

LOVE VERSUS MARRIAGE

by

BARBARA A. MILLER

B. A., Aligarh University, India, 1960

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of English

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1963

Approved by:


Major Professor

LD
2668
R4
1964
M647
C.2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
ANDREAS CAPELLANUS	20
MARRIAGE	30
CHAUCER	44
CONCLUSION	49
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	51
LITERATURE CITED	52

INTRODUCTION

In spite of the above title, this paper is an attempt to discuss the relation of the sexes in the Middle Ages, specifically, "Courtly Love", both from an historical point of view and from the standpoint of the women of the age.

As it progresses, the study of the subject of courtly love becomes very intriguing, but at the same time it becomes slightly confusing. Just about the time one thinks he has found the answer to the paradoxical and complex problem of this sex relationship, he finds himself off on another tangent. Thus I hope to be forgiven if, once in a while, I should inadvertently be led along another, and what might seem to be an unrelated, tangent. Also, I hope to be forgiven for the seemingly flippant title of this paper which, as well as the entire subject of courtly love, may seem entirely alien to the Twentieth-Century mind, the Romantic mind, which would undoubtedly title it, not "Love Versus Marriage", but, as the song goes, "Love and Marriage go together like a horse and carriage".

There are several institutions of the Middle Ages that have a bearing on courtly love, but one of the most important seems to be that of feudalism. The code of the behavior of the knight, chivalry, is one of the factors of feudalism. It was considered necessary for the knight to have at least one lady-love, married or otherwise, in his life at all times. If he had any intention of being a man of fashion, every knight

made a point of being in love, when he was not in battle. Whether he devoted himself

to one lady or distributed his favours broadcast was not a matter of much importance; but he was expected to pay exaggerated compliments and display elaborate courtesy towards ladies of his own class, but often he did not consider it necessary to treat humbler women in the same way. Even towards his ladies a knight could upon occasion be astonishingly rude. Nor was the conduct of the ladies quite in accordance with modern ideas; they were, if anything, more forward than the men in love-making, and pretty nearly their equals in outspoken abuse.¹

This view is also held by Mr. Fraser.²

Just here the thought occurs to me that according to the above quote, it may be that customs have not changed as much as I thought. In this latter part of the Twentieth-Century, "ladies" again seem to be "if anything, more forward than the men in love-making". Of course it is possible that the "ladies" Mr. Salzman and Mr. Fraser knew were different than many I have known.

Courtly love, the formalization of love, was closely related and interwoven with chivalry. It first appeared quite suddenly at the end of the eleventh century in Languedoc and was a love of a highly specialized sort. The sentiment of course is love, but a love whose characteristics may be enumerated as Humility, Courtesy, Adultery, and the Religion of Love. In the Troubadour poetry of the day, the lover is always abjectly obedient to his lady's lightest wish, however whimsical it might be, and silently acquiesces to her rebukes, however unjust.

"There is a service which a feudal vassal owes to his lord. The

¹I. F. Salzman, English Life in the Middle Ages. (London: Oxford University Press, 1929), pp. 249, 250.

²R. A. Fraser, The Court of Virtue (1565). (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961).

lover is the lady's man. He addresses her as midons, which etymologically represents not 'my lady' but 'my lord'. The whole attitude has been rightly described as a 'feudalisation of love'. This solemn amatory ritual is felt to be part and parcel of the courtly life."³

This ceremony was prescribed for the acceptance of the lover by his lady and was an exact imitation by which

in feudalism, the vassal acknowledged his suzerain, and the knight or squire who had gone through it, had contracted similar obligations towards his lady. He placed himself on his knees before her, with his two hands joined between her hands, before witnesses; and he, by words, devoted himself entirely to her, swore to serve her faithfully to his death, and to defend her against all assailants to the utmost of his power. The lady, on her side, declared that she accepted his services, engaged to him her tenderest affections, and, in sign of the union now established between them, she usually gave him a ring, and then she kisses him, and raises him on his feet. This ceremony was termed, on the part of the lady, retaining her lover; on his part, making himself her man, or her servant.⁴

Yet this love, though neither playful nor licentious in its expression, is always what the nineteenth century called "dishonourable love". The poet normally addresses another man's wife, and the situation is so carelessly accepted that he seldom concerns himself much with her husband who is his real enemy and rival. But if he is ethically careless, he is no lighthearted gallant as, "The lady is traditionally desirable and difficult,

³C. S. Lewis, The Allegory of Love. (Oxford: Magdalen, 1936), p. 2.

⁴Thomas Wright, Womankind in Western Europe. (London: Groombridge and Sons, 1869), pp. 136, 137.

and her favours are not lightly given. Love itself is a humbling and refining passion, open only to the "worthy. Chivalry, in the form of difficult adventure, is a means of achieving the respect of the lady".⁵

It seems only natural that love should be the commonest theme of serious imaginative literature. However, a glance at classical antiquity or at the Dark Ages at once shows that what was taken for "nature" was really a special state of affairs. Our code of etiquette, with its rule that women always have precedence, is a legacy from courtly love and is felt to be far from natural in certain Asiatic countries.

It is curious to note how Saltus regarded the origin of love. He thinks that the first created thing was light, then came life and death, with fear in between. There was no love, because love was absent. In Eden, he says, there was none, as Adam and Eve appeared there as adults. In the beginning of things woman was common property.

With individual ownership came the necessity of defence. Man defended woman against even herself. He beat her, stoned her, killed her. With it came the home...wherever situated, surrounded by foes. The foes were the elements. In the thunderclap was their anger....They were placatable, however. They could be appeased, as human beings are, by giving them something. Usually the gift was the sacrifice of whatever the owner cared for most; in later days it was love, pleasure, sense, but in these simpler times, when humanity knew nothing of pleasure, less of love, and had no sense, when the dominant sensation was fright...it was accomplished by the immolation of whatever the individual would have liked to have had given

⁵Charles Mascatine. Chaucer and the French Tradition. (University of California Press, 1957), p. 18.

to him...In the process, man, who had begun by being a brute, succeeded in becoming a lunatic only to develop into a child.⁶

The first image of passion and beauty came with the Queen of the Orient, Babylon.

With the origin of love, a distinction between the different kinds of love was inevitable. C. S. Lewis, in his book, "The Four Loves", makes a distinction between what he calls the "Gift-Love" and "Need-Love". The typical example of Gift-Love, he says would be "that love which moves a man to work and plan and save for the future well-being of his family which he will die without sharing or seeing; of the second, that which sends a lonely or frightened child to its mother's arms".⁷

In spite of this form of gift love, women were still not socially free. With the Romans, who first conquered the women and then their gods, she was treated merely as "a domestic animal over whom he had the right of life and death, a ward who, regarded as mentally irresponsible--might not escape his power even though he died, a woman whom he could repudiate at will and of whom he was owner and judge".⁸ In Greece the civil laws denied legal capacity to women as long as they lived. The reason for this law was, "Woman was not considered to have sufficient mental or moral capacity, she was never sui-juris and the law placed her under the tutelage of masters, her father first, then

⁶E. Saltus, Historia Amoris. (New York: Mitchell Kennerley MCMVI 1906), pp. 1-3.

⁷C. S. Lewis, The Four Loves. (Geoffrey Bles; London, 1960), p. 9.

⁸Saltus, pp. 75-77.

her husband, her father's heirs, and, failing these, the state".⁹ In Germany in the Middle Ages women spent their lives under constant tutelage, but it was not because of their moral or intellectual weakness, but in "terms of their physical shortcomings, their inability to maintain their rights by force of arms".¹⁰ A woman under the mandium, or right of wardship, could in theory do nothing without her guardian. He represented her at law, and he controlled her property. Thus the condition of woman was still perilous. Usually she was shut away more securely and remotely in the feudal society than in the gynaeceum. "If, to the detriment of her lord, she emerged, she might have one of her lips cut off, both perhaps, or more expeditiously, be murdered. She never knew which beforehand".¹¹ Thus there was little hope and only one refuge, the cloister. Here she was generally safe, but there were also regrets, and the leisure was not always very adequately filled.

At this time in history two other forms of love existed, but they were not in keeping with the society of the time. One form is exemplified by the love of Medea, of Phaedra, and of Dido at one end of the scale, and at the other end was the comfort and utility of a good wife like Penelope. The other form was the Platonic conception of love. In this the people preferred to hear how a holy man went to heaven or how a brave man went to battle. The deepest emotion in this kind of love was the love

⁹Maurice Valency, In Praise of Love. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958), p. 59.

¹⁰Valency, p. 60.

¹¹Saltus, pp. 127-129.

of man for man, the mutual love of warriors who died together fighting against odds, and the affection between the vassal and lord.

