

CHAUCER AND JEAN de MEUN AS SELF-CONSCIOUS NARRATORS: THE PROLOGUE TO THE *LEGEND OF GOOD WOMEN* AND THE *ROMAN de la ROSE* 10307-680

By Sherron Knopp

The *Roman de la Rose*, according to F. N. Robinson, "probably exerted on Chaucer a more lasting and more important influence than any other work in the vernacular literature of either France or England."¹ But aside from a few echoes in phrasing and a slight resemblance between Alceste's defense of the poet and Faus Semblant's defense of the lover, Robinson finds its influence on the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women* only "slight" (p. 840). And he does not stand alone in this judgment, for critics who discuss the sources of the Prologue look rather to the *marguerite* poems of Machaut and Froissart (the *Dit de la Marguerite* and the *Dittie de la Flour de la Margherite*), the *Lai de Franchise* of Deschamps, the *Paradys d'Amours* of Froissart, and the *Jugement dou Roy de Navarre* of Machaut than to the *Roman*.² Yet while these works contribute undisputable elements to the Prologue, to look only at the French love poems is to miss its whole spirit and significance. Much more than Robinson suspects, the *Roman de la Rose*, and Jean de Meun's role as narrator in particular, lie behind the comically high-handed treatment Chaucer receives from the God of Love. They account for the tone of the Prologue, radically different as it is from any of the "sources," as well as for particularities in Chaucer's depiction of himself as lover and writer.

The *marguerite* poems, for example, bear directly on the cult of the daisy as it appears in Chaucer's Prologue, and Chaucer explicitly acknowledges his debt to them:

Allas, that I ne had Englyssh, ryme or prose,
 Suffisant this flour to preye aryght!
 But helpeth, ye that han konnyng and myght,
 Ye lovers that kan make of sentement;
 In this cas oghte ye be diligent
 To forthren me somewhat in my labour,
 Whethir ye ben with the leef or with the flour.
 For wel I wot that ye han her-biforn
 Of makynge ropen, and lad away the corn,
 And I come after, glenyng here and there,
 And am ful glad yf I may fynde an ere
 Of any goodly word that ye han left.

(66-77)³

They account for details like Chaucer's assertion in line 123 that the odorless daisy "surmounteth pleynly alle odoures," but their importance does not go beyond descriptive detail; and they do not affect the "plot" of the Prologue at all.⁴

The *Paradys d'Amours* and the *Jugement dou Roy de Navarre*, on the other hand, contribute definite elements to the plot.⁵ Lowes, who has made the most detailed comparison of Chaucer and the *Paradys*, summarizes the similarities between the two poems which he considers more than merely conventional: the poet as an offender in Love's domain is brought to judgment by the God of Love; a lady in royal habit (Plaisance in Froissart) recognizes that her master owes mercy to the suppliant; and the poet makes a *balade* glorifying his lady under the name of the daisy (p. 652). However, even Lowes admits that "if it be true that Chaucer draws in part from the *Paradys* the framework of his Prologue, nothing could better illustrate his consummate skill in handling conventional material than the patent differences between the two" (p. 651).

The differences, in fact, seem more important than the similarities. Both W. O. Sypherd⁶ and Estrich have pointed out that the "significant" similarities of Lowes are neither as similar nor as significant as they may first appear. The accusations by the God of Love are not truly parallel: Froissart is reproved as a lover, Chaucer as a writer. Chaucer is

not a suppliant and he does not repent. Alceste has little in common with the two ladies who berate Froissart, or with Bel Acueil, who represents Froissart's lady. The *balades* in the two poems differ in both content and function: Chaucer's, unlike Froissart's, is neither a *marguerite* poem nor a joyful response at winning his lady. However, even if one overlooks these discrepancies — Chaucer did after all have a vigorous and imaginative mind capable of modifying such things to suit his own purposes — and accepts the two situations as relatively equivalent, the differences in theme and tone are staggering. The *Paradys d'Amours* resembles better Guillaume's idealistic section of the *Roman de la Rose*. Froissart as a lover recalls Guillaume's Amant — the melancholy, dreamy youth on an allegorical quest for a lady, directed by the God of Love. The tone also suggests the beginning of the *Book of the Duchess* — but not the ironic and high-spirited Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women*.

