

R. Pynson's 1526 Edition of The Parliament of Fowls: Editing on Multiple Sources*

Tsuyoshi Mukai
mukai@fwu.ac.jp

(For a final version of this paper, see Poetica (vol. 49, pp. 49-62, 1998)

When W. W. Skeat published W. Thynne's 1532 edition of Chaucer's collected works in facsimile in 1905, he stated in the preface that besides fourteen extant manuscripts and Caxton's edition, Thynne's Parliament was also textually important and should be included among the authorities to edit a definitive text of the poem.¹ His calling of attention to the textual importance of Thynne's Parliament had not aroused any scholar's interest until 1975, when J. Blodgett confirmed Skeat's statement by showing Thynne's use of manuscripts as well as printed texts. Blodgett discussed the textual derivation of Thynne's edition, arguing that Thynne used Caxton's edition as his base text for the first 140 lines and Pynson's edition for the rest of the poem, and that Thynne emended the poem with readings from a manuscript and, especially for the text after line 600, an additional manuscript of a different textual subgroup.² These assertions, in turn, raise a further question -- if Thynne proves to draw on Pynson's 1526(?) edition for his text after line 141 and if Pynson's text is, in the editor's view, so vital, we must look into this edition to gain any textual knowledge about it, as the printed text has so far escaped scholarly examination.³ In this article, I shall make clear the textual characteristics of Pynson's edition, and describe how he went about producing his edited text on different sources, thus arguing that Pynson, not Thynne, was the first editor collating multiple texts in the printing tradition of Chaucer's Parliament of Fowls.

Of Chaucer's Parliament are now known fourteen manuscripts and four substantive early editions:⁴

manuscripts

- B Bodley 638, Bodleian, ff. 96-109v
- D Digby 181, Bodleian, ff. 44-52
- F Fairfax 16, Bodleian, ff. 120-129v
- Ff Cambridge University Library Ff 1.6, ff. 29-41
- Gg Cambridge University Library Gg 4.27, ff. 480v-490v
- H Harley 7333, British Library, ff. 129v-132
- Hh Cambridge University Library Hh 4.12, ff. 94-99v
- J St. John's College, Oxford, LVII, ff. 226-237v
- L Laud 416, Bodleian, ff. 288-289v
- Lt Longleat 258, in the possession of the Marquis of Bath, Longleat House, ff. 85-101
- P Pepys 2006, Magdalene College, Cambridge, ff. 127-142
- R Trinity College, Cambridge R 3.19, ff. 17-25
- S Arch. Selden B 24, Bodleian, ff. 142-152
- T Tanner 346, Bodleian, ff. 120-131

early printings

- Cx Caxton's edition (1477?; STC 5091), ff. 1-17
(Rastell's edition (1525?; STC 5091.5), only sig. a1 and a6)⁵
- Pyn Pynson's edition (1526?; STC 5088), ff. 10-14
- W de Worde's edition (1530; STC 5092), ff. 2-14

Th Thynne's edition (1532; STC 5068), ff. 583-591
 E. P. Hammond postulated the following textual affiliation of the manuscripts and Caxton's edition:⁶

Group A:	Gg, Ff	Group B:	F, B
	H, R, S, Hh, Cx		T, Lt, D.
	P, J, L		

Pynson's Parliament was published in a large folio together with the House of Fame and three other minor pieces.⁷ The text of the House of Fame has been proved to be a mere reprint of Caxton's original edition (1483).⁸ In the case of the Parliament, however, it seems highly probable that Pynson used a manuscript as his immediate source and edited the text at his discretion or with readings from another text. The printer's setting-copy is not extant, but a textual collation between Pyn, fourteen manuscripts, and Cx makes it clear that Pyn's text, throughout the work, has readings characteristic of the B group, especially the □ subgroup, and that, moreover, in this textual family, Pyn's text is closer to B than F. For an example to evince the textual closeness between Pyn and the □ subgroup, Pyn runs:

16/107 For I reed had / of Affrican beforne

-8 That me to mete / that he stode there

me to mete] so FB W, made me to mete Others Th

The textual notes, where for the convenience of later discussion de Worde's and Thynne's readings are also mentioned, indicate that F and B (and de Worde) have the same reading as Pyn, whereas all of the other texts (and Thynne) put here 'made me to mete'. Apparently, in this line Pyn shares a textual corruption with F and B -- a drop of the causative verb 'made'. There are seven more instances of a similar kind, in which Pyn textually agrees with F and B against the other twelve manuscripts and Cx.⁹ Furthermore, according to my collation of fourteen manuscripts and Cx, the manuscript B has ten unique variants, and all of these variants are, without exception, passed down to Pyn, as is illustrated: 4/27 To rede forthe / gan me so delyte] so B W (so) to W),

4/27 To rede for the / gan me so delyte] so B W (so) to W),
 gan] I gan Cx, it gan Others Th

9/63 In this worlde / and cause of armony
 In . . . armony] so B W, In t. w. here and c. o. a. Others Th

20/140 The eschewyng / is the remedy] so B W,
 The e. ys only t. r. Others Th

30/206 euery] so B W, eke euery Others Th

45/313 That erthe / see / and tree / and euery lake] so B WTh,
 That e. and s. and t. and e. l. FYTLtDPH, etc.

48/335 grene] so B WTh (greyne T), grey Others

57/394 all] so B WTh, om Others

57/395 second the] so B WTh, om Others

91/637 That it ought to be / to you a suffysaunce] so B W,
 That to you it ought to ben a suffisaunce PJFTLtDFf (a) om Ff),

That to 3ou oughte to been a suffisaunce Gg,

That to you ought haue ben a suffysaunce Cx,

That to you it ought ben a suffysaunce Th

92/644 I shall you say right sone] so B W,

you wol I say right sone FfPF Th (wol] wel Ff),
 I wil you saye right sone CxHJLt, etc.
 Cf. 37/253 Pyrapus (spelling)] so B W, Priapus Others, Pyriapus Th

Moreover, in the places where B, agreeing with one or more other texts, deviates from F, Pyn almost always follows the Bodley text.¹⁰ These bear excellent witness to the closer relation which Pynson's copytext has to the manuscript B.¹¹

In contrast, there is another different feature to Pyn's text. The text contains not a few variant readings from F or B, and they are scattered throughout the work. Actually there are 54 instances where Pyn agrees with one or more texts of the A-group against any of the B-group. An examination of the nature of these textual concords indicates that most of them may be regarded to be mere coincidences due to an active or accidental textual alteration on the side of the editor or compositor, but that there are some distinctive cases which can have directly derived from a text characteristic of the A-group. Let us examine the following text of Pyn:

21/141 These verses of golde & asure / ywritten were
 -2 Of whiche I gan / astonyed to beholde
 (141) asure] so Th, blacke Others W; verses] so FfCxHRL WTh,
 vers Others
 (142) astonyed] a stounde FBTCx W, stonde LtD, so Others Th

In the use of plural form 'verses', Pyn agrees with the A-group, and in the use of past participle 'astonyed', Pyn is identical with all the texts of the A-group except for Caxton's edition. The coincidence in 'verses' might be due to an independent alteration by way of modernizing, but in the case of 'astonyed' there seems to be a textual corruption involved: the manuscripts F, B, and T provide 'a stounde', a decayed form of 'astonyed', and the rest of the B-group, Lt and D, use 'stonde', a verb which was meant to have improved the corrupt reading. We can posit here that to emend the corrupt line in his base text, Pynson, the editor, may have referred to a text which can be affiliated to the A-group.

A further example of Pyn's textual agreement with the A-group is

56/390 But natheles / as by rightfull ordynaunce
 -2 May I nat let / for all this world to wyn
 But he that most worthy is / shall begyn
 (390) as . . . ordynaunce] so Th, by my ryghtful ordenaunce Ff,
 my ryghtful ordenaunce GgCxP, by my ryghtful goueraunce Lt,
 my ryghtfull gouernaunce Others W
 (392) But] so Th, Ne S, That Others W; most worthy is] so Th, most
 is worthy GgHPJB-group W, is most worthy CxS, is best worthy Ff.

