"The Canterbury (Folk)Tales"
—An Interdisciplinary Undergraduate Seminar

Joseph Ugoretz
Professor Stevens
May 26, 1992

Background, Aims and Approach

No catalogue of the canon of English literature would be complete without Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*. Nearly every university student will have at least the exposure to Chaucer included in an introductory survey course in English Literature. Students whose specific interests lie in Middle English literature in general or Chaucer in particular study the *Canterbury Tales* in much more depth.

For many other students, however, that brief look at the General Prologue and a few of the tales in a survey course is both the introduction to and the culmination of their study of the Canterbury Tales. Yet the *Canterbury Tales* is a text which richly rewards an in-depth, focused course of study, discussion and analysis. These rewards are relevant and available to students from a wide range of disciplines, with a wide range of interests. The fact that it is usually only those students already committed and involved in medieval or Chaucer studies who undertake this type of study represents a grave loss of pedagogical and scholarly opportunities for students and for English departments.

For this reason I am proposing an interdisciplinary undergraduate seminar, "The Canterbury (Folk)Tales," for non-Chaucerians, with a very specific focus and approach to be discussed below. First, however, I would like to describe some of the rewards of this kind of course. One benefit for non-Chaucerians in studying the Canterbury Tales is that of any study of Middle English literature. The linguistic differences and similarities between Middle and Modern English illuminate and clarify many features of both Englishes. A familiarity

with Middle English allows students a greater insight into the history, as well as the structure and usage, of their own English.

In addition, the study of Middle English, like the study of any language, provides a deeper understanding of the time and place in which this language was spoken and written. This fact is related to another benefit of the study of the *Canterbury Tales*. Students with an interest in medieval society, culture and history can gain, from the *Canterbury Tales*, access to a primary historical document, with all its implicit and explicit information about the period in which it was written.

Another important benefit of studying the *Canterbury Tales*, and one that contributes to its attraction for non-specialized, multi-disciplinary students, is its broad popular appeal. These tales have a value as entertainment, as diverting, emotionally involving and intellectually engaging stories, a value which is apparent to almost any reader. They are fun to read, and rewarding as literature in both the scholarly and popular senses.

For all these reasons, then, a course on the *Canterbury Tales* can be both beneficial and attractive to students for whom such a course would not otherwise be included in the major requirements. The audience for such a course would be broad and diverse, including many students who may (or may not) use the course as an introductory step to further literary study.

To take full advantage of the benefits of offering this course, I propose a specific approach: the consideration of the *Canterbury Tales* as occupying a particular transitional space in the continuum between orality and literacy. I have been inspired in this approach

by my own interests in oral poetry and folklore, and in the orality/literacy continuum. Carl Lindahl's *Earnest Games: Folkloric Patterns in the Canterbury Tales* has provided further focus.

I found many of the premises of *Earnest Games*, as well as the direction of the criticism, to be quite close to my interests and ideas. I did think, though, that Lindahl's focus on insults and hostile speech, as well as his emphasis on the power of the word as a *uniquely* medieval ideal and phenomenon, were unnecessarily limiting. I prefer an approach which would avoid some of the limitations of his analysis.

Before explaining the advantages of this specific approach for the specific type of course I am proposing, I would like to present some details of the history, premises, methods, and content of the type of analysis of the *Canterbury Tales* to be used "The Canterbury (Folk)Tales."

Source and analogue criticism of the Canterbury Tales, as well as some oral-formulaic analysis, is not uncommon, and some authors, notably Steven McKenna, have attempted an exploration of the orality/literacy implications of the Canterbury Tales. The approach I am proposing, however, differs from those previously applied, and more closely resembles the "third method" called for by Franz Bäuml in 1984. I am not interested in having students merely track down predecessors and successors of the tales in modern, medieval, or older oral literature, nor am I interested in the almost scientific structural formulaic analysis involved in identifying and piecing together the building blocks of tale-types and motifs. These have been

the dominant themes and approaches in almost all the oral/folkloric criticism previously conducted.

