

A Transcription and Study of British Library
MS Additional 35286
of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*

by

Simon Horobin

Submitted for the Degree of Ph.D
to the University of Sheffield

Department of English Language and Linguistics

August

1997

A Transcription and Study of British Library

MS Additional 35286

of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*

by

Simon Horobin

Submitted for the Degree of Ph.D

to the University of Sheffield

Department of English Language and Linguistics

August

1997

A Transcription and Study of British Library MS Additional 35286 of Chaucer's

Canterbury Tales

Simon Horobin

Summary

Much scholarship devoted to the study of the text of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* has focused on the Hengwrt and Ellesmere manuscripts, attempting to reconcile their many differences in the content and presentation of the poem. In concentrating on these two manuscripts, and a small group of other witnesses dated to the first quarter of the fifteenth century, scholars have largely ignored over forty complete manuscripts copied throughout the remainder of the century. Study of the manuscripts has relied on features external to the text of the poem itself in order to chart the development of the tradition, such as the order of tales, while details of text, language and metre have remained relatively unconsidered.

The subject of this study is a manuscript that has been neglected by scholars due to its date of copying, c. 1430-50, and certain idiosyncracies in the tale-order. Despite these factors this manuscript contains a text closely related to that of Hg, the earliest extant copy of the poem. In addition to preserving an accurate copy of an early exemplar, Ad³ also shows close links with El, particularly in its ordering of the tales and the inclusion of marginalia. This is therefore an important copy of the poem, highlighting the restrictions and limitations of current attitudes to the textual tradition, and with much to offer as an independent witness to an early exemplar, with unique access to materials used in the production of both Hg and El.

This study draws on recent technological developments, such as the availability of electronic versions of Middle English texts and collation software, in order to provide a detailed and comprehensive analysis of Ad³. In addition to this an electronic version of the text is included to enable further research of this kind.

Ent p lacy she hadde a faire freghed
 It was almost a spanne brood, in the
 For hardly she was nocht in the
 ful fetis was her clok, as y was ware
 Of smite about hir armis o the bair.
 A payre of redis with gaudes ai of grene.
 Ther on hang a brace of getre ful shens
 On which ther was first writen a credone D. A.
 And after that a more exact onmid.
 A nother nome was it, hir had she
 That was hir chary chym and plectas the
 monke ther was a faire for the maistris
 An out ryder that loved wel Venetie.
 A manly man to ben an adbot able.
 ful man a deute how he had in stable.
 And when he rode men might his byrdell here
 Snyng in a whyspring wind so clere.
 And ete as loud as with a chapel belle
 Ther as the lorde was keper of the celle.
 The redde of sent maure othe of sent seynt
 By cause that hit was old and comdele thert.
 Tho the monke let olde thinges pace.
 And heelde afor the newe word the space
 He yaf not of the trye a pulled ben
 That seith that hunters be nocht holy men
 For that a monke when he is iccheles
 Is likned to a fish that ys waterles.
 This is to sey a monke out of his cloyster
 But while the tyme he is not worth an oyster
 And of. ayde his oppinion was good
 What shold he pithie and make hym selfe a roode
 Upon a dele at day in cloyster to poure
 Of swyke wyth his hondes a labour.
 So aysyn hit hold what the world be served
 Yet aysyn have his stynk to hym reserved
 Ther fore he was a presour a myght
 Greghouder he hadde as swyft as fowl in flight
 Of pnyng and of hunting for the hare
 Was at his huse for no lyste make he spare
 Gode his oletes purfysd are the hard

for to

Whil a name

in the city of
Amanthe

my only son

CONTENTS

Introduction		i
Abbreviations		v
Chapter 1	The <i>Canterbury Tales</i> Textual Debate	1
Chapter 2	A Description of the Manuscript	28
Chapter 3	The Order of Tales	56
Chapter 4	Omissions and Additions	78
Chapter 5	A Study of the Glosses	94
Chapter 6	A Study of the Language	135
Chapter 7	Minor Textual Variants	190
Conclusion		228
Bibliography		241
Appendix A	Description of Lination System	254
Appendix B	Chronological List of Fifteenth-Century Witnesses	258
Appendix C	A Transcription of the Text in Electronic Form	

Introduction

The conception of the *Canterbury Tales* is traditionally dated to the late 1380's and the composition of the poem is assumed to have occupied Chaucer until his death in 1400. The poem remained unfinished at the time of his death, and no manuscript of the work survives from Chaucer's own lifetime.¹ Scholars remain in disagreement as to whether copies of parts of the poem were circulated prior to 1400, although a reference to the Wife of Bath in Chaucer's *Envoy to Bukton* (c. 1396) and knowledge of Chaucer's poetry in contemporary works suggests access to the material in some form. The century following Chaucer's death saw the production of over fifty complete manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*, and a further four printed versions. The earliest of these witnesses is the Hg manuscript, dated to the first decade of the fifteenth century and thought to represent the first attempt to produce a complete collection of the *Canterbury Tales*.

The production of Hg reveals a number of problems confronted by Chaucer's first editors; problems which continued to trouble subsequent copyists throughout the fifteenth century. The entire century saw editors and scribes struggling to create a single coherent work out of a series of incomplete and contradictory parts. In order to achieve this goal links were composed or altered, extra tales were incorporated and existing ones edited or completed, and the tale-order frequently rearranged. Thus the textual tradition of the *Canterbury Tales* presents a highly complex collection of scribal and authorial contributions, with few concrete clues as to the state of the poem left by Chaucer at the time of his death.

In order to rule out the scribal and recover the authorial, modern editors of the *Canterbury Tales* have focused on the evidence of the earliest manuscripts, those dated

¹The debate over the possibility of extant manuscripts dating from Chaucer's lifetime is reopened by Blake in a forthcoming article entitled 'Geoffrey Chaucer and the Manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*.'

to the first quarter of the fifteenth century. Discussion of this period of manuscript production has concentrated on the Hg and El manuscripts: accurate and authoritative copies carried out by the same scribe. Despite the authority of both these witnesses they present fundamentally different copies of the poem, and much critical and editorial energy has been expended in an attempt to reconcile their many differences in text, metre, content and tale-order. Studies of the textual tradition have tended to chart a development from Hg to El thus reinforcing an assumption that the progression of the production of copies of this poem has a linear development, moving from the confusion of Hg to the certainty of El. However this picture is a simplification of the problem, and it is important that scholars look beyond this first generation of copying to observe the development of the text after the production of El. Despite the impression conveyed by modern scholarship, matters of text, content and arrangement were not standardised with El. Study of later manuscripts shows that the production of copies of the *Canterbury Tales* throughout the fifteenth century was beset by similar difficulties in obtaining and arranging the constituent parts of Chaucer's poem.

The aim of this thesis is to approach the textual tradition from a different angle, that provided by a mid-fifteenth-century copy, British Library MS Additional 35286. A study of this manuscript will provide an insight into the development of the tradition after the first generation of manuscript production, thus allowing a freer and wider view of the development of the text.

The *Canterbury Tales* Project

Much of this study draws on the materials and methodology developed by The *Canterbury Tales* Project, and it will be useful to set out the aims and techniques adopted by the Project as a prolegomenon to my study. The aim of the Project is two-fold: to attempt to discover what Chaucer actually wrote, and to provide complete transcripts and images of all manuscript and pre-1500 printed witnesses of the

Canterbury Tales. The initial stage in achieving these goals is the preparation of the transcripts, carried out using the program *Transcribe* which produces SGML-encoded texts with original orthographic and abbreviative conventions preserved.² Collation of this material is undertaken using the software *Collate*, designed specifically for the collation of Middle English texts with large textual traditions (Robinson 1994). The results of this collation process will then be made available to scholars in both regularised and unregularised forms, allowing access to substantive and accidental affiliation. The collated material is then lemmatised to produce complete databases containing all spellings of every individual word in all manuscripts. The results of the Project's work will therefore give access to a vast body of textual and linguistic data with a variety of applications. The publication of the material will take two forms: CD-ROM editions of individual parts of the poem in all fifteenth-century versions, and CD-ROM editions of complete texts of individual manuscripts. The recent release of the Project's initial publication has allowed access to transcripts, images, collations and spellings of all witnesses of WBP (Robinson 1996). In addition the Project has completed a number of transcripts of complete manuscripts and this study draws on both published and unpublished data.³

Underlying the Project's aims are a number of theoretical assumptions, many of which are central to this study, and it will therefore be helpful to highlight these at this stage. The Project adopts the assumption that all extant manuscripts are in some way descended from one single original archetype, and therefore that every individual reading has an independent value as a witness to this hyparchetype. Thus the recovery of the archetype must be approached through a study of the tradition in its entirety, rather than from the consideration of a small number of early witnesses. In addition to the evidence for the reconstruction of the archetype, the testimony of later manuscripts is significant to a study of the dissemination of the text and the state and availability of exemplars after the first wave of copying of Chaucer's work. In addition to this is the

²The theoretical and technical backgrounds to the transcription procedure are outlined in Robinson and Solopova 1993.

³The Project has prepared complete transcripts of Hg El Cp Ha⁴ Dd La Ad³ Gg En¹ Ds¹.

recognition that manuscripts are not simply of textual value, but also provide important linguistic, orthographic and dialectological information. Similarly this study adopts the attitude that a manuscript is not exclusively a vehicle for a text, but is a testimony to a process of production and assembly that provides a wealth of information concerning modes of presentation, publication and reception of a specific literary work.

The aim of this study is to apply these theoretical and methodological principles to British Library MS Additional 35286. The main focus of my study is the textual and linguistic information provided by this witness, and the significance of this data to an analysis of the textual tradition of the *Canterbury Tales*. This is the first full-length study to draw on the resources provided by the Project, and the application of these materials to a little-known manuscript will provide an important testing-bed of the theoretical and practical backgrounds outlined above.

Abbreviations

Manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*

Ad ¹	British Library Additional 5140
Ad ²	British Library Additional 25718
Ad ³	British Library Additional 35286
Ad ⁴	British Library Additional 10340
Ar	Arundel 140
Bo ¹	Bodleian Library 414
Bo ²	Bodleian Library 686
Bw	Bodleian Library Barlow 20
Ch	Christ Church College Oxford 152
Cn	'Cardigan': University of Texas HRC 143
Cp	Corpus Christi College Oxford 198
Ct	Chetham's Library 6709
Dd	Cambridge University Library Dd. 4.24
Dl	'Delamere': Takamiya 32
Do	Bodleian Library Douce d.4
Ds ¹	'Devonshire': Takamiya 24
Ds ²	Devonshire Fragment
Ee	Cambridge University Library Ee. 2.15
El	'Ellesmere': Huntington Library El. 26 C 9
En ¹	British Library Egerton 2726
En ²	British Library Egerton 2863
En ³	British Library Egerton 2864
Fi	Fitzwilliam Museum McLean 181
Gg	Cambridge University Library Gg. 4.27

Gl	Glasgow Hunterian Museum U.1.1
Ha ¹	British Library Harley 1239
Ha ²	British Library Harley 1758
Ha ³	British Library Harley 7333
Ha ⁴	British Library Harley 7334
Ha ⁵	British Library Harley 7335
He	'Helmingham': Princeton University Library 100
Hg	'Hengwrt': National Library of Wales Peniarth 392 D
Hk	Holkham Hall 667
Hl ¹	British Library Harley 1704
Hl ²	British Library Harley 2251
Hl ³	British Library Harley 2382
Hl ⁴	British Library Harley 5908
Hn	Huntington Library HM 144
Ht	Bodleian Library Hatton Donat. 1
Ii	Cambridge University Library Ii. 3.26
Kk	Cambridge University Library Kk. 1.3/20
La	British Library Lansdowne 851
Lc	Lichfield Cathedral Library 2
Ld ¹	Bodleian Library Laud 600
Ld ²	Bodleian Library Laud 739
Ll ¹	Longleat 257
Ll ²	Longleat 29
Ln	Lincoln Cathedral Library 110
Ma	John Rylands Library English 113
Mc	'McCormick': University of Chicago Library 564
Me	'Merthyr': National Library of Wales 21972 D
Mg	Pierpont Morgan Library 249
Mm	Cambridge University Library Mm. 2.5

Ne	New College Oxford D.314
Nl	Northumberland 455
Np	Naples Royal Library XIII.B.29
Ox ¹	John Rylands Library English 63
Ox ²	Philadelphia Rosenbach Foundation 1084/2
Ph ¹	Phillipps 6570: University of Texas HRC 46
Ph ²	Phillipps 8136: Bodmer Library 48
Ph ³	Phillipps 8137: Philadelphia Rosenbach Foundation 1084/1
Ph ⁴	Phillipps 8299: Huntington Library HM 140
Pl	Columbia University Library Plimpton 253
Pp	Magdalene College Cambridge Pepys 2006
Ps	Bibliothèque Nationale Fonds Anglais 39
Pw	Petworth House 7
Py	Royal College of Physicians 388
Ra ¹	Bodleian Library Rawlinson Poetry 141
Ra ²	Bodleian Library Rawlinson Poetry 149
Ra ³	Bodleian Library Rawlinson Poetry 223
Ra ⁴	Bodleian Library Rawlinson C.86
Ry ¹	British Library Royal 17 D. XV
Ry ²	British Library Royal 18 C. II
Se	Bodleian Library Arch. Selden B.14
Si	'Sion': Takamiya 22
Sl ¹	British Library Sloane 1685
Sl ²	British Library Sloane 1686
Sl ³	British Library Sloane 1009
St	Stonyhurst College B XXIII
Tc ¹	Trinity College Cambridge R. 3.3
Tc ²	Trinity College Cambridge R. 3.15
Tc ³	Trinity College Cambridge R. 3.19

To¹ Trinity College Oxford 49
To² Trinity College Oxford D.29

Pre-1500 printed editions of the *Canterbury Tales*

Cx¹ Caxton's First Edition (1476)
Cx² Caxton's Second Edition (1482)
Pn Pynson (1492)
Wy Wynkyn de Worde (1498)

Manuscript Groups

Robinson's Fundamental Witness Groupings

O Group:

Ad¹-En³

Ad³-Ha⁵

Ra³-Tc¹

Ch

Bo²-Ht

Hg

AB Group:

Dd

Cn-Ma

Ds-En¹

Ii

He

Ne

Cx¹

Tc²

CD Group:

Cp

La

Mm

Ld¹

Ry¹

Ph³

Pw

Sl²

To

Dl

Fi

Nl

Sl¹

Lc

Mg

E Group:

Si

Gg

Bo¹-Ph²

F Group:

Bw

Ln

Ld²

Ry²

Manly-Rickert Constant Groups

a Dd-Cn

b He-Ne

c Cp-La-Sl²

d En²-Lc-Pw-Ry²-Dl-Ha²-Sl¹

Ad³ Ad³-Ha⁵

Bo¹ Bo¹-Ph²

Cn Cn-Ma

Cx¹ Cx¹-Tc²

Dd Dd-En¹

En¹ En¹-Ds¹

En² En²-Ll¹

En³ En³-Ad¹

Lc Lc-Mg

Mc Mc-Ra¹

Mm Mm-Gl

Ne Ne-Cx¹

Ps Ps-Ha¹

Pw Pw-Ph³-Mm

Ra² Ra²-Ht

Ry² Ry²-Ld²

References

<i>ChRev</i>	<i>Chaucer Review</i>
<i>E&S</i>	<i>Essays and Studies</i>
<i>ELN</i>	<i>English Language Notes</i>
<i>EMS</i>	<i>English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700</i>
<i>ES</i>	<i>English Studies</i>
<i>HLQ</i>	<i>Huntington Library Quarterly</i>
<i>JEGP</i>	<i>Journal of English and Germanic Philology</i>
<i>LSE</i>	<i>Leeds Studies in English</i>
<i>MÆ</i>	<i>Medium Ævum</i>
<i>MLN</i>	<i>Modern Language Notes</i>
<i>MLR</i>	<i>Modern Language Review</i>
<i>MP</i>	<i>Modern Philology</i>
<i>N&Q</i>	<i>Notes and Queries</i>
<i>NM</i>	<i>Neuphilologische Mitteilungen</i>
<i>PBA</i>	<i>Proceedings of the British Academy</i>
<i>PMLA</i>	<i>Publications of the Modern Language Association of America</i>
<i>RES</i>	<i>Review of English Studies</i>
<i>SAC</i>	<i>Studies in the Age of Chaucer</i>
<i>SB</i>	<i>Studies in Bibliography</i>
<i>SN</i>	<i>Studia Neophilologica</i>
<i>SP</i>	<i>Studies in Philology</i>

Tales and Links

Tales

CL	Clerk's Tale
CO	Cook's Tale
CY	Canon's Yeoman's Tale
FK	Franklin's Tale
FR	Friar's Tale
GP	General Prologue
KN	Knight's Tale
MA	Manciple's Tale
ME	Merchant's Tale
MI	Miller's Tale
ML	Man of Law's Tale
MO	Monk's Tale
NP	Nun's Priest's Tale
NU	Second Nun's Tale
PA	Parson's Tale
PD	Pardoner's Tale
PH	Physician's Tale
PR	Prioress's Tale
RE	Reeve's Tale
RT	Retraction
SH	Shipman's Tale
SQ	Squire's Tale
SU	Summoner's Tale
TG	Tale of Gamelyn
TM	Tale of Melibee

TT	Tale of Thopas
WBP	Wife of Bath's Prologue
WBT	Wife of Bath's Tale

Links

L1	KN-MI
L2	MI-RE
L3	RE-CO
L4	CO Endlink
L5	CO-TG
L6	CO-TG
L7	ML Headlink
L8	ML Endlink
L9	WB Headlink
L10	WB-FR
L11	FR-SU
L12	SU Endlink
L13	WB Stanza
L14	Host Stanza
L15	ME Headlink
L16	ME-WB
L17	ME-SQ
L18	CL-FK
L19	SQ Endlink
L20	SQ-FK
L21	PH-PD
L22	PD-SH
L23	SH Headlink

L24	SH-PR
L25	PR-TT
L26	TT Headlink
L27	TT Endlink
L28	TT-TM
L29	TM-MO
L30	MO-NP
L31	NP Endlink
L32	NU Headlink
L33	NU-CY
L34	CY-PH
L35	CY-PH
L36	MA Headlink
L37	MA-PA

Chapter 1

The *Canterbury Tales* Textual Debate

The first printed edition of the *Canterbury Tales* was that of Caxton in 1476, and his second edition appeared in 1482. The rationale behind Caxton's second edition is recorded in the famous preface to the work, where he justified the necessity for a new edition by claiming that it represented a much closer witness to Chaucer's own text. Whether Caxton was really concerned with the accuracy of his text, or simply keen to justify the need for a new edition of a popular work, the methodology adopted for this second edition, supplementing the earlier text with readings from a manuscript with certain adjustments to the order, set the precedent for standard editorial practice of the next three centuries. While Caxton boasted that his revised edition presented a more accurate text, his editorial procedure served only to produce a more corrupted witness than that of his first edition. Caxton's second edition formed the basis for Pynson's two editions of 1492 and 1526, while a copy of the same text was partly amended with another manuscript by Wynkyn de Worde for his edition of 1498. De Worde's edition formed the subsequent basis of the version in William Thynne's *The Workes of Geffray Chaucer*, printed in 1532, although under the authorization of Henry VIII Thynne had special access to many *Canterbury Tales* manuscripts. The next two centuries saw many editions of Chaucer's works, particularly those of Stow and Speght, which mostly represent reprints of Thynne's text of 1532. John Urry's posthumous edition of 1721 followed the order of Thynne, although he was aware of many manuscripts and earlier printed editions. While including the entire accepted Chaucerian canon, Urry's edition also contained a life of Chaucer and a Glossary. The preface includes a list of the manuscripts consulted by the editor, complete with accurate descriptions, thus displaying not only an attempt to apply scholarly techniques but also to display materials as an aid to future scholarship. Thomas Tyrwhitt's edition

of 1775-1778 presents an eclectic text, based upon that of Speght, heavily edited with the readings from some 26 manuscripts. His more scholarly approach towards editorial technique is exemplified by his discussion of the problems of tale-order. In creating his text, Tyrwhitt collated approximately 24 manuscripts, including Ha⁵, Dd, Ad¹ and particularly Ha⁴, a highly respected manuscript which became especially important to nineteenth-century editors. This is reflected in Thomas Wright's best-text edition of 1847-51 which used Ha⁴ as a base. By following the evidence of this manuscript very closely, Wright produced an edition with the language and metre of an authoritative and early witness. The later nineteenth century is characterized by the appearance of several collected editions which used Wright's text as a base, such as those of Robert Bell and Richard Morris.

The modern critical debate of the textual tradition of the *Canterbury Tales* begins with Frederick Furnivall and his work for the Chaucer Society. This society was founded by Furnivall himself in 1868, and over the following sixteen years it published transcriptions of six of the principal manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*. Through his close association with Bradshaw, Skeat and Morris, and an affection for Chaucer which allowed the society to flourish at the cost of his other various enterprises, Furnivall was able to achieve his goal: 'To do honour to Chaucer, and to let lovers and students of him see how far the best unprinted manuscripts of his works differed from the printed texts' (Benzie 1983:162).

The society's *The Six-text Edition of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales* consists of diplomatic editions of the manuscripts El, Hg, La, Pw, Cp, and Gg, and was later followed by supplementary publications of Ha⁴ and Dd. Furnivall's study of the manuscripts, while not always strictly confined to matters of textuality, has received much praise and resulted in the felicitous first printing of Hg and El. However, while he was no doubt impressed with the linguistic value of El, it is clear that his judgment was swayed by the physical appearance of the manuscript. Furnivall was also concerned with the completeness of the manuscripts that he printed; a factor which largely influenced his exclusion of Dd from the initial series. Considerations of

completeness and physical beauty were also clearly influential in the selection of La and the exclusion of the plainer Ad³; a decision which resulted in the latter being marginalised in much subsequent scholarship. Despite Bradshaw's many objections, the text was presented in a series of parallel editions, thus forcing Furnivall to adopt a standard arrangement of tales which he could then impose on each of the manuscripts. Furnivall greatly respected the Ellesmere arrangement and considered its revisions, the rejection of L8, the inclusion of L15, the later placement of the Modern Instances, to be the work of the author himself. Bradshaw, however, rejected the validity of these emendations, regarding them as the work of a "subsequent reviser", causing Furnivall to draw on his own resources in the construction of an artificial arrangement. This subject is discussed at length, in *A Temporary Preface to the Chaucer Society's Six-text Edition of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, published as part of the Chaucer Society second series.

While Furnivall accepted that the poem had been left in a fragmentary and unfinished state, he viewed the tales as part of one complete outward journey and arranged them accordingly. His debate on tale-order concentrates largely on an attempt to regularize the geographical and temporal references of this journey, and a desire to recover a scheme that allows the reconstruction of a realistic fourteenth-century pilgrimage. His arrangement begins with GP and the tales of Group A which occupy the pilgrims for their first day, leaving them to spend the night at Dartford. The second day begins with Group B¹ which is followed by Group B², moved to this position on the suggestion of Bradshaw, and thus incorporating what is now termed the Bradshaw-shift. This alteration, implemented in order to place the reference to Rochester before Sittingbourne, is the most crucial of those made by Furnivall and has been the subject of much controversy since. This change permitted Furnivall to suggest an overnight stop at Rochester, a typical resting place for pilgrims making a journey of this kind. The third day begins with Group C, consisting of PH and PD, positioned here at Furnivall's own suggestion, in order to align the Pardoner's reference to his hunger with a time just before breakfast. This is followed by Group D, a break at

Sittingbourne, and CL and ME, united on the strength of their references to the Wife of Bath. At the beginning of the fourth day the storytelling recommences with Group F, FK and SQ, severed from Group E in order to allow the pilgrims their overnight stop at Ospringe, and proceeds with Groups G, H, and I, leaving the travellers to make their entrance to Canterbury at the conclusion of PA. It is important to appreciate the artificiality of this arrangement, and the nature of the workings that lie behind it; this ordering and the system of lineation that necessarily accompanies it have been extremely influential in subsequent editions. While Furnivall's final scheme adopts much of the El order, alterations were introduced with little or no manuscript authority. Furnivall's concentration on the issue of tale-order at the expense of the more crucial problems of the text also exerted an influence over future scholarship. Despite its great influence, Furnivall's arrangement did not win the total support of his contemporaries, particularly that of Henry Bradshaw who devised his own system of ordering. Bradshaw's conclusions were the result of the study of numerous manuscripts, resulting in an arrangement very similar to that of Hg. Although it is now clear that Bradshaw's work would have established a more reasonable foundation for future scholarship, his efforts were only printed posthumously. In contrast the Chaucer Society second series produced a wealth of printed material, incorporating the work of scholars such as Root, Tatlock and Koch. Furnivall was not an editor by his own admission, but he did produce a huge amount of very accurate material which formed the basis for future editions, such as Skeat's Clarendon Chaucer.

Skeat's edition of *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* appeared in six volumes between 1894 and 1895. His text of the *Canterbury Tales* uses El as a base manuscript, as a result of a collation of its readings with the other manuscripts printed as part of Furnivall's 'splendid "Six-text" Edition' (IV. vii). Skeat stressed the importance of the orthographical and grammatical regularity of this manuscript. While Skeat did rely principally on important manuscripts, they are only a small proportion of the large number of complete manuscripts that have survived. He is further criticised for his frequent assertions that certain manuscripts are better than others: assertions

which seldom receive any justification. His editorial practice received close scrutiny from Eleanor Hammond in *Chaucer: A Bibliographical Manual*, from which she concluded that 'his editorial procedure (...) is guided by the erroneous supposition that the true Chaucerian readings may be picked out intuitively, instead of by the laborious and impartial comparison of all the authorities' (Hammond 1908:146). Despite his claim to have 'refrained from all emendation', Skeat introduced many alterations, particularly with regard to orthography and metre, which have led to the incorporation of a body of unrecorded and purely subjective material into the text. A.S.G. Edwards writes: 'Skeat's dexterity as emender has served to interpose a layer of editorial conjecture between manuscript and printed text that is not easy to penetrate, given the vagaries of Skeat's printed variants' (Ruggiers 1984:184).

Skeat's arrangement of the tales follows that suggested by Furnivall, although it may be seen that this did not necessarily reflect the position held by Skeat himself. He saw the usefulness of the internal references to time and place, and felt the contradiction concerning the references to Rochester and Sittingbourne in Tyrwhitt's edition to be unsatisfactory. However he was unable to accept Furnivall's positioning of Group C, believing the correct order of the tales to be: A B D E F C G H I. Skeat felt a compulsion to follow Furnivall's arrangement and lineation. The complexity of Skeat's position increased in 1907 with the publication of his essay *The Evolution of the Canterbury Tales* in the Chaucer Society second series. His study of the manuscripts in this work led him to the conclusion that Hg represents the *Canterbury Tales* in their oldest form and incorporates the best text of any extant manuscript. Skeat's discussion of tale-order also offered a very different stance from that adopted in his earlier edition. He began with the premise that the text is incomplete and therefore inevitably contains inconsistencies and contradictions. The acceptance of these facts allowed him to liberate his arguments from the straitjacket of realistic accuracy, and to discard geographical references as 'such insufficient and shifting data' (Skeat 1907:29). He even revoked his former acceptance of the Bradshaw-shift, arguing that, having recognised the misplacement of Sittingbourne and Rochester, the best solution is 'to

admit the fact and leave it' (Skeat 1907:30). Skeat considered Hg to represent the tales as they were arranged in their earliest form; an arrangement which exerted considerable influence on subsequent orderings. This early stage is followed by four subsequent revisions: three of which were authorial, and the final one the work of a later editor. The first of these rearrangements was represented by Pw, the next by Cp and La, then followed Ha⁴, and finally the El and Gg arrangement. As the El, Gg ordering was scribal, Ha⁴ represents the final arrangement made by the author himself, although this did not imply that it was Chaucer's final and decisive order. These conclusions are important for they attach a far greater significance for both the text and the arrangement of Hg than was usual. He also cited the various misreadings of the word "sterres" at KN 1179, explaining that these various readings represent different interpretations of a misplaced abbreviation mark. This suggests that for this tale the manuscripts may have shared the same exemplar, although Skeat never pursued this possibility. These arguments lead to the possibility of a shared copytext, and a textual transmission that may stem from the one manuscript, Hg, already perceived to be the earliest and the best text of the poem. Skeat himself never addressed these conclusions, nor did he attempt to explain the contradictory position of Ha⁴: credited with the latest authorial order yet also with a treacherous and provincial text.

The next major study, that of John Koch entitled *A detailed comparison of the eight manuscripts of the Canterbury Tales as printed by the Chaucer Society*, appeared in 1913. Koch began with the premise that there is no extant autograph, and that all the extant manuscripts are derived from one common source, 'a copy of the poet's original' (2). He viewed the prior circulation of tales as unlikely, and explained the great variety in the textual tradition as the result of the wide time-gap between the date of the original composition and that of the manuscripts. This time-difference and frequent efforts at copying inevitably resulted in much contamination, progressively amplified through the copying of corrupted exemplars. Editorial revision and scribal emendation were contributing factors in the process of corruption. Koch constructed two separate lines of textual descent represented by groups 'A' and 'B'. Group A contains El, Hg, Gg

and Dd, while B includes Cp, Pw, La and Ha⁴. Within these groups Koch observed the particularly close relationships between the pairs El and Hg, Cp and La, although emphasizing that 'not one can be the direct source of another' (418). Of these groups, 'A' preserves the text in its best form, while 'B' is descended from an inaccurate copytext. Agreements across these groups are the result of contamination, and genuine passages represented by only one individual group or manuscript are explained by the 'assumption of *the existence of some better and more complete Ms.* now lost, to which one or the other scribe of the said Mss had access' (420). Koch's highly detailed study of the variants of these groups led him to the conclusion that El represents the best witness to the text, and is also important as the most complete manuscript, whose language is nearest to Chaucer's own. Hg was also considered to contain an accurate text, and parts of Dd and Cp were seen to exhibit similar reliability. The best order is the Ellesmerian arrangement and, despite his use of Furnivall's order in the discussion of the work, Koch rejected its validity as a tool for future editors of the poem. By rejecting the notion that any extant manuscripts represent authorial revisions, and the concept of prior circulation, Koch attached great importance to purely textual considerations, particularly the construction of textual groups in order to analyse the textual descent from one original copytext. The previous importance of Ha⁴ was significantly diminished by this new attitude, and greater respect was accorded to the more accurate text of El.

Similar ideas may be traced through the work of Brusendorff in his book *The Chaucer Tradition*, published in 1925. He was also willing to allow the Chaucerian holograph to contain errors and inconsistencies, and argued for the inevitability of widespread scribal contamination. Brusendorff divided all the manuscripts into two groups which he termed 'Oxford' and 'All-England'. The All-England group was the more accurate one, while the Oxford group was described as derived from a 'single badly executed copy of the original' (68). The Oxford group was subdivided into 'Bodley' and 'Corpus' groups, while the All-England one was divided into separate branches which he termed 'Ellesmere', 'Cambridge' and 'London'. The Ellesmere

group was also associated with Hg and Gg, the Cambridge chiefly with Dd, and the London group contained Ha⁴, Ha⁵, Ps and Ad³. Of these Brusendorff attached primary importance to El, dating it c.1400, and praising the 'great intrinsic value of its readings' (108). Hg represented an important secondary witness, although it displayed contamination from the Oxford group. Like Koch, Brusendorff discredited Ha⁴, particularly criticising the large amount of scribal error it displayed. However Brusendorff's study is also important for his treatment of the London group, and particularly Ad³. For he recognised that this manuscript contained valuable readings, many of which were associated with those of El. He also recorded independent origins for some readings, citing the particular case of ME 986 which disagrees with other manuscripts yet is in agreement with Chaucer's source. This led him to the conclusion that 'such a case definitely proves that the ancestor of the London group had access to Chaucer's original MS' (100). Brusendorff's concluding remarks on the marginalia are also illuminating for the greater significance they accord to Ad³. This manuscript contains nearly all the marginalia found in El, thus establishing a close relationship between the two. Brusendorff's belief that these commentary glosses are Chaucerian in origin greatly increases this significance, linking both El and Ad³ to the authorial copytext itself.

The end of this early period, marked by the assertion of textual evaluation over subjective criticism, a greater significance attributed to the author's copytext, and the highest importance accorded to El, culminates in Tatlock's article 'The Canterbury Tales in 1400', published in *PMLA* in 1935. Tatlock argued that Chaucer's copytext would have contained an amount of genuine authorial revision. It would have subsequently been submitted to the hands of editorial revisers, and suffered physical damage in the process of scribal copying. He also regarded the 'extra-textual' aspects as scribal additions. It is clear that a complete version of the *Canterbury Tales* was never issued, and there is no evidence to justify the belief that it may have received publication in individual tales or groups, although it is possible that individual parts may have been lent by the author to close friends, or even recited. Therefore at the time

of Chaucer's death in 1400, the copytext would have been in the form of an informal draft, consisting of a series of separate sheets 'certainly not all physically and inseparably unified' (106). He identified the scribal compulsion towards completeness, citing the frequent exclusion of the two solitary lines of the unfinished Part III of SQ as an example. These ideas of the fragmentary state of the author's copytext, and the contrary polished appearance of many of the extant manuscripts introduce important paradoxes, which demand a greater study of the evidence of the manuscripts themselves in an effort to determine what is genuinely Chaucerian.

These ideas were then applied to the question of tale-order, and Tatlock emphasised the significance of the links over internal evidence such as references to place and time. In determining a reasonable arrangement Tatlock once again refused to be swayed by the appeal of any convenient solution represented by any one manuscript. He identified efforts in E1 to conceal incompleteness and consequently judged its excellent order to be the work of a reviser, claiming that as a whole 'None of the MSS., however good, has any authority whatever in determining the order of the "groups"' (131). With the work of Tatlock *Canterbury Tales* scholarship came closer to an unromanticised view of the state of the author's copytext, and a more honest appreciation of scribal practice. His refusal to accept the notion of prior circulation, which in turn necessitates one single copytext, placed great significance on the textual evidence of the early manuscripts. The belief that E1 betrays evidence of the hand of an unauthorised reviser in turn demanded closer study of Hg, already shown to represent the earliest witness to the author's own work, and to contain a highly accurate text itself.

Such a study appeared in 1940 under the combined efforts of Manly and Rickert in the form of their eight volume edition *The text of the Canterbury Tales*. The primary intention of this immense work is plainly set out by the editors in the Prolegomena at the opening of the first volume. Here they explain that having studied the work of previous editors they observed that these editions 'indicated the need for a text of the *Canterbury Tales* based throughout upon the evidence afforded by all the extant MSS

and such early editions as represented MSS no longer in existence' (I. 1). In order to undertake such a demanding task, Manly-Rickert divided their work into eight parts, only two of which contain the critical text itself. Volume I contains descriptions of all extant manuscripts, and Volume II supplies a classification of all these witnesses. The text and the critical notes fill Volumes III and IV, and the greatest part, Volumes V to VIII, comprises the *Corpus of Variants*: a record of all the major variants in all manuscripts.

Their initial task was one of collation, a procedure which they describe in some detail. They used Skeat's *Student Edition* as their base for collation and recorded all variants against this text. They limited their records to those variants of direct use in the construction of the text itself, omitting spelling and dialect forms, incipits and explicits, tale headings and other general forms of rubrication. The manuscripts were then classified according to agreement in unoriginal readings, i.e. variants which are non-authorial. Common variants were then used to establish variational groups, and where they recorded persistence in agreement within the variational groups, they formed Constant groups, i.e. groups whose relationships proved to be constant throughout a large part of the text. They recorded ten such constant groups in total, labelling the four largest and most significant: *a*, *b*, *c*, and *d*. These principal groups may be broken down into smaller subgroups, as is shown by group *a*, which comprises the two subgroups 'Cn' and 'Dd'. The group Cn consists solely of the manuscripts Cn and Ma, while Dd includes Dd itself, but also contains the subgroup 'En¹' consisting of En¹ and Ds. However complex the interrelationships within this constant group may seem, group *a* represents the concept in its purest form, and the evidence for the existence of other groups is far more haphazard. The accuracy of such a method must necessarily be based on a particular set of assumptions, and the editors accepted that certain factors may obscure the evidence of affiliation which ensures such accuracy. These factors include extremely accurate copying, the presence of extensive correction, and a shift in affiliation through a change of exemplar. Manly-Rickert also discussed the problems which occur due to contamination and conflation, which may result in the

composition of accidental rather than purely genetic groupings. The next stage in their procedure was the process of recension, employed to use the variational groups to establish an archetype of all the manuscripts. This text would then form the basis of an authoritative critical text backed up by a complete apparatus criticus. The use of recension is particularly significant for its ability to rule out editorial subjectivity in the adoption of an archetypal text. The procedures outlined above reveal many inconsistencies and paradoxes, some of which the editors were aware and others which appear beyond their control.

A primary instance of such an inconsistency occurs in the editors' use of Skeat's *Student Edition* as a base for collation. Such a procedure demands an authoritative base text, while Skeat's work is an edited text and therefore unsuitable for such a task. Their classificatory procedures reveal similar problems. Manly-Rickert themselves reported the difficulties involved in establishing unoriginal readings, confessing that 'It is true that to use certain readings as errors for establishing genetic groups and then to use these groups to determine whether a reading is erroneous or not seems like reasoning in a circle' (II. 17). This fundamental contradiction is augmented by their confusing presentation of variants, which in turn reveals a shortfall in their ability to classify all the variants with which they were presented. In his review of the work R.K. Root identified the problems involved in tracking down given variants which often prove to be 'of so trivial a character that their evidence in support of the genetic relationship asserted is of very dubious validity' (Root 1941:4). Problems were introduced further by the editors' treatment of those readings affected by random and convergent variation, and those that may be deemed minor or purely accidental readings. While Manly-Rickert were aware of such factors, they based their classifications 'upon the whole body of variants' (II. 23), trusting in 'the regular operation of the laws of probability' (II. 23), a theory which, as George Kane explains, 'assumes that manual transmission is uniformly erratic (...) that there will always be relatively abundant agreement in error between genetically related manuscripts' (Ruggiers 1984:209). Manly-Rickert's groups were therefore based upon the

persistence of variants rather than on their particular significance, and the evidence of their records of classification is more the testimony of a task which swelled beyond the editors' control. The constant shifting of textual affiliation within groups defies any simple or significant analysis, and their constant groups regularly join to comprise groups composed of up to forty manuscripts, with a highly complex system of interrelationships.

Their process of recension demands similar close analysis, primarily as a result of the lack of explanation of any methodology. In the same article Root wrote: 'Nowhere amidst all the wealth of various discussions contained in these volumes is there any consecutive statement of the procedure that has been followed in constituting the critical text' (Root 1941:9). An important paradox lies at the heart of their adoption of this technique. Recension depends upon the existence of one single archetype of all the manuscripts, a notion which clashes with Manly-Rickert's conception of the pre-1400 textual situation. For Manly-Rickert believed that, by the time of Chaucer's death in 1400, there were many varied copies of individual tales which had been significantly revised by the author and circulated among select friends and relations. This allowed for many different versions of each tale, each with an equal claim to be authoritative. This theory led the editors to the conclusion that each tale had its own textual tradition; a theory which precludes any notion of one common archetype for all manuscripts. Despite the recognition of this serious flaw in their methodology, Manly-Rickert believed they could overcome such problems by the use of their own judgment: 'We have therefore proceeded as if all MSS were from the same archetype, being on the watch, however, for indications of separate origin and separate lines of descent' (II. 39). This procedure must therefore introduce editorial subjectivity into a process specifically designed to rule out such an unreliable quantity. This practice, designed to accommodate their theory of prior circulation and authorial revision, allowed them to make many assumptions as to which lines were genuine before recension was carried out, which is particularly exemplified by their acceptance of the genuine status of the extra lines in E1. In his essay 'The Editorial Assumptions in the Manly-Rickert Edition

of *The Canterbury Tales*' Blake criticised this procedure: 'The question of genuineness should be introduced only after the textual history has been uncovered, for that history will provide evidence for evaluating what may or may not be by the original author. If you decide that some parts of a text are genuine, you are already presupposing a textual history which it should be the task of the recension to unravel' (Blake 1983:390). Despite the contradictions and inconsistencies that exist within the Manly-Rickert edition of the *Canterbury Tales*, the immense amount of variational readings considered and the high rate of accuracy lend authority to their work. From it certain influential and important conclusions can be drawn. The text that is presented confirms the great importance of the Hg text and the nature of E1 as an edited text. Yet the Manly-Rickert text remains eclectic, incorporating most of the Hg text while retaining the ordering and extra inclusions of E1. This paradoxical conclusion represents an important beginning of a new period of scholarship in which the text of Hg is regarded as the best, although the ordering and contents of E1 were retained.

After the appearance of the Manly-Rickert volumes, an attempt was made by Germaine Dempster to answer its critics by elucidating some of the governing principles of Manly's hypotheses. In 'Manly's conception of the early history of the *Canterbury Tales*', Dempster clarified Manly's views upon the prior circulation of individual tales and the consequent effect upon the textual tradition of the poem. Manly believed that the originals of the individual tales do not derive from post-mortem drafts but from copies that were written in Chaucer's lifetime for circulation. This theory was based primarily on the huge textual variation displayed by the extant manuscripts, and was reinforced by the apparently 'piecemeal' acquisition displayed in the make-up of Hg. Manly found further justification for this belief from the close connections between many of the early owners of the manuscripts and the poet himself. Therefore at the time of Chaucer's death in 1400 the individual tales were all at varying stages of composition: some incomplete drafts, others awaiting further revision, while some had been circulated as presentation copies. The use of these extremely varied texts as exemplars explains the incompleteness of many of our early manuscripts and

the great number of different lines of textual descent they display. Manly's aim in the formation of his critical text was therefore to reconstruct 'the latest common ancestor of the copies embodying Chaucer's latest intentions' (391): a text based on the head manuscripts of each genetic group. Manly saw the manuscript production after Chaucer's death as marked by seven major witnesses: Hg, El, Ha⁴ and the four lost ancestors of his groups *a, b, c, d*. Hg was regarded as an extremely reliable witness, derived in nearly all places directly from the text to be reconstructed. This resulted in a very close relationship between the Hg text and that of Manly's edition. The only better text is that of El, considered to be derived directly from the papers Chaucer left at his death: a theory which is justified by the excellence of the emendations, which could only be authorial. While Dempster's work did clarify the Manly-Rickert position, it also served to cast doubt over many of the assumptions upon which the theories are based. Manly's theory of major prior circulation necessitates the existence of numerous pre-1400 manuscripts, none of which has survived. This hypothesis also demands acceptance of the possibility that Chaucer released such unfinished works as SQ for general circulation. The whole theory of pre-publication seems to be adopted in order to provide justification for Manly's acceptance of the high authority of the Hg text, while simultaneously claiming the extra passages in El to be Chaucer's final adjustments.

Dempster's subsequent work on the *Canterbury Tales* led her to refine many of the Manly-Rickert hypotheses, thus creating a far more credible, and substantially more integrated picture of the textual tradition. The first of three later articles considers the significance of the change of ink made by the Hg scribe at ME 1075. The break in the text marked by the subsequent use of a lighter shade of ink through the final 100 lines of ME, is of particular importance as the text of ME breaks at exactly the same point in all three manuscripts of the *c* tradition. The break in these manuscripts, Cp, La, Sl², has no contextual justification, and the remainder of the tale is missing. Dempster concluded that this change in Hg 'must reflect a feature of the immediate antecedent of Hg precisely at that point' (326). As the change does not reflect a shift in textual

affiliation, it must be the result of a physical break in the exemplar, such as the end of a separate page. The ancestors of the *c* tradition and Hg have no common ancestor except the original archetype of all manuscripts, thus associating this physical break with this ancestor. These conclusions allowed Dempster to make certain assumptions about the early textual situation and to provide a very different view of the author's copytext. The original of ME must have been an unbound working-copy, still in separate parts at the time of copying by the Hg and *c* group scribes. This provides a complete contrast to Manly's view of tales produced as presentation copies under Chaucer's direction, which would have been complete. From this evidence Dempster rejected the theory of prior circulation, and argued that copying began with scribes creating a large series of copies of individual tales from Chaucer's own papers, intended as exemplars for future collections. The manuscripts which represent heads of genetic groups were made from these exemplars. This theory allows us to suppose far fewer lost copies of tales, and places a far greater importance on the author's copytext, and the importance of understanding its true physical nature. From this view of the common ancestor of these different lines of descent of ME, it is clear that we may suppose a far closer relationship between the heads of the major genetic groups, and the entire manuscript tradition itself. These suppositions are made more definite by Dempster's next two articles, in which she constructed much more simplistic relationships between the major groups than those offered by Manly-Rickert. 'A Chapter of the History of the *Canterbury Tales*' enlarged upon the discoveries made by Manly which showed that for two-thirds of the text there is very close affiliation between the manuscripts of the *c* and *d* groups. Not only did Dempster suggest that the text of the three *c* manuscripts and 13 constant members of the *d* tradition is derived by radiation from a common ancestor *cd*, but also that *d* obtained the links for Groups E and F, missing in *c* manuscripts, directly from Hg. A final footnote to this essay adds a further claim that the ancestor of the *b* group derived its tale-order from the *d* ancestor. Her final essay, 'The Fifteenth-Century Editors of the *Canterbury Tales* and the Problem of Tale-order', addresses the arrangement of the *c* group, arguing that it is

derived directly from that of Hg. The major difference between the two orders, the placement of the sequence D-CL-ME, was seen as the result of influence from the *a*-El order. The ordering of Ha⁴, which shares this same sequence, was also argued to be derived from Hg and not the *c* group. In the final conclusions to this essay, Dempster suggested that there may be a relationship between the Hg and *a*-El arrangements, although this argument was not developed.

