[\textit{œm cyninge}] was \textit{sægd þæt ...} がまず格表示の不確実な実証が主語となる ME 'the king was told that ...' 型に変化し、その後に ME 'He was told that ...' 型が成立したとする従来の説に否定的な立場をとっている。著者は ME でまず 'it was told him [the king] that ...' 型が成立し、少なくとも 'tell to inform < a person > of something' について、accusative of person を支配することから 'he [the king] was told that ...' という能動態の対格を主語とする人称構文が可能であったとし、この 2 つの構文が統語的に合流したために後者の構文が勢力を得るようになったと考えている。この近代型が 'he was told a story' 型を普及させるのに役立ち、結局 that-clause の complementary clause から名詞節への再解釈につながったとする。

第 2 部と対照的に、第 1 部では資料を OE から ModE まで幅広く多様なテキストからとり、従属接続詞の発展を総合的に論じているが、特定の資料のみに依存することが許されないこのような研究には過去の業績をふまえた深い学識が研究者に求める。その点からも本書は日本における英語史研究のひとつの到達点を示すものであろう。なお、ヘプライ語を含めて例文には問題の構成の注解として役立つ現代語訳がつけられている。Bruce Mitchell が 'However, it is hard to say without a native informant how far along the road these and others like them are.' (\textit{OE}S, §2500) と言うように、著者はしばしば解釈上微妙な問題にあえて踏み込んでいるだけに、このような注解的訳が読者に与える便宜は計り知れない。問題の接続詞や非人称構文の発達史に関する情報が希薄であるだけに、本書の存在価値は大きいと言わざるをえない。

学習院大学

Ebbe Klitgård: \textit{Chaucer's Narrative Voice in The Knight's Tale}


The richness in the meaning of Chaucer's language, due perhaps more to its literacy culture than to its orality, is assumed to be discernible by taking larger semantic units into account: phrases, sentences, discourses, or even the narrative poem as a whole rather than single words. How to elucidate the processes involved in the above richness objectively and therefore as systematically as possible seems to be a desideratum in Chaucer studies. In linguistic terms, discourse analysis or pragmatics in particular will contribute to this, and in literary terms, narratology or structural approach to this. This area of research is only possible through a merging of linguistic and literary approaches, or what may be described as 'poetics.' Klitgård's argument with the metalanguage 'voice' is, I think, an attempt at this. This book is based on the Ph.D. thesis submitted to the University of
Copenhagen in 1994. His research focuses mainly on Chaucer and the Late Middle Ages with much interest in narratology.

Klitgård’s book consists mainly of two parts: one (chapters 1, 2, 3) is about how to establish the ‘voice’ as a frame of reference with which to see into the semantic questions of The Knight’s Tale; the other (chapters 4, 5, 6, 7) is about the application of the ‘voice’ to the Tale. His approach is, as he says, based on Seymour Chatman’s communication theory or C.R. Kinney’s poetic narratology, though inspired much by David Lawton’s analysis of ‘voice’. His way of discussion throughout the book is based more on past scholarship than on his own textual evidence: reviews of previous discoveries on the points in question, then his use of them as supportive evidence for his methodology applied to as well as his interpretation about the voices at issue. This is perhaps a way he took to objectify the ‘voice’, a reconstruction of which is easily subject to the subjectivity of the reader.

In chapter 1, with a view to establishing the appropriate model with which to reconstruct the poetic language of The Knight’s Tale, Klitgård reviews, first, representative literary criticisms in the twentieth century, mostly with disapproval, and second, with high value on the recently developed theories of literary communication, proposes a combined approach of linguistics and literary theory, one headed by structuralism and semiotics (p. 24). To the eye of the author who is open to the semantic complexity of the poetic language of the Tale, the dramatic theory by G.L. Kittredge and its subsequent ‘the Knight as persona’ approach is reductive, and more or less the same are a New Critical or ironical approach (E.T. Donaldson) and an exegetical/antimetrical interpretation (D.W. Robertson). He also regards the more recent theories, Marxist, Freudian (character psychology), feminist and the New Historicism (text-external features) as reductive and with little insight into Chaucer’s narrative technique. He also rejects a deconstructivist and postmodern theory because it neglects the presence of the author. On the other hand, he treats medieval literary theories of the 80/90’s with some approval, and gives more weight to a bookish manuscript or reading culture than to an oral one in relation to which nuanced voices are less functional. Finally, he concludes that Chatman’s narrative communication model is the most relevant to his purpose. This distinguishes three different personages at the sending end (the real author, the implied author, the narrator) and at the receiving end (the narratee, the implied audience, the real audience). What we can try to reconstruct is, he says, ‘the implied author, the personage who appears ‘behind’ the narrator, and who is the author’s ‘second self’ (p. 25).