While these approaches may be rewarding and interesting for advanced scholarly studies, the approach I would like the course to take would be more contextual, and would define orality and literacy more loosely and broadly. The strict dichotomy between these two "modes" seems to me less interesting than a view of their relationship as points on a continuum. The *Canterbury Tales* were written at a time, like many other times, when the transitions and the back-and-forth play between orality and literacy were in fluid progress, and I would read the *Canterbury Tales* as evidence of that progress, as a struggle against it, as a celebration of literacy while co-opting the familiarity and force of orality, and as an example of the ways the two sides of the dichotomy simultaneously reinforce and contradict each other.

Neither side of this dichotomy—the view of the *Canterbury Tales* as essentially literate or essentially oral—is, I believe, ultimately verifiable. The terms and arguments of the controversy between these two views, however, are eminently suited to an analysis which would allow students to enter into the tales' structures and textures, while simultaneously introducing them to the application of this controversy to other literatures.

There are differences between orality and literacy, and these can be identified and explored, but there is also orality in all literature, and literacy in all orature. The distinct separation between the "oral mind" and the "literate mind," proposed by Ong, Stock and

Goody, among others, is one which I think is useful only when it is questioned and ultimately elided.

The *Canterbury Tales* is a work in writing (whether it was originally read aloud or not), yet it is the writing of orality, constructed as oral tales (told by the pilgrims orally) which have been written. For this reason, the elision of orality and literacy is especially evident, and the goals and effects of this elision are especially accessible to analysis. If the *Canterbury Tales* can be read as a poem about the writing of poetry, it can also be read as a poem about the writing of orality, about the kinds of tales and tellers which preceded it, coincided with it, and succeed it, up to the present day. Oral/folkloric analysis can be applied to the *Canterbury Tales,* and the *Canterbury Tales* can be applied to oral/folkloric analysis.

At this point I would like to present a brief example of the type of approach I am proposing. The Pardoner's Tale, among others of the *Canterbury Tales,* is well-established as a story which is quite familiar in the oral tradition. I would ask students first to consider and discuss the Pardoner's method of making his living, by means of his oral art, as a preacher and salesman (in fact a con-man). As such a character, he falls into a long line of oral artists as tricksters, swindlers and clowns. I would ask students to consider analogues to this type of character in the many cultures, including their own, where this type of character is viewed with an ambivalent admixture of admiration, condemnation and caution.

The Pardoner is outside society, yet by using its rules and moralities he preys upon it. His problematic sexuality could also be discussed in this regard, with the examples of other characters from

diverse contexts. I would suggest the Lakota cross-dressing shaman/storytellers and the character of Ratso Rizzo in the film *Midnight Cowboy,* and ask students to remember or observe other examples.

I would expect and direct the class discussion of the tale's inclusion of the Pardoner's "confession," as well as the Host's response to the tale, to address this view of the Pardoner as an oral artist. The next step would be to determine the effects and implications of this *writing* of oral artistry, for the *Canterbury Tales,* as well as the orality/literacy continuum, and Chaucer's goals and accomplishments in presenting this oral tale in writing.

Similar analyses, with the tales closest to orality opposed to those closest to literacy, could be conducted for all of the tales. There are no conclusive, factual resolutions to this type of analysis. There are, rather, possibilities and questions to be raised and addressed. This fact enhances the applicability of my specific approach for the specific type of course I am proposing.

Since this course is envisioned explicitly as a course for non-specialists, for students who are not, although they may become, Chaucerians or folklorists, or even literary critics, it is quite fitting that it be planned and taught as a course in skills, rather than primarily based in the transmission of information. For the students of "The Canterbury (Folk)Tales," my primary aim is to open questions, to instill and inspire techniques, skills and ways of looking at the *Canterbury Tales* (and, by extension, other works).

Although it is necessary for students to learn factual and textual information, that learning will be prompted by the process of

inquiry. When a question arises, it will provide the context, and the driving force, for research, reading and lectures. I envision even the definition of the course's approach to be only provisionally and pre-liminarily presented. It will be refined and modified through the class' collaborative inquiries and investigations.

