

# The Summoner's Tale

## Gender and Sexual Identities in the *Summoner's Prologue and Tale*

Ruth Evans (ruth.evans@slu.edu)

An essay chapter from *The Open Access Companion to the Canterbury Tales* (September 2017)

The *Summoner's Tale* is one of the most memorable of *The Canterbury Tales*. Most readers remember its exquisitely comic dénouement, in which a young squire (the servant of a lord), proposes with mock-solemnity an ingenious solution to the mathematical problem of how to divide a fart, the “gift” of the squire’s lord’s parishioner Thomas to Friar John, between the thirteen friars of John’s convent: send it down the spokes of a cartwheel. The tale’s primary purpose is satiric: it ridicules the greed of friars, who were the frequent butt of fourteenth-century English satire. The fart-as-gift – which plays on the symbolic link between money and human waste, reinforcing what Larry Scanlon calls “the general association of friars with anal excretion” (161) – and the fart-division, punningly described by the lord as “ars-metrike” [“cul-culation”] (SumT 2222), a pun on the Middle English word for arithmetic (in Chaucer’s *Knight's Tale*, Theseus’s arena is described as being built by masters of “geometrie or ars-metrike” (KnT 1898)), put the tale firmly in the arena of scatology (toilet humor) rather than sex. So what have gender and sexuality to do with it?

The short answer is that the tale’s satire is informed by popular antifraternal stereotypes in which widespread cultural resentment of the privileges enjoyed by friars is displaced onto negative stereotypes of their gender and sexual identity. It’s a dynamic that we’re familiar with today; the insult “fag” is an expression of anger, contempt, or anxiety that may or may not have anything to do with the sexual or gender identity of the feared, despised, or hated other. The anus in the *Summoner's Prologue and Tale* has sexual as well as scatological connotations, and is also associated in the Middle Ages with greed and corruption: it metaphorically shits on friars because friars themselves are perceived to shit on others, but it also serves to taint friars by associating them with what Robert Mills calls the specter of sodomy, a specter that haunts male-male relations in the Middle Ages, and which, in Mills’s words, continues “to exert a spectral presence in the present” (57). By this, Mills means that our modern category of homosexuality is haunted by the medieval category of sodomy, rather than being continuous with it. In the *Prologue and Tale* sexual and gender identities intersect with constructions of the body, occupational role, social status, and religion, in ways that sometimes differ from current understandings of [intersectionality](#), the straight-queer divide, and the plasticity of sexual and gender identities.

**Tools**

## Antifraternal Stereotypes I: Professional Rivalry

In most manuscripts of *The Canterbury Tales*, the *Summoner's Tale* follows the *Friar's Tale*, and they form a pair. The Friar baits the Summoner by telling a tale about a corrupt summoner, who is in cahoots with the devil. The Summoner gets even with an equally vicious tale, in which a greedy friar gets his come-uppance. "Quiting," a Middle English term that means both [repayment and retaliation](#), is an important dynamic in the *Canterbury Tales* (see the chapter on *The Reeve's Tale* in this volume), and personal animosity between two pilgrims doesn't come any bigger than that between the Friar and the Summoner. Summoners called defendants to trial in ecclesiastical courts. They not only did the church's dirty work, but they also issued false summonses and took bribes. One telling criticism is the complaint voiced by angry defendants before the Bishop of London's commissary court in the fifteenth century: "all summoners are false whoresons, thieves ... and false knaves and the devil's turd [is] in [their] master's teeth" (Forrest 428). Besides indicating popular contempt for summoners, the reference to the "devil's turd" associates them with both Satan and shit.

Friars too were seen as in league with Satan. This was because as regular clergy they were in competition with secular clergy, due to the fact that in the late thirteenth century the pope authorized friars to perform many of the offices of parish priests, including preaching, burying the dead, and hearing confession. Friars professed to live a life of poverty and abstinence, but received money for performing these offices. Hence the stereotype of the greedy friar. In his *Vox clamantis* the poet John Gower, Chaucer's contemporary, asserts: "There is God, there is the world, and there is the Devil Apostate, in whose ranks the friar bears a burden of sin ... [H]e submits to the Devil's own yoke" (190). A late fourteenth-century poem [Preste, Ne Monke, Ne Yit Chanoun](#) states: "Ther shal no saule have rowm in helle [no soul shall have any room in hell], / of frers ther is such throng." These associations are taken up in the *Summoner's Prologue's* vision of the friars that swarm out of Satan's arse, a vision that interestingly conflates popular representations of both summoners and friars, reminding us that the tale-teller is as morally compromised as the subject of his tale.