These lines are part of Pynson's extensive rewriting at ll. 379-92. Here Pyn is identical with Ff, Gg, P and Cx of the A-group in its use of 'ordynaunce', while the rest of the A-group and all manuscripts of the B-group use 'gouernaunce'. As in Ff and Lt, Pynson construes as an adverbial the phrase containing this legal term, whereas all the other texts present it as an object noun phrase of the verb 'let' in the next line, followed remotely by an appositive noun clause 'That he . . . begyn'. Pynson, who might have been puzzled by this loose syntax or felt uneasy at the successive use of 'gouernaunce' at the rhyme position (ll. 387 and 390), probably left his base text and had recourse to another for a better reading.

There is a more decisive case to attest Pynson's use of a reference text for emending:

34/237 And on the temple / sawe I whyte and faire
-8 Of douues sitting / many a thousande payre
And . . . payre] so Th,
And on the temple saugh I white and faire
Of dowues whyte many a hundred paire
B-group (whyte] om D) W,
And on the temple of dowis white & fayre
Saw I syttynge manye a thousand payre
A-group (thousand] hunderede GgFf)

Pyn has two textual variants from the B-group: the manuscripts of the B-group have 'whyte' for Pyn's 'sitting' and 'hundred' for Pyn's 'thousande'. Interestingly, both of Pyn's words can be found in the corresponding lines of the A-group. The text of these lines in the B-group is obviously awkward in its duplicated use of 'whyte', and it is not impossible to interpret this textual departure from the B-group as an editorial practice by Pynson, who happened to notice this corrupt line in his base text and, referring to another text characteristic of the A-group, attempted to improve it by substituting 'sitting' for the second 'whyte' and to augment, in passing, the lecherousness associated with the doves settling on the temple of Venus by preferring 'thousande' to 'hundred'.¹²

In examining these cases, we must also take into account a possibility that the textual agreements between Pyn and the A-group had already appeared in the manuscript which Pynson used as his base text, that is, a possibility that the manuscript itself had a text containing the readings of the B-group, in the main, and partaking of the A-group as well. Here are some ambiguous examples:

3/21 The long day I reed / full fast and yerne
The . . . yerne] so FfRSHh W,
The longe day ful fast I rad and yerne GgCxHGJLd
B-group (B: lacking) Th
24/163 That thou canst nat do / yet mayst thou se (Ba + Ab)
That . . . se] so WTh,
That thou canst not do yet thou maist hyt se
B-group (B: lacking),
3it that thow canst not do 3it mayst thow se
A-group (first 3it] Yf Cx, Though R, om Ff)
Cf. Ff: Cat Du cast nought do 3et may Du se (Ba + Ab)
88/616 Go / leude be thou / whyle thy lyfe may dure
thy lyfe] so Ff W, this world Cx, the world Others Th
95/660 Be of godd hert / and serue ye all thre
serue ye] so Cx W, serueth Others Th
(Be] so W, Bothe RH, Bee ye Cx, Beth Others Th)
96/666 all this was brought to an ende]
this werk (al) brought was to an ende
A-group (al] so CxGgHR) Th,
this werke al wrought was to an ende
B-group (this] om D) W

Unlike the examples discussed above, none of these agreements is motivated by a textual awkwardness or corruption. They are what is called stylistic variants, and any variant reading is really viable in its respective context. Considering the nature of these agreements, they are not likely to be the results of the editor's textual alteration based on an additional text; rather, they can be coincidences accidentally created by the editor's or compositor's own rewriting, or they can even be such agreements as could be traced back to the manuscript Pynson adopted as his copytext.