Since the specific approach proposed for this course, even in its preliminary form, is one that, to my knowledge, has not been previously explored, students will be exploring, in effect, uncharted territory. The excitement and learning involved in new research, in breaking new trails of scholarship, is one that is too often denied to students at the introductory level (which is as far as many students ever go) of the study of literature. Yet this is the type of research that is most effective in engaging students in the field, attracting them to this type of scholarship, and allowing them to obtain the skills and tools which are at the core of the study of literature.

In addition, the contextual study of the orality, the "folk," nature of the *Canterbury Tales,* will provide an introduction for students to this approach's uses and methods, as well as a refinement of this approach and its applications to the study of literature (both as literature is conservatively defined, and in the more diverse sense, including marginalized literatures and oratures). This approach does not preclude the study and application of other critical approaches. In fact, it provides a unique context and framework for examining these approaches. The relevance of the contextual oral/folkloric approach can be measured against the relevance of other approaches, and vice versa, illuminating and expanding the premises and conclusions of each of them.

Finally, the contextual oral/folkloric approach of "The Canterbury (Folk)Tales" foregrounds the entertaining, popular aspects of the *Canterbury Tales*. This will allow students to enjoy, and to examine analytically, the often neglected "fun" or "funny" aspects of the *Canterbury Tales* (including irony, satire, performance, the use of the bawdy, social criticism, gender and sexual orientation issues, and political readings). Not only will students who are inexperienced in literary criticism be more fully engaged, but questions of privileged versus maginalized, canonical versus non-canonical, and "scholarly" versus "popular" literatures can be raised and explored.

"The Canterbury (Folk)Tales," as an undergraduate elective seminar, for students whose major field is not English, or is English but not Chaucer, with the specific contextual oral/folkloric approach I am proposing, will thus be attractive and effective. By possibly bringing more students into the field, or by exposing students to this field, even if they do not continue formal study, this course will benefit the students, and the study of the *Canterbury Tales*.

Practical Issues, Methodology and Pedagogy

"The Canterbury (Folk)Tales" is envisioned as an undergraduate elective seminar, to be offered mainly to students from outside the field of English literature. The course will meet for four hours each week, throughout a twelve-week semester. The enrollment should be limited to a maximum of twenty students, to allow as much discussion and individual participation as possible.

Because the course offers a literary focus, within an interdisciplinary context, it should be offered within the English department,

and cross-listed under folklore and interdisciplinary studies. I would expect students to enroll in the course for a variety of reasons, ranging from an interest in Chaucer, or an interest in folklore, to a need for a humanities elective to fulfill a breadth requirement. For this reason, the course does not assume any specialized prior study of either folklore or the *Canterbury Tales,* but students should be aware that the reading and discussion requirements will be extensive, although not prohibitively so.

We will read the Canterbury Tales in translation, for speed and accessibility, but students will be expected to familiarize themselves with at least some of the tales in Middle English as well (particularly those chosen for their final projects), since when considering orality and oral formulas, the sound of the Tales is as important as the sense. Reading aloud in class, and listening to the audio tape included in Betsy Bowden's *Chaucer Aloud,* will gradually familiarize the class with Middle English. We will follow the Ellesmere order of the Tales, with some discussion of the controversies concerning this or any other choice of order.

The course, as an investigative inquiry into questions raised by both the teacher and the students, will be based primarily in discussion. Students will be required to complete the readings for each session prior to that session, and questions arising from those readings will inspire and determine the shape of the discussions. Because discussion and the free range of ideas and inspirations are at the core of this course, I will dedicate class time and energy early in the semester to creating an open and collegial atmosphere, encouraging the maximum possible amount of collaborative participation.

This participation, along with an informal oral abstract of the final project, and the final project (discussed below), will constitute the requirements of the course. Students will be required to purchase two texts, Lumiansky's translation of the *Canterbury Tales* and Lindahl's *Earnest Games*. The *Riverside Chaucer,* and numerous other texts (see bibliography) will be placed on reserve, to be read (or at least consulted) depending on the resources and needs of individual students.

I will ask students to gain at least some familiarity with conventional oral/folkloric and source/analogue reference and research tools, even though this type of research will not be the main focus of the class. They will be required to discover, by consulting Aarne, Bryan and Dempster, Morris and Thompson, at least one exemplary identification of sources and analogues to at least one tale, and to report this exemplary identification to the class.