Estrich's suggestion remains, that the *Jugement dou Roy de Navarre* lies behind the plot of the Prologue. If so, Chaucer has greatly reduced the 4212-line allegorical poem; but the similarities are striking. As Estrich points out (pp. 25-26), the poem contains some important elements lacking in the other French poems: the heresy of the guilty poet and its punishment, the role of the poet as actor in the poem, the "special feminism motif," and the humor. However, Guillaume takes himself much more seriously as a character than Chaucer, and he takes the charge of heresy more seriously. In fact, he defends his work at such length that the center of the poem becomes not the literary dilemma of the writer so much as the feminist debate of the courtier. Furthermore, although he treats both aspects with "delicately sceptical humor" (Estrich, p. 38), he does not come near Chaucer's zestful satire. For Chaucer is not only accused of having written heresy himself, but of having reproduced someone else's, Jean de Meun's. The specific content of the heresy figures only incidentally in Chaucer's poem, however, because he prefers to explore the function of the poet, on which point he allies himself solidly with Jean. His self-portrayal differs from Mauchaut's in seriousness because, making himself a comic inversion of Jean, Chaucer plays off of Jean's self-portrayal in the *Roman de la Rose*. The humor, sharply focused and double-edged, at once satirizes and salutes Jean. Better than any of the French love poems, then, the *Roman de la Rose* explains the distinctive character and temper of Chaucer's Prologue.⁷

The section of the *Roman* significant for the Prologue extends from lines 10307 to 10680. The scene begins with Amant in the same sad situation in which Guillaume had left him and Jean had adopted him

some 6000 lines earlier, with the not very helpful counsels of Raison and Amis intervening.⁸ Amours appears, for the first time in Jean's poem, smiling on Amant's grief, to question him on the commandments of love. Like most medieval dreamers, Amant shows himself slow and in need of instruction. To Amours' query how well he has kept the commandments, he answers typically: "Ne sai, sire, mais faiz les ai / Au plus leiaument que je sai" (10323-4) [I know not, sir, but I have kept them as loyally as I know how]. Although Amours finds his pupil "trop muables" [too unstable], Amant's sincerity finally moves him to help liberate Bel Acueil from Jalousie's prison.

Immediately following comes Amours' address to his Barons (10493-678), a passage overflowing with all the exuberance of which Jean is capable.⁹ Having set up in the preceding lines a typical "courtly" situation, Jean now reveals his relation to it — and transcendence of it — by imparting his views of himself as lover and writer. As Chaucer will later, Jean finds courtly conventions confining. He utilizes them with sympathy and humor, but he does not accept them as the highest value. Thus he takes over Guillaume's Amant as a persona and maintains the youth's fictional predicament; but he will not identify completely with Amant, and he changes radically the character of the instruction given to him so that it becomes a many-sided scholastic debate.

His relation to Amant is especially important, for Amant motivates and holds together the various parts of the poem. Although, like Chaucer's persona, Amant has been the subject of much discussion,¹⁰ Jean discloses his method and technique in this passage with a clarity for which Chaucer critics would give an arm and a leg. Guillaume he identifies quite literally with Amant. Amours describes him as actually "en perill de mourir" [in danger of dying] unless Amours intervenes to save him from the enmity of Jalousie (10527-30). Once rescued, the very real Guillaume will record his supposedly equally real adventures:

Car, pour ma grace deservir,
Deit il comencier le romant
Ou seront mis tuit mi comant,
E jusque la le fournira
Ou *il* a Bel Acueil dira . . .

(10548-52; italics mine)

[For to deserve my favor he must begin the romance in which will be placed all my commands, and he will continue it to the point at which he will say to Bel Acueil . . .]

Although the words to Bel Acueil are Amant's, the *il* clearly refers to Guillaume.¹¹ Then Guillaume will die and Jean will be born. After a lapse of forty years or so, Jean will assume the pose of Amant and will continue speaking:

Car, quant Guillaume cessera,
Johans le continuera,
 Emprès sa mort, que je ne mente,
 Anz trespassez plus de quarante,
E dira pour la mescheance . . .

(10587-91; italics mine)

[For when Guillaume leaves off, Jean will continue it after his death, so help me if I lie, after a space of more than forty years, and he will say in this predicament . . .]

Amant's adventures are literally Guillaume's; Jean only adopts them.

