

ROBERT KILBURN ROOT

Book of Troilus
and Criseyde



PRINCETON LEGACY LIBRARY

TROILUS AND CRISEYDE

*London: Humphrey Milford
Oxford University Press*

THE BOOK OF
Troilus and Criseyde

By
GEOFFREY CHAUCER

Edited from all the Known Manuscripts by

ROBERT KILBURN ROOT

PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH IN PRINCETON UNIVERSITY



PRINCETON
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS

1926

COPYRIGHT, 1926, BY PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS

**SECOND PRINTING, WITH A FEW CORRECTIONS,
JANUARY 1930**

Princeton Legacy Library edition 2017
Paperback ISBN: 978-0-691-62412-9
Hardcover ISBN: 978-0-691-65485-0

**PRINTED BY PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS
PRINCETON NEW JERSEY, U.S.A.**

PREFACE

TROILUS AND CRISEYDE is the only one of Chaucer's major undertakings which he brought to final completion. If less universal in its appeal than the varied pageant of the Canterbury Tales, it has, by way of compensation, the heightened power which comes from a work of creative imagination brilliantly sustained throughout a long and unified poem. It is of all Chaucer's works the most perfect expression of his art. In portrayal of character, in easy flow of dramatic action, in mastery of execution and grace of manner, it is the outstanding masterpiece of English narrative verse.

For the integrity of its text Chaucer was deeply solicitous. The editor who has labored to purge the text of the miswritings and "mismetrings" which it underwent at the hands of the scribes and early printers, and to incorporate into it the final revisions dictated by its author's exacting taste, has thus the satisfaction of knowing that his work is in furtherance of the poet's own earnest wish. Fortunately the evidence is so full that this work of restoration can be done with a high degree of certainty. The principles on which the text has been constituted are set forth at length in the closing pages of the Introduction.

The work of an editor must always be one of many obligations. In the preparation of the text and variant readings, I have been reminded anew of the debt which

Preface

all Chaucerians owe to the pioneer industry of Dr. Furnivall and his collaborators in the work of the Chaucer Society. It has materially lightened my labors to have in print literatim copies of seven of the manuscripts of Troilus, among them the two important manuscripts, Cp and J, which have served as primary authorities for my text. I have also had in my possession a complete and careful transcript of H4 made for Dr. Furnivall but never printed. When, some years ago, I undertook to complete for the Chaucer Society a study of the textual tradition of the poem, Sir William McCormick most generously turned over to me his collations of seven of the original authorities. It is a pleasure to express anew my gratitude to him. I have myself, however, verified in large part both these collations and the Chaucer Society prints, and have gone to the original documents whenever any important question of the text was at stake.

*In my commentary I have laid under contribution the work of all the scholars who have busied themselves with the poem. Most thoroughgoing is my debt to Dr. Skeat, the only editor hitherto who has given a detailed commentary. I am under particular obligation also to the work of Professor George L. Kittredge in his Chaucer Society volume, *The Date of Chaucer's Troilus*, and in his paper on "*Chaucer's Lollius*"; and to that of Professor Karl Young in *The Origin and Development of the Story of Troilus and Criseyde*. Other obligations I have indicated in the bibliographical list appended to the Notes.*

To my friend Professor Albert S. Cook my debt is of

Preface

a more intimate character. It was he who, years ago, first taught my feet to walk in Chaucerian ways, and who, more important still, gave me the discipline of insistent accuracy, even de minimis, which is indispensable to the work of an editor. To him I have more than once turned for advice as to the procedure to be followed in this edition, and have found him always wise in his counsel and generous in his help.

In the Introduction I have tried to present within reasonable compass the material facts upon which the literary interpretation of the poem must rest; but I have not attempted, except incidentally and by implication, an aesthetic appraisal of Chaucer's art. Nor have I tried to discuss the grammar and phonology of the poem. The essential characteristics of Chaucer's language have already been established; such matters as still remain unsettled must await for their solution a critical text of the poet's other writings. They cannot profitably be considered on the basis of a single poem.

Instead of preparing a complete glossary, I have given in the Notes my interpretation of such passages as involve obscurity, and have glossed many of the less familiar words. For quotations illustrative of such words, I have usually been content to refer the reader to the appropriate section of the New English Dictionary. I assume that the reader of this edition will already be familiar with the common words and constructions of Chaucer's diction.

With the ever increasing attention paid to Chaucer in schools and colleges, the number of readers to whom his language is no longer a serious barrier is large. Both in

Preface

the Introduction and Notes I have had in mind the needs of this class of readers as well as those of the much smaller group of special students. To the still smaller group—though we are after all a goodly company—of professed Chaucerians, those scholars whose own studies have helped to make possible such a volume as this, I “direct” my book, begging them in the words of our kindly master,

*To vouchensauf, ther nede is, to correcte,
Of youre benignites and zeles goode.*

R. K. R.

Princeton, February 2, 1926.

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	v
<i>Introduction</i>	
I. AUTHORSHIP AND TITLE	xi
II. DATE OF COMPOSITION	xiv
III. SOURCES	xx
IV. THE RANGE OF CHAUCER'S READING	xl
V. MORAL IMPORT	xlvi
VI. THE TEXT	li
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xc
<i>Troilus and Criseyde</i>	
BOOK ONE	3
BOOK TWO	57
BOOK THREE	143
BOOK FOUR	233
BOOK FIVE	317
<i>Notes</i>	409
<i>Bibliography</i>	567
<i>Index of Proper Names</i>	571

**Chaucers Wordes Unto Adam,
His Owne Scribeyn**

Adam scribeyn, if eber 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 dape I mot thy werk renewe,
Hit to correcte and eek to rubbe and scrape;
And al is through thy negligence and rape.

INTRODUCTION

I. AUTHORSHIP AND TITLE

THAT *Troilus and Criseyde* is the work of Geoffrey Chaucer is certain beyond dispute. It is referred to as Chaucer's in the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women* (B 332, 441, 469; A 265, 431, 459), and in the "Retractions" at the end of the *Canterbury Tales* (I 1086). It is explicitly attributed to Chaucer in three of the surviving manuscripts, R, S2, and H3, and by Lydgate in his *Sege of Troye* and in his *Fall of Princes*.¹

By what title Chaucer wished his book to be known is not clear. Perhaps, as in the case of the *Book of the Duchess* and the *Legend of Good Women*, no single definitive title was established in his own mind. In the Prologue to the *Legend* the work is spoken of allusively rather than by title—"How that Crisseyde Troilus forsook"; though in B 441 (A 431) the name "Cresseide" is used as though it were a title. In the "Retractions" the work is called "the book of Troilus"; and the same phrase is used by Usk in his *Testament of Love* (3. 4. 258-9), and in the catalogue of John Paston's books (1482 ?).² Lydgate called the poem "Troilus and Cresseide"; and from Lydgate's day until our own the double title has been in general use. Recent scholars seem to prefer the shorter title "Troilus," used by Chaucer himself in the lines addressed to Adam, his own scribe.³

¹ See Spurgeon, 1.24, 27.

² Spurgeon, 1.60.

³ The testimony of the surviving manuscripts proves only that there was a divergence of usage during the century following Chaucer's death. H4 and Cp, in the colophons, call the poem "Liber Troili"; Ph and H2 call it merely "Troylus," S1 has a colophon which echoes the opening line of the poem: "here endeth the book of Troylus of double sorowe in loving of Cri[seyde]." H1, Cl, S2, and J have the longer phrase "Liber Troili et Criseydis." R uses the English phrase "the book of Troylus and of Cresseide." The five remaining manuscripts, of which four have lost the end of the poem, and so lack a colophon, furnish no evidence.

The colophon of Caxton's edition (*circa* 1483) reads: "Here endith

Troilus & Criseyde

That the division into books originates with the poet himself is made clear by 3. 1818:

My thridde book now ende ich in this wyse;

by 4. 26:

This ilke ferthe book me helpeth fyne;

and by the formal proems which introduce the first four books.⁴

There is, however, some ground for believing that the proems to Books II, III, and IV were not present in the poet's earliest intention. Most striking is the fact that they are omitted by R. Since R is consistently a β manuscript, we must assume that these proems, which are present in all the other authorities, had already been composed before R was derived. Nor is there any reason to suppose that they were deliberately omitted by a scribe, or cancelled by the poet himself. The only plausible explanation of their absence in R is that they had been lost from the original before R was derived; and such an explanation implies that in the original they had been added later on loose leaves. It

Troylus as touchyng Creseyde." In the 1517 edition of Wynkyn de Worde the title reads: "The noble and amerous auneynt hystory of Troylus and Cresyde in the tyme of the syege of Troye"; and the colophon reads: "Thus endeth the treatyse of Troylus the hevvy." Pynson's edition of 1526 has, both in title and colophon, "the boke of Troylus and Creseyde." The folio of Thynne (1532) has the title "Troylus and Creseyde"; but the colophon and the running title use the shorter form "Troylus." Stowe's edition of 1561, and Speght's editions of 1598 and 1602, follow the usage of Thynne.

⁴ In the Moutier edition, *Filostrato* is divided into nine cantos, of which the last is a short envoy. In the Paris edition of 1789 the divisions are different. In the absence of a critical edition, one can have no assurance as to the exact divisions of Boccaccio's poem in the copy which Chaucer used. But they must to some extent have corresponded with those given by Moutier; for Book II of *Troilus* ends at the same point in the story as the second canto in Moutier. Book III and Proem IV correspond with Canto III. Book IV corresponds with Canto IV. Chaucer's fifth book deals with the matter found in Cantos V-VIII of Moutier's edition.

Authorship and Title

is significant also that none of the authorities has any proem to Book V.⁵

A further indication that these proems were an afterthought may be found in the fact that the γ MSS. treat the proem to Book IV as a conclusion of Book III. The last two stanzas of Book III are addressed to Venus, and constitute a sort of exordium to the book. The first stanza of the succeeding proem closely continues the thought of this exordium. In all the γ MSS., save S₂ and D, the proem to Book IV is not marked off in any way from Book III. At the end of the proem, CpCIHr have the rubric: "Explicit liber Tercius. Incipit Liber Quartus," and AD begin line 29 with a special initial. In S₂, Book III ends at line 1806 with the rubric: "Explicit Liber Tercius," line 1807 begins with a special initial, and before 4.29 there is a rubric: "Incipit quartus liber." In D, a contemporary hand, apparently that of the scribe, has written in the margin of 3. 1807 the word: "Prologue." The "mixed" text of H₃ indicates the termination of Book III with the erroneous rubric: "Explicit Liber iiijtus"; and at the end of Proem IV writes: "Crt (Certe?) Sic explicit Liber quartus."

The proem of Book I must, however, have been present from the first. It is found regularly in all the MSS., including R.⁶

⁵ The first two stanzas of Book V, which are based on stanzas of *Teseide*, are in the nature of a proem; but none of the authorities so mark them.

⁶ It may be noted that in H₁S₂DigH₃H₄R the proem of Book I is not set off in any way from the rest of the book. In J CpCIAD, line 29 of Book I has a special initial, but there is no rubric such as follows the proems of Books II and III (and, in J, Book IV also).

Though the division into books originates with the author himself, certain of the MSS. fail to indicate the division. Ph, which gives an α text throughout, originally indicated no break in the poem, save at the beginning of Book V, where there is a rubric and space for a special initial. Later the scribe himself supplied indications of books and proems in the margin, and by means of running titles. That these indications came from a γ source is shown by the fact that the proem of Book IV is treated as in the γ MSS. In the portion of H₂ written by Hand 1, which is that of the same scribe who wrote Ph, there is similarly no indi-

Troilus & Criseyde

II. DATE OF COMPOSITION

Chaucer's *Troilus* was completed and given to the public between the spring of 1385 and the end of the year 1386, or, at the very latest, the early months of 1387.

The second of these dates, the *terminus ad quem*, is established by the following facts:

(1) *Troilus* was already known to the reading public before the composition of the earlier, so-called B, version of the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women*, in which Cupid accuses the poet of having undermined men's faith in women by saying as him list of Criseyde.⁷ Fortunately we are able to date the first version of the Prologue with a good deal of certainty. Professor Lowes has shown⁸ that in it Chaucer makes use of the *Lay de Franchise* of Deschamps,

cation of division into books. This portion of H₂ includes the beginnings of Books II, III, and IV.

H₃ indicates no break between Book I and Book II. Proem III is introduced by a special initial, and between Proem III and Book III there is an appropriate rubric. At the end of Book III is found the erroneous rubric, "Explicit Liber iijtus," already noted above. The first stanza of Book V is treated as part of the preceding Book; and, after 5.7, is written the curious rubric: "Explicit ijda pars Vti Libri." Apparently the scribe regarded Book IV as "prima pars quinti libri"; for in H₃ line 26 of Book IV reads,

Thys fyfte and laste boke me helpyth to dyffyne,

where the correct reading is "This ilke ferthe book."

This curious aberration of H₃ could be dismissed as mere scribal blundering, were it not that H₄, a MS. which in this part of the text is totally unrelated to H₃, reads in 4.26: "This feerde & laste book," and shows no break whatever between Book IV and Book V.

These readings of H₃ and H₄, taken with the absence of a proem for Book V, raise the question whether the poet may not have originally intended a division into four books only, the number of parts into which the *Knight's Tale* is divided. Such a supposition gains some support from 4.26-8.

