

dwelling on the numeral and wilfully ignoring the noun. But this is one of those subtleties in which we feel the difference between Spenser and Shakespeare. See Introduction, p. ix.

V. vi. 16 l. 7. That this is things compacte] thing *conj. Church*. Others defend 'things' as genitive. Church's conjecture is preferable to that. But there is no real objection to taking 'things' as nom. pl.

V. vi. 19 l. 3. the euen-tide] th'euen-tide 1596. See note on V. iii. 11.

V. vi. 25 l. 9. nights] Knight's *conj. Church*. This conjecture, like others of Church's, is rather plausible to common sense than convincingly Spenserian.

V. vi. 26 l. 5. Ne lesse] Sense requires 'Ne more'; but see note on II. v. 12.

V. vi. 29 l. 2. armed] arm'd 1596. See note on V. iii. 11.

V. vi. 33 l. 7. auenge] reuenge 16(11)-12-13. Morris and Grosart report 'reuenge 1609': not so in genuine copies examined.

V. vii. 6 l. 9. her] From stanza 15 it appears that 'her' should have been 'his'. But the mistake may be Spenser's.

V. vii. 13 l. 5. to robe] to be 16(11)-12-13.

V. vii. 23 l. 6. See note on III. v. 53 l. 3.

V. viii. 40 l. 6. knowen] knowne 1596. 1596 might be upheld by comparison with VI. iv. 36, where 'vnknowne' = 'shown' = 'blown' = 'sown'. But these are at the end of lines, where the number of syllables is indifferent.

V. ix. 21 l. 1. knights] knight 16(11)-12-13.

V. ix. 44 l. 1. appose] oppose 1609. Mr. Chapman has pointed out to me a parallel use of 'appose' in Drayton (p. 44, l. 4 of the Oxford edition):—
Against these folkes that think them selues so wise,
I thus appose my force of reason wholly.

V. x. 3 l. 6. *Armericke*] *Americke conj. Todd*. Todd's conjecture is highly probable. Otherwise we must take *Armericke* to mean Armoric, i. e. of Brittany.

V. x. 6 l. 4. See note on I. i. 15 l. 6.

V. x. 18 l. 8. fastnesse] safenesse 16(11)-12-13.

V. x. 23 l. 4. threating] threatening 16(11)-12-13.

V. x. 24 l. 5. farewel open field] well fare *conj. edd.* needlessly: 'farewell' here = welcome.

V. xi. 5 l. 9. have riue] not riue 16(11)-12-13.

V. xi. 40 l. 6 is a very effective tetrameter as it stands. The reading of 16(11)-12-13 is not, I think, authentic.

V. xi. 41 l. 6. Upton's correction had already been made in Hughes's second edition.

V. xi. 54 l. 9. corruptfull] corrupted 16(11)-12-13. Morris and Grosart report 'corrupted 1609': not so in genuine copies examined.