

Toward an Understanding of Medieval Bookmaking:

The Case for Guy of Warwick

by

Traci Lynn Gardner

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
in
English

APPROVED:

Anthony J. Colaianne, Chair

James W. Spisak

Daniel W. Mosser

Virginia C. Fowler

August, 1986

Blacksburg, Virginia

TOWARD AN UNDERSTANDING OF MEDIEVAL BOOKMAKING:

THE CASE FOR GUY OF WARWICK

by

Traci Lynn Gardner

Committee Chair: Anthony J. Colaianne

English

(Abstract)

Given the importance of an accurate, well-documented base text for any kind of literary or linguistic analysis, my thesis will consider how the editorial bias forced on a popular and influential medieval romance, the Auchinleck Guy of Warwick, by its EETS editor Julius Zupitza misrepresents the romance's manuscript presentation and has therefore prejudiced scholarship on fourteenth-century bookmaking.

When Zupitza edited the Auchinleck version of the Guy romance, he seems to have had in mind the conventional textual principles upheld by his fellow Victorians. Unfortunately few of these Victorians produced texts which would today be considered acceptable. Though Victorian productions of many works have been replaced by modern editions, Zupitza's Guy is the only available text of the romance. The failure of Zupitza's text is complicated by the

fact that the Auchinleck Manuscript and the Auchinleck Guy, because of its unique division into three poems, figure prominently in medieval bookmaking theory. While three medieval bookmaking theories focus on the Auchinleck, none of the prominent Auchinleck scholars — Laura Loomis, Pamela Robinson, or Timothy Shonk — has recognized how Zupitza unintentionally manipulates the Auchinleck Guy with his textual presentation of the romance.

By indicating the errors and misleading practices which have shaped Zupitza's presentation of the Auchinleck Guy, I plan to establish the necessity for a new, more accurate critical edition of the Auchinleck Guy and to suggest how a more accurate critical edition can influence literary and bibliographical studies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have always had some undefinable urge to complete a thesis project — though none is required of masters candidates in my department. Specifically, I wanted to complete a manuscript study of some kind. Now, with the project completed, I have found that shaping impulse translated into words by Ezra Pound who recollected that "Mr Yeats wrote years ago that the highest poetry is so precious that one should be willing to search many a dull tome to find and gather the fragments."¹

For their help and guidance as I have worked to restore the "precious poetry" of the Auchinleck Guy, I want to thank my three committee members: Anthony Colaianne, James Spisak, and Daniel Mosser. They have proven through their assistance in my efforts to clarify both concepts and sentences their worthy adoption of Mark Twain's credo: "The difference between the right word and the almost right word is the difference between lightning and the lightning bug." If any of my readers are struck by lightning, it is due, no doubt, to the useful commentary of these three friends. I want especially to thank Tony Colaianne for accepting a late request to serve as project chair and for salvaging the fragments of my unfocused draft, Jim Spisak for serving as a reader, as my first director, and for guiding me away from

my original, ill-conceived project and toward the Auchinleck Guy, and Dan Mosser for accepting a request to serve as a reader before he was even settled on the campus.

In addition, for their support during the course of my project, I express my thanks

to the Graduate School and the Cunningham Summer Thesis/Dissertation Awards Committee for providing financial support while I completed my project.

to Virginia Fowler, Wilson Snipes, Evelyn Newlyn, and Vanessa Williams for supporting my fellowship application.

to my officemates — Rusty Swope, Joanna Banach, Natividad del Pilar, George Teekell, and Jenny James — for enduring my complaints this past year.

to Mickey Pellillo for her concern over my well-being.

and, most importantly, to my family for providing emotional support and "peace and quiet."

Without the support of these friends, I would have been unable to finish this project. "Graunt-merci" to one and all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
TOWARD AN UNDERSTANDING OF MEDIEVAL BOOKMAKING: THE CASE FOR <u>GUY OF WARWICK</u>	1
NOTES	60
APPENDIX A. PARALLEL PRESENTATION OF TEXTUAL VARIANTS	67
APPENDIX B. PRESENTATION OF AUCHINLECK MS SHIFT	69
BIBLIOGRAPHY	70
VITA	79

Nineteenth-century editors of early English texts are to be credited with having produced basic editions of important works that up until the late Victorian Age had existed only in manuscripts or in rare early printed editions. Unfortunately, for the modern reader, editorial principles employed in those texts were treated in a most cavalier fashion (if at all), since they were governed solely by the desire to get some version of a text in the hands of a reading public. In so doing, these early editors were frequently careless. Both McKerrow and Greg, the founders of textual criticism in the modern age, were critical of their forerunners — especially those who had based their texts on copies that were immediately available and were, therefore, sometimes very late and very corrupt versions of early texts.

Through the pioneering efforts of Greg and McKerrow and the next generations of editorial theorists including Bowers and Tanselle, modern scholarship now has a much fuller understanding and a more scientific approach to use in the representation of texts. Most of the important editorial work has, however, concentrated on literary pieces which appeared in or after the Renaissance, a period dominated by printed texts (and occasionally autographs and scribal copies). Most editorial work in earlier English literature has focused on the important but not necessarily typical work of Chaucer, Langland, and the Pearl-poet. For these and a handful of other major writers and works we have more reliable critical

editions, but much of the spadework done by the Victorian scholars on the lesser known writers and works of the later middle ages remains to be redone. This thesis focuses on one of the most important of these works — the Auchinleck MS of Guy of Warwick — in the light of what we now know about the transmission of texts.

The only available edition of the Auchinleck MS's (Advocates 19.2.1) early fourteenth century version of the medieval romance Guy of Warwick, edited by Julius Zupitza for the Early English Text Society in the late nineteenth century (1883, 1887, 1891, rpt. 1961), is emblematic of the problems found in textual work and editions before 1900. By considering the editorial biases forced on the Auchinleck Guy of Warwick by Zupitza's edition and by evaluating how that bias has affected scholarship on medieval book production, I plan to establish the necessity for a new, more accurate critical edition of the Auchinleck Guy and to suggest how a more accurate representation can influence literary and bibliographical studies. By exploring these influences, I hope to re-establish the Guy as an important and unique medieval romance.

The Guy romance was extensively revised and reshaped for an ever-changing audience during a period stretching from the Middle Ages to the late eighteenth century. Throughout this period, however, the story remained, in many important ways, a typical romance. Specifically, it relates the tale of an

adventurous knight who participates in battles for the glory of his lady and for the glory of God before dying as a saintly hero. For all its conventional qualities, the Guy was still an extremely popular tale during the entire interval. Though the number of surviving medieval manuscripts is no certain measure of popularity, the tale's inclusion in five Middle English and thirteen Anglo-Norman manuscripts indicates that it was a favored romance.

In addition to this suggested popularity, shortened episodes from the legend which occur in medieval catalogs (Crane 126), exempla and the chronicles (Loomis, Medieval Romance 130) indicate a popularity beyond that of most romances. The Gesta Romanorum, for instance, preserve a brief summary of Guy's early life, a full account of his meeting with his friend Tirri and of his later battle on Tirri's behalf (Loomis, Medieval Romances 130). Gerard of Cornwall, according to Loomis, provides the earliest chronicle account of the Guy tale in his Historia Regum Westsaxonum (130).

Romances such as the Guy were apparently standard courtly reading. In fact, Larry D. Benson maintains that "if contemporary preachers are to be trusted, in many households the reading of romances was part of the ordinary education of aristocratic children" (241). Benson's source, G. R. Owst, confirms that the Guy legend, in particular, surfaced often in medieval sermons. Owst notes, for instance, that

"the tale of Guy of Warwick and the Dragon actually appears, e.g., in Felton's Sermons" (15). Further, Chaucer's allusion to the romance in Sir Thopas intimates that even if the romance itself was not widely read or heard, the Guy legend was certainly well-known by audiences as early as Chaucer's time. By comparison, Loomis points out that "though Chaucer in the fourteenth century was already jesting at Guy of Warwick as a 'romance of pris,' it is ironically true that in sheer popular favor the story for years outlasted anything of his" (Medieval Romances 127).

The romance continued to thrill and excite audiences during the Renaissance period.² During the 1500s, various editions of the poem were published by Robert Pynson, Wynkyn de Worde, William Copland, and John Cawood. A ballad, adding the Dun Cow motif to the Guy legend, appeared in the later 1500s and was licensed to Richard Jones in 1592. The poem was adapted by Samuel Rowlands in 1608, and his version was revised and adapted by editors until the close of the eighteenth century. Further, the Renaissance period's great artists knew and alluded to the romance. Shakespeare mentions Guy and Colbrand in Henry VIII, "I am not Samson, nor Sir Guy, nor Colebrand, To mow'em down before me," (V.iv.20) and refers to "Colbrand the giant, that same mighty man" in King John (I.i.225). Ronald S. Crane notes that Drayton alludes to the tale in Poly-Olbion and that the story was known to

Skelton, Udall, and Puttenham in addition to Shakespeare (131).

The early seventeenth century also saw the romance's adaptation into two tragedies, one of which was so popular that it was revived after the Restoration. The continuing adaptations of Rowland's version of the poem during the century led to the story's redaction in prose, based on Rowland's verses, by Samuel Smithson in 1680. Finally, the story appeared as a chapbook, entitled The Renowned History, or the Life and Death of Guy Earl of Warwick, compiled by John Shurley in 1681. Though it appeared in various genres, the basic story itself changed only slightly, if at all. The consistency between the editions, reprints, and adaptations in various genres during the 1600s and the original legend underscored a popularity that continued during the eighteenth century.

A new prose edition, The Noble and Renowned History of Guy Earl of Warwick, appeared in 1706 under the authorship of one G. L. The book had reached its seventh edition by 1733 and was reprinted into the 1800s. The romance was apparently so popular that although Steele mentions it as a story read by his eight-year-old godson in Tatler no. 95 (November 17, 1709), adults were still familiar enough with the tale for Henry Fielding to allude to it in the opening chapter of Joseph Andrews (1743), and for Samuel Richardson's Pamela (1740) to allude to the romance with the Swiss giant Colbrand

who assists Mrs. Jewkes in keeping Pamela captive in the Lincolnshire House.³

After the first half of the eighteenth century, however, the public's admiration of the tale diminished. Though a good deal of critical comment appeared on the romance from 1750 to the end of the century, the studies by Thomas Warton, Richard Hurd, Thomas Percy, and Thomas Gray were unable to stimulate much interest in the tale compared to its original popularity. While editions were being reprinted into the early nineteenth century, the romance which was "once read and admired by all Englishmen" (Crane 194) had fallen out of favor.

In an attempt to make the once popular romance more accessible, Zupitza chose to edit and publish a text of the medieval Guy, but he failed to consider the complexity of the job. All the medieval manuscripts, save the Auchinleck, follow the Anglo-Norman original's couplet version. Although these different versions often add, delete, or highlight the varying episodes and modernize the language, the versions are remarkably faithful to the original presentation. While the contemporary Middle English versions survive as single poems in couplets, the Auchinleck version begins in short couplets, breaks off into twelve-line tail-rhyme stanzas after Guy's fight with the dragon, and separates the story of Reinbrun (also in twelve-line tail-rhyme stanzas) as a sequel related after Guy's and Felice's deaths. The Auchinleck MS seems to

preserve the first extant editorial attempt to adapt the romance for a particular readership. Unfortunately, Zupitza apparently focused all his attention on his transcription of the medieval manuscripts themselves rather than on the nuances of the individual texts. By failing to consider the tale's rich heritage of editorial accommodation for a constantly changing audience, Zupitza ignored changes we now consider central to our understanding of the romance.