## Interlude: Some Terminology, and the Difference History Makes

Today we'd call the Summoner's aggressive one-up-manship gender expression rather than gender identity. This distinction derives from contemporary [transgender politics](#). Gender expression refers to the outward, culturally-determined signs of gender, such as behavior, clothing, appearance, and name, signs that are usually read in binary terms, as either masculine or feminine. Gender identity, in contrast, is my internal, deeply-held sense of my gender, which may be at odds with my biological sex (the basis for the sex I am assigned at birth), is self-determined, not visible to others, and may or may not be abiding: I may have been born a man, but inside I feel that I am a woman. Gender identities today are plural: not only masculine and feminine, but genderqueer, boi, bigender, transgender, transmasculine, nongender, agender, and [many other terms](#) besides. The categories of sexual identity today are similarly plural: straight, lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer, asexual. Sexual identity usually relates to sexual object choice, and is separate from gender identity, and occasionally even from sexual orientation: the sex I was assigned at birth may be male, but I may identify as a woman (my gender identity), be attracted

only to other women (my sexual orientation), and see myself as lesbian but also at times as pangender (my sexual identity).

But the distinction between gender identity and what has come to be known as sexual orientation in Western cultures is very recent (Mills 11). In the Middle Ages, “unnatural” sexual practices almost always threatened gender identity, as when the twelfth-century French theologian Alain de Lille indicts male-male sex: “The active sex shudders in disgrace as it sees itself degenerate into the passive sex. A man turned woman blackens the fair name of his sex” (67). A man taking the passive role in sex – who is penetrated – risks turning into a woman. The idea that one might wish to claim an “unnatural” sexual or gender identity for oneself, or that this identity might constitute an abiding “truth” of the self, would have made little sense to people in the Middle Ages. I say “for oneself,” because the sexual identities of medieval persons were largely non-self-defined (Salih 2002).

As the cultural historian Michel Foucault argued in the 1970s, our modern categories of sexual identities – homosexual, lesbian, pervert, and so on – were constructed in the late nineteenth-century, in medical and scientific discourses, such as sexology, psychoanalysis, and criminology. The categories functioned not only to classify sexual types but to regulate those that were seen as not doing their sex and gender right. These categories did not exist in the Middle Ages, and there was no identity politics as we understand it today (“lesbian and proud!”). Medieval virgins and sodomites might be considered as constituting self-defining identities (as discussed in this lecture: [Holding It Straight](#)), but people thought of themselves by and large (there are notable exceptions) as engaging in *sexual behaviors*, not as inhabiting *sexual identities*. This is Foucault’s famous distinction – rightly much contested (Gaunt 157) – between pre-nineteenth-century “acts” and post-nineteenth-century “identities”: “As defined by the ancient civil or canonical codes sodomy was a category of forbidden *acts*; their perpetrator was nothing more than the juridical subject of them.” By contrast, the homosexual emerged in the nineteenth century as “a *personage*, a past, a case history and a childhood, in addition to being a type of life, a life form, and a morphology, with an indiscreet anatomy and possibly a mysterious physiology” (Foucault 43, emphasis mine). These classificatory labels (homosexual, gay, lesbian, etc.) were later assumed as positive identities, but the stigma that originally attached to them is in many contexts still there today: an important aspect of Mills’ notion of the specter of sodomy.