In this connection, de Worde's edition affords fascinating, though external, evidence to justify the distinction of two types of textual agreements -- agreements between Pyn and the A-group with or without a second reference text -- and to support the view that to emend the text of a base manuscript Pynson occasionally used a certain text which can be classified as the A-group. De Worde's Parliament, a separate work in a small quarto, was put out in 1530, four years after Pynson's publication. The prologue to the poem indicates that it was published under Robert Copland's supervision in de Worde's print shop, and the epilogue states, true or not, that he established the text from an old, mildewed manuscript. Compared with all its previous texts, de Worde's edition proves to have a marked similarity to and a significant difference from Pyn's text. The affinity between the two texts is dominant. This is exemplified by the fact that in the instances presented above to illustrate Pyn's textual closeness to the B-group, especially the manuscript B, de Worde's reading (W) always corresponds with Pyn. However, it is hardly probable for Copland to have prepared the text directly from Pyn. Pyn had eighty-one unique variants at the time of its publication. Of all these variants, W shares twenty-three with Pyn, and in the other fifty-eight instances, which are distributed evenly throughout the work, W deviates from Pyn, agreeing with the other texts, more precisely, mainly with the □ manuscripts in the B-group.¹³ This unique relation between Pyn and W can be better understood if we assume that their respective exemplar shared a common ancestor and that, while W was simply a descendant, inferior, of this manuscript tradition, Pyn was a composite development incorporating, in places, better readings from a different line of textual transmission. Most of the twenty-three cases where W agrees with Pyn's unique reading may be traced back to the ancestor text, and the fifty-eight cases of W's disagreement with Pyn's unique variant may be largely ascribed to Pyn's editorial or compositorial intervention. It is now worth paying attention again to the instances where Pyn agrees with the A-group and noting W's text in the relevant places. In the examples 3/21, 24/163, 88/616, 95/660, and 96/666, which were given as ambiguous or doubtful instances concerning Pynson's use of a second text for emending, except for 96/666, W also holds a textual property of the A-group in accordance with Pyn's reading, as if to deny the editor's participation in these places. On the other hand, in the examples 21/141-2, 34/237-8, and 56/390, W, disagreeing with Pyn, retains awkward, corrupt readings of the B-group. W's textual differences from Pyn in the three places are crucial as circumstantial evidence to describe a profile of Pynson's production of the text from multiple sources.¹⁴

Now the problem of Pynson's editing. The nature of Pynson's text-production can be detected from the variety and quality of Pyn's unique variants as well as its textual departures from the B-group. In addition to the improving of textual corruptions we have already treated, stylistic revising is another remarkable feature. The examples of lexical substitution are such as 'asure' for 'blacke' (21/141), 'weyght' for 'myght' (22/149), 'alway' for 'euer' (34/236), 'after' for 'afterwarde' (38/263), 'chatterying' for 'ianglynge' (50/345), 'verdyte' for 'large golee' (80/556), 'in the sky' for a pledged phrase 'god wote' (85/595); *'wrestly' for 'wrastlyng' (24/165; its first use, unrecorded in OED, in the sense of "wrestling-bout"), *'fearfull' for 'dredfull' (92/638); 'shorte' for 'sharpe' (81/565; so S), 'flyes' for 'bryddes/foulis' (51/353; so R). Except for the last two instances, these are all unique to Pyn. And by the

editor's textual comparison, the variants with an asterisk (*) are rejected and the others are preferred and adopted in Thynne's edition (Th).

Pynson's concern for intelligible wording is noteworthy. The following alterations, for example, show an aspect of his linguistic sensibilities:

- 30/209 Than I can tell / or euer coude or myght
-10 There is euer clere day / and neuer nyght
 Than . . . myght] so Th,
 No man can tell neuer wold it nyght B-group W,
 Than any man can telle ne neuer wolde it nyght A-group,
 There . . . nyght] so Th,
 But ay clere day to ony mannes syght Others W
- 63/438 For wele nor wo / neuer shall I lette
-9 To serue her / howe farre so that she wende
 For . . . lette] so Th,
 For neuer for no wo ne shall I lete Others W (no] om T)

