

Introduction

Helen M. Hickey, Anne McKendry and Melissa Raine

In *Congenial Souls* (2002), Stephanie Trigg placed Chaucer scholarship at a crossroads, declaring that ‘it may be time to refigure both our understanding of the past and our relation to the future of literary studies’.¹ A decade and a half on, this volume evinces the positive and productive response to Trigg’s call for change by considering both how that future has come to form the present critical moment, and what the Chaucerian past means to us now.

Central to this exploration of Chaucer’s contemporaneity across the centuries is the pioneering research of Trigg herself, whose reputation as an outstanding medieval scholar is closely aligned with her signature concept: the symptomatic long history. As exemplified by *Congenial Souls* and *Shame and Honor* (2012),² this critical methodology carefully interrogates moments of reflexivity, as well as instances of heightened tension between past and present within seemingly stable traditions. In *Congenial Souls*, she argues that ‘the “Chaucer effect” is not the glorious culmination of continuous and harmonious tradition; rather, it is a negatively structured phenomenon produced by the changing and rival discourses of Chaucer criticism, from which none of us is immune’.³ Trigg tackles this illusory continuity through close scrutiny of ‘the discursive voices of Chaucer criticism’ and their construction of traditions, communities and rivalries in relation both to their scholarly predecessors and to their contemporary critical circles, always attentive to how ‘new models of hearing Chaucer’s voice’ reposition seemingly incidental aspects of research as potent enablers of discursive communities.⁴

The methodology established in *Congenial Souls* is similarly integral to Trigg’s approach to the mutually distrustful divide between medieval studies and the study of medievalism; a distrust inherited from nineteenth-century pedagogical constructs and

entrenched by twentieth-century medieval scholarship's dismissal of medievalism as 'popular culture'. *Shame and Honor* applies sustained pressure to this boundary, in the process shedding the 'secondary' status often assigned to medievalism and its 'derivative' associations.⁵ Vexed questions of historical accuracy and factuality are reconceptualised as 'multiple, layered temporalities' and 'mythic capital'.⁶ Such challenges to traditionally secure conceptual delineations and the insights afforded by their re-evaluation regularly coalesce in Trigg's scholarship.

Trigg's scrupulous unpacking of symptomatic moments underscores her sympathetic yet penetrating understanding of the relationship between scholarly research and contemporary social, political and cultural contexts. An illuminating example of this occurs in *Congenial Souls*: Trigg highlights the historical gender bias of the Chaucerian 'community', arguing that it is 'more like a "club" that polices entry on the basis of the applicant's likeness to Chaucer' and where 'imaginative empathy with Chaucer ... often mask[s] a more directly homosocial form of identification'.⁷ Arguing that 'For women readers, the implications of this pattern of identification are crucial', Trigg throws these implications into sharp relief by replicating one of the activities that defines this club's membership: she occupies the 'unofficial space in prefaces and introductions' that (mostly male) Chaucerians have long reserved for 'informal, jovial invocations and impersonations of Chaucer'.⁸ In the form of a spurious epigram, Trigg writes herself into her own *Canterbury Tales* continuation, in which 'the Pardoner' boasts that he will "'top you all with the tale of a woman who, like myself in a way, made her living by speaking in public, and how she lectured on Chaucer to students at a university in Australia'".⁹ Having stressed the centrality of (an often implicitly English) masculinity to Chaucerian communing, the featuring of herself, an Australian woman, as the subject of a Canterbury pilgrim's tale disrupts the cosy recognition that such playful fragments are intended to invoke, teasing apart the interwoven textual, critical and cultural threads that are symptomatic of her own historical moment. Trigg's treatment of this rhetorical strategy exemplifies her nuanced understanding of the role of the supposedly inconsequential utterance in reinforcing and excluding voices from communities. This awareness extends beyond the context of Chaucerian congeniality into her broader concern with challenging the paradigms of privilege and disenfranchisement in academic criticism.

This commitment to politically engaged research is also apparent in Trigg's consciousness of her participation in a scholarly community based in the southern hemisphere. For instance, when foregrounding the distinctive uses of the gothic and the medieval in Australian culture, she reconceives Australia's geographical and critical distance from the North American and British centres of medieval studies (and anglophone humanities scholarship more broadly) as a strength, rather than a deficit, to interlocution:

Poised between the traditional ties with Britain, the successive waves of post-war European and Asian migration, a growing affinity with American culture, and an increasing consciousness of indigenous tradition, Australian critics deploy a sophisticated, global awareness of the working of cultural influence and historical tradition, at both an academic and a more popular level.¹⁰

This privileging of an Australian critical perspective asserts the ethical significance of accommodating difference more generally – insisting, in other words, that diverse voices generate fresh and incisive research perspectives.

