

## **CHAPTER VII: VARIANTS**

### **SINGLE UPPER CASE SIGNATURES (A TO L)**

#### **Chapter Summary**

The variants present in the pages with single upper case signatures are different from those in chapters 5 and 6. Both prose texts are included in this chapter and they confirm Dunn's suggestion that these had not been thoroughly corrected by Caxton (1939, 11-2). Because both prose texts are included in this chapter, the general tendency is towards a low rate of variation. This chapter also includes MO, one of the tales with the highest proportion of line additions and changes in Cx2.

Approximately 63.5% of the variants in this chapter are Cx2-O variants, a lower percentage than that found in previous chapters. The Cx2-Hg/EI variants represent roughly 2.5% of the total. This suggests that there is an increase in the percentages of Cx2-not-Hg/EI and Cx2-Unique variants. The variant distribution in this chapter is very different in as much as the Cx2-Unique variants have increased to double the usual percentage in previous chapters, here representing 22.5% of the total variation. Many of these appear to be the result of mistakes made by the compositors and so are not significant concerning the affiliations of the manuscript source. Examples of this can be found in TM 328, TM 333, PA 950 and PA 965.

The sets included in this chapter exhibit a relatively low frequency of agreement between Cx2 Ad3 Ch and Ha4, although these manuscripts are still more often in agreement with the variants introduced in Cx2 than are others. The tendency is towards a higher index of agreement between Cx2 Ad3 and Ch than with Ha4.

There is also a general tendency --very marked in set 13b-- these agreements with manuscripts belonging to the **a** group, especially Cn and Ma. There are also a few agreements with Cp and La, **c** group manuscripts, but these are very likely to be agreements by coincidence and not necessarily stemmatically significant.

However, a question remains about the affiliations in this part of Cx2. It is difficult to decide if the lower rate of variation could account for the changes in affiliation from Ad3 Ha4 and Ch to agreements with Ma and Cn, or if this could have its origin in a change of affiliation in  $\omega$  itself. An alternative interpretation that should not be disregarded is the idea that Caxton could have changed the manuscript he was using to correct his second edition. Any conclusions must also take into account the fact that some manuscripts lack the end of PA and RT.

**1. SET 13B: THE TALE OF MELIBEE, LINK 29, THE MONK'S TALE, LINK 30, THE NUN'S PRIEST'S TALE AND LINK 31<sup>1</sup>**

**1.1 Set Summary**

This set appears to be the one with the largest number of major changes, especially if we take into account the fact that TM was barely altered in Cx2. One of

---

<sup>1</sup> The witnesses collated for TM are: Ad1 Ad2 Ad3 Bw Ch Cn Cp Cx1 Cx2 Dd D1 Ds1 El En1 En3 Fi Gg Gl Ha2 Ha4 Hg Hk Hn Ii La Ma Mc Ne Nl Pp Se Tc1 To1 Wy. The witnesses collated for L29 are: Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bw Ch Cn Cp Cx1 Cx2 Dd Ds1 El En1 En3 Fi Gg Gl Ha1 Ha3 Ha4 He Hg Ht Ii La Ln Ma Mc Mm Ne Nl Ph2 Ph3 Ps Ra1 Ra2 Ry1 Ry2 Se Sl1 Sl2 Tc1 Tc2 To1 . The witnesses collated for MO are: Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bw Ch Cn Cp Cx1 Cx2 Dd Ds1 El En2 En3 Fi Gg Gl Ha1 Ha2 Ha3 Ha4 He Hg Hn Ht Ii La Lc Ld1 Ln Ma Mc Mg Mm Ne Ph2 Ph3 Pw Py Ra1 Ra2 Ry1 Ry2 Se Tc1 Tc2 To1. The witnesses collated for L30 are: Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bw Ch Cn Cp Cx1 Cx2 Dd D1 Ds1 El En1 En2 En3 Fi Ha2 Ha3 Ha4 He Hg Ht Ii La Lc Ld1 Ln Ma Mc Me Mg Mm Ne Nl Ph2 Ph3 Ps Ry1 Ry2 Se Tc2 To1 . The witnesses collated for NP are: Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bw Ch Cn Cp Cx1 Cx2 Dd D1 Ds1 El En1 En2 En3 Fi Ha2 Ha3 Ha4 He Hg Ht Ii La Lc Ld1 Ln Ma Mc Me Mg Mm Ne Nl Ph2 Ph3 Ps Pw Py Ry1 Ry2 Se Sl1 Sl2 Tc1 Tc2 To1. The witnesses collated for L30 are: Ad1 Ch Cn Cx2 Dd Ds1 En1 En3 Ma Ry1 Wy.

the most evident conclusions that can be drawn from the collation is that the alterations in TM are not stemmatically significant. For instance, two of the fourteen Cx2-not-Hg/El variants --TM 781 and TM 854-- are corrections of compositorial mistakes in Cx1. This also occurs with the Cx2-Unique variant TM 47. Two other of the unique variants --TM 328 and TM 333-- also appear to be compositorial mistakes.

Although some of the readings within the major variants are interesting, many of them only concern words which Cx2 has left out. It is difficult to tell whether these were out in  $\omega$  or whether the compositor made a mistake while setting up the text.

A remarkable feature in this set is the very low frequency of agreement between Cx2 Ad3 Ch and Ha4. The general tendency of the set points more towards an affiliation with manuscripts belonging to the **a** group, especially Cn and Ma.

## 1.2 Analysis of Variant Lines

### 1.2.1 Line Substitutions

As in previous sets, all line substitutions in set 13b are replacements of non-archetypal lines by archetypal ones. There are variants within the line in several of these additional lines. They are discussed below.

MO 6-1 Cx1 Many a man ouerthrowen hatñ sñe  
 MO 7 Cx2 Late no man truste on blynde prosperyte

MO 54-1 Cx1 That strongꝝ worthy andñ nobil hatñ be  
 MO 55 Cx2 Hadñ thou not tolde to wymmen thy secre

MO 60-1 Cx1 Of his strengtñ he hadñ neuer pere  
 MO 61a Cx1 And . xx . yeer of ysrael he hadñ the  
 gouernaunce  
 MO 61 Cx2 And fully twenty yere by yere

MO 62 Cx2 Of ysrael he had<sup>ð</sup> the gouernaunce

MO 78-1 Cx1 Yet neuer lyke to the I fynde

MO 79 Cx2 Now mayst thou wepyn wyth thyn eyen blynde

MO 487-1 Cx1 And<sup>ð</sup> to the cyte she hat<sup>h</sup> it sente

MO 488 Cx2 And<sup>ð</sup> wyth his hede vnto her toun she wente

MO 747-1 Cx1 For this payne no lenger suffre I may

MO 748 Cx2 And<sup>ð</sup> kyssed his fader and<sup>ð</sup> deyde the same day

NP 57a Cx1 Hit was a melodye to here hem synge

NP 57 Cx2 But suche a loye it was to here them synge

NP 104a Cx1 And<sup>ð</sup> of synne and<sup>ð</sup> of complexio<sup>n</sup>

NP 104 Cx2 And<sup>ð</sup> of fume and<sup>ð</sup> of complexions

NP 111-1 Cx1 And<sup>ð</sup> alle as a lape not worth<sup>h</sup> a myte

NP 112 Cx2 Of contek and of waspes grete and lyte

NP 126 Cx2 That bothe of coler and<sup>ð</sup> of malencolye

NP 138a Cx1 For yf ye do I dar ley a grote

NP 138 Cx2 For yf ye doo I dar wel ley a grote

NP 304a Cx1 In his book of the dremes of scipioun

NP 304 Cx2 In affryke of the worthy scypyoun

NP 386a Cx1 And<sup>ð</sup> comynly often tyme it fallith so

NP 386 Cx2 God wote that worldly ioye is sone a goo

NP 466a Cx1 Certis sire than be ye vnkynd<sup>ð</sup>

NP 466 Cx2 Now certes I were worse than a fende

NP 536a Cx1 Nas of ladies maad<sup>ð</sup> whenne Ilion was wonne

NP 536 Cx2 Nas neuer of ladyes made when that Ilion

The variants within the line substitutions are as follows:

MO 61

MO 61 after MO 60-1: Tc2

Out: Cx1 He ðe

Base And fully twenty wynter yeer by yere

Cx2	And fully twenty		yere	by yere
Hg	And fully xx	wynter	yeer	by yere
El	And fully twenty	wynter	yeer	by yere

twenty wynter ] Ad1 Ad3 Ch Cn Dd Ds1 1 El En2 En3 Gg Hg  
Hn Ln Ma Mc Ra1 Py Pw Se Tc1  
twenty ] Bo1 Bw Cp Cx2 Dl Fi Gl Hal Ha2 Ha3 Ht li La  
Lc Mg Mm Ph2 Ph3 Ra2 Ry1 Ry2 Sl1 Sl2 To1  
xv ] Tc2

In MO 61 Hg and El read 'twenty wynter' whereas Cx2 has only 'twenty.' The Cx2 reading is supported by the majority of the witnesses. However, almost all these are **c/d** witnesses representing a single line of descent, while almost all the **O** manuscripts support the reading with 'wynter'. The absence of the word 'wynter' affects the metre of the line, making it irregular. This agreement of Cx2 and **c** and **d** witnesses is likely to be an agreement by coincidence.

