

1962

Allusions to the royal family in the works of Geoffrey Chaucer

Mary Ella Wetten Banzhof
Lehigh University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://preserve.lehigh.edu/etd>

 Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wetten Banzhof, Mary Ella, "Allusions to the royal family in the works of Geoffrey Chaucer" (1962). *Theses and Dissertations*. 3123.
<https://preserve.lehigh.edu/etd/3123>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Lehigh Preserve. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Lehigh Preserve. For more information, please contact preserve@lehigh.edu.

ALLUSIONS TO THE ROYAL FAMILY IN
THE WORKS OF GEOFFREY CHAUCER

by

Mary Ella Wetten Banzhof

A Thesis

Presented to the Graduate Faculty
of Lehigh University
in Candidacy for the Degree of
Master of Arts

Lehigh University

1962



This thesis is accepted and approved in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

September 14, 1962
(date)

John A. Hertz
Professor in charge

J. Burke Sevier
Head of the Department

Preface

My interest in the relationship between Chaucer's works and the current happenings of his day stems from my participation in a Chaucer seminar during the fall and spring terms of 1958-59. During these courses the more scholarship, pro and con, dealing with references to contemporary affairs that I read the more I wanted to read. This paper, then, supplied a concrete purpose for my continued reading. I owe my original and developing interest in this subject to Professor J. Burke Severs, and I am indebted to Professor John A. Hertz for his patient supervision during the writing of this paper.

Since Chaucer was interested in the people from all walks of life, it was necessary to restrict my field of study. The final decision confined the subject to allusions to the royal family; therefore all of the characters discussed within this paper were either members of the royal family or directly connected to them by marriage or parenthood.

In order to arrange this research material in as practical a fashion as possible, I have used two approaches to the topic. A detailed discussion of the scholarship was developed using a simplified form of F. N. Robinson's arrangement of Chaucer's works as a method of organization.¹ This system was chosen because nearly all presentations of Chaucer deal with particular works; therefore this method should prove to be most useful. In order to make it possible to locate quickly all the material devoted to a particular member of the royal family,

I have also constructed a chart and written very brief sketches showing the relationship between Chaucer's works and his royal coevals.

Among the people who have published the books and the papers which have become the source material for this paper are scholars of long standing and considerable renown as well as newcomers to this field of study. Some of them prefer a broad, general approach to Chaucer and his works like Professors Robinson, Brusendorff, Root, French, Kittredge, Lowes, Manly, etc. Others who have concentrated on the allegorical approach to his works have specialized on the relationship of a particular individual to his works. Some of these scholars are Professors Galway (Joan of Kent), Williams (John of Gaunt and Katherine Swynford), Braddy (Richard II and Marie of France), and O. F. Emerson (Richard II and Anne of Bohemia). In addition there are other scholars, too numerous to list, who are more interested in the canon and chronology of the works, Chaucer's narrative technique, the sources and analogues for the works, or other approaches to the study of Chaucer. This last group are interested in political allegory only when it affects their field of study; consequently their criticism is less frequently mentioned.

Table of Contents

	page
Preface- - - - -	iii
Introduction- - - - -	1
<u>Book of the Duchess</u> - - - - -	5
<u>House of Fame</u> - - - - -	10
<u>Anelida and Arcite</u> - - - - -	14
<u>Parliament of Fowls</u> - - - - -	17
<u>Troilus and Criseyde</u> - - - - -	29
<u>Legend of Good Women</u> - - - - -	33
<u>Canterbury Tales</u> - - - - -	50
Minor Poems- - - - -	62
Royal Family and Chaucer's Works- - - - -	72
Footnotes- - - - -	80
Bibliography- - - - -	97
<u>Vita</u> - - - - -	103

Introduction

It is the purpose of this paper to collate and evaluate the scholarship concerned with the possibility that Chaucer was alluding to contemporary people and events in his works. Chronology has been included only where it influences the historical allusions.

Although a historical interpretation of Chaucer's works is not necessary for appreciation and enjoyment, the literary fashion of the fourteenth century included it. Machaut, Froissart, Deschamps, Grgunson, Gower, Langland, etc. used political allegory in many instances. For example, in France, Deschamps used birds and animals to symbolize prominent people - an eagle represented Charles VI of France, a leopard symbolized English Richard II, etc. In Grounson's poetry, it is not difficult to find verses which identify his amie by means of an acrostic. "Le Songe," "Complainte de Granson," and "Le Souhait de saint Valentin" each contain the name ISABEL. In England, Gower's Mirour de l'Omme contains accepted references to the last years of Edward III's reign when Alice Perrers was a powerful influence on the court.¹ I doubt that Chaucerian scholars will deny that the works of these writers were sources for Chaucer and that he also has some accepted references to current events in his major works.² Therefore it seems logical to continue searching for other references to contemporary affairs in the Book of the Duchess, Troilus and Criseyde, the House of Fame, the Legend of Good Women, etc. To

substantiate this theory further, the records prove that Chaucer was employed by the king's government, went on several diplomatic missions for the king, and was intimately associated with the members of the court. What could have been more natural than his subtle allusions to court personalities as they listened to him recite his poetry, the product of his avocation and a source of entertainment for the court?

In considering Chaucer's poems as occasional pieces one must remember that there are serious pitfalls in this type of research. On the one hand, the advocates of historical allegory may become so carried away with their comparisons that they use only facts which substantiate their theories and discard the remainder. They slide also into the habit of using expressions such as "probably" and "it is safe to assume" to introduce their new hypotheses. On the other hand, the distrust of historical allusions exhibited by some Chaucerians is just as lacking in understanding because it denies a literary custom of the day.

On numerous occasions students of Chaucer have objected strenuously to the whole idea of historical allegory or to a portion of a particular hypothesis. A most vociferous dissenter to the theory of historical allusion was John L. Lowes, who refuted one advocate of contemporary allusions after the other because he felt that Chaucer was borrowing directly from his sources. He accepted only a few references like the dedication to Queen Anne found in lines 496-497 of the Legend of Good Women as allusions to contemporary affairs. The major difficulty with his speculations, for they are as much speculation as Bilderbeck's and Galway's interpretations are, is that he refused to credit the fact that

Chaucer might have followed the lead of the French poets who wrote many of their poems to honor some living lady and adapted his poetry to his immediate surroundings. Graunson, as mentioned earlier, wrote poetry to celebrate a Princess Isabel.³ Deschamps wrote several ballads for Philippa of Lancaster, John of Gaunt's oldest daughter,⁴ and others to honor Marie of Hungary. It was Lowes, himself, who mentioned that French marguerite ballads were written to "celebrate the virtues of Marie of Hungary" in the fall of 1385.⁵ I cannot conceive of Chaucer borrowing the words and thoughts of the French poets without being influenced by their purpose; Chaucer was too much interested in people as individual personalities to write words only. His close association with the courts and the business end of managing a kingdom gave him ample opportunity to observe the day-to-day life of Londoners.

The advocates of historical allusion are just as quick to present their views as their opponents are. Their enthusiasm for their subject ranges from Bertrand H. Bronson's cautious approval of the concept of historical allusion, to the point-by-point method of presenting a hypothesis subscribed to by George G. Williams and his predecessors. Some have fallen into the pitfalls mentioned earlier; others have been more prudent. All are worthy of examination and appraisal.

Although I am certain that Chaucer alluded to his acquaintances in his poetry, I am not convinced that all of the quotations which have been suggested as allusions to occurrences are valid. Chaucer probably was referring to current affairs in some instances and simply exercising his poetic ability to translate and interpret the works of others the rest of the time. For Chaucer to have indulged in all of the political allegory that he has been charged with would have been

hazardous indeed, considering that he was a public servant dependent on the generosity and favor of the Crown.

The possibility of ever positively establishing the identities of his characters is remote because of the nearly six centuries of time which has elapsed since Chaucer was alive. In addition to the time element the haphazard treatment which was accorded the records of the fourteenth century during the intervening years must also be taken into consideration. From this standpoint whether one subscribes to the idea that Chaucer was essentially a realist interested largely in his associates or that he was a student of the French and Italian writers who concerned himself only with translating their works into English, one is faced with the same problem -- lack of reliable information. Consequently it is necessary for all those who are interested in Chaucer and his period of history to approach the scholarship relating to it with an open mind.

The Book of the Duchess

The Deeth of Blaunche the Duchesse as Chaucer called it in his Prologue to the Legend of Good Women (l.F418) is the only one of Chaucer's poems that we can date with certainty. It is also the only one we can feel reasonably confident was related to a historical event.¹

It is generally accepted that Chaucer wrote this poem in honor of Lady Blanche, the daughter of Henry, Duke of Lancaster, and the first wife of John of Gaunt. She died of the Black Plague on September 12, 1369, very shortly after the death of Queen Philippa. This was the third visitation of the Plague during Chaucer's lifetime and one which cost England dearly in human lives.² Queen Philippa and Blanche were both well-loved and much-missed representatives of the ruling class. Court records show that John of Gaunt was not in England at the time of his wife's death because he was on a military mission to France, possibly the campaign in Picardy, and did not return until November, 1369.³ Chaucer was also in France at this time on military duty, probably in John of Gaunt's forces.⁴ With these facts in mind it seems reasonable to assume that, since communications were slow in the later half of the fourteenth century, John of Gaunt did not learn immediately of his wife's death and that Chaucer did not compose the elegy until after his return from France. Numerous Chaucerian scholars subscribe to the theory that John of Gaunt requested Chaucer to write the eulogy.⁵

To substantiate further the identification of Lady Blanche with

"good faire White" of Chaucer's poem, Brusendorff states that during the latter half of the fourteenth century, there was

only one Duchess Blanche in England, the first wife of John Gaunt, and towards the close of the present complaint she and her husband are clearly indicated as the models of the dead wife and her lamenting lover (l.1318f.). These lines evidently contain punning allusions to Blanche of Lancaster and John of Richmond, allusions which complete the identification of the present poem with Chaucer's Death of Blanche the Duchess.⁶

The "punning allusions" mentioned above which are found in ll.1318f.,

A long castel with walles white,
Be seynt Johan! on a ryche hil⁷

were first commented on by Skeat. He thought the "long castel" was Windsor and that "ryche hil" had no significance.⁸ Later, in 1916, Professors Tupper and Savage continued the discussion. Professor Tupper established "ryche hil" as the castle of Richmond in Yorkshire which had belonged to John of Gaunt since he was two years old,⁹ but he missed the connection between the "long castel" and Lancaster. The fact that Chaucer chose to identify "Johan" with Richmond and not with one of the properties which he acquired by marrying Blanche is also worthy of note. Professor Savage noticed the connection between l.1318 and Blanche of Lancaster. He based his theory on Camden's Britannia which stated that the Scots called "Loncaster" "Lon castell"¹⁰ and, of course, he also accepted "white" as a reference to Blanche.¹¹ This correlation is also substantiated by ll.948f. in which Chaucer stated

And goode faire White she het;
That was my lady name ryght.¹²

Another possible allegorical reference in the poem may be the

7

presentation of King Edward III as Octavian, the King. Lines 368 and 1314 are used as a basis for this theory.¹³

Chaucer's eight years sickness of ll.33 ff. has elicited a sizable controversy. The scholarship which considers the lines autobiographical is all that this paper is concerned with. The most persistent exponent of this idea is Dr. Margaret Galway, who is convinced that Chaucer was enamored of Joan of Kent, the mother of King Richard II.

Miss Galway contended that Chaucer was following the tradition of courtly love in which it was customary for a poet to attach himself to the service of some well-known lady, usually a member of the nobility. This arrangement benefited both of them -- the poet praised her beauty and virtue in exchange for her patronage. "Good love-songs, too, were considered a poet's best claim to fame and the greater the renown of his lady the better for his own."¹⁴

On June 20, 1370, Chaucer received a passport and license to be abroad until September 29, but his destination is unknown. A reasonable conjecture, Miss Galway feels, is that Chaucer went to Aquitaine with John of Gaunt, who went to take over the command from the Black Prince. While he was in France, it is likely that he read his important new poem at the English court established there by the Black Prince and Princess Joan.

With Joan as hostess Chaucer could not gracefully have proceeded to recite his eulogy of another lady without first pausing to acknowledge her. A way of doing this would have been to introduce into the poem an assurance that his love for Joan, rendered hopeless by her marriage to the Prince, had nevertheless continued unabated 'this eight year'.¹⁵

Since Miss Galway has suggested Joan of Kent as the subject of all Chaucer's extant serious love-poems, it was not strange that she should propose the above theory.

All but two of the other scholars who have different explanations for these lines do not employ historical allegory, or they associate the references in ll.32-40 with persons outside the royal family.¹⁶ George H. Cowling and Marshall W. Stearns connect Chaucer's eight years sickness with the Duchess Blanche herself. Cowling comments that Chaucer was simply saying that "to see Blanche was to love her; and that from the time when he first saw her, on his return from France in 1361, until her death, she was his sovereign lady - but 'That is doon' - she was dead."¹⁷ Stearns feels that "the poet may have been making known his own respect and esteem for the departed duchess by means of a common literary pose".¹⁸ He continues that since Chaucer disavowed interest in the affairs of love throughout most of his other works, the highly conventional quality of these lines makes them "incapable of being misunderstood. Yet they fit the occasion closely."¹⁹ Chaucer's reference in ll.39-40 to the fact that there is only one physician to remedy the present situation fits well "with the lament of a courtly poet for the death of a great lady."²⁰

Professor Stearns continued the historical analogy by explaining the eight year period as the length of time that Chaucer had known Blanche in King Edward III's court. He cited the investiture of John of Gaunt as the Duke of Lancaster in November 1362, as a possible occasion for the beginning of the friendship between Chaucer and Lady Blanche.

I feel that Professor Stearn's theory in the field of historical allegory is the most credible. I agree that his explanation of Chaucer's eight years sickness does not interfere with Professors Sypherd and Loomis's theories that the lines are "highly conventional" and dependent upon the Old French love poems of that period. In view of the fact that the occasion for the writing of this poem is generally accepted by all scholars, it seems reasonable to assume that ll.32-40 should be in the same vein.

The House of Fame

Like other works of Geoffrey Chaucer, the House of Fame has elicited several allegorical interpretations. The arrival of Anne of Bohemia on English shores was suggested first as the occasion for the poem. Somewhat later John of Gaunt's unsuccessful efforts to "marry off" his daughter Philippa were proposed. The most recent attempt to explain the purpose for writing the House of Fame compares the incidents in the poem to the gossip involving John of Gaunt and Katherine Swynford in 1378.

The Richard and Anne theory was first proposed by Rudolf Immelman,¹ who argued that the poem was written to commemorate the arrival in England of Anne of Bohemia to become the bride of Richard II. But, as one of Immelman's critics has commented, he made so many indefensible statements that it was not difficult for Manly and others to discredit this theory.² Later his theory was revived and modified by Aage Brusendorff, who assigned the composition of the House of Fame to the period of time during which the negotiations for Richard's marriage to Anne were in progress, not to the time of Anne's arrival. Brusendorff concluded that the poem was begun in December, 1380, and probably finished early in 1381.³ Both Immelman and Brusendorff based their theories on lines 647 ff. which speak of Chaucer's lack of news from far countries and the final lines of the poem in which Chaucer referred to "a tydyng for to here, / That I herd of som contre" (ll. 2134-2135) and concluded that the only news

worthy of such comment during the time of Chaucer's incumbency in the position of controller of customs⁴ was the arrangement for Richard's marriage to Anne of Bohemia. The fact that Chaucer chose to use a portion of the Aeneid which is a story of infidelity makes me agree with Bronson⁵ and Riedel⁶ that the House of Fame was not an appropriate gift to a couple about to be married, and therefore I would discount both of the theories.

Another theory which should be disregarded for the same reason was Koch's claim that Chaucer was referring to John of Gaunt's efforts to procure a husband for his daughter Philippa. Koch reasoned that Chaucer culminated the poem abruptly because John of Gaunt was unsuccessful in negotiating a marriage for Philippa with either King Charles VI of France or William of Hainault, minor son of Duke Albert.⁷

As I mentioned previously, both B. H. Bronson and F. C. Riedel have pointed out that the presence of the story of Eneas and Dido in Book I of the House of Fame made the poem very inappropriate as an offering to either the queen-bride or Philippa of Lancaster. Bronson simply discredited the earlier interpretations,⁸ but Riedel supplanted them with a postulation that Chaucer was admonishing John of Gaunt for his questionable love affairs.⁹ In addition to political disfavor, Gaunt had also incurred social displeasure because he had appeared publicly with his mistress, Katherine Swynford, during the summer of 1378. Riedel even equated the destruction of Eneas' navy with the defeat of Gaunt's ships in a naval skirmish with the French during the summer. Chaucer's admonitions against false men (HF 269-271), the eagle's warnings of the evils of gossip (765ff), and the reference to Spain and the fighting for the Castilian throne (116-117, 1239ff.) were

also construed to mean that Chaucer was warning John of Gaunt to be more prudent.

Lines 2155-2159, especially line 2159, have also been the cause of some speculation. Who was the "man of great auctorite" whom Chaucer claimed he could not name? Some have guessed that he referred to King Richard and others think that he alluded to John of Gaunt. The choice between the two in some cases was governed by the allegorical interpretation of the balance of the poem. Other scholars named one of these men simply because he was an example of a contemporary man of authority.¹⁰ Although we will never know for certain, Chaucer may be concealing the name of one of these two men or of some other responsible officer of the court, like Sir Simon Burley. I would suggest Burley because he was closely connected with the royal family, having been put in charge of Richard II's education during his minority, and later still wielded enough power to warrant the ire of the Duke of Gloucester when he temporarily controlled the kingdom in the late 1380's. Even Queen Anne valued Burley enough to plead for his life on her knees when the Duke ordered his execution, but she was unsuccessful. In my opinion Burley is as good a suggestion for the "man of great auctorite", as either King Richard or John of Gaunt.

The whole controversy involving the House of Fame can be summed up rather briefly. Chaucer's reference to his personal affairs in lines 653 ff. and his specific statement that this dream occurred on December tenth lead me to believe that there are grounds for supposing that the House of Fame contains some references to contemporary affairs. I agree that the poem would have been a very unsuitable gift to present to a prospective bride, but I am not entirely satisfied that the Duke of Lancaster's extra-marital affairs were the motive for the composition

of the House of Fame. Until some one with access to contemporary papers can prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that Chaucer was not indebted to John of Gaunt for political and personal patronage, this explanation will remain problematical and the only established facts will be the autobiographical ones.

Anelida and Arcite

Three historical analogies to Anelida and Arcite have been promulgated during the last sixty-five years. Two of them have been refuted; the third appears to have slipped by relatively unnoticed or ignored.

As early as 1896, J. B. Bilderbeck expounded the theory that Arcite portrayed Robert de Vere, the Earl of Oxford, and that Anelida was the model for his wife Philippa, the granddaughter of Edward III. It seems that Robert de Vere became "enamored with one of the Queen's damsels, called the Landgravine,"¹ who had come from Bohemia with Queen Anne. He applied to Pope Urban VI for a divorce from the Clementist Philippa and got it. Bilderbeck reasoned that Chaucer began to write the poem in an attempt to "move the Court to active interference in, as well as to sympathy with, the cause of Philippa" and that when he learned that de Vere had definitely applied for the divorce, he abandoned his work.² Although Tatlock found this allegory attractive, he could not accept it because Chaucer was obligated to the Earl of Oxford.³ It would have been poor economics for Chaucer to have ridiculed him.

