A Study of the Codicology of Four Early Manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales;* Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS. Peniarth 392D (Hengwrt), Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS. 198 (Corpus), London, British Library MS. Harley 7334 (Harley 4), and California, San Marino, Huntington Library MS. El. 26 C 9 (Ellesmere)

Estelle Vivien Stubbs

PhD

The School of English: Department of English Language and Linguistics
The University of Sheffield

June 2006

Volume 1

Abstract

A Study of the Codicology of Four Early Manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*; Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS. Peniarth 392D (Hengwrt), Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS. 198 (Corpus), London, British Library MS. Harley 7334 (Harley 4), and California, San Marino, Huntington Library MS. El. 26 C 9 (Ellesmere).

This thesis is a study of the physical features of the four earliest manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales* all dated to the first years after the death of Geoffrey Chaucer. I assess the ways in which codicological examination can contribute to the understanding of a complex textual tradition and inform the study of the text.

The thesis is divided into two volumes. The first volume contains the seven chapters which make up the thesis. The first chapter contains a review of the printed editions of the poem since Caxton's first edition of 1476 and a summary of the most important contributions of scholarship in the twentieth century. It reveals that many influential editions and much scholarship on the textual tradition of the poem have been achieved with scant consultation of the extant manuscripts. The second chapter addresses the problems which have arisen as a result of this neglect and offers suggestions for a different approach to manuscript analysis which will be provided as a result of the examination of the manuscripts in the remainder of the thesis. Chapters three to six contain detailed analyses of the four manuscripts in the survey: Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS. Peniarth 392D (Hengwrt), Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS. 198 (Corpus), London, British Library MS. Harley 7334 (Harley 4), and California, San Marino, Huntington Library MS. El. 26 C 9 (Ellesmere). In chapter seven, I summarise the findings and offer suggestions for future research.

The second volume contains all the appendices numbered 1-20 followed by 22 Plates. For each manuscript there are four or five separate appendices which provide details of the following: a visual overview, a detailed analysis of individual quires, a list of all rubrics, lines added, omitted or variant in each manuscript, and a list of catchwords.

For Norman Blake

Contents

.

Preface

This thesis was begun under the supervision of Norman Blake and in its final form is dedicated to him. Norman suffered a severe stroke in the summer of 2004. He cannot know therefore just how much he is missed by all his colleagues and students.

Norman was always an inspiration. His kindness and generosity and his constant encouragement acted as a spur to his students to do their very best for him. It has been difficult to manage without him. I am grateful to have had the opportunity to work for Norman and to have begun this thesis with his guidance. He always knew I would linger over it but provided continued support in the worst crises. He also believed that the conclusions reached as the result of this research would have the advantage of being poised somewhere in the middle of opposing views about the development of Chaucer's text, thus being able to satisfy most of the people most of the time. This thesis is dedicated to him and I hope I have done justice to his expectations.

I owe thanks to a number of people. I wish to thank my family. My sisters Janice Knibbs and Coralie Swainsbury have shown a continuing interest and concern for my well-being during these last long, drawn-out months. My children, Emily Lebon, Christopher, Lucy and Nicholas Stubbs have not complained of my neglect of their problems and have provided constant and enthusiastic support and encouragement. I know that they are all proud that I have finally managed to complete the task in hand and that is a sufficient recompense.

I owe a real debt of gratitude to three people. Orietta DaRold has provided constant encouragement, particularly since Norman's illness. She has always been generous of her time and advice and I would have faltered without her very real support. Andrew Prescott, for whom I now work at the University of Sheffield, has supported me throughout the writing of this thesis. Without his continuing help, interest and enthusiasm and his suggestions for improvement, it would have been impossible to finish, particularly in the laborious last stages. He convinced me that I could do it. I am particularly grateful to Brian Donaghey in the English Department at Sheffield who took over supervision latterly to enable the thesis to be submitted.

Thank you too to colleagues on the original Canterbury Tales Project; to Peter Robinson, Elizabeth Solopova and Lorna Stevenson at Oxford, Simon Horobin, Claire Thomson and Linda Cross at Sheffield, and for a time Darren Merrill from Utah. We had great fun and many stimulating conversations. Thanks also to those at De Montfort University when the project transferred there. It was good to work with Claire Jones, Jacob Thaissen and Pip Wilcox.

List of Abbreviations

Abbreviations of Tales and Links

The abbreviations for tales and links used throughout this thesis are those devised for the Canterbury Tales Project. The abbreviation for each tale is not followed by 'T' but the reader should assume the word 'tale' as he reads. Thus CL should be read as Clerk's Tale.

The linking passages are usually, though not always, prologues. Where the link represents a prologue I have usually included a description in brackets after the numbered link for the sake of clarity, as for eample L30 (NPP) to refer to the prologue of the Nun's Priest's Tale.

Occasionally a tale has its prologue included in the tale itself as for example in Clerk's Tale, Pardoner's Tale, Prioress's Tale and Franklin's Tale. Those prologues will be represented in the text by CLP, PDP, PRP and FKP.

In the text of the thesis, line number references are those of the Riverside Edition. However, in the Appendices I have also included the line numbers of the Canterbury Tales Project (CTP).

The font used for throughout for references from the text is the Canterbury font used for transcription for the Canterbury Tales Project. Where letters are missing because of manuscript damage they will be represented thus: [x]. Latin abbreviations may be expanded thus [orum].

Some scholars refer to the different parts of the tales as Fragments, while others use the Chaucer Society Group numbers. Some articles cited refer only to Groups, others use Fragment numbers. I have attempted to use the Riverside Fragment numbers as the main point of reference throughout but these are usually supplemented by the Group reference in brackets.

Tales

Sigil	Tales and Links	Frag	Group	Riverside
CL	Clerk's Tale	IV	E^1	1-1176
CO	Cook's Tale	I	A	4365-4422
CY	Canon's Yeoman's Tale	VIII	G	720-1481
FKPT	Franklin's Prologue and Tale	V	F^2	709-1624
FR	Friar's Tale	III	D	1301-1664
GP	General Prologue	I	A	1-858

KN	Knight's Tale	I	A	859-3108
MA	Manciple's Tale	IX	H	105-362
ME	Merchant's Tale	IV	E^2	1245-2418
MI	Miller's Tale	I	A	3187-3854
ML	Man of Law's Prologue and Tale	II	B^1	99-1162
MO	Monk's Tale	VII	B^2	1991-2766
NP	Nun's Priest's Tale	VII	B^2	2821-3446
NU	[Second] Nun's Prologue and Tale	VIII	G	1-553
PA	Parson's Tale	X	I	75-1080
PD	Pardoner's Tale	VI	C	329-968
PH	Physician's Tale	VI	C	1-285
PR	Prioress's Prologue and Tale	VII	B^2	453-690
RE	Reeve's Tale	I	A	3921-4324
RT	Retraction	X	I	1081-1092
SH	Shipman	VII	B^2	1-434
SQ	Squire's Tale	V	F^1	9-670
SU	Summoner's Tale	III	D	1709-2294
TG	Tale of Gamelyn			
TM	Tale of Melibeus	VII	B^2	967-1888
TT	Tale of Thopas	VII	B^2	712-918
WBP	Wife of Bath's Prologue	III	D	1-856
WBT	Wife of Bath's Tale	III	D	857-1264

Links

Sigil	Link	Riverside	Frag	Group	Riverside
L1	KN-MI	Miller's Prologue	I	A	3109-3186
L2	MI-RE	Reeve's Prologue	I	A	3855-3920
L3	RE-CO	Cook's Prologue	I	A	4325-4364

L7	MLHeadlink	Words of the Host to the Company	II	B^1	1-98
L8	MLEndlink	Epilogue of the Man of Law's Tale	II	B^1	1163-1190
L10	WB-FR	Friar's Prologue	III	D	1265-1300
L11	FR-SU	Summoner's Prologue	III	D	1665-1708
L13	CL Envoy	Lenvoye de Chaucer	IV	E^1	1177-1212
L14	Host Stanza	Words of the Host	IV	E^1	1212a-1212g
L15	MEPrologue	Merchant's Prologue	IV	E^2	1213-1244
L17	ME-SQ	Epilogue to ME and Intro to SQ	IV / V	E^2 / F^1	2419-2440 / 1-8
L20	SQ-FK	Words of the Franklin to the Squire and the Host to the Franklin	V	F^2	671-708
L21	PH-PD	Introduction to the Pardoner's Tale	VI	C	287-328
L24	SH-PR	Words of the Host to the Shipman and Lady Prioress	VII	B^2	435-452
L25	PR-TT	Prologue to Sir Thopas	VII	B^2	691-711
L28	TT-TM	Here the Host 'stynteth' Chaucer's Tale of Thopas	VII	B^2	919-966
L29	TM-MO	Monk's Prologue	VII	B^2	1889-1990
L30	MO-NP	Nun's Priest's Prologue	VII	B^2	2767-2820
L33	NU-CY	Canon Yeoman's Prologue	VIII	G	554-719
L36	MA Headlink	Manciple's Prologue	IX	H	1-104
L37	MA-PA	Parson's Prologue	X	I	1-74

Abbreviations of Manuscripts of the Canterbury Tales

Ad1	London, British Library MS. Additional 5140
Ad2	London, British Library MS. Additional 25718
Ad3	London, British Library MS. Additional 35286
Ad4	London, British Library MS. Additional 10340
Ar	London, British Library MS. Arundel 140
Bo1	Oxford, Bodleian Library MS. Bodley414
Bo2	Oxford, Bodleian Library MS. Bodley 686
Bw	Oxford, Bodleian Library MS. Barlow 20
Ch	Oxford, Christ Church College MS. 152
Cn	Austin, University of Texas HRC MS. 143 [Cardigan]
Cp	Oxford, Corpus Christi College MS. 198
Ct	Manchester, Chetham's Library MS. 6709
Dd	Cambridge, University Library MS. Dd. 4.24
Dl	Tokyo, Takamiya MS. 32 [Delamere]
Do	Oxford, Bodleian Library MS. Douce d.4
Ds1	Tokyo, Takamiya MS. 24 [Devonshire]
Ds2	Derbyshire, Chatsworth House, Devonshire Fragment
Ee	Cambridge, University Library MS. Ee. 2.15
El	California, San Marino, Huntingdon Library MS. El. 26 C 9 [Ellesmere]
En1	London, British Library MS. Egerton 2726
En2	London, British Library MS. Egerton 2863
En3	London, British Library MS. Egerton 2864
Fi	Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum MS. McClean 181
Gg	Cambridge, University Library MS. Gg. 4.27
Gl	Glasgow, Hunterian Museum MS. U.1.1.
Ha1	London, British Library MS. Harley 1239
Ha2	London, British Library MS. Harley 1758
Ha3	London, British Library MS. Harley 7333
Ha4	London, British Library MS. Harley 7334
Ha5	London, British Library MS. Harley 7335
He	Princeton University Library MS. 100 [Helmingham]
Hg	Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS. Peniarth 392D [Hengwrt]
Hk	Norfolk, Holkham Hall MS. 667

Hl1	London, British Library MS. Harley 1704
Hl2	London, British Library MS. Harley 2251
Hl3	London, British Library MS. Harley 2382
Hl4	London, British Library MS. Harley 5908
Hn	California, San Marino, Huntingdon Library MS. HM. 144
Ht	Oxford, Bodleian Library MS. Hatton Donat 1
Ii	Cambridge, University Library MS. Ii. 3.26
Kk	Cambridge, University Library MS. Kk. 1.3
La	London, British Library MS. Lansdowne 851
Lc	Lichfield Cathedral Library MS. 29
Ld1	Oxford, Bodleian Library MS. Laud Misc. 600
Ld2	Oxford, Bodleian Library MS. Laud Misc. 739
Ll1	Wiltshire, Longleat House MS. Longleat 257
Ll2	Wiltshire, Longleat House MS. Longleat 29
Ln	Lincoln Cathedral Library MS. 110
Ma	Manchester, John Rylands Library MS. English 113
Mc	University of Chicago Library MS. 564 [McCormick]
Me	Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS. 21972 D [Merthyr Fragment]
Mg	New York, Pierpont Morgan Library MS. 249
Mm	Cambridge, University Library MS. Mm. 2.5
Ne	Oxford, New College MS. D. 314
Nl	Northumberland, Alnwick Castle MS. 455 [Northumberland]
Np	Naples, Royal Library MS. XIII.B.29 [Naples]
Ox1	Manchester, John Rylands Library MS. English 63
Ox2	Philadelphia, Rosenbach Foundation MS. 1084/2
Ph1	Austin, University of Texas HRC MS. 46 [Phillipps 6570]
Ph2	Geneva, Bodmer Library MS. 48 [Phillipps 8136]
Ph3	Philadelphia, Rosenbach Foundation MS. 1084/1 [Phillipps 8137
Ph4	California, San Marino, Huntingdon Library MS. HM 140 [Phillips 8299]
Pl	New York, Columbia University Library MS. Plimpton 253 [Phillipps 9970
Pp	Cambridge, Magdalene College MS. Pepys 2006
Ps	Paris, Bibliothèque National MS. Fonds Anglais 39
Pw	Sussex, Petworth House MS. 7
Py	London, Royal College of Physicians MS. 388

Ra1	Oxford, Bodleian Library MS. Rawlinson Poetry 141
Ra2	Oxford, Bodleian Library MS. Rawlinson Poetry 149
Ra3	Oxford, Bodleian Library MS. Rawlinson Poetry 223
Ra4	Oxford, Bodleian Library MS. Rawlinson C. 86
Ry1	London, British Library MS. Royal 17 D. XV
Ry2	London, British Library MS. Royal 18 C. II
Se	Oxford, Bodleian Library MS. Arch. Selden. B. 14
Si	Tokyo, Takamiya MS. 22 [Sion]
Sl1	London, British Library MS. Sloane 1685
Sl2	London, British Library MS. Sloane 1686
Sl3	London, British Library MS. Sloane 1009
St	Lancashire, Stonyhurst College MS. B. XXIII
Tc1	Cambridge Trinity College MS. R. 3.3
Tc2	Cambridge Trinity College MS. R. 3.15
Tc3	Cambridge Trinity College MS. R. 3.19
To1	Oxford, Trinity College MS. Arch. 49
To2	Oxford, Trinity College MS. D. 29

Pre-1500 Printed Editions

Cx1	Caxton's First Edition c. 1476 *(STC 5082)*
Cx2	Caxton's Second Edition c. 1482 *(STC 5083)*
Pn	Richard Pynson 1492 *(STC 5084)*
Wy	Wynkyn de Worde 1498 *(STC 5085)*

Manly and Rickert's Constant Groups

a	Dd-Cn
b	He-Ne
c	Cp-La-Sl^2
d	En^2-Lc-Pw-Ry^2-Dl-Ha^2-Sl^1

Ad^3	Ad^3-Ha^5
Bo^1	Bo^1-Ph^2
Cn	Cn-Ma
Cx^1	Cx^1-Tc^2
Dd	Dd-En^1

$\underline{En^1}$ En^1-Ds^1

$\underline{En^2}$ En^2-Ll^1

$\underline{En^3}$ En^3-Ad^1

$\underline{Lc}$ Lc-Mg

$\underline{Mc}$ Mc-Ra^1

$\underline{Mm}$ Mm-Gl

$\underline{Ne}$ Ne- $\underline{Cx^1}$

$\underline{Ps}$ Ps-Ha^1

$\underline{Pw}$ Pw-Ph^3-Mm

$\underline{Ra^2}$ Ra^2-Ht

$\underline{Ry^2}$ Ry^2-Ld^2

Robinson's Fundamental Witness Groups

O Group: Ad^1-En^3 Ad^3-Ha^5 Ra^3-Tc^1 Ch Bo^2-Ht Hg

AB Group: Dd Cn-Ma Ds-En^1 Ii He Ne Cx^1 Tc^2

CD Group: Cp La Mm Ld^1 Ry^1 Ph^3 Pw Sl^2 To Dl Fi Nl Sl^1 Lc Mg

E Group: Si Gg Bo^1-Ph^2

F Group: Bw Ln Ld^2 Ry^2

Abbreviations of Journal References

CRev	*Chaucer Review*
E&S	*Essays and Studies*
ELN	*English Language Notes*
ES	*English Studies*
JEEBS	*Journal of the Early Book Society*
JEGP	*Journal of English and Germanic Philology*
LLC	*Literary and Linguistic Computing*
MÆ	*Medium Ævum*
MH	*Medievalia et Humanistica*
MLN	*Modern Language Notes*
MLR	*Modern Language Review*
MP	*Modern Philology*
MS	*Medieval Studies*
NM	*Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*

PMLA	*Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*
PQ	*Philological Quarterly*
RES	*Review of English Studies*
SAC	*Studies in the Age of Chaucer*
SB	*Studies in Bibliography*
SP	*Studies in Philology*
YES	*Yearbook of English Studies*

Introduction

Geoffrey Chaucer died in 1400 leaving the *Canterbury Tales* unfinished. Despite acknowledgement of the unfinished nature of the poem, many scholars have found it difficult to accept that discrepancies in the text and order might precisely reflect the state of creative chaos presided over by an author whose ongoing process of reordering, rewriting and composing was abruptly terminated. The earliest extant manuscripts of Chaucer's poem, thought to have been copied in the years after Chaucer's death, reproduce exactly that state of creative chaos yet they are believed to be the product of scribes attempting the impossible, that is, the fashioning of a complete poem out of disparate parts without any direction. That is not what the manuscripts themselves tell us.

Over the years, textual scholars have created problems by allowing the text to dictate, for example, the order in which the tales should appear. This has had the effect of compounding the complexities of an already-complex textual tradition. It is impossible to get inside the mind of a poet who lived more than six hundred years ago and no amount of interpretative speculation will establish what he may or may not have done as he continued to develop his greatest work. However, as I shall argue in this study, we do have a number of manuscripts which bear witness to a concerted effort by a number of scribes at more or less the same time, to bring their work-in-progress to some kind of resolution. The results, visible in the earliest manuscripts, could be interpreted as a cooperative venture to update, reorder and to some extent to refashion the tales, with fresh inspiration from the author himself.

Some groups of tales were clearly in the process of being resituated at the same time as the scribes were engaged with the copying. This caused problems for those scribes who had already positioned a tale and were then required to reorder and reschedule their work. The arrival of new pieces to augment a number of tales, and the appearance of passages or entire tales lately written, contributed to the collective chaos. The enterprise was not a complete success and appears to have been brought to a premature halt. However, the earliest scribes were professional copyists and many of the problems they faced are disguised to the extent that Chaucer scholars have not felt the need to draw on the abundant evidence visible in the manuscripts to provide more information on Chaucer's text.

The aim of this thesis is to examine the physical nature of four of the earliest manuscripts and to provide an analysis of each manuscript's codicology with reference to the text. The manuscripts to be examined are Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS. Peniarth 392D (Hengwrt), Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS. 198 (Corpus), London, British Library MS. Harley 7334 (Harley 4), and California, San Marino,

Huntinton Library MS. El. 26 C 9 (Ellesmere). The information derived from such an examination will contribute to a more secure understanding of the development of the textual tradition.

1. Geoffrey Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*: The Textual Dilemma

"...a half-assembled kit with no directions."

(Pearsall 1984b: 127)

1.1. Foreword

This chapter examines the textual tradition of the *Canterbury Tales* from Caxton's first printed edition of 1476 to the *Riverside Chaucer* which first appeared in 1987. A brief resumé of the earliest editions is followed by a discussion of the scholarly debate of the later 20th century. The methods adopted by successive editors to arrive at their final text are clarified and some of the editions or manuscripts which helped to inform their decisions are identified. In the editions surveyed, the editors were primarily concerned with text variations and differences in tale order, and any physical evidence on the order of copying and assembly of the different fragments which could be gleaned from the manuscripts they consulted, does not appear to have informed their decisions. However, problems encountered by the early editors resemble those identified in much of the *Canterbury Tales* scholarship conducted in the 20th century, despite the increased availability of the manuscript witnesses themselves for examination and assessment.

1.2. The Earliest Editions

The first printed edition of the *Canterbury Tales* was produced by William Caxton at Westminster in 1476, with a second edition in 1482. Caxton may initially have been unaware that the text of the manuscript he used for his first edition was a poor one[1] but the intervention of an unknown gentleman claiming to have another manuscript which better represented Chaucer's intentions for his poem, gave Caxton the impetus to issue a second edition.[2] Thus an attempt to produce a better text, whether for critical or economic reasons, is the motive behind the second edition. Caxton did not transcribe the second manuscript afresh, he merely did what numerous editors have been doing since that time and emended his first edition with readings from the second manuscript. He also changed the order of some tales, and introduced a new linking passage between FK and SQ. The result was an edition with a unique order and a conflated text.

Caxton's second edition was followed in 1492 with a reprint by Pynson and an edition in 1498 by Wynkyn de Worde, who appears to have corrected a defective copy of Cx2 using a manuscript of high quality. A second Pynson edition was published in 1526.

It is now impossible to trace the manuscripts which Caxton used for his two editions or the manuscript consulted by de Worde. However, the significance of the disparities between the two earliest printed editions and the availability of a further manuscript with a better text used to improve the de Worde edition is at the heart of the editorial difficulties encountered by every editor of the *Tales* to the present day.

The Workes of Geffray Chaucer was printed in 1532 by William Thynne, a member of Henry VIII's household who also held a position in the Exchequer as a collector of the wool custom in the Port of London, just as Chaucer had before him. Thynne had privileged access to Chaucer material both in royal manuscript collections and his own social circle and is known to have owned a number of Chaucer manuscripts.[3] He was responsible for the first attempt at what modern editors would recognise as collation, of both manuscripts and printed editions, professing a determination to find the most authoritative texts for his edition. Although accused of augmenting the Chaucer canon with material later assigned to other authors, (only one of twenty three apocryphal items included in Thynne's edition has anything to do with Chaucer), this may not have been Thynne's intention. Donaghey argues convincingly that Thynne was concerned to preserve items which might otherwise be lost to posterity and was aware that they were not necessarily all by Chaucer (Donaghey: 1997).[4] Thynne's work had important implications for later editors and a number of manuscripts still extant may tentatively be identified as used by Thynne. The text of his 1532 edition remained influential until the eighteenth century.

Stow's edition of 1561 was mainly derivative from Thynne,[5] and Speght's printed in 1598, was again "firmly within this tradition of reprint-with-augmentation" (Pearsall 1984a). Speght had access to a number of manuscripts, but these are not specified and they were not systematically collated. He introduced the beginnings of a glossary which remained standard until the Urry edition of 1721 and the first appearance of an apparatus criticus is to be seen in the 1598 edition, with 'His Life Collected' (probably written by Stow), and 'Arguments to every Booke gathered.'

Urry died in 1715 having done much of the preparatory work for an edition which was eventually published in 1721 as *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, Compared with the Former Editions, and many valuable MSS... By John Urry, Student of Christ-Church, Oxon. Deceased.* His edition was again inclusive; TG was accepted as genuine and attached to CO; RT, missing in the editions of Thynne and Speght, reappears; the Plowman's Tale was included, despite its absence from the manuscripts and early printed editions which Urry consulted, and the Tale of Beryn was added at the end. There was no explanation of Urry's editorial procedure and the edition which had been heralded with aplomb, was summarily dismissed. A variety of manuscripts consulted by Urry and by

Brome, who organised Urry's work after his death, were listed and described in the Preface to the 1721 edition, but Urry's untimely death meant that he was not able to supply information on his use of these manuscripts, nor on his editorial principles. This is a loss, since it was the first time an attempt had been made to introduce a lineation system. The lineation was not consistent, perhaps reflecting an editorial perception of the difficulties involved in arriving at a suitable order. The order of tales in this edition does not reflect the order of any of the manuscripts he consulted.

Thomas Tyrwhitt's work towards his edition of 1775 formed the basis for modern Chaucer editorial practice. Tyrwhitt had access to approximately 24 manuscripts and both Caxtons. However, he relied mainly on Ha5, Dd, Ha4, En1, En3, and La, using a printed edition, (probably Speght's), as his base text. Both in choice of variant and in irregularities of metre, Tyrwhitt recorded the reasons for his choices which were made with manuscript evidence as the ultimate authority. His most important contribution was towards an understanding of a better order of the tales and he is the first editor to show awareness of the *Canterbury Tales* as an unfinished work. Of the projected whole he concluded, "more than one half is wanting" (Discourse 4: 120). He felt that inconsistencies in the text and divergences in the ordering in some manuscripts could be explained if the work was left incomplete at the author's death. Tyrwhitt realised that the manuscripts which he consulted had what he felt were better arrangements than those used by previous editors and by careful examination and comparison of his manuscripts he was able to detect the fault-lines in the different arrangements and provide reasoned arguments for his ordering of the tales.

Presumably because of his use of Ha5, he was immediately confronted by the first major discrepancy in the order, for Ha5 omits CO after RE. This was a problem which Tyrwhitt would not encounter again but it made him aware that this part of the order was unstable.[6] He considered TG as an option but since it did not appear in what he felt were the best manuscripts, he rejected it (Discourse 4: 145). For the first time ML was followed by WB, FR, SU, and Tyrwhitt was able to cite textual references which appeared to confirm that this was the order intended (Discourse 4: 152). ME then follows CL with a rearrangement of the order of stanzas to allow the opening of ME to echo the last lines of the Envoy. Tyrwhitt concluded that this was an area of difficulty in the text which Chaucer had left unresolved. Another problem which arose was that previous editions did not contain the linking passage between ME and SQ, probably because the tales were in a different order (L17 or ME Epilogue-SQ Headlink in modern editions). Tyrwhitt included that link in his edition and the link between SQ and FK (L20) because he felt that the order of tales thus created was a natural order at this point. PH followed FK in Tyrwhitt's

edition, rather than 2NU and CY, because he discerned that the reference in CY to Boughton-under-Blee suggested a position after MO who began his tale in Rochester.

An interesting decision taken by Tyrwhitt was to place MLEndlink, also described as the prologue to SH, in a position preceding SH, because SH had no prologue in the manuscripts he consulted. He believed the prologue to be a Chaucerian composition, but was hesitant to make such a radical change since it was attested by no manuscript available to him.

Differences in the placing of the 'Modern Instances' in MO are also revealed to the reader for the first time. The Epilogue to NP is rejected as spurious and PL is also discarded. In his edition, Tyrwhitt achieved an order of tales now almost universally accepted as probably the best possible order allowing for the fact that the poem is unfinished. However, his introduction of a continuous lineation system (except for the prose tales) conveys the idea of a complete work, despite his arguments to the contrary.

Tyrwhitt's textual emendations provide an interesting insight into his perception of problem areas. He was hesitant to include the last 100 lines of ME which he believed were not attested in the best manuscripts examined by him. He also believed that various lines in WBP, though missing from his favoured manuscripts, were genuine Chaucerian lines, available in only a few manuscripts. He was the first editor to believe that Chaucer may have cancelled them as he revised WBP. He also noted problems with the text of FK. Where Tyrwhitt emends the text it is almost always towards the readings of manuscripts which we now consider to be members of Manly and Rickert's group *a* or those anomalous manuscripts now designated 'O'.[7] Tyrwhitt managed to combine his sense of the necessity for textual and metrical emendation and tale-order adjustment, with an understanding of the manuscripts as holistic entities, thereby anticipating the approach to manuscript studies at the end of the twentieth century. His commentary on the manuscript tradition is an invaluable resource for any modern scholar.

Thomas Wright's 3-volume edition of 1847-51, *The Canterbury Tales*, was the first best-text edition, and used Ha4 as its base. This was used in turn as the basis of both Bell's collected edition of English Poetry (1854-6) and the New Aldine edition prepared by Morris (1867). Wright adopted Tyrwhitt's lineation but did not number the extra lines and used square brackets to indicate lines which he considered spurious. TG, dropped by Tyrwhitt because he considered it inferior and therefore not Chaucer's work, was included by Wright because it appears in Ha4, but it was printed in smaller type and given its own lineation. Wright can be accused of the same failings as many of the editors of Chaucer's text both before and since; he criticised the work of his predecessor but then used it as a base for his own work. Whilst criticising Tyrwhitt for his use of a number of manuscripts in the formation of his text, "written at different times and at different places", Wright's

text formed a continuous whole despite his conviction that Chaucer composed the tales at different times and joined them in a series of stages (Wright 1: xxxiii). The problem of order was not confronted by Wright. He saw many of the tales as separate entities, some possibly published by Chaucer. Nevertheless, he understood the unfinished nature of the whole and felt that the fragments were arranged after Chaucer's death, presumably by the scribes.

At the end of this early period, the availability of greater numbers of manuscript versions for consultation by editors resulted in an increased awareness of the problems facing any editor of the *Canterbury Tales*. In particular, Tyrwhitt's analyses isolated specific areas of difficulty which are still under dispute today: the unfinished CO, the choice of tale to follow ML, the purpose of MLEndlink, the order of tales in the E-F groups and their linking passages, the problem of where to place 2NU-CY and the validity of NPEndlink.

1.3. The 19th and Early 20th Centuries

In 1868, Frederick J. Furnivall established the Chaucer Society. Though not a textual scholar himself, his publication of *The Six-text Edition of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, (1868-1884) made Chaucer's text available in the form of the 6 'best' manuscripts. This was essentially the first time that an edition presented the evidence for the *Canterbury Tales* in the form of complete manuscript transcriptions rather than relying on editorial selection, as had been the case with the early printed editions. In this respect, Furnivall's contribution marks the beginning of modern Chaucer studies. Advances in the understanding of philology and the development of the English Language during the nineteenth century and a renewed interest in the language and metre of Chaucer's poems promoted manuscript studies as a subject of scholarly interest. Editorial techniques began to be refined and an interest in paleography was stimulated by easier access to manuscript sources.

Initially, Furnivall presented diplomatic transcripts of six manuscripts as parallel texts. Hg and El, considered to be of the greatest importance, were presented for the first time, with Gg, Cp, La, and Pw. Ha4 and Dd were to follow later. Furnivall supervised the copying, devised the lay-out, read the proofs and provided the impetus. His choice of manuscript was made with deference to the views of his contemporaries, Bradshaw, Morris, Earle and Murray. A second series of publications included scholarship on the subject of Chaucer and his work. Furnivall's contribution to the second series comprised *A Temporary Preface* to his edition which included a full explanation for his choice of previously unknown manuscripts.

The parallel text was "a brilliant idea" but this presentation raised problems particularly with regard to the order of the *Tales* (Baker 1984: 166). Furnivall accepted the poem as incomplete and fragmentary and therefore devised a method whereby the tales were divided into Groups which he labelled A-I. Each Group had its own separate lineation. The Group letters and line numbers are still used by many scholars today as the most convenient way to describe the different fragments of the poem. However, Furnivall's insistence on a logical, geographical sequence for the pilgrims' journey within the narrative made nonsense of his perception of the poem as fragmentary, since he organised the groups of tales to accommodate his view of topographical and temporal verisimilitude. On Bradshaw's suggestion, an order was achieved in which Group B^2, (SH-NP) was moved to a position earlier in the collection to follow ML. In this way the reference to Rochester preceded the reference to Sittingbourne and the 'Bradshaw Shift' was created, ensuring a subject for heated debate in much subsequent *Canterbury Tales* scholarship. As a result of the relocation of these tales, Furnivall moved the PH-PD group (C) to follow on from the end of B^2 to take account of the meal requirements of the Pardoner. The poem seemingly has a secure beginning and end, so although Furnivall proposed only an outward journey, the poem, ending with the Retraction, appears to be complete. Furnivall's arrangement of the tales and the accompanying lineation system which he devised has had a profound effect on later editions of the *Canterbury Tales* and on subsequent scholarship. Yet the order of tales he adopted was only ever an artificial construct, attested by no manuscript version.

Bradshaw's work with more than 50 manuscripts led him to divide the poem into 12 fragments not 10, and with 12 he felt he was able to divide the poem up into the fragments left by Chaucer at his death (1889). Bradshaw felt that the key to the problem of the order lay with the tales of CL, ME and SQ. He felt that the order posited by Wright and Morris, with Ha4 as the authority, was probably closest to Chaucer's intentions for the finished poem whilst Tyrwhitt's order came about as a result of editorial decisions taken after Chaucer's death. Bradshaw's work, released in 1871, was not formally published until after his death in 1889. In Blake's view, his work on the problems of order would have provided a more secure basis for twentieth century scholarship than the work of Furnivall which has had a greater influence because of its availability in the Chaucer Society editions (1985: 29).

Skeat's six-volume edition *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer,* was published in 1894-5 and was the first critical edition of Chaucer's texts. Skeat used El as the base text, "grammatically accurate, and thoroughly well-spelt" (IV: xvii). Not only did he consider it an accurate and beautifully-presented manuscript, but he also realised the editorial advantage of using a manuscript which contained what was considered to be the

entire canon of tales. Within this edition, the Chaucer Society Groups A-I were adopted, thereby endorsing earlier decisions made about the grouping of the tales and the numbering of the lines, and giving them an even greater authority. Anomalies were bound to arise, such as the passage in the WBP, missing from El, but labelled genuine by Skeat in a footnote. The other four dubious passages in WBP, missing from some manuscripts, were contained in the El text and received line numbers thus implying acceptance within the *Canterbury Tales* canon. MO has the Modern Instances in the middle, unlike El, and the NPEndlink, absent from El, is given the title 'Epilogue'. Skeat's idea of an epilogue allowed links which had no following tale to be accepted as genuine. Thus the link between ME and SQ, split into two by the Chaucer Society arrangement, was split into ME Epilogue and SQ Prologue. Skeat's work was reliant on Furnivall's 6-text edition with consultation of the Chaucer Society's later publication of Ha4. He had access to Dd itself, but it is doubtful whether he examined all the manuscripts at first hand. He neglected to provide reasons for adopting readings from other manuscripts, believing in his own intuition rather than adhering to a consistent and explicable policy thus his editorial judgement was limited and variable.[8] Sometimes he appeared to reject El's readings not for rational reasons but because the majority of manuscripts had different readings.

1.4. Scholarship in The First Half of the 20th Century

In 1907, Skeat published *The Evolution of The Canterbury Tales* for the Chaucer Society, which presented his changing ideas on the development of the text. He emphasised the incomplete nature of the tales and rejected the Victorian notion that it was possible to arrive at a 'correct' order by moving tales to positions which were not attested by any manuscript. This allowed him to reject the Bradshaw Shift. He felt that Chaucer had written as much as he intended and had then started to assemble the parts. Skeat identified four manuscript types which he labelled A-D, with type A the earliest attempt to order the tales, and D the latest. These four types were distinguished according to the order of tales, links and lines. Skeat felt that the Hg order, type A, was the earliest and that the fragments were gradually revised and amalgamated by Chaucer through the arrangements typified by Pw, Cp and La which represented type B, followed by Ha4, type C. In the Ha4 arrangement he perceived 8 fragments and felt that this was the last order established by Chaucer before his death, whilst the rearrangement of the Ha4 fragments, evident within El (type D), suggested that El was a text edited by scribes rather than by Chaucer. Skeat's ideas for the evolution of the text implied that all manuscripts must ultimately derive from a single copytext of Chaucer's poem.

Specimens of all the Accessible Unprinted Manuscripts of the Canterbury Tales had been published in 1892-3 by Zupitza and confined to an analysis of PDP and PDT. Zupitza provided a classification of the manuscripts according to his findings and this was presented in diagrammatic form after his death. Koch made use of Zupitza's groupings to examine the eight earliest manuscripts (1913) and also applied his findings to an edition of PDPT which was published in 1928. Koch saw all extant manuscripts in descent from a common source, a scribal copy of Chaucer's original copytext, unrevised and unpublished in any part prior to the poet's death. Two major groups of manuscripts represented the two separate lines of textual descent. Group A, which he considered the better, comprised El, Hg, Dd and Gg. The manuscripts of Group B were characterised by descent from a less accurate copytext, and were represented by Cp, Ha4, La and Pw. He proposed that any critical text of the *Canterbury Tales* should use El as its base manuscript, supported by Hg and supplemented by Cp and Dd where necessary. Koch paid particular attention to the grouping of tales in the manuscripts, acknowledging their importance in any analysis of the development of text and tale order.

In 1909, Tatlock published his study of Ha4 which he recognised as a crucial early manuscript despite the fact that he found its order to be unsatisfactory and the text inferior. He refuted Skeat's proposal of several Chaucerian revisions, and suggested that differences in the manuscript texts were more likely to be as a result of scribal intervention. Tatlock did not consider that Ha4 had been revised by Chaucer, pointing to the unfinished tales of CO and SQ, the inclusion of the spurious TG, and several missing links. However, he pointed to a revision process which apparently affected tales as far as SQ, an interesting observation which will be investigated in this thesis. Skeat's response was to point to the changing position of CL from Hg through Pw, La and Ha4. Skeat felt that since the linking passages had been changed to accommodate the Clerk's advancement in the order, it was clearly Chaucer's work and therefore the order of Ha4 was Chaucer's final and definitive contribution (1909: 19, 23).

In this early period of the twentieth century, El had replaced Ha4 as the manuscript most favoured by scholars. El was not estimated to be the earliest manuscript, but seemed to represent Chaucer's language most nearly. Hg was considered to be a good, reliable early manuscript, and although Ha4 was felt to contain some interesting readings, its importance was diminished. By this time the order of tales had become an issue of constant debate. Skeat's view of a single, progressive line of development was examined by other scholars but there was no consensus on the order and the alternative view was of two parallel groups of manuscripts in descent from the same copytext.

Such an approach is typified by Brusendorff's work in *The Chaucer Tradition* (1925). His examination of the manuscripts led him to believe that Chaucer had revised

his text which might account for the different versions. Brusendorff decided that Chaucer's work was a rough draft, with unfinished tales from CO and SQ, missing links and missing rubrics, and that although the scribes believed the poem to be a whole, they were still expecting other pieces to turn up. He suggested that this draft was written on loose paper quires, with a good many deletions and corrections, some with marginal notes referring to the authorities used and probably added by Chaucer himself. Acknowledging the status of the copytext as a draft he said, "Chaucer's draft of the Tales will have to be taken as our final text" (126). With reference to the work of Zupitza and Koch, he also confirmed two major textual traditions both in descent from Chaucer's original manuscript. These he labelled 'All-England' and 'Oxford'. The 'All-England' group sub-divided into four more groups which provided the ancestors for Hg, El, Dd and Ha4 and were labelled the Hg, El, Cambridge and London groups. The 'Oxford' group provided the ancestor of Cp and Pw (106). Brusendorff considered the 'All-England' tradition to be greatly superior, with El as the best manuscript. He believed Hg to be important yet contaminated in places by the 'Oxford' group which he saw as descended from a single inferior copy of Chaucer's original. The acknowledgment of a possible connection between Hg and Cp is intriguing and will be further explored in later chapters. Finally, Brusendorff discarded the Victorian theories of geographical and temporal equation, pointing to Chaucer's desire to "individualise a collection of human types" rather than to make "a detailed report on the road from London to Canterbury towards the close of the 14th century" (123).

The decade of the thirties was a period of great significance for *Canterbury Tales* scholarship. First there was the publication in 1933 of Robinson's edition based on the El manuscript. Despite mixed reviews, it was a very successful student edition. Robinson made it clear in the 1933 *Introduction,* reprinted in the second edition of 1957, that the text was "made afresh" by the editor (1957: xi). However, that text evolved from the published manuscript materials of the Chaucer Society supplemented by Cn and Mg, and Skeat's reprint of Thynne's 1532 edition. Thus Robinson's consultation of manuscripts appears to mean the consultation of published diplomatic texts.

Robinson also believed that there were two different types of manuscript which he labelled A and B. The A type was represented by El, Hg, Dd and Gg whilst type B included Ha4, Cp, Pw and La. "The A type of manuscript... is generally accepted as of superior quality to the B type" (1957: xxxvii). However, he also observed on Ha4, "Classified somewhat doubtfully by the textual critics among the manuscripts of Type B, the Harleian copy shows evidence of contamination with the superior Type A, and has many unique readings of great interest" (1957: xxxviii). The suggestion that the Ha4 scribe had access to exemplars used by the El/Hg scribe is another interesting observation which will be examined in later chapters.

The second great contribution to Chaucer scholarship, also in 1933, was the posthumous publication of *The Manuscripts of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales, a Critical Description of their Contents,* by Sir William McCormick with the assistance of Janet Heseltine. Access to the photostatic copies of the manuscripts made by Manly and Rickert in the 1920's enabled McCormick to collate all available manuscripts and to provide a list of the contents of each. The order of the tales was recorded as were any omissions, additions, transpositions or variant lines. Incipits, explicits and the number of lines per folio were noted, whilst attention was also drawn to tales which began at the top of a leaf. McCormick felt that such information could be significant where the leaf was the first of a quire and the manuscript had a peculiarity in its order of tales. As an example, he cited the split of tales in Fragment VII (Group B^2) in Hg, suggesting misplacement of a Section during binding. McCormick used the Chaucer Society Group division and line numbering in his descriptions, identifying as drawbacks the fact that the tales follow each other "in an order which differs from that of every known manuscript or previous edition" and that "Group B is made to represent a combination of two sections of the Tales which are entirely distinct and unconnected in all extant manuscripts except one – MS Selden" (ix). His solution was to distinguish the two sections of Group B as B^1 and B^2 and apply the same principle to the four tales in Groups E and F.[9] McCormick's contribution has proved to be a major reference tool for Chaucer scholars.

In 1935 Tatlock published a seminal article in which he advanced the ideas first postulated by Brusendorff.[10] He supported the view of eight fragments in draft form but believed that the fragments had not been finally assembled by Chaucer and for this reason would not have been published in any form. The drafts were probably on separate sheets and may have been revised, though he felt this would be difficult to prove. Despite the fact that no manuscript has such an order, he found the order suggested by Furnivall to be closest to the poet's intentions, had Chaucer lived to complete his work. Tatlock, like Victorian scholars before him, obviously still felt that it was possible to recover the authorial intention despite the fact that the work was unfinished. Tatlock believed that it was the scribes who had invented their own orders for the groups of tales in their haste to prepare a complete version after Chaucer's death. El, Hg, and Ha4 were, in his estimation, the most important manuscripts with El and Hg sharing a scribe. Hg he believed to be earlier, but El the better. The omissions in Hg and the inferior order, arrived at by editors, pointed to its being possibly the oldest and therefore the most important of all the manuscripts. Although Tatlock believed both Hg and El to have been copied from the same exemplar, he could not account for the disparities between the two.

Throughout the twenties and thirties, John Manly and Edith Rickert had carried out an exhaustive survey of all known manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales.* This

culminated in 1940 with the publication of an 8-volume edition, *The Text of The Canterbury Tales*. Both scholars felt that although previous editions had been of great value, there was a need for a text of the *Canterbury Tales* based on all known manuscripts rather than just a selection, at the same time using evidence from the early printed editions which could afford insight into manuscripts which have since disappeared. The development of photostatic imaging, unfortunately only in black and white, to enable the photographing of manuscripts, meant that they could assemble complete reproductions of the codices. It was an exhaustive study in which all information about the manuscripts was carefully collected. Volume 1 contains manuscript descriptions and for the first time their physical aspects were fully considered. As well as collation, they included descriptions of quiring, scribal hand, form, and illumination. Manly and Rickert's assessments of the dates of individual manuscripts were made by comparing more than 500 documents and manuscripts of the period which had been securely dated, whilst notes on the order of tales provided them with information about the affiliation and textual character of each manuscript. Finally they included a section devoted to special features which they considered worthy of note, and one on provenance which traced the known history of each manuscript. Volume 2 was devoted to the textual tradition of the manuscripts and their inter-relationships. The text of the *Canterbury Tales* appeared in Volumes 3 and 4 with a brief apparatus criticus whilst Volumes 5-8 recorded the major variants in all tales and links.

Manly and Rickert's intention was to purge the *Canterbury Tales* text of 500 years of intervention by scribes and editors thereby restoring a text as close as possible to Chaucer's original, acceptable to all scholars. This archetypal text, labelled O^1 by Manly and Rickert, was believed to represent Chaucer's own copies of the tales with his revisions attached. Oddly, Skeat's *Student Chaucer*, an edited text, was used as the base text for their collations which must have caused problems with the text and may also have influenced their manuscript groupings. By classifying both textual variants and the order in which the tales appeared, Manly and Rickert divided the manuscripts into 4 main groups, *a-d* which could in turn be broken down into a number of smaller groups. The *a-d* grouping was "probably chronological order" (II: 477). El, Gg, Hg, and in some tales Ha4 and Ad3, were considered independent of the groups, with El often associated with *a*. Manuscripts with the *a* order were in the main "derived from a better text" (II: 44), and were probably the closest to Chaucer's intentions. The *b c* and *d* orders had apparently developed because scribes who had been unable to access the texts used by the *a* scribes, either added or omitted parts of the text. As the largest group, manuscripts of the *bcd* type could imply a different version or a different stage of composition from *a*, El, Hg or Gg. The different orders were the result of scribal attempts to assemble the material.[11]

Having collated the manuscript versions and established the major groupings, Manly and Rickert then used the technique of textual recension to try to recover the original text. They also applied an intuitive approach, characteristic of previous editors, for establishing which parts of the poem they considered to be genuine. Then, although they had argued for different originals for different tales, Manly and Rickert attempted to recover the lost archetype, eventually restoring parts of the text which they felt that Chaucer had added at a later date. They concluded that parts of the poem had been circulated in Chaucer's lifetime and that a theory based on the prior circulation of some tales could explain some of the authorial variants in the text and the different textual development of individual tales. Unfortunately, for recension to be applied, all manuscripts must descend from a common archetype and since Manly and Rickert saw the existence of numerous different copies in circulation, their attempt was seriously flawed.

The text of their edition was very like that of Hg, the manuscript they felt was the best and the earliest. However they were not influenced by its order, its rubrics, or its tale divisions. Modern rubrics were supplied for each part, but those from El were also included. El's text was thought to be an edited and conflated version which nevertheless derived from contact with Chaucer's own revised copy. Additional lines included in Skeat's edition were included by Manly and Rickert, which resulted in the need to invent complicated theories to explain the presence in their text of passages not found in the best earliest manuscripts. The order of the tales in the 1940 Edition is the El order, with Groups C and B^2 in the later half of the poem. There is nothing in Manly and Rickert's text itself to establish the unfinished state of either CO or SQ although reference is made to the fact in the notes. TG is omitted because it was not written by Chaucer (III: 446-7) and MLEndlink is rejected as a Shipman's Prologue but included as part of "the development of Chaucer's plan". However, Manly and Rickert surmised that Chaucer's final decision was "not [to] use it for introducing and connecting MLT with any tale now extant" (III: 491). The linking passage between ME and SQ (L17) is split into two parts in their text, not because it is found in any manuscript in this form, but because of the exigencies of the printing of their volumes. In MO, the Adam stanza is included, but no reason is advanced for its omission from Hg. The Modern Instances are in the middle of MO although in both Hg and El they are at the end. L33 (CYP) and CYT follow on from NU because although they do not appear in Hg they were written by Chaucer (IV: 521). The final edition was thus eclectic, with a text very close to Hg, and the tale order of El.

The 1940 edition was assembled in haste after the death of Rickert whilst Manly's own health was failing. The explanatory matter is not always clearly defined although an attempt at clarification was later made by Germaine Dempster. It is always easy to be dismissive of work which is criticised by later scholars but the scope of Manly and

Rickert's undertaking was mammoth and their Volumes are still used constantly by almost every Chaucer scholar. The sheer bulk of their research and the high degree of accuracy achieved is humbling. It is perhaps true that in order to defend their initial intention, the editorial process became the subject, rather than the task in hand. Perhaps they took too little account of the effect of scribal behaviour in the manuscripts and of their own codicological findings, placing greater reliance on late, minor variants in the text to support their theories of manuscript relationships.

1.5. Manly and Rickert's Legacy: The Contributions of Brown and Dempster

Manly and Rickert's 1940 edition did not produce the immediate flurry of scholarly activity expected. Many scholars found the edition daunting and the presentation of the results confusing. However, the work of two scholars, Carleton Brown and Germaine Dempster, contributed significantly in the years immediately following Manly's death. Brown and Dempster subjected the 1940 data to close analysis and each one suggested further areas ripe for investigation. Carleton Brown had been commissioned to review the 8-Volume Edition which appeared in January of 1940. Before the *Review* could be published, Manly died. This may be fortuitous, since Brown's *Review*, although greatly appreciative of the achievement of the two scholars, at the same time confirmed the impression of confusion attendant on trying to sift the data. Brown compared the evidence presented in the 1940 *Edition* with Manly's statements in the *Introduction* to his 1928 version of *The Canterbury Tales*.[12] There Manly had suggested not four main types of arrangement in the manuscripts but only two, much as Brussendorff and Koch had argued.

Brown then attempted to find a rationale for the expansion of manuscript arrangements to at least four as suggested in the 1940 edition. He subjected Manly and Rickert's findings to close scrutiny and found many instances where Manly "repeatedly observes that the unrevised, and therefore earlier, form of the text is found in manuscripts of the *d* type" (Review: 613). Brown felt that the significance of these findings for the classification of the major groups had never been recognised. He produced a list of suggestions filtered from Manly's data for the existence of an earlier tradition found in the *cd* manuscripts. These included a section of KT after c. line 1740, two different stages of work in CYPT and also in the linking passage between PH and PD. In MO, Manly saw two separate versions "differentiated by the readings in lines 3568 and 3616 and by the different position for Modern Instances" (Review: 614). Using Manly's data, Brown then turned his attention to six instances where the presence or absence of certain portions of text might provide evidence for structural development of the tales. He cited MLEndlink, found in nearly all *b*, *c* and *d* manuscripts but lacking in a-El and Hg, and five passages in

WBP which occur only in *a* and *b* manuscripts and a few irregular witnesses. For SU, Brown pointed to Manly's suggestion that the ancestor of the *d* group of manuscripts could represent an earlier and unfinished form of SU. The WB stanza (CL: 1170-76) after CL Envoy, was another case where Brown saw structural development. The stanza is lacking in the 24 manuscripts of group *d* which also have a rearrangement of lines at the end of the tale, and all but two of these manuscripts also omit the CL-ME link. The situation in the *b* and *c* manuscripts may represent the next stage, with the WB stanza and Envoy in the accepted order but with the CL-ME link adapted. Finally, the shorter version of the MO-NP link, found mainly in *b*, *c* and *d* manuscripts was considered to be an earlier form by Manly, and NPEndlink had been cancelled by Chaucer although present in five *a* group manuscripts.

Brown was convinced that Chaucer was in the process of changing the order of the tales at the time of his death and that this was the reason for anomalies and inconsistencies in the text. He believed that the *d* group manuscripts could be representative of an earlier stage in Chaucer's plan for the tales and that the *bcd* manuscripts were closely related. "The noteworthy agreement of the manuscripts of types *b*, *c* and *d* in the arrangement of the tales certainly suggests that it was based upon some tradition which existed even before the revised form of the text. And it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that this tradition antedated the death of Chaucer" (Review: 619). Brown followed up this review with several articles extending his own investigations into the development of the tales and what he felt was evidence of Chaucer's revision of his work.

Germaine Dempster contributed several articles between 1946-49 summarising the more important conclusions which she attributed to Manly. The first of these attempted to clarify Manly's views on the scribes, the manuscript situation at Chaucer's death, the prior circulation of some tales, and the history of the text after 1400 (Dempster 1946). The prior circulation theory had been adopted to explain what Manly saw as the great amount of textual variation in the manuscripts and the manner of piecemeal acquisition of material by the Hg scribe. The probable ownership of several of the earliest manuscripts by members of Chaucer's circle of acquaintance convinced Manly that copies of some tales were already in circulation at Chaucer's death. The scramble to assemble a complete copy involved not only the inclusion of tales previously disseminated, but also tales in varying states of completion or revision. At Chaucer's death there were a number of attempts to produce collections, with Hg, El, Ha4 and the four lost ancestors of the *abcd* groups representative of seven of them. Hg had a collection of tales closest in most instances to the latest common ancestor but El contained authorial emendations and must have been copied from Chaucer's own papers.

Manly's theory of prior circulation has been dismissed by a number of distinguished scholars.[13] However, a different perspective on Manly's argument could provide a means by which the textual tradition at its earliest moment could be understood. If, as some scholars suggest, there was an earlier collection of tales, perhaps circulated in a different format, then why could not those tales form a constituent part of some of the earliest surviving manuscripts?[14] There is certainly evidence in Hg, Cp and Ha4, that tales from previous collections may have been incorporated as the manuscripts were expanded to embrace a final collection formed perhaps at the instigation of the author himself.

Of major importance for scholars of the *Canterbury Tales,* was Dempster's consideration of the change in the colour of ink for the last 100 lines of ME in Hg in the light of group *c* manuscripts which lack those lines (1948a: 325-30). The findings in this article have considerable implications for subsequent work in this thesis and need further explanation. In Hg, at ME 1075, the ink used by the Hg scribe changes to a lighter shade. At precisely the same point, the text of ME in the *c* manuscripts breaks off and the last 100 lines are missing. Dempster concluded that Hg's change of ink "must reflect a feature of the immediate antecedent of Hg precisely at that point" (326). When the last 100 lines were eventually acquired for Hg, there was no shift of affiliation in the text, thus the break must have occurred as a result of the physical condition of the exemplar. The only ancestor common to both Hg and the *c* manuscripts was the original archetype and it was in this copy that the break must have occurred with both scribes having access to the author's copytext, still in the nature of a working copy. Thus, early in the creation of the *Canterbury Tales*, the individual scribes of manuscripts which stand at the head of each genetic group may have used Chaucer's own papers to produce exemplar copies. This theory allowed for a much simpler and more credible view of the textual tradition than that suggested by Manly.

Dempster developed her ideas on the manuscript relationships, first, by endorsing Manly's findings that manuscripts of groups *c* and *d* are indistinguishable in two thirds of the text, which is arrived at by radiation from an exclusive common ancestor - *cd* (1948b: 457-8). For the missing third, groups *c* and *d* are genetically related in all except CL and belong to what Manly called the 'Large Commercial Group'. Dempster provided a useful list of the so-called "losses" in the *c* ancestor which needed supplementing to provide a *d* copy.[15]

Apparently the editor of the ancestor of *d* acquired his text for most of these pieces from a copy "on the line of transmission to √ c copy and probably very near it". An explanation for this state of affairs was given by Dempster: "As to his using as components of the new exemplar two thirds of the √ c and no more, the only plausible explanation is that the other two thirds was not available" (465). The *d* group acquired the

linking passages between tales in Groups E and F, missing from the c tradition, from Hg itself and it was the sudden availability of newly-found linking passages which encouraged the d scribes to modify the c order. The only pieces never acquired by the ancestor of d scribe were CL-ME link (which was also copied late into El), and NPEndlink (469). Like Brown before her, Dempster also noted Manly's suggestions about the final 136 lines of SU and the PH-PD and MO-NP links. The development of the orders then, was apparently much simpler than had been shown by Manly and went from Hg to El and thence to c, d and b. The main difference between the order of Hg and the order of c was in the sequence WB, FR, SU, CL and ME.

It is intriguing that Dempster felt that the development of the a-El order may have influenced the order of c since this must suggest that the c order evolved after El had been completed. It is difficult to see the logic of this, since c still lacks the linking passages which make sense of the El order. Nor does c effect all the changes apparent in El. However, Ha4, which shares the same grouping of those tales with both c and El, was apparently derived from Hg and not from c. These points will be further pursued in subsequent chapters. Dempster also confirmed Manly's view that the order of tales in the b group ancestor developed from the ancestor of d (1948b: 484).

In a later article, Dempster put forward her ideas on how Chaucer began to build up the different blocks of tales and develop the linking passages, possibly in stages (1953). A few tales such as TM, NP and CL may have been part of an earlier collection. At some point Chaucer decided to develop the tales and assign some to different pilgrim narrators. TM was to move from ML and become Chaucer's own tale. The creation of Fragment VII (Group B^2) began, and a new link was needed to join TM to MO. MO had already been linked to NP at an earlier stage but that shorter link originated "before Chaucer tied TT and TM to MO" (1953: 1152). The linking passages, TM-MO (L29), MO-NP (L30), could only have been composed after Chaucer had acquired TM for his own tale. The last part of PH-PD link (L21) could only have been written after PD had been completed, and SH-PR (L24) and TM-MO (L29) links were written as a result of the development which had taken place in the character of WB. All these linking passages Dempster felt were worked on at a late date when Chaucer was beginning to revise the C-B^2 tales.

Dempster examined all the tales which comprise the Groups B^2, D, E, F and C and tried to assess the tales already written, those which were being further refined by Chaucer, and the material which still needed to be composed. Once again, her ideas receive much support from the manuscript analyses which follow. Thus SH, which had originally been told by WB, was in existence when the new WBP was taking shape. PR, PH and PD, existed in isolation and may not have been assigned to a particular pilgrim. TT was composed to pair with TM when that tale was shifted from its ML position, and

although MO was probably linked to NP, the TM-MO link had not yet been planned. CL had a prohemium, an endlink and the Host stanza, yet the Envoy and the CL-ME links had not been written or even conceived. Chaucer had probably not composed ME and SQ at this time and the new WBT was a fairly recent development. The last part of the PH-PD link was probably written at this time and the MLEndlink which linked TM (as told by ML) to SH (as told by WB) was kept in reserve for re-use at a later date. Despite the work which went into creating these groups of tales, Dempster argued that they did not receive Chaucer's finishing touches (1953: 1158).

The observations of both Brown and Dempster have much to commend them. Their assessment of Manly's work and their own extension of some of his themes inform later scholarship on the tales and provide a reference point for the analyses in Chapters 3-6 of this thesis.

1.6. Editions in the Last Half of the 20th Century

With the information provided by Manly and Rickert's vast study, several new editions appeared. Robinson's second edition (1957) was substantially the same as his original, and in Pratt's first edition of 1966 he acknowledged his particular debt to Robinson. However, Pratt's reprint edition of 1974 made much more use of the Manly and Rickert text to the extent that the final version closely resembled Hg.

The Variorum editions, still in progress today, began with an inaugural publication of the Hg manuscript in facsimile.[16] The reason for the initial publication was that Hg was to be the base manuscript for future publications of the single tale editions. Hg's "age, unedited state and its accuracy" are cited by Baker in his introduction to the volume, as reasons for its importance "ahead even of the magnificent and more complete but heavily edited El" (1979: xvii). Baker also pointed to the fact that each century has had its own preferred version of Chaucer's text, but it was his belief that the new Variorum editions would provide texts as close as it was possible to get to Chaucer's intended work. The purpose behind yet another edition of the *Canterbury Tales* was to provide extensive notes as a means of clarifying and comparing the mass of textual evidence, whilst at the same time providing as useful a text as possible. Production of the Variorum single tale editions has involved conservative editing of the Hg text and its collation with ten or more manuscripts representing Manly's chief groups.[17]

A year later, in 1980, Blake's edition of the *Canterbury Tales* was published. This edition is unique in a number of ways, and marks a departure from conventional editorial practice by using not only the text of the Hg manuscript with all its omissions, but also its order. However, he does restore the MO, NP and MA unit, thought to have been

misbound, to a position between TM and PA. Blake is true to the Hg contents and does not include CY which Hg lacks and he also omits CYP, MLEndlink and L15 (MEP). The two controversial linking passages between SQ-ME (L20) and ME-FK (L17) are relegated to the Appendix and the last 500 lines of PA are restored along with RT. Although Blake's edition did not receive universal acclaim, it nevertheless raised the awareness of scholars that a re-examination of the earliest manuscripts might prove more fruitful in any attempt to establish what Chaucer wrote, rather than continuing the practice of basing research on the editions of previous editors and scholars.

The *Riverside Chaucer* edited by Benson has proved to be a very user-friendly guide for the latest generation of students (1987). However, the model of Benson's edition was Robinson's second edition of 1957 and was to a large extent a co-operative venture under the general editorship of Robert A. Pratt and Ralph Hanna III, with contributions from a number of other scholars. The edition's selective, explanatory notes are intended to supply a starting point for scholarship, with sufficient references to help further investigation. Benson points to the proliferation of scholarship in Chaucer-related material and announces that his edition strives to present a diversity of view-points with disputed readings supported by lists of manuscripts and editorial variants. However, an unfortunate aspect of this widely-used and influential edition is that its text of the *Canterbury Tales* is accepted as Chaucer's own version.

1.7. Scholarship in the Last Half of the 20th Century

Apart from the continuing controversy concerning text and order exemplified in the diverse editions of the *Canterbury Tales*, the latter half of the 20th century has also produced a vast amount of scholarship essentially contributing towards an understanding of the lack of harmony between the manuscripts. The availability of manuscript evidence, at second hand in the descriptions of McCormick and Manly and Rickert have encouraged a plethora of theories on the development of the groups, the establishment of the order, the authenticity of linking passages, on revision by Chaucer and arguments for the existence of two authorial orders. All these studies purport to cite the authority of manuscript evidence but in the main they are reliant on the evidence afforded by black and white photostatic reproductions, manuscript transcriptions at second hand, and Manly and Rickert's analyses.

The publication of the Ruggiers facsimile of Hg in 1979 was of great significance for Chaucer studies in a number of ways. Not only did the facsimile present good quality images of each folio of the manuscript (albeit in black and white), but the text was also transcribed alongside each folio image and the El variants were included. Further, the

facsimile is accompanied by Doyle and Parkes' excellent introduction, which discusses the manuscript's codicology and paleographical features, including the evidence of its original production (xix-xlix.). The ink colour, hand of the scribe and the possible milieu of his operation is scrutinised, alongside an examination of the vellum, and the probable timing of the manuscript's copying and assembly. For anyone studying the way in which a manuscript evolves there can be no better tutorial. Doyle and Parkes were able to distinguish that the main scribe had a supervisor who provided the running titles for most folios and therefore appeared to be instrumental in the organisation of the manuscript. This is the sort of information which, with further scrutiny, may provide valuable clues about the status of Hg in the textual tradition. The Hg scribe's collaboration with another scribe who cooperated in his working environment (and who copied Cp and Ha4, two other early copies of the *Canterbury Tales*) had been previously examined by the two scholars in a much-quoted Essay (1978). Their experience of script and document analysis enabled a refutation of the Manly and Rickert theories of commercial scriptoria and a belief that the earliest *Canterbury Tales* manuscripts were produced by scribes responding to the requirements of their clients. Doyle and Parkes' codicological analysis provides a model for the investigation and assessment of the *Canterbury Tales* manuscripts.

A number of scholars contributed articles and books in the 1980's and 90's which attempted to refine the areas of debate. In 1981, Larry Benson produced an article on the order of the tales. He believed that the scholarly debate on manuscript orders was theoretical and conducted purely on the basis of literary analysis (78). Such a situation had apparently arisen because of Manly and Rickert's entrenched view that the manuscripts have no authority in the order of the tales. Benson clearly believed that their opinions were not supported by the evidence and wished to go back to what he called "manuscript evidence" (78). This would support his claim that there were only two manuscript orders, both established by Chaucer, and that Chaucer had finished as much as he wanted to do with the *Canterbury Tales*. However, Benson's manuscript evidence derives from an analysis of the contents of manuscripts supplied by Manly and Rickert.

As Dempster had before him, Benson argued for the *bcd* orders associated with a single scribal tradition. Since manuscripts of the *a* group are not related in their texts, Benson believed it to be extremely significant that in the order of their tales they "depend on an ultimate common ancestor" (93). Whereas Dempster had felt that the *bcd* orders post-dated the *a* order, Benson suggested that the order in El developed from that of Hg and both are later than the orders found in the *bcd* group of manuscripts. The "considerable artistic merit" of the El order, made it unlikely that anyone other than the author himself could have constructed it (111). As the *a-El* order is, in Benson's view, the last order and can be attributed to Chaucer, then all the orders must have originated with

him. Benson's two orders differ only in the placement of Group G, (2NU, CY) and several minor errors which Chaucer did not live to revise. All these errors can be explained by Benson's conviction that Chaucer had revised some of the *Canterbury Tales* at an earlier date.

The Textual Tradition of the Canterbury Tales (1985), set in context Blake's ideas on the earliest witnesses to Chaucer's poem. He rejected the Manly and Rickert notion of the prior circulation of tales, seeing it as a theory developed by them to patch up the holes in their attempts to carry out recension. Blake also pointed to the fact that certain groups of tales are always found in the same order in almost every manuscript, a situation which would not have occurred if the tales had circulated individually. Blake argued that the *Canterbury Tales* was unfinished, but represented the culmination of the work of Chaucer's later years, although the tales were not neccessarily composed in the way they appear in the manuscripts. Since no manuscript had been dated to Chaucer's lifetime, the poem must have been in the form of a working draft and the Hg manuscript represented the earliest attempt by the scribes to organise the fragmentary material into some sort of cohesive whole. Blake recognised clear signs of attempts to arrange what was left in the most appropriate manner, given the absence of linking passages, and perhaps alternative text, present on the copy-text in some places. The Hg order was therefore the first order and provided the basis from which other scribes revised and edited their work. That order was undergoing change as the copying proceeded and this could explain the differences in ink colour for certain passages and sections, and might also explain gaps left in the text. All orders are related according to Blake and the scribes of the other early manuscripts must have been aware of decisions taken for the Hg assembly and also have had access to the Hg exemplars. The poem had a beginning and an end and bits to be fitted in between. The El manuscript he saw as a later, edited text. Blake urged the need for a more rigorous methodology in the editing of Chaucer's texts and felt that modern editors were still too reliant on methods used in the 19th century. He believed that in all probability Hg was copied from Chaucer's own copytext and therefore it is to this manuscript that we should look for the real evidence on Chaucer's language, style and metre.[18]

The Manuscripts of the Canterbury Tales, by Charles Owen was published in 1991, presenting the culmination of his work of forty years on the textual tradition of all surviving manuscripts, during which he had contributed a number of influential articles.[19] Owen believed that none of the manuscript orders was authorial and that the *Canterbury Tales* was an unfinished work, the different fragments representing different stages in the development of the poem. He felt that there was sufficient evidence in the text to establish that Chaucer had worked on individual tales which circulated among his close friends and might be significant of an earlier collection. This theory also has considerable significance

for the remainder of work in this thesis. Owen felt that an early collection might initially have included a shorter GP, a MLP followed by the present TM, and a MLEndlink introducing a shorter WBP. WBT would have been the tale now allocated to SH. Several tales from Fragments VI and VII (Groups C-B^2) were also included in the first collection (1958: 464-75). Owen also argued for a wholesale revision of the Tales beginning in 1394, but gathering in momentum and intensity from 1399 until Chaucer's death in 1400. For the last period of activity he suggests completion of work on B^2, which had involved the movement of TM from ML to become Chaucer's tale, the transfer of SH to B^2, an extension of WBP, with a new WBT followed by the tales of FR and SU and the creation of the so-called Marriage Group. The development of practically the whole of Fragment I was also assigned to this time period, when Chaucer was engaged in a wholesale expansion of his plans and wished to provide four tales for each pilgrim, instead of the original idea of a single tale for each (1958: 475-6). Owen saw the six earliest manuscripts as the first attempts at collections of Chaucer's work, assembled with some difficulty by the scribes to give an impression of a finished work. In many ways, Owen's findings are reminiscent of those of Dempster, particularly his views on the development of the fragments.

In a presidential address to the Medieval Academy of America in 1988, John H. Fisher presented his 'Animadversions on the Text of Chaucer'. This address was Fisher's attempt to summarise the state of *Canterbury Tales* scholarship. What comes over very clearly is Fisher's belief that it is a "scholarly mistake" to consider the Hg text as most Chaucerian but a "critical mistake" to deny a pattern in the development of the tales and treat them "merely as a collection of stories" (792-3). He firmly believed in some kind of overall supervision towards the creation of an authoritative text and order.

"This systematic production of a series of manuscripts, each putting the text of the *Canterbury Tales* in more complete and systematic form, bespeaks some sort of continuing direction". (789)

For this reason an examination of all available evidence on both text and order in the earliest manuscripts was a requirement.

Fisher's earlier work on Chaucer's plan for the *Canterbury Tales*, had much in common with the views expressed by Dempster and Owen. He also saw an earlier collection of tales and felt that it was the development of the group of tales from PH to the NP (C-B^2) which provided the impetus for Chaucer to begin afresh at the beginning (1972: 243). Like Owen, Fisher felt that Chaucer supplemented an earlier GP, which may originally have ended before the inclusion of the descriptions and tales of RE, MI, SU, PD

and MA, and revised some of his previous work such as Palamon and Arcite to be presented as KT. He rewrote and reassigned tales in a wholesale revision process which Fisher believes progressed as far as FK (244). The suggestions of Brown, Dempster, Fisher and Owen for the way in which the tales developed receive much support from the codicological evidence of the earliest manuscripts.

Ralph Hanna also contributed to the Hg-El debate with books and articles which focus first on the difficulties experienced by editors following the 'best-text' method. According to Hanna, "individual manuscripts do not possess absolute value for textual purposes, only what I would call contextual value" (in Pearsall, 1987: 87). He also drew attention to the physical features of the early manuscripts using the evidence of each manuscript's codicology to establish the portions of text, probably in booklet form, received by the scribes (Hanna: 1986). Finally Hanna examined features of Hg's physical structure which he saw as incomplete, with director and scribe unsure about how much would need to be accommodated and with no clear plan of the whole. With reference to the early exemplars of the *Canterbury Tales*, Hanna argued

> "what is amazing about the early circulation...is precisely the early
> proliferation of copies. At least six manuscripts (Hg, Ha4, Cp, Me, El,
> Dd) might be dated from the first decade of the fifteenth century,
> immediately after the poet's death. ... This is in fact unusual, both in
> the poet's canon and generally in Middle English, where frequently
> surviving copies date from long after the act of composition" (1989:
> 73).

With Hanna's comments in mind, it may be pertinent here to state that five of the six manuscripts produced in that 'early proliferation' will be under discussion in this study and possible reasons for such an unusual state of affairs will be offered in the conclusion.

1.8. Afterword

What should have become increasingly apparent in the previous discussion is that after 600 years and numerous editions of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, there is still no consensus about its text or the order of tales. From the first Caxton edition to the recent Riverside version, every editor has attempted to establish both an order of tales and a text which they believe best represents Chaucer's intentions and best satisfies the expectations of all readers for what they perceive to be Chaucer's text. The approach to these problems has varied. Some editors collated manuscripts to arrive at a text which they found to be satisfactory, and so editions will vary according to the manuscripts consulted. Other

editors used the text of a single manuscript, sometimes including emendations from the text of another. These editions will occasionally include additional or variant passages of text, within brackets, in different type, or relegated to footnotes or appendices.

In the last 70 years, there has been a significant attempt to stabilise views on editorial procedure. The problem with trying to develop a critique for editing the *Canterbury Tales* is that the text has never been established. Scholarly opinion varies and Pearsall points out the dangers of producing critical editions from a later manuscript which might endow authority on, for example, the order of the *Canterbury Tales*. He states categorically that there is no authorised Chaucerian order of tales, and points to the emendation policy of editors, working on what he terms the "single textual moment" basis, in which passages from the poem are collated using manuscripts which reflect different stages in the development of the text. Pearsall's view of the *Canterbury Tales* is of "a half-assembled kit with no directions" (1984c: 127).

We can see therefore, that on the whole, editors have been satisfied to produce editions in which both text and order are reliant on the interpretation of evidence supplied from within the text itself. These decisions have been supported and encouraged by the work of individual scholars whose own research is also mainly text-based. A culture is thus established whereby "assumptions and beliefs which have taken on the character of a tradition and an orthodoxy" are never challenged (Knoop and Jones: 89). One way in which such an orthodoxy may be challenged is to begin again at the beginning with the manuscripts themselves.

Towards the end of the 20th century, different methods of analysis have been used by scholars in an attempt to unravel the mysteries of the complicated textual tradition. Important linguistic surveys have provided analyses of the dialect layers of some *Canterbury Tales* scribes and revealed information on the relationship between author and scribe, the nature of the copytext and the milieu of operation. Graphetic studies have considered the patterns of scribal behaviour during the copying process to try to establish an order of work and to assess the portions of text available to the scribes. Computer analysis has enabled the easy comparison of spelling data and of tale orders across all manuscripts thus enabling mass calculation procedures to take place. And changing literary interpretations of the text continue to provide a never-ending source of subjective new ways to look at old texts. All these approaches have provided useful and important information on varying aspects of the textual tradition.

However, to date, noone has attempted an in-depth analysis of the wealth of physical evidence to be found in the manuscripts, despite the fact that such an analysis of the earliest manuscripts might radically alter our perceptions about the development of the

text and the textual tradition as a whole. Nor has any real attempt been made to compare the codicological similarities and differences between extant codices. This is alarming, since it implies an existence for all textual studies, and indeed all the studies enumerated above in a sort of limbo, divorced from the centre of operation, the manuscript page. The physical attributes of a manuscript inform us not only of its actual physical state but also provide a means of entry into the scribal operations at an intimate level. This in turn informs us on the text.

