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Chapter 1
Introduction

1 Chaucer and his poem

For most readers the Canterbury Tales mean the General Prologue, with its gallery of portraits, and a few of the more humorous tales. What we retain is a handful of remarkable personalities, and such memorable moments as the end of the Miller’s tale. These are worth having in themselves, but it requires an extra effort to see the significant relationship among them, and to recognize that their bewildering variety is Chaucer’s technique for representing a single social reality. We may compare the first part of Shakespeare’s Henry IV, where our impressions can be so dominated by Falstaff, Hotspur and Hal as to leave Henry and the problems of his reign in shadow. The comparison is the more suggestive in that Shakespeare has recreated the England of Chaucer’s last years, when a society that is essentially that of the Canterbury Tales was shaken by usurpation, regicide and civil war. Both poets describe a nation unsure of its identity, distrustful of traditional authority, and torn by ambition and materialism into separate spheres of interest. For both, the drives and interactions of individual personalities express a loss of central control, a failure of hierarchy which affects society at all levels.

Shakespeare’s focus is always on a single “body politic,” and though his characters span all levels of society, their situations are determined by a central crisis of monarchical authority. Chaucer’s project is harder to define. He shows us nothing of Shakespeare’s royal Westminster, and gives us only a glimpse of his chaotic Eastcheap; and though profoundly political in their implications, the Tales offer no comment on contemporary politics. But the Canterbury pilgrims, too, are a society in transition, their horizons
enlarged by war and commerce, their relations complicated by new types of enterprise and new social roles. What holds them together is a radically innovative literary structure, a fictional world with no center, defined by oppositions between realistic and idealistic, worldly and religious, traditionalist and individualist points of view.

The plot of the Tales is simple enough. In early April, the narrator is lodged at the Tabard in Southwark, ready to make a pilgrimage to the shrine of St. Thomas à Becket at Canterbury, when a group of twenty-nine pilgrims arrive at the inn. The narrator is admitted to their number and provides portraits of most of the group, each of whom embodies a different aspect of English society. The host of the Tabard, Harry Baily, decides to join the pilgrims, and proposes a game to divert them on the road: all will tell stories, and the best tale will be rewarded at journey’s end with a supper at the Tabard. The bulk of the poem consists of the tales of twenty-three pilgrims, interspersed with narrative and dialogue which link their performances to the frame of the pilgrimage journey.

The literary form of the story collection, in which narratives of diverse kinds are organized within a larger framing narrative, had a long history, and had been treated with new sophistication in Chaucer’s own time. But neither the Confessio Amantis of his friend John Gower, which was in progress during the early stages of his own project, nor Boccaccio’s Decameron, which he almost certainly knew, exhibits anything like the complexity of the Tales. The social diversity of Chaucer’s pilgrims, the range of styles they employ, and the psychological richness of their interaction, both with one another and with their own tales, are a landmark in world literature. In no earlier work do characters so diverse in origin and status as Chaucer’s “churls” and “gentles” meet and engage on equal terms. In the Decameron “churls” exist only as two-dimensional characters in stories told by an aristocratic company. In the Romance of the Rose, the thirteenth-century love-allegory which was the greatest single influence on Chaucer’s poetry, the low social status and coarse behavior of “Evil-Tongue” and “Danger” is allegorical, defining them as threats to the progress of the poem’s courtly lover. But Chaucer’s churls exist on the same plane of reality as the Knight and Prioress. Some are undeniably beyond the pale in ordinary social terms, and their membership in the pilgrim company gives them a voice they
could acquire in no other way. Under the rough authority of the Host, and the wide-eyed, uncritical gaze of the narrator, characters as mean or unsavory as the Manciple and Summoner take part in a dialogue in which no point of view is exempt from criticism and conventional social values have frequently to be laid aside.