Pynson's version here becomes plain and straightforward. This kind of rewriting might well be interpreted in terms of linguistic rationalization or modernization.¹⁵ Normalization of word-order can be also observed in some places: 16/106 I can nat saye] so HR, Can I not say Others WTh; 49/342 The ielous swan / y^t ayenst his dethe sigeth] The ielous swan ayens his deth that singeth' Others WTh; 56/392 he that most worthy is] so Th, he that most is worthy GgHPJB-group W; 77/534 Full harde it were] so LtD Th, Full harde were it Others W; 96/666 this was brought to an ende] this werke wrought/ brought was to an ende Others WTh.

Pronominal modernization, 'them' for 'hem', and 'their' for 'her', seems to be one of Pynson's editorial principles. To be exact, the use of modern forms starts at l. 191, and, excepting two uses of an old form (41/283 and 46/320), the practice is regularly carried out until the end of the poem. A preference of 'them' and 'their', though not on every occasion, was already exhibited in the manuscripts R, S, Lt and Caxton's printed edition, and it is, therefore, not impossible for Pynson's copytext to have contained a similar trait. But to the extent that all the six uses of an old form in the first 190 lines remain unchanged in Pyn¹⁶ and the manuscripts B and F preserve Chaucerian forms of pronouns throughout the work, it is reasonable to ascribe the use of 'them' and 'their' to Pynson's editorial decision.

The examples discussed so far have a positive nature in their own way, but some variants are likely to have been caused by a careless reading or a different interpretation.

- And in my slepe / I mette as I lay
 Howe Affrican . . .
- 14/98 Was comen / & stode right at his beddes syde
 his] the LtD, my Others WTh
- 52/360 The storke / worker of auowtry
 worker] wreker Others WTh
- 55/380 That hote / colde / derke / lyght / moyst / & drey
 derke] heuy Others WTh
- 89/623 Him y^t she cheseth / he shall she haue swithe
 she haue swithe] haue her as swithe JB-group W,
 hire haue as swythe FfCxHP Th (as] a Gg, all R)
- 32/218 Tho was I ware of Plesaunce anone right

-19 And of array / lust / beaute / and curtesy

And . . . curtesy] so Th,

And of araye and lust and curtesye

Others (first and] om Ff, H, R, P) W

33/225 Than sawe I Beaute with a nyce atyre

with a nyce atyre] so Th, without ony atyre Others W

The first four cases are apparently wrong readings and are rejected by Thynne. In the first case, it was at the dreamer's (i.e. the narrator's) bedside that Affrican appeared. In the second, 'lyght', which originally means "of little weight", is wrongly taken for "bright", thus the use of 'derke', and in the third, the use of 'worker' for 'wreker' betrays the common belief that the stork avenges his female on her adultery. In the fourth case, the substitution of 'her' by 'she' is due to an incorrect parsing of syntax. In the fifth case, to the list of properties of Venus is added here a personified 'beaute', which is to appear 6 lines later, as is shown in the last case. Besides, Pynson's profile of Beauty is different and even hostile to Chaucer's in portraying her as naked. Thynne was not cautious to adopt the insertion of 'beaute' at l. 219, but he must have made an aesthetic judgement in approving Pynson's depiction of Beauty.

As is the case with any printed text, Pyn suffers typographical errors. But as compared with Cx and W, they are extremely rare. There can be detected only five mistakes in the whole poem: 6/36 'tellet' for 'tellet', 20/137 'Their' for 'There', 83/578 'prayer' for 'prayed', 94/657 'wake' for 'make', and 98/684 'reke' for 'rede'. The high standard of composing implies a corrector or proof-reader participating in the work,¹⁷ and this collaborative production in a technical division can be another witness to Pynson's wish to publish a better edited text of the Parliament.