The fact that our modern categories of gender and sexual identity do not precisely map onto medieval ones does not invalidate the usefulness of thinking about medieval texts through the prism of these modern categories. Their divergence from medieval understandings of gender and sex invites us to think about the “naturalness” or normality of today’s categories, and to reflect on the historical intersections of sex and gender with social role, religion, and genre. Ridiculing friars as womanizers and hinting that they engaged in queer practices, as the *Summoner’s Prologue* and *Tale* does, is typical of antifraternal satire, which is meant to be offensive. The *Tale* is also a fabliau: a popular, obscene narrative, sexual or scatological (or both), in which, frequently, a character with pretensions is taken down by a trickster figure, and which is often “concerned with the politics of gender and class.” (Scanlon 163) In Chaucer’s text genre crucially shapes the categories of gender and sexuality. Antifraternal satire is not the subjective expression by friars of their gender and sexual identity.

## Antifraternal Stereotypes II: The Womanizer



Womanizing friar. Book of Hours (the calendar page for December), Nantes (?), 3rd quarter 15th century. Genève, Bibliothèque de Genève, MS. lat. 33, f. 12v ([www.e-codices.unifr.ch](http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch)).

Friars made vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, but had a reputation for chasing women. In Chaucer's *General Prologue*, the Friar is portrayed as acquisitive and a womanizer, able to extract a "ferthyng" ["farthing, a coin worth a quarter of a penny"] (GP 255) from even a poor widow, and paying for the marriages of those women he'd made pregnant: "He hadde maad ful many a mariage / Of yonge wommen at his owene cost" (GP 212-13). A barbed reference in *The Wife of Bath's Tale* satirizes friars' womanizing by ridiculing their sexual performance: "Wommen may go sauflly [safely] up and down. / In every bussh or under every tree / There is noon other incubus [spirit that has sex with women] but he, / And he ne wol doon hem but dishonour [he'll only damage their reputation]" (WBT 878-81). In the criminal records of late medieval Winchester, friars are commonly listed as prostitutes' clients (Geltner 99). And in his influential antifraternal polemical tract, the *Defensio curatorum* (1357), Richard FitzRalph, the Archbishop of Armagh, condemns friars for the thrill they derive from being "the privyeste counseile [most secret confidant] of wymmen": a reference to friars' abuse of the privilege of hearing confession in order to get close to women (FitzRalph 73).

## Antifraternal Stereotypes III: The Sodomitical Friar

Friars were also associated with sodomy, though the evidence is not as extensive as for their skirt-chasing. In the late fourteenth century, the dissident lollards accused friars of committing the "cursed synne of sodom" (Matthew 1880, 6). A macaronic poem (one that mingles two languages, in this case, English and Latin) of 1490, known as *Freers, freers, wo ye be* ["Friars, friars, woe to you"], briefly mentions that friars are as interested in a man's son as in his wife and daughter: "Lat a ffreer off sum ordur, / *tecum pernoctare* / Odur thi wyff or thi doughtor / *hic vult violare*; / Or thi sun he weyl prefur, / *sicut ffurtam ffortis*" ["Let a friar of any order stay the night with you, and he'll either want to rape your wife or daughter, or he'll show a preference for your son, like a strong thief"]. Sodomy in the Middle Ages, however, meant far more than male-male anal sex. It could refer to any kind of sex that was not between a man and a woman, or not intended for reproduction, such as masturbation, oral sex, bestiality, or sex between women. Indeed, sodomy could refer to all forms of inordinate desire. Foucault called sodomy "that utterly confused category" by which he meant that in the premodern period in the west neither persons identified as sodomites nor sodomitical acts had any coherence or specificity (101). Sodomy was also a metaphor. Accusations of sodomy were used to slander religious dissidents, such as the

lollards (Dinshaw 55-99) or the Knights Templar, one of whom is seen in the margins of a mid-fourteenth-century manuscript worshipping at and kissing an anus (Mills 275-6). The charge of sodomy was used to demonize religious others, such as Iberian Muslims (Hutcheson 2001).



Friar fox. Hours of Yolande of Flanders, Paris, ca. 1353-1363. British Library, MS Yates Thompson 27, fol. 30r. Friars as wily, deceptive, and rapacious.

