



THE CHAUCER NEWSLETTER

A Publication of The New Chaucer Society

VOLUME 3, NUMBER 2

WINTER, 1981

The Rypon Analogue of the Friar's Tale

Peter Nicholson

One of the closest known analogues of Chaucer's *Friar's Tale* is the following exemplum by the English Benedictine Robert Rypon, which until now has been available only in the summary given by G. R. Owst in his *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England* (2nd ed. [New York: Barnes & Noble, 1961], pp. 162-63). It is one of only three known versions of the story of "The Devil and the Advocate" in which the victim, like the summoner in Chaucer's poem, remains completely unaware that he is the prey. The other two are a poem by the thirteenth-century Austrian Der Stricker and a late fourteenth-century exemplum found in Brit. Lib. MS. Cotton Cleopatra D VIII, f. 110. The Cotton and Rypon texts may be directly or indirectly derived from Der Stricker's version, but they appear to represent a distinctly English tradition of the story. They alone share a number of details with Chaucer, particularly in the opening conversation and in the characterization of the victim. Each also has unique similarities to Chaucer's version. Rypon's provides the closest model for the episode of the carter and his horses, and with Der Stricker's poem it also contains the widow who delivers the final condemnation. In each of these respects the Rypon exemplum provides important evidence on the nature of the story tradition that Chaucer drew upon, and consequently it is worthwhile to have the complete text.

The exemplum is reprinted here from the only known copy in Brit. Lib. MS. Harley 4894, ff. 103^v-104, where it occurs as part of a sermon for the fourth Sunday in Lent that runs from ff. 101-106^v. The manuscript is a compilation of the author's sermons that dates from the first quarter of the fifteenth century. On f. 116^v the author refers to a comet that appeared during the Lenten season of 1401, and Owst takes this as an approximate date for the composition of the whole collection; see his *Preaching in Medieval England* (1926; rpt. New York: Russell & Russell, 1965), pp. 207-08. In reprinting the text I have used modern punctuation and capitalization and modern *u* and *v*, but I have indicated with italics my expansions of the scribe's abbreviations and contractions. The scribe makes no careful distinction between lower case *c* and *t*, and in a number of words I have had to guess on his intention.

For the relations among the other versions of the story see my article on "The Analogues of Chaucer's *Friar's Tale*," *ELN*, 17 (1979), 93-98. The Cotton exemplum can be found in *Originals and Analogues of Some of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, Chaucer Soc. Publ., 2nd ser., No. 7 (London: Humphrey Milford, 1872), p. 105, and in W. W. Skeat, ed., *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, III (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894), 450-51. The text given by Archer Taylor in *Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's Canterbury*

Tales, ed. W. F. Bryan and Germaine Dempster (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1941), pp. 271-72, contains several errors, and his discussion in general is untrustworthy.

3^o in ista prima parte principali restat dicere quomodo peccatum in diabolo denotatur. Sed forsan aliqui boni viri & mulieres abhorrent audire diabolum nominatum. Sed notandum quod est loqui dupliciter de diabolo, uno modo ad suam complacenciam, alio modo ad suam displicenciam. Illi locuntur ad suam displicenciam qui sua maleficia que infert humano generi predicant & exponunt ut tantius caveantur. Illi locuntur ad suam complacenciam qui maledicendo ex negligencia vel rancore aut in coniuracionibus & huiusmodi nominant eius nomen cuius nominatio sibi placet; & frequentius quod petitur, permittitur diabolus adimplere.

Sicut narratur de quodam ballivo cuiusdam,¹ qui colligendo firmas eius domini fuit nimis cupidus lucro proprio & intentus, presertim pauperibus minus parcens. Qui dum quodam die causa sui officii ad quandam villam equitaret, contigit diabolum in forma adolescentis sibi comitem fieri vie sue. Qui diabolus dixit ei, "Quo vadis?" Respondit, "Ad villam proximam in negocio domini met." Cui ille, "Visne lucrari tibi & domino tuo quam potissimum & recipere quicquid voluerint tibi dare?" Respondit ballivus, "Ita volo, quia donum est liberum." Cui diabolus "bene" inquit, "& iuste facis." Cui ballivus "quis" inquit, "& unde es tu?" "Ego," ait, "sum diabolus, & circueo circa lucrum meum sicut & tu circa lucrum domini tui & tuum lucrum. & volo capere non quicumque homines dederint mihi, sed quicumque cum corde & voluntate mihi donaverint libentius acceptabo." Respondens ballivus "iustissime" inquit "facis." Procedentes itaque venerunt prope dictam villulam, & viderunt boves pene indomitos in aratra contraitantes, quos sepius indirecte incedentes & exorbitantes agricola diabolo commendavit. "Ecce," inquit ballivus; "Illa tua sunt." "Non, quia minime dantur ex corde." Deinde in villam venientes audiverunt infantulum plorare, quem mater non potens mitigare, offensa dixit, "Sileas aut demon te habeat." Tunc ballivus "hoc est" inquit "tuum." Respondit, "Nequiquam, quia suo filio carere nolle." Tandem accedentes ad finem ville, vidit quedam vidua pauperula cuius vaccam unicam pridie rapuisset, que ballivum prospiciens, flexis genibus & expansis manibus exclamavit, "Omnibus inferni diabolis te comendo." Tunc ait diabolus, "Certe hoc meum est, quia cordialiter mihi datum. Volo ideo te habere." & acceptum ballivum duxit ad infernum.

Ista inquam narracio, licet in parte iocosa, tum est a certis malis revocacio.² Primo enim docetur homo ne cum negligencia aut rancore diabolum nominet. 2^o, ne sibi aliquid comendet, quia forsan talis comendacio potest sortiri effectum. 3^o, ne officiarum dominorum sint nimis cupidus. 4^o, ne iniuriam faciant pauperibus aut aliis, eorum personas ledendo aut illorum bona extorquendo, ne forsan eis finaliter contingat sicut ballivo contigit antedicto.

Notes

1. *cuiusdam*: supply *domini*? The abbreviation for *-dam* is normally *dā*, but here, as occasionally elsewhere in the MS, *dñf*. The normal abbreviation for *domini* (as in the following clause) is the very similar *dñi*, and the two words might easily have been conflated by the scribe.

2. *revocacio*: MS *revocaciā*

Translation:

Thirdly, in that first main section it remains to say in what way sin is noted in the devil. But perhaps some good men and women dislike hearing the devil named. But it should be noted that speech about the devil is of two sorts, (being) in one way to his pleasure, in another way to his displeasure. They speak to his displeasure who preach about and expose the evils that he inflicts upon mankind, so that these may be guarded against that much more. They speak to his pleasure who, by cursing out of negligence or rancor, or in conjurations and such, name the name of him whose naming pleases him; and more frequently than it is desired, the devil is permitted to carry out (these curses and oaths).

So it is told about a certain bailiff of a certain one, who in collecting the rents of his lord was excessively greedy and eager for his own profit, (being) less sparing to the poor in particular. One day, while he was riding to a certain village on account of his office, it happened that the devil in the form of a young man became his companion on his journey. The devil said to him, "Where are you going?" He replied, "To the next village on the business of my lord." To whom the former (said), "Do you wish to gain for yourself and for your lord as much as (you are) able and to receive whatever they might wish to give you?" The bailiff replied, "So I wish inasmuch as the gift is free." To whom the devil said, "Good; and you do justly." To whom the bailiff said, "Who are you, and where are you from?" "I," he said, "am the devil, and I go about for my profit just as you do for your lord's profit and for your own profit. And I wish to seize not whatever men might give to me, but whatever with heart and will they might give to me very freely I will accept." Replying, the bailiff said, "You do most justly." Proceeding thus they came near to the said village, and they saw coming towards them some nearly untamed oxen on a plough, which the farmer, (since they were) going more often

Editors

Daniel J. Ransom,
University of Oklahoma

J. Lane Goodall,
University of Oklahoma

Lynne H. Levy,
University of Oklahoma

crookedly and off the track, commended to the devil. "Here," said the bailiff, "These are yours." "No, because they are by no means given from the heart." Then coming into the village they heard a baby cry, and the angry mother, not able to pacify it, said, "Be quiet or let the devil take you." Then the bailiff said, "This is yours." He replied, "Not at all, because she does not wish to lose her child." Finally reaching the end of the village, a certain poor

widow whose only cow he had seized the day before saw them, who, perceiving the bailiff, with knees bent and hands outstretched exclaimed, "To all the devils of hell I commend you." Then the devil said, "Certainly this one is mine, because (it is) given to me sincerely. Therefore I wish to have you." And he led the bailiff he had received off to hell.

This story, I say, though in part humorous, is also a summoning away from certain evils. For

first man is taught that he not name the devil out of negligence or rancor. Second, that he not commend anything to him, for such a commendation can perhaps be put into effect. Third, that the officers of lords should not be too greedy. Fourth, that they should not do injury to the poor or to others, by harming their persons or extorting their goods, lest perhaps it happen to them in the end as it happened to the aforesaid bailiff.

University of Hawaii

The Evolution of Henry Bradshaw's Idea of the Order of the *Canterbury Tales**

Donald C. Baker

Although all Chaucerians now recognize that there is no authorial manuscript of the *Canterbury Tales*, and therefore no authorial evidence for the order of the tales, yet the order of the tales remains an endlessly fascinating subject, both as a problem for detective reconstruction and as the underlying assumption of most purely literary criticism of Chaucer's poem.¹ My purpose is not to take on this subject anew, for it has been written on as extensively as may ever be fruitful, but to deal with the development of the first scholarly attempt to construct an order for the tales, one made by a retiring scholar who, although he published little, had an enormous impact on textual studies of early English literature in the second half of the nineteenth century. He was Henry Bradshaw of King's College, Cambridge, and later librarian of the University Library of Cambridge. He it was who developed the famous "Bradshaw Shift" which Furnivall seized upon and elaborated for the Chaucer Society editions (giving full credit to its inventor, as was his custom) in a way which we have reason to believe did not please Bradshaw who, though he liked Furnivall personally, loathed enthusiasm and insisted at all times upon scholarly marshalling of evidence. Furnivall possessed the first to a remarkable degree, but was frequently too busy or unobservant to attend to the latter.

At any rate, we all know of Furnivall's lengthy treatment of the order of the tales in *A Temporary Preface to the Six-Text Edition of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, Part I, Chaucer Society (London, 1868), pp. 9-43. Furnivall's reverence for Bradshaw's opinion is clearly apparent in his opening statement:

There is only one man in the world, I believe, who thoroughly understands this subject, and he is the Librarian of the University of Cambridge, Mr. Henry Bradshaw, M.A. Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. He has lately agreed to throw his work into the Society's publications, but is not able to fix any time for its appearance. What I say, therefore, is merely by way of a stop-gap,—to explain "Group A, Fragment I," in the *Six-Text*—and may have to be cast aside in favour of Mr. Bradshaw's statements and conclusions when they appear. (p. 9)

As we know, Bradshaw's conclusions never did appear, nor did any of his frequently promised work for the Chaucer Society. The nearest that Bradshaw came was the publication in 1871—really against his will—of a piece called "The Skeleton of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*,"

a piece which he had done for delivery at a meeting of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society in 1868 and which was published by Macmillan in London and Cambridge as Memorandum No. 4, in November, 1871. The "Skeleton" is an interesting work, illustrating well Bradshaw's cautious methods; it is a series of texts showing the method of classification of the MSS of the *Canterbury Tales*. Although much of his thought has been superseded, the paper still repays reading. His comments on the order of the tales are not arguments but observations as likely possibilities. The essay was later published in the *Collected Papers of Henry Bradshaw*, edited by F. Jenkinson, Cambridge, 1889, pp. 102-45.

It is to the correspondence between Bradshaw and Furnivall that we must go to see how Bradshaw's ideas developed, and the extent to which they were elaborated later by Furnivall in his *Temporary Preface*. Furnivall's realization that he had extended Bradshaw's ideas well beyond their intended scope is openly admitted:

Tabulating, then, our present result (which must be looked on as tentative, though I hope they're right), we get the following scheme . . . which quite clears Chaucer from having made the tremendous mess of his work that Editors' and writers' want of care has attributed to him, and which is based on a first draft by Mr. Bradshaw for a one day's journey, but contains alterations that he will probably repudiate:—

As Bradshaw had insisted on a day and a half's journey, this is in itself a clear misrepresentation of the Librarian's proposal. Bradshaw began with two assumptions, enthusiastically concurred in by Furnivall, which will not meet universal acceptance today by any means—1) The Pilgrimage was intended by Chaucer to be realistic—that he had been on pilgrimage, and was attempting to adapt his story telling to what might have (or maybe had) actually happened, and 2) Chaucer never abandoned his plans for two tales to Canterbury and two back, the Manciple's being the first on the return journey and the Parson's the last tale before reaching Southwark. Nevertheless, both views are still held by many but not necessarily both by the same scholars. I mention these underlying assumptions of Bradshaw's because the evidence that he marshals is so thickly textual that one is likely to be led to think that Bradshaw is being rigidly scientific, whereas he is in fact making the best possible textual argument for a preconception which is and can be shown to be largely aesthetic—though he would have probably lost his department completely if anyone had told him so.

I propose to print here from mostly heretofore unprinted letters (a few extracts were published in G. W. Prothero's *A Memoir of Henry Bradshaw*, London, 1888) whole letters and significant extracts from Bradshaw to Furnivall

(and one letter from Furnivall to Bradshaw) in which Bradshaw elaborates his growing theory. For the first time Bradshaw will be allowed to speak for himself. These are interesting for the history of scholarship and also interesting for the light that they throw upon the relations between the two men. Furnivall was always the student, Bradshaw the teacher. Though it is fashionable to ridicule much of Furnivall's editing and to admire the austere scholarship of Bradshaw, it is well to mention that 1) without Furnivall, nothing would have been done; 2) Bradshaw opposed to the last the *Six-Text* edition, a project which, with all its faults, has been invaluable, and which Furnivall refused to be bullied and ridiculed into abandoning; 3) Furnivall's was a quick mind if a little shallow, and having grasped Bradshaw's argument, he found the continuing explication of it rather boring. The pertinent letters, Nos. 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, and 632, written from September 21st to the 25th, 1868, are in the University Library Cambridge, Add. 2591, Box 3.

Letter 624 King's College 21 Sept.

Dear Furnivall

Better and better. Everything comes straighter with the *Canterbury Tales*, more than I could possibly have dared to expect. I enclose you a pretty little program of the whole affair, and see if it does not look charming. You know we agreed that Tyrwhitt's points which distinguish his text from the Harleian are to be considered as *editing*. I mean 1) the abolition of the link at the end of the Man of Lawe 2) the shunting of the Second Nonne & Chaucer's *seman* to before the Manciple just because of the mention of Boughton under Blee; and 3) the removal of the modern instances in the Monk's Tale to the end as more appropriate. This granted, you get a large body of MSS. which in the main agree in the order. Merely shunt one of these fragments (beginning with the Shipman) up next to the Man of Lawe in deference to one of these MSS (Arch. Selden B. 14) just as Tyrwhitt shunts the Second Nonne *down* in deference to certain others, & see the result. Re-number the fragments accordingly.

- I General Prologue, Knight, etc.
- II Man of Lawe
- III (late X) Shipman, etc.
- IV (late III) Wyf, etc.
- V (late IV) Clerk
- VI (late V) Merchant
- VII (late VI) Squyere
- VIII (late VII) Frankeleyn
- IX (late VIII) Second Nonne, etc.
- X (late IX) Doctour & Pardonere
- XI Manciple
- XII Person

You will then get 8 groups. A. Prologue—
Cook xxx B. Man of Lawe-Nonnes Prest xxx
C. Wyf-Somnour xxx D. Clerk-Frankeleyn
xxx E. Second Nonne, Chanouns zeman x F.
Doctour, Pardonere xxx G. Manciple xxx H.
Person.

A being Frag. I., B. Frags II, III. C = Frag. IV.
D = Frags V, VI, VII, VIII. E = Frag. IX. F-
Frag. X G = Frag. XI. H. Frag. XII.

Now they must have halted somewhere on
the journey, even apart from any place where
they slept on the way. Now put *hypothetically*
those halting places where the breaks occur
in the sense and sequence of the Fragments,
& see what result you get without the least
further alteration of the positions of the 12
fragments.

Let Sittingbourne be the halting place &
nights resting place of the *first day's* journey.
This is easy enough.

Let Rochester be the afternoon stage. Just
before the Monk's tale Rochester is fast by,
which may mean that the Cathedral was in
sight & therefore they must get on. Now the
Monk's Tale you may remember was speedily
broken off, & on his refusing to go on with
something else, the Nonnes Prest tells a short
story of Chaunteclere & Pertelote, which
would just about carry them to the town.

I put the first stage at the break between the
Cook and the Man of Lawe, & merely suggest
Dartford because it is a large place at a reason-
able distance—& you must understand that
my framework is *hypothetical* to enable you to
get a clearer view of the poem in its relation to
an actual pilgrimage, which I take to have
been one long day's journey & one short one
allowing them to reach Canterbury early.
Well. Beginning the 2nd day's journey from
Sittingbourne there is a place called Ospringe
6 miles on. Put their first stage here, & you
will at once notice that as on the first day after
two tales (Knight & Millere) it was *halfway*
pryme or *passed pryme* (pryme being a portion
of the day not so much a special hour) so here
after two tales (Clerk & Merchaunt) the
Squyere begins his tale & says it is *pryme*.

I mention Ospringe as where they would
breakfast, because I notice that Lidgate, who
wrote his *Sege of Thebes* as a Supplementary
Canterbury Tale told at the Commencement
of the Return Journey, in doing so says that
they started from Canterbury at dawn intend-
ing to make the first stage & breakfast at
Ospring 10 miles from Canterbury.

Now there was a great Benedictine Abbey
at Feversham (2 miles off the road north of
Ospringe), and there was a broken down
Hospital (in the medieval sense of the word)
at Ospringe. Morely suggests that the Chanoun
was one of the Benedictine monks of
Feversham—very unlikely. I think it more
likely that the zeman of one of the Hospital-
lers at Ospringe may have seen the Pilgrims
riding out of their hostelrye at Ospringe
where they had been breakfasting at the end
of their first stage from Sittingbourne, & that
he told his master, & that they pricked after
them. Read Morley—he is very good on this
point. The zeman is a barefaced liar, but this
hostelry can hardly mean Sittingbourne, &
most certainly not Southwark. Boughton
under Blee, the foot of the hill where he prob-
ably caught them up is 4 miles from
Ospringe, *not fully five mile* says Chaucer
adding after^d of the Chanoun. It semed he
had pricked miles *three* & the zeman says he
lived in the outskirts of his town, while they
may have halted for breakfast at the first inn
at the Sittingbourne end of Ospringe. The

episode of the Doctour & Pardonere would
find its place on the level between the top of
Blean down & Canterbury.

The two remaining fragments (XI & XII) all
we have of the return journey, afford no diffi-
culty. In Lidgate the steepness of the hill
above Boughton causes him to suspend his
narrative of the *Sege of Thebes* (& end Part I
of his poem) until they reach the foot—& it is
the difficulty of this hill which no doubt
causes the danger to the sleepy Cook which
causes—the fuss of the Manciple's Prologue—
just as it caused the break of narrative be-
tween the Chanouns zeman & the Doctour on
the journey into Canterbury the day before.
No doubt you will say this is carrying the
matter much too far. But all I want is to pic-
ture to myself the thing as it was, and any-
thing which helps me to do this interests me.
In any case it involves no distortion of the
fragments as found in the MSS. except the
one which we agree is absolutely necessary. I
meant to have said a lot more—but I must
write again—meantime I hope this won't
drown you.

Tell me what you think of this—& whether
you think it really helps in any way to make it
more intelligible. . . .

Ever yours,

Henry Bradshaw

Letter 625 (Furnivall's earlier reply missing)
University Library (undated
but probably the same
day—the 21st—later, after
he has received a letter
from Furnivall to which he
refers).

Dear Furnivall

What a hopeless person you are. If I say
written separately & pieced by link after-
wards you fly out & say I mean written in
early life like the Knight's Tale etc. etc. Please
once for all get rid of the idea that the mention
of Palemon & Arcyte in the Legend implies an
early date. Couplets of 5 accents, or riding
rhyme in Chaucer's latest form of composi-
tion, and there can be no doubt of the Legend
& the Tales being his latest work, so that there
need be no difficulty in the mention of the
Legend in the Man of Lawes Prologue & the
mention of two of the tales in the Prologue
to the Legend, two tales not yet incorporated,
but one (Pal & Ar) clearly written as a *tale*.
You were inclined to allow my suggestion
that the words "though the storie is knowen
lyte" are a translation from what Boccaccio
says of the story & not (what they have been
made) a proof that it was a youthful & forgot-
ten effort on Chaucer's part.

The composite fragments which you have,
are frequently dislocated by the scribes, but
you find nothing approaching the dislocation
of the Group Clerk, Merchant, Squire, Frankⁿ
of your theory. You have fallen into a trap
about the link between the Merchant &
Squire. Did Chaucer write it at the end of the
Merchant's tale to introduce any *one* tale or
did he not? If you say yes (& you can hardly
say otherwise) it must be either the Squire or
the Franklin, not one or other indifferently—
& whichever one you take becomes necessar-
ily linked to the Merchant's tale.

Or will you consider this. Four links give
trouble, by being sometimes found in the
MSS. and sometimes not.

- 1) at the end of the Man[] of Lawe
- 2) at the beginning of the Merchant
- 3) at the end of the Merchant
- 4) at the end of the Squire

As for n^o 1 at the end of the Man of Lawe,
whatever character it is applied to (whether
Shipman, Squire, or Somnour) it is *found* in all
MSS except one class—and in this class we
are agreed that it has been *edited out*, so that
we are bound to restore it even if we put after
it, to show that it is not connected with the
Wyf's Prologue which comes next.

So far so good—now for the others.

Can you conceive such a thing as the
Clerk's Tale, the Merchant's Tale, the
Squire's tale and the Franklin's tale without
any links at all? You will find many MSS. in
which the links one or other or more of them
are omitted.

Please picture to yourself this.

Man of Lawe Link	Prologue Clerk <u>no link</u>
	Merchant <u>no link</u>
	Squire <u>no link</u>
	Franklin

Do you not see that you are here at liberty
to attract either Merchant Squire or Franklin
to the Man of Lawe link if you choose, & you
then see that many MSS. so attract the Squire,
leaving the other two where they were, in
limbo.

Now fancy, as your next step, Chaucer
writing a link at the end of the Squire to
introduce something else:

Man of Lawe Link	Clerk <u>no link</u>
{ Squire Link	Merchant <u>no link</u>
	Franklin

{ Franklin
or
Merchant

Don't you see now that though Chaucer
did write (as we believe) that link to intro-
duce the Franklin, yet if the word Franklin
drops out, there is no reason why the link
should introduce either the Merchant or
the Franklin, whichever seems to suit the
character best. In point of fact some MSS.
do the right thing & attract the Franklin to
the Squire (the Squire being already
attracted or not to the Man of Lawe)—
while others leave the Franklin and attract
the Merchant to the Squire. This is ex-
tremely common.

Now fancy as your next stage Chaucer
writing a link at the *end* of the Merchant's
Tale to introduce the Squire.

Man of Lawe Link	Prologue Clerk <u>No link</u>
(Squire Link)	{ Merchant Link
Franklin or Merchant	{ Squire Link
Link	Franklin

What is the effect of this? This helps to set
matters straight & correct the mistakes. A
word will alter the character of the Link & this
is easily done—but how? The effect of the
newly added link at the end of the Merchant's
Tale is this:

If it is interpreted *wrongly* (that is if the link at the end of the Merchant's Tale is made to introduce anyone but the Squire) it can only & is only made to introduce the Franklin. If it is made to introduce the Franklin, the following combination is possible.

Man of Lawe	Prologue
Link wrongly introducing the Squire	Clerk
Link wrongly introducing the Merchant	<u>No link</u>
Link wrongly introducing the Franklin	

And this is a combination which is found in a very large number of MSS.

On the other hand if this link is interpreted *rightly* (that is if the link at the end of the Merchant's Tale is made to introduce the Squire as it ought to do) then this results in two corrections:

The Squire is drawn away from the Man of Lawe (to wh^h it had been wrongly attracted) & given to the Merchant, & the link at the end of the Squire can by no possibility be now made to introduce the Merchant—so that the only alternative is make it introduce the Franklin (wh^h is correct), so that you get this:

Man of Lawe	Prologue
Link	Clerk
	<u>No link</u>
	Merchant
	Link introducing Squire
	Link rightly introducing Franklin

Now suppose as a final stage, Chaucer prefixing a link to the Merchant's Tale joining it on to the Clerk. This is incapable of any distortion by altering a word, so that [if] you have this link, it must run

Clerk
<u>Link introducing Merchant</u>

and you are free at once from any temptation to alter the link at the end of the Squire, because the only choice there being between the Franklin (which is right) & the Merchant (which is wrong)—the Merchant being here provided for, you have no alternative but to go right & put the Squire & Franklin together and the Clerk & Merchant being necessarily linked, & the Squire & Franklin also necessarily linked, you are set free from the temptation of linking the Merchant & Franklin (which is wrong) and you have no choice but to do what is right & let it stand thus

Man of Lawe	Prologue
Link	Clerk
xxxx	Link rightly introducing Merchant
	Link rightly introducing Squire
	Link rightly introducing Franklin.

There is only one other combination possible—it is not unnatural that a person should think it absurd, when the Squire's Tale is broken off & utterly unfinished, that there should be a bit at the end complimenting him on his success in his tale. Such a thought would lead the link at the end of the Squire to be *edited out*. We see that this has happened even in some of the best MSS. The result of this is as follows:

Man of Lawe	Prologue
Link	Clerk
	Link rightly introducing Merchant
	Link meant to introduce Squire
	Squire
	<u>No link</u>
	Franklin

Here it is very natural to attract the Squire to the Man of Lawe & there being no link to attract the Franklin to the Squire the Franklin remains behind & the link at the end of the Merchant then is easily perverted to introduce the Franklin, thus:

Man of Lawe	Prologue
Link wrongly introducing Squire	Clerk
	Link <u>rightly</u> introducing Merchant
	Link wrongly introducing Franklin

This I believe is what happened in the Lansdowne MS, wh^h accordingly goes a step further & forges a link after the Squire to introduce the Wife fragment, which in any case intervenes between the two fighting fragments.

Viva voce, I am sure I could convince you. I fear all this will only confuse you. What I am convinced of is that had the group been all written off together as the Shipman group, Wife group and others,—the scribes would never have played these tricks with the links. *It is only the end link of a fragment which is ever tampered with.* If you accept this as a golden rule, you will not only solve all your difficulties, but you will be able to master any manuscript or edition however much dislocated and distorted; while otherwise you can only get confusion.

Thanks for M^r Ellis's chapter & Morris' Homilies. You must be amused at what M^r Ellis says about knowing me.

Tell me if you understand anything of what I say.

Ever yours,

Henry Bradshaw.

Letter 626 Furnivall to Bradshaw

3 St. George's Square 22 Sept. 1868

My dear B

I didn't say that you said the Knight's was written in Chaucer's youth, but I instanced the Knight's as written alone before the Tales, just as the Clerk was, tho' neither (as I think) stands or ever stood qua Chaucer alone in the Tales. Your view accounts for the frequent shiftings better than mine, as I have just to break the Merchant off; but I don't care to press my view; it's a matter of first impression, & I can't believe that the Link was written after the Merchant. That interjectional stanza is thrown in just to prevent the link—the catch-up of writing, not talking—being felt too strongly, & to keep up the notion of the travel & chat. Don't waste more time on me about it. It'd be like arguing with me that Chaucer didn't write the Rom. Rose that we have.

Your new arrangement of the Tales I give in to altogether & think your halts & breaks help very much. As Chaucer had of course been the journey himself, I think it quite fair to assume that in the links he'd attend to the real facts of the road. But can you get evidence from Leland, Harison, or some old acc^t of a pilgrimage, as to that 40 miles on the first day? It looks like a long journey for those

times with their awful roads & after winter—the March winds may have dried 'em. I'll ask Dean Stanley.

The Lydgate Osprunge is very neat. Hales or someone has my Morley unluckily. My ordnance map hasn't come yet. Will Harbledown do for Bob up-& down, as Wright says? I've asked J. M. Cowper of Darrington, Faversham, to go down the road and say what is the most up-and-down village he finds.

Yours ever,

FJF

8 Letter 627

Dear Furnivall

I made out the enclosed tables & slips for your benefit after writing to you yesterday, but in comparing them with all the MSS. of which I have an account, I find that even these are not sufficient for the purpose. It is quite impossible to deal with the Clerk Merchant, Squire & Franklin unless you allow that the portions were written separately and the links also written at different stages to link them together. You can then deal with them as you please. In fact the links are fixed into one fragment for the purpose of catching hold of another. It is our duty to see which fragment each link is really fixed into, & then to advance a step forward & see which other fragment it was intended to catch hold of; and further still, to see how sometimes it missed its aim and caught hold of another by mistake. In this latter case we must lay down and register these false aims, & say what fragments have been erroneously caught hold of in any particular MS.

Does this make itself clear to you? Take the following illustration in Fragment II Man of Lawe. A link is stuck into its beginning which is not meant to catch hold of anything. It is simply a prologue. Another link is stuck into its end, genuine beyond all question, but creating difficulties. In some cases the difficulties have been so great that the scribe-editors have cancelled it altogether sooner than leave any abortive link. This I have found in *five* MSS. (There are many more).

Secondly the link has been left abortive, not introducing any character. This I have observed in only *one* MS (Harl. 7334). There may be others like it.

Thirdly the character of the speaker has led the scribe-editor to recognize the description of the Shipman, which all modern scholars agree is much the most appropriate character to the link: accordingly in this case the scribe-editor has made the link catch hold of the Shipman-Prioress-Chaucer-Monk-Nonnes Prest group and draw it up to this point. Good as it is, however, only *one* MS. has hitherto been found to countenance this catch. [Arch Sel.]

Fourthly, the Scribe-editor has recognized in this link the description of the Squire, and has made this link catch hold of the Squire's Tale, then floating about unattached. For indeed, we *must* allow that the link now fixed at the end of the Merchant's Tale was at this stage either not written at all, or else easily misinterpreted so as to allow it to hook on to the Franklin. In any case, there must have been some excuse for the proceedings, for even in the MSS I have myself examined there are *thirteen* which make the 'Man of Law' end link hook on to the Squire.

The result of this is that I must re-write all

my notices of the Fragment and tabulate what I have to say. If you who have studied the matter cannot understand my meaning—how can any other person, who has never thought of the question, find anything but confusion in it?

Something like this.

Fragment II

1. Prologue—2. Man of Law's Tale of Constance—3. Link The only point remaining to be noticed in the text of this Fragment is the Link at the end. It is found in four states.

1. Prologue
Man of Law
No link
2. Prologue
Man of Law
Link introducing nobody
3. Prologue
Man of Law
Link, possibly rightly, introducing Shipman
4. Prologue
Man of Law
Link, wrongly, introducing Squire.

To which may be added

5. Prologue
Man of Law
Link, doubtful

to represent that from a defect in the MS it is now impossible to say which of the other four states was there at first.

You then merely go to your MS. and tick off which of the states your MS represents, & finally you get a statistical table which you can use for many purposes.

You will observe that this link is never other than one of these four, either 1) cancelled or 2) abortive or 3) introducing the Shipman or 4) introducing the Squire.

So of the Merchant's Fragment. The beginning link either exists in the MS. or does not. When it does it is never distorted (& can't be) so as to refer to any but the Clerk fragment. The End-link also either exists or does not exist in the MS. under survey. When it does exist it never (so far as I know) hooks on anything but the Squire which it was written to hook on—, or the Franklin which it was not meant to hook on but to which it can be adapted without much perversion, so that of this we say:

This Fragment is capable of being found in any of the following states

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. No link
No Merchant
No link
i.e., omitted
altogether
(2 MSS.) | 3. No link
Merchant
Link right
introducing
Squire
(? no MSS.) |
| 2. No link
Merchant
No link
i.e., only the
tale
7 MSS | 4. No link
Merchant
Link <u>wrong</u>
introducing
Franklin
3 MSS. |
| 5. Link
Merchant
No link
3 MSS. | 6. Link
Merchant
Link <u>right</u>
introducing
Squire
6 MSS. |

7. Link
Merchant
Link wrong.
introducing
Franklin
? No MSS

To which I should add as overleaf a note showing the alternating necessary, when from a defect in the MS. it is impossible to say what the MS. originally was. . . .

I will not keep you much longer. The Squire Fragment has a link fastened into its broken end written for the purpose of hooking on the Franklin.

This link either exists or does not exist in the MS. When it does exist, it either hooks on the Franklin (which is right) or by altering it slightly it hooks on the Merchant (which it was not meant to do). It never so far as I know, hooks on any fragment but one or other of these two.

Thus:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. No Squire
No link
i.e., omitted
altogether
1 MS | 2. Squire
No link
5 MSS. |
| 3. Squire
Link or no
link
doubtful
from
imperfection
of MS.
4 MSS. | 4. Squire
Link <u>right</u>
introducing
Franklin
2 MSS. |
| | 5. Squire
Link <u>wrong</u>
introducing
Merchant
10 MSS. |

Now as classes 2 and 4 are both correct, & as class 3 must be one of either 2 or 4, it follows that as far as correctness goes, we have 11 correct against 10 MSS where the link is distorted. Of course this is only referring to the MSS. of which I have notes at hand before me. This is enough to show you how much remains to be done, & how much simpler the proof is if you agree to break up your fragments. Let me know what you think, if it does not overwhelm you altogether

Ever yours,

Henry Bradshaw

Letter 632

University Library Cambridge
25 September 1868

Dear Furnivall

1) I should number my pieces as I intended to print them—we know pretty well now what there is genuine, & I don't anticipate that any new couplets or stanzas will now be discovered.

It is imperative that Gen. Prol. 638 should always mean the same line whenever or wherever you refer to it, so I should print thus:

Wel loued he garlyk oynoon and eek lekes
636

And for to drynke strong wyn / reed as blood

Thanne wolde he speke / and crye as he
were wood

.....
640

A fewe termes hadde he / two / or thre

2* No gap in the MS.

Sometimes when a line or couplet is omitted,

the scribe is aware of it and leaves a line or two lines blank. I should of course notice it—But you cannot [something omitted] a footnote without creating confusion in your pages—but there need be no difficulty in using numbers which refer to "notes on the Hengwrt MS." or "Notes on the Ellesmere MS." etc. at the end

I should certainly not supply such things from either a printed book or another MS.

I allow that if there is a considerable gap in a MS. w^h you are printing, you may consider it a favourable opportunity of giving so much of another good MS. which is not included among your six, but I do protest against (& I am convinced Child would protest against) your wishing to make complete copies out of every separate text—as if the people who had the text had no others to read.

.....
About the road home I don't care. If I recognise the Manciple Prologue & Tale as all we have of the first stage of the return journey, and the Person Prologue & Tale as all we have of the last stage of all, I am content to leave matters, & merely give what stages we have.

If I were editing the Canterbury Tales, I should break the poem into seven stages:

- 1st stage From Southwark
- 2nd stage To Rochester
- 3rd stage From Rochester to Sittingbourne
- 4th stage From Sittingbourne
- 5th stage To Canterbury
- 6th stage From Canterbury
- 7th stage To Southwark.

The first three stages may form the first day's journey; the 4th and 5th the second day's journey, and the 6th and 7th the first and last stages of the return journey.

If you think the journey there took more than two days, you must put the second day between the Cook & the Man of Law, & then we have no remains of that day's journey. I put and number only those stages of which we have traces, & I leave the rest to take care of themselves.

1st stage Prologue Knight, Millere, Reve, Cook xxx

2nd stage Man of Law, Shipman,

Prioress, Chaucer, Monk, Nonnes Prest xxx

3rd stage Wyf, Frere, Somnour

Second Day

4th stage Clerk, Merchant, Squire,

Franklin

5th stage Second Nonne, Chanoun's

3emanxxx Doctour, Pardoner

Return Journey

6th stage Manciple

7th stage Person

In editing, I should group my parts of the poem according to stages and number the divisions thus 1st Stage, 1. 1; but I should number the contents of each stage throughout, & so in a general index II. 767 or such references would be all that you would require; and this is hardly more trouble than Tyrwhitt's 17584.

There is one thing which of course you don't enter into at all, & which is always present with me. I look forward to a standard edition of Chaucer's works, which now doesn't exist; and if one's work is so far advanced that it is possible to anticipate confusion now, I am of course for adopting those conclusions in whatever work of the kind the Society does; for it is a great evil in my mind to make all the editions or quasi-editions different. Hitherto Thynne's edⁿ was accepted

from 1532 to 1775. Tyrwhitt's from 1775 to 1846, and T. Wright's has been accepted till now (Morris's text being only T. Wright's verbally corrected). It is this that makes me anxious to discuss with Rossetti & son & others before going to press. In plain words I cannot bear the thought of any publication coming forth with authority, when it is merely the result of a few hasty and crude speculations which a little fair preliminary discussion would get rid of.

All your letters (not your talking by any means) show that you snap your fingers at the whole affair, & it is this always that so thoroughly disheartens me in all my work on the subject.

Yours ever

Henry Bradshaw

P.S. I remember my apparent non-sequitur. What I meant was this. If the Persons Tale belongs to the arrival at Canterbury at sundown or late afternoon—the Pilgrims leave Canterbury in early morning & go home (as we may infer from Lidgate & Beryn was the custom) they must have been a whole day or two nights at

Canterbury for the religious ceremonies. Lidgate & the author of Beryn give natural pictures of the Pilgrimage, & from these, allowed to speak for themselves, & put side by side with the remains of Chaucer's poem, I feel warranted in drawing the conclusion w^h I have drawn.

*Every reasonable effort has been made to get in touch with heirs of Bradshaw and Furnivall with respect to copyright. I acknowledge my gratitude to Dr. A. E. B. Owen, Keeper of Rare Books and Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge, for assistance and permission to publish the letters.

Note

1. The order, or evolution, of the *Tales* received extended consideration for the first time in Tyrwhitt's edition, in "An Introductory Discourse to the *Canterbury Tales*," in which Tyrwhitt abandoned the printed tradition and adopted the order of "the best MSS," involving a shift of the *Second Nonne's Tale* and the *Canon's Yeoman's Tale* to a position after the *Nonne's Preste's Tale*, thus establishing the "Ellesmere Order," albeit

without Ellesmere. It is this to which Bradshaw refers in his correspondence with Furnivall. Skeat, it will be remembered, followed the Bradshaw Shift in his great edition, although it may not be so readily remembered that Skeat abandoned the largely geographical Bradshaw arrangement in his "The Evolution of *The Canterbury Tales*" (Chaucer Society 1907), pp. 30-1. Robinson and Manly-Rickert both followed the Ellesmere order not so much through conviction of its "rightness" but as the best available order supported by the best available MSS, or, as Skeat put it in his essay "I submit that this ought to be final; and that, instead of considering what Chaucer ought to have done, we have rather to consider what he actually did" (31), i.e., according to the evidence of the MSS themselves. The Bradshaw shift was vigorously and exhaustively defended by Pratt, "The Order of the *Canterbury Tales*," *PMLA*, 66 (1951), and several arguments pro and con have appeared since. The "new Robinson" will presumably follow the Bradshaw order of Pratt's edition of *The Tales of Canterbury* (1966), but the most recent thorough edition of the works, that of Fisher (1977), has reverted to the Ellesmere arrangement.

University of Colorado

MEDIAEVAL ACADEMY REPRINTS FOR TEACHING

Conceived and sponsored by the Committee on Centers and Regional Associations of the Mediaeval Academy of America, the Mediaeval Academy Reprints for Teaching series (MART) is designed to bring basic works in medieval studies back into print for classroom use. Two

years ago the series reprinted R. K. Gordon's *THE STORY OF TROILUS* (paperback, \$5.00) and Helge Kökeritz' *A GUIDE TO CHAUCER'S PRONUNCIATION* (paperback, \$1.50), two books of immense value to all students and teachers of Chaucer's poetry. Last year MART reprinted W. A. Pantin's *THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY* (paperback, \$5.00) which many teachers find an excellent supplementary text for studying *The Canterbury Tales*.

This year MART has reprinted a standard reference work for Middle English courses which is often employed as a supplementary

text in Chaucer courses: John Gower's *CONFESSIO AMANTIS*, edited by Russell A. Peck (paperback, \$7.95). A rich collection of tales that embrace a wide range of subjects from love to the governance of England, Gower's major poem is of importance to all students of the fourteenth century.

All MART titles are available from the University of Toronto Press. And suggestions are invited for out-of-print titles that the MART Editorial Board should consider for possible reprinting. These may be sent to David Staines, Department of English, University of Ottawa, Chairman, Editorial Board (MART).

A CALENDAR OF FORTHCOMING EVENTS

1981:

April 3-4, The Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies regional Spring conference, Acta VIII: "The Late Middle Ages." The main speakers will be Juan Bautista Avallé-Arce (North Carolina-Chapel Hill) and Ciriaco Moron Arroyo (Cornell). It is expected that there will be papers on the Age of Chaucer. The Acta conference coordinator is Peter Cocozzella.

April 9-11, The Mediaeval Academy will hold its fifty-sixth annual meeting at Columbia University in New York. Joan Ferrante, Robert Hanning, and Robert Somerville form the local committee.

April 10-11, The Rocky Mountain Medieval and Renaissance Association will hold its 1981 annual meeting at the United States Air Force Academy, near Colorado Springs. For further information write the meeting chairman, Maj.

William E. McCarron, United States Air Force Academy, CO 80840.

April 10-11, The Society for Textual Scholarship announces an interdisciplinary conference on "Current Problems in Textual Scholarship," at the Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York.

April 23-25, The University of Kentucky Foreign Language Conference for 1981 will be held at the University of Kentucky in Lexington. A section on medieval studies will be included. The conference is not regional, but of national scope; scholars from the fifty states and Canada will be giving papers. For further information write to Theodore Mueller, Director, Foreign Language Conference, Univ. of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506.

May 7-10, The Medieval Institute, Western Michigan University will hold the 16th International Congress on Medieval Studies at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan.

August 11-19, Thirteenth Triennial Congress of the International Arthurian Society, Glasgow, Scotland. Write Professor Norris J. Lacy, Department of French and Italian, Univ. of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045.

September 25-27, The Augustinian Historical Institute will hold the sixth Mid-Atlantic States Conference on Patristic, Medieval, and Renaissance Studies at Villanova University. For information, contact Thomas A. Losoncy or Joseph C. Schnaubelt, O.S.A., PRM Conference, Villanova Univ., Villanova, PA 19085.

October, The Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies series of conferences. Though the program of major speakers is not final, the following have accepted invitations: D.W. Robertson Jr., John Block Friedman, Russell Peck, J. Ambrose Raftis, Richard C. Trexler.

October 10, The Midwest Medieval Conference will be meeting at Ohio State Univ. in Columbus. Program chairman for the meeting is Michael Altschul, Department of History, Case Western Reserve Univ., Cleveland, OH 44503. Anyone interested in presenting a paper should submit a one-page proposal to Professor Altschul by 1 April. There is no central theme; papers on any topic germane to medieval history are invited.

October 15-16, The eighth annual Saint Louis Conference on Manuscript Studies will be held at St. Louis University. An invitation has been extended for papers dealing with one of the

four following aspects of the manuscript: codicology, illumination, paleography, and texts. Those wishing to participate should request additional information from the Conference Committee, Vatican Film Library, Pius XII Memorial Library, 3655 West Pine, St. Louis, MO 63108.

October 16-17, The Ball State University Committee for the Advancement of Early Studies will hold their twelfth annual interdisciplinary conference. A competition has been announced for emerging scholars who do not have their doctorate or who have received it in the last seven years. To enter the competition, submit papers on any phase of Medieval/Renaissance Studies (architecture, art, foreign languages and literature, history, language and literature of England, music, pedagogy, philosophy, theology, etc.) All suitable papers will be awarded presentation time of twenty to twenty-five minutes, the better will be awarded presentation time plus small monetary prizes, and the best will be awarded presentation time, small monetary prizes, plus publication. In addition, the Committee wishes to announce a competition for undergraduate students, with a small monetary prize being awarded for the best research presented. Please send five copies of the completed paper plus verification of degree date to Bruce W. Hozeski, Department of English, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana, 47306. Deadline: 15 May 1981.

In addition, established scholars with new research in Medieval/Renaissance studies are invited to give papers. Submit one page abstracts. Finished papers should be limited to a twenty to twenty-five minute presentation in order to leave five to ten minutes for questions. Please send abstracts to Bruce W. Hozeski, Department of English, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana 47306. Deadline: 15 May 1981.

October 22-24, Rocky Mountain Modern Language Association invites papers on all aspects of Old and Middle English language and literature for the annual meeting to be held in Boise, Idaho. Papers should be 15 minutes in length. Please send 75-word abstracts no later than 15 April to Melvin Storm, Dept. of English, Emporia State Univ., Emporia, KS 66801.

1982:

February 18-20, The annual meeting of The Medieval Association of the Pacific will be held at the Claremont Colleges, Claremont, California. In addition to the usual variety of papers on medieval topics, a portion of the Claremont program has been set aside for studies devoted to *Piers the Plowman* or its background. This theme will of course interest many in the field of English, but this early announcement is intended to attract the attention of scholars in other fields, for whom additional lead time is obviously important. Deadline for submission of Claremont proposals will be November 1, 1981. Areas of interest in *Piers the Plowman* or its background solicited for the Claremont meeting are: allegory, Bible, computer, Dante, friars, history, influence (on later tradition), Latin, law, liturgy, meter, monasticism, rhetoric, satire, sources, textual criticism, theology, and Wyclif. A detailed proposal and summary of scholarship appears in the Fall 1980 issue of *Chronica*, and spells out what is meant by these categories in relation to the text. A copy of this issue of *Chronica* can be obtained by writing to Professor Patrick Gallacher, Department of English, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131. Proposals for the Claremont meeting should be mailed to Professor David C. Fowler, Department of English, University of

Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195. On or about January 1, 1982, copies of the Claremont program, together with information about registration for the meeting, can be obtained by writing to Professor Barry Sanders, Department of English, Pitzer College, 1050 North Mills Avenue, Claremont, California 91711.

April 15-18, The 1982 congress of the New Chaucer Society will be held in San Francisco. The program committee would like to hear ideas from scholars and teachers of Chaucer for this program, in terms of format, content, topics, proportions, etc. Presently three kinds of sessions have been proposed: short refereed papers read in groups, large sessions devoted to one topic with one or two major speakers followed by discussion, and major addresses after lunch and dinner. It has also been suggested that panels responding to papers proceed by open discussion rather than formal replies. The conference as a whole will have no theme, but larger sessions might focus on several topics already proposed: Chaucer's aesthetic and its sources, Chaucer and Wycliffe, manuscripts and texts, classical influences, Italian traditions, etc. Any suggestions or comments would be welcome and should be sent to one of the co-chairmen of the program, Donald Fry (Dept. of English, SUNY, Stony Brook, NY 11790) or Penn Szittya (Dept. of English, Georgetown Univ., Washington, DC 20007) before 30 May 1981.

May 6-9, The Medieval Institute, Western Michigan University will hold the 17th International Congress on Medieval Studies at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan.



Writers and Pilgrims

Medieval Pilgrimage Narratives and Their Posterity

by Donald R. Howard

One of our best interpreters of Chaucer provides a delightful guide to writings that rose naturally from a medieval institution and became a literary form with its own heritage. "A captivating book: Howard displays here a sensitive, penetrating mind; a gift for synthesis; a marvelous sense of humor; an enticing style—chattily informal, yet, beneath the surface, exhibiting a tight control." —Warren C. Hollister \$10.95

Also available by Donald Howard:

The Idea of the Canterbury Tales

\$20.00 cloth, \$5.95 paperback

At bookstores

University of California Press

Berkeley 94720

New Publication on Teaching Chaucer

Approaches to Teaching Chaucer's Canterbury Tales, edited by Joseph Gibaldi, the first volume in the new series *Approaches to Teaching Masterpieces of World Literature*, has just been published by the Modern Language Association. The book begins with the Introduction "The Challenge of Teaching *The Canterbury Tales*" by the consultant editor of the volume Florence H. Ridley. The body of the work is divided into two parts, entitled "Materials" and "Approaches." Based on information supplied by more than one hundred teachers of Chaucer throughout the United States and Canada who participated in a survey that preceded preparation of the book, Part I deals with such questions as editions for teaching *The Canterbury Tales*, required and recommended student

readings, aids to teaching (recordings, films, and so on), and "The Instructor's Library"—that is, important reference works, background studies, and critical and linguistic studies devoted to Chaucer and his poetry.

In Part II fifteen experienced teachers of *The Canterbury Tales* discuss their approaches to teaching the work. John H. Fisher begins this section with an essay that argues, among other things, that any literature course centers on the confrontation of student with text and that the teacher's chief role is as mediator between the two. Next, Thomas J. Garbáty, Donald R. Howard, Emerson Brown, Jr., and Mary J. Caruthers offer general overviews of the Chaucer courses they teach. Robert M. Jordan, William Provost, Terrie Curran, and Thomas W. Ross outline more specific approaches. The following three essays deal with teaching *The Canterbury Tales* as part of courses for nonmajors.

Michael D. West and Stephen R. Portch discuss their English literature courses at, respectively, a four-year and a two-year undergraduate school; and Susan Schibanoff describes her more specialized comparative course on women in medieval literature. The final three essays on teaching the backgrounds of *The Canterbury Tales* include a survey by D. W. Robertson, Jr., of the many fields of knowledge that must be brought to bear on Chaucer's poetry to convey its rich complexity; Ernest N. Kaulbach's description of his Tradition of Western Literature course; and Julia Bolton Holloway's account of her seminar *The Medieval Pilgrimage*.

Copies of the book (\$13.50 hardbound, \$6.50 paperbound) may be obtained by writing to Order Department, Modern Language Association, 62 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10011.

ELIZABETH SALTER: AN OBITUARY NOTICE

Elizabeth Salter was born Elizabeth Jones in 1925, in the village of Bream, in the Forest of Dean, where her mother was the village schoolmistress. She received her secondary education at the grammar school in nearby Lydney, and went up to Bedford College, in the University of London, in 1943. The College was partly evacuated to Cambridge during the war, and she spent some of her undergraduate years there. After receiving her B.A. degree, with 1st class honors, she went on to do research for the M.A. under the supervision of Phyllis Hodgson. Her subject was the English prose translation by Nicholas Love of the pseudo-Bonaventuran *Meditationes Vitae Christi*. Material derived from and inspired by her dissertation constituted the basis of her journal publication during the early years of her scholarly career, and the whole dissertation was eventually published in revised form in 1974. In 1949 she was appointed to an Assistant Lectureship at King's College in the University of London, and at this time she also held a part-time appointment at Westfield College.

In 1950 she married Christopher Zeeman and removed to Cambridge. Here she held the Jex-Blake Research Fellowship at Girton College from 1952 to 1955, was appointed Assistant Lecturer in the University of Cambridge in 1953, and Lecturer in 1957. After her divorce from her first husband, she married David Salter in 1960.

During her years in Cambridge, Elizabeth Zeeman contributed very significantly to the development of medieval English Studies in the University, through the energy and determination of her work on faculty committees, through her unrivalled brilliance as a lecturer, and her own example as a scholar. She was at this time developing the ideas on Langland and Chaucer which subsequently found expression in her books on *Piers Plowman* and on the *Knight's and Squire's Tales* in 1963. These books first established her as a scholar of international reputation: deeply sensitive to the writing of the two

great poets, and exquisitely literate, they also embody a view of the work of literature as the writer's creative engagement with the intractable matter of his experience which is both profoundly original and profoundly stimulating.

In 1963, Elizabeth Salter accepted a visiting appointment at the University of Connecticut at Storrs. In 1964 she returned to take up a Readership at the newly established University of York. To this new and challenging task she brought all her strength of mind and enthusiasm, all her wit and charm, and the high reputation of the growing department of English at York owed much to her inspired teaching. In 1969 she was appointed to a Chair, and she was the effective moving force behind the creation of the postgraduate Centre for Medieval Studies in the University of York, of which she was appointed the first Director in 1972. These years saw the publication of a number of articles and books, especially on Chaucer and alliterative poetry, and the establishment, in collaboration with Derek Pearsall, her colleague at York, of the series of *York Medieval Texts*. They also saw the maturing of her work on the relationships between medieval literature and the visual arts. Her lectures on this subject were perhaps the pinnacle of her achievement as a teacher, and the memory of them, for anyone who was privileged to be present, whether at Cambridge, York, or at universities or conferences elsewhere in England or abroad, is unforgettable. Her radiant personal beauty and spontaneous warmth of personality, no less than the challenge of her ideas and the deftness of her presentation, combined to create an irresistible impression.

It was during this time too that there was brought to full fruition perhaps her greatest and rarest talent, as a supervisor of postgraduate research. Her name and her reputation brought students from all over England and the world to work with her and her closest colleagues, and the impress of her personality and her scholarship will remain with them wherever they are now scattered in universities at home and abroad. For, combined with her brilliance, even flamboyance, as a lecturer, and her exquisite

sensitivity as a writer and critic, she was also a meticulous scholar, modest, respectful to her forebears, zealous for the truth and unremitting in her pursuit of it. She communicated this dedication in full measure to her students, and was almost wantonly generous in giving them the results of her own researches. She thought only of the community of scholars and the pursuit of truth, and never of gain to her own personal reputation. Her extraordinary warmth of personality, her spontaneous care and consideration of others, her generosity of nature, made a bond among all who surrounded her, just as her alarming attractiveness and scandalous gaiety made every meeting seem like the occasion for a party. She was patient where patience was needed, and she had the gift of creating an atmosphere of encouragement, so that all the students that she gathered around her could feel that they had something important to say. Many talents bloomed to an unexpected maturity in the warmth of her appreciation.

In 1978, Elizabeth Salter returned to Storrs to accept an appointment as distinguished visiting professor. She always loved America, and had many friends among Americans, to whose natural openness of manner, friendliness, and frank hospitality she responded warmly. It is appropriate that the present memoir should be published first in America. All this time, she maintained an unprecedented flow of publication, as if aware that she had little time left. A series of essays and articles, each with enough ideas to supply a book for most people, distilled the scholarly experience of a lifetime. She was also engaged in the writing of a major book, on the contexts, especially the non-English contexts, of Middle English literature, and in the preparation of a collection of studies on literature and the visual arts. Her friends hope to bring these to publication.

Elizabeth Salter died on May 7th, 1980, eighteen months after her first operation for cancer. Her last days showed mainly concern for those from whom she was departing. She leaves a daughter, Nicolette, and a son, Mark. Her memory remains as the life of those who loved her.

D.P.

Bibliography of the Writings of Elizabeth Salter

Under the Name Elizabeth Zeeman

- "Nicholas Love—a Fifteenth-century Translator," *Review of English Studies*, n.s. 6 (1955), 113-27.
- "Continuity in Middle English Devotional Prose," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 55 (1956), 417-22.
- "Punctuation in an Early Manuscript of Love's *Mirror*," *Review of English Studies*, n.s. 7 (1956), 11-18.
- "Two Middle English versions of a prayer to the sacrament," *Archiv*, 194 (1957), 113-21.
- "Continuity and Change in Middle English Versions of the *Meditationes Vitae Christi*," *Medium Aevum*, 26 (1957), 25-31.
- "*Piers Plowman* and the Pilgrimage to Truth," *Essays and Studies*, 11 (1958), 1-16.

Under the Name Elizabeth Salter

- Chaucer: The Knight's Tale and the Clerk's Tale*, Studies in English Literature 5, London: Edward Arnold, 1962.
- Piers Plowman: an Introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1962.
- "The English Vernacular," *The Listener*, 70 (1963), 652-4, 695-7.
- "Ludolphus of Saxony and his English Translators," *Medium Aevum*, 33 (1964), 26-35.

- "The Alliterative Revival," *Modern Philology*, 64 (1966), 146-50, 233-7.
- "Troilus and Criseyde: a Reconsideration," in *Patterns of Love and Courtesy: Essays in Memory of C. S. Lewis*, ed. John Lawlor, London: Arnold, 1966, pp. 86-106.
- "Piers Plowman and 'The Simonie,'" *Archiv*, 203 (1967), 241-54.
- (with Derek Pearsall) *Piers Plowman*, selections from the C-text, ed., York Medieval Texts, London: Edward Arnold, 1967.
- "Medieval Poetry and the Figural View of Reality" (Sir Israel Gollancz Memorial Lecture, British Academy, 1968), *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 54 (1968), 73-92.
- "Medieval Poetry and the Visual Arts," *Essays and Studies*, 22 (1969), 16-32.
- "Piers Plowman and the Visual Arts," in *Encounters: Essays on Literature and the Visual Arts*, ed. John Dixon Hunt, London: Studio Vista, 1971, pp. 11-27.
- (with Derek Pearsall) *Landscapes and Seasons of the Medieval World*, London: Elek, 1973.
- "Courts and Courtly Love," and "The Mediaeval Lyric," chaps. 12 (pp. 407-44) and 13 (pp. 445-84), in *Literature of the Western World*, ed. D. Daiches, London: Aldus, 1973.
- Nicholas Love's Myrroure of the Blessed Lys of Jesu Christ*, Analecta Cartusiana 10, Salzburg: Institut für Englische Sprache und Literatur, Universität Salzburg, 1974.
- "Henry Adams and W. H. Auden: 'The Age of Anxiety,'" *Notes and Queries*, 24 (1977), 454-5.

- "The Troilus Frontispiece," pp. 15-23 of Introduction to *Troilus and Criseyde: a Facsimile of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge MS 61*, Cambridge: Brewer, 1978.
- "The Timeliness of *Wynner and Wastoure*," *Medium Aevum*, 47 (1978), 40-65.
- "Alliterative Modes and Affiliations in the Fourteenth Century," *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 79 (1978), 25-35.
- "Langland and the Contexts of *Piers Plowman*," *Essays and Studies*, 32 (1979), 19-25.
- "A Complaint against Blacksmiths," *Literature and History*, 5 (1979), 194-215.
- "Chaucer and Internationalism," *Studies in the Age of Chaucer*, 2 (1980), 71-9.
- (with Derek Pearsall) "Pictorial Illustration of late medieval poetic texts: the role of the frontispiece or prefatory picture," in *Medieval Iconography and Narrative: A Symposium* edited by Flemming G. Andersen, Esther Nyholm, Marianne Powell and Flemming Talbo Stukjaer, Odense: Odense University Press, 1980.
- "Troilus and Criseyde: Poet and Narrator," in *The Well of English: Critical and Textual Studies in honor of E. Talbot Donaldson*, ed. Mary J. Carruthers and Elizabeth D. Kirk.
- "The Manuscripts of Nicholas Love's *Myrroure of the Blessed Lys of Jesu Christ* and Related Texts," in *Middle English Prose: Essays on Bibliographical Problems*, ed. A. S. G. Edwards and Derek Pearsall, New York: Garland Press, 1981, pp. 115-28.

The New Chaucer Society

Officers

- President: Charles Muscatine, University of California, Berkeley
- Executive Director: Paul G. Ruggiers, University of Oklahoma
- Deputy Executive Director: Donald M. Rose, University of Oklahoma

Board of Trustees

- Derek S. Brewer, Emmanuel College, Cambridge University
- E. Talbot Donaldson, Indiana University
- John H. Fisher, University of Tennessee
- Donald K. Fry, State University of New York, Stony Brook
- Robert Worth Frank, Pennsylvania State University
- Donald R. Howard, Stanford University
- Alice Miskimin, Yale University
- Charles Muscatine, University of California, Berkeley
- Paul G. Ruggiers, University of Oklahoma

International Secretaries

- Juliette de Caluwé-Dor, University of Liege
- Karl H. Göller, University of Regensburg
- Tadahiro Ikegami, Seijo University
- Stephen Knight, University of Sydney
- Beryl Rowland, York University, Toronto
- Barry Windeatt, Emmanuel College, Cambridge University

- Roy J. Pearcy, Editor—*Studies in the Age of Chaucer*

Hilgrim Books

ANNOUNCES

MS Tanner 346

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Tanner 346 belongs, with the splendid MS Fairfax 16 and MS Bodley 638, to a group named by Eleanor Hammond, "the Oxford group." Written on vellum in several hands of the early fifteenth century, comprised of 132 leaves about 8½ x 6½ inches in size, MS Tanner 346 is the earliest of the "Oxford group" and as such is an important witness in the establishment and canon of Chaucer's minor poems.

The manuscript contains: *Anelida*, *The Complaint of Mars*, *The Complaint of Venus*, and *The Complaint unto Pity*. Most significantly, MS Tanner 346 contains one of only three manuscript versions of *The Book of the Duchess*, the other two being contained in MS Fairfax 16 and MS Bodley 638. Also in MS Tanner 346 are good versions of *The Parlement of Foules* and *The Legend of Good Women*, along with an assortment of fifteenth century poems by Hoccleve and Lydgate.

ISBN 0-937664-50-2 Price: \$185.00

Available 30 April 1981

Available now:

Corpus Christi College Cambridge MS 61: *Troilus & Criseyde*

ISBN 85991 032 6

Price: \$185.00

Cambridge University Library MS GG. 4.27 (3 volumes)

ISBN 0-85991-6

Price: \$490.00

Send inquiries to:

Hilgrim Books

P.O. Box 2399, Norman, Oklahoma 73070

CALL FOR PAPERS

The New Chaucer Society will hold its third international congress in San Francisco on 15-18 April 1982. The program will have three components: two major addresses; three plenary sessions; and six discussion and paper reading sections. Topics for the plenary sessions include: Chaucer and Wycliff; Chaucer's Audience and Language; Chaucer's Manuscripts and Mind. These sessions will move from commissioned speakers to panelists to audience participation. Discussion and paper reading sections will focus on six areas:

1. Exegetical Approaches
2. Chaucer and the Continent
3. The Visual Chaucer (illustrations, iconography, portraits, etc.)
4. *The Canterbury Tales*
5. *Troilus and Criseyde*
6. Prose and Shorter Poems

Scholars wishing to contribute to one of these six sections should send papers NO LATER THAN 1 October 1981 to the program co-chairman, Professor Donald Fry, Department of English, State University of New York at Stony Brook, Stony Brook, New York 11794.