UNIVERSITY OF MURCIA

International Journal of English Studies

IJES

www.um.es/engphil/ijes

The Need for 'Re-editing' *Gamelyn'*

NILA VÁZQUEZ*
University of *Murcia*

ABSTRACT
Modern Philology aims at re-discovering old texts by renewing the approaches and techniques used in critical editing. In the present article, some arguments in favour of the 'need' for editing anew the *Tale of tiamelyn* (included in the manuscripts of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales)* are presented. After an analysis of previous editions of this *Tale,* tlie contents of a forilicoming edition of *tiamelyn* are outlined.

KEYWORDS
the *Tale of Gamelyn*, critical editions, manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*, collation

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the most outstanding features of Philology nowadays is perhaps the eagerness to discover new aspects of previously analysed works, studying in depth aspects that had been neglected by ancient scholars and reaching different conclusions often based on innovative methods of research. In the field of editing, we have lately witnessed the appearance of a great number of 'renewed' editions of literary works published long ago. One could wonder whether these new editions are, in fact, necessary or even useful. I believe that the answer should undoubtedly be that they are. The reasons for carrying out a job of this type are of a different kind, the same literary subjects might be studied following different approaches, using different tools[2] or pursuing different goals. Time passes by and minds change, so that it may become necessary to revise the work done in the past. In literature and linguistics, the same as in life, there are only a few 'absolute truths'. and even some of them might be questioned. One has to admit a certain

* ***Addressfor correspondence:*** Nila Vázquez, Universidad de Murcia, Departamento de Filología inglesa, Facultad de Letras, Campus de la Merced, 30071, Murcia (Spain). E-mail: nilavg@um.es

feeling of admiration for the work of previous scholars, their devotion and the conditions under which they worked. However, their lack of resources and excess of authorial discourse must also be taken into consideration.

II. THE INITIAL IDEA

When Profesor Norman Blake offered me the possibility of preparing an edition of the *Tale of Gamelyn* for the *Canterbury Tales* Project some years ago, I had never heard about it, not even a single mention in my English Literature classes. The first thing I did was to look up the entry *Gamelyn* in the *Oxford Companion to English Literature.* It read as follows:

> ***Gamelyn***, The *Tale of.* a verse romance of the mid-14th cent. From the East Midlands, in 902 lines of long couplets. It is found in a iiumber of maiiuscripts of **The Canterbury Tales.* usually assigiied to tlie Cook, aiid it is possible that Cliaucer did intend to write a version of it for use as the Cook's tale. It is included in *Skeat's Chaucerian and other Pieces, appended as vol. 7 to his edition of Chaucer.
>
> Gamelyn is the youngest of three brothers whose father leaves them his property in equal shares but whose eldest brother cheats him of his eiititlement. Like Orlando in *As You Like *It* (which is clearly related to it), Gamelyii overtlirows the court wrestler and flees to the forest, from where he wages a campaigii to recover his birthright, ultimately with success. The story also has striking affinities with tlie legends of *Robin Hood. It Iias been edited by D.B. Sands in *Middle English* Verse Romances (Drabble, 1985: 377).

Next, I asked some colleagues about this tale. Some of them confessed that they were not acquainted with it (it does not appear in modem editions of the *Canterbury Tales);* one of them told me that it was a spurious tale found in some mansucripts of Chaucer's *Cunterbury Tales,* but, in general, I could not obtain much information until I started to look for material on *Gamelyn.* In the course of time, I have had to explain what this tale is about and, nowadays, my chief intention is to re-discover *The Tale of Young Gamelyn* for the public by preparing an edition that will enable everyone to learn not only about the romance itself, its language, metre and other intemal features, but also about other interesting topics surrounding it, such as its possible authorship, its relationship with previous and later poems, etc.