#### MO 62

Out: Cx1 He Ne

Base	He	hadde	of	Israel	the	gouernance
Cx2	Of	ysrael	he	had <sup>t</sup>	the	gouernaunce
Hg	He	hadde	of	Israel	the	gouernance
El	He	hadde	of	Israel	the	gouernaūce

He hadde of Israel ] Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bw Ch Cn Cp Dd Dl Ds1 1  
El En2 En3 Fi Gg Gl Ha1 Ha2 Ha3 Hg Ht La Lc Ln Ma Mc Mg  
Mm Ph2 Ph3 Pw Ra1 Ra2 Ry1 Ry2 Se Sl1 Sl2 Tc1 To1  
Of Israel he hadde ] Cx2 li Tc2  
He hadde of Ierlm̄ ] Ha4  
He hadde of Ierusalem ] Hk

Here Cx2 has altered the order of the line as it appears in Hg. Only two manuscripts agree with Cx2 on this: li and Tc2, while the rest of the collated witnesses are in

agreement with Hg and El. The agreement of Cx2 Ii and Tc2, since it is not supported by other variants, is likely to be an agreement by coincidence.

NP 57

NP 57 after NP 58: Tc2

Out: Cx1 Ne

Base	But	swich	a	ioye	was	it	to	here	hem	synge
Cx2	But	suche	a	loye	it	was	to	here	them	synge
El	And	swich	a	ioye	was	it <sup>r</sup>	to	here	hem	synge
Hg	But	swich	a	ioye	was	it <sup>r</sup>	to	here	hem	synge

was it ] Ad3 Ch Cp Ds1 1 El En1 Ha2 Ha4 Hg Ld1 Ma Mm  
Ph3 Ry1 Sl2

it was ] Bo1 Cx2 Dl En2 Gg Gl Ha3 Ht La Ln Ph2 Pn Py  
Ra3 Ry2 Se Sl1 To1 Wy

as it was ] Bw Cp Ha2 Ph3 Pw Ry1

was ] Ad1 En3 Ps Se Sl2 Tc1

there was ] He Ii

Hit was a melody ] Tc2

The versions of this line show an alteration in its order from 'was it,' in Hg and El, to 'it was.' The witnesses are divided in these readings, but many of the agreements are likely to be coincidental and, therefore, uninformative from a stemmatic perspective.

NP 104

NP 104 after NP 102: Ra3

Out: Cx1 Bo1 Bw Cp La En2 En3 Lc Mg Ph2 Ry2 Sl2

Base And ofte of fume and of complexions

Cx2 And<sup>d</sup> of fume and<sup>d</sup> of complexions

El And ofte of fume and of compleccioūs

Hg And ofte of fume and of cōplexions

And ofte ] Ad1 Ad3 Ch Cn Dd Ds1 1El En1 Gg Gl Ha2 Ha3  
Ha4 He Hg Ht Ld1 Ln Ma Mc Mm Ph3 Ps Py Pw Ra3 Ry1 Se  
Sl1 Tc1

And ] Cx2 Dl Ii Ne Pn Tc2 To1 Wy

NP 104 is yet another case of a word which is not present in Cx2 making the line one syllable short of the iambic pentameter. The variant distribution does not show any consistent pattern since the omission is found in manuscripts belonging to the **b** group such as Ii Ne and Tc2 and also some belonging to the **d** group --To and Dl. As expected, the later printed editions also agree with Cx2.

NP 138

NP 138 after NP 152: Gg

Out: Cx1

Base	And	if	it	do	I	dar	wel	leye	a	grote
Cx2	For	yf	ye	doo	I	dar	wel	ley	a	grote
Hg	And	if	it	do	I	dar	wel	leye	a	grote
El	And	if	it	do	I	dar	wel	leye	a	grote

And ] Bo1 Bw Cn Cp Dd Dl Ds1 1 El En1 En2 Gl Ha2 Ha4 He  
 Hg Ht La Lc Ld1 Ln Ma Mc Mg Mm Ne Ph2 Ph3 Ps Pw Py  
 Ra3 Ry1 Ry2 Sl1 Sl2Tc1 To1

For ] Ad1 Ad3 Ch Cx2 En3 Gg Ha3 li Pn Se Tc2 Wy

it ] Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bw Ch Cn Cp Dd Dl Ds1 1 El En1 En2 En3  
 Ha2 Ha4 He Hg Ht La Lc Ld1 Ln Ma Mc Mg Mm Ne Ph2 Ph3  
 Pw Ps Py Ry1 Ry2 Sl1 Sl2 To1

he ] Gg Ha3 Ra3 Se

ye ] Cx2 Tc2 Pn Wy

not present ] He Ne

I ] li Tc1

There are two variants in Cx2 NP 138. The first one is the conjunction 'For' at the beginning of the line, where Hg and El have 'And.' Ha4 and Ht agree with Hg and El, but Ad3 and Ch support the Cx2 reading. Although it seems obvious that the Hg variant is more widely distributed among the collated witnesses, there is no way to determine which of the two is archetypal. The second variant is 'ye' in Cx2, where Hg El and the vast majority of the witnesses have 'it.'

NP 536

NP 536 out: Cx1

Base	Was	neuere	of	ladyes	maad	whan	ylioun
Cx2	Was	neuer	of	ladyes	made	when	that Ilion
Hg	Was	neuere	of	ladyes	maad	whan	ylioū
El	Was	neūe	of	ladyes	maad	whan	ylioū

Was ] Ad1 Ad3 Bw Ch Cn Cp Dd Dl Ds1 1 El En1 En2 En3 Gg  
Ha2 Ha3 Ha4 He Hg Ht li La Lc Ln Ma Mc Mg Mm Ne Ph3 Pw  
Py Ra2 Ry1 Ry2 Se Sl1 Sl2 Tc1 To1

Was ] Cx2 Pn Tc2 Wy

Ne ] was Bo1 Ph2

As ] Gl Ps Ra3

ylioun ] Ad1 Ad3 Bw Ch Cp Cx2 Dd Ds1 1 El En1 En3 Gg Gl  
Ha3 Ha4 He Hg Ht li Lc Ln Ma Mc Mg Ps Py Ra2 Ra3 Sl2 Tc1  
that ylioun ] Bo1 Cn Dl En2 Ha2 La Mm Ph2 Ph3 Pn  
Pw Ry1 Ry2 Se Sl1 To1 Wy  
ylioun was wonne ] Ne Tc2

The variant in NP 536 does not appear to be very informative. Cx2 has 'Was' where Hg and El have 'Was.' The printed editions agree with Cx2, but the only manuscript that supports this reading is Tc2. It is interesting, however, that both Bo1 and Ph2 -- group E--have the unabbreviated form 'Ne was.' There is a second variant on this line: the presence or absence of the word 'that' before 'ylioun.'

MO 690

Base	Caught	with	the	lymrod	,	coloured	as	the	glede
Cx2	Caught	wyth	the	lymerodde		coloured <sup>ð</sup>	as	a	glede
Hg	Caught	with	the	lymrod	,	coloured	as	the	glede
El	Caught	with	the	lymerod <sup>ð</sup>	,	coloured	as	the	gleede

the ] Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bw Ch Cn Cp Dd Dl Ds1 1 El En2 En3 Fi  
Gl Ha1 Ha2 Ha3 Hg Ht li La Lc Ln Ma Mc Mg Mm Ph2 Ph3 Pw  
Ry1 Ry2 Se Sl1Sl2 Tc1 To1

is the ] Hn

a ] Cx2

The variant present in Cx2 MO 690 is a singleton and does not provide any information about the affiliations of  $\omega$ .

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

This set probably has one of the highest concentration of major additions, even though TM does not have any. Three long passages have been added --MO 16-1 to 16-8, MO 681 to 704, and L30 4-1 to 5a-- and a whole link, L31 has also been introduced into the text.

MO 16-1 Cx2 Lo Adam in the felde of damascene  
MO 16-2 Cx2 Wyth goddes owen fyngre wrought was  
MO 16-3 Cx2 And not bygoten of mannes sperme vnclene  
MO 16-4 Cx2 And welte al paradys sauynge one tree  
MO 16-5 Cx2 Had neuer worldly man so hygge degree  
MO 16-6 Cx2 As Adam / til he for mysgouernaunce  
MO 16-7 Cx2 Was dryuen out of his hie prosperyte  
MO 16-8 Cx2 To labour and to helle and to myschaunce

MO 681 Cx2 O Noble o worthy petro glorye of spayne  
MO 682 Cx2 Whom fortune held so hie in mageste  
MO 683 Cx2 Wel oughten men thy pyetous deth compleyne  
MO 684 Cx2 Out of thy londe thy brother made the fle  
MO 685 Cx2 And<sup>d</sup> after at a sieg by subtilte  
MO 686 Cx2 Thou were betrayed 7 lad vp to his tente  
MO 687 Cx2 Where as he wyth his own hond<sup>d</sup> slowe the  
MO 688 Cx2 Succeedyng<sup>r</sup> in thy regne and<sup>d</sup> in thy rente  
MO 689 Cx2 The felde of snowe wyth thegle of black therin  
MO 690 Cx2 Caught wyth the lymrodde colour<sup>d</sup> as a glede  
MO 691 Cx2 He brewe thys cursydnes and<sup>d</sup> al thys synne  
MO 692 Cx2 The wycked<sup>d</sup> nest was werker of thys nede  
MO 693 Cx2 Not charles Olyuer that toke ay hede  
MO 694 Cx2 Of trouth and<sup>d</sup> honour / but of armoryke  
MO 695 Cx2 Genelon Olyuer corrupte for mede  
MO 696 Cx2 Brought thys worthy kyng in suche a bryke  
MO 697 Cx2 O Worthy petro kyng of Cypre also  
MO 698 Cx2 That alysaunder wan by hie maystrye

MO 699 Cx2 Ful many an hethen wroughtest thou ful wo  
MO 700 Cx2 Of whiche thyn owen lieges had enuye  
MO 701 Cx2 And for no thyng<sup>r</sup> but for thy chyualrye  
MO 702 Cx2 They in thy bedde han slayn the by the  
morowe  
MO 703 Cx2 Thus can fortune wel gouerne and<sup>r</sup> gye  
MO 704 Cx2 And<sup>r</sup> out of loye bryng men to sorowe