Because this course is interdisciplinary and elective, the final project may take a variety of forms. One choice would be a formal term paper, eight to ten pages in length, selecting at least one Tale and subjecting it to the kind of analysis performed in class, with a detailed and specific focus selected by the individual student. Another choice would be a comparison of at least one Tale with at least one oral (or orally-influenced literate) text chosen by the student from historical or contemporary oral traditions, demonstrating the insights gained by applying contextual oral/folkloric analysis to both works in conjunction or in opposition.

These options are merely suggestive, and students will be encouraged and assisted to creatively design projects which will engage

them intellectually, and allow them to contribute new research and analysis to the field.

I will begin the course with some introductory and preliminary attempts to define orality, literacy, and folklore, and the contextual oral/folkloric approach. Although these definitions will serve as starting points, they will be returned to throughout the course, for questioning, refinement and modification. At the end of the course, I would expect students to have answered some questions, but to have discovered and formulated even more.

As the course progresses, and as we develop our definitions, premises and questions about the *Canterbury Tales* and about folklore/orality, I expect we will see the need to experience some oral performance art in more realistic, grounded contexts than the classroom. I have scheduled one class trip in the preliminary course outline, towards the end of the semester, but I see that as a minimum. Oral art is practiced in so many different contexts, from the commercial and formal, to the personal and spontaneous, and I believe the goals and procedure of the course will be enhanced by experiencing some of these performances in their contexts.

Our questions and discussion may lead us to a performance poetry space such as the Nuyorican Poets' Cafe, a storytelling festival, a folklore or oral history archive, a church service, a street fair sales pitch, or even a rap or dub poetry concert. Any type of oral performance art in a contemporary American context will help to illuminate the medieval English and other contexts. Similarly, such performances exist in recorded versions in a variety of audio and visual

media, and students will be encouraged to bring these to class, as well as viewing (or listening to) some which I will provide.

This proposal is very much a work in progress, as any proposal must be before the course is actually taught, and I see that as an advantage. The course should develop itself, based on the students' input and needs. It is essential to have an outline, and a defined approach, which I have tried to provide, but it is also essential to allow room in that outline and that approach for the students to "drive" the course. I have provided the vehicle and generally mapped the routes we will follow, but the actual rate of speed, the turns and side-trips which will arise along the way, and the ultimate destination, will be determined in the actual teaching of the course. That's what makes the journey worthwhile, for the students and the teacher.

Preliminary Course Schedule

Week One
Introductory remarks and discussion of course approach, orientation and requirements. Introductions and getting-acquainted activities. Lecture and discussion on orality/literacy and folklore. "What is folklore?" and "What is oral literature?" and the problematics of these terms (possibly continuing into Week Two).
Reading: Selections from Ong, Foley and Dundes (*Study of Folklore*).

Week Two
The construction of the *Canterbury Tales* (and issues of ordering) and medieval orality and literacy.
Reading: The General Prologue, selections from Bowden, Stock, Goody and Green, and Lindahl chapters 1-5.

Week Three
The types of the Tales and their tellers. Discussion of contemporary oral artistry. Exercise in oral transmission.
Reading: The General Prologue (continued), selections from Bowden, Mitchell-Kernan's essay in Dundes (*Mother Wit*), and Lindahl chapters 6-9.

Week Four
Fragment One. Gentils and Churls and Fabliaux and Schwänke. Video presentation "Words in Your Face"—contemporary urban oral poetry.
Reading: Fragment One and selections from Dundes (*Study of Folklore*) and Bryan and Dempster.

Week Five
Fragments Two and Three (with emphasis on Three). Women and Folklore, the Wife of Bath as oral artist. Students present exemplary identifications.
Reading: Fragments Two and Three, Muhawi and Kanaana ("Introduction").

Week Six
Fragments Four and Five. Students present preliminary oral reports and selection of topic for final project.
Reading: Fragments Four and Five.

Week Seven
Fragment Six, especially the Pardoner.
Reading: Fragment Six and "The Pardoner's Tale as Anti-Märchen."