III. REVIEWING PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THE *TALE* OF *GAMELYN*

The *Tale of Gamelyn,* which appears only in manuscripts of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tules,* has been printed on different occasions from the early eighteenth century to the present day,[3] Sands' edition (1966) being the most widely known version of the romance. What follows is an analysis of all the printed versions of the *Tale,* paying special attention to the most important ones. For the sake ofclarity, the discussion on the different versions will follow a chronological order. The

first one is John Urry's volume (1721), which includes the readings of nine manuscripts in which *Gumelyn* is present, though his spellings make it impossible to discern on which manuscript the text was based. In the late eighteenth century we find John Bell (1782) and Robert Anderson (1795), who take their texts directly from Urry's. Perhaps the most interesting difference between these two versions of the *Tale* lays in a note introduced in the latter arguing that the *Tale of Gamelyn* was not written by Chaucer.

Moving ahead into the nineteenth century, we find Alexander Chalmers' 1810 edition. This volume offers another replica of Urry's version and includes an inaccurate assertion by the author that the *Tale of Gamelyn* was added to Chaucer's canon by Stow. Thomas Wright (1847-51) is the first editor who decides to detach from Urry's text. In his work he chooses British Library MS Harley 7334 as base text for his edition of the *Cunterbury Tales* and presents *Gumelyn* in smaller type to distinguish it from the other tales.[4] On page 51 Wright says: "Tyrwhitt omits this tale, as being certainly not Chaucer's in which judgement he is probably right". Thus, he accepts the widespread opinion of *Gamelyn*'s spurious character, though the use of the adverbprohubly (he could have chosen 'certainly' or 'absolutely') allows for discussion. This version skips three lines (563, 601 and 602), no doubt due to an unintentional mistake of the editor.

As was the case with Urry's edition, which was followed by later editors of the *Canterbury Tules*, Wright's text was reprinted by Robert Bell and Richard Morris in the course of the nineteenth century. The former reproduces Wright's version in his 1854-56 volume. In fact, the reproduction is so literal that Wright's omission of lines 563,601 and 602 also occurs here. Bell justifies the inclusion of *Gamelyn*[5] in his edition saying: "it is retained in this edition as a curious specimen of a species of composition long popular among the Anglo-Saxon peasantry" (vol. I: 238). On the other hand, Morris's version (1866) rectifies the omission of the lines and corrects some other mistakes. In turn, the edition of the *Tale* of *Gamelyn* presented by Frederik Furnivall (1868) offers the readings of Royal 18 C. II, Harley 1758, Sloane 1685, Corpus, Petworth and Lansdowne 851. It obviously omits Harley 7334 because it had been printed before three times.

Skeat's version (1884) is actually the only proper edition of *Gumelyn* so far. He follows Ha^4 as base text, which is, for him, "much the best and oldest of the manuscripts containing the Tale"(1884: xxx) and collates it with Furnivall's readings in his *Six-Text Print.* It includes an interesting introduction to the *Tale* in which he examines some aspects of the romance, such as its metre, rhymes and lexicon (always through a non-Chaucerian prism), and mentions its connection with Lodge's *Rosalynde,* Shakespeare's *As You Like It* and the ballads of Robin Hood. The flaw of this quite good edition is the overload of personal beliefs and comments when analysing the contents of the *Tale*. Some of them are the following: "I cannot but protest against the stupidity of the botcher whose hand wrote above it *The Cokes Tale*" (p. xiv) when referring to the title *The Cook's Tale* used for *Gumelyn* in Ha^4; or "which may easily have been a mistake for fourteenth, such mistakes being extremely common" (p. xxxv), when discussing Lindner's

dating of *Gamelyn* and trying to excuse him for suggesting it was written in the thirteenth century.[6] Skeat dates the *Tale ca.* 1340, places it in the East Midlands and assumes that there must have been a French original from which it would have been translated. However, he does not offer clear evidence for any of these assertions. Finally, one of the most outstanding benefits of this edition is that it includes a chapter with some explanatory notes and a small glossary at the end which provides grammatical information about some of the tokens.