L30 4-1 Cx2 I seye for me it is a grete disease  
L30 4-2 Cx2 Where as men haue be in welthe and ease  
L30 4-3 Cx2 To here of her sodeyn fal allas  
L30 4-4 Cx2 And<sup>r</sup> the contrarye is loye and<sup>r</sup> solas  
L30 4-5 Cx2 As whan a man hath ben in pour estate  
L30 4-6 Cx2 And clymbeth vp and<sup>r</sup> wexyth fortunate  
L30 4-7 Cx2 And<sup>r</sup> ther abydeth in prosperite  
L30 4-8 Cx2 Suche thyng is gladsom as thynketh me  
L30 4-9 Cx2 And<sup>r</sup> of suche thyng were good<sup>r</sup> for to telle  
L30 4-10 Cx2 Ye quod<sup>r</sup> our hoost by seynt poulis belle  
L30 4-11 Cx2 Ye say right soth , this monke clappeth loude  
L30 4-12 Cx2 He spack how fortune couerd wyth a cloude  
L30 4-13 Cx2 I wote neuer what , 7 als of a tragedye  
L30 4-14 Cx2 Right now ye herde , 7 perde no remedye  
L30 4-15 Cx2 It is for to bewaylen ne compleyne  
L30 4-16 Cx2 That , that is don , and als it is a peyne  
L30 4-17 Cx2 As ye have sey<sup>d</sup> to here of heuynesse  
L30 4-18 Cx2 Syr monke no more of thys so god<sup>r</sup> you  
blesse  
L30 4-19 Cx2 Your tale anoyeth al thys companye  
L30 4-20 Cx2 Suche talkyng<sup>r</sup> is not worth a butterflye  
L30 5a Cx2 For there in is there no dysport ne game

NP 50-1 Cx2 He fethered her an hundred tyme a day  
NP 50-2 Cx2 And<sup>r</sup> s<sup>n</sup>e hym plesith al that euer s<sup>n</sup>e may

L31 1 Cx2 SYr nonnys preest our hoost sayd anon  
L31 2 Cx2 Y blessyd be thy breche and euey stoon  
L31 3 Cx2 This was a mery tale of chauntecleer  
L31 4 Cx2 But by my trouth yf thou were seculer  
L31 5 Cx2 Thou woldest ben a tredefoul a right  
L31 6 Cx2 For yf thou haue corage , as thou hast myght  
L31 7 Cx2 The were nede of hennys as I wene  
L31 8 Cx2 Ye more than seuen tymes seuentene  
L31 9 Cx2 See whiche brawnes hath this gentil preest  
L31 10 Cx2 So grete a necke and suche a large breest  
L31 11 Cx2 He lokyth as a sperhauke wyth his eyen

L31 12 Cx2 Hym nedeth not his colours for to dyen  
 L31 13 Cx2 Wyth brasil ne with grayn of portyngale  
 L31 14 Cx2 But sir fayr falle you for your tale  
 L31 15 Cx2 And<sup>o</sup> after that he with ful mery chere  
 L31 16 Cx2 Sayd to an other man / as ye sñal here

The first major addition in MO is the so-called Adam Stanza. This is not present in Hg and is also missing from Cp Cx1 He Mc Ne S12. Of these, three --Cp Mc and S12-- have left the space for an amount equal to the length of the stanza and two --Cp and Mc--have indicated that the Adam Stanza should follow. The following witnesses all have the Adam Stanza: Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bw Ch Cn Cx2 Dd Dl Ds1 1 El En2 En3 Fi Gg Gl Ha1 Ha2 Ha3 Ha4 Hn Ht Ii La Lc Ld1 Ln Ma Mg Mm Ph2 Ph3 Pw Py Ra1 Ra2 Ry2 Se S11 S12 Tc1 Tc2 To1 . This seems to indicate that even though the lines were not present in Hg, not only were they part of the text of the *Canterbury Tales*, but were expected by the scribes, who thought the stanza should be included. It is possible that the Hg scribe made a mistake while copying the manuscript and accidentally left them out. Even when hand d wrote Cp, probably an early copy of the Tales, he knew that the text needed to be included. It is remarkable, however, that S12 --another c group manuscript-- also lacks the stanza. Most witnesses belonging to the b group, such as Cx1 He and Ne, do not have the stanza. In some witnesses there is evidence that the scribes had *a priori* knowledge of this part of the text, so that one cannot discard the possibility that many more manuscripts had left the space for the Adam Stanza and later filled this in with a text coming from a different exemplar. In this sense, the data provided by lines MO 16-1 to 16-8 cannot be taken as determinant to establish textual affiliation. Another important feature in

the text of MO is the fact that the alteration in the order of the stanzas in Cx2 is unique.

The 'Modern Instances' have been placed after MO 640 and before MO 641 -- MO ends with line 680 in Cx2, just as it does in Cx1, which means that Cx2 lines from 705 to 768. There is no indication of misbinding and, although, the position of the 'Modern Instances' could be the result of a compositorial mistake, alternative explanations should not be discarded:

The change from "bastard brother" in 3568 [MO 684] would seem to have been made in consequence of the reconciliation of the claimants to the throne of Spain... to Henri, the grandson of the bastard Henri of Trastemare.... There has been much discussion of the position of these Modern Instances. The difficulties seem insuperable if we ascribe to Chaucer the placing of the Modern Instances at the end of the tale. All the MSS containing the earlier version of the Pedro of Spain story place the Modern Instances within the tale; all those containing the revised form place them at the end, where they interfere with the close connection between 3956 [MO 680] and the Host's reference to it in 3972 [L30 4-12]. An even more decisive indication that no tragedies should follow 3956 [MO 680] is the formal conclusion of the whole discussion expressed in 3951-56 [MO 675-80]. The solution is perhaps that the Modern Instances belonged to the pre-CT stage of the tale... If later, when he assigned the tale to the Monk, Chaucer omitted them but failed to destroy the two versions, those persons who were trying to bring together and arrange the

parts of the CT may easily have differed as to the proper position for them. (Manly and Rickert 1940, 4: 511)

As explained above, Cx2 places the 'Modern Instances,' not at the end the tale, but after MO 640. Although Manly and Rickert's explanation is of great interest, it does not explain what happened with the text of Hg, which has a different order than the one presented in their edition. According to the analysis presented by Manly and Rickert in the above quotation, it is possible to see that, although Cx2 has what they consider the revised version of the Peter of Spain stanza, without the reference to the 'bastard brother,' the 'Modern Instances' have been included in the position they consider 'correct' and which does not interrupt the continuity with L30. The possibility of  $\omega$  containing the revised version of the Peter of Spain stanza within the tale has to be considered.

The other set of line additions, the ones on L30, are those lines which make the longer version of the link. The short form of L30 has 34 lines and is that found in Hg. El has the long form --54 lines--, which is the same one as in Cx2. The witnesses which have the long form of the link are: Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bw Ch Cn Cx2 Dd Dl Ds1 El En1 En2 En3 Fi Ha2 Ha4 Ht Ii La Lc Ld1 Ln Ma Mg Mm Nl Ph2 Ph3 Ry1 Ry2 S11 and To1 . It is possible that as suggested by Manly and Rickert (1940, 2: 410 and ff.) the link was rewritten by Chaucer, who changed the name of the character interrupting the tale from Host --in the short version-- to Knight -- in the long one.

The word-variants within the line additions are analysed below.

L30 4-2

Base	Where	as	men	han	been	in	greet	welthe	and	ese
Cx2	Where	as	men	haue	be	in	welthe	and	ease	
El	Where	as	men	han	been	in	greet	welthe	and	ese

greet welthe] Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bw Ch Cn Dd Dl Ds1 1 El En1  
 En2 En3 Ha2 Ha4 Ht La Lc Ld1 Ln Ma Mg Nl Ph2 Ph3 Ry1  
 Ry2 Sl1 To1  
 welthe ] Cx2 Fi li

In L30 4-2 Cx2 does not have the adjective 'grete.' Only two other witnesses agree with Cx2 Fi and li in which this is likely to be the result of an agreement by coincidence.

L30 4-4

Out: Bo1 En2 Ph2

Base And the contrarie is ioye and greet solas

Cx2 And<sup>o</sup> the contrarye is loye and<sup>o</sup> solas

El And the contrarie is ioye and greet solas

ioye and greet ] Ad1 Ad3 Bw Ch Cn Dd El En3 Fi Ha2 Ha4  
 La Lc Ld Ma Mg Ph3 Ry1 Ry2

ioye and ] Cx2 Ds1 1 En1

greet ioye and ] Dl Ht li Nl Sl1 To1

and greet ] Ln

Here Cx2 lacks the word 'grete,' and two witnesses --Ds1 and En1-- agree with this. Other witnesses present the word in a different position before 'ioye,' as in Ht, which in other sets has appeared to be related to ω. The variant in Cx2 might have originated by a compositor's eye skip, but there is no manuscript evidence that would permit us to build a strong case here. The agreement with Ds1 1 and En1 could be an agreement by coincidence.