The second conjecture was advanced by Frederick Tupper who equated Anelida and Arcite with Anne Welle, the Countess of Ormond ("Ermon" frequently in the chronicles and documents) and the third Earl of Ormond, son of the second Earl and Elizabeth d'Arcy.⁴ These two persons were not members of the royal family; therefore they are

not of interest to this paper, but personal analogies for Theseus, Ipolita, and Emelye are important. Tupper felt that Theseus symbolized Prince Lionel, Ipolita stood for his wife, the Countess of Ulster, and Emelye depicted the Countess's sister, Maud Ufford, who was the mother of Robert de Vere. He even compared the battles between the English by birth and the English by blood (descendants of the Anglo-Norman settlers of two centuries before) with the battles in the poem between the Athenians and the Thebans.⁵ He also contended that the poem was a tribute to the Countess of Ulster, whom Chaucer had served in his youth and possibly during her fateful sojourn in Ireland.

Just as Bilderbeck's hypothesis was refuted, so has Tupper's theory also been disproved because of lack of substantiating evidence. The two illegitimate sons who may have been born to the Earl of Ormonde prior to his marriage to Anne Welle are not considered sufficient evidence of infidelity to warrant a comparison to this poem. When this portion of the proposed allegory is rejected, the references to members of the royal family have little basis for existence.⁶

The third attempt to find historical allegory was published much more recently by Miss Margaret Galway. In order to advance her contention that Joan of Kent was Chaucer's patroness, and therefore the subject of the majority of his poems, she has suggested that Anelida was Joan of Kent. She feels that the desertion of Anelida, the "feire" heroine, by Arcite, the "fals" knight, paralleled the desertion of Joan by Thomas Holland a year or two after their secret marriage.⁷

An additional corroborating factor for her theory was the fact

that Joan of Kent was called Johanna in contemporary documents and also held the title Lady Wake of Liddel. In the troubadour tradition these two appellations could be construed to form an abbreviated anagram of (Joh)ann-a Lide (l).⁸ To strengthen her hypothesis Miss Galway suggested that Holland (Arcite) had fallen in love with Lady Fame who sent him travelling (ll.194-196). The facts that Chaucer stated that he knew not whether Arcite went travelling wearing red and white, Joan's colors, or green, Lady Fame's color, and that Arcite was "clad in asure" (l.330), the color of the background of Holland's arms, were also used in an effort to establish Joan of Kent's claims to identification with Anelida.⁹

There is, in my opinion, reason to believe that Chaucer did intend to allude to contemporary figures in this poem as well as in the Squire's Tale, since he so abruptly discontinued the composition of both of these tales, and no definite source has been assigned to either of them.¹⁰ A reasonable assumption is that the occasions for writing them no longer existed. But, returning to Anelida and Arcite in particular, inasmuch as the refutations of Bilderbeck's and Tupper's theories are quite credible and Miss Galway has compared Anelida's complaint with a period in Joan of Kent's life when Chaucer was less than ten years old and not likely to have been interested, in nor acquainted with a court love affair, the question of whom Chaucer was describing is still to be answered.

The Parliament of Fowls

No other poem among Chaucer's works has received as many different historical interpretations as the Parliament of Fowls has. The usual prominent members of the English royal family plus a few titled foreigners have been suggested as identifications for the Parliament characters. In all, seven separate allegories have been recommended.

In spite of the fact that the many efforts to establish a connection between contemporary events and this work have not produced an approved theory, the Parliament of Fowls has been generally accepted as an occasional poem. About a century ago, ten Brink remarked: "Undoubtedly the Parliament of Fowls represents the wooing of a person of high rank, crossed, as it seems, by rivals and by impediments of other kinds."¹ Recently, F. N. Robinson commented: "The Parliament looks, without doubt, like an occasional piece."² The only difficulty which remains is the formulation of a theory which is substantiated by the text of the poem.

The two earliest hypotheses have been abandoned as untenable, but they should be mentioned for the record. In the earliest of the modern editions of Chaucer's works, Thomas Tyrwhitt proposed John of Gaunt and Blanche of Lancaster as identifications for the "royal tersel" and the "formel egle."³ But the Italian influences in the poem, noted by ten Brink, made it impossible for the poem to have been written before 1372; therefore since Gaunt and Blanche married in 1359, they

could not represent the "egles."⁴

Later the courtship of Enguerrand, Lord de Couci, and Isabel Plantagenet, the daughter of Edward III, was offered as an explanation.⁵

Lord de Couci was in England with King John of France as a hostage by the Treaty of Bretigny. Even though they were prisoners, they were entertained at the English court as though they were honored guests. The originator of the theory claimed that Enguerrand de Couci had wooed Isabel at Eltham and married her a year later. F. J. Furnivall effectively discounted this theory by proving that the court was not at Eltham in February of 1364.⁶

Late in the nineteenth century John Koch postulated the theory that Chaucer was honoring the marriage alliance between Richard II and Anne of Bohemia and that the poem was written in 1381.⁷ The fact that Anne had several suitors, just as the formel eagle in the Parliament of Fowls did, led him to believe that this match was the occasion of the poem. He cited a biography of Wenceslas I, Anne's brother, by Pelzel as his source of information. Pelzel stated that the emissaries from Richard II came in January of 1381. They were graciously received and the proposed match was regarded favorably because Anne's engagement to the Margrave of Meissen had been broken off and also because Anne had reached the age when she could choose her own husband. Pelzel also commented that Anne had been betrothed earlier to a prince of Bavaria. This account by Pelzel plus Froissart's remarks relative to the ambassadors who were sent to offer Anne a royal English marriage led Koch to think Chaucer was celebrating the arrangements for this marriage. He even quoted line 649, "And after that to have by choys al fre:", as evidence because Anne was of age and free to choose her own husband. Using these contemporary

documents as a foundation for his hypothesis, Koch recommended Anne of Bohemia, King Richard II, William of Bavaria, and Frederick of Meissen as the major figures in the poem,⁸ but his concluding statement is that Chaucer wrote the Parliament on Saint Valentine's Day in 1381, "As a kind of prophecy, not as a historical song."⁹

The second theory involving Richard and Anne was originally offered by Oliver F. Emerson. He agreed with Koch that the "formel" and the "foul royal" were Anne of Bohemia and King Richard II and that one of the other two suitors was Frederick of Meissen. He did not agree though that the third suitor was Prince William of Baiern-Holland (Bavaria) because Anne's betrothal to him was terminated in 1373, when her engagement to the Margrave of Meissen was begun.¹⁰ The annulment of Anne's betrothal to William was complete and apparently satisfactory to William's father, Duke Albert, because he began negotiations very soon for an alliance between his son and Marie, the daughter of Charles V of France. As was pointed out by Samuel Moore, this marriage treaty was never fulfilled, for Marie died in 1377.¹¹ Other reasons for assuming that the William-Anne engagement was completely severed were Sir Simon Burley's pleasant association with Duke Albert when he stopped in Brussels during his journey to Germany as Richard II's emissary seeking Anne's hand,¹² and Anne's visit of a month with William's parents on her way to England to marry Richard II.¹³ The new match with Frederick of Meissen must have been considered very favorable by Anne's father because he pledged the two towns of Brux and Laun as security for the contract. It also seemed quite logical to Emerson to assume that this engagement was not formally severed since Frederick finally forcibly took the two towns from Wenceslas I in 1397.¹⁴

The continuous struggle for a balance of power between England and France and between Pope Urban and Pope Clement VII during the Papal Schism of 1378 had made Anne a political pawn; therefore Emerson reasoned that these controversies should be taken into account. He discovered that Pope Clement advocated a French-German union, but Pope Urban favored an English-German alliance. In fact, the representative of Urban threatened to brand Charles IV, the father of Anne and Wenceslas, as a heretic if Wenceslas I supported French Pope Clement. This threat also precluded a military alliance with France, so Anne's brother wrote to Richard II seeking a closer affiliation with England. This overture, then, led to the marriage of Richard and Anne.¹⁵

He also uncovered two statements which suggested that the Dauphin, who became King Charles VI in September of 1380, was the French candidate for Anne's hand. According to Froissart, when Charles V of France, who was dying, learned of the new relationship between England and Germany, he instructed his courtiers: "Seek out in Germany an alliance for my son, that our connections there may be strengthened. You have heard that our adversary is about to marry from thence to increase his alliance."¹⁶ The other assertion was made by Adam of Usk, an English chronicler, who stated that "The said Lady Anne was bought for a price by our lord the king for she was much sought in marriage by the king of France."¹⁷

Since, according to these reports, Frederick of Meissen and Charles VI were both suitors for Anne's hand at the same time that Richard II was, Emerson suggested them as identifications for the two lesser tercel eagles. A later entry by Froissart indicated that Charles V may have been referring to another German princess when he

requested on his deathbed that a marriage alliance for his son should be sought in Germany to offset the English-Bohemian alliance. This entry has been brought forward by another scholar as evidence that Charles VI was not a suitor for Anne.¹⁸ However, the fact that Anne needed and received a safe-conduct passport from Charles VI before she resumed her journey to England¹⁹ may indicate that Charles VI was interested either in Anne herself or in preventing her marriage to Richard -- which, we do not know. If he was interested in Anne, then he can be considered a suitor in the allegory of the poem, but if he was only interested in stopping the marriage, he does not fit the allegory. He did marry Isabella of Bavaria in 1385.

The fact that the English king claimed France as English territory and therefore did not recognize Charles VI as king of France makes the presentation of Charles as an ordinary tercel eagle understandable. Frederick, on the other hand, was the heir to a small principality; consequently he did not deserve to be represented by a "foul royal" either.

Like Koch, Ermerson thought that lines 645 ff., which state the request of the "formel egle" for free choice of a husband, referred to Anne, who had reached the age which gave her the right to choose her own husband. He also felt that the formel's request for a "respite" in which to make a decision alluded to the year which was consumed by negotiations.²⁰

Another hypothesis was offered by Miss Edith Rickert. Her theory proposed John of Gaunt's eldest daughter Philippa as the formel eagle, King Richard II as the royal tercel, William of Bavaria as the second tercel eagle, and John of Bleis as the third fowl suitor.²¹

The Duke of Lancaster's ambition for the throne, or at least his desire to divert the line of succession to his own line and his lack of popularity in the House of Commons and with the peasantry, was suggested as the social and political situation that Chaucer chose to depict. Why, Miss Rickert asked, had the duke allowed his eldest daughter to reach the mature age of twenty-one unmarried if he did not have royal ambitions? For this reason she suggested that Gaunt was trying to arrange a marriage between the two cousins. The uncertainty of the formel was attributed to the possibility of a marriage between Richard and Anne of Bohemia. Actually, even if the duke did aspire to control the throne, it would have been very poor policy on Chaucer's part to have focused attention on his hopes since the duke's popularity was so uncertain and a foreign alliance for Richard was much more beneficial to England.

Because John of Gaunt sent emissaries to Duke Albert, the father of William of Bavaria, to seek a marriage for Philippa, William was named as the second suitor. Unfortunately Gaunt's representatives were received unfavorably; therefore, to my mind, William was never a suitor of Philippa's.

John of Blois, who was a prisoner of the English, was nominated for the third suitor. According to Froissart, John of Blois was offered his freedom and opportunities to become duke of Brittany under allegiance to the English king and to marry Philippa of Lancaster. He was willing to marry Philippa if he were freed from England, but he refused to renounce his French loyalty; so he was sent back to prison.²⁹ In spite of his original willingness to marry Philippa to gain his freedom, he did not do so when he was released in 1387; consequently he can hardly be called a suitor either.

When one looks at this theory as a whole, the identifications for the major bird characters are very remote possibilities, but Miss Rickert's explanation of the bird parliament as a satire on the political factions which made up the British parliament is quite credible. She claimed that the "foules of ravyne" were the nobility, the water fowl were the great merchants, the seed fowl were the simple country gentry, and the worm fowl were the working class. Miss Rickert's point, of course, was that Chaucer satirized the lower classes to please John of Gaunt.

The next theory was postulated by Haldeen Braddy who, after considerable research, came to the conclusion that the Parliament of Fowls alluded to the marriage negotiations for Richard and Marie of France which he claimed were instigated by Edward III's ambassadors at the peace conferences of 1376.²² Braddy conjectured that Chaucer's trips to the continent in 1376-1377 were for the purpose of representing England at the peace conferences at Buenen and Bruges.²³ Since it was not unusual for marriage alliances to be used to cement peace treaties, Braddy assumed that Chaucer might have been involved in discussing both peace and marriage negotiations. When he found an account of the conferences by a contemporary French chronicler (Froissart also records this information) who stated that marriage between Richard, the son of the Black Prince, and Marie, the daughter of Charles V of France, was discussed at these peace conferences, he suggested Richard and Marie as identifications for the royal tercel and the formel eagle.²⁴

Since William of Bavaria had already been a suitor of Marie's for a few years, Braddy had no trouble naming him as the second tercel

eagle. As I mentioned before,²⁵ almost immediately after the annulment of Anne of Bohemia's betrothal to William, Duke Albert sought to arrange a marriage treaty between his son and Marie. His proposition was agreeable to Charles V and the marriage contract between William of Bavaria and Marie of France was confirmed on March 16, 1375. The marriage never occurred, however, because Marie died in 1377 when she was only seven years old.²⁶

Because the third suitor could not be readily identified, Braddy attributed the presence of the third wooer to the literary conventions of the "contending lovers" type of story which requires three suitors and one maiden. He also reasoned that "A contest in which William was presented as Richard's sole competitor would not have been over-flattering to either the French or English court."²⁷

The lines in which the formel eagle requested a "respite" and in which the "parlement" was adjourned were equated with the break in the conference from late March till May first to permit the emissaries to report to their respective governments. It is during this interval that Braddy claims Chaucer wrote the Parliament of Fowls. Braddy concludes his argument with this thought: "And we may believe that the sudden death of the Princess Marie in May was the real reason why the story of the suspended Parlement was never followed by an epithalamium."²⁸

Manly offered the first major rebuttal to this theory. He criticized Braddy for using Froissart as an authority because his accounts of these conferences were written some years after 1377 and are not supported by any contemporary or extant documents. Manly also cited some discrepancies in the royal accounts, which Braddy also had used, which may mean that Marie died before the conference began.²⁹

Naturally, Braddy answered Manly's accusations and did his best to disprove them.³⁰ To the best of my knowledge, although the articles continued, the debate between the two men was never brought to a satisfying conclusion.

To Manly's objections I would like to add my own. The last two suppositions in Braddy's theory are the ones which cause me to doubt the reliability of his hypothesis. In my opinion, Chaucer was too much of a realist to have used the "contending lover" type of story if he lacked an identification for one of the suitors. Secondly, from March to May is not a year and the position of the word "yer" in line 647 does not make it necessary for the rhyme scheme. If Chaucer were uncertain about the length of time that the indecision would last, he could have used a less definite time measure. Braddy, himself, observed that the reassembly date of May first was set before the commissioners went home in March.³¹

My third objection to the Richard-Marie conjecture concerns the stanza consisting of lines 113-119. Although Braddy definitely stated that the astronomical allusion in lines 117-118 agreed with the position of Venus in April, 1377,³² other scholars who have also consulted modern astronomers state that Venus is never in a true north-north-west position over Britain nor was it close in 1377. B. H. Bronson, in particular, asserted that the "stanza invoking Cytherea is believed to indicate a position of the planet Venus which was most closely approximated -- though never reached for Londoners -- in the spring (April-May) of the years 1366, 1374, 1382, 1390, 1398.³³ Actually the closest that Venus approaches the meridian of London is twenty-two degrees away from north-north-west.³⁴

When one considers the Richard-Marie theory in detail, there just seem to be too many discrepancies; therefore, I question its validity.

The latest and least credible of the Parliament of Fowls allegorical interpretations involves the use of acrostic anagrams. The manipulation of line initials and initials after the caesural pause produced letters which were arranged in a manner which spelled out the names of Lionel of Clarence, Violanta Visconti, Galeazzo, and Milan. These acrostically spelled-out names were proposed as evidence that Chaucer was describing the marriage arrangements for Lionel of Clarence's second marriage. The speeches of the second and third tercel eagles revealed the names of the two envoys who were sent to Milan to open negotiations. These two, Humphrey Bohun (Earl of Hereford) and Sir Nicholas Tamworth were "only suitors by proxy" according to Miss Seaton, author of the theory.³⁵

The name of Edmund of Langley, Earl of Cambridge, was also found in the description of the royal tercel. Miss Seaton explained this by citing a postscript at the end of the commission to the two above-named envoys. The postscript stated that if the Lionel-Violanta negotiations were unsuccessful, then Edmund was to be proposed in Lionel's place. The outcome of this postscript was not explained.

A rebuttal to this proposal by a Lehigh Chaucer seminar student followed in the next volume of Medium Aevum. Mrs. Katherine T. Emerson pointed out that Miss Seaton had followed none of the accepted methods of developing anagrams. Instead she had accumulated a stockpile of letters by various methods from which she was able to construct the names she desired. To show how invalid this method was, Mrs. Emerson produced the names of Richard II, William of Hainaut, Frederick of Meissen,

Charles of France, and Anne of Bohemia by the same method. Naturally the end result of this published discussion was that if this method of selection can be applied to both sets of suitors, it is proof for neither one of them.³⁶ This conclusion I heartily endorse.

Soon another article on acrostics and anagrams appeared. In this article acrostics and anagrams were clearly defined. Acrostics follow an inflexible method and proceed with undeviating regularity. Miss Seaton did not do this; therefore her conclusions are invalid. Mrs. Emerson, on the other hand, ably refuted Miss Seaton but erred by "admitting that any acrostic names whatsoever might be there." Lack of an inflexible system for selecting the letters nullifies the whole procedure.³⁷

As I commented at the beginning of this discussion, no other work of Chaucer's has elicited so many theories. Thomas Tyrwhitt and Henry Morley advocated John of Gaunt and Blanche of Lancaster as the major characters; an anonymous author in the April 15, 1871 Saturday Review proposed Enguerand de Couci and Isabel Plantagenet; John Koch, A. W. Ward, and Emile Legouis promoted Richard II, William of Hainaut, Frederick of Meissen, and Anne of Bohemia; O. F. Emerson and Samuel Moore pleaded the cause of Richard II, Frederick of Meissen, Charles VI of France, and Anne of Bohemia; Edith Rickert defended Richard II, William of Hainaut, John of Blois and Philippa of Lancaster; Haldeen Braddy supported Richard, William of Hainaut, and Marie of France; Ethel Seaton tried to justify Lionel of Clarence and Violanta Visconti; John Manly propagated the theory that it was just a St. Valentine's Day poem; Victor Langhans conjectured that it was Chaucer's own marriage; and others (H. Lange, M. E. Reid, T. W. Douglas, W. E.

Farnham, for example) have accepted portions or combinations of the various theories. In spite of all this effort, no one has proved conclusively that his theory is beyond reproach; therefore there is still opportunity for further research. The encouraging feature of this situation is that the Parliament of Fowls is generally accepted as an occasional poem.³⁸ There is no doubt, though, that Chaucer's manner of presenting the three suitors did not puzzle his listening public as it has twentieth century scholars.

Troilus and Criseyde

Although there has been a vast amount of criticism written about Troilus and Criseyde, a relatively small portion of it deals with historical allegory. There is little doubt or question that two of the allusions, the first two discussed, are reliable evidences of fourteenth century affairs; the other suggestions are still open to conjecture.