Moving forward in time, we find Furnivall's transcription of the Ha[4] manuscript (1885) and Skeat's revision of his 1884 edition (1894). Neither of these two works offers innovative details that could be worth pointing out. The version reached by Furnivall is the one used by French and Hale in their 1930 collection of medieval romances in which no further information is added. In turn, Sand's edition (1966) mentions the connections between Gamelyn, Robin Hood and Lodge's Rosader (the male character in *Rosalynde).* In his introduction to the text, the author offers a brief summary of the plot and acknowledges that his edition combines features of several others. When compared with previously printed versions of the *Tale,* it becomes clear that we are facing a diplomatic edition based on that by French and Hale.

The most recent edition of *Gameíyn* is Knight and Ohlgren's 1997 version, included in the volume *Robin Hood and Other Outlaw Tales.* The editors decide to use the Petworth manuscript as base text because "editorial work on the Canterbury Tales has shown these two manuscripts [Corpus and Harley 7334] to be unreliable"[7] and in view that "collation shows it [Petworth] to offer the best readings [...] in this version *Gamelyn* on a significant number of occasions seems a better poem" (1997: 184). In their introduction to the text they discuss briefly its style, focus on its plot and its narrative and emphasise its connections with the Robin Hood cycle. Knight and Ohlgren date the *Tale ca.*1350-70, following the historians Dunn (1967), Holt (1989) and Keen (1961), and place it near Leicestershire.

The diachronic survey of previous editions of the *Tale* given above reveals that, in those works belonging to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, *Gamelyn* appears in editions of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales,* whereas, in the twentieth century volumes, it is included in collections of romances of various kinds (Middle English Romances, Outlaw Tales, etc.). In the first case, even though the editors did not generally accept the *Tale* as Chaucer's, they decided to include it because it occurred in the manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales* they were using, *i.e.* Corpus, Harley 1758, Harley 7334, Lansdowne, Petworth, Royal 18 C. II and Sloane 1685. In the twentieth century, the position of Harley 7334 as one of the best manuscripts for the *Canterbury Tales* changed and Ellesmere (Huntington Library El. 26 C 9) and Hengwrt (National Library of Wales Peniarth 392 D) started to be regarded as better copies. Neither of these two manuscripts included the *Tale of Gamelyn.* Besides, in the late nineteenth century some eminent scholars, such as Lindner (1878) and, then, Skeat (1884) (following Lindner's premises), resolutely argued against the possible Chaucerian authorship of the romance on the grounds of grammar, lexicon and rhyme in the poem. From that moment on, *Gamelyn*'s position changed from being considered a 'presumably spurious tale' to being completely rejected and

omitted in the following editions of the *Cunterbury Tales.* As a result, the only twentieth century versions of *Gamelyn* we find appear in collections of romances and ballads.

IV. THE NEED FOR A NEW EDITION

Once finished this short analysis of the printed versions of *Gamelyn* that have come to us since it was included in the manuscripts of *The Cunterbury Tules,* a few explanations on the need for a new edition of this romance will follow. As seen so far, most of the editions of *Gamelyn* are basically printed transcriptions of single manuscripts, very often reprinted by other editors of the *Canterbury Tules*. Thus, Urry's blurry version (an exception, for he says he used nine manuscripts), was reprinted by John Bell, Anderson and Chalmers; Wright's version, using Harley 7334 as base text, was, in turn, reprinted by Robert Bell and also by Morris; similarly, Furnivall's edition, using Harley 7334 as base text, was also used by French and Hale and then by Sands, who took it through the latter; Skeat uses Harley 7334 but also Furnivall's ***Six*** *Text* readings and, finally, Knight and Ohlgren,who use Petworth. As can be seen, first Harley 7334 (in almost all the editions) and then Petworth (in one) are the preferred manuscripts for the printed versions of *Gumelyn.* As will become evident in the discussion on best readings for *Gamelyn* below, I believe, however, that neither of these manuscripts should be used as base text for this particular tale. In addition, none of these versions includes especial characters,but offer a modernised and extremely regularised text.

