Dialectal Spellings and Textual Evolution:
the Text of *Guy of Warwick* in Cambridge University Library, MS Ff. 2.38

Yuzuru Okumura

Dialectal Spellings and Textual Evolution:
the Text of *Guy of Warwick* in Cambridge University Library,
MS Ff. 2.38

Yuzuru Okumura

Middle English versions of *Guy of Warwick* are extant in five manuscripts; but, since two of them are only fragments, the major authorities of the romance can be found in the following three manuscripts, listed here in the order of assigned date:

AU National Library of Scotland, Advocates' MS 19.2.1 (1330-40; generally called the Auchinleck Manuscript), ff. 108ʳ-175ᵛ;

GC Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176 (ca. 1475), pp. 1-271;[1] and

CF Cambridge University Library, MS Ff. 2.38 (the end of the fifteenth century or the beginning of the sixteenth) , ff. 161ʳ-239ᵛ.[2]

Textual contents of these versions, all translated from the Anglo-Norman source *Gui de Warewic*, are of course largely identical, but a comparison between them will instantly show that they are quite distinct from each other in verse form and presentation of the materials.[3] AU differs from the other versions in that it consists of three definitely separate stories: the first story, cast in couplets, describes Guy's chivalric adventures before his marriage; the second, in stanzas, focuses on the hero's pilgrimage after his marriage; and the third, also in stanzas, relates the story of Guy's son Reinbrun. L. H. Loomis argued that AU was produced in a London bookshop, where its editor or compiler invented this unique series of three romances out of his source, which, 'like all known French and English manuscripts, offered but one continuous story.'[4] This argument, though not without merit as it excited scholarly interest in the evolution of Middle English versions of the romance, is definitely open to question, in view of the fact that neither GC nor CF presents the romance as 'one continuous story.' GC lacks considerable part of Reinbrun's story, practically providing only the materials corresponding to the first two stories of the AU version. In CF as well, the Reinbrun episode is evidently treated as a separate piece, beginning with a coloured initial and in display script, on f. 231ᵛ (column a, line 1) after the story of Guy ends on f. 231ʳ (column a, line 25) and the rest of the page is left blank. Thus, as F. McSparran says, 'the Middle English versions of *Guy of Warwick* deserve closer analysis,'[5] and we should exploit any source of information in order to reassess the originality of AU's tripartite structure.

The background of a mediaeval text is usually clarified by examining textual contents, but it is now known that dialectal evidence can be equally informative. Two of the versions of the romance listed above, AU and GC, have already been subjected to detailed dialectal scrutiny, leading to some findings which sharply contradict Loomis's argument. A. Wiggins found that the couplet *Guy* and the stanzaic *Guy* of AU, both copied by a single scribe, were composed in different dialects, and maintained that these portions should therefore be taken as independently translated romances, not as a set of romances translated simultaneously out of a single source.[6] GC also provides dialectal evidence which points to the composite nature of the text: as I argued elsewhere, rhyming evidence in GC indicates that this text consists of two sections which are derived from different archetypal exemplars, and that, significantly, those sections precisely correspond to AU's couplet *Guy* and stanzaic *Guy*, respectively.[7] The dialect of CF, however, is yet to be examined closely,[8] and I shall in this paper undertake the task, attempting to find some linguistic evidence which would indicate that CF is still another witness to the composite structure shared by the other extant Middle English versions of the romance. If it proves to be such, the new finding will help to decide whether the romance was generally acknowledged as 'one continuous story,' or each component section of the romance was rather treated as an independent romance.

CF was copied by a single scribe throughout, and if the scribe consistently used his own dialectal forms in copying it, the resultant language would only show how he spelled the words, giving us few clues as to CF's textual history. Fortunately, however, he was a scribe of the third type defined by A. McIntosh, i.e. a scribe who, while mostly using his own favourite forms, still allows some spellings of his exemplar to appear in the text he is copying.[9] The language of CF, as a result, presents itself as a mixture of dialectal features which do not neatly fit into any single geographical area, and some of those features, if properly identified as those handed down from texts underlying CF, will reveal part of the earlier stages of CF's textual transmission.

Analysing a mixture of conflicting dialects in a single text is a complex business in detail, but the basic procedure is simple, as has been expounded by M. Benskin and M. Laing.[10] In order to sort out the constituent elements of a dialectal mixture, we should first of all find a location which accounts for the greatest number of dialectal features in the target text; the features remaining unaccounted for are then analysed afresh by the same process. The process is repeated until all the features attested in the text are accounted for, and the dialectal subsets thus separated represent the different layers of language introduced into the text at different stages of scribal copying. In a simplified hypothetical example, the application of such a procedure would show that a text copied by a single scribe exhibits the following distribution of dialectal features:

Table 1: a Hypothetical Example of Linguistically Composite Texts

	the target text (copied by a single scribe throughout)	
	the first half	the second half
regular dialectal features	South-West Midland	
	uche ('EACH'), *furst* ('FIRST') and *meche* ('MUCH')[11]	
scattered dialectal features	Northern	
	mekil ('MUCH') and *yher* ('YEAR')[12]	
regular dialectal features	ȝet ('YET')	ȝit ('YET')[13]

In this situation, we can reasonably assume that the predominant South-West Midland features shared by the two halves of the text represent the language of the scribe (or of his immediate predecessor, if he is a *literatim* copyist), and that the scattered Northern features, which are incompatible with the set of the South-West Midland features, represent the contribution of an exemplar underlying the whole of the target text. The features ȝet and ȝit might belong to either of these dialectal subsets, but even such dialectally unmarked forms, if distributed in such a way as shown here, have much to contribute to textual studies: their peculiar distribution may suggest that the exemplar of the first half of the text and that of its second half are written in different dialects. Needless to say, the coexistence of two different spelling habits in the exemplar may simply show that the exemplar is a linguistically composite text copied by two scribes, each using his own dialect; but such a finding, if supplemented by extra-linguistic evidence, often enables us to conclude that the exemplar, and hence the target text itself, has a substantially as well as linguistically composite structure, consisting of two component sections each of which has its own textual background.

As the above example shows, it is the distribution of dialectal features in the target text that is crucially important when applying dialectal evidence to textual studies. As was outlined above, there is sufficient evidence that both AU and GC regard the romance as consisting of three sections: Guy's adventure, his pilgrimage and Reinbrun's story. In analysing CF's language, therefore, I shall first divide CF, just provisionally at this stage of the argument, into three component sections corresponding to those of the AU and the GC versions; I shall then examine how dialectal spellings are distributed in those sections, assuming that our scribe might have different spelling habits in different sections. This is of course no more than a working hypothesis, but, if our assumption proves to be a correct one, the finding might shed some light on the internal structure of our text. Table 2 below shows how the three sections of CF here postulated (hereafter referred to as CF [G1], CF [G2] and CF [R], respectively) correspond to

their counterparts in AU and GC:

Table 2: CF [G1], CF [G2] and CF [R], and their Counterparts in AU and GC[14]

		Guy's adventure	Guy's pilgrimage	Reinbrun's story
CF	section	CF [G1]	CF [G2]	CF [R]
	line	1-6966	6967-10786	1-1190
	scribe	scribe (a)		
	verse form	couplets		
AU	line	1-6947	1-3581	1-1521
	scribe	scribe (b)		scribe (c)
	verse form	couplets	stanzas	
	predominant dialect	London	East Midland	Essex
GC	line	1-4416	4417-8066	
	scribe	scribe (d)	scribe (e)	
	verse form	couplets		
	predominant dialect	Central Midland	Central or South-East Midland	
	archetypal dialect	South Midland	North Midland	

Before discussing how spelling variations in our text correlate with variations in its textual affiliation, it would be worthwhile to localise the predominant dialect of CF. Some of the characteristic spellings regularly used for the relevant items throughout CF are listed in Table 3:

Table 3: Forms in CF[15]

	Guy's adventure CF [G1]	Guy's pilgrimage CF [G2]	Reinbrun's story CF [R]
TWO	two (twoo) (((tweyne))) (((twaye)))	two (twoo) (((tweye)))	two twoo
LITTLE	lytull	lytull	lytull ((lytyll))
DID	dud (((dudd[e,yst]))) (((dydyst))) (((dedyst)))	dud (((dude)))	dud
BETWEEN	betwene (((betwyx)))	betwene	betwene
HER	hur		
THEY	they (þey) (((thay))) (((þay)))	they þey	þey (they)

EACH	ech- eche[-] (ych-) ((([i,y]che[-])) (((ylke)))		ech- eche[-]		ech-	
FIRST	furste		furste (((fyrste)))		no examples	
TOGETHER	togedur					
-ING (ppl.)	-ande -ynge (-yng) ((((-ing))) ((((-eng)))		-ande (-ynge) ((-yng)) ((((-inge))) ((((-ant)))		-ande (-yng) ((-ynge))	
HUNDRED	hundurd (hundurde)		hundurd ((hundurde))		hundurde	
SAW (pt. of *SEE*)	sg.	sawe (sye)	sg.	sawe sye	sg.	sawe (((sye)))
	pl.	sye (sawe)	pl.	sawe sye	pl.	sye (sawe)

The forms listed in this table show that the predominant language remains largely consistent throughout the three sections of CF, but that the language consists of more than one dialectal layer. Among the forms listed here, those with strongly dialectal colouring are: *lytull* ('LITTLE'), *dud* ('DID'), *hur* ('HER'), *furste* ('FIRST'), *togedur* ('TOGETHER') and *hundurd[e]* ('HUNDRED'), which are most likely to co-occur in areas ranging from the Central Midlands to the South-West Midlands, or more precisely, in the belt roughly covering Leicestershire, Warwickshire and Worcestershire;[16] and, since most of the other forms used throughout CF are readily incorporated into this dialectal layer, the CF scribe's dialect (or his immediate predecessor's) can reasonably be localised in one of these areas. But CF is also characterised by the fairly frequent use of the markedly Northern form *-ande* ('-ING': present participle ending),[17] which is particularly conspicuous in rhymes.[18] It is well known that even a scribe who consistently translates the dialectal forms of the exemplar into his own will often keep the spellings of rhyming words intact, obviously because he would otherwise distort rhyming effects. The forms of rhyming words should therefore be regarded as archetypal rather than scribal, and the predominance in CF of *-ande* for rhyming present participles indicates that the text stems from an archetypal exemplar characterised by its Northern versification.

Many of the minor spelling variants listed in Table 3 are each attested only once: *dyd-* and *ded-* (both for 'DID'); *betwyx* ('BETWEEN'); *thay* and *þay* (both for 'THEY'); *[i,y]che[-]* and *ylke* (all for 'EACH'); and *fyrste* ('FIRST'). These sporadic forms, all associated with Eastern and Northern parts of England,[19] should be taken as those which our scribe inadvertently picked up from his exemplar, but

which he found exotic and never allowed to stray into his text again.

Some of the other spellings in CF exhibit peculiar patterns of distribution in the text, and I shall now turn to them and discuss how those patterns reflect the internal structure of the text. Our scribe, though 'a conscientious and careful copyist',[20] often behaves in an unpredictable way in choosing a dialectal variant for a given item, switching from one form to another apparently without any particular reasons.[21] But it seems possible to distinguish a number of patterns in which some of the dialectal spellings are distributed within his text. This can be exemplified, firstly, by the forms listed in Table 4, some of which (underlined in the table) seem to be of particular relevance to our purpose:

Table 4: Forms for 'AGAINST', 'HOME', 'WITHOUT', 'MUCH' and '(THE) SAME' in CF

	CF [G1]	CF [G2]	CF [R]
AGAINST	agenste (ageyne) ((aʒenste)) (((agayne))) (((ageynste)))	agenste ((ageyne))	ageyn (agayne) ((ageyne))
HOME	home (((whome))) (((hame)))	home[-] (whome)	home[-]
WITHOUT	wythowte (wythowten) ((wythowt)) (((wythowtyn)))	wythowten (wythowte)	wythowte ((wythowten)) ((wythowt))
MUCH	moche ((mek[u,y]ll))	moche (((mekyll))) (((muche)))	mek[u,y]ll moche (((mykell)))
(THE) SAME	-[i,y]lk[e ((-same))	-same -[i,y]lk[e (((-self)))	-[i,y]lk[e

One of the characteristic patterns of occurrence can be demonstrated by the forms for 'AGAINST' and 'HOME'. A glance at the table will show that *agenste* ('AGAINST') appears as the major form for the item in CF [G1] and CF [G2], but that it abruptly disappears in CF [R]. It will also be noted that *whome* ('HOME') shows a similar pattern of occurrence: while becoming increasingly frequent through CF [G1] and CF [G2], it is utterly unattested in CF [R]. Since *whome* is no more than a minor variant for the item, its absence from some stretches of text, viewed alone, might be laid aside as hardly surprising. But the abrupt and simultaneous disappearance of *agenste* and *whome* in the same portion of the text is surely significant, suggesting that CF [R] has a spelling system which is slightly but definitely different from those of CF [G1] and CF [G2].

The distinctiveness of CF [R] in orthography is also indicated by the characteristic distribution of

variant forms for 'WITHOUT', 'MUCH' and '(THE) SAME'. These items share a similar pattern of shift from one type of form to another, and hence are discussed together here; but, seen in detail, the ways in which they are manifested in the three sections of our text are different from item to item. The spelling *wythowte*, the major form for 'WITHOUT' in CF [G1], becomes a minor variant in CF [G2], surpassed in frequency by *wythowten*; but in CF [R] it regains the status as the major form for the item. Similarly, the variants *mek[u,y]ll*, which in CF [G1] occur as rarer forms for 'MUCH', are in CF [G2] even lower in relative frequency; but they are employed in CF [R] as often as the dominant form *moche*. In the case of '(THE) SAME', *-[i,y]lk[e]* become increasingly replaced by *-same* as the text proceeds from CF [G1] to CF [G2], but the latter is totally displaced by the former in CF [R]. The forms for these items thus indicate that CF [R] here again behaves characteristically, favouring forms which have been becoming increasingly less frequent in the preceding sections.

It often happens that a mediaeval scribe gradually changes his spelling habit in the course of copying a text of extended length. He may closely follow his exemplar in the early stages of the text, but, as the copying proceeds, may gradually eliminate the forms of the exemplar in favour of his own. Or, less commonly, he may begin by using his own favourite forms, but may shift to the increasingly familiar forms of the exemplar. In either case, such a transition from one type of dialect to another is characteristic in that, firstly, it begins at a fairly early stage of copying; secondly, it takes place not abruptly but progressively; and thirdly, it proceeds exclusively in a single direction. Our scribe's behaviour seen above, however, differs in every respect from such a common type of linguistic transition: he abruptly discarded the forms *agenste* and *whome* after he had copied more than 10,000 lines of the text; and, in his choice of forms for 'WITHOUT', 'MUCH' and '(THE) SAME', he swung back and forth, as it were, from forms of type A to those of type B, and again back to those of type A. The distribution in our text of forms for these items is thus difficult to explain unless we assume that it reflects the shift of spelling habit on the part of the exemplar underlying our text. While copying CF [G1] and CF [G2], the scribe reproduced the forms *agenste* and *whome* used in his exemplar, probably finding the former quite acceptable and the latter just tolerable; but in copying CF [R], he found neither of them used in his exemplar, and, since they were not his usual forms, had no reason to employ them. It is also highly likely that *wythowte*, *mek[u,y]ll* and *-[i,y]lk[e]* gradually decreased in frequency in the exemplar of CF [G1] and CF [G2], but again became prominent in the exemplar used for CF [R]; and that these fluctuations of spelling practice in the exemplar were reflected in our scribe's choice of forms. Interestingly, the exemplar of CF [R] thus appears to favour both *mek[u,y]ll* and *-[i,y]lk[e]* simultaneously, the former generally associated with the Northern dialect while the latter with the Southern dialect. The preference for these features might suggest the East Anglian provenance of the

exemplar, and this inference seems to be supported by the absence of *agenste* and *whome* in CF [R]: both of these forms are ascribable to the Central and the West Midlands, and their absence in CF [R] can be taken as a sign of Eastern rather than Western nature of its exemplar's language.

So far we have discussed some dialectal features indicating that CF [R] is based on an exemplar which is dialectally distinct from those of CF [G1] and CF [G2]. The distribution of the spelling variants for 'ARE (present plural of *be*)', shown in Tale 5, suggests that the exemplar of CF [G1] is also to be distinguished dialectally from that of CF [G2]:

Table 5: Forms for 'ARE' in CF

	CF [G1]	CF [G2]	CF [R]
ARE	be (((ben[e]))) (((bee))) (((are)))	be (((bee))) (((bene))) (((beyth))) (((are)))	be (((bee)))

Obviously, the *be*-type of form remains dominant for 'ARE' throughout the three sections of CF, but it is noteworthy that the variant *are*, a characteristic feature of the Northern dialect,[22] is scattered fairly evenly in CF [G1] (found in lines 1192, 2793, 3423, 3429 and 4952), but never appears in the rest of the whole text except the single occurrence in line 7042, i.e. in the very early part of CF [G2]. Besides, the isolated instance of *are* in CF [G2] should not be overestimated, since it appears as part of the line 'That were & are of grete valowre,' where the scribe has every reason to adopt the form instead of *be* juxtaposed with *were*. This behaviour of the form *are*, persisting in almost 5,000 lines of CF [G1] but disappearing thereafter, is another instance of a shift happening abruptly and at a relatively late stage of the text, and can therefore be best explained by saying that the form was contained in the exemplar of CF [G1] but was unattested in that of CF [G2].

The linguistic difference between the three sections of the exemplar underlying CF is further confirmed by the peculiar distribution of the forms for 'SINCE (adverb)':

Table 6: Forms for 'SINCE (adverb)' in CF

	CF [G1]	CF [G2]	CF [R]
SINCE (adv.)	sythen	sythen ((syþen)) (((syth)))	sethyn (syþen) (seþyn) (sythen) (((sythyn))) (((syn)))

Any scribe copying an exemplar written in a dialect different from his own may begin his job under the conflicting pressures from his exemplar's language and from his own linguistic preference. But, as was said above, he will gradually settle down to a largely consistent spelling practice, often in favour of his own spelling habit, or less commonly in favour of his exemplar's; and the forms which he uses for a particular item will become increasingly restricted to a handful of variants or even to a single form. Our scribe's choice of forms for 'SINCE (adverb)', however, rather shows a transition in the opposite direction, from a single form *sythen* to no fewer than six different forms as the text proceeds. He adhered to the form *sythen* in copying CF [G1], but in CF [G2] he occasionally used *syþen* and *syth* as well, while retaining *sythen* as the major variant for the item. In CF [R], he further introduced the forms *sethyn* and *seþyn* and largely switched to them, diverting from *sythen* which he had cherished in copying CF [G1] and CF [G2]. All of these variants might belong to his repertoire of spellings, as they are dialectally unmarked: *syþen, syth, sethyn* and *seþyn* are widely evidenced in the South-East and the South-West Midlands and *sythen* in still wider areas even including the North.[23] But it is unlikely that our scribe's behaviour with reference to this item results from his own free choice out of the forms available to him. A more plausible explanation is that it mirrors the shifting preference on the part of the exemplar: the exemplar of CF [G1] used *sythen* alone; but the exemplar of CF [G2] used *syþen* and *syth* in addition to *sythen*, whereas that of CF [R] preferred *sethyn* and *seþyn*. Thus, we have here a further indication that the three sections of the exemplar underlying CF are dialectally distinct from each other.

Our discussion so far has been exclusively concerned with the language of CF, but it has yielded some findings which can contribute to our knowledge of the processes through which our text evolved into its present shape. It has by now become clear that the exemplar of our text noticeably changed its spelling habit as the text proceeded from CF [G1] through CF [G2] to CF [R]; and, since the orthography in each of these sections remains largely consistent, it is highly probable that CF as a whole is a composite text, its three sections deriving, directly or indirectly, either from three different exemplars or from a single exemplar copied by three scribes with different dialectal backgrounds.[24] If we assume that our text derives from three different exemplars, we can posit a number of further possibilities. It is possible to think, firstly, that our scribe (or any of his predecessors) was so firmly determined to produce a reliable text that he did not hesitate to abandon an exemplar when he was able to find another which he believed to be a more reliable one. Another possibility is that the three exemplars were put together by sheer accident. As was often the case with widely demanded texts, some exemplar-copies of our romance may have been stored in the workshops as sets of loosely bound 'booklets'. After those exemplar-copies were split up into booklets so as to be copied by several scribes simultaneously, it must have been only too easy to mix up booklets which had originally belonged to different exemplar-copies.

There is further a third possibility that each of the three sections of our romance was sometimes bound as an independent booklet and circulated as such: thus, the scribe responsible for the use of multiple sources copied one of the three sections of the text from one booklet, but, since the booklet lacked the other sections, he had no choice but to adopt another to supplement the missing parts.

This last possibility, if corroborated by further evidence, may provide a fresh insight not only into the degree of originality of AU's tripartite structure but also into the evolution of Middle English versions of the romance in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. As was pointed out at the outset of this discussion and summarised in Table 2, AU and GC have virtually identical composite structures: AU is a series of three stories which are distinct from each other in terms of language and verse form; and the GC counterparts of AU's first and second stories can likewise be traced back to different archetypal exemplars. If our assumption is accepted, therefore, it will follow that all the three extant Middle English versions of *Guy of Warwick* share practically the same composite structure. Given such a correspondence, it would seem sufficiently likely that, at least in the early stages of its dissemination, our romance was not always circulated as a complete text, but that its three sections were often circulated as separate stories which were textually independent from each other. It is also interesting to note that this assumption tallies well with the picture which emerges when we arrange the three versions of our romance in chronological order. AU is the earliest extant version, and it is in this version that we find positive proof that the romance was composed of three stories. In GC, which is dated between AU and CF, the sections equivalent to the first two stories of AU are united into what appears to be a continuous romance, but the remaining third section is omitted altogether. CF is the latest in date of the three versions; CF [G1] and CF [G2] here appear as a single story, while CF [R] is added as a piece separate from the preceding materials. The three texts can thus be said to represent different stages of textual evolution of Middle English versions of our romance, from three mutually independent stories to a story as one coherent whole; and this, together with what can be deduced from dialectal evidence, invites us to think that the romance may have evolved in the following way: the French original, presumably due to its extended length, may have been divided into three sections, each of which was then translated into Middle English and circulated independently; in early stages, the three sections may have been juxtaposed as closely related stories, but still in piecemeal form, as in AU; in somewhat later stages, two of the three stories, i.e. the materials concerning the hero, may have been picked up and united into one, as in GC; and in yet later stages, all the three sections may have been put together, though only two of them were integrated into a single story, the remaining third added as a separate piece, as in CF. In any of these stages, there must have been no confusion as to the arrangement of the three sections: Guy's adventure, dealing as it does with the early years of the hero's life, naturally comes

first; Guy's pilgrimage, which deals with the later years of the hero's life, comes next; and the story of Reinbrun, as it focuses on Guy's son and is thus of comparatively less importance than the stories of the father, is properly placed at the final position. There might have been cases in which the three sections of the romance were integrated into a seamlessly unified whole, or even cases in which the whole of the romance was from the start translated and circulated as a single story; but such cases, if any, were certainly exceptional, as there can be found no positive witness to them in any of the extant Middle English versions of the romance.

NOTES

1) The whole volume of this manuscript is devoted to the romance, whereas the other two manuscripts in this list are miscellaneous in content.

2) The Auchinleck Manuscript and Cambridge University Library, MS Ff. 2.38 are available in the following facsimile editions: *The Auchinleck Manuscript: National Library of Scotland, Advocates' MS. 19.2.1,* with an introduction by D. Pearsall and I. C. Cunningham (London: Scolar Press, 1977) and *Cambridge University Library, MS Ff. 2.38*, with an introduction by F. McSparran and P. R. Robinson (London: Scolar Press, 1979). Fragments of Middle English versions of the romance are found in British Library, Sloane MS 1044, no. 625, f. 345^{r-v} and British Library, Additional MS 14408, ff. 74^r-77^v. There are also early printed editions of the romance published by: Wynkyn de Worde (Westminster, 1497?: one leaf) (STC 2nd ed. 12541), Richard Pynson (London?, 1500?: three leaves) (STC 2nd ed. 12540) and William Copland (London, c.1553?) (STC 2nd ed. 12541.5).

3) An outline of the extant versions of the romance is given in J. Zupitza, ed., *The Romance of Guy of Warwick: The Second or 15th-century Version*, EETS es 25 and 26, reprinted as one volume (London: Oxford University Press, 1966), pp. v-viii. See also J. Zupitza, ed., *The Romance of Guy of Warwick,* EETS es 42, 49 and 59, reprinted as one volume (London: Oxford University Press, 1966).

4) L. H. Loomis, 'The Auchinleck Manuscript and a Possible London Bookshop of 1330-1340', *PMLA*, 57 (1942), 595-627; reprinted in, and here cited from, *Adventures in the Middle Ages: a Memorial Collection of Essays and Studies by Laura Hibbard Loomis*, ed. by H. Bullock (New York: Burt Franklin, 1962), pp. 150-87.

5) McSparran and Robinson, *MS Ff. 2.38*, p. xi.

6) A. Wiggins, ed., *Stanzaic Guy of Warwick* (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2004), p. 5. For more detailed information on the language of the first story of the AU version, see her 'Guy of Warwick in Warwick?: Reconsidering the Dialect Evidence', *English Studies*, 84 (2003), 219-230.

7) Y. Okumura, 'Spelling Variations and Textual History: the Text of *Guy of Warwick* in Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176', *Studies in Medieval English Language and Literature*, No. 23 (2008), 7-20.

8) The language of the CF scribe, who is responsible for the whole of the manuscript, has been assigned to Leicestershire; see A. McIntosh, M. L. Samuels and M. Benskin, with the assistance of M. Laing and K. Williamson, *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English* (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1986), I, p. 67 (LP 531). This conclusion, however, results from an analysis of sample portions of the texts copied by the scribe: ff. 35^v-39^v (and scan), 102^v-111^r and 134^r-136^r of the manuscript and also of *Sir Eglamour of Artois* from a printed text; the dialect of our text is, therefore, not yet analysed. The *Atlas* is hereafter referred to as *LALME*.

9) A. McIntosh, 'Word Geography in the Lexicography of Mediaeval English', *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 211 (1973), 55-66; reprinted in *Middle English Dialectology: Essays on some Principles and Problems,*

ed. by M. Laing (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1989), chapter 7.

10) M. Benskin and M. Laing, 'Translations and *Mischsprachen* in Middle English manuscripts', *So meny people longages and tonges: philological essays in Scots and mediaeval English presented to Angus McIntosh*, ed. by M. Benskin and M. L. Samuels (Edinburgh: Middle English Dialect Project, 1981), pp. 55-106; largely reproduced, with rearrangement, in the General Introduction to *LALME*.

11) *LALME*, IV, pp. 26, 29 and 171.

12) *LALME*, IV, pp. 30 and 297.

13) *LALME*, IV, p. 73.

14) In this table, 'scribe (a)', for instance, is named as such just to distinguish him from scribe (b), and so on. For information on the dialects of AU and GC, see Wiggins, *Stanzaic Guy*, p. 5; *LALME*, I, p. 217 (LP 6510) and p. 195 (LP 6350); and Okumura, 'Spelling Variations', 10-13.

15) Related spellings are hereafter given in a single representation by the use of square brackets. An optional element is given in square brackets; thus, *eche[-]* is to be read as *eche* or *eche-*. Square brackets enclosing two elements separated by a comma indicate that the segment within the brackets is obligatory, but that it may be realised by either of the separated elements; thus, *dudd[e,yst]* is to be read as *dudde* or *duddyst*, but not as *dudd*. Round brackets in the tables indicate relative frequency: no brackets = dominant form; (...) = form occurring about 1/3 to 2/3 as frequently as the dominant form; ((...)) = form occurring less than about 1/3 as frequently as the dominant form; and (((...))) = sporadic form.

16) *LALME*, IV, pp. 9, 153-54, 171, 203, 211 and 269.

17) *LALME*, IV, p. 106.

18) Most of the examples of *-ande* (30 out of 34 examples in CF [G1], 30 out of 31 examples in CF [G2] and all the 7 examples in CF [R]) are found in rhymes.

19) *LALME*, IV, pp. 11-12, 25-26, 132, 153-54 and 172.

20) McSparran and Robinson, *MS Ff. 2.38*, p. xv.

21) This can be seen, for instance, in his choice of forms for 'SAW (pt. of *SEE*)': he exclusively uses *sawe* in ll. 2684-3877 (a total of 17 examples) after both singular and plural subjects, whereas he uses *sye* alone in ll. 4130-4873 (a total of 16 examples).

22) *LALME*, IV, p. 32.

23) *LALME*, IV, pp. 69-70.

24) These possibilities are of course not mutually exclusive: it is certainly possible, for instance, that the three sections of the exemplar were copied by different scribes from different exemplars. It should also be added that we can postulate any number of intervening copies between CF and the exemplars which are responsible for contrastive spellings. The original exemplars may well have contained many other instances of orthographic difference, which were eventually to be wiped out in CF through the subsequent processes of scribal translation.