Title	A Bibliographical Note on the Canterbury Tales (1498)
Sub Title	ドゥ・ウォード版『カンタベリー物語』に関する書誌学的考察
Author	徳永, 聡子(Tokunaga, Satoko)
Publisher	慶應義塾大学藝文学会
Publication year	2002
Jtitle	藝文研究 (The geibun-kenkyu : journal of arts and letters). Vol.82, (2002. 6) ,p.243(126)- 257(112)
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	
Genre	Journal Article
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00072643-00820001-0257

A Bibliographical Note on the Canterbury Tales (1498)

Satoko TOKUNAGA

Before William Thynne's collected edition of Chaucerian works appeared in 1532, Chaucer's text was published in a single volume by three major printers—William Caxton, Richard Pynson and Wynkyn de Worde, who commanded the market of printing in late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century England. There have survived at least sixteen editions published before the appearance of Thynne's, which includes the *Canterbury Tales, Troilus and Criseyde, House of Fame, Parliament of Fowls* and several other works.[1] Among them, the *Canterbury Tales* was so popular that as many as five editions were published. Shortly after he set up the first printing shop in England, Caxton published his first edition *c.* 1476 (*STC* 5082) and consequently, around 1483, his second edition (*STC* 5083).[2] Those who work on English incunabula have accepted that Caxton revised the text of his first edition, though partially, with a manuscript source.[3] Following Caxton's death in 1491, Richard Pynson published it in 1492 (*STC* 5084) and afterwards in 1526 (*STC* 5086). Wynkyn de Worde, who, it is believed, inherited Caxton's printing house, also printed this work in 1498 (*STC* 5085). On the one hand, Pynson published his first edition with a new series of woodcuts which were presumably copied from those of Caxton, but textually following Caxton's second edition with minor variants. It has recently been claimed, on the other hand, that de Worde used a manuscript

source as well as Caxton's second edition for setting the text of his *Canterbury Tales*. Recent scholars have examined the first part of the volume as well as those tales set from a manuscript in detail, but there still remain several tales to be textually studied. This paper will examine, therefore, variants in these tales in the latter part which are based on Caxton's text and then argue that they contain diverse changes made by the editor/compositor.

From the early history of printing, Caxton was highly estimated for his literary publications and advanced skills of translation. In comparison, scholarly attention was long neglected regarding de Worde's literary career and his publication of Chaucer.[4] It was not until the twentieth century that advanced any textual analyses of de Worde's text. The textual study of early prints of *the Canterbury Tales* was started by W. W. Greg, who collated the first 116 lines of the *Knight's Tale* in manuscripts and all editions produced before the sixteenth century.[5] Fifty years or so later, William F. Hutmacher's substantial study was published, which for the first time examined a considerable amount of de Worde's text.[6] Hutmacher collated approximately sixty-five percent of the text of de Worde's *Canterbury Tales* with that of Caxton's edition, and analysed textual differences, even if they are very minute ones, including spelling variants, textual omissions, additions and changes. In the end, he reinforced the view of Greg that de Worde's text was mainly set from Caxton's second edition without introducing manuscript sources.[7]

Hutmacher hinted at a significant possibility, however, that de Worde might have referred to a manuscript source in rearranging its tale order, which is made clear from Table 1. (I have utilised Grouping of the tales by Manly and Rickert ;[8] the contents of each Group will be found in Appendix).

Cx1:	A	B^1 F^1 E^2		D	E^1		F^2		G CB^2	HI
Cx2:	A	B^1	E^2 F^1 F^2 D			E^1			G CB^2	HI
Py1:	A	B^1	E^2 F^1 F^2 D			E^1			G CB^2	HI
dW:	A	B^1		D	E^1 E^2 F^1		F^2		G CB^2	HI
a and El:	A	B^1		D	E^1 E^2 F^1		F^2		CB^2 G HI	
b and *d*:	A	B^1 F^1 E^2		D	E^1 F^2				G CB^2	HI
c:	A Gam B^1 F^1			D	E^1 F^2				G CB^2	HI
Hg:	A			D B^1		F^1 E^2 F^2 SN E^1		CB^2	HI	
Ha⁴:	A Gam B^1			D	E^1 E^2 F^1		F^2		G CB^2	HI

The table shows the ordering in the tales of four incunabula and major manuscripts and the groups. It is noticeable that Caxton changed the order of his first edition (Cx1) when he issued the revised version (Cx2), the latter of which Pynson followed. Furthermore, de Worde's (dW) differs from any preceding printed editions. Hutmacher drew attention to the similarity between dW and Ellesmere MS (El),[9] but he failed to notice that dW is identical with that of Ha⁴ (British Library, MS Harley 7334) except for its placement of the *Tale of Gamelyn* (Gam) between Groups A and B^1. Hutmacher reported that the text from the *General Prologue* to the *Franklin's Tale* (Groups A to F^2) of dW basically follows that of Cx2, and it can be assumed that de Worde adopted the ordering of a manuscript and moved Groups E^2 F^1 F^2 after Group E^1, while setting the main text from Cx2.