Trigg's latest thinking about the politics of research has combined powerfully with her investigation into the history of emotions. In *Affective Medievalism* (2018), Trigg and co-author Thomas A. Prendergast construct a more local, personal and affective historical framework through which to explore the concept of 'medievalism as pretext to the medieval' in a pointed inversion of traditional critical approaches.¹¹ In their final chapter, the authors call for an end to the 'mutual exclusion' between medieval studies and medievalism studies, arguing that such separateness 'is not only intellectually misleading but also politically damaging',¹² especially considering the current climate in Western universities in which the humanities are increasingly threatened. Trigg and Prendergast argue that both fields

have every reason to engage with contemporary debates about politics, meaning and culture; to articulate the power of literary and cultural texts, and patterns of historical change; to inform the way we track social change, the way our feelings of and knowledge about the past can change, and the relation between politics, society and the imagination.¹³

This characteristic process of intellectual inquiry also informs Trigg's interest in the relationship between emotions and cultural practices. The history of emotions is a vibrant area of inquiry

for the humanities and, as Trigg notes, ‘the “affective turn” in the domain of academic study also refers to scholarship that foregrounds the emotional work performed by cultural and social commentary as well as our variable degrees of emotional investment in our chosen objects of study’.¹⁴ Trigg softens an often rigidly held distinction by articulating the significance of emotion to both the object of research and the critical methodology applied to it, generating space for reappraisals of previously unconsidered relationships between research object and method, as well as emotion and cognition. The application of a history of emotions framework to the themes and approaches recurrent in her work productively augments Trigg’s critical interrogation of the intersection of ethics, politics and history.

Trigg’s scholarship is typically incisive, historically informed, enthusiastic and expansive. Her unflagging commitment to advancing knowledge in her chosen fields is evident in her own publications, as well as in her willing participation in the debates and dialogues taking place within the academy, coupled with a strong desire to foster active and meaningful engagement with the world outside the university. These hallmarks of her critical style attest to her generous, open and inclusive vision of scholarly community. The diverse approaches, debates and inspirations that connect the chapters in this collection with her work all affirm the resonance of her criticism within contemporary medieval scholarship.

In recognition of the methodological strengths of the symptomatic long history, we have arranged the volume’s chapters in loosely chronological fashion. However, since the contributions also speak to each other thematically across historical periods, the following discussion describes how their interactions address the shape and concerns of current critical debates. Moreover, we see in these interactions both implicit and explicit dialogue with Trigg’s literary criticism, forming intriguing responses to her call to rethink the nature of contemporary scholarship, especially the place of Chaucer within it, and what the medieval past means to us now.

Paul Strohm’s thought-provoking meditation on his relationship with Chaucer, as both critic and biographer, opens this collection and engages with one of its major themes: the intellectual and affective experience of communing with Geoffrey Chaucer in the centuries since his death. Strohm wryly admits that his desire ‘to have a drink with’ Chaucer confirms Trigg’s ‘worst suspicions of male-to-male complicity’ in the futile quest to recover the ‘real’

Chaucer from the simulacrum his poetry constructs. However, Strohm goes on to suggest that there may indeed be intellectually ‘defensible elements’ embedded in the nebulous relations with a revered author such as Chaucer, and he finds these traces in his experience with the poet both as the ‘author-in-the-text’ and through what he terms the ‘biographical encounter’. By engaging with and then complicating the argument in *Congenial Souls*, Strohm reframes the possibility of identification with Chaucer by stepping back from individual texts to consider the poet’s literature as a whole – a *gestalt* – through which the reader may discern ‘certain recurring traits and dispositions – recurring postures and attitudes’ to admire.¹⁵ Furthermore, Strohm’s research as a Chaucer biographer prompts him to consider this *gestalt* as a dynamic experience, in an implicit comment upon the vicissitudes of the concept of authorship in critical discourse.

