

Dramatic Image in Chaucer's Pardoner

Masatoshi KAWASAKI

It has long been recognized that the Fragment 6 of the *Canterbury Tales*, in which ten fragments are to be found, includes the *Physician's Tale*, the *Introduction to the Pardoner's Tale*, and the *Pardoner's Prologue and Tale*. Admittedly, these two tales, without reference to their time and place, have no particular relation to another ones (eg. the 'alestake'⁽¹⁾ in the *Introduction to the Pardoner's Tale* 321, which is an indistinctly abstracted place and is typical of the symbol of this work as a whole). Therefore, perhaps that may be putting it very crudely, it would become extremely difficult to begin to see clearly the whole process of the *Canterbury Tales*, without knowing the condition of these two tales, without knowing their own course and why there are the discontinuity, without appreciating the background of the content or structure and why we have such a conception about their artificiality; for, as most of us are totally unaware of truth, we may wander away from the point. And also, it is probable, the *Physician's Tale* may be part of what is called the 'marriage group,'⁽²⁾ and, so far as the Physician and the Man of Law are both good rivals in contention, there are some similarities between these two tales. However, it is not quite sufficient to give an account of the reason why the group of the *Physician's Tale* and the *Pardoner's Tale* as a necessity follows the 'marriage group,' and at the same time, of the way we might solve the knottiest of problems when we come to face the fact that, considering the poet's mind, it does not always mean obviously emphasis on these two tales as opposed to another ones.

We cannot relate these two tales with any particular cause, but these, isolated, distinct from the rest of the *Canterbury Tales*, apparently have some connected ideas only if we understand the essence of what is. Consequently, in reality, this Fragment 6 has very often been labelled floating fragment. What is the sense of interposing this Fragment between Fragments 1 and 2, Fragments 2 and 3, Fragments 4 and 5, or Fragments 7 and 8? To be sure, this Fragment is, as it were, 'floating' on the surface of the structure

itself. That is why, as reason is, the Pardoner is placed at the end of the list of the pilgrims in the *General Prologue*.

The *Physician's Tale* is the projection of the Physician's mentality.⁽³⁾ The more the story become virtuous or idealistic, the more wrong morality there is; because he insists on the morality in the story of little significance. It would seem that this is the similitude of his portrait in the *General Prologue*. That is, he 'lovede gold in special,' was in collusion with 'apothecaries,' and had him send 'drogges and his letuaries.' According to Chaucer's own depiction, this Physician is versed not just in learning but in the superb healing art. Thus we are all concerned with the facts of his ambivalent attitude.

He was a verray, parfit praktisour:
The cause yknowe, and of his harm the roote,
Anon he yaf the sike man his boote.

(The *General Prologue*, 422-424)

Chaucer, moreover, does continue to make sarcastic remarks: 'His studie was but litel on the Bible.' For all that, he is better known as a watchful politician than as a physician in the literal sense of the word; mainly because he was not quick to spend his money and held on to what he obtained during a plague. In other words, he is a competent man who especially loved gold. The most conspicuous and funny passage would be 'Ful redy hadde he his apothecaries . . . Hir frendshipe nas nat newe to bigynne.'

For ech of hem made oother for to wynne—

(The *General Prologue*, 427)

The Physician's too excessive tenacity for 'gold' is suggestive of his distortion of the motive or ideal. So it is not true that he is an economist; surely not a thrifty person, for he rose in the world owing to the 'pestilence.' The Physician, who does not feel inclined to purchase a piece of land like the Man of Law, to solely earn money like the Merchant, or to set up for a country gentleman, just wants to love or own 'gold' itself and nothing more. This is in truth one of idolatry. 'Gold' is the one and only metal adored by those who are blinded by money. He is an idolater, if ever there was one. Nevertheless, that is not true contentment; because it is not concerned

with adoring the material things, but with the understanding of the whole significance of being. And so, the relationship between himself and another is not based on love; upon closer observation, what distinguishes us from him is mentality in general. If mankind, including himself, were all equal in thought, in feeling, there would be no respect, there would be no ill-will; for, if there is ill-will, there is a desire to dominate which arouses jealousy, anger, passion. Now, beginning with such a point of view, it follows that the Physician is closely connected with the Pardoner on the same ground.⁽⁴⁾ The Pardoner's sin is 'Cupiditas.'⁽⁵⁾ Undoubtedly, his sermon centres upon it; this suggests a standard in terms of which we may judge the effectiveness of his tale. However, the *Physician's Tale* is quite alien to 'Cupiditas.' It is a precious story of virginal purity. Incidentally, Chaucer may have read the story of Virginia in Titus Livius, whom the Physician cites as his authority in the first line of the *Tale*. He certainly knew the version to be found in the *Roman de la Rose*, and possibly he cited Livy as his authority simply because Jean de Meun had done so before him.

