

evidence opposing the idea of Chaucer's boredom, making the nineteenth century theories seem fabricated.

Frank starts refuting the individual boredom charges of later days on page 112, including an interesting parenthese that notes the popularity of the Legend in the 15th, 16th, and 19th centuries. One professor in the 19th century, W.W. Skeats used it as a text for beginning students of early English literature. This same Skeats pointed out, in 1889, that line 2465 of the Legend "...is a hint that Chaucer was already getting tired of his task." A few years later Thomas R. Lounsbury wrote, in his Studies in Chaucer, 1892, that Chaucer was "...steadily growing (dissatisfied)...with his subject which marks its progress (p. 335)," because he felt the legends stifled Chaucer's imagination. This Lounsbury, says Frank, is "...the wellspring of the judgment that Chaucer wearied unto nausea of the Legend," but adds that he thinks Lounsbury is not being "broadminded" enough. (p. 114)

A J.B. Bilderbeck made the strongest statement on the question of Boredom in his Chaucer's Legend of Good Women, London 1902. It seems to him that "...it may be urged that the scheme of the Legend, as a whole, was one which could hardly have commended itself to the author's temperament, and which it is improbable he would have voluntarily undertaken, in view of the burdensome monotony incidental to such treatment of such a subject." (Frank, p. 114)

Frank rejects Lounsbury's premises and moves to his own textual evidences. The evidences, he believes, fall in two catagories. "The great majority are interpreted as expression more or less explicitly by Chaucer that his task bored him. In conjunction with the passages interpreted as expressions of boredom, the fact that the scheme is incomplete and the final tale...is unfinished becomes further evidence that Chaucer grew weary. Finally there is