A study of a manuscript's codicology can reveal a huge amount of information which is relevant to any textual study. Thus analysis of the vellum and of variations in ink colour may reveal instances of text alteration and addition. Quiring patterns and catchwords inform on the availability of exemplars, a predetermined ordering plan or the melding of material previously-copied into a new system of presentation. Features of a manuscript's decoration may help to determine the structure of the text, and where those features display irregularity, attention should be paid to anomalous occurrences. Running titles, where present, have a wealth of information to impart. Assessment of the hand may reveal manuscript supervision by someone other than the scribe. It may also provide information on portions of text copied at different times. Irregularity in the titles may be suggestive of text adaptation, hesitation, or delay in acquiring portions of text. Tracts of text from a previous assembly may be identified by the position of the title, its decoration, or the lack of conformity with titles in the manuscript pattern.

Analysis of the distribution of lines per folio and the space left for rubrics help to establish the copying patterns of the scribe, the organisation of the text or the manuscript page and the difficulties encountered when acquiring portions of text to link with previously copied folios. Signs of delay, or alternatively of haste, provide information on the modus operandi of the scribes and may be discovered whilst exploring the manuscripts as physical objects. Few scholars have attempted such an examination or a consideration of the findings in the light of evidence from the text.

However, from the end of the 1980's a new method of analysis became available in the guise of the computer and its associated programs and tools. Several important early manuscripts were disbound and at the same time, digitised colour images were made of each folio either for use on CD-ROM, the world-wide web, or as high-quality facsimiles. New opportunities were thus created to examine manuscripts in entirely different ways, ways which might assist in the discovery of more information on the "half-assembled kit."

There remains a caveat to all this newly-available information. The computer and the world-wide web are wonderful and enabling tools to assist research. Computer analysis can be used for example, to subject a body of data on spelling or on graphetic distribution to mass calculation procedures at the click of a button, and thereby produce a

huge body of data ripe for further investigation and analysis. However, if analysis of such information is conducted, using as a framework the preconceived notions and misconceptions of previous scholarship, then the value of that information will be diluted or perhaps even perverted. It is my firm belief that a codicological examination of the earliest manuscripts will provide fresh information to be used as a means of establishing a new framework within which such discoveries may take on different dimensions. This is the area which I intend to address in this study, for "...progress requires from time to time, a clearing of the ground by the uprooting of errors and misconceptions, which, from the eminence of the men who believed and published them, have acquired authority" (Knoop and Jones 89).

The next chapter will attempt to define some of the assumptions of previous scholarship and the questions which arise as a result of those assumptions. Also under review will be the work of the Canterbury Tales Project and Linne Mooney's discovery of the identity of the Hg/El scribe both of which have provided information which forces a reconsideration of established views.

Notes to Chapter 1

[1] Cx1 was created using a manuscript version of the *b* text, characterised by omissions, lines now believed to be spurious and poor readings.

[2] Caxton describes the incident in his preface to the second edition.

[3] Thynne's son, Francis, claimed that at his death, his father owned about 25 Chaucer manuscripts including one with the repeated marginal notation, 'examinatur Chaucer'. Furnivall re-edited Thynne's 'Animadversions' which were then published for the Chaucer Society (1876: 6).

[4] Donaghey also demonstrates that Thynne's wishes about the printed order of material in the volume may have had to be compromised by the exgencies of the printing process (1997: 160).

[5] For a discussion of Stow's contribution see the essay by Anne Hudson (Ruggiers 1984: 53-70).

[6] Ad3 is the only other manuscript to omit CO after RE and this may not have been consulted by Tyrwhitt.

[7] The 'O' group was established during work on the first CD-ROM of WBP associated with the *Canterbury Tales* Project. The manuscripts which comprise 'O' are listed in the prefatory matter. It should not be considered a genetic group but "consists of manuscripts whose only relationship appears to be common descent from the archetype of the whole tradition" (Robinson 1997: 80). Further investigation suggests that membership of 'O' varies from tale to tale.

[8] Several distinguished scholars have been critical of Skeat's judgement. Hammond criticised Skeat's limited use of the available manuscripts by suggesting that "an edition of the *Canterbury Tales* based upon the seven MSS (out of more than fifty) which the Society had issued when Skeat prepared his text, cannot be considered as final" (1933: 145-146). Edwards refers to a "layer of editorial conjecture" which is "thicker than it need be", resulting in "a degree of emendatorial impetuosity." This had the effect of obscuring Skeat's successful attempts to reconstruct Chaucer's text (Ruggiers 1984:184).

[9] The resultant groups are as follows:

B^1 = ML; B^2 = SH PR TT TM MK NP; E^1 = CL; E^2 = ME; F^1 = SQ; F^2 =FK.

[10] Tatlock, J. S. P. 'The *Canterbury Tales* in 1400.' *PMLA* 50 (1935): 100-139.

[11] The manuscript groups will be considered further in the second chapter of this thesis.

[12] A discussion on the order of the tales is included in the Preface to the 1928 Edition. The discussion is important because it sets out Manly's views on the order, 'not so chaotic as is usually assumed', at a time when he had barely begun the work which was to lead to the 8-volume edition of 1940. His belief at that time was of a much simpler tradition and has much in common with the work of Koch and Brusendorff and the later suggestions of Benson. "The majority of manuscripts point to two genuine types of arrangement, deviations from which are probably to be explained in part by the shifting from one exemplar to another in copying the manuscript, partly by accidental disarrangements of quires either in the extant manuscript or in some ancestor, and in a few instances perhaps by causes which it is now impossible to ascertain" (78-79).

[13] The rejection of the prior circulation theory is most notably associated with Norman Blake (1985). Despite the fact that Blake now considers that some of the earliest manuscripts could have been in existence in Chaucer's lifetime and may have been supervised by him, he remains convinced that the tales were not in any kind of circulation. For discussion of this see Blake: 1997b and 2000b.

[14] Discussion on the subject of an earlier collection of tales can be associated with the work of the following scholars: Carleton Brown (1933, 1937). Charles Owen (1958, 1959) and John Fisher (1972). However, none of these scholars suggest that the earliest manuscripts could have been in existence in Chaucer's lifetime.

[15] Op. cit.

  A1740-3480 [ie 2nd half of KT, MIP and first half of MIT.]

  A 4325-4422 [CKPT + TG]

  D 1740-ca. E1640 [Most of SU, entire CLPT + Envoy, 395 lines of ME]

  C 329-ca. B 1371 [PDPT + first half of SH]

  B 3181-H 104 [MKT, NPPT, MAP]

  F1545-1624 [End of FK. At 1640 the series of variants peculiar to *bcd* starts]

Depending on the view one takes of the *a-d* groups, the so-called 'losses' could actually be missing pieces which Chaucer was in the process of supplying for his original *d* collection.

[16] Ruggiers, Paul G., ed. *The Canterbury Tales: A Facsimile and Transcription of the Hengwrt Manuscript, with Variants from the Ellesmere Manuscript*. Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1979.

[17] Manuscripts used for the collations include Cp, Dd, El, Ad3, Gg, Ha4, He, La and Pw.

[18] From about 1996, Blake began to modify his position. His contact with the work of the Canterbury Tales Project and some of its early findings and the suggestion by Kathleen Scott that the illumination of El might be dated much earlier (Scott 1997), forced a fresh look at the dating of Hg. Thus Blake set about a reconsideration of the earliest manuscripts and the linking passages in particular. See Blake 1997b and 2000a.

[19] See particularly Owen, 1958, 1959,1988 and 1994.

2. Assumptions, Questions and a Methodology

"...behind every text presented in a modern edition...there lies the spoil heap
of the manuscripts from which it has been drawn. That spoil heap needs to be
examined with all the care that an archaeologist would devote to a midden, so
that all the information the manuscripts have to yield, through contents and
contexts, make-up and layout, decoration and illustration, as well as texts and
textual affiliations, is made available for assessment" (Pearsall 1984b: 121).

2.1. Foreword

In the Introduction to his book, *Pursuing History: Middle English Manuscripts and their
Texts*, Ralph Hanna suggests a schism between literary historians (and editors), and
scholars of the book. Literary historians are interested in the individual text and consider
the physical volumes "something of a nuisance". Scholars of the book, on the other hand,
are concerned with volume descriptions mainly to advertise the contents of a particular
library, and are reluctant to discuss the physical aspects of books about which they may
have a great deal of information (1996: 6). Thus a situation is created whereby valuable
information on the physical state of manuscripts is largely ignored. Hanna's work
postdates Pearsall's suggestion at the head of this chapter by more than ten years, so one
must conclude that the position had not substantially altered in the intervening period and
that few scholars had attempted what Pearsall set forth as a requirement for editors of
medieval texts.[1]

 With the advent of digital imaging and the expansion of the World-Wide Web,
new opportunities have arisen in the last ten years which have enabled a more informed
investigation and assessment of both codicology and text. New discoveries about the
scribes of the *Canterbury Tales* manuscripts may also have an important bearing on
manuscript analyses. Further, the work of the Canterbury Tales Project and its associate
members has provided a new body of evidence for consideration. For this reason,
assumptions which have formed the basis of scholastic opinion on the *Canterbury Tales*
for almost a century need to be re-examined and addressed and the question of the text
and the order needs further investigation in the light of new information. In this chapter, I
intend to address some of those issues as precursor to the manuscript analyses which
follow.

2.2. Why the Need for a Codicological Survey?

In the 1930's McCormick and Manly began a process of analysis of the salient physical features of each *Canterbury Tales* manuscript in an attempt to combine textual analysis with physical observation. Manly and Rickert's survey was conducted at first hand, but the death of all three scholars occurred before they had fully exploited the information on the manuscript descriptions. It would be another forty years before the publication of the Variorum Edition of Hg permitted prolonged examination of that manuscript, albeit at second hand, and increased the scholarly perception of the value of codicological enquiry.

The Doyle and Parkes' description of Hg exerted a considerable influence on *Canterbury Tales* scholars. With their expert guidance, it was possible to visualise how the different bits of the text of the *Canterbury Tales* were received and copied by its scribe. Twenty years later, access to colour images of the manuscript via the Hengwrt Chaucer *Digital Facsimile* (2000) provided a further opportunity to enhance the image of each folio by means of computer technology and recover information which is not always easy to see.

For those who have access to the Facsimile Edition of Ellesmere published by Yushodo in 1996, the opportunity to pore over a life-like reproduction has allowed for a greater appreciation of the codicological features which contribute so much to our overall understanding of a manuscript (Stevens and Woodward 1995a). For example, exploration of the Facsimile's unbound edition, assembled as a pile of separate quires, enables an appreciation of the way in which a manuscript was gradually built up to form a finished codex. In addition, the companion book of essays provides expert analysis not only of the text but also of all physical aspects of the manuscript. It also includes a reassessment of some previously accepted theories. Of major relevance to this thesis is Kathleen Scott's essay on the illumination of Ellesmere in which she suggests a much earlier date for the illumination, closer to 1400 than 1410 (Scott 1995). An earlier date for El pushes back the accepted date for the production of Hg to some time within the lifetime of the poet.

At the end of the 1980's the Corpus manuscript was also disbound, examined and refoliated with the movement of some folios which had been reversed and misplaced in the previous binding. Information on certain features of its codicology, particularly variation in the vellum type was noted by the Librarian at Corpus Christ College, Oxford, but this has never been analysed. Digitised colour images are also now available on the Corpus Christi College website.[2]

The opportunities to re-examine and compare the text of the *Canterbury Tales* in these manuscripts, now in full colour, has been taken up by a number of scholars. However, no-one as yet has exploited the wealth of extra information to provide a

comparison of the codicological features. There has perhaps never been a more opportune time to attempt an archaeological survey of the *Canterbury Tales* midden.

2.3. The Canterbury Tales Project

As well as the opportunities afforded by digital imaging, modern technology has provided a new opportunity to tackle the textual problems and to examine the manuscripts and the text they bear in a number of different ways. In the 1990's, the Canterbury Tales Project was established by Norman Blake and Peter Robinson. The object of the project was "to make available, in computer-readable form, transcripts, images, collations, and analyses of all eighty-four extant manuscripts and four pre-1500 printed editions of the *Canterbury Tales*" (Blake and Robinson 1993: 1). Transcripts were prepared using the program *Transcribe* and encoded using the mark-up language, SGML. A powerful analytic computer tool, the software *Collate*, was developed by Robinson to collate the transcribed texts and to provide material for further analysis. Cladistic analysis was then applied to the findings allowing a swift but preliminary view of manuscript affiliations.[3] The Project's main output has been in the form of single tale analysis which has allowed access to a huge body of textual and linguistic data.[4]

Within the Project, it has also been possible to examine a single manuscript across all its tales. To date, the Hengwrt Chaucer is available on CD-ROM as is also a CD of the first and second editions of Caxton.[5] The single manuscript approach is holistic, seeing the text in its home environment, the manuscript page. Problems faced by the scribes who copied and assembled the texts are easier to assess with such an approach. Clues may have been left by the scribes or printers in the process of incorporating disputed passages of text or at fragment conjunctions. Difficulties in acquisition of material or in the placing of certain passages may be easier to understand using a complete physical record as well as textual analyses. It may also be possible to deduce timelines in the preparation of a manuscript by comparison of the different physical processes involved. This in turn provides an extension to the information provided by the text.

Apart from the examination of Hg undertaken by the Project, several other important studies of individual early manuscripts have been achieved as PhD theses by the project's associate members. Horobin's analysis of Ad3 provided valuable insight into the close connections of that manuscript with both Hg and El (Horobin: 1997a). Thomson's work on La, a manuscript of the *c* group and closely related to Cp established a different relationship between the two manuscripts from that posited by Blake (Thomson: 1998). The PhD dissertation on Cambridge Dd 4.24 by Orietta Da Rold (Da Rold: 2002) is of particular significance for this thesis since her suggestion for an earlier dating for that

manuscript, and the characteristics of its assembly, have much in common with the situation in the four early manuscripts to be examined.[6]

New information on Hg, discovered as a result of the work carried out for the CD-ROM in 2000, has provided the spur to apply similar methods to a re-examination and comparison of the four earliest manuscripts and to re-evaluate Hg in the light of that comparative analysis. This study will concentrate on information supplied as a result of a physical examination and on how such information might expand our knowledge of the text. It will attempt to filter out the processes of production which go into a manuscript's making and a text's creation. In such an examination, the minutiae of the text and disparities between the readings of individual lines will not have as much relevance as the broader aspects of text inclusion, exclusion or placement. An holistic examination of the physical structure in logical and intellectual terms should enhance the view of the scribal process, editorial participation, and the method by which each manuscript was brought to a close. This might be especially useful in assessing the time-line of production and the possible presence or absence in the process of the author himself. The earliest manuscripts are in this instance more valuable for this kind of study, since the question of the date of their creation, the availability of exemplars, the supply of vellum, the time-lines involved in the copying, the decisions taken by the scribes and supervisors at the earliest moment of their creation are all vital for an understanding of the transmission of the text to later generations of copyists.[7]

2.4. Why Examine Hg, El, Cp and Ha4?

The recent discovery by Linne Mooney of the identity of Adam Pinkhurst, Chaucer's "owne scriveyn" and Doyle and Parkes' Scribe B, has brought into sharp focus the activities of the scribes of the earliest *Canterbury Tales* manuscripts and encouraged further speculation on the author/scribe relationship.[8] Adam copied Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS. Peniarth 392D [Hg] and San Marino, Huntington Library MS. El 26 C 9 [El], the Hengwrt and Ellesmere Chaucers, probably the most well-known and certainly the most prestigious. Hg, almost universally accepted as the earliest manuscript, is a defective copy with material missing and an odd order (although this may have been the result of misbinding or haste in the final assembly process). In Hg, marginal apparatus was not allowed for, there is only a single border throughout, initial letters are of flourished penwork with no illumination and its preparation gives one much more of an impression of ad hoc production. Its text according to Manly and Rickert shows "great freedom from accidental errors" and "entire freedom from editorial variants" (I: 276) and is classed by them as of independent origin.

El is the most beautiful of all *Canterbury Tales* manuscripts and probably the most influential for modern editors. The meticulous planning of the volume allows for pre-planned marginal apparatus, running titles, headings and glosses. Miniature pilgrim portraits add to the more sophisticated *ordinatio* of the volume and luxurious illuminated borders transmit a feeling of opulence. El is closely allied in its order with Manly and Rickert's *a* group of manuscripts. According to Doyle and Parkes, the differences between the texts of Hg and El suggest that the two manuscripts were copied from different exemplars with the El exemplar prepared by an editor (1979: 186). Two such different witnesses to the text in both physical and textual terms demand investigation and comparison. Questions arise on the nature of the two copies. Is one earlier and the other later? Were either of them sanctioned by Chaucer? Is Hg a working copy and El a presentation manuscript? These questions have been tentatively addressed by some scholars but more information may help to clarify the situation.[9]

Doyle and Parkes' Scribe D, as copyist of another pair of very early *Canterbury Tales* manuscripts was also a Chaucer scribe. As yet unidentified, D seems to have worked in London from at least the 1390's and it would not be stretching the bounds of credulity to suggest that Adam and D were at least acquainted, perhaps working on similar commissions at more or less the same time. Scribe D was a prolific copyist of vernacular work and co-operated with Pinkhurst at a later date on a copy of Gower's *Confessio Amantis*.[10] This association needs to be borne in mind when assessing the nature of the two *Canterbury Tales* manuscripts copied by each scribe. The two copies made by Scribe D, Oxford, Corpus Christi College MS. 198 [Cp], and London, British Library MS. 7334 [Ha4], are also two different witnesses to Chaucer's text. Manly and Rickert defined Cp as the earliest member of their *c* group and "the least altered copy of a very early lost MS of high quality" (I: 96). However, the manuscript appears to have been finished hurriedly and marginal directions for both illumination and rubrics remain unerased in many margins. Some tales have been allotted chapter numbers which presents an entirely different concept of *ordinatio*. This feature is not consistently applied for reasons which are not immediately apparent.[11]

Scribe D's other manuscript, Ha4, also appears to have been finished in haste. Inconsistencies are everywhere apparent in Ha4, in rubrics, running titles, decorations and also in the textual affiliation of different groups of tales. Thus for some tales the scribe appears to be using exemplars available to him also when copying Cp (I do not here assign a priority), other tales seem to ally with Manly and Rickert's *b* group, some show the definite influence of the *a-El* group and yet others seem to be independent copyings. This is a strange state of affairs but may reflect the position of Scribe D as an independent amanuensis further removed from the hub of activity. As with Hg and El, some work has

been done to try to establish a priority of copying between the two manuscripts, but so far the results are tentative only.[12]

There is no doubt that the *Canterbury Tales* work assigned to both scribes is of early origin but a cursory examination of the text, tale order and *ordinatio* of each of the four copies suggests that both scribes were responding to changing ideas and information whilst in the process of copying each manuscript. Each of the four manuscripts is different and for each scribe may or may not represent an earlier and a later version. Prolonged examination of manuscript images is now possible, using computer tools to enhance and display features which it would not normally be possible to access and new evidence from the manuscripts themselves is sufficient to warrant an investigation of some of the assumptions which have formed the basis for much twentieth-century scholarship.

2.5. Hypothetical Assumptions of Previous Scholarship

Much crucial *Canterbury Tales* scholarship has been founded on a series of assumptions both hypothetical and methodological. The first assumption is exactly as Hanna surmised; literary historians are concerned primarily with the text contained in specific manuscripts, and are prepared to accept the opinions of others as to when and how that text assumed the form it now has. A great deal of modern textual scholarship is therefore based on acceptance of manuscript descriptions made some sixty or seventy years ago. This involves not only the approximate dating of particular codices but also of theories based around such dating, which may themselves have been formulated to fit in with preconceived notions about the textual tradition. Such acceptance immediately imposes strictures on our view of the text and the order of the tales, with the result that many more assumptions cascade from the requirement to observe and not to contravene our belief about the manuscript dating.

The major stumbling block in any *Canterbury Tales* manuscript survey is the post-1400 date assigned to all manuscripts by Manly and Rickert. Until very recently almost all scholars accepted this view, despite the fact that Manly and Rickert themselves acknowledged that they dated mainly on palaeographical criteria and as such should have assigned a twenty-five year window rather than a ten-year one.[13] Now there are considerable consequences if the Hg date of 1400-1410 is expanded to the requisite twenty five years and becomes 1393-1418 and the same applies equally to the dating of Cp, Ha4 and El. It has to be admitted that there is no concrete evidence to suggest a pre-1400 date for any of the earliest manuscripts. However, there is no evidence to suggest that they are all post-1400 either. Hg may be the earliest manuscript, but this is by no

means a certainty, and Cp and Ha4 seem to be equally good candidates. Hanna's views are not typical. He suggests that

> "books like Cp and Ha4 provide the best surviving evidence for what *The Tales* looked like in its initial public appearance, an appearance that would have exercised constraints on the production of El" (Hanna 1996: 181).

Endemic in the assumption of Hg as the earliest manuscript is the view that it is a botched first attempt by a scribe to assemble bits and pieces acquired with some difficulty, a situation which further encourages the notion that Chaucer was by this time deceased. Missing text, and an order of tales which appears to make nonsense of some of the place references cannot have been sanctioned by the author. Thus, stopping points along the pilgrim route are not in the correct order, tales which may have been reassigned to different pilgrims still retain evidence of their former allegiances, and time references in some tales appear to conflict. The order of tales in Hg therefore appears to be a temporary arrangement and Chaucer could not possibly have sanctioned the inclusion of 'adapted' material in an attempt to cover the deficiencies. These traditionally-held scholastic convictions make nonsense of the fact that the *Canterbury Tales* is an unfinished work. If the text is unfinished and disordered, why should not the earliest manuscripts be so as well? Unfortunately, Hg is frequently evaluated as a finished codex, but Hg is a series of discrete units, some of which may have been copied and assembled much earlier than others. Some of those units may have been copied in the lifetime of the poet, others may have been hastily added after Chaucer's death in an attempt to bring the unfinished work to some sort of closure. Codicological surveys of Cp, Ha4 and El suggest the existence of the same unit-type assembly in all four and it is possible that the two scribes were working on Chaucer's tales at more or less the same time and in a similar fashion.

After their minute examination of Hg, Doyle and Parkes dated the hand of the Hg copyist to someone trained in "the second *half* of the 14th century" (1979: xx. My italics). This suggests someone older rather than younger at the turn of the century. This would agree with what Mooney has discovered about the Hg scribe himself, Adam Pinkhurst (2006). Adam was working in London for the Mercers' Guild from as early as the 1370's. Despite working in London for a considerable time during Chaucer's lifetime with at least some of his time spent copying other work by Chaucer (if we are to believe Chaucer's poem to Adam), nevertheless we are expected to believe that he did not begin work on the *Canterbury Tales* until after Chaucer died. This argument seems to me to be untenable. Why would he wait? What was he waiting for? Was he expecting Chaucer to finish the whole poem before he began copying? If Adam were Chaucer's "owne scriveyn", wouldn't

it have been he who was preparing the material for Chaucer, making fresh copies of new tales, of revised versions or linking passages? And might not some of those attempts be visible in the manuscripts which survive? In view of the latest discoveries about one of the most important *Canterbury Tales* scribes, perhaps it is time for a reconsideration of the circumstances surrounding the production of the earliest copies of Chaucer's poem.

Scholars have taken little heed of Doyle and Parkes' remarks in their *Paleographical Introduction to the Hg Facsimile* where they suggest that although "it is easier to believe that Hg was copied before El", nevertheless,

"We cannot determine on purely paleographical grounds whether Hg was written before El or vice versa, or how long may separate them; it is conceivable that to some extent the scribe's work on them overlapped, as the variations in his practices do" (1979: xx).

If Adam's work on the two manuscripts overlapped to some extent, then parts of Hg and El must have been copied in temporal proximity. And precisely the same scenario could account for many of the anomalies in Cp and Ha4. It is certainly true that it is easier to believe that the idiosyncratic appearance of Hg suggests the priority of its making just as the more primitive versions of some of the Cp texts suggest that it was copied before Ha4. However an exploration of the nature of all four manuscripts in the following chapters may help to clarify the situation and extend our understanding of the production of the early copies. It may even be possible to suggest some kind of authorial participation.

The question of authorial involvement in the *Canterbury Tales* does not seem to have perturbed the earliest editors nor was it considered of great importance. Victorian scholars felt that Chaucer had decided on an arrangement, one which might still be recoverable, although not attested by any manuscript version.[14] Skeat latterly changed his views and put forward suggestions of authorial participation in the development of tale orders, seeing a gradual improvement and an amalgamation of the fragments to the situation reached in Ha4. The order of this manuscript he perceived as the last order arrived at by Chaucer before his death. The order of tales in El he believed to have been a scribal order, perhaps sanctioned by Chaucer but not overseen (Skeat 1907: 5). Tatlock was insistent that there could have been no authorial participation in ordering the tales (1935: 131) and Manly also dismissed the suggestion.

"That Chaucer cannot be held responsible for any one of the arrangements in the MSS seems perfectly clear" (1940 II: 475).

Brown, Benson, Owen and Fisher presumably believed that Chaucer must have been responsible for ordering some of the fragments but do not necessarily see his presence in the earliest manuscripts. The question of authorial involvement then is a hazy one and no-one has defined exactly what it could mean, or its importance for the way in which we view the manuscripts which remain.

Assumption of a post-1400 date has led to a constricted view of the manuscripts and has spawned a plethora of elaborate theories to explain irregularities and anomalies. Any suggestion that the manuscripts themselves might hold valuable clues about the state of Chaucer's work at his death is not relevant, since if they are dated after 1400 then nothing of value concerning the situation of the poet or the development of the poem is going to be learnt from them. This is a great loss and an enormous gap in our knowledge of the early text and tale order. A manuscript may be a long time in the making and some parts may have been copied considerably earlier than others, but this is a method of operation which does not seem to have been considered. Viewed in this way, some fragments which had been worked on by the poet could have been copied and set aside by more than one scribe within the poet's lifetime, only to be included in manuscripts after his death. In fact this is exactly what may have happened with several of the earliest copies. Thus to presuppose that all manuscripts were copied after 1400 and to tailor research accordingly is to ignore the evidence of the manuscripts.

2.6. Methodological Assumptions of Previous Scholarship

In addition to the assumptions which involve the dating of the manuscripts, other methodological assumptions include narrow subjective perspectives. Preconceptions about how a manuscript is made for example, can skew valuable research. Too often the idea of a manuscript as the same as a modern printed book denies the evidence of the manuscript itself. As Hanna remarked:

"...pre-print volumes are remarkably alienating objects for anyone coming to them with print conceptions" (1996: 7).

As an artefact ultimately defined by a mechanical process, the method of the manufacture of a printed book is given little consideration. It begins at page 1 and proceeds through to the end. This may or may not reflect the processes of its printing as has been revealed by work on historical bibliography for the last half century.[15] A manuscript is perceived in much the same way, yet few manuscripts have been the focus of codicological surveys. It is of vital importance to evaluate the process of manufacture which may be closer to the

creation process than that of the printed book. For many *Canterbury Tales* scholars, the importance of a particular manuscript is frequently related to the version of the text which it displays. Reference may be made to the illumination or to the hand of the scribe to provide further definition, but the manuscript as an holistic entity is largely ignored. For this reason, much information which might inform the text is missed, for the physical aspects of a manuscript reveal many clues about the processes involved in the genesis of its production.[16] In a printed book, analysis of different type-faces may reveal clues about the way in which the book was prepared for the press. In just the same way analysis of all aspects of a manuscript's codicology can reveal a time-line of its production and will contain human information, even if it is only at the level of scribal activity. This is what we need to know, particularly when trying to decipher any fragment of information which might help to determine the nature of the manuscript and its text.

A further problem with *Canterbury Tales* scholarship has been that scholars have been too acquiescent in accepting the evidence of the manuscripts at second hand, whether in terms of a transcribed text, a black and white facsimile or of someone else's description of its codicology. Evidence at second hand about what a manuscript is, says or shows can be extremely misleading. The use of surrogate versions denies the evidence of the manuscripts and leads to a poverty of observation. We are not all fortunate enough to be able to access the manuscripts as physical objects, but until we do, evidence is liable to be distorted and information missed. For example, one of the most important features of the Ha4 manuscript is the fact that in simplistic terms it divides into two main sections established by the presence or absence of red ink. This small detail defines the physical terms and conditions of Ha4 but also provides information on the time-line of its assembly and the development of its text. However, the use of a black and white facsimile or a black and white microfilm is immediately to deny one of the manuscript's most important physical attributes, and scholars who have developed theories on Ha4 in the absence of the manuscript may have done so without a great deal of important information. Many of the physical features of a manuscript may be obscured or obliterated according to the way in which they are transmitted. This in turn leads to a loss of information on the text. Fortunately the opportunities offered by full colour images now available on CD-ROM or on the World Wide Web open up new possibilities for re-assessing the codicology of the early manuscripts. Unfortunately, they do not yet exist for Ha4.

Second hand information is not always accurate and some scholars assume accuracy in the observations of others to inform their work. In this respect, Dempster's article on the significance of the change of ink in Hg is very revealing. Dempster admits that she has not actually examined Hg herself but is reliant on the excellent descriptions of Manly and Rickert (1948: 326, n.2.) Fortunately for her, their descriptions were excellent

and the resultant article received great acclaim and has been cited by scholars since it was first published in 1948. Unfortunately, because she had not had the opportunity to examine the Cp manuscript in the flesh either, she missed vital information which would have added greatly to her theory and might have altered the course of the last fifty years of scholarship on the *Canterbury Tales*. Manly and Rickert also missed the vital information preserved in that manuscript. It has been available for all scholars since the disbinding in 1987 but descriptions of its codicology by a number of scholars since that time have either reproduced earlier, inaccurate data, or misrepresented the present state of the manuscript. Thus the culture of understanding what a manuscript is and what it shows us has in many cases been arrived at second hand.[17]

As may be perceived from the evidence in the first chapter, editors and scholars over the centuries have assumed that it is possible for an individual to decide what is and what is not by Chaucer. Thus TG, for example, has been rejected by scholars as not by Chaucer since the time of Tyrwhitt.[18] The fact that it appears in manuscripts of Manly and Rickert's *c* and *d* groups rather than the 'better' manuscripts has perhaps been the reason for its automatic relegation, since the perception of that group of manuscripts as 'inferior' casts doubt on the integrity of the tale. But as far as I am aware, TG occurs only in manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*, and this should give us pause for thought. TG appears in both Cp and Ha4 of my sample and its presence and position therefore require consideration. If, as was suggested by Brown and Benson, the *cd* manuscripts are representative of an earlier strand of the *Canterbury Tales*, it is entirely possible that TG was an early piece of Chaucer's which as Skeat suggested, might have retained a position in his collection if he had lived to place it.

One final set of assumptions which needs to be addressed concerns the division of extant manuscripts into four groups, *a-d*, which represent the Manly and Rickert classifications. It should be noted here that their basic manuscript groupings are not in dispute; it is the theories on the relationship between those groups, based on assumptions about the textual tradition as a whole, which need to be queried. In the first volume of the 1940 edition we are told that the "arrangements [of the tales] correspond roughly with the textual groupings" (I: 26), and the *a-d* classification is "probably chronological order" (II: 475-477). These groupings have provided one of the main tools for analysis of the manuscripts, referenced by the majority of scholars. Their findings suggest that Hg, an independent manuscript, is the first attempt, followed by El, also independent, then manuscripts of group *a*. Ha4, *c*, *d* and *b* follow, and finally smaller and imperfect groups and unclassifiable manuscripts (II: 477-489). Such a list immediately creates a hierarchy of development which provides the basis for the majority of arguments on the development of both text and order, and the manuscript situation at Chaucer's death.

However, geographical inconsistencies in the arrangement of tales in El, (the order of the *a* group) suggested to Manly that "We may therefore dismiss the El a̲ as non-Chaucerian" (II: 475). Thus from the outset the conclusions are predetermined: the earliest and best order is scribal and any suggestion that anomalies could have arisen because of work-in-progress on the part of the author and his scribes is denied. This has the effect of severely limiting the area for debate on the production of the earliest manuscripts and forces acceptance of the idea of the pile of papers in Chaucer's room and the formation of an editorial committee. Since this is a notion that I am trying to dispel, it is necessary to provide a brief analysis of Manly and Rickert's groups before a discussion of the fragments of the poem to be examined in the manuscript chapters 3-6.[19]

2.7. The Manly and Rickert Groups: Assumptions on the Development of Text and Order

Whereas *a* and *c* were distinct groups, there was some confusion about *b* and *d*; whether or not they were distinct groups, whether both were allied with *c*, or if *b* was actually an extension of *a*. Allegiances appeared to vary dependent on which part of the tales was being analysed and variations of group allegiances could occur even within tales themselves. Generally speaking, the textual affiliations of the manuscripts followed the order classification, but there were anomalies, and El for example, has an *a* order but its text is of independent derivation. The manuscripts felt to be independently derived were labelled anomalous. Of the four manuscripts in this survey, Hg and El are both of independent origin in terms of their text.[20] Hg is believed to be the earliest attempt to arrange the tales whereas El is thought to be closely allied with the *a* group in its order. Ha4 is apparently unique in contents and arrangement according to Manly and Rickert (II: 481).[21] Cp is "the least altered copy of a very early lost manuscript of high quality", the ancestor of the *c* group. Apparently, this lost manuscript was "derived from the same source" as the ancestor of both *d* and *b* groups but according to Manly and Rickert, this was "not a major tradition" (I: 96).

Although the *b* and *d* groups do not appear to be represented in the four manuscripts chosen for analysis here, Ha4 at times allies itself with both *b* and *d*, as well as *c* and *a* which may be a key factor in understanding how the orders developed.[22] First, it is necessary to understand the hierarchy of manuscript orders as proposed by Manly and Rickert since they have been used as the basis for larger theories on the textual tradition of the *Canterbury Tales*.

Manly and Rickert arrived at their classifications by a synthesis of the information on all manuscripts. Whilst it is vital to include information on all extant manuscripts for

the purposes of evaluating the textual tradition as a whole, the method by which that evaluation was achieved may have skewed the findings.[23] They saw the *a* manuscripts as separate from the *b*, *c* and *d* groups which, along with Ha4 were frequently found together in different combinations. Very common was the *cd* combination which in some tales was joined by *b*, with or without Ha4. Only very occasionally was the *cd* combination affiliated with *a*. They felt that one reason for the discrepancies might be that the *cd* group represented "a different version or a different stage of composition from that represented by *a*, El, Hg or Gg" (II: 42). Their argument is not clearly defined but presumably because they had argued that the *a* order was the earliest, they felt that the "different version" or the "different stage of composition" accessed by the *cd* scribes was acquired or occurred later than the *a* assembly.

A summary of their findings suggests that of the *b*, *c* and *d* groups, group *c* was the earliest attempt to arrange the tales and the scribe of that earliest version did not know the order which had already been established for the *a* manuscripts. It may be pertinent here to examine these suggestions more closely. Why did the scribe of the *c* ancestor not know of an order of tales which had already been established, if we are to believe Manly and Rickert's arguments about the priority of the *a* order? Apparently the sources for the tales accessed by the *c* ancestor were mainly different from *a*. How different were they? They certainly lacked the linking passages in Groups E (CL-ME) and F (SQ-FK), whose tales were anyway arranged in a different order. Also lacking were the last 100 lines of ME, and some of the other tales appeared to be more primitive versions of the text. The *c* and *d* group manuscripts also contained what was considered by Manly and Rickert to be the spurious tale of Gamelyn. Manly and Rickert's argument does not seem logical since if we look at the situation when Hg was originally copied, Adam Pinkhurst was not able to access the parts missing in the *c* ancestor either, although he did not adopt the solution of the *c* scribe and include TG to finish CO.

The Hg texts for almost all tales were superior to the *cd* texts and represented independent copying from a source very close to the author's originals, but the order of Hg was also woefully inadequate compared with *a*. It has been suggested that Hg might be a trial run for the *a* order as in El.[24] Is it not possible then, that both the scribe of *c* and Adam were preparing copies at more or less the same time, when some parts of the tales and many of the linking passages were still missing? If we are not constrained by the argument that the whole of this activity took place after the author's demise, an obvious conclusion might be that the author himself had not yet supplied the missing parts, was still experimenting with the order, and that the scribes were attendant on his decisions. One of the features of the *c* and *d* texts is that for some tales they do appear to represent earlier, more primitive versions of the text. This is particularly obvious in Cp where an

analysis of the tales in the middle portion of the manuscript, CL, ME, FK and NU, show versions which have more omissions, variants and line reversals (when using Hg as the base text) than any other group of tales in the manuscript (Appendix 9). This is also the area where Cp lacks all linking passages and the last 100 lines of ME. Hg, as an Adam Pinkhurst production, may well represent a fresh copying of Chaucer's text made at a time when the poet wished to assemble all possible material for his *Tales*, perhaps as precursor to the creation of a new and definitive version as a presentation copy. It is possible therefore that the making of the ancestor of the *c* group and the copying of Hg were not too far apart in time, with some of the *c* tales copied slightly earlier.

Manly and Rickert's classification continues with observations on the *d* order, presumed to have followed *c*. When the scribe came to fashion the *d* order, he had early copies of some tales and links which were already present in *c*. In fact the only substantial difference between *c* and the majority of the *d* orders is in the position of ME which in *d* is in the Hg position following SQ. However, more linking passages had now come to light so the scribe of *d* rearranged the *c* order to accommodate them. In a number of tales and linking passages, the manuscripts deemed to be *later* than *a* nevertheless appear to have earlier versions of some linking passages. Perhaps the creation of the ancestor copies of the *c* and *d* groups occurred at a time when several scribes, including Adam were assembling material more or less simultaneously, "transcribing from different portions of Chaucer's 'Nachlass', and, very soon, also from each other's manuscripts" (Dempster 1948: 329). The only difference between Dempster's ideas and my own here is in the use of the word "Nachlass".

As for *b*, its creation was apparently after *c* and *d*, (despite the contradictory statement from Manly that the alphabetical listing was "probably chronological"). The earliest *b* manuscript appears to have been assembled using text derived from the ancestral copies of all the groups, much as does Ha4. However, some of the *b* texts are close to *a*, and the *b* manuscripts follow the *a* order. This might give us pause for thought on the way in which the *b* group evolved. In fact Ha4, allied with *b* in a number of tales, shows signs of being copied at a time when all the orders were being fashioned since it also allies itself with each of the groups in the course of its making.

Manly and Rickert's final important observation is that El, Hg, *a*, and Gg "are for the most part derived from a better text". Although occasionally in alliance one with the other in varying combinations, they are "from the same source" in KT, MO, NP, 2NU, CY and MA, a significant group of tales which apart from KT occur as the last tales in El. The implications of Manly and Rickert's findings on this group of tales for the way in which the *Canterbury Tales* developed will be further explored in the course of this thesis. (II: 44, and Chapter 7).

Let us refine the area of debate. The *a* order was considered by Manly and Rickert to be the earliest and the best. Textually the *b* manuscripts are more often associated with the *a* group, rejecting TG and acquiring the Host stanza, but the order of *b* is otherwise identical to *c*. The *b*, *c* and *d* orders were considered to be later than *a* by Manly and Rickert.[25] The *bcd* orders appear to be related in one way or another at different points in the tales. Only on a very few occasions are the texts of *cd* close to *a* and from the same source. This occurs mainly in linking passages which join together some fragments and also in parts of GP, a point which might alert one to the possibility of the later development of *a*.[26]

One thing which becomes clear in the previous analysis is that the situation seems to be hopelessly confused. There is no doubt that Manly and Rickert's evidence for the manuscript contents and affiliations is mainly accurate, but it is their analysis of the information which does not seem logical. Very early manuscripts which have more primitive versions of the text, missing linking passages and orders which do not appear to be as satisfactory as the one established for the *a* group might allow for a logical assumption that they could be earlier attempts to assemble the tales. Rather than assuming that all orders are corruptions of the original order closest to Chaucer's intentions, might it not be more logical to suppose that Chaucer began hesitantly, not always clear about where each tale would fit into the pattern, and worked towards a better order over a number of years. At some stage, Chaucer decided to add new tales, change the position of others, or the name of the pilgrim teller and begin the *Canterbury Tales* anew. His own scribe, Adam, would presumably make fresh, independent copies of some tales, perhaps adding passages lately created by the poet as he developed the framework narrative. In the course of this work, several scribes made copies of the finished portions. Doubtless Chaucer changed his mind several times, not only about what or what not to include, but also about the order in which the tales appeared, or the specific pilgrims to whom he would allot individual tales. Remnants of text or order present as the result of earlier decisions, might be left in the partially-prepared manuscripts. Adam might also call into service copies of tales which he already had, if they could be conveniently incorporated into his new collection. Other scribes may also have been in the process of updating their earlier *d* collections but using as their core texts, earlier, more primitive copies of some tales. This may then have resulted in a *c* collection, like Cp and very similar to Hg. Two thirds of the *d* texts are found in *c*.

At the same time, Adam was called upon to prepare a more luxurious version and the order was again refined, as the *a* order was created. Since the *b* texts and order of tales appear to have been assembled under the influence of *a*, it may have been created during this final attempt to order the tales and may represent a separate copying attempt. The

phenomenon of all orders coalescing in textual affiliations at a very few points in the text, may be connected with the time of the final assembly and thus the *a* order. Since the *a* order is felt to be superior and certainly closely associated with the author via Adam, presumably parts of it at least must have had authorial approval and represents authorial input of some kind. The other orders may also have had authorial approval at an earlier stage in the development of the *Tales*. The scope of the work might also have been tailored according to the author's work commitments or the state of his health.

If we were able to accept such a scenario, it immediately becomes possible to see, for example, how the 'adapted' links came to be inserted into Hg. If, as suggested by Doyle and Parkes, Hg and El were worked on to some extent simultaneously, then the order of the E-F fragments in El, may well have been arrived at *after* the earlier, inadequate arrangement of those tales in Hg. For the El arrangement to work, Chaucer would need to write linking passages. This he did for the order he had established in El. In Hg, the original gaps left between the tales were filled, perhaps not until after the death of the poet, when it became necessary to bring the manuscript to some final resolution and the links were adapted to fit the order as in Hg. The scribe who was responsible for a manuscript copied with the *d* order resembling Hg, gratefully accepted the Hg solution and used the 'adapted' links in the manuscript he was in the process of finishing. From there, it was transmitted to other manuscripts over a period of 100 years.

To test the validity of such an hypothesis, analysis of the textual affiliations of Ha4 may prove extremely useful, since this appears to be the single extant manuscript which may be at the heart of the assembly debate. It is difficult to be entirely precise about all Ha4's affiliations, but a reading of Manly and Rickert suggests the following. For CL, PH, PD, SH, PR, MO, CY and MA, Ha4 is definitely affiliated with Cp and *d*. These tales may well represent tales from the earlier collection suggested by Owen and Fisher, or tales assembled at a time when Chaucer was developing the order in Fragment VII (Group B^2) and expanding the character of WB, as suggested by Dempster and Hammond. For some tales, Ha4 seems to have had access to the copies made by Adam when he was copying the tales for Hg. These include ME, TT, TM, and PA. All the tales in the first fragment of Ha4 from KT-ML and also SQ, WBPT, L11, SU and NP show influence of the *b*-Hg copying. Certain linking passages were also acquired at the same time: CL-ME, PH-PD, PR-TT and TT-TM. In a few places, the Ha4 scribe also had access to the exemplar used by Adam when he was copying El. This applies for the early part of GP, some of KT, for L11 between FR and SU, for 2NU, and for the prologues to NP and MA. For the linking passage between TM and MK, all manuscript groups had access to the same version, a feature which might indicate the late incorporation of the group of tales which occur at the end of the manuscript orders.

Most of the above changes in the Ha4 textual affiliations coincide with changes in its codicological structure. KT-ML + SQ is one very clear division, PH-MO is another. What is interesting when comparing Hg, El, Cp and Ha4 is that many of the same groups of tales are similarly isolated by distinct codicological features. This suggests different time-scales for the assembly and copying of the different fragments. Of major significance is that there appears to be an inter-relationship between all four manuscripts in the order of fragment assembly which could lead to the hypothesis that all four early manuscripts were assembled much more closely in time than has hitherto been thought. By establishing the codicological divisions of the early manuscripts, it may be possible to find areas of correspondence between the order of copying and the gradual development in the order of tales and the development of the text.

2.8. What Text, Which Order?

As may be perceived from the summary in 2.5. and 2.6. of this chapter, many judgements on both text and tale order have been made in the absence of the physical testimony of the witnesses. Before beginning the manuscript examination which comprises the remainder of this thesis, it is necessary to understand what is being examined and why. Questions relating to the text of the *Canterbury Tales* revolve around what should or should not be included in the canon and what is or is not, authorial. Since neither question can ever be answered, it remains to discover as much as possible about the manuscript situation at the earliest moment. In recent years the problems have been highlighted by Blake's publication of *The Canterbury Tales. Edited From The Hengwrt Manuscript.* If Hg represents the first attempt to assemble the tales there is an immediate problem, for Hg lacks certain tales, lines and links found in other manuscripts; TG, CYPT, the five added passages in WBP, the CL-ME link, the MLEndlink, the Adam stanza in MO and the Retraction. At least two other links appear to have been adapted for their position in Hg. The Hg text is considered excellent but the manuscript may have been misbound at some stage in its history contributing to the disorder.

If Adam had access to Chaucer's papers to assemble the text after Chaucer's death, why did he fail to include TG and CYPT? TG may have been acquired by scribes anxious to avoid the lacuna after the unfinished CO, but the absence of CYPT is more difficult to explain, and Pearsall found the idea that it could be spurious, "repugnant" (1985: 18). Analysis of the presence or absence of these passages or whole tales in the other early manuscripts may help to clarify the Hg enigma. As far as I am aware, and as might be expected, solutions to the problems which surround Chaucer's text have been sought almost without exception, from within the text itself. The manuscript, as the medium

through which the text is conveyed to the reader, has rarely been considered sufficiently important to warrant consultation. Thus a codicological examination of the manuscripts might cast more light on the attitude of the scribes towards what they included or excluded and reveal places where doubt or hesitation was common to the preparation of all four manuscripts. This in turn may help to clarify the status of disputed passages of text and the timing of the manuscript preparation.

Another problem is that the scribes of manuscripts considered to have been copied and assembled much later than Hg, appear to have been responsible for the gradual corruption of the text whether by omission, by spurious addition, or as a result of the deterioration of available exemplars. It should be noted that the versions of the text accessed by these later scribes appear to be almost without exception on lines of descent from a more primitive version of the text. Textual difference between the manuscripts has perhaps been over-exaggerated. There are differences, of course, but one only has to examine the Cambridge Gg manuscript where on several occasions the scribe has inadvertently copied the same line twice, and note the disparities between the two versions, to realise that textual difference is often the responsibility of the scribes themselves.

The order in which the tales appear in each of the four manuscripts is different, although with the earliest manuscripts there is not the wide variation that some would have us believe. What remains of Chaucer's greatest work consists of a series of fragments, some comprising one tale, others, several tales. Within the fragments, the tales are usually securely joined by linking passages, but since there is no direction as to the order in which those fragments are to appear, there is variation. The resulting confusion casts doubt on the authenticity of some links and tales and thereby on Chaucer's text. Any editor wishing to produce an edition of the *Canterbury Tales* has to address the problem of tale order. Modern scholarship has dealt with the problem in a variety of different ways, Manly and Rickert by denying Chaucer's involvement in the ordering of his work (II: 475), Helen Cooper by suggesting that the order mattered a great deal to Chaucer, (1983: 57) and Larry Benson who believed that Chaucer had set the tales in some sort of order, but the pile of papers left by Chaucer at his death somehow became disarranged and this led to scribal confusion.[27] Pearsall would present the *Canterbury Tales* "partly as a bound book (with first and last fragments fixed) and partly as a set of fragments in folders..." (1985: 23). This last may of course be an ideal solution, but as I have suggested, ideas and opinions on the order have been formed frequently without resort to the actual physical evidence of the manuscripts. Because no manuscript is believed to date from Chaucer's lifetime, the orders are all seen as scribal attempts to assemble the material in the best possible way after the death of the poet. However, an examination of the earliest

manuscripts might reveal the order in which the two scribes received the tales, how they assimilated them and whether or not there is a discernible plan in the assembly. This in turn might throw more light on the possibility of authorial involvement or provide evidence of scribal interpretation. Information retrieved by such an examination will never supply a complete answer, since none can be found in a work which is patently unfinished. However, there may be much information on the development of both Chaucer's text and the order which may be gleaned from the earliest manuscripts and which will inform future scholarship.

2.9. The Codocological Divisions: Establishing the Fault-Lines

A Comparison of the Tale Orders

Hengwrt	Corpus	Harley	Ellesmere
GP KT L1 MI L2 RE L3 CO	GP KT L1 MI L2RE L3 CO	GP KT L1 MI L2 RE L3 CO	GP KT L1 MI L2 RE L3 CO
	TG	TG	
WBP WBT L10 FR L11 SU	L7 ML MLEndlink	L7 ML MLEndlink	L7 ML
L29 MK	SQ	WBP WBT L10 FR L11 SU	WBP WBT L10 FR L11 SU
L30 NPT	WBP WBT L10 FR L11 SU	CL L13	CL L13 L14
L36 MA	CL L13	L15 ME	L15 ME
L7 ML	ME	L17 SQ Missing quire	L17 SQ
SQ L20	FK	FK	L20 FK
ME L17	NU L33 CY	2NU L33 CY	PH L21 PD
FK	PH L21 PD	PH L21 PD	SH L24 PR L25 TT L28 TM
NU	SH L24 PR L25 TT L28 TM	SH L24 PR L25 TT L28 TM	L29 MK
CL L13 L14	L29 MK	L29 MK	L30 NPT
PH L21 PD	L30 NPT	L30 NPT	2NU L33 CY
SH L24 PR L25 TT L28 TM	L36 MA	L36 MA	L36 MA
L37 PA	L37 PA	L37 PA	L37 PA

A visual table of the differences between the order of tales in the manuscripts serves as a basis for the description of the fragments. The immediate observation to be made on comparing the order of tales and the content of each of the above manuscripts is that whereas there are differences, there are also a great number of similarities. The tales of CL - ME and SQ - FK have to appear separately in the table because they only appear as units in Ha4 and El. For the same reason, MK and NP are not attached to the end of Fragment VII (B^2) because in Hg they are separate and other codicological features suggest that they should be considered separately.

The tendency of modern scholarship has been to acknowledge the unfinished nature of the *Canterbury Tales* and its existence at Chaucer's death as a pile of fragments. To acknowledge the existence of work in a series of pieces, still being worked on by the author at his death, is to acknowledge a method of working which of necessity allows for one section to proceed at a different rate from another. Thus work on the first fragment,

for example, may have been almost complete, whereas work on the central portion of the tales may have been work-in-progress. When one section was in a reasonable state, Chaucer may have requested that copies of that section be made whilst he was in the process of working on the next. At the same time he may have wished to make slight adjustments to work that was already in the process of being copied. If the poet was slow to finish portions of text to be made available to his scribes, they may have filled the time by making second copies of the completed portions, perhaps with slight adjustments to rubrics, ordinatio or text to reflect the latest thinking. In this way, several manuscripts may have been in the process of being copied at the same time. If we take into consideration the ideas of Dempster, Owen and Fisher about the order in which Chaucer may have worked on the tales, then we would need to consider that perhaps work on the group of tales from SH-TM preceded the work on GP-CO or CL-FK. Other tales may also have been in hand, copied by Adam or Scribe D as single tales, which then needed to be incorporated into the expanding collection. This may have required adjustment of existing copy, recopying of substantial portions, or merely a simple insertion. All these features need to be taken into account when examining the manuscripts.

2.10. The Fragments: Establishing the Fault-Lines

2.10.1. Fragment I: Group A (GP, KT, L1, MI, L2, RE, L3, CO)

The group of tales from GP-CO is the same in each manuscript. As a group, these tales are intentionally placed and were meant to be together. Presumably they were intended as such by Chaucer and their position at the beginning of the manuscript is correct and authorial. However, there may have been halts and uncertainties in the course of their assembly which may provide evidence of the progress towards the creation of this opening group. CO was unfinished and the two scribes treated the hiatus differently. This is an obvious area which requires close codicological examination. The end of this fragment is the first fault-line in the order.

2.10.2. Tale of Gamelyn

TG does not appear in El or Hg, neither is it given a fragment number since it is excluded from most modern editions. In Cp and Ha4, TG follows from the unfinished CO, and according to Manly and Rickert's charts, the tale is included in at least 25 manuscripts mainly of their *c* and *d* groups. Depending on any further information to be gleaned on the genesis of the groups in this thesis it is sufficient to note at this point that the presence of

TG in early manuscripts may be worthy of investigation rather than according it the summary dismissal of previous scholarship.

2.10.3. Fragment II: Group B¹ (L7, ML)

In the majority of manuscripts, L7 ML follows immediately after CO or TG. In Hg, two separate blocks of text, WB-SU and MO-MA intervene between GP-CO and L7 ML. In Hg, Ha4 and El, L7 and MLPT begin a new quire and one has a sense of a new beginning. Only in Cp is the tale made to follow immediately after another tale (TG). After ML there is another fault-line in the manuscripts. This is caused because of the existence in some manuscripts of MLEndlink. There is then a variation in the tales which follow ML.

2.10.4. Fragment II: Group B¹ (MLEndlink; also called MLEpilogue or Squire's Prologue)

Cp and Ha4 share an extra passage at the end of ML, designated either MLEndlink or Squire's Prologue. In the Riverside Chaucer however, it is given line numbers and called MLEpilogue. Manly and Rickert suggest that the Endlink is a residual element of an earlier ordering. The problem is this: MLEndlink does not occur in *a-El* where ML is followed by WBP. The position of SQ after ML reflects the order in Hg but despite the fact that there is sufficient space in Hg, the Endlink was never included. It occurs only in manuscripts of the *b*, *c* and *d* types and introduces the teller of the next tale where some manuscripts read Summoner, others have Squire and one has Shipman. Eleanor Hammond suggested that when the order of tales was changing, a badly erased mark for the pilgrim's name on the copytext left the remnants of an 'S' and different scribes interpreted it as either Squire, Summoner or Shipman (1905: 163-4). The presence of the Endlink in two of the manuscripts under consideration will afford an opportunity to examine the inclusion of the passage from a codicological point of view and to present a different hypothesis.

2.10.5. Fragment III: Group D (WBP, WBT, L10, FR, L11, SU)

This group of tales also occurs as a unit in almost every manuscript of the *Canterbury Tales*. The tales had presumably been worked on by Chaucer and are firmly linked, much as with the first unit of GP-CO. In Hg they follow immediately after the unfinished CO and are isolated as a group by a lack of catchword at the end of CO and also at the end of SU. In Cp they follow SQ, and in Ha4 and El they follow ML and precede CL. In terms of the text of these tales, El has four of the five extra passages found in manuscripts of group *a*. None of the other manuscripts has these passages.

2.10.6. Fragment IV: Group E¹ (CL, L13, L14)

Fragments IV and V (Groups E and F) represent the most disordered fragments in the *Canterbury Tales*. Hammond and McCormick separated Furnivall's Group E (CL ME) and F (SQ FK) into E¹ E² F¹ F² to distinguish the four tales which cause the problems. Since the four tales appear in different combinations in the four manuscripts, I shall consider them separately.

In El, Cp and Ha4, CL follows SU. In Hg, CL occurs after NU in a quire of complicated construction. El and Hg both have the Host stanza (L14) at the end of CL but this is missing from both Cp and Ha4, possibly because of codicological irregularities.

2.10.7. Fragment IV: Group E² (L15, ME)

Only in El, Ha4 and the *a* group of manuscripts does ME follow CL, linked by a prologue (L15). In the *c* manuscripts, ME follows CL but there is no L15 (MEP). In Hg, ME follows SQ and is joined by a link (L20) seemingly adapted for the order of tales in Hg. The last 100 lines of ME are copied in a different shade of ink in Hg. These lines are missing from Cp but are present in Ha4 and El.

2.10.8. Fragment V: Group F¹ (L17, SQ)

Both El and Ha4 have a linking passage, L17, between ME and SQ. In Hg, SQ follows ML and there is no linking passage. In Cp SQ follows MLEndlink.

2.10.9. Fragment V: Group F² (L20, FK)

El uses L20 to link SQ with FK. Ha4 has a missing quire at this point and the last part of SQ and two thirds of FK are missing so there is no evidence of a link. Both Hg and Cp have the order ME FK. L20 does not appear in Cp and in Hg, L17 appears to have been adapted to join ME and FK.

The obvious differences between the manuscript orders in Groups E and F need close investigation. There is codicological disturbance in all four manuscripts and it is possible to arrive at an hypothesis which could account for this.

2.10.10. Fragment VI: Group C (PH, L21, PD)

This fragment occurs in all four manuscripts. In El the fragment follows immediately after FK. In Hg, it follows CL. In Cp and Ha4, it follows on from the fragment NU L33 CY

which in turn follows FK. The linking passage between PH and PD evolved in a number of stages according to Manly and Rickert, and Cp and Ha4 show evidence of the earlier passage, with El and Hg the later.

2.10.11. Frag. VII: Group B² (SH, L24, PR, L25, TT, L28, TM, [L29, MO, L30, NP])

The position of this group of tales is the one most disputed by scholars.[28] In El, Cp and Ha4 the tales run from SH-NP. In Hg there is no catchword after TM, and MO and NP appear earlier in the manuscript and link with MA as a discrete Section. For this reason they need to be examined separately in 2.10.12. below. The Group letter B² represents the position of these tales in the Chaucer Society Order after B¹, ML. No manuscript has this order. Bradshaw suggested that MLEndlink was in fact the prologue to SH (attested by the single manuscript Se) and thus the group of tales following SH should be moved up to follow ML. Whilst Bradshaw may have been right in assuming that originally MLEndlink served to precede SH, it may well have been at a time when the present SH was told by the Wife of Bath.[29] There is clear evidence in the *Canterbury Tales* that Chaucer moved tales around and reassigned them to different tellers, and SH may be a case in point. An examination of the manuscripts may do much to clarify the situation on this point.

Owen and Fisher in particular follow Dempster in suggesting that B² was worked on by Chaucer at the stage in the assembly of the tales when he had decided to change the tale told by ML and appropriate for himself the ML's original tale of Melibeus. At the same time, the character of WB was expanded, her original tale was reallocated to SH and moved to form part of the emerging group, B². If this is so, it is possible that this fragment may have been revised and reordered fairly late in Chaucer's life, perhaps at the beginning of the last stage of activity on the poem as envisaged by Owen and Dempster. Depending on the date assigned to the work of Adam and Scribe D, it may be possible to detect evidence of this revision in the manuscripts.

2.10.12. Fragment VII: Group B² (L29, MO, L30, NP)

El, Ha4 and Cp all have MO following on from TM although not necessarily without problems. In Hg there is no catchword after TM and the following tales of MO, NP and MA have been moved forward to a position after SU and before ML.This may have been a simple case of misbinding, however, it is worth bearing in mind that L30 and NP were copied after MO in a different coloured ink in Hg. It was therefore achieved in a separate copying operation from MO. There may have been a reason behind this and therefore I have included MO-NP in square brackets for reconsideration as the manuscripts are examined.

There are two versions of L30, the prologue of NP. One is a shorter version which seems to be an undeveloped form of the longer version. El and Ha4 have the longer link while Hg and Cp have the shorter version.

2.10.13. Fragment VIII: Group G ([2]NU, L33, CY)

In El, 2NU and CY follow NP, so appear in the last group of tales in the manuscript. In Hg NU is awkwardly inserted after FK and there is no CYT. In Cp and Ha4, [2]NU also appears after FK but as in El, the tale is followed by CY. Perhaps of some significance is the fact that in Hg and Cp, NU is always referred to as the Nun's Tale of Saint Cecilia whereas in El, it has become the tale of the Second Nun. Although Ha4 has the Hg, Cp order with NU following FK, it has the El title of 2NU for the tale.

The placing of these two tales in El is the only substantial difference between the orders of El, Ha4 and Cp. Benson suggests that the position of 2NU, L33, CY represents the only difference between the two orders he had distinguished, both of which he sees as inspired by Chaucer.

2.10.14. Fragment IX: Group H (L36, MA)

L36 and MA follow NP in all four manuscripts. However, whilst in El, Ha4 and Cp, MA is the penultimate tale, in Hg the group MK NP MA occurs after WB-SU. In Hg, L36 MA is copied in the same ink as L30 NP, was included at the same time, and can be shown to be a later addition.

2.10.15. Fragment X: Group I (L37, PA)

Although MA precedes PA in almost all manuscripts and might therefore be considered a solid grouping, there is a problem which relates to the appearance of the word 'Manciple' at the opening of the following link, L37. In Hg, 'Manciple' is copied over an erasure. Since I have argued that some copies of tales from an earlier collection might be part of the Hg manuscript, it is possible that PA is one such remnant. In a previous collection of tales, PA may have been preceded by a different pilgrim story. MA may also have been a tale held in reserve by Chaucer until the order had been decided. Benson suggested that Chaucer's original scheme may not have included MA and PA.

PA ends the *Tales* in all four manuscripts. Hg and Cp both have many missing leaves but Ha4 and El retain the entire PA intact. Both Ha4 and El have RT but whereas El has a colophon at the close, Ha4 is left with a blank space and no closure.

2.11. The Codicological Examination

In this chapter I have considered some of the assumptions of previous scholarship about both text and order. I have also examined Manly and Rickert's manuscript groupings and suggested areas where more information is needed to clarify a very confused situation. The different fragments of the poem have been presented and I have attempted to show how information to be supplied by a physical examination of the manuscripts might help to discover more about both text and order. It now remains to outline the procedure to be adopted for the physical examination.

Assessment of a manuscript's codicology involves a consideration of all the physical aspects of the manuscript as object. The physical and textual information then need to be related to each other to reveal features of significance. The following physical and textual aspects will be analysed:

- Vellum type.
- Quiring pattern and quire contents.
- Order of tales.
- Ink colour and distribution.
- Illumination and decorative features including the use of champes and paragraph marks as narratological markers.
- Incipits, explicits and internal tale divisions.
- Catchwords, their presence, absence, ink colour and the hand responsible.
- Running titles, their presence, absence, ink colour and the hand responsible.
- Distribution of lines per folio to include the number of lines, the space left for rubrics and space between tales.
- Textual omissions, additions, transpositions and variations.
- Glosses. (I have completed a transcription of all glosses but lack of space means that this cannot be included).

The information thus assembled in the appendices to each chapter should enable a profile to be constructed for each manuscript. A matrix of the quiring is a requirement, since the quire is the building block and the key to an understanding of a manuscript's codicology. Irregular quires immediately alert to possible problems with the text or with acquisition of material, thus fault-lines may be exposed. Analysis of the type of vellum can be particularly useful where obvious insertion relates to textual problems. Other

codicological features may then be superimposed on to the matrix so that areas of irregularity become clearer.

Different kinds of markers occur throughout the manuscripts. Thus ink colour and running titles are construction markers, parafs, champes and illuminated letters define the narratological structure, and marginal notes to scribes and illuminators as well as erasures and additions, are all vestiges of the production processes of the manuscript. Once all available physical features are noted, it should be possible to assess which areas of the manuscripts may have been problematic during the course of their construction. If the pattern is smooth and consistent then the scribe may have been fortunate, receiving regular copy which provided no problems. Where problems exist it will be necessary to find reasons for the anomalies. Some may be the result of external factors, others may reveal more about the issues and problems associated with copying and assembling the *Canterbury Tales*. The assessment has been done quire by quire for each manuscript and the results are contained in the appendices. It should thus be possible to see if problems at specific fault-lines transgress manuscript boundaries which might suggest a closer working relationship between different scribes.

Each of the four manuscripts has at least one particular feature which defines its overall codicological structure and informs us of the rationale behind its assembly. These features are important for comparison of the way in which each manuscript developed. Thus Hg is divided into discrete Sections which isolates certain groups of tales, and along with variation in ink colour and distribution of running titles, provides information on the timing of the manuscript's assembly. Cp uses a different vellum in key places which may indicate areas of difficulty and provide information on the development of the order. Ha4 may be analysed in a number of ways: the presence or absence of red ink in certain areas of the manuscript, the six different hands which add the running titles, variation in the scribal hand and changes in the rubrication, all provide an intricate web of evidence for analysis. El is probably the most difficult manuscript to assess because of its apparent perfection. However, analysis of the three different styles of illumination, the three different artists and the few anomalies in the decorative structure provide a means for establishing patterns of work.

For the assessment of specific features such as palaeography, illumination and textual analysis I shall defer to the broader expertise of specialist workers in those fields. However, I shall attempt to combine all the evidence with pragmatism and common sense, viewing the scribes as human beings with a job to do.

Notes to Chapter 2

[1] There are some notable exceptions apart from the previously cited works of Doyle and Parkes (1978, 1979). For example see Shonk (1985) and Parkes and Richard Beadle (1979).

[2] Coloured images of the manuscript are available at the Corpus Christi College, Oxford website at the following url: http://image.ox.ac.uk/show?collection=corpus&manuscript=ms198

[3] It is interesting to note that Robinson calls cladistics 'a rather brutal technique. It can, for any one run, allocate a witness to one family and only one, where in fact different parts of the witness might belong to different families'. For further clarification of manuscript affiliations it is necessary to turn to database analysis of the variants (Blake and Robinson 1993: 71).

[4] To date the Project has produced three single-tale CD-ROMs: see WBP (ed. Robinson 1996), GP (ed. Solopova 2000) and MI (ed. Robinson 2004).

[5] Stubbs (ed. 2000). Bordalejo (ed. 2003).

[6] In addition, Bordalejo has contributed two doctoral theses to the *Canterbury Tales* count (Bordalejo 2003), and Jacob Thaissen has recently completed his dissertation. Doctoral theses on Cn (Mosser 1985), Ha3 (Kline 1990) and Gg (Wolfe 1995) have been contributed by scholars from the U.S.A. A dissertation on the glosses of the *Canterbury Tales* was written in 1992 by Partridge.

[7] A single example will suffice to illustrate how information from a manuscript's codicology may inform the textual situation. The first CD-ROM issued by the Canterbury Tales Project was an analysis of WBP. At that time there had been little exploration of the physical state of the manuscripts and global conclusions arrived at as a result of analysis of the text or the cladograms could be somewhat misleading. The computer analysis of Cp suggested that it was further away from the *cd* hypearchetype than other *cd* witnesses, despite being the earliest *c* manuscript. Because of the early date of Cp this did not appear to make sense and Robinson elaborated the theory of 'variant drift' to explain a situation where much later copies appeared to have readings closer to source. However, if at that time, the codicological features of Cp had been analysed, it would have been apparent that the first folio of the WBP in that manuscript is copied onto a leaf of vellum substituted as the manuscript was in the process of being altered. This suggests that there is a reason for textual difference which is not immediately apparent but which might account for the high proportion of variants within the *c* group in the first forty lines of the tale.

[8] See Mooney (2006). Mooney identifies the hand of Hg and El as that of Adam Pinkhurst. His hand occurs in an oath to the Scrivener's Guild, dated around 1392-3, and Mooney traces his career in London as a Clerk of the Mercers' Guild from the late 1370's. The reference to Adam as Chaucer's 'owne Scriveyn' occurs in *'Chaucer's Wordes unto Adam, his owne Scriveyn'*, a short 7-line poem found in Trinity College, Cambridge, MS. R. 3.20. If taken at face value, Chaucer's poem to Adam suggests that the scrivener's work left much to be desired in terms of accuracy. His copies of *Boece* and *Troilus* required checking and correcting by his master. One might infer from this that Adam would not have been Chaucer's first choice as copyist and was perhaps serving an apprenticeship? Before the discovery of Adam's identity, he was commonly referred to as Scribe B, a label assigned to him by Doyle and Parkes to describe the hand of the copyist of the second of five stints in Trinity College, Cambridge, MS. R. 3.2., a copy of Gower's *Confessio Amantis*. They refer to the scribe who copied the fourth stint as Scribe D (1978).

[9] Doyle and Parkes suggest the possibility that production of the two manuscripts may have overlapped to some extent, although they suggest that their texts 'exhibit substantial differences' (1979: xx). However, Horobin argues that for sections of the text, Hg and El were copied from the same exemplar (2003: 45). Exploration of the physical nature of each may add further to the textual debate.

[10] Scribe D's output was prolific. Apart from his contribution to the Trinity Gower and the two *Canterbury Tales* manuscripts, Doyle and Parkes list eight other manuscripts in which his hand has been identified (1978: 177). At least three others have been identified since their article was written.

[11] I shall address the problem of tale numbering in Chapter 4.

[12] Jeremy Smith (1985) tentatively suggests that lingustic evidence might support a view that Ha4 was copied before Cp. My own findings isolate certain groups of tales, some of which may have been copied much earlier than others, and there is no reason why copies of some tales in Ha4 should not pre-date the same tales copied for Cp. However, there are some difficulties with this and further and more detailed examination is required before any judgement can be made. The palaeographical analysis of Cp and Ha4 conducted by Green for an

Oxford M.Sc. Dissertation (2000), suggests that Cp was copied earlier than Ha4, which corresponds with my belief that a number of the tales in Ha4 may be the result of a fresh copying initiative.

[13] The dating by decade was done 'mainly for convenience in arranging the table of groups and approximate dates in Vol. II' (Manly and Rickert 1940 I: 23).

[14] Furnivall, *Temporary Preface* (1868: 9-44) argues for the order suggested by Bradshaw and this was initially supported by Skeat (1894 III: 376-379).

[15] In the last fifty years work done on historical bibliography has demonstrated extensive alteration of early printed material. See for example Donaghey (1997). Methods of analysis for printed books are well-established to the extent that it is no longer possible just to accept the text in the physical object without question. In the field of manuscript studies, the importance of codicological examination to inform the textual process lags far behind, a situation which I intend to address in this dissertation.

[16] Tatlock for example in his examination of Ha4 (1909:11), suggests that three-quarters of the Harley corrections are contained in the first third of the manuscript. The first third of the manuscript is a distinct codicological unit and might suggest a copying stint removed from the remainder. Textual affiliations of the first third suggests contact with the *b* group, and at times with the exemplars of both Hg and El. Application of this information to the codicological unit may provide information on the development of the different textual groupings.

[17] Information contained in the notes on the disbinding of Cp, available at Oxford, CCC Library, reveal that the manuscript is made up of two different kinds of vellum (see my argument in Chapter 4). Dempster's argument for a single copytext available to the early scribes would have been even more convincing with the extra information supplied by Cp. Descriptions by Seymour, Bowers and Bordalejo, all contain inaccuracies. Seymour (1997) has misread the description of the repairs done to the manuscript and suggests that the singletons are now 'pasted' to each other rather than made conjoint with repair parchment. He also assumes that the twelve missing chapter numbers have been 'trimmed off' whereas I can find no evidence to suggest that they were ever there. Bowers, (2004) suggests that twenty three chapters numbers were supplied whereas there are only twelve. Bordalejo, in her codicological description of Cp for her New York PhD thesis (2003) suggests that in Cp, TG is introduced 'without any signs that might allow for further analysis', thereby relying on evidence from previous faulty descriptions.

[18] Urry was the first to include TG but it was rejected by Tyrwhitt on the grounds that it was inferior in manner, style and versification. Wright included it in his three-volume edition of 1847-51 with the comment, "Tyrwhitt omits this tale as being certainly not Chaucer's, in which judgement he is perhaps right. It is however, found in the MS. Harl, and in all the manuscripts I have collated" (Wright 1851 I: 176). Skeat noted, 'some have supposed, with great reason, that this Tale occurs amongst the rest because it is one which Chaucer intended to recast, although, as a fact, he did not live to rewrite a single line of it' (1894: xiv). Therefore, since the time of Tyrwhitt, TG has been debated but has never been a serious contender for inclusion in the *Canterbury Tales*. The Riverside Chaucer does not include TG and notes, "This tale is certainly not by Chaucer" (853). And finally, Partridge suggests that TG was inserted by an early scribe or 'editor' with little modification, 'to repair a perceived deficiency in a copy of the *Tales* which turned out to be the archetype of a large number of surviving codices' (2000: 55).

[19] Results from the analysis of the textual variants in three separate tales for the Canterbury Tales Project (GP, MI and WBP) have extended the Manly and Rickert findings to some extent. The existence of the four main groups is endorsed, although Robinson suggests that *ab* is a single group as is *cd*, and that both groups descend from a common exemplar. It should be noted here that his analysis extends to these three tales only and Manly and Rickert had already established the linking of *ab* and *cd* in all three. It may also be of some significance that the three parts of the *Tales* thus analysed occur earlier rather than later in the order and may have received different authorial attention. However, Robinson also identifies a group of manuscripts, labelled anomalous by Manly and Rickert which represent independent lines of descent from the original copies. These are the 'O' manuscripts. An alpha group of manuscripts is also established and includes some manuscripts classed by Manly and Rickert as independent.