The narrator is one of the most remarkable features of the Tales. He is at once the most innocent and most knowing of men, seemingly guileless as he points to the revealing traits of speech and behavior in his fellow pilgrims, yet astute in filling the gaps created by their reticence, and placing them in relation to the issues affecting their world. Naiveté aside, this narrator must resemble the historical Geoffrey Chaucer, a poet uniquely qualified by background and experience to produce a work so broad in its social vision. He was the son of a successful merchant who had served the crown as a customs official. As an adolescent he entered the service of Elizabeth, Countess of Ulster and wife of Lionel, Duke of Clarence, second son of Edward III. Still in his teens, he was captured while serving with Edward’s invading army in France, and ransomed by the King. From the mid-1360s until his death around 1400 he served the crown, visiting France and Italy on diplomatic missions, working as a customs official, sitting on various commissions and for a term as a Member of Parliament, and acting as Clerk of the Works, in charge of the maintenance of various royal buildings. He was in close touch with the worlds of law, commerce, diplomacy, and warfare, and with the life of the court and aristocracy. He was also one of the most learned laymen of his day, and one of the most European in outlook, fully at home with French culture, and ahead of his time in appreciating the brilliant achievements of fourteenth-century Italy. And though his poetry rarely says so directly, he was acutely aware of the grim realities of English politics.

In the last years of Edward III, the heavy taxation required by long and unsuccessful wars, charges of corruption against high officials, and hostility to the wealth and power of the Church were dividing the country. The “Good Parliament” of 1376 indicted several prominent courtiers and financiers, but its attempted reforms had little effect. In the late 1370s a series of poll taxes brought to a head the longstanding grievances of the laboring classes, who, since the labor shortages caused by the terrible plagues of 1348–49, had seen repeated
attempts to control their wages and mobility. In 1381, under the pressures of taxation, anxiety about foreign competition in the cloth trade, and a concern for legal rights, the Peasants’ Revolt broke out in several parts of southern England. In London many buildings were burned, including the sumptuous palace of Chaucer’s patron John of Gaunt, and a mob killed dozens of Flemish merchants and cloth-workers. Richard II, who had assumed the throne at the age of ten in 1377, showed courage and judgment in negotiating with the rebels, but his later years were marred by favoritism and financial irresponsibility. The Parliament of 1386, in which Chaucer sat as a member for Kent, demanded many reforms, and when Richard refused to accede, battle was joined between the king’s supporters and his chief opponents. The rebel lords, who included the future King Henry IV, having gained a victory at Radcot Bridge in Oxfordshire and marched on London, became the so-called Lords Appellant of the “Merciless Parliament” of 1388, in the course of which a number of Richard’s friends and financial backers were sentenced to death.

Chaucer seems to have maintained good relations with the Court through three troubled decades, though his friends included men deeply involved in the conflicts of the time, some of whom lost their lives. And apart from two disparaging references to the Peasants’ Revolt, his poetry never addresses contemporary political issues. He was clearly troubled by the effects of commerce and social mobility: restlessness, ambition, and a concern with power are pervasive among the Pilgrims, and are always suspect. But in matters of practical politics, his view of established authority seems to have been fundamentally conservative.

On religious questions, too, Chaucer is reticent. In a period of mounting hostility to the established Church, he confines his criticism to the specific excesses of the Friar, Pardoner, and Monk. He never addresses the condition of the episcopal hierarchy, or urges any reform more radical than the renewal of fundamental Christian values outlined in the Parson’s tale. However, it is likely that he was responsive to evangelical tendencies at work among the lower clergy and laity. Throughout the later fourteenth century the reformers known to their opponents as “Lollards” (mumblers [of prayers]), inspired by the largely anti-establishment theology of John Wycliffe, sought to free religious practice from the sanctions of the Church
hierarchy, and placed a new emphasis on the individual conscience. Though attacked as heretics, their concern to distance religion from worldly institutions had a broad appeal. Chaucer’s clear preference for the simple, private piety promoted by the Nun’s Priest and the Parson, as against the elaborately self-dramatizing religiosity of the Man of Law and the Prioress, would be fully consonant with Lollard sympathies. We may note that in the “Epilogue” that follows the Man of Law’s tale in several manuscripts, the Parson is openly accused of Lollardy, and makes no attempt to deny the charge. The accusation is based on his aversion to the swearing of religious oaths, a typical Lollard attitude with which Chaucer shows sympathy elsewhere. It is possible, too, that the capping of the tale-telling game with the Parson’s austere penitential treatise indicates sympathy with the reformers. Certainly Chaucer’s friends included the so-called “Lollard Knights,” courtiers and men of affairs who gave protection to Lollard preachers and maintained certain distinctive practices and beliefs. The extent of their Lollardy is hard to gauge, but several in their wills requested simple funerals and graves, and asked that money from their estates be given to the poor rather than providing rich funeral feasts or bequests to religious institutions. Such austerity did not prevent their pursuing successful careers as soldiers, diplomats and land-owners, but the contradiction is no greater than that presented by Chaucer’s own “Retraction” to the *Canterbury Tales*, in which much of that work and the bulk of his earlier poems are repudiated as “worldly vanities.”