The good vassal is to the good citizen very much as a boy is to a man. He cannot rise to the great abstraction of a 'res publica'. He loves and reverences only what he can touch and see; but he loves it with an intensity which our tradition is loath to allow except to sexual love. Of romance, of reverence for women, of the idealizing imagination exercises about sex, there is hardly a hint. The centre of gravity is elsewhere, in the hopes and fears of religion, or in the clean and happy fidelities of the feudal hall.¹²

There had been epochs in which women wore garments that were brief; there were others in which their robes were long. In Greece women were normally free, in Rome they were unrestrained, while in medieval Europe at this period, they were cloistered. Women entered the convent for many reasons. Sometimes it was for safety from feudal lords; at other times for the pleasures of the table, and so forth. For example, there is the story of Radegonde, who founded a cloister of her own, one with high walls, gardens, porticoes, and baths of a Roman villa. There Radegonde received high ecclesiastics and laymen of position. Among others was Fortunatus, a poet, young and attractive, whom the abbess, young and attractive herself, welcomed so well that he lingered, supping nightly at the cloister and composing songs. "Together they collaborated in the first romance of pure sentiment that history records, one from which the abbess passed to sanctity, and the poet to fame. Thereafter the story

¹²Lewis, The Allegory of Love, p. 10.

persisting may have suggested some one of the pedestals that antiquity never learned to sculpture and to which ladies were lifted by their knights."¹³

Thus it seems the first form of courtly love appeared in the cloisters. But L. B. Solomon thinks that courtly love probably arose as a result of an "intellectual rather than moral distrust; it was the attitude of the philosopher, the ascetic, who saw in woman the greatest material temptation a man could encounter, and hence the greatest menace to the life of the intellect. It was perhaps as reaction against this ascetic ideal that chivalry arose, elevating woman to the position of a deity".¹⁴ However, there have been many diverse opinions concerning the origin of courtly love. For example, Denis De Rouge-mont believed that courtly love sprang from the Catharist Church. These devotees believed that God is love, but the world is evil. Therefore God cannot be the author of the world. The Catharist reject the dogma of the Incarnation, and, consequently, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Their interpretation of the Gospels, especially of the Gospel according to St. John, is entirely spiritual. They have only one sacrament--baptism by the consolatory Holy Ghost, and the kiss of peace, bestowed by the priest on the new brother in the initiation ceremony of a "perfect". Before receiving this kiss, the neophyte was required solemnly to undertake that he would devote himself to God and His Gospel, that he would never lie nor swear, that he would

¹³Saltus, pp. 129-130.

¹⁴Louis B. Solomon. The Devil Take Her. (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1931), p. 46.

avoid touching his wife if he were married, that he would neither kill an animal nor feed on animal flesh, and, lastly, that he would keep his faith secret. After receiving this consolamentum and during the second endura, the Cathars killed themselves voluntarily. Suicide was permitted only if it was in a state of complete detachment from matter. The Catharist Church was composed of two groups--the perfecti and the mere believers, or imperfecti. The latter alone were allowed to marry and to go on living in a world which the Pure condemned. "Thus," says De Rougemont, "I feel I am now entitled to suggest that the troubadours were 'believers' of the Catharist Church and the bards of its heresy. So strong are the presumptions in favour of this view that I do not see what there is to account for the sudden lyric impulse of the troubadours if we refuse to allow that it sprang out of the Catharist heresy."¹⁵ De Rougemont also believes that after the token of love was given by the lady to the knight she "bade him rise, and then imprinted a kiss on his brow. This first kiss was usually the only one, and was called consolament. A number of Provençal priests went so far as to lend their blessing to these mystic unions by placing them under the invocation of the Virgin".¹⁶

In the north of France, a new kind of love poetry developed simultaneously with that of the south. But in the northern poetry the desirable qualities were courage and strength, loyalty, Christian zeal, and a burning desire for fame and glory,

¹⁵Denis De Rougemont, Love in the Western World. Trans. by Montgomery Belgion. (Albert Saifer, 1930), pp. 72-78.

¹⁶Rougemont, p. 72.

the very qualities with which the knight recommended himself to his lady in the southern love lyrics. In the north, the songs extolled the knight as a warrior; while in the south, the songs depicted the knight in love. Thus the knight of the north was dedicated to the service of his lord, his country, his king, his faith, and his church, and only in later times to his lady. He was not encouraged to serve himself. "These ideals of chivalry did not have to be invented. In part they were dictated by the requirements of the profession; they reflected the traditional virtues of the fighting man. The French trouveres based their idea of nobility upon the manly virtues, prowess, loyalty, and honor, those traits which would primarily recommend the fighting man to his lord."¹⁷ The southern troubadours grounded their concept of nobility not so much upon prowess as upon courtesy. "The poet longed for the beautiful in general, but specifically the love of a beautiful woman of whom the knight endeavored to make himself worthy. In declaring himself independent of the determinism of the social system which had created him, the knight as lover submitted himself to another sort of servitude. But it was the high function of the lady, therefore, to guide the lover upward in worth and dignity to the utmost reach of potentiality."¹⁸

Thus all these circumstances together, plus the fact that before the coming of courtly love the relation of vassal and lord, in all its intensity and warmth, had already existed "was a

¹⁷Valency, pp. 39-43.

¹⁸Valency, p. 49.

mould into which romantic passions would almost certainly be poured. And if the beloved were also the feudal superior the thing becomes entirely natural and inevitable. The emphasis on courtesy results from the same conditions. It is in courts that the new feeling arises: the lady, by her social and feudal position, is already the arbitress of manners and the scourge of 'villany', even before she is loved".¹⁹ To this statement, Mr. Solomon, further testifies when he says that "Even before the system of courtly love had reached its greatest popularity the 'silent hammers of decay' were at work on it. The chief trouble was that it left hardly anything to the lover's own discretion; it told him what qualities he should possess--notably, courtesy, humility, generosity, and constancy--and specified in great detail the manner in which he was to exercise these virtues".²⁰

The earliest date we have recorded for the influence of the troubadours in the Provence was when Raymond Berenger of Barcelona married the heiress of the Provencal rulers, in 1112. Thus the intercourse between the Provence and Chateaux become easy and agreeable. But with the Crusades the unsophisticated soldiers of the West came into contact with a people whose manner of entertainments, intercourse and parley, pleased them greatly. The Emperor Alexius was so fascinated with their pageantry and ceremony that he gave the Crusaders a large sum of money, horses, and any arms which they required, in order to get them to bring to his court these people with their new science of refined

¹⁹Lewis, The Allegory of Love, p. 12.

²⁰Solomon, p. 7.

manners, art of ceremony, and rules of etiquette. It is said that he redoubled the pomp and magnificence of his court before the eyes of these simple and unlettered strangers. It was in this manner that the soldiers of the Cross were brought into contact with the most gallant gentlemen upon earth, men whose passionate adoration of women was, in fact, the main motive of their social existence.²¹

The women who until now had been trained after the domestic and learned ideal of the Anglo-Saxons, or who in France, generally, lived in constant terror as weak and unprotected beings, ill-used and violently treated, now ventured forth in crowds to far-distant countries, sometimes accompanying their husbands or lovers, and sometimes setting forth alone. With the growth of chivalry, says Kirby, "womanhood is once more exalted; not merely is woman raised to a position of dignity and respect, but soon becomes an object of adoration complete and entire".²²

However, the troubadours may have exaggerated the importance of love. They made love yield every sensation in life worth having. The passion of love is so highly idealized in their poems that it becomes far more important than life itself. Love for them stands on a pedestal as exalted as honour, or perhaps even a trifle higher. "It is more than religion, for it is itself a religion of a higher and purer kind than that of dogma. As nothing is high enough or exalted enough to say about God, so nothing

²¹J. F. Rowbotham, The Troubadours and Courts of Love. (London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., New York; Macmillan Company, 1895), pp. 25-45.

²²Thomas A. Kirby, Chaucer's Troilus. (Louisiana State University Press, 1940), p. 24.

is high-flown enough or extravagant enough to predicate about love. Love must occupy a man's every thought; it must be complete mistress of his actions".²³ If a troubadour was so unfortunate as to lose his lady-love, the theme of all his songs, the inspiration of all his poetry, he would throw down his art and song entirely, and vow never to sing a song again, and end the rest of his days in a monastery or forest doing penance.

However, the lady is regularly represented as perfection in all her attributes. Her good qualities were doubtlessly exaggerated, but this was probably because of her rank. The poet was often politically her subject, as well as her humble lover. Her perfection is pictured in her physical beauty, which, when portrayed, accords with the mediaeval ideal. Her hair is blond or golden; her eyes are beautiful; her complexion is fresh and clear; and her mouth is well formed and without blemish. In character, she is distinguished for her courtesy, kindness, refinement, and good sense. Her goodness affects all who come near her, making them better. Thus the lady, as a perfect being, occupies a position of exalted superiority in respect to the lover. He becomes her vassal and protests absolute submission and devotion to her. His love for her surpasses all other things in value, and the slightest token from her makes him rich. "She whose liegeman I am without recall, kills me so sweetly with desire...she would make me rich with a thread of her glove, or with one of the hairs that falls on her mantle".²⁴

²³Rowbotham, p. 227.

²⁴William G. Dodd, Courtly Love in Chaucer and Gower. (London: Ginn & Company, 1913), p. 12.

The service which he professes is often carried to the extreme of worship, and he adores her as a divinity, giving and commending himself to her with hands joined and head bowed.²⁵

The lady, however, rarely appears as a personality in the poetry of the troubadours, but remains indistinct in the background. From the poet's portrayal of his own feelings, her attitude toward him is clear enough. She possesses every good quality; but her kindness the lover seldom experiences. To him she is cold, disdainful, capricious and domineering. In vain does he implore pity; in vain does he complain of her cruelty and beg for mercy. Her rigor is unabated. But in spite of all this cruelty, all those who sang of love agreed as to "the ennobling effect of love on the character of the lover. Specifically, because of his love, he becomes courteous, gentle, humble, generous, and courageous. One lover proudly says, 'happy is he whom love keeps joyous, for love is the climax of all blessings, and through love, one is gay and courteous, frank and gentle, humble and proud'".²⁶

In the "Anthology of the Provencal Troubadours" by Hill and Bergin,²⁷ and in "The Court of Venus" by Fraser,²⁸ the idea of the lady representing every good virtue and noble qualities is made explicit. But that is just one side of the picture. On the

²⁵Dodd, pp. 10-12.

