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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.
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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 *thei, their, theim, suche, eche, thurgh, not, neither, shall* (*pr. pl.*), *shuld, -yng(e), litell, ayene, streight, sawe, werke, gaue, doubt, 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.
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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 (Frfr 3)  1.2891: And al the poeple unto thee louteth, And al the world thi pouer doubteth.
(a1393)  Gower CA (Frfr 3)  6.2171: The king was doubtrib of this dom.
(a1393)  Gower CA (Frfr 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 thou 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 Miroir de l’Ommme 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).1 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)2
a1400 Ch’s CT (Hg)  ↙
a1425 Wycliffe: The Bible  2 (doubtinge 1, doubt 1)3
a1425 Ch’s CT (Gg.427)  1 (doubte)4
a1425 Ch’s CT (La 851)  3 (doubte 1, doubtes 2)5
a1425 Ch’s CT (Ha 7334)  2 (doubte 2)6

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 C4 and two manuscripts of Chaucer’s Canterbury Tales (CT).2 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 "scriveyn."4 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,5 and “a1425” by MED. Consequently, we can say that Gower, who has four instances, is the first to use the doubt- type.
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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. 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, *Miroir de L’Ommme* (c. 1377). The glossary of G. C. Macaulay’s edition (1899) lists these words:

- **doubtance, s.** 8069, B. iv. 4, fear, doubt
- **doute, 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 3*), though he has one use of *doubeth, doubtful* and *doubtif*, respectively. Incidentally, *ME* 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 (*dŭbitō > dote*). And then in the 14th century, it is generally said, such spellings as *doute* with etymological *< b >* came into frequent use.11 Tobler-Lommatzsch cites one instance of *doubte* from the Old French translation of Ovid’s *Remedia Amoris* (sans nulle doubtte, *Rem. Am.* 1322),12 but since the Bibliography of *Dictionnaire étymologique de l’ancien français* (http://www. deaf-page.de/) dates the MS, Sächsische Landesbibliothek — Staats- und Universitäts- bibliothek Dresden, Oc. 66, to c. 1375, the first quotation cited by Godefroy is earlier:

> Sur la *doubte* que il ont de nous courroucier. (1359, *Ord.*, III, 362)13

If this is really the first instance in Middle French, it follows that Gower, who must have completed *Miroir de l’Ommme* before Richard’s accession in 1377,14 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.15 In fact, Gower in *Miroir de l’Ommme* uses *debe* beside *dette*, and *soubdeinement* beside *soudainement*, though in CA *dette* 8 : *debe* 0. Also, he doubles consonants in accordance with Latin spelling in *accepter, accord, accuser, commander, commun*, etc.16 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.
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. 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  
1432, Nov. 9  
1453  
1455, May 21  
1455, June 22  
1458 (?) , Jan. 24  
1461, Oct. 11  
1474 (?) , May 9  
1474 (?) , May 9  
1477, March 1  
1479, March  
1491 (?) , March 27  

---
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M4: Others than Caxton group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author/Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.1456</td>
<td>Shirley: Death of James</td>
<td>doubt</td>
<td>1 (doubt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1461, 79</td>
<td>Paston Letters, Pt 1</td>
<td>doubt</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1475</td>
<td>Guy of Warwick (Caius ms.)</td>
<td>dout</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? a.1500</td>
<td>Davies: English Chronicle</td>
<td>doubt</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.1500</td>
<td>The Brut (Addit. 10099)</td>
<td>doubt</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1426, March  
1432, Nov. 9  
1453  
1455, May 21  
1455, June 22  
1458 (?) , Jan. 24  
1461, Oct. 11  
1474 (?) , May 9  
1474 (?) , May 9  
1477, March 1  
1479, March  
1491 (?) , March 27  

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

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. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Doubt Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1482</td>
<td>Polychronicon, Vol. VIII</td>
<td>8 (doubted 6, doubt 1, doubtable 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1483</td>
<td>Legend of the Holy Rood</td>
<td>2 (doubted 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1483</td>
<td>Knight of La Tour-Landry</td>
<td>8 (doubt 5, doubted 1, doubtlyng(e) 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485</td>
<td>Charles the Grete</td>
<td>48 (doubte 26, doubted 16, doubteth 4, doubtyng 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485</td>
<td>Malory's Darthur</td>
<td>60 (doubte 53, doubted 6, doubteth 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1489</td>
<td>Blanchardyn</td>
<td>27 (doubte 13, doubted 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1489</td>
<td>Four Sons of Aymon</td>
<td>91 (doubte 67, doubt 11, doubted 11, doubteth 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.24