In chapter 2, Klitgård applies the communication model to the narration of The Knight’s Tale. He criticizes the Knight persona interpretation (Terry Jones) as reductive and regards the ‘T’ narration as not ostensively attributed to the Knight character but to Chaucer’s
educated voice of the opposing views and concepts. He also rejects the New Historicists whose focus is on knighthood and chivalry for their disregard of aesthetic, poetic and narrative effects. But he approves of C. David Benson, David Lawton, Leonard M. Koff in that they focus on the techniques of poetic narrative: structure, characterization, word choice, imagery and speech. With this in mind, it is possible, he thinks, to reconstruct the narrative voice in The Knight's Tale, which is 'highly problematic: changing, nuanced and sometimes deceptive' (p. 57).

In chapter 3, Klitgård points out the narrator's detached position in relation to the lovers in The Knight's Tale, much unlike Boccaccio's Teuvo. The narratorial stance in most of Chaucer's love poems is highly sympathetic as in Troilus and Criseyde, but here courtly love is degraded to a mere stereotype resulting in a general stance of distance. Narratorial involvement is comparatively obvious in the narrator's self-consciousness about his storytelling and the foregrounding of philosophical and pagan subject matter. Thus, the narrative style is achieved through a complex of contrasts in opposing categories: seriousness vs. humour, high style vs. realism, involvement vs. distance. He also approves of 'the prison/garden' metaphor (V.A. Kolve) and 'a metonymic chain of metaphors' (D.S. Brewer) as contributing to the narrative strategy and/or voice.

In chapter 4, Klitgård regards the occupatio, and their rhetorical variants of diminutio and abbrevatio in the Tale as a narrative strategy (e.g. 'This is th'effect and his entente pleyn. / Now wol I turne to Arcite ageyn 1487–8). These are part of formulatic compositional technique in the medieval romances. However, he says, 'Chaucerian voice is strikingly different exactly because of a very sophisticated administration of narratorial self-consciousness' (p. 57) with some effects of self-irony/effacement.

In chapter 5, Klitgård pays attention to the sharp juxtaposition of the courtly lovers' seriousness, high style, and involvement with the narrator's comic, realistic and distancing filter. Arcite's roaming in the shape of Philostrate is depicted by a homely simile 'a boket in a welle'. A forceful poetic representation of the magnificent tournament (by alliteration, anaphora) is toned down by a humourous simile like 'He rolleth under foot as dooth a bal'. Arcite dies not in battle, but is thrown by his horse after victory in a tournament. This is described anti-heroically with a simile 'As blak he lay as any cole or crowe'. The rashness with which he is carried off — 'Anon he was yborn out of the place' — in simple style defies any glorification.

In chapter 6, Klitgård deals with the high style of rhetoric devoted to the Pagan Deities. Here, he says, the distance of the realistic narrator disappears, and the Chaucerian voice, characteristic of a dream vision, takes over. He makes a stylistic/rhetorical analysis of the temple scenes, Venus, Mars, Diana, and Saturn by drawing attention to images (e.g. 'the
sikes colde' 1920), allegory (e.g. 'The cruel Ire' 1997), metonymy (p. 82), alliteration (p. 84), synaesthesia (p. 84), rime pairs (e.g. 'smerte'—'herte'). And the prayers by the characters are regarded in the same vein. He summarizes this chapter by saying that 'the narrative design in Book III points to the fatal outcome of the story by a forceful poetic description of the pagan universe in the darker aspects' (p. 90).

With the same focal point as in chapter 6, Klitgård, in chapter 7, turns to philosophical passages based on Boethius' De Consolatione Philosophiae in The Knight's Tale. He stresses that Chaucer uses those passages through the characters' local perspective as demonstrated in Arcite's confusion of providence with fate ('On purveiance of God, or of Fortune' 1252). Chaucer's dealings with Theseus in his works are, as he says, various, not of a single coherent vision. In The Knight's Tale, he is endowed with ambivalent images: his way is 'to make a virtue of necessity', which is more pragmatically oriented than philosophically. The narrative design foregrounds the Stoic values of the central characters, as evinced by their philosophical (or philosophizing) speeches, but the narrative voice shows their inadequacy (p. 99). Klitgård ends his book with conclusion and summary, confirming that Chaucer's narrative voice is formed of the paradox of distance and closeness.

There is already a review of Klitgård's book by Roney (1996). This seems to adopt a literary critic's view, but mine is that of a philologist. There are typographical errors in his book other than the ones Roney pointed out, e.g. on pages 45 and 59. About the absence of an index and the internal wrong page numbers, see (Roney 1996: 233).