John Skelton, a contemporary of Pynson, referred to the early Tudor reception of Chaucer and deplored the popular move to tamper with the poet's language:

His Englysh well allowed,

So as it is enpowred,

For as it is employd,

There is no Englysh voyd,

At those dayes moche commended,

And now men wold haue amended

His Englysh, whereat they barke,

And mar all they warke:

('Phillip Sparrowe', ll. 792-9)¹⁸

Skelton directed his critical words at the rationalized text of Chaucer and indicated, at the same time, the emerging literary attitude among the educated to enjoy Chaucer as it was originally 'published'. Printers must have been aware of this taste for the poet's works as classics.¹⁹ The epilogue to de Worde's edition revealed it when Copland tactically declared to prepare the text with 'thylke same langage that Chaucer to the [poem] gaue'.²⁰ It was Thynne's 1532 edition that was able to cater for it. He tried to provide more authentically Chaucerian readings to the text by preferring more archaic and classical variants in the process of collating.²¹ Pynson's edition was not of the kind to respond to such demand. That was an edition which was contrived to be a better text by being rationalized against contemporary standards. The efforts Pynson displayed in editing the text on two sources were praiseworthy as a post-incunabula printer's and they prepared the way for the scholarly editing which was to be done by Thynne.

[Notes]

* I should like to express my gratitude to Dr. Lotte Hellinga for their kindness in reading an earlier draft of this article and giving encouraging advice and criticism. I should also like to thank Professor Linda Wilkins for improving my English. I gratefully acknowledge the research grant from the Ministry of Education of Japan for the present study (05610392).

¹ Skeat says, 'When all is considered, I believe it will be found that Thynne is a respectable authority for the text of this interesting and genuine poem.' The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer and Others: Being a Reproduction in Facsimile of the First Collected Edition 1532 from the Copy in the British Museum, ed. W. W. Skeat (Oxford Univ. Press, 1905), p. xxxiv.

² See Blodgett, 'William Thynne and His 1532 Edition of Chaucer' (Ph. D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1975) and 'William Thynne', in Editing Chaucer: The Great Tradition, ed. P. G. Ruggiers (Pilgrim Books, 1984), pp. 35-52.

³ In recent years, as manuscripts studies were revitalized by 'virtues of bad texts', there has been a quickening of interest in the textual problems between manuscripts and early prints. One such productive area is Chaucer's minor poems. The Parliament, however, still remains largely unexamined. As for the other minor poems, see N. F. Blake, 'The Textual Tradition of The Book of Duchess', English Studies, 62 (1981), 237-48, J. E. Blodgett, 'Some Printer's Copy for William Thynne's 1532 Edition of Chaucer', The Library, 6th Ser. 1 (1979), 97-113, Beverly Boyd, 'William Caxton', and J. E. Blodgett, 'William Thynne', in Editing Chaucer: The Great Tradition, ed. Paul Ruggiers (Pilgrim Books, 1984), pp. 13-34 and 35-52 respectively, John Finlayson, 'Textual Variants in Chaucer's House of Fame: Thynne as Editor', English Studies, 5 (1989), 385-94, A. S. G. Edwards, 'The Text of Chaucer's House of Fame: Editing and Authority', Poetica, 29•30 (1989), 80-92, and A. S. G. Edwards, 'Pynson's and Thynne's Editions of Chaucer's House of Fame', Studies in Bibliography, 42 (1989), 185-6.

⁴ Manuscripts B, F, Ff, Gg, P, and T appear in the following facsimile versions: Manuscript Bodley 638, A Facsimile, with an introduction by Pamela Robinson (Pilgrim Books, 1982); MS Fairfax 16, with an introduction by John Norton-Smith (Scolar Press, 1979); The Findern Manuscript, with an introduction by Richard Beadle and A. E. B. Owen (Scolar Press, 1978); A Facsimile of Cambridge University Library MS Gg 4.27, with an introduction by M. B. Parkes and Richard Beadle (D. S. Brewer, 1979-80); MS Pepys 2006, with an introduction by A. S. G. Edwards (Pilgrim Books, 1986); MS Tanner 346, with an introduction by Pamela Robinson (Pilgrim Books, 1980). For the other manuscripts, I referred to the microfilms or photocopies which were kindly supplied by the relevant libraries and institutions. As for Cx, Rastell, P, and W, I used a copy of each edition which was available in the microfilms 'Early English Books 1475-1640', and for Th, I used a facsimile edition of the first collected