Furthermore, rather than focusing on the individual characteristics of the romance itself and their analysis, the different editors dwell on giving reasons for keeping *Gamelyn* outside Chaucer's canon. In my opinion, neither of the explanations they allege constitutes conclusive proof that this is the case. The refutation of each of their arguments is beyond the scope of the present piece of work. However, a couple of examples will suffice. Lindner's description of Gamelyn's brother's house (an Anglo-Norman house of the 13th century style) is given by this scholar as a reason to situate the romance in the 13th century (1878-79: 321). Skeat's assertion that there is a "small percentage of words of French origin, very different from what we find in Chaucer" (1884: xxviii) cannot be taken into consideration. Skeat also affirms that false rhymes, such as 11.45-6: *two / goo,* or 575-6: *gate / scape,* could have never come out of Chaucer's hands (pp. xxvi and xxvii), basing his explanation on the potential way of pronouncing *twoo* at that time, like /oa/. He also neglects the important fact that rhymes of this kind including plosives /p, t, k/ are found in other contemporary poems (*e.g.* in the *Romaunt of the Rose).* For him, rhymes suchas 11.93-4: *nowe / nowe* and 445-6: *other / other* were simple repetitions resulting from the lack of proficiency of the author, without noticing that these so called 'sentimental' rhymes were frequently used in the erudite poetry in the Middle Ages.

In conclusion, none of the examined editions of the *Tale of Gamelyn* is, from my point of view, completely exhaustive or reliable, and the most accurate one, Skeat's version, is too focused on personal beliefs and decisions and obviously too much influenced by Lindner's

(1878-79) article on *Gamelyn.* In view of the obvious shortcomings of the existing editions of the tale, my goal is to attain a transparent edition that will deal with *Gamelyn* first as a separate piece of work and then as part of the *Canterbury Tales.*

V. SELECTING THE BEST WITNESSES FOR THE TALE

The *Tale* of *Gamelyn,* appears in twenty-five manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*.[8] Following Manly and Rickert's classification of the manuscripts (1940: 49-77), they can be arranged as follows:

-Type c: **Cp,** La, Sl^2
-Type d: Bw, Mm, En', Fi, Gl, Ha', Ht, Ld^2, Lc, Mg, Pw, Ph^3, Ra', Ry', Ry^2, SI', Dl
-Unique: Ch, Ii, Ha^4, To', Ld'

When preparing the edition of a text that has survived in a large number of manuscripts, it is essential to choose carefully the one that will be used as base text and those against which the selected manuscript will be collated. Bearing in mind that the oldest and most carefully written manuscripts very often contain closer readings to the original of an author, and following Manly and Rickert's dating of the manuscripts in which *Gamelyn* appears, the prime candidates for becoming the base text of this new edition are Corpus, Harley 7334 and Petworth. In the following pages I will undertake the analysis of some key examples in these three manuscripts.[9]

When lines 281-283 of *Gamelyn* are analysed in some of the most valuable witnesses that contain the *Tale,* we discover that lines 281, 282 and 283 appear in Cp, Ha^4 and La. On the contrary, they (among others) are missing in Pw, probably because they were not in the text from which it was copied. The scribes of Mm and Ry^2 decided not to interfere, whereas the Pw scribe added a whole line as a new line 283. In manuscripts Fi and Ht the scribes also add a line, completely different from the one in Pw.