This ilke ferthe book me helpeth fyne,
So that the losse of lyf and love yfeere
Of Troilus be fully shewed here,

lines which seem to imply that the death of Troilus is to be transacted, and the poem concluded, in the fourth book.

⁷ *Legend*, B 332-4. See also B 441, 469.

⁸ *P.M.L.A.* 20.753-71.

Date of Composition

a poem written about May, 1385. It seems unlikely that Chaucer should have read this poem until some months after its composition; and Professor Lowes has shown reason for believing that he did not see a copy of it before the spring or summer of 1386. But a passage of the Prologue is imitated by Thomas Usk in his *Testament of Love*,⁹ a work written not later than the winter of 1387-88. The publication of the Prologue to the *Legend* falls, then, between the summer of 1385 at earliest and the autumn of 1387 at latest, with the probabilities favoring the year 1386.

(2) Thomas Usk was well acquainted also with *Troilus*. In Book III, Chapter IV, of the *Testament of Love*, the allegorical personage, Love, cites as authority "the noble philosophical poete in Englissh," and the "tretis that he made of my servant Troilus"; and the book shows throughout a detailed familiarity with the poem.¹⁰ The *Testament of Love* was probably written in 1387. Its author was executed for treason on March 4, 1388.¹¹

(3) In 1387,¹² died Ralph Strode, the London lawyer, who is probably the Strode to whom Chaucer addresses his poem.¹³

The earliest date for *Troilus*, the *terminus a quo*, is determined by the following considerations:

(1) Chaucer can hardly have been acquainted with Boccaccio's *Filostrato*, the primary source of *Troilus*, earlier than his first Italian journey of 1373.

(2) In the account of the popular tumult aroused by Hector's opposition to the exchange of Criseyde, and in the author's comment on the blindness of popular opinion (4.

⁹ Tatlock, *Development and Chronology*, pp. 22-3.

¹⁰ See notes to 1.217, 238; 2.807, 1335, 1380-3; 3.526, 1282; 4.460; 5.1432, and Skeat, *Oxford Chaucer* 7. xxvii.

¹¹ *DNB* s.v. Usk, Thomas.

¹² *DNB* s.v. Strode, Ralph.

¹³ See note to 5.1857.

Troilus & Criseyde

183-203), there seems to be, as Professor Carleton Brown has suggested,¹⁴ a reminiscence of the great Peasants' Revolt of 1381.

(3) A date later than January 14, 1382, the date of the marriage of Richard II to Anne of Bohemia, is established, if we accept the brilliant suggestion of Professor Lowes¹⁵ that the curious mention of the letter A in l. 171 refers to the use of Queen Anne's initial intertwined with the initial R of her royal husband as a decorative device on courtly robes and tapestries, a use of the royal initials for which Professor Lowes cites documentary evidence.¹⁶

(4) In lines 624-5 of Book III, Chaucer supposes a conjunction of Jupiter, Saturn, and the crescent Moon in the sign Cancer. Conjunctions of Jupiter and Saturn take place at intervals of approximately twenty years; but the periodicity of these conjunctions is of such a nature that there are periods of approximately two hundred years during which a conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn occurs in any given sign at intervals of about sixty years, and other periods of over six hundred years during which the conjunction never occurs in that sign. Chaucer's life fell at the very end of one of these six-hundred-year periods during which Jupiter and Saturn are not conjoined in the sign Cancer; such a conjunction had not occurred since the year A.D. 769.

Now the conjunction which Chaucer supposes involves not only Jupiter and Saturn, but the crescent Moon also. In order that the Moon shall appear as a thin crescent, "with hire hornes pale," in the sign Cancer, the Sun must be in, or approaching, the next preceding sign, Gemini, and the time of year must be May or early June; for, according

¹⁴ *Mod. Lang. Notes* 26.208-11 (1911).

¹⁵ "The Date of Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*," *P.M.L.A.* 23.285-306 (1908).

¹⁶ For further discussion of this piece of evidence, see note to l. 171.

Date of Composition

to Chaucer's calendar, the Sun entered Gemini on or about May 12. An approximate calculation, based on Newcomb's planetary tables, shows that on April 13, 1385, Jupiter and Saturn were in exact astronomical conjunction in longitude $86^{\circ} 35'$, i.e., near the end of the sign of Gemini, only three and a half degrees from the beginning of Cancer. But for the astrologer it is not necessary that the conjunction be exact; he would regard Jupiter and Saturn as being in "platic" conjunction when they are not more than nine degrees of longitude apart. In 1385 Jupiter entered Cancer on May 1; and Saturn entered Cancer on May 14. On the latter date both planets were in the sign of Cancer, two and a half degrees of longitude apart, and hence still in "platic" conjunction. The Moon was new on or about May 10 (within a day); and on or about May 13 the pale horns of the crescent Moon were visible very close to Jupiter and Saturn—the very disposition which Chaucer has represented in his poem, and one that previous to 1385 had not occurred for more than 600 years.

The conjunction of 1385 was remarkable enough to secure mention in Walsingham's *Historia Anglicana*:¹⁷

Conjunctio Jovis et Saturni

Eodem tempore Conjunctio duarum maximarum planetarum facta est, videlicet Jovis et Saturni, mense Maio; quam secuta est maxima regnorum commotio, prout patebit inferius, cum attigerit stylus locum.

It is to be noticed that Walsingham dates the conjunction as in the month of May, though the exact astronomical conjunction was on April 13. His interest in the event, as the entry shows, was astrological; and astrologically the platic conjunction in Cancer, which began on May 14, was much more significant than the exact astronomical conjunction of the preceding month, since it involved what the astrologers

¹⁷ Rolls Series, Vol. II, p. 126. The entry appears in nearly identical language in Walsingham's *Chronicon Angliae* (Rolls Series, p. 364) and in the same author's *Ypodigma Neustriae* (Rolls Series, p. 341).

Troilus & Criseyde

called a "permutation of triplicities," i.e., a change in the zodiacal place of major conjunctions from the "triplicity" of Gemini, Aquarius, and Libra to the "triplicity" of Cancer, Pisces, and Scorpio, where conjunctions of Jupiter and Saturn had not occurred for six hundred years. Among the astrological results of this particular change should be floods and heavy rains, precisely the influence which Chaucer has supposed in the passage under discussion.¹⁸

We find, then, that Chaucer has introduced into his poem an astronomical phenomenon so unusual that it had not taken place until his time for many centuries, and one which entailed important astrological consequences. By bringing into his supposed configuration the crescent Moon also in the sign of Cancer, he has made it necessary that the phenomenon should take place in May or early June. In the month of May, 1385, occurred a conjunction which strikingly agrees with that which Chaucer has supposed, and one which attracted the attention of his contemporaries. It would be hard to believe that this is mere accidental coincidence. It is more reasonable to believe that Chaucer took directly from the night's starred face these symbols which he has woven into the high romance of *Troilus*. Since the passage in question was already present in the *alpha* text of the poem, it follows that the poem was not finished earlier than the spring of 1385.

It would not be profitable to attempt to push the *terminus a quo* still later by arguing that the lines in question are found a little before the middle of the poem. We have no data by which to determine the rate at which Chaucer's literary work progressed; nor have we any assurance that he worked consecutively from episode to episode of his story, bringing one to final completion before he began the

¹⁸ For a more detailed discussion of the astrological import of this conjunction, and for a full statement of the astronomical data concerned, see article by R. K. Root and H. N. Russell, "A Planetary Date for Chaucer's *Troilus*," *P.M.L.A.* 39.48-63 (1924).

Date of Composition

next. We must be content to say that the completion of *Troilus* falls between the spring of 1385 and the early months of 1387, the latest possible date for the first version of the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women*.

The date 1385-86 accords with all the evidence summarized above, and with the known facts of Chaucerian chronology. By a writ dated February 17, 1385, Chaucer had been granted permission to administer by a permanent deputy his duties as comptroller of customs and subsidies, and hence should have had leisure for the prosecution of literary work. By 1387 he was already engaged on the Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales*. The displeasure expressed in the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women*, by Queen Alcestis and Cupid, at the heresy against Love's law in the story of Criseyde's falseness, takes on added significance as the echo of the sensation produced among English readers by a very recent poem.

Against this date there is but one consideration of any moment.¹⁹ In lines 5245-56 of Gower's *Mirour de l'Omme*, an allegorical personage called Sompnolent goes to sleep in church, and dreams that he is hearing recited—

la geste
De Troylus et de la belle
Creseide.

There is good evidence to show that this passage of the *Mirour de l'Omme* was written not later than 1377.²⁰ If the

¹⁹ I think we may dismiss as the mistake of a not very reliable witness the statement of Lydgate in the Prologue to the *Fall of Princes* (283-7) that Chaucer wrote *Troilus* "in youthe," "longe or that he deide." In 1385-6 Chaucer was in his middle forties; but even in 1373, when he returned from his first Italian journey, he was some 33 years old, an age to which Lydgate would hardly have applied the phrase "in youthe." The date 1385-6 is sufficiently in accord with Lydgate's phrase, "longe or that he deide." It must be remembered that the very passage of Lydgate which contains these phrases says that the Italian book from which *Troilus* was "translated" bore the title "Trophe," a statement which is almost certainly a blunder (compare p. xl).

²⁰ See Tatlock, *Development and Chronology*, pp. 220-5.

Troilus & Criseyde

“geste” referred to is Chaucer’s poem, it would be necessary to assign *Troilus* to a date earlier than 1377. But such an interpretation of the allusion is by no means inevitable. Troilus was already a famous lover. If in the one surviving manuscript of the *Mirour* his lady’s name had appeared as “Briseide” instead of “Creseide,” the allusion would have been accepted by every one as a vague reference to the story as it is found in the *Roman de Troie* of Benoit. But the substitution of “Criseida” for “Briseida” seems to have been the invention of Boccaccio,²¹ and there is no reason to believe that Gower read Italian. There is excellent reason, however, for supposing that, before 1377, Gower’s good friend Chaucer was already acquainted with *Filostrato*, and if so, he may well have told Gower about it, and have called attention to the alteration of name.²² In the face of the very strong evidence that *Troilus* is to be dated in 1385–86, the name “Creseide” in Gower’s poem must be explained in some such way as this.²³

III. SOURCES

As a narrative poem, Chaucer’s *Troilus* is a work of great originality. One cannot exaggerate the startling sense of novelty with which its subtle blending of romance and realism, of sentiment and humor, must have impressed its earliest readers. Nothing like it existed in the literary

²¹ See p. xxvii.

²² Even Professor Tatlock (*Development and Chronology*, p. 221), who has argued at length that the reference in the *Mirour* is to Chaucer’s poem, assumes that it was in conversation with Chaucer that Gower derived his slight but indisputable acquaintance with Dante.

²³ For a full presentation of the argument, based primarily on the passage in Gower, in favor of an early date for *Troilus*, see the article by Tatlock in *Mod. Phil.* 1.317-24 (1903) and the same author’s *Development and Chronology* 15-33 (1907). Tatlock’s argument is combatted by Lowes in *P.M.L.A.* 20.823-33 (1905) and by Kittredge in his Chaucer Society volume, *The Date of Chaucer’s Troilus* (1909). It is to be remembered that Tatlock’s discussions antedate the evidence offered by Lowes and by Carleton Brown for a date later than 1381, and the evidence based on the great conjunction of May, 1385.

Sources

world of the Middle Ages—English, French, or Italian. For the reader of today it is still one of the greatest of verse narratives, with that highest sort of originality which resides in its energy, its freshness, its truth to life. But its originality does not consist in the invention of a new story. Like many of the world's greatest poets, Chaucer was content to breathe new life into a story already old.

Among the fruits of Chaucer's journeyings in Italy was the acquaintance that he made with the *Filostrato* of Boccaccio, a very lovely poetic narrative of 5704 lines in *ottava rima*, which recounts the love of Troilo for the faithless Criseida.²⁴ So far as plot and *dramatis personae* are concerned, *Troilus* is a free reworking of *Filostrato*. The Italian poem, in its turn, is the poetic expansion of an episode found in the *Roman de Troie* of Benoit de Ste. Maure, and in the Latin paraphrase of Benoit made by Guido delle Colonne.²⁵ Benoit's romance of Troy is an elaboration of the meagre epitomes of Dares and Dictys. So that Chaucer's story is a more than twice told tale.

Dares and Dictys

It will be necessary to treat only in outline the history of the Troy story as it shaped itself through the medieval centuries. This history begins, not with Homer, but with the *De Excidio Trojae Historia* of "Dares Phrygius." The events of the *Iliad* include but an episode of the Trojan War—the wrath of Achilles and its consequences; neither the beginnings of the conflict nor the destruction of the city concern Homer's Muse. Moreover, as sober history the *Iliad* was discredited among medieval critics, because its author lived

²⁴ The printed texts of *Filostrato* give the lady's name as *Griseida*; and this form is found also in certain of the MSS. It is probable, however, that Boccaccio wrote *Criseida*. In any event, the substitution of *Gr* for *Cr* is but a detail of Italian phonetics. See article by E. H. Wilkins, *Mod. Lang. Notes* 24.65-7.

²⁵ Boccaccio seems to have used both Benoit and Guido. See the discussion of the matter by Young, *Origin and Development*, pp. 1-26.