Jean also emphasizes his personal superiority to the lowly and imperfect Amant. Whereas Amant shows himself uncertain about love, unstable, "trop muables" (10323 ff.), Jean depicts himself as a paragon of love. "Au cuer joli, au cors inel" [joyous of heart, supple of body], Amours says he will be born (10566); and one feels that with Amours Jean smiles patronizingly on Amant. Furthermore, Amant at his conventional courtly best can only recite Amours' commandments, while Jean advises (or will advise) Amours himself. Of course, Amours wishes for the advice of both Jean and Guillaume in lines 10605-6. But Guillaume can not be there after all because he is mired in his dilemma. Having caused Bel Acueil's imprisonment by his inexperience in conducting a love affair, he is still languishing in the garden. Jean can not be there simply because he is not yet born — and he gives the impression that he personally would not get into such a dilemma in the first place.

The special care Amours promises for Jean when he is born further shows how different he is from the humble Amant:

Pour ce qu'il iert tant mes amis,
Je l'afublerai de mes eles
E li chanterai . . .

(10636-9)

[Because he will be such a great friend of mine, I
will cover him with my wings and sing to him . . .]

However, Amours' enthusiastic endorsement of Jean, and the concomitant repetition of phrases reminding us that he is still "a naistre" (10567, 10608, 10611, 10618, 10624, 10666) also remind us forcibly that far from being an autonomous reality, Amours is Jean's own creation, traced in his own self-confident image and likeness, and retaining only the name of the conventional courtly god.

The highest authority for love in Jean's poem is Jean. Amours praises him not as a typical courtly lover but as his own equal. When Amours praises him as a writer, he makes him the definitive writer:

Endoctrinez de ma science,
Si fleütera noz paroles
Par carrefours e par escoles,
Selonc le langage de France,
Par tout le regne, en audience,
Que jamais cil qui les orront
Des douz maus d'amer ne morront,
Pour qu'il le creient seulement;
Car tant en lira proprement
Que trestuit cil qui ont a vivre
Devraient apeler ce livre
Le Mirouer aus Amoureux.

(10640-51)

[Imbued with my doctrine, he will spread my words through crossroad and school, in the language of France, through the whole kingdom, in assemblies, so that those who hear them will never die of the sweet pains of love if they will only believe him; men will read them so worthily that all living men should call this book the *Mirror for Lovers*.]

Jean in turn has supplied the conventional God of Love with a new kind of love. Its full character does not become clear until all the facets of it fall into place in Genius' final exhortation; but reading the passage with the whole work in mind, one can see Jean already preparing to sell it — or baptize it — by presenting it under the aegis of Amours. In his buoyant self-confidence, and from the noblest of motives, he simply appropriates the machinery of courtly love. Amours persuasively points out what a misfortune it would be should anything happen to prevent Jean's birth, because "il fera mout de biens" [he will do much good] for all lovers (10622). To those who read it "proprement" (a built-in defense for what he knows to be a departure from the conventional?), the book will be the sole source of belief and a true mirror. Jean has as much confidence in his book as he has in himself.

The whole section, a tour de force of narrative technique, shows in miniature Jean's relation to the courtly tradition and his manipulation of it in the *Roman de la Rose*. It also shows his skill in ironic distancing from his characters (especially through the juxtaposition of fiction and reality), and his gloriously comic egotism which transcends the typical courtly situation and then stops to admire itself. Jean has Amours conclude characteristically with magnanimous good wishes for those who shall come after him, "Qui devotement entendront /A mes comandementz ensivre" (10668-9) [who devotedly will learn to follow my commandments] — which commandments, of course, are to be found in Jean's book. Chaucer, as translator of the *Roman*, falls heir to Amours' prophecy and becomes one of the lucky beneficiaries of Jean — but instead of winning the approval of the god for his work, Chaucer only receives an accusation of heresy.

The accusation is the main issue of Chaucer's Prologue. He had set himself to write a "legend" of "good women," perhaps at the queen's request, perhaps because there had actually been a furor over his work like those raised by the troublesome women against Machaut, by Christine de Pisan against Jean, and by "les dames de Paris" against Alain Chartier.¹² Whatever the immediate motivation of the work, Chaucer like Jean would not let himself be bound to a rigidly courtly code. Hence, as Robert W. Frank, Jr., observes, his "glorious wriggling out from under" the accusation¹³ and his careful preparation in the Prologue for a series of tales about faithful women which are actually less

"courtly" than the works for which he was accused. Like Jean, Chaucer intended to widen the boundaries of the courtly garden.