Modern readers can excuse Zupitza's inattention to Renaissance and later adaptations since his editions concentrate on medieval versions of the romance, though a tracing of the medieval influence on later versions would have heightened the usefulness of his volume. Zupitza's treatment of the medieval Guy is far more problematic since his textual presentation reduces the significance of the Auchinleck Guy's editorial adaptation. Though Zupitza seems to have had in mind conventional textual principles when he edited the medieval Guy, those principles cannot fully justify his presentation of the text since he adapts the techniques without offering any explanation for his choices. Instead of recording a list of variants from a base text, as was the typical practice, Zupitza transcribed the varying manuscripts in full. In his first volume (1875-76, rpt. 1966), then, he edits a fifteenth-century couplet version of the romance (Cambridge MS Ff.2.38) while in the second volume

he presents the unique Auchinleck Guy paralleled by an early fifteenth-century couplet version (Caius MS 107).

By providing complete texts of the Guy romances rather than complicated lists of significant variants, Zupitza does facilitate an easier examination of the romance's multiple versions. It seems that Zupitza was attempting to emulate F.J. Furnivall's six-text edition of the Canterbury Tales with his parallel presentation. Unlike Furnivall, however, Zupitza does not explain the relationship between the three manuscripts he edits. He provides the reader with the text of three important medieval versions of the tale but does not record his reasons for this particular presentation. Yet, the textual relationship between these three versions is presumably the reason for producing the parallel editions.

In the Preface to the first volume of his edition, Zupitza explains: "As the last volume of the M. E. Guy Romances will be accompanied by a general introduction, literary as well as philological, I will avail myself of the present occasion only to treat of the rhymes of our text" (ix). In his footnote, however, Zupitza suggests that "in the mean time," the scholar should consult the Percy Folio MS edited by Hales and Furnivall (ix). But the Hales and Furnivall introduction to "Guy and Colbronde" hardly explains Zupitza's plans. The editors do trace the developments and changes in the romance from its first presentations to the versions included in the Percy MS. They do not, however, trace the genealogy of the

medieval versions of the Guy tale since such a task would extend beyond their immediate focus. The scholar must turn back to Zupitza's promised introduction. Zupitza's second volume, however, which contains the Auchinleck and Caius versions, provides only a "Temporary Notice" which again refers to the Preface of the Cambridge Guy. The scholar is left with no explanation of Zupitza's intentions.⁴

Zupitza implies, in his Preface to the first volume, that the Cambridge Guy is linguistically and structurally similar to the Caius Guy, since part of the couplet version "is preserved in MS. 107 of Caius College, Cambridge," and since he uses the Caius Guy "in correcting or, at least, pointing out obvious faults of the University [Cambridge] MS" (viii). The shortcoming of Zupitza's reliance on the Lachmann tradition, as far as his attitude to the various versions of the medieval Guy is concerned, is not his genealogical tracing of the tale, his recension, but his failure to outline the results of his recension or to highlight a single text based on his collation and recension. Charles Moorman, in his explanation of editorial principles for medieval manuscripts, suggests that the modern editor has three basic ways to present the text: choose a diplomatic, best text such as those by Richard Morris; create a composite text, like Tyrwhitt or Skeat, by determining the "correct" readings; or by recension, establish a relationship between multiple texts like Lachmann or Furnivall (54). Zupitza apparently attempted

to present the Guy according to the third alternative; that is, in the style of Lachmann and Furnivall, yet he never establishes a clear relationship between the manuscripts.

Presumably Zupitza sees the Cambridge MS as the best version of Guy since it is more complete than the Caius version; he thus ignores its more modern language in favor of its completeness. His choice for the transcription of the Caius version as a parallel for the Auchinleck version of the Guy is more elusive, however. If the Cambridge MS preserves the same version and so closely preserves it that Caius can be used to emend the flaws of the Cambridge, need the Caius ever to have been published at all? Perhaps Zupitza's intention was to display the consistency between the two versions even though the Auchinleck Guy is presented in the form of couplets and twelve-line stanzas while the Caius version consists entirely of couplets. Yet the same comparison could be inferred from a side-by-side reading of the Auchinleck and the Cambridge versions, which Zupitza's edition of the Auchinleck version easily facilitates with its references to the parallel lines in the Cambridge MS.⁵

Even though linguistic parallels exist between the two texts, the inferiority of the Caius version makes it unsatisfactory as a parallel text for the Auchinleck version especially when Zupitza states that the Caius text is flawed by its "considerable omissions" (vi). In fact, this clash between the Auchinleck version's unique presentation and the

Caius version's omissions creates one of the major problems in Zupitza's edition and, moreover, makes the volume unacceptable for research on the Auchinleck Guy's divisions and their relationship to the tale's popularity and the manuscript's production.

Modern scholarship on the Auchinleck Guy is based exclusively on Zupitza's transcription of the romance. Whether considering literary, bibliographical or textual questions, the researcher must rely on Zupitza's edition as her primary text. With her choice of Zupitza's EETS presentation of the romance, however, the scholar silently accepts certain assumptions about the text which hide the important editorial reshaping of the romance. The problems with the acceptance of Zupitza's text are quite similar to those with the acceptance of Vinaver's Malory as the basis of Malory scholarship. Murray Evans suggests in his 1979 critique of Vinaver's Malory that

In the case of the anti-Vinaver critic, half the battle is thus already lost: he has almost unwittingly let the enemy choose the field. Before the questions are raised, huge presuppositions clamp silently into place. The divisions and subdivisions of Vinaver's eight "tales," with their catch-titles on separate pages and capitalized colophons, attractively predetermine the critic's vision of his primary material. (263)

Like the Malory researcher, the scholar who accepts Zupitza's Guy also allows the editor to predetermine how she sees her primary text, and therefore, she considers the version's tripartite structure as a flaw rather than an important

editorial restructuring. Conceivably, Zupitza paralleled the Auchinleck and the Caius versions of the romance to make some criticism or assertion which was never made explicit in his edition. Regardless of his reasons for the presentation, Zupitza's volume creates assumptions that the researcher may not recognize as she examines the text because he fails to explain the underlying argument for his parallel presentation.

The Auchinleck's two Guy poems appear to be very closely related as a result of Zupitza's presentation while the Reinbrun seems separate from the romance's first two poems. The distinctions between the manuscript's short couplet Guy and its stanzaic Guy (hereafter GuyI and GuyII respectively) essentially disappear as the two poems blend together in Zupitza's text to create a smooth, convenient parallel for the Caius version of the tale. By contrast, the division between the stanzaic Guy and the Reinbrun continuation becomes irresolvably sharpened and differentiated by the Caius' abrupt conclusion with Guy's and Felice's deaths and its complete omission of the Reinbrun story. The close relationship between the three poems is remolded so that the scholar sees the two Guy poems as a single item and the Reinbrun conclusion as a decidedly different item regardless of the interpretation actually suggested by the manuscript relationship of the three poems.

The change from GuyI's short couplet rhyme scheme to GuyII's twelve-line tail-rhyme stanzas is the most apparent difference between the first two poems; nevertheless, this structural change is usually seen as the location of the romance's first division rather than as an important aspect of that division. Researchers have focused primarily on the romance's unity by interpreting the textual and literary evidence as an indication of the two poems' unity instead of focusing on the important structural shift indicated by the change in rhyme scheme. As Laura Loomis and Evans have noted, the GuyII ends the couplet section of the romance without a summary of the preceding narrative or a concluding "Amen" or "Explicit." GuyII begins its twelve-line tail-rhyme stanzas in the same column as GuyI, immediately after the first section's final line, without so much as an intervening blank line. GuyII has no new item number, no title, and no miniature to mark its beginning.

As specific evidence for the unity of the two Guy poems, Evans states, "G-1 ends with Guy's slaying of a troublesome dragon and G-2's opening summary of the preceding action finishes with mention again of the dragon-slaying before picking up with the plot where G-1 left off" ("Auchinleck" 9). Loomis expands the importance of this narrative linking, as Evans notes, by establishing her view that "it is not in the least, let us observe, a natural break in the story, for Guy's return to England was wholly motivated by love for his

lady, Felice, and he had not, at the end of the dragon story, even seen the lady!" (Ldn Bksp 166). Evans also points to the abruptness of the shift, "halting at Guy's presentation of the dragon's head to the King" ("Auchinleck" 6). Evans finalizes his judgment of the division by stating that "the transition thus resists neat notions of appropriate narrative division, leaving us with the feeling of a hiatus in an ongoing narrative" ("Auchinleck" 6). Together with the textual evidence unifying the two poems, the narrative linking and the abrupt, unnatural location of the shift seem to indicate that the first two parts of the romance were intended as a single item.

Again, Zupitza's edition does not note any of these unifying elements. On the contrary, his presentation suggests that there is an important break between the two sections. GuyI is separated from GuyII in Zupitza's edition by a short centered bar and four blank lines (two above and two below the bar). Further, though Zupitza does omit some of the text's rubricated initials and paraphs, he indicates the structural and thematic movement within the text by reproducing the rubricated G which begins GuyII.⁶

The most significant evidence for the break Zupitza wishes to show between GuyI and GuyII is suggested by his line numbering. Zupitza numbers the parallel lines of GuyI and the complementary section of the Caius version chronologically, in increments of five. The two manuscripts, up until the

Auchinleck's change to tail-rhyme stanzas, share a combined, created numbering system as is conventionally employed in EETS parallel presentations. Though the Auchinleck version begins imperfectly, Zupitza inserts the French couplet version (Corpus College MS collated with Harleian MS 3775) to replace the Auchinleck's missing lines. The first extant line of the Auchinleck version thus appears in Zupitza's edition as line 123 — the corresponding line number for the Caius parallel line. Zupitza continues this critical numbering system throughout the first 7300 lines of the collated texts.

When the Auchinleck version does not include lines which the Caius version supplies, Zupitza skips blank lines in his text, places the next parallel Auchinleck line across from the Caius line, and continues the numbering as if the lines were missing from the Auchinleck text. For instance, while the Auchinleck introduces Guy's "forster fader"⁷ and teacher, Herhaud of Arden, and then moves immediately to a description of the Pentecost feast (A. GuyI, 169-186), the Caius interjects eight lines elaborating on Guy's education. To parallel the Caius and to continue the numbering system, Zupitza leaves eight blank lines in the Auchinleck though there are no blank lines occurring in the Auchinleck MS. Further, the numbering continues as if the Auchinleck had the eight extra lines though lines 176 through 184 are, in fact, blank in Zupitza's text and there is no break in the

Auchinleck MS. Zupitza follows this same system whenever parallel lines do not occur in either the Auchinleck or the Caius version (See Appendix A).

Zupitza's numbering system changes to separate sequences, however, with the Auchinleck switch from couplets to stanzas. Zupitza numbers each of GuyII's stanzas and every fifth line within each stanza while he continues the original numbering system for the Caius version. In addition, the line numbers for the Caius no longer preserve additional lines in the Auchinleck text. Stanzas one and two of GuyII summarize the events immediately preceding the textual division. The Caius version has no parallel introduction, so Zupitza skips blank lines between the last parallel Caius line, which matches GuyI's final line (A. & C. 7305), and the next parallel Caius line. However, these inserted blanks do not affect the Caius numbering system. Though twenty-nine blank lines⁸ intervene between the two Caius lines in Zupitza's edition, the line paralleling the last line of GuyI is numbered 7305 and the first line paralleling GuyII is numbered 7306. Thus, from the available evidence, Zupitza seems to be marking two separate but contiguous sections for the Auchinleck Guy romance and one continuous Caius romance (See Appendix B).

Though Zupitza attempts to indicate the break between these two poems with his short textual break and the line numbering system, he neither defends his apparent separation nor convincingly illustrates that separation in his text.

Nonetheless, there is a definite structural shift between GuyI and GuyII supported by the textual conventions for the entire manuscript and the thematic shift between the two poems. Coupled with his failure to explain the relationship between these Guy poems, Zupitza's parallel presentation effectively denies any kind of manuscript separation.