Troilus & Criseyde

long after the events which he describes, because he is a pronounced partisan of the Greek side, and because he has included in his narrative such impossible details as the active participation in battle of the Olympian gods. To nearly all medieval scholars and authors, also, the *Iliad* in its original language was a closed book. If they read Homer at all, it was in the *Ilias Latina* of Silius Italicus, which long went under the name of "Pindarus Thebanus," an epitome which condenses the poem into some 1100 lines of Latin hexameter, with the total loss of all the qualities which make Homer's poem great.

The *De Excidio Trojae Historia* purports to be the work of an eye-witness, Dares the Phrygian, who was himself present in the beleaguered city.²⁶ It survives to us in forty-four short chapters,²⁷ written in wretched Latin prose, which lacks not only literary charm, but the most elementary qualities of style. There is a prefatory letter, purporting to be from Cornelius Nepos to Sallust, in which Nepos declares that he found the history of Dares at Athens, and has translated it literally into Latin. But the existing text, which certainly is not by Nepos, cannot have been written earlier than the sixth century A.D.²⁸ The narrative begins with the Argonautic expedition, and the first destruction of Troy during the reign of King Laomedon, gives a series of portraits of the principal Greek and Trojan leaders, recounts the various battles and intervening truces which make up the war, and describes the final destruction of the city.

Also the supposed narrative of an eye-witness is the *Epbemeris Belli Trojani* of Dictys the Cretan. The preface

²⁶ Homer, *Iliad* 5.9, mentions Dares as a rich man and blameless, a priest of Hephaestus.

²⁷ In the Teubner series, it fills 52 pages of text.

²⁸ Constans, 6.194. There is some reason to believe that there may have existed a longer Latin text of "Dares," now lost, of which the version which we possess is a condensation. For a discussion of this hypothesis see Constans 6.224-34.

Sources

of this work informs us that Dictys was a citizen of Cnossus in Crete, who, with Idomeneus and Merion, joined in the expedition against Troy. During the war he kept a journal, written in Phoenician characters, of the events which were passing before his eyes. At his death, the six books of his journal were buried with him in a tin case, which was finally brought to light by an earthquake in the thirteenth year of the reign of Nero. At the command of Nero, the document was transliterated into Greek characters; and from this Greek text was made a Latin translation by one Septimius Romanus.

This Latin version is more than twice as long as the *Historia* of Dares, and is written in excellent Latin, apparently of the fourth century A.D.²⁹ While the romantic story of the metal box and the earthquake need not be taken seriously, there is conclusive evidence that the Latin version is indeed a translation from a Greek original. A papyrus found at Tebtunis in 1899 contains a fragment of the Greek Dictys which corresponds with seven chapters of Book IV of the Latin version.³⁰ From the Greek original are derived also a number of Byzantine chronicles of the Trojan War, of which the most important is the *Chronographia* of Malalas (sixth century A.D.).³¹

The narrative of Dictys begins with the rape of Helen, and concludes with the return of the Greek heroes to their homes.

Benoit and Guido

On the basis primarily of Dares and Dictys, more particularly of the former, Benoit of Sainte Maure (near Poitiers) composed in the second half of the twelfth century his

²⁹ Constans, 6.196.

³⁰ *Tebtunis Papyri*, ed. Grenfell, Hunt, and Goodspeed, London, 1907, Vol. 2, pp. 9-18.

³¹ For a list of these Byzantine writings, and for a discussion of their relation to the *Ephemeris* of Dictys, see N. E. Griffin, *Dares and Dictys*, Baltimore (Johns Hopkins Diss.), 1907, pp. 34-108, and Constans, 6.200-24.

Troilus & Criseyde

Roman de Troie,³² a spirited poem in rhymed octosyllabic couplets, which extends to the formidable length of 30,316 lines. Up to line 24,425 Benoit follows the outline of Dares; for the rest of the poem he draws on Dictys, with still an eye now and then on Dares. But into the dull and tedious narratives of his sources Benoit puts life and color and movement. Like many of the medieval romances, the *Roman de Troie* is unduly repetitious and prolix; but it is none the less a work of genuine literary merit.

Of the additions which Benoit made to the story, the one that concerns us is the episode of Briseida, daughter of Calchas, who, sent from Troy to her father's gorgeous tent in the Grecian camp, forgets her love for Troilus, and gives her fickle heart to Diomedes. For this episode there is no hint in Dares or in Dictys—at least in the texts of which we have any knowledge. In the *Historia* of Dares there is frequent mention of Troilus, son of Priam, who is described as “magnum, pulcherrimum, pro aetate valentem, fortem, cupidum virtutis”;³³ but it is always as the warrior, foremost in the field of battle, with no hint of any love-story. Among the portraits of famous personages, Dares describes also Briseida, who is “formosam, non alta statura, candidam, capillo flavo et molli, superciliis iunctis, oculis venustis, corpore aequali, blandam, affabilem, verecundam, animo simplici, piam.”³⁴ But there is no hint of any relation of Briseida to Troilus, nor does Briseida ever figure in the narrative of Dares except for the portrait of her which has just been quoted.

So far as we know, it was Benoit who invented the story

³² Of Benoit nothing is known beyond his name and residence, which he himself gives in line 132 of his poem. Other poems, *Roman de Thèbes*, *Roman d'Eneas*, formerly attributed to him, are probably the work of other poets. Constans dates the poem between 1155 and 1160. This date depends on the identification of the “Riche dame de riche rei,” whom Benoit addresses in lines 13,457-70, with Eleanor, queen of Henry II of England. See Constans 6.165-91.

³³ Cap. 12.

³⁴ Cap. 13.

Sources

of Briseida's faithlessness in love. The story as Benoit tells it is only of the heroine's faithlessness; for it begins at the point where Briseida is to be restored to her father. Troilus is her accepted lover, but there is no account whatever of the course of their love before the separation is decreed. What we have is the portion of the story which fills Books IV and V of Chaucer's poem. The episode of Briseida occupies 1349 lines. Some 500 additional lines are devoted to the death of Troilus at the hands of Achilles. But the passages given to the episode are not consecutive; they are intercalated between accounts of the various battles. The episode begins at line 13,065 of the poem, and ends with line 20,682, or, if we continue to the death of Troilus and Hecuba's lament over her dead son, at line 21,782.³⁵

In the year 1287, Guido delle Colonne, a judge of Messina in Sicily, produced in a rhetorical Latin prose a paraphrase of Benoit's poem, under the title of *Historia Trojana*. He somewhat abridged the long speeches and ornate descriptions of Benoit, and added passages of sententious moral comment and learned digressions; but he altered so little the narrative content of his original that a summary of any portion of Guido would be nearly identical with a corresponding summary of Benoit. So nearly identical are the two works in their substance, that in a majority of cases it is impossible to assert with confidence that Boccaccio, or Chaucer, is following the one rather than the other.

In accordance with the literary ethics of his day, Guido cites as authorities for his history the names of Dares and Dictys, whom he regards as the ultimate guarantors of his reliability as a sober historian, and suppresses all mention of Benoit. There is reason to believe that he had before his

³⁵ A convenient summary of the 8718 lines of Benoit's poem which include the episode is given by Professor Kittredge in his Chaucer Society volume, *The Date of Chaucer's Troilus*, pp. 62-5. (Kittredge follows the line-numbering of Joly's edition, which differs somewhat from that of Constans.)

Troilus & Criseyde

eyes the Latin text of Dares;³⁶ but his overwhelming dependence on Benoit is clear beyond any doubt.³⁷ It seems probable that he had never read the *Ephemeris* of Dictys.³⁸

Boccaccio

It was the genius of Boccaccio which seized on the episode of the faithless Briseida, as it is found in the pages of Benoit and Guido, and made of it a unified and beautiful poetic narrative. What had been an episode in a history of the Trojan War becomes the dominant substance, while the battles about the beleaguered city become only a tenuous background for the story of passionate love and sorrow, in which Boccaccio saw an analogue to his own love for Maria d'Aquino, his "Fiammetta."

Boccaccio is responsible not only for this fundamental change of emphasis. He has of his own invention devised the whole story of the falling in love of Troilo, the wooing, and the final winning of the lady—all the events, in short, which precede the decree which sends Criseida from Troy to her father's tent.³⁹ In Benoit, and in Guido, the episode begins with Briseida's departure, and her status as mistress of Troilus is merely taken for granted. As part of his narrative machinery, Boccaccio created the character of Pandaro, a young courtier, friend of Troilo and cousin of Criseida, to serve as confidant and go-between in the wooing.⁴⁰

³⁶ Constans, 6.322-7.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 6.318-22

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 6.326

³⁹ For his account of the *innamoramento* of Troilo, Boccaccio has drawn to some extent on another episode of Benoit's romance, the love of Achilles for Polyxena, on his own earlier prose romance, *Filocolo*, and on the actual events of his own relations with Maria d'Aquino. See Young, pp. 26-105.

⁴⁰ There is in Benoit a Pandarus, King of Sezile, one of the allies of Priam. He is mentioned but half a dozen times, and is in no way associated with the love of Troilus. There is a passing mention of a Pandarus, son of Lycaon, in Homer, *Iliad* 2.827, in the list of the Trojan allies; compare Virgil, *Aen.* 5.496.

Sources

Another modification in the story, for which Boccaccio is responsible, is the change of the heroine's name from Briseis or Briseida to Criseida.⁴¹ In Homer there is Briseis, the lovely slave girl taken away from Achilles by Agamemnon, and so the occasion of Achilles' wrath, whose name appears in the accusative, Briseida, in *Iliad* 1. 184, and Chryseis, daughter of the seer Chryses, whom Agamemnon relinquishes at the command of Apollo. The accusative of her name, Chryseida, occurs in *Iliad* 1. 182. Dares mentions Briseida only in the portrait which he gives of her, and refers to Chryseida not at all. Dictys mentions neither name; though the two personages to whom the names apply appear as Astynome, daughter of Chryses, and Hippodamia, daughter of Brises. Benoit found in the text of Dares the portrait of a beautiful lady, Briseis, who bore no part in the story, and decided to utilize her as the heroine of one of his episodes. He seems not to have realized that the name Briseis means "daughter of Brises," and so gives her as daughter to the seer Calchas. From Dictys he later took over the Homeric story of the real Briseis, whom he knows only as Ypodamia, the daughter of Brises, and of Chryseis, who appears as Astinome, daughter of Crises.⁴² When Boccaccio wrote the *Filostrato*, he was probably not acquainted with Homer; but his knowledge of Ovid was sufficient to show him that Briseis was associated, not with Troilus, but with Achilles. The third epistle of the *Heroides* is addressed by Briseis to Achilles, and conveys by implication an account of her history.⁴³ Of the associated story of Chryseis he could have learned something from Ovid's *Remedia Amoris* 467-84,⁴⁴ a passage which, if carelessly

⁴¹ In the printed editions of *Filostrato* the name appears as Griseida; see p. xxi, n. 24.

⁴² *Troie* 26,867-27,038.

⁴³ Boccaccio refers to Briseida's true history in the *Ameto* (p. 136) and in the *Filocolo* (1.278); see Young, p. 1, n. 1.

⁴⁴ In Ovid's *Tristia* 2.373, a majority of the MSS. read *Chryseidos*, instead of the correct reading *Briseidos*; see Wilkins, *Mod. Lang. Notes* 24.67, n. 22.

Troilus & Criseyde

read, might suggest that Chryseis was daughter to Calchas.⁴⁵

It would seem, then, that Boccaccio, even in his youthful days, when he composed the *Filostrato*,⁴⁶ was scholar enough to be troubled by the conflict between Benoit's story of Briseida and that found in the *Heroides* of Ovid, and to replace the name by the related name of Criseida. If this substitution involved a new conflict, at least the authentic story of Chryseis was less widely known than that of the true Briseis.

The *Filostrato* is a poem of great literary merit. If it is inferior to *Troilus* in psychological portraiture, in reality, in reflection and interpretation, it is superior to Chaucer's poem in simple directness and passionate intensity. Boccaccio has in large measure identified himself with Troilo, and has seen in the loveliness of Criseida the type of his own lady. Chaucer has told the story with a certain detachment. He is spectator rather than participant. He tells a tragic tale with the philosophic irony of great comedy. Boccaccio's narrative is sentimental, with no trace of humorous comment.

Chaucer and Boccaccio

For the main outline of his action Chaucer has been content to follow *Filostrato* faithfully; at one point only has the English poet drawn heavily on his own invention—the final surrender of Criseyde to Troilus. In stanza 131 of Boccaccio's second canto, the courtship of Troilo has progressed to the stage of an established interchange of letters, the lady's replies being sometimes *lieta*, sometimes *amara*. At the corresponding point of Chaucer's narrative his poem has reached line 1351 of Book II. Between this stanza

⁴⁵ Wilkins, *Mod. Lang. Notes* 24.67.

⁴⁶ The date of the *Filostrato* has not been determined with certainty. A probable conjecture places it about 1338; see H. Hauvette, *Boccace*, p. 88. In that year Boccaccio was twenty-five years old.

