

**DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH BENGAL**

**MASTER OF ARTS-ENGLISH
SEMESTER -III**

**GLIMPSES OF WORLD LITERATURE
OPEN ELECTIVE 304
BLOCK-1**

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH BENGAL

Postal Address:

The Registrar,
University of North Bengal,
Raja Rammohunpur,
P.O.-N.B.U., Dist-Darjeeling,
West Bengal, Pin-734013,
India.

Phone: (O) +91 0353-2776331/2699008

Fax: (0353) 2776313, 2699001

Email: regnbu@sancharnet.in ; regnbu@nbu.ac.in

Website: www.nbu.ac.in

First Published in 2019



All rights reserved. No Part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without permission in writing from University of North Bengal. Any person who does any unauthorised act in relation to this book may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

This book is meant for educational and learning purpose. The authors of the book has/have taken all reasonable care to ensure that the contents of the book do not violate any existing copyright or other intellectual property rights of any person in any manner whatsoever. In the even the Authors has/ have been unable to track any source and if any copyright has been inadvertently infringed, please notify the publisher in writing for corrective action.

FOREWORD

The Self Learning Material (SLM) is written with the aim of providing simple and organized study content to all the learners. The SLMs are prepared on the framework of being mutually cohesive, internally consistent and structured as per the university's syllabi. It is a humble attempt to give glimpses of the various approaches and dimensions to the topic of study and to kindle the learner's interest to the subject

We have tried to put together information from various sources into this book that has been written in an engaging style with interesting and relevant examples. It introduces you to the insights of subject concepts and theories and presents them in a way that is easy to understand and comprehend.

We always believe in continuous improvement and would periodically update the content in the very interest of the learners. It may be added that despite enormous efforts and coordination, there is every possibility for some omission or inadequacy in few areas or topics, which would definitely be rectified in future.

We hope you enjoy learning from this book and the experience truly enrich your learning and help you to advance in your career and future endeavours.

GLIMPSES OF WORLD LITERATURE

BLOCK-1

Unit – 1: Age Of Chaucer	6
Unit - 2: Canterbury Tales 1	27
Unit - 3: Canterbury Tales Part 2.....	48
Unit – 4 : Canterbury Tales –Part-3.....	75
Unit – 5 : Canterbury Tales –Part 4.....	98
Unit – 6 : Canterbury Tales –Part 5	120
Unit – 7 : Canterbury Tales –Part 6	141

BLOCK -2

Unit 8: Canterbury Tales: Characters ,Themes

Unit 9: Mark Twain: His life and work and Contribution in English literature

Unit 10: Adventures of Huckleberry Finn by Mark Twain

Unit 11: Vijay Tendulkar: Life and Work and poem Kamala

Unit 12: Charlotte Perkins Gilman –The Yellow Wallpaper

Unit 13: Famous Writers of World Literature

Unit 14: Indian Aspects in World Literature

BLOCK-1 GLIMPSES OF WORLD LITERATURE

Introduction to Block

The units of Block I shows us the life of Chaucer and his famous work 'Canterbury Tales'. Geoffrey Chaucer was an English poet and Author .he is considered as the greatest English poet of the middle ages, he is best known for his Canterbury Tales. Chaucer has been styled the 'Father of English Literature'. Chaucer had become the Controller of Customs and Justice of Peace in 1389.He was the first writer buried in the Poets' corner of Westminster Abbey. The Canterbury Tales by Chaucer is the most acclaimed work .In the beginning Chaucer had decided that each of the characters would tell four stories per piece. The first two stories would be set on the way of the to Canterbury. He had set a goal of writing 120 stories which was very ambitious. But Canterbury Tales is made up of only 24 tales. The stories end before reaching the destination. Even though many critics have many views The Canterbury Tales is acknowledged as the best for beautiful rhythm of Chaucer's language and its characteristic of clever and satirical wit.

The Canterbury Tales is a collection of 24 tales that runs over seventeen thousands lines written in Middle English between 1387 and 1400.The tale varies in both minor and major ways. Chaucer wrote in London dialect of Late Middle English, which has clear differences with the Modern English.Chaucer doesn't pay attention to the progress of the trip, in fact he pays complete attention to the stories.it has many literary forms, linguistic styles and rhetorical devices.Chaucer chose to write in vernacular English rather than French or Latin.

UNIT – 1: AGE OF CHAUCER

STRUCTURE

- 1.0 Objectives
- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Age of Chaucer
- 1.3 About Modern Society Acceptance
- 1.4 Importance of Chaucer in literature
- 1.5 Summary
- 1.6 Keywords
- 1.7 Questions for Review
- 1.8 Suggested Readings and References
- 1.9 Answers to Check Your Progress

1.0 OBJECTIVES

After learning this unit based on Concept and Aim of society you can learn about the following topics:

- Life of Chaucer
- His contribution in English Literature
- Chaucer as the Father of Poetry
- Chaucer and his era

1.1 INTRODUCTION

World literature is a phase where writers of various ages have given their contribution for the upliftment of the language. Certain writers have made their base so strong that even after ages their writing stand outstandingly famous for ages. Geoffrey Chaucer was an English poet and author. Widely seen as the greatest English poet of the middle Ages, he is best known for The Canterbury Tales. Chaucer has been styled the "Father of English literature". He was the first writer buried in Poets' Corner of Westminster Abbey. Chaucer symbolizes, as no other writer

does, the Middle Ages. He stands in much the same relation to the life of his time as Alexander Pope does to the 18th century and Tennyson to the Victorian era. Chaucer's place in English literature is more important than theirs. It was during the Middle Ages when

The Age of Chaucer was important (the 14th Century). During this period, the people of England found themselves unhappy with many religious, political, and social ideologies. He wrote many of his major works in a prolific period when he held the job of customs comptroller for London (1374 to 1386). His Parliament of Fowles, The Legend of Good Women, and Troilus and Criseyde all date from this time. It is believed that he started The Canterbury Tales in the 1380s.

1.2 AGE OF CHAUCER

Historical Background

The period between 1343 and 1450 is known as the Age of Chaucer. It marked the first significant literary age in English literature. It heralded a new era of learning. Chaucer's age also witnessed many social, political, and religious challenges.

There was a strong dislike for the Papal or Church's interference, which had previously been the citadel of moral authority, social prestige but now suffered from corruption, turpitude and superstitions.

There were strong nationalistic passions due to the 100 Years' War between England and France.

There was also the charged atmosphere due to the Peasant upheavals in England.

The middle class also emerged as a strong social stratum.

All of this represented a transition from a feudal social setup toward a free society where men and women could exercise their individual whims and fancies without fear of reprimand.

There is a transition from the age of Medievalism to the age of Modernism. Geoffrey Chaucer was the night star of the former and the morning sun of the latter.

Notes

Another significant event of the age was the Black Death or plague that affected a third of the country's population. This affected various social dynamics like limiting labour and employable bodies.

Characteristics

Here are the main characteristics of the period

Language

The age saw the emergence of the standard English language. This was the single biggest development of the age as English had previously been heavily curbed by the influence of French and Latin.

The East Midland dialect became the accepted form of standardized English. The language saw great achievement and expression in the masterpieces of Chaucer.

French and Latin saw a waning influence on the language of the day. Chaucer's use of language to describe the man and his place is embellished with beauty, simplicity and humour.

The common examples from the daily life account details of blooming gardens in spring to unique human characteristics. The language glorified themes of beauty, vitality and the secular sentiment.

Curiosity and Criticism:

The age is known for its scathing criticism of the established order and religion. Church's control over temporal affairs of common men was challenged during this period.

There is a renewed interest in the common man's affairs. There is a theme of derision of romance, especially by Chaucer. The drama takes the prominent stage. The dominance of historical fables and romance of Medieval age was eschewed for more humanistic themes. It was a period of great social and intellectual movements as well as poverty, unrest, and revolt. It had the plague called the Black Death as well as the growth of the scientific temper and inquiry.

It had great criticisms of the Church as well as the celebration of the commoners. It is often regarded as the precursor to the Renaissance Movement of the Elizabethan age.

Prose

The English prose had its beginning in this age. Due to the ripening of the language, the prose could now be experimented with. The Biblical translation of John Wycliffe is an example of it.

The prose writing is both original and individual. There are experimental works like that of Thomas Mallory (King Arthur) and also a desire to shed the grip of Latin as seen in demand for an English Bible.

The formation of allegory was refined in this period. There was a return of alliteration which had been replaced with rhymes in the middle ages.

The prominent prose writers of Chaucer's age were Chaucer, John of Trevisa and John Wycliffe. There is also a great influence of Scottish works like Barbour.

Poetry

The Age of Chaucer saw the birth of English Poetry. In Chaucer's age, poetry continued to flourish and assumed an unparalleled position. The most noted poets of this age were Chaucer, John Gower and William Langland.

Spenser became the father of poetic diction as there was no poetic diction before this age. The poetry saw the amalgamation of religion, humanism and secular passions.

There were new forms of poetry like narrative and descriptive poetry that were enhanced during this time period.

Chaucer himself was known for his trenchant observations. He was sociable and loved mingling with people from diverse backgrounds as evidenced in his work; 'The Canterbury Tales'.

In it, he has been able to pen minute peculiarities and complexities of human nature. Chaucer uses seven lined stanza ABABBCC, known as the Chaucerian rhyme meter.

There is liberal use of humour. There is an insistence on human sentiment like in 'The Legend of Good Women'.

Notes

Normally the Chaucerian poems are divided into three stages- Italian (The Parliament of Fowls etc), French (The Romaunt etc.), and English (The Parson's Tale etc.). However, there is also some criticism for the inordinate length of some speeches and preachy discourse on ethics etc.

Age of Germination

Even though there were no novels or drama in his age, Chaucer's work did plant the seeds for its development in the succeeding Elizabethan age. If 'The Canterbury Tales' had been in prose and divided into scenes and acts, it would have been the language's first drama.

Check your Progress-1

1. What was the background of the Age of Chaucer?

.....
.....
.....

2. What was special about language in this era?

.....
.....
.....

1.3 ABOUT MODERN SOCIETY ACCEPTANCE

Chaucer symbolizes, as no other writer does, the Middle Ages. He stands in much the same relation to the life of his time as Alexander Pope does to the 18th century and Tennyson to the Victorian era. Chaucer's place in English literature is more important than theirs. It was during the Middle Ages when The Age of Chaucer was important (the 14th Century). During this period, the people of England found themselves unhappy with many religious, political, and social ideologies. Linguistic

Chaucer wrote in continental accentual-syllabic meter, a style which had developed since around the 12th century as an alternative to the alliterative Anglo-Saxon metre.[33] Chaucer is known for metrical

innovation, inventing the rhyme royal, and he was one of the first English poets to use the five-stress line, a decasyllabic cousin to the iambic pentameter, in his work, with only a few anonymous short works using it before him.[34] The arrangement of these five-stress lines into rhyming couplets, first seen in his *The Legend of Good Women*, was used in much of his later work and became one of the standard poetic forms in English. His

early influence as a satirist is also important, with the common humorous device, the funny accent of a regional dialect, apparently making its first appearance in *The Reeve's Tale*.

The poetry of Chaucer, along with other writers of the era, is credited with helping to standardise the London Dialect of the Middle English language from a combination of the Kentish and Midlands dialects.[35] This is probably overstated; the influence of the court, chancery and bureaucracy – of which Chaucer was a part – remains a more probable influence on the development of Standard English. Modern English is somewhat distanced from the language of Chaucer's poems owing to the effect of the Great Vowel Shift some time after his death. This change in the pronunciation of English, still not fully understood, makes the reading of Chaucer difficult for the modern audience. The status of the final -e in Chaucer's verse is uncertain: it seems likely that during the period of Chaucer's writing the final -e was dropping out of colloquial English and that its use was somewhat irregular.

Chaucer's versification suggests that the final -e is sometimes to be vocalised, and sometimes to be silent; however, this remains a point on which there is disagreement. When it is vocalised, most scholars pronounce it as a schwa. Apart from the irregular spelling, much of the vocabulary is recognisable to the modern reader. Chaucer is also recorded in the *Oxford English Dictionary* as the first author to use many common English words in his writings.

These words were probably frequently used in the language at the time but Chaucer, with his ear for common speech, is the earliest extant manuscript

Notes

source. Acceptable, alkali, altercation, amble, angrily, annex, annoyance, approaching, arbitration, armless, army, arrogant, arsenic, arc, artillery and aspect are just some of the

many English words first attested in Chaucer. Literary

Widespread knowledge of Chaucer's works is attested by the many poets who imitated or responded to his writing. John Lydgate was one of the earliest poets to write continuations of Chaucer's unfinished *Tales* while Robert Henryson's *Testament of Cresseid* completes the story of *Cressida* left unfinished in his *Troilus and Criseyde*. Many of the manuscripts of Chaucer's works contain material from these poets and later appreciations by the Romantic era poets were shaped by their failure to distinguish the later "additions" from original Chaucer. Writers of the 17th and 18th centuries, such as John Dryden, admired Chaucer for his stories, but not for his rhythm and rhyme, as few critics could then read Middle English

and the text had been butchered by printers, leaving a somewhat unadmirable mess.[36] It was

not until the late 19th century that the official Chaucerian canon, accepted today, was decided upon, largely as a result of Walter William Skeat's work. Roughly seventy-five years after Chaucer's death, *The Canterbury Tales* was selected by William Caxton to be one of the first books to be printed in England.

English

Chaucer is sometimes considered the source of the English vernacular tradition. His achievement for the language can be seen as part of a general historical trend towards the creation of a vernacular literature, after the example of Dante, in many parts of Europe. A parallel trend in Chaucer's own lifetime was underway in Scotland through the work of his slightly earlier contemporary, John Barbour, and was likely to have been even more general, as is evidenced by the example of the Pearl Poet in the north of England.

Although Chaucer's language is much closer to Modern English than the text of *Beowulf*, such that (unlike that of *Beowulf*) a Modern English-speaker with a large vocabulary of archaic words may understand it, it

differs enough that most publications modernise his idiom. The following is a sample from the prologue of *The Summoner's Tale* that compares Chaucer's text to a modern translation:

Original Text Modern Translation.

This frere bosteth that he knoweth helle, This friar boasts that he knows hell, And God it woot, that it is litel wonder; And God knows that it is little wonder; Freres and feendes been but lyte asonder. Friars and fiends are seldom far apart.

For, pardee, ye han ofte tyme herd telle For, by God, you have oftentimes heard tell How that a frere ravysched was to helle How a friar was taken to hell.

In spirit ones by a visioun; In spirit, once by a vision; And as an angel ladde hym up and down, And as an angel led him up and down, To shewen hym the peynes that the were, To show him the pains that were there, In al the place saugh he nat a frere; In all the place he saw not a friar; Of oother folk he saugh ynowe in wo. Of other folk he saw enough in woe.

Unto this angel spak the frere tho: Unto this angel spoke the friar thus: Now, sire, quod he, han freres swich a grace "Now sir", said he, "Have friars such a grace That noon of hem shal come to this place?

That none of them come to this place?"

Yis, quod this aungel, many a millioun! "Yes", said the angel, "many a million!" And unto sathanas he ladde hym down. And unto Satan the angel led him down.

–And now hath sathanas, –seith he, –a tayl "And now Satan has", he said, "a tail, Brodder than of a carryk is the sayl. Broader than a galleon's sail. Hold up thy tayl, thou sathanas!–quod he; Hold up your tail, Satan!" said he.

–shewe forth thyn ers, and lat the frere se "Show forth your arse, and let the friar see Where is the nest of freres in this place!– Where the nest of friars is in this place!"

And er that half a furlong wey of space, And before half a furlong of space, Right so as bees out swarmen from an hyve,

Notes

Just as bees swarm out from a hive, Out of the develes ers ther gonne dryve Out of the devil's arse there were driven Twenty thousand freres on a route, Twenty thousand friars on a rout, And thurghout helle swarmed al aboute, And throughout hell swarmed all about, And comen agayn as faste as they may gon, And came again as fast as they could go, And in his ers they crepten everychon. And every one crept into his arse. He clapte his tayl agayn and lay ful stille. He shut his tail again and lay very still.[37]

Manuscripts and audience

The large number of surviving manuscripts of Chaucer's works is testimony to the enduring interest in his poetry prior to the arrival of the printing press. There are 83 surviving manuscripts of the Canterbury Tales (in whole or part) alone, along with sixteen of Troilus and Criseyde, including the personal copy of Henry IV.[41] Given the ravages of time, it is likely that these surviving manuscripts represent hundreds since lost. Chaucer's original audience was a courtly one, and would have included women as well as men of the upper social classes. Yet even before his death in 1400, Chaucer's audience had begun to include members of the rising literate, middle and merchant classes, which included many Lollard sympathisers who may well have been inclined to read Chaucer as one of their own, particularly in his satirical writings about friars, priests, and other church officials. In 1464, John Baron, a tenant farmer in Agmondesham

(Amersham in Buckinghamshire), was brought before John Chadworth, the Bishop of Lincoln, on charges of being a Lollard heretic; he confessed to owning a "boke of the Tales of Caunterburie" among other suspect volumes.[42]

Printed editions

William Caxton, the first English printer, was responsible for the first two folio editions of The Canterbury Tales which were published in 1478 and 1483.[43] Caxton's second printing, by his own account, came about because a customer complained that the printed text differed from a manuscript he knew; Caxton obligingly used the man's manuscript as his source. Both Caxton editions carry the equivalent of manuscript

authority. Caxton's edition was reprinted by his successor, Wynkyn de Worde, but this edition has no independent authority.

Richard Pynson, the King's Printer under Henry VIII for about twenty years, was the first to collect and sell something that resembled an edition of the collected works of Chaucer; however, in the process, he introduced five previously printed texts that are now known not to be Chaucer's. (The collection is actually three separately printed texts, or collections of texts, bound together as one volume.) There is a likely connection between Pynson's product and William Thynne's a mere six years later. Thynne had a successful career from the 1520s until his death in 1546, as chief clerk of the kitchen of Henry VIII, one of the masters of the royal household. He spent years comparing various versions of Chaucer's works, and selected 41 pieces for publication. While there were questions over the authorship of some of the material, there is no doubt this was the first comprehensive view of Chaucer's work. The *Workes of Geffray Chaucer*, published in 1532, was the first edition of Chaucer's collected works. His editions of Chaucer's Works in 1532 and 1542 were the first major contributions to the existence of a widely recognised

Chaucerian canon. Thynne represents his edition as a book sponsored by and supportive of the king who is praised in the preface by Sir Brian Tuke. Thynne's canon brought the number of apocryphal works associated with Chaucer to a total of 28, even if that was not his intention. As with Pynson, once included in the Works, pseudepigraphic texts stayed with those works, regardless of their first editor's intentions.

In the 16th and 17th centuries, Chaucer was printed more than any other English author, and he was the first author to have his works collected in comprehensive single-volume editions in which a Chaucer canon began to cohere. Some scholars contend that 16th-century editions of Chaucer's Works set the precedent for all other English authors in terms of presentation, prestige and success in print. These editions certainly established Chaucer's reputation, but they also began the complicated process of reconstructing and frequently inventing Chaucer's biography and the canonical list of works which were attributed to him.

Notes

Probably the most significant aspect of the growing apocrypha is that, beginning with Thynne's editions, it began to include medieval texts that made Chaucer appear as

a proto-Protestant Lollard, primarily the Testament of Love and The Plowman's Tale. As "Chaucerian" works that were not considered apocryphal until the late 19th century, these medieval texts enjoyed a new life, with English Protestants carrying on the earlier Lollard project of appropriating existing texts and authors who seemed sympathetic—or malleable enough to be construed as sympathetic—to their cause. The official Chaucer of the early printed volumes of his Works was construed as a proto-Protestant as the same was done, concurrently, with William Langland and Piers Plowman.

The famous Plowman's Tale did not enter Thynne's Works until the second, 1542, edition. Its entry was surely facilitated by Thynne's inclusion of Thomas Usk's Testament of

Love in the first edition. The Testament of Love imitates, borrows from, and thus resembles Usk's contemporary, Chaucer. (Testament of Love also appears to borrow from Piers Plowman.) Since the Testament of Love mentions its author's part in a failed plot (book 1, chapter 6), his imprisonment, and (perhaps) a recantation of (possibly Lollard) heresy, all this was associated with Chaucer. (Usk himself was executed as a traitor in 1388.) John Foxe took this recantation of heresy as a defence of the true faith, calling Chaucer a "right Wiclevian" and (erroneously) identifying him as a schoolmate and close friend of John Wycliffe at Merton College, Oxford. (Thomas Speght is careful to highlight these facts in his editions and his "Life of Chaucer".) No other sources for the Testament of Love exist—there is only Thynne's construction of whatever manuscript sources he had.

John Stow (1525–1605) was an antiquarian and also a chronicler. His edition of Chaucer's Works in 1561[44] brought the apocrypha to more than 50 titles. More were added in the 17th century, and they remained as late as 1810, well after Thomas Tyrwhitt pared the canon down in his 1775 edition.[45] The compilation and printing of Chaucer's works was, from its beginning, a political enterprise, since it was intended to

establish an English national identity and history that grounded and authorised the Tudor

monarchy and church. What was added to Chaucer often helped represent him favourably to Protestant England.

In his 1598 edition of the Works, Speght (probably taking cues from Foxe) made good use of Usk's account of his political intrigue and imprisonment in the Testament of Love to assemble a largely fictional "Life of Our Learned English Poet, Geffrey Chaucer". Speght's "Life" presents readers with an erstwhile radical in troubled times

much like their own, a proto-Protestant who eventually came round to the king's views on religion. Speght states, "In the second year of Richard the second, the King tooke Geffrey Chaucer and his lands into his protection. The occasion wherof no doubt was some daunger and trouble whereinto he was fallen by favouring some rash attempt of the common people." Under the discussion of Chaucer's friends, namely John of Gaunt, Speght further explains:

Yet it seemeth that [Chaucer] was in some trouble in the daies of King Richard the second, as it may appeare in the Testament of Loue: where hee doth greatly complaine of his owne rashnesse in following the multitude, and of their hatred against him for bewraying their purpose. And in that complaint which he maketh to his empty purse, I do find a written copy, which I had of Iohn Stow (whose library hath helped many writers) wherein ten times more is adioined, then is in print. Where he maketh great lamentation for his wrongfull imprisonment, wishing death to end his daies: which in my iudgement doth greatly accord with that in the Testament of Loue. Moreouer we find it thus in Record.

Later, in "The Argument" to the Testament of Love, Speght adds:

Chaucer did compile this booke as a comfort to himselfe after great griefs conceiued for some rash attempts of the commons, with whome he had ioyned, and thereby was in feare to lose the fauour of his best friends.

Speght is also the source of the famous tale of Chaucer being fined for beating a Franciscan friar in Fleet Street, as well as a fictitious coat of arms and family tree. Ironically – and perhaps consciously so – an introductory, apologetic letter in Speght's edition from Francis Beaumont

Notes

defends the unseemly, "low", and bawdy bits in Chaucer from an elite, classicist position. Francis Thynne noted some of these inconsistencies in his *Animadversions*, insisting that Chaucer was not a commoner, and he objected to the friar-beating story. Yet Thynne himself underscores Chaucer's support for popular religious reform, associating Chaucer's views with his father William Thynne's attempts to include *The Plowman's*

Tale and *The Pilgrim's Tale* in the 1532 and 1542 Works.

The myth of the Protestant Chaucer continues to have a lasting impact on a large body of Chaucerian scholarship. Though it is extremely rare for a modern scholar to suggest Chaucer supported a religious movement that did not exist until more than a century after his death, the predominance of this thinking for so many centuries left it for granted that Chaucer was at least hostile toward Catholicism. This assumption forms a large part of many critical approaches to Chaucer's works, including neo-Marxism.

Alongside Chaucer's Works, the most impressive literary monument of the period is John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*.... As with the Chaucer editions, it was critically significant to English Protestant identity and included Chaucer in its project. Foxe's Chaucer both derived from and contributed to the printed editions of Chaucer's Works, particularly the pseudepigrapha. *Jack Upland* was first printed in Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, and then it appeared in Speght's edition of Chaucer's Works. Speght's "Life of Chaucer" echoes Foxe's own account, which is itself dependent upon the earlier editions that added the *Testament of*

Love and *The Plowman's Tale* to their pages. Like Speght's Chaucer, Foxe's Chaucer was also a shrewd (or lucky) political survivor. In his 1563 edition, Foxe "thought it not out of season ... to couple ... some mention of Geoffrey Chaucer" with a discussion of John Colet, a possible source for John Skelton's character Colin Clout.

Probably referring to the 1542 Act for the Advancement of True Religion, Foxe said that he "marvel[s] to consider ... how the bishops, condemning and abolishing all manner of English books and treatises which might bring the people to any light of knowledge, did yet authorise the works of Chaucer to remain still and to be occupied; who,

no doubt, saw into religion as much almost as even we do now, and uttereth in his works no less, and seemeth to be a right Wicklevian, or else there never was any. And that, all his works almost, if they be thoroughly advised, will testify (albeit done in mirth, and covertly); and especially the latter end of his third book of the Testament of Love ... Wherein, except a man be altogether blind, he may espy him at the full: although in the same book (as in all others he useth to do), under shadows covertly, as under a visor, he suborneth truth in such sort, as both privily she may profit the godly- minded, and yet not be espied of the crafty adversary. And therefore the bishops, belike, taking his works but for jests and toys, in condemning other books, yet permitted his books to be read."

It is significant, too, that Foxe's discussion of Chaucer leads into his history of "The Reformation of the Church of Christ in the Time of Martin Luther" when "Printing, being opened, incontinently ministered unto the church the instruments and tools of learning and knowledge; which were good books and authors, which before lay hid and unknown. The science of printing being found, immediately followed the grace of God; which stirred up good wits aptly to conceive the light of knowledge and judgment: by which light darkness began to be espied, and ignorance to be detected; truth from error, religion from superstition, to be discerned."

Foxe downplays Chaucer's bawdy and amorous writing, insisting that it all testifies to his piety. Material that is troubling is deemed metaphoric, while the more forthright satire (which Foxe prefers) is taken literally.

John Urry produced the first edition of the complete works of Chaucer in a Latin font, published posthumously in 1721. Included were several tales, according to the editors, for the first time printed, a biography of Chaucer, a glossary of old English words, and testimonials of author writers concerning Chaucer dating back to the 16th century. According to A. S. G Edwards, "This was the first collected edition of Chaucer to be printed in roman type. The life of Chaucer prefixed to the volume was the work of the Reverend John Dart, corrected and revised by Timothy Thomas. The glossary appended was also mainly compiled by Thomas. The text of Urry's edition has often been criticised by subsequent editors

Notes

for its frequent conjectural emendations, mainly to make it conform to his sense of Chaucer's metre. The justice of such criticisms should not obscure his achievement. His is the first edition of Chaucer for nearly a hundred and fifty years to consult any manuscripts and is the first since that of William Thynne in 1534 to seek systematically to assemble a substantial number of manuscripts to establish his text. It is also the first edition to offer descriptions of the manuscripts of Chaucer's works, and the first to print texts of 'Gamelyn' and 'The Tale of Beryn', works ascribed to, but not by, Chaucer."

Modern scholarship

Although Chaucer's works had long been admired, serious scholarly work on his legacy did not begin until the late 18th century, when Thomas

Tyrwhitt edited *The Canterbury Tales*, and it did not become an established academic discipline until the 19th century.[46] Scholars such as Frederick James Furnivall, who founded the Chaucer Society in 1868, pioneered the establishment of diplomatic editions of Chaucer's major texts, along with careful accounts of

Chaucer's language and prosody. Walter William Skeat, who like Furnivall was closely associated with the Oxford English Dictionary, established the base text of all of Chaucer's works with his edition, published by Oxford University Press. Later editions by John H. Fisher and Larry D. Benson offered further refinements, along with critical commentary and bibliographies. With the textual issues largely addressed, if not resolved, attention turned to the questions of Chaucer's themes, structure, and audience. The Chaucer Review was founded in 1966 and has maintained its position as the pre-eminent journal of Chaucer studies.

Chaucer is a major character in the 1917 opera *The Canterbury Pilgrims* by Reginald De Koven, which is loosely based on *The Canterbury Tales*.

Powell and Pressburger's 1944 film *A Canterbury Tale* opens with a recreation of Chaucer's Canterbury pilgrims; the film itself takes place on the road to, and in, wartime Canterbury.

The plot of the detective novel *Landscape with Dead Dons* by Robert Robinson centres on the apparent rediscovery of *The Book of the Leoun*, and a passage from it (eleven lines of Chaucerian pastiche) turn out to be the vital murder clue as well as proving that the "rediscovered" poem is an elaborate, clever forgery by the murderer (a Chaucer scholar).

In Rudyard Kipling's story "Dayspring Mishandled", a writer plans an elaborate revenge on a former friend, a Chaucer expert, who has insulted the woman he loves, by fabricating a "medieval" manuscript sheet containing an alleged fragment of a lost Canterbury Tale (actually his own composition).

Both an asteroid and a lunar crater have been named after Chaucer.

Although he does not appear directly in the fiction books, Chaucer is referred to as an uncle by marriage to Dame Frevisse, a Benedictine Nun appearing in the medieval mysteries by Margaret Frazier.

Check your Progress-2

3. What was special about language in this era?

.....
.....
.....

4. What is Chaucer considered as ?

.....
.....
.....

1.4 IMPORTANCE OF CHAUCER IN LITERATURE

One of the reasons Chaucer is so important is that he made the decision to write in English and not French. In the centuries following the Norman invasion, French was the language spoken by those in power. *The Canterbury Tales* was one of the first major works in literature written in English. Geoffrey Chaucer's contribution to English literature is extremely important. He was the first English writer to write in the vernacular. Previously, Latin was the language used by writers. This

Notes

enabled writers from various countries to share what they had written since Latin was the language used by scholars.

In this fresh and innovative approach, John H. Fisher eloquently explains Chaucer's importance to Western culture. English literature begins with Chaucer. The first writer to demonstrate that English was as effective a medium for literature as Latin or French, Chaucer introduced realism, satire, and humor into English writing. In examining Chaucer's cultural importance, however, Fisher ventures beyond literary excellence, basing his cultural interpretation on inferences about Chaucer's domestic life, about his possible experience in the inns of chancery and inns of court, and about the possibility that Henry V and the Lancastrian government sought deliberately to promote Chaucer's poems as models of what could be accomplished in the vernacular. Fisher's willingness to boldly infer from the scant evidence available allows him to place Chaucer in the poet's, and our, culture in a way he has not been placed before. By attributing to Chaucer innovations to which other writers have only alluded, and by reaching conclusions which others have been hesitant to approach, Fisher presents an interpretation at once controversial, engaging, and informative.