In medieval theology both sodomitical behaviors and greed were seen as types of *luxuria*, that is, inordinate or transgressive desire. The proverbial gluttony and rapaciousness of friars was often associated with the anus as a site of evil and inversion (the overturning of hierarchies) (Beechy 74). In a famous Latin legal deposition recorded in London in 1394, a male prostitute passing as a woman, who went by the names of John and Eleanor Rykener, is reported as having committed “that detestable, unmentionable [Latin *nephandum*], and ignominious vice” (possibly a code word for male-male anal sex, but other “unnatural” sex acts might be intended; “unmentionable” because the Church feared that to give precise details would encourage people to try it) with two Franciscan friars, one Carmelite friar, and two foreign Franciscan friars (Karras and Boyd 111-12). Although this document cannot simply be treated as a statement of fact, because Rykener’s words are those of the recording clerk and because the circumstances of his arraignment are unclear, nevertheless this testimony seems to confirm the popular link between friars and what Tiffany Beechy calls “transgressive sexuality” (74).

#### **Antifraternal Stereotypes IV: Confession and Secret Spaces**

Confession, in Rita Copeland’s words, “invests broad social power and profound spiritual authority in the individual priest, powers that occupy both public and *secret spaces*” (392, emphasis mine). Anxiety about friars’ usurpation of the priestly privilege of hearing of confession often translated into anxiety about their penetration into the secret spaces of the household – and its potential for sexual exploitation of women. It is seen in the poem [Preste, Ne Monke, Ne Yit Chanoun](#), which warns: “Ich man that here shal lede his life [each man alive], / That has a faire doghter or a wyfe, / Be war that no frer ham shryfe” [“that no friar hear their confession”]. This anxiety is also evident in FitzRalph’s comment above, that friars had a role as “the privyeste counseile [most secret confidant] of wymmen.”

#### **Text**



Insulted by the Friar's association of summoners with the devil, and by his final ironic reference to hell as the "heritage" [spiritual inheritance] of summoners (FrT 1641), the Summoner gets even. He kicks off with a fable that puts friars right inside the devil's arsehole. His Prologue's terrifying, [Bosch-like vision](#) of 20,000 friars swarming out of Satan's anus like bees "from an hyve," and returning to it, presents friars' activity as infernal, excremental, furious, recursive, and (ironically) unproductive (and unreproductive) (SumP 1693). The Summoner's moral is that a friar's natural "heritage" (picking up the Friar's reference) is to always have the devil's arse in/on their mind. For Tison Pugh, this vision is "the utmost parody of sodomitical intercourse," in which "the penetration is not merely that of the male member" but "of the male's entire body and his whole fraternal order" (59). But I see this less as a direct reference to anal sex than as a satiric imagining of an arsy-versy world in which friars, who outwardly profess obedience to God, are not only in league with the devil but infest the most private place of his anatomy. Yet the association of the anus with the private and with "unnatural" sexuality raises the specter of sodomy: friars, like sodomites, are shameful and abject.

Friar John's schtick is to extract money from even the poorest person. The *Tale* brilliantly exposes how he does this (and fails), but it also reveals the motive behind the satire, namely the bitter turf wars between friars and the secular clergy. (The point of view of the *Tale* is, however, that of the laity.) The *Tale* alludes to three offices of parish priests that were also performed by friars – preaching, burying the dead, and confession. It opens with a reference to Friar John's inciting "the peple in his prechyng / To trentals" ["to give money for thirty requiem masses sung for a soul in Purgatory"] (SumT 1716-7). The friar then enters a house he has often visited, that of a parishioner, Thomas, and tells Thomas's wife that he has come to speak with her husband because "curatz" ["parish priests"] are "ful necligent and slowe / To grope [examine] tendrely [with solicitous care] a conscience / In shrift [confession]" (SumT 1816-8). Secondly, we guess from his fulsomely bogus response to the wife's casual mention of her child having died two weeks earlier while he was out of town that Friar John is chagrined to have missed the opportunity to earn money by burying the dead, but anxious to ingratiate himself with the wife (SumT 1852-3). He assures her that he saw a vision of her child carried to heaven, that the whole convent prayed for the child, and that the prayers of friars are more "effectueel" ["efficacious"] (SumT 1870) than those of priests, because of their "poverté and ... abstinence" (SumT 1873). The *Tale* thus builds up a picture of a man who shapes his occupational identity – and thus gender identity – through his superiority to his rivals, an identity that is in turn shaped by the *Tale's* genre as antifraternal satire and as fabliau. Our awareness of the shaping role of genre usefully reminds us that Friar John is made up of text, and that we do not have access to his subjective gender identity.