L30 4-8

Base Swich thyng<sup>7</sup> is gladsom as it thynketh me

Cx2 Suche thyngē is gladsom as thynketh me  
 El Swich thyngz is gladsom as it thynketh me

as it ] Bw Dd El La Lc Ln Ma Mg Nl Ph3 Ry1 Sl1  
 as ] Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Ch Cn Cx2 Dl Ds1 1 En1 En3 Fi  
 Ha2 Ha4 Ht Ii Ld1 Ph2 Ry2 To1

In L30 4-8 we find that Cx2 does not have the pronoun 'it,' which is present in El. Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Ch Cn Cx2 Dl Ds1 1 En1 En3 Fi Ha2 Ha4 Ht Ii Ld1 Ph2 Ry2 and To1 support the reading in Cx2. This suppression, however, alters the iambic pentameter and leaves the line one syllable short. It is interesting that Ad3 Ch Ha4 and Ht are all in agreement with Cx2, but we cannot be sure that the omission of 'it' is relevant to establish textual affiliations.

L30 4-11

Base Ye seye righ̄t sooth this Monk he clappeth lowde  
 Cx2 Ye say right soth this monke clappeth loude  
 El Ye seye righ̄t sooth this Monk he clappeth lowde

Monk he ] Bw Ch Dd Dl Ds1 1 El En1 Ha2 La Lc Ln Mg Ph3  
 Ry1 Ry2  
 Monk hath ] Ad1 Cn En3 Ha4 Ld1 Ma To1  
 Monk ] Cx2 Fi Ht Ii Ph2 Sl1  
 Monk clappeth ] Bo1  
 he ] Nl

In L30 4-11, Fi Ht Ii Ph2 and Sl1 are in agreement with Cx2 in the omission of the personal pronoun 'he' or the verb 'hath.' On this occasion, however, they stand alone against the majority of the collated witnesses, which agree with El.

MO 703

Out: Cx1

Base Thus kan Fortune hire wheel gouerne and gye  
 Cx2 Thus can fortune wel gouerne and<sup>b</sup> gye

Hg Thus kan Fortune hire wheel gouerne and gye  
El Thus kan Fortune hir wheel gou'ne and gye

hire ] Ad1 Ad3 Ch Cn Dd Ds1 1 El En3 Gg Hg Ht Ln Ma Mc  
Se Tc1

the ] Hn

not present ] Bo1 Bw Cp Cx2 Dl En2 Fi Gl Ha1 Ha2  
Ha3 li La Lc Mg Mm Ph2 Ph3 Pw Ry1 Ry2 Sl1 Sl2 To

In MO 703 Ad1 Ad3 Ch Cn Dd Ds1 1 El En3 Gg Hg Ht Ln Ma Mc Se and Tc1 agree with Hg and El in having the pronoun 'hir,' but Bo1 Bw Cp Cx2 Dl En2 Fi Gl Ha1 Ha2 Ha3 li La Lc Mg Mm Ph2 Ph3 Pw Ry1 Ry2 Sl1 Sl2 and To1 agree with Cx2 and do not have it. Although a small number of witnesses agree with Cx2, none of the manuscripts that usually support its variants is among them. It is likely that the agreements on this reading are the result of chance and not an indication of stemmatic relationship.

NP 50-1

NP 50-1...NP 50-2

Out: Cx1 El Hg Ad3 Bo1 Bw Ch Cp Gg Ha4 La Ht Ra3 Ad1 Dl  
En2 En3 Gl Ha2 Ha3 He li Lc Ld1 Mc Mg Mm Ne Ph2 Ph3 Ps  
Pw Py Ry2 Se Sl1 Sl2 Tc1 Tc2 To1

Base He Federyd<sup>h</sup> here a C tymys on a day

Cx2 He fethered her an hundred tyme a day

on a] Cn

a ] Cx2 En1 Ds1 Ln Ma Pn Wy

in a ] Ma

of the ] Ry1

NP 50-2

Base And<sup>h</sup> she hym plesyth all þ<sup>t</sup> eu<sup>2</sup> she may

Cx2 And<sup>h</sup> sñe hym plesith al that euer sñe may

NP 50-1 and 50-2 are present in a few of the witnesses only. These include Cn Ds1 1 En1 Ma -- **a** group -- Ry 1 -- **d** group -- and Ln --group **F**.

Once more, in NP 50-1 we find the word 'in' not present in Cx2 and present in Cp. In this case it is the preposition 'on,' which, in fact, appears only in Cp. Ma has 'in' instead of 'on,' and Ry1 has 'of.' The rest of the witnesses agree with Cx2, which is not surprising, since they are **a** group manuscripts. The agreement in the case of Ln could be the result of an agreement by coincidence.

Probably one of the most interesting differences between Cx2 and Cx1, together with the addition of L20, is the addition of L31, a sixteen-line link sometimes referred to as the Nun's Priest's Endlink. This text is present in only 11 witnesses -- Ad1 Ch Cn Cx2 Dd Ds1 1 En1 En3 Ma Ry1 and Wy. Wy was probably set from Cx2 and, for this reason, it is not surprising to find that their texts share many variants. Most of the witnesses that include L31 are manuscripts of the **a** group --En1 Cn Ma. However, the text is also present in Ch, a manuscript, as I have said before, whose text is likely to be genetically related to that of  $\omega$ . Ry1 probably acquired the text through contamination.

However, L31 is textually less interesting than L20. There are very few variants in the sixteen lines and they are located in L31 2, 12, 14, and 16.

#### L31 2

Base	I	blissed	be	thy	breche	and	euey	ston
Cx2	Y	blessyd	be	thy	breche	and	euey	stoon
Ad1	I	blessid	be	thi	breche	and	every	stoon
Ch	Y	blessed	be	thy	breth	7	euy	stoone
Cn	Blessyd <sup>o</sup>	be	thy	Breche	and <sup>o</sup>	euy	stone	
Dd	I	blissed	be	thy	breche	and	euey	ston
Ds1	I	blessed	be	thi	breche	and	eueri	ston
En1	Yblessed <sup>o</sup>	be	thy	breche	and	euy	stoo <sup>o</sup>	
En3	I	blissid	be	thi	breeth	and	every	stoon

Ma Blisced be þi breche and eu̅y stoo̅r  
 Ry1 I blissid be thy breche and eu̅y stoon  
 Wy Y blessyd be thy breche 7 eury stoon

In L31 2 we find the agreement of Cx2 with Ad1 Cn Ds1 1 En1 Ma Ry1 and Wy in the reading 'breche', against 'brethe' in Ch Dd and En3. This reading is likely to have been the one in the archetype of this part of the text.

L31 12  
 Base Him nedeth nat his colour for to dyghen  
 Ad1 Hym needith nat his colour̅ for to dyen  
 Ch Hym nedeth nat his colour for to dyen  
 Cn Hym nedyth not his colour for to dyen  
 Cx2 Hym nedeth not his colours for to dyen  
 Dd Hi nedeth nat his colour for to dyghen  
 Ds1 Him nedeth nat his colour for to dyen  
 En1 Hym nedeth̅ nat his colo̅r for to dye̅r  
 En3 Hym needith nat his colour for to deyen  
 Ma Hym nedith̅ not his colo̅r for to dien  
 Ry1 Hym nedith̅ nat his colours for to dyen  
 Wy Hym nedyth not his colours for to dyen

L31 12 presents the agreement of Cx2 with Ry2 in the plural reading 'colours', against the singular 'colour', which is in Ad1 Ch Cn Dd Ds1 1 En1 En3 Ma.

The variants in L31 14 and 16 are singletons. In line 14, Cx2 reads 'But,' where all the manuscripts have 'Now.' In line 16 it replaces 'vnto' with 'to.' These are, of course, not relevant for tracing the affiliations of ω.

The information in these variants is, obviously, too random and unrepresentative to lead to any conclusions. Manly and Rickert's explanation about L31 is not satisfactory:

Though Chaucer often repeats favorite lines, it seems unlikely that he would have represented the Host as speaking thus to the Nun's Priest after having addressed similar remarks to the Monk (B 3131-52)... It is therefore probable that the NP Link, though genuine, was rejected after the words to the Monk were written. This seems to be supported by the fact that the Host's words to the Priest after the tale suggest a different type of person from that suggested by his words in the Mk-NP Link (B 4000-10) -- a bit surely written after MkT was inserted in CT. Only the a ancestor failed to note the cancellation of the rejected lines (1940, 4: 517).

Manly and Rickert's statement fails to explain how the link came to be in Ch, a manuscript that has a descent that is independent of the **a** hyparchetype, and in Ry2 and Cx2, which they do not classify as belonging to the **a** group. In this way we find that there are three witnesses in total for which we lack a proper account of the reasons why they have included L31. The consistent agreement between Cx2 and Ch and a theory of their genetic relationship could explain at least part of this puzzle.

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

TM 241Cx1 of what rote is engen-dryo<sup>ð</sup> the mater of thy  
 councey<sup>þ</sup> And<sup>ð</sup> what fruyt it may concerne 7 engendryñ .

TM 249 Cx1 And<sup>ð</sup> yf that thou be in doubte whether thou  
 may p-forme hyt or not / Chese rather to suffre than to  
 begynne .

TM 874-r Cx1 And<sup>ð</sup> yet shal he not hooly besye hym in  
 kepyng<sup>7</sup> of his good<sup>ð</sup> name /

The deletions from TM have not been replaced by anything in Cx2. From this one could assume that they could be accidental omissions, i.e. eyeskip, or have been removed from the page for composition purposes, for example, if the text did not fit the space on the page, part of it might have been suppressed by the compositor in order to fit the text into the page.

#### *1.2.4 Line Misplacements*

Cx2 presents several changes in the order of the stanzas in MO.