Sources

of *Filostrato* and the moment when Troilo reaches his final reward in his lady's arms (3. 31), there intervene 336 lines. In a scene which Chaucer has not reproduced, Pandaro pleads with Criseida to have pity on Troilo, breaks down her half-hearted reluctance, and secures the promise that she will yield as soon as time and place may serve (*Fil.* 3. 21-30). In Chaucer's narrative, 1715 lines, almost a quarter of the whole poem, are devoted to this final stage of the wooing. Chaucer has added to the story of his own invention two extended episodes: the scene laid at the house of Deiphebus, where Criseyde is brought to the feigned sick-bed of Troilus, and there promises her ultimate surrender (2. 1394—3. 231); and the even more elaborated scene of the supper at the house of Pandarus, which ends in the union of the lovers (3. 505-1309). For the first of these episodes, Chaucer found a hint in *Fil.* 7.77-85, a scene near the end of *Filostrato* not otherwise utilized by Chaucer, which is laid at the house of Deifebo. For the second, Professor Young has suggested an analogue in the episode of Boccaccio's *Filocolo* in which the lovers, Florio and Biancofiore, are secretly brought together. There is no reason why Chaucer should not have known the *Filocolo*; and there is positive reason for believing that he had read it before he wrote the *Franklin's Tale*.⁴⁷ But in the present instance Chaucer's debt to the *Filocolo*, if there be any debt at all, is but a slight one, and confined to minor details of the episode. In each case we have a secret meeting of lovers arranged by a third party; but the scene in the *Filocolo*, which has many similarities with the secret meeting of the lovers in Keats's *Eve of St. Agnes*, is in its essential and characteristic features wholly unlike that in *Troilus*. It is possible that, when Chaucer represents the impatient Troilus as watching the arrival of Criseyde "thoroughoute a litel wyndow in a stuwe" (3. 601), he is remembering that

⁴⁷ See Lowes, "The *Franklin's Tale*, the *Teseide*, and the *Filocolo*," *Mod. Phil.* 15.689-728.

Troilus & Criseyde

Florio, concealed in Biancofiore's apartments, watched the merry-making "per piccolo pertugio" (*Filocolo* 2. 172).⁴⁸

In the remainder of his narrative Chaucer follows more closely the story of the *Filostrato*. At times he translates or closely paraphrases the Italian for many stanzas together, at times he condenses, at other times expands. Throughout he frequently interpolates into the narrative passages of comment—sometimes in his own person as author, sometimes in the person of one of the characters.⁴⁹

Up to line 1351 of Book II, the point at which begins the long addition discussed above, Chaucer follows, in the fashion just described, the first two cantos of Boccaccio's poem. The episode in which Pandarus learns from Troilus the secret of his love (1. 547-1064) is expanded to more than twice the number of lines which it occupies in the *Filostrato* (*Fil.* 2. 1-34). The episode in which Pandarus reveals the secret to Criseyde (2. 78-595) fills only 244 lines of the Italian poem (*Fil.* 2. 35-67). The striking episode in which Troilus, returning from battle, passes under Criseyde's window, and by his bearing reinforces all that Pandarus has said of him (2. 610-65) is developed from a single stanza (*Fil.* 2. 82), in which Pandaro and Troilo together ride by the lady's window. Entirely Chaucer's own is the

⁴⁸ Professor Young has enumerated several other details in which the two episodes agree—the exchange of oaths, the use of rings, etc. These resemblances may easily be explained as the inevitable coincidences growing out of the general similarity of the two situations, each a clandestine meeting of lovers. But the student should see Professor Young's statement of the case, *Origin and Development*, pp. 139-68, and the adverse criticism of Professor Cummings, *Indebtedness*, pp. 1-12. If Young tends to exaggerate the similarities, Cummings tends somewhat unduly to minimize them. Young has also pointed out a number of passages throughout the poem where Chaucer's language may be paralleled with a sentence from the *Filocolo*. Among the more striking of these passages are 1.950 and 3.1192-3 (see notes on these passages); but even in them the evidence for indebtedness is not certain.

⁴⁹ *Troilus* has a total of 8239 lines as compared with the 5704 of *Filostrato*. W. M. Rossetti, in the Prefatory Remarks to his Chaucer Society volume, *Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde compared with Boccaccio's Filostrato*, estimates that 2583 lines of *Troilus* are close adaptations of lines in *Filostrato*.

Sources

scene in Criseyde's garden where the heroine, musing on her new-found love, listens to the song of her niece Antigone, sung in praise of love.⁵⁰

After the first night of the lovers has been brought to pass, Chaucer again follows Boccaccio's outline, though with a freedom only a little less than he has used in the first two books. In the latter part of the story, when he departs from his Italian model, it is, save for passages of interpolated reflection, chiefly because he has for this part of the narrative also before his eyes the version of the story found in Benoit and in Guido.

The Persons of the Story

The chief personages of Chaucer's poem are taken over bodily from his Italian original, but their characters have been profoundly modified by the alchemy of his art.⁵¹

Troilus, to be sure, remains essentially what Boccaccio made him—the brave warrior and passionate lover, valiant as a lion on the field of battle, as a lover all that the code of courtly love demands that a lover should be. Chaucer has appreciably ennobled his character, making him more the idealist. He has also heightened the trait of sentimentalism, the tendency to luxuriate in his sorrows rather than manfully to seek their practical cure. It is this trait of character which, in league with adverse fate, brings about his tragedy.

Criseyde has been more profoundly altered. Chaucer has shown in his portrayal of her character a power of subtle analysis thoroughly comparable with that of a Samuel Richardson. Her Italian original is simple and direct, a creature of sensuous instinct with a minimum of reflection, who, having once yielded her heart, moves forward to the full accomplishment of her passion with no need of elabo-

⁵⁰ The song itself seems to have been adapted from Machaut; see p. xlvi.

⁵¹ I have elsewhere, *Poetry of Chaucer*, 2d ed., pp. 105-21, given at length my own interpretation of the chief characters of Chaucer's poem.

Troilus & Criseyde

rate stratagem. Chaucer's heroine, with all her beauty and womanly loveliness and grace of demeanor, has from the beginning of the story a fatal weakness—the inability to make a deliberate choice. She thinks always too precisely on the event. No sooner has the love of Troilus found lodgment in her heart than she begins to reflect on the lost liberty of action which must ensue on her acceptance of it. She makes no decision, but drifts with circumstance; and the circumstances are so cleverly manipulated by her uncle that, without the need for conscious decision, her desire is accomplished. Though clearly aware whither she is drifting, she seems to herself to have been trapped, and can, without conscious hypocrisy, reproach her uncle for the perfidy that has brought her where she wished to be. In the later books of the poem, when circumstance is beyond her uncle's shrewd control, she continues to take always the easiest path. It is easier to leave Troilus, heartbroken though she be, than to defy the decree of the Trojan parliament; it is easier to remain with her father than to brave the perils of a return, though she still intends to keep her promise to her lover. Though she never quite tears the image of Troilus from her heart, it is beyond her power to resist the wooing of the "sudden" Diomedes. And so she becomes the type of instability and treachery in love.

The figure of Pandarus, perhaps the finest example of Chaucer's art of portraiture, is almost wholly the creation of the English poet. Boccaccio's Pandaro is the *cousin* of Criseida (and of Troilo also), a high-spirited young gallant, not much differentiated, save in his fortunes, from the hero, Troilo. He is messenger and go-between for the lovers; but he has no need for elaborate scheming and artifice, and he is quite devoid of the ironical humor which marks his English counterpart.

In Chaucer, Pandarus is Criseyde's uncle, a relationship which suggests that he is by some years her senior. Yet he is young enough to be the inseparable companion of Troilus,

Sources

and to be himself a courtly lover—though an unsuccessful one. As a friend he is untiring in his disinterested and loyal service, even when that service involves his own dishonor. For though the artificial code of courtly love blames Criseyde only for her final falseness to Troilus, it quite irrationally demands that her uncle be her jealous guardian. He is the most charming of companions—playful, witty, full of shrewd observation, never dull. He is always laughing—at himself and his own ill success in love, at the extravagances of his love-sick friend, at the irony of life which he so clearly sees. He is the dominating personage of Chaucer's poem, giving to it that pervading tone of humorous irony which is so characteristic of the poet who created him, and so foreign to the passionate intensity of Boccaccio's *Filostrato*.

The Conduct of the Action

If Chaucer has made much more subtle the characters of Boccaccio's story, he has also heightened greatly its vividness, giving to it a compelling sense of actuality.

One of the elements which contributes to this sense of the actual is the care with which Chaucer has marked the passing of his dramatic time. Boccaccio opens his poem in the springtime (*Fil.* 1. 18), but gives no further dating of his story beyond the fact that it is again springtime in *Fil.* 7.78. In Chaucer most of the important episodes are definitely placed in the calendar.

Troilus first sees Criseyde at the feast of Palladion, in the month of April (1. 156). It is on the third of May (2. 56) that Pandarus makes his first visit to Criseyde; and on the morrow of that day he persuades his niece to write Troilus a letter. An interval elapses, during which Troilus is alternately elated or depressed, according to the tenor of Criseyde's answers to his letters (2. 1338-54). Then comes the meeting at the house of Deiphebus, at which Criseyde promises full surrender. The time of year is not specified;

Troilus & Criseyde

but a reference to "Aperil the laste" (3. 360) shows that we are still within the first year of the story. There is again an interval, in which the lovers exchange letters, and occasionally see each other (3. 435-510). Then follows the first night together, which is dated as May or early June by the presence of the crescent Moon in the sign of Cancer.⁵² Apparently an entire year has passed since the beginning of the wooing. The episode of Criseyde's departure for the Grecian camp begins in late July, when the Sun is in the early degrees of Leo.⁵³ At the beginning of Book V (lines 8-14), we are told that there have been three spring seasons since Troilus first began to love her. If one counts as one of these springtimes that in which the story begins, Troilus has enjoyed the full love of his lady during a period of some fourteen months. How long a time elapses between Criseyde's arrival at her father's tent and her final acceptance of Diomedes, Chaucer expressly refuses to say.⁵⁴

But if the action of the story extends over at least three years, the great bulk of the narrative is devoted to the events of a few critical days. Three-quarters of the lines of Book I are given to the day on which Troilus first sees Criseyde, and to the day shortly after when he confides his secret to Pandarus. Beginning with Book II, nearly 5000 lines are devoted to the events of eight days, presented in sets of two, a day and its morrow. These four groups of two centre on Pandar's first visit to Criseyde on his friend's behalf, on the meeting at the house of Deiphebus, on the first night of the lovers, and on Criseyde's departure from Troy. Over 900 lines are given to the nine days which follow her departure. A few significant episodes are thus narrated in full detail, largely by means of dramatic dialogue, while the intervening intervals are dismissed with concise summary.

⁵² See note to 3.624-6, and *Intro.* p. xvi.

⁵³ See note to 4.31-2.

⁵⁴ But see note to 5.1086-92.

Sources

Chaucer's Use of Earlier Authorities

It is characteristic of Chaucer's methods as a literary workman that, when he undertook to retell Boccaccio's tale of romantic love in Troy, he was not content to follow his Italian source alone. He certainly consulted Benoit, and probably also looked into Guido.⁵⁵ In Book IV he corrects by reference to these authorities a mistake of Boccaccio as to the circumstances of Antenor's capture in the *Fifth Battle*.⁵⁶ Where Boccaccio tells us that Criseyde was exchanged on even terms for Antenor, Chaucer follows the earlier authorities by bringing in the name of King Thoas, as coupled with Criseyde in the exchange of prisoners.⁵⁷ In Book V he owes to these authorities Diomedes's taking of Criseyde's glove,⁵⁸ the episode of the fair bay steed, formerly the property of Troilus, which Criseyde gives to Diomedes,⁵⁹ Criseyde's gift to Diomedes of a "pencil of hire sleve" to be worn by him as a favor,⁶⁰ her nursing of Diomedes when he was wounded,⁶¹ and the account of Hector's death at the hands of Achilles.⁶² To Benoit he owes also the lament of Criseyde as she contemplates her own infidelity.⁶³ More significant than any of these minor borrowings is one which affects the very conduct of the story. In Boccaccio (*Fil.* 5. 13), Diomedes, after receiving Criseyde at the gates of Troy, conducts her to her father's tent without any attempt to pay court to her, deferring his love-making till a later day. Chaucer (5. 92-189) follows instead the authority of the *Roman de Troie*, where Diomedes begins his courtship straightway, and receives from the lady the reply that

⁵⁵ See Young, pp. 105-39.

⁵⁶ See note to 4.50-4.

⁵⁷ See note to 4.137-8.

⁵⁸ See note to 5.1013.

⁵⁹ See note to 5.1037-9.

⁶⁰ See note to 5.1042-3.

⁶¹ See note to 5.1044-50.

⁶² See note to 5.1548-61.

⁶³ See note to 5.1051-85.

Troilus & Criseyde

her heart is too sad for love, but were she to love, she would love no one sooner than Diomede.⁶⁴ This borrowing from the earlier source, like a number of those mentioned just before, tends to emphasize the heroine's faithlessness.