In contrast, de Worde did not rearrange the tales of the lattter part, presumably because the manuscript to which he referred had the same ordering with that of Cx2 (G CB^2 HI). It was in this latter part which Hutmacher ignored, however, that a new discovery was made in de Worde's textual sources. Recent studies have examined several tales in detail and proved that a manuscript was also introduced at least in the *Tale of Sir Thopas*, the end of the *Prioress's Tale*, the end of the *Monk's*

Tale and two prose tales (*Melibeus* and the *Parson*).[10] This source is probably a now lost manuscript which might have belonged to the Hg or Gg group.[11] As for the rest of the tales, it has been assumed that de Worde merely relied on Cx2, though the most of the texts have not been studied in detail.

My collation of these tales has confirmed this theory that de Worde used Cx2 as his base text, but at the same time, that there are several substantial changes or corrections as well as corruption in his text. Though such variants are often regarded as minor, they are sometimes indicative of the editor's and/or compositor's contemplation of the text. In the following argument, therefore, I shall present my analyses of the textual differences between Cx2 and dW in the tales of the *Second Nun* (*SNT*), the *Cannon's Yeoman* (*CYT*), the *Doctor of Physics* (*PhyT*), the *Pardoner* (*PardT*), the *Shipman* (*ShipT*), the *Nun's Priest* (*NPT*) and the *Manciple* (*MancT*).[12]

The variants from Cx2 in dW are diverse, but most of them are due to the compositor's carelessness. One of the typical errors caused by the compositor is a typographical one. In particular, types of *u* and *n* are often set upside down ; for example, de Worde prints 'wrongfnlly' where Caxton has 'wrongfully' (*SNT*, l. 442).[13] Such errors can be found in thirteen other places of the tales in consideration.[14] Typographical errors usually occurred when the compositor was so careless that he misread or mistyped the word, and such an error was often caused when two types have very similar shapes, as the following example shows :

[*SNT*, l. 511]　　Cx2 : For in effect they be not worth a myte

　　　　　　　　　　dW : For in effect they be not worth a myce

De Worde's sentence is grammatically correct, but 'not worth a myte

(very small coin)' is idiomatic enough to be found in other places of the *Canterbury Tales*.[15] It can be considered, therefore, that the ligature of *t* and *e* in this line of Cx2 was confusing to the compositor's eyes, which brought about this typographical error.

There are a number of similar typographical mistakes, many of which are found in *CYT*. Several examples will suffice here : dW prints I for in (l. 843) ; wyt for unwyt (l. 1085) ; rome for come (l. 1395) ; armes for hermes (l. 1434). In other cases, grammatical changes were made erroneously ; for example, where Cx2 reads 'The morow cam & forth ridith this marchaunt | To flau*n*dris ward his prentis brought hym auau*n*t' (*ShipT*, ll. 1489-90), de Worde's compositor failed to keep the verb 'ridith' and instead made the reading of 'The morow cam & forth ryde this marchaunt | To flau*n*dris ward his prentis broug*h*t hy*m* auaunt'.

The following example illustrates, however, that de Worde's compositor sometimes made correction of Cx2 as well as introducing a careless mistake :

> [*CYT*, l. 772]   Cx2 : Ol quycsyluer y clepyd mercury crude
>   dW : Of quyksyluer is clepyd mercury crude

One may notice that Caxton's *y clepyd* was erroneously changed into *is clepyd*, which was presumably because the words appeared archaic to the compositor ; and at the same time, it is noticeable that *Ol* is corrected as *Of* in dW. We shall see other examples of correction in dW afterwards. Also, there are still a number of examples of typographical errors, but many of them are of a similar nature. They can be found in *SNT*, ll. 122, 323 ; *CYT*, ll. 797, 835, 1027, 1051, 1267, 1268 ; *ShipT*, ll. 1230, 1267, 1268 ; *NP*, ll. 4371, 4416 ; and *MancT*, l. 132.