There are very few people who read and write English who have not heard of Geoffrey Chaucer, and most of them have read--perhaps even in Middle English--the General Prologue to the Canterbury Tales and a tale or two like the Miller's bawdy fabliau or the Nun's Priest's beast fable about Chauntecleer and Pertelote. Most college students who go further in the humanities take a course in Chaucer, and learn about him, along with Shakespeare and Milton, as one of the "fathers of English literature." Behind the study of this triumvirate lurks an awareness of their "importance." But importance in what sense? Nearly all discussion is of their art and their oeuvre. Their importance is assumed but seldom defined. In this book I explore Chaucer's importance as a cultural cynosure. As the first important secular writer in England, as the first influential writer in the English language, as the first English writer to broaden the subject matter of literature beyond the court and the cloister, he was germinal not only to the development of the English language but to the development of our view of the subjects that literature can treat,

and to our view of authorship. His influence cannot be understood simply through explication of his poetry. As the "new historicism" is reiterating (after two generations of "new criticism" which denied it), an artist's achievement grows out of domestic, political, and intellectual ambiance . Chaucer is given this title Father of English Poetry for a few reasons. First, he is one of the first English poets that we know by name. During this time period, it was common not to know the author's name and label it as "anonymous," largely due to the tradition of passing stories along orally through time from one generation to the next.

Second, we give him the title because of his accomplishments. His largest and best known is The Canterbury Tales. In this work (which is not finished as he died before its completion), Chaucer creates a frame story with his poetry. The outer story is the pilgrimmage that the group is taking to pay homage to Thomas Becket at Canterbury. The inside story is a collection of short stories (the first of its kind which morphs into the short story as we know it today) focusing on the individual travelers.

Third, Chaucer, through his own life experiences, is able to give us a picture of life in his age for all levels of society. His Tales give us the knight (highest ranking of the travelers) to the plowman (revered in Chaucer's time for their importance in providing food for the public, but certainly not considered as a wealthy or sophisticated member of society). Not many authors have ever been able to do this well, and it was several hundred years before Shakespeare came along and was also able to successfully represent all members of society in a straightforward and truthful way while still being entertaining.

Check Your Progress 3

5. What did Chaucer do with language?

.....
.....
.....

6. What is Chaucer considered as the Father of English Poetry?

.....
.....
.....

1.5 SUMMARY

The Age of Chaucer is one of the first ages where there were rich writing . The period now under review is quite short. It includes the greater part of the reign of Edward III and the long French wars associated with his name: the accession of his grandson Richard II (1377); and the revolution of 1399, the deposition of Richard, and the foundation of the Lancastrian dynasty .From the literary point of view, of greater importance are the social and intellectual movements of the periods: the terrible plague called the Black Death, bringing poverty, unrest, and revolt among the peasant, and the growth of the spirit of inquiry, which was strongly critical of the ways of church, and found expression in the teaching of Wyclif and the Lollards, and in the stern denunciations of Langland.

1.6 KEYWORDS

Intellectual – higher mental capacity

Ambiance –the atmosphere around

Inconsistencies – the quality of being inconsistent

Medieval –the middle age

Alliteration- the commencement of two or more stressed syllable.

Apocryphal –the doubtful authorship or authenticity

Manuscript – the original text of an author’s work

1.7 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

Chaucer is considered as the ‘Father of English Poetry’ .Explain the answer through the reasons.

How did Chaucer use language?

Chaucer's writings tell about the society .explain how.

1.8 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

Chaucer Bibliography Online

Geoffrey Chaucer at the *Encyclopædia Britannica*

Works by Geoffrey Chaucer at Project Gutenberg

Works by or about Geoffrey Chaucer at Internet Archive

Works by Geoffrey Chaucer at LibriVox (public domain audiobooks)

Poems by Geoffrey Chaucer at PoetryFoundation.org

Early Editions of Chaucer

BBC television adaptation of certain of *The Canterbury Tales*

Geoffrey Chaucer on *In Our Time*

1.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. The period between 1343 and 1450 is known as the Age of Chaucer. It marked the first significant literary age in English literature. It heralded a new era of learning. Chaucer's age also witnessed many social, political, and religious challenges.

There was a strong dislike for the Papal or Church's interference, which had previously been the citadel of moral authority, social prestige but now suffered from corruption, turpitude and superstitions.

2. The age saw the emergence of the standard English language. This was the single biggest development of the age as English had previously been heavily curbed by the influence of French and Latin.

3. Chaucer wrote in continental accentual-syllabic meter, a style which had developed since around the 12th century as an alternative to the alliterative Anglo-Saxon metre.[33] Chaucer is known for metrical innovation, inventing the rhyme royal, and he was one of the first

Notes

English poets to use the five-stress line, a decasyllabic cousin to the iambic pentameter, in his work.

4. Chaucer is sometimes considered the source of the English vernacular tradition. His achievement for the language can be seen as part of a general historical trend towards the creation of a vernacular literature, after the example of Dante, in many parts of Europe.

5. One of the reasons Chaucer is so important is that he made the decision to write

in English and not French. In the centuries following the Norman invasion, French was the language spoken by those in power. The Canterbury Tales was one of the first major works in literature written in English.

6. Chaucer is given this title Father of English Poetry for a few reasons. First, he is one of the first English poets that we know by name. During this time period, it was common not to know the author's name and label it as "anonymous," largely due to the tradition of passing stories along orally through time from one generation to the next.

UNIT - 2: CANTERBURY TALES 1

STRUCTURE

- 2.0 Objectives
- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Canterbury Tales
- 2.3 Knight's Tale
- 2.4 Miller's Tale
- 2.5 Summary
- 2.6 Keywords
- 2.7 Questions for Review
- 2.8 Suggested Readings and References
- 2.9 Answers to Check Your Progress

2.0 OBJECTIVES

After learning this unit based on Concept and Aim of society you can learn about the following topics:

Canterbury Tales :An Introduction

The Knight's Tale and its Analysis

Millers Tale and Analysis

2.1. INTRODUCTION

In Medieval England, most people were illiterate. This is why Church stain glass windows and wall paintings depict bible stories- it helped the congregation follow the biblical stories. If you were lucky enough to receive an education, however, then you would have learnt French and Latin, the language of the Court and the Church. Chaucer, due to his family's wealth and connection, was one of the fortunate people who learnt to read and write.

Chaucer was not a professional writer but wrote for pleasure, for his own amusement and that of his family and friends. His poetry was a great favourite of the King's. Chaucer wrote in Middle English, writing works such as Troilus and Criseyde and House of Fame. Though not the first to write in the vernacular, he appears to be instrumental in popularising it.

Notes

Whilst working as Controller of Customs and Justice of Peace in 1386, however, he began writing his most famous works- The Canterbury Tales.

The Canterbury Tales, written in a combination of verse and prose, tells the story of some 30 pilgrims walking from Southwark to Canterbury on a pilgrimage to the shrine of St Thomas Beckett. On route, the pilgrims engage in a story telling competition to win a meal at the Tabard Inn! Thus, The Canterbury Tales is a collection of 24 stories, told as the pilgrims make their journey to Canterbury Cathedral.

Chaucer's work is not simply a story; the Canterbury Tales is also a comment on English society at the time. The very fact that Chaucer wrote in English demonstrates his dismissal of accepted practices. Chaucer's characters offer various social insights and raise various questions concerning social class, spirituality and religion. The work was unfinished when Chaucer died.

2.2 CANTERBURY TALES

The narrator opens the General Prologue with a description of the return of spring. He describes the April rains, the burgeoning flowers and leaves, and the chirping birds. Around this time of year, the narrator says, people begin to feel the desire to go on a pilgrimage. Many devout English pilgrims set off to visit shrines in distant holy lands, but even more choose to travel to Canterbury to visit the relics of Saint Thomas Becket in Canterbury Cathedral, where they thank the martyr for having helped them when they were in need. The narrator tells us that as he prepared to go on such a pilgrimage, staying at a tavern in Southwark called the Tabard Inn, a great company of twenty-nine travelers entered. The travelers were a diverse group who, like the narrator, were on their way to Canterbury. They happily agreed to let him join them. That night, the group slept at the Tabard, and woke up early the next morning to set off on their journey. Before continuing the tale, the narrator declares his intent to list and describe each of the members of the group.

Analysis

The invocation of spring with which the General Prologue begins is lengthy and formal compared to the language of the rest of the Prologue.

The first lines situate the story in a particular time and place, but the speaker does this in

cosmic and cyclical terms, celebrating the vitality and richness of spring. This approach gives the opening lines a dreamy, timeless, unfocused quality, and it is therefore surprising when the narrator reveals that he's going to describe a pilgrimage that he himself took rather than telling a love story. A pilgrimage is a religious journey undertaken for penance and grace. As pilgrimages went, Canterbury was not a very difficult destination for an English person to reach. It was, therefore, very popular in fourteenth-century England, as the narrator mentions. Pilgrims traveled to visit the remains of Saint Thomas Becket, archbishop of Canterbury, who was murdered in 1170 by knights of King Henry II. Soon after his death, he became the most popular saint in England.

The pilgrimage in *The Canterbury Tales* should not be thought of as an entirely solemn occasion, because it also offered the pilgrims an opportunity to abandon work and take a vacation.

In line 20, the narrator abandons his unfocused, all-knowing point of view, identifying himself as an actual person for the first time by inserting the first person—"I"—as he relates how he met the group of pilgrims while staying at the Tabard Inn. He emphasizes that this group, which he encountered by accident, was itself formed quite by chance (25–26). He then shifts into the first-person plural, referring to the pilgrims as "we" beginning in line 29, asserting his status as a member of the group.

The narrator ends the introductory portion of his prologue by noting that he has "tyme and space" to tell his narrative. His comments underscore the fact that he is writing some time after the events of his story, and that he is describing the characters from memory. He has spoken and met with these people, but he has waited a certain length of time before sitting down and describing them. His intention to describe each pilgrim as he or she seemed to him is also important, for it emphasizes that his descriptions are not only subject to his memory but are also shaped by his individual perceptions and opinions regarding each of the characters.

Notes

He positions himself as a mediator between two groups: the group of pilgrims, of which he was a member, and us, the audience, whom the narrator explicitly addresses as “you” in lines 34 and 38.

On the other hand, the narrator’s declaration that he will tell us about the “condicioun,” “degree,” and “array” (dress) of each of the pilgrims suggests that his portraits will be based on objective facts as well as his own opinions. He spends considerable time characterizing the group members according to their social positions. The pilgrims represent a diverse cross section of fourteenth-century English society. Medieval social theory divided society into three broad classes, called “estates”: the military, the clergy, and the laity. (The nobility, not represented in the General Prologue, traditionally derives its title and privileges from military duties and service, so it is considered part of the military estate.) In the portraits that we will see in the rest of the General Prologue, the Knight and Squire represent the military estate. The clergy is represented by the Prioress (and her nun and three priests), the Monk, the Friar, and the Parson. The other characters, from the wealthy Franklin to the poor Plowman, are the members of the laity. These lay characters can be further subdivided into landowners (the Franklin), professionals (the Clerk, the Man of Law, the Guildsmen, the Physician, and the Shipman), laborers (the Cook and the Plowman), stewards (the Miller, the Manciple, and the Reeve), and church officers (the Summoner and the Pardoner). As we will see, Chaucer’s descriptions of the various characters and their social roles reveal the influence of the medieval genre of estates satire.

2.3. CANTERBURY TALES SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF THE KNIGHT'S TALE

The Knight’s Tale (I)

The Knight begins his tale with the story of Theseus, a prince, who married Hippolyta, the queen of Scythia, and brought her and her sister, Emelye, back to Athens with him after conquering her kingdom of Amazons. When Theseus returned home victorious, he became aware of

a company of women clad in black who knelt at the side of the highway, shrieking. The oldest of the women asked Theseus for pity. She told him that she was once the wife of King Cappaneus who was destroyed at Thebes, and that all of the other women lost their husbands. Creon, the lord of the town, had simply tossed the dead bodies of the soldiers in a single pile and refused to burn or bury them.

Theseus swore vengeance upon Creon, and immediately ordered his armies toward Thebes. Theseus vanquished Creon, and when the soldiers were disposing of the bodies they found two young knights, Arcite and Palamon, two royal cousins, not quite dead. Theseus ordered that they be imprisoned in Athens for life. They passed their time imprisoned in a tower in Athens until they saw Emelye in a nearby garden. Both fell immediately in love with her. Palamon compared her to Venus, and prayed escape from the prison; similarly, Arcite claimed that he would rather be dead than not have Emelye. The two fight over her, each calling the other a traitor.

This happened on a day in which Pirithous, a prince and childhood friend of Theseus, had come to Athens. Pirithous had known Arcite at Thebes, and at his request, Theseus set Arcite free on the promise that Arcite would never again be seen in Theseus' kingdom. He now had his freedom, but not the ability to pursue Emelye, and lamented the cruelty of fate. Palamon, however, envied Arcite, since he did now have the option of raising an army against Theseus to conquer Athens. The Knight asks which of the nobles has it worse: Arcite, who has his freedom but not access to Emelye, or Palamon, who can see Emelye but remains a prisoner?

(II)

Two years passed. After spending two years in Thebes, one night Arcite dreamt that he saw the god Mercury standing before him, bidding him to be free of hope and care, and telling him to go to Athens to relieve his grief. Arcite decided to disguise himself, return to Athens and pass unknown.

Arriving at the court, Arcite offered his services, and took a post with Emelye's steward under the name of Philostratus. Arcite worked as a

Notes

page in Emelye's house and was so well loved that Theseus soon made him squire of his chamber. Meanwhile Palamon had lived for seven years in his dungeon, before, eventually, he escaped from the tower and fled the city, with the intention of disguising himself and making toward Thebes. That morning Arcite went horseback riding. In the area outside of the city, he dismounted and began to speak to himself, lamenting life without Emelye. Palamon, overhearing, leapt out and revealed himself to Arcite. Since neither had weapons, they made a vow to meet in the same place tomorrow and fight to the death over Emelye.

They returned the next day armed for battle. At the same time, and in the same place, Theseus, Hippolyta and Emelye were out hunting, and, reaching the area where Arcite and Palamon were fighting, Theseus stopped the battle. Palamon told Theseus that Arcite is the man who was banished (and that he has returned, disguised as Philostratus), while he himself is the escaped prisoner.

He also told Theseus that both men love Emelye. Theseus ordered the death of both, but the queen and Emelye took pity on the two men, and begged Theseus for mercy. Considering how much they loved Emelye to risk death by not escaping to Thebes, Theseus asked them to swear that they will never make war against any realm of his. Theseus then decided that the two will wage war on each other, each with one hundred knights, in order to decide whom Emelye will marry.

(III)

Theseus commissioned the building of a stadium a mile in circumference for the duel between Arcite and Palamon. This stadium was opulent, featuring carvings and portraits as well as temples honoring Mars, Diana and Venus. When the day of the duel approached, Palamon brought Lycurgus, the king of Thrace, to fight with him, while Arcite brought Emetreus, the king of India.

The night before the duel, Palamon prayed to Venus to solace his pains of love, asking Venus (goddess of love) to let Arcite murder him if Arcite will be the one to marry Emelye. The statue of Venus shook, an

omen that the goddess was listening. Emelye prayed at the shrine to Diana, the goddess of chastity.

She prayed that she could remain a maiden all her life and not be a man's lover nor wife. She prayed, moreover, for peace and friendship between Arcite and Palamon. But if it was to be her destiny to marry one against her will, she asked to have the one who wants her most. The statue of Diana shed tears of blood, another omen. Then Diana herself appeared to Emelye and told her that she will marry one of the two. Arcite prayed to Mars. He prayed for victory in battle, and the statue of Mars whispered the word "victory" to him, the third omen. Mars and Venus thus waged war upon one another, but aged Saturn found a means to satisfy both of them. He told Venus that Palamon would have his lady, but Mars would help his servant.

(IV)

Theseus set the rules of the battle between the two opposing factions. He ordered that, during the war between the two sides, nobody would suffer a mortal blow. If an opponent was overcome, he was to leave the battle. The people raised their voices in exultation. The two armies were equal in prowess, age and nobility, and Arcite pursued Palamon viciously, and Palamon returned with equal severity. But Emetreus seized Palamon and pierced him with his sword. In the attempt to rescue Palamon, King Lycurgus was struck down, and then Emetreus himself was wounded. Theseus declared that Arcite had won.

Venus was disappointed at the outcome, but Saturn told her that Mars was now appeased and she would receive a similar appeasement. Suddenly, as Arcite was proclaimed victorious, there was an earthquake sent by Pluto that frightened Arcite's horse, which swerved and fell, throwing off Arcite and mortally wounding him. Before he died, Arcite tells Emelye that she could have no more worthy husband than Palamon. His last word before he died was her name. Theseus, in a very long speech referred to as the "First Mover" speech, then ordered Emelye to marry Palamon after a funeral ceremony honoring Arcite: and the Knight's story finishes on a happy note.

Analysis

Notes

It is very likely that the Knight's Tale was written before the Canterbury Tales as a whole project was planned, and so it has the unusual status of being both a part of the tales as a whole, but also a separate work of literature in its own right (though the text has been adapted into the Tales – lines 875-92). It is a very free adaptation of a story by an Italian writer, Boccaccio, whom it seems clear Chaucer very much admired. Chaucer – as he regularly does – hugely compresses the story into the Tale, and adds material heavily influenced by his philosophical hero Boethius (including Theseus' "First Mover" speech).

The Tale is undoubtedly a romance as Chaucer presents it, supposedly a true history of many hundreds of years ago told by an authoritative, high-status figure (in this case the Knight). Yet Chaucer never merely adopts a literary tradition without commenting on it, and the oddities of the Tale often lie in the way it over-stresses the traditional things expected of a romance of its genre. For example, the question of status (raised at the end of the General Prologue when the Host – perhaps duplicitously – has the Knight picked as the first teller) and rank is immediately raised by the progression of the tale. The Knight begins not with the main characters of the tale, Arcite and Palamon, but instead, he begins at the apex of society, describing the exploits of Theseus of Athens, working downward until he reaches the less distinguished Theban soldiers.

Moreover, the tale is deeply improbable in all sorts of ways, and the situation and the moral questions it poses seem more important than the qualities of the individual characters. Characters, in fact, exist only to be moved by the events of the story: to be imprisoned and set free whenever the plot demands, or to fall in love at first sight when it is dramatically convenient. Even the characters acknowledge their lack of free will within the story. The two knights pray to Venus for a literal *deus ex machine*, for they are unable to control their own fate. The Knight's Tale very openly acknowledges the role of fate through the gods: Palamon leaves his fate to theology, blaming his fate on Venus, Juno and Saturn.

Arcite and Palamon as characters, then, without any real autonomy and speaking only formal, elegant laments, are virtually indistinguishable from each other. There is no information on which a reader may base an opinion on their respective virtues. Emelye is equally something of a cardboard-cutout, rather than a fully rounded character (compare her, for example, with the garrulous, fully-individualised Wife of Bath). The Knight describes her as a typical fairy-tale maiden though there is an interesting inversion of the usual formula in that her suitors, not her, are the ones imprisoned in a tower. She even first appears in a garden, a pastoral symbol that balances both purity and fertility.

Emelye proves a problematic character in the scheme of the story. Arcite and Palamon are prepared to fight to the death for her love, despite the fact that neither have had any significant contact with her, nor have any idea whether she would love either man. Yet Theseus accepts this code of conduct and offers the queen's sister as a prize for the two men, whom he previously had imprisoned and had threatened with death only moments before.

The Knight's Tale adheres to traditional values of chivalric, knightly honor in which there are strict codes of behavior which one must follow. This code of chivalry is not necessarily polite and decent, and Chaucer is always keen to draw attention to how unheroic such behavior seems. Within the morality of the tale, for example, Theseus' sudden decision to ransack Thebes to right a wrong is perfectly acceptable as punishment for a transgression against the honor of the dead soldiers; modern and medieval readers alike might feel somewhat differently. Finding them fighting, Theseus condemns Arcite's and Palamon's actions not because they were fighting, but because they did not do so under the proper rules of a duel.

One interpretation of the tale might therefore see Chaucer as almost parodying

– showing the ridiculousness of – such masculine, chivalric codes. Or is Chaucer rather parodying the genre – romance – in which such actions

Notes

are endorsed? Immediately, in this first tale, the looming question of tone hangs over the tale. Where does the Knight's voice stop and Chaucer's begin? If there is parody involved in this tale, is it supposed to sit in Chaucer's mouth, or in the Knight's? The dramatic nature of the tales themselves make it extremely difficult to pin them down to a single, univocal interpretation.

Emelye is also the first of a series of interesting portrayals of females in the Tales. Emelye is, almost, a stereotype of a female character: though, significantly, her will is laid out as entirely separate to her actions. She does not wish to marry either of the knights, preferring a life of chastity to marriage. However, she acknowledges her role as a pawn in the situation, and accepts the destiny proscribed to her by the goddess Diana and the mortal king Theseus (even at the end, married off by Theseus, she receives the husband she explicitly does not desire).

The Knight, like the genre of the romance itself, has a tendency toward lush description, elaborate phrasing, and within his tale, things keep becoming displays of wealth and power. Each of the final events in the story is punctuated by great pageantry. Take, for example, the transformation of the simple duel between Arcite and Palamon into a gala event requiring the construction of a massive coliseum for two armies to wage war on one another, even bringing in the kings of two foreign nations. Other books tell the Knight's story "more playn" (1464), according to the tale, and we can quite believe it.

Yet it is precisely the dressed-up chivalry of the Knight's tale that makes it very difficult to discern precisely what answer it is proposing to its key question: "What is this world? What asketh men to have?"

Check your Progress-1

1. What does the Prologue tell in the audience?

.....
.....
.....

2. What did the Knight tell in his tale?

.....

2.4 THE CANTERBURY TALES SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF THE MILLER'S TALE

The Miller's Prologue

After the Knight finishes telling his story, it meets with the approval of the whole company. The Host then moves to the Monk (another high-status teller) to tell "somewhat to quite with the Knyghtes tale". It is at this point that the Miller, extremely drunk, interrupts "in Pilates voys", proclaiming that he has a tale that will quit the Knight's.

The Host tries to dissuade the Miller, telling him "thou art a fool", and that he is drunk – a statement with which the Miller immediately agrees. The Miller stWhat arts to introduce a tale about how a clerk "set the cappe of" (made a fool out of) a carpenter and his wife, but is immediately interrupted by the Reeve (himself a carpenter) who tries to silence him. The Miller, though, refuses to be dissuaded by the Reeve's argument that tales should not be told about adulterous wives, claiming that

An housbonde shal nat been inquisityf Of Goddes pryvetee, nor of his wyf.

Yet before the Miller's Tale itself begins, our narrator makes another interruption to the story's flow, repeating a sentiment he already voiced in the General Prologue: that the tale he is about to repeat is not his own, but the Miller's. Our narrator has no evil intent in rehearsing such a tale, but he must repeat all the tales told – otherwise, he will be falsifying his material. Thus, should any readers find it offensive, they should turn over the leaf and choose another tale. Men, the prologue finishes, should not "maken ernest of game"; find a serious moral in trivial things.

Notes

The Miller's Tale

A rich carpenter lived at Oxford, with his wife and a clerk, an impoverished student of astrology and constellations: this clerk was called "hende" (crafty, or cunning) Nicholas. The carpenter had recently wedded a wife, only eighteen years old, who he protected fiercely – because, as she was young and he old, he knew he might well be cuckolded.

One day, while the carpenter was at Osney, Nicholas fell to playing and teasing with this young wife, Alison, and caught her "by the queynte", telling her that he'd die for love of her and holding her hard by the hip-bones. She sprang away from him, refusing to kiss him, but he followed her, crying mercy and speaking fairly: and eventually, she agreed to sleep with him. However, the wife worried, as her husband was so jealous and protective, it would be difficult to find an opportunity – Nicholas resolved to beguile his master, and the two agreed to wait for an opportunity.

Another clerk in the parish, Absolon, who had curly, golden hair, was also mad with desire for Alison, and used to sing at her window at night-time, wooing her until he was woebegone. But, of course, there was no point in Absolon's wooing: Alison was so in love with Nicholas, that Absolon might as well go and whistle.

Meanwhile, Nicholas had come up with a plan. Nicholas told Alison to tell John (the carpenter) that he was ill, and lay in his chamber all weekend, until – on Sunday night – the carpenter sent his slave to knock on the door on check that Nicholas was in health. The slave looked through the keyhole, and seeing Nicholas' eyes gaping upward as if possessed, called to the carpenter, who – seeing Nicholas – panicked, and attributed Nicholas' state to his interest in astrology. Nicholas, he thought, had seen the secrets of God, and gone mad. Having ordered his slave to knock down Nicholas' door, the carpenter awoke Nicholas from his "trance" and the two began to speak. Nicholas (all going exactly to his plan) swore John to secrecy, and promised to tell him of Christ's counsel. John was aghast as Nicholas told him that, according to his reading of the moon, next Monday, a flood akin to Noah's flood would drown the world in less than an hour. With the carpenter terrified,

Nicholas proceeded to the next stage of his plan: that, in the manner of Noah, John was to take large wooden troughs, one for each for Nicholas, Alison and John, and hang them up in the roof (full of supplies) so that no-one can see them, sit in them, and wait. Then, when the water arrives, all John would have to do is take an axe, cut the cord, break a hole in the gable, and float away with his wife and his clerk intact.

Moreover, Nicholas continued, God had requested that, lying in their troughs on the Monday in question, nobody spoke a word - and the carpenter's and his wife's troughs should be hung far apart. The credulous carpenter instantly assented, and went off to make preparations, finding troughs and stocking up food.

Monday arrived, and, as night drew in, the three climbed up to the roof. In their troughs, the three of them prayed, and then the carpenter (probably worn out from all his business setting up the troughs) fell fast asleep, snoring. Nicholas and Alison sped down the ladder, and "withouten words mo they go on to bedde", where they remain until the "laudes" bell (a bell for a church service before daybreak) rang.

Absolon, meanwhile had got some information about John the carpenter, and, thinking that John was away from his house, went to sing to Alison and woo her at a low, hinged window which only came up to his breast height. After a first, gentle song, Alison appeared at the window and gave him short shrift - telling him that she loved somebody else, and warning him that she would "caste a ston" unless he went away. Absolon promised to go away if she would kiss him, once.

Alison tells Nicholas to be quiet and watch her: she then unlocks the window, and, as Absolon leans in to give her a kiss, she puts her naked ass out of the window, which Absolon kisses "ful savourly", feeling, as he does it, something rough and long-haired. "Tehee!" says Alison, and slams the window, and Nicholas and her openly mock Absolon from behind the window. Absolon hears it, and resolves to "quyte" the lovers.

Notes

Absolon, moving away from the window, continually says “allas!”, sometimes weeping like a beaten child. By the time he arrived at a blacksmith called don Gerveys, Absolon didn’t care a bean for Alison, and persuaded his friend to lend him the hot poker in the chimney. Holding it by the cold steel, Absolon returns to the carpenter’s window, and knocks again, promising Alison that he has brought her a ring which his mother gave him.

Nicholas had got up “to pisse”, and thought he would make the joke even funnier – pulling up the window, he put his ass out of the window for Absolon to kiss. Absolon then asked Alison to speak, so he can see where she is, and Nicholas, at this moment, lets fly a fart “as greet as it had been a thunder-dent”, so loud that it almost blinds Absolon. But Absolon was ready with his hot iron, and seized his chance, branding Nicholas’ arse. Nicholas, almost dying of his burning pain, cried out for “Water!”, and that cry, awoke John the carpenter from his slumber; thinking Nicholas referred to the flood “Water!”, John, sitting up “withouten wordes mo”, cut the cord with the axe, bringing everything crashing down from the roof, through the floors, until finally landed on the cellar floor, knocked out.

Nicholas and Alison ran out into the street, crying for attention, and the neighbors ran into look at John, who still lay swooning on the floor, pale and white, his arm broken by the huge fall. And, when he opened his mouth to explain himself, he was shouted down by Nicholas and Alison, who claimed he was mad, being frightened of something as ridiculous as Noah’s flood. People laughed at his fantasy, staring into the roof of his smashed house, and turning all of his hurt into a joke – and everything that John argued to preserve his dignity was ignored. Thus ends the Miller’s Tale.

ANALYSIS

“Game” and “erdest” are two important concepts in reading the Tales representing respectively jokiness, frivolousness and fun, and seriousness, morality and meaningfulness. Yet one of the things the

Miller's Tale makes clear is that it becomes very difficult to decide what is lighthearted fun and what is meaningful, moral telling. The story of John the carpenter is grounded in reality: the details of the story all make sense, and it appears to be set within a suburban, believable Oxford that Chaucer might have known. Yet the story itself is clearly a fabliau: and its sources confirm its debt to fabliau - a hugely elaborate trick, set up with huge care in the story, which snaps shut as the story ends. Immediately "realism" is juxtaposed with "fantasy".

The same problem is bequeathed directly to the reader at the end of the tale: when, after the glorious moment at which John comes crashing down through the roof, and our pleasure in Nicholas' elaborate trick stops, Chaucer suddenly focuses on John's pain. The result of the elaborate trick is an old man, lying unconscious, pale and wan, with a broken arm on his cellar floor - his house destroyed, his wife cuckolded. Is Chaucer doing precisely what the narrator tells us, at the end of the prologue, we musn't do, and making "ernest" of "game"? Maybe - and the Tales as a whole tread a careful, ambiguous line between the serious and the comic.

The same ambiguity of tone is applied to the Christian theme which runs throughout the tale. John the carpenter's plan involves floating up through the roof in his kneading tub when the flood comes; and yet the tale replaces his idealistic upward movement with a crashing downward movement, through his house to the cellar floor. Christian uplift is replaced with a rather damning fall. We might usefully compare this to the fall in discourse and in subject matter from the Knight's Tale to the Miller's Tale: a step downward for the tales themselves as a linear movement (as the Host seems to know full well) in Middle English class distinction - a noble knight to a churlish, drunken miller. Metaphorically speaking, John the carpenter isn't the only thing to come crashing down in this tale.

Is this, then, a blasphemous version of Christianity? Well, it all depends how seriously we read it. If we are offended by Absolon's devilish

Notes

transformation at the end of the tale (into a blackened devil carrying a flaming iron), or if we recognise the alignment of Alison and Nicholas with Adam and Eve (and the respective falls from grace which follow), then perhaps we might view the tale as deliberately depicting sin. And yet, even though the tale itself is a comic delight - and there is a tremendous amount of pleasure to be had from reading it - the Miller's Tale is far from a negative, anti-type example of sinners in action.

It's also instructive to note the pleasure of the trick in the Miller's Tale, and the fabliau trick rules it demonstrates. The plot within the tale is hugely clever and elaborate, studded with religious imagery: indeed, when John the Carpenter is mentioned as regularly leaving the house, you wonder why the two didn't just sleep together when he was out? The answer can only be because of the sheer pleasure in executing such a complex structure. The tale moves extremely quickly from plot point to plot point, and everyone (except - and this is significant - Alison) is outsmarted. Even ingenious Nicholas ends up wounded on the buttock. In fabliau, you are only as good as your last trick.