Whereas Strohm has sought an individualised connection with Chaucer-the-man through both his *gestalt* and the historical reality of his day-to-day life as a civil servant and poet, Louise D’Arcens identifies a more generalised pursuit of ‘transhistorical empathy’ with Chaucer through ‘the longstanding preoccupation with Chaucer’s face ... [that] forms its own subgenre of reception’ (chapter 13). Challenging the tenet that ‘transhistorical feeling’ is simply a form of naive projection to be eschewed by historians of emotions, D’Arcens draws upon the hermeneutic concept of *Einfühlung* (‘feeling into’) for her examination of the long ‘empathetic afterlife’ enjoyed by Chaucer’s ‘personae’. In the process, she synthesises Chaucer scholarship, medievalism studies and history of emotions research. Drawing from sources as diverse as late-medieval manuscripts, William Blake’s engravings, nineteenth-century poetry and, in particular, performance (specifically, Pier Paolo Pasolini’s 1972 film, *I Racconti di Canterbury* and comedian Bill Bailey’s stand-up routine from 2001), D’Arcens makes a powerful case for an empathetic-experiential paradigm, acknowledging ‘Trigg’s focus on affective reception in *Congenial Souls*’, and deploys that paradigm to demonstrate how the drive to connect emotionally with the subject ‘Geoffrey Chaucer’ may even displace his writing.

Stephanie Downes also productively engages with Trigg’s research on the face as a site of signification, emotion and communication (chapter 5). Downes differentiates between the movement of the speaking face, crucial to conveying its meaning, and facial pallor that ‘need not involve any movement at all’. Working from

the position that a pale face 'is not something the subject alone can readily perceive', unlike smiling, frowning, blushing or crying, Downes refigures Chaucer's pale faces as offering 'a hermeneutic guide' that asks his readers 'to deploy their own experiential and intertextual face-reading skills'. Downes brings this history of emotions perspective into dialogue with James Simpson's insistence that 'literary cognition is fundamentally a matter of re-cognition' – a stance he reprises in the final chapter of this collection – contributing a fresh perspective to the vibrant discussion of affective experience and the interpretation of textual faces in a specifically Chaucerian context.

Similarly exploiting the rich potential offered by a history-of-emotions – or, more precisely, a history of 'feelings' – approach for reading Chaucer's poetry, Elizabeth Robertson (chapter 2) finds Keats's sensorily evocative concept of 'snail horn perception' apposite for *Troilus and Criseyde's* snail imagery, whereby extension into and withdrawal from the world, principally through the sense of sight, forms the basis for processing an overwhelming intersubjective encounter. Robertson uncovers the significance of medieval optical theory in Chaucer's 'profound investigation of the nature of emotion [through] an in-depth representation of the complex physiological and psychological processes involved in seeing' in *Troilus and Criseyde*. Her finely calibrated exploration of the sensory force and emotional impact of the first encounter between Criseyde and Troilus elucidates the dialectic between the senses and the mind that informs the overpowering experience of falling in love in this text.

By characterising the intermingling of body and world as 'transcorporeality', Jeffrey Jerome Cohen catapults us into atmosphere, not only into the physical layers of air that surround the earth, but also into the 'heavy atmosphere' of Chaucer's *Reeve's Tale*. In chapter 6, Cohen offers a sophisticated analysis of the relationship between medieval texts, emotions, the environment and the current critical moment; in so doing, he reveals the parallel between the earth's atmosphere and the emotional atmosphere that refuses to be contained by the medieval texts that create it. Furthermore, through examples of transcendence – Troilus, celestial beings, astronauts – Cohen reminds his earth-bound readers that 'weighty atmosphere' is difficult to escape.¹⁶ Cohen's intermingling of premodern and modern transcorporeal modes of being is also suggestive for rethinking concepts of Chaucerian communities, past and present.