De Worde's text contains several additional words to Cx2: in *SNT*, l. 76 *ben* is repeated, which is obviously due to the compositor's mistake; in *CYT*, l. 998 *it* is added between *you* and *is*, though this addition can be found in two extant manuscripts Cp and Ph³. The other examples are to be found in *NPT*, l. 4012 where dW reads *a pore cotage* for *a cotage* in Cx2, and dW adds *þᵉ* before *grounde* in 4237; and *To* is added at the beginning of line 1317 in *ShipT*. These additions in dW, however, have no manuscript support and they unfortunately do violence to the metre of the lines.[16]

From the middle of the *Prioress's Tale*, periods continued to be used through the tales of *Sir Thopas, Melibeus* and *Parson*, whose texts are entirely based on a manuscript source, whereas de Worde's use of periods is scarce in the collated text. A particular practice of periods, however, can be noted when dealing with numerals. There are in total nine places where Roman numerals appear in the tales of *CYT*, *ShipT* and *PhyT*. In five cases they are expanded into Arabic numerals (*CYT*, ll. 720, 1332; *ShipT*, ll. 1377, 1391; *PhyT*, l. 30), while periods are added before and after the unexpanded ones (*CYT*, ll. 756, 820; *ShipT*, l. 1521). As the same pattern is also noted in the first part of dW,[17] this could be because of editorial exercises.

According to the result of Hutmacher's collation, twenty-seven transpositions of phrases and words occur in the text of the first half of dW; and Hutmacher analysed that 'in fifteen of these transpositions no violence is done to the sense or meter [. . .]; twelve of these transpositions definitely improve either the meter or the sense [. . .] .'[18] Such transpositions can also be found throughout the text in the latter part of dW. In *CYT*, l. 859, Cx2 reads 'Of thyse namys now <u>wol I</u> me reste', while dW: 'Of thyse namys now <u>I woll</u> me rest'; *CYT*, l. 1135, Cx2 has 'My connynge whiche I <u>you shewe</u> shalle', dW 'My cunnynge whyche I

shewe you shall' ; in *ShipT*, l. 1313, Cx2 'So ful am I of drede and eke of care' ; dW 'So full I am of drede and eke of care' : in *NPT*, l. 4204 Cx2 is 'Cam as hym thought & sayde I am now slawe', whereas dW 'Cam as hym thought & sayd I now am slawe' ; and in *PardT*, l. 578, Cx2 'Lokith the bibyl and there ye mowe it lere', for which dW reads 'Lokyth the byble and there mow ye it leer'. As Hutmacher explained, some trans-positions serve to improve the metre of Cx2 (as in the second and third examples), while the others lead to corruption of it. Moreover, only the first example (*CYT*, l. 859) has a manuscript support for the reading (En[3]), which indicates that it is least likely that these transpositions, even if there is any improvement, are the result of de Worde's referring to a manuscript source.

At various places in the collated texts, one may note that words or phrases in Cx2 are frequently omitted in dW. In *CYT* where a number of typographical errors have already been pointed out, de Worde's compositor was again so careless that he dropped entire lines twice in the page of sig. p2^v.