Language is also undergoing a fall from grace in the Miller's Tale. Summarize the tale and note how little of its action depends on words or dialogue: unlike the long, protracted speeches of the Knight's Tale, the drunken Miller deals in bodily noises. The mechanics of the tale itself twist on a series of non-verbal sounds, bodily noises and one-word exclamations: Absolon's twice knocking at the window, Alison's cry of "Tehee!" as she closes the window the first time, and Nicholas' final, cumulative cry of "Water!". "Withouten wordes mo" is a key phrase in the Canterbury Tales - marking moments at which action is more important than words. The courtly language of the Knight becomes furtive, silent stealing to bed without words in the Miller's Tale.

The degradation - or the problematization - of the whole question of language is present throughout the tales, and draws our attention to the warning the narrator gives us before the Tale itself, that he is only "rehearsing" or repeating the words of the Miller. The narrator retells us

the words of the Miller, who, telling his tale, repeats the “Tehee!” and “Water!” of Alison and Nicholas.

What use – what poetry – what value have these second or third hand words? What do they signify? And most importantly, how far should we read them as belonging to the Miller, to the narrator, or to Chaucer himself?

There is a harder, more vengeful quality to this “quitting” tale, and, again, our attention is drawn to the anger of the teller in the Canterbury framework – how far does the bile of the vengeful Reeve seep into the telling of the story as Chaucer repeats it to us? Larry Benson supposes the Reeve’s Tale, like the Miller’s, based directly on a French fabliau, since two surviving fabliaux offer close parallels to Chaucer’s story, and yet the tone of the tale is quite different from that of the Miller’s.

What the Reeve’s Tale undoubtedly demonstrates is Seth Lerer’s observation that language becomes gradually broken down, gradually devalued as the first fragment progresses. Where the Knight’s courtly, formal language descended to the bodily noises of the Miller’s Tale, language in the Reeve’s Tale seems replaced altogether for the most part - by action. Symkyn’s wife and daughter are not persuaded into bed, or even seduced slightly, but just leapt upon. The denouement of the tale is a dumbshow played out in the dark: silent sex, moving cradles, and, eventually a brawl involving most of the participants on the floor. The graceful, formal, rhetoric of Theseus’ “First Mover” speech already seems a long way away.

Note too that no-one - and this is different even to the Miller's Tale - actually does any verbal persuading in words in the Reeve's Tale. The plot of the tale consists largely of moving things around: beginning with the release of the clerks' horse, followed by the hiding of their loaf of bread by the Miller, and then, of course, the various movements of the cradle at the bottom of the bed. Instead of words, we have another form of signification, in which objects carry certain meanings. The cradle, for example, (a neat symbol, considering what happens in the bed it delineates!) is used to dictate which bed is the miller’s and which not.

Notes

The meaning and the value of words and speaking is central to the Tales as a whole - and language in The Knight's Tale became verbal exclamations in The Miller's Tale, and, in The Reeve's Tale, is replaced by simple, physical signposts. Note too that the two clerks speak in a Northern dialect of Middle English, which might be seen to disintegrate the formality of the language even further: Chaucer, of course, claiming to repeat exactly the words in which someone told the tale, meticulously transcribes the dialect into the direct speech of the clerks.

“The feend is on me falle” (4288) the miller's wife cries out as the miller trips and falls onto her, and the idea of a fall – from grace, from the ceiling in a kneading trough, or from a horse – is key to the final twists of each of the Canterbury Tales told thus far. In a more metaphorical sense, too, we can see that the idea of man’s fall from paradise is replayed to some extent in the move from the romantic Knight’s Tale to the bawdy, human tales of the Miller and Reeve: it is a post-lapsarian, “real” world we are presented with.

One final question is the question of justice. How far is the justice delivered on Symkyn deserved – how far is it funny, how far a necessary justice, and how far is it trickery gone too far? Symkyn is struck out cold by his wife at the end of the tale, and yet Chaucer carefully includes the detail of the clerks beating him even when he lies unconscious. Do we laugh at this, or recoil from it?

Whose side are we on? Deceivers will be deceived: bad people should not expect good things, the Reeve tells us as his moral. But this simplistic justice doesn’t play out so simply within his tale: and the subversion and complication of ideas of justice will only continue through the Tales as a whole.

Check in progress 2

3. What does the miller tell in his tale?

.....
.....
.....

4. What type of analysis do you do from the Millers Tale?

.....
.....
.....

2.5 SUMMARY

The characters mentioned in the above play a vital role in Canterbury Tales. Characters of this literary poetry have been portrayed in such a way that it brings out the mind-set of the people of the medieval period and also the way society worked. The Knight and Miller tell their story and Chaucer brings out their character through their speech.

2.6 KEYWORDS

- Disintegrated – to separate into parts
- Deceivers – to mislead by a false appearance.
- Trickery – to fool others through tricks
- Factions – a group or party or government
- Exultation – the act of exulting
- Credulous – willing to believe or trust too readily.
- Assented – to agree with something
- Complication – involving in difficult conditions.
- Medieval – middle age
- 10. Subversion – an act or instance of subverting

2.7 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

Analyse the characters of the Knight and the Miller in your own words. Explain how the medieval time is brought out in the poem. 3. Chaucer through the speech make the analysis of character.

2.8 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

Chaucer Bibliography Online

Geoffrey Chaucer at the *Encyclopædia Britannica*

Works by Geoffrey Chaucer at Project Gutenberg

Works by or about Geoffrey Chaucer at Internet Archive

Works by Geoffrey Chaucer at LibriVox (public domain audiobooks)

Poems by Geoffrey Chaucer at PoetryFoundation.org

Early Editions of Chaucer

BBC television adaptation of certain of *The Canterbury Tales*

Geoffrey Chaucer on *In Our Time*

2.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1.The narrator opens the General Prologue with a description of the return of spring. He describes the April rains, the burgeoning flowers and leaves, and the chirping birds. Around this time of year, the narrator says, people begin to feel the desire to go on a pilgrimage.

2.The Knight begins his tale with the story of Theseus, a prince, who married Hippolyta, the queen of Scythia, and brought her and her sister, Emelye, back to Athens with him after conquering her kingdom of Amazons.

3.A rich carpenter lived at Oxford, with his wife and a clerk, an impoverished student of astrology and constellations: this clerk was called “hende” (crafty, or cunning) Nicholas. The carpenter had recently wedded a wife, only eighteen years old, who he protected fiercely – because, as she was young and he old, he knew he might well be cuckolded.

4. Deceivers will be deceived: bad people should not expect good things, the Reeve tells us as his moral. But this simplistic justice doesn't play out so simply within his tale: and the subversion and complication of ideas of justice will only continue through the Tales as a whole.

UNIT - 3: CANTERBURY TALES PART 2

STRUCTURE

- 3.0 Objectives
- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 The Cook and His Character
- 3.3 The Man of Law and His Character
- 3.4 Epilogue by the Judge
- 3.5 The Wife of the Bath –Analysis
- 3.6 Discussion between Summoner and the Frair
- 3.7 Summoner’s Tale
- 3.8 Summary
- 3.9 Keywords
- 3.10 Questions for Review
- 3.11 Suggested Readings and References
- 3.12 Answers to Check Your Progress

3.0 OBJECTIVES

After learning this unit based on Introduction to Race, you can learn about the following topics:

Study and analyse the character of the Cook.

Character Analysis of the Man of Law

Epilogue of the Man of law.

Character analysis of The Wife of Bath

Conversation of Two characters.

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In Medieval England, most people were illiterate. This is why Church stain glass windows and wall paintings depict bible stories- it helped the congregation follow the biblical stories. If you were lucky enough to receive an education, however, then you would have learnt French and Latin, the language of the Court and the Church. Chaucer, due to his

family's wealth and connection, was one of the fortunate people who learnt to read and write.

Chaucer was not a professional writer but wrote for pleasure, for his own amusement and that of his family and friends. His poetry was a great favourite of the King's. Chaucer wrote in Middle English, writing works such as *Troilus and Criseyde* and *House of Fame*. Though not the first to write in the vernacular, he appears to be instrumental in popularising it. Whilst working as Controller of Customs and Justice of Peace in 1386, however, he began writing his most famous works- *The Canterbury Tales*.

The Canterbury Tales, written in a combination of verse and prose, tells the story of some 30 pilgrims walking from Southwark to Canterbury on a pilgrimage to the shrine of St Thomas Beckett. On route, the pilgrims engage in a story telling competition to win a meal at the Tabard Inn! Thus, *The Canterbury Tales* is a collection of 24 stories, told as the pilgrims make their journey to Canterbury Cathedral.

Chaucer's work is not simply a story; *The Canterbury Tales* is also a comment on English society at the time. The very fact that Chaucer wrote in English demonstrates his dismissal of accepted practices. Chaucer's characters offer various social insights and raise various questions concerning social class, spirituality and religion. The work was unfinished when Chaucer died.

3.2 ANALYSIS OF THE COOK'S TALE

The Cook's Prologue

Roger of Ware, the Cook, claps the Reeve on the back "for joye". Delighted with the way Symkyn the miller had received his comeuppance in the tale, the Cook then promises a tale of his own, despite the fact that he is only a "povre man" (a poor man). The Host answers, granting Roger the next tale. But he adds "looke that it be good", and comments on Roger's tendency to draw the gravy out of unsold pies, and resell pies that have already been reheated twice in his shop, full of flies.

The Host's conclusion incites Roger the Cook to tell a story "in game" (in jest, in fun).. Roger agrees, and, reminding Harry Bailly (the Host)

Notes

not to be angry, particularly because his tale is about a “hostileer” (pub-owner, like the Host himself), he begins his tale.

The Cook’s Tale

Once an apprentice lived in “our city” (perhaps “Ware” in Hertfordshire – the town the Cook is from) and his craft was selling food. He was a short man, with a dark complexion and black hair – and he was an excellent dancer: so good, that people called him “Perkin Reveller” (to “revel” is to dance and have a good time).

He loved the tavern better than his shop, and, whenever there was a procession in Cheapside, he would run out of the shop to enjoy himself and dance, forgetting about work. He often stole from his master, with whom he lived until he had finished his apprenticeship. However, one day, his master sent for him, and quoting the proverb “It is better to take the rotten apple out of the bag than to have it rot all the other apples”, decided to get rid of him.

Now this jolly apprentice had his leave, and could riot all night if he so pleased

– and eventually, he found board with a companion of his own sort: who loved dice, and reveling, and pleasure. This companion had a wife who, for the sake of appearances only, kept a shop – and had sex for a living. Thus – abruptly – ends the Cook’s Tale.

Analysis

Thus ends the first fragment of the Canterbury Tales with a tale that breaks off before it has really gets anywhere - and the real question is whether the tale is deliberately left unfinished by Chaucer, whether he intended to return to it, or whether we have just lost some of the manuscript. There are no definite answers, unfortunately, and critics have argued for all three positions.

That said, there are a few interesting things about the tale as we have it. Firstly, Roger of Ware seems to have been a real person who lived at the same time as Chaucer. This lends a whole new aspect to the Canterbury Tales, if we consider that Chaucer might have populated his pilgrimage with real people, whom his audience might have recognized. The whole question, raised already in other tales, of reality versus fiction, takes on a deeper level when we consider that Chaucer is not the only pilgrim to have a dual existence - in the real world and within the fictional one. Might this tale be in some way a parody or a joke at the real Roger's expense? It's very possible, but impossible to prove.

Seth Lerer has persuasively argued that – like many other of Chaucer's works, including “The House of Fame”, and “The Legend of Good Women” – there is a very real possibility that the Cook's Tale might have been left deliberately unfinished. It is, Professor Lerer argues, a tale which breaks off just at the point where we understand what sort of tale it is to be – a grim, gritty tale about a prostitute and a drunken, good-for-nothing apprentice. The trajectory from the formal, fictionalized, stylish romance of the Knight's Tale, down through the fabliaux of the Miller and Reeve hits rock-bottom with a realistic tale about a real Cook and animal copulation in exchange for money. We don't hear the Cook's Tale told: but we know all too well what sort of thing is to come next - and so language disintegrates completely at the end of the First Fragment.

Formal language was replaced by bodily noises in the Miller's Tale, language was replaced by action in the Reeve's Tale, and now language stops altogether. The whole project of the Tales comes to a dead standstill.

3.3 THE CANTERBURY TALES SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF THE MAN OF LAW'S TALE

Introduction to The Man of Law's Tale

Notes

The Host, realizing that time is moving on, reminds the pilgrims that, while lost cattle can be found, lost time never returns. Addressing the Man of Law (a lawyer, in modern terms) in a mock-legal way, the Host asks him to tell the next tale, and “stonden in this cas at my juggement” (a joke, for the Host, of course, is to judge which tale is the best).

“Host”, the Man of Law, replies, “To breke forward is nat myn entente”, and reiterating that he does not break agreements, agrees to tell the tale. But, the Man of Law continues, “I kan right now no thrifty tale seyn” (I have no suitable tale now to tell [say]), because Chaucer – excellent at metre and at coming up with clever rhymes – has already told them all in one book or another. The Man of Law then recites a little list of Chaucer’s (actual!) works so far: Ceyx and Alcione (in *The Book of the Duchess*), and the Legend of Good Women – noting that Chaucer has never told a tale about wicked Canacee, who sinfully had an incestuous relationship with her own brother. Nor will the Man of Law tell a tale about her either.

“I speke in prose”, the Man of Law continues, juxtaposing himself with the poet, Chaucer, and then with a good cheer begins his tale.

The Prologue of The Man of Law’s Tale

The Prologue begins by lamenting the condition of poverty; it makes a person steal, beg or borrow for money, it makes a person blame Christ, and it makes a person jealous of his neighbour. If you are poor, the Prologue continues, your brother hates you, and all your friends fly from your side. The Prologue then finally addresses “rich marchauntz”, who are always happy, because they are always rich – before the Man of Law’s personal voice seems to segue in, adding that he would be without a tale to tell, had he not heard a tale from a merchant, many years ago.

The Man of Law’s Tale

In Syria there dwelt a company of wealthy traders who made a journey to Rome. After a certain time there, they heard of the beauty of Constance, the emperor's daughter, renowned equally for her virtue, her goodness and her beauty. When they had seen her themselves, the merchants returned to Syria, and reported to the sultan, who was immediately taken with lust and wonder for Constance.

The sultan met with his advisors and told them of his intent, but they could conceive of no way that he could marry Constance, for no Christian emperor would allow his daughter to marry a Muslim. "Rather than I lese / Custance, I wol be cristned" (Rather than I lose / Constance, I will be christened) answered the sultan, and, insisting that his baronage were christened with him, the sultan set about having his court christened.

The Roman Emperor heard of the sultan's desire, and agreed to it, organizing a huge amount of pomp and circumstance for the occasion. The day arrived for Constance to depart, and everyone prepared themselves. But Constance, overcome with sorrow, arose from bed and dressed to depart, knowing that there was no other way things could be.

It is no wonder, the narrator comments, that she wept, considering that she was being sent to a foreign country, away from her friends, to be married to someone she had never met. Constance then addressed her father, sad to leave him and go to the "Barbre nacioun" (pagan land), hoping that she would fulfill Christ's behest, continuing

I, wrecche woman, no fors though I spille! (I am just a wretched woman, and it doesn't matter if I die)

Wommen are born to thralldom and penance, (women are born to slavery and suffering)

And to been under mannes governance. (and to live under men's governing)

Notes

Constance was brought to the ship, and desperately trying to put on a brave face, sailed away.

Meanwhile, the Sultan's mother, "welle of vices" (a well of vice), who knew her son's intention, called her counsellors to her and told them that she would rather die than renounce Mohammed's law (and Islam). Each man swore to live and die with her, and she instructed them to be baptized as her son had ordered ("Cooold water shal nat greve us but a lite!")

The first part of the tale ends with a damning of the Sultanesse, the "roote of iniquitee", as the Sultan agrees to do her the honor of having the Christians to feast at her table.

(II)

The Christians arrived in Syria with a great and solemn crowd, and, after many celebrations, the time came for all of the Christian folk, along with the Sultan's entourage, to feast at the Sultanesse's house. The tale breaks off to mourn "sodeyn wo, that evere art successour / To worldly blisse" (sudden woe, which is always the successor of worldly bliss) before revealing that every one of the Christians and the Sultan were knifed and cut to pieces at the table. There was now in Syria no-one who had converted to Christianity – only Constance survived.

The Sultanesse's men took Constance and put her in a ship without a rudder, bidding her to learn to sail out of Syria and back to Italy. She had a certain amount of treasure on board, and the men had supplied her with food and with clothes - and forth she sailed across the sea. Constance blessed herself and said a prayer to Christ's cross. At this point the story breaks back to narrative again, and the Man of Law (or Chaucer) raises the question of why Constance was not also killed at the feast – answering it with another question: who saved Daniel in the lion's den? Christian God is the answer to both.

The ship finally crashed on the shores of Northumberland. The warden of a nearby castle found Constance and gave her shelter, but she refused to reveal her identity. He and his wife, Dame Hermengyld, were pagans, but Constance soon secretly converted the wife to Christianity. In this heathen land, Christians could only practice their faith in secret. While walking on the beach, Constance, Hermengyld and her husband came upon a blind Christian, who identified her without his eyes. Although Hermengild feared that her husband would reproach her for attempting the conversion, this miracle converted him too to Christianity.

The warden was not the lord of the castle. Instead, it was Alla, the king of Northumberland. A young knight, influenced by Satan, fell in love with Constance, but she would not return her favors. In an attempt to exact revenge upon her, he broke into the bedchamber where Constance and Dame Hermengyld slept, slit Hermengyld's throat and placed the knife beside Constance. Soon after the warden came home with Alla and found his wife murdered. Taking her before King Alla, who was told all the circumstances of Constance's arrival in Northumberland, the false knight (who killed Hermengyld) insisted that Constance had done the murder.

The people spoke out on her behalf, unable to believe that Constance had done the crime; and this provoked the king to inquire further into the circumstances of what had happened. Constance fell to her knees and prayed, looking around her for help. "Now hastily do fecche a book", King Alla commanded, deciding that, if the knight swore on the book that Constance was responsible, he would think carefully about his decision. A book was brought, and, the knight swore on it that Constance was guilty - at that time, a hand struck him down on the neck-bone, and he fell down like a stone, both of his eyes bursting out of his face.

Witnessing this miracle, the king – "and many another in that place" – was converted to Christianity., and decided to take Constance for his wife. But, who was upset about this wedding but Donegild, the knight's mother? She thought her heart had broken in two. In the meantime, the

Notes

couple were wedded, and Constance gave birth to a boy, named Mauricius, while Alla was away in Scotland fighting. A messenger, taking the news to the king, was forestalled by the queen who insisted he stayed with her that night, and, while he was asleep, replaced his letters with forged ones. Her letters claimed that Constance's baby was foul and wicked; and when Alla wrote back that he vowed to love the child regardless, Donegild replaced his letter with an order to banish Constance and her child from the land on the same boat from which they came.

(III) When Alla returned home, he learned what had happened and murdered his mother for her cruelty, and for being a traitor. But Constance had already set sail, and washed up in another heathen land, where the warden's steward came on board her ship, telling her that he would be her lover whether she liked it or not. Her child cried, and Constance cried also; but the Virgin Mary came to her aid, and, in the struggle that ensued, the steward fell overboard and drowned in the sea.

Returning to Syria, the emperor of Rome had sent an army, hearing of the slaughter of Christians by the sultanness, and, having burnt, slain and avenged themselves on the heathen people, this army was now returning homeward to Rome. The senator in charge of the army met Constance in her ship, and, not knowing who she was, brought her home to Rome, where she stayed for a "longe tyme".

King Alla, having slain his mother, had come to Rome to receive his penance and seek Christ's forgiveness for the wickedness he had performed. The rumor spread through Rome of how Alla was to come in pilgrimage, and this senator came to do him reverence. Constance's son went in the entourage of the senator to feast with King Alla.

The child stood at the feast, looking into the king's face; Alla then asked the senator whose the child was. "A mooder he hath", replied the senator, "but fader hath he noon", and told him the story of how the child was found.

Remembering Constance's face, and seeing the resemblance in her child's face, Alla sped from the table as soon as he could, debating with himself about the hallucination he thought he was having. But afterwards, the senator sent for Constance, and, when Alla saw his wife, he wept, because it had come true.

Constance stood as dumb as a tree, stiff with emotion, when she remembered his unkindness: which he soon explained had not been of his doing. When all was explained, they kissed a hundred times, and were blissfully happy.

The Emperor had granted that King Alla could dine with him; and, as she saw her father in the street, Constance laid down at his needs, and explained to him who she was. There was such joy between the three of them that it cannot be described.

Later, Constance's child Maurice was made Emperor by the Pope, but, the narrator reiterates, "Of Custance is my tale specially". Constance and Alla came to England to live in joy and in peace, but sadly, only a year after they had been reunited, Death took King Alla from the world. Constance, at the very end of the tale, widowed, makes her way again to Rome, to find her father and praise God.

Check your progress 1:

What did the cook mention in his story?

.....
.....
.....

What do you understand about the character of the Man of the law?

.....
.....
.....

3.4 EPILOGUE TO THE MAN OF LAW'S TALE

“This was a thrify tale for the nones!” proclaims the Host, happy with the Man of Law’s tale, before turning to the “Parisshe Priest” to tell the next tale. The Parson then rebukes the Host for swearing blasphemously, only to be mocked in turn by the Host as a “Jankin” (a derisive name for a priest) and a “Lollard” (a heretic). The Host, announcing that the “Lollard” will do some preaching, is interrupted by the Shipman, who objects to the idea of the Parson glossing the gospel and teaching. He promises a tale which will “clynk” like a merry bell, and wake up all the company. But, the Shipman continues, there will be no philosophy or legal matters in his tale (unlike in the Man of Laws) – “ther is but litel Latyn in my mawe!” (there is only a little bit of Latin in my stomach”).

Analysis

There’s another moment at the very start of the Man of Law’s Prologue, in which the boundary between fiction and reality once again seems extremely blurred: the “Geffrey Chaucer” who exists as a character on the Canterbury pilgrimage is ascribed the bibliography of the Chaucer we are reading by the Man of Law, who cites works we know that the “real” Chaucer actually wrote. Once again, the Tales pretend to a real, documentary status, as if they are dramatizing or merely reporting word for word true events, and real people – and our narrator, Chaucer, seems to elide the fictional world with the reader’s world.

The Man of Law, then, a “lawyer” is someone concerned with the laws and rules that hold in place the real world, and – at least, so the General Prologue tells us – he knows by heart all the lines of the common law: “every statu koude he pleyn by rote”. Carolyn Dinshaw, the excellent feminist critic, has written that the Man of Law is indeed “of law”, made up of law, his head filled up with laws; and moreover, she reads the tale of Constance as asserting the status quo of Chaucer’s world at the time the tale was written.

Women, Dinshaw argues, were a matter of business in the middle ages, and – particularly as the marriage of a daughter could produce a strong link between two merchants or families – children were an important financial asset.

Constance, then, first appearing in the tale as a tale told by merchants, is effectively sold forth by her father; the marriage is actually dealt with as if it were a business deal. The Prologue to the tale tells us that the Man of Law even heard this tale from a merchant: and it is not a huge leap to make from the business of merchants, trading goods back and forward across the sea, to Constance, sent from Rome to Syria, to Northumberland, to another heathen land, and eventually back to Rome. Constance, in other words, serves as “goods”, saleable, valuable, and whose value, appropriately, remains constant.

Dinshaw then relates the tale as a whole to that end of the Chaucer bibliography the Man of Law recites in the prologue: the final lines where he disdains to tell a tale concerning incest. The Man of Law’s Tale is indeed full of contradictions: in Dinshaw’s words

“He promises to tell a tale in prose, for example, but instead we get a poem in rime royal. The “poverte” Prologue seems to have only the barest, most expedient relation to the Tale itself.... Most puzzling of them all is the Man of Law’s specific insistence, on the one hand, that he will not tell a tale of incest, and his choice, on the other hand, of a narrative whose motivation in well- known analogues is, in fact, incest...”

(Carolyn Dinshaw, *Chaucer’s Sexual Poetics*, p.88)

The critic Margaret Schlauch has suggested persuasively that in all of the sources to the Man of Law’s tale, Constance’s father makes sexual demands upon his daughter, and Dinshaw wonders whether Constance might be escaping from a father with incestuous desires. What, we might ask, is the relevance of this incest theme to the idea of Constance as a mercantile pawn?

Notes

Levi-Strauss has the answer. If marriage (and the marital sex it makes permissible) is a pawn in a merchant's transaction, and the social order is maintained through trading women and trading marriage, then forbidding incest is the best way to maintain that order. For a daughter – a father's mercantile asset – is no longer an asset in circulation if the father sleeps with her himself. Incest breaks down the idea of a woman as something to be traded: breaks down, in short, the law.

Dinshaw's interpretation is a fascinating one, and one which ties together the prologue and the tale, as well as some of the key notions explored about female identity in the Tales: (i) the idea of the woman as something to be traded, as merchandise, (ii) the idea of a patriarchal society keen to keep women "in circulation", and (iii) the idea of the woman as duplicitous and evil, as presented by the two malicious mothers. What it misses, however, is the over-riding religious nature of the tale; and the good fortune visited on Constance (herself, literally a child of Rome) for maintaining her Christian faith.

Yet Constance is not simply merchandise. Chaucer's – and the Man of Law's tale – also keeps "Constance", (or "a Constance", in precisely the way that "Geffrey" is "a Chaucer") in circulation; within the context of the tale-telling game, it uses Constance's story as a potential avenue for profit. There is an interesting moment early in the first part of the tale when Constance is described as "pale", as if, pre-marriage, she is white, blank, hardly visible. The tale itself dresses Constance - clothes her, and makes her palatable to an audience in order to exchange her - and remember that "text", "textile" and "cloth" (a major piece of merchandise in the Middle Ages) have shared linguistic roots.

Perhaps part of the reason that the tale is the "Man of Law's" and not the "Lawyer's" is precisely to emphasize the fact that Constance, exchanged by men for profit within the tale, is also being exchanged by a Man within the tale-telling framework. The Man of Law and Chaucer, by writing Constance's story, contribute to the way she is exchanged and re-

presented as a feminine symbol within it. Writing a woman is to make her the creation of a man; an idea worth emphasizing before the next tale – the Wife of Bath’s, which takes this idea several stages further - begins.

3.5 THE CANTERBURY TALES SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF THE WIFE OF BATH'S TALE

Prologue to the Wife of Bath's Tale

“Experience”, even if no written authorities existed in the world, “is right ynogh for me”. Thus begins the voice of the Wife of Bath. She has certainly had “experience”, and is keen to justify it against biblical authority. She has had five husbands and justifies it in scripture: Christ never taught that people should only be married once, the Bible says “go forth and multiply”, and Solomon had more than one wife. The Wife’s husbands, picked out by their “chestes” and “nether purs”, have all been good men, and she is looking forward to the sixth. She also points out that Jesus never lays down a law about virginity, and essentially states that we have the parts for sex and should use them as such: “they were nat maad for noght”.

Scripture, the Wife points out, can be interpreted “bothe up and doun” – you can argue that genitals are for purgation of urine, or to tell the female from the male, and for nothing else. The Wife then states again that she will “use myn instrument” whenever her husband decides he wants to “paye his dette”. Her husband, the Wife continues, shall be both her “dettour and my thral” (debtor and slave) and that she would mark it on his flesh.

At this point, the Pardoner interrupts, claiming he was about to marry a wife and that the Wife has put him off – and she advises him to listen to her tale before making a judgement, and looks like beginning it, before going off on another tangent, silencing the Pardoner altogether.

Three of the Wife’s husbands were good, and two were bad: the three were good, rich and old (and impotent!) and they gave the Wife all their

Notes

land, which resulted in her withholding sex from them in order to get exactly what she wanted. Women, the Wife continues, can lie and steal better than any man. She reveals her tactic for manipulating her husbands – deliberately attacking her husband with a whole fistful of complaints and several biblical glossing (for justification) and starting an argument, with the result of her getting what she wants. By accusing her husband of infidelity, the Wife disguised her own adultery – even calling her maid and Jankin in false witness to back her up.

The Wife also got money out of her husbands by claiming that, if she were to sell her “bele chose” (sexual favours), she would make more money than they lavished on her. Thus the Wife treated her first three husbands, the three, good, old, rich men. The Wife’s fourth husband was a reveler and had a mistress as well as a wife. He was a match for the Wife of Bath, sharing some of her qualities, but he soon died.

The fifth husband was the most cruel to her: kind in bed but otherwise violent, beating her viciously. He could “glose” (gloss – persuade – flatter) her extremely well when he wanted to have sex, and she loved him best, because he played hard to get with her. He had been a student at Oxford, and came to be a boarder at the home of the Wife's best friend, Alison, while she was still married to husband number four. Soon after he died, she married Jankin (number five) who was, at twenty, exactly half the Wife's age.

Very regularly, Jankin read his book of “wikked wyves”, a compilation volume of anti-feminist literature, containing works from Valerius and Theophrastus, St. Jerome, Tertullian, Solomon, and many others. The Wife interrupts herself to express her anger at the anti-feminist portrayals of women in books written by male clerks – and wishes that women “hadde written stories” like clerks have, in order to redress balance. Then, her story continues: Jankin was reading aloud from his book by the fire, and the Wife, fed up that he would never finish reading his “cursed book al nyght”, tore out three pages, punching him in the face so that he fell backward into the fire. Jankin got up fast and hit her on the head with his fist, knocking her to the floor, where she lay as if dead. “Hastow slayn me, false theef?” the Wife bellow when she awoke, “and for my

land thus hastow mordred me?” (Have you killed me, false thief? And have you murdered me to get my land?”). Jankin, of course, then begged her forgiveness; and the Wife made him burn his book right there.

Having gained for herself all of the “maistrie” (mastery, control, dominance), Jankin then begged her to keep all of her own land, and – after that day – they never argued again. The Wife was true to him, and he to her, and she was extremely generous to him. At this point, the Wife announces again that she is to tell her tale.

Check your progress 2:

3. What did the Man of law tell in his epilogue?

.....

4. Write a small character sketch of the Wife of Bath?

.....

3.6 THE WORDS BETWEEN THE SUMMONER AND THE FRIAR

The Friar laughs to hear everything that the Wife has said, commenting that it is a “long preamble of a tale” (a long prologue to a tale) – and when the Summoner hears the Friar’s voice, he attacks him, commenting that friars are notorious for their long-windedness, telling him to “go sit down!”. The Friar promises, in revenge, to tell a tale about a summoner to make everyone laugh. The Host quiets them down, and encourages the Wife to tell her tale.