Week Eight
Fragment Seven, especially the Prioress' and Sir Thopas' Tales. The social/political/hegemonic uses of folklore. Chaucer as storyteller within the Tales. Bad art or oral art? What are the characteristics, for Chaucer and the class, of good (folk)storytelling?
Reading: Fragment Seven, selections from Dundes (*Study of Folklore* and *Blood Libel*).

Week Nine
Fragments Eight and Nine. Some storytelling in context. Class trip.
Reading: Fragments Eight and Nine.

Week Ten:
The Parson and the Retraction. Prose versus poetry. The Parson as literate, story-*writing*. Folkloric retraction formulas and similar instances within the earlier Tales. "Aw, c'mon, I didn't really mean it."
Reading: Fragment Ten and review of Lindahl chapter seven.

Week Eleven:
Student reports/performances on specific tales.

Week Twelve
Final definitions and questions, evaluations, concluding remarks.

Bibliography

Required Texts:

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Canterbury Tales.* Trans. R. M. Lumiansky. New York: Washington Square Press, 1971.

Lindahl, Carl. *Earnest Games: Folkloric Patterns in the Canterbury Tales.* Bloomingon: Indiana UP, 1987.

Required Supplementary and Recommended Texts (on reserve):

Aarne, Antti and Stith Thompson. *The Types of the Folktale: A Classification and Bibliography.* Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1974.
——Reference source for exemplary identifications.

Bäuml, Franz. "Medieval Texts and the Two Theories of Oral-Formulaic Composition: A Proposal for a Third Theory." *NLH* 16 (1984): 31-49.
——Useful review of previous research, and starting point for discussion of defining approach for the course.

Benson, Larry D. and Theodore M. Andersson, eds. *The Literary Context of Chaucer's Fabliaux.* Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1971.
——Reference source for exemplary identifications.

Bowden, Betsy. *Chaucer Aloud: The Varieties of Textual Interpretation* [With Audio Cassette]. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1987.
——Required reference for reader response, oral transmission, and oral formulaic analyses and discussions.

Bryan, W. F. and Germaine Dempster, eds. *Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1941.
——Reference source for exemplary identifications.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Riverside Chaucer*. Third Edition. Gen. ed.
Larry D. Benson. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1987.
——Required reference for Middle English, useful
introductory articles, and starting point for exemplary
identifications.

Doane, A. N. and Carol Braun Pasternack, eds. *Vox Intexta: Orality
and Textuality in the Middle Ages*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P,
1991.
——Required reference for defining approach and inspir-
ing questions, especially essays by Tedlock, Foley and Parks

Dundes, Alan. *The Study of Folklore*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice
Hall, 1965.
——Introductory reference for defining terms and
approach.

———, ed. *Mother Wit from the Laughing Barrel: Readings in the
Interpretation of Afro-American Folklore*. Englewood Cliffs,
N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1973.
——Supplementary reference, especially essay on
"Signifying," by Claudia Mitchell-Kernan.

———, ed. *The Blood Libel Legend: A Casebook in Anti-Semitic
Folklore*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1991.
——Supplementary reference for Prioress' Tale.

Erickson, Jon. "Chaucer's Pardoner's Tale as Anti-Märchen." *Folklore*
94 (1983): 235-239.
——Example of Proppian structural analysis.

Goody, Jack. *The Interface between the Written and the Oral*.
Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987.
——Supplementary historical and theoretical reference.

Green, D. H. "Orality and Reading: The State of Research in Medieval
Studies." *Speculum* 65 (1990): 267-280.
——Overview of current research in orality/literacy
controversy.

McKenna, Steven R., "Orality, Literacy and Chaucer: A Study of Performance, Textual Authority and Proverbs in the Major Poetry." diss. University of Rhode Island, 1988.
——Required reference, although exemplary of unnecessarily dichotomous approach to oral/folkloric analysis.

Morris, Lynn King. *Chaucer Source and Analogue Criticism: A Cross-Referenced Guide*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1985.
——Comprehensive reference source for exemplary identifications.

Muhawi, Ibrahim and Sharif Kanaana, eds. *Speak, Bird, Speak Again: Palestinian Arab Folktales*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1989.
——Introductory essay required reference for women and folklore issues.