²⁶Dodd, pp. 10-12.

²⁷R. T. Hill and T. G. Bergin, Anthology of the Provencal Troubadours. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957).

²⁸R. Fraser, The Courts of Venus. (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1955).

other side, we have Mr. H. J. Chaytor, Solomon and Valency (mentioned earlier) who not only portray the picture of the ladies' cruelties but also refute the theory of the abjection of the lover before his lady. Vernon Scannell,²⁹ on the other hand, in his "The Masks of Love", gives a clear picture of the various kinds of ladies that one is likely to encounter within the sphere of the troubadour poetry. So he not only praises the good and virtuous lady, but in contrast portrays a picture of a prostitute. He talks of a jealous wife, as against a humble poet.

Chaytor is opposed to the idea that with the worship of the Blessed Virgin in the eleventh century which had gained popularity, the knights not only bestowed this reverence on the female sex in general, but, as "a vassal owed obedience to his feudal overlord, so did he owe service and devotion to his lady".³⁰ He tells us about Marcabrun, a troubadour, 1150-1195, who was the author of violent invectives against the passion of love. The main theme of his works is that "love is of a detestable lineage; he has killed thousands of men without a sword, and that God has created no more terrible an enchanter". These invectives may have been the outcome of personal disappointment. Yet before the troubadour idea of love could secure the universal recognition, he strove to prevent it from becoming the dominant theme of lyric poetry.

In spite of the efforts of Marcabrun, the poetry of the troubadours became popular. It not only was the founder of

²⁹Vernon Scannell, The Masks of Love. (Putnam, 42 Great Russell Street, London; n.d.).

³⁰Rev. H. J. Chaytor, The Troubadours. (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1912), pp. 15, 43.

courtoisie, an element of inferiority of the lover in relation to his lady, but symbolized her as perfection, and gave her a religious reverence. It developed into religious poetry, not because the crusaders had raised the religious question, or because of the cloistered monks, but because it was a natural development, going from a lower to a higher plane just as St. Bernard "conceives of love as a progression from the carnal to the spiritual. God alone can satisfy the craving that drives man on from one form of experience to another until at last he finds rest where alone it is to be sought, in the love of God....Going beyond the circle of his own personality, in which at first his love is centered, he grows to love God from necessity, because of his own helplessness. The love of God brings with it the love of our fellow-man,...and it is thus an expression of man's love for God".³¹ Thus the courtly lover in his attitude towards his lady is also in some degree disinterested, delighting in her beauty and excellence in themselves, and not merely considering them in relation to himself.

Justin Smith gives us a very interesting example of how love still existed within the church, in spite of the turning of the troubadours from carnal pleasures to religious devotion. The fact, however, still remains that most of these poets who turned to religious devotion were either defeated lovers, or joined the clergy in order to be near the beloved one. Besides this, we must not overlook the fact they were essentially poets who sang of love, and not servants of religion. This is a conflict

³¹C. B. West. Courtoisie in Anglo-Norman Literature. (Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1938), pp. 4, 7-8.

between the poet's heart and his mind, or between himself and love. Piere Roger recalls the central incident in a famous Provençal romance:

Flamenca, so the poem runs, was confined by her husband in a close tower, for no reason at all but groundless jealousy. He kept the key himself, visited her in the tower, and let her out only for church. After a time Lord Guilhem of Nivers (Nevers), young, rich, and distinguished, heard of the sad case, and resolved upon doing something for the captive. The situation seemed rather difficult, but love himself becomes his counsellor. By his advice, Guilhem generously sent the clerk of the cure to study in Paris; and then discovering that he had sinned in turning aside from the sacred career he once began, Guilhem persuaded the cure to tonsure his fair locks and give him the place of clerk. Naturally it became his duty at every mass to offer Flamenca the pax, and the very first Sunday he whispered, 'Alas'. Touched with pity and curiosity the lady replied a week later, 'What pains?'. Then at successive services they conversed as follows, two syllables at each mass, while the husband sat by, wholly unsuspecting:

'I die'----'The cause'?
 'T is love',----'For whom'?
 'For you',----'Can help'?
 'Yes, cure',----'But how'?
 'By ruse',----'Arrange'.
 'T is done',----'Tell how'?
 'You'll go?'----'But where'?
 'The baths'----'Yes when'?
 'Right soon'----'I will'.

The merciful intervention of holy days reduced the duration of this dialogue to three months: but that was time enough for sleepless nights, for prayers to love, for taking counsel of him, for fasts, and for swoons. Meanwhile Guilhem had excavated a passage underground from his dwelling to the baths, the famous Bains de Bourbon; and when the lady entered them, a

square of the pavement was cautiously raised and the lovers fell into each other's arms.³²

We have already observed that courtly love was exalted under the system as a virtue which ennobled those who practiced the art. In theory, love is the fount and origin of every good. It was to achieve these virtues that the courtly lover sought his lady's favour. It must also be noted that the ideals of the courtly system, if we disregard the element of sensualism, were high. This was true, not only in matter of decorum, but of honor as well. Constancy was of the utmost importance. No more grievous fault could be committed, no breach of the canons could be more serious, than for the lover, man or woman, to be unfaithful. We may mention here that in Troilus and Criseyde, Criseyde's fault or crime does not consist in her yielding to Troilus, but in her unfaithfulness to him. To choose for his mistress one whom he would be ashamed to marry was also thought of as unworthy of the lover. Though sensual love lay at the bottom of the system, yet voluptuousness was regarded as fatal to real love. Although according to the courtly ideas "love is in essence sensual, and should be secret and furtive, yet it incited the lover to worthy deeds; it demanded of him nobility of character and moderation in all his conduct. It is a love evil at the heart of it, yet it is a love which 'loses half its evil, by losing all its grossness'".³³

³²Justin H. Smith, The Troubadours at Home. (New York and London: The Knickerbocker Press, 1899), pp. 214-215.

³³Dodd, p. 9.

Such was the theory of the courtly system. For its practical side, we turn to the poetry of the troubadours. Inspired, professedly, by real and actual love affairs, their lyrics present the concrete workings of the sentiment which afterward became the basis of the erotic philosophy not only of Chretien de Troies, but of Andreas himself. T. P. Cross and W. A. Nitze think that Chretien composes the poem of "Lancelot and Guenevere", not only to please his patroness, Marie of Champagne, but that he made it the "vehicle of a system of courtly love". They also think that, "The social convention known as courtly love came into being gradually in accordance with the desires of certain definite people, and it is this personal aspect of the case that is illustrated by the poem concerning Lancelot".³⁴ Thus in the poems of the troubadours, we find portrayed the birth and progress of their love, their emotional experiences, their relation and attitudes toward the ladies whose favour they sought, and their behavior as affected by their passions. Besides these facts that we know from their poetry, they also had a set of rules and principles that later became a mark of a true lover. For example, the idea of fear in the lady's presence became a philosophical principle; while sleeplessness, at first a result of love, became a requirement imposed upon lovers.

³⁴T. P. Cross and W. A. Nitze, Lancelot and Guenevere. (Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1930), pp. 1-2.

ANDREAS CAPELLANUS

Andreas Capellanus, a cleric, who refers to himself as the French royal chaplain, set himself the task of systematizing the conception of Courtly Love. In his most famous book De Amore, 1184-6, which has a three-part scheme, he asks and answers the following questions. What is love? What are the effects? Between whom can it exist? What is the duty of one lover when the other proves unfaithful? How is love acquired, retained? To begin with he rules out the kind of love that is called "Platonic". According to his idea, visible beauty is the source of love, insomuch that the blind are declared incapable of love, or at least of entering upon love after they have become blind. The lover must be truthful and modest, a good Catholic, clean in his speech, hospitable, and ready to return good for evil. He must be courageous in war and free with his gifts. He must be courteous at all times.

