THE GREEN KNIGHT AND OTHER MEDIEVAL DISMEMBERMENTS

Mel Storm

I once gave a talk about medieval books to a group of middle school students in a small Kansas town. I brought with me some sample manuscript pages, the usual hands-on pieces of velum—so convenient for class use in its virtual indestructibility. I tried to give them a sense of the rarity and expense of books in the days before printing. I talked about what it must have been like in the medieval classroom in a world before multiple printed texts, inexpensive note paper, copy machines, and so forth. The students were attentive or at least polite, and I got the impression that the topic was proving to be of interest. So when at last I asked if there were any questions, it was gratifying to see a hand go up immediately. The question, however, was not one I anticipated. It was, instead, "What do you know about medieval methods of execution?"

Reluctant to pander to the latent sadistic tastes of a roomful of Kansas youth—at least in the presence of their teacher—I evaded the non sequitur with a joke of some kind. But no doubt I would have received their full attention if I had given them a reasonably detailed account of, say, the process of hanging, drawing, and quartering. And if they were at all like me at that age, they would probably remember my talk to this day—whereas most of them have probably forgotten everything I said about manuscripts. Further, if any of them had gone on to become students of medieval literature, particularly of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, an account of this notorious method of execution would not have been wasted information. *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, a poem characterized by the extraordinary interconnectedness of its parts, yet simultaneously replete with vivid images of human and animal dismemberment, exemplifies a tradition in which the act of mutilation is rich with significance, particularly in its ties to the theme of social cohesion.

Shakespeare's Polonius, pointing to his head and shoulders, invites Claudius to "Take this from this" if he should be mistaken about Hamlet's loving Ophelia (*Hamlet* 2.2.140). A long tradition precedes him. There is a great deal of "taking this from this" in the Middle Ages or at least in its literature. Heads from shoulders ranks high, but plenty of other parts get separated from plenty of other parts—later to be

summarized, so to speak, in the figure of the knight in the woods whittled away appendage by appendage in *Monty Python and the Holy Grail*. Grendel's arm and shoulder are torn from his body ("he his folme forlet / to lifwraþe last weardian, / earm ond eaxle" [*Beowulf* 970-73]) even before the creature undergoes the more traditional, albeit postmortem, decapitation. Arthur cuts off Mordred's sword hand right up to the elbow in the *Alliterative Morte Arthur* (4242-48). Dante peoples the eighth circle of his *Inferno* with a small catalog of mutilated figures, Mohammed, Ali,. Curio, Mosca, Pier da Medicina, and Bertran de Borne, who carries his head round and round the ninth chasm of the circle like a lantern (canto 28). Donegild, who is merely slain in Chaucer's Man of Law's Tale (493-94), is chopped into pieces in Nicholas Trivet's *Life of Constance* (177). Judith takes, so to speak, that from that in Holofernes's tent (*Judith* 103-17*)*, Biblical apocrypha (Judith 13.4-11) making its way through Old English poetry. Chaucer's Host threatens the Pardoner's "coillons" with yet another kind of surgical removal (PardT 951-55), and Ganelon, drawn apart by horses, famously prefigures the joke about the knight who leaps on his horse and rides madly off in all directions (*Song of Roland,* laisse 189).

We can look at a single author, Chaucer, for example, where Ganelon in particular is a recurrent allusion. The wife in the Shipman's Tale calls down upon herself "vengeance / As foul as evere hadde Genylon of France" (193-04) if she does not repay the hundred franks to Daun John. The Jews in the Prioress's Tale are drawn "by wilde hors" before, not after, being hanged (633-34), a seeming reversal of the usual English execution sequence, if the act of drawing here indicates a Ganelon-like quartering rather than transport in a cart. The Nun's Priest alludes to Ganelon with no reference to his punishment (3227), as does the man in black in the *Book of the Duchess* (1121-23) and the pilgrim Monk as well (2389), but the Monk moves into a more sternly graphic world by recounting the beheading of Holofernes (2567-74) and, in turn, that of Pompey the Great (2690-92). In the Physician's Tale, of course, Virginius beheads his daughter (254-57) and presents the head to the wicked judge. (A secondary theme may be evident here, with Holofernes's, Pompey's, and Virginia's heads becoming, not just dissevered members but presentation pieces, reminiscent, perhaps, of the Parthian production in 53 BCE of Euripides's *Bacchae*, with the actual severed head of the Roman general Crassus as a stage prop [Plutarch 3.416-23]). Less directly, in the *Legend of Good Women* Lucrece swoons so deeply at the prospect

of her disgrace that even if "Men myghte smyten of hire arm or hed" (1817) she would feel nothing. In the Wife of Bath's Tale the punishment for rape is decapitation.