When we trace or follow his own story and his way of speech, then we can discover the extent in which Chaucer created his character, one of the fourteenth century's most vivid fictional personalities, in its last decade.

And ye maistresses, in your olde lyf,
 That iordes doghtres han in governaunce,
 Ne taketh of my wordes no displesaunce.
 Thenketh that ye been set in governynges
 Of lordes doghtres, only for two thynges:
 Outher for ye han kept youre honestee,
 Or elles ye han falle in freletee,
 And known wel ynough the olde daunce,
 And han forsaken fully swich meschaunce
 For evermo; therefore, for Cristes sake,
 To teche hem vertu looke that ye ne slake.

(The *Physician's Tale*, 72-82)

There is something dignified about his advice. He thinks that to teach virtue to many daughters is a primarily important task. His story is, we suppose, tinged with a definite allegory. That is, a maiden of fourteenth years was called Virginia; her father was called Virginius. It is because Chaucer the poet would often make

use of allegorical names. Virginia, as she would say, is 'Nature.' This word is the key to the conception of morality which the Physician strove to inculcate in the public. It is enough for us to grasp the general outline of this story. A distinguishing trait of the story would be simplicity, though this simplicity does not fall back on mere outward settings nor on our own prejudices. The long and the short of it, the aim and purpose of the Physician is as follows: 'Heere may men seen how synne hath his merite' or 'Forsaketh synne, er synne yow forsake.' Not a few of the various meanings may exist in these words, but we would like to believe the simplicity of the story; for the *Physician's Tale* has a stronger tendency to insist on the axiom that an evil deed will be discovered.

At this point, the morality of the *Physician's Tale* bears a curious resemblance to that of the *Pardoner's Tale*, as compared to the rest of the *Canterbury Tales*.⁽⁶⁾ If both of them are not in harmony with each other, it will be because there is a contrast between them. In the *Pardoner's Tale*, the most rigid mysterious power that does not do punishment to wicked men would give birth to vicious deeds themselves. It is true that this is a inconsistent condition, but, on the contrary, we could not find such a mysticism in the *Physician's Tale*. His distant rational air is reflected in the Physician's story; chiefly because, in this story, Virginius did protect his daughter from her virtue's being stained, and, in a similar fashion, the criminals were automatically put to death. Here, we are obliged to feel that all through his tale runs an evanescent mood. The antithesis of an image of the Physician's too excessive tenacity for 'gold,' ironically enough represents a sinful act against the human life. As stated before, we must not forget the fact that this tale was not the Physician's original but the borrowing of Livy's work. That you might as well die as sully the purity of you is a long-standing theme. Chaucer perhaps knew well St. Augustine's teachings that one would not die an unnatural death if soul and body were pure. First, Chaucer should add the conception of morality to the depiction of Virginia's beauty, then subjoin to it her father's last words for her or her answer; the former emphasizes the character of a lesson to be found in the Physician's moralism, whereas the latter stresses his single-minded effort—namely, the effort which he intends to bring the story to a peaceful settlement. Positively, it goes without saying that their life was but a span in the Medieval times. And yet, we could not find the Physician's frigid moralism in the rest of the *Canterbury*

Tales. As a result, we should not imagine that Chaucer himself had not some doubt about Virginius's dauntless action. Anyway, if he had not been the only physician who became favored with a fat purse during a plague, he could not have depicted this story with his capacity to maintain a certain detachment from the routines and fixed customs of those around him. The grotesque, rigid moralism clearly reflected in the *Physician's Tale* has great influence upon the *Pardoner's Tale*.

