

## CHAPTER V: VARIANTS<sup>1</sup>

### SINGLE LOWER CASE SIGNATURES (a TO v)

#### Chapter Summary

The variants present in the pages with single lower case signatures<sup>2</sup> show that most of the readings that Caxton took from  $\omega$  are good: most of them are archetypal readings. Approximately 80% of the introduced variants are Cx2-O variants, that is, those archetypal or very likely to be archetypal. So the general tendency of Cx2 is to reintroduce variants that probably were present in O. This means that  $\omega$  tended to preserve the archetypal reading. Unfortunately, such variants are of no use to determine the affiliations of this manuscript.<sup>3</sup>

Around 10% of the variation in Cx2 are singletons in the current collation. Many of these variants are likely to be due to compositorial mistakes or misinterpretations of Caxton's notes. It is possible that when all the fifteen-century witnesses of the *Canterbury Tales* are transcribed, we might find that some of these variants are present in some other texts. However, at present these variants are not useful to trace the textual affiliations of  $\omega$ .

The other 10% of the variants is more or less evenly divided between Cx2-Hg/EI variants --around 4.5%-- and Cx2-not-Hg/EI variants --around 5.5%. What is interesting about the latter is that Cx2 agrees on as many occasions with Hg against

---

<sup>1</sup> In this and the following chapters, the variants have been silently regularised in the discussions. All the original spellings are retained.

<sup>2</sup> The tales and links signed with single lower case are: GP-KT-L1-MI-L2-RE-L3-CO, L7-ML, L15, ME, L8, SQ, L20, FK, and WB-L10-FR-L11-SU.

<sup>3</sup> See Manly and Rickert (1940, 23).

El, as it agrees with El against Hg. The nature of these agreements, however, is very different.<sup>4</sup>

When Cx2 agrees with Hg against El the reading is usually archetypal. In the agreements between Cx2 and El we have quite a different situation. In two of the sets --sets 1 and 6-- we find that when Cx2 is in agreement with El against Hg, very often the agreement is supported by Gg, frequently with no support of any other witnesses. This is relevant since it has been shown that the affiliation in El seems to shift after line 400 of WBP (Robinson 1997, 110-1). This affiliation of El is close to  $\omega$  before WBP 400, where El shows a relationship with Robinson's **E** group. This relationship appears to be similar to the one shown in sets 1 and 6. This can be confirmed only when the rest of the witnesses are fully transcribed. At present, however, it is valid to assume that further research in this area is required to explain the oddity of this textual relationship. Another important set of agreements is that found in set 7 --L20-- in which Cx2 agrees with El in archetypal readings against the modified version of this link present in Hg. Since these variants in L20 are determinant for the order of the tales and, as has been argued, the versions and order found in Hg are not archetypal, they are further proof of the closeness of  $\omega$  to the origin of the tradition. WBP 484 is also of great interest, since it shows an agreement in error of Cx2 and Hg. This agreement, however, was probably present in the archetype (Robinson 1997, 104). In a very general way we could say that when Cx2 agrees with Hg against El, the readings these share are archetypal, even if they are errors. When Cx2 agrees with El against Hg, we sometimes find that they have the correct reading where Hg has a

---

<sup>4</sup> This difference arises from the fact that the variants in which Cx2 agrees with Hg against El have the tendency to be archetypal, while those in which Cx2 agrees with El against Hg are likely to have originated in a common hyparchetype.

mistake, while in other occasions they agree with Gg in readings that point towards Robinson's **E** group.

FR 33, FR 78, SU 156 and SU 388 are good examples of variants that show very clearly the textual affiliation of  $\omega$  with Ad3 and Ch, while FR 186 shows Ad3 and Ha4 in agreement with Cx2.

There are two variants in this chapter that show most dramatically both the textual affiliations of  $\omega$  and the good quality of its text. These are KT 1179 and RE 9, two lines in which Hg and El agree in error. The former clearly shows the textual relationship between Ad3 Ch Ha4 and Cx2, where these witnesses have the reading 'sterres' in place of Hg and El's 'Sertres.'

In RE 9, where Hg and El agree in the reading 'And,' Cx2 and the **O** manuscripts have the *lectio difficilior* 'Ay,' which, again supports the conclusion that the text of  $\omega$  is the very best quality and very close to the archetype.

These two examples are important because they provide clear evidence about the nature of  $\omega$  but also that they make evident that occasionally the archetypal reading can be found in witnesses other than Hg or El, and that these two can sometimes present a text that is not the archetypal text of the *Tales*.

# 1. SET 1: THE GENERAL PROLOGUE, THE KNIGHT'S TALE, LINK 1, THE MILLER'S TALE, LINK 2, THE REEVE'S TALE, LINK 3, AND THE COOK'S TALE<sup>5</sup>

## 1.1 Set Summary

The variant distribution in this section indicates that Cx2 has a strong tendency to re-introduce variants which are archetypal to the tradition.

The peculiarities of the Cx2-Hg/El variants can be summarised as follows: when Cx2 agrees with Hg, the reading is usually archetypal. In this circumstance the tendency of El is to group with Gg in readings that seem to be characteristic, and which are perhaps related to Robinson's **E** group. When Cx2 agrees with El against Hg, some of the variants seem to be much more informative of the affiliations of  $\omega$ . Of the 15 readings in which Cx2 agrees with El against Hg, on 6 occasions the agreement is supported by Gg, however, in readings that are likely to be non-archetypal.

Another striking example, which also points towards the textual affiliations of Ad3 Ch Ha4 and Cx2 is KT 1179, is where these witnesses have the reading 'sterres' in place of Hg and El's 'Sertres.'

In the Cx2-not-Hg/El Variants we find the most important part of our information. Of these, Cx2 often agrees with Ad3 and Ch, followed by Ha4. Very

---

<sup>5</sup> The witnesses collated for GP are: Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bo2 Ch Cn Cp Cx1 Cx2 Dd Dl Do Ds1 El En1 En3 Fi Gg Ha2 Ha3 Ha4 Hg Ht Ii La Lc Ld1 Ld2 Ma Mg Mm Nl Ph2 Pn Ps Pw Py Ra2 Ra3 Ry1 Ry2 Se Sl2 Tc1 Tc2 To1 Wy. The witnesses collated for KT are: Ad3 Ch Cp Cx1 Cx2 Dd El Gg Ha4 Hg La. The witnesses collated for L1 are: Ad1 Ad2 Ad3 Bo1 Bo2 Bw Ch Cn Cp Cx1 Cx2 Dd Dl Ds El En1 En2 En3 Fi Gg Gl Ha2 Ha3 Ha4 Ha5 He Hg Hk Ht Ii La Lc Ld1 Ld2 Ln Ma Mg Mm Ne Ox1 Ph2 Pn Ps Pw Py Ra1 Ra2 Ra3 Ry1 Ry2 Se Sl1 Sl2 Tc1 Tc2 To1 Wy. The witnesses collated for MI are: Ad1 Ad2 Ad3 Bo1Bo2 Bw Ch Cn Cp Cx1 Cx2 Dd Dl Ds1 El En1 En2 En3 Fi Gg Gl Ha2 Ha3 Ha4 Ha5 He Hk Ht Ii La Lc Ld1 Ld2 Ln Ma Mg Mm Ne Nl Ox1Ph2 Pn Ps Pw Py Ra1 Ra2 Ra3 Ry1 Ry2 Se Sl1Sl2 Tc1 Tc2 To1 Wy. The witnesses collated for L2 are: Ad3 Cp Cx1 Cx2 Dd El Gg Ha4 Hg La. The witnesses collated for RE are: Ad3 Ch Cp Cx1 Cx2 Dd El Gg Ha4 Hg La. The witnesses collated for L3 are: Ad3 Ch Cn Cp Cx1 Cx2 Dd El Gg HA4 Hg La. The witnesses collated for CO are: Ad3 Ch Cp Cx1 Cx2 Dd El Gg Ha4 Hg La.

rarely we find a random group of manuscripts agreeing with Cx2 --agreement by coincidence. In this group of variants, it is remarkable that only on three occasions is Gg in agreement with Cx2 --KT 1461, MI 6, RE 9-- since this manuscript often supports readings --mostly non-archetypal-- shared by Cx2 and E1 against Hg, it is interesting to note that agreements between Cx2 and Gg, without the support of E1 occur infrequently.

## **1.2 Analysis of Variant Lines**

The analysis of variant lines includes line substitutions --when Cx2 replaces a complete line in Cx1--, line additions --when Cx2 includes lines which were not in Cx1-- and line deletions --when lines that were present in Cx1 are excluded from the text but are not replaced by anything else.

The lines introduced in Cx2 --to replace or complete the text-- generally agree with the archetypal readings and are present in the majority of the witnesses. Occasionally, there are variants within the line that require further analysis. Because of the amount of variation in this particular set, some lines have been set apart and included in the electronic appendix d, chapter 5, 1.2.

### ***1.2.1 Line Substitutions***

In this part of the text, all the line substitutions in which a single line is replaced appear to be the result of the re-introduction of archetypal lines in place of non-archetypal ones present in Cx1. All the line substitutions for this set have been retained to serve as examples of the introduction of archetypal lines. Variants within the lines are analysed below.

GP 222a Cx1 To them that had<sup>ð</sup> grete contricion  
GP 221 Cx2 Ful swetly herd<sup>ð</sup> he confession

GP 402-1 Cx1 At ful many abataylle in that lond<sup>ð</sup>  
GP 402 Cx2 By water he sent hem hom to eury lond<sup>ð</sup>

KT 604a Cx1 I wylle not taire yow alle the day  
KT 604 Cx2 Hyt fyll in that seuenth yere in may

KT 1186a Cx1 Lyke vnto the figure of virgynys  
KT 1186 Cx2 Of sterres that ben called<sup>ð</sup> in scripturis

KT 1354 Cx2 Yet songe the larke 7 palamon ryght tho  
KT 1354a Cx1 Vnto the temple purposeth he to go

KT 1715a Cx1 And<sup>ð</sup> aftir hem comunes eche aftir his degre  
KT 1715 Cx2 Of one and<sup>ð</sup> other aftyr her degre

KT 1797a Cx1 He noñ shal lenger vnto his felaw gone<sup>6</sup>  
KT 1797 Cx2 Vnto the folke that foughten thus echone

KT 1950a Cx1 Though y write mighte y note where they dwelle  
KT 1952-1 Cx1 That soroweth and<sup>ð</sup> cryeth I wyl not lye  
KT 1952-2 Cx1 Now wepith Emelye 7 waylith Palamon  
KT 1950 Cx2 Of thē though þ<sup>t</sup> they writen where they dwell  
KT 1951 Cx2 Arcyte is cold<sup>ð</sup> there mars hys soule guye

MI 47a Cx1 And<sup>ð</sup> therto her kyrtil pynchid<sup>ð</sup> with aþ  
MI 47 Cx2 Fayr was this yong wyf and<sup>ð</sup> there wyth all

MI 416-1 Cx1 And<sup>ð</sup> to noman wold<sup>ð</sup> he hit be wreye  
MI 416 Cx2 Ful oft he sayd<sup>ð</sup> alas 7 weleaweie

MI 465-1 Cx1 Eche gan other in armes plye  
MI 465 Cx2 Ther as the carpenter was wont to lye

RE 96a Cx1 They makyn redy al hir owen gere  
RE 96 Cx2 Thys Aleyn maketh redy alle hys gere

RE 167a Cx1 Be cockis herte he shal not a scape vs bathe  
RE 167 Cx2 By godis sale he shal not ascape vs bathe

RE 348a Cx1 Ye false harlot hast thou so hast

---

<sup>6</sup> This line appears after KT 1798.

RE 348 Cx2 Ye false harlot quod<sup>ð</sup> the myllar haste

There are fifteen line substitutions in this set, of which only one is not entirely straight forward. In the case of Cx1 KT 1950 to 1952a presents a problem because the three lines present in Cx1 have been replaced by two in Cx2.

KT 1950a Cx1 Though<sup>ñ</sup> y write mighte y note where they dwelle

KT 1952-1 Cx1 That sorowet<sup>ñ</sup> and<sup>ð</sup> cryet<sup>ñ</sup> I wyl not lye

KT 1952-2 Cx1 Now wepit<sup>ñ</sup> Emelye 7 waylith<sup>ñ</sup> Palamon

KT 1950 Cx2 Of thē though þ<sup>t</sup> they writen where they dwell

KT 1951 Cx2 Arcyte is cold<sup>ð</sup> there mars hys soule guye

Here we can see that Cx1 KT 1950a corresponds to Cx2 KT 1950, that is, the line in Cx1 is a variant line of KT 1950. Cx1 KT 1952-1 appears to correspond to Cx2 1951, since both have the same rhyme word. Technically, Cx1 KT 1952-2 is a deleted line; it has been kept in among the substitutions because it seems to form part of a change in a whole passage.

The discussion that follows focuses on the variants within substituted lines.

KT 604

Out: Cx1

Base  $\text{ϕ}$  It fil , that , in that seuenthe yeer of May

Cx2 Hyt fyll in that seuenth yere in may

Hg  $\text{ϕ}$  It fil , þ<sup>t</sup> , in that seuenthe yeer of May

El  $\text{ϕ}$  It fel , that in the Seuenthe yer in May

that in ] Cp Dd El Gg Ha4 Hg La

in ] Ch Cx2

that seuenthe ] Ch Cx2 Hg

the seuenthe ] Cp Dd El Gg Ha4 La

of ] Ch Cp Hg La

in ] Cx2 Dd El Gg Ha4

There are three variants in KT 604. The first one is that Cx2, only supported by Ch, has suppressed the first 'that.' The second is the 'that' before 'seuenthe' where Ch agrees not only with Cx2, but also with Hg. These three witnesses stand together against all the other collated witnesses which read 'the', and although this particular variant could have been the result of an agreement by coincidence, the consistency of agreements between Cx2 and Ch --especially if it is supported by Hg-- suggests that this might be an archetypal reading.

The third variant in KT 604 is the preposition before 'may,' where Cx2 El Dd Gg and Ha4 have 'in,' while Hg Ch Cp and La have 'of.' In this case, because the reading 'in' can be found not only in Hg and Ch --manuscripts that probably represent two different lines of descent--, but also in c group manuscripts --Cp and La--, one can presume that this is the archetypal variant. Cx2 supported by El and Gg is more likely to have a derivative reading.

KT 1186

Out: Cx1

Base	Of	sterres	,	that	been	clepyd	in	Scriptures
Cx2	Of	sterres		that	ben	called <sup>b</sup>	in	scripturis
Hg	Of	sterres	,	p <sup>t</sup>	been	clepyd	in	Scriptures
El	Of	sterres	,	that	been	cleped	in	scriptures

clepyd ] Ad3 Dd El Gg Ha4 Hg

closed ] Cp La

called ] Cx2

clept ] Ch

In KT 1186, Cx2 is the only collated witness to have the reading 'called' instead of 'cleped.' The Cx2 reading is likely to have originated when either Caxton or one of his compositors attempted to modernise the text. It is very unlikely that this variant might have been present in  $\omega$ .

KT 1354

Out: Cx1

Base	Yet	soong	the	larke	,	and	Palamon	right	tho
Cx2	Yet	songe	the	larke	7	palamon	ryght	tho	
Hg	Yet	soong	the	larke	,	and	Palamon	right	tho
El	Yet	song	the	larke	,	and	Palamon	also	

right tho ] Ad3 Ch Cp Cx2 Dd Hg La

also ] El Gg Ha4

Cx2 agrees with Hg Ad3 Ch Cp Dd and La in the reading 'right tho.' El, supported by Gg and Ha4, has 'also.' The readings are metrically equivalent, so this cannot be used as a tool to decide which variant one should prefer. The variant distribution suggests, however, that 'right tho' is the archetypal reading. As I have explained above, when El and Gg disagree with Hg, there is a tendency of the former to present derivative readings.

MI 416

Out: Cx1 Tc2

Base	Ful	ofte	he	seyde	,	allas	and	weylawey
Cx2	Ful	oft	he	sayd <sup>ð</sup>		alas	7	weleaweie
Hg	Ful	ofte	he	seyde	,	allas	and	weylawey
El	Ful	ofte	, he	seith		allas	and	weylawey

seyde ] Ad1 Bo1 Bo2 Bw Ch Cn Cp Cx2 Dd Dl Ds En1 En2 En3 Fi  
 Gg Gl Ha2 Ha3 Ha4 Ha5 Hg La Lc Ld1 Ld2 Ln Ma Mg Mm Ph2 Pn Ps  
 Pw Py Ra1 Ra3 Ry1 Ry2 Se Sl1 Sl2 Tc1 To1 Wy  
 seith ] El Ht li Nl

In Cx2, MI 416 has the reading 'seyde' which is shared by Hg and the vast majority of the witnesses. El has 'seith,' a variant supported only by Ht Ii and Nl. The variant distribution suggests that 'seyde' is likely to be the archetypal reading, while 'seith' is obviously derivative. It is possible that the variant in El Ht Ii and Nl had its origin in MI 415 which also has a present tense (gooth).

MI 465

Out: Cx1 Ne Tc2

BASE	Ther	as	the	Carpenter	,	is	wont	to	lye
Cx2	Ther	as	the	carpenter		was	wont	to	lye
Hg	Ther	as	the	Carpenter	,	is	wont	to	lye
El	Ther	as	the	Carpenter	,	is	wont	to	lye

is ] Ad3 Bo1 Bo2 Bw Ch Cp Dd El En1 En2 Fi Gg Ha2 Ha5 He Hg Ht  
 La Lc Ld1 Ld2 Mg Nl Ph2 Pw Ra1 Ra3 Ry1 Ry2 Se Sl1 Sl2 Tc1 To1  
 was ] Ad1 Cx2 Ds En3 Gl Ha3 Ha4 li Ln Ma Mm Pn Ps Py Wy

In this line several manuscripts agree with Cx2, and of those that regularly agree with it, only Ha4 is present; Ad1 and En3 both of which have been grouped by Robinson in the  $\alpha$  group, are also in agreement with Cx2. Other manuscripts have the tendency to agree with Cx2; Ad3 and Ch, have the same reading as Hg and El. This variant could easily have been caused by the tendency to substitute the historical present by the narrative preterit. It is likely that the manuscripts that have the reading 'was' do so because of agreement by coincidence.

RE 167

Out: Cx1						
Base	By god	hert	he sal	nat	scape	vs bathe
Cx2	By godis	sale	he shal	not	ascape	vs bathe
Hg	By god	hertʒ	he sal	nat	scape	vs bathe
El	By god	herte	he sal	nat	scape	vs bathe

god ] El Hg  
           godis ] Ad3 Cp Cx2 Dd Gg Ha4 La

hert ] Ad3 Cp Dd El Gg Ha4 Hg La  
           sale ] Cx2

Cx2 has two variants in RE 167. In the first Hg and El agree in the reading 'god,' against that of Cx2 and all the other collated witnesses, 'godis.' The latter alters the metre of the line and gives it an extra syllable. In this line we also find a reading 'sale' that is present only in Cx2 in the current collation. The variant distribution suggests that the archetypal reading is the genitive 'godis' which can be found in manuscripts that clearly represent independent lines of descent. But it must be kept in mind that this is a variant that could easily be inferred by a scribe, and for this reason it is difficult to be certain about which variant is archetypal.

The second variant is a singleton in Cx2, 'sale,' against the rest of the witnesses that have 'hert.'

### ***1.2.2 Line Additions***

Caxton did not only replace non-archetypal lines by archetypal ones, but he also added lines directly from  $\omega$ . In this set he included several long passages --most of which are in KN. The additional lines and passages are:

GP 197-198

GP 253-254

GP 307

KT 290-303

KT 335-342

KT 362-366

KT 735-744

KT 1154-1158

KT 1186

KT 1643-1644

KT 1691

KT 1745-1746

KT 1852

KT 1881

KT 1923-1928

KT 1953

KT 2035-2036

MI 577-584

L3 27-28

The majority of these additions are quite long and all represent text that appears to come directly from  $\omega$ . Most of the readings on these lines show that  $\omega$  was a manuscript which tends to agree with the archetypal readings of the text. In a few of the lines we can find variants that might shed some light on the nature of  $\omega$ . Lines that show one or more variants and are clearly non-archetypal are analysed in the following paragraphs. No further mention of lines which are evidently archetypal will

be made here.<sup>7</sup>

GP 253

Out: Cx1 E1

Base And yaf a certeyn ferme / for the graunt

Cx2 And<sup>b</sup> yaf a certayn ferme for the graunt

Hg And yaf a c<sup>2</sup>teyn ferme / for the graunt<sup>7</sup>

GP 254

Out: Cx1 E1

Base floon of his bretheren / cam ther in his haunt

Cx2 floon of hys brethern cam in hys haunt

Hg floon of his bretheren / cam ther in his haunt<sup>7</sup>

ther ] Hg Ld2 Tc1

not present ] Ch Cx2 Pn Py Wy

GP 253 and 254 are present only in Cx2 Hg Ch Ld2 Pn Py Tc1 Wy. We can disregard the printed editions --Pn and Wy-- since they simply follow Cx2, leaving us with a total of six witnesses. There are no variants in GP 253 in any of the witnesses, but there is at least one in GP 254. In Cx2 the word 'there' is not present, and this is supported by Ch Py and the incunabula. Py appears to have another variant, the addition of 'that' at the beginning of the line. This variant may be scribal and introduced to smooth the metre since, with the suppression of 'there,' the line becomes metrically inconsistent. About the general character of these lines, Robinson wrote:

Hg and Ch probably both have these lines from their (presumed) shared ancestor. Their distribution otherwise is striking: Cx2 and its dependants

---

<sup>7</sup>. Please see archetypal additional lines in the electronic appendix d, chapter V, 1.2.1.

(another sign of the closeness of the 'better manuscript' used by Caxton to manuscripts very near the head of the tradition), Py Tc1 (alpha) and Ld2 (usually cd, but with many readings from outside cd). This distribution can be explained in the same way I explained that of the so-called 'added passages' in The Wife of Bath's Prologue: the lines were present in O, but were marked either for deletion or addition. Different scribes interpreted these marks differently, and hence their distribution does not follow the normal lines of descent. (Robinson 2000b)

The explanation offered by Robinson seems reasonable and accounts for the presence of the lines in some of the witnesses. These lines are different, however, from the so-called 'added passages' in WBP, and are present in Hg, while none of the 'added passages' are found in this manuscript. It is interesting that Cx2 and Ch both have GP 253 and 254, the 'added passages' and L31.

GP 307

Out: Cx1

Base	And	that	was	spoke	,	in	forme	,	and	reuerence
Cx2	And <sup>o</sup>	that	was	sayd <sup>o</sup>		in	fourme		and <sup>o</sup>	reuerence
Hg	And	that	was	spoke	,	in	forme	,	and	reuerence
EI	And	that	was	seyd	,	in	forme		and	reuerence

spoke ] Ha4 Hg Py

seyde ] Ad1 Bo1 Bo2 Ch Cn Cp Cx2 Dd DI Do Ds1 EI En1  
 En3 Fi Gg Ha2 Ha3 Ht La Lc Ld2 Ma Mg Mm Ph2 Pn Ps Pw  
 Ra3 Ry1 Ry2 Se Sl2 Tc1 To1 Wy

Only two manuscripts, in GP 307, share the reading of Hg, Py and Ha4. All the other witnesses, including Cx2 and EI, have the reading 'seyde.' Although the substitution

of one word for the other is an easy one to make, the variant distribution suggests that the reading preserved in Cx2 might be archetypal.

KT 291

Out: Cx1

Base	For	which	,	thow	art	ybounden	,	as	a	knyght
Cx2	For	whyche		thou	art	bounden		as	a	knyght
Hg	For	which	,	thow	art	ybounden	,	as	a	knyght
El	For	which	,	thou	art	ybounden		as	a	knyght

ybounden ] Cp El Ha4 Hg

bounden ] Ad3 Ch Cx2 Gg La

Hg and El, supported by Cp and Ha4, have the reading 'ybounden.' The remaining witnesses support Cx2 and have 'bounden.' This variant, however, might be the product of training or linguistic preference on the part of the scribe and does not really inform us about the nature of  $\omega$ .

KT 296

Out: Cx1

Base	And	thow	art	fals	,	I	telle	thee	outrly
Cx2	But	thou	art	fals		I	telle	the	vtrly
Hg	And	thow	art	fals	,	I	telle	thee	outrly
El	And	thou	art	fals	,	I	telle	thee	outrly

And ] El Hg

But ] Ad3 Ch Cp Cx2 Gg Ha4 La

KT 296 has a change in the conjunction at the beginning of the line: Cx2 has the reading 'But,' which is supported by the majority of the collated manuscripts. Hg and El are on their own in sharing the reading 'And.' It is likely that Cx2 here preserves the archetypal reading while Hg and El have a derivative one.

KT 298

Out: Cx1 Dd

Base	What	wiltow	seyn	/	thow	woost	nat	yet	now	
Cx2	What	wilt	thou	seyn	/	thou	wistest	not	yet	now
Hg	What	wiltow	seyn	/	thow	woost	nat	yet	now	
EI	What	wiltow	seyn	/	thou	wistest	nat	yet	now	

woost ] Ad3 Ha4 Hg  
worest ] Ch  
wistest ] Cx2 EI  
wist ] Cp Gg La

Here Hg reads 'woost' with Ad3 and Ha4; Cp Gg and La all have 'wist;' and only Cx2 and EI have 'wistest,' a reading that seems more consistent, metrically, than the monosyllabic alternatives. This may be an unusual case in which an agreement between Cx2 and EI preserve the archetypal reading.

KT 299

Out: Cx1

Base	Wheither	she	be	a	womman	/	or	goddesse	
Cx2	Whether	she	be	a	woman		or	a	goddesse
Hg	Wheither	she	be	a	womman	/	or	goddesse	
EI	Wheither	she	be	/	a	wōman	or	goddesse	

goddesse ] Ad3 Ch Cp Cx2 EI Gg Ha4 Hg La  
a goddesse ] Cx2 La

Cx2 has the article 'a' before 'goddesse,' a variant that is shared by La. This seems the product of a mistake, since it imitates the structure of the first part of the line. The addition affects the metre of the line and creates a difficult rhythm.

KT 735

Out: Cx1

Base	I	drede	noght	that	outher	thow	shalt	dye
Cx2	I	drede	not		outher	thou	shalt	dye

Hg	I drede noght	þ'	outher thow shalt	dye
El	I drede noght	, þ'	outher thow shalt	dye

that ] Ch Cp El Gg Ha4 Hg La  
 not present ] Cx2

Cx2 is the only collated witness to have left out the word 'that.' More likely than ω not having this word would be to suppose that either Caxton when he was correcting the off-print of Cx1, or by one of his compositors when setting up the text, omitted it.

KT 737

Out: Cx1

Base	Chees	which	thow wolt	or	thow shalt	noght	asterte
Cx2	Chees	whyche	thou wilt	,	thou shalt	not	astert
Hg	Chees	which	thow wolt	or	thow shalt	noght	asterte
El	Chees	which	thou wolt	or	thou shalt	nat	asterte

or ] Ch Cp El Gg Ha4 Hg La  
 not present ] Cx2

Cx2 is the only collated witness to have left out the conjunction 'or', possibly for the same reasons as those in KT 735.

KT 1085

Out: Cx1

Base	¶e	yet	the grete	strengthe	of Ercoles
Cx2	¶e	yet	the	strengthe	of hercules
Hg	¶e	yet	the grete	strengthe	of Ercoles
El	¶ And eek		the grete	strengthe	of Ercoles

¶e yet ] Ad3 Ch Cp Cx2 Dd Hg La  
 And eek ] El Gg  
 ¶e eek ] Ha4

grete] Ch Cp El Gg Hg La

not present ] Cx2 Ha4

There are two variants in KT 1085. The most obvious one is the omission of the word 'grete' which has been left out in both Cx2 and Ha4, and alters the metre of the line and, so, is likely to be a derivative reading. In the second variant Cx2 agrees with Hg and the majority of the witnesses --Ad3 Ch Cp Dd La-- in having 'fle yet' where El and Gg have 'And eek.' As in previous examples, El and Gg agree in a derivative reading against Cx2 Hg and the majority of the witnesses. Ha4 has a combination of both variants, 'fle eek.'