Ong, Walter J. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1982.
——Limited by strict (almost defensive) dichotomous view of orality/literacy, but contains essential, though arguable, observations, clearly presented, concerning "psychodynamics of orality."

Stock, Brian. *The Implications of Literacy*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton UP, 1983.
——Required historical and theoretical reference.

Thompson, Stith. *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature*. 6 vols. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1955-1958.
——Reference source for exemplary identifications.

Words in Your Face. [Video] Various Artists. Produced by Bob Holman. "Alive from Off Center," WNET, New York. Summer, 1991.
——Performance poetry (30 poets) with video and music, to be viewed and discussed in class as contemporary and diverse examples of oral art.

Recommended Supplementary Reading/
Instructor's Background Texts
[asterisks indicate texts yet to be reviewed]

Bakhtin, M. M. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. Michael
      Holquiest. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquiest. Austin:
      U of Texas P, 1985.*

Bäuml, Franz. "Varieties and Consequences of Medieval Literacy and
      Illiteracy." *Speculum* 55 (1980): 237-65.*

Crosby, Ruth. "Oral Delivery in the Middle Ages." *Speculum* 11
      (1936): 88-110.*

Dégh, Linda. *Folktales and Society: Storytelling in a Hungarian
      Peasant Community*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1969.

Finnegan, Ruth. *Oral Poetry: Its Nature, Significance and Social
      Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1977.

Foley, John Miles. *Oral Tradition in Literature: Interpretation in
      Context*. Saint Louis: U of Missouri P, 1986.

————, ed. *Oral Traditional Literature: A Festschrift for Albert Bates
      Lord*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, Inc.,1980.

Gellrich, Jesse. "Orality, Literacy, and Crisis in the Later Middle
      Ages." *Philological Quarterly* 67 (1988), 461-473.*

Goody, Jack and Ian Watt. "The Consequences of Literacy." *Literacy
      in Traditional Societies*. Ed. Jack Goody. Cambridge: Cambridge
      UP, 1963.

Havelock, Eric A. *The Muse Learns to Write: Reflections on Orality
      and Literacy from Antiquity to the Present*. New Haven: Yale
      UP, 1986.

Heffernan, Thomas J., ed., *The Popular Literature of Medieval
      England*. Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 1985.*

Lord, Albert B. *The Singer of Tales.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1960.

Jackson, Bruce, ed. *Teaching Folklore.* Revised Edition. Buffalo: Documentary Research, Inc., 1989.

Mandel, Jerome and Bruce A. Rosenberg, eds. *Medieval Literature and Folklore Studies: Essays in Honor of Francis Lee Utley.* New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1970.

Mew, Constant J. "Orality, Literacy and Authority in the Twelfth-Century Schools." *Exemplaria* 2 (1990): 475-500.*

Ong, Walter J. "Before Textuality: Orality and Interpretation." *Oral Tradition* 3 (1988): 259-269.

————. "Orality, Literacy, and Medieval Textualization." *NLH* 16 (1984): 1-11.

Paredes, Américo and Richard Bauman, eds. *Toward New Perspectives in Folklore.* Austin: U of Texas P, 1972.

Propp, Vladimir. *Morphology of the Folktale.* Second Edition. Austin: U of Texas P, 1968.

Stock, Brian. *Listening for the Text: On the Uses of the Past.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1990.

Tannen, Deborah. "The Oral/Literate Continuum in Discourse." *Spoken and Written Language: Exploiting Orality and Literacy.* Ed. D. Tannen. Norwood, N.J.: ABLEX, 1982, 1-16.*

Tedlock, Dennis. *The Spoken Word and the Work of Interpretation.* Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1983.

Utley, Francis Lee. "Some Implications of Chaucer's Folktales," *Laographia* 22 (1965): 588-599.*

Volk-Birke, Sabine. "Literacy and Orality in Late 14th Century Vernacular Sermons and in Chaucer." *Anglistentag* 1988, 209-219.

Zumthor, Paul. *Oral Poetry: An Introduction*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1990.

————, Nancy Rose and Haidu, Peter. "The Vocalization of the Text: The Medieval 'Poetic Effect.'" *Viator* 19 (1988), 273-282.