The *Pardoner's Prologue and Tale* is acknowledged to have the highest artistic effect and conviction, though it appears to be a queer being for the modern readers. In this typical quality alone is it possible for the unknown to be. Needless to say, that may be the convention of the day, for there can be no doubt of Chaucer's purpose in telling the story as he does. Though we can see that there was the grotesque in the medieval art, it was not always a central element; that is it existed in the outward of the things. In those days, the grotesque was undoubtedly the opposite of the artistic order or structure, existed in the outward of the things, however powerful and consistent construction they had, as we could imagine as clearly as possible. Nonetheless, we must admit that it was allowed to be.⁽⁷⁾ In order to grasp the 'floating' element of the Fragment 6 including the *Physician's Tale* and the *Pardoner's Tale*, we must reconsider how the medieval people's taste for the grotesque was, beyond the expression, with the aesthetic of the time. It is because the medieval people thought of the universe as the whole process of hierarchy, and wickedness as a part of the order of the universe. In other words, the description of wickedness in the art itself was suggestive of that of temptations. That is, to show the danger of wickedness, the medieval artist found themselves under the imperative necessity of depicting the supernatural powers of it.

And so, the poets in the medieval time talked about the truth of things by employing the submerged metaphor or the sign beneath which reality itself lay. Robert P. Miller admirably argues that the reality of literature in any age may be said to lie beneath the sign. He further goes and explains the best argument of this.

Surface realism, however, even in the Middle Ages, was desirable insofar as it did not obscure the real issue of a particular work; and there is ample justification for historical study of the 'realistic' details of mediaeval literature by which its inner sense is communi-

cated to the reader. We have tended, nevertheless, to minimize the importance of the main source of mediaeval symbolic expression: that is the Bible which, as the Word of God, provided, along with the Book of God's other works, the means for ulterior knowledge. Even if enigmatic, the words of the Bible could not be doubted, and here too, as with the Book of Nature, interpretation demanded insight. With respect to either, the letter killed, while the spirit gave life.⁽⁹⁾

Thus, the story or the play was the intentional fallacy so framed up that they might have a good talk about something which we call real; therefore, it needs an exquisitely astute mind and an exquisitely pliable heart, to trace or follow the artistic contrivance. But, that is no reason why we should apply this apparently superficial views to the *Pardoner's Prologue and Tale*; for the depiction of the Pardoner is characterized by the too realistic verisimilitude. Hence, the reality of the *Pardoner's Prologue and Tale* has appeared. As a matter of fact, the Pardoner's moral corruption was a real element in the *Canterbury Tales*. And also, an act of penitence was a popular element among the pilgrims, and the pilgrimage was an act of penitence. Penitence done by the Pardoner who had 'Bulles of popes and of cardinales, / Of patriarkes, and bishoppes,' was, ironically, the highest level of morality for the most of the people at that time; simply because, as for his narrative method, he knows that the 'lewed people' love stories that can be remembered and repeated.

There are two preachers among the pilgrims. They are called the Pardoner and the Parson. The Pardoner, as we said, is placed at the end of the list of the pilgrims in the *General Prologue*, whereas the Parson appears at the end of the *Canterbury Tales*. It is because both of them have not only a rhetorical emphasis but also the significance of the juxtaposition between them. And still, they are closely connected with the system of the pilgrimage. First of all, the pilgrimage is an act of penitence. The Parson is described as an ideal figure, for he preaches the way of life or the behavior of man; on the contrary, the Pardoner, unfortunately, makes an improper use of his power. Assuredly, 'Bulles of popes' becomes important, the money becomes important, and not the man; and for the sake of the 'Cupiditas,' he is willing to sacrifice all the people who are craving for the salvation. That is his sermon is done for the sake of a fake indulgence, though his theme is the punishment of Heaven. In other