The foregoing does not pretend to be an exhaustive catalogue. Reflection on Arthurian story alone would yield up still another substantial inventory, from the gruesomely close shaving of Ysbadden Chief Giant in *Culhwch and Olwen* to the beheading of the giant of Mont St. Michel in multiple texts from Geoffrey of Monmouth on, not to mention Arthur's literal disarming of Mordred mentioned above. But there is more to the matter than simply, in the words of the 1980s Wendy's commercial slogan, "Parts is parts." Sometimes parts may be more than just parts, and their removal more than just simple removal. A long history lies behind the issue.

The early Greek view of the afterlife was dramatically different from that which has become ingrained in later culture. Punishment or reward in the next world was largely disconnected from vicious or virtuous living in this one, and when punishments were indeed allotted, as they were in Tartarus, to those whose behavior had offended the gods, there was little evident connection between the nature of the crime and the form of the punishment. Why should a wheel be Ixion's punishment for attempting to rape Hera? Why should Tityus, who tried to rape Leto, suffer virtually the same punishment as Prometheus for stealing fire, or Sisyphus roll his stone for having temporarily cheated death? (Indeed, Tantalus, denied food and drink for having tried to serve his son to the gods as food, is the rare exception.) But following the spiritual developments of the sixth century BCE, not only in the Mediterranean, but in the Middle East, China, and India as well, individual moral responsibility came more and more to be tied to the fate of the individual in the next world (see Bremmer). Among the Greeks this led from the Orphics to Plato and from Plato beyond, and by the time of Augustan Rome, Virgil's underworld is of a quite different ethical nature from that depicted in Homer's *Odyssey*—that is to say, it is ethical. And at last, by the time we have moved through Virgil to Dante, metaphorical appropriateness has been added to the ethical and moral nexus of offense and punishment. To return to the example cited earlier, when Bertran carries his decapitated head around the ninth bolgia of the eighth circle, he appropriately exemplifies his place among the sowers of discord, his head separated from his trunk as his counsel in life separated King Henry II from his son. Poetry and history coincide in such images, and in law as in art punishment and

142

crime reach a kind of concord. Foucault observes that the calibrations of judicial torture came to correlate "the type of corporal effect . . . with the gravity of the crime" (34), "The poetry of Dante put into laws," as Pellegrino Rossi expressed it in the early nineteenth century (qtd. in Foucault 34).

As we look at the catalog of dismemberments a clear theme emerges. The phenomenon occurs in contexts chiefly involving the social unit as it is threatened either from within or without. Among the more prominent examples I have cited, Grendel threatens the disintegration of Hrothgar's *comitatus*, embodied in Heorot. Mordred breaks with his own father and threatens to destroy the society of the Round Table. Bertran de Borne fosters discord between father and son and sparks civil war, and the others with whom he shares his bolgia, "seminator di scandalo e di scisma" (28.35), are themselves variously cloven—with amputated noses, ears, or hands, cleft to the chin like Ali or, like Mohammed, split bodily end to end, the two halves reintegrated as he progresses around the circle, only to be riven again at the starting point. Donegild's forgeries attempt to turn king against queen. Ganelon, betraying both king and kinsman, fragments Charlemagne's army so that the small rear guard is vulnerable to attack. And what about Chaucer's Pardoner? Why should the Host's threatened violence take the form of mutilation? In my own contextual reading of the tale, the Pardoner threatens to disrupt the common enterprise of the pilgrimage and splinter the group, bringing about disintegration of the pilgrim band in mid-journey (Storm). We could continue the theme of threat to the social unit, most significantly from within but also from without, through the other Chaucerian figures named above, Pompey the Great, for example, in the Monk's Tale or, with a paradoxical associative twist, the beheaded Virginia, victim rather than transgressor, in the Physician's Tale, but further examples are probably not needed to make the point. Edward I seems to have achieved a poetic, if brutal, aptness, when he gave the world the admirably thorough compendium of hanging, drawing, and quartering, so punishing for high treason Dafydd ap Gruffyd, who had turned against his friend Edward in favor of his own brother, Llywelyn. Hanging, drawing, and quartering, as the most severe capital punishment yet devised, was to become the quintessential punishment for treason.