His second division really deals with the casuistry of love. He presents eighteen different cases of lovers and ends this section with the story of the knight of Britian. Andreas gives five different ways in which one could evoke love: bodily beauty, uprightness of character, fluent eloquence of conversation, abundance of riches, and the easy granting of love or anything desired. But he thinks the last two means should not be accredited and ought to be expelled from the court of love. He then proceeds to explain the part of conversation in love-making. "Howsoever eloquent one may be, that alone unaided will not necessarily awaken love in the heart of the beloved: but really

worth-while conversation will add to the stings of love and thereby prove the worth of the suitor. This is brought out by a series of eight different conversations carried on by lovers of the same social rank: a plebeian man to a plebeian woman, a plebeian man to a noble woman, a noble man to a plebeian woman, a noble man to a noble woman, a more noble man to a plebeian woman, and finally a more noble man to a more noble woman".³⁵ In the conversation between a noble man and a noble woman, the story of the British knight is told. In this conversation the man begins almost immediately to express his great admiration for and devotion to the lady; she, however, is quite obdurate and, though agreeing to let the suitor see her frequently, nevertheless remains firm in her determination never to become subject to Venus. However, she asks him to tell her something about all these torments, and the suitor then relates in detail his dream about the palace of Love. It is a handsome structure, quadrangular in shape, situated at the center of the world. Here dwells Love with three groups of ladies. The door facing the east belongs to Love, while the ladies at the south door keep their door always open and linger about its threshold, but those at the west door not only keep it open but wander around outside. The ladies at the north door keep it shut and never know what is going on outside the palace. The knight then goes on to explain that the ladies at the south door are those who are generous with their love, yet hesitate and consider well before bestowing it; those at the west gate are ordinary women who

³⁵Kirby, p. 56.

reject none, while the ladies at the north door accept no suitors and deny entry to everyone. The lady admits that she belongs to the north door. Then he tells her how he was lost in the forest one day, and there he saw a procession in three groups of men and women beautifully attired following a leader wearing a golden crown. He was the king of Love. The Third group of ladies were beautiful, but they were dressed in a garb both distasteful and outmoded and were riding ugly lean nags. Then he was told that the first group of ladies were those who loved wisely, the second were the unclean, and the third were those who refused love. When they arrived at the beautiful meadow, the king of Love, who was with the first group, took his place in the centre circle where there was a fountain flowing with nectar. The second group were in a second circle. Here the water was so cold that it could not support life, but the heat was terrific and there were no trees. The third group of ladies had to sit on bundles of thorns, everything was dried, and the sun shone incessantly; it was as hot there as a fiery furnace. Finally, when he met the king of Love, the king told him to relate all that he had seen to any woman who seemed to stray from the path of love, and then gave him the twelve chief rules of love. The other thirty-one rules Andreas gives to us in another similar episode with a British knight, who rode to King Arthur's palace to get the falcon for his beloved, and thereafter strange adventures ensued. The knight finally was able to secure the falcon which sat on a golden perch, and to the leg of this falcon tied with a

golden chain was a piece of paper in which the rules were written.³⁶ Some of the rules follow:

1. Marriage is not a good excuse for rejecting love.
2. Who does not conceal, cannot love.
13. Love when published rarely endures.
14. Easy winning makes love despicable; the difficulty is held dear.
15. Every lover turns pale in the sight of the co-lover.
16. Every lover trembles at the sudden sight of his co-lover.
23. The one whom the thought of love disturbs eats and sleeps little.
28. The true lover finds happiness only in what he deems will please his co-lover.³⁷

Mr. Weigand thinks that Andreas' chief concern is to instruct his reader, a man, in the ways of winning a woman on whom he has set his heart. The vision, he says, concerns the fate of women and is reported by a man. The whole book is written from the man's point of view and mentions the emotional experiences of woman only incidentally. Of course, Weigand also thinks that it would run counter to "the courtly code for the male to win a complete and easy victory at the first assault. The fortress must be skillfully defended, and complete victory according to the code must be preceded by a long period of probation. There

³⁶Kirby, pp. 55-60.

³⁷H. O. Taylor, The Medieval Mind. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949), V. 1, p. 59.

are four clearly marked stages in the attainment of a lady's favour, the granting of hope, the yielding of a kiss, the embrace or touch of each other's nude bodies, and complete possession. It is understood that the lady after yielding the first three degrees of her favour may always withdraw".³⁸

Andreas also states that, "a too active sexual constitution disqualifies from love". But at the same time he states that "Marriage is no valid excuse for refraining from love". "A woman cannot appeal to her married status for refusing to entertain the solicitations of a lover. Marriage is viewed as a practical contract in which the relations of the two partners are governed not by love but by duty. Marriage relation lacks all the characteristics of true love, such as the blush, the pallor, etc., and that jealousy in a married couple is as base as uxorious carryingson between them are in bad taste (and even sinful)".³⁹ Thus from what has been said it naturally follows that a woman who enters into a contract of marriage has no right on this account to dismiss the man who has been her lover, and also that men with motives of marriage do not qualify as lovers. However, whatever the conditions may be, he does stress secrecy as the prime condition as well as a stimulus of love and delight.

Throughout the work there are references to Eleanor of Aquitaine, and the Countess Marie of Champagne. Obviously it was Marie of Champagne's theories which, to a large degree, inspired Andreas to write his treatise. These ideas were

³⁸H. J. Weigand, Courtly Love. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1956), pp. 18-19.

³⁹Weigand, p. 21.

introduced into northern France, largely through the influence of Eleanor of Aquitaine. This amorous duchess took a lively interest in the doctrines as well as the practices of courtly love. It is said that "her grandfather and the duke of Aquitaine enjoyed the distinction of being the first of the troubadours".⁴⁰ Before leaving her southern home to become the queen of France, she received, and it seems encouraged, advances of a very familiar nature from the troubadour Bernart de Ventadorn. At the northern court, she is said to have lent her authority to the new doctrines. In this she was followed by her daughter, Marie of Champagne, and other noble ladies, who amused themselves and the fashionable society about them by rendering decisions on difficult questions which were argued before the mock courts of love. Naturally, such "decisions soon came to be regarded as definite rules and regulations of the courtly system. Thus in northern France, the new ideas of love received from the first the sanction and support of women of high rank, through whose influence they found their way into contemporary literature".⁴¹

It would, however, be wrong to believe that Chretien de Troies, who was under the influence of Marie of Champagne, was responsible for crystallizing the courtly sentiments, because although the troubadours were the originators of the system of courtly love they also mainly believed that love was an art to be practiced rather than a passion to be felt. After passing through light treatment by some of the other poets, it was

⁴⁰Rowbotham, p. 40.

⁴¹W. G. Dodd, The System of Courtly Love. "Chaucer Criticism", by R. J. Schoeck and J. Taylor, Vol. II. (University of Notre Dame Press, 1961), p. 2-3.

restored mainly in rules and principles set in pattern, so that it became the guide book for ardent lovers. At this stage one might wonder how Andreas made the precepts of courtly love fit in with the precepts of religion. He thinks that the extra-marital relations are a sin according to the strict letter of the law, but he says that it is an exaggeration to think that the deity is gravely offended by such a trifling transgression. He thus reminds the lady, according to Weigand, that the whole secular conduct of life is a continuous offense to God. If she is really concerned about pleasing God she should not be content with halfway measures but renounce the life of the world entirely. He says there are two kinds of love, the pure and the mixed. The pure love is a graded series of solaces that may go so far as the nude touch of each other but stops short of sexual intercourse. He thinks this is the nobler of the two and starts to praise it, but at the same time he says "I do not say this as though I mean to condemn mixed love, I merely wish to show which of the two is preferable. But mixed love too, is real love, and it is praiseworthy, and we say that it is the source of all good things, although from it great dangers threaten".⁴²

We must not forget the fact that Andreas was a cleric, and therefore it is left for the reader to imagine how his manual of courtship unmasked itself as a manual of seduction, especially when he says that even if the lovers have made an agreement that neither may ask for anything more unless both are agreed to it, still it is not right for the woman to refuse to give in to her

⁴²Weigand, p. 22.

lover's desire if he persists. "For lovers are bound, when practicing love's solaces, to be mutually obedient to each other's desires". Of course, we may say that Andreas felt under obligation to pay some kind of lip service to the Christian code which as a cleric he was in duty bound to represent. But his real interest lay in the exposition of the gallant passion in all its aspects. From the following example the reader is left to make his own decision. In his *De Amore*, Andreas states that when it comes to the cleric's turn to try to undermine the lady, to her untutored mind it appears as a much graver sin for a cleric to indulge in the forbidden passion than for a layman. To this he says "it was not God's pleasure to create us as a special class exempted from the stings of carnal desire. So long as a cleric publicly conducts himself in keeping with his high office and with his tongue professes the true doctrine of the Church, such slight deviations from the strict command of the law can be easily condoned".⁴³ Finally he states that "clerics are discreet by profession and wise. They are more sleek and well-fed than their lay competitors, and they are more readily available than the knights whose profession may require them to follow the summons of war at any moment".⁴⁴

Here are some of the abstract principles of and the laws underlying the courtly system as laid down by Andreas:

1. Courtly love is sensual.

⁴³Weigand, pp. 22-23.

⁴⁴Weigand, pp. 22-23.

2. Courtly love is illicit, and for the most part adulterous.

3. A love, sensual and illicit, must needs be secret.⁴⁵

He who reveals the secrets he should keep is branded as a traitor to the God of Love. Nothing is so despicable as to blab after having received favours. Love should not only be kept a secret, but it should also be furtive. It was this element of furtiveness, largely, that made the courtly love incompatible with the legal relations between husband and wife; while the necessity of secrecy gives rise to constant fear of spies.

Another reason for secrecy may be found in the peculiar relations between husband and wife among the higher classes of Mediaeval Society.

Marriage was rarely a matter in which the heart was concerned. Business affairs and political considerations often brought about unions in which no affection could exist. Yet the integrity of the tie and the exclusive rights pertaining to the married state seems to have been insisted upon by husbands. By the theory of courtly love, jealousy could not exist between a man and his wife, and since jealousy was a requisite of love, no love could exist between them.⁴⁶

It is also interesting to note the way in which this necessity of secrecy is so very ably pointed up in Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde. All through this great masterpiece of courtly love, great emphasis is put upon the secrecy needed to protect

⁴⁵Dodd, The System of Courtly Love. "Chaucer Criticism", pp. 4-5.