The publication of the Manly-Rickert text and the subsequent work by Dempster set the scene for a new era in *Canterbury Tales* scholarship: an era which is marked by four major editions of the poem. The first of these is F.N. Robinson's second edition of *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* published in 1957 in order to incorporate any revisions made necessary by the appearance of the Manly-Rickert findings. Robinson retained almost the entire text of his first edition of 1933, which was based upon El. While Robinson recognised the new evidence in support of the Hg text, he was never convinced by the arguments discrediting the El readings as editorial, which he described as 'Manly's argument, if not demonstration, that readings peculiar to the Ellesmere group of manuscripts are often due to emendation' (Robinson 1957:vii). Robinson adopted nearly all the readings of his first edition, which was based upon a complete collation of the eight manuscripts published by the Chaucer Society and the two extra manuscripts Cn and Mg. He did however include 160 variant readings, although his acceptance of Manly-Rickert readings is far outnumbered by instances of its rejection. G.F. Reinecke, having compared the readings in MI and MA, describes Robinson's attitude to the Manly-Rickert text: 'It would seem that he treated their findings in an aesthetic way; his choices are those of a learned literary critic' (Ruggiers 1984:250). Thus with Robinson's second edition El retained its claim to represent the finest witness to the text and order of the *Canterbury Tales*.

In 1979 work was undertaken on a project to produce variorum editions of all of Chaucer's works, and facsimiles of the most important manuscripts. The texts of these editions of the *Canterbury Tales* use Hg as a best-text, which is checked against collations of a small group of the principal manuscripts. These are Ad³, Cp, Dd, El,

Gg, Ha⁴, He, La and Pw, which were chosen as they represent the major families used by Manly-Rickert in their corpus of variants. The editors of the individual volumes are free to include their own emendations, but are encouraged to do so only after careful consideration. Through their reliance on the Hg text, and conviction of the superiority of its readings, the variorum editors attempt to discover the author's original, where Manly-Rickert aimed only to reconstruct the archetype of all manuscripts. Thus the variorum editors intend to compile a final text, described in the editor's preface as, 'as close as we will come to Chaucer's own intentions for large parts of the *Canterbury Tales*' (Ruggiers 1979:xii). It is also significant that, despite their dependence on Hg, the editions retain the traditional Ellesmerian ordering, lineation and contents.

The third major landmark in this modern period was the publication in 1980 of the *Canterbury Tales* edited from the Hg manuscript by N.F. Blake. Blake's attitude towards Hg represents a more radical stance than seen previously, although the arguments that led to the adoption of this manuscript will be considered later: here we are concerned purely with the presentation of this edition. Blake's edition follows the text of Hg, varying only when readings can be shown to be the result of scribal sophistication or errors in the copytext. The number of such emendations is relatively small and an important aspect of the editor's policy was to present 'a "plain" text to remind us of what is actually in the best manuscript so that we can reformulate our ideas about Chaucer's language and metre' (Blake 1980:12). The edition is also unique for its use of the Hg order, where most editors follow that of El or a variation of it. Blake presents the poem in 12 separate sections which are reproduced according to the Hg order, altered only in the restoration of part III, containing MO, NP, MA, to its intended place before misbinding. Blake also sticks rigidly to Hg in deciding the contents of his edition, a decision which results in the excision of L33, CY, L8, L3, and L15. He varies from Hg only in the relegation of the spurious SQ-ME and ME-FK links to the Appendix, and in the restoration of the final 528 lines of PA and RT edited from El, missing from Hg due to loss of leaves.

The final edition to be considered is that of *The Riverside Chaucer*, which appeared in 1987 under the general editorship of L.D. Benson. The text of the *Canterbury Tales*, however, was edited under the combined efforts of Robert A. Pratt and Ralph Hanna III. This does not represent a fundamentally new edition, and its primary significance lies in its widespread adoption as the principal reference work by Chaucer scholars. The editors mainly reprinted the text of Robinson's second edition, correcting some readings and adding very little that was new. The major difference between this edition and that of Robinson lies in the greater scepticism with which the editors treated readings unique to E1, although the editors state clearly that they were 'especially chary of deserting E1 completely because we remain unconvinced (...) by Manly and Rickert's argument that E1 represents a text "editorially sophisticated"' (1120). The textual notes also record the editors' particularly critical attitude towards Robinson's frequent tendency to select metrically smoother lines on the dubious evidence of later manuscripts.

This brief examination of the major editions of this later period reveals that editorial procedure is extremely divided, stretching from the complete adoption of Hg by Blake, to the heavy reliance on a text which had received little alteration since its first publication in 1933 by the Riverside editors. The final decisions as reflected in these editions are, in most cases, the result of much careful consideration of important aspects of the textual tradition. These considerations can be broken down into a number of crucial arguments, thus representing the means by which these editors came to adopt their critical methods. Therefore we shall now move to a consideration of these various arguments, in order to gain a clearer picture of scholarly opinion concerning the early textual situation, and particularly the relationship between E1 and Hg.

Such a discussion must begin with a consideration of the conflicting views of the textual situation before Chaucer's death in 1400. We have already considered the Manly-Rickert proposal of the prior circulation of tales, a notion which receives its most complete rejection in the work of Blake. Working on the assumption that prior

circulation would have been in the form of tales without links, Blake argues that such circulation would have resulted in the breaking up of the order of constant groups in subsequent collected manuscripts. As the constant groups in our extant manuscripts show complete stability in their positioning of individual tales, such a process can be discredited. The complete lack of manuscripts dating from before 1400, and the unfinished nature of the work also make such a theory seem unlikely. Pursuing the issue of the poem's incompleteness, Blake argues that at the time of Chaucer's death there must have been a working-draft of the poem among his own papers. It therefore seems most likely that the early editors of the poem would turn to this authorised copy, which would contain all the fragments Chaucer had composed, rather than attempt to obtain various separate parts from a number of dispersed sources. Such a suggestion renders the theory of prior circulation unnecessary, and draws the discussion of the early textual scene back to the author's copytext, and the notion of a single archetype. Blake argues that the text and arrangement of the early manuscripts can be seen as developments of those aspects in Hg; which in turn suggests that these scribes were aware of these other early manuscripts. As none of these texts recreates the excellence of that of Hg, this situation is best explained by the collective use of the Hg exemplars. These scribes made many rearrangements and alterations of these exemplars, some of which would have been added to the copytext itself. Over this period of early copying extra lines were added to the authorial text, and tales and links were added on extra sheets attached to the copytext. The copytext would therefore become progressively more difficult to read, and a greater variety of interpretations would become available. The resulting state of this draft exemplar would encourage freedom in the handling of the text, while simultaneously offering many varied possibilities.

Blake's theory of one copytext is rejected by Charles Owen Jr. who argues strongly for the concept of prior circulation. In his review of Blake's *The Textual Tradition of The Canterbury Tales* Owen writes: 'The possibility of a tale circulating without its links and at the same time remaining in Chaucer's possession firmly in place in its section does not occur to him' (Owen 1987:186). In an earlier article Owen put

forward his belief that the tales were circulated on a limited basis before 1400, and were therefore known about in literary circles, hence the reference to the Wife of Bath in Chaucer's *Envoy to Bukton*. After the poet's death, such prior-knowledge of the work would have sparked off more circulation of individual fragments. Such a form of circulation would have been particularly encouraged by the disordered nature of Chaucer's papers. The early collected manuscripts, including Hg and El, were compiled from these circulated fragments, which serves to explain the diverse number of textual traditions that are displayed in individual tales. This variety of individual traditions may then be used to approximate the relative popularity among these individual tales, and consequently provide important information about contemporary literary taste.

L.D. Benson's essay 'The Order of *The Canterbury Tales*' argues for pre-publication of material on a much larger scale. He begins with a consideration of the evidence of RT which, whether written as part of the poem or separately, proves that Chaucer had ended his work on the tales. Benson writes: 'We have the work in what Chaucer regarded as its final state; unfinished, unrevised, and imperfect as *The Canterbury Tales* may be, Chaucer was finished with it' (Benson 1981:81). He then argues that the four main orders shown by Manly-Rickert to represent 47 of the manuscripts are derived from two ancestors which differ only in the position of Group G; a difference which may be explained by the misplacement of this Group in the copying of the second ancestor. Other, more minor, textual differences exist between these two arrangements, such as L8, the extra lines in WBP and the position of the Modern Instances in MO. Although the El order can be seen to incorporate most of the later features, it is not possible to ascertain exactly which aspects represent revisions. This situation is best explained by the presence of two earlier versions, the first of which represents a working-copy which was later revised to form the *a*-El ordering. This earlier arrangement, which comprised L8, a different placement of G, but lacked Groups H and I, would thus stand at the head of the non-*a* ordering, while its revised form is the ancestor of the *a*-El tradition. He regards the ordering of Hg as a much later

development, based upon already-ordered fragments which needed replacing in a satisfactory arrangement, thus forming 'a derivative considerably removed from the ancestor of all the non-Type *a* orders' (106). The corollary of this is that the *d* and *c* traditions must have existed before Hg, and therefore there must have been some form of circulation in Chaucer's lifetime. This theory is then backed up by the evidence of Chaucer's *Envoy to Bukton*, and the knowledge of his poetry displayed by Lydgate. Having argued that the *a*-El order represents the superior of the two ancestral arrangements upon which all manuscripts are based, Benson claims that this order must be the work of Chaucer himself, unless we are to 'assume the existence of an unknown literary prodigy who has left no other traces of his genius' (111). The geographical inaccuracies of the El order are rejected as simply part of the many minor errors that remain in this final text. Yet the ease with which Benson allows the presence of inconsistencies, and his uncompromising assertion that Chaucer had finished, published and retracted the poem present many contradictions. It seems strange that Chaucer should have ordered the work so carefully for publication, while SQ and CO remained incomplete. Even if we accept Benson's theory that the poem is complete in its incompleteness, it still remains to be explained why Chaucer would expend so much effort ordering the work and then submitting it for publication, when so much remains incomplete or inconsistent. It is also difficult to explain why the Hg manuscript, with a text so close to the original, had no contact with this authoritative El-ordering. Much of Benson's theory relies on the evidence of RT, which is of questionable authority, and does not appear in Hg and Cp through loss of leaves. It is also difficult to accept that the evidence of RT provides conclusive proof that Chaucer had finished with the work and would add no subsequent revisions, especially as Benson himself proposes that the order was revised after its composition.

As we have seen above in the arguments of Benson, the notion of authorial revision is central to the modern textual debate. Many attempts have been made to detect the presence of earlier plans in the poem, in order to decide exactly what is Chaucerian and what is spurious. Such attempts are most clearly represented by the

work of Owen. Owen discounts the notion of an authorized order, claiming that any evidence of completeness in the early manuscripts is purely the result of scribal intervention. Having accepted this state of affairs, it is possible to detect certain major inconsistencies in the text which testify to the existence of earlier plans. These changes of plan are shown to indicate an expansion in the poet's conception of the nature of the work as a whole. Thus the haphazard attempts at ordering are the result of the diverse nature of the work itself, described by Owen as 'a collection of fragments reflecting different stages of his plan for the work as a whole' (Owen 1982:246). The first stage that Owen identifies is a much simpler scheme, represented by the overall framework: L7-TM, WBP-SH, L37-final tale. This suggestion is mainly justified by the reference in L7 to a prose tale, and the female pronouns found in L23. The second stage in the composition period is marked by what Owen terms 'an interval of religious concern', in which the *Canterbury Tales* were put aside while Chaucer wrote PA and RT, and translated *De Contemptu Mundi*. The third period represents a time of great literary inspiration, exemplified by the creation of the Marriage Group, and the expansion of WBP. It was in this period that the project underwent its greatest amount of change, and most of the tales were composed at this time. The final stage saw Chaucer expand his plan to the four tales per pilgrim scheme whilst also incorporating the ideas of the contest and prize to the framework. This final period also includes the composition of the tales of Group A, which stand as indicative of the poet at his most innovative and creative, Owen writes: 'Innovations and changes which Chaucer made as he worked on Fragment A show us an unimpaired vitality that looked not to the end now in sight but to the ever increasing potentialities of the simple plot he had evolved' (Owen 1958:476). In his *Life of Geoffrey Chaucer* Derek Pearsall also explains the discrepancy between the plan envisaged in GP and the ending found in PA as indicative of the existence of two different plans. Pearsall also regards this as an augmentation of an original one tale per pilgrim plan, to the far grander proposal of GP. He justifies this theory by relating it to Chaucer's general philosophical attitude at that later stage, claiming that the introduction of the four tale plan was 'designed to extend the tale-telling possibilities of

The Canterbury Tales almost indefinitely, meanwhile postponing the bringing to an end of a project that had become coterminous for Chaucer with life itself' (Pearsall 1992:233).

Having considered the pre-1400 situation, it now remains to discuss the view of textual developments after Chaucer's death. As we have already seen the modern period is characterized by a growing respect for Hg, particularly its text, and a continued desire to retain the E1 ordering and contents, despite widespread recognition of its edited status. As the E1 position has altered little since Robinson's work for his edition of 1933, we must concentrate here on the arguments which concern Hg. We have already seen how Blake has drawn on the arguments of Tatlock and Dempster in rejecting the concept of prior circulation and proposing the existence of a single authorial copytext as the archetype for all manuscripts. From these arguments Blake is then able to dispel the suggested 'piecemeal' acquisition of parts displayed by Hg, as the scribe must have possessed the author's copytext in its entirety. Blake argues that the editor had all twelve sections of the poem before him when he began copying, which is particularly exemplified by the evidence of part IV, which contains a large number of sections all copied as a whole, thus displaying no signs of uncertainty. He then rejects the frequent criticism of Hg's haphazard arrangement, showing that the editor organised the text according to a regular system of tale-link-tale wherever this was possible. The pieces that could not be fitted into such a system were placed first in the middle section, and were then followed by those that adhered to this sequence. The editor left gaps for the links that were missing, two of which were later filled by specially-composed pieces which must therefore be regarded as spurious. Proving these links to be scribal is central to Blake's argument, as it is only with such proof that Blake can explain the presence of gaps and later additions; which otherwise stand as testimonies to the concept of piecemeal acquisition. All this material was then copied by an experienced and highly accurate scribe, which resulted in an excellent text with very few additions. As Hg is our earliest extant manuscript, Blake concludes that it represents the first attempt to order Chaucer's papers, and that all subsequent orders are

based upon this arrangement. Any revisions and additions shown by later manuscripts are therefore also scribal and consequently should not appear in an edition of the poem. These arguments set forth a comprehensive view of Hg, and the complete methodology that lies behind Blake's edition of 1980.

Attempts to assess the exact value of Hg through palaeographical and codicological studies have provided some very different conclusions. In their 'Paleographical Introduction' to the *Variorum Facsimile of Hg* (Ruggiers 1979), Doyle and Parkes undertake a thorough study of the physical make-up of the manuscript, arguing that Hg displays many deficiencies and disconformities in its attempt to present a complete collection of the tales. Abnormalities in the make-up of some of the quires, variations in the styles of writing and shades of ink, and the presence of blank pages are taken to suggest 'interruptions in the availability of exemplars of consecutive portions of the series of tales and links', and 'attempts to take advantage of what was available while it was so' (Ruggiers 1979:xxvi). In a further essay, 'The Production of Copies of *Canterbury Tales* and *Confessio Amantis* in the Early Fifteenth Century', Doyle and Parkes study the *ordinatio* of Hg, showing that the cramped nature of marginalia on verso leaves proves that the elaborate glossing system was not envisaged before copying was begun: thus emphasizing the makeshift and hurried aspect of Hg's composition. In his essay 'The Hengwrt Manuscript and the Canon of *The Canterbury Tales*' Ralph Hanna III argues that Hg was not conceived as a complete codex but was planned as a series of booklets. As with other booklet manuscripts Hg was intended to be a miscellany, presenting a collection of the canon of the work but with no concern for arrangement. The booklet form provides great flexibility where exemplars are under limited availability, and also allows the editor to delay any final decisions as to the exact form of the codex. The editor's use of this booklet form thereby testifies to the notion of piecemeal acquisition and the argument that the editor had no access to Chaucer's papers, nor any overall conception of the poem as a whole. These difficulties in acquiring the relevant exemplars lead Hanna to the suggestion of prior circulation, thus presenting a very different picture to that of Blake.

There have also been recent attempts to analyse the importance of Hg through studies of language and spelling. J.D. Burnley's essay 'Inflexion in Chaucer's adjectives' (1982) shows that only 3.5% of the 1586 examples of adjectival inflexions considered fail to agree with the conventions of grammatical accuracy. El is shown to incorporate far more variations in spelling and in the use of final <-e>, and to contain a more haphazard grammar; suggesting that Hg is 'closer to a form of spoken language' than El (175). In 'The Hengwrt and Ellesmere Manuscripts of *The Canterbury Tales*: Different scribes' R.V. Ramsey questions the Doyle and Parkes analysis of Scribe B, claiming that the spelling differences inherent in the two manuscripts' show that they were copied by different scribes who trained and worked in the same shop. By comparing both textually related portions and unaffiliated parts Ramsey shows that his tables of spelling ratios remain constant irrespective of exemplar. Ramsey concludes that the difference in scribes and their habits resulted in identifiable differences in the textual quality of the two manuscripts, thus explaining the greater number of unique variants in El. Ramsey's position was fiercely attacked by M.L. Samuels in 1983, who argues that the language of Scribe B forms part of Type III: a heterogeneous group which comprises a variety of idiosyncratic spelling repertoires. Samuels shows that El and Hg agree in all the instances presented by the Middle English Dialect Survey questionnaire, and that any differences may be explained as a change in habit or of exemplar. This argument is further corroborated by the evidence that Scribe B imposed an identical spelling system on his portion of Trinity College Cambridge MS R. 3.2 of Gower's *Confessio Amantis*.

From this study we can conclude that there are several principal problems that govern the debate of the textual tradition of the *Canterbury Tales*. A satisfactory theory must explain the huge textual variance displayed by the manuscript tradition, whilst also taking into account the conflicting evidence of the complete lack of pre-1400 manuscripts and the numerous post-1400 witnesses. There is also a need for a methodology to establish what is genuinely Chaucerian; one that does not rely on editorial subjectivity but concentrates more on the evidence of the manuscripts

themselves. This is particularly important in a work that displays such great irregularity throughout the manuscript tradition, in its treatment of specific tales, links, and extra lines. The final problem lies in the assessment of the exact relationship between the Hg and El manuscripts. While it is agreed that Hg is the earliest extant witness, containing the best text of all manuscripts, its order, contents and appearance still incur much prejudice; as is exemplified by Ross' comment: 'Hg is (...) an ugly little book but an invaluable one' (Ross 1983:53). El is a later, edited text yet its order, contents and physical appearance are still considered highly authoritative. Therefore the crucial question remains as to how this complex relationship should be reflected in an edition of the poem. This study has also shown that few major textual studies take into account other important early manuscripts, outside the Hg and El debate, and that there have been few attempts to consider the progressive development of the entire textual tradition, in the post Manly-Rickert era. Most of these studies concentrate on the head manuscripts of Manly-Rickert's genetic groups. Few attempts have been made to undertake a comprehensive study of the manuscripts, and important considerations such as additions, deletions, glosses and language have been particularly marginalized. Blake's *The Textual Tradition of the Canterbury Tales* and Owen's *Manuscripts of the Canterbury Tales* are recent exceptions, both of which provide comprehensive views of the overall development of the textual tradition, although amongst the great detail of these works very little material appears concerning Ad³.

We have seen that the overall scholarly treatment of this manuscript has been one of exclusion rather than inclusion. Much of this is due to its initial exclusion from Furnivall's Six-Text edition, which has proved so influential in subsequent scholarship. The view of this manuscript in this period is best exemplified by Skeat's description of Ad³ as 'imperfect' (IV. xiv. However there have been suggestions of the importance of Ad³, particularly in the work of Brusendorff and in its use by the variorum editors as a base manuscript. It is clear from the variorum editions that Ad³ is a manuscript which cannot be ignored, as its readings are regularly shown to be of considerable authority. This is demonstrated in Baker's edition of MA, where the

editor records thirteen variants in the prologue, and eighteen in the tale; the fewest number found after Hg. These close affiliations with Hg and El lead Baker to the conclusion that: 'Ad³ offers for *The Manciple's Prologue and Tale* an excellent text, inferior only to Hg and El' (Baker 1984:58). Baker's work on SQ reveals similar affiliations with Hg, and Ad³ is shown to exhibit the second fewest variants after Hg and El, and to agree with Hg in 61 of the 100 readings in which Hg is at variance with modern editions after Wright.

Despite the importance of this text attempts to categorise its affiliations are few and unsatisfactory, indicating a need for a thorough study of the Ad³ text. Its date of copying, between 1430 and 1450, and the fact that its exemplars remained together to provide the text for Ha⁵ some twenty years later, adds further importance to the Ad³ text. The tale-order follows that of El, varying only in the unusual placement of CO after MA, and the breaking up of Group G. No attempt has been made to consider the possible reasons behind these adjustments in tale-order, and most critics seem content to assume that these are the result of scribal incompetence or problems in obtaining exemplars for parts of the text. Owen has touched on the significance of the marginalia found in Ad³ and the close relationship they share with those found in El, although his suggestion that this relationship may indicate access to El in the production of Ad³ is never developed.

Thus while much previous scholarship has overlooked the evidence of Ad³ there has been some recognition of its importance, although no detailed study of this manuscript has emerged. This is a manuscript with many important affiliations which demand close study in order to untangle the relationships they represent. Its text is of fundamental importance for any complete assessment of the dissemination of the poem in this early period of manuscript production. Its number of unique variants, combined with readings of high authority produce an individual and important text. The evidence of other features, such as the tale-order and marginalia, provide close links with El, and a study of this manuscript must also take account of these aspects and the relationship between these two manuscripts.

Chapter 2

A Description of the manuscript

2.1 Present Location

British Library MS Additional 35286.

2.2 Contents

Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*. GP 154 - PA 397.

2.3 Form and Present Condition

The manuscript is written on parchment in codex form. The text is much mutilated due to the loss of many folios and some complete quires. The remaining leaves are in good condition, although many of them are considerably cockled and there is some heavy soiling on leaves at the beginning and the end of the manuscript, suggesting a long time spent unbound. The ink is faded in places, although the text remains legible.

2.4 Binding

The binding is modern, and is sewn on five bands. There are three paper fly leaves at the beginning, and one older and two modern fly leaves at the end of the manuscript.

2.5 Handwriting

2.5.1 The Main Text

The entire text is copied in one hybrid anglicana bookhand with some elements of the more formal anglicana formata, and occasional influence from the secretary script. The overall impression of the duct is of a cursive upright script, with long looped ascenders and large rounded lobes. The pen seems to have been held or cut at an oblique angle producing many heavy, broad strokes, especially evident in the stems of *f* and long-*s*, and most ascenders. The presence of flourished, continuous strokes, such as the descender of *y* and the limb of *h*, gives the appearance of a fluid and rapid style. The variation in size of many of the graphs, particularly the lack of distinction between upper- and lower-case *a*, added to the confusion over whether certain adjacent words were intended to represent single words, gives the impression that the text was copied in some haste. This is especially apparent in parts of the text where the duct loses many of its cursive features and takes on a smaller, more scratched appearance.

The two-compartment anglicana *a* graph is formed either by two clearly distinct lobes, or by a single lobe divided by a horizontal cross-stroke. The former of these is particularly subject to variation in size and the top lobe often extends to the height of the headline, thus causing much confusion with the upper-case graph which is formed in the same manner. The bottom lobe of this graph frequently consists of a series of broken strokes, more typical of the secretary style. The single-compartment secretary *a* graph is also in regular usage, and there are large sections of the text where this is the dominant form.

Ascenders are generally upright with large loops and extend much higher than minims, as was typical of the less formal variety of the anglicana script. The ascender of *d* extends to the left to form an oval loop, thus lending the graph an exaggerated, slanting appearance; while the lobe is often formed by angular, broken strokes (117^r 1.3/10). There are some examples of forked ascenders on upper-case forms of *h* and *l*,

although such usage is rare (1^r 1.35, 17^v 1.36). Tall, upright ascenders are commonly found on the graph of *h*, while the limb is formed by a long, curved stroke which often curls round to form the next letter, thus enabling clear distinction from the form of *b*. Minim strokes have semi-quadrata serifs on heads and feet, proper to the formata grade of *anglicana*, giving them a distinct, individually-formed appearance. The *i* form is distinguished by the consistent use of the diacritic stroke, although *u*, *n* and *m* are often only distinguishable through context.

There are three forms of *r* found in this hand: short-*r*, long-*r* and 2-shaped *r* with a tail. The short-*r* adopted from the university book hands is found in most instances, while 2-shaped *r* is regularly found after *o* and sometimes after *p* (29^r 1.4); this form always carries a tail. Long-*r* is very rare and is generally found only in the opening folios e.g. 3^v 1.13, 5^v 1.18/19. Long-*s*, formed with a straight, broad stroke, is used medially and initially, while round, or short, *s* is found initially and finally. The *g* graph is the two-compartment 8-shaped form, in which the bottom lobe is sometimes composed of broken strokes. The typical backward-slanting form of *e* is the dominant form of this letter, although reverse *e* is often used in final positions (237^r 1.11). Round *e*, a circular bowl with a bisecting cross-stroke, also makes an infrequent appearance (116^r 1.33). The *y* graph is always dotted thus providing a distinction from the letter thorn. *V* and *u* are easily distinguished, and *v* is predominantly used initially while *u* is found in medial positions. The form of *w* is a particularly distinctive and highly cursive graph which varies considerably in size, causing much confusion over distinctions between upper- and lower-case forms. The *t* graph is also distinctive, as the shaft protrudes quite considerably above the headstroke. The letter *z* is used just 14 times, while *þ* is found only on 4 occasions; both graphs appear only at the beginning of the manuscript.

The scribe also makes use of a display script for copying Latin and French quotations, as found on folios 233^r and 234^r. This script shows an attempt by the scribe to produce a more formal, bastard variety of the *anglicana* style, with more carefully formed individual strokes and more pronounced serifs on the heads and feet

of minims. However, while the writing is distinct from the remainder of the text, this is a rather sloppy and unsuccessful attempt to produce a higher grade script, and the scribe is clearly more comfortable with the more cursive *anglicana* variety.

2.5.2 Marginalia and Rubrics

The hand of the marginalia and the rubrics is also that of the main scribe, and agreement in ink colour in certain passages where the colouration is particularly distinctive, indicates that the glosses were written concurrently with the main text. This is exemplified by the differences in the colour of the ink in the two glosses 'Auctor' on the recto and verso leaves of folio 164, which must have been included during the copying of the text, and not filled in subsequently. The scribe employs an almost identical script for copying the marginalia and rubrics as for the main text, although some extra letter forms and abbreviations are used, particularly for copying the Latin glosses; the ease with which such abbreviations are incorporated suggests a degree of familiarity and experience in copying Latin texts. There is a similar mixture of *anglicana* with some secretary elements, although the secretary form of *g*, not found in the main text, appears in a gloss to KN (11^v) and in the incipit to the Prologue to KN (7^v). Long-*r* makes more regular appearances in the marginalia than in the main text, with examples found on folios 53^v, 56^v, 98^r, and on folio 108^r there is an example of this form used in an initial position. Round *e* is in more regular usage, and there are also examples of unusual forms of upper-case *d*, and upper-case *b*, although neither of these forms is unique to the marginalia (cf. folios 66^v and 233^r respectively).

2.5.3 Punctuation

The text of this manuscript is very lightly punctuated, and the punctus is the only mark which is used with any consistency. This is generally found at the ends of lines, at either sides of numbers (99^r, 127^v), or after upper-case *i*, or lower-case *y* (cf. folios 53^r and 6^r respectively). The *virgula suspensiva* is very rare, particularly in the poetic

texts, and its appearance seems totally haphazard in comparison with the regular usage in the marking of caesurae in other manuscripts of this poem. It is found more frequently at the ends of clauses in the two prose pieces, but even in these texts the usage remains comparatively light and irregular. There is one sole example of the *punctus elevatus* (17^r l.7) and there are no examples of the *punctus interrogativus*, nor are there any of the line-fillers that appear in other witnesses, such as El and Hg. The *punctus* is also used consistently above the *y* graph, while a diacritic stroke is regularly used to mark lower-case *i*, as described above.

2.5.4 Abbreviations

The text of this manuscript employs most of the common forms of abbreviation, such as contractions marked by contraction marks and superscript letters, and brevigraphs. The macron is used very frequently, and is either formed by a single horizontal line, often extending well beyond the end of the line of the text, or a crescent-shaped stroke dotted at the bottom; both these forms are found on folio 1^v. Sometimes a flourish on a final letter is looped round to form an extended macron, as found in the final line of folio 114^r. The superscript hook representing '-er', and superscript 'a', 'r', and 'i' are also regular features of the scribe's repertoire. Many of the standard contractions of certain words are also found: particularly for words with religious associations where familiarity allows drastic contraction. The abbreviation 'w^t' is found only in the prose tales.

2.5.5 Omission and Correction

There is little evidence of correction in this manuscript and any analysis of a corrector's hand must be limited to a consideration of the large amounts of rewriting over faded ink, or erasures, or a single line added in the margin. The evidence of the rewriting and touching-up of parts of the text reveals a clumsy hand which has difficulty in maintaining the duct of the main hand and the morphology of many of the letter forms.

Whether this is the hand of the main scribe, a supervisor, or simply a later owner is debatable, but it is certainly a hand which is unable to recreate the fluency of the principal hand (39^v, 41^r and extensive passages in WBP). The sole example of an omitted line added in the margin is certainly in the hand of the main scribe, although it is copied with a smaller, narrower duct in response to the demands of space (33^v).

2.6 Date

There is no colophon, nor any other internal features allowing an exact dating of the manuscript. The scribe remains anonymous and his hand has not been identified in any other manuscript. Manly-Rickert date the manuscript 1430-50, which seems to be a result of Rickert's study of the decoration in which she concludes that 'all three [Ad³, Ry², Sl¹] are probably close in date and nearest to Pw, Lc, En², and Mm -- that is, c.1430-50' (I. 582). Mosser dates the manuscript XV^{2/4}, which he has informed me is based on palaeographical features such as the use of secretary *a*, the looped tail on the *h* graph, the construction of short *r*, and the appearance of hairline strokes (Mosser 1996).

2.7 Collation

2.7.1 Quiring

The manuscript is arranged in regular gatherings of eight, with a complete series of catchwords and signatures. The only anomaly is quire 20 which is a singleton, or may be the only remaining leaf of a complete quire left to receive the remainder of SQ; cf. Manly-Rickert I. 41 who claim that 'ff. ii-viii (now missing) [were] left blank to receive the rest of SqT'. The quires are signed on the first leaf of each in a sixteenth-century hand; the following signatures are extant: b-i, k-o, q-t, v, x-z, bb-hh, jj.

The collation is as follows:

Present folio numbering: Original quiring:

Folios 1-4	1 ⁸
Folios 5-12	2 ⁸
Folios 13-36	4-6 ⁸
Folios 37-43	7 ⁸
Folios 44-107	9-16 ⁸
Folios 108-114	17 ⁸
Folios 115-130	18-19 ⁸
Folio 131	20 ¹
Folios 132-155	21-23 ⁸
Folios 156-162	24 ⁸
Folios 163-226	25-32 ⁸
Folios 227-233	33 ⁸
Folios 234-238	34 ⁸

2.7.2 Missing portions of text:

GP 1-153	2 folios
GP 234-398	2 folios
KN 411-1040	8 folios

L2 5-66/

RE 1-13 1 folio

L7 68-98/

ML 1-525 8 folios

L15 24-32/

ME 1-64 1 folio

SH 418-434/

L24 1-18/

PR 1-28 1 folio

PA 104-136 1 folio

PA 308-366 2 folios

PA 398-1018 1 folio and further missing quires

2.7.3 The distribution of the text

<u>Tale</u>	<u>Folio number</u>	<u>Lines</u>
GP	1 ^r	154 - 193
	1 ^v	194 - 233
	2 ^r	399 - 438
	2 ^v	439 - 478
	3 ^r	479 - 518
	3 ^v	519 - 557
	4 ^r	558 - 595
	4 ^v	596 - 635
	5 ^r	636 - 674
	5 ^v	675 - 713
	6 ^r	714 - 753

KN

6 ^v	754 - 795
7 ^r	796 - 835
7 ^v	836 - 858
7 ^v	1 - 16
8 ^r	17 - 54
8 ^v	55 - 93
9 ^r	94 - 133
9 ^v	134 - 173
10 ^r	174 - 212
10 ^v	213 - 253
11 ^r	254 - 293
11 ^v	294 - 332
12 ^r	333 - 371
12 ^v	372 - 410
13 ^r	1041 - 1080
13 ^v	1081 - 1118
14 ^r	1119 - 1156
14 ^v	1157 - 1197
15 ^r	1198 - 1237
15 ^v	1238 - 1276
16 ^r	1277 - 1316
16 ^v	1317 - 1356
17 ^r	1357 - 1395
17 ^v	1396 - 1435
18 ^r	1436 - 1475
18 ^v	1476 - 1515
19 ^r	1516 - 1555
19 ^v	1556 - 1594
20 ^r	1595 - 1633
20 ^v	1634 - 1674
21 ^r	1675 - 1716
21 ^v	1717 - 1756
22 ^r	1757 - 1796
22 ^v	1797 - 1836
23 ^r	1837 - 1876

	23 ^v	1877 - 1916
	24 ^r	1917 - 1951
	24 ^v	1952 - 1991
	25 ^r	1992 - 2030
	25 ^v	2031 - 2070
	26 ^r	2071 - 2109
	26 ^v	2110 - 2148
	27 ^r	2149 - 2187
	27 ^v	2188 - 2225
	28 ^r	2226 - 2244
L1	28 ^r	1 - 14
	28 ^v	15 - 50
	29 ^r	51 - 76
MI	29 ^r	1 - 11
	29 ^v	12 - 50
	30 ^r	51 - 88
	30 ^v	89 - 127
	31 ^r	128 - 169
	31 ^v	170 - 207
	32 ^r	208 - 245
	32 ^v	246 - 284
	33 ^r	285 - 323
	33 ^v	324 - 363
	34 ^r	364 - 401
	34 ^v	402 - 440
	35 ^r	441 - 478
	35 ^v	479 - 517
	36 ^r	518 - 556
	36 ^v	557 - 597
	37 ^r	598 - 636
	37 ^v	637 - 666
L2	37 ^v	1 - 4
RE	38 ^r	14 - 52
	38 ^v	53 - 91
	39 ^r	92 - 130

	39 ^v	131 - 169
	40 ^r	170 - 207
	40 ^v	208 - 244
	41 ^r	245 - 281
	41 ^v	282 - 319
	42 ^r	320 - 358
	42 ^v	359 - 396
	43 ^r	397 - 404
L7	43 ^r	1 - 27
	43 ^v	28 - 67
ML	44 ^r	526 - 560
	44 ^v	561 - 595
	45 ^r	596 - 630
	45 ^v	631 - 665
	46 ^r	666 - 700
	46 ^v	701 - 735
	47 ^r	736 - 770
	47 ^v	771 - 805
	48 ^r	806 - 840
	48 ^v	841 - 875
	49 ^r	876 - 910
	49 ^v	911 - 945
	50 ^r	946 - 980
	50 ^v	981 - 1015
	51 ^r	1016 - 1050
	51 ^v	1051-1064
WBP	51 ^v	1 - 19
	52 ^r	20 - 59
	52 ^v	60 - 98
	53 ^r	99 - 136
	53 ^v	137 - 175
	54 ^r	176 - 212
	54 ^v	213 - 251
	55 ^r	252 - 291
	55 ^v	292 - 331

	56 ^r	332 - 370
	56 ^v	371 - 408
	57 ^r	409 - 445
	57 ^v	446 - 484
	58 ^r	485 - 523
	58 ^v	524 - 562
	59 ^r	563 - 588
	59 ^v	589 - 623
	60 ^r	624 - 663
	60 ^v	664 - 700
	61 ^r	701 - 736
	61 ^v	737 - 774
	62 ^r	775 - 811
	62 ^v	812 - 830
WBT	62 ^v	831 - 846
	63 ^r	847 - 883
	63 ^v	884 - 922
	64 ^r	923 - 962
	64 ^v	963 - 1000
	65 ^r	1001 - 1037
	65 ^v	1038 - 1076
	66 ^r	1077 - 1115
	66 ^v	1116 - 1153
	67 ^r	1154 - 1190
	67 ^v	1191 - 1228
	68 ^r	1229 - 1237
L10	68 ^r	1 - 27
	68 ^v	28 - 36
FR	68 ^v	1 - 26
	69 ^r	27 - 62
	69 ^v	63 - 100
	70 ^r	101 - 137
	70 ^v	138 - 173
	71 ^r	174 - 209
	71 ^v	210 - 246

	72 ^r	247 - 283
	72 ^v	284 - 320
	73 ^r	321 - 357
	73 ^v	358 - 365
L11	73 ^v	1 - 26
	74 ^r	27 - 44
SU	74 ^r	1 - 16
	74 ^v	17 - 51
	75 ^r	52 - 87
	75 ^v	88 - 125
	76 ^r	126 - 163
	76 ^v	164 - 200
	77 ^r	201 - 239
	77 ^v	240 - 278
	78 ^r	279 - 315
	78 ^v	316 - 352
	79 ^r	353 - 390
	79 ^v	391 - 430
	80 ^r	431 - 469
	80 ^v	470 - 508
	81 ^r	509 - 546
	81 ^v	547 - 586
NU	82 ^r	1 - 28
	82 ^v	29 - 63
	83 ^r	64 - 98
	83 ^v	99 - 133
	84 ^r	134 - 168
	84 ^v	169 - 203
	85 ^r	204 - 238
	85 ^v	239 - 273
	86 ^r	274 - 308
	86 ^v	309 - 343
	87 ^r	344 - 378
	87 ^v	379 - 413
	88 ^r	414 - 448

CL

88v	449 - 483
89r	484 - 518
89v	519 - 553
90r	1 - 30
90v	31 - 63
91r	64 - 98
91v	99 - 133
92r	134 - 168
92v	169 - 203
93r	204 - 238
93v	239 - 273
94r	274 - 308
94v	309 - 343
95r	344 - 378
95v	379 - 413
96r	414 - 448
96v	449 - 476
97r	477 - 511
97v	512 - 546
98r	547 - 581
98v	582 - 609
99r	610 - 644
99v	645 - 679
100r	680 - 714
100v	715 - 749
101r	750 - 784
101v	785 - 819
102r	820 - 854
102v	855 - 889
103r	890 - 924
103v	925 - 959
104r	960 - 994
104v	995 - 1029
105r	1030 - 1064
105v	1065 - 1099

	106 ^r	1100 - 1134
	106 ^v	1135 - 1169
	107 ^r	1170 - 1176
L13	107 ^r	1 - 24
	107 ^v	25 - 36
L15	107 ^v	1 - 23
ME	108 ^r	65 - 103
	108 ^v	104 - 143
	109 ^r	144 - 182
	109 ^v	183 - 220
	110 ^r	221 - 260
	110 ^v	261 - 301
	111 ^r	302 - 340
	111 ^v	341 - 378
	112 ^r	379 - 415
	112 ^v	416 - 456
	113 ^r	457 - 495
	113 ^v	496 - 534
	114 ^r	535 - 574
	114 ^v	575 - 612
	115 ^r	613 - 648
	115 ^v	649 - 686
	116 ^r	687 - 724
	116 ^v	725 - 764
	117 ^r	765 - 801
	117 ^v	802 - 840
	118 ^r	841 - 878
	118 ^v	879 - 916
	119 ^r	917 - 953
	119 ^v	954 - 991
	120 ^r	992 - 1029
	120 ^v	1030 - 1068
	121 ^r	1069 - 1107
	121 ^v	1108 - 1146
	122 ^r	1147 - 1174

L17	122 ^r	1 - 10
	122 ^v	11 - 30
SQ	122 ^v	1 - 16
	123 ^r	17 - 53
	123 ^v	54 - 90
	124 ^r	91 - 126
	124 ^v	127 - 164
	125 ^r	165 - 202
	125 ^v	203 - 240
	126 ^r	241 - 278
	126 ^v	279 - 318
	127 ^r	319 - 354
	127 ^v	355 - 392
	128 ^r	393 - 430
	128 ^v	431 - 471
	129 ^r	472 - 509
	129 ^v	510 - 546
	130 ^r	547 - 583
	130 ^v	584 - 622
	131 ^r	623 - 661
	131 ^v	662 - 664
L20	132 ^r	1 - 36
FK	132 ^v	1 - 34
	133 ^r	35 - 71
	133 ^v	72 - 108
	134 ^r	109 - 145
	134 ^v	146 - 181
	135 ^r	182 - 218
	135 ^v	219 - 256
	136 ^r	257 - 294
	136 ^v	295 - 332
	137 ^r	333 - 370
	137 ^v	371 - 408
	138 ^r	409 - 445
	138 ^v	446 - 484

	139 ^r	485 - 522
	139 ^v	523 - 561
	140 ^r	562 - 599
	140 ^v	600 - 636
	141 ^r	637 - 674
	141 ^v	675 - 712
	142 ^r	713 - 749
	142 ^v	750 - 782/5
	143 ^r	782/6 - 817
	143 ^v	818 - 855
	144 ^r	856 - 894
	144 ^v	895 - 908
PH	144 ^v	1 - 24
	145 ^r	25 - 65
	145 ^v	66 - 106
	146 ^r	107 - 144
	146 ^v	145 - 182
	147 ^r	183 - 220
	147 ^v	221 - 259
	148 ^r	260 - 286
L21	148 ^r	1 - 10
	148 ^v	11 - 40
PD	148 ^v	1 - 4
	149 ^r	5 - 42
	149 ^v	43 - 80
	150 ^r	81 - 118
	150 ^v	119 - 153
	151 ^r	154 - 190
	151 ^v	191 - 228
	152 ^r	229 - 264
	152 ^v	265 - 301
	153 ^r	302 - 335
	153 ^v	336 - 373
	154 ^r	374 - 411
	154 ^v	412 - 448

	155 ^r	449 - 486
	155 ^v	487 - 525
	156 ^r	526 - 563
	156 ^v	564 - 601
	157 ^r	602 - 639
	157 ^v	640
SH	157 ^v	1 - 35
	158 ^r	36 - 72
	158 ^v	73 - 111
	159 ^r	112 - 151
	159 ^v	152 - 191
	160 ^r	192 - 230
	160 ^v	231 - 268
	161 ^r	269 - 304
	161 ^v	305 - 342
	162 ^r	343 - 380
	162 ^v	381 - 417
PR	163 ^r	29 - 63
	163 ^v	64 - 98
	164 ^r	99 - 133
	164 ^v	134 - 168
	165 ^r	169 - 203
	165 ^v	204 - 238
L25	166 ^r	1 - 21
TT	166 ^r	1 - 12
	166 ^v	13 - 69
	167 ^r	70 - 132
	167 ^v	133 - 190
	168 ^r	191 - 205
L28	168 ^r	1 - 25
	168 ^v	26 - 48
TM	168 ^v	1 - 8
	169 ^r	9 - 27
	169 ^v	28 - 45
	170 ^r	46 - 62

170V	63 - 78
171r	79 - 96
171V	97 - 112
172r	113 - 131
172V	132 - 152
173r	153 - 178
173V	179 - 199
174r	200 - 218
174V	219 - 239
175r	240 - 262
175V	263 - 282
176r	283 - 307
176V	308 - 306
177r	334 - 355
177V	356 - 376
178r	377 - 402
178V	403 - 429
179r	430 - 455
179V	456 - 481
180r	482 - 506
180V	507 - 531
181r	532 - 556
181V	557 - 577
182r	578 - 601
182V	602 - 624
183r	625 - 652
183V	653 - 679
184r	680 - 707
184V	708 - 736
185r	737 - 764
185V	765 - 791
186r	792 - 816
186V	817 - 848
187r	849 - 875
187V	876 - 908

	188 ^r	909 - 918
L29	188 ^r	1 - 25
	188 ^v	26 - 63
	189 ^r	64 - 100
	189 ^v	101 - 102
MO	189 ^v	1 - 24
	190 ^r	25 - 58
	190 ^v	59 - 93
	191 ^r	94 - 128
	191 ^v	129 - 162
	192 ^r	163 - 196
	192 ^v	197 - 232
	193 ^r	233 - 268
	193 ^v	269 - 304
	194 ^r	305 - 338
	194 ^v	339 - 376
	195 ^r	377 - 410
	195 ^v	411 - 446
	196 ^r	447 - 480
	196 ^v	481 - 515
	197 ^r	516 - 552
	197 ^v	553 - 588
	198 ^r	589 - 624
	198 ^v	625 - 660
	199 ^r	661 - 694
	199 ^v	695 - 728
	200 ^r	729 - 762
	200 ^v	763 - 768
L30	200 ^v	1 - 8
	201 ^r	9 - 34
NP	201 ^r	1 - 9
	201 ^v	10 - 46
	202 ^r	47 - 84
	202 ^v	85 - 122
	203 ^r	123 - 161

	203 ^v	162 - 199
	204 ^r	200 - 236
	204 ^v	237 - 275
	205 ^r	276 - 313
	205 ^v	314 - 352
	206 ^r	353 - 390
	206 ^v	391 - 428
	207 ^r	429 - 465
	207 ^v	466 - 500
	208 ^r	501 - 535
	208 ^v	536 - 572
	209 ^r	573 - 609
	209 ^v	610 - 627
L36	209 ^v	1 - 16
	210 ^r	17 - 52
	210 ^v	53 - 88
	211 ^r	89 - 104
MA	211 ^r	1 - 22
	211 ^v	23 - 62
	212 ^r	63 - 101
	212 ^v	102 - 141
	213 ^r	142 - 179
	213 ^v	180 - 218
	214 ^r	219 - 257
	214 ^v	258
L3	214 ^v	1 - 36
	215 ^r	37 - 40
CO	215 ^r	1 - 30
	215 ^v	31 - 58
L33	215 ^v	1 - 9
	216 ^r	10 - 47
	216 ^v	48 - 85
	217 ^r	86 - 123
	217 ^v	124 - 160
	218 ^r	161 - 166

CY	218 ^r	1 - 30	
	218 ^v	31 - 67	
	219 ^r	68 - 106	
	219 ^v	107 - 144	
	220 ^r	145 - 182	
	220 ^v	183 - 220	
	221 ^r	221 - 260	
	221 ^v	261 - 298	
	222 ^r	299 - 336	
	222 ^v	337 - 374	
	223 ^r	375 - 412	
	223 ^v	413 - 450	
	224 ^r	451 - 488	
	224 ^v	489 - 526	
	225 ^r	527 - 564	
	225 ^v	565 - 601	
	226 ^r	602 - 638	
	226 ^v	639 - 676	
	227 ^r	677 - 715	
	227 ^v	716 - 753	
	228 ^r	754 - 762	
	L37	228 ^r	1 - 26
		228 ^v	27 - 64
		229 ^r	65 - 74
	PA	229 ^r	1 - 10
		229 ^v	11 - 29
		230 ^r	30 - 49
230 ^v		50 - 66	
231 ^r		67 - 85	
231 ^v		86 - 104	
232 ^r		136 - 152	
232 ^v		153 - 167	
233 ^r		168 - 183	
233 ^v		184 - 198	
234 ^r	199 - 213		

234 ^v	214 - 229
235 ^r	230 - 241
235 ^v	242 - 255
236 ^r	256 - 267
236 ^v	268 - 281
237 ^r	282 - 293
237 ^v	294 - 308
238 ^r	367 - 381
238 ^v	382 - 398

2.8 Layout

2.8.1 The Main Text

The manuscript consists of 238 folios, measuring 31cms x 22cms, with modern foliation added in pencil in the top right hand corner. The numbering has been added after the many losses to the text and therefore is regular. The ink is mostly light brown in colour although there is considerable variation in shade, from almost yellow (61^v) to a much darker, black colour; found particularly in the pen of the corrector (60^r). The pages are marked up with outer margins in a faint light brown ink, leaving a writing space of 23cms x 12cms, and there are no signs of pricking or ruling, although the lines remain consistently straight.