On the surface, however, he atones for his uncourtly writings, and thoroughly enjoys the chance for posturing. How could he, Geoffrey Chaucer, be at fault for spreading Jean de Meun's insidious heresies when he is clearly the very antithesis of the rascal? His characteristic pose of guileless innocence contrasts perfectly with Jean's omniscient, all-capable stance; and unlike Jean, who could not bear a complete identification with the simple Amant, Chaucer maintains his obtuse identity to the end. The "I" who begins the Prologue with the trusting,

A thousand tymes have I herd men telle
That ther ys joy in hevene and peyne in helle,
And I acorde wel that it ys so;

(1-3)

is no different from the simple-minded "I" caught by the God of Love rendering service to the daisy.

Chaucer's portrayal of himself here as a lover further supports the suspicion that he has his eye on the *Roman de la Rose*. Whereas Jean considers himself more like the God of Love than the humble Amant, Chaucer accepts the lowly pose and makes himself almost a caricature of Amant. By doing so, he ostensibly dissociates himself as far as possible from Jean and his heresies; but by carrying the courtly to the opposite extreme, he undermines it as thoroughly as Jean transcends it. Just as Amant the typical courtly lover, well-meaning though not too bright, seeks the allegorical rose, Chaucer, equally well-meaning but even less bright (giving "ful credence" to all his books), falls madly in love, "ever ylike newe, . . . til that myn herte dye" (56-57), with a daisy. Not a woman but a flower finally elicits a declaration of love from Geoffrey. And not an allegorical flower, either.¹⁴ While Amant's rose is surrounded by the trappings of allegory — Bien Celer, Honte, Peor, Dangier, etc. — and Amant requires lengthy advice on how to approach it, Chaucer simply goes out into the fields to enjoy his flower:

. . . ther daweth me no day
That I nam up and walkyng in the mede
To seen this flour ayein the sonne sprede.

(46-48)

And whan that hit ys eve, I renne blyve,
 As sone as evere the sonne gynneth weste,
 To seen this flour, how it wol go to reste,
 For fere of nyght, so hateth she derknesse.

(60-63)

The allegorical figures of Daunger and Pitee are mentioned in Chaucer's Prologue, but only in connection with the springtime love-making of the birds (160 and 161); no obstacles keep Chaucer from his daisy. Behind the touching simplicity and directness of this love for a literal daisy, Frank rightly suspects also "a sly and cheeky mockery of the worshipful lover and the worship of love" (p. 22). In the light of the preceding discussion, I suggest that the "worshipful lover" is Amant.

Next, to preserve the parallelism with the *Roman*, the God of Love should appear, and he does. But how differently he reacts to Chaucer! Amant followed the prescribed pattern of respectful humility before the deity and received Amours' smiling help and Jean's indulgent approval. Chaucer follows the same pattern, "knelyng by this flour, in good entente" (308); but when the God of Love discovers his identity, he objects strenuously: "Yt were better worthy, trewely, / A worm to neghen ner my flour than thow" (317-18). Not only does the pattern approved by Jean (however much he considered himself above it) not work for Chaucer, but when Chaucer innocently asks why, the angry god blasts him with the accusation of heresy for having translated Jean's work.

It is a marvelous trick to pull on Jean. Jean had envisioned himself serving Amours all his life with his "cueur joli" and his "cors inel" (10566 and 10569); the God of Love curtly informs Chaucer that despite having followed Jean's lead, he is "nothing able" in love (320). Jean considered himself the special friend of Amours ("tant mes amis," Amours had called him, 10636); but for translating Jean, Chaucer is "my foo" (322). Finally, Jean considered his work a great benefit to all lovers and Amours had graciously concurred in the opinion (10648-51); but for emulating him Jean's friend now tells Chaucer:

And thow . . . al my folk werreyest,
 And of myn olde servauntes thow mysseyest,
 And hynderest hem with thy translacioun,
 And lettest folk from hire devocioun
 To serve me, and holdest it folye

To serve Love. Thou maist yt nat denye,
 For in pleyn text, withouten nede of glose,
 Thou hast translated the Romaunce of the Rose,
 That is an heresye ayeins my lawe,
 And makest wise folk fro me withdrawe.