MO 635 Cx1 That of this story writen word<sup>ð</sup> and<sup>ð</sup> ende  
MO 636 Cx1 How that thyse conquerours two  
MO 637 Cx1 Fortune was first frenð<sup>ð</sup> 7 sithen foo  
MO 638 Cx1 ðoman truste vp on his fauour longe  
IF 314vl  
MO 639 Cx1 But haue here in a wayte for euermo  
MO 640 Cx1 Witnes on alle the conquerours stronge  
MO 641 Cx1 THE riche Cresus whilom kyng<sup>7</sup> of lyde  
MO 642 Cx1 Of whiche Cresus Citrins sore hym drad<sup>ð</sup>

MO 701 Cx2 And for no thyng<sup>7</sup> but for thy chyualrye  
MO 702 Cx2 They in thy bedde han slayn the by the  
morowe  
MO 703 Cx2 Thus can fortune wel gouerne and<sup>ð</sup> gye  
MO 704 Cx2 And<sup>ð</sup> out of loye bryng men to sorowe

MO 641 Cx2 THE riche cresus whylom kyng of lyde  
MO 642 Cx2 Of whiche cresus / cirus sore hym dradde  
MO 643 Cx2 Yet was he caught amyð al his pryde  
MO 644 Cx2 And to brenne men to the fyre hym ladde

There is a single misplacement in this set. This is the only instance in which a major misplacement, lines Cx2 641 to Cx2 680 --moved after Cx2 704--, from Cx1 to Cx2 does not follow the line order of the most important manuscripts. This change in line order occurs in a single page and seems to indicate that it is possible that the change in the order of the stanzas was in  $\omega$ . The text of Cx1 stops at MO 680, so it is also possible that the extra text was introduced in a place that either Caxton or his compositors considered appropriate.

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

The variant distribution for this group is as follows:

178 Cx2-O variants, which confirm the excellence of  $\omega$ . These are distributed as 14 in TM, 7 in L29, 71 in MO, 9 in L30, 77 in NP.

34 Cx2-Unique variants, which are unique to Cx2 in the current collation. These are distributed as 16 in TM, 0 in L29, 14 in MO, 1 in L30, 3 in NP.

6 Cx2-Hg/El variants, in which Cx2 agrees with El or Hg against the other. These are distributed as 0 TM, 0 in L29, 2 in MO, 0 in L30, 4 in NP.

The distribution of the agreements by manuscript is as follows:

Hg against El: 4

El against Hg: 2

30 Cx2-not-Hg/El variants, in which Cx2 agrees with another manuscript against both Hg and El. These are distributed as 5 TM, 0 in L29, 9 in MO, 0 in L30, 16 in NP.

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

These variants show, once more, that when Cx2 agrees with Hg against El, it usually does so in variants that are archetypal. The agreements of Cx2 and El, on the other hand, are definitely non-archetypal readings.

### 1.3.1.1 *Hg against El*

#### 1.3.1.1.1 Archetypal Agreements with Hg

There are four variants in which Cx2 agrees with Hg against El. All of these seem to be archetypal. Only one of them --NP 362-- presents a reading that is not supported by Ad3 or Ch, the witnesses that most commonly agree with Cx2.

MO 637

Base	Fortune was first freend and siththe a foo
Cx1	Fortune was first frend <sup>ð</sup> 7 sithen foo
Cx2	Fortune was first a frende 7 sythen a foo
Hg	Fortune was first freend and siththe a foo
El	Fortune was first freend and sitthe foo

a ] Ad1 Ad3 Bw Ch Cn Cp Cx2 Dd Ds1 1 En2 En3 Gg Gl Lc  
 Ln Ma Mg Mm Ph3 Pw Ry2 Sl2 Tc2 To1  
 not present ] Cx1 Dl El Fi Ha1 Ha2 Ha3 Ha4 He Hn Ht li  
 La

There are two very similar variants in MO 637. Cx2 has added two indefinite articles. Cx2 is in agreement with Hg against El in the addition before 'foo'. Most of the collated witnesses also agree with Cx2, including Ad3 and Ch, indicating that this variant is likely to be archetypal. However, El is supported by Ht and Ha4.

NP 111

Base	Of	rede	bestes	that	they	wol	hem	byte
Cx1	Of	grete	bestes	that		wole	hem	byte
Cx2	Of	rede	bestes	that		wol	hem	byte
Hg	Of	rede	bestes	that	they	wol	hem	byte
El	Of	grete	beestes	that	they	wol	hem	byte

rede ] Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bw Ch Cn Cp Cx2 Dd Dl Ds1 1 En1 En2  
En3 Gg Gl Ha2 Ha3 Ha4 He Hg Ht li La Lc Ld1 Ln Ma Mc Mg  
Mm Ph2 Ph3 Pn Ps Pw Py Ra3 Ry1 Ry2 Se Sl1 Sl2 Tc1 To1  
Wy

grete ] Cx1 El Ne Tc2

Cx2 agrees with Hg and the vast majority of the witnesses in the reading 'rede' against the reading of Cx1 Ne Tc2 --**b** group-- and El. Once more, the reading in Cx2 is archetypal, while the one in Cx1 is clearly related to the **b** group.

NP 362

Base	And	chukketh	whan	he	hath	a	corn	yfounde
Cx1	Ay	he	chuckid <sup>ð</sup>	whenne	he	hadde	a	corn y founde
Cx2	And <sup>ð</sup>	chuckyd	whan	he	had	a	corn	y founde
Hg	And	chukketh	whan	he	hath	a	corn	yfounde
El	He	chukketh	whan	he	hath	a	corn	yfounde

And ] Cn Cx2 Dd Ds1 1 En1 Gl Ha4 Hg Ld1 Ln Ma Pn Ps Py  
Ra3 Wy

He ] Ad1 Ad3 Ch El En3 Gg Ha3 He li Se

Ay ] Bo1 Bw Cp Dl En2 Ha2 Ht La Lc Mc Mg Mm Ph2  
Ph3 Pw Ra1 Ra2 Ry1 Ry2 Sl2 To1

Ay he ] Cx1 Ne Tc2

Hey ] Sl1

The reading of Cx1, 'Ay he,' has been replaced in Cx2 with 'And<sup>ð</sup>.' Hg Ha4 Ra3 Cn Dd Ds1 1 En1 Gl Ld1 Ln Ma Pn Ps Py and Wy support the Cx2 reading. The Cx1 reading is the one also found in Ne and Tc2, that is, a **b** group reading. El, on the other hand, has 'He' instead of 'And.' The El reading is supported by manuscripts that

are usually in agreement with Cx2, such as Ad3 and Ch, a fact to be taken into account in the final assessment of this variant. It is likely, however, that the Hg reading is archetypal.

NP 584

Base	The	hope and	pryde eek	of hire enemy
Cx1	The	hope and <sup>b</sup>	the pryde	of her enuy
Cx2	The	hope and <sup>b</sup>	the pryde eke	of her enemye
Hg	The	hope and	pryde eek	of hire enemy
El	The	hope and	pryde	of hir enemy

pride eke] Ad1 Ad3 Ch Cn Cx2 Dd Ds1 1En1 En3 Gl Ha2 Ha3  
 Ha4 He Hg li Ln Ma Mc Mg Mm Ph2 Ph3 Ra3 Ry1  
 eke pride ] Bw Ha2 Ht Lc Mc Mm Ph3 Pw  
 eke the pride ] Cp La Ph2 Pn Ps Se Tc1 To1  
 pride ] Bo1 Cx1 El Ne Tc2 Wy  
 eke for pride ] Dl  
 pride and eke ] Py  
 eke ] Ra2 Ry2

In NP 584, Cx2 agrees with Hg against El in having the reading 'pride eke' instead of just 'eke.' In this, they are supported by the majority of the manuscripts, including Ad3 Ch and Ra3. The El reading, on the other hand, is supported only by Bo1 Cx1 Ne Tc2 and Wy. The suppression of 'eke' in El alters the metre of the line and breaks the pattern of the iambic pentameter.

### 1.3.1.2 *El against Hg*

In both MO 304 and NP 494 we find that Cx2 and El agree against the vast majority of the witnesses. Not even Gg, which in sets 1 and 6 often supports the Cx2/El agreements, shares these readings. This raises questions as to whether they are

the result of agreement by coincidence or if there is trace of a genetic relationship between the witnesses.

### 1.3.1.2.1 Agreements with E1 below the Archetype

MO 304

Base Was noon thogh al this world men sholde seke  
Cx1 Was non though al this worlde men shuld<sup>r</sup> seche  
Cx2 Was none though al this world men wolde seke  
Hg Was noon thogh al this world men sholde seke  
E1 Was noon though al this world men wolde seke

sholde ] Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bw Ch Cn Cp Cx1 Dd DI Ds1 1 En2  
En3 Fi Gg Gl Ha1 Ha2 Ha3 He Hg li La Lc Ma Mc Mg Mm Ne  
Ph2 Ph3 Pw Py1 Py2 Se Sl2 Tc1 Tc2 To1  
wolde ] Cx2 E1  
not present ] Ha4 Hn Ht Sl1

In MO 304, Cx2 agrees with E1 in the reading 'wolde.' No other witness supports this reading. Instead, the vast majority of the witnesses have the Hg reading 'sholde.' Only Cx2 and E1 agree in this reading, so we may assume that this is an agreement by coincidence, since it would have been very easy for a scribe or compositor to change 'sholde' into 'wolde.'

NP 494

Base For a preestes sone yaf hym a knob  
Cx1 For a prestis sone yaf hym a knob  
Cx2 For that a preestes sone yaf hym a knob  
Hg For a preestes sone yaf hym a knob<sup>r</sup>  
E1 For that a preestes sone yaf hym a knob<sup>r</sup>

For ] Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bw Ch Cp Cx1 En2 En3 Gg Gl Ha2 Ha3  
Ha4 He Hg Ht li La Lc Mc Mg Mm Ne Ph2 Ph3 Pn Py Pw Ra2  
Ra3 Ry2 Se Sl1 Sl2Tc1 Tc2 To1

That for ] Cn Dd Ds1 En1 Ln Ma Ps Ry1  
And fore ] DI  
For that ] Cx2 El Wy

As in MO 304, in NP 494 Cx2 agrees with El against the majority of the other witnesses. In this case, Wy also agrees with Cx2, but this is of no importance since Wy was partially based on an off-print of Cx2 and for this reason shares many of its variants. The addition in Cx2 gives an extra syllable to the line and cancels the iambic pentameter by altering the structure the line's structure. Probably the word 'that' was not present in the archetype.