[20] This is perhaps not suprising given what we now know about Adam. One might assume that of all the scribes, Adam would be more closely involved with Chaucer and his work, and might have had direct access to authorial texts.

[21] This is a somewhat misleading statement which I believe over-exaggerates the differences. The text of Ha4 shows a good deal of editorial intervention but its changing affiliations in different fragments make it a really valuable manuscript to analyse.

[22] My own examination of the manuscripts and a consideration of the orders, has led me to believe that the order of *a*, generally considered to be the first and best, is actually the last. My reasons for this will become clearer during the codicological examinations which form the major part of this thesis.

[23] By according far too much significance to variation in much later copies as Hanna has suggested (1995: 229).

[24] See Blake (1997a: 213-18).

[25] Carleton Brown and Larry Benson suggest that they are of earlier origin, with *d* perhaps as the original collection of tales. If we view *d* as an original collection, it may have been arranged as a series of chapters, largely devoid of linking passages between tales.

[26] Presumably the author must have had to adjust copies of GP as the collection of tales changed. Fragments needed to be in place before linking passages could be written, so some sort of order needed to be established.

[27] Benson (1981: 77-117). Benson argued that there were only ever two orders both of which were authorial. The two orders differed only in the position of the tales of the 2NU and CY, probably misplaced at Chaucer's death. Helen Cooper insists that Chaucer did care about the structure of his work and points to the efforts made by the poet to rearrange and reassign tales in his attempt to achieve an order with which he was satisfied. She also believes the El order to be the most satisfactory, providing a 'good progression from fragment to fragment' (1983: 62). See also Cooper in Stevens and Woodward (1995).

[28] See Keiser (1977-8), Tatlock (1935) and Bradshaw (1876).

[29] This is a suggestion mooted by a considerable number of scholars. Tyrwhitt was the first to note that feminine pronouns in the tale suggested that it was originally intended for a female character. For other early believers and a suggestion by ten Brink that the tale was originally intended for the Wife of Bath, see Hammond (1933: 285). Manly was also convinced by the WB argument (II: 350) and Pearsall suggests that there is now general agreement on the matter (1985: 209).

3. Codicological Description of Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, Peniarth MS. 392D: Hengwrt [Hg]

"Hg has a rough and ready character; it has none of the sophistication of El."
(Blake 1985: 59)

3.1. Foreword

Of the four manuscripts whose descriptions form the remainder of this thesis, the codicology of Hg has perhaps received the most attention. The "rough and ready character" of its presentation referred to by Blake has intrigued scholars since the excellence of its text became evident with its first appearance in the Chaucer Society Six-Text Edition. For the purposes of this chapter, the descriptions of Manly and Rickert and Doyle and Parkes have been used extensively as reference points, but my own analyses of the manuscript, completed for the publication of *The Hengwrt Chaucer CD-ROM* (2000) have been extended and augmented in the light of information gleaned from Cp, Ha4 and El. The division of Hg into five discrete Sections, noted by Manly and Rickert (I: 266-283) and Doyle and Parkes (1979: xix-xlix) are the codicological units of the manuscript and form the basis for the discussion which follows.

3.2. General Codicological Description of Hengwrt

3.2.1. Contents

Hengwrt contains only the text of the *Canterbury Tales*. The manuscript omits TG and also all 5 of the added passages in WBP. The Adam Stanza in MO is not included, although it was added in the margin at a later date, before the manuscript was bound. The Modern Instances in MO are placed at the end of the tale. L30 (NPP), is the shorter of the two versions. L8 (MLEndlink), is missing after ML although there is sufficient space for it to have been included. The linking passages L17 (CL-ME) and L20 (SQ-FK) as they appear in El, appear to have been adapted for their position in Hg.[1] Both L33 (CYP) and CYT are missing. L14 (the Host stanza), is included after the Envoy at the end of CL. Much of PA is also missing, perhaps because of deterioration in the final quires.

3.2.2. Material and Quiring

Hg is a vellum manuscript of 250 leaves including a flyleaf numbered as fol. 1. The vellum is not of the highest quality and is grimy and worn in several places. Rats have gnawed the top outer corner of all folios and continued their activity on the inside folios of

quire 27 (fols. 210-215), which has resulted in some loss of text.[2] Since this damage appears to have occurred before the quire was assembled, it seems odd that no attempt was made to recopy the six folios affected. There are 31 quires, normally of 8 leaves. Six quires are irregular: 6^2, 7^6, 12^6, 21^9, 22^{16}, 29^{10}. Catchwords are present in all quires except 6 (a quire of two leaves only), and quires 8, 12, 15, and 29, which coincide with the ends of tales and the division of the manuscript into separate groups of quires or Sections. (Appendix 5)

3.2.3. Scribe

The scribe of Hg is Doyle and Parkes' Scribe B, recently identified by Linne Mooney as Adam Pinkhurst (2006). His hand is described by Manly and Rickert as "A large clear book hand" (I: 268) and by Doyle and Parkes in their 'Paleographical Description'. Doyle and Parkes also identified the hand of a second scribe or supervisor whose role may be particularly significant. Several other hands, one of which they felt might be that of Thomas Hoccleve, are responsible for filling a few lacunae in the text.

3.2.4. Page Size, Format and Ink Colour

The manuscript has been trimmed to a present leaf size of 29.3 x 21.0 cm. (approx.). The writing space varies between 21-23 x 11.5 -13 cm., and is copied with an average of 40 lines in a single column. Rubrics or part divisions in tales usually occupy a four-line space. Pricks for the dry-point ruling are still visible in some places and a few folios in TM and MO still retain evidence of ruling in plummet. Four different colours of ink were detected by Manly and Rickert (I: 268) but Doyle and Parkes identified the further use of the ink which Manly and Rickert describe as grayish, and added a fifth colour variation in quires 6 and 7. The differences in ink colour and shade are particularly significant because analysis of the changes helps to provide information on the progress of copying and also on correspondences between the early manuscripts. Appendix 1 is presented on a single page and designed to give a swift overall impression of the structure of Hg and of the distribution of the different inks. Detailed information by quire is contained in Appendix 2.

3.2.5. Running Titles

Doyle and Parkes noted the presence of a second scribe or supervisor at work on Hg. They assigned to him the responsibility for the majority of the running titles in Hg and most of the sidenotes in PA (1979: xliii). They felt that the titles could be a feature of "finishing"

for the benefit of later users and the decorative marks which enclose them, a conventional framing device (1979: xxxviii). However, my own analysis of the evidence provided by the titles, suggests that in terms of the manuscript's codicology, the running titles provide information which is of vital importance in an understanding of Hg. As a significant presence in the acquisition of material and the assembly of the tales, the Hg supervisor also appeared to be involved in the planning of the codex, and attempting a regular eight-folio arrangement of quires (Stubbs 2000). He was responsible for heading almost every recto folio with the name of the pilgrim and decorating the title with either a punctus mark or a type of punctus elevatus. On the first folio of each quire, the running title is marked before and aft with punctus marks, succeeding folios have punctus elevatus marks to define the title. This system is in place in most quires and suggests a greater degree of planning and supervision than has previously been recognised.[3] (See Plate 1). Analysis of the decoration around the running titles reveals that some tales were prepared complete with titles and later adapted to fit into the more regular manuscript format.[4] Two tales share features of their running titles which are at odds with the remainder of the manuscript and they appear to be intruders from a different set of copy.[5] Where there are anomalies, whether by entire omission of the title or irregularities in the decorative trim, it may be significant of text addition, removal or adjustment in some way. It is therefore possible to use the evidence supplied by the running titles to indicate areas of difficulty with the material, its ordering or its acquisition.[6] It may also reveal more information on the exemplars used by the scribes for individual tales or parts of tales.

Titles for NP and MA were supplied by Adam Pinkhurst himself (1979: xxviii-xxix). As will become increasingly apparent, Doyle and Parkes' observation that the supervisor failed to provide titles for those tales may be of vital significance for an understanding of the relationship between Hg, Cp, Ha4 and El.

3.2.6. Decorative Features

A single four-sided illuminated border with ornamental capital on the opening folio, 2r, is the only illumination in the entire manuscript. Elsewhere, blue ink champes with red pen-work flourishing are standard throughout to mark the opening of tales, prologues and part-divisions in the text. Blue single-line initial letters with no flourishing are used to mark textual divisions in WBP and for each tragedy in MO. Paragraph marks are blue and unadorned.

3.2.7. Order of Tales

Hg exists as five structural Sections, discrete blocks of text whose cohesion varies, with each block showing different signs of adjustment.[7] Possibly because of misbinding, the order of tales is unique and each Section presents the order as follows:

I.   GP KT L1 MI L2 RE L3 CO

II.   WBP WBT L10 FR L11 SU

III. L29 MO L30 NP L36 MA

IV.   L7 ML SQ L20 ME L17 FK NU CL L13 L14 PH L21 PD SH L24 PR L25 TT
      L28 TM

V.   L37 PA

3.2.8. Date

The customary dating of Hg is 1400-1410. Scott's recent suggestion that the El borders could be dated to 1400-1405 at the latest, and those of Hg between 1395 and 1400, has forced a re-evaluation of the evidence (1995: 87-119). Compared with El, Cp and Ha4, Hg has all the appearance of a utilitarian copy of Chaucer's poem. The division of the manuscript into separate blocks of text may suggest a fresh attempt at planning and a provisional order. The main scribe filled in a few missing links some time after certain tales had been written and gave the book a title before its first folio was illuminated. Apparently Hg was then abandoned as there is evidence to suggest that it remained unbound for some considerable time after its making (Doyle and Parkes 1979: xliii, xlvi; Manly and Rickert 1940: I 269-70). This could imply that the manuscript was more in the nature of a working copy, which in turn might explain why it was under preparation perhaps for a number of years, allowing deterioration in different parts.

3.2.9. Textual Affiliation

According to the Manly and Rickert textual analysis, Hg is an independent manuscript which does not display the characteristics of any of their manuscript groups. It shares the same ancestor as El only in FR and half of SU. It is close to El and Gg in CL, MOPT, NP, MA (I: 275).

3.2.10. Glosses

Glossing is light and usually in the hand of the scribe. The exception to this is PA where according to Doyle and Parkes, the contribution of the supervisor to the sidenotes appears to be "in the same grayish ink as his running titles there" (1979: xliii).

3.3. Section I (Fragment I; Group A)[8]

3.3.1. General Observations

- Section I consists of eight quires containing the tales from GP-CO. CO is left unfinished on the final verso of quire 8. (Appendix 2: 1-8)
- Quires 6 and 7 are irregular with two leaves and six leaves respectively.
- Catchwords are present except in quires 6^2 and 8^8. (Appendix 5)
- Quires 1-5 and 8 comprise a vellum which is consistent. The vellum of quires 6 and 7 is slightly different and Doyle and Parkes note also a slight difference in the frame size for the text (1979: xxvii).
- The ink colour is maintained through quires 1-5 and 8 except for the opening rubric on fol. 2r and a marginal note on fol. 57v. In quires 6 and 7 the ink is of a different shade.
- The only illuminated folio is the first folio of the manuscript, 2r. The opening initials of prologues, tales and internal part divisions in KT follow the style adopted throughout the manuscript.
- Running titles in the hand of a partner or supervisor begin on recto folios from 13r-57r with titles missing from fols. 41r and 57r.
- Rubrics are present in all cases and follow a formula for the Section except for the opening of RE which is introduced with a 'Πarrat' rather than 'Here bigynneth'. (Appendix 3)

3.3.2. Description

Section I, begins with GP, (fols. 2r-12v). There are no running titles on any folio of GP, and the opening title of the whole poem, 'Here bygynneth the Book of the tales of Caunꝑbury' is copied above the border in an ink which is a yellow colour. The same distinctive ink is used again later, for the copying of NP and MA in Section III and for two linking passages awkwardly inserted in Section IV. The distinctive ink-colour links the time of their preparation and inclusion.

On fol. 2r is the only illuminated border in the manuscript, a whole vinet (a four-sided border), attached to an elaborate six-line ornamental capital. Noticeably lacking in the style of illumination are certain features which developed in the early fifteenth century.[9] Unflourished blue paragraph marks distinguish the pilgrim descriptions and also provide textual markers. The names of the pilgrims described and enumerated in GP are glossed in the left margin, the only exception being the 'Nonne Chapeleyne and thre prestes' which appears in the right margin. Fragment I, lines 163-4 which attract this gloss may have been a late addition by Chaucer since the descriptions are undeveloped.

KT is introduced by a Latin introduction

Iamq[ue] domos patria Scithice post aspa gentis ᴧᴧ

prelia laurigero ᴧᴧᴧᴧᴧᴧ

followed by the English incipit,

Here bigynneth / the knyghtes tale.

The first 34 lines of KT are visually distinct as if the scribe was instructed to indicate their status as a prologue. At line 35 'Incipit narracio' signals a fresh opening of the narrative. KT is regularly copied and occupies the next three and a half quires (fols. 12v-41r), finishing on the last folio of quire five.

On fol. 13r, is the first example of a running title in a hand identified by Doyle and Parkes as that of a supervisor. Quires three, four and five all have running titles, 'The Knyght' on the rectos of each folio. On the first folios of quires 3-5, punctus marks are placed at either one or both sides of the pilgrim name, those on inner folios are decorated with marks which resemble the punctus elevatus. The supervisor's intention seems to be to distinguish the first folio of each quire by the use of a simple punctus mark as decoration. This would enable the scribe and supervisor to keep track of the first folios and suggests an attempt to regularise the copying of the text. The ink of the running titles appears darker than the ink of the text and may have been put in as the quires were assembled, though not necessarily consecutively.[10] Folio 41, the last leaf of quire 5, with the last ten lines of KT and the opening of the L1 (MIP), has no running title. In an early collection of tales such as Hg, it is possible that the method of heading folios which contained lines referring to more than one pilgrim, had not been clarified.[11] It is equally possible that KT in Hg was completed with no clear idea about the tale which was to follow.

Whilst copying the final rubric of KT 'Here is ended the knyghtes tale' and the initial rubric of L1, 'The prologe of the Milleres tale', the scribe appears to have been manipulating the spacing, allowing ten lines of space for rubrics rather than the standard six. There are a number of alternatives which might explain such a situation. Adjustment of spacing where one tale joins another may be a feature of a very early attempt to combine tales of different length with linking passages into a smooth run of quires of eight folios. It is also possible that the scribe had to wait before the linking passage became available and when it arrived it was two lines shorter than anticipated. The most probable reason relates to the fact that MI which follows, may already have been copied and the opening lines of L1 which needed to be copied to follow KT on the last leaf of quire 5, were fewer than expected. The end of L1, followed by the tale is contained in the irregular quires 6 and 7 with the last part of MI copied onto the opening leaf of quire 8 in the normal text ink.

Quire six, fols. 42-43, consists of two folios only and quire seven, fols. 44-49, is a gathering of six leaves. This is the first irregularity in the assembly of the manuscript. The vellum of both quires is distinctly different from that of the quires before and after. All leaves are extremely dirty and the vellum has a different feel. Doyle and Parkes indicate the difference in ink and size of writing frame compared with the quires on either side. Because of their shared characteristics, the two quires have the appearance of a unit despite the division of folios. A two-leaf quire is an oddity though there are a number of possible explanations. Manly and Rickert suggested a mistake on the part of the scribe, (I: 267) while Ralph Hanna believes that the scribe copied from an exemplar containing the text of the KT and L1 (MIP) only. He believes that the last part of L1 copied onto fol. 42r represents the booklet boundary (1989: 68-69). There is a distinct difference in colour between fols. 41-42, the end of quire 5 and the beginning of quire 6, which reinforces the hypothesis that MI was already copied and assumed its present position as the first fragment was being assembled.[12]

The disposition and nature of quires six and seven suggest that they were themselves an existing booklet containing MIPT. The division into two uneven quires might be indicative of a stage of text adaptation when it was decided that MI should follow KT. A single outside bifolium may have contained the two disparate quires of MI and created a prologue and tale unit of nine folios in a flexible format.[13] As Adam came to the end of his copying of KT he was told to adapt the booklet which he had copied previously, and incorporate it into the larger block of tales which was to become Section I in Hg. In order for this to be an effective incorporation, the original outside bifolium of the older booklet would have to be discarded. The text contained on its original opening leaf

would be recopied and perhaps adapted onto the final leaf of quire 5 (fol. 41), to provide a smooth continuation from KT to MI.[14] The text from the last leaf of the discarded bifolium would then be recopied as the first leaf of quire eight, fol. 50r and lead into L2 (REP).

An alternative suggestion for the irregularity concerns the ways in which scribes could manipulate the folios of a quire whilst in the course of copying. If a scribe was uncertain about the order in which the tales were to appear, he may have begun copying on the fourth leaf of a quire to allow for another tale to precede. Leaves four and five would be the central bifolium and the text would be continuous over the folded central leaf, as in quire 6 (MI).[15] He could then copy onto leaves six, seven and eight and thus more than half the tale would be completed. If the first three empty leaves were not required for another tale to precede, the scribe could simply refold leaves one-three and acquire extra leaves to finish the tale. The textual unit would then be made up of a two-leaf piece followed by six more leaves as in MI. Certainly if we look at SH in quire 26, it appears that the scribe may have copied SH, beginning on the recto of the fourth folio, *before* the arrival of PD which precedes it.

The evidence of the supervisor's work on the running titles at this point is indicative of the manipulation of some folios and a cooperation between Adam and his supervisor in the assembly of the text. The running title of fol. 42r, the opening leaf of quire 6, is decorated with punctus marks whereas the first leaf of quire 7, fol. 44r has the punctus elevatus decoration. (Appendix 2: 6-8) This suggests that it was originally headed when fol. 44 was an internal leaf. The running titles of fols. 42r and 50r, both first leaves of quires, appear to have been copied *after* the titles for the rest of the tale were in place, when MI was added to the collection. The difference in execution is only slight, but the writing is slightly smaller, they are copied rather higher than on other folios and the ascenders of 'h' and 'll' are now lost through cropping.

The tales of RE and CO occupy the remainder of quire 8 (fols. 50r-57v), the last quire of the first Section. Doyle and Parkes remark on signs of haste in the copying of RE and CO, although they also note the careful copying of the opening lines of each folio (1979: xxvi). If the scribe were copying from the author's copytext, he may have been estimating the transfer of the text of RE on to vellum. Once the text was set folio by folio, he could swiftly fill in the remainder. However, there are some distinctly odd features in the presentation. The size of the hand is variable even from line to line in some places. The text on some folios, particularly fol. 53v, appears to have been copied in batches of a few lines. The tale itself begins at the bottom of fol. 51r after 'narrat' in the left margin rather than the more usual initial rubric of the previous tales. The upward slope at the ends of the first two lines of the tale does not line up with the text of the prologue which

precedes it, almost as if the tale was begun before the prologue was copied. Back-filling of text must have happened on occasions when material, particularly linking passages, was not available for copying in the order anticipated. An intimate knowledge of the planned text-run would have been necessary to do this. The impression then, is of a tale copied hastily and initially lacking a prologue. When the prologue arrived, it was slightly longer than anticipated, leaving no room for a rubric between prologue and tale. This is the opposite of the situation between KT and L1 where there was more space than text, but both may be significant of the difficulties of tale assembly.

CO follows RE with regular rubrics and spacing and the prologue and the opening of CO were copied, with text running out about half way down fol. 57v. Again, there is no running title on this last leaf of a quire. When he began, the scribe may have had realistic hopes of acquiring the remainder of CO. Almost all *Canterbury Tales* manuscripts include this fragmentary piece. In Hg and El, space is left to accommodate more text, and in both manuscripts the Cook's fragment breaks off at the end of a quire.[16] In Hg only about a third of a page is left blank and it is suggested by Manly and Rickert that if an extra quire had been added here for the remainder of the tale then the quire signatures which they noted only in Section IV beginning with L7 (MLP), would follow on in alphabetical sequence from the conjectured a-j for the 8 (+1 extra) quires of Section I (1940: 1 274). As the ink of Section IV matches the ink of Section I, the copying may have been consecutive, and ML would then be in the position allotted to that tale in the majority of manuscripts. This may have been the intention, though there are other possibilities.

In the left margin of fol. 57v is the following note; 'Of this Cokes tale maked Chaucer namoore'. (Plate 2) The ink of this inscription appears to be the colour used to copy Section II (WB-FR-SU). However, although Section II follows on from Section I in the present binding order, Section II was copied much later in the course of Hg's preparation. One should not assume therefore that after failing to complete CO, the scribe carried on to copy WB-SU and at the same time added a note to the effect that CO was left unfinished by Chaucer. Almost all the tales in the manuscript may have been copied by the time the scribe came to add the marginal note.

3.4. Section II (Fragment III; Group D)[17]

3.4.1. General Observations

- Section II is a unit of four quires containing WBP-SU. Quires 9-11 are regularly of 8 folios but quire 12 has only 6 leaves, the last of which is blank. (Appendix 2: 9-12)

- Catchwords occur in quires 9-11 but are missing in quire 12. (Appendix 5)
- The vellum is consistent through all quires as is the ink which is distinctly different from the previous Section.
- Running titles in the hand of the supervisor are present on recto folios from 58r-87r though missing from 68v, 80r and 87r. (Appendix 2: 9-12)
- Prologues and tales are introduced with blue ink champes flourished in red as in the previous Section and a division in the text of SU is similarly marked.
- Textual divisions are marked by unflourished blue paragraph markers and in WBP five Lombardic capitals carry out a similar function.
- Rubrics are always present but the incipit to WBP and the explicit to FRP are treated slightly differently. (Appendix 3)

3.4.2. Description

Section II, was probably copied some considerable time after Section I, at a later stage in the development of Hg.[18] WBPT, FR and SU are a group of tales which are also found together in every manuscript except one.[19] The ink of the entire Section is a lighter brown colour than the ink of most of the rest of the manuscript. For this reason, the preparation of these three tales was purposeful and must have taken place within a defined time slot. Ink of a similar shade was also used to copy the words 'Of this Cokes tale maked Chaucer namoore' in the margin of the previous folio 57v, at the end of the first structural Section. Because the ink of the inscription matches the ink of Section II it is not necessary to assume that Section II was destined to follow from Section I. It merely means that when the scribe was in the process of copying Section II he made a marginal note on fol. 57v. However, it is difficult to see where Section II could fit in the manuscript as presently constituted and it may be that the position of these tales was under review whilst Hg was being copied and they never achieved their ultimate intended position.

The texts appear to follow smoothly and are meant to be together although the opening rubric for WBP shows some hesitation on the part of the scribe about what he was copying. The rubric is spread over two lines at the top of the fol. 58r and reads as follows:

Here bigynneth the prologe of the tale

of the Wyf of Bathe

The words of the second line are squashed in, between the first line of the rubric and the red pen-work flourishing of the opening capital of the first line of text, almost as if they were an afterthought.

WBP continues to the bottom of fol. 68r with a regular explicit. WBT follows and both prologue and tale are neatly contained in two quires. Two distinctive features of annotation in WBPT need to be noted here. The first is the use of three marginal dots which begin at the end of WBP and occur at regular 72-line intervals throughout the text of WBT in quire ten. They may indicate that this part of Section II acted as, or was prepared to act as, a copytext for a manuscript with 36 lines to the folio.[20] Why the three dots should also occur next to line 802 on fol. 68r is a matter for conjecture. They mark the end of the WBP before the addition of the next passage beginning 'The frere lough'. This begins in Hg with a second feature of annotation, a Lombardic capital, one of five used in WBP. This passage may be "an addition to the primitive form of WBP" (Manly and Rickert II: 194), composed when Chaucer was extending the linking passages in the pilgrim framework. Of the other Lombardic capitals, the one at WBP 163, (fol. 60r) introduces the Pardoner's interruption of the Wife, a passage which may also have been interpolated as Chaucer developed the prologue. At line 193 an elaborate Lombardic 'N' introduces the line 'Now sire, thanne wol I telle yow forth my tale' which seems a more natural opening line.[21] This feature is important as will be seen when the WBP texts in Cp and Ha4 are considered. The Lombardic capital used at WBP 453 introduces the description of the wife's fourth husband, 'My ferthe housbonde / was a revelour' and at WBP 503 is the reference to the fifth husband. Since WBP was probably extended by Chaucer, the copy in Hg which is close to an authorial draft may reveal some evidence of the way in which the scribe was able to define additions to the text.[22] It might therefore suggest an altogether closer working relationship between scribe and master than has so far been assumed.

Running titles for WBPT are again in the hand of the supervisor though there are some peculiarities worth noting which may be related to the development of the prologue as previously described. There is disturbance in the punctuation of the running titles. (Appendix 2: 9-10) Three folios in quire nine (fols. 58r, 59r, and 62r), which contain the text of WBP, have titles decorated with the punctus marks which elsewhere signify the first folio of a quire.[23] This may in turn have some connection with the difference in the spelling 'Wyf' in the running titles of fols. 58-61 and 'Wif' on fols. 62-65 and 73. The two spellings existed side by side and would have been interchangeable but it is odd that if the second scribe had added the titles at the same time, he did not apply the more consistent visual approach adopted in El by Adam Pinkhurst, where every folio of both Prologue and

Tale is headed 'Wyf'. The first of the four folios spelt 'Wif' is the middle leaf of quire 9, fol. 62r, and is decorated with punctus marks. Perhaps copying began with the text on 62r and four folios were titled accordingly. Fol. 62r is the first leaf of the central bifolium and the suggestion made earlier about the way in which MI may have been copied has relevance here also. However, it is equally possible that WBP had undergone some rewriting and the discrepancies in running titles may reflect the different times of the incorporation of extra or rewritten text.

Another possibility which might explain uncertainty on the part of both scribe and supervisor with regard to the contents and therefore the ordering of quires 9-10 would involve the so-called added passages. Hg has none of the five passages which occur in some other manuscripts in WBP and it is possible that the Hg copy of the tale predates their composition. However, it may be that the scribes were aware of the existence of passages which were either recent additions to the text, in which case they may have existed on separate sheets, or, if such passages already existed, they may have been marked for deletion in the master copy. Since it has been argued by Robinson that the text of WBP in Hg may be a direct copy of Chaucer's own working draft, it is possible that the scribe knew of the extra passages but for some reason decided, or was advised, not to copy them into Hg. There are marginal crosses faintly visible in Hg against places where the added passages would have been included but whether they are contemporary with the manuscript or an indication by a later reader that material was missing is impossible to say.[24]

WBT leads on to L10 (FRP) and once again the linking passage occurs on the last leaf of a quire (10). The situation on folio 74r, the first leaf of quire 11, is strange. The scribe appears to have copied the opening ten lines of FR but only the first two or three words of each of the next ten lines. The ends of the lines were added later in a different hand. It is possible that for some reason the text at the end of these lines had to be erased. The lacunae were subsequently filled by a neat hand copying in secretary script which Doyle and Parkes have dated to the first quarter of the fifteenth century (1979: xlvi). Accidental damage to this outside leaf of a quire is a possible explanation, since even if the scribe was not able to read the words in his exemplar he would hardly begin copying a word and leave it in the middle, as appears to be the case in Line 12 with the word 'tytheres'. It has already been noted that quire 10 may have been prepared as an exemplar. It is possible that each quire in Section II was lent out for copying thus making the outer bifolia particularly susceptible to damage. This text block is a stable entity in almost all manuscripts, a situation which could suggest the possible circulation or copying of these tales as a group.

SUPT appear to follow on smoothly after FR. However, quire 12, the final quire in this Section, is an irregular quire of six leaves whose first and last leaves, fols. 82 and 87, are now separated. They may have been two halves of a bifolium which also suffered from being outside leaves. Doyle and Parkes suggest that before the last rebinding, the first and last leaves of this quire had become detached and were stitched to their neighbours, though they are now joined by a strip of parchment (1979: xxvii). The last leaf of the quire, fol. 87, is blank but ruled, perhaps in expectation of text to link with another pilgrim.

There is some evidence that fol. 82 may have been either a recopied singleton folio or a substitution leaf from a parallel copy. When examined closely, the running title is slightly different in execution from those of the rest of the tale. It is the only one of seven titles to be spelt 'Somnour' rather than the contracted form 'Sõnour' which is used in the running titles for the rest of the tale. Such a feature might merely represent a time difference in the heading of the folios. However, this first folio of a quire has punctus elevatus marks decorating the running title suggesting that folio 82 was originally an internal leaf, perhaps from another copy of the tale.

It is possible that the entire leaf needed to be recopied to incorporate additional material. Evidence for a possible segmentation of text comes from the Christ Church manuscript, dated much later than Hg but which appears to have had some kind of contact with the Hg exemplars. In Ch, it appears that Fragment III, lines 1927-1939, which appear in Hg on fol. 82r and contain a scurrilous attack on friars, were originally missing from the exemplar used by the Ch scribe. Space must have been left in Ch for the lines to be added, since the text on either side of the intruded text is in the hand of the main scribe. The missed lines were eventually copied in a different hand.[25] The main scribe of Ch had access to excellent exemplars, possibly to Hg itself, but the exemplar must have failed him for these twelve lines. However, the fact that he left exactly the correct amount of space to accommodate the missing text suggests that the exemplar from which he was copying had a note or some information to that effect. The fact that the folio containing these lines may have been either a substitution or a recopy when Hg was assembled, suggests possible adaptation of material in this Section. Perhaps SU had originally been prepared to follow an older MLEndlink as suggested by the reading 'Summoner' in the Endlink in Ha4. The Hg Chaucer manuscript may represent the first attempt to include a newly-altered SU in a position after FR.

3.5. Section III (Fragments VII and IX; Groups B^2 and H)[26]

3.5.1. General Observations

- Section III comprises three quires of similar vellum with the tales of MO, NP and MA.

- There are catchwords at the end of quires 13 and 14, but no catchword on the final folio of quire 15 (Appendix 5).

- The Modern Instances occur at the end of MO.

- MO is copied in the regular dark ink but the colour changes dramatically at the bottom of fol. 98v for the English explicit to the tale. The explicit and the tales of NP and MA, fols. 99-111 are then copied in an ink which is a distinct yellow colour.

- The usual blue paragraph marks denote textual divisions, and stanzas in MO are separated by a line of space and introduced by either a blue paragraph mark or by a Lombardic capital to begin each tragedy.

- Running titles are in the hand of the supervisor on recto folios from 89r-98r but from 100v-111 running titles are in the hand of the scribe, some added on versos. (Appendix 2: 13-15)

- Rubrics in MO follow the formula established in Section I. However, rubrics for NP and MA show slight differences in wording which may reflect the mind-set of a scribe who no longer had the benefit of supervision (Appendix 3).

3.5.2. Description

At some stage in the history of the manuscript, Section III is assumed to have been misbound and should have followed rather than preceded Section IV. This assumption is made because Section IV ends with the TM, and L29 (MOP) on folio 88r at the beginning of Section III states that TM has just ended. L37 (PA) which opens Section V on fol. 235r, indicates that the Manciple has just told his tale. However, there is no catchword at the end of Section IV to suggest that MO should follow, neither is there a catchword at the end of Section III to suggest that PA is to follow. There is the added puzzle that the word 'Maunciple' in the opening line of the L37 (PAP) is written over an erasure suggesting that when that Prologue was originally copied, the preceding tale had not been told by MA. It would seem then, that Section III of Hg represents work in progress with evidence of hasty completion. The difficulties encountered in Section III of Hg are reflected in the

other early manuscripts, so the immediate assumption that Section III should automatically follow Section IV may be open to debate.

As it stands, Section III comprises three quires of eight. Quires thirteen and fourteen which contain MO may have been prepared some time before the texts of NP and MA were added. MO appears to be in the ink of the majority copying, with running titles in the hand of the supervisor. Ruling of folios in gray lead is noticeable on several folios in this tale: fols. 88r, 93v, 94r, 94v and 95v. The majority of the manuscript is ruled blind with dry-point so the incidence of the lead ruling might indicate batches of folios prepared and tales copied at much the same time. The only other extensive ruling of folios with lead is in TM, fols. 226-233, which may suggest that the preparation of part of TM and MO were undertaken consecutively, which in turn could support the suggestion that Section III was misplaced but could also suggest a deliberate witholding of MO for some reason known only to the Hg scribe and his supervisor.

The rubric for L29 (MOP), 'Here bigynneth the Prologe of the Monkes t...' is copied in the header of fol. 88r leaving no space for a running title. Manly and Rickert note that there may have been two copies of this linking passage. A much corrected rough draft supplied the exemplar for the ancestral copies of most manuscripts including Cp and Ha4, whereas Hg, El and the *a* group of manuscripts appear to have had access to "a much better fair copy" (II: 396). Running titles for MO include the word 'tale'. This is the only tale with running titles in the hand of the supervisor which includes the word 'tale' in the title. This might suggest that this copy of MO was a remnant of an earlier stage of preparation and existed as a stand-alone tale. The different position for the Modern Instances might be the result of adjustment of previously copied text, perhaps with the addition of a newly written prologue for a fresh order of tales.

MO itself begins on fol. 89r. The usual blue paragraph marks continue through this section with the opening initial of the tale flourished in red ink. Unadorned lombardic capitals are used to define each tragedy. Ironically, in the stanza introducing 'riche Cresus', the initial capital is not plain but flourished with red penwork. The Adam stanza was not copied by the main scribe but was added at a later date in the right margin of fol. 89v by a scribe copying in a tiny secretary script. The right margin of this folio is narrow and the stanza extends into the gutter. Doyle and Parkes suggest that the stanza is unlikely to have been added after the manuscript was in any way bound. They also point to the similarity between this hand in Hg and the hand used to copy the presentation copy of Hoccleve's *Regement of Princes*, made in 1412-1413 (1979: xliii-xliv). If the Adam stanza was copied into Hg at a similar date then it would support the idea that the manuscript was not bound for many years after it was first copied.[27] Manly and Rickert suggest that the

manuscripts which had problems with the Adam stanza are more or less those which have the short, and therefore possibly earlier, form of the following L30 (II: 413). This situation suggests an earlier stage of linking MO with NP in the assembly of material for the *Canterbury Tales*. However, the evidence of Hg here suggests that for some reason the copying of NP was delayed. Reasons for this may become apparent when the other manuscripts are examined. Glosses occur in left and right margins. Those in the left nominate the subject of the stanza, those in the right quote authorities.

NPPT and MAPT are both copied in an ink which is a distinctly different yellowish colour. This ink appears to be the same as that used to write the heading for the whole work on fol. 2, L17 and the first 12 lines of FKP on the inserted leaf fol. 153, and L20 between SQ and ME. The final rubric to MO on fol. 98v was also written in the yellowish ink as the scribe began his copying of L30 (NPP). The material in the yellow ink was almost certainly the last part of the Hg manuscript to be copied since it seems to include finishing features. However there are other possibilities and a definitive order of copying is impossible to establish at the present time.

The running titles for NP and MA were written in the hand of the main scribe and represent the only titles in the manuscript not completed by the second scribe or supervisor (Doyle and Parkes 1979: xxviii). They appear to have been added as a hurried after-thought and are smaller than the running titles of the rest of the manuscript although they follow the pattern of the titles for MO and include the word 'tale' in the titles. The supervisor's role as possible procurer of the latest texts and responsibility for their ordering has already been noted. His contribution appears to have ceased at this stage and presumably he was not available to supply missing material. If a longer version of L30 (NPP) had already been composed, the Hg scribe was unable to access it or did not have sufficient space or time to accommodate the text.

3.6. Section IV (Fragments II, V, IV, V, VIII, IV, VI and VII; Groups B^1, F^1, F^2, E^2, F^1, F^2, G, E^1, C and B^2)[28]

3.6.1. General Observations

- The vellum is consistent throughout all quires and catchwords are present at the end of every quire except the last, quire 29 (Appendix 5).
- Three quires are of irregular length, 21^9 22^{16} and 29^{10} the last quire of this Section.
- Three different inks are used. The majority brown ink is used for most tales. (Appendix 1)

- A variation in the shade of this colour is found in parts of ML, ME, CL and for the whole of FK, a factor which may have considerable significance when Cp is examined.

- The yellowy ink, used for the copying of NP and MA in Section III, is used for the insertion of L20 and L17, another feature which may be of great significance for the order of copying and the assessment of work done on El.

- Running titles in the hand of the supervisor appear on almost all recto folios although titles are missing from fols. 129, 138, 153, 191, 192, 198, 204, 216. (Appendix 2:16-29)

- A different set of decorative markings distinguishes the running titles for NU between fols. 165v-173r. (Appendix 2: 22)

- Textual divisions are marked as usual by blue unflourished paraphs. Stanzas in ML, NU, CL and PR are spaced and each stanza opens with a blue paraph. Large initials flourished with red ink define the openings of prologues and tales and are used for part divisions in SQ and CL.

- Rubrics mainly follow the formula established in Section I where there is no explicit for prologues. However, the inserted Links 17 and 20 both have Explicits, as does L'Envoy, and also the Prohemie of PR (Appendix 3).

3.6.2. Description of Quires 16 - 24

Most scholars consider this Section to be the most disordered, with gaps left unfilled and links missing or wrongly assigned. The three irregular quires and three different shades of ink suggest rewriting and adjustment of material, delay in its acquisition or availability, and the melding of some material prepared possibly slightly earlier in the copying sequence.

The second scribe's system of distinguishing the first folios of quires is continued and ten of the fourteen quires have the running titles of their first folios decorated with punctus marks, a real sign of the implementation of an organisational strategy.[29]

The last quires, 23-27, run more or less smoothly with six linking passages and only one small gap. The tales which comprise Section IV were not necessarily copied in the order in which they appear. Doyle and Parkes remark on the greater cohesion of the last third of this Section, from PH-TM. It is possible therefore that those tales had already received some authorial attention and work was being concentrated in the first part of the Section.

Section IV begins with L7 (MLP) and the ink appears to be the same as in Section I. In most manuscripts ML follows CO and the evidence of the quire signatures in Hg suggested to Manly and Rickert that this might also have been the intention of the Hg scribe and supervisor (I: 274). It should be pointed out here that there is evidence of quire signatures only in Section IV. The signatures for Section I are conjectured by Manly and Rickert and do not exist.

From fol. 123v in ML the ink "goes suddenly grayer near the end of the second stanza" (Doyle and Parkes 1979: xxix). It continues in this gray shade almost to the end of the tale on fol. 128r. Doyle and Parkes do not indicate where the normal brown shade resumes but Vance Ramsey suggests that it begins once more at about line 1136 (Ramsey 1994: 562). Although very difficult to distinguish, there may be a change of colour within the first stanza of the folio. However, if the scribe left blank the parts which are now copied in the grayer shade of ink, fols. 123v-128r (top), then as Ramsey suggests, the scribe must have had an accurate knowledge of the length of missing text. After leaving more than four blank folios he began copying again at about line 1136 in a new quire in the usual brown ink, and finished the last three and a half stanzas of the tale. At some stage he returned to fill in the text of fols. 123v-128r in a slightly different shade of ink. Such a manoeuvre requires adequate explanation since Manly and Rickert indicate that Hg's text for ML is "not edited and almost correct" (II: 182), a feature which should not surprise us if Adam had a close working relationship with Chaucer. Further, they suggest that Hg had as its ancestor "a fair copy of the archetype" (II: 174). Presumably this archetype had gaps, perhaps because the author had not finished his work, since the Hg scribe was not able to acquire all the text at the same time, though he did manage to get the last three and a half stanzas of the tale. When the missing portion eventually arrived, it was of the same excellent quality as the rest of the tale.

It is entirely possible that parts of ML were in the process of being rewritten or revised when ML was copied for Hg, since the tale promised by ML was to be a tale in prose and may originally have been TM. At some stage in the assembly of the tales, Chaucer may have decided that TM was a suitable tale to be told by himself and assigned another tale, this time in verse, to ML. At the end of Section IV, the incorporation of TM as Chaucer's Tale is not straightforward and it is possible that the Hg copy of TM was originally preceded by L7 (MLP) and stood at the head of this Section.

ML ends on the first recto folio of quire 18. The verso was left entirely blank. The Hg scribe either did not acquire a linking passage between ML and SQ or had instructions to leave a blank folio for possible further adjustment of the texts. Bearing in mind the quality of the exemplar used for ML in Hg, it seems strange that if a link for this position had been intended it was not available for the Hg scribe. Manuscripts of the *b, c* and *d*

groups usually have a further passage of 28 lines at this point variously referred to as the prologue of the SQ or MLEndlink. It includes the name of the pilgrim who is about to tell the next tale. However, the pilgrim referred to varies according to the manuscript, and could be either SQ, SU or SH. Manly and Rickert suggest that the reading 'Summoner' "belongs to an early stage in the composition of the *Canterbury Tales*" (II: 189). This perhaps has some relevance for the suggestion in Section II of this chapter that Hg represents a manuscript in which the scribe was reusing tales which had had an earlier existence in a different position and SU may be a case in point. It therefore follows that Hg may be a manuscript in which the author was experimenting with a new order and that the gap after ML, along with the gaps left after the other tales, was left for further consideration. It may have become clear during the course of copying that a better grouping of these tales could be achieved. It should also be noted that the text of the end of ML in quire 18 (fol. 128r), only uses the first recto folio of the quire. If the order ML-SQ had not been intended at this point in the assembly, then it would not have been a very arduous job to recopy a single bifolium.

SQ follows ML after the blank verso and the text continues through the tales of ME and FK. Several features need to be noted at this point. When the tales of ML, SQ, ME and FK were originally copied into Hg, a space was left after each tale.[30] Presumably this space was left to accommodate linking passages to join the tales together, just as had been achieved in Sections I and II. There is very much a sense in this part of Section IV that the scribe was following instructions and copying tales as required to get a sense of apportionment of space and any necessary extra text to be provided. SQ and ME were tales with no prologues and from their presentation appear to have been copied one after the other.

The Hg scribe did fill two of the gaps at a later date. Thus the link between SQ and ME copied onto the verso of fol. 137 is copied in the hand of the Hg scribe but in the yellow ink used for the last half of Section III which suggests that it was a late addition. The link used, joins SQ and FK in El and some of the wording looks as though it has been altered to fit this position in Hg. The same applies to the link on fol. 153 linking ME and FK. This is an inserted folio making an irregular quire of nine folios.[31] In El the same link occurs between ME-SQ. In Hg, the number of lines for the link and the first twelve lines of FK are insufficient to fill the available space on the inserted folio and the scribe spaced the texts accordingly. (Plate 3)

I have argued that the texts of NP and MA and the two linking passages in Section IV were probably the last work of the Hg scribe as he endeavoured to complete the manuscript. It has also been noted that at this final stage the supervisor in charge of the

supply of texts and the ordering and organising of the material took no further part. None of the folios in yellow ink show any features of his work. It would seem then, that the Hg scribe knew that he could not adequately link the tales in the order in which they had been copied. Nevertheless he used, or adapted, available material at a later date to make the manuscript appear more complete. If the Hg scribe acted on his own initiative, the supervisor may not have overseen the copying of material in the last half of Section III or advised on the placement of the two linking passages in Section IV of Hg.

The system of marking the running titles breaks down on the first folio of quire 20 (fol. 144r), which is headed 'The Merchant' without distinguishing features. The writing of the first two lines of this folio is noticeably larger and darker than on the rest of the folio (Doyle and Parkes 1979: xxx). It also appears darker than on the previous folio. Something caused the scribe to pause and may have delayed the smooth continuation of his copying. There may have been scribal difficulties within this quire. The intensity of the ink varies from folio to folio, the different aspects of the hand may suggest time differences in the copying and a line left blank indicates problems in the exemplar.[32]

On fol. 151, the conjugate of fol. 144, there is a change in ink colour for the last 100 lines of ME. The significance of this change in Hg at this point in the text was examined by Germaine Dempster in 1948. She compared the correspondence between the change in Hg's ink colour for the last 100 lines of ME and the absence of those lines in Cp and the *c* manuscripts (1948: 325-30). Since Hg is an independently copied manuscript and has no genetic affiliation with the Cp texts, the logical assumption would have to be either, that there were two separate copies which were both missing the same portions of text or, that the correspondence between Hg's change of ink and the absence of text in Cp, devolved on Chaucer's original copytext as the common ancestor. That common ancestor was probably "written at a time when Chaucer must have been contemplating at least some rephrasing and completing" as Dempster suggests (327).

After copying the newly-acquired ending for ME in the gray ink, the Hg scribe left half a page blank and then began copying the thirteenth line of FK on the next folio. He could have used the space left after the end of ME but he chose to leave a blank. Presumably this was on the instruction that a link would need to be accommodated between ME and FK. The link was finally copied on to an inserted leaf making an irregular quire of nine leaves. It is unclear at what stage this extra folio was added but it was probably when the scribe attempted to finish the manuscript in the yellow ink, copying as well as the link, the missing twelve lines at the beginning of FK.

At the end of FK on fol. 165r, the final rubric is in the hand of the second scribe or supervisor who also provided the running titles in Hg (Doyle and Parkes 1979: xliii).

The ink of the rubric is dark brown, similar to the ink of NU. However, since the ink of most running titles provided by the supervisor is darker in colour than the ink used by the main scribe, the rubric could have been added as the titles were put in place. The rubric at the end of FK is the only rubric in the entire manuscript to be entered by the supervisor. Why he should intervene at this point is unclear but needs to be recorded.

Before considering the inclusion of NU, the next tale in the order, it is necessary to review the copying from the end of ME through FK. The greyer shade of ink which began when the scribe added the last 100 lines of ME continues throughout the whole of FK. FK ends on fol. 165r, the fifth leaf of quire 22, leaving the remaining two thirds of the folio blank. NU, copied in dark ink follows FK on 165v and ends on 173r. CL begins on 173v and is copied in the same greyish ink used for the end of ME and the whole of FK. It is clear then, that the end of ME, all of FK and the first part of CL were copied, presumably consecutively, using the same greyish ink.

The problem comes with the inclusion of NU, copied in a different, dark ink, which doubles the size of quire 22 making a huge 16-leaf quire. If NU had been neatly contained on 8 leaves sitting in the middle of the quire there would have been no problem, as it would be clear that it was a simple insertion. Unfortunately, the copying of NU expands beyond the confines of a single quire and uses 9 leaves, thus encroaching into the regular 8-leaf arrangement with FK at the beginning and CL at the end. The logistics of organising this complicated placing caused problems for Manly and Rickert whose explanation is reproduced diagrammatically by Doyle and Parkes in their *Introduction* to the Ruggiers Facsimile (1979: xxxi). NU is sandwiched between FK and CL, yet as Blake says, "Since the Nun's Tale adequately occupies the space provided, the scribe must have known its length beforehand" (1985: 61). The scribe did know the precise length because I believe that it came already copied and was inserted during the copying of FK. That this is a viable hypothesis can be seen if we consider the way in which several of the tales in Hg are prepared. I have noted previously that MI, for example, may have been prepared in a similar 9-leaf quire, with a floating leaf at beginning or end to provide flexibility for assembly, and this is the case with NU.[33] NU was initially prepared to begin on the first verso folio of what is in effect an eight-leaf quire. This quire was then slotted into the middle of an already established quire of eight leaves. NU is copied continuously through those eight leaves. The end of NU is contained on the recto of the ninth leaf, fol. 173, the first leaf of a second quire and what I would call the floating leaf. (Appendix 2: 32)

CL begins on the verso of the ninth leaf of NU, in the same ink as was used for FK. If we imagine the floating leaf as a bifolium, only the recto of the leaf would have been used for the end of NU. That would leave the verso, plus the recto and verso of the bifolium, free to use for any other text. If the bifolium were folded back on itself, so that

the text of the end of NU was on the third side of the bifolium rather than the first, then the spare recto and verso of the bifolium would be available for the text of FK, now fol. 164 (Appendix 2:32). In Hg and Cp, several tales were prepared to begin on the verso of a leaf.[34] This feature may be significant and will be further apparent when Cp is examined.

Such an approach must have been very important for those manuscripts prepared to take the first collections. It would have been particularly useful where the inclusion of a story, perhaps previously copied, needed to be adapted to the pilgrimage format. It is difficult to see how this could have been achieved without an intimate relationship with the poet himself. It does appear that for some tales, Chaucer was writing to a formula, one that would enable the easy assembly of a major work which comprised a collection of disparate parts. The decision to include NU at this point in the order must have been taken whilst FK and the first part of CL were in the process of being copied.

Further evidence that NU was not copied at the same time as, (and probably before), the FK and CL is provided by an analysis of the running titles. Both NU and the later PA in the final Section have running titles decorated with marks which resemble a trefoil. These decorative marks are entirely different from those used in the rest of the manuscript. (Plate 4) In the interests of consistency, a feature which the second scribe was concerned to promote in the running titles, it is difficult to believe that he decided to decorate them in a fashion which did not match with the surrounding quires. A likely scenario therefore is that these two tales are intruders from a different system, a different set of exemplars, a parallel copy of the Hg manuscript, perhaps prepared for an earlier collection of tales.[35]

In the majority of manuscripts, CY follows NU after a linking passage.[36] Several possibilities are suggested by the absence of CY from Hg. It could be that Hg was prepared at a time when CY had not been written. The tale appears to be a late insertion or after-thought in the pilgrimage as Chaucer was reviewing his ideas for the group of tales which were to appear at the end of his work. It may have been the composition of CY which initially encouraged the grouping FK, NU, CY of the *b*, *c* and *d* orders which could be seen as an earlier stage in the ordering of the tales. The decision to include NU after FK in Hg caused some disruption, but it might be assumed that when this change was effected, CY was either not available or had been held in abeyance until a decision had been made about possible regrouping and repositioning. When Hg was originally copied, the *a* order of CL, ME, SQ, FK had not then been achieved, neither was there any evidence for linking passages associated with that grouping. The position of NU between FK and CL in Hg may therefore be seen as an earlier placement, later superseded when the CL ME SQ FK group became a reality.[37]

After the intrusion of NU, CLP begins on fol. 173v in the same grayish ink as that used for FK. The 'Prohemie', as the CLP is called in Hg, is not divided into stanzas as it appears in El. The number 36 can be seen written twice very faintly in the grime of the bottom left of this folio. One set of numbers appears earlier than the other though when they were added is hard to tell. However, there are 36 lines on this folio and it is possible that this is an instance of a scribal calculation for the apportionment of text. Manly and Rickert note changes in the affiliation of some manuscript groups in this tale. Interestingly they occur at the end of the part of CL in Hg which is copied in the grayer ink. The last three and a half folios, 173v-176v, of the peculiar and extended quire 22, and the opening two lines only of quire 23, fol. 177r, contain the last text to be copied in this ink. It is at about line 213 (fol. 176v of Hg) that two large double groups of manuscripts divide their affiliations.[38] It would seem that the Hg scribe and supervisor were aware that other versions of certain portions of text were available, perhaps earlier versions. The compilers of Hg seemed to have access to what is now considered to be a better text than that available to other scribes. This may therefore be an example of a section of a tale composed earlier but rewritten for Hg's reordering with improvements to the text included by the author himself.

CL effectively ends on fol. 190r, and fol. 190v has WB stanza followed immediately by L13, the Envoy. On fol. 191r the Envoy ends and is followed by L14, the Host stanza. Neither fol. 190v nor 191r has the requisite number of lines for a Hg folio and the text is spread out with extra space taken up by introductions and explicits. The explicit on fol. 191r for example, sits in about seven lines of space. The impression gained therefore, is that the texts of WB stanza, Envoy and Host stanza could have been added to these folios *after* the opening of the next tale in the sequence, PH (which begins at the top of fol. 191v), was securely in place. PH may be another example of a tale previously copied to begin on the verso of a leaf. This feature at the end of CL is important to note since the problems of spacing around WB stanza, Envoy and Host stanza are reflected in El at this precise point.

3.6.3. Description of Quires 24 (end) - 29

The last third of this Section, quires 25-29, Fragments VI and VII (Groups C and B^2) represents a more settled order, one that is replicated through much of the textual tradition. The tales of PH, PD, SH, PR, TT and TM complete Section IV with only one small gap on fol. 203v between PD and SH.

There are no running titles for PH on the last two leaves of quire 24. In quire 25, the bifolium 195-198 is similarly not headed. Fol. 195 contains the text of the end of PH, a

link to join PH and PD, and the beginning of the PDP. Perhaps this bifolium was removed when the link was updated and both folios missed the heading procedure. This may be an occasion where it is possible to see traces of the tales in an earlier state.

According to Manly and Rickert, there were two versions of the passage which now links PH with PD. Originally there was a twelve-line end-link to PH. This can be seen in the late manuscript Dl. It also occurs with variants in Ha4 and Cp. When Chaucer first decided to link together PH and PD, he apparently expanded the link to introduce PD. The expanded link is found in Ha4. Later, he revised the link again and produced the version in Hg, El and most other manuscripts (II: 327). Since the version in Hg is the latest version, it may be that the bifolium on which this text is copied was removed for rewriting.[39]

A gap of fourteen lines was left after the end of PD, fol. 203v. The final rubric of the tale is spread out to look as though it was intended to occupy the space and no linking passage was expected. In effect, the exchange between Host and Pardoner may have been considered a sufficient link. SH begins on the fourth leaf of a quire. Its position, beginning on the first recto of the middle bifolium and not filling the gap on the previous folio, could mean that SH was copied before the text of PD was available.[40] It is possible then that SH was prepared, much as NU may have been prepared, with blank leaves preceding it. This allows for some flexibility in positioning the tale. SH ends neatly at the bottom of the first recto folio of the following quire, 27.

Manipulation of the text on fols. 209 and 216, the first and last leaves of quire 27, is suggested by a number of interrelated features. This outer bifolium encloses six folios 210-215, all of which are damaged in the footer. Doyle and Parkes have suggested that the lower section of fols. 210-212 has been gnawed by rats with slighter damage to the twin folios, 213-215 (1979: xxii). They do not observe however, that the outside bifolium has sustained no damage, so the damage must have occurred before the quire was assembled and the manuscript was bound.

There are several possible ways in which such a situation might have arisen. Maybe the six inside leaves had already been copied with the texts of PR and TT and were awaiting the outside bifolium to link with tales before and after. The linking of PR and TT could have been done before the order of tales in the fragment had been finalised. The inside folios must have been left lying open in such a position as to cause the uneven damage. Perhaps the whole quire had been damaged and the outside bifolium only was recopied. Whatever may have occurred, the texts contained in this quire now follow one another with no gap and suggest a sophisticated level of planning. Three linking passages, two whole short tales, a prologue, the end of SH and the beginning of TM are all contained in this regular quire of eight leaves. There is no hesitation, the work is planned

and runs smoothly to the end of the quire with a regular catchword. Nevertheless, at some stage the outside bifolium was separate from the internal leaves.

The first leaf of the bifolium, fol. 209r, contains the end of SH, and on the verso, L24 and the beginning of PRP. At the other end of the quire, the last leaf carries the text of L28, and the beginning of TM. The running title for the Shipman on the first folio, 209r is different in execution from those in the previous quire (fols. 205-208), suggesting a time difference in its copying. It is smaller, placed higher on the folio and the upper case 'S' of the title does not correspond with the 'S's used for the remainder of the running titles for this tale. The end of the Thopas-Melibeus link and beginning of TM itself are copied on to the conjugate, fol. 216.

There are immediately several observable inconsistencies in the make up of the one leaf and two quires which comprise Chaucer's TM. This tale may already have been copied in a flexible booklet before the Hg texts were joined. It is equally possible that originally, this copy of TM joined on to another tale or prologue, ML perhaps? The text extends from the last leaf of quire 27, a leaf which I have suggested may have been a replacement leaf, through quires 28 and 29. The running title of the first folio of quire 28, fol. 217, has punctus elevatus marks as decoration, as though for an internal leaf. It is possible therefore that there was originally a loose sheet for the first folio of TM which contained the opening text. It is also possible that TM originally occupied a different position in the collection. To adapt TM for use in its present position in Hg, the opening text needed to be recopied onto the last leaf of the previous quire. When the rats attacked fols. 210-215, the recopying process may have been in progress.

Quire 29, with the remainder of TM, is an irregular quire of ten folios which does not fit with the attempt to order the manuscript in eights. Its outside leaves, fols. 225 and 234, do not appear to be ruled with plummet as are fols. 226-233. This suggests that the outside bifolium was not prepared at exactly the same time and may contain recopied or revised material or show evidence of the repositioning of the tale. The first five folios of the quire are now marked in the footer with the Roman numerals i-v. Marking with Roman numerals in this way was a system which, although common enough in other manuscripts, was nevertheless not used elsewhere by the scribe of Hg. The catchword on the final verso folio is missing perhaps because of the recopying of the folio. So although Section III should follow TM according to indications in the text, and originally may have done before the misbinding, the fact remains that when the scribe reached the end of the TM he left no indication of what text was to follow.

3.7. Section V (Fragment X; Group I)[41]

3.7.1. General Observations

- Section V, quires 30, 31, is another discrete unit which contains PAPT only. A last quire possibly of ten leaves, is missing, so it is not possible to know whether RT was included.

- Both vellum and ink colour are consistent throughout the two final quires. PA breaks off at line 551 but the presence of a catchword in this final quire suggests that originally the text continued (Appendix 5).

- Running titles in the hand of the supervisor are found on recto fols. 237-245. On rectos between 246-250, the scribe wrote the Latin names of the deadly sins, probably before the supervisor supplied the pilgrim's name to the right. The titles are decorated with trefoil marks as seen previously in NU in Section IV.

- The supervisor also contributed many of the glosses in the margins of PA.

- No folios are illuminated and textual divisions in the prose are marked by unflourished blue paragraph marks. Both prologue and tale are introduced in the usual manner and large blue letters with red ink flourishing mark the openings. Divisions by subject are introduced similarly.

- The Prohemium closes with an explicit.

- An erasure in the first line of L37, has 'Manciple' now written on the grimy surface.

3.7.2. Description

PA may perhaps be an example of a tale which was copied for a different collection with a different arrangement of tales. It may have been to hand when the Hg texts came to be assembled or was pressed into service to complete the Hg collection. Several features of its presentation support this view. In the first line of L37 the name of the last pilgrim to tell his tale, the Manciple, is written over an erasure. This suggests that originally the name of another pilgrim occupied the space. Manly and Rickert examined the erasure at a time when it may have been easier to distinguish in the manuscript what was previously written there. They suggested 'Frankeleyn' with a possible abbreviation of the 'n' (I: 277). If it had been 'Frankeleyn' then this copy of PA may be a remnant from an earlier assembly of the tales.[42]

It is also possible that a new grouping of tales had been envisaged for the end of the manuscript. It is apparent in Hg that Section III, which begins with MO was hastily finished with the tales of NP and MA copied in the yellow ink. If Chaucer were revising the grouping of tales for the last section, he may have intended another tale to precede PA. Whatever the name of the pilgrim, the erasure in Hg suggests a new departure in the ordering of tales.

PAPT exist as a discrete unit and they may have been copied and were in hand before the Hg attempt to assemble all the tales. PA has certain peculiarities of presentation which do not match the rest of the manuscript. The main scribe was responsible for the text, whilst his partner or supervisor contributed to the glossing, the organisation and the heading of the texts. The running titles of 'The Person' are distinctive, decorated with marks resembling trefoils. NU is the only other tale in the manuscript which has titles decorated in the same way. The trefoil marks appear to be decorative features typical perhaps of a different group of scribes, another scriptorium, or an earlier collection of tales. The distinctive and different treatment of the running titles of these two tales would certainly suggest that they were of the same provenance. Doyle and Parkes suggest an early composition date for PA partly on the grounds of the style of these running titles. They point to the fact that in quire 31, the name of the narrator 'The Person', copied by the second scribe or supervisor as a title, is offset to the right, the central position having been taken by the main scribe who provided the Latin names of the deadly sins as running titles (1979: xxxiv). They suggest that it had not at that stage become obvious to the first scribe that naming the Pilgrim at the head of each folio was to be the style adopted to present the tales (1979: xxxiii). However, Adam Pinkhurst supplied all titles for PA in Ellesmere, and 'The Person' is never used as a title for the tale. The names of the deadly sins are used, as seen in Hg. If we consider Doyle and Parkes' argument for the earlier production of PA in Hg because of the style of the running titles, then we should need to consider that PA in El is one of those tales which could have been prepared in parallel, or in this case, perhaps even earlier than in Hg. This may be important for my argument in Chapter 6 that PA was among those tales prepared early for El.

One could perhaps add that this copy of PA could be a survivor of the original treatise which was taken over to become the tale of the Parson. This would explain why the folios were first headed by the scribe and only later received their *Canterbury Tales* titles in the supervisor's hand. Also of note is that the same supervisor contributed most of the sidenotes in PA.

A further peculiarity of the prose tales of both TM and PA in Hg is the use of a punctuation mark, the paragraphus, similar to an inverted or sideways triangle. (Plate 5) It

is used most frequently in the prose to introduce the numerous sententiae in TM and the biblical quotations in PA. The use of such a mark is not widespread in other manuscripts of the period but occurs in El, and also in Cambridge, Peterhouse MS. 75, the *Equatorie of the Planetis*, which has been proposed as Chaucer's autograph. The use of such a mark almost exclusively in three manuscripts which in their production and date may be closely linked with the poet, suggests that they may have been a feature of Chaucer's personal punctuation system. (Plate 5)

3.8. Conclusions

3.8.1. Section I

If we assume, as now seems possible, that Adam Pinkhurst had worked with, or for Chaucer at some stage in his career, and if Chaucer did not leave his entire work on the *Canterbury Tales* to be copied until after his death, then it is possible that some tales now included in Hg were copied and were in hand in Chaucer's lifetime. This would certainly apply to MI, NU and PA. If this is seen as a possibility, then whenever the Hg manuscript was finally assembled, Chaucer may have been involved in the preparation and presentation of some of the tales included in Hg.

The scribe and his supervisor were endeavouring to arrange the tales into regular quires of eight leaves and the Hg copy could represent a first attempt. The ordering process is reinforced by the addition of the running titles in the hand of the supervisor. The punctus marks around those running titles which occur on the opening leaves of quires suggest an attempt at uniformity of presentation perhaps with the intention of creating a copytext.

It is also intriguing to note that for all the tales in Fragment I, the passages linking two tales together occur either on the central bifolium, as is the case for KT, or on the first or last leaves of a quire. This system allows for a good deal of flexibility when manipulating changes in the position of tales or for filling gaps with linking passages, a feature which might reinforce the view of Hg as the earliest attempt to assemble the tales. It is almost as if the poet was writing to a formula so that if he changed his mind about the position of any tale it would not be a major task to move it.

Apart from the first folio there is no elaborate decoration and the blue and red penwork could easily have been achieved by the scribe himself. The manuscript appears a utilitarian production, more in the nature of a working copy.

The incorporation of a copy of MI which may have been copied earlier suggests a scribe with some knowledge of Chaucer's work and intentions and the existence of a number of tales perhaps independently copied before they became absorbed into a collection. The

possibility that RE was copied before its prologue became available implies that Adam was receiving instructions for the positioning of tales he had already copied, perhaps before linking passages were written. This could suggest a close working relationship with the author himself, for the scribe knew exactly how many lines to expect and how much space to leave. This is not something which would occur if the scribe had no contact with the supplier of exemplars or was waiting for something to turn up.

The final folio of quire 8 with the unfinished CO has no catchword, which distinguishes it from other complete quires in this Section. It is clear therefore, that at this point in Hg's preparation, neither the scribe, nor the author himself, if he were present, had made a decision about the presence, position or completion of CO. There is no sign of TG in Hg, but the use of the demonstrative 'this' in the marginal note could have some significance. If Chaucer had abandoned his plans for 'this' Cook's tale as copied into Hg, he may have had another Cook's tale available in the form of TG. The problem which then arises is why TG was not copied into Hg? The situation may become clearer when Cp and Ha4 are examined.

Fragment I or Group A is constant in almost every manuscript. The impression gained is that Chaucer gathered these tales together deliberately and it is possible that the Hg manuscript is evidence of that initial assembly, perhaps with authorial involvement. The attempt at uniformity of presentation in rubrics and spacing is evident, but the fact that some irregularities remain suggests an earlier attempt than that achieved in El.

3.8.2. Section II

WB, FR, SU were copied as a group in the same time segment with the use of the same colour ink as a unifying factor. The fact that the group was not included after ML, as in El, suggests that the copying of at least parts of Section IV were completed before the WB group was begun, perhaps when a different order of tales was envisaged. Since PA in Section V and MO in Section III are also likely to have been copied earlier in the preparation of the manuscript, it would seem that Fragment III was worked on at a fairly late stage in the making of Hg.

The disturbance in the decoration of the running titles in WBP and SU suggests a tract of text in a state of flux, worked on in what Doyle and Parkes suggest was "one closely consecutive series of sessions" (1979: xxvi) with text added or omitted, or in some way revised. If Robinson's assessment of the closeness of the Hg text to Chaucer's copytext is correct, it may be that the scribe and the poet were working together at this point, which might also explain the absence of the added passages. Robinson points to the "blatant and coarse sexuality" of these passages, much more suitable to a WBP followed

by the tale now assigned to SH (1997: 126). He therefore suggests cancellation by Chaucer. If Chaucer were indeed reassigning tales and had placed SH as part of a group already created for a position later in the collection, he could then concentrate on expanding the character of WB. Hg may reflect that work in progress. Evidence of codicological irregularities in WBP are also evident in the Cp and Ha4 manuscripts and it may be that the situation in Hg will be clarified in the light of those findings.

The irregular quire 12 (SU), appears to have been manufactured to close this group of tales. The incorrect decoration for the running title on the singleton leaf fol. 82r, the opening folio of the quire, and the irregular size of the quire suggests a number of possibilities. At some stage Chaucer must have been involved in linking together the separate tales he had written. The grouping of the tales of WB with FR and SU and the development of the relationships between these pilgrims probably took place after most of the other tales had been completed. It is possible therefore that this copy of SU may originally have been copied for a different position in the running order of tales in Hg. When Chaucer decided to unite the tales of WB, FR and SU, it may have been desirable to reposition SU. If a copy of SU had already been made, it would make sense to reuse as many of the copied folios as was possible, though some recopying would have been inevitable. It may have been at this time that new material in the form of the scurrilous attack on the Friars was incorporated.

The repositioning of SU is possible if we consider the confusion among those manuscripts which retain the section of text referred to as MLEndlink. In the Endlink, the following pilgrim is described as either Squire, Shipman or Summoner. Ha4 amongst the earliest manuscripts reads 'Summoner' and it is possible therefore, that originally the Summoner was destined to tell the tale which followed ML and may have been prepared originally to stand at the head of the WB, FR group in Hg. The Hg scribe may have made use of a copy of SU prepared for that arrangement. If we consider the evidence of the running titles in WBP where three folios show evidence that they may have been intended to be first folios of quires, then it is possible to conjecture that at some point the opening of WB may have been copied to follow SU in the order. The text which now appears on the opening folio of WBP may originally have occurred at the end of a quire containing SU. The second folio of the present quire 9 would then have been the first folio of the next quire and may have attracted the punctus decoration around its running titles. This is only conjecture at this stage, but it is apparent in the other manuscripts that re-ordering and manipulation of material was being carried out as the manuscripts were being assembled.

It should be noted here that MLEndlink does not appear in Hg and a space now follows ML. It is possible, following on from the previous argument about the position of SU, that the space left after the copying of ML in Hg was deliberate, that MLEndlink had been omitted deliberately, perhaps for re-use elsewhere, and that the Hg arrangement represented the latest thinking about the position of the tales. It is also possible, as Doyle and Parkes tentatively indicate, that the scribe of Hg had parallel copies that he was either preparing or already had and could use to supplement missing portions of text (1979: xxvi). Such a feature would mean that one would have to presuppose that text was copied regularly on to folios by the same scribe so that they could be interchangeable. This might suggest more of a production-line type of delivery than seems probable. However, Chaucer's exhortation to Bukton in his Envoy to read the Wife of Bath, allied with the stability of this group of tales in almost every manuscript and the possibility of the use of certain of the Hg quires as copytext, is endorsement for the idea that these tales may have circulated as a unit within a close circle of friends or between scribes.

3.8.3. Section III

The grouping of MO, NP and MA in Hg may be of vital importance in understanding the relationships between the early manuscripts and the developing order. Whereas for Sections I and II in Hg, the groups of tales are found in the same order in almost all manuscripts, the order of tales MO-NP-MA in Section III is the main point of difference between the *a-El* order and the order of the *b*, *c* and *d* groups. The *a-El* order differs in having the tales of [2]NU and CY between NP and MA. Hg does not have the CY, and NU is inserted awkwardly after FK making an irregular quire of sixteen folios. Why should there be a difference?

It may be significant that the Hg order of this third Section was arrived at in haste, seemingly to bring the copying of the manuscript to a conclusion. However, according to Manly and Rickert, the copy of L29 (MOP) found in Hg and El, represents a much better fair copy of the original than that used by Ha4 and Cp. Since MO itself may also be an updated version in Hg and El, it is probable that Adam made a fresh copy after the repositioning of TM and when the author was contemplating the order of tales to follow MO. MO may then have been set aside.

The two different inks used for the copying of this Section of the manuscript were clearly used with some time lapse between the two, and the tales of the NP and MA seem to have been added when the manuscript was being brought to completion. CY was never included. It may be significant that the supervisor of the tales in the rest of the manuscript no longer appears to have had an active role in the planning and ordering of these tales

and that the scribe was left to his own devices to complete as he saw fit. This he did by supplying the running titles for NP and MA and copying the tales in a different ink.

The argument that this group of tales was misbound depends on the view one takes of the nature of the Hg manuscript. If it was a working copy then it would not have been ready for the binder and the position of all Sections of Hg should be seen as temporary arrangements. As work in progress, Chaucer may have been contemplating a revision of the order, in which case, MO, copied in the same ink as TM, may have been set aside to await further inspiration or a group development plan. From the reference in L29, it would appear that MO was set to follow on from TM. From the altered pilgrim's name in L37 (PAP), one could assume that when the alteration was made in Hg, MA was scheduled to precede PA. However, there is no reason to suppose that the order MO-NP-MA had been decided. The codicology supports the suggestion of hesitation and delay before this group was completed.

3.8.4. Section IV

The first half of Section IV lacks the cohesion of I and II and is clearly work in progress. Passages added in different inks at different times, gaps left for possible further text, inserted leaves and enlarged quires, reflect a stage in the development of the central portion of the *Canterbury Tales*. This may be the first attempt to assemble the tales in this Section but irregular features could also reflect tales being moved to different positions.

It is important to realise that when ML, SQ, ME and FK were copied, spaces were deliberately left between tales. Not only that, but portions of text were also missing, discernible in ML, ME, the whole of FK and the opening of CL. When the text eventually arrived, the missing portions were copied in ink which has weathered to a slightly different shade so the clear impression is of a scribe stopping and starting. If this stop-go procedure was related to the supply of exemplars one might expect changes of affiliation in the Hg texts. However, this does not happen and the parts acquired after some delay are always from the same excellent source.

The significance and timing of the use of the three different colours of ink may become clearer when the other manuscripts are analysed, but the two links in yellow ink, almost certainly adapted for the order of tales in Hg, were inserted as an afterthought.

The regularity of running titles marked with punctus marks on the first folios of ten of the fourteen quires in this Section suggests a real attempt to organise the work. The missing titles from the bifolium in quire 25 relating to the linking passage between PH and PD may suggest material rewritten or updated at some stage in the formation of the PH-PD group and whilst Hg was in the process of being copied.

It is possible that Section IV developed over a period of many months as the poet worked on the tales and experimented with different positions. Some evidence for this may be seen in the state of the vellum in different quires. Whereas the vellum appears to be the same type throughout the Section, the outside edges of some quires are more gnawed or degraded than others. Quire 27 is an extreme example and the damage in this quire is specific to lower edges of internal leaves.[43] However, damage to the lower outside edges of folios as far as the end of CL is much greater than to the folios which follow. TM for example has almost no deterioration of the outside edges. This may reflect storage of separate groups of quires before binding, or it could reflect groups of tales set aside whilst work was concentrated in another part of the manuscript. In terms of the tales collected in the first part of Section IV, ML-CL, the greater degradation of the vellum in those tales might suggest a more prolonged preparation schedule.

In terms of the development of the fragments, ML is isolated at the beginning of the Section with space left before the beginning of SQ. In fact all the tales as far as PH were originally similarly isolated and it is only with the opening of Fragment VI (Group C) that there is any real sense that the two tales, PH-PD, were designed to be together. After PD there is another clear break, since PD ends after 26 lines on fol. 203v with the explicit enlarged and spread out to fill the available space. There is no linking passage between PD and SH.