(322-31)

Every accusation against Chaucer thrusts also at Jean's happy ego, all the more effectively for its unassuming indirectness. Even the piling up of offenses mirrors ironically Jean's cataloguing of his virtues.

Although Chaucer sports with Jean even as he shares his blame, he also puts up a show of a defense against the charges. Whereas Amours speaks for Jean, Love's lady Alceste intervenes for Chaucer. Her excuses for him are designed, like his self-portrayal, to dissociate him from Jean's prideful heresies. First, she says, he may be falsely accused; someone may have lied either from envy or in an effort to make small talk with the god (350-61). By treating it as a standard libel to throw at an enemy, she acknowledges the gravity and magnitude of Jean's heresy; and on the surface she clears Chaucer by implying that he would not have gotten mixed up in this dastardly business of his own free will. But he did. Either the worm is confederate with the paragon, or — and Alceste offers a second alibi:

And eke, peraunter, for this man ys nyce,
 He myghte doon yt, gessyng no malice,
 But for he useth thynges for to make;
 Hym rekketh noght of what matere he take.

(362-5)

Jean wrote the *Roman*, or would write it, Amours had said, because he would be "si tr'es sages on" (10571) [a very wise man]. What a blow to his self image that the only reason Alceste can imagine for Chaucer's having translated him is that he is "nyce" and pays little attention to what he writes! Her excuse makes Chaucer's mentality the exact opposite of Jean's; but the wise reader "suspect[s] Chaucer most when he is being most guileless and simple-seeming" (Frank, p. 21). If Alceste is taken in by Chaucer's simplicity, the perceptive reader probably already suspects that the worm and the paragon are indeed in league.

The third hypothesis Alceste offers, that the work was commanded, is a rather neutral one; except that it may ironically be providing Chaucer

with a defense for what is turning out to be a very unconventional prologue to another "command performance." It also subtly calls attention to the fact that writing by command does not cramp Chaucer's style. He is always the master of his material — and hence, if he translated the *Roman*, he almost certainly did it fully conscious of its contents and implications. This train of reasoning takes place in the reader, of course, not in the text; but it seems to occur to Alceste also, at least obscurely, for her next defense is to abandon excuse. Perhaps Chaucer repents "outruly" of the deed, she says, and anyway:

He ne hath nat doon so greuously amys,
 To translaten that olde clerkes writen,
 As thogh that he of malice wolde enditen
 Despit of love, and had himself yt wrought.

(369-72)

Jean is relegated to the innocuous realm of "olde clerkes" in an effort to minimize Chaucer's offense. The thoughts were all Jean's, not Chaucer's; Chaucer merely "followed his author" — a favorite refuge in a touchy situation.

Alceste concludes with a summary of his achievements for the God of Love which again contrasts Chaucer most comically with his illustrious nemesis:

Leteth youre ire, and beth sumwhat trefable.
 The man hath served yow of his kunnyng,
 And furthred wel youre lawe in his makynge.
 Al be hit that he kan nat wel endite,
 Yet hath he maked lewed folk delyte
 To serve yow, in preysinge of your name.

(411-16)

Jean had Amours prophesy the glorious things he would accomplish with his pen; Chaucer has Alceste recapitulate his modest achievements. Jean sets himself up to teach the whole of France the truth about love; Chaucer claims only to have amused the unlearned. His pose of ineptness, at once a caricature of Amant and an inversion of Jean, convinces the God of Love that even if perhaps he is guilty, he is not very guilty. By making himself the antithesis of Jean, Chaucer renders the accusation a bit ludicrous. How could anyone so silly and ineffective actually have

committed heresy? Jean, yes. Jean with his irrepressible ego is capable of anything. But Chaucer? "This man ys nyce," Alceste assures everyone.

Although Chaucer gets himself off the hook completely at Jean's expense by satirizing him in every detail by which he dissociates himself from Jean, the satire is light-hearted and affectionate. Even his dissociation from Jean is only a surface one. The very stance which clears him with Alceste puts him undeniably in league with Jean; for they both play their respective roles to the same end, to justify the non-courtly contents of their works. Jean circumvents possible objections to the *Roman de la Rose* by making the God of Love his spokesman. Roguishly, he lets the deity of the courtly code baptize himself and his work. Chaucer, on his side, sneaks his work past the God of Love under cover of ignorance.