The Wife of Bath's Tale

The Wife of Bath's Tale tells a story from a distant time, when King Arthur ruled the nation and when elves used to run around impregnating women. However, the Wife immediately digresses: now friars have taken the place of elves - they are now the copulating, evil spirits.

Notes

King Arthur had a knight who, when riding home one day from hawking, found a maiden walking alone and raped her. This crime usually held the penalty of death, but, in court, the queen intervened and begged her husband to spare the knight, promising the knight that she would grant his life if he could answer the question "What do women most desire?" She gave him one year to find the answer.

The knight went on a journey but could find no satisfactory answer; some said wealth, others jollity, some status, others a good lover in bed. Despondent that he might not find his answer, the knight was mournful, when, riding beside a forest on his way back to his home, he saw a dance of twenty-four ladies.

Approaching them, they vanished, and in their place, the knight found a hideous old woman, the "lothly lady", to whom he put his question. She agreed to give the answer and assured him that it was the right one, but would only tell him the answer if he would do the next thing that she required of him. When the knight agreed, she whispered in his ear.

When they arrived at court, the knight faced the queen again, and told him that women desired to have sovereignty and "to been in maistrie" (to be in mastery) above their husbands. The lothly lady then spoke up before the court, announcing the knight's pledge, and asking him to take her for his wife. The knight, although now pardoned, was miserable that he had to marry such an old crone, but there was no way for him to get out of it.

Privately, the knight wedded the lothly lady the next day, and the two of them lay in bed. She realized his unhappiness, and confronted him about it. He criticized her for not only being old and ugly, but low-born. She scoffed at his snobbery as a definition and defended her poverty as irrelevant to God. She then gave him a choice, making him see both sides of the argument. Either he could have her as an old and ugly wife who would be entirely faithful to him; or he could have her as a young and fair wife, who would probably cuckold him.

The knight sighed sorely, and thought, but finally told his wife to choose herself whichever option would bring most honor to the two of them. “Thanne have I gete of yow maistrie” (In that case, I’ve got mastery over you) she said – and the knight agreed that she had. The lothly lady asked him to kiss her and “cast up the curtyn” (lift up the curtain) to look on her face – she had transformed into a young and beautiful woman. They lived happily ever after: and, the Wife concludes, let Christ grant all women submissive husbands who sexually satisfy their wives, and let Christ kill all men who will not be governed by their wives.

ANALYSIS

The Wife of Bath is one of Chaucer’s most enduring characters, and rightly, one of the most famous of any of the Canterbury pilgrims. Her voice is extremely distinctive – loud, self-promoting, extremely aggressive – and her lengthy prologue silences the Pardoner and the Friar (who is then parodied at the start of the Tale) for daring to interrupt her. One of the key issues for interpreting the Wife’s tale historically has been the relationship between prologue and tale: some critics have found in the Wife’s fairy-tale ending a wistful, saddened dreaminess from an elderly woman whose hopes for a sixth husband might turn out to be futile. Other critics have treated the tale as a matter of “maistrie” and control, arguing that the Wife’s tale, starting as it does with a rape (a man physically dominating a woman), is deeply ambiguous at its close about precisely whose desire is being fulfilled. Surely there is little point in the woman having the maistrie if all she is to do with it is to please her husband?

Yet it seems to me that the Wife’s tale and prologue can be treated as one lengthy monologue, and it is the voice we attribute that monologue too which proves impossible to precisely define. The Wife’s tale inherits the issue of the woman as literary text (Constance, in the Man of Law’s tale, was “pale”, like paper waiting to be written on, and used as an exchangeable currency by the merchants and – perhaps – by the Man of

Notes

Law) and develops it. Text, and the interpretation of text is absolutely central to the Wife of Bath's Tale. The General Prologue describes her as being swathed in textile, and, of course, "textere", the Latin verb meaning "to weave" is the key to a close relationship between "cloth" and "text" in the Middle Ages. For the Wife, as well as being excellent at spinning a tale, is also excellent at spinning cloth – and is surrounded, problematically in text in just the way the Prologue has her covered in cloth. When, at the very end of her tale, the lothly lady implores her husband to "cast up the curtyn" and see her as she really is, she highlights one of the key problems in the tale: it is very difficult to ascertain precisely where fiction stops and reality begins.

The Wife claims to represent female voices – and her tale consists of a set of women representing each other. The raped maiden is represented by the queen, who in turn is represented by the lothly lady, who in turn becomes a beautiful lady: the image which precedes her appearance is, appropriately, twenty four ladies apparently vanishing into one. The Wife speaks on behalf of women everywhere: and against the male clerks who have written the antifeminist literature that Jankin reads in his book of wikked wyves.

It is odd then, that the Wife, who claims to stand for "experience", spends much of her prologue dealing with written "authority", glossing the Bible in precisely the manner she criticizes the clerks for doing. The Wife is against text, but expert in text; against clerks, but particularly clerical; and, of course, venomous about anti-feminist literature, but also made up of anti-feminist literature. When the Wife throws Jankin's book in the fire, she is in fact burning her own sources (Jerome, Theophrastus et. al) which constitutes a bizarre act of literary self-orphanage. It is as if she burns her own birth certificate.

When you notice too that the Wife (whose name is Alison) has as her only confidant another woman called Alison, there is an unusual sense that she might be talking only to herself. Add to that her almost uninterrupted monologue of tale and prologue – and the almost-

uninterrupted monologues of Jankin (reading from the book of wives) and the lothly lady's lengthy monologue on poverty and gentillesse – and you see that, in fact, the voice of the Wife does indeed take the “maistrie” in the tale itself. It entirely dominates the tale.

The Wife, then, is a far more complicated figure than simply a proto-feminist. She asks the key question herself: “Who peynted the leon, tel me who?”, referring to the old myth that, a lion, seeing the picture of a man triumphing over a lion, asked the rhetorical question which pointed out that the portrayal was biased as it had been painted by a man, not a lion. If the Wife's tale is a depiction of a woman triumphing over a man (and even that is not easy to decide) can it be similarly dismissed?

Perhaps. But of course, for all the Wife decries the clerical tradition and the clerks who leave out the good deeds of woman, she herself as a text is another example of a lecherous, lying, manipulative woman. She falls into the anti-feminist tradition she represents. This is even before you mention that the Wife is being written, at the very least ventriloquised, by Geoffrey Chaucer, a clerk and a man. Is this Chaucer's opinion of proto-feminism and a disavowal of the anti-feminist tradition? Or is Chaucer endorsing the anti-feminist tradition by giving it a mouthpiece which, in arguing against it, demonstrates all of its stereotypical arguments as fact?

Who painted the lion? Whose voice is the Wife's? Is she worthy of – as she does – speaking for women everywhere?

These are all huge, open, fascinating questions that demonstrate why the tale itself is so complex, and interesting to interpret. The key fact not to forget is that you can't have a Wife without a Husband. Whether married to Chaucer, whether Chaucer in drag, or whether a feminist persona all of her own, it's important to view the apparently proto-feminist Wife of Bath from a point of view which understands her strong links to the men in her fictional – and literary – lives.

3.7 THE CANTERBURY TALES

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF THE SUMMONER'S TALE

Prologue to the Summoner's Tale

The Summoner was enraged by the tale that the Friar told, quaking in anger. Since, he says, you have all listened to the Friar lie, please do listen to my tale. The Summoner claims that friars and fiends are one and the same. He tells a short anecdote in his prologue. One day, a friar was brought to hell and led up and down by angel, and was surprised to see no friars there. Are friars so graceful, he asked, that they never come to hell? The angel told him that many millions of friars came to hell, and led him directly to Satan. Satan had a tail as broad as a sailing ship, and the angel called to Satan to lift up his tail. Satan did, and twenty thousand friars swarmed out of his arse like bees from a hive.

The Summoner's Tale

A friar went to preach and beg in a marshy region of Yorkshire called Holderness. In his sermons he begged for donations for the church and afterward he begged for charity from the local residents. The Friar interrupts, calling the Summoner a liar, but is silenced by the Host.

Along went this friar, house by house, until he came to the house of Thomas, a local resident who normally indulged him, and found him ill. The friar spoke of the sermon he had given that day, commenting on the excellent way he had glossed the biblical text (and making the famous comment that “Glosynge is a glorious thyng”) - and essentially ordered a meal from Thomas's wife.

She told the friar that her child died not more than two weeks before. The friar claimed that he had a revelation that her child had died and entered heaven. He claimed that his fellow friars had a similar vision, for they are more privy to God's messages than laymen, who live richly on earth, as opposed to spiritual riches. The friar claimed that, among the clergy, only friars remain impoverished and thus are closest to God; and told Thomas

that his illness persists because he had given so little to the church. Thomas claimed that he had indeed given “ful many a pound” to various friars, but never fared the better for it. The friar, characteristically, is irritated that Thomas is not giving all of his money solely to him, and points out to him that a “ferthyng” (a farthing) is not worth anything if split into twelve. Continuing to lecture Thomas, the friar began a long sermon against anger (“ire”), telling the tale of an angry king who sentenced a knight to death, because, as he returned without his partner, the king automatically assumed that the knight had murdered him. When a third knight took the condemned knight to his death, they found the knight that he had supposedly murdered. When they returned to the king to have the sentenced reversed, the king sentenced all three to death: the first because he had originally declared it so, the second because he was the cause of the first's death, and the third because he did not obey the king.

Another ireful king, Cambises, was a drunk. When one of his knights claimed that drunkenness caused people to lose their coordination, Cambyses drew his bow and arrow and shot the knight's son to prove that he still had control of his reflexes. The friar then told of Cyrus, the Persian king who had the river Gyndes destroyed because one of his horses had drowned in it.

At the close of this sermon, the friar asked Thomas for money to build the brothers' cloister. Thomas, annoyed by the friar's hypocrisy, told the friar that he had a gift for him that he was sitting on, but that he would only receive it if he promised to split it up equally between each of the friars.

The friar readily agreed, and put his hand down behind Thomas' back, groping round – and Thomas let out a fart louder than a horse could make. The friar became immediately angry, and promised to repay Thomas for his fart, but, before he could, the servants of the house chased the friar out.

Notes

The enraged friar found the lord of the village and told him of the embarrassment he suffered, angrily wondering how he was supposed to divide a fart into twelve. The lord's squire spoke up with a suggestion, in return for a "gowne-clooth" from his master: take a cartwheel, and tell each of twelve friars to lay his nose at the end of a spoke. Then the friar of the tale could sit in the centre of the wheel and fart, and each of the spokes would carry the smell along to the rim – and therefore, divide it up between each of the friars.

Analysis

Chaucer carefully shows us the Summoner, quaking with anger, after hearing the Friar's Tale, and those pious readers who might have thought that the Friar's Tale veered close to the line of blasphemous sin would likely have been straight out offended by the Summoner's. It is a bilious, aggressive tale which does not even consider pulling its punches, and the Friar's contempt is roundly "quyt" with a full-on, unrelenting attack from the Summoner.

Anality is a key ingredient in the tale, potentially a reference to the possible interpretation of the General Prologue which argues that the Summoner and Pardoner are engaged in a homosexual relationship. Regardless of whether this reading is accepted, the prologue begins with a journey into the devil's arse, and the tale finds its resolution with the division of a fart, first from Thomas' arse, and then from the friar's.

This journey from arse to arse is only one of several ways in which the Summoner's Tale mechanically closes in on itself, in precisely the way that the friar within it manages to bring about his own humiliation. There is a neat irony in the way that the friar, after a lengthy lecture about anger management and doing away with "ire" (anger) then becomes absolutely furious, looking as if he were "a wilde boor". The structure of the tale has a "quitting"-like circularity to it.

This circularity also features in individual words: The Summoner's Tale operates on a series of clever puns. At the end of the tale, the division of the fart is a challenge, the lord remarks, in "ars-metrike" – in the art of

measurement, but, as Seth Lerer, points out, a challenge too in the metrics of the arse. Moreover, Jankin’s vision of the friars gathered at the spokes of a huge wheel is actually a parody of the Pentecost: the day where the twelve apostles receive the Holy Spirit as Christ ascends to heaven. It is, one might suggest, a reworking of religion entirely appropriate to the piety of the friar (and even the Summoner!) in question.

The most significant pun, however, is the most interesting. The friar in the tale berates Thomas, telling him that a “ferthyng” (a farthing coin) is not worth anything split into twelve; and, then, of course, he is paid for the tales he then tells with a farting, which he must split into twelve. The two words were likely homonyms in Middle English, and the punning extends the idea of quitting – which structures this tale and the Friar’s as a pair – down into the fabric of the tale itself.

Check your progress 3:

5. What did the summoner tell in his tale?

.....
.....
.....

6. What pun is used by the summoner?

.....
.....
.....

3.8 SUMMARY

In the above chapter we study the character Man of the Law. The Man of Law is an intelligent and discerning man who has been appointed as a judge. Being sought after by noblemen, he has made a great deal of money. The narrator says, 'So great

Notes

a purchaser was never known. All was fee simple to him, in effect, Therefore his claims could never be suspect. In medieval society, summoners brought people to the ecclesiastical court to confess their sins. He has a disgusting skin disease that makes his face pimpled and scaly. His outside appearance matches his inner corruption: he is very willing to be bribed in exchanged for a full pardon.

3.9 KEYWORDS

ferthyng- a farthing coin

Summoner- a person calls out

Pardoner- a person who pardons.

Unrelenting- swerving in determination or resolution.

Friar- a member of the Roman Catholic Church or religious order

Impregnating- to make pregnant

Imposing – putting something on with force

Incestuous –involving incest, being intimate

Pomp -magnificence

Bilious - irritable

3.10 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

Explain the epilogue of the man of the law in your own work?

Explain the words of the Summoner and write a character sketch of the summoner.

Explain the speech analysis of the Summoner and the Man of the Law.

3.11 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

Chaucer Bibliography Online

Geoffrey Chaucer at the *Encyclopædia Britannica*

Works by Geoffrey Chaucer at Project Gutenberg

Works by or about Geoffrey Chaucer at Internet Archive

Works by Geoffrey Chaucer at LibriVox (public domain audiobooks) 

Poems by Geoffrey Chaucer at PoetryFoundation.org

Early Editions of Chaucer

BBC television adaptation of certain of *The Canterbury Tales*

Geoffrey Chaucer on *In Our Time*

3.12 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. The cook tells his own story despite being a poor man. He had the craft was selling food. He was a short man, with a dark complexion and black hair – and he was an excellent dancer: so good, that people called him “Perkin Reveller”.

2. The Man of Law laments the condition of poverty; it makes a person steal, beg or borrow for money, it makes a person blame Christ, and it makes a person jealous of his neighbour. If you are poor, the Prologue continues, your brother hates you, and all your friends fly from your side.

3. The Man of Law, then, a “lawyer” is someone concerned with the laws and rules that hold in place the real world, and – at least, so the General Prologue tells us – he knows by heart all the lines of the common law: “every statu koude he pleyn by rote”. Carolyn Dinshaw, the excellent feminist critic, has written that the Man of Law is indeed “of law”, made up of law, his head filled up with laws; and moreover, she reads the tale of Constance as asserting the status quo of Chaucer’s world at the time the tale was written.

4. “Experience”, even if no written authorities existed in the world, “is right ynogh for me”. Thus begins the voice of the Wife of Bath. She has certainly had “experience”, and is keen to justify it against biblical authority. She has had five husbands and justifies it in scripture: Christ never taught that people should only be married once, the Bible says “go forth and multiply”, and Solomon had more than one wife.

Notes

5. The Summoner was enraged by the tale that the Friar told, quaking in anger. Since, he says, you have all listened to the Friar lie, please do listen to my tale. The Summoner claims that friars and fiends are one and the same. He tells a short anecdote in his prologue. One day, a friar was brought to hell and led up and down by angel, and was surprised

6. The most significant pun, however, is the most interesting. The friar in the tale berates Thomas, telling him that a “ferthyng” (a farthing coin) is not worth anything split into twelve; and, then, of course, he is paid for the tales he then tells with a farting, which he must split into twelve. The two words were likely homonyms in Middle English, and the punning extends the idea of quitting – which structures this tale and the Friar’s as a pair – down into the fabric of the tale itself. Finally addresses “rich marchauntz”, who are always happy, because they are always rich.

UNIT – 4 : CANTERBURY TALES – PART-3

STRUCTURE

- 4.0 Objectives
- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 Story of the Clerk
- 4.3 Tale of the Host
- 4.4 Story of the Merchant
- 4.5 Epilogue of the Merchant
- 4.6 The Squire's Tale
- 4.7 Franklin and Squire conversation
- 4.8 Summary
- 4.9 Keywords
- 4.10 Questions for Review
- 4.11 Suggested Readings and References
- 4.12 Answers to Check Your Progress

4.0 OBJECTIVES

After learning this unit based on Introduction to Race, you can learn about the following topics:

Study of the Clerk, Host and the Merchant.

Conversation between the characters

Epilogue of the Merchant.

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In Medieval England, most people were illiterate. This is why Church stain glass windows and wall paintings depict bible stories- it helped the congregation follow the biblical stories. If you were lucky enough to receive an education, however, then you would have learnt French and Latin, the language of the Court and the Church. Chaucer, due to his

Notes

family's wealth and connection, was one of the fortunate people who learnt to read and write.

Chaucer was not a professional writer but wrote for pleasure, for his own amusement and that of his family and friends. His poetry was a great favourite of the King's. Chaucer wrote in Middle English, writing works such as *Troilus and Criseyde* and *House of Fame*. Though not the first to write in the vernacular, he appears to be instrumental in popularising it. Whilst working as Controller of Customs and Justice of Peace in 1386, however, he began writing his most famous works- *The Canterbury Tales*.

The Canterbury Tales, written in a combination of verse and prose, tells the story of some 30 pilgrims walking from Southwark to Canterbury on a pilgrimage to the shrine of St Thomas Beckett. On route, the pilgrims engage in a story telling competition to win a meal at the Tabard Inn! Thus, *The Canterbury Tales* is a collection of 24 stories, told as the pilgrims make their journey to Canterbury Cathedral.

Chaucer's work is not simply a story; *The Canterbury Tales* is also a comment on English society at the time. The very fact that Chaucer wrote in English demonstrates his dismissal of accepted practices. Chaucer's characters offer various social insights and raise various questions concerning social class, spirituality and religion. The work was unfinished when Chaucer died.

4.2 THE CANTERBURY TALES SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF THE CLERK'S TALE

Prologue to the Clerk's Tale

The Host remarks that the Clerk of Oxford sits as coyly and quietly as a new-married bride, and tells him to be more cheerful: "Telle us som myrie tale!" ("tell us a merry tale"). The Host continues to argue that, when someone is entered into a game, they have to play by the rules of that game; and adds that he doesn't want a tale told in "heigh style", but spoken "pleyn".

The Clerk replies kindly that the Host has the "governance" over the company (is "in charge" of the company) and says that he will tell a tale

which he learned from a worthy clerk, Francis Petrarch, who is now dead and nailed into his coffin. He then praises the renowned Petrarch for his sweet rhetoric and poetry; though warns the company, before he begins, that Petrarch wrote a poem in a “high style” exalting the Italian landscape.

The Clerk's Tale

(I)

The tale begins with the description of Saluzzo, a region at the base of Mount Viso in Italy. There was once a marquis of this region named Walter. He was wise, noble and honorable, but his mind was always on seeking immediate pleasures – turning aside more worthy pastime, and even refusing to marry.

The people of his realm confronted him about his steadfast refusal, pleading with him to take a wife, so that his lineage could continue (and so that his son could continue his work in the event of his death). They offer to choose for him the most noble woman in the realm for his wife. He agrees to marry, but makes this one condition: he will marry whomever he chooses, regardless of birth, and his wife shall be treated with the respect accorded to an emperor's daughter, no matter her origin.

He set the day on which he would be married; his people thanked him on their knees, and returned home.

(II) Not far from the marquis' honorable palace, among the poor people, lived a man named Janicula, who had a daughter Griselde, who was exceedingly virtuous, courageous and charitable. While hunting, the marquis caught sight of Griselde and, recognizing her virtue, immediately decided that this exemplary woman should be his wife.

On the day of the wedding, Walter had not revealed to the public the woman he would marry, and the populace wondered whether he might, in fact, not marry at all. Walter had, however, already prepared rich garments and jewelery in Griselde's size. That morning, the marquis came to Janicula's home and asked him for his permission to marry his

Notes

daughter. Janicula was so astonished, he turned red, and could not speak – but did manage eventually to assent to the marriage.

Walter, however, wanted Griselde herself to assent before he married her, and, the two men went into her chamber. Walter asked her hand in marriage, and asked her to be ready to do whatever he said, whenever he said it, but never to resent him; if she agreed to this, he said, he would swear to marry her.

Griselde swore never to disobey him – and he took her outside to introduce her to his populace as his new wife.

The marquis' servants took Griselde and dressed her in all new, expensive clothes for the wedding; she appeared as if she had been born as nobility, not from her actual humble origin. Her virtue and excellence became renowned throughout Saluzzo, and in many other regions, for she was essentially a perfect wife – she appeared as “from hevene sent”. Soon she gave birth to a baby girl, although she would have preferred a son to be his father's heir.

(III) Soon after his daughter was born, the marquis decided to test his wife. The narrator, at this stage, explicitly expresses doubt about why the marquis would test his wife: “as for me” he says, I think it sits “yvele” (“evilly”) “to assaye a wyf whan that it is no need” (“to test a wife when there is no need to”).

The marquis told her that although she was dear to him, to the rest of the nobility she was not. They, he said, objected to her new daughter, and wanted her to be taken away from Griselde and put to death. Griselde received this news without grievance, and answered that she and her child would do anything that pleased her husband. Rather than putting the child to death (though allowing Griselde to believe her child was dead), the marquis instead sent the child away with one of his sergeants to be raised by his sister, the husband of the Earl of Panago, in Bologna. Walter did pity his wife, who remained steadfast and dedicated to him,

silently accepting her fate and that of her child whom she believed dead. Griselde never spoke of her daughter, nor even mentioned her name.

(IV)

Four years passed, and Griselde had another child, a boy, and, when it was two years old, Walter repeated the same test. The people, Walter argued, did not want the low blood of Janicula to succeed him as marquis. She accepted this, and told Walter that she realized she was of low birth and would consent to die if it pleased him. However, she did point out that she had had no benefits of motherhood, only the pain of childbirth and a continued pain of losing her children. The same sergeant came to take away her son, and Griselde kissed her child goodbye.

The people came to loathe Walter, thinking that he had murdered his children. Walter, unruffled by their disapproval, devised his next test: organizing the court of Rome to send a counterfeit papal bull which ordered Walter to divorce Griselde and take another wife. Upon hearing this, Griselde remained steadfast.

However, the marquis had written a secret letter to Bologna, ordering the Earl of Panago to return home his children with huge pomp and circumstance, but without telling them whose children they were. Indeed, the Earl was to pretend that the daughter was to marry the marquis himself.

(V) Walter told Griselde of the papal bull, returned her dowry to her, and sent her back to her father's house. She was stoic upon hearing this, and, though she reiterated her love for Walter, she did not repent for loving him. She only asks that she not be sent naked from the palace, but will be given the simple smock, just the like the ones she used to wear in poverty, to wear to spare her from suffering the indignity of returning home completely unclothed. Walter granted this request, and in, stripping herself of all of her riches, Griselde returned home to her father in her poor clothes once more.

Notes

The people followed her home, weeping for her bad fortune, but Griselde herself did not shed a tear, and, as she approached the house, her father ran out to cover her with his old coat. The narrator, at the end of this part, compares the suffering Griselde has endured to that of the biblical Job.

(VI) The Countess of Panago arrived at Saluzzo from Bologna with Griselde's two children. Walter sent a message to Griselde that he would be married soon and wished for Griselde to plan the ceremony; patiently, Griselde agreed and began to make the arrangements. When the people saw the new wife, they thought, for the first time, seeing her riches and the stately procession, that Walter was right to change his wife.

As the party sat down to dinner, Walter called Griselde into the hall. When he introduced Griselde to his new wife, she pleaded with him not to treat the new wife as unkindly as he did her (not to “prikke with no tormentynge / This tender mayden”) but meant no malice in her words.

At that, Walter kissed Griselde and claimed that she had always been his wife. Griselde stood, astonished, like someone who had woken from a sleep. Walter then revealed to her the actual fate of her two children the supposed new wife was actually Griselde's daughter. Griselde fell down in a swoon, and, on awaking, called her children to her, where she kissed them and held them so tightly that they could not tear the children from her arms. The ladies took her into her chamber, and took her out of her poor clothing, replacing it with a “clooth of gold that brighte shoon”, and a coronet on her head. The two lived happily ever after, and, eventually, the son succeeded his father after his father's death, and was kind in marriage.

This story, the Clerk then continues, is not told so that wives should follow Griselde's example in humility - it is impossible that they would. Every person, however, should try to be constant in adversity and in the face of God, like Griselde was to Walter: this is why Petrarch wrote the story. People under God must live in virtuous patience, accepting whatever will God serves on them.

However, the Clerk continues, it were very difficult to find even two or three Griseldes out of a whole town of people nowadays. If you put them to the test, their “gold” has been so mixed in with “brass” that the coin would snap rather than withstand the pressure. For which reason, for the love of the Wife of Bath (whose sect God maintain “in heigh maistrie”), the Clerk continues, I will now sing a song to gladden you.4.4 Lenvoy de Chaucer

Griselde is dead and her patience is too, and both of them are buried in Italy. No wedded man should try his wife’s patience in trying to find Griselde: he will fail. The Envoy continues to address “O noble wyves”, advising them not to nail down their tongues in humility, or Chichevache will swallow them whole. Follow Echo, that held no silence, and take on the governance yourself, the Envoy continues, and use the arrows of your eloquence to pierce your husband’s armor. The conclusion of the Envoy tells fair women to show off their good looks, and ugly women to spend all of their husband’s money!

Check your progress 1:

1. Explain the speech of the host.

.....
.....
.....

2. What does the clerk tell in his story?

.....
.....
.....

4.3 THE WORDS OF THE HOST

When the Clerk had finished his tale, the Host swore “By Goddes bones” that he would rather lose a barrel of ale that his wife had – even once – heard this tale. It is a noble tale, he continues – before advising the company not to ask why he’d rather not have his wife hear it.

Notes

Analysis

That the Clerk, in a typically clerical touch, gets his tale from a very worthy literary source is not a fiction of Chaucer's. The tale does indeed come from a tale of Petrarch's; yet what the Clerk fails to mention in his citation is that Petrarch himself took it from Boccaccio's Decameron (a fact which Chaucer certainly knew). Another thing, surely known to the clerks in Chaucer's audience, that the Clerk omits to mention is that even Petrarch had difficulty interpreting the tale as he found it in Boccaccio. The key problem, in fact, to reading the Clerk's Tale is interpretation.

The tale itself is simple enough: woman of low birth is horribly tested by her noble husband, made to suffer extremely, and eventually, is restored to good fortune. But what does the tale mean? Not, according to the Clerk, at least, what it seems to mean at first reading: that women should patiently submit themselves to their husbands will. This sentiment, of course, is deeply at odds with the Wife of Bath (herself explicitly acknowledged and praised by the Clerk in the tale) and her tale only a little earlier – and the Clerk endorses the Wife's desire for female maistrie.

Yet why is the tale not to be read as endorsing female subjugation to the husband? Perhaps because the Clerk (as he implies) wholeheartedly endorses the maistrie-seeking of the Wife of Bath, but also, as is twice said in the tale, because there are no Griseldes left in the world today. Is this lack of patient Griseldes a sign of progress, or something to be mourned? If the story is a celebration of Griselde's fortitude, the Clerk accurately judges that it would be impossible for any woman to legitimately withstand the suffering that Griselde faced with such resignation; and indeed, her extreme behavior might not even be read as commendable, for she allows her husband to murder her two children without struggle. The Clerk indicates that women should strive toward the example that Griselde sets, but not necessarily follow her example in such an extreme form. Where does one draw the line? The tale could be read as supporting either pro-feminist or anti-feminist sentiments.

Petrarch's solution to the problem is also voiced by the tale: that the tale is not, in fact, about men and women at all, but how men in general should relate to God. This is a perfectly reasonable interpretation, but as presented by Chaucer, Walter – cruel, testing for no obvious reason, and extremely self-satisfied – does not make for a particularly attractive representative of God. Petrarch's interpretation of his own story is not an absolute one: and nor is Chaucer's (it is important to note that the envoy at the very end of the tale is attributed “de Chaucer” and not to the Clerk – perhaps something more significant than a simple print-setting error). For the envoy advises wives not to nail down their tongues, but to attack their husbands and be shrews - a sentiment which the tale does not reflect at all, particularly when you consider that it is Griselde's strength of character and humility which justify her eventual reward and reunion with her children.

Chaucer, Petrarch, and the Wife of Bath – each have separate lines of interpretation for a single tale, and each of them are potentially justified in the text. Yet the Clerk's presentation does not invite the reading of the tale as simply a fable - there is little heightened or distanced in the presentation. In fact, the telling strives to arouse our displeasure at Walter's conduct, and our sympathy for Griselde - Chaucer, in fact, studs the narrative with deeply humanizing, sympathetic details (for example, the way Griselde, reunited with her children, cannot bear to release them from her embrace) which make an allegorical reading of the tale even more difficult. It is difficult to believe that this tale is simply an allegory of man's relationship with God, when the allegory is written with such focused, emotional detail.

One might note too that Griselde is stripped and dressed in new clothes as her status changes from low, to high, back to low, and eventually back to high. The idea of the woman dressed in cloth (cloth, as we noted in the Wife of Bath's tale, is a symbol for text) reflects the unknowability of a woman's heart and mind, as well as the way Griselde herself can be interpreted and

Notes

reinterpreted (as peasant and as noble wife) in precisely the way that her tale can.

Petrarch is dead and nailed in his coffin, the Clerk emphasizes at the start of the tale – and so is Griselde, he tells us at the end. How either of them felt about the subject matter of the Clerk's Tale is no longer of any relevance; and the complexity and problematic nature of this apparently simply-structured tale depends on just that incitement – how an audience, hearing the tale now, interprets and understands it in the context of their own (medieval or modern) attitudes to gender and marriage.

4.4 THE CANTERBURY TALES SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF THE MERCHANT'S TALE

Prologue to the Merchant's Tale

Following the Clerk's pronouncement on marriage, the merchant claims that he knows all about weeping and wailing as a result of marriage - and so, he thinks, do many people who are married. Even if his wife were to marry the devil, the merchant claims, she would overmatch him. Having been married two months, and having loathed every minute of it, the merchant sees a "long and large difference" between Griselde's patience and his wife's cruelty. The Host asks the merchant to tell a tale of his horrid wife; and, though "for soory herte" (for sorry heart) the merchant claims he cannot tell of his own sorrow, he will tell another tale.