This gory preamble brings us at last to *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. *Sir Gawain* is a poem with a powerful impulse toward unity, an impulse displayed in poetic structure, narrative detail and sequence,

imagery, allusion, chronology, and social setting. The poem follows the
overlapping circuit of the year, with its "twelmonyth and a day"
formula (298, Tolkien edn. here and throughout). The Round Table is a
ready-made image and central symbol, its geometrical unity echoed in
the social unification it signals. It, along with Camelot, is to Arthur
what Heorot is to Hrothgar. Although angular, the pentangle on
Gawain's shield, like the dreamer's pearl in the poet's other great
masterpiece, is as endless and as unbroken as the poem's circles. It
"samned neuer in no side, ne sundred nouþer, / Withouten ende at any
noke, I oquere fynde," the poet says, "Whereeuer þe gomen bygan, or
glod to an ende" (659-61). The poem's two major settings, Camelot and
Bercilak's castle, both exemplify and emphasize social bonds—those of
king and court, lord and court, king and vassal, peer and peer, guest and
host, husband and wife, even debtor and creditor. The narrator
describes even the alliterating sounds that unify the lines as bonds of
loyalty, "lel letteres loken" (35).

But for all this, the poem is at the same time filled with images and
episodes of fragmentation and sundering. The opening establishes the
Trojan context, the aftermath of a war that grew from the severing of
bonds of guest and host and of husband and wife. Three lines into the
poem, we encounter "Þe tulk þat þe trammes of tresoun þer wroȝt" (3),
sometimes identified as Antenor, who, in the tradition established by
Dares and Dictys, is not just an exemplar of treachery but one so
prominent as to have given his name to the second round of Dante's
ninth circle, that of traitors to country—Antenora (Gollancz 95n3;
Dante 32.88). Here, as it happens, is Ganelon himself (32.122), and in
introducing Ugolino, Dante recalls Tydeus, from the Theban cycle,
who ordered the decapitation of Menalippus (or Melanippus) and, when
the head was delivered to him, began eating it (32.130-32).

The Green Knight's own beheading dominates the first section of
the poem, and the overall episode in which it occurs deserves comment.
First, it is important to observe that the Green Knight's threat is to the
bonds of Arthur's court. The Green Knight himself hints as much when
he says he has come not to fight (271), but for another purpose. The
court's response to his challenge reveals that the integrity of the group
of knights has already been compromised, as an embarrassed Arthur is
himself forced to assume the office that should have been theirs, taking
up the challenge as his knights sit silent. The Green Knight is well
aware of the significance of the moment and thus taunts them, "Now is
þe reuel and þe renoun of þe Rounde Table / Ouerwalt with a worde of

on wyȝes speche . . ." (312-13). The knights, failing in their duty, sunder the lord-vassal bond, and Gawain alone undertakes to reconnect it. Significantly, he invokes bonds of family in asserting his worthiness to take up the challenge:

> I am þe wakkest, I wot, and of wyt feblest,
> And lest lur of my lyf, quo laytes þe soþe—
> Bot for as much as ȝe ar myn em I am only to prayse,
> No bounté bot your blod I in my bode knowe. . . . (354-57)

His only virtue, that is, lies in his blood bond with Arthur, his uncle.

A grotesque detail from the beheading scene deserves comment and may suggest the court's awareness of the gravity of what is taking place, its awareness of the present threat to social cohension. The people of the court—many ("fele") of them, the poet says—kick the severed head as it rolls across the floor: "þe fayre hede fro þe halce hit to þe erþe, / Þat fele hit foyned with her fete, þere hit forth roled. . ."(427-28). This may suggest a degree of unexpected savagery among the courtly observers; it may suggest fear or disgust; it may suggest the folk belief that one can kill a supernatural being only by keeping the head separate from the body (Kittredge 192-93). There is yet another possibility. If dismemberment is the punishment of the outsider or insider who has severed or threatened to sever a social bond, then the sundering of the offender may imply reciprocally the reintegration of the threatened union. Are the lords—and, perhaps, ladies—of Camelot attempting to ensure that the bond of their society endures by keeping the Green Knight from becoming whole? Perhaps. But if they are, they fail. The Green Knight can retrieve his head and (as his later appearance in the poem demonstrates) reattach it, and with the Green Knight put back together Camelot again becomes vulnerable, dependent upon Gawain once more to be its restorer through proving true to his promise to accept his own dismemberment.