When he gets a chance to speak for himself, Chaucer reveals his alliance with Jean more clearly. Interestingly and significantly, he does not take the out Alceste offers. He thanks her humbly for her intervention, and adds:

But trewly I wende, as in this cas,
 Naught have agilt, ne doon to love trespas.
 For-why a trewe man, withouten drede,
 Hath nat to parten with a theves dede;
 Ne a trewe lover oght me not to blame,
 Thogh that I speke a fals love som shame.
 They oghte rather with me for to holde,
 For that I of Creseyde wroot or tolde,
 Or of the Rose; what so myn auctour mente,
 Algate, God woot, yt was myn entente
 To forthren trouthe in love and yt cheryce,
 And to ben war fro falsness and fro vice
 By swich ensample; this was my menyng.

(462-74)

Alceste dismisses his arguments and reminds him of his lowly position, of course, but Chaucer has revealed his mind. Whatever the courtly code dictates, he will write about love as it is — including false love — and true lovers should gratefully learn from it. But as Estrich points out, the warning is itself the heresy.¹⁵ Chaucer's heretical excuse even echoes Jean's explanation why vices are included in the *Roman*: "S'il vous plaist la les regardez, / Pour ce que d'aus meauz vous gardez" (19883-4)

[Look at them, if you please, so that you may better protect yourself from them]. Although Chaucer leaves Jean frying in his own grease ("what so myn auctour mente . . ."), he obviously does not think *he* has written heresy. Nor by implication has Jean.

Despite surface differences their basic goals and beliefs are strikingly similar, for Jean's influence on Chaucer was deep and pervasive. (And this is the exact opposite of the influence of the love poets, with whom the differences were striking and the similarities only surface.) Although Jean sets himself up as the model of love and Chaucer presents himself as a worm in love, both violate courtly expectations about the art of love. Both insist on viewing love in its broadest dimensions, unlimited by a restricting code. Although Jean pretentiously directs his work to all of France while Chaucer claims merely to entertain "lewed folk," both are firmly convinced of the truth and validity of their writings. Jean transcends the courtly while Chaucer undermines it, but they meet on the same plane of meaning.

And it is the self-conscious narrative voice which constitutes the focal point and creates the comedy in both works. Jean paints a stunning picture of himself, becomes enchanted with the image, and then exploits it to its most outrageous limits. Chaucer, in an equally outrageous stratagem, puts himself in the center of his work as a simple-minded bungler and becomes equally enchanted with piling up examples of his own ineptness — until it finally occurs to the reader that the *Dümmling* who can not reason his way out of a paper bag created the whole dazzling structure of the work. In fact, the *Dümmling* even manages hilariously in the end to have the *maistrye* over the *Wunderkind*, for he extricates himself and his work from the charge of heresy, leaving his predecessor to the mercy of the accusers. One finally suspects even that the humble, modest, innocent Geoffrey rather inclined to the belief that his works were more true and more valid than Jean de Meun's, and that even if what Jean wrote in the *Roman de la Rose* was heresy, it could not possibly be heresy coming from the pen of Geoffrey Chaucer. But of course no one would ever be able to make a charge of egotism stick on the rascal . . .

Sherron Knopp received an A.B. in English from Loyola University of Chicago in 1971 and an M.A. from UCLA in 1972. She is attending UCLA on a 4-year Chancellor's Intern Fellowship, and from 1972-1974 has been a Teaching Assistant in the Department of English. She is currently writing a dissertation on comic and ironic self-concepts of medieval narrators under the direction of Prof. Florence H. Ridley.