With the opening of SH on the following verso, the tales of B^2 show a level of planning lacking in the earlier tales. This might mean, as Dempster, Owen and Fisher suggest, that the last tales in Section IV of Hg had been subjected to an earlier revision process by the author.[44] Two of the tales, SH and TM, may have been part of an earlier collection, with SH the tale originally told by WB. TM may have been the prose tale referred to by ML in his prologue where he insists that the tale he tells will be in prose. When Chaucer decided to use TM as his own tale, develop the WBP and allot her a different tale, the writing and revision of tales which now make up B^2 may have followed shortly after that. The evidence of quire 27 where the folios with the tales of PR and TT were gnawed by rats whilst lying around waiting to be linked to SH and TM may be proof that the assembly process was lengthy.

There is no catchword at the end of the Section. This may or may not have been deliberate. In El, the illumination and portraits for the tales MO-MA were carried out by different artists, limners and flourishers, suggesting a different time when these tales came together. Since the order of tales at the end of El is different from the Hg order, it could be that when Adam was copying Hg, he held back the last tales to await further instructions. For that reason he did not include a catchword after TM.

Adam's work in this Section appears to involve a quest for a satisfactory order of tales. It is an order which seems to be evolving as he is in the process of copying. The texts for inclusion appear to be a mixture of old friends, new arrivals or updated versions. The degree of manipulation of both material and order seems to me to be taking place at such a high level of sophistication that I find it difficult to believe that it is scribal manipulation, or that it could have been achieved in the absence of the author.

3.8.5. Section V

The main feature which emerges in a consideration of PA is that there was cooperation between the main scribe of Hg and his supervisor. This may have been an earlier association begun before the assembly of Hg which implies involvement with Chaucerian material perhaps whilst the poet was still alive. It is important to note that the second scribe or supervisor provided many of the sidenotes for PA so he was actively involved in the preparation of this tale. Notable also in PA and TM is the existence of the 'paragraphus', a form of punctuation which may provide a closer link with the poet and provide evidence of possible supervision by Chaucer himself.

PA along with NU certainly seems to have existed before the Hg collection began. The different running titles may suggest their existence in an earlier collection which consisted of fewer tales. 'Manciple' copied over an erasure also supports the view that there was a mind-change about the order. The existence of PA as a discrete unit could reflect an earlier concept for the circulation of groups of tales. The initial dissemination of Chaucer's groups of stories may have been in smaller or larger booklets depending on the number of tales to be accommodated, and perhaps arranged according to theme.

It may have been only latterly that the poet decided to extend his work and attempt a wholesale revision and adaptation of the material he had, developing the pilgrim framework to integrate the tales according to a developing vision.

Notes to Chapter 3

[1] In Hg L17 is used to join ME-FK and L20 joins SQ-ME.

[2] This affects the lower lines on fols. 210-215 in PR and TT.

[3] The punctus marks are usually reserved for first folios of quires however, they do occur on a few inside folios: two in WBP fols. 59r, 62r, one or two in ML, fols. 121r (damage to the corner of the folio means that only the bottom point of the feature can be seen: it could equally well be a punctus elevatus), 123r, and one in SQ, fol. 130r.

[4] The running titles mostly appear to be copied in a darker ink than the majority of the text. Some tales may have received these running titles not long after copying, others perhaps much later. A run of folios may display consistency in the position of the running title on the folio and the style of the writing. These may then

be followed by folios in a slightly different style or with a different spelling of the pilgrim name. These inconsistencies suggest that not all folios were given their running titles at the same time.

[5] The different style of decoration around the running titles in PA and NU suggests that these two tales had been copied and headed before they were used in Hg.

[6] For example, two six-leaf quires, 7 and 12, have punctus elevatus marks to decorate the running titles on their first folios. A six-leaf quire is an anomaly which does not fit with the intention to order the manuscript in eights. This may mean that previously-copied material was substituted perhaps with their opening folios removed when tales were joined together.The running titles already in place would not correspond with the punctus decoration employed elsewhere for first leaves of quires. The same might apply to quires 28 and 29 in TM.

[7] It should be made clear here that although the Sections appear as self-contained units, the copying of tales within those units did not necessarily take place consecutively. For the description of the division of the Hg into Structural Sections I-V, see Doyle and Parkes (Intro. xxiii-xxxiii).

[8] See Appendix 1 and 2: Quires 1-8.

[9] Edith Rickert describes the Hg border as having been made 'by a group of old-fashioned illuminators in London' and suggests that its style, as that of El, is of the late fourteenth century (I: 565-6). See also Scott's discussion (1995: 87-119).

[10] The ink, writing style and position of the running titles on, for example, fols. 18r, 26r, 27r, 28r, 33r and 34r seem to me to be so variable as to suggest that they were not all executed at the same time and could indicate a text copied in stages.

[11] When El was copied, the problem had been solved and such folios were mainly headed with the pilgrim whose text began the folio.

[12] Doyle and Parkes cite Manly and Rickert's notes on the change of affiliation in some manuscripts half way through the tale and suggest a possible substitution of text (1979: xxvii). They also note that there is no change in affiliation of the text of Hg.

[13] There is evidence in both Hg and Cp of a carefully calculated system of copying for some tales. Several tales appear to have been copied beginning on the verso of a leaf and therefore extend beyond the confines of the single quire which would have contained them. One possible reason for this scribal practice will become clearer in my discussion of quire 22 in Section IV.

[14] Note has already been made of the scribe's use of space and the absence of a running title for the folio. Both are suggestive of some kind of adjustment. There may be further signs of this adjustment on fol. 50r, the first folio of quire 8, where MI joins L2.

[15] This might sound unlikely, but cumulative evidence in Hg, Cp and Ha4 shows how adept the scribes were in the manipulation of the four bifolia which made up a quire. For further evidence of this manipulation see my suggestions for the inclusion of NU in Section IV.

[16] For an interesting discussion of manuscripts with a gap after the Cook's Tale, see Partridge 2000: 51-85.

[17] See Appendix 1 and 2: Quires 9-12.

[18] Sections I, IV and V are copied in a dark ink which is fairly uniform in colour. Section I must have been completed for the scribe to have added the marginal note, since V and possibly some tales in IV were copied before the tales in Section I. The group of tales WB-SU were therefore almost the last tales to be copied.

[19] The Hk manuscript is rather a hotch-potch of tales, many without links. CL and ME are inserted between WB and FR-SU in Hk.

[20] The three marginal dots occur on fols. 68r, 68v, 69v, 70v, 71v, 72v and 73r.

[21] In a number of manuscripts, for example Cp, Ha4 and Ad3, there are indications that WBP 193 may have been the opening line of a tale. A number of scholars have contributed theories about the time and manner of the development of WBP. See Jones (1925), Owen (1958), and Dempster (1953). Further codicological evidence in the Cp and Ha4 manuscripts in chapters 4 and 5 of this thesis may contributre to the debate.

[22] In his analysis of WBP (Blake and Robinson 1997: 126), Peter Robinson suggests the closeness of the Hg text to Chaucer's own copy.

[23] There are only three other occurrences in the entire manuscript where folios which are not the first leaves of quires are marked with the punctus mark. These occur twice in ML, fols. 121 and 123, and once in SQ, fol. 130.

[24] It is interesting to note that the 'added' passages would have been contained on the outside leaves of quires with Hg's make-up. If they circulated on folios separate from the text itself they would have been extremely vulnerable.

[25] The transcription of Ch was carried out by Claire Thomson and Estelle Stubbs in 1999 for the Canterbury Tales Project. Claire Thomson discovered the presence of a second hand in SU which copied only lines 1927-1939 in SU.

[26] See Appendix 1 and 2: Quires 13-15.

[27] Mooney suggests that since we now know that Chaucer's scribe's name was Adam, he would have been unlikely to omit a stanza by accident which contained his own name (2006). This in turn might indicate that the stanza had not been written at the time when MO was originally copied for Hg.

[28] See Appendix 1 and 2: Quires 16-29.

[29] The first leaves of quires 20 (ME), 24 (CL), 28 (TM), and 29 (TM), do not have punctus marks around the running title. This may suggest text adaptation in the case of ME. Quire 24 bears the initial rubric for the fifth part of CL in the centre of the top border which could suggest that this section of CL was a remnant of a tale copied earlier. The pilgrim title is off-set to the right and unusually is indicated by a paraph. The Hg copy of TM may have been prepared to occupy a different position and received its running titles accordingly.

[30] The first three tales in quires 16-20 were copied with gaps left intentionally between ML and SQ and SQ and ME. The gap between SQ and ME was filled at a later stage with an adapted link. ME originally ended in Hg at Fragment IV line 2318, on the penultimate leaf of the quire. Copies of ME in the *c* group of manuscripts also end at 2318 and it has been assumed that their copytext had lost the last 100 lines (I: I 95). The original copytext for this tale may have ended at precisely the point where it first ended in Hg, fol.151r. The last 100 lines may have been copied onto separate sheets.

[31] Blake has argued that the two disputed linking passages may have been written first for Hg and then 'adapted' for the El order. This does not seem likely because of the clumsy irregularities in metre. For more on this see Robinson's argument in 'Can we Trust the Hengwrt Manuscript?' (Lester: 1999).

[32] There are observable problems encountered by the scribe as he copied ME. The first two lines of fol.144r are darker in colour than the rest of the folio, the first 2 lines of fol. 148r are lighter. The six lines which begin fol. 150r appear smaller and tighter than the rest of the folio. A line left blank by the scribe on fol. 150r, IV: 2230, is filled by another hand. On fol. 145r IV: 1813, 'he' is added. There is variation in the spelling of the running titles, the two on fols. 150 and 151 having the contracted form of Marchaunt. Quires 19, 20 and 21 all contain varying amounts of the text of ME. Manly and Rickert base their classification of manuscripts for ME on two shifts of affiliation, one at IV: 1690, and the second at IV: 2318. The one at IV: 1690 appears on the verso leaf of the last folio of quire 19 in Hg and IV: 2318 is at the bottom of fol. 151r, the last leaf of quire 20 where there is also the change of ink. It is worthy of note that the two changes in affiliation should occur on the last leaves of quires in Hg. One has the uneasy feeling that some textual changes might be attributable to portions of text being tailored to requirements by the author himself.

[33] Up to this point in the analysis, the following tales/links may have been prepared with a floating leaf to allow for the inclusion of tale endings, beginnings or linking passages: KT-MI, MI-RE, WB-FR, ML-SQ, ME-FK.

[34] DaRold makes a similar point about the Dd manuscript. She says, 'In the codicological description of the manuscript I pointed out that the scribe started a textual part at the top of the verso without leaving any space for the incipit of this part' and she continues,'In my opinion this matter could be explained by parts being received at different stages or the scribe trying to give an ordinatio to parts that were not as yet in a stable order' (2002: Conclusion).

[35] See particularly fols. 166r, 167r, 168r and 170r. In NU some running titles are off-set to the right in the top border, a feature which is also reflected in the running titles of PA, and the two tales may have been headed in the same session.

[36] In El and in Manly and Rickert's *a* group of manuscripts the tales of NP, 2NU and CY are grouped together. The NU of Hg and Cp becomes the tale of the 2NU in El with part of the tale separated off as a prologue. Dd refers to this tale as the Tale of Saint Cecile *without a Prologue*. CY is not in Hg whether by accident or design. The position of NU in Hg preceding CL, may reflect an earlier experiment with the order.

[37] This hypothesis will receive further support when Cp and Ha4 are examined as it will become clear that CL appears to have been repositioned in both manuscripts.

[38] Manly and Rickert II: 244-255. This is yet another example of text added in Hg in a different ink, finishing on the first or last leaf of a quire and signalling a change in affiliation in other manuscripts. One is tempted to suggest revision on the part of the author as tales were changing position.

[39] The codicological irregularity at this point in Hg has a counterpart in Cp which will be discussed in Chapter 4.

[40] See the suggestion about the division of folios in quires 6 and 7 containing MI. The scribe may have begun to copy what he assumed would be the central bifolium of a quire. It might not have been clear, when both MI and SH were prepared, exactly what position in the order they would occupy.

[41] See Appendix 1 and 2: Quires 30-31.

[42] Ra3, which with Tc1 has FK linking with PA, has a copy of FK which Manly and Rickert refer to as preserving 'some primitive features', (I: 465). This might suggest the existence of an earlier order FK, PA. The fact that in Hg, FK may have been recopied in the revised ordering process (the ink colour of FK betrays a time difference in its copying), could be a related factor.

[43] The folios which have sustained the greatest damage are those with the tales of PR and TT. Since the outside leaf of the quire is a replacement and contains the link between SH and PR, it is tempting to consider the possibility of the existence of PR in a different position in the order. In PW, both SH and PR follow TG and precede ML. Was Adam reusing older copies of the tales which had originally been in a different position in the order?

[44] Dempster (1953), Owen (1958), Fisher (1972).

4. Codicological Description of Corpus Christi College, Oxford MS Corpus 198: Corpus [Cp]

"As the least altered copy of a very early manuscript of high quality, Cp is of some authority; but...it is not a major tradition" (Manly and Rickert I: 96).

4.1. Foreword

Manly and Rickert's pronouncement on Cp, reflects the opinion of scholars of the *Canterbury Tales* from Furnivall's time to the present day. Their account of the manuscript, although at times confusing, is still the benchmark description by which Cp is analysed.[1] Latterly, Blake has contributed to our understanding of the manuscript, acknowledging it as "a manuscript which has organised the poem in accordance with a different principle, namely by dividing it into chapters rather than into prologues and tales", a feature which he felt was "significant for the position of Corpus in the hierarchy of manuscripts" (1985: 72). Contributions from other scholars include the palaeographical analysis of Doyle and Parkes (1978) and descriptions by Mosser (1996) and Seymour (1997).

Despite the fact that the manuscript was disbound in the 1980's, no scholar has yet made use of the notes provided at the time by the College Librarian. These notes are of enormous significance for *Canterbury Tales* scholarship. Not only do they provide a considerable contribution to the codicological survey of Cp, but analysis of the physical abnormalities noted, when correlated with the development of the text, contradict the Manly and Rickert description at the head of this chapter.[2]

Cp does not divide into structural units as does Hg. The manuscript is designed to give an impression of seamless continuity and it is only by sifting through the evidence provided by codicological indicators that one can begin to understand the rationale behind its assembly. As a manuscript at the head of Manly and Rickert's *c* group, any information to be gleaned may have an important bearing on its relationship with the other early manuscripts. If, as Manly obliquely indicated, and Brown, Benson and Cooper pursued, the *bcd* orders belong to a stage of development in the *Canterbury Tales* which is earlier than that represented in the *a-El* types, then it may be possible to detect some evidence for this in Cp at the fault-lines established by the division of the poem into fragments.[3]

In an early manuscript such as Cp one might expect to find evidence of pauses in preparation, and hesitation on the part of the scribe if exemplars were not readily available. On the basis of the evidence in Cp, there may have been reasons other than exemplar deficiency which forced the scribe to pause in certain places in his assembly of

the material available. If Cp is a manuscript which could be dated earlier than the posited ca. 1410-20, and the existence of several tales without links might support that view, then it is possible that the preparation of at least some of Cp could have taken place within Chaucer's lifetime.

4.2. General Codicological Description of Corpus

4.2.1. Contents

Oxford, Corpus Christi College MS 198 contains only the *Canterbury Tales* from A 73 - 1 290. Six individual folios are missing, of which five were probably illuminated and this causes loss of text in GP, WBP, CL, L15 (MEP), FK-NU, L37-PA.[4] Notably absent are several linking passages, L14, (Host stanza), L15, (CL-ME), L17 (ME-FK) and L20 (SQ-ME in El) and the last 100 lines of ME. The NPEndlink is missing and PA after 1 290 because of loss of leaves at the end of the manuscript which has also removed any trace of RT. The added passages in WBP are missing and in MO, the Adam stanza was never included although space was left on the folio with a marginal note for its inclusion. The Modern Instances are in the middle of MO. Cp includes both L8 (MLEndlink) and TG.

4.2.2. Material and Quiring

Cp is a vellum manuscript of 266 folios which obviously suffered a loss of leaves at an early date. Two quires were misbound at some stage causing disruption of the text. The 1987 conservation and rebinding at the C.C.C. Library restored the correct run of folios but revealed information which had not been identified by previous scholars. The vellum, described by Manly and Rickert as of fine quality, was found to have been supplemented in a number of places by a vellum which was much thicker and hornier. The vellum substitution has major significance for a re-evaluation of this manuscript and for the early history of the *Canterbury Tales*. As far as I am aware, noone has as yet used the information for any analysis.[5] Appendix 6 is presented on a single page and designed to give a swift overall impression of the vellum profile of Cp along with folios missing and singleton folios. Detailed information by quire is contained in Appendix 7.

Individual tales affected by the use of the different vellum are found in the following quires: 11, 12 (ML), 17, 18, 19 (CL), 20, 21 (ME), 21, 22 (FK), 25 (CY) and 33 (NP). Quires where the thicker vellum was used perhaps to enable addition or repositioning of some tales include quires 8 (RE-[CO]-TG), 12 (ML-SQ), 13 (SQ-WBP), 17 (SU-CL), 21 (ME-FK), 25 (CY-PH) and the linking passage 33 (NP-MA).

Further, a quire formerly thought to have been a regular quire of eight leaves was found to contain only two bifolia and four separate leaves joined to the following leaf. The idiosyncrasies of this quire (26), affects the tales of PH, L21 and PD.

After rebinding there are now 35 quires normally of 8 leaves. Eight quires are irregular: 1^7, 11^6, 14^7, 17^7, 19^7, 23^7, 34^7, 35^3 (Appendix 6 and 7: 1-35).

4.2.3. Scribe

Cp is copied by a single scribe, Scribe D as identified by Doyle and Parkes, who also copied the London British Library MS Harley 7334 [Ha4] of the *Canterbury Tales* (1978). The hand of the scribe is a good clear book hand, writing a Bastard Anglicana script, a feature of more luxurious manuscripts from the middle of the fourteenth century. It is confident and even, used not only for the text but also for many of the glosses, incipits, explicits, chapter numbers and corrections. Unlike Ha4, where differences in the script denote differences in the time-scale of its production, there seem to be no such differences in Cp.[6]

4.2.4. Page Size, Format and Ink Colour

The manuscript is ruled mainly in brown ink with double ruling at the top and bottom allowing for a distinct margin. The writing space measures approximately 23 x 14.5 cm. Ruling frequently appears darker on the versos. On some folios the ruling is no longer apparent and others appear to be carelessly ruled with horizontal lines extending haphazardly beyond the verticals. The first and last lines of the text are copied within the double ruling. Allowance has been made for 36 lines per folio of both verse and prose and the text has been carefully assigned to each folio with very few anomalies. The only folio which exceeds 36 lines is fol. 247 in quire 32, which has the NP tale incipit copied below the writing space.

Tales which in other manuscripts are copied with space left between stanzas are copied continuously in Cp. Thus the tales of the ML, CL, PR, and MO have small paragraph marks to indicate a change of stanza though this system is not meticulously adhered to and some paragraph marks divide the text in the wrong place and some are missing. In both NU and TT the paragraph marks are sparse and there is no sense of stanzaic division. The prose tales of TM and PA are copied continuously with the text filling the ruled space and occasionally spilling into the margins. Divisions in the text are marked by paragraph marks and in TM by champe initials as well as paraphs. Catchwords are present in all quires except 1 and 35 (Appendix 10).

For the body of the text, two different shades of ink are used, one a darkish brown and the other slightly darker, almost black. The difference in shade may in some instances be related to the difference in vellum. Apart from the Latin rubric which opens KT, (the rubric appears to be a later addition), red ink is not used at all until WBP. From WBP, running titles are added in red throughout almost the rest of the manuscript. They could have been added at any time in the preparation of the manuscript. On the heavier vellum the red ink takes on an almost luminescent quality. It should be noted that in Ha4 the use of red ink from WBP onwards includes its use for rubrics as well as running titles. In Cp the red ink is used for the titles only and rubrics are in the ink of the text.

4.2.5. Running Titles

From GP to the end of SQ and in MA and PAPT, (quires 1-13, 34 apart from the first folio, and 35), there are no running titles and no visible evidence of their existence. From the beginning of WBP to MAP, (quires 13-34, fols. 100r-257r), running titles or traces thereof occur with astonishing regularity on almost every recto folio. The regularity of their position on each recto and the conformity of spelling suggests that they were all put in at the same time after the manuscript had been assembled. The titles are copied, probably by the scribe in a more formal hand, in a brilliant red ink which jars with the mellow aspect on some folios. On some folios, the top part of the title has been trimmed away but it is usually possible to arrive at an accurate reading by tracing the pattern of the lower portion of the minims.

4.2.6. Decorative Features

Cp is an illuminated manuscript with ornamental capital letters attached to borders and border decoration using a combination of gold leaf and several colours of paint. The size and type of capital letter employed and the nature of the border help to determine the hierarchy of the text.[7]

In the margins of the Cp manuscript are instructions in brown crayon put in by a supervisor to help the illuminator. Against the initial letter of some tales and links are the words 'champe' or 'demi-vynet', or parts of those words in various spellings. (Plates 6 and 7) A champe signifies a gold letter on a background of either pink or blue paint with blue or pink infill. Feathery sprays in black ink with green and gold dots and sometimes leaf-like decoration extend from the letter up and down the border. Champes are employed at the beginning of prologues or linking passages though some are used where a tale is divided into parts. A demi-vynet refers to a painted letter of blue or pink on a sumptuous

gold background with pink, blue or red infill. The letter is attached to a three-quarter border of two stems, one of gold and the other of pink and blue alternating colour. The borders are variously decorated with bosses, flowers and leaf-like shapes. The demi-vynet is used for the opening of the tales. Only two borders in the manuscript are of a whole vynet or four-sided, one for the opening of KT, the other for Chaucer's TM, thereby conveying a greater visual status on those tales.

In GP and briefly in KT, gold *litterae notabiliores*, letters one-line in height, are used to distinguish the descriptions of each pilgrim. (Plate 8)

Paragraph marks of blue with red flourishing or gold with violet, are used to indicate textual divisions, some glosses and most rubrics. Where more than one paragraph mark is used on a folio the colours usually alternate. ME has only 5 paragraph marks in the whole of its text, NP has 3, CY has 1 and FK, PD and SH have none at all. Rubrics are preceded by blue and red paragraph marks with a few exceptions.

Traces of yellow paint highlight the initial capital letters at the beginnings of most lines and some upper case letters within the text, most usually the letter 'I'. This is consistent on almost every folio of the manuscript although on some folios the colour has faded and is barely noticeable. There is a significant change in the intensity and shade of the yellow at quire 22, with the text of the FK. The yellow changes to a greyish colour which continues to the end of the tale in quire 23 and resumes in quire 26 with the last folios of PH and the beginning of PD. From there it continues to the end of the manuscript. This may suggest that the paint decoration for the tales affected was applied at a different time.

Whilst there are some paragraph marks which have been missed by the flourisher, there are signs of a further layer of attention to some tales in the manuscript which were never acted upon. In GP and KT, ML, NP and L37 (PAP) there are faint ghostly paragraph marks against some lines. (Plate 8)

4.2.7. Order of Tales

Cp is a *c* type manuscript according to Manly and Rickert's classification. A summary of its order is as follows: A X B^1 F^a D E^a E^b F^b G C B^2 H I

Cp does not divide into blocks as in Hg, but the following groups of tales may be isolated by specific codicological indicators:

GP KT L1 MI L2 RE L3 CO

TG ML L8 (MLEndlink) SQ

WBP WBT L10 FR L11 SU

CL L13

ME FK

NU L33 CY

PH L21 PD

SH L24 PR L25 TT L28 TM L29 MO

L30 NP

L36 MA

L37 PA

4.2.8. Date

The date given to the manuscript by Manly and Rickert is between 1410-20 although this appears to be at odds with their dating of other manuscripts of the same period. For example, Ha4, copied by the same scribe, is dated to 1410, but it is implied that Cp is an earlier production. Confusion may have arisen because of Margaret Rickert's analysis of the illumination in Cp which she dates from 1410-12 whilst dating Ha4's illumination slightly earlier.[8] It is unwise to base the dating of a manuscript on its illumination since it is possible to carry out such work many years after the manuscript itself has been copied.[9]

4.2.9. Rubrics and Internal Tale Divisions

The incipits, explicits and internal tale divisions are not easy to analyse in Cp (Appendix 8). Because of the positioning of many of these rubrics, their irregular inclusion, and the use of both Latin and English, it is not clear whether any sort of decision about how to present the tales had been made before the scribe began copying. It is possible that most were added after the tales were copied. Faint chalk instructions for internal divisions in KT and ML appear in the margin but were never carried out.

A further complication is that some tales are numbered as chapters. The twelve tales where the chapter numbering is retained are as follows: RE (3), CO (4), ML (5), WBP (7), PD (16), SH (17), TT (19), TM (20), MO (21), NP (22), MA (23), PA (24). These numbers correspond with numbered tales found sporadically in other manuscripts of Manly and Rickert's c and d affiliation.[10]

Scribe D was not aware that the exemplars he received initially, whether of single tales or continuous chunks of stories, needed to be divided in some way into a 'Prologue' and a 'Tale'. In the margins of the folios containing the beginnings of the texts of RE, CO, ML and SQ are remnants of chalk instructions in a large unstructured hand for 'Prolog'.

In the margin to the right of the opening of the MI tale proper (fol. 45r), are the words 'millers tal[e]', on fol. 55r is 'Reeve', and in the footer of fol. 90v 'Squ[ire]' in faded chalk in the same ungainly hand. (Plate 7) From WBP it is more usual to find that the space left for rubrics is used for rubrics which are more formulaic.

Several tales were copied continuously as units with no space left for rubrics between the introductory passage and the tale: MI, RE, CO-TG, ML, SQ, FR, CY, PD, PR and MA. Rubrics may have been added but occupy a space to the right of the text within the text box area. Eight of these tales are also separately referred to as 'fabula' either in the opening rubric or in the explicit. They are: MI, RE, CO, TG, ML, CY, PD and MA.

The following tales continue on to a following linking passage with no space left for rubrics: RE-CO, ME-FK, PH-L21, PR-L25 and TT-L28.

4.2.10. Textual Affiliation

Cp is the earliest of the three manuscripts which make up Manly and Rickert's *c* group.

4.3. Fragment I (Group A)[11]

4.3.1. General Observations

- The order of tales from GP-CO is regular. The first real fault-line in the assembly of tales occurs at the end of the unfinished CO with the inclusion of TG.[12] The vellum of this fragment in Cp is of a consistently "fine quality" (1940: I 92) except for the conjoint leaves 57/64rva and 58/63 (RE-TG) which are of heavier, horny vellum. (Appendix 7: 8)

- The ink colour varies for no apparent reason from dark brown to almost black and significantly the only red ink used in these first quires is for the Latin incipit to KT.[13]

- There are no red ink running titles for the first 100 folios up to the opening of WBP, a situation which is exactly reminiscent of Ha4.[14]

- Traces of yellow paint highlight the initial capital letters at the beginnings of most lines and this varies in intensity at times, perhaps suggesting different times of application or a different recipe for the paint.

- Fol. 12v is illuminated with a whole vynet or four-sided border for the opening of KT. Each of the other tales in this section opens with an ornamental capital and a demi-vynet or three-sided border, (fols. 45r, 55r, 61v, 62r). The fact that both folios 61v (CO) and 62r (TG) have

illuminated initials and three-quarter borders suggests that TG was perceived as a tale in its own right.

- Faint ghostly paragraph marks begin on fol. 8r in GP and continue as far as fol. 38r towards the end of KT.

- Champe initials are regularly used to open the introductory passages which precede MI, RE, and CO which at no time are referred to as prologues.

4.3.2. Description

The opening folio of the manuscript is missing and with it the first 72 lines of text. As the opening folio it may have contained a luxurious border, perhaps with an historiated initial enclosing an image of Chaucer, as in MS Lansdowne. At some stage in the course of this manuscript's history, the illuminated folio was removed. Whether this occurred as a result of theft or by design needs investigation as it could be of major importance in an assessment of the possible dating of Cp. The second folio has suffered as a result of exposure and the ink is very degraded although an attempt was made at some stage to re-ink part of the text in the bottom third of the folio.

The first two quires of Cp have irregularities in their codicology which may indicate that their preparation underwent a number of changes. If a manuscript undergoes alteration then the presupposition must be that there was something in existence to alter. Apart from the missing folio, the first irregularity in quire 1 is a missing catchword on fol. 8v, the conjugate of the missing leaf. A missing catchword may mean that the last folio of the quire had to be recopied for some reason. It is possible therefore that the original bifolium was removed and the last leaf separated from the opening leaf of the manuscript to be replaced by the present singleton with recopied text. The original first folio of the manuscript would be extremely vulnerable as a single leaf and may later have been lost.

Fol. 8 has a second irregularity. It is the first folio in the manuscript which displays the faint ghostly paragraph marks, apparent remnants of supervisory attention. They begin on the last leaf of the first quire (8r), and continue through two thirds of KT. Properly executed paragraph marks with flourishing exist on some folios as well as the ghostly paraphs so it may be assumed that the inclusion of the ghosts happened later. These marks occur in only a few places in the manuscript and may represent a layer of attention to the texts of specifically GP, KT, ML, NP and L37 (PAP), the only tales in which they occur. On fol. 8r, the first of these marks defines an extension to the description of the Parson and on 8v, the introduction of RE, MI, SU, PD and MA as a group of pilgrims. (Plate 8) It is possible therefore that the text on the present fol. 8 was

supplemented at some stage. In the second quire, the remainder of the GP text which follows the introduction of this group is largely made up of individual portraits of these pilgrims, where as Pearsall commented,

> "the 'fit' of pilgrim to tale is consistently close and well-worked out... and it may well be that the group was added late, when Chaucer had developed more fully his ideas about the strategy of the *Tales*". (1985: 53)

If Chaucer added to his pilgrim group in GP as he worked on the Canterbury collection, then early manuscripts such as Cp, might retain evidence of that addition. Cp may have an early copy of GP where the RE, MI, SU, PD and MA are included in the collection for the first time. If Scribe D had access to a copy of GP at an earlier stage in its development then this could have implications for the time of the copying of GP in Cp. The pilgrim descriptions continue into the first half of the second quire. It is possible therefore that the whole of the second quire was added when a decision had been taken to expand the collection of tales. This would explain some of the anomalies in the decorative features which distinguish the first two quires of the manuscript.

A further irregularity of the first two quires concerns the use made of single line champe initials as textual dividers throughout GP and on the first three folios of KT in the second quire. Whereas their use to define each pilgrim description in GP could be understood as a particular way to draw attention to the individual pilgrim portraits, their use for textual divisions in the first few folios of KT is not so explicable. The single line champe initials only occur in the first two quires of Cp and were obviously not allowed for when the text was copied since they are not in line with the text and extend into the left margin. Some appear to have been hurriedly executed and in places it is possible to see either a cross in the margin or penmark parallel lines. Occasionally there is a smudge around the letter as if it has been placed over an erasure and in other places there is a vague yellow blur which may mean that the original letter had already had yellow paint applied as decoration. (Plate 8) It seems that there were several layers of attention to GP, applied at different times, perhaps as the text expanded to accommodate the author's augmented vision.[15]

The use of the small champe initial for textual divisions ends completely on fol. 15r (KT: quire 2), and thereafter paragraph marks decorated with ink flourishing replace the small champe in the remainder of the manuscript. The change in style of decoration from champe to regular paraph may also indicate a lapse of time in the preparation of the manuscript, or difficulty in the supply of exemplars. Where they occur, regular paraphs

mark textual divisions in quire 2, fols. 12r-13v and from 17r-58v in quire 3. The whole of the first fragment is notable for the infrequent use of marks for any kind of textual division apart from the previously mentioned ghost marks. Blue paragraph marks with red flourishing also precede the rubrics on fols. 44r (KT-MI) and 54v (MI-RE) but these are lacking on fols. 61v (L3-CO) and 62r (CO-TG) which may be indicative of the later insertion of the rubrics for these tales, or even of the tales themselves.

Several other anomalies in the decorative hierarchy are also observable within quire 2. The central bifolium (fols. 12r-13v), where GP links to KT, is isolated within the quire. It has no champe initials for text division as used on the folios both preceding and following, but it does have the flourished paragraph marks used throughout the rest of the manuscript. This may suggest a later addition of the text on this bifolium. It also suggests the later arrival of the opening of KT. The use of red ink for the Latin quotation which precedes KT on fol. 12v is also singular in this central bifolium. No more red ink is to be found until running titles are inserted for the first time at the opening of WBP. Further, there is no prologue division for the opening of KT, unlike Hg, Ha4 and El where the first 34 lines are separated to form an introductory passage. In Hg, KT proper commences with 'Incipit narracio' copied onto its own line preceding line 35, and the tale opens with a flourished capital. Ha4 and El both begin line 35 with elaborate initials and treat the first 34 lines as a prologue. In Cp, fol. 13r, with lines 5-39 of KT is characterised by several ink blots, the erasure of a repeated line, line 37 copied over an erasure, and an erased marginal note against line 35 which may read 'narrat'. Line 35 is otherwise undistinguished. The more primitive state of the Cp text again suggests an early copytext, devoid of instruction for textual division, copied by a scribe who was ready to incorporate that instruction when he copied KT in Ha4. On 14r, the small champe initials begin again but cease entirely on fol. 15r. Fols. 15v, 16r and 16v, the last folios of quire 2, have neither champe nor paragraph mark.

The text on the central bifolium of quire 2 contains the final lines of GP (where the two tales per pilgrim are expanded to four), the opening of KT, and the first 75 lines of the tale. It has been suggested that the plans for the four-tale contest may have been introduced in revision done by the author, in which case the scribe of Cp may have been awaiting the revised text.[16] When new text arrived, it could then have been copied at any time during the preparation of the manuscript. The vellum of the bifolium is consistent with the folios before and after, which suggests that it was included in the quire, but left blank to await instructions.

In Cp as in Hg, a number of tales are linked either on the central leaves of a quire or on the outside bifolium. In this fragment, GP links to KT, KT to MI, and RE links to

CO on the central leaves. This arrangement allows some flexibility when copying a work such as the *Canterbury Tales* which may not have reached its final form, and both poet and scribe must have been aware of the possibilities for tailoring the text which such an arrangement ensures.[17] If the poet was developing or supplementing the framework narrative between tales already written, it made sense to allow space for manoeuvre. The same manipulation of space can be seen in Ha4 and as already noted, Adam pursues the same policy between some tales in Hg.

The change from small champe initial to decorated paragraph mark in Cp may also suggest preparation of the end of GP and the opening part of KT at a different time from the rest of KT. It is possible that the exemplar used by Scribe D for the first part of KT ended after about 150 lines since in Ha4 it is at almost exactly the same point that there is an exemplar change. However, when copying Cp, the scribe was not aware of the division of KT into parts, which may be another sign that the available copytext had not received either authorial or supervisory attention. Just visible in four places in the tale are faint marginal directions for the part divisions in a large ungainly script in brown chalk. The instructions were never carried out and must have been added after the tale was copied.

The ghostly marks continue through KT but cease between fols. 38v and 44r, which contain the last 400 lines of the tale. Manly and Rickert suggest that at least the last 300 lines were left unrevised by Chaucer (II: 135). The ghost marks present in the majority of KT may have been included in a comparative revision of the material and Scribe D may have had access to an early copy of KT, none of which had been revised. On fol. 44r KT ends with no explicit, but an erased 'Amen' can be seen adjacent to the text of the last line. L1 follows immediately.

The transition from KT-L1 (MIP) in quire 6, again occurs on the central bifolium. A rubric, 'The Millewardes Tale' occupies a central position on its own line, and is preceded by a flourished paragraph mark. MIPT follow, and are treated as a single unit with no space between prologue and tale although a distinction is made through the use of a champe initial for the opening of the linking passage and an ornamental capital for the tale. Brown crayon instructions for the decorator, 'champe' on fol. 44r and 'dj vynet' on fol. 45r have never been erased. To the right of the last line of the link and spilling over into the right margin are the words, 'Millers tal[e]'. They were executed in brown chalk in the large ungainly script which is now very faint. This instruction may have acted as a guide for the scribe about the position of the tale, or it may be an instruction for the inclusion of a rubric. Both types of instruction, in crayon and chalk are found at the

opening of a number of tales mainly in the early part of the manuscript. Their presence may indicate a group of tales conceived, copied and assembled in temporal proximity.

MI ends on the first line of fol. 54v. A Latin explicit to MI is followed by an English incipit for RE (Appendix 8). The explicit refers to MI as a 'fabula' whereas the incipit to RE in English introduces L2 (REP) as a tale, thus link and tale are again perceived as a unit. Another chalk instruction 'Prolog', to the right of the text box, conflicts with the 'tale' of the incipit. For the first time a tale has a number assigned to it and 'C° iij°' appears to the right of the text box. Several features on this folio might suggest a slight delay before L2 (REP) was received for copying by the scribe. The Latin explicit and English incipit each occupy their own line. The lack of conformity in the language used is odd if both were copied at the same time. For some reason the tale has a chapter number, not present for the previous tales. Some sort of delay in the acquisition of L2, would link the activity of the Cp scribe with the scribe of Hg.

Where RE begins (55r), it is again referred to as 'ffabula' and a large chalk 'Reev[e]' is scrawled to the right of the text. RE continues to fol. 61r where it is followed by L3 (COP) with no sign of, and no space for, explicit or incipit. The same chalk instruction for 'Prolog' is present in the right margin along with the instruction for the decorator, 'champe'. On fol. 61v a line was left between prologue and tale and is now filled with 'Incipit fabula' and the chapter number 'C^m iiij^m'. Folios 61v and 62r, both have three-quarter borders and ornamental capitals. On 62r this signals the opening of TG and a second 'Incipit ffabula' has been inserted adjacent to the text of the last line of the unfinished CO which is followed with no allowance of space by TG.

Thus quire 8 begins with RE, is followed by L3 (COP), CO and ends with TG. For the first time in the manuscript, a different vellum is used. It comprises the two outside bifolia of this quire, fols. 57, 58 with the text of RE, and the conjoint fols. 63, 64ra with the text of TG. The reason for vellum substitution here could be to allow TG to follow as a tale told by CO, whose own tale appears to be incomplete. However, there are other alternatives which will be discussed in the following section.

4.4. Tale of Gamelyn[18]

4.4.1. General Observations

- The first instance of the use of a different kind of vellum involves the inclusion of TG at this point in the order of tales. Quire 9 begins at line

4032 of RE and the first two leaves of the quire are in the heavier vellum. Their conjugates, fols. 63 and 64a have the text of TG.

- The whole of quire 10 (TG) appears to be of the usual vellum as does quire 11 where TG ends on the verso of the second folio and is followed immediately by L7 (MLP).

- Throughout the whole of TG the text is virtually unadorned, with only two paragraph marks, each one blue with red flourishing, to mark divisions in the text.

4.4.2. Description

TG follows immediately after CO on fol. 62r. An incipit for the 'ffabula' is written adjacent to the last line of the unfinished CO but although there are two parallel lines preceding the incipit, the paragraph marker was never completed. The incipit thus appears to be an afterthought. TG opens with a 4-line ornamental capital and the folio has a three-quarter border, but unlike the tales before and after, I can see no evidence of any direction for a tale nor is there any instruction for the decorator. The implication of this is that TG was slotted into this position some time after the tales of MI-SQ were prepared. It is possible that when RE-CO were originally prepared, a space was left after the incomplete CO just as in Hg and El, to await further instructions or extra text. This could have been in anticipation of a continuation which had not yet materialised. When the scribe was told to include TG there was thus a four-line space available at the end of the unfinished CO on fol. 62r, and the whole of the next verso free. If RE-CO were contained in a regular quire of eight leaves, two more folios would also have been available at the end of the quire. These are now folios of different vellum so one would have to speculate that when TG arrived, it had already been copied to link with another tale. If this were the case, the beginning of TG would need to be recopied and the scribe could make use of the available space after CO. Two folios of RE at the beginning of the quire would also need to be recopied. However, the scribe may then have had a complete quire with the remainder of TG already prepared. In quire 10 fol. 73v, TG ends with 'Amen pr charite' and L7, preceding MLPT, begins on the following line.

It is also quite possible that TG was positioned after CO intentionally. There would then need to be another reason for the substitution of different vellum. In Hg, RE was a tale which appeared to be copied erratically. It is possible therefore that there may have been an earlier, unsatisfactory text of the end of RE in Cp which occupied the two opening folios of quire 8 and which underwent a rewriting or extension process. As a result, part of TG also had to be recopied.

4.5. Fragment II (Groups B¹ and F¹)[19]

4.5.1. General Observations

- This group of tales is not a separable unit in Cp since L7 follows TG on the second verso of a regular quire (10) with no space left for rubrics, and a chapter number 5 in the left margin.

- The heavier vellum is used in quires 11, 12 and 13 which is of significance for the tales of ML, ML-SQ and SQ-WBP.

- ML is a tale which usually stands alone in all manuscripts, with discernible fault-lines in the structure of the Tales both before and after. However in Cp, an irregular quire of six leaves and the substitution of different vellum within ML suggests that there were some difficulties associated either with the tale or with its position.

- L8 (MLEndlink) survives in Cp although missing from Hg, El and *a* manuscripts. Manly and Rickert felt that as Chaucer developed the groups of tales and changed the order, small passages such as MLEndlink "ceased to have any proper function" (II: 190). Its presence in Cp therefore may provide evidence of structural alterations in the manuscript (Brown 1940: 614).

- The position of SQ after ML reflects the order of Hg and manuscripts of the *b* and *d* types, although in *bd* SQ is usually followed by ME.

4.5.2. Description

L7 (MLP) follows TG with no space left for rubrics between the two. The quire is of normal vellum which suggests that the sequence TG-ML was planned. It is an order attested by at least 15 manuscripts of the *c* and *d* groups and could therefore be significant of the earlier collection of tales suggested by Brown, Owen and Fisher.

The tale of ML begins on fol. 75r with 'Incipit ffabula' written into the text box on the same line as the last line of Link 7. The normal vellum is used to the end of quire 10. Quire 11 is an irregular quire of six leaves, of which only the middle bifolium is in the normal vellum. In quire 12, the irregular vellum is used for the two outside leaves, fols. 86 and 87 bearing the text of ML, and fols. 92 and 93, the text of SQ.

In Hg, there is a change in the shade of ink at about line 825 of ML and this lighter shade continues almost to the end of the tale (Appendix 1). In Cp, three of the six substituted folios, 85-87, carry the text copied in the lighter ink in Hg, with line 825 occurring on fol. 85r of Cp (Appendix 7: 10-11). The scribe of Cp therefore must have been in a situation similar to the scribe of Hg. For some reason not immediately apparent,

there were problems with the copytext of ML which affected both scribes. In Cp the vellum substitution at this point in the manuscript could have more to do with the shuffling of tales to achieve a different order, but this would not account for the change in ink colour in Hg. Were the scribes updating ML with the latest version, or did they have to to wait for the material to be provided by the author? Another possibility is that the tale in verse now told by ML was originally a shorter tale extended by Chaucer as he was developing his collection of tales.

Alternating decorated paragraph marks demarcate the beginnings of stanzas in ML although they are not consistently present and no space is left between the stanzas. A single ghost paragraph mark on fol. 79r in the margin next to line 288 of ML marks the place where there is a part division in El. No subsequent action to provide a flourished mark was taken.[20]

The large ungainly hand of the marginal directions for 'Miller' and 'Reeve' has written 'Prolog' in chalk, now very faded, on fols. 73v and 90r to mark the beginning of L7 (MLHeadlink) and L8 (MLEndlink). Both folios are in the normal vellum. 'Squire' in the same hand is just visible in the footer of fol. 90v where SQ begins at the top of the folio. This may be evidence of the preparation or positioning of all these tales in temporal proximity. In Cp, SQ follows ML, but in a quire where the two outside leaves, fols. 86/87, 92/93, are again of the thicker vellum (Appendix 7: 12). The two inside leaves, fols. 88-91 are of the regular vellum with ML finishing at the top of 90r, followed by MLEndlink which takes up the remainder of the folio. SQ begins at the top of fol. 90v. It appears therefore, that when MLEndlink was copied, the intention was to follow it with SQ. However, there is a problem. A significant difference at this point in the order of tales is the presence of the Endlink. The link is missing in Hg and Scribe B left a blank folio after ML. In Cp, an explicit to ML is adjacent to the last line of the tale on fol. 90r, and the linking passage begins immediately with a two-line champe. MLEndlink fills the rest of the folio following the final line of ML.

'Prolog' in chalk was added in the margin of 90r after the Endlink was copied, possibly to alert the scribe to a necessary rubric. This suggests that MLEndlink was to be used as the prologue of whichever pilgrim's tale was to follow. Unusually there are only 35 lines on this folio, almost the only irregularity in the manuscript. There may have been a problem with the text of Endlink copied onto fol. 90r. There is an erasure in the middle of the linking passage. The vellum in the centre of lines 1177-1183 is discoloured and the discolouration is also visible on the verso of the leaf. (Plate 9) It appears to represent words erased around line 1179 where the person speaking is said to be the Squire, 'Seyde

þe _Esquier heer_ schal he nat preche' although there is no distortion of ink as sometimes occurs when words are written over an erasure.

The status of MLEndlink is that it may be a remnant of what was originally a prologue for WB.[21] Cp is a very early manuscript perhaps displaying signs of earlier versions of text in the process of transformation as the tales were augmented. The previous existence of the name of another pilgrim in the position of 'Esquier' on this folio of Cp suggests that originally this passage may have connected with a different tale. The position of the word 'heer' in this same line differs in many manuscripts and it has been suggested that the word was added in the margin of the copytext by Chaucer to rectify the meter of the line when a different pilgrim teller was substituted.[22] 'Heer' was then included by the scribes in different places in the last half of the line. In Cp it follows immediately after 'Esquier' and the number of letters in 'Esquier heer' is eleven with one space, making enough room for twleve letters. 'Wif of Bathe' as spelt by the Cp scribe is exactly ten letters plus two spaces, making twelve in all, and may have been the original reading at this point. ML could have been prepared initially with space left at the end of the tale as in Hg. At the time when the link was added in Cp, it may well have been part of an earlier prologue introducing the Wife of Bath. A change of plan, or addition to WBP may have forced the erasure of the original name so that SQ could follow on in the order.

The word 'Squire' is scrawled in chalk in the footer of fol. 90v, so the position of SQ here appears to have been determined at the same time as the organisation of the tales of the MI, RE and CO and the erasure visible beneath 'Esquier'. SQ has no chapter number, unlike the tales before and after, which might suggest that its presence represents a change of plan. On fol. 95r, a folio of heavier vellum, is the opening of the second part of SQ with the anomalous 'The Stag of an hert' instead of an incipit. The last 18 lines of SQ are on fol. 99v and an explicit closes the second part of the tale. The opening lines of part three have been incorporated into the second part and the remainder of the folio is left blank. The following folio, 100, is also an insertion of heavier vellum and WBP begins at the top with the rubric 'Plog vxis Bathe' on the same line as the first line of the prologue, in the ink of the text, and preceded by a pen-flourished paragraph mark. The chapter number 7 follows the rubric and red running titles begin for the first time in Cp signalling a change in both ordinatio and rubrication.

4.6. Fragment III (Group D)[23]

4.6.1. General Observations

- WBP begins on fol. 100r, a folio of substituted vellum. It does not use the space on fol. 99v after the unfinished SQ and it would seem therefore that WBP may not originally have been intended for this position.

- A missing folio at the beginning of quire 14 removes lines 146-217 of WBP.

- WB, FR and SU appear to have been conceived as a unit though there may have been some hesitation before the inclusion of both FR and SU.

- The tales are united by the use of red ink for running titles which begin with WBP and continue more or less regularly to the end of the manuscript.

- An attempt to provide some sort of unified approach to the rubrics distinguishes the tales from those in the previous section, although that approach is mainly dictated from the margins. (Appendix 8).

- An awareness by the scribe of the necessity to label linking passages as prologues also marks a different treatment for these tales.

- The inclusion of CL to follow SU may have been problematic for the scribe and the intrusion of different vellum, probably for that purpose, is visible in quire 17.

4.6.2. Description

WBP, chapter 7, begins in quire 13 at the top of fol. 100r, the conjugate leaf of an inserted bifolium, with a two-line champe initial. Fol. 100 follows the blank half folio left after the unfinished SQ and no attempt was made to make the text continuous. It is possible therefore that WBP did not originally occupy a position following SQ. Adjacent to the first line of text and separated from it by a pen-flourished paragraph mark, is 'Plog⁹ vx̄is de Bathe'. The rubric does not have a dedicated line so was added after the text was copied. (Plate 10)

For the first time in the manuscript, red ink is used for a running title and it mimics the wording in dark ink on line 1. Its use seems to mark a new phase in the manuscript assembly and a different concept in the presentation of the tales. However, there is a problem if we assume that the vellum substitution has been made to allow WBP to follow SQ. The last leaf of quire 13, fol. 101, has not been replaced and is of the majority vellum (Appendix 7: 13). If SQ had originally been copied from fol. 94 to its

conclusion on fol. 99v, then both fols. 100 and 101, conjoint with fols. 94 and 95, would have been available to copy WBP. However, only fol. 100 has been substituted. There are several possibilities for the insertion of a different vellum at this point. One is that some of SQ had to be recopied. More likely, is that there were difficulties associated with the opening of WBP. A further, yet related possibility, is that the text of the beginning of WBP as it now appears was not the text which originally opened the prologue.[24] This may be connected in some way with the erasure in MLEndlink on fol. 90r in the previous quire. Some support for this view comes at the beginning of quire 14.

The first folio of quire 14 is missing and this has removed lines 146-217 of WBP, a total of 72 lines. The folio apparently had a decorated border as the remnants are clearly visible on the surviving stub. According to the decorative hierarchy of the manuscript, an illuminated border is supplied only at the beginning of a tale. It would seem therefore that Cp had a copy of WBP which required alteration at the beginning and this was later supplied on the inserted vellum folio. Such a situation may have occurred at a time when the order of tales was in flux, when TM was removed as the tale told by ML, leaving an Endlink which signalled a different tale, perhaps SH, told by the Wife of Bath. When the erasure noted on fol. 90r in L8 (MLE) secured the position of SQ, the original prologue of the Wife had to be rewritten and her position in the order was changed. It is therefore possible that the text on the missing folio of quire 14 also needed to be rewritten to fit with a later version of WBP.

Cp has none of the added passages in WBP found in the *a* group manuscripts and the tale ends after line 828 on fol. 110r. The scribe left a line of space which he then filled with an explicit to the prologue followed by a three-line champe to open the 'The frere lowh' passage, which would appear to indicate its status as a second prologue to WBT which follows. Manly and Rickert suggest that those lines, 829-856, which begin the quarrel between Friar and Summoner, may have been missing from the earliest draft of WBP when Chaucer was still undecided about which tale to assign to the Wife and before he had developed the group WB, FR, SU (II: 194). If this is so, the Cp scribe must have had an exemplar which originally finished at line 828 thus attracting the explicit. On fol. 110v, truncated because the border of the folio with ornamental capital has been removed, the last two lines of the passage are squeezed in above the incipit for WBT which follows immediately.

WBT ends on fol. 115br with an explicit alongside the last line of its text. An incipit in English to L10 (FRP) occupies its own line and is further reinforced by '¢ Incipit plog⁹ ffris' on the same line as the first line of the link. At the end of the prologue, no space is left between link and tale forcing the English rubric over two lines against the

last line of the prologue and the first line of the tale. Both Latin and English explicits mark the end of FR, one on the same line as the last line of the tale, and the English version, preceded by a paragraph mark on its own line. There is no opening rubric for L11 (SUP) but the tale on fol. 121r is preceded by an English incipit on its own line. Something has happened in the time between the preparation of the first tales and those of WB, FR and SU. In contrast to the first fragments there is now an awareness of linking passages as prologues, and rubrics are mainly in English with at least one dedicated line (Appendix 8).

Quires 14, 15 and 16 have red running titles on recto folios, 'Bathe' for WBPT, 'prologus' for FRP and SUP, 'ffreres' and 'sumnoᵗs' for FR and SU. The only irregularity in the titles is on fol. 116r where 'ffrere' has been erased and 'tale.' substituted. This is followed on the verso by 'ffreres' to regularise the titles again. The mistake seems odd since there is no other example in this manuscript of the scribe using 'tale' in the title. It may be the result of a passage of time between the completion of WB and the addition of FR.

Nowhere in these three quires, 14-16 are the chalk instructions for prologue or tale visible in the margins, nor do there appear to be instructions for the decorator, although the quires do seem more heavily trimmed than those which precede and the instructions may have been lost in that procedure. The quires follow a similar pattern and appear to have been prepared fairly close in time to each other. Folios in all three quires show a definite degradation of ink as if they have been much used and fingered. After the opening folio of WBP, there is no more vellum substitution until the middle of SU so the tales were presumably conceived and copied as a unit.

With the opening of quire 17 comes the first clue that the tale which now follows SU was not originally designed for that position. The first and last folios, fol. 124, (beginning SU 1897), and fol. 130 (beginning CL 108), are of thicker vellum. The second folio is now a singleton since its conjoint leaf is missing. The last two lines of SU are on the sixth verso of the quire, which precedes the missing folio (Appendix 6 and 7: 17).

4.7. Fragments III (end), IV, V, VIII and VI (Groups D, E¹, E², F², G and C)²⁵

4.7.1. General Observations

- An immediate impression of this portion of the manuscript is of a group of tales in flux. The quires are a patchwork of substituted vellum and missing folios which affect every tale in one way or another. There are

three irregular quires of only 7 leaves where significantly the opening folios of CL, ME and NU have disappeared. The missing folios may represent work which remained to be done as a result of the change in order but for whatever reason, was never completed. All quires except 23 and 24 have either one or two replacement bifolia. This affects the tales of CL, ME, FK and the junction of CY-PH (Appendix 6 and 7: 17-25)

- No tale in this section has a chapter number even when the first folio of the tale is in place. It appears that tales were being relocated perhaps with additions to the text where space allowed.

- The texts of the tales from CL to NU are the most deviant of all texts in Cp. There are more lines and entire passages missing, more variant and reversed lines, than in any other portion of the tales in the manuscript (Appendix 9 contains all omissions, additions and variants in Cp).

- Three illuminated folios remain, introducing the tales of FK, CY and PH with champe initials used for the prologue and the three part divisions within CL, for FKP, L33 (CYP), and a further single occurrence of a champe for division of text in CY.

- Paraphs with the usual decoration define the stanzaic division of CL although no space is left between stanzas. Paraphs are used sporadically elsewhere in the text with 5 only in ME and none at all in FK. They occur occasionally in NU and once only in CY. Paraphs also precede the rubrics where they exist.

- The rubrics, where present, are in a rag-bag of styles (Appendix 8). There is no rubric to introduce ME, no explicit to ME and the rubric for the prologue is alongside the text itself. Between NU-CYP, the rubric is contained on a single line and reads as follows, '¢ here endeþ Seint Ceciles tale ¢ hic incipit fabula Canonici'.

- There is no rubric to distinguish the opening or ending of CY and PH follows immediately after the single line rubric '¢ The Doctour of phisik'.

4.7.2. Description

The last two lines of SU are copied onto the verso of fol. 129, the sixth leaf of quire 17. The scribe may then have left a space to await instructions for the tale to follow. Two lines were left to accommodate the English explicit to SU and the English incipit for CL with the spelling 'bygenneþ' rather than 'bygynneth' as used previously (Appendix 8). A

three-line champe initial signals the opening of CLP and a long trail of colour smudged from the paint of the initial extends up to the top border. The gold leaf of the initial letter 'S' spills out of the confines of its ill-defined penwork border. The impression is of speedy execution of the decoration followed by a hasty assembly of the quire before the paint was thoroughly dry. In the left margin is the direction 'champe' for the decorator and unusually for a verso, there is a red running title 'plog'. The running title is positioned in the top border central to the space occupied by the text below. In the same border but further to the right, in the position occupied by running titles for Summoner on previous folios, is a red smudge perhaps caused by an erasure. It is possible therefore that the folio had been headed in anticipation of a different tale. The odd spelling of the incipit, the hastily executed decoration and the erasure in the top border suggest that CLP was not immediately copied to follow SU and may represent a late alteration of plan, although the presence of the champe direction in the left margin would seem to link it with the preparation of the earlier tales.

The next folio, the penultimate folio of the quire, is missing, but would have accommodated 72 lines of text given the regularity of the Cp scribe's copying. Unfortunately, 74 lines of text are missing which, with a possible space between CLP and CL, would mean that in order to arrive at the correct line on the final folio of the quire, three or four lines of text would have to be jettisoned. The final folio of this quire is also of substituted vellum.

Apart from the opening of CLP after SU on fol. 129v, (with its unusual running title and alternative spelling for the incipit), the normal vellum is not used for CL until the second folio of the next quire (18, fol. 132). That the text was somehow being juggled in quire 17 can be seen on the last leaf of the quire (fol. 130) where two lines of text are missing on the recto and one line on the verso. This could be because of carelessness on the part of the scribe, but up to this point in the manuscript, few lines have been omitted through careless copying. Thus the first folio which would have accommodated CL, is missing. The next two folios are of heavier vellum. The first of these folios is the last leaf of quire 17, the second leaf is the first folio of quire 18, fol. 131v which ends at line 254 of CL. If we compare the situation in Hg at this point, the opening of CL in Hg is copied in the grey shade of ink also used to copy FK. The normal ink colour resumes again in Hg in the following quire at CL line 240. It is valid therefore to compare the different ink in Hg and the missing folio and the substituted vellum in Cp. The preparation of CL in both manuscripts show adjustments in the same area which may be significant of revision by the author and may have occurred at round about the same time. It should also be noted

that not only CL in Hg but also ME, FK and NU caused problems for Scribe B. As will be seen in the following description, the same tales caused problems for Scribe D.

CL is copied continuously with no allowance for stanza divisions, and proceeds through quire 18 where the first, third, sixth and eighth leaves are of heavier vellum. Quire 19 presents a situation similar to the one in quire 17. In 19, the second folio is a singleton with a missing conjoint seventh leaf, and the third leaf, conjugate with the sixth is in heavier vellum. The insertion of heavier vellum may relate to the rearrangement of stanzas at the end of CL and the addition of the Envoy. The Wife of Bath stanza may be an addition to the end of CL. This was probably not included when CL was first copied for Cp.[26] The beginning of the Envoy is also on this folio (144v) of heavier vellum and the remainder should have been copied onto the following leaf which is now missing. The fact that once again a folio is missing which would have to accommodate more text than there would be space available, suggests the possibility that in Cp, folios may have been deliberately excised to await instruction about how to proceed, or to allow the scribe time to adapt his collection of tales in the most efficient way possible. The 22 lines missing from the end of the Envoy, plus the 48 lines of ME total only 70 lines. However, depending on when the changes in Cp were being carried out, the scribe may have been aware that a new linking passage, written by Chaucer, was being prepared as a MEP, to be positioned between CL-ME. It may have been for this reason that once more the scribe was in a difficult situation and could not proceed without instruction.

ME begins at line 49 on the last folio of quire 19. Three lines of text are missing on fol. 145r but as there were problems with these lines in Hg and Ha4 there may have been problems with the copytext rather than an intentional omission on the part of the scribe. In quire 20 the outside bifolium is the thicker vellum but the remainder of the quire is regularly copied with ME. In quire 21, fols. 154, 155 (ME) conjoint with 160, 161 (FK), are in heavier vellum although there is no apparent reason for any substitution. ME ends on fol. 159r and in Cp, as with the original copying of ME in Hg, the final 100 lines of the tale are missing. The scribe of Hg added the last 100 lines at a later date and in a different colour ink. In Hg, there was sufficient space left on the folio (152v) after the added lines at the end of ME, to accommodate the first lines of FK. This was never achieved. However, later in Hg's history, a leaf bearing a linking passage (in El joining ME-SQ) was inserted after ME, and the opening lines of FK were copied at the bottom of the verso of the inserted leaf. (Plate 3) It is possible, depending on the time of the making of this part of Hg, that the scribe was awaiting copy from Chaucer himself to complete ME. It is equally possible that this part of Cp represents a very early copying of ME and an order of tales as in Hg, with ME followed by FK.

Cp has a text for FK which shows a great deal of variation, with numerous pairs of lines simply reversed, a few others reversed and variant (Appendix 9). The Cp text could represent an earlier unrevised version of FK with lines now apparently in reverse order being the order of lines as originally written. Several whole passages are missing although these seem to represent stylistic additions which might be made if one were revising or improving the work.[27] In quire 22 (FK), the second folio and its conjoint, the penultimate leaf of the quire, are also of thicker vellum. (Appendix 7: 22) In quire 23, FK occupies the first leaf of the quire. The following leaf is missing and with it the last forty lines of FK.

NU begins at line 37 on the third folio of the quire. The second folio, which would have contained the opening 36 lines of NU is missing. This suggests that the tale of 'Sent Cecile', as NU is consistently called in Cp, was originally prepared to begin at the top of the verso of the missing folio. Since the conjoint leaf is retained, it is possible that the original first folio of NU was preceded by a different tale on the recto and when its position was altered, the first folio had to be excised. To accommodate the end of FK and the opening of NU would anyway require 76 lines, more than could be accounted for on the missing folio. The scribe may also have been aware that some kind of linking passage might be expected which would require even more space. At no point in this copy of NU is there any reference to the Nun. Running titles consistently refer to the tale as 'Cecile' and even the explicit is '¢ Here endeþ Seint Ceciles Tale'. The physical situation is very reminiscent of the situation in Hg. In both Cp and Hg, NU was prepared to begin at the top of a verso leaf, and to continue onto the first leaf of a second quire. The tale appears to have been copied independently in Hg, and before its awkward inclusion between FK and CL. The tales of FK, NU and CL in Hg appear to have been conceived as a unit whilst FK and CL were being copied. Since CL in Cp appears to have been moved deliberately to a position after SU, the arrangement of the tales in this section suggests a later attempt to reposition CL than that of Hg.

NU in Cp is copied continuously, there is no stanzaic division and there is no distinction between prologue and tale. The beginning of the tale itself, at line 120 as it appears in El, is not even defined in Cp by a paragraph mark. There is no suggestion in Cp that the tale is that of the 2nd NU, but this may be because the tale does not follow NP as in El. Manly and Rickert suggest three copies of NU made from O, and Cp, Hg and El/Ha4 all descend from a different copy (II: 433). The description of NU in GP was never expanded and completed by Chaucer and as the tale itself does not seem to have been revised, and since [2]NU-CY is a floating fragment, it may well be that Chaucer had not decided on its final position.

As noted previously, NU was prepared to end on the first leaf of a second quire. Unlike in Hg, where the single leaf may have been folded back on itself to provide space for FK which preceded it, in Cp it was available for CY to follow in quire 24. Between NU and L33 (CYP) a single line of space was left which is now filled with an English explicit to Saint Cecile's Tale and a Latin incipit to the 'fabula Canonici'. The use of the word 'fabula' may link the preparation of CY with the fabulae of the earlier part of the manuscript. This fragment, NU-CY, may then have been set aside until a more secure position for it had been decided in the order of tales.

A further sign that CY, and probably NU which preceded it, may have been prepared contemporaneously with tales in Fragment I can be seen in the marginal instruction for a champe initial to begin L33 (CYP). Unusually however, the champe initial is five lines in height, more in keeping with the size for an ornamental capital. This may suggest an element of confusion when the scribe copied the original text, confirmed by his perception of the prologue as the beginning of the fabula. This is borne out by the small three-line ornamental capital with decorated border which signals the opening of the tale proper on fol. 180r. The direction for a demi-vynet initial shows that the director was aware of the prologue-tale hierarchy even though it may not have been apparent to the scribe when he copied CY. Conspicuous on fol. 184r is a ten-line champe initial. Four folios of heavier vellum, fols. 187r-190v have then been inserted into the centre of quire 25, probably to link CY to PH.

4.8. Fragments VIII, VI and VII (Groups G, C and B²)[28]

4.8.1. General Observations

- The only use of the heavier vellum in this section is where CY is linked to PH on fol. 190v. The vellum of the remainder of the section is of consistently finer quality and the tales appear to run smoothly.

- All quires have catchwords (Appendix 10) and running titles occur regularly on almost every recto folio. Where titles are not apparent, there is usually at least a red smudge to show that they were originally present and may represent the trimming of certain folios before they were incorporated into Cp.

- Illuminated folios at 190v, 195r, 204r, 211r, 214r and 217v open the tales of PH, PDP, SH, PR, TT and TM.

- Champe initials introduce prologues or linking passages on fols. 194v, 210r, 210v, 213v, 216v and 234v. A champe initial introduces PD on fol. 197r rather than the expected illuminated folio with ornamental capital.

- Unusually in this section, champes are twice used as text dividers; in PD on fols. 199r,v and in TM fol. 221v.

- Paragraph marks in the usual colours alternate to mark textual divisions in PR, where the text is copied continuously with no space between stanzas, and paraphs are variously provided for rubrics.

- Until TM, chapter numbers which are included have no preceding paragraph marks and the paraph preceding the incipit for TT has no flourishing which might indicate that they were all added as an afterthought.

- The odd appearance of quire 26, with four singleton leaves which were apparently stuck onto the following leaves, may suggest a different solution to the problem of tale reordering or the addition of new text.

- PD, SH, TT, TM and MO have chapter numbers with PH and PR as the exceptions.

- Apart from the disruption in quire 26, the tales appear to have been copied consecutively with the possible exception of PR.

4.8.2. Description

The single line of space between CY and PH, fol. 190v is filled with the title of the tale '¢ The doctour of phisik' which is reminiscent of the introduction to MI in the first section. An enormous six-line capital introduces PH and the remains of the director's brown crayon instructions for the decorator are just visible beneath the foliage of the border decoration. This suggests that illumination of at least this part of the manuscript was carried out after the vellum substitution. PH continues into quire 26 where there are anomalies which are not easy to explain unless they are significant of rearrangement or revision of text.

Quire 26 is made up of two bifolia as the outside and inside leaves of the quire, and four singleton leaves which were originally stuck to their following folios. (Appendix 7: 26) The fact that these leaves were singletons was only discovered in 1987 when the manuscript was disbound, therefore when Manly and Rickert examined the manuscript, it seemed that quire 26 was a regular eight-leaf quire (I: 92-99).[29] The reason for the single leaves is not apparent. It may be related to the introduction of CY to precede PH or it could be significant of the linking together of the tales of PH and PD. It is not clear at

what stage the latter took place but the two tales may have been a unit before the decision was taken to place them after CY. L21, which joins PH and PDP apparently underwent a number of development stages and the disturbance of these folios may provide evidence for that strand of attention. Manly and Rickert suggest two versions of the link achieved in stages (II: 325). Ha4 and Cp have an intermediate version and El and most other manuscripts the later version.[30]

Within the text box to the right of the opening line of L21 is the word 'Plogus' in black ink and in letters which are twice the usual height.[31] There is no preceding paragraph mark to distinguish it and it appears to have been copied as an after-thought. Instructions for the champe initial appear in the left margin. This is the first of the singleton folios and the link continues onto the second singleton followed immediately by an unusual incipit to PD, '...bygynneþ þe Pdoneres tale folwynge' almost as if the instruction to join the two tales had just been issued to the scribe. The folio is damaged and the opening of the incipit has gone. Both singleton folios, 194 and 195 have sustained damage and they both appear to be heavily trimmed with loss of some of the decorative border in the header of fol. 195r.

PH and PD may already have been joined to make a unit before the decision was taken to precede them with CY. This, as we have seen, was effected in the previous quire by the introduction of substituted vellum. PH and PD may originally have been copied into a differently- arranged quire and it is quite possible that the singleton leaves were part of that quire, perhaps as a central bifolium. The bifolium would need to be separated to take up a new position in a rearranged quire. For example, with a floating opening leaf (cf Hg), the text on the present fols. 191 and 192 at the end of quire 25, may originally have been the text on the opening leaves of a quire containing PH. This would then have meant that fols. 194-195 in the present quire 26 were the central bifolium of the original quire. When CY was joined to PH, the last two leaves of quire 25 had to be recopied with the text of the opening leaves of the original quire onto the conjoint leaves of CYT text. The central bifolium of that quire, now fols.194-5, if separated, could take their place as fols. two and three of the next quire. This would be useful for the scribe because folios such as fol. 195r perhaps with a decorated border, could be reused and the scribe would have four folios already copied. Fol. 199, the last of the singletons, has a champe initial similar to those used for division of text in CL. This may be significant of a type of decoration applied to tales prepared at an earlier stage in the assembly of the manuscript and evident on folios re-used when the manuscript was undergoing a transformation.

The appearance of a chapter number, 16, on fol. 195r allotted to PDPT is curious. Chapter numbers do not exist for any of the tales between the number 7 for WBP and 16

for PD. Thus 8-15 are not so numbered although the numbers missing, match the number of tales available. One interpretation of this could be that the tales from FR-CY were prepared and inserted *after* the outer framework had been decided and tales which had already been prepared were given numbers to ensure their correct placement. It is possible therefore, that chapter numbers for tales from PD-PA were added at the same time as those between RE-ML at the beginning of the manuscript. This situation would be indicative of tales already in hand which could be allotted chapter numbers before the final reorganisation of the order of tales. In order to implement this, the scribe must have had directions from someone who knew how the tales were to be arranged at the specific time when the addition of chapter numbers was carried out.[32] PDP-PDT must have been prepared as a unit and as with the earliest tales of MI and RE, the rubric presents the opening of the prologue as the opening of the tale. This is further reinforced with PDP by the use of a 5-line ornamental capital and three-quarter border rather than the champe initial which would be expected for a prologue. PDT itself, on fol. 197r, opens with a champe initial.

The presentation of these prologue-tale units, such as MI, RE and PD are much more in keeping with the vision of the collection as a series of stories divided into chapters, and the present Cp is intriguing because it appears to represent the beginnings of a new concept of presentation being imposed on material which had had an alternative ordinatio. This could account for the late insertion of the enlarged 'Prolog' next to the opening of L21. The scribe was adding material and was conscious of the fact that at this point, he needed to justify the linking passages to create a prologue-tale system. It is also suggestive of the different layers of changes effected in Cp. When GP was extended to include MI, RE, PD and MA, an earlier scheme of presentation was in progress. This was later superseded by another change in ordinatio represented in WB-SU and the revision of the tales in the central portion of the manuscript with the development of the prologue/tale organisation.

On fol. 204r, there is a Latin explicit to PD, and the tale is pronounced a 'fabula', yet another feature which is reminiscent of the tales of RE, CO, TG and ML. An English incipit is provided to announce SH, and a line of space is left for that purpose between the end of PD and the beginning of SH, with the director's marks for the decorator 'demi-/ vynet' in the right margin and the chapter number 17. SH ends with a simple Latin explicit on the same line as the last line of the text and the 'Words of the Host' are introduced by a 3-line champe, signalled in the right margin yet embracing the explicit, this time in English, for SH (Appendix 8).

Nowhere is there any reference to L24 between SH and PR as a prologue, although PR is introduced as a tale. However, the running title for this folio is 'Plog'. The mixture of Latin and English rubrics continues on the next folio, 210v, with an English incipit for the *tale* of the Prioress, (which is actually a prologue), followed by an afterthought '¢ Plog'. A crayon direction for the champe initial is visible in the left margin. No rubrics of any kind introduce PR on fol. 211r presumably because the scribe had already introduced the tale on the previous verso. The application of the word 'Plog' may therefore have been added at a different time in an attempt to clarify the textual divisions. Like PDPT, PRPT was also conceived as a unit. There is also evidence in the margins that fol. 211r may have had chalk directions scrawled in the large ugly script found in the margins of the earlier tales. This is a possible further indication of a preparation time of PR in temporal proximity with the early tales and it is conceivable that PR may originally have occupied a position earlier in the order in Cp.[33]

A simple Latin explicit is copied after the 'Amen' which ends PR, reminiscent of the erased 'Amen' after KT and the 'Amen' after TG. No other rubric is presented and the linking passage between PR and TT has a regular three-line champe signalled in the left margin. A line of space accommodates the English incipit to TT on the following folio, 214r, and its chapter number, 19. The incipit is preceded by a paragraph mark which has not been flourished, a further indication that preparation of this particular quire may have been hasty for some reason. The decorated initial attached to the border on fol. 214r is instructed in the right margin and again on this folio it is possible to discern what may once have been chalk directions in the right margin against the text of TT. There is evidence of erased writing in the lower border of fol. 214v and also in the right margin. More erased notes are visible in the bottom right hand corner of folio 215r.