In Benoit, and in Guido, Chaucer found repeated appeals to the authority of Dares and Dictys. There is no evidence that Chaucer ever read the *Ephemeris* of Dictys, though he once (l. 146) echoes Benoit by appealing to Homer, Dares, and "Dite."⁶⁵ There is no evidence, either, to show that he had read the prose Dares; but for the portraits of Diomede, Criseyde, and Troilus in 5. 799-840 he has drawn heavily on a poetical paraphrase of Dares, written in Latin hexameters of considerable merit, made in the latter part of the twelfth century by an Englishman, Joseph of Exeter. This work is given by modern editors the title *De Bello Trojano*;⁶⁶ but in the three surviving manuscripts it is called "Frigii Daretis Ylias," or "Liber Frigii Daretis."⁶⁷ When he turned its pages, Chaucer may well have believed that he was reading the Latin translation of the original and ultimate source of Trojan history.⁶⁸

Lollius

Great as is Chaucer's debt to the *Filostrato*, he never in the course of his poem, or elsewhere in his works, mentions the Italian poet by name. Nor does he ever speak of Benoit. "Guido de Columpnis" is listed among the authorities on

⁶⁴ For other instances in which Chaucer seems to have turned to Benoit or Guido, see notes to 4.18-21; 4.38-42; 4.57-8; 4.120-6; 4.203-5; 4.548; 4.813-19; 4.1401-7; 4.1411; 4.1415-21; 4.1478-82; 5.825; 5.1000-1; 5.1002-3; 5.1010-11; 5.1562-3.

⁶⁵ See note to 1.145-7. In *Fame* 1467, Dictys appears under the form *Tytus*.

⁶⁶ See Bibliography, s.v. Joseph of Exeter.

⁶⁷ The *editio princeps*, printed at Basle in 1558, bears the title, "Daretis Phrygii . . . de Bello Trojano . . . libri sex a Cornelio Nepote in Latinum conversi."

⁶⁸ See notes to 5.799-840, and my article, "Chaucer's Dares," *Mod. Phil.* 15.1-22.

Sources

the tale of Troy in *Fame* 1469, and as an authority for the story of Jason in *Legend of Good Women* 1396, 1464; but his name is not mentioned in *Troilus*. But, in suppressing the names of his actual sources, Chaucer had no desire that the reader should regard him as the inventor of the story. He assures us more than once that he is but retelling in English the history written by "myn auctour called Lollius."⁶⁹

The name Lollius has long been one of the puzzles of Chaucerian criticism; and many attempts, some of them highly fantastic, have been made to explain it. If one begins with the testimony of Chaucer himself, one finds that "Lollius," or "myn auctour," is the writer of an "old book"⁷⁰ on the Trojan War written in Latin,⁷¹ whose story of Troilus and Criseida Chaucer is following with scrupulous fidelity. That the name is no mere figment of Chaucer's artistic imagination, invented expressly as a supposed authority for his *Troilus*, is made certain by the fact that "Lollius" is mentioned along with other Latin and Greek writers who have treated of the Trojan War—Homer, Dares, Dictys, Guido delle Colonne, Geoffrey of Monmouth—as one of the "bearers up of Troy" in *Fame* 1468. Though the *House of Fame* has never been dated with certainty, there is strong reason for believing that it antedates *Troilus*, possibly by as much as ten years.⁷² There could have been no motive for introducing into the *House of Fame* a fictitious name among the names of actual writers about

⁶⁹ 1.394. "Lollius" is named again near the end of the poem (5.1653). When, as repeatedly, Chaucer refers to "myn auctour" (2.18; 2.700; 3.502; 3.575; 3.1196; 3.1402; 3.1817) or "the storie" (5.1037; 5.1044; 5.1051; 5.1094; 5.1651), one must assume that "Lollius" is the authority invoked. The name has the fullest MS. attestation; in 1.394, CIH₅ read *Lollyus*, Gg *Lollyous*, H₄ *Lolkius*, W *Lellyus*, the rest *Lollius*; in 5.1653, R reads *bollius*, GgCx *lollyus*, the rest *Lollius*.

⁷⁰ 3.91; 3.1199. Compare also 2.23.

⁷¹ 2.14. The suggestion, originating with Tyrwhitt, that "Latin" means *Latino volgare*, i.e. Italian, cannot be accepted. Unless qualified by some such adjective as "vulgar," the word Latin meant to Chaucer's readers just what it means to us.

⁷² See Kittredge, *Date*, pp. 53-5.

Troilus & Criseyde

Troy; so that we must assume that Chaucer believed in the actuality of "Lollius." For such a belief there is no foundation in fact; the most diligent search of modern scholars has discovered no author named Lollius who has written about Troy.⁷³

The most probable explanation of Chaucer's mistaken belief, an explanation now generally accepted by scholars, was first offered by G. Latham in the *Athenaeum*, 1868, II, 433. According to this explanation, the idea that one Lollius was a writer about the Trojan War sprang from a misunderstanding of the opening lines of the Second Epistle of the First Book of Horace:

Troiani belli scriptorem, Maxime Lolli,
Dum tu declamas Romae, Praeneste relegi.

Properly these lines mean: "While you are practising oratory at Rome, Maximus Lollius, I have been rereading at Praeneste the writer of the Trojan War, i.e., Homer." Horace goes on to show his friend that useful moral teaching may be gained from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.⁷⁴ If one assumes a manuscript of Horace in which scribal corruption had substituted *scriptorum* or *scriptor* for *scriptorem*, and in which the proper name Maximus was written without the initial capital, Horace might easily have been understood to be addressing Lollius as "greatest of writers of the Trojan War."⁷⁵ Whether the mistake originated with Chaucer, or with some one else from whom he took it over,

⁷³ For the attempt, which dates back to Speght's edition of 1598, to identify Chaucer's "Lollius" with Lollius Urbicus, mentioned in the *Historia Augusta* as a writer of the third century A.D. who made a history of his own time, see Kittredge, *Lollius*, pp. 82-9. See also Hammond, pp. 94-8.

⁷⁴ Maximus Lollius, to whom is addressed also *Epistle* 1.18, was a son of Marcus Lollius, consul, general, and governor of Syria, to whom Horace addresses one of his *Odes* (*Carm.* 4.9).

⁷⁵ For various ways in which this wrong understanding might have grown out of a corrupted text of Horace, see Kittredge, *Lollius*, pp. 77-80.

Sources

we cannot say;⁷⁶ but we can feel a good deal of confidence that Chaucer had not read any Latin history of Troy which went under the name of Lollius. When Chaucer cites Lollius, he should, according to our notions, have cited instead Giovanni Boccaccio, who is in fact his "auctour," standing to him in the relation which he attributes to "Lollius."⁷⁷ But this does not mean that "Lollius" is simply another name for Boccaccio.⁷⁸ "Lollius," it must be remembered, wrote long ago, and in Latin.

When Chaucer read the *Filostrato*, he would inevitably have asked himself whence Boccaccio took the story. In Benoit and in Guido he would have found the latter part of Boccaccio's story, though with some notable differences in detail. For all the early part of the story, up to the time when Criseida's exchange is decreed, he, like the modern critic, could find no source. And yet Boccaccio, who makes no acknowledgment of his debt to Benoit or to Guido, says explicitly in the *Proemio* that he is following "antiche storie." What were these "ancient histories"? It is easily possible that Chaucer, misled by some stray bit of misinformation—possibly a scribal note in his own copy of *Filostrato*—actually believed that Boccaccio's source was an ancient history written by Lollius, "Troiani belli scriptorum maximus," that in retelling the story of *Filostrato* he was in effect following, though at second hand, the authority of the great Lollius.

Or, to vary the hypothesis a little, it may be, as Professor

⁷⁶ No one has yet discovered any medieval reference to Lollius as a writer on the Trojan War save those in Chaucer. On the other hand, there is no evidence to prove that Chaucer was acquainted with the *Epistles of Horace*.

⁷⁷ Sometimes, to be sure, Chaucer cites "myn auctour" in support of a specific statement which is not found in *Filostrato*; see Kittredge, *Lollius*, pp. 92-109. In 5.1044, he expressly refers to an authority other than "myn auctour" in support of a detail actually drawn from Benoit or Guido. More than a single authority is implied in 5.19.

⁷⁸ For various attempts to make of "Lollius" a pseudonym for Boccaccio, see Hammond, pp. 96-8.

Troilus & Criseyde

Kittredge has argued,⁷⁹ that, wishing to give to his story the suggestion of antiquity and authenticity, he deliberately invoked, as a piece of literary artifice, the name of Lollius, supposed author of a lost history of the Trojan War.

Further mystification has been created for Chaucerian scholars by a statement of Chaucer's disciple, Lydgate. In the Prologue to his *Fall of Princes*. (lines 283-7), Lydgate says of "my maister Chaucer":

In youthe he made a translacioun
Off a book, which callid is Trophe,
In Lumbard tunge, as men may reede & see,
And in our vulgar, longe or that he deide,
Gaff it the name off Troilus & Cresseide.

Lydgate was apparently aware that the source of *Troilus* was a book not in Latin, but in Lombard tongue, i.e., Italian;⁸⁰ but what he may have meant by saying that this Italian book was called "Trophe" no one knows; and all attempts to guess the riddle have been far from satisfactory.⁸¹

IV. THE RANGE OF CHAUCER'S READING AS SHOWN IN

Troilus

In a preceding section of this Introduction we have considered those sources of *Troilus*—Boccaccio, Benoit and Guido, the paraphrase of Dares made by Joseph of Exeter—which contributed directly to the substance of the story. For the elaboration of his poem—for philosophic comment,

⁷⁹ *Lollius*, pp. 71-2.

⁸⁰ I take it that Lydgate means that the book was written in "Lumbard tunge," not that it was a Latin book called "Trophe" in Italian.

⁸¹ See Hammond, p. 98, and Skeat, *Oxford Chaucer*, 2. liv-lvi. The problem is complicated by the fact that Chaucer himself cites either an author or a book which he calls "Trophee" in *Monk's Tale*, B 3307, as his authority for a statement about the pillars of Hercules. For an ingenious and plausible elucidation of this citation, see article by Kittredge, "The Pillars of Hercules and Chaucer's 'Trophee,'" *Putnam Anniversary Volume* (New York, Stechert, 1909), pp. 546-66. Professor Kittredge makes no attempt to explain Lydgate's mention of "Trophe," which he is inclined to regard as a mere blundering mistake.

Range of Chaucer's Reading

for illustration, and for poetic ornament—he has drawn upon the whole range of his reading; and this reading is extensive enough to justify his contemporary, Thomas Usk, in calling him “the noble philosophical poete in Englishsh.”⁸² *Troilus* is distinctly a “learned” poem.

Of these subsidiary sources, by all odds the most important is the *Consolation of Philosophy* of Boethius, a work which deeply influenced Chaucer's thought, and which he himself translated into English prose.⁸³ No less than nineteen separate passages in *Troilus* are derived directly from this treatise, passages which range in length from a single line to nineteen stanzas. In all these instances there is nothing in the corresponding portion of the *Filostrato* to suggest the Boethian philosophizing which Chaucer has introduced. Of these passages the most extended and the most significant are the discussion of Fortune in 1. 837-54, Criseyde's discussion of false felicity (3. 813-36), the hymn of Troilus sung to Love as the bond of all things (3. 1744-71), and the long soliloquy of Troilus on the conflict between God's foreknowledge and man's freedom (4. 953-1085). The ideas of Boethius are taken over not merely as poetical elaborations of Chaucer's theme; they are sum and substance of the deeper significance which he sees in the story of the tragic love of Troilus, a story which transacts itself in a world of which Destiny is the ineluctable master,⁸⁴ and in which Fortune, the principle of deceitful mutability,⁸⁵ is for ever turning into bitter vanity the hopes of man, and even the happiness which he seems to have achieved.

From the *Epistles* of Seneca⁸⁶ directly or indirectly are taken half a dozen sententious comments, of which all but

⁸² Compare above, p. xv.

⁸³ For an excellent discussion of the part played in Chaucer's thought by the work of Boethius, see B. L. Jefferson, *Chaucer and the Consolation of Philosophy of Boethius*, Princeton Diss., 1917.

⁸⁴ See 2.526-8; 2.622-3; 5.3-7.

⁸⁵ See 4.1-9; 4.391-2.

⁸⁶ See article by H. M. Ayres, “Chaucer and Seneca,” *Romanic Review*, 10.1-15.

Troilus & Criseyde

one are spoken by Pandarus.⁸⁷ In one of these instances (1. 960-1), the quotation is immediately from the *Roman de la Rose*; in another (1. 964-6) it may have come from Albertano of Brescia. It is quite possible that the rest are by way of some intermediate source.

Another source of sententious wisdom is the *Liber Paraboliarum* of Alanus de Insulis.⁸⁸ From the same writer's *De Planctu Naturae*, a book laid under contribution in the *Parliament of Fowls*, comes the phrase "common astrologer," applied to the cock in 3. 1415—a fact duly noted by the scribe in the margin of H4.

There are in *Troilus* only three direct quotations from the Bible,⁸⁹ and these are from the writings attributed to Solomon—two from Ecclesiastes, one from Proverbs. Indirect allusions to St. Luke's Gospel are found at 2. 1503, and 3. 1577.

From the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid is drawn the very considerable body of allusions to classic myth with which Chaucer has ornamented his poem. It is to be noted that virtually all of these allusions are of Chaucer's own addition. Though Boccaccio makes free use of Ovidian myth in the *Teseide*, he has excluded it almost entirely from the pages of the *Filostrato*. Among the myths to which Chaucer alludes are Niobe weeping for her children (1.699-700), the horses which draw the chariot of the Sun (3. 1703), the bitter tears of Myrrha metamorphosed into a myrrh tree (4. 1138-9), Ascalaphus transformed into an owl (5.319), Phaeton's disastrous handling of his father's chariot (5. 664), the hunting of the Calydonian boar (5. 1464-79), the death of Meleager (5. 1482-3), the story of Nisus and his daughter Scylla (5. 1110). Characteristic of Chaucer's attitude towards the pagan deities is a passage in the third

⁸⁷ See notes to 1.687-8; 1.701-7; 1.891-3; 1.960-1; 1.964-6; 4.466.