⁴⁶Dodd, The System of Courtly Love. "Chaucer Criticism", Vol. II, p. 6.

the honor of the lady involved. For instance, in Book LV of this work, Criseyde is to be traded to the Greeks for the Trojan warrior Antenor. Troilus hears the news of the offer of exchange in his father's court but he says nothing, "Lest men should his affeccioun espye; with mannes herte he gan his sorwes drye".⁴⁷

In this system of love taught by the troubadours, we are told that not only was it full of nice rules, distinctions and quibbles, but that there are four degrees in love.

The first is that of hesitating, and the second that of supplicating, and the third that of being listened to, and the fourth is called that of accepted lover. The anonymous troubadour who wrote this, goes on to explain: 'He who has a desire to love a lady, and venturing to speak of his love, is a timid hesitator. But if the lady honours him so much, and encourages him, that he ventures to tell her his pains, then he is justly called a supplicator. And if, through talking and supplicating, he does so well that she retains him, and gives him bands, gloves, or girdle, then he is raised to the degree of one listened to. If, finally, the lady is pleased to grant by a kiss her love to him, she has made of him her lover!'⁴⁸

Thus we may say that in spite of the troubadours being the first to start the system of courtly love with its high ideals and distinctions, their poetry was mainly based on the theme of love existing outside of marriage. But with the revival of these systems by Andreas (we do not say that he omitted the basic theme of their poetry), this same system of courtly love, moulded so as to fit into the pattern of his society, not only found a place in

⁴⁷Geoffrey Chaucer, The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1957), p. 442.

⁴⁸Wright, p. 146.

the poetry of the time, but also in the practical life of the people. Especially it became popular with the ladies who not only, perhaps, liked to practice it, but set up courts of love to hear and give judgment for and against the practices of courtly love.

MARRIAGE

Now, having discussed the "Love" of our title, what can be said concerning "Marriage"? How did marriage fit into the picture of love? It has been found that courtly love very often consisted of the love of an unmarried knight for a married lady, and that in actual practice of feudal society,

marriages had nothing to do with love, and no 'nonsense' about marriage was tolerated. All matches were matches of interest, and, worse still, of an interest that was continually changing. When the alliance which had answered would answer no longer, the husband's object was to get rid of the lady as quickly as possible. Marriages were frequently dissolved, and the same woman who was the lady and the 'dearest dread' of her vassals was often little better than a piece of property to her husband. He was master in his own house. So far from being a natural channel for the new kind of love, marriage was rather the drab background against which that love stood out in all the contrast of its new tenderness and delicacy.⁴⁹

This situation was a simple one, and certainly not peculiar to the Middle Ages. In a society where marriage is purely utilitarian, any idealization of sexual love must begin by being an

⁴⁹Lewis, The Allegory of Love, p. 13.

Idealization of Adultery.

It is, of course, true that no civilization has been free from the taint of social vice. From the dawn of history the problems created by the universal fact of sex and the necessity for organizing and properly directing its expression have been difficult to solve. Some nations have been worse than others in these matters and no doubt some periods have been characterized by less decency and restraint....The criticism which we feel inclined to pass upon the era under discussion is not that it was characterized by sex irregularities, but that it assumed toward the whole question an attitude of hypocrisy which has deceived vast multitudes of people and still continued to deceive them. The heart of the institution of chivalry, we are told, was the ideal of romantic love. What most readers fail to understand is that romantic love, as the medieval man understood the term, was always the love affair of a knight, preferably unmarried, with a married woman. Nor did it involve merely a platonic affection. It is here that Alfred Tennyson appears to misunderstand the true spirit of medieval knighthood. The liaison of Guinevere and Launcelot was entirely proper from the standpoint of chivalry, of correct expression of romantic love.... Perhaps the truest and most accurate portrayal of the real life of the time is to be found in Chaucer who, following Boccaccio, pictures things as they actually were.⁵⁰

The second factor that prevented the men of the Middle Ages from connecting their ideal of romantic love with marriage is the medieval theory of marriage and the sexology of the medieval church. At this point, however, it is interesting to note that the idea of the church consenting to, and formalizing, all marriages had begun years later than the origin of marriage itself.

⁵⁰Frederick D. Krishner, Those Gay Middle Ages. (Chicago: Willett, Clark and Company, 1938), pp. 119-120.

Marriage originated with exogamy, as Mr. Crawley states, "The chief characteristics of the primitive marriage system is exogamy. But it is no less the characteristic of all marriage systems in every age. For what is exogamy?...obviously the one invariable antecedent in all exogamous systems, indeed in all marriage systems, is the prohibition of marriage 'within the house'".⁵¹ Sexual taboo, he believes, produced the religious separation of children in the home; originally it was based on sexual differences which led the father to take the boys about with him, while the mother took the girls. It was afterwards enforced by the principles of sexual taboo, and the use of its relationship that produced various forms of exogamy. For example, in Rumania blood-relationship, to and including the third degree, is a bar to marriage, but also forbidden is what is called, 'relationship in Christ', that is, godparent relationship to the seventh degree. The result is that in the villages young people who want to get married have to go outside of their own neighborhood, that is, they have to practice exogamy. Of course, certain South American tribes give no other reason for avoidance between near relatives except shame. Thus, says Crawley, that "practically all sexual relations, and not merely intercourse, are 'incest' for primitive man...the bringing-up of children in this manner produces what is a psychological impossibility of love between brother and sister. Separation before the sexual instinct shows itself has in effect set the consciousness outwards

⁵¹Ernest Crawley, The Mystic Rose. (Bonl and Liveright Publishers, New York, 1927), p. 204.

by the time puberty arrives, and then when the sexual instinct has appeared, it is biased towards realisation out of the house ...love is produced by chance with acquaintances".⁵²

Mating is as old as Eve, says Mr. Adams and Mr. Pickard, in fact, "it is the oldest and most popular custom ever devised by mankind. Even in the most isolated tribes that explorers have uncovered on this globe, adult males pair up with females to live together as man and wife".⁵³

From the above quote it may be inferred that the necessity for mating caused man and woman to pair and live together as man and wife. We have also seen that since marriage originated with the one main theory of exogamy, man thus could not take upon himself any woman for his mate within his tribe. Thus the form of crude marriage, in which man had complete possession of his wife legally began. In earlier times, a man in order to have a wife had to go out of his tribe and capture a woman, who then automatically became his wife by merely living with him. By capture, what is meant here is that "when the tribe makes war on a neighbouring tribe they kill off the men and marry the women".⁵⁴ Of course in times of peace, marriages were arranged by peaceful negotiations between the fathers of the parties. In most cases, however, in a peaceful contraction of a marriage "some consideration has to be offered to the father or other relatives of the bride, either in the form of the exchange of bride for bride, or

⁵²Crawley, pp. 209-210.

⁵³C. R. Adams and V. O. Pickard, How to Pick a Mate. (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1946), p. 15.

⁵⁴E. Westermarck, The History of Human Marriage. (London: The Macmillan Company, Limited, St. Martin's Street, 1925), Vol. II, p. 240.

of service, or of the giving of property of some kind or other".⁵⁵ Thus "after the rise of a practice of capture the name of 'wife' came to be synonymous with a subject and enslaved woman in the power of her captor or captors, and the name of marriage to be applied to a man's relation to such a woman as possessor of her, the origin of exogamy becomes apparent. Since as a subject and enslaved wife would, in the circumstances of the time, be attainable only by capture, marriage would be possible only through capture, and the prohibition which would apply to capture, would apply to marriage".⁵⁶ The warrior had a sole right, as against his tribe, to a captive taken by him in war. This was made very clear, as among the savages the individual had no right as distinct from the group to which he belonged.

In the Walapia tribe marriage was not thought of as anything more than sleeping together. In cases of parentally arranged marriage, there seems to have been some feeling that the bride should be coy for the first few nights. In the Walapia tribe, says McKennan,

when a boy wants to marry a girl he brings a deer to her house. Later he comes with a Navaho blanket. He sits by the girl and she speaks or not as she chooses. The next time he comes he sits and holds hands with her. The girl does not say whether she likes him or not. The boy keeps bringing presents and after a while the girl's father says she must marry the boy because she has accepted all the gifts. She has no choice.... [If still nothing happens] The girl's people will say to the boy: 'Try it. Go to the

⁵⁵Westermarck, p. 354.

⁵⁶Right Hon. Lord Avebury, Marriage, Totemism and Religion. (London: Longmans, Green and Co., New York, Bombay, and Calcutta, 1911), pp. 70-71.

house. Sneak in and try to sleep with her. She may act coy the first time. But try again and keep on until you get her!".⁵⁷

There were no elopements before marriage in the Walapia tribe. If a girl liked a man very much before she was married, she might go off with him after she was married to someone else; or she might leave her husband and go off with a man she had met after her marriage. She would not do this before marriage because it would ruin her, and her family would lose standing.