L 281

Cp	And sayde haue gainelyn þe Ring and þe Ram
Fi	[* * * * * * * * * *]
Ha⁴	seydeii Gainelyii Ryng
Ht	[* * * * * * * * * * 1
La	seide Gamelin ringe &
Mm	[* * * * * * * * * * 1
Pw	[* *]
Ry²	[* * * * * * * * * *]

L 282

Cp	For þe beste wrastelere þat euer heere cam
Fi	[* * * * * * * * * 1
Ha⁴	best wrasteler here
Ht	[* * * * * * * * * 1
La	best wrastelier þat here

Mm [* * * * * * * *]
Pw [* * * * * * * *]
Ry² [* * * * * * * *]

L **283**
Cp Thus wan Gamely þe Ram and þe Ryng
Fi And Gamelyn that was so 3inge
Ha⁴ Gamelyn
Ht Come and bro3t Gamelyn þe Ram & þe ryng
La wanne Gamelin * rame & * Ringe
Mm [* * * * * * * *]
Pw And Gamelyn bi þou3t hiin it was a faire þinge
Ry² [* * * * * * * *]

In line 246 we witness another intrusion of the Pw scribe, who replaced *oon arme* 'one arm' by *owne arme* 'own arm', in order to achieve a better reading (none of the other manuscripts shows that form).

L 246
Cp And þarto his **oon** arm þat yaf a gret crak
Ha⁴ And þrto his **oon** arin þat 3af a gret crak
Pw And þerto his **owne** arme þat 3af a grete crake

In lines 251 and 267, we see the scribe making mistakes and trying to amend them.

L 251
Cp Than seyde þe Frankelein þat hadde his sone þere
Ha⁴ Thanne seyde þe Frankeleyn þat had his sones þere
Pw Than seide þe frankeley þ[t] had þe sones **[del]**[10]**þre[/del]** þere

L 267
Cp Tuo gentil men þat yemede þe place
Ha' Tuo gentil men þer were þat yemede þe place
Pw Two gentile men **[add]**[11] **þat[/add]** 3emed þe place

Finally, in Iine 292 he first changes the word order of *was it* and then adds *strong* to repair the lost rhythm. Again, Pw is the only manuscript that shows such a reading.

L 292
Cp Than **was it** schett faste w iþ a pyn
Ha⁴ And þanne **was it** schet faste wiþ a pyn
Pw And **it was** shett fast wiþ a **strong** pynne

It seems therefore, in my opinion, that Cp and Ha⁴ are not as *unreliable* as Knight and Ohlgren suggest[12] and that *collation* not always shows Pw offering *the best readings*, at least for this particular tale. Let's consider now some other exceptional readings in Cp and Ha⁴. Particularly, I would like to focus on additions, for omissions can easily be explained as simple scribal errors.

In line 172 both scribes add **vp** perhaps trying to introduce an idiomatic expression. The scribe of Cp places **vp** before the main verb and also introduces the prefix *y-* before the past participle *set,* whereas that of Ha^4 puts **vp** after the main verb. The rhythm of the line is regularised in both cases, though, in the first one, it becomes more elegant.

L 172

Cp	And þer fore þer was **vp** y set a Rain and a Ryng
Ha^4	Aiid þrfor þer was sette **vp** a Ram and a Ryng

In line 414 the scribe of Cp adds *lose* in an attempt to clarify the syntax of the sentence.

L 414

Cp	I wil holde þe couenant aiid þou wil **lose** me
Ha^4	I wol hold þe couenant aiid þou wil me

On the other hand, if we examine the additions in lines 260 and 267 in Ha^4, we see that the rhythm of the lines is altered.

L 260

Cp	And sayde if þer be inoo lat he come to werke
Ha^4	And sayde if þer be eny mo lat hem come to werk

L 267

Cp	Tuo gentil meii yemede þe place
Ha^4	Two gentil inen **þer** were **þat** yeinede þe place

The rhythm is also damaged after the change in word order in line 232 (Ha^4 is the only manuscript showing this reverse word arrangement). In addition, changes such asthose in line 256 a ***liþer maister*** for *alþer maister* and the omission of *oure,* are clear mistakes on the part of the scribe.