Quite early in Troilus and Criseyde Chaucer made what must be an allusion to a contemporary person. As Lowes pointed out many years ago, line 171 of Book I, "Right as oure firste lettre is now an A," must refer to Queen Anne because the line is an addition of Chaucer's and because line 169 is the one place that he spelled Criseyde's name with an "A" instead of an "E" in order to maintain the rhyme scheme which was necessary to introduce Queen Anne's initial.¹ The use of prominently displayed royal initials was ordinary during Edward III's and Richard's reigns.²

Later a substantial argument was advanced by Miss Galway in favor of Joan of Kent as the pattern for Criseyde although she did agree that the line "Right as oure firste lettre is now an A" is an allusion to Queen Anne. She reasoned that Chaucer wrote the Troilus at the behest of Joan to present to the King and Queen as a wedding gift. Joan's amorous adventures were again suggested as the source for Chaucer's characterization of Criseyde but specific incidents in Joan's career were not paralleled with the heroine's action.³

In addition to the poem, the Corpus Christi College manuscript of the Troilus contains a frontispiece which depicts a large gathering of obviously notable people. Brusendorff made an early effort to identify the individuals portrayed by the medieval artist.⁴ Miss Galway adopted this chore and has assigned the names of Chaucer's contemporaries to each of the figures in the foreground of the painting and to some of those in the background. Chaucer and fourteen members of the royal family were proposed as models for the figures in the painting. Among them, of course, were Joan of Kent, Richard II, Queen Anne, and John of Gaunt.⁵

Until 1957, these few parallels between the members of the royal family and Troilus and Criseyde were the only ones cited. At this time G. G. Williams proposed a correlation involving John of Gaunt, Katherine Swynford, and Chaucer himself.⁶ He began his assumption by commenting on the fact that in the Filostrato, Chaucer's major source, Boccaccio identified the chief characters as himself and his mistress. According to Williams, Troilus and Criseyde were not Chaucer and his mistress but Chaucer's close friend and patron, John of Gaunt and his mistress, Katherine Swynford. Troilus, as well as John of Gaunt, was a king's younger son and Criseyde, like Katherine Swynford, was a widow of lower rank, but here this parallel ends because there is no evidence that Katherine was unfaithful to Gaunt. The suggestion that their temporary separation in 1381 was the result of interference by Katherine's father, Sir Payne Roet, is hardly tenable because the latter was dead.⁷ A more feasible explanation is that John of Gaunt and Katherine Swynford succumbed to the pressure of public opinion. It was only a temporary separation because the entries in John of

Gaunt's Register for January 20, 21, March 6, May 4, September 7, 17, 1381 and February 14, 20, 1382 record financial arrangements or personal gifts involving Katherine Swynford. The burning of the Savoy in June of 1381 and the damage to the other residences of the duke at the same time may have contributed to a separation of short duration.⁸ It is possible though that Chaucer's softening of the condemnation of Criseyde as a traitress to love in comparison to Boccaccio's treatment of her is an indication that he was alluding to a real person of his acquaintance.⁹

Another identification of Williams' presents Edward, the Black Prince, as Troilus' older brother Hector. Again Boccaccio did not emphasize Hector, but Chaucer did; he even made Troilus almost a Hector II.¹⁰ Williams thinks that Chaucer did this because the Black Prince was idolized and John of Gaunt was suspected of kingly ambitions toward the English throne. On the other hand because the very credible astrological allusion in Book III, lines 624 ff. would date the composition of this poem about 1385,¹¹ this comparison between Hector and Edward, the Black Prince, is not logical since Edward died in 1376, and there would be no political advantage in seeking patronage from him.

Williams is not alone in his identification of Chaucer with Pandarus. Nevil Coghill¹² also considered Pandarus a self-portrait. Their contention is that Chaucer's additions and changes in Boccaccio's Pandarus fit himself perfectly -- man of proverbs, court figure, diplomat, etc.¹³

Quite recently Williams added to his hypothesis by reassigning identifications for the portraits in the frontispiece of the Corpus Christi manuscript of Troilus. He concurs with Miss Galway and

Brusendorff on the identities of King Richard II and Queen Anne. He reasons, though, that if the illustration was made for John of Gaunt or his descendants, the figure representing Gaunt would be a prominent one, and therefore he selects the tall, blond figure in blue just to the right of Chaucer as John of Gaunt.

The date of 1390 which Williams assigns to the work places the composition after Joan of Kent's death; consequently he does not think that she is represented in the foreground of the picture. She may be in the background.

Williams concludes his article by commenting that "The chief purpose of the frontispiece seems to be to emphasize the relationship of Chaucer and the Troilus to the family of John of Gaunt."¹⁴

In spite of the arguments to the contrary, I believe that only the allusions to Queen Anne and to the rare astrological phenomenon of 1385 have reached the unquestionable class. The other theories still contain too many loopholes to be accepted in toto. Chaucer may have been stimulated to write the Troilus by the example of his sister-in-law and John of Gaunt, but since their separation in 1381 was of short duration and no evidence has been uncovered to indicate that Katherine was unfaithful to the Duke, I doubt that Troilus and Criseyde were intended as characterizations of the Duke of Lancaster and his mistress. On the other hand, if Troilus and Criseyde was written in 1385, the idea that Joan of Kent was the pattern for Criseyde also seems remote because her amorous escapades occurred so long before. I do not think that the public's memory was any better then than it is now.

The Legend of Good Women

It has been argued that since the Book of the Duchess is accepted as an occasional poem, and the Parliament of Fowls and the House of Fame almost certainly allude to actual persons and events, it is likely that the Prologue to the Legend of Good Women was also intended to reflect contemporary happenings.¹ Two major theories have been presented; the first, which has been discussed for well over a century, is the identification of Alceste with Queen Anne, and the second is the portrayal of Joan of Kent as Alceste. The two theories will be examined in the order of their appearance in literary criticism.

Although this paper was not designed as a discussion of the priority of texts, F (B) first or G (A) first, it is impossible to ignore the problem because it is so closely allied with the discussion of historical allusions. Some of the earlier scholars subscribed to the theory that the G (A) version was the original and that Chaucer had added the pronounced allusion to Queen Anne in the F (B) version in order to please her and express his gratitude for her political assistance. For example, Professor Bilderbeck assigned the F (B) version to 1390 because he thought that Chaucer wished to thank Queen Anne for his appointment on July 12, 1389, as Clerk of the King's Works.² He also stated that the "lylye floures" were removed from the god of Love's garland because of a three year truce with France.³

But in spite of all the discussion of historical allusions among the students of Chaucer, it was not references to English history which established the order of composition of the texts with a reasonable degree of concurrence. Instead, it was the noticeable difference in the quality of Chaucer's workmanship that influenced the decision. The F (B) version is a loosely joined collection of passages closely resembling Chaucer's sources whereas the G (A) version, on the other hand, is a much more unified, polished whole. Chaucer, it seems, was farther removed from the originals when he wrote the revised G (A) version. As Lowes expressed it, with "the words of the originals long out of mind, he comes back to the passage on its own merits, and turns the loosely - linked cento into a compact, close-knit unit."⁴

In an article about a year later, Lowes furthered his hypothesis by discussing Chaucer's lines on medieval "old age" (G (A) 258-263, 315, 400-401), the effect of the rhyme scheme in revision, and the fact that there is only a single manuscript of the G (A) prologue but "a dozen or more manuscripts" of the F (B) version.⁵ Since these two detailed studies were made, very few questions concerning the priority of texts have been raised; the F (B) version is considered the original and the G (A) version, the revision.

As early as 1775, Thomas Tyrwhit showed a connection between F 496-497 and Queen Anne.⁶

And whan this book ys maad, yive it the quene,

On my byhalf, at Eltham or at Sheene.

Richard ordered Shene torn down following Anne's death there in 1394⁷ and he undoubtedly did not inhabit it after that date.

If the building in which she died was repulsive to him, lines of poetry which refer to her spending long periods of time there would also have been offensive. Chaucer probably removed the lines in deference to the king's wishes. The fact that they were omitted from the G version is now widely accepted as evidence that it was the revision.

Professor Lowes was the first to suggest that the references to Anne were deleted because of Richard's grief over her death.

On the other hand, Tatlock's date of 1394-1395 for the G revision of the Legend of Good Women can be disputed. He claimed that the revision was made very soon after Anne's death because Richard had recovered sufficiently by the end of 1396 to go through the marriage ceremony again.⁸ Although Richard did marry Isabel of France in 1396, she was only seven years old and her age alone is sufficient evidence to indicate that the marriage was never consummated, and therefore it would not necessarily have interfered with Richard's grief over Anne's death. Richard's marriage to Isabel was politically desirable since peace negotiations with France were under consideration and Richard was under pressure to end the war; therefore the poem does not of necessity have to have been written before 1396. In fact, later in this discussion Miss Galway's theory that the revision was written to honor Queen Isabel will be examined.

In 1870 ten Brink also stated that in his opinion the daisy and Alceste represented Queen Anne. He was convinced that Chaucer had written the Legend to show his appreciation to her for getting him permission to fulfill his custom-house duties through a deputy.⁹

But, in 1903, Tatlock produced evidence to show that Chaucer got the preferment through the efforts of Robert de Vere, Earl of Oxford,

and not the queen.¹⁰ His argument, though, was not intended to indicate that he denied Anne as the daisy and Alceste, but that the incident ten Brink associated with it was fallacious.

Tatlock was convinced that the daisy and Alceste symbolized some living woman because of the personal devotion which Chaucer expressed in the F version but omitted in the G version.¹¹ He refuted Lowes' theory that it was all literary convention borrowed from the French poets he copied and directed toward Chaucer's ideal mistress. Tatlock pointed out, for example, that in French the feminine pronoun must be used with fleur and margherite, but in English the neuter gender is used to refer to such inanimate objects. Since Chaucer used "she" which is "wholly personal" to refer to the daisy, he must have had a living lady in mind who fit the description better than the queen. Tatlock reasoned that

Chaucer wished to pay a gallant and delicate tribute to his queen; that he adopted a well-recognized form, poetic praise of the daisy, which at once set people asking who was really meant; his overt answer in the poem is - Alcestis; an answer which, considering contemporary custom and the strength of his language, was hardly quite satisfying, yet took the crude edge off the identification with the queen; the more subtle answer is indicated when Alcestis herself says at the end that the whole completed poem is to be laid as a tribute at the feet of Anne.¹²

He went on to suggest that Anne may have introduced the flower and leaf cult in England. Since she was young and the fashion-leader of her day, she could easily have imported it. This, of course, would also explain the manner in which the flower and leaf poetry of Machaut, Froissart, and Deschamps progressed to England. Chaucer's own acquaintance with the works of these poets plus his willingness to borrow from them and his devotion to the royal family add to the

plausibility of the theory that Anne was the recipient of Geoffrey's compliment.

Anne possibly was connected with the poem in another way. Lines F 341 ff. contained admonitions to a ruler about the way in which he should govern his people. Through the lips of Alceste (Anne?), Chaucer may have cautioned the king to beware of flatterers and people that carry false tales. In fact, he was quite explicit - "For in youre court ys many a losengeour" (F352). It was probably the words "in youre court" which suggested that Alceste was speaking to King Richard as the god of love. In the middle 1380's, Richard did attempt to take over his own government, but his willful, tyrannical character and his dependence on his court favorites led to extreme dissatisfaction in the kingdom. Because of this situation, there is little doubt in my mind that Chaucer's admonitions to the god of love probably do refer to this period in English history.¹³

In 1914, Bernard L. Jefferson outlined the existing theories. He concisely stated the ideas which support the Anne theory and those which tend to disprove it. Since the supporting theories with few exceptions have been covered already, only the main objections will be noted here. Professor Kittredge had asked these questions. If Alceste were Anne, why did Chaucer tell her to send it to herself, and since Alceste descended to Hell, would this be complimentary to Anne? Citing F510-522:

"Hastow not in a book, lyth in thy cheste,
The grete goodnesse of the quene Alceste,
That turned was into a dayesye;
She that for hire housbonde chees to dye,
And eek to goon to helle, rather than he,
And Ercules rescowed hire, parde,
And broght hir out of helle agayn to blys?"

And I answered ageyn, and sayde, "Yis,
 Now knowe I hire. And is this good Alceste,
 The dayesie, and myn owene hertes reste?
 Now fele I weel the goodnesse of this wyf,
 That both aftir hir deth and in hir lyf
 Hir grete bounte doubleth hire renoun.

he also asked how Chaucer could have written these lines as a compliment to Queen Anne. She was only nineteen or twenty years old at this time and very much alive; Alceste could not be Anne.¹⁴

After weighing these arguments, Professor Jefferson came to a conclusion which other scholars¹⁵ have accepted generally and which I find most tenable. He proposed that Alceste equalled the daisy and Anne equalled the daisy, but Anne does not have to equal Alceste. His explanation is as follows: the first 210 lines honor Anne and Anne alone; the middle portion from line 210 to line 430 he considered a neutral zone in which Queen Anne, Alceste, and the daisy merged into one another by an almost indefinable and dreamlike process. In the last 150 lines of the Prologue Alceste stood practically alone; Queen Anne was involved only when the daisy entered and the daisy participated only to a slight extent.¹⁶

There is another bit of supporting evidence for the Anne theory -- Lydgate, a follower of Chaucer's, asserted in the Prologue to his Falls of Princes that the Legend of Good Women was made "at the request of the quene."

This poete wrote, at the request of the quene,
 A Legende, of perfite holynesse,
 Of Good Women, to fynd out nynetene.¹⁷

Skeat and Pollard rejected Lydgate's theory, but most of the others, including Root, acknowledged the fact that he may be correct. As Professor Root expressed it,

Perhaps Lydgate is reporting authentic tradition; perhaps his statement rests only on his own interpretation of Chaucer's Prologue. Even on this latter hypothesis the evidence is significant. The modern critic would be less diffident of seeing in the poem a meaning found also by a nearly contemporary poet thoroughly conversant with the conventions of mediaeval poetry.¹⁸

One by-product of the theory which connected Alceste with Queen Anne was the identification of the god of Love with King Richard II. The theory was discussed in detail in the last decade of the nineteenth century and the first decade of the twentieth century by such eminent scholars as Professors Skeat, Legouis, Koch, and Bilderbeck. The only one who presented a real argument in favor of the theory was Professor Bilderbeck.¹⁹ He based his identification of Richard on F226-232:

Yclothed was this myghty god of Love
 In silk, enbrouded ful of grene greves,
 In-with a fret of rede rose-leves,
 The fresshest syn the world was first bygonne.
 His gilte heer was corowned with a sonne,
 Insteade of gold, for hevynesse and wyghte.

and G158-164:

Yclothed was this myghty god of Love
 Of silk, ybrouded ful of grene greves,
 A garlond on his hed of rose-leves,
 Stiked al with lylve floures newe.
 But of his face I can not weyn the hewe;
 For sikerly his face shon so bryghte
 That with the glem astoned was the syghte.

In these lines he picked out the following points which the god of love and Richard had in common: 1) beauty of face and auburn or golden hair, 2) "lylve floures newe" which suggested the recently advanced claims of the English kings to the crown of France, 3) richly embroidered robes which could be associated with the pictures of Richard's robes embroidered with circles of vetch beans, 4) the

sun used as a crown which suggested a device employing the sun emerging from behind a cloud which Richard used.

In 1904, Lowes refuted Bilderbeck's theory. He pointed out the correlations between the Prologue and its sources, the French Marguerite poems and the Filostrato of Boccaccio. The descriptive words he claimed came from the sources and therefore do not refer to King Richard II.²⁰ Later Tatlock discussed both theories and concluded that "in Alceste's admonitions to the God of Love (F373-402, G353-388) it seems not unlikely that Chaucer had Richard partly in mind ... though I can hardly ... believe that Chaucer was so impertinent as to offer indirect advice to Richard through Anne."²¹ He went on to say, though, that G360-364 and 368-369, which were added, may refer to Richard's coronation-oath which Parliament had forced him to renew on June 3, 1388, in which he promised to observe the laws of the realm and follow the advice of the lords and parliament, not that of flatterers. If this did not refer to Richard, why was Chaucer so careful to add it to the original sermon on kingship in the revision? Gower, Chaucer's contemporary, was not afraid to express himself to Richard in the Confessio, so why should Chaucer have hesitated?²² It is my opinion that Chaucer was rebuking his young king.

The discussion of the King Richard-Queen Anne identification of Alceste and the god of love has established only a few facts; historically F496-497 must refer to Queen Anne, and it is difficult to rule out King Richard as the intended recipient of Chaucer's advice to kings. The balance of the debate still falls in the realm of conjecture, so it will be well to examine the other theory.

Since it is quite possible that Chaucer paid homage to Queen Anne

in F496-497 only and honored some one else throughout the balance of the poem, Miss Galway's theory may have merit. It is her hypothesis that Chaucer honored Joan of Kent and the deceased Black Prince rather than King Richard and Queen Anne.

Miss Galway divides the Prologue into two parts, F1-196 in which Chaucer did homage to the daisy which symbolized his "lady sovereyne" and F197-579 in which Chaucer related his dream involving the god of Love and a queen who later proved to be Queen Alceste, dressed to represent a daisy.²³

The first facts that she attempts to establish are the identification of the god of Love with a deceased person and the widowhood of Alceste. The god of Love's "aungelyke wynges" of F236, his halo described in F230-231, and his remark to Chaucer before he returned "to paradys" (F563) that "Ne shal no trewe lover come in helle" (l.F553) strongly suggests to her someone who had departed from the earth and now inhabited "paradys." The god of Love was "an authority on what happens after death."²⁴

The widowhood of Alceste was proposed by means of F443-444, the use of the words "my relyke" (F321) by the god of Love to describe the daisy, and Chaucer's use of the classical story of Alceste. In F443-444 the god of Love called attention to the length of time that had passed since he had known Alceste who was "so charitable and trewe" (F443); if the god of Love was a shade, this made Alceste a widow.

The use of "my relyke", meaning "relict", to refer to a widow brought Miss Galway a rebuttal from Roger S. Loomis on the point that "relicit" in the sense of widow was not recorded by the NED

until 1545; its usual meaning in Chaucer's day was "treasure."²⁵ She answered him in a later article with the information that "relicte" in Old French had been in use in the sense of widow since 1363, and that since the court language was French, Chaucer's listeners would attach that meaning to it. Also if it meant "treasure," why did Chaucer remove it in the G-version along with many other "signs that the god represented the deceased Prince".²⁶

The last of these arguments, the Alcestis legend, dealt with a wife who offered to die for her husband, did die, and was returned to earth. To this Chaucer added the transformation of Alcestis into a daisy.²⁷ The use of this argument to suggest widowhood for Chaucer's Alceste seems to be stretching a point since there is no evidence that she did anything suggestive of this story.

Feeling that the lines she had quoted were ample proof that the god of Love and Alceste represented living people, Miss Galway proceeded to advance historical facts to identify them with Prince Edward and Princess Joan. The golden crown which was replaced by a halo she felt referred to the coronets with which Edward III honored some of his sons²⁸ (the Black Prince was one of them). The lines "for hevynesse and wyghte," she thought, may have referred to the extreme physical weakness which afflicted the Prince before his death. Among the members of the court, the Black Prince was the only one eligible to wear a crown or coronet who had left a widow who did not remarry. King Edward had died in 1377, but Queen Philippa pre-deceased him in 1369, so widowhood was not involved there. The Duke of Clarence died in 1368, but his widow remarried very soon after. Prince Edward, the Black Prince, then, who left Princess Joan a widow,

was the choice for the god of Love.²⁹

To try to prove that Alceste was Joan of Kent, Miss Galway cites lines F499-500 in which the god of Love asks Chaucer

"Wostow," quod he, "wher this be wyf or mayde,
Or queene, or countesse, or of what degre,
..."