The Merchant's Tale

Once there was, dwelling in Lombardy, a worthy knight who had lived nobly for sixty years without a wife. However when this knight, January, had turned sixty, whether out of devotion or dotage, he decided to finally be married. He searched for prospects, now convinced that the married life was a paradise on earth, particularly keen to take a young, beautiful wife.

The narrator then defies Theophrastus, the author of a tract attacking marriage, arguing that a wife is God's gift, which will last longer than any other gift of Fortune. There follows a lengthy passage extolling the

virtues of a wife, and the virtue of marriage, citing many biblical examples.

January one day sent for all of his friends, telling them of his intent to marry, explaining that he was ill and old, and wanted a wife no older than twenty, which he could mold like warm wax in his hands. Various men gave him various advice about marriage, some praising it, some arguing against it, and the altercation continued all day. The core of the argument was

between Placebo and Justinus. Placebo cited Solomon, advising January that it would be excellent to marry a young wife, and telling him to do exactly as he pleased. Justinus cited Seneca, arguing that January should be more careful and more thoughtful before taking a wife, warning that a young wife was like to cuckold an old husband.

“Straw for thy Senek!” January responds, agreeing with Placebo’s response that only a “cursed man” would argue against marriage; and with that word, they all arose and January began to prepare for his wedding. Fair women and fair bodies passed through January’s head like images reflected on a mirror set up in a market-place – but eventually, January selected one woman from the many available to him.

Calling his friends to him again, January asked them not to make any arguments against what he had resolved to do, and voiced his only concern - that a man who finds perfect happiness on earth, as he would with his wife, would never find a similar happiness in heaven, for one must choose between one perfect happiness and another. Justinus, furious with January’s foolishness, advised him that God sent a married man more reason to repent than a single man, and so, married, he might be more likely to get to heaven – even suggesting that marriage might be January's purgatory.

The narrator then, by way of an *occupatio* leaves out the wedding ceremony, but tells us that January married his intended, May, in a lavish and joyous ceremony. Venus, the goddess of love, laughed at all of the guests, as January had become one of her knights: when tender youth has

Notes

wedded stooping age, the narrator continues, there is such mirth that it cannot be written.

At the end of the feast, the men cast spices around the wedding house, and everyone was full of joy –

except for Damian, the knight's squire, who was so in love with the lady May that he was almost mad. The men rode home, and said their farewells and thanks to January, who then decided he would go to bed. He drank strong spiced and sweetened wines, and many a medical mixture, before taking his fresh wife in his arms, rocking her and kissing her often, his bristly beard scratching her tender skin. January made an apology for the offense he was about to do her, but reminding her that legally, he could do whatever he liked to her body. The two then had sex until the day began to dawn, at which point January awoke, drank some bread in wine, and sang loudly, sitting upright in his bed. Quite what May thought of all this, only God knows, the narrator comments – though she thought his sexual exploits absolutely useless.

However, Damian, had written a love letter to May that he pinned in a silk purse next to his heart. One day, Damian was not attending January, and to cover for him the other squires told January that Damian was sick. May and January sat at dinner, and January decided to send May to visit Damian, to tell him that January would soon visit soon, after he had rested. May went straight to Damian, and, secretly, Damian slipped his letter into her hand: knowing that she could not afford to have it discovered, May hid the letter in her bosom.

Reading it later, she tore it up and cast it in the toilet so as not to have it discovered.

May had already decided to return Damian's advances, and replied to his letter telling as much –

taking her letter to his bedroom, putting it under his pillow and giving him a secret handshake. Damian awoke the next morning, his sickness all vanished, and returned to serve January humbly. January's house had a garden so magnificent, the narrator now continues, that even he who wrote *Romance of the Rose* could not describe its beauty, nor could

Priapus accurately describe its art. January loved this garden so much that only he possessed the key to it. In the summer he would go there with May and have sex. January had also, in this time, become blind and became increasingly possessive of his wife, which caused Damian great grief – and May too wept very often, for January was always in her company. However, May and Damian kept in touch via letter, and by various secret signs.

May imprinted January's key to the garden in warm wax, and Damian made a secret copy of the key. The eighth of June came round, and January decided, thanks to the incitement of his wife, to go and have sex in his beautiful garden. He sang a beautiful song to awake his wife and tempt her to the garden, and eventually, January, blind as a stone, and May, unlocked the gate and stepped into the garden.

Damian had already entered the garden, as May had made signs to him to do so, and now she signaled to him to climb up a nearby tree, full of fruit. At this point, the narrator makes an unusual departure from the supposed realism of January's story to narrate the descent of Pluto and Proserpina into the garden, who have a long argument about marriage, citing various classical sources.

Pluto, feeling pity for January, wants to restore January's sight so that he can see the villainy about to be done behind his back; Proserpina rejects his argument, telling him that the classical sources which proclaim the evil of women missed out the evil performed by men. Proserpina wants May to have sex with Damian; Pluto wants to restore his sight to prevent it - and Proserpina forcibly ends the argument.

Damian sat high in the pear tree, and May told her husband she longed to pick and eat one of the pears. January bent over so that May could stand on his back to climb the tree - she grabbed a branch, and climbed up into the tree with Damian, who pulled up her dress and began to have sex with her. But, when Pluto saw this, he restored January's sight – and January, seeing his cuckoldry, let out a huge roar and asked his wife what she was doing.

Notes

Without missing a beat, May responds that she had been told that the best way to restore January's eyesight was to "struggle" with a man in a tree; January responds that she was not struggling, but having full penetrative sex. In that case, May continues, her medicine is false – January clearly isn't seeing clearly, she argues. And when January asserts that he can see perfectly, May rejoices that she has restored her sight, and persuades January that he did not see her having sex with Damian. January is delighted, kisses her and hugs her, and strokes her on her stomach, leading her home to this house.

4.5 EPILOGUE TO THE MERCHANT'S TALE

"Goddess mercy!" said the Host, praying God to keep him from such a wife, and noting that clever wives easily deceive foolish men by ducking away from the truth. "I have a wyf", the Host continues, who, though she is poor, is a shrew, always blabbing – and she has several other vices too! The Host then cuts himself off again from discussing his wife, as he worries that someone in the company will report his doing so back to his wife. He is, he claims, clever enough not to reveal everything, and therefore his tale is done.

Analysis

There is a real sense in this tale of goodness slightly gone bad, ripeness becoming slightly rotten. This starts, perhaps, with the opening paean to marriage and the description of January as a worthy, noble knight. It is only as we read on that we realize that, in fact, this apparent positivism is flecked with a bitter irony. January, the noble knight, is also portrayed in unforgiving detail, even down to the scratchy bristles on his neck, and the loose skin on his aged body. We, like May, recoil at the description – there is nothing, for example, of the comfortable, stylized presentation of (for example) the Nun's Priest's Tale here. The narrator is unstinting when he wants to focus our attentions on something unpleasant.

The authorial condemnation of May also departs from the other fabliaux of the Canterbury Tales. Like Alison of the Miller's Tale, she is crafty, but May is also wicked. She escapes without punishment from her husband, but unlike the Miller's Tale this is not a satisfactory conclusion. While the Miller's Tale prized cunning and crafty behavior, the Merchant's Tale adheres to more traditional values. Therefore, May's escape from punishment is a dissonant element of the story, for she behaves contrary to the established values that the Merchant has set for his tale.

May, unlike her husband, largely escapes from the spotlight of the tale – it does not have access to her thoughts (only God knows, at one point, what she thought of her husband) nor does it really describe her body in anything like the detail it lavishes on her husband's. What we see of May is largely a matter of her secret signs and cunning behavior: and the only lengthy description of her, significantly, is given in the context of presenting her as a good option for January to marry. What appears beautiful on the visible outside is clearly rotten in the middle.

This too is represented in the strand of Biblical imagery throughout the tale. It is rather obvious, perhaps, to see May's infidelity with Damien (whose very name, some critics argue, means "snake") as a version of Eve's transgression with the snake – both, indeed, take place in a beautiful garden, though the Bible's Adam does not share the physical disgust of January. Characteristic of the Merchant's apparent bitterness, perhaps, is the remark which follows January's really rather beautiful pastiche (calling May to awake and come into the garden) of the Song of Songs: it refers to them in a blunt, dismissive phrase as "olde, lewed words". In this tale, beautiful women are really venomous, malicious tricksters - beautiful, lyrical poetry is really only old, obscene words.

May, however, despite her low blood, proves herself hugely more intelligent than her noble husband: we might also find analogues for this (at least in sympathy, if not in intelligence) in Griselde of the Clerk's Tale. There is nothing of the indulgent, joyful trickery of the Miller's Tale in the Merchant's Tale, but instead a return to the signification of

Notes

the Reeve's Tale - the moment of sexual intercourse is presented with the same unflinching, uneuphemistic detail, and the preceding action between the illicit lovers in both tales is largely a matter of signs.

Secret signs are everywhere in the Merchant's Tale: things which, like the mirror in the common marketplace (the metaphor for January's pre-wedding fanciful mind), leave a certain impression on the mind. From the letter that May reads and then casts into the privy, to the secret handshake between May and Damien, to the impression of January's key which allows Damien into the garden, this tale is focused on tricky actions rather than words, secret, illicit events rather than open actions.

The bitterness of the Merchant, trapped in his unhappy marriage, can be felt, then, coursing through the veins of the Merchant's Tale at various points; but particularly in its bitterly unhappy (happy) ending, in which blind January is entirely gulled into believing that he has not been made a fool of. Moreover, when we consider that January happily strokes his wife on her "wombe" ("stomach", but also "womb") at the end of the tale, the Merchant might even leave us with a taste of what would happen next: has May just become pregnant with Damien's baby? The suggestion is not as ridiculous as it initially sounds - particularly when you consider that the pear (it is a pear tree in which the couple have sex) was a well-known remedy to help fertility in Chaucer's day. Perhaps May - at the end of this tale - has actually got something (someone!) rotten growing inside her.

Check the progress. 2

3. What does the merchant want to say in his epilogue?

.....
.....
.....

4.6 THE CANTERBURY TALES SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF THE SQUIRE'S TALE

Introduction to the Squire's Tale

The Host asks the Squire to draw near and tell the next tale.

The Squire's Tale

(I)

The Squire tells the tale of Cambyuskan, the king of Sarai in Tartary. With his wife Elpheta he had two sons, Algarsyf and Cambalo, and a daughter Canacee (previously mentioned by the Man of Law). In the twentieth year of his reign, on the Ides of March, his subjects celebrated his nativity.

During the great feast with the king and his knights, a strange knight came into the hall on a brass horse, carrying a broad mirror of glass, wearing a gold ring on his thumb and carrying a naked sword by his side. This knight saluted the king and queen, and all the lords, in order, so reverently and nobly that even Gawain could not have bettered him. The narrator apologizes for not being able to reproduce the nobility of his elocution, punning that he could not climb “over so heigh a style”, and resolving only to reproduce the meaning, not the expression, of what the knight said.

This knight had been sent from the king of Arabia and India, to bring Cambyuskan a steed of brass that could, within twenty-four hours, transport a person safely anywhere on the globe. He also presented to Canacee a mirror that foresaw impending mischance and could determine the character of friends and foes, and a ring that enabled the wearer to understand the language of any bird, and the healing properties of all herbs. His final gift was the sword, whose edge would bite through any armor but whose flat would cure any wounds inflicted by the edge.

Having told his tale, the knight rode out of the hall, leaving his steed standing in the court, and was led to his chamber. The presents were carried into the tower, and the ring given to Canacee, but the brass steed would not move until the knight taught people how to move it. The horse was a source of wonder for the people, compared alternately to the

Notes

Pegasus and the Trojan horse. All one had to do to move the brass horse was to twirl a peg in its ear, according to the knight.

(II)

After the revelry of the night before, the next morning everybody but Canacee remained asleep until late. She had dreamt of the mirror and the ring and thus had her first satisfying rest in a very long time. As she went out walking that morning with her maids, she came across a bleeding peregrine falcon that cried out in anguish. It had maimed itself. Canacee picked up the falcon and spoke to it, a power she had gained from the ring the knight had given her. The falcon told her a tale of a handsome tercelet as treasonous and false as he was beautiful, who fell in love with a kite as well as with the falcon, and left the falcon to love the kite. Canacee healed the bird with herbs which she dug out of the ground, and carried it to a box, covered in blue velvets, with a painted meadow inside it, which she laid by her bedside.

The narrator then leaves Canacee, promising to return to the story of her ring and show how the falcon regained her love, thanks to the mediation of Cambalo, the king's son. First, the narrator says, he will tell of Cambyuskan, and how he won his cities, and after that of Algarsyf, and how he won his wife (for whom he would have been in great peril, were it not for the brass horse) and after that of Cambalo, who fought with the brothers in order to win Canacee, and then – after all that – the narrator intends to pick up where he left off.

(III) The narrator has just begun to set the scene, when he is interrupted...

4.7 THE WORDS OF THE FRANKLIN TO THE SQUIRE AND THE WORDS OF THE HOST TO THE FRANKLIN

The Franklin tells the Squire that he has served himself well, praising his wit, and asserting that no-one in the company is as eloquent as the Squire. The Franklin then comments that he would give twenty pounds worth of land if his own son were a man of such discretion as the Squire – who needs possessions, if he is virtuous! The Franklin continues that he has often rebuked his own son for not listening to virtuous people – the Franklin’s son only plays at dice and spends money, and would rather talk with a page than a nobleman.

At this point, the Host interrupts - “Straw for youre gentillesse!” (“Straw to your nobility!”) – reminding the Franklin that what he is saying is irrelevant, and that each pilgrim must tell at least a tale or two, or break his vow. The Franklin reassures the Host that he is aware of this, even if he is taking a moment to speak to the Squire, and – as instructed by the host – tells his tale, commenting that, if it pleases the Host, his tale will certainly be a good one.

Analysis

Since the Squire's Tale exists only in a fragmentary form, it is difficult to determine precisely how we are supposed to read it. The tale may be a fragment because Chaucer never finished the tale or because the later section of the tale was lost in the manuscripts from which the Canterbury Tales were taken. And yet, the Franklin’s interruption comes at a point which suggests that the Squire’s Tale might be one of Chaucer’s many trick interrupted-endings (see, for example, his House of Fame, or Chaucer’s Tale of Sir Thopas).

For the moment at which the Franklin interrupts comes only two lines after the Squire has outlined his plans – extremely lengthy plans – for the rest of his tale, giving as the last plot point to be covered in his telling Cambalo’s fight for the hand of Canacee. There seems nothing very unusual about that, until we remember that, at the start of the tale, we are clearly told that Canacee and Cambalo are brother and sister. And this is where the tale becomes interesting. Canacee, of course, is the person discussed in the Man of Law’s Prologue – Chaucer, the Man of Law claims, will not tell her story, and nor will he.

Notes

Yet here is Chaucer, in the mouth of the Squire, promising to tell the story of incestuous Canacee. It is certainly true that the Squire's plan for the rest of his tale looks as if it might take four pilgrimages of its own to complete – the Squire, the son of the Knight, certainly inherited his father's long-windedness – and some critics have argued that the Franklin breaks off the tale (either with irony or with faux modesty and compliments) only to prevent the pilgrimage from having to endure all of it. Yet critics – who have paid scant attention to the Squire's Tale, often disregarding it as unfinished – have yet to come up with a fully persuasive explanation of why it is the promise of incest which seems to motivate the abrupt termination of the Squire's Tale.

William Kamowski has also pointed out that the abridgement of the Squire's Tale precedes an abridgement of the Host's original tale-telling plan:

In fact, at the very moment when the Squire breaks off, an apparent reshaping of the grand plan for the Canterbury Tales also takes place. Harry Bailly reminds the Franklin, "wel thou woost / That ech of yow moot tellen atte leste / A tale or two, or breken his biheste" (696-98). Evidently the Host's original plan for four tales apiece will not be realized. It seems more than coincidence that the Host trims his own colossal ambition so soon after the aborting of the Squire's grand plan, which is too large to be realized within the framework of either the Host's storytelling contest or Chaucer's frame narrative.

There are lots of interesting avenues for exploration and interpretation with the Squire's Tale, yet it only seems fair to conclude that the critical work on the Tale remains, like the Tale itself, frustratingly inconclusive.

Check your Progress-3

4. Write the the tale of the squires.

.....
.....
.....

5. What did the Franklin tell the squires?

.....

4.8 SUMMARY

In this part of *The Canterbury Tales* we learn about the description of the merchant provides an external layer of success. He is neatly groomed, and his clothes are colorful, clean, and new. He exudes an aura of success. The Squire is a young knight in training, a member of the noble class. While he is chivalrous and genteel, he is not quite as perfect as his father, the Knight, as he wears fine clothes and is vain about his appearance. The characters tell their tale in a descriptive manner. We've learned that the Franklin in *The Canterbury Tales* is a wealthy member of the middle class. The details of his physical description include his white beard and white silk purse, which he wears on a belt. ... The Franklin appears to be a morally upright character who is moderate in his views on Christian living.

4.9 KEYWORDS

Charitable – to help someone willingly
 Populace – the common people of a community
 Heir – a person who takes over in hereditary
 Explicitly – fully and clearly expressed
 Grievance -sadden
 Sergeants –a non-commissioned officer
 Counterfeit- made in imitation
 Indignity – hurting a [person's dignity
 Biblical- related to bible
 Faux- mistake

4.10 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

Explain the Epilogue of the Merchant in your own words. 2. What does the Squire tell in his tale?

3. Write about the conversation of the Host, Franklin and Squire.

4.11 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

Chaucer Bibliography Online

Geoffrey Chaucer at the *Encyclopædia Britannica*

Works by Geoffrey Chaucer at Project Gutenberg

Works by or about Geoffrey Chaucer at Internet Archive

Works by Geoffrey Chaucer at LibriVox (public domain audiobooks) 

Poems by Geoffrey Chaucer at PoetryFoundation.org

Early Editions of Chaucer

BBC television adaptation of certain of *The Canterbury Tales*

Geoffrey Chaucer on *In Our Time*

4.12 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. The Host remarks that the Clerk of Oxford sits as coyly and quietly as a new-married bride, and tells him to be more cheerful: “Telle us som myrie tale!” (“tell us a merry tale”). The Host continues to argue that, when someone is entered into a game, they have to play by the rules of that game.

2. The tale of the clerk begins with the description of Saluzzo, a region at the base of Mount Viso in Italy. There was once a marquis of this region named Walter. He was wise, noble and honorable, but his mind was always on seeking immediate pleasures – turning aside more worthy pastime, and even refusing to marry. The people of his realm confronted

him about his steadfast refusal, pleading with him to take a wife, so that his lineage could continue (and so that his son could continue his work in the event of his death). They offer to choose for him the most noble woman in the realm for his wife. He agrees to marry, but makes this one condition: he will marry whomever he chooses, regardless of birth, and his wife shall be treated with the respect accorded to an emperor's daughter, no matter her origin.

3. The bitterness of the Merchant, trapped in his unhappy marriage, can be felt, then, coursing through the veins of the Merchant's Tale at various points; but particularly in its bitterly unhappy (happy) ending, in which blind January is entirely gulled into believing that he has not been made a fool of. Moreover, when we consider that January happily strokes his wife on her "wombe".

4. The Squire tells the tale of Cambyuskan, the king of Sarai in Tartary. With his wife Elpheta he had two sons, Algarsyf and Cambalo, and a daughter Canacee (previously mentioned by the Man of Law). In the twentieth year of his reign, on the Ides of March, his subjects celebrated his nativity. During the great feast with the king and his knights, a strange knight came into the hall on a brass horse, carrying a broad mirror of glass, wearing a gold ring on his thumb and carrying a naked sword by his side.

5. The Franklin tells the Squire that he has served himself well, praising his wit, and asserting that no-one in the company is as eloquent as the Squire. The Franklin then comments that he would give twenty pounds worth of land if his own son were a man of such discretion as the Squire – who needs possessions, if he is virtuous! The Franklin continues that he has often rebuked his own son for not listening to virtuous people – the Franklin's son only plays at dice and spends money, and would rather talk with a page than a nobleman.

UNIT – 5 : CANTERBURY TALES – PART 4

STRUCTURE

5.0 Objectives

5.1 Introduction

5.2 Tale of Franklin's Tale

5.3 Tale of the Physician

5.4 Tale of the Pardoner

5.5 The Shipman's Tale

5.6 The Merry Words Of The Host To The Shipman And To The Lady
Prioress

5.7 Summary

5.8 Keywords

5.9 Question for Review

5.10 Suggested Readings and References

5.11 Answers to Check Your Progress

5.0 OBJECTIVES

After learning this unit based on Introduction to Race, you can learn about the following topics:

Study of the Clerk, Host and the Merchant.

Conversation between the characters

Epilogue of the Merchant.

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In Medieval England, most people were illiterate. This is why Church stain glass windows and wall paintings depict bible stories- it helped the congregation follow the biblical stories. If you were lucky enough to receive an education, however, then you would have learnt French and Latin, the language of the Court and the Church. Chaucer, due to his

family's wealth and connection, was one of the fortunate people who learnt to read and write.

Chaucer was not a professional writer but wrote for pleasure, for his own amusement and that of his family and friends. His poetry was a great favourite of the King's. Chaucer wrote in Middle English, writing works such as *Troilus and Criseyde* and *House of Fame*. Though not the first to write in the vernacular, he appears to be instrumental in popularising it. Whilst working as Controller of Customs and Justice of Peace in 1386, however, he began writing his most famous works- *The Canterbury Tales*.

The Canterbury Tales, written in a combination of verse and prose, tells the story of some 30 pilgrims walking from Southwark to Canterbury on a pilgrimage to the shrine of St Thomas Beckett. On route, the pilgrims engage in a story telling competition to win a meal at the Tabard Inn! Thus, *The Canterbury Tales* is a collection of 24 stories, told as the pilgrims make their journey to Canterbury Cathedral.

Chaucer's work is not simply a story; *The Canterbury Tales* is also a comment on English society at the time. The very fact that Chaucer wrote in English demonstrates his dismissal of accepted practices. Chaucer's characters offer various social insights and raise various questions concerning social class, spirituality and religion. The work was unfinished when Chaucer died.

5.2 THE CANTERBURY TALES SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF THE FRANKLIN'S TALE

Prologue to the Franklin's Tale

The old Bretons, in their time, made songs, and the Franklin's Tale, the narrator says, is to be one of those songs. However, the Franklin begs the indulgence of the company because he is a "burel man" (an unlearned man) and simple in his speech. He has, he says, never learned rhetoric, and he speaks simply and plainly – the colors he knows are not colors of rhetoric, but colors of the meadow.

The Franklin's Tale

Notes

The Franklin's Tale begins with the courtship of the Breton knight Arviragus and Dorigen, who came to be married happily. Their marriage was one of equality, in which neither of the two was master or servant; and the narrator comments specifically that when “maistrie” (the desire of the Wife of Bath and the women in her tale) enters into a marriage, love flaps its wings and flies away.

However, soon after their marriage, Arviragus was sent away to Britain to work for two years. Dorigen wept for his absence, despite the letters that he sent home to her. Her friends would often take her on walks where they would pass the cliffs overlooking the ocean and watch ships enter the port, hoping that one of them would bring home her husband. However, although her friends’ comforting eventually started to work, Dorigen remained distressed by the grisly, black rocks visible from the cliff-side, near to the shore. She asked God why he would create “this werk unresonable” (this unreasonable work), whose only purpose was to kill people. Her friends, seeing how terribly Dorigen feared that whatever ship brought her husband home would crash on these rocks and sink, provided further distractions.

One day, her friends had organized a party and a dance in a beautiful garden. It was at this dance that Aurelius, a squire, danced in front of Dorigen, who was as fresh and well-dressed as the month of May. His singing and dancing were better than any man’s, and he was one of the most handsome men alive. Unbeknownst to Dorigen, Aurelius had been in love with her for two years, but had never dared tell her how he felt. It was during the dancing, then, that Aurelius addressed Dorigen, wishing that he, and not her husband, had been sent across the sea, before begging her to have mercy on him and revealing his love.

Dorigen responded by sternly rebuking Aurelius, telling him that she would never be an untrue wife, and had no intention of cuckolding her husband. And then, “in pley” (playfully, flirtily, in fun), Dorigen added that she would be Aurelius’ love on the day that all of the rocks were removed from the coast. This made Aurelius sigh heavily: “Madame”, he said “this were an impossible!” (an impossibility). The dance ended and the guests went home, except for poor, sorrowful Aurelius, who fell to his knees, and holding his hands to heaven, prayed to the gods for mercy.

Arviragus then returned from abroad, and Dorigen was delighted to have him back. Two years passed, and Aurelius lay in torment, and without comfort – except, that is for his brother, a clerk, who suggested that he meet a student of law at Orleans who was versed in the sciences of illusion and “magyk”. Heading toward Orleans, the two came across a young clerk, roaming by himself, who greeted them in Latin, and claimed to know why they came. And before they went a step further, he told them exactly what they were travelling to achieve.

Aurelius leapt down from his horse, and went with this man to his house, where he fed them and showed them wondrous illusions of various kinds. The man eventually agreed to remove the rocks from the coast for a thousand pounds; “Fy on a thousand pound!” responded Aurelius, “This wyde world... I wolde it yeve” (“Never mind a thousand pounds! I’d give you the wide world!”), and promised to pay the man.

The next morning, having stayed at the man’s house, they travelled to Brittany, where, by illusion, the man made it so that, for a week or two, it would appear that the rocks had vanished. Aurelius, who now knew that there was no obstacle to his deal with Dorigen, said grateful prayers, and eventually came to his lady and explained to her, in courtly, formal terms, how he had fulfilled their bargain. She stood astonished, entirely white, never thinking that such an occasion could arise, and went home, despairing.

Arviragus was out of town, and Dorigen was overcome with grief, realizing that she must forfeit either her body or her reputation. She thought about the numerous instances in which a faithful wife or a maiden destroyed herself rather than submitting herself to another. She cited the maidens of Lacedaemon who chose to be slain rather than defiled, Hasdrubal's wife, who committed suicide during the siege of Carthage, and Lucrece, who did the same when Tarquin took her by force.

Notes

When Arviragus returned home and Dorigen told him the truth of what had happened, he told that he will bear the shame of her actions, and that adhering to her promise is the most important thing. He therefore sent her to submit to Aurelius. When Aurelius learned how well Arviragus had accepted his wife's promise, Aurelius decided to let Dorigen's promise go unfulfilled, refusing to break the married couple's "trouthe". He claimed that a squire can indeed be as honorable as a knight. Aurelius then went to pay the law student, even though his affair remained unconsummated, and the man forgave Aurelius' debt, proving himself honorable. The narrator ends the tale by posing the question to the assembled company "Which was the mooste fre, as thynketh yow?" ("Who was the most generous/noble, do you think?").

Analysis

The Franklin's Tale is, as the narrator acknowledges at the start, a Breton lay, a brief romance supposedly descending from Celtic origins, and usually dealing with themes of romance, love and usually containing some sort of supernatural ingredient. Chaucer took the story from Boccaccio's Decameron though the tale weaves well into many of the other Tales, including the Merchant's Tale, which is echoed in many of the Franklin's descriptions. The tale seems to offer the solution to the problem raised and complicated in the other "Marriage Group" tales in its initial comments that "maistrie" has no place in love. Dorigen and Arviragus are among the few happy couples in Chaucer's Tales, and yet one suspects that the problem of "maistrie" is sidelined so as to focus on an entirely different problem, and one close to the heart of the Tales: the problem of language, words, and keeping one's word.

"Trouthe" is a central word in the tale, meaning "fidelity", and "truth", as well as "keeping one's word", and the idea of pledging troth (an Elizabethanism) – giving one's word as a binding promise – is central to the agreements between Dorigen and Aurelius. What the Franklin's Tale shows us is not dissimilar from the Friar's Tale - that we have to watch what we say because, like Dorigen's promise made "in pley", we never quite know how things are going to work out. The word becomes the

marker of the deed, and, not to break her word, Dorigen is almost forced to perform the deed. In a work so concerned with stories and tale-telling, it is significant that Chaucer (as in the Friar's and Manciple's Tales) takes time to remind us of the value of each individual word we speak, and write.

The tale itself, of course, also bequeaths a word to both of its audiences (that is, the pilgrim audience of characters and the real-world audience reading or listening to Chaucer) and asks us to evaluate it in relation to what we have heard. "Fre", the root of our modern word "free", can mean generous (i.e. to give freely) but also has overtones of nobleness, "good behavior". Who, then, is the most generous and noble at the end of the tale?

Arviragus, Jill Mann argues, by being noble enough to become a cuckold to preserve his wife's reputation, sparks off a chain of passivity, which she thinks is an extremely positive thing. Arviragus giving up his rights in Dorigen leads to Aurelius giving up his which in turn leads to the law student giving up his. When one person backs down, Mann interprets, so will the rest of the world.

Mann's is an interesting reading, but it does not quash entirely the thought that Arviragus' priorities might be in the wrong order - is it really more important that his wife holds to a bargain (made only in jest) rather than she sleeps with someone she does not want to sleep with?

Or at least, so she says. It is worth noting that, on Aurelius' first appearance, the tale stresses his good looks and charm, and one wonders precisely what motivates Dorigen, even in jest (and Freud has much to say about the meaning of jokes) to make the bargain. For surely Dorigen is the person who, were the bargain to go ahead, gets the best deal - not only is her husband safely home (and the rocks, for the moment, vanished) but she gets to sleep with both (extremely handsome, so the tale says) men. How, in fact, has Dorigen been generous or free at all? Is Aurelius perhaps the most generous: willingly giving up the thing he

Notes

most desired? Perhaps – but we might perhaps also argue that the thing he gave up, he had no real right to have anyway, considering that the “thing” was sex with another man’s wife. The same might be said of the law student, who foregoes only money: a lot of money, but still only money.

The question of nobility and generousness completely depends from which perspective you read the tale.

Interestingly, we are never told that Dorigen goes to check whether the rocks have in fact vanished or not. Of course, they only exist as a plot twist within a tale – though one of the things the tale’s final question reminds us of is that an existence in words, like the rash promise that Dorigen made, is an existence we dismiss at our peril.

5.3 THE CANTERBURY TALES SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF THE PHYSICIAN'S TALE

The Physician's Tale

As Titus Livius tells us, there was once a knight called Virginius who had many friends, much wealth, and a loving wife and daughter. The daughter possessed a beauty so great that even Pygmalion could not have created her equal. She was also humble in speech and avoided events which might compromise her virtue. The narrator then breaks off to address governesses and parents, telling them to bring up their children to be virtuous.

