf \ldots
\(GgH_5\) \(\mathfrak{J}\)if pat pou vouche saf \ldots
\((H_5 \text{ om. pat})\)

*Rest*: If that she vouche saf \ldots

1701. \[\ldots\] faste \ldots

*Rest*: \[\ldots\] anoon \ldots
\((S_1 \text{ bothe}; Cx \text{ bothe anon})\)

†1733. O nece \ldots \((+ H_4)\)

*Rest*: Nece \ldots

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. \((Gg)H_5H_4\ldots\) demyn \ldots

*Rest*: \[\ldots\] luggen \ldots

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

117. \(H_3\) It sat me wel bette ay ben in a caue
\(Cx\) It sit me wel bet to ben in a caue
\(H_4\) It sat me weel bet to be in a caue

*Rest*: It sat me wel bet ay in a caue
\((Cp \text{ satte}; H_1J \text{ sate}; R \text{ sat to me}; CIH_1J \text{ om. a})\)

The reading of \(\gamma H_2Ph\), 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. \(GgH_5H_4\ldots\) wel more \ldots

*Rest*: Omit wel

159. \(\gamma(-S_2\text{Dig})JR\ldots\) al vertu \ldots

*Rest*: \[\ldots\] euery vertu \ldots

\((S_2\text{Dig euere}; Gg \text{ vertu euery corrected to vertu euere})\)

296. \(H_3H_4 + AD \text{ omit wel}\)
\((Gg \text{ zi for wel}; Cx \text{ lacking})\)
Scattering Agreements.

357. \( \text{Gg} \) jour myn a bek
\( \text{H}_5 \) . . . advice
\( \text{R} \) . . . doyng
\( \text{Cx} \) . counsayl
\( \text{H}_2 \text{Ph} \) . . . abettyng

\text{Rest:} . . . abet

(H\textsubscript{4} habit; JD abit)

These may well be independent attempts to emend a rare word not understood by the scribe.

434. \( \text{JRH}_4 \text{H}_3 \) . . . were . . .

\text{Rest:} . . . is . . .

461. \( \text{H}_4 \text{S}_1 \) . . . wil deeme of it . . .

\text{Rest:} . . . wolde of it deme . . .

(Cl of it wold deme; Cx wyl it deme; GgH\textsubscript{5} don)

466. \( \text{H}_4 \text{Cx} + \text{Ph} + \text{Cl} \) And eek myn emys lyf lith in balauns

(H\textsubscript{4} loue for lyf)
\( \text{H}_2 \text{GgH}_5 \text{R} \) . . . lyf in a balaunce

(H\textsubscript{2} om. a)

\text{Rest:} . . . lif is in balaunce

(S\textsubscript{2} Dig is now in balaunce)

\text{Lith} has been repeated from 465, \textit{For myn estat lith in (a) Iupartye}. Either Ph has introduced the word independently or, more probably, \( \text{H}_5 \) has dropped it because of its similarity to \textit{lyf}. It is just possible that we have here the traces of an authentic revision. The reading of GgH\textsubscript{5}R is entirely possible.

485. \( \text{GgS}_1 \) . . . pis mater . . .

\text{Rest:} . . . pis proces . . .

Since \( \text{H}_5 \) does not share the Gg reading, one must conclude that the agreement of GgS\textsubscript{1} is due to coincidence in independent error.

†535. \( \text{H}_4 \text{H}_5 \) . . . grounded
\( \text{Gg} \) . . . foundit

\text{Rest:} . . . Isounded

(Ph woundid; A Iswounde)

†640. \( \text{GgH}_5 \text{R} \) . . . with swerdis \& with macis

\text{Rest: omit second} with

751. \( \text{GgH}_5 \text{H}_4 \) \textit{Omit it}
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768. JGgH₂γS₁ . . . 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 sanded 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 woemen for to calle
      H₄H₅ . . . in to call
      H₄Ph . . . 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 feyr
      Cx . . . wyth his people in feere
      H₅ . . . with his folk in feere
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 propre.

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 GgH₅ associated with H₂Ph in presenting unrevised readings. Up to line 1200, then, where the character of its readings is changed, GgH₅ 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 GgH₅ 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: H₂PhGgH₅, γH₃CxS₁, and JRH₄. It is to be noted that S₁ ceases to be a γ MS. after line 617, and that H₃ 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, H₂PhGgH₅ 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 H₂PhGgH₅, 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, $H_2Ph$ omit the line and JR occupy a place midway between $GgHgH_4$ and $\gamma H_3CxS_1$. In lines 721, 731, 736–7, 760–1, 813, 859, 1113, JRH$_4$ agree in a variant reading as against all the rest. In lines 701, 792, 825, 897, 908, 922–3, 945, 1093, and 1095–7 $\gamma H_3CxS_1$ agree in a variant reading as against all the rest; and to this list may be added line 1085 in which J agrees with $\gamma H_3CxS_1$. 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 JRH$_4$Cx, and where $\gamma$ is generally in accord with $a$. We should say that $H_2PhGgH_5$ 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 $\gamma H_3CxS_1$; 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 H$_4$.

But if we turn to the lines in which $\gamma H_3CxS_1$ present the variant, we shall find that the $\gamma H_3CxS_1$ 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 $\gamma H_3CxS_1$ 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 $\gamma H_3CxS_1$ reading is somewhat nearer the Italian, this cannot alone counterbalance the presumption that $H_2PhGgH_5$ represent an earlier state of the text.

If the $\gamma H_3CxS_1$ readings represent a later, revised text, how is one to explain the fact that they are not found in JRH$_4$? We must assume that a revised reading, made after the derivation of $H_2PhGgH_5$, is adopted by $\gamma$, by $H_3$, by Cx, by $S_1$, and is then rejected by J, by R, by H$_4$. For outside of this passage there is no evidence that J, R, and H$_4$ 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 H$_4$ 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
Readings Characteristic of \( \gamma \).

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 \( H_2 \)PhGgH\(_5\), and \( \beta \), represented by JRH\(_4\)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 \( \gamma \), \( H_2 \)Ph, and GgH\(_5\).

\( \gamma \) includes, as always, MSS. ClCpH\(_1\)S\(_2\)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.

\[ \text{ClCpH}_1S_2\text{DigAD}(\gamma) \]

\( \dagger 49 \). To which who nede hath god hym brynge (\(+ H_8\))

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 . . .

\( \text{Wordes is certainly a better reading. Cf. 97 and 100.} \)

\( \dagger 101 \). As feythfully . . . (\(+ H_3\))

Rest: As ferforthly . . .

\( \text{(JGg ferforthlich)} \)

The context makes clear that \textit{ferforthly} is correct.

\( \dagger 110 \). If with my deth youre herte may apese (\(+ H_3S_1 + Cx + H_2\))

Rest: . . . youre wretethe may apese

\( \text{(Ph 3our wrath may y apese; Gg 3oure wrepe I may apese)} \)

The \( \gamma \) reading is clearly erroneous. \textit{Herte} is repeated from 109.
But note that Cx, as well as H₃S₁, read herte. The agreement of H₂ I regard as coincidence, since Ph reads wrath. H₂PhGg (but not H₅) read y may or may y.

111. But syn þat ye ...
Rest: For sithen ye ...
(H₃R For syn that)
The context strongly favours For rather than But.

†119. ... er þat ye wende (+ H₄)
Rest: ... er ye wende
(J er we wende; Cx or we hens wende)
A hypermetrical line.

130. ... som tymé frenedly on me se (+ H₃ + H₄)
(H₁ freshly)
Rest: ... frenedly somtyme ...
(H₂PhH₅ om. frenedly; H₂ on me rue and se; Gg frenli sumtyme)
The omission by H₂PhH₅ (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 (+ H₃)
(H₃ ful softly)
Rest: ... but seyde hym sobrely
(Gg sekyrly)

188, 189. With outen hond me semeth þat in þe towne
For this merueyle I here eche belle sowne (- AD)
(S₂Dig Of pis marvelle I here þe belles sowne)
Rest: ...
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 γ original.

203. ... right as I yow deuyse (+ H₃)
JGg ... right as thow wolt deuyse
H₅ ... right as I woll deuise
H₂PhCx ... right as y devise
H₄ ... 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  . . . mery cheere (+ H₃)
    Rest : . . . blissful cheere

*256.  Al sey I nought þow wost wel what I mene (+ H₃S₁)
    R  Al seye I noght thow wost what I wolde mene
    Rest : Thow wost thi seluen what I wolde meene
    (H₂Cx what þat y wold mene)

We have here apparently a revision reading not adopted by JH₄Cx. Note that R agrees with γ only in the first half of the line. The reading wel what I mene must be regarded as merely a γ variant.

301.  Al seyde men soth . . . (+ H₃S₁)
    (AD lacking)
    Rest : Thogh men soth seide . . .

319.  That þet bihyghte hem neuere . . . (− Cl, + H₃)
    (AD lacking; H₃ There thai behight hem)
    Rest : That neuere yit behight them . . .
    (Cx That neuer yit in earnest nor in game)

354.  . . . liketh . . . (AD lacking)
    Rest : . . . listeth . . .

†412.  Omit me

427.  . . . his gode gouernaunce (+ H₃S₁)
    Rest : . . . his wyse gouernaunce

438.  This . . . (− A)
    (D omits line)
    Rest : That . . .

459.  Wolde of hem two . . . (+ H₃)
    H₂PhGgH₅ Wold in þis speche . . .
    JRH₄(Cx)S₁ Wolde on this thing . . .
    (R of for on)

For discussion of this line see below, p. 148.

461.  . . . grace . . . (+ H₃S₁ + R)
    Rest : . . . space . . .

The context favours space.  See below, p. 148.
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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 þerto his aray (− AD, + H₃)

(H₃ ther to and; S₂ ðare with his Aray)

Rest: ... and thereto 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 þat ...

(H₃ And yf that; H₄ That yif he)

558. Ne lengere don him ... (+ H₃)

(H₃ Ne lengere 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 my trowhte ...

Rest: Now by my trowthe ...

For is repeated from 635.
692. \ldots wight \ldots ( + H_3S_1 + R)

Rest: \ldots man \ldots

†722. Omit O (−H_1)

In S_1 the interjection, O, which begins a stanza, is made a two-line illuminated initial. Apparently the γ original planned for such an initial which was never executed. Hence the loss of O, corrected, however, by H_1.

†758. Omit thus ( + H_3 + R)

810. \ldots perof \ldots ( + H_3S_1 + R)

Rest: \ldots of pat \ldots
(H_5 of pis)

†833. Thow mysbelewed 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
(GgH_5H_3 falle)

A nine-syllable line in γ.

880. But of malis if pat I shal nought lye ( + H_3S_1)
(H_1 of for if)

Rest: Omit pat

A nine-syllable line in aβ.

913. Ne \ldots ( + H_3S_1)

Rest: And \ldots

†931. A dulcarnon \ldots
(Cl At altered to A)

Rest: At dulcarnoun \ldots
(H_2Ph Bulcarnon)

1073. \ldots and \ldots

Rest: \ldots or \ldots

1119. And \ldots

Rest: So \ldots

1153. She bad hym pat to telle \ldots
(H_1 Sho bad him for to tel pat)

a pat badde sche him to telle \ldots
(Gg om. hym)

βH_5S_1 This bad she hym to telle \ldots
(H_3 Thus; Cx lacking)
1157. Hym ... (−ClD)

Rest: He ...

An obvious error corrected by Cl and D.

1165. For by pat god pat bought vs bofe two (+H₃)

Rest: ... wroght vs ...

1192. ... hym ... (−Cl)

Rest: ... it ...

1202. But ...

Rest: And ...

1203. ... the blysful goldes 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

(H₃S₂ fere)

ClPh(H₂) ... pat ye woole 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 wroght me for I shal yow serve, which requires the reading he wol in 1291.

1373. Lord trowe ye a coueytous or a wrecche (−Α, + J)

(J or a by corrector; D lacking)

Gg omits or

AH₃RH₃ omit or a

Ph(H₁₂)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 ony 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 stringe 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 blede

(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 hondred sithe he gan pe tyme blysse

(Cl A hondred; ClD 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 allass (− S₂A)

†1708. ... don here sacrifice (− A, + S₁)

Rest: ... don hym sacrifise

The pronoun refers to the sun. All MSS. correctly read hym in 1707.

1723. ... was of hym ... (+ S₁)

Rest: ... of hym was ...

1748. Loue ſat knetteth lawe of companye (+ H₃S₁)

(H₁ knetteth; H₃ kennyth; H₁S₂ and for of)

Rest: Loue ſat enditeth ...

(H₅ endith; Cx endueth; R endyth written and deleted before endyteth; 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 sacrum 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 enditeth 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.
1754. Holden a bond perpetuely durynge (+ H₃S₁ + H₄)
(H₃A aboute for a bond; H₃ doyng)

Rest: Holde in a bond . . .
(H₃ lacking; Ph Holdyn yn a bonde, passage later on
inset leaf)

That the γ reading is correct is proved by the Latin, Foedus perpetuum tenent, Boeth., Book 2, Metre 8. The error of αβ, however, is of a sort very easy to fall into.

Within the γ 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 S₂ continues unbroken. By way of attestation I have selected the following typical cases:

S₂ 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
(H₃ Ph blabbe; H₄ to labbyn)

†306. . . vertew
Rest: . . . vntrewe

†311. Me to loue and seyth . . .
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. 45ᵇ 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. 41ᵇ and 365 at the top of 42ᵃ, 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 γ
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 a readings in lines 1348, 1389, and 1390. (See below, p. 154.) In 1351 AH5 omit Ioye, and in 1365 AH5 read neuere 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 a type closely related to GgH5.

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 ūat

33. AD + H2Ph . . . may . . .
Rest: . . . kan . . .

†124. ADH3 + H2Ph omit ūanne

†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.
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242. $\text{AS}_1$ For sorewe . . .
Rest: For loue . . .

263. $\text{AH}_3$ . . . ful nygh . . .
Rest: . . . wel nygh . . .
(R om. wel)

†450. $AD$ That in pis mene while . . .
$\alpha\gamma$ That in pis while . . .
$\beta S_1$ This mene while . . .
AD present a conflate reading.

†462. $\text{ADS}_1$ . . . pis ping . . .
Rest: . . . here speche . . .
(H$_3$ hire Porpos)

†503. $\text{ADS}_1$ . . . me lyst . . .
Rest: . . . hym lyst . . .

†690. $\text{DS}_1H_3$ . . . daunce
Rest: . . . traunce
(H$_2$ taunce)

756. $\text{DH}_3$ . . . rise to here . . .
Rest: . . . ryse and heren . . .
(H$_4$ ne for and)

799. $AD$ . . . wordes . . .
$\text{ClS}_1$ . . . pytynes . . .
Rest: . . . wonder . . .

884. $\text{ADS}_1$ . . . jerwith shal ye . . .
Rest: . . . ye jerwith shal . . .

1096. $AD$ . . . and . . .
Rest: . . . but . . .

1137. $\text{AH}_3$ . . . syke mennes . . .
Rest: . . . syke folkes . . .

1156. $AD$ . . . soothly . . . (A sooth)
Rest: . . . shortly . . .

†1174. $\text{AHI}_3$ omit first pat

1183. $\text{DH}_3 + H_2\text{Ph}$ . . . dere herte
Rest: . . . swete herte

1308. $\text{DS}_1$ But . . .
Rest: And . . .
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1451. AS₁ . . . hid . . .
Rest: . . . stole . . .

1526. D . . . saue and sound . . .
H₃ . . . sounde and sauf . . .
Rest: . . . sound and soone . . .
(H₃ son and sownd; Gg om. sound and)

†1531. AD omit hard

1744. AH₃ . . . se and erth . . .
(H₃ see and of erthe)
Rest: . . . erpe and se . . .

†1754. AH₃ Holden aboute . . .
Rest: Holden a bond . . .
(GgH₅JRCx[Ph] Hold in)

A clear proof that H₃ is deriving from a MS. like A. In A pe wey, originally omitted, is written above no wight without further indication. Note also 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 γ MSS., which points to the presence of corrections or alternative readings in the γ original. The more important of these agreements are given in the following list:

Scattering Agreements of γ MSS.