Joan's hereditary title was Countess of Kent which may have been intended as a clue to Alceste's identity.³⁰ In the same line is a possible allusion which Miss Galway seems to have missed -- If the title of king is a legitimate reference to the Black Prince, the title "queene" in the line F500 could refer to the facts that Joan would have been queen if Edward had lived and for all practical purposes she did rule during the early years of Richard II's reign.

Professor Legouis had commented twenty-odd years before in his Richard-Anne identification that since Anne was only in her teens, she could hardly have uttered the words of advice to Richard; "They were much more likely to have come from Princess Jeanne, and to have been spoken with the authority and experience of a mother."³¹ This suggestion of Legouis' that Richard's mother, not his wife, spoke the words of advice was the foundation stone for Miss Galway's development of the Joan theory. She conceded that Alceste's (Joan's) speech to the king in lines F342-441 was directed toward Richard II even though it was spoken to the god of Love whom she had already identified as the Black Prince. Alceste's advice was compared with Joan's intercession in the Stafford-John Holland affair. During Richard's Scottish expedition, John Holland, who was Joan's son by a previous marriage, killed the only son of the Earl of Stafford in a fit of rage. The Earl demanded justice; so Richard ordered Holland's lands confiscated.

Miss Galway commented that "Every word of her Alceste's speech (F342-441) which is unfitted to the offence of the lowly poet would fit to perfection the crime of the King's half-brother."³²

Ten years after this theory was first presented Bernard F. Huppe objected strenuously to her analogy of these lines with the Stafford-Holland affair. He called attention in particular to the fact that the lines which Miss Galway says contain Joan's plea for John Holland to Richard II are addressed to the God of Love, who she contends is the Black Prince, in the poem. In the same edition of this journal Miss Galway conceded the issue and abandoned this portion of her theory.³³

In its place she has substituted the efforts Joan made to maintain peace between Richard II and the nobles of the court.³⁴ The particular event to which she alluded was the misunderstanding between Richard and John of Gaunt in early 1385, which nearly resulted in civil war. She cited contemporary chronicles to prove that Alceste's speech on a king's duties was Joan's lecture to her son. Three years later Walter Weese refuted her contentions by showing that the chronicles, the Polychronicon of Ralph Higden, the Historia Anglicana, mention only the fact that Joan visited both Richard and John of Gaunt but do not quote any speeches. The Chronicon Adae de Usk did quote three lines, but the reference was dated 1387, two years after Joan's death. This lack of evidence made the authenticity of this claim suspicious, according to Mr. Weese.³⁵ But he had apparently missed a much earlier note in which she revealed that Walsingham and a fifteenth century chronicler told the story with similar details but dated it at the "beginning of 1385."³⁶ To this I might add that although I do

not subscribe wholeheartedly to Miss Galway's theory, I do think that considering the laxity which is ascribed to the chroniclers of this period, it is entirely possible that Adam of Usk misdated his entry.³⁷

In order to answer the claims of the Queen Anne theory, Miss Galway had to explain the Lydgate verses which said that the queen ordered that the Legend of Good Women be written. In a roundabout fashion the lines were explained by this equation: Lydgate's queen = Queen Alceste = Joan of Kent.³⁸ Now, if Lydgate's proximity (1370 - 1450?) to the time in which this poem was written is considered, it seems improbable that he would speak of "the quene" unless he meant "the Queen of England."

There is, however, one other reason for possibly identifying Joan of Kent with Alceste, which, in turn, will lead on to the position of the G(A)-version in this theory. In the F(B)-version Chaucer eulogized faithful maidens and faithful wives but not faithful widows, but in the G(A)-version he spoke of all three kinds of faithful women. If Alceste was Joan of Kent, then Chaucer was trying to spare her feelings in the F(B)-version since she was betrothed to Prince Edward within a few months of Thomas Holland's death in December 1360 and married to him in October 1361.³⁹ The acceptance of a date after Joan's death for the G(A)-version meant that Chaucer could write freely because he was no longer restrained by her patronage. On this point in the theory Professor Loomis agrees.⁴⁰

Other references were removed in the G(A)-version which indicated a change in the purpose for composing the revision. The

G(A)-version lacks line F212 in which the god of Love came "from afer", lines F230-231 which described his halo, line F321 in which the god of Love called the daisy "my relyke", and lines F563-564 in which he returned "to paradys" at sunset. These differences all fit Miss Galway's theory rather well and "As a result of these omissions the G(A)-version gives no sign that the god was a shade or the daisy alias Alceste a widow; it restores them to the conventional status of Cupid and queen."⁴¹

The reduction in the G(A)-version of the flattery accorded the daisy in the F(B)-version can be used to advance either the Joan of Kent or Queen Anne theory because the exponents of these two theories each can cite the death of a "soveryne lady" to account for its deletion.

After Miss Marion Lossing⁴² definitely discredited Professor Lowes'⁴³ article on the sources of the Prologue to the Legend of Good Women by finding closer parallels in other poems than in the Lay de Franchise, Carleton Brown⁴⁴ stated that he considered the Alceste-Joan of Kent analogy very plausible. Miss Lossing's scholarship made it possible to assign an earlier date to the Prologue which increased the feasibility of the Joan theory.

The G(A)-version, as I mentioned before, has come to be accepted as the revision by the advocates of both theories, each having an explanation that is compatible with their interpretation of the F(B)-version.

The supporters of the Alceste-Queen Anne theory, as was mentioned earlier in this paper, contend that ll.F496-497 which ordered the poem sent to the queen at Eltham or at Shene and the lines of personal

adoration which were deleted in the G(A)-version were removed because of King Richard's grief over Queen Anne's death.

The Alceste-Joan Of Kent theorizers feel that it was Princess Joan's death in 1385 which caused Chaucer to make the Prologue less personal, but they can not avoid attributing the erasure of ll.F496-497 to Queen Anne's death.⁴⁵

Beginning with a comment of J. M. Manly⁴⁶ in 1928, that Chaucer wrote "Rosamonde" for Queen Isabel in mid-November, 1396, Miss Galway has built an allegorical framework to support the theory that he revised the Prologue of the Legend of Good Women to honor Queen Isabel. She conjectured that if Chaucer celebrated Richard's betrothal to Princess Marie of France in the Parliament of Fowls and his marriage to Anne of Bohemia in the House of Fame, he found it politic to write a poem for Princess Isabel. But -- the age of the new queen may have made the composing of such a poem difficult, so he possibly solved the problem by revising the Prologue to the Legend of Good Women.

The basis for this analogy was Isabel's heraldic emblem. When Richard married her, she brought not the device already quartered in the royal arms of England and known as Old France, golden fleur-de-lys freely scattered over an azure field, but the much-praised device introduced by Charles V and known as New France, three lilies only, one below two smaller.

The "lyle floures newe" of l.G161 may refer to the new arrangement of fleur-de-lys on the coat of arms which Princess Isabel brought to her marriage with Richard II. Other evidence, namely the removal of

F496-497 which most scholars now accept as evidence that the G(A)-version was written following Queen Anne's death, indicates that the poem was written after 1394 and quite conceivably in 1396.⁴⁷

In order to summarize the two theories quickly, I will continue to use the order of their appearance as a guide.

The Queen Anne theory, supported by ten Brink, Koch, Skeat, Furnivall, Bilderbeck, and others, is the oldest attempt to explain the poem in terms of contemporary events. Chaucer's request that the poem be sent to "the Quene" has been accepted generally as a specific reference to Queen Anne, but all the other suggestions are still controversial. I am also inclined to accept the proposal that Richard II is the object of the discourse on the duties of kings because he was notorious for his tyrannically erratic personality. Of course, the acceptance of this assumption fits both theories.

In the Joan of Kent hypothesis, Miss Galway pushes her analogy too far. The rather marked omission of references to faithful widows in the F(B)-version and the presence of them in the G(A)-version is good supporting evidence for the Joan proposal, but the forced identification of Joan as Lydgate's queen for whom Chaucer wrote the poem and the sudden switch of identification for the god of Love from Prince Edward, the Black Prince, to King Richard II are more than I can accept.

It is quite possible, though, that Chaucer sought to honor both the King's wife and mother, and reasonable to assume that they were both influential in the court. The dedication to Queen Anne does not necessitate considering her synonymous with Alceste. Chaucer's purpose in choosing the Alceste story was probably no more than his

desire to use a mythical character who, like Anne, was a model of wifely virtue. Considering that Joan of Kent influenced her son's life to a large extent and that for all practical purposes she had had three husbands, he conceivably decided that it would be diplomatic to avoid the mention of faithful widows while Joan was alive.

Since it was not uncommon for literary men to exhort their rulers on the subject of good government, I do not find it incredible for Chaucer to reprove Richard II in a kindly, yet serious way. In addition, I can endorse, without reservations, Professor Tatlock's suggestion that ll.G360-364 and G368-369, which were added to the original sermon, allude to a historical fact, Richard's renewal of his coronation oath on June 3, 1388, at the request of Parliament.

Miss Galway's supposition that Chaucer adapted the Legend's Prologue to honor Queen Isabel is quite credible. The dedication of the Legend of Good Women to Queen Anne and the reference in the Troilus to Queen Anne's first initial are generally accepted as poetic comments honoring Richard's first queen. If Chaucer wished to pay homage to Queen Anne, it is not beyond the realm of possibility that he desired to express his respect for the new queen by alluding to her heraldic emblem.

In brief, my interpretation of the Prologue of the Legend of Good Women is that Chaucer did wish to honor his queen and did offer the poem to her, but I do not think that he was trying to record a contemporary situation under the disguise of a "daisy poem."

The Canterbury Tales

Of all the members of the pilgrimage only the knight has been suggested as a word portrait of a member of the royal family. Therefore, the knight will be discussed first; then his tale and the tales of the Squire, the Man of Law, the Physician, Chaucer (Melibee only) and the Nun's Priest will follow.

There is quite a possibility that Chaucer's Knight is a composite picture of Henry, Earl of Derby, who was Blanche of Lancaster's father, and Henry, Earl of Derby, who was Blanche's son and later Henry IV.¹

The elder Henry was in his prime at the time of the siege of Algezir, the raids in Belmarye, and the combats in the list at Tramissene.² In fact, Rymer's Foedora has been cited as evidence that he was sent there.³ The document contains a letter of credence dated August 30, 1343, sending Henry, Earl of Derby, and William de Montacute, Earl of Salisbury, to Alfonso, King of Castile. To quote Professor Cook: "If the crusading exploit by which Lancaster (Derby) is best known was performed in the South, that of his grandson belongs to the far North, from which the latter doubtless brought reports of the table of honor."⁴ Since the elder Derby's exploits were well-known and Chaucer was well-acquainted with the younger Henry, this is quite possible, but I am inclined to agree with F. N. Robinson that the younger Henry's experiences at the siege of Vilna in 1390-91 came too late to have influenced the Prologue of the Canterbury Tales⁵ and the elder Henry was dead before the earliest record of the Teutonic

table of honor in 1377.⁶ In my opinion it is much more sensible to consider the Knight a typical example of the declining feudal system patterned on all the knights of Chaucer's acquaintance rather than one in particular.

Another possibility, advanced by J. M. Manly, is that the Knight was a composite of the Scropes⁷ who, of course, were not part of the royal family and therefore not part of this discussion.

The Knight's Tale itself has proven to be much more fertile ground for the allegory hunters. Professors Lowes⁸ and Emerson⁹ are the chief exponents of the theory involving Richard and Queen Anne. They have based their comments on the similarity between the natural disturbance which wrecked the ship in which Anne of Bohemia had arrived in England on December 18, 1381, and the "tempest" of 1.884 of the Knight's Tale. The "feste that was at hir weddyng" (1.883) was also equated with the marriage festivities which followed Anne's arrival. The fact that neither Statius nor Boccaccio used the term "tempest" in the sense that Chaucer has used it makes these two scholars feel that this is an addition of Chaucer's. There is no question of the authenticity of the 1381 storm because Walsingham described the event at the close of his account of 1381. Subsequent historians like Stowe and Holinshed also included it in their records.

As further substantiation, Professor Emerson adds line 2973 in which Chaucer refers to alliances between countries. It is true that England was very much interested in furthering her foreign alliances because she was in serious trouble as a result of her long conflict with France. Since Richard II's marriage to Anne was the chief interest of the English Court in 1380-81 and there is a fair amount of evidence

to indicate that Chaucer wrote the original Palamon about 1382, it seems reasonable to assume that he was making allusions to current affairs, and to Richard and Anne in particular.¹⁰

Theseus and Ypolita have also been suggested as complimentary references to Edward III and Philippa. The character of Edward III was much like Theseus as Chaucer pictured him; Theseus saw that showing mercy would improve his reputation as a merciful lord. Lines 1748 ff. which tell of Ypolita's intercession for Palamon and Arcite have been construed to symbolize Philippa's entreaty for the six citizens of Calais.¹¹ Of course, Manly has suggested the possibility that it may refer to Anne's intercession for all offenders in 1382 and J. Parr has advanced the theory that Ypolita's plea could pertain to Queen Anne's plea to the Duke of Gloucester for the life of Sir Simon Burley in 1388.¹²

Professor Emerson suggested also that Theseus may be Emperor Wenceslaus, Queen Anne's brother, since Theseus referred to Emily as "suster" in ll.1833, 2818, 3075.¹³ This may be so, but it does not fit the basic theory any better than A. S. Cook's proposal that Chaucer's model for "his dashing and splendid young king in the Knight's Tale" is Henry, Earl of Derby, later Henry IV.¹⁴

Professor Cook appears to have been very much impressed by Henry because he also considered him the pattern for the minor character Emetreus, who is described in lines 2155-86. Since there is nothing in the Teseide to correspond to this portrait and Wylies' History of England under Henry IV revealed that Henry actually had many of the characteristics and worldly possessions that Chaucer assigned to Emetreus, Cook reasoned that Emetreus and Henry may be one and the same.¹⁵

In a brief note to the Knight's Tale, Manly suggested that Emetreus might have been patterned on Richard II.¹⁶

Similarities between the triumphal journeys of Chaucer's day, for example - Froissart's account of King John of France's entry into London as a captive, and those of the Knight's Tale were noted by Hinckley.¹⁷

It really makes little difference how you arrange the various parts of this basic theory; there are objectionable aspects to them all. If Richard and Anne are Emily and Palamon, then, first, who is Arcite and, second, how can Theseus and Ypolita be Edward III and Philippa since they were dead? If Richard and Anne are Theseus and Ypolita, who are Palamon, Arcite and Emily? If Theseus is Wenceslaus or Henry, Earl of Derby, or King John of France, who are the others?

Before leaving the Knight's Tale, one must consider yet another theory. As usual, Miss Galway proposed Joan of Kent and her suitors as living counterparts of the characters. She equated the dispute between Sir Thomas Holland and Sir William Montague over possession of the Fair Maid of Kent with the fictional dispute over Emily by Palamon and Arcite. Emily's identity was further established by the fact that she wore red and white, the heraldic colors of Joan of Kent (lines 1053-54). Miss Galway pursued the theory further by calling attention to the fact that Holland (Arcite) had the position of steward of Joan's household and later a promotion to marshal or constable in the army of King Edward (Theseus). This, of course, matched the account of Arcite's stay in Theseus's court as "Philostrato".

Miss Galway also identified Emetreus, who was Arcite's chief supporter in the tale, as the Black Prince, who was Holland's chief

defender. In her opinion, much of the description of Emetreus in lines 2155-86 can be applied to Edward, the Black Prince. For example, the fresh laurel wreath (ll.2175f.) was appropriate to the Black Prince after his triumph as the commander of the most hardpressed division of the English army at Crecy and his heraldic emblem contained the lion and leopard of line 2186. If this theory is correct, a draft of the Knight's Tale was probably read at a Feast of the Order of the Garter on April 23, 1377,¹⁸ a date which also fits the theory that Chaucer wrote a version of the Palamon and Arcite story quite early in his career.¹⁹

Although I do not agree with all the theories involving Joan of Kent, this explanation of the original Palamon has fewer obstacles to its veracity than the other theories. When the tale was fitted into the Canterbury Tales at a much later date, the references to alliances with foreign countries plus a few other details may have been added to bring the poem up to date. King Richard's II's political situation during the 1390's was uncertain enough that Chaucer may have considered it unnecessary to go to great pains to change the poem.

Like the Knight, the Squire is probably a composite picture presenting the best qualities of that stratum of chivalry. Two exceptions to this theory suggest young Geoffrey Chaucer or William Montague as the model for the Squire. Young Geoffrey Chaucer was offered because of his service as a page and later a squire in the household of the Countess of Ulster.²⁰ William Montague's claim was advanced by Miss Galway in connection with her Joan of Kent explanation for the Squire's Tale. First of all, the young squire, described in the Prologue (ll.79-100.) was wearing Joan of Kent's

colors - 'whyte and rede.' Second, he may have been permitted to accompany the king on his raids into French territory, and last, William Montague, son of the Earl of Salisbury, was noted for his skill in poetry.²¹

The allegory of the Squire's Tale has one generally assigned character; Cambyuskan was King Edward III. Edward III was chosen as an identification for Cambyuskan because of the resemblance between Edward's celebrations of anniversaries during his reign and the feast described in the first part of the Squire's Tale. For instance, Edward's coronation is reputed to be the occasion when the ceremony of the king's champion was instituted. In the Squire's Tale the strange knight also rode directly into the great hall and up to the king.²²

The earliest attempt to explain the Squire's Tale was based on the Chronicon Henrici Knighton. Brandl identified Cambyuskan as King Edward III; Algarsif as the Black Prince; Cambalo as John of Gaunt; Canacee as Constance of Castile; the deserted falcon as John of Gaunt's daughter, Elizabeth, the Countess of Pembroke; the faithless tercelet as John, the Earl of Pembroke; the temptress kite as Philippa, the Countess of March, who married the Earl of Pembroke after his divorce from Elizabeth; and the "brethren two" as Pedro the Cruel and his bastard brother, Enrique de Trastamare. According to this interpretation, Chaucer intended the tale as a compliment to the House of Lancaster.²³ Brandl reasoned that Chaucer was celebrating the valiant deeds of John of Gaunt in Spain and praising the sympathy of Constance for her step-daughter Elizabeth.

In the very next issue of Englische Studien, Kittredge very ably

refuted Brandl's suggestions. Among other points of disagreement, he noted the vast difference in time between the events which Brandl claimed Chaucer alluded to in part I and those of part II. Part I dealt with the English court before 1377, and part II paralleled the Lancaster family difficulties of 1389-90. Since the falcon episode in the "Squire's Tale" occurred the morning after the strange knight bestowed the gifts, it seemed incredible to Kittredge that Chaucer might be referring to events separated by at least fourteen years.²⁴

Twenty-odd years later in a note attached to an article on the Knight, the feast to celebrate Prince Lionel's marriage to Violante was proffered as a solution to this allegorical puzzle. Galeazzo II was suggested as Cambyuskan; Elpheta, Blanche; Algarsif, Gean Galeazzo; and Canacee, Violante. When evaluating this hypothesis, I must agree with its author that such an explanation is "too fanciful."²⁵

Later, as a side comment in an article on Anelida and Arcite, Edmund Langley, the Earl of Cambridge, was proposed as "Cambalus, the kynges sone."²⁶ This hypothesis was not pursued further, nor does it seem worthy of further study.