On 216r, the last recto of the quire, 3 lines of TT text were missed out but added at a later date in the right margin. On fol. 216v TT ends four lines early. These missing lines were also copied at a later date into the right margin. TT is followed immediately by four lines of L28, the linking passage between TT and TM. If the four lines to end TT had been copied, then TT would have finished neatly with the end of the quire and I suspect that this may have been the original intention. The instruction to follow TT with TM may have been a decision taken when Chaucer decided to allocate TM to himself and develop the grouping of tales at the end of the manuscript. The situation in TT, with missed lines copied in the margin, may have been some kind of compromise on the part of the scribe to fit a tale into insufficient space. There is evidence in Hg at this precise spot that the Hg scribe rewrote the opening folio of TM to incorporate the end of the linking passage. The same may be true of Cp and the text of TT may have had to be tailored to allow for a

linking passage to link with a previously copied TM. Once again, this may have been work carried out on the two manuscripts simultaneously.

TM opens on fol. 217v with the second example in Cp of a four-sided border, a chapter number 20, and an opening rubric in English which begins with a decorated single-line initial capital, a feature of decoration not seen elsewhere in Cp although such initials are used at the beginning of rubrics in the early tales of Ha4. There seem to be at least two layers of work on TM. Three folios only have marginal glosses preceded by flourished paragraph marks, fols. 218r, 225r and 225v. On fols. 218r,v, 219r,v, 220r,v, and 221r there are marginal glosses copied in haste into the margins but lacking the flourished markers. Apart from a single flourished 'Ωota' on fol. 221v, there are no other glosses in TM. Because of the length of TM it is quite possible that the scribes copied the tale in a number of stints. It is also possible that in the course of copying they found it necessary to shift exemplars according to what was available. At 234v TM ends with an English Explicit and Latin Incipit on the same line, 'Ȼ Here endeþ Chaucers tale of Mellibe // Ȼ ₚlog⁹ Monachi'. The direction for a champe initial is in the left margin and L29, the TM-MK link, opens with the words 'Whan ended was þe tale of Mellibe'.

MO begins on fol. 236r after a Latin Explicit to the prologue on the same line as the last line of the link and an English and Latin introduction to MO, 'Ȼ Here telleþ þe monk // De casib[us] viror[um] illustriū'. It seems that both Ha4 and Cp had a copy of MO which was an earlier version than the copy used by the scribe of Hg and El. A six-line ornamental capital begins the tale and the brown crayon sign for a demi-vynet is in the right margin. The chapter number 21, continues the system of numbering which began again at PD in the last part of the manuscript. At the top of folio 236v, eight lines were left blank for the Adam stanza to which the scribe had been alerted. He must have been fairly certain that he could obtain the stanza, as such a gap at the top of a folio is very noticeable, but the space was never filled. The Hg scribe also omitted the Adam stanza, and his copy of MO was different from the one used by the Cp scribe, so whether it was by accident that the stanza was omitted as has been suggested, or whether it was because it had not in fact been written by Chaucer, is impossible to tell. Logic dictates that explanations for the same missing stanza in two early manuscripts, each copied from a different exemplar, must be connected.

Apart from the missing stanza in Cp there are several individual lines which have also been missed out. Lines 281, 313 and 345, all missing, are evenly spaced which may suggest the bottom portion of an exemplar which had deteriorated and lost small sections of text. Flourished paragraph marks define the stanzas of MO but they are not always correctly assigned and some appear to have been added somewhat haphazardly. There are

some glosses mostly preceded by paraphs which were probably entered when the text was copied. MO ends on the top line of fol. 247r.

The treatment of the 'Explicit', adjacent to the last line of MO text (fol. 247r) followed by a line for an English incipit for the following tale is the method adopted for the treatment of all tales and prologues in the last section of the tales from the opening of PD (Appendix 8).

4.9. Fragments VII, IX and X (Groups B², H and I)[34]

4.9.1. General Observations

- The last section of Cp includes the last tale of B² (NP) and its linking to Fragments IX and X.
- The presence of the heavier vellum for almost the whole of NPT could suggest that the tale was added to follow MO when the other changes reliant on the substitution of the different vellum took place.
- Of significance in this last section is the absence of running titles for both MA and PA.
- A missing folio, the sixth of the penultimate quire has removed the end of the final link and the beginning of PA. Three stubbs after the three remaining folios of quire 35 show that three folios have been excised and PA ends after 290 lines.

4.9.2. Description

There are faint remains of 'champe' in brown crayon in the right margin of fol. 247r which contains the text of L30 (NPP). However, there are also signs of more erased writing above the 'champe' instruction. The disposition of text on this folio may have been manipulated. Cp shares with Hg what has been termed the 'short form' of NPP and it is interesting to note that Adam apparently acquired the short form of the linking passage at the same time as he acquired NP. In Hg, both are copied in a different coloured ink and were added at a late stage in the development of the manuscript. It is possible that in Cp also, NPPT arrived late in the assembly of the manuscript. When MO was copied into quire 32 of Cp, the tale ended on the top line of the penultimate recto folio. There were thus almost two folios available at the end of this quire. In Hg it appears that MO was set aside to await development of the last group of tales, presumably by the author.

Eventually, NPPT arrived and its copying may represent the last block of work done on the Hg manuscript. The same may be true of NPPT in Cp.

On fol. 247r, the 34 lines of the short prologue are copied after the single final line of MO and a line of space is left for the English incipit which unusually is given a dedicated line with no clumsy marginal instruction. The spelling of 'beᵹynneþ' for the incipit of both prologue and tale is a further spelling variation not found elsewhere in the manuscript and may suggest copying done at a time apart from the rubrics elsewhere. Another unusual feature of this folio is the position of the incipit to the following NP, which is copied below the ruled space. The explicit to the prologue is copied on the same line as the last line of the link, the 36th line of the folio. This is then followed by the chapter number 22 which extends well into the right margin adjacent to the last line (Appendix 8 and Plate 11). The incipit occupies the 37th line on the folio, below the text box. This is the only occasion in Cp where the scribe copied below the text box space. It is a strange place to include an incipit to a following tale, thus one could speculate that the opening of NP could already have been in place on the following verso before the arrival of L30. The folio may also have been illuminated, another reason why the scribe was forced to copy the incipit at the bottom of the previous folio. There is the same feeling of 'squeezing in' caused by the late arrival of the link, just as there is in the Hg copy.

NP begins gloriously at the top of fol. 247v with a beautiful illuminated initial of six lines in depth and a decorated border. The tale continues on fols. 248r and v, the last leaf of the quire. The whole of the next quire is in the heavier vellum suggesting that the positioning of NPPT may have coincided with work done on the rest of the manuscript to rearrange the order and to add extra passages. On fol. 249r is the first of the three ghost paragraph marks found in NP which otherwise occur only in GP, KT, ML, and PAP. This feature of annotation must tie these tales together in some way. The copying of NP is workmanlike with few added extras such as paragraph marks or glosses. On the last folio of quire 33 is the linking passage between NP and MA.

There is no sign of a NPEpilogue which is present in some of the *a* group manuscripts. A single line of space was left between the end of NP and L36 (MAP). This line accommodates both explicit and incipit in English. There are too many words for the single line and 'ciples tale' follows after the text of the opening line of the prologue which proves that the rubric was entered after L36 (MAP) was copied. The chapter number 23 follows in the right margin. There may therefore have been a hesitation before the rubric was copied and a chapter number was assigned to this tale. There may have been uncertainty about the grouping of the last tales and a definitive order was not initially known.

Quire 34 is the last complete quire in the manuscript. It opens with L36 on fol. 257r and MA begins on fol. 257v. No space was originally left for rubrics and the Latin explicit for the prologue and the incipit to the next tale, again called 'fabula' are copied after the text of the last line of the prologue. The third leaf of the quire is now a singleton, its conjoint leaf having been removed for some reason. The conjoint would have had the text of the opening of PA. From the beginning of MA there are no more red running titles.

The last line of MA also accommodates a Latin explicit, this time with no preceding pen-flourished paragraph mark. The English incipit for L37 (PAP) has its own line, but again has no preceding paragraph mark, both omissions perhaps signs of last-minute inclusion? In the right margin there are the remains of the 'ch' of 'champe', the decorator's instruction for the initial, and the chapter number 24 also without a paraph, is clearly copied in the right margin. A ghost paraph marks a division of the text on fol. 261v in L37. The following folio is missing. All that remains is the stub on which the original decorated borderwork for the opening of PA is just visible.

Several layers of attention and intention are visible in PA. The text was copied with space left for the small paragraph marks which divide the text. These paraphs have all been executed in the alternating scheme of decoration. A few marginal glosses were added at the time the text was copied and have also received their flourished finish. However, on some folios there are glosses in the margins which missed the finishing process. It is difficult to say when these glosses were added, whether in the process of assembly or in the course of use. It is possible that this copy of PA was added to the collection to finish the manuscript and may have been in the possession of the person who commissioned Cp. It is also possible that the missing opening leaf contained something, whether a title or some content, which was unsuitable to the collection of tales as now assembled and for that reason had to be excised. The text of PA shows a great deal of wear as if it has been much pored over. At line 290 the manuscript ends abruptly on the third leaf of the quire. Three folio stubs are still visible and their presence suggests that PA continued onto those leaves now excised. It is entirely possible that poor storage, exposure to damp or some similar problem had caused the deterioration of the end of the manuscript from quite early in its history. Damaged leaves may have been cut out in an attempt to preserve the rest of the manuscript.

4.10. Conclusions

4.10.1. Fragment I (Group A)

A number of codicological indicators suggest that the first eight quires of Cp are not necessarily the smoothly-copied group that a superficial assessment of the manuscript would suggest. The tales are obviously meant to follow one from the other and to that extent the text-run is planned, but the means by which this was achieved, with pauses, changes in the decorative scheme and inconsistency of rubrics, suggests a very early attempt to assemble material whose ultimate form had not been decided. There appear to have been several layers of attention to both the copying and the assembly of these tales which could have stretched over a considerable time.

GP may have existed in an earlier, shorter form, representative perhaps of a mini *Canterbury Tales* with fewer pilgrim stories. It would have been a simple matter for the poet to extend GP as he composed more material and adapted it to a larger vision. That Cp retains a copy of GP, which appears to indicate at least two periods of attention is suggested by the method of the decorative definition of the pilgrim portraits in GP. The single-line litterae notabiliores which open each description were not initially allowed for and represent a second stage of decoration, perhaps effected at the time when the expansion of the author's original vision became a reality, with the composition and incorporation of the tales of MI, RE, CO, PD and MA.

The copy of KT available to the Cp scribe also appears to have been in a more primitive state than the copies used by the Hg/El scribe and the scribes of the group *a* manuscripts. There is no division into parts in the narrative and the concept of using the first thirty four lines to act as a quasi-prologue has not been initiated. It may be more closely related to the original of KT, *Palamon and Arcite*. The use of the few flourished paragraph marks suggests an initial attempt to provide some kind of sparse textual division but the presence of ghost marks in the margins through most of KT indicates that at a later stage, perhaps when groups of tales were being linked together, the text was scrutinised perhaps by the poet himself, and further text divisions were noted. The ghost marks largely coincide with the textual divisions of KT in Hg. The Cp copy of KT must have been in existence for it to be corrected against Hg or another copy with similar textual markers and may therefore be earlier than the Hg copy. This could mean either that KT in Cp was copied before it was copied for Hg, or it could mean that the Cp scribe acquired a more primitive copytext but turned to a revised copy to incorporate the latest features, none of which were actually achieved.

The tales of MI, RE and CO are described as 'ffabulae'. Links 1-3 are not referred to as 'Prologues', the only awareness of a change in status being contained in the

chalk marginal notes. Presumably this was a layer of information provided at a later stage since both L1 and L2 are referred to as 'tale' in the opening rubrics and each prologue and tale is treated as a unit. The appearance of the first chapter number for RE is strange. The use of the ablative case for 'capitulo' is matched by the chapter number for ML. All other references to chapters use the accusative case. The chapter number is correct if KT were to be numbered as chapter 1 and MI as chapter 2. However, no numbers exist for those tales. Why this should be is not apparent although as I have suggested, KT may have been linked to GP at a late date when the necessity to provide chapter numbers may have been forgotten or abandoned as an arrangement idea.

CO ends on fol. 62r. It is possible that as in Hg and El the scribe left a space after CO which was then filled when the decision was taken in Cp to follow CO with TG. If Cp is a very early manuscript as it initially appears to be, there is a problem about the inclusion of TG, since the two manuscripts copied by Scribe B, and thought to be earlier than Cp, omit the tale altogether.

4.10.2. Tale of Gamelyn

TG is a tale which many scholars are reluctant to attribute to Chaucer. However, the use of the majority vellum for most of the tale in Cp would suggest that it had at least been copied as part of the Cp plan, and set aside for some purpose. This suggests that TG was one of the tales available for inclusion in the *Canterbury Tales*, and may indeed have been intended as the tale to be told by the Cook. It is also possible that TG actually formed part of an earlier collection of tales. In support of this hypothesis is the evidence of an earlier state for GP, the more primitive version of KT and the existence of an ordinatio where tales are considered as chapters.

If we consider the wording of the marginal note in Hg at the abrupt end of CO, 'Of this Cokes tale maked Chaucer namoore', the use of the demonstrative adjective could suggest that Chaucer had not written any more of this particular Cook's Tale, but that there might be another tale which Chaucer had decided should be told by the Cook.[35] A number of manuscripts which include TG do refer to it as the 'Cook's Tale' and the information must have been relayed to the scribes somehow. The fact that there is a vellum substitution at this point makes it more likely that the scribe had received instructions of some kind to include the tale in this position since he could quite easily have continued with L7 (MLP). The disruption in the decorative hierarchy with two decorated borders one after the other, first for CO and then TG, suggests that the inclusion of the tale at this point was not a natural incorporation. The problem then is to decide whether or not it was an authorial directive or a scribal decision.

The fact that TG does not appear in the 'better' manuscripts convinced scholars that the scribes of the *c* and *d* manuscripts supplemented the unfinished CO with something they had to hand. It seems to me inherently unlikely that the scribes would feel compelled to supplement an unfinished tale since they felt no such compunction about SQ which was always left unfinished and never supplemented. It is possible therefore that Chaucer had a definite plan to use TG perhaps in a different position. Since some scribes obviously had the impression that TG was written as the tale of the Cook, it might be fruitful to consider this as a possibility. If some parts of Cp belong to an early phase of copying and revising, as evidence in GP would tend to suggest, then it is possible that TG belongs to an earlier period of preparation, perhaps rejected by Chaucer as he developed his poem. More light may be shed on the matter when the evidence of Ha4 is considered.

4.10.3. Fragments II and V (Groups B¹ and F¹)

It would appear that when this part of Cp was copied, the sequence TG-ML was approved, since the presence of the regular vellum throughout quire 10 suggests a regular copying procedure.

The presence of an irregular six-leaved quire (11) spells difficulties for Scribe D. The two outside leaves of this quire have been replaced, a situation which may be explained if we compare the text with Hg at this point. The ink change at ML line 826 in Hg corresponds with the text on fol. 84r in Cp. If fols. 84 and 85 in quire 11 of Cp had to be recopied on different vellum, presumably for a reason similar to the one which prompted the ink-change in Hg, then not only fols. 84 and 85 would be substitutions but also fols. 80 and 81, the conjoints at the beginning of the quire. The first two folios of quire 12 are also of thicker vellum and they too correspond with text in Hg in a different shade of ink. It is impossible to say what may have caused the problem with the text, but if we take into consideration the number of changes in the remainder of the manuscript it is possible to suggest that we are looking at some revision or rewriting of the text of ML at a very early stage.

ML ends on fol. 90r with an explicit alongside the last line of text. L8, MLEndlink follows immediately and begins with a two-line champe suitable for a linking passage. The inclusion of the Endlink presents no visible problems. However, the erasure beneath 'Esquier heer' suggests that soon after this link was copied, there was a change of plan. The link must first have been copied with the name of a different pilgrim, perhaps Wife of Bath, in the place now occupied by Esquier. It could not have been too long before the decision was taken to taken to change the name of the pilgrim to Squire, since SQ in Cp was prepared in the same time-frame as the first tales, displaying the same characteristics

in its codicological make-up. As will be seen when Ha4 is examined, Scribe D also prepared the tales from GP-SQ in the same time-slot for that manuscript, although SQ was later moved to a position further on in the order. The Hg scribe also assembled the tales ML-SQ, so one could assume that this was an early decision, perhaps taken when WB was removed by Chaucer to rewrite the opening of her prologue and to develop WB-FR-SU. The fact that WB-SU is a distinct unit in all four manuscripts, and in all four signals a change in the codicological structure of each one, is significant of the timing of their making.

Several layers of attention to the texts are visible in Cp which unite the preparation of the tales from MI-SQ: the use of chalk instructions in a large unstructured hand for 'Prolog', at the opening of L2 (REP), L3 (COP), L7 (MLP) and L8 (MLEndlink); the scrawled notes in the same medium for the tales of MI, RE and SQ; and the marginal directions for divisions in KT and ML (never acted upon). All of these features suggest that these tales were assembled at the same time. The tales of the RE, CO, TG and ML are also linked by the designation 'fabula'.

From quires 3-13, for most of KT-SQ, and including stanza divisions in ML, paragraph marks are used as textual indicators suggesting that the single-line champe initials of GP and the beginning of KT was a form of decoration later superseded.

The use of different vellum in a number of specific places suggests that the scribe was manipulating portions of text which had already been copied, either supplementing parts of tales he did not have, or recopying certain folios to enable a change in the order. The scribe's work is of the highest quality and these alterations are achieved with the minimum of disruption, sufficient to disguise the actual alterations.

A further indication of manuscript alteration and transformation may be suspected from the presence or absence of chapter numbers. It makes no logical sense to include chapter numbers for some tales but not for others. The fact that the number 5 exists for ML and 7 for WBP but SQ is not numbered 6, suggests a late entry into that position by SQ. The chapter numbers may have more significance than has been supposed as will be seen in my discussion of Fragment VII (Group B^2).

4.10.4. Fragment III (Group D)

As in Hg, WB, FR and SU in Cp may have been copied as a group. The opening of WBP may have been subject to alteration which may link it with a time when SH, as told by WB, was removed, WBP was extended, and WB was given a different tale. There is no linking passage to connect WB with SQ and the half folio left blank after SQ was not used to begin WBP. This is not unusual, as space was left after SQ in both Hg and El. However,

since SQ must have used the first six folios of the quire, there would have been two folios available at the end for whichever tale was to follow. One of these, fol. 100, is the substituted folio with the opening of WBP. Why there needed to be a substitution at this point is unclear, as the last folio of the quire is of regular vellum and continues WBP. Perhaps the opening of the prologue was changed more than once which made a substitution necessary.

The missing folio at the beginning of quire 14 is also curious. The remnants of decoration left on the stub could be either from the frond of a champe or from a more substantial border for a tale. They appear to me to be more appropriate for a champe. This would then signal the beginning of WBP near to the top of the recto side of the missing folio. I can see no suitable beginning for a prologue in the missing lines, so one would have to assume that the missing folio did indeed contain a Wife's Prologue which was in some way different from the prologue she now has.

The added passages are not included in Cp but this is not surprising if we accept Manly's argument that they were added in a single later copy of WBP 'perhaps to meet the taste of some friend' (II: 193). He continues, 'This seems more in accord with the distribution of the passages and the relations of the MSS than the alternative supposition that Chaucer added the passages in his original' (II: 193-4).[36] Further evidence that WBP in Cp may be from an early version is the explicit to the prologue which occurs before 'The Frere Iowh' passage. The passage follows immediately with no problem in Cp, and is decorated with a champe initial. In Hg it begins with a Lombardic capital, which I have suggested may be significant of addition to, or alteration of, the text, and the explicit to the prologue in Hg comes at the end of this added passage rather than at the end of the prologue as in Cp.

The first appearance of running titles in red ink marks a change in the concept of presentation, perhaps under the influence of the preparation of Ha4 which begins using red titles at exactly the same tale. They certainly mark a separation point from the first tales in the time of their assembly. The more regularised rubrics also point to a change in the way in which the tales and their introductions were perceived. The indications for 'Prologue' are no longer confined to the margins but have been assimilated into the wording of the rubrics. However, the tales could still have been copied at an early stage but when rubrics were inserted, the shift in concept had taken place.

The lack of directions for either scribe or decorator suggests that these tales received different attention from the earlier tales and were copied at a different time. At the other end of this fragment, space may have been left after SU to await instructions about the tale to follow.

The missing first folio of quire 14 with its original decorated border was probably the beginning of WBP as it was first prepared. WB-FR-SU would then have been contained in a block of three quires of text very similar to that of Hg. The rewriting of the first folio of the tale caused Scribe D some problems. It is significant that the cladistic analysis of WBP done by Peter Robinson shows a huge number of variants in the first 40 lines in Cp. Robinson could not explain why there should be a concentration in those few lines, but was aware that the analysis for Cp was perhaps distorted as a result. I feel that this is an excellent example of the way in which an analysis of the codicology of a manuscript may help to inform textual analyses, since there is no way of knowing what the original text in Cp was before the substitution of vellum. It therefore defies analysis for this section.[37]

4.10.5. Fragments IV, V, VIII and VI (Groups E^a, E^b, F^b, G and C)

A summary of the possible changes in this section of the manuscript are as follows. It appears that CL has been moved to its present position. It did not originally follow on from SU and ME may not have followed CL. ME lacked the last 100 lines as did the original copying in Hg, but FK seems to have been already in place to follow ME, again, its position in Hg. FK ends on the first folio of quire 23, forty lines early because of the missing second folio in the quire. NU follows, beginning at line 37 and may have had its first folio removed to enable it to slot in after FK. In quire 24, CY follows without problem after NU and appears to have been placed deliberately. NU-CY may possibly be an earlier joining.

Several layers of work are visible in this section. The tales of CL, ME, FK and NU may already have been in existence and their present state in Cp, with missing initial folios, reflect a time when parts of each tale had to be recopied on substituted vellum to take account of the shifting position of the tales and the possible inclusion of further text. The correspondence between the first 240 lines of CL in Hg copied in a different ink, and the vellum substitution for the first 254 lines of CL in Cp, must be related.

The missing folio after fol. 144v where the Clerk's Envoy was begun but not finished, is a real indication of the problems faced by the Cp scribe. 22 lines of the Envoy are missing, and 7 lines for the Host stanza. If the scribe had had access to L15 (MEP) that would have accounted for another 32 lines. Add on to that the 48 lines missing at the beginning of ME and we see that there was no possibility that the scribe could have included everything.

In some places the Cp scribe experienced the same difficulties as the scribe of Hg. Much of the same information received by Adam Pinkhurst must have been transmitted to

Scribe D but whereas the Hg texts for many tales may have been freshly copied, perhaps from the author's own copytext, those of Scribe D may reflect the reuse of previously copied material and the state of the text at an earlier date. This is certainly true of the texts of CL, ME, FK and NU where the departure from the more polished state of the Hg texts suggests some revision by the author for Hg rather than mistakes made in their copying by Scribe D. The absence of chapter numbers for the tales in the central part of the manuscript, and the increased use of a substituted vellum suggests that in Cp, these tales were being reassembled in this order for the first time, a situation which suggests awareness of the Hg scribe's activities.

4.10.6. Fragments [VIII], VI and VII (Groups G, C and B²)

The vellum substitution to join CY to PH is the only occasion in this section where the thicker vellum is used and indicates a deliberate linking of two fragments. Because the vellum substitution has caused the recopying of the opening folio of PH it is not possible to determine whether or not this tale would have had a chapter number. The remainder of the tales in this group appear to have been assembled, though not necessarily copied, in more or less simultaneous succession.

PD, SH, TT and TM all have chapter numbers, although PR which follows SH, is lacking. It is significant that the last chapter number given to a tale before numbers resume again with PD, is for WBP. Several features of the codicology of Fragments VI and VII suggests preparation and assembly at the same time as MI, RE, TG, ML and the opening of WBP. This may be significant of an earlier phase of work on the manuscript, or perhaps of work done to adapt an earlier set of tales and absorb them into a growing collection. It would not be suprising to find that Chaucer worked on the assembly of different groups of tales as his work developed. He may have changed his plans constantly and the scribes may have been in the position of finding their work in frequent need of update.

PH may have had a position in an earlier collection. When it was decided to link CY to PH, some folios may have needed to be recopied. The manipulation of folios in quire 26 where PH joins PD may also represent work done to link two tales previously-copied but perhaps with adjustments necessary as the result of a more developed linking passage between the two tales, or an extension of PDP. PDPT definitely seem to have been conceived as a single unit as were the tales of MI and RE. It is possible that the late references in GP which refer to the tales of MI, RE and PD are significant of a group of tales to be worked on by Chaucer as he developed the Canterbury Tales. It would then not be surprising to find that they all shared similar treatment in copying.

It has been suggested that WB originally told the tale now allocated to SH and that MLEndlink is part of that original prologue introducing SH as told by WB. There is evidence in MLEndlink in Cp that 'Wif of Bathe' could have been the original reading rather than SQ. SQ now follows ML and has no chapter number. It is possible therefore that work was done on ML, WB, and Fragment VII (Group B²), at the same time that SH was removed to a place further on in the order. The chapter numbers may have been added at this time as part of a planning procedure. Perhaps related to all this is the fact that PR has no chapter number either, despite being sandwiched between SH as chapter 17 and TT as chapter 19. This may have some connection with the odd order to be found in Pw, a manuscript with a *d* order of tales, where SH-PR follow TG and precede ML. Such an arrangement could represent an earlier order. It is obvious that at some point the position of all these tales was under review and it seems more logical to suppose that the ordering arrived at in Cp, which mirrors Hg at this point, was an order sanctioned by Chaucer at this particular stage in the development of his plans.

PR begins on fol. 210v[38] and the tale is announced in the rubric, with 'Plog' as an afterthought on the same line. Again the original concept of prologue and tale as a single unit ties in the preparation of PR with tales such as MI and RE in the first fragment. Since there is evidence of an erased name next to the second line of the tale on fol. 211r, it is possible that PR also had a scrawled chalk reminder that this was the tale of the Prioress, further support for the suggestion that PR was prepared with the earlier tales. One further corroborative link is the 'Amen' which ends the tale on fol. 213v, also found after KT and TG.

The exemplar for MO available to Scribe D was an earlier version of the tale than that used by Scribe B when he copied Hg. There is no sign of the Adam stanza in the Hg copy which is curious given Adam's Pinkhurst's ability to obtain the latest versions. The deficiencies in the Cp exemplar, with missing lines and inadequate text divisions may have provided the spur for Adam to make a fresh copy. It is possible that the stanza existed on a separate leaf as an addition and that the original exemplar used by Scribe D had a note to that effect, although the leaf containing the extra stanza was missing when he made his copy of MO. The situation was resolved when El and Ha4 were copied since both include the stanza. The space left in Cp was never filled, an odd state of affairs, but which may be connected with the apparent haste with which the manuscript was completed.

The tales from PD-MO appear to have been assembled at much the same time although some of the tales such as PD, PR and TM may have existed as earlier copies

which were then incorporated into the continuous whole as linking passages were supplied and an order established.

4.10.7. Fragments VII, IX and X (Groups B^2, H and I)

The last part of Cp continues from MO with no apparent problem. All tales have chapter numbers but the substitute vellum used for the copying of NP may suggest that the tale was copied at a later date than the rest of Fragment VII.

MA may not have been the tale intended to follow NP as may be seen by a number of codicological irregularities. The explicit to NP and the incipit to MA were both intended to occupy a single line on fol. 256r. The rubric reads as follows:

here endeþ þe ſlonne p'stes tale ᴧ here folweþ þe ploge of þe mau

¢ ciples tale' 'C^m XXiij^m

There is no paraph to introduce the explicit, nor the incipit. However, the position of a flourished paraph in the middle of the word 'mau ¢ ciple' suggests that perhaps the incipit originally ended after 'þe prolog of þe' with the pilgrim's name added when the tale was copied. Further support for the idea of the later inclusion of MA may be drawn from the fact that there are no red running titles for MA or for the following PA. This perhaps sets the inclusion of these last two tales apart from the rest of the manuscript.

A similar situation occurs on fol. 261r where MA is followed by L37 (PAP). Neither explicit, incipit nor chapter number have received the finishing touches of flourished paraphs. Further, the following folio which would have had the opening text of PA is missing, a situation which was seen earlier in the manuscript where there might have been some kind of awkward transition between tales. It is possible therefore that just as in Hg, NP and MA were added in haste to give the collection some kind of finish.

<div align="center">Notes to Chapter 4</div>

[1] Tatlock's major contribution, 'The Canterbury Tales in 1400', written in 1935, contains not a single reference to Cp, despite his close acquaintance with Ha4, the sister manuscript.

[2] Notes made at the time of disbinding by Linda Lee the Librarian are available with the manuscript at Oxford, Corpus Christi College.

[3] See Brown (1940 and 1942), Benson (1981), and Cooper (1983 and 1997).

[4] Theft is usually suggested as the reason for the missing folios, however other reasons will be offered in the course of the Cp analysis.

[5] However, see Stubbs, E. ' "Here's One I Prepared Earlier". The work of Scribe D on Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 198.' RES (2006), forthcoming.

[6] For a comprehensive description of the script-style of Scribe D see Green (2000). Green applies her analysis of the hand of Scribe D to the changing time-scale in the production of the tales in Ha4. She analyses a type of script-style in Ha4 which unites the tales from the last part of KT as far as the end of ML and including SQ. She calls the overall aspect of this script variation, 'tight and controlled' and suggests that it is Scribe D's consistent script in the whole of Cp.

[7] See the section on illumination by Margaret Rickert in Manly and Rickert (1940 I: 568).

[8] Op. cit. 567-9.

[9] A.I.Doyle generously gave me access to an essay written in 1978 by the late J.J. Griffiths. The title of this essay is 'Some Aspects of the Production of MS Harley 7334'. Griffiths argues for the application of the illuminated initials in Ha4 as later than other features of that manuscript's decoration, citing suggestions made by D.H.Turner and M.B.Parkes. Whilst I do not necessarily agree that all the initials in Ha4 were later applications, Griffiths' assertion that 'later attempts to salvage something from the investment of time and presumably money, may be represented by what appears to be the later addition of initials...' clearly implies that the date of a manuscript's illumination may post-date its actual preparation by a considerable time.

[10] When found in other manuscripts, the chapters retain their Cp numbers despite occasionally being differently placed in the order.

[11] See Appendix 6 and 7: Quires 1-8.

[12] Hg, El and the *a* group of manuscripts leave CO in its unfinished state but manuscripts of the *c* and *d* affiliations supplement CO with TG. Until fairly recently it has been generally assumed (Manly, Dempster) that the order of tales in the *bcd* groups post-dates that of Hg, El and *a*, with TG as an intruder included by scribes to cover a hiatus in the smooth running of the tales. TG is considered to be a non-Chaucerian composition although it is present in no other collection except *The Canterbury Tales*. In Cp, TG may or may not have been included as an afterthought, as an examination of a substitution of vellum at this point may help to clarify.

[13] The Latin incipit occurs on the central bifolium of the second quire which I suggest may be a later insertion.

[14] The correspondence between the two manuscripts in the use of red ink led Manly and Rickert to argue for their retention in the same shop at the same time (I: 94-96). There may be other explanations as will become apparent.

[15] Cp and Ha4 appear to have a common ancestor in GP. However, the Ha4 copy is apparently independently derived from that ancestor and closer to the *ab* group and El (Manly and Rickert II: 87). Manly and Rickert suggest that this was not a final copy but rather, 'a fair copy, representing.....with some slight scribal errors....the stage of development the text had then reached, and intended to serve as the basis for further work' (II: 95).

[16] See Pearsall's suggestions (1985: 52) where he tentatively assigns a date of 1387 for the first work on GP but cites the ideas of Hammond, Nevo and Owen for additions to GP as Chaucer developed his plans. Pearsall also considers the possibility that GP could have been written late.

[17] Such flexibility could mean that the scribe could begin the copying of tales in an agreed order. However, he may not necessarily have received endings of tales or linking passages. The codicological irregularities between GP and KT which occur on the central bifolium suggest a delay before the transitional passages were copied. A central bifolium is easy enough to replace if things go awry. In Cp, both KT and RE end on the first leaf of a quire. If the position of the tale which originally followed were to be changed, it would require much less work to recopy the outside bifolium to accommodate the change in order. This procedure is clearly visible in Hg, particularly in Section IV.

[18] See Appendix 6 and 7: Quires 8-10.

[19] See Appendix 6 and 7: Quires 10-13.

[20] In terms of the timing of the Cp 'alterations', it is worth noting that they frequently seem to have been achieved as a result of access to the thinking behind the preparation of both Hg and El.

[21] See Jones (1925). Jones argues most convincingly that MLEndlink and the first 193 lines of WBP were part of an original WBP when it preceded what is now SH. He believes that when Chaucer expanded the character of WB and gave her a different tale, he separated off the lines which now form MLEndlink to use as a prologue for another pilgrim. Both SU and SQ were tried but as the groups D and E/F developed, Chaucer removed SU and positioned that tale after FR. We may be able to see some of this work in progress in the early manuscripts since the Cp reading is 'Squire' and Ha4 has 'Summoner'. Most scholars accept that MLEndlink is eminently suitable as a Shipman's prologue but do not necessarily agree that SH was originally the tale told by WB.

[22] This observation is normally associated with Pratt (1951), but is to be found in Jones's article cited above at 524-5, n. 29.

[23] See Appendix 6 and 7: Quires 13-17.

[24] See Jones's argument outlined in note 21.

[25] See Appendix 6 and 7: Quires 17-25.

[26] The WB stanza seems to have been added to the end of CL when the order was in a state of flux and WB was set to precede CL.

[27] Lines 439-440, and 483-488 for example, are extended descriptive passages.

[28] See Appendix 6 and 7: Quires 25 -31.

[29] The C.C.C. Library report contains diagrams of the restoration done to quire 26. Before restoration, fols. 194, 195 and 198, 199 were originally singletons tipped to consecutive leaves. They are now joined by repair parchment. The Manly and Rickert description is now also out of date because of the re-foliation of the manuscript.

[30] Pearsall is not convinced by Manly and Rickert's argument about the development of this link (1985: 16). However, the peculiarities of the situation in Cp suggest specific attention to this area of text at some stage in the development of the *Tales* and might warrant further examination.

[31] This suggests incorporation of the instruction at a time when tales were being assigned prologues.

[32] It is interesting to note in this context that the chapter numbers for RE, TM and MO are preceded by decorated paragraph marks and for this reason look as though they belong to a more settled period of assembly and decoration than the other chapter numbers. Once again there may be evidence to be gleaned from the way in which the chapter numbers were inserted which may betray different periods of activity on these tales.

[33] In the PW manuscript, SH-PR precede TG.

[34] See Appendix 6 and 7: Quires 31-35.

[35] Blake makes this observation (2004) but also suggests that the note may have been instigated by Chaucer himself who may have been anxious to dissociate himself from authorship of the piece.

[36] This of course contradicts Robinson's hypothesis that Chaucer removed the passages when he reassigned her original tale to the Shipman and rewrote some of her prologue (Blake and Robinson 1997: 69-132).

[37] Robinson could find no explanation for the fact that other manuscripts related to Cp had better texts than Cp for the first forty lines of WBP. He therefore developed the theory of 'variant drift' whereby later manuscripts corrected back to the original. It would seem therefore that 'variant drift' could be explained if manuscript alteration evidenced by vellum substitution is taken into account.

[38] Seymour suggests 211v, but it is in fact 210v.

5. Codicological Description of London British Library, MS Harley 7334:
Harley 4 [Ha4]

"Interesting as Ha4 is, it is never authoritative." (Manly and Rickert 1940 I: 222)

5.1. Foreword

The Ha4 manuscript is an enigma. In the nineteenth century most editors considered it to be the most authoritative of all manuscripts although its textual variants were frequently puzzling. In 1909, J.S.P. Tatlock analysed the variant readings in an attempt to establish whether they were the result of authorial intervention or scribal meddling. Tatlock was baffled as to why three quarters of his considered variants occurred in the first third of the manuscript and also in half of SQ (which appeared later in Ha4), particularly those variants where there appeared to be emendation of the 9-syllable line (Tatlock 1909:11-13). No attempt had been made in Tatlock's time to relate the textual findings to those of the manuscript's codicology but need to be borne in mind in the description which follows.

Manly and Rickert provided a basic description of the physical features but could not provide the detailed codicological analysis which Ha4 requires to make any sense of its complicated structure. Doyle and Parkes saw Ha4 as "yet another but unfinished attempt to impose an organisation on Chaucer's text" They continue,

"Since different interpretations occur in copies produced by the same scribes it seems more likely that the scribes were following different instructions or different exemplars whilst executing different commissions than that they were responsible for the different interpretations themselves" (1978: 194).

5.2. General Codicological Description of Ha4

5.2.1. Contents

London British Library, MS Harley 7334 contains only the *Canterbury Tales*. Ha4 has none of the added passages in WBP. L14 (Host stanza) is missing. A lost quire has removed the last 56 lines of SQ, L20 (if it was ever present), and the first 515 lines of FK. NPEndlink is also missing. In MO, the Adam stanza is present and the Modern Instances are in the middle, as in Cp. Ha4 includes both MLEndlink, TG, and RT.

5.2.2. Material and Quiring

Ha4 is a volume of 286 folios of heavy vellum. The manuscript is tightly bound in a nineteenth century binding of brown leather with the Harley arms in gold on front and back. Gold tooling is a feature of the borders and spine. In general the condition of the manuscript is very good and it appears to have been little used and well cared for.

Some illuminations have been smudged and some running titles offset which may suggest that the manuscript was hastily assembled in its final stages. Hasty assembly may also be the reason for the missing quire after fol. 156.

The vellum has been trimmed for rebinding and this has partially removed some marginal directions and some signatures. Some folios show deterioration of ink though attempts have been made to re-ink certain passages.

There are 37 quires (Appendix 11 and 12: 1-37) all of 8 leaves except quires 9^6, 19^6 and 37^2. Quire 9 was intentionally a quire of six leaves and marks a text boundary where TG was added. Quire 19, also of six leaves, accommodates the end of ME followed by a linking passage on the final verso which appears to have been added in a slightly different shade of ink after the tale had been completed. Manly and Rickert record that this quire is "sewed between iv and v" (I: 219). A missing quire, which should have followed quire 20, has not been numbered in the list of quires in Appendix 12. Manly and Rickert number this missing quire as 21, which causes some confusion. The text ends on the second recto of quire 37.

Catchwords, mainly in the scribal hand, are regular in every quire except quire 9, the quire containing the text of Gamelyn. Two catchwords are inserted in red ink which provides information on the timing of their insertion. Interestingly, a catchword is present in the irregular quire 19 (ME). For a list of the catchwords see Appendix 15.

5.2.3. Scribe

The scribe of Ha4 is the scribe of Cp. A study of the hand of Ha4 has been made recently by Nichole Green in an Oxford Master's Thesis. In it she notes three discernible script styles, with a fourth used by the scribe mainly for corrections. She believes that the different styles may help to isolate at least four different stages of production in the manuscript. It would be of great significance if it could be shown that other features of the copying and assembly of Ha4 corroborate these findings. Green also suggests that the style used for the first phase of copying in Ha4 corresponds with the style used for the whole of Cp.

Manly and Rickert suggest the presence of at least two supervisors involved in the preparation of Ha4 (I: 220).

5.2.4. Page Size, Format and Ink Colour

The folios measure 24 x 35.5 cm. The writing space is not always completely consistent but generally for the verse measures 13.5 x 23cm and for the prose 17 x 23cm.

The ruling of the folios is in brown ink, double-ruled at top and bottom for the first and last lines of text. This allows for 38 lines of text per folio for both verse and prose. Ruling for running titles is confined to fols. 13r-39v (KT), where at some time during the preparation of the manuscript, someone began a system of elaborate titles. This soon petered out. Pricking for ruling is visible on some folios.

The entire manuscript is copied in an ink of a fairly uniform dark brown. There are occasional discernible colour differences which signify the addition of a word, phrase or short passage at a different stage of production, but there are no obvious colour differences for longer sections, as in Hg. This does not mean that the entire manuscript was prepared at the same time. It reflects rather a consistent formula for the preparation of the ink and therefore perhaps, a consistent environment for the production?

The degradation of ink on some folios may be indicative of a number of things. It could suggest an earlier preparation time for portions of the manuscript; the use of that portion by other scribes as a copytext with the resulting wear and tear and the attempt in some cases to overwrite words which had become particularly worn; the inadequate storage of copied text (cf Hg's rats); the re-use of an earlier collection of some tales.

The use of red ink is significant in Ha4 as it isolates the treatment of the manuscript in selected quires. This provides vital information for the order of preparation of the tales. Where red ink is used, it supplies some rubrics, most running titles, some glosses and two catchwords. The presence or absence of red ink divides the preparation of the manuscript into at least three separate time periods.

5.2.5. Running Titles

More than six hands were involved in adding the running titles to some folios. One of these hands may also be the hand of the scribe (Doyle and Parkes 1978: 194). Four hands may be contemporary with the text and could be significant of different periods in the preparation of the manuscript. Analysis of their form and distribution, allied with other aspects of the codicology, could be indicators of the difficulties which confronted the scribe as he assembled the tales, and provide information about sections of text prepared in temporal proximity. The distribution of the participation of three of the most significant hands may be seen in Appendix 11 which again is an Appendix intended to supply merely

a swift overview of the whole manuscript. Appendix 12: 1-37 shows analysis of the hands quire by quire.

My own examination of the running titles suggests the possible presence of the supervisor or scribe of the Hengwrt/Ellesmere manuscripts at some time during the assembly of Ha4.[1] (Plate 21)

5.2.6. Decorative Features

The illumination of Ha4 and the differences in features of its decoration, including champe initials and decorated paragraph marks, may again be used to divide the manuscript into several units of production.[2] Disparities between units may reflect time differences in their preparation, a change of concept in the presentation of the tales, or difficulties experienced by the scribe or the directors in assembling the material. Units which have the same decorative structure may be assumed to have been produced in temporal proximity and where that decorative structure coincides with other supratextual features may help to establish a time-line of development.

The whole vinet border on the first folio of the manuscript is the only four-sided border in the manuscript. In colour and style it is different from all others and may have been painted by a master illuminator.[3] Three-quarter borders are present elsewhere and used for the beginning of tales, with several exceptions which will be described below. Ornamental capitals of varying heights are attached to the border at the opening of tales. Champe initials of three lines in height, with flourishing extending into the border, are usually used for the opening of prologues. The same champe initials of two lines in height are used for linking passages and for the descriptions of each pilgrim in GP. This perhaps represents an advance on the thinking for the decorative hierarchy of Cp. Again there are exceptions to this which will be covered in the analysis by unit.

Litterae notabiliores of one or two lines define stanzaic divisions and some rubrics, and champes and decorated paragraph marks are used for textual divisions. Decorated paragraph marks are also used before some rubrics and glosses.

5.2.7. Order of Tales

The order of Ha4 is usually classed as unique and this terminology is reproduced by scholars using the Manly and Rickert description (I: 221). It is listed in Manly and Rickert's charts which follow page 494 in the second volume, as anomalous along with Hg. The description 'unique' is misleading, as apart from the inclusion of TG and MLEndlink, and the Cp position of Group G (2NU-CY), the order is the same as El. The order is: A X B^1 D E F G C B^2 H I R

GP KT L1 MI L2 RE L3 CO TG

L7 ML

WBP WBT L10 FR L11 SU

CL L13 L15 ME L17 SQ

(missing quire)

FK 2NU L33 CY

PH L21 PD SH L24 PR L25 TT L28 TM

L29 MK L30 NP L36 MA L37 PA RT

5.2.8. Date

The dating of Ha4 is given as approximately 1410 by Manly and Rickert (I: 220) but the evidence for this could be unreliable. The date when Ha4 was copied is of the greatest importance for our understanding of the development of Chaucer's text and is perhaps a classic example of how treacherous it can be to assign a single date to a manuscript, since the codicological evidence suggests that the copying of the different sections and the finishing processes may have stretched over a considerable period.

5.2.9. Rubrics and Internal Tale Divisions

These are extremely complicated in Ha4 and are contained in a separate appendix (Appendix 13). They vary in ink colour, spacing, language and form, all of which when analysed, give information on the time-line of production.

5.2.10. General Observations

Ha4 was copied and assembled in stages, with groups of tales visibly prepared at the same time. The chronology of preparation does not necessarily accord with the present order of tales in the manuscript and single tales or groups assembled early may now occupy a different position or have been split up in a reordering process. A number of production milestones are identifiable by analysis of codicological features such as rubrication, use of red ink, script, presence or absence of running titles and mise-en-page. In isolation, such features cannot prove the production of tales in temporal proximity, but when more than one anomalous feature occurs in the same quire or group of quires, and when textual analysis supports the codicology, then the preparation of Ha4 in a series of stages is hard to refute.

Ha4 has a superficial air of overall completeness. Only three of the thirty seven quires have fewer than the regular eight leaves. Illumination of folios bearing the opening text of tales is complete but for one exception. Lesser structural divisions of the text defined by two- and three-line champes are also almost all present. However, below that major hierarchy, other features of the manuscript's codicology are variously achieved and provide a means of establishing groups of tales prepared together.

On superficial examination, the making of Ha4 was achieved in a number of stages defined by the presence or absence of red ink. All quires where red ink is absent display other features which suggest a copying and perhaps storing apart from the quires where it is present. However, the split is not a simple one since certain quires which include the use of red ink in running titles may also have been prepared in a different time segment. These are quires where the use of red ink may not be in the hand of the main scribe (Appendix 12: Quires 24-29)

At this stage it is not possible to say which of those units represents the first work to be done on Ha4. Within each unit there are observable difficulties which suggest a scribe in the process of crafting the collection piece by piece. Within Fragments I, II, and V for example, (GP, KT, MI, RE, CO, TG, ML, SQ) the scribe had certain problems at the junction of GP and KT, in KT itself, where L2 joins RE and RE links with L3, where CO ends eight lines early and is supplemented by TG, at the end of TG, at the end of ML, where SQ follows ME, and at the end of what remains of SQ. Such a catalogue of difficulties does not encourage the idea that the scribe was copying from a continuous and stable set of exemplars, or that he was clear in his own mind when he began copying, how he was to link together the material with which he had been supplied. The question which must then be addressed is why Scribe D did not have a clear idea of what he was doing? An examination of each section may clarify the situation.

5.3. Fragment I (Group A)[4]

5.3.1. General Observations

- The vellum is consistent throughout the quires. The order of tales from GP-CO is regular. The first real fault-line in the assembly of tales occurs at the end of the unfinished CO with the inclusion of TG. The first eight quires with the tales GP-TG, fols. 1r-64v are regularly of eight leaves.
- The ink colour is consistent.
- All features such as running titles where present, explicits, incipits and glosses are achieved in the ink of the text. There is no sign of red ink anywhere in this section.

- Running titles in this section are in a number of different hands (Appendix 12: 1-8).

- Ornamental capitals attached to three-quarter borders decorate the opening folios of KT, MI, RE, and CO. An additional decorated border with attached capital introduces L3 (COP). However, within the established decorative hierarchy of the manuscript, a champe initial would be expected.

- Decorated champe initials, usually of three lines in height, provide the distinctive markers for the opening of prologues and linking passages as well as indicating textual divisions. Similar initials two lines in height are also used to distinguish each pilgrim in GP and unlike in Cp, they were planned. Decorated paragraph marks for textual divisions are used infrequently.

- Alternate gold and penwork initial capitals of a single line in height mark the explicits between KT-L1, L1-MI, MI-L2 suggesting a simultaneous concept and assembly of at least quires 5, 6 and 7. Between L2 and RE, a two-line decorated capital breaks the pattern and explicits and incipits between subsequent tales are defined by paragraph marks rather than decorated initials.

- The scribe copied 38 lines to each regular folio. Between KT-L1, L1-MI, MI-L2 a single line was left to accommodate explicits and incipits providing further confirmation of a unity of vision in these three quires and preparation in the same time period. It is not clear when these rubrics were included, but they were not originally planned and the text of the rubrics occasionally appears crowded, with some words spilling over alongside the text of the following line. All three sets of rubrics follow the same formula and are copied in the ink of the text. The penflourished initial 'H' for the 'HEre endeth' of the explicit is in each case followed by an upper case 'E'. The incipit is preceded by a decorated paragraph mark. The pen-flourished initials were completed before the addition of the champe initials, illuminated letters and decorated borders, as in each example cited above, the lower portion of each 'H' is obscured by the later decoration.

5.3.2. Description

Ha4 opens with a glorious, heavily-decorated four-sided border on the first folio. The pilgrim descriptions are alerted by two-line champe initials with flourishing extending into the border. There appear to be no anomalies in the copying of GP until the top of fol. 12r where the Host encourages the pilgrims to draw lots to see who will tell the first tale. This passage, beginning at the top of the folio at Fragment I 837, is introduced with a small champe initial one line in height. (Plate 12) All other divisions in GP are marked with two-line champes, all regularly decorated. The passage may have been a late addition on this central bifolium with an initial completed at a different time from the rest of the decoration. There are several other anomalies in these first few quires which give a sense of the scribe adapting his material after insufficient instruction, or perhaps the first inclusion or recopying of specific sections.

Folio 12r is the first leaf of the middle bifolium of quire 2. There is no incipit for KT and a blank line is left between the end of GP and the opening of KT. 'Knightes tale' in dark ink and a tiny script, is written at the right-hand extremity of the text box frame, probably in the hand of the scribe, but the ink instruction was never incorporated. (Plate 12)

KT opens with a three-line champe initial for the 'W' of the first line, 'Whilom as olde stories tellen us', and this passage is thus treated as a prologue according to the decorative hierarchy of the manuscript. No rubric to indicate it as such was ever included.[5] The Latin incipit for KT, found in other manuscripts, is also missing.[6] On fol. 12v, at the end of the prologue and the beginning of the tale proper, the same situation occurs, a blank line being left between the two parts. It is difficult to envisage a scribe who completed the rubrics between subsequent tales neglecting to include the rubrics between the first two parts unless that part of the manuscript was not present when rubrication was carried out. This is eminently possible as there is evidence in the codicology, supported by the textual analyses of Manly and Rickert that KT in Ha4 was copied in sections and the first part of the tale may have been recopied, edited and added for some reason at a later date.

Elaborate running titles in a display script in black ink begin at fol. 13r (KT) in the second quire and continue in similar fashion through half of quire three. (Plate 13) From fol. 21v the titles change and become less elaborate, continuing in this way until half way through quire 4, fol. 28r. Thereafter there are no more running titles until the end of quire 5 (end KT) where titles begin again in an entirely different hand and act more as a sporadic marker for the folios than elaborated titles.

The information provided by an analysis of all the running titles in Ha4, written in at least six different hands, shows the way in which portions of text were dealt with. They

allow for division of the manuscript into specific areas of activity. In KT, such an analysis is particularly fruitful since the provision of titles and the method of their application divides the tale into sections which generally agree with the analyses of textual divisions provided by Manly and Rickert.[7]

To clarify a complicated situation; in the second quire on fol. 14r, around line 993 where the elaborate titles begin, Manly and Rickert note that the Ha4 scribe begins to edit the text of KT using a draft associated with El. Fol. 14r follows the central bifolium which I suggest may have been a later insert linking KT with GP. The Ha4 scribe continues to correct from the El draft until c. line 1602 (fol. 22r), precisely the place where the elaborate running titles undergo a simplification (II: 133). After line 2148 (fol. 29r), the occurrence of editorial readings is apparently much less frequent. Folio 29r is where the simpler running titles cease altogether and may represent yet another change in the exemplar used by the scribe. Contact with the El exemplar for corrections occurs again, "certainly from 2963" (II: 104), which is found on fol. 39v, and it is on fol. 40r that the hand of a director or supervisor or possibly even the informal hand of the scribe himself, puts in the first of the running titles which continue through the remainder of the quires and tales in this section.[8] From these observations it would seem that the Ha4 scribe copied KT in at least four different time segments and had several exemplars for consultation.

Reference was made in the General Observations to the impression of the unified preparation of quires 5-7. A further feature which confirms this suggestion is the appearance almost at the end of KT (quire 5, fol. 40r) of Hand 2 who begins to add running titles to some folios. (Plate 14) The hand is distinctive and its presence will have significance later in the manuscript for an assessment of the attention to other specific groups of tales. Running titles, usually the name of the pilgrim, are included in this hand at the junction of tales and on one or more folios within the tale itself, the number of titles being dependant on the length of tale. A title is almost always included on a folio close to the end of a tale and the new tale is also signalled by a running title, sometimes using the genitive case of the pilgrim's name with 'tale' attached.[9]

An 'Amē' concludes KT on fol. 41v, and an explicit and incipit in English follow on the next line, 'HEre endeþ þe knightes tale ¢ And þus byggyneþ þe ploge of'... . L1 (MIP), begins with a three-line champe letter immediately and the first line, 'Whan þat þe knight had þus his tale I told ¢ þe myllere' is followed by the end of the incipit (Appendix 13).

Several features are observable here which may be significant for the way in which the first few tales were copied. The explicit to KT must have been in place earlier

than the incipit which follows. The 'H' of 'HEre' is a decorated letter of one line in height. Part of its decoration is obscured by the champe letter which opens the prologue. The name of the Miller follows the first line of text and can only have been included after the line was written. There may have been a pause in the copying at this point or a wait associated with acquiring L1 (MIP). Further confirmation of this delay may come from the running title 'The Knight' which appears at the top of fol. 42r, on which the only text is that of L1. The title is in the same director's hand whose first appearance was at the end of the previous quire. This might indicate that he was pre-heading the folios to give the scribe some sense of the text-run. It seems hardly likely that he would head this folio with the name of the previous pilgrim unless the folio was blank, awaiting text, and the fact that he over-estimated the folios required for the remaining part of KT suggests that he was not exactly certain how long it would be. The Hg scribe also experienced some difficulty with the end of KT and the opening of L1, as the slight codicological irregularities in that manuscript reveal. The Ha4 scribe appears to have incorporated some of the El variants into his copy of L1 (MIP), so may have paused to acquire a fresh copy. It is also notable that when copying this section in Ha4, the scribe is aware that prologue and tale are separable units rather than the single-unit treatment achieved in Cp.

The rubrics at the end of L1, 'HEre endeþ þe ploge of þe Miller ¢ And bygynneth his tale' continue the pattern begun with the previous explicit and incipit. The director who began his work at the end of KT has included running titles 'The Mellerf tale' on the opening folio of the tale itself and 'The Meller' in the middle and at the end of the tale. (Plate 14) Rubrics continue on a single line in the same fashion between MI and L2 (REP) but the two lines left for the rubrics between L2 and RE may suggest a slight delay before either the tale or the prologue was available. This again might correspond with a similar hesitation in both Hg and Cp at this point.

In Ha4, at the end of RE on fol. 57v, there is evidence of an hiatus in preparation. The explicit to RE is copied adjacent to the text of the last line of the tale. A blank line is then left which has no incipit for L3 (COP) which follows. A three-line ornamental capital and a three-quarter border on this folio signal the beginning of a tale in the decorative hierarchy, yet it is the Cook's prologue. A three-sided border for a prologue may signal some confusion about the status of what exactly was being copied as a champe initial would be the expected decoration. On the following folio, 58r, CO proper begins with another 4-line ornamental capital attached to a border. No space is left for an explicit or incipit.

On 58v, CO finishes eight lines early and line 4414 is copied alongside 4413 to finish the couplet. The scribe used his allotted 38 lines for the folio and squeezed the 39th

line adjacent to the 38th. (Plate 15) This odd occurrence at a fault-line in the order of tales needs adequate explanation. It is possible that originally, CO continued onto the third folio of the quire and ended as in the other manuscripts at 4422. The rest of the quire was then left until a decision was taken about what was to follow.[10]

When the direction came to supplement CO with TG, which may already have been copied as a separate tale, the scribe removed the third folio with the remainder of CO, copied the second line of the couplet against the final line on the previous folio, and then inserted four folios (59r-62v) of an already copied TG. He then had to fill in with TG on the spare folios 63r-64v which are the conjoint leaves of 57 and 58 carrying the text of the end of RE and the link RE-CO (Appendix 11). This is precisely what happened in Cp where RE was copied onto two folios of substituted vellum at the beginning of the quire, and TG occupied the two folios at the end.

That there was anyway some doubt about the order at this point may be connected with the scribe's treatment of the explicit to RE. Unlike the links between the previous tales, he elected to write the explicit on the same line as the last line of RE. There is no incipit for any tale which might follow, so when RE was copied, there was obviously the possibility that the position of CO was not secure.

It is intriguing to note that Manly and Rickert suggest that in Ad3 and Ha5, the only variants in RE caused by contamination are also shared with Ha4. In CO, they see "slight evidence for a common ancestor" for Ad3 and Ha4 (II: 166). Ad3 is the only manuscript where L3 and CO have been moved to a position at the end of the manuscript after MA. In Ha5 there is no CO, and ML follows immediately after RE. The end of the manuscript is missing although it is highly likely that the tales would have been in the same order as in Ad3.[11] It is possible therefore that the Ha4 scribe was aware of certain changes that might be about to take place with regard to the position of CO.

5.4. Tale of Gamelyn[12]

5.4.1. General Observations

- A 5-line ornamental capital marks the opening of the tale on fol. 59r.
- Running titles in dark ink in Hand 2 are found on fols. 59r, 62r, 66r and 69r.
- The catchword at the end of quire 8 is not in the scribe's hand as in previous quires. There is no catchword at the end of quire 9.
- The use of both virgule and punctus to mark the caesura is unique to this tale in Ha4.
- Quire 9 is an irregular six-leaved quire.

5.4.2. Description

There is a note in the bottom margin of fol. 58v, 'Icy comécera le fable de Gamelyn' which may be in the scribe's hand or it could be that of a director. The use of the future tense could suggest either, that the decision to follow CO with TG was an unexpected departure from a previously conceived order, or, with emphasis on the 'will' it could mean that the scribes were reverting to a decision taken previously. This is possible if we take account of the argument concerning the position of CO in Ad3. Depending on the timing of the preparation of this part of the manuscript, TG may have been added here at a fairly late stage of the assembly, to bring some sort of conclusion to an unfinished tale.

TG begins at the top of fol. 59r and as suggested above may have been a tale which the scribe had in hand, inserted at this point when the decision was taken to supplement the unfinished CO. Its position is anomalous in that it is both intruder into this group of tales, yet part of the collection also. That the tale is an intrusion is indicated by a number of different criteria. On fol. 64v (quire 8) the catchword is not in the hand of the scribe, unlike the catchwords in the rest of this fragment. On 70v, (quire 9) the final leaf of an irregular six-leaf quire which has the remainder of the TG text, there is no catchword. TG has a further peculiarity. It is the only tale in the manuscript which makes use of both virgulae and punctus marks for the caesura. This must set the time of its copying apart from the other tales in this fragment. Whereas in Hg and El, the scribe makes constant use of virgulae, it is odd that the Ha4 scribe should supplement with the punctus in this tale only. I think it possible to assume therefore that the tale had been previously copied and came to the manuscript specifically to be included as the tale of the Cook. Thus, the situation with the catchwords and the inclusion of virgulae and punctus marks, isolates TG from the tales both before and after. Further, a hand which has not been seen before and is seen again only sporadically in ML, supplies running titles usually spelt 'The kookꝑ' on versos and 'Taɫ' on rectos throughout TG. These titles are present from fol. 58v, which has the last of the traditional lines of CO, and were perhaps supplied in an effort to establish TG as the Cook's Tale. (Appendix 12: 8and 9)

However, TG becomes an integrated part of the whole fragment by virtue of a series of other running titles which are provided by Hand 2, who began heading the tales at the end of KT. The opening folio of TG is headed 'The gamelyne', fols. 62r and 66r have 'The ʒong gamelyñ' and fol. 69r 'The ʒonge gamelyñ' in this hand.

The inclusion of TG then, would appear to be both deliberate but at the same time contrived. This may be related to my argument at the end of the previous section where I

suggest the possibility that TG was a tale which Chaucer may have wished to include, perhaps after revision, as the tale of the Cook, but in a later position in the order as it appears in Ad3. In Ad3, CY is also moved to a later position, to some extent carrying out the changed order of El.[13] It is possible therefore that what we are witnessing in Ha4 is the compromise solution whereby TG is made use of, but not necessarily in the form or in the position which Chaucer would have chosen had he lived.

It is intriguing that in Ha4 at fol. 251r (MA-L37), where CO might have been placed if the thinking behind the Ad3 exemplar had been carried out, there are several irregularities of presentation and an obvious hesitation on the part of the scribe after the third line of the link.[14] Scribe D may have hesitated at this point, unsure whether or not to implement the changes which may have been indicated in the exemplar to which he appears to have had access, used later for Ad3.

5.5. Fragment II (Group B^1)[15]

5.5.1. General Observations

- MLHeadlink, MLP, MLT and MLEndlink are conveniently contained in two quires (quires 11-12) running from fol. 71r-86v and could easily have been a separable unit.

- ML was prepared within the same time frame as the first fragment with no running titles in red ink, and despite the complication of several different hands supplying titles in black ink, the hand of the supervisor who began work at the end of KT is still distinguishable on several folios uniting the tales in the same supervisory period.

- Small decorated single-line letters define the stanza divisions in ML, so although still continuously copied with no space between stanzas as in Cp, the feeling is of a more definite attempt at presentation than in the latter manuscript.

- The single-line letters in ML are in the same style as the solitary single-line letter seen on fol. 12r, the inserted leaf with the final lines of GP-KT, and this may tie in the insertion of that leaf with the copying and decoration of ML.

- As in more or less the whole of Fragment I, the text of Ha4 in ML is once more allied with the *b* group, which although on the same line of descent as the Cp copy, may have been the result of a fresh copy made from the Cp archetype with the benefit of new thinking.[16]

5.5.2. Description

As with the other quires in Fragment I there are no running titles in red ink apart from on the final folio, 86v (quire 11, WBP). MLP opens with a three-line champe initial and continues through to the tale itself with no space left between prologue and tale and '¢ Explici' *plog⁹ incipit fabula'* sharing the last line of L7, and therefore probably added later. For convenience of space perhaps, the rubrics are in Latin, the first time that a Latin rubric is used. The tale is labelled *'fabula'* and opens with a five-line ornamental capital and a three-quarter border. The fact that the prologue and tale are continuously copied and labelled *'fabula'* is reminiscent of the preparation of MI, RE and CO in Cp.

Hand 2 has added 'The man a Lawe' as running titles to fols. 71r, 76r, 80r and 84r. On fol. 71r, the title is written in the right margin about three lines from the top of the folio. Since this folio has a three-quarter decorated border it seems logical to suppose that the border was in place before the title was added. This seems to be an oddity but important to note as it may have a bearing on the reason why and when running titles were added to this first section. Could the tale have been in service as told by a different pilgrim? Is that the reason that running titles needed to be inserted to remind those assembling the manuscript that this was now ML?

The last folio of quire 11, fol. 86r and v, is interesting for a number of reasons. As with Cp, it retains the remnants of MLEndlink. (Plate 16) On fol. 86r, at the end of what we consider to be ML, there is a two-line champe as used for a linking passage which introduces L8, the Endlink, but there is no explicit to ML or incipit for the link and the linking passage is not presented in its entirety. Line 1175 is missing and a blank space is left. The next pilgrim called to speak is the Summoner rather than the Squire of Cp. The word 'heer', incorporated into Cp after the word 'Esquier', is in a different position in the line. On the next folio, 86v, lines 1182-1186 of the link are also missing and the link ends after the first line of a couplet which is appropriate for the WB, 'my ioly body schal a tale telle'.[17] The explicit to ML follows this line. It is on its own line and is followed by the incipit to WBP, also on its own line.

Several observations may be made at this point. Some element of hesitation and mind-changing are apparent. The scribe appears to have begun the link in good faith, copied the first twelve lines and then paused. When he resumed, he left a blank line for some reason, perhaps to include a more appropriate line which would tie in the following tale more meaningfully. At this stage the next pilgrim would seem to be the Summoner. Whether there was further hesitation before he copied the next six lines of the link is difficult to tell, but after he had copied the explicit to ML there is a definite pause in the

copying. From this point on and for the next eight quires, the presentation of the tales changes; according to Green, the script also changes; there is the use of red ink for the first time in the manuscript, not only for running titles but also for incipits and explicits which are spaced each on their own line. A new phase in the production of the manuscript has begun with a different concept of ordinatio.

5.6. Fragments III and IV (Groups D, E¹ and E²)[18]

5.6.1. General Observations

- Unlike Cp in which SQ follows ML, Ha4 has the El order in which WBP follows ML.

- ML fits conveniently into two quires and WBP begins on the final verso folio of quire 12.[19]

- The possible erasure of 'Wif of Bathe' in the Cp version of L8 and the vellum insertion for the opening of WBP suggests that ML-WBP may have been an earlier arrangement, superseded in Cp by the insertion of SQ, as in Hg. Yet this is an arrangement which cannot take into account the further development of Fragments IV and V (Groups E and F). At this stage in the investigation it is not clear which arrangement might have priority and why, but further examination of Ha4 and El might help to clarify the situation.

- Features of the codicology of quires 12-19 in Ha4 suggest that they were copied within the same time frame though not necessarily continuously, and they are united with the same concept of ordinatio, different from that of the first quires.

- The style and presence of running titles in red ink in the same style throughout is also a unifying factor on all but five folios in this section (fols. 127r, 127v, 131v, 133r, 145v).

- Explicits after linking passages and incipits to the following tales are regularly accommodated each on its own line in red ink as opposed to the brown ink of the text in the first section. The commencement of tales is indicated by ¢ Narrat, also in red, copied usually next to the text of the last line of the linking passage.

- Champe initials three lines in height regularly introduce each link acting as prologue, and ornamental capitals with three-sided borders begin the tales.

- Folios are almost always regularly of 38 lines. It is clear that the scribe was attempting to adhere to an orderly system of presentation and that the tales were assembled, if not all copied, as a block.

- A red catchword at the end of quire 16 suggests adjustment of material, a situation which is clearly visible in the following quire with the introduction of ME (Appendix 15).

- There are a number of exceptions to the codicological indicators listed above which are significant for the light they cast on the areas of difficulty for the scribe in his copying and assembly of these tales.

5.6.2. Description

The difficulties the scribe had when joining WBP to follow the MLEndlink have been described in the previous section. With the opening of WBP on fol. 86v, red ink is used for the first time in the manuscript. Compliant with the decorative scheme of the rest of the manuscript, the opening of WBP begins with a three-line champe on fol. 86v.

However, there is an odd occurrence in quire 12. On folio 89r, at line 193 of the prologue, there is an ornamental capital and three-quarter decorated border used in the decorative hierarchy only for the opening of a tale. The concept followed by the scribe suggests that following a prologue of 193 lines, he believed that the Wife's tale opened with the pre-planned five-line capital on fol. 89r. The copy of WBP in Ha4 is of a very early origin according to Manly and Rickert. They suggest the daring possibility that "it is just possible that it takes us back to that early time when Chaucer was still uncertain as to the tale he would assign to the Wife of Bath, and still intended SU to follow ML..." (1940 II: 194). On the evidence of the Ha4 text, it is possible that WBP has undergone some changes, perhaps addition of extra text, as Chaucer expanded his vision of WB. It is possible that in both Ha4 and in Cp we have an early copy of WBP which shows evidence of the process of alteration.

On fol. 97r, there is a discrepancy in the number of lines on the folio with 36 lines instead of 38. Lines 829-856 comprise 'The frere lough' passage. In Cp there is evidence that WBP ended at line 828 as the rubric indicates '℣ here endeþ þe ploge of þe gode wif of Bathe'. In Ha4, there is no explicit to the prologue but a marginal note suggests that it is actually the ending of the tale itself: '℣ here makith þe frere an intᵖretacōn of þe wyfes tale' (my emphasis); and lines 829-856 are treated as in El, as a commentary. Hg has a Lombardic capital at this point which, as was suggested, may have been significant of addition to the original tale as the trio WB-FR-SU were

developed. El has 'Biholde the wordes bitwene the Somonoᵣ and the ffrere' and decoratively treats the words as either a prologue or a linking passage. It is possible that the Ha4 scribe was influenced by the El approach to this passage but did not know either its exact length, or its status.[20]

Like ML, WBP and WBT again fit comfortably into a two-quire booklet. The linking passage between WBT and FR falls conveniently on the last folio of quire 13 and the first folio of quire 14. The tales of FR and SU follow regularly.

At fol. 116v, the prologue for CL begins with two lines left for the explicit to SU and the incipit for CL before the opening champe. There is evidence on both fols. 116v and 117r-118v that the transition from SU to CL was not effected seamlessly and therefore may have occurred at a time slightly apart from the assembly of WB-SU. Line 14 of CLP on fol. 116v appears to have been partially copied then left. When the scribe resumed copying, he left a space and repeated the word 'tale' before continuing with the rest of the prologue. The pause may be related to the beginning of the tale on the next recto. Whereas in the tales WB-SU no space was left between the end of the prologues and the beginning of the tales of those pilgrims, here there is a two-line space with Latin rubrics for explicit and incipit. The wording of these rubrics is still to be seen in the right margin in dark ink, left probably by the scribe himself, to remind him to fill in the two lines of space left for the purpose. This he did, but forgot to remove his notes. The use of Latin may tie in the original preparation (or existence in a completed tale sense) of CLPT with that of MLPT where Latin rubrics are also used. Division into parts in CL also carry either explicit or incipit in Latin and are executed in red ink.

The irregularity of the running titles for the opening folios of CL in quire 15 suggests that they were not added at the same time as those in the following quire where they are all regular (Appendix 12: quires 15-16). At the end of quire 15, the titles read 'The Clerk' on 116v, 'of Oxenford' on 117r, 'The Clerk' on 117v, 'Tale' on 118r, and 'The Clerk' on 118v. In the following quire, the titles all use the genitive case with 'The Clerkes' on the versos and 'Tale' on rectos and were probably headed at the same time. There is some evidence that the Ha4 exemplar for CL changes at around line 212 on the first folio of quire 16 (Manly and Rickert II: 250) which could mean that the opening of CL in quire 16 was copied at a different time from CL in quire 15. Other evidence that quire 16 was copied apart from the rest of CL is the existence of a catchword in red ink which ends the quire on fol. 126v. One of only two red catchwords in the manuscript, and copied in an informal hand which may be that of the scribe, it suggests that the outer folios of this quire may have been inserted in a different time slot from the rest. It may have

been a part of an existing copy which had to be adapted to fit in to its present position, or it could be a freshly-copied version.

The evidence of the codicological disturbance in CL in Ha4 is of great significance. We have seen in Hg and Cp that Adam and Scribe D both had problems with the first part of CL. This is visible in the change of ink in Hg at around line 240, and in Cp where after a few lines of CLP there is then a missing folio followed by two folios of inserted vellum, taking the compromised text to line 254. In Ha4, I have noted the irregular running titles at the beginning of CL on fols. 117 and 118, the last two folios of quire 15. Further, I have pointed to the red catchword on the *final* folio (126v) of the next quire, an irregularity which might suggest that for some reason this bifolium had to be recopied when adjustments were being made to text and order. The conjugate of fol. 126 is fol. 119, the *first* folio of quire 16, and the text of CL on this folio ends at line 255. It may therefore have been as a result of the recopying of fol. 119 that its conjugate, fol. 126v had to be recopied and the catchword added in red ink. Thus we can see that in each of the three manuscripts, the two scribes were making adjustments to the beginning of CL, almost certainly in Cp and Ha4 to reposition it after SU, and in Hg for it to assume its aberrant position after an intruded NU.

Several questions arise as a result of this analysis. Presumably the two scribes each had copies of CL already available and prepared in much the same way. They then had to compromise those copies in order to fit them into a newly-perceived order. Given that both Ha4 and Cp have already had problems with the order of tales after ML where we saw evidence of an earlier order in the process of being altered, then it must be possible to suggest that these two manuscripts were being altered in line with the development of the order as seen in El. Is it possible therefore that some textual differences between the manuscripts may also be related to these early attempts to reorder the tales, as much as to the missing portions of exemplars cited by a number of scholars? The textual differences in the *c* and *d* groups noted by Manly and Rickert for the first 212 lines of CL (II 245), have a suspicious correlation with the first folios of CL in Hg, Cp and Ha4 where textual variants in the *d* group appear to stem from the folios affected by the movement of tales. As Manly and Rickert note, "At line 213, the two branches of *d* come together" (II: 249).