91. ClCH₁ I yow wolde telle . . .
Rest: I wol yow telle . . .

†258. CpH₁ . . . gentileste . . .
Rest: . . . gentilesse (or gentilnesse)

259. CpH₁ . . . ben shal . . .
Rest: . . . shal ben . . .
Scattering Agreements of \( \gamma \) MSS.

293. \( \text{CpS}_2 \text{Dig} \) Han euere thus . . .
\( \text{H}_1 \text{H}_3 \) Han euere this . . .

Rest: Han euere yet . . .

\((H_2 \text{ om. } \text{yet}; \beta \text{ varies})\)

†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 \( \text{fat} \) . . .

\((R \text{ om. } \text{fat}; \text{H}_5 \text{ the whiche})\)

†595. \( \text{ClAD} \) . . . \( \text{vnto } \text{pe souper} \) . . .

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 \( \text{fat} \)

928. \( \text{CpH}_1 \text{S}_2 \text{A} \) . . . grace hadde . . .

\((A \text{ passage written by later hand in space left})\)

Rest: . . . hadde grace . . .

1291. \( \text{H}_1 \text{S}_2 \) . . . fere

Rest: . . . stere

†1419. \( \text{ClAD} + \text{GgH}_5 \) . . . afterward . . .

\((D \text{ after } \text{fat})\)

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 . . .

\((\text{AS}_4 \text{j enuye and ire}; D \text{ om. Ire})\)
Of the combinations noted above, the commonest are $CpH_1$ and $CpH_1S_2(Dig)$; 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 $H_3$ and $S_1$ 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 $H_2Ph$. The instances I have collected are very numerous; but I shall give only the most striking cases. Though lines 1079–1638 of $H_2$ are by hand 2, the close relationship with Ph is not broken.

$H_2Ph.$

13. 

Rest: And in pis world . . .

(13AS_1 word)

98. . . . mercy my dere hert

Rest: . . . mercy swete herte

A hypermetrical line.

137. . . . eke to al myn offence

Rest: . . . egal to myn offence

199. . . . þer y-now

Rest: . . . þer with he lough

220. That yaf ful lightly of þe pace

Rest: That gan ful lightly of the lettre passe

$H_1$ ful lightly gan; $H_3$ lightfully; $GgH_5$ pis lettre; $H_4$ That tenquire aftir the lettre was desirous)

265. . . . help her out of blame

Rest: . . . kep hire out of blame

304. . . . þe tyme þat y was born

Rest: . . . þe day . . .

(GgH_5 þat euere; JH_4 þat day)
†349. And al þe rehetyn 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.*

391. Right as thyth own ...

Rest: Right as pi sclaue ...

(GgRH₄ knaue; H₅ as I can; A felawe; Cl knaue, kn corrected)

†468. ... al þogh he come late

Rest: ... þat loue al come it late

501. ... lettre ...

Rest: ... epistle ...

(GgH₅ pistil)

†571. 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 heuce I pose that he where there

H₄R And seide 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.*

†593. ... Mancalus ...

Rest: ... Tantalus ...

†656. ... an honge payn

Rest: ... an huge rayn

†671. Goth yn anone ...

Rest: The wyn anon ...

(H₅ Let all alone; Cx The wyn was brought; H₃ To wyn anon)

766, 767. Your wymmen all y dare vndirtake

Slepe þat for hem men myght pis house myne

Rest: Youre 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)
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The reading of $H_5$, *I dar vnulirtake*, suggests that the $H_2$Ph reading may originally have stood in the common ancestor of $H_2$Ph and $GgH_5$; 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 neipr good ne gentilnesse

Rest: Ye neypyr bounte don ne gentilesse

($H_5$ bote; $JRH_4$ wisdom; Cx Neyther 30 wysely don)

†946. . . quod Pandare . . .

Rest: . . quod he . . .

1062. . . comith . . .

Rest: . . folweth . . .

1063, 1064. . . and eke men rede in story

bat after sharp shoures is oft victory

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. his liȝt nece I ne serueȝ here of nouȝt

$\gamma H_3 S_1$ This lyght nor I ne seruen . . .

$Gg$ his liȝt ne I seruyn . . .

$H_5$ This lygth ne seruit . . .

$\beta$ I nor this candel seruyn . . .

(R me thynk this candel serueuth; Cx lacking)

†1187. He hir in hise armes to him fast hente

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: Benynge loue thow holy bond of thynge

($H_5$ 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 $GgH_5$ originally had the corrupt reading of $H_2$Ph. The rime word in 1283 is *benygnite*.

(Lines 1289–1428 are lacking in $H_2$)
Readings of $H_2$ Ph.

†1465.  Wel mowen manye men pee dispise
(Ph om. mowen, owʒ inserted later before mony)

Rest:  And seyde o fol wel may men pee dispise
(Cx om. o)

1504.  ... herte ...

Rest:  ... brayn ...

†1600  ... pee firy feende of helle

Rest:  ... flood ...
(With line 1639 begins again hand 1 of $H_2$.)

†1679.  ... hem two ...

Rest:  ... hem bope ...

1744–1771. Troilus's song to love is omitted by $H_2$ 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 $H_2$ Ph 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.
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†171, 172.  Ye schal no more han soveraynte of me
In loue ...
(Gg seurete)

Rest:  Ye shul nomore haue soueraynte
Of me in loue ...
(H₂Ph Of my love)

277.  ... wolde on it gauere & crie
(H₅ on pat)

Rest:  ... wolde vpon it crye
(y vpon it wolde; H₄ wolde on me pleyne & cry; R wolden on yt)

357.  pat gladere was pan ony man in troye
(H₅ of troye)

Rest:  That gladder was þere neuer 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
(H₂Ph to lout)

756.  Let hem not rysen ...

Rest:  Lat no wight rysen ...

†970.  Of deynte ...
(H₅ As deynte)

Rest:  Of duete ...

†1071.  ... so streynede him ...

Rest:  ... to streyne 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 pat 3e ben...
H₅ For suche pat 3e ben...
Rest: Fox pat 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 hope for saue; in 391 GgH₅R₄ read knaue for scnaue. 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 pe lest (+ H₄)
Rest: ... what pe 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 pis mater of 432.

439. ... pe most parte... (+ RCx)
Rest: ... pe more part...
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*459. . . in pis speche . . .
(H_5 his)
\(\beta S_1\) . . . on this thing . . .
(R of)
\(\gamma H_3\) . . . of hem two . . .

We have here one of the rare instances in which \(a, \beta,\) and \(\gamma\) present three distinct readings. The \(\gamma\) 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 \(\gamma\) *this it must go back for its reference to line 456.*

461. . . . space . . . (+ \(J H_4\))

*Rest: . . . grace . . .
(Cx lacking)*

The context favours *space* as the correct reading. It is also the *durior lectio.*

524. Ne . . .

(H_5 Nor)

*Rest: And . . .

And is clearly preferable; but *Ne*, though awkward, is not impossible.

*543. Or \(\varphi\)at the god ou\(\lambda\)t spak out of the tre

(H_2 Ph *om. ou\(\lambda\)t*)

*Rest: Er \(\varphi\)at Apollo spak out of the tre

(A ought *for out*; \(H_4\) 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 pe chaungyng of the moné

(H_2 Ph vp chaungyng)

*Rest: Right soone . . .

558. Ne done hym lenger . . .

\(\gamma H_3\) Ne lengere don hym . . .

\(\beta S_1\) Ne make hym lenger . . .

The \(\gamma\) reading seems to be a simple case of transposition. The revision, if any, is between \(a\gamma\) and \(\beta.\)
And of her wymmen wele a nyne or ten
(H₂Ph om. of; GgH₅ om. a)

Rest: And opere of here wommen nyne or ten
(D om. opere; H₃ of hir fayr wommen)

But who is glad . . .

Rest: But who was glad . . .

Thurgh out an hole wiþ yn a litil stewe
(Gg of a lityl stewe; H₅ a lytyll hole of a stewe)

Rest: Thurgh out a lytel wyndowe in a stuwe
(Cx om. out; D fewe for stewe)

. . . þat best coufe devise (+ H₃)

Rest: . . . that koude best deuyse

The ßγ reading is metrically better.

I mene it now for she gan home to hye
(H₅ om. to)

Rest: This mene I now for she gan homward hye
(ClAD om. now; D can hem ward)

Þat madyn such a reyne fro hevyn a vale
(Gg heue)

Rest: That swych a rayn from heuene gan a vale

At which Pandare lough . . .

Rest: At which pandare po lough . . .
(R that logh; Cx lough tho)

H₂ + D . . . frendly wiþ a frendis chere
Ph . . . prevy . . .
Gg H₅ . . . frely . . .

Rest: . . . gladly . . .

. . . seth þat 3e wolyi dwell (+ J)
(Gg syn 3e wele with me dwelle; H₅ om. seth)

Rest: . . . syn þat yow lyst to dwelle
(Cx om. to)

And . . .

Rest: But . . .

Whan þat he wist . . .

Rest: Whan þat 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 aγH₃ 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. ... scid ... (+ 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 loue 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)
857.  
Hit nEdith more . . .
(H₅ þe more)
REst:  Wel more nede is it . . .
(Clr om. Wel; H₄ now for nede; Cx myster for
nede; R nede it is; H₃ is nede hit; A om. it)

875.  
I pray to god y neuer more have ioy (+ H₃)
(H₃ om. to; neuer moot; Gg neuermore haue I)
REst:  I bidde god I neuere mot haue Ioye
(S₁H₄ paT I; H₄ neuermore; Cx neuer more haue I;
R I haue neuere Ioye)

889.  
Is nedeles . . .
(H₅ endles)
REst:  Is causeles . . .

922.  
. . . tho . . . (+ J)
REst:  . . . þanne . . .

924.  
. . . for . . .
REst:  . . . syn . . .

933.  
. . . clepid . . .
REst:  . . . called . . .

934.  
. . . wrecchis nel hit lere
(H₂Ph here for lere)
REst:  . . . wrecches wol not lere

953.  
This Troylus on knees sone hym set
(Gg kneis; H₅ kne)
REst:  . . . ful sone on kneis hym sette
(H₄ knowes; J knowe; R om. hym)

The a reading is metrically deficient unless one reads a dis-
syllabic kneês or knowes; but in Troil. 3. 1592 the word has
dissyllabic value in all the MSS. (CpH₁AJ read knowes, GgS₁
kneis, ClH₃CxH₄R knees, and H₅ know). Cf. also Prioress's Tale
1719 and Franklin's Tale 1025. In Gower the word is regularly
monosyllabic, knes. It is a monosyllable in 1080.

957.  
H₅Ph  And þough she shold anon have be dede
H₅  And þow she anon shulde haue ben ded
Gg Leavès line blank.
REst:  Ne þough men sholden smyten of here hed
(S₁ þough þat)
The a reading as given by $H_2$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 pat after poynh 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. $H_2$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

($H_3$ om. se; $H_1$ 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: 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. ... no wight ...

Rest: ... no man ...

†1014. ... her ... (— Ph)

Rest: ... his ...

Ph has corrected an obvious slip. The pronouns he and hym are found in all MSS. in 1013, and hym again in 1015. All refer to Ielosye.

1041. ... clepe ...

Rest: ... calle ...

Cf. line 933.

1046. Wheper ye wil ...

($H_2$Ph Wher ye wil; Gg wolde)

Rest: Wher so yow lys ... 

(Cx Whether so; R Wher so euer; A om. yow)

The $\beta\gamma$ reading is preferable; but the a reading is possible.

1063. Folk sene ...

Rest: Men sen ...

($H_3$ For men seyn)

The reading of $H_3$ looks like a conflation, with Folk changed to For.
1067. Eke it pought hym .
Rest: For it poughte hym .

1079. . . his heede (+ H₃R)
Rest: . . . pe hed

1082. . . sche pat schulde his daies liȝt
(Gg he)
Rest: . . . his sorwes lyghte
(H₃ om. lyghte)

Though the α reading is not impossible, I suspect that it is due to a scribe.

†1084. þus seide he ȝet god woot of pis game
(Gg god wot ȝit)
Rest: Than seyde he þus god wot þat of pis game
(H₄R om. þat; Cx grame)

The omission of þat, which H₄R share with α, is certainly an error.

†1086. Therwith for sorwȝ so his hert swette
(H₂Ph þat for so; H₂ swelt; Gg schette; H₅ swett)
Rest: Ther with þe sorwe so his herte shette
(A om. þe; Cx of for so; H₃ 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 allas for schame
Rest: What Troylus wol ye do þus for shame
(A om. ye; H₄ 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 . . .
(H₁ for to tel þat)
βS₁H₃ This bad she hym to telle . . .
(H₃ Thus)

I regard γ as a mere scribal variant of α. The difference between α and β is trivial.
1163. ... answeride him ...
Rest: Omit him.

1250. Hir snowe whit þroote ... (+ H₃R)
(H₂Þh On hir)
Rest: Here snowyssh þrote ...

†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 3oures ... (− Gg)
(H₅ youre)
Rest: For I am þyn ...

1554. At suche a plyt ... (− 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.
*1643. ... al day pis pying ... (+ A)
   (H₅ al wey; Gg₄ pis pyng al day)

Rest: ... pis materc 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, α 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 H₂ 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.¹ The source from which Ph has drawn the stanzas is clearly a MS. of the γ type closely related to H₁. In 1748 Ph reads knyttith with γ instead of enditeth; and in 1755 rosy carte with H₁ instead of rosy day.

Since these stanzas are omitted only by H₂ 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 þan he wold syng in þis 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 H₂ 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 þan he wold syng in þis manere, was followed by a blank space. During this state of the text the ancestor of H₂ Ph must have been derived.

If so, how are we to explain the presence of the passage in GgH₅? Two explanations suggest themselves. Either the ancestor of GgH₅ 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 GgH\textsubscript{5} ancestor was derived. As between these two explanations the evidence does not permit of any decision. In 1751 GgH\textsubscript{5} have the corrupt reading \textit{unstable} of JH\textsubscript{4} instead of \textit{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.\textsuperscript{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 JH\textsubscript{4}RCx agree as against α and γ. With these β MSS. are sometimes associated H\textsubscript{3} and S\textsubscript{1}, which in other lines, as we have seen, are associated, now one, now both, with γ. So varying are H\textsubscript{3} and S\textsubscript{1} 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 H\textsubscript{3} and S\textsubscript{1} agree. H\textsubscript{4} has the two stanzas in \textit{both positions}. In these two stanzas, as we shall see, there are a number of distinctive β readings. H\textsubscript{4} has the two stanzas in the αγ position with αγ readings, and then repeats them in the β position with β readings. Moreover, JH\textsubscript{4}RCx + H\textsubscript{3}S\textsubscript{1} give a variant reading of line 1415 which suits it to a position immediately after the transposed stanzas, and JH\textsubscript{4}RCx + H\textsubscript{2} a variant reading of 1323 which immediately precedes the stanzas in αγ. In S\textsubscript{1} the stanzas have been moved, but 1323 has not been revised. In H\textsubscript{4}, 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 \textit{telle}

\textsuperscript{1} See below, pp. 216–221.
from line 1323 to the first line of the shifted passage. Moreover, had the \( \beta \) 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 \( \beta \) group. It will be noticed that they are much more frequent after line 400.

\[ \text{JH}_4 \text{RCx}(\beta). \]

58. \( \text{JCx} \ldots \) and sor for to sike (\( \text{Cx} \) sore)

\( R \) \( \ldots \) and often sore sike

\( \text{H}_4 \) \( \ldots \) gan ofte forto sike

\( \text{H}_3 \) \( \ldots \) and short gan to syke

\( \text{Rest} : \quad \ldots \text{and short for to syke} \)

The \( \beta \) original must have been confused, since its descendants are so uncertain of the reading.

80. \( \ldots \) to hir seye (\( - \text{H}_4 \))

\( \text{Rest} : \quad \ldots \text{to it seye} \)

82. \( \ldots \) he was \( \ldots \) (\( - J \))

\( \text{Rest} : \quad \ldots \text{he wex} \ldots \)

\( *269. \) For neuer was there wight I dar wel swere

\( \quad (\text{-} \text{R}, + \text{S}_1 + \text{GgH}_5) \)

\( \text{(Cx yit for ther ;}\ \text{H}_5 \text{ pat for ther ;}\ \text{H}_4 \text{ Ne neuer was ther wiht I durste swere)} \)

\( \text{Rest} : \text{For pat man is vnborne dar I swere} \)

\( \quad (\text{Cp I dar wel swere}) \)

A clear case of revision, in which, however, \( R \) retains the earlier reading. \( \text{GgH}_5 \) do not become definitely \( a \) until about line 400 (see above, p. 147).