The text itself is organised according to a strict system of ordinatio: a system which remains very regular throughout the entire manuscript. Prologues are marked with a 4-line ornamental capital in blue, and tales by 3- or 4-line gold ornamental capitals. The only exceptions to this are the beginnings of TT and MA which have 2- and 3-line ornamental capitals in blue respectively. The link between SQ and FK (132^r) is also unusual as it is marked by an 8-line ornamental capital. This capital is included in a totally different format as the letter extends outside the text itself, and no space was allocated for its inclusion within the text. This unique style may suggest that

the ornamental capital was a late decision, although the use of an upper-case *n* for the second letter of the opening word shows that the scribe was aware the line was to be marked as the opening of a separate piece of text. Incipits and explicits are added in rubric in a gap of 2-7 lines left within the text specifically for their inclusion, and are sometimes accompanied by a paraph. The variation in the provision of space seems to be random, as the rubrics themselves seldom vary in length. The rubrics are never deliberately expanded to fill excess space, nor is the hand enlarged. Similarly these rubrics do not appear to be cramped or deliberately squashed to fit into the gaps. The only exception appears at the end of TM where the explicit is added alongside the final sentence of the text, as the scribe has not allotted sufficient space for its inclusion. Incipits to prologues and tales are included in every instance, the heading of L20 being the only exception, while explicits are applied in a more haphazard fashion, with 14 separate pieces remaining unmarked at their conclusion. Paragraph markers are also used within the prose tales, and those in rhyming couplets. The manuscript also contains a complete set of running heads, which contain the definite article and the name of the pilgrim on the top of both the recto and verso leaves of each folio; a formula which remains totally standardised. These are always copied in rubric and are accompanied by a blue paraph with red penwork. There are no running heads for GP, and only paraphs have been included on the verso leaves of folios 116-118, and the recto leaves of 119-121 in ME. The only other disruption of this regular system occurs on folio 62^r in WBP where the running head has been omitted altogether.

Tales composed in rhyming couplets are arranged in single columns throughout with between 35 and 40 lines per page, a variation which is dependent on the size of the script and the fact that individual lines have not been ruled. The left margins are marked with litterae notabiliores at the beginnings of each line, and the texts are copied continuously within tales. The division of parts 3 and 4 in KN, only this division remains extant, is indicated by an incipit and explicit in Latin copied in the margin, and there is no break within the text. The only other division within a text copied in couplets occurs in SQ, where there is a 3-line break within the text, containing Latin

rubrics indicating the end of the first and the beginning of the second parts. The beginning of a description of a different pilgrim in GP is marked by a 2-line blue ornamental capital, and there is no break within the text itself.

The stanzaic texts are generally copied with five 7-line stanzas per page and with a 1-line gap between stanzas. Each stanza opens with a 1-line ornamental capital in blue or red, with the colour alternating between stanzas. There is only one extant part division in ML, and this is included in rubric in the margin and therefore does not affect the overall layout of the stanzas. NU also follows this regular format, although the opening folio of the tale is more generously spaced and contains only four stanzas. The use of 1-line ornamental capitals is also regular, and the system is disrupted only by the omission of the ornamental capital at the top of folio 84^r, the first folio of a new quire. CL Prologue is anomalous as it is arranged in stanzas of varying lengths despite the fact that it is composed in rhyming couplets. The opening folio of the prologue consists of a gap of one stanza at the top, which contains the incipit, and four stanzas containing 6, 8, 6 and 10 lines respectively. The remainder of CLP is copied on the following page in 3 stanzas of 8, 8 and 10 lines respectively. Each of these seven stanzas is separated by a single line, and 'Pausacio' is written in the margin alongside the final line of each stanza, except the fourth stanza of the opening folio. The end of the prologue is followed directly by the explicit and the incipit for the tale, which is in turn followed by the opening stanza of the narrative, which fits neatly on the page. The remainder of the tale is copied with five stanzas of seven lines on each page. The beginning of the second part is signalled by a 2-line blue ornamental capital with no other markings or rubrics. The third part is introduced in the same manner, although here a gap of one stanza is left between parts, at the head of folio 96^v. This is a particularly strange arrangement as there is a 7-line latin gloss copied alongside the empty space. Part four opens with a 3-line ornamental capital and there is the same gap within the text as in the preceding division, at the foot of folio 98^v. No text is missing at either point although some manuscripts include part divisions at these points, and the gaps may have been provisions for incipits and explicits which were never included.

The final part is introduced by the larger 3-line ornamental capital, but there are no divisions or gaps within the actual text. There is a 3-line gap after the end of the tale which contains the rubric 'Lenuoy de Chaucer', and the Envoy opens with a 2-line blue ornamental capital and is copied in stanzas of six lines. Each individual stanza of the tale is marked by a 1-line ornamental capital at the beginning, and this feature is only missing in the first stanza of folio 93^v, and in the fourth stanza of the Envoy. PR is copied with five stanzas per page each divided by a single blank line, and no part divisions are included. MO is copied in 8-line stanzas which are less coherently organised, and are not fitted so neatly on each individual folio. The scribe simply leaves a 1-line gap between stanzas and allows the stanzas to overlap onto subsequent folios wherever necessary.

The prose tales also occupy 35-40 lines per page, and are neatly justified along the right-hand margin, in a writing space of between 14 and 15 cms. The scribe hyphenates many words at the ends of lines, and the inclusion of hyphens is erratic. TM contains no part divisions, while the division between the two parts of penitence in PA is represented by an explicit and incipit included in two blank lines left within the text, followed by a 4-line ornamental capital in gold.

TT is arranged with rhyming couplet lines linked by braces, and with tail lines placed to the right; rhyming tail lines are only occasionally accompanied by braces. Where 'bob' lines are included, these are set to the right of the braced tail lines, although rhyming 'bob' lines are never braced.

2.8.2 Marginalia

Subsections within the text are often indicated through a series of subheadings, which either appear within the text itself, or, more commonly, placed alongside the text in the margin. These are either simply part divisions as on folio 20^r in KN, or thematic breaks as exemplified on 57^v in WBP. The margins also contain a whole series of glosses in Latin or English, which provide quotations, references or translations of

certain parts of the text. These are most frequently copied in the dark brown ink of the main text, although some are in red, and are always accompanied by a paraph; the only exception occurring on folio 24^v where the paraph has been omitted. Paraphs are drawn in red with blue penwork, alternating with blue paraphs with red penwork. These glosses are copied alongside the text in the left-hand margin on verso leaves and in the right-hand margin on recto leaves, although a simple gloss, eg. 'Auctor', 'Nota', may be placed in the right-hand margin on a verso leaf. There is a single example of a gloss placed in the left-hand margin of a recto leaf on folio 151^r, although this is presumably due to a gloss already filling the more usual space. Similarities in the varying shades of ink colour with the colour of the main text show that the marginalia were written concurrently with the copying of the poem (cf. 24^v, 52^r). The full extent of the elaborate glossing apparatus must have been known well in advance, as plenty of room has been left during copying to accommodate the marginalia. This is particularly evident in texts such as WBP and FK where there are large numbers of glosses which still retain a neat decorum on the page. Despite this generous distribution of space, the edges of some glosses are now missing due to the trimming of pages for binding (18^v, 61^v, 67^r).

2.8.3 Decoration and Illumination

The manuscript is very sparsely illuminated, and the ornamental capitals at the beginnings of tales are the only instances where gold leaf is used. Red and blue penwork is found in other ornamental capitals, running heads, paraphs and some marginalia. Gold ornamental capitals are drawn on a purple background, and decorated with sprays with gold trefoil and green dots.

2.8.4 Supervision and Correction

This manuscript contains little evidence of supervision, although there are some examples of rewriting or correction. The most obvious of these are the numerous

occasions where lighter, or faded ink has been touched up with a much darker ink, as discussed above (cf. 60^r, 67^v). There are some instances where lines have been erased and subsequently written over, particularly evident in the first five lines of folio 5^r, and some erasures that have been left blank (41^v, 96^v). On folio 33^v line 344 of MI, 'Worke al bi conseil and þ^u shalt nat rewe', was omitted during copying and has been added in the margin marked by a cross, with another cross marking the place of insertion within the text. There are also occasional examples of omitted words which have been inserted above the line with a carat mark to indicate the addition (2^r l.27, 114^r l.36). A final style of addition is found on folio 10^v where the definite article was omitted at the beginning of line 28. The scribe has erased the initial letter of 'fairenese', replacing it with a lower-case form, and then adding the definite article alongside in the margin.

2.8.5 Order of Tales

GP-KN-L1-MI-L2-RE L7-ML WB-L10-FR-L11-SU NU CL-L13-L15-ME-L17-SQ-
L20-FK PH-L21-PD SH-PR-L25-TT-L28-TM-L29-MO-L30-NP L36-MA L3-CO
L33-CY L37-PA.

In the traditional Fragment symbols this can be expressed as:

Aabcd B¹ D G^a E F C B² H A^e G^b I.

Chapter 3

The Order of Tales

The traditional scholarly attitude towards the arrangement of the *Canterbury Tales* as found in Ad³ has been to view the order as a disarranged version of that of E1 and other manuscripts of the *a* tradition. Very little scholarly energy has been exerted in attempting to discover the possible reasons for the alterations made to this ordering, and the explanations that have been offered are at best unsatisfactory. Skeat makes no attempt to look beyond the large gaps found at the beginning and end of the text, describing the manuscript simply as 'imperfect'. Dempster's analysis is more provocative and she argues that the independent ordering of the Ad³ ancestor may be as old as either the ancestor of *c* or Ha⁴ and is 'possibly borrowed from E1 itself'. She claims that the defects are possibly related to influence from Hg, although are 'no doubt [due] largely to difficulties in obtaining copies of some tales' (Dempster 1949:1140). Thus Dempster suggests that the Ad³ order may be derived from an earlier manuscript, which shows affinities with both the Hg and E1 manuscripts, although she remains unwilling to allow that these divergences from E1 are anything other than 'defects' that have arisen through problems in gaining certain exemplars. Owen's brief consideration of the arrangement of this manuscript is more sensitive, and he recognises the motivation behind the movement of CO as a response to the content of L36. However he still regards the adjustments found in this ordering as 'curious lapses', citing the awkward references that remain in L3, L33, and L37 as particular examples of such irregularity. No attempt is made to examine these pieces in depth, and Owen's claim that the '*Canon's Yeoman's Prologue* [refers] to the saint's legend that should precede it' (Owen 1991:45) reveals a failure to observe that the couplet does not appear in Ad³; the situation is more complex than Owen suggests.

The un-critical attitude towards this arrangement seems largely to derive from the status accorded to E1 which has clouded any judgment concerning manuscripts with variant versions of this order. The aim of this chapter is to provide a detailed study of the ordering of Ad³ in order to understand more thoroughly the nature of the alterations and the methods with which they have been implemented. From this standpoint we shall be able to understand the motivation behind such adjustments more clearly, and thus evaluate what bearing this motivation may have on the ordering of the manuscript overall, and on the debate concerning the conflicting orders found in the E1 and Hg manuscripts. This study will begin with a detailed examination of the tales and links found in the manuscript and the order in which they appear, relating significant features to the entire manuscript tradition. The second part will consider the disposition of the material: the manner of presentation and specific aspects of rubrication and *ordinatio*, in order to uncover evidence of a guiding principle in the distribution of the text. The examination of the scribe's attitude to the material and his awareness of the content before copying will lead into a discussion of the nature of the copytext, and the availability of exemplars before copying was begun. The physical state of the copytext and the scribe's attitude concerning the authority of his exemplar will allow us to judge whether this arrangement is the work of the scribe or of an earlier manuscript. The final section of the chapter will provide an analysis of parts in order to determine the existence of affiliations with established traditions; and particularly to assess the relationship with the *α*-E1 tradition.

The manuscript opens with GP, much of which is missing due to the loss of four leaves from the first quire. The text begins at line 154, omitting the descriptions of the knight, squire, and yeoman; it breaks off again at line 234, and recommences at line 399, thereby omitting the descriptions of the merchant, clerk, man of law, franklin, five guildsmen and the cook. GP is followed directly by KN on folio 7^v, introduced by the rubric: 'Here begynneth the prologe of the knyghtes tale'. This is followed by the first line of the tale itself: 'Whilom as olde stories tellen vs'. This prologue contains the first 34 lines of the text, and the tale itself opens with the line: 'This duke of whom I make of

mencyoun', under the rubric: 'Here bygynneth the knyghtes tale'. The breaking off of part of the tale as a prologue is extremely unusual and is found in only four other manuscripts: Bw, Ph², Ry¹ and Ry². The text of KN is severely interrupted by the loss of the third quire, containing lines 411 to 1040. The remainder of the tale is included without loss and the tale ends on folio 28^r. KN is followed directly by L1 with the conventional rubric: 'Here bigynneth the prolog of the Millers tale', which contains all of the prologue, thereby linking the forthcoming tale with that which directly precedes it. L1 leads directly on to MI which continues uninterrupted until the end of the tale on folio 37^v, and the closing rubric: 'Here endyth the Millers tale'. This regular style of rubrication is maintained for L2, which follows directly on from MI. Only the opening four lines of the text of this prologue remain as the second leaf of this quire is missing. This folio would have supplied lines 5 to 65 of the prologue, and the incipit and first 13 lines of RE. The remainder of the tale is intact and it ends in conventional fashion with the rubric: 'Here endeth the Reues tale'. However this extremely regular and controlled organisation of this first group of tales is disturbed by the removal of CO from this constant group. Yet the manuscript itself shows no signs of such a radical disturbance, and the change is implemented with cool conviction. RE is followed directly by L7, with the incipit following immediately after the explicit on the same page. As with all previous tales, there is no coincidence of tale and quire junction here, and the removal of L3 along with the tale removes any references to the Cook at this point. Despite the great uncertainty and irregularity shown in the treatment of the text of CO throughout the many witnesses, its position at the end of Group A remains almost invariable. It is the only manuscript in which CO appears in an altered position, where it follows on directly from ML. The tale has been omitted deliberately in Ps, Hk, Bo¹, and Ph², and while it does not appear in Ra², it seems likely that it would have filled the missing pages preceding TG, and therefore appearing after ME. Ha⁵ also omits CO with ML continuing directly from RE. Yet as the ordering of this manuscript follows that of Ad³, it seems reasonable to assume that CO would have

shared the Ad³ placement, appearing after MA, although the manuscript is now defective from PD.

L7 opens with the rubric: 'Here bygyneth the prolog of th Sergeantes tale', yet the prologue is incomplete due to a missing quire which interrupts the text at line 68, and also causes the loss of the first 525 lines of ML. The remainder of the text is complete and the tale ends, without L8, found in 35 MSS, on folio 51^v with the explicit: 'Here endeth the Sergeantes tale of noble Custance the Emperours doghter of Rome'. This tale is followed directly by WBP, once again showing no uncertainty in the positioning of these groups. An unusual division appears on folio 54^r, marked by the rubric: 'Biholde how this good wif serued hir .iij first husbondes which were gode olde men'. This is followed by line 193 which is introduced with a 3-line ornamental capital. WBT follows next, with the complete text, followed by L10. Both FR and SU survive in their entirety and retain the regular pattern of rubrication that has been observed so far. An unusual division appears within FR on folio 73^r, where lines 380 and 381 are separated by a gap of two lines, with line 381 beginning with a 3-line ornamental capital. The text of SU also contains an irregular division marked by an additional rubric: 'De quodam potestate iracundo', placed above line 353. The tale ends at the bottom of folio 81^v, although there is no explicit to signal this ending; thus the regular scheme of explicits and incipits is ruptured at this point, possibly indicating an element of uncertainty. The cause of this uncertainty may lie in the placement of NU after SU, with the tale beginning at the top of folio 82^r. Although it is clear from the quiring that this tale must have been intended to stand in this present position, there are certain other elements that contribute to its rather haphazard appearance. The tale opens with a rubric which links both the teller with her tale: 'Here bigyneth the nonnes tale of seint Cecilie'. It is significant that there is no reference to a Second Nun, but more simply to the 'Nonne', a title which remains consistent throughout the running heads for this tale. The tale is not divided into a prologue and a tale as in some manuscripts, and the text ends at the bottom of folio 89^v, without any form of explicit. The placement of NU at this point represents another disruption of a constant group, as this

tale is most commonly found linked with CY and placed later in the arrangement. There are only 5 manuscripts in which the arrangement SU-NU may be found, these are Ha⁵, Ra³, Tc¹, Ht, and Gl.

CL is next in the arrangement, opening on folio 90^r with the standard rubric and 3-line ornamental capital. The text of the prologue is copied in a stanzaic form with each stanza containing varying numbers of lines. This arrangement is particularly unusual as this prologue is composed in rhyming couplets, and we would therefore expect it to be copied as one continuous whole. The word 'Pausacio' is written in the same hand in the margin alongside the final line of each of these stanzas, apart from at line 30 which ends the fourth stanza at the bottom of folio 90^r. However the final lines of this stanza have been squashed in to allow the complete stanza to appear on the same folio, and the opening line of the following page is marked by an ornamental capital, thus proving that these lines were intended to be divided from the rest of the prologue. Each of these seven stanzas opens with an ornamental capital, and the breaks occur at lines 6, 14, 20, 30, 38, 46 and 56. This arrangement seems particularly significant when compared with other manuscripts. Hg presents the prologue as one continuous piece of text, with paragraph markers at each of the same positions as the breaks in Ad³, except at line 46 which has no paragraph marker. Cp also copies the text as one whole, yet includes the word 'Pausacio' in the margin alongside lines 6, 14, 20, and 30. The following folio is lost and therefore we are unable to know whether such a system would have been continued. Ha⁴ adopts the more conventional practice of simply arranging the text as one complete block with no stanzaic or paragraph divisions, as with all other pieces written in rhyming couplets. The arrangement of this prologue in El is particularly significant as this manuscript employs exactly the same method as Ad³, altered only in the addition of a 'Pausacio' alongside line 30, and the use of paraphs at the beginning of each stanza instead of ornamental capitals. The only other manuscripts to employ this format are Ha⁵, which uses both stanzas and pausacios, and Ra¹ which adds pausacios at lines 7, 14, 21, 28, 38, and 56.

CL follows directly on from the prologue with the rubric: 'Here bigynneth the Clerkes tale of Oxenforde', and the tale is divided into 5 sections. These are not specifically referred to as separate parts, but are marked by a one stanza gap in the text, or a 2-3-line ornamental capital. The tale ends with L13 marked by a 2-line ornamental capital and a rubric. There is no L14 or explicit, and the tale is followed directly by the rubric: 'Here bigynneth the prologe of the Marchantz tale'. The text of L15 opens with the echo of the last line of the preceding Envoy thus establishing a direct link between the two tales. The last nine lines of L15, and the opening and first 64 lines of ME are missing due to loss of leaves. The rest of the tale continues uninterrupted until its conclusion on folio 122^r with the explicit: 'Here endeth the Marchantz tale'. This is followed by a 2-line ornamental capital which marks the beginning of L17, the Merchant's Endlink, which also incorporates all of the introduction to SQ, separated only by a paragraph mark. None of this text is headed and the next rubric follows directly on from this as an introduction to SQ: 'Here bigynneth the squyers tale'. The text of SQ includes a division of parts 1 and 2 marked by a Latin rubric on folio 127^r, with the tale ending on folio 131^v, which contains just 3 lines. There is no explicit to signal the end of SQ, and as there is a quire break at the end of folio 130^v it seems that the ending of this unfinished tale was begun on a new quire to allow the scribe to wait for an ending. The seven other leaves that would have made up this quire are now missing, and the remainder of 131^v has subsequently been filled with scribbled drawings and signatures. It is clear therefore that no ending was ever received, and also that the scribe never returned to tidy up the gap he had left after SQ. These signs of uncertainty continue at the top of folio 132^r where L20, the lines linking the Squire and the Franklin appear, yet without any heading. The text begins with a unique 8-line ornamental capital introducing the line: 'In feith squier thow hast the wel y quy't'. The regular method of rubrication is regained at the top of folio 132^v, where the text of FK is introduced with the incipit: 'Here bigynneth the frankeleyns tale', and with a 2-line ornamental capital.

FK is followed directly by PH, which is in turn followed by L21 with the rubric: 'Here bigynneth the prologe of the reheytyng of our hoost'. This link ends on folio 148^v with the explicit: 'Here endeth the reheytyng of our hoost'. PD follows with a series of subheadings within the tale. At line 260/1 the heading 'Of hasardrye' appears, at line 302/1 'Of sweryng', and at line 332/1 we find 'Of Riatours'. The manuscript continues with SH, which is missing its last 17 lines due to a lost folio. This folio would also have contained L24 and the first 28 lines of PR, which are now also missing. The rest of PR follows without loss, followed by L25, the exchange between the host and Chaucer under the rubric: 'Here bygynneth the reheytyng of our hoost'. This is followed by TT, which ends on folio 168^r, and is followed by the host's interruption, L28, entitled: 'Here bigynneth a reheytyng of our hoost'. This is followed on folio 168^v with the introduction to TM, which opens with the rubric: 'Here bigynneth Chaucers tale of Melibee and prudence'. TM ends with the rubric: 'Here endeth Chaucers tale of Melibee and prudence', and is followed by MO with the incipit: 'Here bigynneth the monkes tale'. MO contains the Adam stanza and places the Modern Instances at the end, thus obscuring the echo found in L30 of the tragedy of Croesus which is frequently the last of the Monk's stories. L30 follows next in its long form, as it is found in 14 MSS, with the Knight as the interrupter of the Monk. NP comes next, and L31 which follows the tale in 10 manuscripts is not included in this manuscript.

MA stands after NP, with its prologue which sets up a dramatic situation that demands that a tale be told by the Cook, and it seems to be for this reason that this tale is followed by CO. The scribe ignores the reference to Bobbe-up-and-down under the Blee and its link with the reference to the Blean forest in L33, apparently considering the links with CO to be more compelling. CO is copied directly after MA with no sign of hesitation, nor any attempt to conceal the clashes that occur between the references in L3 and the material that directly surrounds this new positioning. While the sequence MA-CO does answer the demands of L36, it also creates problems through the references to RE that remain in L3. These references are generally used to unite these

two tales, yet in this manuscript there are approximately 180 folios in between the two, and the Cook's close reference to RE is left looking inappropriate. The scribe shows no uncertainty in coping with the sudden, and unfinished ending of CO, and the tale ends with no allusion to its incompleteness. This is followed by the second tale of Group G, CY: a tale which stands alone due to the earlier placement of NU. However the opening two lines which traditionally provide the link between CY and NU are not in this text. This tale ends on folio 228^r, with the rubric: 'Here endeth the tale of the chanons yeman'. This is then followed by L37, which retains the reference to the Manciple in the first line despite the fact that MA appears three tales previously. The manuscript ends at line 472 of PA, with the rest of the tale and RT missing due to the loss of all remaining folios.

With regard to content this manuscript sticks rigidly to what we now consider to be the accepted *Canterbury Tales* canon, and there are none of the spurious additions that occur in other manuscripts. The scribe does not attempt to conceal any incompleteness or inconsistency by adding extra tales, such as TG, or by composing new links. The material missing from this text is due to subsequent loss rather than to scribal incompetence or problems concerning the availability of exemplars. As many of the lost folios are missing from the beginning and end of the manuscript, particularly from KN and PA, this would seem to be the result of a long time spent in an unbound state; a theory further corroborated by the number of heavily soiled leaves found at either end of the manuscript. This was a complete manuscript at one stage, and there are many indications that the scribe was careful to include all the material that was available to him. This is exemplified by his treatment of SQ where he includes the opening two lines of Part III, where many manuscripts omit them in an effort to tidy up the incomplete tale, and leaves a spare quire to incorporate any text that may follow.

While the scribe adopted a rigorous attitude towards the content of the text, he was similarly disciplined in his organisation and presentation of the material. He adopts a standard procedure for indicating the beginnings of prologues and tales. Each prologue is marked by a 3/4-line blue ornamental capital, while the tales are introduced

by a 3/4-line ornamental capital in gold. However the regularity of this system is disturbed by missing folios at the beginnings of many of the early prologues and tales, leaving a haphazard feel to this scheme. There is much consistency in the use of running heads, which all follow the same format and are written in the same hand as the text, always referring to the teller of the tale. The only evidence of inconsistency in this system is found on the verso leaves of folios 116-119, and on the recto leaves of folios 119-121, where the paragraph markers for the running heads have been neatly drawn in, but the headings referring to the Merchant have been omitted. The use of a regularized system of incipits and explicits is further evidence of the scribe's formal approach to the presentation of his material, and his standard procedure is maintained where possible. The lack of coincidence of tale and quire boundaries (the spare quire left at the end of SQ is the only instance of such a coincidence) is further indicative of a rigorously controlled production which has attempted to reduce inconsistency to a minimum. These aspects of the *ordinatio* of the manuscript suggest that careful planning went into the production of the manuscript, either by the scribe or a supervisor, before copying was begun: a standard system was devised and then implemented wherever possible.

Having considered the treatment of the *ordinatio* and the extra-textual aspects, it is important to examine the method of distributing the material itself, in order to establish any guiding principles by which the text was arranged. The earlier sections of the manuscript, particularly groups A-B¹-D, suggest a particular desire to establish a Prologue-Tale-Prologue scheme, which is particularly reinforced by the inclusion of a Prologue for KN. The decision to separate the first 34 lines of KN from the main body of the tale and to refer to them as KN Prologue must be based upon organisational principles, as there is no justification in the text for such a division. Indeed the final lines of GP suggest that the tale itself will follow, while the opening lines of KN which form its prologue in Ad³ represent the beginning of the story with the use of the traditional rhetorical devices of *occupatio* and *diminutio*. The presence of a guiding system based upon the Prologue-Tale sequence rather than the more common Tale-Link

pattern is further justified by the lack of endlinks found in the text, which would serve no purpose in such a system. However, this regular format breaks down at the end of SU which ends without an explicit, and is followed by NU without a prologue, a position found in a number of early manuscripts. A further difference occurs in the rubric introducing NU which refers to the content of the tale and not simply the teller: 'Here bigynneth the nonnes tale of seint Cecilie'. There is an attempt to regain the consistency of the organisation in the following sequence containing CL-ME-SQ-FK, although the complications that these pieces involve are not satisfactorily overcome. Although the scribe includes the complete text of the Merchant's Endlink and the Squire's Headlink, no rubrics are provided and he seems to have been unsure as to what these pieces represented. The omission of L14 at the end of CL would seem to represent an attempt to return to a Prologue-Tale system which such a stanza disrupts, while also accentuating the echo of the last line of the Envoy in the opening of L15. The lack of headings for L20 signals a likely confusion, and it is not until the opening of FK that the original format returns. The desire to establish conformity in the rubrication is further exemplified by the presentation of later links which do not represent official prologues. These links, such as L21, are consistently referred to by the rubric 'The reheytyng of our hoost'. While this shows a desire to adopt a standard method, it may also reveal a possible uncertainty as such rubrics may be used irrespective of content or position. The appearance of the particularly unusual rubric to introduce L21, 'Here bigynneth the prologe of the reheytyng of our hoost', may be the result of a wish to implement these linking passages into the Prologue-Tale scheme, although such an attempt was discarded for all later pieces. The remainder of the text fits neatly into the scribe's governing system, and there is little sign of irregularity in the final tales and links. The only sign of any alteration of this format appears in the rubric that announces the beginning of PA: 'Here bigynneth the persons tale in prose'. This may represent an element of uncertainty, as the reference to the prose format of the tale may have been included as a direction to the copyist.

The scribal attitude to the text may be further understood by a study of the use of subdivisions in the presentation of the material. The scribe of this manuscript shows a particular fondness for the use of part divisions and subheadings, which appear either within the text itself or as part of the elaborate marginal glossing system. The only remaining division in KN occurs on folio 20^r, although if any other such divisions were present they are now missing due to lost folios. The marginalia in this tale also serve to provide subheadings, sometimes through a simple 'Exemplum' or 'Argumentum' or a more specific reference such as: 'The preyour of Palamoun to Venus goddesse of loue'. ML retains the division between parts 2 and 3, although the division between parts 1 and 2 is now missing. Parts 1 and 2 of SQ are divided by an explicit and incipit which occur within the text itself. However, despite the inclusion of the first two lines of Part 3, no division is made and the text forms part of the second section. A division also occurs within the text of PA, separating the first two parts of Penitence. While the text also includes traditional subheadings such as the carver's advice concerning the dividing of the fart in SU, other more unusual rubrics are included. WBP includes the extra heading 'Biholde how this good wif serued hir .iij first husbondes which were gode olde men', while on folio 78^r of SU the subheading 'De quodam potestate iracundo' appears. The use of the divisions in PD, 'Of hasardrye', 'Of sweryng' and 'Of Riatours', gives the tale the appearance more of a sermon than of a story.

From this information we are able to make certain assumptions concerning the nature of the copytext used by the scribe of this manuscript. The rigorous organisation of the text and the lack of uncertainty displayed suggest that the scribe had all his material available before he began copying. The lack of coincidence of tale and quire boundaries indicates that the ordering of the text was carefully developed before any attempt was made to begin the copying process. The only evidence of any uncertainty occurs at the end of SQ where an empty quire was left to allow the inclusion of an ending. The adjustment of the position of CO suggests an intimate knowledge of the entire text of the poem before copying, as the editor must have been aware of the content of L36 and L37 in order to have spotted the necessity for a tale to be told by the

Cook between the exchange in L36 and the host's final words to the Parson: 'For euery man saue thow hath told his tale'. The scribe's apparent freedom in the ordering of his material may be suggestive of a disordered physical state of the exemplar, or alternatively may be indicative of a rather over-zealous nature in our scribe. His ordering may be that of an earlier manuscript, or it may represent a dissatisfaction with an arrangement that was not accorded the hallowed status of our post-Furnivall era. In order to determine the exact motivation behind this unique ordering we must hold the Ad³ arrangement up to the light of other important manuscript orders, and consider its peculiarities within the overall development displayed by these earlier witnesses.

Despite the great variety of arrangements of tales and links displayed by the many manuscripts of this poem, the order of certain elements retain a surprising degree of consistency and are therefore assumed to be associated with the original authorial copytext. Other groupings are remarkably unstable, particularly Groups E and F, although certain patterns emerge across the witnesses, and from these we are able to establish specific traditions and affiliations. Group A remains particularly fixed in its position at the head of the poem, and in the order of the five elements of which it is composed. GP is clearly intended to introduce the entire work, and more specifically KN, while each of the following tales of the group includes a prologue which terminates the previous tale and opens the next. The major uncertainty associated with this Group is caused by the incomplete CO which is expanded by the inclusion of TG in 25 manuscripts, particularly those of *c* and *d* descent. ML is not linked to any other parts of the poem through internal or external references, yet there is much agreement concerning its positioning after the tales of Group A, and it is displaced in only 7 anomalous and 7 *d* manuscripts. Such stability is particularly unusual for a group that consists of one tale, and this degree of consensus may link this arrangement with an archetypal copytext. L8 follows the tale in 35 manuscripts, and this piece introduces a great deal of confusion over the name of the interrupting pilgrim and the tale which should follow. Ad³ omits the link altogether, a feature which is common to all manuscripts of *a* ordering. Group D which follows is a firmly knit group which is only

disrupted in Hk, and even its placement after ML is extremely consistent. The three tales of the group are linked through the content of the prologues, particularly WBP where the quarrel between the Friar and the Summoner is first instigated. The arrangement of the next two groups is very inconsistent, and the arrangement of these four tales varies dramatically across the witnesses. Even the linking passages are subject to change, and an adapted form of Hg's SQ-ME link appears as the SQ-FK link in manuscripts of the *a* tradition. Similarly the ME-FK link found in Hg becomes the ME-SQ link in the form in which it is found in *a* manuscripts. The sequence of these tales found in Ad³ is further indicative of the *a* tradition, although all pure type *a* manuscripts include L14 which is omitted in Ad³. The spare quire left at the end of SQ is also significant as most manuscripts seem content to allow this tale to stand in its unfinished state, and consequently leave no space for a continuation. Considering the late date of composition for this manuscript, it would also seem unlikely for any extra material to become available that had not been received by earlier copyists, and we would expect the scribe to have accepted that this was an incomplete tale and treat it accordingly. The Hg scribe leaves no space for an ending to this tale, and the first two lines of Part III are included and followed directly by the SQ-ME link. Most other scribes show a similar diffidence towards the incomplete state of this tale, and the most common irregularities are simply attempts to tidy up the awkward nature of the ending. However the scribes of Dd and El do leave space at the end of this tale, and clearly expect that an ending will be forthcoming. This suggests a crucial difference in the nature of the copytexts used by these scribes at this point in the exemplar: a suggestion which has led Blake to the explanation that: 'it might (...) be sensible to acknowledge the possibility of an intermediate text between Dd 4.24 and the original copytext' (Blake 1985b:126). PH and PD follow, and these tales are joined by the linking passage in which the host addresses both pilgrims. The placement of these two tales after FK is a further indication of *a* ordering, as 25 other manuscripts, particularly those of *c* and *d* traditions, place Group G at this position. This is followed by Group B², the largest of the Constant Groups, whose tales are all joined through a consistent sequence of links.

The position of the group remains extremely consistent across the witnesses, and is disturbed only in Ch, Se, Nl, and Hg, although the Hg positioning is assumed to be the result of misbinding. The only consistent problems occur over the inclusion of the Adam stanza and the position of the Modern Instances in MO, the two forms of L30, and the omission or inclusion of L31. Ad³ includes the Adam stanza and places the Modern Instances at the end of the tale; a position which concurs with that of 15 other manuscripts, particularly those of the *a* tradition. L30 is found in its long form, a version which adds 20 lines to the shorter form used in 14 other manuscripts, which include Hg and Cp. L31 appears only in Ch and Cx² and *a* manuscripts, although of these it does not appear in El, Gg, Bo¹, Ph² or Ad³. Four manuscripts with *a* orderings, Cn, Ma, En³, and Ad¹, add an extra 6-line continuation of L31 in an attempt to link NP with the following NU. As we have seen earlier the position of NU-CY after Group B² is typical of *a* manuscripts, thought to be the result of the two references to the Blean forest in L33 and L36, although these two tales are regularly joined together due to the reference in the opening line of L33 to the life of Saint Cecilia. The only manuscripts to split Group G are the five manuscripts which omit CY, and Nl and Gl. Nl places CY after PD, adapting the opening line of the prologue accordingly: 'Whan endit was this tale meryle', while Gl positions both CL and CY after RT: probably the result of scribal omission during copying. MA and PA then complete the poem, usually standing alongside each other due to the reference to the end of MA in the opening line of L37, although this order is disrupted in Ra³, Tc¹, Ch, Gl, and Ad³. PA is then followed by RT, although this is missing in many manuscripts due to loss of leaves.

It is clear that Ad³ is closely allied with the arrangement common to the *a* tradition, although there are certain major features which indicate a departure from this order. The most significant of these are the removal of CO and consequent disruption of Group A, and the splitting of Group G, with the unusual placement of both NU and CY. As we have seen above CO forms a stable part of Group A in all but eight manuscripts, and has therefore been considered to have been placed there by Chaucer

himself. The references in L3 link the tale to RE, and the only real confusion CO presents concerns its unfinished state. Scholars have largely overlooked the evidence presented by Ad³, and most have assumed the adjustment to be the result of scribal error or problems in obtaining exemplars. However the motivation behind this action is more likely to represent a logical attempt at scribal editing, although in attempting to regularize the text in this way, the scribe introduced further inconsistencies caused by the references now found in L3, and it is significant that he never attempted to adapt or remove this link.

This adjustment cannot be explained as scribal error or an impulse decision for the alteration must have been made before copying began, as the two tales involved stand at either ends of the poem in the *a* arrangement, and therefore an intimate knowledge of the poem before copying must be assumed. The physical make-up of the manuscript at these two points betrays no signs of hesitancy, and the scribe makes no allowance for a later rearrangement. No caution is displayed over the ending of CO, in contrast to the treatment of SQ, and we must assume that the scribe was aware that no further text would arrive at a later date. This evidence leads to the conclusion that while the scribe felt at liberty to adjust the order of the tales, he was unwilling to make any alterations to the text itself. The fact that the scribe has confidently altered the order that is now regarded as the most successful and has disrupted the arrangement of a group which is generally assumed to be the work of the author himself is more problematic. It is possible that the scribe felt totally at liberty to impose his own scheme upon the order of the text, or was trying to reorganise disordered pieces in his copytext. The copy of CO may have become separated from the remainder of the group thus encouraging repositioning, or the entire arrangement may have seemed much more tentative than we have since assumed. A further possibility is the existence of an earlier manuscript with this ordering which has since been lost. In order to resolve these problems we must gain a clearer picture of the scribe's attitude to the arrangement, by considering this evidence in the light of the most significant of his changes.

While the scribe's treatment of Group G is unusual, particularly for a manuscript that shows close affiliations with the *a* tradition, there are many peculiarities concerning these two tales and their appearances in the early manuscript tradition which must be considered. It is important to highlight the problems associated with the tales themselves and to trace the various solutions presented in the formative stages of manuscript production. The presentation of NU causes particular confusion regarding the various methods of referring to the speaker, such as 'Nun' or 'Second Nun', and the division of the text into a prologue and tale. The pilgrim is referred to as the 'Second Nun' in 39 manuscripts and as the 'Nun' in only eight manuscripts, while the prologue and tale division is found in 30 manuscripts. Scholars have also commented on the inconsistencies between the female narrator's reference to herself as an unworthy son of Eve, and her tale as a written text to be read. NU is not linked with any other tale in the poem outside CY, and this linking couplet is unique as it relates L33 to the tale of the life of Saint Cecilia and does not name the Second Nun herself.

In order to understand the significance of Group G, and its treatment by the Ad³ scribe, we must trace its development throughout the early witnesses of the poem. I shall begin the discussion with Hg, as it is accepted as the earliest extant manuscript. The subsequent order of composition is more problematic so I have elected to consider each tradition in turn, thereby postponing any conclusions as to the dating of individual manuscripts at this stage, thus creating the order: Hg, Cp, La, Dd, El, Gg, Ha⁴, Pw. NU forms part of quire 22 of Hg, the 7th quire of Section IV: the longest part of the manuscript to be written as an indivisible unit. This quire is anomalous and contains 16 leaves, which cover the end of FK, the whole of NU, and the beginning of CL. While this situation would seem to preclude any possibility of uncertainty, scholars have noted that NU is copied in a darker shade of ink and therefore must have been a later insertion (Doyle and Parkes 1979:xxxix). However the space for the later inclusion of this tale must have been allowed during copying, and the exact length of the tale must therefore have been known in advance. The only extra space that remains unfilled is the second half of folio 165^r after the end of FK, which may have been left to accommodate a FK-

NU link, and now contains an explicit added in a different hand. The tale itself begins without an incipit, and there is no distinction between prologue and tale, although line 120 is marked by a 2-line ornamental capital. The running heads refer consistently to 'The Nonne' and the tale ends with the explicit: 'Here is ended the Nonnes tale'. CY does not appear in Hg, and there are therefore no external references to NU or to her tale. The omission of CY from this manuscript has led Blake to claim that it may represent a spurious addition, and he argues that NU may have been deliberately withheld in anticipation of linking it with CY which was still under composition (Blake 1985b:84). Doyle and Parkes, in their very different analysis of the production of Hg, regard the doubling of quire 22 and the later addition of NU as 'another and larger interpolation or rearrangement in the course of production of section IV, for which no or not enough allowance had been made in advance' (Doyle and Parkes 1979:xxxii).

The earliest *c* manuscript is Cp, a manuscript which includes both NU and CY and positions them between FK and PH. However the end of FK and the beginning of NU are missing due to a lost leaf. There is no distinction between the prologue and the tale, nor are there any stanzaic divisions in any of the text. The running heads refer to 'Seint Cecile', and the tale ends with the anonymous explicit: 'Here endep Seint Ceciles Tale'. This is followed by L33 which opens with the reference to the end of the Life of Saint Cecilia. Therefore there is no reference to the Nun in Cp, although without the opening of the tale and the incipit this evidence remains inconclusive. The evidence of Cp also shows that the Hg positioning of NU, which has no external or internal justification, has been retained even after the inclusion of L33 and its reference to the Blean forest. La, possibly a copy of Cp, adopts the order of this manuscript and thus its placement of Group G. The tale opens with the rubric: 'Incipit prologus .2^e. Monyalys', and the prologue and the tale are divided by the rubric: 'Explicit prologus Incipit fabula'. The tale ends with the rubric 'Explicit vita Sancte Cecilie' and is followed by CY which is in turn joined to PH by the addition of a 16-line linking passage. The running heads remain consistent throughout the tale,

referring to 'the Nonne'; thus creating the unusual situation where the pilgrim is termed both the Nun and the Second Nun.