[*CYT*, ll. 1358-60] Cx : What shal I paye tel me I you pray

　　　　　　　　　　　　Iwys qd he it is ful dere I say

　　　　　　　　　　　　Sir at o word yf that it list you haue

　　　　　　　　　　dW : What shall I paye tell me I you pray

　　　　　　　　　　　　Syr at o worde yf that it lyst you haue

[*CYT*, ll. 1386-88] Cx : Thus maketh he his introduction

　　　　　　　　　　　　To brynge folke to her destructyon

　　　　　　　　　　　　Considereth siris how that in eche astat

　　　　　　　　　　dW : Thus makyth he his Introduccyon

　　　　　　　　　　　　¶ Consydereth syres how that in eche astat

In both cases it is clear that the second lines 'Iwys qd he it is ful dere I say' and 'To brynge folke to her destructyon' in Cx2 were entirely omitted in dW. All the versions of the extant manuscripts contain these lines; and furthermore this *lacuna* made the sentences corrupt. They can be assumed, therefore, to have been caused by the compositor's eye -skip. In his 'Introduction' to *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory*, Eugène Vinaver explains such phenomenon in terms of scribal activity in the so -called Winchester manuscript, now British Library, MS Add. 59678 : 'a slowing down of the movement of the hand or an acceleration in the transmission may cause part of the text to drop out. The omission of monosyllabic words, frequent in W [Winchester Manuscript], is an example of this variety of arrhythmia'.[19] Indeed, de Worde's composi- tor had the same tendency to omit such a single word, as in l. 36, *SNT* where Cx2 has 'Thou mayde <u>and</u> moder doughter', dW reads 'Thou mayde moder doughter'; in *CYT*, l. 928 de Worde omitted *not* in Cx2 and reads 'By cause our fyrewas [*sic*] made of beche', whose reading no extant manuscripts and preceding printed editions support. There are still other examples, on the one hand, of unique reading of dW in the following lines: *SNT*, l. 169; *PardT*, ll. 835, 879; *MancT*, l. 273; *NPT*, ll. 4252, 4257, and 4322. It may be interesting to note, on the other hand, that the same omissions as occurred in dW are reported in the collation by Manly and Rickert to be found in several manuscripts:

[*SNT*, l. 384]   Cx2 : Cast al awey > dW : Cast away (Bw Ii Ln Mc Nl Ra²)

[*MancT*, l. 1]   Cx2 : where there stondyth > dW : where stondyth (Bw Fi Ha² Ht Ii Lc Mc Pw Se Tc¹ Tc²)

[*MancT*, l. 62]   Cx2 : eke he hath > dW : eke hath (Ad³ Ps)

[*NPT*, 1. 4032] Cx2 : she neyther whyte > dW : she whyte (Ht <u>Ne</u>)

[*NPT*, 1. 4249] Cx2 : and so sore > dW : and sore (Bw <u>c</u> Dl Fi Gl Ha²)

Only from this data, however, it is too fetched to determine if these readings are adopted from any manuscript source or not. Thus we shall now turn to other textual departures in dW from Cx2.

There are obvious examples in which dW gets rid of textual errors in Cx2, as is observed above. Cx2 has an awkward sentence, for example, in 1. 888 of *CYT* : 'That though a man a myke from hem be'. The *myke* is apparently incorrect and all the extant manuscripts read *myle*. Another example is in 1. 52, *SNT* where Caxton reads 'That thou art the soun of excellence'; the *soun* is obviously due to a compositorial error in Caxton's printing house and there are no surviving manuscripts which contain this reading. Both are respectably corrected as *myle* and *sonne* in dW.

Likewise, there are some examples of textual changes in dW from Cx2 which can be supported from manuscript reading and I would like to categorise them into three groups :

Category 1 [*PhyT-PardT* Link, 1. 316] Cx2 : a nother (En³ Py) > dW : anon

[*PardT*, 1. 683]   Cx2 : Deth (Ne) > dW : Beth

Category 2 [*SNT*, 1. 44]   Cx2 : eterne > dW : eternal (Ha⁴ Hg Gg+)

[*SNT*, 1. 182]   Cx2 : we > dW : ye (<u>Ad</u>³ Ch Hg+)

[*PardT*, 1. 634] Cx2 : special > dW : especyall (Bo¹ Dl Ds+)

[*ShipT*, l. 1232] Cx2 : dure > dW : endure (Gl Gl² Ht +)

[*MancT*, l. 138] Cx2 : merily > dW : mery (Bo¹ Bo2
Gl +)

Category 3 [*SNT*, l. 32] Cx2 : wrethys > dW : wretcyd (Ps : wrec-
chid)

[*CYT*, l. 1054] Cx2 : kidyth (b : kydith) > dW : sheweth
(Ii To)

[*CYT*, l. 1106] Cx2 : ye > dW : he (Ph³)

[*ShpT*, l. 1352] Cx2 : worlde > dW : worde (Bw)

[*NPT*, l. 4363] Cx2 : his > dW : the (Ry¹)

[*MancT*, l. 52] Cx2 : his > dW : the (Gl, Mc)

[*MancT*, l. 170] Cx2 : wylde > dW : wyde (Ha⁴ Ld Ra²)

[*MancT*, l. 279] Cx2 : troubly > dW : trowblyd (Bo¹)

[*MancT*, l. 341] Cx2 : a two > dW : or two (Ha³ Tc¹)

