

## The Use of *doubt(e)* for Determining the Date of a Manuscript

Kisei SAKEMI \*

(Received Sep. 4, 2009)

### Abstract

This paper questions when the letter <b> was introduced into *doute*, examines dictionaries and computer corpora, and concludes that the spelling *doubte* can be a key to date a manuscript. The author starts from his own experience and the personal correspondence with Dr. Margaret Laing, tries to find examples of *doute* and *doubte* (with variant forms) in *OED*, *MED* and the Helsinki Corpus, and suggests in conclusion a further survey on the forms reconstructed by Latin as well as those suffered metathesis or analogy so as to use the results for assigning more accurate date to a manuscript.

**Key Words:** spelling, manuscript, date, corpus

0. When reading *Guy of Warwick* in the Auchinleck MS (c. 1330), I very often resorted to the Caius Cambridge MS 107/176 whenever I encountered difficult passages. In doing so I found many later forms in the Caius MS, such as *they / thei, their, them, suche, eche, thurgh, not, neither, shall* (pr. pl.), *shuld, -yng(e), litell, ayene, streight, sawe, werke, gaue, doubte, people*, and so on. J. Zupitza, the editor of *Guy of Warwick* (EETS ES 42, 49, 59. 1883-91), dates this MS to c. 1400, and D. Burnley and A. Wiggins, who edited an electronic version of all the Auchinleck works for the National Library of Scotland (<http://www.nls.uk/auchinleck/>), followed him. However, personally I was inclined to move the date forward at least 50 years, and put a query to Margaret Laing at the University of Edinburgh to that effect, who pointed out that the *MED* dates the Caius MS to “c. 1475.” I myself am in favor of the later date.

It is, above all, the spelling *doubt(e)* in the Caius MS that attracted my attention. When did this spelling with <b> come into use? First, I tried the quotation-search of *OED* on the condition of ‘date = 1300-1500’. The results are 13 hits for *doubt* and 23 hits for *doubte*. The earliest citation is from “a1300 Cursor M. 22604 (Edin.)”, but since *MED* dates this MS Royal College of Physicians to “a1400”, the second earliest citation from Gower may safely be regarded as the earliest one: “1393 Conf. I. 230 First ben enformed for to lere A craft, which cleped is facrere. For if facrere come about, Than afterward hem stant no doubt.” (Underline mine) Another noticeable fact is that Caxton accounts for 16 out of 23 instances. Did this translator/ printer make this *doubt(e)* popular?

1. According to Dr. Laing, before 1300 there are no instances of *doubt(e)*. In a personal correspondence she writes:

I believe the spelling of ‘doubt’ with <b> came in around 1400. There are certainly no such spellings in my LAEME corpus up to 1300. Beyond that, my sources are the same as yours – OED and MED.

OED points out that the Old French forms from which the word was borrowed into Middle English are all of the *dout-* type. The <b> was introduced as a result of increased knowledge of Latin in late Middle English and early Modern English times (< Latin dubitare). <b> was introduced into both Middle English and Middle French, but was subsequently dropped from French though kept in English.

---

\* Department of Electronics and Computer Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Hiroshima Institute of Technology

I think ca. 1400 is probably about right for the first surviving citations -- see the quotations taken from MED below. I can find none any earlier than the Gower *Confessio Amantis* ones, from the Fairfax MS which is dated end of the 14th century -- so not much after the conjectured composition date of 'before 1393'. The Chaucer MS quoted is from the first quarter of the 15th century.

- (a1393) Gower CA (Frf 3) 1.2891: And al the poeple unto thee louteth, And al the world thi pouer doubteth.  
 (a1393) Gower CA (Frf 3) 6.2171: The king was doubtif of this dom.  
 (a1393) Gower CA (Frf 3) 7.3524: If he be doubtous To slen in cause of rihtwisnesse.. it is Pusillamite.  
 a1425 (c1385) Chaucer TC (Benson-Robinson) 5.1518: Wep if thow wolt, or lef! For out of doubte,  
 This Diomede is inne, and thow art oute.

From her explanation we know that *dou(b)t(e)* derives from Latin *dubitare* and that < b > was introduced into not only Middle English but also Middle French. Is it, then, possible that the form with < b > did not come directly from Latin, but by way of French? That may be the case because, as we shall see later, people familiar with French often used it. It is not surprising at all if Gower, who wrote *Mirour de l'Omme* in French and *Vox Clamantis* in Latin, introduced < b >. By the way, Laing's list does not contain the citation in *OED* from Gower *CA* I. 230. It is because G. C. Macaulay (1900) reads it as *doute* in his edition (2. 2124). However, there is in fact an instance of *doubte* at 4. 1022 in rhyme (: aboute).<sup>1</sup> Is it, then, that this form is Gower's preferred spelling? On the contrary, he preferred *doute* to *doubte*; he has as many as 34 uses of *doute* in *CA*.