Quire 17 has the conjunction of CL-ME, with ME occupying the last two folios recto and verso, fols. 133r-134v. The opening folio of the quire, fol. 127, at line 785 of CL, is not supplied with running titles and the following folio, 128 has 'Tale' on the recto and 'The Clerkis' on the verso, the only place where this spelling occurs. It is possible therefore that both bifolia, 127/134 and 128/133 were substituted when the decision was

taken to follow CL with ME. The mise-en-page of fol. 132, with the end of CL, followed by the Envoy, is not in harmony with previous tale-prologue conjunctions. There is no explicit to CL, although the explicit on the same line as the final line of the Envoy may be classed as such. Ha4 does not include L14, the Host stanza. Cp does not have it either, since the folio on which it would have occurred is missing.[21] A single line of space for the incipit to ME was then left between Envoy and L15 (MEP). On fol. 133r, following the text of the last line of L15 is a red ⓝarrat, as in the tales of WB, FR and SU.

ME continues from quire 17, fol. 133r and ends in quire 19, a quire of six leaves only, on fol. 148v. The ink of ME is very worn in places suggesting folios which have been much handled, and quire 19 gives the impression of being a manufactured quire. A distinctive feature of the copying of ME is the 'nota' signs which occur on a number of folios as do references to 'Auctour'. The notas do not have the same form as those which also occur in the tales ML, SQ and FK, so were probably added separately, perhaps by the scribe himself rather than a supervisor. The 'Auctor' attributions only occur on folios where the Ha4 scribe has apparently switched allegiance to the Hg exemplar. (Appendix 12: 18)

The six leaves of the irregular quire 19 run from fols. 143r-146v, with 147r-148v sewn in to follow (Manly and Rickert I: 219). Several factors need to be taken into acount to understand the nature of the irregularity of this quire. The position of ME after CL is its position in the *a-El* order. In Hg, ME does not follow CL. Since the inclusion of ME in Ha4 creates an irregularity in the make-up of the manuscript, (see above for the possible substitution of fols. 133 and 134), it is safe to assume that when the Ha4 scribe included ME, there was some difficulty about its position. Further corroboration for this comes with the irregularities connected with the quire containing SQ which follows ME in Ha4 but which, when first copied, was probably to be placed after ML, its position in Cp. The existence of an irregular quire of six leaves for ME must have some relationship with the changes being effected whilst the Ha4 scribe was in the process of copying and assembling his copy of the tales.

The first of the folios after the visible sewing in the six-leaf quire, contains the lines which were added in Hg in a different colour ink. Cp does not include these lines and it has always been assumed that they were missing in the exemplar used by both Hg and Cp. Ha4's exemplar for part of ME may have been the one used by the Hg scribe and it is interesting to speculate that these three manuscripts may originally have had early access to ME, perhaps before Chaucer had composed the last 100 lines. One reason for such a suggestion is that for the last 100 lines, manuscripts whose affiliation had been with *b c* and *d* groups for the rest of the tale, seem to change their affiliation to the *a* group, the

group which appears to have acquired the latest versions connected with Chaucer. At precisely line 2319 in Ha4 is a small trefoil mark in the left margin next to the line. Whether the scribe put in the mark as a reminder that more text needed to be added and left a space which he returned to later, is impossible to tell.

The final 100 lines end on the first line at the top of fol. 148v. The rest of the folio was then left blank until L17, the linking passage between ME and SQ was obtained. The link was not quite long enough to fill the space adequately, so the scribe spaced out the explicit to ME, leaving a space both before and after it, and also before the opening of the link. There is no incipit for this prologue. A further line of space is left after the link and the explicit follows on the next line with the incipit to SQ on the line following. A further line of space completes the folio. (Plate 17) Manly and Rickert sum up the situation thus:

"The evidence suggests that quire 20...(the next quire) was written before the links on fol. 148v. Changes of affiliation, to agree with Hg show that these links have been picked up; in Hg they connect ME with FK; hence the Ha4 scribe has had to change 'Frankeleyn' back to 'Squire'; he keeps, however, the 'Sir' of Hg. On fol. 148v the CW are written by a director" (1940: I 224).

5.7. Fragment V (Group F¹)[22]

5.7.1. General Observations

- Features of quire 20, with SQ only, suggest that it was copied in temporal proximity with the group of quires GP-ML. The characteristics of the intervening quires 12-19, (WB, FR, SU, CL and ME) are notably absent. This suggests that quire 20 was moved to its present position when the order of the tales was in a process of flux. It is possible that just as in Hg, ME in Ha4 originally may have followed, rather than preceded, SQ.[23]
- There are no red running titles until fol. 156v, the last verso of the quire.
- Dark running titles in Hand 2 link the preparation with KT-ML. They occur on fols. 149r, 152r and 155r.
- Internal divisions of text are in brown ink, again a feature of the earliest tales.
- The quire ends at SQ line 616 and the rest of the tale is missing.

5.7.2. Description

SQ opens on fol. 149r, although the incipit occurs, as a late addition, on the last leaf of ME, fol. 148v, the 6th leaf of the irregular quire. Quire 20 is a stand-alone quire and the

eight folios are not quite enough to contain all the text of SQ which ends on the last leaf of the quire, 56 lines short. The full text of SQ when first copied, may have continued into a following quire with the last lines of the tale, (as for example NU in Hg), or it may have been a self-contained booklet.

Several features of this quire indicate that it was prepared at the same time as the block of tales GP-ML. Champe initials are used as textual markers and red ink for running titles is absent on all folios except the last verso of the quire where the running title may be presumed to have been added later.[24] There is a part division on fol. 153r and a line of space was left to accommodate the explicit to the first part and the incipit to the second part. These are effected in brown ink rather than for example, the divisions into parts in CL which are in rubric.

Running titles in the ink of the text, each one reading 'The Squyeres Tale' occur on fols. 149r, 152r and 155r. They are in Hand 2 who began heading folios in the first section at the end of KT and conform to the system used there, where an entire title was sometimes used at a junction between quires or tales. A title in red ink does occur on the last verso of the quire, fol. 156v. However, this title does not conform to the system of formal red running titles in the quires which precede and follow SQ. The spelling system of the title in rubric matches that of the titles in dark ink so it is possible that the titles in black and in red may be the informal and formal titles of the same scribe or supervisor. Nichole Green connects the hand of the red ink title on fol. 156v with the hand of the rubricator of quires 24-29, PH-TM, and it is significant that the informal hand of the dark ink titles in KT-ML, and SQ is present in those quires also. If the red and black titles are by two different scribes or directors, it is possible that they worked together. It may be that the quire containing SQ was on hand when the scribe was preparing PH-TM and the title was entered to remind the scribe that he needed to provide the continuation when he had finished his work on those tales.

At the end of the quire, SQ is unfinished and the following quire begins at line 516 of FK, thus a quire is missing which would have needed to accommodate 56 lines of SQ plus a linking passage of 36 lines and 515 lines of FK. The total of missing lines is 607. The most an eight-leaf quire can accommodate is 608 lines, which would leave no room for rubrics between tales. One could assume that the linking passage between SQ and FK should have been available at this time for the Ha4 scribe, since the other passage, L17 is used between ME and SQ on fol. 148v. However, both ME-SQ link and SQ-FK links are late insertions into Hg in what appear to be the wrong places. They are also entered late into El. It is intriguing therefore that the disturbance in the Ha4 quires should occur at precisely the point of irregularity in the other manuscripts. The introduction of the

linking passage would have caused problems for the Ha4 scribe and a previously-copied FK.

When he copied Cp, the same scribe had an order in which FK followed ME. It is possible therefore that his first attempt with the copying of Ha4 also organised the tales in that order. Since it is clear that ME in Ha4 has some irregularities of presentation, it is possible that the two tales, ME and FK at one time shared a quire. When the order had to be changed, the scribe had to do the best he could with folios perhaps already copied, to try to fit them to a new scheme of presentation. Scribe D may not have had time to do the recopying and adjusting necessary for FK in Ha4 and the manuscript may have gone to be bound with a missing quire. Manly and Rickert suggest that the quire signatures visible in Ha4 make no allowance for a missing quire at this point.[25] This means that the quire may have been removed early and never replaced. It may never have been copied.

5.8. Fragments V and VIII (Groups F^2 and G)[26]

5.8.1. General Observations

- The three quires share some features of decoration which may indicate at least a finishing process done at a similar time, although the initial copying may not originally have been consecutive.
- FK has few decorative features such as paraphs, and the text appears stark on the folios.
- Litterae notabiliores introduce the stanzas in 2NU.
- The running titles are in the hand of the main scribe and appear to have been copied in the same time slot as the titles of WBP-ME. Of interest is the offset of a paraph in the top border of fol. 161r. The paraph on fol. 160v which provided the offset, precedes the running title. This suggests the hasty finishing of some of the decorative features at this stage.
- The changing textual affiliations in these tales is interesting. For FK, the scribe appears to have made an independent copy of O. In 2NU, Ha4 is derived from the same ancestor as El and Bo2 only. In CY, Ha4 appears closer to the cd line although the source for all manuscripts was apparently "Chaucer's own rough draft or a hasty fair copy of it" (Manly and Rickert II: 434).
- Yellow paint appears in upper case letters on the outside folios of quires 21, 22 and 23, another feature which suggests that these three quires were treated as a unit and may have been available when the yellow paint was

applied to Cp. That they only have yellow paint on the outside folios of the quires suggests that they had been copied and were stored as a group.

5.8.2. Description

The three quires, 21-23, accommodate the tales of the end of FK, 2NU and CY. In Cp, the three tales appear to have come together for the first time, and the same may be true in Ha4. As in Hg and Cp, NU follows FK, which is then followed by CY, which Hg lacks. If it were not for the intrusion of SQ to precede these tales, the order of tales in Ha4 would be as in Cp. We have seen in the last section that SQ was a tale prepared earlier in the copying of Ha4, just as it was in Cp. It was inserted to precede FK deliberately, causing disruption of ME and perhaps as a result, created the need to provide a new quire containing the beginning of FK. It is probable therefore that the Ha4 assembly belongs to a slightly later stage in the development of the order than does Cp. This is further reinforced by the fact that NU in Ha4 is renamed 2NU, the title adopted in El.

The missing quire after SQ is a puzzle. 515 lines of FK are missing. It is possible that this quire was never copied for Ha4 since the traces of quire signatures which survive seem to take no account of a missing quire.

The copying of FK is stark. Only the occasional marginal notas break up the monotonous appearance of the folios. 2NU follows immediately after FK and is followed by CYPT. Between both these tales two lines of space were left for explicits and incipits. However, the rubrics between FK-2NU are preceded by paragraph marks, whereas those between 2NU and CY are preceded by litterae notabiliores. Since it is the litterae notabiliores for the rubrics which are a feature of the earlier tales, it may be that the linking of 2NU to CY took place early and the linking of FK to 2NU was done at a later stage. In support of this theory is the fact that Manly and Rickert suggest that for 2NU, the Ha4 scribe made use of the draft used by the El scribe which was independently derived from O, Chaucer's own copy. This would seem logical, since when Cp was copied, the tale was called Saint Cecile's Tale, but by the time Ha4 had added this tale, it was renamed the Second Nun's Tale. This must suggest that when adding the titles, the Ha4 scribe had access to some of the thinking behind the change of title which was carried out in El and which may have come directly from Chaucer himself. (Hg and Cp called the tale NU). This in turn suggests a closer co-operation between the scribes in the late assembly of the tales than has been suggested before.

In El the order of the tales is changed and the 2NU follows later in the order after NP. This alteration may have forced the reconsideration of the tale's title. The fact that the Ha4 scribe has renamed the tale but not carried out the move, may say something about

the timing of the change of order. It may also have some connection with the missing quire containing the beginning of FK. Perhaps the scribe was reconsidering the change in the order which had already been achieved in El. The manuscript was bound before all the changes could be carried out.

Something else which needs to be noted is that Manly and Rickert suggest that the curious structure of CYPT could mean that parts of the tale were possibly written "for a special occasion apart from the CT" (II: 434). They suggest that lines 971-1481 (fols. 174v-181v), were the original tale and that the lengthy prologue and the first part of the tale were added late in the Canterbury period for the purposes of the *Canterbury Tales*. If this is so then Ha4 presents a very interesting case, one which suggests that the first part of the tale was added on to material which was previously written. Let us look at the way in which the tale is presented.

The prologue of CY begins on fol. 169r with the usual champe initial. The prologue continues to fol. 171v where a red 'Ɖarraƚ' in the right text box and a 5-line ornamental capital and three-quarter border signal the beginning of the tale. On fol. 175r, at precisely line 971, is a two-line champe initial and another '¢ Ɖarraƚ' as if the tale were beginning at this point. It would seem then, that the scribe of Ha4 had access to a copy which presumably still had 'Ɖarraƚ' for the beginning of the tale, otherwise I cannot think why the scribe would have copied it twice. El breaks the tale into first and second parts, the second part beginning in Ha4 on fol. 174v, a few lines before the narrat. The textual analyses of Manly and Rickert suggest that for CY, the Ha4 scribe used the same rough draft of Chaucer's work as when he first copied CY in Cp. However, Manly and Rickert also suggest that just as the scribe had access to an El-related exemplar for 2NU, he had the same access for CY and corrected his own draft extensively from it.

5.9. Fragments VIII, VI and VII (Groups G, C and B²)[27]

5.9.1. General Observations

- Red ink in quires 24, 25, 28, 29 (3 fols. only) divides the tales as follows: CY (last 44 lines), PH, L21, PDP, PD, SH (first half of tale to line 1395), TM (middle section, lines 2407-2794), TM-L29 and MO (lines 3187-3270). For a visual clarification see also Appendix 11.
- No red ink in quires 26, 27, fols. 197r-212v and quire 29, fols. 221r-228v (except for 226r, 227v, 228r) isolates the following tales: SH (last half of tale), L24, PR, L25, TT, L28, TM (first and last third of tale), L29 and the opening of MO. For a visual clarification see also Appendix 11.

- Textual affiliations of Ha4 in this part of the manuscript may be revealing. From PH-end TM, the changes of affiliation in Ha4 may be matched to the disruption in the codicology of this section and may be instructive in an attempt to estimate the chronology of copying.

- The section is characterised by the presence or absence of red running titles.[28] Quires 24, 25 and 28 are titled in red ink in Hand 6-7. Quires 26 and 27 have no red ink whatsoever. The last quire in the section, quire 29, has three single folios headed in red ink on fols. 226r, 227v and 228r, one title being wrongly assigned.

- In quires 24 and 25, titles are missing from fols. 185r where PH links with PD, and fol. 193r in PD.

- Quires 26, and 27 have titles in dark ink in Hand 2 on fols. 199v (SH), 200r (PR), 203r (PR), 204r (TT), 207r (TM), 210r (TM) and 212r (TM). Quire 29 has a single title in dark ink in Hand 2 on fol. 224r (TM).

- For PH and PD in quires 24 and 25, Ha4 copied from the same group ancestor as Cp. SH follows in the last few folios of quire 25 and both quires with PH, PD and the opening of SH are headed in red ink.

- For SH and PR the scribe appears to have made a fresh copy of the Cp ancestor.

- For the PR-TT, TT and the first part of TM, the Ha4 text shares an ancestor with both Hg and the *b* group, (as with the tales from GP-ML). These tales occupy quires 26 and 27 and have no running titles in red ink. No red ink is used for the tales from GP-ML either.

- For the next part of TM, Ha4 appears to have reverted to the exemplar used when Cp was copied and this text is contained in quire 28, which again has red running titles.

- The last part of TM copied into quire 29 has no red running titles for TM although titles begin again, in confusion, where TM links with MK.

- In L29, both Ha4 and Cp use a much corrected rough draft according to Manly and Rickert.

- The difficulties in this section may be indicative of a scribe patching and piecing work from more than one attempt to assemble the tales. A description of the section may help to clarify the situation.

5.9.2. Description

The red running titles in quires 24, 25, 28, (29) are, according to Green, in a different hand from the titles for WB-CY. They appear to have been added by the supervisor who wrote the single red title 'Squyeres Tale' at the end of quire 20 in which there was also evidence of titles in black ink supplied by Hand 2 who had added titles in black ink in KT-ML. The work of Hand 2 may be seen again in quires 26 and 27 where again there is no sign of red ink, and in quire 29 where three titles in red ink occur at the end of the quire which also has as a Hand 2 title in black ink. Work done on the titles is significant for any analysis of the time-scale in which this manuscript was assembled.

Let us review the way in which this section of the manuscript is joined to the previous tales (FK-2NU-CY). The outside bifolium of quire 24, with CY on fol.181 and PD at the other end of the quire on fol.188, displays anomalies in the decorative features which suggest that the outside bifolium was finished apart from, and later than, the inside folios of the quire. This would suggest that work on PH and possibly the subsequent tales in this section, preceded work done on the FK-CY group.

Folio 181r has a running title in red ink followed by a punctus mark, a system used by some scribes (for example the scribe of the Hg titles), to mark the first leaf of a quire. The paragraph mark which precedes the title is undecorated. Almost at the bottom of the same folio is a large upper case 'T' which lacks the decoration provided elsewhere for the decorated capital. On the verso of fol. 181, a three-quarter border signals the beginning of PH with an illuminated letter five lines in height. The last seven lines of CY precede the opening of PH, and end with an explicit in red ink, on its own line, followed by the incipit to PH on the following line. Both explicit and incipit are preceded by paragraph marks. The second one for PH has received its flourishing. The mark preceding the CY explicit is unflourished. The unfinished nature of the decorations to the end of the CY text on the recto and verso of this leaf would suggest that this text was copied onto 181 *after* PH was in place, thus the decision to join FK, 2NU, CY to PH and PD was taken *after* those tales had been assembled.

In quires 24 and 25 (PH-PD), there are numerous anomalies in the headings of the first few folios almost as if the scribe was building the developing sections piece by piece and was not quite clear about the structure or was receiving directions as he went along. The linking passage between PH and PD, on fol. 185r, originally the endlink to PH (Manly and Rickert II: 325), is labelled as the Pardoner's Prologue and begins with a conventional three-line champe initial suitable for such a link. However, the folio has no running title and it is possible that the scribe may have had to wait for the linking passage. In Hg and El the same passage is recognised as 'Words', or 'myry talking' between

Host, PH and PD, and therefore forms part of the framework narrative. However, in Ha4 on fol. 185v, the running title is 'Pdon'es' and a three-quarter border is attached to a small illuminated initial with 'narrat' against the last line of the link. The opening is thus treated like the beginning of a tale though it is in fact the prologue. This view of the text accords with the Cp copying where the opening of PDP is also treated as a tale, is given a chapter number and the tale itself opens with a champe initial a few folios later. The different ordinatio for this tale in Ha4 may therefore represent an earlier vision of the text visible in some tales in both Cp and Ha4.

The linking passage between PH and PD apparently went through a number of development stages (Manly and Rickert II: 325-328). The earliest version may originally have been an endlink to PH as witnessed in MS Delamere. When the order PH-PD was decided, Chaucer then wrote a continuation of the linking passage with 15 more lines of comments on PH, the previous pilgrim, followed by an introduction to PD. Later still, he revised the whole link and wrote the El version which now appears in most manuscripts. In Cp, the link appears on fols. 194 and 195, both inserted singleton folios, so it would appear that Cp was adapted to include an updated link. Ha4 has the earlier version of the revised link and this may give us some indication of the time of copying of quires 24, 25 and 28.

The tales in these quires, PH, PD, half of SH and part of TM have red running titles and may have been prepared early. They are now being subjected to a cut and paste procedure to update the tales. When copying PDPT Scribe D used the same exemplar for both Cp and Ha4. However, the alignment of Ha4 with the *b* group of manuscripts in PD, may suggest that although the exemplar used was an older version, a newer vision of presentation was in progress and accordingly Ha4 uses a second illuminated border for PDT itself which begins on fol. 187v.

The difficulties encountered by scribe and supervisor in PD can be seen on folios 186r and v. Folio 186r is headed '¢ Tale' with a little further to the right 'pdon', and on 186v the running title is '¢ Pheim.' Still bearing the text of the prologue, fol. 187r is headed 'Pdon tale'. On fol. 187v the three-quarter border and 6-line ornamental capital begin the tale proper. In the single line of space left between the end of the prologue and the tale is a red 'narrat'. Evidence on the last folio of quire 24, (conjoint with the junction of CY-PH on the first leaf of the quire), supports the view that this bifolium may have been copied later than the rest of the folios, as paragraph marks preceding both running title and glosses have no flourishing.

PD is followed immediately by SH. There is no linking passage or prologue but two lines of space are filled with the explicit to PD and incipit to SH. The ornamental

capital and three-quarter border announces the tale. In both Cp and Ha4, PD follows SH with no space left for any prologue. Hg, however has a space of sixteen lines left on the folio after PD has ended. One could speculate therefore, that PH, PD and SH in Ha4 were linked either at the stage of preparation where 'prologues' as a concept had not finally emerged in the presentation of the tales, or that they were copied later when it was clear that no prologue would be forthcoming.

SH continues to the end of quire 25, with the regular running titles for this section in red ink. The quire ends at SH 1395 and that is the end of the two quires with running titles in red ink. The remainder of SH in the next quire, (quire 26, 1396-1624) has no running titles in rubric and the presentation of the tale on fols. 197r-199r is stark with no marks of any kind. These folios may therefore represent a recopying of part of the tale when the order for the next tales, SH-PR-TT-TM was first devised.

Quire 26, which opens with the continuation of SH, and quires 27 and most of 29, are characterised by the infrequent occurrence of running titles in black ink. In the first three folios of quire 26, 197r-199v, a single paragraph mark for a text division is the only noticeable feature apart from the text of SH. There is no explicit to SH which ends below the ruled space on the 39th line of fol. 199v, only an 'Amē', reminiscent of certain tales in Cp. At the top of this folio, in dark ink and added by Hand 2 who provided running titles from KT-ML and SQ, is the running title 'The Schipmans Tale'.

The fact that SH ends below the ruled space might suggest that the scribe was uncertain about which tale was to follow and to allow himself flexibility he did not end the tale on a new leaf. Folio 200r, the central bifolium, has the exact appearance of the apparently inserted leaves 12r-13v in quire 2 (GP-KT). (Plates 19 and 12) There is the same division of the folio into text for the linking passage (L24), and text for PRP, and marginal directions on both folios written in the right margin in dark ink in what I am sure is the same hand, the informal hand of scribe D. Neither direction has been carried out.

On fol. 200r Hand 2 has included a running title 'The prioress Tale' and an 18-line linking passage follows which opens with a two-line champe initial. A line of space is left but is not used for the completion of the rubrics 'plog⁹ p'ore' which appear in the right margin. The concept of the prologue has reached the margins of these folios although they are still not part of the mise-en-page itself. Following on from the first line of the text of the prologue is '⊄ Dnē dñs nr̄' a shorthand version of the 'Domine dominus noster' which appears in Hg. On folio 200v, just visible in the top left corner of the folio is 'oress', probably an indication written by the scribe ahead of his work on PR. Further down, a direction in the left margin for the inclusion of the rubrics, is probably again in

the scribe's own informal hand. Two lines of space have been left to incorporate this marginal note,

p'ores hiꝝ ꝑloꝫ

endeþ þᵉ ꝑloge-7 heꝝ bygȳne hir tale

but the rubrics were never completed. The attempt to find the correct form of words for incipits and explicits suggests either an early attempt to find a formula, which predated the more formalised incipits and explicits of WB-FK, or an attempt to accommodate a prologue where none had previously existed.

A comparison with El at this point is most enlightening. The folio with the opening of PR in El is not illuminated, one of the few exceptions in El, the script is very hastily executed to the point of a scrawl for '¢ Domine dominus noster' and the 'Words of the Host', and the script itself is a good deal smaller than that on the previous folio and obviously done at a different time. Clearly in El, this folio did not get the treatment granted to other folios in the manuscript. Perhaps this was because it was a last-minute inclusion which the scribes accomplished almost as they were bringing their work on the manuscripts to a close. The similarities between El and Ha4 at this point suggest some sort of co-operation or understanding between the two scribes.

The same situation occurs again on folio 203r,v. PR ends with another 'Amen' as in Cp and there is no space left and no explicit or incipit to the linking passage between PR and TT. The verso has the remainder of the linking passage and the beginning of TT which begins on an unadorned folio with merely a champe initial. Marginal instructions for the beginning of the tale are still visible in the left margin, again in the informal hand of the scribe, 'neþ ſ thopas his tale'.

That there is no ornamental capital for this, Chaucer's own tale, albeit a spoof one, is odd unless we are here observing the hasty incorporation of unfinished material. Exactly the same situation occurs in El where again, there is no decorated border for TT although the tale is set out in the manner of Hg, carefully executed and copied. In Ha4, the scribe has not attempted to include the bracketted lines which occur in Hg and El and the copying is mechanical and unadorned. Fol. 204r in Ha4 is the last leaf of quire 26 and has a running title in dark ink in Hand 2, 'Chauceres tale'.

Quire 27 in Ha4, the second quire with no red running titles in this section, continues with TT, followed on fol. 206r by L28 which links TT to TM. This continues

onto the verso where the link ends after 33 lines, leaving five blank lines and no directions. Just visible in the top left corner is 'e of ∫ topas' which must have been a direction to the scribe about the text which was to occupy this folio. Since TM begins at the top of the next folio, it is possible that the first two leaves of this quire were inserted in front of previously-copied folios with the opening of TM. Of note is that the linking passage which joins TT to TM is, in El, another folio without the expected decoration. It would appear that the scribes of both El and Ha4 found themselves in the same situation when they were copying and assembling these tales.

TM begins on the next recto, 207r, and the folio is suitably illuminated though the rough running title of Hand 2 remains at the top of the folio and the informal hand of the scribe is in the top right corner informing us that this is 'Chauc⸍ Tale'. The nature of these undecorated quires implies a late and hurried attempt to assemble this part of the manuscript. It is also significant that the situation in Ha4 mirrors the situation in Hg and El with similarities and problems involving the same passages, suggesting that the scribes of these manuscripts produced these texts in temporal proximity. This is a suggestion made even more probable by the textual affinities between the Hg/El copying and the texts available for Ha4.

One final coincidence which I believe needs to be assessed by an experienced paleographer, is the similarity between the word 'Chauc⸍' in the informal note in the hand of scribe B at the top of folio 207r, and the same word written in dark ink at the top of the opening folio of Hg. (Plate 20) Whilst it may be impossible to suggest a match and therefore the presence of Scribe D with the Hg manuscript at some stage in its history, the idiosyncratic mark, so distinctive in Adam Pinkhurst's repertoire, may be present on folios in the next part of Ha4, suggesting possible cooperation between the two scribes. The remainder of quire 27 contains TM, with Hand 2 on the last recto of the quire supplying 'Chauceres' in dark ink.

In quire 28, every folio, recto and verso has running titles in red ink in Hand 6 or 7. It is the same hand which copied the titles in the earlier part of this section. '¢ Tale' appears on every recto and '¢ Chauc⸍es' on every verso. On fol. 220r, the last leaf of the quire, the running title, 'Tale', is preceded by a mark which closely resembles the mark used by Scribe B, the Hg/El scribe. Whether or not this could tie in the hand of the running titles in this part of the manuscript with the hand of Hg/El is difficult to say, but the mark occurs on other folios in the following section, on fols. 229r, 230r, 231r, all with the text of MO, and on fol. 257v in PA, the Hg-type signature is found in the top border to the left of the running title. (Plate 21)

Quire 29 continues with TM but is a quire in which red ink is seen on only three folios, 226r, 227v and 228r at the end of the quire. A single title by Hand 2 in dark ink is seen on fol. 224r. TM ends on fol. 226r with an explicit followed by an incipit for L29 (MOP), each on its own line. After a vacant line, L29 begins, but the folio is headed with a red 'Tale', the first red running title in the quire. The prologue ends on fol. 227r with no explicit. There is then a blank line and a tiny 'narrat' in the right margin.

MO continues on the verso with stanzas defined by decorated single-line initials and no space between. Unlike in Cp and Hg, the Adam stanza is included. A red running title 'Chauc̃es' in the top margin is obviously the wrong title for MO although 'Tale' on the following recto would serve for whichever tale was copied onto these folios.

The inconsistencies in the decorative features of quire 29 suggest that it was not all prepared at the same time. This could be the result of the decision taken to link TM to MO. The fact that three of the folios at the end of the quire are headed in rubric seem to indicate that they were folios set aside for the copying of TM at the same time as the folios of quire 28. The heading '¢ Chauc̃es' on fol. 227v which has the text of MO, suggests that when the headings were done, the tale to follow TM had not been decided. The tiny 'narrat' in the right margin of fol. 227r, the single line of space, and the absence of rubrics between the tales, reminds one of the situation between GP and KT and may place the preparation of the linking of these two tales in the same time period.

5.10. Fragments VII, IX and X (Groups B², H and I)[29]

5.10.1. General Observations

- Quires 30-37 are more or less regularly titled and demonstrate fewer visible problems than the previous set of quires.

- Litterae notabiliores are used for stanza divisions in MO and the paragraph marks throughout which mark the divisions of the text, glosses and narrats are almost all decorated.

- Rubrics between MO-L30, NP-L36, and L36-MA are all in two lines of space, follow the same formula and are preceded by decorated paragraph marks (Appendix 13).

- In PA, two and three-line champes are used to distinguish major textual divisions.

- A two-line champe introduces RT but unlike El, there is no colophon.

- Running titles are missing on fols. 245v and 248v.

- An irregular red catchword appears on fol. 260v in PA in quire 33 (Appendix 15).

- When copying MO for Ha4 the scribe made use of the same exemplar as for the Cp copy, apparently a much corrected rough draft. Like Cp, the Ha4 copy has several lines missing, now copied into the right margin. The missing lines are not the same as those in Cp, and one can only conjecture about the state of the exemplar.

- In L30 (NPP), Ha4 has the longer form and is closer to the El line but in NP appears to be independently copied.

- L36 (MAP), which follows NP, is curious because Ha4 is affiliated with *a* manuscripts and Manly and Rickert suggest that L36 was lacking in the ancestor of many of the manuscripts and only "recently written" to link up the tale written much earlier in Chaucer's career (II: 449).

- In PAPT, Ha4 is on the same line of descent from the archetype as Hg and Cp.

5.10.2. Description

Despite an overall appearance of cohesion, there are some irregularities which may suggest the finishing of some folios apart from others in the same quire. In quire 31 (fol. 237r), for example, the incipit for L30 (NPP) occurs on the last line of the opening folio, suggesting perhaps that the prologue had already been copied on the verso. The verso is titled 'þe ploge of þe pr'stes tale' . This is the first time that a thorn character has been used for a running title and is more in keeping with the informal notes in the scribal hand left in the margins of the tales of PR, TT and TM. The thorn is used again in the titles for L36 (MAP). This is the linking passage which Manly and Rickert suggest arrived at a late stage in the proceedings and represented Chaucer's latest work. In quire 33 (PA) which ends with an irregular catchword in red ink, several folios have the thorn character in the titles. It is possible that all these individual folios were given their titles after the titles for the rest were in place. This may be related to the copying of certain portions of text which arrived later than those regularly copied.

There are further anomalies. Fol. 257v in quire 33 is one of the folios in this section which has the clearest example of what I have suggested may be the mark of Adam Pinkhurst and could provide evidence of the cooperation of the scribes in the copying of the last tales.

There were also problems with L37 (PAP) and these are evident in the text, visible in the word repetition and blank spaces left by the scribe. (Plate 22) There is room

for speculation therefore that all is not as it initially appears to be in this last section of the manuscript.

On fol. 238r, with the running title 'p⁹stp' tale, only one line of space is left for rubrics, the 'Explicit' to L30 (NPP) being copied alongside the last line of the link. This mise-en-page has more in common with the PDP-PDT, L25-TT, GP-KT and L1-MI. Fols. 238v and 239v both have '₵ The prestes' as running titles, and fols. 239r and 240r both have '₵ Tale'. For the remainder of the quire the titles are regularly ' ₵ The ñonne prestes' and ' ₵ The ñonnes prestes' on versos and '₵ Tale' on rectos.

A similar situation with irregular titles occurs in the following quire (32) where the first two folios, 245r and 246r have '₵ Tale' as would be expected, but there is no running title on the intervening verso to indicate NP. Since the conjoint leaves fols. 251 and 252 are also strangely titled, it is worth considering that when Ha4 was copied, there was uncertainty about the position or inclusion of the last three tales in the manuscript and there was a certain amount of patching and piecing going on.

The irregularities of fol. 251r referred to above, with L37 (PAP) following the end of MA also require some explanation. The link may not have been immediately available, or the scribe may have been alerted to a possible change of plan, because he paused in the first line of the link after writing 'By þat þe mauciple had'. When he resumed writing, he repeated the word 'had' before continuing with the line. He then left blank spaces in two places in the following lines which required numbers to be added for time references, and these were later filled by another hand. In the preparation of this link therefore, the Ha4 scribe had much the same problem as Adam Pinkhurst in Hg where there is an erasure beneath 'manciple'. Manly regarded the word 'manciple' as a clear error on the part of the scribes. It is worth quoting his pronouncement in full.

"Chaucer cannot have been guilty of the absurdity of making a tale of 258 lines, begun early in the morning (H15) last until four in the afternoon" (II: 455).

Manly clearly believed therefore that here we have an example of the scribes making a nonsense of the manuscript arrangements. Further, Tatlock cites the blank spaces left by the Harley scribe as positive evidence that Chaucer did not revise this linking passage (1909: 21). Both scholars may well be correct, but not for the reasons which they assume. This point will be further covered in the conclusion to this chapter.

On fol. 252v the running title is '₵ Psa Rectoris', and fol. 252r is headed '₵ Rector'. PA begins on this folio with a Latin rubric. The last folio of the quire, 252v, is

regularly headed '¢ The Psouns' and the running titles continue from the first folio of the following quire with no omissions, to the end of the manuscript.

PA is copied regularly to the penultimate folio of the manuscript, fol. 285v. The 'Preces' or Retractions then follow, seemingly without pause, and end half way down folio 286r. There is no colophon as found in El. The final quire was originally of four leaves but the first two have been cancelled leaving two leaves for the final text.

5.11. Conclusions

5.11.1. Fragment I (Group A)

Certain features in the structure of the first part of Ha4 suggest that in several places, despite a general cohesion, the codicological integrity of the manuscript is compromised. There could be a number of reasons why this should be so. Though certainly copied within the same time zone, it is probable that the tales in this section were not all copied continuously, though there may not have been very long time gaps between their copying.

The whole of the first fragment is united by a number of features which suggest that the tales were assembled in this order deliberately and within temporal proximity. All tales in this section use the two-line champe to define textual divisions, in GP for the pilgrim portraits and in the remainder of the tales in place of regular paraphs. No red ink is used at all, and incipits, explicits, and formal running titles where present, are in a dark ink.

The same method of introducing rubrics unites the preparation of KT-MI-RE, although CO and TG stand outside this unit. Regular catchwords in the hand of the scribe and regular eight-leaf quires also unite the tales as far as CO. Textually the tales in this first section show influence of exemplars available for El, Ad3, Gg and Hg and the *b* group of manuscripts.

Tales are not considered as chapters as in parts of Cp and there is awareness of a prologue-tale structure. Since the *b* group is supposed to have developed later than the *c* group, one could suggest therefore, that this part of Ha4 may have been copied later than Cp as the exemplars used for Cp are firmly *c*. It is possible, but perhaps less likely, that Scribe D copied this fragment for Cp after he copied Ha4, but used a different set of older exemplars or was responding to different instructions.

5.11.2. Tale of Gamelyn

There is a problem when we consider TG. Scholars have been unable to account for the fact that it is in Ha4 that the directive appears, possibly in the scribe's own hand, to use

TG to follow CO. Yet in Cp, which in many respects appears to have accessed earlier exemplars for the tales, TG seems to follow CO with few discernible difficulties. We have seen from the examination of Cp that TG may have been moved to its present position later in the assembly of that manuscript also. This suggests that the refashioning of Cp was taking place after some of the copying work done on Ha4. It is possible that the scribes had a number of tales which were copied and held as bankers as Chaucer was in the process of rearranging the tales and re-allocating tale to teller. The fact that scholars view TG as unlikely to have been written by Chaucer may simply mean that it was a poor representative of his creative energies and had been set aside by Chaucer himself for further improvement. The scribes may have been aware of this and were reluctant to use it unless so instructed. When Scribe D came to make the Ha4 copy he received some sort of directive to include TG.

Another possibility is related to the codicological irregularities which cluster around CO in Ha4. As has already been noted above with regard to Ad3, the position of CO in the *Canterbury Tales* may have been under consideration as part of the revision process which appears to be happening in both Cp and Ha4. The Ha4 scribe seems to have had access to the exemplar for RE and CO which was used later when Ad3 was copied and thus he may have been aware of imminent changes. If a plan were underway to relocate CO to a position at the end of the manuscript, it is possible that TG was a contender to be attached to CO when that change of position was effected. If those plans were never achieved, perhaps because of the death of the author, there may have been some scribes or supervisors who were already aware of the impending relocation. Whereas in Hg and El, Adam did not feel that plans were sufficiently advanced for him to carry out any such manoeuvre, other directors may have felt that since TG was scheduled to be the tale of the Cook, then it could just as well supplement an unfinished CO wherever that tale appeared.

TG ends in Ha4 in a six-leaf quire with no catchword and plenty of space on the folio to begin another tale. Since there was no attempt to follow TG immediately with ML, it would seem logical to suppose that ML had already been copied when TG was inserted. The Ha4 copy of TG, although from the same archetype as TG found in the 24 other manuscripts which preserve the tale, was nevertheless an independent copy (Manly and Rickert II: 170-172), a factor which would unite the affiliations of all tales in this section (GP-ML and SQ) which all seem to represent fresh copyings.

5.11.3. Fragment II (Group B¹)

MLPT are contained in two quires. A comparison between the copy in Cp and the one in Ha4 is interesting. In Ha4, the scribe began MLPT in a new quire as in Hg and El. He made a fresh copy, but again copied the tale with no space between stanzas, which does not seem as progressive in terms of presentation as the Hg and El copies. However, unlike Cp, in Ha4 the stanzas are clearly and correctly defined by the use of the single-line litterae norabiliores. Evidence of supervisory attention may also be seen in Ha4 with the presence of the black running titles in Hand 2.

On fol. 86r, ML ends and is followed, as in Cp, with a two-line champe initial for the beginning of L8, MLEndlink. Unlike the copy in Cp, the scribe copied 12 lines of the linking passage and then stopped and left a line of space. There is a definite pause in the proceedings here as if the scribe has been alerted to a change of plan. Some time later, he copied a further four lines ending the folio with the line 'Sayde the Sompnour he schal heer nauȝt preche'. On fol. 86v, six more lines of the linking passage are copied with the last four lines completely missed out and WBP begins after two lines for explicit and incipit.

The situation in Ha4 may be related to the situation in the other manuscripts. It was noted that both Cp and Hg had problems with the last part of ML, the Hg problem visible in a change in the shade of ink and the Cp problem associated with inserted vellum. In Hg it appears that the last few stanzas of ML were available before the text which precedes it.

Independent analysis of the script by Green, suggests that there is a slight change in the hand of the scribe around the middle of fol. 85v in Ha4. This change occurs therefore, just before the point where in Hg there is an ink-change. The copying continues in the changed script onto the following folio where ML ends and the first 12 lines of the Endlink are copied. After the blank space left after line 1174, the script undergoes a second change and becomes smaller with a slightly different duct. The remainder of the Endlink, with the Summoner cited as the next pilgrim to speak, is in this same smaller script and ends four lines early on fol. 86v. With the opening of WBP the script changes for a third and final time along with the decorative layout and basic ordinatio of Ha4. These observations made by Green were made purely on the basis of script style. However, the significance of this for the textual analysis cannot be ignored since we now have three early manuscripts manifesting codicological irregularities with the inclusion of WB.

In Hg and Cp, the tale after ML is SQ. In Hg an entire verso was left blank after ML. In Ha4 also, SQ was prepared at the same time as GP-ML and existed in its own

separate booklet, much as in the preparation of Hg. One could almost imagine therefore, that the two scribes must have prepared these tales in the same order, and with some awareness of each other's work. In Cp, MLEndlink may originally have signalled the next pilgrim to speak as the Wife of Bath. However, the disturbance surrounding the copying of WBP in Cp and in Hg suggests that WBP underwent some rewriting and revision. It is possible therefore, that the original tale to follow ML was an earlier WBP. In line with Hg perhaps, WB was removed for rewriting and SQ became the choice for the next tale. For Cp and Hg, that became the order. WBP was removed, presumably to be rewritten and supplemented by Chaucer.

The next decision may have been to follow ML with SU. We have seen evidence that SU in Hg may have been prepared for a different position in the order, perhaps to follow MLEndlink. Ha4 reads 'Summoner' in MLEndlink, but the hesitations and pauses apparent in the codicology of the section and in the timescale of copying suggest that the choice of SU preceded the choice of a new WBP. The linking of WBP with a new tale (visible in the signs in Hg that WBT was being prepared as a copytext), was followed by the development of the linking passages between two more pilgrims, FR and SU. The melding of this group appears to have taken place at a fairly late stage in the Hg assembly. When the decision was made to use the newly formed group WB-FR-SU to follow ML, the Ha4 scribe did not return to erase the word Summoner in the Endlink which he may have copied months earlier, whilst the Hg scribe had continued to grapple with the positioning of the tales of ME, FK, NU and CL.

5.11.4. Fragments III and IV (Groups D, E^1 and E^2)

All the tales in this section of Ha4 are united by a number of features which set them apart from the tales in the previous section. The script style of the scribe is distinctly different, suggesting perhaps more than just a short delay before copying began. The new concept of ordinatio with more regular spacing, 'narrat' for tales, and the absence of champe initials as regular textual markers, suggests a rethink about the way in which the tales were to be presented. Within this group of quires, WB, FR and SU are a definite group, copied together and supplemented by CL and ME perhaps after a pause in the proceedings.

There appears to be some manipulation and recopying of certain folios in CL and ME in Ha4 which may be significant of a scribe, with tales perhaps already copied into booklets, which he was attempting to adapt for new positions. Comparison with both Cp and Hg at this point shows that both scribes were manipulating copy of the first 200-250 lines of CL and adjusting the folios for a different order of tales. Codicological irregularities in Ha4 which affect both CL in quires 15 and 17, and ME in quire 17,

suggest that CL-ME was not the original order. It is possible therefore, that before work on the WB-FR-SU trio which begins this section, the Ha4 scribe had copied both CL and ME, perhaps for the order as in Hg.

In ME, the shift in Ha4 to a Hg-type exemplar half-way through the tale may have promoted the use of 'Auctour' in the ME text (fols. 140r and 141r). The presence of a six-leaved quire to contain the end of ME must also have been a manipulation of previously copied text, particularly since there is evidence of sewing between the fourth and fifth leaf. The last two leaves contain the last 100 lines of ME, missing originally from Hg, and never acquired for Cp, and the linking passage (also missing from Cp but adapted for Hg) between ME and SQ. It is also clear that the linking passage, added on to the last folio of quire 19 to link ME to SQ which follows in the next quire, was inserted some time after the tale had been copied. Contact with the Hg changes for this link are apparent in the bastardisation of the link, retaining the 'Sir' of the Hg copy, but changing 'Frankeleyn' back to 'Squire'. It would appear that Scribe D had access to the thinking behind the changes apparent in both Hg and El at this point. This may be important in defining a time-line of assembly of these tales in all the manuscripts.

5.11.5. Fragment V (Group F¹)

SQ in Ha4 was originally copied at the same time as GP-ML. This would mean that Scribe D had the option to include SQ after ML if he had been directed to do so. Apparently he was not, and the reference in the MLEndlink to the Summoner rather than the Squire as about to tell the following tale, suggests a change of plan at the time when Ha4 was being copied. The time lag, suggested by the difference in the style of the scribal hand between MLEndlink and the tales which now follow, may account for a further change of direction in the decision to reorder the tales.

In quire 20, the presence of black running titles for SQ in Hand 2 of the first quires, and the single title in red ink has some significance which will be further explored in the group of tales PH-TM.[30] It isolates the inclusion of SQ and differentiates it from the three quires which follow.

The irregularities in both physical and textual coherence of quires 19-21, suggests more a problem of order rather than of exemplar supply.[31] There is some evidence that SQ was available for inclusion in the collection at the same time as FK because the form of marginal 'notas' in each tale is in the same style.[32] Since quires 21-23 appear to have been assembled consecutively as a unit, it is probable that SQ and FK came together after the decorative finishing process which was not applied to SQ.

5.11.6. Fragments V and VIII (Groups F² and G)

Red running titles in the hand of the scribe, yellow tipping of letters in the outside folios of all three quires and access to an El-type exemplar for corrections, all seem to suggest that these tales were prepared and stored together as a group, perhaps to await a further instruction.

The missing part of FK is significant because in Ha4 the remainder of FK is firmly linked with 2NU, yet both in 2NU and CY, the Ha4 scribe shows influence from both Cp and an El-type exemplar. It is possible therefore that Scribe D was in the middle of the revisions to the order in Ha4 which also tie it to Hg and El. At the moment of assembly, the Ha4 scribe had not yet resolved the possibility of a different placing for 2NU CY which was evolving in El.

In the next section, CY has been deliberately linked to PH, so the group of tales must have been assembled to occupy the position they now hold. The timing of the movement of these tales may become clearer after an examination of the next section.

5.11.7. Fragments VIII, VI and VII (Groups G, C and B²)

A number of conclusions may be drawn from the state of the quires in this section of Ha4. The red running titles in a hand which may be different from the titles of the tales from WBP-CY unites the preparation of PH-TM despite the fact that three of the quires have scant sign of the use of red ink. In those three quires, the presence of Hand 2 adding titles in dark ink, links the time of their preparation to the tales from GP-ML and SQ.[33]

The tales represented in these quires may show different stages in the development of the Ha4 manuscript. Note has been taken of the later linking of CY to PH. The fact that details of decorative finishing are absent on the last folio of CY indicates that PH must have been copied and decorated before the linking was effected. PH and PD in quires 24 and 25 appear to have been prepared as a unit with the beginning of SH, using the same ancestor as the Cp and Pw copy. Where PH joins PD, Ha4 appears to have a version of the link which is intermediate between Chaucer's earliest vision with an endlink of 12 lines in length (1940: II 326), and the later version found in El.

The apparent division of the copying of SH is curious. However, where the red titles for SH cease in Ha4 at the end of quire 25, Manly and Rickert note a textual puzzle in which groups c and d suddenly come together and appear to make use of the same exemplar. They suggest that some sort of revision may have been made to the original tale when Chaucer decided to move the tale from WB to SH. There is now no evidence of revision, which may in itself suggest that the ancestor copies of all groups, a-d, were made after Chaucer had revised the tale. In Ha4 the revised text would have begun at the

beginning of quire 26 where red running titles cease. For the texts in this quire, SH, PR, TT, TM (beginning), the Ha4 scribe shares an ancestor with Ad3 in SH, then with Hg and the *b* group. The hesitation marked by the extra line copied below the ruled space on fol. 199v where SH ends is also an indication that the Ha4 scribe may have had to wait for further instructions before he was able to follow SH with PR.

It would seem then that Scribe D had copies of some tales he had prepared earlier. He was adapting that material and adding to it to provide a new grouping of the tales. Evidence of this may be seen in TM in quire 28, where for the whole quire, headed in red ink, the affiliations are with the Cp exemplar. In quires 26 and 27 with no red titles (also TM), affiliations are with Hg and *b*.

The remnants of directions, probably in the scribe's own informal hand, to allocate space and indicate positioning of the tales, suggests a first-time attempt to assemble the tales of B^2. If this is so then the alliance of Ha4 with Hg and the *b* group exemplars at this point also suggests that the order of tales was in a process of change when Ha4 was copied.

5.11.8. Fragments VII, IX and X (Groups B^2, H and I)

This final section of Ha4 shows evidence of some hesitation at each tale conjunction. Codicological irregularities show themselves where the longer version of L30 follows on from MO, with the introduction of L36 between NP and MA and where MA is linked to PA. The bulk of the tales appear to have been prepared, but probably existed as separate entities. It is when they take up their final positions in the order that the hesitations and possible delay are apparent.

Affiliations for the links and tales in this section support the idea of cooperation between the scribes. In L30 (NPP), Scribe D had the El exemplar available. L36 (MAP) is referred to by Manly and Rickert as "the recently written prologue" which was difficult to acquire. For this link they suggest that Ha4 and *a* had a common ancestor, an independent copy of O which was difficult to acquire. The archetype of PA, both prologue and tale was apparently a scribe's copy "in which not even the grossest errors had been corrected" (II: 457). However, Scribe D had access to the copytext available for both Hg and Cp.

It is possible that just as there was a hesitation in Hg with the word ' manciple' written over an erasure in L37 (PAP), equally there was hesitation and a pause by the Ha4 scribe. We saw in the first section of the manuscript that the Ha4 text for L3 and CO was associated with the exemplar used by Ad3, and that those tales in Ad3 are located after MA. That such a move was not adopted by other scribes may mean that it represented ideas on the grouping of tales at the end of the manuscript which never reached an

ultimate conclusion because Chaucer did not live long enough to revise and reorder the tales himself.

Clear evidence of the manipulation of text perhaps to accommodate tales previously-copied but lacking linking passages is to be seen where PA begins on fol. 252r, the last leaf of quire 32. The text of the first line of PA has had to be shortened to accommodate the Latin incipit which precedes the tale. This suggests that the linking passage between MA and PA had been copied. PA was in all probability a previously-copied tale, but parts at the beginning had to be revised to fit in with the Ha4 quires. It is almost impossible now to tell which bifolia needed to be recopied, but the presence of a catchword at the end of quire 33 in red ink suggests that certainly this quire needed adjustment.

Notes to Chapter 5

[1] The idiosynchratic mark of Adam Pinkhurst is visible throughout Hg and El. A very similar mark may be seen in Ha4 in the top border of fols. 220r, 229r, 230r, 231r and 257v, in TM, MO and PA. (Plate 21) The marks are mainly attached to the running titles. Whilst it is impossible to state that these marks or the running titles were Adam's work, I have scoured the remainder of the manuscript and have not found them elsewhere. In the conclusion to this chapter, I suggest a close working relationship between Scribe D and Adam, particularly in the last tales. For this reason, the possibility of his access to Ha4 is not as ridiculous as it might first appear. When I first identified what I suspected to be Adam's presence in the Boece manuscript (Stubbs 2002), it was the occurrence of the same distinctive mark which alerted me to his presence. I have also found examples of the mark in the Dd manuscript. Its occurrence there is significant since it defines specific portions of the text of WBP which may signify additions or alterations to the text. Since I argue in the conclusion to this thesis that the work of all the scribes may be inter-related, this is an obvious area for further investigation.

[2] Green divides Ha4 into a series of 'production units' defined by changes in the scribal hand and reinforced by the codicology. Whilst I do not necessarily agree with her views on the chronology of copying, the description of each codicological section as a 'production unit' is very appropriate.

[3] This was the opinion of Margaret Rickert (1940: 568).

[4] See Appendix 12: Quires 1-8.

[5] This central bifolium may have been inserted at a late stage in the assembly of this part of the manuscript and the introductory rubric was never entered. The same situation occurs in quires 26, 27 and 29 where similar marginal instructions were also left unexecuted.

[6] The incipit is also copied late into Cp in red ink on the central bifolium of quire 2. Since red ink is not used again in that manuscript until running titles for tales from WBP are added, and since I suggest the late addition of the central bifolium, it seems safe to conjecture that the Latin incipit was a finishing feature which for some reason was not added to Ha4.

[7] Analysis of the titles at this point also suggest that organisation of KT in Ha4 may be connected with the availability of the El exemplar.

[8] This hand is numbered Hand 2 in the running titles appendix.

[9] A complete catalogue of all running titles with further explanation are contained in Appendix 12.

[10] This is certainly what happened in Hg. It also happened in El, and it should be remembered that the extra unused quire which now surrounds El as end-leaves, may have been a quire set aside for precisely the purpose of finishing CO in some way. Cp was also probably prepared originally with a gap after CO.

[11] Ad3 and Ha5 may have had a common ancestor. Horobin argues that the text of Ad3 'is independently derived directly from the archetype of the tradition and preserves a high proportion of ancestral readings' (1997: 235). Since Alice Chaucer, the poet's granddaughter, is thought to have owned Ha5 at some stage, then she may have had original copies of Chaucer's work in her possession. This would then make sense of the

close textual relationship between Ad3 and Hg, an early and accurate copy of the archetype. Perhaps, as I suggest in the discussion of TG, there was evidence in the archetype of an impending re-arrangement of CO, perhaps taking with it, TG.This move was not effected by Adam Pinkhurst in either Hg or El, perhaps because of the time and the circumstances which prevailed when those manuscripts were copied. (See the conclusion to this thesis). However, some kind of information about an impending relocation may have been retained with exemplars of tales which remained in the Chaucer family after the death of the poet.

[12] See Appendix 11 and 12: Quires 8-9.

[13] 2NU does not move with CY in Ad3. There were problems with the position of these tales. As Benson suggests, the position of 2NU-CY provides the only real difference between the *a* order and the rest of the manuscripts. The use of TG and the different placing of CO may also be related to this reordering process.

[14] Word repetition and blank spaces left for time references, filled in by a later hand, show hesitation in the copying of this linking passage.

[15] See Appendix 12: Quires 10-11.

[16] Owen (1991: 121) provides useful insight into Manly and Rickert's *b* group of manuscripts. Ha4 shows frequent affiliation with this group in a number of tales, yet the *b* manuscripts did not really appear as a tradition until after 1450 when repeated and consecutive copying enabled identification of a *b* group affiliation. It is possible therefore that what we are witnessing in Ha4 is in reality a combination of some fresh copies of the archetype diluted by access to other copies. In other words, an attempt by a number of scribes to produce copies of the *Canterbury Tales* at the same time.

[17] The missing lines 1182-1186, is an omission which Tatlock calls 'striking' (1909: 22). He continues, "Now HI omits, thereby breaking up a couplet, the last 5 lines of the Sh. Prol., where amongst other things the speaker declares the tale shall not be learned, for he has but little Latin in his maw; did the reviser remember, possibly, the Sumner's fondness for Latin (A, 638)?" Green notes a change in script after the missing line 1175. She considers the last ten lines of the link to be in 'a slightly different script'. So perhaps what we are witnessing here is the actual process of the changing order of the tales.

[18] See Appendix 12: Quire 11 (last folio only) and Quires 12-19.

[19] It should be noted here that SQ, which comes further on in the order in Ha4, shares its ordinatio with the first part of Ha4, had already been copied, and was presumably available for inclusion at this point. This means that when making the Ha4 copy, Scribe D initially copied the tales in the same order as they appear in Cp and probably in Hg. However the scribe presumably became aware of another change in the order of the tales and relegated SQ to a later position, placing WBP immediately after ML, whilst at the same time cutting down on some of the linking passage. This may have been a purely pragmatic decision taken because of space restrictions.

[20] This suggests access to the thinking behind the El assembly of these tales by the Ha4 scribe.

[21] Hg and El include the stanza and Manly and Rickert, who follow Tyrwhitt in believing that that it was probably the remnants of an older link which Chaucer discarded when he provided the CL-ME link (15), comment on the fact that although perhaps discarded, it nevertheless turns up in the manuscripts which appear to contain the latest work (II: 265). The codicology of both Hg and El at this point suggest that the stanza may have been a last-minute insertion to fill out the folio.

[22] See Appendix 12: Quire 20.

[23] DaRold remarks on the similar difficulties experienced by the scribe in the assembly of these tales in Dd. The codicological irregularities of that manuscript in many instances mirror the problems of Adam Pinkhurst and Scribe D.

[24] It is obviously extremely difficult to be absolutely certain about the hand of the red title. It could be in the hand of Scribe D, perhaps copied in a different time-period and thus with a slightly different aspect. If the red ink titles and the dark titles in the same quire were representative of the informal and formal hand of Scribe D, then the the dark titles from KT-ML would be in the hand of the main scribe himself. There are other possibilities which are discussed in 5.9.

[25] Ha4 has an alphabetical signature system which probably used 24 letters. 'I' is used but there is no 'j' and probably no 'u'. This would have ended in the 24th quire. Signatures visible in quire 25 begin a fresh system with 'a iij' visible on fol. 191. The missing quire, which should have been present after quire 20, is thus not accounted for. See Manly and Rickert I: 219. They confusingly allot the number 21 to the missing quire.

[26] See Appendix 12: Quires 21-23 (fols. 157r-180v).

[27] See Appendix 12: Quires 24-29.

[28] The Hand of these titles is difficult to be certain about. Doyle and Parkes suggest that all the red titles in Ha4 are in the hand of Scribe D. However, Green suggests that the single red title for SQ on fol. 156v and the hand of the titles from fol. 181v, where PH begins, up to the end of quire 29 where MO begins, are the work of a different scribe. I cannot be certain which of these suggestions is correct and have labelled the Hand 6 or 7. Since this unit is a distinct codicological unit it is possible that the tales in this section had received their running titles earlier than the tales which precede them and therefore appear slightly different from the titles for WB-CY. Until further evidence emerges about the preparation of this unit it is impossible to decide whether they are the work of the scribe himself or display evidence for the presence of a supervisor.

[29] See Appendix 11 and 12: Quires 30-37.

[30] This is not the hand of the titles for WBP-ME or 2NU-CY.

[31] Irregular 6-leaf quire 19, inserted quire 20 with SQ ending 56 lines early, and quire 21 with FK beginning at line 516.

[32] Unlike the notas in ME and ML which seem to have been added in two separate styles, neither of which is the same as in SQ, FK.

[33] The hand of 'Squyeres tale' in quire 20, and that of Hand 2 occur in same quire. The hand of 'Squyeres Tale' is the hand of these red titles in quires 24. 25, 28 and 29.

6. Codicological Description of Huntington Library MS. El. 26 C 9: Ellesmere [El]

"Restraint, intelligence, and good taste help to make Ellesmere
the most beautiful of Canterbury Tales' manuscripts and lend
authority to what is essentially a deceptive book" (Owen 1991:
14).

6.1. Foreword

El is probably the most famous of all *Canterbury Tales* manuscripts. According to Daniel
Woodward "most scholars have come to agree that the Ellesmere Chaucer contains the
most complete authentic text and the most satisfactory arrangement of the tales" (Stevens
and Woodward 1997: 2). Prepared as a luxury product, El is carefully planned,
meticulously executed and ostensibly brought to harmonious completion. It has few of the
codicological irregularities associated with Hg, Cp and Ha4. Where such irregularities do
occur in El, they cast a great deal of light on the activities of the two scribes and their
preparation of all four manuscripts.

In the book of Essays prepared to accompany the 1996 facsimile, the physical
nature of El was subjected to minute expert analysis. A report was prepared on the
findings of Anthony Cains (1997: 29-39) and Parkes and Doyle provided their analyses of
the planning and construction of the volume as well as information on the hand of Adam
Pinkhurst (1997: 41-67). The illumination of El was examined at close quarters by
Kathleen Scott (1997: 87-119), the pilgrim portraits were analysed and the order of the
tales was once more brought under review. Other major scholars provided information on
the language of El, the editing of the text, the context of its production and provided a
comparison with Hg.[1]

However, no attempt was made by any of the scholars to extend the information
gleaned from the El codicology to the codicological irregularities of the other early
manuscripts. The preparation of El was therefore considered somewhat in isolation. In this
chapter, I shall attempt to draw on the expert analyses provided in the book of Essays and
compare them with my findings in Hg, Cp and Ha4.

I have adopted the same approach to an examination of the disbound Ellesmere
facsimile as I have done with the other manuscripts. However, a folio-by-folio description
of El would be extremely boring precisely because of its regularity. For that reason, the
focus of the chapter will be on the few irregular features which provide what I believe to
be some startling evidence for scribal co-operation. These features are mainly related to

the timing of the preparation and assembly of the tales and may be assessed by cross-referencing the information provided by the contributors to the Essays with my own observations. The illumination procedures are vitally important and for that reason I have drawn extensively on the information provided by Kathleen Scott.

It is intriguing to note that Charles Owen perceived the El manuscript as a "deceptive book". A further quotation from Daniel Woodward's Introduction will set the following chapter in context.

> "Like all books, the Ellesmere Chaucer is a product of erring
>
> hands as well as fallible minds. Even so, in the light of the latest
>
> studies, it now seems the nearest thing to an 'ideal' manuscript of
>
> the Canterbury Tales that anyone will ever have" (1997: 3).

6.2. General Codicological Description of Ellesmere

6.2.1. Contents

Huntington Library MS. El 26 C 9 contains what scholars believe to be almost the entire contents of the Canterbury Tales which Chaucer wished to include. El omits TG and MLEndlink as does Hg, but unlike Hg it has four of the five added passages in WBP. The Adam stanza is included in MO and the Modern Instances are at the end. L30 (NPP) is the longer version and Links 17 and 20 appear to be placed where they most logically fit. The Host stanza, L14, is included after CL's Envoy. NU has become 2NU, is followed by L33 and CY and these tales are now positioned after NP. There is no NPEndlink which appears in other a manuscripts. PA is complete and followed by Retraction and a final colophon.

6.2.2. Material and Quiring

The Canterbury Tales is contained in 29 regular quires of eight leaves, 232 folios of vellum. Four leaves of contemporary vellum both precede and follow the text and may originally have constituted a thirtieth quire since the leaves are pricked and ruled in identical fashion to the rest of the manuscript. They now contain a variety of material added at a later date. It is interesting to speculate on the reason why an extra quire of extremely expensive vellum was left unused, a factor which will be covered later in the description.

The skin used to fashion vellum of the highest quality was uterine or unweaned calf. El is made entirely from this luxurious medium and Parkes alludes to "the consistency of the fine follicle pattern throughout" (1997: 42) with each bifolium cut from

a single skin. The ink is a fairly consistent dark brown though there are slight variations discernible in places.

6.2.3. Scribe

The scribe of El is also Adam Pinkhurst, Chaucer's own scribe. He was responsible not only for the text but also for the running titles and glosses. The script is Anglicana Formata in what Parkes describes as "a large 'display' version" (1997: 43). The script is much more even than Hg and the marginal box allowed adequate space for the marginalia which nevertheless was copied by the scribe in a slightly smaller version of his script.

6.2.4. Page Size, Format and Ink Colour

The approximate page size is 39 x 28 cm. although Parkes estimates 10mm cropped from the bottom of the folios and approximately 13mm from the head (1997: 42). Decoration and running titles in the top margins of some folios have sustained damage because of the cropping. Fragments of the ascenders of a single catchword still survive in the lower margin of fol. 184r. Little has been removed from the outer edges. The text is written in a single column to a standard forty eight lines to each folio. The writing space is approximately 31-5 x 15.5 cm. and is ruled in reddish-brown ink with double ruling on all sides. The double margin at the top allows for running titles on each recto and verso. These are entered in the hand of the scribe and the ink of the text and may have been put in at the same time as the main copying. Double ruled lines at the bottom of the text box contain the final line of the text. Only occasionally is this arrangement compromised. The text box is slightly off centre and a single vertical line in the margin, approximately 6 cm. from the writing space, is the outer limit of the space allowed for the inclusion of glosses. It is still possible to see the prick marks for ruling on the outside edge indicating that trimming of that edge has been only slight. The ink colour is brown with little variation to suggest the different copying stints. There are slight variations in one or two places which will be noted in the following description but the overall impression is of a scribe in control of his medium.

6.2.5. Running Titles

Running titles are regularly applied in the headers of rectos and versos throughout the manuscript except for GP. They are in the hand of the scribe and each is preceded by a blue paragraph mark with red flourishing. The titles name the pilgrim whose prologue or

tale is contained on the folio. Titles which use more than one word for the pilgrim, as in Man of Law or Wife of Bath, have the words spread evenly between the recto and verso.

6.2.6. Decorative Features

The illumination of El is more elaborate than in any other *Canterbury Tales* manuscript. Twenty three miniatures, portraits of the pilgrims, are situated in the outside margins next to the opening text of each tale. There are seventy three three-sided borders attached to foliated initials introducing the tales. Where a prologue or a linking passage is on a separate page from the beginning of the tale itself, and where parts of tales need emphasis (as in PA), the same foliated initials attached to decorated borders are used. Paraphs in blue with red flourishing or gold with violet penwork, or smaller initials in the same colours, mark textual divisions, glosses and running titles.

Kathleen Scott's recent work on the illumination of El has produced vital information which may be of considerable significance when related to the codicology of Hg, Cp and Ha4. A summary of her findings is included here, with my own suggestions arrived at as a result of the codicological evidence supplied by all four manuscripts.

Scott detects three hands at work on the border illumination, Hands A, B and C. Each illuminator seems to have employed the services of his own flourisher, and stints of illuminator and flourisher correspond. As well as these six working on the border decoration, there were probably at least two less-skilled assistants employed for the finishing work.

As well as the illuminators, three separate artists were engaged to provide the miniatures of the pilgrims. Artist 1 worked on folios illuminated by each of the three illuminators and completed all the miniatures from the Knight to the Prioress and also the miniature of the Parson. From the analyses provided by Parkes and Emmerson (1997: 41-48 and 143-170), it would appear that, where it is possible to tell, Artist 1 completed the portraits on folios illuminated by Hands A and C *after* their illumination work had been finished. Miniatures supplied for the blocks of text sent to Hand B, appear to have been already completed, *before* work on the illumination began. This suggests that Hands A and C worked ahead of B. Thus, the beginning and end of the *Canterbury Tales*, the fixed points, were probably the first to be copied and illuminated for El. Artist 2 provided the portrait of Chaucer which accompanies TM, and Artist 3 painted the miniatures of the pilgrims from MO to MA (MO, NP, 2NU, CY and MA).

With Scott's analyses in mind, it is now possible to divide the manuscript according to the work of the illuminators (Appendix 16). Each illuminator was responsible for certain blocks of text. Four blocks of text, or runs of tales, can be identified as the sole

responsibility of a single illuminator. Hands A and C can each be assigned a single block, and their stints divide almost equally. Hand B appears to have been responsible for two blocks and his contribution is greater than A and C. These blocks assigned to a single illuminator may or may not have been copied in their entirety before they were passed on to be decorated. However, the blocks were probably not copied in the order in which they now appear.

As shown in the list below, in blocks 1, 2 and 4, the tales were illuminated exclusively by the Hand stated. In block 6, with the heavily illuminated PA, the first folio of L37 (PAP) and the last folio of the tale with Chaucer's Retraction are the only folios which are not the work of Hand C.

The table below indicates the division of illuminated folios in the manuscript. Two asterisks are used to indicate an illuminated folio with a linking passage which joins blocks of text, essentially the fragments as they were copied by Adam Pinkhurst. The illumination of these linking folios were all the responsibility of Hand B.

Scott's analysis identified six borders in E1 which show the work of two illuminators. The folios to which she assigned this divided responsibility for the illumination need to be carefully considered. Scott was not aware of the significance of these folios and reference to them is relegated to a footnote (1997: 92 and 114 n.16). She made no suggestion as to why these specific borders should have been collaborative ventures. However, five of these folios are of vital significance, since without exception, they are all folios which contain the text of linking passages or the opening of tales whose position has changed from the Hg order. The sixth border showing divided responsibility is the last folio of the manuscript containing Chaucer's Retraction. Further investigation will be conducted in the descriptions which follow in the main chapter. The blocks of illumination are divided as follows:

1. GP KT MI RE CO
   Hand A: 11 folios

2. ** ML WBPT FR SU
   Hand B: 12 folios

3. ** CL ME SQ FK
   Divided responsibility: A + B
   A = 4 folios + 3 partial
   B = 6 folios + 3 partial

4. ** PH PD SH PR TT TM

   Hand B: 7 folios

5. ** MK NP 2NU ** CY MA

   Divided responsibility: C + B + A

   C = 6 folios

   B = 3 folios + 2 partial

   A = 2 folios + 2 partial

6. ** PA

   Hand C: 15 folios

   Hand B = L37

   Hands A + B = Chaucer's RT

6.2.7. Order of Tales

The order of tales is Manly and Rickert's *a* order as follows: A B^1 D E F C B^2 G H I. The manuscript's groups of tales divide in accordance with the illumination:

GP KT L1 MI L2 RE L3 CO

L7 ML WBP WBT L10 FR L11 SU

CL L13 L14 L15 ME L17 SQ L20 FK

PH L21 PD SH L24 PR L25 TT L28 TM

L29 MO L30 NP 2NU L33 CY L36 MA L37 PA RT

6.2.8. Date

The approximate date for the production of El has traditionally been assessed as around 1410. However, in Kathleen Scott's re-evaluation of the illumination she opts for a much earlier dating, closer to 1400. Whilst it is as well to be as cautious about the dating of illumination as for palaeographical dating, Doyle and Parkes' suggestion of the possibility of parallel copying for parts of Hg and El also needs to borne in mind in the following examination.

6.2.9. Textual Affiliation

El is considered by Manly and Rickert to be independently copied. However, it has the *a* order and is connected with the *a* group of manuscripts. Exemplars used to copy some of its tales were available at times for other scribes. Presumably Adam Pinkhurst had the same access to Chaucer's work when he copied El as he had when he made the Hg copies. He may also have had access to Hg itself, even if it was merely a bundle of quires at that stage. El and Hg apparently make use of the same actual exemplar only for FR and parts of SU. They are also related in CL, L29, MO, NP and MAPT. El is alone in GP (after c. 332), L2, MI, L3, CO, ME (from 1691), L17, L20, PH, PD, SH, PR, TT and L29 (TT-TM). The *a* manuscripts make use of the same exemplar as El in KT, ML, WBP (after about line 400), WBT and CY.

6.2.10. General Observations

The manuscript was meticulously planned either by the scribe himself, a supervisor or a team. Almost no trace of a supervisory presence is apparent though there are occasional crosses or caret marks to indicate misspelling or missing text and a few corrections written in the margin. There are several examples of corrections over erasures. Marginalia and running titles were expected and allowed for. All running titles appear to have been copied at the same time as the text as well as indexing marginalia such as names within the text, titles of subject matter and also 'nota' and 'auctour'. Explanatory glosses, often interlinear, were also probably copied with the text. Latin glosses appear to have been copied in an ink which has aged to a slightly different colour from that of the text so were probably added at a different time.

A number of skilled workers were employed in the making of El. The scribe would have copied the text and either checked it himself or passed it to a supervisor. The addition of glosses may have been done some little time after the main text was copied. Completed text would have been sent to the limner to add the paraphs. The artist of the miniatures would need to receive the opening folio of each tale to work on his pilgrim portraits. One would envisage the illuminated borders as the last of the tasks but in fact there is evidence in El that some of the portraits were inserted after the folios had been decorated. An analysis of the order of work on El may have significance in the scholarly debate on the order of tales.

6.3. Fragment I (Group A)[2]

6.3.1. General Observations

- The first six quires of El have the tales from GP-CO in their regular order. CO ends half way down the penultimate leaf of quire six and the following leaf is blank.

- There is no opening title, no running titles for GP and the only illuminated border is on the first folio.

- Each pilgrim is named in either left or right margin and three-line decorated initials introduce the descriptions.

- Textual divisions are marked either by initial letters of two lines in height or simple flourished paragraph marks and this is the method adopted throughout the manuscript.

- The illumination and decorative features are sumptuous, the text appears to be meticulously planned and each tale is normally assigned an incipit and explicit (Appendix 18). However, neither KT nor MI has an incipit for a prologue, the only tales apart from PH, TT, TM and MO in the entire manuscript.

- L1 is introduced by '₵ Heere folwen the wordes bitwene the hoost and the millere'/ a linking passage which serves as a prologue.

- The entire section is united by the work of the same illuminator and flourisher and the pilgrim portraits are all executed by the same artist.

- The texts of all the tales in this section of El appear to have been independently derived and may represent fresh copies of Chaucer's tales at the latest stage in their development, perhaps incorporating some changes made by the author himself on his working copy.

6.3.2. Description

The opening folio of El has no title, unusual perhaps in such a meticulously planned codex. However, the placing of the three-quarter illuminated border leaves little space for anything in the top margin and it may be that a full page had been envisaged to act as a frontispiece. The title on the opening folio of Hg was copied at a very late stage in the making of that manuscript and may have been an afterthought. It is equally possible that when the scribe began to copy GP in El, no decision had been taken about the ultimate presentation of the *Tales*.

The first miniature in the manuscript is of the Knight which is positioned in the right margin looking down on the first line of KT. There is no prologue, though visually the instruction 'ɳarrat' in the right margin gives that illusion. 'ɳarrat' is an instruction which is never repeated again in El. Whereas in Hg, KT was divided into three parts, in El it is divided into four, each part ending with an 'Explicit' and the following section introduced by 'Sequitur'. The text of each separate part begins with illuminated letters of four lines in depth, other divisions of text with two-line initials.