In the first group it is conceivable that the change in dW is superior to Caxton's original reading, since the latter is supported by no more than three manuscripts, while the other manuscripts, including the so-called 'landmark' ones, agree with de Worde's text. There are some examples, however, where both readings of dW and Cx2 are to be found in a number of manuscripts, which are categorised into the second group. In any case of variants with manuscript support, including omission, it seems almost impossible to discern the agreement of dW's variants in the collation with any particular manuscript or group of manuscripts. This difficulty is more distinct in the third group of variants, whose readings are supported by less than three manuscripts and manuscript groups, whereas Cx2 agrees at the same place with more superior manuscripts. Thus, it is evident that there are no decisive patterns of

agreement between dW and any manuscript or group of manuscripts. Such variants may be explained as coincidental, as some scholars have pointed out, rather than revision with a manuscript source ;[20] it is more likely that such departures of dW from Cx2 reflect the editor's and/or compositor's own intervention in the text. This is most distinctive where dW modernised words of Cx2 ; dW consistently replaced, for example, *moche* for *mykyl*, *called* for *cleped*. Interestingly, the same procedure of editing is detected in the *Parson's Tale* where dW is set from a manuscript source.[21]

The editor/compositor's involvement in the text might have succeeded in making the text more accessible to the contemporary reader, while in other places failing to do so by introducing some corruption. Such intervention seems, however, to contradict what is declared in the *Prologue* preceding the *Tales*, though this was actually composed by Caxton for his second edition. In this prologue, Caxton explains that he was blamed by a gentleman because his first edition was 'not accordyng in many places unto the book that Gefferey Chaucer had made'.[22] Caxton borrowed a manuscript from the gentleman which is 'very trewe and accordyng unto hys owen first book by hym made'. Then Caxton apologises regarding his first edition that 'by ygnourance I [Caxton] erryd in hurtyng and dyffamyng his book in dyverce places, in settyng in somme thynges that he never sayd ne made and levyng out many thynges that he made whyche ben requysite to be sette in it' ; and he claims that 'I have corrected my book as hereafter alle alonge'. In reprinting his master's edition, de Worde adopted this prologue, preceded by a woodcut illustration representative of *Merchant* among the pilgrims,[23] and followed by the phrase 'By Wylliam Caxton | His soule in heuen won [sic]'. At the early stage of his career, de Worde tended to demonstrate the continuity from Caxton's printing house, presum-

ably because he considered Caxton's authenticity in printing was appealing to the contemporary readership. By reprinting the prologue of the *Canterbury Tales*, de Worde presumably aimed to emphasise this continuity as well as the authenticity of the text.

If Caxton's text was accepted as being 'corrected' according to a 'trew copy', de Worde may well be criticised for his further textual intervention which this paper has examined. I would argue, however, that such discrepancy between printer's articulation and the actual text should be more seriously taken into account when we consider what the notion of 'editing' was at the close of the Middle Ages. The concept of authentic text started to be advanced by early printers, but we have to wait until the appearance of William Thynn's collected works that Chaucerian texts were reconstructed by collating several manuscripts. Textual variants in the collation, I would argue, illustrate that the text received various textual interpolations. At the same time, we have to be aware that they were made in the process not only of editing but also of printing. It will be essential, therefore, to be conscious of making a distinction in the roles played by the editor and the compositor, though this will require further minute study of de Worde's texts.

Appendix : Contents of the tales in each group
    Group A : *General Prologue, Knight, Miller, Reeve, Cook*
    Group B^1 : *Man of Law*
    Group B^2 : *Shipman, Prioress, Sir Thopas, Melibee, Monk, Nun's Priest*
    Group C : *Physician, Pardoner*
    Group D : *Wife of Bath, Friar, Summoner*
    Group E^1 : *Clerk*
    Group E^2 : *Merchant*

Group F¹ : *Squire*

Group F² : *Franklin*

Group G : *Second Nun, Canon's Yeoman*

Group H : *Manciple*

Group I : *Parson, Retraction*

Notes

(1) In addition, Julian Notary and John Rastell issued Chaucer's short verse (*STC* 5089, 5091.5).

(2) *STC* indicates the year of its publication as *c*. 1477, but I have followed Dr Lotte Hellinga's assertion ; see her *Caxton in Focus : The Beginning of Printing in England* (London : British Library, 1982).

(3) For example, see N. F. Blake, 'Caxton's Reprints', in *William Caxton and English Literary Culture* (London : Hambledon, 1991), pp. 107-17, and William Matthews, 'The Besieged Printer', *Arthuriana*, 7. 1 (1997), 63-92.