August 2,
200699

1532 edition, with an introduction by W. W. Skeat (Oxford University Press, 1905). For a bibliographical information of the early printed editions, see A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave, A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland 1475-1640, revised and enlarged by Katharine F. Pantzer et al, 2 vols (The Bibliographical Society, 1986).

⁵ The only extant copy of John Rastell's 1525(?) edition wants its entire text and part of the prologue and the epilogue alone is available. Therefore, we can neither locate this edition in the textual tradition of the Parliament nor examine the relationship between Pynson's and Rastell's editions. In treating Pyn's textual derivation, we should not ignore the possibility of Pynson's reference to Rastell's edition. If Pynson, however, should use Rastell's text as his exemplar, though the publication date, almost simultaneous, of either edition is not clear, my main arguments concerning the editing of text from multiple sources are still tenable. For a more detailed discussion on this subject, see note 14.

⁶ See E. P. Hammond, 'On the Text of Chaucer's Parlement of Foules', The Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago, 1st ser., vol. 7 (1903), 3-25.

⁷ The book was published under the title "Here begynneth the boke of Fame / made by Geffray Chaucer: with dyuers other of his workes". Pynson's Canterbury Tales, House of Fame, and Troilus and Cressida were sold separately, but together they amounted to a composite edition of Chaucer's collected works. This was the second part of this 1526 tripartite edition.

⁸ See A. S. G. Edwards, 'Pynson's and Thynne's Editions of Chaucer's House of Fame', Studies in Bibliography, 42 (1989), 185-6. It was assumed that Thynne derived his text from Caxton (1483), but Edwards has shown that Thynne actually used Pynson's edition. In spite of some attempts to correct or improve Caxton's typographical errors, Pynson's text was so close and faithful a reprint of Caxton's original.

⁹ In three instances out of these seven, B's text is lacking.

(1) 1/3 The slydder ioye / y^t alway slydde so yerne

slydder] so F (B: lacking) W, dredfull A-group Th, blisful TLtD

(2) 4/28 That all the day / thought me but a lyte.

That . . . lyte] so FB W, That a. t. d. me thought it but a lyte CxL Th;

That al day thought me but a lyte TLt D, etc.

(3) 1/5 a] so F (B: lacking), om Lt W, his Others Th (4) 25/169 and] so F (B: lacking) WTh, om Others (5) 51/355 his] so FB WTh, hir/her Others (6) 88/612 haysoge] so FB W, the haysoge Others Th (7) 96/669 A] so FB W, And Others Th Cf. 60/417 chese & chesse (spellings)] so FB W

August 2,
20061010

¹⁰ Except for the places where B favours 'quoth' against F's 'quod', Pyn always corresponds with B's variant reading: 22/150 ne] nor F, so B (Others); 22/152 So] so B (FfCxSJ), om F (Others); 29/201 be] om F, so B (Others); 33/231 a temple of brasse] a temple of glas F, so B (Others); 45/311 Of] On F, so B (Others); 52/364 and] so B (CxHh), om F (Others); 55/381 Hath] Halfe F, so B (Others); 60/420 or] of F, so B (Others); 68/476 full] om F, so B (Others); 85/590 loue alway] so B (GgJ LtD), alway loue F (Others).

¹¹ Manuscripts B, F, and T are so similar in language and contents that they were once thought to have derived from one archetype, but now it is agreed that the items assembled in each manuscript were produced from a number of independent booklets as their exemplars. See Pamela Robinson's 'Introduction' to Manuscript Bodley 638: A Facsimile, pp. xxxvi-vii. Thus, the textual closeness between B and Pyn suggests that Pyn's copytext and B were drawn from a common booklet.