L 232

Cp	Now I am oldere woxe þou schalt fynd me a more
Ha^4	Now I am older woxe þou schalt me fynd a more

L 256

Cp	He is oure alþer maister and Iiis pley is ri3t fell
Ha^4	He is **a liþer** inayster and Iiis pley is ri3t fell

In view of the examples discussed above, it becomes clear that Cp can be regarded as the most reliable manuscript containing *Gamelyn.* This is the reason that leads me to use it as base text for my critica1 edition of the *Tale.* As for the manuscripts I have chosen to collate against Cp, a first group comprises the other most valuable oldest manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales* including *Gamelyn:* Ha^4, La and Pw (Ha^4 also for being unique and La also because it represents type c). Secondly, I have decided to select Mm, Fi, Ht, Lc and Ry^2 which, together with Pw, are

representatives of type d. Finally, Ch should be included because it is a valuable witness and it also shows an unique arrangement of the tales. These manuscripts have been chosen instead of others belonging to the same group on account of Manly and Rickert's collation of the manuscripts (1940), their description and the textual affiliation of their lines. Thus, those late careless copies and those that are direct copies of other manuscripts have not been considered. The only inclusion of a somewhat 'inaccurate' manuscript is Fi. Nevertheless, since it has been suggested that "there is a possibility that in some tales it represents pre-*Canterbury Tules* versions and in others first drafts" (Manly & Rickert, 1940: 163). Therefore, checking its readings of *Gamelyn* against those of the other manuscripts may prove very revealing.

VI. THE LAYOUT OF THE NEW EDITION OF THE TALE

Once finished the selection of the most suitable witnesses on which the new edition of *Gamelyn* will be based, there follows a description of the contents it will include:

The main intention of this new critical edition of the *Tale* of *Gamelyn* is to provide the reader with the possibility of dealing with all the material directly[13] so that she/he can use it for her/his own purposes. That is the reason why it will include a synoptic[14] edition of the text, *i.e.* the simultaneous reproduction of the diplomatic transcriptions of all the chosen manuscripts, accompanied by images of all pages in which *Gamelyn* appears. The results of my collation using Peter Robinson's COLLATE will also be included in the work as a useful tool to check all the explanations given throughout the edition. All these elements: the edited version, followed by a translation into Present-day English and the collated lines, the images of the manuscripts and the single diplomatic transcriptions, will constitute part one of the edition. A chapter on the type of writing and the different scribes will complete this Paleographical Approach, since this type of work has not been done by previous editors of the tale.

The second part of the edition will consist of a complete study of the internal features of *Gamelyn*. It will be divided into (a) Grammar Analysis, including the orthographic variants in the different versions, types of words, word order in the sentences of its lines and dialectal analysis of the word forms, and (b) Metrical Analysis, a study of its metre, rhythm and rhymes. The metrical features of the romance were examined by Lindner (1878-79) and Skeat (1884), but still a detailed analysis is needed.

Finally, a third part will focus on the externa1 features of the romance and it will include two main chapters. One will discuss the problems as regards the authorship of *Gamelyn* and its appropriateness as a second tale for the Cook. There exists a possibility that *Gamelyn* could have been intended for the Yeoman and not for the Cook. However, when Chaucer died the first editors tried to arrange all the papers that had been left and could have misplaced the *Tale*. This chapter will have strong connections with the previous part, for the findings in types of words used, dialectal features and rhymes will help to argue for or against a Chaucerian authorship of *Gamelyn*. The chapter on Literary Connections of the *Tale* will include an extensive analysis of

its relationship with previous and later poems. Some of these connections have been mentioned in the course of time. In his introduction, Skeat (1884) relates this tale to a poem in the Auchinleck manuscript, to Lodge's Rosalynde and the Robin Hood *Ballads*. However, he merely suggests similarities between them, making it necessary a more detailed study to prove up to what extent these connections are significant. In these two final chapters the work done for the preceding parts will be used as evidence for or against other scholars' assertions and my own ones, still the reader will be the one who will have to choose what to believe.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

In the pages above, 1 have tried to argue about the necessity of preparing a new edition of the Tale *of Gamelyn,* since none of the previous editions of this romance has proved to be a 'proper' one. Certain lines from different manuscripts have been analysed in order to determine which witnesses should be more suitable to achieve the best readings of the text. Finally, I have explained the contents this edition will include: a paleographical approach, an analysis of the interna1 features of the poem (mainly its metre and type of words used) and a study of its external features (literary connections and the problem of its authorship).