The maid one day went into the town, toward a temple, with her mother, where a judge who governed the town, saw the knight's daughter, and lusted after her. He was so caught by the maid’s beauty that he concluded “This mayde shal be myn”. At that, the devil ran into his heart, and taught him how he, by trickery, could have the maid for his own. He sent after a churl, who he knew was clever and brave, and told him the plan, giving him precious, expensive gifts for his complicity.

The judge's name was Appius, the narrator now tells us, before asserting "So was his name, for this is no fable", but a "historial thyng notable" (a notable historical event). The false churl, Claudius, made a complaint against Virginius, and the judge summoned him to hear the charge against him. Claudius, in short, claimed that Virginius was holding one of his servants, a beautiful young girl, against his will, and pretending she was his daughter. The judge did not listen to Virginius' argument in his own defense, but ordered that the girl be taken as a ward of the court. Virginius returned home, and called his daughter, with an ashen face. He explained to her that now there were only two avenues open to her: either death or shame. Virginius decided, in a long, mournful speech to his daughter, to kill her, and, although she begged for mercy and another solution, eventually she asked for a little leisure to contemplate her death. She then fell into a swoon, and when she awoke, she blessed God that she could die a virgin. Virginius then took his sword and cut off her head, and took it to the judge.

When the judge saw the head, he tried to escape and hang himself, but soon a thousand people thrust in, knowing of the false iniquity, took Appius and threw him into prison. Claudius was sentenced to be hanged upon a tree – except that Virginius pleaded on his behalf, succeeding in reducing the sentence to exile.

Here, the narrator says, may men see that sin has no reward – even if it is so private that no- one knows of it other than God and the sinner. The last counsel the tale presents us with: "Forsaketh synne, er synne yow forsake" (abandon sin, before sin abandons [destroys] you).

Analysis

After the Physician's Tale has finished, in the prologue to the Pardoner's Tale, the Host claims that he has almost "caught a cardynacle" – almost had a heart attack, and it is not difficult to see why. This is a tale which takes no prisoners: with no prologue to ease us in, this brutal, harsh, violent and uncompromising tale refuses to be read as a fable ("this is no fable") or allegory, but insists that we view its cruel and unpleasant

Notes

events as things which happen in the real world. One rather wonders why the Physician thinks it will win him the prize at the end of the tale-telling.

Moreover, the tale rushes towards its unpleasant conclusion, even at the expense of plausibility. Why doesn't Virginius try to argue with the judge, or call upon the mob of thousand people who, only a little later, burst through the doors to deliver justice? Why doesn't Virginius hide his daughter, or jump on his knightly steed and escape to another land? Again, as in the Knight's Tale and the Franklin's Tale, there seems to be some interrogation of ideas of chivalry: this is a man who, without any need for reflection, would rather preserve his daughter's nobility and honor than keep her alive. Chaucer again casts a negative light across the codes of honor to which men adhere.

Critics have not devoted much attention to the tale, except to say that it provides, perhaps, the first significant "death's head" in the Canterbury Tales: what hitherto has been a fun, "game"-some party, a well-meaning competition, despite its squabbles, is suddenly presented with a tale entirely without good-naturedness or comedy. It is the beginning of a turn toward darkness which entirely changes the tone and tenor of the Tales as a whole, and – although in its criticism of hypocrisy, defense of religion and beauty, and painful, final justice, it has much in common thematically with some of the other tales – it is a tale which seems decidedly set apart from its predecessors.

Check your progress 1:

1. What tale did the physician tell?

.....
.....
.....

2. What moral does it give?

.....
.....
.....

5.4 THE CANTERBURY TALES

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF THE PARDONER'S TALE

The Introduction to the Pardoner's Tale

Following the Physician's Tale, the Host began to swear as if he were mad, wishing a shameful death on the judge and his advocates, and concluding that the cause of the maiden's death was her "beautee". The Host pronounced the tale a piteous one to listen to, and prayed to God that he protect the Physician's body.

The Host, concluding that he has almost "caught a cardynacle" (had a heart attack) after the brutality of the Physician's Tale, decides that he must have medicine in the form of a merry tale, in order to restore his heart. Turning to the Pardoner, he asks for some "myrthe or japes right anon", and the Pardoner agrees, though, before he begins, he stops at an alehouse to "drynke and eten of a cake". The company protests that the Pardoner not be allowed to tell them a ribald tale, but insists instead on "som moral thyng" - a request which the Pardoner also grants.

The Pardoner's Prologue

Radix malorum est Cupiditas (Greed is the root of all evil)

The Pardoner begins by addressing the company, explaining to them that, when he preaches in churches, his voice booms out impressively like a bell, and his theme is always that greed is the root of all evil. First, the Pardoner says, he explains where he has come from, and shows his papal bulls, indulgences, and glass cases crammed full of rags and bones, which he claims (to the congregation, at least) are holy relics with magical properties.

Then, the Pardoner invites anyone who has sinned to come and offer money to his relics, and therefore to be absolved by the Pardoner's power. This trick, the Pardoner says, has earned him at least a hundred marks since he was made a pardoner - and when the "lewd peple" are seated, he continues to tell them false trickeries and lies. His intention, he says, is simply "for to wyne" (to profit), and "nothyng for correccioun of synne" (and nothing to do with the correction of sin); the Pardoner

Notes

doesn't care whether, after burial, his congregation's souls go blackberry picking. Thus, the Pardoner says, he spits out his venom under the pretense of holiness, seeming holy, pious, and "trewe". "Greed is the root of all evils", the Pardoner quotes again, explaining that he preaches against the same vice which he himself is guilty of. Yet, although he knows he is guilty of the sin, he can still make other people turn away from it.

Next, the Pardoner tells the company how he tells his congregation "olde stories" from long ago, "for lewed peple loven tales olde". He will not, he says, work with hands and make baskets, but get money, wool, cheese and wheat for himself, even if it is from the poorest page or poorest widow in a village. He will drink "licour of the vyne", and have a "joly wenche" in every town. "Now hold your pees!" he shouts to the company, and begins his tale.

The Pardoner's Tale

There once lived in Flanders a company of three rioters who did nothing but engage in irresponsible and sinful behavior. At this point, the narrator interrupts the tale itself to launch a lengthy diatribe against drunkenness - mentioning Herod, Seneca, Adam, Sampson, Attila the Hun and St. Paul as either sources or famed drunkards. This in turn oddly becomes a diatribe against people whose stomachs are their gods (their end, we are told, is death), and then a diatribe against the stomach, called, at one point a "stynkyng cod, fulfilled of dong and of corrupcioun" (a stinking bag, full of dung and decayed matter). This distraction from the story itself ends with an attack on dice-playing (dice here called "bicched bones", or cursed dice).

The three drunkards were in a tavern one night, and, hearing a bell ring, looked outside to see men carrying a corpse to its grave. One of them called to his slave to go and ask who the corpse was: he was told by a boy that the corpse was an old fellow whose heart was smashed in two by a secret thief called Death. This drunkard agreed, and discussed with his companions how this "Death" had indeed slain many people, of all

ranks, of both sexes, that very year. The three then made a vow (by “Goddess Digne bones”) to find Death and slay him.

When they had gone not even half a mile, they met an old, poor man at a stile, who greeted them courteously. The proudest of the drunkards responded rudely, asking the man why he was still alive at such a ripe age. The old man answered that he was alive, because he could not find anyone who would exchange their youth for his age - and, although he knocked on the ground, begging it to let him in, he still did not die. Moreover, the old man added, it was not courteous of the drunkards to speak so rudely to an old man.

One of the other drunkards responded still more rudely that the old man was to tell them where Death was, or regret not telling them dearly. The old man, still polite, told the drunkards they could find Death up the crooked way and underneath an oak tree.

The drunkards ran until they came to the tree, and, underneath it, they found eight bushels of gold coins. The worst one of them spoke first, arguing that Fortune had given them the treasure to live their life in happiness - but realizing that they could not carry the gold home without people seeing them and thinking them thieves. Therefore, he suggested, they should draw lots, and one of them should run back to the town to fetch bread and wine, while the other two protected the treasure. Then, at night, they could agree where to take the treasure and carry it safely. This was agreed, and lots were drawn: the youngest of them was picked to go to the town.

However, as soon as he had gone to the town, the two remaining drunkards plotted amongst themselves to stab him upon his return, and then split the gold between them. While he was in the town, the youngest thought of the beauty of the gold coins, and decided to buy some poison in order to kill the other two, keeping the gold for himself. Thus, he went to an apothecary, bought some “strong and violent” poison, poured it into

Notes

two of three wine bottles (the third was for him to drink from), topped them up with wine, and returned to his fellows.

Exactly as the other two had planned it, it befell. They killed him on his return, and sat down to enjoy the wine before burying his body – and, as it happened, drank the poison and died. The tale ends with a short sermon against sin, asking God to forgive the trespass of good men, and warning them against the sin of avarice, before (this, we can presume narrated in the Pardoner’s voice) inviting the congregation to “come up” and offer their wool in return for pardons.

The tale finished, the Pardoner suddenly remembers that he has forgotten one thing - that he is carrying relics and pardons in his “male” (pouch, bag) and begins to invite the pilgrims forward to receive pardon, inciting the Host to be the first to receive his pardon. “Unbokele anon thy purs”, he says to the Host, who responds that the Pardoner is trying to make him kiss “thyn old breech” (your old pants), swearing it is a relic, when actually it is just painted with his shit. I wish, the Host says, I had your “coillons” (testicles) in my hand, to shrine them in a hog’s turd.

The Pardoner is so angry with this response, he cannot speak a word, and, just in time, the Knight steps in, bringing the Pardoner and the Host together and making them again friends. This done, the company continues on its way.

Analysis

The Pardoner has – in recent years – become one of the most critically discussed of the Canterbury pilgrims. His tale is in many ways the exemplar of the contradiction which the structure of the Tales themselves can so easily exploit, and a good touchstone for highlighting precisely how Chaucer can complicate an issue without ever giving his own opinion.

Thus the Pardoner embodies precisely the textual conundrum of the Tales themselves - he utters words which have absolutely no correlation with his actions. His voice, in other words, is entirely at odds with his behavior. The Pardoner's voice, at the beginning of his tale, rings out "as round as gooth a belle", summoning his congregation: and yet his church is one of extreme bad faith. There is a genuine issue here about whether the Pardoner's tale, being told by the Pardoner, can actually be the "moral" (325) tale it claims to be. For, while the tale does indeed demonstrate that money is the root of all evil, does it still count when he is preaching "agayn that same vice / Which that I use, and that is avarice" (against the very vice I commit: avarice"). How far, in other words, can the teller negate his own moral?

Yet the real problem is that the Pardoner is a successful preacher, and his profits point to several people who do learn from his speeches and repent their sin. His Tale too is an accurate demonstration of the way greed and avarice lead to evil. Hollow execution nevertheless, the Pardoner is an excellent preacher against greed. His voice, in short, operates regardless of his actions. Hollow sentiments produce real results.

This is also reflected in the imagery of the tale itself. The Pardoner hates full stomachs, preferring empty vessels, and, though his "wallet" may well be "bretful of pardoun comen from Rome" (687) but the moral worth of this paper is nil: the wallet, therefore, is full and empty at the same time – exactly like the Pardoner's sermon.

In just the same way Chaucer himself in the Tales can ventriloquize the sentiments of the pilgrim – the Reeve, the Pardoner, the Merchant – and so on, without actually committing to it. Because the Tales themselves, in supposedly reproducing the "telling" of a certain pilgrim, actually do enact precisely the disembodied voice which the Pardoner represents. The moral paradox of the Pardoner himself is precisely the paradox of the Tales and their series of Chaucer-ventriloquized disembodied voices.

Notes

There is a doubleness, a shifting evasiveness, about the Pardoner's double audience: the imaginary congregation he describes, and the assembled company to whom he preaches, and tells his "lewed tales", even calling them forth to pardon at the end. The point is clear: even though they know it is insincere, the Pardoner's shtick might still work on the assembled company.

The imagery of the Pardoner's Tale also reflects this fundamental hollowness. The tale itself is strewn with bones, whether in the oath sworn "by Goddes digne bones", whether in the word for cursed dice ("bones") or whether in the bones which the Pardoner stuffs into his glass cases, pretending they are relics. The literary landscape is strewn with body parts, and missing, absent bodies: beginning with the anonymous corpse carried past at the beginning of his tale. Bones, stomachs, coillons – words for body parts cover the page, almost as a grim reminder of the omnipresence of death in this tale.

The General Prologue, suggesting that the Pardoner resembles a "gelding or a mare", hints that the Pardoner may be a congenital eunuch or, taken less literally, a homosexual, and, as the Host seems to suggest at the end, might well be without his "coillons", a Middle English word meaning both "relics" and "testicles". All of the "relics" in this Tale, including the Pardoner's, evade the grasp of the hand. The Pardoner thus can be categorized along with the other bizarrely feminized males in the Tales, including Absolon, Sir Thopas, and, if we believe the Host, Chaucer (the character).

And of course, at the center of the tale, there is a search for somebody called "Death" which, naturally, does not find the person "Death", but death itself. It is a successful – but ultimately unsuccessful – search. All that is left over at the center of the Tales is the bushels of gold, sitting under a tree unclaimed. The root of the tale, as its moral similarly suggests about the root of evil, is money: and money was, to a medieval reader, known to be a spiritual "death". Notably, moreover, in the tale, both "gold" and "death" shift from metaphor to reality and back again; a

neat reminder of the ability of the Tales to evade our grasp, raising difficult questions without ever answering them.

Check your progress 2:

3. What does the pardoner tell about himself?

.....
.....
.....

4. How did he end his speech?

.....
.....
.....

5.5 THE SHIPMAN'S TALE

The Shipman's Tale

A rich merchant, who lived at St. Denis, foolishly took a beautiful woman for his wife. She drained his income by demanding clothes and other fine array to make her appear even more beautiful. There was also a fair, bold young monk, perhaps only thirty years old, who was always at the merchant's house. Indeed, he was as welcome there as it is possible for any friend to be. The monk was generous with his money, and always brought gifts for his lord and for the servants, according to their degree.

One day, as he was going to make a journey to Bruges, the merchant invited John to visit him and his wife before he departed. The monk and the merchant had a merry time together, eating and drinking for two days. On the third day, on which the merchant was ready to depart for Bruges, he awoke early and went to his counting-house to balance his books. John was also awake early and went into the garden to pray. The wife went into the garden, worried that something was bothering the monk. He in turn worries about her; he thinks that she did not sleep well, for the merchant kept her up all night having sex – and she admits, in turn, that in fact she has no lust for her husband. John realizes that there is more to this, and promises to keep everything she tells him secret.

Notes

The wife complains that her husband is the “worste man that ever was sith that the world bigan” (the worst man ever to have existed since the world began”). She also tells him that she owes a debt of one hundred franks, which, if she does not pay (and her husband finds out about it) will disgrace her. The wife begs the monk to lend her the money.

The noble monk tells the wife that he pities her, and promises to “deliver” the wife “out of this care”, and bring her one hundred franks. With that, he caught her by the thighs, embraced her hard, and kissed her many times. The two then parted, and the wife went to her husband in his counting-house, begging him to leave his accounts. The merchant refused, explaining to her that it was essential that he managed his business carefully, as many merchants went bankrupt.

The three dined together that evenings, and after dinner, the monk took the merchant to one side, and asked him to lend him one hundred franks – and the merchant humbly and generously agreed, telling him to pay it again when he could afford to. He fetched the sum and took it to the monk, and no-one in the world but the two of them knew of the loan. That evening, the monk returned to the abbey, and, the next morning, the merchant travelled to Bruges to conduct his business.

The next Sunday, the monk returned to St. Denis, with head and beard all clean and freshly shaved, and – to get to the point – the wife agreed with the monk that, in exchange for the hundred franks, the monk could have sex with the wife all night, a promise which the two of them eagerly fulfilled. The next morning, the monk rode home to his abbey, or wherever pleased him.

The merchant returned home, and, delighted to see his wife, told her about his business transactions - and, when he came into town, he went straight to see his friend, the monk. The monk was delighted to see him, and, after talking about his business trip, the monk told the merchant that he had left his thousand franks with his wife. The merchant went home happy, and his wife met him at the gates – and the two of them had a happy night in bed, until the wife waylaid him, teasing him wantonly.

Finally, the merchant told her he was a little angry with her because she had not told him she had received his money from the monk.

However, the wife was not frightened or taken aback by this, but said quickly and boldly that she had indeed received gold from the monk. The wife then argued that she should be allowed to keep the gold, to pay for good hospitality and to do with as she pleased; and, in return for him giving her his money, she would give him her body: “I wol nat paye yow but abedde”. And the merchant saw that there was no other option but to agree.

5.6 THE MERRY WORDS OF THE HOST TO THE SHIPMAN AND TO THE LADY Prioress

“Wel seyde”, the Host compliments the Shipman, cursing the monk, and warning the men in the company to beware of similar tricks. The monk, the Host interprets, tricked both the man and his wife. Moving forward, the Host then looks for the next tale-teller, and courteously asks the Prioress whether she might tell the next tale: “Gladly”, she assents, and begins her tale.

Analysis

Despite its relative brevity, the Shipman’s Tale interrogates and complicates several key issues raised in earlier tales. After the darker reaches of the Physician’s and Pardoner’s Tales, the Shipman’s Tale returns to fabliau origins, presenting a reasonably simple “trick” story, complicated by Chaucer in the telling.

Primarily, the tale continues the idea, previously raised in The Wife of Bath’s tale, that money, sex, and women are closely inter-connected. It is interesting that, in the second fragment, the Shipman promises to tell his tale, mentioning his “joly body” (attractive figure). Scholars have argued that, in fact, the lines about the Shipman’s “joly body” were intended to be adapted into the mouth of the Wife of Bath, and it is the Wife of Bath’s Tale which immediately follows the Shipman’s promise. The

Notes

bawdy fabliau of the Shipman's Tale is usually assumed to have been intended to be The Wife of Bath's tale before the version we currently have was composed.

Moreover, the Shipman's would not be an unlikely tale for the Wife to have told. At the end, when the Host concludes that the monk tricked both the merchant and his wife, he seems not to have realized the victor at the very end of the tale. Rather like in the Miller's and the Franklin's Tales, we are asked to consider each of the participants at the very close of the tale, and decide who we think has come off best. It is clearly not the merchant, though he has made huge profits in his business dealings, and had his loan repaid, and, though (as the Host argues) the monk has had sex with the wife, remained friends with the merchant, and got off scot-free, it is the wife herself who seems to triumph. Not only has she had enjoyable sex with both the merchant and the monk, but she is one hundred franks better off; and she coerces her husband into agreeing to "pay" in return for sleeping with her.

Like the Wife of Bath, this wife has realized the inherent value of her sexual attractiveness: and in a way that seems to a modern reader uncomfortably close to prostitution, she bears out the Wife's dictum that the "bele chose" is in fact an excellent bargaining tool for women to get what they want from men. As the Man of Law's Tale suggested, the female is a pawn in business transactions, and yet, what the Wives (of bath, and of the merchant in this tale) realize that Constance never even considers, is their own potential profitability. If women's bodies are valuable, these two women seem to say, then why shouldn't we be the ones to profit from our bodies?

One also notices the importance attached in these business dealings to giving one's word, to agreements sealed with kisses and with handshakes, and of one thing being verbally exchanged for another before the words become actions – a reminder, perhaps, of the issues of contracts raised by the Franklin's Tale.

Chaucer ties up these concerns, as so often, in a single pun: "taillynge", which means "credit" (and which the narrator wishes upon the company at the end of the tale) is a close relation to "telling" (i.e. telling a tale) but

also punningly relates to “tail”, Middle English slang for the female genitals. A woman’s “tail” becomes an endless credit note: she will pay her husband, she says, in bed. Women, in this tale, and in the Wife of Bath’s are playing by patriarchal rules in order to beat the men; and the fact that they do beat the men might have been an uncomfortable shift of powers to many of Chaucer’s medieval readers.

Check your progress 3:

5.What tale does the shipman say?

.....
.....
.....

6. What is the credit note at the end?

.....
.....
.....

5.7 SUMMARY

In this above lesson we have studied the characters of the Franklin ,the physician and the pardoner.Through the character the poet tries to bring out the true character of the people. The Shipman is also referred to as the Sailor. He is a tough, weathered, bearded man who has no conscience about stealing alcoholic drinks or throwing a man overboard in a fight. He knows all the havens well as he is well-travelled and good at his job. Chaucer portrays the Physician as well-educated but cunning, greedy, and a bit boastful. If the pilgrims have heard that there's "none like him in this world, no competition / to speak of medicine and surgery", they've probably heard it from the Physician himself.

5.8 KEYWORDS

- Punning-the humorous use of words
- Fragment- pieces
- Indulgence – to get involved in something
- Distractions – something that disturbs attention

Notes

Compliments –wishing someone

Hospitality –welcoming with generosity

ventriloquized -to speak in manner of a ventriloquist

disembodied – to divest of a body

congregation –an assembly of person brought together for common religious worship

10. Brevity- shortness of time or duration

5.9 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

Write the character sketches of the physician and the shipman.

How did the Host connect the speech with the Shipman and Lady Prioress. 3. Write the analysis of the story told by the shipman.

4. How are the stories connected with each other?

5.10 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

Chaucer Bibliography Online

Geoffrey Chaucer at the *Encyclopædia Britannica*

Works by Geoffrey Chaucer at Project Gutenberg

Works by or about Geoffrey Chaucer at Internet Archive

Works by Geoffrey Chaucer at LibriVox (public domain audiobooks) 

Poems by Geoffrey Chaucer at PoetryFoundation.org

Early Editions of Chaucer

BBC television adaptation of certain of *The Canterbury Tales*

Geoffrey Chaucer on *In Our Time*

5.11 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. There was once a knight called Virginius who had many friends, much wealth, and a loving wife and daughter. The daughter possessed a beauty so great that even Pygmalion could not have created her equal. She was also humble in speech and avoided events which might compromise her

virtue. The narrator then breaks off to address governesses and parents, telling them to bring up their children to be virtuous.

2. This is a tale which takes no prisoners: with no prologue to ease us in, this brutal, harsh, violent and uncompromising tale refuses to be read as a fable (“this is no fable”) or allegory, but insists that we view its cruel and unpleasant events as things which happen in the real world. One rather wonders why the Physician thinks it will win him the prize at the end of the tale-telling.

3. The Pardoner begins by addressing the company, explaining to them that, when he preaches in churches, his voice booms out impressively like a bell, and his theme is always that greed is the root of all evil. First, the Pardoner says, he explains where he has come from, and shows his papal bulls, indulgences, and glass cases crammed full of rags and bones, which he claims (to the congregation, at least) are holy relics with magical properties.

4. The real problem is that the Pardoner is a successful preacher, and his profits point to several people who do learn from his speeches and repent their sin. His Tale too is an accurate demonstration of the way greed and avarice lead to evil. However, nevertheless, the Pardoner is an excellent preacher against greed. His voice, in short, operates regardless of his actions. Hollow sentiments produce real results.

5. A rich merchant, who lived at St. Denis, foolishly took a beautiful woman for his wife. She drained his income by demanding clothes and other fine array to make her appear even more beautiful. There was also a fair, bold young monk, perhaps only thirty years old, who was always at the merchant’s house. Indeed, he was as welcome there as it is possible for any friend to be. The monk was generous with his money, and always brought gifts for his lord and for the servants, according to their degree.

6. A woman’s “tail” becomes an endless credit note: she will pay her husband, she says, in bed. Women, in this tale, and in the Wife of Bath’s are playing by patriarchal rules in order to beat the men; and the fact that they do beat the men might have been an uncomfortable shift of powers to many of Chaucer’s medieval readers.

UNIT – 6 : CANTERBURY TALES – PART 5

STRUCTURE

- 6.0 Objectives
- 6.1 Introduction
- 6.2 The Second Nun's Tale
- 6.3 The Canon Yeoman's Tale
- 6.4 The Manciple's Tale
- 6.5 Chaucer's Retraction
- 6.6 Summary
- 6.7 Keywords
- 6.8 Questions for Review
- 6.9 Suggested Readings and References
- 6.10 Answers to Check Your Progress

6.0 OBJECTIVES

After learning this unit based on Introduction to Race, you can learn about the following topics:

Study of the Clerk, Host and the Merchant.

Conversation between the characters

Epilogue of the Merchant.

6.1 INTRODUCTION

In Medieval England, most people were illiterate. This is why Church stain glass windows and wall paintings depict bible stories- it helped the congregation follow the biblical stories. If you were lucky enough to receive an education, however, then you would have learnt French and Latin, the language of the Court and the Church. Chaucer, due to his family's wealth and connection, was one of the fortunate people who learnt to read and write.

Chaucer was not a professional writer but wrote for pleasure, for his own amusement and that of his family and friends. His poetry was a great favourite of the King's. Chaucer wrote in Middle English, writing works

such as *Troilus and Criseyde* and *House of Fame*. Though not the first to write in the vernacular, he appears to be instrumental in popularising it. Whilst working as Controller of Customs and Justice of Peace in 1386, however, he began writing his most famous works- *The Canterbury Tales*.

The Canterbury Tales, written in a combination of verse and prose, tells the story of some 30 pilgrims walking from Southwark to Canterbury on a pilgrimage to the shrine of St Thomas Beckett. On route, the pilgrims engage in a story telling competition to win a meal at the Tabard Inn! Thus, *The Canterbury Tales* is a collection of 24 stories, told as the pilgrims make their journey to Canterbury Cathedral.

Chaucer's work is not simply a story; *The Canterbury Tales* is also a comment on English society at the time. The very fact that Chaucer wrote in English demonstrates his dismissal of accepted practices. Chaucer's characters offer various social insights and raise various questions concerning social class, spirituality and religion. The work was unfinished when Chaucer died.

6.2 THE CANTERBURY TALES SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF THE SECOND NUN'S TALE

The Second Nun's Prologue

The tale, written in rime royal, begins with an invocation for people to avoid sin and avoid the devil, and then a formal invocation to the Virgin Mary.

There then follows an interpretation of the name of St. Cecilia, the subject of the Second Nun's Tale: in English, the narrator tells us, her name might be expounded as "heaven's lily". The lily might represent the chasteness of Cecilia, or indeed, her white honesty. Or, perhaps her name would be best read as "the way toward understanding", because she was an excellent teacher, or perhaps a conjoined version of "heaven" and "Lia". Cecilia, the prologue concludes, was swift and busy forever in doing good works.

Notes

The Second Nun's Tale

Saint Cecilia was by birth a Roman and tutored in the ways of Christ. She dreaded the day that she must marry and give up her virginity. However, she came to be engaged to Valerian. On the day of their wedding, underneath her golden robes, she wore a hairshirt, praying to God that she might remain undefiled.

On their wedding night she told a secret to Valerian: she had an angel lover who, if he believed that Valerian touched her vulgarly, would slay him. Valerian said he would believe her if he could see this angel, and she told him to go to the Via Appia and find Pope

Urban among the poor people. Once Urban purged him of his sins, Valerian would be able to see the angel. When he reached Via Appia, Urban suddenly appeared to Valerian and read from the Bible. Another old man, clad in bright white clothes, with a gold-lettered book appeared before Valerian, asking him whether he believed what Cecilia had told him. When he said he did, Pope Urban baptized Valerian and sent him back home.

Returning home, he found the angel with Cecilia. This angel had brought two crowns of flowers from Paradise that will never wilt, and gave one to Cecilia and one to Valerian. The angel claimed that only the pure and chaste would be able to see this crown. Valerian then asked for the angel to bless his brother and make him pure.

This brother, Tibertius, came and can smell, but not see the flowers. Valerian explained his new faith, and eventually tried to persuade his brother to be baptized. Tibertius, however, did not like the idea of being baptized by Urban, whom, he said, would be burnt if people ever found him. Valerian told his brother not to fear death, because there was a better life elsewhere. Cecilia explains the Holy Trinity and other key tenets of Christianity to him, and afterwards, Tibertius agrees to accompany the couple to Pope Urban.

Tibertius was baptized and became a perfect Christian – and for some time the three lived happily, God granting their every request. However, the sergeants of the town of Rome sought them, and brought them before Almachius the prefect, who ordered their death.

During their execution, one of the sergeants, Maximus, claimed that he saw the spirits of Valerian and Tibertius ascend to heaven. Upon hearing this, many of the witnesses converted to Christianity. For this Almachius had him beaten to death, so Cecilia had him buried alongside Valerian and Tibertius.

Almachius summoned Cecilia, but she refused to appear frightened of him, or bow to his power; and when she was given the choice of forego Christianity or perform a sacrifice, she refused both of her options. She refused to admit any guilt and condemned Almachius for praising false idols. He ordered that she be boiled to death, but she, despite being left all day and night in a bath with fire underneath it, stayed cold – she did not even break a sweat.

Almachius then commanded his servant to slay her in the bath, and, though he struck her three strokes in the neck, he could not decapitate her, and she lay there half-dead. Christians stopped the blood with sheets, and, although she lay there for three days in agony, she never stopped teaching them the Christian faith. She even preached to them, giving them her property and her things, and – after three days – she died, and her body was taken to Pope Urban. He buried her by night among the other saints, and consecrated her church, still worshipped to this day as the church of St. Cecilia.

Analysis

The Second Nun's Tale is a conventional religious biography, a “saint’s life”, as the medieval genre it belongs to is often called. Written in rime royal, it is very likely that Chaucer composed the tale previous to and separate from the Canterbury project, and only adapted it to fit within the Tales later. The Second Nun tells the story of Saint Cecilia in a dry, sanctimonious fashion that exalts her suffering and patient adherence to her faith, and, in a fashion that might be compared to the Prioress’ and the Clerk’s tales, stresses the patent inhumanity and saintliness of Cecilia from the first moment.

Notes

Like the “litel clergeoun” of the Prioress’ tale, Cecilia transcends the horrors of the mortal world: she stands against paganism, against false idols, and even against death, and is rewarded by being translated into a saint at the end of the tale. Some critics have recently begun to compare this tale to the Canon Yeoman’s tale which follows it, wondering whether Cecilia herself might undergo some sort of transformational alchemical process: though she, unlike the false Canon’s trick-coals, is entirely unchanged when heated up.

The tale points to the mythological nature of medieval Christianity. The metaphor of the angelic floral coronets, which only Christians can see, for example, is a physical manifestation of the idea that Christians belong to a City of God, a distinct community with shared values that exists within a secular and often hostile environment. There is perhaps also an interesting thought lurking in the tale about the problematic contradiction (highlighted by the Host in his words to the Monk and the Nun’s Priest) that human ministers of God are not allowed to be sexual beings: Cecilia, of course, sets herself apart from the earthlier women of the Tales (the Wife of Bath is the key example) by, right at the start of the tale, professing her distaste for sex.

Check your progress 1:

1. What is the Second nun’s tale about?

.....
.....
.....