2. On the Internet I got access to the Middle English Compendium and looked up the "doubt\*" type in *MED*. The results are "651 matches in 62 records," but when the form *doubt* used in the prefaces or introductions by later editors and the *doubte* forms which appear in French passages are removed, it comes to 385 instances in 23 records. Let us give them in chronological order, that is, after the Helsinki Corpus, (M1, M2,) M3 and M4.

#### M3 (1350-1430)

1393	Confessio Amantis	4
a1400	Cursor Mundi (Phy-E)	1 (doubt) <sup>2</sup>
e1400	Ch's CT (Hg)-	+
a1425	Wycliffe: The Bible	2 (doubtinge 1, doubt 1) <sup>3</sup>
a1425	Ch's CT (Gg.4.27)	1 (doubte) <sup>4</sup>
a1425	Ch's CT (La 851)	3 (doubte 1, doubtles 2) <sup>5</sup>
a1425	Ch's CT (Ha 7334)	2 (doubte 2) <sup>6</sup>

To M3 there are only 12 instances in all. The instance in MS Hengwrt, D. Sum. [= Summoner's Tale] 1712, is cited from Chaucer Society's publications, but it is an error for *doute*. As we now know, the scribe of Ha 7334 is Scribe D who copied seven manuscripts of Gower's *CA* and two manuscripts of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* (CT).<sup>7</sup> He might have learned that spelling with < b > through copying Gower's work. One of his two uses of *doubte*, D.Sum 1712, is copied *doute* in MS Hg, the MS written by Scribe B, who might be Adam, Chaucer's own "scribeyn."<sup>8</sup> Therefore, the < b > was probably inserted by Scribe D. The instance in *Cursor M*, which was retrieved from *OED* as well, is found only in the Royal College of Physicians MS, and the other MSS, Cotton, Fairfax, Göttingen and Trinity, do not have the < b >, and so this was also introduced by the scribe. The one of two instances I have confirmed in *The Holy Bible* is found at *I. Corinthians*. Cap. XV. verse 27 of the later version, and its MS, British Library, Royal 1 C. 8, is dated "before 1420" by Forshall & Madden,<sup>9</sup> and "a1425" by *MED*. Consequently, we can say that Gower, who has four instances, is the first to use the *doubt*-type.

The above list contains three instances from Lansdowne 851 and two from Harley 7334, and both of them have one instance from Chaucer's *Tale of Melibeus*. This tale is, according to J. B. Severs (1941), a close translation of the *Livre de Melibée et de Dame Prudence* written by Renaud de Louens sometime after 1336. We cannot tell whether the French translator used the *doubt-* type or not, because his holograph has been lost. However, the French exemplar Chaucer worked from might have had *doubt-*; Severs's edition of the French source, the base of which is Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS. fr. 578 (14th c.), does have this < b > form only.<sup>10</sup> Since Chaucer's translation is now assigned to 1386-90, it seems likely that the < b > had been introduced into Middle French before that time. Chaucer did not reach for the Latinized form when it was in his French source, right before his eyes. On the other hand, Gower used that spelling form frequently, but it was in his French work, *Mirour de L'Omme* (c. 1377). The glossary of G. C. Macaulay's edition (1899) lists these words:

doubtance, s. 8069, B. iv. 4, fear, doubt  
doubte, doute, s. 1341, 2112, 4678, T. v. 3, fear, doubt  
doubter, *v.a., n.* and *refl.* 442, 802, 1197, 6324, T. xiii. 1, fear, care, doubt  
doubtous, *a.* 27837, T. iv. 1, doubtful

Of these, only the instance of line 4678 lacks < b >. However, in *CA* (1390-93) he, too, as I mentioned above, holds back the use of it (*doubte* 1 : *doute* 34), though he has one use of *doubteth*, *doubtous* and *doubtif*, respectively. Incidentally, *MED* cites only Gower for the headword *doubtif*. And interestingly enough, Tobler-Lommatzsch's *Alt-französisches Wörterbuch* has the headword *doubtous* (*doubteux*, *Ménag.* I 55), but not of *doubtif*. (Godefroy's *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française et de tous ses dialectes* has both of them.)