KT 1924

Out: Cx1

Base With circumstaunces alle , trewely

Cx2 Wyth circumstaunces alle truly

Hg With circumstaunces alle , trewely

El With alle circumstances trewely

circumstaunces alle ] Ad3 Ch Cp Cx2 Dd Hg La

alle circumstaunces ] El Gg Ha4

In KT 1924, again, Cx2 agrees with Hg against El. The variant is a change in order. Cx2 Hg Ad3 Ch Cp Dd and La have 'circumstaunces alle,' while El Gg and Ha4 have 'alle circumstances.'

KT 1925

Out: Cx1

Base That is to seyn , trouthe , honour , knyghthede

Cx2 That is to sayn trouth honour 7 knyghthede

Hg That is to seyn , trouthe , honour , knyghthede

El That is to seyn , trouthe , hono<sup>r</sup> , knyghthede

knyghthede ] Ad3 Ch Cp Dd El Gg Hg La  
and knyghthede ] Cx2 Ha4

Both Cx2 and Ha4 have added a conjunction before the end of the enumeration. The additional syllable makes the line hypermetrical and it was probably added by the scribe of Ha4 and the one that wrote the exemplar used for Cx2.

KT 2036

Out: Cx1

Base Vpon hir shuldres / carieden the beere  
Cx2 Vpon theyr backes caryden the bere  
Hg Vp on hir shuldres / carieden the beere  
El Vp on hir shuldres / caryeden the beere

shuldres ] Ad3 Ch Cp Dd El Ha4 Hg La  
schulderyn ] Gg  
backes ] Cx2

In KT 2036, Cx2 is the only collated witness to have the reading 'backes' instead of 'shuldres.'

MI 578

Out: Cx1

Base ☿ What who artow / it am I Absolon  
Cx2 What who art thou / it am I Absolon  
Hg ☿ What who artow : / it am I Absolon  
El ☿ What who artow : / I am heere Absolon

it am I ] Ad1 Bo1 Bo2 Bw Ch Cn Cp Cx2 Dd Dl Ds En1 En2 En3 Gg  
Gl Ha2 Ha3 Ha4 Ha5 Hg Hk Ht li La Lc Ld1 Ld2 Ln Ma Mg Mm Nl  
Ph2 Pn Ps Pw Py Ra1 Ra3 Ry1 Ry2 Se Sl2 Tc1 To1 Wy  
I am heere ] El  
I it am ] Fi

In MI 578, Cx2 agrees with the vast majority of manuscripts against the singleton variant in El, 'heere.'

MI 579

Out: Cx1

Base	What	Absolon	,	what	Cristes	swete	tree
Cx2	What	absalon	,	what	crystes	swete	tree
Hg	What	Absolon	,	what	Cristes	swete	tree
El	What	Absolon	,	for	cristes	sweete	tree

what ] Ad3 Bo2 Bw Ch Cx2 Dd Ds En1 Fi Gg Gl Ha2 Ha3 Ha4 Ha5 Hg  
 Hk La Lc Ld1 Ld2 Ln Mg Mm Pn Ps Pw Py Ra3 Ry1 Ry2 Se Sl1 Sl2  
 Tc1 Wy

for ] Ad1 Bo1 Cn Cp El En2 En3 Ht li Ma Ph2 Ra1 To1  
 what now DI

Here, Cx2 agrees with Hg against El. The reading in Cx2, 'what' is supported by the majority of the witnesses, including Ad3 Ch and Ha4. The El reading, 'for,' is shared by several manuscripts, most importantly, by Bo1 and Ph2, Robinson's E group.

MI 583

Out: Cx1

Base	By	Seinte	note	,	ye	woot	wel	what	I	mene
Cx2	By	seynt	note	,	ye	wote		what	I	mene
Hg	By	Seinte	note	,	ye	woot	wel	what	I	mene
El	By	seinte	note	,	ye	woot	wel	what	I	mene

wel ] Bo1 Bo2 Bw Ch Cn Cp Dd DI El En2 En3 Fi Gg Ha2 Ha3 Ha4  
 Ha5 Hg Hk Ht li La Lc Ld1 Ld2 Ma Mg Mm Nl Ph2 Ps Pw Ra1 Ra3  
 Ry1 Ry2 Se Sl1 Sl2 Tc1 To1

not present ] Ad1 Cx2 Ds En1 Gl Ln Pn Py Wy

The omission of 'wel' in Cx2 MI 583, might have been a mistake as are many other omissions. The witnesses that left out 'wel' --Ad1 Ds En1 Gl Ln Pn Py Wy-- belong to

different groups; this suggests that the agreement in this omission might be an agreement by coincidence.

L3 27

Out: Cx1

Base	That	they	han	eten	,	with	thy	stubbul	goos
Cx2	That	they	haue	eten		wyth	the	stubled	ghoos
Hg	That	they	han	eten	,	with	thy	stubbul	goos
El	That	they	han	eten	,	with	thy	stubbel	goos

thy	]	Ad3	Ch	Dd	Gg	El	Hg
the	]	Cn	Cp	Cx2	Ha4	La	

Cx2 has the reading 'the' instead of 'thy' and Cn Cp Ha4 and La support it. The rest of the witnesses --Ad3 Ch Dd Gg El Hg agree with Hg and El

### ***1.2.3 Line Deletions***

GP 163-1 Cx1 Ful fair of hewe and<sup>ð</sup> bright of faas

GP 165-1 Cx1 Whiche afore that tyme hadde be

GP 310-1 Cx1 And<sup>ð</sup> ther with<sup>ñ</sup> ful softe was his speche

GP 406-1 Cx1 For wyse he was though<sup>ñ</sup> he were ful of corage

KT 360-1 Cx1 Hit were a gret thing<sup>ꝛ</sup> to te[unr]x[/unr]e and<sup>ð</sup> to wite

CO 38-1 Cx1 Where he his vnthriftynes sore aboughte

All the lines deleted from Cx1 correspond to variant lines or to extra-lines in the Canterbury Tales Project lineation system (Blake 1997). This means that they are 'variant lines' of those in Hg or 'extra-lines' if they are not present in Hg at all. In many cases, we find that Caxton replaced a variant or extra-line with the corresponding line as found in Hg, as shown in 1.2.1 where I discuss the substitutions.

In some other cases, particularly in KN, we find that whole passages were not present in Cx1 and were added in Cx2 -- again the discussion can be found in 1.2.1. The variant lines in Cx1 have the tendency not to be archetypal, whereas lines added or replaced in Cx2, using  $\omega$  as a source for them, mostly are.

#### ***1.2.4 Line Misplacements***

There are several misplacements in this set which have been corrected in Cx2; the lines have been reordered so as to follow the order in Hg and El. Once more, the importance of the following examples resides in the fact that Cx2 shows a clear tendency to restore the archetypal order of the lines, while Cx1 presents the lines in alternative orders.

Cx1 has line KT 1000 followed by KT 999. This has been corrected in Cx2.

GP 218 Cx1 For he hadde power of confession  
GP 222 Cx1 And<sup>þ</sup> plesaunt was his absolucion  
GP 222-1 Cx1 To them that had<sup>þ</sup> grete contricion  
GP 219 Cx1 And<sup>þ</sup> sayde hym self more than a curat  
GP 220 Cx1 And<sup>þ</sup> of his ordre he was licenciat

GP 218 Cx2 For he had<sup>þ</sup> power of confession  
GP 219 Cx2 As sayd<sup>þ</sup> hym self more than a curat  
GP 220 Cx2 And<sup>þ</sup> of hys ordre he was licenciat  
GP 221 Cx2 Ful swetly herd<sup>þ</sup> he confession  
GP 222 Cx2 And<sup>þ</sup> plesaunt was hys absolucion

Cx1 presents GP 222 after GP 218, that is, the line is out of place in comparison with Hg, and Cx1 is that GP 222 is followed by GP 222-1 --an extra-line. In Cx2 lines from GP 218 to GP 222 follow the Hg line-order. Cx2 has suppressed

GP 222-1 and added GP 221 in its archetypal position. These changes suggest that  $\omega$  had a lineation similar to that of Hg.

GP 402-1 Cx1 At ful many abataylle in that lond<sup>ð</sup>  
GP 401 Cx1 He faught and<sup>ð</sup> hadde the higher hond<sup>ð</sup>  
GP 403 Cx1 But of his craft to reken wel his tyde  
GP 404 Cx1 His stremys and<sup>ð</sup> his daungeres hym be side  
GP 406 Cx1 Ther was non suche from hul in to Cartage  
GP 406-1 Cx1 For wyse he was though<sup>n</sup> he were ful of corage

GP 401 Cx2 Yf that he faught and<sup>ð</sup> had<sup>ð</sup> the hygher hond<sup>ð</sup>  
GP 402 Cx2 By water he sent hem hom to euery lond<sup>ð</sup>  
GP 403 Cx2 But of hys craft to reken wel hys tydes  
GP 404 Cx2 Hys stremys and<sup>ð</sup> hys daungers hym besides  
GP 405 Cx2 Hys herberugh hys mone and<sup>ð</sup> hys lodemanage  
GP 406 Cx2 Ther was none suche from hulle to Cartage

In lines GP 401 to GP 406 of Cx2, we have the addition of line GP 405, and the substitution of two extra-lines of Cx1. These changes altered the line-order which now, in Cx2, follows that of Hg.

GP 520 Cx1 But in his speche discret and<sup>ð</sup> benigne  
GP 519 Cx1 ðe of his techyng<sup>z</sup> daungerous ne digne

GP 519 Cx2 ðe of hys techyng<sup>z</sup> daungerous ne dygne  
GP 520 Cx2 But in hys speche dyscrete and<sup>ð</sup> benygne

GP 686 Cx1 His walet befor<sup>n</sup> hym had<sup>ð</sup> he in his lappe  
GP 685 Cx1 A vernacle hadde he sowid<sup>ð</sup> vp on his cappe

GP 685 Cx2 A vernacle hadde he sowyd<sup>ð</sup> vp on hys cappe  
GP 686 Cx2 Hys walet befor<sup>n</sup> hym had<sup>ð</sup> he in hys lappe

KT 38 Cx1 He was ware as he cast his ye a syde  
KT 37 Cx1 In al his welthe and his most pryde

KT 37 Cx2 In al hys welthe and<sup>h</sup> hys most pryde  
KT 38 Cx2 He was ware as he cast hys eye a syde

Lines GP 519 and 520, GP 685 and 686 and KT 37 and 38 were inverted in Cx1 and restored to the archetypal order in Cx2.

KT 1086a Cx1 The enchauntement of Medea and<sup>h</sup> hardynesse  
KT 1085-1 Cx1 Of Iason I wil not now expresse  
KT 1087 Cx1 He of turnus with his hard<sup>h</sup> fyre corage

KT 1086a Cx2 The enchauntement of medea and<sup>h</sup> hardynesse  
KT 1085-1 Cx2 Of Iason I wyl not now expresse  
KT 1085 Cx2 He yet the strengthe of hercules  
KT 1086 Cx2 Thenchautement of Medea and<sup>h</sup> Circes

In these groups, Cx2 has both lines, KT 1086a and 1085-1, but also has the archetypal lines KT 1085 and 1086, so that even where variant lines are kept, they may be complemented with lines that are unlikely to have been of scribal origin.

### **1.3 Analysis of Word Additions, Deletions and Substitutions**

The variant distribution for this group is as follows:

668 Cx2-O variants, which confirm the excellence of  $\omega$ . These are distributed as 127 in GP, 382 in KN, 11 in L1, 60 in MI, 11 in L2, 69 in RE, 2 in L3, 6 in CO.

75 Cx2-Unique variants, which are unique to Cx2 in the current collation. These are distributed as 14 in GP, 41 in KN, 0 in L1, 7 in MI, 2 in L2, 9 in RE, 2 in L3, 0 in CO.

41 Cx2-Hg/El variants, in which Cx2 agrees with El or Hg against the other. These are distributed as 3 in GP, 19 in KN, 0 in L1, 8 in MI, 0 in L2, 10 in RE, 0 in L3, 1 in CO.

Hg against El: 25

El against Hg: 16

35 Cx2-not-Hg/El variants, in which Cx2 agrees with another manuscript against both Hg and El. These are distributed as 6 in GP, 18 in KN, 1 in L1, 4 in MI, 1 in L2, 5 in RE, 0 in L3, 0 in CO.

### ***1.3.1 Cx2-Hg/El Variants***

Of the Cx2-Hg/El variants all but fifteen are discussed below. These fifteen variants can be found in the electronic appendix d, chapter 5. Nine of the Hg against El variants can be found in section 1.3.1.1 of the appendix. The six of the El against Hg variants are in section 1.3.1.2.

#### ***1.3.1.1 Hg against El***

There are 25 variants in which Cx2 agrees with Hg against El in this set. Some variants are of little help in establishing the textual relationships among the witnesses, some of them are likely to be the product of agreement by coincidence, while in others El appears alone against the collated witnesses. There are nine variants in this category which have been put into the electronic appendix d, chapter 5, 1.3.1.1, these are: GP 432, KT 73, KT 1689, MI 474, MI 590, RE 134, RE 178, RE 310 and CO 10.

Generally, when Cx2 agrees with Hg against El, the variants have a tendency to be archetypal and provide very little information about the nature of  $\omega$ . An interesting characteristic of the Cx2-Hg/El variants in this set is that frequently Cx2 agrees with Hg, while Gg shares the El reading. This agreement between El and Gg occurs in 11 of the 25 variants, in lines GP 161, GP 217, KT 1034, KT 1687, KT 1816, KT 2107, KT 2154, MI 468, RE 82, RE 150 and RE 326. The variant in GP 161 is ambiguous, inasmuch as it is difficult to assert which is the archetypal reading, but has been included with the others since it follows the pattern of Cx2 and Hg against Gg and El. In, for example, KT 2056 the variants in El and Gg, although different, seem to be genetically related. These variants are discussed in section 1.3.1.1.1; they suggest that El and Gg share an ancestor below the archetype. These 12 variants --13 if 2056 is taken into account-- are few however in comparison with the three thousand or so isolated for this research, even though they open a path for further research.

The other four variants --MI 65, MI 188, MI 194 and RE 99-- are probably archetypal readings.

#### 1.3.1.1.1 Agreements of Cx2 and Hg against El and Gg

The variants discussed below are agreements of Cx2 and Hg, usually in archetypal or likely to be archetypal readings, against El and Gg.

GP 161					
Base	On which	,	was first written	,	a crowned A
Cx1	On whiche	that	first was wryte	a	cronned <sup>b</sup> A
Cx2	On whyche		first was wryte	a	cronned <sup>b</sup> A
Hg	On which	,	was first written	,	a crowned A
El	On which	,	ther was first write	a	crowned A

was] Bo2 Ch Cn Ds1 En1 Ha4 Hg Ld2 Ma Nl Py  
     ther was ] Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Cp El En3 Fi Gg Ha2 Ht li La Lc Mg  
     Mm Ph2 Pw Ry1 Ry2 Sl2 Tc1 To1  
 first was] Cx2 Ld1 Pn Ps Wy  
 that ] Cx1 Tc2  
 ther ] Se  
 was graven ] Ha3

GP 217

Base	And	eek	with	worthy	wommen	,	of	the	town
Cx1	And <sup>θ</sup>		with	worthy	yemen		of	the	toun
Cx2	And <sup>θ</sup>	eke	wyth	worthy	yemen		of	the	toun
Hg	And	eek <sup>7</sup>	with	worthy	wommen	,	of	the	town
El	And		with	worthy	wō		of	the	toun

eek ] Ad3 Ch Cx2 Ha4 Hg Ld2 Pn Py Tc1 To1  
 not present ] Ad1 Bo1 Bo2 Cn Cp Cx1 Dl Ds1 El En1 En3 Fi Gg  
 Ha2 Ha3 li La Lc Ld1 Ma Mg Mm Nl Ph2 Ps Pw Ra3 Ry1 Ry2 Se  
 Sl2 Tc2 Wy

All the Cx2-Hg/El variants in GP are agreements with Hg against El. In GP 161 we find that the manuscripts that agree with Cx2 and Hg in the absence of 'that' or 'ther' before 'was first' or 'first was' are Bo2 Ch Cn Ds1 En1 Ha4 Ld2 Ma Nl Py. Manuscripts suspected of having an independent line of descent --O manuscripts--, such as Ch and Ha4, support a line without the word 'ther' --the El reading-- as do manuscripts from Manly and Rickert's a group --Cn Ds1 En1 Ma Nl. Robinson points out that the manuscripts which support this reading are those aligned with the  $\alpha$  exemplar. He describes the status of the reading as follows:

If the reading ther was in the alpha exemplar were altered to was in manuscripts within the alpha line, then the same alteration could have

occurred in the Hg ancestor and Bo2. It is likely that the El reading stood in O. (Robinson 2000b)

Since the line is metrically consistent in both Hg and El, it makes sense to attempt to argue for one of them to be the archetypal reading. Robinson suggests that if one considers the reading in El as archetypal, one should also accept that for the verb 'write,' a past participle should also follow El. If we accept that the El reading is archetypal then Cx2 and Hg here agree in error. It seems, however, that it is likely that the variant in Hg might be archetypal.

In GP 217 we again have a line in which Cx2 and Hg are supported by Ch and Ha4. Robinson again points out that manuscripts belonging to the alpha line confirm the reading that includes 'eek' From his perspective, "...the metrical superiority of the Hg reading, and the common scribal carelessness with 'small words'... suggest that Hg here preserves the O reading" (Robinson 2000b).

KT 1034

Out: Ad3

Base	He	letted	noght	his	felawe	for	to see
Cx1	He	letteth	not	his	felow	forto	se
Cx2	He	letted <sup>ð</sup>	not	hys	felow	for	to se
Hg	He	letted	noght <sup>ʀ</sup>	his	felawe	for	to see
El	He	lette	nat <sup>ʀ</sup>	his	felawe	for	to see

letted ] Ch Cp Cx2 Ha4 Hg

letteth ] Cx1 Gg

lette ] El La

KT 1034 has a change in the tense of the verb. Cx2 agrees with Hg, Cp and Ha4 in the past tense 'letted.' El and La have 'lette,' which might be the equivalent of

'letteth' the reading in Cx1 and Gg, which if true, would show a textual affiliation between Gg and El. The variant distribution of 'letted' suggests that this is probably the archetypal reading.

KT 1687

Base	In	to the lystes sende	,	or thider brynge
Cx1	Vnto	the listis brynge		ne thider sende
Cx2	In	the lystis sende		or thedyr brynge
Hg	In	to the lystes sende	,	or thider brynge
El	In	to the lystes sende	,	ne thider brynge

or ] Ad3 Ch Cp Cx2 Dd Ha4 Hg  
 ne ] Cx1 El Gg La

This line has a change in the conjunction, there is 'or' in Cx2 Ad3 Cp Dd Ha4 and Hg, and 'ne' in El Cx1 Gg and La. This last reading seems to be an interesting one since it links El with Robinson's  $\alpha$ .

KT 1816

Base	But	herkneth me	,	and stynteth noyse alite
Cx1	But	herkeneth me		and <sup>d</sup> styntith alite
Cx2	But	herkeneth me		7 stynte noyse alyte
Hg	But	herkneth me	,	and stynteth noyse alite
El	But	herkneth me	/	and stynteth now alite

noyse ] Ad3 Ch Cp Cx2 Dd Hg  
 now ] El Gg  
 noy ] La  
 not present ] Cx1  
 but ] Ha4

In KT 1816 both Cx2 and Hg present the reading 'noyse.' This is supported by the majority of the collated manuscripts: Ad3 Ch Cp Dd. La has 'noy,' perhaps an

abbreviated form of the word. El shares the reading 'now' with Gg, a manuscript that Robinson has often grouped as E (Robinson 1997). Cx2 and the majority of the manuscripts seem to have what is the archetypal reading.

KT 2107

Base	At	Atthenes	/	vpon	a	certeyn	point	and	caas
Cx1	At	atthenes		vpon		certeyn	poynt	and <sup>d</sup>	caas
Cx2	At	athenes		vpon	a	certeyn	poynt	and <sup>d</sup>	caas
Hg	At	Atthenes	/	vp on	a	certeyn	pointz	and	caas
El	At	Atthenes	/	vp on		certein	pointz	and	caas

a ] Ad3 Ch Cp Cx2 Ha4 Hg La  
not present ] Cx1 El Gg

RE 326

Base	Which	that	I	heelp	/	my	sire	for	to	stele
Cx1	Whiche	that	I	halp		my	fader	forto		stele
Cx2	Whych	that	I	halp		my	syre	forto		stele
Hg	Which	p <sup>t</sup>	I	heelp	/	my	sire	for	to	stele
El	Which	that	I	heelp <sup>p</sup>	/	my	fader	for	to	stele

sire ] Ad3 Cp Cx2 Dd Hg La  
fader ] Cx1 El Gg  
owen selfz ] Ha4

KT 2107 and RE 326 both have variants in which Cx1 El and Gg agree against the rest of the collated witnesses. KT 2107 is another example of Hg and Cx2 agreeing with the majority of the manuscripts against Cx1 El and Gg. El and Gg group together once more. The variant 'fader'/'sire' is very interesting. Of the collated manuscripts only Cx1 and El have the reading 'fader,' which is also the reading of Gg. This might be an indication of an E affiliation for El. Cx2 and Hg share with the other witnesses the archetypal reading, 'sire.'

These two readings are examples of variants shared by E1 and Gg which originated below the archetype. Their importance becomes evident when E1 and Gg agree with Cx2 in such variants, as is explained below.

KT 2107 is another example of Hg and Cx2 agreeing with the majority of the manuscripts against Cx1 E1 and Gg. E1 and Gg group together once more.

KT 2154

Base	Fro	the	tyme	,	that	it	first	gynneth	sprynge	
Cx1	Fro	the	tyme		that	he	begynneþ	to	sprynge	
Cx2	Fro	the	tyme		that	it	first	gynneth	to	sprynge
Hg	Fro	the	tyme	,	that	it	first	gynneth	sprynge	
E1	From		tyme	,	þ'	it	firstʒ	bigynneþ	sprynge	

gynneth ] Ad3 Ch Cx2 Ha4 Hg  
 bigynneþ ] Cp Cx1 Dd E1 Gg La

The change in the verb 'gynneth/' 'bigynneþ' has a clear effect on the metre of the line. In fact, E1 has to suppress the article to avoid adding an extra-syllable to it --only E1 and Ha4 lack the article. Although Cx2 has made the change in the verb, it has kept the preposition 'to' before the infinitive 'sprynge.' The variant 'gynneth' is in Ad3 Ch Cx2 Ha4 and Hg; the other manuscripts --Cx1 Dd E1 Gg and La-- have 'bigynneþ.' One should think, however, that 'gynneth' is the archetypal reading since this, in combination with the presence of the article 'the,' seems more appropriate for the rhythm of the line.

MI 468

Base	In	busynesse	of	myrthe	,	and	in	solas	
Cx1	In	besines	of	myrthe		and <sup>þ</sup>	solas		
Cx2	In	besynes	of	myrthe		and <sup>þ</sup>	in	solas	
Hg	In	busynesse	of	myrthe	,	and	in	solas	
E1	In	bisynesse	,	of	myrthe		and	of	solas

in ] Bo2 Ch Cx2 Dd Ds En1 Ha2 Ha3 Ha5 Hg Lc Ln Ma Mg Pn Ra3  
 Se Tc1 To1 Wy

of ] Ad1 Bw Cp Dl El En2 En3 Gg Ha4 li La Ld1 Ld2 Ph2 Pw  
 Py Ra1 Ry2  
 not present ] Cx1

The witnesses are evenly divided at this point. Cx2 and Hg have the preposition 'in' instead of 'of' the reading of El and 17 other witnesses. They are supported by the **a** group --Dd Ds En1 Ma-- and some of the O manuscripts --Bo2 Ch Ha5 Ra3 Tc1. The reading 'of' seems to be a mechanical mistake in reproducing the first part of the line, but the same can be said about the Hg reading. 'In' seems to be the archetypal reading, another indication that □ was very near the beginning of the tradition. This variant differs in character from the others in which El and Gg agree against Cx2, the ambiguity of this case arises from the presence of other witnesses supporting these manuscripts.

RE 82

Base	Thanne	were	ther	/	yonge	poure	scolers	two
Cx1	Than	were	ther		pore	clerkis	two	
Cx2	Than	were	there		yonge	scolers	two	
Hg	Thanne	were	ther	/	yonge	poure	scolers	two
El	☿ Thanne	were	ther	/	yonge	poure	clerkes	two

yonge poure scolers ] Ad3 Dd Hg La  
 yonge scolers ] Cp Cx2 La  
 yonge poure clerkes ] El  
 poure clerkes ] Cx1 Gg  
 poure scolers ] Ha4

Cx2 agrees with Hg in the reading 'scolers' against that of El, 'clerkes,' also supported by Gg; this suggests that, once more, El is related to the **E** exemplar, as indicated by Robinson in his analysis of WBP (1997 110-1). However, Cx2 had deleted the word 'pore' which appears in Cx1. It is possible that □ lacked this reading, as do Cp and La, but it is more likely that Caxton or one his compositors

made a mistake and deleted a word that appeared in ω. In any case, the variant shared by Cx2 and Hg --'scolers'-- is likely to be the archetypal one.

RE 150

Base	And	whan	the	mele	,	was	sakked	and	ybounde
Cx1	And <sup>ð</sup>	whan	the	mele		is	sackid <sup>ð</sup>	and <sup>ð</sup>	bounde
Cx2	And <sup>ð</sup>	whan	the	mele		was	sackid <sup>ð</sup>	7	bounde
Hg	And	whan	the	mele	,	was	sakked	and	ybounde
E1	And	whan	the	Mele	,	is	sakked	and	ybounde

was ] Cx2 Hg Ad3 Ha4  
 is ] Cp Cx1 Dd E1 Gg La

RE 150 has a change in the tense of the verb. The preterit, found in Cx2 Hg Ad3 and Ha4, is less disruptive in the context of the next line --in which we find another preterit-- which suggests that this variant might be archetypal. The reading in E1, the present 'is,' is supported by Dd, the c group manuscripts Cp and La and Gg.

KT 2056

Base	ŋe	eek	the	names	,	how	the	trees	highte
Cx1	And <sup>ð</sup>	as	to	telle	you	what	the	treys	highte
Cx2	ŋe	eke	the	names		how	the	trees	hyghte
Hg	ŋe	eek	the	names	,	how	the	trees	highte
E1	ŋe	eek <sup>7</sup>	the	names	,	that	the	trees	highte

how ] Ad3 Ch Cp Cx2 Dd Ha4 Hg La  
 that ] E1  
 what ] Cx1 Gg

Here again E1 has a reading that is unique in the current collation. Ad3 Ch Cp Dd Ha4 Cx2 and Hg all have the word 'how' as the variant present in the archetypal text. Gg has the reading 'what' --in agreement with Cx1-- which is possibly a variant from 'that,' the reading in E1.

### 1.3.1.1.2 Likely Archetypal Variants and Ambiguous Variants

The character of the variants that follow is difficult to determine, that is, whether the readings in Cx2 are archetypal or whether they indicate the presence of a hyparchetype.

MI 65

Base	Tasseled	with	silk	,	and	perled	with	latoun
Cx1	Tarselið	with	grene		and	perlið	with	latoñ
Cx2	Tarselyð	wyth	syk		and	perlyð	wyth	laton
Hg	Tasseled	with	silk	,	and	perled	with	latoun
EI	Tasseled	with	grene	,	and	pled	w <sup>t</sup>	latoun

silk ] Ad1 Ad2 Bo1 Bw Ch Cn Cp Cx2 Dd Ds En1 En2 En3 Fi Gg Gl  
 Ha2 Ha3 Ha4 Ha5 Hg Hk li La Lc Ld1 Ld2 Ln Ma Mg Mm Ph2 Pn Ps  
 Pw Py Ra1 Ra3 Ry1 Ry2 Sl1 Sl2 Tc1 Wy  
 grene ] Cx1 DI EI He Ht Ne Se Tc2

In MI 65 the variant reading is 'silk' / 'grene.' Cx2 Hg and the vast majority of the manuscripts support the variant 'silk'. EI, on the other hand, has 'grene,' a reading that is found in the b group --Cx1 He Ne and Tc2. It seems obvious that the archetypal reading is 'silk,' but it is difficult to explain why 'grene' was introduced.