\( *293. \) Han written or this as yit men teche vs yonge

\( \quad (\text{J men yit ;}\ \text{H}_4 \text{ alwey for or this}) \)

\( \text{Rest} : \text{Han euere yet prouerbed to vs yonge} \)

\( \quad (\text{H}_2 \text{ om. yet ;}\ \text{Ph prouerbyd 3et ;}\ \text{H}_1\text{H}_3 \text{ this for yet ;}\ \text{CpS}_2 \text{Dig thus for yet ;}\ \text{S}_2 \text{Dig pise 3onge}) \)

---

1 One is tempted to seek for some connection between the shifting of stanzas 190 and 191 by \( \beta \) 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 \( \text{H}_2 \) is due to mutilation of the existing MS.
371. ... man ... (− H₄)
   Rest: ... wyght ...

379. 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 ay and that H₄S₁ keep the ay word-order.

396. ... doost me ... (− H₄, + S₁)
   (Cx hast me)
   Rest: ... me dost ...

*442. I nyl nat seyn that thogh he laye ful softe (+ S₁)
   (J om. ful; S₁ though þat; Cx lacking)
   Rest: Nyl I nought swere al þough he lay softe
   The ay 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.

444. And ... (+ S₁)
   (Cx lacking)
   Rest: Ne ...

448. This ... (+ H₃S₁)
   (Cx lacking)
   Rest: That ...

449. And ... (+ S₁)
   (Cx lacking)
   Rest: But ...

*450. This mene while ... (+ S₁)
   (Cx lacking)
   Rest: That in þis while ...
   (CpH₁S₂ Dig which for while; AD That in þis mene while)
   Note the conflate reading of AD.

*455. In euery thing ... (+ S₁)
   (Cx lacking)
   Rest: So as þey dorste ...
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 thogh . . .
(Cx lacking)

Rest : . . . she poughte . . .
(Cp he thought)

this fir (− Cx)

Rest : . . . be fyr

wight . . . (+ S₁)

Rest : . . . man . . .

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 every 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; H₃ om. second or)

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 . . ( + S_1)
Rest: Hadde out of doute . .
(Gg Lad for Hadde; H_5 And for Hadde)

525. That thoughte he . . ( + S_1)
(Cx He thought)
Rest: That wyst he . .

528. Thus . . ( + S_1)
Rest: Now . .

529. . . bothe wild and tame ( + H_3 S_1)
Rest: . . bope fremed and tame
(H_2 PhGg 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; H_4 om. the)
Rest: To telle hym next whan grekes sholden fle
(H_2 Ph whan pat pe grekis; Gg whi pe grekys; DS_1 whan pe grekes)
The readings of H_2 Ph and Gg suggest that the line may first have stood: To telle hym next whan pe grekes sholde fle. This was then emended by y by dropping pe (note, however, the reading of DS_1), and later by B by dropping next.

*546. But prey appollo pat he wolde hym spede
(R wel for wolde; H_4 wil for wolde)
Rest: . . helpen in pis nede
(H_2 PhD help hym in his nede; H_3 that he helpe; H_5 to helpen)

554. Whan he was there . . ( + S_1)
Rest: Whan he was come . .
(Cl whanne)

555. . . at hym self . . ( + S_1 + D)
Rest: . . of himself . .

558. Ne make hym lenger . . ( + S_1)
\( \alpha \) Ne done hym lenger . .
\( \gamma H_3 \) Ne lengere don hym . .
(H_3 hym doon)
I regard the \( \gamma H_3 \) reading as a scribal transposition of \( \alpha \).
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*568. And she agayne gan to hym for to rowne
(\text{H}_4 \text{Cx om. first} \text{to} ; \text{H}_4 \text{on game for agayne})
\text{Rest : Soone after bis she gan to hym to rowne}
(\text{Cl to hym she gan} ; \text{Cp} \text{H}_1 \text{S}_2 \text{AH}_3 \text{she to him gan} ;
\text{S}_1 \text{Soon after that she gan unto him rowne} ;
\text{H}_2 \text{Ph} \text{H}_5 \text{H}_3 \text{D om. second to})

573. ... men sholde ... (+ \text{S}_1)
\text{Rest : ... men myght} ...

578. ... soth therof ... (+ \text{H}_3 \text{S}_1 + \text{AD})
(\text{H}_4 \text{there for therof} ; \text{S}_1 \text{AD a soth})
\text{Rest : ... therof soth} ...
(\text{Cl pere for therof} ; \text{H}_5 \text{om. therof})

*579, 580. But pat she graunted with hym for to go
Withoute awayt ... (+\text{S}_1)
(Cx Wythoute nayeng)
\text{Rest : But pat with outen awayte with hym to go}
She graunted hym ...
(\text{H}_2 \text{Ph But ferwith out with hym to go} , \text{Ph inserts}
more after out ; \text{H}_5 \text{withowte more} ; \text{H}_2 \text{om. outen} ;
\text{Gg} \text{H}_5 \text{it for second him})

*588. ... for I do as yow liste
(J pat yow liste)
\text{Rest : ... and do now as yow lyste}
(\text{H}_1 \text{om. and} ; \text{Gg ri\text{ft for now}} ; \text{H}_5 \text{ye luste})

591. ... fel and boones (+\text{H}_3 \text{S}_1)
\text{Rest : ... soule and bones}

\textit{Fel and boones} seems a much more appropriate reading. \textit{Soule}
is apparently an error of "Adam Scriveyn" not corrected till $\beta$.

*593. ... what shold I lenger dwelle
(J longe telle)
\text{Rest : ... what sholde I more telle}
\text{Note that J only partially incorporates the $\beta$ reading.}

*604. But now to purpos ... (+ \text{S}_1)
\text{Rest : But to pe poynt now} ...
(Gg \text{om. now})
†607, 608. And after to the souer alle and some
  Whan tyme was to souer they hem sette (+ S₁)
  (R And afterward to souper . . . Whan it was tyme
    faste they hem sette ; H₄ tyme it was ; Cx they be
    sette)

Rest: And after to be souer alle and some
  Whan tyme was ful softe pey hem sette
  (Cl, hym for hem ; D And after pat to souper, hem
    þei ; GgPh om. þe)

A clear case of error. β has re-eated souer. Note the
emendation of R.

635. For Nece this is yowre owen hous parde (+ S₁)
  (J om. is)

Rest: For whi . . .

659. . . . shal . . .

Rest: . . . wol . . .

*668. And al with Inne shal yowr 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 (+ H₂S₁)
  (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 . . .
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*705. 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.

*759 Here at this litel trappe dore . . . (+ S₁)
(R a for this; J lite)
Rest: . . . seere trappe dore . . .

773. That for to holden longe a man in honde (+ H₂)
(RCx a man longe)
Rest: . . . holde in loue . . .

*800, 801. Gan therwith al aboute hir herte colde
And with a syk she soodeynly answerde (+ S₁)
(Cx om. al; H₄ al hir herte to colde
Rest: Gan soodeynly aboute her herte colde
And with a syk she sorwfully answerede
(H₁ line 800 over erasure; D om. line 800; H₂PhCl ful for she)

*820 O brotel wele of worldly Ioye vnstable (+ S₁)
(JRH₄ o worldly Ioye)
Rest: . . . of mannes Ioye . . .

*882. Ye neyther wisdom don ne gentilesse
(Cx Neyther ye wysely don)
Rest: . . . bounte . . .
(H₅ bote; H₂Ph Ye done hym neiwer good ne)

The reading wisdom is a distinct improvement, serving as it
does to balance folie of 879.

†922. Omit pat (- J)

*937. . . and this mater on honde (+ S₁)
(Cx & haue this mater in hande)
Rest: . . and pat we han on honde
(GgH₃ 3e han; H₅ we be; A in honde)

Note the conflate reading of Cx.

952. . . al be . . .
Rest: . . ben alle . .
(S₁H₅ om. alle)

958. 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 your owen Troilus is lorn  
    Allas . . . (+ H₃S₁)  
  Rest:  Allas youre owne Troylus is lorn  
    I wys . . .  
    (H₂ oure ; Gg om. owne)  

1115.  They gan to frote and ek his templis tweyne (+ H₃S₁)  
    (Cx lacking)  
  Rest:  . . . and wete his temples tweyne  

*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 pis liȝt ne I  
      seruyn ; H₅ pis lyght ne seruyn)  

1141.  . . . his candele . . . (- R, + H₃ + Gg)  
    (Cx lacking)  
  Rest:  . . . pe candele . . .  

1153.  This bad she hym to telle . . . (+ H₃S₁)  
    (H₃ Thus ; Cx lacking)  
  a  pat badde sche him to telle . . .  
    (Gg om. him)  
  γ  She bad hym pat to telle . . .  
    (H₂ Sho bad him for to tel pat)  

I regard γ as a scribal variant of a.
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*1163, 1177.* Criseide answerde ... \(+ H_3S_1\)

(Cx lacking in 1163)

Rest: And she answered ... Precisely the same variation is found in 1163 and 1177.

1214. ... al day ... \(+ H_3S_1\)

Rest: ... often ...

Lines 1212–1246 are written twice in R, once in their proper place on fol 57\(^a\), and earlier, between lines 1099 and 1100 on fols. 54\(^b\) and 55\(^a\). In the earlier occurrence line 1214 has the \textit{ay} reading.

1218. ... now his cure \((- H_4, + H_3)\)

Rest: ... al his cure

1225. ... when it comth to the nede \(+ H_3S_1\)

\(H_4RCx\ om.\ the\)

Rest: ... \textit{ye} it comth to pe nede

\(H_1\ of\ \textit{for}\ \textit{ye};\ \textit{Cl}\ come;\ \textit{H_5}\ to\ com\ to\ nede\)

1239. ... and tolde al hir entente \(+ H_3S_1\)

\(H_4 &\ told\ him\ al\ hir\ entente\)

Rest: ... and told hym here entente

\(Gg\ \textit{tok}\)

Note the conflate reading of \(H_4\).

1245. Is ... \(+ H_3\)

Rest: Was ...

1258. And nexte yow ymeneus I the grete \(+ H_3S_1\)

(Cx \textit{om. yow}; \(H_3\ \textit{om. I}\)

Rest: And nexte \textit{pat} ...

\(Cl\ \textit{pe}\ \textit{for}\ \textit{pat}\)

\textit{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 \(\beta\) reading is corrupt.

1260. ... \textit{pat} ... \(+ H_3\)

Rest: ... which ...

1264. And ... \(+ H_3\)

Rest: For ...

1280. ... whom ... \(+ H_3S_1\)

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 thoghth)
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.
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*1327. ... the gret of his sentence (+ H_3 S_1)
  Rest: ... al hooly 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_3 S_1)
  Rest: ... ony word ... (+ H_4 first copy)

*1334. And putte hem hool in your discretion (+ H_3).
  (J & for in; Cx And I putte)
  S_1 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 pe wo)

1360. And wel a thousand tymes gan he sike (+ H_3 S_1)
  (J thousand)
  Rest: ... an hundred tymes ...

The Italian reads *mille sospiri*, Fil. 3. 37. This would seem to mark the β reading as more original; but since the overwhelming weight of evidence points the other way, the closer approximation of β 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. ... clepyn ... (+ 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 loueres 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 heynnesse (+ H₃)
   (H₃ their besinessē)
Rest: ... al swych heynnesse

*1415. Whan pat the Cok ... (+ H₃S₁)
   (R om. pat)
Rest: But whanne pe kok ...

The Italian reads Ma poich' e' galli ... udiro Cantar, Fil. 3.
42, which marks the αγ 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 purpos
of my raper speche. It was necessary, therefore, to avoid the
repetition of But.

1418. ... and oute hir stremes throwe (+ H₃)
   (J stremyes)
Rest: ... bemys ...
   (H₁ bemye)

Either word is possible. See Skeat's glossary s.v. streem.

1431. ... thy blake weede (+ H₃S₁)
   Rest: ... pi derke wede

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 to our 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 aþ to our emysperie bynde
   (Cp om. second þyn; D and for þyn; H₂Ph vn to soure
eemysper)

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 never mo . . . (− Cx, + H₃S₁)
   (R euermo)
Rest: That neuere more . . .

*1441. For thorugh thy rakel hying out of Troye (+ H₃S₁)
   (J lying; S₁ with for thorough)

Rest: For now for pow so hyest out of Troye
   (H₂Ph For now pow hiȝest so; Gg om. so; H₅ For
   be cause pow 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)
1479. ... may ... (+ H\text{3}S\text{1})
Rest: ... shal ...

1492. ... thus anon (+ H\text{3}S\text{1})
Rest: ... right anoon
(GgH\text{5} and \text{pat anon})

1496. And euerich egle ben the haukes feere (+ H\text{3})
(R an haukys)
Rest: ... pe dowues fere
(Ph a dowves)

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, cohaerentesque 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 ... (+ H\text{3})
Rest: ... er pis ...

1538. But slepe ne may noon in his herte synke (— J)
(Cx om. ne; H\text{4} ther for ne)
S\text{1} ... ne may ñere non ...
Rest: ... ne may ñere ...
(H\text{2}Ph No sleep may ñere; H\text{5} there ne may)

Note the conflate reading of S\text{1}. H\text{3} and J have the αγ reading.

*1561. That som of vs for god our hede may ake (+ H\text{3})
(J hir hede; H\text{3} his hede; Cx That somme of vs our hedis ought to ake)
Rest: ... I trowe here hedes ake

1563. This bright morwe ... (+ H\text{3})
Rest: This mery morwe ...
(Clp murye; Cp mury; H\text{2} 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 blissee; S1 the day gan blysse)
       a An hundred tymes and gan the tyme blysse
       (GgH5 tyme; H2Ph blesse)
       γ An hundred sithe the gan the 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 fletyon; 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 of 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)  

Rest: ... and holde pe wel per Inne  
Note that H₃ retains and, and that R started to write wel. J keeps the ay reading.

1639. ... god biforn (— Cx, + H₃)  
Rest: ... god to forn  

*1645. By god ... (+ H₃S₁)  
Rest: God wot ...  

1665. This tale was ay ... (+ H₃S₁ + AD)  
(Cx alwey; H₃ euer)  
Rest: This tale ay was ...  
(H₂Ph om. ay; H₅ was euere)  

†1685. J drede; RS₁ wo; H₄ ioie; Cx care  
Rest: Agon was euery sorwe and euery fere  
(H₃ om. second euery)  

The β MSS. are uncertain in their reading. Note that H₃ omits euery. It is clear that in the β original the word *sorwe* was either lacking altogether or had become totally illegible.

1720. ... ay withouten drede (+ H₃)  
Rest: ... alwey out of drede  

1746. Love which pat with an holsom alliance (— Cx)  
Rest: Love pat with ...  
(H₅ pat which with)  

1795. ... by right (— J, + H₃)  
Rest: ... of right  
(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 $\beta$ reading is not obviously corrupt.

(2) In a number of instances one of the four regular $\beta$ MSS. gives the $\alpha\gamma$ reading, where the other three present a $\beta$ 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 $\beta$ MSS., or $H_3$, or $S_1$, presents a conflate reading combined of $\alpha\gamma$ on the one hand and of $\beta$ on the other. The most striking instance of this is the fact that $H_4$ has the shifted stanzas (190 and 191) written twice, in the $\alpha\gamma$ position and again in the $\beta$ position.

(4) In a very few instances, lines 608, 922 (?), 1600 (?), 1685, the $\beta$ reading is corrupt.

(5) $S_1$ shares in a majority of the $\beta$ readings throughout Book III, but less consistently in the latter part of the book. $H_3$ shares only occasionally in $\beta$ 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: $JH_4RCx$ are descended from a common original, which must have been a MS. originally of $\alpha\gamma$ type extensively altered by corrections and revisions in the margin and between the lines. In individual cases a single $\beta$ 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 $H_3$ and $S_1$ in the readings of $\beta$ we can more profitably speak in another place (see p. 181).

Within the $\beta$ group no sub-group can be established. With the exception of $J$ all of the $\beta$ MSS., including $H_3$ and $S_1$, 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 $H_4$ and $Cx$, of $H_4$ and $R$, and less frequently agreements involving the carefully written $J$. Especially frequent are such agreements between $H_3$ 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 β MSS.

