

11
service, for which Chaucer in his mature years felt increasing respect." (p. 40)

Gardner feels "None of the theories is fully acceptable," and the clarity of Text G is by no means always greater than of Text F." (p. 595) The differences in the two texts seem to Gardner to "...reflect differences not in Chaucer's taste but in his artistic purpose...religious overtones in Text F disappear or weaken into pure convention in Text G." (p. 597) Chaucer seems to be suppressing his first prologue's analogy between Christian service and the service of Cupid." (p. 599) Gardner finds two reasons for revisions of the Prologue, "First, as Tatlock and others have argued, he meant to revise out references to Queen Anne and her poetasting court. Second - and this is the point I should like to develop here- Chaucer revised Prologue F because it was not consistent with the legend[?] it was to introduce." (p. 604)

The first of the two Prologues makes fun of love by openly burlesquing its silliness. The second, like the tales themselves, asserts the ideal but qualifies the assertion by comically exaggerating, among other things, the true lover's virtue and non-lover's stupidity. (p. 606) In touching on aesthetics and themes, Gardner finds the original narrator "...dainty, too gentle, childlike, (and) incompetent." (p. 606) "The narrator's dream, like his waking experience, gently satirizes the amorous cults." (p. 609) "Prologue G differs from Prologue F, then, chiefly in that it presents a new more serious view of Love, with the result that the narrator must be made, throughout, more realistic without ceasing to be comic, and with the further result that the logical (or psuedo-logical) structure of the original prologue must be abandoned in favor of one much simpler and, unfortunately, less delightful." (p. 610) Gardner sees the F narrator as "...less