The manuscript's editorial numbering indicates that the first two Guy poems are one item while the third Guy poem, the Reinbrun, is a second item. Nevertheless, we cannot rely on the editor's numbering since he makes several errors in the manuscript's item numbering. The editor, whom Timothy Shonk has identified as Scribe 1 (84), passes over item numbers xviii - xx, for instance. Since Shonk has also shown that the editors added item numbers to the text after the volume was decorated (82 ff.), the omission of two item numbers earlier in the text has specific relevance to the Guy's omitted item number.

First, although there is an intervening miniature, the number xvii is used twice for item 12 and item 13, "Life of St. Mary Magdalene" and "Nativity and Early Life of Mary." Second, item number xxvi is used for both item 19, "Floris and Blanchefleur" and for item 20, "Four Philosophers." Although there is a large, centered explicit for "Floris and Blanchefleur," and an intervening blank space of fifteen lines before the next item, "Four Philosophers" begins on the first recto line of a new folio (f.105), the scribe fails to

assign the items separate numbers. If the scribe could overlook two such obvious changes from one tale to another, might he just as easily have missed the change from GuyI to GuyII? Since the contemporary numbering indicates that there is only one item in each of these three instances, the medieval editor's numbering cannot be an absolute guide to his conception of the two poems.

The manuscript titling for GuyI and GuyII also suggests that the two poems comprise one item, yet the Auchinleck volume's conventions and construction suggest that this appearance may be misleading. Most of the Auchinleck items do have titles. In his Scholar facsimile "Introduction," I. C. Cunningham notes that of the twenty-eight items which have undamaged beginnings, only five are missing titles. He lists the untitled items as 10, Speculum Gy de Warwyke; 20, "Four Philosophers"; 21, "Battle Abbey Roll"; 39, "Four Foes of Mankind"; and 40, Liber Regnum Anglie. Cunningham's exclusion of GuyII suggests his acceptance of the Guy's first two poems as a single item. The Auchinleck's titling, however, cannot conclusively show that the two poems are intended as a single item. Cunningham notes, and Shonk confirms (85 ff.), that the manuscript's existing titles "seem to have been an afterthought" since "the scribes leave no place for them" (xiv). He supports his contention by directing the reader to items 27, "The Wenche That Loved a King," and item 29, "Leuedi Saute Was Ferst Found," which

have their titles placed away from the beginning of the item itself. In both of these cases, the preceding item is separated by a miniature (in the case of item 29, a patch which presumably indicates the location of a miniature), leaving no room for a title. The item's title as a result is placed above the column in which it begins.

Since eight lines of item 26, Of arthour and of merlin, intervene between the title and the miniature and text for item 27, the presentation is open to misinterpretation. Similarly, at least four lines of item 28 separate the title from the miniature and text for item 29. Cunningham further proves that the editors decided to title items after most of the manuscript's production was complete by explaining that items 4, "St. Margaret," 5, "St. Katherine," 7, "Bodi and Soule," and 24, Reinbrun, have been "inserted in a space after the explicit for the previous article, with consequent misleading appearance" (xiv).

Since the textual evidence indicates that the titles were added after copying and decoration, researchers might surmise that the GuyII's missing title was overlooked by the medieval editor as he skimmed the leaves and inserted the titles, just as he had omitted the title for the Speculum Gy, or that he recognized the change but decided that placing a title away from the beginning of the text would be too misleading without a miniature or an intervening blank to mark the transition. If the manuscript's titling was purely an

afterthought, as the textual evidence suggests, the scribe would not have been expected to leave a space to mark the beginning of the next item; thus the absence of either a title or room for a title cannot be considered strong evidence for the editor's original intentions.

The manuscript's explicits similarly suggest that the first two sections of the Guy romance are one tale; however, the Auchinleck's explicit conventions indicate a different possibility. Of the twenty-four items with perfect endings, seventeen conclude with an explicit or an amen while seven have no marked conclusion.⁹ Eight of the seventeen items with explicits or amens are religious works which close conventionally with one of these markers. The remaining items — romances, the chronicle, and a filler — would not necessarily conclude with a religious marker, yet in each of these cases, the explicit or amen is preceded by a prayer. Thus, the editor tends to conclude religious items and items ending in prayer with an explicit or amen.

Only two of the seven unmarked items are religious pieces — item 16, "The Assumption of the Blessed Virgin" and item 39, "Four Foes of Mankind." The explicit for "Four Foes" is apparently the result of a scribe's confusion over whether to begin a new item after the filler. Shonk indicates that a "box-shaped scuffed area . . . may represent an outline drawn for a miniature, then erased" (77). Though the twenty-one blank lines following the last line of "Four Foes" show that

there was room for an explicit, the scribe's indecision apparently caused him to forget the marker. Apparently, the explicit for the "Assumption" was omitted because the piece ends perfectly in recto column A and a new item begins in column B (f.78). An amen floating above the next item would be misleading, and one below the text would depart from the manuscript's standard layout.

The omission of an explicit or an amen for the remaining items interestingly bears on GuyI's unmarked ending. The "Battle Abbey Roll" is a list of the names of the Norman barons who fought for William the Conqueror and, therefore, would not necessarily need a marked conclusion, but the remaining three items are narrative tales. The three romances, GuyI, Of arthour and of merlin, and Roland and Vernagu all end with narrative action; there is no prayer and, therefore, no need for an explicit or an amen. These items suggest that the volume's controlling editor apparently planned to mark conclusions, with either an explicit or an amen, of religious works and works ending with prayers but not of all works.

If we apply this convention specifically to the explicit for the first section of the Guy romance, the lack of a clearly identified ending follows the manuscript's pattern. As Guy's adventures in GuyI are motivated primarily by his love for Felice, the section is closer to romance than religion. Further, since the action does not end in a prayer,

there is no need for an explicit or an amen. The lack of an explicit for GuyI cannot be absolute evidence for total unity between GuyI and GuyII.

Like the contemporary numbering, the titles, and the explicits, the abrupt and seemingly unnatural location of the narrative division can similarly be misinterpreted as an indication of the unity between the first two Guy poems. Two narrative themes, however, suggest that the break which occurs immediately after Guy's presentation of the dragon's head to the King of Warwick and before Guy reaches Felice has been calculatingly placed at this particular narrative juncture.

Deiter Mehl has suggested that GuyI follows the courtly romance conventions for a "squire of low degree" theme while GuyII elaborates a kind of saint's legend (223-24):

For the English adapter there was no inconsistency in the juxtaposition of courtly romance and Saint's legend; the legendary second part of the poem arises out of Guy's sudden realization that all he has done so far has been for his own glory, not for the honour of God. (Mehl 226)

The break between the two Guy poems seems to mark the division between these two themes, as Pearsall has confirmed in the Scholar "Introduction." Yet Loomis' contention, echoed by Evans, that Guy has not even seen Felice, who inspires his accomplishments as a squire of low degree, deserves attention. If we accept that the division marks the shift from a courtly romance to a saint's legend, we might well

question, as Loomis and Evans have, why Guy's courting and marriage to Felice is included in the second section of the romance.

The shift from a courtly theme to a religious theme, however, seems to take place almost immediately and encompasses Guy's and Felice's love as well as Guy's conversion from squire to pilgrim. While Guy does pray or refer to God in GuyI, he prays less often than in the second section. Though fighting a fierce Northumberland dragon, Guy offers only one prayer during a period stretching from his preparation for the battle to his presentation of the dragon's head to the King.

"God," he seyde, "fader almight,
That made the day and night also
And for ous sinful tholdest wo,
And heldest Daniel fram the lyoun,
Saue me fram this foule dragoun."
(A. GuyI, 7222-7226)

After this prayer, Guy never again calls for God's aid or mercy through his dragon fight nor does he thank God for his protection after he has won the battle. By contrast, however, Guy and Felice repeatedly speak of God's grace in GuyII. When Guy is reunited with Felice, for instance, he states, "'Ichaue,' he seyde, 'thurch godes sond / Won the priis in mani lond'" (A. GuyII, 5, 4-5). Finally, the two are married in the "chirche" (A.GuyII, 15, 5) and celebrate for

fifteen days. As Mehl explains, the wedding is used "as a preliminary to Guy's sudden conversion, thus emphasizing the inner connection" between the two themes (226).

The religious atmosphere of the first twenty stanzas of GuyII prepares the audience for Guy's announcement that he must go on a penitential pilgrimage to absolve his soul for his sinful youth. Further, Guy's realization as he looks upon God's "firmament" of stars would have proved a poor location for the shift since it would then discount Felice's actions during Guy's absence. Felice's bond to Guy must be presented in the second poem because of the religious nature of their ties and because of her devotion to her lord. In stanza 279 of GuyII, a section omitted from the Caius version, the reader finds that during Guy's absence, Felice has been feeding "thritten pouer men and yete mo / For hir lordes loue she loued so" in hope that "with pan god and our leuedi / Schuld saue hir lord sir Gij, / and help him at his nede" (A.GuyII, 279, 4-9). Felice's later spiritual devotion to Guy would seem discounted if their wedding vows were presented in the courtly romance section of the tale.

Though this important shift in the general theme of the individual poems indicates the purpose for the division, the specific location of the break depends upon another theme which the medieval author was apparently developing in the Auchinleck romance. Deiter Mehl suggests that the poem could have been "originally written by a cleric who wished to

glorify the family of the Earl of Warwick by presenting such a saintly portrait of their ancestor" (224). The shift in the Auchinleck Guy may suggest the Auchinleck version was created to have a more particular emphasis on the Warwick family. The break occurs immediately before Guy's return to his native town of Wallingford. Since's Guy's father has died during his absence (A. GuyII, 3, 4-5), his homecoming is especially significant: Guy is returning to his native city not only as an accomplished knight but also as the inheritor of his father's lands and position. The separation between the couplets of GuyI and the tail-rhyme stanzas of GuyII marks Guy's growth from an unencumbered knight, a 'squire of low degree,' to a more mature, responsible lord. Finally, the division highlights Guy's triumphant return and thus adds to the apparent glorification of the Warwick family.

While the narrative shift in the romance may seem abrupt or unnatural to modern readers, the medieval author did have an underlying justification for both the shift and its location in the tale. In an attempt to explain the break, Loomis has hypothesized "a deliberate shifting in the work of a hack-author" ("Chaucer and the Auchinleck" 137) and Pearsall has postulated that the shift represents "changes of mind on the part of a single translator" (Scholar ix). The literary evidence, however, suggests that such pragmatic explanations cannot account for the romance's calculated and artistic movement. Instead, the narrative evidence suggests

that the medieval author specifically wanted a division at this point in the romance and had conceived of the two sections as separate and distinct entities. Thus, regardless of the Auchinleck editor's attitude toward the two poems, the author who restructured them clearly intended a division.

Set against the Auchinleck author's apparent intentions and the medieval editor's treatment of the romance, Zupitza's subtle emphasis on a break between GuyI and GuyII seems accurate. Yet the close parallels between the Auchinleck version and the Caius version of the romance discount and hide the Auchinleck's arrangement. Loomis remarks that of the Guy versions she has examined,

the closest by all odds to the Auchinleck MS is the fifteenth century manuscript, C, Cambridge, Caius College, 107, a text which Zupitza edited in the same volume with the Auchinleck Guy This C MS, indeed, so largely parallels the Auchinleck MS . . . that Weyrauch [in a 1901 article] thought it copied from the same source. ("Chaucer and the Auchinleck" 138-139)

The accepted unity between the two texts for the romance may partially rely on the confusing location of the narrative division between GuyI and GuyII. Yet, Zupitza's consecutive numbering of the Caius and Auchinleck versions and his location for glosses on the entire text combine with his unexplained editorial decisions to further unify the poems. Together, these elements focus attention on the Caius text as the ideal and the Auchinleck as a confusing, unexplained anomaly.

By numbering the GuyI and the Caius versions together and then changing to a new system at the juncture between GuyI and GuyII, Zupitza highlights the Caius version of the romance as the "best text." GuyI, by following the Caius form and content, and by sharing its numbering system, is presented as a slight variation from the first section of the Caius version and thus also accepted as a "best text." The couplet version in Zupitza's text is shown as a continuous, complete version while the Auchinleck version appears to be a disjointed editorial compilation of the available exempla.