1 am sure that, once this work is finished, no exceptional discoveries as regards *Gamelyn* will have been made. Moreover, this is not the intention behind the edition, for its only aim is to offer a new text (possibly better than any other in previous editions) and to accompany it with some explanations about its nature and its trajectory in the course of time. Going back to the 'absolute truths' mentioned in the introduction, probably nota single one about this tale will be revealed. When dealing with enigmatic topics such as the authorship of a certain piece of work (and this is certainly the case of Gamelyn), the conclusions drawn can be 'possible' or 'probable' but hardly ever 'unquestionable'. Perhaps there lays the attraction that has fascinated so many generations for ages, in the challenge of facing what has always been and will be almost impossible to prove.

NOTES

1. Nila Váquez is part of the research project 'Variation, Linguistic Change and Grammaticalisation', grants HUM2004-00940/FILO (Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia) & PGIDIT05PXIC20401PN (Secretaria Xeral de Investigación e Desenvolvemento, Xunta de Galicia). These grants are hereby gratefully acknowledged.

2. Nowadays computers make it possible to handle enormous amounts of data and the result of the analysis of these data might lead us to conclusions different from those reached in the past.

3. As will be seen below, most editions of the ***Tale of Gamelyn*** are mere transcriptions of single manuscripts.

4. The change of type can be seen as a way to wam the reader that this particular tale is somewhat special, though the editor decides to include it anyway.

5. Since Robert Bell is reprinting Wright's version of the *Canterbury Tales,* which incorporates the Tale of Gamelyn, this tale has to appear in his edition and cannot be leí? out. Though his need for justifying its presence reveals that the author believed it to be spurious and not written by Chaucer.

6. Skeat agreed with most of Lindner's assertions on ***Gamelyn*** but not with his dating of the ***Tale.*** Here, he tries to convince the reader that Lindner could have miswritten "thirteenth century" instead of "fourteenth century". However, a close reading of Lindner's article reveals that the same idea is suggested several times. On one occasion, he talks about dating ***Gamelyn*** 100 years before Chaucer's time (1878-79: 98), thus leaving his intention clear.

7. Knight is here referring to his edition of ***The*** *Franklin's* ***Tale*** for the *Variorum Chaucer,* for which he used Pw as base text and rejected the readings of Cp and Ha4.

8. The manuscripts in which ***Gamelyn*** is found are the following: Bodleian Library MS Barlow 20c (Bw), Christ Church Oxford MS 152 (Ch), Corpus Christi College Oxford MS 198 (Cp), Takamiya MS 32: Delamere (DI), British Library MS Egerton 2863 (En^2), Fitzwilliam Museum McClean 181 (Fi), Glasgow Hunterian Museum U.1.1 (GI), British Library MS Harley 1758 (Ha^1), British Library MS Harley 7334 (Ha^4), Bodleian Library MS Hatton Donat. 1 (Ht), Cambridge University Library Ii.3.26 (Ii), British Library MS Lansdowne 851 (La), Bodleian Library MS Laud Misc. 600 (Ld^1). Bodleian Library MS Laud Misc. 39 (Ld^2), Lichfield Cathedral MS 29 (Lc), Cambridge University Library Mm.2.5 (Mm), Pierpont Morgan Library MS 249 (Mg), Rosenbach Museum and Library 108411 (Ph^1), Petworth House MS 7 (Pw), Bodleian Library MS Rawlinson Poet. 149 (Ra^2), British Library MS Royal 17 D.XV (Ry^1), British Library MS Royal 18 C.II (Ry^2), British Library MS Sloane 1685 (Sl^1), British Library MS Sloane 1686 (Sl^2) and Trinity College Oxford MS 49 (To^1)

9. These examples are taken from a first collation of two hundred lines from eight of the most valuable manuscripts containing *Gamelyn.* This initial survey served as a starting point for deciding which manuscript would be the most suitable one to be used as base text.