The fourth and last conjecture involves Joan of Kent and her entourage. Cambyuskan is again Edward III; Canacee and the falcon are both Joan of Kent; and Cambalo, who ultimately won Canacee, is the Black Prince. The faithful falcon is Joan in her youth and the unfaithful tercelet is Thomas Holland, who left her to go campaigning in France "for his honour." According to Miss Galway, Holland fits the description of the unfaithful tercelet because he petitioned for the solemnization of his marriage contract with Joan upon his return from France.²⁷ Later Miss Galway pursued the comparison further. She

reasoned since Joan was adopted by Queen Philippa after her father was executed,²⁸ she is a likely candidate for the parts of Canacee, Cambyuskan's daughter, and Canacee, the wife of Cambolo. This explanation is acceptable as far as these individuals are concerned, but unfortunately it does not account for identifications for Algarsif or for the "brethren two"; therefore the riddle of the "Squire's Tale" is no closer to being solved than it was before.

There has also been some speculation over the political inferences in the Man of Law's Tale. Since both Trivet and Gower, who told the same story, used Knaresborough Castle as the scene of King Alla's mother's treachery, why didn't Chaucer? He probably did not name the castle, says one commentator, because it was owned by John of Gaunt, his patron or benefactor. Gaunt's career fluctuated from popularity to threats on his life; therefore it would not have been prudent for Chaucer to name a property of his as the scene of treachery.²⁹

Tied closely to this problem is the question of the identity of the Constance in the Man of Law's Tale. Constance of Castile, John of Gaunt's second wife, has been suggested since the attributes which Chaucer ascribes to the Man of Law's heroine fit the personality of Constance of Castile. Like the Constance in the "Tale", Constance of Castile was exiled, married a foreigner, and was known for her piety.³⁰ Naturally this idea has been questioned also on the ground that John of Gaunt and King Richard were frequently not in agreement and that it would have been imprudent for Chaucer to focus attention on John of Gaunt.³¹ Since Chaucer has alluded to John of Gaunt in other places among his writings, there is no reason why he should not have referred to him in the Man of Law's Tale. The fact that he appears to have deliberately

omitted the name of one of Gaunt's castles adds credence to the identification of Constance of Castile with the Man of Law's Constance.

I agree with the majority of the commentators on the Physician's Tale that Chaucer inserted lines 72-104, which cite the responsibilities of governesses and parents, into the material he borrowed from Livy as a warning to his sister-in-law, Katherine Swynford. It is possible that he was cautioning her because her conduct as mistress to John of Gaunt was a poor example for his daughters for whom she was governess.³²

In fact, Elizabeth, the duke's second daughter by Blanche of Lancaster, was everything that Virginia was not. Unlike Virginia, Elizabeth had become involved in a court scandal. She, in spite of her betrothal at an early age to the Earl of Pembroke, had begun a liaison with John Holland, whom she later married. This action, of course, was scandalous because a betrothal then was as legally binding as a marriage is today.³³

Moving on to a later tale, one finds that two theories have been advanced in an effort to understand why Chaucer chose to insert his presentation of Renaud de Louens' adaptation of Albertano of Brescia's Liber consolationes et consilii into the Canterbury Tales as one of the tales told by himself. Either advice to Richard II or to John of Gaunt has been suggested as the purpose of the Tale of Melibee.

The earliest notice of the political flavor of Melibee was Tatlock's comment on line 2389 - "Thou shalt also eschue the conseillyng of yong folk, for hir conseil is nat rype." He felt that this line was directed toward Richard II, who had rejected the more mature counsel of his uncles for the advice of court members more nearly his own age. Immediately following this line in the source are lines which comment on boy kings. Tatlock reasoned that the omission of these

lines from the Tale indicated that Chaucer wrote Melibee about 1377, immediately following Richard's coronation.³⁴ On the other hand these lines could have been omitted because Richard had reached a greater degree of maturity and the lines were no longer applicable. Following this line of thought, Stillwell feels that line 2389 may allude to a date of 1386-1388 and to the counsel of Robert de Vere, who was only three years older than Richard.³⁵ He also suggested that although Queen Anne could not be identified absolutely with Prudence, Chaucer's audience probably thought of the Queen when they were listening to Prudence's discussion.³⁶

Another possibility for interpreting Melibee involves John of Gaunt, who wanted to launch a campaign in Spain to solidify his title to the Spanish throne. Hotson suspected Chaucer of having translated Melibee for the express purpose of warning John of Gaunt of the perils of aggression.³⁷ Gaunt, Hotson reasoned, should have had little trouble seeing "himself as Melibeus and his own better sense (or perhaps that of Katherine Swynford) as the allegorical dame Prudence."³⁸

Later in the process of a research project on the sources for this tale, Professor Severs found a French manuscript which contained the same material that Chaucer used in the Melibee. Since the lines that Hotson used to substantiate his idea were present in the same form in this source manuscript, there is little reason to think that Chaucer added or subtracted material from his source in order to adapt it to John of Gaunt's personal life or to his position on the political scene.³⁹ On the other hand, Tatlock's theory for dating the Melibee based on the omission of the reference to boy-kings was confirmed by Severs' study. Not one of the twenty-three manuscripts he examined omitted the line although some shortened it somewhat.⁴⁰

Some interesting parallels between the Nun's Priest's Tale and the happenings of 1397-98 have been cited by Hotson. He reasoned that since the Renart epic, which has been suggested as Chaucer's source, was "a satire on contemporary society," it is not hard to believe when Chaucer's additions to the original fable are examined that Chaucer intended his listeners to get an implied meaning. The nature of the revelation, however, was so dangerous that it had to be cloaked in a beast fable. The murder of the Duke of Gloucester by King Richard's minions and the subsequent duel and banishments were hardly idle chatter.

First, Chaucer did not give the fox its traditional name of "Renart" but instead named him colfox and later "daun Russel". Between 1360 and 1400, there were two Colfoxes in the Court; both were prominent men associated with Thomas Mowbray, Duke of Norfolk. The relation between their name and Chaucer's fox was revealed when one Nicholas Colfox was implicated before an open Parliament immediately after Henry of Lancaster usurped Richard II's throne. Colfox was accused of being "chief coadjutor" with Mowbray in the murder of the Duke of Gloucester in 1397. Colfox's name was used for the fox but his superior, Thomas Mowbray, Duke of Norfolk, supplied the colors which Chaucer used to describe the beast. Mowbray was made Earl Marshal of England in 1397, an office which permitted him to use the "golden truncheon tipped with black at both ends" as a sign of office. Lines 2902-2904 describe the color of the fox as "bitwixe yelow and reed,/And tipped was his tayl and bothe his eeris/With blak, unlyk the remenant of his heeris". The coloring of the fox is a reasonable facsimile of Mowbray's colors, but the representation of Henry Bolingbroke's colors in the description of Chanticleer is even better.

Second, until Chaucer chose to tell the tale of Chanticleer and Pertolet, no one had bothered to describe the appearance of the cock. In the Nun's Priest's Tale (ll.2861-2864) Chaucer portrayed the cock in the colors of Henry Bolingbroke's coat of arms -- black, white, azure, and gold. It is interesting also to note that other contemporary popular poetry represented Henry "under the guise of a fowl" -- sometimes aquila, egle, falcon, blessed bredd, etc.

The final character identification connects "daun Russell" with Sir John Russel, one of Richard II's hated followers.⁴¹

These comparisons between Chaunticleer and Henry of Bolingbroke, Colfox and Mowbray, "daun Russell" and Sir John Russel are interesting, but only a guess, for Hotson acknowledged that he could not explain the discrepancies in the days and dates which Chaucer was so careful to be specific about, nor could he identify Pertolet since Henry's wife, Mary de Bohun, was dead.

Since Hotson's article was published, evidence that Chaucer may have been describing a particular breed of rooster has been offered. Miss L. P. Boone discovered that the characteristics of the golden-spangled Hamburg breed of chicken fit the descriptions of Chaunticleer and Pertolet nearly perfectly. An especially noteworthy point is that in this breed the hen is as beautiful as the cock, a characteristic that is true of very few breeds of birds. Pertolet was just as brightly plumed as Chaunticleer.⁴²

Hotson's interpretation is "extremely conjectural,"⁴³ for if Chaucer combined the colors of Henry's blazonry with those of the golden-spangled Hamburg, his artistry is superlative, indeed.

The Minor Poems

In addition to the better-known and longer works which Chaucer wrote, approximately twenty relatively short poems have been attributed to him. Of these poems fourteen have been suggested by scholars as vehicles for references by Chaucer to contemporary court personalities.

Since there is often disagreement over the chronology of the poems, I have discussed them, sometimes in groups, according to the person to which they are supposed to allude.

In his 1602 edition of Chaucer's works, Thomas Speght described the poem called "An ABC" as "Chaucers A.B.C. called La Priere de nostre Dame: made, as some say, at the request of Blanch, Duchesse of Lancaster, as a praier for her priuat vse, being a woman in her religion very deuout."¹ Although those Chaucer enthusiasts who subscribe to the idea that John of Gaunt was Chaucer's major patron may accept this comment of Speght's without reservations, there is no corroboration for it among contemporary writings; therefore it cannot be considered an established fact.

Since this poem is a translation of Guillaume Deguilleville's Le Peleringe de la Vie humaine² and does not contain any additions which might be construed as contemporary allusions, it probably will have to remain simply a prayer to the Blessed Virgin which Chaucer translated for personal reasons.

Four of the minor poems, "To Pity," "To His Lady," "Womanly

Noblesse," and "The Balade of Complaint" have been suggested by Miss Galway as expressions of Chaucer's respectful adoration of Joan of Kent. Miss Galway points out that in "The Complaint Unto Pity" Chaucer addresses the lady as "real excellence" (1.59) and "regalye" (1.65). In "A Complaint to His Lady" he calls her "hynesse" (1.70). These expressions, Miss Galway contends, are appropriate titles for the Princess of Wales,³ whom Chaucer was also "certainly or all but certainly" referring to in the "Balade of Complaint" and "Womanly Noblesse."⁴ Although these suggestions fit the over-all presentation of Joan of Kent as the recipient of Chaucer's devotion (in the courtly love tradition), they are hardly significant if the poems are considered as individual units.

According to Shirley, a fifteenth century copyist, the short poem currently titled "Lak of Stedfastnesse" was captioned "Balade Royal made by oure laureal poete of Albyon in hees laste yeeres." He also captioned the envoy - "Lenvoye to Kyng Richard." In another manuscript (MS. Harley 7333), he stated "This balade made Geffrey Chaunciers the Laureall poete of Albion and sent to his souerain lorde kynge Richarde the secunde thane being in his castell of windesore."⁵

Although Shirley's uncorroborated statements have not always been accepted in toto, the disagreements over "Lak of Stedfastnesse" are not concerned with the identity of the person addressed but with the chronology and source of the poem.⁶ To date, though, no one questions Shirley's statement that Chaucer was addressing his sovereign, King Richard II.

One other poem contains a possible reference to King Richard. The poem entitled "Fortune" or "Balade de vilage saunz peynture"

may have been addressed to him. If the three sections of the poem and the envoy are considered together, Chaucer was probably alluding to the situation following the passage of an ordinance by the Privy Council (on March 8, 1390) which prevented the king from making a gift without the consent of the Dukes of Lancaster, York, and Gloucester, the three princes of lines 73 and 76.⁷

On the other hand if the body of the poem was written at an earlier date, "thy beste friend" (lines 32, 40, and 48) may be John of Gaunt who was Chaucer's literary patron during at least part of his career.⁸

Although there is some question of Chaucerian authorship, "The Complaynt d'Amours" may have been written in honor of or for the use of Edward III or Richard II. As Robinson notes (p.866) "An unintelligible heading in MS. H declares it was made 'at wyndesore in the laste May tofore Novembre.'" The fact that "Chaucer became valet of the King's Chamber in 1367, "the poem was found in manuscripts containing other Chaucerian material, and "the language is in general consistent with Chaucer's usage" have caused Robinson to think that the poem is almost certainly the work of Chaucer.

Richard's second queen, Isabel of France, has been proposed as the recipient of several of Chaucer's poems, "To Rosamonde," "Against Women Unconstant," "Merciless Beauty," and "Complaint of Venus."

Over a quarter century ago Miss Rickert and Professor Manly (in separate publications) ventured to suggest that young Queen Isabel was the person Chaucer had in mind when he wrote "To Rosamonde."⁹ Later Miss Galway elaborated on this suggestion and included the other

three poems plus the revision of the Prologue of the Legend of Good Women which was discussed earlier.

The center of this discussion was the "Complaint of Venus," which consists of three amorous poems translated from Sir Oton de Graunson's Les Cinq balades ensuivans. Miss Galway contends¹⁰ that Graunson wrote these ballads and another set entitled Les six balades ensuivans as gifts to Princess Isabel for her fifth and sixth birthdays in November of 1394 and 1395. In July of 1395, Richard II sent envoys to propose a marriage alliance between himself and Princess Isabel. One of the ambassadors was Sir Lewis Clifford, an acquaintance of Chaucer's, who may have carried Graunson's poems (Les cinq balades ensuivans in particular) back to England. Chaucer, to quote Miss Galway, "joined the poetic game" at this point. He probably knew Graunson, who had spent years in England and even vowed allegiance to the English king; therefore it is not strange that Chaucer translated Graunson's French poetry into English for Princess Isabel, who was soon to transfer her allegiance from France to England. Chaucer, also, changed the first and third parts of the poem so that they praise a knight instead of a lady in order that Isabel might, if she desired, present the poem to Graunson, who, in turn, may have answered Chaucer in one of his farewells to Isabel.

Miss Galway continues her explanation by suggesting that when Chaucer met the new queen in person, he wrote the ballad "To Rosamonde" for her. Since he had celebrated Richard's first queen extensively, he also felt the need to offer her a more elaborate work; therefore he revamped the Prologue of the Legend of Good Women to make it appropriate for Isabel (see the chapter on the Legend of Good Women

for these details). When Isabel objected to the recast poem, Chaucer may have answered with "Against Women Unconstant" in which he complains "of her over-fondness for 'newe thing.'" "Merciless Beaute" forms a sequel to "Women Unconstant."

The sequence of these poems, Miss Galway feels, was

"Complaint of Venus" - late 1395 or early 1396
 "To Rosamonde" - soon after Isabel's arrival in
 November, 1396
 Revised Legend Prologue - May, 1397
 "Against Women Unconstant" - May - June 1397
 "Merciless Beaute" - very soon after.

She also mentioned that Shirley must have been misinformed by the house of Lancaster when he associated Isabel of York with the "Complaints of Mars and Venus." Isabel of York, though, may have been the recipient of earlier verse that Graunson wrote. La Complainte de saint Valentin contains lines which mourn a dead princess; since Isabel died in 1392, perhaps Graunson mourned her in these lines.¹²

Shirley's marginal notes and the proximity of the "Complaints of Mars and Venus" in some manuscripts have led some scholars to think that both of these poems were addressed to Isabel of York. Isabel, who was the daughter of Pedro the Cruel, King of Castile, and sister to Constance, the second wife of John of Gaunt, married Edmund of Langley, who later became the Duke of York. Shirley commented at the close of the "Complaint of Venus" that "Hit is sayde that Graunson made this last balade for Venus resembled to my lady of York, answering the Complaynt of Mars."¹³ At the close of the "Complaint of Mars," he remarked "Thus eondethe here this complainte whiche some men sayne was made by [i.e. about] my lady of York daughter to the kyng of Spaygne and my lord of Huntyngdoun some tyme duc of Excestre...¹⁴

Since there is no other evidence to corroborate Shirley's statements, some scholars have found it difficult to accept them without question. Some of the earlier scholars, Skeat for example,¹⁵ accepted Shirley's association of the "Complaint of Venus" with Isabel of York, but most of the students of Chaucer today are not completely convinced.

Shirley's commentary on the "Complaint of Mars" elicited a much greater response. Isabel of York's affairs as an occasion for the "Mars" was accepted reluctantly by Skeat and Furnivall.¹⁶ In 1896, Manly published his evaluation. He felt that the poem was merely an exercise describing an astrological event in terms of human action and emotion. He concluded that it was possible for Isabel of York and John Holland to have been the subjects of the poem, but it was unlikely that it could ever be proved.¹⁷

This evaluation remained acceptable until Brusendorff re-examined the poems and pointed out lines in the two poems which fit the personality of John Holland reasonably well. Holland was a good example of knighthood (cf. ll. 11f. of "Venus"); he also had a poorly controlled temper which fits lines in "Mars" (ll. 36f.). A third quotation (ll. 64-67 of "Mars"), Brusendorff felt, may have alluded to John Holland's forced retirement following the death of the son of the Earl of Stafford at his hands. Because these lines are appropriate to John Holland, Brusendorff concluded that Shirley was correct and Holland must have been involved in an affair with Isabel of York while he was hiding from the law. He also decided that Shirley's remark that "Mars" was written at the command of the Duke of Lancaster was understandable because John Holland had seduced Elizabeth, John of

Gaunt's daughter, (he later married her) and this was an opportunity to "jeer" at the man who had stolen his daughter's honor.¹⁸

G. H. Cowling quickly replied to Brusendorff's statements. He commented that there is no evidence that there was an affair between John Holland and Isabel of York, but there is no question that there was a liaison between John Holland and Elizabeth of Pembroke, John of Gaunt's daughter. Cowling feels that the poem was intended to congratulate this young couple and to gloss over the unsavory beginning of their marriage. Although I do not necessarily agree with Cowling that John Holland and Elizabeth of Pembroke were the major characters in the "Mars," it seems much more consistent with the time in which he lived for Chaucer to ameliorate a touchy situation within one part of the royal family than to invite the ire of Edmund of Langley, another of Edward III's sons, by casting aspersions on his and his wife's name.

The "broche of Thebes" (l. 245 of "Mars") is possibly a play on words according to Cowling - portions of the lady's name, Elisebeth of Pembroche, form the necessary words. He was convinced, also, that Shirley was correct when he stated that "Venus" was a sequel to "Mars." The second poem was "another defence" of the marriage of Elizabeth of Lancaster and Sir John Holland, afterwards Earl of Huntingdon.¹⁹

As an adjunct to her discussion of Joan of Kent as Alceste, Miss Galway suggests that the "Complaint of Mars" presents in allegorical form the story of the liaison between Thomas Holland (Mars) and Joan of Kent (Venus) before their official marriage. Phoebus may represent Edward III who sent Holland off to war in France. The

flight of Venus to Cilenios may symbolize Joan's temporary alliance with William Montague, the Earl of Salisbury.²⁰

The most recent proposal of an occasion for the "Complaint of Mars" was put forth by G. G. Williams, who disagrees with Manly's theory because "the lack of astronomical realism in the poem argues against its being a mere astronomical exercise, and many details of statement and of diction argue for its being a fanciful depiction of a flesh and blood love affair." Williams suggests that Mars is John of Gaunt, Venus is Katherine Swynford, Cilenios is Chaucer himself, and Phoebus is probably William Courtenay, the Bishop of London, who was one of Gaunt's severest critics.

During the period of time between the deaths of Prince Lionel and the Black Prince, John of Gaunt was "thridde hevenes lord above, / as well by hevenysh revolucioun as by desert,..." Between the deaths of his two brothers Gaunt was third in line to the throne as well as being the third most powerful man in the kingdom, financially and militarily.

If Gaunt is Mars, Katherine Swynford must be Venus. Their alliance was the only serious extramarital affair that Gaunt indulged in. Since they lived together for nearly thirty years and eventually married, the public criticism probably was felt sharply by Gaunt. He may have requested Chaucer to write the poem, as Shirley contends.

Although Williams recognizes that we probably will never know whether Katherine was forced to flee as the poem depicts Venus fleeing from Mars, he speculates that "Cilenios' tour" may have been Chaucer's Aldgate residence and the most logical place for Katherine to seek refuge.