MI 188

Base	He	kembed	his	lokkes	brode	,	and	made	hym	gay
Cx1	He	kembith	his	lockis	brode		7	makith	hym	gay
Cx2	He	kempte	hys	lockis	brode		7	made	hym	gay
Hg	He	kembed	his	lokkes	brode	,	and	made	hym	gay
EI	He	kembeth	hise	lokkes	brode	,	and	made	hym	gay

kembed ] Ad1 Cp Cx2 DI En3 Gg Ha3 Ha4 Hg Hk La Ld1 Pn Ry1 Sl2  
 Tc1 Wy

kembeth ] Ad2 Bo1 Bo2 Bw Ch Cn Cx1 Dd Ds EI En1 En2 Fi  
 Ha2 Ha5 He Ht Lc Ld2 Ln Ma Mg Mm Ne Nl Ph2 Ps Pw Py  
 Ra1 Ra2 Ra3 Ry2 Se Sl1 Tc2 To1  
 kembeth al ] Gl

MI 194

Base	And	for	she	was	of	towne	,	he	profred	meede
Cx1	And <sup>ð</sup>	for	she	was	of	toun		he	profrið <sup>ð</sup>	her mede
Cx2	And <sup>ð</sup>	for	she	was	of	toun		he	proferyð <sup>ð</sup>	mede
Hg	And	for	she	was	of	towne	,	he	pfred	meede
El	And	for	she	was	of	towne	,	he	profreth	meede

profred ] Ad1 Bo2 Ch Cp Cx2 Dd Ds1 En1 En2 En3 Fi Gg Gl Ha2  
Ha3 Ha4 He Hg li La Lc Ld1 Ld2 Ln Mg Mm Nl Pn Ps Pw Py Ra3 Ry1  
Ry2 Se Sl1 Sl2 Tc1 To1 Wy

profred hir ] Ad2 Ad3 Bo1 Bw Cn Cx1 Dl Ha5 Hk Ht Ma Ne  
Ph2 Ra1 Ra2 Tc2

profreth ] El

Both lines MI 188 and 194 have a preterite in Cx2 and Hg against a present tense in El. In MI 188 we have a change in the verbal tense. In Cx2 and Hg --as well as in other manuscripts that support this reading -- the past tense 'kembed' has a narrative continuity in 'made.' This continuity breaks in manuscripts that have a combination of past and present tense, as is the case of El. For this reason, it seems that the preterit 'kembed' is more appropriate in this line, perhaps suggesting that this might be the archetypal reading, although, the evidence here is ambiguous.

The case of MI 194 is slightly different from that of MI 188. Here Hg Cx2 and the vast majority of the witnesses have 'profred' in the same place as have Cx1 Ad2 Ad3 Bo1 Bw Cn Dl Ha5 Hk Ht Ma Ne Ph2 Ra1 Ra2 and Tc2. A single manuscript, El has 'profreth' instead of 'profred'. Since this is a singleton --in a tale in which all the manuscripts have been collated-- it can more or less safely be said that the El scribe made a mistake while he was copying. This variant distribution suggest that in all the likelihood, the reading in the archetype is that found in Cx2 and Hg.

RE 99

Base	With good swerd	/ and with	bokeler by	his syde
Cx1	With good <sup>ð</sup> swerd <sup>ð</sup>	and <sup>ð</sup> with	bokeler by	her syde
Cx2	With good <sup>ð</sup> swerd <sup>ð</sup>	And <sup>ð</sup>	bokeler by	hys syde
Hg	With good swerd	/ and with	bokeler by	his syde
El	With good swerd <sup>ð</sup>	/ and	bokeler by	hir syde

his ] Ad3 Cp Cx2 Hg La  
her ] Cx1 El Ha4

Although the reading 'his' is in Cx2 Hg Ad3 Cp and La, the word appears to refer to both John and Alayn, and that should be a plural. It is likely that 'his' might have been present in the origin of the tradition, since it could be used for plural in Middle English. At some point, a scribe must have changed it to 'hir' in an attempt to make it less ambiguous, as in El and Ha4.

### 1.3.1.2 *El against Hg*

Many of the sixteen Cx2-Hg/El variants in which Cx2 agrees with El against Hg are changes in prepositions --eg. KT 308, KT 204, KT 295, RE 99--, articles --eg. KT 210-- and pronouns --eg. KT 186, KT 488, KT 1022. These seem to be very minor, and are unreliable in tracing the textual affiliations of  $\omega$ . Six of these sixteen variants have been put into the electronic appendix d, chapter 5, 1.3.1.2. The variants in the appendix are mostly from KT --KT 210, KT 308, KT 390, KT 488, KT 1022-- and only one comes from a different tale --RE 252. The problem with variants such as changes in prepositions or the addition or deletion of personal pronouns is that they are likely to be the result of agreement by coincidence. In this group, there are two variants which are not necessarily minor: KT 390 and RE 252. KT 390, although an important variant, has manuscript distribution in the current collation making it very

difficult to decide its character. For RE 252 the situation is similar in as much as only a complete collation of the witnesses could help to elucidate. This ambiguity also occurs in the case of the other variants which have been put in the electronic appendix d, chapter 5, 1.3.1.2. However, seven of these have been retained as examples --KT 186, KT 204, KT 1594, KT 2168, MI 296, MI 355, RE 99--, and are discussed in 1.3.1.2.2.

Because some of the witnesses --Ad3 Ch and Ha4-- are consistently in agreement with Cx2 we can infer a common ancestor which these share with  $\omega$ , although, it is difficult to discern whether this ancestor is below the archetype or whether it is O itself. In the Cx2-Hg/El variants in which Cx2 agrees with El against Hg, we find the lowest number of agreements with Ha4 in the whole of the set. The proportion of agreements with Ad3 and Ch remains similar to that of other variants in the set. A few other interesting variants have more bearing on the structure and the metre of the line. An example of this is KT 173, where the witnesses offer different versions of the line. KT 1704 shows that Hg has a mistake whereas the archetypal reading has been transmitted to the rest of the tradition.

#### 1.3.1.2.1 Archetypal Variants in which Cx2 Agrees with Ad3 Ch and Ha4

KT 173

Base	Dwellen	this Palamon	, and eek	Arcite
Cx1	Dwellitñ	Palamon	and <sup>ð</sup>	arcite
Cx2	Dwellyth	Palamon	and <sup>ð</sup> hys felow	arcite
Hg	Dwellen	this Palamon	, and eek	Arcite
El		This Palamon	, and his felawe	Arcite

eek ] Cp Hg La  
his felawe ] Ad3 Ch Cx2 El Gg Ha4  
not present ] Cx1

Cx2 and E1 have the reading 'his felawe' instead of Hg's 'eek'. Most witnesses – including Ad3 Ch Ha4 Gg-- support the variant 'his felawe.' Only Cx1 Cp and La align with Hg in support of 'eek.' KT 173 makes perfect sense in Hg, which has a verb at the beginning of the line and that has been suppressed in E1. The suppression of 'dwellen' makes it necessary to change other words for the line to remain metrically acceptable. But we could interpret it differently and say that the changes of 'his felawe' to 'eek' would require the introduction of another word to smooth the metre. It seems that  $\omega$  might have had the line as it appears in E1 rather than as in Hg, or in the conflated version in Cx2, which is just the result of the combination of the readings in Cx1 and  $\omega$ .

KT 1704

Base	So loude cryde	they , with	loude steuene
Cx1	So lowde cryde	they with	mylde steuen
Cx2	So lowde cryde	they wyth	mery steuen
Hg	So loude cryde	they , with	loude steuene
E1	So loude cride	they , with	murie steuene

loude ] Hg

murie ] Ad3 Ch Cp Cx2 Dd E1 Gg La

mylde ] Cx1 Ha4

The majority of the collated manuscripts -- E1 Ad3 Ch Cp Dd Gg La-- support 'murie,' the reading in Cx2, while 'loude' in Hg appears to be the result of the repetition of the first part of the line. In this sense, the variant is not very useful to trace the affiliation of  $\omega$ . Instead it indicates that  $\omega$  had the archetypal reading.

### 1.3.1.2.2 Variants of Ambiguous Character

KT 186

Base	And	maketh	it	out	of	his	sleep	to	sterte
Cx1	And <sup>ð</sup>	maketh̄	it	out	of	his	slepe	to	sterte
Cx2	And <sup>ð</sup>	maketh	hym	out	of	hys	slepe	to	sterte
Hg	And	maketh	it <sup>7</sup>	out	of	his	sleep	to	sterte
El	And	maketh	hym	, out	of	his	slep̄	to	sterte

it ] Cx1 Cp Gg Hg La  
 hym ] Ad3 Ch Cx2 El Ha4

Both pronouns, 'it' and 'hym' are metrically equivalent and, for this reason, it is difficult to decide which one might be the reading in O. The variant in Hg, 'it,' is supported by Cp Cx1 Gg and La. Cx2 has the variant 'hym' which is found in Ad3 Ch El and Ha4.

KT 204

Base	Bright	was	the sonne	,	and	cleer	,	in	that	mornnyng
Cx1	Bryght	was	the sonne		7	cleer		in	that	mornnyng <sup>7</sup>
Cx2	Bryght	was	the sonne		7	cleer		that	mornnyng <sup>7</sup>	
Hg	Bright	was	the sonne	,	and	cleer	,	in	that <sup>7</sup>	mornnyng <sup>7</sup>
El	Brigh̄t	was	the sōne	,	7	cleer		that	morwenyng <sup>e</sup>	

in ] Cp Cx1 Gg Hg La  
 not present ] Ad3 Ch Cx2 El Ha4

In KT 204 both Cx2 and El lack the preposition 'in,' present in Hg Cp Cx1 Gg and La. Other manuscripts lacking this reading are Ad3 Ch and Ha4. This group shares Cx2's readings consistently. This particular variant on its own does not seem enough to show textual affiliation --especially because in this case the variant is the lack of a

word--, but this, together with other variants, suggests a common origin for Ad3 Ch Ha4 and ω.

Similar examples can be seen in lines KT 201, KT 308 and KT 390, all of which show Cx2 in agreement with two or more of El Ad3 and Ch. All these variants can be found in the electronic appendix d, chapter 5, 1.3.1.2.

KT 1594

Base	Of	al	this	stryf	he	kan	remedie	fynde	
Cx1	Of	al	this	strif	he	can	remedies	fynde	
Cx2	Of	al	thys	stryf	he	gan	remedyes	fynde	
Hg	Of	al	this	stryf <sup>7</sup>	he	kan	remedie	fynde	
El	Of	al	this	strif	,	he	gan	remedie	fynde

kan ] Cx1 Dd Ha4 Hg  
gan ] Ad3 Ch Cx2 El Gg

Ad3 Ch and Gg agree with Cx2 and El in the reading 'gan.' Hg reads 'kan' as do Cx1 Dd and Ha4. However, this is a reading which, because of its character, might have easily arisen as an agreement by coincidence.

KT 2168

Base	Som	in	the	large	feeld	,	as	ye	may	se
Cx1	Som̄	in	the	large	feld <sup>8</sup>		as	ye	may	se
Cx2	Som̄e	in	the	large	feld <sup>8</sup>		as	men	may	se
Hg	Som	in	the	large	feeld	,	as	ye	may	se
El	Som	in	the	large	feeld	,	as	men	may	see

ye ] Ad3 Ch Cp Cx1 Dd Hg La  
men ] Cx2 El Gg Ha4

The variant 'men,' present in Cx2 El Gg and Ha4, has no impact on the metre of the

line. Hg Ad3 Ch Cp Cx1 Dd and La read 'yē.' Again, it is remarkable that E1 and Gg present the same reading --also in Cx2-- which is likely to be non-archetypal, as indicated by its variant distribution, although, we cannot be sure concerning the non-archetypal character of this variant.

MI 296

Base	And on the thressshfold ,	on the dore	withoute
Cx1	And <sup>ð</sup> on the thresshold <sup>ð</sup>	7	on the dore withoute
Cx2	And <sup>ð</sup> on the thresshold <sup>ð</sup>	of the dore	wythout
Hg	And on the thressshfold ,	on the dore	with oute
E1	And on the thressshfold ,	of the dore	with oute

on ] Ad1 Ad2 Cp D1 En2 En3 Fi G1 Ha2 Hg li La Ld1 Ld2 Ln Mg Mm  
 Pw Ra1 Ra3 Ry1 Ry2 Sl1 Sl2 Tc1 To1  
 of ] Bo1 Bo2 Ch Cn Cx2 Dd E1 En1 Ha3 Ha4 Hk Lc Ph2 Pn  
 Ra2 Se Wy  
 and on ] Cx1 He ñe Tc2  
 at ] Ad3 Ds  
 and ] Ps  
 not present ] Ma Py

This case is similar to that of KT 308;<sup>8</sup> the variant in the line is a change in the second preposition. The witnesses are divided, but most of them support the Hg reading, 'on.' It is difficult to know whether this is the result of a repeated mistake, perhaps generated by the scribes remembering and repeating the structure of the first part of the line, or whether it has been genetically transmitted. The variant in Cx2 and E1 is 'of,' which is present in **O** manuscripts --Ch Bo2--, in **a** group manuscripts --Cn Dd and En1, and in **E** group manuscripts --Bo1 and Ph2-- and in Ch and Ha4. The

---

<sup>8</sup> See the electronic appendix d, chapter 5, 1.3.1.2

distribution of the Cx2 variant makes it ambiguous, and although the Hg variant is widely distributed it is difficult to tell which one is the archetypal reading.

MI 355

MI 355 after MI 353: Ch NI Se

Base	Hym	hadde	leuere	,	I	dar	wel	vndertake
Cx1	Hym	hadde	leuer		I	dar	wel	vndertake
Cx2	Hym	hadde be	leuer		I	dar	wel	vndertake
Hg	Hym	hadde	leuere	,	I	dar	wel	vndertake
EI	Hym	hadde be	leuere	,	I	dar	wel	vndertake

hadde ] Cp Cx1 DI En2 Fi GI Ha2 Hg Ht La Lc Ld1 Ld2 Mg Mm NI Pw  
 Ry1 Ry2 Se SI1 SI2 Tc1 Tc2

hadde be ] Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bo2 Bw Ch Cn Cx2 Dd Ds EI En1  
 En3 Gg Ha5 He Ln Ma Ne Ox1 Ph2 Pn Ps Ra1 Ra3 To1 Wy  
 hadde wel ] Ha3 Ha4 li Py

Witnesses with the reading 'hadde' instead of 'hadde be' --as Cx2 has-- appear to be metrically smoother. The additional 'be' is present in manuscripts that belong to the **a** group --Cn Ma Ds En1 and Dd--, in Robinson's **E** group --Bo1 Ph2 and Gg-- and some of the **O** manuscripts --Ad1 Bo2 En3 Ha5 and Ra3. This is another example of a variant of ambiguous character.

RE 99

Base	With	good	swerd	,	and	with	bokeler	by	his	syde
Cx1	With	good <sup>ð</sup>	swerd <sup>ð</sup>		and <sup>ð</sup>	with	bokeler	by	her	syde
Cx2	With	good <sup>ð</sup>	swerd <sup>ð</sup>		And <sup>ð</sup>		bokeler	by	hys	syde
Hg	With	good	swerd	,	and	with	bokeler	by	his	syde
EI	With	good	swerd <sup>ð</sup>	,	and		bokeler	by	hir	syde

with bokeler ] Cp Cx1 Ha4 Hg La  
 bokeler ] Ad3 Cx2 Dd Gg EI

Line RE 99 shows the witnesses to be divided: Cx2 EI Ad3 Dd Gg do not have the

preposition 'with' before 'bokeler,' the other witnesses --Hg Cx1 Cp Ha4 and La-- have repeated the structure of the first part of the line. It is difficult to determine which of these variants is archetypal.

### 1.3.1.2.3 Agreements with El below the Archetype

RE 22<sup>9</sup>

Base	A wif	he hadde /	comen	of	noble	kyn
Cx1	A wyf	he hadde []	come	of	nobyl	kyn
Cx2	A wyf	he hadde y	comen	of	nobyl	kyn
Hg	A wif	he hadde /	comen	of	noble	kyn
El	A wyf	he hadde /	ycomen	of	noble	kyn

comen ] Ad3 Ch Cp Cx1 Dd Ha4 Hg La  
ycomen ] Cx2 El

This is an example of a variant in which Cx2 and El agree in what is likely to be a non-archetypal reading. Even witnesses which are often in agreement with Cx2, such as Ad3 Ch and Ha4, support the Hg variant.

KT 1594, discussed above in 1.3.1.2.2, might have been included here but, as stated above, the partial collation of KT makes difficult the identifying of archetypal variants.

### 1.3.2 *Cx2-not-Hg/El Variants*

This type of variants is the most useful one while trying to determine the affiliations of  $\omega$ , although, even within this type one can find variants that are

agreements by coincidence and offer no help to clarify the relationships of  $\omega$ . An example of this is GP 187, where we have a variant distribution so random that it indicates the agreement is probably due to coincidence.

Probably one of the most striking examples of the textual affiliations of Cx2 Ad3 Ch and Ha4 is KT 1179, where Hg and El have the nonsensical reading 'Setres' in a context where the reading 'sterres' would make sense. Another interesting variant can be found in RE 9, where the vast majority of the witnesses, including Cx2 support the reading 'Ay,' but Hg and El have 'Αηδ.' This last example strongly signals that  $\omega$  was a manuscript of the very best quality and very close to the archetype. Of a total of 35 Cx2-not-Hg/El variants, fifteen --GP 366, GP 379, GP 473, KT 1547, KT 701, KT 466, KT 429, KT 1461, L1 11, MI 6, MI 61, MI 646, RE 18, RE 144, RE 285--, have been put into the electronic appendix d, chapter 5, 1.3.2. The following have been moved since they are either: omissions of articles, prepositions or pronouns --GP 366, KT 466, MI 6, RE 18--; or additions of such words --GP 379, KT 701, KT 1461, RE 144--; or changes and minor variation unlikely to shed light on the affiliations of  $\omega$  --GP 473, KT 429, L1 11, MI 61, MI 646, RE 285. The variant in KT 1547 is the suppression of a verb, but might be an agreement by coincidence.

The other 20 are analysed, individually or in groups, below. These variants show that there is a textual relationship between Cx2 Ad3 Ch and Ha4.

### *1.3.2.1 Archetypal Agreements with Ha4*

---

<sup>9</sup> Although this is a morphological variant, the Canterbury Tales Project policy is to distinguish the

RE 9

Out: Ad3

Base	And	by	his	belt	he	baar	a	long	Panade
Cx1	And <sup>r</sup>	by	his	belt	he	baar	a	long <sup>r</sup>	pauade
Cx2	Ay	by	hys	belt	he	baar	a	long <sup>r</sup>	pauade
Hg	And	by	his	belt <sup>r</sup>	he	baar	a	long	Panade
El	And	by	his	belt <sup>r</sup>	he	baar	a	long	panade

And ] Ch Cx1 El Hg

Ay ] Cx2 Cp Dd Gg Ha4 La

Here Hg and El agree in a reading that is contradicted by the majority of the collated manuscripts. It seems possible that the Hg scribe changed the reading to 'And,' which would indicate that 'Ay' --which is in Cx2 Cp Dd Gg Ha4 and La-- is the archetypal reading. This may be an example of an unusual reading --*lectio difficilior*-- being substituted by a more common one by one of the scribes.

### 1.3.2.2 Agreements with Ad3 Ch or Ha4 below the Archetype

GP 769

Base	ϕ	Ye	goon	to	Caunterbury	,	god	yow	spede
Cx1		Ye	go	o	Caunterbury		god	you	spede
Cx2		Ye	go	to	Caunterbury	ward <sup>r</sup>	god <sup>r</sup>	you	spede
Hg	ϕ	Ye	goon	to	Caunt <sup>r</sup> bury	,	god	yow	spede
El	ϕ	Ye	goon	to	Caunterbury	,	god	yow	speede

Caunterbury ] Ad1 Bo1 Bo2 Bw Cn Cp Cx1 Dd Ds1 El En1 En3 Fi Gl  
Ha2 Ha3 Ha4 Hg Ht li La Lc Ld1 Ld2 Ln Ma Mg Mm Ne Nl Ph2 Ps Pw  
Py Ra2 Ra3 Ry1 Ry2 Se Sl1 Sl2 Tc1 Tc2 To1  
Caunterburyward ] Ad3 Ch Cx2 Pn Wy

KT 72

---

variation in the past participle when Hg and El disagree, based on the fact that this type of variant could potentially affect the metre of the line.

Base	Now	help	vs lord	/	syth	it	is	in	thy	myght
Cx1	Now	help	vs lord <sup>ð</sup>		seth	it	is	in	thy	myght
Cx2	Now	help	vs lord <sup>ð</sup>		sith	yt	lieth	in	thy	myght
Hg	Now	help	vs lord	/	syth	it	is	in	thy	myght <sup>z</sup>
El	Now	help	vs lord	/	sith	it	is	in	thy	myght <sup>z</sup>

is ] Cp Cx1 El Ha4 Hg La  
 lith ] Ad3 Ch Cx2

KT 279

Base	But	that	thow	sholdest	trewely	forthre	me
Cx1	But	that	thou	sholdest	truly	further	me
Cx2	And <sup>ð</sup>	that	thou	sholdest	truly	further	me
Hg	But	p <sup>t</sup>	thow	sholdest <sup>z</sup>	trewely	forthre	me
El	But	p <sup>t</sup>	thou	sholdest <sup>z</sup>	trewely	forthren	me

But ] Cp Cx1 El Gg Ha4 Hg La  
 And ] Ad3 Ch Cx2

GP 769, KT 72 and KT 279 show the same variant distribution. Only Ad3 and Ch support the readings in Cx2. In GP 769 the reading in Cx2 is clearly hypermetrical, and likely to have originated below the archetype. As this variant is also shared by Ad3 and Ch, one can consider that it might be relevant to establish the relationship among these manuscripts.<sup>10</sup> This particular reading is significant because it is likely to be a non-archetypal reading, that is, it occurred for the first time below the archetype, and suggests that these witnesses ultimately descend from the same hyparchetype. As in the previous variant --GP 769--, of the collated witnesses, only Ad3 and Ch support the reading in Cx2. This also happens in KT 279, where both Ad3 and Ch agree with Cx2 in having the conjunction 'And' at the beginning of the line. Hg El Cp Cx1 Gg Ha4 and La have 'But' as their initial conjunction, which seems to be the archetypal

---

<sup>10</sup> Although Pn and Wy also agree in this reading, these used Cx2 as their copy-text and are likely to have acquired the variant from it.

reading.

KT 689

Out: Ad3 Dd

Base	ϕ	Cadmus	/	which	that	was	the	firste	man
Cx1		Of Cadimus		whiche	that	was	the	firste	man
Cx2		Of Cadmus		whyche		was	the	first	man
Hg	ϕ	Cadm <sup>9</sup>	/	which	þ <sup>t</sup>	was	the	firste	man
El		Of Cadmus	/	which	þ <sup>t</sup>	was	the	firste	man

that ] Ch Cp Cx1 El Gg Hg La  
not present ] Cx2 Ha4

KT 1606

Base	The	fallyng	of	the	toures	/	and	of	the	walles	
Cx1	The	fallyng <sup>7</sup>	of	the	touris		and <sup>9</sup>	of	the	wallis	
Cx2	The	fallyng <sup>7</sup>	of	the	touris		and <sup>9</sup>		the	walles	
Hg	The	fallyng <sup>7</sup>	of	the	toures	/	and	of	the	walles	
El	The	fallynge	/	of	the	toures	/	and	of	the	walles

of ] Ad3 Ch Cp Cx1 Dd El Gg Hg La  
not present ] Cx2 Ha4

KT 1949

Base	ŋe	me	ne	lyst	/	thilke	opynyons	to	telle
Cx1	ŋe	me	ne	list		the	oppinions	to	telle
Cx2	ŋe	me		lyst		the	opynyons	to	tell
Hg	ŋe	me	ne	lyst	/	thilke	opynyons	to	telle
El	ŋe	me	ne	list <sup>7</sup>		thilke	opinions	to	telle

ne ] Ad3 Ch Cp Cx1 Dd El Gg Hg La  
not present ] Cx2 Ha4

KT 2192

Base	To	dyen	/	whan	he	is	best	of	name	
Cx1	To	dien		whan	he	is	best	of	name	
Cx2	To	dyen		whan	a	man	is	best	of	name
Hg	To	dyen	/	whan	he	is	best	of	name	
El	To	dyen	/	whan	þ <sup>t</sup>	he	is	best	of	name

he ] Ad3 Ch Cp Cx1 Dd El Gg Hg La  
a man ] Cx2 Ha4

KT 2207

Base	I rede	we make	,	of	sorwes	two
Cx1	I rede	we make		of	sorowis	two
Cx2	I rede that	we make		of	sorowys	two
Hg	I rede	we make	,	of	sorwes	two
El	I rede	we make	,	of	sorwes	two

rede ] Ad3 Cp Ch Cx1 Cx2 Dd El Gg Ha4 Hg La  
rede that ] Cx2 Ha4

All of the preceding group is composed of variants shared by Cx2 and Ha4. KT 689, KT 1606, KT 1949 and KT 2207 are similar to KT 429. They might all have been originated just because the scribe made a mistake or the compositor was careless. KT 2192, however, presents a different case. The Cx2/ Ha4 reading 'a man' cannot have arisen from a mistake while copying the word 'he.' Cx2 and Ha4 are the only witnesses in this collation that share the reading. KT 2192 thus gives more credibility to the other variants that Cx2 shares only with Ha4.

KT 1146

Base	Al	ful of chirkyng	was that sory place
Cx1	Al	ful of chirkyng7	was the sory place
Cx2	And <sup>o</sup>	ful of chyrkyng7	was the sory place
Hg	Al	ful of chirkyng7	was that sory place
El	Al	ful of chirkyng7	was that sory place

Al ] Ch Cp Cx1 Dd El Gg Ha4 Hg La  
And ] Ad3 Cx2

In line 1146 Cx2 agrees with Ad3 --as in some of the most significant variants in this set. Both witnesses have 'aŋo' instead of 'al.' Probably, 'al' is the archetypal reading

and, although it is possible that the variant 'and' could be the result of casual carelessness, must be taken into account since Cx2 shares it with one of the manuscripts with which it is often in agreement.

MI 554

Base A	berð	a	berð	sayð	hend	Nicholas
Cx1 A	berð	a	berð	quod	hend	Nicholas
Cx2 A	berð	a	berð	sayð	hend	Nicholas
Hg † A	berd	,	a berd	,	quod hende	Nicholas
El † A	berd		a berd	,	quod hende	Nicholas

quod ] Cx1 El Gg Ha4 He Hg li Ld1 Ln Ne Nl Py Ra1 Tc1 Tc2  
 seyde ] Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bo2 Bw Ch Cn Cp Cx2 Dd Dl Ds En1  
 En2 En3 Gl Ha2 Ha5 Hk Ht La Lc Ld2 Ma Mg Mm Ph2 Pn Ps  
 Pw Ra3 Ry1 Ry2 Se Sl1 Sl2 Wy  
 quoth ] Fi  
 thought ] Ha3  
 quoth tho ] To1

MI 554 presents very interesting variants. Here Cx2, supported by the majority of the manuscripts, has the reading 'seyde' instead of 'quod' as in Hg and El. It is interesting to notice that Ha4 here agrees with Hg and El, and Ch with Ad3 and Cx2. Bo2 and Ra3, probably **O** manuscripts, also support the reading in Cx2. It seems difficult, in this particular case, to make a final decision as to which of these is the archetypal reading, since the **O** manuscripts appear to be divided evenly. The choice of reading for an edition, would probably depend more on editorial judgement and the weight of the editorial tradition than with any genetic method.

### 1.3.2.3 Variants of Ambiguous Character

KT 250

Out: Dd

Base And if so be / my destynee be shape  
Cx1 And<sup>ð</sup> if it be my destenye so to hape  
Cx2 And<sup>ð</sup> yf it be our destenye so be shape  
Hg And if so be / my destynee be shape  
El And if so be / my destynee be shapen

my ] Cp Cx1 El Gg Hg La

our ] Ad3 Ch Cx2 Ha4

KT 1179

Base As is depeynted / in the Sertres aboue  
Cx1 As it is depaynted<sup>ð</sup> in the serelis aboue  
Cx2 As it is depaynted<sup>ð</sup> in the sterris aboue  
Hg As is depeynted / in the Sertres aboue  
El As is depeynted / in the Certres aboue

Sertres ] Cp Dd El Gg Hg La

sterres ] Ad3 Ch Cx2 Ha4

serelis ] Cx1

Both KT 250 and KT 1179 have variants in which Cx2 agrees with Ad3 Ch and Ha4 against the other witnesses. Instead of 'my,' Cx2 Ad3 Ch and Ha4 have the plural 'oure.' All the other collated witnesses have the reading 'my.'