In contrast to the above-mentioned tribe, among the Gonja tribe in Africa, no marriage could be legitimate without the transfer of the bride-price. However, "a Gonja woman's first marriage creates once and for all the inextinguishable and irreversible status of wife for her. Frequent divorce and remarriage is customary among the Gonja. But later marriages do not add to or subtract from the uxoral status gained by a first marriage. This is symbolized and sanctioned by the requirement that a woman must be ritually freed from the sexual control of her first husband when he dies, no matter how many husbands she has had since".⁵⁸ This idea of freeing one's wife of any sexual act before the husband died originated, I think, because of the idea the Gonja men held that, "it was the man who placed a child in the mother's womb for warmth and protection during the early stages of growth, and that the woman only nourishes it, but does

⁵⁷R. McKennan, Marriage and Sex. American Anthropological Association. (Published by the American Anthropological Assn., Menasha, Wisc., U.S.A., No. 42, 1935), pp. 141-143.

⁵⁸Meyer Fortes, editor. Marriage in Tribal Societies. (Cambridge: Dept. of Archaeology and Anthropology, at the University Press, 1962), pp. 4-8.

not contribute to the actual formation of the foetus".⁵⁹ Thus in order for her next husband to have complete marital rights over her, she had to be psychologically and theoretically freed. Besides this, the practice of polygamy was not uncommon among the Gonja woman. So long as it did not go to extremes, her husband was generally tolerant. I am apt to think that it was this theoretical idea of freeing a woman that made the husband tolerant. However, if the wife carried on terribly and her husband caught her, he would divorce her by merely living alone or with another woman. "Under any circumstances," says Mr. Bergler, "divorce, in most cases, is no solution at all, but only an admission of helplessness to master a situation of inner conflict".⁶⁰ While Honore De Balzac holds a different view about the entire situation of marriage and divorce. He seems to think that the main cause of all the marital problems arise from the fact that "it is difficult for a husband to avoid some mistakes, for, with the majority of husbands, the art of governing a woman is even less understood than that of making a good choice".⁶¹

It is clear that the buying of a bride was the original form of contracting marriage as it later came to be known. But with the passage of time a new term developed for this form of marriage which was known as "mancipatio". This really meant that "the woman was transferred from the father's to the husband's guardianship and was placed completely under the domination of

⁵⁹E. Goody, Conjugal Separation and Divorce Among the Gonja. P. 20.

⁶⁰E. Bergler. Unhappy Marriage and Divorce. (New York: International University Press, 1946), p. 11.

⁶¹Honore de Balzac, The Psychology of Marriage. (London: Privately Printed.) P. 121.

the latter which also meant that he could dispose of her for life, sell her as slave, or even put her to death. What children she bore belonged as a matter of course to the husband and were subject to his authority".⁶²

This form of marriage comes very close to the idea of mediaeval marriage, and as a matter of fact was actually practiced within the mediaeval church. In mediaeval times, "every family was a kind of dynasty, and marriage was for the sake of perpetuating that family....and even among the weavers, artisans, and stonemasons, there was the same feeling. A young girl is kept in the convent in France that she may be out of the world, and may not make the acquaintance of men, and form attachments which might prove an unsurpassable obstacle to her accepting the stranger-husband whom her family had provided or shall provide for her".⁶³ Now accepting this form of marriage to suffice for the mediaeval marriage, we are in order to understand it better, tempted to ask the question, What then did marriage mean to the mediaeval mind? "It meant that two young persons came and took their place in this line of generations, and that they undertook the duty of providing an heir for this family, and of seeing to it that this family tradition should be duly maintained and handed on to another age. That is the reason why the happiness of the young man and the young woman was deemed so merely

⁶²Trans. T. H. Winslow. "The Remaking of Marriage. (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1931), pp. 206-207. (Paul Bjerre, original author.)

⁶³Felix Adler, Marriage and Divorce. (New York: McClure, Phillips and Co., 1905), pp. 9-10.

incidental and secondary a matter when compared with the interests of the family".⁶⁴

Thus for all but a negligible minority; "marriage in the 'good old days' was economically possible to the girl of eighteen and the boy of twenty-one. The boy at that age was earning as much as he would ever earn, unless--what was rare--he chanced to graduate from the journeyman into the master class; and the girl was ready to practise all those arts of the 'virtuous woman' so glowingly enumerated in the final chapter of the Book of Proverbs".⁶⁵

With the intervention of the medieval church in matters of marriage, the system, however, changed considerably. Christian marriage was considered as a sacrament and therefore indissoluble. But the fact still remained that, "in the Middle Ages, as in pagan times, marriage was primarily an economic arrangement which had no necessary connection with the tender passion. And even if the connubial arrangement resulted, as well it might, in a certain domestic affection, it was agreed on all hands that the quality of this feeling was very different from love".⁶⁶ Besides this, according to the medieval view, passionate love itself was wicked, and it did not cease to be wicked even if the object of your passions were your legal mate. If a man had once yielded to this emotion he had no choice between "guilty and innocent" love before him; he had only the choice, either of

⁶⁴Adler, p. 11.

⁶⁵Horace J. Bridges, The Fine Art of Marriage. (Chicago: 203 North Wabash Avenue, 1930), pp. 47-48.

⁶⁶Valency, p. 63.

repentance, or else of different forms of guilt.

The views of medieval churchmen on the sexual act within marriage (there is no question of course, about the act outside marriage) are all limited by two complementary agreements. On the other hand, nobody ever asserted that the act was intrinsically sinful, but all were agreed that some evil element was present in every concrete instance of this act since the Fall....Gregory, at the end of the sixth century, was perfectly clear on this question: for him the act is innocent but the desire an evil....Hugo of St. Victor agrees with Gregory in thinking the carnal desire an evil. But he does not think that this makes the concrete act guilty, provided it is 'excused' by the good ends of marriage such as offspring.⁶⁷

This view of the church only produced a certain willfulness, a readiness to emphasize rather than to conceal the conflict between their "amatory" and religious ideals. Thus if the Church decreed that passionate love even of one's own wife was mortal sin, the advocate of courtly love would produce a "rule" that true love was impossible in marriage. If the Church decreed that the sexual act could be "excused" only by the desire for offspring, then it becomes a mark of a true lover, like Chaucer's knight, that he served Venus "More for delyt than world to multiplye". Thus what chiefly distinguished love from marriage was therefore the voluntary element. "The medieval lady had little to say about the selection of a husband, generally speaking, she had complete freedom of choice with respect to a lover. Accordingly she was able to participate at the same time in two cultural patterns, each of which gave her a special status as a human being. While in the one system she was presumably an

⁶⁷Lewis, The Allegory of Love, p. 16.

imbecile, in the other she was a goddess before whom strong men trembled, all wise, all beautiful, the object of adoration, the mirror of perfection, the guiding star of the knight".⁶⁸ Ellen Key is justified then in saying that, "neither history nor ethnography need be appealed to against an assertion which is sufficiently refuted by the fact that monogamy, according to our strict definition, has never yet been a reality even among the Christian nations, except for a minority of individuals; that all the progress that is ascribed to Christian civilisation has taken place while monogamy was indeed the law but polygamy the custom".⁶⁹

But child marriages were the real curse of medieval home life in high society. The Church did refuse to recognize the bond of marriage if it took place before both parties had turned seven; and though she further forbade the making of such contracts until the age of twelve for the girl and fifteen for the boy, she did not dare to oppose the validity of the marriage once contracted. The law was that the "Church in authorising a reasonable beating, may have had in view the lady's age, which sometimes was tender. Legally a girl could not be married until she was twelve. But feudalism had evasions which the Church could not always prevent. Sovereign though she was over villeins and vassals and suzerains as well, yet the high lords, sovereign too, married when and whom they liked, children if it suited them and

⁶⁸Valency, p. 64.

⁶⁹Ellen Key, Love and Marriage. (G. P. Putnam's Son, New York and London: The Knickerbocker Press, 1911), p. 7.

there was a fief to be obtained".⁷⁰ Then too, "after a few years of marriage, a husband who had wearied of his wife could suddenly discover that they were related...and there was a revival under canonical and pious forms of the ancient practice of divorce".⁷¹

Coulton tells us of one child marriage which touched all England. When the good Queen Anna of Bohemia was dead, for whose sake Richard II would never again live in his Palace of Shene, it was still necessary that he take another wife. He chose the little daughter of the French King, who was then only seven years old. The pair was affianced by proxy in 1395. Next year the two kings met personally between Guines and Artres to discuss the matter. When some remark was made relating to the age of the future queen, the king of England told the king of France that he was well pleased "with the present age of our wife". The rest of the conversation indicated that the marriage would create such an alliance that no other in Christendom could defeat them. Richard II's first marriage, which had turned out so happily, was in its essence a bargain of pounds, shillings, and pence. A contemporary chronicler recorded how Richard offered an immense sum for her in order to outbid his royal brother of France, heads the whole account of the transaction with the plain words, "The king buys himself a wife".⁷²

As I look back upon information concerning the bought and paid for attitude of the medieval male toward the medieval

⁷⁰Saltus, p. 147.

⁷¹G. C. Coulton, Chaucer and His England. (New York: Dutton and Company, Inc., 1927), pp. 204-205.

⁷²Coulton, pp. 207-209.

female--his ability to purchase her as well as rid himself of her almost at will--I cannot help wondering if the women of the day had anything to say about this business of love. I find, after some searching, that she did have some authority in the courts of love. Since the "act of fealty" between lovers was not looked upon lightly, but as a binding law, then there must have been frequent cases in which love's law was called to question.