Notes

1. *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, 2nd ed. (1933; rpt. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1957), p. 564.
2. John L. Lowes, "The Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women* as related to the French Marguerite Poems, and the *Filostrato*" *PMLA*, 19 (1904), 593-683; Marian Lossing, "The Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women* and the *Lai de Franchise*," *SP*, 39 (1942), 15-35; George L. Kittredge, "Chauceriana," *MP*, 7 (1910), 463-83, first suggested Mauchaut's *Le Jugement dou Roy de Navarre* as a source; Robert Estrich, "Chaucer's Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women* and Mauchaut's *Le Jugement dou Roy de Navarre*," *SP*, 36 (1939), 20-39, develops Kittredge's suggestion.
3. This and all quotations of Chaucer are from Robinson's edition. Citations of the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women* are from the F version. For editions of the French poems, see the *Dit de la Marguerite* in *Oeuvres de Guillaume de Machaut*, ed. Prosper Tarbé (Paris: Techener, 1849), pp. 65-67; the *Dittie de la Flour de la Margherite* in *Oeuvres de Froissart: Poésies*, ed. M. Aug. Scheler, 3 vols. (Bruxelles: Victor Devaux, 1870-72), II, 209-15; the *Lai de Franchise* in *Oeuvres Complètes de Eustache Deschamps*, ed. le Marquis de Saint-Hilaire et G. Raynaud, 11 vols., SATF (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1878-1904), II, 203-14.
4. Further, as Miss Lossing justly points out (pp. 16-17), the poems "show a dependence upon each other which is fully as marked as Chaucer's dependence upon them," making it extremely difficult to distinguish which one is Chaucer's immediate source.
5. *Le Paradys d'Amours* in *Oeuvres de Froissart*, ed. Scheler, I, 1-53; *Le Jugement dou Roy de Navarre* in *Oeuvres de Guillaume de Machaut*, ed. Ernest Hoepffner, 3 vols., SATF (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1908-21), I, 137-282.
6. *Studies in Chaucer's Hous of Fame*, Chaucer Society, 2nd series, No. 39 (London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1907), pp. 25-41.
7. The influence of the *Roman de la Rose* on Chaucer has been the subject of surprisingly few studies. The only general ones are Lisi Cipriani, "Studies in the Influence of the *Romance of the Rose* upon Chaucer," *PMLA*, 22 (1907), 552-95, and Dean Spruill Fansler, *Chaucer and the Roman de la Rose* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1914). Both concentrate almost exclusively on structural and verbal parallels. More recently, Charles Muscatine, *Chaucer and the French Tradition: A Study in Style and Meaning* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957), pp. 71-97, argues for a freer and more fruitful interpretation based on the profound unity of spirit between the two authors — a spirit which would have been the most important aspect of Jean's influence "had Chaucer never borrowed a line from Jean" (p. 96). This is the kind of influence I am trying to explore here.

8. *Roman de la Rose*, ed. E. Langlois, 5 vols., SATF (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1914-24). All quotations of the *Roman de la Rose* are from this edition. I wish to thank Professor Lora Weinroth of the UCLA French Department for help with the translations.
9. Alan Gunn, *The Mirror of Love: A Reinterpretation of the Romance of the Rose* (Lubbock, Tex.: Texas Tech. Press, 1952), p. 426, calls it "one of the most brilliant and moving passages of the whole work, and almost the most important one structurally," but he misses the wonderful humor in it.
10. For various views, see Charles Dahlberg, "Love in the *Romance of the Rose*," *Speculum*, 44 (1969), 568; Lionel J. Friedman, "'Jean de Meung,' Antifeminism, and 'Bourgeois Realism,'" *MP*, 57 (1959), 14; Stephen G. Nichols, Jr., "The Rhetoric of Sincerity in the *Roman de la Rose*," in *Romance Studies in Memory of Edward Billings Ham*, ed. Urban T. Holmes, Calif. State College Publications, No. 2 (Hayward, Ca.: California State College, 1967), p. 119; Alan Gunn, "Teacher and Student in the *Roman de la Rose*: A Study in Archetypal Figures and Patterns," *L'Esprit Créateur*, 2 (1962), 129.
11. An unusual and interesting use of what Morton Bloomfield calls "authenticating realism" – comically accomplished by juxtaposing the real (Jean and Guillaume as historical persons) and the fictional (Amours). Cf. Bloomfield, "Authenticating Realism and the Realism of Chaucer," *Thought*, 39 (1964), 335-58.
12. Machaut's troubles are recounted in *Le Jugement dou Roy de Navarre*; for Christine de Pisan and Jean de Meun, see Charles F. Ward, ed., *The Epistles on the Romance of the Rose and Other Documents in the Debate*, Chicago Diss., 1911; for Alain Chartier, see the letters and Alain's "Excusacion" in *La Belle Dame sans Mercy*, ed. Arthur Piaget (Lille: Librairie Giard, 1949), pp. 34-44.
13. *Chaucer and the Legend of Good Women* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972), p. 27.
14. For arguments against an allegorical reading of the daisy, see Frank's notes on pp. 22 and 24.
15. "Chaucer's Maturing Art in the Prologues to the *Legend of Good Women*," *JEGP*, 36 (1937), 330.