The manuscripts of the *a* arrangement present a more radical adjustment of the Hg treatment of Group G. The general pattern that this tradition presents sees Group G moved from its previous position to a later placement between NP and MA. Skeat explained this as the result of the recognition of the two references to the Blean forest in L33 and MA, and this theory has been generally accepted. Seven of the *a* manuscripts also introduce L31, and Ad¹, Cn, En³, Ma include a 6-line extension to link NP and NU. The earliest of these manuscripts is probably Dd, and it is with this that I shall begin. Dd includes L31 after NP and it is probably the first manuscript to include this piece. After L31 there is a gap of 13 blank lines, followed by the rubric: 'Heere endeth the tale of the Nonnes Preest and bigynneth the Secund Nonnes tale of Seynt Cecile withoute a prologe'. The presence of the blank lines shows that the scribe left a gap for a passage that would link the two tales, and subsequently received L31. The link is redundant for the purpose for which it was intended, and Blake argues that the scribe reacted by concluding the tale after the link, thus highlighting that this passage forms part of the previous tale (Blake 1985b:127). This theory is supported by the wording of the incipit which reiterates that NU has no prologue, and that this is not simply a case of scribal incompetence.

While sharing the same positioning for the tales as Dd, E1 approaches the problem from a different angle and presents a clearer solution. Having determined that L31 cannot serve as a link between NP and NU, the E1 scribe omits the piece altogether. He then introduces a division at line 120, thus producing a NU Prologue which, while it does not join the two tales, achieves the degree of conformity sought after by the Dd scribe. The E1 scribe consistently refers to the teller of the tale as the 'Second Nun', and any former confusion has been eliminated by the composition of this highly regular manuscript. Gg follows the order already established by the earlier *a* manuscripts and, as with E1, L31 has been omitted. The leaf containing the opening of NU is now missing, as is the leaf that would have contained the division between prologue and tale,

if such a division was included. As there are no running heads in this manuscript, and the explicit reads: 'Here folwyn the mery wordys of chaucer & of þ^e host', it is impossible to know to which pilgrim the tale was originally allocated. Thus the evidence of Gg remains insufficient for any significant analysis beyond the observation of the ordering of the group, and the excision of L31.

The evidence of Ha⁴ basically represents a more controlled development of the presentation found in Cp. NU follows directly on from FK with the incipit: 'And here bygynneth þe Secounde Nonnes tale'. There is no prologue and tale division as with Cp, and the stanzaic breaks are marked by ornamental capitals and not gaps in the text. The running heads refer consistently to the 'Secounde Nonne', and the tale ends with the explicit: 'Her endeth þe secounde Nonne hir tale of þe lif of seint Cecilie'. NU is linked to CY in the standard manner, and this group is followed by PH. Pw, the earliest manuscript of the *d* tradition, presents Group G in this same position modelled on the Hg order. The rubrication refers consistently to the Second Nun and the text includes the prologue and tale division. CY follows NU, complete with the linking reference, and this is united further within the framework by the addition of a 14-line CY-PH link.

Having considered the development of the placement of the group within the earliest witnesses of the various traditions, we must now turn to the evidence of Ad³ and consider this within the manuscript tradition as a whole. NU is placed much earlier in the arrangement than CY, standing between SU and CL. As this position falls between two constant groups it does not create any confusion over external references. While the adjustment does not introduce any inconsistencies at this point, the scribe makes no effort to incorporate the tale into the framework, and the breakdown in the rubrication reveals a sense of possible uncertainty. The treatment of CY however seems to present a markedly different attitude to that of NU. The first two lines of L33, which contain the reference to the Life of Saint Cecilia do not appear and the prologue opens with line three. This would seem to present the first example of the scribe doctoring the text in order to add a sense of consistency to his alterations. However line four

retains the reference to 'boughtoun vnder the blee' despite the fact that L36, containing a similar reference to the Blean forest, now appears two tales previously. Thus the scribe would seem to have removed the inconsistency from the first couplet, ignoring that of the second. However the evidence provided by the adjustment of CO suggests that the scribe was reluctant to adapt the text, and it seems unlikely that the scribe who left such great confusion in L3 would be troubled by a single awkward reference. This suggests that the text of CY as we find it in Ad³ is derived from an early copy in which these two lines had not yet been added, possibly before the tale was incorporated into the overall framework. As we have seen above this tale is not included in Hg, and this is possibly the state of the text of this tale before it was introduced into the framework as part of the post-Hg development. The two lines that were subsequently added are significant as they refer ambiguously to the Life of Saint Cecilia, and not the Second Nun. As we have seen above this is a feature of Cp where there are no references to the teller of the tale in the extant text, although without the complete text this theory remains somewhat speculative. The disposition of NU in Ad³ carries many of the features associated with earlier witnesses of this tale. There is no division of prologue and tale, and the running heads and rubrics refer consistently to the 'Nonne'. The inclusion of a prologue and the reference to a Second Nun are features associated particularly with manuscripts of the *a* tradition, and it is significant that Ad³ shows neither of these. Thus it would seem that this manuscript, whose order is predominantly based upon that of the *a* tradition, received copies of these two tales that pre-date all the developments now associated with the manuscripts that make up this tradition. The lack of a linking reference in L33 suggests a situation where these tales were not joined, and the position of NU is clearly influenced by earlier orders. While the position of NU in this manuscript does not follow the pattern established by the *c* and *d* traditions and Ha⁴, it may be influenced by Hg itself, with NU appearing directly before CL in both manuscripts, and no others. The position of CY is also unusual, although it remains influenced by the standard *a* arrangement. However the scribe ignores the tentative link with L36, and the *a* order which places this tale before MA, and places CY between CO and PA. The reference to

MA in the first line of L37 is also ignored, although this may be further evidence of Hg influence, as the word 'maunciple' in this manuscript is written over an erasure and is therefore suggestive of a provisional arrangement.

Thus the evidence of the ordering of Ad³ presents a unique blend of features relating to both the already-established *a* tradition, with close associations with El, and also earlier influences, particularly that of Hg. While the evidence of Group G is particularly instructive in determining these affiliations, it is also crucial in a study of the development of the order of the tales in the manuscript tradition in its entirety. In his article 'The Order of *The Canterbury Tales*' Benson identifies two distinctive arrangements from which all manuscript orders are derived. The first of these is the familiar *a*-El order, while the second, the non-*a*, differs only in the placement of Group G between Groups F and C. Benson argues that both of these are Chaucerian in origin and that the *a*-El order represents the revised form. He also suggests that the difference may have occurred due to the misplacement of Group G in copying. However this hypothesis represents an over-simplistic interpretation of the textual evidence relating to this group, which reveals a more deliberate progression of scribal attempts to accommodate these two tales. The arrangement reached by the editor of El is simply a more outwardly satisfactory achievement than that of other manuscripts. Yet we must not mistake the smooth and consistent appearance of El for evidence of genuine authorship. Ad³, a manuscript which clearly had access to the *a*-El models, had texts for Group G that related to the non-*a* tradition, and he consequently presented a different scheme for the arrangement of these pieces. The features of these texts not only highlight the edited nature of El, but their treatment by the Ad³ scribe reveals a definite attempt to achieve a more satisfactory or simply an alternative arrangement. The haphazard nature of these attempts only serves to emphasize the theory that there is no archetypal order, and that Chaucer was not responsible for any of the orders as we find them in our extant manuscripts.

It is not only the major textual features that reveal a close relationship between Ad³ and El, for elements of the *ordinatio* and particularly the *marginalia* suggest close

links between the two. The unusual layout of CL Prologue discussed earlier suggests access to the El materials, while the evidence of Hg and Cp suggests that this feature is also related to these two manuscripts. The marginalia are particularly important as they reveal Ellesmerian influence on a grand scale, and will be considered more fully in chapter 5. Thus the evidence of these features of the manuscript's ordinatio serve to establish an extremely close relationship between the Ad³ copytext and El itself. Yet this evidence may also be traced back through earlier traditions to Hg. The evidence of the tale-order in Ad³ highlights access to materials relating to both Hg and El, and with an early stage in the arrangement of the tales unrecorded in any other extant manuscript.

Chapter 4

Omissions and Additions

In the previous chapter I showed that while Ad³ has lost much text since its composition, the scribe or director was careful to include all the tales and links available and was reluctant to alter or omit pieces of the text itself. In this chapter I shall provide a complete study of the minor textual omissions and additions in order to assess the scribe's attitude to the text, his competence over long periods of copying, and the state of his copytext. This study will also provide information concerning the affiliations with other witnesses, which may become evident through agreement in minor errors. This will allow further consideration of the theories posited in the last chapter, and consequently a more detailed assessment of the place of Ad³ within the textual tradition as a whole. As the potential amount of textual variance is large, this chapter will contain a study of omissions and additions that constitute at least an entire line in length throughout the complete text; variation within an individual line will be the subject of chapter 7. This chapter will also present an analysis of the possible reasons for this variation and its value to a fuller understanding of the textual tradition of the poem.

The first major problem encountered in a study of this nature is establishing a base text, in order to discover where a line has been omitted and where extra lines have been incorporated. This is particularly important for a late manuscript with an eclectic textual tradition, such as Ad³. In order to establish the fundamental differences between the text of Ad³ and the earliest and best text of the poem, I have elected to use Hg for this purpose, which is widely considered to be the earliest witness and the closest to the Chaucerian original. For L33 and CY which are not found in Hg, I shall use Cp as my base text. Having located all the complete lines that vary from these base texts, I shall then analyse the appearance of such variations in other manuscripts, recording any affiliations that may become evident. A comparison of these two

witnesses reveals that there are twenty-three lines missing from the Ad³ text, and a further four lines absent from the text of L33 as it is found in Cp: a surprisingly low number for a text that has frequently been regarded as the product of a sloppy copyist. Some of these omissions may be understood as a result of scribal eyeskip, where the repetition of the opening words, or rhyme words of two separate lines has caused the scribe's eye to move to a line later in the text, thus omitting the intervening passage. A good example of this form of scribal error occurs within TM where line 192 has been omitted due to the repetition of the phrase 'trew frende' at the end of both lines 191 and 192. A further example of this occurs within this same tale, although in this instance the omission has been further induced by a change of folio in the Ad³ manuscript. Here the scribe has copied the first half of line 456: 'this is to seyn the dedly synnes that ben entred in to thin' at the foot of folio 179^r, and then at the head of the fresh folio his eye has been drawn by the exact repetition of this phrase at the end of line 457, causing him to omit all the intervening text. It is for this reason that instead of Dame Prudence warning of the seven deadly sins which may enter a man's heart through his five wits, Ad³ has them coming in through the windows. A change of folio during a piece with extended anaphora has also caused the omission of line 2070 from KN. In this passage describing the construction of Arcite's funeral pyre, three lines begin with 'And thanne'. In Ad³ these lines occur at the head of folio 26^r, and the scribe has missed the first of these presumably as a result of the repetition and the change of folio. Two further omissions seem to fall into this category, although the causes of these errors are less clear than above. The first of these is the omission of lines 131 and 132 of MI, where the similarity in the wording and the repetition of the word 'red' in the openings of lines 131 and 133, 'His rode was reed' and 'In hoses rede', may have influenced their exclusion. Similarly the omission of line 318 of PD may be due to the similarity of the openings of lines 317 and 319: 'I seye that' and 'How that'. Although the interpretations of these later omissions are somewhat tentative, we may be confident that the omissions described are simply the result of scribal error, and are not due to conscious scribal editing. The most significant conclusion to be drawn derives from

the extremely small number of such errors throughout such a large piece of copying, especially within extended pieces of prose as found in TM and PA.

Omission also occurs when the scribe's eye is drawn down to a later line while in the middle of copying an earlier line. Having copied the opening words of line 1159 of ME, 'First whan his sight', the scribe then added the final words of line 1162: 'slaked be a while', thus causing the omission of lines 1160 and 1161. This may have been influenced by the similarity in the openings of lines 1159 and 1161: 'First whan his sighte', and 'Til that your sighte'. A similar mistake is evident in the omission of lines 266 and 267 from the same tale, although in this example there seems to be no explanation for mixing lines 265 and 266. It is also significant that these omissions are entire couplets and that their exclusion does therefore not affect the rhyme scheme. However there are four examples where single lines have been omitted, with no attempt to repair the rhyme scheme. I can find no explanation for these omissions and must assume that they are simply the result of scribal carelessness. The text omitted is unusually innocent in content and any theories of possible editing or censorship may be discounted. One omission, that of the final line of TT, was possibly deliberate as it fits awkwardly into the layout of the text, or it may have been omitted in the exemplar as it is not found in many earlier texts.

Having considered omissions which seem to be the result of simple scribal error and whose significance seems limited, I now move on to more complex textual problems where omitted lines seem to carry a weightier importance. In line 806 of TM the repetition of the word 'confessioun' seems to have caused the scribe to omit the second of these, although on the first of these occasions he has aptly written the word 'confusioun'. Having then written the first three words of line 807 he skips to the end, cutting the line very short. The reading that this gives for line 807 is also found in Dd, El, and Gg, while the Hg reading is found in Cp and Ha⁴. However the case is more complex than the simple preservation of a misreading throughout a manuscript group. The sense of the Hg reading is unclear, and a look at the text in the manuscript itself reveals a large space left between 'in another place' and 'that hath shame of his synne'.

This shows that the Hg scribe was certainly aware that some text was missing from this line, either through a realisation that the sense is unclear or, more likely, due to a physical indication in his copytext. The Cp and Ha⁴ manuscripts have made slight adjustments to the text in order to improve the sense: Cp adds a third person pronoun giving: 'He þat haþ schame for his synne and knowlecheþ it', while Ha⁴ also adds the pronoun but removes the 'and'. While these adjustments may make better sense of the sentence itself, they do not add to a comprehension of the clause within the passage as a whole. The confusion over this line is further demonstrated by the more ambitious attempts of later scribes to repair the sense, which give a variety of suggestions as to the possible rewards of contrition and repentance, such as 'worthy remissioun' (Pw), and the 'reson to be forgyuen by penaunce and grace' (Mc). It seems of further significance that the text added by these scribes is introduced after 'and knowelicheth it', and not where the Hg scribe left his large gap. This would suggest that while these scribes were aware that something was missing, they were not reacting to the same impetus as the Hg scribe. However the solution found in Ad³, El, Dd and Gg seems to be more closely linked to Hg and therefore possibly to the Hg copytext. For this reading seems to show an awareness that the line is missing a considerable amount of text which may not be recovered, and that any attempt to restore text in a place apart from the Hg gap is inaccurate. Without this missing text the line is clearly meaningless, and therefore the line was omitted altogether.

The omission of the two couplets from L33 in Ad³ seems particularly important to an understanding of the early textual history of this piece. The first of these is the opening couplet of the prologue and the implications of this have been dealt with in the previous chapter. The second couplet is found as lines 11 and 12 of the text in Cp, Gg and Ha⁴, but then appears as lines 9 and 10 in Dd. Unlike the omission of the opening couplet of L33, Ad³ is not unique in the omission of these two lines, for they are absent from both El and Fi. The inclusion of these lines in both Dd and Gg, despite their different positions, shows that this is not an error shared by these manuscripts, but a more independent variant thus strengthening the links between Ad³ and El. The

omission of these lines in El and Ad³ might be explained as scribal error, although no reason for such error is evident from the state of the text as we now have it, apart from a possible confusion caused by the repetition of the words 'so swatte'. It is extremely unlikely that the problem may be explained in such a way as Dd and Gg both treat the lines in different ways. Another possible solution is the theory of multiple exemplars, each representing the different placements of the couplet, or the text with these lines omitted. However this would seem unlikely as the minor textual variants found among these witnesses do not provide the strict manuscript groupings that such a theory would necessitate. It is also hard to imagine that many exemplars for this tale were available at such an early stage in the textual history of the poem, especially when L33 and CY are not found in Hg. The problem seems to derive from confusion within the exemplar itself, where the lines have been added after the composition of the text, with no clear indication as to where they should be placed so that scribes reacted in different ways. This theory ties in with Manly-Rickert's assessment of the nature of the copytext which they describe as 'perhaps an uncorrected copy upon which Chaucer was still working' (IV. 521). Whether one argues for Chaucerian authorship of this piece or not, it is likely that the early scribes were copying from a single rough draft. The omission of these lines in the Ad³ and El manuscripts may therefore represent a further reaction to the confusion of a shared copytext. However it does seem unlikely that El, an early manuscript with a very complete text, should have omitted these lines which appear in almost every other witness of the prologue. It would be more easily understood if the lines were simply transposed owing to the confusion exhibited by the Dd manuscript. This leaves us with the conclusion that when the prologue was copied by the scribes of El and Ad³, these lines had not yet been added to the copytext. This conclusion ties in with the theory outlined in the previous chapter which argues that the text of L33 in Ad³ precedes the texts found in all other early witnesses. Therefore it would seem that during copying into these early manuscripts the text was still undergoing revision: revision which included preparing the text for inclusion into the pilgrimage framework, through the reference to the tale of the Life of Saint Cecilia.

The final sets of missing lines in this manuscript are all found in PH: a tale which exhibits much textual variation throughout the various witnesses. The omitted lines are as follows in Hg:

- 17 Outher to graue, or peynte, or forge, or bete
18 If they presumed, me to countrefete
- 41 In hire, ne lakked no condicioun
42 That is to preyse, as by discrecioun
43 As wel in goost as body, chaast was she
- 81 For euere mo, therefore, for Cristes sake
82 To teche hem vertu , looke that ye ne slake

When compared with the small number of lines omitted throughout the entire manuscript, the amount of text missing from this tale seems significant. Indeed some of these missing lines are those containing readings considered by Manly-Rickert to demonstrate evidence of authorial revision. Manly-Rickert viewed the Large Group of witnesses, essentially the *cd* manuscripts, as preserving readings derived from an unrevised version of the text. Manly-Rickert considered Ad³ to be related to this manuscript group in PH, and the apparent confusion exhibited by the above omissions from the Ad³ text may be related to this theory of authorial revision. Severs' discussion of the possibility of authorial revision in the manuscripts of PH argues strongly that the readings highlighted by Manly-Rickert can be understood as the result of scribal corruption, thus rejecting the argument for Chaucerian revision (Severs 1954). A consideration of the omissions found in the Ad³ text suggests a similar

scribal origin for the omission of these lines. Lines 17/18 and lines 81/2 are complete couplets and may easily have been omitted inadvertently, causing no disruption to the rhyme scheme. Even lines 41-3, with an odd number of lines, cause no obvious disruption of the rhyme scheme, as line 44 rhymes with line 40. In fact the rhyme word 'she' is found in both lines 40 and 43 and this recurrence may provide the reason for the scribe's omission of the intervening lines.

L21, the Physician-Pardoner link, is an interesting addition to the debate concerning the question of revision in PH. Most of the manuscripts which contain the link may be divided into two main versions: the first is found in Cp and Ha⁴, and the second in Hg, Dd, and El. This very major division has been used as evidence for unrevised and revised versions of the link, although any theory must remain highly speculative due to the length of the text. Ad³ shows confused affiliations in this piece, following the Hg school for the first twelve lines, and then switching to the Ha⁴ version for the remainder. It is important to notice that the Ha⁴ version does not simply add a couplet at line 10, but also omits lines 11 and 12 of Hg. Ad³ however, retains the Hg couplet as lines 11 and 12, and then includes the extra couplet found in Ha⁴ after line 12. It is at this point that the affiliation changes for this link in Ad³, possibly demonstrating the eclectic nature of the textual tradition it displays throughout. This switch from the Hg version to that of Ha⁴ may simply be the result of contamination, although the definitive nature of the break at line 12 suggests other possible conclusions. The split affiliations shown in the Ad³ version of the link may be viewed as corrupted versions of either tradition, or as midway stages in a process of revision, whether scribal or authorial. Thus in the Ha⁴ version we may have evidence of an unrevised link, which is then revised to give the Hg text, with the Ad³ version preserving a unique interim stage in the revision process. This theory is supported by the evidence provided by other manuscripts, Ha⁵, Cn and Ma, which incorporate the extra Ha⁴ couplet in the Ad³ position, i.e. after line 12, yet show no other textual affiliations with this earlier version. Thus the major differences in the two versions may be accounted for as part of a revision process that is preserved in three stages. The

first stage is that found in Ha⁴, while the second stage, that of Ad³, has the final form of the first 12 lines combined with the earlier version of the remainder of the link. The final version is then the fully revised link found in the Hg and El traditions. The theory of revision of the first twelve lines fits in with Manly-Rickert's analysis of the link, which claims that the first twelve lines were originally composed as a 12 line endlink to PH, which was later expanded to form a link between the Physician and the Pardoner. Further confirmation is offered by the versions found in the manuscripts of the *b*, *c* and *d* traditions, which comprise the first 12 lines of the Ha⁴ text followed by the remaining lines of Hg/El thus suggesting that the opening 12 lines of either version may have existed independently of the remainder, and may have been revised at separate stages in the compositional process. However this mixed version does not hold the unique significance of the Ad³ text as, if we assume that once the remainder of the Hg text had become available, the first 12 lines must have been also available, and therefore this version is simply a later corrupted form due to the confusion caused by the existence of multiple versions.

In order to consider the presence of additional lines in Ad³ I shall follow a similar structure as above. I shall begin by analysing the more minor additions and then move on to the larger passages which may prove more informative in identifying textual affiliations. There are two lines added in Ad³ to the Hg text of GP, which follow line 638. However these lines are found in all other manuscripts except Bo², and were presumably omitted from Hg through scribal error. This theory is supported by the repetition of the word 'Thanne' at the opening of lines 638 and 638/2, which may have induced eyeskip. In Ad³ the couplet is written over an erasure which may suggest a more direct relationship to the Hg omission. However the erasure, at the top of folio 5^r, stretches below the text of the preceding couplet thus suggesting that it is related to the four lines as a whole rather than specifically lines 638/1 and 638/2. As these lines stand at the head of a folio, it seems most likely that the scribe simply started copying at the wrong place and, having recognised his error after four lines, was compelled to erase these lines and replace them with the correct text. A further

additional two couplets are found in the copy of KN, after line 1918. These are found in all manuscripts except Hg, Py and Dd, and are generally considered by modern scholars to be part of the authorial text. This conclusion has tended to be based on subjective bias, due to the high pathetic quality of these lines. There is no obvious reason for the omission in Hg, and the omission in Dd, another early manuscript, may suggest that these lines are the work of a post-Chaucerian imitator. Certainly the wide attestation of these lines throughout the manuscript tradition ensures that little textual value may be accorded to their presence in Ad³. Similarly Ad³ contains a line after line 872 in WBT which is not found in Hg. This line forms the first of a couplet, and the second line is present in Hg, thus suggesting that this first line was in the Hg copytext and was presumably omitted through scribal error. The only other manuscript to lack this line is Ht. L1 contains an added couplet after line 46 which appears in 13 other manuscripts, of which the most significant are El, Gg, and Ha⁴. A couplet which is found after line 518 in the Cp and Ha⁴ texts of CY is also found in Ad³, although it is missing from El and all *a* manuscripts. These two instances show the various and eclectic affiliations displayed by Ad³, which is commonly closely allied with El.

The presence of two substantial additions to the Hg text in FK in only Ad³ and El demonstrate this alliance very clearly. These additions are significant as they highlight a close textual relationship between these two witnesses, in addition to the shared physical features discussed earlier, such as *ordinatio*, *marginalia*, and *tale-order*. The passages in question are a couplet after line 746, and a longer piece constituting six lines after line 782 as follows:

746/1 The same thing I seye of bilyea

746/2 Of Rodogone and ek Valeria

782/1 Peraenture an heep of yow y wis

782/2 Wol holden him a lewde man in this

782/3 That he wol put his wif in Iupertie

782/4 Herkeneth the tale er ye vpon hir crie

782/5 She may haue bettre fortune than yow semeth

782/6 And whan that ye han the tale demeth

It is difficult to evaluate how these passages appeared in these witnesses, and why they are not found in any other manuscripts. Significantly most modern editors include both these passages, presumably due to strong allegiance to the El text, although few attempt to explain their infrequent appearance in the manuscript tradition. Even Manly-Rickert include both passages, despite their belief in the supremacy of Hg and their clear aversion to the content of the first couplet: 'These lines, which occur only in Ad³ El, are so unpoetical that one would gladly believe them an editorial addition. Unfortunately, 1493-98, which also are found only in the same two MSS, seem thoroughly Chaucerian in thought and style and can hardly be rejected from the text' (IV. 487/8). In order to account for their subjective criticisms of these passages, Manly-Rickert pose the theory that the latter addition may be a late Chaucerian insertion and that 'the ancestor of El, who picked them up, was encouraged by their presence to add a few lines himself' (488). The Riverside editors include both passages with an unequivocal note confirming their authority, although with no attempt to explain this unusual attestation: 'In El Ad only, but genuine' (Benson 1987:1129). Manly-Rickert's hypothesis of separate stages of inclusion is evidently based on a highly subjective approach to these passages, and any explanation must treat both sets of lines as one combined act of revision whether Chaucerian or otherwise. There has been much debate over the possibility of authorial revision in FK, although this has centered upon the string of *exempla* which constitute Dorigen's complaint to Fortune, lines 1355-1456. The argument for revision of the complaint was raised by Dempster in an article which examined the structure of the piece by comparison with Chaucer's source,

chapters 41-46 of Jerome's *Adversus Jovinianum* (Dempster 1937). As Chaucer's ordering of *exempla* differs from that of Jerome, Dempster argued that Chaucer's return to earlier portions of his source while compiling the complaint revealed several stages of composition. In a further article Dempster used the evidence of the content and placement of a marginal gloss to reinforce her argument for a separate stage of composition at line 1395 (Dempster 1939). This gloss records the existence of more potential material in the Jerome source: 'Singulas has historias & plures hanc materiam concernentes recitat beatus Ieronimus contra Iovinianum in primo suo libro capitulo 39^o'. In addition to its unusual content, this gloss is significant as its placement varies across the nine manuscripts that contain it. Three of these manuscripts, Hg, Bo² and En³, place the gloss at line 1395, a point at which Dempster had previously charted a move from chapter 41 to chapter 43 of Jerome's text, and a difference in the treatment of the source material. Two other manuscripts containing this gloss, El and Ad³, place it alongside the end of the complaint, thus seeming to indicate a subsequent revision. However the evidence of the source material, and the changes outlined by Dempster are not sufficient evidence to support a theory of authorial revision. While the placement of the gloss at line 1395 in certain manuscripts, including Hg, may be indicative of an earlier version, there is no extant text of the complaint containing this version and therefore such a hypothesis remains difficult to support.

When we turn from this discussion to the evidence of the two extra passages found only in El and Ad³ we are on firmer ground. Here we have two passages, totally unrelated in content and function, which seem to be indicative of revision of the text of the tale as a whole. This possibility is strengthened by the appearance in these two manuscripts alone of a mass of marginal source quotation on a scale unparalleled elsewhere in the *Canterbury Tales*. This act of textual revision and marginal annotation may further include the movement of the gloss considered by Dempster, although such a revision remains less certain.

Ad³ also includes the 'Adam Stanza' in MO which is not found in Hg, although it was subsequently added in the margin in a different hand. The stanza is also missing

from Cp, although space was left for it with the heading 'De Adamo' placed in the margin. Whether the stanza is Chaucerian and was added on a separate leaf, or is the work of a later editor reacting to an indication in the copytext, or simply to his own medieval sense of order and completeness, its absence in the earlier manuscripts is of much greater significance than its presence in Ad³. There are no irregularities surrounding its inclusion and placement, although these features had been established early on in the manuscript tradition. Similarly Ad³ includes the more common 'long form' of L30 which adds a further 20 lines after line 4 to the version found in Hg, Cp, Pw and 11 other manuscripts. The longer form is that of 33 manuscripts, which include Dd, El, Ha⁴, and La.

The most interesting sets of additions to the Hg text are found in WBP, a piece which is subject to a variety of alteration throughout the manuscript tradition. There are five extra passages which are found entire or in part in 19 manuscripts. They appear first in Dd where all five passages are present; these are 6 lines after line 44, 10 lines after 574, 4 lines after 598, 8 lines after 604, and 4 lines after 694. These passages are loosely associated with manuscripts of the *a* tradition, although there is no standard pattern to their representation in any particular group, especially in the earlier stages of the textual tradition. Editors have generally accepted the final 4 passages as genuine, while the authority of the first is less certain, resulting in the extra-textual traditional lineation 44 a-f. The treatment of these lines has been extremely inconsistent, and is clearly influenced by their exclusion from El, which contains all four of the later passages. Both Tyrwhitt and Skeat considered the first set to be genuine, although neither included them in their critical text. In a note to line 44 Skeat quotes Tyrwhitt: 'if these lines are not Chaucer's, they are certainly more in his manner than the generality of the imitations of him', and fully endorses this opinion, stating 'the six lines are certainly genuine' (V. 292). Future editors have been influenced by this practice, and where the first passage is included in a critical text it is often bracketed suggesting, although seldom stating, that it is considered to be of spurious authority. In their discussion of the 5 extra passages, Manly-Rickert argue that the 'textual evidence

suggests that they must all be considered together' (II. 191), yet this has not prompted future editors to change the traditional policy. The post-Manly-Rickert prominence of Hg has not altered the editorial stalemate, despite the fact that none of these passages are found in Hg (the exception is Blake 1980, where all passages are omitted, with the final four placed in the Appendix edited from E1). Some editors have been driven to strange inconsistencies; particularly Robinson who prints D44 a-f as a footnote despite his assurance in the Explanatory notes that they are 'certainly genuine' (Robinson 1957:699). In the Textual notes he is less sure, describing them as 'probably genuine' (891). The Riverside edition includes D44 a-f within the text but places square brackets around them, explaining them as a probable Chaucerian revision. However the use of the square brackets is not explained, nor is the fact that this passage is omitted from E1.

These passages are also significant as they are frequently cited in critical appreciations of WBP and the character of the Wife. Some critics have argued for Chaucerian authorship, and thus use the passages to show the development of the characterization of the Wife, as Chaucer revised his text (Pratt 1961). Others have argued for scribal authorship, and thus use these passages as evidence of varied fifteenth-century receptions for this prologue (Kennedy 1997). Yet these many interpretations show that no one accepted theory has emerged to explain the appearance and textual affiliations of these passages, and often such critical studies are based upon dubious textual evidence and highly subjective readings.

Of the 21 manuscripts that contain at least 1 of the 5 added passages, 14 have all 5. 4 passages are found in E1 and Si, Gg has 3 passages, while Ad³, He and Ha² have 2 sets, and Ld¹ has 1. This evidence would seem to support the Manly-Rickert view that all five passages should be considered as one textual entity. However the majority of the 14 manuscripts to include all five passages appear relatively late in the textual tradition, most are post 1450; five of which have close textual relationships as members of Manly-Rickert's *a* group (Dd, En¹, Cn, Ds, Ma). Manuscripts with other textual relations are considerably later in the tradition and have presumably picked up these passages through contamination. The evidence of the earliest manuscripts however is

totally contradictory, and Dd is the only one of these to include all sets. Hg, Cp and Ha⁴ do not include any of the passages, while Gg omits the first and last. Thus there is no standard formula for the inclusion of these passages, and no decisive point at which they enter the tradition. The evidence of Ad³ provides an interesting addition to this debate, as it presents certain unique peculiarities. It includes only the second and third passages, a combination that does not appear in any other witness. The first sequence is placed after line 576, a placement which is not found anywhere else. Recent textual analysis of WBP has suggested that the five extra passages are indeed genuine, but were marked by the poet for deletion (Robinson 1997). Robinson argues that this change was incorporated to create a more sympathetic portrayal of the Wife of Bath, thus aligning her character with the reallocation of a more serious tale, rather than the bawdy fabliau now allocated to the Shipman. Despite the fact that these passages were subject to authorial deletion, they were picked up early in the tradition and descended through the *a* and *b* traditions. The O Group manuscripts, identified by Robinson as descended directly from the archetype of the tradition, generally do not contain any of these passages. However two manuscripts in this group, Ch and Ad³, do contain some of the passages: Ch has all five and Ad³ has just two. Solopova's study of these passages argues that the situation in both manuscripts can be explained by contamination, a theory further corroborated by the relatively late dates of their production (Solopova 1997). This theory would therefore argue that the two passages found in Ad³ were not found in the Ad³ copytext, but were obtained from a separate source and included into the Ad³ text. This explanation may be further supported by the misplacement of the first of these passages which suggests that the scribe copied it from a sheet that remained external to his copytext, therefore allowing for the possibility of scribal error in including the piece. However it is still difficult to understand why the Ad³ scribe picked up only 2 of these passages, especially as many other contemporary copies contain the full complement of five. If the Ad³ scribe was aware of another text of WBP that contained the extra passages, why was he not able to secure a copy of this text, complete with all added passages? It is possible that the

scribe did have access to all five passages on separate sheets and that he simply missed the signal for their inclusion during copying. Another possibility is that individual leaves carrying the extra passages had become separated from the Ad³ source, and that the Ad³ scribe only received the two passages now found in this manuscript. While the source of the Ad³ extra passages remains impossible to determine, it does seem likely that these textual additions also represent physical additions to the Ad³ copytext.

Thus a study of the omissions and additions found in Ad³ reveals a close relationship with Hg, with several important differences. The appearance in Ad³ of a small number of lines omitted from Hg due to eyeskip demonstrates that while the Ad³ exemplar was close to Hg, Ad³ represents an independent line of descent from this copytext. The number of omissions in Ad³ are few and their trivial nature suggests that these are the result of scribal error. The presence in Ad³ of two extra passages in both WBP and FK demonstrates that certain additions had been made to the Ad³ exemplar, although it is difficult to determine at what stage and from what source the passages were received. The unique presentation of the added passages in the Ad³ copy of WBP and the very limited distribution of the passages in FK suggests that the source for the additions was not widely available. The appearance of the extra lines in FK in Ad³ and El alone, combined with their shared omission of a couplet in L33 demonstrates a close relationship between these two manuscripts. The inclusion of these passages within the body of the Ad³ text shows that they were available before copying was begun, although the misplacement of the first extra passage in WBP suggests that these were added on separate sheets. It seems likely that these textual additions were obtained from one single source and that this source was also that used by the scribe of El, thus explaining the close relationship shared by Ad³ and El in many of the additions to the Hg copytext.

This study of added and omitted lines in Ad³ provides no definite conclusions, but makes a number of suggestions that may be important to an overall assessment of its place in the tradition. The scribe was an accurate copyist who made few substantial errors in copying, such as large-scale omission or copying the same passage twice.

The Ad³ text is close to Hg at this level of textual affiliation, and where variation does occur there is a striking relationship with El suggesting that these two manuscripts shared a common source for a number of important passages not found in Hg, such as L33 and the extra passages in FK and WBP. These affiliations suggest access to exemplars of the highest authority, and that Ad³ may therefore contain important information concerning the nature of the Hg copytext, and its relationship to that used by El. While such a theory reinforces the relationships already observed at the levels of *ordinatio* and *tale-order*, this evidence must be subjected to more detailed textual and linguistic study in order to assess the extent of such affiliations and the exact relationships between these manuscripts.

Chapter 5

A Study of the Glosses

5.1 Introduction

The inclusion of marginal glosses in the production of copies of the *Canterbury Tales* is widespread throughout the fifteenth century, and the great variety of types of gloss reflects a wide range of attitudes towards the text and the overall work. The more scholarly type includes lengthy quotation of source material in the original language, or sometimes more simply the provision of a reference. Glosses of this kind are best exemplified by the numerous quotations from Jerome's *Adversus Jovinianum* in WBP and Innocent's *De Contemptu Mundi* in ML. More sophisticated glosses cite further authorities in order to justify or contradict a reference, or more simply to display a scribe's learning. Other forms of gloss mark the use of rhetorical devices, by the inclusion of 'auctor', 'argumentum' etc. at the head of any such piece of writing. This form of subheading is often used in order to mark certain key speeches or to identify speakers in an important piece of dialogue. This type of glossing is found in KN in Ad³ where each of the individual prayers are marked with a marginal heading identifying the character and the god concerned. Certain passages are also accompanied by a marginal 'Nota' or 'Nota Bene', indicating a moralistic warning or more simply a passage that appealed to a scribe or editor. This type of gloss is sometimes more sophisticated revealing a distinctly individual reaction to a line, commonly found in the margins of Dd. A good example of this is the infamous Dd ironic addition to January's comment on the joys of marriage and the benefits of a wife: 'If he be poure, she helpeth hym to swynke'; with the marginal comment 'or to drynke' (ME 98). This range and quantity of marginal interpolations form a wealth of diverse reactions to Chaucer's text, giving us access to a body of fifteenth-century literary criticism. The close relationships between the appearance of certain glosses across the manuscript tradition

also provide important evidence of manuscript affiliations, where regular similarities in glosses may be indicative of shared exemplars. Glosses that appear regularly in the earliest manuscripts may descend from the Chaucerian holograph, thus providing important information concerning the nature of the poet's foul-papers.

Despite the significance of this corpus of material, few scholars have addressed the glosses in detail. Manly-Rickert included most of the glosses in a specific section in volume III of their work, although its usefulness is hampered by a confusion of presentation and of methods of classification. The section is further limited in its application as no explanation or analysis of the data is attempted. Stephen Partridge has discussed these shortcomings in his essay 'The Glosses and the Manuscript Groups', in which he emphasizes the importance of clearer systems of classification and highlights the significance of the glosses in 'instances where the glosses can draw our attention to relatively little known manuscripts' (Partridge 1993:85). Despite the renown and significance accorded to the wealth of scholarly material incorporated in the margins of El, little consideration has been given to Ad³ which contains almost all the glosses found in El. No complete transcription of the Ad³ glosses is available, nor is there any exhaustive study of the exact relationship with El and the implications of these similarities. Owen touches on the significance of this relationship, arguing that the Ad³ glosses show a particular affiliation with El, rather than Hg or other early manuscripts. This leads Owen to the suggestive, yet somewhat confusing, conclusion that: 'This relationship suggests ready access on the part of Ad³'s makers not just to Ellesmere materials but to the manuscript itself' (Owen 1991:46). A complete study of the glosses of both manuscripts is thus crucial in analysing the close physical relationship between the two manuscripts, and important in determining their relationship to other features such as textual affiliations and tale-order. This chapter will provide a complete transcription of the Ad³ glosses which appear in the verse tales, indicating the appearance of each gloss in Hg and El. This will ignore all part divisions which may appear in the margins, but will include any glosses that are found within the text itself. All Latin abbreviations are expanded, and any insignificant minor textual variation is

ignored. Glosses in the prose pieces have also been discounted as these are often simply the recording of a change of speaker in the margin. I have not attempted to use classifications as it is clear from a study of the glosses, and other modes of categorization that their nature is so disparate that any such attempt carries little authority, and little relevance to the case of Ad³.

5.2 Complete transcription of glosses in Ad³, noting appearance in Hg and El.

GP:

There are no glosses, nor are the names of the pilgrims included alongside their description.

GP/KN:

1.857

Iamque domos patrias scithice post aspera gentis prelia laurigero et cetera

El Hg

KN:

1.306

Quis legem det amantibus

Hg El

1.1271

Nota

1.1363

The preyour of Palamoun to Venus goddesse of loue

El

1.1439

The preyer of Emelye to Dyane goddesse of maydens.

El

1.1491

The Answere of Dyane to Emely.

El

1.1515

The orisoun of arcite to mars.

El

1.1829

Nota periculum.

El

1.1905

Nota

1.1979

Argumentum.

Hg El

1.1980

Nota.

1.2123

Nota

Hg

1.2153

Exemplum.

El

1.2157

Exemplum

El

MI:

Vnde Ouidius Ictibus agrestis

Hg El

Auctor

El

ML:

1.673

Quid turpius ebrioso cui fetor in ore tremor in corpore qui promit stulta prodit occulta.
cuius mens alienatur facies transformatur nullum enim latet secretum vbi regnat
ebrietas.

Hg El

1.826

Nota

O extrema libidinis turpitude que non solum mentem effeminat set eciam corpus eneruat
semper sequuntur dolor et penitentia.

Hg El

1.1034

A mane vsque ad vesperam mutabitur tempus tenent tympanum et gaudent ad sonum organi

Hg El

1.1037

Quis vnquam vnicam diem totam duxit in sua dileccione iocundam quem in aliqua parte diei reatus conscience vel impetus ire vel motus concupiscencie non turbauerit quem liuor Inuidie vel ardor auaricie vel tumor superbie non vexauerit quem aliqua iactura vel offensa vel passio non commouerit.

Hg El

WBP:

1.10

In cana galilee.

El

1.13

Qui enim semel iuit ad nupcias docuit semel esse nubendum

El

1.23

Non est vxorum numerum diffinitum qui secundum paulum Qui habent vxores sic sint tanquam non habentes

El

1.28

Crescite et multiplicamini.

El

1.46

Si autem non continent nubant

El

1.50

Quod si dormierit vir eius liberata est cui vult nubat in domino

El

1.52

Si acceperis vxorem non peccasti et si nupserit uirgo non peccauit set hij qui in domino

se vouerunt Ita idem et cetera.

melius est nubere quam vri.

El

1.56

Lameth qui primus intrauit bigamiam sanguinarius et homicida est

El

1.58

Abraham trigamus

El

1.59

Iacob quatrigamus.

El

1.73

Paulus de virginibus preceptum non habeo consilium autem do et cetera

El

1.76

Inuitat ad cursum tenet in manu virginitatis brauium qui potest capere capiat et cetera

El

1.81

Volo autem omnes homines esse sicut meipsum et cetera.

El

1.86

Bonum est mulierem non tangere.

El: Bonum est homini mulierem non tangere

1.103

Vnusquisque proprium habet donum ex deo. alius quidem sic. alius autem sic.

El

1.106

Qui cantant sequentur agnum xliiijor milia

El

1.147

Ea vocacione qua vocati estis et cetera.

El

1.155

Qui vxorem habet et debitor dicitur et esse in prepucio et seruus vxoris et quod malorum suorum est alligatus.

El

1.158

Et iterum seruus vxoris es noli propter hoc habere tristitiam.

El

1.160

Item si acceperis vxorem non peccasti tribulacionem tamen carnis habebunt huiusmodi et cetera.

El

1.161

Item vir corporis sui non habet potestatem sed vxor et cetera.

El

1.163

Item viri diligite vxores vestras

El

1.192/1

Biholde how this good wif serued hir .iij first husbondes which were gode olde men.[within text]

El [in margin]

1.199

Ierophancias quoque atheniencium vsque hodie cicute sorbicione castrari.

El

1.303

Et procurator calamistratus et cetera

El

1.342

Similiter et mulieres in habitu ornato cum verecundia et castitate orment se non in tortis crinibus aut auro aut margaritas siue veste preciosa et cetera . hec Paulus.

El

1.362

Eciam odiosa vxor si habeat virum bonum et cetera

El

1.369

Amor illius inferno et arenti terre et incendio comparatur Vnde illud et cetera

El

1.371

Infernus et amor mulieris et terra que non dicent satis et cetera.

El: Infernus et amor mulieris et terra que non saciatur aqua et ignis non dicent satis et cetera

El

1.376

Sicut in ligno vermis ita perdet virum suum vxor.

El

1.379

Nemo melius scire potest quid sit vxor . vel mulier nisi ille qui passus est et cetera.

El

1.453

Of the condicyon of the fourth husbond of this Wif and how she serued him

El

1.460

Valerius libro . 5o. capitulo .3o. Metellius vxorem suam eo quod vinum bisset fuste percussam interemit.

El

1.621

Valerius libro .5o. folio .14o.

El

1.633

Nota

1.635

Ne des mulieri nequam veniam prodeundi ecclesiasticus . 27o.

El

1.670

Quis pinxit leonem.

El

1.680

Vtraque cadit vbi alia exaltatur.

El

1.683

In libro Mansor . primus. Vniuscuiusque planetarum .7. Exaltacio illo in loco fore dicitur in quo subito patitur ab alio contrarium . et cetera Velut mercurius in virgine que est casus veneris. alter vero cantus et alacritates et quicquid est sapiferum corpori.

El: In libro Mansor primo Vniuscuiucque planetarum 7 Exaltacio illo in loco fore dicitur in quo subito patitur ab alio contrarium et cetera Velut Mercurius in virgine quod est casus Veneris Alter scilicet Mercurius significat scientiam et philosophiam Alter vero cantus et alacritates et quicquid est sapiferum corpori

1.707

Quid referam phasifphen Clitermistram et Eriphilem quarum prima delicijs fluens quippe vt regis vxor tauri dicitur adpetisse concubitus alia occidisse virum suum ob amor em adulterij Tercia prodidisse amphiorax et saluti viri nonile aureum pretulisse et cetera. hec metellius Marrio secundum Valerium.

El

1.759

Circulus aureus in naribus suis. Mulier formosa et fatua .i. impudica

El

WBT:

1.1082

De generositate

El

1.1150

De paupertate.