The decision was always referred to ladies, and we know the names of several whose decisions on love questions were greatly celebrated....Queen Eleanor of England once judged that according to love's law, love was incompatible with marriage, which, under feudalism, was a mere affair of political and personal interest....In another judgment by Eleanor, a knight sought the love of a lady without success; yet she accepted his presents, and apparently with ardour which gave him full encouragement to hope. Eleanor decided that a woman must either refuse presents offered her in the name of love, or reward them, or be degraded in her rank among womankind.⁷³

The lady judges who were appealed to on these questions called around them a court composed of persons of their own sex to assist them with their counsels. This arrangement appears at first to have been merely voluntary on the part of the lady who was called upon to judge, but soon led to a regular and well acknowledged institution known as the Courts of Love.

These courts were established not only to pass judgment on matters of love, but also to prevent erotic behavior on the part of the knight, and lessen the cruelties inflicted by the lady on the knight. For example:

⁷³wright, pp. 137-138.

Pierre Vidal--a troubadour attached himself to Louve de Penautier as his lady-love, and not content with singing her praise in the most high-flown style, he determined to give a convincing proof to the world.... Remembering that her name, Louve, which meant a "she-wolf", he elected to celebrate henceforth he would be called "Loup", or "the he-wolf",...even this demonstration did not satisfy Vidal, who to convince men he was in earnest, and possibly also to stamp upon the memory of those around him the fact that he was henceforth to be called "Loup",...dressed himself in the skin of a wolf, and offered to be hunted on the mountains by the dogs in that eccentric guise. Accordingly, a pack of hounds was brought, huntsmen were prepared and the extraordinary hunt began. Vidal flying in front in the wolf-skin, and making every effort possible to elude the velocity of the dogs behind him....The unfortunate poet was almost killed by the ferocious animals who had seized him, and with his last breath--for he was supposed to be dying--demanded to be carried to the castle of his lady-love.⁷⁴

There was another troubadour who had left his first lady-love for another lady, but he was not accepted by the second lady, who had asked him to go back to the first. When he did go back, however, he was not accepted on account of his infidelity. He then decided to spend the rest of his days in the forest in a mud hut and let his beard grow till it touched his foot. After two years of this hard life, his friends went to the lady and begged her to take him back, but she still refused. After repeated requests by his friends on the poet's behalf, the lady finally agreed to take him back if two hundred such devoted lovers would crawl on their knees and beg of the lady for

⁷⁴Rawbotham, pp. 233-244.

mercy, then she might take him back. Of course, in those days two hundred such lovers were not hard to get, and finally the poet was restored to the lady's favour. He originally had deserted her because she was rather cruel and gave him not even the hope or slightest sign that she was pleased with his worship.

Wright clings to the supposition that the courts were not mere amusement but were of the strictest order of the day. He continues:

In earlier times, these courts seem to have consisted almost entirely of ladies, but men were afterwards admitted into them, and held office....We have many allusions to courts of this description, in the lighter French poets of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and we might point to several small poems of an allegorical character, in which love is introduced as holding his courts. Among them we must not overlook our own Chaucer's 'Court of Love'. Amid the dissipation of the French court, at the close of the fourteenth and beginning of the fifteenth centuries, the notion of court of love was brought up again, and carried out on a large scale.⁷⁵

CHAUCER

Whether Chucer should be used as a "historical" source to prove the practice of courtly love is a very debatable question. Even though Chaucer may have touched upon many facts of history, he was first and foremost a great dramatic poet. In his writings he touched upon many of the customs and practices of his

⁷⁵Wright, pp. 140-141.

day, and certainly love came in for its share of attention. In the Canterbury Tales, for instance, two types of love are prominent--the courtly love of the higher classes and the fabliau love which he portrayed in the loves of the lives of the people of the lower classes. In the Knight's Tale, for example, love is conceived of as a god whose power is absolute. The Nun's Priest's Tale, on the other hand, tells the humorous love story of Chauntecleer and Pertelote. The Squire hints at the rules of secrecy in love affairs in his Tale. Of course, Chaucer's greatest masterpiece of courtly love is Troilus and Creseyde. It is one thing to retell Chaucer's own idea of a subject or social practice. I feel that he is inclined to display a rather pointed humor at the extravagance of lovers; yet it cannot be said with certainty that he deliberately satirized the courtly love practice. All I seem to be justified in saying is that he used courtly ideas, just as he used every part of life about him, for his artistic purposes. For example, one of the commonest sentiments in the love poetry of the troubadours is that of Chretien. In the book of Andreas the idea was that love is not only good in itself but is the cause and origin of all good. This idea appears in Pandarus's words to the love-stricken Troilus:

And for-thy loke of good comfort thou be;
 ...for nought but good it is
 To loven wel, and in a worthy place;
 Thee oughte not to clepe it hap, but grace.⁷⁶

⁷⁶Dodd, p. 129.

On March 7th, 1277, the moral code of courtly love was condemned by Archbishop Stephen Tempier at Paris. Among two hundred nineteen propositions then condemned as contrary to orthodoxy and good morals, the following expressly related to courtly love:

(1) Simple fornication is not sin. (2) Chastity, i.e., abstinence by vow from illicit things is not a greater good than perfect abstinence. (3) Continnence, the virtue by which one abstains from venereal pleasures, is not essentially a virtue, i.e., a principle of good works. (4) It is impossible that sin be committed in the superior powers of the soul, i.e., in the mind and will; thus sin is a result of brute passion and not of love. (5) Finally, a body of propositions aimed at the destruction of the role of reason and its liberty of judgment in the exercise of the will. The will acts under constraint, necessarily, of the desired object. The appetible object is the sole cause of the motion of the will.⁷⁷ Denomy says that "Andreas sought to show as a necessary conclusion of reason that, if man is viewed solely as a rational and natural creature, subject only to the laws of nature and reason, then reason and nature demand that he enroll in the army of the god of love, that he seek the pleasures of the flesh so that he may be ennobled and grow in virtue and in worth".⁷⁸ He further feels that Chaucer knew of the condemnation of 1277, one of the great events in the history of medieval philosophy. In spite of this Chaucer involved himself in writing

⁷⁷A. J. Denomy. The Two Moralities in Chaucer's Troilus and Creseyde. (Chaucer Criticism, Vol. II, already cited), pp. 153-155.

⁷⁸Denomy, p. 154.

a romance of courtly love despite the risk of an accusation of teaching or, at least of upholding, immorality and the accusation of heresy. "But," he says, "Chaucer, I think consciously set out to meet these dangers by three devices. Unlike Andreas, he was not teaching courtly love ex professo. He was concerned not with giving courtly love a logical or philosophical basis but with using it as a background for a story he had to tell. In the case of Andreas, heresy is actually and expressly taught and defended. With Chaucer an immoral and heretical teaching is utilized as a vehicle."⁷⁹

However, Dorothy Bethurum feels quite differently towards the idea of Denomy when he tries to tell us that Chaucer has used the courtly ideas more for irony. She says, "the end of Troilus can not be taken to mean that Chaucer was urging all youth to renounce earthly love and enter a convent. And if not, and if one lives in the world, one must obey the law of kind and love, for love as 'Chaucer so eloquently says, is the great teacher of virtue', it cured Troilus of his pride and Criseyde of her self-centeredness, and each 'tho (their vices) gan for a vertu change' 'This wolde love, yheried be his grace'".⁸⁰

The entire work deals with the different ideas of the courtly love tradition, but the most explicit of all the courtly doctrines, which is most prominent in Troilus, is the doctrine of secrecy which has already been discussed. Thus if love is ridiculed anywhere in his work, it is done by some of his characters.

⁷⁹Denomy, p. 155.

⁸⁰Dorothy Bethurum, Chaucer's Point of View as Narrator in the Love Poems. (Essay from the Chaucer Criticism, Vol. II), p. 226.

I feel that I actually have no right to say that any thoughts he expresses, either as thoughts or actions of his characters, are his own ideas.

Also, how Chaucer actually felt about women and marriage I cannot tell as he reveals his characters to us. He gives us both the evil and the good views of women. His worst offense toward womankind was his portrayal of the Wife of Bath. The merchant and the host complain of the violent tempers of their wives, and it is somewhat significant that not one of the Canterbury Pilgrims brought his wife with him. The story of Alison, the wife of the Carpenter in the Miller's Tale, which even Chaucer's wit and charm cannot redeem from coarseness, makes us suspect that faithlessness to marriage vows was neither very unusual nor very severely condemned by public opinion, for no one objected to this tale except the Reeve, and he only objected because he was a carpenter himself and consequently did not like to hear a fellow-craftsman ridiculed.

However, in spite of what has been said of the women in the Canterbury Tales, there is no doubt that Chaucer had "stronger personal sympathies with Criseyde". Although the story is professedly written to tell the sorrows of Troilus, the poet himself,

undoubtedly felt the charms of his heroine. It is perhaps from a desire to magnify her attractive qualities that the poet makes Troilus's affair with her the first love experience of the hero; whereas, in Baccaccio, Troilo had often before felt the stings of love.⁸¹

⁸¹Dodd, p. 143.

Dorothy Bethurum in connection with the above quote, says that,

the love poets of the Middle Ages thought they were writing about perfect and stable felicity and then described something that fell short of it. But they were not: they were writing about human love. The troubadours and the Italian poets knew no satisfied love; they knew desire, courtoisie, the elevation that comes from loving the donna angelicata. But peace and security they do not talk about at all; they know it is not to be had. And at the end of the Roman, when Genius compares the earthly garden with the heavenly, he is not only saying what everybody knows, that human happiness is unattainable, that lasting felicity is not an earthly commodity. But the greatest happiness that is possible in the sublunar realm comes from love. And⁸² to that I think Chaucer would subscribe.