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

Of a total of 30 Cx2-not-Hg/El variants, 21 are either non-stematically significant because either they are the product of agreement by coincidence -- TM 467, TM 665, MO 108, TM 792, TM 835, MO 49, MO 64, MO 133, MO 325, L30 6, NP 12, NP 32, NP 103, NP 347, NP 600 and NP 626-- or because they are agreements of Cx2 with later printed editions --as in lines NP 53, NP 140, NP 256, NP 375 and NP 107a, for example. All of these can be found in the electronic appendix d, chapter 7, 1.3.2.

The remaining nine variants could be of importance in tracing the affiliations of  $\omega$  and, for this reason, are analysed below.

#### **1.3.2.1 Agreements below the Archetype with $\alpha$ Witnesses**

TM 267  
Base yow by oure conseilours that we  
Cx1 yow be our counceyllours that we

Cx2 yow be your counceyllours that we  
 Hg yow by oure conseilours þ' we  
 El yow by oure conseilours that we

oure ] Ad3 Bw Ch Cn Cp Cx1 Dd Dl Ds1 1 Gg El En1 Fi Gl Hg  
 Ha2 Ha4 li La Ma Se Tc1  
 youre ] Ad1 Cx2 En3 Hk Mc Ne To1  
 not present ] fl

The variant in TM 267 is very interesting. Cx2 has the reading 'youre,' supported by Ad1 En3 Hk Mc Ne and To1, while Hg El Cx1 and all the other witnesses --with the exception of Nl-- have 'oure.' Ad1 and En3 belong to Robinson's  $\alpha$  group, which could indicate a genetic affiliation. However, Tc1 and Ad3 also belong to  $\alpha$  and both of them agree with the Hg reading.

MO 567

MO 567 out: Hn

Base For thogh I write or tolde yow euere mo  
 Cx1 For though I wrrote or tolde you euyr mo  
 Cx2 For though I wrote and<sup>þ</sup> tolde you euyr mo  
 Hg For thogh I write or tolde yow euere mo  
 El For though I write or tolde yow euermo

or ] Ad3 Ch Cp Cx1 Dd El En2 Gg Gl He Hg La Ne Sl2 Tc2  
 and ] Ad1 Bo1 Bw Cn Cx2 Dl Ds1 1 En3 Fi Ha1 Ha2  
 Ha3 Ht li Lc Ln Ma Mc Mg Mm Ph2 Ph3 Pw Ra1 Ry1  
 Ry2 Se Sl1 To1

In MO 567, Cx2 has replaced the conjunction 'or' with 'and,' which seems to make better sense in the context of this line. The fact that something makes better sense, however, is no indication that this is archetypal and, since none of the **O** manuscripts is in agreement with Cx2, one can assume that 'or' is probably the archetypal reading.

NP 14

Base Of poynaunt sawce hir neded neuer a deel  
 Cx1 Of poynaunt sawce nedith her neuer a deel  
 Cx2 Of poynaunt sawce ne knewe sñe neuer adeel  
 Hg Of poynaūt sawce hir neded neuʳ a deel  
 El Of poynaunt Sauce hir neded neuʳ a deel

sawce ] Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bw Ch Cn Cp Cx1 Dl Ds1 1 El En1 En3  
 Gl Ha2 Ha3 Ha4 He Hg Ht li La Lc Ld1 Ln Ma Mc Mg Mm Ne  
 Ph2 Ph3 Ps Pw Py Ra3 Ry1 Ry2 Se Sl1 Sl2 Tc1 Tc2 To1  
 sawce ne] Cx2 Me Pn Wy

hir neded ] Ad1 Ad3 Bw Ch Cp Dl Ds1 1 El Ha2 Ha4 Hg Ht La  
 Lc Mc Mm Ph2 Ph3 Pw Py Ry2 Tc1 To1  
 she neded ] Bo1 Ha3 li Sl2  
 she nedith ] He  
 knewe she ] Cn Cx2 En1 En3 Ln Ma Me Pn Wy  
 nedith hir ] Cx1 Ne  
 hir nedith ] Gl Ld1 Mg Ps Ra3 Se Sl1  
 hir nedis ] Ry1  
 nedith she ] Tc2

There are two variants in NP 14, one is the addition of the adverb 'ne' and the other the substitution of Cx1's 'nedith her' with 'knewe she.' The addition of 'ne' is supported by Me and the two printed editions. The reading 'knewe she' is found in Cn Ds1 1 En1 Ln Ma Me Pn and Wy. These two variants have the common element of Cx2 being supported by Me --as in NP 273. Although Me is a very short fragment, it has peculiarities that make it interesting. Concerning Me, Manly and Rickert comment: "Textually very close to Dd. But several small variants show that it was not the ancestor of the a group or any member of it" (1940, 1: 362). They date this fragment to the same time as Hg and El, between 1400 and 1410 (1940, 2: 46-7). It is interesting that in the variants above, Dd disagrees with Cx2 and Me.

### 1.3.2.2 Agreements below the Archetype with Ha4 or a Group Witnesses

MO 677

Base	But	that	Fortune	alwey	wole	assaille
Cx1	For	that	fortune	alday	wol	assaylle
Cx2	But for	that	fortune	alday	wyl	assaylle
Hg	But	þʳ	Fortune	alwey	wole	assaille
El	But	that	Fortune	alwey	wole	assaille

But ] Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bw Ch Cp Dl Ds1 1 El En2 En3 Fi Gl Ha1  
 Ha2 Ha3 Hg Ht La Lc Mc Mg Mm Ph2 Ph3 Pw Ra1 Ry1 Ry2  
 Sl1 Sl2 Tc1 To1

For ] Cx1 He li ne Tc2

But for ] Cx2 Cn Dd Gg Ha4 Hn Ln Ma Se

In MO 677, Cx2 has 'But for' at the beginning of the line, where Hg has 'But.' A few witnesses support the Cx2 reading: Cn Dd Gg Ha4 Hn Ln Ma and Se. This is the only reading in the minor variants in this set in which Cx2 is in agreement with Ha4 but, surprisingly, neither Ad3 nor Ch support this reading.

NP 273

NP 273 after NP 271: To1

Out: Mc Ra1 Tc1

Base	And	of	many	a maze	ther	with	al
Cx1	And <sup>ð</sup>	of	many	amase	therwith	al	
Cx2	And <sup>ð</sup> eke	of	many	a mase	therwyth	al	
Hg	And	of	many	a maze	ther	with	al
El	And	of	many	a maze	therwith	al	

And ] Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bw Ch Cp Cx1 Dl El En3 Gg Gl Ha2 Ha3  
 Ha4 He Hg Ht li La Lc Ld1 Mg Mm ne Ph2 Ph3 Ps Pw Py Ra2  
 Ra3 Ry1 Ry2 Se Sl1 Sl2 Tc2 To1

And eke ] Cn Cx2 Ds1 1 Dd En1 Ln Ma Me Pn Wy

Here we again find the agreement of Cx2 manuscripts of the **a** group, Pn Wy and Me: the addition of 'eke' after 'And.' This addition alters the metre of the line and could have been purposely inserted to make the line regular. It might explain why this reading is found in certain manuscripts and not in others.

NP 358

Base	And	trad		as	ofte	er	it	was	pryme
Cx1	And <sup>ð</sup>	trade		as	ofte	or	it	was	pryme
Cx2	And <sup>ð</sup>	trade	her eke	as	ofte	or	it	was	pryme
Hg	And	trad		as	ofte	er	it	was	pryme
El	And	trad		as	ofte	er	it	was	pryme

trad ] Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bw Ch Cp Cx1 Dl El En2 En3 Gg Gl Ha2  
 Ha3 Ha4 He Hg Ht li La Lc Ld1 Mc Mg Mm Ne Ph2 Ph3 Ps Pw  
 Py Ra1 Ra2 Ra3 Ry1 Ry2 Se Sl1 Sl2 Tc1 Tc2 To1  
 trad als ] Mm Ps  
 trad hire eke ] Cn Cx2 Dd Ds1 1 En1 Ln Ma Pn Wy  
 trade hire ] li La

As in previous NP lines, we find here that there is an addition in Cx2 --'her eke'--, supported by manuscripts belonging to the **a** group, as well as Pn and Wy. Once more, the addition alters the metre of the line and makes this hypermetrical, but the consistent agreement of Cx2 and the **a** group in NP could be sign of a genetic relationship.

### 1.3.2.3 Agreements below the Archetype with Ch

NP 506

Base	Is	in	youre	court	and	many	a	losengeour
Cx1	Is	in	your	court	and <sup>ð</sup>	meny	a	fals losingour

Cx2 In in your court 7 many a fals losyngour  
 Hg Is in youre court7 and many a losengeour  
 El Is in youre Co'tes and many a losengeour

Is ] Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bw Cn Cp Cx1 Dd DI Ds1 1 El En1 En2 En3  
 Gg Gl Ha2 Ha3 Ha4 He Hg Ht li La Lc Ln Ma Mc Mg Mm Ne  
 Ph2 Ph3 Pn Ps Pw Py Ra2 Ra3 Ry1 Ry2 Se Sl1 Sl2 Tc1 Tc2  
 To1 Wy  
 In ] Ch Cx2

The variant in NP 506 is not a particularly evident one, but for the purposes of this research is of great importance because it involves a nonsensical reading present both in Cx2 and Ch. Both witnesses repeat the preposition 'In' at the beginning of the line. Even if this is an easy mistake to make and that the possibility of it arising independently in both witnesses remains possible, the fact that Ch and Cx2 have a very consistent history of agreements makes it of great importance and of likely genetic origin.