The stereotype of the womanizing friar further shapes the presentation of Friar John. There are hints that he is sexually interested in Thomas's wife; when he enters the house, he "hire embraceth in his armes narwe" ["tightly"] – does he need to hold her quite so closely? – and "kiste hire sweete" (SumT 1803-4), and flirts with her: "Yet saugh I nat [I didn't see] this day so fair a wyf [woman] / In al the chirche" (SumT 1808-9). Professional and gender identity here satirically intersect. There is an undercurrent of inappropriate sexual suggestiveness in their pretentious banter ("Now, dame, ... now *je vous dy sanz doute* ...") (SumT 1837) and in the wife's complaint that her sick husband does not respond to her sexual advances: "I may nat plesse hym in no maner cas" (SumT 1831). Today we might describe their interchange as heterosexual

banter and Chaucer's text as heteronormative, that is, as reinforcing a cultural norm, but it doesn't make much sense to talk of norms in the Middle Ages, because norms derive from the nineteenth-century science of statistics, although we can talk about the powerful medieval category of the "natural," by which "proper" sexual behavior was judged. In any case, gender rather than sexual identity is at stake here: John's flirtatiousness is a parody of male aristocratic gallantry that satirizes friars' womanizing and their penetration into the space of the household. It is worth noting that the presentation of the wife's gender and sexual identity is shaped by the clerical, antifeminist stereotype of the sex-hungry wife, a stereotype that also informs the *Wife of Bath's Prologue*.

Friar John gets his come-uppance in two stages. The first is when Thomas, tired of the friar's money-grubbing, promises to give him something, on the condition that John will divide it equally amongst the other friars. Thomas instructs him: "'put in thyn hand down by my bak, / ...and grope [feel] wel bihynde. / Bynethe my buttoke there shaltow [you will] fynde / A thing that I have hyd in pryvetee" ["in a secret place"] (SumT 2140-43). In Middle English, *gropen* can mean to examine someone's conscience (the sense in which the friar intended it at 1817), but also to feel with the hand or fingers, touch, stroke, play with, or fondle: in other words, Thomas invites the Friar to caress his anus. Excited by the prospect of riches, the friar "doun his hand ... launcheth [thrusts] to the clifte [cleft between the buttocks] / In hope for to fynde there a yifte [gift]. / And whan this sike man felte this frere / Aboute his tuwel [anus] grope there and heere, / Amydde his hand he leet the frere [let fly to the friar] a fart" (SumT 2145-49).

The arsehole, in medieval culture as today, has an apotropaic function; that is, it wards off evil (think mooning on the battlefield, or the expression "kiss my ass"). Thomas wards off the friar's evil by presenting him with his *tuwel*. In this sense the arsehole is desexualized: a social sign, not a sexual one. Yet the erotic connotations of *gropen*, and the reference to the buttocks [*buttok*, *clifte*] and the anus [*pryvetee*, *tuwel*] carry a mock-sodomitical innuendo, suggesting that Thomas is encouraging the friar to finger-fuck him. But it's Thomas who effectively fucks the friar. It's another of the *Tale's* inversions of the bodily and social orders: arse on the mind; educated friar bested by a "cherle."

Friar John's outraged complaint to the lord to whom he's confessor that "this olde cherle" Thomas has blasphemed the convent is initially met with sympathy (SumT 2182). The lady declares that "a cherl hath doon a cherles dede," essentializing Thomas's gender and role identity (peasants will be peasants) (SumT 2206). But the lord's grudging admiration for Thomas shows a sense that gender and role categories could be fluid: "How hadde this cherl ymaginacioun / To shewe swich a problem to the frere?" (SumT 2218-9). And while the aristocrat, in lofty scholastic fashion, diagnoses the logical and mathematical terms of the problem – the division of the fart is, he pronounces, "an impossible" ["a logical impossibility"], it is the young squire, lower in the social hierarchy, who most fully performs aristocratic masculinity by devising an elegant arithmetical/arse-metrikal solution, which further mocks friars' apostolic pretensions, insofar as it is a parody of Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit (*pneuma*: divine breath/air) descends upon the twelve apostles (SumT 2231). The squire is praised for his "subtiltee," and awarded a new set of clothes, affirming that though only a lord's servant he is smart beyond both his years and station: one of the ways in which Chaucer, who himself started his career as a squire,

demonstrates the reality of social mobility, another important theme of *The Canterbury Tales* (SumT 2290).