The very structure of Zupitza's glosses focuses further attention on the Caius version of the tale. These glosses consist of short, terse sentences which typically summarize major sections of the plot. Occasionally the glosses simply modernize the language, but more frequently they simplify it. For example, for the last four lines of the first stanza of GuyII,

As man most of might.
Balder bern was non in bi:
His name was hoten Sir Gij
Of Warwike, wise and wight.
(A. GuyII, 1, 1-12)

the gloss simply states, "His name was Sir Guy of Warwick" (385). This sort of simplification is typical of the marginal glosses that appear in the outside margin of the recto pages. Thus they are structured to parallel the Caius Guy and to oppose the Auchinleck Guy on the verso.

Complications in this format occur because of the substantial variants between the texts treated by means of a fairly consistent, standardized EETS approach to such textual problems. That is, when large episodes are omitted from the verso version (Auchinleck), the Caius version appears on both recto and verso. Further, large blank spaces are inserted whenever varying episodes are too short to accommodate a two-page presentation without departing from the edition's overall layout. These editorial practices tend to draw the reader's focus subtly away from the Auchinleck side of the edition towards the Caius side. The physical location of the marginalia accents the Caius version and thus affects the researcher's assessment of the two versions.

In this respect, the edition's focus has apparently influenced Mehl's commentary on the texts. Mehl asserts, "The C[aius] version in particular shows that often large sections could be left out or be summarized in a few words without seriously affecting the structure of the poem" (222). He focuses his statement on the "patchwork composition" of the romance and adds that though "the various episodes are linked by the figure of the hero and some continuous threads in the plot, . . . they do not, as, for instance, in Chrétien's poems or in Havelok, logically arise one from the other or add up to an organic whole" (222). Even though Mehl implies a comparison to other versions in his assessment, his analysis of the Caius Guy is surely based on Zupitza's format

as well. Zupitza's parallel presentation would have shown Mehl an instance when episodes had, in fact, been removed from the text and would have suggested that the shorter of the two texts was the preferred version of the tale.

Together, the edition's visual emphasis on the Caius text and the line numbering's suggestion of a "best text" stress the Auchinleck's division as a break in an otherwise unified romance rather than as a significant structural and thematic movement. Though Zupitza apparently hoped to suggest a separation between GuyI and GuyII with his separate line numbering systems for the two poems and his indicated division between them, his presentation of the parallel Caius MS obscures the separation of the Auchinleck romance in favor of a more unified interpretation of the texts. As a result of Zupitza's presentation, Loomis, Mehl and others have based their commentary on an erroneous presentation of the original manuscript.

Likewise, the acceptance of the division between GuyII and Reinbrun indicates a misunderstanding of the separation between those sections of the romance. Zupitza's presentation of the Reinbrun text unduly stresses its break with GuyII. The Auchinleck's third poem begins in Zupitza's text with an emphasized, two-line title, "Reinbrun, / Gij sone of Warwike," which uses the same boldface Gothic formal textura type used at the beginning of GuyI and follows the wording of the manuscript title for the section.

GuyII and the Caius version both have a marked conclusion which Zupitza presents in parallel columns on the preceding two pages. The space following GuyII's and Caius' conclusions is left blank. In Zupitza's text, the Reinbrun begins on a new recto and faces a blank verso. Since the Caius version does not preserve the Reinbrun continuation, the Auchinleck's stanzas follow without interrupting blank spaces. With the Reinbrun, Zupitza begins a new stanzaic numbering system and indicates the rubricated initial beginning the section. Though he makes no note of the interceding miniature or of the change in item number, Zupitza indicates a division in the text at this point.

The textual division between GuyI and Reinbrun does support a sharper structural movement than that between GuyI and GuyII. Reinbrun does have a different contemporary item number, a preceding explicit, a title, and a miniature. Further, if the medieval editor had inserted the Reinbrun continuation within GuyII, the romance's chronology of events would have become unnecessarily confusing. Since the story of Reinbrun's birth and kidnapping, occurring within the narrative on Guy in other versions, is excised and reshaped as an introduction to the usual continuation in the Auchinleck, Reinbrun contains events which would occur before those presented at the conclusion of GuyII. Specifically, if GuyII and Reinbrun existed as a single poem, readers would

be told of Guy's and Felice's deaths, then of Felice's and Reinbrun's early years together.

Zupitza's separation of the Reinbrun poem from GuyII, regardless of its possible justification, seems to overemphasize this division by disguising the important links between the two sections, thereby perpetuating the isolation of the romance's continuation. In many ways, the GuyII and the Reinbrun sections are more closely linked than even GuyI and GuyII, though Zupitza's edition creates a wide textual gap between the two poems.

Though Zupitza makes no comment on the literary aspects of the poems, the Reinbrun is neatly tied to GuyII by extensive narrative linking, as Loomis first explained in 1942. Loomis notes that the second stanza of the Reinbrun poem contains sixteen words taken from the earlier line in the romance which the stanza summarizes. Further, of the repeated words, "werrour, was his ther, doughti, and the concluding line, Ase ye may forthward here, [are] used in precisely the same context as in Guy, A²," and these words "are found in no other English text of Guy of Warwick" (Ldn Bksp 168). Thus, Loomis surmises that "the two stanzaic romances show a planned relation in the Auchinleck Manuscript that is as simple as it is unique" (168). Loomis identifies an important link, then, between two poems which are usually separated by scholars.

The connections between GuyII and Reinbrun are not exhausted, however, with this simple literary bond; instead, a number of textual features further suggest that the medieval editors intended a close relationship between the two sections. First, though the Reinbrun's marked introduction intimates that the editor is starting a new and separate work, the item's placement in the same column as GuyII's concluding lines implies a textual connection similar to that between GuyI and GuyII. Zupitza's insertion of half a page of blank lines immediately after the conclusion of GuyII and of a full blank page after the end of the two versions finish artificially emphasizes the separation between Reinbrun and GuyII.

Zupitza further blurs this important relationship in his text by inaccurately indicating the location in the manuscript of the Reinbrun's introduction. Zupitza glosses the next to the last line of GuyII as beginning "MS. fol. 167 r.b." While this is the accurate location of the two lines and of the poem's explicit, Zupitza mistakenly notes that the first line of the Reinbrun poem appears on "MS. fol. 167 v. b." Zupitza's glosses suggest that the Reinbrun begins in a new column on a new side of the folio when, in fact, the poem continues on the same side and in the same column as GuyII's conclusion. The switch to the verso does not actually occur until the first line of Reinbrun's third stanza, as Zupitza indicates correctly on the second page of his Reinbrun

section. Logically, then, Zupitza's stated progression of the manuscript locations makes no sense, for according to his notation, the GuyII concludes early in the second recto column of the folio, the Reinbrun begins in the second verso column of that same folio, and the Reinbrun's third stanza begins in the folio's first verso column.

Though a close examination of the manuscript reveals Zupitza's error, without a facsimile of the manuscript or access to the original, the researcher could not possibly determine where the Reinbrun actually begins. The problem most likely is the result of a proofreading error, yet any error at such an important juncture could seriously affect the scholar's perception of the original text. Zupitza's error must, to some extent, have shaped the accepted division between the two poems, especially for scholars working before the publication of the facsimile in 1979.

Loomis' influential article, "The Auchinleck Manuscript and a Possible London Bookshop of 1330-1340," illustrates one such instance. Loomis' article was published in 1942 -- twenty-five years before Zupitza's Guy was reprinted and thirty-seven years prior to the Scholar facsimile. The London Bookshop theory was unquestionably accepted until very recently as the foremost authority on the Auchinleck MS's production. Loomis' theory is still cited whenever scholars consider the manuscript. Though Loomis' production theory has recently been challenged and has perhaps been replaced by the

fascicular production theory of Pamela Robinson or by the piecework production theory of Timothy Shonk, Loomis' evidence for narrative linking remains important to a study of the Auchinleck. In particular, she outlines the close relationship between the stanzaic Guy and Reinbrun.

Loomis states that her source for this comparison of the Auchinleck Guy is Zupitza's nineteenth-century edition. With Zupitza's editions as her text, it is hardly surprising that, in the course of her argument, Loomis states: "All the material relating to Guy's son is here excluded in order to be re-assembled later as a new romance. This begins on f. 167 verso and is headed, as many new items in this manuscript were headed, by a miniature" (167). Loomis' statement not only demonstrates her adoption of Zupitza's mistaken identification of the Reinbrun's location but also seems to suggest how Zupitza's error has shaped her perception of the text. She labels Reinbrun a "new romance" as she intimates its fresh beginning on the verso leaf. She seemingly disregards Zupitza's indication that the poem begins in the B column with her direct statement.

Though other researchers before Loomis commented on the Guy's division, Loomis' article quickly became the definitive piece which medievalists consulted before making further commentary on the Auchinleck or on its unique version of the Guy romance. Deiter Mehl's commentary on the romance, originally published (in German) twelve years before the

Auchinleck facsimile and translated a year later, is noticeably based on Loomis' original thoughts. Mehl explains that the romance's division

suggests, as L. H. Loomis has shown, that some deliberate editing, possibly under supervision, went on in the 'bookshop' in which the manuscript was produced. Above all, this division of the Anglo-Norman novel into three separate works makes it very likely that the English adapters did not . . . consider it a unified work of art . . . (222)

Zupitza's apparent proofing error has had far-reaching influences which have assuredly affected the medievalist's perception of the Auchinleck text of the Guy romance by stressing a major division which is not present in the original text.

The final unifying element of Reinbrun's location in the Auchinleck is its placement in the gathering. Zupitza does not mention catchwords, the divisions between gatherings, or the change in scribes. In the presentation of a single item, such textual information would seem superfluous; yet for the Auchinleck Guy with its unique sectioning, the location of the gatherings and their relationship to the organization of the entire manuscript are vital to the scholar's understanding of the romance's division.

Shonk has recently defined the significance of the narrative placement of the divisions between the Auchinleck's gatherings. He explains that there are five manuscript divisions which suggest "that the organizer of the manuscript preferred to begin major items, romances in particular, on a

new gathering, much as today we begin chapters of a book on a new recto page" (75). In support of this notion, Shonk notes that "five of the seven major romances (those longer than ten full folios) begin on new gatherings" (76). The two outstanding romances, Amis and Amiloun and Of arthur and of merlin, according to Shonk, begin later in the gatherings because of the manuscript's production order. Scribe I copied both romances in gatherings begun by other scribes (Scribes II and V respectively) to avoid wasting the five or six remaining folios on filler material.

Shonk explains that he does not consider the Reinbrun in this theoretical explanation because the poem "is a sequel to Guy of Warwick, which precedes it" (76). Yet the textual evidence suggests that the Reinbrun is far more than a sequel to the preceding romance. Since the extant text numbers nine folios, researchers can reasonably assume that Scribe V finishes the Reinbrun on the tenth or a later folio, and, thus, by Shonk's definition, the tale would be a major romance. The tale begins, however, on the seventh folio of a standard eight-folio gathering.

As Shonk has indicated, five of the major romances begin their gathering; the remaining two begin on either the second or third folio. Furthermore, of the remaining short romances, none begins as late in a gathering as the Reinbrun. Five of these romances begin in the first half of their gathering. Only one other romance, Horn childe, begins

in the second half of a gathering, on the sixth folio. Horn childe is also close to the Reinbrun in its length of eight-folios, yet its placement probably depends on the mention of the "Horn Castel" in the preceding Liber Regum Anglie (A. 77/1318), and on the medieval editor's attempt to create a historical collection of the three items (Horn childe, King Richard, and Simonie) following the chronicle.