But if Chaucer’s position on major questions remains elusive, the form of his poem and its treatment of character are themselves vehicles of serious social criticism. A major project of the *Tales* is the testing of traditional values. In the General Prologue a hierarchical model of society, defined by traditional obligation and privilege, provides a tentative framework, but few of the pilgrims can be said to embody traditional roles in a recognizable form, and theirs are the least palpably real of Chaucer’s portraits. More often the rejection or usurpation of traditional roles provides an index to social mobility: again and again such “modern” tendencies as the secularizing of the religious life, or the aspirations of the professions and guilds, take the form of an emulation or appropriation of the style and prerogatives of gentility. Such pretensions are often only a veil for self-interest,
but they point up the inadequacy of traditional categories to define the hierarchical position of newly powerful commercial and professional groups concerned to claim a status and dignity of their own. Faced with so many forms of “worthiness,” the narrator must finally concede his inability to set his characters “in their degree,” the place where they “stand” in traditional social terms.

Chaucer was well situated to appreciate this crisis of values. Familiar as he was with many areas of his society, he was primarily a courtier and a gentleman, for whom courtesy, honor and truth constituted social norms. He would have agreed with the Wife of Bath that gentility bears no inherent relation to birth or fortune, but he clearly saw it as more readily compatible with some ways of life than with others. Hence his portraits of such emergent “gentles” as the Merchant and the Man of Law mix respect for their professional and public functions with a keen awareness of how easily these can coexist with covert or self-deceiving materialism and self-aggrandizement. He would probably have conceded them the status of gentlemen, but there is no clear line between their world and that of the equally professional Shipman and Physician, though the one is perhaps a pirate and the other something of a charlatan.

But if the usurpation of gentility and its prerogatives disturbs Chaucer, the chivalric and courtly ideals are themselves scrutinized in the course of the poem, and it is made clear that they harbor their own inherent contradictions. In keeping with Chaucer’s concern for hierarchy, the Knight, highest in rank among the pilgrims, opens the competition with a tale that promotes the virtues of Theseus, conqueror and knightly hero par excellence. Unabashedly an argument for chivalry as the basis of social order, the tale nevertheless shows chivalry repeatedly unable to contain or subdue disorder, largely because its only resource is authority imposed from above and reinforced by armed power. Ultimately, the tale is a searching exploration of the limits of the chivalric ethic as a political instrument. Other tales extend this critique to courtly values in general, not only by parody, as in the Miller’s rejoinder to the Knight, but by focusing on them directly, as when the Wife of Bath uses the standard of gentilesse to expose an Arthurian knight’s failure to exhibit true courtly conduct. The Squire’s tale, the imaginative vision of a knight in embryo, shows naiveté and confusion coexisting with real virtues
in a young mind that takes courtly values wholly for granted. And the Franklin, a man (like Chaucer) at home on the border between the courtly and practical worlds, subjects the ethical contradictions of the courtly code to a peculiarly modern scrutiny, showing that much of what seems foolish in the Squire’s performance is inherent in the courtly ideal itself.