#### 1.3.2.4 Variants of Ambiguous Character (Agreements with Ht)

MO 576  
 MO 576 after MO 575a: En2 Fi  
 Base And for thee ne weep she neuer a teere  
 Cx1 And<sup>h</sup> for the ne wepte she neuer a teer  
 Cx2 And<sup>h</sup> yet for the ne wepte she neuer a teer  
 Hg And for thee ne weep she neuer a teere  
 El And for thee ne weep she neu<sup>u</sup> a teere

And ] Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Ch Cx1 Dd El En2 En3 Gg Ha4 He Hg Hn  
 li La Ln Ma Ne Ry1 Tc2  
 And yet ] Bw Cn Cp Cx2 DI Fi Gl Ha1 Ha2 Ha3 Ht La  
 Lc Mc Mg Mm Ph2 Ph3 Pw Ra1 Ry2 Se Sl1 Sl2 To1  
 not present ] Ds1

The addition of the word 'yet' makes the line hypermetrical and, because of its variant distribution, one may more or less safely assume that it was not present in the archetype. None of the witnesses which usually agree with Cx2 supports its reading in MO 576. However, Ht is in agreement here, and, if proven consistent, could be an indication of a genetic relationship.

MO 637

Base Fortune was first freend and siththe a foo  
 Cx1 Fortune was first frend<sup>ð</sup> 7 sithen foo  
 Cx2 Fortune was first a frende 7 sythen a foo  
 Hg Fortune was first freend and siththe a foo  
 El Fortune was first freend and sitthe foo

freend ] Ad1 Ad3 Bo1 Bw Ch Cp Cx1 Dd Dl Ds1 El En2 En3  
 Gg Gl Ha1 Ha2 Ha3 Ha4 Hg Hn li La Lc Ln Mc Mg Mm Ne Ph2  
 Ph3 Pw Ra1 Ry2 Se Sl1 Sl2 Tc1 Tc2 To1  
 a freend ] Cx2 Ht

There are two variants in MO 637, and they are both very similar. Cx2 has added two indefinite articles. In the first case, when the article has been added before 'frende,' and Ht agrees with Cx2. In the second case, the addition of 'a' before 'foo,' the agreement is with Hg against El.

## **2. SET 14: LINK 36 AND THE MANCIPLE'S TALE<sup>2</sup>**

### **2.1 Set Summary**

Set 14 is relatively short, but even so, the amount of variation, stated as a percentage, is low. There are only two major additions which have no variants within them.

The minor variants are unusual in so far as in the Cx2-not-Hg/El, in three out of three instances Cx2 agrees with the c group manuscripts La and Cp.

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

#### ***2.2.1 Line Substitutions***

There are no line substitutions in this set.

#### ***2.2.2 Line Additions***

The only addition in this set fills a gap left in Cx1, where the line was not included.

MA 212 Cx2 But as I sayd<sup>h</sup> I am not textuel

#### ***2.2.3 Line Deletions***

There are no line deletions in this set.

#### ***2.2.3 Line Misplacements***

---

<sup>2</sup> The witnesses collated for L36 are: Ad3 Ch Cp Cx1 Cx2 Ds1 El Gg Ha4 Hg Ht La Ra3 Se. The witnesses collated for MA are: Ad3 Bo2 Ch Cp Cx1 Cx2 Ds1 El Gg Ha4 Hg Ht La Ra3.

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:

30 Cx2-O variants, which confirm the excellence of  $\omega$ . These are distributed as 9 in L36, 21 in MA.

7 Cx2-Unique variants, which are unique to Cx2 in the current collation. These are distributed as 3 in L36, 4 in MA.

2 Cx2-Hg/El variants, in which Cx2 agrees with El or Hg against the other. These are distributed as 0 in L36, 2 in MA.

The distribution of the agreements by manuscript is as follows:

Hg against El: 2

El against Hg: 0

3 Cx2-not-Hg/El variants, in which Cx2 agrees with another manuscript against both Hg and El. These are distributed as 2 in L36, 1 in MA.

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

In this group of variants we find two variants in which Cx2 agrees with Hg against El, while there are no instances of agreements of Cx2 and El against Hg. Of these two variants, MA 147 is an archetypal reading shared by Cx2 and Hg. MA 162, is a more difficult case, and it is difficult to determine the nature of its reading.

##### ***2.3.1.1 Hg against El***

### 2.3.1.1.1 Archetypal Variant

MA 147

Base	For al thy song	and al thy Mynstralcye
Cx1	For al thy song <sup>7</sup>	and <sup>8</sup> thy mynstralcye
Cx2	For al thy song	and al thy mynstralcye
Hg	For al thy song <sup>7</sup>	and al thy Mynstralcye
El	For al thy song <sup>7</sup>	and thy Mynstralcye

and al ] Ad3 Ch Cp Cx2 Ds1 En1 Hg Ht La  
and ] Bo2 Cx1 El Gg Ha4 Ra3

Here Hg and Cx2 agree in having the adjective 'al', which is not present in Cx1 and El. Ad3 Ch Cp Ds1 1 En1 Ht and La agree with Cx2, while Gg El Ha4 and Ra3 agree with Cx1. The Cx2 version of the line is metrically regular, while the El version is one syllable short of an iambic pentameter.

### 2.3.1.1.2 Variant of Ambiguous Character

MA 162

Base	This is theeffect	ther nys	namoore to sayn
Cx1	This is the effect	ther is	nomore to sayn
Cx2	This is the effect	ther nys	namoore to sayn
Hg	This is theeffect <sup>7</sup>	ther nys	namoore to sayn
El	This is theeffect <sup>7</sup>	ther is	namoore to sayn

nys ] Ad3 Bo2 Cx2 Hg  
is ] Ch Cx1 Ds1 El En1Gg Ha4 Ht Ra3

In MA 162 Cx2 has the reading 'nys' as does Hg. This reading is supported by Ad3 and Bo2. The rest of the witnesses have 'is' as does El. In this case it is not possible to

decide which reading was present in the archetype, since they only differ in creating a double negative. None of these alters the meaning or metre of the line.

### 2.3.1.2 *El against Hg*

There are no variants in which Cx2 agrees with El against Hg in this set.

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

Of a total of 3 variants Ad3 and Cx2 are in agreement twice. Ch and Ht agree with Cx2 only once. These agreements might seem to be few, but this is due to the length of the set and the amount of variation found on it.

None of the Cx2-not-Hg/El variants is remarkable, these variants are meaningful in the context of the overall agreements of Cx2 with other witnesses.

#### 2.3.2.1 Agreement with Ad3 and Ht below the Archetype

L36 39

Base	Thy	cursed	breeth / infecte	wol	vs	alle
Cx1	Thy	cursid <sup>o</sup>	breth̄	enfectith	vs	alle
Cx2	Thy	cursyd <sup>o</sup>	breth	wyl enfecte	vs	alle
Hg	Thy	cursed	breeth , infecte	wol	vs	alle
El	Thy	cursed	breeth̄ , infecte	wole	vs	alle

infecte wol] Ch Ds1 El Ha4 Hg Se  
wol infecte ] Ad3 Cp Cx2 Ht La Ra3  
enfectith ] Cx1

L36 39 presents an alteration in word order in which Cx2 reads 'wyl enfecte' while Hg and El have 'infecte wol.' The majority of the collated witnesses --including Ad3 and Ht-- agrees with Cx2. Ch and Ha4 support the Hg reading.

### 2.3.2.2 Variants of Ambiguous Character

L36 90

Base	And whan	he hadde	/ powped	in this	horn
Cx1	And <sup>ð</sup> when	he hadde	poupid <sup>ð</sup>	in this	horn
Cx2	And when	he had <sup>ð</sup>	poupyd	in his	horn
Hg	And whan	he hadde	/ powped	in this	horn
El	And whan	he hadde	/ pouped	in this	horn

this ] Ad3 Ch Cx1 El Hg Se  
his ] Cp Cx2 Ds1 En1 Ha4 Ht La  
the ] Ra3

In L36 90 Cx2 has the possessive 'his' instead of 'this,' which is the Hg and El reading. On this occasion, Cx2 agrees with Ht Ha4 and the c group manuscripts Cp and La, while Ad3 and Ch support the Hg reading. Again, the nature of this variant and the fact that it does not alter the metre of the line make it very difficult to judge which belongs to the archetype and which is derivative.

MA 39

Base	Saue oonly	/ that the	sothe / if	I shal	sayn
Cx1	Saue only	the soth <sup>n</sup>	yf I shal	sayn	
Cx2	Saue only	yf the soth	yf I s <sup>n</sup> al	sayn	
Hg	Saue oonly	/ that the	sothe / if	I shal	sayn
El	Saue oonly	/ the sothe	that I shal	sayn	

that ] Hg  
if ] Bo2 Cx2 Cp Ds1 1 Ha4 La  
this is ] Ch  
not present ] Ad3 Cx1 El Gg Ht Ra3

In MA 39, Cx2 has added the conjunction 'if' before 'the sothe.' In the same position Hg has 'that' while El has neither of these. Both the El and the Hg versions of the line are metrically equivalent. The Cx2 version, supported by Cp Ds1 1 En1 Ha4 and La, is one syllable too short. Neither Ch nor Ad3 agrees with Cx2. In fact, they do not agree with Hg either. The variant distribution is not easy to interpret because the available data is too limited.