El

1.1155

Seneca in epistola Honesta res est beata paupertas

El

1.1159

Pauper est qui eget eo quod non habet sed qui non habet nec appetit habere ille diues est
de quo intelligitur id apocal. 3o. dicis quia diues sum

El

1.1166

Cantabit vacuus coram latrone viator et nocte ad lumen trepidabit Arundinis vmbram

El

1.1168

Secundus Philosophus

Paupertas est odibile bonum sanitatis mater curarum remocio sapientie reparatrix
possessio sine calumpnia.

El

1.1170

Vnde et Crates ille Thebanus Proiecto in mari non paruo auri pondere Abite inquit
pessime male cupiditates ego vos mergam ne ipse mergar a vobis

El

1.1175

De senectute

El

1.1181

De turpitudine.

El

SU:

1.171

Melius est animam saginare quam corpus.

El

1.173

Victum et vestitum hiis contenti sumus.

El

1.260

Omnis virtus vnita forcior est seipsa dispersa.

El

Nota

1.265

Dignus est operarius mercede et cetera.

El

1.281

Noli esse sicut leo in domo tua euertens domesticos tuos opprimens subiectos tibi.

El

1.308/1

De quodam potestate iracundo

[within text]

El

1.535

The Wordes of the lordes squyer and his keruer for departyng of the fart on twelue.

El

NU:

1.85

Interpretacio nominis Cecilie quam ponit frater Iacobus Ianuensis in legenda

Hg El

CL:

1.6

Pausacio. Nota.

El

1.14

Pausacio

El

1.20

Pausacio.

El

1.38

Pausacio

El

1.39

Est ad ytalie latus occiduum vesulus ex appenini Iugis mons altissimus qui vertice nebula superans liquido sese ingerit etheri mons suapte nobilis natura padi ortu nobilissimus qui latere fonte lapsus exiguo Orientem contra solem fertur et cetera.

Hg El

1.46

Pausacio

El

1.56

Pausacio

El

1.58

Inter cetera ad radicem vesuli terra Saluciarum vicis et castellis

Hg El

1.59

Grata planicies.

Hg El

1.86

Cateruatim.

Hg El

1.197

ffuit haut procul a palacio et cetera.

El

1.281

Vt expeditis curis aliis ad videndum domini sui sponsam cum puellis comitibus
prepararet.

Hg El

1.295

Quam Walterus cogitabundus cedens eamque compellans nomine

Hg El

1.337

Et insolito tanti hospitis aduentu stupidam inuenit

Hg El

1.344

Et patri tuo placet inquit et mihi vt vxor mea sis et credo idipsum tibi placeat sed habeo
ex te querere et cetera

Hg El

1.356

Sine vlla frontis aut verbi inpugnacione.

Hg El

1.358

Nil ego vnquam sciens ne dum faciam set eciam cogitabo quod contra animum tuum sit
nec tu aliquid facies et si me mori iusseris quod moleste feram et cetera

Hg El

1.400

Atque apud omnes supra fidem cara et venerabilis facta est vix quod hijs ipsis qui illius
originem nouerant persuaderi posset Ianicule natam esse tantus vite tantus morum decor
ea verborum grauitas atque dulcedo quibus omnium animos nexu sibi magni amoris
astrinxerat

Hg El

1.421

Sic Walterus humili quidem set insigni ac prospero matrimonio honestatis summa dei in
pace

Hg El

1.425

Quodque eximiam virtutem tanta sub inopia latitantem tam perspicaciter deprendisset
vulgo prudentissimus habebatur

Hg El

1.428

Neque vero solers sponsa muliebria tantum ac domestica set vbi res posceret publica
eciā subibat officia.

Hg El

1.435

Viro absente lites patrie nobilium discordias dirimens atque componens tam grauibus
responsis tantaque maturitate et Iudicii equitate vt omnes ad salutem publicam demissam
celo feminam predicarent

Hg El

1.448/9 [alongside 1-stanza gap in text]

Ceperit vt fit interdum Walterum cum iam ablactata esset infantula mirabilis quedem
quam laudabilis cupiditas satis expertam care fidem coniugis experiendi altius et iterum
retemptandi.

Hg El

1.499

Nec verbo nec vultu et cetera.

Hg El

1.540

Suspecta viri fama Suspecta facies Suspecta hora Suspecta erat oratio

Hg El

1.603

Par alacritas atque sedulitas solitum obsequium idem amor nulla filie mencio.

Hg El

1.610

Transiuerant hoc in statu anni .iiijor. dum ecce grauida et cetera.

Hg El

1.624

Et olim audisti populum meum egre nostrum ferre connubium et cetera.

Hg El

1.663

ffac senciam tibi placere quod moriar volens moriar

Hg El

1.722

Ceperit sensim de Waltero decolor fama crebescere

Hg El

1.1037

Vnum bona fide precor ac moneo ne hand illis aculeis agites quibus alteram agitasti
namque et iunior et delicacius nutrita est pati quantum ego vt reor non valeret

Hg El

1.1142

Hanc Historiam stilo nunc alto retexere visum fuit non tamen ideo vt matronas nostri
temporis ad imitandam huius vxoris pacienciam que mihi inimitabilis videtur quam vt
legentes ad imitandam saltem femine constanciam excitant Vt quod hec viro suo
prestitit hoc prestare deo nostro audeat quilibet vt Iacobus ait Apostolus Intemptator sit
malorum et ipse neminem temptat probat tamen et sepe nos multis ac grauibus flagellis
exerceri sinit non vt animum nostrum sciat quem scivit antequam crearemur et cetera

Hg El

ME:

1.67

Vxor est diligenda quia donum dei est Ihesus filius sirac domus et diuicie dantur a
parentibus a domino autem proprie vxor bona vel prudens.

Hg El

1.72

Dona fortune.

El

1.83

ffaciamus ei adiutorium et extracta costa de corpore Ade fecit Euam et dixit propter hec
relinquet homo patrem et matrem et adherebit et cetera et erunt duo in carne vna.

Hg El

1.118

Iacob per consilium matris sue Rebecce et cetera

Hg El

1.122

Iudith de manibus Olofermi et cetera

Hg El

1.125

Abigail per suum bonum consilium virum suum Nabal ab ira dauid liberavit.

Hg El

1.128

Ester et cetera Iudeos per bonum consilium simul cum mardocheo in regno assueri.

Hg El

1.131

Seneca sicut nichil est benigna coniuge ita nichil crudelius est infesta muliere

Hg El

1.134

Cato vxoris linguam si frugi est ferro memento

Hg El

1.136

Bona mulier fidelis custos est et bona domus.

El

1.140

Apostolus Paulus ad Ephesianos Diligite vxores vestras sicut Christus dilexit ecclesiam
et cetera

Hg El

1.142

Apostolus Ita viri debent diligere vxores suas vt corpora sua quia qui suam vxorem
diligit nemo vnquam carnem suam odio habuit set nutrit et fouet eam et postea
vnusquisque suam vxorem sicut ipsum diligit

Hg El

1.234

Placebo

El

1.272

Iustinus

El

1.411

Iustinus

El

1.539

Auctor

Hg El

1.625

Auctor

Hg El

1.813

Auctor.

Hg El

1.863

Auctor

El

1.881

Auctor

El

SQ:

1.107

Of the vertue of the stede of bras

El

1.124

Of the vertue of the mirrour

El

1.138

The vertue of the rynge

El

1.148

Of the vertue of the swerd

El

1.199

.i. equus pegaseus

Hg El

1.601

Reditu suo singula gaudent

Hg El

FK:

1.12

Vnde Persius ffonte labra prolui caballino nec in bicipite parnaso me memini
sompniasse

Hg El

1.20 [within text]

Vnde persius Nec fronte labra prolui caballino nec in bicipite parnaso me memini
sompniasse.

1.157

Nota

1.244

Methamorphosios

El

1.323

The compleint of Aurelius to the goddes and to the sonne

El

1.402

Pamphilius ad galatheam vulneror et clausum porto sub pectore telum et cetera.

El

1.544

Ianus biceps

Hg El

1.573

Alnath dicitur prima mansio lune

El

1.575

In nona spera

El

1.647

The compleynt of dorigen ayeyns fortune

El

1.656

30a Atheniensium tyranni cum Phidonem necassent in conuiuio filias eius virgines ad se venire iusserunt et scortorum more nudari ac super pauimenta patris sanguine cruentatas inpudicis gestibus ludere que paulipser dissimulato dolore cum tumultos conuiuias cernerent quasi ad requisita nature egredientes inuicem se complexere precipitauerunt in puteum vt virginitatem morte seruarent

Hg El

1.671

Cum 50 virgines lacedomoniorum messeni violare temptassent

El

1.679

Aristoclide Orcomeni tyrannus adamauit virginem stymphalidem que cum patre occiso ad templum dyane

El

1.691

Nam hasdrubalis vxor capta et incensa vrbe cum se cerneret a Romanis capienda

El

1.697

primo ponam lucreciam que violate pudicie nolens superuiuere maculam corporis cruore deleuit.

El

1.701

Quis valet silencio preterire VII Milesias virgines que Gallorum et cetera

El

1.706

Senapho in Ciri maioris scribit infancia occiso habradate et cetera

El

1.718

Democionis Ariopagitarum principis virgo filia et cetera

El

1.720

Quo ore laudande sunt Cedasij filie et cetera

El

1.724

Nichanor victis Thebis vnius captive virginis amore superatus est.

El

1.729

Quid loquar Nicerati coniugem pie impaciens iniurie viri mortem et cetera

El

1.731

Alcebiades ille socraticus victus et cetera

El

1.734

Alcestan fabule ferunt pro marito Adameto sponte defunctam et Penelopes pudica Omeri
carmen est

El

1.737

Lacedomia quoque poetarum are cantatur occiso apud troiam protheselao et cetera

El

1.740

Porcia sine bruto viuere non potuit

El

1.743

Arthemesia quoque vxor Mauseoli insignis pudicicijs fuisse perhibetur et cetera

El

1.745

Teuta Illiricorum Regina et cetera

El

1.747

Memorandum quod Strato regulus

El

1.748

Vidi et omnes pene Barbares capitulo xxvjo primi.

El

1.749

Item Cornelia et cetera

El

1.750

Singulas has historias et plures hanc materiam concernentes recitat beatus Ieronimus
contra Iouinianum in primo suo libro capitulo 39o

El

PH:

1.14

Quere in Methamorphosios

Hg El

1.16

Apelles fecit mirabile opus in tumulo darij vide in alexandro libro Io de zanz in libro
Tulij.

Hg El

1.89

Nota

Hg El

1.115

Augustinus

Hg El

1.240

Iudicum capitulo xio fuit illo tempore Iepte Galaandes.

Hg El

PD:

1.0

Radix malorum est cupiditas ad Thimotheum 6o

Hg El

1.157

Of glotonye and of lecherye

El

1.157

Nolite inebriari vino in quo est luxuria

Hg El

1.164

Seneca

El

1.180

Ieronimus contra Iouinianum Quamdiu ieiunauit Adam in Paradiso fuit comedit et
eiectus est statim duxit vxorem

Hg El

1.194

Esca ventri et venter escis deus autem et hunc et illam destruit

Hg El

1.201

Ad Philipences capitulo. 3o.

Hg El

1.219

Qui autem in delicijs est viuens mortuus est.

Hg El

1.221

luxuriosa res vinum et contumeliosa ebrietas

Hg El

1.256

Noli vinum dare

Hg El

1.260/1 [within text]

Of hasardrye

El

1.264

Policratici libro Io Mendaciorum et periurarum mater est alea.

Hg El

1.301

Of sweryng and of forsweryng

El

1.302/1 [within text]

Of sweryng

1.306

Nolite omnino iurare

Hg El

1.308

Ieremie 4o Iurabis in veritate in iudicio et iusticia

Hg El

1.332/1 [within text]

Of Riatours

1.416

coram canuto capite consurge

Hg El

1.567

Auctor

El

PR:

1.40

Turpe lucrum

Hg El

1.106

Auctor

El

1.155

Auctor

El

MO:

1.9

Lucifer

El

How lucifer first fil from heuene.

1.16/1

Adam

El

How Adam was dryue out of paradys

1.17

Sampson

Hg El

How sampson was annunciat and thurgh his wyf slayn

1.33

How sampson knette the foxes tailles with fyr

1.41

How the welle sprange out of the asse cheke and sampson dronk ynogh

1.97

Hercules

Hg El

1.120

Ille vates Chaldeorum Tropheus.

Hg El

1.145

Nabugodonosor.

Hg El

1.185

Baltasar

Hg El

De balthasar dicti Regis Nabugodonosor filio.

1.249

Cenobia

El

De Cenobia palmerie Regina.

1.465

De Oloferno

Hg El

1.479

Et fecerunt filij Israel secundum quod constituerat eis sacerdos domini Eliachim.

Hg El

1.489

De Rege Anthioco illustri

El

1.545

De Alexandro

Hg El

1.547

De Alexandro magni philippi Regis macedonij filio

1.585

De Iulio Cesare

Hg El

1.601

Nota de pompeyo

El

1.643

Cresus

Cresus leuitici capitulo ijo de spiritum phitonis habendas octosias iiijto libro. Regum.
capitulo. primo.

1.681

De petro Rege Ispannie

Hg El

1.689

Berthen Claykyn Olyuere Mawne

1.697

De petro Rege de Cipre

Hg El

1.705

De Barnabo de lumbard

Hg El

1.713

De Hugelino Comite de pize.

Hg El

1. 721

De Hugelyno Comyte

NP:

1.165

Nota de sompno

El

1.248

Adhuc de Sompno

El

1.291

De Sompno sancti Kenelmi

El

1.308

Adhuc de sompnijs

El

MA:

1.59

Exemplum de Volucre

El

1.71

Exemplum de Murelego

El

1.79

Exemplum de lupo

El

1.153

Nota malum quid

El

CY:

1.243

Non teneas aurum et cetera

Nec pulcrum pomum et cetera

El

L37:

1.32

Paulus ad Thimotheum

El

5.3 Conclusion

The most striking evidence shown in the lengthy list of glosses found in Ad³ is the almost exact correspondence with the glosses in El. The number of glosses which are unique to Ad³ is small and their significance is slight, as may be shown in a brief discussion. Seven of these unique glosses are the inclusion of 'Nota', found in the following tales: KN(3), ML, SU, FK, WBP. The remaining additional glosses serve simply as subheadings and would seem to be best explained as the work of the Ad³ scribe. Two such headings are found in PD where 'of sweryng' is included within the text at line 302, and 'of Riatours' at line 332. These additions are of little obvious significance, and may be explained as basic scribal additions as they follow the same format as earlier headings found in El, such as 'of hasardrye'. Another possible explanation would posit a common exemplar containing all these subheadings, which were accidentally omitted by the El scribe. This theory would seem unlikely when we consider the case of the Ad³ addition 'of sweryng' which is included in addition to the similar gloss found at the same point in El: 'Of sweryng and of forsweryng'. Another feature unique to Ad³ is the repetition of a gloss shared with Hg and El in FK. This gloss appears in the margins of all three manuscripts alongside line 12, but only Ad³ repeats it within the text after line 20. This repetition may suggest the conflation of two separate sources in the production of Ad³, or may indicate an element of confusion surrounding the inclusion of this gloss. All other unique glosses are found in MO, which principally serve to give a description of the content of some stanzas. Certain of these are also included in addition to the subheadings found in El, and would therefore

suggest that these have been added subsequent to the copying of El. The language and content of these additional glosses suggest that they are the work of the Ad³ scribe, as the inclusion of such headings requires little knowledge beyond a basic understanding of well-known Biblical stories. It seems likely that the inclusion of these headings was motivated by a desire to continue and elaborate on the system found in El possibly in order to give the text a greater appearance of consistency or completeness.

The minor textual relationships between the El and Ad³ glosses clearly illustrate the direction of affiliation, as there are several examples of eyeskip in the Ad³ glosses, where the complete text appears in El. The comparison of the two versions of a Latin gloss at line 371 of WBP demonstrates this point, as the repetition of the word 'non' has caused the scribe to omit the intervening text. On the whole such examples are rare and are best explained as scribal carelessness, or possible unfamiliarity with Latin.

It is evident from even a brief look at the list of glosses found above that Ad³ provides an almost identical copy of the glosses found in El. I have noted that the number of glosses included in Ad³ and not in either Hg or El is extremely small, but it is also significant to show the relationships between glosses shared by these three manuscripts. This information may be demonstrated most conveniently in tabular form:

Disposition of Ad³ glosses

Total number of glosses in Ad ³	235
Number in El	212
Number in Hg	81
Number in Ad ³ El Hg	80
Number in Ad ³ El (not in Hg)	132
Number in Ad ³ Hg (not in El)	1
Number in Ad ³ alone	22

These statistics not only emphasize the close relationship between El and Ad³, but also demonstrate the lack of affiliation with Hg. While 83 of the Ad³ glosses appear in Hg, there is only a single instance of a gloss that is unique to Ad³ and Hg. This gloss is simply the inclusion of 'nota' alongside line 2123, marking the opening of Theseus' 'Primum mobile' speech, and thus of little textual significance.

The evidence of the glosses in Ad³ argues for a very close relationship between the El and Ad³ manuscripts, while the lack of firm agreement with Hg strengthens this connection. The few insignificant additions to the El corpus found in Ad³ have little effect on this close relationship, and are likely to represent the work of the Ad³ scribe. Ad³ contains an accurate copy of the El glosses, although there are some examples of scribal error, which serve to prove the priority of the El text. Thus the most important conclusion to a study of the glosses in Ad³ is that the scribe of this manuscript had unique access to the same body of glosses used by the El scribe. Whether this source was the El copytext, El itself, or a separate source entirely it is difficult to ascertain. The principal significance is the further evidence such a conclusion provides to an overall evaluation of the relationship between Ad³ and an earlier manuscript of high authority.

Chapter 6

A Study of the Language

6.1 Introduction

This study of the language of Ad³ begins by determining which linguistic features are to be considered, and what criteria are to be adopted in order to distinguish between the contributions of the copytext and of the Ad³ scribe. Given the accepted dating of Ad³ to 1430-50, and the number of possible intervening copies, it is unlikely that its orthography will yield much information about its phonology: thus rendering a phonological study of little significance. Similarly the constraints of rhyme ensure a significant degree of stability in the syntax, and thus a study of this feature will be less central. Therefore this chapter will focus principally on aspects of orthography and morphology: thus drawing on the criteria adopted for the linguistic survey carried out by the editors of *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English* (henceforth: *LALME*). Despite the dating of Ad³ it has recently been argued that this manuscript forms part of the O Group manuscripts, related in their similarities to the ultimate archetype, and thus a study of orthography and morphology in relation to this archetype may prove important.¹ As Hg is traditionally viewed as the earliest extant manuscript, and the most accurate witness to this archetype, I use this text as my basis for comparison. The comparison of the orthography and morphology with that of Hg may allow us to observe how closely the scribe preserves the practice of Hg, and which changes seem to derive from his personal preference. Therefore this chapter will use aspects of orthography and morphology in order to determine how close Ad³ is to Hg, and to attempt to uncover any intervening stages of copying.

My analysis has been based on two major resources: electronic transcripts of the complete texts of both Hg and Ad³, and the transcripts of all manuscript versions,

¹The 'O Group' of manuscripts is identified in Robinson 1997.

and complete spelling databases of WBP, provided on *The Wife of Bath's Prologue on CD-ROM* (Robinson 1996). My practice has been to use WBP as a linguistic sample in order to assess the amount and significance of variation between Hg and Ad³. Where the comparison of a certain feature seemed particularly significant, I have examined the variation across the entirety of both manuscripts. Thus the discussion of some features is limited to evidence drawn from WBP, while other aspects are analysed with reference to data taken from the whole poem.

Section 2 of this chapter consists of a profile of the spelling system of the scribe, with corresponding figures from Hg for purposes of comparison. In adopting the system outlined above, I have only included those forms where variation or similarity between Hg and Ad³ seems to be significant and are included in the subsequent discussion. Sections 3 and 4 compare certain aspects of the orthography and morphology of Hg with Ad³, in order to determine to what degree the principles developed in Hg are preserved or modified. Section 5 will analyse the variations from Hg, in order to distinguish the different influences that may have contributed to such variations. This section will focus on the influences of the spellings of the archetype, the dialect of the Ad³ copyist, and the pull of the London Standard. This analysis will then lead to a conclusion as to the type of copying carried out by the scribe, the language of his immediate copytext and its relationship to Hg and the ultimate archetype.

6.2 Profile of Orthographic System

This profile provides complete figures for all variant spellings of a given word in Ad³, with the corresponding information for Hg. The figures include spellings across the entire text of both manuscripts, regardless of whether a particular manuscript lacks certain portions of text. The loss of a number of quires in Ad³ and the omission of certain pieces of text in Hg means that total figures for individual words can vary significantly between the two manuscripts.²

		Ad ³	Hg
AFTER	after	96	220
	aftyr	105	0
AGAIN	agayn(s,es)	70	123
	ageyn(e,es)	61	16
	ayein(s)	2	9
	ayeyn(e,es)	7	0
	ayayns	1	0
	ayen	6	0
ALSO	ek	119	4
	eke	166	22
	eek	48	277
	eken	1	0
ANY	any	144	179
	eny	47	2
ARE	ben	463	210
	been	54	421
	beth	3	25
	ar	2	3
	er	1	0

²This is best exemplified by the variation in the total number of spellings of 'silver', a word recorded just 13 times in Hg, compared to 31 uses in Ad³. However this is principally explained by the omission of CY in Hg: a tale which accounts for 23 such occurrences in Ad³. In the table no distinction is made between singular and plural forms, a distinction which often accounts for the presence of spellings with final <-e> in Hg, eg. *swiche*, *whiche*, compared with <-ø> in Ad³.

	arn	1	2
	bi	1	0
AT	at	321	408
	att	2	0
	atte	86	37
AWAY	away	12	6
	away	16	26
BEFORE		76	147
	er	1	0
	ar	28	40
	bifore	45	81
	biforn	2	0
	befor-		
BOTH	both	18	0
	bothe	119	160
	bothen	1	0
	booth	4	0
	bathe	1	2
		950	1039
BUT	but		
CAN	can	145	0
	canst	5	1
	canstow	1	0
	conne	5	0
	kan	55	200
	kanst	4	5
	kanstow	1	3
	konne	11	17
COULD	coude	52	0
	couth	22	0
	couthe	12	0
	koude	30	130
	kouden	1	2
	kouth	1	1
	kouthe	1	2
	kowde	0	3
EACH	ech	7	44
	eche	41	0
FROM	fro	168	160
	from	82	82
GIVEN	yeuen	26	36
	yiuen	0	1
HUNDRED	hundred	23	32
	hundreth	7	0
IF	if	141	469
	yf	5	1
	yif	320	0
	iffe	2	0

IT	it	1218	1182
	yt	9	0
	hit	33	0
MAN	man	693	710
	men	312	367
	mon	5	0
MANY	many	228	196
	manye	0	44
	mony	2	0
MUCH	much	1	1
	muche	20	69
	muchel	19	37
	moche	35	0
	mochel	30	0
NOT	not	198	0
	nat	608	716
	noght	159	150
	naght	6	0
	naught	5	3
	nought	18	0
OWN	own	1	0
	owne	82	0
	owen	0	4
	owene	0	96
SAW	saugh	49	31
	sagh	9	0
	saw	25	35
	sawgh	1	0
	say(e)	27	48
	seigh	3	13
	sigh	4	0
	sy	1	0
SHALL	shal	515	570
	shall	8	0
	shalle	2	0
	shalt	79	81
	shaltow	24	29
	schal	1	0
	shol	11	0
	shul	95	99
	shullen	15	24
	shulne	3	0
SHE	she	819	904
	sheo	1	0
SHOULD	shold	93	0
	sholde	133	295
	sholdest	7	5
	sholden	7	9

	shuld	23	0
	shulde	45	0
	shulden	4	0
SILVER	siluer	29	13
	seluer	2	0
SISTER	suster	11	16
	sister	3	0
SUCH	swich	251	288
	swiche	1	55
	such	31	0
	suche	18	0
THAN	than	323	282
	thanne	198	283
THESE	thise	101	151
	these	2	0
THOUGH	thogh	131	186
	though	60	26
	thagh	3	0
	taugh	4	0
	theigh	11	7
WERE	were	403	383
	weren	25	24
	wer	2	0
WHEN	when	10	1
	whan	486	554
	whanne	20	20
WHERE	where	123	49
	wher	35	106
WHICH	which	553	476
	whiche	0	99
	wich	1	0
WHILE	while	41	28
	whil	46	66
	whiles	9	3
WILL	wil	99	26
	wol	460	545
	wolle	1	0
	wolt	22	22
	woltow	6	6
	wollen	1	1
WORK(vb)	werk	8	22
	werken	6	14
	wirke	1	0
	wirken	1	0
	worke	6	0

	worken	5	0
	werche	6	6
	wirche	1	5
	worche	2	0
WOULD	wold	127	6
	wolde	190	320
	woldest	7	4
	wolden	13	9
YET	yet	43	212
	yit	206	7

6.3 Orthography

In this section I will consider some features of the orthography of Hg and compare such features with Ad³, examining to what extent the Ad³ scribe preserves this system, or imposes his own. This study will also consider the significance such decisions have concerning the elision of vowel sounds and the resulting effect on metre. I will begin with features that display a close relationship between the orthography of these two manuscripts, moving on to consider elements that show greater variation between them.

6.3.1 Use of fro/from

In order to observe the scribe's attitude to elision of vowels, this section outlines the scribes' uses of *fro/from* before vowels or consonants in both the Hg and the Ad³ copies. The Hg scribe writes *from* on 82 occasions and *fro* 160 times and this usage shows a consistent attitude to the initial letter of the following word. Of the 82 examples of *from* 65 are followed by a vowel (or <h>), while only 17 are followed by a consonant. These exceptions are found as follows:³

FK	514	from Gerounde
GP	326	from tyme
GP	687	from Rome
KN	1825	from Pluto
KN	2174	from which
KN	2206	from this
ME	543	from youre
ML	23	from thee

³Because of the great variation in tale-order between Hg and Ad³ I list tales alphabetically by their sigla. This practice is maintained throughout the chapter.

ML	815	from the
ML	945	from thennes
NU	22	from swich
NU	66	from thennes
SU	16	from penaunce
TM	242	from whennes
TM	361	from the
WBP	463	from drynke
WBP	798	from Denmark

The Ad³ scribe uses *from* on 82 occasions, with 61 of these appearing before a vowel and 21 before a consonant. The examples of *from* before a consonant are listed below in order to allow comparison with the Hg exceptions:⁴

*	FK	514	from Gerond
	GP	671	from the
	GP	692	from berwyk
	KN	1444	from thi
*	KN	1825	from pluto
	KN	1955	from the
*	KN	2174	from whych
*	KN	2206	from this
	L7	24	from the
	MI	185	From day
	MI	293	from wyghtes
	ML	703	from the
	ML	731	from shame

⁴Where there is direct agreement with Hg in this and all subsequent tables, I have added an asterisk in the margin.

	ML	815	from the
*	NU	22	from such
*	NU	66	from thennes
	NU	173	from this
	PD	235	from the
*	SU	16	from penance
*	TM	361	from the
	WBP	47	from the

It is apparent from these lists of exceptions that this change of practice is limited to certain tales only, and that many occurrences in Hg are duplicated in Ad³. This clustering suggests that rather than representing slips by an otherwise consistent scribe, these examples are directly influenced by the copytext. It also demonstrates that even at this level of orthographic presentation, both Hg and Ad³ are very closely linked.

6.3.2 Apocope

The Hg scribe regularly uses apocope when the definite article is followed by a noun beginning with a vowel, a feature which is also found in Ad³. This practice may be demonstrated by the following examples taken from WBP:

1. 49	Ad	thapostle
	Hg	thapostle
1. 79	Ad	thapostle
	Hg	thapostle
1. 89	Ad	tassemble
	Hg	tassemble

1. 117	Ad	thactes
	Hg	thactes
1. 124	Ad	Theexperience
	Hg	Theexperience
1. 160	Ad	thapostle
	Hg	thapostle
1. 341	Ad	thapostles
	Hg	thapostles

This orthographic practice is clearly of metrical importance, and its regularity in both Hg and Ad³ is significant. Three of the above examples are listed among the 24 variants characteristic of Robinson's O Group manuscripts, and thus are likely to derive from the archetype of the tradition.

6.3.3 Use of <3>

The Hg scribe never uses this grapheme while the Ad³ scribe uses it just 14 times within the entire text of the manuscript: all of these occurrences are found within the first two tales with the following distribution:

GP	213
	232
	768
	782
	803
	828
KN	51
	69

332

345

1239

1350

1392

2222

6.3.4 Use of <p>

While the Hg scribe uses this grapheme on 2061 occasions, the Ad³ scribe limits its use to just 4 instances, with a similar clustering among the opening tales:

KN 256

KN 1098

MI 344

RE 376

6.3.5 Use of <u>/<v>

Both Hg and Ad³ tend to use <u> medially and <v> initially, although both scribes display a certain amount of variation. The Hg scribe is absolutely consistent in his use of initial <v>, and <u> is never used in this position, while the Ad³ scribe shows the following exceptions to this rule:

KN 1723 under

KN 1821 upward

L33 96 usen

MI 245	up
MI 299	uerye

The Hg scribe displays slightly less consistency over the use of medial <u>, and <v> is found in this position in the following instances:

CL 939	Pavyk
FK 451	yvoyded
FR 32	Styves
GP 346	plentevous
GP 434	Avycen
GP 787	avys
KN 1379	avow
L11 13	avisioun
L29 51	novys
ME 191	avoutrye
ML 236	avow
MO 710	Nevev
NP 88	Avoy
PD 367	avow
SU 150	avisioun
TT 188	Beves

The Ad³ scribe betrays a similarly sporadic tendency to inconsistency, resulting in a slightly greater number of examples of medial <v>, although these show little correlation with those of Hg:

CY 12	avauntage
CY 61	availle

CY 220	Canevas
CY 221	syve
GP 188	have
GP 193	sleves
GP 233	knyves
GP 461	lyve
GP 462	five
GP 487	proved
GP 521	heven
GP 550	have
GP 583	lyve
GP 585	lyve
GP 614	have
GP 689	have
GP 715	have
GP 799	have
GP 830	evensong
KN 236	avayn
KN 1127	aveze
L28 25	Evangeliste
L33 89	avowe
ML 566	avyse
ML 662	evyr
ML 804	Fyve
MO 674	availle
* MO 710	nevew
* PD 367	avow
TM 79	avayleth
TM 668	avayleth

	TT 26	Ryvere
*	TT 188	bevys

6.3.6 Use of initial <c>/<k>

This variation will be considered using examples drawn from the spelling of the modal verbs 'can' and 'could'. The Hg scribe's practice is always to use <k> in this position, and only once does he write <c> as shown below. The Ad³ scribe's tendency is to use initial <c> in most cases although approximately one in three instances have <k>. However this ratio changes in forms outside the simple *can* and *coude*, as demonstrated in the table below. This suggests that the progression from the initial <k> forms to the Chancery Standard use of initial <c> was more gradual in the forms that were used less frequently. It is also significant that despite the influence of the Chancery spelling the Ad³ scribe retains many examples of the form characteristic of Hg. The following table gives the figures for all spellings of these modals in Hg and Ad³.

	Hg	Ad ³
kan	200	55
kanst	5	4
konne	17	11
can	0	145
canst	1	5
conne	0	5
koude	130	30

kouth	1	1
kouthe	2	1
kowde	3	0
kouden	2	1
coude	0	52
couth	0	22
couthe	0	12

6.3.7 Reflex of OE a+N

The following tables present the figures for the uses of *a/o* before nasals in both Hg and Ad³.

		Hg	Ad ³
HAND	hond	34	61
	hondes	4	9
	hand	59	26
	handes	20	15
LAND	lond	27	26
	londes	2	2
	land	20	15
BOND	bond	12	8
	bondes	2	3

HUSBAND	housbond(e,es)	68	12
	husbond	0	33
	husband	0	1
STAND	stond(e)	21	6
	stand	2	3
STRONG	strong	17	9
LONG	long	20	8
WRONG	wrong	5	10
HANGED	honged	4	1
	hanged	7	7
THANK-	thonk-	10	5
	thank-	38	41

These figures show that in the representation of *a/o* before a nasal there is close similarity between the practices of the Hg and Ad³ scribes. Both copyists use both <a> and <o>, although there is a slight difference in the degree of preference, particularly in the examples for *hand* and *land* where the Hg scribe is twice as likely to write <a>, while the same statistic applies to the Ad³ scribe's tendency to write <o>. Before <-ng> both scribes show a clear preference for <o>, and the Hg scribe is especially consistent.

6.4 Morphology

This section will provide a detailed comparison of general features of the morphology of verbs, nouns, adjectives and adverbs between Hg and Ad³. I will also provide a more specific consideration of the effect that changes in certain morphological features have on metre.

6.4.1 Verbs

6.4.1.1 Infinitives

There are 2 principal forms of the infinitive in Hg, marked by the inflexions <-e> and <-(e)n>, thus allowing variation for metrical effect. The use of an infinitive with final <-e> would allow elision with a following vowel, while the form with final <-en> would remove this possibility. Each of these possibilities are found in the Ad³ language, although a study of the use of the various forms reveals that the metrical principles developed in Hg are not observed in Ad³.

The following table comprises a list of all uses of <-(e)n> inflexions in all infinitives found in the Ad³ copy of WBP, with the equivalent reading in Hg given below. The list shows that final <-n> is regularly used in Hg to prevent elision before a vowel, thus adding an extra syllable. Ad³ preserves many such examples, although there are 3 occasions where an <-en> inflexion is added unnecessarily, suggesting that the Ad³ scribe did not appreciate the metrical significance of this practice (see lines 166, 167, 412). There are also 2 instances in which an added final <-n> inflexion has no metrical implications (lines 48 and 130).

Ad: l. 48: 'Som cristen man shal wedden me anon'.

Hg: l. 48: 'Som cristen man shal wedde me anon'

Ad: l. 73: 'Poul dorst not commaunden atte leest'.

Hg: l. 73: 'Poul dorste nat comanden at the leeste'

Ad: l. 94: 'Wolde leden al hir lyf in chastitee'.

Hg: l. 94: 'Wolde leden al hir lyf in chastitee'

Ad: l. 130: 'That man shal yelden to his wyf his det'

Hg: l. 130: 'That man shal yelde to his wyf hir dette'

Ad: l. 137: 'To goon and vsen hem in engendrure'

Hg: l. 137: 'To goon and vsen hem in engendrure'

Ad: l. 166: 'I was aboute to wedden a wyf allas'

Hg: l. 166: 'I was aboute to wedde a wyf allas'

Ad: l. 167: 'What shold I byen it on my flesshe so dere'

Hg: l. 167: 'What sholde I bye it on my flessh so deere'

Ad: l. 350: 'Thanne wolde the catte wel dwellen in his In'

Hg: l. 350: 'Thanne wolde the Cat wel dwellen in his In'

Ad: l. 357: 'Syr olde fool what helpeth the thespien'

Hg: l. 357: 'Sire olde fool what helpeth thee tespyen'

Ad: l. 393: 'Of wenches wold I beren hem on honde'

Hg: l. 393: 'Of wenches wolde I bern hem on honde'

Ad: l. 412: 'Thanne wolde I suffren him do his nycete'

Hg: l. 412: 'Thanne wolde I suffre hym do his nycetee'

Ad: l. 440: 'Oon of vs two moste bowen doutelees'

Hg: l. 440: 'Oon of vs two moste bowen doutelees'

Ad: l. 442: 'Than womman is ye mosten ben sufferable'

Hg: l. 442: 'Than womman is ye mosten been suffrable'

Ad: l. 563: 'Now wol I tellen forth what happed me'

Hg: l. 563: 'Now wol I tellen forth what happed me'

Ad: l. 635: 'And suffreth his wif go seken halwes'

Hg: l. 635: 'And suffreth his wyf to go seken halwes'

Ad: l. 663: 'To reden in this book of wykked wyues'

Hg: l. 663: 'To reden in this book of wikked wyues'

Ad: l. 698: 'Tho redde he me yf that I shal nat lyen'

Hg: l. 698: 'Tho redde he me if that I shal nat lyen'

Ad: l. 700: 'That caused him to setten himself a fyre'

Hg: l. 700: 'That caused hym to sette hym self afyre'

Ad: l. 763: 'To reden on this cursed book al nyght'

Hg: l. 763: 'To reden on this cursed book al nyght'

Ad: l. 817: 'That al the folk shal laughen in this place'

Hg: l. 817: 'That al the folk shal laughen in this place'

The following table gives all occurrences of final <-en> in Hg where Ad³ omits the inflexion, each of which result in the loss of a syllable thus spoiling the regularity of the Hg metre. However line 375 demonstrates that the Hg line is not always metrically superior, as the lack of elision adds an eleventh syllable that is not found in the Ad³ reading.

Ad: l. 83: 'And for to be a wyf he yaue me leue'

Hg: l. 83: 'And for to been a wyf he yaf me leue'

Ad: l. 375: 'To consume euery thing that brent wil be'

Hg: l. 375: 'To consumen euery thyng that brent wol be'

Ad: l. 391: 'Thei were ful glad to excuse hem ful blyue'

Hg: l. 391: 'They were ful glad to excusen hem ful blyue'

Ad: l. 480: 'Now wol I telle of my fierth housbonde'

Hg: l. 480: 'Now wol I tellen of my ferthe housbonde'

From these examples it seems that the Ad³ scribe most commonly wrote infinitives without final <-n>, although he added this inflexion in certain instances. The addition of the inflexion does not seem to be related to metrical sensitivity, but may be due to a wish to highlight an infinitive form in a complex syntactical structure. This possibility is exemplified in line 167 where the syntax makes the function of *byen* ambiguous, and an <-n> inflexion highlights that this is an infinitive rather than a 1st person present indicative.

6.4.1.2 Present Tense

The dominant marker of the 3rd person singular in Hg is the ending <-eth>, an inflexion which is preserved with great consistency in Ad³. The following table lists all occurrences of the <-eth> inflexion in WBP in Hg and its equivalent spelling in Ad³:

	Hg	Ad ³
0	bigynneth	bigynneth
50	liketh	lyketh
53	rekketh	reccheth
61	telleth	telleth
64	speketh	speketh
76	renneth	renneth
97	liketh	lyketh
102	clepeth	clepeth
104	liketh	lyketh
118	Trusteth	Trusteth
162	liketh	liketh
182	writeth	wryteth
191	taketh	taketh
266	Coueitheth	Coueitheth
274	nedeth	nedeth
275	entendeth	entendeth
281	eyleth	eyleth
293	displeseth	displeseth
305	squyereth	squyereth
316	helpeth	helpeth

321	taketh	taketh
327	rekketh	rekketh
357	helpeth	helpeth
374	brenneth	brenneth
377	destroyeth	destruyeth
432	looketh	loketh
437	suffreth	suffreth
443	eyleth	eyleth
465	engendreth	engendryth
469	remembreth	remembreth
471	tikeleth	tikleth
522	maketh	maketh
524	knoweth	knoweth
630	comandeth	commaundeth
630	forbedeth	forbedeth
633	buyldeth	bildeth
634	priketh	priketh
635	suffreth	suffreth
666	trusteth	trusteth
677	loueth	loueth
678	loueth	loueth
680	faileth	faileth
683	faileth	faileth
755	loueth	loueth
830/1	endeth	endyth

These examples show that the endings of 3rd person singular verb forms correspond very closely between Hg and Ad³, with just 2 occurrences in Ad³ of the variant

spelling <-yth>. The sole example where these manuscripts are not in agreement is explained by disparity over number:

Hg: 640 'I hate hym that my vices telleth me'

Ad: 640 'I hate hem that my vices tellen me'

Phonetic modification of the stem of verbs ending in *d* or *t* produces 3rd person singular forms ending <-t(e)>. Examples of these forms in Hg are also found in Ad³, with one exception in *writeth* at line 687, as shown below. The variation in *writ/writeth* is significant as the Ad³ form adds a syllable thus spoiling the metrical regularity of the Hg line, suggesting that the Hg form *writ* is that of the archetype:

Hg: 389 'Who so that first to mille comth first grynt'

Ad: 389 'Who so that first comth to melle first grynt'

Hg: 687 'Thanne sit he doun and writ in his dotage'

Ad: 687 'Thanne sit he doun and writeth in his dotage'

The use of syncopated forms in the third person singular in Hg is also found in Ad³, represented in WBP by the form 'comth' at lines 389 and 706. The presence of such forms in Ad³ is significant since, although Chaucer evidently exploited this feature for metrical purposes, few manuscripts preserve any examples.⁵ In plural forms all persons adopt the ending <-(e)n> or remain uninflected: variation which may also be manipulated for metrical effect.

⁵The use of the syncopated form *comth* at lines 389 and 706 of WBP is found only in the following ten manuscripts: Ad³, Cn, Cp, Ds¹, En¹, El, Ha⁵, Hg, Ht, Tc¹.

6.4.1.3 Preterite Tense

Plural preterites in Hg commonly end in <-ed>, while some examples add an <-(e)n> inflexion to this form, and are thus metrically significant. The forms found in WBP in Hg are generally replicated exactly in Ad³, although there is less tendency to add the <-(e)n> inflexion, thus in some instances removing a syllable from the Hg line, exemplified predominantly in the variation in the use of *had* and *hadden*.

- Hg: 207 'They loued me so wel by god aboue
Ad: 207 'Thei loued me so wel bi god a boue'
- Hg: 216 'That many a night they songen weylawey
Ad: 216 'That many a nyght thei songe weilawey'
- Hg: 381 'That thus they seyden in hir dronkenesse'
Ad: 381 'That thus thei seiden in hir dronkenesse'
- Hg: 407 'Namely abedde hadden they meschaunce'
Ad: 407 'Namely a bedde had thei meschance'
- Hg: 564 'I seye that in the feeldes walked we'
Ad: 564 'I sey that in the feeldes walked we'
- Hg: 565 'Til trewely we hadde swich daliaunce'
Ad: 565 'Til trewely we hedden swich daliance'
- Hg: 584 'With neghebores that for hym maden sorwe'
Ad: 584 'Wyth neighbours that for him maden sorwe'

- Hg: 597 'And trewely as myne housbondes tolde me'
 Ad: 597 'And trewly as myn housbondes tolden me'
- Hg: 671 'By god if wommen hadden writen stories'
 Ad: 671 'By god yif wymmen had wryten storyes'
- Hg: 673 'They wolde han writen of men moore wikkednesse'
 Ad: 673 'Thei wold haue writen of men more wikkednesse'
- Hg: 796 'After that day we hadden neuere debaat'
 Ad: 796 'After that day we had neuer debate'

6.4.1.4 Past Participles

An important feature of the past participle in Hg is the amount of variation in the use of the <y-> prefix derived from the OE prefix <ge->, apparently exploited by Chaucer for metrical effect. There is remarkable agreement between the appearances of this prefix in Hg and Ad³, represented in the latter by the grapheme <I>. The following lists all such uses in Hg and Ad³ in WBP, demonstrating the exact agreement between the two manuscripts.

- | | | | |
|--------|-------------|-----|------------|
| 1. 17 | 'I had' | Hg: | 'yhad' |
| 1. 71 | 'I sowe' | Hg: | 'ysowe' |
| 1. 117 | 'I wroght' | Hg: | 'ywroght' |
| 1. 323 | 'I blessed' | Hg: | 'yblessed' |
| 1. 367 | 'I rekened' | Hg: | 'Yrekened' |
| 1. 496 | 'I graue' | Hg: | 'ygraue' |

6.4.2 Nouns

Nominal plurality and possession continue to be marked by inflexion in Hg, with most instances adopting the <-(e)s> plural derived from OE strong nouns. There is also a single example of the suffix <-is> in WBP, 'talis'(319), and all such inflexions are represented in the Ad³ language. Despite the widespread dominance of the plural inflexion derived from strong nominal declensions, weak forms did survive in certain instances, some of which are still current in MnE. Examples of these in WBP are: 'children'(675) and 'eyen'(697). Uninflected plurals are also found in our sample, particularly in mass nouns such as 'folk'(301). A final method of indicating plurality is through mutation of the root vowel, shown in the sample by the forms 'men'(673) and 'feet'(588). Weak, uninflected and mutated plurals remain stable across both manuscripts with a single exception in the use of *eyn* at line 358 in Ad³, where Hg has the regular bisyllabic form *eyen*.

6.4.3 Adjectives

While the complex inflexional system found in adjectives in Old English is considerably simplified in the language of Hg, the final <-e> inflexion which in OE marked definiteness and plurality continued to be used with remarkable consistency (Samuels 1988b; Burnley 1982). This inflexion was added to monosyllabic adjectives whose OE stem ended in a consonant, when modifying a plural noun or a singular noun used definitely. In order to assess the stability of final <-e> in the Ad³ language I have surveyed the adherence to this rule in all relevant examples in WBP. The use of this adjectival inflexion in Ad³ mirrors the usage in Hg in many instances, although there are a large number of examples where <-e> though required grammatically is missing, and a greater number of extraneous inflexions. The number of such ungrammatical inflexions suggests the scribe's lack of understanding

of the function of final <-e>, and the nature of many of the errors suggests that the correct usage of these inflexions is coincidental. Certain words which have both uninflected and inflected forms in Hg seem to have just one fixed form in Ad³, exemplified by the regular appearance of *wyse* in Ad³. The following list contains all examples of adjectives in the linguistic sample that are subject to the above rule. I also include the Hg line to allow comparison with the grammatical regularity found in this manuscript. However the consistency of Hg is disrupted on 2 occasions where the scribe has added a final <-e> where it is not required by the principles outlined above. The first of these, line 320, may be caused by confusion over the use of the vocative, while the second, line 457, seems to be due to the positioning of the adjective in rhyme. The tendency to add a final <-e> to adjectives in rhyme is widespread in Ad³, and seems to explain a number of uses of such inflexions: exemplified in line 197 where although both adjectives 'good' and 'old' are plural, only the rhyme word is inflected.

- | | | |
|--------|----|--|
| 1. 18 | Hg | And that ilke man which that now hath thee |
| | Ad | And that ilk man which that now hath the |
| | | |
| 1. 21 | Hg | But þ ^t I axe why þ ^t the fifthe man |
| | Ad | But that I axe whi that the fyfthe man |
| | | |
| 1. 35 | Hg | Lo here the wise kyng daun Salomon |
| | Ad | Lo here the wyse kyng daun Salamon |
| | | |
| 1. 121 | Hg | Of Vryne and oure bothe thynges smale |
| | Ad | Bothe of our vryne and thynges smale |
| | | |
| 1. 180 | Hg | Who so þ ^t nyle be war by othere men |
| | Ad | Who so that nyl be war bi other men |

1. 181 Hg By hym shal othere men corrected be
Ad By him shal other men corrected be
1. 187 Hg And techeth vs yonge men of youre praktyke
Ad And teche vs yonge men of your practyk
- rubric Ad Bihold how this good wif serued hir .iij first
[not in Hg] husbondes which were gode olde men.
1. 196 Hg As three of hem were goode and two were badde
Ad As thre of hem were good and thi were badde
1. 197 Hg The thre men were goode and ryche and olde
Ad The thre men were ryche and good and olde
1. 209 Hg A wys womman wol bisye hir euere in oon
Ad A wyse womman wol bysi hir euer in oon
1. 221 Hg To brynge me gaye thynges fro the ffeyre
Ad To brynge me thinges gay fro the feyre
1. 225 Hg Ye wise wyues that konne vnderstonde
Ad Ye wyse wyues that conne vnderstande
1. 229 Hg I sey nat this by wyues þ^t ben wyse
Ad I sey nat theigh by wyues that ben wyse
1. 231 Hg A wys wyf if that she kan hir good

- Ad A wyse wif yif that she can hir good
1. 235 Hg Sire olde kaynard is this thyn array
Ad Syr olde kaynard is this thin array
1. 242 Hg Sire olde lechour lat thy Iapes be
Ad Sire olde lechour let thi iapes be
1. 261 Hg Some for hir handes and hir armes smale
Ad Some for hir hondes and hir armes smale
1. 274 Hg And that no wys man nedeth for to wedde
Ad And that no wyse man nedeth for to wedde
1. 280 Hg Out of hir owene houses a benedicitee
Ad Out of hir owne houses .o. benedicite
1. 281 Hg What eyleth swich an old man for to chide
Ad What eyleth suche an olde man for to chide
1. 291 Hg Til they be wedded olde dotard shrewe
Ad Til thei be wedded old dotard shrewe
1. 302 Hg Thus seistow olde barel ful of lyes
Ad Thus seistow olde barell ful of lyes
1. 320 Hg I knowe yow for a trewe wyf Dame Alis
Ad I know yow for a trew wyf dame Alys

1. 324 Hg The wise Astrologen Daun Protholome
 Ad The wyse astrologen daun protholome
1. 331 Hg ffor certes olde dotard by youre leue
 Ad ffor certes olde dotard by youre leue
1. 357 Hg Sire olde fool what helpeth thee tespyen
 Ad Syr olde fool what helpeth the thespien
1. 363 Hg The whiche thynges troublen al this erthe
 Ad The which thinges troublen al this erthe
1. 380 Hg Bar I stifly myne olde housbondes on honde
 Ad Bar I stifly myn olde husbondes on hande
1. 449 Hg But I wol kepe it for youre owene tooth
 Ad But I wil kepe it for your owne toth
1. 451 Hg Swiche manere wordes hadde we on honde
 Ad Such maner wordes had we an hond
1. 457 Hg How koude I daunce to an harpe smale
 Ad How couth I daunce to an harpe smale
1. 460 Hg Metellyus the foule cherl the swyn
 Ad Metellyus the foule cherle the swyne
1. 480 Hg Now wol I tellen of my ferthe housbonde
 Ad Now wol I telle of my fierth housbonde

1. 487 Hg That in his owene grece I made hym frye
Ad That in his owene grece I made him frye
1. 503 Hg Now of my fifthe housbonde wol I telle
Ad Now of my fifthe housbond wol I telle
1. 505 Hg And yet was he to me the mooste shrewe
Ad And yet was he to me the most shrew
1. 516 Hg In this matere a queynte fantasye
Ad In this matere a queynt fantasie
1. 525 Hg My fifthe housbonde god his soule blesse
Ad My fifthe husbond god his soule blesse
1. 559 Hg And wered vp on my gaye scarlet gytes
Ad And wered vpon my gay scarlet gites
1. 571 Hg Of mariage nof othere thynges eek
Ad Of mariage ne of other thinges eke
1. 577 Hg Whan that my fourthe housbonde was a beere
Ad Whan that my fourth housbond was a bere
1. 588 Hg Of legges and of feet so clene and fayre
Ad Of legges and feet so clene and fair
1. 596 Hg And fayr and ryche and yong and wel bigoon

- Ad And faire and riche and yonge and wel bigon
1. 598 Hg I hadde the beste quonyam myghte be
Ad I had the best quonyam that myght be
1. 620 Hg And me of olde Romayn gestes teche
Ad And me olde Romayn gestes teche
1. 629 Hg That ilke prouerbe of Ecclesiaste
Ad That ilke prouerbe of Ecclesiaste
1. 634 Hg And priketh his blynde hors ouer the falwes
Ad And priketh his blynde hors ouer the falwes
1. 638 Hg Of his prouerbe nof his olde sawe
Ad Of his prouerbis ne of his olde sawe
1. 665 Hg Than been of goode wyues in the Bible
Ad Than ben of good wyues in the bible
1. 686 Hg Of venus werkes worth his olde sho
Ad Of venus werkes worth his olde sho
1. 750 Hg Be with a leoun or a foul dragoun
Ad Be which a leon or a foul dragoun
1. 758 Hg A fair womman but she be chaast also
Ad A fair womman but yif she be chast also

1. 759 Hg Is lyk a gold ryng in a sowes nose
 Ad Is lyke a goldryng in a sowes nose
1. 774 Hg O hastow slayn me false theef I sayde
 Ad O hastow slayn me fals thef I sayde
1. 793 Hg And þ^t he seyde myn owene trewe wyf
 Ad And that he seyde myn owne trew wif
1. 805 Hg This is a long preamble of a tale
 Ad This is a longe preamble of a tale
1. 809 Hg Loo goode men a flye and eek a frere
 Ad Lo good men a flye and ek a frere

6.4.4. Adverbs

The adverb in Middle English could be formed by the addition of one of three suffixes: <-ly>, <-lich(e)>, <-e>. In Hg most adverbs adopt the first of these types, and this situation is mirrored in the practice of the Ad³ scribe. The following is a list of all adverbs in <-ly> in WBP in both Hg and Ad³:

	Ad ³	Hg
1. 111	parfytyly	parfitly
1. 150	frely	frely
1. 188	gladly	gladly
1. 202	pitously	pitously
1. 211	hooly	hoolly

1. 223	spitously	spitously
1. 227	boldely	boldely
1. 330	myrily	myrily
1. 380	stifly	stifly
1. 402	kyndely	kyndely
1. 407	namely	namely
1. 432	mekely	mekely
1. 486	certeynly	certeynly
1. 492	bitterly	bitterly
1. 499	sotilly	subtilly
1. 517	lightly	lightly
1. 565	trewly	trewely
1. 569	certeynly	certeynly
1. 597	trewly	trewely
1. 642	outrely	outrely
1. 647	gladly	gladly
1. 662	worldly	worldly
1. 712	falsly	falsly
1. 718	priuely	priuely
1. 764	sodenly	sodeynly

Despite the regularity of the <-ly> suffix in the examples drawn from WBP, there are a number of instances of <-lich(e)> in both Hg and Ad³ as listed below:

Hg:

CL 213	pourellich
CL 267	richeliche
CL 706	fulliche

CL 911	hastiliche
CL 1055	pourelliche
GP 140	estatlich
GP 380	realliche
GP 734	rudeliche
KN 410	nameliche
KN 2180	nameliche
MI 429	verrailliche
ML 653	fendlich
ML 685	fendlich
PA 263	lawefulliche
RE 42	smoterlich
RE 68	nameliche
SH 30	knewliche
SQ 166	realliche
SQ 273	festlich
SQ 358	vnfestlich
SQ 615	goodlich
TM 763	goodliche
TM 774	goodlich

Ad³:

	CY 281	oonlych
	CY 334	goodlych
	CY 563	hastilych
*	CL 1055	porelych
*	KN 410	namelych
	KN 1822	frendlych
*	KN 2180	namelych

	ME 818	sotillich
*	MI 429	verraylich
*	ML 653	fendelich
*	ML 685	fendelich
*	PA 263	lawfullych
	PH 21	erthelich
*	RE 42	smoterlych
*	SQ 166	rialiche
*	SQ 273	festlich
*	SQ 358	vnfestlich
*	SQ 615	goodlych
	TM 343	subtillych
*	TM 763	goodlych
*	TM 774	goodlych

6.5 Analysis

The language of Ad³ has much in common with that of Hg in all areas of orthography and morphology. However there are a number of features that differ from the more regular language of Hg, which are due to several important influences to be considered individually in this section. The primary influence is that of the process of fifteenth-century linguistic change which saw the disruption of many of the grammatical principles that underlie Hg, and the rise of a new London standard language. A second influence is found in a small group of forms which appear as minor linguistic features in both Hg and Ad³, often in exactly the same positions in both manuscripts. These forms will be considered alongside an examination of their attestation and distribution across other stages of the manuscript tradition. A final influence is that of the dialect of the scribe of Ad³ or an intervening copytext: an

influence which must be considered alongside any evidence for the type of copying carried out by this scribe.

6.5.1 Influence of Chancery Standard

The emergence of a standard language in the early fifteenth century was initially identified by M.L. Samuels in 'Some applications of Middle English Dialectology' (Samuels 1963). In this article Samuels classified the standard written languages of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries into four major types. Type I is the language of the Wycliffite manuscripts, derived from the Central Midlands dialects, which was used to circulate Lollard tracts throughout the provinces. Type II represents the earliest form of a London Standard and is typified by the language of the main hand of the Auchinleck manuscript. Type III, a slightly later development, is categorised as the language of Chaucer and Hoccleve, as far as can be determined from the best extant manuscripts, and some of the official documents anthologised by Chambers and Daunt (Chambers and Daunt 1931). The chronological development of these standards culminates in the fourth type, "Chancery Standard" in the Samuels' nomenclature, from which our Modern English Standard is ultimately derived. Type IV is represented by the written language of government documents in the large output of vernacular documentation that issued from the Chancery and Signet offices after 1430. These official documents have been diplomatically transcribed and anthologized by Fisher et al., giving us access to specific forms of this language in their original orthography and morphology (Fisher, Richardson and Fisher 1984).

A comparison of the central features that demonstrate the development of the orthography of Chancery Standard with those of Ad³ shows a degree of influence from the pressures of the London Standard. While the dominant spelling of 'such' in Ad³ remains that of Hg's *swich(e)*, there are 49 uses of the Chancery form *such(e)*. Similarly the Ad³ scribe's preference for *nat/noght* mirrors the Hg usage, while there

are a further 198 occurrences of the Chancery spelling *not*. There are 40 instances of the Hg form *much(e,el)*, and a further 65 uses of the spelling *moch(e,el)*. This division is also reflected in the Chancery documents, where 16 examples of *much(e)* are recorded alongside 19 instances of *moche*. The dominant spelling of 'many' in Ad³ is that of both Hg and the Chancery, while the scribe's less usual form *mony* is also found on 5 occasions within mid-fifteenth-century Chancery documents. Other features of the Hg orthography coincide with the parallel spelling in Chancery Standard, and this shared form is also found in Ad³. This situation is exemplified in the spellings *which(e)*, *any*, *but*. Discounting these coincident spellings, it is clear that while Chancery Standard did exert a degree of influence on the language of Ad³, the spellings associated with Hg continued to dominate even in words most likely to display influences of standardisation.

6.5.2 Influence of the Archetype

In addition to the influences exhibited in the Ad³ language from the immediate copytext and the growth of the incipient standard, there are a small number of features that also appear as minor forms in the Hg language, often appearing at exactly the same positions in both manuscripts. Given the consistency of Hg and its assumed place at the head of the textual tradition it might appear surprising that such apparently anomalous forms should occur. However studies of Chaucer's spelling and the copyist of both Hg and El, and his work on the Trinity copy of Gower's *Confessio Amantis* have suggested that the language of Hg and El is that of their shared copyist, imposed by a process of consistent translation (Samuels 1988a). These studies have suggested that forms that are common to both Hg and El, and not found in the same scribe's stint on the Trinity Gower, are due to constrained selection, and thus are the forms of the archetype itself. If Scribe B is indeed a meticulous translator, then these minor forms in Hg may also be relicts: exemplar forms

accidentally preserved in a process of general translation. However, rather than make initial assumptions as to the scribe's method of copying, we must first analyse the distribution of these minor forms throughout the manuscript, and subsequently across the tradition. Where such forms are distributed at random throughout the poem a theory of accidental transcription is probable, but where minor forms cluster within certain tales and quires such a theory is less likely. Where specific clustering is observed I will examine the presence of such forms in E1 and trace their dissemination across the tradition. The minor forms in Hg that I will consider are the following:

- (i) Use of *theigh* 'though'
- (ii) Initial <c> in modals
- (iii) Use of <sch>
- (iv) Use of <agh>
- (v) Ay- forms of 'again(st)'

The two dominant forms for 'though', *thogh*, *though*, concur in both Hg and E1, although there is a change in preference between the two. Despite the consistency of this usage in both Scribe B's manuscripts, a third form also appears in Hg, as shown in the figures below:

	Hg	E1
thogh	186	36
though	26	74
theigh	7	0

Although *theigh* only occurs in 7 instances in Hg, it also appears in Ad³ and the distribution of these occurrences are particularly significant. These occurrences are as follows:

Hg: FR 27
FR 166
FR 226
FR 312
SQ 317
SQ 604
WB 53

Ad³:

* FR 27
GP 230
GP 727
GP 729
GP 737
L20 12
L20 29
SH 136
* SQ 317
* WB 53
WB 229

The concentration of these forms in both manuscripts, and the exact correlation at FR 27, SQ 317 and WB 53 suggests a close relationship between Hg and Ad³, and that the origins of these forms lie in the Hg exemplar, rather than in the copying errors of Scribe B. There are few other examples of this form in other witnesses, although the two manuscripts copied by Scribe D add conviction to this theory. Cp has 2 examples of *peigh* at SH 147 and SQ 604, while Ha⁴ has 3 such examples at ME 48, SQ 604 and WB 952. The presence of this form in both these manuscripts, and the exact agreement with Hg at SQ 604 gives strong support to the theory that this spelling belongs to the ultimate archetype.

While both Hg and El are consistent in the use of initial <k> in modal forms there are 3 exceptions to this practice, distributed as follows:

Hg	FR 280	canst
El	L33 42	can
	MO 48	can

While the figures for these forms may seem insignificant, the presence of the single example in Hg in FR seems to associate this form with the process of deliberate transcription outlined above. Another unusual feature in Hg is the presence of the consonant cluster <sch> which appears only in two words: *yschent* and *bysschop* both of which appear in FR, at lines 12 and 17 respectively. This feature is also found in certain isolated examples in Ad³, as listed below:

GP 683	Discheuele
KN 1407	schook
PD 491	schal
TM 208	frenschipe

A further uncommon feature of the Hg spelling system is found when a back vowel is followed by <gh>, without an intervening <u>. Words spelt in this manner are also found to be grouped in certain tales, again suggesting that this is a feature preserved from the Hg copytext:

GP 135	draghte
GP 136	raghte
GP 384	draghte
GP 398	draghte
FR 17	caght

KN 1173	slaghtre
L21 27	draghte
PD 35	draghte
PD 36	taghte
PD 128	draghte
PD 240	draghte
TM 1575	naght

This spelling is also found in El, although there are far fewer examples:

L21 27	draghte
L36 83	draghte

Ad³ presents a larger number of such spellings, often clustering in the same tales as those of Hg, and with several exact agreements:⁶

	CL 685	aght
	GP 499	taght
	KN 1153	laghyng
	KN 1198	sagh
	KN 1215	sagh
	KN 1683	naght
	KN 1781	taght
	KN 1791	naght
**	L21 27	draght
	L36 83	draghte
	MA 233	taght
	MA 234	naght

⁶Two asterisks have been included to demonstrate where Ad³ is in agreement with both Hg and El, and one asterisk marks an agreement with either Hg or El.

	ME 79	naght
	ME 479	laghet
	ME 741	Thagh
	ME 1043	Thagh
	MI 229	sagh
	MI 275	sagh
	MI 487	sagh
	PA 29	slaghter
*	PD 35	draght
*	PD 128	draght
*	PD 240	draghtes
	PR 53	sagh
	PR 59	naght
	RE 381	sagh
	SQ 179	taght
	TM 104	naght
	TM 862	sagh
	TT 20	raght
	WB 12	taght
	WB 96	Thagh

The final spellings to be considered are *ay-* forms of 'again(st)'. Figures for spellings of 'again(st)', as given in the data, show that the preferred forms in Hg all adopt the *ag-* form. However there are a number of exceptions, found at the following line references:

CL 320
 KN 34
 KN 651

ME 1016

ME 1069

NP 590

RE 146

SQ 662

TM 664

Once again these spellings are supported by the evidence of El, and the close agreement in Ad³:

El:

* CL 320
CO 16
* KN 34
* KN 651
KN 929
L1 46/1
* ME 1016
PA 375
SQ 88
SQ 119
* SQ 662

Ad³:

** CL 320
CL 1110
** KN 34
* L1 46/1
** ME 1016

- * ME 1069
- MI 585
- RE 359
- PA 191
- PR 122
- SH 37
- SH 312
- SH 350
- SH 357
- SQ 581
- TM 268

The evidence of Scribe D's work on Cp and Ha⁴ is also significant to this discussion. The dominant spelling in both these manuscripts adopts the form *aʒ-*, although the spelling with *ay-* is found on 2 occasions in each witness. Both Cp and Ha⁴ have a single such spelling at different lines in SQ (lines 332 and 584/1 respectively), thus reinforcing the Hg clustering, and both agree in the use of *ayeyn* at line 799 of TM.

This evidence shows that while the Hg scribe may indeed have largely imposed his own spelling system onto his copytext, he also transcribed a number of less common forms. The grouping of these forms and their unfamiliarity within the consistent Hg language suggests that these are the spellings of the immediate copytext and, given the place of Hg on the stemma, those of the archetype. Minor appearances of these forms, and their similar distribution within El, Cp and Ha⁴ add further weight to this claim, while the close correlation in Ad³ suggests a close relationship between Ad³ and Hg, or the ultimate archetype. That these spellings have survived the translation of Scribes B and D into their own dialects of East and West Midlands, and the influences of Chancery Standard exhibited in Ad³, further reinforces their claim to represent the orthography of the archetype.

An examination of the linguistic provenance of these forms further supports the hypothesis that they are the spellings of Chaucer's own repertoire. The most significant of these forms is *theigh*: a spelling which seems to have had restricted currency in London English of the Type III variety.⁷ By the later decades of the fourteenth century, this form had been largely replaced by the forms derived from ON *þó*: a development that was necessitated by the homophonic clash that arose with the simultaneous spread of the ON third-person plural personal pronoun *thei(h)*. (Blake 1996: 157) The spelling *þey* is recorded just once in Chambers and Daunt in a Guild Return of 1389, and is not recorded in Hoccleve's holographs. However there are 7 examples of this spelling in Corpus Christi College Cambridge MS 61 of Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*. The widespread use of this spelling is part of an earlier stage in the development of London English, associated with Samuels' Type II: the spellings *þei*, *þai*, *þez* are found in regular usage by Hands I, III, and V of the Auchinleck Manuscript. The use of the other orthographic features I have considered above is less clear than this example, as many of these features are commonly found in other contemporary London documents. However one other feature of Corpus 61 provides a further piece of support for the claim that these features are authorial. Despite the consistent use of <sh> spellings in this manuscript, Corpus 61 also contains 2 occurrences of the <sch> spellings noted above: *scholdest* (I. 774) and *schal* (II. 46). Thus it seems possible that the combination of this minor orthographic feature and the occasional use of *theigh* in this manuscript of high textual authority is linked to the similar situation in Hg. Therefore it seems that these features, comprising a blend of Type II and Type III spellings, are derived from the spellings of the poet himself. The survival of these forms in Ad³ despite the influence of the incipient Chancery Standard, suggests that the scribe considered these spellings as worthy of preservation. While these forms survive relatively infrequently in early copies of the *Canterbury Tales*, they are generally found in similar numbers in both Hg and Ad³. The appearance of such forms in Ad³ reinforces the likelihood that the scribe had

⁷For profiles of localisable London texts see *LALME* III pp. 298-301.

access to an early exemplar of the poem, as these forms disappear from the tradition at an early stage. The close agreement in a number of such forms between Hg and Ad³ demonstrates a high level of care and accuracy in retaining these spellings on the part of the Ad³ scribe.

6.5.3 Other Forms

While many of the central features of the orthography of Ad³ may be attributed to the influences of the archetype and the incipient standard, there remains a number of rogue forms which cannot be explained in this way. These forms are associated with particular dialects and seem to make up a distinct linguistic layer that must be considered separately. The clearest indicators of this layer are the following spellings of 'though' and 'not': *thagh/thaugh* and *naght/nought*. Both spellings of 'not', *naght/nought*, are predominantly Midland forms, covering both West and East Midlands, with some Southern examples (See *LALME* I: Maps 276 and 283). Despite the wide distribution of these forms, the evidence of *thaugh/thagh* allows us to be more specific in our localisation. *Thaugh* is a distinctly West Midland form with little currency outside an area along the Gloucestershire and Herefordshire borders, while *thagh* is also limited to this area, with a minor number of uses in the North West Midlands. (See *LALME* I: Maps 195 and 198) Thus it can be shown that these dialect forms cohere in a specific area of the South West Midlands: specifically that of the borders of Gloucestershire and Herefordshire.

The origin of these West Midland forms is more difficult to assess, as such forms may have arisen as a result of the influence of the immediate copytext, or one or more antecedent stages of copying, or the dialect of the Ad³ scribe himself. This question must therefore be approached through a study of the type of copying carried out by the Ad³ scribe, and thus his attitude to the language of his immediate copytext. McIntosh has argued that all ME scribes fall into three categories of copyist

(McIntosh 1963). The first type of copyist (A) performs a *literatim* transcription of the copytext, preserving all graphemic characteristics. The second type (B) copies on a logographic level, thus producing a 'translation' into his own scribal idiolect. Type C, the most widely represented, combines these two processes with a variety of results. The linguistic data presented above shows that the Ad³ copyist belongs to McIntosh's third category, and that the resulting output is a *mischsprache*. In their discussion of *mischsprachen*, Benskin and Laing have shown that the appearance of exotic dialectal forms must be considered in light of their distribution across the manuscript text (Benskin and Laing 1981). Where such forms are found randomly dispersed throughout the text, they may be viewed as 'relict' forms: exemplar spellings transcribed by an otherwise consistent translator. However where these dialectal forms are clustered in specific textual or codicological sections, particularly at the beginning of a stint of copying, they may be deemed the result of a distinct move from transcription to translation. A third possibility, which presents a more complex dialectal mixture, is produced when a scribe accommodates his own spontaneous usage to that of his exemplar. A scribe operating according to 'constrained selection' will disperse forms from within the limits of his active and passive repertoires evenly throughout the entire text. Thus in order to assess the origins of these West Midland forms in Ad³ we must consider their distribution throughout the text.

The dialectal forms highlighted above are found at the following line references:

<i>naght</i>	KN 1683
	MA 234
	ME 79
	PR 59
	TM 104
	TM 694

nought

FK 853

FK 900

GP 518

KN 237

KN 1543

KN 1617

NU 324

NU 470

SU 19

SU 75

SU 262

SU 263

SU 487

SU 506

WBP 656

WBT 1162

WBT 1187

WBT 1235

thagh

ME 741

ME 1043

WBP 96

thaugh

KN 231

KN 1400

NU 499

WBP 307

The evidence of this distribution points to a significant amount of overlap of these features at the beginning of the manuscript: especially within GP and KN. Other occurrences not limited to the beginning of the text, are also clustered in certain

textual sections. Indeed when we introduce the evidence of further uncharacteristic forms, we find an overwhelming number of such forms also clustered within the opening tales of the manuscript. The sole use of *sheo* is found at line 1809 of KN, the only two occurrences of *iffe* at lines 635 and 656 of GP, and two isolated uses of *att* at lines 346 and 1993 of KN (See *LALME I*: Maps 19, 210). The scribe also writes West Midland <e> for <i> in a small number of related occurrences: *ferst* (GP 530), *seluer* (CY 103, FR 100), *befor-* (CL 894, CY 598), *these* (CY 57, SQ 443). Spellings of 'are', 'before' and 'or' in *ar* are further characteristic of West Midland texts, and all these are found sporadically in the Ad³ language.⁸ These are the references:

'are'	<i>ar</i>	CY 195
		RE 189
'before'	<i>ar</i>	CY 450
'or'	<i>ar</i>	MI 95
		PD 428

Another feature characteristic of West Midland texts is the rounding of vowels before nasals, represented in Ad³ by the forms *mon* and *mony* which appear at the following references only:

<i>mony</i>	KN 395
	L1 73
<i>mon</i>	CY 672
	KN 404
	KN 406
	KN 1685

⁸For the geographical distribution of these forms see *LALME I*: Maps 118, 232, 489.

The combined testimony of the clustering of these features within the opening tales of the text suggests that these forms have been carried over from the exemplar, during an initial process of transcription. As the scribe became more familiar with the copytext he gradually adopted a logographic policy and began to translate these West Midland forms into those of his active repertoire. A final piece of evidence is found in the scribe's use of the graphemes <p> and <3> which are only used in 5 and 14 instances respectively: a usage limited exclusively to the opening folios of the manuscript:

<p>	KN 256
	KN 1098
	MI 344
	RE 376
<3>	GP 213
	GP 232
	GP 768
	GP 782
	GP 803
	GP 828
	KN 51
	KN 69
	KN 332
	KN 345
	KN 1239
	KN 1350
	KN 1392
	KN 2222

Thus it may be that the presence of a number of characteristically West Midland forms in Ad³ is due to the influence of the immediate exemplar, preserved in early portions of the text by the scribe's initial graphemic transcription practice, and subsequently removed by the scribe's adoption of a process of dialectal translation.

However there are two further possible explanations for the dialectal mix found in the Ad³ language. Given the principle of minimising linguistic layers stressed by dialectologists, we must consider the possibility that the forms assigned to different strata of copying should be amalgamated and considered as the result of a single stage of transmission.⁹ As I have shown above the rogue spellings *naght/nought* and *thagh/though* found in Ad³ have a limited dialectal provenance and cannot be accommodated within a London localisation. However it could possibly be argued that the forms discussed above cohere within the West Midland provenance assigned to the features appearing early in the text, and that it is this West Midland exemplar that underlies both Ad³ and Hg. The strongest support for this theory comes from the distribution of recorded uses of *theigh*, shown in *LALME* to cluster around this same area of the West Midlands (Vol. I: Map 201). This localisation is supported by the evidence of the other witnesses of WBP, where 9 manuscripts share a variant of the *they* form of 'though' at line 358. All of these manuscripts can be shown to contain distinctive West Midland or Northern influences.¹⁰ The other orthographic features assigned to the influence of the archetype could similarly be attributed to this localisation, as exemplified by the distribution of forms of 'against' with consonantal <y>, initial <k> in 'could', and <sch> spellings of 'shall' and 'should' recorded in *LALME* (Vol. I: Maps 221, 390, 144 respectively). However the possibility of a West Midland copy underlying the manuscript tradition is problematic, especially considering Chaucer's London associations and the lack of any evidence

⁹Benskin and Laing argue that 'the principle should be adopted of assigning as many of the *Mischsprache*'s forms as possible to a *single* geographical subset, even though such a layer could itself be split in further subsets each having independent local origins' (Benskin and Laing 1981: 83).

¹⁰These manuscripts are: En² Ha² La Cp Nl Ph³ Sl¹ Mc To. General features of dialect and spelling of these manuscripts are outlined in the descriptions found in Manly-Rickert Vol. I.

for the existence of a manuscript displaying such linguistic features.¹¹ This theory is rendered less likely by the limited currency of the distinctive West Midland spellings preserved in the opening folios of Ad³ throughout other fifteenth-century witnesses of the *Canterbury Tales*. Spellings of 'though' with medial <a> or <au> in the witnesses of WBP are generally restricted to copies with a degree of West Midland or Northern influence, such as Ry², N1 and the constant group Ad¹ and En³.

The second possible alternative explanation would view the differences in the spelling systems located in different sections of Ad³ as the result of switches in exemplar during copying. In chapter 3 I have argued that the tale-order and codicology of the manuscript suggest that the direct exemplar was a complete manuscript, and therefore the possibility of the scribe receiving exemplars from diverse sources seems unlikely. The possibility still remains that a number of different exemplars were assembled to form a complete copytext at some stage in the descent of the Ad³ text, and this theory would explain the tendency for rogue spellings to reappear at later points in the text, exemplified particularly in the clustering of such forms in CY.

6.6 Conclusion

This analysis of the language of Ad³ allows us to observe a number of important features of the Ad³ copy of the *Canterbury Tales*, and its place within the tradition. The text is copied in a predominantly East Midland dialect which preserves much of the orthography and morphology characteristic of Hg. While the Ad³ language does display a degree of influence from the incipient standard, Chancery-preferred forms are used alongside those of Hg, and often remain only minor contributions. The

¹¹The only early manuscripts to show a strong degree of West Midland features are Ha⁴, Cp and the closely-related La. However the West Midlandisms in Ha⁴ and Cp have been shown to be the contribution of Scribe D, and both manuscripts share the distinctive layer of Type III spellings that form the backbone of the tradition. The linguistic layers that make up Scribe D's manuscripts are discussed in Smith 1985, chapter 4 and Smith 'The Trinity Gower D-Scribe' in Smith 1988.

survival of a number of Type II forms that may be associated with the ultimate archetype reveals a close relationship between Ad³, Hg and their common ancestor at the head of the tradition. The presence of an underlying West Midland layer, which may reflect that of the immediate copytext, may be helpful in allowing us to establish a provenance for Ad³. The observation that the Ad³ scribe seems to have carried out a translation of this West Midland copytext, while carefully transcribing a number of archetypal features suggests that scribes were more concerned to preserve elements of an archetypal Chaucerian orthography than scholars have traditionally assumed.¹² The clustering of prominent features of each of these separate influences in certain portions of Ad³ may be indicative of shifts in copytext, or may simply reflect breaks in copying. Thus this linguistic evidence may be of codicological and textual significance, and these tentative conclusions must be tested further by comparison with a detailed examination of affiliations in substantive readings across the tradition.

¹²Smith has shown that the distinctly Gowerian forms of the Fairfax and Stafford manuscripts were consciously preserved by subsequent copyists. He argues that this concern to retain the authorial orthography was not shown to Chaucer, concluding that a greater degree of authority was accorded to Gower's work. See 'Spelling and Tradition in Fifteenth-century copies of Gower's *Confessio Amantis*' in Smith 1988, esp. p. 99.

Chapter 7

Minor Textual Variants

7.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to record all substantive variation within the Ad³ copy of WBP in order to provide evidence for a consideration of the nature of the Ad³ copytext, and the relationship of this manuscript to other members of the tradition. In addition this information will allow an assessment of the accuracy of the Ad³ scribe and his attitude towards his immediate exemplar. The chapter is divided into three sections. The first section will provide a complete collation of the Ad³ text of WBP against Hg, recording all substantive variation and any agreements such variation may show with other fifteenth-century witnesses. The second section is divided into two parts, with the first comprising a study of the types of variation recorded in Ad³, and the second examining the evidence for genetic affiliation. The concluding section will attempt to bring this information together in order to determine the place of Ad³ within the tradition.

7.2 Collation of the *Wife of Bath's Prologue*

This section comprises a complete collation of Ad³ against the Hg base text, recording all variant readings found in Ad³ and any affiliations such variant readings display across the entire tradition. Hg is used as the base as the earliest member of the O Group, although this does not imply that it is accurate in all its readings. Agreements with other members of the O Group will form an important aspect of this study, and for this reason I have listed O Group sigla separately. Variation is recorded at the level of substantive differences, and thus only changes in lexis, syntax

and some aspects of morphology are included. The comparison of the Hg and Ad³ manuscripts has been carried out using the *Collate* program (Robinson 1994), and the results of this collation were then compared with the textual data provided by the *Wife of Bath's Prologue on CD-ROM*: thus allowing an accurate and exhaustive study. The data is presented with the Hg reading as the lemma, followed by that of Ad³ and any affiliations with O Group manuscripts, with an alphabetical list of any other manuscripts sharing the Ad³ reading below. Variant readings not found in Ad³ are not included in the following, except in a few instances where such variation has a bearing on the reading found in Ad³.

L 6

atte] at Ad³

Bo¹ El Gg Ii Ld¹ Ln Ph² Ry² Se

L 13

wedded] wedden Ad³

L 16

reprecue] the repref Ad³

Fi Gl Tc¹ To¹

L 26

dyuyne] denye Ad³

L 28

for to] om. Ad³ Bo²

Bo¹ Cx¹ Cx² Ds¹ En¹ Fi Gl He Hk Ii La Ne Ph² Ph³ Pn Ps Ra² Ra³ Si Sl¹

Tc¹ Tc² To¹ Wy

L 36

many] mo than Ad¹ Ad³ Ch En³ Ra³ Tc¹

Bo¹ Bw Cp Cx¹ Cx² Dd Dl Ds¹ El En¹ En² Fi Gl Ha² Ha⁴ He Hk Ii La Lc

Ld¹ Ld² Ln Mc Mg Mm Ne Ni Ph² Ph³ Pn Ps Pw Py Ra¹ Ry¹ Ry² Se Si Sl¹

Sl² Tc² To¹ Wy

L 43

hym on lyue] him alyue Ad¹ Ad³ En³ Ra³

Cn Cp Gl Ha² Lc Ld¹ Ln Ma Mg Mm Ph³ Pw Ry¹ To¹

L 63

as] it as Ad³ Ra³

L 67

no] not Ad³

Bo¹ El Ph²

L 77

But this] This Ad³

Ln Ra²

of] for Ad³

L 93

but] noight but Ad³

Cp Dl En² Fi Gl Ha² La Ld¹ Mm Ni Ph³ Pw Ry¹ Sl¹ Sl²

L 103

euerich] euey Ad³ Ch Ha⁵ Ra³ Tc¹

Fi Ha² Ha⁴ Lc Ld¹ Mc Mg Nl Pw Ra¹ Ra² Ry¹ Ry² Sl¹ Sl² To¹

L 109

the] om. Ad³

L 117

of] om. Ad³

Ds¹ Lc Ld² Mg Ry²

L 121

Of] Bothe of Ad³

our bothe] om. Ad³

L 130

hir] his Ad¹ Ad³ Ch En³ Ha⁵ Ra³ Tc¹

Bo¹ Bw Cp Dl En³ Fi Gl Ha² Ha⁴ Ha⁵ Hk La Lc Ld¹ Ld² Ln Mg Mm Ph²

Ph³ Pw Ra² Ra³ Ry¹ Ry² Si Sl¹ Sl² Tc¹ To¹

L 131

make] pay Ad³ Ch Ha⁵ Ra³ Tc¹

Bw Cp Dl Fi Gl Ha² Ha⁴ Hk La Ld¹ Ld² Ln Mc Mm Nl Ph³ Pw Ra¹

Ry¹ Ry² Sl¹ To¹

L 133

a] om. Ad³

Bw Ry²

L 142

nyl] nyl not Ad³

Bo¹ El Ma Ph² Si

L 148

perseuere] preserue Ad³ Ht

Bw Ld²

nam nat] am nocht Ad³ Ht Ra³ Tc¹

Bo¹ Bw Cn Cx¹ Cx² Dl Ds¹ En¹ Fi Gg Gl Ha² Ha⁴ He Hk Ii La Lc Ld¹ Ld²

Ln Ma Mc Mg Mm Ne Nl Ph² Pn Ps Py Ra¹ Ra² Ry¹ Ry² Se Si Sl¹ Sl² Tc¹

Tc² To¹ Wy

L 150

it] om. Ad³

L 162

Al] And Ad³ Ha⁵

L 172

thee] om. Ad³ Bo² Ha⁵ Ra³ Tc¹

Bo¹ Cn Cx¹ Cx² Dl Ds¹ El En¹ Gg Gl Ha² Ha⁵ He Ii La Lc Ld¹ Ma Mc Mg

Mm Ne Nl Ph² Ph³ Pn Ps Pw Ra¹ Ry¹ Se Si Sl¹ Sl² Tc¹ Tc² To¹ Wy

L 175

is] om. Ad³

El

L 184

it] om. Ad¹ Ad³ Bo² En³ Ht Tc¹

Cn Cx¹ Cx² Dd Dl Ds¹ En¹ Fi Ha² He Hk Ii La Lc Ld¹ Ld² Ln Mc Mg Mm

Ne Nl Ph³ Pn Ps Pw Ra¹ Ry¹ Se Sl¹ Sl² Tc² To¹ Wy

L 196

two] thi Ad (poss. thr[ee] compare: three] Gg Hk Ii Ne)

L 197

goode and ryche] ryche and good Ad³ Ha⁵

Hk

L 203

And] But Ad¹ Ad³ Ch En³ Ha⁵ Ra³ Tc¹

Bo¹ Bw Dd Dl Fi Gg Gl Ha² Ha⁴ Hk La Lc Ld¹ Ld² Ln Mc Mg Mm Nl Ph²

Ph³ Ps Pw Ra¹ Ra² Ry¹ Ry² Se Si Sl¹ Sl² To¹

L 210

as] that Ad¹ Ad³ Ch En³

Ps

L 215

awerk] so awerke Ad¹ Ad³ Bo² Ch En³ Ha⁵ Ra³ Tc¹

Bo¹ Cx¹ Cx² Dd Dl Ds¹ El En¹ Fi Gg Gl Ha² He Ii La Lc Ld¹ Ln Ma Mc

Mg Mm Ne Nl Ph² Pn Pw Py Ra¹ Ry¹ Ry² Se Si Sl¹ Sl² Tc² Wy

L 221

gaye thynges] thinges gay Ad³

L 229

this] theigh Ad³

L 244

ye] thow Ad¹ Ad³ En³ Ha⁵

Bo¹ Cx¹ Cx² El Gg Ha⁴ He li Ma Ne Ph² Pn Ra² Si Tc² Wy

chiden] chidest Ad¹ Ad³ En³ Ha⁵

Bo¹ Cx¹ Cx² El Gg Ha⁴ He li Ma Ne Nl Ph² Pn Ra² Si Tc² Wy

L 247

And] An Ad³

La Pw

L 263

seyst men] seist A man Ad¹ Ad³ En³

Gl

L 283

hem] him Ad³ Tc¹

En²

L 286

They] That Ad³

L 287

hem] him Ad¹ Ad³

L 295

thow] that thou Ad³ Ra³ Tc¹

Gl

L 314

my] ek my Ad³

Bo¹ Ph²

L 316

it] om. Ad³ Ra³

Fi Hk Mc Sl²

of] on Ad³ Ch Ha⁵ Ra³

Cp Dl En² Fi Gl Ha² Ha⁴ Hk La Ld¹ Ln Mc Mm Nl Ps Ra² Ry¹ Se Sl¹ Sl²
To¹

and] or Ad³ Bo² Ra³ Tc¹

Bo¹ Cx¹ Cx² El Gg Gl Ha² Ha⁴ He Lc Ld² Ln Mg Ne Ph² Pn Ps Ra¹ Ry² Si
Sl¹ Tc² Wy

L 339

peril] the perile Ad³

L 340

most] om. Ad¹ Ad³ En³ Ha⁵

enforce] enforcest Ad¹ Ad³ En³ Ha⁵

L 341

seye] seist Ad¹ Ad³ En³ Ha⁵

L 343

he] she Ad³

Hk

L 348

this] thus Ad³ Ha⁵

Cn Cx¹ Cx² Ds¹ En¹ Ha⁴ He Ma Ne Pn Ra² Tc² Wy

L 349

For] But Ad³ Ch Ha⁵ Ra³ Tc¹

Bw Cn Cp Cx¹ Cx² Dl Ds¹ En¹ En² Fi Gl Ha² Ha⁴ He Hk li La Lc Ld¹ Ld²

Ln Ma Mc Mg Mm Ne Ni Ph³ Pn Ps Pw Ra¹ Ra² Ry¹ Ry² Se Si Sl¹ Sl² Tc²

To¹ Wy

L 378

that] than Ad³

L 384

O] A Ad³ Ra³ Tc¹

Gl Ps To¹

L 389

to mille comth] comth to mille Ad³

Bw Fi Mc Ry²

L 396

that] om. Ad¹ Ad³ Ch En³ Ha⁵ Ra³ Tc¹

Bo¹ Cp Dl En² Fi Gl Ha² Ha⁴ Hk La Lc Ld¹ Mc Mg Mm Nl Ph² Pw Ra²
Ry¹ Sl¹ Sl² To¹

hym] hem Ad³ Ha⁵ Ht

Ld² Ry²

chiertee] charitee Ad³ Ht

L 397

my] al my Ad¹ Ad³ Ch En³ Ha⁵

Cn Cx¹ Cx² Dd El En¹ Gg Ha⁴ He li Ld² Ln Ne Ph² Pn Ry² Se Si Tc² Wy

L 408

hem] him Ad³

Ln

Ther] Ther wolde Ad³ Ha⁵ Ht Tc¹

Bo¹ Dd Ds¹ En¹ Fi Ha⁴ He Nl Ph² Ps Pw Py Se Tc¹

L 414

selle] telle Ad³

To¹

L 419

hem] him Ad³

Bo¹ Bw Cp Dl En² Fi Gg Ha² La Ld¹ Ld² Ln Mc Mm Nl Ph² Pw Ra² Si Sl¹
Sl² To¹

L 421

hem] him Ad³

Cp Dl En² Fi Ha² La Lc Ld¹ Mc Mg Mm Nl Ps Pw Py Ra¹ Ry¹ Si Sl¹ Sl²
To¹

hir] his Ad³

Bo¹ Cp Dl En² Fi Gg Ha² La Lc Ld¹ Mc Mg Mm Nl Ph² Ps Pw Py Ra¹ Ry¹
Si Sl¹ Sl² To¹

L 422

hem] him Ad³

Bo¹ Cp Dl En² Fi Gg Ha² La Ld¹ Ld² Mc Mm Nl Ph² Ps Pw Py Ra¹ Ry¹ Si
Sl¹ Sl² To¹

L 425

hem nat] him not Ad³

Cp Dl En² Fi Ha² La Lc Ld¹ Mc Mg Mm Nl Ps Pw Py Ra¹ Ry¹ Si Sl¹ Sl²
To¹

L 444

Is it] It is Ad¹ Ad³ En³ Ha⁵ Ra³ Tc¹

Bw Cn Cx¹ Cx² Dd Dl Ds¹ En¹ Gl He Ii Ld² Ln Ma Ne Nl Pn Ps Py Ra²
Ry² Si Sl² Tc² Wy

L 468

lechours] lecherous Ad³ En³ Ht

Ld² Ln Ps Ra¹ Ry² Se Si Tc²

L 469

þ^t] om. Ad¹ Ad³ En³ Ha⁵ Ht Tc¹

Bw Cx¹ Cx² En² Fi Gg He Hk Lc Ld² Ln Ma Mg Ne Pn Ry² Si Sl¹ Tc² Wy

L 470

on] om. Ad³ Ch

Bw Cp Dl En² Fi Ha² Hk La Lc Ld¹ Ld² Ln Mg Mm Ne Nl Ph³ Ps Pw Py

Ra² Ry¹ Ry² Se Sl¹ Sl² To¹

L 477

is] nys Ad³ Bo²

Cx² Ld² Ph³ Pn Pw Py Ra² Ry¹ Ry² Si Wy

L 486

made] make Ad³

L 499

subtilly] so sotilly Ad¹ Ad³ Ch En³ Ha⁵ Ra³ Tc¹

Bo¹ Cx² Dd Gl Ha⁴ Ph² Pn Py Ra² Wy

L 504

neuere come] come neuer Ad³

He

L 513

I] that I Ad³ Bo²

L 514

to] vnto Ad¹ Ad³ En³ Ha⁵

Cx¹ Cx² Dd He Ma Ne Pn Ra² Tc² Wy

L 518

al day] om. Ad¹ Ad³ En³ Ha⁵ Ra³ Tc¹

Gg Gl Ma Ra¹ Sl¹

L 528

to] at Ad³ Ha⁵

Bw Fi Ln

L 552

be] om. Ad³

Bw li Ln Ma Mg Py Si Tc²

L 554

for] om. Ad³

L 558

to] of Ad¹ Ad³ Ch En³ Ha⁵ Tc¹

Bo¹ Bw Cp Dd Dl Ds¹ Gg Gl Ha² Hk La Ld¹ Ld² Ln Mc Mm Nl Ph² Ph³ Ps

Pw Ra¹ Ra² Ry¹ Ry² Se Si Sl²

L 575

sire] om. Ad³

shal I] I shal Ad³ Ra³ Tc¹

Bw Cp El Ha⁴ La Ln Mc Ra¹ Ry¹ Sl

L 588

of] om. Ad³ Ha⁵ Ra³ Tc¹

Bw Cx¹ Cx² Gg Gl Lc Mg Mm Ne Nl Pn Py Si Tc² Wy

L 593

and] om. Ad³

L 598

myghte] that myght Ad¹ Ad³ Bo² En³ Ha⁵ Ra³ Tc¹

Bo¹ Cn Dd Ds¹ En¹ Fi Gg Gl Ha² Hk La Lc Ld¹ Ma Mc Mg Mm Ph² Ps Pw

Py Ra¹ Ra² Ry¹ Ry² Se Si Sl¹ Sl² To¹

L 620

of] om. Ad³ Ch Ha⁵ Ra³ Tc¹

Bo¹ Bw Cp Gg Gl Ha² Hk La Lc Ld¹ Ld² Ln Mc Mg Mm Ph² Ph³ Pw Ra¹

Ra² Ry¹ Ry² Sl¹ Sl² To¹

L 633

þ^t] om. Ad³ Ht Ra³ Tc¹

Bo¹ Bw Cx¹ Cx² Dl Ds¹ En¹ Gg He Hk Ld² Mc Ne Ph² Ph³ Pn Ps Py Ra¹

Ra² Ry² Se Si Sl² Tc² To¹ Wy

L 635

to] om. Ad³ Tc¹

Bo¹ Gg Ld² Ph² Ry² Si

L 640

hym] hem Ad³ Ch En³ Ha⁵ Ra³ Tc¹

Bw Cx² Gl Pn Wy

telleth] tellen Ad³ Ch Ha⁵

Gg

L 670

peynted] peynteth Ad³ Bo² Ra³ Tc¹

Bw Gl Hk Ld² Ln Ps Ry² Sl²

L 675

Venus] of Venus Ad³ Tc¹

Bo¹ Bw Cn Dd Gg Gl Ha⁴ Hk Lc Ld² Ln Ma Mg Nl Ph² Ra² Ry² Si Sl¹

L 681

And] As Ad³ Ch Ha⁵

Cp Cx² Dd Dl Fi Ha² Ld¹ Mm Ph³ Pn Pw Ry² Se To¹

L 683

ther] where Ad¹ Ad³ Ch En³ Ha⁵ Tc¹

Bo¹ Bw Dl En³ Gg Gl Ha⁴ Nl Ph² Ps Py Ra² Si Sl²

L 694

to] vnto Ad³

L 701

sorwe] care Ad¹ Ad³ Ch En³ Tc¹

Bo¹ Bw Dd Gg Gl Ha⁴ Hk Ld² Ln Ph² Ra² Ry² Si

L 710

hir] om. Ad³ Ch Ha⁵ Tc¹

Bw Gl Hk Ld² Ln Ry²

L 731

that] om. Ad¹ Ad³ Ch En³ Ha⁵ Ht Tc¹

Bo¹ Cp Dd Ds¹ Fi Gg Gl Ha² Ha⁴ Hk La Lc Ld¹ Ld² Ln Mc Mg Mm Pw

Ra² Ry¹ Ry² Se Si Sl² To¹

latumyus] om. Ad³

L 738

gardyn] om. Ad³

L 742

Whan] Whil Ad¹ Ad³ Ch En³ Ha⁵ Ra³ Tc¹

Bo¹ Bw Cx¹ Cx² Dd Gg Gl Ha⁴ Ln Ne Pn Ra² Si Tc² Wy

L 750

with] which Ad³

L 753

angry] wikked Ad¹ Ad³ Ch Ha⁵ Ra³ Tc¹

Bo¹ Bw Gg Gl Ha⁴ Hk Ld² Ln Ry² Si

wyf] womman Ad¹ Ad³ Ch Ha⁵ Ra³ Tc¹

Bo¹ Bw Dd Gg Gl Ha⁴ Hk Ld² Ln Ra² Ry² Si

L 758

she] yif she Ad³ Bo² Ha⁵ Ra³ Tc¹

Ln Mc Sl²

L 766

took] toke him Ad¹ Ad³ Bo² Ch En³ Ha⁵ Ra³ Tc¹

Bo¹ Bw Cn Cp Cx¹ Cx² Dd Ds¹ El En¹ Fi Gg Gl Ha² Ha⁴ He Hk La Ld¹ Ln
Ma Mc Mm Ne Nl Ph² Ph³ Pn Ps Pw Ra² Ry¹ Ry² Se Si Sl¹ Sl² Tc² To¹
Wy

L 772.

his] om. Ad³ Ha⁵ Ra³

Cp Cx¹ Cx² Ha⁴ Hk Ld¹ Ld² Ln Ne Pw Ry¹ Ry² Tc² To¹

L 783

seyde] om. Ad³

thus] this Ad³

am] om. Ad³ Ch Ha⁵

Bo¹ Bw Gg Gl Ha⁴ Hk Ld² Ln Ph² Ra² Ry² Si

wreke] me wreke Ad³ Ch Ha⁵

Bo¹ Bw Gg Gl Ha⁴ Hk Ld² Ln Ph² Ra² Ry² Si

L 786

vsseluen] ourseluen Ad¹ Ad³ En³ Ha⁵

Bo¹ Bw Cx¹ Cx² Dd Ds¹ En¹ Fi Gg Ha⁴ Ha⁵ He li La Ld¹ Ln Mc Ne Ph²

Pn Ps Py Ry¹ Si Sl² Tc² To¹ Wy

L 789

his] of his Ad¹ Ad³ Ch En³ Ha⁵ Ra³ Tc¹

Bo¹ Bw Cp Cx¹ Cx² Dd Gg Gl Ha² Ha⁴ He Hk li La Lc Ld¹ Ln Mc Mg Ne

Nl Ph² Ph³ Pn Ps Ra² Ry¹ Si Sl¹ Sl² Tc² Wy

L 791

that] om. Ad³

Bo¹ Gg Ha⁴ He Hk Ld¹ Ld² Nl Ph² Ph³ Ps Py Ry¹ Ry² Si Sl¹ To¹

vnto] that on to Ad³

L 819

bishrewe me] me beshrew Ad³

L 820

thre] thre a rewe Ad³

L 822

for] om. Ad³ Ha⁵ Ht

Cn Si To¹ Mc Nl Ps Ra¹

L 824

pees and that] and badde pees Ad³

7.3 Discussion

This discussion is divided into two parts. The first part will examine the nature of the variant readings highlighted in the above collation, identifying the types of changes that are evident from a study of these readings. This study will centre on the readings that are unique to Ad³, and other variants likely to have been introduced by the copyist of this manuscript. As shown in the collation many of the variant readings found in Ad³ are also found in other manuscripts, and may therefore represent the accurate copying of an inherited error rather than a change made by the Ad³ copyist. However it is also likely that a number of shared readings are the result of scribes independently making the same changes, or responding to similar difficulties with identical solutions. Donaldson has stressed the tendency for scribes to introduce similar errors, and the subsequent need for an analysis of the nature of such variants in order to establish their significance for a study of genetic affiliation.¹ Coincidental changes are liable to occur for a number of reasons, and many such factors will influence a study of textual affiliation. Changes in language and spelling will produce a large amount of coincidental variation, and many such changes will have a corresponding effect on the metre. Changes that occur as a result of memorial retention of large amounts of copy by scribes will tend to agree coincidentally across unrelated manuscripts. It is important to identify the types of changes liable to be introduced in this way in order to ward against agreements of this nature. These types of variation will be different according to the type of copying performed by the scribe. Therefore it will also be important to consider whether the scribe was transcribing line-by-line, or memorising entire paragraphs, as either method is likely to produce significantly different changes. Following these arguments, and those of Kane 1960, I will examine the variants isolated above for evidence of scribal

¹For if there is one generalization that can safely be made about human beings, it is that, given the same circumstances, they make the same errors that others have made before them and will make after them, and the same errors that they themselves have made before and will make again...those crucial passages which on a glance seem most clearly to show MS affiliation on the basis of shared error are often the very ones that must be excluded from such consideration because the special difficulty of the context was bound to produce the same solutions in different scribes' (Donaldson 1970: 108).

corruption, in order to highlight readings that seem to represent insignificant mechanical errors, whether slips of the Ad³ quill or that of an earlier copyist. Having assessed the evidence of such readings for an understanding of the nature of the Ad³ copyist, the second part will consider the value of the shared variants as evidence of genetic affiliation. By drawing on the previous study of the nature of the variants displayed by this manuscript, this assessment will attempt to rule out trivial agreement caused by coincidental error, and focus on readings that seem to be indicative of a shared, or related copytext. In addition to a consideration of the nature of an individual variant reading, I will draw on manuscript support as a guide to originality. Manuscript support is enlisted at three different levels. The primary consideration for originality is the support of a reading by manuscripts of the O Group, second its appearance in E1 and members of the A Group, and third the support of any other witnesses.

7.3.1 A Study of the Variants

This discussion will begin by considering variation at the level of individual words, noting where a variant word is found in Ad³, and attempting to explain the reason for such lexical substitution. I will then consider examples in which the order of certain individual words is altered, and finally move to a study of large-scale syntactical adjustments where a number of words, or entire phrases, have been manipulated. This study will be carried out in the light of previous models of scribal behaviour, in order to observe how closely the Ad³ scribe adheres to such models and the relative accuracy or carelessness of his copying.²

The first type of variants to be considered are those that are induced by the repetition of a certain word at a different point in the copytext. This commonly results in the omission of entire lines as demonstrated in chapter 4, but may also cause

²The following study is based upon the templates of scribal behaviour described in Kane 1960; Windeatt 1979a; Cowen and Kane 1995.

omissions or alterations within individual lines. Variation of this sort is frequently the result of repetition at the beginning or end of lines, and both types are found at lines 162 and 414 respectively. At the opening of line 162 Ad³ reads 'And' for Hg's 'Al': a variation which may be explained by the appearance of 'And' at the opening of line 161, and the added confusion caused by the identical initial letter in both words. At line 414 the Ad³ scribe recopied the final word of line 413 as his eye returned to the copytext at the wrong point, an error presumably encouraged by the visual and aural similarities between two rhyme words:

Hg	162	Al this sentence me liketh euery del
Ad	162	And this sentence me liketh euery del
Hg	413	And therfore euery man this tale I telle
Hg	414	Wynne who so may for al is for to selle
Ad	413	And therfore euery man this tale I telle
Ad	414	Wynne who so may for al is for to telle

These alterations are found in only two later manuscripts, Ha⁵ and To¹ respectively, and therefore are likely to represent errors introduced by the Ad³ scribe himself. Variation of this kind may also be induced by the repetition of certain similar prepositional constructions. This is exemplified by lines 528 and 552 where the expressions 'at hom' and 'for to se' seem to have influenced the Ad³ scribe's erroneous readings: 'at bord' and 'for to seye':

Hg	528	And hadde laft scole and wente at hom to bord
Ad	528	And had lafte scole and went at hoom at bord
Hg	552	And for to se and eek for to be seye

Ad 552 And for to se and ek for to seye

Another type of variation occurs when a scribe writes a word of similar visual appearance which makes no sense within the context of the line itself. Variation of this kind suggests that the scribe has made an approximate guess at a particular word, based upon a glance at the opening letters and the overall shape of the word. By introducing errors of this kind the scribe displays little sensitivity or understanding of the larger structure of the line. The following readings in WBP demonstrate this type of variation:

Hg 229 I sey nat this by wyues that ben wyse

Ad 229 I sey nat theigh by wyues that ben wyse

Hg 378 This knowen they that been to wyues bonde

Ad 378 This knowen thei than ben to wyues bonde

Hg 468 This knowen lechours by experience

Ad 468 This knowen lecherous by experience

Hg 750 Be with a leoun or a foul dragoun

Ad 750 Be which a leon or a foul dragoun

Three of these readings are unique to Ad³ and thus suggest a rather casual attitude towards recording the exact wording of the copytext, and a lack of attention to the meaning of the text. However while these changes do not fit with the overall sense of the passage, they could be understood within the context of the individual line. The reading 'theigh' for 'this' could be understood as meaning 'however' and thus fits within line 229, while the Ad³ version of line 750 may be read to mean: 'By which a lion or a foul dragoun'. Such changes may be attributed to the type of copying

performed by the Ad³ scribe: a practice that operated as a line-by-line transcription. A further type of variation occurs when a scribe misreads or misplaces an abbreviation mark, exemplified in WBP by the Ad³ scribe's misreading of a contraction mark for '-er' as '-re'. This results in the reading 'preserue' instead of Hg's 'perseuere': an error possibly further induced by the additional use of the superscript hook within the same line:

Hg 148 I wol perseuere I nam nat precius

Ad 148 I wol preserue I am nocht precious

Confusion over minims is the frequent source of similar substitution of single words, demonstrated in WBP at line 26. Here the word 'dyuyne' could consist of as many as six minims depending on the spelling, and thus is a likely source of variation. The Ad³ scribe alone gives the reading 'denye', a variant that reduces the number of minims to three and thus shows little concern for accuracy when confronted with a difficult reading. That words of this nature were a constant source of difficulty to scribes generally is demonstrated by the range of variants found in other witnesses for this same reading. 17 manuscripts give 'deme' while a further two copies read 'deuyse'.

Having considered copying errors that result in the substitution of a different lexical form, I shall now turn to variation at the level of syntax. With variation of this nature we reach a point of overlap between accidental and possibly deliberate alteration, although it is frequently impossible to determine the motivation behind changes of this kind. The most basic level of syntactical change occurs where two words are reversed, with little or no adjustment of the sense. Alterations of this kind seem to be the result of a scribe memorising a large amount of copy, concentrating on the words themselves and thereby accidentally transposing their placement within the line. Examples of this are as follows:

- Hg 197 The thre men were goode and ryche and olde
 Ad 197 The thre men were ryche and good and olde
- Hg 221 To brynge me gaye thynges fro the Feyre
 Ad 221 To brynge me thinges gay fro the feyre

Neither of these readings is found exclusively in Ad³ although their limited manuscript support suggests that their appearance in Ad³ is the work of the scribe himself.

Changes due to the retention of phrases in a scribe's memory often took the form of the alteration of Chaucer's complex poetical syntax to a more basic, colloquial structure. Variation of this type tends to make the meaning more explicit, with scribes altering a difficult Chaucerian construction for a 'more familiar or habitual locution' (Kane 1960:125). This form of alteration could result in the substitution of an unfamiliar poetic expression with a more colloquial formula, or in the imposition of a more colloquial phraseology on to a difficult construction. This may be due to the scribe instinctively imposing the patterns of his own diction, or may be part of a more deliberate editorial policy to make the meaning of the text more explicit. One important result of this form of variation is the omission of a number of small syntactical units or words, the omission of which does not interrupt the flow of the narrative. The Ad³ scribe is careful not to omit entire clauses, although he does frequently omit pleonastic conjunctions and other unnecessary words thus creating a more colloquial sentence structure. This type of omission can be demonstrated by the following examples:

- Hg 396 Wende that I hadde had of hym so greet chiertee
 Ad 396 Wend I had had of hem so grete charitee
- Hg 469 But lord crist whan þ^t it remembreth me

Ad 469 But lord crist whan it remembreth me

Hg 470 Vp on my youthe and on my iolytee

Ad 470 Vp on my youth and my iolytee

Hg 633 Who so þ^t buyldeth his hous al of salwes

Ad 633 Who so bildeth his hous al of salwes

Each of the above examples is found in a large number of other witnesses, demonstrating the frequency with which such alterations occurred. A second result of this type of variation is the frequent adjustments to word-order that are commonly found in scribal copies of Chaucer's works. The Ad³ scribe shows a distinct preference for a more simplistic syntax, often exemplified by a move towards a grammatical structure based around the formula: subject-verb-object. This is best demonstrated by the syntactical adjustments made to line 389:

Hg 389 Who so that first to Mille comth first grynt

Ad 389 Who so that first comth to melle first grynt

However it must also be noted that the symmetry created by the structure 'first comth...first grynt' does add a degree of rhetorical colour to the line. A preference for the positioning of a pronoun directly before a verb is further demonstrated in the reversal of modal verb and subject pronoun in line 575, which ignores the interrogative force of the Hg syntax. The adjustment in syntax also alters the stress pattern of the Hg line, while the omission of 'sire' removes a syllable thus disrupting the metre:

Hg 575 But now sire lat me se what shal I seyn

Ad 575 But now lat me see what I shal seyn

A tendency to rephrase difficult constructions is further exhibited by some of the large-scale rearrangements contained in the following examples:

Hg 121 Of Vryne and oure bothe thynges smale

Ad 121 Bothe of our vryne and thynges smale

Hg 316 What helpeth it of me enquere and spyen

Ad 316 What helpeth on me enquere or spien

Hg 783 And seyde theef thus muchel am I wreke

Ad 783 And theef this moche I me wreke

Hg 819 Quod this Somnour and I bishrewe me

Ad 819 Quod this somnour and I me beshrew

The last of these alterations, unique to Ad³, is the most radical as it disrupts the rhyme word, suggesting that the scribe did not foresee the problems caused by altering the order of the last two words. Although the placement of the object pronoun before the verb seems to contradict the above analysis of grammatical syntax, it is possible that the Ad³ scribe saw 'I me beshrew' as a reflexive construction.

Scribal variation also displays a tendency to include personal and relative pronouns that are implied in the Chaucerian original, thus removing many of the subtleties of Chaucer's composition. The inclusion of these, and other object pronouns and definite articles have the effect of highlighting the relationships within individual constructions and between clauses, thus spoiling much of the economic and understated qualities of Chaucer's style. This tendency may also represent the desire to add emphasis to a word used in a particular context in order to stress its

function and thereby reducing the possibility of ambiguity. This is demonstrated by the inclusion of the pleonastic pronoun and conjunction at lines 295 and 758, suggesting that the scribe added such words to emphasise the force of 'but' when it is used as a conjunction. The introduction of such words also adds extra syllables to a line and thus disrupts the regularity of the Hg metre. The Ad³ scribe displays a relative fidelity to his copytext in this area, although the following examples illustrate a desire to include object pronouns, pleonastic pronouns and conjunctions and definite articles left understood by Chaucer, or simply delayed until a subsequent line:

Hg	63	I woot as wel as ye it is no drede
Ad	63	I woot it as wel as ye it is no drede
Hg	295	And but thow powre alwey vp on my face
Ad	295	And but that thou poure al wey vpon my face
Hg	339	That it is peril of oure chastitee
Ad	339	That it is the perile of our chastitee
Hg	758	A fair womman but she be chaast also
Ad	758	A fair womman but yif she be chast also

In addition to making the sense more explicit, scribes show a tendency to embellish the meaning of a line by increasing the emphasis. This also has the effect of spoiling much of the subtlety of Chaucer's style, as demonstrated by the rather crude adjustment in the verb found at line 131:

Hg	131	Now wherwith sholde he make his paiement
Ad	131	Now wherwyth shold he pay his payment

There are also certain examples that suggest that the Ad³ scribe adopted a rather casual attitude to maintaining the rhyme scheme as mentioned above. This is exemplified by his reversal of the final words of line 819, thus altering the word in the rhyming position. However the scribe does attempt to rectify this situation and to maintain the rhyme scheme, adding the meaningless phrase 'a rewe' at the end of line 820:

Hg	819	Quod this Somnour and I bishrewe me
	820	But if I telle tales two or thre
Ad	819	Quod this somnour and I me beshrew
	820	But yif I telle tales two or thre a rewe

The example of line 731 demonstrates a rather more casual attitude to rhyme, shown by the disruption of a couplet by the omission of the last word of the line. Whether conscious or not the failure to recognise the faulty couplet displays a lack of attention to the details of the rhyme scheme:

Hg	731	Thanne tolde he me how þ ^t oon latumyus
	732	Compleyned vn to his felawe Arrius
Ad	731	Thanne tolde he me how . on .
	732	Compleynd vnto his felaw arryus

Certain other alterations are suggestive of attempts at deliberate scribal editing. An example of such editorial activity is the reading: 'quod she' for the masculine pronoun found in Hg at line 343. It is clear from the context that this pronoun refers to 'thapostle' Paul, while the Ad³ scribe seems to have assumed that the reference is to the speaker of the prologue, the Wife of Bath herself. Another intrusion into the text at line 444 suggests possible scribal editing. Here the scribe seems to have noted the

interrogative construction at line 443 and reversed the opening of 444 in order to provide an answer to this rhetorical question:

Hg 443 What eyleth yow to grucche thus and grone

444 Is it for ye wolde haue my queynte allone

Ad 443 What eyleth yow to grucche thus and grone

444 It is for ye wold haue my queynte allone

The final type of variation that occurs regularly in the Ad³ copy of WBP concerns discrepancies in the number of certain verb forms. These variations are common to many other manuscripts, and it seems that verb and pronoun inflexions were particularly susceptible to variation. The most important point to notice is that these changes are completely consistent as demonstrated in the following sequence of lines:

Hg 419 That made me that euere I wolde hem chyde

420 For thogh the Pope hadde seten hem bisyde

421 I wolde noght spare hem at hir owene bord

422 For by my trouthe I quytte hem word for word

423 As help me verray god omnipotent

424 Togh I right now sholde make my testament

425 I ne owe hem nat a word that it nys quyt

Ad 419 That made me that euer I wold him chide

420 For thogh the pope had seten him biside

421 I wolde not spare him at his owne borde

422 For by my trowthe I quyt him word for word

423 As helpe me verray god omnipotent

424 Though I ryght now sholde make my testament

425 I ne owe him not a word that it nys quytte

7.3.2 Evidence of Affiliation

Where variation in Ad³ is common to other manuscripts we may be able to identify genetic affiliation, especially where certain manuscripts display a persistent relationship. However a consideration of the nature of the variation in this section is also important in order to determine the presence of accidental relationships, formed when two or more scribes independently introduce the same erroneous reading. Thus the identification of shared variants must be considered in the light of the qualitative analysis discussed above, in order to attempt to distinguish between textual affiliation and coincidental variation.

The most prominent feature of a study of the affiliations found in the above variants is the close relationship Ad³ shares with Hg. This is demonstrated generally by the relatively small and insignificant variation from the Hg base text, and more specifically in agreements with Hg against a large number of other manuscripts. However a study of many of the readings that display disagreement with Hg and a relationship with other manuscripts does not reveal any clear lines of genetic correspondence. A number of variant readings are found in a large number of manuscripts thus obscuring any clue as to affiliation. This is demonstrated by the cluster of manuscript sigla found alongside the changes in pronoun number found in lines 419-425. Similarly possibly significant substantive variation is often supported by a weight of manuscript support that confuses affiliation. This is exemplified by the number of manuscripts that contain the following version of line 753:

Hg	753	Than with an angry wyf down in the hous
Ad	753	Thanne wyth a wikked womman doun in the hous

However certain readings that display a close relationship with Hg are also found in a small number of other manuscripts, those argued by Robinson as belonging to the O Group: manuscripts related only by their close proximity to the archetype of

the tradition (Robinson 1997). These manuscripts are: Ad¹ Ad³ Bo² Ch En³ Ha⁵ Hg Ht Ra³ Tc². The agreements in Ad³ with readings highlighted by Robinson as characteristic of this group are as follows:

- 84 nys] Ad³ Ha⁴ Hg Ra² Ra³ Tc¹
- 89 tasseble] Ad¹ Ad³ Ch El En³ Hg Ht Lc Ln Mg Py
- 98 ne] Ad¹ Ad³ Bo² Ch En³ Hg Ht Py Ra³ Tc¹
- 98 I] Ad¹ Ad³ Bo² Ch En³ Hg Ht Py Ra³ Tc¹
- 100 Ne] Ad¹ Ad³ Bo² Ch Dd En³ Hg Ht Ra³ Tc¹
- 111 wol] Ad³ Bo² Ch Cx¹ Cx² En³ Ha⁵ Hg Ht li Ne Pn Ps Ra³ Tc¹ Tc²
Wy
- 114 thactes] Ad¹ Ad³ Bo² Ch En³ Hg Ht
- 124 Thexperience] Ad¹ Ad³ Bo² En³ Ha⁴ Hg Hk Tc¹
- 192 nys] Ad¹ Ad³ Bo² En³ Ha⁵ Hg Si
- 361 as] Ad³ Ch Gl Ha⁵ Hg Ht Py Tc¹
- 484 troce] Ad¹ Ad³ Ch Cx² Hg Hk Pn Wy
- 532 as] Ad³ Ch El Ha⁵ Hg Ht Ra³ Tc¹
- 567 hym] Ad¹ Ad³ Bo² Ch El En³ Gl Ha⁵ Hg Ht Ra² Ra³
- 745 hem] Ad³ El Ha⁴ Ha⁵ Hg Ht li Mc Py Ra²
- 818 wol] Ad¹ Ad³ Bo² Ch En³ Gl Ha⁵ Hg Hk Ra³ Tc¹

Ad³ contains 15 readings of the 24 variants highlighted by Robinson as characteristic of the O Group manuscripts. If these readings are indeed those of a Chaucerian hyparchetype then they provide a useful guide as to the aspects of Chaucer's style that were most subject to corruption by subsequent scribes, and the types of alteration that resulted. In addition to this we may observe the accuracy of the Ad³ scribe in his treatment of these apparently difficult readings. The Ad³ scribe shows a remarkable fidelity to the phrasing of his copy in the treatment of these readings, and thus a sensitivity towards Chaucer's style lacking in many other copyists. However the Ad³

text does present a number of divergences from the readings of the O Group, and a study of these may allow some insight into the changes introduced by this copyist. The nine readings not found in Ad³ are listed below with the reading of O as the lemma:

- 36 many oon] mo than oon (51 MSS)
- 46 [add]me[/add]] me (56 MSS)
- 67 nys] is (47 MSS)
- 117 wys] wyse (25 MSS)
- 154 And] An (52 MSS)
- 215 awerk] so awerke (46 MSS)
- 407 hadden] had (18 MSS)
- 631 roule] royle (42 MSS)
- 766 on] him on (42 MSS)

Several of these readings seem to indicate corruptions of a better reading given by the O Group manuscripts. For example the alteration of 'nys' to the form 'is' demonstrates the tendency for scribes to change a double negative to an easier form of negation. The Ad³ scribe is guilty of this corruption at line 67, although it is interesting to note that he does preserve the double negative in lines 84 and 192. Scribal tendency towards a more prosaic and clumsy style is also possibly the reason for the substitution of the phrase 'mo than oon' for Hg's 'many oon'.

However a number of the above readings suggest that the Ad³ scribe has copied accurately where the Hg scribe and other O manuscripts have not. For example the alteration of the indefinite article 'An' at line 154 for 'And' in Hg, possibly due to confusion over the visual similarity of the two words, gives a nonsensical reading. Another such reading is found in the Hg version of line 766, where the omission of the object pronoun 'hym' disrupts the sense of the line. Other readings interfere with the metrical regularity of an individual line, as found in line

215 where the omission of 'so' removes a syllable from the line. Line 407 also presents metrical problems over the use of the different morphological forms 'had' or 'hadden'. Hg and other O manuscripts have the disyllabic form of the present plural with the <-en> inflexion. However the Ad³ scribe's use of the monosyllable is metrically more regular, again suggesting that this was the reading of O itself. That this difference is not purely a morphological change is demonstrated by the presence of plural forms with the inflexion in the Ad³ copy of WBP, exemplified by the forms 'hadden' and 'hedden' appearing at lines 730 and 565 respectively. The Ad³ scribe seems to have had both forms in his repertoire, and to have been sensitive to the metrical implications concerning their use.

In addition to these readings there are a number of further examples of agreements between Ad³ and certain other members of this group. These readings are as follows:

- 210 as] that Ad¹ Ad³ Ch En³ Ps
 263 men] a man Ad¹ Ad³ En³ Gl
 283 hem] him Ad³ Tc¹ En²
 287 hem] him Ad¹ Ad³
 295 thow] that thou Ad³ Gl Ra³ Tc¹
 340 most] om. Ad¹ Ad³ En³ Ha⁵
 enforce] enforcest Ad¹ Ad³ En³ Ha⁵
 341 seye] seist Ad¹ Ad³ En³ Ha⁵
 384 O] A Ad³ Gl Ps Ra³ Tc¹ To¹
 396 hym] hem Ad³ Ha⁵ Ht Ld² Ry²
 chiertee] charitee Ad³ Ht
 513 I] that I Ad³ Bo²
 518 alday] om. Ad¹ Ad³ En³ Gg Gl Ha⁵ Ma Ra¹ Ra³ Sl¹ Tc¹
 640 hym] hem Ad³ Bw Ch Cx² En³ Gl Ha⁵ Pn Ra³ Tc¹ Wy
 telleth] tellen Ad³ Ch Gg Ha⁵

- 670 peynted] peynteth Ad³ Bo² Bw Gl Hk Ld² Ln Ps Ra³ Ry² Sl² Tc¹
 710 hir] om. Ad³ Bw Ch Gl Ha⁵ Hk Ld² Ln Ry² Tc¹
 758 she] yif she Ad³ Bo² Ha⁵ Ln Mc Ra³ Sl² Tc¹
 822 for] om. Ad³ Cn Ha⁵ Ht Si To¹ Mc Nl Ps Ra¹

A consideration of these variants within the light of the discussion earlier in this chapter suggests that these readings belong among those assumed to be scribal corruptions, rather than the preservation of further authorial readings. Several of these variants demonstrate confusion over verb and pronoun forms, particularly concerning agreement in number. Lines 283 and 287 clearly require the plural pronoun 'hem' where Ad³ and several other manuscripts give the singular form 'him'. Similar errors are found in lines 340 and 341, where the scribes have understood the use of the second person pronoun 'thow' to require a second person form of the verb. However the presence of the modal verb 'most' demands the use of the infinitive as found in the Hg forms 'enforce' and 'seye'. The alteration of the preterite form 'peynted' for the present tense in line 670 spoils the sense of the rhetorical question, and seems to be related to these types of scribal error. The introduction of implied conjunctions is found in a number of these variants and seems likely to represent scribal adjustment, as discussed in the first section above. These words tend to make the meaning more explicit by creating an easier, more prosaic sentence structure. This is exemplified by the following readings:

- Hg 295 And but thow powre alwey vp on my face
 Ad 295 And but that thou poure al wey vpon my face
- Hg 513 I trowe I loued hym best for that he
 Ad 513 I trow that I loued him best for that he
- Hg 758 A fair womman but she be chaast also

Ad 758 A fair womman but yif she be chast also

The introduction of these pleonastic conjunctions is also destructive to the metre, adding an extra syllable to each line. A further example of an added syllable spoiling a metrically regular line is found in line 263. Here the monosyllabic plural form 'men' is substituted by the singular form with an indefinite article, thus adding an awkward syllable. The omission of the phrase 'al day' in line 518 may simply be the accidental omission of a phrase that is not essential to the meaning of the line. However when viewed within the context of the line another explanation is possible:

Hg 518 Ther after wol we crye al day and craue

Ad 518 Ther aftyr wil we crye and craue

The removal of 'alday' in the Ad³ copy of this line has the effect of bringing together the words 'crye' and 'craue', and thus highlights the alliteration of the consonants. This may of course be purely coincidental, although we may be confident that the removal of this disyllabic phrase is the result of scribal intervention whether deliberate or not.

There is a clear difference between the type of variants discussed in this section, and those claimed to be indicative of a close relationship with the archetype of the tradition. We may assume that these variants, found only in a small number of O Group manuscripts, are the result of scribal error rather than the preservation of further features from the hyparchtype. No clear relationships emerge between these manuscripts, although there is evidently a close relationship between Ad³ and Ha⁵: manuscripts paired together on Robinson's cladogram (Robinson 1997:81). It seems likely that these errors were made independently and therefore we may assume that their presence in Ad³ is the result of changes implemented by the scribe himself. The lack of any clear affiliation among these manuscripts in these scribal readings also

reinforces the argument that they are only related in their proximity to the hyparchetype, and not to any intermediary scribal copy.

In addition to the groupings discussed above, a number of further variants suggest a tentative relationship between Ad³ and the manuscripts of the E and F Groups. These readings are as follows:

- 6 atte] at Ad³ Bo¹ El Gg Ii Ld¹ Ln Ph² Ry² Se
- 67 no] not Ad³ Bo¹ El Ph²
- 117 of] om. Ad³ Ds¹ Lc Ld² Mg Ry²
- 133 a] om. Ad³ Bw Ry²
- 142 nyl] nyl not Ad³ Bo¹ El Ma Ph² Si
- 148 perseuere] preserue Ad³ Bw Ht Ld²
- 175 is] om. Ad³ El
- 314 my] ek my Ad³ Bo¹ Ph²
- 389 to mille comth] comth to mille Ad³ Bw Fi Mc Ry²
- 408 hem] him Ad³ Ln
- Ther] Ther wolde Ad³ Bo¹ Dd Ds¹ En¹ Fi Ha⁴ Ha⁵ He Ht Nl Ph² Ps
 Pw Py Se Tc¹
- 468 lechours] lecherous Ad³ En³ Ht Ld² Ln Ps Ra¹ Ry² Se Si Tc²
- 477 is] nys Ad³ Bo² Cx² Ld² Ph³ Pn Pw Py Ra² Ry¹ Ry² Si Wy
- 528 to] at Ad³ Bw Fi Ha⁵ Ln
- 635 to] om. Ad³ Bo¹ Gg Ld² Ph² Ry² Si Tc¹

The relationship between Ad³ and these groups is sporadic and the above list shows that these readings are often shared by a number of other unrelated manuscripts. However the number of readings shared with the E Group, particularly in the first half of the text do suggest a possible relationship between Ad³ and this group. Some of these readings are also found in F Group manuscripts, although this can be explained by Robinson's theory that both E and F are descended from one common archetype.

Three of these readings correspond with the reading of E1, a manuscript whose text has been shown to be closely related to the E Group throughout the first 400 lines of WBP. A further variant reading found at line 175 in both Ad³ and E1 alone suggests a relationship between these two manuscripts, although the omission of 'is' after 'this' is a relatively simple scribal error. It is however possible that the appearance of a small number of characteristic E and F variants in the first half of Ad³ is the result of a close relationship it shares with E1. The percentage of these readings that are found in the first half of the Ad³ copy of WBP may add further support to this theory. This possibility is strengthened by the relationship between these manuscripts that has been demonstrated in earlier chapters at the levels of textual affiliation, tale-order and marginal glossing.

7.4 Conclusion

This study of the textual variants found in the Ad³ copy of WBP suggests a number of conclusions. The Ad³ copytext was close to that of Hg and the Ad³ scribe carried out an accurate copy of his exemplar. In many cases the divergences from this copytext are found in a large number of other manuscript groupings and therefore provide little evidence for the types of variation introduced by the Ad³ copyist himself. They may be the result of inherited scribal errors or the product of the Ad³ scribe agreeing coincidentally with a number of other scribal readings. However agreement in certain readings with a number of manuscripts does suggest a particular relationship between Ad³ and these witnesses. The appearance of Hg among these manuscripts suggests that this group stands close to the archetype of the tradition, while the authorial, rather than characteristically scribal nature of the variants themselves makes it likely that their common ancestor is the archetype itself. Therefore the Ad³ copytext seems related to Hg and the other constituent members of this O Group as a result of its close relationship to the ultimate common archetype.

Ad³ contains a high proportion of the variants characteristic of this group of manuscripts, thereby demonstrating the scribe's ability to preserve difficult readings which became corrupted early in the dissemination of the text. Particularly significant are the small number of variants in which Ad³ disagrees with Hg and other O witnesses. These readings in Hg and the O Group seem to represent easier, scribal corruptions of the Ad³ reading, suggesting that in these instances Ad³ contains a more accurate copy of their common exemplar. A number of other agreements with individual members of the O Group provide clues to the types of changes introduced by the Ad³ scribe, although they provide little evidence of further genetic affiliation beyond the close pairing of Ad³ and the later Ha⁵. The tentative evidence for a relationship between Ad³ and the E and F Groups suggests a possible affiliation between the Ad³ exemplar and a manuscript related to their common ancestor. This relationship may further account for the appearance of other erroneous readings in the Ad³ copy: readings which have widespread attestation throughout the tradition and thus provide no clear evidence of affiliation. The appearance of many of these EF readings in E1 as well may explain their place in Ad³, although the textual relationship between Ad³ and E1 in WBP remains speculative.

Conclusion

1. Introduction

This study of Ad³ has highlighted a number of aspects of this manuscript which have important implications for an understanding of the textual tradition of the *Canterbury Tales*, and this conclusion will draw together the different strands of this discussion. The first section will focus on the relative neglect of Ad³, concentrating on the editorial assumptions that have led to the marginalisation of this manuscript. The second section will address the aspects of this study that suggest that greater prominence should be given to Ad³. This section will bring together much of the material discussed in individual chapters in order to provide a general view of the nature of the Ad³ exemplar, and the scribe's attitude to this exemplar during copying. The third section will summarise the possible uses of Ad³ in future studies of the text and in future editions, and will also highlight areas for future research suggested by this study.

2. The neglect of Ad³

The first chapter of this study reviewed the position of Ad³ within the history of textual criticism of the *Canterbury Tales*, demonstrating that this manuscript has largely been neglected in these discussions. This section will consider the implications of this neglect both for the study of Ad³ and for editorial and textual study of the poem in general. While in theory every witness of a Middle English work may carry independent value for the reconstruction of the text, editors of the *Canterbury Tales* have generally restricted their consideration to a small group of manuscripts. The large number of extant witnesses of this poem does make the study

of all manuscripts a huge task, and the focus on a group of manuscripts makes the editorial process much more manageable. However an editor's decision to use a particular manuscript is frequently based upon a number of assumptions concerning the manuscript tradition which may lead to the marginalisation of important manuscripts which do not conform to these preconceptions. Often the selection of manuscripts is inherited directly from the work of earlier editors, leading modern editors of the *Canterbury Tales* to base their text on the prejudices and preferences of Furnivall and Skeat. This situation is demonstrated most clearly in the modern reliance on the manuscript canon created by Furnivall for the Chaucer Society 'Six-Text' series. While Furnivall was successful in printing many important manuscripts, his choice of texts was largely motivated by considerations such as date of copying, completeness and physical appearance. The reliance on such concerns led to the exclusion of Ad³ from this initial textual canon, although the text itself had remained unexamined.

Considerations of the completeness and appearance of a manuscript are less influential in modern editorial policy, although much of the battle between supporters of Hg and El has been fought on such terrain. Another feature that has guided much recent discussion of the manuscripts is the order of the tales: a consideration regularly invoked by supporters of El. Belief in the priority of El, and a desire to retain the arrangement that is the foundation of much literary critical debate has led to a concentration of discussion on this feature at the expense of a number of others. Furthermore the adoption of the El arrangement has prejudiced consideration of manuscripts whose tale-orders contain adjustments to the El ordering such as Ad³. The comparison of various aspects of tale-order across the manuscript tradition is often relied on in the place of textual collation as the amount of information is much smaller, and more easily accessible. However the relationships shared between various manuscript orders do not necessarily reflect textual affiliations. The make-up of Hg suggests that there was no final authorial arrangement, and demonstrates that an individual ordering need not affect a manuscript's textual authority. Subsequent

freedom in various alterations made to the E1 arrangement stresses that later scribes did not view the ordering of this manuscript as inviolable, and reminds us that we must not consider such adjustments as scribal corruptions of an authorial arrangement. Concentration on the relationships of tale-order also has the effect of marginalising the consideration of textual affiliations, promoting the assumption that a unique arrangement is evidence of a corrupt text. Study of Ad³ has focused on the unusual aspects of its tale-order, allowing editors and textual critics to ignore the text on the basis of idiosyncracies in its arrangement.

One final assumption upon which much editorial practice is based is the reliance on the earliest manuscripts in the belief that these will preserve texts closest to the archetype. Most discussions of the manuscript tradition of the *Canterbury Tales* consider only those complete manuscripts copied in the first quarter of the fifteenth century, ignoring over forty complete copies written throughout the remainder of the century. The belief that an early manuscript will contain an accurate copy of the archetype relies on the assumptions that all early manuscripts shared one archetypal copytext, and that their scribes were sufficiently proficient and concerned to produce a faithful transcription of this copytext. However early copyists may corrupt good copytexts by introducing unique errors or readings from manuscripts related to other traditions. It is also possible that a later manuscript may preserve an accurate copy of an early text, through access to early exemplars or manuscripts no longer extant. Therefore we should not rely entirely on the earliest witnesses but consider manuscripts from throughout the whole of the fifteenth century.

Despite this traditional tendency to consider only a small group of early manuscripts, and to focus on superficial details external to the text itself, the texts of all manuscripts did receive extensive coverage in the work of Manly-Rickert. However Manly-Rickert's assumptions concerning the early history of the manuscript tradition prejudiced their understanding of the text of Ad³, leading them to posit a confused and eclectic history for this text. Their belief in the circulation of copies of single tales representing different authorial versions, and their tendency to view

agreements in minor textual changes as representative of switches in affiliation, led Manly-Rickert to assume a chain of different exemplars used in the production of Ad³. This results in their conclusion that Ad³ is a 'picked-up' manuscript, copied from a haphazard assembly of exemplars of differing authority. Manly-Rickert did observe the close textual relationship Ad³ shares with Hg, although they were unable to reconcile this feature with their view of the Ad³ exemplar and the date of the manuscript's production. In order to explain this relationship Manly-Rickert suggested that the similarities to Hg derive from correction with Hg or a manuscript of the Hg-type. As there is not sufficient evidence of supervision or correction to support such a theory within Ad³ itself, this led the editors to assume that such correction was made to the Ad³ exemplar and subsequently copied into Ad³.

In his extensive attempt to answer the criticisms of Manly-Rickert's work and to justify many of their findings, Ramsey reinforces the editors' neglect of Ad³ (Ramsey 1994). While Ramsey accepts almost all the assumptions adopted by Manly-Rickert, he does identify a fundamental problem in their belief in the existence of widespread contamination between unrelated manuscripts. Ramsey argues that contamination was extremely rare in this period and represents a more modern conception of editing than a medieval one. However despite his rejection of this explanation he makes no attempt to reassess the position of Ad³ claimed by Manly-Rickert to be the product of much contamination, labelling it 'a very corrupt manuscript' (131). Despite his summary dismissal of Ad³ Ramsey does recognise the value of the text of Ch and the reasons for its neglect in the work of Manly-Rickert. However despite his claim that Manly-Rickert frequently undervalued the text of Ch 'because of its lateness' (204), Ramsey's study concentrates exclusively on the earliest manuscripts, claiming that later manuscripts have a greater number of variants and 'texts much farther from the original' (200).

Ramsey's study makes little use of Ad³, drawing on it predominantly as an example of a manuscript produced independently rather than in one of several commercial bookshops. In addition to dividing the manuscripts of the *Canterbury*

Tales into independent and shop-produced books, Ramsey explains the development of the tradition in terms of three stages of production. The first stage is marked by the circulation of single tales and links among the Chaucer circle during the poet's last years, no example of which is now extant. The second stage is represented by the first efforts to assemble complete collections of the poem from these disparate sections of text, while the third stage marks manuscripts produced from the complete copies issued in Stage 2. Ramsey's view of the position of Ad³ within this development is contradictory, and further demonstrates the problems in attempting to classify this manuscript without subjecting it to fresh analysis. Ramsey initially identifies Ad³ as 'an example of parts gathered in Stage 2 for a single scribe and copied by him to make a full manuscript of the *Canterbury Tales*' (245). This description is rather ambiguous although it seems to suggest that Ad³ is a direct product of Stage 2, and thus is grouped with our earliest extant manuscripts. A later discussion seems to correct this confusion by listing Ad³ among the six manuscripts of the ten collated for the Variorum editions that were produced in Stage 3 (301). However this position changes again as Ramsey subsequently claims that 'of the five non-shop manuscripts [Ad³ Dd El Gg Hg], all but Dd were of Stage 2 production (i.e., copied from variously gathered Stage 1 links and tales, in keeping with the earliness of the best non-shop manuscripts)' (378). While these contradictions serve to cast doubt on Ramsey's classifications and his methods of distinguishing between Stage 2 and Stage 3 productions, they also demonstrate the problems involved in attempting to classify Ad³ according to Manly-Rickert's view of its place within the tradition. Ramsey's study illustrates the need for more detailed analysis of later manuscripts such as Ad³ and Ch, especially considering his apparent grouping of Ad³ among the most important survivors of the Stage 2 production period of *Canterbury Tales* manuscripts.

Despite the exclusion of Ad³ from the textual debate and the editorial canon in much of the history of the text, it does figure as one of the base manuscripts for collation adopted by the Variorum Chaucer. These editions rely upon a group of ten

manuscripts for the emendation of their Hg base text, in order to recreate 'the text which is as near as it is possible to get to what Chaucer must have written' (Ruggiers 1979:xviii). The choice of manuscripts is never comprehensively explained, although Baker describes the group as representing the 'most accurate versions' and the 'most important traditions' (Ruggiers 1979:xviii). Despite these ambitious claims the choice of manuscripts is a conventional one, comprising a slightly extended version of the group of eight texts selected by Furnivall for the Chaucer Society transcripts. The decision to include Ad³ within this group is surprising, as no previous scholarship suggests that its text meets either of Baker's credentials. However the introduction of Ad³ into the Variorum 'Top 10' does not provide much original consideration of the text of this manuscript, and discussion of Ad³ in the Variorum volumes generally reiterates the views advanced by Manly-Rickert. The descriptions of Ad³ provided by the individual editors tend to draw extensively on the criticisms of Manly-Rickert and to view this manuscript as containing little textual authority. This tendency to rely on the conclusions of Manly-Rickert is a dangerous one, and demonstrates a further restriction in the attitude of recent editors towards this manuscript. Although Manly-Rickert observed the close textual affiliations between Ad³ and Hg, they never entertained the possibility that a later manuscript might be directly derived from the archetype. They therefore constructed a complicated hypothesis to account for this relationship, claiming that the Ad³ copytext was corrected against Hg or another manuscript closely related to Hg. Despite the speculative nature of this theory it is readily accepted by Variorum editors, who all make reference to the scribe's careless copying of an edited exemplar. This is exemplified by Baker's edition of SQ which records a close relationship between Hg and Ad³ which he explains as supporting Manly-Rickert's theory of correction, concluding that 'Ad³ is a very careless manuscript whose value is only an overall attestation to some link at one time with Hg or a closely related manuscript' (Baker 1990:92). Reliance on the complex and frequently highly speculative theories of Manly-Rickert is also evident in Corsa's edition of PH, where she describes Ad³ as contaminated by manuscripts of the Hg or

El type, and independently derived from cd* in PH (Corsa 1987:66). This view of Ad³ prejudices its treatment by the individual Variorum editors and most record the lack of influence that Ad³ exerts on their critical texts.

Thus the history of the scholarly treatment of Ad³ highlights a number of shortcomings in recent approaches to the textual tradition of the *Canterbury Tales*. In order to reduce the large amount of available data many scholars have relied upon relationships in the order of tales in constructing genetic groups. Where scholars have taken account of the texts of the manuscripts, such studies have often been based upon the work of Manly-Rickert. In choosing to rely upon the data and conclusions provided by Manly-Rickert, scholars have also adopted many of their subjective assumptions concerning the early transmission of the text, and have further ossified the treatment of manuscripts that these editors did not consider significant to the textual tradition in general. Future research must take account of the wealth of neglected manuscripts rather than restricting attention to the earliest manuscripts and those considered important by earlier editors. Studies of the manuscripts must pay greater attention to the details of the text, rather than to the superficial and unrelated question of tale-order. Textual study of the manuscripts must similarly be free from reliance on the conclusions of Manly-Rickert, forcing editors to allow the texts of many marginalised manuscripts to be considered afresh. The next section of this conclusion will summarise a number of the ways in which Ad³ may inform our understanding of the history of the text, allowing us a much freer and wider view of the development of the tradition.

3. The position of Ad³ within the tradition

This study of Ad³ has demonstrated that this manuscript has much to offer both in terms of the quality of its readings, and the evidence it provides concerning the development of the textual tradition. The arguments advanced in this study have

received recent support in the results of the cladistic analysis carried out by Peter Robinson on the manuscripts of WBP (Robinson 1997). This analysis has isolated a group of manuscripts that are related only in their proximity to the archetype of the entire tradition. The presence of Ad³ within this group of authoritative manuscripts provides useful support for the evidence put forward in this study that Ad³ contains a careful copy of a text of the *Canterbury Tales* of the highest authority. In this section I review a number of the aspects of Ad³ that demonstrate this authority, in order to determine the nature of the Ad³ exemplar and the scribe's attitude to his exemplar during copying.

The Ad³ text is independently derived directly from the archetype of the tradition and preserves a high proportion of ancestral readings. This is demonstrated primarily by the close textual relationship it shares with Hg, a manuscript shown to represent an early and accurate copy of this archetype. The presence in Ad³ of almost every element of the elaborate system of marginal commentary and glossing found in E1, suggests that this copytext was added to following the production of Hg. In addition to the extension of the marginal apparatus found in Hg, certain extra passages of text had been incorporated in this copytext and some of these pieces appear exclusively in both Ad³ and E1, demonstrating a close relationship between the two manuscripts. While the addition of the marginalia may be argued to represent consultation with another source rather than further additions to a single copytext, the inclusion of extra passages within the body of the text, such as those in FK and WBP, suggests that the extra material was present in the exemplar before copying was begun. The misplacement of the second of the extra passages in WBP in Ad³ and no other manuscript may be the result of confusion surrounding the indication for the placement of this added material. It may be that the 'added passages' were included into the copytext on loose leaves with a marginal note indicating their inclusion. The addition of these passages in this form may further explain the presence of only two of these passages in Ad³, as text included in this manner may easily be mislaid or omitted. The major adjustment implemented in the tale-order, demonstrating a close

knowledge of the text and careful planning prior to placing quill to parchment, adds further confirmation that these additions and alterations were made to the exemplar and then implemented in the production of Ad³. It therefore seems most likely that Ad³ derives directly from the same copytext used in the production of Hg, and that no intervening copies stand between the archetype and the Ad³ copy. It is probable that this exemplar remained in loose leaf format, allowing rearrangement of fragments and individual tales, and that extra passages of text and marginal material had been added in a similarly independent fashion.

Having discussed the evidence for the state of the Ad³ copytext I shall now consider the scribe's copying practice and his attitude towards his exemplar. The ordering of the tales generally follows that of El and the *a* group manuscripts, and it seems likely that this close relationship is the result of indications in the copytext or at least an awareness of this arrangement prior to copying. I have argued above that the separation of Group G, and the unusual placement of NU and CY are likely to reflect a similar situation in the exemplar rather than editorial intervention. In contrast the movement of CO in order to resolve the dramatic content of L36 does represent a deliberate act of editorial improvement. It seems likely that this is the work of a scribe or editor responsible for Ad³ itself, as major alterations of this kind are unusual in manuscripts dated to the first quarter of the fifteenth century. The lack of support for this change in other manuscripts further suggests that this unique adjustment was implemented in the production of Ad³. We may therefore attribute the careful planning and close knowledge of the text that such an adjustment demands to the scribe or editor of this manuscript. Careful planning of the ordering of tales and links is further evident in the continuous progression of copying, which betrays few signs of uncertainty and allows for no later inclusions or rearrangements. Despite the evidence for a careful attitude towards the tale-order, and access to the order used by the El-*a* manuscripts the Ad³ scribe does exhibit a certain degree of freedom in his attitude to this aspect of the text. While the movement of CO and the consequent disruption of Group A has some justification, it is not supported by any other

manuscript and must be explained as the result of the Ad³ scribe tinkering with the text in an attempt to 'improve' it. The content of L3 and the collective agreement in the positioning of CO after RE in so many manuscripts stresses the likelihood that this placement was devised by Chaucer, and further highlights the radical nature of the Ad³ alteration. Adjustments in tale-order of this kind are most common in manuscripts copied after the first quarter of the fifteenth century, and these aspects of tale-order in later manuscripts must be treated with caution. However it is significant that the Ad³ scribe made no attempts to edit the text itself in order to accommodate this alteration in the arrangement. It seems that a degree of freedom displayed by the scribe in ordering the text did not extend to his treatment of the text itself. Thus while the manuscript does show evidence of scribal intervention, such editorial activity is largely superficial and does not affect the details of the text.

Despite much recent criticism of the Ad³ copyist the close relationship between Ad³ and Hg demonstrates a high degree of accuracy at the substantive level of the text. The small number of omissions of individual lines or groups of lines demonstrates a careful and competent copying practice. There are no instances of added lines found only in Ad³, and most additional lines demonstrate access to material found in E1 and not in Hg, rather than a scribal tendency to introduce unique additions into the text. The presence of a high number of the difficult readings characteristic of the O Group in Ad³ demonstrates a careful and sensitive copying practice at a more minor level. Two such readings, found at lines 154 and 766 of WBP, are not preserved in Hg demonstrating the importance of comparison of Hg with Ad³ in future editorial practice. In addition to such accuracy in the treatment of substantive readings, there is also evidence that the Ad³ copyist was sensitive towards the metre of the text. This is demonstrated generally by the scribe's preservation of a high proportion of the syncopated and contracted verb forms in Hg, and the retention of orthographic conventions that relate to metre, such as the use of apocope to signal the ellision of adjacent vowels. A specific example that shows the preservation of a metrically more regular line than that found in Hg occurs at line 407 of WBP. Here

the Ad³ scribe has used an uninflected monosyllabic form of the present plural form 'had', while Hg's use of the disyllabic form 'hadden' adds an extra syllable making the line irregular. However, two examples in the Ad³ copy of WBP suggest a rather insensitive attitude to the preservation of the rhyme scheme. The scribe's reversal of the final two words of line 819 resulted in the inclusion of the phrase 'a rewe' at the end of line 820 in order to restore the faulty couplet. The omission of the final word of line 731 has also removed the rhyme from this couplet, and no effort has been made to make amends for this disruption.

The careful use of orthographic and morphological conventions, also extends to the scribe's attitude to the spelling of the text as a whole. Ad³ was copied in a spelling system which bears many similarities to that of Hg. The spelling is very regular and many of the differences between Hg and Ad³ may be attributed to linguistic developments that occurred in the decades between their production. However these developments, such as the loss of grammatical final <-e>, and the influence of standardisation do have a certain effect on the text of Ad³, especially in relation to metre. The tendency to preserve much of the morphology of the copytext reduces the effect that such developments have on the metre of the Ad³ text, although a rather erratic treatment of final <-e> does cause some disturbance to the metrical regularity of Hg. A more significant orthographic feature is the presence in Ad³ of a number of minor spelling forms in Hg which appear at many of the same positions in both manuscripts. The distribution of these forms in Hg suggests that these are the result of direct transcription by Scribe B of the exact forms of his exemplar. The agreement in the uses of these spellings in Ad³ provides further support for the close relationship between Ad³ and this same copytext, and demonstrates the scribe's tendency to preserve these orthographic features. Ad³ was copied during the period argued to have come into contact with the incipient London Standard, and some influence of standardisation is found in the Ad³ language. The presence of features allied with those of the London Standard adds further significance to the preservation of a number of earlier spellings which seem to derive from the copytext itself. The

retention of these forms suggests a conscious effort to preserve elements of the spelling of the archetype, in spite of other influences such as the forms of the scribe's own idiolect and those of the London Standard.

4. Suggestions for future research

The role of Ad³ in future editorial work on the text of the *Canterbury Tales* will be a crucial one. As an independent copy of the archetype Ad³ provides important support for many of the readings found in Hg. The appearance of a number of readings in WBP which suggest the accurate copying of readings incorrectly recorded in Hg makes Ad³ an important basis for emendation of Hg in the preparation of future editions. Collation of Hg and Ad³ by future editors is particularly important given the detection of a change of exemplar in El by Robinson (Robinson 1997). The use of an exemplar belonging to the EF tradition for parts of WBP shows that collation of Hg and El must be supplemented by comparison with Ad³ and other members of the O Group. The collation of Hg with other O Group manuscripts is also important in order to test the reliability of Hg across the whole of the *Canterbury Tales* text. While many modern editors rely on Hg as their base manuscript, it has not been possible to test its readings by comparison with a group of witnesses descended independently from the same archetypal copytext. The identification of the O Group makes such comparison possible, allowing editors to assess the support for a particular Hg reading and to identify readings where Hg seems to be in error.

This study also suggests a number of further avenues for future research which will be important to a fuller understanding of the genesis and transmission of the text of the *Canterbury Tales*. Ad³ is a significant member of the O Group manuscripts although further aspects of its relationship with other manuscripts within this group, and the status of the group itself must await the complete transcription and detailed study of all constituent members. Analysis of the close relationship between Ad³

and Ha⁵ suggested by Robinson's cladistic analysis of WBP is another aspect that may aid our understanding of the production of Ad³ and its later history. Study of the dialects of the O Group manuscripts may allow us to isolate further forms which derive from the copytext, providing more possible evidence for the reconstruction of the original language of the archetype. Independent dialectal features of individual O manuscripts may permit the localisation of these important witnesses, providing information concerning their places of production and the geography of the dissemination of their copytext. While there is little evidence to allow the tracing of the fifteenth-century provenance of Ad³, recent work on the early history of *Canterbury Tales* manuscripts has suggested some provisional connections between a number of the names found on these manuscripts and families associated with Essex and Suffolk (Stubbs forthcoming). Manly-Rickert's identification of the name 'Hocden' scribbled in the margin of folio 44^v of Ad³ with the Suffolk village of Hawkdon may place Ad³ among the literary activity described by Stubbs in this region. The presence of the inscription 'John Hedgeman of Hawkedoun' in El, and the connections of this manuscript with the De Vere family (Hanna and Edwards 1996) suggests possible links in the early provenance of these two closely related manuscripts.

This transcription and study of the textual, linguistic and codicological importance of Ad³ is the first step towards a greater understanding of the individual manuscripts that comprise the O Group, and the relationships between these manuscripts. It is important that all O manuscripts are transcribed into electronic form and that they are subjected to similar detailed study. Research into the textual tradition of the *Canterbury Tales* must adopt a much broader approach to the manuscripts, shifting the focus from a small group of early manuscripts to embrace the entire tradition. It has been accepted that the Riverside edition is not the *Canterbury Tales*. It must now be accepted that neither is Hg nor El.

Bibliography

- Baker, D.C., 'The Bradshaw order of the *Canterbury Tales*: A Dissent.' *NM* 63 (1962), 245-61.
- (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.
- (ed.), *Chaucer's Major Poetry*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.
- Bell, R. (ed.), *Poetical Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*. London: Griffin, 1854.
- Benskin, M. and M.L. Samuels (eds.), *So meny people longages and tonges: philological essays in Scots and mediaeval English presented to Angus McIntosh*. Edinburgh: MEDP, 1981.
- Benskin, M. and M. Laing, 'Translations and *Mischsprachen* in Middle English Manuscripts.' in Benskin and Samuels 1981, pp. 55-106.
- Benson, L.D., 'The Order of *The Canterbury Tales*.' *SAC* 3 (1981), 77-120.
- (ed.), *The Riverside Chaucer*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987.
 - 'Chaucer's Spelling Reconsidered.' *EMS* 3 (1992), 1-28.
- Benzie, W., *Dr. F.J. Furnivall, Victorian Scholar Adventurer*. Norman OK: Pilgrim Books, 1983.
- Blake, N.F., *Caxton's Own Prose*. London: André Deutsch, 1973.
- 'The Relationship between the Hengwrt and Ellesmere Manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *E&S* n.s. 32 (1979), 1-18.
 - (ed.), *The Canterbury Tales edited from the Hengwrt Manuscript*. London: Arnold, 1980.
 - 'Chaucer Manuscripts and Texts.' *Review* 3 (1981), 219-32.

- 'Critics, criticism and the order of *The Canterbury Tales*.' *Archiv* 218 (1981), 47-58.
 - 'On Editing the *Canterbury Tales*.' *Medieval Studies for J.A.W. Bennett aetatis suae LXX*. Ed. P.L. Heyworth. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981, pp. 101-19.
 - 'The Text of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *Poetica* 13 (1982 for 1980), 27-49.
 - '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 (1984), 65-79.
 - 'Editorial assumptions and problems in *The Canterbury Tales*.' *Poetica* 20 (1984), 1-19.
 - 'The Debate on the order of *The Canterbury Tales*.' *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 10 (1985a), 31-42.
 - *The Textual Tradition of the Canterbury Tales*. London: Arnold, 1985b.
 - 'The Manuscripts and Textual Tradition of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *Poetica* 28 (1988), 6-15.
 - 'The Chaucer canon: methodological assumptions.' *NM* 90 (1989), 295-310.
 - 'Manuscript to Print.' in Griffiths and Pearsall 1989, pp. 403-32.
 - *A History of the English Language*. London: Macmillan, 1996.
 - 'The Project's Lineation System.' in Blake and Robinson 1997, pp. 5-14.
 - 'Chancery English and The Wife of Bath's Prologue.' *To Explain the Present: Studies in the Changing English Language in Honour of Matti Rissanen*. Eds. T. Nevalainen and L. Kahlas-Tarkka. Helsinki: Société Néophilologique, 1997, pp. 3-24.
 - 'Geoffrey Chaucer and the Manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*.' forthcoming in the *Journal of the Early Book Society*.
- Blake, N.F. and P.M.W. Robinson (eds.), *The Canterbury Tales Project Occasional Papers Vol. I*. Oxford: Office for Humanities Communication, 1993.
- *The Canterbury Tales Project Occasional Papers Vol. II*. London: Office for Humanities Communication, 1997.

- Bowers, J.M., *The Canterbury Tales: Fifteenth-Century Continuations and Additions*. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University Press, 1992.
- Boyd, B. (ed.), *The Prioress's Tale*. A Variorum Edition of the Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, vol. II part 20. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987.
- Brusendorff, A., *The Chaucer Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925.
- Burnley, J.D., 'Inflexion in Chaucer's Adjectives.' *NM* 83 (1982), 169-77.
- *The Language of Chaucer*. London: Macmillan, 1989.
 - 'Sources of Standardisation in later Middle English.' *Tennessee Studies in Literature* 31 (1989), 23-41.
- Caie, G.D., 'The Significance of Marginal Glosses in the Earliest Manuscripts of *The Canterbury Tales*.' *Chaucer and Scriptural Tradition*. Ed. D.L. Jeffrey. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1984, pp. 75-88.
- Caxton, W., [*The Canterbury Tales*. Westminster, 1476] (STC 5082).
- [*The Canterbury Tales*. Westminster, 1482] (STC 5083).
- Chambers, R.W. and M. Daunt (eds.), *A Book of London English 1384-1425*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1931.
- Christianson, C.P., 'A Community of Book Artisans in Chaucer's London.' *Viator* 20 (1989), 207-19.
- *Memorials of the Book Trade in Medieval London: The Archives of Old London Bridge*. Cambridge: Brewer, 1987.
- Cooper, H., *The Structure of the Canterbury Tales*. London: Duckworth, 1983.
- Corsa, H.S. (ed.), *The Physician's Tale*. A Variorum Edition of the Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, vol. II part 17. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987.
- Cowen, J. and G. Kane (eds.), *The Legend of Good Women*. Michigan: Colleagues Press, 1995.
- Crow, M.M. and C.C. Olson, *Chaucer Life Records*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.
- Davis, N., 'A Paston Hand.' *RES* new series 3 (1952), 209-221.
- 'The Language of the Pastons.' *PBA* 40 (1954), 119-44.

- (ed.) *Paston Letters and Papers of the Fifteenth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Vol. I (1971), Vol. II (1976).
 - 'The Language of two brothers in the fifteenth century.' in Stanley and Gray 1983, pp. 23-28.
- Dempster, G., 'Chaucer at Work on the Complaint in the *Franklin's Tale*.' *MLN* 52 (1937), 16-23.
- 'A Further Note on Dorigen's *Exempla*.' *MLN* 54 (1939), 137-8.
 - 'Manly's Conception of the Early History of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *PMLA* 61 (1946), 379-415.
 - 'A Chapter of the History of the *Canterbury Tales*: the ancestor of group *d*, the origin of its texts, tale-order, and spurious links.' *PMLA* 63 (1948), 456-84.
 - 'On the Significance of Hengwrt's Change of Ink in the Merchant's Tale.' *MLN* 63 (1948), 325-30.
 - 'The Fifteenth-Century Editors of the *Canterbury Tales* and the Problem of Tale-Order.' *PMLA* 64 (1949), 1123-42.
- de Worde, W., *The Boke of Chaucer named Caunterbury Tales*. Westminster, 1498 (STC 5085).
- Donaldson, E.T. (ed.), *Chaucer's Poetry: An Anthology for the Modern Reader*. New York: Ronald Press, 1958.
- 'The Psychology of Editors of Middle English Texts.' *Speaking of Chaucer*. London: Athlone, 1970, pp. 102-18.
 - 'The Ordering of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *Medieval Literature and Folklore Studies: Essays in Honor of F.L. Utey*. Eds. J. Mandel and B. Rosenberg. New Brunswick: University of Rutgers Press, 1970, pp. 103-24.
 - 'The Manuscripts of Chaucer's Works and their Use.' *Geoffrey Chaucer*. Ed. D. Brewer. London: Bell, 1974, pp. 85-108.
- Doyle, A.I. and M.B. Parkes, 'The Production of Copies of the *Canterbury Tales* and the *Confessio Amantis* in the early fifteenth century.' *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.' in Ruggiers 1979, pp. xix-xlix.
- Eadie, J., 'The Importance of Hengwrt: two studies.' *ES* 71 (1990), 322-34.
- Edwards, A.S.G., 'Walter W. Skeat.' in Ruggiers 1984, pp. 171-189.
- 'Observations on the History of Middle English Editing.' in Pearsall 1987, pp. 34-48.
- The Ellesmere Chaucer reproduced in facsimile.* 2 vols. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1911.
- Fisher, J.H., 'Chaucer's Last Revision of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *MLR* 67 (1972), 241-51.
- 'Chancery and the Emergence of Standard Written English in the fifteenth century.' *Speculum* 52 (1977), 870-99.
 - (ed.), *The Complete Poetry and Prose of Geoffrey Chaucer*. New York and London: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1977.
 - 'Animadversions on the text of Chaucer.' *Speculum* 63 (1988), 779-93.
 - 'A Language Policy for Lancastrian England.' *PMLA* 107 (1992), 1168-80.
- Fisher, J.H., M. Richardson and J.L. Fisher (eds.), *An Anthology of Chancery English*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1984.
- Furnivall, F.J., *A Temporary Preface to the Chaucer Society's Six-Text edition of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*. Chaucer Society 2nd series 3. London: Trübner, 1868.
- *The Six-Text edition of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*. Chaucer Society 1st series 2 etc. London: Trübner, 1868-84.
 - *The Harleian MS 7334 of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*. Chaucer Society 1st series 73. London: Trübner, 1885.
 - *The Cambridge MS Dd. 4.24 of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*. Chaucer Society 1st series 95-6. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1901-2.

- Gray, D. and E.G. Stanley (eds.), *Middle English Studies presented to Norman Davis*.
Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Greetham, D.C., 'Normalisation of Accidentals in Middle English Texts: the Paradox of Thomas Hoccleve.' *SB* 38 (1985), 121-50.
- Griffiths, J.J. and D.A. Pearsall (eds.), *Book Production and Publishing in Britain 1375-1475*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Hamer, R., 'Spellings of the Fifteenth-Century Scribe Ricardus Franciscus.' in Stanley and Gray 1983, pp. 63-73.
- Hammond, E.P., 'On the Order of the *Canterbury Tales*: Caxton's Two Editions.' *MP* 3 (1905-6), 159-78.
- *Chaucer: A Bibliographical Manual*. New York: Macmillan, 1908.
- Hanna, R. III., 'Booklets in Medieval Manuscripts: Further Considerations.' *SB* 39 (1986), 100-11.
- 'Problems of 'Best-Text' Editing and the Hengwrt Manuscript of *The Canterbury Tales*.' in Pearsall 1987, pp. 87-94.
 - '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.
 - 'Presenting Chaucer as Author.' in Machan 1991, pp. 17-39.
- Hanna, R. III and A.S.G. Edwards, 'Rothely, the De Vere Circle, and the Ellesmere Chaucer.' *HLQ* 58:1 (1996), 11-35.
- Hudson, A., 'Tradition and Innovation in Some Middle English Manuscripts.' *RES* new series 17 (1966), 359-72.
- 'Middle English.' *Editing Medieval Texts: English, French and Latin, Written in England*. Ed. A.G. Rigg. New York: Garland, 1977, pp. 34-57.
- Kane, G. (ed.), *Piers Plowman: The A Version*. London: Athlone, 1960.
- 'The Text of *The Legend of Good Women* in CUL MS Gg. 4. 27.' in Gray and Stanley 1983, pp. 39-58.

- 'John M. Manly and Edith Rickert.' in Ruggiers 1984, pp. 207-229.
- Kane, G. and E.T. Donaldson (eds.), *Piers Plowman: The B Version*. London: Athlone, 1975.
- Keiser, G., 'In Defense of the Bradshaw Shift.' *ChRev* 12 (1977-8), 191-201.
- Kennedy, B., 'Contradictory Responses to the Wife of Bath as evidenced by Fifteenth-Century Manuscript Variants.' in Blake and Robinson 1997, pp. 23-39.
- Kilgour, M., 'The Manuscript Sources of Caxton's Second Edition of *The Canterbury Tales*.' *PMLA* 44 (1929), 186-201.
- Koch, J., *The Pardoner's Prologue and Tale*. Chaucer Society 2nd series 35. London: Oxford University Press, 1902.
- *A Detailed Comparison of the Eight Manuscripts of the Canterbury Tales as printed by the Chaucer Society*. Chaucer Society 2nd series 47. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1913.
- Laing, M. and K. Williamson (eds.), *Speaking in Our Tongues: Proceedings of a Colloquium on Medieval Dialectology and Related Disciplines*. Cambridge: Brewer, 1994.
- LALME: A Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English*. A.I. McIntosh, M.L. Samuels and M. Benskin. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1986.
- Lerer, S., 'Rewriting Chaucer: Two Fifteenth-Century Readings of the Canterbury Tales.' *Viator* 19 (1988), 311-26.
- *Chaucer and His Readers: Imagining the Author in Late-Medieval England*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Lucas, P., 'Consistency and Correctness in the Orthographic Usage of John Capgrave's *Chronicle*.' *SN* 45 (1973), 323-55.
- Machan, T.W., *Medieval Literature: Texts and Interpretations*. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies vol. 79. Binghampton NY: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1991.
- McCormick, W. and J. Heseltine, *The Manuscripts of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939.

- McIntosh, A., 'A New Approach to Middle English Dialectology.' *ES* 44 (1963), 1-11.
- 'Towards an Inventory of Middle English Scribes.' *NM* 75 (1974), 602-24.
 - 'Scribal Profiles from Middle English Texts.' *NM* 76 (1975), 218-35.
- Manly, J.M. and E. Rickert, *The Text of the Canterbury Tales: Studied on the Basis of All Known Manuscripts*. 8 vols. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1940.
- Minnis, A.J. and C. Brewer (eds.), *Crux and Controversy in Middle English Textual Criticism*. Cambridge: Brewer, 1992.
- Moorman, C., 'One Hundred Years of Editing the *Canterbury Tales*.' *ChRev* 24 (1989), 99-114.
- Morris, R. (ed.), *The Poetical Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*. London: Bell & Daldy, 1866.
- Morse, C.C., 'The Value of Editing the *Clerk's Tale* for the *Variorum Chaucer*.' in Pearsall 1987, pp. 122-29.
- Mosser, D.W., 'Witness Descriptions.' in Robinson 1996.
- Owen, C.A. Jr., 'The Development of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *JEGP* 57 (1958), 449-76.
- 'The Alternative Reading of *The Canterbury Tales*: Chaucer's text and the early manuscripts.' *PMLA* 97 (1982), 237-50.
 - Review of Blake 1985b. *SAC* 9 (1987), 183-7.
 - *The Manuscripts of the Canterbury Tales*. Chaucer Studies vol. 17. Cambridge: Brewer, 1991.
- Parkes, M.B., *English Cursive Book Hands 1250-1500*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- 'The Influence of the Concepts of *Ordinatio* and *Compilatio* on the Development of the Book.' *Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays Presented to Richard William Hunt*. Eds. J.J.G. Alexander and M.T. Gibson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976, pp. 115-41.

- Parkes, M.B. and R. Beadle (eds.), *The Poetical Works of Geoffrey Chaucer: A Facsimile of Cambridge University Library MS Gg. 4.27*. Cambridge: Brewer, 1979.
- Partridge, S., 'The Vocabulary of *The Equatorie of the Planetis* and the Question of Authorship.' *EMS* 3 (1992), 29-37.
- 'The Glosses and the Manuscript Groups.' in Blake and Robinson 1993, pp. 85-94.
- Pearsall, D.A. (ed.), *Manuscripts and Readers in Fifteenth-Century England*. Cambridge: Brewer, 1983.
- (ed.), *The Nun's Priest's Tale*. A Variorum Edition of the Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, vol. II part 9. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1984.
 - (ed.), *Manuscripts and Texts: Editorial Problems in Later Middle English Literature*. Cambridge: Brewer, 1987.
 - *The Life of Geoffrey Chaucer*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.
- Petti, A.G., *English Literary Hands from Chaucer to Dryden*. London: Arnold, 1977.
- Pollard, A.W., H.F. Heath, M.H. Liddell and W. McCormick (eds.), *The Works of Chaucer*. London: Macmillan, 1898.
- Pratt, R.A., 'The Development of the Wife of Bath.' *Studies in Medieval Literature in Honor of A.C. Baugh*. Ed. M. Leach. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1961, pp. 45-79.
- (ed.) *The Tales of Canterbury Complete*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.
- Price, D.J., *The Equatorie of the Planetis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955.
- Pynson, R., [*The Canterbury Tales*. London, 1492] (STC 5084).
- *Here begynneth the boke of Caunterbury Tales, dilygently corrected and newly printed*. London, 1526 (STC 5086).
- Ramsey, R.V., 'The Hengwrt and Ellesmere Manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*: Different Scribes.' *SB* 35 (1982), 133-54.
- 'Paleography and Scribes of Shared Training.' *SAC* 8 (1986), 107-44.

- *The Manly-Rickert Text of the Canterbury Tales*. New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1994.
- Reinecke, G., 'F.N. Robinson.' in Ruggiers 1984, pp. 231-251.
- Richardson, M., 'The Earliest Known Owners of *Canterbury Tales* Mss and Chaucer's Secondary Audience.' *ChRev* 25 (1990), 17-32.
- Riddy, F. (ed.), *Regionalism in Late Medieval Manuscripts and Texts: Essays celebrating the Publication of A Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English*. Cambridge: Brewer, 1991.
- Robinson, F.N. (ed.), *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- (ed.) *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957.
- Robinson, P.M.W., *Collate: Interactive Collation of Large Textual Traditions, Version 2*. Computer Program distributed by the Oxford University Centre for Humanities Computing, Oxford, England. 1994.
- (ed.) *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.
- Robinson, P.M.W. and E. 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. (ed.), *The Book of Troilus and Criseyde by Geoffrey Chaucer* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1926.
- 'The Text of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *SP* 38 (1941), 1-13.
- Ross, T.W. (ed.), *The Miller's Tale*. A Variorum Edition of the Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, vol. II part 3. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1983.
- Ruggiers, P.G. (ed.), *The Canterbury Tales: A Facsimile and Transcription of the Hengwrt Manuscript with Variants from the Ellesmere Manuscript*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1979.
- (ed.) *Editing Chaucer: The Great Tradition*. Norman OK: Pilgrim Books, 1984.

- Samuels, M.L., 'Some Applications of Middle English Dialectology.' *ES* 44 (1963), 81-94.
- 'The Scribe of the Hengwrt and Ellesmere Manuscripts of *The Canterbury Tales*.' *SAC* 5 (1983), 49-65.
 - 'Chaucer's Spelling.' in Smith 1988a, pp. 23-37.
 - 'Chaucerian Final -e.' in Smith 1988b, pp. 7-12.
- Scattergood, V.J. and J.W. Sherborne (eds.), *English Court Culture in the Later Middle Ages*. London: Duckworth, 1983.
- Schmidt, K.A.R., *The Authorship of the Equatorie of the Planetis*. Chaucer Studies 19. Cambridge: Brewer, 1993.
- Scragg, D.G., *A History of English Spelling*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1974.
- Severs, J.B., 'Author's Revision in Block C of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *Speculum* 29 (1954), 512-30.
- Seymour, M.C., 'Hypothesis, Hyperbole, and the Hengwrt Manuscript of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *ES* 68 (1987), 214-29.
- Skeat, W.W. (ed.), *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*. 6 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894.
- *The Evolution of the Canterbury Tales*. Chaucer Society 2nd series 38. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1907.
 - *The Eight-Text Edition of the Canterbury Tales*. Chaucer Society 3rd series 43. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1909.
- Smith, J.J., 'Linguistic Features of some fifteenth-century Middle English manuscripts.' in Pearsall 1983, pp. 104-12.
- *Studies in the Language of some manuscripts of Gower's Confessio Amantis*. Ph.D Diss., Glasgow, 1985.
 - (ed.) *The English of Chaucer and his contemporaries*. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1988.

- 'The Trinity Gower D-Scribe and his Work on Two Early *Canterbury Tales* Manuscripts.' in Smith 1988, pp. 51-69.
 - 'Spelling and Tradition in Fifteenth-century Copies of Gower's *Confessio Amantis*.' in Smith 1988, pp. 96-113.
 - 'Tradition and Innovation in South-West-Middle English.' in Riddy 1991, pp. 53-65.
 - *An Historical Study of English: Function, Form and Change*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Solopova, E., 'The Problem of Authorial Variants in The Wife of Bath's Prologue.' in Blake and Robinson 1997, pp. 133-142.
- Speght, T., *The Workes of our antient and lerned English poet, Chaucer, newly printed*. London: Islip for Bishop, 1598 (STC 5077).
- *The Workes of our antient and learned English poet, Geffrey Chaucer, newly printed*. London: Islip, 1602 (STC 5080).
 - *The Workes of our antient, learned & excellent poet, Jeffrey Chaucer*. London, 1687.
- Stanley, E.G. and D. Gray (eds.), *Five Hundred Years of Words and Sounds: A Festschrift for Eric Dobson*. Cambridge: Brewer, 1983.
- Stow, J., *The Workes of Geoffrey Chaucer, newlie printed, with divers addicions, whiche were never in print before*. London: Kyngston for Wight, 1561 (STC 5075).
- Stubbs, E.V., 'East Anglia and the Manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*.' *Middle English Poetry: Texts and Traditions, Essays in Honour of Derek Pearsall*. Ed. A.J. Minnis. Cambridge: Brewer, forthcoming.
- Tatlock, J.S.P., *The Harleian Manuscript and Revision of the Canterbury Tales*. Chaucer Society 2nd series 37. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1909.
- 'The *Canterbury Tales* in 1400.' *PMLA* 50 (1935), 100-39.
- Thynne, W., *The Workes of Geffray Chaucer newly printed with dyuers workes whych were neuer in print before*. London: Godfray, 1532 (STC 5068).

- *The Workes of Geffray Chaucer newly printed with dyvers workes whych were never in print before.* London: Bonham, 1542 (STC 5069).

- *The Workes of Geffray Chaucer newly printed with dyuers workes whych were neuer in print before.* London: Bonham, 1545 (STC 5071).

Tyrwhitt, T., *The Canterbury Tales of Chaucer.* 5 vols. London: Payne, 1775-8.

Urry, J., *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, compared with the former editions and many valuable manuscripts.* London: Lintot, 1721.

Windeatt, B.A., 'The scribes as Chaucer's early critics.' *SAC* 1 (1979a), 119-41.

- 'The text of the *Troilus*.' *Essays on Troilus and Criseyde.* Ed. M. Salu. Cambridge: Brewer, 1979b, pp. 1-22.

- *Geoffrey Chaucer: Troilus & Criseyde. A new edition of 'The Book of Troilus'.* London: Longman, 1984.

Wright, T. (ed.), *The Canterbury Tales of Geoffrey Chaucer. A New Text with Illustrative Notes.* 3 vols. Percy Society. London: Richards, 1847-51.

Appendix A

Description of Lineation System

The lineation system used in this study is that devised by Blake for the *The Canterbury Tales* Project, explained in detail in Blake, 'The Project's Lineation System'. This appendix provides a brief outline of the system and includes a complete list of its constituent elements. This lineation divides all pieces of text found in all fifteenth-century copies of the *Canterbury Tales* into a binary system of links and tales, according to their function in the poem. Each link and tale is assigned a sigil and is lineated individually, according to the numbering of the earliest extant witness of the text. Therefore in most cases the lineation is that of Hg, with lines found in later manuscripts but not in Hg given a '/1' notation. Where a prologue and tale are consistently found placed together across the tradition, with the prologue referring only to the forthcoming tale, they are assigned the same sigil and the lineation is continuous from prologue to tale. Where a given line is found to vary significantly from the base, it is termed a variant line and given a '/a' notation. The sigil accorded to a tale is generally the initial two letters of the pilgrim teller, while links are numbered according to their placement in the text. The numbering system is based on a hypothetical model in which all links appear, irrespective of their authority, and each are numbered according to their position in this model. This is best demonstrated by a complete list of all sigla employed by this lineation, with a description of what each sigil represents. The following list includes all pieces of text listed in alphabetical and numerical order, where a link is found in only a small number of manuscripts this figure is given in brackets.

Tales

CL	Clerk's Prologue and Tale
CO	Cook's Tale
CY	Canon's Yeoman's Tale
FK	Franklin's Prologue and Tale
FR	Friar's Tale
GP	General Prologue
KN	Knight's Tale
MA	Manciple's Tale
ME	Merchant's Tale
MI	Miller's Tale
ML	Man of Law's Tale
MO	Monk's Tale
NP	Nun's Priest's Tale
NU	Second Nun's Prologue and Tale
PA	Parson's Tale
PD	Pardoner's Prologue, Tale and Endlink
PH	Physician's Tale
PR	Prioress's Prologue and Tale
RE	Reeve's Tale
RT	Retraction
SH	Shipman's Tale
SQ	Squire's Tale
SU	Summoner's Tale
TG	Tale of Gamelyn
TM	Tale of Melibee
TT	Tale of Thopas

WBP¹ Wife of Bath's Prologue

WBT Wife of Bath's Tale

Links

L1	KN-MI	
L2	MI-RE	
L3	RE-CO	
L4	CO Endlink	(2 MSS)
L5	CO-TG	(13 MSS)
L6	CO-TG	(1 MS)
L7	ML Headlink	
L8	ML Endlink	
L9	WB Headlink	(1 MS)
L10	WB-FR	
L11	FR-SU	
L12	SU Endlink	(9 MSS)
L13	WB Stanza	
L14	Host Stanza	
L15	ME Headlink	
L16	ME-WB	(3 MSS)
L17	ME-SQ	
L18	CL-FK	(11 MSS)
L19	SQ Endlink	(1 MS)
L20	SQ-FK	
L21	PH-PD	
L22	PD-SH	(19 MSS)
L23	SH Headlink	(1 MS)

¹Although the lineation is continuous throughout WBP and WBT I have separated the two pieces of text for convenience, as I refer frequently to the text of WBP.

L24	SH-PR	
L25	PR-TT	
L26	TT Headlink	(1 MS)
L27	TT Endlink	(2 MSS)
L28	TT-TM	
L29	TM-MO	
L30	MO-NP	
L31	NP Endlink	(10 MSS)
L32	NU Headlink	(4 MSS)
L33	NU-CY	
L34	CY-PH	(21 MSS)
L35	CY-PH	(1 MS)
L36	MA Headlink	
L37	MA-PA	

Appendix B

Chronological List of Fifteenth-Century Witnesses of the *Canterbury Tales*

I. The first decade of the fifteenth century

Ad ⁴	British Library Additional 10340
Cp	Corpus Christi College Oxford 198
Dd	Cambridge University Library Dd. 4. 24
Ha ⁴	British Library Harley 7334
Hg	'Hengwrt': National Library of Wales Peniarth 392 D
Me	'Merthyr': National Library of Wales 21972 D

II. The first quarter of the fifteenth century

El	'Ellesmere': Huntington Library El. 26 C 9
Gg	Cambridge University Library Gg. 4. 27
La	British Library Lansdowne 851

III. The second quarter of the fifteenth century

Ad ²	British Library Additional 25718
Ad ³	British Library Additional 35286
Bo ²	Bodleian Library 686
Ds ²	Devonshire Fragment
En ¹	British Library Egerton 2726

En ²	British Library Egerton 2863
He	'Helmingham': Princeton University Library 100
Hl ⁴	British Library Harley 5908
Ii	Cambridge University Library Ii. 3. 26
Kk	Cambridge University Library Kk. 1. 3/20
Lc	Lichfield Cathedral Library 2
Ld ¹	Bodleian Library Laud 600
Li ²	Longleat 29
Ox ¹	John Rylands Library English 63
Ox ²	Philadelphia Rosenbach Foundation 1084/2
Ph ³	Phillipps 8137: Philadelphia Rosenbach Foundation 1084/1
Pl	Columbia University Library Plimpton 253
Ps	Bibliothèque Nationale Fonds Anglais 39
Pw	Petworth House 7
Ry ²	British Library Royal 18 C.II
Sl ¹	British Library Sloane 1685

IV. Middle of the fifteenth century

Ar	Arundel 140
Cn	'Cardigan': University of Texas HRC 143
Do	Bodleian Library Douce d. 4
Ln	Lincoln Cathedral Library 110
Mc	'McCormick': University of Chicago Library 564
Mg	Pierpont Morgan Library 249
Mm	Cambridge University Library Mm. 2. 5
Np	Naples Royal Library XIII. B.29
Ra ¹	Bodleian Library Rawlinson Poetry 141

St Stonyhurst College B XXIII

V. Third quarter of the fifteenth century

Bw Bodleian Library Barlow 20
Ch Christ Church College Oxford 152
Ct Chetham's Library 6709
Dl 'Delamere': Takamiya 32
Ds¹ 'Devonshire': Takamiya 24
Ee Cambridge University Library Ee. 2.15
Fi Fitzwilliam Museum McLean 181
Ha¹ British Library Harley 1239
Ha² British Library Harley 1758
Ha³ British Library Harley 7333
Ha⁵ British Library Harley 7335
Hk Holkham Hall 667
Hl¹ British Library Harley 1704
Hl² British Library Harley 2251
Hn Huntington Library HM 144
Ht Bodleian Library Hatton Donat. 1
Ll¹ Longleat 257
Ne New College Oxford D.314
Nl Northumberland 455
Ph¹ Phillipps 6750: University of Texas HRC 46
Ph² Phillipps 8136: Bodmer Library 48
Ph⁴ Phillipps 8299: Huntington Library HM 140
Pp Magdalene College Cambridge Pepys 2006
Py Royal College of Physicians 388

Ra ²	Bodleian Library Rawlinson Poetry 149
Ra ³	Bodleian Library Rawlinson Poetry 223
Ry ¹	British Library Royal 17 D. XV
Se	Bodleian Library Arch. Selden B.14
Tc ¹	Trinity College Cambridge R. 3.3
Tc ²	Trinity College Cambridge R. 3.15
To ¹	Trinity College Oxford 49

VII. Last quarter of the fifteenth century

Ad ¹	British Library Additional 5140
Bo ¹	Bodleian Library 414
Cx ¹	Caxton's First Edition (1476)
Cx ²	Caxton's Second Edition (1482)
En ³	British Library Egerton 2864
Gl	Glasgow Hunterian Museum U.1.1
Hi ³	British Library Harley 2382
Ld ²	Bodleian Library Laud 739
Ma	John Rylands Library English 113
Pn	Pynson (1492)
Ra ⁴	Bodleian Library Rawlinson C. 86
Si	'Sion': Takamiya 22
Sl ²	British Library Sloane 1686
Sl ³	British Library Sloane 1009
Tc ²	Trinity College Cambridge R. 3.15
Tc ³	Trinity College Cambridge R. 3.19
To ²	Trinity College Oxford D.29
Wy	Wynkyn de Worde (1498)