10. [del] is the tag used in the *Canterbury* ***Tales*** Project to indicate that the scribe has deleted a certain word

11. [add] is the tag used in the *Canterbury* ***Tales*** Project to indicate that the scribe has added a certain word.

12. *Cf.* the discussion on Knight & Ohlgren's edition above.

13. The aim is not to influence the reader's opinion but, on the contrary, to leave her/him free to examine the data and decide for herselflhimself.

14. With this arrangement, the reader will have easy access to all the information about the different versions presented, allowing for direct comparisons between the image of a certain manuscript and its transcription, between different transcriptions, etc.

REFERENCES

Aiiderson, Robert (Ed.) (1795) ***The*** *Works of the British Poets.* London.

Bell, John (Ed.) (1782) ***The*** *Poets of Great Britain Complete from* **Chaucer** *to Churchill.* London

Bell, Roberi (Ed.) (1854-56) *Annotated Edition of English Poets*. Annotated by John M. Jephson. London.

Chalmers, Alexander (Ed.) (1810) *The Works of the English Poets from Chuucer to Cowper*. London.

Drabble, Margaret (Ed.) (1985) *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*. Oxford: OUP.

Dunn, C. W. (1967) Romances Derived from English Legend. In J. B. Severs (Ed.) *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050-1500.* (Vol. 1. *Romances*). New Haven: The Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences.

French, Walter Hoyt & Charles Brockway Hale (Eds.) (1930) *Middle English Metrical Romances*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Furnivall, Frederick James (Ed.) (1868) *A Six-Text Print of Chaucer's Cunterbury Tules.* Chaucer Society. London: Trübner.

Furnivall, Frederick Jaines (Ed.) (1885) *The Harleian MS* 7333 *of Chaucer's Cunterbury Tules,* The Chaucer Society. London: Trübner.

Holt, J. C. (1989) *Robin Hood.* London: Thames and Hudson.

Keen, Maurice (1961) *The Outlaws of Medieval Legend.* London: Routledge.

Knight, Stephen & Thomas Ohlgren (Eds.) (1997) *Robin Hood and Other Outlaw Tules.* Kalamazoo, Michigan: Western Michigan University for TEAMS.

Lindner, F. (1878-79) The *Tale of Gamelyn. Englische Studien*, 11, 94-114,321-43

Manly, John Matthews & Edith Rickert (Eds.) (1940) *The Text of the Cunterbury Tules, Studied on the Basis of All Known Manuscripts.* 8 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Morris, Richard (Ed.) (1866) *The Poetical Works of Geoffrey Chuucer.* London.

Sands, Donald B. (Ed.) (1966) *Middle English Verse Romances.* London & New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Skeat, Walter W. (Ed.) (1884) *The Tale of Gamelyn, from the Harleian Ms. No.* 7333, *Collated with Six Other Mss. Edited with Notes and a Glossarial Index by the Reverend Walter W. Skeat.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Skeat, Walter W. (Ed.) (1894) *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chuucer.* 7 vols. Oxford: Clarendon.

Urry, **John (Ed.)** (1721) ***The Works of Geoffrey Chuucer, compared with the Former Edition and Many*** *Valuable Manuscripts.* **London: Lintot.**

Wright, Thomas (Ed.) (1847-51) ***The*** *Canterbury* ***Tules of*** *Geoffrey Chaucer. A New Text with Illustrative Notes.* 3 vols. **Percy Society. London: Richards.**