words, as Carleton Brown puts it, the Pardoner's self-exposure was obviously addressed to the Canterbury company and would have been quite impossible in a pulpit discourse.⁽⁹⁾ Moreover, while we appreciate the humorous situation which Chaucer has introduced, we must insist that the Pardoner's speech, 'lo, sires, thus I preche,' does not mean that he was concluding an actual sermon, but merely that he was illustrating his pulpit methods; mainly because his theme, *Radix malorum est Cupiditas* which is a text from the Bible, provides the illustrative *exemplum*. The Parson's sermon is to admonish the people against doing wrong and the main theme in him is the individual's deed based on the Christian faith. However, it would be noted that the Parson has little attraction for us in comparison with the Pardoner. To all the modern readers, the Parson does not seem to be as much part of the medieval people's imagination as the Pardoner is. Indeed, the Pardoner seems to be more impressive. As opposed this, the Parson's sermon bores us. After having seen the Pardoner's portrait, we should realize that, actually, this fact was inherent in the process in the evolution of the *Pardoner's Tale*. The Pardoner preaches not on the pulpit, but in the 'alestake' where he can 'both drinke, and eten of a cake'; but the Parson does not omit 'to visite / The ferreste in his parisshe, muche and lite, / Upon his feet, and in his hand a staf.' The first is, as it were, a vulgar actualist; the second is a sincere idealist. The Pardoner is so agreeable that we ought to have a surprising curiosity to know everything we can. On the other hand, the Parson is so convinced of the frailty of man's life that he does not seem to be a realistic figure; therefore the object that we have is his idea, not his personality. There seems to be no doubt that Chaucer's poetical spirit of superior order is seen at its best in the Pardoner's sermon.⁽¹⁰⁾ We can feel that the Parson's sermon is an ordinary prosaism, or a dull reading; whereas we are convinced that the Pardoner's sermon is a sort of performance. And also the Pardoner is a skillful actor. We are fascinated by him, and at the same time we are inclined to think that he is the object of general aversion. He invariably appears in our imagination throughout the *Pardoner's Tale*. At this point, we must, therefore, research into the Pardoner's personality.

According to Robert P. Miller's brilliant article on the *Pardoner's Tale*, 'the *Pardoner's Tale* fits generally into a scheme of opposition between Charity and Cupidity in the *Canterbury Tales* as a whole. The extreme maliciousness of the Pardoner as a person sets him at

the far end of the scale among the pilgrims. As a type he is even more definitely evil. He is the false eunuch who stands and points the way up the wrong road. He represents the way of cupidity, malice, impenitence, spiritual sterility—just the opposite of the way of the Parson and his spiritual brother, the Plowman. He is that Old Man as he lives and exerts his influence in the great pilgrimage of life. And as the *vetus homo* he is to be opposed to the Christlike figure of the *novus homo*, the true guide—the povre Persoun of a toun.⁽¹¹⁾ Furthermore, John M. Manly argues the Pardoner's portrait as an actual person in the *Some New Light on Chaucer*: 'The evidence seems to indicate that so striking a person as the Pardoner, with his long flaxen hair, his new Italian fashions, and his glaring eyes have been nearly as familiar to Chaucer's readers as was Rouncival itself, which they passed daily as they journeyed between London and Westminster.'⁽¹²⁾ Taking all these distinguished remarks into consideration, we could get into touch with the Pardoner's self which is also common to the greater part of the modern people in different ways. But, giving more and more significance to the Pardoner's state of being brings about confusion; for, the moment we observe it, the moment we seek it, we begin to struggle. That is why we must be passively aware of what the Pardoner is; it is quite important to understand that our problems are, undoubtedly, whether we can step out of this confusion or struggle. If we do not have profound confidence in our capacity to bring some new kind of order out of this difficult condition, we cannot be in a position to perceive his personality and awaken the understanding of Chaucer's artistic mind in the *Canterbury Tales* in another. It is because that is the only way of out of this difficulty.

This Pardoner hadde heer as yelow as wex,
 But smothe it heeng as dooth a strike of flex;
 By ounces henge his lokkes that he hadde,
 And therwith he his shuldres overspradde;
 But thynne it lay, by colpons con and oon,
 But hood, for jolitee, wered he noon,
 For it was trussed up in his walet.
 Hym thoughte he rood al of the newe jet;
 Dischevelee, save his cappe, he rood al bare.
 Swiche glarynge eyen hadde he as an hare.
 A vernycle hadde he sowed upon his cappe.
 His walet lay biforn hym in his lappe,

Bretful of pardoun, comen from Rome al hoot.
 A voys he hadde as smal as hath a goot.
 No berd hadde he, ne nevere sholde have;
 As smothe it was as it were late shave.
 I trowe he were a geldyng or a mare.