At the end of the tale, the lord provides one of the many links between the tale's themes and its poetic form in his observation that the "rumbling of a fart" and "every soun" are "but of eir [air] reverberacioun" (SumT 2233-4). Both farts and speech are only broken air, but they are also both signifiers. Concomitantly, the idea of inversion – friars' improper overturning of social hierarchies – links sodomitical sex with the sliding signifier in what Catherine Cox calls "a narrative erotics" (117), from the friar's wheedling demand for money (he complains to Thomas that they have barely finished building the convent's "fundament [foundations, with a pun on arse/ass]" (SumT 2103)), to the dual senses of *gropen* as confession and caressing, to the lord's "arse-metrike," which links fart-division with the assy-metrical, the cul-culating, and the arsy-versy.

## Conclusion

I have argued that the gender and sexual identities in *The Summoner's Prologue* and *Tale* are largely constructed by and through its twin genres of antifraternal critique and fabliau. This is one reason why the text can, apparently paradoxically, insinuate that friars are both womanizers and sodomites: the underlying motive for the critique is not the threat of their sexuality but that friars are seen as deeply inimical to the social order. Gender identity and sexual identity in the text are not clearly separate; behavior that we might consider heterosexual (a category of sexual identity), such as Friar John's flirtatiousness, is more likely to have been seen then as an aspect of gender, one that intersects with social class and occupation. And because they are literary creations, the characters can never attest to an "authentic" sexual and gender identity.

## Transformation

1. Compare and contrast the portrait of the Friar in the *General Prologue* to *The Canterbury Tales* (GP 208-269) with the representation of Friar John in *The Summoner's Prologue* and *Tale*.
2. Look up *ars-metric* in the OED. What are its meanings in the Middle Ages? Patricia Parker notes that in the early modern period "'ars-metric' is associated with Arabic learning and its backward writing": there is a connection between inversion (arsy-versy), sex by the backdoor, and spelling "backwards," as Jews and Muslims do (42). What is "ars-metrike" associated with in Chaucer's text? What other wordplay is there in the *The Summoner's Prologue* and *Tale*, and how does it contribute to the presentation of gender and sexual identities?
3. The *General Prologue* to *The Canterbury Tales* hints at a close relationship between the Summoner and the Pardoner. How productive is it to read *The Summoner's Tale* in conjunction with the portrait of the Pardoner and *The Pardoner's Prologue* and *Tale*, and to think about how these tales figure relations between men and gender and sexual identities?
4. *The Summoner's Tale* has been very little adapted for cinema, theater, or television. Suggest some reasons why. One notable exception is Pier Paolo Pasolini's [\*I racconti di Canterbury\*](#) (1972), a film adaptation of eight of Chaucer's tales, which concludes with



*The Summoner's Tale*. What does Pasolini's interpretation of the tale add to your understanding of Chaucer's text? Why do you think Pasolini was interested in this tale, and why in 1972?

5. In another obscene tale from *The Canterbury Tales*, *The Miller's Tale*, the young scholar Nicholas lets fly a fart to humiliate his rival Absolon. Absolon, furious, plants a hot coulter (a tool used in ploughing) on what he believes to be the arse of his now hated beloved, Alison. In Robert Mills's words, he "mistakenly directs his tool at the wrong object, ... which effectively reorients his performance in a sodomitical direction" (Mills 277). To what extent do *The Summoner's Prologue* and *Tale* reorient the narrative "in a sodomitical direction," and with what aim? Are there any similarities between the way in which the fart is used within *The Miller's Tale* and *The Summoner's Tale* with respect to defining gender and sexual identities?
6. Suggest some reasons why readers today are interested in gender and sexual identities in the past, even when they are presented negatively.