M. K. Pope, in her *From Latin to Modern French* (p. 149, § 373), states that in Early Old French, that is, from the end of the 5th c. to the end of the 11th c., labials were effaced whenever they were juxtaposed to following dentals (*dūbīto* > *dote*). And then in the 14th century, it is generally said, such spellings as *doubte* with etymological < b > came into frequent use.<sup>11</sup> Tobler-Lommatzsch cites one instance of *doubte* from the Old French translation of Ovid's *Remedia Amoris* (*sans nulle doubtte*, *Rem. Am.* 1322),<sup>12</sup> but since the Bibliography of *Dictionnaire étymologique de l'ancien français* (<http://www.deaf-page.de/>) dates the MS, Sächsische Landesbibliothek — Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Dresden, Oc. 66, to c. 1375, the first quotation cited by Godefroy is earlier:

Sur la *deubte* que il ont de nous courroucier. (1359, *Ord.*, III, 362)<sup>13</sup>

If this is really the first instance in Middle French, it follows that Gower, who must have completed *Mirour de l'Omme* before Richard's accession in 1377,<sup>14</sup> inserted < b > just some twenty years after the first instance in French. According to Pope (p. 422 § 1073, p. 456 § 1218), it is in the later thirteenth century that the earliest spelling treatises which enforce respect for the Latin etyma appeared; that is, the first spelling treatise, *Tractatus Orthographiae*, composed by a student of Paris, and the better known *Orthographia Gallica* which appeared soon afterwards. Pope also says that the few authors of the fifteenth century who, like Gower, still make use of French in literary compositions, model their usage as closely as they can on the speech of France — or rather Paris, are Anglo-French rather than Anglo-Norman.<sup>15</sup> In fact, Gower in *Mirour de l'Omme* uses *debte* beside *dette*, and *soubdeinement* beside *so(u)dainement*, though in *CA dette* 8 : *debte* 0. Also, he doubles consonants in accordance with Latin spelling in *accepter*, *accord*, *accuser*, *commander*, *commun*, etc.<sup>16</sup> This means that Gower knew the new trend in Paris and put it into practice when writing in French.

3. Now to M4 (1430-1500). Let us divide the witnesses in this period into two; one is Caxton and his followers, and the other is others than the Caxton group. And we can see that others than the Caxton group have as few uses of *doubt-* as in M3.

M4: Others than Caxton group		<b>doubt-</b>	<b>dout-</b>
a.1456	Shirley: Death of James	1 (doubt)	1 <sup>17</sup>
1461, 79	Paston Letters, Pt 1	2 (doubt 1, -table 1)	7 <sup>18</sup>
c.1475	Guy of Warwick (Caius ms.)	7 (doubte 6, -ted 1)	6 <sup>19</sup>
? a.1500	Davies: English Chronicle	1 (doubte) <sup>20</sup>	0
a.1500	The Brut (Addit. 10099)	3 (doubted 3)	5 <sup>21</sup>

The occurrences are unexpectedly infrequent. Striking is that MS. Caius of *Guy of Warwick* has seven uses of *doubt-*; the scribe would have been very familiar with French. It is understandable that *MED* dates that MS to c. 1475, for Caxton, who set up a press at Westminster in 1476, uses, as we will see below, the *doubt-* type almost exclusively. The only thing is, the scribe of MS. Caius uses the *dout-* type as well — six times.<sup>22</sup> Now, this list is not all; there are some other examples in *The Paston Letters*. By searching James Gairdner's edition (vols. 2-6) included in the Innsbruck Corpus (= Innsbruck Computer Archive of Middle English Texts), we find 14 instances (the occurrence in 1426 must be removed because N. Davis reads it as *doute* ).

- ~~1426, March~~ ~~doubte~~
- 1432, Nov. 9 Articles de Monsr. de Warrewyk  
 ... so that it may resonably be doubted leste he wol conceive ayeins the said Erle, or eny other that wol take upon him ...
- 1432, Nov. 9 op. cit.  
 ... he hath be stured by summe from his lernyng, and ... the seid Erle doubting the harme that mighte falle to the King, and ...
- 1453 The Duke of Norfolk's Petition  
 ... for doubt lest that othyr yn tyme comyng take example thereof, and
- 1455, May 21 From the Duke of York to Henry VI [No. 1022]  
 ... our ennemyes of approuved experience ... have throwen unto the same ryght stedyously and ryght fraudulentlye manye ambyguytees and doubtes of the fayth, lygeaunce, and dewtee that ...
- 1455, June 22 From Sir John Fastolf to John Paston I [No. 526]  
 ... he hath a lettre of credence to the baylly of Dedham because of doubt of syght of the baylly ys lettre ther for disclosyng, &c., ...
- 1455, July 7 From William Worcester to John Paston I [No. 529]  
 ... for y doubt he shall and most obbey, yff he hath offended.
- 1458 (?), Jan. 24 From Richard, Earl of Salisbury, to Viscount Beaumont  
 ... by the trowth I owe unto the King, but that therby I doubt not, I shulde not rekever, daies of my lyfe, ...
- 1461, Oct. 11 = MED [No. 117]
- 1474 (?), May 9 From Sir Ralph Hastings to John Paston II  
 ... the Connestable sykened with you in his goyng to Calais, of whome I doubt me, and so ...
- 1474 (?), May 9 op. cit.  
 ... I kepe not to make moo, for I doubt me that this we are about, ...
- 1478, March 1 From William Botoner to Sir John Paston II [No. 780]  
 ... and at reverence of Jhesu that my Robert lose no tyme, nether be idelle, for doubt of ymaginacions and temptacions.
- 1479, March = MED [No. 103]
- 1491 (?), March 27 From the Earl of Oxford to Sir John Paston III [No. 822]  
 ... nat doubting but that Sir Edmound Benyngfeld shall be there in like wise.