(The *General Prologue*, 675-691)

It is clear that the Pardoner is accepted as a malignant drunkard in general; partly because he was actually addicted to drinking at the alestake, and partly because he recounted to us all his drinking habit without reflecting his own impudent or immoral behavior. To be sure, he is typical of the drunkard. We cannot remain untouched by such a prejudice. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to ascribe his wicked deeds to his drinking habit. He is affected by other elements than such a superficial habit. The concrete expressions that indicate the Pardoner's most distinctive features, are, as afore-said, '... heer as yelow as wex, / ... a strike of flex,' '... glarynge eyen... as an hare,' 'A voys... as small as hath a goot,' 'No berd hadde he,' and 'a geldyng or a mare.' Walter C. Curry, who pays attention to the meaning of these physical traits according to handbooks on the medieval physiognomy, asserts that 'Glaring eyes' were the mark of a 'man given to folly, a glutton, a libertine,' and still he declares decidedly that the Pardoner was depicted as an eunuch.⁽¹³⁾ As Curry puts it, the pilgrims in the Middle Ages could instantly conclude him to be an eunuch; and so they could discern his character as soon as they observed his physical peculiarity. That is they looked at the Pardoner in terms of the Christian concept of eunuchery. He was 'a gledyng or a mare,' we suspect that he was an impotent. But probably he must not have been an impotent, as we would discover if we pursued him on the right track. When we intend to condemn him, we do not understand him. If we observe him without any condemnation, without any comparrison, we can dig into what he is; namely, to follow it deliberately, the mind must not be tethered to any particular belief or prejudice. As regards it, we must lend our ears to Miller's articulate statement.

The Pardoner, according to his own boast, is by no means a eunuch in this sense. The opposite, however, implicit in the developed Christian concept of eunuchry, provides a sense quite appropriate to the man as he presents himself in his prologue and tale; and this the man as he presents himself in his prologue and tale; and this

type of churchman he represents. It is evident that by *his* act of will he has cut himself off from virtue and good works, and that this act has been performed, not 'amore Christi,' that is, through charity, but through its antithesis, *cupiditas*. The animal symbols of lechery with which he is associated immediately suggest that, although he is perhaps physically frustrated, the inner man hardly 'abides in chastity.' If the *eunuchus Dei* is the *novus homo* of Scripture, the Pardoner, having cut away this possibility, lives impenitently the life of the *vetus homo*.⁽¹⁴⁾

By the way, it should be noted that 'a gentil Pardoner of Rouncival' sang loudly ('Come hither, Love, to me!'), and then, the Summoner, singing bass, harmonized with him. In view of this friendly relationship, we may imagine that they are both endowed with a sense of homosexuality,⁽¹⁵⁾ but they are not. It would be right to suppose that one is in conspiracy with the other; because Chaucer the poet portrays both of them as very wicked sinners. It may be given as a conclusion that an eunuch is not always a homosexual, and a homosexual is not always an eunuch. Excepting these too effeminate descriptions (cf. the *General Prologue*, 672-673), we do not find ourselves suggested by the fact that he plays the woman. The figure of the Pardoner, who gives offense to others, would be, first and foremost, the most important key to his cunning or ingenious dramatic power. For the whole process of dealing so energetically with the sins is, as Paul G. Ruggiers has shown, suggestive of something deep in the Pardoner's own character.⁽¹⁶⁾

Thus, the Pardoner is neither a drunkard nor a homosexual. So, what sort of a man is he? It is too much to say that he was, as it were, a mysterious person or an inscrutable person. He usually makes a contradictory statement in terms of a sexual perversion. For all that, we are likely to be fascinated by his dramatic power all the more, because he has many fatal faults. In the Scriptural exegesis, the exterior physical flaw is a symbol of a demoralized person; therefore, it follows that an eunuch was deprived of the grace of God. The Host contemptuously addresses himself to the Pardoner.

'.....

Thou bel amy, thou Pardoner,' he sayde,

(*The Introduction to the Pardoner's Tale*, 318)

But, at once, all those present begins to cry.

'Nay, lat hym telle us of no ribaudye!
.....'

(*The Introduction to the Pardoner's Tale*, 324)

It is because the Pardoner is the most intellectually arrogant of the pilgrims, contemptuous of the 'lewed people' to whom he preaches and ultimately of all of the pilgrims (cf. Janet Adelman; 'That We May Leere Som Wit'). Now, we must remember the scene that the Pardoner quarreled with the Wife of Bath in the *Wife of Bath's Prologue*.