⁸⁸ See notes to 1.946-9; 1.951-2; 2.36-7; 2.1335; 3.1219-20. This debt was first pointed out by Koeppl in *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen*, 90.150-1.

⁸⁹ See notes to 1.694-5; 3.855; 4.836.

Range of Chaucer's Reading

book, in which Ovidian myth is blended with astrology.⁹⁰ Twice (4. 789-91; 4. 1543-5) there is an unmistakable echo of Ovid's language.

But Chaucer's use of Ovid is not limited to the *Metamorphoses*. The fifth epistle of the *Heroides* (Oenone to Paris) is definitely cited by Pandarus in 1. 653-5, who proceeds to paraphrase four lines of it. In 4. 1645 Criseyde translates *Her.* 1. 12. In 2. 1027 Pandarus echoes *Her.* 3. 3.⁹¹ The *Ars Amatoria* is clearly in Chaucer's mind in 2. 1023-5; 4. 31-2; 5. 1107; and in 1. 946-7 Pandarus translates *Remedia Amoris* 45-6.⁹² In 4. 1548-9 there is a clear echo of *Amores* 1. 15. 10.⁹³ I have found no instances of indebtedness to *Tristia* or to the *Ex Ponto*; nor is there clear evidence that Chaucer used the *Fasti*.⁹⁴

Of Chaucer's intimate acquaintance with Virgil there can be no doubt; but he has drawn very slightly on him for the ornamentation of *Troilus*. In 3. 1495-8 there seems to be an echo of *Eclogue* 1. 60-4. In 5. 212 an allusion to Ixion, and in 5. 644 an allusion to Charybdis, may be traceable directly to the *Aeneid*.⁹⁵

Ultimately from the *Ars Poetica* of Horace come two stanzas (2. 1030-43) in which Pandarus advises Troilus as to the literary style of his first letter to Criseyde. From the same source, apparently, are four lines (2. 22-5) in which the poet himself comments on the change which language undergoes "withinne a thousand yeer." However, the three passages of the *Ars Poetica* concerned are of the sort to be frequently quoted; so that we cannot assert that Chaucer knew Horace at first hand. Of indebtedness to other writings of Horace I have found no trace.

⁹⁰ See note to 3.715-32. For a similar treatment of myth in the *Knight's Tale*, see article by W. C. Curry, "Astrologising the Gods," *Anglia* 47.213-43.

⁹¹ See also note to 4.1548-53.

⁹² See also notes to 4.414-15; 4.421-4.

⁹³ See also notes to 3.1433-5; 4.407-12.

⁹⁴ But see note to 2.77.

⁹⁵ See also notes to 1.57-60; 5.892.

Troilus & Criseyde

Chaucer quotes a "sentence" from the tenth Satire of Juvenal at 4. 197-201, and names Juvenal as his authority.

Of the classic poets other than Ovid, Statius seems to have been most present in Chaucer's memory at the time when he was writing *Troilus*.⁹⁶ Pandarus finds Criseyde and her ladies reading the story of Thebes (2. 100-8), and special mention is made of the catastrophic death of Amphiaraus.⁹⁷ In lines 1485-510 of Book V the *Thebais* is summarized in some detail; and in the midst of this summary all but two of the manuscripts insert a Latin argument of the poem.⁹⁸

When Chaucer wrote *Troilus*, he was already familiar with the *Divine Comedy* of Dante.⁹⁹ It would seem, indeed, that he must have owned, or at least had easy access to, a copy of the poem. In four passages of *Troilus* (3. 1262-7; 4. 225-7; 5. 1541-5; 5. 1863-5), he is clearly writing with the page of Dante open before him.¹⁰⁰ Almost as striking is the debt to Dante in 3. 1419-20; 4. 1538-40; 5. 599-601. The *Divine Comedy* was probably in the poet's mind also when he wrote 2. 1-6; 3. 45; 4. 22+4; 4. 473-6; 4. 1187-8. Of the thirteen passages just cited, seven are from the *Inferno*, and three each from the *Purgatorio* and the *Paradiso*. Of the four passages which are most closely modelled on Dante, one is an address to the Blessed Virgin, which Chaucer turns to the praise of Love; one a simile which Dante in his turn owes to Virgil; one the elevated conception of Fortune as the agency of divine providence; and the

⁹⁶ For a general treatment of Chaucer's use of the *Thebais*, see B. A. Wise, *The Influence of Statius upon Chaucer*, Johns Hopkins Diss. 1911. Some of Dr. Wise's instances of supposed Statian influence on *Troilus* I am not able to accept.

⁹⁷ Perhaps Chaucer had in mind the old French *Roman de Thèbes* rather than the *Thebais* of Statius. See note to 2.100-8, and compare notes to 3.1600; 4.300-1.

⁹⁸ For further instances of Chaucer's debt to Statius, see notes to 1.6-9; 4.300-1; 4.762; 4.1408; 5.1789-92.

⁹⁹ For a summary and discussion of Chaucer's debt to Dante, see Lowes, "Chaucer and Dante," *Mod. Phil.* 14.705-35.

¹⁰⁰ In 2.967-73 and 4.239-41, Chaucer closely reproduces from the *Filosttrato* lines which Boccaccio had taken almost *verbatim* from the *Divine Comedy*.

Range of Chaucer's Reading

last the address to the Blessed Trinity which brings *Troilus* to its close. All of the passages where Dante's influence is manifest are of a character which adds to the tone of artistic and spiritual elevation which so markedly differentiates *Troilus* from the *Filostrato*. The influence of Dante on Chaucer's mind and art is not confined to the passages in which there is definite borrowing of a phrase or an idea. From Italy, and primarily I think from Dante, came the inspiration to tell the story of Troilus in the *bel stilo alto*, to write in the vernacular with the dignity and elevation which mark the great ancients. Particularly Dantesque is Chaucer's method of incorporating into his poem the philosophy of Boethius, and the considerable number of astrological and other scientific allusions which it contains.

Similar in character to his debt to Dante is Chaucer's debt to the *Teseide* of Boccaccio, a poem in its style as ornate and elevated as the *Filostrato* is simple and direct. Whether the *Knigh't's Tale*, in which Chaucer retells, though with much compression, the story of the *Teseide*, was written before *Troilus* or immediately after it, is a question to which no final answer has yet been given. But there is no question that the *Teseide* was already familiar to him.¹⁰¹ Most important of the borrowings from the *Teseide* are the beautiful stanzas (5. 1807-27) which follow the soul of Troilus on its flight through the heavens—stanzas which are of prime importance in enforcing the philosophical interpretation which Chaucer has given to his story. Two other stanzas of Book V (lines 8-11 and 274-80), both of them in the grand manner, are closely imitated from the *Teseide*. Single lines are taken over in 2. 435-6 and 5. 1. Indebtedness of a more general character is found in 1. 659-65; 4. 323-9; 5. 295-322.¹⁰²

¹⁰¹ See Kittredge, *Chaucer's Lollus*, Appendix II (pp. 110-20), "Use of the *Teseide* in the *Troilus*."

¹⁰² See also notes to 5.207-10; 5.304; 5.321-2. It is possibly worthy of remark that the debt to *Teseide* is particularly noticeable in the fifth book of *Troilus*.

Troilus & Criseyde

To the third of the great Florentines the only case of clear indebtedness is in the song of Troilus in 1. 400-20, which is closely translated from sonnet 88 of Petrarch.

The courtly literature of thirteenth and fourteenth century France, which contributed so heavily to the *Book of the Duchess*, the *Parliament of Fowls*, and the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women*, has little place among the influences which helped to shape *Troilus*. The only important exception to this statement is the *Roman de la Rose*, a book with which Chaucer was minutely familiar,¹⁰³ and which he had already, in part at least, translated into English verse. There are nineteen passages of *Troilus* which clearly show its influence, besides several others where the indebtedness is less certain. Of these nineteen passages, seven are from the portion of the poem written by Guillaume de Lorris; and twelve from the continuation of Jean de Meun. Sometimes¹⁰⁴ it is merely the turn of a phrase which shows Chaucer's debt; more often¹⁰⁵ a bit of sententious wisdom has been appropriated. Once (1. 638-44) a whole stanza of moralizing is taken over from the *Roman de la Rose*. In 3. 351-4 a bit of May-time landscape betrays the same inspiration. In other passages¹⁰⁶ it is a conceit or maxim of courtly love.

From the *Paradis d'Amour* of Guillaume de Machaut is apparently derived the general suggestion of the song in praise of love sung in 2. 827-75 by Criseyde's niece, Antigone.¹⁰⁷ Though there are no close verbal parallels, the general similarity of situation and ideas is striking. But with the *Roman de la Rose* and this poem of Machaut ends Chaucer's debt to the courtly literature of France, so far at

¹⁰³ The best treatment of Chaucer's use of the *Roman de la Rose* is by D. S. Fansler, *Chaucer and the Roman de la Rose*, Columbia Diss., New York, 1914.

¹⁰⁴ E.g. 1.969; 2.784; 4.519-20; 5.445.

¹⁰⁵ See notes to 1.449; 1.637; 1.960-1; 2.167-8; 2.716-18; 2.1564-6; 4.1305-6.

¹⁰⁶ See notes to 1.435-48; 1.747-8; 1.810-12; 1.927-8; 3.1634; 5.551-3.

¹⁰⁷ See article by Kittredge in *Mod. Lang. Notes* 25.158.

Range of Chaucer's Reading

least as modern scholarship has been able to discover. It is possible that Chaucer used the twelfth-century *Roman de Thèbes*; see note to 2. 100-8.

Besides bringing to his poem the fruits of a wide reading in Latin, French, and Italian literature, Chaucer has drawn also on his very considerable knowledge of medieval science. Most striking is his acquaintance with astronomy and astrology.¹⁰⁸ The Sun's progress through the signs of the Zodiac marks out for the poem the seasons of the year. The passage of the Moon from Aries to the end of Leo is to measure the period of Criseyde's return to Troilus. A conjunction of Jupiter, Saturn, and the crescent Moon in the sign Cancer causes the heavy downpour of rain which makes impossible Criseyde's departure from the house of Pandarus. Without exception these references to astronomy and astrology are accurately in accord with the best scientific knowledge of Chaucer's day. Thoroughly scientific is the discussion of the significance of dreams.¹⁰⁹ The poem reveals also some knowledge of physiology,¹¹⁰ and an acquaintance with the distinctions of scholastic dialectic.¹¹¹

If Chaucer has enriched his poem and philosophized its story by borrowings from such wise clerks as Boethius and Seneca and Alanus de Insulis, and from such poems as the *Divine Comedy* and the *Teseide*, he has not forgotten the homelier wisdom of the popular proverb. In the notes to this edition no fewer than fifty-seven instances are pointed out in which a proverb or proverbial phrase has been utilized. Twenty-one of these instances are in speeches of Pandarus; and it would seem that the poet intended the reader to recognize a love for proverbs as one of the marks of his character.¹¹² Fourteen proverbs are spoken by Criseyde;

¹⁰⁸ For his knowledge of pure astronomy, see notes to 2.54-5; 3.3; 3.1417-20; 4.31-2; 4.1590-6; 5.652-8; 5.1016-20. For astrological references, see notes to 2.680-6; 3.22; 3.617-26; 3.715-17; 3.724; 3.1255-7.

¹⁰⁹ See notes to 5.360-85; 5.1275-8.

¹¹⁰ See notes to 1.306-7; 3.1088-9.

¹¹¹ See notes to 3.404-6; 4.1505.

¹¹² See 1.756.

Troilus & Criseyde

and sixteen occur in the comments of the author himself. Troilus invokes proverbial wisdom only three times, and Diomedes once. The presence of this considerable mass of proverbial phrases contributes appreciably to the effect of the poem. If the more literary embellishments which Chaucer has added make for elevation of style, the use of proverbs makes the poem at the same time familiar, colloquial, real.

V. MORAL IMPORT

The net result of all the additions which Chaucer has super-added out of his own reading to the story which Boccaccio had told more simply is greatly to heighten its seriousness. Chaucer's narrative is not only more human, more real, more genuine in its passion; it is much wiser. In the code of courtly love which Boccaccio accepts without question, Chaucer sees inherent contradictions and fallacies, which make for a tragic issue. The poem is, in truth, as Cupid in the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women* calls it, a "heresy" against the "law" of courtly love. But Chaucer's wise analysis goes farther than this. In the fickleness and falsehood of Criseyde, a woman so lovely, so sweet and gracious, so much to be desired, he sees the type of mutability, of the transitoriness and fallacy of earthly happiness.