KT ends on fol. 33v, the first leaf of the fifth quire and is followed by the words between Host and Miller which serves as a prologue to MI. The script on this folio has a tighter aspect than on the folios on either side and could have been entered at a different time. An illuminated border decorates fol. 33v with the text of the 'Words' and a second border on fol. 34v distinguishes the opening of the tale with the miniature of the Miller to the right of the text. Illuminated borders are features of both prologues and tales throughout El as is a regular allowance of space for rubrics.

The rubric to introduce L2 (REP) uses the word 'Prologue' for the first time, otherwise the same formula is applied as for MI with running titles, illuminated initials, the same line-count per folio, the same space left for ends of tales and following prologues and the same formula for decorated borders. The miniature of the Reeve on fol. 42r appears to have been painted after the illuminator had finished his work, as details of the Reeve's horse cover some of the decoration (Parkes 1997: 45). RE ends on fol. 46v and is followed by L3 (COP), which continues on fol. 47r where CO begins.

The portrait of the Cook is again placed to the right of the text which is copied on to the verso of the leaf and breaks off at line 58 leaving the remainder of the folio blank. Unlike Hg, there is no note to indicate that the tale was left unfinished by Chaucer. The following folio 48, the last leaf of the quire, is also blank and this represents the first hiatus in the smooth run of tales.

This group of tales appears to have been prepared together. The order of tales is the familiar one and El shares most of the minimal amount of glossing present in Hg. The glosses are mainly of an indexing or explanatory nature with few of the Latin commentary glosses which appear in some of the later tales in El.

The illumination of this first section also provides a continuity which gives the impression of preparation at an early stage in the making of the manuscript. Scott sees the decorated borders for the whole of this first section worked on by a single hand, probably the Master Limner of the three whom she estimates to be involved in the illumination. His work is distinctly 14th century in style and Scott believes that he was trained in that period (1997: 92).[3] This limner's work is supplemented by a flourisher who worked only with this

illuminator, and whose work is distinguishable by his use of blue flourishing on gold paraphs rather than the purple used by a second flourisher who worked with Hand B.

At the end of the unfinished CO, Scott distinguishes a clear break in continuity in the preparation of the manuscript. Not only is there scribal interruption with CO left unfinished, unsupplemented and unexplained, but there is also a shift in the decorative processes of the manuscript. Scott suggests that after the initial quality and control which she associates with the Master Limner, the illumination of the remainder of the manuscript was "parcelled out" among "various limners who may or may not have worked in one shop" (1997: 94). Apparently, there is also a sense in which the attention to detail and quality in the decoration deteriorates. An overall control is exercised, but the feeling is that something has happened in the course of the manuscript's preparation which has resulted in a change of ethos with the commencement of ML and Hand B's contribution to the borders.

Artist 1 completed all the miniatures in this first section. It is possible that, unlike the situation later in the manuscript, the artist completed the portraits of KT, MI, RE and CO *after* the folios were decorated. The only secure evidence for this can be seen in the portrait of the Reeve where details of his horse's feet obscure some of the illumination (Parkes 1997: 45), but examination of the relationship between Artist 1 and the Hand A illuminator later in the manuscript suggests that where it is possible to tell, A's borders were completed before the work of the artist began. It is possible therefore, that this early group of tales was copied, illuminated and perhaps even set aside, some time before work continued on the remainder of the manuscript.

6.4. Fragments II and III (Groups B¹ and D)⁴

6.4.1. General Observations

- The second part of El begins on fol. 49r, the opening of a new quire (7), with 'The wordes of the Hoost to the compaignye'.⁵

- ML, WBPT, FR and SU follow, with the explicit to SU copied irregularly below the ruled text box on fol. 87r, the penultimate leaf of quire 11. MLEndlink is notably absent.

- Affiliations of the El text in ML and WB are with the *a* manuscripts, but there is a change of affiliation for FR and SU, and for the first time in these tales Hg and El apparently derive their text from the same exemplar.

- All illumination in this group of tales was carried out by Hand B with a second flourisher whose work continues through the next groups of tales to fol. 167v, the end of TM.

- The same artist who worked in the first section is responsible for the miniatures, but this time, at least two, possibly three, of the four portraits appear to have been completed *before* the illuminator added the decoration.

- Running titles are regularly applied to all folios with one error of placement on fol. 71r where 'Wyf' is copied instead of the expected 'of Bathe'.

6.4.2. Description

The tales in this group also appear to have been conceived and copied as a single unit. WBP follows ML with no hesitation and with no space left for MLEndlink. ML is copied with space left between stanzas, the regular insertion of flourished paragraph marks or two-line decorated initials, and two extra illuminated folios mark the boundaries between parts. There are several instances of 'Auctour' in the margin which do not occur in Hg but apart from these extra references, the glosses for ML in both manuscripts are the same.

Glossing in WBP is noticeably much fuller than in the Hg version. El also has four of the five added passages in WBP which are not present in Cp, Ha4 and Hg. Of note is that the first of the passages which occurs after line 44 of WBP is the one which is missing. If it had been copied, it would have been present on fol. 63v and it is notable that the copying of this folio is very uneven, the script much larger and the ink blacker than that of the folio following. It is possible that this folio was left blank for some reason and the scribe returned later to fill in the necessary text. It is also possible that he had not left sufficient space to add the extra lines. If Chaucer had added the extra passages at a late stage in the development of the text, Scribe B may already have begun to copy WBP for El.

There were obviously some problems with the text of WBP, and El seems to change exemplar at around line 400.[6] The disturbance in this early part of El may therefore be seen to correspond with difficulties experienced in Hg, Cp and Ha4 for the first part of WBP. It is possible therefore, that the exemplar used by El for the first 400 lines did not contain the first of the added passages. It does seem strange however, that Scribe B, Chaucer's own scribe, should not have had access to the latest version of WBP which was available for the Dd scribe for example, unless as I have suggested above, the

extra material was added after Scribe B had begun WBP for El. 'The *frere* lough' passage at the end of WBP, which in Cp and Ha4 appears to have been an addition to the end of the prologue, is introduced in El with its own incipit identifying it as part of the framework narrative. The explicit to WBP and the incipit to the tale follow immediately afterwards. The last 42 lines of WBT are copied onto fol. 76r and a space is left before the explicit is included to complete the folio. L10 (FRP) thus begins afresh at the top of 76v. SU follows FR regularly but on fol. 87v the explicit to SU is copied below the last line of ruling, an irregularity which allows CL to begin at the top of 87v.[7] There could be a number of reasons for this. It could be because of a simple miscalculation as suggested by Parkes, but it may also be related to the inclusion of CL itself in this position, a situation which will be discussed in the next section.

Let us examine the information to be gleaned from the illumination of this section. The illuminator of all the tales in this group is Hand B, and a different flourisher begins work with him at the beginning of ML. The artist who painted the miniatures for the first section continued with portraits of ML, WB, FR and SU. However, unlike the first group of tales where the miniatures may have been added *after* the illuminator had finished his work, in this section there is evidence that the portraits of ML, FR and SU which are placed close enough to the text or the illumination to be able to distinguish, were included *before* the folios were illuminated. The illumination covers part of the bridle in the ML miniature and the horse's feet in the FR portrait. The miniature of SU was formerly believed to have been included even before the scribe had copied the tale. However, the examination of the text at this point with a binocular microscope proves that the miniature was included after the scribe had done his work.[8] It is no longer possible to determine what sort of hiatus there was between the painting of the portraits and the illumination of the folios but the significance of the time difference may become clearer on an examination of the tales in the next disrupted section.

The illumination work of Hand B in quire 11, the last quire of the section, begins with L11 (SUP) on the first recto, fol. 81r, and ends with CLP on the penultimate leaf, fol. 87v (Appendix 16). CL itself begins on the last recto folio of the quire, a folio which is illuminated by Hand A. There is thus an odd split in the apportionment of work for the illumination in this quire since the outer bifolium had to be acquired by both Hands A and B at different times to do their work. This division of labour seems strange if the text on the folios at the beginning and end of the quire was in place when the illumination was carried out.

Since we have established that in this section, the portraits of the pilgrims appear to have been painted *before* work on the illumination by Hand B was carried out, and since we

also know that in the first section, and indeed in the section which follows, Hand A appears to have illuminated the folios before the artist acquired them, it seems logical to suggest that fol. 88r, the single folio illuminated by Hand A in this section, was illuminated *before* Hand B began his work. This means that CLP may have been copied before ML-SU was in place.

6.5. Fragments IV and V (Groups E and F)[9]

6.5.1. General Observations

- CL is divided into five parts, with parts two, three and four beginning at the top of fols. 90r, 93r and 95r. The text is organised to attain this lay-out with parts one and three ending on a folio copied with five stanzas instead of the usual six. CL is followed by the Envoy and the Host stanza.

- L15 (MEP), a link not found in Hg, occupies most of fol. 102v with text spread out to deceive the eye, but the opening six lines of ME and the thirty two lines of the linking passage means that there are only 38 lines instead of 48 on this folio.

- ME continues to fol. 115r where it is followed by L17 introducing SQ.

- SQ occupies the next seven folios, ending at the top of fol. 122v with the remainder of the folio left blank.

- On fol. 123r where L20 joins SQ and FK, there is a second example of the scribe spreading the text of a linking passage. The 36 lines of L20 are preceded by an incipit placed in generous space at the top of the folio, and is followed by a simple 'Explicit' which again is more than adequately accommodated.

- On fol. 123v, FK begins with a prologue of 20 lines separated out from the text of FK. In Hg there is no separate prologue, but 'narrat' in the margin indicates a division.

- FK continues into quire 17 and links with PH on fol. 133r, the central bifolium.

- Hand A completed the illumination of fol. 88r, where the *tale* of CL begins. He also completed the border on fol. 97r for the fifth part of CL, on fol. 115v for the opening of SQ, and on fol. 123v where FK begins. He thus had sole responsibility for the opening folios of the *tales* of CL, SQ and FK.

- Hand A also contributed to three more borders, on fols. 102v (L15-ME), 115r (ME-L17) and 123r (L20), all containing linking passages not immediately available when he copied Hg, and never available for Scribe D when he copied Cp. If Hand A was the first illuminator to work on these folios, he left them unfinished.

- Hand B was responsible for the illumination of the opening folio of CLP (fol. 87v), fols. 90r, 93r and 95r, where parts two, three and four of CL begin, fol. 101v where CL is followed by the Envoy, and fol. 119r in the middle of SQ.

- Hand B's work is also evident on fols. 102v, 115r and 123r, according to Scott, so presumably it was he who completed the illumination left unfinished by Hand A.

- Folio 102r, with the end of Envoy and the Host stanza, did not receive the expected illumination. This folio has 30 lines of text rather than 48.

6.5.2. Description

In the previous section, the colophon to SU was copied below the ruled space on fol. 87r which suggests accommodation of text for some reason at the junction of Fragments III and IV. This may be, as Parkes suggested, because of the extra space taken for the title to 'The wordes of the lordes Squier', a passage possibly not available when El was first planned, or it may relate to difficulties associated with the end of SU.[10] It is possible therefore that the scribe proceeded with the copying of CLPT on the final folio of quire 11, and delayed the copying of the opening of CLP until the exact space for the preceding tale had been established.

The four tales which comprise this section in El all appear to be independent copies either of the authorial copy itself or from an exemplar derived from the authorial copy. The tales are presented in the order found only in Ha4 of the earliest manuscripts, but whereas in Ha4 there was obvious hesitation in some places as Scribe D assembled the tales in this order and included the linking passages, in El the hesitation is not so apparent though may still be discerned through features of the codicology.

It is the illuminated borders in this section which could betray a lack of cohesion and require satisfactory explanation about the timing of the copying and the illumination. If the tales WB, FR and SU were worked on later in the production of the manuscript, as they were in Hg, Cp and Ha4, then the tales which constitute Fragments IV and V in El may have been begun before the previous tales, WB-SU were completed.

CLP follows SU and begins at the top of fol. 87v after an explicit to SU copied below the ruled space revealing the necessity to adjust the text either for CL to begin at the top of the next folio or more likely because CL was already in place and the explicit to SU had to be crowded in. The tale proper begins on fol. 88r after the last two stanzas of the Headlink. If the tales which precede CL were not ready to be copied, or it was not exactly clear as to the position of CL in the order of tales (its position in El is different from its position in Hg), then it may have been prudent to delay the copying of the first folio of CLP until the exact space for the preceding tales had been established.

Note has already been made of the division of labour on the borders of fols. 81r (SU) and 88r (CL), the conjoint outside leaf of quire 11, and the suggestion was made that Hand A, the Master illuminator, finished his border on 88r before Hand B entered his contribution on fol. 81r. This would suggest that CL was copied before SU. Other evidence provided by the illuminated folios in this group of tales would seem to support the hypothesis that Hand A worked before Hand B and the copying of CL, ME, SQ and FK may have been begun at an early stage in this manuscript's production, perhaps after GP-CO.

Hand A may have had two separate attempts to provide the decorated borders. As well as providing the decoration for the opening of the tale of CL, Hand A provided the borders for the beginning of the fifth part of CL, for the opening of SQ and also of FK. However, he also contributed to the partial decoration of three more borders, where L15 (MEP) links CL to ME, where ME links to SQ and where SQ links to FK.

It is of the utmost importance here to try to estimate the significance of the fact that the three borders just described were left unfinished. All three unfinished borders occur at fault-lines in the tales. The first of these, fol. 102v, involves the linking passage between CL and ME, a passage which does not appear in any guise in Hg and Cp and was a very late entry into Ha4. It therefore had to be provided for Adam when he copied El and changed the order of the tales from the Hg order to place ME after CL.

The previous recto of the same leaf, fol. 102r, has the last four stanzas of the Envoy and the Host stanza. There is no border decoration on this folio, although by strict standards of hierarchy one could have expected a border to define the Host stanza as it appears to be part of the framework narrative. Oddly, there are only five stanzas on this folio, 31 lines of text with two rubrics, which occupy 36 lines instead of 48. The explicit to CL is peculiarly placed, after the Host stanza instead of after the tale proper, and before the Envoy, where it appears in Hg. The lack of expected illumination, the curtailed word-count, the odd placement of the explicit and the fact that the Host stanza itself is of dubious status in the tales and the Envoy may have been a later addition, could imply that

the copying of this folio was left only partially completed as the order of the tales was being manipulated.[11]

Endorsement for this suggestion comes when the situation on fol. 102v is taken into account. L15 (MEP) opens the folio. The 32 lines of the linking passage and the first 6 lines of ME are arranged to deceive the eye. The incipit for the prologue, which is a single line in length, nevertheless occupies at least six lines of space below the decorated border. It is possible therefore that the scribe received the linking passage *after* he had copied the opening text of ME at the bottom of the folio. Corroboration for this comes from the champe initial which opens the linking passage. The decoration of the initial letter is much simpler than the standard decoration and unusually is completely separate from the decorated border. If the initial for the opening of L15 had been in place, then it is difficult to see why the illuminator would not have tied it in with the border decoration as was his usual practice.

The border was left unfinished, presumably by Hand A, and was completed some time later by Hand B. Partial completion of the borderwork of fol. 102v suggests work carried out in haste by Hand A.

The borders completed by Hand A in quires 15 and 16 reinforce the suggestion that work on these tales was a staggered process. The linking passages appear to have been received *after* the main text had been copied and illuminated. The folios bearing the links were then submitted to a hasty illumination process which for some reason there was not enough time to complete.

In quire 15, ME ends and is followed by SQ. Fol. 115v, with the opening of SQ has been illuminated in its entirety by Hand A. The previous recto has the last 12 lines of ME, the explicit, the incipit to L17, and 28 of the 30 lines of that prologue. Though located on the same leaf, the illumination of the verso is complete whereas that of the recto was left unfinished. It makes no logical sense for the illuminator to have had a folio in his possession which required the illumination of both recto and verso and for him to have left the illumination of the recto unfinished but then completed the illumination of the verso. The situation must be related to the acquisition of text for L17, positioned at another of the fault lines of the manuscript.

It will be remembered that in Cp, SQ followed ML as in Hg. In Ha4, SQ was copied at the same time as ML and may originally have been destined to follow that tale though its position was altered to conform with the El order. When Adam copied El, he must have been aware that the order in which he was presenting the tales was different from previous orders. The linking passage is considered to have been written by Chaucer and it is possible that in El we are witness to the pause in the proceedings before Adam acquired that link from Chaucer himself. It may have arrived late in the preparation of the

manuscript and the folio which had previously been illuminated on the verso may have been sent once more to the illuminator to begin work on the decoration of the recto. For some reason, work on the illumination was brought to a halt.

The situation in quire 15 is mirrored in quire 16. Fol. 123v was copied with FKP and the opening of FK. FKP comprises the first 20 lines of the tale as copied into Hg, which in El is separated out as a prologue. This reflects the attempt of the scribe in El to allot prologues to precede tales wherever it was possible to do so. The illumination of the opening of FK on fol. 123v was achieved in its entirety by Hand A. The recto of the folio contains L20, the Words of the Franklin to the Squire and the Words of the Host to the Franklin. Just as with Link 17, there are too few lines for the amount of space available and they are positioned in such a way as to deceive the eye. Just as with Link 17, this recto folio was only partially illuminated and finished at a later date. Fol. 123r is thus the third folio in this group of tales which was only partially completed and which contains text related to a shift in the order of tales between Hg and El.

I have assumed that the partial decoration of these folios was begun by Hand A and completed by Hand B. This seems a logical assumption since fols. 115v and 123v were both decorated in their entirety by Hand A and it seems unlikely that the Master Illuminator would complete the decoration on the verso, then send the folio to Hand B who was not able to complete the job, and the folio therefore had to return to Hand A to finish off. It is possible that the borders of fols. 102v, 115r and 123r were only partially completed because there was no text on them. We have seen that it is doubtful that L15 was in place when the border decoration was done because the initial letter of the prologue is not tied in. The same situation could have existed on the other folios also.

Corroborating evidence that the completed border decoration of fol. 123v was done early, perhaps in temporal proximity with the first borders of the manuscript, comes from the fact that the portrait of the Franklin was painted *after* the illuminator had completed his task, a situation reminiscent of the portrait of the Reeve in the first section. Presumably the partial decoration of the recto folio with the linking passage was done after the illumination of the verso but left unfinished until the link was received and copied.

With the ending of FK, according to Kathleen Scott, the use of gold balls to decorate sprays "either cease to be used or are used in much reduced numbers" (1997: 90). Apart from a few folios mainly in PA, which may anyway have been illuminated earlier rather than later in the decorative processes, the general illumination of the manuscript after FK undergoes a further deterioration in the decorative procedures.

6.6. Fragments VI and VII (Groups C and B²)¹²

6.6.1. General Observations

- The four tales in the previous section seem to have been worked on as a group at an early stage in the assembly of the tales in El. FK is the last of these tales to be illuminated by Hand A, and the order of the tales in Fragments VI and VII which follow, is the pattern of the tales established in Hg.

- In El however, the tales of the E and F groups have been rearranged and NU has disappeared from its position after FK where it is placed in Hg, Cp and Ha4.

- No attempt has been made to supply a prologue or linking passage for PH or SH.

- There are seven illuminated borders instead of the expected eleven and all have been achieved by Hand B. They are FK-PH (fol. 133r), PDP (136v), PDT (138r), SH (143v), PR (148v), PR-L25 (151r), and TM (153v).

- Folios which should have been illuminated according to the regular pattern established earlier, are PH-L21 (fol. 136r), SH-L24 (fol. 148v), L25-TT (fol. 151r) and L28-TM (fol. 153r).

- On the folios which have been illuminated, it is possible to distinguish that at least three of the miniatures were in place *before* the illumination process began; the portraits of SH and PR by Artist 1, and the portrait of Chaucer at the head of TM which is the sole contribution of Artist 2.¹³

6.6.2. Description

It appears that this block of tales was prepared as a batch and since there are borders which have not been illuminated, it would be logical to suppose that the supervisory role of the Master Illuminator had ceased when these tales were assembled. This would accord with the observation of Kathleen Scott that from FK the decoration in this section becomes much less opulent. However, the same artist who painted the portraits for the pilgrims up to FK continued to supply them for PH, PD, SH and PR. As in the section ML-SU, also illuminated by Hand B, two of the portraits were definitely painted *before* the illuminations were added, those of PR and SH. The miniature of Chaucer was also entered *before* that folio went to be illuminated (See Parkes in Stevens and Woodward

1997: 45). It is possible therefore that these folios were copied and set aside, perhaps with spaces left for adjustment of text before any attempt was made to send them to the illuminator.

All tales in this section appear to be independent copies of the archetype, although the linking passage between PH and PD has undergone some revision since it was copied for Ha4. Of significance are the parallels between the preparation of Ha4 and El in this section. In El, all folios noted above which have not been illuminated are precisely the folios in Ha4 which still retain the notes of the scribe in the margins about the provision of text or rubrics. The scribes may have been in consultation about the presentation of this section. Fol. 148r in El, (SH-L24-PRP) is notable for its unadorned state, for the variation in the size of script from line to line and sometimes word to word, and for the haste with which it seems to have been copied. It is almost as though the finishing of this section was achieved in a hurry by a scribe anxious to bring his work on this manuscript to a close.

TT is set out with careful bracketing of the text just as in Hg. There is no illumination of any kind in TT in El and again the impression is either of text entered at the end of the preparation time or alternatively, of text copied and set aside for some reason to await further adjustment or refinement from the author. It should be remembered that the quire containing the end of SH, PR, TT and the opening of TM in Hg, also appears to have been set aside and the internal folios of that quire were then gnawed by rats. A replacement outside folio in the Hg quire enabled TT to be joined to TM. It is possible that just as in Hg, the linking of TT to TM in El took place late in time in the assembly of the manuscript.

The quires in this section show no involvement whatsoever of the Master Illuminator and therefore may have been under review later, rather than earlier in the manuscript assembly, after his work on the manuscript had ceased. The portraits of the pilgrims appear to have been painted *before* the application of the illumination. The tales must have been at least partially copied so that the artists could enter the portraits. Nevertheless the absence of illumination on key folios with linking text suggests that the final order and even the inclusion of some tales (TT for example), may have been arrived at late in the assembly process. It may be pertinent to note that I have argued in the manuscript descriptions in the previous chapters that some of the tales in this fragment were brought together as a result of the transfer of SH from WB and possibly the movement of TM from the tale told by ML. PR also may have been differently placed in an earlier order.[14] It is strange that the preparation of El at this point appears to mirror the preparation of the other three manuscripts for exactly the same stretch of texts. The correspondences in the production of all four manuscripts for the same group of tales

would surely not have occurred in such a dramatically similar way if there had been long periods of time between their preparation.

Also of significance is the fact that TM is contained within two quires, beginning on the verso of the first leaf of quire 20 and ending on the penultimate leaf of quire 21. Once again, with this manner of preparation, it is easy to copy linking text onto the first and last leaves of quires if the order of the tales had not been firmly established when TM was originally copied for El.

6.7. Fragments VII, VIII, IX and X (Groups B², G, H and I)[15]

6.7.1. General Observations

- The last folio of quire 21 appears to represent a new beginning in El. The order of tales in this section of El is different from the order in Hg, Cp and Ha4. Fragment VI, (2NU and CY) has been placed to follow NP and therefore comes between the NP-MA order of the three other manuscripts.

- A new beginning is also signalled by the change of illuminator and artist. A third illuminator begins work on fol. 168r (L29 MOP) and is responsible for most of the borders in this section and with him is a third flourisher.

- A third artist provides the miniatures for all tales except PA which was painted by the artist of the miniatures from KT-PR.

- Despite the apparent new beginning, two complete and two partial borders by Hand A demonstrate that earlier rather than later in the manuscript's preparation, MO was linked to NP and NP to 2NU.

- Hand A's partial contribution to the final folio of the manuscript with Chaucer's Retraction also suggests that this was a tract copied earlier rather than at the last moment.

- Hand B makes a minimal contribution to the borders in this part of the manuscript, completing only three in their entirety and contributing to two more.

- Once again, an analysis of the possible timing of the different decorative features may be significant.

6.7.2. Description

TM ends on the penultimate folio of quire 21. L29 begins at the top of the final recto of the quire and the opening folio is decorated by Hand C, the first folio of his contribution. L29 continues to the bottom of the final verso of the quire with the last eight lines of the link preceding MO on the opening folio of quire 22. Apparently Adam had acquired a much better fair copy of this link than Scribe D, and presumably this was supplied by Chaucer. The first folio of quire 22, with the last lines of the link and the opening of MO has a border decoration by Hand A. Since we have seen in Hg, Cp and Ha4 that MO may have been a tale copied early in the collection, it should not suprise us that the illumination of this tale was achieved in its entirety by the illuminator who appears to have done the first work on El.

We also know that MO and NP were probably linked together earlier rather than later as the tales were gathered together. However, the difference in El, is that unlike Hg and Cp, there is an extended linking passage (L30) between the end of MO and the opening of NP. Hand A illuminated fol. 178r with the end of MO and the opening of L30 in its entirety also. On fol. 178v, L30 comes to an end having used only 38 of the 48 lines. The remaining space is left vacant and NP begins at the top of fol. 179r. One is tempted to suggest therefore that there may have been some delay before the acquisition of the longer form of L30 (NPP), a delay sufficient for the scribe to have continued with the tale on the following recto leaving too much space for the linking passage on the previous folios. One could assume therefore that the decision to link the two tales was a decision taken earlier rather than later in the preparation of El but that there was a delay before the link arrived.

NP is followed in El on fol. 185v by 2NU. The Tale of Saint Cecile, as it is called in Hg and Cp, has changed position and acquired a division of the original text to provide a prologue, lacking in Hg, Cp and Ha4. However, when he copied Ha4, Scribe D used the same ancestor copy as was used by Adam for El (Manly and Rickert II: 433). Ha4 does not attempt to divide out the prologue from the tale, so it is reasonable to assume that there was no division in the copytext shared by the two scribes. In the making of El, the requirement for a prologue encouraged Adam Pinkhurst to separate out 17 stanzas to act as such. It is interesting to consider whether Adam would have taken this decision himself, or whether he had received authorial instruction. It is also interesting to note that on fol. 185v, where NP joins 2NU, the border decoration is another border showing the work of both Hand A and Hand B. One might suggest therefore that the positioning of 2NU was done in the same phase of work as the partially completed work on the tales in Fragments IV and V. Hand A makes no further contribution until he provides the border for L37 (PAP).

The repositioning of 2NU after NP presumably influenced the title, and NU became 2NU. Yet the tale in Ha4 is called the 2NU, although its position following FK reflects the Hg position. Scribe D accessed the El exemplar, and made his copy. He found out later that the tale had been renamed 2NU, and changed position, and he was able to implement the name-change when copying the rubrics. However, he was not able to divide the tale into prologue and tale nor was he able to reposition it, which suggests that NU may already have been copied for Ha4 before the decision to reposition the tale in El was taken.

Hand C supplies the border for the opening of 2NU proper on fol. 187r. He is joined by Artist 3, who provides all the portraits from MO to MA. The miniatures painted by the third artist are larger and sit well out into the margin, so it is difficult to be certain when they were added. Hand C also provides the border for the opening of CY on fol. 194r, but perhaps of significance is that Hand B is responsible for the border on fol. 192r, where 2NU is followed by L33 (CYP). It is possible therefore that the linking of 2NU to CY was achieved very late in the copying of El and the border was left for Hand B, who appears to have worked after A and C.

The remainder of the borders from the end of CY through MA and PA are provided by the third illuminator, Hand C. There are two exceptions which need to be examined. L37, PAP begins at the top of fol. 206r. The border on this folio is illuminated by Hand A, the Master. However, the border on 206v is the work of Hand C. Folio 206 therefore had to pass through the hands of both A and C. If we examine the structure of the quire (Appendix 17: quire 26), we can see that fol. 206 is conjoint with fol. 203. On fol. 203r, where MA begins, the border is again supplied by Hand C. Two artists also had to have access to this bifolium since Artist 3 contributed the portait of the Manciple, whilst Artist 1, who was responsible for all the portraits from KT-PR, painted the miniature of the Parson. The miniature of the Parson was added to fol. 206v *after* Hand C had finished his work on the border since it required the erasure of a daisy bud in the decoration to fit the portrait into the required position.[16] However, this work by Artist 1 may not have been a late return to work on the manuscript.

We have seen that the Hand A illuminator appears to have completed his borders before Artist 1 had the opportunity to work on them. Hand A shared fol. 206 with Hand C. Hand A's work on the border was completed, not left partially finished as in previous examples. I would suggest therefore that Hand C's work on fol. 206v followed closely after Hand A and he also completed the border for fol. 206v *before* the work of Artist 1 began. Hands A and C may therefore have worked to some extent together and at an early stage in the production of the manuscript.

The only other border in this last part of the manuscript which was not completed by Hand C, is the border on the final folio of the manuscript, fol. 232v. This folio contains the text of Chaucer's Retraction and the final colophon, which suggests that the *Canterbury Tales* was compiled by Geoffrey Chaucer. It is therefore an important folio in terms of its relevance to the work of Adam Pinkhurst and his master, Geoffrey Chaucer. Fol. 232v is the final folio on which the work of both Hands A and B are in evidence. This means that one of the illuminators began work on the folio and it was finished by the second. Since I have established that elsewhere in the manuscript, work by Hand A appears to have preceded that of Hand B, one could assume that the same conditions would apply to this last, important folio.

However, another feature which needs to be taken into account is that the conjugate of this folio is fol. 225 where borders of both recto and verso were contributed by Hand C. It is a strange situation in terms of organising the work-flow to have a single bifolium passed between three separate illuminators. In the previous paragraph I suggested that the work on the borders of the last tales was running concurrently between Hands A and C. The conjugate fols. 225/232 passed between both illuminators. In this instance, the border of fol. 232v was only partially completed by Hand A. It could be assumed therefore that Hand C completed his work on the borders of fols. 225rv before Hand A made his partial contribution to the border on fol. 232v. The border on fol. 232v was one of five in the manuscript for which the Master Illuminator did not complete his work.

The border on fol. 232v was completed at some later time. It appears that it was completed by Hand B whose work in the rest of the manuscript appears to be the addition of borders considered necessary for the completion of the manuscript. The work of all three illuminators on this particular important bifolium may provide support for the hypothesis that the Ellesmere manuscript was only partially completed at Chaucer's death, and finished off at some later date when the confusion attendant on the death of the poet in the middle of organising his magnum opus had abated.

6.8. Conclusion

6.8.1. Fragment I (Group A)

This first group of tales in El is beautifully presented, carefully planned and there are no apparent difficulties encountered by the scribe in his copying. The only noticeable irregularity is that KT and MI have no dedicated passage which is described as a prologue though the 'wordes bitwene the Hoost and the Millere' acts as such for MI. The copying of this group of tales may have been carried out early and they may then have

been set aside to await further developments in text and order. For all tales in this section the scribe made independent copies of the archetype, copies which were then accessible by other scribes for correction, (Ha4 in KT and *b* in MI).

It is also possible that all the tales in this section were illuminated before the decision was taken to supplement the descriptions with portraits of the pilgrims. The master limner decorated all eleven borders in this part of the manuscript which represents only 47 of the 232 folios. For the remainder of the tales he was responsible for six complete borders and contributed to a partial illumination of only five more. The apportionment of labour on specific borders is significant and is analysed in the following descriptions.

6.8.2. Fragments II and III (Groups B¹ and D)

The merging of Fragments II and III appears to have been planned as there is no hesitation between the end of ML and the beginning of WBP. The copying of the tales must have been consecutive and it is only at the end of SU where CL follows that there is any perceptible irregularity. The colophon to SU on fol. 87r is copied below the ruled space and follows the regular 48 lines of text thus allowing CLP to begin at the top of the following verso. A possible miscalculation is suggested by Parkes deriving from the excessive amount of space taken to include the subheading 'The wordes of the lordes Squier and kerue for the departynge of the fart on twelue' which begins on fol. 86v and forms the ending of SU. It is possible therefore that this passage and its title were added at a later date than the copying of the rest of SU and insufficient account was taken for the space required for the heading. This then had a knock-on effect on the next folio. However, in view of the changed position of CL from its position in Hg it is interesting that the El scribe also encountered difficulties at the junction of SU and CL. Since the group WB, FR, SU was copied late for Hg in a distinctive ink, it is possible that the same group of tales was added later in El. It is significant perhaps that in El, FR and SU are the only two tales for which Hg and El share an identical exemplar. Perhaps after completing GP-CO, the scribe prepared the four tales CL-FK as the next block, leaving ML-SU until a complete text was available. Some support for this suggestion comes from the activities of the illuminators.

All borders in this section, apart from the last one on fol. 88r, were executed by Hand B. The border on fol. 88r (CL) was illuminated by Hand A, probably the Master illuminator, who had already completed all the borders in the first section. Fols. 81 and 88 are the outer leaves of quire 11. Fol. 81r (SU) is illuminated by Hand B, fol. 88r (CL) is illuminated by Hand A, so at some stage, this bifolium passed through the hands of two

illuminators. One of those borders must have been executed before the other and it would seem logical to assume that if the text were being copied in the order of the tales as they appear, then SU would have been copied and presumably decorated before CL. But there is a problem associated with the timing of the work done on the decoration of these folios. In this section of tales, ML-SU, at least two of the four miniatures were definitely in place before Hand B decorated the folios. We have already ascertained that in the first section, the miniaturist probably worked *after* Hand A had decorated the borders. There is further evidence in the next section, CL-FK, that the miniatures for two of the folios decorated by Hand A were also put in *after* the illumination was in place. It would appear then, that where it is possible to tell, the miniaturist received the folios to paint the portraits of the pilgrims, after Hand A had finished with them. Hand A seems to have been employed on the illumination before B began his stint. The miniaturist also painted the portraits on folios which were to be illuminated by Hand B, but they were done *before* B proceeded with the illumination. This could suggest either that the tales to be illuminated by B were not copied in their entirety when A was illuminating his borders, or that the linking texts between tales were not in place or perhaps needed some adjustment (as we have already seen at the end of SU). The situation in quire 11 therefore, with fol. 81v decorated by Hand B and fol. 88r decorated by Hand A, would indicate that the border for CL may have been completed by Hand A before the ending of SU was copied and Hand B began his work. A clarification of the situation may be apparent on examination of the following section.

6.8.3. Fragments IV and V (Groups E and F)

From an analysis of the application of the decorative features in this section it would appear that the scribe copied the tales CL, ME, SQ and FK and assembled them deliberately in the order in which they now appear. Though he was aware of the intended order, he may not have had access to the passages which were to link the tales together and may not have been able to estimate the exact amount of space to leave at each tale junction. Evidence for this suggestion comes from disturbance in the stints of the Hand A illuminator. Hand A attempted to follow the same practice established in Section 1, that of decorating folios at the opening of each prologue and each tale. However, the fact that he illuminated only the opening of the tale of CL but did not appear to have the previous folio containing the prologue suggests that at the time when CL was originally copied, either its position in the order of tales had not been ultimately decided or the preceding group of tales ML-SU had not been copied in their entirety. Eventually fol. 87rv, where CL follows on from SU, was illuminated by Hand B whom we have established worked

after Hand A had done his work. The same situation occurs where ME follows CL (fol. 102v). Only one border was required here because the prologue to ME, (not included in Hg where ME follows SQ not CL), was contained on a single folio and followed by the first six lines of the tale. Nevertheless, the border was only partially completed by Hand A. The previous recto is unadorned, although the presentation of the Host stanza text suggests a piece of framework narrative which according to the strict decorative hierarchy, should have been illuminated. The Host stanza may have been entered at a late stage, perhaps even after the linking of ME to CL to avoid a large blank space.

An identical situation is suggested by the borders on fols. 115rv and 123rv. Fols. 115v and 123v, where SQ and FK begin, are decorated entirely by Hand A. The previous rectos have borders only partially completed by Hand A, suggesting later acquisition of the linking passages. Since according to Parkes (1997: 45) the portrait of FK was painted *after* the border decoration had been completed on fol. 123v, it would seem that Hand A was again working ahead of the artist, and the borders of this section were achieved in temporal proximity with those of the opening section.

6.8.4. Fragments VI and VII (Groups C and B² up to MO)

It may be relevant at this juncture to refer to Fisher's argument that in his final revision, Chaucer had reached as far as FK. This suggestion might then be related to Kathleen Scott's assessment about the less opulent decoration of the tales after FK. In conjunction with the observations of these two scholars, there is the evidence of the four folios in this section of El which have not received the expected illumination allied with the obvious haste in which the scribe entered some portions of text. The illuminated folios were the sole responsibility of Hand B and presumably he did not have sufficient time, or was not paid adequately to supply the missing illumination. There is no contribution to any decoration whatsoever by Hand A.

Dempster sees the tales in these two fragments as having missed Chaucer's "finishing touches" so one is left wondering why this should be so (1953: 1158)? Scribe D also had problems with exactly the same group of tales in Ha4, leaving notes in the margins which were never acted upon. The situation of the two scribes must be connected in some way.

6.8.5. Fragments VII, VIII, IX and X (Groups B² [MO-NP], G, H and I)

In the middle portion of the manuscript, (CL-FK), the behaviour of the Master Illuminator was noted. He appeared to have contributed to the illumination of the four tales by working on the opening folios of each. Three of the borders in that section were only

partially completed and finished later by the second illuminator. Those partial borders were associated with the linking passages between the four tales, suggesting that the passages may not have been available when the borders for the opening of the tales themselves were completed. The same situation applies in this last group of tales. The first folio of MO was illuminated by Hand A, the folio bearing the link between TM-MO was left for Hand C. This might suggest that when MO was originally copied, the opening of the Prologue had not then been copied to follow TM. MO and L30 were joined securely and El has the longer version of the linking passage. However, where 2NU is slotted in to follow NP, a new position for this tale among the four manuscripts surveyed, the border is once more only partially illuminated by Hand A suggesting a late entry.

The only other folio associated with Hand A in this final portion of El is folio 232v, the last folio of the manuscript. It is on this folio that Adam has copied Chaucer's Retraction and the final colophon naming Chaucer as the compiler of this work. The folio has a border which once again was only partially illuminated by the Master Illuminator.

The contribution of the third illuminator, Hand C is mainly confined to the 14 borders in PA. In PA, the border for the opening folio was completed by Hand C *before* the artist contributed his portrait. This is a situation reminiscent of the work at the beginning of the manuscript. Of the 6 further folios from C in this last section, he appears to have been working with Hand A, and for each of MO, NP and 2NU, one illuminator provided the border for the prologue and the other for the tale. The two illuminators may well have been working together. Hand B contributed three complete borders only in this section. He also finished the work done by Hand A on two folios, where 2NU follows NP and the folio containing Chaucer's Retraction. He completed the borders where 2NU is followed by CY and where PA follows MA. If Hand B was responsible for the illumination of folios where fragments collide, then it is possible to see that the order 2NU-CY and MA-PA may have been arrived at late in the assembly.

Notes to Chapter 6

[1] In Stevens and Woodward (1997). The following essays with their page numbers in the volume have also been of enormous help. J.J. Smith, (69-86), Alan Gaylord (121-142), Richard Emmerson (143-170), N.F.Blake (205-224), Ralph Hanna III, (225-243), Helen Cooper (245-261) and Derek Pearsall (263-280).

[2] See Appendix 16 and 17: Quires 1-6.

[3] Scott's assessment of the role of Hand A is important. His work in the Hatton 4 manuscript, in which Scott sees the presence of the Hand A and Hand B illuminators of El, suggests to her that he was the 'head illuminator of the team (1997: 95). As such he would bear responsibility for the most important borders. His role in El is also as the person 'in charge' and thus would be expected to illuminate the most important borders in that manuscript also. In view of the 'most important' borders in El, I can think of none more significant than those which signal the change in ordering the tales of the manuscript as well as the final folio with its attribution to Chaucer himself.

[4] See Appendix 16 and 17: Quires 7-11.

[5] In Hg, this passage is called the Prohemie of the ML and the tale begins at line 99. The El 'Words' correspond with the Prohemie, and are usually called the MLHeadlink. Lines 99-133 are then separated out in El into a Prologue. ML begins at line 134 in El. In Hg the prologue is absorbed into the tale which begins at line 99.

[6] First noted by Manly and Rickert (1940 II: 196) and developed by Robinson (1996).

[7] Parkes suggests that it was the incorporation of the subheading 'The wordes of the lordes Squier and keruere for the departynge of the fart on twelue' which may have caused a miscalculation on the part of the scribe. (1997: 46).

[8] See explanation by Martin Stevens (1997: 26 n.6).

[9] See Appendix 16 and 17: Quires 12-17.

[10] Manly and Rickert remark on the marked changes in the grouping of the manuscripts after SU 2158 which occurs on fol. 86r of El (II: 227). They also remark that for the last part of SU, the excellent manuscript used by both Hg and El for the first part of the tale was no longer available for El (II: 241). This may have caused delay and as a consequence, the last part of the tale may have been left for a while before it was completed.

[11] As argued in the chapter on Ha4, the Host stanza is believed to be a fragment of a link discarded by Chaucer, yet found in manuscripts, such as El which have the latest work. Since the mise-en-page of this folio in El does not conform to the standard, it is possible that Chaucer intended to do further work at this point in the tales. When it became clear that no more could be expected, Adam used an older passage to fill in the obvious gap at the end of the Envoy. He also appears to have added the stanza in Hg to fill out the space on the folio.

[12] See Appendix 16 and 17: Quires 17-21.

[13] Parkes 1997: 45. Parkes suggests that the borders have had to be modified to avoid the portraits.

[14] The position of SH-PR in PW between CO and ML may perhaps be some evidence for an earlier order.

[15] See Appendix 16 and 17: Quires 22-29.

[16] See Emmerson (1997: 167 n.31, and 168 n.36). Emmerson cites both Dutschke in 'Medieval and Renaissance MSS in the Huntington' (1: 47), and Hanna *Working Facsimile of Ellesmere*: 14, as suggesting the accomplishment of this miniature later rather than earlier in the order of work on the manuscript. Such reasoning must be because the work of the illuminator was already finished before the portrait was added. However, as we have seen in the first section of El, Artist 1 supplied the portraits for the early tales after the work done on the illumination. Since I have established that the work of Artist 1 followed the Hand A illuminator but preceded the work of Hand B, it is necessary to point out that work on B's borders must have been achieved after Artist 1 had finished his work. The miniature of the Parson may therefore not have been completed as a last measure in El.

7. Conclusions

Exploration of the *Canterbury Tales* midden by means of a codicological investigation has revealed a remarkably rich seam of finds which, when subjected to further analysis will contribute to our understanding of the textual tradition.

In this conclusion I shall first summarise the major findings on the Fragments and the order. In the light of those findings I shall briefly reassess the manuscripts, review the arguments for their dating and consider the work of the two scribes, their relationship with each other and with Chaucer himself. These final conclusions are all related to my suggestions for future scholarship since the importance of codicological assessment has been established and the material assembled for this study needs to be augmented and extended. There is so much more to be discovered.

7.1. Overall Assessment: The Fragments and The Order

A huge quantity of data has been produced in this survey. It is impossible in a restricted study of this kind to make minute comparisons of all available data for every link and every tale of the *Canterbury Tales*. However, it is possible to make broad suggestions about the fragments which may in turn throw more light on the situation at or around the time of Chaucer's death.

7.1.1. Fragment I (Group A)

It is obvious that Fragment I was designed to begin the series. As a Fragment it may be secure in all manuscripts but it is evident that the earliest manuscripts had problems in the course of its assembly.

The evidence of Cp suggests that there may have been an earlier vision for the tales and a shorter prologue. The wholesale revision of the *Canterbury Tales* may have begun, as Pearsall suggests, with the addition of another batch of pilgrims, visible in the physical features of the two opening quires of Cp, and it is possible that the remaking of Cp began at this time, within the lifetime of the poet.

The tales in the first fragment of Cp are presented as a collection of stories and this may have been the original concept for some of the tales in Chaucer's collection. Their presentation in Cp may provide evidence of a slightly earlier attempt to assemble a group of tales, or it may reflect the reuse of tales from a different collection. The copy of KT available for Cp lacks the advance in presentation visible in Hg and El, whereas the

evidence of KT in Ha4 suggests access to the El text and an intermittent revision process perhaps as the result of new copy.

In both Cp and Ha4 the linking of GP to KT was achieved much later than the copying of most of KT, at the time when in Cp, red ink had begun to be used, and in Ha4 at the same time as the copying of tales in the B^2 fragment. The presence of the marginal notes in the hand of the scribe, left in the margin of Ha4 between GP and KT, corresponds exactly with the presence of the same type of marginal notes left in parts of B^2 and may represent one of several layers of activity on the manuscript. In Cp, the presence of the first chapter number for RE also links the time of the preparation of the first fragment with the tales in B^2 which also have chapter numbers.

Apart from faint chalk instructions, there is no indication in Cp that each tale in the first fragment is to be preceded by a prologue. When the other three manuscripts were copied, the prologue-tale division was more secure. There cannot have been a great delay in the copying of this fragment but the different attempts appear to be staggered. In Ha4, the use of the dark ink of the text for rubrics through the whole of the first fragment, and up to and including SQ, separates the time of their preparation from the tales which follow.

The two quires which contain MI in Hg were also copied at a different time from the rest of the first fragment. This provides us with the first evidence in Hg of the existence of separately copied individual tales in the process of incorporation into the whole.

The absence of a rubric for the beginning of RE in Hg, the only one missing in the fragment, the fact that no space was allowed for its inclusion, and the beginning of the tale proper signalled only by a marginal 'narrat', allied with the possibility that the prologue was copied after the tale itself, are all slight irregularities significant perhaps of the copying of RE as a separate entity or the acquisition of a newly-composed piece. In Cp, RE is the first tale in the manuscript to be given a chapter number, and in Ha4 there appears to be some hesitation before the inclusion of RE, visible in the two lines of space left for rubrics, the only two-line space left in the first fragment. RE in El is the first tale whose introductory passage is described as a prologue. Thus all four manuscripts have slight irregularities relating to the inclusion of RE.

CO ends the first fragment with space left in Hg and El and with the later addition of TG in both Cp and Ha4. The marginal note in Hg in a different ink, an ink used later in the preparation of the manuscript, and the incorporation of TG at a later time in Cp and Ha4, suggests that CO was originally left unfinished by both scribes in all four manuscripts. My suggestion that the odd note in the margin of Hg could mark the point in

the preparation of all manuscripts when the author died, may seem without foundation. However, the note was made in ink used to copy the group of tales WB-SU, a group prepared by the Hg scribe after much of the rest of the manuscript had been copied. In El the same group of tales may be a later addition, and in Cp and Ha4 at precisely this point both manuscripts undergo a major shift in their ordinatio. My suggestion may therefore be valid.

7.1.2. Tale of Gamelyn

The inclusion of TG in Cp and Ha4 is odd if we believe that there was cooperation between the scribes. Why did Cp and Ha4 include the tale when Hg and El did not? The evidence of Cp before the substitution of vellum suggests that a space was probably left after CO, but that TG was definitely linked with ML. Notable also is that the run of tales MI, RE, CO, TG and ML are all referred to as fabulae in Cp. This suggests a similar concept and preparation time for these tales. It is perhaps significant that the only other tales to attract the 'fabula' rubric in Cp are PD and MA.[1] The copy of MA in Cp is the only tale along with PA in the last half of the manuscript which has no running titles. It may be therefore that a number of tales were prepared early and were in hand, including TG, all introduced or concluded as fabulae and all copied originally to appear earlier rather than later in the order. The making of some parts of the first fragment in Cp and Ha4 may have preceded the work done on Hg and El. This might account for the position of ML following naturally from TG in Cp. It does not account for the inclusion of TG.

However, Chaucer left CO unfinished, as witnessed by the Hg scribe. We have seen that in the exemplar used by Ad3, CO was moved to the end of the manuscript following MA. We have seen also that in the making of Ha4, the scribe had access to the Ad3 exemplar. Hesitation both in the ending of CO and the opening of MA in Ha4 suggests some confusion about these tales. It may have been Chaucer's intention for the further development of the tales to resituate CO[+TG] along with 2NU and CY in a new position witnessed in the Ad3 copy. Because of Chaucer's death, his entire plan may not have come to fruition and Cp and Ha4 were left with part of the information only, that of the linking of TG with CO. A plan only half-completed might also explain the inclusion of 2NU and CY in El with the last tales, the erasure in Hg beneath 'manciple' in PAP and the hesitation visible in all four manuscripts before NP and MA were added in haste.[2]

7.1.3. Fragment II: Man of Law (Group B¹)

When ML was originally copied for Cp, it seems to have been preceded by TG. This may be evidence of an earlier arrangement which is still found in almost all *c* and *d* manuscripts. Since ML in Cp appears to have undergone extensive alteration at the same time that missing text was added in Hg, it seems logical to propose that an earlier or incomplete version of ML in Cp was originally copied before Hg and the presence of TG in Cp was part of the earlier arrangement suggested above. Further corroboration for this suggestion comes from the presence at the end of ML in Cp of MLEndlink, also considered to be a residual element, significant of an earlier order.

We have seen that in MLEndlink in Cp, the name of the pilgrim who is to tell the following tale is SQ. However, that name has been copied over an erasure and the space occupied by 'Esquier heer' is exactly equivalent in space to 'Wif of Bathe'. The codicological irregularities attendant on the inclusion of WB after SQ in Cp could mean that originally an earlier WBP or WBT did in fact follow MLEndlink in a previous order.

MLEndlink is also present in Ha4. However, the link is curtailed, it appears to have been copied in at least three different stages, and it announces the Summoner rather than Squire. In fact it is WB who makes her appearance after MLEndlink in Ha4 and this point in the manuscript's preparation marks a new beginning. The time-lag between the copying of the end of ML with its Endlink, and the inclusion of WB in Ha4 may have been considerable. The fact that SQ was also copied at the same time as GP-ML in Ha4 but now occupies a position later in the manuscript order, suggests that when SQ was originally prepared for Ha4 it was expected to follow the Endlink as in Cp. The presence of the name of the Summoner in Ha4's Endlink and the change of script style at this point suggests a second attempt to order the tales which was again rescinded.

SU is included in Hg with various codicological irregularities which may indicate that there was some manouevring going on with the position of SU. This may point to the time when Chaucer himself was regrouping and rewriting these tales in a time-period which was synchronous in all four manuscripts. It is difficult to see how any scribe, even Chaucer's 'owne scriveyn' would take it upon himself to effect the major changes in the order which we see at this point in the tales. Neither Hg nor El has MLEndlink. Hg has SQ after ML as in Cp but one could assume that this order was later superseded as the making of Hg and El progressed.

7.1.4. Fragment III (Group D)

WB-SU is a group of tales which had received Chaucer's attention, so we could see the constant adjustments to the order at this point in the manuscripts as the result of ongoing development in an order sanctioned and to some extent overseen by Chaucer.

It is clear from the codicology of Cp, Hg and Ha4 that certainly the first 200 lines and perhaps as many as 400 lines of WBP may have been subject to revision of some kind, whether of rewriting, excision or addition. Manly and Rickert speak of a "primitive form" of WBP. They link this early text of the tale with the time when Chaucer intended SU to follow ML. We have seen that between ML and SQ or WBP, both Cp and Ha4 have remnants of an earlier order and vestiges of earlier textual content. We have seen also that in both manuscripts the first part of WBP is in some way compromised, in Cp by a vellum substitution followed a folio later by a mysterious missing folio, and in both manuscripts by the presence of a decorated border where none should exist. Thus an earlier form of the prologue could have existed in a different position and both manuscripts retain some evidence for that earlier version.

Of the four manuscripts, only El has any of the added passages and even in El, the first passage, found after line 44 in other manuscripts, is missing. For the first part of WBP, the first 400 lines, the El text is copied from an exemplar inferior to the one used by Adam when copying Hg which may have been Chaucer's own copy. After line 400, the exemplar used appears to be the same one as used for Hg, but in El the remainder of the added passages are present.

WBT in Hg has marginal marks which appear to be indications for another scribe copying a manuscript with 36 lines to the folio. The marks, in the form of three dots, first begin next to 'The Frere Lough' passage. As previously noted, this passage was considered to be an addition to the earlier form of the prologue and in Cp, the explicit to the prologue occurs before the passage is inserted. It may be pertinent to note that Cp is copied with 36 lines to the folio. This may have no significance whatsoever, but because of the codicological and textual irregularities which now become more frequent in Cp, Scribe D appears to have had some knowledge of the changes being effected in Hg, and thus it needs to be noted.

The complicated manuscript affiliations in SU described by Manly and Rickert have a nightmarish quality, difficult to penetrate. Manly points to the absence of the final episode in SU in the *d* group of manuscripts. He suggests that one possibility is that they represent an earlier, shorter version of the tale. Manly also suggests use of the same exemplar by Hg and El for FR and SU, the only occasion where the texts of the two manuscripts are so close. Can this be related to the late copying of the group for Hg and

the cryptic remark in the same ink after CO? Was it Chaucer's death which intervened before preparation of this group of tales was completed and a revised version of this tale for El became impossible? In Hg, they remain as an isolated unit.

ML finishes in Hg on the first recto leaf of a quire. Since elsewhere in Hg the scribe has no compunction about increasing the size of a quire to 9, 10 or 16 leaves, one is left to wonder why, if WB-SU had been intended to follow ML, it was not so ordered in Hg.

If Chaucer had died in the course of the preparation of this group of tales, then the Hg scribe would have no reason to reposition the group since it would involve structural alterations which he may have felt unnecessary if the Hg units were merely designed to be a copytext made up of several discrete Sections. He therefore left WB-SU as a unit, unattached and uplaced. Adam may not have been responsible for their present position, since when he abandoned the bundles of quires which now make up Hg, they may not have been left in any particular order. The present order, with what we perceive to be the last group of tales (MO-NP-MA) in the middle of the manuscript, is considered to be the result of misbinding. If Section III has been misplaced, then maybe Section II has been misplaced also. Or perhaps, as I have indicated above, there was never any intention that the tales in Hg should be representative of any considered order.

In Ha4 and Cp the WB-SU group marks a new beginning in the preparation of the tales. A new concept of ordinatio is implemented and red ink is used for the first time. Presumably under the influence of the Hg placing, the Cp scribe copied SQ to succeed ML before inserting the opening of WB on substituted vellum. In Ha4, WB-SU group marks a fresh start not only in the ordinatio, but also of script-type and decorative features.[3] In Ha4 as in El and Dd, WB follows ML. In El, WB-SU may have been entered into their present position after ML, later rather than earlier in the manuscript's preparation, the tales were positioned deliberately but were certainly not illuminated in the first wave of decoration done on El.

7.1.5. Fragments IV and V (Groups E and F)

The coming together of Fragments IV and V was also a late development. All four tales may first have been copied individually in booklets, as stand-alone tales, perhaps without the opening and closing passages. For CL and ME, parts of the tales were received late for both Cp and Hg. In Cp, Hg and Ha4, SQ was originally prepared to follow ML but that order was altered as the manuscripts were in the course of preparation. It seems unlikely to me that it would have been a scribal decision, taken by each scribe individually, to prepare the order ML-SQ as seen in Cp, Hg and Ha4, and then to change direction when a

new linking passage came to light which dictated the order CL, ME, SQ and FK. The codicology of the manuscripts does not support this view. In Hg and in Cp, FK was prepared to follow ME, presumably an earlier order for these tales. It is possible that in Cp, the copy of CL, more than half of which is now copied onto substituted vellum, originally occupied a position after FK as in Hg, but assumed its position after SU as SU was extended and the manuscript revised.

The incorporation of CL after SU in Ha4 also appears to have been achieved by a manipulation of some previously copied text, with the opening folios of the tale which follow on from SU, copied later than the remainder of the tale. The copy of ME in Ha4 also appears to have had an earlier existence and shows a great deal of wear on some folios. The last part of the tale, the last 100 lines of which Scribe D never received when he copied the tale for Cp, shifts affiliation from a Cp-type copy to Hg, and is copied onto the last two leaves of an irregular six-leaf quire which shows evidence of sewing between fols. iv and v according to Manly and Rickert (I: 219).

SQ in Ha4 exists as an isolated, unfinished tale, and the quire which should have contained the end of SQ and the majority of FK is either missing or never existed. The links between tales are later additions, just as they are in El, although Ha4 appears to have had access to the Hg adapted links rather than the original El versions. Scribe D then adapted the Hg versions back to suit his order.

In El, as we have seen, these four tales also appear to have been copied before the links arrived. The links are all believed to be genuine. Since the tales had been prepared in El for the order for which the links appear to have been composed, and since Chaucer is believed to have written those links, although later rather than sooner, I can think of no reason other than intuition which could explain Adam Pinkhurst's order of copying CL-ME-SQ-FK for El, unless he had received specific instructions from Chaucer himself and had at least some knowledge of the expected links.

7.1.6. Fragment VIII (Group G)

That three of the four manuscripts still retain an earlier position for [2]NU and CY (where present), suggests that in Scribe D's work they occupy a position previously decided by the author. In Cp, the first folio which would have contained NU is missing. However, the opening of the tale would have been contained on the verso of a leaf, thus the preparation of the tale in both Hg and Cp was similar. I suggested that perhaps the first folio of NU had been removed in Cp because originally NU may have followed a different tale. In Hg, NU is awkwardly inserted to follow FK and represents a contrived solution, but since it required some manipulation to create this order, again, I cannot believe that it was

attempted without authorial approval. There may be a time correspondence between the inclusion of this tale in both manuscripts, achieved at a time when the position of the tale was under review. In Cp and in Ha4, CY was then included to follow on from NU.

The situation in Ha4 provides interesting information of the way in which this fragment was conceived and the time of its creation. Manly and Rickert see three early copies made from Chaucer's original of NU (II: 433). The Cp version may represent the earliest copy of the tale, followed by Hg and finally the ancestor of El and Ha4. If we relate this to the situation in the manuscripts, we might consider the headless Cp copy as the first, copied to occupy a different position and with the beheading occurring in order to remove all evidence of a different tale on the recto and to position the tale after FK as in Hg. The copy for Hg preceded the copy made for both El and Ha4. When NU was copied for Ha4, its position after FK was still valid. A copy of CY made earlier was then placed after NU in Cp and Ha4 and the tales were set aside. This 'setting aside' is visible in Ha4 in the existence of decoration in yellow paint to the initial capitals on the outside folios of the three quires which contain these tales.

We have seen that CL was resituated first in Cp, then in Ha4 and El, when Fragments IV and V were combined. This must have taken place before the decision to remove NU and CY to a position later in the order in El. When CL was repositioned, PH was the next tale in the order in the Hg scheme and in both Cp and Ha4 there is compromise in the codicological features which suggests that when these two fragments (G-B^2) were united, it was deliberate and achieved perhaps under the Hg influence.

That the Hg scribe did not copy CY may be because he became aware that despite his awkward positioning of NU before CL, both tales were scheduled to be placed elsewhere and he left the copying of CY in abeyance until the decision had been finalised by Chaucer. A similar situation occurred in El where the evidence of the illumination stints suggests that 2NU was prepared and partially illuminated before CY made its appearance. Ad3, although a later manuscript, appears to have had access to exemplars used in the making of both Hg and El, and in Ad3, CY is placed after MA-CO and before PA. When we consider that whilst making Ha4, Scribe D seemed to have access to the Ad3 exemplars, and that features of the codicology of Ha4 suggest problems with the inclusion of CO and hesitation by the scribe when he included MA and PA, then it becomes possible to see that the reordering of the tales was an ongoing process of which all the scribes were aware.

After the poet's death, work on the other manuscripts was also brought to a swift halt. It perhaps seemed an unneccessary chore for Scribe D to do any more than to leave [2]NU and CY in their earlier position after FK and add the tales of the NP and MA, the only tales which remained to be included in Cp and Ha4.

7.1.7. Fragment VI (Group C)

PH and PD probably existed either as single tales as Dempster suggested or as a combination at an earlier date than the perceptible alteration to the manuscript orders. We have seen the discrepancies between the manuscript orders in the previous fragment. From the opening of PH to the end of TM, all four manuscripts agree in the tales to be included. However, all four manuscripts display a variety of codicological irregularities suggestive perhaps of a phase of work on these tales achieved at an earlier date but left unfinished. In Hg, the oddly placed CL ends on the folio which precedes the opening of PH. The addition of the Host stanza on this folio appears to have been achieved in hasty fashion. There are only twenty five lines of text on the folio with an Explicit to the Envoy set in four times the amount of space normally allowed. This suggests perhaps the later addition of Envoy on the recto of a folio which already had PH copied on the verso. There is no linking passage, not surprising if we consider that Adam Pinkhurst already knew that CL would have to be relocated and there would never be a link between CL and PH.

In Cp, CY is linked to PH but this is achieved by substituting the vellum for the end of CY and the beginning of PH, thus a deliberate move. Singleton folios used by the Cp scribe in the course of fashioning the link between PH and PD suggest manipulation of previously-copied material as does the presence of a chapter number for PD. In Ha4 features of the codicology suggest that PH, which begins on the verso of a leaf, was also already copied before the decision was taken to precede it by CY.

The linking passage (L21) between PH and PD in both Cp and Ha4 is an earlier version than the link found in Hg and El so one could assume that Scribe D had prepared these tales somewhat earlier and that the decision to follow CY with PH was taken before the relocation of 2NU-CY had been taken for El.

In El the significant lack of expected illumination on folio 136r where L21 is copied may also be an indication of the beginning of a tract of text prepared perhaps in a preliminary fashion, but assembled finally at a late stage. All illumination of the group of tales from the end of FK through PH-PD and as far as the end of TM in El, are the work of Hand B whom I have suggested was responsible for the final acts of illumination done for El.

7.1.8. Fragment VII (Group B^2)

The position of Fragment VII has been the subject of dispute since the time of Furnivall, although Tyrwhitt had also recognised its anomalous position more than a century before. This fragment, and PH and PD which precede it, may bear evidence of both the earliest

work done on the *Tales* and also almost the last. Fisher, Owen and Dempster all suggest that work was carried out on this fragment at a time when the tales were in the process of being restructured. Bradshaw argued that the correct position for B^2 was after MLEndlink, (possibly its original position) and that the fragment needed to be moved wholesale back to that position. Manly countered by wondering whether in fact what we see with the present position of B^2 in the manuscripts is the first relocation of the fragment *away* from the position suggested by Bradshaw. The evidence of the development of B^2 in the manuscripts suggests that Manly was correct.

In Hg, Cp and Ha4 there is evidence that these tales were assembled perhaps using portions of text which had had a previous existence in a different position. Tales such as SH, PR and TM for example, are linked in purposeful fashion in both Hg and Cp, but the crafting necessary to effect this in Hg involved the replacement of an outside folio to link SH to PR at one end, and TT-TM at the other. The inside folios of the quire betray their earlier existence and their ineffective storage.

In Cp, the inclusion of PR is cleverly manipulated, but unlike the tales before and after, PR has no chapter number suggesting a later inclusion. The fashioning of the champe initial for L24, (SH-PR), and for the champe which opens L25 (PRP), both display an irregularity of form, evidence perhaps of their later inclusion. At the other end of the same quire, the rubric introducing TT is unflourished and TT itself is cut short to accommodate four lines of L28 (TT-TM) on the last leaf of the quire, perhaps a deliberate decision.

In Hg, Cp and Ha4, some of the tales in B^2 seem to have been partially prepared in the same time period as the first tales. The last third of Section IV in Hg presents a more settled aspect than the tales from ML-CL, and may have been worked on before the scribe began to grapple with the problems of their assembly. In B^2, Cp has the same crayon marginal directions to the decorator as appear in the early tales suggesting that B^2 was probably prepared at a similar time. The undecorated nature of quires 26, 27 and 29 (SH-MO) in Ha4, and the presence of scribal notes left in the margins, also ties these tales with the preparation of GP-ML.

Assessment of this fragment in Ha4 may provide much of the evidence in support of the theories I have put forward in this thesis: the existence of pre-prepared tales, cooperation between the two scribes, the possibility of an earlier order, the overlapping nature of the preparation schedule for all four manuscripts and the final hasty attempt to complete a collection to which nothing further would be added.

Dempster argued powerfully for the development of C-B^2 at a time when a wholesale revision process was being carried out by Chaucer. At the beginning of the period, she saw the existence of a number of unlinked tales not at that time necessarily

assigned to specific pilgrims. SH had been composed earlier for WB but had been given a new incarnation. PR existed, perhaps as an isolated tale. PH and PD had both been written but had not been linked conclusively. These theories can be seen to reflect the codicological situation in the manuscripts. In Ha4, PH, PD, and SH are tales where the scribe used an exemplar which was the common ancestor of the *c* group. For these tales, (quires 24, 25), Ha4 is provided with red running titles which are judged by Green to be in a hand other than the scribe's, achieved perhaps in a different time period from the titles for tales in the middle portion of the manuscript (WB-CY), and probably earlier. From a point half-way through SH, (opening of quire 26), red titles cease and running titles in Hand 2 appear periodically over the next two quires as they did in the tales from the end of KT to the end of ML. The affiliations of the Ha4 copies change for PR-L25-TT-L28-TM, and Ha4 is allied with what I perceive to be the fresh copying associated with Hg and the *b* group. Notes left in the scribe's informal hand for the inclusion of rubrics appear in the margins of these folios in Ha4. The same informal hand left 'knightes tale', in the margin of fol. 12r where GP is attached to KT and where Ha4 is again affiliated with Hg and the *b* group, so one might also link the addition of the final lines of GP and the opening of KT with the time when this part of B^2 was being assembled.

In quire 28 of Ha4, red titles for TM are present on every folio and it is at around this point in TM that Manly and Rickert suggest that the text of Ha4 is derived from the common ancestor of *c*, rather than the closer affiliation with the Hg ancestor for the first part of the tale. One could suggest therefore that just as with PH, PD and the first part of SH, the quire with red running titles in the same hand, was a remnant from an earlier version of the tale which Scribe D had in hand and was reusing. Where TM ends in Ha4 and MO begins, there are further codicological indications of a quire prepared at the time when these tales were being linked together.

The correspondence between the marginal notes left in Ha4 and the El preparation is especially significant for it provides a real sense of the on-going development of these tales in the same time-slot, and of each scribe's awareness of the work of the other. In the tales between L21 (PH-PD) and the beginning of TM, four separate folios are left undecorated in El. Apart from the opening folio of TM there is no other decoration throughout the tale. This is an odd situation if we consider the fourteen decorated folios in PA of similar length. There is no sign of the work of the Master illuminator and all decorated folios are the contributions of Hand B. Signs of hasty copying in places in this section also set it apart from the measured achievement in much of El. There must be a reason for the similarities.

Dempster makes the point that the linking passages which join SH-PR and TM-MO at the end of this section point to composition by Chaucer after the character of WB was nearing its full development. They suggest material worked on late by Chaucer when he was preparing revision of this section. It is possible therefore that the initial preparation of this group was begun when TM and SH were relocated. Some tales may have been copied, with space left for linking passages which were only added late in the assembly. This accords with the opinion of Fisher and Owen, that the initial work for this group of tales was what inspired Chaucer to begin again at the beginning in an attempt to revise and collect the entire canon. If Chaucer had only revised as far as FK as Fisher suggests, then the final assembly of these tales may have post-dated Chaucer's death. This would then explain the female pronouns left in SH and the anomalous references to place and time in this section. Fragment VII may have been subject to further addition and revision if Chaucer had lived. The scribes may have had to accomplish the ordering of this part of the tales using the material they had, in the provisional order established earlier by Chaucer.

The remainder of the fragment with the tales of MO and NP provides further support for my argument in the preceding paragraph. MO is a tale which appears to have been prepared early in all four manuscripts, but perhaps it is also a tale which Chaucer did not live to redraft. According to Manly and Rickert there were two copies of Chaucer's text of L29 (TM-MO), the first a much-corrected rough draft from which Cp and Ha4 were copied, the second a much better fair copy which provided the text for Hg and El. In the tale, however, the roles are reversed in that although the Cp and Ha4 version is not a particularly good copy, the evidence for slight revisions by Chaucer which appear in the copy used for Hg and El are counterbalanced by what Manly and Rickert term as a copy which was "too defective to be regarded as Chaucer's draft or a good copy of it".

I can think of no adequate reason why Adam should have used such a deficient copy of MO, except perhaps that he was reusing a tale he had in hand. El has the same poor copy of MO, but the folios which accommodate the superior L29 (TM-MO) and the extended version of L30 (MO-NP) have borders contributed by the Hand A illuminator. Apart from the border containing Chaucer's Retraction at the end of the manuscript, only partially illuminated by Hand A, there is only one other border between L30 and RT, which is also the contribution of Hand A. This is a partially-completed border and marks the conjunction of the newly-placed Fragment VIII after VII (NP, 2NU, CY). Since elsewhere in the manuscript we have seen that the Master illuminator was quite capable of providing borders for folios which lacked some text, it is possible that he was here making a hurried attempt to decorate unfinished folios with the extended linking passages for a

newly-established grouping. If both Hg and El were being prepared to some extent in parallel, Adam may have concentrated his efforts on El at this point.[4]

Almost all manuscripts have the MO-NP combination and most scholars suggest that the tales were joined early in the tradition, originally with the shorter form of the linking passage. In Cp we see the shorter form, but the linking passage has been crowded onto the recto folio (247r) with the explicit to MO and the incipit for NP crammed beneath the ruled space. Hg also has the shorter version of L30, copied in the yellow ink used to complete the manuscript. One wonders with both Cp and Hg whether the shorter version of the link was used more because of exigencies of space than because the longer version was not available. Hg in fact does show a sort of hybrid, with the Knight rather than the Host as the interrupter. This situation led Hammond to suggest that Hg's reading was because the scribe was aware of Chaucer's plans to extend the link and his version became hybridised (1933: 243). It could also be related to the fact that Adam may already have copied the longer form into El where 'Knyght' is the reading. Ha4 also has the longer form of the link which is related to the El copy.

7.1.9. Fragment IX (Group H)

Since Fragment VIII has been described in the earlier position found in Hg, Cp and Ha4, we arrive at the inclusion of MA.

As suggested in the Conclusion to the Hg chapter, the order of tales in Hg, Ha4 and Cp, with MA following on from an equally hastily entered NP may reflect a decision arrived at by the two scribes as the easiest way in which to finish three manuscripts which already had the tales of NU and CY in different positions. The evidence for the addition of MA in haste, suggests that the tale was added last, along with PA. Evidence put forward by Manly and Rickert indicates that the prologue for MA was lacking in the ancestor of many of the manuscripts. What they term "a very highly developed technique" visible in the construction of the prologue meant for them that the piece was "recently written" (II: 445-449). In other words, because L36 was written late in Chaucer's life, there was little time for it to have been passed on to other scribes who may have been in the process of making copies of the tales.[5] Scribe D acquired a copy for his Cp assembly but used a different exemplar when he copied Ha4. For the tale, both Cp and Ha4 derive from the same origins. Hg and El also use different exemplars for the link but in the tale descend from a common ancestor.

7.1.10. Fragment X (Group I)

With L37 and PA, we reach the end of the *Canterbury Tales*. Manly and Rickert have no doubt that textual evidence suggests that both prologue and tale were intended to be included as part of the collection by Chaucer. However, they point to the "crude combination" of the two treatises and suggest that they derive from "a poor copy containing errors that Chaucer would certainly have corrected if he had seen them" (II: 455). There were apparently two lines of descent from the original and Cp, Hg and Ha4 derive from one, with El from the other. The opening of PA is missing from Cp as is most of PA.[6] The final quire of Cp may have been an irregularly-sized quire of six leaves before the loss of three folios. It is possible therefore that just as in Hg an earlier copy of PA was being adapted in some way for use in Cp.

In Ha4, L37 was added after pauses in the preparation and the leaving of a number of gaps in the text. The opening of PA and the first part of the tale copied into quire 33 may indicate a preparation time which varied slightly from the copying of the remainder of the tale. The running titles of quire 33 were certainly entered at a different time and the catchword in red at the end of the quire suggests the same phenomenon. They could also be representative of Scribe D making use of some previously copied work as he did in TM. RT is present in Ha4, but the final colophon, present in El, is missing.

The erasure under MA in L37 in Hg may have shown evidence of another tale which was originally destined to precede PA but which was removed, perhaps at a late date in the manuscript assembly when no further development of the order could take place.

Both Hg and El may have had copies of PA, parts of which were prepared earlier and left uncorrected. The running titles in Hg in a different style from all the others (apart from NU) and put in by the supervisor, certainly suggests a separate, earlier existence for the Hg copy of PA. In Hg, PA is also cut short by the loss of leaves at the end of the manuscript. The El copy of PA shows some evidence of preparation slightly earlier in the progress of copying of the manuscript. The borders, the work of Hand C, reflect the more opulent style of the early borders in the manuscript, and Hand C's work may have been overseen by the Master Illuminator. Notable also is the work of Artist 1 in the portrait of the Parson, his only contribution between TM and MA. At the end of El are the words:

Heere is ended the book / of the tales of Caunterbury compiled

by Geffrey Chaucer of whos soule Ihū crist

haue mercy Amen

There may be some significance in the fact that El, prepared as a presentation copy, should include the name of the poet who was in part responsible for the compilation.