And of course the world of the Tales includes a number of characters who are not courtly, for whom the narrator feels a need to apologize and whose coarseness he carefully disowns. The importance of the opposition of “churls” to “gentles” is established by the opening cluster of tales, in which the Knight’s cumbersome celebration of order is challenged by the brilliant and broadly salutary parody of the Miller, and this in turn by the largely *ad hominem* thrust of the Reeve. The descent from highly serious poetry to parody to personal attack implies a breakdown of social order that ends in the flight of the Cook’s wayward apprentice; as the Cook’s narrative disintegrates into the random particulars of London lowlife, we are left at an immense distance from the ceremonial world of Theseus. The social oppositions defined in this opening sequence do not appear again in so clear-cut a form, but their implications pervade the entire poem.

The tension between large, public concerns like those of the Knight and the narrower vision of the churls is also expressed in a contrast of literary genres. Like the Knight, the gentle Squire and Franklin tell tales that can be defined as *romance*, centered on the world of chivalry and courtly idealism. The typical mode of the churls, brilliantly exemplified by the Miller’s and Reeve’s tales, is the *fabliau*, a short comic tale, often deliberately coarse, which normally deals with a bourgeois or lower-class world and emphasizes action, cleverness, and the gratification of instinct. This opposition of genres, too, is clearest in the opening sequence; in later tales romance and fabliau elements are often combined with one another, or adapted to other concerns. In the Merchant’s history of the marriage of January a grotesque attempt at romance is gradually transformed into the fabliau of the elderly hero’s betrayal. The Wife of Bath describes her own marital history in terms that are very much those of the world of fabliau, but then, through her intense imagining of a life in which women would be valued at their true worth
and treated with real *gentilesse*, she transcends that world. From the rough-and-tumble of her fifth marriage she emerges into an equilibrium of mutual respect, and the passage from her prologue to her tale is simultaneously a passage from fabliau to romance. Romance becomes self-critical in the hands of the Franklin, and fabliau is a vehicle for satire in the Summoner’s rejoinder to the Friar. And the tale of the Shipman, who dwells on the border between the world of the professionals and that of the churls, is in effect an upper-class fabliau, pragmatic and mechanical in treating economic and sexual motivation, but deceptively subtle in presenting the private world of its merchant protagonist.

There is a broad pattern in the interaction of romance and fabliau in the *Tales*, an increasing tendency to expose the contradictions and absurdities of the one accompanied by a perceptible rise in the dignity of the other. The shift expresses an increasingly pragmatic approach to the social reality the poem engages, an uneasiness with traditional categories and a desire to bring emerging social forces into confrontation. A broadly similar opposition can be observed among the tales of religion. The first of these, the Man of Law’s tale, presents itself as a religious counterpart to the Knight’s, comparable in solemnity and historical perspective, and similarly committed to affirming order in the face of the uncertainties of earthly life. The Man of Law’s Custance is an emperor’s daughter and the “mirror of all courtesy,” and her story has been aptly described as “hagiographic romance.” The rich rhetoric of prayer and sentiment in the Prioress’s tale is similarly indebted to courtly poetry. At the opposite pole are the Nun’s Priest’s Aesopian fable of the cock and the fox and the spare penitential treatise of the Parson. Together they present a daunting challenge to religious emotionalism and high style, as the blunt colloquialism and materialist skepticism of the churls debunk the ideals of romance.

But the tales of Man of Law and Prioress, whatever their effect as vehicles of religious sentiment, also express distinctive points of view toward the world. The Man of Law’s horror of the familial tensions that continually threaten his Custance, and the broader anxiety about earthly justice that pervades his tale, at times getting the better of his faith in Providence, are the preoccupations of a man who knows these problems at first hand. The Prioress’s tale is
marred by a violence and anti-Semitism that are no less horrible for being virtually invisible to the Prioress herself, and expose the emotional privation behind her façade of genteel and complacent piety. The social and spiritual complexities revealed in the process of tale-telling are the real focus of both performances, and remind us of the importance of character as a vehicle of social criticism, the extent to which we must rely on the often distorted vision of the pilgrims themselves to gauge the bearing of great issues on their lives.

Chaucer goes to extraordinary lengths to show the obstacles to vision and knowledge posed by the pilgrims’ existential situations, and we may compare his perspective to that of the great Franciscan philosopher of the previous generation, William of Ockham. “Ockham’s razor” is often said to have severed philosophy from theology: this is an exaggeration, but his denial of the necessity of natural secondary causes (since there is nothing God might effect through a secondary cause that He is not equally able to accomplish directly), and his confinement of scientia, or real knowledge, to the sphere of observation and logical inference, tend in this direction. They allow us to affirm little about the relation of created life to God beyond the acknowledgment, through faith, of his omnipotence and goodness, and the ethical imperative of obeying his commands. Chaucer accepts similar constraints for his characters. Theseus’ evocation of the benevolent “First Mover,” insofar as it is more than a political gesture, is a leap of faith, and a pervasive concern of the Tales as a whole is the psychological effect of living with no more immediate confirmation of order and providence than such a leap provides. Some characters simply refuse to consider “Who hath the world in honde”; others reveal their anxiety in such neurotic forms as the Man of Law’s vacillating attitude toward Providence or the Pardoner’s compulsive blasphemy; and the Nun’s Priest, apparently after serious thought, seems to have made peace with the likelihood that the large questions of providence and self-determination are unanswerable.

Cut off from a sure sense of relation to the divine, or of their place in a traditional hierarchy, the pilgrims question their own status. Many of the tales are essays in self-definition, attempts to establish values and goals that lead to startling revelations. The Knight,
whose tale begins as an apology for chivalry, finds himself unable to bring it to a satisfying resolution, and is carried steadily toward a confrontation with the horror of violence and death which challenges his chivalric values. The Wife of Bath, trying to justify a life of striving for mastery in marriage, becomes half-aware that her deepest need is to be recognized and valued as a woman, something of which her society seems incapable. The Pardoner flaunts his success as a religious huckster and defies the taboo effect of his sexual abnormality, but gradually reveals a religious inner self that accepts the paradoxical guilt of the scapegoat, an agonizing display that illustrates the intolerance of a Christian society. In all these cases the tale-tellers’ struggles are rendered more painful by a vision of order or harmony or forgiveness that seems to hover just out of reach.

The elaborate context in which Chaucer’s characters live and think is again a landmark in literary history. To compare the Wife of Bath or the Pardoner with the embodiments of lechery and hypocrisy in the *Romance of the Rose* on whom they are modeled is to see at once the greater depth and complexity of Chaucer’s creations. The noble company who tell the tales of the *Decameron* are social equals with no personal history, charming but limited by their very urbanity. Their relations with one another and with the tales they tell exhibit none of the interplay that gives the *Canterbury Tales* their rich complexity. The closest equivalent to the dense social and psychological medium in which Chaucer’s characters function is the *Inferno* of Dante, and their self-revelations are often as powerful as those of Dante’s sinners. But Dante’s characters are necessarily static, fixed forever in the attitudes defined by their besetting sins; Chaucer’s are alive, able to exercise their imaginations in ways which unexpectedly open up new dimensions in their lives. Their condition is one of radical uncertainty and vast possibility.

The project of tale-telling is of course what keeps the lives of the pilgrims open-ended, and the juxtaposition and interaction of the tales are the basis of the poem’s structure. To address the difficult question of the pattern that emerges as the sequence of tales runs its course, we may divide the poem into a series of broad movements. The first is bracketed by the tales of the Knight and the Man of Law, the two major attempts in the poem to address the problem of order. The Knight’s tale, as I have suggested, is undone by
contradictions inherent in the chivalric code. In the Man of Law’s tale commitment is undermined by personal anxiety. He loudly affirms God’s abiding concern for Custance, but feels a need to supplement Providence with an officiousness of his own which ensures that her contact with the world is minimal. Custance never becomes real, her human constancy is never tried, and the narrator remains torn between commitment to faith in God and an irrepressible fear of imminent danger. Thus this first group of tales calls into question the authoritarian models proposed by the two highest-ranking pilgrims. The challenge to order which surfaces in the Knight’s tale and is elaborated in the descending movement of the tales that follow, as social vision is increasingly narrowed by personal concerns, is recapitulated in the Man of Law’s tale as a conflict in the narrator’s own view of the world.

In the broad central area of the poem, social criticism is on a smaller scale. The problem of authority in marriage, introduced in spectacular fashion by the Wife of Bath, is a recurring theme, punctuated by the naming of the Wife in the tales of both Clerk and Merchant, and climaxed by the Franklin’s exhaustive catalogue of the things that make for success in marriage. The astute perceptions of the Shipman likewise center on domestic relations. Otherwise the tales of this section are largely fueled by private concerns. The social conflict dramatized in the first fragment reappears on a reduced scale in the mutual hostility of Friar and Summoner, which combines criticism of institutions with ad hominem malevolence, and the closest equivalents to the institutional commitments of the Knight and Man of Law are the Squire’s breathless and abortive flight of courtly idealism and the tormented piety of the Prioress’s miracle story. The tales of Merchant and Physician are circumscribed by the materialism of their tellers, and the Wife and Pardoner are concerned as much with their status as human beings as with the issues implied by their social roles.

In the midst of the varied company of this central group, the Clerk’s tale stands out with stark clarity. The story of patient Griselde and her tyrannical husband has been explained as answering the Wife of Bath’s challenge to male authority in marriage by vindicating the traditional, misogynistically conceived institution as a proving-ground of virtue. But in the end, as the intensity of Griselde’s
suffering forces its way to the surface, what we learn is that the con-
straints imposed on her are indeed “importable” (unbearable). The
Clerk’s story is a searching comment on power and authority, not
only in the social context implied by the role of Walter, an Italian
minor tyrant of a kind Chaucer may have observed at first hand, but
in the institutionalizing of moral values and the creation of moral
fiction. The almost perversely beautiful style which sets off the pro-
longed sufferings of Griselde cannot wholly conceal a substructure
of sado-masochistic fantasy. The appropriation of her femininity to
an ostensibly moral and spiritual purpose is at times perilously close
to the fetishistic treatment of emblematic figures in other tales. This
tendency is present in the Man of Law’s overprotection of Custance,
and is carried to extremes in the cases of the twelve-year-old Virginia
of the Physician’s tale or the Prioress’s child-martyr. The Clerk’s tale
has superficial affinities with these tales of sainthood, but its purpose
is humane rather than hagiographical. The convoluted irony of his
performance is finally unfathomable, but a number of features of
his tale hint at an underlying sympathy with the Wife’s attempt to
redefine sexual relations, and it is perhaps the most fully achieved
of all the tales in its rendering of the complexities it addresses.

The four tales which follow are concerned with the value of fiction
itself, and the project of the Canterbury Tales in particular. The pil-
grim narrator’s paired tales, Sir Thopas and Melibee, present a polar
opposition of form and style. Sir Thopas, a comic romance rendered
almost chaotic by a proliferation of incident and the confusion of its
hero’s motives, reflects the array of problems Chaucer has set himself
in the Tales as a whole by his deliberate indulgence of the eccentric
energies of his pilgrims. In the Melibee, a moral argument is ex-
pounded with virtually no regard for narrative or personality, and
the result is a cumbersome tale whose human significance never
emerges. The opposition between the brilliant parody of the one
tale and the ponderous moral eloquence of the other show Chaucer
aware of the difficulty of synthesizing his brilliant and varied gifts
and adapting them to the presentation of a coherent world view.

The tales of the Monk and the Nun’s Priest form a similar pair-
ing, one that invites us to ponder the relevance of epic and tragedy
to the concrete and often homely world of the Tales. The Monk’s
collection of nineteen stories of the falls of great men represents a
form Chaucer’s own collection might have taken, a group of exemplary stories organized by a common concern with the workings of fortune. But like the *Melibee*, the Monk’s tale attains coherence only at the price of fragmenting history and falsifying character to reduce its material to simple moral terms. The contrasting tale of the Nun’s Priest is the Aesopian fable of the cock and the fox, lavishly embellished with epic and tragic rhetoric, vivid stories illustrating the truth and value of dreams, and speculation on the theological meaning of Chauntecleer’s capture by the fox. The implicit suggestion that such materials, the resources of some of Chaucer’s most serious poetry, are as applicable to the story of a rooster as to human affairs poses in a new way the question of how literature engages reality.

A third pairing, between the tales of the Second Nun and the Canon’s Yeoman, develops the spiritual implications of Chaucer’s concern with the problems of tale-telling, and points forward toward the religious emphasis of the poem’s conclusion. There is a precise thematic contrast between the Yeoman’s largely confessional tale of the desperate, failed, and finally specious project of “translation” undertaken by his alchemists, and the Second Nun’s impersonal and authoritative depiction of the religious transformations wrought by St. Cecilia. The alchemists’ murky world of fumes, toil, and blind obsession is the antithesis of the tranquil assurance and radiant spirituality with which Cecilia and her companions are vested. The balancing of these tales defines the absolute limits of human art, and the necessity of spiritual authority as a supplement to earthly vision. The two tales that conclude the poem reinforce this point in a way that directly implicates the project of the *Canterbury Tales*. Both are dismissive of fiction, but their messages are sharply opposed. The Manciple’s anti-moral – that it is better not to speak than to risk the consequences of doing so – seems to deny and mock the very idea of serious fiction, and the Parson’s total rejection of “fable” presents the same lesson in a positive form. For the expected verse tale he substitutes a treatise in prose, designed to aid penitents in considering the state of their souls, and including a detailed analysis of the deadly sins and their remedies. As the last of the tales, the Parson’s treatise is a part of the larger economy of the poem. But its effect is to withdraw us to another plane of reality, enabling us to
see the world of the previous tales in perspective, and encouraging us to turn our minds to higher things.

Before we proceed to look more closely at the poem itself, something must be said about its probable contemporary audience. No poem lends itself better to oral presentation, and we can be sure that it was read aloud, but it shows none of the conventional signs of address to a mixed audience of courtly aristocrats that mark Chaucer’s earlier poetry. The *Canterbury Tales* are a boldly experimental work, and it is probable that the audience to whom Chaucer looked for a fully appreciative reception were those most involved in the changes affecting the world the poem describes. In a verse *envoy* (letter) to his friend Bukton, Chaucer urges him to “rede” the Wife of Bath before entering into marriage; the word can bear several meanings, but it is probable that what is being suggested is a private rereading of the Wife’s Prologue, and probable too that the poem as a whole was aimed most directly at readers capable of thoughtful engagement with the issues raised by Chaucer’s poetry. Though a new insight into the condition of women is one of the chief rewards the poem offers, its audience was no doubt largely male. Whether knights, civil servants or men of learning, law, or commerce, they are likely to have been gentlemen who, like Chaucer himself, had learned to function in several worlds, and had few illusions about the workings of justice, commerce, or aristocratic and ecclesiastical power. Such men would recognize clearly the difference between “churl” and “gentle,” and the Peasants’ Revolt may have sharpened their sense of it; but in an age of social mobility they would also recognize that such distinctions were not absolute, and in some cases might even have been drawn by Lollard sympathies into a closer sense of relation to those of lower station. We may assume that the *Canterbury Tales* did for them what they can still do for us, making them more aware and more tolerant of human diversity, and so, in a sense of the word important to Chaucer, more gentle.

2 Chaucer’s language

Chaucer spoke and wrote the English of the South East Midland region, the language of Gower and Wycliffe, the spoken language of London, and the branch of Middle English from which our own
English most directly descends. By Chaucer’s day English was rapidly recovering from its displacement by French as the language of the upper and administrative classes. Legal and other public documents began to be produced in English, translation from French and Latin was steadily increasing, and there is evidence of English replacing French in grammar schools.