64. \( H_4 \text{Cx} \ldots \) that he wepte 
\( \text{Rest} : \ldots \) as he wepte

131. \( H_2 \text{Cx} \) And that ye souffren 
\( R \) And that ye vouche sauf 
\( H_4 \) And if that ye agreue 
\( H_2 \text{Ph} \) And \( \text{pat ye agreyn} \)
\( \text{Rest} : \) And \( \text{panne agree} \)

We have here a variant reading which is certainly not coincidence. Clearly there is some connection between \( H_3 \) and \( \text{Cx} \) in this line. Note also the reading of \( R \). The reading \( \text{pat ye} \) instead of \( \text{panne} \), 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 
\( \text{Rest} : \) Inmortal god

Note the connection between \( J \) and \( GgH_5 \). Later in the line \( H_4 R \) read \( \text{thou maist} \) where the rest read \( \text{pat mayst} \).

242. \( H_3 \text{Cx} \ldots \) euer more 
\( \text{Rest} : \ldots \) alwey more

273. \( H_4 \text{Cx} \ldots \) bothe in fere \( (\text{Cx I fere}) \)
\( \text{Rest} : \ldots \) eke yfere

302. \( H_4 \text{Cx} \) For tonge 
\( \text{Rest} : \) O tonge

354. \( R \text{Cx} \ldots \) for to pleye 
\( \text{Rest} : \ldots \) best to pleye

367. \( H_3H_4 \ldots \) to the to be wrey 
\( \text{Rest} : \ldots \) to be by wreye
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526. \(H_3C_xS_1\) And dredis . . .  
Rest: Omit And

627. \(R_CxH_5\) . . . euer man & womman . . .  
Rest: . . . euer maner womman . . .

724. \(H_4R\) . . . with thi rede cope  
Rest: . . . with þi blody cope

831. \(H_4C_x\) . . . sekinnesse . . .  
Rest: . . . selynesse . . .

968. \(H_3C_xH_4\) om. here.

1211. \(H_5R_H_5\) . . . I had not now ben here (H_5 had not)  
Rest: . . . I were now not here  
(CxA not now)

1313. \(H_5H_4\) In suche gladnesse . . .  
Rest: Of swych gladnesse . . .

1383. \(H_5H_4\) . . . I shal a rede  
Rest: . . . I shal yow rede  
(Cx I shal now rede)

†1534. \(R_Cx\) om. real.

1548. \(J_RH_3 + G_g\) . . . the selue wyse  
Rest: . . . þe same wyse

1605. \(R_CxS_1\) Was . . .  
Rest: Saw . . .

1642. \(H_3H_4R\) . . . wrathin . . .  
Rest: . . . greuen . . .

1643. \(H_3C_xR_S_1\) . . . 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 y had been copied. Note that JH_4 read tere.

†1647. \(H_3C_x\) om. first.

1649. \(H_4C_x + H_5\) . . . I owe . . .  
Rest: . . . I shal . . .
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1694. \( H_3 Cx \ldots \) that anye hert may thanke

Rest: \( \ldots \) that herte may by-thynke

1820. \( H_3 Cx \ldots \) lady swete

Rest: \( \ldots \) herte swete

The various combinations of β 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 β original was a corrected and revised MS., and that consequently it offered to the eye of a scribe many alternative readings. That the β original was of such a character is further proved by the fact that not infrequently an a reading is retained by one or more β 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 β MSS., but, in a considerable number of instances, we discover \( H_2 Ph \) readings (not shared by GgH5) reappearing in β 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 GgH5 become a MSS. There are, however, not infrequent cases throughout the book.

\( H_2 Ph \) and MSS. of the β Group.

5. \( H_2 Ph + H_4 Cx H_3 \) om. ay (R lacking)

53. \( H_2 Ph + H_4 R \ldots \) myn hert dere

Rest: \( \ldots \) my lady dere

Compare line 1820, where \( H_3 Cx \) substitute lady for herte.

†65. \( H_2 Ph \) Aha god help quod Troylus so rewfully

\( Cx \) A ha god quod Troylus so sorowfully

Rest: \( \ldots \) A ha quod Troylus so rufully

84. \( H_2 Ph + Cx \ldots \) hert \ldots

Rest: \( \ldots \) wit \ldots

†116, 117. \( H_2 Ph + Cx \) transpose lines 116 and 117 to the detriment of the sense

Text. Trad. N
146. \( \text{H}_2\text{Ph} + \text{H}_3\text{CxS}_1 \) Receyve in gre...

Rest: Receyuen wel...

\( \text{H}_4 \) Receyuyn I wil

168. \( \text{H}_2\text{Ph} + \text{H}_4\text{RCx} \) no lenger pat ye pleyn

Rest: no lengere ye ne pleyne

193. \( \text{H}_2\text{Ph} \) aíorne...

Cx adiourne...

\( \text{H}_4 \) adiure...

Rest: coniure...

205. \( \text{H}_2\text{Ph} + \text{H}_3\text{CxS}_1 \) om. right.

†228. \( \text{H}_2\text{Ph} + \text{H}_4\text{Cx} \) blyve...

Rest: lyne...

Blyve has been repeated from 225.

277. \( \text{H}_2\text{Ph} + \text{JRCx} \) al pe peple...

Rest: al pe world...

280. \( \text{H}_2\text{Ph} + \text{JRCxH}_3\text{S}_1 \) fordone...

Rest: for lost...

\( \text{H}_4 \) forlorn

*282. \( \text{H}_2\text{Ph} + \text{JH}_4\text{RCx} \) pe pray y eft alpogh pow shuldest dey

(PhCx thogh)

Rest: Yet eft I pe byseche and fully seye

\( \text{H}_5 \) om. eft, om. pe; D fully preye

A clear case of revision, in which GgH\(_5\gamma\)H\(_3\)S\(_1\) present the revised reading, while all four of the regular \( \beta \) MSS. retain the unrevised reading of \( \text{H}_2\text{Ph} \). It is possible that the return to the original reading was deliberate, since this reading is distinctly preferable.

303. \( \text{H}_2\text{Ph} + \text{JH}_4\text{RCx} \) Hath made ful meny a lady...

\( \text{J} \) om. a

Rest: Hastow made many a lady...

Line 302 reads: \textit{O tonge allas so often here byforn}. The reading of \( \text{H}_2\text{Ph} \), 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. \( H_4 \) Cx read in 302 For tongue, and so obviate the difficulty.

329. \( H_2 \) Ph + \( H_3 \) ... wyse men ...
   Cx ... wyse folk ...
   Rest: ... wyse ...

487. \( H_2 \) Ph + R ... went
   Rest: ... was sent

571. \( H_2 \) Ph + \( H_3 \) Cx ... that he were there
   \( H_4 \) R ... that he ther wer
   (\( H_4 \) om. that)
   Rest: ... that he were

737. \( H_2 \) Ph + R Art þow a gast lest she wole þe byte
   Rest: ... so þat she wole ...
   (\( H_4 \) for that)

†786. \( H_2 \) Ph + Cx omit right

797. \( H_2 \) Ph + JRCxH₃ How þat ȝe sholden love on hatte horaste
   (\( H_2 \) Ph shold, hat; \( H_3 \) atte; Cx om. hatte)
   Rest: ... on þat hatte Horaste

The reading on þat hatte gives a hypermetrical line. þat is not necessary to the sense, but the scribes may well have felt that it was necessary.

915. \( H_2 \) Ph + \( H_4 \) Cx Ye knowe wele eke he is ȝour own knyght
   (\( H_4 \) weel eek how he is)
   Rest: Ye knowe ek how it is youre owne knyght
   (Gg he is; \( H_5 \) ȝe twayne ek he ys; R om. owne)

Note that the reading he for it is shared by Gg\( H_5 \). Note also the conflate reading of \( H_4 \).

930. \( H_2 \) Ph\( I_5 \) + R ... wit ...
   Rest: ... mynde ...

1009. \( H_2 \) Ph + \( H_3 \) ... good hert myn ...
   Cx + D ... good hert ...
   Rest: ... good myn ...
   (Cl lone for myn by corrector)
The confusion between *but*, *for*, and *and*, points clearly to a corrected original.

Rest: 

**1107.** \( H_2 \text{Ph} + \text{Cx} \) *omit ful*

\( R \) *wel for ful*

\( \text{Gg omits quod she ful} \)

**1241.** \( H_2 \text{Ph} + R \) (*second copy of lines*) + \( S_1 \) . . . *can gesse*

\( H_3 \text{Cx} \) . . . *gan gesse*

**1480.** \( H_2 \text{Ph} + H_3 \text{Cx} \) . . . *in pis place . . .*

**Rest:** . . . *yn pis plit . . .*

**1487.** \( H_2 \text{Ph} + \gamma S_1 \) . . . *oure humble seruaunt . . .*

\( \text{Cx} \) . . . *your seruaunt . . .*

**Rest:** . . . *your 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 \( H_2 \text{Ph} \), 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 "rubbings" 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 \( H_2 \text{Ph} \), and after line 400 the original of GgH\(_5\). It is, then, the MS. we have called the *original*. Subsequent to the derivation of the \( H_2 \text{Ph} \) original and the GgH\(_5\) 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 $H_2$Ph 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 $H_2$Ph 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 $S_1$ 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.

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, II₂, 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 a 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 ferpe booke 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 a 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 iiij*.* At the end of Proem IV, H₃ writes *Ort Sic explicit Liber quartus*. *Ort* (the Chaucer Society reprint wrongly gives it as Lōt or Lrt) does not seem to be a recognized abbreviation. I take it to mean certe or correcte. In line 26 H₃ reads *Thys fyfte and lasete boke.*

The omission of stanza 102, lines 708–714, is a clear case of error. The stanza is found in a 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 Crisseyde 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.

$$\text{ClClpH}_1S_2AD(γ).$$

9. . . wripe . . . (+ S₁ + J)

Rest: . . . wrye . . .

Wripe, from O.E. wriðan, and wrye, from O.E. wrīgian, 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 \textit{wrye} is definitely established, since it falls under the rime.

12. . . . myn herte right now . . . (— Cl)
   (D myn herte gyynneth now to bleede)
   \textit{Rest:} . . . right now myn herte . . .

39, 40. Ector & many a worpi wight out wente
   Wip spere in hond and bygge bowes bente ($+S_1+H_5$)
   (Cl on hond)
   \textit{Rest:} Transpose order of lines. \textit{(Gg lacking)}

Either order is possible; but the arrangement of \(y\) separates
\textit{Wip spere in hond}, etc., from \textit{armed bryght and shene} of 38.

78. . . . or in what manere wyse ($+H_3S_1+J$)
   (Cl for \textit{for in})
   \textit{Rest:} . . . and in what manere wyse
   (Ph \textit{om. what})

The Italian reads \textit{e`l modo}, \textit{Fil. 4. 6}, which supports \textit{and}. The substitution of \textit{and} for \textit{or} and \textit{vice versa} is of frequent occurrence in the MSS.

†80. Ye han er pis wel herd it me deuyse
   (A wele harde or this me deuyse, wele \textit{by corrector over erasure}; D me herd it wele devise)
   \textit{Rest:} . . . herde me yow deuyse
   (R \textit{om. yow}; H_4 me herd weel yow; Cx herd me wel devyse; H_3 me herde or this you devise; S_1 wel herd me yow)

The line in \(\gamma\) is so awkward that it must be regarded as corrupt. Apparently the trouble began by the careless dropping of \textit{yow}, as in \(R\) and \(Cx\). The variations of the MSS. point to confusion in the common original.

88. . . . you lordes for to plese (— \(AD\))
   \textit{Rest:} . . . my lordis yow to plese

163. And . . . ($+S_1$)
   \textit{Rest:} Or . . .

†191. . . . nede to folk . . . (— \(A\))
   ($H_1$ tolk \textit{for} to folk; \(S_2\) \textit{om. to})
   \textit{Rest:} . . . nede of folk . . .
Readings Characteristic of $\gamma$.

197. ... trewe ... $(+ S_1)$
( A trew over erasure)

Rest: ... soth ... 

215. And fynaly ...
$a + S_1$ But fynally ...
$\text{JRH}_3$ What fynaly ...
$H_2H_4Cx$ That finally ...

220. Vnto ... $(+ S_1)$

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 $\gamma$ reading is probably corrupt.

†317. ... pis ...

Rest: ... thilke ...

(J thilke; $H_3Cx$ that)

Thilke, with its full dissyllabic value, is necessary for the metre.

410. Yf pis be goodly she is glad and lyght $(+ S_1)$
$H_3$ ... thus is she gladde and lyght
$Cx$ ... she that is glad & lyght

Rest: ... þat is glade and lighte

Note the conflate reading of $Cx$, and apparently also of $H_3$.

484. But tel me now ... $(+ S_1 + Cx)$
$a$ But sey me this ...

$H_2H_4R$ But telle me þis ...

†498. Nay god wot ...
$a$ Nay Pandarus ...

$\beta S_1$ Nay nay god wote ...

The $\gamma$ reading gives a nine-syllable line.

532. ... and leue þi nyce fare $(+ Cx)$
$\text{PhS}_1$ ... þis nyce fare
$\text{GgH}_5$ ... þyn grete care

Rest: ... this nyce care

($H_4$ al thi nyce care)
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 *Troy. 1. 1025; 2. 1144.*

542. Al pis haue I my self yet pought ful ofte (+$S_1+H_2R$)  
(D eke *for* yet; $H_2$ ymagened yet ful ofte)  
Rest: *Omit yet*  
(J I thought)

If one reads *my selue*, as in Gg$H_3$, *yet* is unnecessary.

570. I moste here honour leuere han pan me (+$S_1$)  
$\alpha$ I haue hir honour leuere yit than me  
$\beta$ I must hir honour leuer saue pan me.  
($H_2$ saue leuer; $R$ kepe leuere)

The $\gamma$ reading is intermediate between $\alpha$ and $\beta$.

608. Thenk ek how . . . (+$S_1$)  
($S_2$ *om. ek*)  
Rest: *Thynk how pat . . .*  
($H_2H_4$ *om. pat*)

657. . . . *yn pis cas . . . (+$S_1$)  
Rest: . . . of this case . . .

†708–714. *Omit stanza 102.*  
The stanza is found in $S_1$. Cf. above, p. 183.

732. Into here chaumbre . . .  
Rest: Into the chaumbre . . .

The Italian reads *Nella camera sua, Fil. 4. 86*, which supports the $\gamma$ reading; but the variation is trifling, and the closer approach of $\gamma$ to the Italian may well be fortuitous.

773. That ilke day pat I from yow departe (+$S_1+Ph$)  
(Cl hym *for* yow)  
$JH_3Gg$ . . . I shal from yow . . .  
$\beta$ . . . 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  
\(-\text{ClA}, + H_4\)  
(D om. thi; H$_1$ me for the; S$_2$ This message which pat bi me Troilus sent)  

Rest: Omit message  
\(\alpha\) pat for which; Ph This pat Troillus by me the sent;  
H$_2$ 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 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 disperato of the Paris ed. Moreover, the Italian rime \textit{dire: morire} is exactly translated by 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 $\psi$at . . . (+ S$_1$)  

Rest: And $\psi$at that . . .  
\(\beta + \text{Ph om. that}\)  

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 . . .
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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 per.

†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 (+ H₃Gg)

1530. And ...

Rest: Or ...

1572. ... pis 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.

261. \(\text{ADS}_2 + S_1\) ... what haue I pe agilte

(A gilte)

Rest: ... what haue I pus agilt

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$_1$ ... I wil ...

Rest: ... I wolde ...

462. CpH$_1$ Now foulle falle hire for thi wo and care

D ... pat for pi woo care

ClH$_3$ ... pat for pi wo wold care

(Cl hath by corrector)

S$_2$ ... for pe wold wo or care

S$_1$ ... pat for pi wo wold care

A ... for pi wo at care

$H_2 H_4 R C x + G g P h$ ... for thi woo pat care

H$_5$ ... for pi wo that woll care

J ... 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 foulle falle hir for pe wolde care*.

470. AD ... herte ...

Rest: ... brest ...

(H$_4$ body)

511. Cl(Cp)H$_1 + J H_4$ Or with pi colde strok myn hete quenche

(H$_1$ om. pi; Cp. lacking)

Rest: ... my herte hete quenche

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 \( \text{CpH}_1\text{S}_2 \).
Readings Characteristic of \( \alpha \).