KT 1179 is another example in which the variant in Cx2 agrees with Ad3 Ch and Ha4. Hg El Cp Dd Gg and La share the reading 'sertres.' Only Cx1 has 'serelis.' It could be assumed since Ad3 Ch Ha4 and Cx2 have shown a consistent relationship in this part of the text, that their ancestor corrected a mistake in O. The first person specifically to call attention to this variant was Skeat, when he wrote:

That *sterres*, i.e. stars, is the right reading is certain; for there is a parallel passage in B 194 –“For the *sterres*, clearer than is glass, is written,” etc.

Yet the scribe of the Hengwrt MS. very oddly spelt the word *sertres*,

making the *t* the fourth letter instead of the second: and so producing a ghost-word. The remarkable point is, that Petworth has *certres*, with *c* for *s*; Corpus and Lansdowne have *sertres*; Ellesmere has *certres*;... so that all these practically follow suit. Only the Harleian, which is so often independent of the rest, has the right spelling *sterres*. (Skeat 1907, 37)

Skeat also advanced the theory that the archetype must have had an abbreviation for 'er' and that this was misinterpreted by hand b --the Hg scribe-- among others. If Skeat were right then the archetypal reading would have been 'sterres.' And, since he also points out that Ha4 might represent a different line of descent, his hypothesis would agree with the findings of this research. A different interpretation was put forward by Manly and Rickert when they wrote:

2037 [KT 1179]. This is an excellent example of the way in which a carelessly placed sign of abbreviation may give rise to trouble. There can be little doubt that O contained the letters "stres" with the common sign for "er" placed, not, as it should have been, between  $\underline{t}$  and  $\underline{r}$ , but carelessly, so that the scribes understood it to precede  $\underline{t}$  instead of following it. This blunder appears in every main line of descent; other readings are wild efforts to give meaning to the word. It is astonishing that none of the scribes recognized and corrected the error. Editors who read "sterres" are undoubtedly giving what Chaucer wrote. (1940, 3:432)

From this perspective, the archetype contained a mistake which made the text ambiguous and promoted mistakes in its copying. The reference made to the mistake not having been corrected would then be due to the supposition that no scribe

modified the text of the archetype of the tradition to modify its ambiguous reading.

This interpretation is also found in Blake:

There are many textual features which can also best be explained on the hypothesis that the early scribes used the same copytext. The most intriguing is the misreading of *sterres* (1:2039) in KtT which is found in so many manuscripts. In Hg it appears as *sertres*, and other manuscripts have different readings. It has often been proposed that these misreadings come from the misplacement of an abbreviation for *er* so that scribes were confused as to what the correct reading was. Some tried to represent what was in the copytext and others interpreted it to make sense of the passage. The important point is that many of the early scribes were clearly responding to an identical stimulus, though the way in which they responded was different. The original copytext had a reading that was far from clear and the scribes made what they could of it; some, like that of Ha7334, managed to deduce what the right reading was. Since this ambiguous reading must have occurred in the original copytext, it is most sensible to assume that these scribes had access to that original. There is no need to assume intermediate exemplars in which this ambiguous reading was interpreted in diverse ways. (1985, 169-70)

This perspective on the mistake being in the archetype allows Manly and Rickert and Blake to maintain that Hg is nearer to the archetype than other witnesses, and to support the hypothesis that Hg is only one step removed from O. The view proposed by Blake could mean that other witnesses, showing the reading 'sterres,' could also have derived directly from the archetype.

KT 383

Base	And	art	a knyght	a worthy	and an	able
Cx1	And <sup>ð</sup>	art	a knyght	worthy	and <sup>ð</sup>	able
Cx2	And <sup>ð</sup>	art	a knyght	a worthy man	and <sup>ð</sup>	able
Hg	And	art	a knyght <sup>7</sup>	a worthy	and an	able
El	And	art	a knyght <sup>7</sup>	a worthy	and an	able

and an ] Ad3 Cp Dd El Ha4 Hg La  
 man and ] Cx2 Ch  
 and ] Cx1 Gg

KT 854

Base	Withouten	luge	/ or oother	officer
Cx1	Withoute	luge	or other	officere
Cx2	Without	ony luge	or other	offycere
Hg	With outen	luge	/ or oother	officer
El	With outen	luge	/ or oother	Officere

luge ] Ch Cp Cx1 Cx2 El Gg Ha4 Hg  
 luge any ] Ch Cx2

Lines KT 383 and KT 854 are lines in which Cx2 agrees with Ch against both Hg and El. In KT 383 we find the word 'man' added. This seems to make more sense than the indefinite article in Hg and El. The importance of these two variants is their suggestion that there might be a genetic relationship between Cx2 and Ch which is probably below the archetype.

KT 2164

Base	That nedeth	/ in oon of	thise termes	two
Cx1	That nedith	in one of	the termys	two
Cx2	That nedis	in one of	thyse termys	two
Hg	That nedeth	/ in oon of	thise t <sup>r</sup> mes	two
El	That nedeth	/ in oon of	thise termes	two

nedeth ] Cp Cx1 El Gg Hg La  
 nedes ] Ad3 Ch Cx2 Dd  
 wendep ] Ha4

The variant distribution in this line clearly suggests a relationship between Cx2 Ad3 and Ch. Dd also supports their reading. These witnesses have 'nedes' instead of the Hg/El reading 'nedeth.' The nature of this variant makes it very difficult to determine which one is the archetypal reading.

L2 17  
 Base But if ik fare , as dooth an Openers  
 Cx1 But yf I fare as doth an open ers  
 Cx2 But yet I fare as doth an open ers  
 Hg But if ik fare , as dooth an Openers  
 El But if I fare , as dooth an Openers  
 Ha4 And 3it I fare as doth an open ers

if ] Cp Cx1 Dd El Hg La  
 yet ] Cx2 Ha4

Although it is obvious that there is a relationship between Cx2 and Ha4, this particular variant differs from the others. At first sight 'if' --the variant in Hg-- and 'yet' --in Cx2-- are very different, but the spelling in Cx1 'yf' may help to explain how the Cx2 reading came into being. There is no indication that would allow one to drop this variant as irrelevant, but the Cx1 spelling of 'yf' leaves open the possibility that the change might have been introduced by one of the compositors, and therefore that the origin of the Cx2 reading might not necessarily have been its manuscript source.

RE 59

Base	Bothe	of	his	catel	,	and	his	Mesuage
Cx1	Bothe	of	his	catel		and <sup>h</sup>	his	mesuage
Cx2	Bothe	of	hys	Catel		and <sup>h</sup>	of	hys mesuage
Hg	Bothe	of	his	catel	,	and	his	Mesuage
El	Bothe	of	his	catel	,	and	his	Mesuage

and his ]Cp Cx1 Dd El Gg Ha4 Hg La  
and of hys ] Ad3 Cx2

Cx2 and Ad3 have added the preposition 'of' in RE 59, thus altering the syllabic count in the line and making it irregular. It seems an easy mistake to make, unconsciously reproducing the structure of the first part of the line. The agreement between Ad3 and Cx2 could, however, be of genetic origin. It is difficult to determine adequately the character of this variant.

#### 1.3.2.4 Other Examples

GP 187

Base	As	Austyn	bit	how	shal	the	world	be	serued	
Cx1	As	austyn	dide	but	hou	shal	the	worlde	be	serued
Cx2	As	Austyn	byddeth	how	shold <sup>h</sup>	the	world <sup>h</sup>	be	serued <sup>h</sup>	
Hg	As	Austyn	bit <sup>7</sup>	how	shal	the	world	be	serued	
El	As	Austyn	bit	,	how	shal	the	world	be	serued

bit ] Ad1 Bo1 Bo2 Ch Cp Dl Ds1 El En1 En3 Gg Ha3 Ha4 Hg La Lc  
Ld1 Mg Mm Ph2 Pw Ra3 Ry1 Ry2 Se  
haue bit ] Cn  
did ] Cx1 Ha2 Ht Nl Tc2  
biddeth ] Cx2 Fi Ld2 Ma Pn Ps Py Wy  
not present ] Ad3

The variant in Cx2 in GP 187 seems to be the result of random variation --agreement by coincidence. Caxton obviously corrected the strange reading 'ðide but' that was in Cx1, but the correction was not very successful, since he introduced 'biddeth,' a reading that clearly alters the metre of the line. This variant is present in all the incunabula and also in Ld2 --Robinson's **F** group-- Ma --**a** group-- Fi --**d** group-- Ps --an **O** manuscript-- and Pn --a **b** group witness. This variant distribution is sufficiently random for it to be disregarded when one attempts to determine the nature of  $\omega$ .

GP 238

Base	His	nekke	whit	was	,	as	the	flourdelys
Cx1	Milk		whit	he	was	as	the	flour delyce
Cx2	Hys	necke	was	whyt		as	the	flour delys
Hg	His	nekke	whit	was	,	as	the	flour delys
El	His	nekke	,	whit <sup>7</sup>	was	,	as	the flour delys

whit was] Ad1 Bo1 Bo2 Ch Cp Dl El En3 Gg Ha2 Ha3 Ha4 Hg li La Lc  
Mg Ph2 Pw Py Ra3 Ry1 Ry2 Sl2 Tc1 To1  
was whit ] Cn Cx2 Ds1 En1 Fi Ht Ld2 Ma Mm Pn Ps Se Wy  
whit as ] Ha2 Ha3 Lc Mg Tc1

The variant in GP 238 'was whit' can be found in Cx2 and in some of the **a** group manuscripts, such as Cn Ds1 En1 and Ma. Interestingly enough, Ht, a manuscript that Robinson has associated with  $\alpha$ , also appears in this group. Clearly the original reading was 'whit was,' the alteration in word-order, however makes it difficult to

decide whether its presence in Cx2 is the result of a compositorial mistake or whether it has a genetic relationship to the reading in the **a** group manuscripts.

## **2. SET 2: LINK 7 AND THE MAN OF LAW'S TALE<sup>11</sup>**

### **2.1 Set Summary**

Of the ten Cx2-Hg/El variants, on three occasions Cx2 agrees with Hg against El, and only one of these variants might be considered to be ambiguous, since, based on the current collation, it is impossible to determine which variant is archetypal. When Cx2 agrees with El against Hg in this set, it seems that the variants are supported by a fair number of manuscripts, although two of these lines are of an ambiguous character.

In this set, the Cx2-not-Hg/El variants show a consistency of agreement with Ha4 and occurs on five occasions. Ch and Ad3, the two manuscripts that most commonly agree with Cx2, do not support its readings in any of the Cx2-not-Hg/El variants. Ch and Ad3 share the Cx2 reading in the Cx2-Hg/El variants. An interesting point is that Bo2 shows up in the Cx2-Hg/El variants in support of Cx2 and El when they disagree with Hg, and on one occasion Bo2 agrees with Cx2 in the Cx2-not-Hg/El variants. At this stage it is too soon to speculate about the possibility of a relationship between Cx2 and Bo2.

---

<sup>11</sup> The witnesses collated for L7 are: Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Cx1 Cx2 Dd Ds El En1 Gg Ha4 Ht La Ra3. The witnesses collated for ML are: Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Cx1 Cx2 Dd Ds El En1 Gg Ha4 Hg Ht La Ra3.

All the line substitutions in this set are non-archetypal versions of the lines for archetypal ones.

## **2.2. Analysis of Variant Lines**

### **2.2.1 Line Substitutions**

In this set, all the line substitutions are replacements of non-archetypal lines in Cx1 for archetypal lines in Cx2. None of the lines in Cx2 has minor variants within. A list of all the substitutions in this set follows.

L7 42a Cx1 Plese yow , and<sup>o</sup> therto wole I do my payne  
L7 42 Cx2 Alle my behest I can no better sayn

mL 178a Cx1 That most you louet<sup>n</sup> with obeissaunce  
mL 178 Cx2 And<sup>o</sup> ye my moder my souerayn plesaunce

mL 548a Cx1 Of hym that hath be la<sup>o</sup> in a prees  
mL 548 Cx2 Among<sup>r</sup> a prees of hym that hath be ladde

mL 550a Cx1 And<sup>o</sup> suche a colour in the knyghtis face chees  
mL 550 Cx2 And<sup>o</sup> suche a colour in hys face he had<sup>o</sup>

mL 551a Cx1 Men myghte knowe his face in all the prees  
mL 551 Cx2 Men myht knowe hys face that was be stad<sup>o</sup>

mL 887a Cx1 That had<sup>o</sup> suche sorowe as I said<sup>o</sup> before  
mL 887 Cx2 For hys wyf wepyth and<sup>o</sup> sigheth sore

### **2.2.2 Line Additions**

There are no line additions in this set.

### **2.2.3 Line Deletions**

There are no line deletions in this set.

#### **2.2.4 Line Misplacements**

There are no misplacements in this set.

### **2.3 Analysis of Word Additions, Deletions and Substitutions**

The variant distribution for this group is as follows:

163 Cx2-O variants, which confirm the excellence of  $\omega$ . These are distributed as 17 in L7, 146 in ML.

29 Cx2-Unique variants, which are unique to Cx2 in the current collation. These are distributed as 3 in L7, 26 in ML.

10 Cx2-Hg/El variants, in which Cx2 agrees with El or Hg against the other. These are distributed as 2 in L7, 8 in ML.

Hg against El: 3

El against Hg: 7

8 Cx2-not-Hg/El variants, in which Cx2 agrees with another manuscript against Hg and El. These are distributed as 0 in L7, 8 in ML.

#### **2.3.1 Cx2-Hg/El Variants**

There are 10 Cx2-Hg/El variants in this set, but the distribution in the agreements of Cx2 with one or the other differs from that of other sets. In set 2, most of these variants are agreements of Cx2 and El against Hg --this occurs seven times. Only on three occasions does Cx2 agree with Hg against El.

### 2.3.1.1 *Hg against El*

All three variants in which Cx2 agrees with Hg against El, although similar at first sight, require individual attention. L7 51 and ML 20 and ML 555 are minor additions: an adverb, an article and a pronoun. However these changes might have arisen in a manuscript for very different reasons.

#### 2.3.1.1.1 Archetypal Variants

ML 20

Out: Ad3

Base	Alle	the	dayes	/	of	pouere	men	been	wikke
Cx1	Al	they	that			poure	men	be	wikk
Cx2	That	al	the	dayes	of	poure	men	ben	wycke
Hg	Alle	the	dayes	/	of	pou'e	men	been	wikke
El	Alle		dayes		of	poure	men	been	wikke

the ] Bo2 Ch Cp Cx2 Dd Ds1 En1 Ha4 Hg Ht La  
they ] Cx1  
not present ] El

ML 20 shows the opposite of the example above. In this case the article 'the' is not present in El. All other witnesses, with the exception of Cx1, have included the article in the line. Even though if the addition of an article is a very minor change that could easily have been the result of scribal intervention, this is clearly more likely to be the archetypal reading.

ML 555

Base	Duchesses	/	and	ye	ladies	euerichoun
Cx1	Duchesse		and <sup>b</sup>		ladyes	euerichone
Cx2	Duchesses		and <sup>b</sup>	ye	ladyes	euerichone
Hg	Duchesses	/	and	ye	ladies	euericho <sup>r</sup>
El	Duchesses	/	and		ladyes	euerichone

ye ] Ch Cp Cx2 Ds1 En1 Gg Ha4 Hg  
 þe ] Bo2  
 eek ] Ad3  
 not present ] Cx1 El Ht La

The addition of 'ye' to ML 555 has an impact on the metre of the line. Here Cx2 and Hg are supported in its inclusion by Ch Cp Ds1 En1 Gg and Ha4, which means that El is in the minority group with Ht La and Cx1. Ad3 has 'eek,' while Bo2 has ' þe,' suggesting that a scribe might have misinterpreted a 'y' for a later 'thorn.' The variant in Cx2 and Hg appears to be archetypal.

#### 2.3.1.1.2 Ambiguous Variant

L7 51  
 Base And if he ne haue nat seyð hem , leue brother  
 Cx1 And<sup>ð</sup> yf he hath not sayð<sup>ð</sup> hem leue brother  
 Cx2 And<sup>ð</sup> yf he ne hath not sayð<sup>ð</sup> hem leue brother  
 Hg And if he ne haue nat seyð hem , leue brother  
 El And if he haue noht seyð hem leue brother

ne ] Cx2 Ds1 Hg  
 not present ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Cx1 Dd El En1 Gg Ha4 Ht La  
 Ra3

In this case we have an adverb, 'ne,' which has been added in Cx2. With this addition, Cx2 agrees with Hg against El. Among the collated manuscripts, only Cx2, Ds, and Hg have it. The adverb here seems unnecessary, since it is part of a double negative, and it makes the line break the iambic pentameter. It is very difficult to decide whether the presence of the adverb in the line is archetypal or not. One could argue that it is an easy mistake to make and that some witnesses have added an extra word

into the line, but the opposite can also be suggested: that it was an easy mistake to correct and that the scribes deleted it to smooth the metre of the line.

### 2.3.1.2 *El against Hg*

Of the seven variants in which Cx2 agrees with El against Hg, five are discussed below. The variants in ML 809 and ML 818, both of which could be the result of agreement by coincidence, can be found in electronic appendix d, chapter 5, 2.3.1.2. It is interesting to note that for these seven variants, only three times do Cx2 and El agree with Gg: in ML 818 --a likely agreement by coincidence--, ML 411 and ML 197. In both the latter cases, Hg is the minority, and the variant distribution suggests that Cx2 and El have the archetypal reading.

#### 2.3.1.2.1 Archetypal Variants

ML 411

Base	Dame Hermengyld /	Constablesse	of	thilke	place
Cx1	Dame hermegilde	the Constablis wyf	of	þ <sup>e</sup>	place
Cx2	Dame hermegild <sup>ð</sup>	the Cōstablesse	of	that	place
Hg	Dame hermengyld <sup>ð</sup> /	Constablesse	of	thilke	place
El	Dame Hermengyld <sup>ð</sup> /	Constablesse	of	that	place

thilke ] Cp Hg La

the ] Cx1 Ha4 Ht

that ] Bo2 Ch Cx2 Ds1 En1 Gg El

The variants 'that' and 'thilke' in this line are equivalent in their meaning, as is also 'of the.' But the weight of the distribution, in this case, seems to indicate that 'that' is probably the archetypal reading. This is shared, not only by Cx2 and El, but also by

Bo2 Ch Ds1 En1 and Gg. The Hg reading has only three witnesses which include Cp and La, usually considered of little authority.

### 2.3.1.2.2 Ambiguous Variants

L7 20

Base	Lordynges	the tyme	/ it wasteth	nyght and day
Cx1	Lordingis	the tyme	it wastit̄n	bothe nyght 7 day
Cx2	Lordyngis	the tyme	wastyth	bothe nyght and <sup>ð</sup> day
Hg	Lordynges	the tyme	/ it wasteth	nyght <sup>7</sup> and day
El	Lordynges	/ the tyme	wasteth	nyght and day

it ] Ad3 Ch Cp Cx1 Gg Hg La  
 not present ] Bo2 Cx2 Dd Ds1 El En1 Ha4 Ht Ra3

The addition of 'it' to L7 20 does not make a metrical difference in the line since the previous word ends with a vowel. The manuscript distribution is as follows: 'it' is present in Ad3 Ch Cp Cx1 Gg Hg La and is not present in Bo2 Cx2 Dd Ds1 El En1 Ha4 Ht Ra3. This even distribution makes it very difficult to decide which of these readings might have been present in the archetype.

mL 197

Out: Ad3

Base	☿ O	firste moeuer	/ cruel firmament
Cx1	O	frosty mornynge	cruel firmament
Cx2	O	fyrst moeuyng <sup>7</sup>	cruel fyrmaruent
Hg	☿ O	firste moeuer	/ cruel firmament
El	☿ O	firste moeuyng	/ crueel firmament <sup>7</sup>

firste moeuer ] Hg

firste moeuyng ] Bo2 Ch Cp Cx2 Dd Ds1 El En1 Gg Ha4 Ht  
 La

frosty mornynge ] Cx1

The variant 'moeuyng' for Hg's 'moeuer' is very consistent. All the collated witnesses agree with Cx2 and E1. Such consistency is unusual and would indicate that Hg is in error, showing when we put the variant in context it seems evident that Hg possibly has a reading that seems to make better sense. This does not presuppose that the Hg reading was in the archetype of the tradition. If this had been the case, we should have to assume that the reading 'moeuyng' was introduced very early. The variant distribution however, with 'moeuyng' widely spread through the tradition, suggests that this --being a worse reading-- might have been the one that was present in the archetype. More support for this idea is the reading as it appears in Hg, which could have been a correction introduced by the scribe --since this reading makes much better sense. The ambiguity of character of this variant makes it impossible to tell which of them was present in the archetype.

### 2.3.1.2.3 Non-Archetypal Variants

ML 90

Out: Ad3

Base	And	al	his	lust	,	and	al	his	bisy	cure
Cx1	And <sup>o</sup>	al	his	lust		and <sup>o</sup>	al	his	besy	cure
Cx2	That	al	hys	lust		and <sup>o</sup>	al	hys	besy	cure
Hg	And	al	his	lust	,	and	al	his	bisy	cure
E1	That	al	his	lust <sup>r</sup>		and	al	his	bisy	cure

And ] Ch Cp Cx1 Gg Ha4 Hg Ht La

That ] Bo2 Cx2 Dd Ds1 E1 En1

ML 90 is a case of substitution. We have a group of manuscripts that start the line

with 'And' and another that uses the conjunction 'That.' As in the case of L7 20, the manuscript distribution is even –but not the same. Ch Cp Cx1 Gg Ha4 Hg Ht and La have the reading 'And'; while 'That' is supported by Bo2 Cx2 Dd Ds1 El and En1. This distribution is consistent with that of the variant for L7 20, with the only exception of Ha4 which has moved from agreeing with Cx2 and El to being aligned with Hg.

ML 849

Base	Of	lubaltare	,	and	Septe	,	dryuyng	ay
Cx1	Of	lualter		and <sup>h</sup>	septe		driuyng <sup>7</sup>	ay
Cx2	Of	lualter		and <sup>h</sup>	septe		dryuyng <sup>7</sup>	alway
Hg	Of	lubaltar <sup>7</sup>	,	and	Septe	,	dryuyng	ay
El	Of	lubaltar <sup>7</sup>		and	Septe		dryuyng <sup>e</sup>	always

ay ] Hg Cx1 Ht Gg Ha4 Cp La  
 always ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cx2 Dd Ds1 El En1

Here the variant 'alway' adds an extra syllable to the line. Cx2 agrees with El Ad3 Bo2 Ch Dd Ds1 En1, while the reading 'ay' is found in Hg Cp Cx1 Gg Ha4 Ht and La. As in lines L7 20 and ML 90, Cx2 shares this variants with Bo2 Dd El and En1.

### 2.3.2 Cx2-not-Hg/El Variants

A total of 8 Cx2-not-Hg/El variants can be found in this set. Three of the variants --ML 27, ML 435 and ML 487-- , which might have been the result of scribal mistakes or of carelessness on the part of the compositor, can be found in the

electronic appendix d, chapter 5, 2.3. Of the remaining five, three --ML 55, ML 456 and ML 962-- are agreements of Cx2 and Ha4.

When the variants in Cx2 for this set are grouped with El, they are in agreement with Bo2 and Dd. However, when the source of Cx2 departs from Hg and El, it often agrees with Ha4, which is, in fact, the most consistent agreement for the set.

### 2.3.2.1 Ambiguous Variants in which Cx2 Agrees with Ha4

ML 55

Out: Ad3

Base	Vnto	thise	Surryen	Marchauntz	,	in	swich	wise
Cx1	Vnto	thyse		marchantis		in	suche	wyse
Cx2	Vnto	thyse	surriens	marchantis		in	suche	wyse
Hg	Vn to	thise	Surryen	Marchauntz	,	in	swich	wise
El	Vn to	thise	Surryen	Marchantz	,	in	swich a	wyse

Surryen ] Bo2 Ch Cp Dd Ds1 El En1 Gg Hg La  
 surriens ] Cx2 Ha4  
 soueraigne ] Ht  
 not present ] Cx1

ML 456

ML 456 after G ML 462: Ds

Base	☿	Bright	was	the	Sonne	,	as	in	that	Someres	day
Cx1		Bright	was	the	sonne		as	n	a	somers	day
Cx2		Bryght	was	the	sonne		as	in		somers	day
Hg	☿	Bright	was	the	Sonne	,	as	in	that	Som'es	day
El		Bryght	was	the	sonne	,	as	in	that	Som'es	day

that ] Bo2 Ch Cp Ds1 El En1 Gg Hg  
 a ] Cx1  
 the ] Ht La  
 not present ] Cx2 Ha4

ML 962

Base	flow	god	quod	he	,	and	his	halwes	brighte
Cx1	flow	god <sup>h</sup>	quod	he		and <sup>h</sup>	his	halowis	bright

Cx2    flow god<sup>ð</sup> quod<sup>ð</sup> he    7    al    hys halowys bryght  
Hg    flow god quod he , and    his halwes brighte  
El    flow god quod he , and    hise halwes brighte

and ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Dd Ds1 El En1Gg Ha4 Hg Ht  
and al ] Cx2 Ha4

Lines ML 55, ML 456 and ML 962 are examples of variants in which Cx2 agrees with Ha4 against all the collated witnesses.

In line 55 the added 's' in the word 'surriens' could be fortuitous, but since most of the Cx2-not-Hg/El variants are in agreement with Ha4, this has to be taken into account. The variant in ML 456 is an omitted 'that' which has an impact on the metre of the line. ML 962 has added the word 'al,' which appears to smooth the metre. All these variants could have been the result of an agreement by coincidence. Because agreements between Ha4 and Cx2 can also be found here as in other sections of the *Tales*, it seemed a good idea to keep these variants in a group.

### 2.3.2.2 Ambiguous Variants in which Cx2 Agrees with Ht

ML 564

Out: Dd

Base    flow    hastily    ,    do    fecche    a    book    ,    quod    he  
Cx1    flow    hastely       do    fet       a    book       quod    he  
Cx2    flow    hastely       goo    fet       a    book       quod<sup>ð</sup>    he  
Hg    flow    hastily    ,    do    fecche    a    book    ,    quod    he  
El    flow    hastily    ,    do    fecche    a    book<sup>7</sup>    quod    he

do ] Ad3 Ch Cp Cx1 Ds1 El En1Gg Ha4 Hg La  
go ] Cx2 Ht  
not present ] Bo2

As an isolated variant, the substitution of 'do' for 'go' in ML 564 is the most interesting reading in this set. Both verbs are imperatives and they have the same function in the sentence. The substitution does not affect the meter in any way. The only manuscript in agreement with Cx2 is Ht --which also supports the reading in ML 659 (see below).

ML 659

Base	☿	Wo	was	this	kyng	whan	he	this	lettre	hadde	seyn
Cx1		Wo	was	this	kyng <sup>7</sup>	whan	he	this	lettre	had <sup>b</sup>	seen
Cx2		Wo	was	the	kyng	whan	he	this	lettre	had	seen
Hg	☿	Wo	was	this	kyng <sup>7</sup>	whan	he	this	lettre	hadde	seyn
El	☿	Wo	was	this	kyng <sup>7</sup>	whan	he	this	lettre	had	sayn

this ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch CP Cx1 Dd Ds1 El En1 Gg Ha4 Hg La  
the ] Cx2 Ht

ML 659 shows a similar substitution to that of ML 564. The variant is 'this' for 'the,' and, again, Cx2 is in agreement with Ht. The fact that Ht has also changed the second 'this' in the line for 'the' might led one to doubt the authority of the manuscript in this case, since it might imply that the change is scribal and not genetic, that it was the scribe who changed the first and second 'this' to 'the.'

### 3. SET 3: LINK 15<sup>12</sup>

#### 3.1 Set Summary

---

<sup>12</sup> The witnesses collated for L15 are: Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Cx1 Cx2 Dd Ds El En1 Gg Ha4 Hg Ht La Ra3.

The 6 variants in this set belong to the Cx2-Unique variants and to the Cx2-O variants, which are of no help when trying to establish the affiliations of  $\omega$ . This set would have been of great importance had it shown any stemmatically significant variation since L15 is not present in Hg. This omission in such an important manuscript as Hg might have been the result of the re-ordering of the links related to ME, SQ and FK --L17 and L20, which could have resulted in the elimination of L15.

### **3.1 Analysis of Variant Lines**

#### ***3.2.1 Line Substitutions:***

There are no line substitutions in this set.