The "Complaint of Mars," then, according to Williams, is a plea for tolerance for John of Gaunt's illicit love affair with Katherine Swynford which had been so severely criticized by Knighton and Walsingham.²¹

Whether "Mars" is an occasional poem or not is almost impossible to determine, but the introduction of non-astronomical diction, Shirley's comments, and the presence of descriptive details which may be clues to the occasion for the poem should at least cause the reader to keep an open mind.

The poem which may be Chaucer's last composition and also the only one among the minor poems to allude to Henry IV is "The Complaint of Chaucer to His Purse." The "Complaint" itself is not addressed to anyone in particular; therefore it might have been written earlier than the envoy, for King Richard II to hear.²² If it was written earlier, I see no reason why it might not have been intended for John of Gaunt to hear since he had given Chaucer pensions in the past. The poem also does not indicate the rank of the person being petitioned.

The "Envoy," which is present on all but three of the eight manuscripts, plainly refers to Henry's acquisition of the throne on September 30, 1399 by "free eleccioun" of Parliament.²³ In 1398, Richard had banished him from England for ten years; therefore when Henry returned in 1399 and forced Richard II to abdicate, he claimed the throne by conquest. He claimed the throne by right of succession, and Parliament declared him king by free election.²⁴ Thus Henry IV was

... Conqueror of Brutes Albyon,
Which that by lyne and free eleccioun
Been verray kyng, ... ("To His Purse" 11.22-24.)

No one doubts that in this poem Chaucer was addressing a

particular member of the royal family, especially since Henry IV granted Chaucer an additional forty marks on October 3, 1399,²⁵ and confirmed Richard II's grants to him of £20 a year and a butt of wine on October 18th of the same year.²⁶

The Royal Family and Chaucer's Works

In order to be certain that the names referred to in the discussions of Chaucer's individual works are not just a jumbled mass of character identifications, I have compiled a chart which utilizes the persons of Chaucer's acquaintance for its principle of organization. Each individual is shown in relation to the works and characters for which he has been suggested as an identification.

I would also like to point out that in the process of research and in an effort to be factual it is not difficult to forget that these cognomens were identifications for "real" people. We must remember that Chaucer's contemporaries had all the anxieties and problems peculiar to their age. They were constantly striving to advance their business and social positions; they had problems to solve in their personal lives, just as we do. We must also recognize the fact, though, that the society in which they lived was organized on a different plan.

Since the years of Chaucer's lifetime included the reigns of three kings - Edward III, Richard II, and Henry IV - and Chaucer enjoyed the favor of each in his turn, it is not strange that they have been proposed as models for his characters. The first of these kings was the grandfather of both of the rulers who followed him although he had designated only Richard as his heir. Henry usurped Richard's throne on 1399.

Edward III with his queen, Philippa of Hainault, had been the reigning monarch of England since 1327. During his sovereignty

the Hundred Years' War over England's claim to Aquitaine and later the crown of France was begun and waged intermittently until a time long after his death in 1377. It was the many ramifications of this war which served as inspirations for the suggested allusions to contemporary affairs in Chaucer's works.

Since the Prince of Wales, Edward the Black Prince, predeceased his father, King Edward III named his grandson, Prince Richard, son of the Black Prince, as heir to the throne. It is not strange then, inasmuch as Richard's reign coincided with the height of Chaucer's literary productivity, that his marriage negotiations caused the largest number of conjectures. He actually married Anne of Bohemia, the daughter of the emperor Charles IV, and Isabel, the daughter of King Charles VI of France. In addition to minor references, the House of Fame, the Parliament of Fowls, and the Legend of Good Women have each been suggested as an occasional poem honoring Richard and Anne, his first bride. The immaturity of Queen Isabel, who was only seven years old when she married Richard in 1396, is probably the reason that only a revision of the earlier Legend of Good Women and a few minor ballads were credited to her honor.

The third occupant of the English throne during Chaucer's lifetime was Henry of Bolingbroke, Earl of Derby. He was the eldest son of John of Gaunt and Blanche of Lancaster. Through a series of circumstances which cannot be described here, Henry usurped the throne of Richard II, basing his claim on the right of conquest, the right of inheritance, and the right of election.¹

A potential king who died too soon was Edward, the Black Prince. He was the first son of King Edward III and Queen Philippa. During

his father's reign he distinguished himself in France and ruled over Aquitaine, the English province in France. When his health began to fail, John of Gaunt took Edward's place as governor of Aquitaine.

Edward's wife and the mother of his two sons (the youngest became Richard II) was Joan of Kent. Quite understandably the contemporary chronicles did not treat Joan kindly because of the unorthodox circumstances surrounding her early marriage. To understand the seriousness of the mix-up, it is necessary to realize that during early English history a betrothal was as binding a contract as marriage. Joan, whose father had been arrested, tried, beheaded for conspiracy against his young nephew, Edward III, and later exonerated, was adopted by Queen Philippa. As a result she spent much of her childhood at Woodstock with Prince Edward and William Montague as her playmates. William Montague, who later became the Earl of Salisbury, was the illegitimate son of Edward III by the sister of William Montague, the first Earl of Salisbury. Later the king betrothed Joan to William Montague, but before her marriage took place Joan secretly married Thomas Holland who promptly went off to war for a couple of years. During the interval that Holland was in France the king caused Joan and William Montague to be married. When Thomas Holland returned, he appealed to the Pope and on November 13, 1349, Joan was restored to him by papal orders. Subsequently Holland died and Joan married Edward, the Black Prince, in October of 1361. Only two of Joan's seven children were alluded to by Chaucer -- John Holland and Richard II.

Another frequently alluded to member of the royal family was John of Gaunt, the third son of Edward III. Through the first two of his marriages he acquired wealth which gave him political power in England

and a claim to the throne of Castile. In 1359, he married Blanche, the daughter of Henry, Duke of Lancaster. Shortly after the death of Blanche's father, King Edward bestowed the rank of Duke and Duchess of Lancaster on his son and Blanche. Ten years later Blanche died of the plague, leaving three children, Elizabeth, Henry, and Philippa, who all have been suggested as contemporary counterparts of Chaucer's characters. A short time later John of Gaunt effected a political marriage with Constance of Castile, the daughter of Pedro the Cruel, King of Castile and Leon, who had been driven from his throne. It was through this marriage that Gaunt acquired the title of King of Castile and Leon and the mammoth task of taking physical possession of it.

After the death of the Duchess Constance, Gaunt married Katherine Swynford, who had been the governess for Blanche's children and Gaunt's mistress of many years standing. Katherine was also Chaucer's sister-in-law.

Only two other of Edward III's children have been mentioned in connection with Chaucer's works -- Lionel of Clarence, his second son, and Philippa de Couci, his granddaughter, who married Robert de Vere. They were each suggested for one work and both theories have been discredited.

With the exception of Isabella of York, all those listed in the following chart have already been identified in the course of this discussion. Isabella of York was also, like Constance of Lancaster, a daughter of Pedro the Cruel, King of Castile and Leon. Like her sister she had married into the royal family of England when she wed Edmund of Langley, the Duke of York.

Chart of The Royal Family and Chaucer's Works

Court Figure	Work	Reference or Character*
King Edward III ²	<u>Book of the Duchess</u>	Octavien ³
	"Knight's Tale"	Theseus ⁴
	"Squire's Tale"	Cambyuskan ⁵
King Richard II	<u>House of Fame</u>	eagle ⁶
	<u>House of Fame</u>	"man of gret auctorite" ⁷
	<u>House of Fame</u>	To honor Richard and Anne ⁸
	<u>Parliament of Fowls</u>	"foul royal" ⁹
	<u>Parliament of Fowls</u>	To honor Richard and Anne ¹⁰
	"Knight's Tale"	Palamon ¹¹
	F-version of the <u>Legend of Good Women</u>	God of Love ¹²
"Lak of Stedfastnesse"	Lenvoy dedicated to King Richard ¹³	
Queen Anne	<u>Troilus and Criseyde</u>	Reference to Anne's initial ¹⁴
	<u>House of Fame</u>	To honor Richard and Anne ¹⁵
	<u>Parliament of Fowls</u>	"formel egle" ¹⁶
	F-version of the <u>Legend of Good Women</u>	Alcestis ¹⁷
	"Knight's Tale"	Emily ¹⁸
Queen Isabel	G-version of the <u>Legend of Good Women</u>	Addressed to Isabel ¹⁹

*The footnote numbers refer to a compilation of the major critical works which discuss each character assignment.

Court Figure	Work	Reference or Character
	"Rosamonde"	Addressed to Isabel ²⁰
	"Against Women Unconstant"	Addressed to Isabel ²¹
	"Merciless Beaute"	Addressed to Isabel ²²
	"Complaint of Venus"	Addressed to Isabel ²³
King Henry IV	"Knight's Tale"	Emetreus ²⁴
	"Prologue" to the <u>Canterbury Tales</u>	Knight ²⁵
	"Complaint of Chaucer to his Purse"	Addressed to Henry IV ²⁶
Edward, the Black Prince	F-version of the <u>Legend of Good Women</u>	God of Love ²⁷
	"Knight's Tale"	Emetreus ²⁸
	"Squire's Tale"	Cambalo ²⁹
	"Squire's Tale"	Algarsif ³⁰
	<u>Troilus and Criseyde</u>	Hector ³¹
Joan of Kent	F-version of the <u>Legend of Good Women</u>	Alcestis ³²
	<u>Book of the Duchess</u>	"Lady Sovereign" ³³
	<u>Anelida and Arcite</u>	Anelida ³⁴
	<u>Troilus and Criseyde</u>	Criseyde ³⁵
	"Knight's Tale"	Emily ³⁶
	"Squire's Tale"	Canacee ³⁷
	"To Pity"	Addressed to Joan ³⁸
	"To His Lady"	Addressed to Joan ³⁹
	"Balade of Complaint"	Addressed to Joan ⁴⁰
	"Womanly Noblesse"	Addressed to Joan ⁴¹
	"Complaint of Mars"	Venus ⁴²

Court Figure	Work	Reference or Character
John of Gaunt	<u>Book of the Duchess</u>	Black Knight ⁴³
	<u>House of Fame</u>	Warning to the Duke ⁴⁴
	<u>Parliament of Fowls</u>	royal tercel ⁴⁵
	<u>Troilus and Criseyde</u>	Troilus ⁴⁶
	"Squire's Tale"	Camballus ⁴⁷
	"Tale of Melibee"	Melibeus ⁴⁸
	"Complaint of Mars"	Mars ⁴⁹
	"Complaint of Mars and Venus"	Phoebus ⁵⁰
Blanche of Lancaster	<u>Book of the Duchess</u>	"goode faire White" ⁵¹
	<u>Parliament of Fowls</u>	Formel eagle ⁵²
	"An A B C"	Requested by Blanche ⁵³
Constance of Castile	"Squire's Tale"	Canacee ⁵⁴
	"Man of Law's Tale"	Constance ⁵⁵
Katherine Swynford	<u>House of Fame</u>	Warning to John of Gaunt and Katherine ⁵⁶
	<u>Troilus and Criseyde</u>	Criseyde ⁵⁷
	"Physician's Tale"	Advice to governesses ⁵⁸
	"Tale of Melibee"	Prudence ⁵⁹
	"Complaint of Mars"	Venus ⁶⁰
Philippa of Lancaster	<u>House of Fame</u>	"tydynges" were plans for her marriage in 1384 ⁶¹
	<u>Parliament of Fowls</u>	Formel eagle ⁶²
Elizabeth, Countess of Pembroke	"Squire's Tale"	deserted falcon ⁶³
	"Complaints of Venus and Mars"	Venus ⁶⁴

Court Figure	Work	Reference or Character
Lionel of Clarence	<u>Parliament of Fowls</u>	royal tercel ⁶⁵
	<u>Anelida and Arcite</u>	Theseus ⁶⁶
Henry, Earl of Derby	"Prologue" to the <u>Canterbury Tales</u>	Knight ⁶⁷
Philippa Plantagenet	<u>Parliament of Fowls</u>	Formel eagle ⁶⁸
Thomas Holland	<u>Anelida and Arcite</u>	Arcite ⁶⁹
	"Knight's Tale"	Arcite ⁷⁰
	"Complaint of Mars"	Mars ⁷¹
	"Squire's Tale"	Unfaithful tercelet ⁷²
John Holland, Earl of Huntingdon	"Complaint of Mars"	Mars ⁷³
William Montague, Earl of Salisbury	"Complaint of Mars"	Cilenius ⁷⁴
	"Knight's Tale"	Palamon ⁷⁵
Isabella of Castile, Duchess of York	"Complaint of Mars"	Venus ⁷⁶
Robert de Vere, Earl of Oxford	<u>Anelida and Arcite</u>	Arcite ⁷⁷
Philippi de Couci, granddaughter of Edward III	<u>Anelida and Arcite</u>	Anelida ⁷⁸

Footnotes

Preface

1 F. N. Robinson, ed., The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, 2nd. ed. (Boston, c1957), p.XXIX. This edition of Chaucer's work has been used throughout this paper for all line references.

Introduction

1 Edith Rickert, "A New Interpretation of the Parliament of Fowls," MP, XVIII (1920), 4-5; Bernard F. Huppe, "'Piers Plowman' and the Norman Wars," PMLA, LIV (1939), 37ff.; H. S. Bennett, Chaucer and the Fifteenth Century (Oxford, 1947), p.10; Gardiner Stillwell, "John Gower and the Last Years of Edward III," SP, XLV (1948), 454-471; Haldeen Braddy, Chaucer and the French Poet Graunson (Baton Rouge, La., 1947), pp.72-73. The use of disguises for the names of prominent people in the works of English writers from the twelfth century on also is attested to in Rupert Taylor's, The Political Prophecy in England (New York, 1911).

2 Book of the Duchess- 1.948- "goode faire White"; 1.1318f. "ryche hil," "long castel," "walles White," "seynt Johan."
Troilus and Criseyde, I- 1.171- "Right as oure firste lettre is now an A."

House of Fame- ll.652-660- lines referring to Chaucer himself.
Legend of Good Women- ll.496-497- "And whan this book ys maad, yive it the quene, / On my byhalf, at Elthem or at Sheene."

"Nun's Priest's Tale" in the Canterbury Tales- ll.VII
3394-3396- "Certes, he Jakke Straw and his maynee / Ne Made nevere shoutes half so shrille / Whan that they wolden any Flemyng kille."

3 Braddy, Chaucer and Graunson, pp. 71-85.

4 George L. Kittredge, "Chaucer and Some of His Friends," MP, I (1903-04), 4f.

5 John L. Lowes, "Prologue" of the Legend of Good Women as Related to the French Marguerite Poems and the Filostrato, " PMLA, XIX (1904), 608. Lowes cited several French Marguerite poems, but he apparently did not realize that he gave the name of an honored person in nearly every case.

Book of the Duchess

- 1 Robinson, p. 266.
- 2 George L. Kittredge, Chaucer and His Poetry (Cambridge, Mass., 1933), p. 37.
- 3 Marjorie Anderson, "Blanche, Duchess of Lancaster," MP, XLV (1948), 157.
- 4 Robinson, p.xxi.
- 5 Kittredge, Chaucer and His Poetry, p. 37; Marshall W. Stearns, "A Note on Chaucer's Attitude Toward Love," Speculum XVII (1942), 573; Robert D. French, A Chaucer Handbook (New York, c1947), p.86; and others.
- 6 Aage Brusendorff, The Chaucer Tradition (London, c1925), p.294.
- 7 Robinson, p.279.
- 8 Walter W. Skeat, The Academy, XLV, 191. This reference was not available; therefore the content was obtained through Frederick Tupper, "Chaucer and Richmond," MLN, XXXI (1916), 251.
- 9 Tupper, "Chaucer and Richmond," 251.
- 10 The derivation of the word Lancaster could be pursued from another angle. The "lan" seems a reasonable abbreviation of the O.E. "lange" which means "long" in modern English. The "caster" is accepted as the Latin word "castra" which meant "camp". In its passage through O.E. to M.E. the word became "ceaster," meaning "city, castle, town."
- 11 Howard J. Savage, "Chaucer's 'Long Castel,'" MLN, XXXI (1916), 442-443.
- 12 Robinson, p.276.
- 13 Tupper, "Chaucer and Richmond," 250; A. S. Cook, "Chaucerian Papers," Trans. of Conn. Acad. of Arts and Sciences, XXIII (New Haven, 1919), 31; and Robinson, p.775.
- 14 Margaret Galway, "Chaucer's Hopeless Love," MLN, LX (1945), 433-434.
- 15 Galway, "Chaucer's Hopeless Love," 432-433.
- 16 Several writers, among them Bernhard ten Brink and Adolphus W. Ward, have expressed autobiographical theories which involved lesser figures of the court. Bernhard ten Brink (History of English Literature,

trans. William Clark Robinson, vol. II, part I (New York, c1892), 48-49.) considered the eight years sickness autobiographical, but he does not name a recipient of Chaucer's unfortunate love. A. W. Ward (Chaucer (New York, n.d.), p.55.) was of the opinion that either "the Philippa Chaucer of 1366 was Geoffrey Chaucer's wife, whether or not she was Philippa Roet before marriage, and the lament of 1369 had reference to another lady -- an assumption to be regretted in the case of a married man, but not out of range of possibility. Or -- and this seems on the whole, the most probably view -- the Philippa Chaucer of 1366 was a namesake whom Geoffrey married some time after 1369 -- possibly (of course only possibly) the very lady whom he had loved hopelessly for eight years, and persuaded himself that he had at last relinquished, and who had then relented after all."

W. O. Sypherd ("Chaucer's Eight Years Sickness", MLN, XX (1905), 240-243.) stated that in his opinion Chaucer's lines were not autobiographical but simply patterned after the conventional love-poems of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

R. O. Loomis ("Chaucer's Eight Years Sickness," MLN, LIX (1944), 178-180) followed Sypherd's lead in order to refute Miss Galway's theory that Joan of Kent was the cause of Chaucer's sickness. He cited Machaut's Jugement due Roi de Behaigne in which a lady confessed to a lovelorn state for seven or eight years as the source of Chaucer's number eight since G. L. Kittredge had demonstrated that this particular poem was a source for the Book of the Duchess.

17 George H. Cowling, Chaucer (New York, n.d.), p.15 n.1.

18 Stearns, 573.

19 Stearns, 572.

20 Stearns, 573.

House of Fame

1 Lacking access to Rudolf Immelman's discussion of his Richard and Anne theory in E St, XLV, 397 ff., I have utilized B. H. Bronson's and F. C. Riedel's reports of it in their articles dealing with this poem.

2 Bertrand H. Bronson, "Chaucer's House of Fame: Another Hypothesis," University of California Publications in English, III (1934), 176-177.

3 Brusendorff, pp. 163-165.

4 Bernhard ten Brink, in his volume Chaucer Studien (Muenster, 1870), placed the date for the House of Fame between June 1374 and February 1385, because of Chaucer's reference in ll.652 ff. to his position as controller of customs.

5 Bronson, "Chaucer's House of Fame: Another Hypothesis," 180.

6 Frederick Carl Riedel, "The Meaning of Chaucer's House of Fame," JEGP, XXVII (1928), 441-442.

7 Since Professor Koch's article in E St, L, 369 ff. was not available, I have been forced to use Bronson's and Riedel's accounts of it.

8 Bronson, "Chaucer's House of Fame: Another Hypothesis," 191.

9 Riedel, 457-468.

10 For example: F. J. Snell, Age of Chaucer (London, 1926), p. 185; W. O. Sypherd, "The Completeness of Chaucer's House of Fame," MLN, XXX (1915), 67n.

