

of his audience and the role he had as a writer heretofore." Frank tells us to look at the tales used as "... an oblique challenge to the code (courtly love)." Frank draws an analogy between the Legend and Whitman's Leaves of Grass, and ends his discussion of the Prologue with this laudatory statement; "It serves to break through not to a democratic poetry, but to a poetry more of the world and less of the garden, to a realm of experience beyond the patterned and polite, the limited and predictable emotions and movement of courtly love." (pp.35-36) This last statement can also be applied to Frank's opinions of the majority of the tales.

Although Frank dismisses the controversy over precedence of versions of the Prologue the controversy has popped up in recent years, and is studied in John Gardner's essay published in the Journal of English and German Philology entitled "The Two Prologues to 'The Legend of Good Women.'" (2) Besides his own theories on why there are two prologues to the Legend Gardner presents four fairly well recognized theories from the past. The first presented by J.S.P. Tatlock, Mind and Art of Chaucer, Syracuse, (p. 75) centers his speculation on the death of Queen Anne, and thinks Chaucer removed some of the "silliness" to please Richard II. The second is from F.W. Robinson's 1957 edition of The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, Boston, and he vaguely feels that the revision was made because "Chaucer wanted to improve the general organization of the Prologue." (p. 839) The third comes from Kemp Malone's Chapters on Chaucer, Baltimore, 1957, which says the "...revision reflects Chaucer's altered sense of what constitutes good poetic style." (p. 99) The fourth, and last, theory is D.D. Griffith's from An Interpretation of Chaucer's "Legend of Good Women", Chicago, 1923, which feels "Chaucer's object was to revise out the obvious use of Christian