Gawain, of course, before he comes to face the challenge he expects, beheading at the hands of the Green Knight, encounters one he does not expect, temptation at the hands of the Green Knight's wife. This test takes place at a second court, a kind of anti-Camelot, if you will, with another society and another set of loyalties and obligations, another set of bonds. But first Gawain must find this second court. So grateful is he when he does find it that he gives thanks to both Jesus and Saint Julian, "Þat cortaysly had hym kydde, and his cry herkened"

(775). The Julian of the passage is commonly identified as Julian the Hospitaller, fittingly reflecting his role as the patron saint of hospitality (see *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, ed. Tolkien and Gordon 99n; Andrew and Waldron 237n). The reference may, however, have evoked simultaneously a second Saint Julian, Julian of Auvergne, who, according to the *Legendum Aureum*, sought out persecution deliberately and was willingly beheaded. When the Roman executioners took his head to his friend, Ferreolus, with the threat that they would do the same to him unless he would sacrifice to idols, Ferreolus refused. Julian's head and Ferreolus's body were buried together. When disinterred long after, Julian's head, cradled in his friend's hands, was found to be undecayed (Voragine 1.126-27).

Once inside Bercilak's castle, Gawain embraces a new fealty, confirmed explicitly by oath after his host welcomes him as guest: "'I am wyʒe at your wille to worch youre hest, / As I am halden þerto, in hyʒe and in loʒe, / By riʒt" (1039-41). The oath is reaffirmed later, in a context in which Bercilac is surely referring, ironically, to Gawain's unwitting double obligation—to host and to Green Knight. "ʒe han demed to do þe dede þat I bidde; / Wyl ʒe halde þis hes here at þis onez?" (1089-90), asks his host, and Gawain replies that he will, "Whyl I byde in yowre borʒe, be bayn to ʒowre hest" (1092).

The host's "hest," of course, is the establishment of the exchange agreement, with Gawain bound for three days to exchange his winnings for what his host brings back from the hunt. The sequence of the hunts, for which prey Gawain has promised reciprocity, is familiar enough, although it may be appropriate to recall some of the details. In this middle section of the poem the dispatching and dismembering of various animals echoes the dismemberment of the Green Knight at the beginning and anticipates the promised dismemberment of Gawain at the end. The description of the deer hunt offers hides pierced ("bigly bote" 1163) with broad arrowheads; the animals that escape the arrows are "toraced," that is, "slash[ed] to pieces . . . mutilate[d]" (*MED* "torasen") and "rent" (1168) by dogs, while, back at the castle, Gawain's contemplation of the "dunte" that he faces keeps his libido in check (1283-86). But if one seeks imagery of dismemberment, one need only consult the butchering scene, replete with detail that would do credit to a slaughterhouse training video, that stretches over two stanzas (1323-61).

The boar hunt imperils both sides, hunters and hunted, with the threat of various modes of sundering. Dogs' backs are bitten "in

sunder" (1563), and the men, too, are with "tusches torne" (1579). The boar dies violently, its heart "schyndered" (1594), that is to say, cleft or severed (*MED shinderen*), by the lord's blade. The same verb had described the beheading of the Green Knight in line 424, where the blade in Gawain's hands "schyndered þe bones," as well as the splintering of the hunters' arrows that "schyndered in pecez" as they struck the boar's hide (1458). The poet devotes less detail to the butchering of the boar than of the deer, but the details he provides are important. In fact, they are pointedly reminiscent of the technique, a century old by then, of hanging, drawing, and quartering, differing primarily in sequence rather than in detail. A skilled woodsman first cuts off the boar's head and displays it "on hiʒe" (1607), as the heads of traitors who had suffered Edward's ultimate sanction were displayed at the Tower of London. Then the woodsman "Braydez out þe bowels, brennez hom on glede" (1609), that is, pulls out the bowels and burns them on the fire, yet another stage of the drawing and quartering of traitors, varied only slightly here in that the body, once the entrails are removed, is cut into halves rather than quarters. The halves of the boar are then bound back together for transport to the castle—what can be dissevered can be rejoined, like the Green Knight himself, or Mohammed in the eighth circle, or a threatened court. Back at the castle the lord displays, and Gawain praises, the parts, the huge severed head in particular:

> Þat oþer knyʒt ful comly comended his dedez,
> And praysed hit as gret prys þat he proued hade,
> For suche a brawne of a best, þe bolde burne sayde,
> Ne such sides of a swyn segh he neuer are.
> Þenne hondeled þay þe hoge hed, þe hende mon hit praysed,
> And let lodly þerat þe lorde for to here. (1629-34)

After Gawain praises the dismembered parts of the boar, his host, ominously, perhaps, given the context, praises Gawain. "Bi saynt Gile," he says, "ʒe ar þe best þat I knowe!" (1644-45). We might note that thus, even in the exchange of winnings, the host sustains the hunting motif, invoking Saint Giles, a French saint who was nourished in his hermitage by the milk of a doe. When one of King Charles's huntsmen tried to shoot the doe, the arrow instead wounded the saint (Voragine 2.147-48).

In the scenes intercut between castle and forest, the fox hunt sequence makes particularly emphatic Sir Gawain's bond of loyalty to his host and his personal aversion to treachery. His greatest fear, when the lady comes beguilingly to him the third and final time, is that he should "be traytor to þat tolke" who is his host (1775). But sex is not the ultimate temptation, nor is the gold ring the lady offers as gift— significant in its circularity as image of both completeness and unity and perhaps as Freudian substitution for the sexual congress he also abjures. Instead, a second band, the girdle, proves Gawain's undoing— the belt that will protect its wearer so long as it is fastened—its circle complete—around him (1851-52). It too, endless like the dreamer's pearl in *Pearl*, is in Gawain's thought a "jewel"—"a juel for þe jopardé þat hym iugged were" (1856). But this "jewel" is the band that ensnares Gawain, when, trying to avoid the Green Knight's ax blade by accepting it, he falls into temptation and is caught, just as the fox, trying to save himself from the lord's (and thus the Green Knight's) blade, also recoils ("schunt for þe scharp" [1902]), and, in consequence, falls into the jaws of the hounds behind him.

The pattern of animal mutilation already established continues with the death of the fox. First "woried" (1905), that is, strangled (*MED wirien*) by the dogs, the fox is next "tyrven" (1920-21), that is, flayed (*MED tirven*) by the hunters. Flaying was yet another punishment for traitors, invoked in English law under Henry I for the killing of one's lord (Swanton 21). In *Havelok the Dane* Godard is graphically flayed for plotting the king's death (2430-511), rather than simply beheaded, as is Godric in the same poem, no doubt because Godard, unlike Godric, was "the kinges owne frende" (375) and thus a breaker of still stronger bonds even than those between king and subject. It may be worthy of note that, if one choses, as I have done, the glossing of "strangled" from among the possibilities offered by the *MED* for *woried*, the link with human torture in the death of the fox is further strengthened through evocation of the common practice of partial strangulation before initiation of the ordeal.

Taken all in all, *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* is, among so many other things, a poem of decapitations and dismemberments. Complete and near beheadings frame and intersect an embedded second narrative in which animals are dismembered and their parts given as testing gifts to a knight who expects himself soon to undergo a like fate. The framing episodes of the poem, the Camelot sequences, are set in a society the bond of which is being tried. In the embedded narrative,

an individual is being tested, his success or failure—and that of the Camelot he represents—hinging upon his maintaining fidelity to the bonds of a second social group. Gawain's fidelity to Bercilac and his court becomes the measure of his fidelity to Arthur and Camelot and, in a sense, of his fidelity to himself. If he successfully keeps intact the reciprocal bond of guest and host he will himself remain intact, just as, conversely, the Green Knight earlier, at the beginning of the narrative, challenged the integrity—the intactness—of Camelot and was beheaded. Despite the vehemence of his final self-condemnation, Gawain largely maintains his fidelity to social bond, proving true, on the whole, to the Green Knight in the latter's roles as challenger, husband, and host, and thus he is spared not just death but, specifically, decapitation.