#### ***3.2.2 Line Additions***

There are no line additions in this set.

#### ***3.2.3 Line Deletions***

There are no deletions in this set.

#### ***3.2.4 Line Misplacements***

There are no misplacements in this set.

### **3.3 Analysis of Word Additions, Deletions and Substitutions**

The variant distribution for this group is as follows:

4 Cx2-O variants, which confirm the excellence of  $\omega$ .

2 Cx2-Unique variants, which are unique to Cx2 in the current collation.

0Cx2-Hg/El variants, in which Cx2 agrees with El or Hg against the other.

0 Cx2-not-Hg/El variants, in which Cx2 agrees with another manuscript against both Hg and El.

### ***3.3.1 Cx2-Hg/El Variants***

There are no Cx2-Hg/El variants in this set.

### ***3.3.2 Cx2-not-Hg/El Variants***

There are no Cx-not-Hg/El variants in this set.

## **4. SET 4: THE MERCHANT'S TALE<sup>13</sup>**

### **4.1 Set Summary**

In this set we find a surprising combination of additions, deletions and substitutions. Although in most cases lines which have been added in Cx2 replace non-archetypal lines in Cx1, this set presents additions which have been introduced to supply text which was not there before.

The minor variants in this set are less informative than in others. Several of them are suppressions in which Cx2 agrees with one or two other witnesses and this

---

<sup>13</sup> The witnesses collated for ME are: Ad1 Ad3 Bo2 Bw Ch Cp Cx1 Cx2 Dd D1 Ds El En1 En2 En3 Fi Gg Ha2 Ha3 Ha4 Ha5 He Hg Hk Ht Ii La Ln Ma Mg Mm Ne Nl Ph3 Pn Ps Pw Py Ra2 Ra3 Ry1 Ry2 S11 S12 Tc1 Tc2 To1 Wy.

could very well be the result of agreement by coincidence rather than evidence of genetic relationships.

There are some variants in which Cx2 agrees with Ad3 Ch and Ha4 as it usually does. But there are two occasions on which Cx2 agrees with Gg. These --as do the agreements with a group manuscripts-- seem to be accidental, but they could also indicate a textual relation and, for this reason, they need to be taken into account in the final analysis.

## **4.2 Analysis of Variant Lines**

### ***4.2.1 Line Substitutions***

The majority of the lines which have been introduced in Cx2 are archetypal, while the lines found in Cx1 are non-archetypal lines. Lines in Cx2 that substitute non-archetypal lines present in Cx1 are: ME 70, 402 and 403, 533 and 534, 572, 742, 828, 1022.

ME 70a Cx1 Or othir yeftis meuable of fortune  
ME 70 Cx2 Or moeblis all ben yeftes of fortune

ME 234-1 Cx1 To you telle I this tale and<sup>o</sup> to non other  
ME 233 Cx2 Iustus sothly called<sup>o</sup> was that other

ME 533a Cx1 So fressh she was and<sup>o</sup> therto so likand<sup>o</sup>  
ME 534a Cx1 When he saw her daunce with a ring<sup>o</sup> on hir hand<sup>o</sup>  
ME 533 Cx2 So sore hath venus hurt hym wyth her bond<sup>o</sup>  
ME 534 Cx2 As that she bare it daunsyng<sup>o</sup> in her hond<sup>o</sup>

ME 574-1 Cx1 So hastid<sup>o</sup> I anuary it most be don  
ME 572 Cx2 And<sup>o</sup> they haue don ryght as he wold<sup>o</sup> deuyse

ME 742a Cx1 And<sup>ð</sup> alle was pyte and<sup>ð</sup> tender herte  
ME 742 Cx2 Lo pyte renneth sone in gentyll hert

ME 828a Cx1 His det<sup>h</sup> therfore desirith<sup>h</sup> he vttirly  
ME 828 Cx2 He wepeth and<sup>ð</sup> he wayleth pytously

ME 986-2 Cx1 Whiche that hir rauysshed<sup>ð</sup> out of pina  
ME 986-1 Cx2 Eche aftyr other ryght as ony lyne

ME 1022a Cx1 That she shal redily excusen her  
ME 1022 Cx2 That I shal yeue her suffyciaunt answere

In one very interesting and unusual case --Cx2 ME 986-2-- we find that a variant line has been replaced by another variant line. The variant lines are:

ME 986 Hg Whos answere hath doon many a man pyne  
ME 986-2 Cx1 Whiche that hir rauysshed<sup>ð</sup> out of pina  
ME 986-1 Cx2 Eche aftyr other ryght as ony lyne

ME 986 appears in Hg Bo2 En1 and Nl. ME 986-1, is present in El Cx2 Ch Dd Ds1 Gg and Ha4. ME 986-2 is in Cp Cx1 Ad3 La Ld1 Ld2 Ne Nl and Ra3. The fact that the line as it appears in Cx2 is also in Ch and Ha4 is consistent with the usual affiliations of  $\omega$ , but, these witnesses are also grouped with El and Gg. What seems clear when we analyse the three lines and their distribution among the different witnesses is that all three of them must have been introduced in the tradition at a very early stage. Cx2 has a variant in ME 986-1 which it shares with Gg against all the other witnesses. This variant is 'ony' instead of 'a', the latter supported by El Ch Ds1 and Ha4. It is difficult to know if a metrical difference has been triggered by the variants, since this depends on the final '-e' of the rhyme word, 'lyne.'

Another interesting major change is the substitution of ME Cx1 574-1 by ME

Cx2 572. Although the line in Cx2 is archetypal, and therefore requires no further analysis, it presents a peculiarity that seems worth pointing out. While most substitutions are made line by line, in the sense that the relative position of the lines is the same in both Cx1 and Cx2, this substitution also required an alteration in the order of the lineation of Cx2 and this was inserted in its archetypal place as line 572.

#### **4.2.2. Line Additions**

As in previous cases, additions made to Cx2 are archetypal lines. Of a total of twelve added lines in Cx2, three have word variants which might help in tracing the affiliations of  $\omega$ . A list of the added lines follows:

ME 63 Cx2 This sentence 7 an hundred<sup>ð</sup> thynges worse  
ME 64 Cx2 Wryteth thys man there god his bones corse

ME 402 Cx2 So delycate wythout woo and<sup>ð</sup> stryf  
ME 403 Cx2 That I shal haue my heuen in erthe here

ME 1036 Cx2 Yet haue ther founden many another man  
ME 1037 Cx2 Wommen ful trewe ful good<sup>ð</sup> and<sup>ð</sup> vertuous  
ME 1038 Cx2 Wytnes of hem that dwelle in crystes hous  
ME 1039 Cx2 Wyth martirdom they preuyð<sup>ð</sup> theyr constaunce  
ME 1040 Cx2 The Romayn gestes eke make remembraunce  
ME 1041 Cx2 Of many a very trewe wyf also  
ME 1042 Cx2 But sir ne be not wroth also  
ME 1043 Cx2 Al though he said<sup>ð</sup> he fond no good<sup>ð</sup> womman

As I mentioned before, there are three lines which have word variants within, these are ME 1038, 1042 and 1043. Their analysis follows:

ME 1038

Base	Witnesse	on hem	,	that dwelle	in Cristes hous
Cx2	Wytnes	of hem		that dwelle	in crystes hous
Hg	Witnesse	on hem	,	that dwelle	in Cristes hous
El	Witnesse	on hem	,	þ' dwelle	in Cristes hous

on ] Bo2 Ch Cp El Ha4 Hg Ht Ra3  
of ] Ad3 Cx2 Dd Ds1 En1

Cx2 has the variant 'of' instead of 'on' --present in Hg El Bo2 Ch Cp Ha4 Ht and Ra3. The variant distribution indicates that it is likely that 'on' is the archetypal variant. Manuscripts belonging to the a group share Cx2's reading, and Ad3 is also in agreement.

ME 1042

Out: Cx1

Base	But	sire ne	be nat	wrooth	,	al be it	so
Cx2	But	sir	ne be	not	wrooth	also	
Hg	But	sire ne	be nat	wrooth	,	al be it	so
El	But	sire ne	be nat	wrooth	,	al be it	so

al be it so ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Dd Ds1 El En1 Gg Ha4 Hg Ht Ra3  
also ] Cx2

ME 1043

Out: Cx1

Base	Thogh	that	he seyde	,	he foond	no good womman
Cx2	Al	though	he said <sup>þ</sup>		he fond	no good <sup>þ</sup> womman
Hg	Thogh	þ'	he seyde	,	he foond	no good womman
El	Thogh <sup>h</sup>	þ'	he seyde	,	he foond	no good wōman

Thogh ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Dd Ds1 El En1 Gg Ha4 Hg Ht Ra3  
Al thogh ] Cx2

The minor variants within lines 1042 and 1043 are singletons. In ME 1042, Cx2 has 'also' instead of 'al be it so' --as in all the other collated manuscripts-- and this could easily be the result of a mistake. The case of ME 1043 is similar, although this line has a double variant. In the first place, Cx2 has suppressed the word 'that' and perhaps because of the impact that this had on the metre of the line 'thogh' was substituted by 'although,' adding an extra syllable.

### *4.2.3 Line Deletions*

The deletion of lines ME 1109-1 to 1109-8 and ME 1132-1 to 1132-4 are the most noticeable deletions in this set. It is important to note that they have not been substituted by anything in Cx2, they have just been suppressed. These lines are unique to Cx1 in the current collation, but it is possible that they might be a characteristic of the **b** group.

ME 1120 and 1121 are not present in Cx2. There is not way of knowing if these lines were dropped accidentally or were not present in  $\omega$ .

ME 1109-1 Cx1	A grete tente a thrifty and <sup>ð</sup> a long <sup>ɹ</sup>
ME 1109-2 Cx1	She sayde it was the meriest sy[dub]t[/dub]te
ME 1109-3 Cx1	That euer in her lif she was at yet
ME 1109-4 Cx1	My lordis tente seruit <sup>h</sup> me nothing <sup>ɹ</sup> thus
ME 1109-5 Cx1	He foldith twifolde be swete lhesus
ME 1109-6 Cx1	He may not swyue worth <sup>h</sup> a leek
ME 1109-7 Cx1	And <sup>ð</sup> yet he is ful gentil and <sup>ð</sup> ful meek
ME 1109-8 Cx1	This is leuyr to me than an euynsong <sup>ɹ</sup>
ME 1132-1 Cx1	Stif and <sup>ð</sup> round <sup>ð</sup> as ony belle
ME 1132-2 Cx1	It was no wonderm though her bely swelle
ME 1132-3 Cx1	The smok on his brest lay so theche
ME 1132-4 Cx1	And <sup>ð</sup> euer me thoughte he poynti <sup>ð</sup> on the breche

mE 1120 Cx1    And<sup>ð</sup> vp he yaf a roringe and<sup>ð</sup> a cry  
mE 1121 Cx1    As doth<sup>n</sup> the moder when the child<sup>ð</sup> shal dy

#### ***4.2.4 Line Misplacements***

There are no misplacements in this set.

### **4.3 Analysis of Word Additions, Deletions and Substitutions**

The variant distribution for this group is as follows:

184 Cx2-O variants, which confirm the excellence of  $\omega$ .

24 Cx2-Unique variants, which are unique to Cx2 in the current collation.

3 Cx2-Hg/El variants, in which Cx2 agrees with El or Hg against the other.

Hg against El: 0

El against Hg: 3

14 Cx2-not-Hg/El variants, in which Cx2 agrees with another manuscript against both Hg and El.

#### ***4.3.1 Cx2-Hg/El Variants***

This set is unusual since the totality of the Cx2-Hg/El variants are agreements with El against Hg, a characteristic that is not found in other sets. Other manuscripts

that support these agreements are also unusual, and we find agreements with the **E** group as well as with **El**.

#### 4.3.1.1 *Hg against El*

There are no variants of **Hg** against **El** in this set.

#### 4.3.1.2 *El against Hg*

##### 4.3.1.2.1 Agreements with **El** and **Gg** likely to Originate below the Archetype

ME 548

Base	God	grante	thee	,	thyn	homly	fo	espye
Cx1	God <sup>ð</sup>	graunte	the		thyn	harm	to	aspye
Cx2	God <sup>ð</sup>	grante	the		thyn	homly	foo	tespye
Hg	God	grante	thee	,	thyn	homly	fo	espye
El	God	graunte	thee	,	thyn	hoomly	fo	tespye

fo espye ] Ch Cp Ha4 Hg li Ld2 Π  
fo tespie ] Ad3 Bo2 Cx2 Dd El En1 Gg Ht  
to espye ] Cx1 li Π  
forto espye ] Ph3

In ME 548 the variant in Cx1 'to aspye' has been substituted by 'fo tespye.' In the first place, Cx2 has the addition of 'fo,' which is found in the vast majority of the witnesses, excluding only manuscripts of the **b** group. Cx2 has also substituted 'to aspye' for 'tespye.' This contracted form of the preposition and of the infinitive of the verb, although not a metrical variant, is different from the form in **Hg**. Other manuscripts that agree with Cx2 and **El** are: Ad3 Bo2 and Gg. Among the rest of the

witnesses, Ch Cp and Ha4 have 'fo espye.' The Cx2 reading is probably non-archetypal.

ME 1096

Base	For	I	am	blynd	,	ye	sire	nofors	quod	she
Cx1	For	I	am	blind <sup>ð</sup>		ye	sire	no force	quod	she
Cx2	That	I	am	blynd <sup>ð</sup>		ye	sire	no force	quod <sup>ð</sup>	she
Hg	For	I	am	blynd	,	ye	sire	nofors	quod	she
EI	That	I	am	blynd <sup>ð</sup>	,	ye	si <sup>r</sup>	nofors	quod	she

For ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cx1 Dd Ds1 En1 Ha4 Hg Ht Ii Ld1 Ld2 Nl Ph3 Ra3  
 That ] Cx2 EI Gg Ne

In this line we have a change in the initial conjunction. The majority of the manuscripts agree with the Hg reading 'For,' only Cx2 EI Gg and Ne read 'That.' As in ME 720, Cx2 is in agreement with manuscripts of the E group.

#### 4.3.1.2.2. Archetypal Variant

ME 597

Base	For	we	han	leue	,	to	pleye	vs	by	the	lawe
Cx1	Now	haue	we	leue		to	pleye	vs	be	the	lawe
Cx2	For	we	haue	leue		to	pleye	vs	by	the	lawe
Hg	[unr]xxx[/unr]	we	han	leue	,	to	pleye	vs	by	the	lawe
EI	For	we	han	leue	,	to	pleye	vs	by	the	lawe

For ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cx2 Dd Ds1 EI En1 Gg Ha4 Ht Ra3  
 Now Cp La Ld1 Ld2 Ph3  
 [unr]xxx[/unr] ] Hg  
 Now haue ] Cx1 Ii Ne Nl

Although, in theory, the variant in ME 597 is an agreement of Cx2 with EI against Hg, we cannot be sure which reading the latter previously had at this point. Of the

collated manuscripts, those belonging to the **c** group --Cp and La-- and the **b** group --Cx1 Ii Ne NI and Ld1<sup>14</sup>-- and Ld2 and Ph3 agree with the Cx1 variant 'flow.' The rest of the collated witnesses, and among them notably, the **O** manuscripts --Ad3 Bo2 Ch Ht and Ra3-- support the Cx2 reading. This variant distribution strongly suggests that the reading is archetypal to the tradition.

#### *4.3.2 Cx2-not-Hg/El Variants*

The agreements within this group appear to be random: Cx2 sometimes agrees with Ad3 Ch Ha4 and Ht, at others it agrees with manuscripts from the **a** group. If these variants are put into the overall context of previous sets, however, they do not appear to be as random and seem to fit the general patterns of affiliation of Cx2, especially in the relationship with Ad3 Ha4 and Ch. Ra3 is a manuscript that shows a few agreements with Cx2 in this set. Such agreements between Cx2 and Ra3 had not become evident in previous sets.

There are fourteen Cx2-not-Hg/El variants, only six of which are discussed here. The analysis of lines ME 24, ME 661, ME 469, ME 733, ME 823, ME 833, ME 885 and ME 835 can be found in the electronic appendix d, chapter 5, 4.3.2. These variants tend to repeat the data presented below. Thus, ME 661 is very similar to ME 298. While ME 469, ME 733, ME 823, ME 833 and ME 885 are instances of a suppressed word in Cx2 and these agreements are probably the result agreements by coincidence. ME 835 has the addition of an article in Cx2 in which it agrees randomly with manuscripts of the **a** and **c** groups.

---

<sup>14</sup> See Robinson's groupings in his stemmatic analysis of GP.

#### 4.3.2.1 Archetypal Variants

ME 720

Base	Or wheither	,	it	thoughte	Paradys	,	or helle
Cx1	Or whether		he	thoughte	it	paradyse	or helle
Cx2	Or whether		her	thoughte	it	paradyse	or helle
Hg	Or wheither	,	it	thoughte	Paradys	,	or helle
EI	Or wheither	,	p <sup>r</sup> hir <sup>r</sup>	thoughte	it	Paradys	or helle

it thoughte] Ad3 Bo2 Ds1 Hg Ht  
 hir thoughte ] Ch Cx2 Dd En1 Gg  
 that hir thoughte ] Cp EI<sup>15</sup> La  
 it semed ] Ha4  
 he thoughte ] Cx1 li Ld2 ne ni Ph3

The amount of textual variation in ME 720 appears to indicate that the phrase was problematic for the scribes. Hg Ad3 Bo2 Ds1 and Ht read 'it thoughte,' while Ch Dd En1 and Gg agree with Cx2 in the variant 'hir thoughte.' The Cx2 version is metrically more regular, although the line in EI has an extra word, 'that' which was deleted from Ch. The agreement of Cx2 with manuscripts of the **a** --Dd and En1-- and **E** --Gg-- groups and Ch is not unusual and indicates a common source.

#### 4.3.2.2 Variants of Ambiguous Character and Likely Agreements by Coincidence

ME 174

Base	Old	fissh	,	and	yong	flessh	,	wol	I	haue	feyn
Cx1	Old <sup>b</sup>	flessñ	wolde	haue	yong	flessñ					fayn
Cx2	Old <sup>b</sup>	fyssh	7	yong	flessh	wil	I	haue	ful	fayn	
Hg	Old	fissñ	,	and	yong	flessñ	,	wol	I	haue	feyn
EI	Oold	fissñ	and	yong	/	flessñ	,	wolde	I	haue	fayn

<sup>15</sup>. Ch has 'that hir thoughte' but the word 'that' has been deleted. Presumably the scribe corrected the reading because he found that it altered the metre of the line.

wol I haue feyn ] Ad3 Bo2 Dd Ds1 El En1 Hg Ht Ra3  
 feyn ] Cx1  
 wol I haue ful feyn ] Ch Cp Cx2 Gg Ha4 La

There are several variants in ME 174, which turn out to be archetypal. One, however has a different nature. Cx2 has added the adverb 'ful,' which is not present in Hg or El. This addition makes the line a regular iambic pentameter. The Cx2 variant is supported by Ch Cp Ha4 and La. Of these witnesses, Ch and Ha4 are in regular agreement with Cx2, and indicates that the variant was probably in  $\omega$ . In the current collation it is not possible to tell whether this variant is archetypal or not.

ME 298  
 Base Mo goode thewes , than hir vices badde  
 Cx1 Moo good<sup>ð</sup> vertues than vicis badde  
 Cx2 Moo thewes good<sup>ð</sup> than her vicis badde  
 Hg Mo goode thewes , than hir vices badde  
 El Mo goode thewes , than hir<sup>ƿ</sup> vices badde  
 Gg Moo thewys goode , than [add]her[/add] vicis badde

goode thewes ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Dd Ds El En1 Gg Ha4 Hg La Ra3  
 goode vertues ] Cx1 li  
 thewes goode ] Cx2 Gg

In this line Cx2 and Gg have 'thewes goode' where all the other collated witnesses have 'goode thewes.' This variant possibly arose by chance, since it is no more than the inversion of two words. However, given the fact that Cx2 has shown a slight tendency to agree with the E group --Gg and El in parts--, this variant might prove more meaningful than appears at first sight, once the analysis is completed.

#### 4.3.2.3 Non-Archetypal Agreements with Witnesses of the a Group

ME 954  
 Base Or ellis , I empeyre so my name

Cx1	Or	ellis		I	empeyre	so	my	name
Cx2	Or	ellis	that	I	empeyre	so	my	name
Hg	Or	ellis	,	I	empeyre	so	my	name
El	Or	elles	,	I	empeyre	so	my	name
Dd	Or	ellis	if that	I	, enpeire	so	my	name
Ds	Or	ellis	if that	I	empeire	so	my	name
En1	Or	els	yf pat	I	empeyre	so	my	name

I ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Cx1 El Gg Ha4 Hg Ht li La ñe Ra3  
that I ] Cx2 Dd Ds1 En1

Here Cx2 has added the word 'that,' which also appear in the **a** group manuscripts, Dd Ds1 and En1, although these have 'if that' instead. The manuscript distribution indicates that the variant is not archetypal, but the agreement with manuscripts belonging to the **a** group should not be dismissed.

ME 1021								
Base	ñow	by	my	modres	sires	soule	,	I swere
Cx1	ñow	be	my	modris	siris	soule		I swere
Cx2	ñow	by	my	modris		soule	sire	I swere
Hg	ñow	by	my	modres	sires	soule	,	I swere
El	ñow	by	my	moodres	sires	soule		I swere

siris soule ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Cx1 El Gg Ha4 Hg Ht li La Ld1 Ld2 ñe  
ñl Ph3 Ra3  
soule sire ] Cx2 Dd Ds1 En1

In ME 1021, we again find that Cx2 agrees with **a** group manuscripts --Dd Ds1 En1. Here the variant is 'sires soule ' -- Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Cx1 El Gg Ha4 Hg Ht li La Ld1 Ld2 Ne ñl Ph3 Ra3-- versus 'soule sire' --Cx2 Dd Ds1 and En1. In fact, as in ME 1021, Dd Ds1 and En1 have added another word to the line, perhaps in an effort to make the metre smoother after the syllable loss in 'sire.'

#### 4.3.2.4 Non-Archetypal Agreements with Ad3 and Ha4

ME 560

Base	And	whan	they	say	hir	tyme	,	go	to	reste
Cx1	And <sup>þ</sup>	when	they	se	her	tyme		go	to	reste
Cx2	And <sup>þ</sup>	when	they	see	her	tyme	they	go	to	reste
Hg	And	whan	they	say	hir	tyme	,	go	to	reste
El	And	whan	they	sye	hir	tyme	,	goon	to	reste

say hir tyme ] Bo2 Ch Cp El Hg Ht  
se hir tyme ] Cx1  
see hir tyme they ] Ad3 Cx2 Dd Ha4  
saw hir tyme ] Ds1 En1 Gg Ph3 La Ra3

This line shows, once more agreement between Cx2 Ad3 and Ha4. These witnesses have added the personal pronoun 'they' before the verb 'goon.' The rest of the collated witnesses agree with Hg and El in not having this word, which alters the metre of the line.

## 5. SET 5: LINK 8<sup>16</sup>

### 5.1 Set Summary

The text of L8 is not present in all the witnesses to the text of the *Canterbury Tales*. In fact, this part of the text, also known as the Man of Law's Endlink, is present only in 35 witnesses (Blake 1996, 12). All the witnesses belonging to Manly and Rickert's **b** group have the link --He Ne Cx1 Tc2 Ha3 Ln Py Ra3 Tc1 Mc and Ra1--, all of the **c** group --Cp La and Sl2-- 17 of the **d** witnesses, only excluding Mg --Lc Ha2 Sl1 En2 Bw Ry2 Ld2 Dl Ry1 Fi Ii Ht Ra2 Pw Mm Gl and Ph3-- and three of the witnesses that do not fit into Manly and Rickert's major groups--Cx2 Ha4 and Wy.

This wide distribution across the tradition indicates that a major change was made to the text, either by addition or by deletion. Manly and Rickert suggested that the link represents an early stage of the work, when Chaucer was thinking of assigning TM to the Man of Law (1940, 2:189). In fact, they indicate which version of L8 has the earliest stage of composition:

The link with the reading "Somnour" in 1179 clearly belongs to an early stage in the composition of CT. The Host's comment, "This was a thrifty tale", is distinctly less appropriate to the tale of the "Banished Queen" than to Melibeus, the prose tale presumably promised by the Man of Law and first assigned to him. Equally inappropriate to the story of the Banished Queen are the subjects the new narrator declares he will avoid (1188-90). When Melibeus was transferred to Chaucer himself and the Summoner involved in the quarrel with the Friar, this endlink ceased to have any proper function and became a mere vestigial organ... It was, however, still in existence and accessible to the early scribes who were trying to collect and piece together the tales and fragments of the CT into a connected whole. (1940, 2:189-90)

According to this interpretation, L8 probably remained with the rest of the *Canterbury Tales*, and the best way to explain this would be that it was marked for deletion in the archetype of the tradition. Two **O** manuscripts have L8 --Ha4 and Ra3-- and the variant distribution shows that Cx2 is in agreement with them. It is important to note, however, that the text in Ha4 stops at line 23, i.e. in the middle of a

---

<sup>16</sup> The witnesses collated for L8 are: Cp Cx1 Cx2 Ha4 Ht La Ra3.

couplet that is completed by the final rubric. All the other collated witnesses have 28 lines and one wonders what happened to the rest of the text of Ha4.

There are seven variants in the text of L8 in Cx2, three of which are singletons and four of which are Cx2-not-Hg/El variants. Of this last group, two variants could be the result of agreements by coincidence or memorial contamination and the other two --L8 10, L8 27-- are of ambiguous character.

## **5.2 Analysis of Variant Lines**

### ***5.2.1 Line Substitutions:***

There are no line substitutions in this set.

### ***5.2.2 Line Additions***

There are no line additions in this set.

### ***5.2.3 Line Deletions***

There are no line deletions in this set.

### ***5.2.4 Line Misplacements***

There are no line misplacements in this set.

## **5.3 Analysis of Word Additions, Deletions and Substitutions**

The variant distribution for this group is as follows:

0 Cx2-O variants, which confirm the excellence of  $\omega$ .

3 Cx2-Unique variants, which are unique to Cx2 in the current collation.

4 Cx2-not-Hg/El variants, in which Cx2 agrees with another manuscript against both Hg and El.

### ***5.3.1 Cx2-Hg/El Variants***

There are no Cx2-Hg/El variants in this set, since the text is not present in Hg or El.

### ***5.3.2 Cx2-not-Hg/El Variants***

All the variants in this set show that the text as it appears in Cx2 is a very early one. The most interesting variant is in L8 27, where we find the Cx2 reading 'physlias' instead of the Cx1 'physick.' The analysis of this variant can be found below in 5.3.2.2.

#### ***5.3.2.1 Agreements by Coincidence or Memorial Contamination***

L8 21  
Base Or springen Cokkel in oure clene corn  
Cx1 Or speynh cokyl in our clene corn  
Cx2 Or spryngen cokyl in our clene corn

springen ] Cp Cx2 Ha4 Ht La Ra3  
speynh ] Cx1

The variant in Cx1, 'speynh' is unique. Other witnesses have the infinitive form, 'springen.' The variant in Cx1 might be explained as a misinterpretation of what the scribe wrote; this misinterpretation could have happened when the compositor was setting up the text, or when the manuscript source of Cx1 was copied. Cx2 agrees

with the rest of the witnesses in this reading, but this could be a compositorial correction.

L8 25  
Out: Ha4 Ht  
Base That I schal waken al this compaignie  
Cx1 That it shal wakyn al this company  
Cx2 That I shal wakyn al thys company  
  
I ] Cx2 Cp La  
it ] Cx1 Ra3

Here the variant in Cx1 is 'it,' which is substituted by 'I' in Cx2. The majority of the collated manuscripts are in agreement with Cx2, but this could be the result of a compositor correcting the line without using  $\omega$ .

### 5.3.2.2 Variants of Ambiguous Character

L8 10  
Base Oure ost answerde O lanekyn be ye there  
Cx1 Oure oste answerde lankyn be ye there  
Cx2 Oure hoost answerd<sup>o</sup> o lankyn be ye there  
Cp Oure ost<sup>r</sup> answerde O lanekyn be ye pere  
Ha4 Our Ost<sup>r</sup> answerd O lankyn be 3e pere  
Ra3 Oure oost answerid o lankyn be ye there  
  
O ] Cp Cx2 Ha4 Ra3  
pey ] Ht  
not present ] Cx1 Ht La

In L8 10 we find that Cx2 has added an interjection that is missing from Cx1 La and Ht. This addition alters the metre of the line and is present in Cx2 Cp Ha4 and Ra3. Both Ha4 and Ra3 are **O** manuscripts, and all are indications that the interjection was

in the archetypal text. But even though the variant might be archetypal, it is difficult to tell whether it is the result of contamination or of a correction from  $\omega$ .