Frank Grady, in chapter 7, considers an atmosphere of a different kind, namely, the psycho-social premodern *zeitgeist* that governs the interplay between literary convention and the construction of a seigneurial self, as expressed in the work of two of the fourteenth century's most significant poets. Trigg's reading of the circular and linear narratives in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* is Grady's starting point; he takes Trigg's emphasis on the 'difference in [the] sameness' of *Sir Gawain*'s structure and inverts it, focusing on 'sameness in difference' in order to ascertain parallels between *Sir Gawain* and Chaucer's *Book of the Duchess*.¹⁷ Common to both narratives – albeit unspoken, in the case of *Sir Gawain* – is the overarching significance of Fortune, a force whose continuously turning wheel produces the repetition visible in conventional medieval narratives of aristocratic rise and fall. Despite the texts' differences, Grady argues that their shared 'seigneurial poetics' result in a similarly 'hydraulic' mobilisation of their hunting scenes, allowing Gawain and the Man in Black to eschew temporarily the demands of chivalric action while they experience the non-courtly states of enforced bedrest and overwhelming melancholy. In Grady's memorable assessment, 'Hunting is where the idea of seigneurial agency goes to hide when the narrative of Fortune rears its head' – a formulation that sharpens our awareness of the complicated interface between literary production and the chivalric conventions that structure aristocratic self-image.

In chapter 3, Helen Cooper's discernment of the subtle nuances of Chaucer's parody in *Sir Thopas* combines with a determination to 'hear' Chaucer's voice without 'killing the joke'; a critical framework that illuminates a literary Chaucer who is contemporary across the centuries. Mindful of the tale's dual audiences – the reader or listener who appreciates Chaucer's virtuosity, and the pilgrim audience that does not perceive the parody – Cooper furnishes a nimble and affectionate survey of potential sources for the seemingly minor detail of *Sir Thopas*'s 'mourning maidens'. She finds that 'Middle English romance could embrace a plurality of mourning and sleepless maidens', who are generally treated with 'the same kind of light touch that Shakespearean comedy carries'. These depictions form a striking contrast with the psychological flatness and lack of agency displayed by the maidens of *Sir Thopas*, leading Cooper to conclude that Chaucer's suppression of the conventional romance maiden is an overlooked contribution to the parodic intent of his tale. Cooper's approach deftly demonstrates

the ongoing potential for enriching the meaning of Chaucer's texts through close attention to contemporary intertextuality.

Where Cooper identifies meaning in overlooked intertextual connections, Ruth Evans's meticulous scrutiny of Chaucer's poetic technique reveals a lacuna in the scholarship and asks why 'rhyme-breaking' – "where syntax crosses rhyme units" – has barely registered among Chaucerian critics before now (chapter 4). Evans traces the origins and effect of rhyme-breaking, a little-studied yet powerfully expressive device, arguing that Chaucerian rhyme-breaking warrants closer attention not only for its poetic function, but also for its potential to illuminate Chaucer's position within the multilingual context of late-medieval England.¹⁸ With the exception of Stephen Knight and Thomas Ohlgren, Evans notes, critics have generally overlooked Chaucer's rhyme-breaking, despite its presence in the *Canterbury Tales*, the *Book of the Duchess*, the *Legend of Good Women* and *Troilus and Criseyde*. According to Evans, Chaucer 'exploits the technique to produce a range of narrative effects'; it is especially effective when utilised 'to produce an ironic effect' that gives dynamism to his verse. Moreover, Evans draws attention to the political possibilities of form, and her casting of Chaucer as a European versifier also participates in the growing critical concern with situating Chaucer in a broader global context.

In the late fifteenth century, the overlap between manuscript production and the new technology of printing significantly affected organisational and compositional editing principles.¹⁹ In chapters 8 and 9, Thomas A. Prendergast and David Matthews search for the intent behind two examples of editorial intervention in this period, in both cases situating Chaucer's texts within these broader dynamics. In his examination of the 'Chaucerian' *Prologue* to the *Tale of Beryn*, Prendergast argues that 'th[e] privileging of the author's recuperable intention is more modern than medieval', raising the question of how the *Beryn*-scribe understood his own compositional practice when he acted upon an irresistible desire to complete the pilgrims' journey to Canterbury. Among the relevant conceptual categories of authorship, scribal activity and textual completeness, Prendergast's response to this question attributes agency to the text itself – not supplanting other forms of intervention, but complicating their interactions. Prendergast's case study bypasses the authorially oriented Chaucerian text to alight on something that could be described as "Canterbury Talesian", with compelling implications for both the medieval

understanding of the *intentio auctoris*, and the concept of author and text more broadly.