Anelida and Arcite

1 J. B. Bilderbeck, "Chaucer's 'Anelida and Arcite,'" N&Q, 8th Series, IX (1896), 301.

2 Bilderbeck, "Chaucer's 'Anelida and Arcite,'" 301.

3 J. S. P. Tatlock, The Development and Chronology of Chaucer's Works (London, 1907), p.84.

4 Frederick Tupper, "Chaucer's Tale of Ireland," PMLA, XXXVI (1921), 190-196.

5 Tupper, "Chaucer's Tale of Ireland," 208, 212.

6 Robert K. Root, The Poetry of Chaucer (New York, c1922), pp. 295-296; Robinson, p. 788; French, pp. 100-101.

7 Margaret Galway, "Joan of Kent and the Order of the Garter," University of Birmingham Historical Journal, I (1947), 44.

8 Margaret Galway, "Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," MLR, XXXIII (1938), 180.

9 Galway, "Joan of Kent and the Order of the Garter," 44-45.

10 Robinson, pp. 717, 788.

Parliament of Fowls

1 ten Brink, Chaucer Studien, p. 129. This item was translated in John Koch, "The Dates and Personages of the Parliament of Fowls," Essays on Chaucer, Chaucer Society, part IV, XII (London, n.d.), 404-405.

2 Robinson, p. 791.

- 3 Thomas Tyrwhitt, Canterbury Tales, I (London, 1775-78), XXVII, note e; Henry Morley (English Writers, V (London, 1893), 154 ff.) agrees.
- 4 ten Brink, Chaucer Studien. This item was translated in Koch, "The Dates and Personages of the Parliament of Fowls," 405.
- 5 Saturday Review, XXXI (April 15, 1871), 468.
- 6 Frederick J. Furnivall, Trial Forewords (London: Chaucer Society, 1871-73), pp. 72-74.
- 7 Koch, "The Dates and Personages," 406-408.
- 8 Emile Legouis (Geoffrey Chaucer, trans. L. Lailavoix (London, 1913), p.82.), Tatlock (Development, pp. 41-42.) and Snell (p.170.) agree with Professor Koch in spite of the introduction of the other Richard-Anne theory and the Philippa of Lancaster supposition in the interim.
- 9 Koch, "The Dates and Personages," 409.
- 10 Oliver F. Emerson, "The Suitors in Chaucer's Parliament of Fowls," MP, VIII (1910), 45-47.
- 11 Samuel Moore, "A Further Note on the Suitors in the Parliament of Fowls," MLN, XXVI (1911), 10.
- 12 Oliver F. Emerson, "The Suitors in the Parliament of Foules Again," MLN, XXVI (1911), 110.
- 13 Moore, "A Further Note," 11.
- 14 O. F. Emerson, "The Suitors," 48-49. It should be noted that this statement contradicts the contemporary account by Pelzel which J. Koch cited to support his theory.
- 15 O. F. Emerson, "The Suitors" 49, 51-53.
- 16 O. F. Emerson, "The Suitors," 54.
- 17 O. F. Emerson, "The Suitors," 54.
- 18 Rickert, "A New Interpretation of the Parliament of Fowls," MP, XVIII (1920), 9.
- 19 O. F. Emerson, "The Suitors," 55-56.
- 20 O. F. Emerson, "The Suitors," 61.
- 21 Rickert, "A New Interpretation," 16-28.
- 22 Haldeen Braddy, Three Chaucer Studies, part ii (New York, 1932),

p. 16. This publication was expanded from "The Parlement of Foules: A New Proposal," PMLA, XLVI (1931), 1007-1019.

- 23 Braddy, Three Chaucer Studies, p. 29.
- 24 Braddy, Three Chaucer Studies, pp. 15-16.
- 25 For more details refer to p. 19.
- 26 Braddy, Three Chaucer Studies, p. 70.
- 27 Braddy, Three Chaucer Studies, p. 54.
- 28 Braddy, Three Chaucer Studies, p. 56-59, 60.
- 29 John M. Manly, "Three Recent Chaucer Studies," RES, X (1934), 267-272.
- 30 Haldeen Braddy, "Historical Background of the Parlement of Foules," RES, XI (1935), 204-209. This article was followed by another by Manly ("Historical Background of the Parlement of Foules," RES, XI (1935), 209-213.)
- 31 Braddy, Three Chaucer Studies, p. 43.
- 32 Braddy, Three Chaucer Studies, pp. 56-59.
- 33 Bertrand H. Bronson, "The Parlement of Foules Revisited," ELH, XV (1948), 248.
- 34 Bronson, "PF Revisited," 251; Robinson, pp. 791, 793; John Koch, The Chronology of Chaucer's Writings, Chaucer Society (London, 1890), pp. 37-38.
- 35 Ethel Seaton, "The Parliament of Fowls and Lionel of Clarence," Medium Aevum, XXV (1956), 169-171.
- 36 Katherine T. Emerson, "The Parliament of Fowls and Lionel of Clarence: A Reply," Medium Aevum, XXVI (1957), 107-108.
- 37 William F. Friedman and Elizabeth S. Friedman, "Acrostics, Anagrams, and Chaucer," PQ, XXXVIII (1959), 1-20.
- 38 Robinson, p. 791.

Troilus and Criseyde

- 1 John L. Lowes, "The Date of Chaucer's 'Troilus and Criseyde,'" PMLA, XXIII (1908), 285-287.
- 2 Lowes, "The Date of Tr.," 293-296.

- 3 Margaret Galway, "The Troilus Frontispiece," MLR, XLIV (1949), 168-172.
- 4 Brusendorff, pp. 19-25.
- 5 Galway, "Troilus", 162-165.
- 6 George G. Williams, "Who Were Troilus, Criseyde, and Pandarus," Rice Institute Pamphlet, XLIV (1957), 126-146.
- 7 Cook, "Chaucerian Papers," Trans. of The Conn. Acad. of Arts and Sciences, XXIII (1919), 55-63.
- 8 Eleanor C. Lodge and Robert Somerville, ed., John of Gaunt's Register, 1379-1383, 2 vols., Camden Third Series, LVI, LVII (London, 1937).
- 9 Williams, "Who Were," 130.
- 10 Williams, "Who Were," 132-133.
- 11 Robinson, p. 811.
- 12 Nevil Coghill, The Poet Chaucer (London, 1949), p. 76.
- 13 Williams, "Who Were," 141.
- 14 George G. Williams, "The 'Troilus and Criseyde' Frontispiece Again," MLR, LVII (1962), 173-178.

Legend of Good Women

- 1 Margaret Galway, "Chaucer's 'Lady Sovereigne,'" MLR, XLIII (1948), 400.
- 2 J. B. Bilderbeck, Chaucer's Legend of Good Women (London, 1902), p. 101.
- 3 Bilderbeck, Chaucer's LGW, p. 105.
- 4 John L. Lowes, "The Prologue of the LGW as Related to the French Marguerite Poems, and the Filostrato," 660-661.
- 5 John L. Lowes, "The Prologue to the Legend of Good Women Considered in its Chronological Relations," PMLA, XX (1905), 780-801.
- 6 Tatlock, Development, p. 103.
- 7 Robinson, p. 846.
- 8 Tatlock, Development, p. 122.
- 9 Tatlock, Development, p. 103. This was originally taken from ten Brink's book Chaucer Studien, pp. 147 ff.

- 10 Tatlock, "Dates of Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde and the Legend of Good Women" MP, I (1903-04), 324-329.
- 11 Tatlock, Development, pp. 104-110.
- 12 Tatlock, Development, p. 107.
- 13 ten Brink, History of English Literature, pp. 116-117.
- 14 George L. Kittredge, "Chaucer's Alceste," MP, VI (1908-09), 436.
- 15 Root, p. 142, French, p. 127, and others.
- 16 Bernard L. Jefferson, "Queen Anne and Queen Alcestis," JEGP, XIII (1914), 438-439.
- 17 Tatlock, Development, p. 111.
- 18 Root, p. 141.
- 19 Bilderbeck, Chaucer's LGW, pp. 85-7, 103.
- 20 Lowes, "Prologue of LGW as Related to French Marguerite Poems and the Filostrato," 670.
- 21 Tatlock, Development, p. 120 n.
- 22 Tatlock, Development, p. 121 n.
- 23 Galway, "Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," 145-171.
- 24 Galway, "Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," 148.
- 25 Roger S. Loomis, "Chaucer's Eight Years Sickness," MLN, LIX (1944), 180 n 7.
- 26 Margaret Galway, "Lylle Floures Newe," TLS (Sept. 29, 1945), 468.
- 27 Miss Galway notes on p. 148 of her article in MLR, XXXIII, that the source studies indicate Chaucer borrowed this from Froissart's Dittie de la Fleur et de la Margharite. This point of scholarship was established long before by John L. Lowes, "Legend of Good Women, Marguerite poems and Filostrato."
- 28 Richard II bestowed some of these coronets on his uncles and on De la Pole after Edward III's death.
- 29 Galway, "Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," 149. The other recipients of coronets were the dukes of Lancaster, York, and Gloucester who all died after 1394 and Robert de Vere who died in 1392 but was deprived of his coronet long before.

- 30 Galway, "Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," 150.
- 31 Legouis, p. 41.
- 32 Galway, "Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," 157.
- 33 Huppe, "Historical Allegory in the Prologue to the Legend of Good Women," MLR, XLIII (1948), 393-399; Galway, "Chaucer's Lady Sovereign," 400.
- 34 Galway, "Chaucer's Hopeless Love," 434-435.
- 35 Walter Weese, "Alceste and Joan of Kent," MLN, LXIII (1948), 474-477.
- 36 Margaret Galway, "Chaucer's 'Sovereign Lady'" TLS (Oct. 10, 1942), 499.
- 37 Lowes, "The Prologue to the LGW considered in its chronological Relation," 766 and Sydney Armitage-Smith, John of Gaunt (Westminster, 1905), p. 321 n.
- 38 Galway, "Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," 162.
- 39 Galway, "Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," 152.
- 40 Loomis, 180 n 7 and Galway, "Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," 162.
- 41 Galway, "Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," 163.
- 42 Marion Lossing, "The Prologue to the Legend of Good Women and the Lai de Franchise." SP, XXXIX (1942), 15-35.
- 43 Lowes, Legend of Good Women, Marguerite Poems and Filostrato, 593-683.
- 44 Carleton Brown, "Legend of Good Women," MLN, LVIII (1943), 278.
- 45 Galway, "Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," 164.
- 46 John M. Manly, ed., Canterbury Tales (New York, c 1928), p. 40.
- 47 Galway, "Lylle Floures Newe," 468.

Canterbury Tales

- 1 Albert S. Cook, "The Historical Background of Chaucer's Knight," Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, XX (1916), 237.
- 2 John M. Manly, "A Knight Ther Was," Transactions of the American Philological Association, XXXVIII (1907), 92.

- 3 Manly, "A Knight Ther Was," 93.
- 4 Cook, "Chaucer's Knight," 237.
- 5 Robinson, p. 652.
- 6 Muriel Bowden, A Commentary on the General Prologue to the Canterbury Tales (New York, 1949), p. 63.
- 7 Manly, "A Knight Ther Was," 107.
- 8 John L. Lowes, "The Tempest at Hir Hoom-Cominge," MLN XIX (1904), 240-243.
- 9 Oliver F. Emerson, "A New Note on the Date of Chaucer's 'Knight's Tale'," Studies in Language and Literature in celebration of the Seventieth Birthday of James Morgan Hart, November 2, 1909 (New York, 1910), pp. 203-254.
- 10 Robinson, p. 669.
- 11 Henry B. Hinckley, Notes on Chaucer (Northampton, Mass., 1907), p. 75; Stuart Robertson, "Elements of Realism in the 'Knight's Tale,'" JEGP, XIV (1915), 233.
- 12 Manly, Canterbury Tales, p. 549; J. Parr, "The Date and Revision of Chaucer's 'Knight's Tale,'" PMLA, LX (1945), 317.
- 13 O. F. Emerson, "A New Note on the Date of Chaucer's 'Knight's Tale,'" p. 249.
- 14 Cook. "Chaucer's Knight," 237.
- 15 Cook, "Chaucer's Knight," 167-170.
- 16 Manly, Canterbury Tales, p. 555.
- 17 Hinckley, Notes on Chaucer, p. 61.
- 18 Galway, "Joan of Kent and the Order of the Garter," 41-44.
- 19 Robinson, p. 669.
- 20 Robinson, p. 653.
- 21 Galway, "Joan of Kent and the Order of the Garter," 47.
- 22 Galway, "Joan of Kent and the Order of the Garter," 45-46.
- 23 Alois Brandl, "On the Historical Personages of Chaucer's 'Squieres Tale'," Essay on Chaucer, Chaucer Society, part VI, XIX, Series 2, #29 (London, 1892), 623-641. This originally appeared in E ST, XII (1888).

- 24 George L. Kittredge, "Supposed Historical Allusions in the 'Squire's Tale,'" E St, XIII (1889), 7-9.
- 25 Cook, "Chaucer's Knight," 185n.
- 26 Tupper, "Chaucer's Tale of Ireland," 198.
- 27 Galway, "Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," 181.
- 28 Galway, "Joan of Kent and the Order of the Garter," 15-16.
- 29 A. C. Edwards, "Knaresborough Castle and Kynges Moodres Court," PQ, XIX (1940), 308.
- 30 Edith Rickert, Chaucer's World (New York, 1948), p. 325; Armitage-Smith, John of Gaunt, p. 357.
- 31 Roland M. Smith, "Chaucer's 'Man of Law's Tale' and Constance of Castile," JEGP, XLVII (1948), 343.
- 32 George L. Kittredge, "Chaucer and Some of His Friends," 5 n 7.
- 33 Tatlock, Development, pp. 154-155.
- 34 Tatlock, Development, p. 192.
- 35 Gardiner Stillwell, "The Political Meaning of Chaucer's 'Tale of Melibee,'" Spec., XIX (1944), 442.
- 36 Stillwell, "Melibee," 443.
- 37 J. Leslie Hotson, "'Tale of Melibeus' and John of Gaunt," SP, XVIII (1921), 452.
- 38 Hotson, "'Tale of Melibeus' and John of Gaunt," 437.
- 39 J. Burke Severs, "The Source of Chaucer's 'Melibeus,'" PMLA, L (1935), 98-99.
- 40 Severs, 99 n 14.
- 41 J. Leslie Hotson, "Colfox versus Chauntecleer," PMLA, XXXIX (1924), 762-781.
- 42 Lalia Phipps Boone, "Chauntecleer and Partlet Identified," MLN, LXIV (1949), 78-81.
- 43 Robinson, p. 751.

Minor Poems

- 1 Root, p. 82; Snell, p. 136; Robinson, p. 855; and others.
- 2 Snell commented (p. 137) that "As a version, Chaucer's A.B.C. is certainly free - sentences, for instance, are transposed - but it is modelled far too closely on the French to be regarded in any other light." French and others have made similar comments.
- 3 Galway, "Chaucer's Hopeless Love," 436; Galway, "Troilus," 170.
- 4 Galway, "Chaucer's Hopeless Love," 436.
- 5 Brusendorff, pp. 274 f.; Manly, Canterbury Tales, p. 40.
- 6 Both the late 80's and the late 90's have been advanced as dates and Boethius (Skeat, I, 84), Dechamps (Braddy, "Date of Chaucer's 'Lak of Steadfastnesse,'" 487-490), and Graunson (Braddy, Chaucer and Graunson, pp. 67-69; 88 f) have been suggested as possible sources.
- 7 Robinson, p. 860.
- 8 Howard R. Patch, "Chaucer and Lady Fortune," MLR, XXII (1927), 381.
- 9 Edith Rickert, "Documents and Records," MP, XXV (1927), 255; Manly, Canterbury Tales, p. 40.
- 10 Galway, "Chaucer, Graunson, and Isabel of France," 276 ff.
- 11 The exact year of Isabel's death is uncertain; I have found statements that she died in 1392 (Brusendorff, p. 268 n 2; Robinson, p. 862) and in 1394 (Root, p. 77; French, p. 113).
- 12 Braddy, Chaucer and Graunson, p. 76.
- 13 French, p. 112.
- 14 French, pp. 91-92.
- 15 Skeat, I, 87.
- 16 Skeat, I, 65; Furnivall, p. 80.
- 17 John M. Manly, "On the Date and Interpretation of Chaucer's 'Complaint of Mars,'" Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature, V (1896), 124.
- 18 Brusendorff, pp. 261-268.
- 19 George H. Cowling, "Chaucer's 'Complaintes of Mars and Venus,'" RES, II (1926), 405-410.
- 20 Galway, "Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," 183 ff.

- 21 George G. Williams, "What is the Meaning of Chaucer's 'Complaint of Mars,'" JEGP, LVII (1958), 167-176.
- 22 Robinson, p. 864.
- 23 Brusendorff, p. 253; Root, p. 78; French, p. 113; etc.
- 24 M. Dominica Legge, "The Gracious Conqueror," MLN, LXVIII (1953), 18-21.
- 25 Robinson, p. 865.
- 26 Cowling, Chaucer, p. 37. The text of Henry IV's reply to Chaucer when he asked to have Richard's patents to him confirmed can be found in Allen Rogers Benham, English Literature: From Widsith to the Death of Chaucer (London, 1916), pp. 610 f.

The Royal Family and Chaucer's Works

- 1 Henry IV's claims to the throne were spelled out in the "Lenvoy de Chaucer" which was attached to the twenty-one line poem, "The Complaint of Chaucer to his Purse." An explanation of the significance of the lines of the "Lenvoy" has been published by M. Dominica Legge, "The Gracious Conqueror," MLN, LXVIII (1953), 18-21.
- 2 The only references to Queen Philippa are made in conjunction with King Edward III's decision to spare the six citizens of Calais.
- 3 Cook, "Chaucer's Knight," 176; Cook, "Chaucerian Papers," 31.
- 4 Hinckley, Notes on Chaucer, 61, 75, 77; Robertson, 233-234; Galway, "Joan of Kent and the Order of the Garter," 42-43.
- 5 Brandl, 624, 636-637; Galway, "Joan of Kent and the Order of the Garter," 45-46.
- 6 R. Imelmann, "_____", Englische Studien, XLV, 397 ff. This reference was not available; therefore the content was obtained through Robinson, p. 779 and John Edwin Wells, A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1400 (New Haven, 1926), p. 656.
- 7 Snell, p. 185; Wells, p. 656.
- 8 Brusendorff, pp. 162-165; Sypherd, "The Completeness of Chaucer's House of Fame," 67 n.
- 9 The Richard II, Anne of Bohemia, William of Hainaut, Frederick of Meissen theory: Koch, "The Dates and Personages of the Parliament of Fowls," 40-409; Snell p. 170; Tatlock, Development, p. 42. The Richard II, Anne of Bohemia, Frederick of Meissen, Charles VI of France theory: Oliver F. Emerson, "The Suitors in Chaucer's Parlement of Foules," 45-62; O. F. Emerson, "The Suitors in the Parlement of

Foules Again," 109-111; Moore, "A Further Note on the Suitors in the Parlement of Foules," 8-12; O. F. Emerson, "What is the Parlement of Foules?" JEGP, XIII (1914), 566-582; Mary E. Reid, "Historical Interpretations of the Parlement of Foules," Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, XVIII (1923), 60-70; Douglas, 378-384. The Prince Richard, Marie of France, William of Hainaut theory: Braddy, "Parliament of Fowls: A New Proposal," 1007-1019; Braddy, Three Chaucer Studies, 93 pp. The Richard II, Philippa of Lancaster, William of Hainaut, John of Blois theory: Rickert, "A New Interpretation of the Parlement of Foules," 15-29.