Klitgård uses 'point of view' and 'voice' indiscriminately as shown in his various paraphrases like 'tone of voice', 'stance', 'attitude', 'vantage-point', 'effects', and 'interpretations'. Even his 'voice' is functional in two ways: Chaucerian 'voice' (singular) as an integrated sense and 'voices' (plural) as a concrete segmentalized sense. The 'point of view' is roughly directed to what extent the things in question are observed and understood by the narrator/characters in the text, and the 'voice' is more linguistically oriented, made tangible to the listener by the speaker's selection of words and phrases, for further information about which see, for instance, Kinoshita (1997), an achievement on narratology. If Klitgård had distinguished between these two, his argument could have been more understandable and systematic. He is indeed sensitive to a hierarchical difference in the point of view and to its subsequent voice qualities in The Knight's Tale (see his dependence upon Chatman's theory: the author, the implied author, the narrator . . . ). But he does not seem to have used this as a structure for his argument. On this point, K. Nakatani's (1963: 78) remark is worth noticing: 'Chaucer's vantage-point in writing The Knight's Tale is neither on earth, nor in heaven. He is, as it were, situated in the place from which he is able, at once, to look down on the earth and to look upon the heaven above'.
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In accord with where the poet stands between the two poles, the contours of voice are assumed to be determined. In the view of Palamoun, for instance, who agonizes over his being confined to prison, although Arcite is let out of it, saying ‘But I must been in prison through Saturne’ (1328), the ‘prison’ is merely earthly functional, and yet in the wider view of the implied author, it is susceptible to its metaphorical or macrocosmic sense, of which Plamoun, a pagan hero, is ignorant. Here two views are held in tension, one producing a serious tragic voice, the other, although subtly hidden, producing a distanced comic voice.

Illustrating ‘the voice’ with examples, Klitgård focuses on those of the narrator with the sole exception of Theseus. To me the ‘narrative’, a more inclusive term than the ‘narratorial’/‘narrator’s’, should involve the characters’ point of view/voice. It is also administered by the implied author whose function Klitgård is primarily concerned with. Besides the limited viewpoint of the participants in the Tale and the unlimited one of the implied author, the little difference in innate characters between Palamon and Arcite, and the deliberately passivated role of Emily (much unlike those in Troilus and Criseyde) are regarded as central to the poetic design and the voice control.

Klitgård’s view on the three dichotomies: humour, realism, distance vs. seriousness, high style, involvement is appreciated (although inherited from D.S. Brewer, C. Muscatine, Derek Peasall, K. Nakatani, etc.), but his illustration of the two sets in separate chapters (5, 6/7) results in some inconsistency. This is particularly true of chapter 7. Boethian philosophical passages are produced through a localized view of the participants in the Tale, and therefore in the view of the implied author, the apparent involvement voice is open to criticism and made relative. The two opposing views are condensed in those passages rather than analytically or separately incorporated into them. With regard to the ‘hidden voice’ there, Klitgård is forced to refer to ‘dramatic irony’, ‘ambivalence’ and ‘paradox’. Thus there arises a gap between the structural design of his book and his sensitive response to the subtleties of the voice. If he had in mind Gordon (1970), who regards Boethian passages in Troilus and Criseyde as working in an ambivalent/ambiguous way, he would hesitate to deal with them as an instance of ‘involvement’.

Klitgård stresses the importance of style and rhetoric in his study. However, his understanding of rhetoric is restricted to part of dispositio and elocutio. Since the narrative ‘voice’ is central to the poetic design as a whole, he should take into account the five faculties of inventio, dispositio, elocutio, memoria, and actio (Cf. Vinsauf: Poetria Nova). As regards Arcite’s death, we hear the narrator say ‘His spirit chaunged his hous and wente ther./As I cam nevere, I kan nat telly wher’ (2809–10). We ask why he says so, and where, and how, and in what tone of voice. More attention should be paid to ‘inventio’, with regard to which
see, for instance, the 'three ages' (J. Burrow 1984) and the 'triangle models' (S. Oka 1995). The modern communication theory contributes to answering these, but to Chaucer its predecessor, classic rhetorics, is more familiar and available.

Klitgård regards extreme application of text-external factors as typical of exegetical or New Historicism approach as reductive and therefore irrelevant to the determination of the voice. For the reconstruction of the voice of the implied author, text-internal evidence should primarily be accounted for, and only secondarily text-external, not the other way round. I think he is right in the direction. When necessary, or perhaps secondarily, he extends his attention to the text-external, say, 'intertextual' factors — Boccaccio's Teseida, Boethian texts, the courtly love tradition — and appraises the validity of the language of the Tale with a relative/critical perspective.

Klitgård arrives at and consolidates his conclusions most of all by the well established scholarly achievements rather than by his own minute analyses of the Tale. I have an impression that he reinterprets or reintegrates the old discoveries under the name of the narrative voice. After reviewing previous criticisms, he asserts 'Yet...', 'However...', but concludes that Thurston, Kolve and Brewer offer alternative frameworks to supplement my own general outline for analysis' (p. 49). New approaches are, I think, only valid when new facts are discovered through them. On this point, he seems to be more problem conscious about 'approaches' than about new facts perceived through them. He apparently discusses Chaucer's administration of narratorial self-consciousness as if he were adding to new facts, by saying 'However, I hope to demonstrate...'. I wish he had had a chance to read Bennett (1947), Malone (1951), and Masui (1964), who discuss the potential of metalinguistic commentaries. In linguistic terms, Brinton (1996) has made a far more systematic and elaborate analysis of them. It should be noticed, however, that his combined way of linguistics and literary criticism for the totality of the semantic complexity of Chaucer's language, with the 'voice' as the key word to it, is highly to be appreciated. Further research in this area will be rewarding in the still analytically oriented Chaucer scholarship in the way of either linguistics and literature.
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