Matthews also identifies substantial discrimination within editorial and discursive modes, this time at work in William Caxton's editing practices. Comparing Caxton's printing of John Trevisa's translation of Ranulph Higden's *Polychronicon* with his treatment of poetical works such as Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, Matthews argues that while Caxton 'locates himself as a philological editor where *verse* is concerned', the editor instead 'updates' the language in Trevisa's *Polychronicon* in an effort to achieve 'a modernity-effect'. However, Matthews resists the conclusion that Caxton is 'modernising' Middle English in linguistic terms and instead demonstrates that Caxton was engaged in a self-conscious attempt to render Trevisa's work into 'what the printer thought was good English, and what he wanted to be good English, in his time'. Matthews draws a nuanced distinction between conceiving of philology as a tool for the interpretation of an unfamiliar language, and as a practice that renders texts completely transparent for their own time, affirming in the process the distinctiveness apparent in Caxton's treatment of Chaucer's texts.

Nineteenth-century forms of medievalism intervened vigorously in contemporary debates about national identity, gender, class and the status of medieval literature (including its academic institutionalisation) in ways that still resonate in today's culture, politics and scholarship. The three chapters in this collection that interrogate the significance of Chaucer and the medieval past to nineteenth-century political, academic and cultural concerns do so from distinct yet complementary temporal and thematic perspectives.

Stephen Knight substantially enriches our knowledge of the eccentricities as well as the broader trends apparent in Chaucer's nineteenth-century popular reception through his survey of hitherto little-known Chauceriana, liberated from obscurity by the recent digitisation of archival records (chapter 10). Knight traces in painstaking detail the wide-ranging and at times unexpected contexts in which Chaucer appeared throughout the century, unearthing materials such as cartoons, poems and reviews in publications as diverse as *Cycling: An Illustrated Weekly*, newspapers, ladies' journals, children's books, and examples outside the popular press, including, as Knight happily notes, 'a victorious Victorian racehorse named Chaucer'. His overview tracks instances of symptomatic change in which Chaucer and his works participated in the promotion of national agendas of Englishness

(although not limited to England geographically), as well as the establishment of Middle English literature as a respectable field of academic enquiry.

One of the major impediments to the nineteenth-century project of Chaucer's canonisation was the incontrovertible fact of his Catholicism, and this is the focus of Andrew Lynch's analysis in chapter 11. Lynch identifies the strategy employed by nineteenth-century commentators to obscure this unpalatable truth by promoting 'a non-controversial critical discourse in which the poet figured as "Fresh Chaucer", "Simple Chaucer", and "Child Chaucer"'. These deft editorial interventions simultaneously transformed Chaucer into the father of English poetry and infantilised his Catholicism. This reach towards institutional adulthood, Lynch argues, engendered the suppression of certain of his works, such as the 'Retraction', while generating an increased interest in his possible association with John Wyclif. The effect of this combination was to enhance substantially Chaucer's reconfiguration as a proto-Protestant and representative of English nationalism.

The narrator of William Morris's *News from Nowhere* exhibits an elusive relationship with his medieval dream vision counterpart. In chapter 12, John Ganim teases out this shadowy presence by identifying the influence of Chaucer's own dream visions upon Morris's novel. As Ganim argues, the dream vision genre promoted the expression of 'psychological experience and fantasy', generating a 'free space' into which Morris weaves his perverse familial situation. Ganim's exploration of Morris's eroticised but anxious politics in this text also draws upon Trigg's study of the affective history of bluestone in her home state of Victoria.²⁰ For Ganim, this history of emotions framework illuminates the moment towards the end of the novel when the narrator's guide, Ellen, lays her hand on the wall of a house so that 'stones and emotions meet in an ecstatic union'. Through this encounter, and in an echo of Cohen's transcorporeality, Ganim draws out the implications of the ecosexual erotics of Morris's politics, combined with the masculine subjectivity informed by the medieval dream vision narrator, for the utopian vision of the novel.

In a fitting concluding chapter, James Simpson addresses incisively the concerns with which we introduced this volume: the formation of the critical present, the uses of the past, and the place of the humanities in contemporary academia. For Simpson, the idea of recognition is an essential mode of thinking that is distinctive

to humanities scholarship. By tracing interconnections within two pairings of literary texts – Virgil’s *Aeneid* with Dante’s *Divine Comedy* and Chaucer’s *Troilus and Criseyde* with Henryson’s *The Testament of Cresseid* – Simpson argues that ‘Understanding text is dependent on recognition of the text’s long pre-history, compacted into the deep coding of genre’. In other words, meaning in each text is generated by recognising prior experiences, textual or embodied, rendering the ‘recovery of truth ... all the more intense for having been known already’. Simpson’s paradigm of re-cognition – of how ‘recovery [of the already-known] always feels new’ – is itself a theory of contemporaneity, and a rallying cry for humanities scholarship to recover the connections he identifies within (or despite) current political and ideological constraints. In this framework, ‘recognition’ of the Chaucerian text is one example of ‘a marvellous uncovering of the immanent and already there’ that will generate new, unpredictable interpretations according to the context in which the process occurs; in such a schema, Chaucer – his life and his poetry – represents an ever-rich resource for the simultaneous ‘rediscovery’ of the past and the practice of innovative scholarship in the present. Simpson thus characterises the work of the humanities as *rediscovery* in place of *discovery*, and the chapters that comprise this collection undertake just such a practice.

The authors collectively strive for innovative methodologies as well as an attentive awareness of the cultural and political implications of their research, while maintaining a determined close focus on the texts themselves and their historical contexts. In the past, these approaches were, at times, considered mutually exclusive. Yet, as Trigg avers, such distinctions are far from stable. The past we think we know is endlessly open to revision according to what the present compels us to search for: the work of cultural, textual and historical rediscovery is never complete. Whatever motivates and shapes this desire to revisit the past, these authors participate in the centuries-long investigation into how and why Geoffrey Chaucer’s life, poetry and prose remain intensely affective, intellectual and contemporary.

Notes

- 1 Stephanie Trigg, *Congenial Souls: Reading Chaucer from Medieval to Postmodern* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002), p. xxiv.

- 2 Stephanie Trigg, *Shame and Honor: A Vulgar History of the Order of the Garter* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012).
- 3 Trigg, *Congenial Souls*, p. 21.
- 4 Trigg, *Congenial Souls*, p. 197.
- 5 Trigg, *Shame and Honor*, p. 26.
- 6 Trigg, *Shame and Honor*, pp. 95, 36.
- 7 Trigg, *Congenial Souls*, p. 28.
- 8 Trigg, *Congenial Souls*, pp. 38, 42.
- 9 Trigg, *Congenial Souls*, p. 40.
- 10 Stephanie Trigg (ed.), *Medievalism and the Gothic in Australian Culture* (Carlton: Melbourne University Publishing, 2006), p. xiii.
- 11 Thomas A. Prendergast and Stephanie Trigg, *Affective Medievalism: Love, Abjection and Discontent* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018), p. 5.
- 12 Prendergast and Trigg, *Affective Medievalism*, p. 120.
- 13 Prendergast and Trigg, *Affective Medievalism*, p. 121.
- 14 Stephanie Trigg, 'Introduction: emotional histories – beyond the personalization of the past and the abstraction of affect theory', *Exemplaria*, 26:1 (2014), 3–15 (p. 9).
- 15 Strohm takes the concept of *gestalt* from Roman Ingarden and Wolfgang Iser. See chapter 1 for detailed references.
- 16 Cohen's emphasis on atmosphere recalls his collaboration with Trigg on affect and the elements; see Jeffrey Jerome Cohen and Stephanie Trigg, 'Fire', *postmedieval*, 4:1 (2013), 80–92. Trigg continues this line of enquiry in her identification of a shared emotional response to the trauma of the Great Fire of 1666 and Victoria's devastating Black Saturday bushfires in 2012; see 'Vitreous archives: fire and transfigured objects', in Grace Moore (ed.), *On Fire* (Brooklyn: Punctum Books, forthcoming).
- 17 Stephanie Trigg, 'The romance of exchange: *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*', *Viator*, 22 (1991), 251–66.
- 18 On Chaucer's multilingual context, see Ardis Butterfield, *The Familiar Enemy: Chaucer, Language, and Nation in the Hundred Years War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); and for a wonderful contemporary collection, see Candace Barrington and Jonathan Hsy, *Global Chaucers: Online Archive and Community for post-1945, non-Anglophone Chauceriana*, <https://globalchaucers.wordpress.com>, accessed 6 May 2018.
- 19 Trigg's interest in the politics of editing began with her edition of *Wynnere and Wastoure*, in which she observed that 'The genre of the edition, its characteristic narrative stance, its decorum and its form are objects of study pending investigation in their own right: in the meantime, we are probably right to approach the editorial task with suspicion'; Stephanie Trigg (ed.), *Wynnere and Wastoure*, Early