10 ten Brink, History of English Literature, p. 84; Cook, "Chaucer's Knight," 189.

11 O. F. Emerson, "A New Note on the Date of Chaucer's 'Knight's Tale,'" pp. 249-251.

12 Skeat, xxiv; Bilderbeck, Chaucer's Legend of Good Women pp. 85-87, 103; Legouis, pp. 39-40.

13 Manly, Canterbury Tales, p. 40; Braddy, "Date of Chaucer's 'Lak of Stedfastnesse,'" JEGP, XXXVI (1937), 487-490.

14 The theory that Book I line 171 of Troilus and Criseyde referred to Queen Anne has been generally accepted.

15 See footnote 8.

16 See the first two theories footnoted in footnote 9.

17 Jefferson, "Queen Anne and Queen Alcestis," 434-443; Legouis, p. 41; Skeat, xxiii; ten Brink, History of English Literature, p. 112-113.

18 Parr, "Date and Revision of Chaucer's 'Knight's Tale'" 324; Manly, Canterbury Tales, p. 40; O. F. Emerson, "A New Note on the Date of Chaucer's 'Knight's Tale,'" 249.

19 Galway, "Lyllye Floures Newe," p. 468; Galway, "Cancelled Tributes to Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," N&Q, CXCI (January 1948), 2-3; Galway, "Chaucer's, Graunson and Isabel of France," RES, XXIV (1948), 279-280.

20 Manly, Canterbury Tales, p. 40; Rickert, "Documents and Records," MP, XXV (1927), 255; Galway, "Chaucer, Graunson, and Isabel of France," 275, 278.

21 Galway, "Chaucer, Graunson, and Isabel of France," 275.

22 See footnote 21.

23 Galway, "Chaucer, Graunson, and Isabel of France," 273-280.

24 Cook, "Chaucer's Knight," 167-175.

- 25 Cook, "Chaucer's Knight," 214, 236-237.
- 26 Legge, 18-21; Brusendorff, p. 253; Manly, Canterbury Tales, p. 40.
- 27 Galway, "Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," 149-161; Galway, "Cancelled Tributes to Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," 2; Galway, "The Troilus Frontispiece," 173-174.
- 28 Galway, "Joan of Kent and the Order of the Garter," 43-44.
- 29 Galway, "Joan of Kent and the Order of the Garter," 46-47.
- 30 Brandl, 624, 637-638.
- 31 Williams, "Who were" 132-133.
- 32 Legouis, p. 41; Galway, "Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," 145-171; Galway, "Geoffrey Chaucer, J. P. and M. P.," MLR, XXVI (1941), 21; Galway, "Chaucer's 'Sovereign Lady,'" p. 499; Galway, "Cancelled Tributes to Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," 2; Galway, "Chaucer's 'Lady Sovereign.'" 400; Loomis, "Chaucer's Eight Years' Sickness," 178-180; Galway, "Chaucer's Hopeless Love, 435-436; Galway, "Troilus," 173-174.
- 33 Galway, "Chaucer's Hopeless Love," 431-434, 437-439; Galway, "Cancelled Tributes to Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," 3.
- 34 Galway, "Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," 179-180; Galway, "Joan of Kent and the Order of the Garter," 44-45, 48.
- 35 Galway, "Troilus," 168-169, 176; Galway, "Joan of Kent and the Order of the Garter," 49-50.
- 36 Galway, "Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," 183; Galway, "Joan of Kent and the Order of the Garter," 41-43; Galway, "Cancelled Tributes to Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," 3.
- 37 Galway, "Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," 180-183; Galway, "Joan of Kent and the Order of the Garter," 45-48.
- 38 Galway, "Troilus," 170; Galway, "Chaucer's Hopeless Love," 436.
- 39 See footnote 38.
- 40 Galway, "Chaucer's Hopeless Love," 436.
- 41 See footnote 40.
- 42 Galway, "Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," 183.
- 43 Savage, "Chaucer's 'Long Castel,'" 442-443; Schoenbaum, "Chaucer's Black Knight," MLN, LXVIII (1953), 121-122; Snell, p. 142; Tupper, "Chaucer and Richmond," 250-252.

- 44 Riedel, 443-469.
- 45 Tyrwhitt, Canterbury Tales, xxvii, note e; Morley, 157-164.
- 46 Williams, "Who were" 127-139, 143.
- 47 Brandl, 624, 635-636.
- 48 Hotson, "'Tale of Melibeus' and John of Gaunt," 437-452.
- 49 Williams, "Meaning of 'Complaint of Mars?'" 168-170.
- 50 Cowling, "Mars and Venus," 408.
- 51 Anderson, "Blanche, Duchess of Lancaster," 157; Paul F. Baum, "Chaucer's Puns," PMLA, LXXI (1956), 243; Brusendorff, p. 294; Savage, "Chaucer's 'Long Castel,'" 442-443; Schoenbaum, "Chaucer's Black Knight," 121; Snell, p. 142; Root, p. 59; Stearns, "A Note on Chaucer's Attitude toward Love," 573-574; Tupper, "Chaucer and Richmond," 251.
- 52 See footnote 45.
- 53 Snell, p. 142; Root, p. 57.
- 54 Brandl, 624, 635-636.
- 55 Rickert, Chaucer's World p. 325; Smith, "Chaucer's 'Man of Law's Tale' and Constance of Castile," 344-351.
- 56 Riedel, 443, 450-469.
- 57 Riedel, 453; Williams, "Who were" 126-146.
- 58 Kittredge, "Chaucer and Some of his Friends," 5n.7; Karl Young, "The Maidenly Virtues of Chaucer's Virginia," XVI (1941), 348.
- 59 Hotson, "'Tale of Melibeus' and John of Gaunt," 437.
- 60 Williams, "'Complaint of Mars,'" 171-176.
- 61 John Koch, "_____", EST L, 369 ff. This reference was not available; therefore its content was obtained through Robinson, p. 779.
- 62 Rickert, "A New Interpretation of the Parliament of Fowls," 15-29.
- 63 Brandl, 624, 633-634.
- 64 Cowling, "Mars and Venus," 407-410.
- 65 Seaton, 168-174; K. T. Emerson, 107-109.
- 66 Tupper, "Chaucer's Tale of Ireland," 208-216.

67 Cook, "Chaucer's Knight," 236-237; Manly, "A Knight Ther Was," 92-93.

68 The Philippa Plantagenet and Enguerrand de Couci theory: _____, "_____", Saturday Review, XXXI (April 15, 1871), 468, col. 2.

69 Galway, "Joan of Kent and the Order of the Garter," 42.

70 Galway, "Joan of Kent and the Order of the Garter," 42-43.

71 Galway, "Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," 183.

72 Galway, "Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," 181.

73 The John Holland and Isabella of York theory: Brusendorff, pp. 261-268; Skeat, p. 64. The John Holland and Elizabeth of Lancaster theory: Cowling, 407-410.

74 Galway, "Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," 183.

75 Galway, "Joan of Kent and the Order of the Garter," 42-43.

76 See the John Holland and Isabella of York theory in footnote 73.

77 J. B. Bilderbeck, "Chaucer's 'Anelida and Arcite,'" N&Q, 8th Series, IX (1896), 301 f.

78 See footnote 77.

Bibliography

- Anderson, Marjorie, "Blanche, Duchess of Lancaster," MP, XLV (1948), 152-159.
- Armitage-Smith, Sydney, John of Gaunt (London, 1904).
- Baum, Paul F., "Chaucer's Puns," PMLA, LXXI (1956), 225-246.
- Benham, Allen Rogers, English Literature: From Widsith to the Death of Chaucer (London, 1916).
- Bennett, H. S., Chaucer and the Fifteenth Century (Oxford, 1947).
- Bilderbeck, J. B., "Chaucer's 'Anelida and Arcite,'" N&Q, 8th Series, IX (April 18, 1896), 301-2.
- _____, Chaucer's Legend of Good Women (London, 1902).
- Boon, Lalia Phipps, "Chauntecleer and Partlet Identified," MLN, LXIV (1949), 78-81.
- Bowden, Muriel, A Commentary on the General Prologue to the Canterbury Tales (New York, 1949).
- Braddy, Haldeen, Chaucer and the French Poet Graunson (Baton Rouge, La., 1947).
- _____, "The Date of Chaucer's 'Lak of Steadfastnesse,'" JEGP, XXXVI (1937), 481-490.
- _____, "The Historical Background of the Parlement of Foules," RES, XI (1935), 204-209.
- _____, "Messire Oton de Graunson, Chaucer's Savoyard Friend," SP, XXXV (1938), 515-531.
- _____, "The Parlement of Foules: A New Proposal," PMLA, XLVI (1931), 1001-1019.
- _____, Three Chaucer Studies (New York, 1932).
- _____, "Parliament of Fowls Revisited," ELH, XV (1948), 247-260.
- Brown, Carleton, "Legend of Good Women," MLN, LVIII (1943).
- Brusendorff, Aage, The Chaucer Tradition (London, 1925).

- Coghill, Nevil, The Poet Chaucer (London, 1949).
- Cook, Albert S. "Chaucerian Papers," Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, XXIII (1919), 1-63.
- _____, "The Historical Background of Chaucer's Knight," Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, XX (1916), 161-240.
- Cowling, George H., Chaucer (New York, n.d.).
- _____, "Chaucer's 'Complaintes of Mars and Venus,'" RES, II (1926), 405-410.
- Douglas, Theodore W., "What is the Parliament of Fowls?" MLN, XLIII (1928), 378-384.
- Edwards, A.C., "Knaresborough Castle and Kynges Moodres Court," PQ XIX (1940), 306-309.
- Emerson, Katherine T., "Parliament of Fowls and Lionel of Clarence: A Reply," Medium Aevum, XXVI (1957), 107-109.
- Emerson, Oliver F., "A New Note on the Date of Chaucer's 'Knight's Tale,'" Studies in Language and Literature in Celebration of the Seventieth Birthday of James Morgan Hart, November 2, 1909 (New York, 1910), pp. 203-254.
- _____, "The Suitors in Chaucer's Parliament of Fowls," MP, VIII (1910), 45-62.
- _____, "The Suitors in Chaucer's Parliament of Fowls Again," MLN, XXVI (1911), 109-111.
- _____, "What is the Parliament of Fowls?" JEGP, XIII (1914), 566-582.
- French, Robert D., A Chaucer Handbook (New York, c 1947).
- Furnivall, Frederick J., Trial Forewords, Chaucer Society (London, 1871-1873), pp. 72-74.
- Galway, Margaret, "Cancelled Tributes to Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," N&Q, CXCI (1948), 2-3.
- _____, "Chaucer, Graunson and Isabel of France," RES, XXIV (1948), 273-280.
- _____, "Chaucer's Hopeless Love," MLN, LX (1945), 431-439.
- _____, "Chaucer's 'Lady Sovereign,'" MLR, XLIII (1948), 399-400.
- _____, "Chaucer's Sovereign Lady," MLR, XXXIII (1938), 145-199.

- _____, "Chaucer's 'Sovereign Lady,'" TLS (October 10, 1942), 499.
- _____, "Geoffrey Chaucer, J.P. and M.P." MLR, XXXVI (1941), 20-22.
- _____, "Joan of Kent and the Order of the Garter," The University of Birmingham Historical Journal, I (1947), 13-50.
- _____, "Lylle Floures Newe," TLS (September 29, 1945), 468.
- _____, "The Troilus Frontispiece," MLR, XLIV (1949), 161-177.
- Hinckley, Henry B., Notes on Chaucer (Northampton, Mass., 1907).
- Hotson, J. Leslie, "Colfox versus Chaunticleer," PMLA, XXXIX (1924), 762-781.
- _____, "Tale of Melibeus and John of Gaunt," SP, XVIII (1921), 429-452.
- Huppe, Bernard F., "Historical Allegory in the Prologue to the Legend of Good Women," MLR, XLIII (1948), 393-399.
- Jefferson, Bernard L., "Queen Anne and Queen Alcestis," JEGP, XIII (1914), 434-443.
- Kittredge, George L., Chaucer and His Poetry (Cambridge, Mass., 1933).
- _____, "Chaucer's Alceste," MP, VI (1908-1909), 435-439.
- _____, "Chaucer and Some of His Friends," MP, I (1903-1904), 1-18.
- _____, "Supposed Historical Allusions in the 'Squire's Tale,'" E ST, XIII (1889), 7-9.
- Koch, John, "The Dates and Personages of the Parliament of Fowls," Essays on Chaucer, Chaucer Society, part IV, #XII (London, n.d.), 400-409.
- _____, The Chronology of Chaucer's Writings, Chaucer Society (London, 1890), pp. 37-38.
- Legge, M. Dominica, "The Gracious Conqueror," MLN, LXVIII (1953), 18-21.
- Legouis, Emile, Geoffrey Chaucer, trans. L. Lailavoix (London, 1913).
- Lodge, Eleanor C. and Robert Somerville, ed., John of Gaunt's Register, 1379-1383, 2 vol., Camden 3rd series, vol. LVI, LVII (London, 1937).
- Loomis, Roger S., "Chaucer's Eight Years' Sickness," MLN, LIX (1944), 178-180.
- Lossing, Marion, "The Prologue to the Legend of Good Women and the Lai de Franchise," SP, XXXIX (1942), 15-35.

- Lowes, John L., "The Prologue to the Legend of Good Women considered in its Chronological Relations," PMLA, XX (1905), 766-801.
- _____, "The Prologue of the Legend of Good Women as Related to the French Marguerite Poems and the Filostrato," PMLA, XIX (1904), 593-683.
- _____, "The Date of Chaucer's 'Troilus and Criseyde,'" PMLA, XXIII (1908), 285-306.
- _____, "The Tempest at Hir Hoomcominge," MLN, XIX (1904), 240-243.
- Manly, John M., ed., Canterbury Tales (New York, c 1928).
- _____, "The Historical Background of the Parlement of Foules," RES, XI (1935), 209-213.
- _____, "A Knight Ther Was," Transactions of the American Philological Association, XXXVIII (1907), 89-107.
- _____, "On the Date and Interpretation of Chaucer's 'Complaint of Mars,'" Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature, V (1896), 124.
- _____, "Three Recent Chaucer Studies," RES, X (1934), 267-272.
- Moore, Samuel, "A Further Note on the Suitors in the Parliament of Fowls," MLN, XXVI (1911), 8-12.
- _____, "The Prologue to Chaucer's Legend of Good Women in relation to Queen Anne and Richard," MLR, VII (1912), 488-493.
- Morley, Henry, English Writers, V (London, 1893) 154 ff.
- Parr, Johnstone, "The Date and Revision of Chaucer's 'Knight's Tale,'" PMLA, LX (1945), 314-324.
- Patch, Howard R., "Chaucer and Lady Fortune," MLR, XXII (1927), 381.
- Reid, Mary E., "Historical Interpretations of the Parliament of Fowls," Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, XVIII (1923), 60-70.
- Rickert, Edith, "A New Interpretation of the Parliament of Fowls," MP, XVIII (1920), 1-29.
- _____, Chaucer's World (New York, 1948).
- _____, "Documents and Records," MP, XXV (1927), 249-255.
- Riedel, Frederick C., "The Meaning of Chaucer's House of Fame," JEGP, XXVII (1928), 441-469.
- Robertson, Stuart, "Elements of Realism in the 'Knight's Tale,'" JEGP, XIV (1915), 226-255.

- Robinson, F. N., ed., The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, 2nd, ed. (Boston, c 1957).
- Root, Robert K., The Poetry of Chaucer (New York, c 1922).
Saturday Review, XXX (April 15, 1871) p. 468, col. 2.
- Savage, Howard J., "Chaucer's 'Long Castel,'" MLN, XXXI (1916), 442-443.
- Schoenbaum, Sam, "Chaucer's Black Knight," MLN, LXVIII (1953), 121-122.
- Seaton, Ethel, "The Parliament of Fowls and Lionel of Clarence," Medium Aevum, XXV (1957), 168-174.
- Severs, J. Burke, "The Source of Chaucer's 'Melibeus,'" PMLA, L (1935), 98-99.
- Skeat, Walter W., Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, 2nd ed., I (Oxford, 1899), 64 ff.
- Smith, Roland M., "Chaucer's Man of Law and Constance of Castile," JEGP, XLVII (1948), 343 ff.
- Snell, F. J. Age of Chaucer (London, 1926).
- Stearns, Marshall W., "Note on Chaucer's Attitude toward Love," Speculum, XVII (1942), 454-471.
- Stillwell, Gardiner, "John Gower and the Last Years of Edward III," SP, XLV (1948), 454-471.
- _____, "Political Meaning of Chaucer's 'Tale of Melibee,'" Speculum, XIX (1944), 433-444.
- Sypherd, W. O. "Chaucer's Eight Years' Sickness," MLN, XX (1905), 240-243.
- _____, "The Completeness of Chaucer's House of Fame," MLN, XXX (1915), 67.
- Tatlock, John S. P., "The Dates of Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde and Legend of Good Women," MP, I (1903-1904), 317-329.
- _____, The Development and Chronology Works (London, 1907).
- ten Brink, Bernhard, Chaucer Studien (Muenster, 1870).
- _____, History of English Literature, trans. William C. Robinson, vol. II, part I (New York, c 1892), 112 f.
- Tupper, Frederick, "Chaucer and Richmond," MLN, XXXI (1916), 250-252.

_____, "Chaucer's Tale of Ireland," PMLA, XXXVI (1921), 186-222.

Tyrwhit, Thomas, ed., Canterbury Tales, I(London, 1775-1778).

Ward, Adolphus W., Chaucer, in English Men of Letters, John Morley, ed. (New York, n.d.).

Weese, Walter, "Alceste and Joan of Kent," MLN, LXIII (1948), 474-477.

Wells, John E., A Manual of the Writings in Middle English (New Haven, 1926).

Williams, George G., "What is the Meaning of Chaucer's 'Complaint of Mars?'" JEGP, LVII (1958), 167-176.

_____, "Who were Troilus, Criseyde, and Pandarus," Rice Institute Pamphlet, XLIV (1957), 126-146.

Vita

I was born on September 19, 1920 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania to Mary Ella and William Robert Wetten. My early education consisted of eight years at the Rutledge Public School and four years at Swarthmore High School from which I graduated in June of 1938.

After four years of undergraduate work at Millersville State Teachers College, Millersville, Pennsylvania, I was awarded the degree of Bachelor of Science in Education in May of 1942. My degree certified me to teach in the secondary fields of English (college major) and social studies (minor).

Since there was a shortage of industrial arts teachers during World War II and I had discovered that I liked this work also, I returned to Millersville for the summers of 1942, 1943, and 1944 to earn a total of thirty credits in industrial arts which permitted me to have woodworking and mechanical drawing added to my teaching certificate.

From September 1942 until March 1943, I was the industrial arts teacher at Chadds Ford Consolidated School, Chester County, Pennsylvania. From March 1943 until June 1944, I taught mechanical drawing and civics at Spring City High School, Spring City, Pennsylvania.

Because I married Kenneth C. Banzhof (B.S., Millersville, 1938, M.Ed., Lehigh, 1953), I did not teach again until the 1953-54 term. That year I taught fifth and sixth grades at Paradise

Township School, Monroe County, Pennsylvania.

From September 1956 until June of 1958 I taught junior high English and ancient history at Pocono Township School, Tannersville, Pennsylvania. During the period of September 1958 until August 1959, I completed the course requirements and began my thesis for a master's degree in English at Lehigh University.

In September 1959, I returned to the Pocono Township School to teach senior high English. Since September, 1960 I have been a member of the English department at East Stroudsburg State College, East Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania.