

Oxford Guides to Chaucer



The Canterbury
Tales



Oxford Guides to Chaucer



The Canterbury Tales



HELEN COOPER



300651809



CLARENDON PRESS · OXFORD

1989

Oxford University Press, Walton Street, Oxford OX2 6DP

Oxford New York Toronto

Delhi Bombay Calcutta Madras Karachi

Petaling Jaya Singapore Hong Kong Tokyo

Nairobi Dar es Salaam Cape Town

Melbourne Auckland

and associated companies in

Berlin Ibadan

Oxford is a trade mark of Oxford University Press

Published in the United States
by Oxford University Press, New York

© Helen Cooper 1989

Extracts from *The Riverside Chaucer* © Houghton Mifflin Company 1987

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without
the prior permission of Oxford University Press

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way
of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out or otherwise circulated
without the publisher's prior consent in any form of binding or cover
other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition
including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Cooper, Helen, 1947-

The Canterbury tales.—(Oxford guides to Chaucer)

1. Poetry in English. Chaucer, Geoffrey,

1340-1400. *Canterbury tales*

I. Title II. Series

821'.1

ISBN 0-19-811191-6

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Cooper, Helen.

Oxford guides to Chaucer. *The Canterbury tales*/Helen Cooper.

Bibliography: p. Includes index.

1. Chaucer, Geoffrey, d. 1400. *Canterbury tales*. I. Title.

PR1874.C64 1989 821'.1—dc19 88-35160

ISBN 0-19-811191-6

Phototypeset by Cotswold Typesetting Limited, Gloucester

Printed in Great Britain

by Biddles Ltd.

Guildford and King's Lynn

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>ChR</i>	<i>Chaucer Review</i>
<i>EETS</i>	<i>Early English Text Society</i>
<i>ELH</i>	<i>English Literary History</i>
<i>ELN</i>	<i>English Language Notes</i>
<i>ES</i>	<i>English Studies</i>
<i>JEGP</i>	<i>Journal of English and Germanic Philology</i>
<i>MÆ</i>	<i>Medium Ævum</i>
<i>M&H</i>	<i>Medievalia et humanistica</i>
<i>MLN</i>	<i>Modern Language Notes</i>
<i>MLQ</i>	<i>Modern Language Quarterly</i>
<i>MP</i>	<i>Modern Philology</i>
<i>MS</i>	<i>Medieval Studies</i>
<i>NLH</i>	<i>New Literary History</i>
<i>NM</i>	<i>Neuphilologische Mitteilungen</i>
<i>N&Q</i>	<i>Notes and Queries</i>
<i>PMLA</i>	<i>Publications of the Modern Languages Association</i>
<i>REL</i>	<i>Review of English Literature</i>
<i>RES</i>	<i>Review of English Studies</i>
<i>SAC</i>	<i>Studies in the Age of Chaucer</i>
<i>SP</i>	<i>Studies in Philology</i>
<i>UTQ</i>	<i>University of Toronto Quarterly</i>

FOREWORD

THE idea for a series of guides to Chaucer originated in a sense that medieval studies in general and Chaucerian studies in particular had advanced to a point where a reappraisal of his poetry was both possible and necessary. The three volumes are devoted to the shorter poetry, *Troilus and Criseyde*, and the *Canterbury Tales*. We see these books as fulfilling a role comparable to the introduction to a good edition, but at greater length than would be possible there. The kind of line-by-line expository material that the notes to an edition would contain is included only where such matters are of wider importance for an understanding of the whole text or where recent scholarship has made significant advances. We hope to provide readers of Chaucer with essential and up-to-date information, with the emphasis falling on how the interpretation of that information advances our understanding of his work; we have therefore gone beyond summarizing what is known to suggest new critical readings.

The original plan for the series was designed to provide some degree of consistency in the outline of the volumes, but it was part of the project from the start that there should be plenty of room for each author's individuality. We hope that our sense of common interests and concerns in our interpretation of Chaucer's poetry will provide a deeper critical consistency below the diversity. Such a paradox would, after all, be true to the nature of our subject.

Helen Cooper

A.J. Minnis

Barry Windeatt

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

FIVE years go, when Oxford University Press first asked me to draw up a scheme for a series of Chaucer handbooks, I did not quite realize what I was letting myself in for. It may be that they did not realize either. My part is now complete, and I must pay thanks to their English editor, Kim Scott Walwyn, for her encouragement, patience, and broad-mindedness.

To have asked any of my medievalist friends to comment on the draft of such an extensive work would have been taking unfair advantage of their willingness, so its errors are all on my own head. It could not, however, have been written without outside help. Charlotte Morse generously agreed to take a core sample in the shape of the section on the Clerk's Tale, and if the scholarship is sharper there than elsewhere, it is to her I owe it. V. A. Kolve very kindly gave me access to his unpublished work on the Summoner's Tale. Other colleagues—John Alford, Edwin Craun, Ruth Morse—have commented on other sections; and two of my fellow Fellows from University College, Oxford, have given me the benefit of their expertise, Colin Day on the chemistry behind the Canon's alchemy, and Alexander Murray on all kinds of things from sophisms to suicide. The undergraduates who have cross-examined me on the *Tales* in tutorials, and urged fine readings of their own, have provided a stimulus to excellence of which I can only have fallen short.

My greatest debt, however, is to my husband. That there are far fewer infelicities than in the original drafts I owe to his sharp eyes. He has helped me every page of the way, and has remained sufficiently interested in the *Tales* in spite of it all to reread them at the end. The last word of thanks must go to my children, for their tolerating Chaucer as an extra member of the household for so much of their lives, and for bearing with a mother who, as the youngest described it, 'sits upstairs writing and writing and writing. Her book has taken far too long.'

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

xiii

Introduction

i

Bibliographical Note

3

The Canterbury Tales

5

Date 5; Text 6; Genre 8; Sources and Analogues 9; Structure
15; Themes 17; Style: Language, Rhetoric, and Prosody 21

FRAGMENT I(A)

The General Prologue

27

Date and Text 27; Genre 28; Sources and Analogues 30;
Structure 32; Themes and Style: A Guided Tour of the General
Prologue 33, The Knight 34, The Squire 36, The Yeoman 37,
The Prioress 37, The Monk 39, The Friar 40, The Merchant 42,
The Clerk 43, The Sergeant of Law 44, The Franklin 45, The
Guildsmen 47, The Cook 48, The Shipman 48, The Doctor of
Physic 49, The Wife of Bath 50, The Parson 52, The Ploughman
53, The Miller 53, The Manciple 55, The Reeve 55, The
Summoner 56, The Pardoner 57, The Tabard 59

The Knight's Tale

61

Date 61; Text 62; Genre 63; Sources and Analogues 64,
1. Boccaccio: The *Teseida* 65, 2. Boethius 68, 3. Minor Sources:
Statius, the Ovidian Tradition, the *Roman de la rose*, Dante, English
Romance 71; Structure 73; Themes 76, A Note on Astrology 83;
The Tale in Context 85; Style 87

The Miller's Tale

92

Prologue 92; Date and Text 94; Genre 95; Sources and
Analogues 96; Structure 99; Themes 100; The Tale in Context
103; Style 104

The Reeve's Tale

108

Prologue 108; Date and Text 109; Genre 109; Sources and
Analogues 110; Structure 112; Themes 113; The Tale in Context
114; Style 115

The Cook's Tale

118

Prologue 118; Date and Text 119; Genre 119; Sources and
Analogues 120; Structure, Themes, and Style 120; The Tale in
Context 121

FRAGMENT II(B')

- The Man of Law's Tale 123
 Introduction 123; Date and Text 125; Genre 126; Sources and Analogues 127; Structure 129; Themes 130; The Tale in Context 133; Style 135; Epilogue: A Textual Note 136

FRAGMENT III(D)

- The Wife of Bath's Prologue 139
 Date and Text 139; Genre 140; Sources and Analogues 141; Structure 147; Themes 148; The Prologue in Context 151; Style 153
- The Wife of Bath's Tale 156
 Date and Text 156; Genre 156; Sources and Analogues 157; Structure 160; Themes 161; The Tale in Context 163; Style 164
- The Friar's Tale 167
 Prologue 167; Date and Text 167; Genre 167; Sources and Analogues 168; Structure 170; Themes 171; The Tale in Context 172; Style 173
- The Summoner's Tale 176
 Prologue 176; Date and Text 176; Genre 176; Sources and Analogues 177; Structure 178; Themes 179; The Tale in Context 181; Style 182

FRAGMENT IV(E)

- The Clerk's Tale 185
 Prologue 185; Date and Text 186; Genre 187; Sources and Analogues 188; Structure 191; Themes 193; The Tale in Context 197; Style 200
- The Merchant's Tale 202
 Prologue 202; Date and Text 202; Genre 203; Sources and Analogues 204; Structure 206; Themes 207; The Tale in Context 212; Style 213

FRAGMENT V(F)

- The Squire's Tale 217
 Prologue 217; Date and Text 217; Genre 218; Sources and Analogues 219; Structure 222; Themes 223; The Tale in Context 226; Style 227

The Franklin's Tale	230
The Ending of the Squire's Tale: The Squire-Franklin Link 230;	
Date and Text 231; Genre 232; Sources and Analogues 233;	
Structure 235; Themes 236; The Tale in Context 240; Style 242	

FRAGMENT VI(C)

The Placing of the Fragment	247
The Physician's Tale	248
Date and Text 248; Genre 248; Sources and Analogues 250;	
Structure 251; Themes 252; The Tale in Context 255; Style 257;	
The Physician-Pardoner Link 258	
The Pardoner's Prologue and Tale	260
Date and Text 260; The Prologue: Sources and Analogues 260;	
The Prologue: Structure, Themes, and Style 262; The Tale: Genre	
263; Sources and Analogues 264; Structure 266; Themes 268;	
The Tale in Context 271; Style 273	

FRAGMENT VII(B²)

The Placing of the Fragment	277
The Shipman's Tale	278
Date, Attribution, and Text 278; Genre, Sources, and Analogues	
278; Structure 280; Themes 281; The Tale in Context 283;	
Style 284	
The Prioress's Tale	287
The Shipman-Prioress Link 287; Date and Text 287; Genre 288;	
Sources and Analogues 289; Structure 291; Themes 292; The	
Tale in Context 295; Style 296	
<i>The Tale of Sir Thopas</i>	299
Prologue 299; Date and Text 299; Genre, Sources, and Analogues	
300; Structure 304; Themes and Style 305; The Tale in	
Context 308	
<i>The Tale of Melibee</i>	310
Prologue 310; Date 311; Text 313; Genre 313; Sources 314;	
Structure 315; Themes 316; The Tale in Context 319; Style 321	
The Monk's Tale	323
Prologue 323; Date 324; Text 325; Genre 327; Sources and	
Analogues 328; Structure 330; Themes 332; The Tale in Context	
334; Style 334	

The Nun's Priest's Tale

338

Prologue: Text 338; Prologue: Themes 339; Date and Text 340;
Genre 340; Sources and Analogues 342; Structure 346; Themes
348; The Tale in Context 350; Style 352; Endlink 356

FRAGMENT VIII(G)

The Placing of the Fragment

357

The Second Nun's Tale

358

Date 358; Attribution and Text 358; Genre, Sources, and
Analogues 359; Structure 360; Themes 361; The Tale in Context
363; Style 366

The Canon's Yeoman's Tale

368

Date and Text 368; Prologue 369; Genre 370; Sources and
Analogues 371; Structure 373; Themes 374; The Tale in Context
377; Style 378

FRAGMENT IX(H)

The Manciple's Tale

383

Prologue 383; Date and Text 384; Genre 385; Sources and
Analogues 385; Structure 388; Themes 389; The Tale in Context
391; Style 393

FRAGMENT X(I)

The Parson's Tale

395

Prologue 395; Date 398; Text 399; Genre, Sources, and
Analogues 400; Structure and Themes 402; The Tale in Context
404; Style 407

Chaucer's Retractions

410

Imitations of the *Canterbury Tales* 1400-1615

413

Filling in the Gaps: The Cook's and Squire's Tales 413; Tales for
the Pilgrimage: *Beryn*, *The Siege of Thebes*, Two Ploughman's Tales
415; The Non-Canterbury Tales: *The Pilgrim's Tale*, *The Cobbler of
Canterbury*, *Greene's Vision* 418; The Afterlife of Individual Tales
420

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

428

INDEX

431

INTRODUCTION

The object of this book is to give an up-to-date summary of what is known about the *Canterbury Tales*, together with a critical reading of each tale. The whole work and each of the tales are discussed under the following headings (though I sometimes conflate sections if this makes better sense):

Date. Some of the tales are believed to have been written as independent works before the *Tales* itself was conceived; and there are various theories about the progress of composition. I give evidence where this is available, and record hypothesis where it seems plausible.

Text. There are some eighty surviving manuscripts of part or all of the *Tales*, and no two of them say quite the same thing. As it is fearfully easy to base an argument on a passage of doubtful authenticity, or on structural patterns adopted by editors on flimsy manuscript evidence, I try to note those variants that could significantly affect the sense or the style. I also indicate the kind of glosses that accompany each tale, and if these are ever likely to be Chaucer's.

Genre. The *Canterbury Tales* is unique among story-collections for its generic variety—a variety often insisted on in the links between the tales. Some of the most interesting individual tales also mix genres within themselves. A sense of genre, to judge from the many comments made on the subject within the work, was crucial to Chaucer's conception of the *Tales*, and I try to give some indication of its function and effect.

Sources and analogues. Where specific sources are known for the individual tales, I give summaries and an account of Chaucer's use and adaptation of them. I also discuss the sources of illustrative material, authoritative aphorisms, and so on. Where no sources are known, I try to reconstruct the literary context in which he was working.

Structure. The tales are often intriguingly structured, both in the arrangement of their narrative material and in their tendency to play games with fictive forms. I discuss the ground plan of each tale, how structure can affect meaning, and the interest in the process of storytelling that Chaucer shows.

Themes. Chaucer does not write full-scale allegory; he rarely writes a story that does not carry some kind of overt meaning, often expressed in digressions, comments from the narrator, and concluding *moralitees*. In this section, I look at the relation of such matters to the narratives that contain

them, and also at the *sentence*, the inner meaning, behind the tales, whether this is made explicit or not. The ways in which tale and teller can affect each other are also discussed here.

The tale in context. The tales of the Canterbury sequence could stand as autonomous short stories or narrative poems, but they do not: they are placed within a larger work, and each tale affects the others and is affected by them. This section studies the additional meanings and resonances that result from their being part of the larger scheme.

Style. The style—or styles—of each tale can be as distinctive as its genre or its themes, and is indeed an integral part of such things. I analyse aspects such as the choice of words and images, the verse forms, rhetorical heightening, and characteristic syntax of each tale.

In addition, I provide separate discussions of the linking passages or prologues. One characteristic of the links is the quantity of critical or theoretical comment they contain, and I have tried to bring out this emphasis.

Such a division into separate areas of discussion is a matter of convenience, and the most frustrated or sceptical reader will still not be as conscious as I am of the artificiality of some of these boundaries. How Chaucer treats a source is inseparable from what he wants to say; we seldom read the tales as isolated units, without being aware of the Reeve's breathing fire at the Miller, or the Merchant's glancing over his shoulder at the Wife of Bath. I have tried to arrange the material so that it is possible to find the discussion of a specific point where it would most reasonably be expected, but the sections, like the tales, are not watertight units, and there are plenty of spills and leaks.

I have not attempted to give a complete survey of critical viewpoints on the tales, though the annotated bibliographies at the end of each section record some of the lines of battle. My own approach shares in the recent critical stress on Chaucer's literary and stylistic awareness, his sheer multifariousness, rather than in readings that see the tales as dramatic speeches by their tellers, or as allegories of orthodox Christian teaching, though I have learnt much from such interpretations. But there are as many interpretations of Chaucer as there are readers; he is supremely skilled at providing material for an almost infinite variety of readings (though he would be startled at some of the interpretations he has produced). It is impossible, therefore, to write a definitive study of the *Tales*, and I am very much aware of how far this book falls short. The scholarship on the work is vast; I have had to make a large number of omissions in the course of selecting material, and there will inevitably be other accidental ones. But

more importantly, Chaucer is not the kind of author on whom it is possible to be definitive. The *Tales* itself is unfinished; its possibilities are endless. I have tried to keep the sense of the work's open-endedness, even where it has led me down some unexpected paths. I do not expect that every reader will follow me along all of them: to try to claim the Clerk's Tale for feminism is perhaps a lost cause before it starts.

Bibliographical Note

The Riverside Chaucer, edited by Larry D. Benson—alias 'Robinson 3'—came out when I was half-way through the writing of this book. I have adjusted all quotations by reference to its text, and profited greatly from its scholarship. I have also kept alongside me its predecessor, the second edition of F. N. Robinson's *Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*; the eight volumes of Manly and Rickert; Skeat's magnificent edition; and those volumes of the Variorum Chaucer that have so far appeared. As no edition of a work such as the *Canterbury Tales* can replace the manuscripts, I have also relied heavily on manuscript facsimiles, especially that of Hengwrt; and I have frequently consulted the Chaucer Society prints of other manuscripts and occasionally the manuscripts themselves. Full details of the printed editions I have used are given below.

Each section of the discussion of the tales is followed, wherever appropriate, by its own brief annotated bibliography, which records works I have used in compiling the section and areas of further reading. I am most deeply indebted for factual material; the interpretations I give are usually my own.

I have profited from reading many excellent critical works on the *Tales* as a whole, and these are listed in the General Bibliography. I give abbreviated references to them in the section bibliographies only when I owe them a specific debt, or where their discussion is of particular importance.

Editions

- Benson, Larry D. (general ed.), *The Riverside Chaucer* (Boston, 1987, Oxford, 1988 (paperback)); 3rd edn. of Robinson (see below). This is the most recent standard student edition of Chaucer, and is the text used in this book.
- Donaldson, E. T. (ed.), *Chaucer's Poetry: An Anthology for the Modern Reader* (2nd edn., New York, 1975). This edition omits the prose tales and slightly modernizes the spelling, but contains excellent critical material.
- Fisher, John H. (ed.), *The Complete Poetry and Prose of Geoffrey Chaucer* (2nd edn., New York, 1989). A useful comprehensive edition.
- Manly, John M. (ed.), *The Canterbury Tales* (New York, 1928). Although in many respects superseded, some of the critical material is still of value.
- Manly, John M., and Rickert, Edith (eds.), *The Text of the Canterbury Tales* (8 vols., Chicago, 1940). This describes the manuscripts and records all textual variants.

Robinson, F. N. (ed.), *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (2nd edn., Boston and Oxford, 1957). Skeat, W. W. (ed.), *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (7 vols., Oxford, 1894-1900). Although his scholarship is often outdated, Skeat is still a lucid and valuable source of essential information.

A Variorum Edition of the Works of Geoffrey Chaucer (Norman, Okla.) is a multi-volume edition, currently in progress, under the general editorship of Paul G. Ruggiers. Volumes on individual tales that appeared before this book was completed are listed in the appropriate bibliographies.

Manuscript facsimiles and transcripts

Ellesmere: *The Ellesmere Manuscript Reproduced in Facsimile* (2 vols., Manchester, 1911).

Gg.4.27: *The Poetical Works of Geoffrey Chaucer: A Facsimile of Cambridge University Library MS Gg.4.27*, with introductions by M. B. Parkes and Richard Beadle (3 vols., Cambridge, 1979-80).

Hengwrt: *The Canterbury Tales: A Facsimile and Transcription of the Hengwrt Manuscript*, ed. Paul G. Ruggiers (Variorum I, Norman, Okla. 1979).

Chaucer Society transcripts edited by Frederick J. Furnivall:

Cambridge MS Dd.4.24 (1901-2).

Corpus MS (1868-77).

Harleian MS 7334 (1885).

Lansdowne MS (1868-77).

Petworth MS (1868-77).

The Canterbury Tales

Date

The writing of the *Canterbury Tales* occupied the last dozen or so years of Chaucer's life. He probably started work on it in the late 1380s; he died in 1400, and it is not known whether he continued working on it until his death. Within this period, all dates are conjectural, and are discussed separately for each tale in the course of the book. Two of the tales, the Knight's and Second Nun's, were written at some earlier date, and from time to time early composition has been suggested for a number of the others. Many were probably written before a specific place in the sequence was assigned to them, or a specific teller; the General Prologue need not have been written first, nor need the articulating device of the pilgrimage have given Chaucer the idea of writing a story-collection.

The year 1387 is the traditional date of the pilgrimage. This particular pilgrimage, however, is fictional, and Chaucer himself does not date it. It could be any sweet April of the later fourteenth century, or of the Middle Ages. The work's placing between contemporaneity and timelessness is peculiarly ambivalent. It contains a handful of references to such specific matters as the nefarious financial activities of the hospital of St Mary Rouncival, and the Peasants' Revolt; but one would never guess from reading it just how troubled were the years in which it was composed. They were years of social and political unrest that led to the execution of several of Chaucer's close associates and culminated in the deposition of Richard II. Wyclif and his followers were challenging the institutions and the beliefs of Christendom; and the whole idea of feudal hierarchy was under pressure from the peasants' demands for rights, the demographic collapse following on the Black Death, and the continuing rise in the importance of money rather than land or rank in the social machinery. Yet the *Tales* does belong to this era. It is reflected in the impatience of both the 'cherles' and the moneyed bourgeoisie of the *Tales* to accept any humble place assigned to them, in the satire on the corruption rife within the Church, in the ability to ask questions of a kind disallowed by the official faith as to the nature of the providential ordering of the world, in the stress on the qualities of the good ruler. The work is more concerned with ethics than with politics; but the ethical questions it considers are both the timeless ones of fallible human beings living in an unstable world, and those raised by the frightening breakdown of hierarchy and stability in late fourteenth-century England.

W. W. Skeat (*Works of Chaucer* (p. 4 above), iii. 373) calculated the 1387 date out of the need

to find a year when a pilgrimage that started on 17 April (see II(B')5) would not include a Sunday; but the whole argument rests on an anachronistic notion of realism.

Barbara W. Tuchman, *A Distant Mirror: The Calamitous Fourteenth Century* (New York, 1978), is the most telling study of late fourteenth-century Western Europe, though not all her conclusions are fully applicable to England.

Anthony Tuck, *Richard II and the English Nobility* (London, 1973), gives a detailed account of the political events of the period.

Text

There are fifty-five surviving manuscripts that appear once to have contained the complete *Tales*, though some of them are now damaged. A further twenty-eight contain one or more individual tales, or survive in such fragmentary form that it is impossible to tell whether the remaining leaves once belonged to a manuscript of the whole work or to a copy of a single tale.