Up stirte the Pardoner, and that anon:
'Now, dame,' quod he, 'by God and by seint
John!
Ye been a noble prechour in this cas.
I was aboute to wedde a wyf; allas!
What sholde I bye it on my flessch so deere?
Yet hadde I levere wedde no wyf to-yeere!
'Abyde!' quod she, 'my tale is nat begonne.
.....'

(*The Wife of Bath's Prologue*, 163-169)

And also, even the most courteous Knight, who is willing to make peace between two quarreling men, makes an insinuating remark at the Pardoner's attitude.

'Namooore of this, for it is right ynough!
Sire Pardoner, be glad and myrie of cheere;
And ye, sire Hoost, that been to me so deere,
I prey yow that ye kisse the Pardoner.
And Pardoner, I prey thee, drawe thee neer,
And, as we diden, lat us laughe and pleye.'

(*The Pardoner's Tale*, 926-967)

But, if not taking these contexts into account, we don't fail to feel that it is inevitable that the modern readers should be attracted by the Pardoner's character. So that, 'thise gentils' entreat him to tell them some moral story.

'.....
Telle us some moral thyng, that we may leere

Som wit, and thanne wol we gladly heere.'

(*The Introduction to the Pardoner's Tale*, 325-326)

The Pardoner has a good knowledge of how to trick another person out of their property. He is aware that their mind could be disturbed, attacked by an indefinite inquietude, which might consist of a bundle of accumulations and experiences. It is certain that he trades on another's ignorance. He is an admirable observer. And, he makes himself agreeable to everybody as the case may be. His speech to the Wife of Bath is as follows.

'Dame, I wolde praye yow, if youre wyl it were,'

Seyde this Pardoner, 'as ye bigan,
Telle forth youre tale, spareth for no man,
And teche us yonge men of youre praktike.'

(*The Wife of Bath's Prologue*, 184-187)

Thus, the Wife of Bath's words change from 'thou' to 'yow' on account of the Pardoner's delightful speech.

'Gladly,' quod she, 'sith it may yow like;
.....'

(*The Wife of Bath's Prologue*, 188)

This shows that he produces an erotic atmosphere around him. We must admit that the quality of a skillful actor is well brought out in this passage.

Although the Pardoner agrees to their proposal, he must think up some honest piece while he drank. In a work completed after many years' labor Alfred David has summed up the attitude toward him.

Pardoner's reply that he needs time to reflect upon 'som honest thyng while that I drynke' is an ironic acknowledgment of the general opinion the pilgrims have expressed about him. They expect him to be shocking. What they have not considered is that he makes his living by telling moral stories, and therefore, the Pardoner decides to treat them to a demonstration of his professional skill. He will shock them all right, not, however, with the immoral story that they expect from him but far more ingeniously with a 'moral thyng.' The cynical confession of his own corruption and the blasphemous

spirit in which he preaches his sermon is more outrageous than any fabliau could be.⁽¹⁷⁾

Indeed, he has something difficult but pertinent to say on the Pardoner; therefore, we should accept the progressive remarks, as he always contemplates the possibility that understanding might be directed toward ideals of a human being.

The Pardoner's speech that 'Telle us some moral thyng, that we may leere / Som wit, and thanne wol we gladly heere,' shows that his true motive is admitted by everybody. In order to recognize the reason why he neither seeks a different world nor merely succumbs to environment, we should study his dramatic or verbal persuasive power, not his arrogant attitude. For he has a great flow of language. We know at least one worthy person who is essentially no more honest or creative than one of the cleverer people. As we have already realized in the *General Prologue*, the Pardoner has an inclination for a cheerful but noisy song; moreover, we may note by way of a side remark that, since he is shown singing love songs with the Summoner in a voice 'as smal as hath a goot,' he is imaged as an animal. Since we have the description of the animals that are traditionally representative of sensuality or lewdness (such as 'goot', 'hare', and 'mare'), we are obliged to notice that there is an air of obscenity or immorality about the *Pardoner's Tale*. As a matter of fact, he is created obscene or immoral. No one could have doubts as to this being true. On the other hand, we could associate a viper's deadly poison with 'tonge' (cf. 'If cow, or calf, or sheep, or oxe swelle, / That any worn hath ete, or worm ystonge, / Taak water of that welle and wassh his tonge,' the *Pardoner's Prologue*, 354-356). That is, we could see that his preaching is performed with smooth things; mainly because his intention is nothing but profit and not at all correction of sin, and certainly many a sermon very often comes from evil purpose. By this trick he has gained a hundred marks year after year since he become the Pardoner. His sermon bears some resemblance to a song; so that he can have every word at his finger tips (cf. 'For I kan al by rote that I telle,' the *Pardoner's Prologue*, 332), and addresses himself to the pilgrims.