Throughout Book IV \( \alpha \) is attested by a large number of variant readings, of which many are of a very striking sort; but the MSS. which give these \( \alpha \) readings change as the book proceeds. During the first 196 lines \( \alpha \) is represented, as in Book III, by \( H_2 \text{PhGgH}_5 \); 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 \( \alpha \) MS. For lines 197–298 \( \alpha \) is represented only by GgH5Ph. At about line 300 \( H_3 \) becomes an \( \alpha \) MS., and remains so till near the end of the poem; 1 and between 430 and 438, J also joins the \( \alpha \) group. With line 686 the \( H_5 \) fragment terminates. So that from line 687 \( \alpha \) is represented by JGgH3Ph. The continuity of \( \alpha \) 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 \( H_5 \).

\[
H_2 \text{Ph}(Gg)H_5(\alpha).
\]

25. Thow cruel god eke fadir of Qwyrine (+ \( H_5 \))
\((H_3 \text{ to } \text{for of, gode for god})\)

Rest: Thow cruel Mars ek fader to Quyryne
\((A \text{ Mars over erasure; D om. ek; R lacking})\)

†33. Omit ful (+ Cl)

*37. . . . pat day pei issen ment (+ J)
\((\text{Ph issu; } H_2 \text{ pat day } \text{fus ment; } H_5 \text{ pat day of assignement})\)

Rest: . . . pei fighte mente
\((H_4 \text{ fouhten})\)

The form \( issen \) (O.F. \( issir \)) is found only in J, which here retains the \( \alpha \) 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. \( issest \) 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 \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \).
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a' Greci uscì negli ampi piani, Fil. 4. 1. (The Paris ed. reads uscendo all' improvviso, 5. 1.) Moreover, the fact that issen 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  
(PHryphio; 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: Bofe in assage . . .

93. . . . out of toun . . .  
Rest: . . . out of Troye . . .

*102. I may her have for pat is doubtles  
Rest: . . . right sone douteles  
(H₃ soone or doubtles)

*105. . . . am broght in wrecchidnes  
Rest: . . . haue al pis heuynesse  
(H₃ distresse)

110. . . . graunt . . .  
(H₂PH grauntith)  
Rest: . . . yeue . . .

(With line 113 begins again Gg)

H₂PhGgH₅(α).

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

(Cp H₁ JR makeden; DS₂ maked)

130. . . . on either cheke

Rest: . . . by eyther cheke

131. . . . mercy . . .

Rest: . . . socour . . .

139. . . . his safe conduyt hem sent (— H₆)

(H₂ 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

(H₂ Ph þe for þo)

Rest: . . . with þo wordes wel neygh deyde

(A myghe drede; RCxS₂ ful for wel)

*160. . . . þe grauntynge with stonde

(H₂ Ph 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 . . . (+ H₄ R)

Rest: . . . þo fantasies . . .

(H₃ þhat fantasye; D þi)

195. H₂ þat our wil . . .

Ph þat our voys . . . (voys over erasure)

GgH₅ þat oure acord . . .

Rest: That al oure voys . . .

(With line 196 ends H₂ and H₂ ceases to be an a MS.)
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GgH₅Ph(a).

*212. To ȝilde anon for Antenore Crisseyde

Rest : For Antenor to yelden out Criseyde
(Cl vp for out)

215. But fynally . . . (+ S₁)

Rest : For Antenor to yelden out Criseyde
(Cl vp for out)

215. But fynally . . . (+ S₁)

γ 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 α 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 si, che
paion due fontane, 5. 24.

*258. þat wel oneþe þe body may suffysye

(H₄ myght)

Rest : That wonder is þe body . . .

(A wonder his; D wonder it is; H₄ wondis)

The Italian reads, Che'l capo e'l petto appena gli bastava,
Fil. 4. 29.

262. How mayst þu þus for reuthe me begyle (+ H₄)

(Ph myght thou; H₄ thus me begile)

Rest : How myghtestow for reupe me bygyle

266. . . . so crewel . . . (+ H₄)

Rest : . . . þus cruel . . .
269. Whi wilt pou pann of ioye me deprue
   (Ph of pis ioy)

   Rest: Why wiltow me fro Ioye pus depreyue
   (ACx thus from Ioye me; H₃ from Ioye thus me)

286. ... pyn gery violence

   Rest: ... pi greful violence
   (H₁DS₂JR gerful; Cp serful; S₁Cx gyreful; H₃ grevyl)

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 turment...
   (Gg turnement)

   Rest: On lyue in torment...
   (RCx Ay lyue in turment)

The Italian reads, mentre la vita Durerà, Fil. 4. 34.

297. ... mysauntery

   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 lyt & 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 sorrowful lyfe wyldyhen in distresse

   Rest: But ende I wil as Edippe yn derknesse
   My sorrowful lyf and dyen in dystresse
   (R liuen for dyen; JH₂ for destresse; Cx But euer wyl I as Edyppe in derknesse Lede my sorrowful 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 $a$ text, though it reads sorrowful for woful and in for for with $\beta\gamma$ and corrupts 300. Beginning at 326 it shares all the $a$ readings; but in 306 and 322 it goes with $\beta\gamma$.

306. Fle forp anon & do myn herte brest

Rest: Fle forth out of myn herte and lat it breste

(A Fle for poupfe; R om. forth; $H_3$ fouruth oute;

Cx Fleer oute of myn hert or it brest)

322. For thy no fors whan that the body sterve

(Lines 307–322 of Gg by corrector)

Rest: For þi no fors is pough þe body sterve

(J whan for pough; $H_2H_4RCxH_3$ For now no; D þis body)

Note that J retains whan from the $a$ reading.

(With line 326 $H_3$ becomes consistently an $a$ MS.)

$GgH_5PhH_3(a)$. 

326. And longe mote 3e in ioye endeure

Rest: . . . mot youre lyf yn Ioye endure

327. And . . . (+ A)

Rest: But . . .

340. þerwith . . .

(Ph þat with)

Rest: For which . . .

($H_2H_4$ om. For)

341. . . sorwis . . . (+ $S_2$)

Rest: . . . peynes . . .

347. . . chaungyn . . .

Rest: . . . yelden . . .

The Italian reader, 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)
-GgH₅PhH₃ (a).  197

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 pre . . .
    (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 aryʒt  
3if pis be goodly pat is glad & lyʒt  
(H₅ _om. first pat; H₅ Ph hir good; H₃ _first pat and gode inserted above; Gg & ryʒt, is for be; H₅ the other for second pat; H₃ thus is she gladde)  
Rest:  Yf pis be goodly pat is glad and lyght  
And pis is fayr and pat kan good arijght  
(γS₁ 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 þyn)  
Rest:  Thenk ek . . .

430.  . . . to make . . . (+ H₂)  
Rest:  . . . to don . . .  
(With line 438 J becomes an α MS.)

JGgH₅PhH₃.

438.  To traysen hir pat trewe is vnto me (+ ClAD)  
(Gg trostyn; H₄ trysyn, is trew to me; Cl trassen)  
Rest:  To traysen a wight that . . .  
(H₂ truste; H₄ traiist; RCx tray; S₂ trayne)

441.  Or I so do . . .  
(Gg om. so; H₅ illegible)  
Rest:  Er I pus do . . .  
(D do pus; H₂H₄R Or I soo werche)

445.  What Pandarus syn I haue hir behight  
Rest:  For Pandarus syn I haue troupe here hight  
(ClS₂ syn pat; H₄ hir trouthe; H₂H₄ plight; Cx syth I hyr trouthe behight)

454.  . . . for thy . . .  
(H₃ 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 yiuen hire
But now his comyng ...
(J is for his; H₃ om. his)
Rest: Er pow me slowe I wolde haue yeuen hire
But now pi 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; pen 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 repeled
     (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)

γₕ₁ I moste here honour leuere han pan me
β  I must hir honour leuere saue pan 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
     (H₅ H₅ 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 . . . (+ I)
     (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 wrechces . . .
The Italian, e’timidi rifiuta, Fil. 4. 73, supports the βγ reading.

604. Thow shalt thy pees ful wel hiraftir make (+ Cl)
(PhH₅ om. ful; Ph her pees; H₅ heraftir wel)
D Thou shalt þi selne 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 told 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 . . .
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 answerde . .
   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 ellys 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.)
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.

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 swythe;
Ph in Aprille ful swithe)

Rest: Therwith pe terys from here eighen two
Doun fille as shour in aperill swythe
Here white breste she bet and for the wo
(H₂ And therwith; Cp om. from; R ful swythe;
S₁Cx dooth swythe; 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 new 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.
The revision, with its direct address to Criseyde's mother, fits the lines better to 761, which reads in all MSS. O Cullus, fader, thyn be al þis 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 Argyue.)

767. . . . or oother creature
(Ph of eny creature)
Rest: . . . or lyues creature
(II₂ a lyues; H₄ lyussh)

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 pouogh ...  

*789, 790. Yit in the feld of pite out of peyne  
Ther pluto regneth ... (- Ph)  
(Gg 3e 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
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*835. And every worldly Ioye . . .
(J worldly; Gg wordely; H₂ worldes)
Rest: And alle worldly blysse . . .
(R And ek as; H₁ wordly)

843. . . . sorwful . . .
Rest: . . . woful . . .

853. What . . . (— Ph)
Rest: That . . .

854. . . . pat . . .
Rest: . . . which . . .

867. . . . and oother Ioyes . . .
Rest: . . . and ek here Ioyes . . .

*868. . . . and thus for hem she lith allone
(Gg from hem)
Rest: . . . and þus lith Criseyde allone
(ClCPH₁DS₁ lith now Criseyde)

876. . . . I trowe wel . . . (+ RS₁)
Rest: Omit wel.

881. . . . worldly . . .
(JGgH₃ wordly)
Rest: . . . erfely . . .

*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 sorw . . .
(D Iwis so this; R thus; Cx his)

*906. To sen hym in þat wo þat he is Inne
Rest: To sen þat sorwe whiche þat he is Inne
The Italian, di veder Troilo affliito, Fil. 4. 105, supports the a reading.

915. . . . softly
(Ph shortly)
Rest: . . . hastily
JGyPhH₃ (a).

923. That wot I wel and therfore yit I seye

Rest: That know I wel and for þi . . .
(R om. and; D as for and; Cx therfor)

924. Lat be this sorwe . . .

Rest: So lef þis sorwe . . .
(Cx So lete; D To leue)

936. . . . of short auyusement (+ D)

Rest: . . . in short . . .

(H₄ at)

938. And þat that I kan helpe . . .

(Ph om. that)

Rest: And what þat 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 some out of þis world to pace
For wel he þouhte þer was noon oþer grace
(Cx om. second to; JGgH₂RA nas for was)

We have here a clear case of revision, in which JGg have the ßγ reading. We must assume that the revision was made before J and Gg were derived.

*953–1085. H₅Ph + 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 ofyn 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: Let be and þeuk right þus . . .
(A om. right; Cx Here lete see & thynk on thy dysease)

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 (+ \(H_2\)Cx)
Rest: . . . it more

1124. But . . . (+ \(H_2\)H_4)
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
(H_2 & oþer kiste; \(H_4\) & ech oþir kiste; A afore kyste)

*1133. What for to don . . . (+ Cx)
Rest: Wher þat he was . . .
(S_2 he wist was)

1134. GgPh . . . for sorwe & for wepyng
(Ph om. second for)

\(H_3\) . . . for sorow And for sobbing

Rest: . . . for wo and for sobbye
(A for woo of sobbye)

Note that J agrees with βγ. The Italian, singhiozzi, Fil. 4.
115, supports the reading sobbye.

*1138, 1139. So bittre teeris wep nat thurgh the rynde
The woful mirra writen as I fynde
(J thurght)

Rest: So bittre teris weep nought as I fynde
The woful myrra prough þe bark and rynde
(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: . . . wipen 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 þat . . .
   Rest: And þis . . .

1183. As men don folk . . .
   Rest: As men don hem . . .
   (S₁ him)

1185. . . the shethe . . . (— Ph, + H₄)
   Rest: . . . his shethe . . .

1190. . . no more he lyuen shulde (— J)
   (Gg leue ne schulde)
   Rest: . . . he longer lyuen sholde
   (R no longer lynen he sholde; H₄ thei for he)

1194. . . kan . . .
   Rest: . . . may . . .

1199. . . and folowe hir spirit forth in hye
   (Ph now in hye)
   Rest: . . . love or hye
   (A hīe or lowe; DS₂R and for or)

   Forth in hye must mean “forth in haste,” a more appropriate idea than the “low or high” of ßγ.

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.

   TEXT. TRAD.
*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 a3yn 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 allas that euere they were born
(H3 om. euere; Gg were pey)

Rest: Bywaylynge ay pe day pat pey were born
(A Bywaylynge cursynge, he for pey; D at for ay)

1284. . . . right to conclusioun
(H3 to Ryght; Ph to pe conclusion)

Rest: . . . to my conclusyon

1289. Gg Makynge here . .
Ph Makyng ay here . .
H3 Make here I shal . .

Rest: Makynge alwey . . . (+ J)

*1290. That in effect this thing pat I shal seye
(H3 That doubts thyss thing that in effect I sey)

Rest: That now pese wordes whiche pat I shal seye
(R om. That now, you seye; H4 om. now; D om.
second pat)

*1294. For fynaly . . . (− H3)

Rest: For yn effect

Cf. line 1290.

1315. And thus . .

Rest: And panne . .
*1322.  JGgPh That we shul eueremo togeddere dwelle
     (Ph wil; Gg delle)
     H_3  That I may haue a liberte to dwelle

Rest:  So as we shulle togederes euere dwelle
     (D om. euere; H_4 euermor)

1323.  ... Ioye ...
     (H_3 Ioyes)

Rest:  ... blysse ...

1332.  Oonly but yf it my fader be
     (H_3 Al holy but yf)

Rest:  But yf pat onlyche ...
     (H_2 H_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 |at ...

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 estab-
lished. Up to the point where H_2^1 terminates (line 196), the
familiar relationship of H_2^1 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
     (βS_1 anon withouten lette)
The Manuscript Relations in Book IV.

†55.  ... for hem ...  
Rest:  ... for harm ...  
62.  ... eke ...  
Rest:  ... and ...  
123.  ... hem ...  
Rest:  ... it ...  
194.  ... lo pus sey we ...  
Rest:  Omit lo

Up to the point where $H_5$ terminates, the relationship of $GgH_5$ is maintained. A few instances will suffice.

$GgH_5$.

206.  $Gg$ But pus it fel ryzt in conclusioun  
$H_5$ But pus to fell to conclusioun  
Rest:  O nyce world lo py dyscretion  
(Ph blinde for nyce)

248.  ßerwith the sobbis ...  
Rest:  The heyghe sobbes ...  
(H$3$ om. heyghe)

The Italian reads Gil. alti singhiozzi, Fil. 4. 28.

473.  ... out with proserpyne  
Rest:  ... down wip proserpyne

588.  ... nyne dayis ... (+ Cx)  
Rest:  ... nyne nyght ...  

As among $JGgPhH_3$, there seems to be a closer relationship of $JGg$ on the one hand, and of $H_3Ph$ on the other. For this the strongest evidence is the fact that $H_3Ph$ 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 $H_3Ph$ alone give the earlier reading, while $JGg$ agree with $\beta\gamma$, lines 950–952, has already been given in the list of $a$ readings above, p. 207. The evidence would seem to show that $H_3$ and Ph are derived from the $a$ parent at an earlier stage than J and Gg. There are, however, instances of GgPh and of $GgH_3$. The agreements within the $a$ group, most of them of a trivial character, are illustrated in the following list.
Scattering Agreements of a MSS.

412. $H_3\text{Ph} + RCx \ldots$ full dere

Rest: \ldots for dere

(H$_4$ at deere)

474. $H_3H_5 \ldots$ lyue \ldots

Rest: \ldots won\ldots

(Gg wene; $H_2$ duelle)

496. JGg$H_5$ Or \ldots

Rest: O \ldots

(Cx Loo)

799. $JH_3$ How myghte it euere al red ben \ldots

Rest: \ldots yred ben

(H$_1$ yherd)

The Italian, *Chi potrebbe giannmai narrare a pieno*, Fil. 4. 95, supports the reading *al red*.

842. GgPh + Cx *om.* pleynt.

876. Gg \ldots er pis

J \ldots al how over erasure

Rest: \ldots al how

1144. GgPh \ldots to lesse \ldots

Rest: \ldots to wayken \ldots

(A waylen; DS$_2$ waken; $H_1$ woken; J weiken; $H_2$ makyn; $H_4$ make)

1208. JGg Thow Attrepos pat is ful redy heere

(Gg antropos pat art)

Rest: And Attropes make redy pow my ber\ldots

(H$_2$ pow me her ber; $H_4$ *om.* pow)

1228. JGg \ldots he wolde therwith \ldots

Rest: \ldots therwith he wolde \ldots

1246. Gg$H_3$ *omit* ful (CLR right *for* ful)

†1266. Gg$H_3$ \ldots herte \ldots

Rest: \ldots art \ldots

1295. $H_3\text{Ph}$ I wyl it doo \ldots

Rest: That wol I don \ldots

1366 $H_3$ cause *for* wey; Ph *om.* wey
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1451. J . . . pat ich yow heere store
Gg . . . pat I here stire

Rest: . . . pat I haue here yow store

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 oute 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 gretely)

*1312, 1313. Considereth now that tyme it is of trewe

Ye may not faille of myn estat to here

Rest: Syn wel ye wot pat it is now a truwe

Ye shul ful wel al myn estat yhere

(Cl ye wel; GgCx om. pat; 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 avrò cagione, Fil. 4. 132.*

*1322.* That I may have a liberte to dwelle

JGGP'h That we shul euermo to geddere dwelle

Rest: So as we shulle to gederes euere dwelle

*1325.* Of pourviaunce our counseil for to hide

Rest: That for þe beste . . .

(Cx 1s for That)

1336. . . . as brode . . .

JGgPh . . . . as muche . . .

Rest: . . . . as wyd . . .

*1363–1365.* In hoste amouge the grekys euer in fere

Hit nyl not bee and gode soo wysly Rede

My soule as ye haue cause noon to drede

Rest: Among þo men of armes euere in fere

For which as wysly god my soule rede

I kan not sen wherof ye sholden dre.de

(Cx om. euere; Ph so for as; R wherfore for wherof;

S$_1$ þat 3e shuld dre.de)

The Italian reads (*Fil. 4. 135*)—

\begin{quote}
Ed a che far tra' Greci mi terrebbe,
Che come vedì sou sempre nell' armi.
\end{quote}

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 þe Court to don þe wrafe pace

Of Priamus . . .

(Gg cuntre; H$_1$ space)

The reading of $H_3$ is awkward but possible.

1402. Yif thys be les . . .

Rest: If þat I lye . . .

*1404.* In myddys hys werk or bere hym fast on honde

Rest: Makynge his sort and beren hym on honde

(JGGP'h$H_2H_4$ or beryn; R fast on honde)

Note that R agrees with $H_3$ in the phrase *fast on honde.*
The Manuscript Relations in Book IV.

*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 dispelse sterede)

*1442. Shal I neuer as in thys worlde haue Ioye

Rest: Ne shal I neuer haue hele honour ne Ioye

(H₂ H₄ 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. 83a. Fol. 83b, 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 84a 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. 83b, 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 colotype 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 some 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)
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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 "Disputynge with hym self in pis materere," 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 H₃Ph₁, in which stanzas 136 and 156 followed uninterruptedly 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 *Teseiude* 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
H₂H₄, in which case H₂ has derived the passage from some foreign source (as Ph does before our eyes); or the common original of H₂H₄ contained the passage, and H₄ itself (or an intermediate ancestor) is responsible for the omission. For the first of these hypotheses, that H₂ has derived the passage from a source other than the common ancestor of H₂ and H₄, 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. JDS₁Cx I am for he nas; ClCpH₁AH₂Ph lorn waylawey; Rest lorn so weylaway
958. JPhD omit second comth
961. S₂ for signe; Ph purgh signe; Rest foresight
964. ClCpH₁S₁JPh desponeth; H₂RCxADS₂ disposeth
965. PhS₂ his for here
968. AR pei for per
970. CxS₂ omit men
973. H₂R whiche for whos
974. RCx omit men
975. ClS₁R And for Ne; S₂ om.
986. H₂DS₂ writen for wijpen; Cx worchen
987. ClCpH₁ADJPh nere; H₂RCxS₁S₂ wer
989. JPhCx Vnstidfast and no certein for Vncerteyn and no stedefast; D om. stedefast
991. ADR omit cler
994. ClCx corsed wykkednesse for wikked corseodnesse
998. JPhCx seyn it bifore; Rest omit it
1004. AS₂ not for to be for not to be
1006. H₂PhS₂ nedfully for nedely
1007. Ph that shul falle; D which shal falle; Rest whiche pat falle
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 JGgPhH₄ it comes
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Immediately after stanza 105, *i.e.* after line 735; in βγ it is moved down to the position which it occupies in Skeat’s edition. In βγ the first line of the stanza is changed to accommodate it to its new position, as is also line 737, which in βγ immediately follows the stanza in question (cf. above, p. 203). There can be no doubt that this 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 βγ 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 βγ arrangement succeeds better in co-ordinating words and deeds.

**Readings Characteristic of β.**

Besides the large number of instances in which βγ agree as against a, there is a considerable number of cases in which the β MSS. agree as against ay. The great majority of these cases are found in the first six hundred lines of the book; and the only striking cases of β readings, of the sort which are so numerous in Book III, occur before line 170. During the early part of the book β is represented by JRH₄H₃Cx. At line 197, with a new handwriting, H₂ joins the group. At about line 300 H₃ becomes an a MS.; and J goes over to a at line 438. From there on β is represented by H₂H₄RCx. In the early part of the book S₁ frequently has β readings. After line 166 it is very rarely found with β. In the following list its participation in the β reading is always specifically noted.

\[ \text{JH}_4 \text{RCxH}_3 (\beta). \]

7. \( \ldots \text{a mowe (} + S_1 \) \)
   \( \text{(H}_3 \text{ om. a)} \)
   \( \text{Rest:} \ldots \text{pe mowe} \)
29. \( \ldots \text{tolde} \ldots \text{(- J)} \)
   \( \text{Rest:} \ldots \text{seyd} \ldots \)
*41, 42.  . . anon withouten lette
Hir fomen in the felde hem faste mette
(R ful for hem; H\(_3\) on the felde faste they mette)

Rest:  . . withoute lenger lette
Here fomen in þe feld anon hem mette
(S\(_1\) anon withouten lette; H\(_2\)Ph eny lenger; D om.
anon; H\(_2\)PhDS\(_2\) they met)

Note that S\(_1\) has the \(\beta\) reading in 41 and the \(a\gamma\) 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 (— H\(_3\), + S\(_1\))
(H\(_4\)neuertheles; RS\(_1\) ther was; JH\(_4\) At gret requeste;
H\(_4\)R 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
(CpH\(_1\) a greke requeste; H\(_5\)(Gg)S\(_2\) a gret request;
H\(_3\) To pryamus whas yeven at his Requeste,
gan to trete; A than for yeue; D þen þei gan;
A touchynge for to chaugen.)

A clear case of deliberate revision. That \(\beta\) 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 H\(_3\), so that we must assume that H\(_3\) 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 . .
(H\(_3\) it eft bringe)

Rest: That þei wolde brynge it . .
(H\(_2\)Ph brynge hem)

124.  Right for despit . .
Rest: Right in despit . .
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*126. The town shall yet be set upon a fire (+ S₁)
(H₄Cx on a fire)

Rest: The town of Troye shall be set on fire
(S₂ om. ben; Ph a fyre)

132. . . sikes soore (+ S₁)

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. Abod what oother lordes wolde saye
(H₄ what that other)

Rest: Abod what lordes wolde vnto it seye
(H₁ And for Abod; H₂PhGgH₅ADoS₂ to for vnto)

*166. Yif thow debate it liste she be thy foo (+ S₁)
(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 . .
αS₁ 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 α MS.)

JH₂H₄RCx(β).

328. . . here (– H₄, + Ph)

Rest: . . . pere
344. ... at the parlament
   Rest: ... in ...

418. ... moot (− Cx)
   Rest: ... shal ...

(With line 438 J becomes consistently an α MS.)

\[ H_2H_4RCx(\beta). \]

441. ... werche ... (− Cx)
   Rest: ... do ...

461. ... now her now ther ... (− Cx)
   (H₄ now heere & there)
   Rest: ... now this now pat ...
   (A om. pat)

470. My deth ... (+ Gg)
   Rest: The deth ...

484. But telle me pis ... (− Cx)
   α But sey me this ...
   γS₁ + Cx But tel me now ...

†528. 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 \( H_2H_4R \) is metrically deficient.

570. ... saue ...
   (R Kepe)
   Rest: ... han ...

573. ... it ... (− Cx)
   Rest: ... here ...

581. ... is per but litell reste
   γS₁ ... per is but litel reste
   α ... is litel hertes reste

588. *Omit* neuere (+S₁, + PhAS₂)

**Text. Trad.**
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594. And rather be in blame a liteel stounde (+S₁)
γ . . . in blame a lite yfounde
(Cl litel; S₂ sound)
α . . . a lite in blame Ifownde
(H₃ litel)

That the ay reading is more original is shown by the Italian, innanzi esser ripreso algoanto, Fil. 4. 72.

598. . . holde you . . .
Rest: . . holden pe . . .

†630. And dey . . . (−CX, +D)
Rest: A dieu . . .

662. . . pes tidinges new (−CX)
(H₄ all these tithyngis)
Rest: . . pis 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 penes

773. . . I mote from you departe
Rest: . . pat I from yow departe
(JH₃Gg I shal from yow; Cl from hym)

868. . . lieth Cresseide Alone (+AS₂)
a . . . for hem she lith allone
Rest: . . lith now Criseyde allone

938. And pat I may helpe . . .
(R helpe may)
γS₁ And what pat I may helpe . . .
a And pat that I kan helpe . . .
(Ph om. that)

948. . . no more . . . (−R, +S₁, +H₃Ph)
Rest: . . no lenger . . .
(Gg no ṣyng)
1178. \[ H_2 \ldots \text{brethe that felte he non} \]
\[ H_4 \ldots \text{ne breth felt he non} \]
\[ R \ldots \text{in breth ne felte he non} \]
\[ Cx \ldots \text{breth ne felte he none} \]
\[ a \ldots \text{and breth ne felte he non} \]
\[ \gamma S_1 \ldots \text{for breth ne felte he noon} \]

1310. \textit{Omit second so} \ (+ PhGg, + AD) 
\textit{(Gg now for so; R parde for so)}

1438. \textit{For which full oft ful pitously hir preid} \ (- R, +J)
\textit{(H_4 Cx he for hir)}
\textit{Rest: . . . ful ofte he pitously her preyde}
\textit{(GgRD ful ofte pitously he preyede; Ph ful pitously he her prayde)}

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:

\[ H_2 H_4. \]

†299. \ldots I son it \ldots 
\textit{(H_4 sonne)}
\textit{Rest: . . . I seen it . . .}

312. \ldots wepe fortl: \ldots 
\textit{Rest: . . . wepen out . . .}

397. \ldots in no seruise 
\textit{Rest: . . . in my seruyse}

445. \ldots plight \(+ S_2\) 
\textit{Rest: . . . hight}

495. \ldots it foryete \ldots 
\textit{Rest: . . . fat foryete . . .}
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†596. Hit is no shame to you more pan vise

Rest: ... ne no vice

(Cp om. ne; GgH₅Cx om. no)

598. ... holde you full nyse

Rest: ... holden pe for nyce

(RCx you)

733. ... 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 H₂H₄ reading, since for ded corresponds to stesa, about as closely as does for woo to dolente.

†1417. ... was trew good & kinde

Rest: ... trewe was and kynde

(H₃ om. and)

1456. ... ouer-renne ...

Rest: ... at-renne ...

(H₂ oute Renne; A atterne)

†1584. Men say pe sufferaunt ouercomth pe proude parde

Rest: Omit pe proude

A hypermetrical line.

Less striking is the list of readings in which RCx agree as against H₂H₄ and ay.

RCx.

†96. ... my sherte

Rest: ... here sherte

109. R ... and your bounte

Cx ... & of youre bounte

Rest: ... and of bounte

151. ... ful ney ... (+ S₂)

Rest: ... wel neygh ...

209. Omit he

296. Ay lyue in turment ...

Rest: On lyue in torment ...

(a In wo in turment)
301. ... liuen in distresse

   Rest: ... dyen ...

   (a endyn)

412. ... ful deere (+ H₃ Ph)

   Rest: ... for dere

   (H₄ at deere)

†698. ... audience ...

   Rest: ... aduertence ...

1177. Omit and

   There are a few cases, all of which may be coincidences, in which H₄ Cx agree in a variant reading:

   H₄ Cx.

517. Omit is

666. Omit right (+ H₃)

896. ... come here ...

   Rest: ... be here ...

1451. Omit yet

1455. ... fadir ... (+ H₃ Ph)

   Rest: ... sire ...

In 112 H₄ RCx read *town and folk* instead of *folk and town*; and in 305 the same MSS. read *woeful nest* for *wo vnneste*.

The only closer relationship among the β MSS. is that of H₂ and H₄. The scattering agreements, when not due to coincidence, must be explained as due to the presence of alternate readings in the β original.

Of the β group readings, but few present striking variations, and those few are found before line 167. There are, however, no clear cases in which β is in error.

In Book IV the most striking series of variants is that which divides α from βγ. In other words γ 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 $H_3$ and J have both become a MSS., may be graphically represented by the following diagram:

The broken line, $a \ldots \beta$, 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 $\gamma$ alone remains intact, and where the distinction between $a$ and $\beta$ becomes greatly confused. Save for the Teseide passage at the end of the book, which is omitted in $H_2H_4$ 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 $\gamma$. With $\gamma$ is associated in a large number of cases $S_1$. Occasionally other MSS. share in a $\gamma$ reading. The participation of $S_1$ or of other MSS. is in every case specifically noted.
Readings Characteristic of \( \gamma \).

ClCPH_1S_2AD(\( \gamma \))

†9. \[\ldots \] his bemes clere (+ H_3 + Cx)
J(Gg)Ph \[\ldots \] cleene
H_2H_4RS_1 \[\ldots \] shene

A clear case of error, since the rime words in 11 and 12 are *grene* and *queen*.

60, 61. And forth she rit ful sorwfully a pas
Ther nys non oper reme dye yn pis cas
(Cl right for rit)

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 reme dye*, etc., comes more appropriately immediately after 59, But forth she mot for ought pat may bytyde. 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 raunt ful sorwefully 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. \[\ldots \] swete herte

Rest: \[\ldots \] deere herte

107. Whan pis was don \[\ldots \]

Rest: Whan tyme was \[\ldots \]

115. That he nolde don his peyne and al his myght
(S_2 ne wolde ; Cp om. and)

Rest: That he nyl don his herte \[\ldots \]

(H_4RS_1 nolde ; H_2 wil)

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
in the common original of all MSS. and that the reading of \( \gamma \) is a scribal emendation, not improbably correct.

166. Ek I am not . . . (+ S\(_1\))
   \textit{Rest}: Nor I am not . . .
   (J nam: H\(_2\)PhNe: GgRCx For)

242. . . pis sustene (+ S\(_1\))
   \textit{Rest}: . . ek sustene

245. For langour . . . (+ S\(_1\))
   \textit{Rest}: For longyng . . .
   The context strongly favours longyng.

412. The folk wol wene . . . (+ S\(_1\))
   \textit{Rest}: The folk wol seyn . . .
   The Italian, \textit{diria l' uom}, \textit{Fil. 5. 35}, confirms the reading seyn.

†436. . . of heigh prowesse (+ S\(_1\))
   \textit{Rest}: . . of heyg 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. our)
   \textit{Rest}: Omit forth
   Without forth we have a nine-syllable line, since attributive our seems to be always monosyllabic.

565. Lo yondir saugh I myn owene lady daunce (+ S\(_1\))
   (Cl yende)
   \textit{Rest}: . . . last my lady daunce
   (H\(_4\) my lady last daunce)

613. . . shal . . .
   \textit{Rest}: . . . wil . . .
   (S\(_1\) lacking)

†711 Omit second ther (+ S\(_1\))

924. Ye leuere ban be lord of Greces twelue (+ S\(_1\))
   (Cl pe for be; H\(_1\) ben a lord; A Grekys)
   \textit{Rest}: . . . kyng . . .
   The Italian, \textit{Più volentier che re de' Greci adesso}, \textit{Fil. 6. 22}, supports the a\(\beta\) reading.

944. Ye wol me graunt . . . (+ S\(_1\))
   \textit{Rest}: 'Ye me graunt . . .
973. I trowe ek wel . . . (− A, + S₁)
Rest: I trow it wel . . .
992. . . . er . . . ( + S₁)
Rest: . . . yit . . .
    (H₂RH₃ om. yit)
†1006. And gan to syke & seyde O Troylus & Troye town
    (H₁ O Troilus town; CpD O Troie town)
Rest: . . . O Troye town
A clear case of error in the γ original, rightly emended by CpD, and mistakenly emended by H₁.

1021. . . . bedde . . . ( + S₁ + H₃)
Rest: . . . reste . . .
    (H₄ chamber)

1070. . . . is now for me to rewe ( + S₁ + H₃)
    (Cl om. for; ADS₁ is now me for)
Rest: . . . it is now for to rewe
    (R om. for; Ph is me now to repente)

1081. . . . shold I . . . (− Cl, + JH₃)
Rest: . . . myght I . . .
    (ClGg myghty)

1163. . . . right soth . . . (− A, + S₁)
Rest: . . . ful sothe . . .

1168. . . . dar I seye (− A, + S₁)
Rest: . . . soth to seye

1270. . . . per is no remedye . . . ( + S₁)
Rest: . . . ther lith no remedy . . .

1295. . . . of pat pou art in doute ( + S₁ + H₃)
    (H₃ of wych)
Rest: . . . ther thow art now in doute
    (JCx om. now; H₂ in a doute)

1316. . . . may . . . ( + S₁ + H₃ + H₂)
Rest: . . . shal . . .

1390. . . . myn owen lady free (− Cl, + S₁ + H₃)
Rest: . . . myn hertes lady free
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1413. As ye ... (+ S₁ + Cx)
Rest: As she ...

1449. ... þe bor ... (+ S₁ + H₃)
Rest: ... this boor ...
(Gg bope for boor; Cx om. boor)

1543. Thorough purueaunce ... (+ S₁)
Rest: By purueaunce ...

1585. Omit first pat (+ S₁)
(H₃H₄Cx om. second pat)

1674. ... o lady myn Crisseyde (+ S₁ + H₃)
Rest: ... o lady bright Criseide
(Gg by scribe over erasure)

1775. ... she ... (+ S₁ + R)
Rest: ... ye ...

1806. Dispitously ... (+ S₁ + Cx)
Rest: Ful pitously ...

†1809. ... þe seven þe spere (+ S₁ + H₃)
JRCx ... the viij speere
(H₂H₄ 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 S₁ shares all the γ readings except one (line 1081), and that a doubtful case. Beginning with line 1021, H₃ shares in about half of the γ readings.

We have now to consider some scattering agreements within the group of γ MSS.
Readings Characteristic of \( \gamma \) MSS.

12. \( \text{Cp Syn that the sone I Troilus of Ecuba the queene} \)

\[ \text{Rest : Omit I Troilus} \]

\( (H_1S_2 + H_4 \text{ have gloss Troilus over sone; } S_1 \text{ has gloss in margin}) \)

\( \text{Cp has taken into the text a gloss which must have stood in the} \)
\( \gamma \text{ original. The I is the sign } \cdot \text{ which regularly introduces a} \)
\( \text{gloss.} \)

26. \( \text{CpH}_1S_2 \ldots \text{ here to fore} \)

\[ \text{Rest :} \quad \ldots \text{ here byfore} \]

\( (H_3 \text{ eke byfore}) \)

†42. \( \text{CpH}_1S_2 \ldots \text{ crye} \)

\[ \text{Rest :} \quad \ldots \text{ drye} \]

†55. \( \text{A pore, D poor, for yore} \)

88. \( \text{Cp Of which the sone Diomede of Tideus took hede} \)

\[ \text{Rest : Omit Diomede} \]

\( (S_2D \text{ have gloss Diomede over Tideus; } H_2 \text{ has gloss in margin; } H_4 \text{ diomedes for the sone of Tideus}) \)

†208. \( \text{AD + H}_2H_4 \ldots \text{ and eke Cipride} \)

\[ \text{Rest : Omit eke} \]

\( \text{Eke is taken over from the preceding line.} \)

321. \( \text{AD + Gg} \ldots \text{ on me} \ldots \)

\[ \text{Rest :} \quad \ldots \text{ of me} \ldots \]

335, 336. \( \text{H}_1S_2 \ldots \text{ pe care} \)

\( \ldots \text{ this fare} \)

\[ \text{Rest :} \quad \ldots \text{ pe fare} \]

\( \ldots \text{ pis care} \)

\( (A \text{ pe mone} \ldots \text{ pis care allone; Gg care corrected from fare}) \)

522. \( \text{H}_1A \text{S}_1 + \text{Gg} \ldots \text{ preyde} \)

\( (H_1 \text{ preyed}) \)

\[ \text{Rest :} \quad \ldots \text{ seyde} \]

†572. \( \text{DS}_1 \text{ Now goode swete herte} \ldots \)

\[ \text{Rest : Omit herte} \]

599. \( \text{DS}_1 + J \ldots \text{ blisful god} \ldots \)

\[ \text{Rest :} \quad \ldots \text{ blisful lorde} \ldots \]
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733. ClCpH₁ AS₁ + JH₃ . . . po yonder wallys (H₃A the)
Rest: Omit po

750. AS₁ . . . bytyde what may bityde
Rest: Omit may

943. A So þat or þat I departe . . .
D So þat or I departe . . .
Rest: So er þat I departe . . .
(H₄ For for So; H₂H₄ om. þat)

993. AD I neuere er wroughte
Rest: Omit er

†1048. ClD omit kepen

1057. AS₁ + Cx . . . and eke . . .
Rest: . . . and on . . .

†1093 ClH₁ omit so

†1153. ClCpH₁ . . . whan þat . . .
Rest: Omit þat

1193. AD + Ph . . . by est & ek by weste
Rest: . . . by west & ek by este

†1277. AD + Gg omit maner

1343. AD may sterete 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 mysymetre . . .
S₂ Ne þis mysymetre . . .
Rest: Ne þe mysymetre . . .

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 CpH₁S₂ agreeing in several cases in a variant reading. It is to be noted that Cl is present in very few of these combinations.
Readings Characteristic of a.

The long series of a 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 a readings in the whole book; and in a number of those either H₃ 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 a reading is presented only by JGg. Further, it will be found that in the trivial readings of the group individual β MSS. frequently share. The list of a readings follows.

\[ \text{JGgPhH}_3(a). \]

9. \[ \text{J(Gg)Ph} \ldots \text{hir bemys cleene} \]
   \[ \text{H}_2\text{H}_4\text{RS}_1 \ldots \text{his bemes shene} \]
   \[ \gamma\text{H}_3\text{Cx} \ldots \text{his bemes clere} \]

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 γ reading.

202. \[ \ldots \text{no wight} \ldots \]
   \[ \text{Rest:} \ldots \text{no ping} \ldots \]
   \[ \text{Wight suits the context better than ping.} \]

476. \[ \ldots \text{and thennes wolde he wende} \]
   \[ \text{Rest:} \ldots \text{and seyde he wolde wende} \]
   \[ (\text{S}_1 \text{pat he wolde}; \text{Cx with pandare his frende}) \]

523. \[ \text{Omit As (– H}_3) \]
A nine-syllable line in JGgPh.

570. \[ \ldots \text{ful busily (– J, – R)} \]
   \[ \text{Rest:} \ldots \text{ful blysfully} \]
Either reading is possible.

583. \[ \ldots \text{in my memorie (– Ph, + H}_2\text{R)} \]
   \[ (\text{J momorie}) \]
   \[ \text{Rest: Omit my} \]

My is necessary to the metre, since the rime words in 585, 586 show that we must accent memórie.
The Manuscript Relations in Book V.

†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 dissyllabic.

†730. ... *walles (− H₃, + D)*
*Rest: ... halles*  
(H₃ hawlys)
A clear case of error, since all MSS. read *wallys* in 733.

885. *Nor ... (− Ph, + H₂ H₄)*  
(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. ... *tenth the nyght (− Ph)*  
(J nyght *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 that that Ioncs of his purueiaunce (− H₃, + H₄)*  
*Rest: Omit that.*
A nine-syllable line in βγ.
1502-1504. JGg And how ypomedon with blody wownde
   And ek Parthonope in litel stownde
   Ben slayn and how Cappaneus the proude
Rest : And how ypomedon yn lytel stounde
   Was dreynyt 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; H₂ dede And dreynyt; 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 Parthenopæus 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 gоо 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 α 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 α MSS.

154. H₃Ph + Cx . . . any creature
Rest: . . . every creature
   (D has the H₃Ph reading by later hand; H₂H₄ every
   ooper)

217. GgPh omit right.

308. JPh + Cp swerd repeated from 307 for sheld.
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318. H₃Gg That certeiny I mot nedes dye
     (H₃ must needes)
     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 leue broper dere

364. H₂Ph . . . what that they meen
     Rest: . . . what dremes mene

407. GgPh Now rys vp . . .
     Rest: Omit vp

469. H₃Ph . . . owne . . .
     Rest: . . . howue . . .
     (H₂ ounge; 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 whan he hade songen sone
     (Gg hade songe also sone)
     Rest: This song when he pes songen hadde soone
     (Ph whan pes sungyn had he; H₄ om. pes)
     The Italian reads, cantando cost 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 wil 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 . . . vnnethe my lyf . . .
    Rest: . . . my lyf vnneþe . . .
    (Gg silf 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 kyttid).

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:

H₂H₄RCₓ(β).

9. . . . his bemes shene (— Cₓ, + S₁)

J(Gg)Ph . . . cleene

γH₃Cₓ . . . clere

Text. Trad.
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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 þus & pleyde (+ H₃)
   (R lacking; H₂ Iaped he; H₃ forthe for þus)
   Rest: ... seyde

Pleyde is certainly correct; for all the MSS. have seyde 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: Thencheson ...
   The Italian reads, Chi ne fosse cagione, Fil. 5. 61.

732. Omit al (− Cx, + H₃Ph)

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.
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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. . . knowne 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 3e in armes bisy day by day

†1321. That tunge tell can . . .

S1Cx . . . can telle . . .

Rest: Omit can.

1386. Remorde for Commene.
1572. \ldots poust \ldots (+ Ph)

\textit{Rest:} \ldots soughte \ldots

1602. \textit{Omi:} why

Apart from this relationship of \(H_2H_4\), which is, however, occasionally broken, the \(\beta\) MSS. fall into no recognizable sub-groups. We may notice a few scattering agreements, of which only one is of any significance.

\textbf{Scattering Agreements of \(\beta\) MSS.}

60. \quad \(H_2R + H_3\) soberly \textit{for} sorrowfully

89. \quad RCx + D his crede \textit{for} pe crede

211. \quad \(H_4Cx + Gg\) waywith; \(R\) waltryth; \(J\) whileth; \(Ph\) swellith; \textit{Rest} wayleth

236. \quad \(H_4Cx + Ph\) \textit{omit} right

265. \quad \(H_2R\) peynes \textit{for} sorwes

266. \quad RS\_peynes \textit{for} sorwes

652. \quad RCx ek old \textit{for} olde ek; \(a + H_2\) om. ek

1082. \quad RCxS\_ + Ph + A right sory; \(H_4\) ful sory; \textit{Rest} sory

1083. \quad \(H_4CxS\_\ldots\) in any aduersite

\textit{Rest: Omit any}

\(H_4CxS\_\ldots\text{emend to avoid a nine-syllable line.}

1203. \quad \(H_2Cx\) ymagin \textit{for} Iuggen

1498. \quad \(H_4\) omits the Latin summary of the \textit{Thebais}; \(H_2\) contains an additional line, \textit{Feruidus ypomedon timidique in gurgite mersus}, not found in the other MSS.

1545. \quad \(H_4\) submitted, \(R\) summitted, \textit{for} smytted

1790. \quad \(H_4RCx\) be thou \textit{for} be

\*1866. \quad \(H_2R\) Trine vnite vs from our cruel foone

\textit{Rest:} \quad Vs from visible and Inuysible foone

This reading of \(H_2R\) has every appearance of being genuine.

1868. \quad \(H_2R\) take \textit{for} make

Note that here and in 1866 \(H_4\) and \(H_2\) are at variance.
The Stanzas from Teseide.

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 O. 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 to pis Troylus for loue, 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 sorrow 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 freshe 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, \( H_3 \) and Ph omit the passage entirely, while J and Gg have the last stanza. There was further evidence in Book IV that \( H_3 \) 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 \( H_3 \). But the passage is found regularly in \( H_3 \).

The association of \( H_3 \) with the \( \alpha \) 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 \( \beta \) as against \( a\gamma \); and, beginning at line 1021, it shares in eight \( \gamma \) readings. Among these \( \gamma \) readings, one falls within the Teseide passage. \( H_3 \) agrees with \( \gamma S_1 \) and the inset leaf of Ph in reading seventh spere, 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 \( \gamma \) source somewhere in the tradition of \( H_3 \), as we see it added before our eyes in Ph; or that in the latter part of the book \( H_3 \) 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 \( \alpha \) 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 \( H_2H_4 \), which we have shown to be of the \( \beta \) group? It is here that we must recognize our lack of any satisfactory answer. We can merely point to the fact that the \( H_2H_4 \) parent is of a peculiarly composite character. In Book I it is definitely an \( \alpha \) MS.; in Book II it wavers between \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \); in III, though overwhelmingly \( \beta \) in character, it has the shifted stanzas 190 and 191 twice over, once in the \( a\gamma \) position and again in the \( \beta \) position; in Book IV \( H_4 \) (and probably the \( H_2H_4 \) parent) agrees with \( \alpha \) in omitting the free-choice soliloquy. Perhaps the Teseide passage, if added later, was written on a loose sheet, which the \( H_2H_4 \) scribe failed to notice, or to find.

We may conclude by saying that, in the absence of certain
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 $\beta$ 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 $H_2PhH_4$, 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 $\beta y$. 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 $H_2PhGgH_5$, now agreeing with $\gamma H_3Cxs_1$ against $JRH_4$, and now with $JRH_4$ against $\gamma H_3Cxs_1$. 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 $H_2PhGgH_5$; the $\beta$ by $JH_4RCx$ 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 $H_2Ph$, 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, 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 βγ 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 α 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.
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 $\beta$. 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 $\beta$ 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 $\beta \gamma$ can be proved to be in error as against a correct reading in $a$.

**The Character of $\gamma$.**

In sharp contrast to the variations which distinguish $a$ and $\beta$ are those which characterize $\gamma$. These are (1) the omission of stanza 102 of Book IV, a stanza necessary to the sense;\footnote{See above, p. 183.} (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;\footnote{See above, pp. 182, 183.} 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 $\gamma$ obviously
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.
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\( \beta \) 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 \( JH_4 \) RCx 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 \( H_2 \) 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 \(\alpha\) readings four seem to be erroneous. But one conclusion is possible. The \(\alpha\) 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 Cocytus for the Phlegethon of ay. 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
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.*, \( H_3, H_2 Ph, GgH_5, H_4 \), 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 liad 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 H₂. 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.

TEXT. TRAD. 8
If the β 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 α MSS. Can one say that this MS. or that represents the β 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 $H_2 P h G g H_5$ 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 $H_3$, in so far as the latter is a β 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 β 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 β 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 “ofte 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 H₄ of the two shifted stanzas of Book III.

(4) The position of γ midway between α and β, 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 γ original was derived.

(5) The presence in the α original of a number of obvious errors, and the almost total lack of manifest errors in the β 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 α MSS. present α readings, and so with β. 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 α group three distinct stages are discernible. Though the readings characteristic of γ are, unless otherwise supported, to be regarded as not authentic, in one sense γ 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 β 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 α version, in which several minor stages are discoverable, and the revised β version. In γ he will recognize merely an intermediate stage between the two. Instances in which α, γ, and β present each a different reading are rare. In such cases the γ 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.
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 rope in 4. 596 has to do with the Cecilia Chaumpaigne episode seems to me quite fanciful.
constitute the text at its two extremes of revision, in its α form as it was first published, and in its β 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 α.

There is but one MS. which represents the α 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 γ 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 H₂; but this aid is not very satisfactory. The first hand of H₂, which has written most of the α 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 H₂¹ and Ph, we have a text somewhat better than that of H₂ 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 α, by means of which the readings of H₂ Ph can be checked.

In Book I α is represented by H₂ Ph and H₄. No reading can be regarded as a genuine α reading unless it has the support of these two authorities. We should be justified in regarding as genuine the reading of H₂ Ph or of H₄ alone, only if it also received the support of one or more β 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 H₂ Ph or of H₄, not found in the other, as genuine. Conversely,
we must accept as belonging to the $\alpha$ original any reading in which $H_2Ph$ 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 $H_2Ph$ and $H_4$ was fortuitous. There are in Book I a number of readings in which $H_2PhH_4$ 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 $H_2PhH_4$ 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 GgH$_5$. 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, GgH$_5$ 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 $H_2PhGgH_5$, 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 $H_2PhGgH_5H_4$. It is not easy to say what attitude should be adopted towards readings found in $H_2PhGgH_5$ not supported by $H_4$ and in $H_2PhH_4$ not supported by GgH$_5$. Of the latter the clearest cases are found in the first 57 lines, before GgH$_5$ join the $\alpha$ group. After that point, the $H_2PhH_4$ readings are no more impressive than are the cases of agreement between $H_2Ph$ and Cx, or $H_2Ph$ 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 $H_2Ph$, 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 $H_2PhGgH_5$. With these MSS. are associated sometimes $\gamma H_3CxS_1$, sometimes JRH$_4$. An attempt at explaining this eccentricity of JRH$_4$ 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 $H_2PhGgH_5$ 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 assured 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 + GgH₅yH₃S₁. 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.
Conclusion.

In the great majority of these cases, though not in all, $\gamma$ shows $\beta$ readings.

In Book V $\alpha$ continues to be represented by JGgPh$H_3$; but the distinctive $\alpha$ 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 $\alpha$ reading. From line 1021, $H_3$ takes on a mixed character, sharing in about half the $\gamma$ readings. It is, therefore, an uncertain witness to $\alpha$. Ph also frequently deserts the $\alpha$ 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 $\alpha$. Despite the shifting character of its attestation, the unity and continuity of the $\alpha$ text throughout the poem cannot be doubted. It is preserved by the steady and virtually unbroken adherence of the $H_2$Ph parent, and after Book II by that of Gg($H_3$). Throughout the poem, the $\alpha$ text is indicated as the earlier version by its closer following of the Italian.

Of the $\alpha$ 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 $\alpha$ text throughout the poem. For Books I and II, $H_2$Ph must serve as basis for a critical text of $\alpha$. In Book III, where $\gamma$ shares in most of the $\alpha$ readings, a critic wishing to reconstitute $\alpha$ might take $\gamma$ 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 $\beta$.**

When we turn to the problem of reconstituting the $\beta$ text, we are confronted with similar difficulties. For $\beta$ we have throughout the poem two independent witnesses—R 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 $\beta$ text in lines 701–1113 of Book II. See above, pp.126–128.
The Text of $\beta$.

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 $\beta$ text is represented by $JGgH_5H_3RCx$, and in all but a few lines by $\gamma$ also. In every single case where the variation is at all striking $\gamma$ has the $\beta$ 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, $GgH_5$ desert $\beta$ for $\alpha$. After 1200, they are $\beta$ MSS., frequently in agreement with $J$. $H_4$ presents a mixed text, a collation of $\alpha$ 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, JRH$_4$ present an aberrant text, with a marked tendency to revert to $\alpha$ readings. The character of this JRH$_4$ text I have not been able to determine satisfactorily. The only safe procedure in Book II is to regard as genuine $\beta$ readings only those which have the support of $\gamma H_3 Cx S_1$. In a great majority of cases these authorities are supplemented by JR[H$_4$].

Throughout Book III, $\beta$ is represented $JH_4 RCx$. In the first 400 lines, where, however, there are hardly any striking variants, it has the support also of $GgH_5$. $H_3$ and $S_1$ present mixed texts, collations of $\beta$ and $\gamma$. The $\gamma$ group stands midway between $\alpha$ and $\beta$. In some sixty-five cases it presents $\beta$ readings; in a much larger number of cases, including the great majority of the striking revisions, it has $\alpha$ readings. Repeatedly we find individual $\beta$ MSS. reverting to the unrevised text. In line 256 we have what seems to be a genuine $\beta$ reading given only by $\gamma H_3 S_4 R$. In general, however, the $\beta$ 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 $H_4$, $R$, and $Cx$. Each of the four chief representatives of $\beta$—$J$, $H_4$, $R$, and $Cx$—is independently derived from the $\beta$ original; so that a reading supported by any three of the four must be regarded as genuine. The $\beta$ readings of $S_1$ seem also to have been independently derived; those of $H_3$ come from a source apparently akin to $Cx$.

In Book IV, $\beta$ gains at line 197 the adherence of $H_2$; but as $H_2$ in its third and fourth hands is closely related to $H_4$, it serves as a check on $H_4$ rather than as an independent witness. At line 326, $H_3$ ceases to give even its intermittent $\beta$ readings; and with line 438, $J$, hitherto the backbone of $\beta$, becomes an $\alpha$ MS. Through
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 Teeseide 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 $a$, 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.\(^1\) 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 importance, 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, S₂Dig, 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 readings 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 confirmation 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 attestation for the connection of CpH₁S₂Dig as against CIAD, 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 S₂Dig were derived before Cl, and Cl before AD. The presence in the γ original of such corrections will explain the chance associations 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.

γ reading. In the rare cases where they divide two and two, he will call in the evidence of $S_2$ Dig, and perhaps of $S_1$ and $H_3$.

When the γ 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 γ reading can be regarded as authentic unless supported by MS. authority outside of the γ group; and since $S_1$ and $H_3$ so frequently share in γ 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 α, β, and γ present three distinct readings; and second, if the γ 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 γ reading is recognizable as a variant of either α or β, 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 γ represents the middle stage. Of the second there is but one clear case. In line 1748 of Book III where γ$H_3$S$_1$ read knotte, the remaining MSS. read enditte. Since both words are found in Chaucer's source, Boethius, we must assume that the common original contained both readings.¹

If a γ reading is supported by one authority independent of γ, 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 γ reading, supported by one independent witness, was present as an alternative reading in the common original. If γ has the support of two independent authorities, we must assume this to have been the case; but instances of this are not frequent.

The γ 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 β MSS. save Cx have reverted to a modified α text.

We have indicated the process to be followed in reconstituting $a$, $b$, 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 $b$ 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 $b$. To base one's edition on Ph, the only consistently $a$ MS., or on R or Cx, the only consistently $b$ 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$_1$. Of the three, the choice will probably fall upon Cp. This basal MS. will first be corrected by the other $\gamma$ MSS., and then purged of its distinctive $\gamma$ readings. This purified Cp 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 $b$ 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 wele.
II. 26. Line written by later hand.
64. Songe by later hand.
III. 1261. For Benienyng read Bemenyng.
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 menyng.
387. Omit second hire.
465. For doon read noon.
559. For And read That.
632. For And read But.
664. For kynge read kyng.
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 throte read prote.
746. one over line, (f) later.
931. For And read But.
1442. opere corrected from operes.
1734. Omit which.
III. 1. At beginning of proem read: Incipit prohemium Tercij Libri.
630. For a read it.
801. For ful read she.
1089. & over erasure.
1094. For For read But.

Harleian 2280.
I. 72. All but first word over erasure.
398. so over line.
470. For charppe read sharppe.
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.uble by scribe in margin.
283. For And read But.
300. For If read And.

TEXT. TRAD.
### Appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>352.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>749.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>764.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>913.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1298.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1299.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1429.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>983.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1107.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1344.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>829.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1086.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1290.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1466.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1467.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1616.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Gg. 4. 27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>856.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>921.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>855.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>915.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>922.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1065.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1460.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1436.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>717.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>755.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1104.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1220.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1060.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1069.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
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1028. it over line, later.
1034. Read yis (not italicized).

I. 299. Omit to.
349. For And read Yif.
380. even corrected from meury.
505. to over erasure by later hand.
508. with in by scribe over erasure.
655. hym have mercy by later hand over erasure; for read &.
840. For destreyed read desteyned.
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 Neece read myn.
1621. it over line by scribe.
1690. 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 columna baiulat by scribe in margin.
831. be written and erased after May.
838. Omit and.
908. or over line by scribe.
933. Dulcaron 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. or a 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 faileth thynge 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.
1350. 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.
806. In medium librata / statum Criseis he riles promit in affec tum vultus nodatur / in equos flauicies / crinata / Vmbraque minoris / delicias ocu has iunc / tos suspendit in / arcus / diuiejs forme cer / tant insigne amorum / Sobria simplicitas / comis pudor ari / da num quam / posecenti / pietas gracia fandi
Appendix.

lenis / by scribe in margin.

827. Troilus in spacium / surgentes expli / cat arcus / mente gigas et/ te puere. mixtoque / vigore / nullique 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 dreadyd read dredes.
540. For manye read many.
632. For sharpe read sharppe.
693. Read: Thi wo to telle and tell me if the liste.
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 thanke read thank.

III. 1. Initial not executed.
833. For but read ful.
922. though corrected from thought.
1593. Omit out.

IV. 717. she sholde corrected from sholde.
1394. Note should read [Most of stanza 190, 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 sethe.
1030. 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 over.

IV. 28. For Lvt (or Lvt) read Crt (or Ct).
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. selle deleted before lyf.
422. Read: The new lone outhe chaost labour or other woo with outhe 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 woide, 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 mistaken 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.

Phillipps.

II. 1083. Line later by scribe in space left blank.
1119. For wordis read woordis.
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III. 257. For hade read have.
292. Line later by scribe in space.
299. For caust read canst.
320. Line regularly written:
That neuere zet behight hem pis ne that.

IV. 772. For I read y.
785. For Myft read My hert.
790. Line later by scribe in space.

V. 331. sawe over line, later.
1796. For mismetre read mis-metre.
**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>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41, 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 13</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24–28</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>55, 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>42, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>130, 131</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43, 44</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>143, 144</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>150, 151</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57, 58</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>38, 59</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>163–167</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>44, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>181, 182</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87–91</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>45, 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>55, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93–96</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>199</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Index.</th>
<th>Book I</th>
<th>Book I</th>
<th>Book I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>68, 82</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>49, 68</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>56, 68</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425, 426</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>72, 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>56, 66</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>483</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>57, 63</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>58, 71, 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>59, 74, 82</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>63, 74, 77</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>50, 70</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>58, 64, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>63, 71</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592</td>
<td>67, 74</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>890-896</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>58, 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>71, 77</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>52, 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>52, 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>58, 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>52, 65, 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>69, 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1000, 1001</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Index.</th>
<th>Book I</th>
<th>Book I</th>
<th>Book I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1001</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1002</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1007</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1012</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1014</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1024</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1032</td>
<td>58, 75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1057</td>
<td>65, 79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1064</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1076-1078</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1081</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>94, 115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>92, 113, 122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>100, 113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>94, 98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-35</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>94, 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>84, 95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>92, 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>95, 117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>98, 105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book II)</td>
<td>(Book II)</td>
<td>(Book II)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>98, 117</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>98, 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>92, 122</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>478, 479</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>85, 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>91, 98</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>85, 96, 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>93, 101</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>86, 109, 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>95, 115</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>92, 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>96, 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421, 422</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>701-1113</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Line Index

*(Book II)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>978</td>
<td>117, 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>980</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1005</td>
<td>87, 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1013</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1018</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1024</td>
<td>99, 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1026</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1055</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1068</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1079</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1083</td>
<td>96, 110, 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1084</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1085</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1091</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1093</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1095–1097</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1104</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1105</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1108</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1109</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1113</td>
<td>88, 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1116</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1119</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1120</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1142</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1143</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1147</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1152</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1155</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1156</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1162</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1164</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1168</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1172</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1181</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1189</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1196</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1202</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1211</td>
<td>112, 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1240</td>
<td>88, 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1249</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1265</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280</td>
<td>88, 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1286</td>
<td>97, 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1291</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1292</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1298</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1311</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1312</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The lines are sorted by page numbers.*
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1314</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1316</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1321</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1333</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1344</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1347</td>
<td>89, 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1352</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1356</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1383</td>
<td>112, 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1394</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1395</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1398</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1399</td>
<td>102, 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1426</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1429</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1429, 1430</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1433</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1434</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1439</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1442</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1452</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1455</td>
<td>113, 116, 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1487</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1493</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1513</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1517</td>
<td>91, 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1519</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1526</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546</td>
<td>103, 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1616</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1624</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1644</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1663</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1665</td>
<td>91, 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672, 1673</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1677</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The lines are sorted by page numbers.*

*(Book III)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Lines</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</td>
<td>94, 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The lines are sorted by page numbers.*
<p>| (Book III) | 130 | 462 | 139 | 651 | 149 |
| 203 | 178 | 468 | 143 | 659 | 143 |
| 205 | 178 | 468 | 160 | 659 | 163 |
| 220 | 178 | 484 | 179 | 668 | 143 |
| 228 | 178 | 487 | 169 | 671 | 143 |
| 230 | 131 | 489 | 160 | 672 | 163 |
| 231 | 137 | 490 | 160 | 673 | 163 |
| 242 | 139 | 501 | 160 | 677 | 163 |
| 243 | 139 | 139 | 160 | 683 | 146 |
| 256 | 140 | 508 | 160 | 690 | 139 |
| 258 | 140 | 512 | 160 | 692 | 133 |
| 259 | 140 | 514 | 171 | 694 | 149 |
| 263 | 142 | 518 | 161 | 696 | 149 |
| 265 | 147 | 524 | 148 | 699 | 141, 150 |
| 266 | 158 | 525 | 161 | 702 | 163 |
| 269 | 175 | 526 | 176 | 705 | 164 |
| 273 | 146, 178 | 527 | 141 | 712 | 150 |
| 277 | 178 | 528 | 161 | 717 | 150 |
| 280 | 178 | 529 | 161 | 722 | 133 |
| 282 | 141, 158 | 533 | 132 | 724 | 176 |
| 293 | 141, 158 | 532 | 132 | 737 | 179 |
| 300 | 137 | 536 | 132 | 751 | 150 |
| 301 | 131 | 537 | 132 | 756 | 139, 146 |
| 302 | 175 | 543 | 148 | 758 | 133 |
| 303 | 178 | 544 | 161 | 759 | 164 |
| 304 | 142 | 546 | 161 | 766, 767 | 143 |
| 306 | 137 | 549 | 148 | 773 | 164 |
| 311 | 137 | 554 | 161 | 776 | 150 |
| 319 | 131 | 555 | 161 | 786 | 179 |
| 329 | 179 | 558 | 132, 141, 148, 161 | 786 | 179 |
| 349 | 143 | 568 | 162 | 797 | 139 |
| 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 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Index.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book III)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Line Index

### Book III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1708</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1723</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744-1771</td>
<td>145, 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754</td>
<td>137, 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>140, 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1778</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1779</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1783</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Book IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-28</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39, 40</td>
<td>184, 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41, 42</td>
<td>192, 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-59</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>212, 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Book IV (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>193, 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>185, 194, 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295, 296</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300, 301</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>196, 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>197, 227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410, 411</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>213, 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>198, 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>198, 227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470</td>
<td>189, 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484</td>
<td>185, 199, 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>185, 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506, 507</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>186, 200, 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581</td>
<td>200, 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Index.</td>
<td>(Book IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588</td>
<td>200, 212, 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594</td>
<td>200, 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>596</td>
<td>201, 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>598</td>
<td>201, 226, 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>201, 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>647</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>662</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>666</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>674</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>691</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>696-698</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>698</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708-714</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>717</td>
<td>190, 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>723</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>732</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>733</td>
<td>202, 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>734</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>736-742</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>739</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750-752</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750-756</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>757</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>758</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>762, 763</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>765</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>767</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773</td>
<td>186, 204, 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>775</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>781</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>782</td>
<td>190, 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>788</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>792, 790</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>791</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>794</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book IV</td>
<td>Line Index.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1572...</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575...</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584...</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608...</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1628...</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654...</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657...</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688...</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1697...</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The line index is for Books IV and V, with cross-references to Book V when applicable.