In 1450's, there is one more besides these five instances:

1451, January 28 From Sir John Fastolf to Thomas Howes [No. 1005]

I doubt they can doo it, they I remembre it not, but yhyt it ...

Moreover, in No. 1022 of 1455 appears *redoubted*, and in No. 575 of 1467 *undoubted*. The Paston family was located in Norfolk, but the several members of the family, John I (1421-66), Edmond I (1425-49), William II (1436-88), and John II (1442-79), according to N. Davis (2004), died in London, so the Pastons must have often gone to and from London. In fact, most of those who appear in *The Paston Letters* belonged to the upper ranges of society; they must have been educated and capable of reading French without difficulty. The spelling with silent < b > might have struck them as fashionable. Nonetheless, in that collection the *dout-* type is still dominant, appearing 42 times.<sup>23</sup> From this and the above list of M4 we could say that before 1450 there are still very few occurrences of the *doubt-* type.

4. It seems to be Caxton (c. 1422-91) and his successor Wynkyn de Worde (d. 1534) that made the spelling of *doubt-* type popular. Robert Copland (fl. 1508-1547), whom de Worde hired as a translator, could be grouped into this company. Here is the occurrences of *doubt-* in the books Caxton translated or added passages to.

1482	Polychronicon, Vol. VIII	8 (doubted 6, doubtte 1, doubttable 1)
1483	Legend of the Holy Rood	2 (douted 2)
1483	Knight of La Tour-Landry	8 (doubte 5, doubted 1, doutyng(e 2)
1485	Charles the Grete	48 (doubte 26, douted 16, doubtteth 4, doubtyng 2)
1485	Malory's Darthur	60 (doubte 53, doubted 6, doubtteth 1)
c. 1489	Blanchardyn	27 (doubte 13, doubted 14 )
c. 1489	Four Sons of Aymon	91 (doubte 67, doubt 11, doubted 11, doubtteth 2)

Since the volume VIII of *Polychronicon* was written by Caxton himself, the spelling is his own, and it was adopted from French. With regard to his attitude on translation, Octavia Richardson (1884: vii-viii) says as follows.

... In his translation of this work, Caxton shows himself piously literal. Words and phrases, both foreign and unusual, he transferred bodily to his text; nothing ever deterred him, simply because it was French; he wandered along every winding of the sentences he was rendering, and brought them over with all their sinuosities into the English.<sup>24</sup>

Wynkyn de Worde used the same spelling that his master did. However, in the three works he published there are only 28 instances.

1499	Three Kings of Cologne	4 (doubte 3, doubttes 1)
1506-8	Works of Richard Rolle	17 (doubte 8, doubt(e)full 4, doubted 3, doubttes 1, doubtles 1, doubttable 1)
c.1510	The Gesta Romanorum	7 (doubte 7)

It may be because de Worde, being contented with reprints, translated very few books himself. *The Cambridge History of English and American Literature* (1907-21, Vol. II. XIII) says as follows.

... We have no evidence that de Worde did anything in the way of editing or translating; but he had in his employ assistants who were able to translate from the French.

De Worde had several translators under him, one of whom was Robert Copland (c. 1470-1548). In *The Foure Sonnes of Aymon* (1554) reprinted by his son, William Copland (fl. 1548- 1568), too, the *doubt-* type is a dominant form, but this work, where Caxton's preferred forms, such as *grete*, *deth*, *werke*, *knowlege*, *see* and *coude*, are replaced with *death*, *great*, *worke*, *knowledge*, *sea*, and *could* respectively, reflects Early Modern English. Incidentally, the search results of CE 1 (1500- 1570; 27 works) in the Helsinki Corpus for both types are *dout\** 23 vs. *doubt\** 45. Despite the adoption and dissemination of the *doubt-* type by the Caxton group,<sup>25</sup> even in the 16th century the *dout-* type survived perseveringly.