Boccaccio had dedicated the *Filostrato* to Fiammetta, his own mistress, and in his envoy had warned young lovers not to put trust too lightly in every fair lady, many of whom are, like Criseida, "unstable as leaf in the wind" (*Fil.* 8. 29-33). Chaucer's poem is dedicated to "moral" Gower and to "philosophical" Strode, a poet-moralist and a learned professor of philosophy. His warning to "yonge fresshe folkes" is that this world is but a transitory Vanity Fair, that only in God is there neither variableness nor shadow of change. And then, by way of enforcing his moral, he takes over from the *Teseide*, which had in its turn taken them from the *Somnium Scipionis* of Cicero, three

Moral Import

noble stanzas (5. 1807-27) which follow heavenward the soul of the slain Troilus. From his station in the eighth heaven Troilus looks down upon the spot where he was slain, and laughs at the woe of those who were weeping his death, condemning our human pursuit of "blind" pleasure, which of its very nature cannot last.

Troilus laughs. He has not laughed before in the whole course of the poem since the very beginning of the story, before his first sight of Criseyde, when, himself heart-free, he made merry over the woes of foolish lovers. The ironist Pandar, though himself a disappointed lover, laughs often enough—a quiet, humorous laughter. He laughs even at his own ill success in love. But Troilus has set his heart too passionately on the things which at the very outset of the story, and now again at its close, he recognizes as "vanitee." He has taken life too seriously; now, like the poet who created him, he sees in life a high but comic irony.

It is in this spirit of a wise and thoughtful irony that Chaucer has conceived and executed his poem, a spirit poles asunder from the tender sentiment and ardent passion which inform the *Filostrato*. He has called *Troilus* a tragedy; and it is a tragedy in the medieval sense of the term—the story of a man cast down by adverse fortune from great prosperity and high estate into misery and wretchedness.¹¹³ The five books into which he has disposed his story suggest the five acts of tragic drama.¹¹⁴ There is, moreover, a quite tragic insistence on the idea of destiny.

It is "through his destiny" that Troilus first falls in love with Criseyde. It is destiny again which sends him riding "an esy pas" below Criseyde's window, at the very moment when Pandarus has disposed the lady's thoughts to answer love by love. Troilus, when the Trojan parliament issues its decree for Criseyde's departure, sees the hand of destiny at work:

¹¹³ See note to 1.4

¹¹⁴ See Horace, *Ars Poetica* 189-90.

Troilus & Criseyde

For al that comth, comth by necessitee;
Thus to be lorn, it is my destinee. (4. 958-9)

And so he debates the question of man's freedom and God's foreknowledge, inclining his argument to the side of predestination. The fall of fortune is made to seem inevitable and ineluctable.

And yet the story does not make on us a really tragic effect. It is rather a tragic story handled in the spirit of high comedy. Chaucer has not treated his theme with *tragic* intensity. Great tragedy leaves us with the sense of irreparable loss, of a hurt for which there is no healing. Hamlet dies with the unforgettably tragic words: "The rest is silence." The last we hear from Troilus is a peal of celestial laughter.

The poem is, of course, not written merely as an apologue, to point the moral that earthly joy is but "fals felicittee." There is full understanding and appreciation of its human values. The modern reader who dissents from this moral may disregard it, if he will, and find the story but little injured for his taste by its concluding stanzas. Yet it is no mere tacked-on moral. It is implicit in the whole poem. Of its genuineness, of the poet's complete sincerity, no one who has read Chaucer's other writings with attention can doubt. Chaucer is not so much pointing a moral, as giving us at the end his own verdict as to the permanent values of those aspects of our human life which are for the moment of such passionate importance.

For Chaucer, and for other of the finer spirits of the Middle Ages, this verdict implied no lugubrious doctrine of narrow Puritanism. Rather it made for a serene Catholic temper, which could thoroughly enjoy and understand the world, while still recognizing its "vanity," which could retain its serenity because it did not take either the joys or the sorrows of the world too seriously.

The story conceived by Benoit de Ste. Maure, and developed by Giovanni Boccaccio, has been reshaped by the

The Text

creative genius of Chaucer, deepened and enriched in its human values by his keen observation, interpreted in the light of much reading and wise thought, and retold with exquisite grace and beauty. Much as it owes to "olde bokes," it remains—even for an editor who has laboriously scanned its every syllable, and pursued its every allusion—something perpetually fresh and new, one of the great original and authentic poems of the English-speaking race.

VI. THE TEXT

Troilus and Criseyde is preserved in sixteen manuscript copies, of which two, H₅ and Dig, are incomplete.¹¹⁵ Two of the early printed copies, those of Caxton and Thynne, present texts which are independent of the existing MSS., and therefore rank with the MSS. as authorities. The 1517 edition of Wynkyn de Worde is similarly an independent authority for the first 546 lines of Book I. All the other printed editions derive either from earlier prints or from MSS. still extant, and have, therefore, no value as authorities.

I have already given, in the publications of the Chaucer Society, detailed descriptions of the manuscripts.¹¹⁶ The account of them given in the following pages is, therefore, of a

¹¹⁵ There are also three brief fragments, none of which has any critical value. Three stanzas (3.302-22), incorporated into a short poem in rhyme royal, of which they constitute stanzas 4-6, are found in the Cambridge University Library, MS. Ff 1.6, fols. 150b, 151a. (Printed in the Chaucer Society volume of *Odd Texts of Chaucer's Minor Poems*, p. xii.) One stanza (1.631-7), with the title "Pandare to Troylus," is found in Trinity College, Cambridge, MS. R. 3.20, fol. 361a, a MS. written by Shirley. (Printed in *Odd Texts*, p. x.) Two strips of vellum, found in a book-binding, which contain longitudinal sections from 5.1443-98, are described in the Appendix to the Report of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society, Vol. VI (1887), pp. 331-5. (This fragment I have not seen.) There are no variant readings in these passages which determine the affiliation of the fragments; but the last does not share a γ reading in 5.1449.

¹¹⁶ *The Manuscripts of Chaucer's Troilus, with Collotype Facsimiles of the Various Handwritings*, Chaucer Society, First Series, No. XCVIII, 1914; and *The Textual Tradition of Chaucer's Troilus*, Chaucer Society, First Series, No. XCIX, 1916, p. 1-33.

Troilus & Criseyde

more summary character. In the case of the printed editions, I have listed all the early prints, and identified the character of their texts; but of the more modern editions I have discussed only those which present a new text, disregarding, or at most briefly mentioning, those which are merely new printings of a text already published.

The Manuscripts

ADDITIONAL (A). British Museum, MS. Additional 12,044. A vellum manuscript, 10 x 7½ in., of 113 leaves, which contains only *Troilus*. It is written in two hands, both of the fifteenth century. The first hand has written as far as 3.1709; and the second hand has completed the volume, which has, however, lost its final leaf, and so terminates with 5. 1820. A later hand has made corrections and supplied missing lines.

A is throughout a γ manuscript, closely related to D, save for 3. 1345-414, a passage omitted by D, which the scribe of A has supplied from a source akin to GgH5. Besides the corruptions which it shares with D, it introduces many corrupt readings, frequently omitting words not necessary to the sense, but required by the metre. The readings of A, or of the AD parent, can be used to check those of ClCpH1 in reconstituting the γ original. In some instances, however, the AD parent has corrected γ errors.

CAMPSALL (Cl). The property of Mrs. Bacon-Frank, Campsall Hall, Doncaster. A vellum manuscript, 12 x 8¼ 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.

Cl is consistently a γ manuscript, somewhat closer in its readings to AD than are CpH1S2Dig. Remarkably free from gross blunders, it is an authority of high value for a reconstitution of the γ original.

The Text

Cl has been printed by the Chaucer Society in *A Parallel Text Print of Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde*, and in a separate volume.

CORPUS (Cp). Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS. No. 61. A vellum manuscript, 12½ x 8 7/10 in., of 151 + 2 leaves, which contains only *Troilus*. It is beautifully written in one hand of the early fifteenth century.

Cp is consistently a γ manuscript, somewhat closer in its readings to H1S2Dig than to ClAD. It presents the γ text with a high degree of purity, and is spelled with exceptional consistency. It serves as one of the basic authorities for the present edition.

Cp has been printed by the Chaucer Society in *A Parallel Text of Three More MSS. of Chaucer's Troilus*.

DIGBY (Dig). Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS. Digby 181. A paper manuscript, 11 1/8 x 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, which ends in the middle of a page with 3. 532, is written in one hand of the fifteenth century.

Dig is consistently a γ manuscript, closely related to S2, with which it shares innumerable corruptions, besides many others peculiar to itself. Its value as an authority is negligible.

DURHAM (D). Bishop Cosin's Library, Durham, MS. V. II. 13. A vellum manuscript, 11 x 7 in., of 111 + 5 leaves, which contains, besides *Troilus*, *Cupid's Letter* by Hoccleve. *Troilus* is written in one hand of the fifteenth century. Two other contemporary hands have made corrections and supplied missing lines.

D is consistently a γ manuscript closely related to A. Its text is, however, more corrupt than that of A.

CAMBRIDGE Gg 4. 27 (Gg). Cambridge University Library, MS. Gg 4. 27. A vellum manuscript, 12¾ x 7 5/8 in.,

Troilus & Criseyde

of 516 leaves, which contains a miscellaneous collection of Chaucer's works, and Lydgate's *Temple of Glass*. 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, and therefore lacks the beginning of all the books of *Troilus*, and the conclusion of all save Book II.

The text of *Troilus*, which is closely related to that of the fragmentary H₅, is of composite character. In Book I, and through 2. 63, it is consistently a β manuscript, somewhat resembling the β portion of J. From 2. 64 to 2. 1209 it presents a "mixed" text, predominantly α in character but with frequent β readings. It shares, however, in none of the distinctive JRH₄ readings so numerous between 2. 701 and 2. 1113. From 2. 1210 to 3. 398 it resumes its β character, with readings akin to those of J. At 3. 399 (with one earlier instance in 3. 243) Gg becomes definitely and consistently an α manuscript, and so continues to the end. As an α manuscript, it presents the text at the same stage of revision as does the α portion of J.

The text of Gg is very corrupt. Some of its corruptions are shared by H₅; but many others are not. GgH₅ together constitute an important witness to α , particularly in Book III, where the only other authority is H₂Ph.

The *Troilus* text of Gg is printed by the Chaucer Society in *A Parallel Text Print of Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde*.

HARLEIAN 2280 (H₁). British Museum, MS. Harleian 2280. A vellum manuscript, 9½ x 6 3/8 in., of 98 + 1 leaves, which contains only *Troilus*. It is written in one hand of the mid-fifteenth century.

H₁ is consistently a γ manuscript, similar in the character of its readings to CpS₂Dig. Its orthography varies but little from that of Cp. Comparatively free from corruptions of its own, it is an authority of the first importance for the reconstitution of the γ original.

H₁ is printed by the Chaucer Society in *A Parallel Text Print of Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde*.

The Text

HARLEIAN 3943 (H2). British Museum, MS. Harleian 3943. A vellum manuscript, $10\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{5}{8}$ in., of 116 leaves, which contains only *Troilus*. It is written in four hands, all of the fifteenth century, of which the first and second seem to be 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. 1079-638 (from which lines 1289-428 are missing, because of the loss of two leaves). 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 volume, the work of Hands 1 and 2, which he restored and corrected, subsequently turning over the task of completing the work to Hand 4. The scribe of Hand 1 is the same as the scribe who wrote Ph.

The portions written by Hands 1 and 2 present consistently an α text, closely related to that of Ph. The portions written by Hands 3 and 4 are closely related to H₄, and, like it, present α readings in Book I, and β readings in the rest of the poem. Despite many corruptions, H₂ (with Ph) is an important witness to α in the first three books, and after 4. 196 (with H₄) to β .

H₂ is printed by the Chaucer Society in *Chaucer's Troilus and Cryseyde compared with Boccaccio's Filostrato*.

HARLEIAN 1239 (H3). British Museum, MS. Harleian 1239. A vellum manuscript, $15\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ 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 1.1 to 2. 1033, Hand 2 from 2. 1034 to 3. 1603, and from 3. 1758 to the end; Hand 3 has written 3. 1604-759, lines 1758, 1759 of Book III being written twice.

The text presented by H₃ is both composite and "mixed." The portion written by Hand 1 is a β text of a type similar

Troilus & Criseyde

to that of the source of Cx; but there are occasional indications, more particularly in Book II, of contamination with a γ manuscript of the same type as A. H₃ and Cx agree with γ S1 against JRH₄ in the series of striking variants in 2. 701-1113. From 2. 1034 to 3. 1095, H₃ is fundamentally a γ manuscript of the same type as A; but in Book III it not infrequently deserts the γ reading, and shows occasional contamination with β . From 3. 1096 to 4. 299 it is again a β manuscript, with only slight traces of contamination with γ . With 4. 300 it becomes an α manuscript, and so continues to the end of the poem, though a β reading appears in 4. 322, and in the latter part of Book V there are again indications of contamination with γ . In its α portion, H₃ presents the text at a stage of revision not far removed from that found in Ph. H₃Ph omit the free-choice soliloquy entire. In 4. 1301-442, H₃ has a series of unique readings which seem to represent a stage more primitive than that of Ph. At the end of Book V, however, it contains the *Teseide* stanzas, derived apparently from its γ constituent.

Throughout, the text of H₃ is extremely corrupt. This fact and its "mixed" character make it an unreliable authority. Its chief value lies in its testimony to an early stage of α in Book IV.

H₃ is printed by the Chaucer Society in *A Parallel Text of Three More MSS. of Chaucer's Troilus*.