The texts vary in multitudinous small details and some major ones, and attempts to reconstruct Chaucer's original, or the copy of his work that served as archetype for the earliest manuscripts, have met with only partial success. Some variants are due to miscopying, but the nature of others suggests that Chaucer himself was still in the process of making alterations, additions, and excisions to his work. Furthermore, it is not known whether he had a final arrangement in mind for the order of the tales, and so whether any of the extant manuscripts preserve an order that has any authorial justification. There is however more consistency among the manuscripts than this might suggest. They all start with the General Prologue and end with the Parson, and most of the tales move around in constant groups, or 'Fragments'. There are two widespread orders for them, differentiated only by the different places assigned to Fragment VIII(G). The one most widely adopted in modern editions, and which I use in this book, is as follows:

Fragment I(A)	General Prologue, Knight, Miller, Reeve, Cook
Fragment II(B')	Man of Law
Fragment III(D)	Wife, Friar, Summoner
Fragment IV(E)	Clerk, Merchant
Fragment V(F)	Squire, Franklin
Fragment VI(C)	Physician, Pardoner
Fragment VII(B')	Shipman, Prioress, <i>Sir Thopas</i> , <i>Melibee</i> , Monk, Nun's Priest
Fragment VIII(G)	Second Nun, Canon's Yeoman
Fragment IX(H)	Manciple
Fragment X(I)	Parson

In the alternative manuscript ordering, Fragment VIII(G) appears before VI(C), to give an order Second Nun—Canon's Yeoman—Physician—Pardoner. Fragments I and II (A and B') appear together in almost all

manuscripts; Fragments VI and VII (C and B²) and IX and X (H and I) also consistently follow each other. By contrast, Fragments IV and V (E and F), of Clerk-Merchant-Squire-Franklin, are frequently broken up, and the four tales are often separated. The positions of these four tales and of the wandering fragments are discussed in more detail in the course of this book. There is no manuscript justification for the Victorian partiality, preserved in some more recent editions, for moving Fragment VII (B²) forward to follow the Man of Law's Tale.

The earliest extant manuscript is preserved in the National Library of Wales, MS Peniarth 392 D, known as 'Hengwrt'. This was copied at about the time of Chaucer's death, and it contains the best text—the nearest, that is, to what Chaucer apparently wrote. The scribe, however, appears to have received his copy in bits and pieces; his attempts to order it are very much an *ad hoc* affair, and they have been rendered still worse by later misbinding. The order in which the tales appear is therefore disjointed to an unusual degree. Some of the copy for the *Tales* appears never to have reached his hands at all: most notably, the Merchant's Prologue and the entire episode of the Canon's Yeoman are both lacking. Even here, however, most of the constant groups appear—Fragment I(A), III(D), VI–VII(C–B²), IX–X(H–I).

It was probably the same scribe who not long afterwards wrote the most beautiful of the extant manuscripts, the Ellesmere (Ellesmere 26.C.9 in the Huntington Library, San Marino, California). This is so finished and elegant a work that later editors were naturally inclined to use it as a base text, although some of its readings are inferior to those of the battered Hengwrt. It is the earliest manuscript to contain the tales in the order listed above, which may well not be Chaucer's own but which does make good sense.

I have tried not to complicate this book by too many manuscript sigla: scholars of Chaucer's text will in any case require far more detail than I can give here. I therefore refer only to a few manuscripts apart from Hengwrt and Ellesmere: two from the Cambridge University Library, Dd.4.24, whose scribe had some intriguingly eccentric moments, and Gg.4.27, the earliest 'complete works' of Chaucer; and one from Corpus Christi College Oxford, MS 198, known as Corpus. All belong to the early years of the fifteenth century.

A bibliography of editions and facsimiles of the *Tales* that I have used is given on pp. 3–4 above. Manly and Rickert's *The Text of the Canterbury Tales* remains the indispensable work of reference on textual variants, although its conclusions are increasingly called into question (see in particular George Kane's critique in Paul G. Ruggiers (ed.), *Editing Chaucer: The Great Tradition* (Norman, Okla., 1984), ch. 11). Ralph Hanna III summarizes the present state of scholarship in his textual notes to Benson's 'Robinson 3'.