Thus if Chaucer is a little kind to Cresseide, it should not be wondered at, because, basically, Chaucer was writing the romance of two human beings set against the background of courtly love. Besides, Chaucer was a poet with a man's heart and a woman's tender words.

CONCLUSION

As I look back upon the above picture of courtly love and marriage, I realize how intriguing, paradoxical, and complex the problem of the sex relationship is within the entire system of "courtly love and feudal tradition". But in spite of what has been said, about the very rigid rules, I must say that there were some homes in which love, somewhat as it is thought of today, was

⁸²Dorothy Bethurum, p. 229.

demonstrated. Such love and marriage as has been seen in this paper was not an ideal state of things, but for centuries they served to people the earth. Also, what has been said in relation to love and marriage has pertained largely to the upper classes. Among the poor it is probable that marriage was less "clogged by mercenary motives". There is slight evidence on this subject, but it is known that with the rise of the middle class and other determining factors, the whole feudal system began to fall apart. With the decay of feudalism went many of the practices here described. However, I might say that the love and marriage practices of the age under discussion are certainly making a "return engagement" in our own age--the wheel of Fortune is turning--and Hollywood and Reno are not the only "biggest little cities", where they are making their scheduled appearance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer wishes to express her sincere appreciation to Dr. William C. Hummel, Professor of English, Kansas State University, for his guidance, constructive criticism and help in the preparation of this report.

Sincere appreciation is also due Dr. Earle Davis, Head of the Department of English, and Dr. Arthur Langvardt, Professor of English, for their valuable counsel.

The author wishes to express her sincere appreciation to her guardian, Mr. Indhubhai A. Patel, for his support, and to her mother, Lilian F. Miller, for encouragement throughout the period of stay in the United States.

LITERATURE CITED

- Adams, Dr. Clifford R. and Vince Pickard. How to Pick a Mate. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, Inc., 1946.
- Adler, Felix. Marriage and Divorce. New York: McClure, Phillips & Co., 1905.
- Avebury, Right Hon. Lord. Marriage, Totemism and Religion. London, New York, Bombay, and Calcutta: Longmans, Green and Co., 1911.
- Balzac, Honore de. The Psychology of Marriage. London: Printed privately, n.d.
- Bergin, Thomas Goddard. Anthology of the Provencal Troubadours. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.
- Bergler, Edmund. Unhappy Marriage and Divorce. New York: International University Press, 1946.
- Bjerre, Paul. The Remaking of Marriage. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931. Translated by T. H. Winslow.
- Bridges, Horace J. The Fine Art of Marriage. Chicago: 203 North Wabash Avenue, 1930.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey. The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer. Editor F. N. Robinson. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1957.
- Chaytor, H. J. The Troubadours. Cambridge: University Press, 1912.
- Coulton, G. C. Chaucer and His England. New York: Dutton and Company, Inc., 1927.
- Crawley, Ernest. The Mystic Rose, two volumes. New York: Boni and Liveright Publishers, 1927.
- Dodd, William C. Courtly Love in Chaucer and Gower. London: Ginn and Company, 1913.
- Fortes, Meyer. Marriage in Tribal Society. Cambridge: Dept. of Archaeology and Anthropology at the University Press, 1962.
- Fraser, Russell A. The Court of Venus. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1955.
- Hall, John. The Court of Virtue. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1565. Ed. by Russell A. Fraser.

LITERATURE CITED

- Adams, Dr. Clifford R. and Vince Pickard. How to Pick a Mate. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, Inc., 1946.
- Adler, Felix. Marriage and Divorce. New York: McClure, Phillips & Co., 1905.
- Avebury, Right Hon. Lord. Marriage, Totemism and Religion. London, New York, Bombay, and Calcutta: Longmans, Green and Co., 1911.
- Balzac, Honore de. The Psychology of Marriage. London: Printed privately, n.d.
- Bergin, Thomas Goddard. Anthology of the Provencal Troubadours. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.
- Bergler, Edmund. Unhappy Marriage and Divorce. New York: International University Press, 1946.
- Bjerre, Paul. The Remaking of Marriage. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931. Translated by T. H. Winslow.
- Bridges, Horace J. The Fine Art of Marriage. Chicago: 203 North Wabash Avenue, 1930.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey. The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer. Editor F. N. Robinson. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1957.
- Chaytor, H. J. The Troubadours. Cambridge: University Press, 1912.
- Coulton, G. C. Chaucer and His England. New York: Dutton and Company, Inc., 1927.
- Crawley, Ernest. The Mystic Rose, two volumes. New York: Boni and Liveright Publishers, 1927.
- Dodd, William C. Courtly Love in Chaucer and Gower. London: Ginn and Company, 1913.
- Fortes, Meyer. Marriage in Tribal Society. Cambridge: Dept. of Archaeology and Anthropology at the University Press, 1962.
- Fraser, Russell A. The Court of Venus. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1955.
- Hall, John. The Court of Virtue. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1565. Ed. by Russell A. Fraser.

Weigand, Hermann J. Courtly Love in Arthurian France and Germany. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1956.

West, C. B. Courtoisie in Anglo-Norman Literature. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1938.

Westermarck, Edward. The History of Human Marriage. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1925. In three volumes.
V. II.

Wright, Thomas. Womankind in Western Europe. London: Groombridge and Sons, 1867.

LOVE VERSUS MARRIAGE

by

BARBARA A. MILLER

B. A., Aligarh University, India, 1960

AN ABSTRACT OF
A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of English

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1963

Courtly love first appeared quite suddenly at the end of the eleventh century in Languedoc. It was a love of a highly specialized type, and generally consisted of the love of an unmarried knight for a married lady. It was this form of love lyrics of the troubadours, who were considered the originators of this new system of courtly ideals. The lover is always submissive to his lady's lightest wish, however unjust, and calls her midons, which etymologically represents not my lady but my lord. Just as in feudalism the vassal acknowledged his suzerain, so the knight or squire contracted similar obligations towards his lady. However, there were four degrees in this form of love. The first is that of hesitating, the second that of supplicating, the third that of being listened to, and the fourth is called that of an accepted lover.

In the poetry of the troubadours the lady is regularly represented as perfect in all her attributes. Although her good qualities are exaggerated, the poet often was her humble lover as well as politically her subject. Her character is distinguished by courtesy, kindness, refinement, and good taste. She rarely appeared as a personality in the poetry of the troubadours, but from the portrayal of the poet's own feelings, her attitude toward him is made clear. Although she possesses every good quality, her lover seldom experiences her kindness.

Andreas Capellanus, who had worked out quite fully the rules and regulations of love in his De Amore, raises and answers questions like, What is love? Between whom should it exist? What is the duty of one lover when the other proves unfaithful? How

can love be acquired and retained? He also gives an account of how the British knight acquired the rules of love through his vision of the palace of the God of Love.

Eleanor of Aquitaine and her daughter, Marie of Champagne, were mainly responsible for the introduction of this form of love into northern France. Before leaving her southern home to become queen of France, she encouraged this form of love and at the northern court she is said to have lent her authority in matters pertaining to the new doctrine. Marie of Champagne also promoted this new doctrine. She was not only content to impress them on Chretien de Troies, who in turn introduced them into his new romances of the Round Table, but is said to have established courts of love. These courts served two other purposes also. One, they not only prevented the courtly lover from going to extremes in his behavior, but, two, restrained the lady from being too cruel towards her lover.

The most important doctrine of this whole system of courtly love was the doctrine of secrecy and the idea that true love existed only outside of marriage. Marriage had nothing to do with love and no nonsense about marriage was tolerated. All matches that were contracted by the feudal lords were matches of interest. The same lady who was the dearest dread of her vassal was often little better than a piece of property to her husband. Thus in a society where marriage was purely utilitarian, any idealization of sexual love must begin by an idealization of adultery.

The second factor that prevented the men of the Middle Ages from connecting their ideal of romantic love with marriage was

the medieval theory of marriage--or the sexology of the medieval church. On the one hand, nobody ever asserted that the act was intrinsically sinful, and, on the other hand, all were agreed that some element of evil was present in every concrete expression of physical love. Jealousy was a prerequisite for a lover but considered to be in bad taste for a husband.

The third evil that existed within the medieval church was child marriage. In spite of the prescribed age by the church for a legal marriage between two persons, the people married at all ages, and the Church had very little to say against the influence of wealth.

How Chaucer actually felt about the entire system of courtly love is hard to tell, but I can only say that in his Troilus and Creseyde he has lavishly made use of the courtly ideas of love. How he actually felt about the women of the age is again a question that he can answer best. All I can say is that his worst offense toward womankind was his portrayal of the wife of Bath. It is also significant that none of the Canterbury pilgrims brought their wives with them. Thus I feel I have no right to say that any thoughts he expresses, either as thoughts or actions of his characters, are his own ideas. Even at times if he tends to be more sympathetic towards Creseyde than is Boccaccio, it is only natural as Chaucer was a poet with a very human heart.

In conclusion, love as I have depicted it, often existed only among the upper classes. With the fall of feudalism and

the rise of the middle class, many of these practices here described fell into decay or were completely ignored.