..... 'in chirches whan I
preche,
I peyne me to han an hauteyn speche,

And rynge it out as round as gooth a belle,

(The *Pardoner's Prologue*, 1-3)

He is a prominent actor. This description demonstrates that, being a very important figure, he is entrusted with the accomplishment of vital purposes.

(To be continued)

Notes

Text: F. N. Robinson, ed.; *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Oxford U.P., 1957).

- (1) Cf. O E D: A stake or post set up before an alehouse, to bear a garland, bush, or other sign, or as a sign itself; an alepole. Also *fig.* (See. *The General Prologue*, 667).
- (2) Cf. G. L. Kittredge; 'Chaucer's Discussion of Marriage,' in *Chaucer—Modern Essays in Criticism*, edited by Edward Wagenknecht (Oxford U.P., 1959) pp. 188-215.
- (3) Trevor Whittock; *A Reading of the Canterbury Tales* (Cambridge U.P., 1968) pp. 179-184.
- (4) John Gardner remarks the ironic relationship between the *Physician's Tale* and the *Pardoner's Tale*. That is both men are proud, self-loving dissemblers; but one of the two, the Pardoner, knows what he is, while the other, pompous and affected, does not. John Gardner; *The Poetry of Chaucer* (Southern Illinois U.P., 1977) p. 298.
- (5) G. L. Kittredge called him 'the one lost soul among the Canterbury Pilgrims.' G. L. Kittredge; *Chaucer and His Poetry* (Harvard U.P., 1915) p. 180.
- (6) Robert O. Payne; *The Key of Remembrance* (Yale U.P., 1963) pp. 147-170. He discusses Chaucer's moral and structural intent.
- (7) A. C. Spearing, ed.; *The Pardoner's Prologue and Tale* (Cambridge U.P., 1965) pp. 35-37. He says that 'the pace of the narrative, . . . gradually increasing to an almost grotesque violence, . . . is expressive of the very nature of the story.'
- (8) Robert P. Miller; 'Chaucer's Pardoner, the Scriptural Eunuch, and the *Pardoner's Tale*,' in *Twentieth Century Interpretations of The Pardoner's Tale*, edited by Dewey R. Faulkner (Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973) p. 44.
- (9) Cf. Carleton Brown; *Chaucer—The Pardoner's Tale* (Oxford U.P., 1979) pp. vii-xx.

- (10) Cf. G. L. Kittredge; 'Chaucer's Pardoner,' in *Chaucer—Modern Essays in Criticism*, edited by Edward Wagenknecht (Oxford U.P., 1959) p. 119.
- (11) Robert P. Miller; 'Chaucer's Pardoner, the Scriptural Eunuch, and the *Pardoner's Tale*,' in *Twentieth Century Interpretations of The Pardoner's Tale*, edited by Dewey R. Faulkner (Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973) pp. 68–69.
- (12) John M. Manly; *Some New Light on Chaucer* (N.Y., 1926) p. 130.
- (13) Cf. Walter C. Curry; *Chaucer and the Medieval Sciences* (N.Y., 1926) Chapter 2.
- (14) Robert P. Miller; 'Chaucer's Pardoner, the Scriptural Eunuch, and the *Pardoner's Tale*,' in *Twentieth Century Interpretations of The Pardoner's Tale*, edited by Dewey R. Faulkner (Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973) p. 53.
- (15) Cf. Guy Rosolato; *Essais sur le Symbolique* (Orion Press, Paris, 1969).
- (16) Paul. G. Ruggiers; *The Art of the Canterbury Tales* (the University of Wisconsin Press, 1965) p. 126.
- (17) Alfred David; *The Strumpet Muse* (Indiana U.P., 1976) p. 195.