6.3 THE CANTERBURY TALES SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF THE CANON'S YEOMAN'S TALE

Prologue to the Canon's Yeoman's Tale

With the story of Saint Cecilia finished, the company continues on its journey until two men overtake them. One was clad all in black but with a white gown underneath – a Canon - and his horse sweated as if it ridden for three miles. The horse that rides underneath the

Canon's Yeoman similarly sweated so much that it could hardly go further. The

Canon (the first man) greets the company warmly, and explains that he had hoped to join them; his Yeoman too is extremely courteous.

The Host asks if the Canon can tell a tale, and his Yeoman responds that he knows more than enough about mirth and jollity – and adds that, if the Host knew the Canon as well as he does, he would wonder how he could do some of the things he can. The Canon is, the Yeoman says, a “passyng man” (an outstanding, [or sur-passyng] man). The Host guesses that his master is a clerk, but the Yeoman says that he is something greater, telling him that he could pave all of the ground from here to Canterbury in silver and gold.

The Host is quite amazed, but then asks why – if the Canon is so important - he cares so little for his honor, and dresses so shabbily. The Yeoman seems initially horrified at the question, but then adds in secret that the Canon believes that overdone dress-sense is a vice. The Host asks where the Canon lives, and the Yeoman tells him that it is in hiding places and the back lanes of the suburbs of a town. The Host then turns to the Yeoman himself, asking why his face is so discolored. The Yeoman explains that is because he spends his time blowing in the fire – and then reveals that the Canon and he spend most of their time doing “illusioun”, borrowing money, promising profit and then slipping away.

While the Yeoman was talking, the Canon drew near and heard everything – and chastised

him, telling him to hold his peace, and warning him that he was revealing things that should not be revealed. The Host bids the Yeoman to tell on, and when the Canon realized that the Yeoman would not be silenced, he fled. Since his lord is gone, the Yeoman concludes, he will tell the company everything he knows.

The Canon Yeoman's Tale

(Prima pars)

Notes

With this Canon, the narrator begins, I have lived for seven years, and yet I am no closer to understanding his science. The “slidyng science”, as he calls it, has made him only poor – and, so he argues, it will do to anyone who applies himself to it. The narrator then expounds in detail the processes of alchemy, with reams of scientific terminology, rehearsing an inventory of vessels made of pottery and glass, apparatus like curcurbites and alembics, and minerals like arsenic and brimstone.

The narrator then recites the four spirits (volatile substances – which are easily evaporated by heat) and the seven bodies (metals) which, in medieval alchemy, were an almost forerunner to the periodic table. No one who practices alchemy, the narrator concludes, will profit: he will lose everything he puts into it. No matter how long he sits and learns the terms, he will never gain from it. The narrator then turns on God, saying that though God had given them hope and they had worked hard to discover the philosopher’s stone, they had had no luck.

Alchemists, the narrator continues, are liars. The narrator then tells of the reactions some of the metals produce - shattering pots, sinking into the ground, and leaping into the roof; and, he says, when a pot explodes, his master just throws away the elements (even when someone points out that some of the metal has survived) and starts again, despite the money that people have spent to buy the goods. The narrator reveals that – despite any arguments about why the pot might have shattered – the alchemists always seem to get it wrong. Finally, the narrator claims that nothing is what it seems: apples which look nice are not good, men that seem the wisest are the most foolish, and the man who seems most trustworthy is a thief.

Et sequitur pars secunda

This is the tale proper of the Canon’s Yeoman, and it tells of a Canon whose infinite falsehood and slyness cannot be written. He makes anyone he communicates with behave foolishly, and yet people ride for miles to make his acquaintance, not knowing or suspecting that he is a charlatan.

The narrator then makes a slight aside to apologise to canons in general, claiming that his tale is of one bad canon, but is not representative of all canons, just as Judas was the one traitor among the apostles.

In London, there lived a priest who sung masses for the dead – and one day he was visited by the false Canon, who begged him to lend him a certain amount of gold. The priest obliged him, and, three days later, the Canon returned to pay him back. Expressing gratitude that the Canon has paid him back on time, the priest prompts a speech from the Canon about the importance of “trouthe” and keeping one’s word. The Canon then promises to show the priest some of his “maistrie” before he goes. The narrator then comments on the falsehood and dissimulation of the Canon, before apparently addressing the audience of the pilgrimage: “This chanon was my lord, ye wolden weene?” (This canon was my master, you think?). No

– this Canon, the narrator tells us, is another Canon, and, even in describing him, the Yeoman’s cheeks blush red.

The Canon sent the priest’s servant to bring quicksilver and coals, and then took a crucible and showed it to the priest, telling him to put an ounce of quicksilver in there. The priest did as he asked, and they put the crucible into the fire. Yet the false Canon took a fake coal, unseen, which had a hole in it, stopped with wax, which held silver filings. While the priest was wiping the sweat from his face, laid the coal in the furnace just above the crucible.

Naturally, the wax melted and the silver filings ran out over the crucible.

Next, the Canon told the priest to bring him a chalk stone, promising to make a gold ingot of the same shape. The Canon slyly inserted a metal rod into the chalk, and, when he threw into a bowl of water, the chalk melted away leaving only the silver rod. The priest was delighted, but the Canon decided to prove himself once more. Taking another ounce of quicksilver, the Canon took up a hollow stick, filled at one end with silver filings, and, putting it above the bowl of quicksilver, made it seem as if the silver (from the stick) had been translated from the quicksilver.

Notes

Thus by various tricks and schemes, the Canon filches the money from his unsuspecting audience, and charges them huge amounts for his wisdom and his trickery. Moreover, by telling the priest that, if he (the Canon) were caught, he would be killed as a sorcerer, the Canon secured still higher prices for his services.

It is easy, the narrator concludes, for men to take the gold they have and turn it into nothing. Moreover, after cataloguing some authorities (including Arnaldus of Villanova, Hermes Trismegistus, and Plato) who wrote of the philosopher's stone, the narrator firmly concludes that God does not want men to know how to get it – and therefore, we should “let it goon”. If God does not want it discovered, so it should remain.

Analysis

The Second Nun's Tale is hardly over, when two new characters arrive on the pilgrimage, sweatily riding up behind the pilgrimage and eventually overtaking them. The arrival of the Canon and his Yeoman is such an unusual event – particularly at this point of the Canterbury Tales – that the compiler of the Hengwrt manuscript (see “The texts of the Tales” for more information on the manuscripts) actually left it out altogether. It is an unusual construction, and one with “transformation” and “change” as its central themes - not surprisingly, then, it pins down a change already starting to occur within the fabric of the Tales as a whole. Alchemy is the subject of the Canon Yeoman's tale, as he calls it, the “sliding” science: and alchemy argues that all things are in a state of perpetual change, slipping from one thing to another. Coals can become the philosopher's stone, metal melts to become a false covering for a crucifix, and thanks to the trickery of the tale's false Canon, we are never quite sure what substance it is we are examining. Can we ever tell what it is we are looking at – can we ever know the difference between true and false?

The Canon himself is a mysterious, imposing and peripheral figure, and one who, at the very moment his falsehood appears to be rumbled, runs

away from the company, and from the Tales – for good. He is almost silent, and yet his silence is not (like Chaucer's) from shyness, or from high-status - clad in a hooded black robe, with a glimpse of white underneath, he even physically appears shrouded and covered up. Moreover, we never actually ascertain whether the Yeoman's tale is about this Canon, or – as he claims – about another Canon. It seems hugely improbable, even to take the Yeoman's words at face value (and the tale offers other warnings about doing that!), that the Yeoman would have this amount of knowledge about an entirely different Canon. The Canon then is a liminal figure, sitting somewhere on the border between reality and fiction, between true and false.

His Yeoman too starts his literary life as his advocate: praising the Canon as an extraordinary, wonderful, skilled man, before immediately retracting all that praise (almost without any provocation) to unmask his master as the tricky charlatan he is. Yet this casts huge doubt on the veracity of what the Yeoman actually utters - there is a big difference between his initial claim that the Canon could pave the way to Canterbury with gold, and the portrait of the Canon built up in his tale. Moreover, the sweating arrival of the pair (their horses are so wet that they can hardly move), combined with the all-black Canon and blushing-red Yeoman suggests that even the characters within the frame narrative of the Tales are undergoing some sort of alchemical transformation. There is a sliding transformation in what the characters actually say and think – but this is backed up in the visual metaphor of them being physically “slydinge.”

The central image of the Canon Yeoman's tale is the devilish furnace at the center of their back-street workshop, and (rather like the alchemical/furnace imagery in Jonson's *The Alchemist*) it is a complex metaphor: for hell, for devilish behavior – and falseness, but also for money. As the Pardoner argued in his tale, money is the root of all evil: and yet, unlike the slight comeuppance the Pardoner is served with by the Host at the end of his tale, justice is entirely absent from the denouement of the Canon Yeoman's tale. The last furnace we saw in the

Notes

Tales was Gervays' in The Miller's Tale – a timely reminder, perhaps, of the neat interclicking justice of Absolon's branding Nicholas. Neither the Canon nor his Yeoman receive any sort of narrative punishment.

Yet the way that this timely reminder of the profitability of falsehood intrudes upon the Tale also points to the complex narrative problem of the Pardoner's tale: just in the way that the Pardoner's hollow words and empty bones could bring people to salvation, so too can the Canon's trickery actually make him money – and, moreover, the Canon's Yeoman can supposedly turn this experience into a moral tale for the company to listen to. Of what substance is a tale made? Can a tale acknowledge the desire for gold and the ingenuity of the misdemeanors of those who pursue gold without endorsing them? As it is reaching its conclusion, the pilgrimage is waylaid by another pertinent reminder of the tale-telling project and its questionable substance. Tales, as Chaucer will admit in the retraction, and language, are not always innocent.

Check your progress 2:

2. Write a about the canon?

.....
.....
.....

3. Write about the Yeoman story.

.....
.....
.....

6.4 THE CANTERBURY TALES SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF THE MANCIPLE'S TALE

Prologue to the Manciple's Tale

The Host turns to the sleeping cook, and asks whether any man might be able to wake him. Awaking, pale and unalert, the Cook proclaims that he would rather sleep than have some of the best wine in Cheapside. The Manciple steps in courteously, excusing the cook, and then mocking him

– his open mouth, which the devil could put his foot in, his stinking breath – to his face for his drunkenness. The Cook is furious, but too drunk to speak, and promptly falls off his horse. Everyone lifts him up out of the mud, and the Host addresses the Manciple, telling him that the Cook is too drunk to tell a tale, and has more than enough to do keeping himself out of the mud and on his horse.

However, adds the Host, it is a folly to openly mock the Cook to his face, for one day he might have his revenge, and “quit” the Manciple’s words. “No”, says the Manciple, and produces a draught of wine, which he gives to the Cook to drink, with the result that the Cook thanks him generously. Everyone is much amused, and the Host comments that good drink turns rancor into love, blessing Bacchus, god of wine. He then asks the Manciple to tell his tale.

The Manciple’s Tale

When Phoebus, god of poetry, lived on earth, he was the lustiest of bachelors, a superior archer and the envy of all for his singing and playing on his musical instruments. Phoebus kept in his house a white crow, which could imitate the speech of any man, and who could sing more beautifully than a nightingale.

Phebus also had a wife, whom he loved more than his own life, and did his best to please her and treat her courteously – except that he was extremely jealous, and so would watch her suspiciously. Guarding a wife so closely, the narrator reminds us cynically, is pointless if she is faithful, there is no need to do so, but if she is unfaithful no amount of monitoring will keep her faithful. Take any bird, he says, and put it in a cage – and no matter how gilded the cage and how good the treatment, the bird would still twenty thousand times rather go and eat worms in a forest. Animals, the narrator insists, can never be trained to be unanimalistic. So do men, the logic continues, always have a lecherous appetite to sleep with someone socially lower than their wives. Flesh is fond of novelty.

This Phoebus, though he had no idea of it, was deceived: his wife had another man, “of litel reputacioun”, hardly worth comparing with

Notes

Phoebus himself. One day when Phoebus was away, she sent for her “lemman” (lover – a word the narrator takes some pains to reject having said). The white crow saw their “working” together, and said nothing until Phoebus returned home, when the crow sang “Cokkow! Cokkow!” (Cuckold! Cuckold!). Phoebus initially thought the bird sang a song he did not recognize, but the crow clarified that his wife had had sex with a man of little reputation on his bed.

Phoebus thought his heart burst in two – he took his bow, set an arrow to it and murdered his wife, and for sorrow of that, destroyed his harp, lute, cithern and psaltry, snapping too his arrows and his bow. Then he turned to the crow, calling it a traitor, mourning his wife, and accused the crow of lying to him - and then, to “quite anon thy false tale”, pulled out every one of the crow’s white feathers, made him black and took away his song and his speech, slinging him out of the door and leaving him to the devil. It is for this reason that all crows are black.

The narrator turns to his audience, and tells them to be aware of what they say - never tell a man that he is a cuckold because he will hate the messenger. One must think on the crow and hold one’s tongue.

Analysis

There is something hugely destructive – and self-destructive – about this tale, and particularly the way it takes the god of poetry, himself a plausible representative for the whole idea of the Tales themselves, and turns him into a petty, jealous murderer. The Manciple’s Tale is almost painfully brief - not given to flights of fancy, we are given the simple information – jealous husband, unfaithful wife, talking crow, and then destruction, of wife, of crow, and of poetry.

The Manciple’s Tale is also a cousin, though a darker cousin, of the Nun’s Priest’s Tale, and it seems likely, at least, at first, that a tale about a talking crow and the mythical god of poetry will be another fantastical beast fable – the genre leads us to expect the happily ending exploits of

another Chaunticleer. Yet what actually happens is a bitter shift in tone - the happy, metaphorical beginning of the tale falls through into a painful reality. The god of poetry is a jealous human, and the white-feathered beautiful-voiced talking crow becomes the black, hollow-voiced harbinger of doom of reality. The tale brings the reader back to earth with a bump, and its reminder is clear: know when to fall silent. Know when not to speak, when not to tell.

And “tell” is an appropriate verb to raise - like Chaucer himself, the crow can counterfeit the speech of every man. The crow, in other words, is a veritable Canterbury poet himself - and what this tale teaches him, through physical suffering, is that some subjects are simply not to be told. Chaucer, in the Retraction, raises the worry that the Tales are sinful or blasphemous, and the moral “hold your tongue” could not simply be the message of the final Tales, but a thought a nervously religious Chaucer was increasingly coming to find in his own mind.

Telling, in other words, has its limits - and it is better to stop before there are real consequences to it. As the final real “tale” (discounting the Parson’s sermon) of the Tales, it makes for a bleak, but unmistakable end.

Check your progress 3:

4. Why does the Maniciple take the cook’s place?

.....
.....
.....

5. What is the theme of the Maniciple’s tale?

.....
.....
.....

**6.5 SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS TALES
THE OF THE PARSON'S TALE AND
CHAUCER'S RETRACTION**

Notes

By the time the Manciple's tale had finished, the sun had set low in the sky. The Host, pronouncing his initial degree fulfilled, turns to the Parson to "knytte up wel a greet mateere" (conclude a huge matter) and tell the final tale. The Parson answered that he would tell no fable – for Paul, writing to Timothy, reprovved people who turned aside from the truth and told fables and other such wretchedness.

What the Parson promises is morality and virtuous matters - and jokes that he does not know of the alliterative poetry tradition of the South. He leaves his tale, he says, to clerks, for he himself is not "textueel". Everyone agreed that it was the best way to end the project, and asked the Host to give the Parson the instruction to tell the final tale. The Host did so, hasting the Parson to tell his tale before the sun went down.

The Parson's Tale

The Parson's tale is not actually a tale as such, but a lengthy medieval sermon on the subject of penitence. The first part of his sermon defines the three parts of penitence – contrition, confession and satisfaction, and expounds at length (with several biblical examples) the causes of the contrition.

The second part of the sermon considers confession, which is the truthful revelation of the sinner's sin to the priest. Sin is then explained as the eventual product of a struggle between the body and soul for dominance of a person – and therefore there are two types of sin: venial (minor, smaller sins) and deadly (serious sins).

The third part of the sermon considers each of the seven deadly sins as branches of a tree of which Pride is the trunk. Pride is the worst of the sins, because the other sins (Ire, Envy, Sloth, Avarice, Gluttony and Lechery) all stem from Pride. Each sin's description is followed by its spiritual remedy – and the Parson states the rules for oral confession.

There are a number of conditions to penitence, including the intensity of the sin committed, the haste to contrition and the number of times the sin was committed. The fruit of this penitence is goodness and redemption in

Christ. Following this short return to the subjects of penitence (and satisfaction), the final lines seem to suggest, by way of images of the sun and the morning, a vision of Paradise: bodies which were foul and dark become brighter than the sun, the body, formerly sick and feeble, becomes immortal and whole, and in a place where no-one feels hunger, thirst or cold, but is replenished by the perfect knowledge of God. This paradise, the final lines of the tale conclude, is only attainable through spiritual poverty and by avoiding sin.

Analysis

One of the biggest questions about the Tales as a whole is precisely how they end. Throughout his works, and even within the Tales (look, for example, at the interruptions of Sir Thopas and the Monk's tales) Chaucer proves that he knows how to create a false ending, a trick ending, which ends by not ending, by not concluding. The Canterbury Tales ends on a decidedly pious and religious note, first with the Parson's lengthy sermon, and then with a retraction written as "Chaucer". The Parson's sermon, a translation from a medieval work designed to advise clergy in the salvation of souls, would be a plausible medieval sermon – there seems nothing in it that is ironic: it is a perfect example of its genre.

Yet can the Parson's sermon seem anything other than just another genre? In a work which has anthologized genres – we have already read beast fables, saint's lives, fabliaux, Breton lays, and all manner of other stories – and problematised them, drawing attention to their speaker's voice as something (as the Pardoner points out) ventriloquized, can we really be expected to take the Parson's voice seriously?

Critics disagree wildly about the answer to this question. The same problem applies to Chaucer's retraction – which, as in the Man of Law's prologue, blurs the line between the Chaucer writing the Tales (who has also written the Book of the Duchess, Troilus and Criseyde, and so on) and the fictional Chaucer who is a character within the pilgrimage. Is the Chaucer who writes these tales just another constructed voice?

Or, perhaps, is the Retraction of the tales a genuine one? Chaucer, in this theory, genuinely was dying and was unable to finish the work – or for

Notes

some reason, felt the need to immediately retract it, as he genuinely believed that it did come too close to sin. Thus, before the Host's plan was complete, he concluded the tale with a pious sermon and then a Retraction: no-one could therefore accuse the Tales of being unchristian. Is it a death-bed confession?

A Retraction is a fairly usual way for a medieval work to end, and perhaps that points us to the aforementioned effect: its very normality is perhaps a clue that Chaucer's intention is not pure and simple. For it could be read simply as another "funny voice" – the voice of the Chaucer who told Sir Thopas: could be read as comedy rather than penance. Moreover, as

E.T. Donaldson has firmly stated, the use of the Parson's Tale as an interpretative key to unlock the whole of the Tales is problematic, particularly when you consider the deliberate religious provocation of tales like the Miller's, the Wife of Bath's and the Merchant's. The tales by no means seem to be written to a purely Christian agenda - though Christianity is undoubtedly a key theme.

End-points in Chaucer are difficult to definitively interpret, and perhaps this dichotomy was intended by Chaucer himself. Perhaps this ending is simply one way of closing down the Tales – the Manciple's tale, of course, has been only the most recent in a line of tales which reiterate the advice of these final fragments to hold one's peace, and know when to fall silent. Is this Chaucer, on an imaginary, real or literary deathbed, punningly, holding his peace, but also being "at peace"? One thing is for sure: understanding the ending of the Tales seems a fitting encapsulation of the complex problem of interpreting the work as a whole.

Check your progress 4:

6. What do you know about the Parson tell in his story?

.....
.....
.....

6.6 SUMMARY

In this above chapter we study about The Second Nun who in 'The Canterbury Tales' is a somewhat cryptic character who denounces laziness and praises virginity. In this lesson, we'll learn about her description and discuss clues to her character. The Yeoman is an unhappy person. He is a young man who serves as an assistant in a job he does not like. His work has ruined him physically and financially. A manciple is someone who's in charge of purchasing food and supplies for an institution like a school, monastery or law court. This particular manciple works for an inn of court (the "temple"), which is a place where lawyers might live or gather. The Parson - The only devout churchman in the company, the Parson lives in poverty, but is rich in holy thoughts and deeds. The pastor of a sizable town, he preaches the Gospel and makes sure to practice what he preaches. He is everything that the Monk, the Friar, and the Pardoner are not.

6.7 KEYWORDS

Baptized – to immerse in water or sprinkle , to cleanses spiritually

Execution – the act or process of executing

Paganism – pagan spirit

Transformational –something that changes

alchemical – a form of chemistry

contradiction - difference

Blurs- to obscure

Anthologized –to compile anthology

Genres -types

Encapsulation –to summarize

6.8 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

Write the analysis of the Second Nun in the story of Canterbury.

Do you feel that the story and life of the Nuns in the story is different

.Explain how?

Why does Chaucer write retraction at the end of the poem?

Do you find the Similarities in the characters in the story.

6.9 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

Chaucer Bibliography Online

Geoffrey Chaucer at the *Encyclopædia Britannica*

Works by Geoffrey Chaucer at Project Gutenberg

Works by or about Geoffrey Chaucer at Internet Archive

Works by Geoffrey Chaucer at LibriVox (public domain audiobooks) 

Poems by Geoffrey Chaucer at PoetryFoundation.org

Early Editions of Chaucer

BBC television adaptation of certain of *The Canterbury Tales*

Geoffrey Chaucer on *In Our Time*

6.10 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. The Second Nun's Tale is a conventional religious biography, a “saint’s life”, as the medieval genre it belongs to is often called. Written in rime royal, it is very likely that Chaucer composed the tale previous to and separate from the Canterbury project, and only adapted it to fit within the Tales later. The Second Nun tells the story of Saint Cecilia in a dry, sanctimonious fashion that exalts her suffering and patient adherence to her faith, and, in a fashion that might be compared to the Prioress’ and the Clerk’s tales, stresses the patent inhumanity and saintliness of Cecilia from the first moment.

2. The central image of the Canon Yeoman’s tale is the devilish furnace at the center of their back-street workshop, and it is a complex metaphor: for hell, for devilish behavior – and falseness, but also for money.

3. This is the tale proper of the Canon’s Yeoman, and it tells of a Canon whose infinite falsehood and slyness cannot be written. He makes anyone he communicates with behave foolishly, and yet people ride for

miles to make his acquaintance, not knowing or suspecting that he is a charlatan.

4. The Host turns to the sleeping cook, and asks whether any man might be able to wake him. Awaking, pale and unalert, the Cook proclaims that he would rather sleep than have some of the best wine in Cheapside. The Manciple steps in courteously, excusing the cook, and then mocking him – his open mouth, which the devil could put his foot in, his stinking breath – to his face for his drunkenness. The Cook is furious, but too drunk to speak, and promptly falls off his horse.

5. When Phoebus, god of poetry, lived on earth, he was the lustiest of bachelors, a superior archer and the envy of all for his singing and playing on his musical instruments. Phoebus kept in his house a white crow, which could imitate the speech of any man, and who could sing more beautifully than a nightingale. Phoebus also had a wife, whom he loved more than his own life, and did his best to please her and treat her courteously – except that he was extremely jealous, and so would watch her suspiciously.

6. There is something hugely destructive – and self-destructive – about this tale, and particularly the way it takes the god of poetry, himself a plausible representative for the whole idea of the Tales themselves, and turns him into a petty, jealous murderer. The Manciple's Tale is almost painfully brief - not given to flights of fancy, we are given the simple information – jealous husband, unfaithful wife, talking crow, and then destruction, of wife, of crow, and of poetry.

7. The Parson's tale is not actually a tale as such, but a lengthy medieval sermon on the subject of penitence. The first part of his sermon defines the three parts of penitence – contrition, confession and satisfaction, and expounds at length (with several biblical examples) the causes of the contrition.

Notes

The second part of the sermon considers confession, which is the truthful revelation of the sinner's sin to the priest. Sin is then explained as the eventual product of a struggle between the body and soul for dominance of a person – and therefore there are two types of sin: venial (minor, smaller sins) and deadly (serious sins).

The third part of the sermon considers each of the seven deadly sins as branches of a tree of which Pride is the trunk. Pride is the worst of the sins, because the other sins (Ire, Envy, Sloth, Avarice, Gluttony and Lechery) all stem from Pride. Each sin's description is followed by its spiritual remedy – and the Parson states the rules for oral confession.

UNIT – 7 : CANTERBURY TALES – PART 6

STRUCTURE

- 7.0 Objectives
- 7.1 Introduction
- 7.2 The Prioress Tale
- 7.3 Analysis of Sir Thopas
- 7.4 Tale of Milbee
- 7.5 The Monk's Tale
- 7.6 The Monk's Tale –Analysis
- 7.7 The Nun's Priest's Tale
- 7.8 Summary
- 7.9 Keywords
- 7.10 Questions for Review
- 7.11 Suggested Readings and References
- 7.12 Answers to Check Your Progress

7.0 OBJECTIVES

After learning this unit based on Introduction to Race, you can learn about the following topics:

Study of the Clerk, Host and the Merchant.

Conversation between the characters

Epilogue of the Merchant.

7.1 INTRODUCTION

In Medieval England, most people were illiterate. This is why Church stain glass windows and wall paintings depict bible stories- it helped the congregation follow the biblical stories. If you were lucky enough to receive an education, however, then you would have learnt French and Latin, the language of the Court and the Church. Chaucer, due to his family's wealth and connection, was one of the fortunate people who learnt to read and write.

Notes

Chaucer was not a professional writer but wrote for pleasure, for his own amusement and that of his family and friends. His poetry was a great favourite of the King's. Chaucer wrote in Middle English, writing works such as *Troilus and Criseyde* and *House of Fame*. Though not the first to write in the vernacular, he appears to be instrumental in popularising it. Whilst working as Controller of Customs and Justice of Peace in 1386, however, he began writing his most famous works- *The Canterbury Tales*.

The Canterbury Tales, written in a combination of verse and prose, tells the story of some 30 pilgrims walking from Southwark to Canterbury on a pilgrimage to the shrine of St Thomas Beckett. On route, the pilgrims engage in a story telling competition to win a meal at the Tabard Inn! Thus, *The Canterbury Tales* is a collection of 24 stories, told as the pilgrims make their journey to Canterbury Cathedral.

Chaucer's work is not simply a story; *The Canterbury Tales* is also a comment on English society at the time. The very fact that Chaucer wrote in English demonstrates his dismissal of accepted practices. Chaucer's characters offer various social insights and raise various questions concerning social class, spirituality and religion. The work was unfinished when Chaucer died.

7.2 THE CANTERBURY TALES SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF THE PRIORESS' TALE

Prologue of the Prioress' Tale

The Prioress' prologue is simply a prayer to the Virgin Mary, worshipping God, and asking her to help the narrator properly to tell of God's reverence, and to guide the tale as it is told.

The Prioress' Tale

Once in an Asian town, there was a Jewish ghetto at the end of a street, in which usury and other things hateful to Christ occurred. The Christian minority in the town opened a school for their children in this city at the other end of the same street. Among the children attending this school was a widow's son, an angelic seven year old who was, even at his young age, deeply devoted to his faith. At school he learned songs in Latin, and

could sing his Ave Marie and Alma redemptoris, a song giving praise to the Virgin Mary, and pay due reverence to Christ.

As he was walking home from school one day singing his Alma redemptoris, he provoked the anger of the Jews of the city, whose hearts were wasps' nests made by Satan. They hired a murderer who slit the boys' throat and threw the body into a cesspit.

The widow searched all night for her missing child, begging the Jews to tell her where her child might be found, but they refused to help her or give her any information. Jesus, however, gave her the idea to sing in the place where her son had been cast into the pit: and as she called out to him, the child, although his throat was slit, began to sing his Alma redemptoris. The other Christians of the city ran to the pit, amazed at what was happening, and sent for the provost.

The provost praised Christ and his mother, Mary, and had the Jews tied up. The child was taken up and carried, in a great and honorable procession to the nearest abbey, his corpse singing all the while. The local provost cursed the Jews, and ordered their death by hanging. Before the child was buried, holy water was sprinkled onto him, and he began to speak. The abbot of the abbey questioned him as to how he could sing, and the child answered that the Virgin Mary had placed a grain on his tongue that allowed him to speak. The abbot took this grain from his tongue, allowing him to die, and finally pass on to heaven. The child was buried in a marble tomb as a martyr, and the tale ends with a lament for the young child, but also for "Hugh of Lyncoln" (a real child martyr, allegedly slain by Jews in Chaucer's day).

Analysis

The Prioress' Tale is overtly a "Miracle of the Virgin", a reasonably common Christian genre of literature which represents a tale centered around Christian principles and a devotion to the Virgin Mary, but within the warm affection that the Prioress shows for her Christian faith is a

Notes

disquieting anti-Semitism immediately obvious to the modern reader in our post-Holocaust times.

The tale is an unabashed celebration of motherhood, and an unapologetic argument for the virtue of Christianity over Judaism, and in most critics' readings, it partly serves as a grim reminder that anti-Semitism by no means began with Hitler in the Second World War. The guiding figure of the tale is the Virgin Mary, addressed directly in its prologue, who serves both as the exemplar for Christian values and as the intervening spirit who sustains the murdered child before he passes on to heaven. Her mortal parallel is the mother of the murdered boy, who dearly loves her son and struggles to find the boy when he is lost.

The Tale itself, as Seth Lerer has pointed out is "a nightmare of performance..." which "dramatizes just what happens when a performer faces a hostile audience". The little clergeoun of the tale (the child) is an unsuspecting victim, murdered solely because of his eagerness to sing: one of many tales which seems to take as its theme the danger of speaking, the potential danger of words and language, and a warning about what happens to people who open their mouths at the wrong moment (other such tales include those of the Manciple and the Nun's Priest).

Despite its interest in song and performance, the key question still seems to be whether we are to read the tale as an outdated example of anti-Semitism, acceptable to a medieval audience but acceptable no longer or whether there is another option. If there is, it probably lies in the sentimental presentation of the Prioress' Tale, and the juxtaposition of the extremely angelic singing seven year old, and the extremely cruel and horrible Jews (who even go to the lengths of throwing the child's corpse into a cesspit). If we remember that the Prioress is a woman so sentimental that she even cries over a dead mouse, it's quite a contrast in her personality that she expends such vitriol over the Jews. Perhaps there is some sort of contrast; perhaps the Prioress is intended to be held at

arm's length from Chaucer. The bottom line with this tale is that it entirely depends on your reading of the details.

Check your progress 1:

1. What is the prioress tale about?

.....

2. What does it celebrate?

.....