HARLEIAN 2392 (H₄). British Museum, MS. Harleian 2392. A paper and vellum manuscript, 8½ x 5¾ in., of 145 + 2 leaves, which contains only *Troilus*. It is written in one hand of the middle of the fifteenth century, which has also supplied a large number of marginal notes in Latin.

H₄ presents a composite text, which in certain parts of the work is also "mixed." In Book I it is definitely an α manuscript. It contains stanza 128, omitted by all other MSS. save H₂Ph, and shares with H₂Ph in a large number of α readings. In Book II it is a mixture of α and β , with

The Text

the α element decreasing in importance as the book proceeds. In 2. 701–1113 it shares with JR in a number of striking variants, the character of which is discussed on p. lxxx. In Book III it becomes distinctively a β manuscript, and so continues to the end, sharing in virtually all the β readings of Book III, and avoiding the many α readings of Book IV. A striking instance of its "mixed" character is found in the fact that it contains stanzas 201, 202 of Book III twice over, once in the α position with α readings, and again in the β position with β readings. It omits the free-choice soliloquy of Book IV, an α characteristic not shared by the closely related H2. With H2 it omits the *Teseide* stanzas in Book V. The adhesion of H4 to the α tradition in the omission of these passages is surprising, since a contaminated text ordinarily incorporates lines found in any of its constituent authorities. With R, it omits the Latin argument of Statius in Book V.

Throughout, H4 is closely related to the portions of H2 written by Hands 3 and 4. In its β portions, the common parent of H2H4 stands somewhat nearer to R than to the other β authorities.

Though not free from corruption, H4 is purer than H2 or R. It is of the utmost importance as a witness to α in Book I; and in Book IV, after J ceases to give a β text, it is an important witness to β .

HARLEIAN 4912 (H5). British Museum, MS. Harleian 4912. A vellum manuscript, $11\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{5}{8}$ 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.

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

Troilus & Criseyde

ST. JOHN'S (J). St. John's College, Cambridge, MS. L. 1. A vellum manuscript, 10 x 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ in., of 121 + 8 leaves, which contains *Troilus*, and, in a sixteenth-century hand, 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.

The text of J falls into two sharply defined parts. Up to line 430 of Book IV, J is consistently a β manuscript. Between 430 and 438 it becomes an α manuscript, and so continues to the end. In its β portion, the text of J shows certain affinities with R. In 2. 701-1113 it shares with H₄ and R in a series of striking variants. A connection also exists between J and the β constituent of GgH₅, which is most clearly marked after 2. 1210. In its α portion, J presents the text in the same state of revision as Gg (here consistently an α MS.).

In both portions, the text of J is remarkably free from blunders. Its orthography is throughout consistent, and strikingly similar to that of Cp. It is an authority of primary importance as a witness to β in Books I-III, and to α in the last two books. In conjunction with Cp, it has been used as a basal authority for the present edition.

J is printed by the Chaucer Society in *A Parallel Text of Three More MSS. of Chaucer's Troilus*.

PHILLIPPS (Ph.). MS. Phillipps 8250, the property of T. Fitzroy Fenwick, Esq., Cheltenham. A paper and vellum manuscript, 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ x 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, the same hand as Hand 1 of H₂.

Ph is throughout an α manuscript, except for the passages added later, on inset leaves and in the margin, which are from a γ MS. akin to H₁. The scribe copied an α MS. and then, after his copy was completed, supplied its deficiencies from a γ source. The hymn to love (3. 1744-71),

The Text

the free-choice soliloquy (4. 953-1085), and the *Teseide* stanzas (5. 1807-27), are on inset leaves. Ph is closely related to the portions of H₂ written by Hands 1 and 2, with which it shares a great number of corrupt readings. Despite its corruptions, it is a very important witness to α . It is the only manuscript which gives an α text throughout the poem.

RAWLINSON (R). Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS. Rawlinson Poet. 163. A paper manuscript, 11½ x 8¼ 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 to 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 scribes. The character of the text does not change significantly with the change of scribes.

R is throughout consistently a β manuscript of the same type as the β portions of J and H₄, with which it shares in a series of distinctive readings, apparently authentic, in 2. 701-1113. There is no evidence of any close relationship with any of the β authorities. Moreover, R has certain unique characteristics: it omits the proems of Books II-IV, and contains after 2. 1750 a unique stanza, which seems to be genuine. With H₄, it omits the Latin argument of Statius (5. 1498).

Despite manifold corruptions, R is an important witness to the text of β . It is the only manuscript which gives a β text throughout the poem.

SELDEN B 24 (S1). Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS. Selden B 24. A paper manuscript, 10¼ x 6 5/8 in., of 231 leaves, which contains, besides *Troilus*, a miscellaneous collection of English and Scottish verse of the fourteenth and fifteenth

Troilus & Criseyde

centuries, among which 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.

S1 presents a "mixed" text, based on a γ authority akin to AD, and a β authority of the same general type as Cx and the β portions of H3. Up to 2. 617 it shares virtually all γ readings, and shows only slight traces of β influence. In the remainder of Book II it shares only occasionally in distinctive γ readings; but in 2. 701-1113, where JRH4 depart from the other β authorities, S1 agrees with γ H3Cx. In Book III it shares in some fifteen γ readings, and in over sixty β readings, with stanzas 201, 202 in the β position. In Book IV it shares in twenty-four γ readings, but has stanza 106, which γ omits. In Book V it shares in twenty-four out of thirty-five γ readings, but has lines 60, 61 in the $\alpha\beta$ order. It would seem that the method of its scribe-editor was to take a β exemplar and "correct" it to γ readings, thoroughly at the beginning, and thereafter only spasmodically.

Despite a superficial Scottish cast, which results from the consistent writing of *qub* for *wb* and from the use of the Northern pronominal forms *thair* and *tham*, the text of S1 is remarkably free from corruption; but its value is greatly impaired by its "mixed" and "edited" character. Its witness to the well attested text of γ is usually superfluous; as an authority for β , it can be used only with caution.

SELDEN, SUPRA 56 (S2). Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS. Selden, Supra 56. A paper manuscript, 8¾ x 5 5/8 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.

S2 is throughout a γ manuscript, closely related to the fragmentary Dig, with which it shares innumerable corruptions. Dialectally it is strongly marked by Northern

The Text

forms. With Dig, it is occasionally of use in determining a γ reading where the other evidence is confused; but with the generous attestation of γ , its evidence is seldom needed.

The Printed Editions

CAXTON'S EDITION *circa* 1483 (Cx). Caxton's edition of *Troilus*, the *editio princeps* of the poem, is a small folio of 120 leaves, of which the first and the last two are blanks. There is no title; the colophon reads: "Here endith Troylus / as touchyng Creseyde / Explicit per Caxton." The book was probably issued in 1483. Four copies are known to exist. Two, one of which lacks a few leaves, are in the British Museum, one in the library of St. John's College, Oxford, and one in the John Rylands Library at Manchester. Besides these, there is a fragment of eight leaves in the British Museum.¹¹⁷ A rotographic reproduction of the perfect British Museum copy is deposited in the Library of Congress at Washington.¹¹⁸ This reproduction has been collated for the present edition.

Despite its beautiful letter-press, Caxton's edition is very carelessly edited. It must have been printed from a single corrupt and defective manuscript. Had any attempt been made to collate it with any other authority, Caxton would certainly have supplied its missing passages. Twice an eight-stanza leaf of the manuscript copy was reversed.¹¹⁹ Three times a leaf of the original was missing, with consequent omission of eight stanzas.¹²⁰ Five stanzas are omitted at 3. 442-476. A number of lines and short passages show unique corruptions, which may be attributed to the conjectural emendation of Caxton's editing.

Caxton's manuscript was consistently of the β type, and

¹¹⁷ For fuller bibliographical description, see Seymour de Ricci, *A Census of Caxtons*, Oxford, 1909, p. 30.

¹¹⁸ Modern Language Association Deposit, No. 14.

¹¹⁹ 1.785-812 follows 1.840, and 1.904-31 follows 1.959.

¹²⁰ 1.449-504; 2.246-301; 3.1114-69.

Troilus & Criseyde

was similar in character to the β portions of H₃. H₃Cx agree with γ S₁, as against JRH₄, in a series of striking variants in lines 701–1113 of Book II. Despite its corruptions, Cx is an important witness to the text of β . Its value is increased by the fact that it reproduces, however corruptly, a single lost manuscript.

WYNKYN DE WORDE'S EDITION 1517 (W). In 1517, Wynkyn de Worde published *Troilus* in a small quarto of 139 + 2 leaves, of which the first and the last are flyleaves. There are 23 quires, alternately of eight and four leaves each. Title (fol. a 1): "The noble and ameraus aunicyent hystory of Troylus and Cresyde, in the tyme of the syege of Troye. Compyled by Geffraye Chaucer." Below the title is a wood-cut of the hero and heroine. The text begins on fol. a 2 ro. A wood-cut introduces each of the succeeding books. Colophon:

Thus endeth the treatyse / of Troylus the hevvy
By Geffraye Chaucer / compyled and done
He prayenge the reders / this mater not deny
Newly correcked (*sic*) / in the cyte of London
In flete strete / at the sygne of the sonne
Inprinted by me / Wynkyn de worde
The .M.CCCCC. and .xvii. yere of our lorde.

Wynkyn de Worde's edition is extremely rare. There is a copy in the Cambridge University Library, and one in the Henry E. Huntington Library at San Gabriel, California.¹²¹ A rotographic reproduction of the copy in the Huntington Library is deposited in the Library of Congress at Washington.¹²²

After line 546 of Book I, Wynkyn de Worde's edition is a mere reprint of Caxton's, reproducing all the omissions, transpositions, and corruptions of Cx, and differing from it only in minor variations of spelling, and by the introduc-

¹²¹ The leaves of this copy measure $7\frac{1}{4} \times 5$ inches.

¹²² Modern Language Association Deposit, No. 31. My collations have been made from this reproduction.

The Text

tion of a few typographical errors. But, for the first 546 lines of the poem, W is entirely independent of Cx. For this portion of its text, W reproduces a lost manuscript of α type, closer to H₄ than to H₂Ph. Line 546 of Book I is the last line on fol. a 8 *vo.* of Caxton's edition, and is thus at the end of the first quire of eight leaves. It is clear that the copy of Cx which Wynkyn de Worde used had lost its first quire, and that this missing portion was supplied from a manuscript copy. For the first 546 lines, then, W is a valuable witness to the text of α ; for the rest of the poem it has no significance.

PYNSON'S EDITION 1526. In 1526 Richard Pynson published a collection of Chaucer's works, printed in double columns, which includes *Troilus*, the *Canterbury Tales*, and certain of the minor poems.¹²³ It was issued in three parts, each with separate foliation, which could be bound together, or sold separately. The part containing *Troilus* has the title: "Here begynneth the boke of Troylus and Creseyde newly printed by a trewe copye." The colophon reads: "Here endeth the boke of Troylus and Creseyde / emprinted at London in Fletestrete by Rycharde Pynson / printer unto the kynges noble grace."

The "trewe copye" from which Pynson "newly printed" his text of *Troilus* was merely a copy of Caxton's edition, the omissions and transpositions of which are slavishly followed. The spelling is somewhat modernized; and there are occasional typographical errors.¹²⁴ Pynson's edition can, therefore, contribute nothing towards the establishment of Chaucer's text.

THYNNE'S EDITION 1532 (Th). In Thynne's folio edition of Chaucer's works published in 1532,¹²⁵ and reissued in

¹²³ For full contents, see Hammond, pp. 114-15.

¹²⁴ I have collated the text of Book I from rotographs of the copy in the British Museum.

¹²⁶ For my collations I have used the photographic facsimile reproduction published in 1905 by the Oxford University Press.

Troilus & Criseyde

1542 and about 1550, the text of *Troilus* fills fols. 170–218 and part of fol. 219 a. Judged by sixteenth-century standards, and even by those of a later date, Thynne's text of the poem merits high praise. It is remarkably free from careless blunders, and preserves in a majority of the lines the integrity of Chaucer's metre. It is easily the best edition of the poem published before the nineteenth century. Unlike the prints of Caxton, Wynkyn de Worde, and Pynson, it is really edited, being based on a collation of several authorities.

These authorities were at least three: (1) Caxton's edition; (2) a γ manuscript closely akin to CpHIS2; (3) a manuscript which was of the α type, at least in Books I and II.

The use made of these authorities is not the same throughout the poem. In Book I, where γ presents the revised β text, Thynne found Cx and his γ manuscript in substantial agreement. He gave, particularly in the early part of the book, precedence to Cx, though avoiding the glaring corruptions of this authority. In Book I, Th shares very few of the distinctive γ readings. It contains, however, a considerable number of α readings, the most important of which is the inclusion of stanza 128, otherwise found only in H2PhH4. In Book II, the proportion of distinctive γ readings is much greater, and the influence of Cx is much less. In the first 800 lines are found a few α readings; but after line 800, Thynne seems to have consulted his α authority little, if at all.¹²⁶ In Books III–V, the text of Th is to all intents and purposes consistently of the γ type, save that it avoids the confusion of γ as to the proem of Book IV,¹²⁷ and contains stanza 102 of Book IV, which is omitted by γ . There are in these books no instances where an α reading has been adopted; and only rarely does one discover any trace of Cx. Th consistently avoids the dis-

¹²⁶ It is possible that this lost authority was of composite character, and ceased to present α readings after 2.800.

¹²⁷ See p. xiii.