In *Pearl*, the concatenation of echoing words that links stanza to stanza and section to section links the final line to the first, and the poem becomes as "endeleȝ rounde" (738) as the pearl it describes. The last long line of *Sir Gawain*, "After þe segge and þe assaut watz sesed at Troye" (2525), echoes almost verbatim the first line, "Siþþe þe sege and þe asaute watz sesed at Troye" (1), and the poet thus achieves again the same concatenative effect. *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* begins at its ending and ends at its beginning—as the saying goes, a neat trick if you can manage it. But this is no mere trick, no mere rhetorical tour de force. The circularity of the poem is a structural manifestation of unity in a poem with unity as its theme. More than this, the final stanza, like the first, traces the descent of Arthur's Britain from Troy through Brutus, as the poet repeats and modifies the theme of disintegration that the Trojan reference had initiated in the poem's opening stanza. Here at the end, however, the treasonous "tulk" is absent, Antenor or whoever he may be, and the knights of Camelot, the court unified and whole, cement their unity around the Round Table by embracing the looped baldric that Gawain wears:

> Þe kyng comfortez þe knyȝt, and alle þe court als
> Laȝen loude þerat, and luflyly acorden
> Þat lordes and ladis þat longed to þe Table,
> Vche burne of þe broþerhede, a bauderyk schulde haue,
> A bende abelef hym aboute of a bryȝt grene,
> And þat, for sake of þat segge, in swete to were. (2513-18)

The Round Table is healed and even the nick in his neck, the nearest Gawain has come to mutilation, is itself healed (2484). "Honi soyt qui mal pence," says the Garter Knight motto puzzlingly placed as coda at the end of the manuscript of the poem. From Edward III, founder of the Order of the Garter and grandson of the king who initiated hanging, drawing, and quartering, comes the motto that, whether by the poet's design or that of some other, caps the poem in which Gawain stays intact and the Green Knight and the Round Table are put together again.

Emporia State University

Works Cited

Alliterative Morte Arthur. King Arthur's Death: The Middle English Stanzaic Morte Arthur and Alliterative Morte Arthure. Ed. Larry D. Benson. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1974. 115-238.

Andrew, Malcolm, and Ronald Waldron, eds. *The Poems of the Pearl Manuscript:* Pearl, Cleanness, Patience, Sir Gawain and the Green Knight. Exeter: U of Exeter P, 1996.

Beowulf . Klaeber's Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg. Ed. R. D. Fulk, Robert E. Bjork, and John D. Niles. 4th ed. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2008.

Bremmer, Jan N. *The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife.* New York: Routledge, 2002.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Riverside Chaucer.* Ed. Larry D. Benson. 3rd ed. Boston: Houghton, 1987.

*Culwych and Olwen. The Romance of Arthur: An Anthology of Medieval Texts in Translation.*Ed. James J. Wilhelm. New York: Garland, 1994. 25-58.

Dante. *Inferno. The Divine Comedy.* Trans. John Sinclair. 3 vols. 1939. Rpt. New York: Oxford UP, 1981. Vol. 1.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage, 1977.

Gollancz, Israel, ed. *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight.* London: Oxford UP, 1940. EETS 210.

Havelok the Dane. Ed. Ronald B. Herzman, Graham Drake, and Eve Salisbury. Kalamazoo, MI.: Medieval Institute Publications, 1979.

Judith. Beowulf and Judith. Ed. Elliott Van Kirk Dobbie. New York: Columbia UP, 1953. The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records 4: 99-109.

Kittredge, George Lyman. *A Study of Gawain and the Green Knight.* Cambridge: Oxford UP, 1916.

Monte Python and the Holy Grail. Dir. Terry Gilliam and Terry Jones. Perf. Graham Chapman and John Cleese. EMI. 1975.

Pearl. Ed. E. V. Gordon. Oxford: Clarendon, 1953.

Plutarch. *Plutarch's Lives.* Trans. Bernadotte Perrin. 11 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1914-26. 3: 314-23.

Shakespeare, William. *The Riverside Shakespeare.* Ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton, 1997.

Sir Gawain and the Green Knight. Ed. J. R. R. Tolkien and E. V. Gordon. 2nd ed. rev. Norman Davis. Oxford: Clarendon, 1967.

Song of Roland. Trans. C. K. Scott Moncrieff. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1959.

Storm, Melvin. "The Pardoner's Invitation: Quaestor's Bag or Becket's Shrine?" *PMLA* 97 (1982): 810-18.

Swanton, M. J. "'Dane-Skins': Excoriation in Early England." *Folklore* 87.1 (1976): 21-28.

Trivet, Nicholas. *Trivet's Life of Constance.* Ed. Margaret Schlaugh. *Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales.* Ed. W. F. Bryan and Germaine Dempster. 1941. New York: Humanities, 1958. 165-81.

Voragine, Jacobus de. *The Golden Legend : Readings on the Saints.* Trans. William Granger Ryan. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1993. 2 vols.

Wendy's. Advertisement. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OTzL VIc-O5E.>