7.3 THE CANTERBURY TALES SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF CHAUCER'S TALE OF SIR THOPAS

Prologue to the Sir Thopas

When the Prioress' Tale was done, every man in the company looks serious, having heard of the miracle she described. Until the Host, beginning to joke, turns to Chaucer himself ("he looked upon me") and asks him what sort of man he is, as he is always looking at the ground. "Looke up murily", the Host tells Chaucer, calling him a doll ("popet") and describing him as elvish-faced. The Host then demands that Chaucer tells a "tale of myrthe", and "that anon" (do it soon). Chaucer replies to the Host that he only knows one tale: a rhyme that he learned many years before.

The Tale of Sir Thopas

(I) Asking the "lords" to listen, the tale announces itself as being "of myrthe and of solas" (fun and seriousness). It then introduces Thopas, a fair knight with a white face, rose-red lips, blond hair and beard, and a seemly nose. Thopas was very well dressed and he could hunt for deer,

go hawking, and he was a good archer. Many maidens were brought in for him to sleep with, but he was chaste, and no lecher.

One day Thopas went out riding on his gray horse, carrying a lancegay and a longsword, and passed through a forest which had many wild beasts in it (buck as well as hares). Thopas heard the birdsong and fell into a love-sickness, and rode so fast that his horse sweated.

Thopas therefore lay down to give him and his horse a rest, deciding that he would be in love with an elf-queen.

Thopas then climbed back into his saddle to find an elf-queen, but he came across a great giant called “Sire Olifaunt”, who threatened Thopas that, if he left his territory, he would kill his horse. Thopas (described as “the child”) said that he would meet with the giant tomorrow, as he had forgotten his armor, and travelled in the opposite direction very fast. This giant threw stones at him, but he got away.

(II) “Yet listeth” (keep listening) to my tale, the narrator continues, because Thopas has again come to town. He commanded his merry men, as he had to fight a giant with three heads. They gave him sweet wine and gingerbread and licorice, and then Thopas got dressed in his armour. The end of this fit tells the company that if they “wol any moore of it” (want to hear any more) then the narrator will try to oblige them.

(III) “Now holde youre mouth, par charitee” (Now shut up, for charity’s sake) begins the third fit, before explaining that Thopas is of royal chivalry. Thopas drank water from the well with the knight Sir Percivel, until one day...

Here the Host “stynteth” [stops] Chaucer’s Tale of Thopas

No more of this, for God’s sake, says the Host, criticizing the “rym dogerel” which Chaucer uses. Chaucer asks why he has had his tale stopped when it is the best rhyme he knows – and the Host replies that his crappy rhymes are not worth a turd, advising him rather to tell

something in prose. Chaucer obliges, promising “a litel thyng in prose”, finally asking the Host to let him tell “al my tale, I preye”.

Analysis

Sir Thopas offers up one of the funniest moments in the *Canterbury Tales*. Written in ridiculously bouncy tail rhyme, the poem is a hilarious parody of Middle English verse romances packed full of bizarre pastoral details. Thopas, for example, is hugely effeminized, well-dressed, and with a girl’s name (Thopas was usually a woman’s name in the medieval period). Thopas falls in love, in the manner of the courtly knight, before he has decided who he will be in love with (an elf-queen, in the end) and runs away from his climactic battle at the end of the first fit because he has forgotten his armour.

In the Ellesmere manuscript, the setting of Sir Thopas has the tale ever vanishing into the margin, and close readers will note the way each fit is half the length of its predecessor - there is, as well as its “dogerel” parody of verse romance, a definite sense that Chaucer the character has definitely run out of things to say. Note the number of times Chaucer has to ask the company to listen or to be quiet (implying perhaps the jeers and responses of a less-than-impressed pilgrim audience) and note too the way that details from the prologue seem to echo in the *Tales*: an effeminized, antisocial Chaucer becomes an effeminized, entirely chaste Thopas, the Host’s comment that Chaucer looks like he would find a “hare” becomes a forest with hares for wild beasts, an “elvish” looking-Chaucer inspires the “elf-queen who is to be Thopas’ lover. To that, we might add, a storyteller Chaucer reluctant to tell a tale (but pushed into the spotlight) becomes a knightly Thopas desperate to escape knightly combat. The apparent purposelessness of the narrative, packed with pointless details, might well reflect a narrator who is making the tale up as he goes along.

There are several interpretable jokes hidden in the fabric of the tale. Chaucer is parodying his own endless inventiveness, celebrating his own skill at creating varied voices, by presenting himself as someone who

cannot even come up with a single bearable story – and, silenced by his own characters, the abortion of Chaucer’s tale actually points to a remark about the strength of his characterization. Chaucer’s characters, it seems, are so well written that they give advice about tale-telling to their writer. Sir Thopas, vanishing fit by fit as it does, also demonstrates Chaucer’s awareness of his own elusiveness, the self-vanishing quality which enacts the invisibility of the writer’s point of view – which we have already mentioned in several other tales. The Chaucer sent into the fiction to represent the author is, we and he know all too well, a poor imitation of the real thing - but it is the nearest thing to an omniscient author we are going to get.

Check your progress 2:

3. What is the story of Sir Thopas?

.....
.....
.....

7.4 THE CANTERBURY TALES SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF CHAUCER'S TALE OF MELIBEE

The Tale of Melibee

There was once a young man named Melibee, mighty and rich, who had with his

wife Prudence, a daughter called Sophie. One day he took a walk into the fields, leaving his wife and daughter inside his house, with the doors shut fast. Three of his old enemies saw it, and, setting ladders to the wall of his house, entered, beating his wife, and giving his daughter mortal wounds in five places: "in hir feet, in hire handes, in hir erys, in hir nose, and in hir mouth" (972).

When Melibee returned and saw what had happened, he was like a madman, tearing his clothes, weeping and crying. Prudence, his wife,

stopped his tears, and gave him some useful advice from various authorities. Prudence eventually advised him to call a group of people to come to him, to explain to them what had happened, and listen to their counsel.

As per his wife's instructions, Melibee took counsel from "the grete congregacioun of folk", and the advice falls into two camps. The surgeons, physicians, lawyers, and the old urge caution, and a considered reaction, but his neighbors and "yonge folk" urge war.

Melibee wants to wage war, and Prudence urges haste - there follows an argument about who should prevail, and Prudence, eventually, triumphs. She tells Melibee that he should choose his counselors carefully, and to set their advice against their – apparent and hidden - motives.

Prudence then, at length, goes through all of the advice that Melibee has been given and shows him that open war is not a good option, for a variety of moral, ethical, and practical reasons.

Prudence interprets the attack on Sophie as the damage done to her because of man's vulnerability to the World, the Flesh, and the Devil. Her remedy: negotiate peace and leave all to God's grace and forgiveness.

The three enemies who have performed the deed are found and brought before Prudence, who suggests forgiving them; Melibee again argues for a fine, which she again argues him out of. Melibee forgives them, and, delighted with himself, praises at length his own generosity.

Analysis:

Don't worry if you've never read Melibee in full - a very famous academic (who I shall leave nameless) studying at one of the world's most renowned universities once admitted to me that she'd never made it right through either. Melibee, first and foremost, seems to be a punishment for cutting Chaucer off mid-flight with Sir Thopas; before

beginning it, he promises a “litel thyng in prose”, asks that he is not interrupted, and then delivers a hugely lengthy tale of almost unsurpassed dullness. If one saw in *Thopas* running from the giant the figure of Chaucer trying to escape the Host’s demand, Melibee seems to represent him coming back with the armor.

Some critics have also argued that an omission Chaucer deliberately makes from its source, Renaud de Louens' *Livre de Melibee et de Dame Prudence* [after 1336] (itself a translation of Albertanus of Brescia, *Liber consolationis et consilii*) [1246]) points to Melibee as a separate composition intended for the recently-crowned Richard II. Among Melibee’s many pieces of advice, Chaucer omits, significantly for a child-king, “Woe to the land that has a child as king”. Is this, perhaps a manual for a king?

Melibee is also rather self-consciously a construction; a patchwork of proverbs, sayings and wise words, some of which have already appeared in the tales, and none of which are likely to be entirely original. Part of the reason for its length is that its characters constantly cite authority after authority to justify their opinion – and this academic arguing inflates the thin plot of the tale into page after page of citation and quotation. So keen is everyone to get their favorite authority into the argument that we never even find out what happens to mortally-wounded Sophie.

Melibee is, like *Thopas* (improvised from its situation), a text made up of text – and it proves (particularly if the Parson’s tale, the only other tale in prose, was a late addition to the Canterbury project) Chaucer’s mastery of genre, if nothing else. Prose tracts, full of academic discussion rather than dramatic, narrative progression, are not without of his ability.

Within the tale itself, Prudence is another example of the patient and long-suffering wife who demonstrates her virtue through stoicism, and, like Constance, her name is an obvious signifier of one of her prominent qualities (Sophie, the daughter, has a name meaning “wisdom”). Her role in the story is not as an active agent, she is a passive influence on the

other characters; and she is a good example to consider in examining the issue of “female counsel”, raised hitherto but particularly in the Nun’s Priest’s Tale. Melibee suggests, above all, that women are worthy counselors and interpreters, and, although the tale celebrates Prudence, its title is apt - it points to Melibee himself, a man able to learn from his wife, whose name means “sweet learning” or “sweet knowledge”.

7.5 THE CANTERBURY TALES SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF THE MONK'S TA LE

Prologue to the Monk's Tale

When Chaucer's tale of Melibee has finished, the Host says (for the second time) that he wishes his wife could hear the tale of Prudence and her patience and wise counsel: his wife, he goes on to extrapolate, is an ill-tempered shrew. Turning to address the Monk, he bids him be 'myrie of cheere', and asks whether his name is John, Thomas or Albon, asking which house he is of. Admiring the Monk's skin and stature, the Host jokes that he could be a good breeding fowl, if only he were allowed to breed! Religion, the Host goes on, has taken up all the best breeding people, and left just the puny creatures to populate the world.

The Monk takes all this joking well, and promises a tale (or two, or three) of the life of Edward the Confessor, but first, announces he will tell some tragedies, of which he has a hundred stored up. Tragedy, as the Monk defines it, is a story from an old book of someone who fell from high degree and great prosperity into misery, and ended wretchedly; tragedies are also usually presented in hexameters, he thinks.

The Monk's Tale

7.6 THE MONK'S TALE

Lucifer is the first tragedy told, who fell from an angelic heaven down to Hell. Adam is next, the one man not born of original sin, who was driven from Paradise.

Sampson's tale is told at greater length, explaining how he fell from grace when he admitted his secret to his wife, who betrayed it to his

enemies and then took another lover. The story is that Samson slew one thousand men with an ass's jawbone, then prayed for God to quench his thirst. From the jawbone's tooth sprung a well. He would have conquered the world if he had not told Delilah that his strength came from his refusal to cut his hair. Without this strength his enemies cut out Samson's eyes and imprisoned him. In the temple where Samson was kept he knocked down two of the pillars, killing himself and everyone else in the temple.

Hercules' tragedy is next. Hercules' strength was unparalleled, but he was finally defeated when Deianera sent Hercules a poisoned shirt made by Nessus.

Nabugodonosor (also spelled Nebuchadnezzar), was the king of Babylon who had twice defeated Israel. The proud king constructed a large gold statue that he demanded his subjects pray to or else be cast into a pit of flames. Yet when Daniel disobeyed the king, Nebuchadnezzar lost all dignity, acting like a great beast until God relieved him of his insanity.

The next tragedy is about Balthasar, the son of Nebuchadnezzar, who also worshipped false idols. He had a feast for a thousand lords in which they drank wine out of sacred vessels, but during his feast he saw an armless hand writing on a wall. Daniel warned Balthasar of his father's fate. Daniel warned him that his kingdom would be divided by Medes and the Persians. Balthasar, according to the Monk, exemplifies the way that Fortune makes friends with people before making enemies with them.

Cenobia (or Zenobia), who was beautiful and victorious in war, is the next tragic hero of the tale. The queen of Palmyra refused the duties of women and refused to marry, until she was forced to wed Odenathus. She permitted him to have sex with her only so that she could get pregnant, but no more. Yet the proud woman, once Odenathus was dead, was defeated by the Romans and paraded through Rome bound in chains. King Pedro of Spain, subject of the next story, was cast from his kingdom by his brother. When attempting to regain his throne, Pedro was murdered by this brother.

Peter, King of Cyprus, is the next subject; he brought ruin on his kingdom and was thus murdered.

Other tragedies include Bernabo Visconti, who wrongly imprisoned his nephew. Ugolino of Pisa, a count, was imprisoned in a tower in Pisa with his three young children after Ruggieri, the bishop of Pisa, had led a rebellion against him. His youngest son died of starvation, and out of his misery Ugolini gnawed on his own arms. The two children that remained thought that Ugolini was chewing himself out of hunger, and offered themselves as meals for him.

They all eventually starved. Nero did nothing but satisfy his own lusts and even cut open his own mother to see the womb from which he came. He had Seneca murdered for stating that an emperor should be virtuous. When it appeared that Nero would be assassinated for his cruelty, he killed himself. Holofernes ordered his subjects to renounce every law and worship Nebuchadnezzar. For this sin Judith cut off Holofernes' head as he was sleeping.

The Monk next tells of Antiochus Epiphanes, who was punished by God for attacks on the Jews. God made Antiochus infested with loathsome maggots. The Monk then admits that most have heard of Alexander the Great, poisoned by his very own offspring. He follows with the tale of Julius Caesar, who had Pompey murdered but was himself assassinated by Brutus. The final story is of Croesus, King of Lydia, the proud and wealthy king who was hanged.

All of these tales are simply re-tellings of the popularly known stories: all focus on the same theme of people of high degree falling into misery or death. Finally the Monk's Tale is interrupted.

Analysis:

The Monk provides one of the first-known definitions of tragedy in English literature, and, though his tale might have been fascinating to Chaucer's medieval audience, many of whom would not know the classical stories it largely details, it does not receive a huge amount of attention or adoration from modern readers and critics.

The Monk's tragedies are drawn from a variety of sources: Biblical, classical, historical and even some that, in Chaucer's time, would have been within reasonably recent folklore and memory. Yet the model of tragedy that the Monk offers is not, in fact, a classical model as such, but a Boethian one - a reminder of the mutability of life itself, and the tendency of fickle, feminine Fortune to spin her wheel and bring those at the top crashing down to the ground. It is, on one level, simply a series of car-crash narratives - an unrelenting dark, Boethian reminder that the high-status end miserably.

Some more recent studies have tried to locate the Monk's tale, with its emphasis on the stories told about the history, and its focus on the writers from whom the Monk has drawn the stories, as a response to Boccaccio's *De casibus* tragedies and a comment on the involvement of writing, poets and poetry in the support of tyrants and despots.

Yet neither of these readings of the Tale really explains what it is doing within its context. Louise Fradenburg argues very persuasively in her book that the Monk is a death's head at the feast - a sudden explosion of misery and death into the festive fun of the Canterbury project.

The Monk's own solid physical reality, good for breeding (so the Host jokes - and breeding is the opposite of dying) is juxtaposed with his tales, precisely about the end of the body and its death, rather than life and strength.

Moreover, the numbers that the Monk quotes - he has a hundred tragedies in his cell, of which he manages to fit in seventeen before he is interrupted - suggest a painfully dismal repetition of the fall from fortune to misery, fortune to misery, fortune to misery. It is rather as if the Monk himself becomes a sort of anti-Canterbury Tales all of his own: each of his mini-tales progressively darkening the horizon.

It is no wonder then that the Knight sees fit to interrupt the Monk and halt his tale - particularly as the Monk tells tales largely about the demise of high-status characters (and the Knight, of course, is the pilgrimage's

highest-ranking pilgrim). The Monk himself presents a threat to the fun of the tale: he is all 'ernest' and no 'game', as the Host points out to him, and - beginning a trend which arises more and more as these final tales progress - when he is interrupted, he refuses to speak any further. One of the tellers has his mouth firmly closed.

Check your progress 3:

4. What is the tale of Melibee?

.....
.....
.....

5. What was the tale of Sampson?

.....
.....
.....

6. What are the different tragesies the monk mentioned?

.....
.....
.....

7.7 THE CANTERBURY TALES SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF THE NUN'S PRIEST'S TALE

The Prologue of the Nun's Priest's Tale

Here the Knight "stynteth" (stops) the Monk's Tale

"Hoo!" says the Knight, "good sire, namoore of this". The Knight then praises the Monk, but says that he has heard quite enough about mens' sudden falls from high status and grace, and would far rather hear about men climbing from poverty to prosperity.

The Host steps in to concur, telling the Monk that his tale is boring the company, and that his talk is worth nothing, because there is no fun to be had from it. The Host asks the Monk to tell another tale - and the Monk responds that, having no desire to play and have fun, he has said all he has to say. The Host then turns to the Nun's Priest, asking him to draw near, and asking him to be merry of heart in his tale. "Yis, sir", says the

Nun's Priest – and, described as a “sweete preest” by the narrator, the Nun's Priest begins his tale.

The Nun's Priest's Tale

A poor widow, rather advanced in age, had a small cottage beside a grove, standing in a dale. This widow led a very simple life, providing for herself and her daughters from a small farm. In a yard which she kept, enclosed all around with palings and with a ditch outside it, she had a cock called Chauncleer, who was peerless in his crowing. Chauncleer was beautifully coloured, with a comb redder than coral, and a beak as black as jet, and he had under his government seven chickens, who were his paramours, of which his favourite was

Dame Pertelote.

One morning, Chauncleer began to groan in his throat, as a man who was troubled in his dreams does, and Pertelote, aghast, asked him what the matter was. Chauncleer replied that he had had a bad dream, and prayed to God to help him to correctly interpret it. He had dreamt that he, roaming around the yard, saw an animal “lyk an hound” which tried to seize his body and have him dead. The “hound's” colour was somewhere between yellow and red, and his tail and both his ears were tipped with black.

Pertelote mocked him, telling him that he was a coward. Pertelote then argues that dreams are meaningless visions, caused simply by ill humors (bad substances in the body) – and quotes

Cato at length to demonstrate her point. Her solution is that she will pick herbs from the yard in order to bring his humors back to normal.

Chauncleer disagreed, arguing that while Cato is certainly an authority, there are many more authorities available to be read who argue that dreams are significations – of good things and bad things to come. He stated the example of one man who, lying in his bed, dreamt that his friend was being murdered for his gold in an ox's stall, and that his body was hidden in a dung cart. Remembering his dream, this man went to a dung cart at the west gate of the town, and found the murdered body of his friend. Chauncleer then described the story of two men, who were

preparing to cross the sea. One of them dreamed that, if he crossed the sea the next day, he would be drowned - he told his companion, who laughed at him, and resolved to go anyway. The ship's bottom tore, and his companion was drowned. Chaunticleer also cited the examples of Macrobius, Croesus and Andromache, who each had prophecies in their dreams.

Then, however, Chaunticleer praised Pertelote, asking her to speak of "mirth", and stop all this talk of prophecy - the beauty of her face, he says, makes him feel fearless. He then quoted the proverb "Mulier est hominis confusio", translating it as "Woman is man's joy and all his bliss", when it actually translates "Woman is man's ruin". Chaunticleer then flew down from his beam, called all of his hens to him, and revealed that he'd found a grain lying in the yard. He then clasped Pertelote to him with his wings, and copulated with her until morning.

When the month of March was over, Chaunticleer was walking in full pride, all of his wives around him, when a coal fox (a fox with black-tipped feet, ears and tail) broke through the hedges and into the yard. He bode his time for a while. The narrator then goes off into an aside, addressing Chaunticleer, and wishing that he had taken "wommennes conseils" (woman's counsel) - before he moves back into the tale, reminding us that his tale "is of a cok".

Chaunticleer sang merrily in the yard, and, casting his eyes among the cabbages, caught sight of the fox - and would have fled, but the fox addressed him, asking where he was going, and claiming to be his friend. The fox claimed to have met Chaunticleer's mother and father, and talked of his father's excellent singing voice, and the way his father used to stretch out his neck and stand on his tiptoes before singing. The fox then asked whether Chaunticleer can sing like his father - and Chaunticleer stood on his tiptoes, stretched out his neck, closed his eyes, and, as he began to sing, the fox grabbed him by the throat and ran off to the wood with him.

The poor widow and her two daughters, hearing the cry of the chickens, ran after the fox toward the crove, and many other men and animals ran after them. Chaunticleer managed to speak to the fox, and encouraged him to turn to his pursuers and curse them, telling him that he was going to eat the cock. The fox agreed – but as he opened his mouth to agree, the cock broke from his mouth suddenly and flew high up into a tree. The fox tried to persuade him down, saying that he had been misinterpreted, and that Chaunticleer should fly down in order that he might “seye sooth” (tell the truth) about what he had meant, but Chaunticleer knew better this time. The fox finally cursed all those who “jangleth whan he sholde holde his pees” (chatters when he should hold his peace).

The narrator then addresses everyone who thinks the tale is mere foolery, asking them to take the moral of the tale, rather than the tale itself: taking the fruit, and letting the chaff remain.

Thus ends the Nun’s Priest’s Tale.

Epilogue to the Nun's Priest's Tale

The Host, praises the tale as "myrie", and then, as he did with the Monk, suggests that the Nun's Priest would be an excellent breeding man (trede-foul) if only he were allowed to breed

- for the Nun's Priest, the Host continues, is brawny, with a great neck and large chest. Analysis

The Nun’s Priest’s Tale is one of the best-loved and best-known of all of the Tales, and one whose genre, in Chaucer’s time and now, is instantly recognizable. It is a beast fable, just like Aesop’s fable, and as one of Chaucer’s successors, the medieval Scots poet Robert Henryson, would go on to explore in great detail, its key relationship is that between human and animal. The key question of the genre is addressed at the end by the narrator himself: telling those who find a tale about animals a folly to take the moral from the tale, disregarding the tale itself. But can we take a human moral from a tale about animals? Can an animal represent – even just in a tale – a human in any useful way?

For a start, it is important to notice that the animal-human boundary is blurred even before the tale begins, when the Host mocks the Nun’s Priest (who, being a religious man, would have been celibate) and

suggesting that he would have made excellent breeding stock (a “tredefowl”, or breeding-fowl, is the word he uses). The thought is an interesting one – because if we can think of the Nun’s Priest himself as potentially useful in breeding, animalistic terms, then can we think of his tale in potentially useful in human terms?

The question frames the other themes of the tale. The issue of woman’s counsel is raised again (last foregrounded in Chaucer’s tale of Melibee) explicitly – should Chaunticleer take Pertelote’s advice about how to interpret his dreams? Should he disregard his dreams, and get on with his life? He does, of course, looking among the cabbages (perhaps even to find herbs), when he sees the fox – and at that point, the tale seems to suggest, he should never have listened to his wife in the first place: his fears were valid.

That is, until we remember what the narrator tells us anyway at a crucial point, that his tale is “of a cok” – about a chicken. It is hardly as if we need a prophetic dream to tell us that foxes like eating chickens: its what we might call animal instinct. This is doubly highlighted when, after quoting Cato and discussing the various textual politics of dream interpretation, Chaunticleer calls his wives excitedly to him because he has found a grain of corn – and then has uncomplicated animal sex with Pertelote all night. It is a contradiction, Chaucer seems to imply, to expect unchicken-like behavior from a chicken: yet the contradiction is one which fuels the whole genre of beast fable. If the Nun’s Priest had too much human dignity and restraint to be a breeding fowl, Cato-quoting Chaunticleer has animal urges too strong to be a viable auctour.

Except that, of course, with the possible exception of Arviragus and Dorigen in the Franklin’s Tale, there is no more stable and robust “marriage” in the Canterbury Tales than Chanticleer and Pertelote’s. The two fowl have a fulfilling sexual relationship - and the sex occurs as a pleasurable, uncomplicated end in itself, a stark contrast with the sexual transactions of the Franklin and the Wife of Bath’s tales. In one sense, then, the animals are not so bestial.

Notes

Interpreting dreams, incidentally, is a favorite theme of Middle English literature, and it frames a whole genre of poetry, known as “dream poems”, of which Chaucer himself wrote several (including the *Book of the Duchess* and the *House of Fame*). Dreams and text are closely intertwined, and – even in this tale – the way in which a dream poem juxtaposes the text of the dream with the text of the story is clear. Is a dream any more or less real than a tale? If we can take a moral from a tale, can we take one from a dream?

This tale is in many ways a return to the ground, a return to basics. We start with a poor widow, and a dusty yard - a setting far removed from the high-culture classical tragedies of the *Monk*. Moreover, the tale keeps emphasizing anality and bottoms - in Chaunticleer’s two examples of dreams-coming-true, a dung cart and a breaking ship’s “bottom” are the hinge of the story, and Pertelote’s advice to Chaunticleer is to take some “laxatyf” to clear out his humours. There is a good-natured sense of groundedness about this tale, a return – after the dark run of *Monk* (interrupted), before him the punishing *Melibee* (and interrupted *Sir Thopas*) and bitter *Prioress* – to the humour and warmth of the early tales. Yet its theme also darkly foreshadows the end of the tale-telling project itself.

If the tale, taken simplistically, does endorse prophetic dreams (though, as mentioned above, a look at the animal nature of its characters might be seen as parodying the whole concept!) then what is the “moral” that the narrator wants us to take away at the end? As ever, this isn’t totally clear. Yet one thing it might be is the importance of speaking or not speaking.

One of the things that makes Chaunticleer the morally-representative chicken a problem is the fact that he can speak and argue with his wife on the one hand, yet cry “cok! Cok!” when he sees a grain on the floor. He is both chicken and human, rather like Chaucer writes as both himself and as *Nun’s Priest*. The tale, however, is structured by people knowing when to speak and not knowing when to speak: *Pertelote* speaks out to wake Chaunticleer from his dream, Chaunticleer foolishly opens his mouth to sing for the fox when he is captured, and it is Chaunticleer’s

final visitation of the trap that he himself fell into on the fox which causes him in turn to open his mouth – and let Chaunticleer go. Know when you should “jangle” (chatter) and know when to hold your peace.

It is a theme of course which points a sharp finger at the whole idea of a beast fable - the whole genre, we might argue, resting on the writer precisely ignoring the correct moments to have a character speak or not speak; and it also is a dangerous moral for the Tales as a whole. In a work of literature that constantly apes orality, the injunction to shut up is a serious one – and, as a comparison of the Nun’s Priest’s Tale to the Manciple’s Tale reveals – one very much in Chaucer’s mind at the very end of the Canterbury project.

Check your Progress 4:

7. What is the tale of the Nun?

.....

8. What is the theme of the story?

.....

7.8 SUMMARY

In this chapter we study about the prioress, Sir Thopla, Melibee, the monk. The only devout churchman in the company, the Parson lives in poverty, but is rich in holy thoughts and deeds. The pastor of a sizable town, he preaches the Gospel and makes sure to practice what he preaches. He is everything that the Monk, the Friar, and the Pardoner are not. The Monk, Chaucer tells us, is a manly man. ... Like the Prioress, the Monk is all sorts of things that, as a religious figure, he should probably not be – a hunter, overfed, expensively-dressed in fur and gold jewelry, and a cultivator of expensive habits. Chaucer tells about two different characters Melibee and Sir Thoplas.

The characters are very different from their names.

7.9 KEYWORDS

Effeminized –the state or quality of being effeminate

Antisocial –somebody who follows own unsocial rules against the society

Parodying –a humorous satirical imitation

Congregation –to come together

Triumphs - victorious

Extrapolate –to infer from something that is known

Hexameters – a dactylic of six lines

Paramours – an illicit lover

Juxtaposes- to place close together

Boethian –Roman philosopher

7.10 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

How is the life of the Nuns and the Monk in the Medieval period?

Write the similarities or links that join the characters together.

Chaucer have created an epic through the writing of Canterbury Tales.Explain.

7.11 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

Bisson, Lillian M. (1998). *Chaucer and the late medieval world*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Cooper, Helen (1996). *The Canterbury tales*. Oxford guides to Chaucer (2 ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pearsall, Derek Albert (1985). *The Canterbury tales*. Unwin critical library. London: G. Allen & Unwin.

Scattered among the nations: documents affecting Jewish history, 49 to 1975. Alexis P. Rubin (ed.).

7.12 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. The Prioress' prologue is simply a prayer to the Virgin Mary, worshipping God, and asking her to help the narrator properly to tell of God's reverence, and to guide the tale as it is told. The Prioress' Tale is overtly a "Miracle of the Virgin", a reasonably common Christian genre of literature which represents a tale centered around Christian principles and a devotion to the Virgin Mary, but within the warm affection that the Prioress shows for her Christian faith is a disquieting anti-Semitism immediately obvious to the modern reader in our post-Holocaust times.

2. Sir Thopas offers up one of the funniest moments in the Canterbury Tales. Written in ridiculously bouncy tail rhyme, the poem is a hilarious parody of Middle English verse romances packed full of bizarre pastoral details. Thopas, for example, is hugely effeminized, well-dressed, and with a girl's name (Thopas was usually a woman's name in the medieval period). Thopas falls in love, in the manner of the courtly knight, before he has decided who he will be in love with (an elf-queen, in the end) and runs away from his climactic battle at the end of the first fit because he has forgotten his armour.

3. There was once a young man named Melibee, mighty and rich, who had with his wife Prudence, a daughter called Sophie. One day he took a walk into the fields, leaving his wife and daughter inside his house, with the doors shut fast. Three of his old enemies saw it, and, setting ladders to the wall of his house, entered, beating his wife, and giving his daughter mortal wounds in five places: "in hir feet, in hire handes, in hir erys, in hir nose, and in hir mouth".

4. Sampson's tale is told at greater length, explaining how he fell from grace when he admitted his secret to his wife, who betrayed it to his enemies and then took another lover. The story is that Samson slew one thousand men with an ass's jawbone, then prayed for God to quench his thirst. From the jawbone's tooth sprung a well. He would have conquered the world if he had not told Delilah that his strength came from his

Notes

refusal to cut his hair. Without this strength his enemies cut out Samson's eyes and imprisoned him.

5. The Monk provides one of the first-known definitions of tragedy in English literature, and, though his tale might have been fascinating to Chaucer's medieval audience, many of whom would not know the classical stories it largely details, it does not receive a huge amount of attention or adoration from modern readers and critics. The Monk's tragedies are drawn from a variety of sources: Biblical, classical, historical and even some that, in Chaucer's time.

6. The Nun's Priest's Tale is one of the best-loved and best-known of all of the Tales, and one whose genre, in Chaucer's time and now, is instantly recognizable. It is a beast fable, just like Aesop's fable, and as one of Chaucer's successors, the medieval Scots poet Robert Henryson, would go on to explore in great detail, its key relationship is that between human and animal.

It is a theme of course which points a sharp finger at the whole idea of a beast fable - the whole genre, we might argue, resting on the writer precisely ignoring the correct moments to have a character speak or not speak; and it also is a dangerous moral for the Tales as a whole.