(4) H. S. Bennett asserted, for example, 'De Worde lacked Caxton's literary interest and typographical skill', in his *English Books & Readers 1475 to 1557 : Being a Study in the History of the Book Trade from Caxton to the Incorporation of the Stationers' Company*, 2nd edn (Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1952 ; repr. 1970), pp. 185-86.

(5) W. W. Greg, 'The Early Printed Editions of the *Canterbury Tales*', *PMLA*, 39 (1924), 737-61.

(6) William F Hutmacher, *Wynkyn de Worde and Chaucer's 'Canterbury Tales' : A Transcription and Collation of the 1498 Edition with*

Caxton² *from the General Prologue through the Knight's Tale* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1978).

(7) In his introduction, Hutmacher affirmed that the 'results of this investigation strongly suggest a confirmation of conclusions that have heretofore been only assumed: that Wynkyn de Worde used as his source William Caxton's edition of *The Canterbury Tales* (1485), that he had no other source'; Hutmacher, pp. 1-2.

(8) John F. Manly and Edith Rickert, *The Text of 'The Canterbury Tales': Studies on the Basis of All Known Manuscripts*, 8 vols (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940).

(9) Hutmacher, p. 21.

(10) See the following articles for de Worde's use of a manuscript source in the *Canterbury Tales*. Thomas J. Garbáty, 'Wynkyn de Worde's "Sir Thopas" and Other Tales', *Studies in Bibliography*, 31 (1978), 57 -67; Lotte Hellinga, 'Manuscripts in the Hands of Printers', in *Manuscripts in the Fifty Years after the Invention of Printing: Some Papers Read at a Colloquium at the Warburg Institute on 12-13 March 1982*, ed. by J. B. Trapp (London: Warburg Institute, University of London, 1983), pp. 3-11; Daniel Ransom 'Prolegomenon to a Print History of the Parson's Tale: The Novelty and Legacy of Wynkyn de Worde's Text', in *Closure in 'The Canterbury Tales': The Role of The Parson's Tale*, ed. by David Raybin and Linda Tarte Holley, Studies in Medieval Culture, XLI (Kalamazoo, MI: Western Michigan University, Medieval Institute Publications, 2000), pp. 70-93; Satoko Tokunaga, 'The Sources of Wynkyn de Worde's Version of "The Monk's Tale", *Library*, 7th ser., 2 (2001), 223-35.

(11) See the articles by Garbáty, Ransom and Tokunaga.

(12) The prologue of the 'Nun's Priest's Tale' (lines 3957-4010) has a short version, which appears in the Hengwrt manuscript and 7 manuscripts of Group B, two manuscripts of Group C and the related Petworth MS. 7, and two late anomalous manuscripts, while Caxton's second edition has a long version. Derek Pearsall has argued that it is most reasonable to conclude that de Worde printed this prologue from a manuscript rather than Caxton's text. However, he maintains that the *Tale* was set from Caxton's second, and therefore I have included the *Tale* in my argument. See Pearsall's remarks

in *A Variorum Edition of the Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, 8 vols (Norman : University of Oklahoma Press, 1979-   ), II, part 9 : The Nun's Priest's Tale, ed. by Derek Pearsall (1983), p. 109. Also, for the *Manciple's Tale*, see *A Variorum Edition of the Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, II, part 10 : The Manciple's Tale, ed. by Donald Baker (1979).

(13) All underlines in this paper are mine.

(14) *SNT*, ll. 73, 128, 186, 266 ; *CYT*, ll. 814, 886, 1144, 1177, 1185, 1401, 1450 ; *PardT*, l. 402 ; *ShipT*, l. 147.

(15) For example, in the *Knight's Tale*, l. 1558, and *CYT*, l. 633.

(16) As for the additions in the first part of dW, see Hutmacher, pp. 25-26.

(17) Hutmacher, p. 30.

(18) Hutmacher, p. 31.

(19) Eugène Vinaver, 'Introduction,' to *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory*, ed. by Eugène Vinaver, 3rd edn, rev. by P. J. C. Field, 3 vols (Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1990), I, p. cxii. I appreciate Ms Takako Kato for giving me this information.

(20) *Variorum*, ed. by Pearsall, p. 109.

(21) Ransom, pp. 80, 83-84.

(22) N. F. Blake, ed., *Caxton's Own Prose* (London : Deutsch, 1973), p. 62 ; all the following quotations are from here.

(23) The woodcut for *Merchant* might have been chosen with intention to reflect Caxton's career as a London mercer before he established himself as a printer.