Much as the medieval editor attempts to create a historical collection with his placement of the Horn childe, Reinbrun's deliberate placement suggests that he wished to shape a tightly connected series of the Guy romance's episodes. Though the manuscript's production order suggests conventional scribal practices, those conventions indicate that the Reinbrun's placement must have been planned for its specific location in the gathering. As Shonk has hypothesized in his reconstruction of the Auchinleck's production process, Scribe I, the apparent editor of the volume, began GuyI on a new folio. Once he completed GuyI and GuyII, he gave at least gathering 24, and perhaps the whole Guy romance, to Scribe V who copied Reinbrun beginning on folio 7 rb of the eight-folio gathering. Since the placement indicates that Scribe I had to have completed his work on GuyI and GuyII before Scribe V could begin Reinbrun, the piece must have been intended for its specific location on folio 167.

Though the Auchinleck preserves many changes from one scribe to another, both within and between folios, at no other point in the volume does a scribe other than Scribe I pick up a folio that he did not begin and complete it with an item extending into a new gathering. Typically, when a different scribe begins work late in a gathering, he is adding shorter items to fill the quire. For instance, Scribes II and IV fill out gathering 16, which was begun by Scribe III, with two short fillers. Moreover, of those items begun by any scribe in the latter half of a gathering which extend into the next gathering, only the Reinbrun requires a full gathering to complete. Usually, the pieces end early in the following gathering, often in the first half of that gathering. Seynt Katerine, copied by Scribe I, begins on the sixth folio of one gathering and ends on the second folio of the next gathering. The Life of St. Mary Magdalene, also copied by Scribe I, begins on the gathering's last folio and finishes on the fourth folio of the following gathering. Finally Scribe I's Horn childe, as noted earlier, begins on the sixth folio and is apparently completed on the missing sixth folio of the succeeding gathering. The scribal practices shaping this production are not unusual, yet they do suggest that for this volume, the Reinbrun's placement plainly diverges from the practices for the rest of the manuscript.

This unique placement signifies the editor's attitude toward the relationship between the sequel and the Guy romance as a whole. Regardless of which book production theory the scholar adopts, she must accept that GuyII was finished before Reinbrun was begun. Whether working in a bookshop or on pieces farmed out by an editor or bookdealer, the next scribe to work on the gathering, Scribe V, could not determine the location of GuyII's conclusion as precisely as the manuscript relationship between the two pieces indicates would have been necessary for him to work on any part of the Reinbrun poem. Scribe V must have waited for Scribe I to finish his work on GuyII before work on Reinbrun could begin. This production order underscores the close relationship between the three poems. The Reinbrun is placed unusually late in the gathering although it could stand as a major romance. The editor's placement suggests that he wanted to preserve continuity between the three poems, even at the loss of controlling editorial preferences for the rest of the volume. Though researchers can perhaps tell that the medieval scribes and editor considered Reinbrun a new item by its item number and miniature, the poem's placement in the volume indicates that the bookmakers did not consider Reinbrun a new romance. On the contrary, the Reinbrun is an integral part of the complete Guy romance.

By failing to note either the narrative links between GuyII and Reinbrun or the important location of the narrative

division between them, Zuptiza seems to emphasize the elements separating the two poems rather than those connecting them. Further, with his accentuated division, Zupitza overlooks and, in effect, dismisses the similarity of the narrative break in the Anglo-Norman and the other Middle English versions of the romance. In both the French and the Middle English versions, a clear break occurs after Guy's and Felice's deaths. Ewert's edition of the Anglo-Norman version shows a break immediately after the deaths. A new episode begins with the brief story of how Tirri hears of the deaths, travels to England, retrieves the bodies, and moves them to a special abbey built in their honor in Lorraine before it then continues with the adventures of Reinburn and Herhaud.

Significantly, however, before the new section begins, the description of Guy's and Felice's deaths is concluded with a prayer and an amen which seem to indicate a separation much like the prayer and explicit between GuyII and Reinbrun. The Anglo-Norman version's concluding prayer, and the introduction to the following section, indicate the Anglo-Norman author's use of conventional markers for ending and beginning episodes.

Ensemble sunt en la compaigne
De Nostre Dame, sainte Marie;
E issi nus doinst Deu servir
Ke en sa gloire puissum venir. Amen.

Ore avez, seignurs, de Gui oi
Cum il sa vie en ben feni,

Fei e lalté tut dis ama,
Sur totes reins Deu honora;
E Deu le gueredun li rendi,
Cum vus avez ici oi
Totes buntez en li esteint,
Aventures beles li aveneient,
En bataille ne vint ne en estur,
U il ne fust tenu al meillur.
(ll. 11629-11642)

This same movement is also apparent in the Caius version of the tale. In fact, the wording is close enough to the French version to at least raise the possibility that the Caius author was translating from a French exemplar very similar to the version Ewert edits. Though no "amen" is present in the Caius version, there is an obvious closure and a fresh beginning:

To-gedyr be they in company
In blysse: I hope to oure lady,
Iesus graunt vs so to do,
That we may com hym to.
Lordyngis, now have ye herd
Of Gye of Warewyke, how he fard,
And how he led hys long lyfe
In bateyle and in stryfe,
But euer he lovyd hevyn kyng
Moste ouer all thyng,
And god hath a-quyt hys mede,
In geste as ye have herd rede.
(C. ll. 11060-11071)

Like the French author, the Caius author uses the standard conventions for movement between the romance's episodes.

The Auchinleck version does not include this section; instead, the narrative for Guy's and Felice's deaths flows smoothly into that for Tirri's glorification of the bodies.

The final stanza of GuyII, however, does seem to preserve the content, if not always the wording, of the French and Middle English versions.

Now haue ye herd, lordinges, of Gij
That in his time was so hardi,
And holden hende and fre,
And euer he loued treuthe and right,
And serued god with al his might,
That sit in trinite,
And ther-fore at this ending day
He went to the ioie that lasteth ay,
And euermore schal be.
Now god leue ous to liue so,
That we may that ioie com to.
Amen, par charite.

Explicit.

(A. GuyII, 299, 1-12),

GuyII's final stanza marks the same kind of movement as the passages from the Anglo-Norman and the Caius Middle English versions, yet the movement is interpreted in Zupitza's text as a major break between two romances rather than as a shifting between episodes as it is treated in other cases.

Zupitza's attitude toward this shift is even more confusing when his treatment of the Auchinleck's break is compared to his treatment of a similar break in the Cambridge version of the romance. Though the Cambridge Guy preserves a closure and introduction relying on similar conventions, its structural break occurs later than that in the Anglo-Norman or the Caius versions. In spite of the Cambridge's structural shift at the same point as the Auchinleck's structural movement, Zupitza presents the Cambridge Guy's

episodes as part of a smooth-flowing, continuous narrative. The Cambridge version relates the placement of the bodies in the abbey, then concludes with a conventional prayer.

Of Gye an endynge y muste make:
To Cryste, crowned kynge, y hym betake
And to hys modur also now ryght,
That they vs brynge to that blys bryght.
(Cambridge, ll. 10783-10786).

Without skipping even a line, Zupitza continues with the Reinbrun episode.

Lystenyth now, y schalle you telle,
As y fynde in parchement spelle,
Of syr Harrowde, the gode baron,
That lyeth in Awfryke in pryson.
(Cambridge, ll. 10787-10790).

Thus, Zupitza's presentation shows a complete, unified tale which seemingly contrasts with the widely separated tales in the Auchinleck text.

By reading Zupitza's marginal notes and his footnotes, however, the reader of the Cambridge learns that the concluding prayer is followed by blank lines and that the continuation begins in the first column of a fresh verso. Thematically, then, Cambridge shifts at the same point in the narrative while the manuscript break is accented textually even more than the Auchinleck in terms of the physical distance between the sections.

Zupitza's presentation of these three Middle English manuscripts creates new visual interpretations of the romance — but these interpretations represent pivotal departures

from the manuscripts which should be the basis of the presented text. It would have been more accurate for Zupitza to reverse his physical presentation of the Auchinleck and the Cambridge MSS. The Auchinleck Reinbrun would then continue in the same column and on the same page as the GuyII's conclusion. The Cambridge break would leave at least several blank lines between the conclusion of the section on Guy and the introduction of the Reinbrun-Herhaud episode.

In addition to his confusing visual arrangement of the texts, Zupitza's parallel presentation of the Auchinleck and Caius versions further distorts the manuscript presentation of the Auchinleck's GuyII and Reinbrun. Since the Caius Guy ends with Guy's and Felice's burial at the Lorraine abbey, the Auchinleck would have been more accurately paralleled by the Cambridge text for the romance. Thus, Zupitza's edition not only disguises the Auchinleck's similarity to the French original as well as to other Middle English versions, but its physical comparison to the abbreviated and therefore less satisfying Caius version of the romance also inaccurately sharpens the textual division between GuyII and Reinbrun.

Unlike his presentation of the division between GuyI and GuyII, where Zupitza tries to indicate the textual and thematic relationship between the two poems, Zupitza's presentation of Reinbrun hides the manuscript relationship between GuyII and Reinbrun to the extent that the edition has subtly created a sharp interpretative split between the

two poems which has been accepted by scholars and researchers for more than one hundred years. Zupitza's division is so strong that it has dominated commentary even by scholars who seemingly recognize the unity between the poems but insist upon establishing a division.

Loomis, in an apparent attempt to explain the division, states Reinbrun's "whole contents [was] thus achieved only by keeping for it material elsewhere always included in the story of Guy himself" (Ldn Bksp 167). Loomis' comments suggest inaccurately that the medieval authors separated large sections from GuyII and then combined all of these sections into the Reinbrun poem — a poem which would not exist without the editorial compilation of excised sections of text. As evidence for her position, Loomis demonstrates that the removed Reinbrun material "fills lines 8987-9370 and 11657-12926" in Ewert's Anglo-Norman Gui de Warewic. Further, Loomis notes that the material is also found within the Guy tale "in Zupitza's editions of two Middle English versions in couplets; and in Copland's edition (n.d.) of the old verse romance" (Ldn Bksp 166).

Loomis somehow misses the fact that in the Anglo-Norman and Cambridge versions, Reinbrun's adventures are redacted for over one thousand lines after Guy's and Felice's burials. Only the first thirty-one stanzas of GuyII are moved from earlier in the poem; the Reinbrun's remaining ninety-one stanzas contain material which is located after the deaths

of Guy and Felice in the other complete versions of the romance.

Loomis' analysis of the movement from GuyII to Reinbrun is partially understandable because of her reliance on Zupitza's edition of the romance. Because the Caius version abruptly ends without the Reinbrun material included in other versions of the romance, the Auchinleck author seems to be completely reshaping a new section from the excised earlier material. Loomis' assertion that the Auchinleck Reinbrun's "whole contents" was the result of retaining material from earlier passages may well be an outgrowth of her reading of Zupitza's parallel presentation of the texts.

Loomis tries to show the Reinbrun as a newly created section rather than a continuation of the preceding narrative because Zupitza presents it as such in his edition. Yet her commentary first suggests that Reinbrun is a new romance fashioned by the Auchinleck editor, and then outlines a tight list of parallels which show a "planned relationship" between the poems. Her insistence on a division clashes with her lengthy demonstration of the narrative linking and similarities between them. Much like Mehl, who segregates Reinbrun in the "Short Romance" section of his text though he has identified it as part of the tripartite Guy romance, Loomis establishes unifying connections between the poems which contradict her separate ideas on division in the romance. Later commentators, like Loomis and Mehl, have been

seemingly forced to justify Zupitza's presentation rather than to analyze its accuracy.

Zupitza's editorial carelessness, or perhaps his failure to care at all about fine points of faithful presentation of his text, is in fact rather typical of his age — the legendary mistakes of Alexander Grosart are probably the best known — but those practices are inadequate now in light of what we know about the transmission of variant texts. The dependence on the Zupitza text has resulted in the dismissal of the particular artistic strengths of the Auchinleck Guy. Zupitza's visual manipulations of the Auchinleck (intentional or not) have had the unfortunate result of relegating this version to the large heap of undistinguished variant medieval texts: what commentators have perceived in the Zupitza text is the undistinguished work of a hack writer.