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Doubt Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1499</td>
<td>Three Kings of Cologne</td>
<td>4 (doubte 3, doubtes 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1506-8</td>
<td>Works of Richard Rolle</td>
<td>17 (doubte 8, doubt(e)full 4, doubted 3, doubtes 1, doubtles 1, doubtable 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1510</td>
<td>The Gesta Romanorum</td>
<td>7 (doubte 7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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, 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, doubtous 7, doubtynge 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 *double*. 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 *dout-* 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 (*Boece* ed. by Skeat)  1  doubte
? 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. 321, reads it as *dowteth*. Another MS Skeat collated with, Brit. Lib. Addit. 10.340 (EEETS ES 5), also reads *douthe*. 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.
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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 doubt, 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. If we collect and study more forms of this kind, not only such Latinized forms as subtle, debt, describe, perfect, adventure, advise/advice, assault, fault, equal, etc., but also such common words as bird, could with < l >, delight with < gh >, guide with < ui >, sound with < d >, and autumn, the first user of which is Chaucer, we would be able to assign a more accurate date to a manuscript.

Notes

1. I owe much to Dr. Margaret Laing, who gave me a detailed and polite answer to my query. I also wish to thank Mícheál 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.

2. 4. 1022 Wheref thei weren alle in doubt.
3. 22604 Saint peter sal be domb þat dai, / þat he ne a word dar noht spek, / For doubt of demsteris wrek.
4. 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 | sidefast 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 ...
5. 4. Pars 1023 thow schat not schryue thee for veynglorye / ne for ypocrise / ne for non cause but only for the doubt of ihesu Crist
6. 5. Emch 1722 ... to here / Neiþer Theodomas Þit halfe so clere / And Thebes whan þe Cite was in doubt / ... a-boute. /
   B.Mel 1884 For doubtlesse, 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
7. According to J. J. Smith (1988), his hand is identified in the following 12 MSS: Trinity, Cambridge R.32 (Gower, CA; quires 9, 15-19, and parts of 14), University Libr, London V.88 (Piers Plowman ‘C-text’), BL Addl 27944 (Bartholomaeus; fols. 7-27v, 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 C3, 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 "scriveyn."
9. The earlier Wycliffite version is adopted from the following five MSS, which Forshall & Madden date as follows.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>book</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>came</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corp. Ch. Coll. Oxford, 4</td>
<td>before 1420</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douce 369 (1)</td>
<td>before 1390</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douce 369 (2)</td>
<td>before 1390</td>
<td>? 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douce 370</td>
<td>before 1400</td>
<td>? 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL, Royal 1 B. 6</td>
<td>before 1400</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Universitäts-bibliothek 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[d]). The ten instances of *doubte(s)* in the Dresden MS (531, 869, 1112, 1332, 1431, 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*.


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.’


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 *doubt* 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.

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

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


p. 495 And also with bishoppes & men of te spiritueltie, 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 lorde, & 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: dout(e) 3, doutid 1, doutet 1.

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

23. The details of 42 instances are:

dout(e) 17, dout(e) 21, dowyng 1, dowtful(l) 2, dowtabill 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 (EEr P. S. 204), Arthur Dickinson, 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 2.32 of Boece is, according to Samulls (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 doubt, Chaucer appears to be one of the earliest users of subtil(e) : in Hg subtil appears 15 times and subtitle 4 times, while solit/ sotil 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.


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. Lumb, 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, Caluaria, ...
p. 459, vol.4 men conjecture that cite to be callede in the langage off Allemaynes Rauenesburghe, whiche soundeth in Englische the cite of ravenes. /
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Unfortunately he used only manuscripts of inferior quality for his edition of 1516. A few verses from the Apocalypse were lacking in the manuscripts at his disposal. He simply re-translated them from the current Latin version! Erasmus' intention with his edition was to provide a basis for a new Latin translation of the New Testament. The Reformers used it to produce vernacular translations of their own. For such an ancient period as that between A.D. 100 and 300 it is of course much more difficult to be confident about the date of a manuscript. There is infinitely less comparative material. Nevertheless we are now in a fairly comfortable position to date papyrus manuscripts according to their handwriting. Manuscript submission has surely become quicker and more efficient with the help of online submission systems. These systems have a tracking feature that helps authors track the progress of their manuscripts by the status displayed on the interface. However, authors sometimes find the status changes confusing and get worried. However, authors sometimes find the status changes confusing and get worried.