L8 27

L8 27 after L8 26: Cx1 Cx2 Cp La Ra3

Base  $\Pi e$  Phislyas ne termes queinte of lawe

Cx1  $\Pi e$  of phisik ne termes queynte of lawe

Cx2  $\Pi e$  of physlias ne termes queynte of lawe

Phislyas ] Cp Cx2 La Ra3

phisik ] Cx1 Ht

L8 27 present an interesting variant. Cx1 reads 'phisik' and Ht agrees with it. The other witnesses --Cx2 Cp La and Ra3-- all read 'Phislyas.' It seems that the proper noun is more appropriate for this line, and the variant distribution suggests that Cx1 has a mistake. Of all the variants in this set, this is the only one that might suggest that L8 was present in  $\omega$ .

## 6. SET 6: THE SQUIRE'S TALE<sup>17</sup>

### 6.1 Set Summary

As is the case with other sets, the variants in which Cx2 agrees with Hg against El appear to be archetypal. Of the 14 Cx2-Hg/El variants, Cx2 agrees with Hg on five occasions. This is unexpected, since in other sets it is clear that the majority of the Cx2-Hg/El variants are clearly agreements with Hg against El. This is one of the first indications of the unusual character of this set. On nine occasions, Cx2 agrees with El against Hg, and on eight of them the agreement is not only with El, but also

---

<sup>17</sup> The witnesses collated for SQ are: Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Cx1 Cx2 Dd Ds El En1 Gg Ha4 Hg Ht La.

with Gg. The single variant in which this does not occur is SQ 15, where Gg is missing part of the text. This persistent agreement between Cx2 El and Gg is consistent with the E affiliation which Robinson points out for El in WBP, and is similar to what happens in set 1.

One of the most interesting aspects of this agreement is that in the Cx2-not-Hg/ El variants, Cx2 never agrees with Gg, whereas the majority of the agreements are with a group manuscripts, such as Dd En1 and Ds1.

## ***6.2 Analysis of Variant Lines***

### ***6.2.1 Line Substitutions:***

SQ 545 Cx2 Ne couthe man by twenty thousand<sup>b</sup> part  
SQ 546 Cx2 Counterfete the sophyms of hys art  
SQ 547 Cx2 Ne worthy to vnbokelen hys galoche  
SQ 548 Cx2 There doublenes or faynyng<sup>r</sup> shold<sup>b</sup> approche  
SQ 549 Cx2 Ne so couthe thonke a wyght as he dyd<sup>b</sup> me  
SQ 550 Cx2 Hys maner was an heuen for to see

There is only one major addition in this set, which comprises lines 545 to 550. Lines SQ 545, SQ 546, SQ 548 and SQ 550 are archetypal. Their readings are Cx2-O variants. SQ 547 has a suppressed word --'were'-- which appear to be a mistake in Cx2, but not necessarily attributable to  $\omega$ . There is an added 'to' in this line, a variant that is supported by Ad3 Cp Ds1 Ha4 Ht and La, against Hg El Bo2 Ch Dd En1 and Gg, i.e. it is a Cx2-not-Hg/El variant. Since the word after 'to' starts with a vowel --'vnbokele'-- its addition has no impact on the metre of the line.

The other line with a Cx2-not-Hg/El variant is SQ 549 in which the verb 'koude,' a reading supported by Hg El Ad3 Bo2 Ch Dd Ds1 En1 and Gg, is replaced by 'couthe' witnessed by Cx2 Cp Ha4 Ht and La.

### 6.2.2 *Line Additions*

There are no line additions in this set.

### 6.2.3 *Line Deletions*

There are no major deletions in this set.

### 6.2.4 *Line Misplacements*

The only misplacement in the set is the inversion of lines SQ 175 and SQ 176 in Cx1. These were corrected in Cx2 and follow the order commonly found in the manuscripts.

SQ 176 Cx1 For none engynys wyndas ne polyue

SQ 175 Cx1 They may hit out of the place dryue

SQ 175 Cx2 They may hyt not out of the place dryue

SQ 176 Cx2 For none engynys wyndas ne polyue

## **6.3 Analysis of Word Additions, Deletions and Substitutions**

The variant distribution for this group is as follows:

87 Cx2-O variants, which confirm the excellence of  $\omega$ .<sup>18</sup>

15 Cx2-Unique variants, which are unique to Cx2 in the current collation.

14 Cx2-Hg/El variants, in which Cx2 agrees with El or Hg against the other.

Hg against El: 5

El against Hg: 9

7 Cx2-not-Hg/El variants, in which Cx2 agrees with another manuscript against both Hg and El.

### 6.3.1 Cx2-Hg/El Variants

Among these variants there are five agreements with Hg against El, and 9 agreements with El against Hg. Three of the five variants in which Cx2 agrees with Hg are archetypal --SQ 30, SQ 130, SQ 464. Of the nine variants in which Cx2 agrees with Cx2El, eight are readings in which Cx2 and El agree with Gg. The other variant, SQ 15, appears to be the result of a misinterpretation of Caxton's correction mark on the part of the compositor.

#### 6.3.1.1 Hg against El

##### 6.3.1.1.1 Archetypal Variants

SQ 30, SQ 130 and SQ 464 have variants that are proof of the quality of  $\omega$ : they are archetypal.

SQ 30

Base	It	moste	been	/		a	Rethor	excellent
Cx1	I	muste	be		a	clerk	and <sup>b</sup>	a rethour excellent
Cx2	It	muste	be		a	clerk	and <sup>b</sup>	rethour excellent
Hg	It	moste	been	/		a	Rethor	excellent <sup>7</sup>
El	I	moste	been	/		a	Rethor	excellent <sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> The number given refers only to word variants and does not include those already discussed as part of the line additions or substitutions.

It ] Cx2 Cp Hg Ad3 Ch Dd Ds1 En1 Gg Ht La  
 I ] Cx1 El Bo2  
 He ] Ha4

The variant 'it,' shared by Hg and Cx2, is supported by the majority of the witnesses --

Ad3 Ch Cp Dd Ds1 En1 Gg Ht and La-- indicating that this is the archetypal reading.

SQ 130

Base	Hath	set	hir	herte	,	on	any	maner	wight
Cx1	Hatñ	set	her	herte		in	ony	maner	wight
Cx2	Had <sup>ð</sup>	set	her	herte		on	ony	maner	wyght
Hg	Hath	set	hir	herte	,	on	any	maner	wight <sup>7</sup>
El	Hath	set	hi <sup>7</sup>	herte	,	in	any	maner	wigh <sup>7</sup> t <sup>7</sup>

on ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Cx2 Dd Ds1 En1 Gg Ha4 Hg Ht La  
 in ] Cx1 El

In SQ 130 we find another example of a reading in Cx2 that has returned to what can be assumed to be the archetypal reading, supported by the majority of the witnesses.

Only Cx1 and El have the reading 'in.'

SQ 464

Base	¢	Tho	shrigh <sup>t</sup> e	this	Faukon	,	yet	moore	pitously
Cx1	[	Tho	shright	this	faucon			more	pitously
Cx2	[	Tho	shryght	thys	faucon		yet	more	pytously
Hg	¢	Tho	shrigh <sup>t</sup> e	this	Faukon	,	yet	moore	pitously
El	¢	Tho	shrigh <sup>t</sup> e	this	Faucou <sup>7</sup>	,	moore	yet	pitously

yet moore ] Ad3 Ch Cp Cx2 Dd Ds1 En1 Hg Ht  
 moore yet ] El Gg  
 moore ] Bo2 Cx1 Ha4 La

The variant here is the change in the order of the words 'yet moore,' and even though this seems a random change, the variant distribution clearly shows that this is

the archetypal reading. There are only two witnesses --El and Gg<sup>19</sup>-- that support 'moore yet'

### 6.3.1.1.2 Variants of Ambiguous Character

SQ 30, SQ 130 and SQ 464 have variants that are proof of the quality of ω: they are archetypal. These are discussed below.

SQ 15

Gg: The line is out after the word 'Yong'

Base	Yong	fressh	,	and	strong		in	armes	desirous
Cx1	Yongʒ	fressĥ		andʒ	strongʒ	ʒ	in	armys	desirous
Cx2	Yongʒ	fressĥ			strongʒ		in	armys	desirous
Hg	Yongʒ	fressĥ	,	and	strongʒ		in	armes	desirous
El	Yongʒ	fressĥ	,		strongʒ	and	in	Armes	desirous

and strong ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Cx1 Dd Ds1 En1 Ha4 Hg Ht La  
not present ] Cx2 El  
in ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Cx2 Dd Ds1 En1 Ha4 Hg Ht La  
and in ] Cx1 El

In line 15, Cx2 agrees with Hg against El in omission of the second 'and,' and with El against Hg in the suppression of the word 'and' before 'strong,' since Cx2 has no conjunctions in this line --it has suppressed both 'and's that appeared in Cx1. The lack of a conjunction after the word 'strong' in which Cx2 agrees with Hg against El, is supported by Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Dd Ds1 En1 Ha4 Ht La, i.e. all the witnesses with the exception of El and Gg, for which this part of the text is missing. The case in which Cx2 agrees with El against Hg --the conjunction 'and' before the preposition 'in'--, is

---

<sup>19</sup> The agreements between El and Gg in this set are very consistent.

supported only by Cx2 and E1, which makes it a very doubtful reading. Possibly Caxton made a deletion mark meant for the 'and' that appears in Cx1 after the word 'strong,' and the compositor misunderstood the sign as an indication to delete both 'and's.

SQ 506

Base	Right	so ,	this	god	of	loues	ypocrite
Cx1	Right	so	this	god <sup>b</sup>	of	loue	this lpocryte
Cx2	Ryght	so	this	god <sup>b</sup>	of	loues	lpocryte
Hg	Right	so ,	this	god	of	loues	ypocrite
E1	Riġht	so	this	god	of	loue ,	this ypocryte

loues	]	Ad3	Bo2	Ch	Cp	Cx2	Dd	Hg	Ht
loue	this	]	Cx1	Ds1	E1	En1	Gg	Ha4	
loue	]	La							

There are two variants in this line. The first is the genitive 'loues' -- Cx2 Hg Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Dd Ht -- against the nominative 'loue' --E1 Cx1 Ds1 En1 Gg Ha4 La. Some of the witnesses having the nominative form 'loue' also have the second variant of the line the extra word 'this.' Of these, only La omits it. This variant distribution makes it impossible to decide which of the two lines is archetypal. The line as it appears in E1, however, could be the result of a repetition of the structure of the first part of the line, resulting in the removal of the *lectio difficilior* 'loues ypocrite' in favour of a more common expression.

### 6.3.1.2 *El against Hg*

Of the nine variants in which Cx2 agrees with El against Hg, eight are discussed below. The other --SQ 15-- can be found in the electronic appendix d, chapter 5, 6.3.1.2. In this set, variants in which Cx2 agrees with El have a common characteristic: on every occasion El and Cx2 agree with Gg.<sup>20</sup> The agreement between El and Gg is consistent with Robinson's suggestion that El is affiliated to his **E** group for part of the WBP and indicates a common ancestor below the archetype for these three witnesses in this set.

#### 6.3.1.2.1 Agreements of Cx2 with El and Gg Indicating an Ancestor below the Archetype

##### SQ 194

Base	Dyuerse	folk	dyuersely	han	demed
Cx1	Dyuerse	folk	diuersly		demedē
Cx2	Dyuerse	folk	dyuersly	they	demed <sup>h</sup>
Hg	Dyuerse	folk <sup>7</sup>	dyu <sup>s</sup> ely	han	demed
El	Diu <sup>s</sup> e	folk	, diuersely	they	demed

han ] Ad3 Bo2 Cp Dd Ds1 En1 Hg La  
 they ] Cx2 El Gg Ha4 Ht  
 not present ] Ch Cx1

##### SQ 231

Base	And	of	Achilles	,	for	his	queynte	sperē
Cx1	And <sup>h</sup>	of	Achilles		for	his	queynte	sperē
Cx2	And <sup>h</sup>	of	Achylles		wyth	hys	queynte	sperē
Hg	And	of	Achilles	,	for	his	queynte	sperē
El	And	of	Achilles	,	with	his	queynte	sperē

for ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Cx1 Dd Ds1 En1 Ha4 Hg Ht La  
 with ] Cx2 El Gg

<sup>20</sup> . Unfortunately, Gg is incomplete at this point. In folio 277r there are complete lines from 25 to 38, and in 277v from 67 to 76. SQ stops at 606. For this reason some lines cannot be collated and no conclusion can be drawn concerning Gg's affiliation.

SQ 290

Base	What	nedeth	yow	,	rehercen	hir	array
Cx1	What	nedith̄	you	to	reherce	here	aray
Cx2	What	nedyth	me	to	reherce	here	aray
Hg	What	nedeth	yow	,	rehercen	hir	array
El	What	nedeth	me		rehercen	hir̄	array

yow ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Dd Ds1 En1 Hg Ht  
 me ] Cx2 El Gg

SQ 419

Base	Of	shap	,	of	al	that	myghte	yrekened	be
Cx1	Of	s̄hap		of	al	that	myghte	rekened <sup>ð</sup>	be
Cx2	Of	shap		and <sup>ð</sup>	alle	that	myghte	rekened <sup>ð</sup>	be
Hg	Of	shaṽ	,	of	al	that	myghte	yrekened	be
El	Of	shaṽ	,	and	al	that	myghte	yrekened	be

of ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Cx1 Dd Ha4 Hg Ht La  
 and ] Cx2 El  
 and of ] Gg  
 not present] Ds1 En1

SQ 447

Base	Which		proeueth	wel	,	that	outher	Ire	or drede
Cx1	Whiche	that	preuyth̄	wel		that	other	Ire	or drede
Cx2	Whyche		preuyth	wel		that	othyr	loue	or drede
Hg	Which		proeueth	wel	,	þ <sup>t</sup>	outher	Ire	or drede
El	Which		proueth	wel	,	that	outher	loue	or drede

Ire ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Cx1 Dd Ds1 En1 Ha4 Hg Ht La  
 loue ] Cx2 El Gg

SQ 491

Base	☿	Ther	I	was	bred	,	allas	that	ilke	day
Cx1	[	There	y	was	bred <sup>ð</sup>		allas	that		day
Cx2	[	There	I	was	bred <sup>ð</sup>		allas	that	hard <sup>ð</sup>	day
Hg	☿	Ther	I	was	bred	,	allas	that	ilke	day
El	☿	That	I	was	bred	,	allas	that	harde	day

ilke ] Hg Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Dd Ds1 En1 Ha4 Hg Ht La  
 harde ] Cx2 El Gg  
 not present ] Cx1

SQ 502

SQ 502 after SQ 500: Hg

Out : La

Base	That	no wight	wolde	han	wend	,	he koude	feyne
Cx1	That	no wight	wolde	haue	wend <sup>ð</sup>		he coude	feyne
Cx2	That	I ne	coude	haue	wend <sup>ð</sup>		he coude	feyne
Hg	That	no wight	wolde	han	wend	,	he koude	feyne
El	That	I ne	koude	han	wend <sup>ð</sup>	,	he koude	feyne

no wight wolde ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Cx1 Dd Ds1 En1 Hg Ht  
I ne koude] Cx2 El Gg  
no wight wende ] Ha4

SQ 614

Out: Gg

Base	Thogh	he were	gentil	born	,	and	fressh	and	gay
Cx1	Thogh <sup>h</sup>	he were	gentil	born		and	fress <sup>h</sup>	and <sup>ð</sup>	gay
Cx2	Though	he were	genty <sup>l</sup>	born			fressh	and <sup>ð</sup>	gay
Hg	Thogh	he were	gentil	born	,	and	fress <sup>h</sup>	and	gay
El	Thogh <sup>h</sup>	he were	gentil	born	,		fress <sup>h</sup>	and	gay

and ] Ad3 Bo2 Cp Cx1 Dd En1 Hg Ht  
not present ] Cx2 El La

Among those collated El and Gg are the only witnesses to agree with Cx2 for lines SQ 231, SQ 290, SQ 419, SQ 447, SQ 491 and SQ 502. In SQ 194, we also find Ht and Ha4 supporting the reading 'they,' but this variant could be explained as memorial contamination, since a very similar structure is found in L2 3 --'Diuerse folk / diuersely they seyde.'

All the variants in lines SQ 231, SQ 290, SQ 419, SQ 447, SQ 491 and SQ 502 are metrically equivalent. It would be impossible to determine which of these are archetypal but for the fact that the majority of the witnesses align with Hg, including manuscripts which clearly have different lines of descent, such as Ad3 Cp and En1.

In SQ 614, Cx2 suppressed the conjunction 'and.' Other witnesses have two conjunctions and read 'and freesh and' as does Hg. Only El and La lack the first 'and' as does Cx2.

Of all these variants, the most striking is the one found in SQ 502, involving the substitution of the Hg reading present in Cx1 --'no wight wolde'-- for 'l ne koude,' found in Cx2 El and Gg. All the variants in which Cx2 agree with El and Gg against Hg and the rest of the collated witnesses in this set, seem to indicate a shared ancestor below the archetype for these.

The Cx2-Hg/El variants are of great interest in this set. When Cx2 agrees with Hg, the variants seem to be archetypal, even when there is no other evidence for them besides their manuscript distribution. On the other hand, El often appears related to Gg --Robinson's **E** group. In every instance in which Cx2 agrees with El, it shows this same **E** group affiliation.

### **6.3.2 Cx2-not-Hg/El Variants**

The Cx2-not-Hg/El variants clearly show that the majority of the agreements relate Cx2 to Dd Ds1 and En1, i.e. these are obviously variants that can be found in witnesses belonging to the **a** group. Six of the seven Cx2-not-Hg/El variants are discussed below. SQ 363 has been placed in the electronic appendix d, chapter 5, 6.3.2 since its variant distribution --Cx2 and En1 in agreement against the rest of the collated witnesses-- makes it appear the product of an agreement by coincidence.

6.3.2.1 Agreements of Cx2 with Dd Ds1 or En1 (a Group Manuscripts)

SQ 186

Base	Ther	with	so	horsly	,	and	so	quyk	of	eye
Cx1	Therwithñ	so	horsly			and <sup>ð</sup>	so	quyk	of	ye
Cx2	Therwyth	so	horsly			and <sup>ð</sup>	so	quyk	at	eye
Hg	Ther	with	so	horsly	,	and	so	quyk	of	eye
El	Ther	with	so	horsly	,	and	so	quyk	of	eye

of ] Cx1 Hg El Bo2 Ch Cx1 El Gg Ha4 Hg La  
 at ] Cx2 Dd Ds1 En1

SQ 394

Base	If	it	be	taryed	,	til	that		lust	be	cold
Cx1	If	it	be	taryed <sup>ð</sup>		til			lust	be	colde
Cx2	If	it	be	taryed <sup>ð</sup>		tyl	the		lust	be	colde
Hg	If	it	be	taryed	,	til	p <sup>t</sup>		lust	be	cold
El	If	it	be	taryed	,	til	that		lust	be	coold <sup>ð</sup>

that ] Bo2 Ch El Gg Hg  
 the ] Cx2 Dd Ds1 En1  
 that the ] Ad3  
 not present ] Cx1 Cp Ha4 Ht La

SQ 410

Base	And	with	hir	beek	hir	seluen	so	she	prighte	
Cx1	And <sup>ð</sup>	withñ	her	bek	her	self		she	pyght	
Cx2	And <sup>ð</sup>	wyth	her	bek	her	self		to	twyght	
Hg	And	with	hir	beek <sup>7</sup>	hir	seluen	so	she	prighte	
El	And	with	hir	beek	,	hir	seluen	so	she	prighte

she prighte ] Bo2 Ch El Gg Ha4 Hg  
 she plighte ] Ad3  
 to twyght ] Cx2 Ds1 En1  
 so twyght ] Dd  
 she pyght ] Cx1 Cp Ha4 Ht La

In lines SQ 186, SQ 394 and SQ 410 we have the same situation, Cx2 agrees with Dd, Ds1 and En1 against Hg and El. In SQ 186 we have a change of preposition 'at' for

'of,' and SQ 394 has 'the' for 'that.' Clearly, these variants have no metrical impact on the line and, because of their distribution, there is no reason to doubt that the archetypal readings are those present in Hg and El. SQ 410 has a very interesting variant: 'prighte' is supported by Hg El Ch Bo2 and Gg, 'twight' is supported by Cx2 Dd Ds1 and En1. Two further variants are 'plighte' in Ad3 and 'pighte' Cx1 Cp Ha4 Ht and La.

SQ 285

Base	The	vsshers	,	and	the	Squyers	,	been	ygon
Cx1	The	vsshers		and <sup>ð</sup>	the	squiers		ben	gon
Cx2	The	vsshers		and <sup>ð</sup>	the	squerye		ben	gon
Hg	The	vsshers	,	and	the	Squyers	,	been	ygon

Squyers ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Cx1 Ds1 El Gg Ha4 Hg La  
 squery ] Cx2 Dd En1  
 be quiers ] Ht

The affiliation for the variant in this line, where Cx2 reads 'squerye' is similar to the example in the previous group. Dd and En1 agree with Cx2, but in this case, Ds1 agrees with Cx1 in reading 'squiers.'

SQ 363

Base	And	in	hir	sleep	,	right	for	impressioun
Cx1	And <sup>ð</sup>	in	her	sleep	for	here		impression
Cx2	And <sup>ð</sup>	in	her	sleep		ryght	for	the impression
Hg	And	in	hir	sleep̄	,	right	for	imp <sup>3</sup> ssiō
El	And	in	hir <sup>?</sup>	sleep̄	,	riġht	for	impressiō

for ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Dd Ds1 El Gg Ha4 Hg Ht La  
 for the ] Cx2 En1  
 not present ] Cx1

In SQ 363 Cx2 has an added article. Because of the nature of this variant and because it is supported by a single manuscript --En1-- it is difficult to say whether there is a

real genetic relationship between Cx2 and En1. However, En1 appears in most of the Cx2-not-Hg/El variants, so for this reason we cannot completely ignore the agreement in this line.

### 6.3.2.2 Agreements of Cx2 and Ha4

The variants in SQ 263 and SQ 355 are ambiguous because they could have been the result of agreement by coincidence. They have been retained because they show agreements of Cx2 and Ha4 as these two witnesses might yet prove to be genetically related.

#### SQ 263

Base	That	it	is	lyk	,	an	heuene	for	to	heere
Cx1	That	it	is	lik		an	heuen	for	to	here
Cx2	That		is	lyk		an	heuen	forto		here
Hg	That	it	is	lyk	,	an	heuene	for	to	heere
El	That	it	is	,	lyk	an	heuene	for	to	heere

it ] Cx1 Hg El Ad3 Bo2 Ch Dd Ds1 En1 Gg Ht  
 not present ] Cx2 Cp Ha4 La

#### SQ 355

Base	For	of	hir	fader	,	hadde	she	take	leue
Cx1	For	of	her	fader		hadde	she	take	her leue
Cx2	For	of	her	fader		hath	she	take	her leue
Hg	For	of	hir	fader	,	hadde	she	take	leue
El	For	of	hir	fader	,	hadde	she	take	leue

hadde ] Ad3 Bo2Ch Cp Cx1 Dd Ds1 El En1 Gg Hg Ht La  
 hath ] Cx2 Ha4

The suppression of the personal pronoun 'it' on SQ 263, could be the result of a simple mistake. Only Cp Ha4 and La agree with Cx2. All the other manuscripts

include 'it.' The main interest here is that in SQ 355 Cx2 agrees again with Ha4, where both have the verbal tense 'hath' instead of 'hadde'.

## 7. SET 7: LINK 20<sup>21</sup>

### 7.1 Set Summary

Link 20 is determinant in the question of tale-order, since it names the next speaker and provides internal evidence which clarifies who is the speaker of the next tale. The link varies its function in the manuscripts by linking different tales, and Hg and El use it differently. In Hg, L20 is used to link SQ and the ME. In El it links SQ and the FK, as in Cx2. The link is present in 31 witnesses: Ad1 Ad3 Bw Cn Dl Ds El En1 En2 En3 Fi Gl Ha5 Hg Ht Ii Ld1 Ld2 Ln Ma Mg Mm Nl Ph3 Ps Pw Py Ra2 Ra3 Ry2 and, of course, Cx2. The collation for L20 includes all the witnesses.

The variants in this part of the text are important, not only to the textual tradition in the sense that they provide information of affiliation and descent, but also because they are intrinsically related to issues affecting the order of the tales.

Because this link is not present in Cx1, one can safely assume that it was probably set up directly from  $\omega$ . This would mean, if proven to be true, that we have a non-conflated text that came directly from Cx2's manuscript source. For this reason there are no extra lines in this set.

---

<sup>21</sup> The witnesses collated for L20 are: Ad1 Ad3 Bw Cn Cx2 Dl Ds El En1 En2 En3 Fi Gl Ha5 Hg Ht Ii Ld1 Ld2 Ln Ma Mg Mm Nl Ph3 Ps Pw Py Ra2 Ra3 Ry2.

### 7.3 Analysis of Word Additions, Deletions and Substitutions

The distribution of variants in L20 is as follows:

26 Cx2-O variants, which confirm the excellence of  $\omega$ .

4 Cx2-Unique variants, which are unique to Cx2.

3 Cx2-Hg/El variants, in which Cx2 agrees with El or Hg against the other. In this set all three variants are agreements between Cx2 and El against Hg.

Hg against El: 0

El against Hg: 3

4 Cx2-not-Hg/El variants, in which Cx2 agrees with another manuscript against both Hg and El.

#### 7.3.1 Cx2-Hg/El Variants

##### 7.3.1.1 Hg against El

There are no agreements of Cx2 with Hg against El in this set.

##### 7.3.1.2 El against Hg

###### 7.3.1.2.1 Archetypal Agreements of Cx2 and El

L20 3

Base	Quod	the	Marchant	consideryng	thy	youthe
Cx2	Quod	p <sup>e</sup>	frankeleyn	cōsideryng	thy	youthe
Hg	Quod	the	Marchant <sup>r</sup>	consideryng	thy	youthe
El	Quod	the	Frankleyn	consideryng	thy	yowthe

Marchant ] Bw Dl En2 Fi Gl Hg Ht li Ld2 Ln Mg Mm Nl Pw Py Ra2  
Ra3 Ry2

Frankeleyñ ] Ad1 Ad3 Cñ Cx2 Ds El En1 En3 Ha5 Ld1 Ma  
Ph3 Ps

L20 24

Base	What	Marchaunt	pardee	sire	wel	thow	woost
Cx2	What	frankeleyñ	parde	Syr	wel	thou	woost
Hg	What	Marchaūt	pardee	sire	wel	thow	woost
El	What	Frankeleyñ	pdee	sire	wel	thou	woostʀ

marchaunt ] Bw Dl Fi Gl Hg Ht li Ld2 Ln Mg Mm Nl Pw Py Ra2 Ra3  
Ry2  
Frankeleyñ ] Ad1 Ad3 Cñ Cx2 Ds El En1 En3 Ha5 Ld1 Ma

L20 27

Base	¢	That	knowe	I	wel	sire	quod	the	Marchant	certeyñ
Cx2	[	That	knowe	I	wel	sire	quod <sup>þ</sup>	thys	frankeleyñ	
Hg	¢	That	knowe	I	wel	sire	quod	the	Marchant	c <sup>2</sup> teyñ
El	¢	That	knowe	I	wel	sire	quod	the	Frankeleyñ	

marchaunt certeyñ ] Bw Dl Fi Gl Hg Ht li Ld2 Ln Mg Mm Nl Pw Py  
Ra2 Ra3 Ry2  
Frankeleyñ ] Ad1 Cñ Cx2 Ds El En1 En3 Ha5 Ma Ph3  
Frankeleyñ certeyñ ] Ad3 Ld1 Ps

All of these variants, in which Cx2 agrees with Hg against El, are in the reading 'Frankeleyñ' as opposed to 'Marchant.' This probably indicates that the readings in Hg are scribal in origin. This has been suggested by Helen Cooper (1995) and by Robinson (1999), among others. Their articles make clear that the Hg order of this section of the tales and its variants in L20 are scribal. Robinson also puts forward the theory that after the scribe copied Hg and altered the links to fit the new order, L20 itself was modified in O, thus giving rise to the appearance of these readings in the **d** group.