5. To the search results of *MED* there is one more work left. It is an English translation of the tale of *Melusine* the water-nymph written in around 1387 by Jean d'Arras, a North French trouvère, at the request of John, duke of Berry. The prose translation is included in Brit. Lib., Royal 18. B. 2 (c. 1500), which also has many uses of *doubt-*.

c.1500 Melusine, Pt 1 86 (doubte 71, doubted 21, doubtful 7, doubttyng 4, doubtles 4, doubt 3)

The translator is unknown, but since it is said to be a close translation of the French prose, it is possible that it was rendered by Caxton (d. 1491) or Copland, for in late mediaeval England very few translators used this spelling as frequently as Caxton or Copland did. This form does not appear in *The Regiment of Princes* by Hoccleve (c.1368- c.1430) nor in *The Troy Book* nor *The Siege of Thebes* by Lydgate (c.1370- c.1450). Nor does it in the saints lives by John Capgrave (1393-1464) or *An Anthology of Chancery English* (ed. J. H. Fisher et al). However, my inference may be wrong because if it had been translated by Caxton or Copland, they would have printed it, not copied as it is in the MS. Royal 18. B. 2.

Now, to this *Melusine* there is also another version in stanzas of seven lines, which W. W. Skeat (1866) calls *The Romance of Partenay or of Lusignan*, and the MS of this verse, Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 3. 17 (the early 16th c.) also has *doubte*. Skeat (op. cit., p. xx) says that "the author may have been born, of English parents, in the province of Poitou, where the legend of Melusine was extremely well-known."

## 6. Conclusion.

Gower, who seems to be the first in England to use the spelling with < b >, usually uses the *dout-* type, and from carelessness he inserted < b > into the forms with *doubt-*, for in writing in French he was anxious to introduce < b > into those forms. In 1450's the *doubt-* type appears occasionally, and that in the letters written by such upper-class persons as the Paston family. Then the spelling form was popularized by Caxton who remained faithful to the French original, and his successors, de Worde and Copland, contributed to it. Therefore, if the *doubt-* type appears more often than the *dout-* type, then the MS could be placed to around 1475.

Finally, let us check the Innsbruck Corpus in order to verify this statement. (I exclude both the *Paston Letters* and the works by Caxton and de Worde.) As a result, the four files, it turned out, have the < b > form.

? a.1425	BOESKE ( <i>Boece</i> ed. by Skeat)	1	doubteth
? a.1450	HERBARUM (de Viribus Herbarum)	1	(doubtid)
c.1488-96	LETTCHRI (Christ Church Letters)	3	(doubtful 2, doubtedly 1)
a.1500	BRUT2 (The Chronicles of England)	3 + 2	(doubted 3 + vndoubted 2)

This result is almost the same as the above search results of *MED*. Eight instances out of ten are after the appearance of Caxton. The three in *Christ Church Letters* are from 1488, 1490 and 1496, and its MS can possibly be of somewhat later date. The five in *The Chronicles of England* are from Brit. Lib. MS, Addit. 10,099 (a.1500). Only two instances are relatively earlier. But the MS of *Boece* which Skeat used as a base text, Camb. Univ. Lib., Ii. 3.21,<sup>26</sup> reads it as *downteth*. Another MS Skeat collated with, Brit. Lib. Addit. 10,340 (EETS ES 5), also reads *doutep*. So does the MS the *Riverside Chaucer* is based on, Camb. Univ. Lib., Ii. 1.38 (*douteth*). Therefore, it is probable that Skeat inserted < b > by mistake.



Then only one instance remains. That appears in *A Middle English Translation of Macer Floridus de Viribus Herbarum*, the MS of which is probably Sloane 2269, and *MED* dates it to “? a.1450”. Since this text has one instance of *doute*, too, the dating by *MED* seems to be plausible.

Thus this spelling form is likely to help us to date a manuscript. So will the form *bird*. *MED* states that the first instance of the metathesized form is in 1419, and that from around 1475 downward it became popular.<sup>27</sup> If we collect and study more forms of this kind, not only such Latinized forms as *subtle*<sup>28</sup>, *debt*, *describe*, *perfect*,<sup>29</sup> *adventure*, *advise/advice*, *assault*, *fault*, *equal*, etc., but also such common words as *bird*, *could* with < l >, *delight* with < gh >, *guide*<sup>30</sup> with < ui >, *sound* with < d >, and *autumn*, the first user of which is Chaucer,<sup>31</sup> we would be able to assign a more accurate date to a manuscript.<sup>32</sup>

## Notes

\* I owe much to Dr. Margaret Laing, who gave me a detailed and polite answer to my query. I also wish to thank Míceál F. Vaughan, Associate Professor of English and Comparative Literature, University of Washington, for his very careful reading of my draft and his many constructive comments.

