

CONCLUSION

1. IMPLICATIONS OF THE DIFFERENT TALE-ORDERS IN THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE *CANTERBURY TALES*

In the previous chapter I analyzed the individual orders of some important manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*. In this section of the conclusion, I would like to suggest paths to take this further and to attempt to explain the relationships between these witnesses of the text. Particularly, I discuss the importance of tale-order matters in relation to O and also to the codicology of the early manuscripts. In this section of the conclusion, I consider parts of the text that appear in some manuscripts and not in others, such as CY and the passage that links the Second Nun's tale with it (L33).

As shown in chapter 6, there are peculiarities in the manuscripts of the *Tales* that might have profound implications on the order in which each of them presents the text. Sometimes, the scribes made an effort to complete the text (by adding TG, for example). At other times, they showed that they had not realized (or did not care) that a specific part of the text was missing and would never be recovered (as happened with SQ).

1.1 When the Scribes Know What to Do

1.1.1 The Cook's Tale (CO)

The unfinished CO puzzles the modern reader and leads to speculation about the reasons Chaucer might have had to leave the tale in such a state. Is it that Chaucer died

and could not complete it? Did he decide that the tale might become excessive since it features a prostitute? Did Chaucer intend to make a modern statement about textuality by including a tale that was complete in its incompleteness? (Pearsall 241) Scholars who have taught the *Canterbury Tales* are likely to have come across students who proposed these and other alternatives, but most specialists, such as Pearsall, seem to believe that the tale was never finished. The reason for this is very simple: the Hg scribe left a note for us:



Figure 8. Gloss after CO in Hg

This comment can be interpreted in different ways. Stubbs, referring to this specific comment states: "The Hg/El scribe proved in his copying of Hg that he copied under instruction and was reluctant to include material without specific endorsement. His marginal comment affirming that there was no continuation of the Cook's Tale is simple but definite" (Stubbs). Although this is a possible explanation, it is not devoid of a great deal of speculation on her part (that is, that the scribe was "reluctant to include material without specific endorsement"). There is no need to confer upon the scribe such an amount of responsibility; indeed, Parkes and Doyle just tell us that this is a "well informed comment," which is more than enough. Stubbs insists on the privileged position

of this particular scribe because she has put forward this hypothesis about the textual tradition:

The scribe of Dd, who may have been known to the Hg/El scribe and whose manuscript shows close connections in varying ways in both text and tale order with Hg and El, also left a blank space after the Cook's Tale. El has no comment of any kind when the text of the Cook's Tale runs out, but this time two and a half folios are left blank to the end of the quire, again with no catchword. (Stubbs)

This observation about Dd leaving blank the rest of the folio as in Hg and El is correct (see plate 39). However, the Dd feature is weak (the space is not enough to insert anything else), while in other manuscripts, notably Ch (plate 37), we find a longer space and three more folios left on the quire. This means that several manuscripts could have had the option of adding TG at this point, but only a few did.

1.1.2 The Tale of Gamelyn (TG)

As pointed out in the previous chapter, some of the scribes 'completed' CO by adding TG immediately after. It is unclear how the Cp scribe decided to make the addition and, indeed, there is no sign of hesitation in this manuscript that might have indicated that TG was not part of its copy-text (plate 38). However, CO ends in mid-folio in Cp, just as in Hg, El and Dd, with the difference that in this manuscript a new tale is included in such way that it appears to be told by the Cook. However, the rubric used for TG is just 'Incipit Fabula,' without any specificity as to who is the teller of Gamelyn.

Clearly, the Ch scribe had left a space after CO and this space was later completed with TG (which also required the introduction of an extra quire.) Indeed, of the manuscripts analysed for this work, only Ha4 finishes the folio with the last lines of CO and starts TG in the next folio (plates 40 and 41). This means that even when the scribes included TG, they finished CO in mid-folio.¹ As suggested in chapter 6, the importance of the indication for the inclusion of TG in Ha4 and the different ink, color for rubrication and paper used in Ch indicate that the tale was a later addition to the original text of these manuscripts.

The most important feature about CO is the fact that the scribes found ways of dealing with its incompleteness, Hg with the note about its incompleteness and Cp, Ha4 and Ch with the introduction of TG as the 'real' Cook's Tale. This leaves Dd and El as the manuscripts, which, for one reason or another, did not need to include a rubric or an extra-tale. This fact, when taken into account together with other features in tale-order and with word-variants, suggests that there might be an interesting line of research in trying to discover if there are any other features that could act as links between Dd and El.

1.2 When the Scribes Do Not Know What to Do

1.2.1 The Squire's Tale (SQ)

The position of SQ (together with the other re-arranged tales, ME, CL and FK) is one of the most interesting features in the order of the witnesses of the *Canterbury Tales*, but this tale presented a problem for the scribes since it, like CO, was incomplete. There has

been some speculation as to the reason why scribes did not attempt to complete SQ as they did with CO (see Partridge's article, "Minding the Gaps"). This could be because SQ is a much more substantial piece of work. (No scribe in the analysed manuscripts makes reference to this; that is, we do not have a gloss indicating that its incompleteness was due to Chaucer himself). In fact, the Hg scribe left a blank page after SQ. Only the last two lines of the tale are present in folio 137v of Hg and the rest of the page has been completed with the adapted version of L20 in a yellowish ink. It is possible that the scribe had intended to leave the rest of the folio blank awaiting for the continuation of SQ and, when he received the extra links, he decided to include the adapted version of L20 which had to be crammed into the folio.

Ha4 has lost the last page of SQ, but consistently we find that the different scribes left a space, which often remained blank, at the end of it. It seems that the scribes, even in late manuscripts such as Ch, left some space for the continuation of the tale, which never appeared.² Ad3 also shares this same characteristic: in 131v, we find only the last three lines of SQ (plate 42), and at the beginning of 132r L20 starts. However, what is interesting about folio 131 in Ad3 is that it is a singleton leaf. The Dd scribe has left a similar kind of blank space (plate 45), and this also happens in El. Cp is not an exception in this matter, and its scribe has written the last 18 lines of SQ in folio 99v, leaving the rest of the folio blank (plate 44). This blank, however, is not at the end of the quire, as one would expect if the scribe had the intention of attempting to complete the text; rather, it is two folios before the end of the quire. WBP starts in 100r.

It seems very peculiar that when all scribes seem to be able to cope with the lack of completion of CO, these same scribes appear to be waiting for a conclusion of SQ to appear. One has to wonder how much of this attitude is actually related to the gloss in Hg for CO and the lack of it for SQ. Even if the Hg scribe had thought of giving SQ the same treatment as CO, that is to add an explicative note to let the reader know that the tale had reached him in its incomplete state, this never happened. Instead, the Hg scribe forced the text of L20 to fit in a reduced space and lost any opportunity of ever adding the explanatory gloss.

1.3 Could a Scribe Have Left Text Out?

1.3.1 The Canon's Yeoman's Tale (CY) and L33

As I have explained before, in reference to Hg, it is conceivable and also probable that the scribe altered the sequence of the tales and indeed part of the text to compensate for text that never reached his hands. In the previous chapter, I put forward the hypothesis that because the Hg scribe never received CY he altered the order of his text and the reading in the first line of L37. This question then arises: how did this reading spread to almost the whole textual tradition. The answer might be that the Hg scribe not only altered his copying order and the text of L37 in Hg, but also changed the text of his exemplar. It is even possible that when the Hg scribe eventually received L33 and CY he decided to change their place to before MA in O. This may not be the first time this scribe behaved in this manner, since Robinson has suggested that this particular scribe did exactly this in at least one other instance: L20 and L17.³

If it is true that the Hg scribe modified the text of the archetype, then we must assume that any copies bearing a different order or variants at these points must have had their origin in a pre-existing copy of such an archetype. If this were true, in turn, we would have to admit that manuscripts such as Ad3 and Ch (both of which have a different treatment of L33 and CY) might have as their ultimate ancestor an unaltered copy of O which was produced at some point before the alterations were introduced in to the archetype. In any case, the alteration of L37, along with the order L36-MA L37-PA, must have been introduced at a very early stage, before Cp was copied. However, at this point, the alteration of L17 and L20 had not been performed in O.

1.4 Altering the Order of the Tales

After carrying out a codicological analysis of the manuscripts, it has become increasingly evident that some of them were not copied from exemplars which had the same tale-order which is now extant; instead, either the scribes or their supervisors, by mistake (as in Hg) or on purpose (as in Ha4 and Ch), modified, in one way or another, the order of the tales. This means that even when a scribe had a specific order in front of him, he could have changed this in order to suit specific needs.

At this point, and just as a way of experimenting with this hypothesis, I have created a tale order containing what seem to me moderately conservative alterations to the original data drawn from the tables. TG has been suppressed from both manuscripts in which it seems to be an obvious addition: Ha4 and Ch. I give this created order the sigil BB. This item represents the order of the tales, not as it was in the archetype of the

tradition, or as it was intended by Chaucer, but as it seems to better explain the tale-order in the early manuscripts: GP-KT-L1-MI-L2-RE-L3-CO L7-ML WB-L10-FR-L11-SU CL-L13-L15-ME-L17-SQ-L20-FK PH-L21-PD SH-L24-PR-L25-TT-L28-TM-L29-MO-L30-NP L36-MA NU-L33-CY L37-PA RT. This order could be interpreted as a modified version of Manly and Rickert's **a** order, but instead it is intended to explain the variations in tale-order in the analysed witnesses of the *Canterbury Tales*.

The new tree (plate 30) including this created order and the modified Ch and Ha4 does not show dramatic differences from other trees, but it shows enough differences to make it interesting. For example, if we take two BreakPoint distance unrooted phylograms, we find that Ha4 appears in a similar position (plate 31) as the one it had before (plate 9). Ch has moved from a position near to Ha4 in plate 9, to one very close to Dd and the **a** group. The same occurs if we compare plates 9 and 31: Ch has moved from being with Ld1, in a branch in the central part of the tree, to being grouped with the **a** manuscripts. This new grouping of Ch and the **a** group (supported by both the BreakPoint distance and the IEBP trees) is interesting because these witnesses seem to share some characteristics with manuscripts of the **a** group, and these are often difficult to explain. For example, if we were to think that Ch is completely unrelated to **a**, then the only explanation for the presence of L31 in this manuscript would be contamination. However, analysis of word-variants in the manuscripts suggests that Ch might have some relationship with this group (as Ch tends to cluster with Hg and El, as can be seen in MI⁴). Because the elimination of TG from the data groups Ch and the **a** manuscripts, one

could suspect that this possible relationship between Ch and the **a** manuscripts requires further research.

Not surprisingly, the BB order also groups together with **a**. Although there is a crucial difference between the **a** order and that of BB (the position of NU-L33-CY) the general stability of the group seems to have made this item less determinant in the overall shape of the tree.

Although the inclusion of the item with the created order and the alterations in Ch and Ha4 in the phylogenetic analysis does not seem to have a dramatic effect on the overall shape of the tree, the changes are enough to make this an interesting starting point for future research. Few of the manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales* have been analysed in detail. This is especially true of the later manuscripts (as is the case for Ch); however, after my brief approach to the codicological aspects of these texts, it seems that it would be of great interest to carry this research further. The results of such research might suggest that there are other points of the textual tradition in which new links were incorporated to the text and in which the tales were re-arranged for one or another reason. For example, we might be able to point out one manuscript (or more than one) that was closer to the moment at which certain parts of the text were added. Perhaps we might even be able to tell, when (and in which manuscripts or hyparchetypes) the order changed to become that of specific groups or individual manuscripts. If we are lucky, there might still be **d** manuscripts holding some clues as to the origin of this recension which, although textually less important, might hold key aspects of the textual tradition of the *Tales*.

2. SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESES ADVANCED BY THIS WORK

At the beginning of this work, the main task was to find out if there is a clear relationship between the word-variant stemmata and the tale-order stemmata; that is, if the tale-order could have been transmitted from one manuscript to another through the same family relations as those by which the word-variants were transmitted from one manuscript to another. This work hypothesized that if phylogenetic software can be used to show or clarify genetic relationships among manuscripts on the basis of word variants, it should also be able to show any existent relationships between the tale-orders when the appropriate data was used.

There are two differences between this and previous research carried out about the order of the *Canterbury Tales*. Firstly, computer technology is used to help us understand the problems of the relationships between the different tale-orders. Secondly, tale-order is not seen as an isolated feature, but is, instead, studied together with the evidence drawn from the word-variants. The assumption behind this procedure is that a break in the correlation between tale-order and word-variant stemmata might suggest that there was some degree of intervention in the order of the tales at that point of the tradition.

2.1 Manly and Rickert's Tale-Order Classification

One cannot pay sufficient tribute to the work carried out by Manly and Rickert on the subject of tale-order in the manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*. The path they opened has allowed many scholars to continue this research. With the help of sophisticated

computer tools, however, it is possible to broaden and deepen their initial research. The analyses produced for this work allow us to establish when Manly and Rickert made a correct assumption and when they fell short of establishing certain groups. For example, manuscripts such as Bo1 and Ph2, which were re-classified as **E** by Robinson according to their word-variants, present a particular tale-order. The phylogenetic software usually places these witnesses together on the basis of the order of their tales, and this seems consistent with Robinson's **E** group. Other manuscripts, which Manly and Rickert assigned to the tale-order **a** group, but which clearly had different affiliations in their word-variants, place consistently with **a**. This is the case of El, a manuscript for which Manly and Rickert were not able to establish clear word-variant affiliations throughout. Robinson has suggested, based on such variants,⁵ that El is likely to be an **O** manuscript. My own research on Caxton's first and second editions of the *Canterbury Tales* showed that for some variants in parts of the text, El (together with Gg) could be affiliated with the **E** group. Although this might appear inconsistent with the El and Gg tale-orders, which is that of **a**, it is possible that the **E** hyparchetype descended from a manuscript of the **a** group and that, in turn, Bo1 and Ph2 descended from an **E** manuscript with a modified order. This reasoning is a good example of how word-variants and tale-order can be used together to explain manuscript affiliations. In fact, this hypothesis about the formation and development of the **E** group shows that some areas of the textual tradition can become much clearer when the order of the tales in different manuscripts is analyzed. If, indeed, the **E** group is proven to be a derivation of **a**, then Manly and Rickert's

classification would have been partially correct about the inclusion of these two manuscripts in the **a** group.

Another imprecision in Manly and Rickert's **a** group for tale-order is the inclusion of Ad3, which exhibits changes which do not seem to be directly related to **a**. Moreover, word variation in Ad3 has suggested that this manuscript might be closer to the origin of the tradition than previously thought. It is likely that the tale-order in Ad3 was directly copied from its exemplar, and, for this reason, this manuscript must have been removed at least one step from the origin of the tradition.

It is fair to say that Manly and Rickert were right in the general way in which they classified manuscripts according to their tale-order, but occasionally, as in the cases of Bo1 Ph2 and Ad3, their classification lacks precision. These witnesses, roughly grouped with the **a** witnesses, appear to be related to subgroups (Bo1 and Ph2 are likely to be **E** manuscripts) or be closer to the archetype than most of **a** (as might be the case of Ad3). A similar situation is found with the so-called anomalous manuscripts, which the more powerful tools we now have might show as grouping with other manuscripts. Ch is a good example of this, since with the suppression of TG, the phylogenetic software groups it together with the **a** manuscripts for the new tale-order data.

2.2 Refining Manly and Rickert's Groupings

The weaknesses in Manly and Rickert's classification according to tale-order may derive from this being the only criterion taken into account for the groupings. From this

procedure also arises the problem of the lack of compatibility between their word-variant and their tale-order groupings. To combine both aspects into a single classificatory schema is undoubtedly more complex than was possible when they attempted their work, but, in the light of the present work, it appears that such an endeavour might be a fruitful one.

As stated above, Ch appears with the **a** group in plates 30 to 33. Because these plates are only based on tale-order, the information offered by them cannot be seen as a definitive link. However, Ch shares whole passages, such as L31, with **a** manuscripts. Further research on the manuscript affiliations of Ch might show more clearly if there is indeed a relationship between this manuscript and manuscripts of the **a** group.⁶

Ha4, analysed with or without TG, appears very close to Wy in the middle of the stemmata, as if serving as a link for all groups. The idea that the person supervising its copying was the one who thought of acquiring the 'missing' tale suggests that at least another manuscript already had added it to the sequence of the *Tales*. Although many scholars (see especially Blake, *Textual*) may feel inclined to state that this proves the precedence of Cp over Ha4, this does not seem so clear in the light of the present research. The possibility still remains open that the exemplar used for Cp was already in existence, but that Cp itself had not yet been copied when Ha4 was produced. The hypothesis of the existence of an exemplar previous to Cp (which has been considered one of the earliest extant manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*), is supported by the fact that the manuscript does not appear to exhibit hesitation in the order of the tales, which

suggests that its scribe might have been copying successively from the beginning to the end.

One of the main reasons why it is necessary to take into account both word-variants and tale-order to establish manuscript groupings is that at some points of the textual tradition scribes and their supervisors changed the order of the tales. Such a situation represents a break between the line of descent of tale-order and word-variants; that is, it is possible that the word-variants in a manuscript might be related to those of another while their tale-orders might differ. Whenever this occurs, it provides strong evidence that either one of the extant manuscripts or its exemplar had its tale-order modified. This opens another area of research with reference to textual reception and manuscript culture: we should attempt to deduce the underlying reason behind each change.

If both word-variant and tale-order are used to establish the relationships among the witnesses of the *Canterbury Tales*, one should be able to produce a much more refined version of the groups observed by Manly and Rickert, which might help to explain the chronology of the production of some manuscripts.

2.3 Tale-Order and the New Stemmatics

It seems clear that no order extant in the manuscripts of the *Tales* is Chaucerian, but even if there were a Chaucerian order, it would be impossible to distinguish from all the others. The question then is not how to find, approach or re-build a Chaucerian order, but which order is the best to use in an edition of the *Tales*. A solution which has been

commonly used by editors is to use the order of a specific manuscript (facsimiles and best-text editions are likely to use this procedure). The problem is that all tale-orders are unsatisfactory and all might need some emendation or not, depending on the perspective of the editor. For example, intentionalist editors are likely to search for the order that seems to them to be closer to Chaucer's intentions. Best-text editors might prefer to adopt the order of the manuscript being edited. *The Riverside Chaucer* uses the E1 order (the **a** order) as a base, but it adds L8 in brackets after ML. L14 (the Host Stanza) is also added in brackets, although it is present in E1.⁷ L31 has been included, but the textual notes suggest that the editors think it was cancelled,⁸ a widely accepted scholarly opinion. *The Riverside Chaucer* contains what is probably the most widely read edition of the *Canterbury Tales*, but the text presented in it is a conflated one which has its origin in the comparison of manuscripts and early printed editions. The problem with the order in the *Riverside* is more a conceptual issue than anything else. It seems clear that the order in *Riverside* is exactly the same of that of F. N. Robinson's edition (on which *Riverside* was based). Robinson briefly argued that the order he retained for the second edition of *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* was that transmitted in the manuscript tradition (F. N. Robinson viii), but although some **a** order manuscripts have L31,⁹ not a single one of them has L8.¹⁰ In this way, we can see that, even though F. N. Robinson appears to have thought that his edition followed the order of the 'best manuscripts,' he did not follow this order as closely as he could have done. The presence of L8 is especially interesting because of Robinson's rejection of the Bradshaw shift (F. N. Robinson 2). This link has been the main justification for the shift (which requires SH to immediately follow ML-

L8); therefore, its inclusion in an edition which claims to follow the order found in the best manuscripts appears peculiar.

The Bradshaw shift has been accepted by many editors, apparently because they wish to find an order representing Chaucer's intention. This brings us to the question of the reason for preferring one particular order instead of another. A different editorial approach, the New Stemmatics,¹¹ proposes, not to reconstruct an authorial or archetypal text, but to 'construct' a text that better explains the textual tradition as it is extant.¹² In this way, if we adopt this approach, the order of the tales which an editor would aim for should be that which helps the reader understand all the orders extant in different manuscripts. In light of this approach I have proposed as the order of a possible edition of the *Canterbury Tales* that expressed in the created order included in the last set of stemmata (plates 30 to 33).¹³ This tale-order, as stated before, is basically the **a** order with a modification in the position of NU-L33-CY based on the Hg variant at the beginning of L37 and the position of the tales in Ch, Ad3 and Bo2, all of this taken into account together with the evidence of the word-variants.

2.4 Tale-order and Word-variants

This research dissipates some of the doubts about the transmission of the order of the tales from one manuscript to another. The fact that there are some instances in which tale-order and word-variants do not overlap indicates that scribes and their supervisors faced similar problems to those that modern editors face. The scribes also struggled to make

sense of an unfinished text which appeared to have no fixed final form. The changes they made do not prevent research on tale-order from being carried out or being a helpful tool for scholars and other readers to understand better the textual tradition of the *Tales*. Instead, they represent a challenge for the researcher who has to take into account several different aspects of the study of texts in order to obtain the maximum results for his or her work. The role of codicology, which appears to have been underestimated in studies of tale-order in the *Canterbury Tales*, has proven to be of primary relevance to understand the copying process of particular texts, as shown by previous studies (Stubbs) and particularly in chapter 6 of this work. Occasionally, this kind of analysis has been useful in showing that a specific order is likely to have been already present in a manuscript's exemplar (as seems to be the case of Ad3). Often, as in the cases of Hg, Ha4 and Ch, the structure of a manuscript might suggest that its order was being created as the manuscript was being copied.

At those points of the textual tradition in which scribal intervention can be seen, more research is necessary to try to explain the reasons why the changes are likely to have occurred and to revise the manuscript affiliations.

2.5 Further Research

The relative success of the codicological analysis of the studied manuscripts is encouraging because it offers new possibilities of further study. An interesting area of research would be, for example, the manuscripts classified as **d** in Manly and Rickert's

tale-order table. These manuscripts have some links, such as L5, L16, L18, L22 and L34, that are usually considered spurious, but it is possible that the presence of these links could offer help in investigating the relationships within **d** order witnesses. This investigation, in turn, might be helpful in dating some of these manuscripts more accurately. In any case, the addition of these links suggests more than intervention in tale-order, since they show clear attempts to complete the text.

Clearly, more research on the word-variants of some of the analysed witnesses is also necessary. The tools which are now available to collate the text have not yet been exploited to their full potential (partly because not all witnesses of the text have been transcribed), and only a complete collation of the most important witnesses of the *Tales* could potentially offer clearer answers to the questions of affiliation and development of the text. It is important, however, to combine the evidence from word-variation with that of the order of the tales. These two aspects of the textual tradition are better analysed together, in a deliberate manner, not just by accidental and obvious agreement, but by using all the tools available for this research. The use of evolutionary biology software has shown relations that we did not suspect existed, and has confirmed, in combination with codicological analysis, that some manuscripts (such as Ch and Ha4) require a much more detailed textual analysis to be used in conjunction with the conclusions presented in this work. The combination of codicological analysis and computer-assisted analytic techniques have already produced significant insights into the development and transmission of the *Canterbury Tales*. They have raised new questions and opened

alternative inquiry approaches, suggesting a long and fruitful future for this kind of research.

¹ See, for example, Ad3 (which has CO in a peculiar position, see plate 36), Ch (plate 37), and Cp.

² In Ch eventually, a different hand added PL at the end of 228v (plate 43).

³ “The only possible explanation is that the text of the links was not altered just in Hengwrt. It was altered, probably by the scribe’s supervisor, in the exemplar, that is, in *O* itself. The three tales were then placed in the exemplar in the same order as they are copied in Hengwrt, with the now-altered text of the links connecting them. This newly reshuffled *O*, then, in turn became the exemplar not only of the type *d* copies but also of Manly and Rickert’s *c* group, and the additional group I label *f*.” (Robinson, “Can We Trust” 207)

⁴ MI, edited by Peter Robinson, will be published by Scholarly Digital Editions later this year.

⁵ The data available was that of GP and WBP.

⁶ In light of the Canterbury Tales Project's research which has already been published, it appears that Ch is also linked to Hg, which suggests that its copy-text might have been a good and early manuscript.

⁷ The reason for the editors of the *Riverside* to include this stanza in brackets is that they think that it might have been cancelled by Chaucer (Benson 1128).

⁸ See Benson 1133.

⁹ The witnesses which have L31 are Dd En1 Ds1 Cn Ma En3 Ad1 Ch Cx2 Wy Pn.

¹⁰ About the order of this edition, F. N. Robinson writes: “In the present edition the inconsistent arrangement of the best manuscripts is followed, and no attempt is made to correct discrepancies left standing by the author, or to reconstruct the stages of a pilgrimage which he seems never to have completely planned.” (2).

¹¹ Robinson points out about the New Stemmatics: “Like the stemmatics of the last century, its aim is to illuminate the history of the text. Unlike the stemmatics of the old century, its aim is not a well-made edition, but a well-informed reader” (“Analysis”).

¹² In this sense, such a text is recognized to be the last production of the textual tradition instead of an attempt to reproduce the first. This also allows the text to be superceded by a new edition if new evidence becomes available.

¹³ The created order, for which I have used the sigil BB, is as follows: GP-KT-L1-MI-L2-RE-L3-CO L7-ML WB-L10-FR-L11-SU CL-L13-L14-L15-ME-L17-SQ-L20-FK PH-L21-PD SH-L24-PR-L25-TT-L28-TM-L29-MO-L30-NP L36-MA NU-L33-CY L37-PA RT.