¹² It is questionable whether Pynson used Cx as a reference text of the A-group, but these three cases seem to point to the possibility of Pynson's reference to the other text than Cx. Incidentally, according to my textual examination of 14 manuscripts and Cx, Cx has 102 unique readings, in two of which Pyn agrees with Cx (47/328 Cx foules] so Pyn Th, foule Others W; 74/653 Cx no maner of] so Pyn, no maner Others WTh). As for Thynne's change of the base text at l. 141, which was asserted by Blodgett, the switch does not preclude the use of Caxton's edition thereafter. This can be proved by the fact that Caxton's unique readings are taken over by Thynne at l. 524a•b (Cx charge] so Th, iuge Others PynW; Cx ye] so Th, men Others PynW).

¹³ The textual relationships between W and its prior texts will be dealt in greater detail in my forthcoming article, 'The Prologue, Text, and Epilogue in de Worde's Edition of The Parliament of Fowls: An Examination of the Printer's Commercial Tactics'.

¹⁴ De Worde's textual (dis)agreements with Pyn in these cases are of great consequence in another dimension. They can be used as a clue to consider the relationship between Pynson's and Rastell's (Ras) editions which we mentioned in note 5. If we speculate that Pynson might have used Ras as his exemplar, we can posit roughly the following possible cases:

a) In the case that Pyn was a faithful reprint of Ras, it follows that Rastell made the composite text using different sources and that W's copytext, Ras's base text and the manuscript B derived from a common booklet.

b) In the case that Pyn used Ras as his chief exemplar and another text as a subsidiary exemplar, it follows that Ras's text is affiliated to the B-group and thus Ras can be added among the candidates which may have been used as W's copytext.

August 2,
20061111

c) In the case that Pyn used Ras as a subsidiary exemplar, it follows that Ras's text is affiliated to the A-group along with its previous print Cx.

In any case, my arguments are tenable concerning the existence of a printed edition which was prepared from two different sources. Irrespective of Pynson's reference to Ras, it was Pynson, except for the case a), who produced and published the composite text. In the exceptional case, we can understand that Rastell worked as an editor/printer like Pynson who has been described in the present article.

¹⁵ These two revisions seem to have something to do with the use of a negative form, but Pynson did not always tamper with the multiple negation. He left unchanged the other cases (44/306, 69/477, 70/486, and 94/653).

¹⁶ De Worde's edition also has pronouns modernized. The initial six cases ('hem' 6/40, 12/82; 'her' 2/9, 6/39, 12/82, 13/86), which Pynson's compositor(s) left intact, are substituted by modern forms except for 6/39. In contrast, there can be found two cases in which W preserves 'her' against Pyn's 'their' (70/488a•b).

¹⁷ Pynson's concern with good printing stood out among his contemporary printers. He was the second to hold the official position of printer to the king and also the first printer that referred to an English corrector. For his life and works, see H. S. Bennett, English Books and Readers 1475-1557 (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1969), esp., p. 187, Henry R. Plomer, Wynkyn de Worde and his Contemporaries from the Death of Caxton to 1535 (Grafton & Co., 1925), esp., pp. 120-1, E. G. Duff, A Century of the English Book Trade 1457-1557 (The Bibliographical Society, 1905), pp. 126-7, and Percy Simpson, Proof-Reading in the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Centuries (Oxford Univ. Press, 1935), pp. 110-11.

¹⁸ Chaucer the Critical Heritage, ed. D. S. Brewer (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978), vol. 1, p. 85.

¹⁹ For the reasons the Bodley manuscript was housed and used in a grammar school, Robinson points out the 'respect in which Chaucer was held as a rhetorician and the assimilation of his works to the classics'. See her 'Introduction' to Manuscript Bodley 638: A Facsimile, pp. xxxix-xl.

²⁰ De Worde's edition, sig. B6v.

²¹ See Blodgett, 'William Thynne', in Editing Chaucer: The Great Tradition, ed. P. G. Ruggiers, pp. 47ff.