### **Works Cited and Suggestions for Further Reading:**

*Alan of Lille: The Complaint of Nature*. Trans. James J. Sheridan. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1980.

Allen, Valerie. *On Farting: Language and Laughter in the Late Middle Ages*. The New Middle Ages. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Beechy, Tiffany. "Devil Take the Hindmost: Chaucer, John Gay, and the Pecuniary Anus." *The Chaucer Review* 41.1 (2006): 71–85.

Copeland, Rita. "Confessional Texts." *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature*. Ed. David Wallace. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999. 390–406.

Cox, Catherine S. *Gender and Language in Chaucer*. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 1997.

Dinshaw, Carolyn. *Getting Medieval: Sexualities and Communities, Pre- and Postmodern*. Durham: Duke, 1999.

Fitzralph, Richard. *Defensio curatorum*. Trans. John Trevisa. Ed. Aaron Jenkins Perry, EETS, OS 167. London Oxford UP, 1925.

Forrest, Ian. "The Summoner." *Historians on Chaucer: The 'General Prologue' to The Canterbury Tales*, Edited by Stephen Rigby and Alastair Minnis. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2015. 421–442.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1: An Introduction*. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage, 1990.

Gaunt, Simon. "Straight Minds/'Queer' Wishes in Old French Hagiography." *Premodern Sexualities*, Edited by Louise Fradenburg and Carla Freccero. New York and London: Routledge, 1996. 155–73.

Geltner, G. *The Making of Medieval Antifraternalism: Polemic, Violence, Deviance, and Remembrance*. New York: Oxford UP, 2012.

Gower, John. *The Voice of One Crying. The Major Works of John Gower: The Voice of One Crying and The Tripartite Chronicle*, Edited by Eric W. Stockton. Seattle: Uof Washington P, 1962.

Hutcheson, Gregory S. "The Sodomitic Moor: Queerness in the Narrative of Reconquista." *Queering the Middle Ages*, Edited by Glenn Burger and Steven F Kruger. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2001. 99–122.

Jordan, Mark, D. *The Invention of Sodomy in Christian Theology*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1997.

Karras, Ruth Mazo and David Lorenzo Boyd. "'Ut cum muliere': A Male Transvestite Prostitute in Fourteenth-Century London." *Premodern Sexualities*, Edited by Louise Fradenburg and Carla Freccero. New York and London: Routledge, 1996. 99–116.

Masi, Michael. *Boethian Number Theory: A Translation of the De Institutione Arithmetica*. Studies in Classical Antiquity, 6. Rodopi: Amsterdam, 1983.

Matthew, F. D. *The English Works of Wyclif*. EETS OS 74. London: Trübner, 1880.

Mills, Robert. "Homosexuality: Spectres of Sodom." *A Cultural History of Sexuality in the Middle Ages*, Edited by Ruth Evans. Oxford: Berg, 2011. 57–80.

Mills, Robert. *Seeing Sodomy in the Middle Ages*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2015.

O'Brien, Timothy. "'Ars-Metrik': Science, Satire, and Chaucer's Summoner." *Mosaic: An Interdisciplinary Critical Journal* 23.4 (1990): 1–22.

O'Rourke, Michael. *Fisting and Other Gifts for the Graduate Students*. 2017.  
<http://www.inthemedievalmiddle.com/2007/03/fisting-and-other-gifts-for-graduate.html>.

Parker, Patricia. "Spelling Backwards." *Rhetoric, Women and Politics in Early Modern England*, Edited by Jennifer Richards and Alison Thorne. London: Routledge, 2007. 25–50.

Pugh, Tison. *Queering Medieval Genres. The New Middle Ages*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Salih, Sarah. "Sexual Identities: A Medieval Perspective." *Sodomy in Early Modern Europe*, Edited by Tom Betteridge. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2002. 112–30.

Scanlon, Larry. *Narrative, Authority, and Power: The Medieval Exemplum and the Chaucerian Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.

Szittyá, Penn R. *The Antifraternal Tradition in Medieval Literature*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 1986.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).