But the effect of this dependency on a carelessly presented text has had consequences far beyond a simple misunderstanding or misreading of the merit of a particular medieval text — it has in fact been used as key evidence towards more far-reaching theories about the process of medieval bookmaking. It is not surprising that historians of the bookshop would reason from Zupitza's presentation that the manuscript was produced inside Loomis' proposed London bookshop. Shonk, however, has recently contested Pamela Robinson's version of the production theory¹⁰ which submits that the bookmen produced fascicles or booklets on

speculation which were then shown to the customer who examined and chose which booklets were to be bound in his volume.

Because of the high cost of medieval bookmaking and the volume's unified layout, Shonk argues that the Auchinleck was produced in a piecemeal fashion similar to that theorized by Doyle and Parkes¹¹ and that the awkward transitions which Robinson and Pearsall note as evidence of a fascicular production "instead . . . display the problems created by piecework composition by independent scribes and the compiler's desire to assign major pieces to new gatherings" (77). Shonk theorizes that a specific buyer ordered the book requesting some "popular romances" and some "religious pieces," then "in more general terms, made known his needs or tastes so the book dealer could select other items to supplement the major poems" (90). After his interview with the customer and "after the deal was struck," Shonk suggests

the dealer copied some of the manuscript himself and hired the help of independent scribes to speed up his production. He sent away with those scribes sections of a planned volume. Along with the exemplars, he gave instructions concerning the format of the folios and plans for illustrations. (91)

Though Shonk's piecemeal theory extends the motivation for Guy's three-part structure beyond a compilation of three exempla in a bookshop, he perpetuates the hack-work construction theory by implying that the editor would (as Scribe I) copy the first two poems then farm out the third

section to be copied by another scribe. According to this theory, the Reinbrun seems to be a short romance added because it continues the Guy tale. Further, Shonk's assertion that scribes share "gatherings and even leaves, but never a poem" (74) maintains the false separation of Reinbrun from GuyI and GuyII. Even as late as Shonk's 1985 article, the Guy was still interpreted as a hack work. The demonstrated unity between the three Guy poems, a unity which Shonk failed to see, and the legend's influence on the volume as a whole underscore the possibility of Robinson's fascicular production theory and seem to indicate a conjunction of piecemeal and fascicular production.

The Auchinleck volume does have a specific focus on the Guy legend which might seem to invalidate a fascicular production theory because of the expense of creating a specifically focused volume without an existing buyer. As noted earlier, Mehl concludes that the romance's emphasis on Guy's crusades as a saintly knight perhaps indicates that the story "was originally written by a cleric who wished to glorify the family of the Earl of Warwick by presenting such a saintly portrait of their ancestor" (224). While proving the intentions of the romance's original author is impossible, the editorial intentions behind the Auchinleck Guy's restructuring are revealed by the location of the shifts in the romance, the editor's physical arrangement of the romance, and the allusions to Guy in the rest of the

manuscript. Furthermore, those editorial intentions suggest that the romance and the assembled volume were designed for a customer who had a particular interest in the Guy legend.

The tripartite structure which the Auchinleck editor imposes upon the Guy romance demonstrates the item's importance to the volume. The shifts in the story do not occur in any arbitrary fashion, as was often assumed by earlier readers, but at planned junctures which highlight significant events in the story. GuyI ends with the knight's final conquest as a "squire of low degree." GuyII opens with the knight's triumphant homecoming and shifts the focus from romance to saintly legend. Finally, the romance's third poem, Reinbrun, unifies the tale of Guy's son into a single poem which demonstrates the Warwick family's enduring virtue and integrity by relating Reinbrun's chivalric battles. The romance's division into three poems, then, seems especially designed to praise Guy's fortitude as an errant knight and a Christian crusader in addition to extending his glory to the Warwick family by considering Reinbrun's conquests.

Similarly, the manuscript's presentation of a single Guy romance seems designed to give the tale the significance accorded to such lengthy, episodic romances as Of arthur and of merlin or King Alisaunder. The deliberate placement of the three poems as a continuous narrative allows the editor to structure a single, unified romance while also presenting three individual movements within that tale. Just

as he seeks to create a historical collection of the manuscript's last four items,¹² he creates a Warwick collection of the three Guy poems, which combine with the two following items, Sir beues and Of arthur and of merlin, to compose a series of romances focusing on chivalric British heroes. Furthermore, this juxtaposition allows the editor to heighten Guy's adventures to the level of King Arthur's courtiers. The medieval editor seems intent on accenting the popular Guy romance by shaping the tale into more specific and extensive praise and glorification of the hero and his descendants.

The reshaping of the Guy romance alone could suggest a considerable amount of textual accommodation; additionally, the references to the knight and the verbal reminiscences between the Guy and other items suggest the hero's influence on the final contents of the Auchinleck volume itself. Pearsall identifies the Guy romance as "the great prestige item" of the book because of the verbal reminiscences in Amis and Amiloun, the revision of the Speculum Guidonis, by replacing Count Guido of Tours with Guy, into the Speculum Gy of Warewyke, and the addition of Guy to the manuscript's chronicle (x). Köbling notes further verbal reminiscences in his edition of Beues of Hamtoun. These modifications suggest that the Auchinleck editor reshaped the volume to glorify the Warwick family.

Based on the volume's specific focus, we might extend and strengthen Shonk's theory: the likelihood of any bookdealer producing such a specifically-focused text on the off-chance that a buyer might wander into his shop and want just that book is low when set against the high cost of book production and the volume's definite accent on the Guy legend. The medieval editor's manipulation of the Auchinleck Guy would seem to contradict of Robinson's bibliographic production theory, for how could a bookdealer afford to restructure the Guy romance and focus an entire volume or group of booklets around that romance without knowing that he had a customer willing to purchase the finished items?

If Shonk's theory is correct, however, we should expect to see the proposed fascicles as intruding breaks in the volume's continuity rather than the structural segments that Robinson's theory suggests would be available for the buyer to choose among.

In the facsimile, Pearsall outlines the twelve booklets with little comment on the unity of each grouping:

Booklet nos.	Gathering	Item nos.	Texts	Scribe
1	1-6	1-9	Religious poems (incl. <u>King of Tars</u>)	1
2	7-10	10	<u>Speculum Gy de Warewyke</u>	2
		11-13	Religious poems (incl. <u>Amis</u>)	1
3	11-16	14-19	Miscellaneous	3
		20	<u>Sayings of the Four Philosophers</u>	2
		21	List of names of Norman barons	4
4	17(?) -25	22-3	<u>Guy of Warwick</u> and continuation	1
		24	<u>Reinbrun</u>	5
5	26-36	25	<u>Reinbrun</u>	5
		26-9	<u>Arthour and Merlin</u> plus 3 fillers	1
6	37	30-31	<u>Lay le freine, Roland and Vernagu</u>	1
7	38-[?]	32	<u>Oteul</u> (and other poems?)	6
8	[?]-41	33-6	<u>Kyng Alisaunder</u> plus 3 fillers	1
9	42-4	37-9	<u>Tristrem</u> and <u>Orfeo</u> plus 1 filler	1
10	45-7	40-42	<u>Chronicle</u> and <u>Horn childe</u> plus 1 filler	1
11	48-[?]	43	<u>Richard</u>	1
12	52	44	<u>The Simonie</u>	2

(Adapted from Pearsall ix)

After this list, Pearsall continues his discussion of the possible booklet production and states that "the bookshop produced a series of booklets or fascicles, consisting of groups of gatherings with some integrity of contents (note the pious nature of the romances in the first two groupings)" (ix). Pearsall's note, however, only begins to consider the important implications of the proposed fascicles' contents and placement in the volume.

Most important to the question of the Guy's unity is the conscious placement of all three of the poems within a single booklet. Robinson's fascicular theory emphasizes the cohesiveness of the three poems as a single romance. The placement of the Guy within a single booklet, however, cannot alone prove a fascicular production. Nonetheless, the

remaining fascicles do seem to have a certain integrity of contents and in several cases neighboring fascicles join to create a focused block within the volume which would support Robinson's theory.

The first two fascicles, as Pearsall notes, focus on religious items. The fourth grouping's focus on the English hero Guy combines with the following booklet's focus on Beues and Arthur to create the chivalric block mentioned earlier. The sixth booklet's Breton lai, "Lay le freine," and Roland and Vernagu combine with the seventh fascicle's Oteul¹³ to form a block of French romances. Finally, as suggested earlier, the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth booklets create a historical collection. The remaining fascicles (three, eight, and nine) preserve less focused collections of romances.

Regardless of the integrity of these fascicles, their existence does not provide an explanation for the specific adaptation of the volume's Speculum Gy, Amis and Amiloun, Beues of hamtoun, and the short chronicle, as Shonk's theory of bespoke production does. The fascicular placement of these four items suggests that perhaps scribes combined a piecemeal production with a fascicular production to create the volume. The placement of Speculum Gy, Beues of hamtoun, and the chronicle at the beginning of their respective booklets intimates that the editor was possibly creating a set of specifically focused fascicles to integrate with the existing booklets already chosen by his patron.

The outstanding item, Amis and Amiloun, follows Speculum Gy in the second booklet and thus extends the focus on Guy to the fascicle's second item as well. Since both the Speculum Gy and Amis and Amiloun are homiletic items, the two provide a continuation of the first booklet's focus on religious items while strengthening their own relationship to the Guy romance by their juxtaposition. Rather than beginning Amis and Amiloun after Speculum Gy to avoid wasting five or six folios in a gathering begun by another scribe as Shonk suggests (76), the homiletic romance seems to have been purposefully chosen for this location since it continues the booklet's focus on Guy's Christian nature. The editor seems to have consciously shaped a booklet to continue the religious focus of the first fascicle while inserting the Guy legend into that collection.

Likewise, the fifth gathering, beginning with Beues and including Of arthur and of merlin, seems to have been specifically designed to recall the preceding Warwick collection as well as to create a block of English romances which makes a subtle contrast for the sixth and seventh fascicles' French focus. Again, Shonk's assumption that the Arthurian romance was placed behind Beues to avoid wasting folios seems to discount the collection which the editor seems to be shaping of the three romances. Finally, the tenth fascicle's short chronicle seems designed to place the Guy legend within a historical context, especially since the item

is followed by Horn childe and placed beside the eleventh booklet's King Richard and the twelfth's Simonie.

Based on the placement of the focused items in the booklets and the integrity of the volume's fascicles, the Auchinleck seems to be a volume created from existing booklets in a bookdealer's shop and expanded by adding three or four fascicles (depending on the existence or creation of the Guy itself) focusing the volume on the English hero. These created booklets could have been farmed out to independent scribes according to Shonk's theory, returned to the editor who completed the quires, and assembled the volume. After the book was decorated as a unit, Scribe 1, as the editor, wrote the catchwords, titling, and item numbers before selling it to a buyer.

The creation of a series of booklets to supplement a group of existing fascicles strengthen the unity of the constructed groupings and can shed light on the text's confusing anomalies. For example, the creation of the tenth fascicle to connect Guy with the existing historical items can perhaps explain the insertion of the filler "Alphabetical Praise of Women" in the historical collection. Since Horn childe apparently ended three leaves short of the full gathering, the editor was forced either to add an interrupting filler or to waste a large amount of space. Even with the filler, the gathering ends with twenty-five blank lines. If the editor were consciously shaping a historical collection for

an ordered volume, surely he would have begun Richard immediately after Horn childe, regardless of his interest in beginning major pieces in a new gathering, to strengthen the connections between the collection's items — as he does with the Guy poems, Beues, and Of arthour and of merlin. Indeed, "Alphabetical Praise of Women" is indicative of all the fillers in the volume: all the pieces which Pearsall identifies as fillers occur at the end of a miscellaneous, unfocused booklet or at the end of a fascicle or a block which begins with an item focusing on the Guy. Three fillers occur at the end of the fifth fascicle which begins with Beues and completes the chivalric British heroes block. The unfocused eighth and ninth fascicles end with three and one fillers, respectively. Finally, the tenth booklet, as mentioned, ends with one filler which interrupts the historical collection but fills out the specially focused booklet. Other than the interrupting "Alphabetical Praise," fillers do not occur, even at the ends of fascicles, within the volume's structured blocks.