The language was not the essentially synthetic language that Old English had been. During the long dominance of French, and partly under its influence, the inflections that had indicated the number and case of nouns had largely disappeared in favor of a greater reliance on prepositions, and those indicating the tense and person of verbs were being replaced by auxiliary verbs. The native processes of coinage, the combining of existing words or the addition of prefixes and suffixes to form new compounds, had largely fallen into disuse because of the ready availability of equivalent French terms. The result of these developments is a language much closer to our own than Old English, but we must still allow for many peculiarities: elliptical or paratactic syntax; double and triple negatives; the omission of articles; the habit of forming the negative of such verbs as *witen* (know), *wile* (will or wish) and *ben* (be) by replacing the initial consonant, if any, with *n*.

But for most students the chief obstacle to reading Chaucer in his own language is the unfamiliar look of Middle English spelling, in which *y* often replaces *i*, and a word can appear in several different forms in a single text. This is in part the inconsistency of an orthography which was not to be standardized for another 300 years, but it also reflects the fluid state of pronunciation and accent. At a time when English was drawing freely on French for its vocabulary, the patterns of stress proper to the two languages seem to have been to some extent interchangeable, and Chaucer exploits this circumstance to achieve some of his most striking metrical effects. In polysyllabic words of French or Latin origin such as “daungerous,” “adversitee,” or “memorie,” the main stress may fall on the final syllable, as we hear it in French, or occur earlier, as in modern English. At times the same freedom is exercised with non-French words. “Sorrow” appears also as “sorówe,” and as the vestigially Anglo-Saxon monosyllable “sorwe.” Terminal *e*, originally a grammatical inflection, had become largely a convenience in pronunciation, and
Chaucer frequently relies on it to sustain the iambic movement of a line, though it also occurs at points where the meter requires that it be suppressed.

Hearing Chaucer’s English can do a great deal for comprehension, and there are a few basic rules. Middle English vowels sound approximately as in a modern European language: short a has the sound of modern German “Mann” rather than modern English “hat”; short o is closer to “long” than to American “got”; short u is as in “put” rather than “putt.” Of the diphthongs, au has the sound of ou in modern “loud,” and ou that of oo in modern “food.” All consonants are pronounced, so that in a word like “knight,” monosyllabic for metrical purposes, the “k” and “gh” (= ch in modern German ich) are clearly audible.

In general, for speakers of modern English, and especially for those used to American English, Middle English at first requires a certain physical effort to pronounce, but soon becomes a physical pleasure. It is helpful to begin by exaggerating each sound, and noting the role of teeth, tongue, palate, and lips in producing it. A mirror and a tape recorder can be very useful, and I have listed some recordings of portions of the Canterbury Tales in the bibliography.

3 The text of the Canterbury Tales

The Canterbury Tales are incomplete. What survives is a series of fragments, usually consisting of two or more tales whose sequence is clear. In general there is good manuscript evidence for the ordering of these fragments, and scholars now accept almost unanimously the order of the handsome early fifteenth-century Ellesmere Manuscript. Like nearly all manuscripts, Ellesmere reflects some scribal editing. It frequently regularizes meter and even syntax, sometimes obscuring Chaucer’s meaning in the process. In this respect it is inferior to the Hengwrt manuscript, evidently produced by the same scribe and much less heavily edited. But the links and juxtapositions of tales in Ellesmere are far more plausible than in Hengwrt (which, among other peculiarities, omits the Canon’s Yeoman’s tale altogether). It seems likely that Ellesmere reflects a later and more leisurely editorial process, and it provides the basis for most standard editions.
The ten fragments of the text in Ellesmere are arranged as follows:

I. General Prologue, Knight, Miller, Reeve, Cook
II. Man of Law
III. Wife of Bath, Friar, Summoner
IV. Clerk, Merchant
V. Squire, Franklin
VI. Physician, Pardoner
VII. Shipman, Prioress, Sir Thopas, Melibee, Monk, Nun’s Priest
VIII. Second Nun, Canon’s Yeoman
IX. Manciple
X. Parson, Chaucer’s Retraction

In what follows I have taken the Ellesmere ordering for granted, though I have indicated places where my reasons for doing so were chiefly thematic. All quotations are from the *Riverside Chaucer*, ed. Larry D. Benson (Boston, 1987). Roman numerals indicate Ellesmere fragments.