7.2. The Manuscripts

It now remains to consider the new light shed on the four manuscripts in this survey.

7.2.1. Hengwrt

My examination of Hg for this thesis was conducted in the light of information from the other three manuscripts. It was also achieved with the knowledge that the scribe of Hg had a name, a profession, a location and a rough date for his activities. When I examined Hg in 2000, I was aware of the similarities of production between the four manuscripts but had not then realised the extent of those similarities. It seemed logical to suggest that certain groups of tales in Hg, such as GP-CO and WB-SU had been worked on by Chaucer since these are the two fragments which cohere in almost every manuscript of no matter what date. The group of tales from SH-TM had a similar cohesion. I also tentatively suggested that the tales were not copied in the order in which they appear in Section IV, the longest Section of Hg. Doyle and Parkes' suggestion that some of the work on Hg and El may have overlapped, led me to consider that some groups of tales may have been copied for El soon after being completed for Hg.

What I was not aware of in 2000 but which has come to light in the course of this survey, is that the two tales copied late into Hg, NP and MA, were also added irregularly to the other three manuscripts. This is a peculiar situation if we consider that the estimated time difference between Hg and Cp for example could be as much as fifteen years. What is also apparent is that the two scribes worked on the same blocks of tales for each manuscript in more or less the same order, again an unlikely situation if a distance in time separates their making. This is not to suggest that the two scribes were working together, merely that they had access to the same information at roughly the same time. Each scribe also had some single tales available which had already been copied and which then needed to be merged to make a continuous whole. This was often dependant on linking passages which may not initially have been present for either scribe.

The question of the missing links brings into focus the varied explanations of previous scholarship to account for either their omission, variation or perhaps their eventual inclusion. It also relates to a changing order. However, if there are two scribes, both copying the same groups of tales in the same order for each of two separate manuscripts, both scribes waiting to be supplied with the same linking passages which

often arrived after the tales themselves had been copied, then it is possible to suggest that the scribes were working closely with the author himself and were reliant on his supply.[7]

The fact that the work on Hg was supervised for much of the manuscript, visible in the work of the second scribe or supervisor on the running titles, was also a source of interest. The supervisor's role appeared to have finished before the scribe hurriedly copied NP and MA and added the adapted links between tales in Section IV. As shown, this must have been the last work done on the manuscript. Just before these final hasty additions, the scribe copied WB-SU as a block, leaving no indication as to where that block might be placed. These tales are suitably headed by the supervisor, so his presence during their copying is certain. However, in the same ink used to copy these tales, the Hg scribe made the marginal note at the end of CO to the effect that Chaucer did not finish the tale. If Adam was working for, or with Chaucer, and Chaucer was still alive, it is doubtful that he would have written such a comment, since presumably a solution to the unfinished tale would be forthcoming. One must assume therefore, that even if Chaucer did work with Adam, he was not around after Adam had finished copying WB-SU for Hg.

However, it appears that someone supervised the majority of Hg up to the time when WB-SU was copied. That mysterious supervisor may have been Chaucer himself. If Adam was at the same time making a parallel copy, El, then parts of that copy may also have received the benefit of some authorial control. The presence of some kind of scribal 'style sheet' is apparent in El and it is difficult to believe that this would have been initiated by the scribe. Improvements in the order of some tales, CL, ME, SQ and FK for example, are also visible in El and the linking passages between those tales must have been written for the El order. The links are considered to be by Chaucer but, as with Hg, they arrived late for El, when parts of the manuscript had already been illuminated. This suggests an order of work in which the initial groupings in Hg were subjected to authorial scrutiny and then improved, which would support my suggestion in the Hg conclusion that the order of Section IV was evolving as the tales were copied.

7.2.2. Corpus

Probably the most important feature of this investigation has been the analysis of the vellum substitution in Cp. The implication that there may have been an earlier, mini-collection of tales is significant for our understanding of the way in which the *Tales* developed. The fact that substitution of a different vellum in Cp coincides with parts of Hg copied in different shades of ink, suggests that a reconsideration of the date of the making of Cp is a requirement. The timing of the Cp alterations suggests that they were carried out at a time when Adam Pinkhurst was in the process of making fresh copies of

some tales for Hg, perhaps towards a definitive collection. Some parts of Cp must have been in existence for it to be subject to alteration and this suggests that the Cp copies of some tales already existed before being freshly copied for Hg. This could be suggestive of authorial revision. Awareness of the Hg scribe's activities also suggests a closer cooperation between the work of Adam Pinkhurst and Scribe D than has been suggested before, since the codicological irregularities, although different in each manuscript, were nevertheless the result of exactly the same influences.

Both scribes were exposed to the same problems at the same places in the collection, caused not necessarily by the absence of the next exemplar but perhaps more to do with the rescinding of previous instructions on the order of tales, the expectation of different or expanded linking passages, or the revision of portions of text as a result of the change in order. Further, the present position of some tales in Cp appear to have been arrived at under the influence of both Hg and El, also suggesting a revised order. The tales in the central portion of Cp lack all linking passages, exactly as when they were first prepared for Hg. A different vellum in Cp is substituted for parts of tales which correspond with text in Hg copied after some delay. The final correspondence between the two manuscripts is the late and hurried entry of the tales of NP and MA and the incorporation of a copy of PA probably made earlier.

7.2.3. Harley 7334

A detailed codicological analysis of Ha4 has also provided information on its production schedules which may influence our perception of the progress of the development of the order. The division of the manuscript into portions defined by the use or non-use of red ink and the supratextual features which exist in the quires where red ink is not present, assist in our understanding of the way in which the fragments were assembled. The changing textual affiliations of Ha4 also offer some idea of the impetus to create another, perhaps more up-to-date, copy of the tales than that of Cp. However, it is significant that in the later tales, Scribe D either had to resort to some of the Cp exemplars to complete the manuscript, or already had those tales in hand before the new initiative began.

When Ha4 was begun, other attempts to assemble the collection were also underway, which is why Scribe D had exemplars available which were representative of the *cd* tradition of Cp, the *b* development with Hg and the *a* group associated with El. The significance of textual and metrical revision, visible according to Tatlock in the first third of the manuscript, should give us pause to consider whether the informed arbiter of some of those textual revisions could have been Chaucer himself and the reason that they do not continue into the second half of the manuscript was because Chaucer was by that time

deceased. That this is possible is perhaps reinforced by the fact that Ha4 was also brought to a swift conclusion with signs that NP and MA were added hurriedly just as in Cp and Hg, and for Fragment VI (Group C) and for much of Fragment VII (Group B^2), the scribe made use of the Cp exemplars suggesting that Fragment VI and the early part of VII may have been in existence but had not received Chaucer's final revisions as suggested by Dempster. Ha4's access to the El and Ad3 exemplars is visible in a number of places in the manuscript, not least in the group of tales PR-TM where signs of hasty copying and inclusion of these tales are manifest in El by the absence of the expected illuminated folios and in Ha4 in the notes of the scribe left in the margins of these tales. Thus the making of Ha4 perhaps provides us with the best evidence of the cooperation of the two scribes at different times in the preparation of Chaucer's *Tales*.

7.2.4. Ellesmere

El is the deceptive manuscript described by Owen. The meticulous planning which went into the preparation of El and the apparent regularity of its making obscure the few places where it is possible to see through the protective shield of its opulence. They also disguise the fact that there may have been a considerable time difference from initiation to completion. As with the other three manuscripts, a number of tales were prepared and even partially illuminated before the requisite linking passages appeared. However, Adam knew the approximate length of what he would receive and was able to disguise their late arrival. If my suggestions about the timing of the work of the illuminators is acceptable, then there are discernible similarities in the assembly of all four manuscripts. The difficulties experienced by Scribe D in his making of Ha4 are matched in the same portions of El.

Scott suggests a marked deterioration in the decorative quality of El after FK. Several folios are left without illumination and a different illuminator, flourisher and artist were commissioned for the tales of NP, [2]NU, CY and MA. In Ha4, an entire quire which should have contained FK is missing. It may never have been copied since the traces of quire signatures which survive seem to take no account of a missing quire. In Hg, the 'Explicit' after FK is unique in being the only rubric added in the hand of the supervisor. It is entirely possible then that Fisher was right and that Chaucer had reached as far as FK and had not finalised his plans for the last tales. Adam Pinkhurst, commissioned to make El, perhaps as the definitive copy, carried out his master's latest instructions as far as he was able and moved 2NU and CY to a position between NP and MA at the end of the manuscript. The tales of Fragments VI and VII were copied

hurriedly, visible in the uneven script and the missing illumination of some folios in this section. They obviously missed Chaucer's "finishing touches" as Dempster suggested.

7.3. The Question of the Date

The two scribes appear to have been working on the tales in the Canterbury collection in roughly the same order, the work on one group of tales by one scribe seemingly overlapping with production of the same group of tales by the second, the later attempt showing some improvement or development in terms of presentation of text and also of order. The order in which the tales were worked on by the two scribes is not the order of the tales as they now appear in the manuscripts and it is possible to conclude that an ordered and settled exemplar of the entire tales did not exist. It is possible to speculate therefore that some instructions for the assembly must have been orally transmitted, whether from author to scribe, or scribe to scribe, a situation which may be clarified in this conclusion. Initially both scribes lacked the same portions of text for each of the four manuscripts, mainly the linking passages which made sense of the evolving order, and both scribes had to bring all four manuscripts to a hasty conclusion. These are conditions which could have existed either before Chaucer's death, after Chaucer's death, or both before and after.

There are several possibilities for the creation of these *Canterbury Tales* collections. The one still most frequently accepted by the majority of scholars is that all manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales* were produced after Chaucer's death. This is a neat solution because it allows scholars to consider the tales as a whole and to offer theories which can be applied to the entire collection rather than just to individual tales or groups of tales. It also provides a useful explanation for the inconsistencies of order, for textual variations, as well as the obvious signs of difficulty experienced by Adam and Scribe D in the midst of the assembly process. If all manuscripts are post-mortem productions, then it puts the onus firmly back on to the scribes whose job it was to assemble an unfinished piece of work with no actual signposts as to how it should be presented. The scribes apparently had to seek far and wide for some tales and linking passages, although how they knew that linking passages were necessary when an order of tales had not been established is not explained, nor why, if there was no required order, they did not simply copy the tales as Chaucer had left them as a series of unlinked units. However, when the linking passages eventually came to light they were almost without exception considered to be the work of the author, so needed to be included somehow. There was no consistent exemplar supply, therefore the scribes received the text piecemeal, and cobbled the separate pieces together in an order which seemed satisfactory. What is amazing with this

hypothesis is how often the scribes independently arrived at the same order. Occasionally the scribes came across a piece such as TG which apparently was not written by Chaucer. Some scribes then took it upon themselves to insert it after CO because that tale was unfinished and needed to be supplemented.

A second suggestion might be that all four manuscripts were produced within Chaucer's lifetime. Dating all four manuscripts to such an early date is problematic for some scholars who detect signs of later work in the illumination of Cp and Ha4 for example. From the point of view of the palaeography I do not think that there would be a problem with an earlier date, and Adam Pinkhurst's hand in Hg and El in particular shows features suggestive of a date before 1400 (Doyle and Parkes 1979: xx). However, scholars point to discrepancies in both text and order which Chaucer would not have allowed to remain if he had been alive, and in the process of revising the tales and overseeing the assembly. Nor would Chaucer have allowed the inclusion of a patently inferior TG if he had been present when the manuscripts were being copied. If Chaucer was alive when Hg, El, Cp and Ha4 were in the process of being copied, then an explanation is required as to why they are all different.

A third possibility emerged when Hg was examined for the *Hengwrt Digital Facsimile* in 2000. The appearance of Hg suggests that it was a working copy rather than a finished manuscript. Its physical state, existing in separate unlinked sections, suggests work in progress and should be viewed as precisely that. To consider it as an example of a finished product is to mistake the conditions of its existence. Thus scholars formulating theories on the entire textual tradition using Hg as the progenitor are perhaps affording it an importance which is misplaced. It needs to be analysed in the context of the preparation of the other three manuscripts. If we view Hg as it really is, a collection of fragments displaying evidence of last-minute additions and adjustments to make it acceptable and perhaps saleable, then we have to consider why it had been left in such a state.

One answer could be that parts of Hg were copied in Chaucer's lifetime and with his approval. Those parts may not have been subject to minute scrutiny by Chaucer but they may represent a first or even a second step towards the final collection. Adam copied what he was told to copy. He left spaces where instructed until Chaucer provided him with the missing text. This could explain why whenever there was a hiatus, the material Adam eventually acquired was always original and of the same high quality. Some tales which Chaucer may have been busy revising were initially only copied in part by Adam, ML for example, or parts of CL, and he assembled the tales provisionally to await further instructions from Chaucer. Some groups of tales such as Fragment VII (Group B^2) may have been partially copied and worked on as Chaucer developed the linking passages between tales and devised the framework. Author and scribe cooperated on groups of tales

and each group may have been left incomplete. Some unfinished material may then have been passed to Scribe D who had already copied some tales in the expectation that this was an ongoing preparation process towards a final collection. All this work probably took a considerable time and the making of Hg may well have coincided with the initiation of work on El, hence the probable existence of the parallel copies mooted by Doyle and Parkes.[8]

Most scholars accept that the *Canterbury Tales* is an unfinished piece of work. If they could accept that the earliest manuscripts were also unfinished pieces of work in a staggered state of preparation at the time of Chaucer's death, with most of the right pieces but not necessarily corrected or in a satisfactory order, then many of the seemingly inexplicable problems which surround the poem, its text and order, and the role of the scribes who were attempting to carry out the author's latest ideas, fall into place. The production of the copies of Hg, Cp, Ha4 and El could be seen as having been begun in Chaucer's lifetime, reaching various states of completion, and finished off in cooperative haste after the poet's death.[9]

7.4. The Two Scribes

Adam Pinkhurst appears to have worked for the Company of Mercers from as early as the 1380's. His hand in the Hg and El manuscripts does not prove that he worked *for* or *with* Geoffrey Chaucer, but references in Chaucer's poem to a certain Adam who had copied at least *Boece* and *Troilus* for him, suggest that some work had been submitted to a professional scribe called Adam, perhaps for publication purposes. The possibility is also expressed in the poem that the same Adam might produce further work for Chaucer in the future. I have no doubt that the hand of Adam Pinkhurst in the oath to the Scrivener's Guild is the hand of the Hg and El manuscripts. I am also quite certain that Adam was in some way involved with the production of the *Boece* manuscript (Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS. Peniarth 393D), although I am uncertain whether he is the actual scribe or just the corrector and annotator.[10] It would appear then, that Adam Pinkhurst was a Chaucer scribe for at least part of his working life.

We still know very little about Scribe D. However, he is believed to have been working in London certainly in the 1390's, and in the early years of the next century he participated in copying a Gower manuscript along with Adam Pinkhurst. Doyle and Parkes suggest that the individual copying stints of the scribes did not take place in the same location (1978: 195-197). This would accord with the evidence of the work of Adam and Scribe D on the *Canterbury Tales* manuscripts, where a hiatus in the times of copying portions of text, betrays some kind of distance, not necessarily of miles, but of separate

location. It is hard to believe that two experienced scribes both copying work by the same authors would not have been known to each other, particularly since there is evidence that all four of the earliest manuscripts appear to have developed with some knowledge of each other's work both for ordering the tales and for correction of copied pieces.

It is traditional to label Scribe D a Gower scribe because of his prolific output of *Confessio Amantis* manuscripts. However, at some point in his career he was, for a time at least, also a Chaucer scribe. For the present it is impossible to estimate when individual tales or portions of the *Canterbury Tales* were copied but it is probable that some tales, now incorporated into the manuscripts as we have them, were copied some years before others and possibly in different locations. Thus parts of D's two manuscripts may contain copies of tales made earlier than the extant examples of Adam's work and vice versa. This is hypothesis only, but the possibility that some of Scribe D's tales could be earlier copies of the same copytexts, used slightly later by Adam Pinkhurst for Hg and El perhaps with authorial improvements, could mean that the progression from D's 'inferior' copies to the 'superior' texts of Hg and El demonstrate the beginning of Chaucer's revision process found wanting in the texts of the *Canterbury Tales*.[11]

7.5. The Scribes and the Author

What is quite apparent is that both scribes were masters of their craft to the extent that they have been able to persuade those who have examined their work over the centuries that Cp and El for example, are collections of tales smoothly copied and presented. If it were not for the existence of Hg and Ha4, such a view might never have been challenged, nor would it have been easy to suggest alternative theories. Both scribes show the same flexibility and are clever manipulators of their materials and the text with which they were provided. In some places it is clear that they were working to mathematical formulae appropriate to the number of lines per folio that they were copying. It is difficult to work to a formula without some knowledge of what was expected. It is also apparent that some of the calculations were slightly inaccurate, a situation which would surely not have arisen if the exact length of certain links was known.[12] Where those calculations went awry for whatever reason, the scribes were able to cut and paste, manipulate and manoeuvre to achieve an end-product which showed little evidence of disturbance. One is left with the impression that at times the calculations were achieved with the full co-operation of the author himself and that in certain places the text was being tailored to the manuscript requirements. It is almost as if Chaucer ordered the scribes to copy the text of consecutive tales leaving sufficient space for him to provide a linking passage which occupied a single folio.

It is clear that certain tales were also being copied to a similar formula by each scribe. NU for example in both Cp and Hg begins at the top of a verso leaf and came to each manuscript pre-prepared. In three of the manuscripts, ML was prepared to begin on the first leaf of a quire. Preparation of the group SH-PR-TT-TM is also strikingly similar in all four manuscripts as I have demonstrated. Tale conjunctions frequently occur on the middle bifolium or the first or last leaves of a quire, all places where addition of extra text for linking passages, or changes in the order, might be achieved with the minimum of disruption. All these features suggest some elements of pre-planning.

The tales were quite clearly in a state of flux when each of the four manuscripts was assembled. That state of flux could be interpreted in a number of ways as I have already suggested. Part of the copying and assembly could have taken place within Chaucer's lifetime as he was motivated to collect together his single tales and existing groups, link them where necessary and provide the overall framework. The completion of the project was interrupted by the death of the author and the scribes finished off what they had as well as they could.

Examination of the codicology of the manuscripts allows us to see some changes in each manuscript as they are happening. Since the rearrangement of tales or groups of tales by the scribes was frequently dependant on the acquisition of new portions of text, it makes it more likely that Chaucer himself was involved in their organisation and supply. For example, the opening folios of WBP in both Hg and Cp display anomalies suggestive of a newly-acquired beginning for that tale. Parts of WBP in both manuscripts must have been in place for alterations to previously copied text to take place. Unless Chaucer worked alone on those adjustments, and left them with his papers to be found after his death, then he must have been around and participating in their creation. The same is true of the linking passage between PH and PD. Revision of the link appears to have taken place between their copying for Cp and Ha4 and their appearance in Hg and El, but was nevertheless achieved in Cp and Ha4 by the manipulation of previously-copied material.

The adjustments to the texts of B^2 were described in the conclusion of the Hg chapter as providing evidence of a high degree of sophisticated planning involving the use of previously-copied material, the inclusion of three linking passages, and the probable late composition of TT to pair with an existing copy of TM. The assembly of these tales was not achieved as a result of scribal whim since it was dependant on changes of order as well as assimilation of new material. The similarities in the codicological structure of the manuscripts in B^2 suggests that in each of the four manuscripts the Fragment was assembled in a similar time-frame.

The set pieces which occur together in almost all manuscripts, GP-CO, WB-SU, SH-TM had been worked on by Chaucer and copied by the scribes. The copying of the

same tales in each manuscript reveal broadly the same patterns of acquisition, change and assimilation which suggests that they were included in the collection in the same time period. Changing ideas on presentation, text division, wording of rubrics, extension of linking passages and development of the framework narrative were in progress as the scribes were in the process of copying. If these changes were the responsibility of an overall supervisor who was aware of the work of each of the scribes, it is difficult to explain why so many changes appear to have been effected as part of the "rolling revision" process described by Hanna.[13] The fact that precisely the same patterns of acquisition and delay are present also in the Cambridge Dd copy, suggests that the three scribes were all aware of each other's work and working synchronously. The abrupt ending of Dd without the tales of MA and PA further reinforces the suggestion that those tales were a last-minute addition to the four manuscripts in this survey.[14] One could assume that since the scribes were working together, they were in the process of a cooperative venture to release the work of a dead poet to the world. If this had been so, then why are there discrepancies in text and order? If their concern had been to produce the canonical text, surely they would have been concerned to provide a text and order which was more stable than it appears across the earliest manuscripts.

The order and linking together of other tales CL, ME, SQ and FK for example, presumably had authorial approval since the linking passages are seen as genuine. Yet this order occurs only in Ha4 and El of my sample. As a group, those tales were worked on late, visible in the codicology, and only achieve their El and Ha4 position very late in the manuscript assembly. Progress towards such a state of affairs is visible in Cp, which has effected some of the order change but does not have the linking passages; in Hg, where the extra links are added late and adapted; in Ha4 where the scribe received the links via the Hg copies and adapted his tale order to include them; and in El where the tales were written, but the linking passages arrived late, and were copied into spaces left for them.

7.6. Authorial Involvement

Let us review the arguments against Chaucer's involvement in the making of any of the early manuscripts. Scholars appear to find it untenable that Chaucer would have sanctioned 'publication' of an unfinished work. However, if, as I have suggested, these four manuscripts were begun, but left unfinished at Chaucer's death, then their publication would not have been sanctioned by Chaucer. They may have been finished hurriedly, by the scribes, to enable publication of a piece of work which would never have any final format.

A second argument involves the inconsistencies in place and time visible in some tales. Most scholars now dismiss this Victorian argument, since the work is unfinished and the tales which display the inconsistencies are clearly unrevised and appear, with one exception in the latter half of the manuscript. However, it still exerted an influence over Manly's perception of Chaucer's involvement in the making of the manuscripts and this in turn influenced his dating procedure. The majority of scholars still accept Manly's dates without question. Manly's argument is worth quoting in full in this regard.

"That Chaucer cannot be held responsible for any one of the arrangements in the MSS seems perfectly clear. Let us first examine the group which contains El and the *a* group of MSS. It was long ago pointed out that Chaucer cannot have been responsible for placing the tales forming Block B^2 after those forming Block D, for in B^2 line 3116 reads 'Lo Rouchestre stant heer faste by', whereas in D 845-48 the Summoner promises to tell two or three stories of friars before they come to 'Sittingbourne', which lies some eleven miles beyond Rochester. Moreover, it is incredible that after placing the telling of the Manciple's short tale in the morning (cf. H 15-17) Chaucer should represent the hour of the day at the close of it as four in the afternoon (I 1-5). We may therefore dismiss the El-a arrangement as non-Chaucerian." (II: 475)

If the El arrangement is not Chaucerian and all other orders were created after El, then we can see how the entrenched view of the scribal orders is perpetuated. However, Manly refers to the Summoner's reference to Sittingbourne. This reference occurs in 'The frere lough' passage which a comparison of the codicology of the four manuscripts suggests may have been a later addition, added perhaps in the last phase of editorial activity when groups of tales were being resituated.[15]

The lines in B^2 3116 occur in L29. We know that L29 (MOP) which contains the reference to Rochester was not linked by the Hg scribe to TM which precedes it, and is part of the group of tales which I suggest may have been awaiting Chaucer's final revisions. It is not surprising therefore that textual inconsistencies remain in places where codicological irregularities suggest unfinished business.

The second problem cited by Manly in MA and in L37 (PAP) is fascinating in the light of the findings of this thesis. I have suggested that MA was added late in all the manuscripts in order to bring closure to an unfinished piece of work. I have also suggested that the group of tales at the end of the manuscript were under review whilst all four manuscripts were in the process of being copied. In Ha4 the scribe left a space for the time

references in L37. They were added later in a hand other than the scribe's. In Cp we see the hasty and incomplete addition of NP and L37-PA. In Hg, NP-MA occur in an odd position, are copied in the last ink used in the manuscript, and 'Manciple' in L37 is written over an erasure. El has a rearrangement of the last tales which may suggest ongoing work by the author to develop the grouping at the end of the manuscript. We may therefore conclude that to base any argument on the inconsistencies of place and time references in the later tales, let alone Manly's categorical, yet infinitely influential pronouncement dismissing the El arrangement of tales, without recourse to the codicological information supplied by the earliest manuscripts, is to misunderstand the nature of the earliest copies and the timing of their preparation.

In support of the scribes' activities taking place whilst Chaucer was still alive, one could cite Fisher's opinion, certainly substantiated by the codicological examinations, that a gradual development in arrangement, in ordinatio, in the acquisition of linking passages and (in Hg and Cp) of extra text, is perceptible in a comparison of all four manuscripts. Fisher did not suggest that this could have taken place within Chaucer's lifetime but I believe that the visible development in the earliest manuscripts *towards* what is now considered to be the best arrangement of the unfinished fragments in the opinion of most scholars, suggests the unfinished work of the creator rather than mistakes made by his several amanuenses.

The question of a possible earlier order has to be addressed. This is visible in the attempts made by the scribes to resituate some of the tales. Who directed them to do so? Why were they both attempting to reorder the same tales if there was no master-plan behind the assembly? Why were some tales already copied? If the author had died then one would have to postulate some kind of supervision, undertaken by someone who had an intimate knowledge of Chaucer's intentions and an awareness of a hidden cache of genuine linking passages which could be produced when all the tales were in situ and awaiting the finishing touches. This seems hardly credible.

And if Adam Pinkhurst eventually managed to assemble the tales for El, and Scribe D had access to some of the El exemplars for Ha4, why did D have similar problems to Adam in the CL-FK group of tales? Why did he leave marginal directions in the margins of tales in B^2 which show similar problems of assembly in El? Why, if he had access to the El and Ad3 thinking about 2NU CY, did he leave those tales in a different position in the order? It seems unreasonable to suggest that after a lapse of years between copyings, the same problems would occur in exactly the same places, in each of two manuscripts copied by a single scribe which resulted in codicological irregularities.

If we accept that these four manuscripts were begun in Chaucer's lifetime and to some extent supervised by him, then the question arises as to who was responsible for paying for the venture. Were all these manuscripts prototypes, initially supported by the poet but perhaps eventually paid for by the Chaucer family after the poet's death? Was there on overall supervision process in progress which involved Adam Pinkhurst, Scribe D, and Wytton, the scribe of Dd? Were other scribes also involved, assembling the copies which must have been in existence at about the same time? Were any of the scribes attached to the families of Chaucer's friends who may have requested updates for their earlier collections? Can any of these manuscripts be representative of the commercial book trade in London at the turn of the fifteenth century? All these suggestions involve much speculation. There are many alternatives which remain to be explored but it is possible that the four manuscripts in this study provide evidence of work done for the poet himself, work done on behalf of Chaucer's circle of acquaintance and work done as a commercial venture, thereby linking the production of the earliest copies of the *Canterbury Tales* within the context of patronage, the poet's family, his own friends and the business world to which he also belonged. The questions raised on all these areas in this study need to be actively pursued.

7.7. Afterword with Some Suggestions for Further Research

The purpose of this dissertation has been to demonstrate the vital importance of an analysis of the codicological framework of a manuscript within which a text is situated. It is of particular importance for those *Canterbury Tales* manuscripts which are closest in time to the date of composition but similar analyses of the codicological features of later manuscripts also need to be undertaken as a requirement. This would allow insight into the portions of text which remained as exemplar copies. Such analyses would then need to be related back to the physical construction of the earliest copies.

I have established that an understanding of the features of a manuscript's codicology are vital for any analysis of its text, down to the level of the individual folio. I have ascertained that certain physical anomalies may also help to explain some textual problems such as the constant shifts in affiliation apparent in the Manly and Rickert manuscript descriptions. If portions of text were being physically dismembered whilst at the same time being either augmented, diminished or in some way altered in the earliest copies, it becomes possible to see how a textual tradition of extreme complexity is created. Much more work is necessary to explore these suggestions and to relate them to portions of disputed text.

The stifling effect on scholarship of the acceptance without query of a date for all manuscripts after Chaucer's death has also been addressed in this study and I believe I

have offered valid reasons to challenge the inflexibity of such an argument. The date challenge has received remarkable support in the last year by the discovery of the identity of Adam Pinkhurst. Awareness of his presence in London for a considerable time within the lifetime of the poet necessitates a reconsideration of his role as a Chaucer scribe. His known association with Scribe D at a later date allows us to consider the possibility of earlier cooperation between the scribes also perhaps within the lifetime of the poet. Evidence from the manuscripts surveyed in this thesis encourages the idea that there was a working relationship between the two scribes. This can be seen in the similarities in work practices, the sharing of exemplars and the hasty completion visible in all four manuscripts. More information on all *Canterbury Tales* scribes is a requirement as is the need to establish some kind of scribal database as a resource for manuscript scholars.

In the summary of the earliest editions in the first chapter I suggested that specific areas of difficulty in the *Canterbury Tales* were apparent to Tyrwhitt at an early date and have been the subject of controversy ever since. I believe that evidence supplied by the codicological irregularities of the manuscripts summarised in this conclusion may further the debate on all those areas under scrutiny and provide an opportunity to reconsider suggestions made by many scholars over the years. Those suggestions may then be evaluated in the light of a different perspective. A single example will demonstrate how knowledge of a manuscript's physical attributes may contribute to an understanding of the text and set the ideas of previous scholarship within a fresh context. I shall consider the importance of assessment of the manuscript medium.

All four manuscripts in this survey were copied onto vellum.[16] However, a significant feature of Cp is that it is made up of two different kinds of vellum. Analysis of the intrusion of the heavier vellum has provided a wealth of ancillary information. It completely changes our view of Cp as a manuscript and may also force a reassessment of its date and of the development of the entire textual tradition.

A knowledge of the different vellum-type in Cp and the correspondence of the vellum changes with the use of different shades of ink in Hg adds considerably to Dempster's already strong argument about a single copytext available to a number of scribes. This in turn provides substantial support for Hanna's rolling revision process and Blake's theories of a single copytext under constant review.

The insertion of a different vellum into Cp to alter the manuscript, mainly in line with Hg, suggests the existence of the earlier collection of tales in a different order mooted by Brown, Owen, Dempster and Fisher. It also suggests the possibility of composition of new material or revision of existing text at a late stage in Chaucer's life. This might then reopen the debate on Chaucerian revision of the Tales categorically denied by Tatlock (1909). As a consequence of this, the suggestions of Brussendorff and

Robinson about Hg and Ha4 could then be further evaluated. There is reason to believe, as Brussendorff did, that Hg *is* a manuscript which displays evidence of 'contamination' from 'inferior' copies of Chaucer's original such as Cp, and Ha4 *does* appear to be 'contaminated' by the 'superior' tradition exemplified in El as Robinson suggested.

The requirement for a thorough examination of the manuscript medium to precede any textual analysis may be seen in the example from the work of the Canterbury Tales Project suggested earlier. Awareness of a different vellum-type for the first folio of WBP in Cp would have informed the textual analysis of this tale and prevented the invention of a theory to explain a textual situation which may have an actual physical explanation.

The pattern of vellum substitution throughout Fragments IV and V (Groups E and F) in Cp provides a real insight into how copies of the texts were undergoing enforced change whilst the manuscripts themselves were being copied. This could suggest that some textual anomalies are the result of tale movement rather than the product of inattentive scribes or missing portions of exemplars.

Thus knowledge of the existence of the two kinds of vellum in Cp raises a host of other questions relating to the dating of Cp and the making of Hg, an earlier collection of stories, a working relationship between the two scribes and the presence or absence of the author himself. This in turn provides information for those engaged in spelling or linguistic analysis, for if a group of tales isolated by codicological features are similarly isolated in spelling peculiarities or dialectal features then we may find firm evidence for groups of tales composed at different times and in different places during the course of the poet's life. It may be seen therefore that a single important feature of the Cp codicology, hitherto unnoticed, has considerable ramifications for *Canterbury Tales* scholarship.

The problem of order, grappled with by editors and scholars in their attempt to find the best way to present the tales, and brought into sharp focus with Furnivall's decision to accept Bradshaw's ideas on the position of Fragment VII (Group B^2), is also given a further dimension by the exploration of the physical state of the fragments. Blake's view of the close relationship of all the orders and the scribes' awareness of each other's work is supported by evidence in all four manuscripts, and with some qualification, Benson's argument in favour of two orders differing only in the position of 2NU and CY may be seen to have some substance. Fisher's ideas of visible development in the ordering of the tales is also a reality.

Some of Manly and Rickert's ideas on the prior circulation, or at least the prior existence of copies of some tales receive striking endorsement from the evidence supplied by Cp, Hg and Ha4. However, the suggestions of the two scholars and the development of their ideas by Dempster on the formation of the manuscript groups in the order *a-d* may need to be questioned in the light of codicological evidence.

Finally, the scribes' access to single tales and groups of tales previously copied, provide evidence of the booklets proposed by Hanna and his explanation of manuscript variation resulting from versions copied from a single draft 'at different times or in different ways' and being essentially a 'time driven' 'rolling revision' is convincing in the light of the continuous overlapping activities of the scribes.

The value of codicological enquiry is thus firmly established. It remains to urge the establishment of some kind of repository for all the information gathered. I am thinking of some kind of electronic database. If such a store of information on the physical features of manuscripts were readily available for use by other researchers, it would enrich scholarship and reduce the number of elaborate theories based on out-dated descriptions. The collection could be constantly updated by scholars or students working in the relevant fields. It would need to be a simple but effective method of recording information. Such databases do exist. The British Library's Survey of Illuminated Manuscripts is one such and this records basic information on manuscripts in their collection. However, I would envisage something whereby when new discoveries are made, researchers could add to manuscript descriptions already supplied and also mount the results of their own investigations. To do this would require the agreement of a number of influential scholars on a method of recording such information. Although this would initially require funding of a substantial nature, it cannot be beyond the realms of possibility. Such a collection would have ramifications for all those engaged in the study of manuscripts and their texts.

Notes to Chapter 7

[1] There must be some significance in the fact that MI, RE, SU, PD and MA are all pilgrims whose descriptions were included at the end of GP as Pearsall's late arrivals. The various difficulties attendant on the inclusion of all these tales for both scribes in each of the four manuscripts suggests that they were added as part of a developing plan sanctioned by Chaucer himself.

[2] Corroborative evidence may be found in the text of L36 (MAP). We know that this prologue was acquired late by the scribes and may have been one of the prologues which Chaucer wrote late in his life. In the prologue, reference is made to the fact that the Cook has still to tell his tale. If this is so, then my suggestion that CO was about to be relocated to the end of the *Tales* makes sense. Gamelyn may have been part of that relocation.

[3] SQ had been prepared for Ha4, but was set aside, suggesting that whilst in the process of copying SQ, a directive was received regarding a new order in which SQ would occupy a later position.

[4] Since NU had already been copied for Hg and would have required a further major shift to bring it in line with the El order, it may be at this time that work on Hg was temporarily abandoned.

[5] See the argument in note 2.

[6] There is a discrepancy in the description of Cp by Manly and Rickert at this point, and the one provided by the CCC Librarian. Manly and Rickert describe the stubs of five more folios in the last quire (I: 92). The CCC description establishes only three stubs.

[7] Blake's article in 2000 'The Links in the *Canterbury Tales*' contains important observations on many of the linking passages. Whilst I believe that the evidence of Cp and Ha4 in L8 (MLEndlink) disproves Blake's arguments about that particular link, his suggestions about the uncertainty surrounding the inclusion of

NPEndlink, found in only nine manuscripts mainly of the *a* group, appears to confirm the manuscript evidence of scribal hesitation concerning the grouping and positioning of the last tales.

[8] All the evidence suggests that parts of Cp and Ha4 may have had a similar parallel existence.

[9] The similarities between the production of Hg, El, Cp and Ha4 extend also to Cambridge Dd which shows the same features of delay, readjustment and inclusion. These manuscripts must all have been produced very close in time to each other.

[10] See Stubbs (2002: 166). Mooney now suggests a date of 1385 for the Boece copy (2006: 113). This suggestion demands a reconsideration of the dating of Hg.

[11] Cp and Ha4 are seen as later manuscripts by Manly and Rickert. In their argument, the copies of tales found in Cp and Ha4 demonstrate deterioration in the scribal copies or the individual attempt to 'improve' by the Ha4 scribe (who also copied the much inferior Cp). If in fact some of Cp and Ha4 could be shown to be copied earlier than Hg and El, then it becomes possible to see that in some tales, the 'improvements' found in Hg and El may have been arrived at in consultation with Chaucer himself.

[12] To cite just a few examples: KT-MI, L3-RE in Hg, L17 and L20 in El, TT-TM in Cp and L8-ML in Ha4.

[13] Hanna (1988: 24-25) suggests "Chaucer seems never to have formally "published" discrete textual versions that were then subjected to extensive later rewritings followed by a second "publication." Apparent revisions in the text seem to reflect manuscript versions drawn either at different times or in different ways from a single draft. One model for such production of copies would see their variations from one another as essentially time-driven and reflecting a process of "rolling revision": manuscript variation accurately reflects different layers of revision of the text made at different times by the poet and variously available to copyists depending on when they derived their texts from the holograph".

[14] As Da Rold indicates, Dd is defective at the end with half of the final quire torn away, but if the Dd scribe was working with knowledge of the activities of Adam and Scribe D, and if as I suggest, the collection of tales was finished in haste after the death of the author, then this may be the reason for the missing final tales in Dd.

[15] In Cp, the explicit to WBP occurs before this passage is copied. In Hg the explicit to WBP occurs after the passage, but the passage itself begins with a Lombardic capital which I suggest may have been used to indicate lines added to the original. The explicit to WBP follows the same passage in Ha4, and Scribe D uses wording to introduce the lines which are reminiscent of El, and reflect a slight advance in the thinking behind the inclusion.

[16] Da Rold's examination of the paper used to copy Cambridge Dd has produced vital information about that manuscript's creation.

Bibliography

Alderson, W. L. 'John Urry (1666-1715).' In Ruggiers 1984, pp. 93-115.

Baker, Donald C. 'The Bradshaw Order of the *Canterbury Tales*: A Dissent.' *NM* 63 (1962): 245-61.

— 'Introduction: The Relation of the Hengwrt Manuscript to the Variorum Chaucer Text.' In Ruggiers 1979, pp. xvii-xviii.

— 'Frederick James Furnivall (1825-1910).' In Ruggiers 1984, pp. 157-169.

— ed.*The Manciple's Tale*. A Variorum Edition of the Works of Geoffrey Chaucer. Vol. II part 10. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1984.

— ed. *The Squire's Tale*. A Variorum Edition of the Works of Geoffrey Chaucer. Vol. II part 12. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1990.

Baugh, A. C. 'The Original Teller of the Merchant's Tale.' *MP* 35 (1937-8): 16-26.

Beadle, Richard, and A. J. Piper, eds. *New Science out of Old Books: Studies in Manuscripts and Early Printed Books in Honour of A. I. Doyle*. Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1995.

Bell, N. E. 'The Price of Books in Medieval England.' *The Library,* 4th ser. 17 (1937): 312-32.

Bennett, H. S. 'The Production and Dissemination of Vernacular Manuscripts in the Fifteenth Century.' *The Library*, 5th ser. 1 (1946):167-78.

Benson, Larry D. 'The Order of The Canterbury Tales.' *SAC* 3 (1981): 77-117.

— ed. *The Riverside Chaucer*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987.

Blake, N. F. *Caxton and His World.* The Language Library. London: A. Deutsch, 1969.

— 'The Relationship between the Hengwrt and Ellesmere Manuscripts of the Canterbury Tales.' *E&S* 32 (1979): 1-18.

— ed. *The Canterbury Tales. Edited from the Henwgrt Manuscript.* London: Edward Arnold, 1980a.

— 'The Text of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *Poetica* 13 (1980b): 27-49.

— 'On Editing the Canterbury Tales.' In *Medieval Studies for J. A. W. Bennett aetatis suae LXX.* Ed. Peter L. Heyworth. Oxford: Clarendon, 1981a, pp. 101-19.

— 'Critics, Criticism and the Order of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *Archiv* 218 (1981b): 47-58.

— 'The Editorial Assumptions in the Manly-Rickert Edition of *The Canterbury Tales*.' *ES* 64 (1983): 385-400.

— 'Geoffrey Chaucer: The Critics and the Canon.' *Archiv* 221 (1984a): 65-79.

—   'Editorial Assumptions and Problems of the *Canterbury Tales.' Poetica* 20 (1984b): 1-19.

—   '*The Textual Tradition of the Canterbury Tales.'* London: Edward Arnold, 1985a.

—   'The Debate on the Order of *The Canterbury Tales.' Revista Canaria de Studios Ingleses* 10 (1985b): 31-41.

—   'The Manuscripts and Textual Tradition of *The Canterbury Tales* Again.' *Poetica* 28 (1988): 6-15.

—   'The Chaucer Canon: Methodological Assumptions.' *NM* 90 (1989a): 295-310.

—   'Manuscript to Print.' In Griffiths and Pearsall 1989b, pp. 403-32.

—   'Editing the *Canterbury Tales*: An Overview.' In Blake and Robinson 1993, pp. 5-18.

—   'The Ellesmere Text in the Light of the Hengwrt Manuscript. In Stevens and Woodward 1997a, pp. 205-224.

—   'Geoffrey Chaucer and the Manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales.' JEEBS* 1 (1997b): 95-122.

—   'The Project's Lineation System.' In Blake and Robinson 1997, pp. 5-14.

—   'Editing the *Canterbury Tales*: Preliminary Observations.' *Anglia* 116 (1998): 198-214.

—   'The Links in the *Canterbury Tales.'* In *New Perspectives on Middle English Texts: A Festschrift for R. A. Waldron.* Eds. S. Powell and J. J. Smith. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer 2000a, pp. 107-118.

—   'A New Approach to the Witnesses and Text of the *Canterbury Tales.'* In *New Directions in Later Medieval Manuscript Studies: Essays from the 1998 Harvard Conference.* Ed. D. Pearsall. Woodbridge, Suffolk: York Medieval Press in association with Boydell Press, 2000b.

—   'Caxton's Second Edition of the *Canterbury Tales.'* In *The English Medieval Book: Studies in Memory of Jeremy Griffiths.* Eds. A. S. G. Edwards, V. Gillespie and R. Hanna III. London: The British Library, 2000c.

—   'Chaucer, Gamelyn and the Cook's Tale.' In *The Medieval Book and a Modern Collector: Essays in Honour of Toshiyuki Takamiya.* Eds. Matsuda, Takami and Richard Linenthal and John Scahill. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2004.

Blake, N. F., and Peter Robinson, eds. *The "Canterbury Tales" Project Occasional Papers, Volume I.* Oxford: Office for Humanities Communication, 1993.

—   *The "Canterbury Tales" Project Occasional Papers, Volume II.* London: Office for Humanities Communication, 1997.

Blodgett, J. E. 'William Thynne (d. 1546).' In Ruggiers 1984, pp. 35-52.

Bordalejo, B. 'The Phylogeny of the Tale Order in the Canterbury Tales'. PhD Diss., University of New York, 2003.

—   'The Manuscript Source of Caxton's Second Edition of the Canterbury Tales and its place in the Textual Tradition of the Tales'. PhD Diss., De Montfort University, 2003.

Bowers, John M. 'Two Professional Readers of Chaucer and Langland: Scribe D and the HM 114 Scribe.' *SAC* 26 (2004): 113-146.

Boyd, Beverly. *Chaucer and the Medieval Book*. San Marino, Calif.: Huntington Library, 1973.

—   'William Caxton (1422?-1491).' In Ruggiers 1984, pp. 13-34.

—   ed. *The Prioress's Tale*. A Variorum Edition of the Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, Volume II part 20. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987.

Bradshaw, H. 'The Skeleton of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*.' *Collected Papers of Henry Bradshaw*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1876.

Brown, A. L. 'The Privy Seal Clerks in the Early Fifteenth Century.' *The Study of Medieval Records: Essays in Honour of Kathleen Major*. Eds. D. A. Bullough and R. L. Storey. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971

Brown, Carleton. 'The Evolution of the *Canterbury Tales*: Marriage Group.' *PMLA* 48 (1933), 1041-59.

—   'The Man of Law's Head-link and the Prologue of the Canterbury Tales.' *SP* xxxiv (1937): 8-35.

—   Review of Manly and Rickert 1940. *MLN* 55 (1940): 606-21.

—   'Three Notes on the Text of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *MLN* 56 (1941): 163-75.

—   'Author's Revision in the *Canterbury Tales*.' *PMLA* 57 (1942): 29-50.

Brown, Michelle P., and Patricia Lovett. *The Historical Source Book for Scribes*. London: British Library, 1999.

Brusendorff, Aage. *The Chaucer Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925.

Bullough, Donald A., and R. L. Storey, eds. *The Study of Medieval Records: Essays in Honour of Kathleen Major*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Burnley, D. 'Scribes and Hypertext.' *YES* 25 (1995): 41-62.

Caie, Graham D. 'The Significance of the Early Manuscript Glosses (with Special Reference to the *Wife of Bath's Prologue*).' *CRev.* 10 (1975-76): 350-360.

Caxton, W. [*The Canterbury Tales*. Westminster, 1476] (STC 5082).

—   [*The Canterbury Tales*. Westminster, 1482] (STC 5083).

Christianson, C. Paul. 'A Century of the Manuscript-book Trade in Late Medieval London. *MH* 12 (1984): 143-65.

—   'Early London Bookbinders and Parchmeners.' *The Book Collector* 34 (1985): 41-54.

—   'A Community of Book Artisans in Chaucer's London.' *Viator* 20 (1989): 207-218.

—   'Evidence for the Study of London's Late Medieval Manuscript-Book Trade.' In Griffiths and Pearsall 1989.

—   A Directory of London Stationers and Book Artisans 1300-1500. New York: Bibliographical Society of America, 1989.

Cohen, E. S. 'The Sequence of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *CRev* (1974-5): 190-5.

Cooper, Helen. *The Structure of the "Canterbury Tales"*. London: Duckworth, 1983.

—   'The Order of the Tales in the Ellesmere Manuscript.' In Stevens and Woodward 1997, pp. 245-261.

Corsa, Helen Storm, ed. *The Physician's Tale*. A Variorum Edition of the Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, Volume II part 17. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987

Crow, M. M. 'John of Angoulême and his Chaucer Manuscript.' *Speculum* 17 (1942): 86-99.

Crow, Martin M., and Clair C. Olson, eds. *Chaucer Life-Records*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.

Da Rold, Orietta. 'A Study of Cambridge University Library MS Dd. 4.24 of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales.' PhD Diss. De Montfort University 2002.

De Hamel, Christopher. *A History of Illuminated Manuscripts*. 2nd Edition, London, Phaidon Press Ltd., 1994.

Dempster, Germaine. 'Manly's Conception of the Early History of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *PMLA* 61 (1946): 379-415.

—   'On the Significance of Hengwrt's Change of Ink in the Merchant's Tale.' *MLN* 63 (1948a): 325-30.

—   'A Chapter of the Manuscript History of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *PMLA* (1948b): 456-84.

—   'Fifteenth-Century Editors of the Canterbury Tales and the Problem of Tale Order.' *PMLA* 64 (1949): 1123-42.

—   'A Period in the Development of the *Canterbury Tales* Marriage Group and of Blocks B² and C. *PMLA* 68 (1953): 1142-59.

Donaghey, B. 'William Thynne's Collected Edition of Chaucer: Some Bibliographical Considerations.' In *Texts and their Contexts: Papers from the Early Book Society*. Eds. John Scattergood and Julia Boffey. Bodmin, Hartnolls Ltd. 1997, pp. 150-164.

Donaldson, E. Talbot. 'The Ordering of the Canterbury Tales.' *Medieval Literature and Folkore Studies: Essays in Honor of Francis Lee Utley*. Eds. Jerome Mandel and Bruce A. Rosenburg. New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1970, pp. 193-204.

———— 'The Manuscripts of Chaucer's Works and their Use. In *Geoffrey Chaucer: Writers and their Background*. Ed. D. Brewer. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1974.

Doyle, A. I. 'English Books In and Out of Court from Edward III to Henry VII.' In *English Court Culture in the Later Middle Ages*. Eds. V. J. Scattergood and J. W. Sherbourne. London: Duckworth, 1983, pp. 163-181.

— 'The Copyist of the Ellesmere *Canterbury Tales*.' In Stevens and Woodward 1997, pp. 49-67.

— 'Recent Directions in Medieval Manuscript Study.' In *New Directions in later Medieval Manuscript Studies. Essays from the 1998 Harvard Conference*. Ed. D. Pearsall. Woodbridge, Suffolk: York Medieval Press in association with Boydell Press, 2000.

Doyle, A. I., and M. B. Parkes. 'The Production of Copies of the *Canterbury Tales* and the *Confessio Amantis* in the Early Fifteenth Century.' In *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts, and Libraries: Essays Presented to N. R. Ker*. Eds. M. B. Parkes and A. G. Watson. London: Scolar Press, 1978, pp.163-210.

— 'Paleographical Introduction.' Hengwrt Facsimile. In Ruggiers 1979, pp. xix-xlix.

Eadie, J. 'The Importance of Hengwrt: Two Studies.' *English Studies* 71 (1990): 32-34.

— 'The Wife of Bath's non-Hengwrt lines: Chaucerian Revision or Editorial Meddling?' *NM* 96 (1995): 169-76.

Edwards, A. S. G. 'Walter Skeat (1835-1912).' In Ruggiers 1984, pp. 171-189.

— 'Observations on the History of Middle English Editing.' In *Manuscripts and Texts: Editorial Problems in Later Middle English Literature. Essays from the 1985 Conference at the University of York*. Ed. D. Pearsall. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1987.

Edwards, A. S. G., and Derek Pearsall. 'The Manuscripts of the Major English Poetic Texts.' Griffiths and Pearsall 1989, pp. 257-278.

Edwards, A. S. G., Vincent Gillespie and Ralph Hanna III, eds. '*The English Medieval Book: Studies in Memory of Jeremy Griffiths*.' The British Library Studies in the History of the Book. London: The British Library, 2000.

Egerton, A., ed. *The Ellesmere Chaucer: Reproduced in Facsimile*. 2 vols. Manchester: The University Press, 1911.

Emmerson, Richard K. 'Text and Image in the Ellesmere Portraits of the Tale-Tellers.' In Stevens and Woodward 1995a, pp. 143-170.

Fisher, J. H. 'Chaucer's Last Revision of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *MLR* 67 (1972): 241-51.

— 'Animadversions on the Text of Chaucer, 1988.' *Speculum* 63 (1988): 779-93.

Fredell, Joel. 'The Lowly Paraf: Transmitting Manuscript Design in the *Canterbury Tales*.' *SAC* 22 (2000): 213-80.

Furnivall, Frederick J. *A Temporary Preface to the Six-Text Edition of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales.* Chaucer Society 2nd series 3. London: Trübner, 1868.

— *A Six-text Edition of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales:* Chaucer Society 1st series 2. London: Trübner, 1868-84.

— 'The Harleian MS. 7334 of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*.' Chaucer Society: 1st series. London: N. Trübner & Co. for the Chaucer Society, 1885.

— 'The Order of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *The Academy*, (12 October 1895): 296-7.

— 'The Cambridge MS. Dd. 4.24 of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales,* completed by the Egerton MS. 2726 (the Haistwell MS).' Chaucer Society: 1st Series, 95-96. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. for the Chaucer Society, 1901-2.

Gaylord, Alan. 'Portrait of a Poet.' In Stevens and Woodward 1995a, pp. 121-142.

Green, Nicole. 'Scribe D and the Production of One Early Manuscript of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*: London, British Library, MS. Harley 7334.' M.Sc. Diss., The University of Oxford, 2000.

Griffiths, J. 'New Light on the Provenance of a Copy of the *Canterbury Tales*. John Rylands Library, MS Eng.113.' *Bulletin of the John Ryland University Library of Manchester* 77 (1995): 25-30.

Griffiths, Jeremy, J. and Derek Pearsall, eds. *Book Production and Publishing in Britain 1375-1475.* Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Hammond, Eleanor. 'On the Order of the *Canterbury Tales*: Caxton's Two Editions.' *MP* 3 (1905-6): 159-78.

— 'A Scribe of Chaucer.' *MP* 27 (1929): 27-33.

— Chaucer: *A Bibliographical Manual.* 1908; rpt. New York: Peter Smith, 1933.

Hanna, Ralph, III. *The Ellesmere Manuscript of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales: A Working Facsimile.* Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1989.

— 'Booklets in Medieval Manuscripts: Further Considerations.' *SB* 39 (1986): 100-12.

— 'Problems of 'Best-Text' Editing and the Hengwrt Manuscript of *The Canterbury Tales*.' In Pearsall 1987, pp. 89-94.

— 'Authorial Versions, Rolling Revision, Scribal Error? Or, the Truth about *Truth*.' *SAC* 10 (1988): 23-40.

— 'The Hengwrt Manuscript and the Canon of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *EMS* 1 (1989): 64-84.

— '(The) Editing (of) the Ellesmere Text.' In Stevens and Woodward 1995, pp. 225-243.

— *Pursuing History: Middle English Manuscripts and their Texts.* Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1996.

Hartung, A. E. ' The Clerk's Endlink in the d Manuscripts.' *PMLA* 67 (1952): 1173-81.

Heseltine, J. E. 'A Study of the Links and some Outstanding Divergencies of Arrangement in the Manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales.*' In McCormick 1933.

Horobin, Simon. 'A Transcription and Study of British Library MS Additional 35286 of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales.*' PhD Diss., University of Sheffield, 1997a.

— 'Additional 35286 and the Order of the *Canterbury Tales.*' *CRev* 31 (1997b): 272-8.

— 'The 'Hooked G' Scribe and his Work in Three Manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales.*' *NM* 99 (1998): 411-7.

— 'The Language of the Hengwrt Manuscript.' In *The Hengwrt Chaucer Digital Facsimile.* Ed. E. Stubbs. Leicester: Scholarly Digital Editions, 2000.

— *The Language of the Chaucer Tradition.* Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2003.

— Horobin, S. and Linne R. Mooney. 'A *Piers Plowman* Manuscript by the Hengwrt/Ellesmere Scribe and its Implications for London Standard English.' *SAC* 26 (2004): 65-112.

Hudson, A. 'John Stow (1525?-1605).' In Ruggiers 1984, pp. 53-70.

Jones, Alex I. 'MS Harley 7334 and the Construction of the Canterbury Tales.' *ELN* 23 (1985): 9-15.

Jones, Richard F. 'A Conjecture on the "Wife of Bath's Prologue.' *JEGP* 24 (1925): 521-32.

Kane, George. 'John Manly (1865-1940) and Edith Rickert (1871-1939).' In Ruggiers 1984, pp. 207-229.

Keiser, G. R. 'In Defence of the Bradshaw Shift.' *CRev* 12 (1977-8): 191-201.

Kennedy, Beverly. 'Contradictory Responses to the "Wife of Bath" as Evidenced by Fifteenth-Century Manuscript Variants.' In Blake and Robinson 1997, pp. 23-39.

Koch, John. *A Detailed Comparison of the Eight Manuscripts of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales: As Printed in the Publications of the Chaucer Society.* Chaucer Society 2nd series. London: Kegan Paul, 1913.

— *The Pardoner's Prologue and Tale: A Critical Edition.* Chaucer Society 2nd series 35. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1928.

Kolve, V. A. 'The Cook's Tale and The Man of Law's Introduction: Crossing the Hengwrt/Ellesmere Gap.' *Chaucer and the Imagery of Narrative: The First Five Canterbury Tales.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1984, pp. 257-296.

Lee, Linda. Oxford, Corpus Christi College Library. Notes made at the disbinding of Oxford, Corpus Christi College MS. 198.

Lerer, Seth. 'Rewriting Chaucer: Two Fifteenth-century Readings of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *Viator* 19 (1988): 311-26.

— *Readings from the Margins: Textual studies, Chaucer, and Medieval Literature.* San Marino, Calif.: Huntington Library Press, 1996.

Lester, Geoffrey, ed. *Chaucer in Perspective: Middle English Essays in Honour of Norman Blake.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Manly, J. M. *Canterbury Tales By Geoffrey Chaucer.* George G. Harrap, London, Calcutta, Sydney, 1928.

Manly, J. M. and Edith Rickert. *The Text of the Canterbury Tales: Studied on the Basis of all Known Manuscripts.* 8 vols. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1940.

Mann, Jill. 'Chaucer's Meter and the Myth of the Ellesmere Editor of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *SAC* 23 (2001): 71-107.

McLaren, Mary-Rose. 'Reading, Writing and Recording. Literacy and the London Chronicles in the Fifteenth Century.' In *London and the Kingdom: Proceedings of the 2004 Harlaxton Symposium.* Eds. Matthew Davies and Andrew Prescott. Forthcoming.

McCormick, Sir William and Janet E. Heseltine. *The Manuscripts of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales: A Critical Description of Their Contents.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.

McIntosh, Angus, M. L. Samuels, and Michael Benskin., eds. *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English.* 4 vols. Aberdeen: Aberdeen Univ. Press, 1986.

Minnis, A. J., ed. *Middle English Poetry: Texts and Traditions: Essays in Honour of Derek Pearsall, York Manuscripts Conference.* Woodbridge, Suffolk: York Medieval Press in association with Boydell Press, 2001.

Minnis, A. J., and Charlotte Brewer, eds. *Crux and Controversy in Middle English Textual Criticism.* Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1992.

Mooney, Linne R. 'A Middle English Text on the Seven Liberal Arts.' *Speculum* 68 (1993): 1027-1052.

— 'More Manuscripts written by a Chaucer Scribe.' *CRev* 30 (1996): 401-07.

— 'Chaucer's Scribe.' *Speculum* 81 (2006): 97-138.

Moore, S. 'The Position of Group c in the *Canterbury Tales*.' *PMLA* 30 (1915): 116-23.

Moorman, Charles. 'One Hundred Years of Editing the *Canterbury Tales*.' *The Chaucer Review* 24 (1989): 95-114.

— *The Statistical Determination of Affiliation in the Landmark Manuscripts of the Canterbury Tales.* Lewiston, N.Y., Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 1993.

Morse, Charlotte C. 'What the "Clerk's Tale" suggests about Manly and Rickert's Edition - and the *Canterbury Tales* Project.' In Minnis 2001, pp. 41-56.

Mosser, Daniel W. 'The Two Scribes of the Cardigan Manuscript and the Evidence of Scribal Supervision and Shop Production. *SB* 39 (1986): 112-25.

— 'A New Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*.' In Blake and Robinson 1993, pp. 75-84.

— 'Description of the Witnesses.' *The "Wife of Bath's Prologue" on CD-ROM*. Ed. P. Robinson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

— 'The Language, Hands, and Interaction of the Two Scribes of the Egerton 2726 Chaucer Manuscript (En1).' In Blake and Robinson 1997, pp. 41-53.

Owen, Charles A., Jr. '*The Canterbury Tales*: Early Manuscripts and Relative Popularity.' *JEGP* 54 (1955): 104-110.

— 'The Development of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *JEGP* 57 (1958): 449-76.

— 'The Earliest Plan of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *MS* 21 (1959): 202-10.

— 'The Alternative Reading of the *Canterbury Tales*: Chaucer's Text and the Early Manuscripts.' *PMLA* 97 (1987): 237-50.

— Review of Blake 1985. *SAC* 9 (1987): 183-87.

— 'Pre-1450 Manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*: Relationships and Significance.' *CRev* 23 (1988): 1-29; 95-116.

— *The Manuscripts of the Canterbury Tales*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1991.

— 'What the Manuscripts tell us about the "Parson's Tale".' *MÆ* 63 (1994): 239-49.

Parkes, M. B. *English Cursive Book Hands, 1250-1500*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.

— 'The Influence of the Concepts of Ordinatio and Compilatio on the Development of the Book.' In *Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays Presented to Richard William Hunt*. Ed. J.J.G. Alexander and M.T. Gibson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976, pp. 115-141.

— *Pause and Effect: An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West*. Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1992.

— 'The Planning and Construction of the Ellesmere MS.' In Stevens and Woodward 1997, pp. 41-47.

Parkes, M. B., and A. G. Watson, eds. *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts and Libraries: Essays presented to N.R. Ker*. London: Scolar Press, 1978.

Parkes, M. B., and Richard Beadle, eds. *Poetical works of Geoffrey Chaucer: A Facsimile of Cambridge University Library MS. Gg.4.27*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1979.

Partridge, Stephen Bradford. 'The Canterbury Tales Glosses and the Manuscript Groups.' In Blake and Robinson 1997, pp. 85-94.

—   'The Manuscript Glosses to "The Wife of Bath's Prologue".'*The "Wife of Bath's Prologue" on CD-ROM.* Ed. P. Robinson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

—   'Minding the Gaps. Interpreting the Manuscript Evidence of "The Cook's Tale" and "The Squire's Tale".' In Edwards et al., 2000.

Pearsall, Derek, ed. *Manuscripts and Readers in Fifteenth-century England: The Literary Implications of Manuscript Study. Essays from the 1981 Conference at the University of York.* Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1983.

—   ed. *The Nun's Priest's Tale.* A Variorum Edition of the Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, Volume II part 9. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1984a.

—   'Thomas Speght (ca. 1550-?).' In Ruggiers 1984, pp. 71- 92.

—   'Texts, Textual Criticism, and Fifteenth-century Manuscript Production.' *Fifteenth-century Studies: Recent Essays.* Ed. R. F. Yeager. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1984b.

—   *The "Canterbury Tales".* London: Allen & Unwin, 1985.

—   ed. *Manuscripts and Texts: Editorial Problems in Later Middle English Literature. Essays from the 1985 Conference at the University of York.* Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1987.

—   *The Life of Geoffrey Chaucer: A Critical Biography.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.

—   'The Ellesmere Chaucer and Contemporary English Literary Manuscripts.' In Stevens and Woodward 1997, pp. 263-280.

—   'The Values of Manuscript Study: A Personal Retrospect.' *JEBS* 3 (2000): 167-81.

—   ed. *New Directions in Later Medieval Manuscript Studies. Essays from the 1998 Harvard Conference.* Woodbridge, Suffolk: York Medieval Press in association with Boydell Press, 2000.

Pickering, O. S. 'The Present Popularity of Middle English Manuscript Studies: Some recent work reviewed.' *Archiv* 226 (1989): 99-106.

Piper, Edwin F. 'The Miniatures of the Ellesmere Manuscript.' *PQ* 3 (1924): 241-56.

Pollard, G. 'The Company of Stationers before 1557.' *The Library,* 4th ser., 18 (1937): 1-38.

Powell, Susan, and J. J. Smith, eds. *New Perspectives on Middle English Texts: A Festschrift for R. A. Waldron.* Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2000.

Pratt, Robert A. 'The Order of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *PMLA* 66 (1951): 1141-67.

—   ed. *The "Tales of Canterbury": Complete.* Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1966.

—   ed. *The "Tales of Canterbury": Complete.* Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1974.

—   'Chaucer and the Hand that Fed Him.' *Speculum* 41 (1966): 619-42.

Price, D.J. *The Equatorie of the Planetis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955.

Pynson, Richard. [*The Canterbury Tales*. London 1492] (STC 5084).

Ramsey, R. V. 'The Hengwt and Ellesmere Manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*: Different Scribes.' *SB* 35 (1982): 133-54.

— 'Paleography and Scribes of Shared Training.' *SB* 38 (1986): 107-44.

— 'F. N. Robinson's Editing of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *SB* 42 (1989): 134-52.

— *The Manly-Rickert Text of the "Canterbury Tales"*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1994.

Reinecke, G. F. 'F. N. Robinson (1872-1967).' In Ruggiers 1984, pp. 231-251.

Richardson, Malcolm. 'The Earliest Known Owners of *Canterbury Tales* Manuscripts and Chaucer's secondary Audience.' *CRev* 25 (1990): 17-32.

— *The Medieval Chancery under Henry V*. List & Index Society. Special series. Kew: List & Index Society, 1999.

Robinson, F. N., ed. *The Complete Works of Chaucer*. Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin, 1933.

— ed. *The Complete Works of Chaucer*. 2nd edn. Oxford University Press: London, 1957.

Robinson, Pamela. 'The Booklet: A Self-contained Unit in Composite Manuscripts.' *Codicologica* 3 (1980): 46-69.

— ed. *Of the Making of Books: Medieval Manuscripts, their Scribes and Readers*. Essays presented to M. B. Parkes. Aldershot: Scolar Press; Brookfield: Ashgate, 1997.

Robinson, Peter. 'An Approach to the Manuscripts of the "Wife of Bath's Prologue".' *Computer-based Chaucer studies*. Ed. I. Lancashire. Toronto: University of Toronto Centre for Computing in the Humanities, 1993.

— *The "Wife of Bath's Prologue" on CD-ROM*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

— 'A Stemmatic Analysis of the Fifteenth-Century Witnesses to The Wife of Bath's Prologue.' In Blake and Robinson 1997, pp. 69-132.

— 'Can We Trust the Hengwrt Manuscript?' In Lester 1999, pp. 194-217.

— 'The One Text and the Many Texts.' *LLC* 15 (2000): 5-15.

Robinson, Peter, and Elizabeth Solopova. 'Guidelines for Transcription of the Manuscripts of the Wife of Bath's Prologue. In Blake and Robinson 1993, pp. 19-52.

Root, R. K. 'The Text of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *SP* 38 (1941): 1-13.

Ross, Thomas W., ed. *The Miller's Tale*. A Variorum Edition of the Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, Volume II part 3. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1979.

— 'Thomas Wright (1810-1877).' In Ruggiers 1984, pp. 145-156.

Rouse, Mary A., and Richard H. Rouse. *Authentic Witnesses: Approaches to Medieval Texts and Manuscripts.* Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991.

Ruggiers, Paul G., ed. *Editing Chaucer: The Great Tradition.* Norman, Okla.: Pilgrim Books, 1984.

— ed. *The Canterbury Tales: A Facsimile and Transcription of the Hengwrt Manuscript, with Variants from the Ellesmere Manuscript.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1979.

Samuels, M. L., and J. J. Smith. 'The Scribe of the Hengwrt and Ellesmere Manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*.' In *The English of Chaucer and his Contemporaries: Essays by M. L. Samuels and J. J. Smith.* Ed. J. J. Smith. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1988, pp. 13-22 and 38-50.

Schmidt, K.A.R., *The Authorship of the Equatorie of the Planetis.* Chaucer Studies 19. Cambridge: Brewer, 1993.

Scott, Kathleen L. 'An Hours and Psalter by Two Ellesmere Illuminators.' In Stevens and Woodward 1995, pp. 87-119.

Seymour, Michael C. 'Of this Cokes Tale.' *CRev* 24 (1990): 259-62.

— *A Catalogue of Chaucer Manuscripts: Works Before the "Canterbury Tales".* Vol. 1. Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1995.

— *A Catalogue of Chaucer Manuscripts: The "Canterbury Tales".* Vol. 2. Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1997.

Shonk, Timothy A. 'A Study of the Auchinleck Manuscript: Bookmen and Bookmaking in the Early Fourteenth Century.' *Speculum* 60. 1 (Jan. 1985): 71-91.

Skeat, W. W. *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer.* 7 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894.

— *The Evolution of the "Canterbury Tales".* London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. for the Chaucer Society, 1907.

— *The Eight-Text Edition of the Canterbury Tales.* Chaucer Society 3rd series 43. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1909.

Smith, Jeremy J. 'Linguistic Features of some Fifteenth-century Middle English Manuscripts.' In Pearsall 1983, pp. 104-112.

— 'Studies in the Language of Some Manuscripts of Gower's Confessio Amantis.' PhD Diss. Glasgow University, 1985.

— ed. *The English of Chaucer and his Contemporaries: Essays by M.L.Samuels and J.J. Smith.* Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1988.

— 'The Trinity Gower D Scribe and his Work on Two Early *Canterbury Tales* MSS.' In Smith 1988, pp. 51-69.

—   'The Language of the Ellesmere Manuscript.' In Stevens and Woodward 1995, pp. 69-86.

Solopova, Elizabeth. 'Metre and Scribal Editing in the "Wife of Bath's Prologue". In Blake and Robinson 1997, pp. 143-164.

—   'The Problem of Authorial Variants in the "Wife of Bath's Prologue". In Blake and Robinson 1997, pp. 133-142.

—   ed. *The "General Prologue" on CD-ROM*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

—   'The Survival of Chaucer's Punctuation in the Early Manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*.' In Minnis 2001, pp. 27-40.

Speght, Thomas. *The Workes of our antient and lerned English poet, Geffrey Chaucer, newly printed.* London: Adam Islip for Bishop, 1598 (STC 5077).

—   *The Workes Of Ovr Ancient and learned English Poet, Geffrey Chavcer, newly Printed.* London: Adam Islip, 1602 (STC 5080).

Stanley, E. G. 'Of this Cokes Tale maked Chaucer na more.' *Poetica* 5 (1976): 36-59.

Steer, Francis W. *Scriveners' Company Common Paper, 1357-1628: With a continuation to 1678.* Publications London Record Society. London: London Record Society, 1968.

Stevens, Martin. 'The Ellesmere Chaucer: Essays in Interpretation.' In Stevens and Woodward 1997, pp. 29-47.

Stevens, Martin, and Daniel Woodward, eds. *The "Canterbury Tales": The New Ellesmere Chaucer Facsimile (of Huntington Library MS EL 26 C 9).* Tokyo: Yushodo Co.; San Marino, Calif.: Huntington Library Press, 1995.

Stevens, Martin, and Daniel Woodward, eds. *The Ellesmere Chaucer: Essays in Interpretation.* San Marino, CA & Tokyo: Huntington Library & Yushodo Co., Ltd., 1997.

Stow, John. *The Woorkes of Geffrey Chaucer, newly printed, with diuers addicions, whiche were neuer in printe before. London: Ihon Kyngston for Ihon Wight dwellyng in Poules Churchyarde, 1561.* (STC 5075).

Strohm, Paul. 'Jean of Angoulême: A Fifteenth-Century Reader of Chaucer.' *NM* 79 (1971): 69-76.

Stubbs, Estelle, ed. *The Hengwrt Chaucer Digital Facsimile.* Leicester: Scholarly Digital Editions, 2000.

—   "A New Manuscript by the Hengwrt/Ellesmere Scribe? Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, MS. Peniarth 393D." *JEBS* 5 (2002): 166-173.

—   '"Here's One I Prepared Earlier". The work of Scribe D on Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 198'. *RES* (2006). Forthcoming.

Tatlock, John S. P. *The Harleian Manuscript 7334 and Revision of the Canterbury Tales*, Chaucer Society 2nd series 37. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1909.

—   'The Canterbury Tales in 1400.' *PMLA* 50 (1935): 100-39.

Thomson, Claire E. 'A Transcription and Study of British Library MS. Lansdowne 851 of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*.' PhD Diss., University of Sheffield, 1998.

Thynne, William. *The Workes of Geffray Chaucer newly printed, with dyuers workes whych were neuer in print before.* Lo[n]don: Thomas Godfray, 1532 (STC 5068).

—   *The Workes of Geffray Chaucer newlye printed, wyth dyuers workes whych were neuer in print before.* London: Bonham, 1542 (STC 5069).

Tschann, Judith. 'The Layout of Sir Thopas in the Ellesmere, Hengwrt, Cambridge Dd.4.24, and Cambridge Gg.4.27 Manuscripts.' *CRev* 20 (1985): 1-13.

Tyrwhitt, Thomas. *The "Canterbury Tales" of Chaucer to which are added, an essay upon versificatio; an introductory discurse; and notes.* 5 vols. London: Payne, 1775-1778.

Urry, John. *The works of Geoffrey Chaucer, compared with the former editions, and many valuable MSS.* London: Bernard Lintot, 1721.

Windeatt, B. A. 'The Scribes as Chaucer's Early Critics.' *SAC* 1 (1979): 119-41.

—   'Thomas Tyrwhitt (1730-1786).' In Ruggiers 1984, pp. 117-143.

Woodward, Daniel and Maria Fredericks. 'The Preparation, Repair, and Rebinding of the Ellesmere Manuscript: A Summary of Anthony G. Cains's Report.' In Stevens and Woodward 1997, pp. 29-39.

Wright, Thomas, ed. *The "Canterbury Tales" of Geoffrey Chaucer: A New Text with Illustrative Notes.* 3 vols. Percy Society. London: T. Richards, (vols. 1 and 2, 1847; vol. 3, 1851).

Zupitza, Julius, ed. *Specimens of all the Accessible Unprinted Manuscripts of the Canterbury Tales.* Chaucer Society publications. First series, parts 1, 2 and 3. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. for the Chaucer Society, 1892-93.