This practice further strengthens the unity of the Guy poems. Since fillers are apparently not inserted in the middle of blocks, the editorial decision to continue Reinbrun on the next to the last leaf of its gathering, rather than to insert a filler and begin Reinbrun in a new booklet, suggests that the medieval editor conceived of the three poems as a single collection or grouping. In effect, the

Auchinleck MS preserves a major editorial adaptation of the popular Guy romance into a Warwick collection of three tightly unified poems, yet Zupitza's edition of the romance has concealed the restructuring for over a century by obscuring the editorial intentions behind the Auchinleck's unique separation with a misleading visual presentation of the romance and thereby diminishing the importance of the volume's focus on the Guy legend. With his inaccurate edition of the Auchinleck Guy, Zupitza has depicted the romance as a hack production rather than a specially constructed version of the tale, unintentionally begun a critical debate over the medieval editor's intentions for the three-poem romance, and prejudiced bibliographical theory on the Auchinleck MS and the fourteenth century.

In his 1966 Presidential address to the Mediaeval Academy, Albert C. Baugh opened his speech about the creation, presentation, and preservation of the Middle English romance with important comments about evaluating the present state of scholarship. Baugh stated:

It is a familiar phenomenon in the scholarship on any subject that ideas which begin as opinions become petrified into dogma at the same time that assumptions have a way of taking on the status of fact. In secondary works they are generalized and disseminated. From time to time it is well to take stock by reexamining the evidence and trying to appraise the validity of current views Often in the process one becomes aware of questions not previously resolved, sometimes not clearly apprehended. (1)

Modern scholarship on the medieval Guy of Warwick has reached the threshold which Baugh describes; but in order for our understanding of the romance to develop more fully, we must reconsider our attitude toward the Auchinleck Guy without the biases imposed by Zupitza's edition. A clearer and more faithful presentation of the unique artistic features of the Auchinleck Guy, unencumbered by the silent changes imposed by its only "modern" editor, will no doubt go a long way towards helping us to determine how medieval books were produced and the kinds of artistic choices medieval editors made in preparing texts for buyers. In such a difficult area of inquiry, where elaborate theories are spun from the most elusive kind of evidence, a clear text is a sine qua non for the researcher. The questions I have raised generate further questions, and it is certain that we will find no answers until such a new text exists.

NOTES

- ¹ See Pound's "The Prose Tradition in Verse" in Literary Essays of Ezra Pound, p. 371.
- ² I have taken my history of the romance's popularity, from the Renaissance to the Victorian period, primarily from Ronald Crane's "The Vogue of Guy of Warwick," though similar information is recorded in Charles Dunn's commentary in A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, in Velma B. Richmond's The Popularity of Middle English Romance, and in Hales and Furnivall's introductory comments to "Guy and Colbronde" in Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript.
- ³ See D. C. Muecke's 1967 article, "Beauty and Mr. B," Studies in English Literature 1500-1700.
- ⁴ The introduction to the EETS Speculum Gy mentions the editor's indebtedness to the late Zupitza, but the editorial information notes nothing about the romances which Zupitza edited. If Zupitza planned to explain his intentions in this text, he was apparently unable to do so before his death.

⁵ Parallel lines in the EETS Cambridge MS are identified in the Auchinleck text by a Boldface C and a line number. Though not identified in the text's apparatus, these line numbers clearly indicate the parallel lines in the Fifteenth-Century edition.

⁶ Of the Auchinleck GuyI's first extant folio's four rubricated initials:  [ilke], G[ij], I[t], and G[ij]. Zupitza indicates only the last of these four rubricated initials. The text of Zupitza's edition marks absolutely no indication of the additional three rubricated initials. The rubricated G which Zupitza chooses to include is, in the manuscript, nearly a duplicate of the earlier rubricated G which he omits. The two G's are the same height, each is two lines tall; both have an ascender and a descender of approximately the same length; both are decorated with the same circular pattern.

Zupitza's choice to indicate one G and dismiss the other is as baffling as his omission of the other two initials. Especially strange is his omission of the rubricated I when he indicates a rubricated Q for the parallel line in the Caius version (See lines 185 of Appendix A). The two lines are presented on the same line of the text though on opposite pages and are obviously narrative parallels. The Auchinleck's "It was upon a Pentecoste day yteld" [A. 185] obviously mirrors the Caius' "Qn WITONSONDAYE called Pentecoste" [C. 185]. By indicating one of the rubricated initials, Zupitza's text seems to show that one manuscript has a more definite movement from the preceding section when, in fact, if Zupitza's reproduction of the Caius rubricated

Q is accurate, both texts have an identical movement. Altogether, Zupitza omits, in addition to the first three initials, only one more rubricated initial, at line 1063.

He has, however, several other rubrication errors. At line 5379, Zupitza indicates a rubricated initial instead of a paraph as indicated in the manuscript. In Reinbrun, Zupitza omits six paraphs (at stanzas 26, 33, 40, 107, 109 and 111), though he replaces the rubricator's omitted paraphs and restores the misplaced paraph (at GuyII stanzas 90, 109, and 230, and Reinbrun stanzas 2 and 19). Although Zupitza is for the most part accurate in his transcription, his omission of the first three rubrics in the Auchinleck Guy romance, as well as an additional eight rubrication errors, force the researcher to recognize that the Auchinleck transcription is not necessarily the best possible piece of scholarship.

- 7 I have preserved the manuscript spelling, capitalization, and punctuation. Thorns and youghs have been modernized. References to manuscript locations conform to the standard abbreviations for two-column folio presentations (r - recto, v - verso, a - first column, b - second column). For example, fol. 167 r.b. refers to the second recto column on folio 167.

⁸ Though only two stanzas intervene between the two parallel Caius and Auchinleck lines, and, thus, twenty-four lines, Zupitza uses an additional five lines to mark the movement between GuyI and GuyII; therefore, the total number of blank lines separating the two Caius lines is twenty-nine.

⁹ Of the Auchinleck's items with perfect endings, seventeen have an ending marked by either an explicit or an amen.

The marked items are:

Item Number	Title
4	St. Margaret
6	St. Patrick's Purgatory
7	Bodi and Soul
9	Clerk who would See the Virgin
13	Nativity and Early Life of Mary
14	Seven Deadly Sins
19	Floris and Blanchefleur
20	Four Philosophers
23	Guy II
25	Sir beues of Hamtoun
29	Leuedi Saute
33	King Alisaunder
35	The Sayings of St. Bernard
36	David the King
38	Sir Orfeo
40	Liber Regum Anglie
42	Alphabetical Praise of Women

Those items with perfect endings but with no marked conclusion are:

Item Number	Title
16	Assumption of the Blessed Virgin
21	Battle Abbey Roll
22	Guy I
26	Or Arthour and Of Merlin
31	Roland and Vernagu
39	Four Foes of Mankind

¹⁰ Pearsall adopts Robinson's and Loomis' fascicular production order in his Scholar Facsimile "Introduction" to the manuscript (ix).

- ¹¹ See A. I. Doyle and M. B. Parkes, "The Production of Copies of The Canterbury Tales and Confessio Amantis in the Early Fifteenth Century."
- ¹² The historical collection is composed of the short chronicle, Horn childe, King Richand, and The Simonie (omitting the intervening filler — "Alphabetical Praise of Women").
- ¹³ In the facsimile introduction, Pearsall notes extensive linking between Roland and Vernagu and Oteul as well as the possibility of a missing Charlemagne and Roland. The verbal linking between the two extant French romances furthers the integrity of the block of romances by suggesting that the two fascicles were created and displayed as a single grouping rather than as separate fascicles.

10	BYWARD'S BUN,	[AUCHINLACK MS.]	CATUS MS.]	GUY OF WARWICK.	11	
	þei a man bar an hundred pounds, Upon him, of gold y-grounde, þe[r] nas man in al þis londe þat durst him do achaine no schonde, þat lirst him worþ of a slo, So gode pais þer was þo.	140		Fastouned he had such a peen, That neuere sithle noon better was : Though men did bere an hundred pounds, Vpon him, of penyes rounde, Ther shulde not bee founde in aH the londe A thief that him wolde hurto ne shoude, Nor take fro him the worthe of a sloo : So good pees there was tho.	135 140	<small>A man barbed with steel was safe from all attack.</small>
	<small>C. 110. Turab. p. 2, l. 19.</small> þilke steward hadde a soun Trew & wise atto frome ; Al folk he dede him loue, For þat noman schuld him schouo ; & riche giftes giuen he wold, For þat he schuld be fre yhold. þerl Rohaud he serued þo, As he schuld his kinde lorde do ; þerl him loued awipe dero, Ouer al oþer þat þer were. Of his coupe serue he him dede, He was preyed to him in euerich stede :	145 150		That some Stywarde had a sofo Wise and curteys at Fromo ; aH men him did loue sothely, Ther was noon that him wolde shonye. To aH men yiftes giue he wolde, Therefore so curteis he was holde. The Erl Rohaud he serued tho, His kynde Lorde, so mote y goo. The Erl him loued hertly and dere, Ouer all other that with him were. Of his coupe he him seruo Dilde, And priuyest with him in euery stede :	145 150	<small>This steward had a man, true and wise, beloued by all.</small>
	þerl michel him worþschipeþe, & for his fader loue to him clepede.	155		The Erl Rohaud mikel him worshipped, And for his fader loue tho fathur him cleped. Guy of Warrewik his name was, In aH the courte noon more honoured nas :	155	<small>He serued Earl Rohaud, and was his cup bearer. His name was Guy of Warwick.</small>
	<small>C. 120.</small> Gij of Warwike his name was, In court non better beloued þer nas, So he was among grot lordinges, Litel & michel in al þinges.	160		Of knyghtes and of grete lordinges, Of more and lasse, in aH thinges. Mikel he was, and of grete mighte, And fairest of all other be sighte :	160	<small>He was gentle and strong.</small>
	<small>M.S. 10473</small> Ouer al oþer feirest bi sight : Al þai wonderd strongliche, For his feirhed was so miche ; So mani go-lence in him were, Al him preyed þer y-fero, (Of bordis & turnament y-wis, Kniytes to haue & holden of pris.	165		aH him beholde wondrily, His fairnesse was so grete truly ; So many goodnesse in him were : aH him preised that were there.	165	<small>beautiful and good</small>
	<small>M.S. 10473, vol. 2 C. 130. Turab. p. 2, l. 47</small> Gij a forster fader hadde, þat him lerd & him rualde	170		Guys a foster fader hadde, That him lorned and also rualde	170	<small>Guy was taught</small>

Of wodde & riuer & oþer game :
 Herhaud of Arden was his name.
 He was hende & wale y-taucht,
 Gij to lern forþat he nauht ;
 Michel he coupe of hauk & hounde,
 Of estriche fauours of gret mounde.