### **3. SET 15: LINK 37, THE PARSON'S TALE AND THE RETRACTION<sup>3</sup>**

#### **3.1 Set Summary**

The data for this set shows a very low rate of variation. The set comprises more than a thousand lines of PA, which is highly unusual and indicates that the tale was not corrected. This is consistent with TM and with Dunn's observations about the treatment of the prose by Caxton (1939, 11-2).

In PA we find other unusual characteristics, for example, of the nine Cx2-O variants, at least three --PA 190, 308 and 969-- are the result of the correction of an obvious mistake in Cx1. Both PA 190 and 969 had presented repeated words in Cx1, one of which was suppressed in Cx2. These corrections did not require a manuscript; they are changes that could be made without any external reference. One of the Cx2-Unique variants, in PA 531, is also the result of one such correction of Cx1. Of a total of 34 Cx2-unique variants, nine are compositorial mistakes in Cx2 --PA 58, PA 80,

---

<sup>3</sup> The witnesses collated for L37 are: Ad3 Ch Cp Cx1 Cx2 Ds1 El En1 Gg Gl Ha4 Hg Ht La Ra3. The witnesses collated for PA are: Ad3 Ch Cp Cx1 Cx2 Ds1 El En1 Gg Ha4 Hg Ht La Ra3. The witnesses collated for RT are: Cx1 Cx2 En1 Ha4 Ht La.

PA 316, PA 404, PA 422, PA 539, PA 937, PA 950 and PA 965. This indicates that, of thirty-four variants, ten did not require an external source to be introduced.

In this set, we find that there are a total of 1 Cx2-Hg/EI variants and 6 Cx2-not-Hg/EI variants. However, all the latter are likely to be the results of agreements by coincidence.

### 3. 2. Analysis of Variant Lines

#### 3.2.1 Line Substitutions

There are no line substitutions in this set.

#### 3.2.2 Line Additions

There is one line addition in this set. In RT at the end of 1008, the ending of the line was added in Cx2.

RT 1008			
Base	defaute of	myn vnkonnynge	and nat
Cx1	defaute of	myn vnconnyng	
Cx2	faute of	myn vnconnyng	7 not
En1	defaute of	myr̄ vnkonnyng	and nat
Ha4	defaute of	m̄ vncōnyg	and not
Ht	defaute of	myr̄ vnkōnyng	7 not
La	defaute of	myn vnkonynge	7 n[sp]xxx[/sp]

Base	to my wyl	that wolde ful fayn	haue seyd
Cx1			
Cx2	to my wyl	, that Wold fayn	haue sayd <sup>ð</sup>
En1	to my wil	, þat wold <sup>ð</sup> fayr̄	haue seid <sup>ð</sup>
Ha4	to my wille	þat <sup>7</sup> wolde fayn	haue sayd

Ht	to my wil	þat wold	fayne	[unn]x[/unn]aue	seid
La	to my wil	þat wolde	fulfeyne	haue	seide

Base	bettre	, if	I hadde	had	konnyng
Cx1					
Cx2	better	yf that	I had <sup>ð</sup>	had <sup>ð</sup>	connyng
En1	better <sup>̄</sup>	yf	I hade		connyng <sup>7</sup>
Ha4	better	if <sup>7</sup>	I hadde		cōnyng
Ht	better	if	I hadde		konnyng
La	better	if	I hadd		konyng

This is the only major change made to the prose in Cx2. Concerning this and the other variant found in RT, Dunn reports:

Caxton, like any other medieval reader, would have been impressed by Chaucer's retraction, and probably had already made the correction in the margin of the copy of Cx<sup>1</sup> from which he printed... At any rate, this restoration does not enable one to single out a manuscript source for it, and this passage does not indicate that any other of the prose was collated with the new manuscript. (1939, 11)

The fact that Caxton actively corrected RT when the rest of the prose was set up directly from Cx1 is remarkable. It suggests that Caxton gave great importance to this part of the text and that he thought it needed to be accurate, perhaps because here Chaucer addresses the reader directly.

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

There are no line deletions in this set.

### ***3.2.3 Line Misplacements***

There are no line misplacements in this set.

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

The variant distribution for this group is as follows:

17 Cx2-O variants, which confirm the excellence of  $\omega$ . These are distributed as 7 in L37, 9 in PA, 1 in RT.

39 Cx2-Unique variants, which are unique to Cx2 in the current collation. These are distributed as 4 in L37, 35 in PA, 0 in RT.

1 Cx2-Hg/El variant, in which Cx2 agrees with El or Hg against the other. This is in PA.

The distribution of the agreements by manuscript is as follows:

Hg against El: 1

El against Hg: 0

5 Cx2-not-Hg/El variants, in which Cx2 agrees with another manuscript against both Hg and El. These are distributed as 0 in L37, 5 in PA, 0 in RT.

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

Only one Cx2-Hg/El variant can be found in this set, bearing out the earlier the statement that no corrections had been made to the prose texts.

##### ***3.3.1.1 Hg against El***

The only variant in which Cx2 agrees with Hg against El can be found in PA 294.

### 3.3.1.1.1 Variant of Ambiguous Character

PA 294

Base ꝛ Dedly synne / as seith Seynt Augustyn is / whan man

Cx1 Dedely synne as saith saint Austyn is whan a man

Cx2 Dedely synne as sayth saynt Austyn is whan man

Hg ꝛ Dedly synne / as seith Seynt Augustyn is / whan man

El ꝛ Deedly synne / as seith seint Augustyn / is whan a man

man ] Cx2 Ha4 Ht Hg

a man ] Cx1 El Ds1 1 En1 Gg

not present ] La

The variant in PA 294 is the suppression of the indefinite article before 'man' in Cx2.

The article is not present in Hg Ha4 and Ht. The Cx1 variant is supported by El Ds1 1

En1 and Gg. The variant slightly changes the meaning of the sentence, and the

version in Cx2 presents a text that appears to refer to humanity in a general way. The

version in Cx1 and El, however, suggests that a specific example is being referred to.

The text of PA has examples of both uses, so that style is not helpful to determine

which version is archetypal. In fact, to add or suppress an indefinite article is so

common that the variant is likely to be the result of an agreement by coincidence.

### 3.3.1.2 *El against Hg*

There are no variants in which Cx2 agrees with El against Hg in this set.

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

Of the five Cx2-not-Hg/El variants three are suppressions of words that were present in Cx1 --PA 214, 369 and 305-- while the other two are an addition and an alteration in word order. The distribution of these variants is so random that they are probably the result of agreements by coincidence. Since there are so few variants in this set, I have retained them as proof of the low rate of correction in PA.

#### 3.3.2.1 Likely Agreements by Coincidence

PA 214

Base	ϕ	Πazarenu	,	is	as	much	for	to	seye
Cx1		Πazarenu		is	as	moche	for	to	saye
Cx2		Πazarenu		is	as	much		to	saye
Hg	ϕ	Πazarenu	,	is	as	much	for	to	seye
El		Πazarenu	,	is	as	much	for	to	seye

for to] Cx1 Ds1 1 El Hg  
to ] Cp Cx2 Ha4 Ht La

PA 269

Base	and	ones	stoned	almoost	to	the	deth	,	
Cx1	and <sup>δ</sup>	ones	stoned <sup>δ</sup>	al-	most	to	the	deth	,
Cx2	and <sup>δ</sup>	ones	stoned	almost	to		deth	,	
Hg	7	ones	stoned	almoost	to	the	deth	,	
El	and	ones	stoned	almoost	to	the	deeth	,	,

the ] Cx1 Ds1 1 El En1 Hg La  
not present ] Cx2 Ht

PA 305

Base	thynges , that he ne may nat perfourne	∇	eek
Cx1	things that he ne may not performe	,	eke
Cx2	thynges that he may not performe	,	eke
Hg	thynges , þ <sup>t</sup> he ne may nat pfourne	∇	eek <sup>7</sup>
El	thynges , that he ne may nat <sup>7</sup> pfourne	¢	Eke ,

ne ] Cx1 El Ha4 Hg  
not present ] Cx2 Ds1 1 En1 Ht

The suppression of one or more words in Cx2 could be the result of the need to adjust the length of the line. It is also very easy for a compositor to leave out a word, especially when the suppressed words are prepositions and conjunctions. Of the three lines, the most interesting is PA 214, where the reading is supported by Cp Ha4 Ht and La. In fact, Ht is the only witness to support all the variants in which Cx2 has suppressed a word.

PA 284

Base	lhus crist oure creatour	,	thanne is it ded-ly
Cx1	lhesu Crist our creatour		thenne is hit dedely
Cx2	lhesu Cryst our creatour		thenne it is dedely
Hg	lhū crist oure creatour	,	thanne is it ded-ly
El	lhū crist <sup>7</sup> oure creatour <sup>7</sup>		thāne is it deedly

is it ] Cx1 Ds1 1 El En1 Hg Ht La  
it is ] Cx2 Ha4

In PA 284, Cx2 has an alteration in the order of the words. The Cx1 reading 'is hit' has been changed to 'it is.' The Cx2 reading is obviously an easier version than that found in Cx1. Although Ha4 supports Cx2, this reading probably arose by chance, that is, it is an agreement by coincidence.

PA 718

Base that is the blisse of heuene

Cx1 that is the blisse of heuen ,

Cx2 that is in the blisse of heuen ,

El that is the blisse of heuene

is ] Ch Cx1 El En1 Ht

is in ] Cx2 La

Here we find that Cx2 and La have added the preposition 'in.' This agreement is likely to have occurred by coincidence, and can be explained as being a change that could have easily been introduced by the compositor.