All the variants in Link 20 in which Cx2 agrees with El against Hg, are agreements in the reading 'Frankeleyñ.' The Hg readings --'Marchant' (L20 3),

'Marchaunt' (L20 24), 'Marchant certeyn' (L20 27)-- are of doubtful origin in Hg and probably, were the result of the scribe receiving the tales without the links and copying the tales in the order in which they appear in Hg --SQ, ME, FK. Later, the Hg scribe received the links and realised his mistake. At this point he decided to go ahead and changed the names in the links so they would agree with the tale order as he had copied it. The final result was the sequence SQ-L20-ME-L17-FK, as opposed to the El one ME-L17-SQ-L20-FK.

The variant 'Frankeleyn' in which Cx2 agrees with Hg against El appear to be very strong evidence that the order of the sequence ME-L17-SQ-L20-FK is archetypal to the tradition or, in other words, that it might have been the sequence in O --the origin of the tradition. I should also like to make it clear that this is not the sequence in Cx2, which instead has a doubtful L15-ME L8-SQ-L20-FK, with the Man of Law's Endlink as the Squire's Prologue.

### **7.3.2 Cx2-not-Hg/El Variants**

#### *7.3.2.1 Agreements of Cx2 with Ad3 in Variants below the Archetype*

L20 5

Base	As	to	my	doom	ther	is	noon	that	is	heere
Cx2	As	to	my	dome	ther	nys	none	that	is	here
Hg	As	to	my	doom	ther	is	noon	p'	is	heere
El	As	to	my	doom	ther	is	noon	that	is	heere

is ] Ad1 Ad3 Bw Cn Cx2 Dl Ds El En1 En2 En3 Fi Gl Ha5 Hg Ht li Ld1  
 Ld2 Ln Ma Mg Mm Nl Ph3 Ps Pw Py Ra2 Ra3 Ry2  
 ne is ] Ad3 Cx2 Ps

In L20 we find an agreement of Cx2 and Ad3 with Ps. On its own, this might appear unimportant. But in the context of many other agreements with Ad3, supports a possible common origin for this manuscript and ω.

L20 17

Base	For	he	to	vertu	lusteth	nat	entende
Cx2	For	he	to	vertu	lysteth	not	tendende
Hg	For	he	to	vertu	lusteth	nat	entende
El	For	he	to	vertu	listneth	nat	entende

nat ] Ad1 Ad3 Bw Cn Cx2 Dl Ds El En1 En3 Fi Gl Ha5 Hg Ht li Ld1  
 Ld2 Ma Mg Mm Nl Ph3 Ps Pw Py Ra2 Ra3 Ry2  
 nat to ] Ad1 Ad3 Cn Cx2 Ds En1 En3 Ht Ma Nl Ps Py Ra3  
 Ph3

Just as in L20 5, L20 17 has Cx2 in agreement with Ad3, but here we also find the reading supported by a group manuscripts. This addition might be the result of agreement by coincidence.

### 7.3.2.2 Ambiguous Variant

L20 18

Base	But	for	to	pleye	at	dees	and	to	despende
Cx2	But	for	to	pleye	at	dyse	and <sup>l</sup>	dyspende	
Hg	But	for	to	pleye	at	dees	and	to	despende
El	But	for	to	pleye	at	dees	and	to	despende
Ad3	But	for	to	pley	at	dys	and	to	dispende
Ds	But	for	to	pley	at	dys	and	dispende	
En1	But	for	to	pley	at	dys	and	dispende	

to ] Ad3 Bw El Gl Ha5 Hg Ld1 Ld2 Ln Mg Mm Nl Ph3 Ps Pw Ra2 Ra3  
 Ry2  
 not present ] Ad1 Cn Cx2 Dl Ds En1 En3 Fi Ht li Ma  
 lust<sup>r</sup> ] Py

In this case, we have what might be interpreted as an  $\alpha$  reading with Cx2 sharing the omission of 'to' with Ht, the  $\alpha$  manuscripts --Ad1 and En3--, and the **a** group manuscripts --Cn Ds En1 and Ma. The possible link between  $\alpha$  and  $\omega$  makes this variant potentially important. Its variant distribution suggests that it was transmitted from copy to copy, even though the presence or absence of 'to' before an infinitive could easily have been the result of an accident, probably how it came to be omitted from Fi.

## **8. SET 8: THE FRANKLIN'S TALE<sup>22</sup>**

### **8.1 Set Summary**

The major variants in this set follow the overall structure of previous sets in which Cx2 substitutes variant lines with their regular counterparts. But the two major groups of additions --FK 746-1 to 746-2 and FK 782-1 to 782-6-- are lines which Cx2 shares with E1 and Ad3, and are the only two other witnesses that have them. Once more, a strong genetic relationship between Cx2 and Ad3 is suggested by their frequent agreements. This is an important agreement because these lines have all the characteristics of Chaucer's writing and might have been written by him.

The number of Cx2-Hg/E1 and Cx2-not-Hg/E1 variants is very small in this set. There is only one variant in which Cx2 agrees with E1 against Hg, and there are 10 Cx2-not-Hg/E1 variants. Of these ten variants, three --FK 499, FK 506 and FK

663-- are words which have been omitted in Cx2, and their agreement with other witnesses seems to be an agreement by coincidence. The fact that a relatively long stretch of text presents so few variants in comparison with the text of the other sets remains to be explained. That there is only one Cx2-Hg/EI variant, is especially interesting.

## 8.2 Analysis of Variant Lines

### 8.2.1 Line Substitutions:

All the line substitutions in this set are cases of variant or additional lines which have been replaced by their archetypal counterparts. A list of all substitutions follows. The variants within the line are analysed below.

133a FK Cx1 And<sup>h</sup> thus they her sorowes for to slake  
133 FK Cx2 Her frendes saw here sorowes gan for to slake

267a FK Cx1 For as wisly as god<sup>h</sup> my sowle saue  
267 FK Cx2 For wyth a word<sup>h</sup> ye may me sleen

274a FK Cx1 ðe neuer vnderstode I your entent  
274 FK Cx2 But now Aurelye I knowe your entent

322a FK Cx1 And<sup>h</sup> his prayer made first to the sonne  
322 FK Cx2 Vnto the goddis and<sup>h</sup> first vnto the sonne

328a FK Cx1 Therefore my lord<sup>h</sup> cast ye your ye  
328 FK Cx2 Lord<sup>h</sup> phebus cast thy mercyable eye

422a FK Cx1 And<sup>h</sup> of many dyuers coniuracions

---

<sup>22</sup> The witnesses collated for FK are: Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bo2 Bw Ch Cn Cp Cx1 Cx2 Dd Dl Ds El En1 En2 En3 Fi Gg G1 Ha1 Ha2 Ha3 Ha4 Ha5 He Hg Hk Ht Ii La Lc Ld1 Ld2 Ln Ma Mg Mm Ne Nl Ph2 Ph3 Pl Pn Ps Pw Py Ra3 Ry1 Ry2 Se S11 S12 Tc1 Tc2 To1 Wy.

422 FK Cx2 Touchyng<sup>7</sup> the eyght and<sup>o</sup> twenty mancions

546a FK Cx1 And<sup>o</sup> aftir this ale bothe good<sup>o</sup> and<sup>o</sup> fyn

546 FK Cx2 Byforn hym stant braun of þ<sup>e</sup> tuskyd<sup>o</sup> swyne

Lines FK 56, 267, 274, 328, 422, and 546, are archetypal, and their text is as good as that of any other witness. FK 133 is different in as much as it has the phrase 'for to slake,' where the majority of the witnesses have 'to slake.' Only three witnesses agree with Cx2: D1 Ii and Mm. But the construction 'for' plus the infinitive seems sufficiently common for this agreement to be an agreement by coincidence.

### ***8.2.2. Line Additions***

Among the line additions we find that FK 56, 291, 292, 549-554 and 754 are archetypal, and their text is as good as that in any of the very best witnesses. The variants within the line are discussed below:

56 FK Cx2 Loue wyl not be constreyne<sup>o</sup> by maystrye

291FK Cx2 Is there none other grace in you quod<sup>o</sup> he

292 FK Cx2 No by that lord<sup>o</sup> quod<sup>o</sup> she that make me

549 FK Cx2 Doth to hys mayster chere and<sup>o</sup> reuerence

550 FK Cx2 And<sup>o</sup> prayeth hym to doon hys dyligence

551 FK Cx2 To brynge hym out of hys peynes smert

552 FK Cx2 Or wyth a swer<sup>o</sup> that he wold<sup>o</sup> slyt hys hert

553 FK Cx2 Thys subtil clerk / suche routhe had of this man

554 FK Cx2 That nyght 7 day he spedde hym that he can

746-1 FK Cx2 The same thyng<sup>7</sup> I saye of belyea

746-2 FK Cx2 Of Rodogone and<sup>o</sup> eke valeria

753 FK Cx2 Alas quod<sup>h</sup> she that euer I was born  
754 FK Cx2 Thus haue I said quod she thus haue I sworn

782-1 FK Cx2 Per auenture an heepe of you ywys  
782-2 FK Cx2 Wyl holden hym a lew<sup>o</sup> man in thys

782-3 FK Cx2 That he wyl put hys wyf in leopardye



782-5 FK Cx2 She may haue better fortune than you semeth  
 782-6 FK Cx2 And<sup>ð</sup> whan that ye han herd<sup>ð</sup> the tale demeth

Line FK 753 is interesting in as much as the witnesses are divided as to the position of the words 'I' and 'was.'

FK 753

Out: Cx1 Ha3 He ðe

Base	☿	Allas	quod	she	that	euere	was	I	born
Cx2		Alas	quod <sup>ð</sup>	she	that	euer	I	was	born
El	☿	Allas	quod	she	that	eu'e	I	was	born
Hg	☿	Allas	quod	she	þ <sup>t</sup>	eu'e	was	I	born

was I ] Ad1 Bo1 Bo2 Bw Cn Cp Dd En2 En3 Fi Gg Ha2 Ha4 Hg Ht La  
 Ld1 Ld2 Ma Mm ðl Ph2 Pw Ry1 Ry2

I was ] Ad3 Ch Cx2 Dl Ds El En1 Gl Hk li Lc Ln Mg Ps Py Ra3

I was I ] Ha5

Cx2 agrees with El against Hg and are supported by Ad3 Ch Dl Ds En1 Gl Hk li Lc Ln Mg Ps Py Ra3, although this kind of variant, which is just an alteration in the word order, may have arisen by chance.

There are two passages in this set in which Cx2 agrees with only two manuscripts. These passages --FK 746-1 to 746-2 and FK 782-1 to 782-6-- are also found in El and Ad3. There are two lines in which the witnesses disagree.

FK 782-3

Base	That	he	wol	putte	his	wyf	in	luptie
Cx2	That	he	wyl	put	hys	wyf	in	leopardye
El	That	he	wol	putte	his	wyf	in	luptie
Ad3	That	he	wol	put	his	wif	in	luptie

The variant 'luptie,' shared by E1 and Ad3, seems a less likely possibility than 'leopardye' which would make more sense in the context of the line. There are no more witnesses to this line making it difficult to know which variant is archetypal, but the fact that the line has a variant could indicate a close genetic relationship between these witnesses.

FK 782-4

Base	Herkneth	the tale	er ye vp	on hi <sup>ƿ</sup>	crie
Cx2	Herkeneth	the tale	or ye	on hym	crye
E1	Herkneth	the tale	er ye vp	on hi <sup>ƿ</sup>	crie
Ad3	Herkeneth	the tale	er ye vpon	hir	crie

In FK 782-4 we find another variant, but this could be due to chance rather than to  $\omega$ . Cx2 has the reading 'on' where Ad3 and E1 have 'vpon.' Because prepositions are often changed by scribes, this might not be significant. The second variant in the line --Cx2's 'hym,' E1 and Ad3's 'hir'-- may be a mistake by the Cx2 compositor since here the text seems to require the feminine form. This could just be the result of following the masculine pronouns of the preceding lines.

### ***8.2.3 Line Deletions***

The only deletion in this set is FK 54-1, a non-archetypal line which formed a couplet with FK 55a – a line retained in Cx2. The addition of FK 56 in Cx2 completes the couplet in this text.

54-1 FK Cx1 In loue and<sup>b</sup> forbere eche other nedely

### 8.2.4 Line Misplacements

The misplacements in this set involve the inversion of a couplet. The lines have been restored to their archetypal order in Cx2.

122 FK Cx1 Men mowe so longe graue in a stoon  
121 FK Cx1 Be processe as ye knowen euerichon

121 FK Cx2 By processe as ye knowen euerychon  
122 FK Cx2 Men mowe so longe graue in a stoon

268 FK Cx1 Here at your feet god<sup>ð</sup> wolde I were begraue  
267a FK Cx1 For as wisly as god<sup>ð</sup> my sowle saue

267 FK Cx2 For wyth a word<sup>ð</sup> ye may me sleen or saue  
268 FK Cx2 Here at your feet god<sup>ð</sup> wold<sup>ð</sup> I were begraue

419 FK Cx1 Al were he there to lerne another craft  
420 FK Cx1 Had<sup>ð</sup> priuely vp on his deske laft

420 FK Cx2 Had<sup>ð</sup> pryuely vp on hys deske laft  
419 FK Cx2 Al were he there to lerne another craft

### 8.3 Analysis of Word Additions, Deletions and Substitutions

The variant distribution for this group is as follows:

179 Cx2-O variants, which confirm the excellence of ω.

7 Cx2-Unique variants, which are unique to Cx2 in the current collation.

1 Cx2-Hg/El variants, in which Cx2 agrees with El or Hg against the other.

El against Hg: 1

10 Cx2-not-Hg/El variants, in which Cx2 agrees with another manuscript against both Hg and El.

### 8.3.1 Cx2-Hg/El Variants

The only variant in this set is an agreement of Cx2 and El against Hg. It is remarkable that Cx2 and El are the only two witnesses to present it, and even more so since all the manuscripts have been collated for this set.

#### 8.3.1.1 Hg against El

There are no variants of Hg against El in this set.

#### 8.3.1.2 El against Hg

There is only one variant in this set in which Cx2 agrees with El against Hg. This is likely to be a non-archetypal variant.

FK 576

FK 576 after FK 574: Cn

Out: Ha1

Base	Ful	subtilly	he	kalkuled	al	this
Cx1	Ful	subtilly	he	calked <sup>ð</sup>	al	this
Cx2	Ful	subtylly	he had <sup>ð</sup>	calked <sup>ð</sup>	alle	thys
El	Ful	subtilly	he hadde	kalkuled	al	this
Hg	Ful	subtilly	he	kalkuled	al	this

he] Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bo2 Bw Ch Cn Cp Dd Dl Ds El En1 En2 En3 Fi Gg  
Gl Ha2 Ha4 Ha5 Hg Hk Ht li La Lc Ld1 Ld2 Ln Ma Mg Mm Nl Ph2 Ps  
Pw Py Ra3 Ry1 Ry2  
he hadde ] Cx2 El

Only two witnesses have added the verb 'hadde' in FK 576: Cx2 and El, and not even Gg, a manuscript that has the tendency to follow El in this kind of agreement against Hg, supports this reading. This is an easy mistake to make, but one wonders whether this odd agreement could possibly have anything to do with a genetic relationship.

### 8.3.2 Cx2-not-Hg/El Variants

The ten Cx2-not-Hg/El variants are likely to be the result of an agreement by coincidence. Three of these --FK 315, FK 698, and FK 812-- have been retained here and analysed. The other seven --FK 158, FK 231, FK 499, FK 506, FK 632, FK 663 and FK 798-- can be found in the electronic appendix d, chapter 5, 8.3.2.

#### 8.3.2.1 Ambiguous Variant

FK 812

FK 812 after FK 808: Bw En3 Py

Base	To	yow	and	eek	I	se	wel	youre	distresse
Cx1	To	you	and <sup>b</sup>	eke	I	se		your	distres
Cx2	To	you	and <sup>b</sup>	eke	I	se		your grete	dystres
Hg	To	yow	and	eek	I	se	wel	youre	distresse
El	To	yow	and	eek	I	se	wel	you <sup>r</sup>	distresse

youre ] Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bo2 Bw Ch Cn Cp Cx1 Ds1 DI El En1 En2 En3  
Fi Gg Gl Ha2 Ha3 Ha4 Ha5 He Hk Hg Ht La Lc Ld1 Ld2 Ln Ma Mg  
Mm Ph2 Pw Py Ra3 Ry1 Ry2  
your grete ] Ch Cx2 li  
you ] ŋe

Both Cx2 and Ch in FK 812 have added the adjective 'greet.' Although the variant is not present in any other witness, the frequent agreement between Cx2 and Ch does not allow us discard the possibility of this being due to a genetic relationship.

#### 8.3.2.2 Likely Agreements by Coincidence

FK 315

FK 315 after FK 316: li

Base	Hym	semed	that	he	felte	his	herte	colde
------	-----	-------	------	----	-------	-----	-------	-------

Cx1	He	saiþñ	that	he	felith	his	herte	colde <sup>ð</sup>
Cx2	Hym	semeth	that	he	felyth	hys	herte	colde <sup>ð</sup>
Hg	Hym	semed	that	he	felte	his	herte	colde
El	Hym	semed	that	he	felte	his	herte	colde

semed ] Ad1 Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cn Cp Dd El En1 En3 Fi Gg Gl Ha1 Hk Hg  
 Ht La Ld1 Ln Ma Nl Ph2 Ph3 Ps Pw Py Ra3  
 semeth ] Bw Bo1 Cp Cx2 Dl Ds1 En2 Ha2 Ha5 La Lc Ld1  
 Ld2 Ln Mg Ph2 Pw Ry1 Ry2  
 seith ] Cx1 Ha3 He li Ne

FK 315 has an element in common with FK 231: Cx2's variant is the archetypal verb, but not in the tense of Hg and El. Cx2 has 'semeth,' a reading supported by Bo1 Bw Cp Ds Dl En2 Ha2 Ha5 La Ld1 Ln Ph2 Pw and Ry1, that is basically **c** and **d** and some others. Hg has the preterite 'semed<sup>ð</sup>' also found in Ad1 Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cn Dd El En1 En3 Fi Gl Gg Ha1 Hk Hg Ht Ma Nl Ph3 Ps Py Ra3. Because this reading is found in Hg and El and also in witnesses that usually align with Cx2, one can assume that the preterite is the archetypal form.

FK 698

FK 698 after FK 696: Ha1

Base	At	Rome	whan	she	oppressed	was
Cx1	At	Rome	for	she	oppressid <sup>ð</sup>	was
Cx2	At	Rome	for that	she	oppressid <sup>ð</sup>	was
Hg	At	Rome	whan	she	opp <sup>ð</sup> ssed	was
El	At	Rome	whan	she	opp <sup>ð</sup> ssed	was

whan ] Ad1 Ad3 Bo2 Bw Ch Cn Dd Ds El En1 En3 Gg Ha4 Ha5 Hg Ht  
 Ma Py

there ] Bo1 Cp Dl En2 Fi Ha2 La Lc Ld1 Ld2 Ln Mg Mm Ph3  
 Pw Ry2 Ra3 Ry1

for ] Cx1 Ha3 He li Ne

for that ] Cx2 Ha1 Hk

whan that ] Ha5

the ] Gl

Three witnesses, Ha1 Ha5 and Hk, agree with Cx2 in adding a pleonastic 'that.' This might be an attempt to make the line metrically more regular and, if so, it could be the result of agreement by coincidence, since anyone could have added the word. Ha5, which usually forms a pair with Ad3, does not agree with it in this instance and might indicate of the non-genetic origin of the variant.

**9. SET 9: THE WIFE OF BATH'S PROLOGUE, THE WIFE OF BATH'S TALE, LINK 10, THE FRIAR'S TALE, LINK 11, AND THE SUMMONER'S TALE<sup>23</sup>**

**9.1 Set Summary**

In general, the variants in which Cx2 agrees with Hg against El are additions that affect the metre of the line. When these variants do not have a metrical effect, they make evident their archetypal character. For example see WBP 484.

Among the Cx2-not-Hg/El variants a fairly consistent agreement exists between Cx2 Ch and Ad3, sometimes joined with Ha4.

Two remarkable variants in this set are FR 268 and SU 388 in which Cx2 and other witnesses appear to preserve the archetypal reading against Hg and El.

---

<sup>23</sup> The witnesses collated for WBP are: Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bo2 Bw Ch Cn Cp Cx1 Cx2 Dd Dl Ds El En1 En2 En3 Fi Gg Gl Ha2 Ha4 Ha5 He Hg Hk Ht Ii La Lc Ld1 Ld2 Ln Ma Mc Mg Mm Ne Nl Ph2 Ph3 Pn Ps Pw Py Ra1 Ra2 Ra3 Ry1 Ry2 Se Si S11 S12 Tc1 Tc2 To Wy. The witnesses collated for WBT are: Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Cx1 Cx2 Dd Ds El En1 Gg Ha4 Hg Ht La. The witnesses collated for L10 are: Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Cx1 Cx2 Dd Ds El En1 Ha4 Hg Ht La Ra3. The witnesses collated for FR are: Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Cx1 Cx2 Dd Ds El En1 Gg Ha4 Hg Ht La Ra3. The witnesses collated for L11 are: Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Cx1 Cx2 Dd Ds El En1 Ha4 Hg Ht La Ra3. The witnesses collated for SU are: Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Cx1 Cx2 Dd Ds El En1 Gg Ha4 Hg Ht La.

## 9.2 Analysis of Variant Lines

### 9.2.1 Line Substitutions

The line substitutions in this set are replacements of non-archetypal lines in Cx1 for archetypal lines in Cx2

WBP 381a Cx1 And<sup>ð</sup> of other thinges both<sup>n</sup> more and<sup>ð</sup> lesse  
WBP 381 Cx2 That thus they sayden in theyr dronkenesse

SU 310a Cx1 Whiche hasty was in Iugement algate  
SU 310 Cx2 As sayth seneke , that duryng<sup>7</sup> his astate

SU 522-1 Cx1 That a fart sholde be departid<sup>ð</sup> now  
SU 521 Cx2 Who euer herd<sup>ð</sup> of such<sup>n</sup> a thyng<sup>7</sup> or now

SU 546a Cx1 Right here before you sittyn<sup>7</sup> in a chaire  
SU 546 Cx2 Wythout wynde or perturbyng<sup>7</sup> of ayer

There are four line substitutions in set 9. Of these, SU 310 and SU 546 are mere substitutions of non-archetypal for archetypal lines, but SU 521 is much more interesting; since, Cx2 agrees with Hg and the **O** manuscripts against El.

### 9.2.2 Line Additions

WBP 197 Cx2 The thre men were good<sup>ð</sup> and<sup>ð</sup> riche and<sup>ð</sup> old<sup>ð</sup>

WBT 1165 Cx2 Iuuenal spekyth therof ful meryly

FR 227 Cx2 My trouthe wyll I hold<sup>ð</sup> to the my brother  
FR 228 Cx2 As I am sworn and<sup>ð</sup> eche of vs tyl other  
FR 229 Cx2 For to be trewe brother in thys caas  
FR 230 Cx2 And<sup>ð</sup> bothe we goon aboute our purchas

Line WBP 197 is not present in Cx1, and it is also missing in He, Ne, and Tc2 --the other **b** group manuscripts. The line in Cx2 agrees with both Hg and El, and with the majority of the manuscripts. Its addition only confirms that  $\omega$  had an archetypal line.

As was the case with line WBP 197, line WBP 381 is missing in He, Ne, Tc2, and in Se. It is present in the majority of the manuscripts and is also archetypal.

A very interesting line in this set is WBT 1165, where Cx2 has a variant that differs from Hg and El:

WBT 1165

Out: Cx1

Base luuenal seith / of pouerte myrily

Cx2 luuenal spekyth therof ful meryly

Hg luuenal seith / of pouerte myrily

El luuenal / seith of pou<sup>r</sup>te myrily

seith ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp El Gg Hg Ht La

spekyth ] Cx2 Dd

of pouerte ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp DdEl Gg Hg Ht La

therof ful ] Cx2

None of the collated witnesses shares the variant in Cx2 --'threof ful' instead of 'of pouerte'-- and it would be interesting to know whether any other fifteenth century witness supports it.

The four lines that have been added in FR 227-230 are additions that were not present in Cx1. Presumably they must come directly from  $\omega$ , which makes them very interesting. In general, these lines are consistent with the majority of the early manuscripts. Cx2 agrees with Hg and El and the **O** manuscripts. There is one variant,

however, in line FR 227 where Cx2 agrees with Hg against El. Lines FR 227 to FR 230 are the only example in this set where added lines do not replace other lines.

FR 227

Out: Cx1

Base My trouthe wol I holde , to thee my brother

Cx2 My trouthe wyll I hold<sup>ð</sup> to the my brother

Hg My trouthe wol I holde , to thee my brother

El My trouthe wol I holde , to my brother

to thee ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cx2 Dd Ds En1 Ha4 Hg Ht Ra3

to ] Cp El Gg La

This is an example of four lines, in this set, that were taken directly from  $\omega$ . Here Cx2 and Hg agree against El. Only two manuscripts --Cp and La-- support El in suppressing 'thee', all other manuscripts agree with the Hg reading.

### 9.2.3 Line Deletions

There are only two deletions in this set. WBP 332-2 is present in Cx1 Ii Ld1 Ry1 Se Tc2. WBP 332-1 is present in Cx1 Ne He.

WBP 332-1 Cx1 Be thow neuyr wrot<sup>h</sup> for myn instrument

WBP 332-2 Cx1 Though it be somtyme to a good<sup>ð</sup> felaw lent

### 9.2.4 Line Misplacements

In Cx1 WBP 510 follows WBP 536. In Cx2 it follows WBP 509 and precedes WBP 511. There is another case of reordering in lines WBT 900 and WBT 901, which appear transposed in Cx1 --where WBT 901 immediately precedes WBT 900. In Cx2 the order has been changed to follow that in Hg and El.

### *9.3. Analysis of Word Additions, Deletions and Substitutions*

The variant distribution for this group is as follows:

277 Cx2-O variants, which confirm the excellence of  $\omega$ . These are distributed as 108 in WBP, 48 in WBT, 1 in L10, 41 in FR, 12 in L11, 67 in SU.

40 Cx2-Unique variants, which are unique to Cx2 in the current collation. These are distributed as 13 in WBP, 8 in WBT, 1 in L10, 6 in FR, 2 in L11, 10 in SU.

14 Cx2-Hg/El variants, in which Cx2 agrees with El or Hg against the other. These are distributed as 7 in WBP, 3 in WBT, none in L10, 1 in FR, none in L11, 3 in SU.

Hg against El: 10

El against Hg: 4

27 Cx2-not-Hg/El variants, in which Cx2 agrees with another manuscript against both Hg and El. These are distributed as 12 in WBP, 3 in WBT, none in L10, 5 in FR, none in L11, 7 in SU.

#### ***9.3.1 Cx2-Hg/El Variants***

The 14 Cx2-Hg/El variants require closer examination since they are of the utmost importance --as are the Cx2-not-Hg/El variants-- to determine the affiliation of  $\omega$ . In four of these fifteen variants Cx2 agrees with El against Hg, these are lines WBP 46, WBP 316, WBP 604-1, WBT 862, and SU 527. In the other ten, lines WBP 58, WBP 210, WBP 457, WBP 484, WBT 1002, WBT 1015, FR 140, FR 227, SU 473, and SU 532, it agrees with Hg against El.

##### *9.3.1.1 Hg against El*

Of the ten variants in which Hg agrees with Cx2 against El, two --SU 473 and SU 532-- have been placed in the electronic appendix d, chapter 5, 9.3.1.1 since they are likely to be archetypal. The rest of the variants --WBP 58, WBP 210, WBP 457, WBP 484, WBT 862, WBT 1002, WBT 1015 and FR 140-- are discussed below. As in other variants in which Cx2 agrees with Hg, the majority of these seem to be archetypal, although, WBP 484 differs by showing an agreement with Ad3 Ch Ad1 and Hk. This is peculiar in as much as the reading 'troce' is clearly nonsensical, but was possibly present in O. See the discussion below.

Among all the Cx2-Hg/El variants in the two, probably most important ones 'troce/ croce' and 'sith/ sothe,' Cx2 is divided in its agreement. In the former, Cx2 agrees with Hg; in the latter with El. Robinson makes a detailed analysis of the origin of the added passages and suggests that these passages might have been in  $\omega$  and that  $\alpha$  and  $\omega$  might be one and the same (1997, 124). Robinson's evidence lies in the number of corrections found in the 'added passages' indicating that  $\omega$  probably contained them.

#### 9.3.1.1.1 Likely Archetypal Variants

WBP 58

Base And many another holy man also

Cx1 And<sup>b</sup> meny another man also

Cx2 And<sup>b</sup> meny another holy man also

Hg And many another holy man also

El And many another man also

holy ] Ad1Ad3 Bo1Bw Ch Cn Cp Cx2 Dd Dl En2 En3 Fi Gl Ha2 Ha4

Hg Hk Ht La Lc Ld1 Ld2 Ma Mc Mg Mm Nl Ph2 Ph3 Pw Py Ra1 Ra2

Ry2 To Wy

not present ] Bo2 Cx1 Ds El li Ln ñe Ra3 Se Si Sl2 Tc1 Tc2

WBP 210

Base	To	gete	hir	loue	ye	ther	as	she	hath	noon
Cx1	To	gete	her	loue		there		she	hath	noon
Cx2	To	gete	her	loue	ye	there		she	hath	noon
Hg	To	gete	hir	loue	ye	ther	as	she	hath	noon
El	To	gete	hir	loue		ther	as	she	hath	noon

ye ] Ad3 Bo2 Bw Ch Cx2 Fi Ha2 Ha5 Hg Ht La Lc Ld2 Ln Mg Pw  
Ra3 Ry2 Se Sl2 Tc1 To Wy

not present ] Ad1 Bo1 Cx1 Dd Dl Ds El En3 Gg Gl Ha4 Hk li  
Ld1 Ma Mc Ne ñl Ph2 Ph3 Ps Py Ra1 Ra2 Ry1 Si Tc2

These two variants follow the same pattern. In Hg there is a word that makes the line metrically longer. In line 58, Cx2 has added the word 'holy', agreeing with Hg against El. With the addition of this word the line becomes decasyllabic, and most of the early manuscripts agree with this reading. The **b** manuscripts lack this reading, as does Cx1. As does line 58, line 210 has a word --'ye'-- that makes a difference in the number of syllables in the line. Again, Cx2 and Hg agree against El and other manuscripts -- Cx1 Dd Ds Ad1 Bo1 Dl En3 Gl Hk li Ne Ph2 Ph3 Ps Py Ra1 Ra2 Tc2-- , which include the **b** group and some of the **O** manuscripts.

WBP 457

Base	How	koude	I	daunce	to	an	harpe	smale
Cx1	Wel	coude	he	daunce		and	harpe	smale
Cx2	How	coude	I	daunce	vnto	an	harp	smale
Hg	How	koude	I	daunce	to	an	harpe	smale
El	Wel	koude	I	daunce	to	an	harpe	smale

How ] Ad3 Bw Ch Cx2 Ha4 Ha5 Hg Ht Lc Ld2 Ln Mg Ry2 Wy  
Wel ] Bo1 Cn Cx1 Ds El En3 Gg He Hk Ma Ne Ph2 Se Si Tc2  
Tho ] Dd Ra2  
I ] Gl Tc1 Ra3  
Lorde howe ] Cp En2 Ha2 Mm ñl La Ld1 Ry1 Sl2 To

This variant, 'Wel' for 'How,' seems much more meaningful than the two preceding it, since it is a substitution rather than an addition or deletion. In this line Hg and Cx2 agree with Ad3 Bw Ch Ha4 Ha5 Ht Lc Ld2 Ln Mg Ry2 Wy. Some of the **O** manuscripts -- Ad3 Ch Ha4 Ha5-- and Robinson's **F** group --Bw Ld2 Ln Ry2-- agree with the reading, and more significant is the fact that Ch and Ha4 are part of this agreement. The reading 'Wel' is shared by manuscripts belonging to different groups: Bo1 Ph2 and Gg --**E** group--, Cx1 He Ne Tc2 --**b** group--, Cn Ma Ds --**a** group--, and El and En3, the only **O** manuscripts that share this reading.

WBT 1002

Base	Assembled	been	,	this	answere	for	to	here
Cx1	Assembled <sup>ð</sup>	ben		his	answer	for	to	here
Cx2	Assembled <sup>ð</sup>	been		this	answer	for	to	here
Hg	Assembled	been	,	this	answere	for	to	here
El	Assembled	been	,	his	answere	for	to	heere

this ] Cx2 Hg Ht

his ] Ad3 Ch Cp Cx1 Dd Ds El En1 Gg Ha4 La

This variant might be a mistake shared by Hg and Cx2 --and also found in Ht. All the other manuscripts collated for this reading agree with El. However, it is also notable that both readings --'his' or 'this'-- make equal sense and neither alters the metre of the line.

WBT 1015

Base	Dooth	as	yow	list	I	am	here	at	youre	wille
Cx1	Dot <sup>h</sup>	as	you	list	I	am		at	your	wylle
Cx2	Doth	as	you	list	I	am	here	at	your	wylle
Hg	Dooth	as	yow	list <sup>7</sup>	I	am	here	at	youre	wille
El	Dooth	as	yow	list <sup>7</sup>	I	am		at	youre	wille

here ] Ad3 Ch Cp Cx2 Dd Hg Ha4 Ht La  
 not present ] Bo2 Cx1 Ds El En1 Gg

In contrast to WBT 1002, WBT 1015 has a variant that greatly affects the metre of the line. Cx2 has added the word 'here', in agreement with Hg Ad3 Ch Dd La Cp Ha4 and Ht. The word is not present in El, and this is supported only by Bo2 Ds En1 and Cx1. The absence of the word makes the line one syllable too short. Independently of the metre, the variant distribution suggests that the reading in Cx2 and Hg is likely to be archetypal.

FR 140  
 Base Ꝛe of swiche lapes , wol I nat be shryuen  
 Cx1 Of suche iapis wol I not be shryuyn  
 Cx2 Ꝛe of suche lapis wol I not be shryuyn  
 Hg Ꝛe of swiche lapes , wol I nat be shryuen  
 El Ꝛor of swiche lapes , wol I nat be shryuen

Ꝛe ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cx2 Dd Ds En1 Gg Ha4 Hg Ht Ra3  
 Ꝛor ] El  
 Of ] Cp Cx1 La

In the current collation, El has a unique variant in FR 140. It is not surprising that the addition of 'Ꝛe' at the beginning of the line in Cx2 agrees with Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cx2 Dd Ds En1 Gg Ha4 Hg Ht and Ra3.

#### 9.3.1.1.2 Variants of Ambiguous Character

WBP 484  
 Base I made hym of the same wode a troce  
 Cx1 I made hym of the same wode a croce  
 Cx2 I made hym of the same wode a troce  
 Hg I made hym of the same wode a troce  
 El I made hym of the same wode a croce

troce ] Cx2 Hg Ad3 Ch Ad1 Hk Pn Wy  
 croce ] Bo1 Bo2 Bw Cn Cp Cx1 Dd Ds Dl El En3 Fi Gg Gl Ha2  
 Ha4 Ha5 He Ht li La Lc Ld1 Ld2 Ln Ma Mg Mm Ne Nl Ph2  
 Ph3 Ps Py Ry1 Ry2 Si Se Tc1 Tc2 To  
 hood ] Mc Ra1  
 groce ] Ra3  
 cote ] Ra2

The reading "troce" is nonsensical, but is shared by several witnesses --Cx2 Hg Ad3 Ch Ad1 Hk Pn Wy-- five of them belong to Robinson's **O** manuscripts, the other three being the incunabula --all of them ultimately based on Cx2. This particular variant is of extreme importance for Cx2, since it shows an obvious relation with the **O** manuscripts. Robinson (103) suggests that this reading originated in an error that was present in O itself, i.e. in the origin of the tradition. However, because of the character of this variant it is difficult to decide whether the reading is archetypal or was introduced below the archetype.

WBT 862

Base	By verray force	/	he rafte	hir	maydenhed
Cx1	Be verray force		byrefte her	her	maydenhed <sup>ð</sup>
Cx2	By verray force		he byrefte her		maydenhed <sup>ð</sup>
Hg	By verray force	/	he rafte	hir	maydenhed
El	By verray force	/	birafte	hir <sup>ʰ</sup>	maydenhed

he rafte hir ] Bo2 Cp Ds En1 Hg Ht  
 by rafte [add]he[/add] hir ] Gg  
 birafte hir ] Ad3 Ch Dd El Ha4  
 he birafte hir ] Cx2  
 he rafte hir hir ] La  
 byrefte hir hir ] Cx1

Exceptionally both versions, that of Hg and that of El, are metrically equivalent. In Hg we have 'he rafte' which El substitutes by 'birafte.' There is an obvious variant in the verb: 'birafte' and 'rafte', which are synonymous. Cx2 has

added 'he' as in the Hg reading. Several manuscripts have agree with Hg and Cx2 in having the reading 'he' Cp Ds En1 Ht and La, some of those same manuscripts --Ds En1 La Ht -- also agree with Hg in the reading 'rafte,' but Ad3 Ch Dd and Gg agree with El in the reading 'birafte.' Probably  $\omega$  had 'he rafte' just as does Hg, but that either Caxton did not realise and did not add both corrections or that the compositor overlooked Caxton's instructions to include it. The result is that Cx2 has a line that is not metrical, and it is very difficult to decide if whether or which of the variants was present in the archetype.

In general it seems that when Cx2 agrees with Hg this is usually in lines where Hg seems to have a better reading than that in El. However, in the cases in which Cx2 agrees with El we are confronted with more ambiguous readings.

### 9.3.1.2 El against Hg

The variants in which El agrees with Cx2 against Hg are unusual in as much as they do not show the consistent affiliations with Gg found in previous sets.

#### 9.3.1.2.1 Likely Archetypal Variants

WBP 604-1

after WBP 598-2: li

Out: Hg Ad3 Bw Cp Ad1 Bo1 Bo2 Dl Ha4 Ht La Ra3 En3 Fi Gl Ha5 Hk

Lc Ld2 Ln Mc Mg Mm Nl Ph2 Ph3 Ps Pw Py Ra1 Ra2 Ry2 Sl2 Tc1

To

Base Yet haue I Martes Mark vp on my face

Cx1 Yet haue I a marke of Mars vp on my face

Cx2 Yet haue I Martis mark vp on my face

El Yet haue I Martes Mark vp on my face

Martes Mark] Cx2 El Gg Pn Wy  
 a Mark of Mars ] Ch Cx1 Ha2 li Ne Tc2  
 Mars Mark] Cn Dd Ds1 En1 Ma  
 mars is Mark ] Ld1 Ry1 Se

This variant occurs in one of the so-called added passages. Elizabeth Solopova points out that the reading shared by Cx2 El Gg Pn and Wy --'Martes Mark '-- is metrically superior to the one found in the other manuscripts --'a marke of Mars'.<sup>24</sup>

### 9.3.1.2.2 Variants of Ambiguous Character

WBP 316

Base	What	helpeth	it	of	me	enquere	and	spyen
Cx1	What	nedith	it	of	me	to	enquere	or pryen
Cx2	What	nedyth	the	of	me	to	enquere	or pryen
Hg	What	helpeth	itʒ	of	me	enquere	and	spyen
El	What	nedeth	thee	of	me	to	enquere	or spyen

it ] Ad1 Bo1 Bo2 Cx1 Ch Cp Dl En2 En3 Gg Gl Ha2 Ha4 Ha5 He Hg  
 Ht La li Lc Ld1 Ld2 Mg Mm Ne Nl Ph2 Ph3 Ps Pw Ra2 Ry1 Ry2 Se  
 Si Sl2 Tc1 Tc2 To  
 the ] Bw Cx2 Cn Dd Ds1 El Ln Ma Ra1 Wy  
 not present ] Fi

Here, the reading 'it' is shared by most manuscripts, including Hg, while a few manuscripts have the definite article in its place. Cx2 and El agree in the reading 'the' and so do Cn Dd Ds1 Ln Ma Ra1 and Wy. The Hg reading is likely to be archetypal, while the Cx2 reading seems to be related to Robinson's  $\alpha$  manuscripts.

### 9.3.1.2.3 Variants Likely to Have Originated below the Archetype

WBP 46

Out: Cn He li Ma ne Se Tc2

Base	For	sith	I	wol	nat	kepe	me	chaast	in	al	
Cx1			I	wol	hym	not	forsake	no	thing <sup>r</sup>	at	al
Cx2	Forsoth	I	wyl		not	kepe	me	chast	in	al	
Hg	For	sith	I	wol	nat	kepe	me	chaast	in	al	
El	For	sothe	I	wol	nat	kepe	me	chaast	in	al	

sith ] Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bo2 Bw Ch Cp Dd En2 En3 Fi Ha2 Hg Ht Lc Ld1  
Mg Nl Ph2 Ps Ra3 Ry1 Tc1

sothe ] Cx2 Dl El Gl Ha4 Hk La Ld2 Ln Mc Mm Ph3 Py Ra1  
Ra2 Ry2 To Wy

sir ] Pw

siche ] Sl2

not present ] Cx1 Ds Si

Here Cx2 agrees with El against Hg, and, Robinson has suggested that the appearance of 'sothe' in Cx2 is the best indication that this is indeed a Chaucerian reading. My concern here is not so much whether Cx2 points to a Chaucerian reading but whether it can say something about  $\omega$ . Here Cx2 differs from manuscripts with which it had agreed before, remarkably Hg and Ch. However, it is important to point out that this variant might have originated in a compositor's mistake, since the 'i' and the 'o' are next to each other in the type box. This variant possibly originated below the archetype.

SU 527

Base	And	ther	it	wasteth	,	lite	and	lite	away
Cx1	And <sup>o</sup>	there	it	wastith		lith	and <sup>o</sup>	lith	away
Cx2	And <sup>o</sup>	euer	it	wastyth		lyte	and <sup>o</sup>	lyte	away
Hg	And	ther	it	wasteth	,	lite	and	lite	away
El	And	eue	it	wasteth	,	lith	and	lith	away

ther ] Bo2 Cp Cx1 Ds En1 Hg Ht La

euer ] Ad3 Ch Cx2 El Ha4

---

<sup>24</sup> See Elizabeth Solopova (1997, 135).

In SU 527, the Cx2 variant is shared by Ad3 Ch El and Ha4. This is a remarkable variant because it suggests a common ancestor for all of these witnesses. Because of the variant distribution (where manuscripts of the **c b a** groups and **O** witnesses) indicates that the variant might have originated below the archetype, but only a complete collation of the witnesses could confirm this.

### *9.3.2 Cx2-not-Hg/El Variants*

This type of variant is, at least as valuable as the previous type --Cx2-Hg/El-- in determining the affiliations of  $\omega$ . Their significance depends on their distribution as well as on other factors, but they are of great importance and should be taken into account. Thirteen of the Cx2-not-Hg/El variants are discussed in the electronic appendix d, chapter 5, 9.3.2. The variants in WBP 111, WBP 202, WBP 667, WBP 669, WBP 706, WBP 734, WBP 790, WBT 853, WBT 1023, SU 73, SU 89, SU 275 and SU 571 have been taken out because, in all likelihood, they are the result of agreements by coincidence. The rest of the variants are analysed below.

#### *9.3.2.1 Likely Archetypal Variants*

WBP 44-3

Out : Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bo2 Bw Cp Dl El En2 En3 Fi Gg Gl Ha2 Ha4 Ha5  
 Hg Hk Ht La Lc Ld1 Ld2 Ln Mc Mg Mm Nl Ph2 Ph3 Ps Pw Py Ra1  
 Ra2 Ra3 Ry2 Sl1 Sl2 Tc1 To1

Base Dyuers scolis makyth parfight clerkis

Cx1 Diuers scolis makifñ diuers clerkis

Cx2 Dyuers scolis makyth parfight clerkis

Dd Diuſe scoles maken [add]p̄fyt[/add] [ud]diuerse[/ud]  
[ud]werkes[/ud] clerkes

parfit ] Cx2 Pn Wy  
[add]p̄fyt[/add] [ud]diuerse[/u] ] Dd  
dyuerse ] Ch Cn Cx1 Ds1 En1 He li Ma ņe Ry1 Si Tc2  
sotil ] Se

WBP 44-5

Base	Makyth the	werkman	parfyte	sikerly
Cx1	Makith the		parfiter man to be	sikerly
Cx2	Makyth the	werkman	parfyte	sikerly
Dd	Maken the	[add]werkman[/add]	p̄fyt [ud]man[/ud]	sekirly

werkman parfite ] Cx2 Pn Wy  
[add]werkman[/add] p̄fyt [ud]man[/ud] ] Dd  
parfite man ] Ch Dd Ds1 En1 Ma Ry1 Si  
parfite man full ] Cn  
parfiter man ] Cx1 He li ņe Se Tc2

Lines WBP 44-3 and WBP 44-5 belong to the first of the so-called 'added passages.'

Some scholars believe these passages to be authentic, although the first one is often considered to be doubtful. The whole passage must have been present in  $\omega$ , and enabled Caxton to correct the lines as they appeared in Cx1. In these two lines Cx2 agrees only with Pn and Wy. This is normal since de Worde printed from a defective version of Cx2 and Pynson is likely to have based his edition on Caxton's. The only exception to this is Dd: the scribe copied the text as it appears in all the other witnesses and then corrected to agree with Cx2. There are two possible explanations for this: either the scribe was careless and made a series of mistakes in the passage which he had to correct later or, on the contrary, he was very conscientious and looked for a new manuscript from which to correct the passages. In any case, the corrected text in Dd is very close to that of the lines in Cx2, and these are the only two witnesses with 'parfight' and 'werkman.' It might seem odd to speak about

archetypal readings in the added passages, but those in Cx2 almost certainly reflect an early stage of that text.

FR 33

Base	Quod the Somnour / yput	out	of	my	cure	
Cx1	Quod the sompnour	put	out	of	my	cure
Cx2	Quod <sup>h</sup> the sompnour	put	out	of	our	cure
Hg	Quod the Somnour / yput	out	of	my	cure	
El	Quod the Somono <sup>r</sup> / yput	out	of	my	cure	

my ] Bo2 Cx1 Ds1 El En1 Hg  
 our ] Ad3 Ch Cx2 Dd Gg Ha4 Ht La  
 not present ] Ra3

FR 33 shows a case in which Cx2 agrees with the majority of the witnesses against Hg and El. In fact only Bo2 Cx1 Ds1 En1 Hg and El have the reading 'my,' the rest of the witnesses have 'our.' The variant does not affect the metre of the line, and based only on variant distribution it seems that 'our' is the archetypal reading.

FR 64

Base	Do stryke hire / out	of	oure	lettres	blake	
Cx1	Do stryke her	out	of	oure	lettris	blake
Cx2	Do stryke the	out	of	our	lettris	blake
Hg	Do stryke hi <sup>r</sup> /	out	of	oure	lettres	blake
El	Do striken hi <sup>r</sup> /	out	of	oure	lettres	blake

hire ] Bo2 Cx1 Ds El En1 Hg Ht  
 the ] Ad3 Ch Cp Cx2 Dd Gg Ha4 La Ra3

Cx2 has the variant 'the' instead of 'hir.' The Cx2 reading is supported by Ad3 Ch Cp Dd Gg Ha4 La Ra3, while 'hir' is only in Hg El and Cx1. Again, this variant does not affect the line's metre, but its distribution indicates that probably 'the' is archetypal.

FR 268

Base	The Carl	spak o thyng	but	he thoghte	another
Cx1	The chorle	spak o thingz	but	he thoughte	another
Cx2	The chorle	spak o thyngz	7	thoughte	another
Hg	The Carl	spak o thyngz	but	he thoghte	another
EI	The carl	spak oon /	but	he thoghte	another

but ] Cx1 Dd Ds EI En1 Hg La  
and ] Ad3 Ch Cx2 Gg Ht

In this line, Hg and EI have added the word 'he' to the conjunction 'but.' This addition alters the metre of the line. Cx2, on the other hand, has only the conjunction 'and,' a reading that is supported by the majority of the collated witnesses. It seems that in this particular line Hg and EI probably do not have the archetypal reading.

SU 388

Base	I haue hym	toold /	hoolly al	myn estat
Cx1	I haue hym	tolde	al myn	hert
Cx2	I haue hym	told <sup>b</sup> all	holy myn	astate
Hg	I haue hym	toold /	hoolly al	myn estat <sup>7</sup>
EI	I haue hym	toold	hoolly al	myn estat <sup>7</sup>

hoolly al ] Bo2 Ds1 EI En1 Ha4 Hg  
al hoolly ] Ad3 Ch Cp Cx2 Gg Ht La  
al ] Cx1

Here Cx2 has the reading 'al holy' where Hg and EI have 'holy al.' Ad3 Ch Cp Gg Ht and La support the Cx2 reading, suggesting that this word-order might be archetypal to the tradition. The reading in Cx1 is 'al.'

### 9.3.2.2 Likely Non-Archetypal Variants

WBP 477

Base	The	flour	is	goon	ther	is	namoore	to	telle
Cx1	The	floure	is	go	ther	is	nomore	to	telle
Cx2	The	flour	is	go	there	nys	nomore	to	telle
Hg	The	flour	is	goon	ther	is	namoore	to	telle
El	The	flour	is	goon	ther	is	namoore	to	telle

is ] Cx1 Hg El Bw Ch Cp Dd Ds Gg Ad1 Bo1 Cn Dl Ha4 Ht La Ra3  
 En2 En3 Gl Ha2 Ha5 He Hk li Lc Ld1 Ln Ma Mc Mg Ne Nl Ph2 Ps Py  
 Ra1 Se Tc1 Tc2 To

nys ] Cx2 Ad3 Wy Ld2 Ph3 Ra2 Ry2

In WBP 477, Cx2 has the reading 'nys' instead of 'is,' as in Hg and El. The variant in Cx2 is supported by Ad3 Wy Ld2 Ph3 Ra2 Ry2. Among these manuscripts, Ad3 is the only one that regularly joins Cx2. The variant distribution seems to indicate that 'is' is the archetypal reading.

WBP 499

Out: En2 Fi

Base	Which	that	Appellus	wroghte	subtilly
Cx1	Whiche	that	appelles	wrought	subtilly
Cx2	Whyche	that	appelles	wroughte so	subtylly
Hg	Which	that	Appellus	wroghte	subtilly
El	Which	that	Appelles	wrogfite	subtilly

not present ] Bo2 Bw Cn Cp Cx1 Dl Ds1 El En1 Gg Ha2 He Hg Ht li  
 La Lc Ld1 Ln Ma Mc Mg Mm Ne Nl Ph3 Ps Pw Ra1 Ry1 Se Si Sl1  
 Sl2 Tc2 To1

so ] Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Ch Cx2 Dd En3 Gl Ha4 Ha5 Hk Ld2 Ph2 Pn  
 Py Ra2 Ra3 Ry2 Tc1 Wy

Once more, we find that Cx2 has added an adverb where other witnesses have nothing. The adverb alters the metre of the line. Among the manuscripts that have added 'so' --Ad3 Ch Ha4 Wy Ad1 Dd En3 Gl Ha5 Ld2 Ra2 Ra3 Ry2 and Tc1-- we

find Ad3 Ch and Ha4, but we also find manuscripts that are probably completely unrelated to Cx2, such as Gl and Ry2. Ad1 Ad3 En3 and Tc1 --all in agreement with Cx2 -- are what Robinson has classified as the  $\alpha$  group.

WBP 681

Out: En2 Py Ra3

Base	And	thus	god	woot	Mercurie	is	desolat
Cx1	That	thus	god <sup>ð</sup>	woot	Mercur	is	dissolate
Cx2	As	thus	god <sup>ð</sup>	woot	Mercury	is	dyssolate
Hg	And	thus	god	woot <sup>ʀ</sup>	Mercurie	is	desolat
El	And	thus	god	woot <sup>ʀ</sup>	Mercurie	is	desolat <sup>ʀ</sup>

And ] Hg El Bw Ds Gg Ad1 Bo1 Bo2 Cn Ha4 Ht La Wy En3 Gl Hk li Lc  
 Ld2 Ln Ma Mc Mg Nl Ph2 Ra1 Ra2 Ry1 Si Sl2 Tc1  
 As ] Cx2 Ad3 Ch Dd Dl Fi Ha2 Ha5 Ph3 Pn Se To  
 That ] Cx1 He Ne Tc2

Several witnesses agree with Cx2 in having the conjunction 'as' at the beginning of the line. Among these, we find Ad3 and Ch which often support the Cx2 readings. Hg and El have the conjunction 'And' instead of 'AS' and many other witnesses share this reading. The repeated agreements of Cx2 Ad3 and Ch, make a genetic relationship between these very likely.

WBT 852

Base	Wommen	,	may	go	saufly	vp	and	down	
Cx1	A	woman	may	go	sauely	vp	and <sup>ð</sup>	doun	
Cx2	Wommen		may	now	go	sauely	vp	and <sup>ð</sup>	doun
Hg	Wommen	,	may	go	saufly	vp	and	down	
El	Wōmen	,	may	go	saufly	vp	and	doun	

may go ] Bo2 Cx1 Ds1 El En1 Gg Ha4 Hg Ht La  
 may now go ] Cx2  
 may go now ] Ad3 Ch Dd La

Cx2 has added the adverb 'now' in WBT 852. Other witnesses --Ad3 Ch Dd and La-- also have the added word, but in a different position, after the verb, while Cx2 has it before the verb. The compositor probably misunderstood the indication made by Caxton about the place in which the word had to be inserted.

FR 78

Base	Feynyngē	a cause /	for he wolde	brybe
Cx1	Feynyngē	a cause	for he wolde	her bridil
Cx2	Feynyngē	a cause	for he wold <sup>h</sup>	haue a brybe
Hg	Feynyngē	a cause /	for he wolde	brybe
El	Feynyngē	a cause /	for he wolde	brybe

wolde ] Bo2 Cp Cx1Dd Ds1 El En1 Gg Ha4 Hg Ht La  
 wolde haue ] Ad3 Ch Cx2 Ra3

In FR 78, Cx2 has added ' haue a ' which is supported by Ad3 Ch and Ra3. Once more a genetic relationship is suggested between Cx2 Ad3 and Ch. Ha4, the other manuscript that frequently agrees with the Cx2 variants, does not support this.

FR 186

Base	In diuers	art	and in diuerse	figures
Cx1	In diuers	arte	and <sup>h</sup> in diuers	figuris
Cx2	In dyuers	acte	and <sup>h</sup> in dyuers	fyguris
Hg	In diu's	art <sup>7</sup>	and in diu'se	figures
El	In diu's	Art <sup>7</sup>	and in diu'se	figures

art ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cx1 Ds El En1 Gg Hg Ra3  
 acte ] Cp Cx2 Ha4  
 actes ] Dd  
 artes ] Ht  
 attes ] La

The variant in FR 186 is 'art'/'acte .' Hg El Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cx1 Ds En1 Gg and Ra3 read 'art,' while Cp Cx2 and Ha4 have 'acte.' It is likely that the 'r' and 'c' might have been confused by the scribes; the variant distribution seems to indicate that 'art' is the archetypal reading.

SU 156

Base	With many a teere ,	triklyng	on my cheke
Cx1	With many a teer	trillyngz	on my cheek
Cx2	Wyth many a teer	tryllyngz	on our cheek
Hg	With many a teere ,	triklyng	on my cheke
El	With many a teere ,	triklyngz	on my cheke

my ] Bo2 Cp Cx1 Dd Ds El En1 Gg Ha4 Hg Ht La  
 our ] Ad3 Ch Cx2

As in FR 33, in SU 156 Cx2 has 'our' instead of 'my.' On this occasion, both Ch and Ad3 support the reading in Cx2; although this is unlikely to be the archetypal reading, it shows, again, a genetic relationship between Ad3 Ch and ω.

SU 453

Base	He grynt	with his	teeth ,	so was he	wrooth
Cx1	He grintith	wit̄h the	teth	so was he	wroth
Cx2	And <sup>ð</sup> gryntyth	wyth the	teth	so was he	wroth
Hg	He grynt	with his	teeth ,	so was he	wrooth
El	He grynte	with his	teeth ,	so was he	wrooth

He ] Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Cx1 Ds El Gg Hg Ht La  
 And ] Cx2 Dd En1 Ha4

In SU 453, Cx2 Dd En1 and Ha4 have the conjunction 'and' instead of the personal pronoun 'he.' The variant distribution indicates that 'he' is probably archetypal to the tradition, although 'and' should not be discarded without further analysis.