1. 4. 1022 Wherof thei weren alle in doubte.
2. 22604 Saint peter sal be domb þat dai, / Pat he ne a word dar noht spek, / For doubt of demsteris wreke.
3. Professor Vaughan helped me to find Wycliffe’s *doubtinge* in the margin of the earlier version of Ecclesiasticus Cap. V (p. 133).  
Ecclesiasticus. Cap. V. .... in techinge now the truthe, and now afferm | ynge the con | trarie of truthe, whiche thing techeris doubt | inge ether vn | stidefast in feith, ben wont to do. in the weye of the Lord;  
I. Corinthians. Cap. XV. ... whanne he seith, alle thingis ben suget to hym, with outen doubt outakun hym that suget | ide alle thingis to hym. And ...
4. I.Pars 1023 thow schat not schryue thee for veynglorye / ne for ypocrise / ne for non cause but only for the doubte of ihesu Crist
5. E.Mch 1722 ... to here / Neip̄er Theodomas zit halfe so clere / And Thebes whan þe Cite was in doubte / ... a-boute. /  
B.Mel 1884 For doubtelesse, if we bien sory & repentant of þe sinnes & giltes þe whiche we haue trespasede in ...  
B.NP 3108 Of dremes for .I. saie þe doubteles / þat mony a dreme ful sore is for to drede
6. D.Sum 1712 In which þer went a lymytour aboute / To preche and eek to begge it is no doubte  
B.Mel 1216 And if so be þat þou be in doubte wher þou maist parfome a þing or noon chese rather to suffre þan bigynne.
7. According to J. J. Smith (1988), his hand is identified in the following 12 MSS : Trinity, Cambridge R.3.2 (Gower, *CA*; quires 9, 15-19, and parts of 14), University Libr, London V.88 (*Piers Plowman* ‘C-text’), BL Addl 27944 (*Bartholomaeus*; fols. 2-7v, 96-335v), Bodl Bodley 902 (Gower, *CA*; fols. 2-16v), Corpus Christi, Oxford, B.67 (Gower, *CA*), Christ Church, Oxford 148 (Gower, *CA*), Columbia University Libr, Plimpton 265 (Gower, *CA*), BL Egerton 1991 (Gower, *CA*), Bodl Bodley 294 (Gower, *CA*), Princeton, University Libr, Robert H Taylor MS (Gower, *CA*; fols. 7r-190r), BL Harley 7334 (*CT*), and Corpus Christi College, Oxford MS 198 (*CT*). And in BL Harley 7334 and Corpus Christi Oxford 198, “the majority of forms are commonly found in the Southern Midlands, many of them invariable between the MSS.” Interesting enough, the Latin word *cicada* appears only four times in ME (see *MED*, Part C.3, p. 271), three of which are used by Trevisa in his translation of *De Proprietatibus Rerum* and Higden’s *Polychronicon*.
8. Linne Mooney (2006) thinks that Scribe B might be Adam, Chaucer’s own “scribeyn.”
9. The earlier Wycliffite version is adopted from the following five MSS, which Forshall & Madden date as follows.

	book	date	<i>came</i>
Corp. Ch. Coll. Oxford, 4	11	before 1420	4
Douce 369 (1)	16	before 1390	6
Douce 369 (2)	34	before 1390 ?	151
Douce 370	3	before 1400 ?	73
BL, Royal 1 B. 6	8	before 1400	0

However, I suspect that Douce 369 (2) and Douce 370 were copied after 1450, because the occurrence of *came*, which appears frequently after 1420, is very prominent in these two MSS. Another reason is that although Royal 1 C. 8 (a 1425), from which almost all items in the later version are adopted, has only 11 instances of *came*, Dc 369 (2) has 151 instances, and Dc 370 has as many as 73 instances in three books.

10. The spelling of *doubt-* type appears at lines 346, 368, 408, 415, 530, 531, 533, 537, 540, 543, 544, 545, 555, 684, and 685.
11. This information is based on the personal correspondence with Yuji Kawaguchi, professor of French at Tokyo University of Foreign Studies. He says that as to the date of the first instance of a spelling form, there seems to be no reliable reference book, but that it is in 1694 that the spelling *doubte* was returned to *doute* by the Academy.
12. Tobler-Lommatzsch gives this quotation from *Altfranzoesische Uebersetzung der Remedia Amoris des Ovid* (Leipzig, 1871), which G. Koerting edited based on Sächsische Landesbibliothek — Staats-und Universitätsbibliothek Dresden, Oc. 66. Koerting dates this MS to the early 15th century or the last quarter of the 14th century. The translator is anonymous, but Koerting thinks he is a person from Paris. To this translation there is another MS, which is in San Marco Bibliothek in Venezia and lacks both the beginning and the ending. It is less than half of the Dresden MS (fol. 15-76<sup>d</sup>). The ten instances of *doubte(s)* in the Dresden MS (531, 869, 1112, 1322, 1341, 1771, 1996, 2069, 2143, 2242) are all *doute(s)* in this San Marco MS. Incidentally, the homepage of Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France says that a trouvère named Jacques d'Amiens in Picardie (fl. 1250-80) also translated *Ars Amatoria* and composed a poem titled "li Remedes d'amors", but this is, according to Koerting, has little to do with Ovid's *Remedia Amoris*.
13. *Ord* means *Ordonnaunces des Roys de France de la troisième race*, p. p. E. J. de Laurière et al., Paris (Imp. roy.) 1723-1849. But I have not seen this book yet.
14. A. E. Hartung, *A Manual*, Vol. 7, p. 2198.
15. M. K. Pope, op. cit. p. 423 § 1075. P. Studer (1920: 4-16), stating that Anglo-Norman was a homogeneous language with distinctly Norman characteristics and that by the middle of the 14th century it was a dead language, prefers the term 'Anglo-Norman' to 'Anglo-French.'
16. G. C. Macaulay, op. cit. p. xxxii.
17. *The Dethe of the Kyng of Scotis*, p. 25 ... Yit doubt y nat that ye shall se the daye and the tyme, that ye shall pray my soule, ...  
The one instance of *dout-* is found in the next page (p. 26) :  
... I doute me full sore that, and ye contynue thus your tourmentes upon my wretched person, that for the ...
18. Clement Paston to John Paston 1 (1461) ... but put all things out of doubt he is such a man as will not lye.  
William Paston I to Richard Lee (1479) ... if he did them any wrong, and where as ther is a doubtable mater;  
The seven instances of *dout-* include *doute* 6 and *dout* 1, in the letters of 1426, 1460, 1479 and in the petitions of 1449, 1454??.
19. The seven uses of *doubt-* in the Caius MS of *Guye of Warrewik* are:  
50 And grettly doubted in euery place. 1175 For doubte of deth y woll not flee:  
1197 For the more men woll the doubte 1930 After good men withoute doubte  
3960 All the sarasyns of him had doubte. 6090 For doubte of deth y woll not flee.'  
6099 And Amys anone, withoute doubte.  
The instances of *dout-* are given in note 22.
20. An English chronicle of the reigns of Richard II, etc., ed. J. S. Davies.



[25th year of Henry VI] ... And there they brak up their waache, and euerye man went to his owne dwellyng-place, ... and no doubte of hit was (sic) a fervent coolde weder and a bytynge.

21. *The Brut, or The Chronicles of England*, edited from Ms. Raw. B171 (pp. 14-286), B173 (pp. 452-5), Add 10099 (pp. 491-533), etc., ed. F. W. D. Brie.

p. 495 And also with bisshoppes & men of te spirituelte, in so fer forth tat tei doubted sore tat he wold haue had te Temperalties out of ter handes;

p. 497 This King, beyng in his Cradel, was moche doubted & dradd, bicause of te gret conquest of his fadre, ...

p. 523 ... Bokyngham & othir lordes. & forthwith tei Arose, for tei durst ne lenger Abide, for tei doubted tat te hole Cite shold haue risen Ayenst teme, but ...

On the other hand, the five instances of *dout-* are: doute 3, doutid 1, doutet 1.

22. In Caius MS there are six occurrences of *dout-*: dowte 3, dowl 1, doute 2.

23. The details of 42 instances are:

dout(e) 17, dowl(e) 21, dowyng 1, dowlful (l) 2, dowlbill 1

24. However, L. Kellner (1890: cxi) says that he cannot admit Miss Octavia Richardson's statement with regard to Caxton's 'piety.'

25. Among the books published by William Copland there is *Valentine and Orson* (1555), which was translated from the French by Henry Watson at the request of Wynkyn de Worde in 1503-5. Concerning the vocabulary in *Valentine and Orson*, the editor of that book (EETS O.S. 204), Arthur Dickson, says as follows.

... Writers of his time coined words freely, and in particular translators frequently 'translated' merely by giving the foreign words an English guise; in this they followed the precedent of Caxton, and most of the words which Watson seems to have been the last to use are Caxton's words.

26. The uppermost layer of CUL li. 3.21 of *Boece* is, according to Samuels (1983: 34), in the language of the NW Kent-London border, and the dialect of the scribe was quite close to that of his exemplar.

27. Recently I have noticed this metathesized form used in Wynkyn de Worde's edition of *Gesta Romanorum*, while the other three MSS, Brit. Lib., Harley 7333 (c. 1440), Brit. Lib., Addit. 9066 (c. 1440), and Camb. Univ. Lib. Kk 1.6 (a. 1500), all have *brid(de)* or *bryd*, and the two of these, Harley 7333 and Addit. 9066, are both dated by *MED* to "a1500 (? a1450)".

28. Interestingly, unlike the case with *doubte*, Chaucer appears to be one of the earliest users of *subtil(e)*; in Hg *subtil* appears 15 times and *subtile* 4 times, while *sotil/sotel* 0, but *soutilite* 2.

29. The earliest instance of *perfect* with < c > is found at *Ayenbite of Inwyt* (1340), which is said to be Dan Michel's own holograph:

p. 127: ... Huo þet þise uour uirtues mi3te zuo habbe / he ssolde by wel perfect and yblissed ine þise wordle / and more ine þe oþre.

30. The search results of the *MED* corpus for *guide-/guyde-* show that Gower may also be the first user of this spelling, while Chaucer's preferred form is *gyde-*. Interestingly enough, this form is used by both Scribe D and the Caius scribe of *Guy*.

31. See Terasawa (1977: 85).

32. For example, *MED* regards the date of the St. John's College MS H 1 of Trevisa's *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden* as almost the same as that of Trevisa's translation (1387), while another MS Brit. Lib., Addit. 24194 is dated to "c.1410." According to the introduction (p. lviii) by C. Babington and J. R. Lumby, Mr. Bond, of the British Museum, told them that "both are certainly of the same period, namely, about the reign of Henry IV [1399-1413]" and that "the Tenison MS. [= Addit. 24194] appears slightly the older of the two." Why, then, does not *MED* date the St. John's MS to "c.1410" or "c.1410-15"? In fact, this MS has three occurrences of *sound\**, which first appeared about 1400:

p. 355, vol. 1 ... thei begynne with a softe noyce and tune, and pleyenge priuely vnder a dulle sounde of a more grosse corde returne to the same.

p. 115, vol. 1 ... the mownte of Syon, ... whiche is callede, after the langage of men of Sire, Golgotha, soundenge by

interpretacion, Caluarria, ...  
 p. 459, vol.4 ... men coniecture that cite to be callede in the langage off ?e Allemaynes Rauenesburghe, whiche  
soundethe in Engliche the cite of ravenes. / ...

### Works Consulted

- Beadle, Richard and Richmond, Colin. ed., *Paston Letters and Papers of the Fifteenth Century: Part III*. Oxford: Early English Text Society, 2005.
- Bryan, W. F. and Dempster, G. eds., *Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's 'Canterbury Tales'*, Chicago, 1941, repr. New York: The Humanities Press, 1958.
- Davis, Norman. ed. *Paston Letters and Papers of the Fifteenth Century: Part I and Part II*. Oxford: Early English Text Society, 2004.
- Forshall, J. and Madden, F. *The Holy Bible, Containing The Old and New Testament, with The Apocryphal Books Translated from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and his Followers*. Oxford: The University Press, 1850.
- Godefroy, F. *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française et de tous ses dialectes, du IXe au XVe siècle*, 10 vols., Paris. 1937.
- Hartung, Albert E. ed., *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1500*, 8 vols., New Haven: The Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1967-86.
- Kellner, Leon. *Caxton's Blanchardyn and Eglantine*. Oxford: Early English Text Society, 1890, repr. 1962.
- Koerting, Gustav. *Altfranzoesische Uebersetzung der Remedia Amoris des Ovid*. (nach der Dresdener Handschrift) Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1971.
- Macaulay, G. C. ed. *The Complete Works of John Gower: Vol. 1 The French Works*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1899.
- Middle English Dictionary (= MED)*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1952- 2001.
- Mooney, L. R. "Chaucer's Scribe," *Speculum*, 81 (2006), 97-138.
- The Oxford English Dictionary on Compact Disc*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Pope, M. K. *From Latin to Modern French with Especial Consideration of Anglo-Norman: Phonology & Morphology*. Manchester University Press, 1934, repr. 1961.
- Sakemi, K. "Corpora and Manuscripts: Is the Preterit *cam* a Northern Form?" *Studies in Medieval English Language and Literature*. No. 20 (2005), 101-114.
- Samuels, M. L. "Chaucer's Spelling." *Middle English Studies presented to Norman Davis*. Eds. D. Gray and E. G. Stanley. Oxford: OUP, 1983, 17-37.
- Skeat, W. W. *The Romans of Partenay, or of Lusignen*. London: Published for the Early English Text Society by N. Trübner, 1866 reprinted 1987.
- Smith, J. J. "The Trinity Gower D-Scribe and His Works on Two Early *Canterbury Tales* Manuscripts." *The English of Chaucer and his contemporaries*. Aberdeen, The University Press, 1988.
- Studer, Paul. *The Study of Anglo-Norman. Inaugural Lecture*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1920.
- Tobler, A. and Lommatzsch, E. *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1955.
- Yoshio, Terasawa et al. ed., *The Kenkyusha Dictionary of English Etymology*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha. 1997.