175

a. 122. It was opon a Pentecost day yteld, 185

þerl a gret fest held
 At Warwike in þat cite,
 þat þar was y-won to be
 þider cam men of miche miht,
 Erls & barouns boþe spliht, 190

Lenedis & maidens of gret mounde,
 þat in þe lond wer y-founde.
 Eueriche maiden ches hir loue
 Of knyhtes þat wer þider y-come,
 & euerich kniht his leman 195

Of þat gentil maiden wiman ;
 When þai were fro chirche y-come,
 þer alijt mani a noble gome.
 þerl to þe mete was sett,
 Gij stode forþ him in þat fiett, 200

þat was þe steward sone,
 þerl to serue it was his wone.
 To him he cleped Gij,
 & him hete & comandi 205
 þat he in to chambre went,
 & grette wale þat maiden gent,

Of wodde, of Ryuer, of all game :
 Herhaud of Arderne was his name.
 He was curteys, and well taughte,
 Guye he lerned and forgate him nauhte ;
 Mikeþ he kouthe of haukes and houndes, 175
 Of Ostours, of Fankots of grete moundes.
 All that wolde of him oughte craue,
 With good wille they shulde it haue.
 To parsons and to pouer knyghtes
 Ofte he wolde yue riche yiftes ; 180
 And to other ofte yue he wolde
 Halfroy or stede, siluer and golde,
 Euery man after his good dede [p. 7]

ON WEDNESDAYE called Pentecoste 185
 The Erls halde a grete feste
 In Warrewik, that good Citee,
 As it enor was wonte to be.

There were Erls, barons, and knyghtes,
 And many a mad of grete myghtes ; 190
 Ladies and maydens of grete renown,
 The grettest desired ther to be bownd.

Many a mayde there ches hir loue anone
 Of knyghtes that thider were come,
 And the knyghtes also their femans there 195
 Of the maidens that there were.

When they fro chirche were come,
 In to the halle they yode full sone.
 When the Erls to the mete sette was,
 Guye stode before him in that plaa, 200
 He that was Sywarles sone,

To whom the Erls grette loue had nonne.
 The Erls cleped to him Guye,
 To him gan sey and commaunded on highe,
 That he in to the chambre wente 205
 And grette wale his daughter that was so gente ;

the Herbaud of Arden.

175

180

[p. 7]

On Pentecost day the Earl held a gret fest.

to which came erls and barons, and ladies of renown.

190

Every maiden ches her loue, and every knyght his leman.

195

Gye stood before the Earl to serue.

200

and the Earl to serue the Earl's daughter.

205

324	GUY, ARRIVING AT WALLINGFORD, [AUCHINLECK MS.]	
	At Warwik þai henge þe heued anon :	7305
	Mani' man wondred þer-aþon.	
	G od graunt hem heuen blis to nicle	1
	þat herken to mi romaunce rede	
	Al of a gentil knijt :	
	þe best bodi he was at nede	
	þat euer miȝt biastriden stede,	5
	& freest founde in sijt.	
	þe word of him ful wide it rau,	
	Ouer al þis world þe priis he wan	
	As man most of miȝt.	
Turnbull, p. 277, l. 207.	Balder bern was non is bi :	10
	His name was hoten sir Gij	
	Of Warwike, wise & wijt	
	¶ Wijt he was, for soþe to say,	2
	& holden for priis in eueri play	
	As knijt of gret bounde.	
	Out of þis lond he went his way	
MS. A. 1. 7. a.	burch mani diuers cuntray,	5
	þat was biȝond þe see.	
	Seppen he com into Ingland,	
	& Aþelston þe king he fond,	
	þat was boþe hende & fre.	
	For his lone, ich vnder-stond,	10
	He slouȝ a dragoun in Norþhumberlond,	
	Ful far in þe norþ cuntre.	
a. 222v.	¶ He & Herhand, for soþe to say,	3
	To Wallingford toke þe way,	
	þat was his faders tonn.	
	þan was his fader, soþe to say,	
	Ded & birid in þe clay :	5
	His air was sir Gionn.	

CAIUS MS.] FINDS HIS FATHER DEAD AND BURIED. 385

At Warrowik he henge that hede anone :	7305	The head was hung up, and wondered at by many.
Many wondred theron anone full sone.		
		May God reward them who listen to my tale about a gentle knight.
		His name was Sir Guy of Warwick.
		He was a famous knight.
		Having been in many foreign countries,
		he came to King Alisoun,
		and killed a dragon in Northumberland.
Guy of the king his leene nome, In-to his contree to wende home. To Wallingford he is come, His free men there he fonde some, That of him were bliþe alle That of him they harde so tella.	7310	Guy's father was dead and buried.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

An Anonymous Short English Metrical Chronicle. Ed. Ewald Zettl. EETS 196. London: Oxford UP, 1971.

The Auchinleck Manuscript. The National Library of Scotland. Advocates 19.2.1 Ed. Derek Pearsall and I. C. Cunningham. London: Scolar, in association with National Library of Scotland, 1979.

Baugh, Albert C. "The Authorship of the Middle English Romances." MHRA Bulletin 22 (1950): 13-28.

---. "Making of Beves of Hamtoun." Bibliographical Studies in Honor of Rudolf Hirsch. Eds. William E. Miller and Thomas G. Waldman with Natalie D. Terrell. Library Chronicle 40, i. Phila: U of Phila Library, Friends of the Library, 1974. 15-37.

---. "The Middle English Romance: Some Questions of Creation, Presentation, and Preservation." Speculum 42 (1967): 1-31.

- Bennett, Henry S. "The Production and Dissemination of Vernacular Manuscripts in the Fifteenth Century." The Library, 5th series, 1 (1947).
- Benson, Larry D. "Courtly Love and Chivalry in the Later Middle Ages." Fifteenth Century Studies: Recent Essays Ed. Robert F. Yeager. Hamden, Conn: Archon, 1984. 237-57.
- Bliss, A. J. "Notes on the Auchinleck Manuscript." Speculum 26 (1951): 652-53.
- Burrow, J. A. Medieval Writers and Their Work. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1982.
- Chaytor, H. J. From Script to Print: An Introduction to Medieval Literature. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, 1945.
- Crane, R. S. "The Vogue of Guy of Warwick." PMLA 30 (1915): 125-94.
- Doyle, A. I. "English Books In and Out of Court." English Court Culture in the Later Middle Ages. Eds. V. J. Scattergood and J. W. Sherborne. New York: Duckworth, 1983.

Doyle, A. I. and M. B. Parkes. "The Production of Copies of the Canterbury Tales and the Confessio Amantis in the Early Fifteenth Century." Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts and Libraries: Essays Presented to N. R. Ker. Eds. M. B. Parkes and Andrew G. Watson. London: Scolar, 1978. 163-210.

Dwyer, Richard A. "The Appreciation of Handmade Literature." Chaucer Review 8 (1973): 221-40.

Editing Chaucer: The Great Tradition. Ed. Paul E. Ruggiers. Norman, OK: Pilgrim Books, 1984.

Evans, Murray J. "The Explicits and Narrative Division in the Winchester MS: A Critique of Vinaver's Malory." PQ 58 (1979): 263-81.

---. "14th- and 15th-Century Romance MS Layout and the Malory MS." Twentieth International Congress on Medieval Studies. 1985.

Fielding, Henry. Joseph Andrews and Shamela. Ed. Martin C. Battestin. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1961.

Fragments of an Early Fourteenth-Century "Guy of Warwick" Ed. Maldwyn Mills and Daniel Huws. Medium Aevum Monographs, New Series IV. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1974.

Gui de Warewic, Roman du XIIIe Siecle. Ed. Alfred Ewert. 2 vols. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Edouard Champion, 1933.

Hector, L. C. The Handwriting of English Documents. Dorking: Kohler and Coombes, 1980.

Jacobs, Nicolas. "The Processes of Scribal Substitution and Redaction: A Study of the Cambridge Fragment of Sir Degarre." Medium Aevum 53 (1984): 26-48.

Keiser, George R. "Narrative Structure in the Alliterative Morte Arthure, 26-720." Chaucer Review 9 (1974): 130-44.

Klausner, David N. "Didacticism and Drama in Guy of Warwick." Medievalia et Humanistica, N.S. 6 (1975): 103-19.

Loomis, Laura Hibbard. "The Auchinleck Manuscript and a Possible London Bookshop of 1330-40." Adventures in the Middle Ages: A Memorial Collection of Essays and Studies. NY: Burt Franklin, 1962.150-187.

- . "The Auchinleck Roland and Vernagu and the Short Chronicle." MLN 60 (1945): 94-97.
- . "Chaucer and the Auchinleck Manuscript: 'Thopas' and Guy of Warwick." Adventures in the Middle Ages: A Memorial Collection of Essays and Studies. New York: Burt Franklin, 1962. 131-49.
- . "Chaucer and the Breton Lays of the Auchinleck Manuscript." Adventures in the Middle Ages: A Memorial Collection of Essays and Studies. NY: Burt Franklin, 1962. 111-130.
- . Medieval Romance in England: A Study of the Sources and Analogues of the Non-cyclic Metrical Romances. NY: Oxford UP, 1924; rpt, 1959.
- Manuscripts and Readers in Fifteenth Century England: The Literary Implications of Manuscript Study. Essays from the 1981 Conference at the University of York. Ed. Derek Pearsall. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1983.
- Mehl, Dieter. The Middle English Romances of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1968.

Moorman, Charles. Editing the Middle English Manuscript.
Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1975.

Of Arthour and Of Merlin. EETS, 279. Ed. O. D.
Macrae-Gibson. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford UP for EETS,
1979.

Owst, G. R. Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England NY:
Barnes and Noble, 1966.

Parkes, Malcolm Beckwith. "The Influence of the Concepts of
Ordinatio and Compilatio on the Development of the
Book." Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays
Presented to Richard William Hunt Ed. J. J. G.
Alexander and M. T. Gibson. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.

Pearsall, Derek A. Old English and Middle English Poetry.
Vol. 1 of The Routledge History of English Poetry.
London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977.

Pollard, Graham. "The Company of Stationers Before 1557."
The Library, 4th series, 18 (1938): 14-15.

Pound, Ezra. "The Prose Tradition in Verse." Literary Essays
of Ezra Pound, Norfolk, Conn: New Directions, 1954.

Richmond, Velma Bourgeois. "Chaucer's The Book of the Duchess and Guy of Warwick." Papers on Language and Literature 11 (1975): 404-07.

---. "'Guy of Warwick': A Medieval Thriller." South Atlantic Quarterly, 73 (1973): [554]-63.

---. The Popularity of Middle English Romance. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green UP, 1975.

Robinson, Pamela R. "A Study of Some Aspects of the Transmission of English Verse Texts in Late Medieval Manuscripts." Diss. Oxford U, 1972.

---. "'The Booklet': A Self-Contained Unit in Composite Manuscripts." Codicologica 3 (1980): 46-49.

The Romance of Guy of Warwick. Edited from the Auchinleck Manuscript in the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh and from Manuscript 107 in Caius College, Cambridge. Ed. Julius Zupitza. EETS 42, 49, 59. London: Oxford UP, 1966.

The Romance of Guy of Warwick, The Second or Fifteenth Century Version. Edited from Cambridge University Library Manuscript Ff.2.38. Ed. Julius Zupitza. EETS 25, 26. London: Oxford UP, 1966.

The Romance of Sir Beues of Hamtoun. Ed. Eugen Köbling.
EETS, ES 46, 48, 65. London: Oxford UP, 1973.

Root, R. K. "Publication Before Printing." PMLA 28 (1913):
417-31.

Schramm, W. L. "The Cost of Books in Chaucer's Time." MLN
48 (1933).

Speculum Gy de Warewyke. Ed. Georgiana Lea Morrill. EETS,
ES 75. London: Oxford UP, 1973.

Shonk, Timothy [Allen]. "A Study of the Auchinleck
Manuscript: Bookmen and Bookmaking in the Early
Fourteenth Century." Speculum 60.1 (1985): 71-91.

Thompson, James Westfall. The Medieval Library. New York:
Hefner, 1967.

Trounce, A. McI. "The English Tail-Rhyme Romances." Medium
Aevum 1 (1932): 87-108, 168-82. Medium Aevum 2 (1933):
34-57, 189-98. Medium Aevum 3 (1934): 30-50.

Vinaver, Eugene. Form and Meaning in Medieval Romance.
Cambridge: 1966.

---. The Rise of Romance. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.

---. Malory. Oxford: Clarendon, 1970.

**The vita has been removed from
the scanned document**